UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 1

JANUARY 10, 1966, TO JANUARY 27, 1966
(PAGES 1 TO 1414)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1966

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

J
11
.R
v. 112
pt 1

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1966

The 10th day of January being the day prescribed by Public Law 89–340, 89th Congress, 1st session, for the meeting of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, the Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

The VICE PRESIDENT called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, of the Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, before whom nations rise and fall, grant us now the grace to be still and to know that Thou art God. Thou art the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob. Thou art, too, the God of Washington, of Lincoln, and of the Unknown Soldier. Be now the God of these chosen and trusted leaders of the people who, in this new year, are again assembled in the Nation's service.

We recognize Thy guiding hand in the high achievements wrought in this historic Chamber in the year that is gone. May this new year record new and even greater strides toward the shining goal of freedom and the common good that is the American dream.

For such continuing achievement inspire and equip Thy servants in this new session. Grant them strength equal to their task, integrity equal to all testings, wisdom sufficient to light the way ahead, devotion to match each day's demands.

We pray that in these days of mortal peril America may be privileged to lift a brave, clear voice in the council of the nations in defiance of terror and all tyranny, and in defense of the things that make for peace. Grant that this voice, so widely heard, may find ready and friendly response throughout the earth.

May our own deeds make it manifest to all mankind that our sincere desire is for the rejection of war as the brutal, senseless arbiter among the nations, and for the establishment of the rule of reason and justice in good will among men.

So may the peoples and races of all mankind have reason to rejoice with us that Thou hast made and preserved us a nation. In the name of Christ. Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 1 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Ellender
Fannin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

SENATOR FROM VIRGINIA—CREDENTIALS—RESIGNATION AND APPOINTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the Governor of Virginia, with an enclosure, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Richmond, November 12, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: The Honorable Harry F. Byrd submitted his resignation as a Member of the U.S. Senate as of 10 p.m. Wednesday, November 10, 1965. It was accepted as of that date and recorded in the Executive Journal November 11, 1965.

A copy of Senator Byrd's letter of resignation is enclosed.

Sincerely yours,
A. S. HARRISON, JR.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
November 6, 1965.

His Excellency ALBERTIS S. HARRISON, Jr.,
Governor of Virginia,
Richmond, Va.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR HARRISON: It was 50 years ago this month that I first was elected to the Senate of Virginia. Since then through the partiality and generosity of the people of Virginia I have served as Governor of our Commonwealth and for nearly 33 years I have served in the U.S. Senate.

The people of Virginia have been so very good to me and I have overwhelming gratitude for the confidence they have shown in me through so many years. I have sought to merit this confidence by dedicating myself to those programs and policies which, in my judgment, were in the best interests of all the people of our State and Nation. I am fully conscious, of course, that I have made errors of judgment, but I have sought, as best I could, to conscientiously discharge my responsibilities to the best of my ability.

Always have I tried to be frank with the people of Virginia. During this past session of Congress, which was a long and difficult one, I found that the burdens of office bore more heavily on my shoulders than at any time in the past. I found that I tired more easily, particularly during the long committee sessions. In looking toward the forthcoming session, which starts in January, and after consultations with my physicians concerning the pain I have been suffering as a result of arthritis, I have reluctantly reached the conclusion that I must give up the heavy responsibilities entrusted to me by the people of Virginia. I have concluded that the time has come for someone younger to bear these burdens and shoulder these responsibilities.

I hereby submit my resignation as a Member of the U.S. Senate, to become effective upon receipt of this letter.

While this letter is addressed to you, Albertis, as the chief executive of our Commonwealth, I would be pleased for you to make it available to the people of Virginia, for whom, in my heart, I have enduring gratitude. While I shall no longer be in public office I shall continue to take a keen interest in Virginia and in her people.

To you, personally, I send my warm regards.

Faithfully,

Harry F. Byrd.

Received and accepted this date, November 10, 1965, and recorded November 11, 1965.

A. S. Harrison, Jr.,
Governor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter of resignation will be placed on file with the Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I present the certificate of appointment of Hon. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., as a Senator from the State of Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate of appointment will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Commonwealth of Virginia,
Governor's Office,
Richmond, November 12, 1965.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: I enclose certificate appointing the Honorable Harry F. Byrd, Jr., of Winchester, Va., to fill the vacancy in the office of U.S. Senator from Virginia.

Respectfully yours,

A. S. Harrison, Jr.

Certificate of Appointment

Commonwealth of Virginia,
Governor's Office,
Richmond.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Virginia, I, Albertis S. Harrison, Jr., the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint Harry F. Byrd, Jr., a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the resignation of Harry F. Byrd, is filled by election as provided by law.

Witness: His excellency our Governor Albertis S. Harrison, Jr., and our seal hereto affixed at Richmond, Va., this 12th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1965.

By the Governor:

Albertis S. Harrison, Jr.,
Governor.

Carter O. Lowance,
Acting Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate of appointment will be placed on file with the Secretary of the Senate.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The VICE PRESIDENT. The new Senator from the State of Virginia will come forward and the oath of office will be administered to him.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., escorted by Mr. Robertson, advanced to the desk of the Vice President; the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President; and he subscribed to the oath in the official book. [Applause, Senators rising.]

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

Alabama.—Lister Hill and John J. Sparkman.

Alaska.—E. L. Bartlett and Ernest Gruening.

Arizona.—Carl Hayden and Paul J. Fannin.

Arkansas.—John L. McClellan and J. W. Fulbright.

California.—Thomas H. Kuchel and George Murphy.

Colorado.—Gordon Allott and Peter H. Dominick.

Connecticut.—Thomas J. Dodd and Abraham A. Ribicoff.

Delaware.—John J. Williams and J. Caleb Boggs.

Florida.—Spessard L. Holland and George A. Smathers.

Georgia.—Richard B. Russell and Herman E. Talmadge.

Hawaii.—Hiram L. Fong and Daniel K. Inouye.

Idaho.—Frank Church and Len B. Jordan.

Illinois.—Paul H. Douglas and Everett McKinley Dirksen.

Indiana.—Vance Hartke and Birch E. Bayh.

Iowa.—Bourke B. Hickenlooper and Jack Miller.

Kansas.—Frank Carlson and James B. Pearson.

Kentucky.—John S. Cooper and Thruston B. Morton.

Louisiana.—Allen J. Ellender and Russell B. Long.

Maine.—Margaret Chase Smith and Edmund S. Muskie.

Maryland.—Daniel B. Brewster and Joseph D. Tydings.

Massachusetts.—Leverett Saltonstall and Edward M. Kennedy.

Michigan.—Pat McNamara and Philip A. Hart.

Minnesota.—Eugene J. McCarthy and Walter F. Mondale.

Mississippi.—James O. Eastland and John Stennis.

Missouri.—Stuart Symington and Edward V. Long.

Montana.—Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf.

Nebraska.—Roman L. Hruska and Carl T. Curtis.

Nevada.—Alan Bible and Howard W. Cannon.

New Hampshire.—Norris Cotton and Thomas J. McIntyre.

New Jersey.—Clifford P. Case and Harrison A. Williams, Jr.

New Mexico.—Clinton P. Anderson and Joseph M. Montoya.

New York.—Jacob K. Javits and Robert F. Kennedy.

North Carolina.—Sam J. Ervin, Jr., and B. Everett Jordan.

North Dakota.—Milton R. Young and Quentin N. Burdick.

Ohio—Frank J. Lausche and Stephen M. Young.

Oklahoma.—A. S. Mike Monroney and Fred R. Harris.

Oregon.—Wayne Morse and Maurine B. Neuberger.

Pennsylvania.—Joseph S. Clark and Hugh Scott.

Rhode Island.—John O. Pastore and Claiborne Pell.

South Carolina.—Strom Thurmond and Donald Russell.

South Dakota.—Karl E. Mundt and George S. McGovern.

Tennessee.—Albert Gore and Ross Bass.

Texas.—Ralph W. Yarborough and John G. Tower.

Utah.—Wallace F. Bennett and Frank E. Moss.

Vermont.—George D. Aiken and Winston L. Prouty.

Virginia.—A. Willis Robertson and Harry Flood Byrd, Jr.

Washington.—Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson.

West Virginia.—Jennings Randolph and Robert C. Byrd.

Wisconsin.—William Proxmire and Gaylord Nelson.

Wyoming.—Gale W. McGee and Milward L. Simpson.

RESIGNATION OF FELTON M. JOHNSTON AS SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND JOSEPH C. DUKE AS SERGEANT AT ARMS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate sundry communications to the Senate. The communications will be printed in the Record at this point.

The communications are as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Office of the Secretary,
November 29, 1965.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
Vice President of the United States,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Vice President: As you are aware, my term of office as Secretary of the Senate is scheduled to end the close of business December 31, 1965, as provided by Senate Resolution 140, agreed to August 20, 1965.

I have been advised that Public Law 89–314, approved November 1, 1965, extends the period during which prospective annuitants may receive the annuity increase of 6.1 percent to the close of business December 30, 1965, instead of the previously authorized date of November 30, 1965. For this reason, I feel that I would be greatly benefited by advancing my retirement by 1 day. I understand that this will create no problem in the administrative operation of the Senate so I, therefore, submit to you my resignation as Secretary of the Senate to be effective the close of business December 30, 1965.

Sincerely yours,

Felton M. Johnston,
Secretary of the Senate.

The Vice President,
Washington, D.C., November 29, 1965.

Mr. Robert A. Brenkworth,
Financial Clerk,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Brenkworth: This is to advise you that I have accepted the resignation of Felton M. Johnston as Secretary of the Senate, effective the close of business December 30, 1965. This action is taken in my capacity as President of the Senate since the Senate is in adjournment and, therefore, is unable to act on the resignation submitted by Mr. Johnston.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Hubert H. Humphrey.

U. S. Senate,
Office of the Sergeant at Arms,
Washington, D.C., December 29, 1965.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the U.S. Senate.

Dear Mr. Vice President: In the absence of the U.S. Senate, I hereby submit to you, as President of the Senate, my resignation as

Sergeant at Arms of the Senate to be effective at the close of business December 30, 1965.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH C. DUKE,
Sergeant at Arms.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., January 6, 1966.

Mr. ROBERT A. BRENKWORTH,
Financial Clerk, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRENKWORTH: This is to advise you that I have accepted the resignation of Joseph C. Duke as Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, effective the close of business December 30, 1965. This action is taken in my capacity as President of the Senate since the Senate is in adjournment and, therefore, is unable to act on the resignation submitted by Mr. Duke.

Best wishes,

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 165) which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 165

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. DIRKSEN the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 166) which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 166

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 167), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

S. RES. 167

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 8 O'CLOCK P.M., WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1966—JOINT SESSION TO RECEIVE MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with Senate practice, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 8 p.m., Wednesday, January 12, when it will assemble in a body to proceed to the Chamber of the House of Representatives to hear in joint session the message of the President on the state of the Union at 9 p.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until 8 o'clock p.m. on Wednesday, January 12, 1966.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1966

This being the day fixed by Public Law 340, 89th Congress, enacted pursuant to the 20th amendment of the Constitution, for the meeting of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, the Members of the Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock were called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Hon. CARL ALBERT, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) laid before the House the following communication:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1966.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words of Scripture: Zechariah 4: 6: *Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts.*

Almighty God, we humbly beseech Thee that the clear and unmistakable mandates of Thy Spirit may now guide our President, our Speaker, and the Members of the Congress, as they enter upon this second session.

Grant that some finer essence of good will and love may inspire humanity as it searches and strives for the peace of the world.

Help us to share in the mission and ministry of our blessed Lord, who taught us to pray:

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven; give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever.

Amen.

RESIGNATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 14, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker of the House of Representatives,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As of the close of business on December 30, 1965, I hereby tender my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives, representing the 17th Congressional District of the State of New York.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN V. LINDSAY.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Gross
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss

Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 385 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ELECTION OF HON. CARL ALBERT, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA, AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair requests the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] to assume the chair.

Mr. BOGGS assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on account of the unavoidable absence of the Speaker due to the death of his beloved brother, and at his request, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 627

Resolved, That Hon. CARL ALBERT, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of the Honorable CARL ALBERT as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ALBERT assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore and Mr. CELLER administered the oath of office.

CERTIFICATES OF ELECTION TO THE 89TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) laid before the House the following communications which were read by the Clerk:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1966.

The Honorable THE SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., as a Representative-elect to the 89th Congress from the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Ohio, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Clarence J. Brown is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1966.

The Honorable THE SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of THOMAS M. REES as a Representative-elect to the 89th Congress from the 26th Congressional District of the State of California, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable James Roosevelt, is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., and Mr. REES appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 628

Resolved, That a committee of three members be appointed by the Speaker pro tempore on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate, to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled, and Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

NOTIFICATION TO SENATE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 629

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House inform the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration and ordered printed:

JANUARY 10, 1966.

The Honorable THE SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: In compliance with the requirements of rule III, clause 2, of the rules of the House of Representatives, I have the honor to submit herewith a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress.

Very respectfully,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

ELECTION OF EDWARD A. GARMATZ OF MARYLAND TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 630) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 630

Resolved, That EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 631

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be at 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, your committee on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty. The President asked us to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 9 o'clock p.m., January 12, 1966, to a joint session of the two Houses.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1966

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 529

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, January 12, 1966, at 9 o'clock p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

S. RES. 165

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

S. RES. 166

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

RECESS ON JANUARY 12, 1966

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, January 12, 1966, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY OF THIS WEEK

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS IN THE RECORD

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, and without making the procedure a precedent, all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD and to include pertinent material therewith.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Speaker has asked me to announce that on Wednesday, January 12, 1966, the date set for the joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open. No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM MUST NOT BE USED TO STIFLE DISSENT

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, during the recess of the Congress, serious questions have been raised about the Selective Service System being used punitively and as a device for muffling political protest. I am deeply concerned that in the situation of the reclassification of a number of University of Michigan students after a protest demonstration or sitin at the Ann Arbor, Mich., selective service board, the draft was used as a means of punishing the demonstrators.

While the Selective Service System insists that it is not employing its powers of military conscription to punish or threaten to punish those who engage in political protests and demonstrations, nonetheless, the result of the Ann Arbor affair most assuredly has created that impression.

While we are not operating within the framework of a formal declaration of war, clearly, we are actively fighting a war in Vietnam. As a result emotions are running high here at home. There is widespread criticism of our Vietnam policy which has been manifested by widespread protest, much of it generated by students and young people. In such a situation we must make sure that there is no erosion in the bedrock of our society—the guarantees of freedom of speech and freedom to dissent.

I firmly believe that the draft should not be used as an instrument of law enforcement. Violations of the law should be prosecuted by the appropriate law enforcement agencies, not by local draft boards.

Because of my strong feelings on this particular matter, I have lodged with the Director of the Selective Service System, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, a protest and a request that he reconsider and review his department's position to insure that the draft never is allowed to become an instrument of the state to suppress lawful political protest.

ELIMINATE THE MEDICARE DISCLAIMER

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill striking out provisions in the Social Security Amendments of 1965—the medicare bill—on which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has based a decision to require some 2 million American citizens, aged 65 and over, to sign and file a disclaimer of membership in the last 12 months in any organization "which is required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950 as a Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization or a Communist-infiltrated organization."

Along with filing this bill I have protested to John W. Gardner, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the decision of his Department to extract from these 2 million free Americans this unnecessary and demeaning disclaimer.

The effect of this requirement, to condition much-needed health benefits on the signing and filing of the affidavit, is, I believe, not required by the medicare law—Public Law 89-97. Rather, in my opinion, the requirement of the disclaimer is based on an administrative decision of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Nonetheless, if the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare persists in contending that the medicare bill demands the disclaimer, then the offensive sections of the law should be stricken.

My bill accomplishes this by amending the Social Security Amendments of 1965 and eliminating the provisions which deny hospital insurance benefits to uninsured individuals who are members of certain organizations or have been convicted of certain offenses and to eliminate the provisions which deny supplementary medical insurance benefits to persons who have been convicted of certain offenses.

Mr. Speaker, it is my abiding conviction that such disclaimer affidavits infringe on the rights of free Americans no less than loyalty oaths or other bald attempts to enforce, or attempts to guarantee, a unanimity of ideological beliefs. I personally have fought many wars over this principle, and it is disturbing that there must be still another test on this issue.

It seems incredible to me at this point in time, when happily there is a decrease in such manifestations of the politically inspired witch hunting which swept this country in the early 1950's, that this unfortunate situation has developed in the administration of a program for providing health benefits to our aged citizens. Why only last session, the Congress eliminated disclaimers as requirements for participation in the Job Corps and for VISTA volunteers as part of the Federal Government's antipoverty program.

Furthermore, it was not so long ago that the Congress amended the National Defense Education Act to eliminate a disclaimer that for years the academic community had considered offensive—so offensive, in fact, that many of our leading colleges and universities refused to participate in the programs that were established by the act.

Even Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Gardner stated in a television interview January 2 that he, personally, was not sympathetic with the concept of the affidavit.

Significantly, members of other groups within our society—such as farmers and businessmen—are not required to formally swear fealty to our Government in order to participate in Federal programs of financial or technical assistance. Why demand this disclaimer of these 2 million elderly Americans?

Can we be blind to the manifest folly of these disclaimers? Do they not tell millions of our aged that, unless they are guarded about whom they associate with, that they run the grave risk of losing their eligibility for this new Government health program? And is this not a patent infringement of the rights of the individual? Of course, it is. There is no need for me to labor the point.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is not a new one for any of us. What is startling, as I have already noted, is that I am forced to speak out here today in support of a bill whose only purpose is to reassert the fundamental rights of the individual.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by stating that all that is required now is for the Congress to affirm that, when it passed the medicare bill last session, it authorized no disclaimer, no disqualifications, no loyalty oaths. I call upon the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to eliminate the disclaimer by administrative action. If he fails to do so, then favorable action on my bill would constitute that affirmation.

NON-COMMUNIST AFFIDAVIT REQUIREMENT FOR HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL BENEFITS

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to eliminate from the Medicare Act the provision that allegedly requires some 2 million elderly persons to sign a non-Communist affidavit before becoming eligible for hospital and medical benefits. I say "allegedly" because it is clear that it was not the intention of Congress to require such an affidavit. It was an administrative decision on the part of HEW to demand that all of the 2 million who are presently uninsured under social security, railroad retirement, or civil service programs sign this affidavit. That decision is wrong.

Let it be pointed out that persons in this category must vow that they are not members, as defined by the Internal Security Act of 1950, of a "Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization, or a Communist-infiltrated organization." The only organization to so qualify, according to the Justice Department, is the Communist Party itself. But an aged person who goes into a social security office to make his claim does not necessarily know that. The application does not tell him that. He must guess, and thus may very well be deterred from applying, fearful that he may be ineligible or, perhaps, committing perjury. Let it further be noted that the procedure does not make a similar demand on those belonging to Fascist organizations, such as the Ku Klux Klan or the American Nazi Party. Does HEW or Congress mean to suggest thereby that it is acceptable to be a Ku Kluxer or a Nazi? Finally let me point out that such a disclaimer is not required of persons applying for crop loans, business loans, or shipping subsidies. Why then single out elderly persons who apply for medicare?

I personally find it reprehensible that we must apply a political test for a health benefit to a person who seeks in his declining years the comfort of medical and health insurance. I think HEW is wrong in its interpretation of the law. I would, in fact, like to insert into the RECORD a brief prepared by the American Civil Liberties Union, sent to me in the form of a letter and which demonstrates incontrovertibly how grievously HEW is in error. But to eliminate all equivocation, my bill will strike out that section of the Medicare Act on which HEW bases its decision. I think it should be the clear expression of Congress that this vestige of a shameful era of our history be excised from the administration of the Medicare Act.

I include January 4, 1966, letter from American Civil Liberties Union:

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
Washington, D.C., January 4, 1966.

DEAR SIR: Undoubtedly you have read in the press that the Social Security Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is requiring an estimated 2 million elderly persons to answer a complex non-Communist question before they qualify for benefits under the recently passed medicare bill (Public Law 89–97).

Form SSA–18, entitled "Application for Hospital Insurance Entitlement" contains the following question:

"Are you now, or have you been during the last 12 months, a member of any organization which is required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950 as a Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization, or a Communist-infiltrated organization?"

Under the medicare law, 19 million Americans, aged 65 and over, will be eligible for payments covering a substantial portion of hospital costs beginning July 1, 1966. Most of them are now covered under social security, railroad retirement, or civil service programs. Benefits for approximately 2 million, presently uninsured, will be financed from general Treasury funds and it is this group which has to file this form.

HEW officials are quoted in the press as claiming they have no choice but to obey the mandate of Congress. However, that is simply not true. HEW, by a simple administrative decision, could eliminate the question, since it is not specifically required in the law as passed by Congress. This is the latest error by HEW in what can only be described as a comedy of errors by that Department with regard to this section of the medicare bill.

The alleged basis for the HEW requirement is section 103, under the title "Transitional Provision on Eligibility of Presently Uninsured Individuals for Hospital Insurance Benefits." Its subsection (a) sets forth those who are eligible for hospital benefits who are presently uninsured.

Section 103(b), however, disqualifies any individual "who is, at the beginning of the first month in which he meets the requirements of subsection (a), a member of any organization referred to in section 210(a) (17) of the Social Security Act."

That section in the Social Security Act is found in 42 U.S.C. section 410(a)(17) containing definitions relating to employment. It holds that employment for social security benefits shall not include "service in the employ of any organization which is performed (a) in any quarter during any part of which such organization is registered or there is in effect a final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board requiring such organizations to register, under the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended, as a Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization, or a Communist-infiltrated organization and (b) after June 30, 1956."

It should be noted that the responsibility for the disqualification section in the medicare bill was initially HEW's. That Department, in drafting the original medicare bill included section 103(b), because "it supposed that Congress" wanted it. It now seeks to justify its non-Communist question on the application on the same basis. However, HEW is wrong for the following reasons:

1. Congress did not specifically require this question to be asked, although there is a disqualification in the law for membership in such organizations. Congress did not specify that any individual, before he could qualify for medicare, had to answer such a question. The asking of this question was wholly an administrative decision by HEW.

In contrast, the Congress, recently, in amending the National Defense Education Act (Public Law 87–835), eliminated such a disclaimer and substituted for it a provision making it a criminal offense for any member of a Communist organization to apply for, or attempt to use, any payment or loan under the National Defense Education Act. This substitution we find also offensive, but it was clearly the intent of Congress, in passing the National Defense Education Act amendment, not to permit asking the question of whether individuals were members of such organizations. In fact, the major purpose of the amendment was specifically to eliminate the disclaimer that was considered such an affront to the academic community.

2. There is nothing in the law, as passed by Congress, that refers to the last 12 months. This, again, was an administrative decision by HEW. The disqualification set forth in the law refers solely to membership at the beginning of the first month in which the individual meets the requirements of applying for medicare.

3. Although HEW has contended in a number of newspaper stories that it was required to place this provision in the application, it is interesting to note that queries

of other disqualifications in the law are not asked of applicants. For example, individuals who have been convicted of offenses under chapter 37 (relating to espionage and censorship), chapter 105 (relating to sabotage), chapter 115 (relating to treason, sedition and subversive activities under title 18 of the United States Code), or section 412 or 413 of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended, are barred under section 104 of the law, but no inquiry concerning these offenses is made.

Nowhere on the application is there any indication as to what organizations are required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950. It is difficult for an individual to find out which organizations fall within this category. There is no indication, for example, that there is not now a final order made by the Subversive Activities Control Board for any organization to register as a Communist-infiltrated, and that the only one against whom an order has been made to register as a Communist-action organization is the Communist Party, U.S.A., and that the only orders against so-called Communist-front organizations are against organizations which haven't been in existence for years. As to the number of such organizations, we can only point to the confusion exposed in a recent article in the Reporter magazine:

> "It is a measure of the difficulty applicants for medicare benefits may have in truthfully answering the question that the Times, going on the basis of orders of the SACB, figured membership in about 20 organizations, other than the Communist Party, to be relevant. The Social Security Administration told us the figure, excluding the party, was seven. And an official of the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice pointed out that only five of these seven in fact had final orders against them—adding that, in any event, all seven were now defunct."

Needless to say, the form has been presented to applicants with no list attached. People should not have to guess about what they are signing.

So far I have only discussed why HEW has not only the power and authority to eliminate the non-Communist question from SAA-18, but, indeed, should not have included it in the first place.

However, isn't it about time that the irrelevant, discriminatory, and punitive sections of the Social Security Act be eliminated? Are we, as a nation, so frightened, so lacking in humanity, that we must deprive some elderly persons of retirement and medical benefits available to all citizens, because they have been convicted for certain crimes, or belong to, or work for certain verboten organizations—even the Communist Party itself?

The effect of such provisions is to put on notice millions of elderly people that their receiving much needed Government aid is conditioned on their giving up their right of freedom of association under the first amendment. This is bound to deter them from joining not only the proscribed organizations but other kinds of controversial political groups. We also note that the law and the HEW form concern themselves solely with various kinds of designated Communist organizations. Does this mean that persons belonging to other groups generally regarded as antidemocratic, such as the Ku Klux Klan or the American Nazi Party are free of any sanctions? We do not here pass on the merits of any particular political group, but merely point out the discriminatory nature of the law and the HEW form by singling out one particular kind of political association.

In recent years such manifestations of McCarthyism (no other word seems quite as descriptive) as loyalty oaths, disclaimer affidavits, and disqualifications based on organizational membership or advocacy have been decreasing. Indeed, just in this past session, Congress eliminated similar disclaimers as requirements for Job Corps enrollees and VISTA volunteers under the antipoverty program (Public Law 89-253).

Senator JACOB JAVITS has also recently contrasted the treatment of other groups who receive Federal funds:

> "No farmer is asked to sign a loyalty oath to get a crop loan; no small businessman is asked to sign a loyalty oath when he seeks financial help from the Government. And certainly the officers of no ship line are asked to sign such an oath when they seek and get a big ship subsidy."

THE LATE HONORABLE H. D. DENNY, JR.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House of the death of a distinguished former Member of this body, Harmar D. Denny, Jr., at the age of 79. He was a personal friend of mine and of my family in Pittsburgh. He was a Member of the House of Representatives from the old 29th Pennsylvania Congressional District, serving in 1951 and 1952.

He served his country and his community with distinction in the tradition begun many years ago by his ancestors, Ebenezer Denny, the first mayor of the city of Pittsburgh, and Gen. James O'Hara, quartermaster general under Gen. George Washington. He was also the great grandson of Harmar Denny, a Member of this House more than 100 years ago, from 1829 until 1837.

Harmar Denny, Jr., thus carried on his family's five-generation tradition of public service and civic leadership.

In addition to service in the U.S. House of Representatives, he was public safety director of the city of Pittsburgh and was appointed by President Eisenhower as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Mr. Denny was a natural choice for the CAB, having a lifelong interest in aviation, and having served in the Air Corps in both World War I and World War II. He was a bomber pilot in the first conflict. In the Second World War he served with the Eastern Flying Training Command and at the Command and General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. On his retirement from the service he received a permanent commission as lieutenant colonel.

Mr. Denny was an unsuccessful candidate for mayor of Pittsburgh in 1941 at a time when he was an Air Force colonel and was unable to campaign personally.

Later he made his successful bid for elective office, winning a seat in Congress from the old 29th District. Subsequent redistricting erased that district and Mr. Denny ran unsuccessfully against my own predecessor here, the late Herman Eberharter.

In addition to his law career and his many civic and public service activities, one of Mr. Denny's principal interests was as a member of the National Executive Committee of the Boy Scouts of America. He devoted a great deal of his time to the Allegheny Council of the Boy Scouts.

His wife, Mrs. Mary Blair Burgwin Denny, died last September.

To his two daughters, Mrs. John B. Saxman, Jr., of Bozeman, Mont., and Mrs. Archibald Angus, of Buxton, England, to his son, Mr. James O'Hara Denny, of Pittsburgh, and to his 13 grandchildren and 2 great grandchildren, my wife and I extend our deepest sympathy at their great loss. I know that all of you who served here with him and knew him as the distinguished public servant that he was, join us in that expression.

LIEUTENANT HAUSCHILDT AND LIEUTENANT OLEJNICZAK

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, I would pay a heartfelt tribute to the memory of a young man, who was the first to represent the 2d Congressional District of Illinois at the Air Force Academy.

When Lt. John Hauschildt had been graduated from the Academy and was visiting Washington he and I were photographed together in the shadow of the dome of our Capitol. The photograph is hanging on the wall of my office in the Rayburn Building.

On October 5, 1965, he was killed in action in Vietnam. I received the sad tidings a few days later at the time of the passing of my brother, Frank Hurbut O'Hara, to whom I had been bound in tender affection and mutual interest all his life.

To the parents of Lt. John Hauschildt, who gave his life to his country and whose photograph will continue to hang on the wall of my office, goes my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I always have taken a deep interest in the young men I have appointed to the service academies. I have wished to make available for the service of my country the young men who would measure up to the highest standards of ability and of character. I think this is equally the approach of all my colleagues in the matter of these appointments. I am very proud of the record at the academies and afterwards in the service of the young men whom I have named, after competitive examinations, and on their own merits, during the years that I have been in the Congress.

Just today I received a letter from the Reverend Andrew Dillon, Order of Carmelites, from which I quote this paragraph:

> Did you read in the Saturday Evening Post that one of your constituents, Lt. Julian Olejniczak, received the Silver Star for valor in Vietnam? We are all proud of him here, because he graduated from Mount Carmel in Chicago. I believe you sponsored him for West Point. The Post article was written

by his commanding officer, who received the Medal of Honor.

The story in the Saturday Evening Post is an epic of pure heroism, the gripping story of how 12 heroic Americans defended 1 tiny outpost of freedom against a major Vietcong attack.

Captain Donlon calls Lieutenant Olejniczak a one-man army. He was a mass of wounds, hit in both legs, the left hand and elbow, the shoulders and the back. Yet he kept on fighting. The grenade barrages, we are told in the article in the Saturday Evening Post, had jarred him loose from his weapons and he looked about for something, anything, and then resolved "to leap upon the first Vietcong to enter the pit and fight him with his bare hands."

Lieutenant Olejniczak was one of the group of survivors of the heroic battle for Nam Dong received by President Johnson at the White House and awarded the Nation's medal of recognition of high courage beyond the call of duty.

Mr. Speaker, Julian Olejniczak made the highest mark of all the candidates from the Second District that took the Federal civil service examination in the spring of 1957. He made a grade of 83 and I am told that of the thousands taking the examinations only 10 percent made 80. These are not entrance examinations, nor are they in a strict sense competitive examinations, but they do give me a pretty good basis for final selection.

He made a record at West Point that was a source of pride to me, always in the top third of his class, and on the dean's list—a high honor.

I have been glancing through the memos, the grades, and the correspondence in his file. On June 1, 1957, he wrote me thanking me for the chance I had given him to "prove my feelings for my country" and adding that the only way he could repay me was "by a good record at the Academy and afterward."

On September 10, 1957, after 9 weeks of cadetship, he wrote me that he hoped to be a credit to me, to his family, and his State at West Point and "during my career as an officer of the Regular Army."

On September 19, 1957, I wrote him of my pleasure over the fine progress he was making at the Academy. I added:

> I know that you will be a great credit to the Second District of Illinois and that long after I am gone my service to my beloved country will continue to be reflected in the contribution you will be making to its security and welfare.

On July 19, 1960, I wrote him:

> I have just received the superintendent's report on your work at the U.S. Military Academy and I was happy to note your standing in the upper third of your class.
>
> Evidently you are bending every effort to fit yourself as an outstanding officer in the U.S. Army, and you will be a credit and source of pride to your family, to me and to the great 2d District which you represent.

Mr. Speaker, it is in young men like John Hauschildt, and Julian Olejniczak that our country has its strength and its moral armament. Love of country and devotion to its ideals were part and parcel of John Hauschildt, who prepared himself for service to his country and died in the cause of freedom. Julian Olejniczak's guiding thought in the years of his cadetship, as shown in the excerpts from my correspondence with him, and as was the case with John Hauschildt, was to prepare himself to be a credit to his family and his country during his career as an officer in the Regular Army of the United States of America. They represent patriotism in its noblest expression—love of family, home, and country.

VIETNAM VETERANS' BENEFIT BILL SHOULD RECEIVE EARLY APPROVAL

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment my distinguished colleague, the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE of Texas, for his statement during the adjournment period that a bill to give veterans benefits to the men who are fighting in Vietnam should be one of the first bills to be taken up in this session of Congress.

If I know the gentleman from Texas, and I think I know him well, he will follow through on this statement to the best of his outstanding ability, and we will be considering such a bill in a matter of weeks. Hearings already have been held in the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on a bill passed by the other body, and on some 45 similar bills.

To underscore my concern, today I am introducing a comprehensive veterans' benefit bill, containing major provisions similar to the bills Mr. TEAGUE's committee has considered, with several important improvements. I hope the changes I have incorporated, principally to add hospital benefits and job counseling and placement rights, may be considered if Chairman TEAGUE holds additional hearings before bringing a bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the Members who had the opportunity to visit Vietnam during the adjournment period. Along with others who spent time in the combat areas, I can testify to the fact that our fighting men there have fully earned and should receive benefits equal to those which have been accorded to our veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. The GI bill benefits already have more than repaid the investment of public funds by producing millions of educated, productive Americans, who are contributing to our economy, our well-being, and our tax collections at a far higher rate than would have been possible without the GI bill benefits.

To sum it up, Mr. Speaker, I believe this session should early turn its attention to a bill providing for new veterans' benefits, and I believe such a bill should be quickly and overwhelmingly passed in order to give our forces in the field emphatic evidence of congressional approval and the Nation's appreciation for the outstanding job they are doing.

THE COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to provide educational and other readjustment assistance to our cold war veterans.

The proposal is similar to one which passed the other body during the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

In the past this bill and similar legislative proposals have been known as the cold war GI bill. This description seems less than adequate at a time when American fighting men are engaged in fierce and hazardous combat in the swamps and jungles of Vietnam.

During the recess it was my privilege, as chairman of a congressional study mission to the Far East, to visit Vietnam and to see the dedication of our fighting men to the cause of stopping Communist aggression.

It also was my privilege to visit with our boys in Korea, who are holding the ceasefire line in a sensitive and potentially dangerous area of the world. There too, one could not help but be impressed with the quality of character exhibited by our troops.

In Vietnam and Korea, as in the Dominican Republic, and hundreds of other posts throughout the world, our American fighting men are giving much in order to insure the preservation of our freedoms.

It is indeed fitting that we at home express our gratitude to these men—as we have in the past to the veterans of World War II and the Korean war. There can be no better way to assist these men and women obtain educational benefits and other assistance upon their return to civilian life.

Those who serve in the Armed Forces shoulder a disproportionate burden of citizenship. Often while they are serving their country, others of their age are preparing for occupational or professional careers.

It is clear that no person, no matter how ambitious or how talented he may be, can progress at a normal rate in our rapidly changing society and economy when threats to peace call him away to military duty for long periods of time.

Our society is setting a breathtaking pace because of rapid technological advancement. Today's skill is tomorrow's surplus and obsolescent ability. We should assist our former servicemen in adjusting to these conditions.

The enactment of this proposal not only will be an act of justice toward those who are sacrificing civil gain to military duty, it will also benefit our country in many other ways.

None of us need be reminded of the effects on our society of the World War II

GI bill. Veterans who availed themselves of the programs have raised their educational and income levels, with resultant benefits to our Nation.

John S. Gleason, Jr., former Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, has estimated that the GI bill, which cost approximately $14.5 billion, continues to pay for itself at a rate of close to $1 billion per year.

This return comes from additional tax paid by better educated, higher paid former servicemen. There is every reason to expect that the program of readjustment assistance proposed for cold war veterans would have a similar impact.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this legislation is clear and compelling. This, the 1st day of the 2d session, 89th Congress, is an appropriate date to introduce the bill in order to emphasize its prime importance to our Nation.

It is my hope that early in this session, the House will approve a program of aid for our returned and returning servicemen.

WITHOUT BRACEROS—A YEAR OF PROGRESS

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of all our colleagues to the final report of the California Farm Labor Panel which was released in Los Angeles, Calif., on December 1, 1965.

This well-documented report by three distinguished Californians illustrates clearly that 1965 was an excellent year for the State's agriculture.

It makes clear, despite the strident and unrealistic cries of some, that 1965 was a highly successful year for growers, for consumers, and—at long last—for American farmworkers.

It should lay to rest forever the distortions and brazen protests that California agriculture cannot get by without mass importation of foreign workers.

This comprehensive report reveals that with the end of Public Law 78—

Tens of thousands of additional jobs have been made available for domestic workers in 1965;

Domestic workers received higher wages in 1965;

Farm income was up in 1965—Gov. Edmund G. Brown recently reported that the State's farm income hit a record of $3.7 billion this year; and

The decrease in foreign workers resulted in some $50 million remaining in the country, helping our balance-of-payments situation.

Quite significantly, the prices of produce remained generally stable in this first year of transition to the exclusive use of domestic seasonal farmworkers.

In October, for example, the Consumer Price Index showed that the prices of fresh fruits and vegetables were 3.9 percent below those in 1964.

And the November wholesale price index showed that prices of fresh and dried fruits and vegetables were 12 percent lower than in 1964 and 5 percent below the 1957–59 average.

Mr. Speaker, despite the very substantial and encouraging progress which has been made, still more needs to be done. As the panel so correctly suggests, the task ahead is "one of making wages and working conditions sufficiently desirable to attract an adequate number of productive farmworkers."

I urge our colleagues to carefully review the panel's recommendations so that we can "not only secure for growers and processors a wholly domestic labor force adequate for their needs, but also raise farm occupations to a level of dignity and economic viability they have not yet achieved."

Mr. Speaker, all Americans are greatly indebted to the excellent service rendered by the panel—Chairman Benjamin Aaron, Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr., and Arthur M. Ross.

The report follows:

FINAL REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA FARM LABOR PANEL TO SECRETARY OF LABOR W. WILLARD WIRTZ, DECEMBER 1, 1965, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

During 1965, California agriculture has been undergoing a change of such magnitude that it may properly be characterized as revolutionary. This change has been in the employment of farm labor. It has resulted in a transition from heavy reliance upon foreign contract laborers (of whom nearly all have been Mexican braceros) in the cultivation and harvesting of many major crops to the recruitment and use of a domestic force of farmworkers for those purposes. Despite the magnitude of the changes this transition is not yet complete. Moreover, it has been accompanied by a variety of problems of adjustment. Nevertheless in our judgment, the program initiated by the Secretary of Labor to substitute American residents for foreign contract workers in the California farm labor force has been a substantial success.

The purpose of this report is fourfold: First, to review briefly the origins and development of the use of foreign contract laborers in California agriculture, together with the reasons which led the Congress to allow legislation permitting that system to lapse; second, to describe the program developed by the Secretary of Labor to carry out his understanding of the congressional intent; third, to set forth, fully and frankly, the successes and failures of the Secretary's program as we view them at this time; and finally, to present a series of recommendations which would, we believe, not only secure for California growers and processors a wholly domestic labor force adequate for their needs, but also raise farm occupations to a level of dignity and economic viability they have not yet achieved.

HISTORY OF FOREIGN FARM LABOR IN CALIFORNIA

California agriculture has been characterized throughout its history by crop specialization, large-scale land ownership, and reliance on hired farm labor, rather than on the family farm which shaped the structure of so much of the Nation's agriculture. These characteristics were evident almost 100 years ago and persist today. The nature of specialty crops has changed, the average size of farms has increased here as elsewhere, and the sources of hired farm labor have been varied and many. But the essential nature of this structure has not been altered.

When California agriculture changed in the last century from an extensive system relying on cattle and sheep to an intensive one of crop cultivation, its dependence on seasonally hired farmworkers increased. Its needs were met in a variety of ways by a succession of different immigrant groups.

Originally, the industry relied primarily upon Chinese labor. With the exclusion of the Chinese in 1882, it turned to Japanese workers. These in turn were shut out in 1906, to be followed by the Hindustani and later the Filipinos, of whom the majority in this country were farm laborers as late as 1930. At one period or another, laborers of European origin have figured prominently in this history: Italians, Spaniards, Portuguese, Russians, Germans, Armenians, and others. And virtually all Californians of Mexican descent who were engaged in agriculture were employed as farm laborers, as were those Mexicans who immigrated here. The latter have been an everpresent source of labor for much of the State, whether or not there existed a formal legal immigration policy to arrange their entry.

During the depression years, the State received great waves of domestic immigrants: the "Okies," "Arkies," and Texans who were refugees from the failing farm economy. They more than filled the need for hired laborers until the war years of the 1940's. The loss of workers to service industries in the cities and the need for increased food and fiber production aroused concern over possible shortages in labor supply. The number of migrant farmworkers from other States dwindled, the Japanese farmers and family workers were relocated, and the growers urged the Government to import more Mexican workers.

Beginning with a group of 1,500 in September 1942, Mexican nationals were admitted for temporary agricultural employment in California and other States under various authority. Early in 1943, Public Law 45, the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, was enacted to increase the number. This was not done without controversy. Some groups argued that there was no need for additional labor and that just as the worker had to face the risk of shorter periods of employment and the competition of foreign workers, so the farmer should assume the risks of a tight labor market and the hazards of weather.

Public Law 45 was superseded by Public Law 229 in 1944, the peak wartime year for Mexican workers. Public Law 229 was followed by Public Law 893 in 1948, and in 1951, during the Korean conflict, Public Law 78 was enacted. All of these laws were designed to make additional seasonal workers from Mexico available. However, the number of Mexican entrants into California under these programs was far less than the number of such workers in its fields. From 1942 to 1956, when more vigorous enforcement of immigration policies commenced, the number of illegal entrants, or "wetbacks," added significantly to the total used.

Since 1956 the number of Mexican national workers, while fluctuating, has generally declined in California agriculture. Public Law 78 was scheduled to expire originally on December 1, 1953. It was extended, however, from time to time until Congress decided that on balance the law's undesirable economic and social effects outweighed its value to the growers, and on December 31, 1964, the law was allowed to expire.

In his statement on the termination of Public Law 78, issued December 19, 1964, the Secretary of Labor commented in part:

"The explanation given for this program has been that the work the braceros do won't be done by U.S. workers. It includes 'stoop labor' in vegetable, sugar beet, and cotton fields, the picking of citrus fruits, and other agricultural labor.

"A good deal of this work is unquestionably hard and unpleasant. But this is only part of the story. The rest of it is that the wage rates which have been paid for these jobs have been less than the rates paid for other kinds of work which are just as hard and just as objectionable. And the working conditions maintained by some of the growers have been so bad that church and civic groups and labor organizations have protested bitterly.

"There has been increasing complaint against the importation of these hundreds of thousands of foreign workers being paid wage rates as low as 60 cents an hour while about 4 million U.S. men and women are unemployed.

"There has also been accumulating evidence that U.S. workers will be available to do this work if decent working conditions are provided and if it is paid for on terms in line with those for other work that is equally hard and unpleasant."

THE SECRETARY'S PROGRAM

The guiding purposes of the Secretary's program for transition to a wholly domestic farm labor force have been to carry out the will of Congress and at the same time to allow for the harvesting of crops without undue loss to growers and processors.

During the spring, Secretary Wirtz moved to assist agricultural employers in making the transition by permitting a limited importation of Mexican workers under Public Law 414. He made it plain that chronic or large-scale importation of braceros through this device would subvert the intent of Congress and could not be countenanced. He also emphasized that farm employers would be eligible for supplementary foreign labor only if they had made full use of domestic labor available and had cooperated fully with Federal and State agencies in domestic recruitment. To provide a meaningful test of recruitment possibilities, criteria wage rates were established. The minimum hourly rate in California was $1.40, and the Secretary stipulated that piecework rates would have to provide at least that amount in hourly earnings before an application for Mexican labor could be considered. Additional criteria included provision for transportation, adequate free housing, meals at cost, and written contracts.

On April 15, 1965, Secretary Wirtz appointed the California Farm Labor Panel, charging it to assist him in carrying out these policies by determining facts and making specific recommendations to him regarding applications and arrangements for supplemental labor. The panel was further charged to "make recommendations for any further procedures which will effectuate the purpose of serving fully all agricultural labor needs, of relying on domestic workers for this so far as they are available, and of maintaining adequate agricultural wages and working and living conditions."

In response to the Secretary's instructions, the panel has held hearings, gathered facts, and made recommendations regarding needs for additional agricultural labor; it has engaged in informal efforts with all parties concerned to gain acceptance of the Secretary's policy and to encourage and assist in its implementation; and from its experience, it has formulated certain recommendations that appear at the end of this report.

THE CALIFORNIA FARM LABOR EXPERIENCE, 1965

Although there have been localized difficulties, 1965 has been an excellent year for California agriculture. The crops have been brought in with much less recourse to braceros than last year, and at the same time, grower gross revenues have generally been higher. Net figures are not yet available, but they will undoubtedly reflect increased costs of wages, recruitment, machinery, and other items.

Manpower

Tens of thousands of additional jobs have been made available for domestic workers, who in 1965 accounted for 97.3 percent of the man-years of labor in California's seasonal hired agricultural employment.[1] Contract foreign labor provided only 2.7 percent of the total. The significance of these figures becomes apparent when they are compared to the 1959–64 averages, which show that domestic labor[2] accounted for 73.7 percent of total seasonal man-years, with foreign labor providing 26.3 percent. As shown by table I, seasonal domestic man-years increased from an average of 100,500 in 1959–64 to 115,000 in 1965, while foreign man-years dropped from 35,780 to 3,200.

TABLE I.—*Seasonal employment in California agriculture—Man-years of foreign and domestic labor, 1959–65*[1]

Average	Total, seasonal man-years	Seasonal domestic man-years	Domestic as percent of total	Contract foreign man-years	Foreign as percent of total
1959–64	136,280	100,500	73.7	35,780	26.3
1965	118,200	115,000	97.3	3,200	2.7

[1] 1965 data are based on employment through mid-September and on projections for the rest of the year.

Source: State of California, Department of Employment, Research and Statistics Rept. 851 No. 2, "Seasonal Employment in California Agriculture, 1959–65," prepared Oct. 1, 1965.

Table II shows that the increase in domestic seasonal employment in 1965, as compared with the 1959–64 average, has varied from month to month. It amounted to approximately 18,000 in March, 37,000 in June, and 21,000 in October.

TABLE II.—*Employment of seasonal agricultural workers in California by nationality, 1959–65*[1]

	Total, seasonal workers		Domestic workers		Contract foreign workers	
	Average, 1959–64	1965	Average, 1959–64	1965	Average, 1959–64	1965
Jan. 15	99,400	90,500	79,600	89,600	19,800	900
Feb. 15	86,100	83,400	66,300	83,400	19,800	0
Mar. 15	76,500	74,800	56,100	74,200	20,400	600
Apr. 15	95,800	85,800	70,100	85,700	25,700	100
May 15	156,300	141,200	114,000	140,400	42,300	800
June 15	173,000	167,300	126,700	163,900	46,300	3,400
July 15	163,100	143,000	123,400	142,700	39,600	300
Aug. 15	173,500	147,800	130,600	147,200	42,900	600
Sept. 15	226,300	179,300	158,500	167,900	67,800	11,400
Oct. 15	187,900	163,000	126,500	147,600	61,300	13,400
Nov. 15	102,400	----------	77,400		25,000	----------
Dec. 15	96,100	----------	77,700	----------	18,400	----------

[1] Based on midmonth estimates, employment as reported during the midweek of each month (the week containing the 12th).

Source: State of California, Department of Employment, Research and Statistics Section, Rept. 851 No. 1, table I prepared Sept. 21, 1965, and data subsequently available from the same source.

The table shows a considerable drop in total seasonal man-years during the period. Several factors are responsible, including increased mechanization and reduced acreage in a number of crops, as well as a generally more stable use of labor, with a larger proportion of people getting steadier work for longer periods.

The changeover from foreign to domestic labor appears most strikingly in the composition of the seasonal work force in specific localities at comparable dates for this year and last. For example, on June 27, 1964, there were 3,970 seasonal domestic workers in Salinas and 10,000 braceros. A year later the work force was composed of 8,230 domestic workers and only 1,660 foreign workers.

The data in table III suggest that most of the additional seasonal domestic workers were local[3] workers. This is particularly true of the peak months of June, July, and August. In June 1965, there were 20,000 more local domestic workers than the average for June 1959–64.

Although monthly comparisons of this year and the 1959–64 average employment of local domestic farm labor show little pattern, the increase averaged 10,300 more local workers a month this year. A peak of 115,600 local seasonal workers were in the fields this June as compared with a peak average of 94,900 for June the previous 5 years.

There was a fairly steady increase of intrastate migratory workers in each month of this year as compared to the 1959–64 average. The average monthly increase was 5,200 workers, with the peak in September, when there were 34,900 intrastate workers in the fields.

The increase of interstate migratory workers, although steady, was not as marked as that of local and intrastate workers. The average monthly increase over 1959–64 was 3,700 with the peak again in September, when approximately 19,000 interstate workers were in California.

---

[1] The source of labor data is the State of California Department of Employment, "Seasonal Employment in California Agriculture, Man-Years of Foreign and Domestic Labor, 1959–65," Oct. 1, 1965, and data subsequently available from the same source.

[2] A substantial number of domestic farmworkers in California this year, as in the past, are Mexican "green carders," that is, Mexican nationals who have been accorded the status of permanent resident aliens under our immigration laws and who therefore have the right to work in this country in any pursuit. The number of Mexican permanent resident aliens in California on Jan. 1, 1965 was approximately 300,000, slightly more than the number who registered on that date in 1964. There are no figures on how many of this total were engaged in agricultural work. Unlike the braceros, however, "green carders" are legal residents of the United States, and those who work in agriculture are hired in the same way as are native domestic workers.

[3] Locals are those recruited from the immediate crop area.

TABLE III.—*Employment of seasonal domestic agricultural workers in California by type of worker, 1959–65* [1]

	Total, domestic seasonal workers		Local workers		Intrastate migratory workers		Interstate migratory workers	
	Average, 1959–64	1965	Average, 1959–64	1965	Average, 1959–64	1965	Average, 1959–64	1965
January	79,600	89,600	63,800	70,300	11,500	13,900	4,300	5,400
February	66,300	83,400	53,600	64,100	9,000	13,800	3,700	5,500
March	56,100	74,200	45,100	56,700	7,400	12,100	3,500	5,400
April	70,100	85,700	55,700	63,900	9,500	14,800	4,800	7,000
May	114,000	140,400	88,200	101,200	17,900	25,600	7,900	13,600
June	126,700	163,900	94,900	115,600	21,500	30,500	10,300	17,800
July	123,400	142,700	91,000	97,500	21,700	27,100	10,800	18,100
August	130,600	147,200	92,700	101,200	25,500	29,400	12,400	16,600
September	158,500	167,900	111,600	114,000	31,500	34,900	15,400	19,000
October	126,500	149,600	94,000	109,800	22,700	27,900	9,800	11,900
November	77,400		63,000		9,500		4,800	
December	77,700		63,600		10,100		4,000	

[1] Based on midmonth estimates employment as reported during the midweek of each month (week containing the 12th).

It appears that the most important factor in attracting additional domestic workers to farm labor this year was a higher wage level. Data in the State of California Department of Employment, DE 881–A report, "California Weekly Farm Labor Report," indicate that in general wages tended to approach, and in some cases exceeded, the Secretary's criteria of $1.40 an hour minimum, through either hourly wages or piece rates, particularly in those areas where growers requested foreign workers or have contemplated requests.

Undoubtedly, a second factor bringing more domestic workers into harvest labor was their understanding, gained from local and national publicity, that they were no longer competing with Mexican labor for agricultural jobs because the bracero program had been terminated.

The decrease in foreign workers and the rise in domestic employment has undoubtedly had significant economic ramifications for the balance-of-payments problem. Average bracero earnings for 1959–63 were approximately $81 million, of which a large portion certainly ended up in Mexico. In 1964, the figure was $78 million, while in 1965, bracero earnings dropped to an estimated $12 million.[4]

On the reasonable assumption that approximately 75 percent of bracero earnings in the United States returns to Mexico, we can estimate that from 1964 to 1965 the outflow of money from this country has been reduced by about $50 million. At the same time we should note that earnings of domestic workers have been augmented by tens of millions of dollars. The multiplier effect of the spending of these wages in the community makes the economic impact of keeping these wages at home even more important, and should particularly be borne in mind in appraising export losses suffered by growers through inability to harvest all of their crops.

Crops

The analysis of the farm labor experience in California this year would not be complete without a consideration of trends in individual crop production and values. Data for the major crops traditionally relying on bracero labor are given below for 1959–64 and 1965.[5]

For the majority of crops surveyed, acreage was down this year. In some instances this was because of concern over the availability of harvest labor, in others because of market factors, and in still others because of informal quotas imposed by processors. Changes in total value were not uniform, and varied by crop. Where crop value increased over previous years, it did so despite substantial reductions in harvested acreage. Although in all cases total man-years of labor were down, the decrease in contract foreign man-years ranged from 70 to 100 percent and the increase in domestic man-years went as high as 297 percent over the 1961–64 average.

Tomatoes for processing: This has been an excellent year for processing tomatoes. The harvest is well on its way to a new record in per-acre yields, and despite over 26,000 fewer acres this year compared with the 1959–64 average, production has exceeded expectations, with estimated total crop value up by more than $10 million over last year and $20 million over the 1959–64 average.

Specifically, harvested acreage was 18.7 percent below the 1959–64 average, with a yield 18 percent higher. The higher yield has to some extent offset the cutbacks in acreage, and total production was only 3.6 percent below the average for the previous 5 years. Some of the decrease in acreage this year was necessitated by the processors' stock carryover from last year and their predicted inability to handle more than about 110,000 acres of production in 1965. It is also apparent that some decrease was due to uncertainty on the part of growers and processors as to the availability of an adequate labor supply.

Total man-years in the harvest decreased 27.8 percent from the 1961–64 average, with contract foreign man-years dropping 70.2 percent and domestic man-years increasing 131 percent.

Braceros were admitted to the State in significant numbers for only one crop—the tomato harvest. An analysis of how these braceros were used in appended to this report. The data indicate that the requests for bracero labor substantially exceeded the actual need, a conclusion that also applies to a number of other crops.

With this year's experience in mind, a spokesman for the California Tomato Growers Association recently announced that his association "will never again ask for braceros." The spokesman cited three factors that influenced the growers' new position: Success in harvesting crops with a greatly increased number of U.S. workers and only half the Mexican nationals they had claimed to need to avoid disastrous losses; the development of mechanical harvesters; and a desire to be free of Government regulations.[6] Governor Brown has recently expressed the conviction that next year "the tomato harvest will be accomplished entirely by domestic labor in combination with mechanized harvesters." [7]

Table IV shows the data for the processing tomato harvest.

TABLE IV.—*Tomatoes for processing*

A. ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959–64 AND 1965

	Average, 1959–64	1965	Change (average 1959–64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Harvested acreage	142,617	116,000	−26,617	−18.7
Production (tons)	2,541,000	2,450,000	−91,000	−3.6
Average yield (tons per acre)	17.8	21.0	+3.2	+18.0
Total value	$65,558,000	$86,000,000	+$20,442,000	+31.2

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT 1961–64 [1] AND 1965

	Average, 1961–64	1965	Change (average 1961–64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 1,749.3	4,041.7	+2,292.4	+131.0
Foreign	[1] 6,557.1	1,956.0	−4,601.1	−70.2
Total	[1] 8,306.4	5,997.7	−2,308.7	−27.8

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

Strawberries: As with tomatoes, a marked change in the strawberry harvest occurred this year. There was a 100.5-percent increase in domestic man-years and an 89.5-percent decrease in foreign man-years. Total man-years for the harvest dropped 40.9 percent.

Harvested acreage and production were down this year, but average yield rose 13.1 percent above 1959–64. Total value of the crop was 5 percent above the 6-year average.

There was some crop loss in strawberries and in asparagus this year. Some of the loss may be attributed to a scarcity of workers, which in turn was partly the result of poor weather at the beginning of the harvest.

---

[4] Bracero earnings data supplied by State of California Department of Employment, Research and Statistics Section.

[5] Crop data in this section are based on California Crop and Livestock Reporting Service, "Harvesting Acreage, Production, Price, and Value for Selected California Crops by Labor Use, 1959–63 Average and 1964–65," Sept. 22, 1965, and 1965 data subsequently available from the Reporting Service.

[6] "Tomato Growers' Switch—'No need for Mexicans,'" San Francisco Chronicle, Friday, Oct. 8, 1965, p. 6.

[7] Press release, LCH, No. 966, Oct. 15, 1965, p. 1.

Many of the workers who were prepared to work the strawberry and asparagus harvests were unwilling to stand by during the harvesting delay caused by rain. A second factor in the labor shortage at the critical harvest time was the long delay between the authorization for bracero labor and its arrival—a delay caused by the lengthy negotiations between the growers and the Mexican Government. Poor housing and inadequate piece rates contributed to the difficulties.

The detailed data for strawberries are in table V.

Lettuce: A 9.6-percent increase in harvested acreage of winter lettuce, coupled with a 1.7-percent increase in average yield, resulted in a 11.2-percent increase in production this year compared with 1959-64. The total value of the crop, however, was down 10.6 percent.

With harvested acreage in spring lettuce dropping 5.4 percent below the 1959-64 average, and average yield rising 4.7 percent, production came out 1.2 percent below the 5-year average. In contrast to the winter crop, total value of spring lettuce was 96.1 percent above 1959-64.

Detailed crop value figures for summer and fall lettuce are not yet available.

So far as the panel is aware, there was no labor shortage in the harvesting of winter and spring lettuce. Fluctuations in price and production must, therefore, have been caused by other factors.

The change in the composition of the labor force is as marked in lettuce as in other crops. Domestic man-years increased 126.8 percent above the 1961-64 average, and foreign man-years were down 98.4 percent, with total man-years for the harvest down 33.3 percent.

Table VI contains the detailed figures for the lettuce harvest.

Citrus: There was a considerable change in the composition of the labor force in all citrus crops this year. This was due to the voluntary action of the citrusgrowers, who, because they felt unable to pay a guaranteed minimum of $1.40 per hour to all workers, elected to pay piece rates with no minimum hourly guarantee. This decision automaticially made them ineligible to apply for bracero labor. Domestic man-years increased 156.8 percent over the 1961-64 average in Valencia oranges, 50.8 percent in naval oranges, 297.3 percent in lemons, and 171.1 percent in grapefruit. Foreign labor was almost eliminated, disappearing entirely in Valencia oranges and grapefruit, and decreasing by 99.6 percent in navel oranges and 97.8 percent in lemons. This transition was not accomplished without substantial cost to the growers. For example, the southern California Valencia orangegrowers were unable, because of labor shortages, to satisfy more than 60 percent of the market demand.

Harvested acreage in Valencia oranges was 16.6 percent below the 1959-64 average, but because of an increase in average yield of 33 boxes per acre, or 14.3 percent over the 5-year average, production fell only 4.7 percent. Total crop value was down 32.6 percent.

The situation was somewhat different in navel oranges, where harvested acreage was 8 percent above the 1959-64 average. With an increase in average yield of 15.9 percent, total production increased by 25 percent. Total crop value this year was 10.4 percent above the 5-year average.

There was a 16.8 percent decrease from the 1959-64 average in harvested acreage of lemons, a 4.4 percent increase in average yield, and a consequent 12.9 percent decrease in production. The value of this year's crop, however, is 14.5 percent above the 5-year average.

In the grapefruit crop this year, an increase of 0.3 percent in average yield and a 40-percent increase in harvested acreage resulted in a 40.5-percent increase in production over the 1959-64 average. Total crop value rose 22.4 percent.

Detailed data for the four citrus crops are in table VII.

Summer melons: This was a low yield year in summer melons. Harvested acreage was 15.4 percent below the 1959-64 average, production was down 18.7 percent, and average yield fell 3.7 percent. Crop value was 2.6 percent below the 5-year average.

The harvest was completed with 16.3 percent fewer man-years than the 1961-64 average. Harvesting was completed with 76.7 percent more domestic workers and with no foreign labor.

Detailed data for melons appear in table VIII.

Asparagus: Harvested acreage in asparagus this year was 20.7 percent below the 1959-64 average. As average yield remained about the same, total production fell off by 20.8 percent. The total value of the crop was 5 percent below the 6-year average.

This harvest was achieved with a 40.1-percent decrease in man-years, including an 88.7-percent drop in foreign man-years and a 6.1-percent rise in domestic man-years.

There was a major loss in production of white asparagus, due to the lack of sufficient farmworkers to harvest the crop. The primary reason for this shortage is that the work is arduous and unpleasant, and the piece rates offered were insufficient to attract the necessary number of workers.

TABLE V.—*Strawberries*

A. ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959-64 AND 1965

	Average, 1959-64	1965	Change (average 1959-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
A-1. All strawberries:				
Harvested acreage	10,950	8,300	−2,650	−24.2
Production (pounds)	202,991,000	174,000,000	−28,991,000	−14.3
Average yield (pounds per acre)	18,538	20,964	+2,426	+13.1
Total value	$38,413,000	$40,349,000	+$1,936,000	+5.0
A-2. Fresh market strawberries:				
Production (pounds)	125,525,000	103,000,000	−22,525,000	−17.9
Total value	$28,478,000	$28,634,000	+$156,000	+.5
A-3. Processing strawberries:				
Production (pounds)	77,466,000	71,000,000	−6,466,000	−8.3
Total value	$9,935,000	$11,715,000	+$1,780,000	+17.9

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT 1961-64[1] AND 1965

	Average, 1961-64	1965	Change (average 1961-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
All strawberries, total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 1,166.7	2,399.0	+1,172.3	+100.5
Foreign	[1] 3,396.7	357.5	−3,039.2	−89.5
Total	[1] 4,563.4	2,696.5	−1,866.9	−40.9

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

TABLE VI.—*Lettuce*

A. WINTER AND SPRING LETTUCE—ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959-64 AND 1965

	Average, 1959-64	1965	Change (average 1959-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Winter lettuce:				
Harvested acreage	42,617	46,700	+4,083	+9.6
Production (hundredweight)	7,561,670	8,406,000	+844,330	+11.2
Average yield (hundredweight per acre)	177	180	+3	+1.7
Total value	$29,635,000	$26,479,000	−$3,156,000	−10.6
Spring lettuce:				
Harvested acreage	17,120	16,200	−920	−5.4
Production (hundredweight)	2,950,000	2,916,000	−34,000	−1.2
Average yield (hundredweight per acre)	172	180	+8	+4.7
Total value	$9,962,800	$19,537,000	+$9,574,200	+96.1

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT 1961-64[1] AND 1965 FOR ALL LETTUCE (WINTER, SPRING, SUMMER, AND FALL)

	Average, 1961-64	1965	Change (average 1961-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 1,464.5	3,322.1	+1,857.6	+126.8
Foreign	[1] 3,600.3	58.5	−3,541.8	−98.4
Total	[1] 5,064.8	3,380.6	−1,684.2	−33.3

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

TABLE VII–A.—*Citrus: Valencia oranges*

A. ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959-64 AND 1965

	Average, 1959-64	1965	Change (average 1959-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Harvested acreage	74,365	62,000	−12,365	−16.6
Production (boxes)	17,100,000	16,300,000	−800,000	−4.7
Average yield (boxes per acre)	230	263	+33	+14.3
Total value	$61,514,000	$41,472,000	−$20,042,000	−32.6

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT, 1961-64[1] AND 1965

	Average, 1959-64	1965	Change (average 1961-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 631.8	1,622.7	+990.9	+156.8
Foreign	[1] 1,254.1	0	−1,254.1	−100.0
Total	[1] 1,885.9	1,622.7	−263.2	−14.0

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

TABLE VII–B.—*Citrus: Navel oranges*

A. ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959-64 AND 1965

	Average, 1959-64	1965	Change (average 1959-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Harvested acreage	60,182	65,000	+4,818	+8.0
Production (boxes)	12,483,000	15,600,000	+3,117,000	+25.0
Average yield (boxes per acre)	207	240	+33	+15.9
Total value	$51,264,000	$56,610,000	+$5,346,000	+10.4

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT, 1961-64[1] AND 1965

	Average, 1961-64	1965	Change (average 1961-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 1,448.9	2,185.2	+736.3	+50.8
Foreign	[1] 331.5	1.3	−330.3	−99.6
Total	[1] 1,780.6	2,186.5	+405.9	+22.8

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

TABLE VII–C.—*Citrus: Lemons*

A. ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959-64 AND 1965

	Average, 1959-64	1965	Change (average 1959-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Harvested acreage	49,279	41,000	−8,279	−16.8
Production (boxes)	15,500,000	13,500,000	−2,000,000	−12.9
Average yield	315	329	+14	+4.4
Total value	$37,149,000	$42,525,000	+$5,376,000	+14.5

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT, 1961-64[1] AND 1965

	Average, 1961-64	1965	Change (average 1961-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 687.5	2,731.5	+2,044.0	+297.3
Foreign	[1] 2,816.7	63.1	−2,753.6	−97.8
Total	[1] 3,504.2	2,794.6	−709.6	−20.2

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

TABLE VII–D.—*Citrus: Grapefruit*

A. ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959-64 AND 1965

	Average, 1959-64	1965	Change (average 1959-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Harvested acreage	9,217	12,900	+3,683	+40.0
Production	2,918,000	4,100,000	+1,182,000	+40.5
Average yield (boxes per acre)	317	318	+1	+.3
Total value	$6,208,000	$7,599,000	+$1,391,000	+22.4

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT, 1961-64[1] AND 1965

	Average, 1961-64	1965	Change (average 1961-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 79.0	214.2	+135.2	+171.1
Foreign	[1] 86.8	0	−86.8	−100.0
Total	[1] 165.7	214.2	+48.5	+29.3

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

Detailed data for the asparagus harvest, along with breakdown of production and total value for fresh market and all processing, including a cannery green and white and freezer asparagus, are found in table IX.

Summary of experience

This year's record shows that great progress has been made toward a wholly domestic (i.e., nonbracero) farm labor force. In addition, those who argued that no Americans would do stoop labor, or could climb trees or work in high temperatures, have been proven wrong.

The fact remains, however, that agriculture is still not competitive with other industries for domestic labor. Although wage rates have risen, they are below the levels prevalent in other industries. Little has been done to augment family housing facilities, to provide more stable employment throughout the harvest season, or to disseminate more reliable information on employment, earnings, and manpower.

The following section examines the functioning of some of the programs designed to increase the availability, use, and competence of domestic farm labor. The achievement of an adequate domestic farm labor force depends upon the acceptance and support of these programs by workers and growers alike.

PROGRESS AND EVALUATION OF RELEVANT DOMESTIC FARM LABOR PROGRAMS

A number of existing programs to build an able and adequate domestic farm labor force have been intensified and a number of new policies and programs have been initiated over the last year. The knowledge and experience we have gained as these policies and programs developed have been crucial in implementing the transition to a wholly domestic farm labor force. We wish to set out here what has been done and what we have learned.

Intensified intrastate recruitment: California initiated intensive efforts this year to reach heretofore untapped sources of farmworkers and to make better use of workers already in the farm work force. In mid-December of 1964, Federal-State mobile recruitment teams were organized to fan out from Stockton, Oakland-San Francisco, Bakersfield, and Los Angeles. A Federal-State mobile followup team was organized to meet new recruits on arrival in the work areas and to assist in orienting and training the new workers. They also were available to assist in the adjustment of complaints.

From December 24, 1964, to April 30, 1965, 25,380 workers were contacted and over 10,000 were placed through intrastate positive recruitment.[3]

---

[3] Positive intrastate recruitment occurs when a prospective employer sends his recruiter to a local employment office or recruiting center with authority to hire applicants and provide them with transportation to the work site. This is in contrast to normal recruitment, where the local employment office refers a worker to a harvest area where hiring will be done on the spot.

TABLE VIII.—*Melons; summer*

A. ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959-64 AND 1965

	Average, 1959-64	1965	Change (average 1959-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Harvested acreage	42, 533	36, 000	−6, 533	−15.4
Production (hundredweight)	5, 757, 000	4, 680, 000	−1, 077, 000	−18.7
Average yield (hundredweight per acre)	135	130	−5	−3.7
Total value	$24, 028, 000	$23, 400, 000	−$628, 000	−2.6

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT, 1961-64 [1] AND 1965

	Average, 1961-64	1965	Change (average 1961-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 587.3	1, 037.9	+450.6	+76.7
Foreign	[1] 652.6	0	−652.6	−100.0
Total	[1] 1, 239.9	1, 037.9	−202.0	−16.3

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

TABLE IX.—*Asparagus*

A. ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959-64 AND 1965

	Average, 1959-64	1965	Change (average 1959-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
A-1. All asparagus:				
Harvested acreage	69, 200	54, 900	−14, 300	−20.7
Production (hundredweight)	1, 928, 000	1, 527, 000	−401, 000	−20.8
Average yield (hundredweight per acre)	28	28	0	0
Total value	$24, 724. 000	$23, 496, 000	−$1, 228, 000	−5.0
A-2. Fresh market asparagus:				
Production (hundredweight)	599, 000	624, 000	+25, 000	+4.2
Total value	$9, 300, 000	$9, 861, 000	+$561, 000	+6.0
A-3. Processed asparagus:				
Production (tons)	66, 450	45, 150	−21, 300	−32.0
Total value	$15, 424, 000	$13, 635, 000	−$1, 789, 000	−11.6
A-3(a). Processed asparagus, cannery white:				
Production (tons)	29, 835	15, 214	−14, 612	−49.0
Total value	$7, 489, 500	$5, 294, 000	−$2, 195, 500	−29.3
A-3(b). Processed asparagus, cannery green:				
Production (tons)	23, 071	17, 586	−5, 485	−23.8
Total value	$5, 260, 000	$5, 266, 000	+$6, 000	+.1
A-3(c). Processed asparagus, freezing:				
Production (tons)	13, 544	12, 350	−1, 194	−8.8
Total value	$2, 674, 500	$3, 075, 000	+$400, 500	+15.0

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT, 1961-64 [1] AND 1965

	Average, 1961-64	1965	Change (average 1961-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
All asparagus:				
Total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 1, 156.9	1, 227.1	+70.2	+6.1
Foreign	[1] 1, 097.7	124.2	−973.5	−88.7
Total	[1] 2, 254.6	1, 351.3	−903.3	−40.1

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

In May 1965, leaders of the Mexican-American community suggested that from 3,000 to 10,000 Mexican-American workers available in the central coastal area were not being reached by the regular State department of employment recruitment. A pilot program was started in San Jose to reach these workers. A special office was set up to operate during June, with provisions for extension if it should prove successful. Twelve Mexican-American leaders from the San Jose area were hired by the department of employment to recruit in the Mexican-American community. The growers provided money to hire three Mexican-American community leaders to work in cooperation with the temporary department staff. Growers provided day-haul transportation from San Jose to the Salinas area strawberry fields. Recruiters met with community groups, and prepared and distributed handbills and pamphlets. News releases and paid advertising were used. Door-to-door canvasses were conducted. The results, however, were disappointing.

A total of 1,849 workers, of whom 976 had Spanish surnames, were hired from the new community recruitment center list. Of these, 63 percent worked only 1 day. The special office was closed at the end of June, and the San Jose Farm Labor Office assumed supervision of the day-haul operation.

Because this was the first time Mexican-American recruiters were used by the State department of employment, it is possible that the lack of success can be attributed to the newness of this program. It is also possible that the reluctance of the Mexican-Americans to do what has traditionally been considered bracero work was a strong factor in their lack of response, particularly because braceros were already working in the area.

In mid-July, farm-labor supervisors and local office managers from tomato-producing areas met with office staff to evolve a plan of action for more widespread recruitment of tomato pickers than ever before attempted. The State office of the department prepared and distributed some 40 TV slides in English and Spanish. News releases were prepared for all local offices. Some 35,000 tomato recruitment pamphlets were distributed in addition to the hundreds of recruitment flyers prepared by local offices. Signs were posted on bulletin boards, in labor camps, and in businesses frequented by workers. Some theaters used spot announcements to publicize the need for tomato pickers. Sound equipment broadcasts and house-to-house canvasses were employed. Day-hauls were conducted from as many as 90 supervised and unsupervised points before school opened, and subsequently from about 75 points. Military bases were contacted to recruit off-duty military personnel and their families. Up to seven busloads of youths were hauled daily from a point near Mather Air Force Base near Sacramento.

The department of employment central and local farm placement staffs cooperated fully with the California department of social welfare central and local staffs in assuring that all social welfare recipients who could be channeled into farmwork knew about and were assisted in securing farm jobs. Their occupational codes of unemployment insurance claimants were examined and possible employees were channeled into farmwork.

About the time the department of employment began its recruitment for the tomato harvest, the Mexican-American leaders again offered to help recruit the Mexican-Americans who, they believed, were not being reached by the department's efforts. The Federal Bureau of Employment Security then hired 4 Mexican-American leaders as consultants, and the State department of employment hired some 25 indigenous community leaders recommended by the BES consultants. These Mexican-American community leaders were hired to contact their people and urge them to take jobs and to help meet the labor shortage in the tomato harvest.

From August 18 to September 20, over 14,000 domestic workers were referred to tomato growers by local offices in the interior valley and central coast districts. Through the efforts of the industry and the department, an estimated 18,700 man-weeks of work were performed by domestic workers hand-harvesting cannery tomatoes during the week of highest domestic employment in these districts. This compares with the 1964 statewide peak of 5,250 domestic man-weeks of employment in both hand and machine harvest of cannery tomatoes.

Interstate recruitment

Historically, the State department of employment and growers have been reluctant to conduct interstate recruitment. State officials have contended that recruitment in other States with foreign workers would merely create a shortage that would have to be filled in those States by the importation of additional foreign workers. Growers and community leaders have been fearful of the impact of an influx of out-of-state labor upon welfare programs, the educational system, the police, and other community agencies and facilities. Growers also argued that labor alleged to be available through interstate recruitment was neither qualified nor reliable and that the recruitment process itself was too costly.

This year, under the necessity of entering the competitive market for domestic labor as required by the Secretary of Labor's recruitment criteria of December 19, 1964, and with the strong encouragement of the Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security, the California Department of Employment, and the growers who wanted to remain eligible to receive foreign workers joined in recruiting in 11 States and 2 territories.

This program was a dismal failure. Of the 50,000 workers requested by California under the Federal-State interstate clearance system from January 1 through September 13, only 3,173 workers were actually recruited. Examination of the program suggests that substantial administrative problems exist in the interstate recruitment system, and that there are aspects of California agricultural working conditions that are not now sufficiently attractive to bring in out-of-State workers. Certainly, substantially higher wages would be an immediate competitive advantage that should be exploited to the fullest if a productive and willing work force is to be recruited and retained for California agriculture. It should be pointed out, however, that, excluding Hawaii, California growers already pay the highest wages in the country for agricultural work. It is unrealistic to assume, therefore, that they will continue to raise wages unless similar action is taken by their counterparts in other States.

The importance and potential of interstate recruitment cannot be overestimated. Had the interstate recruitment program achieved only a minimal success, it is likely that the number of braceros admitted to California this year could have been cut in half. Moreover, it is apparent that with the virtual elimination of foreign labor, California growers will continue to need out-of-State workers during the peak harvest season.

A-Teams

To meet some of the demand for domestic farm workers during the summer, the Secretary of Labor established a youth farm employment program for high school athletes. The program, known as A-Team (athletes in temporary employment as agricultural manpower), provided for the recruitment of teams of 20 to 30 boys to work on farms. Each team was to be supervised by a coach or teacher, with recruitment and work assignments to be handled by the State employment service.

The availability of A-Teams was a factor in considering requests for additional foreign workers, and growers requesting or receiving certification to use foreign workers in the course of the summer were reminded by the panel and by the regional administrator of the Bureau of Employment Security that they would be required to use any available workers west of the Mississippi, including A-Teams, before being certified as eligible to use foreign labor. In particular, the panel relied on its understanding that A-Team labor was available when on May 29 it recommended against an application for foreign workers in the Blythe area.

The A-Team program in California provided jobs for 51 teams and 1,679 students. The teams came from 10 States (New Mexico, Nebraska, Idaho, Kansas, Iowa, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, Texas, and California). Forty-one teams and 1,471 students were employed in the 3 areas of Salinas, Blythe, and Stockton, where foreign workers were used or requested. The following comments apply to these three areas:

The best record of contract completion by the students was in the cantaloup harvest in Blythe, where average hourly earnings ($1.85) were highest. Of 486 students, A-Team and informal high school groups, 419 remained to complete the season—evidence that high earnings can be a factor in attracting reliable workers in agriculture, as elsewhere. The success of the program in Blythe, an area specifically denied certification for foreign workers because of the availability of A-Teams, can also be attributed in large part to the growers' fine cooperation in providing good housing, food, and recreational facilities.

The overall record of A-Team performance was mixed. Some teams stayed on for their full contract, others for as little as 3 days. Some were praised by their employers, others were discharged almost on arrival. Some had the responsible adult leadership of their coaches, others had only indifferent supervision from older students. While some found the work too arduous, others complained they were not given enough work. The earnings record shows average hourly earnings for some teams as low as 81 cents and for others as high as $1.94.

Although the program obviously suffered because of hurried programing, inadequate communications and understanding among all the parties, and lack of coordination with the existing youth employment program in California, a major reason for the relatively low use of A-Teams was the reluctance of many growers to accept them, and the tendency of some growers to make the work relationship unpleasant.

The record indicates that there is merit in the A-Team, just as there is merit in the regular summer youth employment program of the California Department of Employment. This regular overall youth program placed about 25,000 youths in 1964, and double that number in 1965. The California program is especially to be commended. If it continues to expand, the need for A-Team workers in this State will be sharply reduced.

However, the value of the A-Teams cannot be estimated from their production record alone. The publicity surrounding the program undoubtedly alerted many adults to opportunities in harvest work. Growers who, for reasons of their own preferred not to employ youths, were also stimulated to exert extra effort in recruiting adults. This was a consequence of the regulation that no certification of foreign workers would be considered so long as available youths wanted to work. Another result operating in favor of continuing the program is that it affords an opportunity for youths who might otherwise spend their summers in idleness to work, to earn money, and to contribute to the welfare of society.

Manpower Development and Training Act programs

The Manpower Development and Training Act contains provisions that could be applied profitably to manpower for the field harvest. As developed in California, however, these opportunities have not been realized.

From January 1 to September 14, 1965, 1,020 trainees started training in 23 agricultural projects. Three of these, with approximately 300 beginning trainees, were directed to field harvest activity.[9] The largest field harvest project involved 238 trainees in tomato picking at Davis. A generous estimate indicates that a maximum of 40 of the 209 trainees completing the course actually entered employment as tomato pickers. This poor showing can be attributed to inadequate time for planning and recruitment and unsatisfactory arrangements during the training period. In particular, complaints about the food, training allowances, crew bosses, extended separation from families, and unfavorable publicity contributed to trainee discontent and disaffection.

The paucity of Manpower Development and Training Act programs in harvest labor is the result of strong opposition to such programs by organized agricultural labor in one part of the State and to the disinterest of the growers in another area.

Work simplification devices and mechanization

Significant laborsaving and work simplification has been achieved this year through the improvement of experimental models, the transition from the experimental model to limited operational use of some devices, and the greater employment of previously developed techniques and machines.

Tomatoes: In the tomato harvest the return to an old technique has simplified the picker's task and thus made the job more attractive to women and youth. In recent years pickers have used lug boxes that hold 50 pounds of tomatoes. This year buckets were returned to use, eliminating the need to haul the 50-pound lug box. Couples and families were hired, so that a family could pick into the buckets and the adult male could then carry all the boxes picked by the group. In some instances the pickers were instructed to leave the boxes in the rows, and loading crews with trucks came through later. In Gilroy, one employer paying 17 cents a box for picking only—with swampers hired separately—reported that the pickers had doubled their output upon being relieved of the lugs.

Last year, 70 tomato-picking machines were estimated to have picked about 3.5 percent of the 3-million-ton canning tomato crop. About 260 machines were expected to be available in 1965. In mid-September it was too soon to determine how many were available and being used, and what percent of the final production might be machine picked. However, early estimates were around 25 percent, and it is certain that the industry will rely increasingly on machine picking in the future. Estimates of the number of such machines to be used in next year's harvest have gone as high as 800.

Melons: In 1964, the Blythe area used about 12 conveyors in the melon harvest; this year it used 40. In addition, an experimental device may eliminate the need for the picker to lift the melon from the furrow to the conveyor belt. The worker would pick the melons and place them in furrows, with the machine then picking them up. If successful, this would eliminate 30 percent of the present labor need.

Four or five times as many conveyors in the melon districts from Kern to Stanislaus Counties are believed to have been used in 1965 as in 1964. These machines did not reduce labor requirements but did make the job easier and encouraged employment of women and youths in the cantaloup harvest.

Lettuce: A lettuce harvesting machine developed by University of California agricultural engineers has been devised to replace the older lettuce machines, which were largely conveyors and field packing platforms expediting the harvest of hand cutters. Operated by one man, the new machine feels the heads, testing for maturity, and cuts those which are ready for harvest. A four-row model may permit the machine and operator to replace 10 to 15 hand cutters. The machine is being developed and used experimentally in the Salinas area. It is judged to be nearly operational and there is expectation that 10 machines may be in use by 1966.

Similar advances in machinery and laborsaving innovation are being made in a number of other crops, including sugarbeets, cotton, brussels sprouts, carrots, prunes, peaches, and apricots.

Housing

The dearth of migrant family housing in California is one of the factors that precludes full use of both interstate and intrastate migrant workers. Growers and State and Federal authorities have been well aware of this lack, but as long as sufficient single domestic workers and braceros were available to meet seasonal needs, growers were reluctant to invest in family housing. This year marked a small beginning in the provision of more family housing.

---

[9] State of California, Department of Employment, Farm Labor Service, "Approved Agricultural Manpower Development and Training Act Courses—California—for the period Nov. 27, 1962, to Sept. 13, 1965."

The impetus for housing has come from three sources: growers and community groups, title III(B) of the Economic Opportunity Act, and the California Department of Finance demonstration program (with funds granted from the Housing and Home Finance Agency).

From the private sector have come some proposals and some action. Proposals have been advanced for mobile homes for migrant workers and for mobile-home migrant caravans to follow the crops. In Yolo County, one grower converted half of a single-man camp to 52 motel-type family units, and two other growers built floored tent units for families. The Blythe Growers Farm Labor Association has planned 70 apartment-type family units, which they hope to have financed by Farmers Home Administration funds.

Also in the Blythe area, individual growers have provided the land on which family units will be built. Workers employed by growers in the area are being assisted in preparing applications for FHA loans. Seven units have been started, 19 more are being processed, and an additional 50 are being planned. It is hoped locally that in 5 years about 200 family units and 200 to 300 low-cost apartment-type units will be built.

Under title III(B) of the Economic Opportunity Act and in conformity with the California migrant master plan, $1,926,000 has been made available for flash peak housing. A number of different designs for demountable housing have been proposed and reviewed. In addition, several hundred units are being planned in five of the counties designated to accommodate migrant centers under the migrant master plan.

The demonstration program of the California Department of Finance involves a grant from the Housing and Home Finance Agency to construct 48 prototype units at $4,000 each. It is expected that such construction grants will spur the housing industry to find new ways to meet the need for low-cost migrant family housing. That this represents the smallest of beginnings is evident when the program is placed in the context of the estimate of the finance department's consultant on housing and community development that the need for low-cost farmworker family housing units in California will be between 10,000 and 30,000 units within the next 5 to 10 years.

Most existing housing for migrant workers is unsuitable for family occupancy. Living conditions are sometimes primitive in the extreme. It is a particularly unhappy fact that municipal and other public authorities are responsible for the conditions and maintenance of a number of these squalid camps. This is a situation that demands remedial action.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Now that Public Law 78 has been terminated, California farmers must look to the domestic labor force to meet their labor requirements. The task thus becomes one of making wages and working conditions sufficiently desirable to attract an adequate number of productive domestic workers. Above all else, what is required is a change in the expectations and attitudes of the growers. Employer resistance to the Secretary of Labor's program to switch to an all-domestic supply of farmworkers was a major, though by no means the exclusive, cause of some of the difficulties encountered this year. Specifically, a refusal to accept the full implications of the congressional decision not to renew Public Law 78 has led some growers to keep wages unrealistically low, to deal in providing adequate housing, and to cooperate half-heartedly or not at all with various efforts to recruit domestic farm labor.

On the other hand, we are gratified by the efforts of a number of major growers and processors to accommodate to the new situation. Although exercising their rights to disagree with the substance of the timing to some of the Secretary of Labor's program to eliminate bracero labor, they have, nevertheless, accepted the objectives of that program and have taken substantial steps toward making it a reality.

The current trend appears to be in the direction of a more intensive cultivation of reduced acreage for many crops, much greater use of harvesting machines, and the employment of a smaller but more productive labor force under improved working conditions and at substantially higher wages. Growers and processors have the right to expect aid and guidance from appropriate Federal and State agencies in the recruitment of their employees; they have no right, however, to continue to claim competitive advantages and special protection not available to others.

Recognition of these facts by all elements in the California agricultural industry will make completion of the transition referred to at the outset of this report easier and quicker.

The panel also wishes to make the following recommendations:

Wages: We urge the adoption of a wage policy by the growers of California which will make California agriculture competitive with other industries for labor. At the same time, we urge the Federal Government to take the necessary steps to raise farm labor wages throughout the country.

We believe that hourly rates should not fall below those prescribed by Federal or State minimum wage laws not otherwise applicable to farm labor, and we urge flexible piecework rates that will insure substantially higher average hourly earnings for productive workers.

Nothing that has occurred in California agriculture this year supports the repeated charge—which we now assert to be a myth—that no American workers will perform "stoop labor." On the contrary, there is ample evidence that Americans will perform even more onerous work, provided that the wages are fair and the working conditions are decent. Adequate wages and attractive working conditions will produce not only sufficient numbers of workers, but also a more productive and responsible work force.

With people of varying skills working at their own pace, harvest labor lends itself to a piece-rate system of payment. Indeed, in most instances such a system is essential to attract adequate workers because of the relatively low prevailing hourly wage rates. This year the Secretary of Labor's criteria for eligibility to employ foreign contract labor included a minimum hourly rate of $1.40. Although this was substantially above the prevailing hourly rate in previous years, and that being paid in most other States, it is clearly inadequate to sustain a worker above the poverty level on an annual basis, even assuming—contrary to the fact—that he obtains as much as 2,000 hours of employment at that rate. What is needed, therefore, is a system of piece rates high enough to attract farmworkers and also adequately compensate the superior workers for their increased productivity. These observations are meaningless, however, unless enough workers sufficiently skilled to take advantage of such piece rates can be recruited.

Housing: Adequate housing must be provided for farmworkers and their families. Existing facilities and programs should be used to the fullest extent possible; if these prove insufficient, further legislative and administrative aid should be secured.

Where economically feasible and structurally possible, existing barracks housing should be converted to family units.

There should be tighter regulation and stricter enforcement of farm labor housing codes.

There should be fuller funding of existing federally sponsored farm housing programs, such as those administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Farmers Home Administration. We urge the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, which has the authority and money to be of substantial assistance, to do more in this field.

There should be more experimentation by all concerned with building techniques and arrangements, as well as with financing plans, so that the maximum amount of housing can be built at the minimum cost. This is particularly needed for flash peak housing, where the relatively short period of usage makes normal housing arrangements extremely expensive.

If existing facilities and programs prove insufficient or too restrictive to rapid progress, we urge new legislation which will make it possible for growers, assisted by the State and Federal Governments, to build new family housing.

Recruitment: We urge a complete reexamination of the present interstate recruitment system.

The U.S. Department of Labor should convene a conference of leading grower and labor representatives, the highest officials of the State and Federal agencies involved, and members of the California Farm Labor Panel to initiate this review. The conference should deal specifically with the roles and responsibilities of Government and growers in recruitment.

An effective recruitment program should be undertaken by the growers. Recruitment teams should be sent to other States well in advance of the harvest season to interview and screen farmworkers and enter into firm contracts with them for employment for fixed periods during the harvest season. Such contracts should include commitments regarding transportation, compensation, housing, and food. Some growers are already carrying out programs of this type for next year's harvests. We urge others to follow their example.

Protection: We believe that the farmworker should be protected by the same social legislation as are his counterparts in industry.

Specifically, this means unemployment compensation for agricultural labor, as well as coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and improved Social Security Act coverage.

Statistical reporting: Better information about labor requirements, hours worked, and wages earned must be collected and made available. The Panel recommends that Federal and State agencies collaborate to solve the technical problems and effect an appropriate division of labor. Four areas in particular need attention.

1. Worker requirements must be stated more accurately. Although it is difficult, because of weather and other unpredictable factors, for growers to be precise about their labor needs, studies of some crops have shown that reliable estimates of labor requirements can be developed.

2. There must be more accurate statistics on employment in specific crops and areas and on the available supply of agricultural workers.

3. Wages, hours, and earnings must be reported. It is surprising, but nonetheless true, that no comprehensive or accurate data are available for the wages, hours, and earnings of domestic farmworkers.

4. Data on the duration of employment of individual workers are also necessary for the effective recruitment of an adequate domestic farm-labor force.

Miscellaneous recommendations: More and improved training programs should be developed, especially for farm labor supervision. Present supervision is notoriously inadequate and is itself a product of the bracero system. From now on, California agriculture must rely heavily on newly developed training and supervisory skills if it wishes to attract and hold the kind of workers it seeks. We believe these workers are available and will respond to offers of higher wages and better conditions. These attractions will be further enhanced as growers develop an improved supervisory force; for it is apparent that field supervisors whose experience has been limited largely to overseeing the work of braceros also need training in dealing with American workers.

Higher and more rigidly enforced standards of field sanitation are essential to decent working conditions and should be provided. At the very least, all farmworkers, including adult males, should be provided with the field sanitary facilities specified in the California Industrial Welfare Commission's Order No. 14–65, effective September 15, 1965, applicable to women and minors employed in agricultural occupations. These facilities include adequately screened and properly ventilated toilets and adequate working facilities, which are readily accessible to employees. Evidence indicates that these regulations have been widely ignored, even in respect to women and minors. The same is true of the requirement that each place of employment shall be supplied with potable drinking water, suitably cool, and convenient to employees.

Facilities such as these are not frills; they are absolutely essential to maintain minimum standards of health and decency. We regret the necessity, in the year 1965, to make so elementary a consideration the subject of a specific recommendation.

CONCLUSION

By phasing out the use of braceros, the first long step has been taken toward eliminating the special disadvantages of wage earners in California agriculture. But it is only the first step. Much remains to be done before farmworkers will have the same status as those in other industries and before agricultural employers will have built and maintained a reliable and efficient domestic labor supply.

CALIFORNIA FARM LABOR PANEL.
BENJAMIN AARON,
Chairman.
DANIEL G. ALDRICH, Jr.
ARTHUR M. ROSS.

APPENDIX A—OFFICIAL ACTIONS OF CALIFORNIA FARM LABOR PANEL [1]

APPOINTMENT

Secretary Wirtz appointed the California Farm Labor Panel by Secretary's order No. 11–65, dated April 15, 1965. The members of the panel as appointed by Secretary Wirtz were Benjamin Aaron, professor of law and director, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California at Los Angeles, chairman; Dr. Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr., chancellor, University of California at Irvine; and Dr. Arthur M. Ross, professor of industrial relations, University of California at Berkeley. Dr. Ross has since been named commissioner of labor statistics.

HEARINGS, MEETINGS, AND CONSULTATIONS OF THE FARM LABOR PANEL

Organization meeting: The three members of the panel met at Professor Aaron's offices at UCLA on April 17, held an organization meeting, and announced a schedule of hearings at Stockton and Salinas on April 20.

April 19: Meeting with Jesse Tapp, president, State board of agriculture, San Francisco; meeting with State personnel from the Governor's office, department of agriculture and department of employment, Sacramento; meeting with San Joaquin County farm adviser, University of California Agricultural Extension Service, Stockton.

April 20: 8 a.m., Public hearing in Stockton to consider evidence of pending requests for foreign workers to work in asparagus harvest; 2 p.m., public hearing in Salinas to consider evidence on pending requests for foreign workers for Monterey County, primarily for the strawberry harvest.

April 21: Meeting with headquarters and regional Department of Labor staff concerned with farm labor problems, office of Dr. Ross, Berkeley.

April 23: Meeting of panel at offices of Chairman Aaron, UCLA, to prepare and issue panel's interim report of that date. (The panel recommended 1,000 foreign workers for asparagus harvest and 1,500 foreign workers for the strawberry harvest, and Secretary Wirtz adopted the recommendation on April 26.)

May 7: Public hearing in Santa Maria by panel's hearing officer to take evidence on request of Santa Maria Farmers Association for 100 foreign workers for the strawberry harvest in Santa Barbara County. (This request was subsequently withdrawn, and no action thereon was taken by the panel.)

May 11: Public hearing by panel's hearing officer at Stockton to hear witnesses who could not be heard at panel's earlier hearing of April 20. (No new foreign labor requests were pending before the panel on the date this hearing was held.)

May 12: Public hearing in Salinas to consider a new request for foreign workers submitted by the strawberry industry and the vegetable row crop industry for a total of 2,150 workers.

May 19: Meeting of panel at offices of Chairman Aaron, UCLA, to consider record of hearings by panel's hearing officer and to act upon new request from the strawberry and vegetable industries of Salinas. (The panel recommended an additional 1,000 workers for these crops, and Secretary Wirtz immediately accepted this recommendation.)

May 20: Public hearing in Blythe, Calif., by panel's hearing officer to consider evidence on request of Blythe Growers, Inc., for 949 foreign workers for Blythe melon harvest.

May 29: Panel met at offices of Chairman Aaron, UCLA, to consider new requests for foreign workers requested by the Salinas growers and the melon request from Blythe Growers, Inc. A late request for 500 additional foreign workers for the asparagus harvest had been withdrawn by the date of the May 29 meeting. (The panel recommended denial of all pending requests in its report to the Secretary of May 29.)

June 9: Chairman Aaron and Dr. Ross held meetings in Fresno with growers, State officials, and the association manager of Agricultural Labor Bureau to obtain information on pending request for foreign workers for the San Joaquin Valley melon harvest. (This request was not certified to the panel by the State, and no action thereon was taken by the panel.)

June 16: Meeting of panel members Aldrich and Ross with the tomato industry in Stockton to receive general labor demand information concerning the canning-tomato harvest to begin the middle of August.

June 17: Meeting of panel member Aldrich with Canners League of California and officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, State department of agriculture, and University of California concerning general farm labor problems, with particular emphasis on forthcoming canning-tomato harvest.

July 30: Meeting of panel at Department of Labor offices, San Francisco, with officials from State department of agriculture, State department of employment, and University of California concerning labor needs for canning-tomato harvest and announcement of further meeting on August 10.

August 10: Meeting of panel in Department of Labor offices, San Francisco, on canning-tomato requests and announcement of recommendations to authorize 8,000 foreign workers for the canning-tomato harvest. (This authorization was subsequently increased by 900 for another crop area, and the recommendations were immediately adopted by Secretary Wirtz.)

August 18: Field investigation trip by panel member Ross at Merced and surrounding area in connection with early stages of tomato harvest.

August 19: Additional field trip by panel member Ross to Patterson and surrounding area in connection with tomato harvest.

August 26: Meeting of panel in Department of Labor offices, San Francisco, and announcement of recommendation for additional authorization of 9,500 foreign workers for tomato harvest, for a grand total of 18,400. Recommendation was adopted that day by Secretary Wirtz.)

October 5: Meeting of panel member Aldrich with Council of California Growers at Los Angeles to discuss current labor problems and prospects for 1966.

APPENDIX B—DISPOSITION OF MEXICAN NATIONALS AUTHORIZED FOR TOMATO HARVEST

The number of foreign contract workers for tomato harvest requested by growers, certified by the California Department of Employment, and approved by the Secretary of Labor is shown below. Also shown is the number of calendar man-days represented by those requests and approvals.

	Workers	Calendar man-days represented
Requested by grower associations	29,859	2,059,372
Certified by California Department of Employment	18,785	1,335,599
Approved by Secretary of Labor	18,400	1,159,176

Of the total of 18,400 workers approved by the Secretary of Labor, all had starting dates ranging from August 27 to September 5, 1965, and initially terminated October 31, 1965. Later extensions were authorized for 1,072 from October 31 to November 7, 1965, and an additional 1,395 from October 31, to November 15, 1965. Some of the initial requests for the original 18,400 were canceled by employers resulting in only 17,597 foreign workers actually arriving, representing 895,933 man-days, if all had stayed in tomatoes through their termination dates as finally authorized above.

Of the 17,597 braceros who arrived, not all calendar man-days represented by the authorizations involved were used in tomato harvest. There were two reasons for this: Some were authorized for use in other activities at the request of growers, and some of the workers voluntarily returned to Mexico prior to their authorized termination date. Of the 17,597, some were reallocated at the request of grower associations for use in other activities. If all of these braceros had remained for the periods authorized (and requested) and had been used in the activities for which they were authorized, these reallocations from tomato harvest would represent a total of 120,519 calendar man-days. Of the 17,597 braceros who arrived, the following were not available for tomato harvest because they had terminated. These amounted to 2,034 by October 7, 1965; 4,343 by October 14,

---

[1] The following chronology does not include numerous informal contacts by individual members of the panel with representatives of grower organizations, labor unions, and other interested groups throughout the State which have occurred almost continuously from the time the panel was appointed to the present.

1965; 8,839 by October 21, 1965; and 11,918 by October 29, 1965.

Cumulative terminations through later dates are 15,011 by November 4, 1965; 16,213 by November 12, 1965; and 17,074 by November 17, 1965.

These terminations represent a further loss of at least 139,187 calendar man-days from the total authorized by the Secretary for tomato harvest.

The following summary table indicates the disposition of requests and the allocation of braceros in the tomato harvest. For purposes of compiling the table, the assumption has been made that all braceros authorized for reallocation to other activities were used in those activities for the balance of their contract and that no more than 11,918 braceros terminated before October 31, 1965.

	Calender man-days
Requested by grower associations	2,059,372
Certified by the California Department of Employment	1,335,599
Approved by the Secretary of Labor	1,159,176
Braceros who actually arrived	895,933
Not used in tomato harvest because:	
Reallocated to other activities	120,519
Terminated	139,187
Total	259,706
Net calendar man-days actually available for tomato harvest	607,798

This is less than one-third of those requested and a little over half of those approved by the Secretary of Labor.

GI BILL FOR VIETNAM VETERANS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would provide educational and vocational training assistance to veterans of military service in Vietnam. I urge my colleagues in the House to give their full support to the measure.

In our present deep concern over the heavy demands in men and money which are being made in connection with the Vietnam war, we ought to also consider the plight of the young veteran who is back from the Vietnam fighting. Other than his military skills, he probably is not trained to earn a livelihood in civilian life. More likely than not, he has had his education interrupted by his military service.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing would provide vocational readjustment benefits and restore lost educational opportunities to members of the Armed Forces who risk their lives in Vietnam and whose achievement of educational or vocational goals has been interrupted by reason of active duty after January 1, 1964. This would be accomplished under the bill by the payment of a monthly allowance to veterans pursuing full-time courses in approved educational institutions or training establishments. The veteran with no dependent would receive $110; the veteran with one dependent would receive $135; and the veteran with more than one dependent would receive $160 monthly. Allowances on an adjusted basis would also be provided to veterans who pursue less than a full-time program of education and training.

While the proposed legislation is a means by which the Nation can express its gratitude to the veterans of the Vietnam conflict, it also is a vehicle which will enable the Nation to develop to the fullest extent the peaceful endeavors of our battle-hardened Vietnam veterans. Surely we can do no less for these young men.

POPULATION EXPLOSION

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, although the press has done an excellent job of telling us what we will be doing in the session which opens today, I have yet to see included in the subjects for action the establishment of a policy to deal with the worldwide population explosion. The press has forecast that the Congress will deal with the symptoms of this explosion, that we will attempt to prescribe painkillers to make them hurt a little less. But the press has not forecast that we will discuss the fundamentals of the problem and take action which seems appropriate.

Let us be blunt, Mr. Speaker. There are a number of important issues which will be acted upon by this 2d session of the 89th Congress. But no issue is more important and no set of problems are more pressing than the world population explosion. I would submit that if this Congress will accept its clear responsibility to establish policies to deal with the population explosion, it will be remembered far more for this reason than for any other.

We can take constructive action in this field. We can support the efforts already initiated by President Johnson. We can encourage their expansion. And we can pass legislation establishing our belief that family planning information, services, and supplies should be made available to all who request them. We should also make it clear that such information, services, and supplies should be a part of our AID programs, upon the request of the foreign governments involved.

And, Mr. Speaker, we should make it clear that we see no possibility whatsoever of providing enough surplus food from our own lands to prevent mass starvation in countries whose populations will at least double in the next 25 years if family planning programs are not undertaken on a broad scale. We would delude both ourselves and countries abroad if we claimed otherwise.

It is my greatest hope that this session the Congress will address itself squarely and vigorously to the problems of family planning, birth control, and the population—both here and abroad.

We made 5 days of progress last year, but the problem grew by 365 days. We cannot afford to allow another year to slip by with no action. For the problem will soon be so great that no solution within our values will be possible.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN TABER

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House that one of our beloved and most distinguished former colleagues, my immediate predecessor in the 35th Congressional District of New York, the Honorable John Taber, of New York, passed away quietly during our adjournment period, at his home in Auburn, N.Y., on November 22, after a long illness, at the age of 85. He served in this body for 40 years and retired in 1962 after having served as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in two Congresses and also for a number of years immediately prior to his retirement as the ranking Republican member of that great committee. I am sure we are all deeply saddened by his passing.

I take this time to advise Members of this House, his friends and former colleagues, that I have taken time on Wednesday, prior to the recess period, so that all who might wish to comment on the life and achievements of John Taber might do so at that time.

DUKE WILL INVEST $1 BILLION IN APPALACHIA

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Duke Power Co. is asking permission of the Federal Government to invest $1 billion in Appalachia. Today I am introducing a bill which would permit Duke Power Co. to build a small low-level retaining wall across the Savannah River at Middleton Shoals. With this retaining wall to impound cooling water, Duke would build the world's largest steamplant for the generation of electricity. This steamplant on undeveloped land in Anderson County near Iva, S.C., would cost Duke over $210 million. The retaining wall between South Carolina and Georgia, necessary for the cooling water, would cost only $3½ million.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would permit Duke Power Co. to spend one-quarter of a billion dollars in Anderson County alone. At this moment, while this bill is being introduced, Duke Power Co. is also seeking a license from the Federal Power Commission to begin still other power generation projects which would eventually cost $700 million in Oconee and Pickens Counties, South Carolina, and Transylvania County, North Carolina. Anderson, Oconee, Pickens, and Transylvania Counties are all in the region designated by Congress as Appalachia. The Congress last year authorized, after exhaustive hearings and years of study, $1 billion to develop the Appalachian region. Appalachia was declared by Congress to be behind the national average in per capita income and industrial development. Congress acknowledged that access roads, higher income and job opportunity were urgent in the Appalachian region. Therefore Appalachia received special attention by the Congress and thus a billion dollars of public funds.

Duke Power Co. on January 4, 1965—more than a year ago—applied for a license here in Washington to spend $700 million of private capital in the Keowee-Toxaway area of Appalachia. The Secretary of Interior incredibly intervened opposing this development. The Secretary later withdrew the intervention but his action delayed consideration of the project. Last Friday, the Secretary again entered the case and filed another request for a delay of 90 days. South Carolina Electric Cooperatives withdrew all objection to the Duke development; however, the so-called newly formed Bistate Committee composed of North Carolina and Georgia electric cooperative leaders are continuing their objections before the Federal Power Commission. It is incredible that such interests far removed from Appalachia would oppose development of the region. The Blue Ridge Cooperative in the immediate area of Oconee and Pickens Counties has even endorsed the Duke development. The cooperatives nearest the project in South Carolina and throughout South Carolina are not opposing the Duke development in Appalachia.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill 4 years ago which would permit Duke to build this $210-million steamplant at Middleton Shoals. It passed the House of Representatives unanimously but encountered opposition in the other body and Duke was not permitted to proceed with this gigantic development on the Savannah River. With taxpayers' money and national attention now focused on the Appalachian region there is no logical reason why Duke Power Co. should not be permitted to proceed at once with its billion dollar development in Appalachia—both the $210 million at Middleton Shoals and the $700-million complex at Keowee-Toxaway. Duke's proposed development in Oconee and Pickens Counties and Transylvania County in North Carolina is known as the Keowee-Toxaway project. Both of Duke's proposals at Keowee-Toxaway and at Middleton Shoals are indispensable to the future power needs of the people in western South Carolina and North Carolina.

One of the major problems confronting this Congress is an increase in the budget to prosecute the Vietnam conflict and for national defense. The Congress is faced with the problem of this increase in the budget without imposing additional taxes on our people. The billion dollar Duke development when completed would pay into the Federal Treasury annually $30 million in taxes. These Duke projects would pay into the hard-pressed State and local treasuries more than $25 million additional annually in taxes. Duke, at the present time, is paying over $1 million a week in taxes.

Past experience has demonstrated that for every dollar invested in the generation of electricity three additional dollars are invested in new industry and expansion of old industry in the same general area. Should Duke be permitted to invest this $1 billion in the generation of electricity, another $3 billion would be invested in new and expanding industries in the same general area. This would add additional millions in revenue to the Federal, State, and local treasuries. Fifty-five percent of all new industry located in the Carolinas has been located in the area served by Duke Power Co. Power, water, and recreation are necessary for industrial growth and job opportunity in the Appalachian region. By 1985, this area will need four times the electricity now being used. Duke proposes to supply that need with an abundance of cheap electricity. Their rates at the present time are 20 percent below the national average. Duke has reduced rates five times in the last 6 years with the latest reduction becoming effective this month. Duke Power Co., is already providing water without charge to 17 different municipalities in the Carolinas. The Duke development in Oconee and Pickens Counties would not only furnish a fantastic amount of cheap electricity but an abundance of pure fresh mountain water would become available to industry, municipalities, and rural water systems. In this same area, Duke proposes to open up more than 60,000 acres of its land above the Keowee-Toxaway development for hunting, recreation, and wildlife. Roads and bridges will be built opening up for the first time some of the most beautiful mountain scenery in the world. By the year 2000 it is estimated that the United States will have a population of 300 million.

The eastern seaboard from Atlanta to Boston will be virtually one continuous urban area. Already the beaches along the Atlantic seaboard are overcrowded. Where are these teeming millions to go for recreation? Their only hope will be Appalachia.

This Duke development built with private capital and its attendant taxpaying projects is beyond the fondest dreams of those of us who sponsored Federal aid to Appalachia. It would be incomprehensible and incredible to delay further this development by Duke Power Co. The Congress should immediately grant the authorization for the retaining wall at Middleton Shoals. This dam would not flood one single acre of land not presently owned by Duke and would not remove 1 square foot from taxation in Georgia or South Carolina. Even that land flooded would continue on the tax books and taxes would be paid on every acre by Duke. The Bistate Committee and the Secretary of Interior should withdraw their opposition immediately. The Bistate Committee and the Secretary of the Interior should be the greatest advocates of this Duke development in Appalachia. The Duke developments when completed would purchase from $135 to $140 million worth of coal each year from the depressed coalfields of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Kentucky—all in the Appalachian region. Traffic on the depressed railroads of Appalachia would greatly increase. The Duke Power Co.'s plant alone at Middleton Shoals would require 95 carloads of coal each day. One operator of a small railroad located in Pickens County stated recently that with the Duke development at Keowee-Toxaway their railroad would be extended into the foothills of Appalachia and traffic would be greatly increased hauling construction crews, cement, steel, and machinery to the site of the Duke projects.

Duke should be offered every encouragement by the Federal Government to proceed with this fantastic development. This dynamic and farsighted company is asking the Federal Government to let it help develop Appalachia. It is manifesting a confidence in the future of Appalachia. Duke alone is willing to match the $1 billion appropriated by Congress. This Duke development would result in vastly improved educational opportunity—increased teachers' salaries, school facilities, hospitals, hospitalization, roads, and job opportunity. We can no longer deny taxpaying industry the same privilege to develop an area as has already been granted the Federal Government. Appalachia needs more education of the variety offered by Duke University. Appalachia needs more medicare, hospitalization, and medical research of the variety provided by Duke University. We need more of the humanitarianism and education as offered by the Duke endowment. Virtually every college in the Southeast has benefited by the Duke endowment.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government needs the tax revenue. Appalachia needs the Duke development now. The area presently served by Duke is a growing, expanding, fully employed area. Charlotte recently passed the 250,000 mark in population. We should permit Duke to extend this prosperity into the heart of Appalachia and help relieve the taxpayers of the entire country of their burden.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking South Carolina's two distinguished and able representatives in the other body, the Honorable STROM THURMOND and the Honorable DONALD RUSSELL, to join me in introducing this bill at their earliest convenience.

EXCLUDING MONTHLY SOCIAL SECURITY PAYMENTS FROM INCOME OF VETERANS' PENSIONS

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide that monthly social security benefit payments to veterans shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining their eligibility for a pension under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

I do this because during the months following enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, which granted annuitants a 7-percent increase in benefits, I have been contacted by numerous of our elderly veterans whose pensions have been reduced because of that increase. I do not believe it to be fair to take away from the veteran something that had been given to him. With all of our programs to fight poverty, a hardship is being imposed on these individuals, many of whom have only about $2,000 a year income to support man and wife. If the criterion for determining poverty is an income of less than $3,000 a year, one can readily see the injustice of the current situation.

I believe there are two separate concepts involved in these programs. The annuities under the Social Security Act are based upon the contributions the individual made during his working years; the veterans' pensions are based upon the sacrifice the individual made to protect our freedom. A grateful nation should justly reward its veterans; not penalize them for having contributed to the progress of the Nation during peacetime.

I feel very strongly that social security annuities should have no effect on a veteran's pension, and I am hopeful that Congress will in this session act to remove this inequity.

PETER J. MANENA, COMPANY CITIZEN OF THE YEAR, COMPLIMENTED BY THE LATE HONORABLE T. ASHTON THOMPSON

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on June 28, 1965, my predecessor, the Honorable T. Ashton Thompson, was principal speaker at a public affairs forum in Pittsburgh which was sponsored by the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. At the forum one of the employees of PPG's chemical division in Lake Charles, within my district, was honored as company citizen of the year. The man receiving this outstanding award on that occasion is Mr. Peter J. Manena, prominent citizen and police juror of Calcasieu Parish.

Congressman Thompson had planned to document the honor bestowed upon Mr. Manena in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and had prepared for insertion therein the following remarks which I now wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues in his behalf:

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 28, 1965, it was my distinct honor and privilege to be present in Pittsburgh when Mr. Peter J. Manena, a good friend of mine, a fellow Louisianian, and an employee of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. at Lake Charles, was named PPG's "Citizen of the Year—1965."

This presentation, made by Mr. David G. Hill, president of Pittsburgh Plate Glass, was part of a Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. public affairs program for which I was invited to be the guest speaker.

I was indeed gratified and proud to see Peter Manena receive this award because it is visual proof that working men and women can participate in politics and in public affairs and can make substantial contributions to the administration of government. I am equally proud that Mr. Manena is from my congressional district. He is an outstanding civic-minded individual, and he has been helpful to me on many occasions in the pursuit of things beneficial to our areas.

Especially, I feel the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., which sponsors this annual community awards program, should be congratulated for encouraging all their employees, not just those in Louisiana, to become active in politics and community affairs. Many of PPG's employees in Lake Charles have long been active in their community affairs and have done creditable jobs, but perhaps no one has reflected the interest of a company and its interest in a community in greater measure that has Peter J. Manena.

With further reference to this matter I commend to the attention of Members of this body the following articles from the Lake Charles American Press of June 14, 1965, and the Beaumont Enterprise of June 15, 1965:

[From the Lake Charles (La.) American Press, June 14, 1965]

"PPG SELECTS MANENA FOR TOP HONOR

"PITTSBURGH, PA.—Peter J. Manena, a member of the plant security force at the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. chemical division plant in Lake Charles, has been named 'Company Citizen of the Year,' according to David G. Hill, company president.

"Manena will be honored at the public affairs forum here June 28 when a trophy will be presented to him.

"He was selected from 70 nominations throughout the country, made from among 38,000 company employees.

"Manena is presently serving his third 4-year term as a member of the Calcasieu Parish Police Jury and has been active in civic and religious work in the community.

"The annual award is made in recognition of employees who are helping to make their communities better places in which to work and live.

"Manena was originally employed by PPG chemical division in Lake Charles as a guard-fireman in 1947. He was reassigned as a gate guard in 1953 and still serves in that capacity."

[From the Beaumont Enterprise, June 15, 1965]

"P. J. MANENA TO RECEIVE HONOR—PITTSBURGH PLATE GLASS NAMES 'CITIZEN OF YEAR'

"LAKE CHARLES.—Peter J. Manena, member of the plant security force at the Pittsburgh Plate Glass chemical division plant at Lake Charles, has been named 'citizen of the year' by the company, David G. Hill, president, announced today.

"Manena was selected from among 70 plant employees nominated throughout the country for their contributions in making their communities better places in which to work and live.

"SET CEREMONY

"PPG has 38,000 employees in plants over the United States.

"Manena, who is also a Ward 3 Calcasieu Parish police juror, will be honored at a public affairs forum in Pittsburgh on June 28.

"U.S. Representative T. A. Thompson, of Louisiana, will be principal speaker and Manena will receive an engraved glass trophy.

"FIRST RECIPIENT

"Mrs. Manena will accompany her husband to Pittsburgh for the presentation.

"Manena is the first recipient of the annual award which is sponsored by the company's civic and governmental affairs committee.

"Each plant, technical center or other operating unit of PPG may organize a community service awards committee.

"SUBMIT NAME

"From nominations submitted by employees, members of families or anyone in a community familiar with an employee's community activities, the local committees decide what achievements merit recognition for a community service citation. The citation winner's name is submitted to the civic and governmental affairs committee to be considered for the 'citizen of the year' award.

"Manena has been at PPG since 1947. Born in Morgan City, he moved to Lake Charles at an early age. He graduated from LaGrange Senior High in 1933 and attended Louisiana State Normal School in Natchitoches, now Northwestern State College, for 2 years, where he majored in history and political science. He was in the Air Force for 3 years.

"Mr. and Mrs. Manena have a son, Peter Joseph Manena, Jr., and a daughter, Beverly Patricia Manena.

"He is serving his third 4-year term on the police jury."

ANTIDEMONSTRATION BILL

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's involvement in the Vietnam war has caused serious debate throughout the country by many groups, individuals inside and outside the Government, and in the news media. This is healthy and needed.

However, there are those persons who have gone beyond the constitutional bounds of freedom of speech and assembly and who have actually subverted the national interest of the United States and its efforts to protect the general population and preserve the peace.

In October 1965, for example, 11 demonstrators were arrested at Truax Air Force Base near Madison, Wis., when they tried to enter the installation to make a citizen's arrest of the base commander.

A group in Oakland, Calif., this past summer and fall, marched on the Oakland Army Base and attempted to stop troop trains going to the installation.

These recent actions by misguided individuals make necessary legislation designed to prohibit demonstrations which impair U.S. military operations.

Today, I am introducing in the House of Representatives a bill which would provide penalties of a fine up to $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 10 years or both to those people who interfere with the operations of the military forces of the United States. It covers those who would interfere, those who would urge the interference of military operations and those who distribute material urging interference.

I urge that the legislation be quickly acted upon to protect our continued military operations in this time of national concern and crisis.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO DEFINITION OF TREASON

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the definition of treason.

There is considerable evidence of increasing interest and activity in the United States directed toward giving direct aid and comfort to North Vietnam, the Vietcong and other Communist groups and organizations. This aid and comfort is being given by individuals and certain organizations within the United States who owe allegiance to the United States. The effort to render such aid and comfort on the part of these individuals and certain organizations is for clearly treasonous purposes. There is an intent to betray the Government of the United States. One may reasonably infer from their remarks and propaganda that if the United States were in a legal or technical state of war, there seems to be no doubt that many of their activities such as effort to collect money and supplies for the Vietcong, would be treason and might well be prosecuted for the offense of treason.

Unfortunately, it appears that there is severe doubt as to whether such activities can, under the present statutes of the law, be prosecuted for treason because the United States is technically not engaged in war with North Vietnam or the Vietcong, nor is North Vietnam or the Vietcong at war with the United States. In view of this loophole in the treason statutes, I am offering an amendment to article 3, section 3, of the U.S. Constitution which limits and restricts the United States as to what offense it may prosecute for treason.

There is no doubt that had the framers of our Constitution anticipated the type and nature of unconventional warfare initiated by Communist groups and powers—that is the conduct in the modern world of undeclared war—they would have made adequate provision in the articles.

The amendment which I propose is clearly in the reason and spirit of the treason statute and corrects a technical deficiency. We have too long permitted subversive and treasonable activities during the cold war. These activities can and should be punished by provision of law.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE AMENDMENT

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow, under specific conditions, an additional deduction in determining the value of a decedent's taxable estate, for the value of land which was used by such decedent for farming purposes.

This bill is designed to give much needed relief to the agricultural integrity of our land by maintaining at death the productive factor of land for agricultural purposes.

It is important to remember that Florida, as well as many other parts of the United States, has had an unprecedented growth economically as well as populationwise. This is particularly noticeable in the field of agriculture. As agriculture intensified in certain areas so did concentration of population for industrial and recreational purposes. In other words, keen competition developed for the use of land.

The present exemption of $60,000 from a decedent's taxable estate works a hardship on farm families and could eventually destroy our time-honored tradition of carrying on the family farm through inheritance. Enactment of this bill into law will help assure the heirs of decedent farmers a fair chance to continue the agricultural use of our land.

COLD WAR VETERANS' BENEFITS ACT

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to be named the "Cold War Veterans' Benefits Act."

Many of my colleagues in both Houses of Congress have introduced this type of legislation and I am glad to join with them because surely our service personnel engaged in the Vietnam and Dominican areas are suffering the same hardships and loss of life as our veterans in World War II who were able to benefit from similar legislation that I am now introducing.

FLUE-CURED TOBACCO PLANTING AND EXPORTS

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing for appropriate reference a bill to permit Flue-cured tobacco farmers the opportunity to space better their tobacco planting and to require the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain records of exports of tobacco by type.

Concerning this latter provision, Mr. Martin E. Hearn, of the Florida Farm Bureau Federation, has discussed thoroughly with me the necessity of keeping these records. It is believed that this information will be of great value to the Flue-cured tobacco farmers of Florida.

I have already introduced H.R. 10390 in August of last year which would permit farmers to space better their tobacco planting because now their allotment is on a poundage basis.

ECONOMIC INCENTIVES FOR POLLUTION CONTROL

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works. May I say this is not a new idea. Similar bills have been introduced in Congress since 1947. In addition, a number of States have recently moved forward and adopted measures to ease State and local taxes in order to encourage good pollution control practices by industry.

The matter of dirty air and dirty water can no longer be ignored. We have finally come to recognize that this is one of the greatest problems facing our country today. Some progress is being made in this area, but if we are to clean up our air and water a large part of the job must be done by private industry. We cannot simply point the finger at private industry and say, "You are causing much of the pollution—do something about it." We must recognize frankly that the purchase and installation of equipment to control pollution is a big expense. Control costs money. At the 1962 National Conference on Air Pollution it was pointed out that the cost of air pollution control equipment is approximately 25 percent of the cost of the basic production equipment.

Unlike many capital outlays that ultimately produce new profits, these costs basically serve the health and safety of the public and return nothing to the investors. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate that there be some public sharing with private industry of the economic impact of these expenditures. Our tax laws already provide economic incentives in related areas. For example, farmers may deduct expenditures to purchase or acquire fertilizer, lime, ground limestone, marl, or other materials to enrich, fertilize, or condition land used in farming. It would seem that it is time we give equal tax treatment to the quality of the air and water which sustain our lives as we do the quality of farm soils or mineral deposits.

We are investing millions of dollars to help our cities construct needed municipal waste treatment facilities. We should now invest some money through our tax structure to help and encourage industry—especially the small, marginal producer—to install pollution control equipment in their plants. It is a good investment to help make and keep America beautiful and to help protect the health and safety of our people.

It is my hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will give this legislation early and favorable consideration.

COMMISSION ON NOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to create a Commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters to curb the flow of obscene books, pictures, and other materials.

Congress should take action this session so we can really begin a thorough study of the traffic in pornographic and salacious literature and other matters, and devise means of putting the merchants of smut out of business. Because of the numerous court decisions in this area, the problem is far more complicated than it appears. The Commission which would be set up would be composed of experts and they would be charged with the responsibility of drafting model laws for Federal, State, city, and county governments. An information program to alert teachers, parents, and others to the dangers of obscene literature and the means of combating it would be outlined also.

Those of us who have long been concerned realize what problems are involved in this fight. The Post Office Department, except in hard core cases, is often helpless in trying to stop the traffic. Police are hampered and courts are handcuffed in prosecuting those who originate or sell salacious books, pictures, etc., because of the faultiness of legal definitions. In fact, the public information programs on this subject have been lacking because of shaky guidelines. Many hesitate to raise a clamor for fear of being accused of censorship. It is for these two reasons—the lack of meaningful definitions and the inherent dangers of censorship—that a commission is needed to give a thorough study to this problem.

It is my hope that the Committee on Education and Labor will report this legislation promptly as it will be the long, first step in wiping out a national evil. J. Edgar Hoover has said:

> The circulation of periodicals containing salacious materials plays an important part in the development of crime among the youth of our country.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON COMMENTS ON SECOND SESSION

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, we gather to convene the 2d session of the 89th Congress and look forward to fulfilling our legislative responsibilities to the American people.

To my colleagues in the House of Representatives and to our distinguished Speaker, may I say how pleased and proud I am on this occasion to once again join with you and embark on the mission of preserving and protecting our democracy.

The eyes of the country and the world are on us today. We are meeting under trying world circumstances.

Clearly, Vietnam is the No. 1 question before the Nation. It will be the No. 1 question before Congress this year.

The adjournment period gave all of us in Congress the opportunity to spend time with the people we represent and to gage their thinking. The men and women of Rochester, Monroe, and Wayne County made plain to me that they are very concerned about the war in Vietnam. Generally they support our position, but want to know more about our policy.

With more American lives being lost every day, with the continuation of gloomy reports from Vietnam, and with the increasing cost of this war, I intend to do all I can in this Congress to open up the Vietnam question for full view. Only then, can Congress and the country best make the decisions that will have to come this year.

With Congress now back in session, legislative proposals are also the center of attention. Some of them are carryovers from the first session, others are new, having gone in the House hopper at the start of today's session.

I am introducing a number of bills and resolutions for consideration this year. As this second session convened, I submitted quite a few and others, now in preparation, will be offered in the near future.

Each of these measures I am sponsoring will be detailed for the information of the people I represent and my colleagues as the work of Congress progresses. However, I would like to list a few new proposals and some of the benefits they would bring.

Before noting the legislation, I think it is important to point out that many of these items resulted from meetings with constituents during the adjournment period and evaluating problems that need legislative remedy.

Of special interest to consumers are two bills I am introducing, one to set tire safety standards and the other to limit to nonlethal levels the total number of children's aspirin that can be packaged together. Both bills, I hope, can overcome present hazards to public health and safety.

In the area of small business, where I have particular concern because of my service on the Small Business Committee, I am proposing new tax aids, credit guarantees, and loan programs.

For veterans, new Horton bills will include correction of the pension reductions which have been suffered as the result of increased social security benefits—increases which do not offset the pension losses—and PX privileges for veterans at least 50-percent disabled.

Amendments to the law regulating the National Labor Relations Board are among the proposals I plan in order to assure the original intent of political independence for this panel.

Affecting foreign commerce will be my bills to control the export of walnut logs, which are in very short domestic supply, to maintain price stability and new protections for American business against the illegal practices of countries that attempt to sell in our country at prices below the level of their own nation. This latter practice, known as dumping, has been very injurious to certain segments of our economy.

Tax legislation will continue to have my legislative attention. I am working on measures to assist the States in meeting their revenue needs and to more equitably treat the income of widows and widowers.

Other proposals planned for introduction concern a lowering of postal rates for photographic materials, fairer import duties for religious missionaries and protection for agricultural cooperatives.

TWO AMERICANS SECRETLY WORKING ON EGYPTIAN ROCKET PROGRAM

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times today carried a front page report to the effect that two Americans are secretly working on the Egyptian rocket program, in an effort to assist the United Arab Republic in developing medium range rockets, for military purposes. Such activity is clearly contrary to the U.S. policy of opposing an arms escalation in the Middle East, and I believe it calls for a thorough investigation by the Department of State and a full disclosure to the public. I have today, written to the Secretary of State requesting such an investigation and a public report.

In addition, there is a distinct possibility that the two Americans involved may be former Federal employees who, in the course of their work, may be marketing their Nation's secrets for private gain, in violation of Federal law. I have therefore also requested that the Attorney General look into this matter to ascertain if such violations are taking place.

I think it is deplorable for American citizens to thwart the will of their Government by taking it upon themselves to upset the tenuous arms balance that exists in the Middle East. I cannot understand how an American can justify working on a project such as this, particularly after our own Government reportedly blocked the shipment of parts and materials which Nasser wanted to use on the project. I firmly believe that a full investigation and disclosure are necessary, so that we in the Congress may take appropriate legislative action to insure that these abuses do not recur.

REPRESENTATIVE ADAIR INTRODUCES BILL AUTHORIZING PROGRAM OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR VETERANS OF MILITARY SERVICE SINCE JANUARY 31, 1955

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the continuing escalation of our combat involvement in Vietnam and the increasing scope of the military draft calls have produced a side effect which has not yet been recognized by the administration. I am referring, of course, to the disruption of the lives of thousands of young Americans serving our Nation in faraway corners of the earth. The educational and career plans of these young men are being interrupted and deferred indefinitely—forever in some cases—while they satisfy their military obligations.

In an effort to assist these young people in attaining the educational and vocational status to which they might normally have aspired and obtained had they not served their country, I am today introducing a bill authorizing a program of education and training for veterans of military service since January 31, 1955.

Members of Congress, representatives of major veterans organizations, labor unions, school, and educational associations and servicemen themselves, particularly those now serving in Vietnam, have expressed support for legislation of this kind. Despite this impressive list of supporters, the Johnson administration has failed to sanction educational benefits for veterans of current service. In fact, just last September, a spokesman for the administration advised our committee that enactment of legislation of this nature would be inconsistent with the administration's objectives.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is as necessary today as it was during the Korean conflict when the Congress enacted a similar program for the young men and women who served during that period. Each day more of our youth are committed to combat in Vietnam. Enlistments and tours of duty are frequently extended. The uncertainties of military service are the same today as they were during the Korean conflict.

It has been said that the enactment of this program would be too costly. Even the Veterans' Administration, while opposing the extension of educational benefits to current servicemen, applauds the beneficial results to the Government of the World War II and Korean conflict educational programs. In a recent release entitled "The GI Bill Paid Off" the Deputy Administrator of the Veterans' Administration estimates a $20-billion return to the Federal Government in additional income taxes alone on the $19 billion invested in the World War II educational program. There is every reason to believe that a similar program today would be equally productive of results.

It has also been said that the mounting costs of waging war in Vietnam require a slowdown in domestic spending with no costly new programs being adopted. I subscribe to this philosophy. For those who would use this philosophy, however, as an excuse to oppose this type of benefit, let me emphasize and underscore the fact that the cost of an education and training program for the serviceman of today must be viewed as one of the necessary costs of war. Preparing the serviceman returning from war to take his place in our civilian economy is as essential to our national interests as was the task of preparing him for military duties through basic training.

If we can provide billions of dollars to educate various segments of our society, we can afford no less for the youth who is risking his life to preserve our way of life. I sincerely pray that the President will recant his administration's opposition to educational benefits for the returning serviceman and lend the influence of his office to the immediate enactment and approval of such legislation.

A brief analysis of significant provisions of my bill follows:

PROVISIONS OF VETERANS' EDUCATION BILL INTRODUCED BY HON. E. ROSS ADAIR, JANUARY 10, 1966

This bill, entitled the "Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 1966", will provide a program of education and training for veterans of current service.

Service requirements: At least 6 months military service between February 1. 1955, and the date of termination of compulsory military service.

Duration of education or training: Education or training time shall be earned at the rate of 1½ days of education for each day of military service during the specified period. The period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled shall not exceed 36 months.

Time limitations: Education or training must be initiated within 3 years after the veteran's discharge or release from active duty or 3 years from date of enactment, whichever is later. Veterans who have been unable to initiate programs of study within 3 years of separation because of the nature of their discharge shall be permitted to initiate a program of education or training within 3 years after the nature of the discharge was corrected or changed to make him eligible.

Expiration of education and training: No education or training shall be afforded an eligible veteran beyond 8 years from discharge from active duty or 8 years from enactment of this law, whichever is later. The entire program of education and training shall terminate 8 years after the date of termination of compulsory military service.

Payments to veterans: Each eligible veteran pursuing a program of education or training shall receive an education and training allowance to meet in part the expenses of his subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment. The following allowances are payable.

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION TRAINING

Full time, 14 semester hours: $130 monthly, no dependents; $160 monthly, one dependent; $190 monthly, two or more dependents.

Three-quarters time: $95 monthly, no dependents; $120 monthly, one dependent; $140 monthly, two or more dependents.

Half time: $60 monthly, no dependents; $75 monthly, one dependent; $90 monthly, two or more dependents.

Less than half-time: Allowance computed at the rate of the established charges or $130 per month for full-time course, whichever is the lesser.

Institutional and on-the-job training: $105 monthly, no dependents; $180 monthly, one dependent; $150 monthly, two or more dependents.

Apprenticeship or on-the-job training: $80 monthly, no dependents; $100 monthly, one dependent; $125 monthly, two or more dependents.

Institutional on-farm training: $110 monthly, no dependents; $130 monthly, one dependent; $150 monthly, two or more dependents.

Miscellaneous provisions: Educational institutions which qualify to participate in this program include public or private elementary school, secondary school, vocational school, correspondence school, business school, junior college, teachers college, college, normal school, professional school, university, scientific or technical institution or other institutions furnishing education for adults.

SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this 1st day of the 2d session of the 89th Congress to offer a word or two in recognition of one of our most distinguished colleagues in the other body. I feel it is especially fitting that we dwell for a moment today on both the man and the career that is LEVERETT SALTONSTALL; because today marks the opening of the last session of the U.S. Congress in which we shall be honored by his contributions to our deliberations.

There is an unreal quality about the fact that LEVERETT SALTONSTALL has decided it is time to step out of public life. To many of us who have come to the Congress within the last 20 years, the name SALTONSTALL has always been synonymous with the Senate as well as with the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He is the savant to which virtually all of us in both bodies have had occasion to turn at one time or another for guidance, for wise counsel, for reasoned judgments. Certainly for the Massachusetts delegation, and I believe I speak for all who are honored to serve the great Commonwealth, both Democrat and Republican, "LEV" SALTONSTALL has been both friend and leader, both colleague and counselor.

Senator SALTONSTALL's career has been unique in this day and age. And in its singularity, it has set a high example for anyone in public service, now and for all time to come.

His record is not marked with blazing innovation. He is not a fiery frontiersman, thrusting forward with a crusader's sword in one hand and the head of his enemy in the other. He is not a man of bombast or flamboyance; he has left sensationalism and false bravado to those who have not yet plumbed the depths of their own character in search of the honest bedrock upon which LEV SALTONSTALL has always stood.

And yet he is a progressive, he is a man totally committed to improving the lot of those he serves. He is also a moderate in that he is able to always to perceive the middle ground, able always to temper enthusiasm for one cause with consideration for another, perhaps conflicting, point of view. He has never shaken his New Englander's concern for fiscal integrity. And yet he has tempered this with the realistic knowledge that true progress can often be a costly proposition.

For us in Massachusetts, and again I claim the privilege of speaking for all my fellow citizens, Senator SALTONSTALL has been a source of quiet but ever constant pride. His manner, his immense dignity, his unwavering integrity, his unhesitating commitment to the principle that his first allegiance and responsibility lay with the people; these are the hallmarks of Senator SALTONSTALL's nearly half century of public service.

In many ways, he is a throwback to his own ancestral forebears, which include both Presidents Adams and a succeeding roster of Massachusetts leaders too long to list here. He is an individual who has stubbornly refused to give in to the headlong rush for headlines, to the helter-skelter pace of an age in which, far too often, the ability to spend unlimited sums of money has come to be the accepted standard of statesmanship. And yet he has been singled out; he has been chosen to represent modern people with modern problems.

He is a moderate in politics. As such, his contributions to the Republican Party are beyond value. He is again the rock to which all segments of our honored party have been able to turn for wise arbitration of our internal debates, and for leadership in our contentions with the opposition. Here again, it has not been a mailed fist or a slashing sword that has led the way, but rather a quiet and powerful reaffirmation of the commitment we all must make toward the public interest. He has led by example and deed, rather than by empty oratory or a blank check.

Senator SALTONSTALL first entered public service some 45 years ago as alderman in his hometown of Newton, Mass. Over the years he has risen to serve 14 years in the Massachusetts Legislature; and 8 of those years as speaker of the house. He went on to become Governor of the Commonwealth, and is the only man ever to be chosen by the people for three terms in that high office. Indeed, he is the only man in the country to serve three terms as Governor in the 20th century.

He might have held that high office longer had he not come to the U.S. Senate in 1945 where, from that time to this, he has served both his beloved home State and his country.

It is a unique career in politics; one which we might all well envy. And it has been achieved without the glittering rhetoric and explosive dash that has come to be the hallmark of modern-day politicians.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL is symbolic of all that New England represents in the minds of historians and nostalgic native sons. He has been called the last of the Brahmins by many of his latter-day biographers. And, while he certainly embodies the intellectual and social cultivation associated with that class, he has lacked utterly the snobbish aloofness and superior affectations.

In a sense, he has been a Renaissance Brahmin, preserving the traditions of one of New England's oldest and most respected names, and yet paying heed also to the needs of today's complex and dynamic society in which the elite are blended with the ordinary, in which the aristocracy and the hoi polloi serve and are served alike by one another.

He has compiled a lifetime career in public service of the highest order. And yet, he has preserved a wholesome and viable private life as well. He has found the elusive pathway which so few of us seem to find in which we are able to serve in both camps without sacrificing the greater needs and responsibilities of either. He has set an example for living, in both his public and private life, which should command the attention and following of all men.

Speaking for myself, I deem it a high honor and a singular distinction to have been able to serve the citizens of Massachusetts and of the United States alongside LEVERETT SALTONSTALL. I am proud to share his party affiliation. I am deeply flattered that he has seen fit to mention me, along with the other distinguished gentlemen from my State, as a possible successor to his seat in the other body. And while it is a worthy aspiration to occupy that seat, it will never be possible to fill it as it has been filled for the last 21 years.

Thank you.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Richard G. Capen, Jr., director of public affairs of the Copley Newspapers at La Jolla, Calif., has made a number of talks on the subject "Where Do We Go From Here?" Excerpts from this series of talks follow, and I think the readers of the RECORD will find these talks very provocative, because they clearly outline the challenge to the United States and to the Congress:

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

(By Richard G. Capen, Jr.)

Despite today's atmosphere of prosperity, there is an uneasiness across the Nation. War in Vietnam, crime in the streets, and the growing power of the Federal Government are not encouraging a sense of stability as we look to the future.

It used to be that when a person wanted something, he worked to earn it. Today he stages a riot, insisting that it be given at someone else's expense. It used to take a lifetime of plain hard work and scrimping to provide a family with a little surplus and sense of security. Today mobs of demonstrators demand that they be given it, out of our earnings and with no effort on their part.

So-called minority groups seem to think the world owes them a comfortable living. They forget that society's obligation is to guarantee opportunity, not handouts.

Because the American way of life has been attacked from within, some have begun to wonder whether there really is anything distinct about our country. America's greatest hope and its greatest opportunity rests in rediscovering the limitless power of the individual. In short, we need a rebirth of Americanism and personal responsibility.

Because of the increasing trend to substitute Government and money for individual responsibility, some have tended to accept our greatest promise as being the continuing growth of government. The Great Society was not born in the 1960's. The concept of improving our standard of living has existed in America for more than 200 years.

Our Founding Fathers were concerned with freedom. They wanted a society in which individual liberty was paramount. Their objective was to have the people control Government, with the migration to this land reflecting a rejection of the notion that the state could be author of utopia.

It cannot honestly be said that we are moving closer to protection of individual rights with the continued mushrooming of the Federal Government.

The current list of Federal efforts is nearly endless—medicare, antipoverty programs, regional, medical centers, job corps, aid to Appalachia, minimum wage increases, packaging and labeling legislation, 35-hour weeks, double pay for overtime, and urban renewal, to name a few. Congress is writing into law the concept that every American is entitled, through Government help, to a job, a reasonably good living, comfortable housing, medicare, Federal college scholarships, a beautiful neighborhood, pollution-free air and water, urban renewal and job retraining.

In the next year, each of us will contribute $413 to help pay someone else's rent and bulldoze his decaying neighborhood. We'll put up another $100 toward road construction projects through Appalachia. And, to finance farm surpluses, we will pay $236.

With these costly programs has come a concurrent increase in the size of Government. Today, $1 out of every $5, and one job out of every eight, flow from the Federal Government. In 30 out of 50 States, the Federal Government has more civilian employees on its payroll than the State government. Uncle Sam spends some $6 billion a year for its own required paperwork, including about 1 billion reports a year, or 5 for every citizen.

It has been estimated that more than 2,400 Federal departments, bureaus, agencies and commissions issue guidelines regulating our national economy.

The recently passed medicare program may jeopardize the entire social security system. It is certain to impose unmanageable burdens on hospitals. Few realize the impact of these increased taxes over an average working career. If a 21-year-old employee were to deposit his and his employer's social security payments in a 4-percent savings account until retirement, he would have $81,000 in that account at the age of 65.

Another example of growing Federal power is the Housing and Urban Affairs Department, recently authorized to coordinate all urban and housing problems. Because only 14 out of the 40 or more Federal programs to aid such problems come under the Department's jurisdiction, another layer of bureaucracy has been created, causing costly confusion by overlapping responsibility.

In the 15-year life of Federal urban renewal, fewer than 100,000 homes have been provided on subsidy-cleared land. Meanwhile, our enterprising private housing industry has built nearly 22 million homes.

The Federal Government is rapidly becoming the dominant voice in education, spending more than $6 billion per year. With such subsidies, it is only logical that Washington will insist upon a considerable amount of control.

It would seem that some of the best ideas and programs in education have not been the gift of government, but have come from the individual efforts of our educators and interested professional groups. Many professors are appalled at the number of youngsters overloading the college campuses without any intellectual basis for being there.

If the fetish of college for everybody is accepted as national policy, we should ask where our responsibility ends for educating those who look upon college as just a means of postponing work.

It is estimated that more than $20 billion is being spent for the multitude of efforts covered under the anti-poverty program and we hear more and more about the project's growing chaos, bureaucratic bungling, waste, and extravagance. Poverty has been defined to suit political expediency. We have been told that one-fourth of our citizens still live in poverty. No doubt some do. But if we applied the same yardstick to England, three-fourths of the British would be classified as "poor."

Congress has all but eliminated the power of Governors to object to anything Federal poverty-war planners wish to do within the States. One out of every nineteen Job Corps staffers makes over $19,000 a year. While a patriotic young American GI earns $78 a month fighting in Vietnam, a high school dropout is paid $200 in a Job Corps center. It is estimated that it costs the Federal Government $6,000 annually to provide one Job Corps position. For that price, we could send such young men to the finest colleges in the country. The Post Office Department recently confirmed that nearly half of its 8,700 Job Corps workers were recommended by Congressmen and Senators, indicating political overtones in the selection process.

We tend to forget the record of private industry which has fought its own war on poverty by providing 6 million new jobs in the past 5 years. At some point we must ask ourselves whether there is to be a limit to such massive welfare spending programs. Do we have a moral obligation to subsidize a man who would rather take relief than work? Must we support, without limit, families that refuse to abide by even minimal standards of behavior?

Perhaps the handout philosophy is getting out of bounds, only to encourage the corruption of the charity and ethics.

The most serious—and tragic—domestic problem of our time is the general disrespect for law, sometimes encouraged under the banner of civil rights. The theory of obeying only those laws which a person likes is a dangerous doctrine in a civilized society. While it is ironic that the recent violence has come in the wake of the most sweeping civil rights laws in the Nation's history, it is perhaps understandable.

Too many believe that morality can be legislated. Too many believe that racial problems can be settled in the streets. Too many expect, from someone else, that which they must earn for themselves.

Equitable civil rights must ultimately be achieved in the hearts of men, through responsible citizenship, and proven accomplishment. This Nation was built by immigrants—yes, minority groups—who struggled for opportunity and who scorned the false idea of "something for nothing."

Over the past 200 years, this Nation has grown into the most powerful country in the world—through character, integrity, and self-reliance. Our American heritage is built upon individual risks, a few failures, and a great many resulting successes. Are we prepared to substitute the Federal Government paternalism for our own individual rights and responsibilities?

While the trends may be discouraging, there are, I believe, practical ways in which we can rebuild individual integrity. As a beginning, the younger generation must be prepared to understand, and defend, the American way of life.

Our population is growing at a phenomenal rate. A new power group is emerging. It is very young, affluent, used to great job security, and highly educated. The changes ahead are almost beyond belief.

The average age of our citizens will drop from 33 to 25 by 1968. By 1970 ours will be the youngest country in the free world with 50 percent of our population under 26 years of age. The center of political gravity will soon lie with a generation that knows the depression, and even World War II, only out of history books.

More than 80 percent of the population increase in the next 10 years will be among persons under age 35. More than 12 percent of our population today was not alive at the time of the inauguration of the late John F. Kennedy as President.

In short, an entire new generation must be educated. They must fully understand and appreciate the heritage and principles which have made our country great. They must understand the values of free enterprise, those principles which have made our Nation the wealthiest and most productive in all recorded history. The task will not be easy, if recent surveys of high school and college students are any indication.

Such polls have revealed that 84 percent of our young people do not think patriotism is important. Some 56 percent voted for Government regulation of business. Nearly half would do away with freedom of the press, 62 percent said that Government has the responsibility to provide jobs, and 43 percent guessed that the average net profit for industry, after taxes, was between 10 and 25 percent. More than 61 percent did not believe there was a need for profit at all.

This new group, upon whom the Nation's future rests, must be reached. They include the community leaders of tomorrow. Above all, they will have the voting power and they must understand the true impact of their decisions.

The business and professional communities have a great stake in this challenge. They must be prepared to defend the economic principles of our system, as a persuasive argument against those who would substitute government authority for personal responsibility. Too often, the public is told about business by professors, politicians, and labor leaders, but seldom by those who know the most about it—businessmen themselves.

Each responsible citizen must be prepared to support effective local law enforcement. We must challenge public apathy and acceptance of deliberate violations of the law in the name of so-called civil rights. Such attitudes turn demonstrations into violent riots and free speech movements into filthy speech tirades.

We must support the administration's position of firmness in southeast Asia. However, at some point we must decide which war will have top priority—that against communism or that to conquer domestic "poverty." Can we afford to pour billions into both efforts indefinitely?

It is no secret that organized labor has moved its efforts from the bargaining table to the halls of legislatures to achieve its ends. Labor has used government as a source of power to win economic and other aims.

Over the past three decades, government has reshaped union-management relationships, steadily adding weight to the side of labor. The pendulum must be swung in the other direction. Some restraints on union power are overdue and industry must speak out forcefully on such issues, in the interest of labor as well as business.

The traditional two-party system of our country has provided the strength of our constitutional system. Efforts must be redoubled to enhance the balance between political powers so that Congress is something more than a "White House east."

The business and professional communities should increase their support of individual candidates and parties, both in time and money. We must encourage young people to seek politics as a profession. This includes giving dignity and adequate compensation to those in office.

If the States are to assume a more forceful role in our Federal system, long range master plans should be developed for each State. Tax structures should be revised. State legislatures must assume a more aggressive role in solving problems which will otherwise be delegated, by default, to Washington. Today there are some 125 separate programs of Federal aid to States and localities. Such grants have tripled in the past decade.

There should be more pay-as-you-go financing of capital expenditures on the State level. Underwriting such projects, through bond issues, can cost up to 50 percent more with added interest payments.

Recognizing that college enrollment will increase 50 percent in the next 5 years, consideration should be given to tuition charges at State colleges and universities to defray the mounting costs for education. Perhaps then more young people would appreciate the privilege of education.

In summary, it is up to every citizen to speak out for individual freedom of choice, personal responsibility and sound fiscal policies. They have always been our greatest source of strength. And they are our best hope for the future.

. Free enterprise is dependent on freemen. It is not enough for business to maintain a defense against those forces which threaten free enterprise. Businessmen must aggressively assert their roles as leaders of moral and cultural development. They must join with other community leaders to restore man's pride in achieving excellence in his work.

We should be positive in selling the benefits of our way of life as effective arguments against those who would belittle our success. For our Nation to be equal to Russia's economy we would have to abandon three-fifths of our steel capacity and rip up 14 of every 15 miles of our paved highways.

Two out of every three miles of our railroads and 7 out of every 10 of our homes would have to be destroyed. We would have to junk 19 out of every 20 of our cars and trucks and slash our paychecks by three-fourths.

Does this comparison make us a second-rate nation?

Ever-accelerating change has produced unlimited opportunities for the future. The pace of this change is dramatized when recorded history is condensed down to 50 years.

On that abbreviated scale, man stopped living in caves 10 years ago. Five years ago picture writing was started. Two years ago Christianity came into being.

Just 5 months ago, the printing press was invented and 10 days ago electricity discovered. Yesterday, the Wright brothers flew their first plane, television was discovered this morning, and jets came into being 10 minutes ago.

Are we prepared for the next 10 seconds of time on this condensed scale of mankind?

There have been 25 civilizations before ours and all have been destroyed—not from without but from within. If our American way of life vanishes, it will not be because of communism. It will be because of our own apathy, our own unwillingness to assume the individual obligations to society.

The challenge is ours but—where do we go from here?

THE POLISH GOVERNMENT IN EXILE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the truly legitimate voices on behalf of the oppressed people of Poland are heard throughout the free world rather than by any spokesmen of the Soviet-imposed government in Warsaw. The Polish Government in exile maintains its activities in London, and in my opinion, far more accurately represents the aspirations of the Polish people than does the Warsaw regime.

His Excellency August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland, addressed members of the Polish Government in exile, the Council of the Republic of Poland, and representatives of Polish organizations and of the Polish community in Great Britain on January 2, 1966, as follows:

This year, Poland begins the second millennium of her chronicled history. Looking back at the last thousand years, this past cannot but fill every Pole with pride. We Poles assuredly made some mistakes during these 10 centuries: we would not be human if it were otherwise. But many were the great things we accomplished, and manifold the invaluable services we rendered to mankind.

Relatively soon after joining Christendom, Poland became its outer rampart: suffice it to mention the battle of Lignica (1241) against the Mongolian onslaught on Europe, the relief of Vienna (1683), and the Russo-Communist attack repulsed at the battle of Warsaw in 1920. In other domains, the Poles also did much for Western civilization with which they were linked by acceptance of the Christian faith from Rome. Very numerous are the saints, men of learning, poets, writers, musicians, and other representatives of the arts whom the Polish nation gave to the world.

It did much to establish liberty, the ideals of which were definitely encoded in the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May 1791—an act lauded by many beyond Poland's frontiers as combining in exemplary form guarantees of liberty with a strong administration of state. It can be stated without hesitation that this fostering of the idea of liberty by the Poles was one of the reasons behind the conspiracy for the dismemberment of Poland by her three autocratic neighbors.

The loss of independence did not, however, hold up the struggle of the Poles for liberty and their labors for the development of civilization. This struggle was thenceforth an armed one. It is no exaggeration to affirm that Poles fought wherever the fight for freedom raged, in Europe just as in America.

Very soon after the partitions of their country, the Poles linked their fortunes with France, then in the glory of her fight for liberty after the great revolution. The formation of the Duchy of Warsaw restored transient independence to a part of Poland. But Poland's freedom again ended after Napoleon's downfall: the Congress of Vienna effected a fourth partition of Poland and masked its decision by imparting to Russian-occupied Poland the form of a quasi-independent state under the style of the Kingdom of Poland.

With the object of perpetuating the order of things it had imposed upon Europe, the Congress of Vienna set up an association of great powers known as the Concert of Europe which was jointly to uphold this system and maintain peace. With the passage of time, however, the individual aspirations of the various powers proved more powerful than international obligations. Local wars began to break out between them, such as the Austro-Prussian War and the Franco-Prussian War. Realizing the impossibility of maintaining peace under the principles of collective action, the great powers had recourse to the theory of the balance of power. It was expected that by the conclusion of appropriate alliances, it would be possible so to balance the power of the various groups that nobody would dare launch a war. But, it soon transpired that, with human fallibility, people wrongly appraised not only the strength of others but also their own.

In the outcome, the first World War broke out in 1914 and, as it happened, all three of the powers who had participated in the partitions of Poland were simultaneously defeated. This enabled the United States, then making her first appearance on the international arena as a great power, to give the war the character of one for the freedom of nations.

As a result, not only Poland—who resumed the fight for independence immediately hostilities began—but also other nations, such as Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Finland became independent states. However, barely 15 years after total defeat in the First World War, the Germans began to revert to their imperialistic ambitions. Poland called for action against the revival of German imperialism, even to the extent of a preventive war, but her summons passed unheeded. It was only after the seizure of Austria and the fall of Czechoslovakia that the Western Powers perceived this resurrected German imperialism might become dangerous likewise for them. The illusion was harbored that, with the help of Communist Russia, then Fascist Germany might be restrained from recourse to war. It was only after a Russo-German agreement for a fresh partition of Poland was concluded on the initiative of Moscow that Europe at length realized that a danger which menaced the freedom of the whole world had arisen.

It resulted in the Second World War. Its course is well known. America was again obliged to help western Europe endangered by German imperialism. But this time, Germany's unexpected attack upon the Soviet Union made the latter—despite her will—an ally of the Western Powers and a participant in the victory over Germany. Although it was Russia's attitude as Germany's ally in 1939 which led to the outbreak of the war; although Russia behaved during the war as barbarously as the Germans—America and Great Britain abandoned the ideals of the freedom of nations and reverted to the idea of a concert of great powers which was now to dominate not only Europe but even the world. It was with this aim that the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam agreements were concluded.

Yet, once again, these hopes proved illusory. The 100-million Europeans given over to her subjection did not satisfy Russia's insatiable imperialism. She occupied part of Germany and, hoping for further conquests, blocked the signing of a peace treaty and launched the cold war. The idea of a concert of great powers has now again been abandoned and the principle of a balance of power restored to favor, regardless of the fact that more than one effort had been made to establish world peace from a position of strength and that this always ended in disasters which sometimes brought about the irretrievable destruction of certain great powers.

It is to be feared that once again a similar great catastrophe may overwhelm mankind if the excessively self-confident powers—particularly now there are weapons whose use could endanger the existence of all humanity—do not realize that world policy should be based on the principles of liberty and justice, not on force.

The whole Polish nation is now carrying on the struggle for these ideals of liberty and justice. The Poles are conducting it under exceedingly difficult conditions: under a government imposed upon them by Russia and handicapped by a very adverse economic situation evoked not only by the defective system of an alien Communist creed, but also by Russia's onerous exploitation of Poland. Withal, the Poles have to fight for the most elementary attributes of liberty, such as freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and personal freedom. History brings assurance that the Polish nation will strive for the triumph of the ideals of liberty, in the name of the Almighty, until victory is attained. I wish this triumph not only to Poland but likewise to all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, certainly as we commence a very vital year in the history of the U.S. Congress we must not be blind to our obligation to persistently work toward the goal of providing true and lasting freedom to all peoples. There will not be lasting peace, and freedom-loving people will continue to suffer as long as world Communist conspiracy continues its activities. It is my hope that the people of Poland and the other captive peoples of communism will find in this coming year progressive developments leading toward restoration of freedom.

PROGRESS AND EXPANSION OF THE FOOD FOR PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Harvey] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as one of the coauthors of Public Law 480 back in the 83d Congress I have watched with a great deal of pride the progress and expansion of the food for peace program, as it is more commonly known.

Since this program necessarily expires this year, it seems appropriate today, the first day of the session, to discuss some of the merits of this worthwhile program.

As the ranking Republican on the Foreign Agriculture Operations Subcommittee, I would like to commend the Republican Task Force on Agriculture, headed by Congressman ODIN LANGEN, of Minnesota, for the splendid service this committee performed this past fall in bringing to the attention of the American people the need for the establishment of a U.S. World Food Study Commission to plan the future U.S. role in the approaching world food crisis.

As one case in point, the President recently approved a $50 million loan to India to buy U.S. fertilizer at the time he ordered the speedy delivery of 45 million bushels of wheat to relieve the famine there. Agriculture Department officials predict, however, that the real impact of this famine in India will occur in May.

All over the world there are incidents pointing to the need for the continuation of this program. For instance, South Vietnam is now importing as much rice as it used to export, and we now find Japan becoming a larger importer of both rice and wheat as its prosperity permits more livestock output.

A recent article that I read concerning this subject referred to a statement by Louis M. Thompson, associate dean of agriculture at Iowa State University. He pointed out that to meet world food needs 10 years from now there will be 700 million more people to feed. During the closing days of the first session I introduced House Joint Resolution 699 which calls for the establishment of a U.S. World Food Study Commission. I hope the Congress in its wisdom will see fit to act favorably on this legislation.

COLIN STAM

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I and my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee were saddened to learn of the death of Colin E. Stam who passed away on January 6. Mr. Stam retired in June 1964, after 37 years of service to the Congress. For 27 of these years, he had been Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. Mr. Stam made major contributions to our tax laws beginning with the Revenue Act of 1928, the first major effort toward codification of those laws, to and including the Revenue Act of 1964.

During his 37 years of service to the Congress, Mr. Stam was recognized as a foremost authority in the field of Federal tax law. However, he not only was outstanding for his competency, Mr. Stam also was exemplary for his integrity, impartiality, and objectivity. He was always ready to advise and counsel, not only Members of the Joint Committee and of the Congress, but representatives of legal and professional organizations, business associations, and individual taxpayers beset by tax problems. On his retirement in June, 1964, he left behind a dedicated staff of highly competent experts to carry on in his fine tradition.

Colin Stam truly dedicated his life to the service of his country and the Congress. He placed his duties to the Congress above all else. His passing will be mourned by all who knew him.

LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING THE AWARD OF EXEMPLARY REHABILITATION CERTIFICATES TO CERTAIN DISCHARGED SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation authorizing the award of exemplary rehabilitative certificates to certain discharged service personnel. My bill would amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes.

The net effect of the proposed legislation is that individuals will be given an opportunity to submit evidence of exemplary postservice conduct for a period of 3 years after separation, which, when taken into consideration with all other factors surrounding the original discharge, will entitle them, if recommended by the board, to a certificate which, it is hoped, will be of assistance to them in readjusting to civilian life.

The proposed legislation, as recommended by the committee, will make the following changes in the law:

First. It will require the boards of review, discharges, and dismissals, and the boards for the correction of military, Navy, and Air Force records to operate under uniform procedures established by the Secretary of Defense. That uniformity does not exist today.

Second. It will require the boards to take into consideration the following factors in all cases that are being reviewed by the respective boards:

First. The conditions that prevailed at the time the incident, statement, attitude, or act which led to the original discharge or dismissal.

Second. The age of the individual at the time of the incident, statement, attitude, or act which led to the original discharge or dismissal.

Third. The normal punishment that might have been adjudged had the act or incident been committed in civilian life.

Fourth. The moral turpitude, if any, involved in the incident, statement, attitude, or act which led to the discharge or dismissal.

These will be the minimum criteria for all future reviews.

The boards may establish other criteria. In addition to that, however, all boards will be authorized to award an examplary rehabilitation certificate in those cases where the individual requesting a review of his discharge or dismissal introduces evidence of not less than 3 years of postservice conduct in justification of his request for a review of his discharge or dismissal. The same criteria will be applicable in these cases as in all other cases reviewed by the boards. But under the proposed legislation, the boards will be required to take into consideration, as a factor, postservice conduct indicating that the individual has rehabilitated himself, that his character is good, and that his conduct, activities, and habits since discharge have been exemplary for a period of not less than 3 years following discharge.

It should be noted that this certificate will not be a substitute for the previous discharge. It will be dated as of the date it is issued by the board, and it will not be issued in lieu of the original discharge.

The certificate, if granted by the board, will not entitle an individual to any benefits to which he was not otherwise entitled under the original discharge.

ACTION NEEDED ON TRUTH IN PACKAGING LEGISLATION

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on this first day of the new session I would like to mention one important legislative proposal which unhappily has been effectively ignored in the House for too long. It is my hope that we can move the measure forward in 1966.

I refer to the fair packaging and labeling legislation, formerly termed the truth in packaging bill, designed to protect the consumer against deceptive methods of labeling and packaging. It is a substantive matter which promises to have a profound impact, touching upon the entire buying public; over the years it has attracted considerable controversy.

Last May 6 I had the privilege of appearing before the Senate Commerce Committee in order to express my strong supporting views. Over in the other House they have investigated the matter in great detail; the Senate body, in its deliberations, has compiled comprehensive and, I am convinced, conclusive documentation pointing to the need for correction in this vital area.

The purpose of the bill is to establish minimum fair standards to protect consumers against the advertising and illustration of product content which is deliberately misleading. The Government is required to issue regulations which all manufacturers must obey.

It will be mandatory for the Federal Trade Commission to issue rules which: First, require a statement of net content on front panels or labels of commodities; second, establish standards of prominence for net content statements; third, prohibit addition of misleading qualifying terms, such as "jumbo quart"; fourth, specify certain exceptions; fifth, prohibit statements of price reduction, such as "cents off"; sixth, prohibit package illustrations which misrepresent content.

The measure envisages additional regulations after further study and consultation between the Government, business, and the public.

I have the greatest admiration for the genius of American business, and this legislation is not directed at their manifold methods of selling, honestly, a host of goods to consumers everywhere. We do not want to saddle business with arbitrary restrictions and bureaucratic processes. The provisions of this bill will not inhibit growth and diversification in the food industry. Rather, the effect will be to enhance legitimate consumer choice and instill an intelligent measure of protection against widespread deception and abuse.

I certainly hope and urge that our Commerce Committee come to grips with this important legislation during the new session. In my view it provides essential protections to all consumers, establishing minimum standards of labeling and packaging which are just and practical.

DR. HUGH L. DRYDEN

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, with the death of Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, the country lost a veteran of the U.S. space program, a dedicated and brilliant scientist-engineer who quietly gave much of his life to government and to excellence in government. Dr. Dryden was the first and only Deputy Administrator that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has had since its creation in 1958. As much as any other single man he was a symbol of progress in our space efforts. His broad vision and devotion to the idea that the United States should go forward in the exploration of space was the guidepost for progress in our space program.

Dr. Dryden was highly respected by his colleagues both as an administrator and as a scientist-engineer. He will hold an eminent place when the history of man's accomplishments in space is written. Although the country mourns his passing he will be long remembered for his many contributions to the good of his country.

A REMINDER OF THE SACRIFICES BEING MADE BY OUR MEN IN VIETNAM

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, on this 1st day of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter, which vividly reminds us of the sacrifices our men in Vietnam are making for us. This letter, which appeared last month in the Greeneville Sun, one of Tennessee's leading dailies, was written on Thanksgiving Day by Capt. David T. Sites, a Marine Corps aviator, to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Byron D. Sites of Greeneville, Tenn. Captain Sites relates what his life in Vietnam is like and expresses his gratitude for his present duties.

I know that my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD will read this letter with the same overwhelming pride that I did. For we can be justly proud that our Nation has produced such a stanch and loyal defender of freedom as David Sites.

ARE WE THANKFUL ENOUGH?

A few days ago we read a letter from Capt. David T. Sites, a Marine Corps aviator, and son of Mr. and Mrs. Byron D. Sites of Greeneville. The letter was written on Thanksgiving Day from Chu Lai, the base from which many of the Marine strikes against the Vietcong are made. This letter is such a touching reminder of the sacrifices being made by our men in Vietnam in behalf of those of us in this country who take our blessings largely for granted that we are publishing the letter as an editorial. It follows:

THANKSGIVING, *Nov. 25, 1965.*

DEAR FOLKS: As unpleasant as this holiday seems to me now—for this year at any rate—it is probably one that I will remember and appreciate as much as any other. We have had a week of torrential rains which was followed by a nice day yesterday. About sunset yesterday the rains set in again and we have had a steady drizzle all day. Up until the day before yesterday, when we put up a new tent, life has been almost unbearable. Our old tent was full of dry rot and holes and gave very little protection. We didn't have nearly enough buckets or pans to put under all the holes so the floor was awash also. During a couple hours lull we put up a new tent. It is much better, but even it came with 2 gaping holes in the middle. Be that as it may, this tent is far superior and gives adequate protection from the elements. I can put this new tent down as one thing to be thankful for.

I can also be thankful for the marines living out in the holes around this airfield who have the job of keeping me from getting my throat cut. They probably haven't been dry in weeks. Many of them will probably be out in the jungle tonight eating their Thanksgiving turkey out of a C ration can—cold—cold—while I will be eating turkey at our messhall, hot.

I am most thankful that such a thing will not happen in Greeneville, Tenn., or Fort Wayne, or Angola, Ind., or Jacksonville, N.C., or Florida as happened in Hiep Duc (Hep Duc) SVN. This outpost is 35 nautical miles to the northeast of here. I do not know how many times I have routinely escorted helicopters up the peaceful looking little valley, which leads to this town from the rice paddy studded coastal lowlands, to resupply the ARVN troops who were stationed there. When I found out that I would be going to this place again to escort helos I would speak of it as you might speak of going to Bulls Gap or Morristown. A week ago this routine little outpost was overrun by VC. The town chief and other dignitaries and their families were disemboweled and impaled on stakes in the town square.

True, similar incidents occur in the States, but are the product of warped and twisted minds. In this country it is a way of life. No one is safe. Torture, murder, and other indescribable crimes against humanity are the order of the day. I am thankful for the fact that this will not happen in my country.

I am thankful that I can make the preceding statement so emphatically. I can make that statement because I can look about me every day and see why it is true. There are those who I work with that I expect to endure the privations and other discomforts of military life because they have chosen the Marine Corps and the other branches of the service as their way of life; their profession. The vast majority, however, are the people next door, the guy who will live down the block from you next year or service your car or handle your account at Merrill, Lynch. Despite their varied backgrounds, they are able to put up with the horror and terror of war and all its attendant misfortunes and function efficiently; just as if they were back at the corner garage or Merrill, Lynch. They are also able, if it must be, to fight and die here, as long as it may take, until the job is done. This is a characteristic of the American people which has manifested itself from our very beginning and has not died, despite the claims of the sociologists. This is still basically a citizen army which has a belief—for some it is not as clear as for others—and will see it through to the end. For the younger ones, the demonstrators, et al., give the momentary doubts and arouse their anger, but this is in their leisure; this is infrequent. For the older ones, like myself, there is no serious question as to where our duty lies.

I do not delude myself with visions of a world like the one described by the idealistic teacher of the New Testament, but I do believe that I may be instrumental in hastening the arrival of a state of the world which may approach it. I know this because there are so many fine people here working together to achieve this end.

I am thankful that I have a life and a skilled body to offer, or sacrifice if the need be, to our way of life. I am not afraid because I have been there and I know there are many others like me who will see that my loved ones are safe if I am unable to do so myself.

Love,

TOM.

VETERANS' PENSION AMENDMENTS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief statement concerning a bill I have introduced to amend the laws relating to pensions for veterans and their survivors.

A number of amendments to liberalize and improve the pension laws were enacted in 1964 under Public Law 88-664. Other deficiencies and injustices in these laws, however, remain in need of correction. The bill I am proposing would make several important corrections in this area of veterans' legislation, particularly with respect to the types of income that are included in applying the income limitations of the pension laws.

The bill provides, first, that the retirement income of a pensioner shall be excluded in computing his income for the purposes of the income limitations of the pension laws. This means that income received from social security, civil service retirement, or a private pension plan could not, as it now may, be used to reduce the amount of a veteran's pension or to completely disqualify him from receiving a pension.

The enactment of this provision would eliminate the possibility of another anomalous situation from arising such as arose last year when the enactment of a cash benefit increase by the Social Security Amendments of 1965 resulted in some 20,000 veterans and veterans' widows having their VA pensions reduced or canceled.

Under existing law, 10 percent of a pensioner's retirement income is disregarded in determining his pension. This makes very little sense and adds complexity to the law. I believe that a total exclusion of such income should be enacted.

The second amendment contained in the bill is intended to add simplicity and uniformity to provisions of the pension laws that are now overly complex and discriminatory. This amendment would allow the entire income of a veteran's spouse to be disregarded in determining his income. Under existing law there are two pension programs in operation. One of these is for those who were on the pension rolls prior to July 1, 1960. The other pension system, established by Public Law 86-211, is for those whose pensions were initiated since that date. Pensioners under the old pension system may elect, if they so wish, to come under the new system. The rules that apply with regard to the income of a spouse are different under the two systems. All of such income is disregarded for those under the old system, while under the new system the law provides for the exclusion of all of the spouse's earned income, or $1,200 of her other income, whichever is the greater. This change in the bill would merely apply the same rule—the one that now applies to those under the old system—to all pensioners. This is not a great change in terms of dollars and cents, but it would improve the law by ridding it of its present confusing provisions.

The third section of the bill would similarly provide uniform treatment for those under the two pension systems. It would eliminate the "net worth" test which applies to pensioners under the new system but not to those under the older system. This test allows the VA to consider the total assets of a pensioner, not merely his income, in determining his eligibility for, or the amount of, his pension. The present "net worth" test should be abolished because it tends to penalize veterans who have had the foresight and initiative to provide some savings or a home for themselves and favors those who have not.

The last section of the bill eliminates a provision of the law that requires a veteran's pension to be reduced while he is a patient in a VA hospital. This is another provision that applies only to those under the new pension system. As with the two changes preceding it, this amendment would merely apply the same rule that now applies under the old pension system to all pensioners.

Mr. Speaker, the veterans' pension rolls are made up predominantly of aged veterans and their widows. Monthly pension payments are small in relation to today's living costs, ranging from $43 to $100 a month for a veteran with no dependents and from $27 to $64 a month for a veteran's widow. These payments are circumscribed by stringent income limitations. The bill I am offering would grant a moderate amount of relief to those in need of pension assistance. I do not think it is too much to ask for them.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOGUS, MAINE, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL AND CENTER

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this country has always felt that a veteran who has served his country should not be left untended in his time of need. As part of the country's gratitude for the devotion of its servicemen, the Government has established numerous facilities to provide medical care for its veterans.

The first such medical facility was located at Togus, Maine. It was in March of 1866 that this national home opened its doors. Togus, originally a luxury resort, built to draw visitors from Saratoga, N.Y., was bought by the Government and remodeled to provide housing for disabled veterans. On October 6, 1866, the first veterans arrived at Togus.

From that modest beginning, Togus rapidly expanded until in the early 20th century, Togus contained, not only medical and housing facilities, but also a zoo, a theater where Broadway shows were performed by road companies, and even a hotel for visitors who came there.

The Togus Band, which was discontinued in the twenties, gave concerts every day except Monday for the veterans and visitors from the surrounding countryside. This band became famous statewide and even received national recognition for its excellent performances.

In 1930, Togus became a Veterans' Administration facility when the Consolidation Act of that year was passed. A modernization program was begun and many buildings were remodeled and rebuilt. After 1945, Togus became known as a VA center, a hospital with regional office facilities.

The Togus reservation today comprises 1,323 acres with beautifully landscaped lawns, woodland with ponds and streams, recreational areas, and a farm. Togus contains one of the most modern hospitals in the country, staffed by a distinguished personnel who have gained national and international renown in their fields. Togus has become one of the most respected psychiatric hospitals in the East.

The Veterans Affairs Committee and the entire Nation take great pride in the progress that Togus has made since its inception. The committee and the Nation sends its heartiest congratulations to Togus VA Center on its 100th anniversary. We all hope that its progress will go on and that it will continue to stand as a standard of excellence for the entire veterans hospital program.

A GREAT NEWSMAN RETIRES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no group of men in any business better appreciates the value of the press than those of us in this body. Newspapers are indeed indispensable in our business, not only as a medium for bringing our own views and programs to our constituents, but, more importantly, for bringing all facts of all cases, all sides of all stories, all shades of opinions before all the people, all the time. Newspapers do this, but only because of the quality of the men who write and edit and publish the news.

Ours is a country where the tradition of great newsmen predated our own existence as a country. And from the days of John Peter Zenger, Tom Paine, and Ben Franklin we have had newsmen who have been thorough in their research, courageous in their writing. Doubtless there are many who fit that tradition now. None fits its better than a dear friend of mine, Aaron Benesch, who has just retired after more than 50 years of distinguished service in his career.

A New Year's Day article that appeared in my area in the Newark Star-Ledger, as well as in other Newhouse newspapers across the country, set forth the simple chronology of Aaron's career; and I am pleased to include it with my remarks so that those who may only have known him casually may understand just what experience this man had as a reporter, political writer, city editor, and managing editor, as well as the Washington bureau chief for a major newspaper syndicate.

Aaron's professional competence has been recognized, from the beginning, in the variety of his responsible positions. This you can easily gather from the article. But what most of you cannot know is the story of the man behind the story. Painstaking, but never petty; analytical, but never acrimonious. This was Aaron hunting down his story. He asked a lot of questions: hard-hitting, direct, precise questions without any curves of innuendo. And when he wrote he presumed nothing of his readers. They did not have to dig out a background story from an old paper. Aaron gave them the full story, complete to the minute it went onto the presses. He respected confidences, but never abused the truth. His inherent wisdom and vast experience combined to give him an acute insight into a problem and if one were intelligent enough, an interview or talk with Aaron could give the one being interviewed a much better understanding of the subject matter. But this was for one to gather for himself, Aaron never thrust it unwanted upon him.

Perhaps the best measure of the esteem and affection in which his colleagues hold him was to be seen in the party given in Aaron's honor last Friday night in Washington. Many of us, like myself, could not break away from commitments at home. Many did, a hundred or more coming from all over the country to pay their respects. Those of us who did not sent wires or letters, warm, unpretentious words of genuine feeling for a dear friend. Among these were the senior Senator from Missouri, Mr. Symington; former Mayor A. P. Kaufmen, of St. Louis; Harry S. Kramer, a prominent attorney from St. Louis; Norman Isaacs, vice president and executive editor of the Louisville Courier and Times; Richard H. Amberg, publisher of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat; Mort Pye, editor of the Newark Star-Ledger; Irving Dilliard, former editor of the St. Louis Post Dispatch; Howard B. Wood, of USIA; FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and his Assistant Director, C. D. DeLoach; the two Senators from New Jersey, Mr. Case and Mr. Williams; the gentlemen from Saddle River, Mr. Widnall; the gentleman from Collingwood, Mr. Cahill; the gentleman from Jersey City, Mr. Daniels; the gentleman from Bayonne, Mr. Gallagher; the gentleman from Paterson, Mr. Joelsen; the gentleman from West Orange, Mr. Minish; and the gentleman from Livingston; Mr. Krebs. Perhaps the most memorable of all such testimonials came from a distinguished surgeon from St. Louis, Dr. I. C. Middleman, who, as a young lad, was Aaron's copy boy. And among the friends who were there was Aaron's longtime associate and friend, Duncan Baumann, general manager of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

Fortunately, though Aaron will no longer have a regular byline, he will continue to be a regular visitor in our midst, for he and his gracious lady, Eva, will remain in Washington. I look forward to spending many a happy hour with them.

[From Newark Star-Ledger, Jan. 1, 1966]

Aaron G. Benesch Ends Longtime News Career

Washington.—Aaron G. Benesch, associate editor of the Newhouse National News Service, retired Friday after a career spanning more than a half century of newspaper work in St. Louis and Washington.

Mr. Benesch is a former managing editor of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat and of the old St. Louis Times. In Washington, he has covered every administration since President Truman's.

Mr. Benesch, a native of St. Louis, entered newspaper work in 1913 as a $3-a-week copyboy on the St. Louis Star, and became a reporter a year later "when I donned long pants." He joined the St. Louis Times in 1924 as a political writer and columnist, and subsequently served as city editor and managing editor.

CITY EDITOR

When the Star and Times were consolidated in 1932, Mr. Benesch became a political writer for the combined daily. He was named city editor in 1934 and held that position until the Star-Times suspended publication in 1951.

His first tour of duty in Washington was from 1951 to 1953, when he headed the Globe-Democrat's bureau. He was managing editor of the Globe-Democrat from 1953 to 1957, and has been in the Capital since, first as bureau chief for the Newhouse newspapers and from 1962 as associate editor of the Newhouse newspapers.

KEY INVESTIGATOR

Mr. Benesch, a veteran of a colorful era in St. Louis journalism, had a key investigative role in two sensational kidnaping cases—the Hellas Matler abduction in 1915 and the Muench baby hoax case in 1935—and testified as a witness at both trials.

His coverage of national politics dates back to the 1928 Republican convention in Kansas City, that nominated Herbert Hoover for the Presidency.

A member of Sigma Delta Chi, the National Press Club, and the White House Correspondents Association, Mr. Benesch lives with his wife, Eva, in Chevy Chase, Md. A daughter, Mrs. Harry Block, lives in Paris, where her husband is a civilian engineer for the U.S. Defense Department. There are two grandchildren.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION GETS OFF TO GOOD START

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate, I think, on the 1st day of the 2d session of the 89th Congress to bring to the attention of our colleagues a report which deals with the results of some of our recent legislative activity. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the work of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Although its program started with great handicaps it is now operating effectively and persuasively. On Monday, January 20, an article appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch which delineates the fine work this Commission has been doing:

Equal Job Opportunity Commission Overcomes Some Early Handicaps, Gets Off to Good Start—Staff Members Encountering Little Opposition

(By James C. Millstone)

Washington, January 1.—The Federal Government's newest civil rights arm—the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—has overcome early setbacks to achieve a notable start at grappling with the problems of job discrimination.

A major source of strength has been the almost universal acceptance its representatives have received from business and labor, in the South as well as the North.

Staff members—Negroes and whites—speak of the unfailing courtesy of their reception when working on complaints of job discrimination, and of the tremendous reservoir of good will they find among employer and labor groups on behalf of equal employment opportunities.

Of more than 700 complaints investigated, only 2 companies involved have declined to cooperate. Many employers sent representatives to Washington to work out problems of compliance with the Commission staff. Others made top executives available to Commission investigators on weekends and at night.

Commission Chairman Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., said, "Each day our staff brings back from the field a new report of a company or a union which has coupled recognition of the law with good will. The Commission believes there are thousands of employers and labor leaders prepared to take the extra step to give effect to the spirit of the law."

The Commission's responsibility is to assure that all Americans are considered for hiring, firing, and promotion on the basis of ability and qualifications, without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. It went into business 6 months ago under two handicaps: The five Commissioners were appointed late, delaying the agency's organizational period, and Congress cut their first-year budget by nearly 15 percent.

The shortage of staff and money has hurt all the more because, in its first 6 months, the Commission received 3,100 complaints, more than it expected to handle in its first full year. Staff members now expect to receive 4 times as many as the 2,000 complaints they estimated when they prepared their current budget.

Nonetheless the promise of the Commission's work is evident from the appraisals made for the Post-Dispatch by spokesmen for business, labor, and civil rights groups. There were minor criticisms, but each segment subscribed to the view that the Commission had assembled an able staff, had demonstrated the desire to do a good job, and deserved the confidence of all sides.

A concrete and dramatic example of the Commission's value came 2 weeks ago when Roosevelt's intervention helped solve a racial labor dispute in Bogalusa, La., hotbed of Ku Klux Klan activity and of racial violence.

Bogalusa's largest employer is the Crown-Zellerbach Corp. paper plant. As do concerns in many Southern cities, the plant has separate job classifications for Negroes and whites, with two sets of lines for seniority and promotion.

At the request of what the Commission will identify only as "interested parties," Roosevelt brought together leaders of the Negro and white unions and of the company. In a closed, 3-hour meeting in the Federal building in New Orleans—a meeting that included an emotional, personal appeal by Roosevelt—the group reached agreement. The segregated lines of seniority would be merged;

principles established thereby would be extended to other sections of the plant.

The Bogalusa accord demonstrated one of the Commission's most valuable functions. Kenneth F. Holbert, Deputy Chief of Conciliation, explained it this way:

"We provide an apparatus for bringing together the views of Government, management, and employees of all colors within an orderly framework where differences can be discussed and adjusted in a fashion that is not tainted from the beginning by ill feeling."

Commissioners believe that much of their early success can be attributed to the orderliness of the procedures they have established—which appeal to all parties involved—and to the low key, skilled work of their 24 investigators.

Commissioner Samuel C. Jackson, a Topeka, Kans., attorney who formerly was a member of the board of directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, said the investigative work was vital to the Commission's task.

"We have professionally trained investigators who know their jobs," Jackson said. "They do not conduct inquisitions but make a bona fide effort to gather facts. They know we do not want to punish business or labor. We just want everybody to comply with the law.

"We are beginning to see results. The end product of a successful conciliation demonstrates that we have developed rules of procedure that business can live with and have put together a good staff."

The complaint procedure has taken up the bulk of the Commission's time thus far. It begins with the filing of a complaint of some form of discrimination. If it meets the qualifications, the complaint is assigned to an investigator. He reports to the Commission, which determines whether a violation of the law appears to have occurred. If so, conciliators attempt to resolve the complaint.

The accent throughout is on persuasion, conciliation, voluntary compliance. The Commission has no enforcement powers. If conciliation fails, the complainant may take the issue to a U.S. court. Thus far, six cases have gone to court, but none has been concluded. About 20 cases have been successfully conciliated.

Whether the Commission should have additional power—such as authority to order a company to stop discriminating—is a subject of debate. Business is leery of efforts to strengthen the Commission, believing that a club in the Commission's hands would shatter the cooperative relationship so quickly established.

The most difficult cases, Holbert said, concern discrimination in upgrading employees, in training opportunities and in hiring, and segregated or discriminatory local unions. Although some adjustments have resulted from every case to reach conciliation, he said, many such cases "have not yielded to conciliation with any marked success."

On the other hand, industry has agreed to end segregated facilities in every instance that has come to the Commission's attention.

Satisfied that its complaint and conciliation system is off to a sound start, the Commission next will turn its attention to a broader program. This will be an approach to business and industrial leaders in virtually every major city in the United States to encourage what the Commissioners call "affirmative action."

The Commission wants business to actively recruit, train, hire, and promote minority-group employees. To achieve that end, the Commission has developed a 60-city plan that will be tested in the next few weeks.

"The name of the game is jobs," said Roger B. McKenzie, Director of the Commission's Office of Technical Assistance and a former California business executive. "If there is to be real progress in equal employment opportunities, it will have to be fostered by the business community, because they have the jobs."

The Commission is organizing a series of 1-day conferences for business leaders in 60 cities with populatons exceeding 150,000 to urge them to form local councils to promote minority employment. The first will be in Atlanta and will involve businessmen from key cities throughout the South.

Those attending will be briefed on the advantages of merit employment and will be told of the efforts of business councils in cities such as Milwaukee and Chicago to work on the problem. After the meetings, McKenzie hopes they will go back to their communities and establish this program.

Will the approach work?

"We don't know," McKenzie said. "We do know that there has been progress for business wherever the work force has been integrated. It is to the advantage of business to ease community problems.

"We feel we have a chance of success in the South by using the principle of togetherness, so that no one businessman is forced to go the equal-employment route alone.

"Also, business has got to understand that if we can't make this law work as it is written, the statute is going to be changed and teeth will be added to make it work."

Its early success has given the Commission confidence and hope for the future. Both attributes are revealed in the agency's budget expectations. Facing a year where budget cutbacks are the order of the day, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission fully expects to receive a substantial increase from the White House for the coming year.

VIETNAM AND THE NATIONAL BUDGET

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the resumption of the 89th Congress for 1966, I think we must face the fiscal facts and ask the American people to do so as well.

The central and essential fact we must recognize is that over 75 percent of our national budget is devoted to current military expenditures and paying the cost of our involvement in World War II and the Korean conflict. We must remember that over 75 cents of every tax dollar received by the United States is spent for these purposes.

Thus, we are left with less than 25 cents of every tax dollar to meet the entire cost of Federal Government not connected with the military. This includes all Federal salaries, operation of all Federal departments and agencies and all nonmilitary Federal programs.

In view of this fact, it is irresponsible for any lawmaker to suggest that in terms of the national budget, a significant percentage of our total expenditure can be eliminated by scuttling social programs enacted within the past few years. I must point out that in many cases, those who call for such action are those who opposed the programs the most vehemently in the first place.

It must also be noted that those who are the quickest to vote for huge military appropriations are the loudest in denunciation of taxation. As one of only six Members of the House who voted against eliminating $5 billion in revenue annually from excise taxes, many of which were on luxury items, I think I have the right to say this.

As a result of our involvement in Vietnam, our young men are making terrible and tragic sacrifices. Why then do we not face the fact that it is in order for us to make some pocketbook sacrifices at home to support them?

It is demagoguery to suggest that the financial burden of the Vietnam struggle can be met in any significant or meaningful way by cutting down on a few programs designed to help the underprivileged. If we really mean what we say about Vietnam, we will be men and women enough to pay the cost in taxation and not ask the poor and underprivileged of our land to do so for us.

RETIREMENT OF LOUIS B. SELTZER, EDITOR OF THE CLEVELAND PRESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the announcement this past week of Mr. Louis B. Seltzer, editor of the Cleveland Press, Ohio's largest daily newspaper, to retire.

Louis B. Seltzer by this announcement concludes approximately 50 years of service with this Scripps-Howard newspaper. During the span of years, and in particular, during the last 37½ years while he served as editor of the Press, Louis B. Seltzer has developed a proud, national reputation in not only the field of journalism, but in the field of brotherhood and positive civic action.

Mr. Seltzer often referred to as "Mr. Cleveland" seemed to develop the faculty of adjusting to the level of those with whom he would come in contact and seemed always able to comprehend and understand not only the problems of the lofty and the mighty, but the problems and the concerns of the lowliest Americans. As editor of the Cleveland Press, he has always displayed a keen understanding of his community and its social, economic, and political problems.

He seemed to always enjoy being near the heart of the controversy within the community in taking strong positive positions on the issues. Whether one agreed with Mr. Seltzer or not, one could still respect the skill, the energy, and the dedication that poured forth from this one individual. One could sense that right or wrong here was a leader, unafraid to lead.

Through the years he has been both damned and praised and as he leaves the arena of controversy and passes his responsibility to his successor, there truly will be a void in the community life of Cleveland. He has been honored to serve on the Pulitzer Prize Advisory Board and he helped found the American Press Institute at Columbia University. But I do believe that one of the proudest moments of his life came in 1951 when the men and women of the Nation honored him for his work in the field of brotherhood by naming him as the 1951 Brotherhood Award Winner of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

On the personal and professional levels, Louis Seltzer's life, wherever his work has taken him, has been a symbol of brotherhood and he has lived out that principle, truly a man who walks as he talks with respect to the principles of love, fraternity, and friendship without regard to race, color, or national origin.

Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope that Louis B. Seltzer would find new fields to conquer and new challenges to interest him. Were he to retire and withdraw from concern it would be a waste of the rich talents which God endowed him and I would certainly express on the occasion of his retirement the hope that he be blessed with good health to enable him to participate to the greatest and fullest extent in the future.

A WORTHY BEGINNING—RESULTS IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, one of the prominent columnists of our day, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, has written an article entitled "A Worthy Beginning—Results in the War on Poverty." Because it is a very perceptive and honest appraisal of the war on poverty, I commend it to the membershop of the House.

The article follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 5, 1966]

A WORTHY BEGINNING—RESULTS IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The war on poverty isn't in a "mess"; it isn't falling apart. And his enemies are not going to "bury" Director Sargent Shriver.

The purpose of this report is to try to put things in better perspective.

Certainly there have been failures and shortcomings, frustrations, and acts of incompetence. You simply don't get 26,000 projects off the launching pad in 13 months to help directly 1,500,000 of the very poor without some things going haywire at some points. They are.

But nothing could be more inaccurate than the impression that the war on poverty is mostly chaff. It isn't. The grain is beginning to grow.

It is too early to measure the end results, but it is not too early to report that a worthy beginning has been made.

The war on poverty has aroused a fuller awareness that in the midst of an affluent America there is "another America" where several million families with an average yearly income of $1,800 languish in poverty without the means or stimulus to escape.

Not just among social workers but among businessmen, labor leaders, educators, students, the professions, and the public, the conviction has come that it doesn't have to be so, that much can be done—and should be.

The war on poverty, even with some false starts, is mobilizing this conviction and giving it expression. The Federal Government is being joined by State and local governments, by private industry and universities, labor unions, veterans' groups, civic and social organizations.

Enough has been done to show that there is far more that is right than wrong about what has been done so far:

More than 625 local communities pooled private and public resources to help the poor help themselves.

The Job Corps has already enrolled 17,307 young men and women in 84 basic-education and work-skill training centers in 36 States.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has provided work experience and training for 500,000 people in 1,400 projects in 50 States. This enables them to stay in or return to school or increase their employability.

The work-study program is doing a needed job toward halting the waste of human resources because each year at least 100,000 qualified students have been kept from college through lack of funds. Grants to 1,120 institutions are now providing work opportunities to 100,000 students so they can help pay their way.

Undoubtedly, many of these and other projects need self-examination and correction. The Office of Economic Opportunity is at the crossfire of conflicting ideas on how best to operate such a complex program. There is no book on this subject. It is inevitably being written from trial and error and it will need to be rewritten at many points. The danger is to attempt too much too fast, and here a second look is in order.

But, in addition to constructive scrutiny and criticism, the war on poverty deserves support for a beginning which is enlisting the Nation in a venture to break the cycle of poverty for many people.

THE MORALE OF THE U.S. FORCES IN VIETNAM HIGH

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCGRATH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor and pleasure of spending the Christmas holidays with our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine troops in Vietnam, and I am thrilled to be able to report to you and to my colleagues that the morale of the U.S. forces fighting in that terrible war is tremendously high.

It is a compliment to the 195 million Americans that, when a tiny group of their number began creating the impression that our people were not behind our Vietnamese effort and that our troops there were forgotten men, the majority of our Nation showed by actions as well as talk that they are, indeed, behind our war effort and, more important, highly cognizant of the sacrifices being made by our military men and of the wonderful job they are doing against tremendous, unimaginable odds.

Mr. Speaker, no American who has not seen it for himself can imagine what type of war our men are being called upon to fight. Never in the history of modern warfare have trained, well-equipped troops been sent to fight an army of guerrilla fighters in terrain such as the terrible landscape of South Vietnam. Yet, our troops are proving themselves adaptable to their situations and are making tremendous inroads in Vietcong-held territory, are taking a fearsome toll among Vietcong and North Vietnam soldiers, and, just as important, are convincing the Vietnamese people that they are in that country only as liberators and without any other motives.

The example of American-styled democracy being exported to South Vietnam by our fighting men is, slowly, perhaps, but nonetheless surely impressing the Vietnamese with its many benefits. In the ultimate test—the choice Vietnamese villagers are daily called upon to make between loyalty to the Vietcong or partnership with the Americans—more and more of these decisions are going to our side.

And our fighting forces are backed up in Vietnam by thoughtful, workable plans for the self-governing of villages and hamlets liberated from the Vietcong, and these programs have been accelerated as of January 1. Our psychological warfare tactics are making ever greater impressions upon individual Vietcong, and today, desertions from their forces are taking place at a faster rate than our military forces can kill them in battle.

Mr. Speaker, we have sent dedicated, highly motivated men to fight in Vietnam. During my Christmastime tour of the battle areas and to our 7th Fleet's nuclear task force in the South China Sea, I asked every commander to whom I spoke how he compared the men under his command with those over whom he served in World War II and the Korean conflict.

Without exception, generals, admirals, colonels, majors, and captains told me that today's American fighting man is superior to their counterparts of one and two generations ago. Our military men today are more highly educated and, thus, better able to understand what is at stake in southeast Asia. And they are more adaptable to conditions under which they must prosecute the war, and this is of high importance in Vietnam.

There is no question among our fighting men that the vast majority of the American people is solidly behind them and behind the administration's policy in southeast Asia. What is more, they are deeply and vocally appreciative of the tremendous outpouring of support in the form of letters and gifts received by them at Christmastime.

The picture in Vietnam is by no means entirely rosy, Mr. Speaker. Nor are our troops able to understand our military policy in this warfare completely. Like many of us in the United States, they cannot understand why we do not disrupt North Vietnamese supply lines by blockading or bombing the harbor at Haiphong and by other means.

But their loyalty to our cause is unquestioned and unquestioning, and they are acquitting themselves wonderfully under conditions of warfare and civil disruption which could turn the military efforts of lesser men into shambles.

The principal impression which I brought away from Vietnam is that of the great military job being done by our fighting men and of their fine morale. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a second impression which I have gained while there and that is the necessity to improve the scope of the information we at home receive of that strange and terrible war.

Americans living today can recall World War I, World War II, and the Korean fighting, in all of which there were organized lines along which the fighting took place. When our troops advanced in a certain direction, we were making progress. When the enemy advanced in the opposite direction, we were retreating.

There is nothing like that in this war. Our forces secure pockets, or enclaves, in a nation which is otherwise completely held by the enemy. Our troops can enlarge these cleared areas, but they are not linked by any front lines. Our pockets dot the South Vietnamese map. Some of them are close to Saigon, the capital. Others are dozens of miles south and hundreds of miles to the north or west. When the Vietcong attacks or overruns a Vietnamese or American position near Saigon, for instance, in the absence of real knowledge of the situation, many Americans are apt to think, as I have heard some of my constituents say:

> They're within a few miles of the capital. We've just about lost the war.

Nothing could be more incorrect, Mr. Speaker, but if our people are only given daily reports of fire fights or patrol movements or air strikes, they will never be able to understand what kind of war their sons and friends are fighting, and if our military participation should be necessary for a long period of time, they will have no knowledge on which to base their evaluation of our efforts.

We are in the Vietnamese war to stay until an honorable settlement has been achieved, and, therefore, I think greater pains must be taken to inform the American people who have, so far, given their unstinting support to our involvement in it, a better picture of what that war is like, since it cannot be likened to any other war in which Americans now living have fought or watched.

My trip to Vietnam was tremendously worthwhile, Mr. Speaker, since it gave me a full picture of what type of war it is and what we are doing to win it, both in battle and in the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese. Most important, it made me tremendously proud to be an American and a Representative of Americans who are fighting this difficult war and of those who are supporting it at home.

WAR ON POVERTY CONTINUES TO BE OF MAJOR CONCERN TO THE NATION AND TO THE CONGRESS

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the 2d session of the 89th Congress, the operation of the war on poverty continues to be of major concern to the Nation and to the Congress.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] who is the ranking member of the ad hoc subcommittee on poverty, and I have proposed major reforms in the antipoverty battle.

So that the House will be aware of our views, I am pleased to include at this point in the Record a joint statement spelling out our intention:

JOINT STATEMENT OF HONORABLE ALBERT QUIE, OF MINNESOTA AND CHARLES GOODELL, OF NEW YORK

Congressman Albert Quie, of Minnesota, and Charles E. Goodell, of New York, today proposed "a drastic redirection and new strategy in the war on poverty that will do something besides create controversy and waste money." The two Republicans, members of the Education and Labor Committee which handles the poverty legislation in the House, said "positive progress toward human dignity for all Americans will flow from these reforms." They said they would introduce their proposal soon after the new Congress meets next week.

"The first thing that must be done is to enlist the poor themselves in the cause. You can't win a war unless the people you're fighting for are on your side. Under our proposal a minimum of one-third of the members of every community action board will be selected by the poor themselves. This will place them on an equal level with local officials and social welfare agencies who now dominate the poverty program to the point of suffocation. A clear requirement as to the makeup of community action boards would eliminate the bloody and bitter battle among those at the local level who should be fighting the common enemy of poverty rather than each other. Involvement of the poor at policymaking levels can give a new direction to the poverty program, help free it from the old welfare dole approach and offer hope that the poor can get some of the money now siphoned off into political machines. A properly representative community action board can exercise truly local control of community action programs without constant intrusions by administrators from Washington."

Congressman Goodell released a memorandum he had sent to Republican Congressmen outlining in detail the significance of involvement of the poor in the poverty program.

"Although the Director, Sargent Shriver, apparently believes in this kind of approach, the administration opposed amendments to the law that would require involvement of the poor and it now appears that Mr. Shriver has been forced to surrender control of critical aspects of the program to other powers in the administration. As much as OEO crows about involvement of the poor, it is unlikely that more than 1 out of 20 members of community action boards are truly selected by and representative of the poor themselves. For example, Chicago, Los Angeles, Cleveland, St. Louis and Oakland—to name only a few—have virtually no representatives of the poor on the policymaking boards.

"The failure to exploit this new exciting potential of the poverty program, combined with the administrative chaos at OEO, leads us to the sad conclusion that Mr. Shriver is a marked man in the administration."

Aside from representation of the poor on local community action boards, a truly effective war on poverty should do the following things:

PRIORITY FOR CHILDREN OF THE POOR

To interrupt the cycle of poverty is the first priority. It is obvious that all problems of poverty cannot be solved overnight and it is intolerable that any poverty funds be diverted from neglected children who could be saved by a relatively small effort on the part of society.

Head Start, proposed by Republicans 3 years ago and the most successful part of the poverty program, has been brought to almost complete halt by one of the worst bureaucratic tangles in the history of our country. OEO, having observed the glittering promise and demonstrated performance of preschool training, has arbitrarily reduced Head Start funds. Head Start should be transferred to HEW and funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act through State and local education agencies and the local community action boards. State advisory councils composed of individuals experienced in preschool programs should be required in every State.

Child development and care centers should be a major emphasis under community action programs.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

The community action phases of the poverty program should remain under OEO. All other programs, including agricultural, small business and adult education, should be separately funded and transferred to existing agencies, to be coordinated at the local level through involvement of the community action boards.

Rural community action programs should be separately funded and operate under different structures than urban programs. More than half the poor in this country live in rural areas, yet community action programs, which are oriented to urban areas, by and large are not meeting the needs of the rural poor. Only 5 to 10 percent of the money has been granted to rural community action programs. The problems of rural poor are quite different than the urban poor.

JOBS FOR THE POOR

Private industry must be brought more effectively into the war on poverty. The Republican Human Investment Act would offer a tax credit to employers which develop special programs to train and employ workers with low levels of education. Since tax credits are not a part of the jurisdiction of our committee, we recommend early action on this proposal in the Ways and Means Committee.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps should employ only youngsters from poor families. It is a national scandal that so many friends and relatives of politicians have been employed under this program designed to give work experience and income to poor youngsters so they will recognize the necessity of education in getting a good job.

Private employers, as well as public and nonprofit agencies, should be encouraged to hire youngsters from the Neighborhood Youth Corps, with the Federal Government paying one-third of their wages rather than 90 percent. Job Corps centers should be transferred from OEO and integrated under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Wherever possible, Job Corps centers should be operated under contract with private industry.

STATES AS PARTNERS IN WAR ON POVERTY

A bonus plan should be enacted for those States willing to match Federal funds on a 50–50 basis above the present level of funding. Under this plan, present allocations by State would continue, but additional funds would go to those States willing to participate as partners in the poverty war.

To date, the war on poverty fails completely to utilize the vast resources and experience of State agencies. State governments have been completely bypassed. This represents a tremendous loss of potential in the poverty war.

HOUSING

De facto racial discrimination must be removed from the urban renewal program through more adequate provision for those displaced. On-the-spot verification of proper relocation facilities, more stringent enforcement of housing codes and utilization of other rehabilitation and relocation tools provided at Republican urging in the Housing Act are urgently required. Too often the poor accurately refer to urban renewal as Negro removal.

HATCH ACT-TYPE PROTECTION

The poor must be protected from the cynical diversion of poverty funds into urban political machines. Likewise, public officials and poverty workers should be spared the internal controversy and bitterness involved when poverty money is used to promote personal ambitions and build personal political empires.

EXPERIMENTATION AND INNOVATION

An important aspect of community action programs is the freedom for local boards to experiment with new approaches to old and seemingly intractable problems. Some promising experiments are underway, such as store-front schools for dropouts. A variety of such programs should be funded, each in small amounts until they prove themselves. There should be no place for such meaningless and self-defeating so-called poverty experiments as the Black Arts Theater in Harlem or artificial insemination of scrub cows.

SELECT COMMITTEE

As previously proposed by Congressman WILLIAM AYRES, of Ohio, a select committee should be formed in the House to investigate thoroughly the whole operation of the poverty program.

PREAUDITS AND ACCOUNTING REFORMS

Preaudits and strict accounting reforms will bring to an end the loose and scandalous shoveling out of taxpayers' money that has occurred all too often in the present poverty program.

The Quie-Goodell poverty proposal would eliminate the waste, abuses, and developing scandal in the poverty program. In so doing, it will permit greater expenditures of money in high priority areas such as Head Start, child development centers, and community action while maintaining total expenditures below the present level of spending. The present poverty war, unless drastically altered, cannot effectively survive the fiscal pressures of the war in Vietnam. A new, bold, imaginative, commonsense approach to the war on poverty will produce the kind of results that will give it a high priority for funds at the State and local levels as well as in Congress.

If the present war on poverty is continued without change, it will accomplish some good at extraordinary cost, but the war will eventually bog down in a stalemate. We must not permit this to happen. The United States has the potential in the foreseeable future to win a war against poverty if it is waged in the right way.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, the following Members were granted leave of absence:

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and through January 17, 1966, on account of illness in his family.

Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through January 12, on account of dental surgery.

Mr. CAHILL (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), on January 10 and 11, on account of official business.

Mr. JONES of Alabama (at the request of Mr. WAGGONNER), for week of January 10, 1966, on account of illness in family.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for the period from January 10 to February 1, on account of personal illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. STRATTON, for 60 minutes, on Wednesday.

Mr. ROBISON (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 60 minutes, on Wednesday, January 12, 1966.

Mr. CALLAWAY (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 60 minutes, on Thursday, January 13, 1966.

Mr. RYAN, for 10 minutes, on Wednesday, January 12, 1966; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2471. An act to improve and clarify certain laws of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

THE LATE HONORABLE HERBERT C. BONNER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on next Wednesday I shall seek recognition for the purpose of paying appropriate tribute to our deceased colleague, the late Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER.

Mr. Speaker, I now send to the Speaker's desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 632

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, January 12, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

The following executive communications were submitted subsequent to adjournment of the 89th Congress, 1st session:

1710. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on audit of Federal Home Loan Board for the period of July 1, 1963, to December 31, 1964, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 53 and 67 (H. Doc. No. 352); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 624, agreed to on October 22, 1965).

1711. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of audit of Federal Home Loan Banks supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the period July 1, 1963, to December 31, 1964 (H. Doc. No. 353); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 624, agreed to on October 22, 1965).

1712. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of examination of Financial Statements Fiscal Year 1965, Export-Import Bank of Washington (H. Doc. No. 354); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 624, agreed to on October 22, 1965).

[*Submitted January 10, 1966*]

1713. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress, pursuant to rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 343); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers.

1714. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States transmitting a report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States (H. Doc. No. 356); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1715. A letter from the national quartermaster-adjutant, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., transmitting reports of national convention proceedings and activities for the year ending September 30, 1965, including an audit report, pursuant to Public Law 105, 88th Congress (H. Doc. No. 357); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1716. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 2, 1965, reporting on a plan for the flood control project on Gin and Muddy Bayous in Mississippi, in partial response to an item in section 203 of the Flood Control Act approved October 23, 1962 (title II, Public Law 87-874), Lower Mississippi River Basin (H. Doc. No. 358); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

1717. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of activities for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 214 (H. Doc. No. 328); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1718. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain acts relating to the inspection, classification, certification, testing, and identification of cotton, tobacco, and grain; and the examination of warehouses licensed under the U.S. Warehouse Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1719. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting a report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, pursuant to 45 Stat. 1222; 16 U.S.C. 715b; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1720. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480 agreements, signed during September 1965, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1721. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480 agreements, signed during October 1965, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1722. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480 agreements, signed during November 1965, pursuant to Pubic Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1723. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for Indian health activities, Public Health Service," for the fiscal year 1966, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1724. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Foreign quarantine activities, Public Health Service," for the fiscal year 1966, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1725. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Agency for International Development for "Supporting assistance" for the fiscal year 1966, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1726. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Agency for International Development for "Administrative expenses" for the fiscal year 1966, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1727. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Grants to States for public assistance" for the fiscal year 1966, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1728. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Grants to States, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration," for the fiscal year 1966, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1729. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Post Office Department for "Operations," for the fiscal year 1966, has been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriations for handling a higher mail volume than that on which the appropriation was based and for increased costs resulting from the enactment of Public Law 89–116, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1730. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Readjustment benefits" for the fiscal year 1966, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1731. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Compensation and pensions" for the fiscal year 1966, has been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1732. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Management and protection, National Park Service," for the fiscal year 1966, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1733. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Post Office Department for "Transportation" for the fiscal year 1966, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1734. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Support of the U.S. prisoners" for the fiscal year 1966, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1735. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the "Limitation on salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board," for the fiscal year 1966 had been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1736. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a report that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Bonneville unit, central Utah project, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 83–172; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1737. A letter from the Secretary of Defense transmitting the report "Real and Personal Property of the Department of Defense, as of June 30, 1965", pursuant to the provisions of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (sec. 410, as codified in sec. 2701 of title 10, United States Code); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1738. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make permanent the act of May 22, 1965, authorizing the payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1739. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) transmitting a report on the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1740. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) transmitting a report of certain additional projects for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1), and pursuant to authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1741. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) transmitting a report of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain additional facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air Force Reserve utilizing authorization contained in section 701 (3)(b) of Public Law 88–390, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1), and to the authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1742. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force transmitting a report of military construction contracts awarded without competition for the period January 1 through June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–188; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1743. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force transmitting the U.S. Air Force flying pay report, as of August 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 301(g), title 37, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1744. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force transmitting a report on the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force at the seat of government, as of the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 1966, pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1745. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a report on the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army, and the Army General Staff on September 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 3031(c) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1746. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Army to donate two obsolete German weapons to the Federal Republic of Germany; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1747. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a report on the Department of the Army aviation personnel above the grade of major, for the period July 1–December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 301(g) of title 37, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1748. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appointment of Col. William W. Watkin, Jr., professor of the U.S. Military Academy, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1749. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period January 1 to June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 79–520; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1750. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting a report of Federal contributions program, equipment and facilities (reporting symbol OCD–CONG(Q)2), for the quarter ending September 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1751. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarter ending September 30, 1965, pursuant to subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1752. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Treasury Department, transmitting a report of negotiated purchases and contracts for experimental, developmental, or research work, since May 7, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 2304e of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1753. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Treasury Department, transmitting a report on the number of officers above the rank of lieutenant commander, or equivalent, in the Coast Guard, entitled to receive flight pay, and the average monthly flight pay authorized by law paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of the report, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 79–301; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1754. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transmitting an audit report for the fiscal year ending August 31, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 630, 74th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1755. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting the 73d quarterly report covering the 3d quarter 1965, pursuant to the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and and Currency.

1756. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a report covering the progress made in liquidating the assets of the former Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1965, pursuant to 67 Stat. 230 and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1757. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) transmitting the report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July–September 1965, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1758. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July–October 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1759. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for the first 2 months of fiscal year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1760. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for 1964, pursuant to the provisions of section 17(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1761. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war, and reconversion activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1965, pursuant to 67 Stat. 231 (15 U.S.C. 609 note), and with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957, 3 CFR, 1954–58 Comp.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1762. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and to amend section 6 of the act approved July 2, 1940, as amended, to eliminate requirements that applications for motor vehicle title certificates and certain lien information related thereto be submitted under oath; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1763. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act approved August 17, 1937, so as to facilitate the addition to the District of Columbia registration of a motor vehicle or trailer of the name of the spouse of the owner of any such motor vehicle or trailer; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1764. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, as amended, so as to bring within the provisions of such acts any person operating a motor vehicle under the influence of a drug rendering such person incapable of operating the motor vehicle safely; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1765. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the 52d Annual Report of the Public Service Commission for the calendar year 1964, pursuant to the provisions of paragraphs 14 and 20 of section 8 of an act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1914; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1766. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 79–592; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1767. A letter from the Secretary of State transmitting the fifth annual report on the activities of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West Honolulu, covering the period July 1, 1964, through June 30, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 86–472; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1768. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 (Public Law 845–81); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1769. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting the seminannual consolidated report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of June 30, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 87–195; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1770. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report on the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees on U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of October 1965, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1966, and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1771. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report on the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees on U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of November 1965, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1966, and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1772. A letter from the General Counsel, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the 23d Semiannual Report of the U.S. Information Agency, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 1008 of Public Law 402; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1773. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense transmitting a report of the Department of Defense relative to its disposition of foreign excess personal property located in areas outside of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, for fiscal year 1965, pursuant to section 404(d), title IV of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1774. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare transmitting a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, pursuant to section 203(o) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1775. A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Department of State, Agency for International Development, transmitting a reply to the Comptroller General's report of July 16, 1965, on questionable grant of corn to the United Arab Republic under title II, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1776. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting further reference to the report to Congress dated December 31, 1963, entitled "Erroneous Purchase of a Technical Data Package From Westinghouse Electric Corp. for $1,010,000"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1777. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a review of investigations and actions by certain agencies pertaining to Government employees licensed to drive taxicabs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1778. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the unauthorized acquisition of passenger vehicles by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1779. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on potential savings through the use of houses owned by the Federal Housing Administration as Government quarters for certain Coast Guard members in the St. Petersburg and Miami, Fla., areas, U.S. Coast Guard and the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1780. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the examination of the financial statements of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the act of May 7, 1928 (22 U.S.C. 278a); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1781. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a review of the assignment of enlisted personnel to nonmilitary activities, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1782. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on savings available through more extensive use of contract vehicle service and of certain mail-handling equipment, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1783. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on Army aircraft grounded because of a lack of required repair parts, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1784. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the need for current evaluation of available community housing prior to construction of military housing, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1785. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on savings to the Post Office Department as the result of greater utilization of U.S. air carriers rather than foreign air carriers; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1786. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the use of dollars rather than foreign currencies to pay U.S. expenses in the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1787. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on potential savings through improved management controls over allowances paid to members of shore patrols, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1788. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the need for reappraisal of task system assignments for the collection of refuse by the Department of Sanitary Engineering, District of Columbia government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1789. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on problems and additional costs expected to result from the use of stage construction of the Capital Beltway, Interstate Route 495, in the State of Maryland, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1790. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the improvement in the administrative audit of payments for accrued leave to the Department of the Army personnel who were discharged and immediately reenlisted, as performed by the Finance Center, U.S. Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1791. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the suspension of competitive rate accommodation exchange service for U.S. Government personnel in Brazil by the Treasury Department and the Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1792. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the examination of financial statements of the Veterans' Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 4207; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1793. A letter from the Secretary of Defense transmitting the Fifth Report of the Federal Voting Assistance Program for the period September 1963 to September 1965, pursuant to Public Law 296, 84th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

1794. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare transmitting the third semiannual report on automotive air pollution, pursuant to section 6(b), Public Law 88–206; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1795. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce transmitting a report of activities under title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, pursuant to section 1309 of the act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1796. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases as of September 30, 1965, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1797. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases as of October 31, 1965, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1798. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a report showing information on the permits and licenses for hydroelectric projects issued during fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, financial statements of proceeds derived from licenses issued, and the names and compensation of persons employed by the Commission, pursuant to section 4(d) of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1799. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1963, Publicly Owned"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1800. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prescribe the measure of damages for timber trespass on lands and certain other interests in lands under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1801. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting the ninth annual report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, pursuant to 70 Stat. 105; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1802. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1803. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a report of three orders and supporting documents covering cancellations and adjustments against individual Indians or tribes of Indians, for the fiscal year 1965, pursuant to 47 Stat. 564; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1804. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a report of reclassification of certain lands of the North Platte project in the States of Wyoming and Nebraska, pursuant to chapter 418, 53 Stat. 1187; 43 U.S.C. 485; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1805. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a proposed concession contract which will authorize the Rainier National Park Co. to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public in Mount Rainier National Park for a 20-year term from January 1, 1966, in the new Paradise Day Center, and a 10-year term in the existing facilities, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service, pursuant to the provisions of 67 Stat. 271, as amended by 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1806. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a proposed concession contract, which will when executed by the Director of the National Park Service, authorize Bullfrog Marina, Inc., to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public at the Bullfrog Basin site of the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, Utah, for the period January 1, 1966, through December 31, 1985, pursuant to 67 Stat. 271, as amended by 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1807. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a proposed concession contract to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public at the Oregon Inlet Fishing Center, Cape Hatteras National Seashore, N.C., for the period January 1, 1966, through December 31, 1975, pursuant to 67 Stat. 271, as amended by 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1808. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 109, *The Duwamish Tribe of Indians, petitioner,* v. *The United States, defendant,* pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1809. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 237, *Upper Chehalis Tribe, et al., Petitioner* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1810. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 173, *The Cherokee Nation or Tribe of Indians, Petitioner,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1811. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the following claims: Docket No. 161, *The Yakima Tribe, Petitioner,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant, the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation et al., Intervenor;* docket No. 222, *The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation as the Representative of the Palouse Band, et al.;* docket No. 224, *The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation as the Representatives of the Moses Band, et al., Petitioners,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1812. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 319, *The Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation, California, Petitioner,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1813. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to dockets Nos. 351 and 351–A, *The Chemehuevi Tribe of Indians, the Chemehuevi Tribe of Indians by Dan Eddy, Petitioners,* v. *The United States of*

America, Defendant, pursuant to 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1814. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 334 amended, *The Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, et al., Petitioners,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1815. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 66, *The Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, et al., Petitioner* v. *United States, Defendant,* May 6, 1957, order dismissing petition, pursuant to 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1816. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 46, *The Nooksack Tribe of Indians, on Relation of Joseph Louis, Chairman of the General Council, Petitioner* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1817. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 71–A, *The Citizen Bank of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma, et al.,* docket No. 15–J, *The Potawatomie Tribe of Indians, et al., Petitioner,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1818. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 314 amended, *The Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, et al., Petitioners,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1819. A letter from the president, Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A., National Memorial, Inc., transmitting a copy of the audit report for the period April 1, 1964, to March 31, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 85–903; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1820. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a report on identical bidding in advertised public procurement, pursuant to section 7 of Executive Order 10936; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1821. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a report on action taken pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 89–175; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1822. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Richard C. Mockler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1823. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a copy of a report on equal protection in the South and a copy of the hearing held before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in Jackson, Miss.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1824. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a report describing the progress made under the Voting Rights Act of 1965; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1825. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the court's opinion and findings on December 17, 1965 in the case of *Schutt Construction Company, Inc., etc.* v. *the United States,* Cong. No. 3–59, which had been referred to the court pursuant to House Resolution 282 of the 86th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1826. A letter from the Executive Director, Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting the 16th and 17th Annual Reports for the years 1963 and 1964, pursuant to section 2, Public Law 232, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1827. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a report of the Maritime Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 for the period July 1 to September 30, 1965; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1828. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a report of activities under title XII, Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, reported as of September 30, 1965, pursuant to section 1211 of this act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1829. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on positions established during 1965 under Public Law 313, 80th Congress, pursuant to section 202, title II, Public Law 87–367; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1830. A letter from the Director of Personnel, Office of the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report of scientific and professional positions established under the authority contained in 72 Stat. 213a; 5 U.S.C. 1161(e); pursuant to 72 Stat. 214; 5 U.S.C. 1163; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1831. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration, Office of the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report concerning scientific and professional positions established under the authority contained in Public Law 313, 80th Congress, during 1965; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1832. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, transmitting information regarding the allocation or placement of positions in grades 16, 17, and 18, pursuant to section 503(a), Public Law 84–854; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1833. A letter from the Librarian of Congress transmitting a report with respect to scientific and professional positions established in the Library of Congress, pursuant to section 202 of title VI, Public Law 87–367; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1834. A letter from the Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting the annual report for calendar year 1965 on the scientific or professional positions authorized under Public Law 313, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1835. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 22, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Cheboygan Harbor, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted March 30, 1955. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

1836. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 21, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Perquimans River, N.C., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

1837. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 10, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Royal River, Yarmouth, Maine, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted August 25, 1960. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

1838. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 10, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a letter report on Arkansas River, Wybark and Choska, Okla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted July 3, 1962. It is also submitted in response to section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–874); to the Committee on Public Works.

1839. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 5, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Tangier Channel, Accomack County, Va., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted January 14, and July 16, 1958. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

1840. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 1, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Middle Decatur Bend, Missouri River, Iowa and Nebr., authorized by section 105 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 14, 1960. No action by Congress is recommended as the authorized improvement has been approved for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 207 of the Flood Control Act of 1962; to the Committee on Public Works.

1841. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 16, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Avon Harbor, N.C., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 3, 1959. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

1842. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 24, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Traverse City Harbor, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 3, 1959. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

1843. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks

Memorial Board; to the Committee on Public Works.

1844. A letter from the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting a copy of the 32d annual report for the period July 1, 1964, to June 30, 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

1845. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a list of research grants awarded by the Department of Agriculture during fiscal year 1965, pursuant to section 3, Public Law 85–934; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1846. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report of the transfer of research and development funds, pursuant to 77 Stat. 141, 143; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1847. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report of contracts negotiated under 10 U.S.C. 2304(a) (11) and (16) for the period January 1 through June 30, 1965, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304(e); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1848. A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, transmitting the 15th annual report covering its activities during the fiscal year 1965; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1849. A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, transmitting a copy of the 10th annual report, pursuant to section 114, Public Law 870, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1850. A letter from the President, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the 37th annual report of the work and operations of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, for fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 278a (H. Doc. No. 330); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1851. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the U.S. Government for fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 264 and 31 U.S.C. 66b (H. Doc. No. 323); to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1852. A letter from the Public Printer, transmitting the annual report of the Government Printing Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 28 Stat. 603; to the Committee on House Administration.

1853. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a statement exhibiting the several sums drawn pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 84; to the Committee on House Administration.

1854. A letter from the director, legislative commission, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the 47th Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in Portland, Oreg., August 24 to 26, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 77–249 (H. Doc. No. 359); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and ordered printed with illustrations.

1855. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a statement setting forth all the judgments rendered by the U.S. Court of Claims for the year ended September 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1856. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 103(e) of Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961, and section 208 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1857. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84–854; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1858. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a report of research facility grants issued, fiscal year 1965, pursuant to section 10 of Public Law 88–74; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1859. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1860. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army transmitting the Annual Report of the United States Soldiers' Home for fiscal year 1965, and the report of the annual inspection of the home, 1965, by the Inspector General of the Army, pursuant to the provisions of 24 U.S.C. 59, 60; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1861. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of need to strengthen procedures for determining whether loan applicants are unable to obtain financing from private or cooperative credit sources, Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1862. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of review of policies and procedures applied in evaluating foreign source components and barter bids for an undersea cable communications system, Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1863. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 11–A *The Otoe and Missouri Tribe of Indians, Petitioner,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1864. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 54, *The Crow Tribe of Indians, Petitioner,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1865. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 303, *The Ottawa Tribe and Guy Jennison, Bronson Edwards and Gene Jennison, as Representatives of the Ottawa Tribe, Petitioners,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1866. A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, transmitting a report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers of America for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88–504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 11857. A bill to provide that FHA's new liberalized mortgage financing terms for veterans shall be available to qualified veterans without regard to whether or not they have previously used their VA home loan entitlement; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 11858. A bill to provide that FHA's new liberalized mortgage financing terms for veterans shall be available to qualified veterans without regard to whether or not they have previously used their VA home loan entitlement; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 11859. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the payment of benefits to survivors of deceased beneficiaries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11860. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the effective date of an award for claims for compensation and pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11861. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 11862. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 11863. A bill to provide for uniform, fair, and equitable treatment of persons, businesses, or farms displaced by Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 11864. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide criminal penalties for wrongful interference with or impairment of the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States during a period of war or armed conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 11865. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11866. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 11867. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the General Federation of Women's Clubs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 11868. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to authorize credit unions in military organizations overseas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 11869. A bill to amend titles X and XVI of the Social Security Act to permit blind persons to earn up to $300 a month without any reduction in the aid payable to them thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 11870. A bill to amend the Sherman Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of price increases in certain industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 11871. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11872. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11873. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit the use of social security records to aid in locating runaway parents who are failing to comply with court orders for the support of their children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRALEY:

H.R. 11874. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a pension under title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 11875. A bill to amend the Tucker Act to increase from $10,000 to $50,000 the limitation on the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts in suits against the United States for breach of contract or for compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11876. A bill to waive certain limitations upon claims under Public Law 88-519 (78 Stat. 699); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11877. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to permit the waiver of certain retirement or annuity payments under programs administered by the Federal Government; and to waive certain overpayments of veterans pensions resulting from enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 11878. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall acquire additional land for the Beverly National Cemetery, N.J.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11879. A bill to provide for improved benefits under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, to strengthen the financial condition of the fund created by such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 11880. A bill to authorize conclusion of an agreement with Mexico for joint measures for solution of the lower Rio Grande salinity problem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 11881. A bill to grant the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Savannah River between South Carolina and Georgia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon:

H.R. 11882. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Olalla division of the Umpqua project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 11883. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to certain veterans of the induction period by making available to them assistance in obtaining education and training and farm and home loans; medical care for non-service-connected disabilities; and job placement assistance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 11884. A bill to repeal the "cooly trade" laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 11885. A bill to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1965 to eliminate the provision which denies hospital insurance benefits to uninsured individuals who are members of certain organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H.R. 11886. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the basis on which pension is payable by providing that public or private retirement payments (including social security benefits) shall not be counted as income and that the income of the spouse shall be disregarded in the determination of annual income of a veteran; to eliminate the "net worth" eligibility test; and to repeal the requirement of reduction of pension during hospitalization for veterans with dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 11887. A bill to amend section 3 of the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11888. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11889. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to reduce the age for participation in the Job Corps program and the work-training program provided for therein; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11890. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to redefine the requirements relating to accreditation of schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11891. A bill to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11892. A bill to safeguard the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize a limitation on the total quantity of aspirin permissible in containers of aspirin intended for children; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11893. A bill to amend the Capper-Volstead Act, with respect to the control of unfair practices affecting associations of producers of agricultural products and members thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11894. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11895. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11896. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to all unremarried widows and widowers and to all individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 3 years or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11897. A bill to restore non-service-connected veterans' pensions which have been reduced or eliminated because of the receipt of increased social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11898. A bill to more effectively prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, age, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11899. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11900. A bill to strengthen the competitive enterprise system by assisting qualified small business concerns to obtain leases of commercial and industrial property, where stringent credit requirements tend to exclude such concerns, by authorizing the Small Business Administration to guarantee, directly or in cooperation with others, the payment of rentals under such leases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11901. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for increased eligibility for and greater utilization of the displaced business disaster loan program established under section 7(b)(3) of that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 11902. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 11903. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 11904. A bill to provide for the best care, welfare, and safeguards against suffering for certain animals used for scientific purposes without impeding necessary research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 11905. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Great Salt Lake National Monument, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 11906. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Constellation National Historical Site, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 11907. A bill to grant court leave to employees of the United States when appearing as witnesses on behalf of a State in any judicial proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 11908. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in Vietnam; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 11909. A bill to amend section 317 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and to provide for the maintenance of records of exports of Flue-cured tobacco by type, value, and poundage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11910. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11911. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow under specified conditions an additional deduction, in determining the value of a decedent's taxable estate, for the value of land which was used by such decedent for farming purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 11912. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase the exemption from duty in the case of gifts sent by members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11913. A bill declaring May 29 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 11914. A bill to amend section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit further Federal use and donation of exchange sale property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 11915. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to make discrimination because of age in employment an unlawful employment practice; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 11916. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage behavior which threatens national economic stability; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 11917. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize increased appropriations for assisting construction of municipal sewage treatment works, and to strengthen authority to enforce pollution abatement; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 11918. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the interest on church bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 11919. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to make discrimination because of age in employment an unlawful employment practice; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 11920. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 11921. A bill to amend section 5(1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide benefits for children of deceased railroad employees who are over the age of 18 and below the age of 22 and are attending an educational institution as full-time students; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11922. A bill to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1965 to eliminate the provisions which deny hospital insurance benefits to uninsured individuals who are members of certain organizations or have been convicted of certain offenses, and to eliminate the provisions which deny supplementary medical insurance benefits to persons who have been convicted of certain offenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 11923. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 11924. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to grant to certain veterans of peacetime service entitlement to hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities on the same basis as veterans of periods of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11925. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make burial benefits under chapter 23 of that title applicable to all veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11926. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that peacetime veterans will be accorded hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities on the same basis as veterans of a period of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 11927. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit deduction by brokers of certain costs and expenses from rental collections on properties acquired under the veterans' loan programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11928. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide special death compensation for the widows and children of certain veterans who die while entitled to additional compensation by reason of being in need of regular aid and attendance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11929. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall operate at least 18,000 beds in its domiciliary facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11930. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the preservation of certain disability ratings; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11931. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide special death compensation for the widows and children of certain veterans who die while suffering from a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11932. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for a pension of $75 per month for widows of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11933. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for presumptive service connection in cases where certain veterans contract progressive muscular atrophy within 7 years of separation from service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11934. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that any veteran entitled to additional compensation by reason of being in need of regular aid and attendance shall be furnished prescription drugs by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11935. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the period of presumption of service connection for certain cases of multiple sclerosis from 7 to 10 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11936. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, in order to provide increased protection against eviction of dependents from premises rented for dwelling purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 11937. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 11938. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Monmouth-Dallas division, Willamette River project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 11939. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.J. Res. 789. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.J. Res. 790. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.J. Res. 791. Joint resolution to extend the period for filing record of sales and leases of cotton farm acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 792. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to modernize, coordinate, and foster passenger rail transportation within the area of such States and authorizing the multistate authority to request the President of the United States to enter into negotiations with the Government of Mexico to secure its participation with such authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.J. Res. 793. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.J. Res. 794. Joint resolution to extend the period for filing record of sales and leases of cotton farm acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.J. Res. 795. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the definition of treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.J. Res. 796. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the right of citizens of the United States 18 years of age or older to vote in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H. Con. Res. 530. Concurrent resolution to favor the establishment of an international living museum of traveling exhibits; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 633. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 634. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 94; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

374. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, relative to a formula for determining the representation in State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

375. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, relative to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

376. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, transmitting a copy of Assembly Joint Resolution 1 approved on October 25, 1965, relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

377. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, transmitting a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 8 approved on October 25, 1965, relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

378. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, transmitting a copy of Senate Resolution 4 approved on October 28, 1965, relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

379. Also, memorial of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland, relative to present policies of the United States in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

380. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to urging the Department of Defense to revoke its directive ordering the closing of the Springfield Armory; to the Committee on Armed Services.

381. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to urging the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission to select the city of Haverhill as the

location for its proposed 200-billion-electric-volt accelerator; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

382. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to commending the President of the United States for his position on Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

383. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

384. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to authorizing the construction of a dam across the Savannah River, and Duke Power Co. to construct an electric generating plant on the Savannah River; to the Committee on Public Works.

385. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, relative to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 11940. A bill for the relief of Fred M. Osteen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 11941. A bill to provide for the free entry of one Weissenberg rheogoniometer for use of Case Institute of Technology; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 11942. A bill for the relief of Leon Shapu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 11943. A bill for the relief of Alcidia Aldonsa da Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 11944. A bill for the relief of Vincenza Chiarello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11945. A bill for the relief of Irena Bancic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H.R. 11946. A bill for the relief of Arthur Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11947. A bill for the relief of Dr. Romulo S. Ancog, his wife, Concepcion Ancog, and their minor children, Consuelo, Roberto, and Cristeta Ancog; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11948. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manouchehr Atash and his wife, Homa Atash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 11949. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Wakulla County, Fla., to George Strickland; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11950. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Wakulla County, Fla., to C. Taff; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 11951. A bill for the relief of Chan Kwok Doon (also known as Wong Si Dip and Gordon Wong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 11952. A bill for the relief of Maria Karidakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11953. A bill for the relief of Jose Luis Calleja-Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 11954. A bill for the relief of Sp. 5 (E-5) Luis Perez Tonson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11955. A bill for the relief of Marie Tavil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 11956. A bill for the relief of Dr. Raphael J. Ho Tai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 11957. A bill for the relief of Muriel Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 11958. A bill for the relief of Huseyin Duru; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 11959. A bill for the relief of Aleksandra Grozdanic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 11960. A bill to authorize the President to retire Lt. Gen. Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 11961. A bill for the relief of Albert R. Sabaroff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 11962. A bill for the relief of John E. Tucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 11963. A bill for the relief of Lennart Gordon Langhorne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 11964. A bill for the relief of Miss Marianna Mazzucco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

287. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Oklahoma State Pipe Trades Association, Tulsa, Okla., relative to the current legislative program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

288. Also, petition of Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, Waltham, Mass., relative to the farm labor problem as it relates to harvest workers for the Massachusetts apple crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

289. Also, petition of Polar Bear Association and Polar Bear Post 436 VFW, Detroit, Mich., relative to supporting the cause of freedom against the tyranny of communism; to the Committee on Armed Services.

290. Also, petition of Building and Trades Department, AFL-CIO, San Francisco, Calif., relative to enactment of legislation, H.R. 10027 and S. 1665, relating to picketing in a labor dispute; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

291. Also, petition of General Executive Board, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers of America, Washington, D.C., relative to section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

292. Also, petition of Noland A. Hale, Cleveland, Ohio, and others, relative to the Federal minimum wage law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

293. Also, petition of the International Executive Board, International Woodworkers of America, Portland, Oreg., relative to the workers' right to organize; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

294. Also, petition of United-Italian American Labor Council, Inc., New York, N.Y., relative to section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

295. Also, petition of Alabama State Chamber of Commerce, Montgomery, Ala., relative to the policy and actions of the United States in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

296. Also, petition of Knights of Columbus, Philadelphia Chapter, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the policy and actions of the United States in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

297. Also, petition of Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A., North Chicago, Ill., relative to the policy and actions of the United States in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

298. Also, petition of Okinawa City, Town & Village Governments Association, Naha, Okinawa, relative to a request for early return of administrating authority over Okinawa to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

299. Also, petition of Okinawa City, Town & Village Governments Association, Naha, Okinawa, relative to a request for carrying out of election of the chief executive by popular vote; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

300. Also, petition of the City Council, Anchorage, Alaska, relative to donations to cities of Federal surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

301. Also, petition of Board of County Commissioners, County of Martin, Williamston, N.C., relative to the death of Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, a Representative of the First Congressional District of North Carolina; to the Committee on House Administration.

302. Also, petition of mayor and board of commissioners, town of Williamston, Williamston, N.C., relative to the death of Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, a Representative of the First Congressional District of North Carolina; to the Committee on House Administration.

303. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to sundry petitions; to the Committee on House Administration.

304. Also petition of the National District Attorneys' Association, Stockton, Calif., relative to urging passage of S. 1636 regarding Federal-State conflict over water rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

305. Also, petition of California Association of Airport Executives, Inc., relative to urging Congress to enact appropriate measures which would require the Civil Aeronautics Board to assure that certificated airlines maintain service and schedules to meet the need of the communities they serve; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

306. Also, petition of Jack Bright and John W. Oliver, 300 MacDonald Avenue, Irwin, Pa., relative to registering Communists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

307. Also, petition of the clerk of the board of supervisors, county of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to paying tribute to Russell Galbraith O'Brien for his patriotic contributions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

308. Also, petition of International Woodworkers of America, Portland, Oreg., relative to the "one man, one vote" ruling of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

309. Also, petition of Ivan E. Loftis, Columbus, Ohio, relative to a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

310. Also, petition of National Association of Postmasters of the United States, Omaha, Nebr., relative to their appreciation to each Member of the 89th Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

311. Also, petition of the International Woodworkers of America, Portland, Oreg., relative to the social security system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

> (b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the second calendar quarter of 1965 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Norman Abelson, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,312.50. E. (9) $499.40.

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service, Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.

D. (6) $156. E. (9) $144.45.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,935.20. E. (9) $4,935.20.

A. Donald C. Alexander, 603 Dixie Terminal Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. National Piano Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 1801 Gilbert Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $20,208.99. E. (9) $188.36.

A. Allen & Murden, Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London E.C. 3, England, and Norwegian Shipowners Association, Post Office Box 1452, Oslo, Norway.

D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $575.96.

A. Allen & Murden, Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Informal Committee of European and Other Foreign Cruise Ship Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $10,500. E. (9) $801.07.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $7,666.16.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $285. E. (9) $367.46.

A. American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $5,587.31. E. (9) $5,587.31.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $4,137.86. E. (9) $4,137.86.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $12,266.56. E. (9) $12,266.56.

A. American Humane Association, 896 Pennsylvania Street, Denver, Colo.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $166.87. E. (9) $15,302.21.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,121.06. E. (9) $81.58.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $7,491.14. E. (9) $7,491.14.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $10,290. 06. E. (9) $21,770.47.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Consolidated International Trading Corp., Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $150. E. (9) $90.57.

A. Richard H. Appert, 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Halcon International, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $42.55.

A. Roy A. Archibald, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $513.57. E. (9) $145.69.

A. Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, 1000 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, 304 West 58th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,687.50. E. (9) $723.53.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Commissioner of Baseball, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $300.86.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Lever Brothers Co., 390 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $45.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Lever Brothers Co., 390 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $8,333.33. E. (9) $1,262.07.

A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $1,244.92.

A. Lester Asher, 228 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Conference of labor organizations.

D. (6) $750.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $4,135.15.

A. Frank Baird-Smith, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW.. Washington, D.C.

A. Bandag, Inc., 1056 Hershey Avenue, Muscatine, Iowa.

E. (9) $1,932.47.

A. Lowell R. Beck, 1705 DeSales Street, Washington, D.C.

B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $30.

A. John H. Beidler.

B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,150. E. (9) $172.77.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $5,514.04.

A. Leon G. Billings, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750.

A. Joel D. Blackmon, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $750.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,425.32.

A. Bernard L. Boutin, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,706.25. E. (9) $8.85.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, 537 Cherry Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, 537 Cherry Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Chas. B. Bowling, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $600.

A. Col. A. A. Brackett, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Wally Briscoe.

B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 535 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $126. E. (9) $7.50.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,432.73. E. (9) $4.50.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $100.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $8,563.85. E. (9) $8,563.85.

A. J. Robert Brouse, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Animal Health Institute, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert J. Brown, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $111.

A. James E. Bryan, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $2,291.14.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, 24 Beekman Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $630. E. (9) $345.21.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $584.50. E. (9) 242.29.

A. George H. Buschmann, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturers of automotive parts and accessories.
D. (6) $23,330. E. (9) $8,987.60.

A. George H. Buschmann, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cement producers.
E. (9) $1,647.72.

A. Business Equipment Manufacturers Association.
E. (9) $755.46.

A. Business Information Service, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $3,673.21. E. (9) $1,598.17.

A. Marvin Caplan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,211. E. (9) $191.92.

A. Col. John T. Carlton, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. W. W. Carson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, ORC & B Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. South African Sugar Association, Norwich Union House, Durban Club Place, Durban, South Africa.
E. (9) $4,326.17.

A. Donald E. Channell, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $22.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dental Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Citizens Committee on National Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,725. E. (9) $9,627.24.

A. Allen C. K. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clay L. Cochran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,770.78. E. (9) $289.19.

A. David Cohen, 1223 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1223 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100.02. E. (9) $204.20.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $15.06.

A. Paul G. Collins, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Committee on Constructive Price, 3 Gateway Center, Post Office Box 2276, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,375.

A. Harry N. Cook, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Waterways Conference.

A. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $37,782.63. E. (9) $26,557.46.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $814.85. E. (9) $814.85.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Writing Instrument Manufacturers Association, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. William A. Cromartie, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Park Sherman Co., 1200 Park Avenue, Murfreesboro, Tenn.
D. (6) $383.39. E. (9) $33.39.

A. Henry Ashton Crosby, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Cuba Claims Association, Inc., 407 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.
D. (6) $725. E. (9) $779.46.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Charles A. Darnell, 3129 Brereton Court, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Valentine B. Deale, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bandag, Inc., 1056 Hershey Avenue, Muscatine, Iowa.
D. (6) $1,900. E. (9) $32.47.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
E. (9) $55.51.

A. Robert F. DeLay, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Ronald W. De Lucien, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $60.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,535. E. (9) $1,653.15.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $553.14.

A. James M. Earnest, 1000 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mauritius Sugar Syndicate, Plantation House, Place d' Armes, Post Office Box 312, Port Louis, Mauritius.
E. (9) $3,014.41.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17.30. E. (9) $25.08.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $140.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Post Office Box 1776, Raleigh, N.C.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,725.25.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $284.75. E. (9) $37.05.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $674.46. E. (9) $39.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $798.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,925 E. (9) $16.70.

A. William J. Fannin, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. Arthur S. Fefferman, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Henry G. Fischer, 1726 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Educational Television, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,835. E. (9) $300.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $847.90.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnel, Fla.

A. William Flythe, Jr., 1411 35th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Frederick W. Ford.
B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 535 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $278. E. (9) $6.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $376.78. E. (9) $376.78.

A. James F. Fort, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $310.50.

A. Robert W. Frase, 1820 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 1 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $3,135.

A. Milton Fricke, Papillion, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $133.67. E. (6) $133.67.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $275.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,465.98. E. (9) $607.82.

A. Harry J. Gerrity, 907 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Building Owners & Managers, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $157.74.

A. Royce L. Givens, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,550.

A. Robert Glicker, 1642 South 52d Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $127.91. E. (9) $67.91.

A. Harry L. Graham, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Harlan V. Hadley, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Taxation Committee of Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $625.

A. Robert N. Hampton, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,874.98. E. (9) $118.97.

A. William A. Hanscom, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,437.50. E. (9) $225.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $231.38. E. (9) $7.66.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,749.98. E. (9) $124.20.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Constructive Price, 3 Gateway Center, Post Office Box 2276, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,575.64.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $36.08.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Wool Trade Association, 155 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $93.75.

A. Norman Hill, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,574.

A. Carey W. Hilliard, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $674.46. E. (9) $27.

A. Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC, retired, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $103.55.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $73.65.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. John W. Holton, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $398.94.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel H. Horne, 1145 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Park Sherman Co., 1200 Park Avenue, Murfreesboro, Tenn.
D. (6) $383.39. E. (9) $33.39.

A. Harold A. Hosier, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $809.60. E. (9) $606.60.

A. David P. Houlihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $2,649.99.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Automatic Merchandising Association, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $307.50.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Floyd E. Huffman, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $674.46. E. (9) $106.

A. Illinois State Conference of Building Trades Unions, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,585.51.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,246.51.

A. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $1,687.51.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $550.

A. Rear Adm. Alexander Jackson, Jr., 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Chas. E. Jackson, 715 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $15.10.

A. Ralph K. James, 1115 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $440. E. (9) $23.26.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $713.75. E. (9) $30.64.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $55.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Guatemala Sugar Producers Association, Guatemala City, Guatemala.

A. Karelsen, Karelsen, Lawrence & Nathan, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $107.20.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. Ken Kendrick, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,872.73. E. (9) $4,872.73.

A. William F. Kenney, New York, N.Y.
B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, Room 1022 Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $262.50.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $424. E. (9) $5.27.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman.
D. (6) $1,980. E. (9) $1,980.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,796.

A. William L. Kohler, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $316.94.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kominers & Fort, attorneys, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. T. J. Stevenson & Co., 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $23.93.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $4,873.33.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,368. E. (9) $584.25.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $525.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $21.50.

A. Thomas B. Lawrence, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) $650.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $42.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,679.96. E. (9) $7,679.96.

A. Lawrence J. Linck & Co., 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $933.87.

A. John Linnehan, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $496.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL-CIO, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $1,120.45.

A. Maj. Gen. George O. N. Lodoen, USA Ret., 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Long, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Printing Pressmen & Assistants' Union of North America, Pressmen's Home, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,075. E. (9) $160.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $292.75.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,490.18. E. (9) $517.68.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 11th & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $5,625. E. (9) $887.18.

A. William C. McCamant, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $874.96.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,537.50. E. (9) $100.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $813.11. E. (9) $323.12.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,451.22. E. (9) $711.10.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $580. E. (9) $15.55.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $146.74.

A. James D. Mann, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,796.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

D. (6) $3,255. E. (9) $327.90.

A. P. H. Mathews, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $584.40. E. (9) $260.01.

A. Albert E. May, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $340. E. (9) $26.55.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,900. E. (9) $340.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Apparel Manufacturers Association, Inc., 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2,700.

A. William R. Merriam, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $3,090.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $1,150.75.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Telephone Answering Exchanges, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $90.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The League of New York Theatres, Inc., and the National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $310.65.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 918 16th Street, Washington, D.C.

B. Northern Textile Association.

A. Manfred L. Minzer, Jr., 233 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. United Coin Collectors Alliance, Post Office Box 5756, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) $1,200.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,875.

A. Stephen A. Mitchell, Post Office Box 932, Taos, N. Mex.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. R. Modrall, Post Office Box 466, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

B. Aetna Life Insurance Co. and Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., 151 Farmington Avenue, Hartford, Conn.

A. J. R. Modrall, Post Office Box 466, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

B. Travelers Insurance Co. and Travelers Indemnity Co., 1 Tower Square, Hartford, Conn.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 536 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.

B. Unorganized group of petroleum companies.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,737.50. E. (9) $25.70.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $625.

A. Carlos Moore, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. Clarence W. Moore, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Cuba Claims Association, Inc., 407 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.

A. Mrs. Jennelle Moorhead, Eugene Continuation Center, Eugene, Oreg.

A. Curtis Morris, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, 304 West 58th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $7,955.

A. John J. Murphy, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bricklayers, Masons & Plasterers International Union of America, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,600. E. (9) $638.03.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) $113.29. E. (9) $196.49.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,174.98. E. (9) $334.12.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $2,291.14.

A. National Association of Building Owners and Managers, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $9.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $9,858.72. E. (9) $15,159.99.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $417,126.04. E. (9) $17,660.18.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $16,045.05.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,872.73. E. (9) $4,872.73.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.

D. (6) $26,055. E. (9) $2,107.84.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $510,617.75. E. (9) $11,982.65.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $4,556.30.

A. National Committee for Immigration Reform, 1616 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,675. E. (9) $3,160.14.

A. National Community Television Association, Inc., 535 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $542.50. E. (9) $542.50.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $137.89. E. (9) $249.99.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,013.40. E. (9) $7,702.55.

A. National Council Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. (9) $272.63.

A. National Council Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $412.51.

A. National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa.

E. (9) $4,240.34.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $108,659.79. E. (9) $15,472.85.

A. National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc., 920 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $20,049.49. E. (9) $20,049.49.

A. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,667.99. E. (9) $2,007.44.

A. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $8,850.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $8,891.14. E. (9) $28,536.61.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,738.08. E. (9) $2,283.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.

D. (6) $5,300. E. (9) $5,300.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $829.95.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,252.71. E. (9) $1,032.

A. National Rice Users Conference, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $27,400. E. (9) $14,726.36.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $37,985.73. E. (9) $13,379.74.

A. National Tax Equality Association, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $23,852.62. E. (9) $18,062.25.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $428.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

D. (6) $1,354.50. E. (9) $7,821.04.

A. Edward K. Nellor, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $746.51.

A. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,024.63. E. (9) $1,817.67.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,750.

A. Sarah H. Newman, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,650.

A. W. R. Noble, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Farm & Power Equipment Dealers Association, Material Handling Equipment Distributors Association, and National Retail Hardware Association.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,050. E. (9) $38.66.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Citizens Committee for Balanced Legislative Representation, 870 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $25,000. E. (9) $1,806.42.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,200.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Sugarcane Planters, Gonzaga Building, Manila, Philippines.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Philippine Sugar Association, Davies Building, Manila, Philippines.

D. (6) $4,500.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

E. (9) $5,454.69.

A. Osceola Operating Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,200.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Fred W. Peel, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hecla Mining Co., Wallace, Idaho.

E. (9) $70.50.

A. Sandford Z. Persons, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United World Federalists, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $306.79.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N.J.

D. (6) $4,038. E. (9) $1,978.90.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $146.63. E. (9) $42.47.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $67.55.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.

D. (6) $33,361.55. E. (9) $1,350.

A. S. L. Platt, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Quinn & Quinn, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. British West Indies Sugar Association, Post Office Box 170, Bridgetown, Barbados, West Indies, Compania Azucarera Valdez, Casilla 4329, Guayaquil, Ecuador; Azucarera Nacional, S.A., Apartado 75, Panama City, Panama, Corozal Sugar Co., Post Office Box 27, Corozal, British Honduras.

D. (6) $14,375. E. (9) $2,595.73.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,500.

A. W. A. Raftery, 304 West 58th Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Motor & Equipment Manufacturers' Association, 304 West 58th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $547.05.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Bermuda Trade Development Board, Hamilton, Bermuda.

D. (6) $1,666. E. (9) $426.38.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bulk Food Carriers, Inc., 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $41.26.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Elizabeth, N.J.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $89.05.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Seatrain Lines, Inc., 595 River Road, Edgewater, N.J.

D. (6) $900.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $8,527.43.

A. Peter Regalado, 1520 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $799.98. E. (9) $169.85.

A. Reilly & Wells, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Printing Industries of America, Inc., 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $88.23.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Respess, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $305.03. E. (9) $170.15.

A. John J. Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,828. E. (9) $200.68.

A. Gloria Riordan, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc. 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $125.45.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Animal Health Institute, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. John F. Rolph, III, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1.54.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ad Hoc Committee of Publishing Companies, 60–62 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $12.40.

A. Rubenstein, Wolfson & Co., Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Independent Coal Operators Association, Pikeville, Ky.
E. (9) $115.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $779.12.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco., et al.

A. Edward J. Schmuck, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aetna Life Insurance Co. and Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., 151 Farmington Avenue, Hartford, Conn.

A. Edward J. Schmuck, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Travelers Insurance Co. and Travelers Indemnity Co., 1 Tower Square, Hartford, Conn.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Bankers Association of America, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $3,556.65.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,509.73. E. (9) $719.75.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $172.15.

A. Kenneth D. Shaw, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $474.99.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $300.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $575.

A. Single Persons Tax Reform Lobby, 1692A Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $637.47. E. (9) $693.96.

A. W. A. Smallwood, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James E. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $226.28.

A. Milan D. Smith, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 712 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,249.99. E. (9) $1,909.73.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,426.67. (9) $4,208.11.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. State and Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $19,957.51.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart (Annalee), 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $30,928.25. E. (9) $8,648.02.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Council of Flatware Importers, Inc., 241 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa; Association of Landowners of Okinawa.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $1,400.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fuji Iron & Steel Co., Ltd., 80 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $61.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters' Association, No. 2, 3-Chome, Nihonbashi, Muromachi, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $200.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters' Association and Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association of Tokyo, Japan; Miscellaneous Goods Division, Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, Inc., and Imported Footwear Group, National Council of American Importers, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $300.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Steel Wire Products Exporters' Association, 36 Hisamatsucho, Nihonbashi, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.
E. (9) $30.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Vinyl Goods Manufacturers' Association, 11, 3-Chome Akasaka-Denmacho, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan.
E. (9) $55.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Silver Co., 241 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. A. D. Sutton & Sons, 1 West 37th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $195.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. New York Mercantile Exchange, 6 Harrison Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 520 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Philip W. Stroupe, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $450. E. (9) $146.60.

A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 3900 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $57.12.

A. C. Austin Sutherland, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Sutherland, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Aetna Life Insurance Co. and Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., 151 Farmington Avenue, Hartford, Conn.

A. William A. Sutherland, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Travelers Insurance Co. and Travelers Indemnity Co., 1 Tower Square, Hartford, Conn.

A. Monroe Sweetland, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $418.88. E. (9) $198.21.

A. Russell A. Swindell, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.

B. North Carolina Railroad Association, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.

D. (6) $2,745.66. E. (9) $1,027.87.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Trans World Airlines, 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,775.50.

A. Eugene M. Thorez, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $175. E. (9) $35.40.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cooperative League of USA, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $8.85.

A. Gladys Uhl, 1616 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Committee for Immigration Reform, 1616 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,453.17. E. (9) $162.30.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $1,363.22.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,137. E. (9) $2,137.

A. United World Federalists, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,935.75. E. (9) $4,935.75.

A. F. Bourne Upham, III, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $580.

A. Charles R. Van Horn, 17th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Charles and Baltimore Streets, Baltimore, Md.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $175.93. E. (9) $43.28.

A. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $103.50. E. (9) $2.98.

A. Franklin Wallick, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $2,971.14. E. (9) $951.71.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.

B. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Wheat Users Committee, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $36,069. E. (9) $3,000.

A. Don White, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.

B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.

D. (6) $768.77. E. (9) $1,395.08.

A. Douglas Whitlock, II, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,067.78. E. (9) $71.39.

A. Donald S. Whyte, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $375.

A. Robert P. Will, 487 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, 1111 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $1,169.64.

A. Laurens Williams, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Aetna Life Insurance Co. and Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., 151 Farmington Avenue, Hartford, Conn.

A. Laurens Williams, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Travelers Insurance Co. and Travelers Indemnity Co., 1 Tower Square, Hartford, Conn.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,403.08. E. (9) $572.05.

A. Wilmer, Culter & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Government of the Bahamas, Nassau, Bahamas.

A. Everett T. Winter, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Nathan T. Wolkomir, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,307.73. E. (9) $1,337.86.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1965:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th

(Mark one square only)

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

Note on Item "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **If This Report Is for an Employer.**—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) **If This Report Is for an Agent or Employee.**—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. Receipts (Including Contributions and Loans):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $--------Dues and assessments
2. $--------Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $--------Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $--------Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $--------Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)

6. $--------Total for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $--------Received during previous Quarters of calendar year

8. $--------Total from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $--------Total now owed to others on account of loans
10. $--------Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $--------Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $--------"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": --------

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through ------------------, 19----)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	Total

Note on Item "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **If This Report Is for an Agent or Employee.** In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. Expenditures (Including Loans) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $--------Public relations and advertising services
2. $--------Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $--------Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $--------Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $--------Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $--------Telephone and telegraph
7. $--------Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $--------All other expenditures

9. $--------Total for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $--------Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $--------Total from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $--------Total now owed to person filing
13. $--------Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $--------Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	Total

A. Charles D. Ablard, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $7.38.

A. Francis L. Adams.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $315. E. (9) $27.60.

A. Clarency G. Adamy, National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. (9) $250.

A. Air Force Sergeants Association, Post Office Box 908, San Antonio, Tex.
E. (9) $300.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,464.28. E. (9) $4,464.28.

A. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

A. Miss Milnor Alexander, 320 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $960. E. (9) $1,024.68.

A. George Venable Allen, 4370 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $219.65.

A. American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $355.38. E. (9) $4,126.95.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $30,500. E. (9) $30,500.

A. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $36,752.77.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,129. E. (9) $3,545.52.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $323,949.93. E. (9) $5,561.35.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Humane Association, 896 Pennsylvania Street, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $2,251.98.

A. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $1,275.

A. American Insurance Association, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $13,815.44. E. (9) $13,815.44.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,059.19. E. (9) $3,121.13.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
D. (6) $2. E. (9) $2.

A. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,250.85. E. (9) $38,405.07.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,243.99. E. (9) $152.97.

A. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $251.65.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $47,653.72.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,291.52.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $6,279.26. E. (9) $6,279.26.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,113.28. E. (9) $411.04.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $8,406. E. (9) $6,627.

A. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $650. E. (9) $1,431.27.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,254.43. E. (9) $1,254.43.

A. American Surveys, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Certain cement companies.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $66.16.

A. American Taxpayers Association, 326 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $806. E. (9) $2,143.61.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, Whitin Machine Works, Whitinsville, Mass.
D. (6) $4.66.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $12,095.61. E. (9) $12,095.61.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,139.35. E. (9) $2,139.35.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spiegel, Inc., 2511 West 23d Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Alabama Railroad Association, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $96. E. (9) $206.86.

A. George W. Apperson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David Apter, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of the Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, British Columbia.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $151.75.

A. David Apter, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Guild of Prescription Opticians of America, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $4,566.75.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,526.31.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Margaret Lee Weil, 50 East 83d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2.

A. The Associated General Contractors, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $525.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,204.47. E. (9) $8,204.47.

A. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $51.81. E. (9) $585.44.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $205.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $200.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National AeroSpace Services Association, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $55.35.

A. Douglas B. Bagnell, Fairhope, Ala.

B. Maine Potato Council, Presque Isle, Maine.

D. (6) $300.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $272.51.

A. Frank Baird-Smith, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $562.79.

A. Bandag, Inc., 1056 Hershey Avenue, Muscatine, Iowa.

E. (9) $1,332.96.

A. Harry A. Barbour, 4925 Deal Drive SE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and Washington Parking Association, Jefferson Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,999.97.

A. Ernest L. Barcella, Washington, D.C.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $675.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

D. (6) $3,600.

A. William G. Barr, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes.

B. Insurance Co. of North America and Life Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) $460.35. E. (9) $156.60.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roy Battles, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,050.

A. John H. Beidler.

B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,095. E. (9) $578.92.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $7.75.

A. J. O. Bellenger.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $71.71.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $5,250.

A. Reed A. Benson, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

D. (6) $5,265. E. (9) $683.50.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leon G. Billings, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,125.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $605.

A. James C. Black, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Eugene P. Boardman, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $517.50. E. (9) $15.05.

A. Fred F. Bockmon, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $550. E. (9) $1,053.93.

A. Maurice G. Boehl, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $992.50.

A. Joseph Borkin, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert T. Borth, General Electric Co., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,900. E. (9) $141.30.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $96.25.

A. Bernard L. Boutin, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,406.25. E. (9) $26.26.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, 537 Cherry Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, 537 Cherry Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Samuel E. Boyle, 428 South Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $903. E. (9) $1,012.20.

A. Col. A. A. Brackett, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Marvin Braverman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Michael Ladney, Jr., 18125 East Ten Mile Road, East Detroit, Mich.

E. (9) $7.40.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Wally Briscoe.

B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 535 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $135. E. (9) $14.

A. Wayne L. Bromley, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,950.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $569.04.

A. J. Robert Brouse, 1030 15th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Animal Health Institute, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $82.69.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,454.63.

A. Donald C. Bruce, 3219 Oliver Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Conservative Union, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Suite 1101, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,249.99.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $48.20.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. George S. Bullen.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Norman D. Burch, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association (Trade Association), 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $52.70.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George J. Burger, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Burke, Finlen Hotel, Butte, Mont.
B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Post Office Drawer 1445, Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $350.

A. C. P. Burks, the American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $562.50.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $502.07.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,999.99.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $58.75.

A. Herbert H. Butler, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $500.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $90.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $421.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Marvin Caplan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,211. E. (9) $125.30.

A. Ronald A. Capone, Kirlin, Campbell & Keating, the Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London, England.
E. (9) $661.

A. Col. John T. Carlton, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. James R. Carnes, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,700.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $334.33.

A. H. Allen Carroll, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone and Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $165.

A. Blue Allan Carstenson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,446.02. E. (9) $49.24.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. G. Richard Challinor, 101 West 11th Street, Kansas City, Mo.
B. Flood Insurance Associates, Inc., 101 West 11th Street, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $3,600.

A. Alger B. Chapman, Jr., 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Chapman, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,708.50.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Alaska Pipeline Co., Post Office Box 6554, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $171.42.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 420 South Milwaukee Avenue, Libertyville, Ill.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $122.44.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Asociacion de Comerciantes en Licores de Nogales, Sonora Obregon No. 102, Nogales, Sonora, Mexico.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $108.80.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bruynzeel Fabricken, Zaandam, Holland, and Bruynzeel Suriname, Paramaribo, Suriname (subsidiary).
D. (6) $4,643.60. E. (9) $675.40.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 139–141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $22.66. E. (9) $50.30.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S.A. de C.V., Balderas 36, Primer Piso, Mexico D. F., Mexico.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $1,206.60.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $3,400. E. (9) $1,080.49.

A. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $150.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,057.99. E. (9) $4,661.76.

A. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $2,074.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earl W. Clark.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,225. E. (9) $82.76.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Roger A. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Conference of America, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Colonial Sugar Refining Co., Ltd., 1–3 O'Connell Street, Sidney, Australia.
E. (9) $593.04.

A. Earle C. Clements, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $10.15.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $874.99. E. (9) $1,166.88.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.
D. (6) $874.99. E. (9) $1,166.88.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $874.99. E. (9) $1,166.88.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. P. Lorillard Co.
D. (6) $874.99. E. (9) 1,166.88.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philip Morris Inc.
D. (6) $874.99. E. (9) $1,166.88.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $874.99. E. (9) $1,166.88.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Superior Oil Co.
D. (6) $104.50. E. (9) $104.50.

A. Clay L. Cochran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,770.78. E. (9) $315.88.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $212.02.

A. Joseph Cohen, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Cole & Groner, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Task Force of Small American Shipbuilders, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Navigation System, Inc., Box 7, Guam.

A. J. I. Collier, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $193.75.

A. Collier & Shannon, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Collier & Shannon, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Footwear Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $217.90.

A. Collier & Shannon, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tool and Stainless Steel Industry Committee, c/o Carpenter Steel Co., Reading, Pa.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $103.80.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $1,254.21.

A. Committee for Automobile Excise Tax Repeal, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $22,737.89.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Committee for a Free Cotton Market, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $37,757.50. E. (9) $7,998.83.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,090. E. (9) $12,852.68.

A. R. T. Compton, National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Texaco Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $69.43.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $252. E. (9) $51.64.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. John Shepherd Cooper, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas and Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $2,324.80.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Post Office Box 239, Portsmouth, N.H.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,307.33.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cigar Manufacturers' Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,550. E. (9) $37.80.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 1477 West Penden Street, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $6.65.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Footwear Division, Rubber Manufacturers' Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $489.95.

A. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,130. E. (9) $3,130.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,545. E. (9) $8.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters Inc.
D. (6) $800.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Lightweight Aggregates Percentage Depletion Committee, care of John W. Roberts, Post Office Box 9138, Richmond, Va.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. P. Moller, 8 Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Savings & Loan Bank of the State of New York, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Wheat Users Committee, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $827.83.

A. Frank M. Crance, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $413.65.

A. Robert E. Cronin, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $644.09. E. (9) $644.09.

A. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,225. E. (9) $366.10.

A. John T. Curran, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,800. E. (9) $2,606.25.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Louis S. Damiani, Post Office Box 54, Gatun, C.Z.
B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council, AFL–CIO, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $1,338.48. E. (9) $1,863.

A. Charles A. Darnell, 3129 Brereton Court, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. F. Gibson Darrison, Jr., 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 901 West 22d Street, Oak Brook, Ill.
E. (9) $37.45.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $57,061.59. E. (9) $608.44.

A. Clifford Davis, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Louisville Gas & Electric Co., Louisville, Ky.
D. (6) $125.

A. Clifford Davis, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shawnee Coal Co., Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $125.

A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.
D. (6) $182.90. E. (9) $182.90.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Nursing Home Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.
D. (6) $20,000. E. (9) $160.97.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of D.C., 2300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Peoples Life Insurance Co., Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Equitable Life Insurance Co.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Virgin Islands Gift & Fashion Shop Association, St. Thomas, V.I.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Valentine B. Deale, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bandag, Inc., 1056 Hershey Avenue, Muscatine, Iowa.
D. (6) $1,270. E. (9) $62.96.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 220 Central Building, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $134.72.

A. Ronald W. De Lucien, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $60.

A. Milton C. Denbo, 1341 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Automatic Car Wash Association, Inc., 4432 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1.50.

A. George H. Denison, 4433 31st Street South, Arlington, Va.
B. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Max A. Denney, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $575.

A. John M. Dickerman, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber & Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $18.45.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,687.50. E. (9) $155.75.

A. George S. Dietrich, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $84.42. E. (9) $7.50.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, Rust Building, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Engineering Co., Inc., 74 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,266.95. E. (9) $66.95.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 South Street, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $1,111.70. E. (9) $61.70.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Thurman & Wright, 1203 Latham Square Building, Oakland, Calif.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Service Headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $6,375. E. (9) $873.62.

A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $337.50. E. (9) $26.25.

A. District of Columbia Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 710 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,600. E. (9) $1,600.

A. District Lodge 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Transit Union, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companys, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $18.34.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $4.50.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $909.78.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, American Insurance Association, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $389.25.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,093.10. E. (9) $158.

A. Leonard K. Dowiak, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Durand, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $205.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $140.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $516.25. E. (9) $161.25.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Jewelers of America, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $815.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water & Power of the City of Los Angeles, 111 North Hope Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,600.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $6,881.25.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., 10017.
D. (6) $192. E. (9) $15.20.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $878.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,925. E. (9) $23.20.

A. Family Tax Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $926.61.

A. William J. Fannin, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50,032. E. (9) $22,056.30.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $600.

A. Arthur S. Fefferman, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

A. Maxwell Field, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
B. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $41.50.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
D. (6) $6,750. E. (9) $150.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $7.87.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,200.

A. Frederick W. Ford.
B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 535 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $278. E. (9) $8.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,612.50. E. (9) $70.32.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $115.

A. John G. Fox, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $196.84.

A. Morley E. Fox, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $258.40. E. (9) $285.

A. Charles A. Francik, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.
D. (6) $420.

A. R. Frank Frazier, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,500.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,829.08. E. (9) $7,237.30.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Steamship Co., 1210 Standard Plaza, Portland, Oreg.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $631.90.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Aubrey D. Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $170.

A. William A. Georghegan, Pierson, Ball & Dowd, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Soap & Detergent Association, 295 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Arthur P. Gildea, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink & Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $306.40.

A. Neal P. Gillen, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ginsburg & Feldman, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Health Plan, 1901 Trinity Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $26.80.

A. Ginsburg & Feldman, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Plastic & Chemical Corp., Railroad Avenue, West Haverstraw, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,324.50. E. (9) $85.96.

A. Ginsburg & Feldman, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Ohio Valley Association, 902 Union Trust Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $56.94.

A. Robert Gladwin, Boston, Mass.
B. Massachusetts General Hospital, Fruit Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $185.56.

A. Glenn F. Glezen, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip M. Glick, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District of Columbia Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 710 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,600. E. (9) $610.

A. Don A. Goodall, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. John A. Gosnell, National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,833.34.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Florists' Transworld Delivery Association, 900 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Government Employes' Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,355.61. E. (9) $3,283.33.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $19.40.

A. George Grant, 4801 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ministry of Industry, Thailand Government.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $325.83.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James A. Gray, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10. E. (9) $68.51.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, Union Pacific Railroad Co., 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
E. (9) $451.31.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Oceanic Properties, Inc., Post Office Box 2780, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, American Smelting & Refining Co., American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $1,910.

A. Seymour C. Guthman, Executive Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Syndicat des Distillateurs et producteurs de Sucre de Madagascar, 282 Boulevard., St. Germain, Paris, France.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Robert W. Haack, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington. D.C.
B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $186.80.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,225. E. (9) $99.78.

A. Harlan V. Hadley, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Taxation Committee of Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $625.

A. Hal H. Hale, 421 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Andrew G. Haley, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $462.92.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. G. Hall, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,875.10.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comision Nacional Para el Estudio, de la Caña y el Azucar, La Paz, Bolivia.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $112.

A. Mildred B. Harman, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $750.49. E. (9) $336.78.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $253.94. E. (9) $5.17.

A. R. A. Harris, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,249.96.

A. Burr P. Harrison, Graichen Building, Winchester, Va.
B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass., Redfield Gun Sight Co., Denver, Colo., O. F. Mossberg & Sons, Inc., New Haven, Conn., High Standard Corp., Hammond, Conn., Browning Arms Co., Morgan, Utah.
D. (6) $5,166.80. E. (9) $57.94.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,680. E. (9) $9.63.

A. Hays & Hays, 920 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $300.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 230 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $240.72.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $264.06. E. (9) $264.06.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $153.60.

A. Robert W. Healy, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. and Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William H. Hedlund, 909 American Bank Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, Calif., Mobil Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif., Union Oil Co. of California, Los Angeles, Calif., Shell Oil Co., San Francisco, Calif., Tidewater Oil Co., San Francisco, Calif., Richfield Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Laurance G. Henderson, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mayer, Friedlich, Spiess, Tierney, Brown & Platt, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., and Simpson, Thatcher & Bartlett, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. $1,160.82.

A. John K. Herbert, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $383.14.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $25.06.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $74.93.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass.; Redfield Gun Sight Co., Denver, Colo.; O. F. Mossberg & Sons, Inc., New Haven, Conn.; High Standard Corp., Hammond, Conn.; and Browning Arms Co., Morgan, Utah.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. J. J. Hickey, 405 Majestic Building, Cheyenne, Wyo.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co.

A. M. F. Hicklin, Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $935.35.

A. John W. Hight, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y., and Robert K. Gray 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Norman Hill.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,574. E. (9) $222.68.

A. James A. Hirshfield, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $11.

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cane Sugars Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $138.18.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Apartment Association of America, Inc., 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,925. E. (9) $252.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Joint Committee on Transportation for Metropolitan Washington.
D. (6) $253.13. E. (9) $785.91.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Specialty Contractors' Association, Inc., 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $281. E. (9) $260.21.

A. Lee B. Holmes, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $21.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Donald E. Horton, American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,625. E. (9) $13,101.12.

A. W. T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $275.

A. William J. Hull, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. William J. Hull, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. Everett Hutchinson, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Erna H. Schuyler, Costa Mesa, Calif.
E. (9) $284.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,087.50.

A. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $17,013.85. E. (9) $17,013.85.

A. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $394.54.

A. Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $615.42.

A. International Armament Corp., 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.

E. (9) $1,500.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $540.

A. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $2,975. E. (9) $4.75.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 19 Summit Court, St. Paul, Minn.

D. (6) $3,999.73. E. (9) $9,505.49.

A. Rear Adm. Alexander Jackson, Jr., 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $187.97.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

E. (9) $200.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,222.50. E. (9) $54.65.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.

B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn., Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky., Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn.; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N.J., and Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Mayfield, Ky.

E. (9) $480.50

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $726.25. E. (9) $18.20.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,607.74. E. (9) $172.31.

A. T. Richmond Johnson, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Central Arizona Project Association, Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. Willis Johnson, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Ned Johnston, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Maufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. George Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.

B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

D. (6) $552. E. (9) $630.97.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $29.40.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $700.

A. William J. Keating, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $15.

A. Howard B. Keck, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

E. (9) $300.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

E. (9) $275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) $159.01.

A. Eugene A. Keeney, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

E. (9) $134.40.

A. William J. Kerwin, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $2,812.20. E. (9) $2,413.95.

A. John L. Kilcullen, McNutt, Dudley & Easterwood, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $50.

A. Edward W. Kiley, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $750.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $630. E. (9) $27.71.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,802.

A. John D. Knodell, Jr., 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) $214.79.

A. George W. Koch, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 G Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $4,926.92.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $4,387.50. E. (9) $4,456.48.

A. June Kysilko, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $9,281.25.

A. Laborers' Political Action League, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,469.19. E. (9) $2,207.11

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,990. E. (9) $6,480.71.

A. Kenneth C. Landry, 1735 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Richard H. Lane, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.

A. Robert D. Larsen, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Swaziland Sugar Association, Mbabane, Swaziland.

E. (9) $272.22.

A. Reed E. Larson, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $200. E. (9) $50.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $900.

A. George H. Lawrence, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $312.50. E. (6) $61.22.

A. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $36.25. E. (9) $111.22.

A. Leonard F. Lee, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) $61.50.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $165. E. (9) $127.50.

A. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,739.47.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $42.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Nils A. Lennartson, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $8,749.98.

A. Gilbert B. Lessenco, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Mills, Inc., 9200 Wayzata Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) $2,300.

A. Edith M. Lesser, 2924 Rittenhouse Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington Home Rule Committee, 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,299.99.

A. Roy T. Lester, M.D., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 335 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $375. E. (9) $4.75.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $929.28.

A. Lightweight Aggregate Percentage Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 9138, Richmond, Va.

D. (6) $200. E. (9) $985.26.

A. Lester W. Lindow, Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $121.25.

A. David A. Lindsay, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

B. ICI Financial Corp., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $81.66.

A. Donald J. Lipsett, 1420 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Conservative Union, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,624.99.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $687.50. E. (9) $24.57.

A. Basil R. Littin, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

B. Continental Oil Co.

A. Fred Livington, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Maj. Gen. George O. N. Lodoen, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Long, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Printing Pressmen and Assistant's Union of North America, Pressmen's Home, Tenn.

D. (6) $1,075. E. (9) $120.

A. Paul H. Long, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $41.45.

A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.

B. National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.

B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., Roanoke, Va.

D. (6) $600.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Charles Emmet Lucey, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Support Group for Progressive Banking, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Government Employees' Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,682.66

A. McCarty & Wheatley, 1200 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Evan Jones Coal Co., Box 619, Anchorage, Alaska, and Usibelli Coal Mine, Inc., Usbelli, Alaska.

D. (6) $625.

A. McCarty & Wheatley, 1200 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Semitropic Water Storage District, 2714 "L" Street, Bakersfield, Calif.

D. (6) $900.

A. Guy G. McConnell, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $800.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $200.

A. Angus H. McDonald.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,230.98. E. (9) $97.36.

A. Benny W. McGehee, Post Office Box 908, San Antonio, Tex.

B. Air Force Sergeants Association, Post Office Box 908, San Antonio, Tex.

D. (6) $300.

A. F. Howard McGuigan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,562. E. (9) $232.90.

A. Clarence M. McIntosh, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $2,021.40. E. (9) $20.70.

A. William F. McKenna, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $34.

A. Richard F. McMahon, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Thomas E. Flynn, Eastern Conference of Teamsters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $315.

A. Robert D. McMillen, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $2,392.80.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selingsgrove, Pa.

D. (6) $2,500.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,254. E. (9) $182.28.

A. James E. Mack, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Confectioners Association, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jos. R. MacLaren, 4 Linden Drive, Hudson Falls, N.Y.

B. Potlatch Forests, Inc., 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $1,425. E. (9) $516.38.

A. H. E. Mahlman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., c/o Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.

D. (6) $812.50. E. (9) $206.45.

A. Don Mahon, National Federation of Independent Unions, 1127 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,020.68.

A. Carter Manasco, 5932 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.

B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,600. E. (9) $140.95.

A. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $1,455.87.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,802.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

D. (6) $525. E. (9) $1,437.95.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Robert O. Marritz, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $64.

A. David M. Marsh, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Insurance Association, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $400. E. (9) $14.25.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

D. (6) $3,255. E. (9) $318.90.

A. Michael Marsh, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $330.13.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $140.65. E. (9) $93.15.

A. Thomas A. Martin, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

D. (6) $120. E. (9) $120.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, American Committee on Japan, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $250.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $200.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,999.93. E. (9) $1,480.

A. P. H. Mathews, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,091.09. E. (9) $672.96.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $90. E. (9) $4.02.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert A. Means, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $3,135.72. E. (9) $15.65.

A. Donald Melvin, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $196.85.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $225.20.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

E. (9) $1,548.63.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Box 128 Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1625 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,739.47.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Capt. A. Standley Miller, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $100.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Telephone Answering Exchanges, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $90.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The League of New York Theatres, Inc., and The National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $90.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Dallas, Tex., Chamber of Commerce.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Intracoastal Canal Association, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.

D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.

D. (6) $3,465. E. (9) $686.18.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $555.56.

A. Luman G. Miller, 424 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Oregon Railroad Association, 424 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $949.46.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Othmer J. Mischo, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $152.50.

A. Stephen A. Mitchell, Post Office Box 932, Taos, N. Mex.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 536 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. G. Merrill Moody, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $27.82. E. (9) $49.68.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Morison, Clapp, Abrams & Haddock, the Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $510.28.

A. Ray R. Murdock.
B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700.

A. John J. Murphy, Wileliner Estates, Route 2, Box 113–D, Edgewater, Md.
B. National Customs Service Association.

A. Robert F. Murphy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,582.16. E. (9) $94.25.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Murtha, National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Associated Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,530. E. (9) $822.46.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–65 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $15.25.

A. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,318.88. E. (9) $10,703.20.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $200.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,869.24. E. (9) $1,869.24.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $8,042.19.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $683.03. E. (9) $552.50.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,669.99. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,809.36. E. (9) $11,809.36.

A. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $400.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,024.68. E. (9) $1,024.68.

A. National Committee for International Development, 1762 Church Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,370. E. (9) $4,825.80.

A. National Community Television Association, Inc., 535 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $435. E. (9) $435.

A. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $6,375.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $3,626.03. E. (9) $3,626.03.

A. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,183. E. (9) $2,183.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $160.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $70.71. E. (9) $250.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $503.28.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $280.28. E. (9) $280.28.

A. National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa.
E. (9) $6,155.88.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $441,337.05. E. (9) $2,544.18.

A. National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,703.20.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $18,823.32. E. (9) $23,499.64.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,734.38. E. (9) $1,034.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,012.84. E. (9) $8,012.84.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,333.32.

A. National Particleboard Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7,596.75.

A. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,930. E. (9) $11,440.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,195.53.

A. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,562.52.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $123,396. E. (9) $2,472.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $100.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

D. (6) $16,059. E. (9) $8,275.04.

A. Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $8,037.50. E. (9) $7,701.93.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $45. E. (9) $21.56.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,321.20.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $3,894.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 1 East First Street, Reno, Nev.

B. Nevada Railroad Association, 1 East First Street, Reno, Nev.

A. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) $441.50. E. (9) $441.50.

A. Mrs. Sarah H. Newman, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George L. Nichols.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $127.88.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $706.23.

A. Stanley D. Noble, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert W. Nolan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles M. Noone, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $263.82.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 514 Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $975. E. (9) $13.33.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $220.22.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Graham T. Northup, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $5,100. E. (9) $5,942.

A. E. M. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $200.

A. Michael J. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $200. E. (9) $539.15.

A. Ira H. Nunn, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $250.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street, Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $525.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Transit Association, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Citizens Committee for Balanced Legislative Representation, 870 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

E. (9) $3,108.93.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. El Paso Natural Gas Co., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $134.73.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Outdoor Amusement Business Association, Box 143, Southfield, Mich.

E. (9) $99.43.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Roadside Business Association, 1430 Rand Tower, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,823.40.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 7703 Normandale Road, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) $2,500.

A. John B. O'Day, C.L.U., 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $10,642.39.

A. Jane O'Grady, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,820. E. (9) $282.72.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

E. (9) $2,213.01.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $450. E. (9) $35.34.

A. Harry D. Orr, Jr., 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Robert O. Anderson, Roswell, N. Mex.

E. (9) $43.39.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.

B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

E. (9) $152.50.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $150.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.

B. Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.

A. Walter Page, Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

E. (9) $179.49.

A. J. D. Parel, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $400.49. E. (9) $245.

A. Kenneth Wells Parkinson, 1100 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Committee for a New Patent Office Building, 1331 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,457.60. E. (9) $113.53.

A. James D. Parriott, Jr., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

B. Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $55.80.

A. James G. Patton.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $214.18.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $40.94.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. Family Tax Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

D. (6) $800.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.

D. (6) $200. E. (9) $40.25.

A. Peter J. Pestillo, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,437.48. E. (9) $125.

A. Ervin L. Peterson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Milk Industry Foundation and International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 910 17th Street NW., Washington. D.C.

E. (9) $31.61.

A. Harold Peterson, 500 Minnesota Federal Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. National R.E.A. Telephone Association, 500 Minnesota Federal Building, Minneapolis. Minn.

D. (6) $7,000. E. (9) $1,081.83.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $43.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, Post Office Box 6787, Orlando, Fla.

E. (9) $255.84.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.

B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $21.

A. Kenneth T. Peterson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hotel & Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, 6 East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph D. Phelan, 485 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Colorado River Association, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $730.

A. Richard N. Philleo, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,273.30. E. (9) $100.86.

A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $156.71.

A. Pierson, Ball & Dowd, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Federal Cartridge Corp., 2700 Foshay Tower, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) $250.

A. Bruce O. Pike, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $580.

A. T. E. Pinkston, Kentucky Railroad Association, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.

E. (9) $519.20.

A. Phyllis T. Piotrow, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Population Crisis Committee, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $107.25.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Texaco Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $700. E. (9) $1,255.

A. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.

E. (9) $240.25.

A. S. L. Platt, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. James K. Polk, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. John W. Pompelli, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert R. Poston, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $172.93.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $9.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $9.60.

A. Graydon R. Powers, Jr., Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marvin J. Powers, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $400.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,500.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $150. E. (9) $4.75.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sugar Sales (Pvt.), Ltd., Throgmorton House, Jameson Avenue, Salisbury, Rhodesia.

D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $406.16.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $890.42. E. (9) $338.36.

A. Earl G. Quinn, 9807 South Oakley Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $823.50. E. (9) $869.52.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., et al.

D. (6) $13,249.97. E. (9) $8,206.90.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $444.40.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Albert Rains, 823 Forrest Avenue, Gadsden, Ala.

B. Mayer, Friedlich, Spiess, Tierney, Brown & Platt, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $499.99. E. (9) $62.69.

A. James A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Tidewater Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Rea, Cross & Knebel, 917 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Midwest Solvents Co., Inc., 1300 Main Street, Atchison, Kans.

D. (6) $480. E. (9) $19.20.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.

B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.

D. (6) $150.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,150. E. (9) $1,443.95.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.

B. Texas Railroads.

D. (6) $310.

A. Peter Regalado, 1520 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $20.

A. J. A. Reidelbach, Jr., 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $200.

A. Reilly & Charles, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. New Process Co., Warren Pa., and Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Reilly & Wells, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Printing Industries of America, Inc., 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,600. E. (9) $579.85.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $89,493.63.

A. Retired Officers Tax Credit Committee, Post Office Box 1965, Annapolis, Md.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $718.89.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,034.70. E. (9) $8,750.94.

A. Reynolds Metals Co., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $280.

A. William A. Reynolds, 526 Northwest 30th Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.

B. Land Use Committee, Pocatello, Idaho.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $3,500.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Continental Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Richards, 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,133.34. E. (9) $14.02.

A. Dorsey Richardson, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.

B. Louisiana Railroads.

D. (6) $25.75. E. (9) $121.17.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Entertainment Law Committee, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. State Farm Mutual Insurance Co., Bloomington, Ill.

A. Richard J. Riddick, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $136.46.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. Gloria Riordan, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL–CIO, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500.

A. John Rippey, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

D. (6) $625. E. (9) $169.25.

A. William Neale Roach, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Armament Corp. (Interarmco), 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. Roger Robb, 1100 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Committee for a New Patent Office Building, 1331 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $637.50.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $250.

A. Austin L. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $812.50.

A. Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roberts & Holland, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Furman-Wolfson Corp., 1440 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $112.27.

A. Roberts & Holland, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. I.O.S., Ltd. (S.A.), 119, Rue de Lausanne, Geneva, Switzerland.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, in care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $85.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Animal Health Institute, in care of Mr. Robert Brouse, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $400.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Plywood Corp., 777 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $500.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $185.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $437.50.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $526.

A. Raymond A. Rourke, 333 Medford Street, Charlestown, Mass.

B. Revere Sugar Refinery, 333 Medford Street, Charlestown, Mass.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ad Hoc Committee of Publishing Companies, 60–62 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $88.13.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Insurance Association, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $7,000. E. (9) $74.86.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pinkerton's, Inc., 154 Nassau Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $.50.

A. Rubenstein, Wolfson & Co., Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. National Independent Coal Operators Association, Pikeville, Ky.

E. (9) $115.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building. Washington, D.C.

B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron Ohio.

A. Rule of Law Committee, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $39. E. (9) $39.

A. Albert T. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $810. E. (9) $408.75.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,576.84. E. (9) $60.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Business Press, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $1,332.47.

A. William H. Scheick, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $3,200.76.

A. Henry P. Schmidt, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $933.74.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington, D.C. Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $107.54.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,575. E. (9) $316.37.

A. David C. Sharman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., c/o Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $1,093.75. E. (9) $650.94.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge & Madden, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $968.

A. Carroll M. Shaw, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ira Shesser, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Max Shins, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $992. E. (9) $20.

A. Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, 1204 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bluejay Oil Co., National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, 1204 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Fiduciary Counsel, Inc., 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, 1204 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Insurance Securities Inc., 100 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, 1204 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Investors Management Co., Westminster at Parker, Elizabeth, N.J.

A. Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, 1204 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Leitchfield Manufacturing Co., 2408 Douglass Boulevard, Louisville, Ky.

A. Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, 1204 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National FHA Apartment Owners Association, Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, 1204 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Shipley, Akerman & Pickett (for National Realty Trust), 1204 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, 1204 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pet Shop Management, Inc., Post Office Box 109, Fond du Lac, Wis.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 306 International Trade Mart, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. A. Z. Shows, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Neale Roach Associates, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Sidley, Austin, Burgess & Smith, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $1,626.47.

A. Jack C. Skerrett, 717 19th Street South, Arlington, Va.
B. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Harold S. Skinner, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Continental Oil Co.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

A. Harold Slater, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,312.50. E. (9) $9.65.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $23.70.

A. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. E. Stratford Smith, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $57.15.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $105.

A. Irvin A. Smith, 418 East Rosser Avenue, Post Office Box 938, Bismarck, N. Dak.
E. (9) $1,004.33.

A. James R. Smith, 1060 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramac, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.

A. Robert B. Smith, 121 Second Street, NE, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $55.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,148.70. E. (9) $1,007.04.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $591.73. E. (9) $316.

A. Thaddeus S. Snell, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Particleboard Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $275.25.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1726 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $325. E. (9) $55.57.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,730.77.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3492, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,131.95. E. (9) $6,776.47.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $607.94.

A. William W. Spear, 214 Fremont National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $729.17. E. (9) $8.90.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence Speiser, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Nell May F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hamilton Watch Co. and Elgin National Watch Co.

D. (6) $200.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $120. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Reynolds Metals Co., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $280.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Rule of Law Committee, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $37.50. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart (Annalee), 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $23,707.12. E. (9) $5,821.88.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $2,065. E. (9) $9.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,426.25. E. (9) $29.62.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $179.10.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $625.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Post Office Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Box 907-X, Route 1, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, 25 Main Street, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Tuscarora Reservation, Lewiston, N.Y.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herald E. Stringer, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $4,625. E. (9) $436.40.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,875.

A. Sam S. Studebaker, Tipp City, Ohio.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $600.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Greene, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Sugar Producers of Guadeloupe and Martinique, Boite Postale 175, Pointe-a-Pitre, Guadeloupe.

E. (9) $439.34.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Greene, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for International Housing Through Private Housing, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $12.56.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Greene, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. South Puerto Rico Sugar Co., 5 Hanover Square, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $169.71.

A. Austin Sutherland, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. M. Tarr, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,153.83. E. (9) $752.40.

A. Wm. B. Thompson, Jr., 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $497.93. E. (9) $290.

A. John N. Thurman, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 635 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $987.36.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.

D. (6) $147.50. E. (9) $138.09.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,318.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $224.31.

A. John H. Todd, Post Office Box 23, 1065 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1065 Shrine Building, Office Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $14.25.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,187.50. E. (9) $54.25.

A. Joel B. True, 840 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.

B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $200. E. (9) $150.

A. John W. Turner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Range Association, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.

E. (9) $94.38.

A. David G. Unger, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

E. (9) $929.98.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $362,584.84. E. (9) $44,895.03.

A. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2,340.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,640.74.

A. United States Plywood Corp., 777 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $500.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $24,106.89.

A. Lois W. Van Valkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va.

B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $105. E. (9) $8.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,038.40. E. (9) $15.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $263.80. E. (9) $129.60.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,298.34. E. (9) $8,190.76.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $50.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) $200.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5. E. (9) $1.15.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $225. E. (9) $4.96.

A. William H. Webb, LaSalle Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,875.36. E. (9) $1,034.69.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $3,746.32.

A. Peter P. Weidenbruch, Jr., 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $105.20.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph H. Welch, 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. Wellington Management Co., 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. (9) $28.74.

A. Wenchel, Schulman & Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Michael Ladney, Jr., 18125 East 10 Mile Road, East Detroit, Mich.

E. (9) $45.14.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.

E. (9) $601.30.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $232.75.

A. Marc A. White, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Donald S. Whyte, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $375.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude G. Wild, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $250.

A. Albert E. Wilkinson, 202 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $785.70.

A. Mr. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.

B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.

D. (6) $150. E. (9) $41.72.

A. Harding deC. Williams, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,916. E. (9) $381.74.

A. Robert E. Williams, Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $950. E. (9) $516.16.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $227.68.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for Automobile Excise Tax Repeal, Farragut Building, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,897.20. E. (9) $378.39.

A. Clark L. Wilson, Association Building, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Consultant to the Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee.

D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $792.23.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,153.70.

A. Henry B. Wilson, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 121 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (Service Organization), 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $150.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $329.98.

A. Everett T. Winter, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $610.12. E. (9) $610.12.

A. Clay B. Wolfe, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $828.60. E. (9) $880.

A. Lewton B. Wolfe, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Venlo Wolfsohn, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $16.35.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Transportation-Communication Employees Union, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

D. (6) $750.

A. Hal J. Wright, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph M. Wyatt, 501 Keyser Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Roadside Business Association, 1430 Rand Tower, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $438.24.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Support Group for Progressive Banking, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $800.

A. Theodore O. Yntema, 3950 Franklin Road, Bloomfield Hills, Mich.

B. Committee for Automobile Excise Tax Repeal, Farragut Building, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Howard E. Young, 4622 Creek Shore Drive, Rockville, Md.

B. Best Universal Lock Co., Inc., 6161 East 75th Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $39.90.

A. J. Banks Young, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $637.50.

A. Kenneth Young, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,562. E. (9) $486.18

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Roger E. Zylstra, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $50.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1965:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______◀

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◀

A. Arthur Andersen & Co., 69 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. David Apter, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Guild of Prescription Opticians of America, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Floor Covering Committee Affiliated With the National Council of American Importers, 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Margaret Lee Weil, 50 East 83d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Automatic Car Wash Association, 1115 Union Planters Bank Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Bandag, Inc., 1056 Hershey Avenue, Muscatine, Iowa.

A. Emmett Ellwood Barbee, Box 843, Boulder City, Nev.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James P. Bass, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Reed A. Benson, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass.

A. Eugene P. Boardman, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael H. Cardozo, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Law Schools, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 139–141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Citizens Political Action Association of Prince Georges County, 110 Northway Road, Greenbelt, Md.

A. James R. Clark, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Colonial Sugar Refining Co., Ltd., 1–3 O'Connell Street, Sydney, Australia.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Oil Shale Corp., 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Cole & Groner, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Task Force of Small American Shipbuilders, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marvin K. Collie, 2201 First City National Bank Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Arthur Andersen & Co., 69 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association Maximum Service Telecasters.

A. Frank M. Crance, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Clifford Davis, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Louisville Gas & Electric Co., Louisville, Ky.

A. Clifford Davis, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shawnee Coal Co., Nashville, Tenn.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Peoples Life Insurance Co., Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Equitable Life Insurance Co., and Government Employees Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Valentine B. Deale, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bandag, Inc., 1056 Hershey Avenue, Muscatine, Iowa.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Responsive Environments Corp., 21 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Milton C. Denbo, 1341 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Automatic Car Wash Association, 4432 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Franklin W. Denius, Post Office Box 1148, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Electric Service Co., Post Office Box 970, Fort Worth, Tex.

A. John M. Dickerman, 900 17th Street NW., Washington.
B. National Lumber & Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Engineering Co., Inc., 74 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. R. Michael Duncan.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Basic Management, Inc., Post Office Box 2065, Henderson, Nev.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Las Vegas Valley Water District, 3700 West Charleston Boulevard, Las Vegas, Nev.

A. Emergency Committee To Protect Cotton Growers, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D.C.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Sugar Cane League of the U.S.A., 414 Whitney Building, New Orleans, La., and Florida Sugar Cane League, Post Office Box 1207, Clewiston, Fla.

A. Joseph B. Friedman, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. M. Golodetz & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Goodwin, Procter & Hoar, 84 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. National Association of Business Development Corp.

A. George Grant, 4801 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ministry of Industry, Thailand Government, Thailand Embassy, 2300 Kalorama Road, Washington, D.C.

A. George Grant, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Milton S. Gwirtzman, 844 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. HRH Construction Co., 579 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comision Nacional Para el Estudio, de la Caña y el Azucar, La Paz, Bolivia.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

A. H. Struve Hensel, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. C. H. Stuelcken Sohn, Stuelckenwerft, Hamburg-Steinwerder, Germany.

A. J. J. Hickey, 405 Majestic Building, Cheyenne, Wyo.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., U.P.R.R. Building, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. John W. Holton, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Everett Hutchinson, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Meryle V. Hutchison, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

A. Spencer A. Johnson, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Murray B. Jones, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Engineering Service Contractors, Inc., 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth B. Keating, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Population Crisis Committee, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. B. Kirklin, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D.C.

A. John D. Knodell, Jr., 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Robert D. Larsen, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Swaziland Sugar Association, Mbabane, Swaziland.

A. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul H. Long, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. McCarty & Wheatley, 1200 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Semitropic Water Storage District, 2714 L Street, Bakersfield, Calif.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Guy G. McConnell, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. Perkins McGuire, 800 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. C. H. Stuelcken Sohn, Stuelckenwerft, Hamburg-Steinwerder, Germany.

A. Robert D. McMillen, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Rufus W. Manderson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James M. Massey, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James E. Meals, 1143 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Air Line Pilots Association, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mercantile Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Mercantile Trust Company National Association, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific Lighting Corp., 600 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. John H. Murdoch, Jr., Barclay Building, 1 Belmont Avenue, Bala Cynwyd, Pa.

B. National Water Company Conference, Barclay Building, Bala Cynwyd, Pa.

A. National Auto & Truck Wreckers Association, Inc., 18 Second Avenue, San Mateo, Calif.

A. National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa.

A. National Particleboard Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Rice Users Conference, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Nixon, Mudge, Rose, Guthrie & Alexander, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Talisman Sugar Corp., 1400 First National Bank Building, Miami, Fla.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Transit Association, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. El Paso Natural Gas Co., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Harry D. Orr, Jr., 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Robert O. Anderson, Roswell, N. Mex.

A. Pacific Lighting Corp., 600 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Brig. Gen. John L. Person, USA (Ret.), LaSalle Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Harold Peterson, 500 Minnesota Federal Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. National R.E.A. Telephone Association, 500 Minnesota Federal Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. John P. Philbin, 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Bruce O. Pike, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Mrs. Phyllis P. Piotrow, 1730 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Population Crisis Committee, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John W. Pompelli, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Population Crisis Committee, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Prather, Levenberg & Seeger, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Comité de Productores de Azucar, 376 A Miro Queseda, Lima, Peru, and Confederation of Workers of Peru, Tigre 173, Lima, Peru.

A. Earl G. Quinn, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bulk Food Carriers, Inc., 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. South Atlantic & Caribbean Line, Inc., 250 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Edward M. Raymond, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. A conference body for farmer cooperatives marketing farm products and/or purchasing farm supplies.

A. Rea, Cross & Knebel, 917 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Midwest Solvents Co., Inc., 1300 Main Street, Atchison, Kans.

A. William M. Requa, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Continental Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.

A. Henry P. Schmidt, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. James M. Schuette, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Beer Wholesalers' Association of America, Inc., 6310 North Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge & Madden, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard L. Shook, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. W. Roger Springate, Sr., Security Trust Building, Lexington, Ky.

A. Single Persons Tax Reform Lobby, 1692A Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. James E. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Thaddeus S. Snell, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Particleboard Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond E. Steele, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American and Canadian Importers of Green Olives, Inc., 70 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. AFCO Credit Corp., 108 John Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hohenberg Co., Inc., 1431 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. ICI (New York) Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Toyoshima & Co., Inc., 303 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Unione Industriale Prato, Prato, Italy; Maylis Associates, 200 West 34th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Greene, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Sugar Producers of Guadeloupe and Martinique, Boite Postale 175, Points-a-Pitre, Guadeloupe.

A. Ralph L. Tabor.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wheat Consumers Committee, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Morton M. Winston.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Hal J. Wright, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph M. Wyatt, 501 Keyser Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Roadside Business Association, 1430 Rand Tower, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Howard E. Young, 4622 Creek Shore Drive, Rockville, Md.

B. Best Universal Lock Co., Inc., 6161 East 75th Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Lester L. Zosel, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Salute to the Union of Burma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, the Union of Burma celebrated the 17th anniversary of her independence. Today it gives me great pleasure to extend heartiest congratulations, belatedly since the Congress was not in session, to His Excellency General Ne Win, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Union of Burma; to His Excellency U On Sein, the present Burmese Ambassador to the United States; and also to His Excellency U Tun Win, who will become the new Burmese Ambassador to the United States very soon.

The peoples of the world have long been fascinated with this beautiful and mysterious land. To her neighbors in India Burma is known as the golden peninsula because of the large reserves of uncrowded land and forests and plentiful minerals and gems. Rudyard Kipling expressed the Englishman's wonderment with Burma in his poem "Mandalay":

> Come you back to Mandalay,
> Where the old flotilla lay:
> Can't you 'ear their paddles chunkin' from Rangoon to Mandalay?
> On the road to Mandalay,
> Where the flyin' fishes play,
> An' the dawn comes up like thunder outer China 'crost the bay.

Burmese leaders characterize their nation's policy in international affairs as one of nonalinement, or the determination to resist entanglement in either of the power blocs of the cold war. A corollary of this neutralist posture is active support for the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Burma joined the United Nations in 1948 and has since worked to strengthen its many activities. She has participated in the UNESCO Research Center on Social Implications of Industrialization, in southeast Asia as well as in the Colombo Plan Council for Technical Cooperation, in south and southeast Asia. The specialized agencies to which Burma has given particularly outstanding service are the International Labor Organization and the Food and Agricultural Organization.

Symbolic of Burma's engagement in international relations is U Thant, Burmese citizen and presently the Secretary General of the United Nations. Formerly a Burmese civil servant, he is the first citizen from the developing nations to serve in this important post.

In addition to efforts to promote international harmony, Burma seeks forms of social, political, and economic order so that the Burmese people can enjoy national unity and economic prosperity. General Ne Win, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of Burma, has sought to solve many of his country's problems through a plan known as the Socialist economic system for Burma. This project calls for the nationalization of such activities as industries, mines, and banks. Illustrative of this is the recent Government move to take over the administration of many civil hospitals and health centers in order to maintain uniform health service throughout the country. Another example of the nation's effort to achieve economic well-being is a 5-year plan for construction of a hugh dockyard at Sinmalaik on the Hlaing River. Burmese students are being sent abroad for training in dockyard management so that when the dockyard is completed, there will be enough trained Burmese to run it efficiently.

Today we pause to send warmest wishes to the Burmese people and to reaffirm our belief that Burma's economic and political growth as a free nation is important to southeast Asia and to all the countries of the free world.

Price Notice Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a price notice bill, to require companies in basic industries to give notice to the President of any proposed price increase, and to require a 60-day waiting period prior to the effective date of the price increase.

My bill would give both industry and Government time to review fully results that are likely to flow from a proposed price increase in a basic industry. It will provide a forum in which private interests and officials charged with Government responsibilities can have freedom to act.

Four times in the last 3 years the President of the United States has been confronted with announcements that companies in industries basic to the well-being of the entire economy were going to raise prices, in the face of and notwithstanding the concern of the President's economic advisers that excessive inflationary pressures necessarily would result. In 1962, the steel industry proposed such a price rise, and in 1965 the aluminum and copper industries tried to increase prices in an inflationary manner. In 1966, elements of the steel industry wanted a price hike in structural steel, which according to the President's economic advisers, would have been inflationary, and injurious to the economy. In each instance the President has had his busy schedule abruptly disorganized, and has had to resort to vigorous action to safeguard the interests of all of the people.

Such confrontations between the President and industry are undesirable, destructive, and are incompatible with orderly Government-business relationships.

The bill that I am sponsoring will accomplish the following:

First. Provide a method to identify basic industries in which the private pricing action of one firm is of nationwide concern and is contrary to the interests of the public to avoid inflation. One standard relates total industry sales to the gross national product. Information needed to establish the precise percentage relationship on an informed basis will be secured during the hearings on the bill.

Second. Afford a waiting period, prior to the effectiveness of such a price increase, during which time the forces of both sides can take the matter to the public, and explore likely results of the proposed price increase. During the waiting period, if appropriate to the circumstances, hearings could be held by interested congressional committees.

Third. Panic buying of articles affected by proposed price increases would be avoided. After the completion of the waiting period, the price increase would be retroactive to the date of announcement.

Fourth. Maximum freedom from direct Government interference in the private sectors of the economy is retained. The Government would not establish mandatory price ceilings or direct price controls. If the Government is unsuccessful in its efforts to cause a recision, the proposed price increase would be effective at the end of the waiting period.

Fifth. Administrative problems that attend direct Government regulation, and expenditures that would be involved in the establishment of a new Government agency, are avoided.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 11870

A bill to amend the Sherman Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of price increases in certain industries, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Development of the interstate and foreign commerce of the United States in certain basic industries has resulted in an undue concentration of economic power. Pricing actions of individual companies in basic industries have a direct effect on the public interest, and may be detrimental to the general public welfare. It is the intent of Congress in this Act to provide a method for private interests to be coordinated with the responsibilities of the Government in the pricing of goods and services in such basic industries.

SECTION 1. The Act of July 2, 1890, as amended, commonly referred to as the Sherman Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. 1, et seq.) is amended by adding a new section, to be section 9 thereof, as follows:

"SEC. 9. No person in the industries designated in this section 9, or to be designated by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the provisions of this section 9, shall increase the price of goods or services manufactured or supplied by such person until 60 days after delivery to the Government official designated by the President of notice of the proposed price increase. Such notice shall include: (1) the name and address of the person making the price increase, (2) the basic industry in which such person does business, and (3) the goods or services involved in the price increase. During said 60 days, the President may take such action as he determines to be appropriate. Unless the notice is withdrawn prior to the termination of said 60 days, the price increase that was the subject of such notice shall be effective as of the date the notice was delivered.

"Within 60 days after enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Commerce shall publish in the Federal Register a list of the basic industries that are subject to the provisions of this Act. The basic industries that are subject to the provisions of this Act are the steel industry, the aluminum industry, the petroleum refining industry, the copper industry, and the automobile industry, and such additional industries that are designated after the Secretary of Commerce finds there is compliance with the following:

"(1) Industries in which the combined sales of the four largest persons amounts to 75 per centum or more of aggregate sales in the industry, and aggregate sales in the industry amount to — per centum of the Gross National Product, or

"(2) Goods or services produced in the industry are included in the list of strategic and critical materials pursuant to the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpile Act (50 U.S.C. 98, et seq.), and

"(3) Such additional standards as may be established by the President.

"The provisions of this section 9 shall not apply in any industry in which the price of goods and services is subject to direct control by an agency of the United States."

SEC. 2. This Act shall be effective on and after 60 days after the date of enactment.

Independence Day of Chad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in calling to the attention of this Congress the 11th of January, which marks the national holiday of the Republic of Chad. This former colony of France achieved its independence on August 11, 1960, but proclaimed January 11 as its national holiday.

On this occasion, we wish to extend warm and personal felicitations to His Excellency Francois Tombalbaye, the President of the Republic of Chad; and to His Excellency Boukar Abdoul, Chad's Ambassador to the United States.

It is fitting that the hearty and industrious people of Chad should adopt "Unity, Work, Progress" as their motto. Since gaining their independence, they have kept these goals clearly in mind, and have constantly striven to make them a reality.

The Republic of Chad is the largest of the former French Equatorial African countries, more than twice the size of France. Its population, estimated at close to 3 million, is divided roughly into two main parts. The segment in the north is mostly Arabized while the group in the south is largely animist in religion but with Christians among the leaders.

Little has been written on the early history of Chad. Europeans did not begin exploring the region until the early 19th century, and at that time the trade in slaves was being carried on in various parts of the region. During the period when France was engaged in various military campaigns in west Africa, Chad was viewed as an area of great strategic importance. As a result, it was organized as a French military base area in 1900.

Chad became an administrative territory of the Federation of French Equatorial Africa in 1913. In the early stages of World War II, Chad was the first of the French territories in Africa to rally to the support of the Free French, and served as a supply base for Allied operations in East Africa and the Mediterranean.

The year 1946 saw increased autonomy and French citizenship conferred on Chad and other dependencies. The enabling act of 1956 and constitutional referendum of September 1, 1958, set the basic framework for full Chadian independence and membership in the French community in 1960.

Chad's economy, which is agricultural, has two strong pillars: cotton and stock raising. Cotton is the principal money crop and accounts for approximately 80 percent of Chad's exports. During 1964 imports were up 15 percent while exports increased by 11 percent. France continues to be the leading customer and supplier, although trade with the United States has also seen a steady increase.

Chad's landlocked position has thus far proved to be a major handicap in overcoming some of her economic difficulties. This has resulted in the Government's placing highest priority on a rail link to the sea via Cameroon.

Judging from the facts I have mentioned, it would appear that Chad is well underway in its quest for "Unity, Work, Progress." Her friends in the Congress and the American people as a whole extend best wishes and congratulations to the Republic of Chad, her Government, and her hardworking people on their national independence day.

Coast Guard Helicopter Rescue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, immediately before Christmas the Coast Guard helicopter unit stationed near the mouth of the Columbia River, at Astoria, Oreg., proved once again conclusively the value and wisdom in establishing this squadron at this location.

Six people are living today who would certainly be dead were it not for the prompt, efficient, and heroic reaction of the Coast Guard helicopter squadron commanded by Comdr. Robert Lawlis.

A helicopter flying from the Shell Oil Co. exploratory ship off the Oregon coast experienced a loss of power and was forced to ditch approximately 1 mile west of Seaside, Oreg., and the six men aboard were soon in the water clinging to the floats of the lost helicopter. The temperature in the water was between 30° and 40°.

When the Coast Guard was alerted, surface vessels and the helicopter from Astoria were at once dispatched and within a very short period of time the helicopter located the six men. Four were immediately hoisted aboard and taken to the Seaside Hospital and the other two were saved within 20 minutes.

The survivors estimated that two of them would not have lasted in the water for more than 5 minutes and that the remaining four probably could not have survived for more than 20 additional minutes. Surface vessels certainly would not have located them within this time.

The rescue helicopter was commanded by Lt. Comdr. Robert Burns and piloted by Chief Aviation Pilot Clyde M. Causley. All of the rescued survived without serious aftereffects.

I would like to emphasize that these are not the first lives saved by this great squadron but this is the largest number saved at any one time and certainly the most dramatic rescue. This emphasizes the arguments made prior to the location of the helicopter squadron at the mouth of the Columbia River, and certainly if the squadron had engaged in no other activity since its formation, this one rescue would have justified its existence.

Likewise, I am pleased to point out that the Coast Guard command has heretofore pressed for and secured authority to erect a permanent hangar at the Clatsop County Airport which is even nearer than the present base of the helicopters near the town of Astoria itself.

This squadron presently has two helicopters and in normal course of events one helicopter is apt to be engaged operationally and it is always possible that one may be on the ground for repairs or normal maintenance.

It would seem to me that the proved effectiveness of this squadron would strongly justify the assignment of more helicopters to the squadron which has done such an outstanding job in search and rescue during the past many months.

We in Oregon salute Commander Lawlis, Commander Burns, Chief Causley, and all members of this fine Coast Guard unit in Astoria.

Worldwide Population Explosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, although the press has done an excellent job of telling us what we will be doing in the session which opens today, I have yet to see included in the subjects for action the establishment of a policy to deal with the worldwide population explosion. The press has forecast that the Congress will deal with the symptoms of this explosion, that we will attempt to prescribe painkillers to make them hurt a little less. But the press has not forecast that we will discuss the fundamentals of the problem and take action which seems appropriate.

Let us be blunt, Mr. Speaker. There are a number of important issues which will be acted upon by this 2d session of the 89th Congress. But no issue is more important and no set of problems are more pressing than the world population explosion. I would submit that if this Congress will accept its clear responsibility to establish policies to deal with the population explosion, it will be remembered far more for this reason than for any other.

We can take constructive action in this field. We can support the efforts already initiated by President Johnson. We can encourage their expansion. And we can pass legislation establishing our belief that family planning information, services, and supplies should be made available to all who request them. We should also make it clear that such information, services, and supplies should be a part of our AID programs, upon request of the foreign governments involved.

And, Mr. Speaker, we should make it clear that we see no possibility whatsoever of providing enough surplus food from our own lands to prevent mass starvation in countries whose populations will at least double in the next 25 years if family planning programs are not undertaken on a broad scale. We would delude both ourselves and countries abroad if we claimed otherwise.

It is my greatest hope that this session the Congress will address itself squarely and vigorously to the problems of family planning, birth control, and the population—both here and abroad.

We made 5 days of progress last year, but the problem grew by 365 days. We cannot afford to allow another year to slip by with no action. For the problem will soon be so great that no solution within our values will be possible.

Servicemen Should Be Able To Mail Gifts From Combat Zones Duty Free to Their Families in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to liberalize the dollar limitation on gifts which can be mailed duty free from foreign countries into the United States. I have drafted this legislation to apply specifically to our servicemen in combat areas because I know that some of the families of servicemen had to pay customs duties on gifts which they received from Vietnam last Christmas. I had one specific instance brought to my attention. I know there must be others.

An editorial in the Junction City (Kans.) Daily Union on Wednesday, November 24, called attention to the fact that the wife of a Fort Riley soldier, now in Vietnam, received a shipment of Christmas gifts from her husband on which she was required to pay customs duties. The editorial writer was upset, as well he should have been, and I became upset myself when I learned all of the details in a letter from the wife of the serviceman involved.

She received a Christmas package from her husband with two sweaters and a camera for her two daughters and herself. She had to pay a 42½-percent duty on the sweaters and a 15-percent duty on the camera. All told, it cost her $10.81 in customs duties before the mailman would release the gifts.

This is definitely not right. I have no argument with the imposition of customs duties on foreign imports, but I certainly think we should make an exception when it comes to the gifts which servicemen send home from combat zones.

Most of the time these men must buy the gifts whenever they have a free moment. Their shopping is usually limited to the PX and they have to purchase what is available and not give too much thought to the customs duties.

Gifts valued under $10 can be mailed from foreign countries under present regulations as long as not more than one gift is sent to any one person in any one day. This is all well and good for tourists who can take the time to be selective and can make separate mailings. It does not help a serviceman though, who has to make his purchases at one time and mail them in one package.

The bill I have introduced would increase this $10 limitation to $50 and it would apply only to servicemen in combat zones as designated by the President. I think the $50 figure is a realistic one and will cover most of the gift purchases which servicemen make for their families at Christmas time or whenever there are birthdays and anniversaries to be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, this is a little thing, but it will mean a great deal to the members of the Armed Forces and their families. I would hope that hearings could be scheduled on this legislation right away. I am certain that the testimony will bear out the soundness of making this special concession for these people. I would hope that this change could be made so that another Christmas would not pass without making some provision for servicemen to send home duty free gifts on a basis which is reasonable and just.

Need for a Breakthrough in Urban Transport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, during the last session I introduced legislation—H.R. 9200—to establish a federally supported research program designed to achieve a technological breakthrough in the development of new urban transportation systems. Such systems are desperately needed by our cities today. If they are not forthcoming soon the urban transportation crisis will reach unmanageable proportions.

Twenty-one other Members of the House have introduced identical legislation. In the Senate, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] introduced an identical bill—S. 2599—which was cosponsored by 10 other Senators.

The sponsors of the legislation in the House, in addition to myself, include: the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], H.R. 9201; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL], H.R. 9202; the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], H.R. 9763;

the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser], H.R. 9995; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gilligan], H.R. 9826; the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths], H.R. 9996; the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern], H.R. 9997; the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Irwin], H.R. 10857; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson], H.R. 9998; the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Long], H.R. 9999; the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCarthy], H.R. 10000; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Minish], H.R. 10001; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead], H.R. 10002; the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer], H.R. 9203; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Ronan], H.R. 10003; the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal], H.R. 9204; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Stalbaum], H.R. 10279; the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan], H.R. 9205; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik], H.R. 9206; the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Weltner], H.R. 9207; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Yates], H.R. 9208.

The sponsors of S. 2599, in addition to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], include: the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall].

In the winter 1965 issue of the Transportation Journal, published by the American Society of Traffic and Transportation, appears my article explaining H.R. 9200 and the need for new urban transport systems:

Research Is Needed To Develop New Modes of Urban Transport

(By Representative Henry S. Reuss)

Today our Federal Government is committed to substantial research to develop new transportation modes for travel to other cities by rail, to other countries by SST, and to other planets by rocket. Unfortunately, it has no plans to develop new modes for travel within our cities, just the areas where new transportation systems are needed most.

Here is what the administration is planning. It has committed $90 million over a 3-year period to develop a new system of high-speed ground transportation for travel between cities. The new system, once in operation, will be a boon to the intercity traveler who neither likes to travel by automobile nor by airplane, but who now is discouraged from taking the train because of the bumpy, slow ride he must endure.

For the traveler who does like to fly, the administration is going ahead with a program for the development of a supersonic plane which when operational in the 1970's will travel at speeds between 1,800 and 2,000 miles per hour. The total project will cost an estimated $1 billion or more, a substantial portion of which will be in Federal funds. A great asset to the intercontinental traveler, the SST will also insure that the U.S. aircraft industries continue as makers of the most advanced planes in the world.

Finally, for the ultimate in travel the Federal Government has committed itself to developing a transportation system for sending a man to the moon—at an estimated total cost of $20 billion in Federal funds. This program is fine for boosting our international prestige and advancing scientific understanding. It, like the others however, does little for the urban traveler.

What the urban traveler needs most is a transport system what will carry him about the city rapidly, safely and economically.

The transportation problems confronting our cities today is extremely serious. People are forced to rely primarily on automobiles. As a result, city traffic is highly congested. It is a long and frustrating experience to travel from one part of a metropolitan area to another. Where public transportation does exist in the form of a bus or subway system, the urban traveler rarely can go from origin to destination without transferring or walking some distance to complete the trip.

FEDERAL RESEARCH PROGRAM NEEDED

In response to the need for better urban transportation systems, I, along with 20 other House Members, have introduced legislation in the 89th Congress amending the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide an additional $10 million a year for each of the next 2 years—or the remainder of the life of the program [1]—earmarked exclusively to carry out a research program to achieve a technological breakthrough in the development of new modes of transportation for the city traveler.

From discussions with a wide variety of transportation experts, I know that the technological expertise for developing the new modes is available in our universities and in industry, and what is needed is a Federal incentive to bring this expertise to bear on the problems of urban transport. At the same time, under this program, other available talent could be put to work on the analysis of social and economic problems confronting our cities as they relate to transportation. For instance, a report by the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc., for the Department of Commerce on new ground transportation technology that might be used between now and 1980 suggests that the city traveler wants a transport system which retains the individual freedom now available to him in the automobile.[2] The research program I have proposed, besides developing the new system itself, could also study the attitudes of people toward various different modes.

SHORTCOMINGS OF PRESENT SYSTEMS

Present-day urban transportation systems, heavily oriented around the automobile, leave much to be desired. Here are some of their drawbacks:

Air pollution

Automobiles are the chief cause of the air pollution which hangs over our cities. The result of the air pollution is that the city dweller is more subject than his country neighbor to all types of respiratory diseases.

One substance from automobile and diesel exhaust that becomes a part of the air is a hydrocarbon known as benzpyrene, which tends to induce cancer. Motor vehicles are also a principal source of carbon monoxide and oxides of nitrogen, both of which have varying degrees of ill-effect on health. The consequences in large metropolitan areas can be serious. Breathing New York City air, for instance, is like smoking two packs of cigarettes a day.[3]

The problem could have even more serious long-term consequences. An expert on air pollution, Prof. Morris Neiburger, of the University of California at Los Angeles, predicts that polluted air may well doom humanity within the next century if steps are not taken soon to replace the automobile with a vehicle propelled by a system other than the internal combustion engine. Dr. Neiburger maintains that devices to eliminate exhaust from cars will not be adequate and as the population expands and living standards rise, increasing numbers of people—not only in America but in countries where the automobile is now a rarity—will acquire and drive their own cars. He has said, "the world's atmosphere will grow more and more polluted until, a century from now, it will be too poisonous to all human life to survive, and civilization will pass away."[4]

A good urban transport system could greatly reduce air pollution.

Traffic congestion

A commuter taking the bus to work may spend 45 minutes or more traveling a few miles from home to office. If he drives his car he may move more rapidly, but he has the problem of parking it and every day upon leaving work he runs the risk of being caught in a monumental traffic snarl. The greatest of these—to date—clogged the streets of Boston for 5 hours on the evening of December 30, 1963.

Heavy traffic, too, is a danger as well as a frustration to the individual, whether he walks or drives. The National Safety Council has reported that in 1964 there were 14,500 deaths from motor vehicle accidents in urban areas and 980,000 personal injuries.

A good urban transportation system could make city travel much safer.

High costs

Whatever his personal choice of transportation, the city dweller pays more than he realizes for the present commuting patterns heavily reliant on roads and freeways. Not only does he pay between 10 and 12 cents a mile to drive his automobile to and from work—or half this if he goes by public transportation—but taxes on property, gasoline, and other items are higher than they might be because of the expense of constructing urban freeways, usually at the cost of $10 to $15 million a mile.

In addition, the cost of accidents is high, raising the price of insurance policies. The National Safety Council reports that damage bills for all urban accidents in 1964 amounted to $4.6 billion, with property damage accounting for over half, or $2.6 billion.

A new urban transport system, more efficient and cheaper to build than those we now have, could cut costs, both for the individual and for the city.

---

[1] H.R. 9200, introduced June 17, 1965, 1st sess., 89th Cong. Members introducing identical legislation are as follows: Thomas L. Ashley, of Ohio; Earle Cabell, of Texas; Leonard Farbstein, of New York; Donald M. Fraser, of Minnesota; John J. Gilligan, of Ohio; Mrs. Martha W. Griffiths, of Michigan; Seymour Halpern, of New York; Charles S. Joelson, of New Jersey; Clarence D. Long, of Maryland; Richard D. McCarthy, of New York; Joseph G. Minish, of New Jersey; William S. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania; Abraham J. Multer, of New York; Daniel J. Ronan, of Illinois; Benjamin S. Rosenthal, of New York; Lynn E. Stalbaum, of Wisconsin; Mrs. Leonor K. Sullivan, of Missouri; Charles A. Vanik, of Ohio; Charles L. Weltner, of Georgia; and Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois.

[2] Connell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc., "A Projection of Technology Applicable to the Future Highway System of the Boston-Washington Corridor" (Buffalo, N.Y., Oct. 2, 1964), CAL Report No. VJ–1913–V–1; Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.B. 166–878, p. 164.

[3] Council of the City of New York, "Air Pollution in New York City," June 22, 1965, Publication No. M–970, p. 26.

[4] Washington Post, Aug. 9, 1965.

Urban planning

Because our cities' transportation systems are dominated by the automobile, highways are often the predominant structures in urban areas, creating ugly sites and taking up valuable real estate. Also, once the cars are downtown, they must be parked while their drivers work or shop, thus taking up more valuable land.

City planners now have little choice but to build freeways. They are pushed by the demands of travelers who want their own cars, and pulled by the Federal grant-in-aid program that gives States 90 percent of the cost of constructing freeways.

A good urban transportation system, more desirable than the automobile, would free the city from its shackles to the expressway and provide an opportunity for better urban planning.

Good public transportation would bring other advantages to the city. If the system were automated and the vehicle traveled on restricted guideways, it could be used for carrying cargo other than passengers during nonpeak hours. In the early morning, the system could be closed entirely to passenger travel while goods were distributed about the city. Special containerized vehicles carrying goods to downtown stores could, in the period of a few hours, replenish the shops entirely. Thus it would be unnecessary for trucks to clog central city streets during the day, thereby making the downtown area more enjoyable for the pedestrian.

The practice of supplying the stores might also be reversed so that those orders taken by merchants during the day over the phone could be delivered to decentralized distribution points in the early morning hours. The next day the housewife could have all her deliveries presented to her door in time to free her for other activities that day.

ALTERNATIVES TO HIGHWAYS ARE POOR

Cities today have no sensible alternatives to building massive urban highway systems. They can turn to the conventional modes of public transportation, but these, too, have their shortcomings. Subways, like freeways, are expensive to build, costing up to $20 million a mile where the underground area is not already utilized for other public services. Buses are little improvement over automobiles, since they still contribute to air pollution, cause traffic congestion, and can also run into other vehicles or pedestrians.

If a city does decide to develop a conventional public transportation system, it has little help available to it outside its own financial resources. The Federal program authorized by the Mass Transportation Act of 1964[5] and now administered by the new Department of Housing and Urban Development is modest in scope and funding, with the result that only limited benefits fall to the city. The act carries a grant authority of $375 million over a period of 3 years to pay two-thirds of the cost of establishing new urban transit systems or making improvements on existing ones. Since it would cost an estimated $10 billion to properly equip our Nation's cities with conventional modes of public transportation, the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is no more than the proverbial drop in a bucket.

The program, thus, is not designed to bring about the needed revolution in urban transportation. All it can do is help some cities hold the line a while longer with obsolescent systems which some day will have to be supplanted or supplemented if the city's residents and workers are to maintain any meaningful degree of mobility.

The 1964 act does contain a provision which authorizes the expenditure of $10 million a year, out of the total authorization of $375 million, for research, development, and demonstration projects in all phases of urban mass transportation.

Because the pressures on the whole program for help in providing more buses and subway cars are considerable, the administrators of the program have made the decision for the time being to apply all of the $10 million for research, development, and demonstration to the demonstration of already developed systems.

ONE NOVEL IDEA—THE COMMUCAR

Amending the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide another $10 million annually exclusively for research and development of new modes of urban transport would complement the existing program by preparing for the greater demands for good public transportation which will most certainly develop as our urban areas continue to swell in population.

The research program would focus on developing systems which were fast, safe, and economical, do not pollute the aid, and satisfy the apparent need of people for individual transport while at the same time make good city planning possible. The program would be able to capitalize and improve upon the numerous ideas which already have been put forward for new systems of urban transport, among the most imaginative of which is the commucar, developed by a group of students and faculty at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The commucar is a small, lightweight vehicle capable of carrying up to four passengers. It can be driven independently under its own electric power or along public guideways, getting its electricity from a side rail. On the guideway, the vehicle is controlled by a computer system which takes its passengers directly to their destination without transfer. Under its own power, a commucar could travel about 50 miles an hour, while on the automatically controlled guideway it could travel as fast as 100 miles an hour. Since the system would be automated, the density of traffic along the guideway would be much greater than along freeways, while at the same time the possibility of accidents would be greatly reduced.

Because the vehicle is compact and light, it could be easily parked. Because it could be automatically controlled, it could be put back on the system, driverless, to be used by another commuter or shopper. Thus it would be possible either to own the vehicle or merely to rent it for a trip downtown. And the system might be adapted for use, as suggested earlier, for transporting goods about the city.

The commucar is only one of many ideas that could be developed and demonstrated under a federally sponsored research program.

Another proposal, quite similar to the commucar, is the starrcar—for self-transit rail and road car—devised by the Alden Self Transit Systems Corp. of Westboro, Mass.

Still a third proposal is the teletrans, a system of individual vehicles which, unlike the commucar and starrcar, are confined to guideways running either underground or in enclosed tubes supported above streets by metal arches. Powered by electricity and entirely automated, the teletrans vehicle is designed to run at an average speed of 45 miles per hour. Stations, sidetracked off the main course, are spotted along the guideway approximately every half mile. Since the vehicle would not have to go through each station, the trip would be nonstop, and since the entire system would be automated with the destination of the vehicle set by computer before the passenger embarked, no transferring would be required. This system has been under development by the Teletrans Corp. of Detroit, Mich.

TRADITION OF FEDERAL SUPPORT

It is by no means alien to Federal policy to use technology derived as a part of a concerted national program to develop a service of benefit to the general public. The Manhattan project, for example, one of the greatest Federal undertakings of all time, resulted in nuclear power for civilian use.

Like it is doing in the supersonic transport and high-speed ground transport projects, the Federal Government would join in the development of a transport system that will benefit everybody. Once the system is operational, the Federal Government would release it to private firms who would then produce and operate it.

Such a research program, although federally sponsored, would in all likelihood be carried out jointly by universities and industry with the most up-to-date technological expertise. The electrical industry, for instance, could develop the systems which will guide the vehicles from origin to destination, and the automobile and aerospace industries could design and construct the actual vehicles.

Today nearly 75 percent of our population lives in cities. By 1980 nearly 80 percent of all Americans will be living in urban areas. This 80 percent—over 200 million—will have to get about the cities for the ordinary events of day-to-day living. They will need a system that will be quick, safe and economical, which does not pollute the air, and which fulfill their desire for individual transport while at the same time making good city planning possible. This is the system that can be developed under a federally sponsored research program.

World War on Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on December 9, 1965, in addressing the organization meeting of the Committee on the World Food Crisis, I said that I feel it is the destiny of this country to attack starvation around the world.

Moreover, I told the dedicated people gathered for this important meeting that I am convinced this mission of our country is so urgent, its rewards to all mankind so promising, that nobody can head it off.

So deep is this conviction, Mr. Speaker, that I am now proposing a world war on hunger.

I disclosed my plans for legislation in a release to the press for Sunday, January 9. Because of the broad interest of the Members of this body in this important undertaking, and with the consent of the House, I am placing this press announcement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The press statement follows:

COOLEY TO INTRODUCE WORLD WAR ON HUNGER BILL

Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY, of the House Committee on Agriculture, announced today he will introduce early in the new session of the Congress a bill opening the way for a world war on hunger, through extension and expansion of America's food-for-peace program.

The bill would authorize financing of the export of $14 billion worth of food and fiber in the next 5 years, over and beyond U.S.

---

[5] Public Law 88-365, July 9, 1964.

normal dollar exports of agricultural commodities.

"We live in a hungry and dangerous world," Mr. COOLEY said. "I am told that 12,000 persons die each day of starvation around the world, and many millions of people are hungry and ragged." Then he declared:

"Our humanitarian instincts, the world population explosion, and the cause of peace, demand imaginative, sound, and positive action at this time. There are two magic words in all the languages of the world—food and raiment. I am convinced that our world superiority in the production of food and fiber can be used to encourage great masses of humanity into peaceful pursuits, moving them toward self-reliance and self-sufficiency in the production of food and fiber. This should strengthen the bonds of friendship among free nations. Moreover, I am convinced that in the end bread will be more important than bullets in bringing peace to the world."

He emphasized also that such an undertaking as proposed in his bill should, in the long run, contribute substantially to the economic stability of rural America.

The new Cooley bill would establish as policy of the United States:

1. Deliberate production of food and fiber by America's free-enterprising farmers to feed hungry people and to clothe those who are ragged, in friendly nations around the world. Such relief no longer would be limited to distribution of U.S. surplus food and fiber.

2. Aids to these nations in building their own agriculture to meet the needs of their peoples.

"I am not proposing," Mr. COOLEY said, "that we remove forthwith the restraints upon farm production now operating through voluntary farm programs. If we did this, we might again find ourselves buried in surpluses. Neither do I suppose that the United States can feed everyone who is hungry around the world. But our farmers have mastered the arts of abundance and they can produce food and fiber, beyond our own needs, that can build the physical strength and morale of the populations in many places around the world where these people work in the direction of self-sufficiency in agriculture.

"It is my thought that our war on starvation and destitution should be directed to those areas where governments and people are trying to help themselves. We can supply temporary relief with food and fiber in programs to develop agriculture in many places. Moreover, we could supply fiber, food, and other aids while people in these other nations are developing harbors, transportation, storage, and other facilities, to accommodate the improvement in their own food resources.

"I caution again against anyone supposing that I propose a sudden unleashing of our total agricultural potential, for if we did this we certainly would pile up new surpluses in our own warehouses, since there are now so many places around the world that have very limited facilities for receiving, storing, and distributing food and fiber."

Heretofore the United States has shared with other nations through the food-for-peace program only the surpluses in the operation of programs designed to reduce the overabundant production of America's farms.

"I propose now, since our surpluses are vanishing," Mr. COOLEY said, "that we produce food and fiber deliberately as a matter of national policy, for sharing with those underfed and ill-clothed peoples who undertake sound programs to build up their own agricultural production and, thereby, to achieve self-sufficiency in the face of the world population explosion.

"The bill I am drafting is simple. Its major provision will be in the form of an amendment to Public Law 480—the food-for-peace law—to provide guidelines and rules for the worldwide distribution of food and fiber from our farms—this distribution not to be limited to surplus food and fiber as now provided by Public Law 480.

"The food-for-peace program has helped feed millions of hungry people in many countries. We are fortunate now, in looking toward a world war on hunger, to have the machinery and the know-how in our Department of Agriculture to undertake such a new program in combination with programs to develop the food and fiber sufficiency of countries where there now are millions of people ill-fed and ill-clothed.

"Our farmers would be the key to the whole program I envision. Their income, and the well-being of rural America, must be protected and advanced in this new undertaking. I would hope that this new program would keep millions of acres in production and employ on our farms many thousands of people who would be dislocated if we proceed with further restrictions upon our agricultural production."

The Agriculture Committee chairman said he hopes to open public hearings on the legislation early in February.

Salute to Cameroon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Republic of Sudan celebrated the 10th aniversary of her independence. As you are aware, the 2d session of the 89th Congress had not yet convened. However, I did not want the opportunity overlooked to extend to the people and the Government of Sudan the warmest felicitations of this country on this occasion. Congratulations are therefore extended on this occasion to His Excellency Ismail el Ezhari, the President of the Supreme Council of State; and to His Excellency Abbash el Obeid, the Sudanese Ambassador to the United States.

Traditionally, most Americans anxiously await the end of an old year and look forward to the approach of the new year in anticipation of prosperity, progress, and peace. But January 1 has even more significance to the people of the Republic of the Sudan.

It was on this date in 1956 that this huge country was proclaimed an independent and soverign state. Comprising an area almost one-tenth of the African continent, this young and dynamic Republic is a land of more than 12 million inhabitants.

However, it should be noted that while the Sudan is celebrating its 10th anniversary as an independent Republic, its historical legacy goes back very far indeed. Ancient Egyptian inscriptions and references in the Old Testament—to the Land of Kush—bear evidence of the Sudan's past greatness. During most of the 19th century, the Sudan was under Turkish-Egyptian subjugation with a short period of independence between 1885 and 1899. Following the joint British-Egyptian reconquest of the country in 1896-98, a new governmental system had to be devised. This resulted in joint Anglo-Egyptian administration or condominium, as the system was called.

The Sudan is a land of sharp contrasts, divided between the economically developed Moslem North and the largely pagan and Christian underdeveloped South. However, strong efforts are being made to overcome these and other handicaps.

Sudan's somewhat small and scattered population and lack of known resources has forced the country's economy to remain primarily an agricultural one. Cotton is the mainstay of the Sudanese economy, and accounts for approximately 70 percent of the country's total exports and about 30 percent of the total world production of the long staple variety. The Gezira scheme, which developed a large portion of the south to relative wealth, has proved itself a model of agricultural achievement which other undeveloped areas conceivably could adopt. Extensive irrigation could increase the chances for an even more diversified economy. Liberal foreign trade policies have aided in stimulating Sudan's exports and imports. Its world trade balance is satisfactory and foreign exchange reserves have steadily grown to over $150 million. Annual capital formation is at approximately 10 percent and development investments are growing at a rate of more than 8 percent of the gross national product, which has been estimated at $900 million.

Internal problems have not prevented the Sudan from taking an active part in international affairs, as its membership in the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa has demonstrated; in addition, the Sudan is an important member in such organizations as the League of Arab States, the Organization of African Unity, and the International Cotton Advisory Committee.

Though the Sudan has been experiencing what one might call growing pains there is little doubt as to the resolution and determination of this large and friendly country to meet the challenges and overcome the difficulties which beset it.

I am certain that the entire American people join me in extending warm and sincere congratulations on this, the 10th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of the Sudan.

It's Uncle Billy Frost's 103d Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William B. "Uncle Billy" Frost of Pampa, Tex., is celebrating his 103d birthday today, and his many hundreds of friends in Pampa, the Texas Panhandle, and all over the United States are flooding him with messages of congratulations and best wishes.

"Uncle Billy" is an institution in our hometown of Pampa not only because of his personal charm but also because he is one of the true pioneers of the U.S. petroleum industry. Uncle Billy's father drilled a well in Drake, Pa., credited with being the country's first. Uncle Billy, when he was 14 years old, went to work pumping oil wells and followed the petroleum boom through fields in Pennsylvania, Kansas, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Texas before settling in Pampa, in the heart of the great Panhandle oil and gas field.

We in Pampa and the Texas Panhandle are proud to salute Uncle Billy Frost on the occasion of his birthday and, God willing, hope to enjoy his warm friendship for many more years.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, as the 2d session of the 89th Congress begins, people throughout the world are deeply concerned about the war in Vietnam and the course which will be taken in the year ahead. The Members of this distinguished Chamber have a responsibility to express themselves to their constituents, to the Nation, and to the world on this, the most vital issue of the day.

During the period of adjournment, I had the opportunity to address thousands of my constituents in 43 speaking engagements and appearances, during which I discussed a variety of subjects. Invariably the first question raised was on the subject of U.S. policy in southeast Asia and our commitment in South Vietnam. While the greatest number appeared to support the administration policy, they seemed unanimous in urging that we find an avenue to peace.

I also visited Thailand where I discussed the situation in South Vietnam with servicemen, some of whom reside in Fifth Congressional District of New York. They all seemed to understand the reasons for our commitment in southeast Asia and they questioned why some at home failed to understand as well. They also shared the desire for peace and urged that every diplomatic channel be kept open to encourage initiation of negotiations for peace.

Our Nation is the strongest and greatest power in the world today—but with that power goes responsibility. No nation can have great power and a quiet conscience. Its leaders and its people must sometimes suffer either the reproaches of having used force or the reproaches of having failed to use it.

I am distressed by the increasing U.S. losses and the increased role of our troops in combat zones. I abhor war and the misery caused by human conflict. Our President had made it clear that our bipartisan foreign policy is to defend South Vietnam so long as aggression from the north continues. Our Nation wants peace and President Johnson has made it clear that we stand ready to engage in unconditional discussions to consider any solution which will bring peace to this troubled area of the world.

On December 18, 1965, in response to the voices of my constituents, I sent the following telegram to the President:

> HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
> *President of the United States,*
> *White House, Washington, D.C.:*
>
> In light of the offer for a 12-hour truce to permit American boys to celebrate Christmas, I respectfully suggest that you announce the acceptance of the offer and implement immediately negotiations to extend the truce. I further respectfully recommend that as evidence of our announced intentions to negotiate and to demonstrate American compassion, you direct cessation of the bombing in North Vietnam pending the negotiations now under condideration. The month of December should not be the only period to practice peace on earth and good will toward men. We must work at it 365 days a year.
>
> HERBERT TENZER,
> *Member of Congress.*

I was as pleased as you were to listen to the voices which followed and to see how the administration responded to the voice of the people. Diplomatic channels were opened with dynamic and energetic force. Every effort was made to convince the nations of the world that the United States truly wanted peace in southeast Asia.

While we continue to meet our commitment in South Vietnam we must always bear in mind that to negotiate is not to capitulate. In the nuclear age when man is capable of self-destruction there is even greater reason to strive for peace, however, in so doing we cannot turn our back on tyranny and injustice anywhere in the world.

In one of our southern cities, the home of the 1st Air Cavalry Division, which has the greatest number of families with men in Vietnam per capita of any city in the United States, there was a demonstration of women and children asking that we "support their daddies in South Vietnam." Not one sign read "Send my daddy home."

Let those who demonstrated and participated in paying for full page ads, urging a cessation of bombings in North Vietnam, now take ads urging Hanoi to understand that our Government is serious in its efforts to transfer the war from the battlefield to the conference table.

There were less ships of our allies reaching the port of Haiphong with supplies during 1965 than there were in 1964. The progress in this area, while significant, is not yet enough. We should consider seriously the termination of any and all aid to nations carrying supplies to our enemies.

We should also give consideration to the blockade of the port of Haiphong thereby cutting off the supplies which our enemy uses to support their aggression.

I favor a continuing dialog—both public and in the Congress—on this most vital issue of the day. The voices of our Representatives should echo through this Chamber during the session which started today so that people in the United States and throughout the world may look to the strongest democracy in the world for guidance and strength in the trying hours and days which lie ahead. This Chamber of freemen must not shrink from its responsibility of sounding the commitment for freedom and the search for peace in the world. It should distinguish itself by being both a forum for freedom and a forum for peace. Our President needs our support and the people deserve our continuing expression of their hopes for peace.

Government Should Prosecute Aptheker, Lynd, and Hayden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the press reports that the Justice Department is making a study of the violations of Federal laws which were committed by three American citizens who recently went to Hanoi. The trip was admittedly made without authority and in open defiance of law.

The three culprits were Herbert Aptheker, Staughton Lynd, and Thomas Hayden. The alleged mission was to contact Communist authorities and discuss with them our efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement of the war the Communists are waging against the South Vietnamese.

Upon their return these anti-American emissaries reported in Moscow they had talked at length with the North Vietnamese Premier, Phan Van Dong, and others. Their report was hazy and meaningless. Among other things, they decided the Communists did not know about President Johnson's unconditional offer of negotiations, and the United States was at fault.

Does this conduct constitute a violation of our laws? That is the question the Justice Department is now trying to determine. If there is substantial evidence of their guilt, then it would seem that they should be prosecuted.

Press reports state the Justice Department is reviewing several laws that might be applicable to the unauthorized trip. Among them are violation of State Department travel and passport rules, sedition, treason, and an 18th-century law—the Logan Act—which prohibits negotiations with foreign powers by private U.S. citizens.

From their own admissions it would seem that they did some negotiating. Moreover, their travel in defiance of the law which requires them to clear the trip with the State Department would seem to present an open-and-shut case against them.

Federal law provides penalties of up to 5 years in prison and a fine of $5,000 for this unauthorized trip.

Mr. Speaker, these violations are serious and should be treated accordingly. At the very time that our troops are fighting and some dying in a fight against Communist aggressors, these characters go to Hanoi and give aid and comfort to the enemy.

While these three are obviously mentally, morally, and emotionally immature, they should nevertheless be made to answer for their subversive activities. Being mentally sick is in this instance not a valid excuse.

After all, who are these crackpots? Aptheker is an admitted Communist of the old Stalin school. He is an enemy of the United States. He is described as the Communist Party's leading intellectual at the Institute of the Marxist Studies in New York. He revels in bloodletting and anarchy. Of the Negro riot in Los Angeles he was quoted last September as saying: "Of course, Watts was glorious."

Lynd, an associate professor of history at Yale, is likewise a revolutionary. He was affiliated with the pro-Peiping Progressive Labor Party; and was also identified with the Socialist Workers Party and the American Youth for Democracy—both cited as subversive by the Attorney General. He led the August 9 demonstration in Washington against the administration's policy in Vietnam, and got himself arrested for violating the law.

This man once called for "civil disobedience so persistent and massive" that the President, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, and other high officials would have to resign. In a speech last September, Lynd was quoted as saying a Socialist scholar should be ready at any moment to put aside his books and devote himself "to the jugular" to bring about a better world, and added:

> I wonder whether every teacher who calls himself a Socialist does not have a duty to become a professional revolutionary.

In speaking of the march on Washington last August, Yale's professor said:

> Nothing could have stopped that crowd from taking possession of the Government. Perhaps next time we should keep going.

Thomas Hayden, the third member of the trio, is a founder of the left-wing Students for a Democratic Society, and is obviously pro-Communist.

It is evident that this motley crew are all retarded intellectuals and troublemakers. They should be made to answer for their crimes.

Birthday Salutation to Republic of Chad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the African Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am happy and honored to extend birthday greetings to the Republic of Chad, to Francois Tombalbaye, the able President of the Republic, to Boukar Abdoul, Chad's distinguished and popular Ambassador to the United States, and to all the people of this proud and happy land. Although independence came to Chad on August 11, 1960, it is January 11 that is celebrated as its national holiday.

Chad is the largest country, both in area and population, of former French Equatorial Africa. With an area of over 500,000 square miles, it is more than twice the size of France, or approximately as big as California, Texas, and Oklahoma. Chad is bordered by Libya on the north, Sudan on the east, Central African Republic on the south, and Niger, Nigeria, and Cameroon on the west. The capital, Fort Lamy, is near the Cameroon border just south of Lake Chad.

France organized Chad as a military area on September 5, 1900. In 1910 it became one of the four territories of French Equatorial Africa, which was dissolved in 1959 when Chad, as well as the three others—the Middle Congo, now Republic of the Congo, Ubangui-Shari, now Central African Republic, and Gabon—became fully autonomous members of the French community.

The independence of Chad, as well as that of the other former French territories in West and Equatorial Africa, climaxed a series of measures on the part of France tending toward increased autonomy for its overseas territories. These measures were inaugurated by the French Constitution of 1946 which conferred French citizenship on inhabitants of black African dependencies and other overseas areas, decentralized certain powers, and initiated participation by local advisory assemblies in the political life of the overseas territories.

The enactment of the Overseas Reform Act, known as the Loi Cadre of June 23, 1956, introduced further liberalizing reforms. These forms, in addition to removing remaining voting inequalities, provided for the creation of governmental organs assuring a measure of self-government to individual territories. On August 11, 1960, Chad became an independent nation.

Under its third constitution approved April 14, 1962, the Republic of Chad adopted a presidential type of government. The chief of state has the title of President of the Republic and is also the Chief Executive. The constitution established a unicameral National Assembly with a 5-year term, an Economic and Social Council, and a Supreme Court. Election of Assembly members is by universal adult suffrage.

Chad is self-sufficient in food production, with room for expansion of both yield and acreage, and has extensive fish resources as well as an estimated 4 to 5 million head of cattle. Fish, cattle, meat, and hides constitute the principal potential for increased exports, of which cotton now constitutes 80 percent.

In planning for economic and social development initial emphasis is being given to education and technical training, the establishment of local processing industries, the construction of tourist accommodations and facilities, and improved transport within the country and to the Atlantic ports. The extensive game reserves and relatively pleasant climate during part of the year make the country potentially very attractive to tourists.

Relations between the United States and Chad are friendly. The United States maintains an embassy in Fort Lamy, and the Republic of Chad has an accredited ambassador in Washington.

At present there are no direct U.S. commercial interests in Chad; the Chadian Government hopes to interest an American company in prospecting for oil in the northern desert area. The climate for American investment in such areas as hotel construction and joint ventures in small industries—such as a tannery, a meat-processing plant, or a cottonseed-oil plant—however, is believed to be good.

Recently when I was a delegate to the 20th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, it was my privilege to become well acquainted with the competent Ambassador from Chad to the United Nations, His Excellency Boukar Abdoul, who is also Ambassador to the United States.

I also had the privilege of hearing the representative of that proud country in the general debate on October 7 emphasize the need for international cooperation and harmonious economic development. It was indeed a great pleasure to me to work with Ambassador Boukar Abdoul and others in the peace-seeking tasks of the United Nations.

The Late Prime Minister Shastri, of India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, twice in less than 2 years, India has suffered the loss of its leader.

Each death has been a tragedy and a crisis of major magnitude, not only to India, but to the world.

Each has also marked a turning point and an awakening to reality in this new—yet old—land after centuries of slumber.

The first death was Prime Minister Nehru, the Kashmir aristocrat who led one-sixth of the world's population along the dangerous and difficult path of self-government for 17 years.

The second death was Prime Minister Shastri, the tiny man from near the holy city of Benares, who attempted to weld India into a cohesive whole in the face of crises.

Nehru was a man of strength who believed passionately in peace, a world leader who saw his dreams of a neutral and economically strong India surrounded by peaceful neighbors exploded by Red Chinese attacks on Indian soil.

Shastri was a man of compassion who believed in strength in the face of threats from outside its borders and who turned inward toward domestic problems rather than outward toward the world.

Shastri was also a man of courage, who negotiated a ceasefire with neighboring Pakistan on the day of his death, even though such negotiations were dangerous to him politically.

Prime Minister Shastri's time in office was short. But his accomplishments may well prove to be among the greatest in Indian history.

His efforts to bring peace to Kashmir, to feed the people of India and find the means by which India could defend itself from Red Chinese aggression are deeds which many thought impossible of achievement.

Out of the death of this man so small in physical stature but so large in heart and mind could come peace and stability for India and the subcontinent and a richer life for its people.

Independence of Cameroon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on the 1st of January, the Federal Republic of Cameroon celebrated the 6th anniversary of her independence. Congress was not in session on this day, and I am therefore, belatedly, extending warm felicitations to His Excellency Ahmadou Ahidjo, President of Cameroon; and to His Excellency, Joseph Owono, Cameroon's Ambassador to the United States.

This date marked the anniversary of the independence of a most unusual African state. This pleasant and beautiful country is Africa's only example of a federation of English-speaking and French-speaking states. The federation is almost as large as the State of Texas, and has a growing population, numbering at present in excess of 4 million.

The Cameroon was a German protectorate from 1884 to 1916 but was split following World War I into two League of Nations mandates, one British and one French. Following World War II, these areas were converted into United Nations Trust Territories. Each Cameroon attained independence in 1960 and, after plebiscites in the British Cameroons—February 1961—the present federation was created. The northern part of the British Cameroons, whose citizens rejected federation with the Cameroon Republic, became an integral part of the northern region of Nigeria in July 1961.

Agriculture is the main occupation of the vast majority of the population and agricultural produce accounts for approximately 80 percent of the country's exports. Cameroon is nearly self-sufficient in many food resources, some of which are peanuts, bananas, millet, and palm oil products. This fact alone gives it an advantage over many newly independent states.

Another bright spot in Cameroon's economic picture is the potential of its mining industry. There is a large variety of mineral deposits such as gold, diamonds, manganese, mica, lignite, bauxite, and rutile—a primary source of titanium. Thus far, however, only bauxite—aluminum ore—has been found in large quantity. Work is now well underway on the construction of a north-south railway route that will facilitate the transport of bauxite from the newly discovered Tibati deposit of East Cameroon.

Though the federation has been beset with problems arising largely from cultural differences which are a remnant of the colonial past, Government officials have been steadfast in their determination to keep these issues from fragmenting the federal structure.

I am certain that the Congress and the Nation join me in a salute to the gallant struggle for unity and progress which Cameroon is striving to achieve. On this, the sixth anniversary of the Federal Republic of the Cameroon, I offer my warmest congratulations and best wishes for the future.

Underground Maps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, all of us were amazed and shocked on the evening of November 9, 1965, when our entire Northeast was blacked out and on the brink of disaster. Many of our Government agencies have been inquiring into the situation, and have been seeking ways and means of preventing a repetition. Unfortunately none of them has been able to assure us that this could not reoccur anywhere in the country—and perhaps even on a far greater scale.

That is why I noted with great interest a recent meeting of officials of the Office of Civil Defense, the District of Columbia, and other interested parties with the top executives of a company called Sanborn Map Co., of Pelham, N.Y. They demonstrated for their audience an entirely new concept in underground maps.

Why do I call attention to underground maps?

As we all know, beneath the surface of our great cities are many miles of cables, sewers, pipes, gas mains, vaults, and other vital facilities. Frequently these underground conduits abut upon or overlap each other. It is obvious, therefore, that repair or maintenance work on any one may set off a chain reaction that could seriously damage others. Certainly urgent repairs necessitated by a major power failure could be seriously hampered.

It is a fact that each utility normally has a map of its own underground facilities. However, frequently it knows little or nothing about contiguous facilities of other agencies. Under the new process created by Sanborn Map Co., all of the various installations are clearly shown on one basic grid. In addition, each of the municipal and private utilities is shown individually with its own overlay. The result is that repair and maintenance crews can operate with greater ease and safety. Precious hours may be saved. Hospitals and manufacturing plants, homes and schools will be functioning far sooner after a power failure.

This is, of course, an important service to assist our municipalities. Nevertheless, I know from experience that it is human nature to put things off, and I fear, therefore, that in the normal course of things it may be many years before all of our municipalities have this protection.

These underground maps and surveys can be of inestimable value in determining breaks and interruptions of power transmission. They could result in the pinpointing of disconnections of lines, cables, belts and transmission conveyances and save vast expenditures.

In cases of fire and flood these maps would be of great value to our municipalities.

I do not venture to state that another power blackout, break, or shortage could be prevented but these maps would materially aid in the work of restoration and report.

Also with these maps cities could reduce the cost of urban renewal projects. They would aid in municipal fire protection and sanitation. They could be helpful in matters of traffic control, subway and tunnel construction, building of highways and bridges, and for setting up telegraph and telephone systems.

The uses are legion.

Special Report on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, last November I made a special report on Vietnam to my constituents. Much of the material in it still has application. I have asked that it be reproduced below:

SPECIAL REPORT ON VIETNAM

(By Congressman CRAIG HOSMER)

"Vietniks" demand we get out of Vietnam. Mothers wonder why their sons are sent there. The President wants to negotiate. Military leaders want a victory. Most Americans believe we should see it through. There are many questions about the war.

What is the country like? Half the size, but similar in shape, population, and coastline to California. It's rugged—mostly thick tropical forests, dense mangrove swamps, and concealing rice paddies. Vietnam is more a collection of small villages and hamlets than a strong nation to which the people give allegiance as we do to our country. The people are very poor. Until recently their only contacts with their government were visits from the tax collector with no benefits in return.

Along with Laos, Cambodia, and North Vietnam, South Vietnam was created from French Indochina after France's 1953 defeat at Dienbienphu.

Who are the Vietcong? The Vietcong are strong Communist forces seeking to seize South Vietnam with the same war of liberation strategy used successfully in Cuba. Following 1953, the North Vietnamese Communist dictatorship of Ho Chi Minh saw the south as ripe for takeover by this means. The war now is in its 12th year. Red China, just to the north, encourages the aggression by supplying great amounts of munitions.

How do the VC fight war of liberation? Strictly according to Communist doctrine. Cadres of VC political organizers and disciplined military units infiltrated South Vietnam. Glittering Red promises of a better life recruited thousands of South Vietnamese into VC ranks. Where promises failed, threats were used. Systematic terrorism began. Village chiefs, schoolteachers and officials were murdered wholesale. Kill-and-hide guerrilla tactics—so effective in Vietnam's concealing terrain—were used by VC military units to capture much of the country. Final victory was to be capped by consolidating guerrilla bands back into regular military regiments for the last battles.

Why haven't the VC won? For two reasons: First, millions of South Vietnamese would rather be dead than Red. They've fought back desperately and valiantly. Second, the United States has helped them fight. To begin with, by supplies and military "advisers" and now directly with over 160,000 men and more coming every day. Early this summer the tide of battle began to change. Now it's the VC who suffer setbacks.

Why is the United States fighting? For at least three strong reasons: (1) Born in freedom, our country cares for the freedom of others. (2) Should South Vietnam fall, so will Laos and Cambodia—then Thailand, Malaysia, Burma, and Indonesia. Ultimately all of Asia—the Philippines, Formosa, Korea, Japan, and New Guinea—could pass behind the Bamboo Curtain. We fought World War II to keep the Far East from domination by a single, determined aggressor who would force our first line of defense back to the Pacific Coast. We fight in Vietnam for the same reason. (3) Castro got away with his war of liberation. If we don't defeat this one, the Communists surely will start more of them all over Latin America, Africa and elsewhere in the world. U.S. troubles will be endless.

What we are doing in Vietnam is morally right, militarily sound and geopolitically correct.

How do U.S. forces fight? At sea Navy Task Force 77's carrier aircraft share with the U.S. Air Force an around-the-clock harassment of North Vietnam, bombing and strafing anything that moves on roads, rails, or trails. In South Vietnam they blitz suspected Vietcong concentrations. They are on immediate radio call to aid friendly units engaged on the ground. The Navy also hunts and sinks Vietcong shipping in South Vietnam's inland waterways and along the coastline. Its guns fire at enemy units ashore. A U.S. naval officer assists the captain of each Vietnamese Navy ship.

On land the Vietcong enemy wears no uniform and assumes many disguises. He may be anywhere—a laborer or farmer by day, a guerrilla at night. There are no frontlines. One is seldom out of range of the fighting anywhere in South Vietnam. The U.S. Army and Marines fight independently and in cooperation with Vietnamese forces to search out and destroy the enemy. Often the Vietcong cannot be identified until he fires at you.

How is U.S. morale in Vietnam? It's tops—ashore, afloat, and in the air. A fighting day may last 16 to 20 hours—our men are glad to take it. They know their job and its importance. They want to win and are determined to do so. I talked with many wounded in field hospitals. They want to recover quickly and get back to their fighting units. They feel the demonstrators at home stab them in the back as they face the enemy and are as hostile to them as to the Vietcong.

Do planners in Washington try too much to run the war? Most probably. The volume of instructions to generals and admirals on the spot is tremendous. They know as much about fighting this kind of war without letting it get out of hand as Washington does. They know the circumstances at hand much better. It would seem wiser to give them more authority while still reserving top policy decisions to the Pentagon.

What would happen if we pulled out of Vietnam? Our resolve and action is the keystone of free world resistance to Communist aggression all over the world. Pull out that keystone and everything collapses. Red China and the U.S.S.R. get a green light to take over most of the world.

Why not declare war, bomb Hanoi, blockade the north, etc.? Wisdom of these actions must be kept under constant review. For the present we do a good job destroying supplies from Red China and reinforcements from North Vietnam. Also, supplies from the U.S.S.R. and other bloc countries are coming in less quantity than might be expected. Should we escalate in North Vietnam, it would give Ho Chi Minh cause to call on his allies for more effective help. Thus, there are two sides to the coin when contemplating these possible actions. We want the best one up.

Should we use atomic weapons? In my judgment this amount of force is not needed against targets in North Vietnam and the location of friendly forces and people in South Vietnam is too close for their safe use.

How about using 'nonlethal' gases? These agents, such as tear gas and nausea gas, could be used very effectively. Example: clean out enemy caves and tunnels with nonlethal gas instead of lethal explosives. A lot of killing could be avoided and the work of our forces made easier. The gas here suggested for use does not kill and does not leave lasting aftereffects. It is unlike World War I's deadly gases which created so much horror.

Do we fight cold war along with the hot? Indeed we do. Realizing this is the key to understanding why military victory over the VC is only part of the job in Vietnam. To win final victory and get out we must create a strong nation there—stable and able to take care of itself militarily and in other ways. This means convincing the people that Communist promises are hollow—that the better life comes from their own free government and alliance with the United States.

How do we fight cold war? In addition to fighting, every one of our servicemen does something to make the people's lives better. As they liberate a village they bring in food and medical supplies; they help rebuild schools, roads and other public services. This is done through and in cooperation with Vietnamese Government officials. It teaches the latter how government should serve the people. It demonstrates to the people that real benefits—not just hollow promises—follow allegiance to their own government. It also demonstrates to the VC they have chosen the wrong side—many are defecting from the Communist side.

We also have in Vietnam many hundreds of dedicated U.S. civilians in the U.S. Information Service and AID mission. They risk their lives daily to carry the war for men's minds to the rice roots—right inside enemy strongholds. They also help build up the country's economy to make it self-sustaining. They often fly through heavy barrages of antiaircraft fire to drop millions of leaflets urging surrender of the VC and rallying the people to their government. An important part of their ammunition is relief supplies for the people bought by contributions from Americans.

When will we win in Vietnam? No one can predict when or how the military war will end. Right now it looks like the VC effort will intensify for a while, then it could peter out after some months—but terror tactics will continue much longer. Final victory will take a long time. We must win the cold war too. That will be when Vietnam not only is peaceful, but when a strong nation is welded together—able to care for itself against the enemy and to provide a decent life for its people.

What can we at home do to help the cause? (1) Use this document and other data to convince doubters of the importance of America's stake in Vietnam. (2) If you know a serviceman there, write him your appreciation for his bravery and sacrifice—say the same thing to his family here at home. (3) In addition to your regular donation to United Crusade, consider a contribution earmarked for "Vietnamese relief" to an organization such as CARE or Catholic Relief.

A Bill To Enable the Joint Economic Committee To Combat Inflationary Price-Wage Behavior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 11916 to amend the Employment Act of 1946. This bill would help the Federal Government in its battle against inflation and enable the Congress to play a more important role in it.

Unjustified price advances and wage settlements can threaten our economic growth and stability. H.R. 11916 would help to bring an informed public opinion to bear on such wage and price increases. At the same time, it would help us avoid hasty and inappropriate steps such as imposing mandatory controls, or raising taxes or interest rates before we have achieved our national employment goals.

The bill is designed to prevent inflation stemming from administered prices and wages—price and wage levels which are determined by decisions in industries with large firms or unions, without effective restraint by competitive market forces. When such increases occur in these pace-setting industries, great inflationary pressure results.

Restrictive monetary policies have a dampening effect on the economy as a whole. But they are relatively ineffective against inflation caused by administered price increases or wage settlements.

MORE EFFECTIVE MECHANISM NEEDED

In order to stabilize prices without ending the unparalleled expansion we have enjoyed for the past 5 years, we need a more effective mechanism to operate on administered prices. H.R. 11916 provides such a mechanism. It will allow our economy to continue to grow, and it will let us continue to reduce unemployment, without our experiencing inflationary price increases.

The bill follows the same voluntary approach which the Council of Economic Advisers has used in recent years.

Since 1962, the Council has formulated wage-price guideposts which have been utilized by the President in urging industry and labor to refrain from price and wage increases which exceed the guideposts. The bill strengthens this existing arrangement by establishing a regular procedure for focusing an informed public opinion upon price and wage increases.

My proposal would enable Congress to aid the executive branch in fighting inflationary practices. Under it, Congress through the Joint Economic Committee, would participate both in establishing the guideposts and in determining whether they have been violated.

PROVISION FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS

The bill calls for the Joint Economic Committee to pass each year on the guideposts recommended to it by the Council of Economic Advisers. The Committee could hold public hearings, at which both industry and labor would have an opportunity to make their views known. If the Committee disapproved of the CEA guideposts, Congress would make the final decision on them.

Once the guideposts became effective, the Committee would be advised by the CEA of possible breaches of the guideposts which threaten national economic stability. The Committee would then hold public hearings to determine whether the guideposts have been breached, and whether such breach in fact threatened national economic stability. If it did, the Committee could make recommendations to the President or to the parties involved concerning possible actions which would be in the public interest.

These recommendations would be advisory, and would not be binding on anyone. But they would certainly be influential in restraining harmful action.

H.R. 11916 does not create any new bureaucracy. Under it, the CEA would continue to initiate the guideposts. Through the Joint Economic Committee, which is experienced at holding hearings on inflationary price advances, Congress would bring its opinion to bear on potentially inflationary actions.

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS

The American people have a substantial interest in price and wage decisions which affect the national economy. An informed public, aware of the significance of major price and wage decisions and having a standard by which to judge whether individual actions are in the public interest, can help the parties involved to make responsible decisions in the national interest.

Through their representatives in Congress, the people of the United States will acquire representation in the wage-and-price-setting process. And the mere knowledge on the part of management and labor that they may be invited to justify price or wage action before a public body would encourage more consideration of the public interest.

I hope that management and labor in the pace-setting industries will recognize the necessity for this measure. But in any case, the interest of the American people as a whole in the stability of our economy is paramount, and must take precedence over the right of any private group to take action injurious to the economy without review of any kind.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Two November 1965 editorials from the New York Times and the Washington Post underscore the need for a more orderly procedure toward inflationary price-wage increases:

From the New York Times:

> After a mystifying display of internal confusion the Johnson administration has apparently decided to fight higher aluminum prices as a menace to the Government's anti-inflation program.
>
> We share the administration's conclusion that the increases put into effect by the major aluminum producers are inflationary and thus destructive of the national interest. But the contradictory signals the White House gave the country before arriving at its decision point up the need for a more orderly system for policing the wage-price guideposts Washington has erected to protect the economy.
>
> Such cat-and-mouse tactics are a poor way to enforce a program of voluntary economic restraint; yet they are unhappily characteristic of much of the White House approach to maintaining its hold-the-line precepts.
>
> The country wants no mandatory wage-price controls.
>
> A systematic procedure is needed through which the Council of Economic Advisers would give the country a full report on the economic justification for wage or price increases in strategic industries whenever their effect might be to unstabilize living costs.
>
> The Council ought not have veto power; merely letting the public know when labor or management overreaches itself will be corrective enough. It will also guard against the apparent willfulness of the present machinery.

From the Washington Post:

> What clearly emerges from the tangled tale of negotiations are the weaknesses inherent in stabilizing wages and prices by intermittent doses of moral suasion, exhortation, and occasionally, coercion.
>
> But as the economy moves closer toward full employment, the disciplines of the marketplace are weakened and the burden borne by Government policy grows correspondingly heavier. That is why a set of rules—a uniform code that would guide Government in its efforts to restrain inflationary pressures—is sorely needed.
>
> Rule one is that there should be a minimum of uncertainty about the Government's immediate intentions. Whatever the cause, the administration's handling of the aluminum affair has been maladroit. It opens itself to charges of disingenuousness when it disavows a connection between stockpile sales and the increase in aluminum prices. It creates an image of fickleness and indecision when it suddenly reverses its position after leading observers to believe that an agreement with industry had been reached. There is no room for uncertain trumpets in the struggle to hold the price line.
>
> Rule two involves criteria. Admittedly the Government is given little warning of impending price hikes. But when the Government finds it necessary to act, great care should be taken to justify its position in a white paper or shorter statement. Such utterances would serve to establish standards—whether based on the adequacy of industry profits or competitive position in world markets—for the application of restraints.
>
> Rule three deals with the crucial question of equity, the fairness of laying the restraining hand on some corporations and some labor unions while allowing others complete freedom to make inflationary decisions.
>
> Until now the efforts to stabilize prices have centered almost exclusively in the manufacturing sector of the economy where big business and big labor confront one another in the glaring light of publicity. Yet it makes little sense to stabilize the prices of manufacturers when construction costs and the prices of services are permitted to climb. Nor has the administration always exhibited the political courage required for consistency. The outsized wage settlement in the automobile industry, coming as it did before the last presidential election, was blinked at. And little effort has been made to secure the decreases in auto prices which are clearly indicated by the guideposts.
>
> If the twin goals of full employment and price stability are to be achieved, the Government must provide the counterweight of restraint to the market power that is wielded by business and labor. But restraints that are intermittently applied or based upon improvisations are not likely to be effective under conditions of high level employment. It is time to formulate detailed rules of the game.

It is clear that administered price increases have a substantial effect on our economy. The bill deals with these increases in such a way as to interfere as little as possible with the wage-and-price-setting processes of private enterprise. It would help relieve fears that economic growth will be further restrained by heavyhanded fiscal and monetary measures. And it would enable us to devote our energies and resources to dealing with the vital problems which confront us at home and abroad.

The text of H.R. 11916 follows:

H.R. 11916

A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage behavior which threatens national economic stability

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby declares that a new mechanism is needed to carry out the aims of the Employment Act of 1946 to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power (which includes the concept of reasonable price stability). Restrictive fiscal and monetary measures are appropriate and effective for controlling price and wage behavior caused by overall excessive demand. But in the absence of overall excessive demand, restrictive fiscal and monetary measures may be both harmful and ineffective. Such measures are harmful because they dampen the demand necessary for maximum employment and production. They may be ineffective with respect to individual price and wage behavior in industries with large firms or unions. This Act provides a mechanism for bringing to bear an informed public opinion in order to restrain such price or wage behavior when it threatens national economic stability by causing inflation.

DETERMINATION OF PRICE-WAGE GUIDEPOSTS

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4(c) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting a semicolon, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) to transmit to the joint committee not later than forty days from the enactment of this paragraph, and not later than January 20 of each year thereafter, price-wage guideposts which would, if observed, achieve noninflationary price and wage behavior;".

(b) Section 5(b) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a semicolon, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) to review the price-wage guideposts transmitted to it by the Council. If the joint committee determines that such guideposts are not appropriate to their purpose, it shall promptly report to the Senate and House of Representatives a bill or resolution setting forth appropriate price-wage guideposts. The price-wage guideposts transmitted to the joint committee by the Council shall take effect upon transmittal, and shall remain in effect until such bill or resolution is enacted, or until superseded by the Council. Any bill or resolution relating to price-wage guideposts shall be referred to the joint committee. Such bill or resolution shall be eligible to be reported to the Senate by the members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate, and to the House of Representatives by the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives; and".

DETERMINATION OF PRICE-WAGE BEHAVIOR INCONSISTENT WITH GUIDEPOSTS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 4(c) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) to study actual or imminent price and wage behavior, in industries with large firms or unions, inconsistent with the price-wage guideposts; and to report promptly to the joint committee any such price or wage behavior which threatens national economic stability."

(b) Section 5(b) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) Promptly upon receipt of a report from the Council pursuant to section 4(c) (7) if it deems it advisable, or upon its own initiative, to hold public hearings, to determine whether price or wage behavior is inconsistent with the price-wage guideposts, and threatens national economic stability; and promptly to file a report with the Senate and House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations of actions in the public interest to be taken by the President or the parties concerned."

Section 5 of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as (f) and (g), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) For the purpose of carrying out its functions under paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (b), the joint committee or, on the authorization of the joint committee, any subcommittee or member thereof, may administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the joint committee or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the joint committee, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 through 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section."

A Salute to the Rural Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the diffusion of agricultural knowledge from the laboratory to the land in America has been truly a great service provided by our rural press. I want to pay tribute to the enduring dedication of agricultural magazines, rural papers, and local newspapers to the science of American farming.

It is no wonder that other nations consider American agriculture our greatest success story.

The constant flow of information from the laboratory through the publisher to the producer on the farm has contributed vitally to the abundance of food and fiber that has blessed our Nation. Famine stalks in many lands that do not have the facilities for such communication with people on the land.

Our rural press must be given every encouragement to continue this invaluable service to America, and to find ways of assisting other nations of the world in developing similar systems of scientific communication.

The harsh challenges of both famine and abundance must weigh constantly upon the minds of world leaders. The resolution of the enormous problems will contribute immeasurably to a lasting world peace.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I shall place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an exchange of letters between the Agricultural Publishers Association and the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Orville L. Freeman. The letters follow:

AGRICULTURAL PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., December 27, 1965.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For more than 50 years, the Agricultural Publishers Association has dedicated its efforts to the service of the Federal Government, science, and the American farmer. Many of our publications are over 100 years old. We believe our contributions to the growth of American agriculture, that stands as a miracle before a hungry world, are self-evident.

This past year foreign nations have been in touch with our association and its members to study the methods used in providing farmers with a constant flow of vital information. For it is well known that many nations have technical data, but lack an inexpensive method of making it available. I, personally, have been invited to visit Europe next spring and will assist in any way I can.

The wisdom and foresight of our Government in promoting agriculture is reflected in the Second Class Mail Act of 1879 which provided low-cost distribution to periodicals, "originated and published for the dissemination of information of a public character, or devoted to literature, the sciences, arts, or a special industry; and has a legitimate list of subscribers." We sincerely believe we have made our contributions to a special industry; namely, farming.

Although agriculture is a booming industry in the United States, we, like our customers, have not shared in the Nation's prosperity. As if to parallel the decline in farm income, our advertising revenues are 10 percent lower today than in 1957. We share your hopes and ambitions for an upsurge in farm income to the rural family between now and 1970.

President Johnson has clearly reflected the challenge, that lies ahead, in his message of November 3, 1965. Upon signing the Food and Agriculture Act, he stated, "In a time of technological revolution and rapid change, which is occurring on our farms no less than in our factories and laboratories, we must constantly look to the future. New ways must be explored to keep agriculture and agricultural policy up to date, to get the full benefit of new findings and of new technology, to make sure that our bountiful land is used to the best of our ability to promote the welfare of consumers, farmers, and the entire economy."

Mr. Secretary, we pledge our full resources in order that our farm people will continue to receive "the full benefit of new findings" and to rededicate our efforts that, through cooperation with your Department and the land-grant colleges, we can assist agriculture in reaching the new horizons you have so clearly outlined.

For your review, I am enclosing material that reflect our past cooperation and with which we shall help you lead us to new levels of prosperity.

Yours very sincerely,
JAMES MILHOLLAND, Jr.,
President.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., January 6, 1966.

Mr. JAMES MILHOLLAND, Jr.,
President, Agricultural Publishers Association, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. MILHOLLAND: Thank you for your interesting letter of December 27. I assure you that the uniquely valuable service which the members of the Agricultural Publishers Association have rendered American agriculture for more than half a century is both recognized and appreciated.

I was particularly interested in your comment that people of other nations have contacted your association and its members in an effort to learn more about the methods used to provide American farmers with a constant flow of vital information. This is a highly encouraging development. On my own travels abroad it has been very plain that one of the biggest agricultural problems facing the world in its efforts to combat hunger and improve nutrition is how to close the gap which exists between technical data in the laboratory and the application of these data on the land. Whatever contributions you and your associates can make to help improve the diffusion of agricultural knowledge, especially in economically emerging nations, will be a truly great service.

Here at home we have devised policies and programs to improve farm income, revitalize rural America, take better advantage of the opportunities created by agricultural abundance, and use food and agricultural knowhow in the interests of world peace and economic development.

We have made substantial progress toward these objectives. Farm net income last year was $14 billion—a gain of 20 percent since 1960. Net income per farm exceeded $4,100—40 percent above 1960 and easily the highest ever.

More than 100,000 local and rural leaders are now working for community growth and new economic opportunity in over two-thirds of the Nation's counties.

The American people enjoy an abundance of top quality foods and spend only about 18.5 percent of their disposable income for it. Nowhere else in the world is food so plentiful and never has it been relatively so cheap. In addition, over 40 million Americans, many with low incomes, have a better diet due to expanded food distribution programs.

Agricultural exports in 1965 are estimated at $6.2 billion—two-fifths more than in 1960. About one-fourth of our exports are food-for-peace shipments that meet food needs and foster economic development in friendly nations all around the world.

New programs have enabled us to nearly eliminate the astronomical grain surpluses of 1960 and 1961. And the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 now gives us new long-term farm programs running through 1969.

On the basis of its present progress agriculture can look forward confidently to new horizons.

We expect another rise of perhaps a half billion dollars in farm income this year—with additional increases after that.

We expect accelerated progress in the creation of new jobs, new industries, new opportunities throughout rural America.

We expect further reductions in the real cost of food. By 1970 we will be spending only about 17 percent of our disposable income for food, and for a better diet too. As a result, a family of four will have $160 more a year to spend on other things.

We expect grain surpluses to disappear before 1970 and we look for substantial reductions in the surpluses of cotton and tobacco.

We expect continued growth in farm exports, perhaps as much as 25 percent by 1970—pushing exports well beyond $7 billion.

But, as President Johnson pointed out in signing the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, new ways must constantly be explored "to keep agriculture and agricultural policy up to date, to get the full benefit of new findings and of new technology." In pursuing our agricultural goals, we need, we seek, and we confidently expect the continued assistance of the magazines and rural papers affiliated with the Agricultural Publishers Association.

Again, many thanks for your letter and your promise of support in helping agriculture and rural America reach the new horizons for which it strives.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words of Scripture: II Corinthians 4:8: *We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed but not in despair.*

Eternal God, whose visible presence is withdrawn from us, give us a vivid and vital sense of the nearness of Thy Spirit, directing us in the ways of humility, righteousness, and justice.

Grant that the daily record and influence of our life, that we exert upon others, may help them overcome their struggles and sorrows, misfortunes, and miseries.

May the Master be our contemporary and companion in our efforts and enthusiasm to build a better world and a finer civilization to bring peace and good will among men.

We beseech Thee that our living for the Kingdom of God may be more inward and personal and incarnate and pervade our thinking in regard to needy humanity.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 10, 1966, was read and approved.

ELECTION OF CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., TO BE A MEMBER OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 635 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 635

Resolved, That CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Government Operations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SKI WEEK

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 767 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 767

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the period beginning January 21, 1966, and ending January 30, 1966, as "National Ski Week," in recognition of the economic, recreational, and healthful aspects of the sport of skiing; and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week by participation in appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN TABER

The SPEAKER. Under an order of the House heretofore entered into, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as I informed the House on Monday, our friend and former colleague, the Honorable John Taber, of Auburn, N.Y., passed away quietly during the recent congressional adjournment period, on November 22, 1965, following a long illness.

Most of the upstate New York district which John Taber served with such great distinction for 40 years in this House, including his home city of Auburn, is now included in the district which I have the honor to represent. He was my immediate predecessor as New York State's "Finger Lakes Congressman." And I am proud to rise today to pay tribute to his long service in this House, and to the forcefulness and integrity which so clearly marked his public career.

Few men or women have served longer in Congress than John Taber served. And few ever stood more consistently or determinedly for the ideals and beliefs which they cherished. I am sure many of us would, in all candor, acknowledge that we did not always agree with John Taber's stands on some of the issues of the day. But I know too that all of us admired the courage and forthrightness with which he expressed his point of view and worked and defended it, both in the great Committee on Appropriations and here on the floor of this House.

For nearly half a century John Taber was one of the handful of men who are the real leaders of this House. During two Congresses, the 80th and the 83d, he was the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. During the remaining period, until his decision to retire voluntarily from Congress in 1963, he was the ranking minority member of that committee. Other Members can and I know will want to comment more fully than I can do on John Taber's work within that great committee. But I am sure they will agree with me that courage and integrity were among his most outstanding attributes.

Once John Taber had made up his mind what was the right course to follow, he never let any considerations of personal glory, or expediency, or party favor deflect him from that course. He was consistently a firm and solid rock for the principles and ideals of the governmental policy in which he believed. And those ideals in which he did believe he espoused, incidentally, with a fervor and a sense of deep conviction that is all too often lacking in public life today. He was not afraid to go down the line for his convictions. He defended his own views of fiscal responsibility on the floor of this House just as vigorously when the man in the White House was a Republican as when he was a Democrat.

I like to think, Mr. Speaker, that this courage and determination, and this granite forthrightness which John Taber's service here always typified, represent the best in the soil and background of upstate New York from which he sprang. He represented a basically rural district, one that probably had more farm families than almost any other district in the State. His rugged individuality, his insistence on a strict accounting for every public tax dollar spent, his determination to see that unneeded frills and embellishments were eliminated from every Government operation, his insistence that the taxpayer should get a solid dollar of value for every dollar of Government money spent—all these reflected the basic, working creed of those sturdy men and women of rural, upstate New York who for generations had had to wrest their living from a not always friendly soil, and who had never been able to fall back on anyone to help them over periods of stress and trouble.

Perhaps our views of things have changed a bit in the years since John Taber first took his seat in this House, during the administration of Warren Gamaliel Harding. Perhaps we have become a more complex, a more complicated, a more populous, a more urban, a more harassed, and yes, as the recent power blackout and current transit difficulties in New York City have made so clear, even a more vulnerable nation than we once were back in the simple days of Harding normalcy in 1923. But no matter how much we change, surely those same simple virtues of prudence, of good sense, of thrift, and most of all, of simple courage and integrity for which John Taber stood in this House, will always have their proper place in our public as well as in our private life. And it is good and fitting and proper that we should pause here to remind ourselves once again of that simple truth.

Many of us will remember John Taber as a stern man, almost gruff in fact. There was something in him of the sturdiness and aloofness of the New England Puritan, something of the no-nonsense silence of the western frontiersman. But I have found over and over again, as I have tried in these past 4 years to serve the people of the Finger Lakes district of New York whom John Taber served so long and so faithfully, that John Taber's gruff exterior really masked a deep concern for the individual problems and difficulties of his neighbors, be they big or small, Republicans or Democrats. Hundreds, thousands, of people in the counties which he represented back home, found that John Taber was never too busy to listen to their problems, never too occupied with the heavy responsibilities of the Committee on Appropriations to put in a word in their behalf with this or with that Government agency. He was a good Congressman to his people, an effective Congressman. He helped keep government close to the people back home, always responsive to their individual needs and problems. He did well the job that all of us have come to realize is such an important part of the responsibilities of every effective Member of this House.

Influential and distinguished as he was in Washington, John Taber never lost touch with the people back home in Auburn. His public career began in this community, as a member of the Board of Supervisors of Cayuga County, representing his own ward in the city of Auburn. And in his 40 years as Congressman and as chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, his headquarters back home remained a simple, book-lined law office on Auburn's main street, one flight up, which you could reach only by climbing a rather rickety flight of stairs. John Taber was respected back home because he never stopped being an active participant in the life of his own home community. He never lost the common touch, walk as he might with Presidents or with Kings.

Mr. Speaker, John Taber's career was an important part of the unfolding story of the growth and development of New York State and of this great Nation as a whole. As we enter now upon a new and even more solemn session of this Congress, as we prepare to meet in this chamber tonight to hear the words and recommendations of the President of the United States on the burning issues of war or peace half a world away in the steaming jungles of southeast Asia, perhaps in pausing to remember John Taber we can somehow catch a new awareness of the courage and conviction and steadfastness that have always been typical of the people of New York State and of America in the finest hours of our history.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in late November 1965 the United States lost one of its finest statesmen—a legislator of tremendous ability, a gentleman of the highest standards, a citizen dedicated to the best for his beloved country and all mankind.

Our former colleague, John Taber, from the old 36th District of New York, died on November 22, 1965, in Auburn, N.Y., at the age of 85. In the Congress he was one of my closest personal friends despite a substantial difference in age. My admiration was unlimited for all of his wonderful qualities. John Taber's many kindnesses to me, I deeply appreciated; but in retrospect I will always and especially cherish them because they were words of wisdom, a pat on the back or perhaps a deserved criticism from one of the great legislators of our time.

John Taber's record was one of dedication, forthrightness and service. He served his country in local and Federal Governments for half a century—including 40 years in the House of Representatives. During his entire tenure in this House, he served with highest distinction on the Appropriations Committee, was chairman 4 years in the 80th and 83d Congress, and for many years was the senior Republican. He retired from Congress voluntarily December 31, 1962.

During those 40 years, he developed a reputation as a "fiscal vigilant" because of his undeviating dedication to economy in government. Some people might look at the constant growth of Federal spending and say that Congressman John Taber fought a losing battle for four decades. But one must wonder just how much more Federal spending there would have been if there had not been a John Taber in the Congress as the "watchdog of the Treasury." As an expert in Federal fiscal matters he scrutinized and cut the budgets in his responsibility on the House Appropriations Committee. Administrations from President Roosevelt to President Kennedy knew John Taber was there protecting the taxpayer's interest. And as our good friend, the late Clarence Cannon, himself a fiscal expert on the Committee on Appropriations, once said, "It would be a national calamity if Mr. Taber ever retired."

John Taber by developing the record in committee hearings was able to cut great chunks out of every presidential budget, and his reductions in the field of foreign aid, which he viewed as a "gravy train," were consistent no matter which President was in the White House. And while he had a passion for economy, he supported the act which created the Marshall plan, occasionally fought cuts in foreign aid, particularly military assistance, opposed lend lease but once the bill was law, voted for the appropriations to make it effective, and voted funds for the Office of Price Administration after OPA became law.

Those of us who were fortunate to know and work with John Taber appreciated what a valiant, able, and truly kindly man he was. I was sad when he retired from the Congress. I was saddened even further to learn of his death for here was a man above men. To his son, Charles, Mrs. Ford and I extend our deepest sympathies.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the New York Times of November 23, 1965, the day following Mr. Taber's death:

EX-REPRESENTATIVE JOHN TABER DIES AT 85; "FISCAL VIGILANTE" LED COMMITTEE—FINGER LAKES CONGRESSMAN SERVED FOR 40 YEARS ON APPROPRIATIONS UNIT

AUBURN, N.Y., November 22.—Former Representative John Taber, a veteran of 40 years in Congress, died today at a nursing home here after a long illness. He was 85 years old.

WATCHDOG ON EXPENDITURES

Perhaps more than anything else, John Taber's nicknames typified his long congressional career.

As the ranking member of the powerful House Appropriations Committee, he was variously known as "the watchdog of the Treasury," John (Cash and Carry) Taber, the "fiscal vigilante" and sarcastically, "Generous John."

During his days on the Hill, the art of cutting pieces and chunks out of the Federal budget became known, in Washington parlance, as "Taberizing."

For 20 consecutive terms, beginning in 1923, John Taber represented the predominantly Republican, generally thrifty and heavily rural Finger Lakes region of western New York. When he retired from Congress on December 31, 1962, his 36th District became part of the reapportioned 35th District.

Mr. Taber was named to the House Appropriations Committee in his first term. He became the ranking member in 1933 and was its chairman in 1947 and again in 1953.

As the chairman, he was one of the most influential men in the Government, and it seemed that Congress was divided into three bodies: the Senate, the House, and John Taber's 43-man committee.

He scrutinized Federal budgets with a vengeance, searching for the smallest extravagance and pouncing on its author when he discovered one. No item was too small for his attention, and he relentlessly insisted that each entry be separately and fully justified.

"We're not going to use a knife to cut down Federal appropriations," he was fond of saying, "we're going to use a sledgehammer."

Cabinet members and department heads who came before his committee stood in awe of his fiscal prowess and credited him with a sixth sense that enabled him to spot any excess in a budget request.

John Taber denied any occult techniques. "I just use simple fifth-grade arithmetic," he once said. "You'd be surprised how much we can save with just a little elementary figuring."

> A tall, imposing figure with a deep, rasping voice that penetrated to every part of the House Chamber, he was often accused by his critics of using the committee to block projects not in accord with his conservative views.
>
> During the committee hearings he was a forbidding prosecutor as he grilled witnesses. Once, shortly after the war, a representative of the War Department was asking the committee for funds to build a swimming pool at a hospital only a few miles from Waikiki Beach.
>
> "Tell me General," Mr. Taber rasped, "what makes you think those boys would swim in your expensive pool up on the hill there, when they could go down to Waikiki Beach and see all the beautiful girls?"
>
> The son of Franklin P. and Mary Parker Taber, he was born on May 5, 1880, in Auburn, where he was educated in public schools. After receiving a bachelor of arts degree from Yale in 1902, he studied for a year at the New York Law School and was admitted to the New York bar in 1904.
>
> He then joined his father's law firm of Taber and Brainard in Auburn, where he remained until 1918, when he opened his own practice.
>
> The descendant of three State assemblymen, Mr. Taber plunged into Republican politics in Auburn. He became a member of the Cayuga County Republican Committee and in 1911 was elected a special county judge, a post he held until 1919.
>
> Indirectly, it was Franklin D. Roosevelt, Mr. Taber's archenemy who made it possible for him to become appropriations chairman. In the Roosevelt landslide of 1932, 12 Republican members of the committee were swept out of office, leaving Mr. Taber the ranking minority member.
>
> When Republicans gained control of Congress in 1946, the New Yorker was made chairman. He lasted only one term, until the Democrats regained the House majority in 1948. He was chairman for a second 2-year period after the Republican successes in the 1952 elections.
>
> ### ENEMY OF GOVERNMENT WORKER
>
> One of his money-saving goals in 1947 was to prune a million persons from the Federal payroll. Roughly 2.2 million persons were employed by the Government at the time, and although he failed, hordes of Government workers were "Taberized" during his reign.
>
> In domestic matters, Mr. Taber vigorously opposed all programs tinged with the New Deal or Fair Deal. During World War II, however, he backed all war appropriations and accepted the administration's foreign policy. After the war he resumed his economy battle and fought to cut back foreign aid.
>
> A member of the Cayuga County and New York State Bar Associations, Mr. Taber was also a Mason and an Elk. He has served as a trustee of the Auburn Trust Co. and as president of the Whitney Point Water Co.
>
> His wife, the former Gertrude Johnson, died January 26. A son, Charles, survives.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, one of the great men of our day passed away during the past adjournment of Congress. The Honorable John Taber died in his hometown of Auburn, N.Y., on November 22, 1965.

To those of us who knew him personally and served with him in the U.S. Congress, his death is a great personal loss. With his passing, the entire Nation lost a legislator and political leader of great stature who had a profound influence on the financial affairs of this country over a period of two decades.

John Taber was of the Jeffersonian belief that those who are governed least are governed best. He had a Hamiltonian concern for the financial integrity of the Federal Government and the Nation. He often said:

> I have always believed people could spend money to better advantage than Government. I have always believed that unless Government is kept out of those fields that people can better exploit for themselves, we will lower our standard of living.

John Taber was born on May 5, 1880 in Auburn, N.Y. He was the son of the late Franklin P. and Mary Parker Taber and was one of four children. It might well be said that his interest in politics was inherited. He was the decendant of three State assemblymen. His great-great-grandfather, Silas Bowker, was a member of the New York State Assembly from 1814–1824. His great-grandfather and grandfather also held State assembly seats.

Mr. Taber was a resident of Auburn all of his life. After graduation from the Auburn public schools, he attended Yale University from which he graduated in 1902. He studied law at New York Law School and was admitted to the New York State bar on November 15, 1904. He then joined his father's law firm of Taber & Brainard until he opened his own law office on January 1, 1918. He was an active member and former vestryman of St. Peters Episcopal Church in Auburn.

John Taber was active in State and National politics for 60 years. At the age of 25—1 year out of law school—he started his political career as supervisor of Auburn's second ward. He later served 8 years—1910 to 1918—as special county judge. His nearly 20 years of service in the local Republican organization earned him the titles "Mr. Republican," "Uncle John," and "Honest John."

Mr. Taber came to Congress—the 68th—in 1923 from the picturesque Finger Lakes region in upstate New York and represented that congressional district for 20 consecutive terms until his voluntary retirement on January 3, 1963. At the time of his retirement he had the longest continuous tenure of any Republican in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Taber was elected to the Committee on Appropriations of the House at the time he came to Congress in 1923. He is the only person to have served a total of 40 years on that committee. He became the ranking Republican on the committee in 1933 and served 30 years as Republican leader of the committee. Twice during this period he served as chairman; in the 80th and the 83d Republican controlled Congresses.

During his chairmanship in the 80th Congress he exerted great leadership in a major drive to balance the budget. Both Republicans and Democrats were surprised by the amount of money he was able to carve out of the President's budget. His 24 years in Congress and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations gave him a thorough knowledge of the workings of the various Government departments. He dug hard and deep for facts to enable the committee to get underneath the surface of budget requests to determine minimum needs. He was hard to convince but was a very fair-minded man in all matters.

During this period the word "Taberize" became part of the Federal jargon, meaning to hack with a meat ax. Also, he began to be known by such labels as "watchdog of the Treasury," "John, 'Cash and Carry' Taber," "Fiscal Vigilante," and "Meat Ax John." He was even facetiously called "Generous John" on occasion.

Mr. Taber once told a reporter during an interview:

> Someone once called me "Meat Ax John." But that didn't bother me. Sometimes a meat ax was needed on some of those wasteful requests.

Again in the 83d Congress, he made a major effort to balance the budget. Largely as a result of his dedicated leadership, the Congress was able to reduce the budget in 1954 by nearly $5 billion. He frequently used to describe his approach to Federal budgets by saying:

> We're not going to use a knife to cut down Federal appropriations, we're going to use a sledgehammer.

Mr. Taber was the first chairman of the Joint Budget Committee created by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. While this approach to a balanced budget was never successful, he did his best to make it work. He also was a member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures for 20 years prior to his retirement. His strong support for the work of this committee was of great value to its chairman, the Honorable Harry Byrd, of Virginia.

Regardless of party, Taber's colleagues in both Houses of Congress admired his honesty, integrity, sincerity, and high sense of public duty. They envied his tenacity and energy. They often accorded him the highest accolade that one politician can bestow upon another: "He always keeps his word."

In a tribute to Mr. Taber on his 75th birthday, former Speaker of the House JOE MARTIN stated:

> If there is anyone in this country who deserves the title "watch dog of the Treasury" it is John. During his long service in this House he has saved this country many billions of dollars. Because of his service the taxpayers of America have been saved heavy taxes. He is a man who, regardless of political consequences, never failed to support legislation for the benefit of the country. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 5, 1955.)

On this same occasion, the late Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn paid tribute to Mr. Taber as follows:

> Mr. Chairman, I want to join in every kind word that the gentleman from Massachusetts,

> Mr. MARTIN, has said with reference to our beloved colleague, John Taber. He has been an outstanding Representative for many, many years. John Taber's word is his bond. I have enjoyed my service with him.

John Taber was a man with unusual qualities of leadership. He had a keen intellect and a rich background of knowledge. He was a person with complete balance and exceptional judgment. He was firm but fair. He was stern but warm and considerate. He was dedicated to his principles but understanding of the viewpoint of others. His ideals were lofty but his approach was earthy. He possessed a keen sense of humor which endeared him to all who knew him.

His personality and qualities of statesmanship grew naturally out of the background that produced him. He came from a district of farms and small towns in western New York. The largest city was his hometown of Auburn. One-third of the people lived on farms. Winters were cold. Foresight and thriftiness were virtues.

John Taber was a great believer in fifth-grade arithmetic. He had little use for the slide rule and higher mathematics. One day he asked a Government witness for a percentage figure. "I don't have my slide rule with me," the budget officer replied. "Wait just a minute," Taber drawled as he pulled out a 3-inch pencil stub, "I'll have it for ye."

In the April 7, 1957 issue of New Republic, Eugene Rachlis cited an interesting example of John Taber's unusal ability to carry his point of view to those to those within the sound of his voice. Mr. Rachlis stated:

> In cloakrooms, old-time Representatives recall the day when the sheer power of Taber's voice restored the hearing of a long deaf colleague. No one recalls either the subject under debate, although it must have been appropriations for Taber to have been speaking at all, or the name of the Representative who threw away his hearing aid. But it is said that Taber made one point with such violence that the deaf man, unmindful until then of what was going on, suddenly sat upright, looked around with a most bewildered expression, then turned around and shook hands with an equally bewildered Taber.

The Treasury Daily Statement was Mr. Taber's "bible." He received his copy daily and carried it with him wherever he went. It was not unusual to see him pull the report from his pocket at budget hearings and other committee meetings and quote the contents to other members and departmental witnesses. Resulting economies in Federal expenditures cannot be measured, but there can be no doubt that his influence saved the taxpayers of the Nation tremendous sums of money.

On Mr. Taber's 80th birthday, the late Honorable Clarence Cannon—with whom he served for over 30 years—stated:

> I will say this—and I challenge any man to dispute it—if you judge men by the amount they have saved this country, John Taber would get the biggest salary of any man in the country—it is my earnest belief that but for his service the national debt would be at least $10 billion bigger than it is.

The passing of John Taber, and the death of the late Clarence Cannon in 1964, mark the end of an era in the history of the Congress and the Nation. There are still many in Congress who have the same conservative approach to economy in Government. But the experienced leadership of these two dynamic economy advocates is sorely missed by those of us who have inherited their mantles. The overpowering spending pressures of today's world are almost irresistible. The need for more men like John Taber becomes increasingly great as these pressures expand.

A paragraph contained in the November 24, 1965, issue of Roll Call, the newspaper of Capitol Hill, sums it up very well:

> It is not easy to say "no" when even the voters seem willing to tolerate continued deficit budgets, but John Taber did so with gusto and conviction. His type will be hard to replace.

Those of us who remain behind to continue his good work will need to draw upon the memory of his constant devotion to his principles and his outstanding record of economy in Government. His wise counsel and courageous leadership will continue to be a source of inspiration and encouragement to all who knew him.

Mr. Taber married the former Gertrude Johnson on April 13, 1929. Mrs. Taber died January 26, 1964, at Auburn Memorial Hospital after a brief illness. He is survived by a son, Charles, of Auburn, and two sisters—Miss Emily Taber of Auburn and Mrs. Amos Thacher of Garden City, Long Island, N.Y.

To them I wish to extend my heartfelt sympathy and condolences. They and all of us have lost one of God's noblemen.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened last November to learn of the passing of the former Republican dean of this House, the Honorable John Taber, of New York. As a fellow New Yorker, I have known and respected him from the time I first became a Member of the House in the 75th Congress.

John Taber's principal concern through most of his congressional career was the execution of public funds. As chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the first postwar Congress and again during the Korean war in the 83d Congress, he devoted himself to the difficult task of supervising the consideration of appropriation bills under two different administrations.

In his 40 years of service as a Member he saw and took part in the development of this country during the post-World War I days of the twenties, the depression of the early thirties, the World War II transformation, and the precarious era of the cold war period. During all those years, he applied himself to his duties with a steadfast determination and single-mindedness of purpose. At the time of his death he had been a member of the bar of the State of New York for exactly 60 years and 1 week.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from New York in extending to the family and friends of John Taber our sincere condolences.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his kind remarks. I now yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to warmly embrace every kind word and thought expressed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and others here about the late honorable and much beloved John Taber, of New York. He was truly a great American, one of the Nation's great public servants who left his imprint on the public decisions of his time.

John Taber was blessed with an abundance of that great Christian virtue of kindness. The milk of human kindness ran deeply in him.

He was ever fair in dealing with his fellow man; a man of unimpeachable integrity. Speaker Rayburn once said of him that his word was his bond—and it was.

Humility, self-effacement were but two of the hallmarks of this outstanding man. He once remarked, "I'm just an ordinary Congressman"; but he was not.

He had an abiding belief in the proposition that the House of Representatives was the supreme guardian of the peoples liberties and that the power of the purse was the weapon through which to assure their preservation.

Few if any men have erected a more consistent record of public service. Holding an abiding philosophical attachment to the proposition of limited Central Government, he was an apostle of economy in public expenditure all his days here in the Halls of Congress. And he was well-suited to pursuit of this always unpopular course. Of rugged character, his courage was undaunted in the face of the odds and of adversity. He possessed a firmness and perseverance of purpose which nothing but the impossible could divert from its direction. He was motivated by a deep belief in the philosophy of the old Chinese proverb that if you cut your own wood it will warm you twice.

George Washington, the Father of our Country, once remarked that it is incumbent upon every person of every description to contribute to his country's welfare. John Taber not only left no such debt unsettled; he left a large credit balance upon which we and others to come can draw for inspiration and strength.

America can never have too many John Tabers. He was a true patriot in the good old-fashioned inspirational sense of the word. He was my good and always helpful friend. In the words of the Prophet Isaiah, he lifted up a standard for the people of his day. May the Lord bless his memory.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas. I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, certainly I want to add my word of tribute to one of the greatest friends I ever had.

John Taber was already a highly respected, experienced Member of this body when I came here as a freshman in 1935. I could never repay him for his wise counsel, the helping hand he was always willing to offer, and the inspiration of his attitude toward the House of Representatives, which he loved so deeply.

John was a fighter who asked no quarter and gave none.

But his adversaries were worthy opponents—never enemies.

Beneath a gruff exterior was a man of great kindness, and with a delightful sense of humor that could and did come to the surface even when the going was rough and the debate heated.

John Taber left the membership of this great body a rich legacy of dedication to duty, of high competence and a willingness to shoulder far more than his fair share of the arduous committee work that is so vital to the success of the legislative process.

Those of us who worked with John Taber are well aware of the high regard in which he was held by his colleagues as a man of complete integrity.

It was my privilege, on an occasion some years ago, to visit his district and to speak on his behalf.

There I learned firsthand of the respect and honor he enjoyed among the people who sent him, time and again, to represent them in this body.

A truly great American has left the scene after a long and distinguished career of service to his country.

To his bereaved family I extend my sympathies and share its sorrow.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana. I now yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my friends from the great State of New York in paying tribute to an outstanding former Member of the House. John Taber, in his long and distinguished career, had the honor of presiding over the great Committee on Appropriations and of serving as its ranking Republican member for many years. He was devoted to economy in government and to the American way of life. He was a man of strong will and undisputed integrity. He was a big man in every sense of the word. It was my privilege, which I shall always cherish, to have been a friend and colleague of this noble man and great American.

I extend to his loved ones my deepest sympathy in their grief.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of a great American, Congressman John Taber.

Few men ever served in this House longer or more effectively than our late colleague from New York. Mr. John was a man of great integrity, ability, and courage. His relentless fight for fiscal sanity contributed greatly to the stability and strength of our country and resulted in the saving of many billions of dollars for American taxpayers. This Nation is indeed fortunate that the many talents of this outstanding patriot were devoted for so many years to the best interests of our Government and country.

Mr. Taber's unsurpassed record of devotion to duty and accomplishment will continue to inspire those of us fortunate enough to serve with him and will serve as an excellent example for public servants in the years to come.

I am deeply grieved at the loss of a true and devoted personal friend, but I shall always be grateful that it was my privilege to know him and enjoy his warm friendship and wise counsel.

I extend my deepest sympathy to the members of his family in their bereavement.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there is no way by which I can possibly express the grief that is mine with the passing of my beloved friend and former colleague, John Taber. No words can convey the personal loss I feel.

Nor is there any way nor any words by which any one of us can so much as presume to add an inch to the stature of this truly great man. His accomplishments as a Member of this body towers high above our reach. They stand as a lasting monument, 40 years in the building, to guide us, to inspire us, and to guide and inspire all who come after us.

There was nothing dramatic about John. He was not given to dramatics. He was not one that radiated enthusiasm. He never became excited, nor did he seek to excite. Many looked upon him as cold, calculating, and unapproachable.

But that was only the impression one might have who did not really know him. Beneath that apparent cold exterior was a warmth, a compassion and an understanding without limits. Those of us who were privileged to work with him and to know him came to recognize that he was a man entirely without pretense and of the highest quality. There are all too few such men.

For something like 25 years I served with him. During this period I came to know him intimately. And I take immeasurable pride in saying that he and I became personal friends. One could not have a friend more loyal than he.

In the fullest sense of the word, John Taber, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and twice its chairman, was the "watchdog" of the Federal Treasury. I do not believe any man served in the Congress who had a more detailed knowledge of the Federal budget than John. Nor do I believe any man did more toward saving tax dollars for the American people. There is no way of ever determining how much waste he uncovered and how many dollars of unnecessary Federal expenditures he prevented. The figure must be in the billions over the many years he worked with painstaking care on the appropriation bills.

This is a fact of record. In all the years I have served in this body not often has the Congress ended up with not only a balanced budget but a surplus to apply on the national debt. And that was a Congress when John Taber was chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Truly, John has written his name indelibly on the pages of history. He is no longer with us. But he lives. He will live forever in the history of the Congress he loved, and in the minds and hearts of we who loved him, as a statesman, as a man of character, and as a warm personal friend.

I have lost a fine and good friend, and I extend my sincerest sympathy to his family.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

I now yield to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I join in the tributes which have been paid to a former distinguished Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, when I first came here, now 25 years ago, John Taber was one of the very first people that I came to know. I was impressed then with his diligence, his knowledge, his dedication, his hard work, his integrity, and his devotion to duty.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the years that we served together I would say that those attributes were the ones that distinguished him as a Member of this great body.

The country is a greater country because John Taber served here, and as the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends], my colleague, the minority whip, said, his exterior may have been cold but he had a warm heart and an understanding sympathetic personality.

Mr. Speaker, I was honored to number him a friend.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York, the senior Republican Member from that great State [Mr. Fino].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, as dean of the New York Republican delegation, I wish to join my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton], in his remarks here this afternoon.

In 1953, when I first came to this Congress, John Taber of my own State of New York was the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. To a freshman Congressman, he was a powerful and imposing man.

I had not known John Taber personally until then except by reputation. He was a man of great legislative and administrative ability. He brought a rarely matched skill and dedication to his job. As chairman and later ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, he was a valiant watchdog of the Treasury, saving countless millions of dollars from waste during his many years in the House.

John Taber will be missed. He has been missed since his retirement. This House and this country can always use men like John Taber. Unfortunately, we always have too few of them.

I am proud that John Taber was a son of the State of New York. New York can be proud of his 40 years of service in the Congress. They were years of achievement—they were years of dedication. Not only will we, in Congress, miss him but he will be a great loss to this Nation and to New York State.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Flynt].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to join with the gentleman from New York and others in paying this deserved tribute to the memory of a beloved colleague and expressing our high regard for him.

When I was first elected to the 83d Congress in a special election, John Taber was the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

After my election to the Committee on Appropriations and for the remainder of John Taber's congressional service, I served on the Committee on Appropriations with him while he was ranking minority member. As a member of the committee and of the House of Representatives, I had the opportunity to come to know him and know him well.

To know him was to have a very high regard and respect for him. I admired his courage, his ability, his integrity, and the intense loyalty that he demonstrated as an able, and patriotic American.

This country is better because of his service. This country is poorer because he is no longer with us as a Member of this House. But his influence will be felt and he will be remembered as long as there remains in the House of Representatives a single Member who served with him and who came to know and to respect him.

The fiscal policy and stature of this country increased greatly during the period of John Taber's almost 40 years of service. During that time he saw an annual budget exceed the combined total of the budgets for the first dozen years of his service as a Representative in the Congress.

John Taber's regard for and recognition of his responsibilities as a Member of this legislative body and to the American people increased with each year of his service and increased in proportion to the increase in the amount involved in the annual appropriation bills enacted by the Congress.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is with deep reverence and with a sincere high regard for the memory of this departed Member that my family and I extend to his family and his friends, our deepest sympathy in the loss of their loved one, this great American.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for his very eloquent remarks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join my colleagues today to pay my tribute to the memory of one of the greatest Americans of this century, the late John Taber.

After a long and distinguished service in this body, with a record for fiscal responsibility which has been unmatched in this century, Mr. Taber voluntarily retired to private life hoping to enjoy some years of relaxation free from the constant pressures of office which have steadily mounted in recent years. Alas, it was not to be. After only a few short years in private life, the grim reaper paid his call and Mr. Taber was denied the opportunity to enjoy for long the retirement he so richly deserved following almost a lifetime of dedicated service to his Nation in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Stanch defender of the free enterprise system, valiant fighter for fiscal responsibility, implacable enemy of waste and extravagance, John Taber has left for posterity a monument more lasting than bronze.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hanley].

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last November 22, this body lost one of its most distinguished former Members and the citizens of central New York lost one of their most outstanding public servants.

John Taber, who represented the congressional district adjacent to my own, served in the House of Representatives for 40 years. While it was not my privilege to serve with him, I knew of his dedication to the needs of his constituents in central New York. His name was a household word in our area.

At the time of his resignation, in 1962, he was the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee. Though he was an avid stalwart of his party, he always put his country ahead of partisan gain and in so doing won the respect and confidence of his colleagues.

John Taber's voice is silent now, but the memory of this dedicated man will live on in central New York as long as decency and honor remain a part of our value system.

I join his successor, Congressman Sam Stratton, in saluting the memory of John Taber and I extend my deepest sympathies to his family.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cederberg].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying this deserved tribute to our late colleague, John S. Taber.

I had the honor and privilege to serve with Congressman Taber on the Committee on Appropriations for a number of years before his retirement. I recall coming to the 83d Congress, being appointed to that committee, and making his acquaintance. As time went by I observed that one could not help but have a greater respect each year for his ability, his integrity, and his knowledge of the fiscal situation in our country.

I was always amazed at the wonderful liaison that took place between John Taber, when he was chairman or minority member of that committee, and our late colleague, Clarence Cannon, who also served on that committee. I think we had at that time an example of one of the finest liaisons between the two sides of the House and, between the two ranking members of the Committee on Appropriations. In the long run I think it was good for our country that that wonderful relationship took place.

Our country has lost a wonderful man, a man who has made a great contribution to the welfare of this country. His service in the Congress is missed, and I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. STRATTON. I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Robison].

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our late departed friend and colleague, the Honorable John Taber, of Auburn, N.Y.

Although the phrase has been often used, and in differing ways, I believe it was Henry Clay, also a former Member of this body, who first reminded us that:

> Government is a trust, and the officers of the government are trustees; and both the trust and the trustees are created for the benefit of the people.

In my own memory of John Taber, it is probably this facet of his public career—that is, his own personal idea about the approach a public servant should take toward his task—that will remain in my mind, for, in every possible sense of the word, John Taber considered himself a "trustee," and all the several public offices that he held at various times as being "trusteeships" for the people he served, and served so well.

His was truly a distinguished career of public service. Born at Auburn in 1880, educated at Yale, and admitted to the New York State Bar Association in 1904, in the following year he became the supervisor of his township and, thus, a member of the Cayuga County Board of Supervisors. Learned and respected in the law, he moved on in 1910 to become Cayuga County's special judge, a post he held through 1918.

Active also in political affairs, he was a delegate to the National Republican Conventions in 1920, 1924, and again in 1936, and in addition was the chairman of his own county's Republican committee from 1920 to 1925.

First elected to this House of Representatives in November of 1922, he served herein from March 4, 1923, until his retirement at the end of the 87th Congress in late 1962.

His first committee assignment—most unusual as all of us know for any first-termer—was to the Committee on Appropriations, and this was his only major committee assignment, here, during the ensuing 40 years. In that period of time, John Taber saw great changes come about in the nature of his responsibilities as he witnessed the growth of our annual Federal budget from $3,748 million in 1923, to close to $100 billion by the end of his years of service.

John Taber was deeply concerned by this trend, and by the manner in which—at least in his view—the Congress, itself, seemed to gradually lose its control over the budgetary process. To many, John Taber's views, here, were old-fashioned, and, from that viewpoint, his critics were sometimes numerous, but all of them had always the utmost respect for Mr. Taber, and for his knowledge as an articulate and outspoken fighter for what he considered to be the demands of fiscal responsibility.

They all had, too—as did all of us who were privileged to work with and to know him—constant admiration for his integrity, and the depth of his honesty.

And this was appropriate, for to John Taber, as to Benjamin Cardozo, who put it this way:

> A trustee is held to something stricter than the morals of the marketplace. Not honesty alone, but the punctilio of an honor the most sensitive, is then the standard of behavior.

It was this kind of character that Mr. Taber brought to his work as a member of the great Committee on Appropriations of this body, of which committee he served as chairman in both the 80th and 83d Congresses, and as ranking minority member from 1935 on in all other Congresses prior to his retirement.

I think it can accurately and fairly be said, without fear of contradiction, that John Taber was one of the great Members of this body, and that his voice was one of the strongest voices ever raised in this chamber. This body—and this Nation—was the better for his service to the people he trusted, and who had trust in him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to our beloved Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about John Taber we talk about not only one of the great Americans of all time but also one of the great legislators of our Nation's history.

John Taber always served in this body in accordance with his fixed beliefs, his views on legislation, and he always served according to character.

Between us there developed a very strong and close friendship, a friendship which I treasured in life and the memory of which I shall always treasure as long as I live.

Members have heard me on a number of occasions refer to the importance of friendship not only in the journey of life but particularly in a legislative body. I have repeatedly said to friends of mine that the middle aisle means nothing so far as friendship is concerned and that friendship transcends party and political considerations.

As a Democrat I would never ask a Republican friend of mine, on the basis of friendship, to do something which was contrary to a fixed policy of his party. But there are many things which come within the realm of friendship—many intangibles—and the limitations of party principle or position are very small in area.

In the journey of life which we take with each other, where respect and friendship for each other exist without regard to the middle aisle, I see no middle aisle where friendship is involved, when I can at any time be of assistance to a colleague of mine.

Why do I refer to this when I talk about John Taber? It brings back to my memory something that happened during the fourth term of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and it involved another great and dear friend of mine who has taken the journey into the Great Beyond. My colleagues who served with him will remember him as another great American and another great legislator, Bill Ditter, of Pennsylvania. What a man he was. What men both of them were.

F.D.R. had sent up an appropriation for some agency, the head of which was getting headlines in unpopularity at the time. I believe it involved some $18 million on a regular appropriation bill, and the Committee on Appropriations cut out the $18 million. The time was ripe. The emotionalism existed. The head of the agency and the agency were going through a period of pain and travail, which occasionally happens without regard to what administration might be in power. So the $18 million was not appropriated.

I was at the White House one night after F.D.R. arrived back from one of his last trips abroad—I believe it was his last trip, as a matter of fact—and the head of the agency was talking with the President. Everybody was around the President. He saw me. He said, "John, come here." I supposed that the President wanted to transfer this conversation to me, and I did not blame him. He said to me, "So-and-so"—and called him by his first name—"Has a problem. I sent up a request for $18 million and the Congress cut it out. I am going to send up a supplemental appropriation request. I should like to have you get it in the bill. I should like to have it in the supplemental bill."

I said, "I will do what I can, Mr. President." And he said, "I will leave it up to you."

I have served many years in the Congress. I have learned a little from this experience. I am practical, at least. I do not know everything, but I try to learn a little from my contacts with my friends and my colleagues.

I sent for John Taber and for Bill Ditter, and I said; "The 'Great White Chief' at the White House spoke to me yesterday, and I will tell you what he said. He said, 'John, I want you to get this appropriation through.'" And I said to them, "I want to show the President I can do it. That is all. Now you are my pals and you are my friends, and friendship, as you and I know, is a two-way street. This is no policy in your party. I do not know how you are going to do it. I am not going to speak to anyone else on the committee about it. I do not know how you are going to do it, but I would like to have you do it."

So, 3 or 4 weeks went by. They held hearings, and so forth. It is in my mind now that one day John Taber and Bill Ditter met me in the hallway coming, apparently, from the Committee on Appropriations. Well, you remember how John would have his head down when he was talking with you. He called me and motioned to me and said, "John," and you know how he would talk. He said, "John, you remember that appropriation matter you talked to Bill and me about?" I said, "Yes. Sad news?" He said, "Well, John, we could not give the $18 million. All we could do, John, was $17,750,000."

Now, those are memories. JOHN McCORMACK never forgets those things. When we are talking about John Taber it brings my mind back to this incident. It is one of the memories of friendship and respect. John Taber was my dear friend. My thoughts of him today and my remarks are not only of him as a colleague but as more than that, a dear and valued friend of mine. I think John Taber, if he could speak to us from beyond the Great Divide, would be happy that I made reference to that incident showing the meaning and significance of friendship among us in the journey of life.

I join with my colleagues from New York, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, in expressing my deep sympathy on the passing of our dear friend and in extending to his son my profound sympathy.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker of the House for those remarks. I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from New York, the successor to the great John Taber, yielding to me. I had the experience of serving as a subcommittee chairman under John Taber, and I think it bespeaks the rapid transition in which we all pass here in this Chamber, that as I look about me I see no other Republican Member of the present House of Representatives who can make that statement. So fast has the chain of events moved, and so fast have the characters changed on this floor of the House of Representatives in the past few years.

As our beloved Speaker just said, John Taber was often referred to in the press and elsewhere as a rather crusty character. Yet I know of no one who had a real sense of human kindness closer to his heart than did John Taber. I know of no one who, in spite of great responsibilities that he bore, when he was alternating, in the years that I served here before, with Clarence Cannon in chairmaning this great Committee on Appropriations, was more anxious to be helpful to his junior colleagues. In the 83d Congress when John Taber resumed the chairmanship of that great committee, I remember how anxious he was to provide a spot or a group of spots on this committee to some of the promising newcomers here in the House of Representatives. His love of tradition was not such that there was any hidebound attitude which prevented him from providing opportunities for those who did come here in their first initiation into this body.

It was at that time in the 83d Congress that for the first time anyone then here could recall—and I do not know of any comparable circumstances since—when there were six Republican freshmen Members of the House of Representatives who were given places on that great Committee on Appropriations. Among those were our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas], who now stands as the second ranking Republican on that committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], who now serves as the chairman of our conference, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cederberg], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], who now serves in the other body. I can recall that John Taber asked only one question. I happened to be sitting in his office as he made a number of telephone calls, as he put it, "to check out some of these freshmen." He asked only one question, "Will they stand up?" That is all he asked of the people whose opinion he wanted to get with respect to the placement of these six newcomers on that great committee.

I had the pleasure of knowing his son, Chuck, who served him in such a devoted fashion while John was here in the House. I know Chuck must feel very much alone these days with his mother and dad both gone. I hope he will take some comfort and a measure of great pride in having the opportunity to read this Record tomorrow and gain therefrom some measure of the great pride that all of us felt who had an opportunity to serve with John Taber on this great Committee on Appropriations, and particularly to serve under his chairmanship and to feel the great esteem in which he is held by his former colleagues on both sides of the aisle and all those who served with him here in this great House of Representatives.

I thank the present incumbent of the seat that John Taber held so long and so proudly, for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for his very eloquent tribute.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Pirnie].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the death of our beloved former colleague, John Taber, saddens all who knew him. His long and distinguished service on the Appropriations Committee, of which he twice acted as chairman, made him an acknowledged expert in governmental fiscal matters. To this task, he brought personal convictions to which he remained faithful throughout his 40 years in the Congress. Economy and efficiency were objectives he truly sought. His dogged determination brought him national recognition as a real champion of sound operating practices.

He loved this country and worked hard to preserve its greatness. Although he had a gruff exterior, those close to him appreciated his sensitivity and relied on his sympathetic understanding. He was eminently fair in his judgments and charitable in his attitudes. Yes, John was truly a true friend and a thorough gentleman.

The real strength of government lies in the character of its leadership and men like John Taber are always needed on the national scene. He set a high standard of public service which grateful constituents and admiring colleagues will long remember. This great legislator reflected real credit upon his State of New York and the Congress.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton] for yielding to me and I take this time to likewise join with my colleagues who have paid tribute to the memory of John Taber, who was one of the great stalwarts of the House of Representatives and who was beloved by those who had the privilege of serving with him here in the House of Representatives and by those he served through his long public career.

Although I am well aware that he lived a long and full life, I confess to a sense of deep personal loss at his passing, a sense of loss that remains vivid because I admired him so much, and because I continue to receive expressions of regard for him from his former constituents in Wayne County, now part of the 36th District of New York which I have the honor to represent.

For 20 consecutive terms John Taber represented in the House the beautiful Finger Lakes region of western New York. He was named to the House Appropriations Committee in his first term. He became the ranking minority member in 1933, and became the committee's chairman in the Congresses that began in 1947 and 1953—the 80th and the 83d. His service was monumental in scope, depth, and quality. It was one of the greatest examples of fiscal integrity and fiscal responsibility ever demonstrated by a Member of Congress charged with the awesome duties incident to the congressional power of the purse.

He scrutinized Federal budgets with extraordinary care. No item was too small for his attention, and he relentlessly insisted that each entry be separately and fully justified. Cabinet members and heads of executive departments who came before him stood in awe of his fiscal prowess. They credited him with a sixth sense that enabled him to discover any excess in a budget request.

The finest memorial to this great man and to his achievement as a Member of Congress is a steady adherence to the cause to which his life was dedicated; the sound management of the public funds, the people's contributions in taxes to their Government.

Mr. Speaker, parenthetically, I might add that when I first went to New York State—my wife's family was from the small town of Interlaken, N.Y., which was located in the congressional district represented by the gentleman from New York, Mr. Taber—I learned firsthand of the great service he was rendering to his constituents in that congressional district.

Also, I had the privilege of following the career of the late great John Taber while I attended Cornell University Law School in Ithaca, N.Y., and then later when I moved to Rochester, N.Y., the area which it is now my privilege to serve in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the important contribution that I can make to the remarks that have been made here today is this: I have the privilege of representing the 36th Congressional District which includes the County of Wayne, which at one time was a part of the congressional district represented by the late John Taber in this House of Representatives. Even today as I make my rounds in Wayne County I hear many great things about John Taber and the representation that he rendered that county and that congressional district while he served here in the House of Representatives.

So, Mr. Speaker, I join here today in paying tribute and respect to the memory of John Taber, and extend to his son my deepest sympathy.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Denton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with mixed emotion—sadness over the loss of a former colleague, and pride in having served with him.

Former Congressman John Taber lived a long and very useful life. I am sure that prior to his death at age 85 he spent many days in retrospect, thinking of the things he had seen and things he had done.

John Taber and I did not agree in our political philosophy but he was sincere and dedicated in his beliefs.

And, as a great advocate of economy in our Government he served a very useful purpose. He was often criticized for cuts he made in appropriation measures. But again, I must say that men of his political views are absolutely necessary in our Government.

John Taber was an expert in his field. He had unlimited knowledge of Government activities and expenditures. He knew all the techniques of budget preparation; of investigations and hearings; and he was a master at reaching agreements in conference.

As a young, junior Democrat I had the opportunity several times to sit beside Mr. Taber, as a senior Republican, in conference committees. And I must say that his advice was always good.

He served many years in Congress and left his imprint here in many ways.

I extend my sympathy to his family but offer them consolation in the thought of the worthwhile life John Taber led and of the great service he rendered to his Government and to his country.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can add anything to the fine tributes from so many of my colleagues to our greatly beloved former colleague and good friend, John Taber. But I surely want to add my voice to the accolades on his behalf today.

I always refer to Chairman Taber as "Mister John." It has been my pleasure to have worked with him in excess of 20 years on the Committee on Appropriations, so I think I can appraise him accurately. Men do not come any finer. By any yardstick used to measure him, Mr. John was a big, outstanding man. He has wielded a great influence in the Congress for sound fiscal policy and measures. His influence will endure.

Everyone who ever knew him will attest to his honesty, his integrity, his sincerity, and high sense of public duty. Mr. John was a big man—big in so many ways—big in heart—big in dedication to his country—big to the high purposes he devotedly served.

Mr. John was a kind man, an able man, a greatly beloved and respected man. His big voice in the Halls of Congress will continue to ring in our memories and in our hearts. His objectives were noble. His goals will continue as a heritage for our Nation in future generations. He was a great friend and we are all saddened by his passing.

I join with all my colleagues in extending to his son, Charles, his sisters, and every member of his wide circle of friends and loved ones our heartfelt sympathy, our sorrow at their great loss, and our appreciation for a job well done by Mr. John.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN TABER

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to have served with John Taber on the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee for a number of years. While we did not always agree 100 percent on all matters, our relationship was always close and cordial, and my admiration for him continued to increase as we worked together through the years. He was always fair and considerate in his approach to committee affairs, and as the late Speaker Rayburn once said, "His word was his bond." He was a man you could always trust.

During his 40 years of service in the Congress and as a leading member of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Taber never varied from his belief that Government expenditures must be curtailed wherever possible to maintain the financial integrity of the Nation. He dedicated his intelligence, his ability, and his energy to the proposition that Federal budgets should be reduced wherever and whenever possible to the barest minimum necessary to meet the public need.

He once stated on the floor of the House:

> I appreciate that mine is perhaps a lone voice in the wilderness, but I am expressing the sentiment and issuing a warning that I believe needs to be issued to all America at the present time. That warning is to balance our budget or face disaster.

While many of us—I suppose we should say a majority of us—regarded his views on general fiscal policy in the later years as somewhat dated, all of us who knew him and worked with him always admired and respected the depth of his convictions and the breadth of his devotion to the pursuit of what he saw as the public interest. Never once did I see Mr. Taber put self-interest above the national interest—nor do I believe he ever did. As has so well been said, America can never have too many John Tabers.

I consider it a great privilege to have served with John Taber. I consider it a great honor to have been included among his friends. His passing was a great loss to all of us who knew him well, as well as to the people of this great Nation.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, we gather at this hour in this hallowed House Chamber to honor a departed colleague, the Honorable John Taber, who passed away last November 22 in his home at Auburn, N.Y.

Later today every seat in this Chamber will be filled, every chair in this balcony will be occupied as we gather to listen to the President deliver his state of the Union message. The klieg lights will blaze, the television cameras will instantly carry the Presidential image to the Nation and the radio microphones will record every word for the waiting public.

The atmosphere of this evening will be quite different from the scene that greets us at this moment as we quietly and reverently pay tribute to a departed patriot. Not that John Taber would have wanted the hoopla of a television performance or a joint session of the Congress, but his accomplishments and contributions to America certainly warrant such treatment.

One thing is certain. John Taber would have been intensely interested in the state of the Union message we will receive today. He would have been keenly aware of the problems facing our Nation. He would have listened intently for clues to the budget message that will be received later this month.

This one-time chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations had a tremendous grasp of the fiscal problems facing the Nation and was a vigorous protector of the people's resources. Those of us who now serve on the Appropriations Committee cannot help but reflect on the principles and accomplishments of this former chairman. Perhaps John Taber's approach to fiscal problems can best be described as soundly conservative. His efforts saved the American taxpayers untold billions of dollars, but a really deserving project or request never floundered for lack of funds. It is well for us to recall the life of John Taber as we now tackle the sober problems of financing a war and putting pyramiding domestic spending in proper perspective.

John Taber knew that no government can long endure by spending more than it receives or by delaying payments to some future time. As a member and chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and as a member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, John Taber contributed greatly to the well-being of his Nation and his people. We owe him a tremendous debt of gratitude and can only repay that debt by following his example as we approach the grave problems facing our Republic.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for an opportunity to pay my respects to the late Congressman John Taber, of New York. John Taber was a Member of great power and distinction in this body. He served with dedication through some 36 years, during many of which he was either chairman or ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Taber and I disagreed on many issues. We stood on opposite sides of the fence on a substantial proportion of the major questions of the day. But he was a man of integrity who fought hard and openly for that in which he believed.

He was a politician of the old school and he was respected for it.

I join with my colleagues who mourn the passing of John Taber and I extend my condolences to his survivors.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened by the passing of my friend of long standing and our very distinguished former colleague, the able, distinguished gentleman from New York, Hon. John Taber.

Congressman Taber served with outstanding distinction in this body for many years. During his service, he made a memorable record here, not only as a great, devoted, and respected leader of the Appropriations Committee, but as a great American, faithfully, earnestly, and ably serving our country.

I thought a great deal of John Taber. He was a sound, solid, devoted public servant. He was rugged of character and conviction, irrevocably committed to free American institutions.

He had a keen, alert mind and was an untiring, deeply dedicated worker.

While he was very considerate of others, he expected others to be considerate of him. He was invariably willing to listen to the appeals of others, even though he did not agree with them.

He was a keen, able debater, and at times a dynamic debater, and he did not hesitate to express his views with force and conviction.

He was a man of exceptional vigor of expression and resolution of purpose.

John Taber was a dear friend of mine, and I had occasion to talk with him on numerous occasions about legislative and governmental matters, and I always found him to be reasonable and generous and willing to go out of his way to be helpful.

I held John Taber in highest esteem and regarded him as one of the finest Americans I have known. The records of this body are replete with evidence of his splendid service, his leadership, his accomplishments, his devotion to duty, and he will long be remembered here.

In my mind and heart, I will always carry with me some of the most happy recollections and fondest memories of this great son of the State of New York who served here for so many years as the conscientious devoted servant of the Nation.

I am very sorry and greatly saddened, indeed, to learn of the passing of this great American and I tender to his family my most heartfelt sympathy for the loss of such dearly beloved one and such a fine public servant and patriot who served his district and his country with honor, distinction, and achievement for so many years.

We will always remember John Taber because he was a valued friend, an outstanding Congressman and a great American.

May the good Lord bless and keep him in His eternal home.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the late Representative John Taber rendered long and valuable service to this Nation.

Through the years, as chairman and ranking minority member of the House Appropriations Committee, he was a stalwart in the ranks of the conservatives. He abhored wasteful spending and never ceased to oppose the increasing and unmanageable Federal debt.

It was with great regret that I witnessed his voluntary retirement from the House of Representatives, and it was with a feeling of personal loss that I learned of his death.

Mrs. Gross joins me in extending sympathy to Mrs. Taber and other members of the family.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to join today in paying my deepest respect to the memory of our former colleague and friend, the late John Taber, of New York.

Mr. Taber served with great distinction for many years on the House Committee on Appropriations and it was my privilege to serve with him on the committee from 1958 until his retirement at the close of the 87th Congress.

He was extremely able and had an outstanding amount of knowledge about the operations of government. His reputation as a stanch fighter for fiscal responsibility and economy in government was both widely known and richly deserved.

John Taber's contributions and accomplishments were many. Our Nation is better off for his having served so conscientiously and well in the House of Representatives.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late John Taber, who so ably represented the State of New York in the Congress for almost 40 years.

John Taber was an outstanding legislator with a deep sense of fiscal responsibility. A man of good judgment, he had firm convictions and the courage to stand behind those convictions. He was blessed with the ability to express his thoughts with great clarity.

With his retirement in 1962 the American people lost one of their ablest public servants and the Congress lost one of its most effective lawmakers.

I will never forget John Taber. When I came to the House of Representatives in 1953, John was chairman of the Appropriations Committee, holding one of the most responsible and time-consuming positions of the House. I learned quickly just how considerate he was to freshmen Members. He always had the time and was always willing to counsel the junior Members. Even though we were of opposite political faiths, he was very helpful to me. I valued his friendship most highly.

To his son, Mrs. Haley and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the fine service and to the long years of dedication to the House of Representatives rendered by our former colleague, John Taber.

Many great and distinguished men have served in the Congress of the United States from New York, but I know of no man more dedicated to his own State and to his country. John Taber was a legislator who served the public interest with all the strength and capacity at his command. His sense of conviction, his purpose, and his understanding won the respect and admiration of his colleagues and the gratitude of his constituents. It was a great honor to have served with him and to have been numbered among his friends.

Mrs. King and I express to his family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, death removed one of this century's legislative giants when it claimed our former colleague, the Honorable John Taber, at the age of 85 last fall.

One of the most proud moments of my 11 years on Capitol Hill was the January day in 1959 when I learned I had been named to serve under Mr. Taber on the powerful House Committee on Appropriations. He had become a virtual legend in his own time for the depth and breadth of his fiscal knowledge. He served as chairman of the committee during the 80th and 83d Congresses and was ranking minority member at the time I was appointed.

There have been few minds as keen as John Taber's and no newcomer to the complex activities of the Appropriations Committee could have asked for a more brilliant counselor. I shall always be grateful for the courtesy and patience he showed me during my early days on the committee and for the guidance he generously continued to give me during the succeeding years. When he retired at the close of the 87th Congress, in 1962, he had given 40 years of his life to public service in the House of Representatives, and had saved the taxpayers literally billions of dollars in that time.

He now has joined the ranks of illustrious Appropriations chairmen whose memories are a continued inspiration to those of us who have been privileged to serve under them.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that John Taber was a man of great integrity and that he had a deep sense of fiscal responsibility. For these qualities he will be long remembered, not only among his colleagues but also former ones. He will always occupy a spot of special regard, however, for his lesser known qualities of humor and charitability among his closer friends. His many years of service in the House elevated him to the top spot on the Appropriations Committee where he served conscientiously and vigorously. As much as I admired his fiscal capability, I will always remember him with fondness for his delightful qualities as well. He was indeed a great American of whom we can be very proud.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the passing of my good friend and distinguished former colleague, John Taber, of New York, during our adjournment period.

As a freshman Congressman in the 83d Congress, no man did more to help me learn and understand the workings of the Congress. His guiding hand was an inspiration to me in my early years as a Member of this body.

It was my privilege to serve with John Taber on the Appropriations Committee for the first 10 years of my service here in the Congress, and I shall always look back on those years and on John Taber's influence with a fond memory of what he meant to me and to all his colleagues in the Congress. No Member of Congress has had greater influence on me or been as helpful to me as John Taber.

Mr. Speaker, John Taber has been sorely missed in the Congress since he retired in 1962. He will now be sorely missed by the thousands who knew and loved this man who exemplified all that is good and fine in a Member of Congress.

I would like to express my deepest sympathies to the family of John Taber and to his many friends who will always remember him as a great Member of Congress, an outstanding American leader, and a true friend.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Congressman Taber left a great heritage to his family and to our country—for he was a man of courage and character, of tremendous ability, which he always used for the public good. From the first day of my service with him here he manifested a personal interest in me and my efforts and he never failed to exemplify kindness to all who knew him. Our country is stronger because of his battles for fiscal soundness and for the other battles he waged for our benefit.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, John Taber, Clarence Cannon, and I came to Congress together. We were Members of the 68th Congress. Clarence Cannon has gone to his rest and now John Taber follows. Thus, in their passing there is for me more than a tinge of sadness. We had shared many memories and lived through much of the same history.

John Taber brought to bear upon his work the highest integrity of purpose and conviction. Throughout his years in Congress he placed always first the welfare of the Nation. He never ceased to do battle against extravagance and unwarranted spending. His constituency had every reason to love him and it did, and repeatedly sent him back to Congress until he retired.

John Taber left an indelible mark upon the tablets of history of this body. Public service at best is often arduous and wearisome, but nevertheless rewarding. We who knew and loved John Taber will not subscribe to the cynicism of "The evil that men do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones." The good he did is not interred with his bones. It will remain forever a part of the greatness of this country.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the late John Taber's great pride was the Committee on Appropriations. He was a real friend to every Member who served on that committee, but I suppose it was a natural development that he should take particular interest in Republican Members who developed under his tutelage. He was solicitous for our welfare, and tried to give the opinions and desires of each of us all the consideration they deserved.

Although it is well known that Mr. Taber was an avid cutter of budgets, his feeling of reverence for the Congress of the United States and his fine sense of patriotism often caused him to prepare appropriations for purposes which he did not approve. I do not imagine any Member liked our programs of foreign aid any less than did John Taber. However, when the Congress authorized a program for foreign aid, Mr. Taber proceeded to fund it to the best of his ability. He was the first chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, serving in that capacity while chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations in the 80th Congress. Mr. Taber was a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations until he retired from this body.

The guidance which John Taber gave to the various departments and bureaus during the appropriations process have caused him to do their work better and with less expense to the taxpayer than they would otherwise have done. Our Government is more efficient, and the taxpayer is certainly better off, because John Taber was willing to be a watchdog of the Treasury and an implacable enemy of bureaucratic waste.

In his passing the United States has lost a fine citizen and the State of New York has lost an able and devoted son. Many people, both here and in his home, have lost a loyal and devoted friend. Mrs. Rhodes joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his family.

Mrs. **KELLY**. Mr. Speaker, although the Honorable John Taber left our ranks several years ago, he has been remembered with fond and vivid memories.

Now as we gather to pay tribute to his memory, I must note not only his fiery stands in the House but his judicial and legislative service to his loyal constituency. The voters of the former 38th District of the State of New York brought John Taber back to the House of Representatives again and again for 20 consecutive terms and he served under the leadership of 7 different Presidents.

As ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Appropriations, he performed a vital national service by advocating and fighting for a conservative fiscal policy. The era of his leadership was noteworthy as a stimulant to the two-party system of Government.

A strong man, a good man, a man concerned with the security of our country, his spirit is indeed missed in these chambers.

It is with pride that I acknowledge the virtues of this great New Yorker and look back with gratification on being one of his associates and colleagues

Mr. **DULSKI**. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we in Congress pay tribute today to the memory of a distinguished gentleman, our former colleague, the Honorable John Taber, who represented the 36th District of New York for 40 years before his retirement.

It was with profound sorrow that I learned of his death last fall.

Congressman Taber was a courageous man, one who was not afraid to stand alone if necessary. He was a forthright man and an honest man. It was my rare privilege to serve with him in the 86th and 87th Congresses. I was tremendously impressed by his remarkable abilities, and his intimate knowledge of the intricacies of the Federal budget.

Congressman Taber was indeed an inspiring example of political service.

Mr. **PELLY**. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able, conscientious, and influential Members of this House when I first came to Congress was the late John Taber, of New York. He had a wonderful grasp of government and complete courage to vote his convictions.

When he retired in 1962, it was because he did not feel able to continue, physically and mentally, to carry out his responsibilities. This was a real loss to the House and to the country, but I felt he was right, because he knew he was unable to carry on as he had done when he was a younger man.

Personally, I learned a great deal from John Taber, but most of all, I admired his integrity. His courage and example will always be an inspiration to me. He was a truly great man and I and many others are better for having been associated with him.

Mr. Speaker, one thing I recall about John Taber was his human understanding and warmth under a gruff exterior. Another quality I remember about him was that when he knew he did not have the votes to prevail, he did not complain or capitulate. Instead, he made his argument and then accepted defeat in good humor.

Today, much of my viewpoint and many of the opinions I express are the result of listening to John Taber. He was no orator, but he had the figures and could forcefully defend his position. He was always highly respected by Members on both sides of the aisle.

His collaboration and long friendship and association with the late Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, was widely known and served as a wholesome influence in maintaining good legislative procedure.

As it must to all of us, death came to John Taber. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us try to emulate his fine record on behalf of the Nation and fiscal understanding.

I was greatly distressed to read of his death, but his work was done—and well done—so, in spite of sorrow and a sense of loss, those of us who knew him, it seems to me, should emphasize how fortunate we were. For that, we are all thankful. John Taber is at rest and his problems are over; we are thankful for that, too.

Mrs. **HANSEN** of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join today the other Members of this House and pay tribute to the memory of John Taber who served this Nation long and served this Nation most effectively for over 40 years.

Congressman Taber was one of the most respected Members of the House Appropriations Committee and he was also considered as one of the watchdogs of the U.S. Treasury.

Even after his retirement he continued to speak in defense of the ideas in which he believed so thoroughly.

His steadfastness, courage, integrity, and a deep sense of responsibility to the American taxpayer will always be remembered.

I extend my deepest and sincerest sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. **ROONEY** of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the Honorable John Taber, of New York. I knew John Taber for almost 20 of the 40 years he served here in this House. I particularly came to know him through my service on the House Committee on Appropriations of which he was a member of 39 years. While I must admit that on many an occasion we differed markedly on policy I must at the same time salute his lifetime goal—efficient and economic government for the benefit of the taxpayers and country as a whole. In the years that I had the honor of serving with John Taber on the Appropriations Committee, I also came to know him not as the gruff, angry man as the press so often likes to depict what it calls congressional "watchdogs," but rather as a fine, warm, friendly, and considerate man.

When John Taber resigned from the House of Representatives in 1962 after 40 years of service, the loss was felt not only by the people of his district in New York, but by every Member of this body—regardless of which side of the aisle he occupied.

I have lost a firm, true, and respected friend in the passing of John Taber.

Mr. **EVINS** of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John Taber, a distinguished former Member of the Congress, passed away while Congress stood in adjournment. It is my purpose today to pay a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of John Taber whose courage and adherence to principle stand unsurpassed in the Congress.

When I first came to Congress—the 80th Congress—John Taber was the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations. I admired him then and later served with Congressman Taber as a member of this committee. My respect and admiration for Congressman Taber continued to grow. We disagreed at times but in disagreement I never failed to respect my colleague.

He stood forthrightly for what he believed—and he believed in the positions he took. Congressman Taber stood for fiscal responsibility and he espoused what he consider to be sound budgetary principles.

He was a colleague for whom all of us who served with him had the highest regard. His integrity was of the highest degree and his devotion to his district, to his State, and to the Nation was absolute.

John Taber was a dedicated American, a patriot, a servant of the people, a friend, and a devoted believer in this great institution, the Congress.

He served long and he served well, and was a stalwart citizen.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the late John Taber was a most valuable Member of this body. He served with great distinction for nearly 40 years. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, once as chairman, he became known as the watchdog of the Treasury. In that capacity he was instrumental in saving American taxpayers untold billions of dollars. It is doubtful if any one Member has ever done more in that respect.

John Taber was indeed a great American. He was devoted to the cause of good government, of sensible restraint in the function of the Central Government, and of those fundamentals which make the competitive free enterprise succeed. During his long period of distinguished service Mr. Taber did more than his share in the preservation of our institutions. We need more men of his dedication if our Republic is to be preserved.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD, following the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the life and achievements of the late John Taber.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE HERBERT COVINGTON BONNER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, we pause to pay tribute to our beloved colleague, HERBERT BONNER, who has passed from the shores of sound to the realm of silence. He has answered his last rollcall.

By his intelligent devotion to duty, his great fidelity to truth, and by the honest and courageous manner in which he discharged all of the vital functions of high office, he endeared himself to his colleagues in Congress and to his countrymen. Modesty and simplicity marked his life; truth was his master; and his unblemished character was the tower of his strength. HERBERT BONNER was a dedicated public servant and was held in high esteem by the Members of Congress with whom he served so long and so well and by all the Presidents of our Nation with whom he served. He was near and dear to the people of the district which he so well and ably represented, and all the people of our State and of our Nation owe him a great debt of gratitude. He made many great and grand contributions to the welfare and happiness of the people of his district, State, and Nation. As chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries he had jurisdiction over our merchant ships which sail the bosoms of the seven seas and visit all the ports of the world in the prosecution of peaceful and profitable commerce. The Coast Guard which has saved the lives of thousands of people is under the jurisdiction of his great committee. The Coast Guard never had a better friend, nor have merchant seamen ever had a greater champion than HERBERT BONNER. He was worthy of the faith and confidence of the thousands of friends who trusted him.

JUST BE GLAD

(By James Whitcomb Riley)

O heart of mine, we shouldn't worry so!
What we've missed of calm we couldn't have, you know!
What we've met of stormy pain,
And of sorrow's driving rain,
We can better meet again, if it blow!
We've erred in that dark hour we've known,
When our tears fell with the shower, all alone!
Were not shine and shower blent
As the gracious Master meant?
Let us temper our content with His own.

For, we know, not every morrow can be sad;
So, forgetting all the sorrow we have had,
Let us fold away our fears,
And put by our foolish tears,
And through all the coming years just be glad.

Let us be glad that we knew and loved HERBERT BONNER, and let us today pay tribute to the nobility of his soul. We cannot beautify his character, nor can we exalt his life. We can at this moment only commune with the spirit of our devoted friend.

Mr. Speaker, I insert as a part of my remarks appropriate editorials which appeared in the November 8 edition of the Daily News, and which were written by those who knew and understood and appreciated the true worth of HERBERT COVINGTON BONNER:

[From the Daily News, Nov. 8, 1965]

HERBERT C. BONNER, A GREAT AMERICAN

HERBERT COVINGTON BONNER, truly a great American, has answered his last rollcall.

Here was a man who for most of his adult life had been in the public, serving fully and capably his fellow man, knowing full well that when one serves well his fellow man, he has served his God better.

Here was a man who never stopped to ask "what is politically wise?" Rather he asked only "what is humanly right?"

Here was a man who lived with his political future in his hands, but with his Nation, his State, and his beloved First Congressional District in his heart.

Here was a man who chose all his life to light a candle rather than to curse the darkness. Along the way he lit many candles and in this hour of sadness the lights of love, faith, honor, truth, self-respect, and tremendous dedication glow more brightly, as the man lies in stillness, than they ever did in life.

In his days here we all knew he was a wonderful person. In death we realize now how much greatness we have lost. His strength lay in his courage, his courage in his faith, and his faith stood every test and was never found wanting.

Here was a man who spent his happiest hours here with his own "homefolks," as he so proudly and so often said. No heart was bigger; no soul more generous. His entire life was lived with genuine kindness and love for all and with bitterness and malice toward none.

Here was a man set apart in his generation, a man beloved by so many because he loved so many, a man who has so many monuments which he built and which shall stand as long as one of us remains who knew him and loved him.

HERBERT BONNER, for us, cannot die. Like a ship sailing out of harbor, we lose sight of the physical being, but what he did for so many and what he meant to so many are matters which death cannot take away nor time dim. The candles he lit in his life have served not only to chase away the darkness, but in greater and more glowing terms, they have kindled the fires of hope, freedom, and progress for so many whose steps otherwise might have faltered as they groped along life's pathway. From his life, we the living, can find new faith, and from his works, we the humble, can find new inspiration.

HERBERT BONNER finished his journey on Sunday. What a beautiful thought to feel that he deserved to go away on the day of rest.

Those he loved and those by whom he was beloved are one today in sadness, while at the same time we can look upon his life proudly and say "there was a man." He does not die; he lives forever in the hearts of those he served; he was a joy to himself and an inspiration to those about him.

Yes, he was a great American because he was first a great human being.

[From the Daily News, Nov. 8, 1965]

MILLIGAN STEW

(By Dave Milligan)

There was not a vindictive bone in his body.

When we were on opposite sides of a bombing range squabble, he treated me with such friendship, cordiality and warmth that there were times I didn't know which side I was on * * *.

That's when I found out why people voted for HERBERT BONNER, because knowing him personally, it was impossible to vote against him.

I was chatting with Mr. R. S. Spencer, Sr., of Englehard the other day and I found out something else about him.

Years ago, shortly after the turn of the century, Mr. BONNER was a tobacco and snuff salesman.

This is what Mr. Spencer said: "HERBERT use to sell me snuff and tobacco when I opened my store 60 years ago, I was only a boy, and HERBERT was too.

"He would come down from Washington on a horse and buggy, and as you can guess we didn't have much in the way of roads back then, but, that's the only way he could get there, so that's the way he came."

That's 75 miles by horse and buggy.

And he wasn't sure at all of making a sale.

Edmund Harding said he traveled about five counties on horse and buggy. So, if somebody tells you they don't make them like HERBERT BONNER anymore, he's probably right.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Henderson] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Scott] be permitted to extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, during the 5 years I have served as a Member of this body, I have seen on many occasions the flag over the Capitol flying at half mast. I recall when it was so lowered upon the death of President John F. Kennedy. I remember when the body of Gen. Douglas MacArthur lay in state in the rotunda. I have recollections of the death of such congressional giants as the late Sam Rayburn and Clarence Cannon, but none of them came quite so close to home as the recent death of my respected colleague, Herbert Bonner.

Having served as a Member of Congress for 25 years and for some 15 years before that as secretary to Congressman Lindsay Warren, of North Carolina, who later became Comptroller General of the United States, Herbert had been on the Washington scene far longer than the great majority of his colleagues. I never tired of hearing his accounts of Washington in general and the Hill in particular during the early twenties when life was simpler, problems less complex, but no less pressing or important.

But unlike many men of his years, he never lived in the past or failed to recognize the changes wrought by time. He kept constantly abreast of current problems—both those national in scope and nature and those of particular or peculiar interest to the people in his own congressional district.

No Congressman ever kept more attuned to the thinking and the wishes of his constituents, or worked any harder or more effectively to promote their interests and well-being.

I learned a great deal from Herbert Bonner. Some of it came through verbal advice, but a considerable portion from observation of a skilled politician at work.

He will be sorely missed: by his colleagues here in the Congress, by governmental leaders and officials at all levels of government, but most of all by the thousands of common people who were his constituents and whose cause he ardently championed.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the State of North Carolina, the Congress, and our country have suffered a great loss through the passing of Herbert Covington Bonner on the morning of November 7, 1965.

I want to join our colleagues in paying tribute to our departed friend and express my deep sorrow that he has been taken from us. I was proud to number him among my closest and most cherished friends and will miss his easy and friendly good humor and his wise counsel.

Congressman Bonner was born in Washington, Beaufort County, N.C., on May 16, 1891. He came to Washington in 1940 as secretary to Congressman Lindsay C. Warren, a position he held for 16 years. Upon Mr. Warren's retirement from Congress and his subsequent appointment as Comptroller General of the United States by the late President Roosevelt, Herbert Bonner announced his candidacy for Congress and was overwhelmingly elected on November 5, 1940, to the 76th Congress to fill the unexpired term of Congressman Warren. On the same day he was elected to the 77th Congress and was thereafter elected to each succeeding Congress up to and including the 89th.

No words of mine could add anything to the fine record Mr. Bonner has made as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The written record is an appropriate and eloquent eulogy to him and is replete with proof of his legislative contributions in all areas coming within the jurisdiction of his committee. Nor were his contributions confined to the work of his committee. He kept abreast of all of the more important issues coming before the Congress from time to time and has left a lasting imprint upon the legislative history of our country.

During the 9 years I had the honor and pleasure of being associated with him, I came to love, admire, and respect Herbert Bonner for his high Christian character, his ability as a legislator, and his unflinching loyalty to duty and friends. His manner of life, his achievements, and his faithful service to his country will long serve as an inspiration to others. I extend to his lovely wife, Eva, and all of his family, my very deep sympathy. May the days ahead lighten the burden of sorrow occasioned by their sad loss.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Herbert C. Bonner the House has lost a genuinely able and dedicated Member, and I have lost a warm friend. It has been my good fortune to know Herb Bonner for almost 30 years. When he was elected to the House in 1940, to succeed Lindsay Warren, we were already acquainted with each other through his service as the invaluable secretary to Representative Warren. That acquaintanceship soon ripened into real friendship, and it was my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries immediately after the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Upon becoming a Member of this House, he brought with him an experience that few Members have had as a result of his 16 years, beginning in the 69th Congress in the office of Representative Warren. As a member and chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Herb Bonner has been the author and prime mover of some of the most important legislation enacted by the Congress in the past 20 years. His knowledge of shipping laws and problems was phenomenal. His efforts to strengthen the U.S. Coast Guard established him as one of the best friends of that great branch of the Armed Forces.

Herb Bonner was, first of all, a dedicated American. What was best for our country was his first concern and dominated all his actions. During World War I, he served overseas as a noncommissioned officer in the armed infantry with the 81st Division.

Through his many activities in his congressional district in North Carolina, Herb Bonner earned for himself the affection and regard of his constituents and proved himself to be a real humanitarian. We need men like Herb Bonner in the Congress and in every aspect of American life. We are all going to miss him. To his beloved widow and family, I extend my sincere condolences. I know that my colleagues share their grief.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of the late Herbert C. Bonner on November 7, 1965, the people of North Carolina and the Nation lost an outstanding Representative in the Congress. It is with a deep sense of sadness and personal loss that I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to this great American, who has laid aside the burdens of this life for a richer reward.

I was shocked and saddened when the news reached me that Herbert Bonner had passed away. He had been in Congress for many years when I took my seat as a Member of the 85th Congress on January 3, 1957.

Prior to coming to Congress I had met Herbert Bonner, and I was familiar with his great record of service to the people of his district, State, and Nation. During the years that I was privileged to serve with him in the House of Representatives I grew to love and admire the many fine qualities exemplified in his sterling character and in his devotion to his work in behalf of his district, State, and Nation. I grew to respect his wise judgment and his views on matters affecting the national interest.

Herbert Bonner had a rich background of public service. By experience and training he was superbly fitted to be an outstanding Congressman. Prior to taking his seat in the 77th Congress he had served as secretary to another great North Carolinian, former Congressman Lindsay Warren.

He measured up in every respect to the demanding duties and responsibilities of his high office. Yet in his approach to his work and in his contact with his fellow man Herbert Bonner displayed a deep and abiding understanding and appreciation of human nature. This characteristic endeared him to all who had the privilege to know him and to work with him.

Herbert Bonner was a patriot, a Christian gentleman, and a statesman. He was proud of the fact that he had served his country as a sergeant in World War I and had fought overseas with the 81st Division, U.S. Army. He was a strong and persistent supporter of national defense. As chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee he had an outstanding record of service.

His State and Nation will miss him in the trying days that lie ahead. All of us, however, can take pride in his many accomplishments. We can take renewed strength in the principles for which he labored.

A great oak has crashed to the earth and against the sky there is a blank space. To the members of Herbert Bonner's family Mrs. Whitener and I extend our deepest sympathy and sincere condolences on the great loss which they have sustained.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished friends from North Carolina in their tribute to our late, beloved colleague Herbert Bonner. Representative Bonner was a pillar of strength in this House for many years. Chairman of the great Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he was a master in his legislative field, He was devoted to the cause of the American Merchant Marine. As much as any Member who ever served in the House, he understood its importance to our safety and our security. The last speech he made was a plea on behalf of the American Merchant Marine.

Congressman Bonner served with distinction. He served with rare dignity. He served with great credit to his district, his State, and his Nation. He was a constructive Member of the House. He was a conscientious Member, a studious Member. At every moment of the day he was a gentleman—kind, courteous, and considerate.

On more than one occasion I have been with Herbert Bonner in his district. It was a joy to observe the esteem and affection in which he was held by the people he represented. They loved him. They trusted him. They looked to him for leadership in the great issues which confront our Nation. As for me, I shall miss him as long as I live. He was one of the best friends I had in this House. His death has left a great void not only in the legislative operations of this Chamber, but in the heart of every one of us.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his family, to all his host of friends and his loved ones.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. Kornegay].

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor, though a painful one, to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a friend and former associate—Herbert C. Bonner.

Even as we meet now to pay our respects, it seems strange to me that he is not here among us—to share in the work and deliberations of this great body. For, he served here not only long—for a quarter of a century—but he served here with distinction.

With his death, the First Congressional District of North Carolina lost an able champion, the State of North Carolina lost a distinguished representative, the Nation lost a noble statesman, and the world's waterways lost a fearless pilot.

We shall all miss his wise counsel and diligent work in behalf of his district, his State, and his Nation. But those who were privileged, as I was, to know him personally will miss even more the warmth and sincerity of his friendship. There will always be a void which can only be filled by the memory of a man who was small in physical stature but big in heart and accomplishments.

I was proud to call Herbert Bonner friend. I valued that friendship as I shall his memory. I extend my heartfelt sympathies to his family and many friends.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Garmatz].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago I had the sad duty and, yet, the signal honor, to be a member of the official congressional delegation to go to Washington, N.C., to attend the last rites for our beloved friend and colleague, Herbert C. Bonner, who left us in the early hours of Sunday, the 7th of November.

I had the privilege of serving in Congress with Herb Bonner ever since 1947 when I first came to Congress. We served on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, an assignment meaningful and dear to both of us, since 1949.

He was my friend.

For almost 11 years now, since Herbert C. Bonner became chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, we have stood close together on the majority side of the committee. It was always a pleasure and a privilege to counsel with him. His views on committee matters were always fair and impartial. Though he had short patience with those who tried to dissemble, he was always patient with those who appeared before us in sincerity.

Herb Bonner was a statesman. He was a creator in legislative matters. He not only gave a ready ear to those who approached him with proposals in accord with the constitutional right of petition, but he often vigorously took the initiative to advance worthy causes or explore fields which had otherwise been neglected or pursued too parochially.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he has been justly acclaimed for the leadership he asserted in the many fields under our committee's jurisdiction: safety of life at sea following the *Andrea Doria-Stockholm* collision, the Isthmian Canal studies, the transpacific and transatlantic superliners, the unique and highly successful Boating Safety Act, the maritime labor management studies of 1955 and 1962, the nuclear ship *Savannah* legislation, the atomic icebreaker legislation, his recognition of the significance of and action in the vital field of oceanography, the reorganization of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, significant efforts in behalf of our ailing domestic shipping industry, the legislation to require authorization of major programs of acquisition, construction, and improvement in the U.S. Coast Guard, and many other things.

He was a broad and intense man who gave wholly of himself to the public service to which he was devoted.

Perhaps the most moving testimonial of all to the greatness of Herbert Bonner was the splendid service rendered to him at his funeral in his hometown of Washington, N.C. The reverence and human respect in which he was held was everywhere evident, from the crowds of neighbors who filled the beautiful St. Peter's Episcopal Church to the outpouring of affection shown by the hundreds of schoolchildren who reverently lined the way to his last resting place.

We who knew him, are happy that our ways ran together for a while.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Lennon].

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, the State of North Carolina, the Congress, and this Nation of ours have lost a very distinguished and dedicated public servant. Those of us who are on the floor today have lost a very personable, winsome, lovable friend.

Before I became a Member of this House on January 3, 1957, it was my privilege, during 1953 and 1954, to visit rather extensively in the great First Congressional District of North Carolina, so ably represented by Herb Bonner. There I found the respect, the esteem, and the affection with which he was held by all the people of his district.

Mr. Speaker, since becoming a Member of this body in January of 1957 I have found that Herb Bonner was held in the highest esteem and respect and affection by the full membership of this House.

I have been privileged during the past 9 years to serve as a member of the committee chaired by Herb Bonner, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

I have never known a more knowledgeable man and I never expect to know a more knowledgeable, interested, or concerned man than Herb Bonner was with respect to our national maritime policy.

He was a man of great tolerance. He was tolerant of everything but intolerance. He was a man with a very keen sense of humor. He was a man with a deep sympathy for the problems and personal sufferings and conditions which existed in our world and with individuals.

I counted him a good friend. I have lost a good friend. My wife Kay and I want to join with his other friends on the floor today to extend to his beloved and attractive wife, Miss Eva, as I have always called her, our sincere sympathy for the loss of a man who will always be remembered for his great service.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy and sad heart that I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the memory of Herbert Covington Bonner. Although Herbert had been in declining health for most of 1965, his death came as a profound shock to Mrs. Jonas and to me.

For a number of years we had lived in the same apartment house with the Bonners. Hardly a day passed that Eva and Annie Elliott did not spend some time together. They corresponded during congressional recesses, frequently borrowed household items from each other, and exchanged gifts. I cannot count the times Herbert would knock at our door to share with us something special Eva had prepared for supper, and frequently I carried something to their apartment which Annie Elliott had prepared and which we wished to share with them. We often visited back and forth and Herbert and I often rode down to the Capitol together. Ours was therefore a close, personal friendship which ripened with the years, and through this close and intimate relationship I came to know Herbert better than would have been possible through mere association in the Congress. It is because of this close friendship that we felt such a sense of personal loss in his passing.

When I sat in the quiet church in little Washington attending the funeral services for my departed friend, the words of John Donne, written about 350 years ago, expressed my feelings on that sad occasion:

> Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee (me).

And yet perhaps Angelo Patri best described the feeling I had when my friend died:

> In one sense there is no death. The life of a soul lasts beyond his departure. You will always feel that life touching yours, that voice speaking to you, that spirit looking out to other eyes, talking to you in the familiar things he touched, worked with, loved as familiar friends. He lives on in your life and in the lives of others who knew him.

So on this sad occasion I speak not of this man's distinguished public career; that subject will be dealt with by others who were more closely associated with him in his congressional work. I speak not of the leadership he displayed as chairman of the great Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. That subject will be discussed by others who worked with him from day to day in the committee room. I speak not of the great loss suffered in his death by his district, State and Nation; others will devote their attention to that subject.

I speak of the deep sense of personal loss my wife and I feel over the going away of a dear friend who will be sorely missed as the days and years go passing by.

To his grieving Eva, who was Herbert's constant companion through the years, Annie Elliott and I send our profound sympathy. She has lost a gentle, kind, considerate, and devoted husband. We grieve with her because we have lost a tried and true friend.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Harvey].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much having the opportunity to participate in this eulogy to our friend from North Carolina, Mr. Bonner. When I first came to the House in 1947, it was my privilege to serve on the committee now known as the Committee on Government Operations of which Mr. Bonner was a member. He became one of my first friends and I am happy to say also became one of my best friends during the intervening years.

My first experience in traveling with the committee came in 1949 when a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations made a trip to Europe to observe the operation of the Marshall Plan. It was on this occasion that I had a real opportunity to observe the fine wisdom, tact, diplomacy, and understanding of Herbert Bonner. Indeed, he steered our committee through very many troublesome experiences because Europe at that time was still in the throes of the aftermath of World War II and we were in a position of trying to determine what we could and should do to alleviate the situation.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have lost a fine friend and North Carolina has lost a fine Congressman. I would say that he was truly more than a Representative from the State of North Carolina, he was a representative of the people of the United States. It was my great privilege just to have known Herbert Bonner and to have profited by his fine character. Mrs. Harvey and I join in extending to his widow, Eva, our sincerest and deepest sympathy in this hour of her grief.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Taylor].

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my distinguished colleagues in paying respect to our late and esteemed colleague, the Honorable Herbert C. Bonner. The people of North Carolina and the Nation realize that in Herbert Bonner they had a great and dedicated representative in the U.S. Congress.

Congressman Bonner was a man of the people. He served as a sergeant in World War I, and throughout life he was a soldier in the ranks. He remained humble and close to the people whom he served. He kept an open mind and a responsive heart to the needs of the people. Even though he walked with kings, he kept the common touch. He loved the Democratic Party and his loyalty to that party even during times of storm and stress was firm and consistent.

Congressman Bonner's fairness and fine qualities of character made him a friend of Congressmen of both political parties. He established a standard of excellence in public service which all of us might well try to emulate. He added dignity, respect, and integrity to politics.

Mrs. Taylor and I also lived in the same apartment house with Herbert and Eva Bonner. We have never had better neighbors. When they would go home on weekends they would frequently bring us fresh fish from the North Carolina coast. Mr. Bonner did not miss an opportunity to do a favor for a friend and in turn he was held in high esteem and affection by the Members of Congress, by the people of his congressional district, and by his friends throughout the world.

As a Member of Congress for 25 years, Mr. Bonner never lost faith in the principles of duty and devotion to the causes of freedom. We can keep faith with him now by continuing to fight for fair play, and justice, and freedom, and Americanism—as he would have done. Mr. Bonner was a friend to Mrs. Taylor and me, and we shall miss him.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Downing].

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, it was my sad duty also to be present at the funeral of our beloved friend, Herbert C. Bonner, in the beautiful little town of Washington, in his beloved State of North Carolina. At that funeral there were literally thousands of people, sad people, from all walks of life, who had come to pay a final tribute to a beloved friend. It was an impressive display of devotion and love for their fellow man. It was my great privilege to have known Mr. Bonner. It was another great privilege to have worked with him. I loved him as a man, I respected him as a colleague and I shall cherish his memory forever.

Mr. Speaker, the domestic maritime industries have lost a close friend and a strong advocate.

For more than 10 years, Herbert C. Bonner dedicated himself to the creation of legislation that would vitalize our Nation's maritime fleet and domestic fisheries. His chairmanship of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee spanned difficult years for the United States sea-based industries. But Herbert Bonner's patient legislative leadership has enabled our domestic maritime and fisheries interests to make progress—even in the face of harsh competition on the seas and hard economic ceilings on development.

My North Carolina neighbor—my First Virginia District and his First North Carolina District adjoin—have been good neighbors and good friends for the nearly 7 years that we worked together on maritime and fisheries legislation. He helped me as a patient and thoughtful teacher and as an understanding House colleague. His passing has caused me real sorrow and I will remember the man all my life—not only for the warm friendship we knew but also for his contributions to our maritime industries.

Herbert Bonner's record in this body is a record of great dimension—encompassing safety of life at sea, the nuclear ship *Savannah*, the atomic icebreaker, oceanographic advancements, and fisheries research. His mark is on every major piece of maritime legislation to emanate from the Capitol. We are all able to take a measure of pride in his dedication to meaningful legislation for the industries he served. Herbert Bonner served us well, Mr. Speaker, and he served his constitutents well. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed colleague, the beloved HERBERT BONNER, and to extend my deepest sympathy and condolence to his widow and his family.

As a Representative of a State completely surrounded by water, I have had the occasion to seek the counsel and assistance of HERB on many occasions about Merchant Marine and Fisheries matters, he being the chairman of that great committee.

Mr. Speaker, HERB BONNER always lent a willing, and, what is more important, a cheerful and attentive ear and shared of his wisdom accumulated over the years.

Mr. Speaker, his constituents, his State, and the Nation, have lost a devoted and dedicated public servant. We will long reap the benefits of his toil. I, for one, can honestly state that my life has been enriched for having known HERB BONNER. I shall miss him as a friend and counselor.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in this expression of respect for the memory of our late and great friend, HERBERT BONNER.

When I came to this body just a few short years ago, Mr. BONNER was known to me as an able legislator and a key figure in the House of Representatives. I, and I believe all North Carolinians respected him as a statesman who in his years of leadership had been an eloquent champion of causes for his State and his Nation. In a personal way this man's ability, integrity, and wide-ranging knowledge was demonstrated to me in the early days of my first year of service here in the House of Representatives. And it was demonstrated as he extended the hand of friendship and help across the political aisle. He was one who was willing to give of his advice and counsel from his vast store of information and eminent good sense.

Mr. Speaker, HERBERT's passing was a great loss to the State of North Carolina, and it was a loss to America. I was profoundly moved at his funeral services in December because of the fact that literally thousands of people in his hometown came out to pay respect to their friend and fellow-townsman, HERBERT BONNER. In this way they were returning the unswerving devotion that had been so markedly obvious in HERBERT BONNER's years of service to the people in his district.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Broyhill joins me in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Bonner. We shall miss HERBERT in the years ahead. We shall miss his mellow good humor, his friendship, and his inspiring example as a dedicated servant of his State and the American people.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I could not permit these tributes to the late HERBERT BONNER to close without adding a few words.

Mr. Speaker, I was not a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and I do not come from the area represented by the late great HERB BONNER. However, I would like to relate to the Members of the House a pleasant experience which I had with this fine gentleman. A few years ago my family wanted to make a visit to the State of North Carolina. I spoke to Mr. BONNER about our anticipated trip. Instead of sending over some tourist brochures—he went out of his way to propose an itinerary through his district. He mentioned the important things to see. Also, he offered to make reservations. This demonstrated to me his spirit of unselfishness and his desire to be of service to any of his colleagues.

Then, Mr. Speaker, when we arrived in the district which he represented I learned that everyone in that district was proud of their Congressman. When I mentioned that I was a fellow Member of the House of Representatives, they would say, "Do you know our Congressman?" I said, "Yes; not as well as I would prefer, but in the few years that I have had the privilege to know him, it has been a great thrill to be an associate of a man like HERB BONNER."

Mr. Speaker, I feel that a few words should be said about his work on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. This is a way of saying some of the things that he did for his country.

Mr. Speaker, HERB BONNER was not simply a proponent of a strong merchant fleet, or just another advocate. He was its champion. I am sure that his warning, again and again, will stand us in good stead. We are beginning now to wake up to the fact that not as much attention has been given to our merchant fleet as should have been given in the past. I know that the new chairman of the committee will follow in the footsteps of the late HERBERT BONNER to see that measures are taken to arrest the declining strength of our fleet and instead build up our merchant marine which represents such a great asset not only to our commerce but as an arm of our national defense.

Mr. Speaker, we have all lost a good friend. I know that as the years go by he will always be esteemed in the memory of his fellow Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished dean of the North Carolina delegation for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, on the first day of my service in this body I met a quiet, soft-spoken, and sweet-tempered gentleman who performed an act of gracious neighborly kindness to a freshman Member of the House of Representatives.

For nearly 12 years after that I had the privilege of officing in close proximity to this fine American, HERB BONNER.

North Carolina has sent many outstanding men to the Congress, but I doubt that any Representative of that great State has ever been held in higher esteem or greater affection by his colleagues, than our dear friend, HERB BONNER.

A quiet, modest, and kindly man, HERB BONNER was both persuasive and powerful in his participation in debate. He handled the legislation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, over which he presided as chairman, with outstanding ability and success.

A gentleman in the finest and broadest sense of the word, HERB BONNER contributed greatly to the constructive work of the House of Representatives, and won new friends with every day of his service.

He will be missed by a host of friends in this body, and every one who knew him well will treasure the memory of his friendship.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STUBBLEFIELD].

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of great personal loss that I join my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to the memory of the late Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER. In a broader sense, however, his untimely passing is a loss to every citizen of this great Nation. I was privileged to serve on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee under his capable chairmanship. I shall remember him as a highly dedicated legislator who served the public interest with all the strength and capacity at his command.

It goes without saying that HERBERT BONNER was a man of integrity and unquestionable character. He loved his native North Carolina and was continually alert to opportunities to be of service to the people of his district and State. His devotion to and love of country was unexcelled, as evidenced by his zealous efforts to uphold and defend those principles which have made this country great. HERB BONNER will be missed, not only by his devoted family and Members of this House, but also by countless people throughout the Nation who came to know and respect him.

I extend sincere sympathy to Mrs. Bonner and to the other family members.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the country have lost a great man and a distinguished legislator. I have lost a dear friend. In HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina, were combined the qualities that endear a man to friends, colleagues, constituents, and even to casual acquaintances. His life was a record of achievement worthy not only of praise, but of emulation as well.

He was born in Washington, N.C., on May 16, 1891, and completed his education in Warrenton, N.C. During World War I, he served as a sergeant in the AEF. In 1924, he became an aid of Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, then a member of the State assembly, but soon to be elected to the U.S. House of Representatives.

HERBERT BONNER accompanied Mr. Warren to Washington, D.C., where he was employed by Mr. Warren as a congressional assistant.

When Mr. Warren was appointed Comptroller General of the United States in 1940, HERBERT C. BONNER, his faithful and dedicated assistant through the years, ran successfully to fill the vacancy. He was continuously reelected thereafter, and served in the halls of the House of Representatives for a quarter of a century.

As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives from the time of his first election to this body in 1940, and as committee chairman from 1955, he was impartial in his criticism of the role of management, labor, and the Federal Government in maritime affairs. He believed that maritime labor demanded excessive wages, that management refused to cross the frontiers of automation, and that the Government was unwilling to broaden Federal aid. His efforts through the years were strenuous indeed as he sought to impose some order on what he once called "the Alice in Wonderland world" of the maritime industry.

After hearings by his committee, construction was authorized for the nuclear-powered commercial ship, the freighter *Savannah*. When the $50 million vessel was finished in 1962, and the crew specially trained, the vessel was struck, and demands were made for better accommodations, more safety precautions, and increased benefits. This incident and others convinced Representative BONNER that Federal arbitration might be necessary in the maritime industry.

He was thus an ardent proponent of modernizing the U.S. merchant fleet. He once wrote:

> The inability of domestic shipping to revive or even survive with traditional means of cargo handling and traditional ships is painfully evident.

He called upon his congressional colleagues to find ways to get "new ideas and new life into water transportation." He bent his every effort to this purpose.

He became convinced that an international agency to oversee safety standards on all ships was necessary after the collision of the vessels *Stockholm* and *Andrea Doria* in 1956. His committee held an investigation of that disaster which had occurred outside American territorial waters, off Nantucket Light, and had claimed 50 lives.

HERBERT C. BONNER's interest in maritime affairs came naturally to him. His district spanned Pamlico Sound and the Outer Banks of North Carolina. In the words of a friend, "He loved the water and was a superb fisherman." He even worked with pleasure-boating associations to promote water safety among small boat owners.

He initiated a congressional study of the present efficiency of the Panama Canal as a modern interocean waterway. A board of consultants, appointed at his suggestion, is studying the problems of modernizing the canal, and considering the feasibility of constructing alternate routes.

During his 25 years as a Member of Congress, HERBERT C. BONNER served on six committees. He was a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from 1945 to 1947. As chairman of a Subcommittee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, he supervised an investigation of postwar profiteers who had bought U.S. surplus materials and then resold them to the Government at inflated prices. After this inquiry had been completed, Representative BONNER led a group of Members of the House on a 41-day worldwide examination of both efficiency and waste at American military establishments abroad.

Among his recorded votes were those which favored lend-lease and the Marshall plan. He was awarded the American Legion's Distinguished Service Medal for his efforts to strengthen the merchant marine. He was often called the "Father of the *Savannah*."

Last summer, when he returned to the House of Representatives after a painful operation and a long convalescence, he was greeted by applause on the floor of the House by his fellow Members. It was well that this accolate was given to him then, for he was lost to us on November 7, 1965.

He was soft spoken but incredibly hard working. His manner was retiring, but his popularity among the Members of this House was overwhelming. On this occasion, I join with all of his friends here, throughout the country, and back in North Carolina, in mourning his passing.

Mrs. McCormack and I extend to Mrs. Bonner our deep sympathy in her very great loss and sorrow.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the American merchant marine, beset by difficult problems today, owes its present strength and growth to our colleague, HERBERT BONNER, more than to any other man in our country. By his passing last fall, our merchant marine has lost its stoutest defender, its greatest exponent, its strongest promoter.

Stricken though he was with a fatal malady, HERBERT BONNER continued to work in the best interests of our country until the end. He was planning to direct the conduct of thorough hearings into the present status of the merchant marine, the problems which it faces, with a view toward providing remedial, constructive legislation which would bolster our merchant fleet and give to it renewed vigor and greater world influence. HERBERT BONNER, the great patriot that he was, also was working to find ways and means to furnish more merchant ships for carrying desperately needed food, medicines, and other cargo to our troops in South Vietnam and to the stricken people of that wartorn country.

Devotion to his country and to his people in his beloved North Carolina, and a love of this House, were the guiding actions of his life. HERBERT BONNER not only was a dedicated public servant, but also he was a great man—a wonderful human being who was beloved by all.

HERBERT BONNER devoted his entire life to this House—he was a congressional secretary for 16 years to the late Congressman Lindsay C. Warren, of the First District of North Carolina. When his boss was appointed Comptroller General of the United States by President Roosevelt in 1940, HERBERT BONNER elected to run to succeed Congressman Warren. And elected he was in November 1940 to the 77th Congress—the same Congress in which I first entered this House.

From his first term until his last breath, HERBERT BONNER was a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and for the last 10 years of his public service, he was chairman of that great committee. Probably the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has never had a more perceptive, hard-working chairman since it was established. HERBERT BONNER provided the kind of leadership and direction which only a man of farsight and dedication can give, and HERBERT BONNER gave his devotion in large measure.

There is no doubt that he did more to refurbish and strengthen the American merchant marine than has any other man in the history of our country. Among the many significant pieces of legislation in other fields which he promoted and steered to passage were the Small Boat Act of 1958, which gave a classification system to thousands more of our smaller boats and thus enhanced boating safety throughout the Nation; and the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, which provided for the establishment of an independent, separate agency for commercial fisheries, and also brought vastly expanded protection for our Nation's wildlife.

What I have cited here are but a small rendering of the contributions made to his State and our Nation by HERBERT BONNER. I loved him as a brother; I salute him as a fellow colleague of this House which we all love so well; and I am happy and proud to have known him, to have shared in his friendship and his wisdom. May God rest his soul always.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the life and memory of the late Honorable HERBERT BONNER, the able former chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It was my privilege to serve with Mr. BONNER during the whole of his 25 years as a Member of the House. Indeed, he and I became friends during the time he was an aid to the late Lindsay Warren of the great State of North Carolina, whom he succeeded.

I could not improve upon the fine sentiments expressed here but I can do no less than endorse them. It was a pleasure and an honor to serve in this great representative body with a man of the stature of HERBERT BONNER. The people of North Carolina and of the Nation owe him a debt of gratitude for his contributions to the national welfare.

May the Lord bless his memory.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the tragic passing of our respected and admired colleague, HERB BONNER, was a sad event for the Nation and for the district which he represented for so many years in such a distinguished way, as well as for all of his host of friends and admirers, both here and throughout the country.

Herbert Bonner was elected to the Congress shortly after I became a Member, and we have served together throughout the years as close friends. His contributions as chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which has handled such a volume of legislation of vital interest to this Nation over a period of many years, will serve as a monument to his dedication, ability, and intense devotion to duty.

Those of us who have observed Herb Bonner over the years in the House of Representatives are familiar with the extent to which he always informed himself in detail on the legislation which he handled on the floor of the House and which he guided to successful passage. We all know the meticulous manner and the precision with which he responded to questions and the comprehensiveness of his responses on the whole range of matters falling within the scope of his committee jurisdiction. He was assiduous in protecting and promoting the interests of his district, his State, and the Nation. His diligence in assisting his constituents and in looking out for their interests was a matter of common knowledge in the House.

I extend to his surviving family deepest sympathy and condolences but with a reminder that his career of public service will forever stand as a monument to his character and the great work which he has accomplished.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Herbert Bonner was a Member of 14 consecutive Congresses, and at the time of his passing only 14 Members of the House, including Speaker McCormack, former Speaker Martin and Chairman Celler, the dean, had enjoyed a longer tenure of service. When the 89th Congress convened, six of its Members had come in with the 76th Congress and had been reelected at each succeeding election. Now the number has been reduced to four by the deaths during the past year of Clarence Brown and Herbert Bonner. I shall always remember Herbert Bonner as a man of infinite patience and unfailing courtesy. A number of times I consulted with him in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on matters of interest to my constituents living on Lake Michigan and always he was generous with his time and most gracious in his manner. He was held in respect and affection by the members of the Illinois delegation and our grief at his passing is real and deep. He was a great American in peace and in war, being a combat veteran with the 322th Infantry of the 81st Division in World War I. To his wife and the members of his family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of loss and sorrow that I learned of the passing of our beloved friend and colleague, Herbert C. Bonner. For more than a quarter of a century he had served with great distinction in the House of Representatives and during that time he won the friendship, esteem, and admiration of all who came to know him.

As chairman of the important Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries he showed a rare legislative insight and the highest degree of statesmanship. It was my privilege and honor to work with Herb Bonner through the many years we served together in the House of Representatives. He was a great Democrat and a credit to our party. He was one of those unassuming, modest men who worked quietly and succeeded in reaching his goals.

Herb Bonner's legislative achievements were significant and many. His passing leaves a void that will long be felt in this House, and we shall miss his cheerful personality and the outstanding abilities he applied to the legislative work of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the host of his friends and fellow workers in extending our heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathy to the family of our departed friend, Herbert C. Bonner.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it was a deep sense of sadness when I learned of the passing of the admired and highly respected Congressman Herbert Bonner. I want to join my colleagues in the House this afternoon in eulogizing this outstanding statesman and gentleman from North Carolina.

I had the privilege and pleasure of knowing Herbert Bonner when he was a traveling salesman in North and South Carolina and later when he was secretary to Congressman Lindsay Warren, who was later appointed to the position as U.S. Comptroller General. Mr. Bonner was an outstanding Member of this body and also made an excellent record as secretary to Mr. Warren for approximately 10 years before he succeeded Mr. Warren as a Member of the House. I am certain I have never met anyone who had a better sense of humor and possessed all those necessary factors to work with all types of personalities.

Congressman Bonner made an excellent committee chairman and I am certain every member of his committee feels as I do when I state that the State of North Carolina and the entire country have lost one of its greatest statesmen.

Congressman Bonner could come as near sizing up a person and knowing the sincerity behind any proposal made by a Member of Congress than any person I have ever had an opportunity to know since I have been a Member of Congress.

Mrs. Bonner has my deepest sympathy and every person privileged with Herbert's acquaintance will always miss him.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our dear, beloved friend, and very distinguished colleague, Congressman Herbert C. Bonner, of North Carolina, is a great loss to the Congress and the Nation and to this great deliberative body.

His long devoted service here constitutes an imperishable record which has been marked by outstanding ability, unexcelled fidelity to principle, and the highest order of patriotism.

He was both articulate and knowledgeable.

His diligence and his work and his attention to duty marked him as an extremely conscientious public servant.

His spirit of dedication commanded the respect, confidence, and admiration of all of us and all those who knew him.

His great district and State have sustained a truly irreparable loss since his concern for his own people knew no bounds, and he served them with an unselfish devotion.

He was, in truth, as a soldier, gallantly serving the Nation, when he was stricken at the very height of his powers, while zealously upholding the cause of God and country.

His family and all his dear ones who are so sorely afflicted by his untimely passing are the ones who will feel his loss most keenly. Their burden of sorrow is, indeed, a very heavy one, and in extending my deepest sympathy to them in this hour of sad bereavement, I hope and pray that the good Lord will bring them reconciliation and the courage and patience to bear their loss with strength and fortitude.

Herb Bonner will long be remembered in this body. His service was so memorable, his friendship so warm, and his ties so enduring. Both his laudable service and the memory of his true friendship will long remain with us, and his outstanding achievements will brilliantly illuminate the annals of this, the greatest deliberative body in the world, for many years to come.

We may well say of him: "Well done, thy good and faithful servant." May the good Lord smile upon him and bring him peace in His eternal home.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege for me to have the opportunity to serve on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee under the chairmanship of our departed colleague, the Honorable Herbert Bonner.

Through many long and involved hearings, I found him to be able and completely fair in his conduct of the committee. With scores of other Members, I will miss the presence of my friend, Herbert Bonner, in the House of Representatives.

I extend my sympathy to his widow and to other members of his family.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the absence of Congressman Bonner from our Chamber is sadly felt by us all; and the country mourns his passing as an able and dedicated legislator and American. It was my pleasure for several years to serve on his Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and it was a rich and inspiring service because of his ability, character, and his kindness to all with whom he associated. We have lost a great Congressman and a dear friend and our hearts go out in sympathy to all his bereaved family.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our late beloved chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the Honorable Herbert C. Bonner, whose death is a grievous loss to all of us.

I have had the honor and the privilege of working with him as a member of the committee which he so ably headed. I found him to be a man of deep understanding, a devoted public servant, and a capable leader. His guidance and counsel were always most helpful. He was particularly helpful to me in matters pertaining to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy and other Coast Guard installations located in my district in Connecticut.

During the quarter of a century of his service in the House of Representatives, HERBERT BONNER not only left his imprint on Congress and on many legislative acts, but he also left a host of friends and admirers who had the highest regard for him. We shall always remember him as a man of wisdom, patience, courtesy, and able leadership. His death is a deep loss to those of us who had the occasion to work with him more closely.

I extend to his widow and to other members of his family my deepest sympathy in this hour of their great bereavement.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, for more than 10 years it was my good fortune to serve on the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, while HERB BONNER was the chairman. During this time, I learned firsthand that HERB was a man of the highest integrity, dedicated to the welfare of all matters coming under his committee jurisdiction.

For a number of years, my wife and I lived right across the hall from the HERBERT BONNERS in an apartment house. It was during this time that I first learned to know HERB and to realize that, modest and quiet though he was, he had a wide knowledge and keen understanding of the problems confronting the maritime and fishing industries. Especially, I discovered the patient care he always gave to his committee responsibilities.

So it is that my association with him—now, unhappily, terminated—has left warm memories as well as deep respect and admiration.

It was a real honor to serve under HERBERT BONNER, and I shall never cease to cherish this experience.

To his wife, who was so dear to him and always his close companion, my wife and I extend our most profound sympathy. We share her sorrow. The memory of her husband's fine character and wonderful record is something that Mrs. Bonner will retain along with the devotion of her husband's friends, and we hope these blessings will always bring her comfort and satisfaction.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join in tribute to our esteemed colleague, Hon. HERBERT BONNER, of the State of North Carolina.

Over the past 20 years during which Congressman BONNER served his constituents and his country so well, he earned the respect and admiration of us all.

His strength and quiet wit will long be remembered and will surely be missed by those of us who considered him a valued friend.

Having been brought up spending my summers on the shores of Long Island, where the sport of fishing was enjoyed by amateurs as well as professional sportsmen, I shared a common interest with Congressman BONNER. It was always a great pleasure for me to listen to his many fishing experiences.

I am sure the Outer Banks of the Carolina Coast will no longer be the same. The fisherman has gone to his eternal home.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened and shocked when I learned that on November 7, 1965, the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina, died in Walter Reed Army Hospital here in Washington. I wish to join my many colleagues in sadly saluting the memory of a man who devoted 25 years of his life to serving the people of North Carolina and the United States.

For most of the 25 years HERB BONNER spent in the House of Representatives, and in his service on the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he fought to strengthen and stabilize this country's maritime industry. He believed as most of us do, that the merchant marine was, and is a vital part of America's strength. For a decade as chairman of that vital committee, he fought for improved safety regulations at sea and technological advancement throughout the industry. In fighting to strengthen the merchant marine, a fight that I wholeheartedly did and do support, HERBERT C. BONNER was serving not only the great State of North Carolina, but all the people of this country. He shall be sorely missed.

To his family, I extend my deepest sympathy and condolence.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of HERBERT BONNER the Nation has lost a wise and able statesman. But, more particularly, the American Merchant Marine has lost a champion and skilled architect. No man labored more or gave more unstintingly of himself on its behalf throughout almost three decades than did HERB BONNER.

The fast, modern greyhounds of the seas, which today carry the American flag to the farflung corners of the globe, stand in living tribute as a monument to the endeavors of this one man. These same ships, constructed as a result of the vision and foresight of HERBERT BONNER, are today bridging the oceans to supply American troops in Vietnam. Seamen and American fighting men throughout the world owe a great debt to this man. Truly, one can say that memorials to his achievements are now in being throughout the world wherever American-flag merchant ships ply their trade.

But to me the death of HERB BONNER means much more. I have lost a warm and personal friend with whom I have labored side-by-side for more than 13 years. He was a close confidant. He was a man whose counsel I held in greatest respect. He was a man whom I grew to love more with each passing year.

Perhaps the English poet laureate, Robert Southy, best expressed my feelings when he said, and I quote:

> The loss of a friend is like that of a limb; time may heal the anguish of the wound, but the loss cannot be repaired.

To his devoted and gracious widow, Eva, I can only say that her sadness is shared by HERBERT's legion of friends and admirers. Perhaps this fact will make her burden just a little easier to bear.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, while Congress was adjourned, one of our most esteemed and dedicated colleagues, Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina, passed away. I was saddened to learn of his death and to realize that Congressman BONNER would not be with us any longer. We shall miss him—I want to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to his memory.

HERBERT C. BONNER served in the Congress for a quarter of a century. Congressman BONNER was a great American. He served his country well; he served his beloved State of North Carolina well, and he served his district well and long and faithfully. As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marines, he was known nationally as the father of the nuclear-powered ship *Savannah*, and for other work directed toward moderning our merchant marine fleet.

I knew HERBERT C. BONNER as a dedicated American, an able colleague, and a man devoted to principle. He had a keen grasp of the responsibilities of public service, and he responded to those responsibilities.

He will be sorely missed in the Congress and most difficult to replace. His legacy of service will live for untold generations as a monument to his dedication.

I extend to Mrs. Bonner and other members of his family my deepest sympathy in their irreplaceable loss.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying homage to the late Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER. It was my privilege to serve but briefly with this courtly gentleman on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which he so ably chaired for more than a decade.

My great regret is the brevity of my association with HERB BONNER. It is my personal loss that I did not know him sooner. He was a man whom I rapidly grew to respect and admire. Dedicated in purpose and undaunted by adversity, Chairman BONNER gave unsparingly of himself to the service of his constituents, the development of a strong American merchant marine, and the preservation of this Nation's natural resources. The product of his tireless efforts stand in tribute and memorial to his skill and dedication.

The late Father Edmund A. Walsh, S.J., of Georgetown University, was a stanch advocate for a strong American merchant marine. Men such as Congressman BONNER must have been in his thoughts when Father Walsh wrote:

> A statesman is the rare thinker who keeps his gaze fixed on the next generation. He will have learned wisdom from past errors and schooled himself to distinguish the deep and permanent residue of economic history from the surface tones that speak only of quick gains and enhanced profits. He will be a statesman in the measure that he teaches men to fasten on abiding values and rescues them from the lure of the temporary and the transient.

Such a public leader was the late Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER. His untimely death is a loss not only for his beloved State of North Carolina, but for the Nation as a whole.

To the widow of our late beloved chairman and to other members of his family, I extend my heartfelt sympathy in this their hour of bereavement. All our hearts are saddened over their loss, but comforted in the knowledge of the privilege of having known and labored with the late Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER. I knew him as a wonderfully generous, considerate, always fair, and effective chairman under whose leadership I was proud to serve.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I join in the eulogies that have been accorded to my late friend and colleague, HERBERT BONNER. Quiet, calm, and sensible, he was a faithful and devoted Member of this body. Always honorable and conscientious, HERBERT commanded universal respect. With his passing I have lost a close personal friend, and the Nation has lost a valuable public servant. To the surviving family I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished predecessor in the House, the Honorable Carl T. Durham, has sent me a statement to place in the RECORD in the memory of his lifetime colleague and close personal friend, the late Honorable HERBERT COVINGTON BONNER.

It is a pleasure and a privilege to comply with Mr. Durham's request, particularly in view of his intimate association with Mr. BONNER in the House and his personal affection and regard for him. Mr. Durham's statement follows:

> I wish to extend to Mrs. Bonner and the people of the First Congressional District of North Carolina my deep and sincere sympathy in the loss they have sustained in HERBERT's passing. For more than 40 years HERBERT and I were close friends, and I served with him in the Congress for more than 20 years. His personal popularity and the high esteem in which he was held extended throughout the House of Representatives and the Senate as well. During the many years in which he served the first district he gave to his constituents a dedicated service. He will now take his place in the history of our State of North Carolina as one of the great and effective men to serve in the U.S. Congress.
>
> But the canvas of his achievements was not restricted to his district and State, for, as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he made significant and enduring contributions to our national maritime policy which will long be remembered.
>
> My heartfelt sympathy goes out to Eva and the family in their great bereavement, which is shared by all who knew HERBERT and his sterling worth to his district, State, and Nation.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the life, character, and service of our late beloved colleague, HERBERT C. BONNER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION CONTINUES TO SPEND MORE MONEY THAN IT TAKES IN

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, facts revealed in the daily statement of the U.S. Treasury for December 30, 1965, indicate that the administration continues to spend more money than it takes in, continues to borrow money to pay current bills, and that the outflow of gold from this country continues.

Currently the Government is spending money at the rate of $380 million a day or $16 million every hour of every day and night.

This year-end statement of the U.S. Treasury shows that from July 1, 1965, through December 30, 1965, the Government spent $11 billion more than it took in. In the corresponding period last year the excess of spending over receipts was $9 billion. Therefore, the deficit in the first half of the current fiscal year is $2 billion more than it was last year.

That same Treasury statement shows that on December 30, 1965, the national debt stood at $321 billion as contrasted with $318 billion on December 30, 1964. This debt has climbed from $290 billion when Eisenhower left office to $321 billion on December 30, 1965—an increase of $31 billion during the 5 Kennedy-Johnson years. It now takes about a billion dollars a month to pay the interest on that debt.

The statement also shows that gold on hand at December 30, 1965, stood at $13.7 billion as contrasted with $15.3 billion on December 31, 1964. This is a loss of $1.6 billion in gold during calendar year 1965.

I bring these facts to the attention of the House at the beginning of the new session of Congress because they indicate that the administration is not yet prepared to practice fiscal discipline but is continuing headlong down the spendthrift road. The continued erosion in the purchasing power of our dollars is one aftermath of this policy, and I would remind my colleagues that those who suffer most from inflation are people in the poverty classification who must live on fixed incomes and who see their dollars buy fewer and fewer groceries.

Soon we will be called upon to decide how we shall finance the increasing costs of the war in Vietnam. There are only several choices: The Government can continue its present policy of borrowing, taxes can be increased, or it can reduce spending on projects that can be deferred until the war is over and we have our financial house in order.

I do not know how you feel about it but my view is that the latter course is the one we should follow.

FAILURE OF THE GEORGIA LEGISLATURE TO SEAT JULIAN BOND

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it was a poor decision that the Georgia Legislature made this week in voting to prevent Mr. Julian Bond, of Atlanta, from taking the seat to which he was duly elected at the last election. Mr. Bond is one of the spokesman of that generation of young southern Negroes who have shown their courage and their dedication to the finest values of American life.

However, in encouraging draft card burners, he is wrong. Yet I do not believe it was the act of statesmen for members of the Georgia House to deny him his seat. Expression of opinion cannot properly serve as a bar to the right of public office. His exclusion was unfortunate in coming at a time when Georgia was showing to her sister States in the Deep South the way to adjustments to a new era in racial relations.

I believe in doing so they violated the spirit of the first amendment which guarantees freedom of speech to all citizens. I hope the Georgia Legislature will repent. Georgia's record in recent years has been too good for the State to be stigmatized by this unwise act.

COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to provide for the enactment of a cold war GI bill, similar to those enacted for veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict.

Mr. Speaker, it is very evident that our present selective service law is just what its name implies, selective. Unfortunately, it selects for service in the military those who in too many cases cannot afford to seek higher education.

The Members of this House and of the other body, too, decided in their wisdom some years ago that those who gave time out of their productive years to defend this Nation ought to receive some assistance in order that they could compete on a more even basis with those who stayed behind. This is a very sound approach and I think that before we ring down the final curtain on the 89th Congress, we ought to do as much for our young men in uniform today as we did for those who served in earlier wars.

It is very gratifying to learn that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] who has done such a great job as chairman of the House Committee, agrees with me that something should be done. I would like at this time to publicly commend the gentleman from Texas as one of the best friends the American veteran has ever had. His willingness to aid future veterans as well as those who served earlier is to his eternal credit.

The Korean GI bill and the earlier World War II bill were not giveaways, rather, they were investments which have since enactment repayed the Government many times in the form of increased tax revenue.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I have always supported legislation which will serve to broaden educational opportunity. This bill will serve to do the same for those young men who are now serving this Nation throughout the world.

I strongly urge immediate passage of a cold war GI bill of rights.

H.R. 11894—HORTON BILL TO COMPENSATE VICTIMS OF VIOLENT CRIMES

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this session, I introduced H.R. 11894—the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act of 1966. This is the first, and perhaps the most crucial of a series of legislative proposals dealing with crime that I plan to introduce this year. It provides for the compensation of citizens who fall victim to the violent and heinous crimes which have become increasingly common in our Nation's cities.

Compensation for personal injury suffered by victims of criminal violence is a problem that we can no longer ignore. Daily, we read of the horrible incidents suffered by hapless victims of criminal violence. Here in the District of Columbia, the seat of government of a great country, it is hardly safe to go abroad after the setting of the evening sun. A similar situation, I believe, exists in many other areas of this country. Incidents of this nature are so numerous, and of such frequency that any attempt at enumeration is pointless. Overall, the Federal Bureau of Investigation reports that during the first 9 months of 1965 the crime index was up 5 percent over the same period for the prior year. Increases were reported in all crime categories, ranging from a 2-percent increase in aggravated assault to 6 percent in forcible rape. Nationally, the violent crimes of murder, forcible rape, aggravated assault, and robbery, as a group showed a substantial increase. According to FBI reports, criminal offenses in my own community of Rochester, N.Y., rose 70 percent in the past 3 years.

In the perpetration of these offenses the victim is in a very real sense a double victim. He is attacked by the assailant, often brutally beaten, stripped of his possessions, and left senseless with his body battered and torn. In many instances the victim is the only support of his family. Society, as well as the victim, suffers from thse acts of criminal violence.

It seems that in this country we have proceeded on the theory that if the criminal were prosecuted, crime would be reduced and there would be fewer victims of the criminal. This has not been the case. Crime continues to increase.

It is the innocent victim of crime who must pay for the medical treatment which he must receive. It is the survivors of a murdered wage earner who must face years of financial hardship and perhaps poverty. The plight of victims of crime, I submit, should be brought more in line with that of disabled employees. A disabled worker may receive substantial compensation for an injury suffered in the course of his employment, even though his negligence may have contributed to the injury; yet, the same worker, if disabled from a criminal attack for which he bore no responsibility whatsoever, has no similar protection.

Our governments spend billions in protecting us from criminals. We sanction the fact that our governments go to great lengths to protect suspected criminals from punishment. But should not our governments owe an obligation to compensate innocent victims of crime, crimes inevitably resulting through the difficulty of providing perfect police protection?

The concept of compensation for victims of crime is not new. Hammurabi, the King of Babylonia, in ancient times, is reputed to have formulated and placed in operation a limited compensation scheme under which victims of murder or robbery committed by a highway bandit who escaped was paid only by the community which failed to apprehend the criminal.

In this country, the accepted view has been that compensation for an injury inflicted by one person upon another is a civil matter between the parties concerned, capable of settlement in the civil courts by way of an action for damages. In many instances the assailant either is unknown or, if he is known, is without means, in which case a suit would be a futile proceeding.

Compensation schemes under which victims of crime are compensated by the state for personal injuries became effective in 1964, in New Zealand—New Zealand Laws 1963, No. 134—and in England—Command 2323. In our own country, the State of California last year adopted a compensation scheme and thus became the first State in the Nation to give limited compensation to the victims of a crime.

The principle of compensation for innocent victims of crime has substantial support in this country. U.N. Ambassador Goldberg in his James Madison lecture at New York University Law School pointed out that the victim of a crime of violence "has been denied the protection of the laws in a very real sense, and society should assume some responsibility for making him whole"—39 New York University Law Review 224 April, 1964.

I am proposing to create a Federal Violent Crime Compensation Commission. This would be a three-man tribunal. The Chairman and the two other members, chosen because of their legal experience, are to be appointed for 8-year staggered terms by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Commission will consider the claims of those injured by criminal violence occurring in areas where the Federal Government exercises general police power. It will be the Commission's function to examine the evidence presented to it both to determine what level of compensation should be granted and whether, in fact, the person making the claim was truly an innocent victim. The Commission would be authorized to order payment for: First, expenses actually and reasonably incurred as a result of the injury or death of the victim; second, loss of earning power; third, pecuniary loss to the dependents of deceased victims; fourth, pain and suffering of the victim; and fifth, other pecuniary loss resulting from the personal injury or death of the victim which the Commission determines reasonable. Compensation would not be awarded in excess of $25,000 in any case. The determination of the Commission is to be considered final; there will be no right of appeal. Application for compensation must be made within 2 years of injury or death.

The bill applies only to those areas of the country where the Federal Government exercises general police power. These are the District of Columbia and the special maritime and territorial jurisdictions of the United States. In no way will this legislation impinge upon the jurisdiction and rights of the States, but it should serve as a model of progressive criminal legislation for the 50 States of this Union.

Compensation would not be awarded in two situations: First, if the victim is a relative of the offender; or, second, if the victim was at the time of the injury or death living with the offender as his wife or her husband or as a member of the offender's household.

Mr. Speaker, I have commented on some of the principal provisions of H.R. 11894. It is my sincere hope that hearings will be held, that the committee will report favorably, and that this Congress will follow the promptings of fairness and social necessity in enacting this meritorious legislation.

SECURITY OF THE HOUSE CHAMBER RELATES TO NEED FOR STAFF IDENTIFICATION CARDS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the House that tonight we shall be addressed by the President. He will deliver his state of the Union message. I am reminded that the security of this Chamber will be very much involved. I am also reminded that on the opening day of the 1st session of the 89th Congress the question of security came up. It was as a result of an incident that occurred on that date that I submitted House Resolution 261. That resolution called for the issuance of identification cards to employees of the Members of House and the committees on Capitol Hill.

The resolution was reported and adopted by the House on July 1 of 1965. To date no identification cards have been issued.

I feel that it is important for us to provide our employees on the House side with means of identification, particularly during these days when security is so important, so that they can have ready identification for those who have the responsibility of security. The identification cards would also be a means of convenience for employees, because with such identification they could be identified readily in the community in which they are working.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just take this occasion to remind the House that it is important for us to give our employees these identification cards, and I hope that they will be issued soon.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE PEOPLE OF CHAD ON THEIR INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, these first few weeks of January find the continent of Africa going through many experiences, some pleasant, and some otherwise. But even in the midst of all this, it is fitting to take a few moments to pay tribute to the anniversary of one of Africa's newer states. I refer to Chad which celebrated its independence day on January 11. France granted independence to Chad on August 11, 1960, but the national holiday celebrated was first inaugurated on January 11, 1961.

Chad was organized as a military area by France in September 1900, and in 1910 became one of the four territories comprising former French Equatorial Africa. Chad became a fully autonomous member of the French community in 1959, and gained complete independence in 1960.

Since independence, Chad has retained close political and economic ties with France and is a member of the French community and the franc zone. Chad's relations with other African states have been friendly, and she has participated along with the other states of former French Equatorial Africa in a customs union, a postal union, and a mutual defense pact. In addition to membership in the United Nations, Chad is an active member of the African and Malagasy Common Organization and the Organization of African Unity. Relations with the United States have been friendly and both Governments expect the trend to continue.

The Chadian Government is gallantly attempting to overcome some of the country's economic difficulties which arise largely from Chad's landlocked position and the scarcity of known mineral resources. Chad is self-sufficient in food production and is now engaging in a program of crop diversification. Though cotton accounts for more than 80 percent of Chad's cash crop income, the outlook is bright for increased revenue from the growing fishing industry. Chad's growing foreign trade and expenditures on technical and agricultural training for its people are firm and definite indications that the Government is committed to progress and internal stability.

I am sure my colleagues all join me in congratulating the people of Chad and in wishing them best wishes on their anniversary in the fervent hope that they find the inner satisfaction for which they have worked so hard and which they so richly deserve.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SHOULD STATE POLICY IN RELATION TO RHODESIA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson appears in full color this evening to give an accounting of his administration, I hope he will explain to the citizens of this country why he has joined with the leeching British monarchy in an outrageous attempt to strangle and destroy the Government of Rhodesia, which seeks its independence as our forefathers did 190 years ago.

An economic blockade is ordinarily considered to be one step short of hostilities. Has the United States been committed to war, or the support of a war, if the economic boycott fails to bring the Rhodesians to their knees?

British profiteers have refused to stop trading with the Communist Vietcong, with Communist China, and Communist Cuba. Does the U.S. Government have a double, triple, or quadruple standard of morality to be applied in the case of friendly Rhodesia?

Yes; let us have a full-color explanation from Lyndon Johnson as to why this outrageous action has been taken against a friendly government.

Mr. Speaker, on December 17, 1965, on the occasion of British Prime Minister Wilson's conference at the White House in connection with the Rhodesian situation, I sent the following telegram to President Johnson:

> Newspapers quote your Assistant Secretary of State, G. Mennen Williams, as stating that British economic penalties should be strong enough to bring down the Southern Rhodesian Government providing Rhodesia cannot get enough imports from "modern-day private buccaneers looking for quick profit."
>
> Williams is also quoted as saying "we believe Britain will continue to apply measures that will be adequate to resolve the situation and we will support those measures."
>
> It takes an inordinate amount of gall for any official of this Government to commit the United States to an economic boycott of Rhodesia when at the same time Britain's "modern-day private buccaneers looking for a quick profit" are trading with the Communist Vietcong, Communist Cuba, and Communist China.
>
> How can you, Williams, or any other official of this Government, commit the United States to an economic boycott of Rhodesia and at the same time close your eyes to the perfidious trading by the British with the Communists with whom we are at war?
>
> If the purpose of Prime Minister Wilson's trip to this country is to further involve us in Rhodesia, he should be invited to pack his bags, and any commitment to join in a British boycott should be rescinded forthwith. Citizens of this country are entitled to expect integrity on the part of their leaders, not pandering and doubletalk.

As of this date, January 12, 1966, I have had a letter from one of the President's underlings at the White House stating only that the telegram had been received and it would be made available to the President.

SOFT POLICIES OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I have today directed a letter to the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Katzenbach, demanding to know why the Department of Justice, apparently taking encouragement from the usual soft policies of the State Department, has not taken action concerning Herbert Aptheker, a professor from Yale by the name of Lynd, and one other fellow that went over to the southeast Asia theater, in Vietnam, in what, if the newspapermen are correct, appears to be a clear-cut violation of the Logan Act. It seems to me that the U.S. Government should stop applying double standards in cases of this nature and prosecute violations of the Federal statutes.

RYAN RESOLUTION TO CREATE A HOUSE COMMITTEE ON URBAN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution to create a new House standing committee consisting of 25 members, to be called the Committee on Urban Affairs. During the last session of this Congress we approved the establishment of a new executive department, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to cope with the staggering problems of urban America. That was a gratifying decision for me because I had fought for the creation of such a department since I entered the Congress, introducing legislation to that end and working for its passage. Logic now demands that the Congress set up in both its Houses a parallel standing Committee on Urban Affairs, with specific jurisdiction for housing, mass transit, air and water pollution, water supplies and sewage facilities.

More than 130 million Americans live in urban or metropolitan areas at the present time, and the figure is expected to increase dramatically by the end of this decade. It has been predicted that by 1970 as many as 25 million of our 30 million new citizens will settle in cities and metropolitan areas. Our cities are our future.

Yet our cities are plagued by grave ills. In a word they are sick. People are living in decaying and inhuman housing; our schools are delapidated and overcrowded affecting the quality of the education our youngsters receive; the air is fouled with noxious and clearly hazardous pollutants; pure water and an adequate supply of it is a rarity in many cities; crimes of violence are increasing at a frightening rate so that our citizens are afraid to enter their parks and subways; the streets of our cities are choked with stalled traffic, while public transportation systems wither and die for lack of patronage. The quality of life in the city is perilously close to bestial. Remedies are expensive, but as the crisis of our cities mounts, and intensifies, our cities find they simply do not have the necessary funds to reverse the blight, decay, and deterioration.

In recognition of this the Congress during the last session finally gave the city a spokesman in the President's Cabinet by setting up the new department. This new department, which is now being shaped, is intended to bring order out of the chaos that now characterizes the manner in which we currently deal with our urban problems.

Mr. Speaker, there is a vast array of Federal programs, both new and old, relevant for curing the ailments of our cities and bringing about a revitalization of urban life. But dedication, imagination, and, above all, coordination are mandatory if present Federal efforts and, hopefully, expanded ones in the years ahead are to make our cities and the sprawling urban areas which spill over city, county, and State lines, not only livable but pulsating, viable centers of commerce, education, and culture to nourish all of our people economically, esthetically, and spiritually.

It is not an overstatement to describe the city as this great Nation's domestic frontier as the relentless exodus from rural America continues. At the same time there is a virtual army of people ready and willing to enlist in the front ranks of those who will battle to tame this new frontier. Part of the task of the new department will be to encourage and use this talent (in our neighborhoods, in our colleges and universities, in industry, and in our city halls) to devise new ways of meeting the crisis of our cities. I firmly believe that the action of the Congress during the last session, establishing the new Urban Affairs Department, deepens the commitment and strengthens the resolve of the Federal Government to give increased weight to urban centers in deliberations on overall national policy. The new Department equips the Federal Government more adequately to participate in the search for and implementation of solutions to urban sickness.

The new Department is designed to pull together all of those Federal programs that can be brought to bear on the problems of our cities. If there is one point on which all serious observers on urban affairs agree, it is that housing, transportation, open space, water and air pollution, and sewage disposal are interdependent problems. We are on a fool's errand if we attempt to solve problems in isolation, such as providing decent, safe housing for our growing urban population but not at the same time considering how water supply, sewage, and other waste disposal, transportation, and traffic control, the availability of open space for restoring the mind and body, and the prevention and elimination of blight from surrounding areas all affect the adequacy of any urban environment. Clearly the new Department will have to address itself to this whole galaxy of problems if the overall impact of Federal programs is to have its desired effect.

Mr. Speaker, it is inevitable that there will be an expansion of the Government's role in this national problem. I believe that the Congress has an important organizational step to take as evidence that we truly understand that urban problems are national problems. That step is to set up a new standing committee—a Committee on Urban Affairs. Logic demands a Committee on Urban Affairs with jurisdiction for urban problems generally and for certain very specific areas to achieve a coordinated response on the part of both the executive and legislative branches.

At the present time the jurisdiction in both branches of Congress for the legion of problems that afflict the cities is scattered throughout a host of standing committees and subcommittees. Urban problems have proliferated at a chaotic rate since the last major congressional reorganization in 1946, yet a committee structure that evolved two decades ago is still being employed to direct the affairs of our cities. There should be a new committee with an overall approach to urban affairs if Congress is to play a proper and creative role in pushing back the urban frontier so that people in our cities can live the good life in the Great Society.

The benefits flowing from the establishment of a Committee on Urban Affairs would be twofold. Congress would profit by being able to have a more modern and effective instrument for overseeing the new Department of Housing and Urban Development, and our cities would be able to deal with one congressional committee instead of half a dozen in seeking assistance for a concerted and effective attack on urban problems.

The responsibilities of this new committee would be broad.

Of the many ills that afflict life in our cities, nothing cries out for action more than that of people trapped in substandard housing and the miserable social conditions that slum housing brings in its train. Under my resolution the Committee on Urban Affairs would be responsible for housing and the related Federal programs of urban renewal, slum clearance, code enforcement, and community renewal.

In addition, the other proper concerns of the new committee should be mass transportation as it relates to the large population centers of the Nation as well as streets and highways in our urban areas and the enormously complex problem of sewage disposal. Highway planning must be coordinated with the growing need for comfortable, clean, yet swift public transportation facilities if these programs are not to be self-defeating. A massive effort is required to clean up our rivers and streams which too often are open sewers.

Air and water pollution must be given much greater attention in the future than in the past. The control of poisons in our air and water supplies in the years ahead may be critical in determining if the city thrives or only survives. A Committee on Urban Affairs should address itself to the question of waste disposal.

Crisis breeds challenge, and this country faces its greatest challenges today in our cities. Washington, the Nation's Capital, is a textbook illustration of what has happened to the American city.

Mr. Speaker, a Committee on Urban Affairs would be an important vehicle for assuring that the Congress prepares to meet this challenge and for assuring that all our city dwellers—from all income groups—have an equal opportunity to share in the fruits of life in the city which, with vision and care, can be transformed and, indeed, reborn.

Let me close by reiterating as forcefully as I can that our cities need help. The creation of a new standing committee, the Committee on Urban Affairs, will enable the House to play a creative and significant role in providing this help and meeting the challenge of the urban frontier.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the gentleman from New York for his excellent suggestion. I wish to associate myself with his remarks, and I intend to introduce a companion resolution to carry out his proposal for the establishment, in both Houses of the Congress, of a permanent committee to deal with the urban problems of America. Certainly this resolution is timely.

As we look upon the face of America today, we find that 72 percent of the American population is housed in America's urban areas. Less than a century ago the United States was an agricultural country. Today, certainly, we have an urban America.

There are vast problems in our large cities, as the gentleman has quite properly pointed out. It seems to me that a committee of the Congress charged with the express responsibility of guiding legislation to help solve these problems would indeed bring a great deal of economy to the Congress and perhaps a greater understanding of the problems of these cities.

As a Member from a congressional district in the heart of a large metropolis, Chicago, I can fully appreciate the gentleman's concern over the problems of the big cities.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman, and I hope that his proposal will receive early consideration by the House.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his support and for his interest in my proposal. I hope that the idea of a standing Committee on Urban Affairs will receive widespread support, as the new Department of Housing and Urban Development prepares to take on the tasks which have been assigned to it by the President.

There is a task force at the present time formulating recommendations for the structure and the exact nature of the jurisdiction of the new Federal Department. I hope that its recommendations will be bold and sweeping. The Federal Government must recognize its responsibility to urban areas. The urgent needs of our cities deserve the focus of a standing House committee. Remember the Department of Agriculture is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture. Urban affairs now merit similar attention.

THE QUALITY AND AVAILABILITY OF EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Roncalio] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RONCALIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the quality and availability of education must be the constant concern of those who direct their efforts toward a better society. Service to this goal is the responsibility of every citizen; the necessary commitment of every public official.

The 89th Congress ably met this commitment in the passage of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act which opened the resources of our Federal Government to this common venture. I was happy to support and vote for this legislation.

But concern must be continuing, not diminished by legislative accomplishments of even this scope and magnitude. The success of this, and future legislation, will ultimately rest on the vigilance and service of public servants and conscientious parents and citizens.

It is then with some apprehension that I note a development which threatens disservice to this goal. I refer to certain aspects of the "personality testing" conducted by researchers under the auspices of the Office of Education.

Section 402 of the Civil Rights Act authorizes the Office of Education to conduct a survey and make a report to the President and Congress on the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities because of race, color, religion, or national origin in public educational institutions. Although this specific survey will conclude July 2, 1966, the authorization of researching with public funds is a continuing activity of the Office of Education and any questions related to this activity should be settled as soon as possible.

Publication of portions of one of these personality tests indicates that the nature of the questions and the method of testing could represent an intrusion on the privacy of the individual, and a potential breach in the personal relationship between parent and child.

Questions asked of students in civil rights testing included: "Who is now acting as your father?" "Who is now acting as your mother?" "Where does most of the money come from that pays for your food, house, and clothing?" "How do you and your friends rate socially in this school?" and several questions on the racial balance a student prefers among his classmates, teachers, and friends.

The special subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee has reviewed other personality tests containing questions of an even more personal nature. These tests include questions on race, religion, family income, compatibility of parents, sexual experiences, and cultural stature of the family in the community.

I do not question the merit of personality testing, but I believe there are several safeguards which should be enacted to strengthen the program and protect the rights of the individual.

I would recommend that the Office of Education exercise its authority to review questions submitted by researchers under grants of public funds. The questions are theoretically reviewed by boards of experts to minimize improprieties. I recommend that they are in fact reviewed, and any questions not likely to serve the general ends of the testing be removed or revised.

The Government Operations Special Subcommittee alleges that there is no evidence that all questions were reviewed. In this situation, the researcher has essentially been given a blank check. The propriety of questions rests on the basis of his personal judgment, although his research is financed by taxpayers' money. The situation is alarming when one considers what abuses could be wrought in its name.

If the authority of the Office of Education is not clear in this regard, then I would recommend enabling legislation to require the Office of Education to review and approve all research testing conducted with public funds.

Second, in view of the fact that participation by schools is voluntary, I recommend that this same privilege be extended to students. Therefore I propose first, each test be strictly voluntary; second, parental consent be obtained for students below college level; third, a copy of the test be made available for inspection by parents, if they wish, before granting consent; fourth, parents be given a clear idea of the nature of the test when consent is sought. The nature of the questions should be made known.

I realize these safeguards will require additional time, but by informing parents of the reasons for testing and specific questions, the researcher will more than likely win greater support for his efforts. In those cases where parents object, the right of privacy will be respected.

The law recognizes the privileged relationship between lawyer and client; doctor and patient; and priest and parishioner. No less serious and constant is the parent-child relationship. It should never be compromised by the role of teacher and student.

The parent-child relationship is threatened when students are indirectly compelled to answer questions on intimate and personal family matters.

This delicate matter must be studied objectively, with no mind to render researchers powerless to conduct surveys. It is no inquisition; no blanket condemnation of research effort or tests.

Because we recognize the merit of good testing, we seek to strengthen the effectiveness of good tests and preclude the disasters inherent in bad testing and in compulsory testing. We must not presume to preempt the authority of experts in their own field of study, but rather accomplish two ends.

First. We can correct any future "sins of omission" in the determination of authority by formalizing the policy of review and revision by the Office of Education, a policy to be enforced by the Office itself.

Second. We can strengthen the effectiveness of the tests by bringing parents in as cooperative and knowledgeable partners in research.

Third. We can protect the rights of privacy of those who elect not to answer what they consider highly confidential subject matter.

I would respectfully request that my colleagues carefully study the findings of the Government Operations Special Subcommittee with a mind to clarifying this matter.

I would also respectfully request that Mr. Harold Howe II, who has just assumed his post as Commissioner of Education, direct the attention of his staff to a serious study of this issue with a determination to remove the apprehensions of so many Americans.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE JOHNSON-McNAMARA STRATEGIC BOMBER CUTBACK TO DETERRING A SOVIET SURPRISE ATTACK ON THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, accompanying these remarks is a table entitled "Comparative Table Illustrating Possible Impact of Johnson-McNamara Bomber Cutback on U.S. Strategic Retaliatory Capability Under Varying Assumptions." I must emphasize that neither the table nor these remarks contain classified information of any kind. The figures are not to be construed as evidencing actual U.S. stockpile quantities of nuclear weapons, nor the deliverable megatonnage of any particular weapons systems. Rather, the figures are either published by the Government, nonofficial estimates found in usually reliable publications, consolidations, reconciliations and extrapolations for either or both or simply arbitrary assumptions for comparison purposes.

The basic purpose of the figures on the table are to illustrate that whether or not our strategic bomber payloads are calculated at 10 megatons, or 400 percent greater at 40 megatons, even this large discrepancy in the assumption results in only a minor difference in the actual percentage reduction in deliverable megatonnage the proposed cutback will result in. Under the 40-megaton assumption, we will end up with a 29-percent cutback leaving us with only 71 percent of our current capability. Under the 10-megaton assumption, we will end up with a 22-percent cutback leaving us with only 78 percent of our current capability. The difference of 400 percent in assumptions makes only a 7-percent difference in the size of the cutback.

Moreover, if the judgment of former Strategic Air Command Commander Gen. Curtis LeMay is correct, and the proposed TFX bomber proves inadequate as a substitute for the bombers being eliminated, the cutback in deterrent will be even more drastic. As indicated by the table, it will amount to a 58-percent cutback under the 40-megaton assumption or a 48-percent cutback under the 10-megaton assumption. Of the untried, as yet even undesigned TFX bomber, General LeMay has publicly stated:

> This will be inadequate to do the job for several reasons * * * insufficient ranges, insufficient size. It just is not big enough.

Attention again is directed to the table and its last line which illustrates that under the most optimistic of the assumptions Secretary McNamara's claim of a present 3 or 4 to 1 U.S. strategic superiority over Soviet strategic forces would drop to 2.34 or 3.12 to 1, while under the most pessimistic assumption it would plummet to 1.26 or 1.68 to 1.

It is clear that Mr. Johnson and Mr. McNamara still see a need for U.S. strategic retaliatory forces to deter Soviet surprise attack. Otherwise they would simply eliminate them rather than reduce them.

This need is based on the repeated assertions of Soviet leaders that communism shall dominate the world. Marxist-Leninist dogma compels these leaders to carry forward a program of world domination. Further, it charges them to carry it forward with maximum haste, utilizing the highest degree of force which can be employed without provoking retaliatory action that would impose unacceptable damage to the Communist homeland and base of power. If they do not do so, they are guilty of the Communist sin of deviation from dogma.

The principal—perhaps the only—reason for U.S. strategic forces is to have the capability to impose unacceptable damage on the Communist homeland which, in fact, deters Communist leaders from a dogmatic decision to strike us to expedite the program of world domination. Our strategic forces are realistically based on an understanding of this Communist doctrine and are in realistic response to it.

If these forces are eliminated or reduced to a point where Communist leaders calculate they are capable only of imposing "acceptable" damage, then deterrence fails and the Soviets are compelled to strike us.

To avoid this consequence, the United States must continually and correctly answer two basic questions: "What does it take to deter the Soviets?" and "Do we have it?" We have continually and correctly done so up to now. At least, any miscalculation has been on the upside, rather than the downside, otherwise we would have been attacked.

What about the future?

Will these Johnson-McNamara manipulations leave us with or without sufficient strikeback damage imposing capability to continue deterring the Soviets from a decision to strike us? Put another way, will they leave us with what the Kremlin calculates as a capability to continue to impose "unacceptable" damage on them, or will they leave us with only a capability the Kremlin calculates can impose "acceptable" damage? Apparently the President and his Defense Secretary have the feeling the Kremlin will remain deterred. If they are wrong and the move invites a surprise nuclear attack, Secretary McNamara himself last February told the House Armed Services Committee that such an attack could kill as many as 149 million Americans. Thus the lives of that many Americans may ride on the correctness of their judgment. Yet neither official has given the American people the slightest clue as to what they base this most vital of all defense and survival judgments upon.

On the one hand, Aleksei N. Kosygin and Leonid I. Brezhnev—the new Soviet rulers—are superbly equipped correctly to assess both the damage their surprise attack might do the United States and the damage our surviving retaliatory force might do to them in return. Lieutenant General Brezhnev in 1961 was declared a "hero of the Soviet Union" for his outstanding service in the space and missile program. Kosygin played a key role in running the country's economic system during the Khrushchev years.

On the other hand, President Johnson has never claimed expertise in the area of assessing strategic force capabilities. He relies on Secretary McNamara's judgment and advice. How good is Secretary McNamara's judgment on strategic force levels now that he has had almost 5 years on-the-job training in defense matters? It can be considered no more infallible than any of his other judgments which, in the past, on some very vital defense issues have proved quite questionable. Examples:

His following statement October 2, 1964, on the Vietnam war:

> The major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965 * * * by the end of this year (1964) * * * the U.S. program should have progressed to the point where 1,000 U.S. military personnel can be withdrawn.

The Senate Armed Forces Subcommittee report of August 1965 concluding that shortages of supplies have existed in Vietnam despite the Secretary's claim to the contrary.

His leadership participation in the Cuban crisis settlement which failed to obtain on-site inspection for removal of Soviet missiles.

Downgrading of the role and influence of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the McNamara regime.

The Secretary's dogged opposition to nuclear propulsion for new aircraft carriers.

The steady deterioration of relationships with our NATO allies during his tenure of office.

His scheme of reorganization of Army divisions which necessitated "re-reorganization" and delay in getting troops to Vietnam and which has resulted in several other divisions becoming sadly unbalanced for lack of infantrymen.

His part in the still controversial and partially obscured TFX contract award.

His arbitrary and highhanded merger and downgrading of Reserve and National Guard forces.

DOD's retirement of the U.S. stockpile of 24-megaton nuclear bombs.

DOD's scrapping of plans for such weapons systems as Pluto, Skybolt, Dinosoar, and the B–70.

His redeployment of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe away from points where they can be used immediately against surprise invaders.

The Secretary's insistence that potential antimissile and antisatelite defense weapons be kept in R. & D. rather than installed.

Further, as to the Vietnam war:

As late as May 1965, the Defense Secretary fixed $700 million a year as the added dollars needed for the war. A few months later, the costs began to run up into the billions. Now the Congress is to be asked for an additional $12.5 billion.

In mid-1964, with U.S. casualties rising, the Defense Secretary was insisting that Vietnam was not a war and that American soldiers being killed there were not in combat; but were advisers and instructors.

In 1964 there was a flurry caused by complaints of U.S. fliers that their old, slow aircraft were crashing, losing wings, falling apart. Congress was told the B–26's and T–28's involved had been carefully tested and were performing outstandingly. Then later the fighter-bombers were grounded and it was acknowledged that some might have had structural defects.

When Congress complained about the use of World War II planes rather than jets, it was told that new jets were not suited to this war, that propeller-driven aircraft were better. Now a growing share of the Air Force and Navy planes in use in Vietnam are jets.

Secretary McNamara's habitual and profligate misuse of "numbers game" techniques which deceive himself and result in misstatement of defense capabilities. Example:

His claim to have increased by 45 percent the number of combat ready Army divisions. The claim conveys the impression of an Army increase of nearly one-half; that is, a boost of from 14 pre-McNamara divisions to 20 or 21 divisions, and a manpower increase of almost 400,000 over the Army's previous 900,000 level. In actuality, at the time of the claim he had added only 63,273 men—a 7-percent boost. The arithmetic on division numbers is even more revealing. Under Eisenhower, 3 of the Army's 14 divisions were considered in training. McNamara subtracted these from the 14 to get 11 divisions against which to calculate his percentage of increase. He then produced three new combat ready divisions by the simple expedient of issuing the "in-training" divisions additional equipment and relabeling them combat ready. The two more divisions needed to get 16 to reach the "magic 45-percent increase" came out of thin air. They simply were created by reshuffling manpower from existing divisions to newly created ones and classifying them "combat ready," too. The final easy step was to divide 11 into 5 to produce the magic 45 percent.

In assessing whether the Johnson-McNamara manipulations reducing the Nation's strategic capabilities will leave us sufficient power to threaten retaliatory damage sufficient to deter the Kremlin leaders many factors must be considered. Among them are these:

First. The U.S.S.R. places great emphasis on large yield weapons for strategic deterrence. Its arsenal stocks them heavily. It has tested a 57-ton megaton weapon and announced the ability to fabricate 100-megaton warheads. It has the large missiles needed to deliver them. Undoubtedly in their eyes the creditability of our deterrent threat dwindles because of our major shift from aircraft delivering 40 megatons to missiles delivering only 1 megaton.

Second. The U.S.S.R. claims success in developing antiaircraft and antimissile defenses able to hit a fly in the sky. It proceeds with a vigorous program to install them at many strategic locations. It is argued by some that installations of this nature are significant because they signal an intention to strike first, then utilize the defensive weapons to minimize retaliatory damage.

Third. Success in war and therefore success in deterring a war requires a substantial amount of overkill or excess capability. Our deterrent force must both survive and penetrate enemy territory with sufficient undamaged aircraft and missiles to inflict unacceptable damage—even after suffering substantial reductions. These reductions include: Damage by the enemy's first strike, malfunctions, accidents, attrition during flight, destruction while over enemy territory, missed targets, and so on. For example: During World War II we manufactured a quantity of bullets 65 times that of the entire population of the Axis powers and 2,000 depth charges for every enemy submarine. For every enemy submarine "killed" an average of 1,500 depth charges were expended. Compare this 1,500-to-1 ratio with the Secretary's 3 or 4 to 1.

Fourth. It is reasonable to assume the Soviets assign some realistic diminution factor to our retaliatory capability arising from our recurring need to divert resources to troubled areas such as the Dominican Republic and Vietnam.

Fifth. It is reasonable to assume the Soviets assign some realistic diminution factor to the credibility of our deterrent, not only from repeated Kennedy-Johnson administration moves to scale it down in size, but from related administration policies, such as the 50-percent cutback in fissionable material production, large slashes in the military budget, wide-ranging activities of the U.S. Disarmament Agency, and consistently reiterated presidential fears of escalation, proliferation, and accidental war.

Sixth. The area of the Soviet Union is some 8.6 million square miles. The satellite countries add further to this figure. The area of the United States is 3.6 million square miles. The basic strategic coverage load on the United States by this measure thus exceeds that of the Soviets by over 2 to 1.

Seventh. The high density population and industrial concentration characteristics of the United States compared to those of the Soviets places a relatively smaller strategic load on the U.S.S.R. than upon us.

Eighth. The heavy odds that the Soviets will initiate a surprise first strike attack against us, rather than the United States striking first against them, further lessens the Soviet strategic load.

Ninth. The McNamara 2- or 3-to-1 ratio applies only to the Soviet threat. Such substantial megatonnage as increasingly must be reserved to deter Red China's growing nuclear arsenal must be deducted from, and therefore diminish, the U.S. side of this equation.

Tenth. The fact that the Soviets tend to accept rather large damage factors before, in their own minds, they classify them as unacceptable. In World War II they readily accepted 25 million human fatalities and the destruction of 40 percent of their industrial capacity without considering the combined loss unacceptable damage.

According to testimony in House Armed Services Committee files up to 149 million American lives can be lost unless surprise nuclear attack upon the United States is deterred. With a national population of 195 million people, this means each of us has a 76.4 percent chance of being one of those fatalities.

That is precisely what is at stake—our lives. Each of us has that bet on whether President Johnson and Secretary McNamara know what they are doing and are correctly answering the questions: "What does it take to deter the Soviets?" and "Will we have it after the cutbacks are made?"

Considering the fallibilities of Mr. McNamara's judgments, the many considerations involved in answering the questions, and what each of us has at stake here, we have an absolute right to far better assurances than the President and his Secretary have given that they proceed with wisdom.

The administration's duty to the Nation to furnish this information is clear and it is challenged to do so, without declassifying military secrets, just as I have refrained from utilizing classified material to make the challenge.

Unless and until it does satisfactorily and independent judgments can be made, the only safe assumption is that the projected lowering of present U.S. strategic capabilities to 71 percent of their existing levels is deadly risky business and must be vigorously opposed.

Comparative table illustrating possible impact of Johnson-McNamara bomber cutback on U.S. strategic retaliatory capability under varying assumptions

	1-megaton missile payload assumption comparison for 40-megaton and 10-megaton bomber payload assumptions with and without availability of 210 TFX bombers			
	With TFX available		Without TFX available [1]	
	40 megatons	10 megatons	40 megatons	10 megatons
Strategic Force now:				
680 B-52's and B-58's	27,200	6,800		
1,350 missiles	1,350	1,350		
Total	28,550	8,150		
Johnson-McNamara alterations:				
Less:				
425 bombers eliminated	17,000	4,250		
Subtotal	11,500	3,900	11,500	3,900
Add:				
360 missiles	360	360	360	360
210 TFX bombers	8,400	2,100	0	0
New total	20,310	6,360	11,860	4,260
Percent reduction in net megatonnage	29 percent	22 percent	58 percent	48 percent.
Percent of "new" force to "present" force level	71 percent	78 percent	42 percent	52 percent.
New U.S. to U.S.S.R. strategic superiority ratio based on McNamara claim of "3 or 4 to 1" present ratio.	2.13 or 2.84 to 1.	2.34 or 3.12 to 1.	1.26 or 1.68 to 1.	1.56 or 2.08 to 1.

---

[1] Gen. Curtis LeMay states the proposed TFX bomber will be "inadequate to do the job." Its potential megatonnage is eliminated from consideration in these two columns.

BAY COUNTY, MICH., BAR ASSOCIATION VOICES SUPPORT OF OUR MILITARY FORCES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most every Member of this House returned from his home district with expressions of loyalty and patriotism on behalf of constituents or constituent organizations within the district he represents with respect to our international situation.

Recently the Bay County, Mich., Bar Association adopted a very splendid resolution in support of our forces who are struggling on the field of battle to hold back the Red tide.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE BAY COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States of America, in the interest of freedom and liberty, are engaged in an armed and bloody conflict with the Communist Vietcong and North Vietnam in southeast Asia; and

Whereas there have been in recent weeks and months, obstructive public demonstrations by sundry groups and individuals in the United States supporting the aforesaid Communist enemy, such as the flying of Vietcong flags, burning of draft cards, the attempted obstruction of troop train movements, drives to collect money, supplies and blood for said enemy, which is or may be injurious to the morale of our troops, some of whom may overlook the fact that said activities constitute the viewpoint of but a small minority of people: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Bay County Bar Association does and it hereby congratulates the members of the Armed Forces of the United States for their gallant and heroic efforts in southeast Asia in the defense of our country and freedom and further, that said bar association extends its unswerving support to our Armed Forces for their speedy and victorious termination of hostilities; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of Defense of the United States of America.

COOPERATION WITHIN THE FREE WORLD

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, now that the United States has agreed to cooperate fully in the embargo on Rhodesia, the time has come to halt British and other free world shipments of vital supplies to Communist Cuba.

The shipment of British oil and Canadian wheat to Cuba strengthens that Communist base just off our shores, a base from which revolution and terror are being exported to other Latin American lands. We recall that it was from Cuba, only 3 years ago, that Soviet leaders sought to get a nuclear drop on the United States.

Since 1963, however, 83 vessels carrying the British flag, 52 Lebanese ships, and a number of other free world carriers have landed supplies in Cuba—supplies which help to keep communism operating there. These figures were made public by the U.S. Maritime Administration in December.

Britain, thus, is helping Cuba, where a large part of the populace has been forced to flee Communist terror and tyranny. On the other hand, not a single British civilian or soldier has been killed in Rhodesia, which rebelled against British rule.

Surely our administration should insist that Britain and the others of our allies cooperate with us as we have with them. A free world embargo of Cuba should be proclaimed at once.

"THERE IS A TIME FOR DECISION"

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on October 7 of last year, Mr. Herbert V. Prochnow delivered an address at DePauw University, entitled "There Is a Time for Decision." Mr. Prochnow is president of the First National Bank of Chicago and the purpose of the address was in connection with the "Dr. Paul L. Morrison Fund in Political Economy," and Mr. Prochnow was one of the visiting professors.

His address is quite provocative and raises some very important questions as to our economy. The address follows:

THERE IS A TIME FOR DECISION

(An address by Herbert V. Prochnow, president, the First National Bank of Chicago)

(NOTE.—The "Dr. Paul L. Morrison Fund in Political Economy" was established in 1961 in honor of Dr. Morrison. It is designed to bring to DePauw University political economists of international prominence to conduct seminars and to lecture to students and faculty. Dr. Prochnow is the fifth visiting professor to appear at DePauw under this program.)

In the fall of 1914, the somber shadow of war fell across the world. After 4 fateful years, a war-weary mankind celebrated an armistice in a spirit of triumph. But the brave new world for which men were giving their lives eluded the grasp of the statesmen. Dictatorships sprang up. Communist revolutions erupted. Currencies were destroyed. The colonial system tottered.

Then came the 1920's, when we spoke lyrically of a new era with depression impossible and prosperity inevitable. But the towering structure of prosperity collapsed. We were caught in the debris of a disastrous market debacle. Economic depression overtook the world. Unbelievably, we then began the grim enterprise of a second World War, engulfing almost all of mankind, and ending only when the terrifying clouds had left behind their dead at Hiroshima. The last great empires were shattered and whatever stability they had provided in the world was gone. Reasonable certainty in international affairs had come to an end. The world lay half in ruins. Dozens of new nations, inexperienced in self-government, struggled for survival as they faced poverty, disease, and illiteracy. There was an alarming drift to communism as men and women desperately sought economic security. In only a few years, communism swept over one-third of the world's population and one-fourth of the earth's surface. The idea that the progress of mankind is inevitable was proved false.

Those were dark and disillusioning days. And yet, as we now know, the raw materials of economic and social renewal were present in Western Europe, waiting only to be given leadership and American financial assistance to make this in less than two decades one of the great areas of strength in the world.

Today, only one-half century since World War I, we have become the most powerful nation on earth. We have become the finest illustration in history of how a people enrich life and raise their whole level of economic well-being when they are given justice, liberty, and incentive. However, as we look back over these years with their booms and depressions, the massive loss of men and property in two world wars, the rise of communism, the dissolution of great empires, the creation of dozens of new nations, and the development of nuclear power, we may well agree with Alfred North Whitehead that "the progress of civilization is not wholly a uniform drift toward better things." This half-century was a time of triumph and tragedy.

We may ask ourselves, what are our responsibilities in a free society which in less than a lifetime witnesses such revolutionary changes? More than 2,200 years ago a philosopher said that "for everything there is a season, a time to break down and a time to build up; a time to keep silence and a time to speak; a time for war and a time for peace." There is a time for everything. For what, we may ask, is this the time? What are the issues for which the time has now arrived? What are the problems for which we should say, "Now is the time to discuss them. Now is the time for their solution. Now is the time for decision. Now is the time for action." Consider then some of the problems and issues confronting our people.

The men who laid the foundation of this country had definite convictions regarding the objectives of a free people. The primary objective was to assure that the rights of every human being would be safeguarded and that he would have the opportunity to develop his talents and capacities fully.

From the time of Aristotle and Plato, men have earnestly debated the role of government in a nation's economic life. There has never been a time in American history when government has not participated in our economic life. However, the role of government has not only changed; it has also expanded over the years. Looking at the record of the past, we may ask whether the role of government will continue to expand as it has since the founding of the Republic. A few questions may indicate the probable trend. Will scientific progress increase with far-reaching effects on industry, communication, travel, and employment, so that those affected will seek government assistance? Will uncertainties continue to arise in our economic life for different groups? Will government be expected to provide remedies for these problems? Will the social security program grow smaller, stand still, or grow larger? Will the millions of persons in our rapidly growing metropolitan centers demand better coordination and development by government of water resources, sewage plants, educational facilities, and streets and highways?

Will rising incomes of the people lead them to demand more hospitals, and medical and recreational facilities as they have in the past? Will the increasing development of atomic energy for peace-time purposes lead to the establishment of agencies for its regulation and inspection? Will vastly increased highway and transportation requirements in the next 10 years lead to large expenditures by government? One could continue these questions, but the probable increasing role of government in the years ahead seems clear.

And yet, the overriding economic fact is that it is not government, but modern industry, with massive automated and power-driven equipment, producing a continuous flow of goods and services for the economic enrichment of man that is the great social instrument of our time. The enormous production of wealth, widely distributed to the masses, has far surpassed the expansion of the role of government. With the broad distribution of wealth, we have found that in the very process of producing wealth, industry is making its market while it is making its goods. Now is the time to understand more clearly what this massive American industrial plant with its vast outflowing of goods means to the Nation as it gives economic freedom in increasing measure to our people.

If we maintain the incentives for the continuing expansion and modernization of our industrial plant, it is certain to make available to the masses the comforts, conveniences, and cultural advantages that once were the privilege of the few. In many respects this is the major economic development of our time. It has destroyed decisively the idea that this Nation has reached economic maturity. It is giving the people that economic freedom from which the higher values of a society flow. It is enabling us to cultivate increasingly those values that lie beyond economics.

With something less than a prophetic revelation, Karl Marx once said that capitalism would impoverish the people until nothing would remain but masses of "exploited proletariat" and a few "exploiters." Few men have been so wrong, so completely, and so rapidly.

Modern industry also has outdated much of the economic philosophy of Thorstein Veblen. You will recall that Veblen looked upon business leaders as the modern leisure class. He said that the relation of the leisure class to the Nation's economy is "a relation of acquisitiveness, not production; of exploitation, not of serviceability." Veblen spoke critically of a society in which the rich have conspicuous leisure to indulge in conspicuous consumption. However, conspicuous consumption by the few is not the characteristic of the American economy. It is not the few with conspicuous leisure who crowd the highways on Sunday afternoons with 72 million automobiles.

It is not the ostentatious consumption of a few rich persons that has put 73 million television sets into American homes. It is not the conspicuous consumption and waste of a small number of rich persons that sends 2 million people abroad each year, makes over 20 million Americans stockholders, and put hundreds of millions of appliances into tens of millions of American homes to free men and women of drudgery and raise their standard of living. It has not been government, but modern business organization using the greatest industrial plant in the world that has made this economic miracle possible. It has been billions of dollars of savings and investment poured into modern production facilities that has magnified and multiplied the physical efforts of labor so that man can be liberated from poverty.

We have created on a large scale a new economic instrument in our society, the modern business organization, with professional management bringing together men of skill and knowledge with every type of equipment at their command to produce a continuous flow of goods and services for the people. It is time we recognized this significant development and realized that we are witnessing now the social ministry of a machine civilization. It is one thing for a John Ruskin to warn us of the social perils of a machine civilization, but it is no less important for us to be aware of its great social possibilities. The modern business enterprise is the driving force that has made possible the world's greatest consumer market. It has raised the standard of living of our people to the highest level in history. It has produced a complex array of equipment for the Nation's defense in a turbulent world. It has paid a large share of the Government's bills.

Over 400,000 businesses begin each year and almost as many go out of existence. Millions of American consumers in the marketplace determine which products and services they want. They determine therefore which business organizations will succeed and which will fail. No central government makes these decisions. Each day the American people by their choices provide the discipline in the marketplace which determines the direction of the Nation's economic life.

This country was at one time primarily an agricultural Nation. We have moved in our history from a simple pastoral era into a complex technological society. Today only 7 or 8 percent of the labor force is in agriculture. As men left agriculture, they became industrial workers. Professional, technical, and managerial employees are now the largest group in our working population. They are vital to the continuance of modern enterprise. Of equal significance, the largest single group of employees today consists of teachers. This is a fundamental change in our society and it will accelerate.

The changing character of our employed groups will have a far-reaching impact on the Nation. With the multiplication of professional skills and talents, we shall be bolder in attacking new economic frontiers and in making economic advances. The gap between the advanced and the developing nations may well be further widened with all the problems that follow. No nation can now advance satisfactorily in the competitive struggle between nations unless it rapidly increases the number of its well-educated persons. The untrained and the unskilled are unfortunately liabilities in the economic and social progress of a society. In the early development of a nation the clearing of forests, the building of roads, the cultivation of fields all proceed before a society is finally able to create a skilled, technically trained people.

Thirty years ago only 1 out of every 8 employed Americans had been to high school. Today 4 out of 5 children of high school age attend high school. Thirty years ago only 4 percent of the young people of college age were in college. Today the figure is 35 percent for the entire country and closer to 50 percent for metropolitan areas. An estimated 54 million students, or almost 28 percent of the total population, are enrolled in schools and colleges this fall. Approximately 5.4 million are enrolled in colleges and professional schools. We shall spend about $39 billion on education in the current school year.

In our educational revolution we are creating the producers of modern society—persons who come to their responsibilities with knowledge and with engineering, scientific, economic, and technical skills. They provide the scientists, doctors, accountants, teachers, chemists, and production, distribution, legal and economic authorities we need in modern industry. They are the increasing number in an advanced society who work with their minds. We are certain to have vastly increased expenditures for education to maintain leadership in the world.

Consider another problem for which the time for decision may have come. The U.S. dollar is the reserve currency for many nations. The economic and financial strength of this Nation and the integrity of its currency are therefore matters of the first concern. Our responsibility as a great nation has been complicated in recent years by the persistent and large deficit in our balance of payments. We have initiated many arrangements designed to give us more time to solve this problem. The technical skill which produced these arrangements—the huge currency swap transactions with foreign central banks; the various types of Treasury bonds issued to obtain foreign exchange; the increased cooperation of central banks; and the London gold pool—is to be commended.

We are currently engaged in a program of voluntary restraint to redress the deficit in the balance of payments, and current figures indicate that the outflow of funds has been reduced. Let us assume that we are successful in bringing our payments into equilibrium. Let us also assume that in 6 months, or a year, or 2 years from now, we lower the walls of restraint that have held up the outflow of funds. What steps will we have taken to correct the fundamental causes of our current payments problem?

Will the European market still be attractive to Americans for investment? For example, will tens of millions of European homes without central heating still offer an attractive market for manufacturing facilities abroad? Will the one-fourth of all French homes without running water still be a tempting market for the production of appliances in Europe? Will Europe—with only 1 automobile for every 15 persons compared to 1 for every 2.7 persons in the United States—continue to be a profitable field for American investment? Will direct investment abroad by Americans still be attractive? It is in fact to the long-run advantage of this Nation to have profitable, direct investments made abroad by American business. The Nation's welfare might be better served if we placed less of the responsibility for correcting the balance-of-payments deficit on the private sector and more on the public sector of our economy.

Let us assume that the present voluntary restraint program was necessary as a temporary measure. Having thus agreed, can we not also agree that the sooner it is possible to end any program of restraint—either voluntary or compulsory—the better it will be for us and for the world? The ultimate objective of the foreign economic policy of all nations must be the elimination of restrictions to the free flow of capital and goods. Necessary as restraints may seem as temporary measures, they are contrary to the basic principle of increasing economic freedom for men and nations. Moreover, restrictions on the outflow of funds are holding measures. They are not basic corrections of the balance-of-payments deficit.

No other nation can approach in magnitude the industrial power of the United States and its capacity to improve the economic welfare of the people of the world. The gross national product of the United States is approximately twice that of its nearest rival, Russia, and six times that of the third largest economy, West Germany. As we have noted, it has been modern private industry, with its massive, power-driven, automated equipment, which has been the major instrument for the economic enrichment of our people.

Machines supply 98 percent of the power for our industry. Men are free from the hardest physical labor and drudgery and, in a significant measure, from poverty. Our people have more leisure hours, receive better wages, and have more plant, equipment, and energy-producing facilities working for them than any people in the world. The unusual industrial power and genius of our people can, in the years ahead, also contribute greatly to the economic betterment of all peoples when goods and capital move freely between nations. A machine civilization has the possibility of bringing a new dynamic into the lives of millions of people over the world. Only when we eliminate barriers to the free movement of goods, services, and capital, will we succeed in utilizing most efficiently the skills and imaginations of men everywhere. This is another major economic issue which urgently requires reexamination if this Nation is to solve the problem of its balance of payments deficit and yet make the contribution to world stability and progress which the peculiar industrial genius of its people might assure.

There is a growing acceptance now of the philosophy that the economy of a nation operates best if credit at all times is relatively easy with interest rates kept low. Is this philosophy sound? Would we maintain that the economy of a nation operates best if the supply of labor is relatively easy with wage rates kept low, especially since labor costs in so many products constitute a large part of the total cost? Would we maintain that the economy of a nation operates best if the supply of farm products or raw materials is relatively plentiful with their prices kept low? Would we maintain that it is sound economic policy to single out one item—labor, steel, automobiles, farm products, raw materials, or credit—and seek to keep its supply plentiful and its cost low? The marketplace should determine the level of interest rates, wages and rent, and the prices of steel, farm products and raw materials. It is not a question of low price, or high price, but the right price at any given time. The right price is the price determined in the market. The time is here for an intellectually mature approach to this economic problem.

Do we as a nation also need to set down more clearly our priorities for expenditures? For example, we are spending billions of dollars in space exploration. These programs may be more important to the Nation's welfare than an expenditure for any other purpose. And yet, it is doubtful whether our people understand the urgent necessity for these programs in relation to many other heavy commitments such as Vietnam.

Which expenditures now should have priority over the critical need for more and better schools and housing to help relieve present racial tensions?

By 1980, it is estimated that we shall have 50 million more automobiles on our highways. The number of American families increased 20 percent from 1950 to 1962, but the number of car-owning families increased by 60 percent. If our population increase continues at its present rate annually, we shall have almost 350 million people by the end of the next 35 years using 300 million cars. Obviously, these increases do not seem sustainable. How far can these trends continue with the absorption of land and the staggering expenditures for tollways? Water resources constitute another serious problem. The time is here for intelligent discussion of what the priorities should be for meeting some of the great needs of our society, such as educational facilities, housing, transportation, water resources, space exploration, and halting the deterioration in the heart of our great metropolitan centers where tens of millions now live.

Our international relations also constitute an area we need to reexamine constantly and critically. World leadership has brought with it responsibilities we had neither anticipated nor sought. The shattering of the great world empires following two world wars has resulted in the emergence of dozens of new nations with over 1 billion persons. This may be the single most important economic and political development of our time. In their struggle against poverty and ignorance, these people will constitute for years a continuing threat to the peace of the world. We cannot ignore this threat nor is there any assurance that we can adequately meet it.

With only 195 million people, can this Nation possibly solve problems of poverty, illiteracy, disease, inadequate tax systems, inflation, and land reform for almost 1½ billion people? Eight hundred million of these people live in India, Pakistan, Indonesia, and southeast Asia, 50 million in the Middle East, 240 million in Africa and 230 million in Latin America. Today, African and Asian nations represent over 53 percent of the United Nations membership. The 36 African nations alone represent almost one-third. If current population trends continue for only 35 years, there will be 5 to 6 billion people in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and they will constitute well over 80 percent of the world's population. It is estimated that more than 500 million children of school age in the world are not now enrolled in any school. Are we to conclude that the opportunity of these nations to defeat poverty, illiteracy, hunger and disease will steadily become less probable in the years ahead?

In India alone there are nearly 500 million persons, one-seventh of the world's population. The increase in population is between 10 and 12 million annually. The birth rate is among the highest in the world. Eight out of ten persons are illiterate. The overwhelming majority do not have enough income to feed themselves adequately.

An estimated 40 percent of the people must live on 10 cents or less a day. In New Delhi, it requires over 10 cents a day to buy even enough rice for a minimum diet. Many persons have bad water supplies and no sewage systems. Even in the large cities, only one-half the houses at the most have sewage disposal. An estimated 1 million people in Calcutta have no homes at all. Seventy percent of the people of India are engaged in farming. Over 90 percent of the 600,000 villages are without electric power.

With the exception of Red China, here in one nation of 500 million persons in an area about two-fifths the size of the continental United States there is the greatest povery, unemployment, illiteracy and mass misery of any place on earth. India is engaged in a struggle for survival. There are major food shortages. Inflation is bad. Food, machinery, and raw materials must be imported on a large scale, resulting in heavy trade deficits. Large crash development programs by the government have resulted in substantial budget deficits and heavy borrowing from the central bank. No other nation has so many unemployed or underemployed. Some sources estimate that perhaps 40 million persons have work less than one-half day a week. The United States and several other nations are pouring many hundreds of millions of dollars of aid annually into India in a struggle to assure some economic progress for the nation at the same time it seeks to maintain the freedom of its people. Our total economic aid to India has probably exceeded $6 billion. Counterpart funds, the Indian currency we receive in payment of our large so-called sales of agricultural products, have been accumulated to our credit in India in amounts that run into the equivalent of billions of dollars.

However, India is only one country. Nearby is Pakistan with 100 million persons with comparable problems. To the southeast is Indonesia with 100 million people. There are other nations in the Far East—the Philippines, Korea, Vietnam, Burma, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia—with equally difficult economic and political problems. With the possible exception of Israel, there are an additional 50 million persons in the nations of the Middle East—Iran, Iraq, Jordan, and others—who are struggling against illiteracy and poverty.

Two entire continents, Africa and Latin America, have come forward as areas whose economic and political problems require attention.

Historically, the greatest single event of the 1960's may be the political liberation of Africa. This continent is about four times as great in area as the United States, 50 percent larger than Soviet Russia and larger than all of North America. It is almost 5,000 miles long and 4,500 miles wide—with an area as large as the United States, Western Europe, India, and Red China combined. Ninety-seven percent of the 240 million people are of African origin and they speak 700 languages or dialects. Approximately 85 percent of the people cannot read or write, and 62 million of the 83 million children of school age are not in school. The average annual income of $132 per person is less than that of any other continent.

This continent has over 40 percent of the world's hydroelectric potential and one-fifth of its forests. For some years Africa has provided the free world with nearly all its industrial diamonds, more than one-half of its newly mined gold, one-fourth of its copper and important quantities of lead, zinc, manganese, iron, cobalt, bauxite, platinum, uranium, and other metals. Practically the entire world's supply of columbite, a rare metal used in jet engines, comes from Nigeria. There are also important new discoveries of oil. The continent has nearly every mineral and can produce almost every crop. Here are great resources invaluable to the industrial expansion of the free world in the years ahead.

Today there are 56 nations in Africa. Although each of the 56 countries is at a different level of economic and political development, there is overall a potentially explosive nationalism. Unfortunately, as Arnold Toynbee has indicated, freedom came to Africa while the masses of its people south of the Sahara were still living in a precivilizational state of their development. They are therefore faced with the overwhelming problems of setting up governments with little or no experience to prepare them for this difficult responsibility.

Africa as a whole is one of the least developed areas of the world. The continent provides an unfortunate example of poverty, illiteracy, hunger, disease and inadequate medical facilities, industrial skills, and capital. In 22 countries of tropical Africa less than one-half the children go even to the first primary grade in school. Moreover, in these 22 countries an average of 95 percent of the primary schoolchildren never enter a secondary school. To provide elementary school buildings alone might cost two or three times the total national budget of a country and this would not include the expense of running the schools.

Even if there had been no colonization, there is no reason to believe that Africa would have overcome its tragic poverty. There is also no assurance now that if Africa is left to itself it will enter a period of accelerated economic progress. Here then are the ingredients of political instability and revolution. Here also are 240 million persons we hope will achieve economic progress peacefully within the framework of democracy.

In addition to these undeveloped areas of the world, we need also to evaluate the magnitude of our problems and new commitments in Latin America. Many Latin American nations have had independence for more than a century. There are in Latin America approximately 230 million people in an area about twice the size of the United States. Their average life expectancy is only 45 years compared with 70 years in the United States. The population is increasing at the striking rate of 2.3 percent each year, faster than any other major part of the world, and compared to 1.5 percent for the United States. The cities are growing at the remarkable rate of 5 percent a year, and 3 of the 10 largest cities of the world are now in Latin America—Mexico City, Buenos Aires, and São Paulo.

Over one-half of the labor force of Latin America is engaged in agriculture and yet less than one-fourth of the gross national product comes from this industry, indicating its backwardness. Less than 5 percent of the landowners own 70 percent of the land, and less than 5 percent of the land is cultivated, compared with 18 percent in the United States. In some countries such as Bolivia, Colombia, Peru, and Venezuela less than 3 percent of the land can be cultivated. Only 5 percent of the total land area of South America is suitable for agricultural production compared to 10 percent in the United States and 37 percent in Europe.

Over 50 percent of the adults in Latin America are unable to read or write. Despite Brazil's progress, the illiteracy rate is still over 50 percent. Argentina rates best with only 13 percent. Fifteen million Latin American children are without classrooms. Even in a Latin American nation as advanced as Mexico, it is estimated that more than one-third of the people have no formal education. Forty million of the seventy million children who are 5 to 19 years of age in Latin America do not attend any school. Moreover, the number of children to be educated is increasing at the rate of 5 million every year which is making the problems almost impossible of solution.

Raising the living standards of the present population of 230 million people is a mammoth undertaking, but the problem will be infinitely greater if the population of Latin America continues to grow at the present rate, and more than doubles in a generation. This would be an almost insuperable problem for nations with highly advanced industrial economies, but with economically retarded and politically volatile countries it almost certainly means periods of turmoil and serious trouble for the governments involved.

Many Latin American countries are largely dependent for their export income on one commodity. The biggest single Latin American export is petroleum. Coffee is second. To illustrate, 92 percent of the export income of Venezuela comes from petroleum. Chile receives 65 percent of its export income from minerals. Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Haiti receive 50 to 75 percent of their export income from coffee. Coffee also constitutes from 15 to 30 percent of the exports of Ecuador, Honduras, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua. A sharp drop in the prices of these commodities, especially if there are rising prices in the manufactured goods these countries import, results in a severe curtailment of their imports, huge budget deficits, and not infrequently in political instability. Inflation has also been a widespread and serious problem.

What assurance can we have that these nations, many of which are largely unprepared for self-government, do not endanger the peace of the world through revolutions and violence? Who is to provide educational facilities for hundreds of millions who are illiterate?

How can we assure even the necessary food when per capita food production in various areas now is less than it was before World War II? Nearly two-thirds of the world's people have inadequate food supplies. World food production has been lagging behind population growth. In Latin America, Africa, and the Far East, food production is growing only two-thirds as fast as population. In Latin America food production is below the levels of 25 years ago. In the last 5 years, the population of Latin America has increased almost twice as fast as food production. Medical science has brought about a sharp decrease in infant mortality in the less developed nations, and children under 15 years of age who are unable to add to production constitute 40 to 45 percent of the population, compared to 20 to 30 percent in the developed industrial countries.

Can we provide pure water supplies and drainage systems soon for hundreds of millions of these people? Can we supply means of transportation, communication, and power to many countries that are completely without such facilities? There is not sufficient available investment capital in the entire world to accomplish these objectives within a reasonably short time.

The per capita rate of growth of the national product in the less developed countries averaged 2.5 percent annually between 1950 to 1955. It declined to 1.9 percent over the next 5 years and is estimated at about 1 percent now. In recent years, the average income per person in the less developed nations increased by only $1 a year. More than one-half of the persons in the entire world earn less than $100 per person per year. The difference between the incomes of the peoples of the developed and the underdeveloped nations is widening at an increasing rate.

We must recognize that it is no easy task for governments in these nations in their present stage of development and with widespread illiteracy and poverty to follow middle-of-the-road policies that satisfy the radical elements, the military groups, the large landowners and businessmen. The leaders of many of these countries who are constantly facing crises feel impelled to speak the language of economic urgency and to adopt policies of expediency rather than wisdom. Governments will be considered politically inadequate if they are not economically responsive to need. As one considers the problems of the less developed nations, it seems inevitable that we shall face a turbulent and politically unstable world for years. Consequently, this is a time to be certain that we are sufficiently strong to maintain leadership in this kind of world. This is the time also to decide whether this Nation alone should attempt to assume responsibility for law and order everywhere. Can we ever be sufficiently powerful to maintain order wherever trouble may arise in the entire world? If not, what are the dimensions of our responsibility?

We have emphasized earlier the increasing role of business enterprise in this Nation. However, in varying degrees this is a worldwide development. In a world dedicated to improving the economic welfare of hundreds of millions of persons who are in poverty, business enterprise becomes a major center in a nation's life. The efficiency of production, the values of enlightened management, the widespread distribution of income to the masses, the opportunities given to individuals for economic progress, and a dedication to the primary objectives of a free competitive society all become of prime importance.

If widespread economic progress depends upon the organization of relatively large business enterprises, the world will adopt mass production, mass distribution, mass communication, and mass education. Fortunately, these are ideas of the West, and especially the United States. Other nations may not accept our form of government. They may advocate centralized government with a minimum of freedom for the people. But they will be compelled to adopt the basic ideas of Western economic and business organization if they are to meet the desperate economic needs of their people. As they do, they may also find that these institutions flourish best in a free society where men have the opportunity and incentive to develop their talents.

These are some of the great issues which confront us. I trust I have not in these few minutes brought a false clarity to difficult issues. I am under no delusion that these are simple problems. But there is a time for the discussion and solution of great issues. There is a time for decision and action, or the relentless drift of events will make the decisions. These are issues for which the time for decision may now have arrived.

H.R. 10567 SHOULD BE DEFEATED

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Thomson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the people living on rural routes throughout America want their good mail service to continue, they had better see to it that bill H.R. 10567 is defeated. This bill would authorize the Postmaster General to furnish rural carriers the vehicles needed for the delivery of mail.

The rural carriers throughout the United States travel each day in excess of 1,800,000 miles. There are 31,135 rural routes. If the Postmaster General elected to supply that number of vehicles, the paperwork in keeping track of them would be a monumental task. In addition, requests for repairs, the authorizations and the vouchers would pile up in Washington so deeply the postal service would be nothing but a paper-shuffling agency, rather than a mail delivery service.

Even worse would be the effects on the mail delivery service itself. Many rural carriers by necessity keep more than one vehicle so service may be uninterrupted. Many need special equipment for winter service, including 4-wheel drive. Many carriers live in small towns where emergency vehicles would not be available to them, and no motor pools could be established for prompt replacement due to motor failure or breakdown.

All of these problems are now met in an admirable manner by the loyal and hardworking rural mail carriers of America. They take pride in the regularity and efficiency of their service, and I know that they look with great apprehension at this proposal which would greatly cripple the efficiency of the service they now provide and would be more costly to the Government.

I will urge the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to make a very critical analysis, not only of the costs of this measure, but the effects on the service. When all factors are reviewed, I have every confidence that this proposal will be abandoned even by its sponsors.

FREE WORLD TRADE WITH NORTH VIETNAM AND CUBA

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, perhaps nothing better demonstrates the lack of U.S. prestige than the fact that even our allies have not heeded our requests for an embargo on Communist North Vietnam and Cuba.

The record shows that, despite requests by the State Department, free world vessels continue to unload vital supplies in quantity in both North Vietnam and Cuban ports.

We are not only cooperating in the economic boycott of Rhodesia but are flying oil into next-door Zambia. Yet British-flag vessels unload the preponderance of free world oil and food reaching our North Vietnam and Cuban enemies.

British vessels carried almost 60 percent of 1965 shipments into North Vietnam ports—31 more British vessels entered Cuban ports since 1963 than those of the nearest free world competitor.

Yet we are, I repeat, assisting the British-led blockade against Rhodesia. This is tragic. American lives and American safety are at stake. The time has come to halt free world shipping to our Communist enemies—and we must do it.

COMMERCIAL JETS IN WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers yesterday carried the account of the decision of the Federal Aviation Agency opening Washington National Airport to short-range and intermediate commercial jet operations.

In my opinion, this is a most progressive step, even though some of the area politicians are expressing concern.

Most of the major commercial air carriers have announced that they are phasing-out their piston equipment, and by 1970, I imagine all commercial airlines will be flying jets exclusively.

As the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have been working with the Administrator, General McKee, and the Federal Aviation Agency on this particular subject since mid-September last year.

Although those persons interested in Friendship and Dulles International Airports express concern with this decision, I feel that General McKee and his Agency have made a sound decision based on public convenience and necessity. Attached to my remarks is the letter I received from General McKee on January 11, together with the press release by the Federal Aviation Agency on this subject:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1966.

Hon. SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DEVINE: In view of your interest, I would like you to know that I have just given approval to an agreement with the airlines for the operation of short-haul jets into Washington National Airport starting April 24, 1966. I am enclosing a copy of the announcement outlining the details.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. MCKEE,
Administrator.

FAA OPENS WASHINGTON NATIONAL TO SHORT-HAUL JET OPERATIONS

Washington National Airport will be opened to 2- and 3-engine short-haul jets on April 24, shortening the flight time between the Nation's Capital and certain major cities in the eastern half of the United States by a significant margin, the Federal Aviation Agency announced today.

The airport, which was opened on June 16, 1941, has never previously accepted scheduled air carrier jets. The lifting of this prohibition will assure Washington that the airport will remain a close-in air carrier airport as the airlines replace their propeller-driven planes with pure jets. Prior to the development of the smaller 2- and 3-engine jets, Washington National with its runways of 6,870, 5,202, and 4,724 feet could not handle 4-engine jets on a regular schedule. The introduction of such smaller jets as the Boeing 727, the Douglas DC–9, the BAC–111, and the Caravelle has altered the picture of air carrier service at Washington National since these newer, smaller airplanes can use the two longer runways regularly.

No consideration is being given to permitting the operation of big 4-engine jets from Washington National.

The FAA noted that the opening of jet service at Washington National does not change the basic roles of the two federally owned and operated airports serving the Washington area. Washington National will continue to serve the short- and medium-haul markets while Dulles International will still perform the function for which it was designed—the service of long-haul domestic and international markets.

Airlines have agreed to limit nonstop jet operations from Washington National to a radius of approximately 650 miles, except that this limit will be extended as far as 1,000 miles for scheduled service which was available from the airport in 1965. The jets will serve cities such as Miami, Memphis, St. Louis, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Minneapolis, New York, and Boston. Nonstop jets may also fly from Washington National to Montreal and Bermuda. The airlines will announce the dates when jet service to such cities will begin.

The two- and three-engine jets will cruise at approximately 550 miles per hour, nearly one-third faster than any propeller or turboprop aircraft.

The small and medium jets will climb out of the airport area more sharply and swiftly than propeller-driven aircraft, but otherwise they will use the same flight patterns now in effect at Washington National. Although the noise created by jet engines is different from that of piston engines, jet engine noise levels at Washington National are expected to be about the same as is now created by the piston aircraft.

The FAA decision was made after months of study devoted to the probable impact on air passenger traffic in the Washington area if jet restrictions at Washington National were modified. The most reliable data available indicate that the use of Washington National by short- and medium-range jets will not prevent the continued growth of the other area airports, Dulles International and Friendship International.

With intermediate jet service, passenger traffic at Washington National is expected to rise from the current rate of 7 million persons per year to about 10 million within the next decade. Airlines are planning to enlarge their facilities at the airport, and the Federal Aviation Agency anticipates an eventual major modernization program for the terminal.

Traffic at Dulles International Airport is expected to rise from the 1965 total of 1 million passengers to about 2 million passengers a year by 1975. The airlines have agreed to maintain the daily schedule of flight service out of Dulles that was in effect on October 1, 1965, as a minimum—an average of 89 daily flights. Traffic at Friendship Airport, also is expected to increase significantly during the next 10 years.

The readjustment of landing fees at both Washington National and Dulles has been completed. The landing fees at both airports will be 32 cents per 1,000 pounds for jets. The Federal Aviation Agency estimates that net revenues from landing fees during the first year of jet operations will increase approximately $550,000. During fiscal year 1965, landing fees at Washington National returned approximately $1.1 million to the U.S. Treasury.

Although jet service at Washington National will not begin until April 24, when daylight saving time starts and the airlines revise their schedules, practice and familiarization flights with the two- and three-engine jets are now permissible.

IN SUPPORT OF A BILL TO RESTORE CUTS IN VETERANS' PENSIONS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of this Congress, we enacted a measure to increase the social security benefits by 7 percent. I supported this proposal. Unfortunately this legislation caused many of our veterans and widows of veterans to have their veterans' retirement benefits reduced and in some instances terminated.

How did this happen? During the 88th Congress it was clear to most of us that because of increased living costs, something must be done to increase the benefits of those receiving social security. We recognized at that time that an increase in social security could result in many veterans and widows having their veterans' payments reduced. So we enacted legislation which provided that 10 percent of all payments to an individual, including social security, would be exempt from the computation of income for veteran pensions.

Last year when we increased the social security benefits by 7 percent, the net result in many cases was to increase the veterans' annual income above the amount he was legally allowed to earn with the unintended result being that his veterans' benefits were reduced or terminated. One veteran told me that he received a $4 increase in social security per month and suffered a $25 reduction in his monthly veteran benefits. I am sure every Member of this body would want to see this situation corrected.

Therefore, I have introduced a bill today which permits a veteran to waive all or any part of annuity payments for purposes of increasing or determining eligibility for veterans' pensions. I believe every man ought to have a choice in this matter, and I hope Congress will act favorably this session to rectify this situation.

THOUGHT-PROVOKING EDITORIAL FROM THE WINFIELD, KANS., DAILY COURIER

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a very thought-provoking editorial from the Winfield, Kans., Daily Courier. Its excellent message should be fair warning to all of us that we should stop, look, and reflect carefully before we enact legislation which further weakens the traditional legislative powers and adds to the catalog of strong executive powers.

For some time I have felt that Congress should begin exerting those responsibilities entrusted to it in the Constitution of the United States. It is no accident that Madison, Jefferson, and the Founding Fathers placed the powers of the legislative branch in the very first article of the Constitution. Their experience with a strong monarch and the limits they placed on the executive branch should be observed and respected, not ignored. This fine editorial does an excellent job of pointing out what is happening and what can happen if we are not more careful:

[From the Winfield, Kans., Daily Courier, Dec. 9, 1965]

NEW PRESSURES

Recent events in aluminum, steel, copper, shipping, the railways, and in the schools make it clear that in the past 20 years or so the White House indirectly has acquired a trunkful of new powers.

These new powers were not directly provided to the President by the Constitution. They were not intentionally given to the President by Congress.

They are, rather, powers he has acquired as byproducts of dollars and contracting and allocation authority voted by Congress for entirely different purposes.

A President with imagination, widespread government know-how and determination can use these tools for a variety of objectives for which they were not intended. He can even deny he is using them for these other purposes.

He can impose his will on wide areas of the economy and for objectives that greatly affect our personal lives.

He can, for example, use new indirect powers to influence prices, profits, wages, hiring, managing and firing policies and what local city and county schools teach. He can decide that some firms will grow and others decline.

The multibillion-dollar stockpiles were set up so that the United States wouldn't be caught short of basic materials in a major war.

By selling or refusing to sell materials from the stockpiles a President can force prices down or up and thus regulate company profits.

The multibillion-dollar defense and space budgets were voted to keep the United States safely ahead of Communist Russia.

But a President can use this multi-billion-dollar-a-year contracting power to give or refuse contracts to major companies as a tool to force these firms or their unions into line.

By selecting areas where new contracts were let or new Government facilities built, a President could wipe out the prosperity of one community and create prosperity in another.

Antitrust laws were voted to prevent monopolies from harming the public and small businessmen.

But at some future date a President's underlings conceivably could threaten an antitrust investigation against a large firm which refused to cooperate in a Government program—say, a program to roll back prices. A firm could be threatened with a study of its tax returns.

Since, even for innocent firms, the cost of gathering evidence and conducting a defense might be very costly, the temptation to go along with a President could be overpowering.

Congress voted billions for education. A President can shut off sizable chunks of money to major school systems until those systems comply with administration rulings. These can go far beyond whether a school system integrates. Through national testing requirements, Federal rules on teaching and teachers can be indirectly applied to schools receiving Federal money.

If the Federal Bureau of Investigations should ever be headed by a man less honest and courageous than J. Edgar Hoover, the files of that organization could be a strong weapon in the hands of a President who wanted to convince individuals to follow his suggestions.—R.C.

ACTION SHOULD BE TAKEN TO HALT IMMEDIATELY ALL FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM AND CUBAN PORTS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, on New Year'e Eve, I telegraphed the President and asked that action be taken to halt immediately all free world shipping to North Vietnam and Cuban ports.

I pointed out that our cooperation in the embargo on Rhodesia in Africa gives us the tool to persuade our allies to take this step.

My telegram read as follows:

According to press and news media we are participating in enforcing oil and vital materials embargo against Rhodesia. May I urgently recommend that we now insist on reciprocity by British and all the free world governments in enforcing embargo upon Communist North Vietnam and Cuba? British and other free world ships continue to land oil and other vital supplies in quantity in North Vietnam thus strengthening the very enemies with which we are now at war. Maritime Administration reported in early December 1965 that 83 British, 52 Lebanese, and other free world ships have landed oil, wheat, and so forth, in Cuban ports while ignoring our embargo requests and thus increasing threat of communism in the Americas. Now is the time for firm, decisive action on this matter by the United States.

I received an acknowledgment from the White House and was assured my views would be given consideration. I feel that not a moment should be lost in enforcing an embargo on our two active Communist enemies. So far 11 days have gone by without, so far as I am aware, any action being taken.

The entire situation was forcefully summarized by Columnist Arthur Kroch in the New York Times of December 5, 1965, who said:

Ships of our allies are regularly delivering cargoes essential to the North Vietnamese economy; and, except for South Korea, the Asiatic nations have no troops on the bloody battlefield.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING INTO NORTH VIETNAM AND CUBAN PORTS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, how inept in diplomacy can we get?

Here we are busy halting oil, sugar, and other shipments into Rhodesia. Yet our present diplomats cannot get our friends to stop shipping vital supplies to our active enemies. We know the State Department has tried but apparently not very hard and certainly not with effect.

British ships, Lebonese ships, Scandinavian ships, and other free world ships continue to carry oil and food to North Vietnam and to Cuba. The Communists fighting us from North Vietnam and endangering us from Cuba are thus strengthened.

It does not seem to me it would take undue skill for our diplomats to say: "If we are helping you, why you don't help us?" Or even, "If you won't help us, we won't help you."

After all, this is not a pink tea. This is not table tennis. Free world shipments to North Vietnam and Cuba endanger the flower of our manhood in one case and our security as a nation in the other.

If the administration's diplomats cannot get an embargo on free world shipping to North Vietnam and Cuba, I suggest we fire them and get some diplomats who can.

COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, a vital piece of unfinished business confronts us as we begin the 2d session of the 89th Congress and demands the earliest possible consideration. I speak of the proposal commonly known as the cold war GI bill. It is well known that this session of Congress will be preoccupied with the war in Vietnam. Certainly our concern for the many aspects of this situation would be unforgiveably incomplete if we failed to seek just and equitable treatment for our fighting men defending the cause of freedom in that remote area of the world. Casualty figures alone do not tell us the full extent of the sacrifices being made by our men in uniform. Without doubt the American GI in Vietnam is making a contribution to his country at the cost of a personal sacrifice no less great than that made by his older brother in the Korean conflict or his father in World War II. We should make certain that the Vietnam veteran is accorded the same rights and privileges that we have granted in the recent past.

No doubt we will have to decide this session what Federal programs are most deserving of tax money already hard pressed by the requirements of the Vietnam war. Clearly this would not seem to be the time to initiate new programs. But even though the cold war GI bill is a new program it should be equally clear that at a time when our draft calls are on the increase and our military services are being bolstered to meet our growing commitments in South Vietnam that this is no time to slight those people directly responsible for carrying out this country's difficult and demanding job of stopping Communist aggression and subversion. I believe the American people demand that we take proper care of our veterans and that they further believe certain domestic programs, regardless of their peacetime merit should give way where necessary.

I am indeed encouraged by the announced intention of the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee to hold early hearings on this bill and feel certain that an equitable program can be agreed upon in the very near future. A Congress would not be well remembered by history that failed the Nation's veterans. They are not failing their country.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue which has the broad support of the American people as is indicated by an editorial which appeared in the December 27, 1965, edition of the State Journal, Lansing, Mich., entitled "Troops in Vietnam Merit GI Benefits." Its logic is clear, its argument simple and direct, and I commend it to my colleagues. Under unanimous consent I will insert it in the RECORD following these remarks.

A GI education program will require added appropriations but its cost should be considered an integral part of the cost of the war in Vietnam. It is not a fringe benefit. It is essential to insuring that the disruption experienced by these young men will not necessarily work a continuing hardship on them as they seek to realize their life plans and goals.

The editorial follows:

TROOPS IN VIETNAM MERIT GI BENEFITS

> Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, Democrat, of Texas, the father of the GI bill of rights for Korean war veterans, predicts early approval of a new bill which would provide similar benefits for American fighting men in Vietnam.
>
> The prediction should be borne out by Congress when it gets down to business next year.
>
> TEAGUE said recently he expected Congress to pass, by the end of February, legislation extending education and home-buying benefits to veterans with more than 180 days of active duty since 1955. Such a bill already has been approved by the Senate.
>
> In simple justice to those who are fighting in Vietnam for the same principles U.S. troops fought to uphold in Korea, we share Representative TEAGUE's hope that the Johnson administration will retreat from its opposition to the measure when the House Veterans' Affairs Committee resumes hearings on the bill next month.
>
> Previous bills have helped millions of veterans, including those who fought in World War II, go to college and buy homes. Similarly, the new bill would pay college or vocational school expenses and guarantee loans for purchase of homes, farms, and farm equipment for veterans of more than 180 days' active service since the Korean GI bill expired January 31, 1965.
>
> Commenting on administration opposition to the bill, TEAGUE said: "Money is the whole thing." He estimated the cost would be several hundred million dollars in the first year.
>
> Congress this year passed costly Great Society legislation at the bidding of the same administration that up to this point has opposed granting to GI's fighting in Vietnam benefits similar to those made available to the veterans of World War II and Korea.
>
> Conserving the taxpayers' money is an important objective—a point which hasn't bothered Johnson when he has pushed through Congress other spending programs he has deemed in the Nation's interest.
>
> The public should not be required to pay for frills as well as the increasing cost of the war in Vietnam and other essential spending but fairness and justice to the U.S. forces in Vietnam certainly should not be regarded as a frill.
>
> The bill already passed by the Senate was also sponsored by a Texas Democratic lawmaker, RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.
>
> Legislation that would extend the GI benefits to veterans of the Vietnam conflict deserves the support of another prominent Texas Democrat—President Johnson.
>
> But whether Johnson supports it or not, Congress has an obligation to enact it at next year's session.

THEY'D HAVE TO SEE IT TO BELIEVE IT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, too often here in Washington, the elected and appointed officials forget who they really work for.

Appearances of the last session of this body to the contrary, we do not work for the President or for a powerful lobby. We work for the people of the United States of America and it is to them that we owe an accounting for our daily efforts.

And yet only one day of the year do we even allow them into our workshop. And then it is not to see us work, but to listen with us. Tonight the President will come to the House to deliver the state of the Union address to Congress, giving the American public the rare chance to view the interior of this Chamber.

But then they will only have the opportunity to hear the Chief Executive give them his one-sided version of what his Great Society administration has done and what it intends to do.

Then the heavy doors behind us will shut for another year on the television cameras that could and should be reporting our actions into the homes of the people those actions affect.

It is of utmost importance that the Nation see Congress in action with its own eyes.

Last year bills were rammed and railroaded through the House under intense White House pressure. In many cases there was inadequate debate.

Major legislation passed without any amendments permitted except those approved by the White House. Many of these amendments would have improved the legislation.

In other cases, amendments were offered, and no debate upon them was permitted. In short, there were times last year when the legislative process was a mockery under the heavy hand of the White House.

Had the American people been able to see this House the evening that the highway beautification bill was rolled over repeated pleas for an open debate and finally rubberstamped sometime after midnight, they would view their legislative process with grave concern.

Perhaps if they could have sat here at other times and seen the effects of the administration hatchetmen on our deliberations, they would ponder about the balance of power they read about in school.

If they could have heard amendment after amendment to the bill repealing section 14(b) shouted down before they were even heard, they would have wondered if there were any freedom of speech left here.

Just a few glances of some of the mock deliberations of last year would have given them some serious doubts about this consensus they hear so much about.

But the truth is an elusive thing, and these strong-arm tactics must be seen to be believed.

I have introduced today, legislation to make sure that the American people will be able to see the performance of their democracy in action. The bill would let the television cameras stay in this Chamber after the President leaves tonight and allow them to continue reporting to America just what we do and how we do it.

I believe if the American people see this happening with their own eyes, they will demand that this lick-and-promise lawmaking end at once. They will insist on Congress doing a thorough and a fair job of legislating. The searching and all-seeing eye of the TV camera will do a good deal in straightening out and strengthening the legislative branch of Government.

My colleagues of the minority and I seek to bring to the American people the truth instead of the hodgepodge of consensus-culled information distorted by the bureaucracy's public relations departments.

CLEVELAND URGES CONGRESSIONAL BROADCASTING BILL STRESSES PEOPLES' RIGHT TO LOOK AND LISTEN

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today, in company with nine other Members, I am introducing legislation by which it would be possible for public sessions of the House and House committees to be broadcast live by radio and television.

This legislation carries the endorsement of the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing, of which I am chairman, but it is not really a partisan proposal. I hope it will win significant support from our Democratic colleagues who are likewise concerned to keep the public as well informed about the legislative branch as they are about the executive branch, which so dominates the airways.

The development of electronics media has revolutionized the country. It is changing the conduct of government, political campaigning, education, advertising, and journalism. A picture is, indeed, worth a thousand words. This legislation would bring the House of Representatives—the peoples' forum—into the electronic age, at least so far as communications is concerned.

PRESIDENTIAL DOMINATION OF AIRWAYS

It is about time. For some years, our Presidents have recognized the importance of television. Through the power and prestige of their office, they are able to dominate this media to present their particular viewpoints to the people under the best possible conditions. Tonight, for instance, President Johnson is coming to deliver his state of the Union message. He has chosen his time with careful deliberation—it is the prime viewing time across the Nation. Indeed, until the advent of television, Presidents delivered these addresses at noontime. The effect is that the message is addressed directly more to the people of the country than it is to their elected representatives. There is a subtle but profound constitutional change in this. It is a change which elevates the position of the executive branch at the expense of the legislative branch, although the two are created coequal by the Constitution.

When the President departs, the cameras and the microphones will depart with him. Under our present rules, the doors of the House will remain shut to them throughout the important debates of this very important session, unless, of course, the President chooses to come again in this way to address us.

LIVE BROADCASTS WOULD STRENGTHEN DEMOCRACY

In my opinion, this is wrong. In the interests of elemental democracy as well as the interests of the Congress itself, radio and television should be permitted, under certain limitations prescribed in these bills, to bring the public to the floor. They should be able to see and hear the great debates which will decide their futures. The public should have a chance to hear the minority arguments.

I believe further that one of the best ways to win public support for some of the much-needed reforms of congressional procedures would be for the public to see and hear how some of their business is conducted.

PUBLIC RIGHT TO KNOW

I sometimes refer to this legislation as look and listen bills. The public has a right to look and listen and this legislation would allow the people to come into their Congress. It would help to offset the overconcentration on the President and his points of view and it would help to redress the present imbalance between the two branches of government.

This legislation is a vital, first step in modernizing the Congress, and I strongly urge its prompt consideration by the House.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN VIETNAM?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege, following the adjournment of Congress, to make a study tour of Vietnam and other parts of Asia. I made this trip at my own expense in order that I could report to my constituents, the situation in Vietnam from first-hand observation. I know that many of my colleagues went to Vietnam and shared in much of the information I was able to gather and I am sure many of them will report their findings to the House from time to time, as I intend to do.

At this point I would like to point out the most disturbing element of this very confusing war situation. That is the support the Communist enemy, the Vietcong, is receiving from our allies. Ships of many nations from the free world are steaming daily into the harbor at Haiphong, unloading goods and materials for the North Vietnamese which enable them to carry on the war in which American boys are dying in the cause of freedom for all people. I have called repeatedly, as many of you have, for a blockade of the harbor at Haiphong.

A situation which has not been publicized, and which is even more shameful than the free use of the harbor at Haiphong by our allies, is the shipping of goods through the Mekong River, through South Vietnam into Cambodia. The South Vietnamese are powerless to prevent these shipments because the Mekong River is considered an international waterway. In the past year, while American men have been fighting to the death to halt the Communist aggression against South Vietnam, more than 250 ships of our allied nations have sailed up the Mekong River and unloaded supplies in Cambodia near the very heart of the area where these supplies are needed by the Vietcong to wage their war against a free people.

Now, listen to this startling fact, about the same number of free nation ships have been going into Haiphong harbor and the combined total of allied shipments to Haiphong and through the Mekong River add up to more than the total goods and materials shipped to the North Vietnamese by Communist nations. Surely we in Congress and the American people have the right to ask the President, what goes on in Vietnam?

Mr. Speaker, is there a Member of this Congress who can give a reasonable explanation to his constituents and to the mothers, fathers, wives, and children of the men who have died at the hands of the Vietcong for such support of our enemy by nations which are supposed to be our friends?

Why does the President keep these facts from the American people? Is it because he puts less trust in his own people than he does in the hope that the Communists do not really mean what they say when they threaten to bury us and rule the world?

I am firmly convinced that the first order of business of this session of Congress should be to demand a frank report from the President concerning his intentions in Vietnam. The very least the American people should expect is that he take whatever action is necessary to cut the supply lines to North Vietnam, especially those supply lines being used by nations who freely accept our aid and support, but continue to send in goods to strengthen our enemy and theirs. We cannot continue to fight for the freedom of the world unless the rest of the world is willing to contribute something to the protection of freedom. Not another day should go by without serving notice on the world that no further shipments are going to be permitted through Haiphong Harbor or up the Mekong River.

PEOPLE WORRIED ABOUT U.S. ROLE AS WORLD POLICEMAN

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week two of my colleagues, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Ellsworth] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] joined me in sending a letter to the President, in which we reported public concern about the U.S. role as world policeman. As it dealt with the Vietnam war and the need for a better union of free-nation effort in world affairs, I am placing the text in the Record:

January 7, 1966.

Dear Mr. President: We hope your state of the Union message will include recommendations for a more perfect union of the free nations. This would lift the spirits of the American people. It would give them hope that in the future we will no longer be virtually alone in "guarding the gates of freedom," as is the case today in Vietnam.

The American people are disappointed and distressed because our major allies are not sharing the military burdens we have assumed in southeast Asia. They are also worried about what lies ahead if the United States attempts to police the world by itself.

Your message presents a splendid opportunity for you to announce steps which hopefully will lead to effective free-world teamwork in dealing with worldwide trouble spots like Vietnam.

The atmosphere will change from gloom to promise if you will state U.S. willingness and desire from this day forward to follow policies that are developed jointly with our allies. If we are ever to achieve cooperative action, we must accept cooperative policymaking. We must treat our allies as responsible and trustworthy partners.

Policy on all critical problems which have worldwide importance should be developed automatically within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Had we developed policy with our allies in the early days of the Vietnam struggle we could reasonably expect their full cooperation today.

We must set goals worthy of the tremendous sacrifices now being made in Vietnam. Long-range objectives of the free-world community must be defined. Free-world institutions—presently weak and in confusing array—must be brought together and strengthened. Resolutions to these ends will be before the new session of Congress, and your encouragement will be most helpful and gratifying.

Sincerely yours,

Paul Findley.
Robert F. Ellsworth.
Albert H. Quie.

TRIBUTE GIVEN TO DR. R. F. TROIANO

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last October more than 400 of the leading citizens of Yonkers, N.Y., paid tribute at a Columbus Day dinner to Dr. R. F. Troiano for his years of dedicated service to the community—New York State's fifth largest city.

On that occasion, Dr. Troiano had a most important message, not only for the city of Yonkers, but for our entire Nation. He proposed a fund for America—a fund not of dollars, but of citizenship.

I was proud to join the many community leaders in Yonkers in honoring Dr. Troiano and I was deeply impressed by his message. In the hope that people all over the United States will read and take this message to heart, I offer, for inclusion in the Record, an article and an editorial which appeared in the Yonkers, N.Y., Herald Statesman following Dr. Troiano's tribute:

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, Oct. 13, 1965]

Good Citizen Offers Yonkers a New Fund

A physician who was singled out for Columbus Day honors has offered his community a different kind of fund: a pledge of good citizenship.

The proposal came at a Columbus Day dinner in the Polish Community Center at which 400 community leaders saluted Dr. R. F. Troiano for outstanding service to Yonkers. Here's what he had to say:

"I have often been asked why I participate in any community services. The answer comes from a deep personal conviction that whatever service an individual renders his local government, he in turn renders a service to his country. And right now in these critical hours our country needs the fullest measure of your civic abilities and capabilities.

"What with so much lawlessness, crime, and terror, so much public apathy and self-indulgence, civic, moral, and family irresponsibility, and so much hatred and loss of faith in God, and with so much loss of patriotism and with so many factions and factors bent on the destruction of America, it behooves us all to dig deeply into the roots of our national heritage and reaffirm the great principles of God and country.

"As you know, there are funds for all things and funds for all causes. As we celebrate the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, I would like to propose a Fund for America, a fund wherein the contribution is not in terms of dollars and cents, but of one's self in the pledge of good citizenship.

"A citizenship that is pledged to hard work, self-improvement, fair play, and full of the spirit and zeal that made America great.

"A citizenship that is pledged to civic, moral, and family responsibility.

"A citizenship that is devoid of racial hatred and racial prejudice and is dedicated to the premise 'that all men are created free and equal with liberty and justice for all'.

"A citizenship that pledges allegiance and swears loyalty to these United States of America and offers duty with honor.

"A citizenship that offers prayer and devotion to God, and states loudly and clearly, 'In God we trust.'"

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, Oct. 15, 1965]

Dr. Troiano Rallies All Yonkers to a Pledge of Civic Service

General Eisenhower, on the occasion of his 75th birthday anniversary, made some welcome homely references to simple patriotism.

He expressed regret that—for some inexplicable reason—we seem to have downgraded an emotion so basically beautifully, and importantly American.

Readers must have been extraimpressed to hear ex-President Ike's sentiments, if they had just finished enjoying the Columbus Day speech of Dr. R. F. Troiano, which we proudly published in yesterday's Herald Statesman under the headline, "Good Citizen Offers Yonkers a New Fund."

In home after home, we feel sure, Dr. Troiano's meaty remarks were not only read but probably reread aloud to other members of the family.

In one such household, as the reading concluded, the mother exclaimed, "You can say that again."

We echo the same sentiment. Indeed we will "say that again," for Dr. Troiano's words deserve clipping and saving, and frequent reread—aloud, for whole families.

"I would like to propose a fund for America," said the physician, "a fund wherein the contribution is not in terms of dollars and cents but of one's self—in the pledge of good citizenship.

"A citizenship that is pledged to hard work, self-improvement, fairplay and full of the spirit and zeal that made America great. A citizenship that is pledged to civic, moral, and family responsibility.

"A citizenship that is devoid of racial hatred and racial prejudice and is dedicated to the premise that 'all men are created free and equal with liberty and justice for all.'

"A citizenship that pledges allegiance and swears loyalty to the United States of America and offers duty with honor.

"A citizenship that offers prayer and devotion to God, and states loudly and clearly: In God we trust."

Now, then, doesn't that put us all back into the channels of solid American thinking that were established in 1776? Aren't those words the very warp and woof of the good American life, envied around the globe?

Thank you very much, Dr. Troiano.

BILL PROVIDING CANCELLATION OF ANY DISTRIBUTIVE FRANCHISE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Klucynski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill providing that upon the cancellation of any distributive franchise, the terminated franchise holder shall have the right to recover damages and the cost of any necessary legal action arising from the failure of the franchisor to act in good faith in complying with the terms and provisions of the franchise agreement.

At the present time, the so-called Automobile Dealers Day in Court Act which was passed in 1956, gives this protection to automobile dealers. In a sense it is class legislation. Do not misunderstand me. I am pleased that our automobile dealers have this very valuable protection. I simply want to extend it so that all franchise holders may have the same benefits regardless of the commodity which they market.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most crucial matter. The franchise method of distribution is one of the most rapidly growing marketing systems in our economy.

Typically, there is great disparity of size and, consequently, of market power between the franchisor and the franchisee. The holder of the franchise is most often a small businessman who has chosen this method of distribution in order to become an independent businessman. The supplier—the grantor of the franchise—is typically a medium sized or a large corporation. All too frequently the franchise holder has either an informal verbal agreement with his supplier or a written franchise agreement that has been verbally modified from time to time in various respects.

The franchised distributor plays a most important role for his supplier. It may be said that he carries his supplier's economic banner into battle. Through service and salesmanship, he builds up consumer demand for the supplier's product in the local marketplace. This, obviously, adds value to the trademark or brand name of the supplier. It is equally obvious that it is patently unfair for the franchise to be able to cancel the franchise of his local distributor unless he has acted in full good faith and has complied with the terms and provisions of the agreement and has compensated the dealer for any sums to which he is entitled.

This is the purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker; to insure that all franchise holders are treated fairly and equally by their suppliers. It is my hope that the committee to which this bill is referred will hold hearings promptly on this measure and that when it comes to the floor of the House, each of the Members of Congress will give serious considerations to its provisions.

DONALD W. DOUGLAS RECEIVED CALIFORNIA MANUFACTURER OF THE YEAR AWARD, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding Californian and a great American has recently been singled out for a well-deserved recognition. We speak of one of the airframe industry's giants and leaders, Donald W. Douglas. This past year he was named "California Manufacturer of the Year" and on January 21 this year he will receive the annual Tony Jannus Award from the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce for his outstanding contributions in aviation.

Over 40 years ago, Donald Douglas commenced his fruitful, rewarding career in aviation in a small building in Santa Ana, Calif., a city in my 34th Congressional District. In this first venture he joined another of the great giants of aviation, Glenn L. Martin. In 1961 Donald Douglas, still moving on the frontier of developments in air space vehicles, came back to Orange County and to the 34th Congressional District by choosing this area for his great new plant which builds space vehicles such as the Saturn IV. In this facility the Douglas organization will also be doing much of its research and development for space science.

It is, therefore, a singular privilege for me to bring to the attention of this House and the American people, the great career of a man whose experience spans the entire history of aviation and to ask that all of you join me in saluting this man, his career, and his contribution to the building of an industry, for making his country a leader in a new science.

I include herein the remarks of Gov. Edmund G. Brown upon the occasion of extending the "California Manufacturer of the Year Award" to Mr. Douglas on November 19, 1965:

REMARKS BY GOV. EDMUND G. BROWN, "CALIFORNIA MANUFACTURER OF THE YEAR AWARD," 1965, LOS ANGELES, NOVEMBER 19, 1965

It is a tremendous pleasure to join you today in paying tribute to a great Californian—Donald W. Douglas.

Mr. Douglas' career spans the entire history of aviation in this country; he was consultant to the Connecticut Aircraft Co. in 1915 and chief engineer for the Glenn L. Martin Co. that same year. He served as chief civilian aeronautical engineer for the U.S. Signal Corps during World War I; he designed the first Martin bomber; and then in 1920, he moved his family to California to start his own airplane manufacturing venture.

Donald Douglas really symbolizes the kind of Californian who has come here as a pioneer and stayed to contribute to our State's growth and greatness. He was not yet 30 and his assets added up to only $600 when he came here. But he soon had designed and built the "Cloudster," of which we have the model here today. Since that time, his achievements in aviation read like an encyclopedia of the history of American aviation. The B–19 during World War II; the DC–4 transports; the DC–6; a whole series of great airplanes, culminating with the DC–9, which was flown this year and will go into airline service in 1966.

Donald Douglas' leadership has also extended to the Douglas Thor, which has been the first stage in launch vehicles for such satellites as Explorer I, Pioneer V, the Discoverer series and many more. It has also been part of the development of the orbiting solar observatory, Telstar, and the world's first international satellite, the S–51.

As Governor of this great State, let me tell you that I am glad, for the sake of all of us, that Donald Douglas decided to come here back in 1920, with that $600 in his pocket.

It is men of such vision and courage who have built this State in the past and are building California today.

It is men of this high caliber who account for California's leadership; for the fact that we lead all States in prime military contracts, with 22.1 percent; and in prime contracts awarded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—47.6 percent.

Four California industries—electrical equipment, ordnance, aircraft, and instruments—employed an average of 483,900 workers in California last year. They accounted for 35 percent of all manufacturing employment in the State—far higher ratio than in any other in the Nation.

California accounts today for nearly one-fourth of all the increase in employment in the United States since 1950, and for 31 percent of the increase in manufacturing. It has been predicted that we will lead the Nation in manufacturing by 1970.

Aerospace and the California State government are closely linked—more closely here than anywhere else. This year the industry accepted our invitation to apply its sophisticated knowledge to earthbound problems—transportation, information, waste management, and crime. They have given us magnificent reports and we are going to benefit from them in the near future. Mayor-elect John Lindsay has already decided to follow our lead in New York.

Donald Douglas, as Governor I want to express the appreciation of your fellow Californians. There are almost 19 million of them. By 1970, there will be more than 21 million—and we will still be America's best, richest, most vital, and thriving market. You have done much to bring us to that position. We salute you for your 50 years as a great American, and expect many more achievements from you in the future.

STRIVING TO MULTIPLY BREAD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the world in general, with the leadership of the United States in particular, has right now the potential to feed 10 times the present population of the earth or 30 billion people.

Such a statement, by many, will be branded as extravagant. Even as winter now comes the grim prospect is for a rising tide of hunger. In all underdeveloped countries grave concern is constantly expressed over a growing population which exceeds the available food supply. Yet we maintain that the contention there is not enough food for the growing masses of people is false. It is predicated on the presence of unnecessary and undesirable restraints on production, processing, and distribution. It rests on inefficient methods of providing protein; it exists because of unjustifiable waste, spoilage, and deterioration.

We have, in the United States, developed the greatest agri-business combination in the world's history. It must now be restricted in its output by artificial farm policy. Wedded to this giant we have in the food industry of America a tremendous team of processors, packagers, distributors, and retailers. These, working together, have produced a confusion of food variety and an embarrassment of food abundance. We challenge the world, therefore, to call on the full strength of this existing combination. The truth is that not only does this existing team work now at half power, but the food technologists who stand behind this team have a scientific potential for building a bigger pot pie or a larger bowl of rice, or whatever is required by the table of man. Bring the full force of our scientific advances to bear on the food shortage and all must see at once the positive proof of our original proposition. We can feed 30 billion people.

Two-thirds of the world, or 2 billion people, are chronically undernourished, lacking both in quantity and quality of food. This hunger means death for some, poor health, and physical weakness for many, and lack of vigor and intelligent response for all. Virtually two-thirds of the earth's inhabitants are operating at a sublevel of potential because of lack of protein. Protein malnutrition is primarily due to an inadequate consumption of animal protein. The world's deficit in this valuable food item today is estimated at 40 billion pounds. At the same time there exists in the untapped resources of the sea a sufficient yield of protein to feed 30 billion people a year, 10 times the world's present population. In addition to this we lose, through inefficiency, spoilage, and waste, one-half, or more, of our present large protein production, that is why we believe that all too many people in this world are starving in the midst of abundance. Within a 10-year span we could easily supply a protein sufficient diet for 12 to 15 times the present world's population—estimated at 3 billion. We face frustration in feeding the world's multitudes simply from a lack of political motivation to bring to bear on the problem of food shortage the resources and the knowledge readily at hand. The irony is that food technology now holds out, to a yet ignoring world, ready answers for this problem. There are three fronts in particular where food technology now stands on the frontier of a fantastic new developments which can produce protein foods high in quality, low in price, and easily distributed. We will discuss these three food frontiers in the following sections:

PASTEURIZATION OF FOOD PRODUCTS

One of the grave limiting factors faced in the distribution of foodstuffs arise from deterioration and decay. There are two new emerging treatment methods by which deterioration can be stopped and decay substantially delayed. The first of these new methods arises from the scientific application of atomic energy. Some time ago it was discovered that treatment by radiation rays of certain active elements would lengthen the shelf life or storage and distribution life of foods. These experiments started some years ago and are now at a stage for dramatic application for food processing. This procedure will have dynamic and far-reaching effects in many lands. A paper published by the Department of the Interior in October 1965 demonstrates this fact.

Louis J. Ronsivalte and J. W. Slavin, working at the Technological Laboratory, U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, reported that fresh, frozen, or refrigerated fish, treated by low doses of gamma rays from a cobalt 60 source, increased storage life 1 month. The report states:

> The value of fishery products as a source of protein is well known and since man's dependence on them is anticipated to increase it is inevitable that he apply his latest technology to the sea. In general fishery products are relatively perishable and consequently distribution of fresh fish and shellfish is limited to coastal areas. Wider distribution is possible.

The report then goes on to show how fresh fish treated by the gamma rays reduced by 99 percent the deteriorating bacteria which causes decay, and in this sterilized condition such fish could maintain their fresh state over a sustained period without measurable loss of flavor or food quality.

Such a discovery applied to a country like Peru could have a phenomenal effect. The coast of that country is rich and abundant in fish life, yet the Indians of the interior, located just a few miles from the coast, are suffering from serious protein deficiency. Cheap fish products in great quantities could be made available inland if a treatment plant was installed in one or more of the port cities of Peru. This would be true, also, in India and Africa where great untapped fisheries are available for exploitation. Further studies and research carried out by and between our Government and our great food industry can, and should, widen to the greatest extent the varieties of fish and foodstuff which respond well to this radiation pasteurization. Government research should establish maximum storage times; test and select most efficient packaging and conduct economic feasibility studies for broadening the market of foods thus treated.

Another promising approach to food pasteurization and sterilization lies in recent experiments being conducted with high frequency waves varying from the ultrasonic to the X-ray. Such electronic treatments have destroyed insect life in tropical fruits. These pests destroy countless tons of otherwise consumable fresh food product. There is, in other experiments, the unfolding possibility of other stages of pasteurization and sterilization against destructive organic bodies and bacterial growth. These advances are not as well published and, perhaps, not as fully developed as the irradiation processes. They are, however, another of the emerging methods to increase the effective life of food products and thus widen the time range of distribution and storage of food.

PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

Another technological breakthrough is occurring in the development of protein concentrates. The experiments in this technology have been occurring in both cereal grains and in fish products. These developments not only show us new source for protein but also indicate increases by a factor of substantial proportions in our efficiency in producing concentrated protein. The present food chain process for concentrating protein is to feed fish and cereal products to chicken, swine, and beef to produce animal protein. Animal meat building processes concentrate the proteins of vegetables, fish, grasses, and cereal grains. This is a very inefficient method of concentrating protein as these are all warm-blooded creatures and they burn more protein in keeping warm than they store in the live tissue which builds meat. Let us see how this works in fish. Quoting from a recent memorandum done by W. M. Chapman, of the Van Camp Sea Food Co., the story is told as follows:

> The discovery of the nutritional benefits of a 2- to 7-percent fishmeal addition to the diet of chicken, swine, and cattle in making them grow and produce better has led to a most enormous growth of world fisheries for the kind of fish that did not accommodate themselves well or cheaply to generally direct human food. Taking out most of the oil and most of the water resulted in a nutritionally beneficial product with good stability.

The use of fish for this purpose on a worldwide basis has risen from about 590 metric tons of meal in 1948 to 3,500,000 tons in 1964. Converted to round weight of fish, this means an increase in use from about 3.4 million tons of raw fish for this purpose in 1948, to about 20 million tons—approximately 40 percent of all of the fish caught in all of the world—in 1964.

Why should chicken, swine, and cattle in the United States eat better than two-thirds of the world population? An obviously desirable objective is to skip the chicken, pig, or cattle step, where much protein is burned up to keep the animal warm, and produce a defatted, dehydrated, stable fish protein concentrate under hygienic conditions suitable for human consumption. The Congress has provided the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries with funds to tackle the technological problem of doing this and the research is not only promising but already is being carried out on a pilot plant scale. This new processing technology could have a revolutionary effect on the domestic fisheries. Its advocates and proponents claim it will. Viobin Corp. of Massachusetts is already a major private producer of fish powder which when ultimately refined is an odorless, tasteless white powder compound. The president of the Viobin Corp. had this to say:

> A new food has been created made from the fish of the sea. The new food is as nutritious as milk or meat and will cost one-third to one-fifth the cost of milk. The new food can be made anywhere in the world; it does not spoil; does not change; keeps indefinitely until used. The new food can wipe out chronic protein starvation plaguing 2 out of 3 people on earth. The new food can solve the problem of the world's terrifying exploding population.

The powder can be made of many varieties of fish, including many of the so-called scrap fish. Four or five hundred-pound sacks of this powder would deliver more concentrated protein than a full cattle boat loaded with beef—and without the losses from heat generation, the losses of time, the losses of expense in raising and handling the cattle. The shipping weight and the ultimate handling weight of the end product are greatly reduced.

The powder can be added to any indigenous staple such as rice, beans, or corn flour and thus the problem of acceptance in the variety of food cultures around the world is quickly overcome. One teaspoon of the powder concentrate provides all the protein required for 1 day.

At the same time, protein concentrates from cereal are also being developed that have all of the advantages claimed for fish protein concentrates. The most successful practical breakthrough has come in Guatemala in Central America. There, an institute of nutrition, called INCAP, originally founded by the Kellogg Foundation and now funded by all the Central American countries, has produced a product called "Incaparina." After a series of experiments, starting in 1950, a vegetable mixture designated No. 9B was derived. It consists of 29 percent ground maize, 29 percent ground sorghum, 38 percent cottonseed flour, 3 percent tortula yeast, and 1 percent calcium carbonate with vitamin A added. The generic name mentioned above, "Incaparina," was given to this mixture. In 1962 a report on this product states as follows:

> Numerous laboratory trials of Incaparina have clearly proved that its protein, quantitatively and qualitatively, closely approaches that of milk, a food in short supply and expensive to buy in Central America. Incaparina is easy to prepare and when cooked, sweetened and flavored, closely resembles the "atole" so savored by a majority in this area.

Incaparina is now licensed for production in Central America to Quaker Oats Corp. and it produces, when mixed with water, a fluid equal or superior to milk for less than 1 cent a glass. It is used widely in school food programs and is available for purchase in most stores in Central America. The United States should turn its technological know-how immediately to similar protein concentrates, using excess and spoiling grains. This flour product, like the fish flour previously discussed, has a long storage life and is easily transported with little likelihood of loss from spoilage. Think of the vast good our surplus cereals could do if used in this way.

Purdue University recently developed a new hybrid corn high in protein. Plant pathologists have long realized that normal corn is low in amino acid content, the essential ingredient of protein. What the botanists and plant specialists in Lafayette, Ill., have done is to breed into the corn this absence of amino acid. Such a new corn will be important to animal feeders but more highly significant in those lands in Latin America and Africa where corn is the principal staple in the diet.

The most interesting and dramatic development for protein concentrate is in the pure chemical approach. Announced from Holland not long ago has been the isolation of a natural protein called lysine. Lysine has been derived from coal, a heat energy source gradually losing the battle to electrical and atomic power. The Dutch claim they could revolutionize the world's food problem with the new process.

Lysine is an odorless, white powder with a slightly salty taste. It is the most important of the 18 amino acids necessary for building body protein in man and animals. A Dutch spokesman states that since animal foods such as meat, eggs, and dairy products are in such short supply, especially in emerging countries, lysine could be the immediate and ready answer. It can be made in unlimited quantities and at an attractive price, the spokesman said. Large-scale production is predicted in the very near future.

FREEZE-DRY FOOD PROCESSING

The third and final new frontier in food technology is the freeze-dry method. In this process the food product is first frozen then all the water is extracted under very critical vacuum conditions. The product resulting, when packaged to prevent penetration of either moisture or air, will preserve perfectly for from 3 to 5 years. With the introduction of fresh water the food becomes reconstituted as when it was itself fresh.

This process produces a food output which is extremely light of weight. Most of the living tissue of animal and food products from the land have a greater percentage of their weight in water. This process has now been perfected to the point where integrity of the food quality is assured. The resulting food product needs none of the expensive refrigeration other fresh food distribution requires. Already numerous plants in the United States are processing chicken, shrimp, and coffee by the freeze-dry method. Combination foods, such as soup, are also in the production stage. With the help of purchases by the U.S. Army, by AID missions, and by other Government agencies, a volume operation would be possible to put into the market in places all over the world a competitive food product that would have an impact equal to that provided by frozen foods or by the discovery of canning. Although the process is, at this time, slightly more expensive than these other methods, the resulting product is so light in weight and has such a long shelf life and is capable of delivering such a superior product that it certainly deserves the support of any forward-looking nation.

A FISCAL POLICY FOR FOOD

It needs to be noted that no substantial progress in developing food potential will come without a commitment of substantial funds by our Government. Why, we ask, is it not as reasonable for Government to combine with the food industry for dramatic advance in the weaponry against hunger as for the Government to spend billions with the airframe and electronic industry in the race into space. We are buying the same basic governmental objectives. National security, national prestige, and national goodwill is what we get each time we shoot out into space a rocket on a several-hundred-million-dollar mission. We would score in each of these areas with a meaningful advance in producing, preserving, or distributing food to the starving millions who share this globe with us. A dollar invested in the food industry by Government would be a greater multiplier in the economic machine than the dollar spent in space. The food industry is as diverse as any in our economy so the effect of dollar input would spread. Each dollar would buy more action than it does in the expensive sophisticated and specialized space industry. Of course we do not suggest reducing our effort in space.

We believe, that an invitation by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior to offer mission oriented projects for bid to the combined skills of the food industry and food scientists would amaze the world and greatly strengthen our country, just as such an invitation by the Defense Department and its partnership with the missile and space industry and its scientists has done in that area. After all, we only build bullets and bombs, missiles and rockets, to either store them or to destroy them. They have no productive place in our society or in our lives. Why can we not then afford to create food for distribution without too great a concern for the ability to make immediate or direct profit. Remember, that before men can increase standards of living such as will make them consumers of our goods, they must be educated. Before men can be educated they must be fed sufficiently well to provide an intelligent response to the teaching effort.

The first step toward a market of almost 2 billion people must be an improvement in diet. This is the fact that deserves, and should hold, our respectful attention. It is also a fact that justifies a reasonable investment.

May we point out that the thrust of this paper has avoided a damaging conflict with the distribution of other countries' food products. We have also been mindful of the restricting and frustrating limitations of food cultures, we have, therefore, suggested lines of endeavor which would, first, preserve foods and widen their arc of distribution, whatever the kind and quality in a given country; second, develop protein additives which can be assimilated and adapted to any class of food preference; third, encourage a processing method which reduces the weight, which is the principal cost factor in distribution, and lengthen the shelf life of food without expensive refrigeration and, finally, maintain the fresh quality of the food item or the combination being processed.

The great opportunity of the United States and its most promising contribution to its own goodwill and to the world's peace is to push forward with all haste and vigor the advent of the day of plenty for all peoples.

With the resources committed to the war in Vietnam for 1 year, we could hasten that day's arrival to within the next 10 year's span. Can we neglect the effort?

The great hope, the great challenge of our time, is to strike from the neck of mankind the tyrannical and demeaning yolk of hunger. The voice of Pope Paul the VI rings with this message in his historical address to the United Nations:

> You must strive to multiply bread so that it suffices for the tables of mankind.

Here then lies the proven path to peace. Summons an arsenal of effective weaponry against the common enemy of man, hunger. It has been truly said that peace cannot come to a world one-third well fed and two-thirds ill fed. It was the Prince of Peace himself who said:

> If you love Me, feed My sheep.

O DICK RENDELL, WE WISH YOU WELL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the House radio gallery was lacking one of its most colorful and knowledgeable figures as the House convened on Monday for the 2d session of the 89th Congress. From the time of his accreditation to the radio gallery in 1934, Richard Rendell, chief of the Mutual Broadcasting System's Capitol Hill unit, and acknowledged dean of the radio gallery, has been absent from opening day ceremonies here only because of his military service in World War II and his work as a war correspondent in Korea.

I know my colleagues are familiar with my friend Dick Rendell's capabilities as a reporter and commentator during his long and dedicated association with the communications media of the Nation's Capitol. He has traveled with and reported on the daily developments affecting the Nation's great and near great. I am happy to say that he will continue to do so, although at the moment he is temporarily out of harness and a patient at the Washington Hospital Center. Dick Rendell, on January 5, underwent surgery on his left eye but is making excellent progress toward full recovery. On October 6, 1965, he underwent surgery on his right eye.

I had the pleasure of talking with Dick Rendell at the Washington Hospital Center yesterday and thus I can report that my fellow native of Waterbury, Conn., and Dartmouth alumnus was in fine spirits and confident of an early return to the Hill which he knows so well and where he is so deservedly admired.

VACHEL DAVIS OF ELDORADO, ILL.—MINE SAFETY PIONEER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Gray] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, occasionally we should pause and give commendation to the people who have pioneered our country along the lines of our industries that have been a source of great economic development and progress in our time.

One of those people who has pioneered in mine safety is my friend and constituent, Mr. Vachel Davis of Eldorado, Ill. For over 30 years he has made a valuable contribution to the safety and welfare of the coal miners of the United States. He spent a quarter of a century as staff cartoonist of the United Mine Workers Journal and, in addition, has contributed many coal mine safety posters and drawings, as well as poetry and editorials plugging and crusading for the coal miner's welfare and safety in the mines of our country.

He is responsible, with the help of Illinois State officials, to have erected a bronze statue at the State capitol in Springfield to the memory of all coal miners who have lost their lives in mine accidents, which is the only statue of its kind in any capitol of the United States.

I want to commend my friend, Vachel Davis, for his many years of service and contributions as a public servant to the welfare of the miners of our great country and who is deserving of all the recognition he has received for his unceasing efforts in behalf of the coal mine safety program of this valuable industry—that has served the United States in war and peace.

CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI—MICHELANGELO OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Annunzio] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a House concurrent resolution which would authorize procurement of a marble bust of the great artist, Constantino Brumidi, for placement in the Nation's Capitol.

It is a genuine pleasure for me to join the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, Hon. Paul Douglas, in introducing this legislation which would recognize Brumidi's genius and his magnificent contributions to the beautification of the Capitol.

I call upon all of my colleagues to join me in introducing similar concurrent resolutions to honor the memory of a great American who gave so much to our beautiful Capital City of Washington. The resolution directs the Joint Committee on the Library to secure a marble bust and have it placed in the corridor known as the Brumidi corridor located on the first floor of the Senate wing of the Capitol.

Evidence of Brumidi's genius is evident everywhere in the Capitol. His stirring murals, his colorful and expertly executed paintings, and his bold and moving frescoes, portraying supreme moments in American history, can be found in the corridors, in the committee rooms, and in the rotunda.

One of the outstanding examples of Brumidi's work is the President's Room on the Senate side of the Capitol where Brumidi labored for more than 6 months. This room has the distinction of being called the most exquisitely decorated room in America.

Hundreds and thousands of visitors from every congressional district in America and from all parts of our Nation visit our Capitol. They view with admiration and with great awe the work of Brumidi.

Constantino Brumidi, the artist, was a political refugee from Italy who brought his career to an abrupt halt when he vowed he would not paint another stroke until he had found liberty. In 1852, at the age of 47, he sailed for the United States, and here he found the freedom he had sought for so long.

He began his work in the Capitol in 1855, and for 25 years thereafter, he worked devotedly and with all the strength and talent that he possessed to beautify the Capitol. He had a mission in life to perform and he performed that mission on behalf of his beloved America and this great city of Washington.

This great man took such outstanding pride in his adopted country that he signed all of his works simply, "C. Brumidi, Artist, Citizen of the United States."

All of us in the Congress know the story of his tragic death, the result of a fall at the age of 75.

The Members of this Congress appropriated the sum of $400 in 1950 in order to mark his grave in Glenwood Cemetery which had been unmarked for over 50 years.

Mrs. Myrtle Murdock, wife of a former Congressman, took an interest in Brumidi and through her efforts, a bronze marker was finally provided in 1950 by the Congress.

There is no other tangible recognition of this great artist's contributions that can be found in the Nation's Capital today. For too long we have withheld the recognition that is so justly deserved by Constantino Brumidi. It is, therefore, entirely fitting, and proper, and appropriate, for the Congress to act with vigor in passing the House concurrent resolution which I have introduced today authorizing the placement of Brumidi's bust in the Capitol in Brumidi's corridor and thereby demonstrate to the entire world our Nation's gratitude to this great man and this great American.

Millions of schoolchildren throughout America, have been asking the question, "What does Constantino Brumidi look like?" By the passage of this resolution they will have the opportunity to view his bust in the Senate corridor named in his honor.

My distinguished colleagues, let us join together in answering this question of the schoolchildren of America by cooperating and passing without hesitancy or delay this House concurrent resolution which would place a marble bust of Brumidi in the Capitol for all to see.

COLD WAR VETERANS' BENEFITS ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Roberts] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Korea emergency period was ended by Presidential proclamation, effective January 31, 1955, and service in the Armed Forces after that date is not legally considered wartime service. Since the veteran benefit structure is based on the concept of wartime and peacetime service, many benefits are denied to servicemen currently serving in the Armed Forces, even those serving under hostile conditions, because the current military situation has not been legally characterized as a war emergency. It is the purpose of the bill to provide war veteran benefits for veterans who entered service after January 31, 1955. The bill has the following major features:

First. Education and training benefits are provided for service after January 31, 1955, and for so long as the draft continues. These benefits accrue at the rate of 1½ days eligibility for each day of service, not to exceed 36 months. The education and training allowance is $130 a month for full-time training, with proportionate amounts for three-fourths and one-half time training. Under this bill, training may be taken in colleges, below college level training, such as vocational courses, apprentice and on-the-job training, and farm training. The basic purpose of this educational program is to restore lost educational opportunity and assist the veteran in achieving the educational objectives which he likely would have achieved had his training not been interrupted by military service.

Second. Guaranteed and direct home loans are provided by this bill. The basic provisions of the Korea program are extended to this new cold war group. Seven thousand five hundred dollars of a loan made by a private lender may be guaranteed or, in certain areas declared as direct loan areas because of a shortage of mortgage financing, the Veterans' Administration may make a loan of up to $15,000 directly to the veteran. A new feature has been added to the loan program in an effort to make it self-supporting. The veteran borrower would be required to pay a fee of one-half of 1 percent, one time, at closing, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. This fee would be placed in a revolving fund to indemnify the Administrator against losses growing out of default on the part of veteran borrowers.

Third. Under the service-connected compensation program in operation at the present time, veterans with a service-connected disability incurred in peacetime service receive 80 percent of the wartime compensation rate. This bill provides that veterans being discharged from service after January 31, 1955, with service-connected disabilities, will receive the wartime rate of compensation for a service-connected disability.

Fourth. The Veterans' Administration operates the largest hospital and medical system in the world. Veterans with service-connected disabilities and war veterans with non-service-connected disabilities are eligible for admission. Those veterans with non-service-connected disabilities must sign a statement of inability to pay to gain admission. Peacetime veterans may not be admitted for non-service-connected disabilities. This bill makes veterans being discharged after January 31, 1955, eligible for hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities if the veteran is otherwise qualified.

Fifth. War veterans are eligible for a $250 burial allowance at death. Veterans with peacetime service are not eligible for this burial allowance. This bill makes those veterans being discharged after January 31, 1955, eligible for burial benefits.

Sixth. The Veterans' Administration operates a program which provides specially equipped automobiles for war veterans who have lost or lost the use of a limb from a service-connected cause. Peacetime veterans are not eligible for this benefit. This bill makes those veterans being discharged after January 31, 1955, eligible for an automobile grant if they have the qualifying disability.

Seventh. In order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the application of veterans' preference with regard to veterans serving after January 31, 1955, the bill contains a provision which grants veterans' preference to veterans with service during the qualifying period. Veterans discharged without a disability would be given 5 points preference and those discharged with service-connected disability would receive 10 points preference for employment in the Federal service.

The structure of veterans' laws which has developed over the past 200 years has been based on the concept of wartime and peacetime service. War veterans have been given substantially more benefits than peacetime veterans. This system worked very well through World War II. It was after World War II, when we entered the so-called cold war, that problems have arisen. It was during this period that we have continued compulsory military service for an extended period of time for the first time in our history. Prior to World War II, we had very few servicemen stationed outside the United States. Today our servicemen are scattered throughout the world, and in many instances are serving under combat or near-combat conditions. During the period of time which is covered by this bill, our Nation has gone through a series of crises associated with Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Taiwan-Matsu, Lebanon, Berlin, Laos, and Vietnam. The perpetual cold war condition, with its crises, compulsory military service, and expanded overseas commitments, make this bill necessary if our servicemen, during this tense period of history, are to receive equitable treatment.

ROA HONORS CONGRESSMAN PORTER HARDY, JR.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 1966, one of the senior Members and one of the most respected Members of this body, the Honorable PORTER HARDY, JR., was honor guest at a dinner in his home district at Norfolk, Va. On this occasion he was presented by the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States with ROA's Distinguished Service Citation, in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the safety and security of the United States. At the same time, he received a similar award on behalf of the Reserve Officers in the State of Virginia through their association.

I know of no Member of this House who more richly deserves this recognition, nor to whom it is given more appropriately from the citizen-soldiers who know him not only for his work here in the Nation's Capital but also for his service as a citizen-leader in his home community.

Some years ago the late Winston Churchill made the observation that a "Reserve officer is twice the citizen." In that respect, men like PORTER HARDY earned for themselves the respect and esteem for being "thrice the citizen."

The dinner to which I refer was sponsored by the Adm. David G. Farragut Chapter of the ROA at Norfolk. The president of this chapter, Lt. Col. LeRoy H. Jacobs, and the president of the Virginia Department of ROA, Col. Alexander Campbell-Murrelle II, both spoke in glowing tribute of Congressman HARDY. Their words reflect the general admiration and esteem in which thousands of his fellow Virginians regard PORTER HARDY.

Members of this House will, in my view, benefit from reading the outstanding address which our colleague gave on that occasion. I am including it herewith in my remarks as being rich in wisdom and counsel from a Member of Congress whose experience and dedication are known to us all:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN PORTER HARDY, JR., TO ADMIRAL DAVID G. FARRAGUT CHAPTER, ROA, NORFOLK, JANUARY 8, 1966

As Reserve officers, most of you have experienced the terrible challenge of war. You, better than other groups in America, therefore, recognize that there is no substitute for military readiness.

Your awareness of the positive requirement for a military force second to none in the world is shared by most Members of Congress and accounts for the demonstrated unwillingness of the Congress to support Secretary McNamara in his broadside Reserve proposals until we are sure they will not reduce the strength of our Reserve Forces.

As the ranking majority member of the Hébert subcommittee, I participated in that subcommittee's successful effort to derail the McNamara locomotive which would have by now shoved the Army Reserve into the limbo of history.

Unfortunately, critics in some sections of the country castigated the subcommittee for its action which they interpret as simply another illustration of congressional obstructionism. These critics assume, I might add without basis, that a recommendation by the Executive, per se, must be good, and therefore demands immediate approval by the legislative branch of Government.

Many of these critics appear to believe that Congress does not have the professional competence to question recommendations of this kind from the executive branch and, therefore, they look for some ulterior political motive.

In this instance, the Committee on Armed Services was accused by some of seeking to protect a powerful, pressure group of reserve officers who were more concerned with their own personal situation than their Nation's problems of national security.

In short, the subcommittee was accused of engaging in political logrolling to satisfy and appease the selfish interest of our reserve officers.

You already know it, but let me reassert that the action taken by our subcommittee was without regard to any parochial or special interest group.

Not a single member of the subcommittee, either in public or private discussions with me, evidenced the slightest concern with the political results of the subcommittee's actions.

The members of the subcommittee were solely concerned with the national interest. That was the basis for their deliberations and the basis for their ultimate decision.

It would be a sad day indeed if organizations such as the ROA departed from the national scene and deprived Congress of the opportunity to look at the reverse side of the coin.

Since Congress presumably reflects the will of the people and in view of its duty and responsibility as provided under section I, article 8, of the Constitution, "to raise and support armies and to maintain a navy," it would certainly seem that the executive branch, and specifically Secretary McNamara would consult the Congress before announcing drastic changes in the Reserve program.

Sadly enough, this is not the case. You well recall the announcement of November 13, by which Mr. McNamara inactivated 751 Army Reserve units at one fell swoop. This was just 3 short weeks after Congress adjourned and was in direct conflict with specific Senate committee action. I do not think Mr. McNamara would have done this if Congress had been in session. Within a few days now when the Congress reconvenes we will be requested to approve the merger of the Army Reserve into the Army National Guard. At least this time the proposal is expected to contemplate authorizing legislation rather than a dictatorial executive order in defiance of the constitutional authority of Congress.

The Department of the Army, on November 18, 1965, sent a communication to all of its responsible component commands in which, among other things, it stated as follows:

"DOD and DA continue to support the 8-division, 16-brigade, 550,000 structure, all in the National Guard, and believe that this structure will serve best to meet national security requirements. When the Congress reconvenes in January, DOD and DA will urge the Congress to support the reorganization plan as originally proposed, and to enact the five items of legislation proposed by the Secretary of Defense in May 1965 as being necessary to accomplish fully the objectives of the proposed reorganization."

That, in a few words, reflects the arrogance of the Pentagon and its almost contemptuous disregard for the Congress. I doubt very much that it reflects the true military judgment of the Army. Rather, it may represent the imposition of command from DOD—so vividly expressed by General Johnson as "institutional constraint."

As a matter of fact, that same communication outlines the guidelines used for the preparation of the fiscal year 1967 budget for the Army's Reserve components, as follows:

"(a) The reorganization as initially proposed by the DA and DOD will be executed beginning July 1, 1966. The majority of the reorganization will occur in the period July through September; it will be completed by December 31.

"(b) Each corps headquarters will be inactivated not sooner than 30 days after the last of its USAR paid drill units are phased into the National Guard or are inactivated. All corps will be inactivated on or before March 31, 1967.

"(c) Fiscal year 1967 end strength will be 580,000, including an add-on of 30,000 for the selected Reserve Force, all of which will be in the National Guard.

"(d) 60,000 fillers will be authorized for fiscal year 1967.

"(e) The technician authorization for fiscal year 1967 will be continued at the present level of 27,220 (exclusive of civil defense technicians) plus the number of technicians required by the augmented strength of the selected Reserve Force. The phasing of technicians from the USAR to the NG will be in accordance with the reorganization schedule."

Finally, the messages indicates that:

"Reorganization planning in accordance with the foregoing will be resumed. State troop lists for the 550,000 structure continue as enunciated in reference (a). Scheduling should be adjusted to contemplate reorganization beginning on July 1, 1966, and continuing thereafter generally along the lines planned for the 1965 reorganization."

Now, I don't want to prejudge the legislative proposals, and certainly I believe they should and will receive careful consideration by the committee and the Congress. But already I see in this situation the kind of Executive pressure of Congress which is, in my view, both distasteful and improper. Unless we adopt the Pentagon proposals Mr. McNamara will point out that since its planning and funding for the next fiscal year had been predicated on the assumption that Congress will grant this authority by July 1966, the failure of Congress to do so will jeopardize the national interest and the national security.

The press then will be persuaded to drag up all the old familiar cliches about the obstructionism in Congress and its inability to act positively to meet the new challenges of history.

Perhaps Congress does on occasion act slowly and deliberately. But is this not in reality one of the great functions of the legislative branch? Let me explain.

One of the great merits in any form of government based upon the separation of legislative and executive powers is the fact that in its necessity to deliberate and debate the merits of an action proposed by the Executive, it often avoids costly and tragic national errors.

In the political history of modern times, beginning in 1776, the continuing ability of our form of government to function, and function well, is in itself eloquent testimony to the effectiveness of the legislative process.

To quote a political contemporary on Capitol Hill: "Our Government is much like an old scow. It does not move fast; it does not move very far at one time; but it does not sink."

We call ourselves a young country—and we are. But keep in mind that our form of representative government is the oldest continuing political system in the world. At its own steady pace, the scow proceeds on the river of time—while flashier craft have gone aground or gone to the bottom.

The great stabilizer of that system is the very slow-poke quality built into the elaborate constitutional separation of powers.

We are a Federal Union as well as a representative democracy. Those two characteristics create the two Houses of Congress and lead directly to the sometimes, perhaps maddening, but indispensable deliberations of the democratic process.

Every dictator that we have known in modern times has been a "benevolent despot." His assumption of powers was, the despot claims, not for his own aggrandizement, but for his "nation's welfare."

In short, he justifies temporarily setting aside the democratic legislative process on the pretext of being able to swiftly provide otherwise unattainable efficiencies in government.

Ridiculous? Of course it is. We know, and appreciate, that liberty and freedom cannot be turned on and off like a light bulb.

We know that if the people—through their Congress—forfeit their right to draft our laws—they also forfeit their freedom.

Yet, there are people today—a few I hope—who consider that our deliberative body, the Congress, is an "unnecessary evil."

They would, if given the opportunity, reduce the Congress to a mere rubberstamp for the Executive. This then would enable the executive branch of Government to exercise its infinite wisdom to effect radical changes now resisted by the representatives of the electorate.

Your Congress is therefore, in a very literal sense, our Nation's front line defense against threats from within to the liberties of us all.

The Congress fulfills this mission by the explicit and daily exercise of its constitutional authority. It does this by reflecting the will of the people—and not the will of the Executive in the laws that it writes.

To the everlasting credit of our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, his committee has led the fight to emphasize that Congress, under the Constitution, must assert its constitutional responsibility "to raise and maintain armies."

During the 1st session of the 89th Congress, the executive branch was told in no uncertain terms that its military pay recommendation was grossly inadequate; and the committee, against the strongest Executive pressure, wrote its own bill. Both the House and Senate unanimously supported the committee's action—and the committee's action became law.

The Congress, again in connection with the proposal to merge the Reserve Forces, also demonstrated its independence of the executive branch in asserting its constitutional responsibility by prescribing minimum strengths for our Reserve components.

Recently, most Members of Congress were taken by surprise when the Secretary of Defense, acting for the President, announced determinations of the Executive to use the stockpile disposal program as a means of economic control.

Now, at the moment, it is not my intention to pass upon the objectives of these actions, nor to question whether it was in the national interest to utilize the disposal of aluminum and the disposal of copper from the national stockpiles as a means of preventing an inflationary increase in prices. However, I do seriously question the propriety of the action taken by the executive branch.

It is my intention to urge the Committee on Armed Services and the Congress to inquire into this matter in depth since, in my judgment, it is yet another illustration of the Executive infringing on the powers of Congress.

In pursuing an inquiry concerning the possible abuse by the Executive of statutory power—Congress again will make its unique and positive contribution to our democracy.

Only a little more than 2 years ago, a great American, in commenting on the right and the responsibility to question the Executive's use of power, commented as follows:

"We therefore can pay honor to the deepest source of our national strength.

"That strength takes many forms, and the most obvious are not always the most significant.

"The men who create power make an indispensable contribution to the Nation's greatness, but the men who question power make a contribution just as indispensable, especially when that questioning is disinterested, for they determine whether we use power or power uses us."

This statement, emphasizing the responsibility of Americans to question the use of power was made by John F. Kennedy in his speech honoring the late poet, and former member of Amherst College faculty, Robert Frost, on October 26, 1963.

We need to stop the growing tendency of the Executive to ignore the will of the Congress by reading into the statutes authority which was never intended.

I am confident that the 2d session of the 89th Congress will enact new legislation concerning the Reserve Forces. There is always room for improvement, but I know the committee will want to be sure that the changes will improve our defense posture. I feel certain also that any new legislation adopted will include provisions to protect the constitutional rights and responsibilities of the Congress. And perhaps it may be necessary to spell out more clearly and to limit more specifically the authority delegated by Congress to the Department of Defense.

Our reserve subcommittee chairman, Mr. Hébert, has indicated that he is thinking along this same line, and I expect him to support fixing by statute the minimum strengths for each of the Reserve components.

This will leave no doubt as to the will of the Congress in this regard.

I have rambled tonight—but with a purpose. I have attempted to point out that the ramparts of freedom must be guarded by every American—be he a member of the general public, a member of our Reserve Forces, or a Member of Congress. Each has his role to play.

Each must make his daily contribution in the support of liberty by being eternally vigilant, not only with regard to external enemies, but also against the abuse of power by uncontrolled Central Government.

CHAD INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Farnum] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 11, marks the observance of independence day for Chad, a former colony of France. Though Chad's formal independence was achieved on August 11, 1960, the Government declared January 11, 1961, as its first national celebration of the event.

Chad is more than twice the size of France and has a population rapidly approaching 3 million persons. Historically, the French were exploring the area now known as Chad as early as 1891, but were able to learn very little about the country's early existence. However, France quickly recognized Chad's strategic importance and in 1900, during the French quest for empire in West Africa, Chad was organized as a military area. In 1910 it became one of the four territories of French Equatorial Africa, which was dissolved in 1959, at the time Chad became a fully autonomous member of the French community.

The people of Chad are justly proud of their country's role in support of the free French forces during World War II. During the bleak period of Nazi Germany's drive into north Africa, Chad was the first African colony to rally to France's call for assistance and it played an important part in the Allied thrust into north Africa to defeat Rommel's desert forces. Cooperation between the former colony and metropole have continued, and relations have grown even closer as a result of increased trade and French technical assistance.

The United States has viewed sympathetically the gallant struggle in which President Francois Tombalbaye and his government have been engaged in an attempt to accelerate Chad's economic development and help her people realize more of the fruits of independence.

Various geographic handicaps such as a scarcity of known mineral resources, a lack of many power resources, and a landlocked position with few rail lines serve as serious barriers to the country's achieving the rapid economic growth to which the Government is firmly committed. However, the picture is not all bleak since Chadian trade has increased remarkably, she is self-sufficient in food production, and she has a growing fishing industry which will bring in needed revenues.

I am certain that I speak in behalf of the Congress and the American people in expressing best wishes and warm congratulations to the President of the Republic, Francois Tombalbaye; Minister of Foreign Affairs, Jacques Baroum; Minister of State for National Defense, Robert Delsia Soussia; His Excellency Boukar Abdoul, Chad's Ambassador to the United States, and all of the people of Chad on their anniversary.

HURRICANE BETSY LOSSES AND YOUR INCOME TAX

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, late in September my State was struck by one of the most devastating hurricanes in the history of our country. That storm, Hurricane Betsy, did hundreds of millions of dollars in damages. Our National Government and Congress responded in many ways, including the passage of bills calling for the rehabilitation of schools, public buildings, and more especially, the so-called Betsy bill, which aided thousands of homeless and afflicted.

There were many stories of bravery and leadership in the wake of the hurricane, and they continue to unfold as our area completes the job of rehabilitation.

The New Orleans Times-Picayune, which is one of the oldest and most successful newspapers in our country, despite the almost total disruption of communications, and the New Orleans States-Item, both published by the Times-Picayune Publishing Corp., never missed a single edition. This in itself was a remarkable record and brought commendation from the journalistic profession.

More recently, the newspapers sponsored, under the direction of Mr. George Healy, widely known executive editor of the Times-Picayune and New Orleans States-Item, and their distinguished Washington correspondent, Mr. Edgar A. Poe, a tax institute at the New Orleans Municipal Auditorium.

This institute was held in connection with an informative series that the Times-Picayune ran on details of reporting hurricane losses on income tax forms.

It was a huge success, exceeding the expectations of its sponsors. On the night of December 15, over 3,200 people jammed the municipal auditorium in New Orleans to hear officials of the Internal Revenue Service and the Louisiana State Department of Revenue discuss tax relief due as a result of the hurricane, and following the meeting the newspaper received almost 20,000 requests for information on reporting losses.

I include herewith a copy of the series, from the Times-Picayune, based on information prepared by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service and the Louisiana Department of Revenue, along with newspaper accounts of the institute:

RECORD OF STORM DAMAGE SHOULD BE PREPARED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE

This is the first of a series of articles discussing the Federal and State income tax treatment of casualty losses. Many types of losses come within the casualty loss category; however, these discussions will be limited to nonbusiness losses of the type resulting from Hurricane Betsy.

As soon as possible a record should be made of the damages caused by Hurricane Betsy. This record should be as complete as possible and should list the damages to real property, which is land and buildings or other immovable improvements, and should list the items of personal property, which is movable property such as furniture, clothing, etc., which was damaged or destroyed. To the extent possible you should also have records to show that you are the owner of the property, the cost or other basis of the property, the amount of depreciation allowed or allowable (if any), the value of the property before and after the casualty and the amount of insurance or other compensation received or expected to be received.

A deduction for a loss is allowed only for the actual physical damage to your property resulting from the casualty. The losses are subject to certain limitations in computing the amount which may be deducted on your return. These limitations will be covered in later discussions.

Any decrease in the value of the property because it is in or near a disaster area and because there is a possibility that the area may again have a similar disaster is not a casualty loss. The basic measure of a casualty loss is the difference between the fair market value of the property immediately before the casualty and its fair market value immediately after the casualty.

The cost of repairs to the damaged property is an acceptable measure of the decrease in value and thus the loss if the taxpayer shows that (1) the repairs are necessary to restore the property to its precasualty condition, (2) the amount spent for the repairs is not excessive, (3) the repairs do not care for more than the damage suffered, and (4) the value of the property after the repairs does not as a result of the repairs exceed the value of the property immediately before the casualty.

Entire Property Must Be Considered and Expert Appraisal May Be Made

In computing the amount of the casualty loss resulting from physical damage to real property the entire property must be considered as a unit. For example, if you own a lot on which your residence is located and the only damage inflicted by Betsy was the uprooting of a large tree, your loss is the difference between the fair market value of the entire property immediately before the casualty and its fair market value immediately after the casualty. You may not base your loss on the value of the tree which was destroyed.

The best means to establish the fair market values of real property is to have an appraisal made by an expert real estate appraiser. Whether or not this is necessary or feasible will depend upon the circumstances in each case and the decision must be made by the individuals concerned.

Computation of the casualty loss from damage to real property is illustrated by the following examples.

Example 1. Mr. A owns a home which received extensive damage from Betsy consisting of wind damage and damage from flood water. The fair market value of the entire property immediately before the casualty was $18,000. As a result of the physical damage to the property the fair market value immediately after the casualty was only $15,000. Mr. A's loss is $3,000.

Example 2. Mr. B owns a home which received extensive damage from Betsy. The fair market value of the entire property was $18,000 immediately before Betsy hit. Repairs for the damages caused by the storm cost Mr. B $2,700. These repairs were necessary to restore the property to its precasualty condition, the amount for the repairs made was not excessive, the repairs were not more than necessary to take care of the damage suffered, and the value of the property after the repairs is not more than $18,000. Mr. B's loss is $2,700.

The examples above do not consider the limitations which will be discussed later or insurance proceeds or other compensation which will also be discussed later.

Separate Computation Must Be Made for Each Item of Personal Property

The amount of the casualty loss from damage or destruction of personal property is also the difference between the fair market value of the property immediately before the casualty and the fair market value of the property immediately after the casualty. A separate computation is made for each item of personal property. Any relationship between the cost of replacement and the amount of the loss is merely accidental.

Assuming that you have prepared a list of the articles of personal property which were damaged or destroyed by Betsy, you should enter by each item in columns (1) its cost or other basis to you, (2) its value before the casualty, (3) its value after the casualty, (4) the decrease in value, and (5) the amount of the loss.

A form to aid in the computation of your Betsy loss has been devised and printed by the New Orleans district office of the Internal Revenue Service and will be available upon request after December 15.

At this point it is necessary to discuss the limitation on the amount of the loss on nonbusiness assets which has been mentioned in earlier discussions. These limitations apply to losses of personal property and real property.

The loss on a property is the decrease in fair market value resulting from physical damage to the property by the casualty. The loss may not exceed your cost or other basis in the property. This limitation could only arise if the fair market value before the casualty is greater than your basis. On the other hand, your loss may not exceed the fair market value of the asset immediately before the casualty. This limitation arises only if the fair market value of the property immediately before the casualty was less than your basis. You will find that this is an important factor in determining your loss on personal property.

These limitations are brought out in the following examples:

Example 3. Mr. A. purchased real property for $10,000 in 1948 which he has used only as a personal residence since that time. The fair market value before Betsy hit was $18,000. Due to the physical damage caused by Betsy the fair market value of the property after the casualty was $6,000. The decrease in value is $12,000 but Mr. A.'s loss is limited to his basis of $10,000.

Example 4. Mr. B. purchased a boat for $2,000 in 1960 which he used only for personal recreation. The fair market value of the boat immediately before Betsy hit was $1,000. The boat was completely destroyed by the casualty and so salvage was realized. Mr. B.'s loss is $1,000, measured by the precasualty value of the property rather than his cost.

Deduction Is Allowed for Specific Damages Not Covered by Insurance

In our prior discussions we have considered the limitations applied in computing the amount of the casualty loss. We should now consider the steps necessary to compute the amount of the deduction to be claimed on your income tax return.

The statute allows a deduction to individuals for specific types of losses sustained during the taxable year and not compensated for by insurance or otherwise. The deduction for losses of nonbusiness property arising from casualties is included in these losses but there is a further provision that nonbusiness casualty losses are allowable only to the extent that the amount of the loss to such individual arising from each casualty exceeds $100.

At this time we will consider the $100 limitation feature and leave the discussion of compensation by insurance or otherwise until later.

The $100 limitation feature applies to each individual taxpayer for each casualty. This will be illustrated by the following examples.

Example 5. Mr. A owns an auto which cost him $3,000. The fair market value of the auto was $700 immediately before Betsy hit. During the course of the storm a tree fell on the auto which resulted in its value being reduced to salvage value only which amounted to $50. Mr. A was not compensated for his loss by insurance or otherwise. His loss is $650 and his deduction is limited to the amount in excess of $100 or $550.

Example 6. Mr. A and Mr. B jointly own a boat which they use only for recreation purposes. They paid $2,000 for the boat and its fair market value immediately before Betsy hit was $1,500. The boat was completely demolished by the casualty and there was no salvage realized. Their loss was $750 each but they may each deduct their loss which is in excess of $100, therefore they each may deduct $650.

This feature will be considered further in our next discussion.

State law differs in that deductions for State income tax purposes do not have a deductible feature, whereby the amount claimed is reduced by $100. Under State law, all losses are included with no deductions.

The $100 Deductible Feature Also Applies to Multiple Damage From One Cause

We have considered a loss of property which was jointly owned by two individuals, now we shall consider multiple losses from a single casualty.

Suppose that Mr. A owns a home which was damaged by Betsy's high winds and was flooded by the resulting high water brought by Betsy. The flood water also damaged Mr. A's auto and much of his household furnishings, appliances, and clothing. Let us also suppose that Mr. A received no compensation by insurance or otherwise for his losses.

Since all of these losses resulted from a single casualty the amount by which his total losses exceed $100 is the amount of his deduction on his income tax return.

If Mr. A had a loss from an auto accident in April 1965, in addition to the Betsy losses, the amount of this loss is also limited to the amount which is in excess of $100.

In our discussion concerning jointly owned property we considered the rule that each of the owners is subject to the $100 limitation for each casualty. There is an exception to this rule in the case of a husband and wife who file a joint return.

If a husband and wife jointly own property which is damaged by a casualty their combined loss will be considered as the loss of one taxpayer for the purposes of applying the $100 limitation if they file a joint return.

Suppose that Mr. and Mrs. A jointly own their home which suffered damage from Betsy and they are not compensated for the loss by insurance or otherwise. If they file a joint return the amount by which the total loss exceeds $100 is the amount of their deduction. If Mr. and Mrs. A file separate returns they must each make a separate computation of their loss and each apply the $100 limitation to determine the amount to be deducted on their separate returns.

As mentioned in a previous article, there is no $100 deductible feature under Louisiana law applying to State income tax. Under Louisiana law, all losses are included with no deductions.

Value of Shrubbery, Trees May Not Be Computed as Factor of Damages

In one of our earlier discussions we considered the fact that in computing the amount of the casualty loss of real property the entire property must be considered as a unit. We also discussed the conditions under which the cost of repairs could be used to measure the loss.

Let us now consider further the loss to real property resulting from destruction of trees or shrubbery. While the value of these separate items may not be used to determine the amount of the loss, the total of the actual expenditures for (1) removing destroyed or damaged trees and shrubbery, less any salvage recovered, (2) pruning or other measures taken to preserve damaged trees and shrubs, and (3) replanting necessary to restore the property to its approximate value before the casualty may, where appropriate, serve as evidence of the amount of loss to the property due to the damage to trees and shrubbery.

Since we have considered the various methods of measuring the amount of casualty losses and the limitations which must be considered to determine the amount of the deduction to be claimed, we should now consider items which are related to Betsy losses and which may be subject to some confusion.

Food, medical supplies, and other forms of subsistence which you receive do not reduce the amount of your casualty loss deduction. Neither does the receipt of these items by you result in taxable income to you.

The cost of appraisals made to establish the amount of your loss resulting from a casualty is not a part of the casualty loss. The com-deduction but is an expense of determining your income tax liability and is deductible as such if you itemize your nonbusiness deductions for the year in which the fees are paid. The cost of photographs made to assist in making the appraisals or to establish the nature of the damages is also subject to this treatment.

Under State law certain deductions may be made even though the items of expense occur on property the taxpayer does not own. Among those items are the expense of removing blown-down trees, pruning shrubbery, and removing debris. These costs will be allowed as casualty losses by Louisiana even though the taxpayer does not own the property, if he, in fact, paid the necessary cost.

Deduction Is Allowed for Nonbusiness Damages Not Covered by Insurance

A deduction is allowed for nonbusiness casualty losses sustained during the year and not compensated for by insurance or otherwise but limited to the amount by which the loss from each casualty exceeds $100. As we have covered the $100 limitation feature, this article will be devoted to insurance recoveries or other compensation for losses.

We believe that insurance proceeds will not present a problem. If your property was damaged by Betsy to the extent of $2,000 and you are compensated for your loss by insurance proceeds in the amount of $1,500, you have sustained a loss of $500 not compensated for by insurance.

We expect that most of your problems will concern financial assistance from sources other than insurance. Amounts received from the Red Cross or other disaster relief agencies for the purpose of restoring or rehabilitating property lost or damaged by Betsy are treated the same as insurance proceeds. However, amounts received from these agencies as disaster relief for food, medical supplies and other forms of subsistence have no effect on the amount of your casualty loss deduction and are not includible in your income.

Amounts received from a disaster relief fund maintained by your employer, if the amounts are not compensation for services, for the purpose of restoring or rehabilitating property lost or damaged by Betsy are also treated the same as insurance proceeds.

Any amounts which you receive as gifts from your relatives, friends and neighbors do not reduce the amount of your casualty loss deduction even though you use all or part of the gifts to restore or rehabilitate the property lost or damaged by Betsy.

At this time we do not know what the income-tax effect will be of the partial forgiveness of disaster loans made by the Small Business Administration. This matter is presently under study in the Washington office of the Internal Revenue Service, and as soon as an answer is received it will be issued as a press release to this newspaper.

Claim for Damages May Be Carried to Previous Year as Tax Deduction

This discussion will be devoted to the deduction of nonbusiness casualty losses. The discussion will be limited to Betsy losses of nonbusiness property. If you realized a gain on the disposition of business assets during 1965 or if you realized a gain on an involuntary conversion of property into money or other property, this discussion may not apply to the treatment of your nonbusiness casualty loss.

Nonbusiness deductions are claimed on page 2 of form 1040. If you file form 1040A you may not claim nonbusiness deductions.

Your casualty loss should be claimed in the section "Other deductions" on page 2 of form 1040. In this space you should identify the deduction and show the amount. The computation of the deduction should be shown on a separate schedule attached to your return and the computation should include any amount compensated for by insurance or otherwise. The special form designed by the New Orleans district office should be helpful in making a correct computation of the allowable deduction.

If you claim a casualty loss deduction you will also want to claim your other nonbusiness deduction such as contributions, taxes, interest and medical expenses as well as any expenses incurred in determining the amount of your casualty loss if they were paid during the year of the casualty.

If your casualty loss exceeds your income for the year of the casualty you may have a net operating loss which can be carried to a prior taxable year as an additional deduction for that year or carried over to subsequent years.

A net operating loss is a carryback to the third preceding taxable year and any excess is a carryover to the following taxable years, in the order listed or until no excess remains, (1) the second preceding year, (2) the first preceding year, and (3) each of the five subsequent years.

If you have a net operating loss you may file a claim for refund for the prior year to which the loss is carried. A claim for refund may be filed at any time before the 15th day of the 40th month following the close of the loss year. A refund will be made only after the correct amount of the refund has been determined.

You may apply for a quick refund of a prior year's tax by filing form 1045 for a tentative adjustment of taxes which are affected by a net operating loss carryback. Form 1045 must be filed within 12 months from the end of the loss year. Filing of form 1045 will result in a quick refund which is subject to final adjustment at a later date.

Since net operating losses may become quite complicated we urge you to take advantage of the assistance which will be offered in our final discussion if you believe that you are entitled to a carryback to prior years.

Louisiana income tax laws differ in that the entire amount of hurricane loss is deductible only in 1965 and no part of the deduction can be carried back to a prior year or forwarded to a subsequent year.

Example Includes Principles Taken Up in Articles Previously Offered

This article will be devoted to an example which we hope will include all of the principles previously discussed and some of the problems with which you will be most concerned.

Example 7. Mr. and Mrs. Doe own their home which they purchased in 1960 for $18,000. The fair market value of this property was $19,000 immediately before Betsy hit. Their home was damaged by Betsy's high winds and floodwaters. Their auto which cost $3,000 and which had a value of $1,600 was severely damaged by the floodwaters. Their furniture, appliances, clothing, the children's toys and other personal effects were damaged in varying degrees by the floodwater.

Mr. and Mrs. Doe prepared a list of the family's personal effects which were damaged or destroyed by Betsy, using the lower of cost or value immediately before the casualty and the value (if any) of each item after the casualty. They determined that the total amount of their loss on these items was $3,500.

The value of their home after the casualty was determined to be $14,000 and the entire decrease in value was due to the physical damage to the property.

Mr. and Mrs. Doe were compensated for their loss to the extent of $300 insurance for wind damage to their home, they received $1,600 for a total loss settlement on their auto, but the insurance company received the auto, and they received $1,000 from a disaster relief agency for the purpose of restoring or rehabilitating property lost or damaged in the casualty.

Their casualty loss deduction is computed as follows:

Loss on home ($19,000 less $14,000)	$5,000
Less insurance recovered	300
	4,700
Personal effects	3,500
Auto	1,600
Less insurance recovered	1,600
	0
Excess of loss over insurance recovery	8,200
Payment from disaster relief agency	1,000
Total loss to Mr. and Mrs. Doe	7,200
Less $100 limitation on nonbusiness losses	100
Amount of casualty loss deduction to be claimed	7,100

If the above amount exceeds their income for 1965 the Does may file a claim for refund of 1962 income tax or they may request a tentative adjustment of 1962 income tax by filing form 1045.

Internal Revenue Service Offering Information on Tax in Publications

In this concluding discussion of Betsy losses we will summarize some of the prior discussions and list sources of additional information in case the answer to your problem has not been included in one of our articles.

We hope that you have prepared a detailed list of the personal effects which were damaged or destroyed by Betsy. This list not only will assist you in supporting the deduction which you claim on your return but will be a valuable aid in preventing your overlooking items lost. The more time that elapses before your list is prepared the greater are the chances of omitting articles from your list.

The amount of your casualty loss is determined by the reduction of the property's value by physical damage inflicted by the casualty, subject to the limitations discussed. Your Betsy loss is deductible on your 1965 income tax return even though you have not made the repairs. Of course, if you measure the loss by the actual expenditures made for repairs, the amount can not be computed until the amount of the repairs is known but the loss was still sustained during 1965 and is a deduction for that year.

Another feature of casualty losses is the adjustment which must be made to the basis of property for computing the gain or loss on the subsequent sale or other disposition. This adjustment requires that the basis be reduced by the amount of the damage to the property and that the cost of repairs made to correct the damage should be added to the reduced basis. This feature will not affect your current deduction of the casualty loss but must be taken into account in computing the gain or loss in the year in which the property is sold.

Detailed information about casualty losses is available in Internal Revenue Service Document No. 5174 (12–64) which may be obtained free of charge upon request from any Internal Revenue Service office.

Internal Revenue Service information publications "Your Federal Income Tax" and "Tax Guide for Small Business" include the information on casualty losses as well as detailed information to aid you in preparing your income tax return. These publications are available at most Internal Revenue Service offices for 50 cents a copy.

You can receive personal assistance with your casualty loss problems by calling the nearest Internal Revenue Service office. In New Orleans the number is 527–2435.

Written requests for assistance should be addressed to the District Director of Internal Revenue, Post Office Box 30309, New Orleans, La., 70130.

Questions pertaining to Louisiana income tax should be addressed to Louisiana Department of Revenue, State Office Building, 325 Loyola, New Orleans, La., 70112.

Thorough Cross Section of Area People Present—More Than 3,000 Given Many Answers

(By Gene Barnes)

Municipal auditorium had what was probably its most attentive audience in years Tuesday night.

The occasion was the Hurricane Betsy Tax Institute; and the crowd, estimated at more than 3,000, had money on its mind.

It was a thorough cross section of people in this area. There were executive types in tailored suits and fishermen in overalls. There were women in furs and women in slacks.

Almost everyone had at least two things in common—they had suffered losses from Hurricane Betsy and they were determined to save as much as possible on their Federal and State income taxes because of it.

WOMAN TAKES NOTES

The crowd seemed to hang on every word. A Negro woman took copious notes. An elderly man sat literally on the edge of his seat, straining to hear. A middle-aged matron whispered in her husband's ear and looked apologetically at his neighbors.

The institute, sponsored by the Times-Picayune and New Orleans States-Item, was held about tax problems resulting from Betsy's foray.

An estimated 30,000 persons will file losses on their income taxes next year because of Betsy.

Homer Lindsay, deputy State fire marshal at the auditorium, estimated that 3,200 of them were in attendance—despite rainy weather.

Not everyone stayed to the end. "I found out what I want to know," said an old man, donning his raincoat and departing about 15 minutes before the end of the program.

ANSWERS SOUGHT

But for every one who left early at least five others stayed after the formal program ended, to swarm around a battery of Federal and State experts and seek answers to specific problems.

And the program was not without laughter. One speaker lauded the ability of residents of this area to be humorous in the face of adversity.

As an example, he told of a letter a woman gave to her husband for mailing to the Times-Picayune. In the letter, she asked how much she could deduct on a 15-year-old wedding dress ruined by floodwaters.

The husband posted the letter, but before he did, he wrote this postscript at the bottom: "She lost the thing 15 years ago. I wish she had lost it 16 years ago."

Judging from a number of persons interviewed, most of the audience sought general information; but a large number had specific problems.

Mrs. Anthony K. Keko, who had to move from her home in Buras to Metairie following Betsy's devastation, estimated her family lost more than $75,000 in the storm. She also lost her 77-year-old father-in-law, Gergo Keko, whose body still has not been found.

TAKING COURSE

Mrs. Keko said she is taking a course on taxes to learn more about her situation but attended the institute in hopes of picking up additional information.

"How can I save money and pay Uncle Sam as little as possible," was the way Michael J. Liuzza, Sr., put it when asked why he was attending.

Liuzza, of 220 Serpas in Carolyn Park, said he had 6 feet of water in his home and estimated his total losses at $40,000.

"I think it's wonderful when the Government and newspapers team up to help people not familiar with tax laws," he said.

Mrs. Paul Barriere, a Negro mother of 10, said, "All we had left was a mirror on the wall" after Betsy.

Even after the Small Business Administration forgiveness grant "we still will have lost plenty," she said. "I'm trying to find out how much of a tax refund we can expect."

TWOFOLD PURPOSE

Joseph J. Calo, 532 Rosa Avenue, Metairie, had a twofold purpose in attending. He was a tax accountant seeking to find answers for his clients and a homeowner looking for personal answers as well.

One of his questions had to do with carryback and carry-forward losses. He got the answer from Internal Revenue Service men there.

Mrs. Raymond Gautreaux said information pamphlets and forms distributed at the institute should answer most of her questions.

"I've been doing our own income tax forms since we've been married and I ought to be able to figure them out without too much difficulty," she said.

Mrs. Gautreaux's family had to leave its home at 3027 Music after suffering losses of some $10,000. The family is temporarily living at 4702 Perlita.

Louis Barnes, 101 Nutria Drive, Chalmette, and George Santos, 3106 Jackson Boulevard, Chalmette, said the institute was both educational and constructive.

Another man seemed extremely pleased to learn that he can deduct the loss of food spoiled in his freezer because of no electricity. "That alone made it worth the trip here," he said.

Deduct "Forgiven" SBA Loan, Storm Victims Are Advised—Tax Steps Outlined Here by Experts

(By Clarence Doucet)

Hurricane victims who made Small Business Administration loans must deduct the "forgiven" part of their loan from the total casualty loss from Betsy claimed in their 1965 Federal income tax returns.

That announcement came Wednesday night at the Hurricane Betsy Tax Institute at Municipal Auditorium.

The institute was sponsored by the Times-Picayune and the New Orleans States-Item.

Harold LeBlanc, Federal revenue agent from Baton Rouge, made the announcement about the SBA loans as he outlined the Internal Revenue Service's policy regarding recovery of Betsy victims from sources other than insurance.

He said the "forgiveness" part of the SBA loan is considered as "compensation other than insurance."

RELIEF CITED

Along the same lines, the IRS announced that money made available by "disaster relief" agencies must also be considered a recovery other than insurance.

In these cases, as well, any recovery or reimbursement received from these groups would reduce the casualty loss claimed on tax returns, he said.

LeBlanc was one of several Federal and State income tax officials who addressed the institute.

An IRS official said that more than 4,000 packages, which contained information and forms for filing Federal and State income tax returns, were handed to persons as they entered the auditorium.

Actual attendance was estimated by a fire marshal at more than 3,200.

Chester A. Usry, New Orleans district director for the IRS, headed the Federal tax officials. William E. Tuttle, Baton Rouge, director of individual income tax for the Louisiana Department of Revenue, headed the State revenue department delegation.

Other IRS officials who spoke included Ralph P. Hebert, chief, audit division, New Orleans district; and Thomas Byrnes, revenue agent and senior instructor, New Orleans district.

Edgar Poe, Washington correspondent for the Times-Picayune, was master of ceremonies.

PUBLIC SERVICE

Poe explained that the sole purpose of the institute was to "provide a public service." He said one result will be to minimize the income taxes of persons who suffered losses due to Hurricane Betsy.

Usry announced that the IRS office in New Orleans will have a special telephone service for hurricane victims who wish additional information about their particular problems. Betsy victims desiring this assistance should dial 527–2371.

Usry also announced that beginning January 3, 1966, specially trained personnel will be available to assist taxpayers in person in Room 117 in the Federal Building at 600 South.

He urged hurricane victims to file their returns before February 15 to avoid the delay which usually comes after that date.

"If you send them to us after February 15," Usry added, "your returns will hit us with 100,000 others, and I don't know when you'd get your refund in that case.

Brynes defined casualty tax losses—in this case Betsy losses—noting that for tax purposes they are divided into real property losses and personal property losses. Combined, they represent the total casualty loss.

He said that food, medical supplies and subsistence given to hurricane victims does not reduce their casualty loss.

LeBlanc, in addition to announcing the IRS policy concerning "forgiveness" loans, also answered in general terms questions submitted to the IRS via the Times-Picayune.

He emphasized that any losses because of Betsy are 1965 losses and must be reported in 1965 returns. He also emphasized that, though some lost items may have had great sentimental value to the owner, they must be reported at their actual worth immediately before the hurricane.

Hébert urged taxpayers to "be reasonable in estimating the values of articles damaged or destroyed."

He said revenue agents and auditors have been reminded to "be reasonable and practical when considering the values reported on income tax returns."

Hébert also said taxpayers should provide "an adequate explanation of the casualty loss claimed on your return."

He added:

"Remember, the purpose of an adequate explanation is to enable the auditor to evaluate the reasonableness of the loss claimed without having to audit your return. Therefore, it is to your advantage to include in your return all the important information concerning the loss."

Other State income tax officials attending were: J. W. Brown, Baton Rouge, chief administrative assistant for individual taxes; Harold Couvillion, Baton Rouge, reviewing auditor, and Wilson Barrett, auditor in the New Orleans office.

AWARDS GIVEN

At the conclusion of the stage presentation, Usry presented certificates of meritorious public service to both newspapers for sponsoring the institute. The certificates were signed by IRS Commissioner Sheldon S.

Cohen. Poe accepted for the Times-Picayune; and Walter Cowan, managing editor of the States-Item, accepted for his newspaper.

Persons attending were then invited to address personal questions concerning their individual tax problems and Betsy losses to IRS agents, who were positioned at 17 tables in front of the stage. Three other tables staffed by Federal and State tax personnel, were also available.

The packages distributed to persons attending the institute contained "Hurricane Betsy Losses and Your Income Tax," a reprint of the 10-part series which appeared in the Times-Picayune"; copies of the special sheets prepared by the IRS to aid hurricane victims in listing their losses; copies of Form 1040, the U.S. individual income tax return; a copy of the booklet, "Disaster, Casualties, and Thefts: How the Federal Income Tax Applies"; instructions for filing Form 1040 for 1965, as well as copies of the 1965 Louisiana Income Tax Return and a special sheet to submit with State returns for claiming losses.

ADDRESS BY HON. HALE BOGGS, DEMOCRAT, OF LOUISIANA, ON WAR IN VIETNAM TO THE PRESS CLUB OF NEW ORLEANS, DECEMBER 20, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, during the recess between sessions of the 89th Congress, I traveled to southeast Asia to see firsthand the U.S. effort in South Vietnam and to assess our trade policies in other countries in that area.

Upon my return I reported my findings in a speech to the Press Club of New Orleans and I would like to offer this report to my colleagues.

I would also like to report that reaction to the speech was very favorable, and through communications and conversation with my constituents in the Second District of Louisiana, I have found overwhelming support of U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

Here are my remarks:

Address by Hon. Hale Boggs, Democrat, of Louisiana, on War in Vietnam to the Press Club of New Orleans, December 20, 1965

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I have just now returned from a trip which has taken me halfway around the world, and from the Northern to the Southern Hemisphere. I have been in New Zealand, Australia, Vietnam, Hong Kong, and Japan.

I wanted especially to go to Vietnam. As the war has quickened and as more Americans have become involved, I felt it essential, if I were to make intelligent determinations in the Congress on the issues involved, to go there and talk with our people and the Vietnamese people.

I felt it would be best, however, to go first to other countries closely associated with Asia, and also directly in the path of the Chinese Communists' thrust for world conquest.

Happily, I was able to combine these two missions. As you know, for years I have served as chairman of the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Joint House-Senate Economic Committee. In this capacity, I have helped to write many of our trade and tariff bills, and I have worked as hard as I know how to expand trade and commerce through our own port here in New Orleans.

I also wanted to look at the problems and promises of trade between these countries and our own, and I wanted more particularly to stress the advantages of our own home port. In each country I met with the top people, both in and out of Government, and today, briefly, I would like to report to you some of my observations.

New Zealand is a long way. From Washington to Wellington, its capital city, is not only halfway around the world, but it also means a complete change of seasons. I was there in their late spring, and one of the days there was bright and sunny and the beaches were crowded with bathers. Christmas is very different from ours in that the people go to the countryside and the beaches, and do very much like we do on the Fourth of July.

New Zealand is an agricultural country. It produces lamb, wool, and beef—all for export. It is vitally concerned with such problems as the impact upon their trade by the possible entry of Great Britain into the Common Market. It is vitally concerned with our own import and export policies, and very much concerned with the measures we have adopted to prevent export of investment funds because of the unfavorable balance of payments existing there.

With these preoccupations, one would think that Vietnam would not be a matter of grave concern to these people—but this is not the case. They now thoroughly understand what would happen to them should we withdraw from Vietnam.

And even greater understanding exists in Australia, a country which has stood with us in World War I, World War II and the Korean war. Australia is a land mass almost the size of the continental United States. It has been described as the world's largest island and smallest continent. Throughout this vast area only 11 million people reside, and immediately above that continent lies Indonesia with the heaviest concentration of population on earth. From Indonesia to the southeast Asian peninsula and Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos is an easy jump. So Australia is acutely aware of Vietnam; acutely aware of the stakes involved.

Then I went to Hong Kong, the incredible city which has grown in 15 years from 500,000 people to 4 million people. There is a city that trades with the whole world, and is part of the mainland of Communist China. Practically all of the food consumed by the 4 million people who live in Hong Kong comes from the mainland. Why does Hong Kong exist, people ask. The answer is not difficult to come by. It is to Red China's advantage to allow Hong Kong to operate as a free and separate entity, because through this great port is generated most of the hard currency which the Communist Chinese use to purchase essentials from the outside world for their economy.

But most of all, Hong Kong is a listening post. The intelligence agents of all nations move in and out of the area.

What does one learn in Hong Kong? Several things, I think. One, that the split between Russia and China is a very real one, having an impact on every Communist Party on earth, and vitally affecting decisions which may ultimately determine whether or not world war III is avoided. One soon discovers that the very old leaders of Communist China—the average age of the 17 men who make up the top leadership is 68—face many problems of their own, the main one being what the Communists call revisionism, namely the tendency to forsake militant revolution for internal development, using some of the same incentives employed by free enterprise societies outside the Communist orbit.

So having gone to these places, I went to Vietnam. I was there several days. I talked to our Ambassador, to our military leaders, to our soldiers. I visited hospitals, the countryside. I did everything possible to find out all that I could about all that is going on there. One can only get impressions and one hopes that they are valid ones.

Let me say that I have no advice to give to the military. I have complete confidence in General Westmoreland and the other splendid officers who make up our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps leadership in that part of the world.

They have now, and will continue to have, my full support.

Now for some observations. First, we must stay in Vietnam until a just and lasting peace is obtained. Why? Because it is a crucial test between our country and Communist China, and its outcome may well determine whether we ultimately fight world war III or not. Communist China believes that it must conquer the world. It believes that it can do this through so-called wars of "national liberation." Here in the dense jungles and broad deltas of the tropics, every method of terror and coercion has been employed to bring about the success of this so-called war of "national liberation." Why is the Vietcong strong? Because the methods of terror and assassination remove the energetic adult leaders and force the young men from the villages and countryside into the Vietcong.

If we leave without a just peace, then the word is out that the West has lost and communism has won. The impact of this is quite obvious to any thoughtful person. Suffice it to say that Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Indonesia, Pakistan, India, would fall very quickly. The chances are that when the Philippines come under the gun, we would then be in an all-out world war III. These are the simple, basic reasons for being in Vietnam.

Some argue that Vietnam is so far away, and is so insignificant that its conquest by Hanoi and Peiping presents no problem of such magnitude as to justify the present escalation of our military efforts.

Let us examine this for just a moment. In 1931, you may recall, the then Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, urged President Hoover and the British Government to confront the Japanese when that nation committed aggression against Manchuria. Mr. Stimson was not heeded, and Manchuria led on ultimately to Pearl Harbor and the chain of aggression was not broken until many Americans had lost their lives on islands that most of us had never heard of. There are many similar events of the recent past which might be cited, the failure of the League of Nations, Mussolini's conquest of Ethiopia, Hitler's defiance of treaty obligations, his seizure of one country after another, and ultimately the blood and sweat and the death and destruction of World War II.

So the notion that we can secure a quick peace by ignoring and forgetting about Vietnam is something that all of recent history tells us is wrong. And our Communist adversaries themselves have made it quite clear peace would not come with the sacrifice of the people of South Vietnam. Already they are talking about "national liberation" of Thailand. Thailand has never been a colonial nation. From whom would it be liberated? Not from us, or the British, or the French, but from the Thais.

And if we left, does any sensible person believe that the balance of power in the world would remain as it is now? Does anyone believe that Berlin would be secure, or that Communist terror would not be promoted throughout Asia and Africa and Latin America?

In a remarkable interview a few days ago, Ho Chi Minh, the leader of North Vietnam, rejected any notion of negotiation other than by way of total surrender on the part of our people.

I have been in Japan. Their laborious effort has been quite successful in creating a peaceful and a democratic society. Its economy and industry are now harnessed to the ways of peace. After being in Japan, I am convinced that it could not continue this course, if we, in effect, surrender in Vietnam and withdraw from southeast Asia. One other important consideration arose time and time again in my discussions in Vietnam, Japan, and elsewhere, and that is that the split between the communism of China and the communism of Russia is very real indeed. If we withdraw, there can be no doubt that the Chinese brand of communism, that repeatedly and explicitly says it wants no peace, shall become dominant. That is why negotiation on the terms laid down by Hanoi and Peiping would, in my opinion, visit a holocaust upon the world rather than bringing lasting peace.

Is there an easy way out? Is there a simple solution? The answer is "No." Imagine if you will the United States with half of the cities and towns under Communist control. Imagine no road or railroad or canal or river safe for communication and transportation. Imagine the farmer unable to produce his crop because of terror, murder and assassination, and imagine a terrain of jungles and swamps largely inaccessible, and you get some notion of the problems in Vietnam. Add to this fact that most of the leadership—the mayors, the councilmen, the educators, the editors, the physicians, the lawyers, and engineers have been assassinated. It is under these conditions that we seek to join with the forces of the South Vietnam Government to pacify the Communist-occupied areas of South Vietnam. This is why our military leaders don't claim victory. They say we have stopped "losing."

Six months ago, village after village was being surrounded and overcome, and the Government forces had retreated to the town squares and to the city of Saigon. Today, many of the villages have been retaken from the Viet Cong terrorists. More than that, the people know that we are there and we intend to stay. The impact of this is one of enormous significance.

Now, about our own men. Our forces are extremely able, tough, alert, and intelligent. Most of the men in our forces today are high school graduates; most of our officers are college graduates. Most of them are trained in government, in economics, and political systems; and most of them, thank God, understand the philosophical and political threat of communism so that they know what the war is about. The morale of our men is tremendous. Inspiring is the only word to describe it.

What has been the impact on them of so-called peace demonstrations here at home? All of the soldiers to whom I spoke understood that the demonstrations were the work of small minorities, or were promoted by Communist agitators. None were deceived into believing that they represented any major opinion in our country.

In some ways the effect has been quite opposite from that intended—in that literally millions of Americans have written to our forces in Vietnam expressing support. I presented petitions of support from about 7,000 citizens, gathered by the Americanism Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans area, and from about 3,500 students, staff, and faculty members of Tulane University. These expressions of support from our own area are being duplicated throughout the Nation, and are enormously encouraging to our forces.

There is no doubt that our military effort in Vietnam is vital to the ultimate success of the South Vietnamese people in achieving a stable, viable government under a free society. But the fact is that military success in defeating the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese Army is one aspect in a long, arduous task of rebuilding the South Vietnamese society to meet the challenges and responsibilities of self-government as a modern state. One of the toughest aspects of our job in Vietnam—in terms of the long haul—is succeeding with our economic and social programs there.

Today more than 1,000 employees of the Agency for International Development—many of them working in the countryside and the small hamlets and villages—are engaged in helping the South Vietnamese people in the fields of agriculture, health, education, public works, public safety, public administration, labor industrial development, and various provincial operations such as resettlement of refugees, rehabilitation of Vietcong prisoners and others. Our Government is now providing more than $300 million a year for our technical personnel to work with the South Vietnamese in these important areas. This economic assistance is a four-point effort in four major areas:

1. Grant aid: To finance imports to help maintain the South Vietnam economy on a day-to-day basis, and to prevent serious inflation, and curb the balance-of-payments deficit.

2. Capital projects assistance: To broaden the economic base and improve urban facilities with water supply systems, electrification, improved harbors, roads, and transport facilities.

3. Technical assistance: To improve human skills through education in agricultural methods, public health, public safety, public works, public administration, logistics, and other areas.

4. Counterinsurgency: To maintain basic services for the people by providing foodstuffs, farm tools, roofing, and cement and other things. Included in this part of the aid program is strengthening of the national police.

What are the prospects for immediate victory? Victory in this instance is not like that of a conventional war in that it must mean the containment of militant communism. This will undoubtedly take time and effort and sacrifice. But the stakes are enormous and the price is worth our best efforts. I don't mean to be pessimistic. The fact that we have taken a stand there has already had tremendous repercussions throughout Asia, Africa, and more particularly in Indonesia, where the Communists have now been denied victory.

I recall as vividly as any experience of my life, the days of the Cuban crisis. You may remember that Congress had just adjourned and President Kennedy summoned all of the congressional leaders back to Washington. There in the Cabinet Room of the White House he outlined in detail the Russian missile threat to the United States. For one momentous week the Nation looked down the nuclear barrel. On the Monday after the Sunday morning that Khrushchev wrote his letter to the President indicating withdrawal of the missiles, President Kennedy said, at his final briefing, "The military threat of Russia is receding. Now the threat will come from Communist China as it develops the hydrogen bomb."

Two years later, almost to the day, gathered in the same room, almost the same people, with the exception of President Kennedy. President Johnson briefed us on the explosion of the first nuclear device in China. There were many questions directed at Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara. The principal one was, What threat does this pose to the free world? The answer came back—very little as of now, but a major and dangerous one 10 years from now, barring no change in the aggressive government now dominant in China.

And as I talked with our leaders in Vietnam and Saigon, these meetings kept recurring in my mind. So this is the ultimate challenge of Vietnam. Whether we turn back the threat now or whether we repeat the events of other days and ultimately face a China infinitely stronger than it it today, determined to conquer the rest of mankind. In essence, our success in containing communism in south Vietnam may well determine whether or not our country and the free world will be forced to fight world war III.

Our men in Vietnam understand this and they are willing to make the sacrifices required to prevent this from happening.

This is what all of our people at home must understand. This is what the so-called demonstrators, unless they be Communist motivated, do not understand. And this is the message that I bring back from that far-off place where Americans are fighting to preserve your freedom and mine.

In conclusion, let me quote from the address made by President Johnson at the Johns Hopkins University in April 1965:

> "We fight because we must fight if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny. And only in such a world will our own freedom be finally secure. * * *
>
> "The first reality is that North Vietnam has attacked the independent nation of South Vietnam. Its object is total conquest. * * *
>
> "Over this war, and all Asia, is another reality: the deepening shadow of Communist China. The rulers in Hanoi are urged on by Peiping. This is a regime which has destroyed freedom in Tibet, attacked India, and been condemned by the United Nations for aggression in Korea. It is a nation which is helping the forces of violence in almost every continent. * * *
>
> "Why are we in South Vietnam? * * *
>
> "We are there because we have a promise to keep. Since 1954 every American President has offered support to the people of South Vietnam. We have helped to build, and we have helped to defend. Thus, over the years, we have made a national pledge to help South Vietnam defend its independence. And I intend to keep that promise.
>
> "We are also there to strengthen world order. To leave Vietnam to its fate would shake the confidence of all these people in the value of American commitment, the value of America's word. The result would be increased unrest and instability, and even wider war.
>
> "We are there because there are great stakes in the balance. Let no one think for a moment that retreat from Vietnam would bring an end to the conflict. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another. The central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied.
>
> "There are those who wonder why we have a responsibility there. We have it for the same reason we have a responsibility for the defense of the freedom of Europe. World War II was fought in both Europe and Asia, and when it ended, we found ourselves with continued responsibility for the defense of freedom.
>
> "Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam, and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves, only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way.
>
> "It should also be clear that the only path for reasonable men is the path of peaceful settlement.
>
> "Such peace demands an independent South Vietnam securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others, free from outside interference, tied to no alliance, a military base for no other country."

Mr. Speaker, since my speech was delivered, our Government has undertaken by every honorable means a monumental effort to bring about the kind of just peace described in the last paragraph quoted above. For the sake of all mankind, the whole world hopes for success despite the fact that it has now been conclusively shown that the leaders in Hanoi desire to continue aggression.

NARCOTICS ADDICTION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, four bills in total, which must occupy a position of absolute priority on the congressional agenda of 1966.

The problem is narcotics addiction. The need is for a more humane and effective Federal approach to that grave reality. The focus must be an attempt to differentiate the sickness of narcotics use from the crime of narcotics distribution, and in such cases to substitute rehabilitation for pure punishment.

The bills I am introducing today are intended to make it possible for the Federal Government to make such distinctions in narcotics cases. Each is designed to allow a more flexible response to what is finally an immensely complicated psychological, medical, and social reality. Two of the measures attempt to modernize procedures for the prosecution and punishment of narcotics crimes. Two seek to promote a new Federal commitment to research, treatment, and rehabilitative services and facilities for addicts. The bills are complementary.

A more enlightened narcotics policy requires initially that diseased addicts be withdrawn from the category of simple criminals. Accordingly, one of my bills would authorize the pretrial civil commitment of addicts for medical treatment and probationary care—in lieu of criminal prosecution. My own State of New York has been a pioneer in providing civil commitment for addicts. The bill I today introduce attempts to write such procedure into Federal law. Persons accused of narcotics crimes would be allowed the option of undertaking a compulsory treatment and rehabilitation program, rather than standing trial for offenses presently designated as crimes, but usually the simple expression of their narcotics disease.

Safeguards are built into this approach. The civil commitment program would not be open to persons charged with stealing narcotics for resale, nor would it be available to criminals convicted of two or more felonies, nor to those with a prior pending felony charge. Persons who had previously participated in civil commitment programs on two or more occasions would also be prohibited from further participation. These safeguards are necessary, though it is my own view that all narcotics criminals must eventually be given open rehabilitation opportunities.

My second bill seeks to move in that direction. Our first goal, however, must be treatment of the young addict, the first offender, and those most vulnerable to the criminal trade of dope distribution. We must try to break the vicious circle of addiction, imprisonment, release, and renewed addiction.

The second bill seeks certain reforms in existing narcotics criminal law. The operating principle is to be prosecutorial discretion in enforcing narcotics laws in order to provide incentive for addicts convicted of Federal crimes to pursue treatment while in confinement. If adopted this legislation would allow Federal courts to use probation, parole, and suspended sentences as tools to promote the rehabilitation of the addict-criminal. Changes envisaged would allow judges to determine whether an accused is a major peddler of narcotics, and should be tried under the most stringent provisions of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, or is a simple addict arrested for possession alone and deserving of less punitive treatment. The principal intention of this provision is to provide, within the structure of the law, clear incentives for narcotics addicts to avoid narcotics peddling, and to seek rehabilitation while in custody. The bill also provides some flexible sentencing provisions for the Federal Youth Corrections Act.

I believe the approach in this provision is not inconsistent with vigilance against illegal narcotics traffic. There are many ways to eliminate that traffic—one, I believe, is to take as many young and first offending addicts out of the stream. Prosecutionary discretion in narcotics cases is a means to that end.

A commitment to greater use of rehabilitative services in narcotics will not be possible unless the Federal Government can initiate a new program for construction and funding of treatment facilities. The third bill I introduce today, consequently, provides $25 million a year for a 3-year program of aid for new services and research projects.

A formula of two-thirds, one-third Federal-State matching grants will control the appropriation of 80 percent of the grants. The remaining 20 percent will be given as a direct 100-percent grant to nonprofit private organizations with little capital of their own. Equally important in this measure, I believe, are the provisions to encourage new people to enter the narcotics rehabilitation field. Vocational training would be expanded with use of funds authorized by the legislation.

Let me say then that I would hope programs in rehabilitation would make a special attempt to utilize cured addicts or rehabilitated criminals, or even poor people in the services. The reality of narcotics addiction is unique. Those who have shared the experience of victimization, and those who have found the skill to overcome oppressive conditions are best equipped to help their fellows.

The fourth bill in the program I am submitting provides aid for the construction and acquisition of treatment facilities. Its formula is essentially similar to that in the third bill, dealing with rehabilitation services. It authorizes expenditures of $50 million a year for 2 years.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me once again express my conviction that narcotics legislation must receive attention during this session of Congress. Under President Johnson's skilled leadership, the country is beginning to grow aware of the invisible poor and exploited amidst us. I suggest that the plight of no citizen in this country is as tortured and agonized as that of the narcotics addict. To cure a social problem, we must first properly identify it. As much as anything, the bills I am today introducing seek to establish a new definition and approach to narcotics problems. Only when this is achieved will we have any grounds for hope that the terrible fact of addiction can be eliminated.

U.S. FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR REX M. WHITTON

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the International Road Federation is one of the outstanding worldwide organizations active in the field of highway transportation. This organization publishes monthly a paper known as World Highways, which has extensive circulation in all sections of the globe. I am happy to note that in the January 1966, issue, there is a long article paying proper tribute to an old friend of mine, the U.S. Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton.

I have known Rex since he was the chief highway engineer for the State of Missouri. I worked closely with him in those days, and even more so since he assumed the most important role of Administrator of our vast highway program. Under Mr. Whitton's guidance the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which authorized the construction of our great highway system, has been properly implemented and the results can be seen today in the vast new roads that crisscross all sections of our land.

I am privileged and proud to have the opportunity to place into the RECORD this tribute to a most distinguished public servant, Rex M. Whitton.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article from the January 1966, issue of World Highways:

PERSONALITY PROFILE: U.S. FEDERAL ADMINISTRATOR OVERSEES REVOLUTIONARY HIGHWAY PROGRAM

U.S. Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton has headed the Bureau of Public Roads during the most momentous period in the history of the U.S. Federal-State highway program.

Now rounding out his 5th year as the top U.S. highway official, he has probably overseen more revolutionary developments in the program than occurred during the previous

45 years of the Bureau of Public Roads-State highway department roadbuilding partnership.

Mr. Whitton took office as Federal Highway Administrator on February 10, 1961, under the late President John F. Kennedy, bringing with him the benefit of more than 40 years experience with the Missouri State Highway Commission, nearly 10 of them as its chief engineer. He applied his energies to advancing the top-priority work on the 41,000-mile (66,000-kilometer) National System of Interstate Highways while at the same time accelerating construction and reconstruction of other elements of the U.S. road network.

When he assumed direction of the Bureau of Public Roads there were about 10,000 miles (16,100 kilometers) of the Interstate System in use, including more than 2,000 miles of existing roads that had been incorporated into the system. Today half the 41,000 miles (66,000 kilometers) is in operation, another 6,000 miles (9,700 kilometers) are under construction, and comparable progress has been made on the other Federal-aid road programs.

But Mr. Whitton's impact on the total U.S. highway effort has principally been felt in adjusting it to new conditions and challenges both at home and abroad. Shortly after he took office he began reorganizing the Bureau to devote increased attention and talent to the specialized fields of planning, research and development, and highway safety.

PLANNING R. & D. SAFETY

Under Mr. Whitton's direction, the Bureau has been pursuing an intensified nationwide effort to foster planning in all U.S. cities. The planning itself is a State and community responsibility, but the Bureau is offering financial assistance, advice, and encouragement.

The Bureau and the States also have undertaken broad studies of U.S. highway needs after 1972, when the present huge program is scheduled to expire or taper off.

In urban transportation research the Bureau has stepped up efforts to improve methods of predicting and planning for future needs and is working on improved electronic-control systems for more efficient use of available street capacity. It has recently made Federal funds available to the States in much greater amounts for such purposes.

Research and development in highway location, design, and construction have been varied and productive and the future promises far more positive results. The use of aerial-survey techniques, coupled with the computer, has been notable; nuclear, sonic, and other nondestructive testing devices have been developed; and roadbuilding machinery is becoming automated.

Mr. Whitton has established an Office of Highway Safety in the Bureau that deals with the problem of traffic accidents—their causes and a means of reducing road deaths and injuries. He instituted a spot-improvement program to eliminate hazards at highway locations with high accident records. The Bureau is also exploring information and guidance systems involving electronic detectors, communications, computers, and other similar devices that will aid drivers.

During the 1st session of the 89th Congress, just ended, a law was enacted that may have far-reaching effects on halting the rising trend of auto deaths and accidents. It directs that after December 31, 1967, each State should have a comprehensive highway-safety program approved by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce.

ETHICS AND ESTHETICS

Any list of Mr. Whitton's contributions to highway progress in the United States must include the adoption and promotion of human and moral values in the road program. In 1962, for example, financial assistance to families and businesses displaced by Federal-aid road construction was made possible for the first time. Until then relatively few States made any payments for moving costs. Now the Federal Government reimburses States for an appropriate share of moving costs paid by an individual, a family, a business, farm, or nonprofit organization.

He has long been an advocate of esthetic design of highways themselves and of preventing unsightly encroachments on the adjacent countryside. He took an active part in promoting President Johnson's highway beautification program, which became law on October 22, 1965.

"The people who build highways know that what they build will last for years," Whitton has said. "They know that how they build will have a deep influence on the areas they serve. They know that highways are the windows to the beauty and grandeur of America.

"The people who build highways want to build with beauty. They want to preserve and enhance our natural and manmade heritage. They want to serve the spiritual as well as the physical needs of our Nation."

AN INTERNATIONALIST

Mr. Whitton has taken a more active role in international road matters than any of his predecessors and his leadership has projected the Bureau's activities further into world transport problems and attempts at solutions. He has attended virtually all of the international highway and traffic engineering conferences during his term of office. He was a principal speaker at the Fourth IRF World Meeting in Madrid in 1962, at the IRF Regional Conferences in Tokyo in 1964 and Lima in 1965, at the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress in Washington in 1963, and at many other similar meetings.

"We in the United States claim no special fountain of knowledge," he told the Lima meeting in May of this year. "When it comes to technical theory and practice, we have received knowledge from the experts of other nations, just as we have given it.

"I think all of us come eagerly to conferences such as this, to exchange ideas and information, and at once to learn and to teach one another. For it is thus that we build better roads—which build better communities, regions, and nations—and a better world."

In addition to assistance to six Central American countries in the building of the Pan American Highway, the Bureau of Public Roads also participated during fiscal 1964–65 in road-improvement programs in the 13 countries of Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Iran, Jordan, Laos, Nepal, Peru, the Philippines, Spain, Sudan, Turkey, and Yemen. Other types of assistance were given to Burundi, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, and Togo.

The Bureau, under Mr. Whitton's leadership, is cooperating with IRF in a worldwide survey of research and development in the highway and highway-transport field. The total project will make available the results of road research around the world to all who request them. With the pilot project finished, the program has been extended during the current year to 17 countries within the Americas, Europe, and Asia.

HONORED AMONG MEN

A native of Missouri, Mr. Whitton has spent his entire working life advancing highway research, development, and construction. He has received virtually all available honors in the highway field of the United States. He served as president of the American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHO) in 1956. He is a past chairman and presently a member of the Executive Committee of the Highway Research Board (HRB).

In 1958 he received the George S. Bartlett Award for outstanding service to highway progress in the United States. He was voted one of the "Top 10 Public Works Men of the Year" by the American Public Works Association in 1960, and in the same year he was the recipient of the Thomas H. MacDonald Award for continuous outstanding service in the highway-engineering field.

At a time of life when most public officials have gone into retirement Mr. Whitton has set an energetic pace for his colleagues of the Bureau and of the highway program generally. He has been widely praised by high Government officials, Members of Congress and other U.S. leaders, not only for his contributions to the highway effort, but also for his enthusiasm and bristling energy.

His present superior, Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, probably summed up the consensus of opinion when he pointed out that Mr. Whitton leads and executes a road and road-transport program almost as large as that of the rest of the world combined.

"In carrying out this vast undertaking he has proven to be an efficient and effective executive and engineer whose integrity is consistent with the highest public ethics," the Secretary said. "His monuments are the thousands and thousands of miles of roads here in the United States which reflect his more than 45 years of service in land communications."

WATER POLLUTION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced two bills to encourage States and private business concerns to take immediate and effective action to overcome the menace of water pollution. This legislation is fully in keeping with past congressional action in this area, and I urge all my colleagues who are concerned with this problem to lend their support to these efforts.

Last year, I was privileged to be in the forefront of legislative efforts which established the framework within which the Federal Government would assist in the abatement of water pollution. We set up a new Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and provided funds to help the States develop improved methods of controlling water pollution, and to assist the States on a matching basis in the construction of community sewage treatment plants. The bills I have introduced today would further this effort by increasing by $100 million the amounts to be made available to the States, and by providing a tax benefit to private concerns which meet their social responsibilities by constructing waste treatment facilities.

Prior to the enactment of Public Law 89–234, the Congress had made available to the States, $100 million a year in Federal matching grants for the construction of community sewage treatment plants. This amount was allocable on the dual basis of population and per capita income, and with respect to those funds that basis still obtains. In addition, grants had been limited to 30 percent of construction costs, or $1 million whichever was less, but the Federal contribution could be as high as $4 million if a joint project involving many communities were involved.

During the last session this authorization was increased to $150 million, with the additional $50 million distributable on the basis of population alone. Also, the limits of $1 million and $4 million were increased to $1.2 and $4.8 million respectively. Because this authorization has proven to be totally inadequate, one of the bills I introduced today would further increase authorized matching grants to $250 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. Moreover, this additional $100 million will be distributable on the basis of population alone, and will not be subject to the per-project limit of $1.2 or $4.8 million.

This distribution formula is designed to provide a relatively larger share of Federal assistance to States with larger populations which have a demonstrably greater need for sewage treatment plants. The direct relationship between population concentration and water pollution has been amply demonstrated, so I believe that this formula for the distribution of the additional $100 million is certainly a fair one.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the States have shown their serious concern for the need to take action to curb water pollution. I am particularly proud that on last election day, my fellow New Yorkers overwhelmingly approved the total commitment to rid our State of water pollution, by adopting a $1 billion bond issue. Half of this figure will go to municipalities in the form of State grants; while the other half will be used to prefinance the Federal Government's full 30-percent share as necessary.

One of the bills I introduced this afternoon would enable the State to set about implementing its programs immediately by authorizing reimbursement to New York of the full Federal share of the costs of eligible construction projects. While this authorization is necessary, it is by no means a departure from established congressional policy, for similar authority exists with respect to Federal-State highway construction projects.

Another measure I introduced is designed to encourage private concerns to join in the undertaking to combat water pollution, by providing a tax benefit for any taxpayer who constructs a new waste treatment facility, the construction or installation of which is completed after the enactment of the bill. This benefit consists in permission to depreciate the entire cost of construction, or as much thereof as the taxpayer desires, within the first year.

Last year we enacted effective air pollution legislation and in so doing brought forth a national response to a problem which was national in scope. Water pollution represents a similar threat to health and a drain on our economic resources, and calls for comparable effective action at the Federal level. The need for clean waters has become more urgent with each passing year; the water shortage has become more critical, and the residents of our metropolitan areas need and deserve more opportunities for healthful recreation. Only an all-out effort of this kind can succeed in making our waters safe for drinking, swimming, and fishing. I believe that my legislation will provide the all-out effort we need.

COST OF LIVING ON THE INCREASE

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the greatest hazard which every American and every American family faces has scarcely been mentioned here today. This is inflation which is reflected in the rising cost of living and in the reduced buying power of the dollar.

The truth is that this administration is giving with one hand and taking away with the other. Inflation is a thief which, as other speakers will show, hurts the needy most in its robbery. They will also emphasize that inflation is the cruelest form of taxation.

Thus while the administration seeks wildly to push money into one pocket of the needy, it is extracting that money from the other pocket. If the power to tax is the power to destroy, inflation is the secret taxation which can destroy the prosperity of every American man, woman, and child. As we will show, it is already hurting them. As a matter of fact, inflation is really the imposition of a national sales tax on every man, woman, and child who uses his or her dollars to buy goods and services.

Inflation is growing. The cost of living rose by about 2 percent in 1965. One of our speakers will tell just what that means to every American.

And inflation is the great untalked about national problem. Today we propose to talk about it and to show that its acceleration stems from present wild spending and growing administration deficits.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater thief than inflation. There is no more evil thief than inflation because the poor and the aged suffer more from it.

An increase in the cost of living hits the poor hardest because they can least afford to pay. It next hits those who, with hard work and prudence, have provided for old age because it cuts the buying power of the dollar they have saved.

Now, in 1965, the cost of living increased about 2 percent. If it were to increase at that rate for 20 years, $1 in every $3 saved will simply vanish. It will have been plucked from your pocket and your neighbors' by the politicians of administration ilk who advocate wild spending and unsound fiscal policies.

I would recall to you that, in the Truman era, the rising cost of living outran the spiral of wage increases. We are apt to forget. But let us not forget that inflation such as this administration is inducing by wild spending is a thief that robs most from the poor and the aged—but robs from us all.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry but I have here a report that because of our wild spending policies, the Government bonds our people have been buying in good faith are dropping in real value.

I note that Gordon C. Murray, writing in the San Diego Evening Tribune, states that a citizen who bought a "safe" Government bond 10 years ago would take a beating if he sold it today. He reveals:

> When issued on February 15, 1955, this bond cost $1,000 and paid 3-percent interest. At maturity February 15, 1995, the Government will redeem it at its full face value.
>
> But right now—according to a price listed in the Wall Street Journal of December 23, 1965—the bond is worth only $831.40. This means that an original purchaser who for some reason must sell at this time loses money. Not only has he lost $168.60 of his original cost, but he has also lost $15 on the average for each of the almost 11 years he has held the bond, because he could have made up to 4½ percent—$45 instead of $30 annually—in some other type of conservative investment.
>
> Furthermore, the $831.40 remaining has been subject to the inroads of inflation at the rate of over 1 percent per year.

Mr. Speaker, according to this report, those who advocate and support wild and uncontrolled spending are robbing people who invest in good faith in the bonds of our Government which have been in the past, and should be, utterly safe.

Inflation is the cruelest and most cowardly form of taxation.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the buying power of the dollar is being drastically reduced by wild spending, and there has been no spending wilder than the way the administration has tossed about the funds voted by Congress to help the poor.

For instance, we have just learned that four Job Corps trainees won an all-expense tour to the Rose Bowl game. It seems they were selected for "their prowess in punting, place-kicking, passing, and running the 50-yard dash, as well as for writing an essay 'What the Job Corps Means to Me.'"

When I read this announcement, I asked a reporter to check on OEO press releases for me. I found that in 18 recent days, the taxpayer had footed the cost for 72 press releases—and what press releases. They were all on one side of slick paper. They were not mimeographed. They were expensive photo offset jobs.

In 1 day, 31 of these releases were issued by the Poverty Administration in

Washington. Know what? Each was sent in a separate envelope.

I note that in a grant for Monmouth County, N.J., $52,000 of $67,000 was earmarked for administrative salaries and expenses.

But those press releases showed me why the OEO needs all those $50 consultants, to lick stamps.

Not only do the poor need to be protected from the poverty administrators. This tossing around of our dollars decreases their value. When a person hands us a bad check we call him a crook. What do you call an administration that hands out shrinking dollars?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if the wild throwing away of our taxpayers' money by this administration continues unchecked, the dollar that each employee and each employer puts into social security funds will be worth only two-thirds what it is now worth in buying power as it is paid.

This is based upon last year's increase in the cost of living. But as the deficit grows—and we are told it is going to be much bigger in billions in fiscal 1967 than it was in fiscal 1966—so will the cost of living inevitably go up. This is a fact of import to each citizen because it means an acceleration of inflation and an even faster drop in the buying power of the dollar.

According to official U.S. figures today's dollar is worth 38-plus cents of a 1940 dollar which, in turn, was worth only 69 cents of a 1930 Republican dollar.

Big spending—and resulting inflation—robs those paying in for a pension in their old age, or paying for unemployment insurance to take care of them in bad times. I say: Watch those who are spending your money so wildly.

When a foreign government does it, we call it dangerous inflation. When this administration does it, it is called economic statesmanship.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, when inflation and wild spending, its primal cause, are discussed, one cannot avoid the money tossed away on foreign aid to those who have turned around and bitten the hand that fed them.

I call to the attention of the House in this connection a column in the New York Journal-American of October 8 by that veteran columnist, Walter Winchell, who said:

> Now read this one and blow your tops: The following nations in 1963 got U.S. handouts and voted for Russia against the United States at the U.N.:
>
> Afghanistan ($235,800,000): It voted with the United States six times and for Russia eight times. Algeria ($94,600,000): Voted with us three times, with Russia nine times. Burma ($117,100,000): Voted with us four times, against us eight. Cambodia ($366,400,000): Voted four times with us and eight times with Russia. Ceylon ($84,300,000): Votes six times with us, eight with the Reds. Ethiopia ($201,600,000): Voted five times for our side and eight for Russia. Ghana ($159,200,000): Voted six for us and eight against. India ($4,692,900,000): Voted eight-eight. Iraq ($68,300,000): Voted three-seven. Jordan ($412,200,000): Voted three times for us and six against. Laos ($328,400,000): Voted three-seven. Mali ($1,900,000): Voted twice for us and nine times for Moscow. Syrian Arab Republic ($83,500,000): Voted four-seven. Tunisia ($355,200,000): Voted seven-eight. Uganda ($12,100,000): Voted three times for us and seven for Nikita. United Arab Republic ($802,400,000): The Nasser ingrates voted eight times for Russia and only three times for us. Yemen ($29,000,000): It voted once for Americans and seven times for the So and soviets.

Now I ask the Members to consider: Was this aid or blackmail? They are all back for more this year. I suggest it is time we start taking a hard look at these requests and ask, Are they in the interest of our Nation and the advancement of peace and freedom?

We are a nation that believes in doing good but not in being done wrong.

And the housewife, the laborer, the aged, and all of us are paying in decreased buying power of the dollar for these throwaways. This is the sort of senseless spending that causes inflation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the root causes of the accelerating inflation which has cut the purchasing power of the dollar by almost two-thirds since 1940 is the loss of our gold reserves.

The worldwide dollar crisis of the past 5 years has been caused in part by the Democratic administrations continuing to follow the theory of deficit financing. Today we have less than $5 billion of gold to use for foreign payments, less than 2 years supply today when the dollar drain is running at the rate of $3 billion a year.

Today it is within the power of foreign governments, with $28 billion in short-term dollar balances, to break the dollar. Probably only the fact that foreign governments hold so many keeps them from doing this.

The wonder is not that the administration has substituted tokens for silver coins and removed the metal backing for the dollar. The wonder is that the administration does not move to balance the budget instead of resorting to marginal stopgap methods to improve our balance of trade such as harshly restricting American foreign investments.

Inflation is robbing the poor, the aged, and all of us. Is this administration incapable of making the United States again the free world's citadel of responsible public finance and solid currency?

JUAN T. TRIPPE—PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, last month it was my pleasure to be in New York at the time the annual awards were being made by the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame. Many of the football greats of the past and present were in attendance. It was an evening I shall long remember.

You would naturally think, Mr. Speaker, that the main address would be delivered by an alltime, everybody's all-American. As it turned out, the highlight of the evening was contributed by Mr. Juan T. Trippe, chairman and chief executive officer of Pan American World Airways.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Trippe was hardly a Christy Flanagan, a Tom Harmon, a Pudge Heffelfinger or a Tuss McLaughry during his brief tenure on the Yale football squad. As a matter of fact, by his own admission, he was a guard on his freshman team.

However, there is more to the story than that. Juan Trippe neglects to mention that his brief career as a Yale lineman resulted from a severe back injury in an early scrimmage, a back injury which still plagues him periodically.

While, because of the injury, Juan Trippe did not join the immortals of the college game, he was still able to interrupt his education during World War I and become a Navy flier; and, later on, with some of his old combat and college colleagues to found the airline which is now Pan American World Airways.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting to add that on the night last month on which he delivered the principal address, Mr. Trippe's football and business associates thought well enough of his contributions to the game to award him the Football Foundation Gold Medal for 1965.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Trippe's remarks of last December 7 might well serve as an inspiration to other young college men who do not necessarily become all-Americans but who play the game. He has some serious and provoking thoughts; and under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I insert Mr. Trippe's talk as a part of the Record:

REMARKS BY JUAN T. TRIPPE, CHAIRMAN AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, AT THE ANNUAL AWARDS DINNER OF THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL FOUNDATION AND HALL OF FAME, DECEMBER 7, 1965

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, may I first thank you for the signal honor you have conferred this evening. When the officers of the National Football Foundation informed me, several months ago, that I had been selected to receive this year's Gold Medal, I told them the Selection Committee must have gone "berserk." Some terrible mistake had been made which the committee should promptly correct. Now, as I look around this room, starred with all-Americans—as I see many old friends and football greats of my vintage—among them Ham Fish and Don Lourie, I am, more than ever convinced, your committee must have had a blackout even worse than we had here in

New York several weeks ago. What is a freshman guard, who, as our chairman just pointed out, never won his letter, to say about football in such a company as this?

I suppose the answer is obvious. I suppose what I can do is to undertake to speak for the people I really represent—for the rest of the freshman guards—for the rank and file of men and boys who have played football since the game began—the unsung thousands, who may or may not have won a varsity letter, who may or may not have eaten at training tables, who may or may not have heard their names at the end of a long cheer or even a short one, but who, nevertheless played—played their hearts out and came back to play some more.

And what shall I say on their behalf? What would they want me to say? That they are proud to be represented here, of course. But beyond that? Well, probably, that they are a little troubled—as they recall their old football days—and compare them with a bit of the so-called bigtime football they now often read and hear about. For we, of course, we old freshman guards, we of the rank and file, are men who "went out for the team" as the saying used to go—men who turned up at practice, with hundreds of others, and worked our way through the scrimmages and the first games and either made it or didn't make it, but anyway offered ourselves: men who tried * * * who went out.

But is that what happens now? We don't know. We wonder. We hear rumors on some campuses these days that going out for the team is as dead as Dink Stover. We hear stories about a young man at some university or other—the name changes each time the tale is told—who reported for practice when the season started, only to be met, not by a welcome, not even by a kind word, but only by incredulous astonishment not untouched by amusement. Didn't he know that there was nothing to go out for? That the football team was already chosen? That it had been chosen for months? For a year maybe? Hadn't anybody explained to him volunteers weren't expected? That the place for eager students was in the stands?

And then too, there is another story we keep hearing—perhaps I should say the same story turned the other way around. One of the national news weeklies told it a couple of weeks ago. A great football coach at a well-known university is being asked about his latest triumphs, and here I quote: "Aw, shucks," he says, "I'm not a great coach. I'm a good recruiter." So he is asked about his recruiting practice, and he replies, "Our grants-in-aid are based on academic achievement and need. By academic achievement we mean the boy can read and write. By need—well, we don't take a boy unless we need him."

Now, we understand, of course, we old freshman guards, that football coaches have a right to a sense of humor, and this coach was probably jesting. Even so, such articles bother us—and bother us for football reasons. For what they imply, is simply and obviously, that the game of football is becoming a spectator's game—so far as players like ourselves—the rank and file of football-loving students—are concerned.

Now we have nothing against spectator football, particularly when it is as exciting to watch as modern football has become. Compared with our old muddy struggles, the contemporary game is a delight, and the touchdown pass to the far corner is a far prettier thing from a high seat in the bowl than it ever was from the muck with your face in it. But the point is—that what we cared about, and what thousands of youngsters could still care about, is the game, as a game to play. We freshman guards and freshman tackles and all the rest didn't love football because it looked exciting from 40 rows up. We loved football because it was exciting to be in. We liked the sense of combat—of companionship in combat. We admired the courage football develops and the stubborn purpose it demands. We remember even now the conflict of bodies, the matching of wills, the moments of grace, the glimpses of physical brilliance, of spiritual ardor. We remember the triumphs. We remember too—and with gratitude for their revelations of human dignity and self-control—the defeats. All our lives, gentlemen, we remember these things. They were a strength to us, a resource, in the difficult moments when we needed strength. They still are.

Football, I suspect, has been the same for all of you—for the varsity stars and the all-Americans as well as for the rest of us. How many of you in this room have found yourselves remembering in some moment of apprehension, even of despair, the smell of kicked-up earth and the bitter taste of mud and lime on some field where once, long, long ago, you helped to stop the Harvards or California or the Navy or Notre Dame, or whatever conquering team you had no chance to stop, and somehow did? How many of you, when you have found yourselves beginning to doubt the other fellow, perhaps even your coworker in the company—have cast your minds back to the unspoken and unquestioned loyalties of this game you used to play?

To any other audience than this, such questions would have a sentimental sound. It is no longer fashionable in our generation to talk of the playing fields of Eton when we think of the terrible Waterloos through which our age has had to live and fight. But with this audience, apologies and explanations are not necessary. You are here not because you love football as a spectacle—but because you love it as a game, and because you know what you owe that game. Because you know what the Nation owes it. And I am not thinking, nor will you be thinking, merely of the number of athletes it has contributed to the armed services, great as that contribution has been. I am thinking, as you are, of the qualities—the character, the courage, the resolve—which this game has developed in the minds and spirits of many of the Nation's greatest leaders, not alone in the armed services, not alone on Capitol Hill, but throughout American industry and even in the White House.

All of us have our examples, our favorite stories, of this influence of football and I have mine. Mine has to do with the establishment, in the spring of 1941, a few months before Pearl Harbor, of a civil transport service across Africa just south of the Sahara Desert to support General Montgomery in his defense of Egypt against Rommel, the Desert Fox. We had discussions with Churchill and, a few days later, with Roosevelt. Both agreed that such a route was necessary and Pan Am were asked to undertake and rush the job of building a 4,000-mile airway from Bathhurst to Khartoum and north to Cairo. Every hour counted. The machinery—earthmovers and the like—was made available by Mayor LaGuardia, right off the streets here in New York City. A vessel, tied up at a pier on the East River, was requisitioned to transport it. But where were the men to direct this brutal emergency job to come from—the job of building, under forced draft, an airway, including five airports, across Africa. Construction materials, fuel and supplies would have to be moved by jeep, truck, and camel—for there were few roads.

Well, gentlemen, they came as volunteers, a round dozen of them, from the Yale football team of the previous fall. The job was finished in 5 weeks. The mortar shells and tank ammunition were flown from West African ports to Montgomery's army in Egypt—just before the crucial battle of El Alamein—for the Allied armies in Europe—the turning point of World War II. Air Marshal Portal, that great Britisher, is on record—had the munitions not arrived—Montgomery was lost.

Now moral and spiritual and physical education of this kind does not come from occupying seats in football stadiums. It does not come from listening to the statistics of consecutive wins and losses. It does not even come from marching up and down between the halves with an trombone or a drum. It comes from playing football. And what troubles me—what troubles every man, I think, who really loves the game of football—is the present, all too obvious tendency to take the playing of the game of football away from the students themselves.

This is being done in various ways. One way is to abolish football. About 130 universities and colleges, including the University of Chicago where Alonzo Stagg turned out some of the greatest teams and some of the most remarkable men the game has known, took that ultimate step a generation ago.

But there is also another way of taking the game away from the students. When football is played, not by undergraduates who go out for the team, but by specialists recruited for the purpose, some of whom are not really students at all, football is just as certainly removed from the reach of the college community as if it had been abolished. Future professional players might profit from such a game, but not the rank and file of the college generation—the future businessmen, lawyers, statesmen, scientists, soldiers—the citizens of the Republic.

As a spectator sport, professional football today has hit the jackpot. Pro football is big business. A club franchise is worth $10 million. Millions of people pay each fall to watch the pros. Fifty million more follow closely on television. Television rights are worth $75 million. As a spectator sport, pro football now leads baseball. But while millions of people enjoy pro football as spectators, less than 1,000 play pro football. Playing the game is what really counts and pro football makes no contribution to playing the game.

A decade ago, we would have been told that the remedy lay in intramural football—with an intercollegiate slant—such as is played at Cambridge and New Haven. Few, I think, would say that now. Intramural games are sometimes badly played. Injuries persist. The intercollegiate twist at the season end does not help. The fact is that football—true football—is drama as well as sport. It demands dramatic settings—dramatic tension—precisely such a setting as the great games provide. All of us, however, now can see some progress in the development of the playing game. A dozen institutions which banned football altogether a generation ago, have seen the error of their ways. Today, undergraduate students at Fordham, New York University, Santa Clara, Chicago, and St. Mary's are fortunate to be again playing football. Today, many scholar-athletes are playing great football. Many of them are all-American. Seven, seated here at the head table, are proof that Phi Beta Kappas can and do play great football, too.

The playing game also has been assisted by the NCAA. The football scholarship for recruitment has now been abolished on all but a few campuses. A program of grants-in-aid has been substituted. The playing rules have been changed. Free substitution is allowed. The new two platoon system means many more boys can play the game.

But much remains to be done. Today, less than 60,000 play college football—a paltry 1 percent of the student body. The number soon could be doubled. There is a real challenge, a real opportunity for college and university presidents. But the presidents can't do it alone. They need the enthusiastic support of their governing boards—their trustees, their board of regents, the fellows of their respective corporations. The hundred institutions that still ban football could soon be made to see the light—in their own interests and in the interests of their undergraduates.

Other colleges and universities throughout the land, supported by the major football conferences, could consider scheduling junior varsity and 150-pound contests along with their varsity games. Such contests are accepted practice in intercollegiate rowing. They would be equally popular in football. Football squads would soon expand. The playing game would grow by leaps and bounds.

Codes and regulations of the several conferences could be clarified to solve remaining problems relating to grants-in-aid. Conferences could arrange central clearinghouses to review and coordinate their policies relating to individual student applicants. High school players would qualify for scholarships—but only to the extent financial assistance was required. Integration of all students in campus life would soon follow. Voluntary spring football practice should be considered everywhere—including the Ivy League. College oarsmen and trackmen, if they choose, now go out in the fall as well as in the spring. There should be no discrimination against students who play football.

College football would continue to attract all who love amateur sport. Big stadiums would continue important on the campus, as will big libraries and big laboratories.

College football, as this foundation has always insisted, could everywhere become part of the college; all players part of the college community; the coaches part of the college faculty. All football teams would then represent their colleges, their universities—not in a journalistic, but in an actual sense.

If this can be brought about, truly brought about, other difficulties will vanish. College football, as a player's game, would not compete with professional football, which is necessarily just a spectacle. But college football, secure from professional competition, would continue to develop and in the true amateur spirit. Ever larger audiences would be drawn, as they used to be, from the men and women who care about the institution and its boys. College football, as a player's game, will produce, not more potential professionals—but more, many more, potential citizens—prepared for the tensions and burdens which our great and noble game has prepared so many men, over so many years, to bear.

LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: A MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Zablocki] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in this time of strained world relations it is truly tragic that the great leader of India, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri, should be taken from our midst.

His passing is particularly untimely because of the apparent progress which was being made in the talks at Tashkent between India and Pakistan.

At the same time, it is significant that his last official act was the signing of an agreement providing for mutual withdrawal of troops—an act of peace which exemplified a life spent in the search for peace.

In our meeting in New Delhi last month I found the Prime Minister dedicated to the welfare of the Indian people and to the cause of world progress through peaceful cooperation. For his unending zeal and statesmanlike leadership in those two causes he has earned the respect of people everywhere.

His life was a testament to the belief that true strength does not rest in physical stature, but in moral character. Although frail by appearance, there was within him great nobility and courage, and the ability to lead the second largest nation in the world.

To his family, his associates in the Indian Government, and to the people of India I express my deepest sympathy in this hour of bereavement.

It is my great hope that in selecting their new leadership, the Indian people will continue the great tradition of Gandhi, Nehru, and Lal Bahadur Shastri.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to the following:

Mr. Keith (at the request of Mr. Garmatz) for the week of January 10, on account of official business.

Mr. Rogers of Florida (at the request of Mr. Garmatz), for the week of January 10, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Roncalio, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hosmer, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include a table.

Mr. Fogarty (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Zablocki (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

To the following Members (at the request of Mr. Hutchinson):

Mr. Halpern, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Laird, for 45 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hutchinson) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Morse.
Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Don H. Clausen.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Powell.
Mr. Fuqua.
Mr. Farbstein.
Mr. Tenzer.
Mr. Reuss.
Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Brademas.
Mr. Edwards of California.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair is now going to declare a recess until this evening, when the two Houses will meet in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States.

The House will stand in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m., the bells to be rung at 8:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 529. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session to receive a message from the President.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 529 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 321)

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the President pro tempore of the Senate and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore taking the chair at the left of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Albert; the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Boggs; the gentleman from New York, Mr. Celler; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Gerald R. Ford; and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Arends.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Montana, Mr. Mansfield; the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Long; the Senator from Georgia, Mr. Russell; the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Fulbright; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Dirksen; the Senator from California, Mr. Kuchel; the Senator from Iowa, Mr. Hickenlooper, and the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Saltonstall.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 p.m., the Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The **SPEAKER**. Members of the Congress, I have the great pleasure, the highest privilege and the distinguished—and I might also add, personal honor of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The **PRESIDENT**. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the House and Senate, my fellow Americans, I come before you tonight to report on the state of the Union for the third time. I come here to thank you and to add my tribute once more to the Nation's gratitude for this, the 89th Congress.

This Congress has already reserved for itself an honored chapter in the history of America.

Our Nation tonight is now engaged in a brutal and bitter conflict in Vietnam. Later on I want to discuss that struggle in some detail with you. It just must be the center of our concerns. But we will not permit those who fire upon us in Vietnam to win a victory over the desires and the intentions of all of the American people. This Nation is mighty enough, its society is healthy enough, its people are strong enough to pursue our goals in the rest of the world while still building a great society at home. And that is what I have come here to ask of you tonight.

I recommend that you provide the resources to carry forward with full vigor the great health and education programs that you enacted into law last year.

I recommend that we prosecute with vigor and determination our war on poverty.

I recommend that you give a new and daring direction to our foreign aid program designed to make a maximum attack on hunger and disease and ignorance in those countries that are determined to help themselves, and to help those nations that are trying to control population growth.

I recommend that you make it possible to expand trade between the United States and Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

I recommend to you a program to rebuild completely on a scale never before attempted entire central and slum areas of several of our cities in America.

I recommend that you attack the wasteful and degrading poisoning of our rivers, and as the cornerstone of this effort clean completely entire large river basins.

I recommend that you meet the growing menace of crime in the streets by building up law enforcement and by revitalizing the entire Federal system from prevention to probation.

I recommend that you take additional steps to insure equal justice to all of our people by effectively enforcing nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection by making it a serious Federal crime to obstruct public and private efforts to secure civil rights and by outlawing discrimination in the sale of rental housing.

I recommend that you help me modernize and streamline the Federal Government by creating a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation and reorganizing several existing agencies.

In turn I will restructure our civil service in the top grades so that men and women can easily be assigned to jobs where they are most needed, and ability will be both required, as well as rewarded.

I will ask you to make it possible for Members of the House of Representatives to work more effectively in the service of the Nation through a constitutional amendment extending the term of a Congressman to 4 years concurrent with that of the President.

Because of Vietnam we cannot do all that we should or all that we would like to do. We will ruthlessly attack waste and inefficiency. We will make sure that every dollar is spent with the thrift and with the commonsense which recognizes how hard the taxpayer worked in order to earn it.

We will continue to meet the needs of our people by continuing to develop the Great Society.

Last year alone the wealth that we produced increased $47 billion, and it will soar again this year to a total over $720 billion. Because our economic policies have produced rising revenues, if you approve every program that I recommend tonight our total budget deficit will be one of the lowest in many years. It will be only $1.8 billion next year.

Total spending in the administrative budget will be $112.8 billion. Revenues next year will be $111 billion. On a cash basis, which is the way that you and I keep our family budget, the Federal budget next year will actually show a surplus.

That is to say, that if we include all the money that your Government will take in and all the money that your Government will spend, your Government next year will collect one-half billion dollars more than it will spend in the year 1967.

I have not come here tonight to ask for pleasant luxuries and for idle pleasures. I have come here to recommend that you, the representatives of the richest Nation on earth, you the elected servants of the people who live in abundance unmatched on this globe, you bring the most urgent decencies of life to all of your fellow Americans.

There are men who cry out that we must sacrifice. Well, let us rather ask them, who will they sacrifice? Are they going to sacrifice the children who seek the learning, or the sick who need medical care, or the families who dwell in squalor that are now brightened by the hope of home? Will they sacrifice opportunity for the distressed, the beauty of our land, the hope of our poor?

Time may require further sacrifices, and if it does, then we will make them. But we will not heed those who wring it from the hopes of the unfortunate here in a land of plenty.

I believe that we can continue the Great Society while we fight in Vietnam. But if there are some who do not believe this, then in the name of justice let them call for the contribution of those who live in the fullness of our blessing, rather than try to strip it from the hands of those that are most in need.

And let no one think that the unfortunate and the oppressed of this land sit stifled and alone in their hope tonight. Hundreds of their servants and their protectors sit before me tonight here in this great Chamber.

The Great Society leads us along three roads—growth and justice and liberation.

First is growth—the national prosperity which supports the well-being of our people and which provides the tools of our progress.

I can report to you tonight what you have seen for yourselves already in almost every city and countryside. This Nation is flourishing. Workers are making more money than ever, with after-tax income in the past 5 years up 33 percent; in the last year alone up 8 percent. More people are working than ever before in our history, an increase last year of 2½ million jobs. Corporations have greater after-tax earnings than ever in history. For the past 5 years those earnings have been up over 65 percent. Last year alone, they had a rise of 20 percent. Average farm income is higher than ever. Over the past 5 years, it is up 40 percent. Over the past year, it was up 22 percent alone.

I was informed this afternoon by the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury that his preliminary estimates indicate that our balance-of-payments deficit has been reduced from $2.8 billion in 1964 to $1.3 billion or less in 1965.

This achievement has been made possible by the patriotic voluntary cooperation of businessmen and bankers working with your Government.

We must now work together with increased urgency to wipe out this balance-of-payments deficit altogether in the next year.

As our economy surges toward new heights we must increase our vigilance against the inflation which raises the cost of living and which lowers the savings of every family in this land. It is essential to prevent inflation that we ask both labor and business to exercise price and wage restraint, and I do so again tonight.

I believe it desirable because of increased military expenditures that you temporarily restore the automobile and certain telephone excise tax reductions made effective only 12 days ago. Without raising taxes or even increasing the total tax bill, we should move to improve our withholding system so that Americans can more realistically pay as they go; speed up the collection of corporate taxes; and make other necessary simplifications of the tax structure at an early date. I hope these measures will be adequate, but if the necessities of Vietnam require it, I will not hesitate to return to the Congress for additional appropriations or additional revenues if they are needed.

The second road is justice. Justice means that a man's hope should not be limited by the color of his skin.

I propose legislation to establish unavoidable requirements for nondiscriminatory jury selection in Federal and State courts, and to give the Attorney General the power necessary to enforce those requirements.

I propose:

Legislation to strengthen the authority of Federal courts to try those who murder, attack, or intimidate either civil rights workers or others exercising their constitutional rights and to increase penalties to a level equal to the nature of the crime.

Legislation resting on the fullest constitutional authority of the Federal Government to prohibit racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing.

For that other nation, within a nation, the poor whose distress has now captured the conscience of America, I will ask Congress not only to continue but to speed up the war on poverty, and in so doing we will provide the added energy of achievement with the increased efficiency of experience to improve the life of our rural Americans and our farm population. We will plan for the future through the establishment of several new community development districts, improved education through the use of Teacher Corps teams, better health measures, physical examinations, and adequate and available medical resources.

For those who labor I propose to improve unemployment insurance, to expand minimum wage benefits, and by the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act to make the labor laws in all our States equal to the laws of the 31 States which do not have tonight right-to-work measures.

I also intend to ask the Congress to consider measures which without improperly invading State and local authority will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest.

The third path is the path of liberation. It is to use our success for the fulfillment of our lives. A great nation is one which breeds a great people.

A great people flower not from wealth and power but from a society which spurs them to the fullness of their genius—that alone is a great society.

Yet slowly, painfully on the edge of victory has come the knowledge that shared prosperity is not enough. In the midst of abundance modern man walks oppressed by forces which menace and confine the quality of his life and which individual abundance alone will not overcome.

We can subdue and we can master these forces by bringing increased meaning to our lives if all of us, Government and citizens, are bold enough to change old ways, daring enough to assault new dangers, and if the dream is dear enough to call forth the limitless capacities of this great people.

This year we must continue to improve the quality of American life.

Let us fulfill and improve the great health and education programs of last year, extending special opportunities to those who risk their lives in our Armed Forces.

I urge the House of Representatives to complete action on three programs already passed by the Senate—the Teachers Corps, the rent assistance, and home rule for the District of Columbia.

In some of our urban areas we must help rebuild entire sections and neighborhoods containing in some cases as many as a hundred thousand people. Working together private enterprise and Government must press forward with the task of providing homes and shops, parks and hospitals, and all the other necessary parts of a flourishing community where people can come to live the good life.

I will offer other proposals to stimulate and to reward planning for the growth of entire metropolitan areas.

Of all the reckless devastations of our national heritage none is really more shameful than the continued poisoning of our rivers and our air.

We must undertake a cooperative effort to end pollution in several river basins, making additional funds available to help draw the plans and construct the plants that are necessary to make the waters of our entire river systems clean and make them a source of pleasure and beauty for all of our people.

To attack and to overcome growing crime and lawlessness I think we must have a stepped-up program to help modernize and strengthen our local police forces.

Our people have a right to feel secure in their homes and on their streets, and that right just must be secured.

Nor can we fail to arrest destruction of life and property on our highways.

I will propose a Highway Safety Act of 1966 to seek an end to this mounting tragedy.

We must also act to prevent the deception of the American consumer, requiring all packages to state clearly and truthfully their contents; all interest and credit charges to be fully revealed; and keeping harmful drugs and cosmetics away from our stores.

It is the genius of our Constitution that under its shelter of enduring institutions and rooted principles there is ample room for the rich fertility of American political invention.

We must change to master change, and I propose to take steps to modernize and streamline the executive branch, to modernize the relations between city and State and Nation.

A new Department of Transportation is needed to bring together our transportation activities. The present structure, 35 Government agencies spending $5 billion yearly, makes it almost impossible to serve either the growing demands of this great Nation or the needs of the industry or the right of the taxpayer to full efficiency and real frugality.

And I will propose in addition a program to construct and flight test a new supersonic transport airplane that will fly three times the speed of sound, in excess of 2,000 miles per hour.

I propose to examine our Federal system, the relation between city, State, Nation, and the citizens themselves. We need a commission of the most distinguished scholars and men of public affairs to do this job, and I will ask them to move on to develop a creative federalism to best use the wonderful diversity of our institutions and our people to solve the problems and to fulfill the dreams of the American people.

And as the process of election becomes more complex and more costly we must make it possible for those without personal wealth to enter public life without being obligated to a few large contributors.

Therefore, I will submit new legislation to revise the present unrealistic restriction on contribution to prohibit the endless proliferation of committees, bringing local and State committees under the act, to attach strong teeth and severe penalties to the requirement of full disclosure of contribution, and to broaden the participation of the people through added tax incentive, to stimulate small contributions to the party and to the candidate of their choice.

To strengthen the work of Congress I strongly urge an amendment to provide a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives which should not begin before 1972.

The present 2-year term requires most Members of Congress to divert enormous energies to an almost constant process of campaigning, depriving this Nation of the fullest measure of both their skill and their wisdom. Today, too, the work of Government is far more complex than in our early years, requiring more time to learn and more time to master the technical tasks of legislating. And a longer term will serve to attract more men of the highest quality to political life. The Nation, the principle of democracy, and I think each congressional district, will all be better served by a 4-year term for Members of the House, and I urge your swift action.

Tonight the cup of peril is full in Vietnam.

That conflict is not an isolated episode, but another great event in the policy that we have followed with strong consistency since World War II.

The touchstone of that policy is the interest of the United States. But nations sink when they see that interest only through a narrow glass.

In a world that has grown small and dangerous, pursuit of narrow aims could bring decay and even disaster.

An America that is mighty beyond description, yet living in a hostile or despairing world, would be neither safe nor free to build a civilization to liberate the spirit of man.

In this pursuit we helped rebuild Western Europe. We gave our aid to Greece and Turkey, and we defended the freedom of Berlin.

In this pursuit we have helped new nations toward independence, we have extended a helping hand to the Peace Corps and carried forward the largest program of economic assistance in the world.

In this pursuit we worked to build a hemisphere of democracy and of social justice.

In this pursuit we have defended against Communist aggression—in Korea under President Truman, in the Formosa Straits under President Eisenhower, in Cuba under President Kennedy, and again in Vietnam.

Tonight Vietnam must hold the center of our attention, but across the world problems and opportunities crowd in on the American Nation. I will discuss them fully in the months to come, and I will follow the five continuing lines of policy that America has followed under its last four Presidents.

The first principle is strength.

Tonight I can tell you that we are strong enough to keep all of our commitments. We will need expenditures of $58.3 billion for the next fiscal year to maintain this necessary defense might.

While special Vietnam expenditures for the next fiscal year are estimated to increase by $5.8 billion, I can tell you that all the other expenditures put together in the entire Federal budget will rise this coming year by only six-tenths of a billion dollars. This is true because of the stringent cost conscious economy program inaugurated in the Defense Department and followed by the other departments of Government.

A second principle of policy is the effort to control, to reduce, and to ultimately eliminate the modern engines of destruction.

We will vigorously pursue existing proposals—and seek new ones—to control arms and stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

A third major principle of our foreign policy is to help build those associations of nations which reflect the opportunities and the necessities of the modern world.

By strengthening the common defense, by stimulating world commerce, by meeting new hopes, these associations serve the cause of a flourishing world.

We will take new steps this year to help strengthen the Alliance for Progress, the unity of Europe, the community of the Atlantic, the regional organizations of developing continents, and that supreme association, the United Nations.

We will work to strengthen economic cooperation, to reduce barriers to trade, and to improve international finance.

A fourth enduring strand of policy has been to help improve the life of man.

From the Marshall plan to this very moment tonight that policy has rested on the claims of compassion and the certain knowledge that only a people advancing in expectation will build secure and peaceful lands.

This year I propose major new directions in our program of foreign assistance to help those countries who will help themselves.

We will conduct a worldwide attack on the problems of hunger and disease and ignorance.

We will place the matchless skill and the resources of our own great America in farming and in fertilizers at the service of those countries committed to develop a modern agriculture.

We will aid those who educate the young in other lands and we will give children in other continents the same headstart that we are trying to give our own children. To advance these ends, I will propose the International Education Act of 1966.

I will also propose the International Health Act of 1966 to strike at disease by a new effort to bring modern skills and knowledge to the uncared for, those suffering in the world, and by trying to wipe out smallpox and malaria and control yellow fever over most of the world during this next decade, to help countries trying to control population growth by increasing our research, and we will earmark funds to help their efforts.

In the next year, from our foreign aid sources we propose to dedicate $1 billion to these efforts, and we call on all who have the means to join us in this work in the world.

The fifth and most important principle of our foreign policy is support of national independence, the right of each people to govern themselves and to shape their own institutions.

For a peaceful world order will be possible only when each country walks the way that it has chosen to walk for itself.

We follow this principle by encouraging the end of colonial rule.

We follow this principle abroad as well as at home by continued hostility to the rule of the many by the few, or the oppression of one race by another.

We follow this principle by building bridges to Eastern Europe. I will ask the Congress for authority to remove the special tariff restrictions which are a barrier to increasing trade between the East and the West.

The insistent urge toward national independence is the strongest force of today's world in which we live.

In Africa and Asia and Latin America it is shattering the designs of those who would subdue others to their ideas or their will.

It is eroding the unity of what was once a Stalinist empire.

In recent months a number of nations have cast out those who would subject them to the ambitions of mainland China.

History is on the side of freedom and is on the side of societies as shaped from the genius of each people. History does not favor a single system or belief unless force is used to make it so.

And that is why it has been necessary for us to defend this basic principle of our policy—to defend it in Berlin and in Korea and in Cuba and tonight in Vietnam.

For tonight, as so many nights before, young Americans struggle and young Americans die in a distant land.

Tonight, as so many nights before, the American Nation is asked to sacrifice the blood of its children and the fruits of its labor for the love of its freedom.

How many times in my lifetime and in yours have the American people gathered as they do now to hear their President tell them of conflict and tell them of danger.

Each time they have answered, they have answered with all the effort that the security and freedom of this Nation required, and they do again tonight in Vietnam.

Not too many years ago Vietnam was a peaceful if troubled land. In the North was an independent Communist government. In the South a people struggled to build a nation with the friendly help of the United States.

There were some in South Vietnam who wished to force Communist rule on their own people, but their progress was slight. Their hope of success was dim. Then little more than 6 years ago North Vietnam decided on conquest, and from that day to this, soldiers and supplies have moved from North to South in a swelling stream that is swallowing the remnants of revolution and aggression.

And as the assault mounted, our choice gradually became clear. We could leave, abandoning South Vietnam to its attackers and to certain conquest, or we could stay and fight beside the people of South Vietnam.

We stayed. And we will stay until aggression has stopped.

We will stay because a just nation cannot leave to the cruelty of its enemies a people who have staked their lives and independence on America's solemn pledge—a pledge which has grown through the commitments of three American Presidents.

We will stay because in Asia and around the world are countries whose independence rests in large measure on confidence in America's word and in America's protection. To yield to force in Vietnam would weaken that confidence, would undermine the independence of many lands, and would whet the appetite of aggression. We would have to fight in one land and then we would have to fight in another or abandon much of Asia to the domination of Communists.

And we do not intend to abandon Asia to conquest.

Last year the nature of the war in Vietnam changed again. Swiftly increasing numbers of armed men from the North crossed the borders to join forces that were already in the South. Attack and terror increased, spurred and encouraged by the belief that the United States lacked the will to continue and that their victory was near.

Despite our desire to limit conflict, it was necessary to act to hold back the mounting aggression to give courage to the people of the South and to make our firmness clear to the North. Thus, we began limited air action against military targets in North Vietnam. We increased our fighting force to its present strength tonight of 190,000 men.

These moves have not ended the aggression, but they have prevented its success. The aims of the enemy have been put out of reach by the skill and bravery of Americans and their allies, and by the enduring courage of the South Vietnamese who, I can tell you, lost eight men last year for every one of ours.

The enemy is no longer closer to victory. Time is no longer on his side. There is no cause to doubt the American commitment.

Our decision to stand firm has been matched by our desire for peace.

In 1965 alone we had 300 private talks for peace in Vietnam with friends and adversaries throughout the world.

Since Christmas your Government has labored again with imagination and endurance to remove any barrier to peaceful settlement. For 20 days now we and our Vietnamese allies have dropped no bombs in North Vietnam.

Able and experienced spokesmen have visited in behalf of America more than 40 countries. We have talked to more than a hundred governments, all 113 that we have relations with and some that we do not. We talked to the United Nations, and we called upon all of its members to make any contribution that they could toward helping gain peace.

In public statements and in private communications to adversaries and to friends in Rome and Warsaw, in Paris and Tokyo, in Africa and throughout this hemisphere, America has made her position abundantly clear.

We seek neither territory nor bases, economic domination or military alliance in Vietnam. We fight for the principle of self-determination that the people of South Vietnam should be able to choose their own course, choose it in free elections without violence, without terror, and without fear. The people of all Vietnam should make a free decision on the great question of reunification.

And this is all we want for South Vietnam. It is all the people of South Vietnam want. And if there is a single nation on this earth that desires less than this for its people, then let its voice be heard.

We have also made it clear from Hanoi to New York that there are no arbitrary limits to our search for peace. We stand by the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962. We will meet at any conference table. We will discuss any proposals—4 points or 14 or 40—and we will consider the views of any group. We will work for a cease-fire now, or once discussions have begun.

We will respond if others reduce their use of force and we will withdraw our soldiers once South Vietnam is securely guaranteed the right to shape its own future.

We have said all this and we have asked and hoped and we have waited for a response.

So far we have received no response to prove either success or failure.

We have carried our quest for peace to many nations and peoples because we share this planet with others whose future, in large measure, is tied to our own action and whose counsel is necessary to our own hopes.

We have found understanding and support, and we know they wait with us tonight for some response that could lead to peace.

I wish tonight that I could give you a blueprint for the course of this conflict over the coming months, but we just cannot know what the future may require. We may have to face long, hard combat or a long, hard conference or even both at once.

Until peace comes, or if it does not come, our course is clear. We will act as we must to help protect the independence of the valiant people of South Vietnam. We will strive to limit the conflict, for we wish neither increased destruction nor do we want to invite increased danger.

But we will give our fighting men what they must have, every gun and every dollar and every decision, whatever the cost or whatever the challenge.

And we will continue to help the people of South Vietnam care for those that are ravaged by battle, create progress in the villages, and carry forward the healing hopes of peace as best they can amidst the uncertain terrors of war.

And let me be absolutely clear. The days may become months and the months may become years, but we will stay as long as aggression commands us to battle.

There may be some who do not want peace, whose ambitions stretch so far that war in Vietnam is but a welcome and convenient episode in an immense design to subdue history to their will. But for others it must now be clear that the choice is not between peace and victory. It lies between peace and the ravages of a conflict from which they can only lose.

The people of Vietnam, North and South, seek the same things, the shared needs of man—the needs for food and shelter and education—the chance to build and work and till the soil free from the arbitrary horrors of battle—the desire to walk in the dignity of those who master their own destiny. For many painful years, in war and revolution and infrequent peace, they have struggled to fulfill those needs.

It is a crime against mankind that so much courage and so much will and so many dreams must be flung on the fires of war and death.

To all of those caught up in this conflict we therefore say again tonight: Let us choose peace, and with it the wondrous works of peace, and beyond that, the time when hope reaches toward consummation, and life is the servant of life.

In this work we plan to discharge our duty to the people whom we serve.

This is the state of the Union.

But over it all—wealth and promise—and expectation—lies our troubling awareness of American men at war tonight.

How many men who listen to me tonight have served their Nation in other wars? How very many are not here to listen?

War in Vietnam is not like these other wars; yet, finally, war is always the same. It is young men dying in the fullness of their promise. It is trying to kill a man that you do not even know well enough to hate.

Therefore, to know war is to know that there is still madness in this world.

Many of you share the burden of this knowledge tonight with me. But there is a difference. For, finally, I must be the one to order our guns to fire—against all the most inward pulls of my desire. For we have children to teach, and we have sick to be cured, and we have men to be freed. There are poor to be lifted up and there are cities to be built and there is a world to be helped.

Yet, we will do what we must.

I am hopeful and I will try the best I can with everything I have to end this battle and to return our sons to their desires.

Yet, as long as others will challenge America's security and test the dearness of our beliefs with fire and steel, then we must stand or see the promise of two centuries tremble. I believe tonight that you do not want me to try that risk. And from that belief, your President summons his strength for the trials that lie ahead in the days to come.

The work must be our work now. Scarred by the weaknesses of man, with whatever guidance God may offer us, we must nevertheless, and alone, with our mortality, strive to ennoble the life of man on earth.

Thank you and good night.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 9 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the message of the President is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 13, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 89th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (2 U.S.C. 25), approved February 18, 1948: Clarence J. Brown, Jr., 7th District, Ohio, Edwin W. Edwards, 7th District, Louisiana, and Thomas M. Rees, 26th District, California.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1867. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 404(d) and 408 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize members of the uniformed services to be reimbursed under certain circumstances for the actual cost of parking fees, ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1868. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the Annual Report of the Office of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia, for fiscal year 1965, pursuant to Public Law 81–686; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1869. A letter from Steptoe & Johnson, attorneys at law, Washington, D.C., transmitting the Annual Report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1870. A letter from the vice president, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting the Annual Report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1965, pursuant to law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1871. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of all compensatory royalty agreements affecting oil and gas deposits in unleased Government lands which were entered into during calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 30 U.S.C. 226(g); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1872. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 31st annual report of the Commission covering the fiscal year July 1, 1964, to June 30, 1965, pursuant to law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1873. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered, as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 13(c) of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1874. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1875. A letter from the Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, transmitting the final report of the U.S. Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88–447; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1876. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered into in cases of certain aliens, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1877. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Nationality Act, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report of visa petitions, according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1878. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a list of positions in the Legislative Reference Service allocated to certain grades, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84–854; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1879. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report of a position established "in addition to the number of positions otherwise authorized by law to be placed in such grade," pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84–854; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1880. A letter from the Postmaster General and the Chairman, Board of Trustees, Postal Savings System, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–348 (H. Doc. No. 331); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H.R. 11965. A bill to amend chapter XIII of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 11966. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11967. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 26, 1934, to authorize the overprinting of certain of such stamps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 11968. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs requiring a doctor's prescription among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the voluntary program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H.R. 11969. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 11970. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 11971. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase by 10 percent the amount of retirement, annuity, and endowment payments excluded from income for the purpose of determining the eligibility of an individual for pension under that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 11972. A bill relating to dealings in good faith between parties to franchise agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 11973. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11974. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 11975. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to make discrimination because of age in employment an unlawful employment practice; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 11976. A bill to establish the resale price of wheat at 115 percent of the support price; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 11977. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 11978. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase by 10 percent the income limitations applicable to the payment of pensions under that chapter to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and to widows and children of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 11979. A bill to make permanent the act of May 22, 1965, authorizing the payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 11980. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to donate two obsolete German weapons to the Federal Republic of Germany; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 11981. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 11982. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 11983. A bill to amend section 120 of title 23 of the United States Code to increase the Federal share payable to certain States on account of Interstate System projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 11984. A bill to amend section 701 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize additional accumulation of leave in certain foreign areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 11985. A bill to provide educational assistance for veterans who have served in the Armed Forces since October 1, 1963; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 11986. A bill to prohibit reimbursement at Government expense under section 4167(a) of title 39, United States Code, of matter mailed by Members of Congress and certain other officials under the franking privilege without specific address, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.R. 11987. A bill to amend the internal revenue excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 11988. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 11989. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to make discrimination because of age in employment an unlawful employment practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11990. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional first-year depreciation allowance (up to 100 percent of cost) for new waste treatment facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 11991. A bill to provide a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provision for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 11992. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code with respect to individuals who are to be included as dependents under chapter 7 of that title; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 11993. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 11994. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a full tax deduction for child care expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 11995. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 11996. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to permit the waiver of certain retirement or annuity payments under programs administered by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 11997. A bill to amend and extend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11998. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11999. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase to $250 million the authorization for fiscal year 1967, and to authorize reimbursement of States that prefinance certain treatment works; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 12000. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall disclose certain information in his files to courts of competent jurisdiction to assist them in connection with the issuance of child support orders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 12001. A bill to amend paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12002. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Department of the Navy shall have the rank of vice admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 12003. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a pension under title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 12004. A bill to improve payroll administration with respect to payment of compensation from clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 12005. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 12006. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 12007. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase by 10 percent the amount of retirement, annuity, and endowment payments excluded from income for the purpose of determining the eligibility of an individual for pension under that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.J. Res. 797. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.J. Res. 798. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.J. Res. 799. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the last week of October 1966 as National Gifted Child Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.J. Res. 800. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue annually a proclamation designating June as Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H. Con. Res. 531. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 532. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 565, and House Report No. 952 (89th Cong., 1st sess.); to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H. Res. 636. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 13; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Res. 637. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 638. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H. Res. 639. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to transfer the responsibilities of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H. Res. 640. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to employ eight additional employees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Res. 641. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Res. 642. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H. Res. 643. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H. Res. 644. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H. Res. 645. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H. Res. 646. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Res. 647. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H. Res. 648. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H. Res. 649. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H. Res. 650. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Res. 651. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Res. 652. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H. Res. 653. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H. Res. 654. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H. Res. 655. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H. Res. 656. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Res. 657. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H. Res. 658. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H. Res. 659. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H. Res. 660. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 12008. A bill for the relief of Caterina Caliendo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12009. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Colombo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 12010. A bill for the relief of Richard C. Mockler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 12011. A bill for the relief of Rachel Stimpson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.:

H.R. 12012. A bill for the relief of Thomas M. Scanlon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 12013. A bill for the relief of Bernard L. Gomberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 12014. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clotilde Arnoldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 12015. A bill for the relief of Cotton Products Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12016. A bill for the relief of Wong Yue Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 12017. A bill for the relief of Alberto E. Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12018. A bill for the relief of Mr. Chung-Yen Mao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 12019. A bill for the relief of Antonio Enzo De Paris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12020. A bill for the relief of Amado Manuel Vina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 12021. A bill for the relief of Leda Kemmet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 12022. A bill for the relief of Terrance L. Lindemann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 12023. A bill for the relief of Itzhaq Feldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 12024. A bill for the relief of William Temes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 12025. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose V. Yason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12026. A bill for the relief of Achille Buonapane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12027. A bill for the relief of Herman Hyman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 12028. A bill for the relief of Jai-Poong Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12029. A bill for the relief of Harzal M. Rahmani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 12030. A bill for the relief of John Burnham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 12031. A bill to authorize the appointment of Col. William W. Watkin, Jr., professor of the U.S. Military Academy, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 12032. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nacima Antoun Charchafliah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 12033. A bill for the relief of Antonio Manuel de Rezende de Sousa Andrade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12034. A bill for the relief of Evena J. Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 12035. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Mangiameli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 801. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning March 14, 1966, as National Citrus Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

312. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the International Woodworkers of America, Portland, Oreg., relative to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1966

The Senate met at 8 o'clock p.m., pursuant to the order of January 10, 1966, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast brought us to this high hour, we give Thee hearty thanks that tonight we, and the Nation, may hear the voice of the President of the United States. We are grateful for his restoration to health, and we pray that Thou wilt continually replenish his strength and wisdom and courage.

Be Thou with the millions across the Nation who will listen to the President tonight. Prepare them all, by love of country and dedication to its lofty principles, to hear with open mind and loyal devotion to America. Give all to recognize how great a thing it is to hear without distortion: what demand it makes upon the sincerity of our pursuit of truth, the purity of our dedication to equal justice under law, the reach of our compassion, the sensitivity of our conscience.

Make us equal, then, to the demands upon all hearers this night, that we all may remember the words of our Lord when He said, *Take heed how ye hear.*

In His name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Hon. CARL ALBERT, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, had been elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The message also notified the Senate that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker pro tempore on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had been assembled, and that the Congress was ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message further notified the Senate that a quorum of the House was present and that the House was ready to proceed with business.

The message announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 529) providing for a joint session to receive a message from the President, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina, and transmitted the resolution of the House thereon.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the joint committee appointed by the Senate and the House of Representatives to notify the President that quorums of the two Houses have assembled and are ready to receive any communication he may desire to make have performed that duty and now report that at 9 o'clock tonight the President will deliver to Congress his message on the state of the Union.

JOINT SESSION TO RECEIVE MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 529, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 529, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 529) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, January 12, 1966, at 9 o'clock p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the joint session tonight to hear the President of the United States deliver his state of the Union message, the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 8:30 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Senators are expected to gather here and to leave the Senate Chamber at 8:42. Therefore, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 8:30 p.m., at which time there will be a quorum call before proceeding to the House Chamber.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 8:30 p.m. today.

At 8:30 o'clock p.m., on the expiration of the recess, the Senate reconvened, when called to order by the President pro tempore.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

The following additional Senators attended the session of the Senate tonight:

E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator from the State of Alaska; SAM J. ERVIN, JR., a Senator from the State of North Carolina; HENRY M. JACKSON, a Senator from the State of Washington; THRUSTON B. MORTON, a Senator from the State of Kentucky; ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, a Senator from the State of Connecticut; and HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., a Senator from the State of New Jersey.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 321)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is now time for the Senate to move as a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.) the Senate, preceded by the administrative assistant to the Sergeant at Arms (William S. Cheatham); the Secretary of the Senate (Emery L. Frazier); the Sergeant at Arms-designate, Robert G. Dunphy, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address by the President of the United States on the state of the Union.

(The address by the President of the United States, this day delivered by him to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress, appears in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

At the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses, and in accordance with the order previously entered, at 9 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m., the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 14, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Morris Weinberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, Morris Weinberg will celebrate his 90th birthday. At the same time, he and his gracious wife, Dora, will celebrate their 65th wedding anniversary. It gives me great pleasure to salute these fine people who have contributed so much to the enrichment of American life.

Morris Weinberg is the founder of the Day-Jewish Journal, a paper which has been an important voice in Jewish-American affairs since 1914. But even before that, Morris Weinberg was a dynamic force. Since the turn of the century, he has been a man who has devoted himself to noble causes. His is a name that evokes the warmest feelings of admiration and respect. He has served his people and his country very, very well.

Mr. and Mrs. Weinberg are currently enjoying in Palm Beach, Fla., a retirement which they have both earned. I am certain that my colleagues, of whatever faith they may be, join me in extending their salutations and best wishes to Morris and Dora Weinberg. I wish them many, many more years of fruitful and happy life. They are a wonderful example of fine Jews and fine Americans.

George Perrin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, George Perrin, president of Plastics Research

& Development Corp., Fort Smith, Ark., is a resident of the district which I am honored to represent. In December he was named to receive the 1966 American Success Story Award, 1 of only 10 businessmen throughout the country to be so named, by the Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc.

Mr. Perrin was cited for one man's ability to build a prestige independent business by seeking out and filling industrial needs. From a modest start, he built Plastics Research & Development Corp. to a 60,000-square-foot plant with completely coordinated facilities for product development, mold building, custom molding, assembly, packaging and distribution serving leading manufacturers and distributors. Divisions of Plastics Research manufacture and distribute home decorative products, toys, military identification, and fishing tackle, with worldwide sales employing 200 people. Especially noted are his 124 models of realistic fishing lures.

We are proud to have him in our area. He is doing a wonderful job for the State of Arkansas and for the country as a whole. My heartiest congratulations to George Perrin.

A Call for a Public Awareness of U.S. Maritime Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the January issue of the magazine Navy, published by the Navy League of the United States there is an article which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues. This article consists of excerpts from a speech by Capt. James E. Heg, U.S. Navy, and is entitled "A Call for a Public Awareness of U.S. Maritime Plight."

Captain Heg, in his speech, calls upon the public to awaken to the facts about the critical state of our merchant marine. He astutely points out the fact that the Soviet Union is planning a modern automated merchant marine and that it is ironic that we as a nation compare all of our forms of power to that of the Soviet Union with the exception of our merchant marine power.

Mr. Speaker, within a few years, Captain Heg points out, the Soviet Union will be in a position to dominate the sea lanes and he leaves it to his readers' speculation as to what such a situation could portend for the United States. He goes further by pointing to the great amount of money that is being spent in other areas of transportation.

This article points out that since the Merchant Marine Act was passed in 1936 that the United States has spent more on the development of one single aircraft than it has in all 29 years in the area of merchant marine development. As a matter of fact, during 1966 the U.S. Maritime Administration is slated to spend no more than the minuscule sum of $250,000 on research and development toward advanced ships and systems. Compare this with what we are spending for air transportation and other means of defense.

I commend this article to my colleagues.

The Plight of the Little Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, during the recess, in traveling about my part of Michigan, I was of course pleased to note the general feeling of prosperity, but was dismayed to observe the number of truly small businesses that have closed their doors; small merchants on the main streets of country towns. I am certain this condition is not peculiar to my district but is general throughout the Nation. The really small businessman, managing his own store, running his own shop, employing a few people, has been much more than a symbol of enterprise in the rural communities of America.

Much of the plight in which the little businessman finds himself today is due to governmentally imposed regulation. No one outside these groups of doughty competitors realizes the economic burden which a multitude of increasingly complex reports for governmental agencies casts upon them. Burdensome and equivocal regulations, sometimes misinterpreted by Government employees in the field, to impose impossible economic burdens, have been enough to drive the smallest enterpriser from the ranks of the self-employed.

Mr. Speaker, it has been truly said that a business enterprise never stands still. In business you either go forward or backward. These small business people do not complain about the rigors of competition. They are willing to take their chances with their competitors. Their plea is to be freed from Government regulations written with big business in mind, which overburden them but are taken by their bigger competitors in stride as part of overhead.

In recent months I have received several letters from small businessmen in my district making this plea. Among them is a letter from Fred Koning, a restaurateur in Douglas, Mich., within my congressional district. The Saugatuck-Douglas area is one of Michigan's fine summer resorts, and Fred Koning, in a long-established business, has been successful thus far. But he writes me as follows:

> During the last three decades, we have seen fit to subsidize the world, the farmer, the laborer, the Negro, the poor, including the ones that could work but won't. There are families that have prospered on relief.
>
> On the other hand, the Government has guaranteed big business a profit by letting contracts on a cost-plus basis.
>
> Have the powers that be ever considered the little businessman? I don't mean the small businessman; I mean the little ones, like myself.
>
> We have never asked for nor wanted any subsidies. All we want is a chance to survive. How many of the legislators who are so concerned with the welfare of the masses have ever been in a competitive field and have had to earn a living by competition, let alone meet a payroll?
>
> Wouldn't it be possible to think of all of us instead of the select groups they have seen fit to sponsor?
>
> As little business people, all we ask is the right to run our own business—sink or swim—and pay our taxes.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> FRED KONING.

Mr. Speaker, we would do a better job at lawmaking, and the bureaucracy would write fairer regulations, if the concerns of little businessmen were taken into account. All big business started small. The man or woman who has an idea and the ability and courage to venture it in competitive enterprise still contributes much to our progress; and Government should take care in its laws and regulations that an economic, political, and social climate encouraging small business is fostered.

Anniversary of Independence of Chad, January 11, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, 1966, a country formerly part of French Equatorial Africa, but with an area more than twice that of France, celebrated the anniversary of its independence.

That nation, Chad, had been one of the four territories in French Equatorial Africa since 1910. Through a series of progressive steps, which included the dissolution of French Equatorial Africa in 1959, Chad assumed a place among independent nations of the world in 1960.

Little is known of the early history of this landlocked area. At the time of first reports from European travelers in the late 19th century, individual domains were ruled by warring sultans and the territory served primarily as a hunting ground for foreign slave traders.

Today, President Francois Tombalbaye leads the nation under a constitution approved in 1962. President Tombalbaye and his 2.8 million fellow citizens are moving their new nation forward on all fronts—political, social, and economic.

Although Chad has a desert area as large as the State of Texas, it is self-sufficient in food production. National imports reached $34 million and exports $25 million in 1964. The United States is participating in the economic development of Chad with a modest aid program which, since 1962, has averaged some $700,000 annually.

Chad maintains friendly relations with our country and retains close ties with France as a member of the French Community. It has occupied a seat in the United Nations since 1960.

Therefore, it is appropriate that the United States, conscious of its own relative youth, acknowledge and offer congratulations upon the anniversary of independence of a still younger member of the community of nations.

Salute to Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Republic of Sudan celebrated the 10th anniversary of her independence. As you are aware, the 2d session of the 89th Congress had not yet convened. However, I did not want the opportunity overlooked to extend to the people and the Government of Sudan the warmest felicitations of this country on this occasion. Congratulations are therefore extended on this occasion to His Excellency Ismail el Ezhari, the President of the Supreme Council of State; and to His Excellency Abbash el Obeid, the Sudanese Ambassador to the United States.

Traditionally, most Americans anxiously await the end of an old year and look forward to the approach of the new year in anticipation of prosperity, progress, and peace. But January 1 has even more significance to the people of the Republic of the Sudan.

It was on this date in 1956 that this huge country was proclaimed an independent and sovereign state. Comprising an area almost one-tenth of the African continent, this young and dynamic Republic is a land of more than 12 million inhabitants.

However, it should be noted that while the Sudan is celebrating its 10th anniversary as an independent Republic, its historical legacy goes back very far indeed. Ancient Egyptian inscriptions and references in the Old Testament—to the Land of Kush—bear evidence of the Sudan's past greatness. During most of the 19th century, the Sudan was under Turkish-Egyptian subjugation with a short period of independence between 1885 and 1899. Following the joint British-Egyptian reconquest of the country in 1896–98, a new governmental system had to be devised. This resulted in joint Anglo-Egyptian administration or condominium, as the system was called.

The Sudan is a land of sharp contrasts, divided between the economically developed Moslem north and the largely pagan and Christian underdeveloped south. However, strong efforts are being made to overcome these and other handicaps.

Sudan's somewhat small and scattered population and lack of known resources has forced the country's economy to remain primarily an agricultural one. Cotton is the mainstay of the Sudanese economy, and accounts for approximately 70 percent of the country's total exports and about 30 percent of the total world production of the long staple variety. The Gezira scheme, which developed a large portion of the south to relative wealth, has proved itself a model of agricultural achievement which other undeveloped areas conceivably could adopt. Extensive irrigation could increase the chances for an even more diversified economy. Liberal foreign trade policies have aided in stimulating Sudan's exports and imports. Its world trade balance is satisfactory and foreign exchange reserves have steadily grown to over $150 million. Annual capital formation is at approximately 10 percent and development investments are growing at a rate of more than 8 percent of the gross national product, which has been estimated at $900 million.

Internal problems have not prevented the Sudan from taking an active part in international affairs, as its membership in the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa has demonstrated; in addition, the Sudan is an important member in such organizations as the League of Arab States, the Organization of African Unity, and the International Cotton Advisory Committee.

Though the Sudan has been experiencing what one might call growing pains there is little doubt as to the resolution and determination of this large and friendly country to meet the challenges and overcome the difficulties which beset it.

I am certain that the entire American people join me in extending warm and sincere congratulations on this, the 10th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of the Sudan.

Ski in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Sponsoring Committee, I call your attention to the first annual Pennsylvania Ski Ball which will take place next Saturday evening, January 15, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in this city. The affair is designed to promote our State's rapidly growing recreation industry, particularly the outstanding ski resorts, as well as to make a contribution to assist in financing the U.S. ski team at the next Olympic games.

Winter sports enthusiasts in this area should be especially interested in the excellent winter sports facilities now available in Pennsylvania. It is a long day's trip to New Hampshire or Vermont, but Pennsylvania's winter wonderlands are between 2 and 4 hours by car from the Nation's Capital. Many groups and families leave Washington on Friday afternoons to enjoy full weekends of winter sports in our State.

Gov. William Scranton and Senators HUGH SCOTT and JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jr., are honorary chairmen of the Pennsylvania Ski Ball sponsored by the Pennsylvania Society of Washington. General chairman is Attorney William D. Patton, of Johnstown, who is vice president of the society. We all invite you to take advantage of the healthy recreational facilities that are in such easy reach of this area.

Paralyzed at 9, Dicky Chaput Wins Jaycee Outstanding Young Man Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, next Saturday in St. Paul, Minn., Richard Raymond Chaput, of Nashua, N.H., will be honored by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce as one of 10 outstanding young men in America for 1965.

The great dimensions of this achievement become clear when one realizes that Richard Chaput has been paralyzed from the neck down by childhood polio for 21 of his 28 years. For much of his boyhood, his adolescence, and now in his young manhood, Richard Chaput has been confined to bed. His nights must be spent in an iron lung.

In his book, "Not To Doubt," Mr. Chaput describes the physical and mental torment through which he passed and how he overcame the blackest depression and despair, with the aid of his native cheerfulness and a rocklike faith in God. He is also the first to recognize the essential love and support received from his family and friends, particularly his parents.

INSPIRATION TO THOUSANDS

Through his book, his articles, and stories, Richard Chaput has touched and inspired countless thousands. The act of writing is immensely difficult for him. Because of his affliction, it is hard for him to speak and he cannot use his hands or arms at all. Dictating letters or other writing is very difficult. Most of his writing is done on an ingenious electric typewriter specially designed so that he can operate it painstakingly with his tongue.

I first met him in person last year when I called on him at the nursing home where he was staying. It was apparent at once that here was a most unusual person. He had accepted his grievous condition philosophically, not without question, but without wasting time in railing and complaining against a situation which was beyond the power of man to change.

NASHUA MAN OF THE YEAR

He was named Man of the Year by the Nashua Junior Chamber of Commerce last year and soon thereafter the process was started to nominate him for the national honors now accorded to him. I was honored to endorse this nomination on his behalf and I now feel honored once more to pay him this tribute in the House of Representatives.

He is a truly outstanding and most inspirational American. I congratulate him on his award and I congratulate the Jaycees on the wisdom of their choice.

One-Quarter Century of Farm-Labor-Consumer Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of its 25 years of service, the California Farm Research and Legislative Committee published an interesting and colorful brochure entitled "One-Quarter Century of Farm-Labor-Consumer Action." The purpose of the brochure is to review the history and accomplishments of the committee, and this purpose is certainly well achieved.

The Farm Research and Legislative Committee had its beginning in February 1941, when, due to the loss of an export market in war-torn Europe and the subsequent sharp drop in the price of fruit, Santa Clara County prune and apricot growers banded together to ask for purchase by the Federal Government of some of the unsold fruit. This first unified effort resulted in an appropriation of $25 million and a successful increase in the market price of fruit.

Behind the developing variety of programs which the committee has worked for, the overriding commitment was and is to the family farm, the farm which provides a living for a farm family, members of which do most of the work rather than directing the work of others. To help insure the economic survival of the family farm the committee places top priority in establishing jointly owned and operated farmer-to-consumer marketing and distribution cooperatives. To achieve this goal, the committee is working with farm groups, other cooperatives, and organized labor.

The hope is that such cooperatives will help to reduce the sometimes very great spread between consumer prices and what the farmer receives. For while the general standard and cost of living have been rising, the level of farm income has been a consistent problem. As "One-Quarter Century" illustrates, "from 1953 to 1964, net farm operator's income dropped at an average annual rate of 1.4 percent. In 1964 per capita nonfarm income was $2,595; in contrast per capita farm income was $966."

The Farm Research and Legislative Committee is not concerned only, however, with the level of farm income. The committee has taken an active role in the advocacy of a Federal food stamp program to provide a better diet for low-income families, of a Federal school milk program, and of lower gas and electric rates in the region. Further, their international concern is evident in the committee's early support and educational campaign for the establishment of the United Nations as well as the Food and Agriculture Organization's freedom-from-hunger campaign.

Accurately described in this brochure as the "nerve center" for the Farm Research and Legislative Committee is its executive secretary Mrs. Grace McDonald, who doubles her tremendous workload by serving as executive secretary for the Northern California Freedom-From-Hunger Campaign. Judging from the achievements of the past 25 years, I feel confident that Mrs. McDonald and her associates on the California Farm Research and Legislative Committee will continue to work successfully with and for farmers, laborers, and consumers in California.

Interest on Poor Man's Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times on January 11 had an editorial entitled "Fair Play on Savings Bonds" and because I agree with the sentiments expressed in the editorial, I am calling it to the attention of my colleagues by quoting it now at length.

FAIR PLAY ON SAVINGS BONDS

> Alert investors have been getting much higher yields since the Federal Reserve raised interest rates in December. But buyers of savings bonds from the U.S. Treasury still receive just 3¾ percent on their purchases. Thus the Treasury is, in effect, shortchanging savings bond buyers, who are mainly people in the low- and middle-income brackets.
>
> Apparently these small savers are also learning that savings bonds are no bargain. Despite the fact that many bonds are bought through payroll deduction plans, sales in December were 11 percent less than they were a year earlier.
>
> A higher rate of interest on Treasury savings bonds would protect small investors who do not know their way around the financial markets. By increasing purchases of the bonds, it would also help the fight against inflation. There is no need to make bond rates competitive with marketable Treasury obligations, which fluctuate in price, or even with the new high rates being offered financial institutions. Savings bonds are the safest of securities and offer a tax advantage as well; so a small increase would suffice.
>
> The President has the power to raise the rate to a maximum of 4¼ percent. It will take at least 4 percent to play fair with small savers. We think 4 percent should be offered them—and soon.

Because most of the holders of Treasury savings bonds are in the low- and middle-income bracket and have no lobby here in Washington, I am prepared to join others who articulate their problems, in endeavoring to get the President of the United States to exercise his power to raise the rate of interest on these bonds.

It is most significant that on the same day that this editorial appeared in the Times there were other articles in the Wall Street Journal which pointed up the necessity for Presidential action at this time. These articles contained the following significant information:

First. Yields on Treasury's latest issues of short-term bills hit a 6-year high. Yields on 26-week bills rose to 4.737 percent and the average return to investors on 13-week bills rose to 4.585 percent. These Treasury bills are purchased primarily by banks and large corporations.

Second. Short-term interest rates resumed an upward course along a broad front since the Federal Reserve Board boosted the discount rate to 4½ percent last December 5. Large New York City, Chicago, and west coast banks are offering 4.875 percent on certificates of deposit of 180 days and longer.

Third. GMAC and International Harvester increased their rate on 180- to 270-day paper to 4⅞ percent.

Mr. Speaker, because of all of these events, I am urging the President and the Secretary of the Treasury to increase interest rates on Treasury savings bonds to the maximum limit of the President's power, but in any event to at least 4 percent.

Service of General Wadsworth Outstanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, January 16, 1966, will mark the retirement of Brig. Gen. Louie C. Wadsworth from the National Guard.

With his retirement a chapter closes in Florida National Guard history and his place will be difficult to fill. His has been a record of dedication and service, and I join with his friends throughout the State and Nation in paying tribute to him as he concludes a distinguished military career.

Ceremonies Sunday will see General Wadsworth promoted to Major General and retired.

So closes a career that began when he enlisted in Company E, 154th Infantry, Florida National Guard in Live Oak, Fla., April 18, 1923.

General Wadsworth rose through the ranks, being commissioned a second lieutenant in 1936. He held this rank when called to active duty in November 1940. He served with the 124th Infantry as platoon leader, company commander, battalion executive officer, and battalion commander at Camp Blanding, Fla., and Fort Benning, Ga., in January 1944.

He later served as regimental executive officer and regimental commander of the 3d Student Regiment, the Infantry School.

He served in the Asiatic-Pacific Theater as G-3 with general headquarters, Armed Forces, Pacific, from June 1945 until December of that year.

Released from active duty at Camp Blanding, April 26, 1946, with the rank of colonel, he accepted an Organized Reserve Corps appointment prior to release from active duty, and served in this capacity until named battalion commander, 1st Battalion, 124th Infantry Regiment in grade of lieutenant colonel. He was promoted to colonel and July 29, 1962, was promoted to brigadier general and served as assistant division commander until reorganization in 1963 when he was redesignated as deputy commander of the division, the position which he held upon retiring.

His decorations and awards include the American Defense Service Medal, American Campaign Medal, Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal, World War II Victory Medal, Army Forces Reserve Medal and two hourglass devises, Philippine Liberation Medal, Florida Distinguished Service Medal, Florida Service Medal, and Active State Service Ribbon.

In addition to his distinguished military service, General Wadsworth has been an outstanding citizen in his role as publisher of the Suwannee Democrat, respected weekly newspaper in Live Oak.

Under his leadership, the Suwannee Democrat has been cited with most of Florida's major weekly newspaper awards and has been in the forefront of activities which have led to progress for the county and its people.

Born May 30, 1906, in Mayo, Fla., he moved to Live Oak at the age of six and has made his home there since that time with the exception of the time spent in college and the armed services.

The son of the late Charles Randell Wadsworth, Sr., and Mrs. Nellie Wadsworth, he attended Suwannee High School and graduated with the class of 1924. He graduated from Davidson College in North Carolina. After working for a year with the Addressograph Co., he returned to Live Oak in 1931 to become editor of the Suwannee Democrat and has been connected with the paper since, with the exception of the time spent in military service.

He served as president of the National Guard Officers Association in Florida in 1950. He served two terms as president of the Suwannee County Chamber of Commerce, and in 1955 was named Man of the Year in Suwannee County.

Another primary interest in his civic life was his membership on the board of trustees of the Suwannee County Hospital, a position he held many years.

He is a member of the Kiwanis Club and has been active in various other civic groups. He served as lieutenant governor of the Florida district for Kiwanis Clubs.

He served as president of the Rotary Club in 1938 and was president of the Junior chamber of commerce in 1940. He served as commander of the Suwannee Post 107, American Legion, in 1951.

One of his continuing interests has been the Suwannee County Fair, serving several times as president. He was one of the founders of the present fair and is the only director left of the original group.

He served as postmaster in Live Oak from July 1947 to September 1948.

In 1956 he served as chairman of a county commission-appointed committee to construct the coliseum building in Live Oak.

The publication of the newspaper and the operation of its plant has been the primary interest and concern of the publisher through the years. Active in the Florida Press Association, he served as president in 1948-49, and served for 11 years as a director of the association.

As publisher of the paper, he has directed the Suwannee Democrat to a position of high regard among the press of Florida.

He also published the Dixie County Advocate in Cross City, the Mayo Free Press in Mayo and the Branford Herald in Branford for a number of years.

The Wadsworths make their home on the corner of 11th Street and Pine Avenue in Live Oak. He is married to the former Miss Clara Staley, and they have two daughters, Mrs. Gayle McCrimon, and Charlotte.

General Wadsworth is a warm, personal friend, and I wanted to take this opportunity to pay tribute to him as he concludes his distinguished service in the National Guard. His shoes will be hard to fill, and I know that he can look back with a great deal of satisfaction and personal pride in the great contributions which he has made.

Let's Remove Politics and Profit From the War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Representative DON H. CLAUSEN, of California, before the California State Chamber of Commerce. Representative CLAUSEN is a great independent thinker with a wealth of fresh, interesting, and new ideas. His speech offers an incisive analysis of the poverty program.

The speech follows:

LET'S REMOVE POLITICS AND PROFIT FROM THE WAR ON POVERTY

(Address of Congressman DON H. CLAUSEN before the California State Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Dec. 9, 1965)

The so-called war on poverty got off to a bad start and is still in deep trouble. In the past few days, scandalous headlines were appearing with increasing frequency as I left Washington. Many Members of Congress pointed out in the congressional debate this year the problems inherent in the law. It is not enough to put a good label on a bill and then to neglect meaningful standards and guidelines. The first thing that is wrong with this act is that it was not written by Congress but by the administration. As problems in the war on poverty have gained increased attention by the public, the administration, in its sensitivity, has refused to allow amendment to the act.

Last year when hearings on the amendment of the act were opened by the House Education and Labor Committee, Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL charged that the war on poverty was a "giant fiesta of political patronage—a political porkbarrel" and made assurances that needed directives would be written into the law.

It appeared that something substantial would be done, but as witnesses appeared, testifying to the slipshod manner in which the program was being implemented, pressures were applied and the hearings were stopped after only 5 days of testimony. A few meaningless amendments were forced through Congress speedily and then, with the poverty program doomed to another year of operation without direction, Chairman POWELL hastily called for a complete examination of the program. A large committee staff was assembled, hearings were promised in the field, but following 3 months of investigation, nothing substantial has resulted.

The major issue of the war on poverty, according to the attention it has received in recent months, has been the issue of the involvement of the poor. A truly effective war on poverty will not do things for the poor people—it will do things with the poor people. This is the difference between the welfare-dole approach of the past and the potential of the future.

Almost any social worker or person working with the poor can tell you what the poor's problems are—lack of education, lack of a job and lack of motivation, among others. One of the characteristics of poverty is that it is generally handed down from generation to generation. No wonder many of the poor have become cynical, bitter and without hope.

If we cannot involve the poor in the solution of their own problems, they will have no place to go but to the streets. No one knows their problems better than the poor themselves. They must be involved in policy decisions of the program where proposed solutions to the problems are being developed.

Make no mistake about it—all the public relations work on the war on poverty has raised great expectations among the poor. We had better make this program work or its failures will generate a new and more serious revolt among the poor.

There is another reason why the poor should be involved in policy roles. Many of their frustrations derive from their conflict with the big city governments and institutions. In some ways they have good reason for frustration. Certainly our big city governments leave a great deal to be desired. If the poor are not involved they are going to fight and circumvent the existing institutions. This means picket lines, riots and demonstrations that waste energy and talents that could be otherwise employed. Involvement can show the poor that they can work through existing agencies.

This does not mean that local government, social agencies, and the State should not have anything to say. I am an advocate of local control. With the right kind of representative community action boards, dictation from Washington should become virtually unnecessary. To date the States have been completely bypassed and so have the poor.

During the debate last year, the Republicans proposed an amendment that would insure balanced representation on community action boards. Belatedly, the Office of

Economic Opportunity has been applying our proposal, but it is not written into the law. Consequently, many communities have been torn asunder in the strife over the establishment of a program. Proper legislation could avoid this waste.

When the guidelines were first established for running the program, the administration showed little interest in the requirement that the poor participate in running their own programs. The first directives did not even mention representation of the poor, although the law requires "maximum feasible participation of the poor."

Mr. Shriver apparently now believes that the poor should not only help at the service level, but also at the highest policy level. The Bureau of the Budget and the administration apparently do not agree with Mr. Shriver.

Why is it important that the poor be involved? What will involvement mean? First, involvement will mean motivation. Being involved provides a glimmer of hope for people—that their opinions are heard and listened to. They see a channel of working out their frustrations and finding solutions to their own problems. Second, involvement means responsibility. In order for a person to act responsibly, he must be given responsibility. If he has no decision concerning the factors that affect his life, he will not feel that he is responsible to carry out the decisions made for him.

Why have the administration spokesmen suddenly become so cautious over this issue of involvement of the poor? The poor and their advocates have seen participation as an opportunity to change or overthrow existing institutions and government. The program, which the administration conceived as a political boon, or boondoggle, has suddenly boomeranged. The poor will simply not be pacified by another handout program when something new and better was promised and is available.

There is more to the poverty program than the question of involvement of the poor. There are other programs beside the community action program in which political motivation has compromised the effectiveness of the program. I am speaking particularly of the Neighborhood Youth Corps. This program, properly administered, could provide training for the great numbers of unemployed and unemployable youth. Instead, politicians have again stepped in to use this program for their own ends. Recent newspaper studies of Rhode Island Neighborhood Youth Corps programs are indicative of what is happening throughout the country. Rather than enrolling poor youths to whom this program would give needed income, training and motivation, enrollees are typically from families whose income is in excess of $7,000 per annum. Although this income level is not high, it is far above the poverty standard. Some of the youths, I was appalled to learn, were college enrollees. People have been placed on the payrolls of the program as supervisors, when they were performing no functions for the corps, but holding other municipal jobs. The list of abuses goes on and on. The Boston program is the most recent example of corruption. There, enrollees collected paychecks long after their names were off the payroll, and some employees of the program collected several salaries through the use of forged identification cards provided to them by the program's employees.

The Project Headstart section is generally recognized as the best part of the poverty program. It is interesting to note this section was originally proposed 4 years ago by Republicans, but turned down by the Democratic majority. It was included in an education bill I coauthored, H.R. 6422.

The question is, Where do we go from here? The Republicans in Congress joined by a number of Democrats, the National Chamber of Commerce and other organizations were opposed to the original legislation. The reason was not that we were against helping the poor; rather we were against the manner in which we felt this loosely drawn program would be administered. It is unfortunate that many of our objections have been borne out. Those include the lack of coordination, confusion, flaunting of established governmental structures and the cruel hoax of raising people's expectations far above the ability of this program to fulfill.

Despite objections, the war on poverty has become an economical, social, and political fact of life. We must deal with it as a reality. What are our alternatives? We can vigorously oppose the program, and by so doing, be charged with being against the poor. The second alternative is to ignore, or refuse to take part in, the war on poverty because this problem is not of our making. This approach would be to bury our heads in the sand, and, again, we would be charged with the responsibility for failure.

Our final alternative is to take an active part in the program. This is my recommendation. Our major targets should be the removal of politics and profit from poverty. The war on poverty is making many changes, some distasteful and some necessary, in most localities across the Nation. At this point, it may be to our best interests to take over and direct the poverty program with the dynamic and creative leadership that we know is available in the private sector. It is not only to our benefit, but it is our responsibility to take an active interest in these programs to insure that the decisions being made are carefully weighed and carried out in a proper manner. I am suggesting that the chamber members become, when possible, members of the community action boards. There may also be roles for you to fill in offering training experiences for program enrollees. This could be of benefit to the employer and the employee.

In this way, the poor can watch you in action. They will gain knowledge from your participation. You will gain more respect as a responsible community leader. As we all realize the war on poverty is far from the solution to the problem of economic deprivation in our country, we must seek other means of alleviating the problem. One of the primary problems of poverty is lack of employment by the poverty-stricken. Jobs must be developed for these people and more importantly, the people must be developed for the jobs. Those of us who have worked for a living or developed business enterprises know that the only real answer for reduction of poverty and unemployment is to create opportunities for the individual to become self-motivated, increase his productivity and add his effort to the acceleration of economic growth. Human energy is the mainspring to progress. Our continuing challenge is to develop programs that spark the enthusiasm of a young man or woman who is attempting to propel himself into orbit in the mainstream of American life.

With this thought in mind, a group of determined Republicans, myself included, have coauthored legislation that we think will truly provide this type of opportunity for working Americans. Rather than creating a new bureaucracy that might inhibit the management of the program, we have chosen to accentuate the positive aspects of existing institutions and enterprises. We have introduced the Human Investment Act package. The first of two bills in this package would encourage employers to increase their job training and retraining programs significantly by permitting them to deduct as a tax credit up to 7 percent of funds spent in such programs. When they provided the 7 percent tax credit for machinery investment incentives, I believe they left out the most important ingredient—incentives for upgrading the qualifications of human resources. The purpose of this legislation is to correct this oversight.

The second bill would permit employers to hire persons over 45 without serious concern over the extra costs involved for health insurance and retirement plans. This, too, would be accomplished by allowing tax credits to balance, in part, any such added costs.

In case you haven't guessed it, I'm trying to use the tax structure to help create incentives for people to advance their way in life rather than destroy their initiative through excessive taxation. As we seek means of improving our education, employment, and other programs for social progress, we must seek positive means of making the tax structure a constructive tool in our way of life, not a destructive tool. Proper tax reform is the answer.

Rather than taking away initiative by way of free money and help, people should be encouraged to become motivated volunteers by permitting them to take measured tax deductions if they, in turn, accept certain social responsibilities.

This approach may not fit the Great White Father's protocol of paternalism, but it provides unlimited opportunities for a man to chart his course toward a life of dignity, self-respect, and the cherished independence that remains the dream of freemen everywhere.

Federal-Aid Secondary Roads—Our Stepchild Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, following my recent speech before the County Supervisors Association of California on the need for a more balanced highway system throughout the Nation, I have had numerous requests for the full context of my remarks.

Serving as a member of the Roads Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee, I believe the material contained therein would be of interest to other Members of the House. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I request unanimous consent to its inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN DON H. CLAUSEN BEFORE THE COUNTY SUPERVISORS ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER 22, 1965

It is an honor and a privilege to have this opportunity of speaking to my beloved alma mater, the County Supervisors Association of California. As a former member of this political fraternity, I can assure you that it gives me a great deal of pleasure to welcome your organization to my congressional district. The fact that you brought this convention to our beautiful north coast is, I am sure, appreciated by the people of Humboldt County. But, I am also certain that those of you who are visiting the redwood country for the first time are equally pleased with the hospitality and exposure to this land of the tall trees.

In selecting a topic for today's presentation, I decided to touch briefly on a subject that certainly must remain close to each and every member of the boards of supervisors throughout this great State of California. It has often been said that "a supervisor who doesn't concern himself with the roads in his district can expect to be a one-term supervisor."

While we are interested in all types of roads—expressways, freeways, parkways, access and scenic roads, connecting roads, etc.—I believe the roads that require and attract the attention of county supervisors are the Federal-aid secondary roads.

During my service on the board of supervisors, it seems, we were always waiting for our allocation of funds so as to accelerate the construction of another section of roadway that was "crying" for improvement.

With this background, you can certainly understand why, when the opening occurred, I jumped at the chance to be appointed to the Road Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee. In the years to come, I hope my position and service on this important committee will prove beneficial to all concerned with highway matters.

In reviewing the progress of highway construction over the past decade, one must conclude that substantial headway has been made. Since 1947, nearly $8 billion have been spent on Federal-aid secondary highways. That money has improved more than 252,000 miles of roadway. In 1948, there were 378,000 miles of secondary highways. Since then the mileage has nearly doubled to 620,000 miles with about 18,000 miles in urban areas. This money has built 32,000 bridges, it has eliminated 600 railroad crossings and has protected over 3,600 railroad crossings with warning devices or gates. By any standard—this is a good record—it is an impressive record—but it is still not enough.

The needs, the backlog for construction and the deficiency lists continue to mount.

In my judgment, the importance of our secondary roads has never been fully realized. The financial resources have not kept pace with the increasing demand for improvement.

Speaking quite candidly, it has never made much sense to me to build great expressways and freeways for the enjoyment or safety of our traveling public and then subject this same traveler to narrow roadways or "cow trails" when driving on county roads. Certainly there is room for a more balanced recognition of our overall highway transportation requirements.

It would seem quite obvious to anyone that as we step up our efforts to improve the interstate and primary highways, we should certainly do the same for our secondary road system.

As highways begin to receive more and more attention because of the increasing number of vehicles, the growing number of miles traveled each year and the resultant increase in gas tax revenue, it would seem only logical that secondary road improvement would keep pace. Regrettably, I do not see this to be the case.

Secondary roads comprise about 20 percent of the total road mileage in the country, but the money authorized for improving and maintaining them amounts to only about 2 percent of the total.

It seems to me that as we seek a balance in our entire system of highways in this country, a more realistic allocation of the tax revenues to Federal-aid secondary roads would go a long way toward providing the answer.

With the State and Federal Governments having preempted the gasoline tax source of revenue—it would seem reasonable that we have the continuing responsibility to reappraise our revenue allocations with adequate attention given to the changing needs of the cities and counties. Certainly, without the tax source directly available to them, the supervisors hands are tied. If additional funds are needed to fund the programs, we at the State and Federal level must assume the leadership role and I can assure you, this is taking place. As you know the Ways and Means Committee has jurisdiction over additional revenues and again, our Road Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee has forthrightly presented our case to the committee. The Transportation Committee of your State legislature have been equally aggressive at the State level.

At this point, however, I believe I should make known to you that your financial problems are not the only problems we must consider.

As you know, highway legislation before the House Committee on Public Works is generally handled in a bipartisan way. Shortly after the latest estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate Highway System was submitted to the Congress, the chairman and ranking member of our Road Subcommittee introduced bills which would have approved the cost estimate for the purpose of apportioning interstate funds, and would have authorized the appropriation of an additional $5 billion to meet the increased costs of the Interstate System. The original authorization of $37 billion now requires $42 billion. Enactment of either of these bills would have provided for the completion of the Interstate System on schedule in 1972.

H.R. 6548, was overwhelmingly approved by our Committee on Public Works and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means to take appropriate action with regard to financing. However, it soon became obvious that the Committee on Ways and Means had no plans to act on the bill despite the fact that in many States the highway program was being delayed pending apportionment of additional Federal-aid highway funds.

As a result, it was necessary to act upon Senate Joint Resolution 81, which permitted apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds authorized for fiscal year 1967 only but did nothing to provide the additional funds necessary for completion of the Interstate Highway System on schedule by 1972. So, as you can see, we all have our work cut out for us. As you know, we in California want the completion on schedule so that Highways 101 and 50 can be added to the Interstate System.

The only alternative would be to extend the scheduled completion date. To me, this is totally unacceptable in view of the fact that completion of the Interstate Highway System will result in an annual saving of 8,000 lives and $11 billion in transportation costs.

In order to emphasize my interest in the secondary road problem, I think it would be appropriate for me to read my comments made during the debate on Senate Joint Resolution 81:

"Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 81, a resolution to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to increase the amount authorized for the Interstate System for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, to authorize the apportionment of such amount, and for other purposes.

"I want to draw the particular attention of my colleagues to section 2 of the bill which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of the needs of the Federal-aid highway system after 1972. The Secretary would be required to submit a report of his findings to Congress not later than January 1, 1967.

"This study will include, among other subjects, the extension or improvement of the present Interstate System, the possible development of freeways or express routes on a different basis, special urban highway problems, classification revision for Federal-aid primary and secondary systems, and their urban extension, and other matters. I am particularly anxious that the study include a comprehensive review of the Federal-aid secondary highway system, and officials of the Bureau of Public Roads have stated that the study will do this. In a speech before the county engineers on February 21, 1965, Mr. Ralph P. Agnew, Chief of the Secondary Roads Division, Bureau of Public Roads said:

" 'Such examination (of the secondary system) on an intensive scale is scheduled in the study being planned by the Bureau of Public Roads in cooperation with State and local officials to provide a sound basis for such a highway program in the future.'

"Mr. Rex Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, has also indicated that the study of future highway needs will include review of the Federal-aid secondary system.

"While the dramatic interstate highway program attracts most of the public attention, the Federal-aid secondary highway program is also of critical importance to the Nation's welfare. It is in the development of the Federal-aid secondary system that the voices of the county and other local road officials will most effectively be heard. Under the law, programs for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system must be selected by the State highway department and the appropriate local officials in cooperation with each other. In addition to this, under the policies adopted by the Bureau of Public Roads, not less than 50 percent of the Federal-aid secondary funds apportioned to each State for any fiscal year after diversion of the highway planning survey funds shall first be made available to the appropriate road officials and shall remain so available until the end of such fiscal year for roads not on the State highway portion of the Federal-aid secondary system.

"The total mileage of routes designated on the Federal-aid secondary system, as of December 31, 1963, was 626,438 miles. The actual traveled ways of these routes totaled 618,041 miles. Of this mileage, nearly 180,000 miles do not have a paved surface.

"The highways on the Federal-aid secondary system are essential for the day-to-day activities of our citizens, particularly in view of our rapidly shifting population patterns. It is necessary that highways on the Federal-aid secondary system be improved to adequate standards in the interest of not only adequate transportation but also in the interest of reducing loss of life, injuries, and property damage which result from vehicle accidents on the secondary system.

"In light of these considerations, I was surprised and disturbed at the proposal of the President to divert one-third of all funds apportioned for the Federal-aid secondary highway system to the construction of scenic and recreational roads and landscaping and roadside development on roads, irrespective of whether they be on the Interstate primary or secondary system. I am certainly in favor of measures designed to protect and enhance the beauty of our highways, but I cannot believe that such should be done at the expense of needed highway construction. The diversion of needed highway funds from the Federal-aid secondary system, in my opinion, is deplorable. This is further emphasized by the fact that the proposal was not based upon any comprehensive study of actual needs of the Federal-aid secondary system and, in fact, was made in the face of the fact that, a study of all highway needs, including those of the secondary system is about to get underway, under the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 81.

"Mr. Speaker, I strongly support Senate Joint Resolution 81 and urge my colleagues to join me in its support. I am particularly interested in the highway needs study provision, and am looking forward to the report of the Secretary of Commerce and its findings and recommendations concerning the Federal-aid secondary system."

In conclusion, I want to extend my sincere thanks to the supervisor of my own district and your great organization for sending Bill MacDugall back to represent you during the hearings on the previously mentioned move to divert funds from the FAS program.

I need not remind you of how magnificently Bill presents your case before legislative committees. Everyone on the committee was greatly impressed and the results speak for themselves. The pressures were so great the administration finally withdrew their request for fund diversion and asked that the beautification package be financed from the general fund. This was indeed a great victory.

Believe me, we have every reason to accelerate the construction programs now before us. We must meet whatever requirements are necessary to complete the system, but in the meantime, it behooves all of us to expand the cooperation and coordination of highway planning. We must restudy our highway needs with particular attention given to a functional reclassification of our highway systems.

During the past few years, we have concentrated on the critically needed Interstate and Defense Highway System. However, in my opinion, we should not concentrate solely on freeways and expressways—more attention must be given to the farm-to-market and secondary road systems. The Interstate System is a model achievement of what can be done with proper and coordinated planning. And yet, the Interstate System is only expected to carry 20 percent of the estimated 1 trillion miles that will be driven by 1976—10 short years from now. That other 80 percent—800 billion miles—will be driven on the primary and secondary highways.

It seems only logical to me—that our goal must be a balanced highway system. With transportation and highways recognized generally as the economic lifeline to a community, one can only conclude that a "balanced highway system" would mean a "balanced economic development" throughout our land.

With the acceleration of funds and a new emphasis on secondary roads, a comprehensive system could be developed that will speed motorists to their destinations in the safest possible manner.

And then one day, perhaps, we can minimize the slaughters on our highways that cost more American lives over one weekend than have been lost during our entire involvement in the war in Vietnam.

I thank you for the privilege of being with you.

United States-Canadian Relations—Address by Congressman Tupper, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our colleague the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] is one of the most knowledgeable Americans in the field of United States-Canadian relations. As a member of the United States-Canadian Interparliamentary Group, Mr. TUPPER has had frequent and productive contacts with our Canadian neighbors.

Believing that too many Americans take Canada for granted, he led a group of his Republican colleagues, in which I was proud to be included, in the preparation of a white paper on United States-Canadian Relations in which 26 recommendations for U.S. policy were discussed. The white paper has been enthusiastically received throughout Canada and the United States.

On the occasion of the Mapleleaf Dinner in New York City on December 8, Mr. TUPPER outlined the white paper and assessed its impact to that point.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. TUPPER's speech in the RECORD:

MAPLELEAF DINNER SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN TUPPER, OF MAINE, NEW YORK CITY, DECEMBER 8, 1965

The inimitable Art Buchwald, 6 weeks ago, suggested that, if Canadians seriously desired more attention from the United States, you would have to create such a serious problem for us that we could not afford to ignore you any longer. Buchwald suggested you might develop a serious internal Communist threat, or build your own atomic bomb, or demand that the United States give back the St. Lawrence Seaway, or build a Berlin-type wall along the boundary, or burn the American flag at Niagara Falls. But not even Mr. Buchwald's vivid imagination could anticipate the course you chose—to turn out our lights.

I suspect that throughout generations to come, a new cliche will be added to that long list of familiar phrases which are "trotted out" upon the occasion of every speech on United States-Canadian friendship. In the future, our two countries will not only share the world's longest unfortified border, a common language, a common culture, and a common heritage, but a common fuse as well.

On last September 27, nine of my Republican colleagues in the House of Representatives and I issued a detailed white paper on United States-Canadian relations. We listed 26 specific recommendations to the U.S. administration for U.S. policy, covering such areas as education and journalistic exchange programs, U.S. business practices in Canada, trade relations between the two countries, expansion of the United States-Canadian International Joint Commission, problems of water sharing, U.S. immigration policy, and the organization of the U.S. Government to deal with Canadian affairs.

It seems appropriate for me to review with you tonight the reception which this Republican effort has achieved over the past 10 weeks. Our efforts received broad editorial endorsement by nearly every major Canadian newspaper. My own office has been flooded with letters of congratulations and appreciation from Canadian citizens—both private and public. And, contrary to the expectations of some skeptics, we were able to achieve the not inconsiderable feat of producing a provocative document on United States-Canadian affairs in the middle of the Canadian election without, at the same time, providing either candidate with an election issue.

While we are, of course, gratified by the favorable reaction in Canada, the document was written primarily to influence Americans and the U.S. administration. While U.S. newspapers have also been generous in their comments, we have not perceptibly budged the administration in its lethargic approach toward United States-Canadian affairs.

The chairmanship of the American section of the International Joint Commission is still vacant, as it has been for the last 477 days.

Canadian relations in the Department of State are still anachronistically conducted under the Office of British Commonwealth and Northern European Affairs.

There are still no plans, of which I am aware, to expand the Fulbright student exchange program to include Canada.

The Merchant-Heeney report of 6 months ago is still merely a skeleton of guiding principles with no meat yet put upon the bones.

The more far-reaching of the Republican proposals of last September will take a long time to consider, to negotiate, and to implement. But the simple steps indicated above could be taken now, by simple direction of the President. And though they are small steps, they could do much to restore to Canadian-American relations a sound basis upon which more progressive measures can be built.

Permit me to pause for a moment to stress the need for a chairman of the U.S. section of the International Joint Commission. Throughout the 477-day American vacancy, the corresponding Canadian post has been filled by one of Canada's most outstanding public servants, the Honorable A. D. P. Henney, who on two occasions has been Canadian Ambassador to the United States. His appointment has been a great honor to the United States. By comparison, the long U.S. vacancy is insulting.

Through all the ups and downs of Canadian relations, the IJC has remained a steady bulwark of close international cooperation. Its technical studies prepared the way for international agreements on the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Columbia River Basin projects. Today it is charged with examining the important problems of water pollution and decline in the water level of the Great Lakes. In these and its more routine tasks, the IJC is severely hampered without an American chairman. Most immediately relevant of all, it is the IJC which has the technical capacity, if provided with the appropriate political leadership, to undertake an intensive international study to prevent a recurrence of the frightening power failure of November 9.

My Republican colleagues and I, in a statement on July 23, pleaded with the President to fill the vacancy. We urged him to do so in our September 27 white paper. In a personal letter to the President on October 19, I once more encouraged him to remove this increasingly serious irritant in United States-Canadian relations. Once more on November 9, the day after the Canadian elections and the day of the blackout, I again wrote to the President to urge his action. Perhaps a direct appeal from the officers and directors of the Canadian Society of New York would have a greater influence at the White House. In any event, I encourage you to send one.

One other subject requires special comment and immediate attention. On last September 30, the Congress passed new immigration legislation. I welcomed it and voted for it as a long-overdue change in U.S. immigration policy by removing the obnoxious and discriminatory system of national quotas. The bill, nonetheless, contains a serious flaw—an annual limit of 120,000 immigrants from the Western Hemisphere that might seriously hinder the flow of immigrants to this country from our contiguous neighbors—from Canada and Mexico. The State of Maine's culture has benefited greatly from immigrants from the Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces.

During the fiscal year 1964, 139,284 persons, including spouses and children, emigrated from the Western Hemisphere countries to the United States. Over one-half of these came from our immediate neighbors—38,074 from Canada and 32,967 from Mexico.

If the rate of Western Hemisphere emigration to the United States remains at this level or, as is more likely, increases, and if the bill is administered on a first-come, first-served basis, there is no assurance whatsoever that Canadian and Mexican emigration to the United States will not be affected.

I am sympathetic to the proposition that if regional immigration quotas are assigned to the rest of the world, they should also be assigned to the Western Hemisphere, for there is no inherent difference between these nations and others. There is, however, one vital distinction between Canada and Mexico and all the other nations of the world. They are the only two countries which border directly on the United States—and in my opinion fully free and unlimited immigration between the United States and its immediate neighbors should be maintained.

The bill provides for a study commission to review its potential effects on Western Hemisphere immigration before it goes into effect in June 1968. I hope the study commission will carefully consider the desirability of amending this legislation before that date, to provide for a continuing free flow of immigrants across U.S. borders with Canada and Mexico.

As our September white paper warns, however, "if no limit is placed on immigration from Canada to the United States, the two Governments will nonetheless have to agree on a formula which will prevent citizens from third countries emigrating to Canada, meeting the requirements for Canadian citizenship and then emigrating again to the United States under the quota-free Canadian clause."

It is tempting to dwell here on some of the far-reaching, more provocative proposals of our Republican white paper, and I can assure you that our congressional group in the months to come will spell out in even greater detail the concepts which we have developed for a program of continued water sharing, for an expanded role for the IJC, for further study of how to expand United States-Canadian trade, for a systematic effort to increase student and journalistic exchange. But it may be more important here to stress a portion of that report which has, thus far, received only secondary attention.

We suggested that in addition to all the frequently cited and indisputably correct reasons for closer United States-Canadian ties, there is a new obligation that this highly complex and vulnerable world has imposed upon our two great nations. It is the obligation to set a standard in the conduct of international affairs, to provide a model for relations between independent states. If the United States and Canada cannot establish a model of peaceful and progressive relations, which nations can?

Throughout history, men have grouped together for their common security, for their common prosperity, and for both. The catalyst of unity for some was geography. For some it was religion. And for the last three centuries it has been the nation-state.

Nationalism as a unifying force has provided the impetus for progress. It has produced prosperity out of poverty and order out of chaos. Its virtues are evident.

But the vices of nationalism are no less evident. It has set people against people. It has allowed demagogues to lead by creating a mythical challenge from without. And in a world where man's capacity of destruction seems endless, national unity has become, in a real sense, a source of international disunity and intense peril.

It was misconducted nationalism which throughout the last three centuries fanned the latent embers of human emotion into the flames of war. It is a luxury the world can no longer afford. As the newly independent nations of Africa and Asia set out on the inevitable search for national power and national prestige, we must strive to provide for them a better example than the national history of their elders.

We said in September that the purpose of the efforts of the United States and Canada must be to seek to identify and reemphasize the constructive virtues of the nation-state system while minimizing its destructive vices. In the transformation of men and nations, it is necessary to begin where the problems are small—and where the opportunity for progress is great. It is from this perspective that United States-Canadian relations takes on more significance and more promise than relations between any two other countries of the world. It is in this perspective that we share a greater obligation to set aside petty disagreements and differences in order to build on the North American Continent a model of cooperation between independent states which we would see repeated by nations everywhere.

That obligation extends far beyond the two Governments to the peoples of both countries. Its beginning must be found in education about each other. We said in September that there is an appalling ignorance about Canada in the United States, and we suggested that 1966 be designated as "The Year of a New Awareness of Canada." No matter how extensive its interest and dedication, the Government alone cannot create that new awareness, cannot itself forge the foundation of mutual understanding between peoples—an understanding which can allow our two countries to write the first chapter of a new and more noble history of relations between nations.

Therefore, I urge you and organized groups of Canadian citizens which exist in every major city in this country to declare 1966 as your own personal "Year of a New Awareness of Canada" in the United States. I urge the U.S. chambers of commerce, the Rotary, the Lions, the Kiwanis, our political parties, and trade unions, our church groups and educational foundations, the Leagues of Women Voters, and the World Affairs Councils to accept their share of responsibility for building a basis of understanding upon which our two Governments can build a model of international relations.

The challenge and the opportunity are there. The challenge and the opportunity are yours.

A Breakthrough in New Urban Transport Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last session I introduced H.R. 9200, which would have amended the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for an urban transport research and development program.

Twenty-one other Members of the House have introduced identical legislation. In the Senate, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] introduced an identical bill, S. 2599, which was cosponsored by 10 other Senators.

The sponsors of the legislation in the House, in addition to myself, include: the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], H.R. 9201; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL], H.R. 9202; the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], H.R. 9763; the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], H.R. 9995; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN], H.R. 9826; the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], H.R. 9996; the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], H.R. 9997; the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. IRWIN], H.R. 10857; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON], H.R. 9998; the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG], H.R. 9999; the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCARTHY], H.R. 10000; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH], H.R. 10001; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD], H.R. 10002; the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], H.R. 9203; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RONAN], H.R. 10003; the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], H.R. 9204; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM], H.R. 10279; the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], H.R. 9205; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], H.R. 9206; the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER], H.R. 9207; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], H.R. 9208.

The sponsors of S. 2599, in addition to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], include: the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The January 1966 issue of Traffic Quarterly carries an article by me explaining the need for Federal research and development into the problems of urban transport, and outlining the provisions of H.R. 9200:

A BREAKTHROUGH IN NEW URBAN TRANSPORT SYSTEMS

(By Representative HENRY S. REUSS)

The most pressing transportation problem facing the country today is to devise systems of public transport capable of meeting the needs of large metropolitan areas.

As a cure for the intracity transportation problem, we are relying on the Mass Transportation Act of 1964. Unfortunately, the act can do little more than help cities purchase new buses or replace wornout subway cars. While this program has been helpful, the Federal Government has not taken the additional step it should take. It has not sponsored substantial research in an effort to develop new, dynamic systems which will provide urban dwellers with good public transport.

Within the past year, the administration has committed $90 million to a 3-year program to develop new modes of high-speed, intercity ground transportation. It has also given the go-ahead to a program to develop a supersonic air transport which could require as much as a $1 billion investment of public funds.

We should be making a comparable effort to develop new systems of moving people about within our cities rapidly, safely, economically, and efficiently.

Today, nearly three-quarters of our population lives in urban areas. By 1980 the urban population will be 80 percent of the total, or over 200 million people—more than the present population of the entire country. All of these people will have to move about the cities in which they live. We cannot forever depend on existing transportation systems. The Federal Government must promote the development of systems which will supplement existing modes.

In view of this need, during the last session of Congress I introduced legislation, H.R. 9200, to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 setting up a research program aimed at achieving a technological breakthrough in the development of new modes of urban transportation. Twenty other Members of the House have introduced identical legislation.

The bill carries an authorization of $10 million annually for the next 2 years—the remainder of the life of the mass transit program—and makes it mandatory that the research be undertaken. The research, the legislation specifies, must be designed to create completely new urban transit systems, rather than merely finding ways of improving existing ones.

SPACE AGE TECHNOLOGY IS NEEDED

Technological breakthrough is a space age phrase which has yet to be applied generally to earthly space age problems. Wonders have been accomplished in our efforts to send a man to the moon. There is no reason why this same genius cannot be put to use to send a man more speedily from his home to his place of work or other city destination.

A comparison of the Federal Government's expenditures for research and development illustrate dramatically how these efforts neglect common areas of human need. For fiscal 1966, the administration requested nearly $15.5 billion for research and development. Most of the funds were earmarked for the Department of Defense, the space program and the Atomic Energy Commission—$13 billion. Other agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, got lesser amounts totaling $2.5 billion.

Some Federal research and development funds do go for improving transportation systems. But here again the effort is badly out of balance, with no funds earmarked specifically for intracity transit problems.

Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, in testimony May 25, 1965, before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the administration's proposal, since enacted, to set up a Federal program to develop new modes of high-speed ground transportation for travel between cities, reported on Federal transportation research expenditures. He said that in fiscal 1963 the Federal Government spent $275 million for aviation research, $24 million for highway research, $15 million for water transportation research, and $7 million for research into intercity rail problems.

The funds invested in highway research, for example, were largely devoted to safety problems and ways to improve road design, construction, and maintenance.

Rail transportation research is being augmented during the current fiscal year by an additional $10 million as a result of enactment of the high-speed ground transport program. The remaining $10 million of the $20 million authorized for this program, familiarly known as the northeast corridor project, is being used for gathering statistics on ground transportation needs and demands—$2 million—and setting up a demonstration high-speed train to run along the corridor—$8 million. The Congress authorized a total of $90 million for the program over a 3-year period, with increasingly larger amounts going for research. Of the entire $90 million, the Department of Commerce has earmarked $8 million for the statistics program, $18 million for demonstration, and $64 million for research and development.

THE NEED IS FOR INTERCITY TRANSIT

It is well that the Federal Government intends to help achieve a technological breakthrough in rail transportation between cities, and in the supersonic air transport which will be able to fly at speeds up to 2,000 miles per hour. But we should recognize the equal, if not greater, need for a technological breakthrough in intracity transportation.

Few statistics are available on the demand for intercity, as opposed to intracity, travel. However, one of the ways of measuring the need for service, as Secretary Connor demonstrated in his testimony, is in population density. The Secretary reported, as part of his justification for Federal assistance to the northeast corridor project, that the population density of the area which the proposed system would serve was 854 people per square mile.

The population tables for 1960 show that in the 120 largest cities in the country, those with populations over 100,000, the population density ranges from 6,000 to nearly 25,000 people per square mile. While these figures are admittedly at best a rough guide, they do give an indication of where the need lies.

In addition, the advantages which truly effective and efficient urban transportation systems would offer cities are numerous.

Air pollution, caused to a large extent by automotive exhaust which continues to aggravate the city dwellers and to injure their health, would be reduced. Prof. Morris Neiburger of the University of California at Los Angeles, an expert on air pollution problems, has predicted that polluted air may well kill off our civilization within the next century unless the automobile population explosion is checked. In order to prevent this he suggests we need to develop a vehicle which has the advantages of the automobile but is not powered by the internal combustion engine.

Accidents as a result of transportation would be reduced. Private motorcars are the most serious cause of vehicular accidents, and in 1964 automotive traffic caused 1.7 million injuries, of which 47,800 were deaths. In urban areas alone there were 980,000 injuries and 14,500 deaths. In addition, the costs resulting from accidents are considerable. In 1964 the damage bills for all urban accidents amounted to $4.6 billion, with property damage accounting for over half, or $2.6 billion.

Good urban transport systems would reduce commuter costs. Automobiles are expensive to operate. Including depreciation, maintenance and repairs, fuel, insurance and other related expenses, a car costs between 10 cents and 12 cents per mile to run.

Finally, strangulation of city areas by urban highways, excessive numbers of parking lots, and all the rest that goes with present commuter traffic results in making our cities uglier rather than more beautiful places to live and work. Establishment of effective urban transportation systems would help to reverse this trend.

ACT NEEDS RESEARCH MANDATE

The Mass Transportation Act of 1964 authorized a total grant appropriation of $375 million over a 3-year period. The funds are given to communities to meet part of the cost of improving mass transportation facilities and equipment. The law also stipulates that of the $375 million, up to $10 million a year can be appropriated for a program of: "Research, development and demonstration projects in all phases of urban transportation (including the development, testing, and demonstration of new facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods) which he determines will assist in the reduction of urban transportation needs, the improvement of mass transportation service, or the contribution of such service toward meeting total urban transportation needs at minimum cost."

This is not a proper mandate for the type of research program that is needed, for under this provision all the funds for research, development, and demonstration have been devoted to demonstration projects.

The cost of equipping our cities properly with existing mass transportation facilities has been put as high as $10 billion. Obviously, $375 million will not move us very far toward this goal. Thus, the demands on the program are considerable, and the administrators apparently have felt it necessary to apply all the program's financial resources (including the $10 million annually for "research, development, and demonstration") toward meeting the demand.

Writing in this journal for July 1964, John C. Kohl, Assistant Administrator (Transportation) of the old Housing and Home Finance Agency, the predecessor to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, described the Agency's policy toward the pilot mass transit demonstration project, which preceded the 1964 act:

"Further, the emphasis of the law upon 'carrying out urban transportation plans and research' has been interpreted to mean that demonstration projects should be oriented to operational problems and the practical evaluation of specific plans or the prosecution of basic transportation research."

The policy of the Department remains unchanged today.

While the demonstration grants no doubt lead to greater knowledge and understanding of urban transport problems, they do not begin to explore the possibilities that are on the horizon and where the real solution to our intracity transit problems lie.

Demonstration projects, as described by the Department, are categorized under three main types. The first type consists of testing the effect in changes in service and fare structure. The second tests new equipment and operating techniques (e.g., exclusive bus rights-of-way, new signaling devices, new fare collection equipment and new types of transportation systems), in order to evaluate their performance under actual service conditions. The third tests new techniques or methods for organizing, managing, promoting or coordinating transit operations.

An example of the type of new systems which the Department has assisted include Pittsburgh's skybus consisting of small lightweight vehicles capable of carrying approximately 30 people and operated along a separate right-of-way. Another example is Oakland's air cushion vehicle which is propelled by a turboshaft engine and capable of traveling over both land and water.

While steps in the right direction, these systems do not constitute a technological breakthrough. They are only a glimpse of what can be done as a result of extensive research.

INDIVIDUAL TRANSPORT DESIRED

The American people have an apparent desire for transportation systems stylized to their own individual needs. They want transportation which enables them to leave when they wish and go directly to their destination without transferring. Because existing urban transport systems do not satisfy this criterion, the city traveler today relies heavily on his automobile for getting about the city.

An October 1964 report by the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc., of Buffalo, N.Y., for the Office of the Under Secretary for Transportation Policy in the Department of Commerce documented this point in reviewing new urban transportation systems still in the drawing board stage. The study on which the report was based was contracted as part of the Department's analysis of transportation needs in the Northeast Corridor running from Washington to Boston between now and 1980 and designed to forecast new highway technology which might be utilized in that area.

According to the Cornell report, an urbmobile system which gives the city traveler "individual freedom, dispersal of origins, and feeder capability on the street networks, coupled with a capability to reach the city center under automatic control on a high-density track system" is the mode of urban transport which should be developed because it would meet the desire of people for individual transport.

The report stated that a new urban transport system "must, to a high degree, be immediately compatible with people and their established way of life, else it will not even survive its childbirth and growing pains." Therefore, it suggests, the "direction for development in commuter transportation that appears to hold more promise is that of an automated system of small individual urban vehicles." The report concludes:

"The automated portion of the system could properly be routed and integrated with existing streets and urban expressways to best serve the origin-destination requirements of both the suburban and the urban population. This system would, at least in its initial applications, be designed to supplement the existing street system rather than replace it."

THE COMMUCAR—A GOOD EXAMPLE

A good example of the urbmobile and the type of new system which could be developed under an extensive Federal research program is the commucar which has been proposed by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The commucar was the result of a cooperative faculty-student effort in the spring of 1964 stimulated by the institute's natural interest in transportation problems generally and by its work for the Department of Commerce on preliminary aspects of the northeast corridor project.

The commucar is envisioned as a small, lightweight vehicle which can carry up to four passengers. It could travel along guideways getting power from an electric siderail, or it could be driven independently under its own power. Besides safety and speed, the commucar, as conceived, would have the advantage of taking its passengers directly to their destination without the necessity of transfer. Because the vehicle as designed would be light and compact, it could be parked easily and in constricted quarters, even perhaps racked one upon the other.

Other systems include the starrcar developed by the Alden Self Transit Systems Corp. of Westboro, Mass., and the teletrans devised by the Teletrans Corp. of Detroit, Mich. The starrcar is quite similar in function to the commucar, while the teletrans system confines its vehicles to the guideways, keeping them under automatic control at all times.

While technologically feasible, more research is needed before model demonstration systems for the commucar for example, can be constructed. Because of the scale of the project and the expense involved, this research is unlikely to be undertaken unless it is sponsored by the Federal Government. While conducting the research, the engineers could undoubtedly take advantage of advances made by the space industry, particularly in the area of propulsion and computer control. Perhaps some of the space advances could be adapted to urban transportation use.

The automotive industry, too, would be able to contribute its expertise in developing the vehicles to be used in new systems, and then in manufacturing them.

In fact, the research program could, and should, go beyond merely developing the technological features of a new system. It should seek to determine the impact it would have on the society in which it will operate. As John Kohl stated in his July 1964 article in this periodical with regard to the pilot mass transit demonstration program then in operation, "Overall, the problems of urban transportation are being considered as integral parts of the physical and social complex of urban growth and change; they are not treated as isolated technical problems, to be solved entirely by transportation considerations." This is entirely a proper undertaking for any federally sponsored research program.

FEDERAL INCENTIVE NEEDED

Private industry, as it is expected to do now, cannot carry the burden of this research. Mr. Kohl in a speech to the National Transportation Engineering Conference in Cincinnati, Ohio, on February 19, 1964, pointed out that the transportation industry is slow to undertake its own research and development programs because of the difficulty of getting that investment back through the sale of the new equipment and systems. Thus, only a federally financed program can get the job done. The histories of the Manhattan project which ultimately produced atomic energy for civilian use, and of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration which has contributed so much to our knowledge in the use of space vehicles demonstrate the value of a concerted Federal effort into a particular problem.

If the Federal Government had not taken the initiative in the development of atomic energy and space satellites, we would never have reaped the harvest we enjoy today. Without a considerable Federal effort to devise new urban transportation systems, it will be many years before we successfully cope with this problem. If we launch today a Federal research program for the development of new modes of urban transport, we can enjoy the fruits of the work in the 1970's.

The report of the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory concludes that the Federal Government should undertake a research program to develop new modes of urban transport. Among its major recommendations for improving transportation along the northeast corridor it says:

"Initiate a program to define, design, and develop an experimental prototype urban individual transportation system employing a specialized form of vehicle and guidance."

The report goes on to point out that many of the technical and system aspects of new urban transport systems still in the drawing board stage have not yet been solved. Consequently, it says:

"Technical study in greater depth, accompanied by experimental development, is necessary before the technical feasibility, economics, and public acceptance can be realistically evaluated."

Furthermore, John Kohl, in an April 16, 1964, speech before the Conference on Responsibilities for Urban Transportation Planning in Newark, N.J., predicted that a Federal stimulus would be necessary to foster the research necessary to develop new systems and that the stimulus would be forthcoming in the then pending Mass Transportation Act of 1964. He said:

"It is confidently believed that a very modest Federal effort coupled with the program to improve the financial climate of the transit industry can unlock the great research and development talents of American industries and universities so far as urban transportation is concerned. As a result, there can be available in the not-too-distant future, better and more appropriate transit systems to complement our unexcelled highway facilities and to round out an effectively balanced system of community transportation.

"If we recognize the true nature of the present crisis—that of avoiding the loss of public transportation—we can avert it before it assumes staggering proportions."

Unfortunately, the stimulus that Mr. Kohl suggested would be forthcoming from the 1964 act has not materialized. Thus if we are to recognize the true nature of the present crisis we need to establish soon a federally sponsored research program that will unlock the great research and development talents of American industries and universities.

We know the technological breakthrough is needed: to develop systems which can carry people quickly, safely, and economically from place to place within urban areas, without polluting the air, and in such a way as to meet the needs of the people for individual transport, and at the same time contribute to good city planning.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 13, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted this verse of Scripture:

John 1: 17: *The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.*

Almighty God, teach us that no aspiration or hope or truth, vouchsafed to our souls, is too high or holy to be fulfilled by Thy love and power.

Grant that we may cultivate those truths which will make us wise and faithful toward Thee and give us a conception of life and duty which relates to the inheritance and destiny of humanity.

May the life of the Christ, which was full of Thy grace and truth, make us equal to all the issues, the problems, the difficulties, the tragedies of our troubled and tangled times.

Help us to realize that He is still the keeper of the kind of life which we must seek to know and be ready and eager to share with mankind.

May we feel that the need is urgent and the time is opportune that men everywhere must partake in His grace and truth.

In His name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AFFIRMATION: VIETNAM—STUDENT BODY MOVEMENT AT EMORY UNIVERSITY

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, at Emory University in Atlanta, Ga., a large number of the student body at that great institution have organized and launched a movement to affirm the college students' support of this Nation's commitment in Vietnam. The operation is entitled "Affirmation: Vietnam." Under the leadership of young, intelligent, patriotic students at Emory, the organization, under the direction of Mr. Remar Sutton, general chairman, is getting widespread support among all of our college students and among business, professional, and citizen leaders in general.

At a time when this Congress and our Nation's leadership are faced with the critical problems in deciding how best to commit and employ our resources to achieve peace and promote understanding throughout the world, it is encouraging and, yes, even inspiring to one in public office to observe such patriotism and understanding in the vast majority of our college students in this land. We in Georgia are particularly pleased that such a movement has been launched by our young leaders and I believe this Congress will be glad to take note of the positive support generated by these young Americans swiftly approaching the time when they must shoulder the responsibilities we carry today.

It is planned that this movement by these young Georgians will result in a mass gathering of college students from all the institutions in Georgia and from neighboring States as well on the 12th of February in the Atlanta Stadium, at which time it is hoped that the world may be put on notice that a vast majority of our young people in America today fully realize the grave and complex problems confronting our Nation and freedom-loving nations everywhere. This sharp contrast to a small minority of Americans unwilling to make the sacrifices necessary to preserve our freedom is a most welcome display of patriotism at this time of crisis.

It is unfortunate that we find ourselves engaged in a conflict so widely misunderstood and it is important not only for the issues surrounding the immediate conflict to be thoroughly understood, but it is imperative that the public understand this effort to be one of avoiding world war III, the cost of which we simply cannot afford or the results of which we simply cannot afford. There is an old proverb admonishing us to study and remember our history or else we shall be condemned to live it again and now is the time when everyone must reflect upon the histories of World War I and World War II and realize that this effort in Vietnam is to try to eliminate the possibility of confrontation with adversaries in a world war III which would subject our people and our resources to catastrophe.

I salute the leadership of the "Affirmation: Vietnam" operation and I trust that this expression of patriotism for our country and confidence in our leadership will spread to all the college campuses throughout the United States.

PROJECT AFFIRMATION VIETNAM

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks just made by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of students at Emory University, Atlanta, Ga., project "Affirmation: Vietnam" has been undertaken. While I do not know all of the student leaders of this movement, those who are personally known to me represent the finest of America's youth.

I am informed that a statewide rally has been scheduled in Atlanta, Ga., on Saturday, February 12, 1966, and that the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, has accepted an invitation to attend, at which time the written affirmation of thousands of Georgians supporting the position of the U.S. Government in Vietnam will be presented. I have signed this affirmation of support, and I expect to be present in Atlanta on February 12.

The question of whether the United States should be committed in southeast Asia is no longer debatable. Our commitment is a fact.

The word of the Government of the United States was given in 1954 during the administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower and during the incumbency of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. That commitment has been ratified by President John F. Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and subsequently ratified by President Lyndon B. Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk.

The eyes of the world, among friend, foe, and uncommitted alike, are focused on the United States and upon the question of whether an honorable commitment made by the United States will be honored and defended.

During recent months certain private individuals and some organized groups have publicly repudiated the position of the United States of America. Some have burned draft cards, and others have advocated the burning of draft cards. With such position I find myself in total disagreement.

While I respect the right of free speech at all times, I do not believe that the right of free speech includes treasonable utterances or the lending of aid and comfort to an armed enemy which is inflicting casualties on American men at arms.

If either or both of our two sons is called to active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States, each will respond with pride in his country. Each will enter service with my full approval and with all the continuing support which, as a citizen and a Representative in Congress, I can provide for all Americans who serve in the Armed Forces of the United States.

All 50 colleges and universities in Georgia have indicated their participation in and support of "Affirmation: Vietnam." Georgia colleges agree unanimously on the program of "Affirmation: Vietnam" and the good it can do in affecting majority interest on the national press and international opinion, and more important, that the people of the United States stand behind our commitment.

Project "Affirmation: Vietnam" demonstrates the pride in country which these young Americans feel. It demonstrates that they wish to repudiate those who lend aid and comfort to the Communists of Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow. I commend them for initiating this project, and I wish them every success as they indicate the overwhelming support of the Government of the United States and the commitment which this Government has made.

The chairman of "Affirmation: Vietnam," Remer M. Sutton, Jr., in commenting on its purpose, quoted Commodore Stephen Decatur, an American naval hero, who in 1816 said:

> Our country. In her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong.

PROJECT AFFIRMATION VIETNAM

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with my colleagues, and I am happy to know that young Georgians are asserting their support of our commitment in Vietnam through the proposal of "Affirmation: Vietnam." In times of crisis such as this it is imperative that the citizens of our great Nation give their willing support to the actions and commitments made by our Government.

Many times the State of Georgia has proved itself a leader among the States, and by "Affirmation: Vietnam" I am sure the people of Georgia will once again distinguish themselves as a strong citizen body behind their Government.

I believe that keeping our commitment in Vietnam and southeast Asia is essential for it is there that the future influence and power of the United States will be determined. We must prove in Vietnam that aggressive warfare can be stopped.

There are none more worthy of our support than our fighting men in Vietnam. By their bravery and skill against the terrorist tactics of the enemy, they have proven themselves worthy of a place in our hearts. It is for them and the future of our freedoms that I wish every success in this effort of the college youth of Georgia. I congratulate, too, the 10th district student leader, Stanton Singleton, Jr., and his friends who are leading this action in my district.

PROJECT AFFIRMATION VIETNAM

Mr. TUTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUTEN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is with profound pride that I join my fellow colleagues from the State of Georgia in recognizing some young Georgians for a patriotic move, "Affirmation: Vietnam."

At a time when some of the youth of our Nation are failing entirely to express the convictions of the average American, it is encouraging indeed that a group of young people from Georgia express the real spirit of American young manhood.

I join my colleagues in lending my entire support and commendation to this group of young Americans. I predict that their spirit of patriotism will spread throughout the realm of our Nation.

PROJECT AFFIRMATION VIETNAM

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of Saturday, February 12, 1966, Secretary of State Dean Rusk will address a great rally in our new stadium in Atlanta, Ga.

The rally will be an important and significant event because it was conceived by the college students in my district and elsewhere in Georgia and it evidences a strong desire on their part to demonstrate their allegiance to the principles on which our Nation was founded and a desire to hear firsthand from one of our Nation's leaders. We are proud of the fact that the Secretary of State is a native of Georgia and received his high school education in Atlanta.

The meeting has been named "Affirmation: Vietnam." In early December I met with key student leaders who told me they deplored as highly misleading the enormous publicity given a relatively few young people who publicly burned their draft cards and otherwise expressed their contempt for our lawful processes of government. They expressed their desire to show their appreciation for our heritage. I gave them my wholehearted encouragement.

After visiting extensively with young people of high school and college age I am convinced that the greatest hope for the extension of freedom in this world is to be found in the hearts and minds of this rising generation.

I commend this expression of loyalty on the part of these young men and women.

I extend my remarks by attaching the highly informative bipartisan report of five U.S. Senators to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States dated January 6, 1966, which I believe will be of interest to all who share a deep concern about Vietnam:

THE VIETNAM CONFLICT: THE SUBSTANCE AND THE SHADOW

(Report of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE, Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Senator J. CALEB BOGGS to the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate)

A. VIETNAM: THE SUBSTANCE OF WAR

1. Introductory

The most important new factor in the war in Vietnam has been the introduction of large numbers of U.S. troops into South Vietnam and their direct entry into combat. This augmentation of the U.S. military role in Vietnam was a response to a near-desperate situation early in 1965. There is no question that the Government of Vietnam in Saigon was faced with a rapidly deteriorating position at that time.

After the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem, repeated coups had weakened the cohesiveness of the central authority and acted to stimulate public disaffection and indifference to the war. At the same time, there was a greatly accelerated military drive by strengthened Vietcong forces. Their control expanded over large areas of the country, particularly in provinces adjacent to the western borders. Communications and transportation between population centers became increasingly hazardous, except by Vietcong sufferance. In short, a total collapse of the Saigon government's authority appeared imminent in the early months of 1965.

U.S. combat troops in strength arrived at that point in response to the appeal of the Saigon authorities. The Vietcong counter response was to increase their military activity with forces strengthened by intensified local recruitment and infiltration of regular North Vietnamese troops. With the change in the composition of opposing forces the character of the war also changed sharply.

2. Military forces of the Government of Vietnam

The Government of Vietnam now has approximately 635,000 men under arms. Of this number, however, only about 300,000 are regular troops of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, with about 88 percent being Army troops. A general reserve of six airborne battalions and five marine battalions is equipped to fight anywhere in the country.

The Vietnamese Government has six fighter-bomber squadrons. It also has a small navy, composed of sea, river, and coastal forces.

In the total of 635,000 men there are also regional forces of about 120,000 men which act as a constabulary in the 43 Provinces. Each province chief, who has a military well as a civil capacity, has a number of regional force companies under his command. Popular forces number about 140,000. Lightly armed, this group is recruited as a rule from local youth to act as defenders of villages and hamlets. A civilian irregular defense group is recruited by the Vietnamese Special Forces. It numbers about 25,000 and is posted in border areas for patrol purposes. Finally, there is a national police of about 50,000 men.

The total of 635,000 men in all categories is expected to be expanded in the current year, although a substantial increase is not anticipated. The sources of expanded recruitment are not great and, in any event, are shared with the Vietcong. Moreover, a high desertion rate continues, despite determined efforts to reduce it.

3. U.S. and international forces in Vietnam

In 1962, U.S. military advisers and service forces in South Vietnam totaled approximately 10,000 men. This number had increased by May of 1965 to about 34,000. At that time the American force was still basically an advisory organization. Americans, in regular combat units, were not yet engaged on the ground. U.S. helicopter companies were in use but only to supply tactical transportation to regular Vietnamese units and the U.S. jet fighter-bombers in the country with the exception of two or three squadrons of aircraft were not yet engaged in support of the Vietnamese Armed Forces.

By December 1965, however, there were approximately 170,000 U.S. troops in South Vietnam. Additionally, there were about 21,000 soldiers and marines from the Republic of Korea an infantry battalion and a battery of artillery, comprising some 1,200 men, from Australia, and a New Zealand artillery battery of about 150 men.

The augmented U.S. ground forces were composed of two Army divisions, the 1st Infantry Division and the 1st Air Cavalry Division, and two separate brigades, the 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division, and the 173d Airborne Brigade. The Australian and New Zealand troops were attached to the latter group. A full U.S. Marine division reinforced by a separate regiment was in Vietnam with the support of six Marine fighter-bomber squadrons.

The small Vietnamese coastal force was augmented by a number of U.S. naval ships and Coast Guard vessels. The U.S. 7th Fleet was off the Vietnamese coast. Planes from its carriers were active in the air campaign against North Vietnam. They were also reinforcing the U.S. Air Force and Vietnamese fighter-bomber squadrons in operations in South Vietnam.

Ten U.S. Air Force and Marine fighter-bomber squadrons were operating from five jet airfields in Vietnam; a sixth field was under construction. B–52 bombers from Guam were providing additional air strength, concentrating on more remote Vietcong bases which had previously been immune to harassment or attack.

The magnitude of the expanded U.S. military effort has required a vastly enlarged support complex. Starting almost from scratch in May of 1965, a logistic system has been built. There are four major logistic support areas. One is in the Saigon region, including Bien Hoa and Vung Tau. The other three are located along the coast, at Cam Rahn Bay, at Qui Nhon in Binh Dinh Province, and at Da Nang. The rapid infusion of American forces has strained the facilities of the new logistic system to the utmost, with long delays in unloading and moving equipment not unusual. There have also been and still are shortages of important items of supply despite efforts to eliminate these shortages.

4. Relationship of United States and Vietnamese forces

From the point of view of American policy and practice, the war itself remains a Vietnamese war. The American command emphasizes that U.S. forces in Vietnam are there to support the Vietnamese and their Armed Forces in the effort to resist aggression by infiltration from the north and terrorism and subversion from within. Vietnamese sovereignty and the paramount role of the Vietnamese are meticulously respected and the supporting nature of the U.S. role is stressed.

There is no combined or unified command of the international forces in Vietnam. United States and Vietnamese forces work together through coordination and cooperation. The commander of the U.S. forces maintains close liaison with the Vietnamese Minister of Defense and the Chief of the Joint General Staff. Strategy and plans are devised together. Parallel instructions are then issued to the respective commanders through corps and division to regimental level. In the execution of an operation a joint command post is set up or liaison officers are exchanged and terrain is apportioned for tactical areas of operation. According to American military commanders these arrangements have proved to be practical and workable.

5. Vietcong-North Vietnamese forces

In December 1965, the best available estimates placed Vietcong strength in South Vietnam at 230,000 men. This figure is double that of 3 years ago. Total Vietcong strength, apparently, is steadily increasing despite the serious casualties which these forces have suffered the past few months.

Of the present total, approximately 73,000 are main force soldiers, including 14,000 regular PAVN (People's Army of North Vietnam) troops from North Vietnam. The Vietcong forces also include about 100,000 militia, some 17,000 support troops who operate along lines of communication, and approximately 40,000 political cadres. It is estimated that the Vietcong, through local recruitment in the south and infiltration from the north, have the capability of a substantial increase in their numbers within a short period of time.

Infiltration of men from North Vietnam through Laos has been going on for many years. It was confined primarily to political cadres and military leadership until about the end of 1964 when North Vietnam Regular Army troops began to enter South Vietnam by this route. It is anticipated that with the multiplication of routes through Laos the rate of infiltration is likely to increase threefold from the present estimated 1,500 per month. The monsoon, which earlier was considered to be of great significance in its effect on the reinforcement capabilities of the Vietcong as well as on the ability of both sides to prosecute the war, has proved in experience to be of minor consequence if, indeed, of any consequence at all.

6. Current state of the war

By November 1965, American troops were directly involved in battle to a much greater degree than at any other time in the history of the Vietnamese conflict. At the same time, the intensity of the war itself reached a new high. The Vietcong initiated 1,038 incidents during the last week of November and the total number of incidents which had increased steadily throughout 1965, reached 3,588 in that month. These incidents involved armed attacks up to regimental strength as well as terrorism and sabotage of various kinds and antiaircraft fire against U.S. aircraft. In the later months of 1965 the trend was toward larger attacks, except in the Mekong Delta where there were numerous small-scale actions.

With the increase in the intensity of the conflict, there were increased numbers of casualties among all participants. In the month of November 1965, alone, 469 Americans were killed in action, a figure representing about 35 percent of all Americans killed in action in the war until that date. In addition, 1,470 Americans were listed as wounded and 33 as missing. During the same month the South Vietnamese Army reported 956 soldiers killed in action, 2,030 wounded, and 355 missing. The Vietcong, for their part, are estimated to have lost 5,300 men killed in the month and, in addition, 595 were taken prisoner. Many of these casualties were regulars of the North Vietnamese Army.

7. The security situation in South Vietnam

The presence of U.S. combat forces has acted to arrest the deterioration in general security in Government-controlled parts of South Vietnam. It has also improved the ability of the Vietnamese Government to hold Saigon, the strategic heart of the country, the coastal bases, and certain other key areas in the country. In the latter connection, it should be noted that a strategic route (19) from the coast to the western highlands has been reopened for convoyed ground traffic to Pleiku, a major military strong point in the western highlands. On certain other roads, an improvement in security is also reported.

8. Vietcong reactions

Faced by a blunting of their military efforts, the Vietcong have reacted strongly to the new situation. Beginning in June an estimated 1,500 North Vietnamese troops per month have entered South Vietnam through Laos and this number is rapidly increasing. The estimates are that at least seven regiments of regular troops from North Vietnam are now in the country with more on the way. At the same time the Vietcong have in recent months greatly stepped up the recruiting, induction, and training of South Vietnamese in the densely populated delta region. They have increased their small-scale attacks in that area, aiming apparently at isolated outposts and at demoralizing the regional and popular forces as well as harassing lines of supply and communication.

The stepped-up activity of the Vietcong in the countryside has been paralleled by an effort on the part of the Government forces to strengthen their control over the population in the base areas and their immediate environs. These base areas themselves are held in some force. At the U.S. Marine base at Da Nang, for example, the perimeter of security has been pushed out about 10 miles. The bulk of the U.S. Marine forces, however, is now preoccupied in defense within that perimeter. Nevertheless, it is still possible for the Vietcong to bypass the defenders and penetrate the area in sporadic hit-and-run raids. Communications between the base areas along the coast are still subject to Vietcong ambush and attack.

In Saigon, heavily defended as it is, the rattle of automatic weapons fire or the explosion of mortar shells in the outskirts of the city are not uncommon sounds by day or by night. Vietcong ability to carry out terroristic attacks within the city itself is from time to time made evident. Indeed, it is considered by some that Saigon with its many vulnerabilities to sabotage and terrorism and Hanoi with its exposure to air attack are mutual hostages, one for the other.

9. Impact of increased American forces on the Vietnamese

The arrival in Vietnam of American combat troops in large numbers has had an immediate positive psychological effect on Government-held areas. Not only has there been an improvement of morale in the Government and the Armed Forces, there has also been a return of confidence among Vietnamese civilians. This is especially true in Saigon where the increased American presence is taken as insurance against an imminent collapse of the existing structure.[1] Politically and commercially minded Vietnamese, seeing that the United States had so far committed itself, have found renewed courage and confidence.

Of great significance is the fact that there has been a period of Government stability in Vietnam following the arrival of additional U.S. troops. This stability is more essential than ever for the maintenance of public confidence after the debilitating consequences of the repeated coups which followed the assassination of President Diem. It is also vital for the effective prosecution of the war and the formulation and carrying out of social, economic, and political reform programs.

10. The government of Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky

The new leadership in Government which is drawn largely from military circles, is young and hopeful, but with little knowledge of politics. Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, the Prime Minister, recognizes that a purely military solution to the problems of Vietnam is not possible. Security and social and economic reform, in his view, must proceed hand in hand in order to gain the support of the people.

The new leaders express the intention of moving toward some form of representative civilian government, taking into account the history and needs of the Vietnamese people. They speak of a consultative assembly to prepare the way for a constitution and hearings throughout the country on the constitution with a view to a referendum at the end of 1966. The referendum, according to their concepts, would be followed by elections to a legislative body by the end of 1967, if by that time elections can be held without intimidation in as much as two-thirds of the country. Some observers believe that, perhaps, not more than 25 percent of the villages under Government control in South Vietnam would be free from intimidation at an election at the present time.

In addition to prosecuting the war, the Government of Vietnam is seeking to initiate measures to protect and improve the welfare of the population. With the indispensable assistance of U.S. aid, food and other commodities are being imported into the country to meet current needs and to insure that the price of staples such as rice, fish, and canned milk remain within the reach of the people.

11. The pacification or civic action program

A new effort is also being made to bring the people of the villages into closer and firmer rapport with the Government. In the period following the fall of the government of Ngo Dinh Diem, the so-called pacification or civic action program which brought government, police, economic, and social organization into the hamlets, was allowed in large measure to lapse. Due to subsequent changes of government, there were eventually only a very few people left to carry on this work. Military necessity required the Government to concentrate on attempting to stop Vietcong military advances.

The present Government is once again seeking to create an organization to carry out a program of pacification or civic action. Screening the cadres left from the programs of previous governments, a basic group has been selected. Together with additional groups to be trained it is expected that a total number adequate to meet the needs for pacification teams in the priority areas chosen by the Government of Vietnam will be available by the end of 1966.

The present plan for pacification work is regarded by observers as more thorough and more realistic than previous efforts. It contemplates teams remaining in each village for an initial period of several months with subsequent followups over a period of at least 1 year. The belief is that the inhabitants can generally be sufficiently won over to the side of the Government in that period and conditions established where elections for local officials can be held. It is realized, however, that even then the work cannot be considered as completed.

12. Other programs

In addition to giving strong support to the pacification program, the new Government has numerous other plans to better the lot of the people. There are, for example, projects to improve the pay of the troops, construct low-cost housing, and redistribute land. In this connection a program has been inaugurated to give 700,000 acres of land to 180,000 farmers. It is generally recognized that Government programs of this kind, many of which have been attempted in various forms before, will require years before any substantial political effect upon the population can be anticipated.

13. Economic aspects of the conflict

The Government of Vietnam has also instituted a resources control program in an effort to restrict the Vietcong's ability to get the things they need to carry on the war. In most parts of Vietnam, which is a naturally rich and productive country, it is not difficult to obtain enough food to support life. This is particularly true in the fertile and densely populated delta of the south with its great rice fields and network of interconnecting canals. The Vietcong obtain money by many means, including taxation and extortion, and they can and do use these funds to purchase food in the countryside and medicines in district and provincial towns. The Vietcong can and do attack trucks and convoys on the roads and seize the weapons, ammunition, and the other goods which they may carry.

---

[1] The illustrative story is told of the Vietnamese professional man who sold his house in Saigon in January of 1965 in despair over the deteriorating situation, only to buy back the same house later in the year, following the arrival of American troops, for twice the price at which he had sold it.

By a system of rationing, identity cards, and resource control, including checkpoints and mobile control teams, however, the Government hopes to stop the Vietcong from obtaining key commodities such as food and medicines in key areas such as the highlands, which is a deficit region. In other areas it is hoped that the system will make goods less available for the Vietcong and more difficult for them to obtain.

It must be said that there is also a reverse side to this picture. The Vietcong, operating in the countryside, have the ability to restrict the flow of food to cities and population centers such as Saigon. Vegetables, for example, come to Saigon from Dalat in the central highlands. Sugar also comes to Saigon along the same road which is controlled in part by the Vietcong. It is common knowledge that commodities reaching Saigon's markets by road from the Dalat area have paid a tax to the Vietcong before reaching the city and that unless the tax is paid they will not reach the city. The fact is plain: Much of Saigon's indigenous food and commodity supply depends on the sufferance of the Vietcong and on payments to them.

The ravages of war and terrorism, however, are taking a toll of the country's productive capacity. Rice fields and rubber plantations in areas that are being bombed and fought over no longer produce their contribution to feed the people and to nourish the economy. Fledgling enterprises in outlying areas, cut off from supplies and from markets by interrupted communications, wither, and fail.

Along with increased Vietcong activity in the delta in recent months, there has been growing Vietcong restriction on the flow of rice from that region to the Saigon market. The result is that Vietnam, a rice surplus region, in 1966, will have to import at least 300,000 tons of rice from abroad under U.S. aid programs to feed the population of the cities and towns and under the Government's control.

Although, as has been said, the arrival of large numbers of American troops has gone far to restore business confidence in the cities of Vietnam, there have been adverse effects as well. One of these is the creation of a labor shortage, particularly among skilled workers, as men have been drained away from normal areas of employment to the base complexes and other regions where construction projects are being pushed to create the logistic structure and other facilities required by the American forces.

Inflationary pressures resulting from the war and the changed U.S. role have thus far been kept within bounds. Saigon itself, however, has an overstimulated atmosphere of almost hectic prosperity, in some respects, as the impact of spending by American servicemen and the effect of U.S. defense expenditure make themselves felt. There are also the beginnings of the rumblings of personal discontent and antagonism which generally characterize the reaction in any nation to the sudden infusion of a large body of foreign forces.

14. Summation

In sum, the overall control of the country remains about the same as it was at the beginning of 1965. It is estimated that about 22 percent of the population is under Vietcong control and that about 18 percent inhabits contested areas. About 60 percent of the population in the country is, at present, under some form of government control, largely because of its hold on Saigon and other cities and large towns.

The population of the cities has been augmented by a great number of refugees. Hundreds of thousands in number, they are for the greater part composed of people who have fled to the cities in an effort to escape the spreading intensity of the war. In this sense, they are unlike the refugees who came from North Vietnam in 1954. These earlier refugees consciously chose to leave their ancestral homes and come south permanently, rather than accept a Communist regime. The new refugees, for the most part, are believed merely to be waiting for an end to the fighting in order to return to their homes and land.

The Vietcong have stepped up sabotage, terrorism, and hit and run attacks in the Government-held areas which are, principally, cities and major towns and indeterminate, but limited, extensions outward from them. Harassment by United States and Vietnamese air attack and airborne forces has increased in the firmly held Vietcong areas of South Vietnam which are almost entirely rural. And, of course, North Vietnam has been brought under air attack.

In general, however, what the Saigon government held in the way of terrain in the early months of 1965 (and it was already considerably less than was held at the time of the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem), is still held. What was controlled then by the Vietcong is still controlled by the Vietcong. What lay between was contested at the outset of 1965 and is still contested.

B. VIETNAM AND THE NATIONS OF ASIA

Other nations of Asia generally view the conflict in Vietnam with great concern. Those countries nearest to Vietnam see in the spread and increasing intensity of the warfare a heightened danger of a spillover into their territory. They sense that the longer the conflict continues and the more it escalates the greater becomes this danger to themselves. Furthermore, they fear the effect upon their own future should all of Vietnam become a Communist state.

Laos already finds itself deeply although unwillingly involved on the fringes of the war in Vietnam. The fighting within Laos, which continues despite the 1962 Geneva Agreement, is now a closely interwoven part of the Vietnamese struggle. The connection is most pronounced in the eastern part of Laos which lies within the control of the Communist Pathet Lao forces. This region, the so-called Laotian panhandle, is a natural infiltration route for men and supplies from North Vietnam into South Vietnam. A long border abutting on South Vietnam makes it possible for troops and equipment from Hanoi to reach far south through Communist-controlled territory in Laos with a minimum of risk before being diverted across the border into South Vietnam by any number of lateral communications routes. New roads have been constructed through this mountainous terrain along which men and supplies can pass, for the most part undetected, protected as they are in some regions by double canopies of jungles foliage. These roads are not easily susceptible to aerial interdiction.

Cambodia, in a different manner and to a much lesser extent than Laos, is already directly touched by the fighting in Vietnam. There are repeated charges that Cambodian territory is being used as a base for Vietcong operations. That is possible in view of the remoteness and obscurity of the border but there is no firm evidence of any such organized usage and no evidence whatsoever that any alleged usage of Cambodian soil is with the sanction much less the assistance of the Cambodian Government. Prince Sihanouk responded immediately to a recent allegation that the Cambodian port of Sihanoukville is being used to transship supplies to the Vietcong by calling for an investigation by the International Control Commission which was set up under the Geneva Accords of 1954.

Cambodia's overwhelming concern is the preservation of its national integrity which, in times past, has been repeatedly violated by more powerful neighbors and is still subject to occasional forays from a minor dissident movement (the Khmer Serai) which has been allowed to base itself in the neighboring nations. Cambodia seeks recognition and respect of its borders by all parties to the conflict. It asks to be left to live in peace so that it may concentrate on its own problems and internal developments. The Cambodians have made great internal progress, largely through their own efforts supplemented by a judicious use of aid from the United States in the past and from other nations both in the past and at the present time. They have a peaceful and productive nation with an intense sense of national unity and loyalty to Prince Sihanouk.

The fact that fighting in South Vietnam has raged close to the border and there have, as a result, been occasional border incursions and bombing of Cambodian territory has caused the deepest concern to the Cambodian Government. Cambodia can be expected to make the most vigorous efforts to resist becoming directly involved in the struggle surging through South Vietnam and to repel to the best of its capability direct and organized invasions of its territory which may stem from the mounting tempo of the war.

Thailand, the only country on the southeast Asian mainland directly allied with the United States, seeks to cooperate with the United States as an ally while avoiding a spillover of the war into Thai territory. That course is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain. Thailand has a large number of North Vietnamese living in its northeast region bordering on Laos. This element retains an affinity for Hanoi and is susceptible to its influence. Moreover, in the recent past Peiping has brought to the forefront a Thai leader in exile and has increased the intensity of its propaganda attacks against Thailand. Reports of terrorism and sabotage in the northeast of Thailand are increasing.

The Vietnamese war was brought very close to Thai territory in November 1965. A Pathet Lao military thrust toward the Laotian town of Thakkek on the Mekong, which was supported by North Vietnamese troops, was fortuitously driven back by Government forces. Had it not been repelled, the war, in effect, would have reached the point where it made direct contact with Thailand's frontier.

Nations in Asia more geographically remote from the war in South Vietnam are nonetheless conscious of the dangers to the entire area as the struggle in South Vietnam becomes more prolonged and ever more intense. These countries range from neutral and nonalined Burma through such allies of the United States as the Philippines and Japan.

Each of the countries of Asia has its own internal problems. Each has varying degrees of internal stability. Each has as a principal concern, the avoidance of direct involvement in the Vietnamese conflict. With the exception of Korea, there is little likelihood of substantial material help from these sources in providing military assistance in South Vietnam. Others are either unwilling or reluctant to become involved in a military sense or are unable to do so because of inner difficulties or the broader strategic requirements of the Asian situation. Even with respect to Korea, it is obvious that any withdrawal of forces for use in Vietnam creates new problems of military balance as between North and South Korea. It should not be overlooked that peace in the Korean peninsula is still held together only by a tenuous truce.

The Asian nations generally are aware of their own relative powerlessness to influence the main course of events, or, in the final analysis, to control their own destinies should the conflict in Vietnam ultimately develop into a confrontation between the United States and Communist China with all that such an eventuality might imply for the peace of Asia and the world. In Japan, for example, there is a deep anxiety over the possible consequences to that nation of such a confrontation if it should materialize. The memory of the escalation of the limited Manchurian incident of 30 years ago into a seemingly interminable war on the mainland of China is not yet dead in Japan.

To sum up, then, the nations of Asia recognize the immense importance to themselves of what is transpiring in Vietnam. But they also recognize their own limitations in the face of it. Their immediate preoccupation, in any event, is with their own internal problems and development. Throughout the area there is a continuing interest in activities involving peaceful cooperation for economic development. The Peace Corps is generally welcomed wherever it operates and, notably, in the Philippines. The new Asian Development Bank is being launched with considerable enthusiasm. The Mekong project has warm support throughout the region and considerable interest in Cambodia, which is central to the concept.

It is clear that none of the nations of the area desires the domination of either China or the United States. Given a choice, it is doubtful that any nation would like to see the influence of the United States withdrawn completely from southeast Asia. Generally speaking, the nations of the area welcome peaceful ties with the United States and our participation in the development of the region if that participation does not become overwhelming.

C. THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE

Without exception the Soviet Union, Poland, and Rumania give full and firm support to the position of Hanoi and the Vietcong. They are quick in their denunciation of the United States role in South Vietnam and vehement against United States bombing in North Vietnam.

Part of this solidarity is undoubtedly derived from ideological affinities. Whatever attitudes they may manifest toward Communist China, and they vary, it is clear that responsibility for the continuation of the conflict in Vietnam is assigned to the United States and this is regarded as an impediment to improvement in political relations with this country.

There is no reason to believe that the Soviet Union, in present circumstances, sees its way clear or, in fact, is anxious to play a significant role to assist in bringing an end to hostilities in Vietnam. The Soviet Union has steadfastly refused to join with the United Kingdom, the other Cochairman of the 1954 Geneva Conference, in calling for a reconvening of that Conference. They have emphasized repeatedly in public statements as well as in other ways that they have no intention of taking an initiative for peace in Vietnam at this time.

The countries of Eastern Europe have reason for concern over the continuation of the conflict in Vietnam and its escalation. Some of these reasons have to do with their own national preoccupations and the situation in Europe. Both Poland and Rumania, for example, have a very substantial trade with the Western World and remain interested in increased trade with the United States should conditions permit. Both might well be disposed to make a contribution to a settlement of the Vietnam problem to the extent their capabilities permit but only should they see some possibility of success.

D. COMMUNIST CHINA

Behind the war in Vietnam, behind the fears and preoccupations of other Asian nations and through the attitudes of the Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union runs the shadow of Communist China.

Until now the Chinese Communists have not introduced their manpower directly into the conflict although they clearly recognize that the war may reach that point. They recognize, too, that the war may impinge upon China herself at some point and have begun to make preliminary preparations for that eventuality.

For the present, however, the Chinese appear to take the view that their direct intervention in Vietnam is not required since: (1) the war in South Vietnam is a people's war which the Vietcong are winning; (2) North Vietnam is successfully defending itself; (3) the more the United States escalates the war the higher our casualties will be and the more discouraged we will become; and (4) the United States cannot win, in any event, according to Chinese theories.

It is from Communist China that Hanoi and the Vietcong derive the bulk of their outside material support. It is from Communist China that there has also flowed encouragement of resistance to negotiation or compromise. As the war escalates and Hanoi becomes ever more dependent upon Chinese support, a dependence which Soviet aid at best only tempers, the likelihood also increases that North Vietnam will not be able to negotiate a settlement without at least the tacit consent of China. In fact, that point may already have been reached.

E. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

A rapid solution to the conflict in Vietnam is not in immediate prospect. This would appear to be the case whether military victory is pursued or negotiations do, in fact, materialize.

Insofar as the military situation is concerned, the large-scale introduction of U.S. forces and their entry into combat has blunted but not turned back the drive of the Vietcong. The latter have responded to the increased American role with a further strengthening of their forces by local recruitment in the south and reinforcements from the north and a general stepping up of military activity. As a result the lines remain drawn in South Vietnam in substantially the same pattern as they were at the outset of the increased U.S. commitment. What has changed basically is the scope and intensity of the struggle and the part which is being played by the forces of the United States and those of North Vietnam.

Despite the great increase in American military commitment, it is doubtful in view of the acceleration of Vietcong efforts that the constricted position now held in Vietnam by the Saigon Government can continue to be held for the indefinite future, let alone extended, without a further augmentation of American forces on the ground. Indeed, if present trends continue, there is no assurance as to what ultimate increase in American military commitment will be required before the conflict is terminated. For the fact is that under present terms of reference and as the war has evolved, the question is not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open ended. How open is dependent on the extent to which North Vietnam and its supporters are willing and able to meet increased force by increased force. All of mainland southeast Asia, at least, cannot be ruled out as a potential battlefield. As noted, the war has already expanded significantly into Laos and is beginning to lap over the Cambodian border while pressures increase in the northeast of Thailand.

Even if the war remains substantially within its present limits, there is little foundation for the expectation that the Government of Vietnam in Saigon will be able, in the near future, to carry a much greater burden than it is now carrying. This is in no sense a reflection on the caliber of the current leaders of Vietnam. But the fact is that they are, as other Vietnamese Governments have been over the past decade, at the beginning of a beginning in dealing with the problems of popular mobilization in support of the Government. They are starting, moreover, from a point considerably behind that which prevailed at the time of President Diem's assassination. Under present concepts and plans, then, what lies ahead is, literally, a vast and continuing undertaking in social engineering in the wake of such military progress as may be registered. And for many years to come this task will be very heavily dependent on U.S. foreign aid.

The basic concept of present American policy with respect to Vietnam casts the United States in the role of support of the Vietnamese Government and people. This concept becomes more difficult to maintain as the military participation of the United States undergoes rapid increase. Yet a change in the basic concept could have a most unfortunate impact upon the Vietnamese people and the world at large. What is involved here is the necessity for the greatest restraint in word and action, lest the concept be eroded and the war drained of a purpose with meaning to the people of Vietnam.

This danger is great, not only because of the military realities of the situation, but also because, with a few exceptions, assistance has not been and is not likely to be forthcoming for the war effort in South Vietnam from nations other than the United States. On the contrary, as it now appears, the longer the war continues in its present pattern and the more it expands in scope, the greater will become the strain placed upon the relations of the United States with allies both in the Far East and in Europe.

Many nations are deeply desirous of an end to this conflict as quickly as possible. Few are specific as to the manner in which this end can be brought about or the shape it is likely to take. In any event, even though other nations, in certain circumstances, may be willing to play a third-party role in bringing about negotiations, any prospects for effective negotiations at this time (and they are slim) are likely to be largely dependent on the initiatives and efforts of the combatants.

Negotiations at this time, moreover, if they do come about, and if they are accompanied by a cease-fire and standfast, would serve to stabilize a situation in which the majority of the population remains under nominal government control but in which dominance of the countryside rests largely in the hands of the Vietcong. What might eventually materialize through negotiations from this situation cannot be foreseen at this time with any degree of certainty.

That is not, to say the least, a very satisfactory prospect. What needs also to be borne in mind, however, is that the visible alternative at this time and under present terms of reference is the indefinite expansion and intensification of the war which will require the continuous introduction of additional U.S. forces. The end of that course cannot be foreseen, either, and there are no grounds for optimism that the end is likely to be reached within the confines of South Vietnam or within the very near future.

In short, such choices as may be open are not simple choices. They are difficult and painful choices and they are beset with many imponderables. The situation, as it now appears, offers only the very slim prospect of a just settlement by negotiations or the alternative prospect of a continuance of the conflict in the direction of a general war on the Asian mainland.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in a pledge of support to the "Affirmation: Vietnam" movement organized by a group of responsible and clear-thinking students of draft age in my home State of Georgia.

The movement has served notice on the protesters and demonstrators that America will no longer sit idly by while a small, but loud, misguided minority gives aid and comfort to our enemy.

The movement's phenomenal growth is heartening to all patriotic Americans. Started by a handful of students at Emory University just last month, "Affirmation: Vietnam" has grown into a large organization with a nucleus of supporters from 47 Georgia colleges and universities. It is a politically nonpartisan group of young Americans dedicated to the task of making known to the world that our Nation's commitment against Communist aggression is supported by her people and will be fulfilled.

On February 12, the group will stage a huge rally in Atlanta's new stadium to show grassroots support of our commitment to South Vietnam. The guests will include many prominent Georgians from across the Nation. Secretary of State Dean Rusk is scheduled to speak. It is hoped that Bob Hope will find it possible to attend.

It is my prayer that the success of this movement will inspire college students in all 50 States to take a strong, positive stand during this period of crisis.

America today must regain some greater inner force than has yet been marshaled in order to save its own liberty and what is left of freedom in the world. The freshness, exhuberance, and ingenuity that youth offers in support of a free world is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Davis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in informing the membership of this House that one of the principal leaders in the movement which has been designated as "Affirmation: Vietnam" is one of my constituents, Mr. Terry Adamson of Calhoun, Ga. I am tremendously proud of the fact that young Mr. Adamson, who is club chairman and in charge of congressional liaison, has given unstintingly of his time and energy to support the movement which has done so much to evince popular support for our Nation's policy in Vietnam.

From the first time I heard of this proposal I have felt great enthusiasm for it and have expressed my support both privately and publicly.

I have informed Mr. Adamson and the entire membership of "Affirmation: Vietnam" that my endorsement of the principles of this organization is both enthusiastic and unhesitating, and I have pledged and do now pledge wholehearted support of its position.

I am deeply impressed with its wholesome and patriotic manifestation of confidence in our Nation's foreign policy and in the encouragement which the movement gives to the American soldiers who are making such great sacrifices in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I should like for you and the membership of this body and the people of the United States to know that this particular Member of the House of Representatives stands solidly behind his constituent, Terry Adamson, and all likeminded Americans who are ready and willing to stand up and be counted in support of our commitment in Vietnam.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Weltner] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the university and college students of Georgia have initiated and organized Affirmation: Vietnam, a project which has my approval and unqualified support. My colleagues here in the House have expressed their pride in these young people, and I join with them in applauding this expression of constructive patriotism.

The original impetus came from a group of students at Emory University in Atlanta, and now includes representation and support from most colleges and universities throughout the State. Its sponsors include Senators Richard B. Russell and Herman Talmadge and other notable Georgians and Atlantans, as well as the entire Georgia delegation to the House of Representatives. Remar M. Sutton, Jr., is providing excellent coordination of the movement in his capacity as general chairman.

The culmination of Affirmation: Vietnam will be a rally at Atlanta Stadium on February 12. It is a very special honor that Secretary of State Dean Rusk, a native Georgian and product of Georgia schools, will make the major address.

Students have traditionally and historically occupied a unique place in our society. Their enthusiasm and intelligence have been joined to many causes, and they have not hesitated to debate the issues with clear candor, and without regard to personal gain.

In recent months, the students voice has often protested our commitment in southeast Asia. Therefore, this spontaneous movement by Georgia students is deeply gratifying and reassuring.

I am proud to be connected with this project, and I hope that the demonstration of support for the reasoned principles of our country's commitment will be noted by the rest of our Nation.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Hagan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the people of our Nation were shocked during the past year by the unpatriotic demonstrations of several thousand students who opposed our efforts to defend the freedom of South Vietnam.

In an effort to show that the actions of these objectors do not represent the attitude of the majority of this Nation's young people, a group of Georgia students have formed an organization called Affirmation: Vietnam. Their purpose is to show the nations of the world that the vast majority of young Americans believe in, and fully support, this Nation's commitment to protect the rights of free people in every land.

As one of the sponsors of this organization, I commend the people of Georgia for giving their full support to "Affirmation: Vietnam." I also recommend this action to our college students across the Nation.

A MAGNIFICENT STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, last night the President delivered a magnificent state of the Union message. It was a message worthy of the leader of the world.

The President was frank and forthright with the American people. He told them the hard facts about the world in which they live. He also showed them what is possible in the world today. He presented a positive, courageous program on honoring our commitments to the people of the world—not only in defense of freedom but in support of those who desire to help themselves in the fields of education and health.

In my opinion the President accurately described the goals and aspirations of the American people. While he made it clear that the road to greatness and peace will not be easy, he reassured us of the boundless potential of this Republic and of mankind. I am sure that his pursuit of peace through strength and justice, and his program for progress will have the overwhelming support of the American people.

PEACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, there is much to commend in President Johnson's state of the Union message which we heard in this Chamber last night, but I found nothing more encouraging than the President's careful and specific enunciation of the terms on which our Government would agree to a peace in Vietnam. I feel that at times the President sounded harsh. I would respectfully disagree with some of the premises he advanced as essential for American diplomacy. But we need not dwell on these areas of disagreement because within the speech the President offered a viable blueprint to end the Vietnamese war.

Until now it has been said—with some accuracy—that our terms for peace have been vague and our intentions unclear, in spite of our offers to negotiate unconditionally. I think the President did much last night to supply the necessary clarification. The President said:

> We seek neither territory nor bases, economic domination nor military alliance in Vietnam. We fight for the principle of self-determination, that the people of South Vietnam should be able to choose their own course—choose it in free elections without violence, without terror and without fear.

He said further:

> The people of all Vietnam—

And I ask you to take note of the word "all"—

> should make a free decision on the great question of reunification, and this is all we want for South Vietnam; it is all the people of South Vietnam want.

The President went on to say:

> There are no arbitrary limits to our search for peace. We stand by the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962, we will meet at any conference table, we will discuss any proposals—4 points or 14 or 40—and we will consider the views of any group.

Let us take note once again of the reference to "four points" which undoubtedly is to Hanoi's celebrated four points program and that "any group" includes the Vietcong's National Liberation Front. Finally, the President pledged:

> We will withdraw our soldiers once South Vietnam is securely guaranteed the right to shape its own future.

The President's words, Mr. Speaker, contain—in my view, the formula for a just peace in Vietnam. It will allow the Vietnamese people the opportunity to choose for themselves what kind of government they want. If the Vietcong embody the wishes and the hopes of the people they will presumably be offered the means to represent them as soon as the people have had the chance to make their declaration at the polls. There is room in the President's formula, Mr. Speaker, for the Vietcong to contend peacefully for the mandate of the South Vietnamese people. And there is in the President's formula the means for Vietnam to resume its life as a nation united, as a people no longer divided by an arbitrary barrier set up for reasons of diplomatic expediency in a treaty a dozen years ago. The President has offered fair terms to the enemy in Vietnam. I hope the enemy sees fit to accept them as the basis for the restoration of peace.

Let me note finally that the morning paper carries a dispatch from Saigon reporting a meeting between Premier Ky of South Vietnam and the senior Senator of New York [Mr. JAVITS]. Premier Ky, according to this dispatch, expressed to Senator JAVITS a willingness to conduct a free election in South Vietnam by late 1967. I regard this as a hopeful indication of the willingness of the South Vietnamese Government to cooperate in achieving peace. After all, late 1967 is not very far away.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I look upon the President's peace proposals last night as the most generous and most specific which he has yet publicly offered. It is not 100 percent what the other side wants, but one cannot expect it to be. There are clearly two sides to this dispute. It certainly presents, however, a sound basis for working out differences in a manner that can secure satisfaction and justice to both sides.

A BILL TO REPEAL THE LIMITATION OF LIABILITY FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY DOMESTIC COMMERCIAL ATOMIC POWERPLANTS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to repeal the limitation of liability for damages caused by domestic commercial atomic powerplants which are licensed in the future. This measure is of vital importance to the coal producing areas of the United States.

As the law now stands—it was amended last year to extend this particular feature to August 1, 1977—operators of atomic powerplants buy insurance in the amount of $74 million. This is all the coverage that the insurance pools will grant. The Federal Government adds $486 to make the total amount available for any atomic plant $560 million. But the law goes further; it says that if the damages exceed $560 million—nobody will have to pay the public for the excess. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the injured members of the public will have no recourse for the amount of damages they will suffer in excess of the $560 million fund.

At first glance, this sum of money might seem sufficient to cover any conceivable damages. If we were dealing with an ordinary piece of machinery—this would certainly be true. In atomic power, however, we are dealing with the most deadly substance ever discovered.

In 1957, in the so-called Brookhaven report, AEC scientists estimated that total property damage, if the worst came to the worst, could amount to $7 billion, spread over an area of about 150,000 square miles. They said the chances of such a catastrophe happening are remote, but not impossible.

In the 1957 report, AEC was talking about a very small atomic plant—about one-fifth the size of the large ones being constructed today. In June of last year, AEC Chairman Glenn Seaborg said the amount of possible damage depends primarily on the amount of fission products in the reactor and he pointed out that reactors being built today are much larger than the one considered in the 1957 report. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it must be concluded that the amount of possible damages may be, under the worst possible circumstances, several times $7 billion, yet the law limits our citizens to recovery of $560 million.

Moreover, our citizens have no insurance protection of their own against property damage from an atomic powerplant catastrophe. Each and every homeowner's policy, each and every policy covering a business building, contains a radiation exclusion clause in the fine print—and this clause means that if your home or your business property is made uninhabitable by radiation from an atomic powerplant accident your insurance company will not reimburse you for your loss.

Mr. Speaker, the utilities have repeatedly told the members of the public that atomic powerplants are safe. Yet last year they told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that they would not build atomic powerplants if they had to be legally liable for the damages in excess of $560 million. If these plants are safe, Mr. Speaker, the utilities do not need more than $560 million coverage and this no-recourse provision should be stricken from the law. The ordinary legal rights of citizens should be restored.

If, on the other hand, these plants are not safe; if $560 million insurance is not enough to cover the damages; if utilities are not confident enough to build such plants with $560 million insurance—then I say to you that these plants should not be built at all. We have plenty of fossil fuels to enable us to proceed with reasonable caution in the development of atomic power. We can well afford to gather 15 or 20 years of experience with 10 or 15 large atomic plants before we spread them all over the country. Let us have an opportunity for a reasonable amount of experience before we let more such plants be built under a provision of the law which may deprive the public of the right to compensation for damages.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would not apply to atomic plants which have already received construction permits. It would apply only to plants seeking such permits in the future. Our people are entitled to restoration of their legal rights with respect to such plants. There is no conceivable excuse for continuing the no-recourse provision. It boils down, very simply, to this: If atomic powerplants are safe the no-recourse provision is unnecessary and should be repealed; if atomic powerplants are not safe, they should not be built.

PRESIDENT SPEAKS THE HEART AND MIND OF AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last night in a time both of peril and of promise, President Johnson spoke the heart and the mind of the American people.

There will be no backward steps in our quest for a fullness of life for all our people. and for all peoples everywhere.

There will be no cessation in our search for the doors to negotiation and the pathway to peace.

With courage to meet the problems and firmness to face the dangers, with faith that all will be well as long as we hold true to ourselves and the unselfish purity of our destiny, Mr. President, with you we will press on, confident and unafraid.

LUNCHEON OF THE KIVA CLUB OF SANTA FE, N. MEX.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, during the Christmas holidays I had the privilege of attending a luncheon of the Kiva Club of Santa Fe, N. Mex., of which I am a member.

At each place at the luncheon a copy of a quotation from an unknown author was placed. I was very impressed not so much by the actual wording of the quotation, but by the intent.

I believe that the intent of this quotation could well become the feeling of this 2d session of the 89th Congress. I am submitting this quotation for your appraisal and consideration:

> Our most valuable possessions are those which can be shared without lessening: Those which, when shared, multiply. Our least valuable possessions are those which, when divided are diminished.

VIETNAM VACUUM

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress meets today the primary subject on all our minds is Vietnam. The President again outlined the somber realities of Vietnam in his state of the Union message last night. The question is: How best can we in Congress help in the great effort to bring peace and contain communism in that troubled area?

The President's recent peace offensive is a sincere and imaginative move to bring the principals in the Vietnam conflict together to work for peace. The President's efforts deserve the enthusiastic support of all Americans, regardless of how they stand on our involvement in Vietnam. Last night he again spelled out to the world that America's only ambitions in Vietnam are that the people might live in peace and freedom. This has been the purpose of the American presence since the beginning and remains the purpose today.

Mr. Speaker, the words of our late President John F. Kennedy ring loud and clear today throughout this Chamber:

> Our judgment is only as good as our information.

We, however, the representatives of the people of this great land, lack much of the information on which to base a sound judgment on the vital subject of Vietnam, a judgment we must express in the votes we cast for future appropriations.

Americans have always rallied in unity when adversity has struck, but today disquieting sounds are heard in the land. Why?

Because the people and their representatives in Congress are forced to probe for peace in a Vietnam vacuum.

Bits of information, generalizations, and cliches fill this vacuum and are charged with an impact totally inconsistent with their importance. This convinces me of the urgent need for full debate on the floor of this House on the all-engrossing topic of Vietnam.

We have had numerous briefings; they have been inadequate because vital omissions have confused, rather than informed, us to the hard facts and realities.

We are told that security demands the withholding of certain information, but that the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee are updated constantly. I do not know whether or not they are, and although I hold great esteem for the able chairmen of both committees, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], it is not enough that only these men and their committees be made privy to such vital information.

All Members must be provided with all the facts, and as they happen. Timing is of the first importance; and we should be kept abreast of developments, if necessary, on a day-to-day basis. It is our responsibility to the people of this Nation to see that Congress is adequately informed to pass judgment for that people.

If any Member of this body is a security risk, from whom information must be withheld, though I am confident there is none, then he does not belong in Congress.

I recently traveled on my own to Vietnam to see for myself what is happening there.

I was given every bit of information I desired in the war zone. General Westmoreland is most anxious that all Members be adequately informed and was extremely cooperative.

However, while in Vietnam, I was greatly disturbed to read reports, since confirmed by the State Department, that some sort of purported peace offer had been made by Hanoi indirectly, and that these offers were dismissed by the State Department. As illustrated by the appended editorial from the New York Times of November 1, 1965, long after the offers were reported to have been put forth, Secretary Rusk and his aids conducted briefings for Members of Congress. Never once was any indication made that any kind of peace overture had been made. In fact, we were told that the Government was looking for some sign from Hanoi that they would agree to some sort of negotiation.

I charge that this is a serious omission by the Secretary of State.

I do not know if the reported offers were valid or not, but I do think we, as Representatives, deserve at least the courtesy, if not the responsibility, of being informed.

Another serious problem faces us. Do we really know if the basic premise behind our fight to preserve freedom in Vietnam is shared by General Ky and his junta? We are entitled to an early explanation of the conflicting reports about whether Ky will sit down to unconditional talks as outlined by President Johnson and reiterated by him last night.

Much more needed information may still remain in files marked "Top Secret" in the State and Defense Departments. It is time they were opened to Members of Congress.

It is time, also, that we met our responsibility and brought to the floor in general debate the full facts so that the confidence and unity of the American people can be restored, and so that all the world will know that we seek nothing in Vietnam save the preservation of peace and freedom, and to serve notice on all would-be oppressors, that people are entitled to live in freedom and choose their own destiny without outside force determining their right to life, liberty, and their own pursuit of happiness.

The article referred to follows:

A CHANCE THAT WAS MISSED

The details, and just what each person did or said at the period a year ago when Hanoi sought a discussion with the United States on ending hostilities in Vietnam, must and will be sifted by history. The outstanding—and many will think devastating—fact is that Hanoi offered to talk and Washington refused. This may well prove a heavy burden for the Johnson administration to justify.

The story in the current edition of Look magazine, in which Eric Sevareid quotes Adlai Stevenson, was virtually an open secret last autumn and winter. The evidence that Hanoi put out feelers was well substantiated; and the State Department now concedes the fact. But according to Robert McCloskey, State Department spokesman, "all our indications were that there was no serious intent on the other side." Even if this assumption turned out to be true, how could it be known positively without testing Hanoi's intentions?

Secretary Rusk, according to Mr. McCloskey, has a "sensitive antenna" and he would have known—or sensed—when North Vietnam was really prepared for peace talks. This comment reminds one of the ancient Roman practice of drawing auspices from the flight or the entrails of birds. It would be a shuddering thought that the fate of nations and of thousands of young Americans depends on Dean Rusk's antenna. Yet, this is what Mr. McCloskey indicated.

The dates, before and after the 1964 presidential elections, are worth recalling. Many voices in the United States—including that of the New York Times—called for efforts to seek negotiation with North Vietnam before escalation of the American involvement. Unfortunately, it was too firmly believed in Washington that Hanoi must make some peaceful gesture in action, not words, and that a firm and bellicose stance by the United States would induce North Vietnam to back down and openly seek peace. There was also a widely held belief, especially at the Pentagon, that if the United States did not make a firm and decisive stand in Vietnam all of southeast Asia would fall like dominoes and the United States would sooner or later be facing Communist China in Hawaii.

Therefore, it was not until April, in his now famous Johns Hopkins speech, that President Johnson asked for unconditional discussions. The might-have-beens of history are forever incapable of proof. Perhaps nothing would have come a year ago of some quiet talks with Hanoi. Yet, as U Thant observed yesterday, much of the present tragedy might have been averted if some bold steps had been taken last year. The gnawing thought will never be erased: that opportunity tapped faintly on the door—and the United States would not open it.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the President on his state of the Union message.

I was particularly impressed that the President is determined to press on with the march on many fronts toward the Great Society. He has wisely rejected the counsel of those men of little faith who told him that he would have to cut back on his domestic programs because of the Vietnam war.

Not only has he refused to slow down the programs launched by the historic 1st session of the 89th Congress last year, but he outlined an extensive set of exciting new proposals for action by the Congress this year.

Perhaps the most moving and most eloquent passage in his speech was the one in which he said that, if increasing sacrifices at home had to be made because of the Vietnamese conflict, they should be made by those best able so to sacrifice, not those least able. To those who call for sacrifice he put these burning questions:

> Whom will they sacrifice? Will they sacrifice the children who seek learning—the sick who need care—the families who dwell in squalor now brightened by the hope of home? Will they sacrifice opportunity for the distressed—the beauty of our land—the hope of our poor.

I congratulate the President also on his refusal to heed the counsels of those who believe that a military victory in Vietnam is possible and necessary. The sincerity of the President's overwhelming desire to achieve a peaceful settlement in that stricken land was clear not only from his words but from the way he spoke them.

On December 8, in an open letter to the President, I urged him to pursue new and imaginative approaches to a peaceful solution of the Vietnam conflict.

Specifically I urged an open-ended suspension of bombing in the north and a ceasefire in the south. I am greatly encouraged that, since Christmas, there has been such a suspension of bombing in the north and that the President last night announced his intention to "work for a ceasefire now or when discussions have begun." He also indicated a readiness to pursue a policy of deescalation when he said:

> We will respond if others reduce their use of force.

I only regret that the President did not, as I had also suggested a month ago, make perfectly clear his acceptance of the inevitability that representatives of the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam would have to be included in any meaningful negotiations; but it is significant that he did say:

> We will meet at any conference table, discuss any proposals—4 points or 14 or 40—and consider the views of any group.

We can only hope and pray that the President's moderate approach, coupled with his far-flung efforts to make our intentions clear, will evoke a corresponding moderation on the other side, and that we may indeed see an early end to the tragic conflict in Vietnam.

So that it may be a part of the permanent record, I am including in today's Record the text of my open letter to President Johnson of last December.

I will look forward with keen anticipation to the specific proposals the President will send us, both in implementation of his Great Society goals, and to carry out his plans for this country fully to carry out its responsibilities in seeking to build a better and more peaceful world.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent, I include herewith the text of an open letter on the subject of our policy in Vietnam which I sent to the President on December 8, 1965.

President Lyndon B. Johnson,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: In my congressional district, as I am sure in others, there is a deep and growing uneasiness about the situation in Vietnam. This feeling has been accentuated recently by the disclosures that our Government had been sounded out a year ago by U Thant, on the possibility of talks with Hanoi, and had reacted negatively. It has also been accentuated by the fact that Secretary McNamara, who once spoke of getting finished in Vietnam in a few months, now talks of a long struggle, and that Secretary Rusk offers no plan for the achievement of negotiations looking toward an honorable and stable peace.

I do not mean to suggest that the majority of my constituents are not willing to support you on Vietnam. Of 8,000 replies I received last June to a questionnaire, 58 percent indicated support of your general policy or even more drastic measures. While the stepup since then in the scale of our military efforts, and the rising casualty rate, may have caused some diminution in this percentage, I believe the majority of my constituents are prepared to trust your judgment as to what is necessary. Nevertheless, the number of thoughtful, patriotic people who are expressing their unhappiness about what is going on is certainly increasing.

First of all, there is uncertainty as to what our position is. Last spring we were told that more Americans had to be sent to Vietnam because we were losing; recently we have been told that more men have to go though we are not losing. Statements that you make, indicating your determination to find a peaceful solution, seem to be contradicted by members of your administration. For example, last summer you stated that the issue of whether or not we should talk with representatives of the Vietcong would not be an obstacle to negotiations, but since then Secretary Rusk has repeated that we could not deal with the Vietcong. (As I have previously stated, I myself cannot see how we could refuse to include the Vietcong in any serious negotiations; they would be bound to be involved, for example, in any talks regarding the conduct of elections in South Vietnam.)

Second, there is a feeling, which I share, that we have somehow been drawn, step by step, into a situation which is to no one's advantage so much as that of the Communist Chinese, and that we appear to have no plan for extricating ourselves from this veritable trap. Increased military activity on our part leads to increased military activity on the part of the Communists to which we in turn feel we must respond with counteraction, and so on and on.

We talk about our desire to negotiate, yet our offers to negotiate—our alleged weekly feelers—often seem couched in terms that make it impossible for the North Vietnamese, as prideful nationalists, to accept them. For example, we say that we have repeatedly tried to find out whether Hanoi would be willing to negotiate if we suspended our bombings of North Vietnam. Can we not understand that, to the Communists, an affirmative answer to this kind of query would seem like a surrender, a sign of national weakness?

Or we say that we will suspend bombing in the north if Hanoi will pull out one division from the south. Again, from their point of view, what kind of deal would that be? To suspend our bombing would cost us nothing, and we could resume at any moment; but for Hanoi to pull out a division would mean the waste of the enormous effort involved in bringing the division into South Vietnam, and to reverse the process and send the division back south would be equally costly.

From the beginning, we should have been trying to stimulate the natural Vietnamese fear of the Chinese, and to keep Hanoi, if possible, from becoming wholly dependent on Peiping. Yet the effect of our actions has apparently been just the opposite—to drive a reluctant Hanoi into the embrace of Peiping. Hanoi's present apparent rejection of any negotiations, except on terms that would represent a total surrender for us, parallels Peiping's position completely. Somehow we must find a way to reverse the trend.

I tend to agree with those who feel that we have not been imaginative in our efforts to negotiations started, that we have assumed, without justification and incorrectly, that we could pressure Hanoi to agree to negotiate by military action that would hurt. And I am emphatically opposed to the current argument that we can accomplish our objective by hurting Hanoi still more; e.g. by extending the bombing to industrial and other targets in the Hanoi-Haiphong area. Such tactics would not only be likely to stiffen still more the resistance and determination of the North Vietnamese, but would once again be driving Hanoi more firmly than ever into total dependence on Peiping.

I know that you, Mr. President, are desperately concerned about American casualties in Vietnam, and that you want to see to it that our forces have every bit of equipment and supplies they need to carry out the tasks they are given to do. I feel the same way.

I also believe, Mr. President, that you want to get the fighting stopped as soon as possible, so as to put an end to the casualties. These purposes are not inconsistent. Both are important. Both are in the interest of our fighting men.

Since our present course of action seems to be leading only to steady intensification of the hostilities, and does not seem to be bringing a peaceful settlement any closer, is it not imperative that we seek new approaches to the solution of our ghastly problem?

Specifically, should we not suspend the bombing of North Vietnam once again, and mobilize the influence of the nonalined nations of Asia to help us get negotiations started. In making such a gesture to emphasize our desire to end the hostilities, we would do well to link the announcement to the Buddhist religious holidays, such as the New Year which occurs in January, rather than referring solely to our own Christmas and Chanukah season. Instead of announcing a time limit to the suspension, which would once again have an ultimatum-like sound, we should, I believe, leave the matter of duration indefinite. An encouraging response might take time to develop and emerge.

Even more dramatically, we might well announce a unilateral cease-fire in the south, coupled with a proposal that the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese units suspend hostile action, also. If they refused to so respond, we would be free to resume military action ourselves within a matter of hours.

Granted, it might be difficult to get the South Vietnamese Government to agree to these procedures, but the effort should be made, and surely we are not without means of persuasion. If such persuasion proves impossible, we should proceed with the conciliatory moves on our own.

Let it not be said that such a course might cause political trouble in Saigon. That argument was somewhat persuasive when we still held to the position that this was Saigon's war to win. Today that position is in tatters. It has become our war—not to win, because a military solution is impossible—but our war to fight until we can find a way to negotiate an honorable and lasting settlement. Our own involvement is now too great for us to allow the unpredictable political winds in Saigon to deflect us from the course we want to take.

I cannot say that such measures as I have proposed would lead to fruitful negotiations, or to any negotiations. They will not, I am sure, if Peiping can help it. But I do say that I can see no better way for us to try to escape from the morass we are now in. And we should explore every possibility of escape that is open to us, instead of stubbornly plowing deeper into the morass day by day.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

EXCISE TAXES ON ESSENTIALS SHOULD NOT BE REIMPOSED

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the message which our great President addressed to our Nation last evening was a message of peril as well as of hope—of sacrifice with prosperity—of challenge as well as accomplishment.

Most of the Members of this House, I believe, will agree with the President that it has become necessary to reimpose some of the taxes which were reduced last year. But it would be my strong plea that the taxes selected to be reimposed not be those taxes on such basic necessities as telephone service or perhaps on motor vehicles, but rather on what all of us would agree are far less essential goods such as jewelry, furs, handbags, and cosmetics. The restoration of these latter taxes would recoup an estimated $550 million annually, almost as much as the $640 million lost by the reduction in the telephone tax.

If more tax revenues are needed, I would hope that serious consideration would first be given by the distinguished members of the House Committee on Ways and Means to increasing the personal income tax rates while simultaneously increasing personal exemptions in such proportions that families with incomes of $4,000 or less a year would not pay increased taxes.

Mr. Speaker, all of us will agree that sacrifices may have to be made this year, and for many years to come. Let us not take the easy path. Let us consider the needs of our people, and their relative sacrifices, before we select what taxes we shall reimpose upon them.

COMMENT ON THE STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I think there will be general disappointment with the lack of any Presidential decisions on Vietnam, however hard and difficult they may be, and there are no easy decisions in this situation.

The President said our current peace efforts have met with neither success nor failure. When you tell an enemy you would like to negotiate, and he spits in your face, calls your offer a sham and a hoax, and starts shooting at you with everything he has, only a blind optimist would say his reaction is still in doubt.

He spoke of a war stretching into years in Vietnam. Not many people will agree with a status quo policy that bleeds our finest young men indefinitely against the Communist hordes of Asia. Have we learned nothing from the French experience in Indochina?

On the domestic scene, the President surprised Republicans and Democrats alike by his decision to launch a dozen new controversial programs while those initiated last year are still in a state of disrepair and bureaucratic chaos, the new Department of Urban Affairs, for example, which still does not have anyone to head it. Most certainly transportation problems are a vital part of urban affairs. Yet, the President now calls for a new Department of Transportation which would add thousands of new employees to the Federal payroll. At this rate, there will soon be a separate Federal agency for every problem area. Is Government to be fragmented into hundreds of agencies with overlapping functions? The proliferation has got to stop somewhere, and I hope the Congress is ready to draw the line here and now.

EXCISE TAXES SHOULD NOT BE REIMPOSED

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as is always the case, the state of the Union message delivered by the President last night has prompted varied reaction here in the Congress, throughout the country, and throughout the world. Like each of you, I found areas of both agreement and disagreement with what the President had to say.

While the President discussed many problems of greater urgency, I was deeply disturbed to hear his recommendation that the Congress temporarily restore the automobile and certain telephone excise tax reductions made only 12 days ago.

I have advocated the repeal of these discriminatory excise taxes for the past 10 years. I readily recognize our need for added revenue to finance our growing commitment to sustain the war in Vietnam, but I am stunned that the President would suggest that we reinstate the same old discriminatory temporary taxes that took a quarter of a century to remove. It is of particular interest to note that in his message to the Congress on May 17, 1965, the President urged reduction of the excise tax because, among other reasons, he wanted to end an unfair burden on many businesses and workers who produce the commodities singled out for excise taxation. Now he is back asking that this unfair burden be reinstated.

As I have argued so many times, why should a single business or activity be saddled with a tax that all taxpayers are not asked to share? This is wrong. If we need money, and I believe we do, let us devise some means of raising it with fairness.

It is too early, of course, to speculate on what action the Congress will take on the President's request. But if we reimpose the excise tax cuts voted just a few months ago, which became effective only 13 days ago, the Congress will certainly be made to look whimsical, without conviction, and nothing but a perfect rubberstamp.

The whole ridiculous situation reminds me of the nursery rhyme about how—

> The King of France and 40,000 men marched up the hill and then marched down again.

HOUSE DEMOCRATIC STEERING COMMITTEE AND HOUSE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, House Resolution 661, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 661

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1966, there shall be payable from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, until otherwise provided by law, not to exceed $5,000 annually for necessary expenses, other than salaries, to each of the following:

(1) the House Democratic Steering Committee; and

(2) the House Republican Conference.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACTIVITY REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I have today filed the activity report of the committee for the 1st session of the 89th Congress. I personally feel that the committee had a very good record and I commend this report to the attention of the Members.

Mr. Speaker, for some years the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been studying and investigating the important subject of broadcast ratings. For the committee I have today filed the broadcast ratings report under the resolution authorizing the committee to undertake this work. This is a very important report, and I commend it to the Members for their attention.

JET AIR SERVICE FROM THE WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I suggested that the time was going to come, in view of the phasing-out of piston aircraft by the air carriers, that the Washington National Airport would no doubt have jet air service. I had in mind, of course, the smaller jets that could operate in and out of this airport, such as the two- and three-engine jets.

On January 11 the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration sent a letter to me as chairman of the committee in which he included an announcement of the Federal Aviation Agency that beginning April 24, 1966, short-haul jet operation would begin at the National Airport.

I personally think that this was a good move. I saw it. I have seen it for some time. I personally do not believe that it will take anything away from Dulles or Friendship. Both are important facilities serving this area, and they will make a very great contribution to the area in the future.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the majority leader if he will announce the schedule for the remainder of the week and any legislative schedule that he might have for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. We do not have a legislative program ready for next week. I think there are two bills on the Consent Calendar, and very few bills on the Private Calendar.

ORDER TO DISPENSE WITH THE CALL OF THE CONSENT CALENDAR ON MONDAY NEXT AND THE PRIVATE CALENDAR ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar in order on Monday next, and the call of the Private Calendar in order on Tuesday next, may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ORDER THAT BUSINESS IN ORDER ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY OF NEXT WEEK BE DISPENSED WITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JANUARY 17

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION OF HON. OREN HARRIS AS CHAIRMAN AND MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 13, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In view of my imminent departure from the House of Representatives to assume a new role for me as U.S. district judge for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas, I hereby tender to you my resignation as chairman and a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I leave this important assignment with affection and deep appreciation for the members of the committee with whom I have served over the years.

With genuine respect and high esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

OREN HARRIS,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, who has rendered outstanding service as a legislator and as chairman of the important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, is—and I pause—accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF HARLEY O. STAGGERS TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 662) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 662

Resolved, That HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of West Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected Chairman of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H.R. 11892—HORTON BILL TO CURB POISONING BY CHILDREN'S ASPIRIN

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have become increasingly concerned about a serious health hazard to small children. In an effort to make a commonly prescribed and used drug, aspirin, palatable to them, flavoring is added to make it as appealing as candy to many youngsters. So appealing is the medicine, that it has become a leading cause of death by poisoning to preschool aged children. Each year 150 small children in this country die from an overdose of so-called baby aspirin.

I believe that Congress should act to eliminate this needless danger. Therefore, on the first day of this second session, I introduced H.R. 11892, a bill which will direct the Food and Drug Administration to require that aspirin intended for use by children be packaged in bottles of not more than 25 tablets.

At the present time, the standard bottle of baby aspirin contains 50 tablets. Each tablet contains 75 milligrams of aspirin. Thus the total dosage in the bottle is 3.75 grams, which is more than a lethal amount for a 30-pound child. Generally, these bottles are sealed with "safety caps," which are difficult for small children to remove. But they are not foolproof, and candy aspirin remains a leading cause of death from poison for America's preschoolers.

If my bill is enacted, and the standard bottle of baby aspirin contains only 25 tablets, instead of 50, a young child might eat all the tablets without serious danger. According to the Food and Drug Administration, this limitation cannot be imposed without new legislation.

We all have known, directly or indirectly, the grief and heartaches of parents who have lost a child. This anguish is always greater when everyone knows that the death easily might have been prevented. Most of us have heard from numerous parents who are still frightened from the experience of having discovered just in time that their sweet-toothed youngster had consumed a full bottle of baby aspirin. They, as well as many pediatricians, surely join me in support of this bill.

Because we live in a country where people today are living healthier, longer, and safer lives than ever before in history, it is especially saddening to see accidental, needless death continue unprevented. This bill to limit the number of tablets in baby aspirin bottles to 25 would obviate hundreds of anxious moments on the part of parents, thousands of dollars in medical expenses, at least 150 lives, and inestimable grief each year. I hope Congress will take prompt action.

GREAT LAKES WATER—IS THERE ENOUGH?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the problems of water supply are not new to the Members of the House of Representatives. From New York City to southern California, and from Chicago and the Great Lakes to the State of Texas, the short supply of water is of great concern to governmental officials, and the general public. To survive on this earth, we need water. And so it is that diminishing and inadequate water supplies are of tremendous relevance to all who are trying to make a better America.

Thanks to Mr. Abraham Feldman, president of the Chicago District Waterways Association, an excellent article on the subject of water supply in the Great Lakes has been brought to my attention. Entitled "Great Lakes Water—Is There Enough?" the article was published in the November 1965 edition of the Chicago Bar Record. It is written by Mr. Albert J. Meserow, chairman of the Great Lakes Commission of Illinois.

Under previous consent, I include the article in the RECORD:

GREAT LAKES WATER—IS THERE ENOUGH?

(By Albert J. Meserow [1])

Needless to say, water is probably the most important of all our natural resources because it is fundamental to life. We could do without oil, gas, coal, and most minerals, but without water, man could not exist.

We, in Chicago being blessed with an abundance of fresh water from Lake Michigan, take for granted this precious resource. As a result, we are inclined to be wasteful with our water. The residents of the arid Western States, and even New York, envy our apparent unlimited source of water from Lake Michigan.

With all of the water of our Great Lakes, the largest body of fresh water in the world, water needs and its equitable distribution, present many problems.

One of the first legal problems that has faced the Great Lakes started back in 1900. The Illinois Waterway which flows into the Mississippi was the cause of original litigation in the U.S. Supreme Court by Missouri against the State of Illinois. Prior to 1900, the Illinois Waterway and the Chicago River flowed into Lake Michigan. Because of the then increase in population and the continued discharge of Chicago sewage into the Chicago River, and ultimately into its drinking water in Lake Michigan, the flow of the Chicago River and Illinois Waterway was reversed away from Lake Michigan and down the Illinois Waterway to the Mississippi. This brought complaints from the city of St. Louis and resulted in an injunction suit against the State of Illinois by Missouri.

In 1926 the States of Wisconsin and Michigan later joined in by New York, Minnesota, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, brought original injunction proceedings in the U.S. Supreme Court against Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, to restrain them from diverting large amounts of water out of Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway. The Great Lakes States based their complaint on the fact that navigation was being impaired by the lowering of the levels of the lakes, and that the lowering of the levels caused a decrease in the amount of power output. The case was referred to the late Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, appointed by the Supreme Court as Special Master in Chancery. Long and extended hearings were held, which ultimately resulted in a decree by the U.S. Supreme Court, entered in 1930. This decree provided that the amount of diversion which Illinois could take out of Lake Michigan was to be limited to 6,500 cubic feet per second from 1930 to 1935; 5,000 cubic feet per second from 1936 to 1938; and 1,500 cubic feet per second from 1939 and thereafter. The decree also permitted domestic pumpage, without limitation. The present authorized diversion is 1,500 cubic feet per second, plus domestic pumpage, which totals about 3,300 cubic feet per second. The city of Chicago pumps about 1 billion gallons of water per day for domestic purposes. The decree also provided that the sanitary district shall construct sewage treatment plants for the treatment of Chicago's sewage over a period of years. Plants were constructed by the Sanitary District of Chicago at a cost in excess of $200 million and are now undoubtedly some of the finest treatment plants in the world.

The decree of the U.S. Supreme Court reserved jurisdiction of the subject matter and the parties.

This case has been reopened from time to time by both the Great Lakes States and Illinois, and in 1941, while assistant attorney general of Illinois, I had the pleasure of representing the State of Illinois in requesting the Supreme Court to grant Illinois additional diversion. This was based upon the condition of the Illinois Waterway at Brandon Pool adjacent to the city of Joliet, where Illinois charged that the waters were so polluted with sludge that they constituted a health menace. It has been proved that the condition was an extreme nuisance, but the Court refused to find it a menace to health since no one drank this water or bathed in it.

The only Justice that Illinois was able to convince of the soundness of its position was Justice Black, a most astute and intelligent scholar.

Illinois continued to require more water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway. Although the sanitary district treated all of the sewage from the entire Chicago area to the maximum efficiency, the maximum possible efficiency was only 92 percent. The remaining 8 percent of the effluent required more fresh water dilution. This requirement continued to increase as the population and industry grew. The present treatment by the sanitary district of sewage and industrial wastes has a population equivalent of 8 million persons.

As a result, Illinois caused to be introduced in Congress bills authorizing the increase of diversion in varying amounts from 1,500 cubic feet per second to 3,500 cubic feet per second.

Two bills authorizing an increase in diversion passed Congress only to be vetoed by President Eisenhower.

The Great Lakes States, principally Michigan, Wisconsin, and New York, were fearful that Illinois would continue its congressional demands for more water, and to combat this effort, these States in 1959, did file a petition in the U.S. Supreme Court to reopen the 1930 decree for the purpose of compelling Illinois to reduce its authorized diversion from the 1,500 cubic feet per second to 750 cubic feet per second and to compel Illinois to discharge the effluent, bringing the treated sewage from the sanitary district plants, back into Lake Michigan instead of into the Illinois Waterway as it does at present.

The State of Indiana is not a party to this case and has taken a neutral position throughout the litigation.

The record shows that if Illinois is compelled to send its effluent back into Lake Michigan, the cost to Illinois in facilities and improvements will be approximately $600 million. The Great Lakes States opposing Illinois presented evidence that the cities of Cleveland, Toronto, and Milwaukee all send their effluent in times of storm flow into Lake Erie and Lake Michigan respectively. It is also true that each of these cities does not permit bathing by its residents because of the polluted condition of the lakes adjacent to its shores.

If I may give my personal views, I feel that if Chicago was compelled to put its effluent back into Lake Michigan, the source of its drinking water, we would be turning water history back to the primitive stages that now exist in too many of our cities.

---

[1] Member, Chicago Bar Association, Judiciary Committee; chairman, Great Lakes Commission of Illinois.

For example, Ganges River in India, where the women wash their clothes, where sewage is dumped into the river, and the ashes of cremated remains of their deceased are scattered on this river, and it is also used as a source of drinking water.

All our efforts should be directed to minimize pollution of drinking water and not increase it, nor should a court turn back the clock on modern thinking and methods respecting health.

No report as yet has been made by the special master in this case, but is generally felt that whatever the ultimate decision of the U.S. Supreme Court will be, none of the litigants will benefit. In addition, it has resulted in considerable expense to the taxpayers of each of the participating States.

With the increase in population continuously demanding more water, and the increased demands for industries along the Great Lakes, not only in Illinois but in all States and Canada, a problem exists which generally cannot adequately be solved through litigation.

Those concerned with water problems in the Middle West, and even the attorneys who are litigants in the Lake Michigan diversion case will unofficially state that they have come to the realization that litigation over water problems and resort to the courts will not solve the problem, nor does long, costly litigation benefit anyone.

The Great Lakes States, other than Illinois, have now come to the realization that they, too, need additional water diversions out of the Great Lakes.

The State of Ohio plans to build a canal from Lake Erie across the State down to the Ohio River. This will require additional water out of Lake Erie.

The city of Cloquet, Minn., near Duluth, wants more water from Lake Superior for domestic use.

The city of Syracuse, N.Y., which is 30 miles from Lake Ontario, requires more water for domestic use and seeks it from Lake Ontario.

Montreal, Quebec, Canada, wants more water for navigation purposes at its port.

The State of Wisconsin requires more water from Lake Michigan for dilution of sewage.

These demands for more water from the Great Lakes could be multiplied many times.

It is no longer a Chicago problem alone, but has become a national and international problem.

In the face of all of these problems and extensive court cases which have arisen in recent years, there has come into existence the Great Lakes Commission. This Commission created by Compact between the States came into existence in 1955. It can be stated with authority that the Commission originated as a result of the many problems over water that existed between the Great Lakes States. Its member States are Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Pennsylvania, New York and Ohio. Provision is made in the compact for membership by the Canadian Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, subject to their laws permitting such membership. The Commission is composed of five representatives from each State appointed by the Governors of each of the States, with the exception of Minnesota which has five members of its legislature as delegates to the Commission. On the Commission are experts in water and sanitation, industrialists, legislators, port directors, and attorneys-general.

The Commission is concerned with all of the water resources, planning, and problems of the Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes Commission, recognizing the increased needs for more water, the many pollution problems, and the extreme fluctuations of the levels, feels that litigation between the respective States is not the solution to these problems, but on the contrary, better results can be accomplished through amicable agreements between all parties.

It was toward this end that Governor Kerner and I, in 1961, went to our State Department in Washington and obtained their consent to carry on discussions with the Provincial officials of Ontario and Quebec.

The representatives of the Great Lakes Commission did have many fruitful meetings with the Canadian representatives who were always most cooperative in trying to reach a solution of our common water problems.

At the present time the most serious problem confronting the Great Lakes is the extreme low levels. The present levels of the Great Lakes, particularly Lake Michigan, Huron, and Erie are at an all-time record low. These low levels have resulted in damage to navigation. Lake vessels cannot load to capacity resulting in loss of revenue; shore properties have been damaged by reason of the change in distances to the shore; piers and dock facilities have become useless; recreation areas and wildlife have been adversely affected; sanitation has been indirectly affected and power has been curtailed.

It is generally agreed by the technical experts on both sides of the border that the causes for the extreme low levels are not man made, but on the contrary are due to natural causes, such as lack of precipitation and evaporation, and in a minor degree the tilting of the earth. The diversions out of the Great Lakes Basin, such as at Chicago, are more than compensated for by the inflows from the Long Lac and Ogoki Rivers.

Since 1940, Chicago has been withdrawing an annual average of 1,500 cubic feet per second, plus domestic pumpage, totaling about 3,300 cubic feet per second, pursuant to U.S. Supreme Court decree, without change. Since 1940 we have witnessed extreme high levels in 1952 and 1953 and now the record low levels. This should prove conclusively that the diversion by Chicago has no material effect on the fluctuating levels of the lakes.

Although there has been no study made of the amount of the damage in dollars, due to the low levels, from the information which I received as chairman of the Great Lakes Commission, I estimate the annual loss on the Great Lakes to be in excess of $100 million.

The Canadians as well as the Great Lakes States are seriously affected by the extreme low levels and in 1964, at the invitation of Prime Minister John P. Robarts, of Ontario, and at the invitation of the Montreal Port Council, meetings were held in Toronto and in Montreal to discuss the acute problem of the low level of the lakes and St. Lawrence which were and still are causing considerable damage.

At these meetings, Governor Kerner and I, as chairman of the Great Lakes Commission, representing the eight Great Lakes States were most cordially permitted to express our views and offer our cooperation to the solution of the problem.

As a result of these meetings it was agreed by both the Canadians and representatives of the States, that a request should be made to the proper respective government officials for reference to the International Joint Commission, for a study of this problem.

In behalf of the Great Lakes Commission I directed communications to President Johnson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Gov. Otto Kerner, who has always indicated a strong interest and concern in Great Lakes problems, personally talked with President Johnson about the urgent need for a study of the regulation of lake levels, particularly in view of the present acute record low levels.

Recognizing the urgency of the problem, our Government as well as the Canadian Federal Government did make a reference to the International Joint Commission requesting a study of the factors affecting the fluctuations of the water levels in the Great Lakes and connecting waters.

The International Joint Commission is now well on its way toward its study. It has selected its Board of Control of most competent technical experts from both sides of the border who will supervise the study.

The first step in such a vast engineering accomplishment is, of necessity, preliminary studies. Although this probably should have been started 100 years ago, we may be thankful that at long last the study has been commenced.

Although we are all most pleased with the references to the International Joint Commission, by the terms of the reference it does not include the study of additional sources of water as inflows into the Great Lakes, and whether such additional inflows are necessary or feasible. The reference does provide that if at the termination of the study the Commission finds it feasible to broaden the study to include inflows, it may do so.

As a result of a study of water requirements for the Nation made during the administration of the late President Kennedy, it was found that by 1980, the need for water for domestic and industrial uses will be doubled.

Communities all around the Great Lakes not only in the United States, but Canada as well, are requiring more water from the Great Lakes for domestic use, for sanitation, industrial uses, navigation, power, and recreation. There is no reason for denying the fulfillment of these needs. It is true that the integrity of these valuable waters must be preserved. But with greater use of inflows into the Great Lakes from sources outside the basin, which now flow elsewhere and are wasted, these needs can be adequately met and the integrity of these waters will still be preserved.

Some of the sources for greater inflows into the Great Lakes from the United States are those of the Fox River in Wisconsin, the Des Plaines River in Illinois, and the Kankakee River in Indiana and Illinois. The plans contemplated the construction of reservoirs or detention basins to contain the storm flows and flood waters from these three rivers. They would then be connected up with Lake Michigan by pipelines or tunnels over a relatively short distance. It is estimated that the detention from any one of these rivers would be sufficient to compensate Lake Michigan for the amount of water taken out by the State of Illinois. The cost of such a project would not be too great considering the benefits involved.

Another plan under consideration is the study being completed by the U.S. Corps of Engineers and by the International Joint Commission, on the feasibility of controlling the levels of Lakes Michigan, Huron, and Erie. This would be accomplished by the use of underwater weirs at the narrow channel of the St. Clair River near Detroit. Through this method of using these underwater dams, it is possible to control the levels of these three lakes. Lake Superior and Ontario levels are already controlled.

Canada presents two additional sources for water into the Great Lakes. First, the Albany River watershed, which is north of Lake Superior and could be used to bring additional waters into lake Superior. These waters now flow north into Hudson Bay and are wasted. At the present time, there are two rivers from this area, namely, the Ogokie and the Long Lac, whose flows were reversed from Hudson Bay and now flow into Lake Superior. The flow into Lake Superior of these two rivers average about 5,000 cubic feet per second. There is the possibility of tapping a larger area in the upper Albany River watershed. In this area, there are thousands of fresh water lakes and streams which flow north into the Hudson Bay and are wasted. They could be reversed for additional waters into Lake Superior.

The second and probably the most feasible of the sources in Canada is the Grand Canal project which utilizes the Harricanaw River which now flows directly north into James Bay, adjacent to Hudson Bay. This river could be reversed, and by the use of dams and pumping stations, the waters from the area would be sent into Georgian Bay adjacent to Lake Huron. As part of this plan, there is contemplated a canal which would connect the Ottawa River in this area with Montreal.

There has been introduced in the Parliament of Canada a resolution requesting a study of the feasibility of this Grand Canal plan. The reversal of the flows of rivers is already being used by the Russians. The engineering principles involved in the Canadian Grand Canal plan are being used by the Russians on the Don-Volga Canal near Stalingrad and are being contemplated for use by them on the Techora and Bychegda Rivers to replenish the Caspian Sea.

The Canadians have estimated that as much as 100,000 cubic feet per second could be diverted into the Great Lakes from these sources in Canada. This can be compared with the 1,500 cubic feet per second now used by Chicago and being litigated and opposed by the Great Lakes States.

Canada will benefit by these proposed plans because it will mean additional power which is extremely important to these Provinces, and it will mean more water for the Port of Montreal, and more water in the lakes on the Canadian shore. It also could undoubtedly mean some type of compensation to Canada for these natural resources, by those States or communities on the Great Lakes who will be using this additional water.

Another plan is the so-called Parsons plan or Nawapa which is a vast project to bring water into the Great Lakes and the western part of the United States from Alaska and the Yukon Territory.

In conclusion may I state that in my opinion, the most feasible ultimate solution for all of the problems of levels, and uses of the water of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence, can be properly accomplished through their management and regulation. This to be done by mutual agreement, through an agency of both Federal Governments, the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and the eight Great Lakes States.

Such an agency would have the power and authority to manage these waters for all purposes.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S UNFINISHED PLAN TO ELIMINATE SLUM HOUSING DESERVES THE SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. **HUTCHINSON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WIDNALL**. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed this year in President Johnson's state of the Union message, as I have been in his state of the Union messages in the past, to find no mention of a major unfinished plan of President Kennedy to end the exploitation of our elderly citizens, millions of whom are living in housing that does not meet even the barest minimum standards of health and safety.

President Kennedy first raised this issue on February 21, 1963, in a moving and humane message to Congress recommending aid to the elderly citizens of our country. In this speech he called to the attention of the conscience of the Nation studies that show that many of the needy aged live in substandard housing, and pay exorbitant rentals. According to the 1960 census, one-fourth of those aged 60 and over did not have households of their own but lived in the houses of relatives, in lodging houses, or in institutions. Of the remainder, over 30 percent lived in substandard housing which lack a private bath, toilet, or running water or was otherwise dilapidated or deficient, and many others lived in housing unsuitable or unsafe for elderly people, as President Kennedy pointed out.

President Kennedy proposed that the Federal Government require that, as a condition for receiving Federal grants for old-age assistance under social security, a State's plan must establish and maintain standards of health and safety for housing rented to recipients of old-age assistance. There is a precedent for such a requirement, he said, in the 1950 legislation which required the establishment of similar standards for institutions.

If adopted, President Kennedy's proposal would have quickly eliminated substandard housing in which such a large percentage of the Nation's recipients of old-age assistance live. The adoption of this landmark proposal would give the several States very broad latitude in providing realistic protection for aged renters and sufficient time in which to get their provisions into operation.

President Kennedy's proposal was introduced as section 4 of H.R. 5839 on April 24, 1963, by the able chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], and a companion measure was introduced in the Senate as S. 1358 by Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, of Florida. It has been reintroduced in the 89th Congress by Senator SMATHERS as S. 991. These measures have not been adopted to date.

In an attempt to aid the elderly, I introduced on March 18, 1965, as part of H.R. 6501, the Republican housing bill, a section—section 202—which provided that the use of Federal funds under title I, IV, VII, X, XI XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act for payment, including rents, for housing accommodations be conditioned upon the establishment or designation of a State or local authority or authorities which shall be responsible for developing and maintaining standards of health and safety for such housing accommodations and upon such accommodations conforming to the minimum standards housing code, laws, and regulations relating to health, sanitation, and safety of buildings required by section 101(a) of the Housing Act of 1949. All the Republican members of the housing subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee joined with me in introducing this significant legislation. This section was not adopted.

I am today introducing legislation designed to implement the recommendations of President Kennedy. I propose two bills, which I hope President Johnson and the administration will support, and I include President Kennedy's views, and the text of these measures at this point in my remarks:

EXCERPTS FROM PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY'S MESSAGE TO THE CONGRESS ON AID FOR THE ELDERLY, FEBRUARY 21, 1963[1]

In the last three decades, this Nation has made considerable progress in assuring our older citizens the security and dignity a lifetime of labor deserves. But "the last of life, for which the first was made" is still not a "golden age" for all our citizens. Too often, these years are filled with anxiety, illness, and even want. The basic statistics on income, housing, and health are both revealing and disturbing.

A far greater proportion of senior citizens live in inferior housing than is true of the houses occupied by younger citizens. According to the 1960 census, one-fourth of those aged 60 and over did not have households of their own but lived in the houses of relatives, in lodging houses, or in institutions. Of the remainder, over 30 percent lived in substandard housing which lacked a private bath, toilet, or running hot water or was otherwise dilapidated or deficient, and many others lived in housing unsuitable or unsafe for elderly people.

Third, many of our older people, with very limited income, live in rental housing which falls far short of any reasonable standard of health or safety. As mentioned earlier, among households headed by a person 65 years of age or over who live in rented housing, nearly 40 percent are in quarters classified as substandard. Yet they are frequently charged exorbitant rents for this housing.

It is estimated that old-age assistance payments presently going into payments of rent equal some half a billion dollars a year—a fourth of the $2 billion total that is expended in Federal, State, and local funds for all old-age assistance. These funds should not subsidize substandard housing. The establishment of State rental housing standards is long overdue. I therefore recommend that, as a condition for receiving Federal grants for old-age assistance, a State's plan must establish and maintain standards of health and safety for housing rented to recipients of old-age assistance. There is a precedent for such a plan requirement in the 1950 legislation which required the establishment of similar standards for institutions.

H.R. 12054

A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require conformity with minimum housing standards as a condition of public welfare assistance, and to help implement the recommendations made by President John F. Kennedy in order to eliminate slum housing in which millions of citizens are living

[Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, Jan. 13, 1966]

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting after "for effectively dealing with the problem of urban slums and blight within the community" the following: ", for requiring that the use of Federal funds (under this title, under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act, and under any other law) for the payment, including rents, for housing accommodations be conditioned upon the establishment or designation of a State or local authority or authorities which shall be responsible for developing and maintaining standards of health and safety for such housing accommodations and upon such accommodations conforming to the minimum standards housing code, laws, and regulations relating to health, sanitation, and safety for buildings required by subsection (a),".

---

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 109, pt. 2, pp. 2693–2699.

H.R. 12055

A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to require conformity with standards of health and safety for rental housing occupied by recipients of assistance, and to implement the recommendations made by President John F. Kennedy in order to eliminate slum housing in which millions of citizens are living

[Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, Jan. 13, 1966]

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2(a)(10) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (B), by inserting "and" at the end of subparagraph (C), and by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(D) provide for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities which shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards of health and safety for the quarters or other premises in which recipients of such assistance reside and which are secured on a rental basis;".

SEC. 2. Section 402(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and (13)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(13) provide for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities which shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards of health and safety for the quarters or other premises in which recipients of aid under the plan reside and which are secured on a rental basis; and (14)".

SEC. 3. Section 1002(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and (13)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(13) provide for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities which shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards of health and safety for the quarters or other premises in which recipients of aid under the plan reside and which are secured on a rental basis; and (14)".

SEC. 4. Section 1402(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and (12)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(12) provide for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities which shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards of health and safety for the quarters or other premises in which recipients of aid under the plan reside and which are secured on a rental basis; and (13)".

SEC. 5. Section 1602(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (16), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (17) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(18) provide for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities which shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards of health and safety for the quarters or other premises in which recipients of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled reside and which are secured on a rental basis."

SEC. 6. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective July 1, 1966.

A LATIN AMERICAN TEACHER VISITS JOHNSON CITY, TENN., AS PART OF THE PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, last July I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 12, page 17068, a report on an "Adventure in International Friendship," which has been undertaken by the cities of Johnson City, Tenn., and Guaranda, Ecuador, as part of the people-to-people program.

My previous insertion told of the experiences of two Johnson City women, Mrs. May Ross McDowell and Miss Ada Strong, while visiting their sister city in South America. That insertion also included reports of other visits and projects between citizens of the two cities.

As a sequel to that report, I would like to insert today a most thoughtful and interesting commentary on the return visit that Lenyna Boada, a teacher from Guaranda, made to Johnson City last summer. Particularly noteworthy is Miss Boada's impression of our Nation as one where "the spirit of equality in all human relationships" prevails.

I would like to compliment Lenyna Boada, May Ross McDowell, and the citizens of both cities for the fine efforts they are making to bring our hemisphere closer through a deep understanding and appreciation of our two diversified but compatible cultures.

REPORT OF LENYNA BOADA TO THE COUNCIL OF GUARANDA IN ECUADOR, TO THE JOHNSON CITY BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB, TO JOHNSON CITY, TENN., OUR SISTER CITY IN THE UNITED STATES, AND TO ALL THE PEOPLE OF GOOD WILL IN FURTHERING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONSHIP AND FRIENDSHIP THROUGH MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING

A simple girl from Guaranda in Ecuador is still dreaming of her lovely sister city and her wonderful "cousins."

It's 4 months now and Lenyna Boada still remembers as if it were happening at the moment, all the round of welcoming remarks, honors, gifts, and pleasantries in the city commission chamber of her sister city, where Mayor Ed Backus presented her a certificate of honorary citizenship of Johnson City, an official key to the city, which was also the key to their hearts, and a miniature city flag.

She couldn't find enough words at that time and can't find them now to express the deepness of her gratitude toward the Business and Professional Women's Club which sponsored her going there to share with them unforgettable hours of wonderful experience.

In the inter-American relations that have the purpose of promoting mutual understanding among the peoples of our continent, our city of Guaranda as everyone knows has been declared by mutual consent, sister of Johnson City, in the State of Tennessee. Under these noble and progressive presages, in the month of March 1965, Mrs. May Ross McDowell, official representative of the expressed American city, made a visit to her sister city here in Ecuador.

This event of pleasing memories for our Province, impressed deeply in the heart of the official representative, sentiments of great sympathy for this land and its inhabitants. She intends to give practical expression to her interest by means of a program which will be realized gradually.

One of the activities projected, was to get an invitation for the undersigned, unfortunately for one of the most modest citizens of Guaranda to attend the 10th International Federation Congress of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, a cultural event of universal nature, that was to be held in Washington, D.C., from July 29 to August 3.

Everything began in 1964 when the World Affairs Committee of the Johnson City Business and Professional Women's Club started a fund called pennies for hospitality to bring a person from Latin America to the International Meeting of the B. & P.W. Club in Washington. Miss May Ross McDowell who was favorably impressed with the reception given to them in their sister city selected me for this project because I know a little English. And the Business and Professional Women's Club of Johnson City generously accepted to patronize my trip, convinced the participation in the people-to-people program is one of the finest things that can be done toward furthering friendship with people of other countries and to help spread the principles of democracy, because the more we know about each other the better we appreciate one another.

This was the beginning of this pleasant dream that I enjoy dreaming again each day.

People find it almost impossible to believe that Johnson City was so hospitable and gracious to only a simple teacher like me. But in honor to truth I have to say that all the persons whom I met were so nice to me that the more I think of it the more I feel indebted to them. I'll never forget how they sacrificed their valuable time just to be with me. I never thought I could feel so much at home in a foreign country. I don't know if they realized how much their thoughtfulness meant to me. I only ask God to give me the opportunity to express my gratitude in some way.

The program, the pictures and the articles written about my visit are proof that I did not simply dream the things I tell my friends. They can see the books which the Business and Professional Women's Club gave me. They can admire my State citizenship emblem which Mr. David Burkhalter, city manager pinned on me. They can see the key, the flag and the Honorary Certificate of Citizenship of Johnson City, Tenn. They can also see the Honorary Certificate of Citizenship of the State of Tennessee which Gov. Frank Clement gave me through Col. Carl A. Jones, Johnson City Press Chronicle publisher and they are deeply interested when I tell them the way the various directors of the several social, educational, economic, and cultural institutions gave me many demonstrations of affection and consideration which I know were not meant only for me but rather for all the people of our city of Guaranda.

What I heard and saw of those wonderful men and women of the Rotary, the Kiwanis, the Lions, the Optimist, the Altrusa, the Pilot, and the B. & P.W. Club, really impressed me. They are all such very happy persons. And I understand that it is because in the midst of the monotony of their daily occupations the sentiment of duty carried out offers the heart a sweet calm, and tranquillity.

The United States is a great Nation because the spirit of equality prevails in all human relationships. Americans are friendly and cooperative. They work hard to perfect themselves materially and spiritually. That's why industry has reached such a high level and American farms have become models for the world.

After all that I have seen in the United States I really hope that our relationship of sister cities will be extended indefinitely. There is so much that Guaranda and the Province of Bolivar can learn from Johnson City, Tenn. We can learn the ways its citizens work, their dedication, their sacrifices, and the techniques that they use to make out of old Johnson City a city grown young. I know that later with the spirit of cooperation and aid that exists in all the citizens of the United States of America we will get a decided economical and technical help, because now more than ever the North American citizen wishes to be loyal to the postulates of the Alliance for Progress.

Having finished the program of activities in Johnson City which included, besides the things already mentioned, visits to historical, industrial, and scenic points of interest in the area, tours of the city, visits to private homes, to schools and public facilities as well as TV and radio programs, I left for Richmond and Williamsburg, Va., and Washington, D.C., accompanied by Mrs. May Ross McDowell, Mrs. Justine Bacon, and Miss Frances Bewley.

In Richmond we went to the State capitol and I learned that it is the meeting place of the General Assembly of Virginia, which is the oldest lawmaking body in the Western Hemisphere. Here Hon. Robert L. Clark invited us for dinner at the John Marshall Hotel which is one of the Nation's leading convention hotels.

Williamsburg is the capital city of colonial Virginia. It has been restored to its early appearance through the generosity of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and members of his family.

Arriving at Washington I was delighted by the beauty and nobility of the Nation's Capital. I especially enjoyed visiting the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial and President Kennedy's tomb because my visit to these places reminded me of the great principles these men stood for.

While in Washington we attended the 10th International Federation Congress. The Congress was attended by delegates from all the continents in the world, many of whom were outstanding personalities of the cultural and social world. During the Congress, we had very interesting lectures on the social and economic order, given by eminent men and women of North America. To me the Congress was dazzling. The organization and the development of the program was precise and perfectly well calculated. All the resolvent conclusions had the primordial concept that the business and professional women clubs should be organized in all parts of the world because the experience of 46 years has taught that women constitute a powerful promisory force of peace and understanding.

The esteem that the several cultural, political, and social entities had in my person for Ecuador and particularly for Guaranda culminated with an invitation which I received from Congressman JAMES H. QUILLEN, who represents the First District of Tennessee, for a luncheon in the National Capitol.

We also visited the Honorable Ambassador from Ecuador, Mr. Gustavo Larrea, and related to him all my wonderful experiences and the many honors that I had received, thanks to the sistership relationship between Johnson City, Tenn., and Guaranda.

Another proof of the interest of Johnson City in this program is that a select delegation from our sister city, composed of its mayor and his retinue, will arrive for the celebration of the 6th of December in our Capital City. This delegation comes solemnly invited by the Illustrious Municipal Council of Quito and our sister city will have a float in the national brotherhood parade on December 6.

Finally, I would like to conclude this report by once again expressing my most sincere gratitude to all who have helped to make possible this most unforgettable experience of my life, my visit to the United States of America.

REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, there is a clear and growing need for thorough, thoughtful reorganization of the executive branch to enable it to meet its great responsibilities. It is encouraging that many Federal officials, as well as many individuals outside government, have recognized the need for far-ranging reforms. But it is discouraging and disappointing that reorganization is being approached piecemeal and planned in secrecy.

The most immediate problem, of course, is the new Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. The President must appoint a Secretary and other top officials for HUD, and must also suggest a definition of the new agency's duties and scope. Until this is done, the Department will continue in its present legal limbo, with increasing confusion and loss of morale.

The wisdom of reorganizing a department hardly organized at all would be questionable in any case. It is more dubious because the recommendations for reorganization have been prepared by a top-level panel which has worked, as Ben A. Franklin pointed out in the New York Times on January 2, "under such elaborate security precautions that even the meeting place was unknown." While this supersecrecy may have been intended to insulate the panel from pressures, it has also served to keep the public almost fully ignorant of the scope of the group's inquiries or the nature of its conclusions. Unless we are provided with a full blueprint of the recommendations submitted to Congress, and their impact on other agencies as well as on HUD, intelligent criticism of the program will be impossible—and so will be intelligent support.

Reorganization should also be discussed openly and comprehensively in the area of conservation and natural resources. With the publication of its interim report on the Potomac River Basin, an interdepartmental task force has proclaimed its desire to bring together, in a concentrated and coordinated attack on the problems of the Potomac, a full battery of programs administered by many separate offices. These ad hoc arrangements might suggest permanent reforms in this field. An editorial in the Washington Sunday Star of January 9 notes that consolidation of conservation activities into a Department of Natural Resources was advocated years ago by the Hoover Commission, and has recently been recommended by Senator Moss. Certainly the proposal should be examined in the light of 1966, under circumstances encouraging a free exchange of opinions and a full marshaling of arguments of every side.

In my judgment, the best vehicle for a comprehensive study of the organization of HUD, conservation activities and all other Federal operations would be a new Hoover-type Commission with a firm congressional mandate, representation of many talents and interests, and full public confidence. Since last September, when 26 of my colleagues joined me in introducing bills to establish such a commission, great interest in the proposal has developed in many parts of the country.

I am especially pleased by the thoughtful consideration given my bill by Dr. Arthur A. Flemming, president of the University of Oregon. Dr. Flemming's remarkable record of public service makes him uniquely qualified to evaluate this proposal. His experience includes distinguished performance as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; as a member of the Civil Service Commission; as the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and member of the National Security Council; and as a member of both the First and Second Hoover Commission:

It seems to me—

Dr. Flemming wrote—

that the far-flung operations of the executive branch might well bear close study once every decade * * *. For a variety of reasons, including changes of conditions, the methods, incentives, and restrictions build into our programs need periodic review and updating where necessary. I know that it is awkward and time consuming for departmental officers to take the time to facilitate the work of such study commissions and to react to their proposals. But, I still think this is a healthy process, particularly if the study commission operates in an atmosphere of mutual respect and tolerance.

Dr. Flemming's comments are worthy of careful consideration, and I would like to bring them to the attention of the Congress, along with the articles from the New York Times and the Washington Star:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, Oreg., October 13, 1965.

HON. CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MATHIAS: I noted with interest your letter asking for my views on the establishment of a commission to study the operations of the executive branch of the Government.

By way of general comment, I certainly favor the objectives of this bill. While I do not think that bodies such as this should be permanently constituted, it seems to me that the far-flung operations of the executive branch might well bear close study once every decade.

I think that the particular value of such bodies as you are proposing comes from the potential freshness of viewpoint of the members. Personally, I believe that our Government would gain considerably if its administrators and evaluators had the time and opportunity to keep asking themselves the question "Why do we do this?" and "Why do we do it this way?"

If we really could stand back every now and then and have a chance to think anew on our methods and our effectiveness, we might well be surprised at the number of times we would see that a change is clearly indicated. Programs get started, and often the methods and incentives used are the products of necessary compromise and stem from conditions that exist at a particular point in time. For a variety of reasons, including changes of conditions, the methods, incentives, and restrictions built into our programs need periodic review and updating where necessary.

I know that it is awkward and time consuming for departmental officers to take the time to facilitate the work of such study commissions and to react to their proposals. But, I still think this is a healthy process, particularly if the study commission operates in an atmosphere of mutual respect and tolerance. In this particular respect I would hope that the task forces or study groups of the inquiring commission would conduct their investigations as openly and constructively as possible. Moreover, the inquiring commission should give ample opportunity to departmental officers to react as completely as possible to the tentative findings and recommendations which are being considered by the inquiring commission. The inquiring commission should not bring itself to final public recommendations until it has had a meeting of minds with the executive branch on the basic facts and findings upon which its conclusions and recommendations are based.

This can be accomplished by circulating draft reports in advance or by holding hearings. At all costs the inquiring commission should avoid the situation in which it "springs" a report on the public and on the agencies with which the report is concerned, and the inquiring commission is forced to concede later that it used out-of-date information or drew unwarranted conclusions from the facts it had. This situation can even be more unfortunate if the commission has terminated, and its recommendations, no matter how badly conceived, have to be dealt with in the Congress and the agencies. In such circumstances a great deal of time and energy is wasted, and the public is left confused.

I note that you are proposing to associate two Governors with the work of the inquiring commission. I can see both advantages and disadvantages to that proposal, but I think, on the whole, it is worth trying.

I think that the bill is technically sound in other respects, and look forward with interest to its progress.

Very sincerely and cordially yours,
ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, *President*.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 28, 1966]

JOHNSON DECISION ON HOUSING NEARS—NEW DEPARTMENT IN CABINET NEEDS OFFICIALS AND DUTIES

(By Ben A. Franklin)

WASHINGTON, January 1.—After 4 months of delay, President Johnson is finally approaching one of his most crucial and politically sensitive decisions to keep the Great Society from bogging down in the great bureaucracy.

A Presidential announcement is expected next week, just before Congress reconvenes on January 10, on the new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The 11th Cabinet Department, approved by Congress last August, is expected to become the key operating Agency of Mr. Johnson's ambitious "hopes of the American city." The President, more than most people, is acutely aware that the cities, with their multiplying problems, are where more than 70 percent of the population live.

Mr. Johnson must choose not only the seven top Cabinet and sub-Cabinet leaders of the new Department—appointments he has repeatedly postponed since last September—but also a new definition of the scope of the Federal role in reforming the urban environment.

NEW LEGISLATION SEEN

The departmental reorganization is likely to require legislation. Thus, the main thrust of the President's proposals to reform the new Department before it really begins may be withheld for a special message to Congress early in the year.

But the President probably cannot put off the politically delicate and administratively portentous selection of a Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Under the timetable written into the legislation, the Department has been in suspended animation since November 9, when Mr. Johnson allowed it to come into being "in name only." He instructed its predecessor, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, to remain alive—operating as if it were the Department—though the congressional mandate declared that the agency "shall lapse" November 9.

This was done under a Justice Department memorandum that cited a definition of "lapse" in Webster's New International Dictionary, Third Edition, as meaning "to pass gradually." The result of this "gradualism" in the Agency has been declining morale, mounting confusion and a spate of legal questions about the authority of its officials.

Robert C. Weaver, the Administrator of the Agency and a candidate for the new secretaryship, has been labeled the "nontitular head of a non-Department."

The fact that the department known as HUD, or Hud, is still without leaders and still requires administrative pruning 5 months after its creation by Congress and 2 months after its nominal beginning is considered certain to spur partisan election year criticism in Congress.

"BUNGLING IN SECRECY"

Some Republicans have already accused the administration of "bungling in secrecy" in its attempt to redraw HUD's organization. Others have charged that the HUD legislation was "forced through Congress without adequate debate."

The Republican criticism of "secrecy" was an allusion to the special urban study group Mr. Johnson assigned in November to review the new Department's organization, powers and duties, and thus to prevent the Housing and Home Finance Agency from acquiring departmental status without significant reform.

Critics of the Agency, an 18-year-old conglomeration of autonomous New Deal and Fair Deal housing bureaus, have charged for years that it was among the most impenetrable of bureaucratic thickets and that its alliances were primarily with the housing and banking industries rather than with urban communities.

Even Mr. Weaver has called his agency "an administrative monstrosity."

The President's eight-man panel, headed by Dr. Robert C. Wood of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, completed its recommendations in almost air-tight secrecy. The meetings here were held under such elaborate security precautions that even the meeting place, a room in the U.S. Maritime Commission, was unknown to most interested Government and industry officials.

SOME DEMOCRATS ANNOYED

They were thus prevented from campaigning for or against proposals. The secrecy, however, invited Republican criticism and even the annoyance of some Democrats.

Dr. Wood submitted his committee's findings to the White House last week. The recommendations, reported to have included some "wild proposals" have remained secret. One proposal, however, was reported to call for the moving of one of the principal operating arms of the antipoverty campaign, the community action program, from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the new Department.

The President's public dreams for a better urban society have been generous. In his special massage to Congress on the cities last March, he called for urban housing construction during the balance of this century that would equal "all that we have built since the first colonists landed on these shores."

"It is as if we had less than 40 years to to rebuild the entire urban United States," he said.

He said that "much of our hope for American progress will depend on the effectiveness with which the critical Federal programs are carried forward" by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Some changes reported to have been suggested by the study group would probably be so unpopular with the large circle of pressure groups surrounding the new Department that they would most likely be toned down or abandoned.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star,
Jan. 9, 1936]

WHAT HOPE FOR A BEAUTIFUL AMERICA?

There may yet be a fighting chance for the preservation of "America the Beautiful."

This is true because, for the first time, Americans seem to be waking up to a realization of how close we are to losing it.

We are beginning to see what we have done to the natural surroundings that are our heritage. We see marginal farmlands and surplus crops wasting away the soil. We see drought and flood following in the wake of the destruction of forest and prairie. We see wild plant and animal life sorely threatened. We see our lakes and watercourses carrying more and more filth. We see our air soiled by the noxious fumes of our material progress.

We sense that we have been blind to the fact that we are a part of the balance of nature, not beings standing apart. We begin to understand that the old American ideal of taming the wilderness, of conquering nature, constitutes a cruel deception that we have practiced on ourselves. We realize that we have overconquered, overtamed, overkilled, overexploited. We even glimpse the possibility that, like the great civilizations of the past, what some are calling the world's most overdeveloped Nation could perish in its own filth in a land stripped and despoiled of all that had once made it great and bountiful.

It is against this background of a new awareness on the part of the American people that one should view the record of the last session of Congress, which earned the sobriquet "conservation Congress." It is against this background, especially, that one should view the call to husband and beautify the land that has been sounded by one of the most politically astute Presidents in history and by his wife—a call that already is bearing fruit in terms of detailed studies such as the Potomac watershed report made public yesterday.

The legislative response to the proconservation mood of the Nation so far is impressive. The Water Quality Act of 1965 represents the beginning of a really meaningful attack on pollution. The Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 bears the same relationship to water supply. Research on desalinating water has been stepped up. A clean air act signals an attack in that quarter. The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 aims at accelerating the retirement and preservation of soil not required or not suitable for crops. A program of highway beautification has been at least begun. A hopper full of laws has added park and recreation lands to serve the growing need for places where people can flee the pressures of our increasingly urban life. Still other legislation aims at restoring the spawning runs of fish in our rivers, protecting decimated wildlife species and their habitat, curbing floods, ameliorating the effects of strip mining, overgrazing, overforesting.

This and much more has come to pass in response to a steadily mounting public resolve to reverse, if possible, the effects of a century of misuse and exploitation. And there is every indication that the 2d session of the 89th Congress will continue the job so well begun by preserving some of our few as yet unspoiled wild rivers, as yet uncut virgin forests and as yet unextinguished wildlife species, and add even more sorely needed recreational areas to the national stockpile.

But, before we congratulate ourselves too freely, we should remember a few things. One is that what Congress has recently accomplished or may be about to accomplish represents a long-overdue backlog piled up by Congresses and administrations that did little or nothing to reverse the trend toward destruction of the land. Some of the legislation recently passed was needed in William McKinley's time, in Theodore Roosevelt's time or in Calvin Coolidge's time, but wasn't passed because a majority of Americans either didn't know or didn't care.

Another thing to remember is that what is now being done is only a beginning, in some cases only a small beginning. The task of controlling pollution alone is staggering for example. The problem of stabilizing water resources is equally formidable.

Perhaps the greatest problem of all, however, lies in the character of the machinery that is expected to carry the job forward once the President and Congress have provided the stimulus, authority and funds. Unfortunately, at present we must look for tangible and visible progress to a welter of agencies that through pork-barrel politics, jealousies, trial and error, compromise and Parkinson's law share conservation responsibility. Several agencies with different allegiances and viewpoints plan and build dams, for example. Public forests are administered by one department, other public lands by another. Responsibility for water resources lies in one place, for water pollution abatement in another. That the agencies involved frequently work at cross purposes is common knowledge. Equally well known is the tendency of many agencies to acquire know-how without at the same time acquiring know-whether. It is fine to make the desert bloom like a rose, but to make it bloom with surplus cotton is quite another matter.

What is needed is a single executive force to give meaning to what is being promised and legislated, an executive force that can truly coordinate the many-fronted effort that must be made.

A bill introduced by Senator Moss, of Utah, last August may offer the type of solution we sorely need. In the main its provisions follow the thinking of the Hoover Commission. It would cut to the heart of the problem by substituting for the present Interior Department a Department of Natural Resources, transferring to it most if not all Federal functions having to do with conservation. The Secretary of Natural Resources would be charged with developing an overall plan for our land and water, taking in all, not just some, considerations.

To apply the words of Gifford Pinchot, founder of the Forest Service and the first top-flight professional conservationist to serve in the Federal Government, each agency at present tends to "ride its own hobby in its own direction." The conservation of natural resources, Pinchot wrote, "is one single question with many parts * * * one great central problem of the use of the earth for the good of man."

The problem is unlikely to be solved until one man, with authority to act, takes charge.

SMALL BUSINESS IN THE FLORIST INDUSTRY

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, a situation is now developing which could well have serious implications for the survival of an important segment of small business in the United States.

In a January 3, 1966, letter to all florists, Western Union announced its full-fledged entrance into the retail flower business on a national scale. Flower orders will be accepted at all Western Union offices for delivery in any community served by a participating florist. Florists who wish to participate are directed to reply to Western Union by January 24. Western Union states that they will withhold a 20-percent commission from the principal amount of each flower order.

A recent publication of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, entitled "Profile of the Retail Florist Industry," states:

> The retail florist industry, comprised of approximately 22,000 establishments, truly qualifies as an industry of small businesses. The annual sales average for all U.S. florists is slightly over $50,000. Nearly two-thirds of retail florists in the United States have annual gross sales below $50,000. These florists have averaged sales of about $24,000 annually per establishment.

These statistics certainly raise grave questions concerning the ability of these small businessmen to survive if they yield a 20-percent commission to Western Union on telegraphic orders.

I am particularly concerned about the competitive effects of the Western Union program. Western Union enjoys sole occupancy of the message toll telegram field. Such an advantage is subject to abuse if it is used to grant a lower effective rate for telegraphic orders than is available to other private enterprise organizations dealing in "flowers by wire." The deadline of January 24 set forth by Western Union for florists to indicate their participation in this system is certainly unreasonable in view of the public policy questions involved.

The action of Western Union deserves the closest scrutiny of the Federal Communications Commission. I am delighted that the Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies of the House Select Committee on Small Business intends to conduct hearings on this subject. I am sure that many in the florist industry will wish to see the results of this hearing before deciding whether to participate in the new Western Union program.

The right of entry into the marketplace must remain open to all honest businessmen. However, the Congress has a responsibility to insure that that competition is not rendered unfair either by the active consent or the passive acquiescence of the Federal Government.

FHA AND FNMA

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Subcommittee on Housing held public hearings to investigate speculation about an imminent increase in the FHA interest rate, as well as reductions in the FNMA prices. This speculation began with the recent action of the Federal Reserve Board.

I agree with the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman BARRETT, who have expressed their fears that the FHA will be stampeded into jacking up its interest rates, placing a greatly increased burden on the average homeowner and slowing down the home construction industry, and that FNMA, which buys FHA and GI mortgages, will weaken its support operations by cutting the prices it pays to mortgage sellers.

During yesterday's hearing, Phillip N. Brownstein, Commissioner of the FHA, and J. Stanley Baughman, President of the FNMA, confirmed the fact that they had neither been consulted nor given advance notice of the Federal Reserve Board's action. It seems rather strange to me, and I am sure to many other Members of Congress, that the chief executives of the two agencies in the Federal Government perhaps most deeply affected by changes in the money market and in interest rates were not given the opportunity to discuss or participate in the Federal Reserve Board's decision to raise the rediscount rate. This in itself is a matter which requires much study and discussion by the Congress.

A second and equally important matter which emerged from yesterday's brief hearing concerns the nature of the FHA and the FNMA themselves. Both of these agencies apparently view themselves as businesslike organizations, required to be self-sustaining, competitive with private industry, and dependent on market forces. There is, of course, nothing wrong and it is quite admirable for a Government agency to conduct itself according to sound business principles. This aspect of FHA's and FNMA's operations is commendable.

But when so-called market forces and the need to remain competitive so as to be able to attract private capital have the effect of curtailing an important part of the Federal housing program and of depressing the home building industry, then I believe it is time for Congress to take another look at these two agencies. For the question may well be raised which master is being served, the mortgage-banking industry or the home-buying public?

Questions I asked at yesterday's hearing, for example, brought out the fact that FHA's share of total housing starts constitutes about 16 percent, as contrasted with a more than 50-percent share in the past. In other words, the Federal Government's mortgage insurance program is today not a very potent one as is evidenced from the fact that it is not serving a very sizable portion of the home mortgage market.

What is the reason for this decline? What can be done to reverse it? These questions must be fully answered if we are to have a workable housing program.

Chairman BARRETT very wisely recessed yesterday's hearings and left the door open for their resumption. I intend to press for continued hearings so that some of these matters can be explored.

PANAMA CANAL: WHY THE SURRENDER?

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since the announcement by the President of his decision to renegotiate the basic Panama Canal Treaty of 1903 with the Republic of Panama, many of our thoughtful citizens in various parts of the Nation have wondered, and still wonder, why the executive branch of our Government should have succumbed to political blackmail and who is responsible.

Even if the world at this time were at peace without a war cloud to be seen anywhere, it would be unwise for the United States to consent to the abrogation of the 1903 treaty with Panama. Perpetual sovereignty over the Canal Zone and the grant of the perpetual right to maintain and operate the canal were indispensable inducements that led to the formulation and adoption of the 1903 treaty with Panama instead of going ahead with the Nicaragua Canal. Under its provisions the United States built the canal with funds supplied by the taxpayers of the Nation; and, in like manner, the canal has been maintained, operated, and protected efficiently since it was opened to traffic.

To surrender all these rights and privileges so indispensable for the building, maintenance, and operation of the canal would be suicidal in character. Moreover, the world is not at peace but actually on the verge of nuclear war with smaller wars and revolutions in various countries where communistic revolution has obtained a foothold; a time, indeed, when Red revolutionary governments are openly declaring that every nation on earth must accept the reign of communism by any means, however sanguinary and brutal. Surely this is not the time for our country to surrender the Canal Zone and thus become impotent to maintain and operate the great interocean waterway, which constitutes the key agency for the freedom of the Western World.

The treaties now proposed by the United States and Panama, if ratified, would drive our Government from the isthmus because the radicals of Panama will never consent to the presence of the United States on the isthmus. Besides, the surrenders thus proposed will in nowise satisfy these radicals and communistic revolutionary policies behind them until our country abjectly withdraws entirely from the isthmus, with resulting takeover by Red power inevitable.

In such event, Panama itself would be the first to suffer, for, unless U.S. sovereignty over the canal enterprise continues, Panamanian independence will be destroyed. This is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth; and it is, indeed strange that those in positions of responsibility in Panama do not realize the perils in which their country is being placed. Every encroachment on our indispensable authority as regards the canal means the opening of another gate to communistic revolutionary infiltration not only in Panama but also throughout all Latin America, with inevitable disasters that always mark Red takeovers.

In a brief article in his column, "In the Hemisphere," in the November 1965 issue of American Opinion, Harold Lord Varney, distinguished president and founder of the Committee on Pan American Policy of New York, supplies new information on the answers to why our Government acted as it did. It is interesting to note that President Johnson, when he was the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, strongly opposed the action of the Eisenhower administration as regards the display of the flag of Panama in the Canal Zone as evidence of that country's sovereignty over the Canal Zone territory.

The indicated article follows:

[From American Opinion, Nov. 1965]

PANAMA CANAL

(By Harold Lord Varney)

Lyndon B. Johnson has chosen to go down in history with the dubious title of the President who gave away America's Panama Canal. His latest prostration was his September 24 statement, with President Marco Robles, of Panama, that he was surrendering to the Panamanians on all basic disputed issues regarding the canal.

The collapse was abject and total. The President proposed to surrender American sovereignty over the Canal Zone—a sovereignty which was given to the United States in perpetuity by Panama under the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903. Not only that, but he went further and announced his willingness to cede part ownership and operation of the Panama Canal, itself, to the Republic of Panama, and he even agreed to meet the Panamanian demands to turn the canal from a service to the hemisphere into an extorting enterprise.

Many in Washington who have fought over the years to preserve the canal were stunned by the Presidential announcement. One was Congresswoman LENORE SULLIVAN, chairman of the House Merchant Marine Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, who said that this was "the most terrible thing this country of ours has ever done."

The Johnson action stands in striking relief to the vote (Feb. 2, 1960) of the House of Representatives against any change in the U.S. status in the canal. That vote was assured by the overwhelming margin of 381 to 12.

That President Johnson is not acting according to his own convictions in making the present abject surrender is indicated by his statements during the time of the Eisenhower administration when the first steps were taken to weaken American sovereignty over the Canal Zone. Writing to one of his constituents on October 3, 1960, the then Senator Johnson identified himself with the above House vote by saying, "The President has chosen to ignore congressional advice and he is now responsible for the consequences of his decision."

Who then is responsible for President Johnson's decision to give away the canal?

The humiliation of the situation is that the United States is surrendering to blackmail. The Communist-led 1964 riots in Panama could have been quickly halted if President Chiari had called out the National Guard. Instead, he stubbornly refused to mobilize the National Guard and permitted the violence to continue for 3 days. His object was to panic Washington into negotiations to revise the 1903 treaty. Although there was not the slightest necessity for us to accept such negotiations, we panicked. President Johnson stepped into the baited trap for negotiations. The complete capitulation to Panama, which has now been announced, is the bitter fruit of this action.

Historians will long ponder the reasons which brought President Johnson to make this surrender. The initial responsibility should perhaps be placed on President John F. Kennedy, Former President Roberto F. Chiari of Panama, who was in office during the 1964 riots, let the cat out of the bag on this matter when he disclosed that President Kennedy had promised him, when he visited the White House in 1962, that the United States would renegotiate the 1903 treaty. Though this was not announced in the communique which was issued by Kennedy and Chiari after their meeting, it was a private pledge which President Johnson has now felt it necessary to honor.

CUBA: BEACHHEAD FOR OVERTHROW OF WESTERN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, among the problems of the Caribbean the wresting of control of the Panama Canal from the United States has long been a key objective of the world revolutionary movement known as the international Communist conspiracy. The setting up in that strategic area of a Soviet satellite in Cuba was an important step in advancing its overall program for encirclement of the United States.

Serving as a beachhead for Red conquest not only of the Caribbean but also of other countries of Latin America, Cuba has now become a training ground for revolutionary activists sent to infiltrate, subvert, and overthrow constitutional governments of other countries of Latin America.

Two recent articles in the Reader's Digest, which tell the alarming story and are commended for reading by Members of the Congress and others concerned with the subject of hemispheric subversion, follow:

[From the Reader's Digest, August 1965]

Cuba's Brazen Blueprint for Subversion

(By Kenneth O. Gilmore)

On the northern coast of Venezuela's Paraguaná Peninsula, there is a lonely stretch of beach in a small inlet known as Macama. Half a mile from this beach, in a two-room stucco hut, lives 24-year-old Lino Gerardo Amaya, a wiry, quiet campesino. On the morning of November 1, 1963, Lino and his 18-year-old brother, Pedro, set out along the beach in search of a lost goat. They came upon two men in bathing suits, standing on the shore looking out to sea. Beside them was a shiny 16-foot aluminum boat with a handsome outboard motor. The taller of the two calmly waved his hand. "Hello, Frank, how are you? Don't you work for the Creole company?"

"I'm not Frank," replied Lino, "and I never worked for Creole."

Lino didn't find his goat that day. But shortly before 5 p.m. he and his brother headed back to the beach, fishing poles in hand. All that day a thundercloud of suspicion had been building up in his mind. What were those two strangers up to?

At the beach the brothers found the boat and outboard motor. And more. The coarse dark sand was scuffed with footprints—lots of footprints now etched by the lengthening shadows. And something else. A rope mark, its coils clearly imprinted in the sand, led from the water toward a tree.

Lino followed the mark, Pedro behind him. At its end they spotted the corner of a piece of canvas. They pulled it up. Underneath lay a large dark bag. They dragged it out and loosened a thick drawstring. Four automatic rifles. And layers of bulging cartridge belts.

On hands and knees they pawed away more sand and found more sacks of rifles, more cartridge belts. And now that they looked harder, it was apparent that a large section of sand was loose and soft ahead of them.

Lino sprang up. "We've got to tell the police," he said.

BURIED TREASURE

Shortly before 10 p.m. Lino arrived at the Jadacaquiva police station. He told his story to the prefect, Antonio Lugo, who immediately relayed the news to Police Commandant Eusebio Olivares Navarrate, at Punto Fijo, the largest town on the peninsula. Olivares roared off for the lonely beach with five jeeploads of policemen.

Soon the police were digging into the sand like pirates seeking lost treasure, grunting, heaving, hauling. In 15 minutes, Olivares had seen enough. He switched on the radio in his patrol car, gave the stunning news to the State Governor, Pablo Saher.

It took 4 hours to hoist the entire deposit from its temporary grave. The hole in the ground was 8 feet deep, 6 feet wide, and 90 feet long. The cache—automatic rifles, machineguns, antitank guns, mortars, bazookas, demolition charges, and thousands of rounds of ammunition—weighed 3 tons.

In Caracas, the Venezuelan capital, President Rómulo Betancourt was awakened at home and briefed by phone. He ordered a naval patrol of the peninsula and sent a special alert to every security and military agency in the country. For 2 years Fidel Castro had boasted that he would export his Cuban revolution to the mainland of South America. Oil-rich Venezuela was his prime target. "With victory in Venezuela," cried Cuba's old-line Communist boss Blas Roca, "we shall no longer be a solitary island in the Caribbean confronting the Yankee imperialists." Castro-trained guerrillas of Venezuela's Communist Armed Forces of National Liberation (FALN) had terrorized the countryside in an attempt to paralyze the nation. They had dynamited oil pipelines and bridges, burned stores and warehouses, robbed banks, raided police stations, kidnaped and murdered officials, and blasted the streets with sniper and machinegun fire. More than 50 policemen had been cut down in the streets of Caracas alone, and twice as many civilians.

But never before had the FALN been equipped with mortars and bazookas. Obviously something special was afoot.

A NEW LEAD

At the heavily protected Caracas headquarters of Venezuela's state security police (Digepol), chief of investigation Orlando Garcia Vázquez studied a surveillance report that had just come to his desk. It was late Monday afternoon November 3, exactly 48 hours after Lino had looked under the canvas. The report disclosed that at 10:30 a.m. that day a young woman known to have Communist connections was seen near the home of Eduardo Machado, a Venezuelan Communist Party boss. She was followed to a cafe on Negrin Street, where she sat chatting with three men. Fifty minutes later all four drove to a complex of four housing units known as "Urbanización Simón Rodríguez."

The woman strolled to building No. 1 and took the outside elevator to a fourth-floor apartment, No. 49. Her companions loitered in the area, making sure she was not being followed. Two hours later she came back to the car and sped to the old section of the city, where she was observed talking with several leaders of Central University's Communist-controlled student federation, some of whom had recently returned from Cuba.

Inspector Garcia was sure apartment No. 49 was "hot." Too many precautions had been taken. "I think we had better hit this place as soon as possible," he told his boss.

Shortly after midnight five Digepol agents in two groups sauntered toward building No. 1, chatting and laughing as if returning from a party, Garcia and two agents took the elevator to the fourth floor, while the others climbed the stairs, the only other exit.

Garcia knocked gently at apartment 49. There was a shuffling of slippers. The door opened a crack, revealing a middle-aged woman in a nightgown.

"We've come with a search warrant," said Garcia, shouldering his way in. "Is anyone else here?"

"No," she replied.

In a bedroom they found a young man in bed. "Stay very still," warned Garcia. "Who are you?"

"Germán López Méndez," the man replied, and handed over his identification card. No. 618945—Germán López Méndez—born November 27, 1941—5 feet 6 inches—hair brown—eyes brown. On the left-hand corner was pasted a small mug shot: a slim face, placid eyes, thin mustache, wavy hair. It matched the man.

"What's your occupation?" Garcia asked.

"I'm a teacher. Just visiting here for a couple of days."

"Okay, don't move while we search," Garcia said.

BIBLE ON TERROR

The men began to hunt, opening closets, pulling out drawers, looking under beds and in toilet tanks. Under one corner of the suspect's bed two objects were extracted: The first, a small light-blue airline traveling bag full of drawing equipment and materials—ink pens, tracing paper, rulers, compasses, crayons.

"What are you doing with these?" Garcia asked López.

"I've never seen them before," López answered, as if bored.

At first, Garcia thought the second item was a Bible. Book-size, it was enclosed in a dark-brown leather case with a zipper on three sides, the kind of covering often used for a Bible. Inside was a looseleaf notebook. Garcia flipped through some 70 pages. He found that he was holding an instructor's manual on the handling of arms and explosives—an FALN "bible."

Garcia glanced at the man on the bed. "This belong to you?"

"No."

About 5 a.m. Garcia returned to headquarters with his two suspects. "Keep searching," he told two agents left behind. "Mattresses, pillows, everything. When you're finished, start all over again. There's bound to be more than we've found."

Digepol's files indicated that the woman, who claimed to be a nurse, was a contact for a fugitive FALN leader. The man who called himself López was fingerprinted, and a search through the files disclosed his real identity: Luis Eduardo Sánchez Madero, age 24. On the margins of the FALN sabotage manual were notes jotted down in his handwriting, among them a precise schedule of his last day of instruction on October 21: 6 a.m.—rise; 8 to 12—courses in artillery and mortar; 2 to 6 p.m.—training in recoilless rifle, bazooka, and machinegun and cryptography; 8 to 10—study; 11—bedtime.

PUZZLE BECOMES PICTURE

Meanwhile, at apartment 49, an agent had found, taped to the bottom of a desk drawer, a 2-inch-thick stack of papers. Included in the material were lengthy descriptions of arms and explosives plus an intricate checklist for pulling off a successful sabotage or kidnaping operation: escape routes, floor plans, guards, alarm systems, cover stories, hiding places. There was also a large map of Caracas showing every street and major building in the city, and four pieces of transparent paper—overlays for the map—dotted by rectangles, circles, arrows, asterisks, crosses; parallel bars, and triangles.

What did it all mean? Garcia and his men studied these and other items, zeroing in on several papers crisscrossed with neatly ruled lines. At the top of each perpendicular column were large letters: "F," the symbol for fusil, Spanish for rifle; "PERS" for persons; "M" for mortar; "Csr" for cañone sin retroceso—recoilless rifle; and "B" for bazooka. The same type of arms found at Macama.

More notes were studied, such as a list of apartment buildings, offices and streets with specific designations of weapons. These numbers were compared. The map was pulled out, and the overlays with their symbols were arranged and rearranged. At last the puzzle became a picture. The rectangular figure meant "artillery," the triangle "fixed group," the open circle "troop positions," the slanted parallel lines "barricade," the cross "emergency station," the five-sided figure surrounded by arrows "object of attack." Sánchez Madero had drawn up a detailed plan for attack upon Caracas using the weapons delivered at Macama.

The Urdaneta barracks was the prime objective. A walled fort perched on the city's highest ground, it held a concentration of troops. Here also were tanks, near a jail holding top FALN terrorists. The scheme: isolate the troops and free the prisoners to join in the attack. This one phase of the operation called for 3 artillery units, 6 fixed groups of 3 to 4 men, 3 mobile groups plus positioning of 12 FALN troop units in carefully chosen locations. Assigned to do the job were 374 men, 195 rifles, 8 mortars, 12 bazookas, 4 recoilless rifles, 75 machineguns.

Apartment houses near the barracks were selected, from which snipers and machinegunners could pick off soldiers trying to reach jeeps and armored cars. Mortars would knock out key exits, sabotage units would cut telephone lines, seize power stations and blow up vital streets; bazookas and recoilless rifles would be waiting for tanks—if they made it through the carnage.

FANTASTIC?

At Miraflores Palace the attack plan was laid before President Betancourt. "To those of us who have witnessed FALN's murder and arson for 3 years, it doesn't seem so shocking," he confided to a colleague. "But this is going to look fantastic to the outside world."

Indeed, the question was: Would the "outside world" believe it? Could they prove conclusively where the plan had originated where the arms had come from?

The first point hinged on Sánchez Madero. An exhaustive check of all airline listings was undertaken. It was a long shot but it paid off, Sánchez Madero had fled from Venezuela to Jamaica on March 5, 1962, listed as "Luis E. Sánchez M.," after an armored-car robbery in which his fingerprints were found. In Jamaica he had boarded a KLM special flight, No. 977 from Kingston to Havana, Cuba. He had cockily given the airline his destination address: House of Americas (headquarters in Havana for the infamous Institute of People's Friendship, the processing agency for Cuba's Latin American terrorist trainees).

Tracing of the arms was turned over to the Venezuelan Army. An elaborate effort had been made to disguise the weapons. All serial numbers had been ground off. Near the trigger of each rifle, a hole had been cut, obviously to remove the insignia. But whose insignia?

Several of the weapons were rushed to Fabrique Nationale d'Armes de Guerre at Herstal-lez Liège, Belgium, whose trademark had been left on. Fabrique Nationale, the largest private arms manufacturer in the Western World, had filled an order by the Cuban Army for 22,500 automatic rifles on March 23, 1959. Now company experts examined the rifles dug up at Macama and reported that "the coat of arms of Cuba was stamped in the place where a cut has been made." Moreover, the Cuban weapons had their serial numbers uniquely located on the left side of the trigger guard, as these had been before they were ground off. Rifles with these characteristics had never been delivered to any country but Cuba.

As for the 31 "UZI" 9-mm. machineguns, the Belgium company also confirmed that they had been bought by Cuba. But the Venezuelans went a step further. Where a seal had obviously been ground away, an etching solution was applied. Slowly the chemical made decipherable the outlines of a legend. Under a magnifying glass an ornate crest could be distinguished—the crest of the Cuban Army.

The case was airtight. It was time to bring charges.

IRREFUTABLE PROOF

The wood-paneled main council room of the Pan American Union Building, 4 blocks from the White House in Washington, D.C., was packed on December 3, 1963. Venezuela had called the Organization of American States into emergency session to charge Cuba with aggression. Ambassador Enrique Tejera-París of Venezuela was speaking: "The people of Venezuela have been the constant victims of the insults and attacks of Cuba's Castro regime. Now in the face of the new act of aggression by Cuba, for which there is definite and irrefutable proof, Venezuela is forced to take this action."

An investigating Commission was immediately set up, composed of representatives of Argentina, Colombia, Costa Rica, Uruguay, and the United States. On December 8, the Commission flew to Caracas, along with a team of military advisers. There they heard detailed accounts from a score of witnesses ranging from Minister of National Defense Gen. Antonio Briceño to Juan DeDios Marín, a young Venezuelan who had been in Cuba for several months receiving military training in the handling of arms and guerrilla tactics. (See "Inside a Castro 'Terror School,'" the Reader's Digest, December 1964.)

Venezuelan Army officials picked out weapons at random, and before the eyes of the investigators demonstrated how the Cuban insignia could be raised chemically. Ward P. Allen, chief U.S. representative, was especially curious about the aluminum skiff and outboard motor that had been left behind on the beach that first morning by the two strangers. Odd, he thought—a Johnson motor with the manufacturer's marking: the Outboard Marine Corp. of Canada, Ltd., serial No. C367809. The Canadian Ambassador in Caracas was asked to have the motor investigated. A report came back through Canadian Government channels: four Johnson outboard motors, including C367809, had been purchased by an exporting company in Montreal and flown to Cuba on October 1, 1963, consigned to the National Institute of Agrarian Reform, Poultry Division.

A DAMNING VERDICT

On February 24, 1964, the OAS Commission presented its verdict: "The shipment was made up of arms originating in Cuba that were surreptitiously landed at a solitary spot on the coast for the purpose of being used in subversive operations to overthrow the constitutional government of Venezuela. The objective of the 'Caracas plan' was to capture the city of Caracas, to prevent the holding of elections on December 1, 1963, and to seize control of the country."

This plan, plus Cuba's "propaganda methods, provision of funds, training in sabotage and guerrilla operations," concluded the investigators, added up to "a policy of aggression." A 112-page report was submitted with a mountain of facts and proof, much of which is the basis for the preceding account.

Colombia's OAS representative found it hard to contain his fury. "This is not an incident of unwary sailors," he declared. "It is a serious international incident which is part of a carefully thought-out plan of Cuba for carrying the Communist revolution to the hemisphere."

La Tribuna, a major newspaper in Lima, Peru, commented: "What is important is the next step: that is, what kind of action will be taken against a government convicted of armed intervention?"

Incredibly, the answer to that question was in grave doubt. Several Latin countries balked at imposing firm measures against Cuba, clinging to the ancient concept of nonintervention which had originated years before Soviet communism moved into the hemisphere. Principal backsliders were Mexico, Uruguay, Bolivia, Chile and Brazil, all of whom at the time maintained diplomatic relations with Cuba.

SANCTIONS OR NOT?

Venezuela would not be put off, and pressed for a foreign ministers' conference of the 20 American Republics to punish Castro. It called for mandatory steps such as cutting off all trade, air travel and diplomatic relations with Cuba. "If the OAS does not apply sanctions to Castro's Cuba, it means the bankruptcy of democracy and the inter-American system," warned Venezuela's Foreign Minister Marcos Falcón Briceño.

Then in April 1964 a revolution in Brazil led by Gen. Humberto Castelo Branco, a firm anti-Castroite, ousted left-leaning President João Goulart. (See "The Country That Saved Itself," the Reader's Digest, November 1964.) Soon after, Brazil expelled Cuba's diplomatic delegation. Now those seeking stern measures against Castro felt that the continent's largest nation could be counted on when the chips were down.

Still, weeks, then months, dragged by while diplomats dickered over sanctions that would assure the necessary two-thirds vote. Finally, on July 21, more than 8 months after Lino stumbled on the arms at Macama, the hemisphere's foreign ministers gathered in Washington for the crucial voting.

The hemisphere states should not maintain diplomatic or consular relations with Cuba: 14 yes, 4 no, 1 abstain. They should suspend their trade, either direct or indirect, with Cuba, except for humanitarian reasons: same vote. They should suspend all sea transportation, again with the humanitarian exception: 14 yes, 3 no, 2 abstain. Any new attempts to subvert an American republic could bring quick armed retaliation without consultation: 15 yes, 4 no.

By the time the final resolution had passed, it was 12:15 a.m. July 26, the day Castro annually celebrates the birth of his revolutionary July 26 movement. At long last the American Republics had branded an outlaw in their midst. Within 6 months Chile, Bolivia, and Uruguay broke relations with Cuba. More significant was that key resolution giving the green light to OAS nations, alone or collectively, to strike back without delay should Castro be caught in further subversion.

THE THREAT REMAINS

Whether this provision will be used for direct retaliation against the Cuban sanctuary is quite another matter. Just last November representatives of Latin American Communist parties slipped into Havana to map out a bold new strategy with the Soviets to accelerate Red revolutions. A secret declaration (released in Moscow 2 months later) was signed promising "active aid" to "freedom fighters" in Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras, Paraguay, Panama, Haiti, and Venezuela.

Operations center for this guerrilla warfare is Cuba's subversion and espionage agency, the DGI (whose biggest unit promotes Latin revolutions), advised by at least five Soviet intelligence specialists. Squads of Latin Americans are trained by the DGI's Department of Special Schools. This department and other Cuban organizations have turned out at least 5,000 graduates. "This training today represents the most serious threat to democracy in Latin America," says Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Jack H. Vaughn. "We know of cases where the individuals of a given country trained in Cuba return by the hundreds. These people form a cadre of guerrilla units, and the larger the number, the greater the threat ultimately that they will make a move."

AN APPALLING SCOREBOARD

The scoreboard of riots, bombings, assassinations, violence, and espionage emanating from Cuba is appalling. In Guatemala a band of terrorists with a hard-core strength of about 300 men roams the mountains with headquarters in the Lake Izabal region. Five of them recently burned the U.S.-aid-program garage in Guatemala City, gutting 23 vehicles. Last February during a festive parade in the capital, 10 Guatemalan soldiers were killed by a grenade lobbed into the back of their truck. Chief of these guerrillas is stocky, tough Marco Antonio Yon Sousa who has secretly received $200,000 from the DGI.

A contingent of Panamanian Communists recently went back to Cuba for a second round of guerrilla instruction, while even more are preparing to journey to Havana. Next door in Colombia, banditry and kidnapings, once confined to remote rural regions, are closing in on the cities. Former Cabinet Minister Harold Eder was grabbed by kidnapers and a $250,000 price put on his head even though he had been murdered before the ransom demand. A newly organized Cuban-backed Army of National Liberation (ELN) directs much of this violence. In Moscow, Pravda propagandizes that events in Colombia are "very little different from the dirty war being fought in Vietnam."

Finally, look at the grim tragedy in the Dominican Republic. In classic style a band of skilled Communists swiftly exploited an explosive chaotic revolution. At least 77 known Communists were pinpointed and, as President Johnson has disclosed, "two of the prime leaders in the rebel forces were men with a long history of Communist association and insurrections." He noted that many of the "conspirators" were "trained in Cuba" and, "seeing a chance to increase disorder, to gain a foothold, joined the revolution."

WHERE NEXT?

Where will the graduates of the Soviet-Cuban Communist combine strike next? Where within our hemisphere will U.S. soldiers have to be sent next to avert a Communist coup while Havana and Moscow have a propaganda field day? And will we and our friends be able to discover and act against the next blueprint for subversion before it is too late?

No one can say—so long as an operations center for "wars of liberation" functions with impunity in Cuba. Time and time again our officials have said this subversion "must stop," yet it continues. Our words and warnings are scorned, and we go on merely reacting to one Cuban-fomented foray after another.

One long-overdue solution is for the OAS to modernize its rules and machinery so that it can act swiftly against Communist "interventions." Otherwise, Latin countries must accept U.S. fast action when lives and liberties of nations are in the balance, as in the Dominican Republic.

Another solution lies in tightening the economic noose around Cuba. Considering the mess communism has made of the Cuban economy, experts say it would collapse within weeks if most outside assistance was cut off. Why, for example, should we permit a procession of Soviet oil tankers to steam into the Caribbean to fuel Cuba's industries and utilities so that this springboard for subversion can survive? And why should we allow non-Communist nations to furnish vital items—867 shiploads since 1963?

When Secretary of State Dean Rusk called for sanctions against Cuba last summer, he pointed out that "subversion supported by terror, sabotage, and guerrilla action is as dangerous a form of aggression as an armed attack." And he added these significant words: "Today it is Venezuela which is under attack. Is there any one of us who can say with assurance, 'It cannot be my country tomorrow'?"

[From the Reader's Digest, November 1965]

HOW CASTRO SPREADS THE REVOLUTION

(By Robert S. Strother)

Armed with submachine guns and pistols, six young thugs stormed into the Banco de Crédito in Lima, Peru, last July 16. They took $10,000 in cash, then fled in a stolen car. It looked, at first, like a routine bank robbery. Then a sinister story emerged.

Four of the gunmen were arrested at the Lima airport while trying to escape. Investigation revealed that the men were members of a Communist "expropriation team," assigned to rob banks and business offices. Their purpose: to finance a revolution. The $10,000 loot, like that of a number of earlier bank holdups, was not recovered. Presumably, it had been delivered to one of three guerrilla gangs operating against landowners in the Andean highlands.

The bank-robbing team was a link in a continent-wide chain of criminals—the "action units" of Castro-sponsored "national liberation fronts." Since Castro seized power in 1959, these gangs have pulled off hundreds of robberies and payroll holdups in South American countries and in Haiti, Panama, and Puerto Rico.

Students of history recognize a familiar pattern. Nearly 60 years ago a team directed by Joseph Stalin held up banks in czarist Russia to finance the party's Bolshevik wing in the Russian revolution.

CRIME COLLEGE

Occurring at the same time as two leftist bombings in Lima and renewed guerrilla activities in the central highlands, the Lima robbery jolted Peru into the realization that Castro had made that country a priority target, along with Venezuela and Colombia, in his campaign to overthrow non-Communist governments. The Peruvian Congress denounced "aggression by Communist imperialism," and made terrorist crimes punishable by death. President Fernando Belaúnde Terry declared a state of seige, and sent civil guard and airborne counterinsurgency commandos into action against the guerrilla bands.

Of the 34 guerrillas taken in one bloody encounter in the rugged terrain around Cuzco, several were identified as graduates of Castro terror schools. Others said they had been trained as revolutionaries at a "crime college" in Nanking, China. Many were students from Lima's own San Marcos University. (The university is known to be a center of subversion but is untouchable because the law in Peru—as in many Latin American countries—grants "immunity from all Government authority" to anyone within the confines of a campus.) Also seized were a number of forged identity cards and guerrilla-warfare instruction pamphlets from Cuba.

A "VIETNAM" HERE?

Castro has long coveted Venezuela's vast mineral wealth for the Communist cause. The Organization of American States proved that 3 tons of weapons hidden on the Venezuelan coast late in 1963 had been smuggled in from Cuba. (See "Cuba's Brazen Blueprint for Subversion," the Reader's Digest, August 1965.) Ever since, Castro has openly bragged of his support of Latin American terrorists, and the Havana press now refers to Venezuela as "the Vietnam of the hemisphere."

To emphasize his determination, Castro has violated diplomatic usage by giving German Lairet, representative in Havana of Venezuela's Armed Forces of National Liberation (FALN), the status of ambassador. Lairet states his aims:

"The goal of the armed fight in Latin America must be the destruction of all existing regimes and their replacement by Communist governments. The forces of national liberation must exploit any political or economic crises. Through front organizations and tontos útiles (useful fools) they must demand the release of Communist prisoners, howl for freedom of the press if a Communist newspaper is suppressed, agitate for constantly higher wages. And even if these demands are granted, we must not drop the fight."

FUNDRAISING BY GUN

Bank robberies, payroll holdups, and jewel thefts by FALN's gunmen are common occurrences in Venezuelan cities. A meeting of inter-American police officials was held in Caracas to plan defensive measures for banks. Twice on the opening day it was interrupted by nearby bank holdups. In some cases, Caracas bank robbers have fled with their loot directly to sanctuary on the Central University campus—often in the so-called Stalingrado Dormitory. From there they thumbed their noses at police. Students tried to lynch an officer who entered the campus in disguise; he barely escaped with his life.

Besides bank and payroll holdups, the FALN also directs sporadic business-office robberies, embezzlements, police assassinations, strikes, bus burnings, the incessant sabotage by fire and dynamite of American-owned companies. To heighten the fear and wear down the police, guerrilla chieftains like the notorious Douglas Bravo often boastfully publish advance warnings of their crimes. In the chaos produced by the terror, ordinary lawlessness multiplies along with politically motivated crime.

FALN uses professional criminals in difficult holdups and safecrackings. Cars may be another source for the FALN fundraisers. From 40 to 70 cars are stolen in Caracas every week—despite the chains and padlocks used by owners. Quickly disguised with new paint and fake numbers, they are sold in nearby countries.

Last year, the Women's Anti-Communist Movement of Venezuela began publishing regular full-page newspaper ads, listing the 140 to 200 major crimes of the preceding month. One headed "Ya Basta" (that's enough) summed up the fearful toll of terror in Venezuela at 3,500 murders and 16,500 armed robberies in 4 years.[1]

BURN THE FILES

Even more demoralizing, however, are the capture and looting of entire towns by guerrilla units—often armed with weapons from Czechoslovakia and propaganda from Red China. The raiders seize cash and arms, liquidate opponents, destroy tax and criminal records. A typical foray opened the intensified drive against Colombia last January 8. A band of 50, armed with grenades and automatic rifles, surrounded the mountain town of Simacota, gunned down 3 policemen and a small boy, cut the telephone wires, then spent 2 hours looting stores, offices and private homes. The guerrillas, commanded by a woman they called Mariela, wore olive-green uniforms with red armbands identifying them as the "Army of National Liberation."

For more than 15 years, Colombia has reeled under a brutal rural terror in which more than 200,000 men, women, and children have been killed by bandits. In recent months the Government seemed to be gaining against them, but the Simacota attack signaled the beginning of a new ordeal. It was the first appearance of a well-organized modern guerrilla unit. Only the month before, while in New York City to appear before the U.N. General Assembly, "Che" Guevara had indicated that Colombia might be a top-priority target for Communists when he said that "revolutionary conditions are ripe" and that "liberation struggles" were already taking place there.

In the cities, student-led riots erupted, extortion cases multiplied. The nation's criminal records were destroyed by a mysterious fire. President Guillermo León Valencia declared a state of emergency and begged threatened businessmen not to flee the country. Bogotá newspapers report that 700 more Colombian youths have gone to Cuba for training in subversion. Some 20,000 soldiers are kept busy in the back country, trying to break up "independent states" proclaimed by Communist gang chiefs. In the chaos, "social decomposition," as sought by the Communists, moves ahead.

GENERATOR OF HATE

As violence increases, radio stations in Havana, Moscow, and Peiping hurl a staggering total of 410 hours of propaganda a week into Latin America, most of it pure hate. The Moscow line seeks to drive a wedge between classes; the Peiping line blows on every ember of discontent or envy among the colored peoples of the world, and openly incites them to revolt against white people.

---

[1] Venezuela's crimes recall those of Russian revolutionaries in 1906. "The month of October alone witnessed 121 terrorist deeds, 47 fights with police, and 362 'expropriations,'" says Boris Souvarine in his biography, "Stalin." "In 4 months, 2,118 Government agents and officials were killed and wounded, following on 2,000 casualties in the preceding 18 months."

The three U.S. Presidents in office since the rise of Castro have vowed that the United States would not allow him or his Red masters to use Cuba as a center for subverting the rest of the hemisphere. Yet Cuba's role as the generator of hate and chaos expands daily.

Not Latin America alone but the entire Western Hemisphere is under attack. The essential immediate step, if the terror is to be crushed, is to replace the present halfhearted watch over Communist Cuba with an effective quarantine that could end the ordeal.

TARGET U.S.A.: A WARNING FROM PEIPING

(By Seymour Topping in New York Times)

Communist China now openly declares that its support of revolutionary wars in underdeveloped countries is a strategy directed at the eventual encirclement of the United States and Western Europe. And, it asserts, the war in Vietnam demonstrates that a people's war in Asia, Africa or Latin Americas can be waged successfully against the United States.

The new definition of Chinese Communist global strategy is contained in a 30,000-word article by Lin Piao, Minister of Defense and a vice chairman of the Chinese Communist Party. The article was published last September in Jenmin Jih Pao, the party newspaper, and in all Provincial and municipal newspapers throughout the country.

It stated that the outlook for worldwide revolution was more favorable than ever before; that application of the theories of Mao Tse-tung could result in an overcoming of the superior material strength of North America and Western Europe.

The article reviewed Mao's military strategy, which holds that revolutionary bases must be established in rural areas so that cities can be encircled from the countryside. This conflicts with the global pattern of Marxist-Leninist theory—adhered to by Moscow—that the proletariat must lead the revolution. The Maoist position in essence is that the revolution must be based on the peasantry.

"In a sense, the contemporary world revolution also presents a picture of the encirclement of cities by the rural areas," writes Lin Piao. "Taking the entire globe, if North America and Western Europe can be called 'the cities of the world,' then Asia, Africa, and Latin America constitute 'the rural areas of the world.' Since World War II, the proletarian revolutionary movement has for various reasons been temporarily held back in North America and the West European capitalist countries, while the people's revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa, and Latin America has been growing vigorously."

The Minister of Defense added: "In the final analysis, the whole cause of world revolution hinges on the revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African, and Latin American peoples, who make up the overwhelming majority of the world's population."

Lin Piao further noted: "We shall fight in ways most advantageous to us to destroy the enemy, and wherever the enemy can be most easily destroyed."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.
Mr. PELLY.
Mr. TUPPER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VIVIAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ST. ONGE.
Mr. MACKIE.
Mr. RONCALIO.
Mr. CELLER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 17, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1881. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of all laws enacted by the Eighth Guam Legislature, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1882. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the 20th annual report of the Agency's operation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 79-377, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1883. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Federal Aviation Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. A report on activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 89th Congress, 1st session; without amendment (Rept. No. 1211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. A report on broadcast ratings; without amendment (Rept. No. 1212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 12036. A bill to provide for U.S. participation and leadership in an international effort to end malnutrition and human want, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 12037. A bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 12038. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the critical period for the national security; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 12039. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 12040. A bill to provide for the best care, welfare, and safeguards against suffering for certain animals used for scientific purposes without impeding necessary research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 12041. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a pension under title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12042. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 12043. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R.12044. A bill to repeal the limitation of liability for damages caused by domestic commercial atomic powerplants which are licensed in the future; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R.12045. A bill to provide for improved benefits under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, to strengthen the financial condition of the fund created by such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R.12046. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R.12047. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 12048. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States to assist them in the construction of facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug abusers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12049. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States to assist them in establishing treatment and rehabilitation services for drug abusers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R.12050. A bill to authorize civil commitment in lieu of criminal punishment in certain cases involving narcotic addicts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R.12051. A bill relating to the penalties for violations of certain narcotic and marihuana laws of the United States, and to the treatment of narcotic addicts and other persons suffering from a mental or physical condition committed to the custody of the Attorney General; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 12052. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the Texas Scottish Rite Centennial; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12053. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12054. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require conformity with minimum housing standards as a condition of public welfare assistance, and to help implement the recommendations made by President John F. Kennedy in order to eliminate slum housing in which millions of citizens are living; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12055. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to require conformity with standards of health and safety for rental housing occupied by recipients of assistance, and to implement the recommendations made by President John F. Kennedy in order to eliminate slum housing in which millions of citizens are living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 12056. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer the deactivated bathyscaphe *Trieste* to the city of San Diego, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.J. Res. 802. Joint resolution to extend the period for filing record of sales and leases of cotton farm acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. Res. 663. Resolution providing for further expenses for studies and investigations pursuant to House Resolution 44; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 12057. A bill for the relief of George Apostolopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12058. A bill for the relief of Shabtai Levy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12059. A bill for the relief of Michael Stefanakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12060. A bill for the relief of Saradis Vogiouklis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 12061. A bill for the relief of Pietro Silvio Licata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 12062. A bill for the relief of Louis H. Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 12063. A bill for the relief of Leo Cassanelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12064. A bill for the relief of Maurice Hatem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 12065. A bill for the relief of Antonina Dudzinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12066. A bill for the relief of Antoune Boutros Elkhouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 12067. A bill for the relief of Agnes C. Stowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 12068. A bill for the relief of Bienvenido A. Cruz and Genina P. Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

313. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Great Incohonee (national president), Improved Order of Red Men, Watkins Glen, N.Y., relative to a commendation of the National Government for its stand in Vietnam, encouraging punishment for destroying draft cards, and encouraging studies of certain other governmental activities, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Consolidated Edison Indian Point Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we, the citizens of New York, must welcome the announcement that the Consolidated Edison Co. plans to quadruple the capacity of its Indian Point nuclear generating plant in Westchester County. Indian Point is the company's second largest producer of electricity, surpassed only by its plant in Ravenswood in Queens County. The latter station is conventional, using coal and/or fuel oil. New York City, which must always be supplied with power—inordinate power—will have adequate electrical power with the enlarged nuclear capacity at Indian Point.

Thus, Consolidated Edison acknowledges public responsibility.

Nuclear generation of power has become competitive with other fuels in cost. But the real advantage of nuclear power is the absence of damaging substances pumped into the air, causing pollution. With nuclear power there is no smoke nuisance. Coal burning on the other hand, produces air pollution. No matter how much you try to prevent such pollution with expensive apparatus, there is no appreciable abatement of the soot in the atmosphere.

More and more energy is being used for commercial, industrial, and residential purposes. Almost everything moves by electricity—even toothbrushes. The Consolidated Edison's facilities are taxed to the utmost to supply the demand of electricity and it is hard put to develop new sources of power.

Despite the opposition aroused, most of it unrealistic and unnecessary, to building a nuclear plant in Ravenswood, Queens, I supported that effort in the interest of progress and an answer to the city's needs. There was no inherent danger as charged. Public anxiety, however, triumphed despite the safety assurances and that project was abandoned.

At the time of the hearing on the Queens Ravenswood proposed nuclear plant, there was an emotional appeal that the safety of the city would be endangered by a possible nuclear explosion. Appropriate scientific evidence was developed to prove the contrary. There are numerous cities harboring nuclear projects, with no apparent danger. The public must sooner or later realize that nuclear power must have widespread use. The removal of the poison from the air more than compensates for whatever increased cost there may be in the generation of nuclear power.

Eventually, I presume, the generation of nuclear power will become cheaper than any other source of power. When the Indian Point project is fully expanded, that station alone will provide electricity to satisfy the needs of 2½ million people. In addition, I understand that this company will add a 500,000-kilowatt generating unit to its Arthur Kill Station in Travis, Staten Island, at a cost of $65 million.

This will be a conventional unit. It will be set up to meet the additional needs of the population of New York City.

In a subsequent statement, I will have something to say about the company's hydroelectric plant at Cornwall, N.Y.

These additional facilities are clear indications that this company does not wish to risk another blackout in New York City. There are certain purblind people who always wish to stand in the way of progress. They are so addicted to the old ways that they fear the new. They would "rather bear those ills we have than fly to others that we know not of." But the scientists know the effects of nuclear energy and they see no danger if there are proper safeguards. The future reservoir of almost all power will be nuclear and the present skeptics will have to realize this sooner or later. These are the same skeptics who, in the 15th century, warned Columbus not to set out on his voyage to India which finally led him to America. These are the same skeptics who, in 1888, said the Brooklyn Bridge would fall down. These are the same skeptics that denigrated Kittyhawk and flying machines and these are the same skeptics who scoff at our efforts to seek to reach the moon.

Congratulations to Paul A. Miltich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, Paul A. Miltich, a correspondent for the Booth newspapers of Michigan, has been elected to membership on the standing committee of correspondents.

Paul's election victory—he received the highest number of votes cast—indicates he is held in high esteem by his colleagues.

We join other members of the Michigan delegation in congratulating Paul Miltich in his victory and he has our best wishes for a successful term of office.

Representative Pelly Calls for a Full Congressional Debate on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House of Representatives, as the 2d session of the 89th Congress convenes, look forward to fulfilling our legislative responsibilities to the American people. It will require great patience, wisdom, and dedicated service to preserve and protect our Republic from enemies, both domestic and foreign, as under our oaths of office we are sworn to do.

Clearly, Vietnam is the No. 1 problem before the Nation. It will be the major question before the Congress this year.

Already, Mr. Speaker, I have had a number of private conversations with individual members of committees having jurisdiction over foreign affairs and defense. During the recess, these colleagues have been looking into the war in Vietnam and our military situation.

I have asked a question of one of our colleagues, who, as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, has been briefed recently by officials of the Department of State. My question was one I was frequently asked last fall by constituents; namely, why the conduct of the war and the policies we are pursuing is not a fit matter for congressional debate. In answer, I was informed that a high-ranking official of the State Department had told the House committee, in executive session, that the administration was "almost of a mind to allow such a debate." What a shocking statement. Imagine the implication that the Congress of the United States can only debate such an issue if the Department of State so approves. Certainly, such an implication impugns the independence of this great legislative body.

Personally, Mr. Speaker—and as one who have supported the President—I strongly favor a full and open discussion of the southeast Asia situation, and consideration by the Congress—as provided under the Constitution—as to a declaration of war on North Vietnam.

In this connection, I frankly doubt if the American people are being given the facts. For example, Secretary McNamara has said that the United States has stopped losing the war, but my conversations with Members who have recently visited Vietnam and studied the situation lead me to believe that, on the contrary, in the overall picture this may well not be true.

Of course, the latest peace promotion has been gratifying to the American public and has no doubt somewhat improved the unfavorable world image that has hurt our cause in the past.

Meanwhile, it seems to me that alternatives should be known. I refer to the fact that accelerating the war by bombing Hanoi or major facilities and industries is not the only course before us. Nor is a tight blockade our only course. I am informed that all the United States has to do is to bomb North Vietnamese dikes and that country will be flooded and rendered economically helpless. The resulting floods, I am told, would completely disrupt the war efforts of the North Vietnamese.

Mr. Speaker, with more American lives being lost every day and with general lack of public knowledge as to our policies—except that we will talk peace anywhere, at any time, and with no conditions—I favor opening up the subject of Vietnam for full and free discussion by the Congress. Only on that basis can the country make the proper decisions and provide the right answers to this unhappy issue.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, at home, the people are raising questions about the war. Who will say that they are not entitled to the facts?

Certainly, these facts, and the full and complete picture, were not included in President Johnson's state of the Union message.

The scheduled briefing of Members of Congress by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in an off-the-record session, is all to the good. But the imposition of secrecy only serves to confuse the issue publicly. What is needed is a full debate, with all questions and answers on the record. Under our system of government, the public should not be kept in the dark.

As in the past, I will try to dig out what facts I can, and always refrain from partisan criticism. But, unless frank and full answers to the questions which my constitutents raise are forthcoming, I will feel impelled to protest and point up any such failures.

Mr. Speaker, other than this, the Democrats in the administration and in this House of Representatives can count on my support of a bipartisan foreign policy. But, as I have said, I must have the facts and I must know more about just what is our foreign policy.

State of the Union Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's state of the Union address last night was a most sobering experience not only for all of us in Congress, but also for the Nation as a whole. It was a serious report to the American people, and to the world at large, on the problems confronting us at home and abroad in the trying days and months ahead.

The President minced no words. He described the situation in the world today as he sees it from his vantage point of leadership. As a capable leader of his Nation and one of the outstanding leaders of the world, he prescribed a program of constructive recommendations which should go far in coping with many of the problems facing us. I feel certain the Congress and the American people will uphold the President in most or all of his recommendations.

I believe that most of the President's proposals are in the best interests of America because their aim is to provide greater strength and security for our country, continued economic prosperity for our people, and peace for a troubled world which is hungry for peace.

On the whole, it was a momentous address, earnest in tone, impressive in its presentation. I found the President's confidence in the strength of America most reassuring in these crucial days in world history.

Congressman Conte Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of this body two very fitting honors which were bestowed on the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, SILVIO O. CONTE.

On April 29, 1965, Congressman CONTE was honored by an honorary membership in Phi Sigma Alpha, political science honorary, at Northern University in Boston. Then in December, he was initiated in Phi Delta Phi legal fraternity.

In accepting the Phi Sigma Alpha award, our colleague said in part:

> In politics, as much as in any other field, there is a mutually constructive and beneficial relationship between the theorist and the activist—between the teacher and the doer. We must exploit this relationship to the fullest. I think the future of the country depends in large measure on how successful we are in establishing a dialog between the poles of theory and action.
>
> Today, at least as urgently as ever before in our history, this country is in need of enlightened public officials, men and women who are dedicated to some higher goal than simply winning elections and holding office.
>
> We must have a recommitment to the ideals and principles of the Nation's founders who not only dreamed the great dream, but had the practical skill and wisdom to bring that dream to reality.
>
> I do not wish to imply that such men are not in our midst today. I believe, by and large, most of those in public service are sincere, honest, forthright men who are motivated by the highest ideals and prin-

> ciples. Unfortunately, the political spectrum in which many of them must circulate does not always permit decisions or advocacies that are in the best interests of all the voters.
>
> A man cannot bring much influence to bear on government until he comes to power, and the road to power is paved with political bargains, kickbacks, patronage, false promises, and all the other degrading, underhanded tricks that are designed to curry favor and serve the powers of vested interest.
>
> By the time a man reaches the heights of power on this escalator, he is apt to be too corrupted or obligated to exercise it honestly and in a statesmanlike manner.
>
> On the other hand, the sworn obligations of a Member of Congress, for example, are paradoxically at odds with the role of the academic theorist. A Congressman is too deeply committed to the day-to-day operations of the system in which he functions.
>
> In that system, his role must be a partisan one. That is, he must operate to a very considerable extent on the basis of partisan commitments, on a very distinct political bias. Thus, he is compelled to give up a sizable measure of the objectivity which is an indispensable virtue of the scholar.
>
> The scholar is not so pressured. He can and must assert his independence and his objectivity. He cannot allow his judgment to be even partially colored by partisan affiliations or commitments.
>
> Not since the very dawn of our society, when our Founding Fathers forged a batch of revolutionary ideas into a republic have we seen the roles of practical politics and objective scholarship woven together in a tight-knit-viable fabric.
>
> Our admiration of the Founding Fathers from the vantage point of history stems, in large part, from the fact that they combined the skills of practical politics with the wisdom and balanced judgments of classic scholars. They were statesmen in the truest sense of the word.
>
> It must be conceded that we have lost a measure of that erudition in our public leadership over the years. We have seen power pass through corrupt and abusive fingers. We have seen politics manipulated for gain and vested interest. We have produced a somewhat tarnished folk image which puts the politician a cut or two below the statesman. We have seen the separation of politician and political scientist.
>
> There is, on the other hand, a very serious and respectable effort being made these days to resolve some of the complex problems that have grown up as a direct result of the separation of practical politics from political science. The process of academic inquiry goes on and, I think, is presently enjoying a unique resurgence among scholars and politicians alike.
>
> There has even been, surprisingly, a gradual swing of the pendulum in some schools of thought away from the traditions and principles which have given them their lifeblood.
>
> We seek a union of scientific rationale and the cold-blooded pragmatism of everyday politics.

On December 4, the Massachusetts Congressman was inducted into Phi Delta Phi, with which many of the Members of this body are associated.

The honor was bestowed at the National Lawyers Club by the Marshall Inn in recognition of our colleague's dedication as a law student when he completed a 3-year course in 2 years in addition to holding down several part-time positions; for his service to his community as a member of the legal profession, and for his outstanding political achievements.

By his initiation he joined the heritage of such men as the late, gifted statesman, John Foster Dulles; the former Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn; Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT; Justice Hugo Black; Senator DAN INOUYE; and Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

At the initiation ceremony, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] made some remarks of which, I think, the legal profession and the Members of this body should be cognizant so that they can give guidance to their ultimate fulfillment.

He said in part:

> If there is some counsel which I, as practicing politician involved with the scope and activity of our Federal Government, could give you tonight, it would be to dedicate yourselves to safeguarding the preeminence of the individual to society; and, more specifically, to apply the great skills you have developed toward making law responsive to the needs of the individual, to making it the protector and servant of all the people, not just those who can afford to buy it.
>
> In all fairness, I must also tell you that such a course is not an easy or materially rewarding one. You won't get rich solving the problems of the poor. But if you are like me, you will find the psychic satisfactions more than adequate. And, there is both a challenge and a responsibility for each of us in this work.
>
> Let me tell some of the reasons why I feel it is so important.
>
> Today this Nation and the world are in the midst of some of the most revolutionary social changes since the Germanic barbarians overran the Roman Empire. The thrust of this modern social revolution is moving us closer and closer to the lotus beds of a paternalistic welfare state in which the Federal Government will clothe and house and feed us; will plan our cities and pay our bills; will plant our crops and fence our wilderness; and will tend our ills, deliver our babies, and bury our dead.
>
> There are now programs of aid and assistance for just about every phase of life that could pose the slightest problem for us. We have a broadly comprehensive program for aid to education. We have disaster aid for business, medicare for the aged, social security, housing grants and loans, and now we even have a program whereby the Government is going to subsidize rent payments for the poor.
>
> In order to make all of these programs work, in addition to the controls and tax regulations and fair employment rules that set the boundaries, a vast body of administrative law has been created.
>
> It is with this kind of law that the poor and underprivileged must deal in order to take advantage of the assistance programs which have been set up for their benefit. The paradox is that they are also the least equipped to deal with such law. They are the least able to understand, and the least able to pay for someone else's understanding and counsel.
>
> This is not the spirit of the new jurisprudence. This is not preserving and upholding the preeminence of the individual. This is subordinating the individual to the clumsy, sluggish, random machinery of the state. It subordinates him to the institutions that are created to help him.
>
> It is in this realm, I believe, that the greatest challenge lies for the legal profession today. It lies in bending this sudden new, mammoth body of administrative law applied in what Justice Brennan termed the administrative forum, as distinct from the judicial forum, to the individual. It lies in bringing that law to the individual and making it work for him; in establishing the recognition of human beings as the most distinctive and important feature of the universe; and in forcing upon government the limitations which, Justice Brennan argues, are necessary to preserve human dignity and our sacred heritage of freedom.
>
> There is a job to be done here and I can tell you, from the vantage point of a U.S. Congressman, that job is not being done today.
>
> Probably 75 percent of a Congressman's time, on the average, is spent trying to help some poor guy back home get himself out of a tax jam, or get a fair shake on some land the Government wants, or to press a claim on his social security, or some other similar problem involving a confrontation with an agency of the Federal Government.
>
> Unfortunately, 75 percent of a Congressman's time—or even 100 percent—is not enough to help all the individuals with problems.
>
> The gap persisted and the number of problems grows in direct proportion to the growth of the Government. If we are to create meaningful progress for society, we must make certain these programs serve the people who need them. We must bend every effort to keep them from becoming simply a rathole for tax dollars, a system for creating Federal jobs but little else.
>
> Pay heed to the problems of the poor. Give of your time and talent to bringing the law to the poor, to giving them the legal assistance they so desperately need. It is an obligation you must face, an obligation to your country and to your fellow man.

Needed: Men To Match Mountains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 11, it was my pleasure to accompany Mr. and Mrs. John Borzea of my hometown of Rock Springs, Wyo., to the first annual President's Conservation Awards banquet sponsored by the National Wildlife Federation and Sears Foundation, which was held at the Statler Hilton.

My host, John Borzea, received the honor that evening of a Governor's Conservation Award, and it was my particular pleasure to observe the awards to others who have made notable contributions to the field of conservation which is so vital to everyone in the Nation.

The shocking blight which confronts the urban areas of America was touched upon in the main speech by Secretary Freeman. I could not help but contrast the problems of megalopolis America to the beauty of life in those areas of the Rocky Mountain West where we still have, as in Wyoming, considerably less than four human beings per square mile, where we still have clean air and clean water, and hope to keep it that way.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but ponder the historical presence of western problems of economic growth. In a book now a best seller in the West, the "History of Wyoming," by T. A. Larson, we find that the problems confronting Wyoming were precisely the same 75 years ago as today. They were, first, how to maintain the payrolls of its few industries; second, how to maintain the population growth; and third, how to attract more payroll from the public as well as the private sector.

Secretary Freeman's speech touches on much of a program which can protect a worthwhile natural environment for society. But until man learns to move from the megalopolis environment, and to love and live in harmony with an environment of higher elevations and of lower populations, the problems may be ever with us.

In any event, I believe that Secretary Freeman's speech is one of the best in my experience in Washington, and I am happy and proud to attach it to my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN PREPARED FOR DELIVERY TO THE FIRST ANNUAL PRESIDENT'S CONSERVATION AWARDS BANQUET SPONSORED BY THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION AND THE SEARS FOUNDATION, JANUARY 11, 1966, AT THE STATLER HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

We live in an age of revolution.

We have long enjoyed the benefits of the abundance revolution in agriculture, for no person in this country today need go hungry.

The scientific and technological revolution enables man to walk in space today and consider walking on the surface of the moon tomorrow.

Electronic computers in dust-free, humidity-controlled, air-conditioned rooms have launched the cybernetic revolution and these machines now produce other machines, operate factories, regulate traffic, improve access to man's vast storehouse of information, write payrolls and talk with other computers doing the same thing.

And here tonight we are witnessing the beginning of another revolution—the conservation revolution. At least, a revolution in the concept of conservation.

A decade ago, the National Wildlife Federation might have given an award to the individual who did the most to preserve and protect wildlife.

But tonight the National Wildlife Federation concludes its first annual awards program with an emphasis on unity of purpose in conservation making awards for wildlife, soil, water, and forest conservation.

Awards in six other categories of individual achievement in conservation, together with the four at-large national awards dramatize the diversity of conservation activities—and the unifying purpose of guarding our renewable resources so they are available in undiminished supply to serve many uses today and tomorrow—and for all time to come.

It is an eloquent response to the plea which President Johnson made a year ago. In his message on natural beauty, he said: "Our conservation must be not just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. Its concern is not with nature alone, but with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not just man's welfare but the dignity of man's spirit."

This is a wise and perceptive statement. I will attempt tonight to interpret and apply it as broadly and meaningfully as the President intended. The point I want to make is that when true conservation principles are put in operation we will cease to crowd ourselves into vast cities, and more and more Americans will return to the countryside to live and work. When that takes place America will be a better nation.

There is today great ferment among conservation groups; ferment caused not by competition, but rather by a new vision of what cooperation can accomplish—and the disaster which can befall this great Nation in its absence.

THE ASCS

A decade ago, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Interior would not have traveled 3,000 miles across country to sit down together with local people to discuss future development plans for land, water, timber, and wildlife resources in the area surrounding the community. But that is what Secretary Udall and I did last week.

A decade ago, a newspaper in North Dakota would not have written that "By far the largest operation in creating and restoring (wildlife) habitat on privately owned lands has been conducted through the agricultural conservation program administered by the (USDA's) Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service."

But today, ASCS the farmers commodity program arm is spending much of its time working with USDA's Soil Conservation Service, local soil and water conservation districts, and with State game and fish agencies to help private landowners including the use of incentive payments to produce wildlife along with farm crops on their acres.

A decade ago, the advice of wildlife groups would not have been sought in establishing management programs and policies on land moving to other uses than crop production—nor would local communities and counties be encouraged and helped to convert cropland into much needed parks and recreation facilities.

But today, through the recently enacted cropland adjustment program, that is happening. We are assisting farmers to convert as much as 40 million acres of cropland to uses which will provide the Nation new access to the outdoors.

It is appropriate that I take this important occasion to announce appointments to a wildlife advisory board which will counsel the Department as we develop procedures under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 to improve wildlife. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is working closely with the USDA to assist local communities and county governments to acquire land under this program for recreational development.

DEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION

A decade ago, Soil Conservation Service would not have joined with Interior's Fish and Wildlife Bureau to strengthen management and prevent policy conflicts within Public Law 566 small watershed projects. But this kind of cooperation is almost routine today not only for wildlife protection but also for recreation and for water for industrial and community uses—all conservation goals now financed by the small watershed program. Community organizations seeking to expand uses for renewable resources are being encouraged to participate in sponsoring and planning watershed projects.

A decade ago, the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, Defense, and Agriculture did not review together the use of pesticides on public lands so wildlife would be preserved while other resources are being protected. But we are doing this today; and the USDA has stepped up its research activities to develop nonchemical means as well as safer chemicals to control pests and plant diseases. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, and the USDA also have begun a broad cooperative research programs to determine and gage the effects of pesticides use in human health, animal life, and on soil and water to obtain vital information lacking today.

Two decades ago, there were widespread concern that the Potomac, as with other major rivers of the United States, was becoming increasingly polluted and someday would be little more than an open sewer—inhospitable to fish and wildlife and too dangerous for recreation. For 20 years too little has been done, and our worst fears have been realized.

POTOMAC RIVER PLANS

But now a comprehensive Potomac River basin plan has been prepared under the guidance of Secretary Udall, at the direction of President Johnson, which will employ the resources and skills of many State and Federal agencies. This plan, which can serve as a model for other regions to follow under the River Basin Planning Act, can help to not only clean up the Potomac but also provide unparalleled wildlife and recreation opportunities in upstream areas and in nearby portions of national forests lands.

Five years ago, when smaller communities throughout the American countryside faced serious water shortages or growing pollution problems, there was not much community leaders could do.

Plagued with declining population and an inadequate tax base, these communities usually found that credit resources to finance basic community improvements were not available. Today, the Congress has greatly enlarged the program of the USDA to assist these communities to establish and improve water systems and sewage treatment facilities.

A decade ago, the need to develop many more outdoor recreation opportunities concerned only a few people—among them, was a new Governor of Minnesota. Yet anyone who took time to study the rapidly increasing recreation uses of parks and forests—State and national—could see what was coming.

TRUE MULTIPLE USE

In the last 10 years, the States have greatly increased their investment and in recent years the Federal Government has acted on a wide front to enlarge the capacity of land, timber, and water resources in the public domain to provide outdoor recreation. A massive survey of outdoor recreation needs has been completed, and a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has been established in the Department of Interior.

The Congress recently created a number of national recreation areas and in 1964 passed the Wilderness Preservation Act giving permanent wilderness status to 9.5 million acres of primeval America—including almost 2 million acres it has been my privilege and pleasure to move into that category by executive order of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Interior through the national parks and the USDA through the National Forests have greatly enlarged the recreation potential of public lands. Today the USDA can provide financial assistance to farmers who wish to develop recreation as an income-producing crop to supplement their farm income.

Thus, in recent years dramatic progress has taken place in conservation policies and programs. It is marked by new emphasis on a unified approach and a new spirit of cooperation among groups and agencies, private and public alike, concerned with the Nation's renewable resources—and by an emphasis on wise and effective use, with greater concern for the needs of individual resource users.

Thus, a society which began soil and water conservation programs primarily as a means of protecting these resources for agricultural uses by those who owned the land now finds that the same principles and techniques must be applied to a vastly wider canvass of problems and needs.

Agriculture alone cannot support a vital and growing rural community that wishes to offer its young people an equally wide range of job and income opportunities, public services and cultural and recreational outlets as they can find in metropolitan areas. And the urban areas, reaching out to consume land and water in prodigious quantity are finding that they must mend their ways for they have misused and wasted land and water to the point where life in the megalopolis increasingly is becoming more costly, complicated and less satisfactory.

It is crystal clear that as a nation we have to make a given quantity of land, water, timber and wildlife resources serve more than one purpose at the same time. Multiple use on private as well as public land will become an ever increasing necessity of life.

As a conservationist, I have always believed in this basic concept. As a public servant concerned with the kind of a society we build for ourselves and for our children, I know that we must practice it as a matter of commonsense—as a matter of conserving the values of a free society.

A GROWING NATION

Within the time span of one generation—within the next 35 years, the population of the United States likely will grow by another 100 million persons. We already are having a difficult time making the renewable resources we possess in great abundance serve the needs of 200 million Americans. What are we going to do when the demands of another 100 million people are placed on the same quantity of renewable resources?

This is the challenge that confronts the true conservationist today.

And I do not believe we will meet that challenge unless we begin now as a matter of National policy to spread out—to create and maintain greater opportunity for more people to live good lives where open space exists—rather than bunching up in our great cities.

I am not suggesting that we abandon the city and dismantle it. The great cities of America will continue to grow.

But I am suggesting that we should begin now to create other alternatives than megalopolis as a place to live. To crowd another 100 million bodies into the large metropolitan complexes is not wise. Our cities today face critical problems in trying to maintain a decent environment for those already there—let alone absorb another 100 million bodies.

The water shortages which struck New York City are more serious than those which a drought and shortage create. They are indicative of the difficulty which the megalopolis has in providing adequate services for its citizens.

In the recent power failure which struck the Northeast, the smaller communities were able to restore power much sooner than in New York City.

Smog—air pollution—no longer is the exclusive possession of Los Angeles, nor is air pollution any longer associated exclusively with heavy industrial concentrations. It is a blight which appears today wherever people crowd together. Washington, D.C., has very little industry, but there are days when smog mars the sunset over the Potomac.

When the commercial, business and cultural life of millions of people can be halted because of a dispute over transportation—and when the prospect of people driving to work threaten a traffic jam even worse than no transportation at all—then it is time to consider other alternatives than larger and larger urban complexes.

These conditions destroy the beauty and charm of the city; they erode the quality of life and the joy of living. And they are getting worse, not better.

We must, as President Johnson has said, practice creative conservation. We must not only restore what has been corrupted, but also inovate new techniques in the use of our renewable resources which will protect man's welfare and raise his spirit.

We must employ conservation to develop in rural America those conditions which will enable many more people than today to enjoy a better, more gracious, more abundant and healthful life. We must end the neglect of rural America.

As a place to live, rural America has great assets.

It has a growing number of adequate family farms—and a farming economy which will provide food and fiber abundance and contribute increasingly to a stable economic base for the local community.

It has space for new industry, for new homes and for outdoor recreation. It has water for communities and industry, for agriculture, for wildlife and for recreation. The programs which are becoming increasingly available at State and Federal levels can help insure the wise development and use of these resources.

And rural America has the time to make certain that the development and use of these resources is planned to create the maximum opportunity for a good life for millions of people.

Conservation alone—planning the wise use of our renewable resources—will not automatically create the broad range of job and income opportunities and related services and cultural and recreational activities which rural America must offer, but without conservation the conditions which will make for a brighter more meaningful life for millions more Americans in the countryside U.S.A. will not be possible.

Conservationists—regardless of their special interests—can provide critical leadership in the restless quest for a better way to live.

I would close tonight with a little verse that frequently races through my mind:

"Bring me men to match my mountains,
  Bring me men to match my plains,
Men with empires in their purpose,
  And new eras in their brains."

Thank you and goodnight.

Address by Senator Len B. Jordan at Idaho Reclamation Association Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HANSEN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, on December 13, 1965, Senator LEN B. JORDAN, of Idaho, spoke to the annual convention of the Idaho Reclamation Association on the subject of water resources.

Mr. Speaker, Senator JORDAN is one of the most knowledgeable men in the Pacific Northwest on this subject. As Governor of Idaho for 4 years he was very active in the formation of the Columbia River Compact Commission, which seeks to guarantee water for present and future needs for the participating States. He was cited by the other member States of the Columbia Basin for his outstanding achievements in this regard.

After completing his term as Governor, he was called to Washington, D.C., to act as chairman of the three-member U.S. delegation of the International Joint Commission, formed to work out water problems with our friends and neighbors to the north, the Canadians.

So it is that, when Senator LEN JORDAN speaks of water and water problems, he speaks with authority. His talk of December 13 is a keenly perceptive analysis of current and future water problems in the Pacific Northwest. I commend it to my colleagues.

REMARKS BY SENATOR LEN B. JORDAN, IDAHO RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, BOISE, IDAHO, DECEMBER 13, 1965

I am honored to be asked to keynote your annual convention. You, representatives of the Idaho Reclamation Association, are meeting at a time when the challenges of developing our State's land and water resources takes on added emphasis because of increased interest nationwide in the value of our water resources.

Your fine organization, with which it has been my pleasure to work for many years, has had a leading role in the development of Idaho. I am confident that you will not shirk this role at a time when our State's water resources are being coveted by people across the Nation for a variety of purposes other than making our desert bloom and produce for Idaho.

Water is more than a natural resource—it is a necessity of life. Here in the United States we have lived more than 200 years before the water problem became generally acute. But the uses we make of water in modern society are so tremendous that they stagger the imagination.

The coming of our industrial era, the raising of our living standards, and the increased application of water to land have now highlighted the problems until in much of the Nation there is grave and increasing concern over water resources.

Planning for the development of water resources has undergone a marked evolution during the past 50 years. At the turn of the century the use of water resources was planned largely on a single-purpose, single-project, single-agency basis. Too frequently other equally important uses of water were overlooked. This was because no agency was authorized to plan for comprehensive development. Each carried out its specific function as prescribed by law.

The local people, through established agencies, such as State water resource boards and/or interstate compact commissions should have an effective voice, along with the Federal agencies in this planning which would recognize and properly weigh all the varied and sometimes contrary programs affected by the proposed development of water resources.

In the Northwest we are especially favored with an abundance—sometimes a superabundance—of potable water. This is not to say that our water is always available in the right place at the right time. The problems of distribution are always with us. How to capture nature's rainfall on our watersheds and then by proper storage and supply management mold this water resource to best achieve its multipurpose benefits is a real challenge, but one that is richly rewarding. These multipurpose benefits must include domestic, industrial, reclamation, power, navigation, recreation and fish and wildlife. No longer can we tolerate single-purpose planning.

Here in Idaho finances are the greatest stumbling block to Idaho's desire to put its water resources to beneficial use. We must look to new financial sources as our traditional ones are growing short. Water user payments, power generation revenues and flood control benefits from our projects now being studied will not in most cases provide needed finances for the project.

Idahoans are almost unanimous in their belief that to assure that we do not lose our water, we must put it to use on the land. We have a similar unanimity for such projects as the Lower Teton Dam, Lynn Crandall Dam, supplemental water for areas south of the Snake River in Cassia, Twin Falls and Owyhee Counties, the southwest Idaho development project and other projects as yet unannounced. However, it is when the subject of getting these projects financed that we see our water resource development hopes stalemated.

Projects with a high benefit-to-cost ratio that could be paid out largely by water users have long since been constructed. After these were built we used power revenues to supplement water user fees to insure project feasibility. But the remaining water development projects in southern Idaho are far beyond the ability of water users to pay out in a reasonable length of time even with added power revenue benefits from the project.

With the reduction of rates for Federal power generation now under the Bonneville Power Administration, power revenues which might have been available to future Idaho projects have been reduced. And to date we haven't been able to get funds for Idaho projects from Federal projects downstream in the BPA system even though Idaho watersheds provide a substantial portion of the water which turns the turbines at these downstream sites. Thus, the financial straitjacket on Idaho water resource development becomes tighter.

Flood control benefits of Idaho projects are another help in financing. However, the recent signing of the Columbia River Treaty with Canada has preempted much of the flood control values that could have come from Idaho storage, because of the huge amount of Canadian storage, we have already purchased for this purpose. Here we see another financial source being materially reduced.

One basic point I wish to emphasize early in this statement is the interdependence of land and water. Any serious study or planning for one must necessarily and inevitably involve the other. Sound water resource development depends first of all on a healthy, well-maintained watershed. This is of primary importance.

Several years ago I spent a summer in Afghanistan investigating the economic feasibility of a large reclamation development. There I found that centuries of watershed abuse had first removed all of the timber from the slopes and the higher elevations. Overgrazing land had contributed to the destruction of the brush and grass cover, leaving insufficient vegetation to retard the runoff. Erosion was inevitable and devastating almost beyond belief. Soil movement had bared the hillsides to bedrock so that there was little more runoff retardation than from the roof of a building.

Masonry arched bridges perhaps a quarter of a mile long stood stark and desolate in the desert, mute evidence to the fact that a rampaging river had dammed its own channel by lodging debris against the bridge piers and then cutting a new channel as if in defiance of man's effort to contain it. At flood stage the river was a monster out of control. In the heat of summer when water was most needed the river would shrink to a docile, sluggish stream, an altogether inadequate fraction of its flood stage.

In Afghanistan I have seen drifting sand dunes uncover the houses of a village that was once the center of an irrigated agricultural community. Here are the ghosts of a civilization that perished for lack of water—a silent indictment of man's refusal to observe sound conservation practice.

This is where I learned more of the importance of watershed protection against complete ruination. Here it was indelibly printed in my mind that we cannot take for granted that water will always be available downstream, no matter how we abuse the watershed upstream.

In the Columbia Basin most of the watershed is federally owned. This poses a real problem because the funds available for watershed protection on public lands are not adequate. Moreover, funds which provide technical assistance to private landowners for soil conservation have been substantially reduced in the administration's budget.

In order to protect our watersheds, sometime in the not too distant future, it may be necessary to levy against power sales for headwater conservation purposes, including additional headwater storage. A very small assessment per kilowatt hour on all power sold, public, private, Federal, and non-Federal alike could provide a fund to keep the watersheds healthy. A prudent businessman employs similar methods to protect his long-range interest. No less prudent should be our approach to sound conservation and watershed protection.

A second point I wish to make is that there is no single uniform policy, no magic formula relating to water resources which can be applied to all parts of the country at all times and in all places. The problems involve particular needs and uses of water from State to State, from basin to basin and from region to region.

While it is generally sound to plan coordinated development of water resources by large river basin areas, it is possible to place too much importance on this concept without giving full consideration to the States as sovereign units in basin complexes because the large river systems have no respect for State lines. For example, basin planners must concede the validity of water rights that are perfected under State law.

Too often the upstream States of a river basin are short changed in the allocation of benefits derived from main stem plants downstream. A case in point is the Columbia Basin. Testimony before congressional committees indicates that some 13 million average kilowatts of hydroelectric power can be developed in the U.S. portion of the Columbia River Basin that will be cheaper than an alternate source. Most of this power development will be in the State of Washington or on its boundary. Yet the watersheds of the State of Washington will supply but a small part of the water that passes through these mainstem turbines.

Washington watersheds contribute less than 3 percent of the water at Grand Coulee, 8 percent of the water at Chief Joseph, and 13 percent of the water at McNary. Thus most of the water originates on upstream watersheds, but the downstream reclamation projects receive a lion's share of the benefits. Simple equity would call for a sharing of downstream benefits with upstream States which supply the water.

Insofar as upstream Canada is concerned the United States-Canada Treaty gives recognition to the contribution that will be made by yet-to-be-built Canadian storage. A cash payment of more than one-quarter of a billion dollars has been made by the United States to Canada. This will pay for Canada's entitlement to a share of increased production at U.S. plants downstream made possible by Canadian storage for a 30-year period. Bear in mind that not 1 gallon of new water will be added to the Columbia. What will be accomplished is a partial regulation of the steamflow, storing the flood peaks and releasing the water when normal streamflows are lowest. In addition Canada will receive $64 million for flood control benefits to the United States.

This treaty is a great step forward in river basin planning. As a former chairman of the U.S. section of the International Joint Commission, I was privileged to work on the early stages of the Columbia Treaty and I know firsthand the months and years of assembling the basic data which preceded the additional months and years of hard bargaining. The significant fact is that an accord was reached and consummated in a treaty thus indicating, at the international level, a meeting of trained minds as to the value of upstream watershed and storage resources.

Likewise the upstream watershed and storage resource of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, and Oregon make a contribution similar to, and perhaps even greater than, that to be made by Canada.

Now someone will probably challenge this comparison on the basis that much of the U.S. headwater storage is for reclamation and that part of this water is consumptively used. The answer is that the purpose of upstream storage is to capture the floods at or near the source and to release the stored waters as needed.

Irrigation accomplishes this purpose admirably. Even the water that is lost by transpiration or evaporation is returned in the form of added precipitation. Only that small part which becomes a part of the plant is truly lost.

In Idaho, on the Snake River alone, we have between 8 and 9 million acre-feet of storage now through reclamation projects. Two-thirds of this water returns to the Snake River during its low flows. Thus, by shaping and improving the runoff pattern, reclamation contributes substantial flood control benefits and hydropower benefits as well.

At present time no provision is made for upstream States to share in downstream benefits and there is no provision in the law for such a sharing. Nor is there any provision in the law that would prohibit some such arrangement as a Columbia Basin project account through which upstream reclamation projects might share in the downstream power revenues as an aid to reclamation beyond the ability of the water users to pay. This is not an unreasonable arrangement.

Let us review briefly, the evolution of reclamation law. The basic reclamation law, beginning in 1902, required that the cost of irrigation facilities be repaid, but without interest. Even though such projects benefited directly many other people in the community, the water users were responsible for the repayment of the total cost. Under this general requirement the projects which were relatively simple and easy to build were constructed, leaving the more complicated and expensive ones undeveloped. Although many of these more complicated and expensive irrigation projects are desirable and worthwhile, the water users are unable to return the irrigation costs in full and it is thus impossible to establish their feasibility under reclamation law without repayment assistance from sources other than the project lands.

In recognition of this situation the Congress has from time to time, enacted legislation providing for the use of power revenues to assist in the return of costs of a reclamation project.

Up until now only an individual project-by-project approach has been legislated in the Pacific Northwest. To illustrate: the Columbia Basin Reclamation project in the State of Washington of 1 million acres will require financial assistance in the amount of $474 million from power revenues from Grand Coulee Dam. By 1975 the power costs of Grand Coulee with interest will have been paid back to the Federal Government. The net power revenues from 1975 to 2022 are pledged to pay that part of the Columbia Basin reclamation project beyond the ability of the water users to pay. The water users on this project will pay $125 million.

This project is an outstanding example of a thoroughly sound reclamation project integrated physically and financially with a specific power project and using a substantial block of assistance from project power revenues.

However, under this piecemeal approach, the development of a reclamation project depended entirely upon the accident of location and the physical possibility of developing power in connection with irrigation on each side specific project. Other reclamation projects of equal merit but having no direct tie-in with a hydropower installation could not be developed unless power assistance was made available from another source not directly a part of the reclamation project.

Congress has met this problem in three major river basins of the West by providing for the use of power revenues to aid irrigation on a basinwide basis. The effect of this action has made possible the development of desirable but isolated irrigation projects by providing financial assistance from the pooled net power revenues of all Federal power projects in the basin after power costs and interest have been repaid to the Federal Government. The basins where this basin account principle applies include the Missouri, the Upper Colorado, and the central valley of California.

To date all efforts to implement a basin account for the Columbia have been unsuccessful. In lieu of a basin account a few isolated irrigation projects in the lower basin have been tied to a specific Federal power project not physically a part of or in any way connected with the irrigation project for which financial assistance is sought.

In my opinion this practice discriminates unfairly against an upstream State which supplies much more water for main stream powerplants than the downstream State which is the sole beneficiary of all funds that might be available for irrigation assistance from these downstream plants. Moreover, it could lead to the rejection of a sound reclamation project in an upstream State in favor of a downstream project of less merit.

The use of political muscle to reserve all power benefits downstream exclusively for downstream reclamation assistance does violence to the concept of the interdependence of land and water resources. It works a gross injustice on upstream States simply because the accident of a State boundary may separate the upstream watershed from the downstream hydroplants.

For many years the National Reclamation Association has been on record to the effect that reclamation development on a basin wide multipurpose basis is the only manner in which full utilization of river basin water resources can be realized.

A basinwide Columbia project account should be properly funded. I do not contend that the Federal power projects alone shall carry the whole burden of assistance to future reclamation. Every hydropowerplant in the Columbia Basin should contribute to the project account whether it be Federal, private, or non-Federal public.

Federal power projects do not require licenses from the Federal Power Commission. All other hydroplants do require 50-year licenses. As in other river basin accounts no funds would be available from Federal hydro projects until the power costs plus interest are repaid to the Federal Government and then only such unassigned revenue that has not been already pledged as authorized financial assistance to reclamation.

In the case of licensed projects no financial assistance should be required under existing licenses but should be a part of rate base for a license renewal.

The amount of assistance required and what legislation is necessary to implement a Columbia Basin project account are matters that should be discussed in a proper forum between the States involved and I believe the proper forum is a Columbia Basin compact meeting.

Back in 1951 when I was Governor of Idaho, at my instigation, a Columbia Basin compact proposal was made by Idaho to the other basin States. Over the years numerous meetings were held and more than once an acceptable compact seemed near accomplishment. Having worked on the Columbia Treaty, I know how worthwhile and productive such discussions can be. It is my hope that agreement among the State will soon be reached, for I earnestly believe the compact concept has a very real and mutually valuable place in interstate negotiations.

At present, the compact seems to be stalled. I regret that this is so. But a new approach to cooperative planning may be provided by the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 which I was pleased to cosponsor. The need is great for serious conferences between authorized representatives of the several States in the Columbia Basin. All of the States now have proper agencies to engage in open discussions of our many common problems. Idaho's new water resources board is off to a good start. I applaud its effort and its willingness to tackle the problems without fanfare or delay.

I turn now to another matter which should be of grave concern to Idaho reclamationists and conservationists. Recently there was introduced in the Congress the administration's wild rivers bill which would designate five rivers in the United States to be preserved in their wild state. Included in the five are Idaho's Salmon and Clearwater Rivers.

Both of these rivers are part of a comprehensive plan for Columbia Basin development as detailed in House Document 531 adopted by the 81st Congress, 2d session. This document indicates that the combined runoff of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers is greater than the total runoff of the Colorado River Basin and that the combined hydroelectric potential of these two rivers is greater than the hydroelectric production of Grand Coulee Dam.

Do not forget that the Grand Coulee Dam is the paying partner for the "cash register" which supports the 1-million-acre project in the State of Washington. This will point up the magnitude of the economic values which will be lost to Idaho if the wild rivers bill passes in its present form.

Now we in Idaho agree that our two rivers have wild characteristics in abundance. We are not unmindful of the need to preserve for posterity something of this irreplaceable resource. We know, too, that two-thirds of the area of Idaho is federally owned, and that, of all the States in the Union, Idaho has the largest area set aside for a single purpose wilderness use—a wilderness that is traversed by many miles of streams of unsurpassed wild beauty.

So in Idaho we have a double loyalty in our great love for the wild, in our determination to protect our great wildlife and recreation resources and in our desire to grow and develop agriculturally and industrially. We believe that these objectives are not incompatible.

We are pleased that Idaho can contribute so much in wild beauty, spawning grounds, wildlife and recreation resources, and water in great abundance to the community of Northwest States, but frankly we believe that some place in this whole picture there should be a measure of reciprocity.

Because they are important to Idaho reclamationists, I quote the minority view of Senators THOMAS H. KUCHEL, GORDON ALLOTT, LEN JORDAN, MILWARD SIMPSON, and PAUL FANNIN, on S. 1446, the wild rivers bill:

"We agree with the concept that certain of our Nation's great scenic rivers should be preserved in their free-flowing condition. We agree that such rivers should be set aside to promote sound water conservation and the public use and enjoyment of the scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values. We agree that the policy of the Congress to preserve, develop, reclaim, and make accessible for the benefit of all the people selected parts of the Nation's free-flowing rivers is a commendable objective. This is a highly praiseworthy use of America's dwindling resources to meet the ever-increasing demand of our pleasure-seeking population and has its rightful place in the overall plan of national outdoor recreation.

"We agree in the proper use of river basin planning for additions to the system as outlined in section 3(c) of the proposed legislation, as well as the general procedures set forth in sections 3(d) and 3(e).

"A river or rivers should not be included in the wild river system if such inclusion would seriously disrupt the present or potential higher beneficial use of the river or the economy of the area through which the river flows or which it serves. No river should be set aside in perpetuity from future harnessing to supply water for our cities, for agriculture, for flood control, to generate hydroelectric power, or to aid navigation without careful and thorough study to determine whether it is feasible and desirable in the public interest. Review should be made of all comprehensive river basin plans, and potential alternative uses of the water and related land resources involved must be evaluated.

"Section 3(b) and following, of S. 1446, provide the procedure whereby certain designated and new rivers may be added to the wild river system. Such additions are subjected to a most thorough study and evaluation at all levels of government and by any and all agencies which may profess an interest. This is not so with respect to those rivers designated in section 3(a). The rivers listed in section 3(a) become 'instant' wild rivers upon the signing of the legislation, notwithstanding the fact that such rivers may be a part of a comprehensive river basin plan or subject to future study under State or Federal laws.

"Congress, at this session, enacted into law the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–80). Its specific purpose is to inventory and evaluate the water resources of the Nation, river by river, State by State, basin by basin, with Federal, State, and local participation. Congress also enacted into law the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (Public Law 89–72), whereby it expressed its intent to encourage non-Federal development and operation of recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement features of Federal water resources projects. The act recognizes that there are non-Federal as well as Federal responsibilities with respect to the provision of outdoor recreation opportunities and fish and wildlife enhancement and it is anticipated that the Federal water agencies will work with the States and local governments in the determination of the scale and development of these aspects of recreation.

"Both of the above acts contemplate comprehensive study before further action. We do not feel that such study has been given, or a complete investigation into the feasibility of including in the wild river system the two wholly Idaho rivers, the Salmon and the Clearwater, has been made.

"The committee considered and rejected amendments submitted by Senator JORDAN which would have removed the two Idaho rivers from the 'instant' section, section 3(a), and placed them in the study section, section 3(b), while at the same time placing a moratorium on any further development of the rivers pending a full and comprehensive study of the potential economic need for future development of the rivers. It is our belief that further study would not defeat the purpose of this legislation and that the public has the right to know.

"Both of these rivers are a part of a comprehensive plan for Columbia Basin development, incorporated in House Document 531 adopted by the 81st Congress, 2d session.

"The combined runoff of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers is greater than the total runoff of the Colorado River and the combined hydroelectric potential is greater than

Grand Coulee or greater than all hydroelectric potential on the entire Colorado River.

"Back through the years these rivers (especially the Salmon) have been protected as sanctuaries for anadromous fish spawning. Until the dams versus fish controversy is settled no development plans are being pressed. Ever since the building of Grand Coulee Dam, which destroyed all upstream anadromous fish runs above that point, the few remaining spawning beds have increased in value and importance.

"The salmon problem will be solved in one of two ways: no salmon at all in the upper reaches (as appears possible now) or a means will be found to pass salmon over dams. (The new 750-foot Dworshak Dam will have facilities for migrating salmon.) In either case, it may be possible to have both fish and dams in the not too distant future. Until this is solved no one proposes dams and we do not.

"The importance of the decision to be made here must not be taken lightly. We are not arguing for dams in wild rivers. We do argue for the right to evaluate the effect of plan changes.

"The economic effect of an abrupt change for the Salmon and Clearwater from the plan adopted in House Document 531 is a subject of great concern. A Columbia Basin account does not exist. Thus the full economic shock of this change from full development to freeflowing status will be borne by Idaho alone. This is unwarranted, unnecessary, and inequitable. Idaho's greatest resource is water—it has no fossil fuels. To deprive one State of the right to evaluate the economic potential of two great rivers with a combined value equal to that of a fully developed Grand Coulee with its million-acre reclamation project or the equivalent of a fully developed Colorado River is the greatest inequity in this bill.

"The defeated Jordan amendment would have placed these two Idaho rivers in the study section with full guarantee to protect their free-flowing status until the economic dislocations are studied and worked out. The Green River in Wyoming, which faced similar controversy, was moved from the 'instant' section to the study section of the bill for further study.

"This present bill creates a National Wild Rivers System. But there is no language in the bill that would provide even partial compensation to a State for economic losses resulting from a change of plans from full development to freeflowing status of its rivers. Surely it is not intended to penalize one State excessively. Under the circumstances, the least that should be done is to regard the inclusion of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers in the 'instant' section of the bill as a Columbia Basin contribution. This would involve full basin account status for Idaho in the community of Columbia Basin States. For this there is ample precedent. Even in this bill the segment of the Missouri River, now in the study section, if placed in the wild river system would be a Missouri Basin contribution to the system rather than a contribution wholly and solely by Montana.

"We think it is important that wild rivers be designated where the people are so that many more can enjoy this resource. The bounties attaching to wild river designation should not be confined to areas already served by abundant resources for outdoor recreation. This is so important that perhaps no State should have two rivers until all States have one river so designated. The stated purpose to reclaim and restore could very well apply to such rivers as the polluted Potomac which is a national disgrace.

"As has been mentioned before, the primary purpose of the bill is to keep the wild rivers in a freeflowing condition. A report from the Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, indicates that the Salmon River and the Clearwater River may be too wild. These rivers are the worst flooders on the Columbia River system.

"While these two rivers in an average year contribute only 14 percent of the normal flow of the Columbia River at The Dalles, in 1948, when millions of dollars of damage was done by the flood waters of the Columbia, the Salmon and the Clearwater contributed 27 percent to the floodflow. In the disastrous flood of 1964, the two rivers contributed 30 percent. Dworshak Dam, now under construction on the north fork of the Clearwater, would only reduce these percentages to 23 and 25½ percent, respectively.

"The bill prohibits the Federal Power Commission from authorizing a dam or other project work under the Federal Power Act in any wild river area except as specifically authorized by Congress. It should clearly be understood that no legislation could prevent Congress from authorizing necessary and desirable flood control projects or other public works of any kind if any subsequent Congress made such a decision.

WATER RIGHTS

"During the consideration of this bill by the Interior Committee, certain amendments submitted by us were adopted by the committee and are a part of the bill as sections 5(d) and 5(h). These amendments clearly express the intent of the committee that, by the passage of this legislation there will be no change in the established principles of Federal-State water law.

"There will not be a reservation or appropriation of all unappropriated water of the rivers and streams included in the wild river system areas. There will be a reservation of waters only for the purposes outlined in the bill and only in quantities necessary to accomplish these purposes.

"When acquiring water rights for wild river purposes, rights which are vested under established principles of State or Federal law, just compensation shall be paid.

"The jurisdiction of the States over waters of any stream included in a wild river area should not be affected by the passage of this bill. The Federal Government should be required to comply with State laws when acquiring water rights or vested interests therein.

"We shall reoffer amendments for consideration by the Senate which will expressly confirm these principles. Subsequent to committee action, the Department of the Interior has advised that it does not object to the adoption of these amendments."

In his letter to the President of the Senate endorsing the national wild rivers system, Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall had this to say:

"The President, in his state of the Union message of January 4, 1965, called attention to the need to protect the beauty of America, which he noted has sustained our spirit and enlarged our vision for more than three centuries. He expressed the hope that some of the unspoiled stretches of our waterways will be preserved under a wild rivers bill. There is a need to act now to protect this part of our heritage.

"In his February 8 message on natural beauty the President recommended the establishment of a national wild rivers system. The enactment of the draft bill enclosed with this letter will carry out that recommendation. The bill is designed to preserve, reclaim, and make available for the benefit of all the American people specifically chosen segments of the Nation's diminishing resources of free-flowing rivers.

"While river flows have been harnessed to aid navigation, control floods, increase farm productivity, and hydroelectric power, too little attention has been given to the importance of protecting the very water we drink and the values of fish and wildlife, scenic, and outdoor recreation resources. These values, although often measureless in commercial terms, should be preserved by a program that will guarantee America her heritage of unspoiled, unpolluted, free-flowing rivers. Our belief is shared by a wide range of public and private authorities, and the time to act is now, before it is too late."

So I repeat that I do not disagree in principle with the purpose and objectives of a National Wild Rivers System. I repeat also from the language of the minority views that no provision is made to compensate a State for economic losses resulting in a change of plans from full development of its rivers to less than full development in order to provide free-flowing wild rivers "for the benefit of all the American people."

I believe the wild rivers bill, S. 1446, should be amended to correct what obviously might be an unreasonable diminution of a State's natural resource potential for a national purpose.

Without attempting to suggest the wording of such an amendment, certain basic equities should be maintained. For example: If the dedication of the output of the watersheds of a State is made "for all of the people" then all of the people should make fair restitution to the State for the loss of potential economic alternate development. The language of the amendment should be broad enough to cover any wild river in any State.

It just happens that Idaho is asked to contribute two of the five rivers of the initial Wild Rivers System. It just happens that Idaho's two rivers have greater economic value under alternate development than all the other rivers mentioned in the bill.

The amendment should provide, therefore, that whatever net economic losses are sustained, that State should receive from the Federal Government a nonreimbursable credit for application to water resource development as determined by that State, approximately equal to the loss sustained.

There is a wealth of precedence for the use of nonreimbursable costs in resource development. Let me cite a few:

The rivers, canals, and harbors of the Nation have been improved and maintained from the Federal Treasury. There is no reimbursement. The users of the waterways pay nothing for the transportation arteries into which hundreds of millions of dollars have been poured. It is justified on grounds that cheaper transportation by water is a national asset.

A second precedent is found in the Flood Control Act. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by the Federal Government to protect people, farmlands, home, and industries from the ravages of floodwaters. No portion of the funds so paid is reimbursable, or ever has been. This is based on the proposition that safety from flood damage makes for a greater national prosperity.

A third and even more illuminating precedent is found in the authorization of several recent projects wherein the benefits calculated for recreation and for fish and wildlife are capitalized and treated as nonreimbursable items. To illustrate, the Touchet division of the Walla Walla projects will cost $15,709,000, of which nearly $8 million, or more than 50 percent, is allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement, a nonreimbursable item. Again, under the justification that such development is a national asset.

What, then, could be so unfair in recognizing the need to make a State whole if certain of its resources are taken for all the people of the Nation—resources which, under alternate development, would enrich the economy of the State concerned.

Senate bill 1446 provides for a review board consisting of the Secretary of the Interior, who shall be its chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and the Governors of the several States.

The purpose of this board is to consider the change of circumstances of the status of any river included within the National Wild Rivers System and to report to each Congress any significant changes that might call for legislative action.

The duties of this review board could be expanded to include making a determination of economic losses to a State arising from inclusion of a river or rivers in the National Wild Rivers System for the benefit of all the people. Restitution could be provided in the form of nonreimbursable credit for such water development assistance as the preempted resources might have made to a State's economy under full or at least an alternate plan of development. Such nonreimbursable credit should be utilized entirely at the discretion of the affected State.

I ask you as reclamationists to weigh carefully the merit of the plan I suggest here. This plan is definitely in the interest of wise use and proper conservation of our land and water resources without imposing undue burden on any area. I urge the proponents and the sponsors of S. 1446 to join me in my effort to make a wild river bill workable and equitable.

The amendment should be written in general language to cover all dislocations in all other States where wild rivers are involved. This is simply the application of the accepted rule in water resource development that recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement are nonreimbursable items.

What is Idaho's stake in such an amendment? Let us look at some figures on S. 1446 which are used here for illustrative purposes only, subject to the refinement that proper research will provide. On the credit side of the account the Northwest will gain the preservation of a fish resource calculated by the Fish and Wildlife Service to be worth $11,062,000 per year.

On the debit side Idaho will lose potential hydroelectric production estimated in House Document No. 531 as being in excess of 2 million kilowatts valued conservatively at $40 million per year. Idaho will also lose the flood protection that proper stream regulation would provide. But, from a reclamation standpoint by far the most important point, is that Idaho will also lose the reclamation assistance that this hydroelectric production would provide in a total amount not less than $400 million based on the fact that a comparable hydroelectric output at Grand Coulee Dam provides that amount of assistance to about 1 million acres of new land.

I have spent enough time at the bargaining table with our Canadian neighbors on similar water resource problems to know that Idaho has an interest in wild rivers legislation that must be protected and defended by proper amendment before the bill is passed.

To sum up: I repeat what I said at the beginning: Finances are the greatest stumbling block to Idaho's future reclamation development. There is general unanimity for such projects as Lower Teton, Lynn Crandall, for supplemental water for Salmon Falls, new water and supplemental for other vast areas on both sides of the Snake River in eastern and southern Idaho, the southwestern Idaho development project which must include also the Weiser, Payette, and pumping projects in the Bruneau and Wickahoney areas.

Idaho's reclamation future depends on developing a reliable paying partner to supplement what the water users can pay.

Idaho must look to the output of its own watersheds for this source. This is Idaho's entitlement—our resource heritage.

Before we surrender—without compensation—Idaho reclamation's potential cashbox to a National Wild Rivers System, let us be sure we know what we are doing.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 14, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all being, throned afar,
Thy glory flames from sun and star;
Center and soul of every sphere,
Yet to each loving heart how near!

We bless Thy name that Thou art near, near enough to hear us when we call upon Thee. Our need is great, and we pray that Thou wilt cleanse and empower us to do Thy will for each one of us this day.

Especially do we seek divine blessing upon Thy servants in this Chamber now confronted with responsibilities, so massive and so many, in this new session of the Congress.

May they find the needed strength, and renewed confidence, as they turn to Thee in the petitions of the ancient prayer which they may make their own:

"Direct us, O Lord, in all our doings, with Thy most gracious favor, and further us with Thy continual help, that in all our works, begun, continued, and ended in Thee, we may glorify Thy holy name, and finally, by Thy mercy, obtain everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 10, 1966, and Wednesday, January 12, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

This is the first annual report on the operation of the International Coffee Agreement required by section 5 of the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-23).

The International Coffee Agreement represents an important element of our foreign policy, especially as that policy is directed toward the problems of the less-developed countries. Our participation in the agreement should help make it possible to avoid the sharp rises and falls in coffee prices that have adversely affected U.S. consumers and growers of coffee in foreign countries alike. Stability of prices will help those countries heavily dependent on coffee exports to plan for and carry out their economic development and diversification programs. The steady economic progress of these countries is, in turn, an important stimulus to a healthier and more stable political climate in each.

I believe that during 1965 the dual aims of the agreement—adequate supplies of coffee to consumers and markets for coffee to producers at equitable prices—have been met. I am also confident that the Congress will view with satisfaction the spirit of international cooperation that has increasingly come to characterize the operation of this agreement. The passage of the International Coffee Agreement Act permitted its implementation for the year that began October 1, 1965. The results to date justify our confidence that the agreement will further advance the national interest of the United States.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1966.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 767) authorizing the President to proclaim National Ski Week; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 767) authorizing the President to proclaim National Ski Week, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ROBERT G. DUNPHY, SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 168) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Robert G. Dunphy, of Rhode Island, be, and he is hereby, elected Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I notice that the Dunphy family—his wife and five children—are present.

I should like to say a word to the children about their daddy that they perhaps do not know, and that is the high esteem and affection in which their daddy is held by all the Members of this august body.

Bob Dunphy came to us as a young boy in 1941, when he was employed in the Post Office Department.

In 1942 he went away to World War II. After the termination of that conflict, he came back to us. In 1955 it was my honor, together with my senior colleague at that time, the venerated Theodore Francis Green, to sponsor Bob Dunphy as Deputy Sergeant at Arms.

During the time that he has served in that capacity, he has earned the admiration and affection of every Member of the Senate.

It was my privilege to present to the conference Tuesday his name for appointment to the high office of Sergeant at Arms of the Senate.

I am quite sure that this man, who is still young, will serve this body with great distinction. I know of no man who is better qualified for that post. He is a man of even temperament and great ability. I know he will do an excellent job, one that will reflect credit not only upon his wife and children, but also upon the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join wholeheartedly in the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island. He offered Bob Dunphy's name in the Democratic conference, and the nomination was seconded by the Senator's colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL].

All of us have every confidence in the integrity and ability of Robert Dunphy, of Rhode Island, who is now the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to add a word to what the Senator from Rhode Island has said. Although we all regret the departure of Joe Duke as Sergeant at Arms, I believe we can commend the conference for selecting Bob Dunphy as his successor. I am satisfied that a better selection could not have been made. I know that Bob Dunphy will render distinguished service to the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, occasions of retirement and succession always come as an admixture of both sorrow and joy.

Bob Dunphy succeeds Joe Duke. Thirty-four years ago, in the middle of the depression, Joe Duke contacted his Senator, Henry Fountain Ashurst, in the hope that Joe could come to Washington and serve in some public capacity.

He began his service in Senator Ashurst's office. He has served Senators and the Senate with real distinction and affability and friendliness from that day to his retirement.

Now he is succeeded by the one who has been his assistant for nearly 12 years.

Bob Dunphy is one of the friendliest public servants that I have ever encountered. He tries always to serve to the very best of his ability the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. To him I extend the hand of fellowship as he joins the group of Senate officials who serve this body. I wish him and his family well.

RETIREMENT OF JOSEPH C. DUKE AS SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time I wish to express my deep personal regret and the regret of the entire Senate for the retirement of Mr. Joseph Duke, of Arizona.

Joe Duke wanted to retire on three previous occasions, but at my personal urging and request he remained. Finally, he reached the point where, because of his health and the health of his wife, he had to get away to rest and recuperate.

It is with great sorrow and deep regret that we note his departure. However, we are extremely fortunate to have in the person of his successor a man of the caliber of Robert Dunphy.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The expressions which have just been uttered by the minority leader, the majority leader, and the Senators from Rhode Island and Vermont, are certainly reechoed among each of us who sits in this Chamber.

I call Joe Duke my friend—so does the minority leader and the majority leader—so do all of us. Joe Duke has ministered to the wants and needs of Senators in a superb manner. From time to time, I look forward to seeing him in the State of Arizona, as he will be a neighbor of mine.

I also wish to pay tribute to the successor to the excellent man who now is in retirement. Bob Dunphy is made of the same kind of cloth. He, too, may look forward to a tenure of responsibility as Sergeant at Arms of the Senate with the same high caliber of service in which the multitudinous responsibilities of that office were discharged by his predecessor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to add a few words regarding Joe Duke.

Yesterday, I wrote him a letter expressing my appreciation for his helpfulness and fairness. I will not discuss in detail here the contribution which he made to the work of the Senate but I feel that I should mention here some of the qualities which made him so valuable to this body: He was always fair, impartial, and helpful to every Member of the Senate no matter on which side of the aisle he sat.

To me, that is as high a compliment as I can pay him, because, of course, his was a partisan appointment. Despite the fact that he was selected by the majority party he carried out his responsibilities in a way that made us all feel he was our friend and helper as we carried on our work as Members of the Senate.

I am sure that his successor, Mr. Dunphy, will carry on in the same manner because of his experience and association with Joe Duke.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I, too, would like to add my words of commendation to the great record which Joe Duke created as Sergeant at Arms of the Senate.

I have known him for a long while. He has been Sergeant at Arms most of the time I have been in the Senate. Joe Duke is the kind of Senate employee of whom every Member can be proud.

In every sense of the word, he was the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, not of one particular party or one particular side of the aisle. I can truthfully say that I have never made a request of Joe Duke which he did not fulfill with both dispatch and cheerfulness.

It may well be—I know nothing about it—that he may have conferred more kindnesses, courtesies, and favors on the Democratic side of the Senate than he did on the Republican side. If he did, it was our fault. We may not have had as much imagination or ambition in making requests as did others, but I can say that I have heard many Republican Senators in past years applaud the fairness, the objectivity, and the courtesy of Joe Duke.

I am happy that Bob Dunphy has been trained by him. I do not know Bob Dunphy as well as I know Joe Duke, but I feel that, having been trained under that kind of tutelage, we can look forward to the same kind of fair, courteous, and helpful service that we have always enjoyed. Certainly, we will give Mr. Dunphy an opportunity to demonstrate the fact—and we do so with great confidence.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the distinguished majority leader in expressing my keen appreciation of the kind of service rendered the Senate by our former Sergeant at Arms, Joe Duke, and to express regret that he is leaving us.

I have been a Member of this body through most of the service of Mr. Duke as Sergeant at Arms, and in the House of Representatives for 14 years previous to that. I am therefore able to judge him both by his own performance and by comparison. By that test, he has been an excellent public servant, and I dislike to see him go.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator can be certain that that will be the policy of Bob Dunphy.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I know that I share the sentiments of all my colleagues when I say that we will be very sorry to see Joe Duke retire after 30 years' service to the U.S. Senate.

Joe has been a friend to all of us and we junior Members of the Senate will never forget his great kindness and useful advice during our early days in these halls.

Joe has discharged his duties as Sergeant at Arms with great honor; he has worked diligently to insure the efficient operation of his office; and he has proved an invaluable friend to all of us.

I know that Bob Dunphy, our new Sergeant at Arms, will carry out the heavy responsibilities of this office with the same diligence and care. And I know that Joe is pleased that his successor is so ably qualified to discharge these important duties.

Mr. President, I congratulate Joe Duke for a job well done, and I extend to him my thanks for his great help and assistance.

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, we are all going to miss having Joe Duke around. His ability and efficiency as Sergeant at Arms have helped to keep the Senate institution operating smoothly for all the years of my tenure. Although he is still a relatively young man, he has served us as Sergeant at Arms for 15 years. He has rendered distinguished service in dealing with the many administrative details handled by his office. He has aided me many times with counsel and personnel problems. I am sure he has had his difficulties in resolving the conflicts that arise when such efficient service is being rendered to all his 100 bosses, but he can take pride in the smooth manner in which these questions have been resolved.

I shall miss him; we shall all miss him. He has aided the entire Senate.

We wish him a happy and well-earned retirement.

Mr. **CHURCH**. Mr. President, I join with other Senators who have paid tribute to our Sergeant at Arms, Joe Duke, who has retired. I, for one Senator, am much indebted to Joe Duke for the many kindnesses that he extended to me.

I know that all Senators will miss him. I join with my colleagues this morning in wishing that his health will improve as his burdens are lightened by retirement, and that the years ahead will be many and happy ones for him for his family.

Mr. **BIBLE**. Mr. President, in a note advising me of his retirement, Joe Duke prefaced his remarks with the phrase, "It is with a feeling of sadness." It is with an equally deep feeling of sadness that I rise to bid farewell to this fine friend and dedicated public servant.

I have known Joe Duke most of my life. I have had the privilege of observing his work as Senate Sergeant at Arms for many years. I know, as every Member of this body knows, that he has given added stature and immeasurable value to the post he has held for so long.

The Senate has been fortunate to have so able and tireless a man as Joe Duke serving as Sergeant at Arms. Congress as a whole has benefited from the work of Joe Duke, and so has the Nation.

Certainly he richly deserves all the happiness that awaits him in retirement. But we will miss him. And I suspect that he will miss us.

So it is with a mixture of happiness and sadness, actually, that I say goodby to Joe Duke. Together with the goodby I offer my sincere best wishes for the happiness that follows fulfillment.

Mr. **FANNIN**. Mr. President, all of us who have come to rely with confidence upon the ability and unfailing courtesy of Joseph C. Duke are saddened by his retirement.

The office of Sergeant at Arms of the Senate is a difficult and demanding position, but Joe Duke earned the respect and admiration of every Member who served in this body by the efficient and effective performance of his duties. He has truly earned his retirement.

As an Arizonan it is with particular pride that I want to note again that Joe is a native of my State who began his career of service to the Senate with the late Senator Henry Fountain Ashurst. Despite his many years in Washington he has never lost his affection for home, and I know he is looking forward to full-time enjoyment of Arizona's sunshine once again.

All of us have lost a true and faithful servant in the full sense of the term. And I know everyone in the Senate, as well as his host of friends in the Capital, wish Joe Duke the fullest possible measure of health and happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. **MONTOYA**. Mr. President, it was with the deepest regret that I learned this week of the retirement of my old friend, Joseph C. Duke, as Sergeant at Arms of this body.

I have known Joe Duke for 30 years, from the days when he was a Capitol policeman and I was a law student at Georgetown, and I am proud to say that we have been friends all those years.

A lot of water has flowed under the bridge since that time, but Joe Duke has remained essentially the man I knew back in the 1930's—warmhearted, generous, intelligent, knowledgeable, efficient, and loyal.

Now, he has earned his rest, and I wish him well.

But I must confess that I feel a twinge of envy, too, because Joe Duke will be returning to the great Southwest which is home to both of us, and there is no finer place in the world in which to live.

In his 15 years as Sergeant at Arms, the duties and responsibilities of that office expanded enormously, but Joe Duke took the new demands in stride and continued to serve the Senate in exemplary fashion.

I know of no individual who is held in higher esteem by the Members of this body, and I know of no individual who is more deserving of that esteem.

In the short time that I have been a Member of the Senate, he has helped me and my staff in a hundred different ways, making the adjustment to this office far easier than it might otherwise have been.

He will be sorely missed.

Mr. **YOUNG** of Ohio. Mr. President, it was a matter of great regret to me when I read the announcement that Joseph C. Duke, Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, was retiring. For 15 years he has performed outstanding service in that important position. I consider that he is a fine public servant. Over the years he has been most helpful to me and I know that he has been helpful to my colleagues. I hope, as all Senators do, that he will very speedily recover his full and complete health.

All his many friends on and off Capitol Hill are all very sorry indeed that he has chosen to retire. Joe Duke's record as Sergeant at Arms of the Senate was one of unfailing courtesy, competence, knowledge, and efficiency. He was a credit to the Senate, an institution which he loved and which he served with complete dedication.

We shall all miss Joe Duke. I join with my colleagues in wishing Godspeed and happy landings to this fine public servant who is leaving us, and all good things to him and Mrs. Duke.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Property or Services for Experimental, Developmental, or Research Work

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on property or services for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report on Research Facilities

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research facilities, grants executed, fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Reports on Agreements Concluded Under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements concluded during the month of September 1965, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements concluded during the month of October 1965, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report of National Forest Reservation Commission (S. Doc. No. 74)

A letter from the President, National Forest Reservation Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

Improvement of Laws Administered by Farm Credit Administration

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Reports on Export-Import Bank Insurance and Guarantees on U.S. Exports

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees on U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of October 1965, not previously reported, totaled $722,582; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees on U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of November 1965, not previously reported, totaled $100,980; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Statement on Judgments Rendered by the U.S. Court of Claims (S. Doc. No. 75)

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement on judgments rendered by that court, for the year ended September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Reports on Approval of Loans to Certain Electric Cooperatives

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the approval of a loan to the Indiana Statewide Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., the Hossier Energy Division, of Osgood, Ind. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the approval of a loan to the Southern Illinois Power Cooperative, of Marion, Ill. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the approval of a loan to the Big Rivers Rural Electric Cooperative Corp., of Henderson, Ky. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Reports on Reapportionment of Appropriations

Thirteen letters from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, dated October 28, October 28, November 17, November 22, November 22, December 21, December 21, December 23, December 27, December 28, December 29, and December 29, 1965, respectively, reporting, pursuant to law, that sundry appropriations in the various departments were reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Transfer of Research and Development Funds

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the transfer of research and development funds, for the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Real and Personal Property of Department of Defense

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on real and personal property of that Department, as of June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Payment of Special Allowances to Dependents of Members of the Uniformed Services

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make permanent the act of May 22, 1965, authorizing the payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Officers on Duty With Headquarters, Department of the Army and Army General Staff

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army and the Army General Staff, as of September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Department of the Army Flight Pay

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of the Army flight pay, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Appointment of Col. William W. Watkin, Jr., Professor of U.S. Military Academy

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appointment of Col. William W. Watkin, Jr., professor of the U.S. Military Academy, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, Regular Army, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Reports of U.S. Soldiers' Home

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the U.S. Soldiers' Home, for the fiscal year 1965, together with a report of the annual inspection of the home, 1965, by the Inspector General of the Army (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Reimbursement of Fees Paid by Certain Members of the Uniformed Services

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 404(d) and 408 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize members of the uniformed services to be reimbursed under certain circumstances for the actual cost of parking fees, ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Air Force Military Construction Contracts Awarded Without Competition

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded without competition, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Officers Assigned or Detailed to Permanent Duty at the Seat of Government

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that, as of September 30, 1965, there was an aggregate of 2,225 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Air Force Flying Pay

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Air Force flying pay, for the 6-month period ended August 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Military Procurement Actions for Experimental, Developmental, or Research Work

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military procurement actions for experimental, developmental, or research work in the interest of national defense or industrial mobilization, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Additional Facilities Projects Proposed for Air Force Reserve

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain additional facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air Force Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Project for Naval and Marine Corps Reserve

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, on an additional project for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, at Galveston, Tex. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Projects for Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on projects for the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Procurement Receipts for Medical Stockpile of Civil Defense Emergency Supplies and Equipment Purposes

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on the actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarter ended September 30, 1965; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Coast Guard Flight Pay

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, on Coast Guard flight pay, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Program

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Federal Contributions Program—Equipment and Facilities

A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Office of the Secretary of the Army, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal contributions program—equipment and facilities, for the quarter ended September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Liquidation of Assets of Reconstruction Finance Corporation

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the liquidation of assets of the former Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Export Control

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Reports on Department of Defense Procurement From Small and Other Business Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the period July–August 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for July–September 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for July–October, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Progress of Liquidation Activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting pursuant to law, on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1965; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Provision of War Risk Insurance and Certain Marine and Liability Insurance for the American Public

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Activities Under Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on activities under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Provision of Aviation War Risk Insurance

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of aviation war risk insurance, as of September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Negotiated Purchases and Contracts Made by the Coast Guard

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Treasury Department, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on negotiated purchases and contracts made by the Coast Guard, since May 7, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 (Public Law 845–81) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Permits and Licenses for Hydroelectric Projects Issued by Federal Power Commission

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on permits and licenses for hydroelectric projects issued by that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Migratory Bird Conservation Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission

A letter from the Executive Director, Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, Portland, Oreg., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the years 1963 and 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Federal Maritime Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Authority for Performance of Certain Functions of the Federal Aviation Agency

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Federal Aviation Agency, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Economic Inquiry Into Food Marketing

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, an economic report by its staff, entitled "Economic Inquiry Into Food Marketing, Part III, the Canned Fruit, Juice, and Vegetable Industry" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

Publication of Federal Power Commission

A letter from the Vice Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a publication entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1963, Publicly Owned" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

Proposed Legislation Relating to District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act approved August 17, 1937, so as to facilitate the addition to the District of Columbia registration of a motor vehicle or trailer of the name of the spouse of the owner of any such motor vehicle or trailer (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and to amend section 6 of the act approved July 2, 1940, as amended, to eliminate requirements that applications for motor vehicle title certificates and certain lien information related thereto be submitted under oath (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, as amended, so as to bring within the provisions of such acts any person operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of a drug rendering such person incapable of operating the motor vehicle safely (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of Office of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency

A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co.

A letter from the firm of Steptoe & Johnson, attorneys at law, signed by Frederick S. Hill, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., Washington, D.C., for the year ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Combined Statement of Receipts, Expenditures, and Balances of the U.S. Government

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the U.S. Government, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Finance.

Report of the Renegotiation Board

A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report of Veterans' Administration

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Balances of Foreign Currencies Acquired Without Payment of Dollars

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Visit of Pope Paul VI to the United Nations

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a letter from Msgr. Franco Brambilla, chargé d'affaires a.i. of the apostolic delegation, and a letter from His Holiness, Pope Paul VI, to the Members of the U.S. Senate, in acknowledgment of Senate Resolution 153, relating to his visit to the United Nations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report of U.S. Information Agency

A letter from the General Counsel, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Exchange Scholars

A letter from the Chairman, the Board of Foreign Scholarships, Department of State, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on exchange scholars, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Disposition of Certain Foreign Excess Personal Property

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of Defense on the disposition of foreign excess personal property located in areas outside the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Research Grants Awarded by Department of Agriculture

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research grants awarded by the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Certain Personal Property Received by State Surplus Property Agencies

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, for the quarter ended September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Questionable Grant of Corn to United Arab Republic

A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Agency's reply to the report of the Comptroller General in the matter of the questionable grant of corn to the United Arab Republic under title II, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Erroneous Purchase of Technical Data Package From Westinghouse Electric Corp.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of his letter to the Secretary of Defense in reference to the erroneous purchase of a technical data package from Westinghouse Electric Corp., dated December 31, 1963 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Procurement of HY–80 Steel Plate

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to request, a suggested reply to the letter received from A. H. Whitelaw, Tar Barrell Hill, North Stonington, Conn., which related to the report of the Comptroller General to the Congress in June 1965, on the procurement of HY–80 steel plate (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports of Acting Comptroller General

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of Financial Status, fiscal year 1965, Export-Import Bank of Washington, dated November 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of Federal Home Loan Banks supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the period July 1, 1963, to December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the period July 1, 1963, to December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial status of Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year 1965, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the savings in transportation costs through utilization of U.S. air carriers rather than foreign air carriers, Post Office Department, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the use of dollars rather than foreign currencies to pay U.S. expenses in the Republic of Korea, Agency for International Development, Treasury Department, and the Department of State, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the unauthorized acquisition of passenger vehicles by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the assignment of enlisted personnel to nonmilitary activities, Department of Defense, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of investigations and actions by certain agencies pertaining to Government employees licensed to drive taxicabs in the District of Columbia, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need for reappraisal of task system assignments for collection of refuse, Department of Sanitary Engineering, District of Columbia Government, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings through improved management controls over allowances paid to members of shore patrols, Department of the Navy, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on problems and additional costs expected to result from use of stage construction of the capital beltway, Interstate Route 495, in the State of Maryland, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings through the use of houses owned by the Federal Housing Administration as Government quarters for certain Coast Guard members in the St. Petersburg and Miami, Fla., areas, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on improvement in administrative audit of accrued-leave payments to reenlistees by the Finance Center, U.S. Army, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indianapolis, Ind., Department of the Army, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need for current evaluation of available community housing prior to construction of military housing, Department of the Navy, dated November 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the suspension of competitive rate accommodation exchange service for U.S. Government Personnel in Brazil, Treasury Department and Department of State, dated November 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Army aircraft grounded because of lack of required repair parts, Department of the Army, dated November 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings available through more extensive use of contract vehicle service and of certain mail-handling equipment, Post Office Department, dated November 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need to strengthen procedures for determining whether loan applicants are unable to obtain financing from private or cooperative credit sources, Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of policies and procedures applied in evaluating foreign source components and barter bids for an undersea cable communications system, Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, Treasury Department, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1965, Veterans Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CANCELLATIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS OF DEBTS AGAINST INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cancellations and adjustments of debts against certain individual Indians or tribes of Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON RECLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN LANDS OF NORTH PLATTE PROJECT, WYOMING AND NEBRASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that certain lands of the North Platte project, in the States of Wyoming and Nebraska, have been reclassified regarding their suitability for irrigation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION OF LANDS IN BONNEVILLE UNIT, CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Bonneville unit, central Utah project, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LANDS IN TRUST FOR THE APACHE TRIBE OF INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS MEMORIAL BOARD

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY GUAM LEGISLATURE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of Guam, during the year 1965 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACTS IN NATIONAL PARKS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract to provide services for the public in Mount Rainier National Park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract to provide services for the public at the Bullfrog Basin site of the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, Utah (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract to provide services for the public at the Oregon Inlet Fishing Center, Cape Hatteras National Seashore, North Carolina (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS ON CLAIMS OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, docket No. 66 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Nooksack Tribe of Indians, on relation of Joseph Louis, chairman of the general council, docket No. 46 (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Citizen Bank of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma, et al., Docket No. 71–A, and the Potawatomi Tribe of Indians, et al., Docket No. 15–J (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, et al., Docket No. 334 amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Duwamish Tribe of Indians, Docket No. 109 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of Upper Chehalis Tribe, et. al., Docket No. 237 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Cherokee Nation or Tribe of Indians, Docket No. 173 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Otoe and Missouri Tribe of Indians, Docket No. 11–A (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Ottawa Tribe and Guy Jennison, Bronson Edwards, and Gene Jennison, as representatives of the Ottawa Tribe, Docket No. 303 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Vrow Tribe of Indians, Docket No. 54 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Chemehuevi Tribe of Indians, the Chemehuevi Tribe of Indians by Dan Eddy, Docket Nos. 351 and 351–A (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, et al., Docket No. 314 Amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claims of the Yakima Tribe, Docket No. 161, the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation as the representatives of the Palous Band, et al., Docket No. 222, and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation as the representatives of the Moses Band, et al., Docket No. 224 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation, Calif., Docket No. 319 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF ANNUAL MEETING OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D.C., September 22–23, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON EXEMPTIONS FROM THE ANTITRUST LAWS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States, dated January 1, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Identical Bidding in Public Procurement

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on identical bidding in public procurement, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Military Personnel Claims Settled by Department of the Army

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military personnel claims settled by that Department, for fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Richard C. Mockler

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Richard C. Mockler (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Damages for Timber Trespass on Lands and Certain Other Interests in Lands Under Jurisdiction of Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prescribe the measure of damages for timber trespass on lands and certain other interests in lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and on lands under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report of Subversive Activities Control Board

A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, relating to the failure of State and local officials in certain areas of the South to protect persons exercising constitutional rights and to prevent and punish racial violence (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico

A letter from the Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, El Paso, Tex., transmitting, pursuant to law, a final report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Audit Report of Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A. National Memorial, Inc.

A letter from the President, Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A., National Memorial, Inc., for the period April 1, 1964, to March 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Admission Into the United States of Certain Defector Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Adjustment of Immigration Status of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered relating to the adjustment of the immigration status of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reports According First Preference Classification to Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports according first preference classification to certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Catalog of Federal Programs for Individual and Community Improvement

A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a catalog of Federal programs for individual and community improvement, dated December 15, 1965 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Reports on Scientific or Professional Positions

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on scientific or professional positions in that Department (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on scientific or professional positions in that Department, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Director of Personnel, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on scientific or professional positions in that Department, for the fiscal year 1965 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a Civil Service Commission position in grade GS–18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Report on Scientific and Professional Positions

A letter from the Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on scientific and professional positions in that Agency, for the calendar year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, reporting, pursuant to law, on positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Report on Automotive Air Pollution

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on automotive air pollution, dated December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

Report of Tennessee Valley Authority

A letter from the Chairman and directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Authority for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, and ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

Report on Federal Voting Assistance Program

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal voting assistance program for the period September 1963 to September 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Report of Government Printing Office

A letter from the Public Printer, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Office, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Report of National Academy of Sciences (S. Doc. No. 76)

A letter from the President, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Academy, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962; ordered to be printed as a Senate document.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A proclamation issued by the Governor of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Whereas the United States of America is traditionally a nation of small businessmen and enterprisers; and

"Whereas those stalwarts, the independent businessmen of America, for generations have supplied leadership and sturdy qualities of greatness that have served our Nation well; and

"Whereas it is in our best interests that we recognize and foster the spirit of small business and enterprise, and the economy in which it can take root, grow, and flourish:

"Now, therefore, I, Otto Kerner, Governor of the State of Illinois, do hereby urge recognition of the vital role played by small business as a dramatic and integral part of our free enterprise system. I further urge that the gates of opportunity for small business firms be kept open, not only for our own generation but for those to come, in order that we may live in peace and prosperity in contrast to those who would destroy this Nation.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Illinois to be affixed.

"Done at the capitol in the city of Springfield, this 28th day of September, in the year of our Lord 1965, and of the State of Illinois the 147th.

"Otto Kerner,
"*Governor.*

"By the Governor:

"Paul Powell,
"*Secretary of State.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution Urging the Department of Defense To Revoke Its Directive Ordering the Closing of the Springfield Armory

"Whereas the recent reaffirmation by the Department of Defense of its directive ordering the closing of the Springfield Armory has dealt a stunning blow to the thousands of skilled workers employed therein, and will unequivocally have a serious effect upon the economy of western Massachusetts and the entire Commonwealth; and

"Whereas the closing of the Springfield Armory, in the light of this country's commitment in Vietnam and other countries, is contrary to good sense and foresight in view of the outstanding contributions made by the armory affecting the quality and effectiveness of the weapons of our fighting men and women; and

"Whereas the movement for the retention of the Springfield Armory has received the enthusiastic support of countless dedicated and interested citizens of the Commonwealth, the clergy, the college community, the elected public officials of the Commonwealth, labor organizations and countless private organizations; and

"Whereas the city of Springfield and surrounding communities have throughout the years demonstrated their ability to provide maximum standards of excellence in projects at the armory and, if the armory is retained, will fulfill once again the faith and confidence of the people of the Commonwealth and the Federal Government in the economy and natural resources of the area; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Department of Defense to revoke its directive ordering the closing of the Springfield Armory, and commends the efforts of all parties and groups working unceasingly to accomplish this vital goal; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate November 23, 1965.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution Commending President Lyndon B. Johnson on His Administration's Position on Vietnam

"Whereas the policy of the United States continues to be that of promoting self-determination of the internal governmental structure in all countries of the world; and

"Whereas the crisis in Vietnam is a prime example of the Communist influence and disruptive effect of interference with the internal deliberations of a struggling, strife-torn country; and

"Whereas the Johnson administration's position on Vietnam merits the full support of the vast majority of our citizenry, despite the ill-tempered and ill-advised attitude of a relatively small minority in the country advocating withdrawal of American forces and assistance to that proud nation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts Senate commends President Johnson's judgment on meeting the crisis in Vietnam, and deplores the attitude and unpatriotic demonstrations employed by certain dissident groups and individuals in this country in regard to the Johnson administration's conduct of United States foreign policy in Vietnam; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the Senate November 1, 1965.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"Resolutions Urging the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission To Select the City of Haverhill as the Location for Its Proposed 200-Billion-Electron-Volt Accelerator

"Whereas the Greater Haverhill area, with its wide divergence of employment supply and economic and technical resources, is ideally suited as the location of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission's proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator; and

"Whereas the location of said accelerator on a thirty-five-hundred acre site in the city of Haverhill has received the enthusiastic support of countless dedicated and interested citizens of said city together with the college community, the clergy, the various chambers of commerce, the elected public officials of the Commonwealth, and scores of private organizations; and

"Whereas the city of Haverhill has throughout the years demonstrated its ability to provide the best possible site for a project of the magnitude of said accelerator and will, if selected as the location thereof, fulfill once again the faith and confidence of the people of the Commonwealth and the Federal Government in its economy and natural resources; and

"Whereas a site evaluation team will arrive on November 3 in the current year to inspect the only area in the Commonwealth which has been proposed for the location of said accelerator, which team will be escorted by leading business and labor leaders, and high public officials of city and State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts senate respectfully urges the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission to select the city of Haverhill as the location for its proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator, and unequivocally endorses and commends the efforts of all parties and groups working unceasingly to accomplish this worthwhile goal; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate November 3, 1965.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Resolution 14

"Resolution expressing the support of the House of Delegates of Maryland for the present policies of the United States in Vietnam

"The House of Delegates of Maryland wishes to express on behalf of the people of the State of Maryland its support for the policies of the national administration and of Congress in Vietnam.

"The house of delegates takes this action, particularly in view of the many expressions of disapproval throughout the country as to these policies. This house notes with pride also that there have been no major demonstrations in the State of Maryland opposing the present policies of the administration and of Congress.

"Millions and millions of Americans without regard to politics have endorsed and are supporting the present policies of this country in Vietnam and the House of Delegates of Maryland is pleased to add its endorsement also: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland,* That this body expresses its support and endorsement of the present policies of the administration and of the Congress with respect to Vietnam; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the house is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, as presiding officer in the Senate of Maryland, the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress, and each member of the Maryland delegation in the Senate and House of Representatives.

"By the house of delegates, October 21, 1965.

"Marvin Mandel,
"*Speaker of the House of Delegates.*
"James P. Mause,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution making application to Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to apportionment of State legislatures

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico,* That application is respectfully made to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'Sec. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'Sec. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.'; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That if Congress has proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any effect; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the New Mexico delegation to the Congress of the United States.

"Signed and sealed at the capitol, in the city of Santa Fe.

"Mack Easley,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Bruce King,
"*Speaker, House of Representatives.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Resolution 34

"Joint resolution applying to the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 84th General Assembly of the State of Tennessee (the Senate concurring),* That this general assembly respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'; be it further

"*Resolved,* That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

"*Resolved,* That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Adopted: February 23, 1965.

"WILLIAM N. BARRY,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"JAMES G. MADDOX,
"*Speaker of the Senate.*
"Approved.
"FRANK G. CLEMENT,
"*Governor.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Resolution relative to ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, proposed by the Congress of the United States, relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

"Whereas the 89th Congress of the United States of America has adopted Senate Joint Resolution 1, two-thirds of each House concurring therein, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in the following words, to wit:

" 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

" '*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

" 'SEC. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

" 'SEC. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

" 'SEC. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

" 'Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after the receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.' "; and whereas, said proposed amendment will be valid as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, a majority of all the members elected to each house of said Legislature voting in favor thereof,* That the proposed amendment be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of California; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State of California to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Secretary of State of the United States.

"CARLOS BEE,
"*Speaker pro tempore of the Assembly.*
"HUGH M. BURNS,
"*President pro tempore of the Senate.*
"Attest:
"FRANK M. JORDAN,
"*Secretary of State.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION

"Joint resolution relative to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways

"Whereas the Federal law now requires the completion of the portion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in California by October 1, 1972; and

"Whereas this State will not be eligible for reimbursement from the Federal Government for any expenditures made by it after that date on the Interstate System; and

"Whereas the Federal Highway Administrator has recently announced that this State will probably not be able to complete the construction of certain portions of the Interstate System within the city and county of San Francisco by October 1, 1972, and that he has removed from this State a large portion of the mileage and funds which were available to reimburse this State for construction of the portion of the Interstate System within the city and county of San Francisco: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to extend the 1972 deadline on the availability of Federal funds for the reimbursement of States for expenditures made on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Federal Highway Administrator is requested not to take any action to reallocate to any other State any of the funds which were available to reimburse the State of California for the construction of that portion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways within the city and county of San Francisco; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Federal Highway Administrator."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

"Joint resolution applying to the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Legislature of Alabama respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'; be it further

"*Resolved,* That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

"*Resolved,* That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Approved February 24, 1965.

"I hereby certify that the foregoing copy of an act of the Legislature of Alabama has been compared with the enrolled act and it is a true and correct copy thereof.

"Given under my hand this 25th day of February 1965.

"McDOWELL LEE,
"Secretary of Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"H.J. RES. 5

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to apportionment of State legislatures

"Whereas the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled recently that both houses of State legislatures must be elected on an equal population basis; and

"Whereas the decision struck down the time-honored practice for each State to organize its own legislative body in that manner which will best serve the people of the particular State concerned; and

"Whereas these decisions strike at the very heart of the type of representative government which existed in this country in the days of colonial government long before the adoption of the Constitution of the United States and from which the present organization in the Congress and the State legislatures was copied; and

"Whereas this body does not believe that it is equitable or in the best interest of the people of the entire country to apply a different and more drastic formula for apportioning representatives of the various legislatures of the States than the U.S. Constitution specifies for both Houses of the Congress; and

"Whereas the only recourse the States and the people have in preserving some discretion as to how to balance the varied interests and geographical considerations within their boundaries is through action by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of Alabama (both houses thereof concurring), That the formula for determining the representation in the State legislatures should be sufficiently flexible to produce a legislative body reflecting the regional and local values which the State may deem appropriate; and be it further

"Resolved, That this body memorializes the Congress of the United States to give prompt consideration to proposing to the several States for ratification an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will unequivocably empower a State, at its option, to achieve equality of representation in its legislative body by utilizing population in apportioning one house of its legislature and any criteria as in its wisdom may be in its individual best interest in apportioning the other house of its legislature, thereby permitting the States to retain the pattern of governmental structure which has withstood the test of time and has proven its merits both in the National Government and in the States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the several other States are urged to join this State in this petition; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the President and Secretary of the Senate of the United States and to the clerks and secretaries of the legislative bodies of all other States.

"Approved August 13, 1964.

"I hereby certify that the foregoing copy of an act of the Legislature of Alabama has been compared with the enrolled act and it is a true and correct copy thereof.

"Given under my hand this 14 day of August 1964.

"JOHN W. PEMBERTON,
"Clerk of the House."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 4

"Joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas Senate Joint Resolution 1 of the 89th Congress, 1st session, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas the amendment so proposed shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submisison by the Congress; and

"Whereas the purpose of the proposed amendment is in keeping with the desires of the people of this Commonwealth to insure an orderly and responsible exercise of the powers and duties vested in the highest executive office of the National Government; and to insure the proper discharge of the office of President of the United States and the office of Vice President of the United States: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

"SECTION 1. The amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 1 of the 89th Congress, 1st session, entitled 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office' and reading as follows, hereby is ratified:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

" 'SEC. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

" 'SEC. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

" 'SEC. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

" 'Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within 4 days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within 48 hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within 21 days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within 21 days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.'

"SEC. 2. The Governor of the Commonwealth shall cause certified copies of this resolution to be sent to the Administrator of General Services of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States. The secretary of state of this Commonwealth shall cause certified copies of this resolution to be sent to the Governor of each of the United States.

"HARRY LEE WATERFIELD,
"President of the Senate.
"SHELBY McCALLUM,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"JOHN W. WILLIS,
"Chief Clerk of Senate.

"Approved:

"EDWARD T. BREATHITT,
"Governor.

"SEPTEMBER 17, 1965."

The petition of Choko Kuwae, president, Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, of the island of Okinawa, praying for a solution of the prepeace treaty compensation issue; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Resolutions adopted by We, the People, National Coalition of Patriots To Protect Self-Government and Save American Freedom, of Phoenix, Ariz., favoring a declaration of war against North Vietnam, and that the Government should return the conduct of the war to the military; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Naval Reserve Association, Washington, D.C., expressing appreciation to the Congress for the enactment of the Armed Forces pay bill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Minnesota Association of Public Accountants, favoring the enactment of House bill 10529, to prohibit banks from performing professional accounting services; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the California Association of Airport Executives, at Oakland, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to require the Civil Aeronautics Board to assure that certificated airlines maintain service and schedules and to meet the need of the communities they serve; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the State Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, Social Democratic Federation of Wisconsin, relating to the war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Student Government Association of Nicholls State College, Thibodaux, La., commending the Congress and the President on the Government's stand on Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions signed by Tomio Sato, chairman, Hirara City Assembly, Eiharu Nakamura, president, Okinawa City, Town and Village Governments Association, and Seiki Miyagi, president, Association of Chairmen of City, Town, and Village Assemblies in Okinawa, of the island of Okinawa, praying for a chief executive public election; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Two resolutions adopted by the United-Italian American Labor Council, Inc., of

New York, N.Y., relating to Vietnam and NATO; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A concurrent resolution adopted by the House of Man, signed by Saxton Doggett and sundry other citizens of the United States, favoring the convening of the Charter Review Conference of the United Nations, for the establishment of government, law, justice, peace, prosperity, and freedom for all the peoples of the earth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, U.S. section, Washington, D.C., relating to (1) Vietnam; (2) International Cooperation Year; (3) China; (4) intervention in Latin America; (5) chemical, biological, and radiological warfare; (6) Japan relations; and (7) Disarmament Conference and Multilateral Force (MLF); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the southern California branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, in Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the assumption of leadership by the United States in the matter of the improvement of the world's underprivileged, through the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the southern California branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, in Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the creation of a U.S. Department of Peace; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Anchorage, Alaska, favoring donations of Federal surplus property to cities; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the National District Attorneys' Association, Stockton, Calif., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1636, regarding Federal-State conflict over water rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Greater South Dakota Association, of Huron, S. Dak., favoring the authorization of the Oahe Irrigation Unit in central South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Resolutions adopted at a joint convention of the North Dakota Water Users Association, the North Dakota Water Management Districts Association, Inc., and the North Dakota Irrigation Districts Association, at Grand Forks, N. Dak., favoring an acceleration of the water resources program in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Becker County, Minn., relating to funds to place a bituminous surface on a road in that county being constructed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the 1965 annual convention of the Western States Land Commissioners' Association, favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a loan and grant to the State of Hawaii for the construction of the Kokee water project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the New Jersey Society, Sons of the American Revolution, Newark, N.J., relating to the employment of Prof. Eugene Genovese by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Bryant D. Rowland, of San Pablo, Calif., enclosing his letter of congratulations to the secretary of state of California for his decision to run for reelection; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, U.S. section, Washington, D.C., relating to acts of violence in the South; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Jack Bright and John W. Oliver, citizens of the United States, praying for an investigation of the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in releasing the Communists in America from registering with the U.S. Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Gandy-Brown Post No. 4588, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Bossier City, La., protesting against the dissemination of communistic ideology by self-acclaimed Marxists in our Nation's colleges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the United-Italian American Labor Council, Inc., of New York, N.Y., favoring the designation of Columbus Day, October 12 of each year, as a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the southern California branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, at Los Angeles, Calif., relating to human rights in the southern California area; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by the Idaho Cooperative Council, Inc., of Boise, Idaho, relating to agricultural cooperatives, reapportionment of State legislatures, administration of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, agricultural exemptions in the Fair Labor Standards Act and voluntary participation in organizations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Oklahoma State Pipe Trades Association at Tulsa, Okla., commending the President and his legislative programs for the health and welfare of the working people of our Nation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the 1965 convention of the Virginia AFL–CIO, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1781, to prohibit the interstate trafficking in strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A memorial signed by Rev. Christian C. Christopher, and sundry other persons, members of the Bath, N.Y., Church of the Nazarene, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 1211, to provide for the conduct of national elections on the first Sunday in November; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the Missouri Credit Union League, at St. Louis, Mo., expressing its endorsement of the enabling legislation that made it possible to extend the credit union idea beyond the borders of the United States to provide further emphasis on the brotherhood of man; ordered to lie on the table.

A paper in the nature of a petition, signed by Gordon T. Nesvig, clerk of the board of supervisors of Los Angeles County, Calif., relating to the custom of standing when the national anthem is played, originated by Russell Galbraith O'Brien in 1893; ordered to lie on the table.

AUTHORIZATION OF EXPENDITURE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 170) authorizing the expenditure of additional funds from the contingent fund for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 170

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-ninth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 171) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 171

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

Sec. 2. Pursuant to its authority under section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the committee is authorized to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, documents and to take such testimony on matters within its jurisdiction as it deems advisable.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $105,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATION OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 174) providing additional funds for an investigation of intergovernmental relations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That S. Res. 59, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1965 (authorizing an investigation of intergovernmental relations), is hereby amended on page 2, line 23, by striking out "$129,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$137,000".

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TOWER, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 2732. A bill to make the direct home loan benefits of section 1811 of title 38, United States Code, available to veterans of the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. LAUSCHE):

S. 2733. A bill to provide for the free entry of one Weissenberg rheogoniometer for the use of Case Institute of Technology; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. BURDICK):

S. 2734. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to adjust sugar quotas for domestic areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2735. A bill to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 2736. A bill for the relief of Drs. Renato C. and Amparo Castro;

S. 2737. A bill for the relief of Drs. Jaime E. and Lydia L. Lazaro;

S. 2738. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ezzat N. Asaad; and

S. 2739. A bill for the relief of Dr. Blanche L. Asaad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS:

S. 2740. A bill for the relief of Rama I. Mani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina:

S. 2741. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to corporations for contributions to colleges and universities; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 2742. A bill for the relief of Rosario Ilardi; and

S. 2743. A bill for the relief of Nocolo Vitale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2744. A bill to provide for cost-of-living adjustments in star route contract prices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2745. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat sintering or burning as a mining process in the case of shale, clay, and slate used or sold for use, as lightweight concrete aggregates; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2746. A bill to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2747. A bill to authorize conclusion of an agreement with Mexico for joint measures for solution of the lower Rio Grande salinity problem; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 2748. A bill to assure adequate and complete medical care for veterans by providing for participation by the Veterans' Administration in medical community planning and for the sharing of advanced medical technology and equipment between the Veterans' Administration and other public and private hospitals; and

S. 2749. A bill to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 2750. A bill for the relief of You I Souk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 2751. A bill for the relief of David R. Slemon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2752. A bill to amend section 2(a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2753. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain phosphate rights to Willard Roe and Fred Roe, Polk County, Fla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2754. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio Valdes-Rodriguez;

S. 2755. A bill for the relief of Ena Herminia Mourino de Moya;

S. 2756. A bill for the relief of Rita Maria Garmendia de Alsina;

S. 2757. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alberto Fernandez-Bravo y Amat;

S. 2758. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Carlos Cilvino Dominguez y Del Rosal;

S. 2759. A bill for the relief of Carlos Miguel Calonge-Diaz;

S. 2760. A bill for the relief of Armando Jose Alonso-Garcia;

S. 2761. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio Sanguily, Jr.;

S. 2762. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael Jacinto Novo y Pividal (Rafael Nobo); and

S. 2763. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marcial Alfredo Marti Prieto (Alfredo Marti); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HOLLAND when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2764. A bill for the relief of Jotu Advani; and

S. 2765. A bill for the relief of Frank Doral Cutler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2766. A bill to amend section 6 of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof limiting payments thereunder to plans provided by carriers licensed to operate in all States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 2767. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to permit the duty free entry of gifts not exceeding $100 in retail value from members of the Armed Forces serving in a combat zone; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2768. A bill for the relief of Juliana Maguay Sugitan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2769. A bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2770. A bill to control the use of the design of the great seal of the United States and of the seal of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning March 14, 1966, as National Citrus Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S.J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to establish the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MOSS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for Mr. DOUGLAS):

S.J. Res. 125. Joint resolution extending the date for transmission of the economic report; considered and passed.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CHARTERING BY ACT OF CONGRESS OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. DOMINICK) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. CON. RES. 68

Whereas June 15, 1966 will mark the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the Charter of the Boy Scouts of America;

Whereas the Boy Scouts of America was the first youth organization to be granted a charter by Act of Congress;

Whereas the Congress has been kept informed of the programs and activities of the Boy Scouts of America through the annual reports made to it each year by this organization in accordance with such charter;

Whereas these programs and activities have been designed to instill in boys the moral and ethical principles, and the habits, practices and attitudes, which are conducive to good character, citizenship, and health; and

Whereas, by fostering in the youth of the Nation those qualities upon which our strength as a nation is dependent, the Boy Scouts of America has made a contribution of inestimable value to the welfare of the entire Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby pays tribute to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the charter of the Boy Scouts of America, and expresses its recognition of and appreciation for the public service performed by this organization through its contributions to the lives of the Nation's youth.

RESOLUTIONS

ELECTION OF ROBERT G. DUNPHY, SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 168) electing Robert G.

Dunphy, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP OF CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 169) making changes in the membership of certain standing committees of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

AUTHORIZATION OF EXPENDITURE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 170) authorizing the expenditure of additional funds from the contingent fund for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-ninth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 171) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 171

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. Pursuant to its authority under section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the committee is authorized to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, documents and to take such testimony on matters within its jurisdiction as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $105,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. TOWER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 172); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. RES. 172

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $138,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO MAKE CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS, AND TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS THEREFOR

Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. BENNETT) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 173); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. RES. 173

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) deposit insurance;

(4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(8) securities and exchange regulation;

(9) credit problems of small business; and

(10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $110,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATION OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 174) providing additional funds for an investigation of intergovernmental relations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That S. Res. 59, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1965 (authorizing an investigation of intergovernmental relations), is hereby amended on page 2, line 23, by striking out "$129,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$137,000".

APPOINTMENT OF MR. LONG OF LOUISIANA AS CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BREWSTER submitted an original resolution (S. Res. 175), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. LONG of Louisiana be, and he is hereby, elected Chairman of the Committee on Finance, in lieu of Mr. Harry F. Byrd, Sr., of Virginia, resigned from the Senate.

DEATH OF HON. HERBERT C. BONNER, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 176) relative to the death of Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, of North Carolina, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. ERVIN, which appears under a separate heading.)

EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AND OPINION BETWEEN THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD AND OTHER ECONOMIC AGENCIES

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 177) to provide for information and exchange of opinion between the Federal Reserve Board and other economic agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. PROXMIRE, which appears under a separate heading.)

DIRECT HOME LOAN BENEFITS FOR VETERANS OF VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], I am introducing a bill that would make veterans who have served on active duty during the Vietnam conflict eligible to obtain direct loans for housing from the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2732) to make the direct home loan benefits of section 1811 of title 38, United States Code, available to veterans of the Vietnam conflict, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may I inquire of the distinguished majority leader whether the provisions for loans to veterans in the Vietnamese conflict are similar to those that are available to the GIs of World War II?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That I cannot say. I am complying with the request of Senators.

Mr. KUCHEL subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier the distinguished majority leader introduced for certain Members of the Senate legislation to provide certain benefits to American GIs serving in the present tragic conflict in southeast Asia. There is no reason why those in uniform serving there should be discriminated against as compared with those who served in uniform in World War II. I have consistently taken that position.

I ask unanimous consent that my name be added to the legislation introduced earlier.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] quite appropriately expressed my feelings in connection with legislation introduced today to bring benefits to the Vietnam combat veterans now engaged in this very disagreeable and disastrous war in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added to the legislation introduced today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LANDS HELD IN TRUST FOR APACHE TRIBE OF MESCALERO RESERVATION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administration purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation.

The Mescalero Tribe is moving ahead in its efforts to develop the economy of the reservation and to raise the health and living standards of the members of the tribe. In order to protect certain existing water and sewage systems, sewage treatment facilities, and telephone and power lines, and to provide needed land on which to build low-rent housing for the Indians, this land should be held in trust by the United States for the Mescalero Indians.

The land is entirely within the boundaries of the Mescalero Indian Reservation as set apart by Executive order of May 29, 1873. However, it developed, that the property had been settled prior to that time by a non-Indian. The non-Indian's right was not determined until 1915, by which time various buildings and facilities of the Mescalero Indian School and agency had been constructed on the land. The non-Indian's interest in the land was purchased by the Government in 1918 for $10,000.

The Government discontinued use of the property for agency and school purposes about 13 years ago and since that time it has been beneficially used by the tribe for agricultural purposes on a permit basis.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife have entered into a lease with the tribe for the use of 18.15 acres of tribal land, adjoining the land in question, for the Mescalero National Fish Hatchery. A 12.49-acre parcel of the 99.84-acre tract is presently being used by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries in connection with the hatchery. The tribe has passed a resolution agreeing to execute a lease to continue to make this tract available to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries upon enactment of this bill.

There is a scarcity of tribal land suitable for contemplated Indian housing. A portion of the tract in question is ideally situated for this purpose, but before an agreement can be reached with the Public Housing Administration, title to the land must be in the tribe.

In view of these circumstances and the need of the Indians, I request that this bill be appropriately referred and be given early consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2735) to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CREDIT AGAINST INCOME TAX TO CORPORATIONS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am introducing today legislation which would allow a credit against income tax to corporations for contributions to colleges and universities.

This proposal is designed to encourage greater financial support for our higher educational institutions without unnecessary Federal interference and control. The need for such financial support, in the face of booming enrollments, is obvious.

However, I am aware that the country faces a serious revenue situation with the conflict in southeast Asia. Even so, I introduce this legislation in order that it may receive the full attention of the Nation and the Congress; that it may be studied and discussed; that it may be considered by appropriate committees; and that, when we can afford it, it may be enacted into law.

If events favor us so as to relieve the military demand upon our revenues before this current session of Congress adjourns, then I would hope that the Congress will act favorably on the legislation which I have introduced.

If we must wait a year, or 2 years, or more, so be it. But whenever the Nation can afford to act again in the field of higher education assistance, I feel that the approach embodied in this bill should be incorporated into our programs.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on this subject, delivered in North Augusta, S.C., on November 23, be included in the RECORD as a further argument for this legislation.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR DONALD RUSSELL, DEMOCRAT, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO NORTH AUGUSTA LIONS CLUB, NORTH AUGUSTA, S.C., NOVEMBER 23, 1965

It has been said that the future rides with the progress of education. And this is just as true of the individual as of a nation or a State. The new era in which we live and will live for the foreseeable future is one which demands far greater competency of the individual than ever before. It is no longer enough that one is strong and anxious to work. Far more important—indeed, the first and the primary test for employment—despite a few unfortunate Federal requirements—are educational qualifications. Such qualifications, it must be noted, too, are being pushed upward and some form of post-high-school education is being given growing importance. It may be argued that this emphasis on educational qualifications may be excessive and often unnecessary but the hard fact remains that it does exist and it must be taken into account in planning for the future. Accordingly, every State or society has a direct concern in seeing that there exists complete opportunity for all its qualified youths to secure college or university education of such character as suits their special talents.

The financial burden, of this obligation, though, is taxing our resources, both private and public. Such burden is compounded by our explosion of population as well as by the phenomenal inflation of costs. And the future offers little hope of a relaxation in either demand for services or in costs of operation.

For the private college and university this problem is especially acute and undoubtedly will become more so. Lacking the financial resources to expand to meet rising demand and oppressed by rising costs, such institutions are threatened with a sharp drop in their relative position vis-a-vis public supported institutions.

I believe and believe fervently in both the need for, and the value of, publicly supported educational institutions at all levels. I am a product of such institutions and I have spent a considerable part of my time, both as student, and as administrator, in a system of public education. But I have never felt—and here I think I express the feeling generally of all publicly supported colleges and universities—that publicly supported institutions of higher learning should carry the exclusive burden of college and university education. The deadening uniformity of a single publicly supported and publicly controlled system of higher education would not be conducive to that form of intellectual innovation which must be the symbol of tomorrow. The publicly supported institutions—and society in general—need and require the stimulus of competition in ideas, in methods, and in philosophy provided by strong and growing independent and sectarian private institutions. The dual system of private and publicly supported colleges and universities has sparked in the past our progress, culturally, and technologically, and must continue our intellectual bastion for the future.

Unfortunately, the private institutions are facing a desperate future, unless given significantly greater financial support to enable them to continue to play their proper role in educational progress and to provide that necessary complement to publicly supported institutions.

To some extent, this need has been generally recognized. It has found expression in congressional legislation during the last and earlier Congresses. Federal aid, designed to aid both public and private colleges and universities, has been enacted. Many objections, however, have been raised to such aid for private institutions. These objections are often contradictory.

On the one hand, many sincere people object to any public support of private or sectarian institutions. Some of these base their objections on constitutional grounds. Others of them express reservations on the propriety of public support for institutions which are beyond governmental control. On the other hand, many—especially those involved in private or sectarian education—feel honestly and sincerely that Federal aid, long continued, can destroy the independence of the private institutions. In some instances, too, there is a feeling that such aid will destroy that separation of church and state, a matter of fundamental moment to many. This issue has recently arisen in connection with one of our outstanding denominational universities.

I shall not attempt to weigh these conflicting views. It is sufficient that many sincere and honest citizens, whose opinions must be respected, entertain these fears. And yet it is unthinkable that, in some way, we cannot fashion an acceptable remedy for the plight of the private college and university—that we cannot find some formula which will permit us to open up new avenues of support for such institutions without violating any of the sincere reservations of many earnest citizens.

The Congress has already recognized this problem and sought to solve it. It has authorized corporations to contribute up to 5 percent of their income for, among other purposes, educational purposes as a tax deduction. Unfortunately, this has not met the problem; it does not provide the needed remedy. It has not induced that level of corporate giving that is demanded. The reason is obvious. Under this legislation, the corporation actually receives credit for only one-half of its gifts.

I propose that, instead of permitting a mere income deduction, the corporation be given full credit against its tax bill for all gifts for educational purposes (up to 2½ percent of its tax liability). This is what the Congress has already authorized, except that there must be a matching by the corporation. Under this proposal of mine, the matching requirement is eliminated. And since the gift is treated as a credit against the tax itself, the corporation has every incentive to make the gift. It actually loses nothing from the making of the gift. It either pays the sum in taxes to the Government or it gives it to an educational institution of its own choosing for a purpose determined by it. It is difficult to see why any corporation will elect not to exercise this choice.

It is thus reasonable to believe that practically every corporation will avail itself of this right. At present levels of corporate income, this would mean a fund of about three-quarters of a billion dollars annually available from private giving for the benefit of the educational institutions of this Nation.

And since such fund will be contributed by private corporations, it will be free from constitutional objectives or reservations about the separation of church and state. It will involve no threat of governmental control of an educational institution. The separation of church and state will not be violated. The argument over governmental support of a sectarian institution will be avoided.

It will be argued, I am sure, that the government is the real loser in this transaction. Actually, however, it is losing no more, at least theoretically, than it would if all corporations took advantage of the existing law. And it will be accomplishing what the vast majority of our thoughtful citizens feel most important and what most legislators profess to be their purpose in proposed legislation. It will be providing real and substantial aid to both public and private institutions of higher learning, at less cost, and without the heavy hand of bureaucracy. It will not involve any new governmental department to administer it, no new bureaucracy to forge new requirements, no broad expansion of government employees. And it will permit free enterprise to compete with government in support of higher education. It will, also, provide new opportunities for our private institutions to compete more effectively with public institutions, to the benefit of both.

This, of course, does not mean that public institutions may not participate in these gifts but they will do so in full competition with the private institution. It would seem reasonable, too, that the corporate giver would give special attention to the more limited resources of the private institutions in the selection of the beneficiaries of its gifts.

Because I feel that this remedy will be of benefit to our whole program of higher education, I expect to offer legislation incorporating this plan at the next session of Congress. I hope it will receive wide acceptance and may be enthusiastically agreed to.

I would like to make clear that I do not offer this suggestion as a substitute for any existing legislation or as an objection to other legislation that may be proposed to aid higher education. I offer it rather as a supplement to these, recognizing the growing need for financial support on the part of all institutions of higher learning, both public and private. I offer it as a means of giving to the colleges and universities in this Nation more options and broader opportunities, free from conscientious objections entertained by many, and with full recognition of the fact that the strength of the America of the future depends upon the strength and vitality of its colleges and universities, public and private.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2741) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to corporations for contributions to colleges and universities introduced by Mr. Russell of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

RESTRICTION OF CONDITIONS GOVERNING REDUCTION OF VETERANS' BENEFITS UPON READMISSION OF VETERANS FOR MEDICAL CARE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care.

Under existing law (38 U.S.C. 3203(a)(1)) the monthly compensation or retirement pay otherwise payable to a veteran without wife, child, or dependent parent who is being furnished hospitalization or other institutional care by the Veterans' Administration is reduced by one-half, but not below $30 per month, beginning the first day of the seventh calendar month following the month of admission. This requirement also applies to pension under laws in effect prior to enactment of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959. Generally, the amounts withheld under this provision are paid in a lump sum upon the veteran's discharge from the institution. Amounts withheld from an incompetent veteran are not payable to him until 6 months after a finding of competency. If any veteran leaves a veterans' hospital against medical advice or as the result of disciplinary action the withheld benefits may not be paid to him until 6 months after departure.

If the veteran's monthly benefit payment has been reduced under these provisions and he leaves the hospital against medical advice or as the result of disciplinary action the existing law further provides that the reduction shall be effective immediately upon his being readmitted by the Veterans' Administration for further care, irrespective of how long a period has elapsed.

In the related area of discontinuance of aid and attendance allowance during VA institutional care these allowances are ordinarily discontinued during hospitalization beginning with the first day of the second calendar month following the date of admission (38 U.S.C. 3203(f)). These discontinued benefits are not paid to the veteran upon discharge. Moreover, the law provides that if the veteran leaves the hospital against medical advice and is thereafter readmitted the aid and attendance allowance will be discontinued from the date of readmission, regardless of the time between episodes of hospitalization.

Section 1 of the bill would amend section 3203(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, to provide that reduction of the benefit immediately upon readmission following discharge against medical advice or as the result of disciplinary action shall apply only where the readmission occurs within 6 months following the prior termination of care. Section 2 of the bill would correspondingly amend section 3203(f) of the title to provide the same time limitation with respect to discontinuing aid and attendance allowance immediately upon readmission of a veteran who departed contrary to medical advice.

These amendments would soften the existing requirements for immediate reduction or discontinuance of benefits upon rehospitalization by preventing them from operating in an unduly punitive manner detrimental to the veteran's health and well-being. One obvious purpose of the existing provision was to discourage premature departures before hospital and medical treatment has been completed. Another apparent purpose was to deter veterans from leaving the VA institution before completion of treatment with the deliberate purpose of reentering shortly thereafter in order to initiate a new period of care during which the reduction would not be applicable until after the first 6 months or, with respect to aid and attendance allowance, until the first of the second calendar month after the date of admission.

These basic purposes will be adequately served by applying the requirement for reduction or discontinuance upon readmission only to those cases in which the veteran returns within 6 months. This would not appreciably affect the deterrent value of the basic provision. That provision would no longer operate to discourage veterans from applying for needed hospital care after the lapse of 6 months, particularly where such care may be required for a relatively short period.

It is important to note that in a good many instances rehospitalization after a 6-month interval may be due either to a new condition or a marked change in the disability or disease for which the veteran was previously hospitalized.

Finally, it should be noted that these amendments will alleviate some administrative problems which have arisen under the existing law. As matters now stand, it is necessary to maintain suitable administrative controls for indefinite periods after veterans leave the VA institution against medical advice in order to assure that upon a readmission, even 5 or more years later, the veteran's award will be promptly reduced. This presents difficulties and, in some cases, delays in making reductions result from a failure to make a timely discovery, when the veteran is readmitted, of the facts concerning prior hospitalization. This sometimes results in establishing overpayments against the veterans concerned.

Because of the relatively small number of veterans involved, the additional cost to the Government would be small.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2746) to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2746

A bill to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of section 3203(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting the comma immediately after the words "upon a succeeding readmission for treatment or care" and inserting "within six months from the date of such departure,".

SEC. 2. Section 3203(f) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting the comma immediately after "admitted to hospitalization" in the third sentence and inserting "within six months from the date of such departure,".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall also apply to cases in which pension eligibility is subject to the provisions of section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959.

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE AN AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO TO ELIMINATE SALINITY IN THE LOWER RIO GRANDE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to carry out the agreement between the United States and Mexico announced December 30, 1965, aimed at reducing the salt content of the lower Rio Grande.

Discharge of saline water through the Mexican El Morillo drain has endangered the usefulness of the Rio Grande water for irrigation by U.S. users. The International Boundary and Water Commission has recommended a solution which has been endorsed by the United States and Mexican Governments, to construct a canal or drain in Mexico diverting the saline waters of El Morillo drain from the Rio Grande to the Gulf of Mexico.

The United States and Mexico would share equally in the costs of construction and operation of the diversion canal, and a portion of the U.S. costs are expected to be repaid by the water users.

The bill I introduce today follows the recommendation of the administration and would authorize the United States to participate in this needed project.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2747) to authorize conclusion of an agreement with Mexico for joint measures for solution of the lower Rio Grande salinity problem, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2747

A bill to authorize conclusion of an agreement with Mexico for joint measures for solution of the lower Rio Grande salinity problem

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of State, acting through the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to the conditions provided in this Act, to conclude an agreement or agreements with the appropriate official or officials of the Government of the United Mexican States for the construction, operation, and maintenance by the United Mexican States under the supervision of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, of a drainage conveyance canal through Mexican territory for the discharge of waters of El Morillo and other drains in the United Mexican States into the Gulf of Mexico in the manner, and having substantially the characteristics, described in said Commission's Minute No. 223, dated November 30, 1965. The agreement or agreements shall provide that the costs of construction, including costs of design and right of way, and the costs of operation and maintenance, shall be equally divided between the United Mexican States and the United States. Before concluding the agreement or agreements, the Secretary of State shall receive satisfactory assurances from private citizens or a responsible local group that they or it will pay to the United States Treasury one-half of the actual United States costs of such construction, including costs of design and right of way, and so long as such agreement or agreements remain in force, one-half of the actual costs of operation and maintenance allocated under such agreement or agreements to the United States.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State for use of the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, without fiscal year limitation, such sums as may be necessary to defray costs that accrue to the United States under such agreement or agreements for the construction, operation, and maintenance of such drainage conveyance canal project.

PARTICIPATION BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION IN MEDICAL COMMUNITY PLANNING AND SHARING OF MODERN TECHNOLOGY AND EQUIPMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a bill to assure adequate and complete medical care for veterans by providing for participation by the Veterans' Administration in medical community planning and for the sharing of advanced medical technology and equipment between the Veterans' Administration and other public and private hospitals.

The proposed legislation would authorize the Administrator, when he determines it to be in the best interest of the prevailing standards of the Veterans' Administration medical care program, to enter into agreements providing for the exchange of use—or under certain conditions the mutual use—of specialized medical facilities between Veterans' Administration hospitals and other public and private hospitals or medical schools in a medical community.

Any such arrangement would include a provision for reciprocal reimbursement based on a charge, unit or otherwise, which covers the full cost of services rendered or supplies used. Any proceeds to the Government resulting from such arrangements would be credited to the applicable Veterans' Administration medical appropriation.

As indicated by its title this legislation has a dual purpose: to assure—

First, adequate and complete medical care for veterans; and

Second, optimum effective utilization of specialized medical resources, under the direct control of the Veterans' Administration, during periods when immediate needs do not require maximum usage.

In the past decade the dramatic advances in medical science and technology have produced highly specialized and costly staff, procedures, and equipment. Because of the cost of such equipment, and the scarcity of the technical staff required, the availability of such resources is extremely limited. In the ever-changing complex of medicine with all its ramifications, the cost of medical care and treatment will continue to climb for all users. This applies to the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery as well as to community medical facilities.

The Veterans' Administration, which operates the largest single system of medical facilities in the world, has within its system a portion of these scarce medical resources in various locations, and has provided considerable leadership in the field of medical research. This leadership, however, has its attending obligations. Today the health needs of many communities are not being met either because of the complexity of the problems, or the magnitude or the resources required.

While current law permits the use of our facilities by nonveterans in emergencies for humanitarian reasons, the Veterans' Administration is unable to permit the use of such facilities and equipment, as well as expertise of its staff, for nonemergent situations even if there are no similar facilities available. This situation exists even though these scarce medical facilities are not always utilized to the maximum and could be available to the community, without detriment to the care and treatment of veteran-beneficiaries, during periods when our immediate needs do not require maximum utilization.

Possession of the newer complex medical diagnostic or treatment modalities in the Veterans' Administration, and others by affiliated or local hospitals, with shared use of each by both groups, would make for more efficient utilization of such diagnostic or treatment modalities at lower unit costs for all. For example, very special facilities, staff, and equipment are necessary for hemodialysis. Sharing some of the costs for such services by mutual use on a time available basis could have the effect of increasing the Nation's limited supply of scientists and equipment in this field.

In the treatment of certain tumors, two very expensive instruments can provide the high level of energy radiation needed, but with different characteristics. These two instruments complement each other. Rarely can a single hospital afford to own or maintain both machines nor can they be used to maximum capacity when use is restricted to the immediate patient population of the individual institution. An agreement, whereby the Veterans' Administration would only be required to furnish one of these machines, in order to provide complete medical care for veterans thus obviating the need for providing the other in a Veterans' Administration facility, is an example of the economic efficiency which could be achieved under the proposed authority. Moreover, to attract high quality personnel and to maintain staff skills at their peak, it is necessary that such facilities not only be available but that they be regularly and actively employed.

Again, most open heart surgery is done for the correction of congenital defects early in life or for malfunctioning heart valves in older patients. While the Veterans' Administration does not have a large number of patients requiring this type of surgery, there is a distinct hope that surgical treatment may become available for coronary artery disease, a frequent killer of veteran patients. The advantage of interchange of available know-how, personnel, and experience, with that of the medical schools is needed to further develop Veterans' Administration capabilities in this area.

Benefits will be gained by both the Veterans' Administration and the entire medical community if agreements can be entered into for the mutual use, or exchange of use, of specialized medical resources. Cooperative use of such equipment should result in a much broader therapeutic armamentarium. In addition, such shared usage of facilities would reduce the need for each hospital to have on its staff highly trained scarce categories of professional personnel. Accordingly, I believe that the proposed agreement will improve the Veterans' Administration capability to provide complete medical care for veterans.

It is not anticipated that the enactment of the proposed legislation will result in any additional expenditure of public funds. It should, instead, reduce the overall medical costs to the Government for certain of its complex medical care obligations. As a result, such legislation will in the long run, undoubtedly, result in economic gain to the Government as its full potential is achieved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2748) to assure adequate and complete medical care for veterans by providing for participation by the Veterans' Administration in medical community planning and for the sharing of advanced medical technology and equipment between the Veterans' Administration and other public and private hospitals, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2748

A bill to assure adequate and complete medical care for veterans by providing for participation by the Veterans' Administration in medical community planning and for the sharing of advanced medical technology and equipment between the Veterans' Administration and other public and private hospitals

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter I of chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 5007. SPECIALIZED MEDICAL RESOURCES

"(a) To secure certain specialized medical resources which otherwise might not be feasibly available, or to effectively utilize certain other medical resources, the Administrator may, when he determines it to be in the best interest of the prevailing standards of the Veterans' Administration medical care program, make arrangements, by contract or other form of agreement, as set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) below, between Veterans' Administration hospitals and other public or private hospitals (or medical schools or other medical installations having hospital facilities) in the medical community:

"(1) for the exchange of use of specialized medical resources when such an agreement will obviate the need for a similar resource to be provided in a Veterans' Administration facility; or

"(2) for the mutual use, or exchange of use of specialized medical resources in a Veterans' Administration facility, which have been justified on the basis of veterans' care, but which are not utilized to their maximum effective capacity.

The Administrator may determine the geographical limitations of a medical community as used in this section.

"(b) Arrangements entered into under this section shall provide for reciprocal reimbursement based on a charge which covers the full cost of services rendered, supplies used, and including normal depreciation and amortization costs of equipment. Any proceeds to the Government received therefrom shall be credited to the applicable Veterans' Administration medical appropriation.

"(c) For the purpose of this section the term 'specialized medical resources' means medical resources (whether equipment, space or personnel) which because of cost, limited availability, or unusual nature, are either unique in the medical community or are subject to maximum utilization only through mutual use.

"(d) Eligibility for hospital care and medical services furnished any veteran pursuant to this section shall be subject to the same terms as though provided in a Veterans' Administration facility, and provisions of this title applicable to persons receiving hospital care or medical services in a Veterans' Administration facility shall apply to veterans treated hereunder."

(b) Such chapter 81 is further amended by adding at the end of the table of sections relating to subchapter I the following:

"5007. Specialized medical resources."

PREPAYMENT OF VETERANS' VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION TRAVEL EXPENSES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care.

Section 111 of title 38, United States Code, authorizes the payment of the actual necessary travel expenses, or in lieu thereof an allowance based upon mileage traveled, of any person to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place in connection with vocational rehabilitation, counseling required pursuant to the war orphans' educational assistance program, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care. Subsection (b) of such section 111 currently authorizes the prepayment of the mileage allowance paid in lieu of actual travel expenses. Section 529 of title 31, United States Code, prohibits the advance of public money "unless authorized by the appropriation concerned or by other law."

This bill would amend this statutory prepayment provision (38 U.S.C. 111 (b)), to authorize similar action with respect to: first, the round-trip local travel expenses of a person eligible therefor; second, the expense of hiring an automobile or ambulance; and third, the fee authorized for the services of a nonemployee attendant, where required by a person eligible therefor.

Experience has demonstrated that on occasions individuals eligible for travel expense payment do not have sufficient funds for completing their travel. Attendants assigned to accompany a beneficiary during travel, and ambulance or hired-car owners who transport the beneficiary, must now await final payment for services rendered until they return to their point of origin, after which a claim must be filed and processed by correspondence. This legislation will remedy these situations and will authorize the payment of the prescribed expenses and allowances before the individual leaves the Veterans Administration station. Such a course of action will eliminate the need for adjudicating and processing the claim by correspondence. It will also simplify our administrative fiscal procedures and, in addition, will improve public relations between the Veterans Administration and the claimant.

The enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Government. Instead, it is anticipated that some savings in administrative costs will occur.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2749) to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2749

A bill to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 111(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Payment of the following expenses or allowances in connection with vocational rehabilitation, counseling, or upon termination of examination, treatment, or care, may be made before the completion of travel:

"(1) the mileage allowance authorized by subsection (a) hereof;

"(2) actual local travel expenses;

"(3) the expense of hiring an automobile or ambulance, or the fee authorized for the services of a nonemployee attendant."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2(A) OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I recently had called to my attention that the Export-Import Bank granted a hard loan to the Government of Morocco for the expansion of the phosphate industry of that country. I understand that the expansion which will be undertaken will have an adverse effect upon the phosphate industry in this country.

In looking into this matter I found that the Export-Import Bank is not required, under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, to consider the effect loans approved by the Bank would have on the domestic economy.

Mr. President, without going into detail with specific reference to the phosphate industry, I can visualize other instances whereby loans approved by the Bank would have a decided effect on our economy. Accordingly, I send to the desk a bill to amend section 2(a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, which, if enacted, would require the Board of Directors of the Bank to make a finding that the domestic economy will not be adversely affected prior to approving any loan, and, if it finds to the contrary, such loan shall not be approved. I ask that this bill be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2752) to amend section 2(a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DUTY-FREE GIFTS TO ARMED FORCES IN VIETNAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill that will permit members of our Armed Forces serving in a combat zone to ship, duty free, gifts not exceeding $100. As Senators know, the law now states that gifts, in order to be duty free, must not exceed a $10 value.

My purpose in introducing this bill at this time, of course, is for the benefit of our military men serving in Vietnam. The story was brought quite close to home this past Christmas. As most Senators know, the 1st Division from Fort Riley, Kans., is in Vietnam, but many of the wives and families of these fighting men remained in Junction City, Kans. Christmas for these families was not one of their better Christmases, but they tried to make the best of it. However, those that had to pay duty at the local post office for their own Christmas presents were a little bitter, and I do not blame them. As is pointed out in the editorial from the Junction City Daily Union, which I would like printed in the RECORD at this point, this particular wife had to pay a considerable amount for her own Christmas present. Had her husband shipped these two sweaters in separate boxes on separate days, there would have been no duty. However, one problem in Vietnam is getting one box, enough paper, string, and so forth, to mail it and then getting it mailed.

I would like to point out that this bill is limited to only members of the U.S. Armed Forces serving in a combat zone. Senators will recall a similar law was in effect during World War II, and then last session we changed our postage laws in order to allow these particular troops free postage. So I am most hopeful that we can get early action on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2767) to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to permit the duty-free entry of gifts not exceeding $100 in retail value from members of the Armed Forces serving in a combat zone, introduced by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. MUNDT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The editorial presented by Mr. CARLSON is as follows:

[From the Junction City Daily Union, Nov. 24, 1965]

SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE

An unfortunate situation was brought to the attention of the Daily Union Tuesday after the wife of a Fort Riley soldier now in Vietnam received a shipment of Christmas gifts from her husband. She was required to pay customs duties. For example, two sweaters valued at $19 required an additional 42 percent, or about $8 more.

As nearly as the Union can learn, the duties are fixed by act of Congress and the post office workers act only as agents for the Treasury Department in collecting duties on shipments having a wholesale value of more than $10 if more than one shipment is made each day. Even purchases made at the post exchanges are subject to a duty if the article was made in a foreign country.

It seems unjust to order military personnel overseas and then require them to pay a duty on Christmas gifts when they can make the purchases only in a foreign land, even providing they have a chance to enter a store or shop.

Such instances may become numerous in the next 30 days because many of the gifts purchased abroad now are on the high seas, en route to relatives and friends here in the States.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added to the bill introduced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] because it deals with the problem brought to my attention today also in connection with Christmas gifts being forwarded to South Dakota by soldiers in Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PARKING FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia.

Preliminary hearings on the parking situation in the District of Columbia, as well as conferences with experts in the fields of urban planning, District of Columbia officials and Federal and local organizations, have convinced me that legislation is urgently needed to establish a public parking agency in the District. The bill I have introduced today is based upon the draft prepared by the Commissioners' Citizens Advisory Committee and the experiences of other major cities, as described in our preliminary hearings.

The bill creates a Parking Board composed of the three District of Columbia Commissioners. The Parking Board will be assisted by a nine-man Advisory Council composed of the Secretaries of Interior and Commerce, the General Services Administrator and the Chairmen of the National Capital Transportation Agency and the National Capital Planning Commission.

The Board is authorized to acquire land by purchase, by grant from any Government agency, or by condemnation. The condemnation power is carefully circumscribed to insure that it is sparingly and fairly invoked. The Board could operate a parking facility through a private management firm or it could lease or sell a parking facility while retaining control over rates and quality of service. Private parking facilities would be required to file schedules of rates and new garages could not be constructed at locations that would be inconsistent with sound planning or interfere with efficient traffic flow.

The overriding philosophy of my bill is that parking is an integral part of a balanced transportation system. The bill requires comprehensive study every 5 years to determine the available transportation resources in the National Capital area and to analyze what additional parking facilities, if any, are required to implement an efficient and economical transportation system. Rates in public parking facilities would be established to encourage short-term parking by shoppers, businessmen, and others who wish to draw upon the financial, commercial, cultural, and other resources of the central city.

The Parking Board would also be authorized to establish fringe lots in the District of Columbia and in the suburbs to accommodate commuters, tourists, and other long-term visitors to the Nation's Capital. The fringe lots could be built on Government or acquired land, and authority is expressly included to construct parking facilities under the Mall and in air rights over any freeways. This would enable those who use the freeways to drive directly into a parking garage, without ever crossing a city street, and either walk or take a short rail or bus ride to their destination.

Hearings on this bill will be held on January 19, 20, and 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2769) relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROTECTING OUR NATIONAL EMBLEMS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to provide protection to the great seal of the United States and the seal of the President.

It is regrettable, Mr. President, that punitive measures are necessary to prevent the reproduction of the great seal of the United States and the Presidential seal for commercial gain and to falsely indicate Federal agency, but such abuses are a daily occurrence.

The Secretary of State has long been charged with the custody of the great seal die and press, whose uses are strictly regulated, but there has never been any means of regulating private reproduction of the emblem. In the absence of any statutory power to prohibit abuses, the State Department has often sought to dissuade private organizations and commercial concerns from using the seal. Facsimiles of our national coat of arms have, nevertheless, appeared on letterheads, on program cards, newspaper advertisements and various types of merchandise such as jewelry and leathergoods.

When I first inquired of the State Department about these abuses, I was informed by letter that "such instances of private exploitation or proposed exploitation of the coat of arms are becoming more numerous and more various." Later in the letter I was told that "the Department is convinced that the Government should begin to exercise suitable control over use of the coat of arms."

Mr. President, there is now before the Judiciary Committee, S. 1597, which I introduced last spring in order to prohibit the reproduction of the great seal for certain commercial purposes or to falsely indicate Federal agency. Both the State Department and the Justice Department have noted their support for the objectives of my bill; however, the State Department has suggested other procedures for implementing these objectives—procedures designed to give more effective protection and apply additionally to the seal of the President. These suggestions, which are viewed favorably by the Justice Department, are incorporated in the bill I am introducing today.

In brief, the bill will authorize the President to prescribe rules and regulations for the use and reproduction of both seals. The Attorney General will be empowered to enjoin reported violations, and violators will be subject to fine of not more than $250 or imprisonment of not more than 6 months, or both.

It is my sincere hope that in response to this bill and S. 1597, the Judiciary Committee will conduct hearings as soon as possible in order to determine the most effective means of affording the needed protection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2770) to control the use of the design of the great seal of the United States and of the seal of the President of the United States, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GOLDEN SPIKE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am today introducing a joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission to work with a similar group set up by the Utah State Legislature in planning an appropriate commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the linking of the United States by transcontinental railroad.

That centennial comes up on May 10, 1969. It was a hundred years ago that the twin bands of steel were joined at Promontory, Utah, welding the Nation from sea to sea, and opening up a new era of development for a struggling young nation. Its commemoration offers an opportunity to pay tribute to the leadership and vision which produced the railroad and to the endurance of the men who laid the rails. It also gives us a time and a place to pay special tribute to the railroad industry of today and all of the men and women who are a part of it.

Utah is already planning to make the centennial a great event. The colorful history of the laying of the rails, and of the driving of the spike itself, offer an opportunity for drama and pageantry. The passage of my bill last session to establish the Golden Spike National Historical site has given the National Park Service the authority to undertake, and I trust complete, a broad program of development in time for the celebration. The purpose of the resolution I am introducing today is to provide the machinery through which the Federal Government can cooperate with the Utah Golden Spike Centennial Commission, with patriotic and civic organizations, and with the railroads themselves in planning the most appropriate and effective celebration possible. The driving of the Golden Spike was not only an event of national importance, it was a turning point in our history. It marked the end of an era, and the beginning of a new one. The day of the covered wagon and stagecoach was largely over, America was on its way to becoming a modern industrial giant.

The resolution calls for the establishment of a 13-member Commission, composed of 8 Members from the House and Senate and 5 members appointed by the President. It authorizes a modest sum of money for payment of the expenses of those who participate in its work, and provides for its dissolution as soon as the celebration has been concluded.

Appropriate celebration of significant events is always the result of careful and coordinated planning. I feel that the passage of the resolution I am introducing today will be an essential step to the appropriate celebration 3 years hence of the centennial of the driving of the Golden Spike at Promontory, Utah.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 124) to establish the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TRANSMISSION OF THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], I introduce a joint resolution extending the date for transmission of of the economic report. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The joint resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 125) extending the date for transmission of the economic report, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding the provisions of Section 3 of the Act of February 20, 1946, as amended (15 U.S.C. 1022), the President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 27, 1966, the 1966 Economic Report.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNOUNCEMENT—TRAFFIC SAFETY HEARINGS

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations will resume hearings on the Federal role in traffic safety on February 1 when it will receive testimony from Mr. Ralph Nader, author of the recently published book "Unsafe At Any Speed." On February 2, Mr. Howard Pyle, president, National Safety Council will testify. On February 3, New York State Senators Simon J. Liebowitz and Edward J. Speno will describe New York's experiences in the safe-car field and the work of the Joint Legislative Committee on Motor Vehicles, Traffic, and Highway Safety. The hearings will be held in room 3304, New Senate Office Building and will commence at 10 a.m. each day.

NOTICE OF JOINT HEARINGS ON MILITARY JUSTICE

Mr. **ERVIN**. Mr. President, as chairman of both the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and a specially appointed subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, I wish to announce that joint hearings will be held by the two subcommittees on 18 bills (S. 745–S. 762) designed to improve the quality of military justice and to more effectively safeguard the constitutional rights of military personnel involved in judicial and administrative proceedings.

The hearings are scheduled for January 18, 19, 20 and 25, 26, and 27, at 10.30 a.m. each day, in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building. Any person who wishes to testify or submit statements pertaining to the bills should communicate with the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2729, TO AMEND THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Banking and Currency Committee will hold a hearing on S. 2729, a bill to amend the Small Business Act with respect to provisions of the act relating to the revolving fund.

The hearing will be held on Tuesday, January 18, 1966, at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with this bill are requested to notify Reginald Barnes, assistant counsel, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-3921.

HEARINGS ON NOMINATION FOR DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF MINES, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. **JACKSON**. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to announce that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold a public hearing next Tuesday, January 18, on the nomination by President Johnson of Dr. Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., to be Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines. The hearing will be at 11 a.m. in the committee room, 3110 New Senate Office Building.

Prior to his appointment, Dr. Hibbard was manager of the metallurgy and ceramics research programs of General Electric at Schenectady, N.Y. He is the president-elect of the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical, and Petroleum Engineers for 1966 and chairman of the National Academy of Science's Materials Advisory Board.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a biographical sketch of Dr. Hibbard be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Biographical Sketch of Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., Director, Bureau of Mines, U.S. Department of the Interior

Dr. Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., one of the Nation's outstanding metallurgists, became Director of the Bureau of Mines on December 1, 1965, following earlier successes as an educator, researcher, and as an industry manager of scientific and engineering research.

Born in Bridgeport, Conn., January 20, 1918, Dr. Hibbard was graduated from Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., and received a doctor of engineering degree from Yale University in 1942. Following his military service in World War II as an officer in the Navy Department's Bureau of Ships, he joined the Yale faculty as an assistant professor and later became associate professor.

Dr. Hibbard's growing reputation in teaching and research attracted industry, and in 1951 the General Electric Co. enlisted him for its Research and Development Center in Schenectady, N.Y. There he progressed to the position of manager of metallurgy and ceramics research, which he held until he was beckoned to public service by President Johnson as Director of the Bureau of Mines.

As an expert in such fields as the plastic deformation of metals and the metallurgy of copper and its alloys, Dr. Hibbard has won wide recognition from many professional societies. In 1950 he received the Raymond Award of the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical & Petroleum Engineers. From 1957 to 1961 he served as a director of the institute, and is now its president-elect for 1966. In addition, Dr. Hibbard belongs to the British Institute of Metals and the New York Academy of Sciences, and is a fellow of both the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He is also a member of the Materials Advisory Board of the National Academy of Sciences, and is currently its Chairman.

Dr. Hibbard has been elected to many honorary and professional fraternities including Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, Alpha Chi Sigma, and Gamma Alpha. He is the author of more than 70 scientific papers and has been widely recognized as a major contributor to the science of metallurgy.

Dr. and Mrs. Hibbard have three children and reside in Rockville, Md.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATIONS OF ROBERT C. WEAVER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE SECRETARY, AND ROBERT C. WOOD, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY, OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a hearing on the nominations of Robert C. Weaver, of New York, to be Secretary, and Robert C. Wood, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary, of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The hearing is scheduled to be held on Monday, January 17, 1966, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, at 10 a.m.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with these nominations are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone 225–3921.

I ask unanimous consent that the biographies released by the White House about Dr. Weaver and Dr. Wood be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the biographical information was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Biographical Information on Robert C. Weaver

Mr. Robert C. Weaver was born in Washington, D.C., on December 29, 1907. He was educated at Harvard University, receiving a B.S. in 1929, an M.A. in 1931, and a Ph. D. in 1934.

From 1933 to 1937 he was the Adviser for Negro Affairs, Department of the Interior, and from 1937 to 1940 he served as the special assistant to the Administrator, U.S. Housing Authority. He also worked from 1940 to 1944 as an official on the War Production Board, where he became Chief of the Minority Group Service Division. From 1945 to 1948 Mr. Weaver was a member of the American Council on Race Relations.

After teaching at Northwestern University, Columbia Teachers College, and New York University, Mr. Weaver became the director of opportunity fellowships, John Hay Whitney Foundation, a position he held until 1954.

In 1954, Mr. Weaver was named the deputy commissioner of the New York State Division of Housing and from 1955 to 1959 served as the State rent administrator, New York. From 1960 to 1961 he was the vice chairman of the New York City Housing and Redevelopment Board.

Mr. Weaver became the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in 1961, a position he has held since that time.

He is the author of "Negro Labor, A National Problem" (1946), "The Negro Ghetto" (1948), and "The Urban Complex" (1964).

He lives at 4600 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Mr. Weaver is married to the former Ella V. Haith.

Biographical Information on Robert C. Wood

Prof. Robert C. Wood, a native of Jacksonville, Fla., is chairman of the political science department at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Born in St. Louis, Mo., on September 16, 1923, he served with the 76th Infantry during World War II. He received an A.B. from Princeton University in 1946. At Harvard University, he was awarded an M.A. in 1947, a master of public administration in 1948, and a Ph. D. in 1950.

From 1949 to 1951 he was associate director, Legislative Reference Bureau of the State of Florida. At the U.S. Bureau of the Budget from 1951 to 1954, Mr. Wood served as a management organization expert in the housing field.

Mr. Wood became a lecturer and then an assistant professor of government at Harvard University in 1954. In 1957 he left Harvard to join the faculty at MIT where he taught as an assistant professor of political science from 1957 to 1959, and as an associate professor from 1959 to 1962. In 1962, Mr. Wood was named professor of political science; and in 1965, he became the chairman of the Political Science Department at MIT.

He is a member of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency, the Committee for Economic Development, and the American Academy for Arts and Sciences. He was elected to Phi Beta Kappa at Princeton.

He is the author of "Suburbia, Its People and Their Politics" (1958); "Metropolis Against Itself" (1959); "1400 Governments, the Political Economy of the New York Region" (1960); and the coauthor of "School Men and Politics" (1962), and "Government and Politics of the U.S." (1965).

Mr. Wood lives on Trapelo Road, Lincoln, Mass., with his wife, the former Margaret Byers, and three children, Francis, Margaret, and Frank.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH:

Article entitled "This Must Be a Citizen Action Program," consisting of an interview with Senator Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine, and dealing with a program of natural beautification, published in the General Electric Forum.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 169), as follows:

S. Res. 169

Resolved, That Mr. Metcalf be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Finance, in lieu of Mr. Harry F. Byrd, Sr., of Virginia, resigned from the Senate;

That Mr. Tydings be, and he is hereby, assigned to the Committee on Public Works, in lieu of Mr. Metcalf, resigned;

That Mr. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., of Virginia, be and he is hereby, assigned to the Committee on Armed Services, in lieu of Mr. Harry F. Byrd, Sr., resigned from the Senate, and that Mr. Byrd be, and he is hereby assigned to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, in lieu of Mr. Tydings, resigned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

THE 1966 HOLIDAY RECESS SCHEDULE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the holiday recess schedule for calendar year 1966 which has been discussed with and approved by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], and a copy of which has also been sent this day to every Member of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the schedule was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Lincoln's Birthday (Saturday, February 12, 1966): From conclusion of business Thursday, February 10, until noon, Wednesday, February 16. Pro forma meeting, Monday, February 14.

Washington's Birthday (Tuesday, February 22, 1966): No business after the reading of the Farewell Address.

Easter (Sunday, April 10, 1966): From conclusion of business Thursday, April 7, until noon, Wednesday, April 13. Pro forma meeting, Monday, April 11.

Memorial Day (Monday, May 30, 1966): From conclusion of business Friday, May 27, until noon, Wednesday, June 1. Pro forma meeting, Tuesday, May 31.

July 4 (Monday): From conclusion of business Friday, July 1, until noon, Wednesday, July 6. Pro forma meeting, Tuesday, July 5.

WILD RIVERS SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 778, Senate bill 1446.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1446) to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the System, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Wild Rivers Act".

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress finds that some of the free-flowing rivers of the United States possess unique water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values of present and potential benefit to the American people. The Congress also finds that our established national policy of dam and other construction at appropriate sections of the rivers of the United States needs to be complemented by a policy that would preserve other selected rivers or sections thereof in their free-flowing condition to protect the water quality of such rivers and to fulfill other vital national conservation purposes. It is the policy of Congress to preserve, develop, reclaim, and make accessible for the benefit of all of the American people selected parts of the Nation's diminishing resource of free-flowing rivers. For this purpose there is hereby established a National Wild Rivers System to be composed of the areas that are designated as "wild river areas" in this Act, and the additional areas that may be designated in subsequent Acts of Congress. Areas designated as "wild river areas" by subsequent Acts of Congress shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of this Act unless the subsequent Acts provide otherwise.

DEFINITION OF WILD RIVER AREA

(b) A wild river area eligible to be included in the System is a stream or section of a stream, tributary, or river—and the related adjacent land area—that should be left in its free-flowing condition, or that should be restored to such condition, in order to promote sound water conservation, and promote the public use and enjoyment of the scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values.

NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM

SEC. 3. (a) The following rivers, or segments thereof, and related, adjacent lands, most of which are public lands, as depicted on maps numbered "NWR–SAL–1001, NWR–CLE–1001, NWR–ROG–1001, NWR–RIO–1000 and NWR–ELE–1000" are hereby designated as "wild river areas":

(1) Salmon, Idaho—the Salmon from town of North Fork downstream to its confluence with the Snake River and the entire Middle Fork.

(2) Clearwater, Middle Fork, Idaho—the Middle Fork from the town of Kooskia upstream to the town of Lowell; the Lochsa River from its junction with the Selway at Lowell forming the Middle Fork, upstream to the Powell Ranger Station; and the Selway River from Lowell upstream to its origin.

(3) Rogue, Oregon—the segment extending from the Applegate River to the Route 101 highway bridge above Gold Beach.

(4) Rio Grande, New Mexico—the segment extending from the Colorado State line downstream to near the town of Pilar, and the lower four miles of the Red River.

(5) Eleven Point, Missouri—the segment of the river extending from a point near Greer Spring downstream to State Highway 142.

Said maps shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

FEDERAL-STATE PLANNING FOR ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM

(b) The Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture where national forest lands are involved, after consultation with interested Federal agencies, are directed to consult with the Governors and officials of the States in which the rivers listed below are located to ascertain whether a joint Federal-State plan is feasible and desirable in the public interest to conserve segments of these rivers. They shall submit to the President their recommendations for inclusion of any or all of them in the National Wild Rivers System, and the President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations for such legislation as he deems appropriate:

(1) Buffalo, Tennessee—The entire river from its beginning in Lawrence County to its confluence with the Duck River.

(2) Cacapon, West Virginia—entire river and its tributary, the Lost River.

(3) Green, Wyoming—the segment extending from its origin in the Bridger Wilderness Area, south to its confluence with Horse Creek.

(4) Hudson, New York—the segment of the mainstem extending from its origin in the Adirondack Park downstream to the vicinity of the town of Luzerne: Boreas River from its mouth to Durgin Brook; Indian River from its mouth to Abanakee Dam; and Cedar River from its mouth to Cedar River flow.

(5) Missouri, Montana—the segment upstream from Fort Peck Reservoir toward the town of Fort Benton.

(6) Niobrara, Nebraska—the mainstem segment lying betwen the confluence of Antelope Creek downstream to the headwaters of the proposed Norden Reservoir east of the town of Valentine, and the lower eight miles of its Snake River tributary.

(7) Skagit, Washington—the Skagit from the town of Mount Vernon upstream to Gorge powerhouse near the town of Newhalem; the Cascade River from its mouth to the confluence of the North and South Forks; the Sauk from its mouth to Elliott Creek; and the Suiattle from its mouth to Milk Creek.

(8) Susquehanna, New York and Pennsylvania—the segment of the Susquehanna River from a dam at Cooperstown, New York, downstream to the town of Pittston, Pennsylvania.

(9) Wolf, Wisconsin—the segment reaching from the confluence of the Hunting River downstream to the town of Keshena.

(10) Suwanee, Georgia and Florida—entire river from its source in the Okefenokee Swamp in Georgia to the gulf, and the outlying Ichetucknee Springs, Florida.

(11) Youghiogheny, Maryland and Pennsylvania—from Oakland, Maryland, to the Youghiogheny Reservoir, and from the Youghiogheny Dam, downstream to the town of Connellsville, Pennsylvania.

RIVER BASIN PLANNING FOR ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM

(c) In all planning for the use and development of water and related land resources, consideration shall be given by all Federal agencies involved to potential wild river areas, and all river basin and project plan reports submitted to the Congress shall discuss any such potentials. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make specific studies and investigations to determine which additional wild river areas within the United States shall be evaluated in planning reports by all Federal agencies as potential alternative uses of the water and related land resources involved.

OTHER ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM

(d) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall also submit to the President from time to time their recommendations for inclusion in the National Wild Rivers System of any other river or segment thereof. The President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations for such legislation as he deems appropriate.

(e) Recommendations made under this section shall be developed in consultation with the States, those Federal agencies which normally participate in the development of recreation plans and comprehensive river basin plans, any commissions established pursuant to interstate compacts the assigned responsibilities of which would be affected, and commissions or other bodies which may be established for the purpose of developing a comprehensive plan for the river basin within which the contemplated wild river area would be located. Each such recommendation shall be accompanied by (1) expressions of any views which the agencies and States consulted pursuant to the foregoing may submit within ninety days after having been notified of the proposed recommendation, (2) a statement setting forth the probable effect of the recommended action on any comprehensive river basin plan that may have been adopted by Congress or that is serving as a guide for coordinating Federal or Federal and State programs in the basin, and (3) in the absence of such plan, a statement indicating the probable effect of the recommended action on alternative beneficial uses of the resources of the basin.

(f) Whenever it is proposed to add a river or segment thereof to the National Wild Rivers System, and the river or segment runs through non-Federal land, recommendations with respect to its addition and with respect to whether it should be wholly or partly acquired, protected, and managed pursuant to exclusive State authority shall be made to the President by the Governor of each State concerned. Such recommendation to the President shall be accompanied by or based upon a general State plan which assures the effectuation of the purposes of this Act in perpetuity. The President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations with respect to the designation of such river or segment thereof as a part of the National Wild Rivers System and the administration of such area by State authority, together with such draft legislation that he deems appropriate.

NEED FOR LAND ACQUISITION

(g) Any recommendation for an addition to the National Wild Rivers System shall indicate the extent to which land will need to be acquired by the State and by the Federal Government, and the extent to which the acquisition of scenic easements or other interests in land may be an adequate substitute for the acquisition of a fee title.

ADMINISTRATION OF SYSTEM

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall administer the wild river area designated by subsection 3(a), paragraph (4) and the Secretary of Agriculture shall administer the areas designated by paragraphs (2) and (5). The area designated by paragraphs (1) and (3) shall be administered in a manner agreed upon by the two Secretaries, or as directed by the President.

(b) Wild river areas designated by subsequent Acts of Congress shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, except that when the wild river area is wholly within, partly within, or closely adjacent to, a national forest such area shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture unless it is also partly within, or closely adjacent to, an area administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in which event the wild river area shall be administered in such manner as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, or as directed by the President. The Secretary charged with the administration of a wild river area or portion thereof designated by this Act or by subsequent Acts may agree with the Governor of the State for State or local governmental agency participation in the administration of the area. The States shall be encouraged to cooperate in the planning and administration of such wild river areas where they include State-owned or county-owned lands. Any Federal land located within a wild river area may, with the consent of the head of the agency having jurisdiction thereof, be transferred to the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary or State for administration as part of the wild river area. Any land transferred hereunder to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture for administration as part of a wild river area in connection with the National Forest System shall become national forest land.

(c) Within the exterior boundaries of a wild river area as defined by section 3 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire lands or interests therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided,* That neither Secretary may acquire lands, waters, or interests therein by condemnation without the owner's consent when 75 per centum or more of the acreage or stream bank within the entire wild river area is owned by Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, but this limitation shall not apply to the acquisition of scenic easements. Lands owned by an Indian tribe may be acquired only with the consent of the tribal governing body. In the exercise of his exchange authority the

Secretary of the Interior may accept title to any non-Federal property within a wild river area, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction within the State in which the river or segment thereof runs, except lands within the National Park System or the National Wildlife Refuge System, which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The properties so exchanged shall be of approximately equal fair market value. If they are not of approximately equal fair market value, the Secretary of the Interior may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. The Secretary of Agriculture, in the exercise of his exchange authority, may utilize authorities and procedures available to him in connection with exchanges of national forest lands. Any such lands acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture within or adjacent to a national forest shall upon acquisition become national forest lands. Money appropriated for Federal or State purposes from the land and water conservation fund shall be available for the acquisition of property for the purposes of this Act. As used in this Act the term "scenic easement" means the right to control the use of land (including the air space above such land) for the purpose of protecting the scenic view from the river for the purposes of this Act, but such control shall not affect any regular use exercised prior to the acquisition of the easement.

(d) Neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire lands by condemnation, for the purpose of including such lands in any wild river area, if such lands are located within any incorporated city, village, or borough within such area, when such entities shall have in force and applicable to such lands a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(e) Neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the Secretary of Agriculture may exercise any authority to acquire county-owned lands within any wild river area without the consent of said county as long as the county is following a plan for the management and protection of such lands that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(f) Wherever the power of condemnation has been conferred by this Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may acquire in fee title by condemnation an area which may not extend more than three hundred feet on either side of the stream, tributary, or river; and either Secretary may acquire by condemnation for scenic easements, or other interests in land other than fee title, an area which extends no more than one thousand three hundred and twenty feet from either side of the stream, tributary, or river.

(g) A wild river area shall be administered for the purposes of water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values contributing to public enjoyment, but without limitation on other uses, including timber harvesting and livestock grazing, that do not substantially interfere with these purposes. The Secretary of the Interior, in administering such areas, may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas of the national park system and such statutory authorities otherwise available to him for recreation and preservation purposes, and the conservation and management of natural resources, as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Secretary of Agriculture, in administering such areas, shall utilize the statutory authorities relating to the national forests in such manner as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(h) No lands, waters, or interests therein other than scenic easements may be administered under this Act as a part of the National Wild Rivers System if such lands, waters, or interests were acquired by a State under its power of condemnation for the specific purpose of making such lands, waters, or interests therein a part of the National Wild Rivers System under this Act.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. (a) The Federal Power Commission shall not authorize the construction, operation, or maintenance of any dam or other project work under the Federal Power Act (41 Stat. 1063), as amended (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.), in any wild river area except as specifically authorized by the Congress.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall affect the applicability of the United States mining and mineral leasing laws within the National Wild Rivers System, except that all mining claims located after the effective date of this Act shall be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of national forest lands, may prescribe to effectuate the purposes of this Act. Any patent issued shall recite this limitation. All such regulations shall provide among other things for safeguards against pollution of the river. Any portion of a wild river area that is within the national wilderness preservation system shall be subject to the mining and mineral leasing provisions of both the Wilderness Act and this Act, and in case of conflict the more restrictive provisions shall apply.

(c) The head of any Federal or State agency administering a wild river area shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with the appropriate State water pollution control agencies, for the purpose of eliminating or diminishing the pollution of waters within a wild river area.

(d) The jurisdiction of the States and the United States over waters of any stream included in a wild river area shall be determined by established principles of law. Under the provisions of this Act, any taking by the United States of a water right which is vested under either State or Federal law at the time such river is included in the Wild Rivers System shall entitle the owner thereof to just compensation. Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

(e) Nothing in this Act shall affect the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the States under other provisions of law with respect to fish and wildlife.

(f) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify or be in conflict with any interstate compact made by any States which contain any portion of the National Wild Rivers System.

(g) A State shall have such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access by such State to the beds of navigable streams, tributaries, or rivers (or segments thereof) which are vested in the State, in case such beds are located in a wild river area.

(h) Designation of any stream or portion thereof shall not be construed as a reservation of the waters of such streams for purposes other than those specified in this Act, or in quantities greater than necessary to accomplish these purposes.

SEC. 6. In recognition of the fact that changes may occur in the circumstances of wild river areas included in the National Wild Rivers System or in the needs for the resources associated with such areas, which will require future Congresses to make changes in the System, and in order to assure that the Congress is kept informed of such changes in circumstances or needs, there is created a National Wild Rivers Review Board, to make reviews and furnish reports to the Congress as hereinafter provided.

The National Wild Rivers Review Board shall consist of the Secretary of the Interior, who shall be its Chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and the Governors of the several States for the purpose of consideration of the status of any river included within the National Wild Rivers System which lies within their States.

Within sixty days after the convening of a new Congress, commencing with the second Congress after the enactment of this bill, the National Wild Rivers Review Board shall file a report and recommendations with the President of the Senate and with the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Such report shall contain a discussion of any significant developments since the date of enactment of the bill, or since the last report, including but not limited to the following subjects: technology of passage of fish over dams; status and trends of anadromous fish runs; activities by way of construction or otherwise pursuant to international agreements relating to any basin in which wild rivers are designated; Federal or State legislative changes which affect the financing of river development projects, including basin account authorizations relative to any basin in which wild rivers are designated; projected national, regional, or local demand for additional electrical generating capacity, particularly as related to existence or possibility of declarations of national emergency.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the bill will not be called up for consideration until Monday of next week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the further information of the Senate, though not necessarily in this order, following S. 1446, the Wild Rivers Act, which is now the pending business, it is hoped to be able to bring up Calendar No. 850, H.R. 8126, an act to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law; Calendar No. 879, H.R. 3349, an act for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; Calendar No. 917, H.R. 30, an act to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla.: and also Calendar No. 795, S. 2271, a bill to authorize the payment of an allowance to certain employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

The last bill must be cleared with certain Senators before it can be brought up.

Concerning the District of Columbia minimum wage bill and the Interama bill, commitments to bring them up early in the 2d session were made in the closing days of the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Following, it is anticipated that the measure providing for repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act will be called up.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me ask the majority leader whether he intends to bring these bills up by motion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Approximately in that order. If the distinguished minority leader will allow me a little flexibility, I shall discuss this matter before any of them are called up.

Mr. President, those are the first five bills before the proposal for repeal of section 14(b) will be called up.

REPEAL OF SECTION 103(b) OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week, I was asked by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] to announce that he would be unavoidably absent until January 17.

He is presently on a mission and had announced his intention to introduce a bill to repeal section 103(b) of the Social Security Amendments Act of 1965, a provision in the medical care program which requires a loyalty oath of some 2 million older citizens.

The Senator has asked me to advise Senators that the bill will be introduced on Monday, January 17, and will lie on the table for 1 week thereafter for additional cosponsors.

FREE ENTERPRISE AWARDS ASSOCIATION CITATIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on December 21, 1965, the Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc., an organization to promote incentive and champion the cause of the American democratic system, made its 14th annual awards.

The 10 recipients came from all over the United States to praise and credit the American way of life for making success possible. Mr. Talbot T. Speer, who rose to own America's oldest paper, the 238-year-old Maryland Gazette, a newspaper chain, and Baltimore Business Forms, Inc., was the FEAA's awards chairman for the Waldorf-Astoria ceremonies.

I am happy to say that 2 of the 10 award winners are from my State of Illinois. They are Mr. Everette E. Ballard, president of All American Life & Casualty Co., Park Ridge, Ill.; and Mr. Morris B. Beschloss, of Flossmoor, Ill., the president of Hammond Valve Corp., Hammond, Ind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article concerning these success awards, and the names and backgrounds of the recipients, along with statements made by each of them praising America's free enterprise democracy and advice to those seeking success.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ten Men Who Rose From the Ranks Presented FEAA's 14th Annual 1965 American Success Story Awards Today—Examples of Success Possible Under America's Democracy Praise U.S. Freedoms and Opportunities—Ex-Editor, Newsboy, Clerk, Insuranceman, Others Cited—Americans Vote Americanism Over Any "Ism," Says Speer

New York City, December 21.—The 14th annual, 1965 American Success Story Awards were presented today to 10 men who symbolize the success possible to all under America's free enterprise democracy. They came from all over the United States to praise and credit the American way of life for making success possible.

Mr. Talbot T. Speer who rose to own one of America's oldest papers, the 238-year-old Maryland Gazette, a newspaper chain and the Baltimore Business Forms, Inc. presented the awards as FEAA's awards chairman at the Waldorf-Astoria ceremonies in the gold room.

Mr. Speer read the citations which stated that the recipients, "had won an enduring place in the history of American endeavor by achieving success despite adversity through industry, sacrifice, and ethics, symbolizing the success possible to all under America's free enterprise system." He cited them for their contributions to the economic growth of their communities, to their industries and their dedicated work in civic, religious, philanthropic causes.

Mr. Speer urged edtiors, leaders, and Americans in all fields to, "Get on a soapbox too to counteract the Communist-organized anti-American demonstrations staged to subvert our people to communism and disloyalty. He said that despite years of Red propaganda, Americans, free to vote any "ism" have always chosen Americanism. The Cuban exodus is further proof that the American way of life pays off and that millions want to get into America—nobody wants out. He warned that our Nation's life was at stake in these days of crisis and urged all Americans to cherish, champion, and defend our democracy which allows private enterprise, religious freedom, and the highest standard of living.

The Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc., was chartered in 1952. With leaders in all fields it carries out its charter duties, "to promote incentive and champion the cause of the American democratic system to bolster the faith of all people in the American way of life."

The recipients, selected from various U.S. trades and areas to show the opportunities and success possible in all parts of the United States were:

JAMES S. HUNT

James S. Hunt, 67 (residence, 4040 Galt Ocean Drive, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.) founder, president, chairman, Coral Ridge Properties, Inc., Fort Lauderdale, Fla; director, member executive committees, of Alleghany Corp., New York City, and Investors Diversified Services, Minneapolis, Minn.; director: New York Central Railroad System, New York World's Fair Corp., New York City, Florida State Development Commission. Chairman, Bank of Commerce, Bank of Florida, Financial Life Insurance Co., Financial Fire & Casualty Co., Fort Lauderdale, and others. Orphaned at 12. Was newsboy, car polisher, busboy, odd jobs. Joined Royal Air Force in 1915 at 18. Won Croix de Guerre, other honors. Won Silver Star in World War II as small boats invasion commander, retired as rear admiral USCGR. Was world's largest Chevrolet dealer. Originated "Blue Book." in 1945, at age 47, sold dealership and risked savings to start Coral Ridge Properties with 95 acres. His leadership, integrity, and acumen built company into Nation's most honored and largest builder-developers. His Coral Ridge development, 6½ miles (including Galt Ocean Mile he purchased for $19 million) has 7,000 homes. Company-owned oceanfront hotels, high-rise cooperative, condominimum and rental apartments, shopping centers, banks, insurance companies, other properties earn millions of dollars. Still expanding, Hunt has strated the city of Coral Springs on a 10,000-acre site for 60,000 residents. Cited as an example of free enterprise in action, for his rise from orphan to war hero, outstanding citizen and builder-developer.

KENNETH S. KELLEHER

Kenneth S. Kelleher, 42 (residence, 7116 Marine Drive, Alexandria, Va.). President, founder, Keltec Industries, Inc. (formerly Aero Geo Astro Corp.), Alexandria, Va. Subsidiaries: AGAI Corp., GBL Associates, Inc., SSI, Inc., Alexandria, Va.; Astro Communication Laboratory, Inc., Gaithersburg, Md.; RFD, Inc., Tampa, Fla.; Western Microwave Laboratories, Inc., Santa Clara, Calif. Affiliates: General Testing Laboratories, Inc., AGAC-Derritron, Alexandria, Va. Was scrap metal laborer, weighmaster. Worked way to earn B.A. and M.A. in math at North Carolina and Maryland Universities in 1958, after years of achievement in antenna and aerospace fields he left security of top positions with major companies and Government, risked savings and founded Aero Geo Astro Corp., now Keltec Industries, Inc. He started with $10,000, three employees, small space, no customers or products. In 7 years his dynamic direction, engineering, and executive genius built Keltec to 21 plants in 5 States, employes 1,000 technicians in the research, design, and production of military, aerospace and commercial equipment. It makes receivers, antennas, computers, environmental and water processing, and other equipment, with $15 million yearly sales worldwide. He is acclaimed for developments in electronic scanning and "dish" replacement antennas, and his 50 technical papers. Cited for contributions to his field and space age electronics vital to national defense.

TED C. WETTERAU

Ted C. Wetterau, Sr., 76 (residence, 32 Country Lane, Frontenac, Md.). Chairman, Wetterau Foods, Inc., Hazelwood, Mo. Divisions: Mexico, Scott City, Mo.; Bloomington, Ind. (IGA Foodliners Franchise Area: Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, Arkansas, Tennessee, Indiana, Kentucky. Subsidiaries: Non-Foods, Inc., Desloge, Mo.; Wetterau Finance Co., Monroe Realty & Investment Co., Mo.; president, Grocers Company of Chicago. Director, Independent Grocers' Alliance (IGA), Jefferson Bank & Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo. Was clerk in father's small wholesale grocery. Under his marketing genius Wetterau Foods, Inc., grew to IGA franchises in seven States. Its 634 employees and 256 trailers supply hundreds of IGA foodliners with one-stop source of meats, dairy frozen-foods, all grocery products from four modernized distribution centers which occupy 99 acres, 800,000 square feet of warehouse, 69,000 square feet of freezer area. To enable IGA members to compete with giant chains WFI also provides merchandising, financing, bookkeeping, and other services. WFI's varisized package stores can be equipped and opened in 10 weeks. WFI stocks 5,100 items with $145 million in sales, spends $2½ million on IGA foodliner advertising, $2½ million for new stores and expansion. Cited for preserving free enterprise and independent ownership by supplying IGA members with merchandise, service and know-how to secure success and raising the living standards in the areas it serves.

EVERETTE E. BALLARD

Everette E. Ballard, 64 (residence, 501 Edgemont Lane, Park Ridge, Ill.). President, All American Life & Casualty Co., Park Ridge, Ill. Went to one-room school and worked father's farm even while attending Southern Illinois University at 15. At 18, rode horseback to one-room country school to teach all eight grades and clerked in grocery summers. In 10 years he left teaching to sell insurance in the dedicated belief that it was a public service and protection against all hazards. In 29 years became an outstanding insurance executive. In 1952 he left a secure position to join newly formed All American Life & Casualty Co. as sales director. It had a two-room office, no salesmen or policies. In 2 years he became president. Today, E. E. Ballard's years of experience, wisdom, and dynamic drive has built All American into leadership. It is licensed in 48 States, has $675 million of life insurance, $20 million premium income, $41 million assets, 1,136 field representatives, 673 full-time brokers, and 300 employees in its large, efficient home office. Ballard created a full line of policies with matchless benefits to serve the changing needs of all types of people and inflationary trends. Everette E. Ballard was cited for his dedication and contributions to the American free enterprise system through his services to the personal insurance business. (The company's prompt handling of claims has made it a model in its field.)

HARRY C. GRAVELY

Harry C. Gravely, 47 (residence, 1200 Sam Lions Trail, Martinsville, Va.). President, Gravely Furniture Co.; divisions: Ridgeway Clock Co., Ridgeway Table Co., Worth Furniture Co., Ridgeway, Va. Director, Virginia Furniture Co., Martinsville, Va. Earned B.S. in chemistry at William & Mary College while learning family furniture business starting as packer. Gave up chemist job to work up to president at Gravely. When industry conditions closed one of his plants he courageously improved his Ridgeway tables, Worth bedroom, dining and living room furniture and gambled on making Ridgeway "grandfathers," "grandmother" and "granddaughter" floor clocks traditionally European made. He imported fine 8-day clock movements, had Virginia craftsmen make cabinets and became world's largest supplier of floor clocks with various designs, heights, colors, woods, and chimes, selling for $200—an industry first. Still expanding, he has completed a $1 million conveyorized, 200,000 square foot factory on an 11-acre site, has a $1½ million payroll, nationwide sales force, and display rooms with multimillion in sales to thousands of retail stores nationwide. Cited for his enterprise to bring a new floor clock industry to Virginia and America and bucking its traditional European domination.

MORRIS B. BESCHLOSS

Morris B. Beschloss, 36 (residence, 1800 Western Avenue, Flossmoor, Ill.). President, Hammond Valve Corp., Hammond, Ind. Director, press relations chairman, Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Information Bureau. Director, Valve Manufacturing Association. Was Berlin immigrant raised in small Illinois town. Earned B.S. at University of Illinois, daily Illini sports editor (Sigma Delta Chi). Was Army captain, taught military science at University of Illinois, and Army psychological warfare division. Started at Hammond as advertising manager in 1956, worked up to president. His leadership sparked sales, new products, and expansion. He originated overnight delivery servicenters. He entered competitive industrial valve field, broadened line of gate, globe, and check valves to make Hammond a leading supplier to the plumbing and other industries selling over 800 items with multimillion in sales through distributors. A new $1 million, 2-acre addition will expand its 125,000-square-feet plant. Cited as an example of small-town boy makes good, for his young executive ability, selfless contributions to his industry.

ROBERT F. HAYES

Robert F. Hayes, 61 (residence, 1054 Lynwood Boulevard, Nashville, Tenn.). President, chairman, founder, Hayes Garment Co., Nashville, Tenn. Divisions: Hopkinsville Clothing Manufacturing Co., Hopkinsville, Ky.; Todd Manufacturing Co., Elkton, Ky.; Simpson Manufacturing Co., Franklin, Ky.; Monroe Manufacturing Co., Gamaliel, Ky.; Roswell Manufacturing Co., Roswell and Alpharetta, Ga. Chairman, H-K Corp., Atlanta, Ga. Earned University of Kentucky Engineering B.S. Was rural teacher, engineer, rag baler. In 1949 he risked savings and built Hayes Garment Co. through grit and genius from one plant to eight, employing 2,200 people to become a leading maker of casual pants, utility and work wear for men, boys, the rental laundry trade, and the military with $24 million in U.S. and worldwide sales. Cited for his up-from-the-ranks career and leadership which has built thriving industries in his communities.

JAMES W. SIKES

James W. Sikes, 36 (residence, 2427 Nevada Road, Lakeland, Fla.). President, founder, Florida Tile Industries, Inc. Earned business administration degree at University of Florida. Was insuranceman. In 1954, with no experience, he mortgaged home and risked buying an indebted, decrepit tile factory. When his one sill product failed he ventured a $189,000 loan from SBA and paid off in 2 years. Sikes programs built FTI to sixth largest in fierce field. On FTI's 15 acres he installed modern automated equipment that made a complete quality tile line for all fields in all sizes, shapes, colors, and textures. Its 400 employees, a truck fleet, help speed orders to 60 distributors and warehouses in 15 States with $17 million in ceramic tile sales. Cited as a beginner whose success in a competitive industry also contributed to its progress and his area.

GEORGE PERRIN

George Perrin, 38 (3008 Dallas Drive, Fort Smith, Ark.). President, founder, Plastics Research & Development Corp., General Industries Corps., Fort Smith, Ark. Was salesman, picture framemaker. His genius built firm to a 60,000-square-feet plant employing hundreds making products for manufacturers. He grew to modern coordinated facilities for product development, mold building, custom molding, assembly, packaging, distribution. PRDC makes and sells worldwide, home decorative items, toys, military identification, making kits, and fishing tackle. He is acclaimed for his 124 models of realistic rebel fishing lures. Cited for one man's ability to build a prestige independent business by seeking out and filling needs of industry.

PAUL C. GREEN

Paul C. Green, 67 (1741 South Main Street, Aberdeen, S. Dak.). President, Hub City Iron Co., Hub City Iron Store, Aberdeen, S. Dak. Director, Aberdeen National Bank. Had ninth grade (pioneer area) schooling. Was radio operator World War I. Took mail business course. Bought father's indebted small machine shop in which he had worked since age 12. His skill built Hub into a 12-building, 200,000-square-feet modern plant and foundry. Hundreds of craftsmen make gear boxes, engine valve guides, sleeves and inserts, shop equipment and parts for automotive and industrial engines and farm implements. Cited for his vital contributions to his field, to American industry, and our national defense.

STATEMENTS MADE BY FEAA'S 1965 AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY AWARDS RECIPIENTS PRAISING AMERICA'S FREE ENTERPRISE DEMOCRACY AND ADVICE TO THOSE SEEKING SUCCESS.

James S. Hunt, president, chairman, Coral Ridge Properties, Inc.: "Americans start with success because they have the advantages of freedom and opportunity to create their own destiny and achieve their goals. Then the harder you work the luckier you get. The payoff is seeing your fellowmen enjoying the fruits of your labors."

Kenneth S. Kelleher, president, Keltec Industries, Inc.: "It is vital to our Nation's survival that space electronics be permitted to develop with a minimum of restrictions. Only in this way will there be opportunity of opening new electronics fields for success."

Ted C. Wetterau, Sr., chairman, Wetterau Foods, Inc.: "Free enterprise is expanding in America due to organizations in many fields that supply guidance, merchandise, and financing to enable beginners to compete and achieve big business success."

Everette E. Ballard, president, All American Life & Casualty Co.: "The multi-billion-dollar insurance industry is free enterprise in action wherein any American can insure education, retirement, and security for his family and protection against all hazards."

Harry C. Gravely, president, Gravely Furniture Co.: "In America anyone is free to compete in any field. American craftsmen and production methods can excel in fields dominated by foreign manufacturers."

Morris B. Beschloss, president, Hammond Valve Corp.: "Under America's free enterprise democracy any person from any walk of life or origin can succeed in any field of his choice by doing a better job that the competition."

Robert F. Hayes, president, chairman, Hayes Garment Co.: "Free enterprise competition is the policeman that eliminates shoddy products and services and awards success to quality in all fields, thus building a stronger America."

James W. Sikes, president, Florida Tile Industries, Inc.: "A company's success is due to making a better product, teamwork, fair play, and loyalty between employer and employees and participation in community and civic projects."

George Perrin, president, Plastics Research & Development Corp.: "Success is inevitable if you serve your customers and your country with integrity and seek out and supply their needs."

Paul C. Green, president, Hub City Iron Co.: "My success in Aberdeen, S. Dak. is proof that under America's free enterprise system any U.S. area can supply loyal, skilled manpower, and opportunities for worldwide expansion."

SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE—1965 AWARD AS MAN OF THE YEAR IN GEORGIA AGRICULTURE

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, on Monday of last week, before returning to the Capital, I had the privilege of attending a most enjoyable occasion in Atlanta in honor of my friend and colleague, Senator TALMADGE.

The occasion was the formal presentation to Senator TALMADGE of the 1965 award as Man of the Year in Georgia Agriculture by the Progressive Farmer magazine.

It would not be possible to have selected a more worthy and deserving recipient than the Senator from Georgia for this award. The Members of the Senate are well aware of his many contributions as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in promoting a prosperous and healthy agriculture. He has labored to see that farm families receive a fair and equitable share of the national income.

His efforts during the last session in connection with the new farm legislation bore telling evidence of the diligence and dedication with which he has worked to secure an overall farm program that is good for the farmer, the consumer and the taxpayers. He, of course, is the principal author of the new cotton program which all of us hope will help to solve the difficult problems that long have plagued the entire cotton textile industry in the United States.

But Senator TALMADGE's undisputed credentials as a foremost agriculture author are not based solely on his legislative accomplishments, formidable though they are. He is, himself, a son of the soil. He grew up on his family's farm in south Georgia and has never lost his love for the land and its products. He is today a highly successful farmer in his own right, and when his official duties do not require his presence here or elsewhere, he may be found at his lovely old farm home in Henry County, Ga.

I know that all of Senator TALMADGE's many friends share my great pride that this richly deserved honor has come his way.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a citation from the Progressive Farmer of the record of leadership and distinguished service that Senator TALMADGE has rendered to agriculture in Georgia and in America.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE—MAN OF THE YEAR IN AGRICULTURE

No one has more claim to the title "Friend of the Farmer" than Georgia's Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE.

Born and reared on a farm in Telfair County where he was a 4–H and FFA member, HERMAN TALMADGE grew up as as son of Georgia's commissioner of agriculture. He then followed in his father's footstep as Governor of the State.

He is now earning a reputation in Congress as a friend of the farmer, particularly the cotton farmer of the Southeast. He has labored long and hard to help farm people achieve a fair share of the national income.

Senator TALMADGE's feet are firmly fixed on Georgia soil. He operates two farms of his own—one at Lovejoy where he lives and another, the old family homestead, at Forsyth 35 miles away.

Senator TALMADGE served as Governor for 6 years before being elected to the Senate in 1956. His administration was marked by positive accomplishments of a lasting nature with emphasis on a broad program of social services. During his terms nearly a billion dollars of new permanent improvements were provided, including school and college buildings, road and highways, hospitals, and health centers.

Improved educational opportunities were made available to all Georgia children. Youth centers were established. Parks were expanded. Hospitals were built. Welfare benefits were doubled. Rural roadbuilding took place at an unprecedented rate. A statewide forestry improvement and protection program was inaugurated.

Much of the credit for the Rock Eagle 4–H Center goes to HERMAN TALMADGE. The auditorium there is named for him. As Governor, he matched private donations with State money to assure its completion.

As a Member of the Senate, Mr. TALMADGE soon won national recognition as a student of government and as an authority on agriculture.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is absent on a mission, and probably will be absent until the end of January. I ask that he be given leave of absence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLIN F. STAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last week, in the passing of Colin F. Stam, the Nation lost one of its outstanding authorities on taxation. For over one-third of a century he was counselor and adviser to the House Ways and Means Committee, to the Senate Finance Committee, and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue and Taxation.

He received an honorary doctor of law degree from Dartmouth College in 1958 and the Rockefeller Public Service Award in 1961. Colin Stam's outstanding public service was recognized by the Tax Foundation on December 4, 1964, when he was honored as the recipient of the Tax Foundation's annual award for distinguished public service. He considered this award, conferred on him after he retired from public life, as one of the high honors of his long career.

In the 37 years he served the Congress, Mr. Stam was known as one of the most dedicated public servants on the Hill. His legacy to the Nation, among other things, is the constructive tax legislation which is now a part of our tax structure.

Those of us who had the privilege of working with him appreciated his knowledge, his courtesy, and his interest in our individual problems. He was always most cooperative and will be truly missed.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the January 8 issue of the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLIN STAM, AN AUTHORITY

In Washington the other day Colin F. Stam, aged 69, died of a stroke.

Outside Washington, almost no one would know of him. Even in the Capital he never was a headline man. To those relative few who did know him, or were acquainted with his work, he was a top authority in his field, a Government employee who was the soul of nonpartisanship, a man who devoted most of his life to one job and neither asked nor wanted public acclaim.

Mr. Stam retired in 1964, but for the previous 37 years he had been either assistant or chief counsel to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, a special agency of Congress. If it was facts, or expert judgment in the tax field you wanted, Mr. Stam was your man. Others handled the politics or the policy of tax law.

Facts he would supply to any who asked, Congressmen, news reporters, anyone who needed facts. Otherwise, he usually had a pencil in his teeth—and a man with a pencil in his teeth doesn't talk much. Colin Stam was a man in the Government who knew his business and did it—which probably accounted for his being so widely unsung.

CITY AND COUNTRYSIDE DEPENDENT ON SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate an address made by my colleague, the Senator from Kansas, JAMES B. PEARSON, before the Kansas Association of Conservation Districts at their annual meeting on December 6, 1965.

Senator PEARSON covered a broad range of subject matter dealing with the conservation and development of natural resources. He made what I consider to be one particularly important point on cooperation. He said:

> We must stress cooperation as a necessity. This means that we must bring the urban areas into the total conservation picture. The city is as dependent upon sound soil and water conservation practices as the countryside. City and county officials and residents need—desperately, in many cases—to be informed about their interest and responsibility in the conservation effort.

There are other significant points, too, in this address which I think will be of interest. I ask unanimous consent to have Senator PEARSON's address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JAMES B. PEARSON TO THE KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS ANNUAL CONVENTION, WICHITA, KANS., DECEMBER 6, 1965

It was my pleasure to meet with many of you several days ago at the annual meeting of the State Association of Kansas Watersheds in Topeka. I am pleased to have the opportunity to meet again with this distinguished group of natural resource conservationists.

There has never been a time in the history of our Nation when the conservation and development of our natural resources was more in the public mind than it is today. Never before have the national, State and local governments found so firm a common cause as in conservation matters. Never have soil and water conservation districts, and other active conservationist organizations, had so great a fund of knowledge, experience, financial support, and opportunity as they have today.

This broad acceptance and widespread support of the conservation movement is a source of great satisfaction to those who are dedicated to making the best possible use of the Nation's natural resources for the larger benefit of all the people—today and in the days of the future.

The soil and water conservation districts have done a good job in bringing the conservation message to rural landowners and operators throughout the Nation. Here in Kansas, the entire State is covered by soil and water conservation districts—105 of them. Seventy-nine of these districts have signed modernized agreements with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, allowing their cooperators to benefit by the new multiple purpose conservation programs supported by the Federal Government.

The district leadership in Kansas has a right to be proud of the large number of cooperators in the State and the great number of soil conservation plans which have been drawn up. However, the total acreage of land on which basic plans have been fully applied—about 2,400,000 acres—is disappointing when compared with the 24 million acres of land covered by basic soil conservation plans. Here is a case of not enough support to get the job done. There aren't enough soil conservation technicians, not enough financial support, not enough firm interest in getting these plans applied for everybody's benefit. Many farmers and ranchers are not taking advantage of the long-range conservation programs available to them.

And so soil and water conservation districts are charged with a challenging opportunity here—to help public officials, landowners, land users, and other responsible citizens to understand the importance of resource conservation and development to Kansas and to the Nation.

We Kansans cannot be satisfied that 34 percent of needed soil and water conservation work on farms and ranches has been completed, and that approximately 1½ percent is being completed annually. We are going to have to do better than 1½ percent a year if we are going to meet future demands upon our land, water and related resources. I am confident that we will do better than this; circumstances will compel it. Progress often is born of necessity. Yet, often, too, much has been lost because progress waited for necessity. It is wise to plan ahead—to avoid crisis by anticipating it and acting to prevent it from arising.

Kansas, as we know, is not alone with this problem of making resource conservation a more vital force in the State. The percentage of completed soil and water conservation work is higher in Kansas than in many other States. The currently anticipated rate of completion of remaining work is about the same as for most States. We are confronted with a serious national problem and a dynamic national challenge. But the basic responsibility for meeting the challenge and solving the problem rests within each State.

The record clearly shows that Congress recognizes the importance of conserving and developing our natural resources. Federal legislation has been far-seeing and far-reaching over the years. Without it there could not have been the advances made in soil and water conservation work. Congress continues to be aware of the need. I am pleased to have had a part in the passage of recent legislation that contributes significantly to the conservation of our soil and water resources. Let me mention several of these recent acts.

The Agricultural Act of 1965 puts the cropland adjustment program on a long-term basis, making it possible to plan land requirements for agricultural and nonagricultural purposes more effectively.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act provides for Federal assistance to State and local economic development organizations, and for studies, information, and advice to communities on solving unemployment problems. Soil conservation districts may act as the local legal body to sponsor projects proposed for community development.

The Rural Water and Sanitation Facilities Act provides for grants and increased loans for development of rural water systems, and for the extension of sewer lines into rural areas.

These acts and other Federal legislation assure a continuing national interest in soil and water conservation and development. It therefore follows that we may expect a comparable effort at the State and local levels to improve the outlook for realization of conservation objectives.

As I remarked at the recent watershed meeting, I am opposed to what amounts to taxing individual landowners and operators for technical services which traditionally have been provided without charge by the Federal Government, because now, as in the past, these services have benefited the general public, not only in the rural areas but in the towns and cities, too.

Take, for example, small watershed projects, where the rural landowner is required to perform certain land conservation practices even before construction of the dam which protects and serves a broad area. These farmers and ranchers are, it seems to me, entitled to some public help in bringing soil and water conservation measures to their land. And, with the multiple-purpose projects, the general benefit is greatly emphasized. The city—its residents, commercial houses, and industries—uses the project reservoirs for water supply. Both urban and rural residents use them for many forms of recreation, for wildlife habitat, for park-like setting that combines beauty and utility.

There is, certainly, broad public interest in the conservation of our natural resources that justifies the expenditure of public money—including Federal money—for this purpose. But I do not favor the Federal Government getting any more involved in State and local problems than is absolutely necessary. I don't think you do, either. I am persuaded that the gap between Federal expenditures for resource conservation and development, and support from State and local governments must be narrowed.

An estimated $34 million in Federal funds is involved in completing watershed projects authorized for construction in Kansas. This amount may be contrasted with the $345,000 in total State funds appropriated by the Kansas Legislature for soil and water conservation work in fiscal year 1966, and the $187,000 in local governmental contributions for this work in the current fiscal year. Yet, Kansas is ahead of some other States in its support of soil and water conservation work.

The wise concern of Kansas lawmakers and government officials for the conservation and use of soil and water resources is indicated in the Kansas soil conservation district law, which has made available State financial assistance to soil conservation districts, and the State Water Plan Act, which provides for State participation in water conservation programs. Let us resolve, as citizens deeply interested in the future welfare of Kansas, that these acts will become increasingly more significant in the development of our soil and water resources.

We must stress cooperation as a necessity. This means that we must bring the urban areas into the total conservation picture. The city is as dependent upon sound soil and water conservation practices as the countryside. City and county officials and residents need—desperately, in many cases—to be informed about their interest and responsibility in the conservation effort.

With nearly 2,000 nonfarm landowners and operators in Kansas receiving technical assistance through soil conservation districts in fiscal 1965, the town and country nature of the conservation endeavor is clear. This trend will, of course, continue and become even more significant in the years ahead.

There are many ways to measure the value of soil and water conservation work. But none, I think, is more important than the generation of local spirit, initiative, and cooperation to accomplish a task of common concern. This is where the soil and water conservation districts make their greatest contribution.

Kansas is a land of great open spaces where the fields seem to stretch endlessly away. Kansas remains essentially an agricultural State, with 95 percent of the total land area still in farms today, even though approximately 75 percent of the more than 2 million residents of the State live in urban communities. Kansas must expect dramatic change, occasioned by dynamic national growth.

The broad acres of Kansas beckon further development. The conversion of cropland to nonagricultural uses has increased. Permit me to cite a few statistics, then comment briefly on this point. In fiscal year 1965 alone, nearly 88,000 acres of cropland were converted to grass and trees as a result of soil and water conservation work, and an additional 3,700 acres of cropland were converted to nonagricultural uses as a result of the watershed protection program. More than 67,000 acres of cropland will be converted to grass under Great Plains conservation program contracts. Eighty-five district cooperators have switched 10,500 acres from farming activity to recreation as a primary source of income.

I said at Topeka that I favored conversion of land not needed or suitable for growing crops to grass or trees, for pasture, wildlife conservation and recreation—so that it will be preserved in a protective and useful state. But I said, also, that tomorrow's America is going to need efficient crop production when all demands upon the land and its resources are going to be much greater than they are now. Let me expand on that statement here.

There is going to be a good deal more conversion of crop acreage in future years as the Nation's population continues to grow and with it increasing demands upon the land for urban, recreational, and other uses. Yet, even with greater efficiency in the production of crops, we'll need vast acreages to grow the food and fiber our future population will require. And we need to look beyond our borders and consider how this rich production might change the course of history in far-off lands—if we take advantage of the opportunity.

Let us not be misled by so-called crop surpluses. We know very well that there are no crop surpluses in the world as a whole. There is, however, an inadequate distribution system of the world's food products. There are, indeed, underfed and undernourished people right in our own country. Millions of people in the world go hungry every day, and countless numbers starve to death each year. Revolutions, with their threat to all peoples are born of want and deprivation.

We can view the matter as an ideological, moral or military issue, however we wish. In any case, we owe it to ourselves, as people living in a free and lavishly endowed society, to be sure not only that our own are adequately fed, but to see to it that everything possible is done so that our food production—current and potential—helps to satisfy a desperate need of mankind. When we do this, and we have not done it to the extent of our ability, we will reach a new level of maturity as a nation; and we will prove ourselves, in a way more significant than our possession of superior military power, that we qualify for leadership of all free peoples and those aspiring to be free.

Let us not talk down agricultural production. We can't afford to do so. Let us, rather, develop additional outlets for what we produce so that the undernourished people of the world may, in larger measure, benefit by the productive capacity of our fields.

Mindful of the challenges that confront us, I am confident that the people of Kansas will continue to strive for the highest development of the State's rich and varied resources, and for the best possible use that can be made of these endowments. In this vital effort, the soil and water conservation districts are charged with a rewarding responsibility. Your experience, knowledge and dedication, and the respect you have earned through years of productive service to your communities, make you uniquely qualified for your challenging role in the accelerated conservation movement of tomorrow. I wish you well, because I wish Kansas and the Nation well. And I want to play a part in the success that surely will be yours.

DEATH OF AMBASSADOR MYRON M. COWEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the recess of the Senate an able and valued American, Myron M. Cowen, passed away. Myron Cowen served our country with distinction, ability, and diligence as Ambassador to the Philippines during the time of the Huk Rebellion. He contributed immensely to the betterment of American-Philippine relations. He was a man of keen intelligence and sound judgment, who represented this country always with distinction and integrity, not only as Ambassador to the Philippines, but also as Ambassador to Belgium and Australia. We shall miss his services. We shall miss them now, and in the years ahead. And I know I speak for the Members of the Senate when I express to his family our deep sorrow and appreciation for his many contributions to our country in its relations throughout the world.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Manila Chronicle, entitled "Ambassador Myron M. Cowen," be printed at this point in my remarks, as well as an editorial from the New York World-Telegram.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manila Chronicle, Nov. 4, 1965]

AMBASSADOR MYRON M. COWEN

It was during the tenure of Myron M. Cowen as U.S. Ambassador to the Philippines that a good measure of rapport was established between the Filipinos and the Americans.

Ambassador Cowen, in certain ways, was blustering in his manners but perhaps it was precisely because of his unorthodoxy that he was able to get the understanding of many Filipino officials and with them work out a modus vivendi.

There were problems between Filipinos and Americans, some of them of grave importance, but always Ambassador Cowen, without abandoning his primary duty of protecting the interests of his country, tried and often succeeded in seeing the Philippine side and arriving at some sort of compromise which somehow eased the tension and paved the way for closer relationship.

And so it was that when Ambassador Cowen had to leave, many Filipinos, some of them stern critics of American policy in the Philippines, regretted his departure.

But never since his departure had the Ambassador lost interest in the country he had learned to love. For during the last few months, he was engaged in an educational project which, when consummated, would bring benefit to the Ateneo de Manila.

Yesterday, the shocking news was flashed across the wires that Ambassador Myron M. Cowen was dead. The measure of his worth to the Filipinos may be measured by the fact that to a great many of them, his passing is almost like the passing of a beloved countryman.

[From the New York World-Telegram, Nov. 4, 1965]

MYRON COWEN

Fifteen years ago the Communist Huks in the Philippines were starting off about as menacingly as did the Vietcong subsequently in South Vietnam. And financial problems in the Philippines were even more troublesome.

But America, and the anti-Communist Western World, were fortunate to have as U.S. Ambassador in Manila a skilled diplomat and businessman, Myron M. Cowen. Working closely with President Elpidio Quirino and Defense Minister Ramon Magsaysay, Mr. Cowen lent a most effective hand in helping to solve both problems. The eminent Philippines stature in Asia today stems from surmounting those crises of 1950.

Mr. Cowen's death Monday night at 67, in Washington, will be widely mourned. His illustrious career included ambassadorships also in Australia and Belgium. He distinguished himself as a diplomat, lawyer, and businessman of consistent achievement.

MYRON MELVIN COWEN, 1898–1965

(Eulogy delivered by Francis O. Wilcox, Nov. 3, 1965)

We are gathered here today to honor the memory of a distinguished American whose life and works constructively and helpfully affected the lives of many thousands of people both at home and abroad.

Wordsworth has reminded us in his famous ode, "Intimations of Immortality" of the nature of birth and life and immortality.

> "Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting;
> The soul that rises with us—our life's star
> Hath had elsewhere its setting
> And cometh from afar.
> Not in entire forgetfulness
> And not in utter nakedness
> But trailing clouds of glory
> Do we come from God who is our home."

Myron Cowen was born in Logan, Iowa, in 1898. After his schooling at Wofford College and at Drake University, he rose to national prominence first as a practicing attorney then as U.S. Ambassador to Australia, the Philippines, and to Belgium. He attended many international conferences, representing our country with unusual ability and distinction.

Although he achieved outstanding success in the practice of law it was the field of international relations that eventually claimed his first interest and his first loyalty. He was a modest man so that even his closest friends might not fully appreciate the extent of his commitment to world affairs.

It was his privilege to serve our country abroad during a very exciting and important period in its history. During his tour of duty in the Philippines, for example, the Philippine Government was in the process of taking effective action to crush the Huk rebellion and Myron was in a position, as the American Ambassador in Manila, to be helpful to the great President, Ramon Magsaysay, in many ways. He served as Ambassador to Belgium at a time when the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was in its formative stages and when the preliminary discussions that later resulted in the European Economic Community were taking place. He also served as a member of the U.S. delegation to the San Francisco Conference of 1951 to conclude the treaty of peace with Japan.

Even after his retirement from active service abroad his keen interest in international affairs continued unabated. Merely to list his activities is to suggest to a certain degree the breadth of his interests. He was a member of the board of directors of DACOR which is designed to promote the interests of retired Foreign Service officers. He was an active member of the Council on Foreign Relations in New York. He was a charter member of the council's Washington counterpart—the Washington Institute of Foreign Affairs—and served as its treasurer since its inception some 5 years ago. I think it is safe to say that without Myron's enthusiastic support during its early stages the institute, which performs a very valuable service in our Nation's Capital, might not now be in existence.

Some years ago he also recognized the great need for a club in the Washington area where younger diplomats might come to relax and meet their colleagues from other lands. Largely as a result of his persistent efforts the International Club came into being. Myron was a life member of the club and served on its board of directors.

There can be no doubt about his deep dedication to the task of training young people in the important field of diplomacy and international relations. He was, I believe, the only person in Washington who served as a member of the board of advisers or the advisory councils of the three great institutions here engaged in this task—the School of International Service of the American University, the Georgetown School of Foreign Service, and the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies.

Nor were these memberships of a pro forma character. On a number of occasions Myron reminded me that as a member of the advisory council of the school of advanced international studies he was much interested in our program and was anxious to help in any way that he could. I took him at his word and from time to time I sought his advice and counsel. He was never too busy to help. I am sure the other institutions found him—as we did—a very thoughtful and a very helpful counselor and friend.

I have spoken of Myron Cowen the diplomat and statesman. Now let me say just a few words about Myron Cowen the man.

In this country we like to think of sincerity, kindness, courage, integrity, and humility as great Judeo-Christian virtues. These qualities he had in abundance and with their help—and with the help of a charming and devoted wife—he carved an enviable place in the hearts and minds of his countrymen.

He was a loving husband, a devoted father, a successful attorney, a loyal and able public servant, and a generous contributor to many worthy causes.

One of the finest tributes I can pay to any man is to say that he is a gentleman. Myron Cowen was a gentleman in every sense of that term. He was thoughtful and considerate of others and he was deeply interested in doing what he could to promote the interests of the common man. His kindly smile and his warm and friendly manner endeared him to all those who knew him well.

I was always impressed by his democratic attitude. He eschewed arrogance and he was always willing to listen with patience and respect to points of view that differed from his own. He approached life with a humility that was refreshing, an interest in humankind that was inspiring, and a cooperative spirit that was reassuring.

The story of Myron Cowen's life is a wonderful story of an American boy born in humble circumstances in a small town in the Middle West who worked his way to a position of leadership and prominence in this great country of ours. It is a remarkable tribute to his capacity, his industry, his integrity, his sound moral standards, and his ability to get along with other people. It is also a remarkable tribute to the American way of life.

William Cullen Bryant has admonished us that we should:

> "So live, that when thy summons comes to join
> The innumerable caravan which moves
> To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
> His chamber in the silent halls of death,
> Thou go not, like the quarry-slave at night,
> Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
> By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave,
> Like one that wraps the drapery of his couch
> About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

I am sure that Myron Cowen has lived the kind of life that will enable him to approach his God with the serenity of spirit and the faith about which William Cullen Bryant and the psalmists of the Old Testament have written so beautifully.

It is only natural that when a loved one is taken from our midst we should give way to sorrow. Yet when that individual has lived a rich and full life, when he has, by his thoughtfulness and his good deeds, helped to make the world a better place for us all, then we should rejoice that we have been privileged to share his friendship. We should express our gratitude for the splendid contribution he has made to the well-being of his fellow man and to the cause of peace among the nations. There can be no finer achievements than these.

GEORGE DIXON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the adjournment of Congress a very dear friend of many of us, George Dixon, passed to his reward. He was known by many Senators.

George Dixon was a man with a sense of humor appreciated by all. While at times some may have criticized his views, all will remember always that George Dixon was sympathetic and sensitive. For he appreciated the problems of the people of the country and of the world. And, too, he understood well the work of the Senate and the House. George Dixon was devoted to his country. His contributions were countless and his career illustrious as was evidenced by the hundreds of newspapers syndicating his column throughout the country and in Canada. His advice and counsel which many of us had valued so highly through the years, will be sorely missed.

He is survived by his sister, Mrs. Thomas Smith of Vancouver, British Columbia, by a niece, Mrs. Norman Hopkins of Toronto, Canada, by his wife, whom so many of us know, and for whom we have a great deal of love and affection, Mrs. Ymelda Chavez Miller Dixon, and by two daughters, who are two of the finest girls I have ever known, Mrs. Ismael Gonzales and Miss Stanlee Miller.

To all of the family Mrs. Mansfield, my daughter Ann, and I extend our deepest sympathy and great regret and sadness at the passing of this outstanding friend and most trustworthy columnist.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, George Dixon was one of my closest friends. It happens that my three very closest personal friends have died within the last few years—Senator Clair Engle, my neighbor Ed Murrow, and George Dixon. George Dixon was an internationally known columnist and one of the best known and most admired men in Washington. George was a friend of the great—indeed he was himself a great man—a very great man. His sudden and unexpected death from a heart attack deeply saddened all who knew him personally and the millions of Americans who regularly read his columns and felt a kinship with this great journalist. His humor as well as his compassion for his fellowmen will be missed by all.

Mr. President, I desire also to pay tribute to Mrs. Ymelda Dixon, an outstanding woman. She is a great lady and their years of married life together were radiant with successes, happiness, and love. Mrs. Young and I again express our deepest and heartfelt sympathy to Ymelda Dixon and her lovely daughters. Also to his mother-in-law, Mrs. Ymelda Chavez, the widow of our late beloved colleague, Senator Dennis Chavez of New Mexico. I know of the great love George had for Mrs. Chavez.

YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that last Saturday night at Constitution Hall there was an inspiring and stirring program which was sponsored by area chapters of Young Americans for Freedom. It was publicized as a freedom rally. It was designed to bring together young Americans from this part of the country in support of the determination of the United States not to accept defeat in Vietnam.

This nationally publicized event was a very dramatic rejoinder and refutation to the street walkers, the teach-ins, the draft-card burners, and other misguided Americans, young and old, who have been publicly taking actions and making statements, giving aid and comfort to the aggressor in Vietnam.

It was my pleasure, along with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] to represent the U.S. Senate at that meeting and on that program, which also included addresses by two distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, by Admiral Arleigh, and a number of other prominent Americans.

I regret that I do not have transcripts of all the addresses but I have the excellent one prepared by Senator DODD of Connecticut, who, because of illness in the family, was unable to attend, but whose talented son, Prof. Tom Dodd, Jr., of this city, read it with great emphasis and persuasion before this audience of more than 2,500 Americans, most of them of draft age, and most of them young Americans attending colleges and universities throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of Senator DODD, along with the statements I made at Constitution Hall last Saturday night be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

In my opinion, Mr. President, great credit should go to the fine student organization, Young Americans for Freedom, for arranging this freedom rally and for the great audience which attended it. It was one of a series of patriotic rallies sponsored by YAF throughout the country generally under the able leadership of Tom Charles Huston, its national chairman. This program is also widely publicized in the New Guard, the official monthly magazine of Young Americans for Freedom.

In the words of National Chairman Huston, this young American crusade was devised "to demonstrate to the world that American and Asian and all youth are united in their strong support of United States policy in Vietnam and in their fervent desire to see freedom, not Communist tyranny, prevail in Vietnam.

I now call attention to the two addresses alluded to earlier in my remarks.

There being no objection, the addresses of Senator DODD and Senator MUNDT were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DODD

I regret very much that my commitments make it impossible for me to be with you here tonight. But I want to take this opportunity to express my personal admiration for the young men and young women who have taken the initiative in organizing this meeting. I also want to commend the many hundreds of young people of the Washington area who have turned out to bear witness to the fact that the youth of our country, in their overwhelming majority, support the commitment of our Government to stem the tide of Communist aggression in Vietnam.

In every generation the strength of idealism and the hold of moral values manifest themselves primarily in the attitude of youth. And I believe that the swelling chorus of support for our Vietnam policy on our campuses and across the Nation has given more than ample proof that our young people are sound.

It has demonstrated, if this needed demonstration, that our young people have a remarkable understanding of the world in which we live, that they have a profound sense of moral values, that they are motivated by the same ideals which gave birth to our Nation, and that, in defense of these ideals, they are prepared, like their forebears, to pledge their lives and their sacred honor.

Not so many months ago, our press and our radio were lavishing so much attention on the anti-Vietnam teach-ins and on the burning of draft cards and on the other antics of a noisy minority on our campuses, that many people were led to believe that this minority represented a substantial sector of American public opinion. But the massive reaction to the Vietnik demonstrations in recent months has demonstrated beyond challenge how little this minority truly represents.

Polls taken on campus after campus, for example, have revealed that 75 to 80 percent, and in some places more, of the student body in our universities, support our commitment to the freedom and independence of Vietnam.

Across the Nation, the young Democrats, the young Republicans, and the junior chambers of commerce have united in a massive effort to collect and send gifts of needed items from the people of America to the people of South Vietnam.

In drives on various campuses, scores of thousands of volunteers have lined up to donate their blood in support of our forces in Vietnam.

In many of our major cities there have been parades and mass rallies, such as the rally you have organized in Washington tonight, for the purpose of letting the administration know and letting the world know the true feelings of the American people.

But, although their numbers may be small, the opposition to our Vietnam policy is highly organized and disposes of apparently limitless funds for repeated full-page advertisements in the press of the country and for rallies requiring the mobilization and transportation of many thousands of people. Because of these advantages they have been able to obtain a degree of attention from the world press that is out of all proportion to their actual strength.

There are many honest critics of our Vietnam policy, and the traditions of our society demand that their voices be heard. It is unfortunate, however, that, in the clamor of the anti-Vietnam agitation, the voices of many thousands of loyal Americans who oppose the war because they are pacifists or because they do not understand the issues, have become confused and blended with the voices of the Communists and other pseudo-Americans masquerading as pacifists.

There is no point in appealing to the Communists, because their commitment is not to the peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war but to the Communist subjugation of Vietnam and ultimately of our own society.

I believe, however, that we should all seek to appeal to those loyal Americans who are unaware of the facts or who have been misled by the anti-Vietnam agitation.

We must seek to make them understand, as the great majority of the American people understand, that communism is not an agrarian reformer movement, that it is on the contrary the most total and brutal tyranny ever devised by man for the subjugation of his fellow man.

We must seek to make them understand that in this respect there is no difference between communism in South Vietnam and communism in North Vietnam and communism in the Soviet Union or Red China or Hungary or Tibet or anywhere else.

We must seek to make them understand that the Communists mean business, as the Nazis meant business, when they speak of the goal of world conquest. We must strive to persuade them to ponder the writings of Lenin and Stalin and Mao Tse tung and the recent statement of Chinese Communist Defense Minister, Marshal Lin Piao, in which he frankly discussed the role of the Vietnam war and of other so-called wars of national liberation in their master plan for the destruction of American power and world conquest.

We must ask them whether they are prepared to draw a line against the expansion of Communist power or whether they are not prepared to draw such a line. And if they agree with us that this line must be drawn—as every loyal American must do—we must then ask them where they propose to draw the line if Vietnam falls. For it is a total illusion to believe that the Communist conquest of Vietnam would produce peace in the area. It would, on the contrary, prepare the way for new and larger aggression, directed against all the free countries on the periphery of Asian communism.

The choice before us in Vietnam, therefore, is not the simple choice between war and peace. The choice is whether to make whatever effort may be necessary to defeat Communist expansion in Vietnam, or whether to fight at a later date and under much more difficult circumstances to fend off Communist aggression and subversion in the Philippines or Japan or India or even Australia.

I would therefore urge the young people who are assembled at this gathering tonight not to content themselves with voicing approval of the administration's policy.

It is good that you should do so.

But the convictions which we share imposes on each one of us the duty to master the facts and master the arguments necessary to expose the lies of Communist propaganda.

It imposes on each one of us, in short, the duty to become both a missionary and a fighter on the home front in the cause of freedom for ourselves and for other peoples. This is the least that we can do to show our support for American policy in Vietnam and for the American boys who are today suffering and dying on the ramparts of freedom.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR MUNDT

Freedom in Asia, American world leadership, and peace in our time are all at stake in the outcome of the Vietnamese war now involving both our military forces and our diplomatic leadership in Washington. The disruptive and disillusioning demonstrations by misguided and misled Americans which range all the way from draft card burnings to White House picketing and teach-ins, to offers of aid in terms of blood and dollars to the Communist North Vietnamese fighters who are killing American boys do not represent the vast majority of Americans; they render a great and costly disservice to our American servicemen abroad; they create false and dangerous foreign misconceptions about American attitudes; and they make less likely to succeed both our sacrifices in the fighting areas and our overseas missions engaged in the current peace offensive.

The question is not whether people in high public office or in private life have the legal right to stimulate these demonstrations of dissent and disservice, but whether any American has the ethical right when we are deep in this war to give aid and comfort to the enemy, to expand our casualty lists, to place in greater jeopardy perhaps hundreds of thousands of young Americans not yet in uniform, and to prolong the enemy's will to fight and hope for victory by creating across the world an impression that we are sharply and widely divided in support of our American position that aggressive, militaristic communism must not be permitted to win a victory by force and intrigue in southeast Asia.

The current lull in our effective military effort in Vietnam and the prevailing pressures being applied to win world support for an equitable and lasting peace at the conference table, are both handicapped by the mischievous road blocks already placed in the path to peace by those whose deeds, actions, and words have caused the Communist high command in Saigon, Peiping, and Moscow unfortunately and erroneously to mistake every sincere offer of peace by the United States as a manifestation of weakness and indecision on our part rather than a constructive desire to work out a just and lasting peace formula in southeast Asia.

Whether this current abatement in our military pressures and our air strikes together with the acceleration of our American efforts to induce conditions whereby negotiations replace strife and talks are substituted for expanded killing becomes known simply as the lull before the storm which results in larger battles and growing casualty lists or as a lull in the fighting which ushers in the dawn of peace and the universally desired conclusion of the war in Vietnam on equitable, enforceable, and enduring terms is not yet known to any man. But we do know now that the tasks both of our peace planners and of our battle commanders have been made greater, more certain, and far more difficult by the unsettling and unseeming demonstrations and actions here at home—whether inspired by local Communists or led by people of good will—which when reported globally and played up by foreign propagandists give the impression that the United States is ready to junk its role of world leadership and willing to buy a temporary peace by selling its friends into slavery. As a consequence, some of those in the Communist camp have deluded themselves into believing we Americans are so badly divided at home that all that is required for a Communist victory and a takeover of all of Asia is a stubborn and sustained refusal by the Communist leadership to consider any basis for ending the war and promoting a peace other than an unconditional defeat for the United States in Vietnam and a valid American national policy of permitting militant communism to succeed anywhere so long as its foreign invaders actually do not drop bombs or land armies on American soil.

Let us all hope and devoutly pray, therefore, that this great demonstration of national unity here in historic Constitution Hall tonight will give the lie to those fairweather friends of freedom whose decibels of dissent and manifestations of malice toward American policy have injured both the cause of early peace and eventual victory.

Let us tell the world by our presence here tonight and by this program in support of a resolute refusal to accept defeat from communism that America continues to be the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Let us support rather than sabotage the sacrifices and the purposes of the brave young men now fighting to protect the freedoms of us all.

Let us, of course, retain and exercise our American concepts of free speech and our right and duty to criticize the methods employed both in our crusade for peace and in the conduct of the war when conscience or judgment compel us to do so but by all means let such criticism and comment be both constructive and consistent with our determination not to sell freedom short in Asia.

Let us make sure, in short, when we offer counsel or criticism that it is of such a nature that no Communist warmonger, dictator, or propagandist anywhere can find comfort in our words or deeds or can twist their meanings or motivations in such a manner as to convince either himself or others that they represent a weakening of our will to win or a divided American attitude in our resistance to Communist war gains.

Our suggestions and criticisms should be directed toward making America's position stronger and more successful and never be of such a nature as to strengthen the enemy's determination or desire to continue or expand the war.

Let us also continuously reexamine the tools and methods which we are employing to achieve success in Vietnam so as to identify and correct any shortcomings on our side. In this area, I sincerely hope this session of Congress opening on Monday will speedily approve legislation to create a Freedom Academy in America designed to provide our citizens and others with the professional training in depth required to enable American civilians abroad to operate as effectively and successfully on the peace front in projecting cold war programs and in holding and improving liberated areas as our men in uniform have demonstrated their abilities to win victories and to halt invasions on the war front. Otherwise, we shall continue to lose to subversives and agitators the areas brought into the sunlight of freedom by tremendous sacrifices by ourselves and others.

A House of Representatives committee has unanimously reported and approved the Freedom Academy legislation; experience clearly teaches the sad lesson of how badly we need its trainees in Vietnam, in the Dominican Republic, and in many other areas. The time is clearly here when we should cease employing amateurs against professionals in our political and economic efforts overseas just as we learned long, long ago not to utilize inadequately trained manpower or inferior weapons in our military operations.

Let us now unite, equip, and thoroughly train Uncle Sam's other arm so we can utilize all our potential talents and techniques in resisting the expansionist efforts of communism. Military efforts and battlefield techniques alone cannot win and hold the peace so essential to existence in this atomic age. We need a Freedom Academy to train nonmilitary experts in cold war tactics today fully as much as we need our great military academies at Annapolis, West Point, and Colorado Springs.

Finally, my good Americans, let us hope and pray for peace—an early, equitable, enforceable, and enduring peace.

Let us unanimously resolve, however, until it comes to continue to convince the Communist aggressor that while we will always welcome and embrace peace we shall likewise always abhor and reject surrender.

History is filled with bloody testimony teaching the lesson that to appease communism or any other marauding and aggressive tyranny in minor matters is to invite the time and to create the cricumstances necessitating bigger and bloodier wars, closer to home, and more damaging in their consequences if our free civilization is to survive.

There is no security or peace available under the umbrella of another Chamberlain which will protect the freedom and inspire the people who look to the American Eagle as a symbol of human justice, of human liberty, as a safeguard against the rule of tyrants, and as the protector of conditions making possible an enduring peace.

REMARKS OF MAJORITY LEADER ON STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in his third annual state of the Union message, President Johnson has set forth a course of action which is at once realistic, responsive, and imaginative. His concepts are designed to pursue human goals worthy of a great people and to seek peace in Vietnam. It was inevitable that the President should have addressed himself to the seriousness of the situation in Vietnam. He leaves no doubt that he will continue to strive for a just and reasonable end to the unfortunate conflict in that war-torn land without compromising the right of the Vietnamese people to choose their own future.

Yet despite his concern and the concern of the Nation with the war in Vietnam, the President has not asked for a choice between the needs of war abroad and the demands of a decent and dignified society at home, between honoring our commitments to the world and honoring our obligations to fellow-Americans. He believes we are big enough and sensible and competent enough as a nation to do both. And in this connection he has promised us realistic and prudent management of the budget, a decreased deficit and an improvement in the balance of payments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials from the Baltimore Sun and the New York Times of January 13, 1966, commenting on the President's state of the Union message be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 13, 1966]

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

President Johnson laid out a realistic course for the Nation last night in his report to Congress on the state of the Union. He could not promise peace in Vietnam, but he could promise an honest effort to find a basis for peace. He aimed no new threats at North Vietnam but renewed his promise to stand firm against the Communist move to take over South Vietnam by force. He shows every intention of trying to keep the war under control, and in perspective, while the United States stresses its desire for a settlement on reasonable terms, and in this position the President deserves public support.

On the domestic side his handling of the budget and the related issue of inflation also seems realistic. His forecast of $112.8 billion in expenditures for the next fiscal year, after allowing for increases in defense items, indicates that he has carried out his pledge to hold down on nondefense items without sacrificing the continuing objectives of his Great Society program. If his forecast of $111 billion in revenues proves accurate—and it reflects an increase anticipated because of the rise in the gross national product—the deficit will be held to $1.8 billion without new income taxes. This would keep inflationary pressures within control and would be a mark of prudent management, all the more so in conjunction with his estimate that the deficit in our balance of payments for last year was down to $1.3 billion.

His proposals for new legislation—on the selection of juries and on crimes against civil rights workers, for a new Department of Transportation, for greater attention to the problems of the cities and pollution, for a 4-year term for Congressmen—will come into clearer focus after details are spelled out. The list is more modest than last year.

"I believe," he said, "we can continue the Great Society while we fight in Vietnam." He can expect wide support on both points so long as his approach continues to be realistic.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 13, 1966]

THE STATE OF THE UNION

President Johnson's state of the Union message was an eloquent but troubled rendering of the contradictory situation in which the country finds itself. Rebutting those who set up a false choice of "guns or butter," he pointed the way for an affluent, confident society whose problems are many but whose resources are great, whose mood is confident, and whose horizons are bright with hope. Looking at Vietnam, however, Mr. Johnson had to sketch a scene that is much grayer, where the issues are in doubt, and where the outcome does not wholly depend upon the Nation's will or its soldiers' valor.

Mr. Johnson's discussion of the war and the probing for peace was carefully balanced. He reaffirmed the Nation's determination to resist Communist use of force. But he made equally plain to Hanoi and to Peiping that he earnestly seeks peace. He could offer no results of his latest diplomatic overtures, but he did give assurance that he will persist in searching for a way to begin fruitful negotiations. He made no threats and issued no ultimatums. His language was notable for its sober tone and its unmistakable commitment to peace.

On domestic problems, the President's message set forth a comprehensive program which had in it something for everybody—and in some cases a bit too much. But he did place the Nation's serious domestic needs in their proper relationship to the war in Vietnam and to the other heavy burdens this country bears in the world. To those who would use that war and those burdens as pretexts to halt necessary reforms and to require sacrifices from those least able to make them, Mr. Johnson has returned the right answer: the United States is rich enough and strong enough to act responsibly both at home and abroad.

Slums, poverty, racial injustice, polluted rivers, and inadequate schools are sources of grave national weakness. If this session of Congress responds to the President's forthright call for action to overcome those weaknesses, this country will be in a much better—not a worse—position to meet whatever challenges the future may bring. But to meet this challenge will be expensive; and we doubt that Mr. Johnson's approach to his difficult tax and budget decisions is really bold enough. Without ruling out a substantial tax rise later, the President chose to rely for the present upon a mere speedup in personal withholding and corporate tax payments and small increases in automobile and telephone excises.

This city's transit strike has apparently had the unintended good effect of directing Mr. Johnson's attention forcibly to the long-evaded problem of improving Taft-Hartley procedures for coping with national emergency strikes. But instead of going on to propose a general revision of Taft-Hartley to give it better balance and bring it up to date—something that is also sorely needed—Mr. Johnson once again emphasized labor's demand for repeal of the right-to-work provision (sec. 14(b))—something that is not at all needed.

The President's civil rights recommendations are excellent. It is imperative that Congress strengthen the authority of the Federal courts to deal with the murder of civil rights workers and Negroes in the South. His recommendations to deal with discrimination in the sale and rental of housing and to improve the system of jury selection are also welcome.

A striking feature of Mr. Johnson's message is his vigorous, reformist approach to the Nation's political institutions. His request for a thorough overhaul of the laws regulating campaign expenditures is one that we have long urged on this page; Mr. Johnson's affirmation of the need for reform is most encouraging. Other of his proposals which have great merit include a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives, home rule for the District of Columbia, and a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation. His suggested Highway Safety Act of 1966 is recognition of the fact that the dreadful carnage on the highways is reaching the proportions of a national crisis that requires a national solution.

The theme of the President's message is epitomized in his words: "We must change to master change." It is the true theme for the United States both at home and abroad in the coming year.

RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR INFORMATION AND OPINION EXCHANGE BETWEEN THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD AND OTHER ECONOMIC AGENCIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit a simple resolution calling for greater coordination among the fiscal and monetary policymakers of the Federal Government.

Although this resolution results from recent hearings held by the Joint Economic Committee on the Federal Reserve Board's latest discount rate increase, it is expressly designed not to compromise the independence of the Board in any way. In fact the language of the resolution explicity recognizes the independence of the Federal Reserve Board.

At the same time the resolution recognizes that there has been an almost comic breakdown in communication between the great economic policymaking arms of our Government.

The Federal Reserve Board's announcement last month of the increase in the rediscount rate not only contradicted the views of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, but it was taken in ignorance of the biggest fact in economic policy: the shape of the upcoming budget.

It was made crystal clear in the hearings on December 13 and 14 that the Federal Reserve Board members who voted to increase the rediscount rate had not the slightest idea what would be in the President's budget as revealed to the Congress last Wednesday night. The Board, of course, was free to guess. And the hearings disclosed that their guesses were consistently and uniformly wrong.

Most of the Board members expressed a desire for a tax increase instead of a discount rate increase. But all clearly assumed there would be no tax increase, that there would be no step-up in income tax withholding, that there would be no speed-up of $3 billion in corporation income tax collections.

The projected deficit of less than $2 billion and the proposed cash surplus in the upcoming budget were factors none of them had anticipated.

And yet, Mr. President, every economist in the Nation would agree that these wholly unanticipated plans of the President will have a serious and profound effect on our economy, and on the prospects of inflation which the discount rate increase was designed to curb.

Mr. President, the need for the exchange of information and opinion—and I might add the acquiescence of Governor Martin in the desirability of exploring this need—was summarized in an exchange between Governor Martin and myself on December 14 in the hearings before the Joint Economic Committee. I ask unanimous consent that a short excerpt from those hearings be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts, Relative to Coordination, From Hearings Held Before the Joint Economic Committee on Recent Actions of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System

(From vol. 2, 1965, Dec. 14, 1965, pp. 301–305)

Senator Proxmire. I am not talking about independent or more dependence or taking orders or taking directions. I am simply talking about the greatest possible amount of mutual information going both ways, frank, full, blunt discussion on the part of members of the Federal Reserve Board on fiscal policy and members of the administration on monetary policy, not with any feeling you are dictating to them what they should do, but making clear what is your best judgment, which is excellent and very valuable judgment to them. It should be.

I would like to get at whether or not you think it would be worthwhile considering one of the following four alternative methods of increasing coordination:

No. 1, regular meetings, weekly or monthly or four times a year, at any rate as often as possible, of all members of the Federal Reserve Board and some top members of these other agencies that are involved, the Budget, the Council, and the Treasury.

That is one possibility and maybe there are reasons why it can't be accomplished. What I am deeply concerned about is, Governor Martin, you have one vote, the other members have six votes. They have the ability therefore to determine policy as you know. You are the Chairman but as I understand it, the law does not give you any extraordinary power except that you are the chief executive officer. There is no other influence you have that they don't have. The majority leader cannot have any more influence in determination of policy than I have as an individual Senator. I think all members of the Board should have the greatest opportunity to be briefed. That is one alternative.

The second is the possibility of position papers prepared and circulated regularly with the arguments adduced from each of the other three important economic policy agencies. I can see that there would be problems involved here but I think it might be very, very helpful, particularly if they were kept in confidence and you had an opportunity to decide on a free and frank discussion that way in writing.

A third is for you to follow the same policy you do now but to keep a recorded transcript of the kind we have here of your discussions with the Council, Treasury, and Budget which would be made available in full promptly, the next day, to the other six members of the Board, and then maybe some opportunity for them to comment if they wish.

A fourth would be to establish a formal secretariat to work with all four agencies and to work directly with them to keep them all informed fully and to work for the greatest amount of understanding on the part of all members of the Federal Reserve Board and all members of these other three agencies not with a notion that the President would dominate or that the administration would dominate but that you would be fully and completely informed, not simply you but the other six members of the Board.

What is your reaction to these four possibilities? Do you think they might be considered and explored seriously?

Mr. Martin. I think we ought to explore carefully and conscientiously every avenue of improving coordination within the Government.

The independence we are talking about is independence within the Government, not independence of the Government. All four of these methods and several others that you have suggested have from time to time been discussed and evaluated and there are problems with all of them as you yourself recognized in outlining them.

I don't say that any one of them ought to be discarded, per se. I think our purpose ought to be to get better coordination throughout the Government not only in the Federal Reserve but in other areas of Government and the only thing that we ought to be careful about is that we do not substitute dictation for coordination.

Senator Proxmire. But you would feel that there might be further consideration, particularly since there is a feeling in the country I think, and some feeling in the Congress, that it may be a matter of misunderstanding.

Mr. Martin. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In 1961 a former Board Chairman, Marriner Eccles, said:

> There must be a liaison, a responsible relationship between the administration and the monetary system. This does not mean political control in the undesirable sense which is often implied.

My resolution simply attempts to insure that such a relationship exists without compromising the independent decisionmaking powers of the Board.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 177) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

S. Res. 177

Whereas the monetary powers of the Federal Reserve System, particularly its open market operations and the establishment of bank discount rates, have a substantial effect on the Nation's fiscal policy as determined and applied by the President, the Bureau of the Budget, the Treasury Department, and the Council of Economic Advisers;

Whereas the coordination of fiscal and monetary policies is essential to a sound national economy;

Whereas the Employment Act of 1946 requires the Federal Government "to use all practicable means consistent with its needs * * * to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities * * * and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power,"; and

Whereas, the independence of the Federal Reserve System is an established policy of our Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in order to achieve a greater coordination of the Nation's monetary and fiscal policies in accordance with the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946, it is the sense of the Senate that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, together with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, should adopt procedures for the regular, formal, and frequent interchange of information and viewpoints on the fiscal and monetary policies of the Government. Such procedures should assure the fullest interchange of information and viewpoints possible, but nothing herein should be construed as affecting or abridging in any way the independence of the Federal Reserve System.

Sec. 2. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget are requested to jointly report to the Senate, on or before June 30, 1966, with respect to any procedures which have been adopted in accordance with the sense of this resolution.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 3 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM SACRIFICED FOR NONEXISTENT BOOKKEEPING SAVINGS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I was shocked to learn upon my return to Washington for the opening of this second session that the Bureau of the Budget had crippled the special milk program with a directive that $3 million appropriated for reimbursing school districts dispensing milk under the program was to be withheld. As a result the reimbursement rate, which had already decreased by 5 percent due to program growth coupled with insufficient appropriations, was cut by an additional 5 percent for a total cut of 10 percent.

This has a number of serious consequences.

First. Less milk will be used under the program because local school districts will have to assume an increased share of the costs of the program or pass them on to the schoolchildren.

Second. More milk will have to be purchased under the price support program because less milk will be used in the special milk program. This means that the $3 million saved by depriving schoolchildren of nature's perfect food will be paid out by the Federal Government for purchasing and storing milk under the price support program that ordinarily would go into the special milk program. In other words, instead of going into children's stomachs the milk will be powdered and stored in warehouses at Government expense.

Third. The poor children who benefit most from the special milk program will be the first to drop out of the program if the increased cost created by a reduction in Federal participation is passed on to the schoolchildren, as it undoubtedly will be in some instances.

Finally, this action reaffirms a regressive approach by the Bureau of the Budget toward an important social welfare program at the very time that expenditures for other new society programs are increasing. Last year $103 million was spent on the program. This year, despite a growth in the school population and percentage of participation, the program was cut back.

Mr. President, I serve notice that as a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations I intend to do everything in my power to rectify this grave mistake. Furthermore, until this outrageous situation is rectified this Senator intends to rise on the floor day after day throughout what promises to be a long session to hammer into the heads of this Government the detailed reasons why schoolchildren should be drinking milk which otherwise—at the same cost to the Federal Government—will rot in storage.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I completely agree with the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin concerning the action of the Bureau of the Budget in arbitrarily cutting the appropriations made by Congress for the purchase of milk for schoolchildren. The Senator from Wisconsin is exactly correct. The Bureau of the Budget has ignored the fact that Congress did not see eye to eye with the Bureau, and in raising slightly the appropriation for that purpose expected its final action to be carried out, and still expects it to be carried out.

I shall strongly support the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in behalf of the people of my State and, I am sure, the schoolchildren of America and the dairy farmers as well, I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida, who has rendered magnificent service, year after year, in fighting for this appropriation under most difficult circumstances. He has been more responsible than any other Senator in obtaining more adequate appropriations than would otherwise have been made, in view of the opposition both in the House and by the Bureau of the Budget. I am extremely grateful to him.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his gracious remark. The Senator from Wisconsin has, of course, been the spearhead of this effort. The Senator from Florida has agreed with him completely on this subject.

LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as we mourn the death of Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri, of India, we feel the loss of a man who on the day of his passing had reached new heights in his search for peace on the Asian subcontinent. It is never an easy task for a man to succeed a great national hero; yet Mr. Shastri, as successor to the late Jawaharal Nehru, who was revered as a saint by the Indian masses, had shown during his 19 months in office a combination of strength and gentleness that had brought him close to the hearts of his people and indeed had earned a special place for him in the hearts of people the world over.

The name of Shastri now joins those of Gandhi and Nehru as three Indian immortals of our own times.

Prime Minister Shastri was a devoted seeker after peace, and a man determined to free his country from poverty. He was a friend of America; a friend of mankind. His gentle strength conveyed to us something of the mystical nature of the Indian soul.

DEATH OF HON. HERBERT C. BONNER, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 632

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Herbert C. Bonner, a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, the House do now adjourn.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and myself, I submit a resolution relating to the death of the very able and much loved Representative from North Carolina, Herbert C. Bonner, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. 176), as follows:

S. RES. 176

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Herbert C. Bonner, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, shortly after the 1st session of the 89th Congress adjourned, the United States lost one of its truly outstanding citizens in the death of the Honorable Herbert C. Bonner, the Representative for the First District of North Carolina and chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The many friends Herbert Bonner had over the years felt a very deep personal loss in his passing. He was a very down-to-earth person who always put the welfare of the public ahead of other considerations. I am sure he did this because he loved just plain people so much and because he knew them and their problems.

I knew Herbert Bonner for many, many years, and I have never known a more conscientious, honest, and dedicated man in my life.

Although we have lost a dear friend and the Nation has lost a dedicated public servant, all of us are better off for having known Herbert Bonner and benefited from the work he did in the Congress of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution is considered and unanimously agreed to.

TRENDS IN COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on the subject of trends in county government be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. This article from American County Governments, published by the National Association of Counties, was written by my good friend John Alexander McMahon, who until recently served as general counsel of the North Carolina Association of County Commissioners.

Mr. McMahon, a graduate of Duke University and Harvard Law School, drew from many years of his experience as assistant director of the Institute of Government in Chapel Hill, N.C., and as chief officer of our State's vigorously active Association of County Commissioners in writing this useful and interesting article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADITIONAL ROLE AND MODERN PROBLEMS INFLUENCE FUTURE DIRECTION OF COUNTIES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Under the leadership of their general counsel, John Alexander McMahon, the counties of North Carolina became symbols of progressive government. Just before leaving that position to assume new responsibilities elsewhere, Mr. McMahon reflected on the trend of county government today.)

The direction of county government, here and elsewhere, is being influenced by two major factors. One grows out of the traditional role of the county as a subdivision of the State. The other grows out of the different kinds of problems that counties of different sizes are facing.

Counties were originally created by the State to carry out certain activities which the legislative body believed could be handled best under local administration. From the earliest times, counties provided law enforcement through the sheriff's office; the recording of deeds and other documents through the register of deeds office; and judicial administration through the clerk of court office and through the inferior and superior courts. Counties also conducted elections for county and State offices, built roads, cared for the poor and the sick, and provided public schools.

Since counties were created for the State's purposes, it was natural for the legislative body to enact detailed statutes with respect to the administration of their activities. For example, the register of deeds was told how to register instruments; he was told how to appoint and compensate the assistants in his office, and the legislature itself made provision for his compensation.

This kind of statutory procedure can be contrasted with the way the legislature has dealt with cities and towns. They were created to provide services required by a compact community, such as water and sewer, fire protection, and sanitation. The initiative for creation usually came from the citizens of the community. The legislature granted broad powers and duties to the governing boards of these municipalities, including complete power to determine their organizational structure. This made it far simpler to centralize the administration of cities and towns.

MORE SERVICES

Faced later with demands by the people for services, the legislature granted power to counties to decide whether other activities should be carried on, and if carried on, the extent to which performed. Thus the legislature has authorized counties to establish public health programs, to establish and maintain hospitals and, more recently, to provide mental health services, libraries, agricultural extension programs, trade and vocational courses, industrial education centers, and community colleges. The legislature has authorized counties to protect property through firefighting programs, building codes, and zoning, and to build and operate airports, to establish recreation programs, to maintain civil defense programs, and to conduct other activities.

Thus counties today serve a twofold purpose. They are subdivisions of the State and they are units of local self-government.

Because of the county's role as a subdivision of the State the direction of county government is a matter of State policy. It is true that county officials often have their own suggestions with respect to activities they administer, but because of the State-county partnership they share the initiative with others.

External influences, which grow out of the traditional role of the county as a subdivision of the State, thus have a substantial bearing on the direction of county government.

URBAN COUNTY PROBLEMS

The large urban counties have a growing mobile population and an expanding urban area. These combine to create problems.

First of all, the urban counties are faced with the problem of taking over and providing on a countywide basis some of the services traditionally performed by cities. For a number of years there has been a movement toward countywide operation of library service, for example. Since World War II, county activity in hospital construction and maintenance has far outdistanced municipal interest. An interest in airports has recently become evident, and if county experience in North Carolina follows county experience elsewhere, there will soon be an increased interest in parks and recreation. None of these activities is a respecter of municipal boundaries, and counties will become more and more involved in all of them.

A second problem lies in the demands of people in unincorporated areas for services traditionally provided by cities. Many counties have recently received demands for water and sewer service in unincorporated areas, and some have come from areas into which the nearby city cannot justify expanding its service. The near future may bring demands on counties for pure water on a wholesale basis for both unincorporated areas and smaller municipalities, and the same may be true of demands for the disposal of sewage. There are already the faint stirrings of interest in housing and renewal to clear up slums in unincorporated areas.

A third problem is developing as communities spill across county lines and make regional cooperation imperative. This is making itself apparent in the physical planning area. The organization of the Piedmont Crescent 2,000 Commission recognizes the fact that land development is no respecter of county lines. Regional cooperation in hospital planning has already developed in several areas and will develop in others. We may see in the future a recognition that decentralization of industry has advantages in the overall development of an area, whereas at present each county desires maximum industrialization for itself.

A fourth problem of the large urban county lies in the necessity for developing rural-urban cooperation and communication. Urban growth patterns affect rural areas quite dramatically, not only through the effects of changing land uses on property values, but also through tax increases on rural as well as urban property to meet the cost of growth.

Finally, there is the problem of reorganization. Most large counties have already reorganized internally to meet the challenges ahead. They have county managers and county planning departments to provide centralized administration and long-range planning. Will there be a need for external reorganization, like city-county consolidation or "metro" government? In North Carolina, we do not have the overlapping and duplication of activities that have led to this kind of development elsewhere, and we may achieve the major advantages of consolidation merely through cooperation in planning between counties and municipalities.

RURAL COUNTY PROBLEMS

The small rural county has a different set of problems. More often than not, there is a decline in population, through small increases in town population will often partly offset the declining population of the rural areas. But size, more than population loss, presents the problem of providing adequate services with too few people to serve and too few taxpayers.

The schools may have too few students for a full curriculum geared to the needs and abilities of the students. The welfare department may have too few cases to justify the intensive services that some people require; child welfare service is a typical example. Many departments have too little work to justify the salaries demanded by highly trained people. And finally there is the limited tax base that must finance these services.

Some of these difficulties are being offset by multicounty operations, particularly in the health and library areas. Joint operations in other areas may follow. But the regional arrangement is easier in some cases than others, and problems arise where mountains or water add transportation difficulties. The problem of sufficient population must be solved, or the people in these smaller counties will suffer. Merger of counties is no answer, for merger itself can do little to overcome the problems presented by a scattered population.

A second problem faced by the small rural county is the need for industry and job opportunities. The competition, however, is terrific. There are some 14,000 communities in the United States engaged in the hunt for new industry, and industry continues to be attracted to the more populous areas where other business is succeeding.

A third problem may lie in reapportionment. Recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions announcing the "one man, one vote" rule, unless changed by constitutional amendment, will mean loss of representation to many of the smaller counties. Legislative representation, certainly, has been one of the biggest single factors militating against merger of counties, and loss of representation could change the picture. Whether reapportionment itself will affect the direction of county government cannot be foretold.

One important problem that faces all counties is the necessity for obtaining and retaining sufficient competent personnel. In small counties, the salary problem is coupled with the necessity for finding people who want to live in smaller communities.

An additional problem lies in money, for all counties will be faced with increased demands for services, and these demands will mean higher taxes. The one thing worse than higher taxes is the consequences of failure to meet the demands. If they are not met, people will turn to the State capitol and Washington for help. History tells us that there the call will be answered. Generally speaking, it has proved true that the demands for services are stronger than the demands for economy in government, and the greatest threat that faces county government in the years ahead is failing to provide what the people want and demand.

SIGNIFICANCE

If the problems are met, this itself will give a changing direction to county government. If the problems are not met, we can expect to see increased State and Federal activity, and this, too, will affect county government's direction.

One difficulty is that large counties are faced with different challenges from those of small counties. Large counties will need help from small counties in solving their problems, at least where legislation is needed. And small counties will need help from the large counties in financing expanding services to serve people who live in the rural areas and small towns.

As we look at the direction of county government, we can count ourselves fortunate that we do not face the problems of those States where one metropolitan area is dominant. Our more even spread of population in North Carolina is advantageous in that problems are more widely shared and understood.

But with the differences we do have, small counties and large counties can develop together. Working together, we can continue to build, and the direction of county government, like the direction of State and municipal government, will be in the tradition of good government.

A NEW CATHEDRAL FOR SITKA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by him concerning a new cathedral for Sitka.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BARTLETT

On January 2, fire, spread by 15-mile-an-hour winds, swept a section of the city of Sitka in southeast Alaska. Before the fierce flames were extinguished, 2 churches and 11 buildings housing 21 businesses and 8 apartments were razed.

According to figures I have received, the loss in real and personal property was close to $2 million. Perhaps a more important figure is the estimate of $3.5 million put on rebuilding the burned-out section of Sitka. Insurance will cover only $835,000 of the loss.

For Sitka, a small city, the loss is extensive. However, I am happy to report that residents led by Maj. John W. O'Connell, launched plans to rebuild their city almost immediately after the flames were put out. They will have the aid of the Small Business Administration, which already has declared the city eligible for disaster loans.

Robert E. Butler, SBA Alaska Director, and two aids, inspected the site of the fire the day after the tragedy. I know I speak for the people of Sitka when I say the speed with which the SBA investigated and acted was greatly appreciated.

But my principal purpose in speaking today is not to pay tribute to the courageous people of Sitka who are demonstrating the same spirit that so many Alaskans showed in rebuilding after the Good Friday earthquake of 1964.

Rather, my purpose is to call national attention to the loss of a building on which it is impossible to place a value—St. Michael's Cathedral.

Estimates have been made on the cost of reconstructing St. Michael's, but I know of no way to put a price on the historical value of the church. The cathedral is believed to be the oldest church in Alaska and was one of the few buildings remaining from the days of Russian rule.

The cathedral, called by the National Survey of Historical Sites and Buildings the finest example of Russian architecture in the United States, was dedicated in 1848. Construction began 4 years earlier.

From 1848 until 1862 and from 1905 until the present it was the cathedral for the Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska.

Some of the ornaments inside the cathedral date from an earlier church at Sitka. The icon of the Archangel St. Michael, patron saint of Sitka, was brought to the colony in 1816 by Father Alexis Sokoloff, the first priest assigned to the town founded 17 years earlier.

Father Ivan Veniaminov, the great Russian missionary, came to Sitka, capital of Russian-America, in 1834. He returned to Russia 4 years later to appeal for an expansion of church activities in Alaska.

Father Veniaminov came back as Bishop Innocent of Alaska and launched a program which included schools and theological seminaries. It was under his leadership that the cathedral was built. Sitka became the home of the bishop.

For a time after the Alaska purchase the church continued to receive support from Russia, but since 1918 local congregations have been the sole support of orthodox clergy and churches in this country. In 1933 the ruling bishop of the Russian Orthodox Church of North America declared the church on this continent to be temporarily autonomous from the Communist-controlled organization in the Soviet Union.

As cathedrals go, St. Michael's was not imposing in size. Built in the shape of a cross, the church was 97 feet long and 66 feet wide. Despite its modest dimensions, the building had a graceful grandeur and beauty seen against its backdrop of beautiful mountains.

A four-story bell tower, constructed of massive, hand-cut logs, supported an octagonal belfry which held eight bells ranging in weight from 75 to 1,500 pounds. A carrot-shaped steeple topped by a gilt cross rose above the belfry.

A dome, like the steeple, showing the influence of oriental architecture, covered the center of the church.

The interior of the cathedral was as ornate as the wood exterior was plain. Walls were covered with painted cloth, but of most interest were the many sacred objects, paintings, and icons on display.

I won't attempt to note all that the church contained. A brief description of the iconostas, the partition in an Eastern Orthodox Church which separates the main part of the church from the sanctuary, will suffice to give an idea of the richness of the church's interior. The partition was adorned with 12 icons, splendid examples of repoussé art. In this art form, figures are painted on canvas. Then a craftsman, working with a thin sheet of silver, beats out the form of clothing worn by the figure, reproducing folds and ornaments in the original painting. The 12 icons on the St. Michael's iconostas required 50 pounds of silver.

Perhaps the cathedral's most famous icon is the Sitka Madonna, known throughout the world. The painter of the icon was Vladimir Lukich Borovikovsky, a great portrait painter who died in 1826. Employees of the Russian-American company gave the icon to the church.

Fortunately, through the efforts of firemen, priests, and residents, all of the precious items of the cathedral, with the exception of a single painting, were saved. Unfortunately, the church books, dating back to the early 1800's, were destroyed.

There are many reasons why St. Michael's should be rebuilt, but the most compelling reason is to give these beautiful ornaments, sacred objects, paintings and icons saved from the flames a proper setting. While a reconstructed church will not be of equal historical importance as the original, it seems only right that the ornaments be displayed in a church which recreates as closely as possible their original setting.

It will be possible to rebuild a replica of St. Michael's because detailed plans of the cathedral are on file in the Library of Congress.

The plans are on file because of a project of the National Park Service known as Mission '66. In 1956, Congress approved appropriations so that the Park Service could embark on a 10-year program to upgrade national parks which had been neglected during and immediately following World War II. Part of that effort was directed toward resuming the Historic American Building Survey, which had been suspended during World War II.

The six measured drawings of the cathedral were done as part of the survey. I think the tragedy at Sitka demonstrates the value of that survey. Because of that survey, it will be possible to reconstruct the cathedral.

I am happy to report that a drive to raise funds for construction of a replica already has been started by interested Alaskans. Contributions are being sent to the St. Michael's Cathedral Fund established by the Sitka Historical Sites Restoration Committee, a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization under the chairmanship of James T. Thomason.

The drive has attracted statewide support. For example, a formal campaign has been launched in Anchorage. The committee is headed by Merrill Mael, and includes among others Mayor Elmer Rasmuson, William Hopkins, an aid of the Governor, and Robert D. Arnold, my special assistant in Alaska.

It was reported that the Alaska State Chamber of Commerce has pledged $10,000 to the fund.

A radio station in Cleveland, acting on its own, reportedly made an appeal for funds.

A nationwide effort is being planned, and I am pleased to serve as the honorary chairman of this portion of the drive.

Estimates on reconstructing the church range from $500,000 to $800,000. I hope that money will be raised and that Sitka will once again be the site of historic St. Michael's Cathedral.

In closing I would like to quote from a study made for the National Park Service. Better than I could, the quotation sums the historical importance of the cathedral:

"In our opinion, St. Michael's Cathedral is of sufficient national historical and cultural significance to qualify as a national historic site.

"First, as the cathedral and spiritual center for the Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska for many years, both during the Russian and American periods of Alaskan history, it is the structure best suited to commemorate the influence of the Eastern Orthodox Church in the development of Alaska.

"Second, as the oldest known surviving religious structure in Alaska and as a splendid and typical example of Orthodox church architecture in Alaska, it is eminently qualified to illustrate for future generations one of the cultures which has contributed to the formation of our American civilization and our national scene.

"Third, as one of the very few structures of any type still remaining from the period of Russian occupation, it symbolizes and commemorates the meeting of Eastern and Western cultures on the western edge of America.

"Fourth, because of its association with Father Veniaminov it commemorates one of the great, though little known, men of the American missionary frontier.

"This site is a natural point at which to present these broad aspects of American history. No other national historic site commemorates these particular phases of our country's history. Nearby Sitka National Monument presents another, though related, phase of Alaska's story—the culture of the natives and their resistance to white settlement."

THE MANSFIELD REPORT ON VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, our distinguished majority leader, Senator Mansfield, of Montana, and his colleagues, Senators Aiken, Muskie, Inouye, and Boggs, deserve the highest commendation for their forthright report on the grim realities of the situation confronting us in Vietnam.

If there is to be a meaningful debate in Congress on the war in southeast Asia, it must be based upon a realistic assessment of where we are, whence we came, and where we are headed. Too much mischief has already been done by the instant victory advocates who keep assuring us that the Vietcong will collapse, if we will just push the war up still another notch.

The sobering effect which the Mansfield report should inspire cannot help but add new momentum to the quest for a rational settlement of the war in Vietnam.

Mr. R. H. Shackford, staff writer for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, has given a fine appraisal of the Mansfield report in an article published in the January 10 edition of the Washington Daily News. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

VIETNAM DEBATE WARMS UP—THE MANSFIELD REPORT HAS STIRRED HAWKS AND DOVES

(By R. H. Shackford)

Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield's grim but extraordinarily candid report about the mess in Vietnam has set the hawks and the doves at it again.

It has created the background for a debate, already under way, that is certain to grow in intensity as Congress reconvenes and President Johnson faces new decisions.

The hawks in private denounce Senator Mansfield for his candor, claiming that his report aids and abets the enemy and will mislead Hanoi about U.S. intentions.

The doves praise the report, especially for its candor. They argue that it is about time some one courageously painted the real, pessimistic picture as a contrast to the ones created daily by U.S. military and diplomatic spokesmen.

The hawks, who include those who for years have argued that just a little more pressure will bring the other side to its knees, claim the situation is more hopeful than Senator Mansfield sees it—provided a little more escalation is ordered.

The doves suggest that the outlook in Vietnam is even bleaker than Senator Mansfield's public report and that the Senator's private report to President Johnson was much more ominous about the future.

NOT THAT SIMPLE

The hawk-dove formula is a gross oversimplification of official Washington. And there are no known official doves who would cut and run.

But the hawk-dove formula today does describe roughly the views of those who, given today's facts, would proceed quite differently—those who would go all out for a military solution and those who would hold only what we have and play for time.

Within the next few days and weeks, after the President's state of the Union message and the end of the jet-borne diplomatic mission (both American and Soviet), the battle lines for the debate will be much clearer.

Response to the Mansfield report, however, already has shown the broad outlines.

GOP UNITY

Republican leaders, including Senator Everett Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois, whom the President has done so much to flatter and woo, have put their prestige behind the hawks who want total military victory before negotiations.

Democratic leaders are divided. Some of the conservative congressional committee chairmen, such as House Armed Services Chairman Mendel Rivers, Democrat, of South Carolina, would light the fuse, even if it leads to Peiping, if Hanoi does not back down immediately.

But other influential Democrats oppose further escalation and would, in fact, seek ways to deescalate, even unilaterally.

The value of the Mansfield report is that it states without flinching several facts that Johnson administration officials have conceded privately for some weeks but have been unwilling to spell out for the public.

These include:

The vast U.S. escalation of the war in Vietnam has failed to produce the original objectives—to reduce Communist military activity and to bring Hanoi to the conference table for a negotiated compromise settlement. Senator Mansfield says the Communists have matched the increased U.S. commitment.

Senator Mansfield estimates that the acceleration of Vietcong efforts is so great that it is doubtful the Saigon government can even hold what it has, let alone extend it, without a further augmentation of Ameriman forces on the ground.

The situation is already perilously close to where it will no longer be possible to retain the myth that it is a Vietnamese war. The mere weight of American involvement makes it an American war. Weekend reports from Saigon confirm this trend—the huge U.S. troop operation against the Vietcong's "iron triangle" was undertaken without even telling the South Vietnamese high military command anything about it.

After nearly a year of high-intensity bombing, both in the north and south, and bloody ground-fighting, the control of the country—measured by both terrain and population—is no better than it was early in 1965 when, Senator Mansfield discloses, the Saigon regime was about to collapse and sent an S O S to the United States for American ground troops.

Vietcong recruiting in the south continues to be successful. And the North Vietnamese—undeterred by our bombings—have doubled their infiltration rate and are expected to triple it to 4,500 per month soon. A high desertion rate in the South Vietnamese army continues and, Senator Mansfield warns, there is no chance of the South Vietnamese substantially increasing their regular forces much above the current 300,000 figure.

All the American military talk about the pro and con effects of the monsoon on the military operations of both sides was a miscalculation and poor judgment. Senator Mansfield said the consequences of the monsoon were minor, if there were any at all.

Weekend news stories from Saigon quoting Air Force pilots achieving "excellent results" from large raids on the Ho Chi Minh trail in Laos will be taken with a grain of salt by readers of Senator Mansfield's report. He says the trail is "not easily susceptible to aerial interdiction" because most of it is protected "by double canopies of jungle foliage."

Senator Mansfield's basic conclusion is the center of the debate—that there is "only a very slim prospect of a just settlement by negotiations" with the "alternative prospect of a continuance of the conflict in the direction of a general war on the Asian mainland," meaning war with Communist China.

Privately, many administration officials have agreed with that appraisal, if our military policy continues unchanged. In fact, some think it is inevitable in the long run, and a few would argue the sooner the better.

Senator Mansfield warns that Asians, frequently portrayed by administration officials as wholeheartedly behind us, are most fearful of a United States-Chinese war, but recognize their "relative powerlessness" to influence the big events.

THE SIGN AT TASHKENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Mr. Walter Lippmann, ever the journalist of substance and insight, has given us another profound statement on the meaning of the recent events at Tashkent. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lippmann's column, which was published in the Washington Post of January 13, 1966, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Sign at Tashkent

(By Walter Lippmann)

Death came to Shastri at a high moment in his life, and the grief which is worldwide is therefore lighted with the poetic grandeur of the circumstances. He did his best day's work and died in the evening when he had completed it. The world is the better for what was done in Tashkent. For mankind has needed badly to be shown that it is still possible to get on top of the intractable violence of human affairs.

None will suppose that peace has now been established. No doubt the way ahead will be full of trouble. Nevertheless, we have seen at Tashkent at least a part of the pattern of what might be the shape of things to come. The conflict between Pakistan and India could become a catastrophe for hundreds of millions of people. What we have been shown in Mr. Kosygin's mediation has been that the primary responsibility for making peace lies with those who are most directly concerned. The powers most directly concerned are those who are nearest to the conflict—Pakistan, India and the Soviet Union.

Mr. Kosygin was able to do what neither Mr. Wilson nor Mr. Johnson could have done. That is not because he is cleverer than they, but, in the last analysis, because he is nearer. Great Britain, in spite of the ties of the Commonwealth, has been helpless; the United States, in spite of its wealth and power, has been ineffective. The critical advantage of the Soviet Union has not been due to race, color, or culture, but to geography. The Soviet Union can talk with authority about peace in Asia because it is a power with an Asian frontier of thousands of miles.

I have come increasingly to think that the cardinal defect of our own foreign policy in this century of the wars and disappointments and frustrations has been the pursuit of idealism separated from the geography of the world. The American globalist school of thought has dominated American strategic and diplomatic policy since 1917.

In that time we have fought and won two world wars and have always been too high-minded to make peace after either of them. The globalists have always been too high-minded to make the compromises and concessions which are the essential ingredients of any peace settlement. Now we are engaged in a war which has no visible limits, and the reason given to us by our globalist leaders comes down to saying that we have appointed ourselves the guardians of the peace of the world.

Before the globalist illusion came upon us, we thought it was our business to define our vital interests and defend them. As against the gross self-delusion of globalism, there is the traditional realism which holds that a sound foreign policy is based on a careful and constant study of the geography of the world. This leads to the realization that American power cannot be equally effective all over the globe. A full understanding of this simple, self-evident, profound truth is the beginning of wisdom in foreign affairs.

Globalism is the thinking of those who have not learned the facts of life. They include the zealots of the world revolution who expect all mankind to imitate and follow them. They include also the idealists who have overreacted from their old isolationism and expect to enforce everywhere their own views of the moral law.

They cannot do that, and when they try to do it, the reality of things asserts itself and the reckoning cannot be long postponed.

POLITICAL LUXURIES

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record an editorial entitled "Political Luxuries," published in the Wall Street Journal of today, January 14, 1966.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Political Luxuries

"I have not come here tonight to ask for pleasant luxuries or for idle pleasures."—Lyndon B. Johnson in the state of the Union message.

In the sense that, but for Vietnam, the administration presumably would be asking for much more domestic spending, the President's claim of modest budgeting is correct. All the same, the programs he has sketched seem amply supplied with luxuries and pleasures for a time of grievous war.

Mr. Johnson argues that his civilian recommendations represent a sort of minimum that must be done for schoolchildren, the sick, and the poor. Any sacrifices required by war, he insists, must not come from cutting back on aid to those most in need.

It follows, then, that anyone who questions this huge spending on the homefront is a monster of hardheartedness. The unfortunate fact nonetheless is that the projects the Government has embarked on and now wants to expand are not necessarily in the interests of those they are supposed to help. In some cases, like the notorious business of urban renewal dispossessing the poor, they are injurious.

Consider the so-called war on poverty, which the President asks Congress not only to continue but to speed up. At present it is a costly and wasteful chaos which benefits politicians but scarcely the poor. Instead of a speedup it needs a pause for an examination of its faults and to see why it is being run so badly.

For another example of good governmental management, look at Mr. Johnson's remarkable plea for a new Department of Transportation—because, as he puts it, the existing structure of no less than 35 agencies, spending $5 billion a year, is practically incapable of serving the Nation's needs. No institution except Government could get away with failure on that grand scale.

What would benefit the people, including the poor (and the poor taxpayer) is Federal austerity to reduce the danger of a serious inflationary outbreak. Here, too, in implying that the forthcoming budget will be noninflationary, the Government appears on weak ground; the President himself suggests so when he warns we must all increase our vigilance against inflation.

The budget forecast is for fiscal 1967 spending of nearly $113 billion, a staggering drain on the economy. But with the hope that revenues will reach $111 billion the anticipated deficit is "only" $1.8 billion as compared with much higher earlier estimates.

The revenue expectation may well be unduly optimistic and will prove wildly optimistic if the economy should slow down just a bit or fail to expand between now and the end of the period 18 months hence. Accept the revenue figure at face value and it still depends on rescinding the excise tax cuts put in effect only at the beginning of this year and on various gimmicks such as accelerating corporate tax payments.

Even if they were not excessively expensive and inflationary, the administration's plans rest on an intellectual confusion that Federal outlays are good for your soul as well as your body.

"A great nation is one which breeds a great people," says Mr. Johnson. "A great people flower not from wealth and power but from a society which spurs them to the fullness of their genius * * *. This year we must continue to improve the quality of American life."

In practice, though, that noble dream turns out to have very little to do with quality; it is, and in the nature of government must be, almost wholly quantitative and materialistic. Doling out dollars does not automatically make education better, and certainly it does not spur people to the fullness of their genius. The hand of Government pressing down everywhere is more likely to demean the quality of life, including the precious quality of individual liberty.

We agree with the President that this Nation is strong enough to fight in Vietnam and do what is necessary at home. It is difficult to agree that all the proposed domestic spending is necessary, wise or effective. And there can be no guarantee of continued strength if the Government persists in indulging in the political pleasures of handouts and the exorbitant luxury of inflation.

RENEWAL OF THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, today marking the 83 years since the establishment of the Civil Service Commission, the Honorable John W. Gardner, Secre- of Health, Education, and Welfare, delivered an address on "The Renewal of the Government Service."

This excellent address commemorated the 83 years of the merit system service in the U.S. Government. It preceded the awards for distinguished service of Civil Service Commission employees.

Secretary Gardner emphasized that the duty of the career service was not only to search out the gifted young people of our schools and colleges for recruitment into Government service, but to continue their growth and education and qualifications after formal education ceases.

All organizations of our society today are competing desperately to get their share of the flow of talent—

Secretary Gardner said—

but few are developing that talent properly after they get it.

I commend this excellent speech to the attention of the Congress, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENEWAL OF THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

(By John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

We are here to commemorate an important beginning and to honor a fine tradition. The civil service is one of our noblest social institutions and I am proud to have a part in this tribute to it.

But I have learned from long experience that it is not really necessary to congratulate institutions. They have built-in mechanisms for self-congratulation that are marvelously effective. Having participated intimately in the life of Government agencies, the military services, business firms, and universities, I feel that I can make that generalization on the basis of fairly comprehensive experience.

So I am going to honor the civil service by talking about the goals ahead rather than the laurels already won.

First, let me clear away some general questions. Is the Federal Government bureaucratic? It is indeed. But so are business firms, colleges and universities, the military services, State and local governments, and philanthropic organizations.

Is the Federal Government in danger of going to seed? It is in the gravest danger. But so are all other organizations large and small.

I think most of you know my views on the decay and renewal of organizations.

Briefly, I believe that most human organizations that fail in their missions or fall short of their goals do so not because of stupidity, not because of faulty doctrines, but because of the internal decay and rigidification to which they are all subject. They get stiff in the joints. They get in a rut. They go to seed.

I know that many of you are familiar with my diagnosis of what brings that condition about. So I am going to limit myself today to a few brief comments on what I regard as the most important single line of therapy for moribund organizations.

Organizations go to seed when the people in them go to seed. And they awaken when the people awaken. The renewal of organizations and societies starts with people. And since the first and last business of the civil service is people, this seems an appropriate occasion to examine the problem.

Specifically, I want to talk about what the Federal Government does to develop talent—after recruitment. Recruitment itself is worthy of discussion, and there is a vastly better job to be done on that front, but that is not the problem that interests me at the moment.

As a society, we are pursuing energetically, almost feverishly, the identification and nurture of gifted young people in our schools and colleges. In contrast, we are quite haphazard about the provisions for their continuing growth after formal education ceases. Almost all organizations in our society today are competing desperately to get their share of the flow of talent. But few are developing that talent properly after they get it.

The still untapped source of human vitality, the real unmined reservoir of talent is in those people already recruited and thereafter neglected.

The quickest and most effective road to renewal of the Federal service is the mining of that untapped resource. It is not only a means of tapping unused talent and opening up new stores of vitality, it is a solution to the old, old problem of developing a government service that is responsive—responsibly responsive—to changing top leadership. Vital people, using their gifts to the full, are naturally responsive. People who have stopped growing, defeated people, people who no longer have confidence in the use of their own powers, build bastions of procedure between themselves and any vital leadership.

Now, how does one go about renewing the people in the Government service—or anywhere else for that matter? There are many sources of renewal, of course. One is the uninvited crisis. Wars and depressions bring a certain amount of renewal, though the price is far higher than sensible people are willing to pay.

Another source is challenge and competition, and in this respect our Constitution has built-in provisions for the renewal of elected officials. But appointive officials, not facing the challenge of an election, are denied that stimulus.

Another source of renewal is rapid growth. Very rapid expansion of an agency is apt to have a highly stimulating effect upon the people within it.

Still another source of renewal is the sheer vitality of top leadership. I think, for example, that President Johnson has been as vigorous, if not cyclonic, a force for renewal as we have seen in this Government.

But what about the more mundane things that good government administrators can do to renew their organizations? What about the good personnel practices and procedures that will insure renewal? I'm going to give you an oversimplified answer, but an oversimplification based on having observed the personnel field with a professional eye for 30 years.

I am going to assert that the best means of inducing growth, developing talent, and insuring continued vitality in the individual is change. The change may take many forms—a change of troubles, a change of assignment, promotion, living in different parts of the country, moving in and out of Government, sampling the different worlds that make up this society, serving abroad, serving in an organization that is itself rapidly changing.

It follows, I believe, that the single condition that would contribute most to greater vitality in the Government service today is flexibility of reassignment. In his state of the Union message, President Johnson pledged bold leadership to bring this about.

The size of the Federal Establishment and the diversity of activities it encompasses offer unexampled opportunities for imaginative reassignment. With such an array of possibilities it is unforgivable that any reasonably competent Government servant should suffer in a job that does not suit his talents.

It is unforgivable that any Government servant should lack the stimulus to personal growth that comes with change. The individual should be allowed to move and the agency should be allowed to move him without damage to his status or his feelings.

Free, frequent, and fluid movement among all the agencies of Government should be the accepted rule. The ambitious or merely restless young person who wants to sample several different lines of work should not be punished or penalized. Restlessness and vitality go together. And especially promising young people should be systematically reassigned through several agencies to insure their growth.

Beyond that there should be a great increase in the planned movement of individuals between the Federal Government and the other worlds that make up American life—the world of business, the military, the universities, the labor unions, agriculture, State and local government. I have moved in several of these worlds, and I am continually shocked at their mutual ignorance of one another. That ignorance breeds both complacency and paranoia. Each of these worlds imagines that it is uniquely close to the moral center of American life, and believes that the other worlds aren't really quite to be trusted with the American future.

Of all these worlds, the Government service has the least excuse for being provincial. It should have the capacity to understand all of the other segments of society. Without that understanding it will not be able to serve them effectively.

I would also favor an oversea assignment early in the career of those young Government people who seek to rise to the top. We have gotten past the day when only those individuals who have an explicit international interest should think of going overseas. The work of Government at home and abroad needs the breadth of perspective acquired by experience overseas. Such experience is valuable any time during one's career, but the earlier it comes the better.

All the processes of refreshment I've mentioned are particularly needed in the case of professional, scientific, technical, and scholarly people. Government needs such people more and more. But it will neither get them nor keep them if it doesn't provide the opportunities for further growth that they value so highly.

There is no excuse for Government to lose out in the competition for talent. It has a built-in advantage over every other employer. The cynics would deny this but the truth is that talented people are attracted to Government because it gives them an opportunity to render service to the entire Nation. They come with the highest motives. They leave when their purpose is thwarted or when they begin to feel trapped. Government cannot afford to be inhospitable to these people.

The administration of the affairs of this Nation is complex and dynamic. They are going to become increasingly so. The Congress has just enacted a staggering amount of legislation which must now be translated into action. It would be hard to overstate either the magnitude of the tasks ahead or their importance to the Nation.

President Johnson made this abundantly clear in his state of the Union message on Wednesday.

Now, let me ask these questions:

Is the Federal service capable of meeting this challenge? Of course, but to do so it must take some significant steps to renew its spirit and its people.

Is renewal compatible with the Federal merit system? It most certainly is. The merit system, now in its 83d year, represents a great advance in the personnel practices of government. We are not about to return to a spoils system.

But tenure was not designed to trap people, to make them inert. It was designed to free them from the capriciousness of politics. They need both the protection of a career system and opportunities for growth.

We can preserve all the great traditions of the system and still maintain the vitality that is so essential in this rapidly changing and infinitely challenging moment of history.

Recognizing that the very size and nature of the system make it particularly susceptible to stagnation, we can make special efforts to build in arrangements for renewal. Through some of the devices I have mentioned we can turn the concept of tenure into a positive asset rather than a deterrent to the full use of our talent.

The momentum generated by the President and the flood of legislation enacted by the Congress have given us unparalleled opportunities to create new patterns of work and to bring new strength and vitality to the career service.

I am optimistic that we will do so, and that optimism is based in no small measure on the fact that one of the boldest innovators in government today, John Macy, is also Chairman of this Commission.

John Macy introduced this session with some kind remarks about me and I want to end it with a tribute to him. I think he is a superb example of the best that the Federal service can produce, and I am proud to have shared this platform with him.

THE WAR ON WANT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, while Congress was out of session, an outstanding sermon was preached at the YWCA service in Washington Cathedral by the Reverend Dr. Elfan Rees, who is secretary of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, for the World Council of Churches, Geneva, Switzerland.

In discussing "The War on Want," a world problem, on November 14, Dr. Rees urged public understanding, public compassion and public support for the most liberal kind of governmental and intergovernmental action to prevent widening of the gap between the hungry and the overfed in the world.

He recalled the Chinese proverb:

> If you give a man a fish, you feed him for a day, but if you teach him how to fish, you feed him for a lifetime.

While we are teaching the hungry to fish, "how to plow deeper furrows, plant better seed and grow better harvests," he added, there is need to feed the hungry, just as parents feed their children while they are being educated.

I ask unanimous consent that this very pertinent sermon be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You know my text very well. It is the sentence from the Lord's Prayer: "Give us this day our daily bread." I know you all say the Lord's Prayer, but I don't suppose any one of you here has ever thought of saying it in the first person singular. My Father which art in Heaven, as though you were the only child of God. Forgive me my trespasses as though you couldn't care less about the sins of mankind. Lead me not into temptation, as though the pitfalls of life to other people were immaterial. Now, this is not a bright idea of mine. As long ago as 1400 the great Moravian reformer, Jan Huss, preached a sermon in which he accused his congregation of doing exactly that. And I was so fascinated by the idea, as one is by a snake, I tried it myself just for the hell of it. And it sounded like a prayer out of hell. And the more I said it the more I began to feel that I was separating myself from my family, from my community, and from mankind. And the words that stuck most in my gullet was when I said "give me this day my daily bread," as though it was immaterial what was on the table for my family—as though it mattered not that my neighbor next door was short of food—as though it mattered not that millions unknown to me were half starved. And then I remembered that one of the temptations of our Lord was that He should turn stones into bread. And He refused it because at that time it was only His personal hunger that mattered. But when later in His ministry He was told that thousands were hungry, you remember what He told His disciples? "Don't send them away. You give them something to eat." You know, as one who is too old and of the wrong sex to belong to the YW, one of the things that I'm sorry about your generation is that you have forgotten one of the great things of my generation. The four freedoms that were enunciated by Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill. Do you even remember them? Freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want. Even in those dark days of 1940 the specter of hunger was stalking the world. Today it is a much more material thing than a specter. The facts of life that happen around us today is that two-thirds of the world go to bed hungry every night. The privileged one-third, those of us who live in North America and Western Europe and Australia, we have 17 percent more food than we need. And the rest of the world has 24 percent less than is required to keep it reasonably healthy. Let me put this in a more vulgar fraction. In the United States of America in a day the average person eats 4½ pounds of food and very often looks like it. In Asia they eat 1¼ pounds of food a day, and 85 percent of that is rice. And in the big cities of India at this moment the rice ration has been cut by 50 percent. One-third of the world has to diet, two-thirds starve.

And the grim factor in this situation is that the hungry are multiplying the population far faster than the wise are increasing food production. During the course of this service the population of the world will increase by 5,000. By this time tomorrow it will have increased by 120,000. We anticipate 48 million more births than deaths in the next 12 months. You know, even in North America you have a sort of population explosion. Your population has increased 30 percent in the last 20 years. But during the same time your food production has increased by 50 percent. Why should you worry? You can use that unpleasant English phrase, "I'm alright, Jack." In Asia the population increase is also 30 percent, but the food production has increased only by 25 percent. Twenty years of technocracy, of technical assistance, of charity, of science, and the food consumption of the hungry is down by 8 percent. You would think, wouldn't you, that this staggesing problem of population explosion and the lag in food production would be one and indivisible. But that is not so in fact. While scientists and the United Nations are bending their energies to increase food production, far too many obstacles are being placed in the way of internationally planned family control. Let's be frank; too many of those obstacles are placed there by the Christian church or parts of it. And not until we who call ourselves Christians have greater unanimity and greater wisdom on this problem can we play our proper role in this tragic situation. Meanwhile, we can turn ourselves to what we can do for the hungry with what we have.

Five years ago the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations started a freedom-from-hunger campaign. Like anything else in the United Nations it had to begin with a resolution. Sometimes that's where things end as well. And I want to read you the preamble of this resolution. "Considering," it says, "that a large part of the world's population still doesn't have enough to eat and an even larger part doesn't get the right kind of food * * *." Now this isn't a resolution by a church synod; this is a resolution adopted by hard-bitten diplomats and specialists. The campaign has two aims. First, to create a worldwide awareness of hunger and malnutrition which apart from the human suffering and degradation that is involved pose a serious threat to peace. And second, to create a tribunal of opinion in which solutions can be organized. Much has been done. There are national freedom-from-hunger committees in so many countries. Much has been done by individual countries, none more than by the United States.

I don't know if you know of your Public Law 480, but millions of hungry people do. If I may give you just one example, the food provided under that law at this moment is feeding one-fifth of the total population of Bechuanaland, where they have had no rain for 3 years. Some of us are worried that the Public Law expires next year. Worried because far too many of you don't know it. And we hope and pray and believe that the U.S. people and Government will continue to look at world hunger compassionately and creatively. What was planned as a 5-year campaign has become a permanent campaign. It's a long-term job, but it is a long-term job charged with urgency. The gap between the hungry and the overfed has widened in those 5 years, not narrowed. It's urgent because the hungry can't afford to wait. And it is urgent because the world can't afford to wait.

Lord Boyd-Orr once said "hunger is the worst politician." And how right he is. If I wanted to preach communism it wouldn't be to you, it would be to the hungry. You can't digest Karl Marx on a full stomach. If I wanted to cause trouble in the world it would not be to you I would turn, but to the hungry. Hunger is the worst politician. There are two other things that most disturb me as a Christian. The one is that the mass of the hungry are, by and large, the so-called colored people. And the mass of the well-fed are, by and large, the white. And race relations, God knows, are bad enough without their being exacerbated by hunger. What's even more disturbing is that, by and large, the well-fed call themselves Christians. And, by and large, the hungry don't. And I find nothing in Holy Writ that links obesity with sanctity.

It has been said that every war is either a crime or a crusade. I'm talking to you about a crusade. The war on want. It is a world problem. It is a governmental and intergovernmental problem. We can't do it by private societies, collecting subscriptions. The effort of every one of the rich nations must be harnessed if we are to achieve victory. Only governments can do that and only they in concert. Aren't you relieved to hear that? So what? I'm not a government. But this, I say, neither precludes nor excuses the churches. God's purpose as revealed in Jesus Christ is to redeem the whole of human life. And if the church is to carry conviction that His Gospel is the only Gospel it must do so by showing that redemption is for the whole of human life and is offered by One who came not only that man might have life but have it more abundantly. And I am proud that there is so great a Christian response to this tragic need. In Germany, in Austria, in Switzerland, there are bread for my brother campaigns. Here in America, Church World Service and National Catholic Relief have been sending millions of tons of food to the hungry. And with your continuing compassionate help could send more. Again I say, it's clear that only massive international action can begin to solve the problem. But this depends for success on public understanding, public compassion, and public support. And if we can get understanding in the churches and in the Y's, we'll get compassion. I know it. And where there is compassion there will be a wave of public support for the most liberal kind of governmental and intergovernmental action. If this campaign has a philosophy it might be the old Chinese proverb "If you give a man a fish you feed him for a day, but if you teach him how to fish you feed him for a lifetime." And the main theme of this campaign is to teach the hungry how to fish if you like, how to plow deeper furrows, plant better seed and grow better harvests. It's education. But I need not remind you that while you are being educated your parents have to feed you. And every kind of emergency aid, the work of UNICEF, the work of the church agencies, the work of anybody who sends food to the hungry, helps to feed them while they're learning how to fish. And I am glad that not only member churches of the World Council of Churches, but the great Roman Catholic Church also, are committed to this campaign. Pope John the XXIII said of it, rightly and holily, "Beloved children, must we repeat and exalt the principle of human solidarity and remember and preach loudly the duty of those communities and individuals who live in plenty to reach out to those who live in want." I treasure all those phrases, but one I love most of all was when he says, "Preach loudly." I remember when I was an undergraduate I used to buy the gramophone records of some music-hall type who called himself Jack Smith, the Whispering Baritone. I have an uneasy feeling that our pulpits are filled with the Reverend John Smith, the whispering preacher. Preach and preach loudly so that we may be heard outside. Now one of the great privileges I have had in America is meeting many of my brother clergy who tell me that the pace of life in your country is so fast that apparently you all have tranquilizers for breakfast, and that their ministry consists almost entirely of comforting the disturbed. And I thank God it isn't mine. If I were to define my ministry just now, it's disturbing the comfortable, and nobody looks more comfortable than you do. Nicolas Berdaiev once said that "bread for oneself is a material preoccupation; that bread for others is a spiritual preoccupation." Give us this day our daily bread, not every other day as happens in some countries. And so I remind you again of our Lord's command. You give them something to eat. You remember the disciples replied, "We only have five loaves and two small fishes." You daren't give that answer. It wouldn't be true. But you do have an answer. It's the theme of your week. You give them something to eat. Yes, Lord.

SENATOR HARRIS HONORED

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a signal honor which has been awarded to one of our colleagues, Senator FRED R. HARRIS, the junior Senator from my home State of Oklahoma. He has been named by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce as one of the Nation's 10 outstanding young men in 1965, and has gone to St. Paul, Minn., for an awards congress scheduled Friday and Saturday.

I believe my colleagues on both sides of the aisle join me in congratulating the honored Senator from Oklahoma. Despite his youth—he is 35—he has made an excellent record since he won election in 1964 to serve out the last 2 years of the late Senator Robert S. Kerr's term. He not only has been a faithful Member, with an excellent attendance record, he has presided hour after hour with the patience we ask of new Members. He also has made an extensive study of Senate rules and procedure in carrying out what could have been a routine chore.

Those of you who have served on the Public Works or Government Operations Committees with him have learned what a hard and effective worker he is. The senior Senator from Arkansas, chairman of the latter group, has appointed him to the chairmanship of a new Special Subcommittee on Government Research. Under his vigorous leadership, I am sure we are going to learn a great deal about our national research effort with answers to such questions as where it is done, by whom, whether or not there is duplication, and whether or not its results are readily available.

FRED HARRIS's excellent first year record in the Senate undoubtedly had to do with his selection by the Jaycees. They probably also considered important the fact that a man, barely old enough to serve and making his first statewide race, won a runoff primary as well as a general election against impressive contenders.

Elevation to high office at a minimum age has happened before to the junior Senator from Oklahoma. He was elected to the State senate at the age of 25, a year and a half after his graduation from the University of Oklahoma Law School. He also has practiced law in Lawton, Okla., not far from his hometown of Walters, Okla.

I congratulate both Senator HARRIS and the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce for a wise selection.

U.S. POLICY AND ACTIONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, there are very few Members of Congress who have as clear an understanding of the history and the conflicting forces involved in the Vietnam war as has our colleague the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. I am glad to say "junior." It happens that, according to the calendar, he is one of the older Senators, but in accord with his activity and with his thinking, he is one of the youngest and most vigorous.

He was one of the very first of our statesmen to speak out repeatedly in opposition to the policy being pursued in Vietnam by the United States. Whether or not citizens agreed with his point of view, he has demonstrated outstanding leadership in helping to initiate a public debate on Vietnam, and our present policies in southeast Asia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on December 9, 1965, Senator GRUENING in a speech entitled "U.S. Policy and Actions in Vietnam," delivered at Harvard and Boston Universities, made a masterful and scholarly argument opposing our Nation's present policy in Vietnam. I commend this to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. POLICY AND ACTIONS IN VIETNAM

(Remarks of Senator ERNEST GRUENING delivered at Harvard and Boston Universities December 9, 1965)

I have been asked to address you on the subject of the U.S. policies and actions in Vietnam. As you know, for reasons which I will discuss in detail, I am not in agreement with those policies and actions.

Recently those who have publicly criticized those policies have come under increasing attack. This is a surprising development. I would assume that in this land of freedom, the right to speak out openly on behalf of peace would be taken for granted. I would consider it not only a right but a duty—an imperative duty.

As the St. Louis Post Dispatch—one of the Nation's finest newspapers—stated editorially on December 2:

"One of the striking things about the criticism of Vietnam policy is its persistent refusal to be silenced. We hope that continues to be the case. Every citizen shares the moral responsibility for his country's conduct. If he believes his country's conduct to be wrong, but fails to speak out, he is betraying his own obligations as a citizen. Just as public criticism of a no-negotiation policy brought about a policy of pro-negotiation, so criticism of mistaken objectives in Asia can bring about adoption of the right objectives. It is vital that discussion of the Nation's Asian objectives be free and vigorous."

Since the Bill of Rights, the first of the 10 amendments to the Constitution, prohibits the Congress, and by implication all other legislative and executive authorities in the Nation and State, from abridging freedom of speech, the burden of proof should rest heavily on any who would deny or seek to impair such freedom. I know of no right more precious or more inherent in our Nation's philosophy and its often reiterated professions.

But our Nation is now at war—an undeclared war, to be sure—and many of our fellow citizens hold the view that it is our duty as patriotic Americans to support the administration, which has assumed the responsibility for our course of action in southeast Asia, and is conducting the war. When our men are dying in combat deep passions are naturally aroused, the martial spirit becomes rampant, and dissent and protest become increasingly perilous.

Yet it is just at such a time that speaking out is more than ever essential.

Earlier this week I received a letter from a professor in a large western State university, asking me to come there and address the student body and faculty on Vietnam and related matters. I quote from his letter:

"We have had a small protest demonstration * * * and this has produced a most violent reaction which has assumed chilling proportions, creating a climate extremely unfavorable to rational discussion of these problems."

There in a brief sentence you have what is going on all over the country, and it emphasizes the need for presentation on both sides of the case for and aaginst the U.S. policies in southeast Asia, and our armed intervention there.

So, whatever the consequences, I agree with the Post-Dispatch editorial that he who dissents from his country's policy but fails to speak out, is indeed betraying his obligations as a citizen.

Clearly it is not easy to oppose the publicly expressed and reiterated declaration of policy and related action by the President of the United States, policies largely supported by the press—with some honorable and courageous exceptions—and in behalf of which the powerful machinery of Government is militantly mobilized.

Yet those who disagee with our national policy in this area can support President Johnson's statement in his April 27 news conference, which is pertinent to recall.

Asked: "Mr. President, do you think any of the participants in the national discussion on Vietnam could appropriately be likened to the appeasers of 25 or 30 years ago?"

He replied: "I don't believe in characterizing people with labels. I think you do a great disservice when you engage in name calling. We want honest, forthright discussion in this country, and that will be discussion with differences of views, and we welcome what our friends have to say, whether they agree with us or not. I would not want to label people who agree with me or disagree with me."

It is not a secret that I have been one of those who have disagreed. I began voicing my disagreement in a full-length speech on the floor of the Senate on March 10, 1964, just 21 months ago. It was entitled: "The United States Should Get Out of Vietnam." That was before our country had committed a single soldier to combat, or dropped a bomb. It would have been far easier to negotiate an honorable settlement at that time and to obviate much of the slaughter and all else that has happened since and the grim prospect that now lies before us.

Among the imperative reasons for full public discussion and disclosure is because, in my view, the justification for the course which has now so deeply and tragically involved our country in Vietnam and in southeast Asia, with apparently only a prospect for further and deeper involvement, is that the basis—the alleged basis—as I have studied it differs very materially from the actual historic record. And it is not possible realistically to appraise what should have been our course of action and what it should be now and in the future without a presentation of that other side of how we got into this mess.

During World War II the French colony of Indochina was overrun by the Japanese. Fighting to liberate this area were Vietnamese and the Allied Forces at war with Japan. The native aspirations—part of the worldwide revolt against foreign domination, against colonialism—were for independence. But the French wanted to regain their colonial possessions. Because of the fear that Communist China would take over this area, the Eisenhower administration was urged to assist the French in reconquering their former colony. Certain voices in the United States urged all-out military assistance. Others advised against it. President Eisenhower declined to send our troops into combat to aid the French although we did give the French substantial financial assistance and some cooperation in military training through a military mission established in Saigon. But lacking this all-out support, the French were defeated by the local forces, the Vietminh, suffering staggering losses and surrender at Dienbienphu.

In consequence, there was a meeting at Geneva of representatives of 14 nations, where accords were drawn up which provided that 3 new nations should be born out of the former French colony—namely Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. The accords provided that Vietnam was to be temporarily—but only temporarily—divided into North and South Vietnam for reasons of demobilization, but that within 2 years an election would be held to choose the officials who would govern the reunited Vietnamese.

The United States was in South Vietnam with its military mission at Saigon, and with the political demise of the French, was in charge. It was the United States that brought Ngo Dien Diem back from monastic life in the United States, was installed by us as President of the Cabinet and in a subsequent plebiscite backed him against the playboy Emperor Bao Dai.

Now we come to what I consider the pertinent part of the history of U.S. involvement.

The United States did not sign the Geneva Accords but it expressed support of them in a unilateral statement.

This statement by Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith, dated July 21, 1954, was declared by him to be a unilateral declaration of U.S. position in these matters, and it stated:

"The Government of the United States being resolved to devote its efforts to the strengthening of peace in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations takes note of the agreements concluded at Geneva on July 20 and 21, 1954."

The statement declared its support of paragraphs 1–12 inclusive of the Geneva agreements and that "it will refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb them in accordance with article 2(4) of the Charter of the United Nations dealing with the obligation of members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force," and second it "would view any renewal of the aggression in violation with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security.

"In connection with the statement in the declaration concerning free elections in Vietnam my Government wishes to make clear its position which it has expressed in a declaration made in Washington on June 29, 1954, as follows: 'In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted fairly.'

"With respect to the statement made by the representative of the State of Vietnam, the United States reiterates its traditional position that peoples are entitled to determine their own future and that it will not join in an arrangement which would hinder this. Nothing in its declaration just made is intended to or does indicate any departure from this traditional position.

"We share the hope that the agreements will permit Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam to play their part, in full independence and sovereignty, in the peaceful community of nations, and will enable the peoples of that area to determine their own future."

You will note that in this declaration by the United States, we speak only of Vietnam, not of South Vietnam or North Vietnam, but Vietnam, and we reiterate our traditional position that its people are entitled to determine their own future.

On the same day, July 21, 1954, President Eisenhower issued a statement confirming Under Secretary Bedell Smith's declarations.

Now the official justification for our subsequent and present military involvement there and our steadily increasing involvement in South Vietnam was stated as follows:

In the state of the Union message in January 1965, President Johnson said: "We are there, first, because a friendly nation has asked us for help against Communist aggression. Ten years ago we pledged our help. Three Presidents have supported that pledge. We will not break it.

He elaborated on this statement in his Johns Hopkins speech on April 7, 1965, saying:

"Why are we in South Vietnam?

"We are there because we have a promise to keep. Since 1954 every American President has offered support to the people of South Vietnam. We have helped to build, and we have helped to defend. Thus, over many years, we have made a national pledge to help South Vietnam defend its independence.

"I intend to keep that promise. To dishonor that pledge * * * would be an unforgivable wrong."

Now let us go back and see what that first pledge was—the pledge by the first of the three Presidents President Johnson refers to, namely President Eisenhower.

It was contained in a letter to President Diem as President of the Council of Ministers of Vietnam on October 23, 1954. I will read it.

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have been following with great interest the course of developments in Vietnam, particularly since the conclusion of the conference at Geneva. The implications of the agreement concerning Vietnam have caused grave concern regarding the future of a country temporarily divided by an artificial military grouping weakened by a long and exhausting war and faced with enemies without and by their subversive collaborators within.

"Your recent requests for aid to assist in the formidable project of the movement of several hundred thousand loyal Vietnamese citizens away from areas which are passing under a de facto rule and political ideology which they abhor, are being fulfilled. I am glad that the United States is able to assist in this humanitarian effort."

You will note that what I shall read now, which follows those first two paragraphs of President Eisenhower's letter to Diem, says nothing about a further request by President Diem for assistance. The only request of record was limited to assistance in moving several hundred thousand Vietnamese from the north to the south. There is nothing to indicate that Diem was asking and that President Eisenhower was responding to a request "for help against Communist aggression."

I now resume the quoting of Eisenhower's letter:

"We have been exploring ways and means to permit our aid to Vietnam to be more effective and to make a greater contribution to the welfare and stability of the Government of Vietnam. I am, accordingly, instructing the American Ambassador to Vietnam to examine with you, in your capacity as Chief of Government, how an intelligent program of American aid given directly to your Government can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial, provided that your Government is prepared to give assurances as to the standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid were supplied."

Consider now this language. "We", namely, the Government of the United States, "have been exploring ways and means" of aiding Vietnam. But that aid is to be given only "provided that your Government is prepared to give assurances as to standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid were supplied."

Now to continue President Eisenhower's letter:

"The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. The Government of the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the Government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms."

I continue to quote from President Eisenhower's letter:

"It (namely the Government of the United States) hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government. Such a government would, I hope, be so responsive to the nationalist aspirations of its people, so enlightened in purpose and effective in performance, that it will be respected both at home and abroad and discourage any who might wish to impose a foreign ideology on your free people."

So here we have a third precondition for U.S. aid. The Viet Government was to be a government respected both at home and abroad. We know how responsive it was to the aspirations of its people, how enlightened its purpose, how much respected at home—since a civil war broke out against it. And it was not respected abroad, as evidenced by the fact that Ambassador Lodge supported the removal of Diem and the Nhus. Of course, those conditions prescribed by President Eisenhower were not fulfilled by the Diem regime. But in any event nothing was said about sending in our troops. There was no promise or pledge of military aid.

This is further confirmed by a White House statement of November 3, 1954, which states that President Eisenhower had instructed Gen. J. Lawton Collins as his special representative "to explore" with President Diem and his government how "to help them with their critical problems and to supplement measures adopted by the Vietnamese themselves." Again, no mention of any request by Diem for that aid. Had there been, it is hardly likely that such a request would not have been mentioned. That is why I believe that we asked ourselves in. The most that was implied was economic aid which was given, and President Eisenhower himself declared a few months ago that he had only offered economic aid. During the remaining 6 years of the Eisenhower administration, we had a military mission which did not exceed some 600 officers and men; not one of these were engaging in combat, no American lives were risked or lost during that period. So much for the first of the three Presidents.

Now we come to the second President, John F. Kennedy, who was persuaded by his Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, to escalate our commitment to the extent of sending military advisers whose number rose before the end of his Presidency to some 15,000. But as late as September 2, 1963, less than 3 months before his death, in an interview with CBS newscaster, Walter Cronkite, President Kennedy said: "I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the Government to win popular support that the war can be won out there."

So, President Kennedy had reached the conclusion that Diem had not fulfilled Eisenhower's conditions although he had had 9 years to do so from 1954 to 1963. And then President Kennedy goes on to say: "In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists. We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort, and, in my opinion, in the last 2 months the Government has gotten out of touch with the people."

I believe this record shows that we did not make a solemn pledge to support that Government. And in any event that Government ceased to exist after its failure was manifest. One of the reasons why civil war broke out against Diem in addition to his own oppressive tactics of jailing hundreds of people without trial, some of them being tortured in prison, was the repudiation of the provision to hold general elections in July 1956. This was the most basic item in the Geneva Accord and you will recall our unilateral commitment to it by Walter Bedell Smith, Under Secretary of State, when he stated:

"In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections."

Yet, the United States, which dominated the situation of South Vietnam, approved and ratified that Government's refusal to hold the elections. We and they refused to hold them for the reason, frankly stated, that it was felt that Ho Chi Minh would be elected President. But what principles are we espousing when we agree to go to an election and then call it off because we feel we are going to lose it? That is the unquestionable record on this issue. How do we square that with our national conscience and a tradition that would be inviolate under our standards?

Now, some deny that this is a civil war and one of the partial myths on which we base our actions is that the whole trouble stems from aggression from Hanoi. Well, no one could have been better informed on this issue than John F. Kennedy who was in the Senate since 1953 and who, in his news conference of July 18, 1963, referred to "the civil war which has gone on for 10 years."

Chapter 3, article 16, of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities provides: "With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the introduction into Vietnam of any troop reinforcements and additional military personnel is prohibited."

And further: "With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the introduction into Vietnam of any reinforcements in the form of all types of arms, munitions and other war materiel, such as combat aircraft, naval craft, pieces of ordnance, jet engines and jet weapons and armoured vehicles, is prohibited."

The Geneva agreement provided for an International Commission to supervise the carrying out of the Geneva Accord and to see that its provisions were carried out in Vietnam. The Commission consisted of three representatives, one from Canada, one from India, and one from Poland. They made various reports which indicated increasing violations of the agreements by both parties. When one reads them objectively one gains the impression that the violations by the South Vietnamese under U.S. tutelage were far more serious and far more extensive. A special report by the Commission in paragraph 12 states:

"Since December 1961 the Commission's teams in South Vietnam have been persistently denied the right to control and inspect, which are part of their mandatory tasks. Thus, these teams, though they were able to observe the steady and continuous arrival of war materiel, including aircraft carriers with helicopters onboard, were unable, in view of the denial of controls, to determine precisely the quantum and nature of war materiel unloaded and introduced into South Vietnam."

And it continues in paragraph 17:

"As the Commission has been denied mandatory controls, as pointed out earlier in paragraph 12 above, it has not been able to make a precise assessment of the number of military personnel and the quantum of war materiel brought in. However, from December 3, 1961, up to May 5, 1962, the Commission's teams have controlled the entry of 72 military personnel, and observed but not controlled 173 military personnel, 62 helicopters, 6 reconnaissance aircraft, 5 jet aircraft, 57 fighters/fighter bombers, 25 transport aircraft, 26 unspecified types of aircraft, 102 jeeps, 8 tractors, 8 105-mm. howitzers, 3 armoured carriers (tracked), 29 armoured fighting vehicle trailers, 404 other trailers, and radar equipment and crates, 5 warships, 9 LST's (including 4 visiting LST's), 3 LCT's, 5 visiting aircraft carriers and spares of various kinds."

In the case of North Vietnam, the Commission (the Polish delegate dissenting, which is not surprising since he represented a country behind the Iron Curtain) concluded that "in specific instances there was evidence to show that armed and unarmed personnel, arms and other supplies had been sent from the North to the South with the purpose of supporting, organizing and carrying out hostile activities including armed attacks, directed against the armed forces and administration of the zone in the south. These activities are in violation of articles 10, 19, 24, and 27 of the agreement of cessation of hostilities in Vietnam."

Obviously, both sides, North and South, were violating the Geneva agreement. It would appear that those of the South were far larger and they had the support and approval of the United States. The violations on both sides were charged by the Canadian and Indian representatives who may well be credited with impartiality. The Polish delegate, whose report may not be accepted as unbiased, refused to join in the indictment of the charges against North Vietnam but joined with his colleagues against those of the South.

We now come to further U.S. violations. The United States is a signatory to the United Nations Charter. In fact, the United States was largely instrumental in creating the United Nations.

Article 2, of chapter 1, paragraph 4, provides:

"1. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

Article 33 of chapter 6, provides:

"1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice."

Now you notice that this article does not say that they may do this but that they shall do it, and lists eight alternative methods which should be used "first of all." Now we may well ask, did we, the United States, when there were violations of the Geneva agreements, seek a solution by negotiations? We did not. Did we seek a solution by inquiry? We did not. Did we seek a solution by mediation? We did not. Did we seek a solution by conciliation? We did not. Did we seek a solution by arbitration? We did not. Did we seek a solution by judicial settlement? We did not. Did we seek a solution by resorting to regional agencies or arrangements? We did not. Or did we seek a solution by "other peaceful means of our (their) own choice?" We did not.

One of the "regional agencies or arrangements" whose aid we might have invoked for a peaceful solution was the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization which was created at the instance and by the leadership of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and whose signatories were the United States, Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, The Philippines, Thailand and the United Kingdom. It reaffirms in article I the agreement to settle international disputes by peaceful means and, to quote it exactly:

"The parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

Thus having used force the United States was also violating the SEATO treaty. I have spoken of the violation of article 2, paragraph 4, chapter 1 (which was specifically mentioned by Under Secretary Walter Bedell Smith's declaration of U.S. policy which we would adhere to), and the violation of article 33, chapter 6, of the United Nations Charter that provides for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. Another violation was that of article 37 which provides that if parties to a dispute of the matter referred to in article 33, fail to settle it by the means indicated in that article they shall refer it to the Security Council. Again not "may" but "shall." The United States has not done that.

So when those in authority in Washington speak of "a national pledge" as a justification for our course of action in Vietnam, I find it difficult not to contrast that dubious conditional, qualified, tentative offer of help to a vanished South Vietnamese Chief of State—who did not fulfill the conditions—with our violation of the unqualified treaty commitments, of which there could be no more solemn category—the United Nations Charter, the Southeast Asia Treaty, and the violations of the unilateral statement by Under Secretary Walter Bedell Smith, reiterated on the same day by President Eisenhower, that we would support Vietnam supervised elections in 1956.

To review briefly what has happened in the Congress: In August of 1964 it was reported that two, or possibly three, PT boats had attacked our 7th Fleet in the Tonkin Gulf. But if, as reported (although it is questionable whether the full facts have been revealed to the American people), this was an act of aggression—although perhaps as unimportant as an attack by a 14-year-old boy with a beanshooter against Cassius Clay—the President was wholly within his rights to order a retaliatory attack by airplanes from the fleet on the base from which these PT boats emerged. However, the next day a resolution drafted in the White House was submitted to the Congress not merely approving everything that had been done before in southeast Asia, but giving the President unlimited power in his own discretion to use the Armed Forces of the United States anywhere in southeast Asia. It passed the House unanimously and in the Senate there were two opposing votes—those of Senator Wayne Morse and mine. I could not justify giving the President this unlimited, unrestricted power out of which our steadily escalating military commitment stems. For one thing the Constitution of the United States is specific that only Congress can declare war. We are now at war, and in my judgment, and that of Wayne Morse, who is a constitutional lawyer, we are thereby in violation of the Constitution.

In February last we started bombing North Vietnam. The justification for this drastic change of policy was that there had been an attack on one of our outposts at Pleiku. Pleiku is about 200 miles south of the 17th parallel, the boundary between North and South Vietnam. At night a group of Vietcong passed through the lines of the South Vietnamese troops who were either too inert or uninterested to alert our men in the barracks. The Vietcong opened fire with a mortar of American make, which they had apparently secured from the South Vietnamese forces, and killed 8 American soldiers. There was no direct relation between this incident and North Vietnamese infiltration, but it was made the justification for the bombing which has now continued for 10 months with no appreciable result. It appears rather to have hardened the determination of the North Vietnamese to continue what they have been doing and rather to increase their aid to the South Vietnamese National Army of Liberation.

Last May the President sent to the Congress an appropriation request of $700 million to conduct this undeclared war in Vietnam. President Johnson frankly stated that this request was being made not because moneys were needed to supply our Armed Forces in Vietnam, for he could transfer money needed from other sources, but rather as a vehicle to secure additional congressional approval of his carrying on the undeclared war in Vietnam and anywhere else in southeast Asia that he saw fit. This the President made clear at the outset of his message, when he stated: "This is not a routine appropriation. For each Member of Congress who supports this request is also voting to persist in our effort to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam. Each is saying that the Congress and the President stand united before the world in joint determination that the independence of South Vietnam shall be preserved and Communist attack will not succeed."

Since this money was not needed and was to be used merely as a symbol of support for our policy, I found myself unable to vote for it, as likewise did Wayne Morse, and we were joined by another Senator, Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin. In the House, seven Members voted against it.

Going from these factual presentations to the realm of personal opinion, it is my deep-seated belief that we made a very serious mistake in getting involved militarily because first, in my view, nothing that happens in South Vietnam jeopardizes the security of the United States. And even if it did so there is a question of whether that would justify our invading Vietnam and bombing it any more than we can justify the seizure by Stalin of the formerly independent countries surrounding Russia—Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary—on the grounds that their control was essential to the security of Soviet Russia. Nor do I subscribe to the domino theory which is that had we not gone in, these nations of southeast Asia would have fallen into the hands of the Communist Chinese. And then we are told in sequent flights of fancy that after southeast Asia the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand would fall and we would have to be fighting the Communists on the beaches of California. That to me is errant nonsense. Certainly our control of the Pacific by sea and air renders that absurd. Moreover I am not a pacifist and I do not like and am utterly opposed to the advance of totalitarianism anywhere. If a situation should arise whereby a free government such as that of Australia or New Zealand were threatened by attack and invasion by the forces of imperial communism and there was a request from those governments for our aid, I would be for giving that aid without stint or limit. The situation in South Vietnam is quite different. I am confident, and this is further in the realm of opinion, that had we stayed out entirely we would have three independent countries formed out of French Indochina, that they would have installed their own social and political ideology, which they would have had every right to do, and that a united Vietnam would have adopted communism as its social and economic system. But it would have been a Communist regime independent of Peiping and there is evidence that many non-Communists are enlisted in the civil war against the South Vietnam Government. The history of Vietnam shows conclusively their people's dislike and fear of the Chinese, and their war is largely motivated by a desire to get rid of all foreign rule. They want independence, and that should be a cause that ought to appeal to Americans. They did not want the French in. They did not want the Chinese, and I doubt whether a majority want us in. In Europe, to achieve a corresponding situation, namely in Yugoslavia, a Communist state independent of Moscow, the United States invested $2 billion in aid for Tito, and our policy makers considered that, and now consider it, a sound and profitable investment.

I need not detain you longer to point out what has happened and what is happening. I consider our bombing of North Vietnam totally without justification morally, legally, or otherwise. It is the sort of thing we condemned scathingly when done by totalitarian powers in past years; and as we have seen now after 10 months of such bombing, it has merely stiffened the resistance of those whom we are fighting. We are getting in deeper and deeper; not only are our casualty lists growing, but the toll of not merely those fighting but of civilian noncombatants mounts daily. It is my reasoned view that in our effort to stop the advance of imperialist communism, we are actually aiding it. So far, at least, the situation must be to the liking of the Communist rulers of China, for to date they have not committed a single soldier to this war. And yet there we are—a great Western Power, the greatest in the world—engaging in a desperate, bitter, and horrible struggle on the continent of Asia with a small Asiatic nation, sacrificing the lives of our youth and spending billions of dollars.

The situation is different even from that of Korea. First, there was overt aggression from the North there. Second, we were there under a United Nations mandate. Third, the South Koreans wanted to fight. These factors are not present, at least not in the same degree, in Vietnam. There was no overt initial aggression from the North at the start. There has been infiltration, subsequent infiltration, but paralleling the U.S. support of South Vietnam, and at least not appreciably until our and Diem's refusal to hold elections. The United States went in unilaterally and until very recently, and only in response to great pressure from us, we had little support from our SEATO allies—none from Pakistan, none (to speak of) from Britain, none from France, and when administration spokesmen cite the total number of nations that are allegedly with us—in a kind of numbers game—we find that they have come in late and largely with only token assistance. In the November 29 issue of Newsweek there was a little item in its Periscope column entitled "Spain Lends a Hand" which reads: "Spain is the latest country to lend a hand in Vietnam. After much prodding from L.B.J., the Franco government hopes to ship in four ambulances with medical crews. Actually the ambulances will have little significance (the helicopters do their work now) but the medics are wanted and the Spanish contingent will be welcomed as evidence of support for the United States and Saigon."

When I was in South America last January I found that every American Ambassador had received orders to go to the President of the country to which he was accredited to request support for our efforts in Vietnam. Many of them were reluctant to do this and in many cases their pleas were unheeded, while in others there was the same kind of token compliance which we now see we have coming from Spain. These countries are all recipients of lavish American aid and the United States is, in effect, paying for these tokens and is in a position to apply pressure.

I could only wish there could be a ready and quick answer to and a way out of the tragic dilemma that the President, his advisers, and the people of the United States find themselves in. We are now so deeply committed that a way out is extremely difficult to find. There have been numerous suggestions made and we should explore them all actively. Our so-called unconditional discussions are not unconditional as long as we do not firmly pledge willingness to negotiate also with the people who are doing the fighting, the National Liberation Front, or Vietcong; guarantee the carrying out of the general agreements to which we once pledged support, namely supervised elections in all Vietnam, but whose violation we approved, and make every effort for a cease fire and simultaneous phasing out of the combatants of both sides. Unless we make such modifications in our attempts at negotiation and stop the bombing of North Vietnam—because no people will yield under those circumstances—this senseless war will go on and get steadily more disastrous.

What the United States should do—in sum—is to return to the rule of law. We should have invoked the United Nations at the very beginning when we felt that treaty commitments were violated and we have not used the United Nations as we should have.

In this connection, the disclosures by Adlai Stevenson to Eric Sevareid, which appeared in the November 30 issue of Look magazine, that both McNamara and Rusk turned a deaf ear to the efforts of U Thant to secure negotiations which were then possible, are very disturbing.

Because I strongly value adherence to law, I cannot approve the action of a few of our draftees in burning up their draft cards. They are in violation of the law and must take the consequences, however one may sympathize with their feelings that we should never have been in Vietnam and that what we are doing there is morally wrong and self-defeating. But peaceful protests and freedom of speech should remain inviolate and we should continue to urge almost any sensible solution that would put an end to the killing. It would be much better than the dark prospect of more and more slaughter which lies ahead and which ultimately, in my judgment, will result in a solution which could have been achieved bloodlessly a few years ago. The sad fact is that we cannot win this war. When I say "win" I do not necessarily mean that in a strict military sense. If we continue to pour troops into southeast Asia, blast its villages from the air with bombs and napalm, kill more tens of thousands, we may in time impose a military domination, although even that is by no means certain. But even if we did, what then? Sooner or later the problems of Asia will be settled by Asians, as they should be. We should have learned that the white man cannot settle them for the Asians. We will be told that there are some Asians fighting on our side, as in the case of the Koreans, but they are beholden to us, and in general, it appears to me that we have very little spontaneous enthusiastic support from almost any source.

I cannot conceive that it is desirable or wise for us to throw our young men into every cockpit in the world where Communist totalitarianism rears its ugly head. And why should we assume the role of self-appointed "citizen fixit," of world policemen, all over the globe? If the cause is sufficiently good and urgent, an approach should always be made under the United Nations on a basis of international legality and with the support, from the very beginning, of others who believe that freedom is truly at stake and that those for whom we fight also know and value freedom and are prepared to do their share. This is far from the reality in Vietnam.

There are still other impending grave casualties of our military plunge into the quagmire of southeast Asia. To date over 1,500 fine young Americans have been killed in action. Several hundred more have died in noncombat fatalities. Ten thousand have been wounded, many crippled for life, and that ghastly toll is just beginning. Meanwhile, the great achievements on the domestic front of President Johnson and the 89th Congress in its 1st session—and they were great—will be largely nullified. They will be nullified just as their implementation was to begin. The inspiring vision of the "Great Society" will be blurred if not blacked out. There will not be the means both for the construction of that society at home and the destruction of war abroad. Most tragic of all, apart from the human sacrifices and the blighting of countless homes, is the fading of the national image of our beloved country, of which, despite some of its failings, we have had every right to be proud, to cherish, and to wish to maintain.

I can only express the fervent hope that we can, somehow, soon, call a halt before that image and that vision of this great land become a memory. Let us all do our utmost to bring that about.

PROXMIRE POSTMASTER BILL SUPPORTED BY ARTHUR D. LITTLE, EFFICIENCY EXPERT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last year I introduced legislation which would place postmasters' appointments under the civil service system. At that time I pointed out that the present system of political patronage injured post office employee morale. Postal employees are forbidden by Federal law to participate in the very political activities that are essential under the patronage system if they are to get a postmastership. I also indicated that patronage matters of this kind tie up valuable staff personnel. They create dissension in State and local parties. For every party worker who is a successful postmaster appointee, there are 5 or 10 who are disappointed and resentful.

The distinguished management consultant firm of Arthur D. Little has recently cited the present postmaster appointment system as an example of time wasted "on nonpolicy business by Congress that could be saved without significant political cost or effect." This conclusion was included within a management study of the Congress commissioned by NBC News in connection with its special report "Congress Needs Help."

The specific language of the Arthur D. Little report states:

> The time spent on postmaster and service academy appointments serves little useful purpose. Some 21,000 postmaster appointments and all appointments to the military academies clear through congressional offices. These appointments * * * are an avoidable distraction. In the judgment of many Congressmen, the political values of this time-honored custom are not commensurate with the amount of time it takes.

I agree with the report's comments. I hope that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will schedule early hearings on my proposal, S. 252, in the coming year.

CHURCH CONCERN FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on November 12, 1965, the board of directors of the Council of Churches of Greater Washington passed two resolutions which I deeply hope the Senate heeds in carrying out its duties and responsibilities to the citizens of the District of Columbia and the Nation at large during the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

The first resolution expresses the council's support for appropriations to implement the rent supplement program authorized by Congress last year as part of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. As a member of the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I am particularly aware of the long hours spent in committee and in conference on this legislation. All of my colleagues in the Senate remember the thorough floor debate conducted on the measure. Yet the rent supplement program will simply be a frustrating monument to legislative inefficiency if, after these many hours and days of work, we do not appropriate the money to initiate the program.

The second resolution expresses the hope that the site of the National Training School for Boys will be used for low- and middle-income housing. As many of my colleagues know, this site has been prominently mentioned for a proposed new Government Printing Office. In fact it was put forward by the Government Printing Office a matter of weeks after Bolling Field was ruled off limits for a new printing plant.

Mr. President, as a member of the Legislative Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee I had an opportunity to explore the GPO's justification for its new $49 million white elephant. Even were the proposed location for this building submarginal land, I would question the wisdom of approving such an undertaking. But when the land could and should be used to house the victims of slum dwellings in our Nation's Capital I believe it would be criminal to build a sprawling printing office there.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these resolutions printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RENT SUPPLEMENT

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has adopted rent supplements as part of the Nation's total attack on the housing problem; and

Whereas the Congress has not approved the necessary financial appropriations to fund the rent supplement program; and

Whereas leaders of private enterprise, social welfare, and labor support the rent supplement program: Now, be it therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Council of Churches of Greater Washington urges upon the Congress that it approve the appropriations requested by the President of the United States for this program; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Council of Churches of Greater Washington calls upon the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, and its pertinent commissions and divisions, to lead the churches of the Nation in a program of action in support of the rent supplement program.

NATIONAL TRAINING SCHOOL SITE AND HOUSING

Whereas housing for low- and middle-income families is one of the greatest needs in the District of Columbia and Metropolitan Washington; and

Whereas approximately 110,000 persons in the District of Columbia live in overcrowded housing, and more than 5,000 families are on the waiting list of the National Capital Housing Authority for public housing; and

Whereas land for low- and middle-income housing is not readily available in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the site of the National Training School for Boys is soon to be vacated; and

Whereas the National Capital Planning Commission is faced with the opportunity of making a crucial decision on the future use of the site of the National Training School for Boys; and

Whereas a compromise proposal has been advanced to secure a large section of the National Training School site for use by the U.S. Government Printing Office; and

Whereas the U.S. Government Printing Office can be continued, with expanded facilities, where it is now located, or can be located elsewhere than on the site of the National Training School for Boys: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Council of Churches of Greater Washington (a) reaffirm its previous recommendation to the National Capital Planning Commission that the site of the National Training School for Boys be used "for a planned residential community emphasizing housing for low- and middle-income families"; (b) develop a campaign of public education and action, in cooperation with other groups, on this matter; and (c) urge the churches of Metropolitan Washington to support this position.

VAST IMPROVEMENT IN ECONOMIC STATISTICS WELL WORTH PRICE TO TAXPAYERS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Dr. Otto Eckstein is recognized as one of the most brilliant economists in the country. A distinguished Harvard professor, Dr. Eckstein has just completed a tour of service on the President's Council of Economic Advisers as one of the three top economic advisers to President Johnson.

On October 28, 1965, Dr. Eckstein addressed the annual meeting of the Federal Statistics Users' Conference. In this address, Dr. Eckstein spells out the immense contribution, the remarkable improvement in economic statistics in recent years makes to our present economic policymaking.

At a time when Government economic policy is being honored and praised as never before—thanks to our remarkably prolonged prosperity—the part played by this vast improvement in statistics—the economic intelligence on which all policy is based—should not be forgotten.

Mr. President, in view of the necessity that the Congress and the country appreciate the importance of paying the price to improve these statistics, I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Eckstein's remarks printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INFORMATION BASE FOR PROSPERITY

(Remarks by Otto Eckstein, member, Council of Economic Advisers, at the annual meeting, Federal Statistics Users' Conference, Washington, D.C., October 28, 1965)

Fellow users of Federal statistics, people poke fun at statistics. You do need to keep your sense of humor about them. And that is a lot easier to do when the figures are going well. But I am going to try to be serious about our statistics tonight, to tell you why I think they are essential to our economic progress.

The Council of Economic Advisers is not one of the official members of the Federal Statistics Users' Conference. But let me assure you that we share your concerns. Without the steady flow of information that comes to us every day, our job of advising the President on economic policy would be quite impossible. Indeed, we take our information system so for granted that we tend to forget just how far we have come in such a short time and how completely we have become dependent on that system for private and public decisionmaking in this economy.

ADVANCES IN STATISTICS

Let's go back 65 years, to the turn of the century. What was in the Statistical Abstract back then, when it was published by the Statistics Bureau of the Treasury Department? In 1900, the Statistical Abstract included series on Federal Government receipts and expenditures; money supply and banking system balance sheet data; imports and exports by country and commodity; rail and water transportation; commercial failures; wire and postal communications; and production and prices of major agricultural, mineral, and industrial commodities. There were as yet no summary price indexes, although preliminary work on wholesale price indexes had been going on for a few years and the index commenced in 1902. We did have some good population censuses and census of manufacturing every 10 years and there were private figures on stocks, interest rates, and particular industries. And BLS was already doing some special surveys of wages and employment.

I would not have wished to prepare the annual CEA forecast of the economy back in 1900.

Now let's move up 25 years to 1925. We had made progress by then. The Department of Labor was publishing wholesale and cost-of-living price indexes, as well as monthly estimates of employment and data on wages and hours in selected industries. The Department of Commerce was publishing seasonally corrected monthly statistics on production, stocks, and unfilled orders in various "basic" industries, and the Census of Manufactures was taken every 2 years. Many of the familiar monthly publications had been started by then including the Survey of Current Business, the Monthly Labor Review, and the Federal Reserve Bulletin.

Now let's go to 1945. That certainly is part of the modern era, and there were quite a few significant additions to the Federal statistical program. Perhaps the two most important were the monthly Report of the Labor Force, begun in 1940 as the first direct measure of unemployment, and the national income and product statistics, started in the thirties. There were no direct measures of unemployment all through the great depression, and even today the estimates for that period are based on the necessary hazardous system of taking the difference between estimates of employment and total labor force.

But we were still far short of what we have now. Today we have an input-output matrix, quarterly deflated GNP and its components, and many other elaborate statistics. Anticipations surveys of business and consumer intentions have become regular and carefully watched series.

The quality of these statistics has also improved greatly. The samples of the surveys are bigger and better. Seasonal correction is applied to most figures and the unadjusted figure is becoming almost a rarity in use. Concepts have been sharpened. Improved data processing is making the results available much more rapidly.

ADVANCES IN ECONOMIC POLICY

We have also come a long way in the goals we have set for ourselves and in the use of economic policy. We are now in the 56th month of expansion.

Our rate of growth of real output since the shallow trough of the last recession has been 5.3 percent a year; the gap between potential production and actual production has narrowed from $50 billion to less than $20 billion; unemployment is down to 4.4 percent; disposable personal income is up by $116 billion and consumption by $104 billion; profits after taxes are up by $20 billion and investment for plant and equipment by $22 billion.

Some people speak of this expansion as if it were a miracle. Others as if it were an ever-expanding bubble that is heading for its inevitable bursting. But to the technical analyst there is no miracle and no bubble, but rather a readily explained period of progress in which our economy was permitted to show the growth of which it was really capable.

The major difference between this expansion and those before it lies in the realm of policy, both public and private. The Federal Government fully appreciated the enormous influence which it exercises through its budget which absorbs over a fifth of all the purchasing power in the economy and returns a roughly similar amount through spending. In this expression the Federal budget did not withdraw an undue share of the growth of incomes, but rather acted as a mild stimulant to compensate for a demographic situation which somewhat dampened the buoyancy of private demands.

It was the tax cut of 1964 which really marked the arrival of the new era in economic policy. With the economy not in recession, but making little progress in closing the gap between actual and potential production, with the budget expected to be in deficit, the Government deliberately reduced tax rates to stimulate private purchasing power. The results are now well known. In the year and a half since the tax cut GNP in current dollars has risen by $73 billion (equivalent in constant dollars to a rate of 4.9 percent a year); disposable personal income is up by $57 billion; and consumption expenditures rose by $53 billion, maintaining the traditional relation between consumption and income; unemployment has fallen from 5.9 to 4.4 percent.

Since the tax cut, the growth of the economy has accelerated substantially. Equally important, the great gains of the last 2 years have accrued not only to those with the incomes to benefit directly from tax reduction, but to all segments of our society. The employment gains have come in a particularly favorable pattern from a social point of view.

In the last 24 months, employment of unskilled nonfarm workers rose by 7.6 percent, compared to a gain of 5.2 percent for the highly skilled (craftsmen and foremen). The incidence of poverty, defined as standard family income below $3,000, was reduced from 20 to 17½ percent from 1962 to 1964, and has clearly fallen again this year. Unemployment in the designated major depressed areas has fallen proportionately more than total unemployment, from 8 percent in July of 1963 to 5.2 percent this last July. And even the Federal budget itself has turned out to benefit from tax reduction. In the year after the tax reduction, in fiscal 1965, administrative budget revenues were higher by $3.5 billion than the year before, and the Federal deficit shrank from $8.2 to $3.5 billion.

THE INFORMATION BASE FOR THE EXPANSION

Economic policy in this expansion was predicated on an analysis and projection of the national income accounts. Other information was used as well, but the focal point, the organizing scheme, was the gross national product and its major components. Each year's projection of the gross national product accounts could be carried out by direct estimates of Government spending. Investment was projected by use of the several surveys of business investment intentions together with econometric approaches. Consumption could be estimated by the traditional consumption-income relationship, by separate analysis of auto sales, and by the analysis of the intentions surveys for consumer purchases. State and local government expenditures could be projected fairly accurately by extrapolating their growth at an annual rate of 8 to 9 percent which they followed since 1950. I think it is safe to say that we never did fully master the art of projecting inventory investment or net exports with any reasonable degree of precision. But with the solid evidence that we had, it was possible to chart the general progress of the economy a year ahead.

As each year went by, the quarterly figures for the gross national product accounts gave us good evidence on the economy's progress and permitted comparison of the projection with performance. To be sure, the initial gross national product figures sometimes are revised more drastically than we would wish. But all in all, these quarterly figures together with data on employment, industrial production, sales, orders, and inventories, hours and earnings, prices, money and credit, construction contracts, and other major indicators, have provided sufficient information to permit policy to be formulated in a reasonable, quantitative way. If our forecasts have not always been accurate, the fault has been as much ours as the data's.

THE OUTLOOK FOR THE ECONOMY

So much for the past. What about the future? How long can this expansion last? Everyone has a nagging suspicion that the inexorable workings of the business cycle will catch up with us sooner or later, that contraction must follow expansion. But that's not a really interesting proposition. The key question is when? Is the end of this expansion in sight? Or will you meet a year from now, still asking how long can it last?

I have no firm answer to that question, but I do know this. The hard statistical evidence that we have now at hand, and as you know there is a lot of it, suggests continued good progress. The early evidence on the outlook for fixed business investment next year is very good. Consumers appear to be as willing as ever to spend the traditional fraction of their rising incomes. And the Government budget can be expected to continue to be designed to sustain prosperity within the limits of our productive potential. The Council has not yet completed its first full-scale formal exercise of projection for 1966. We do not yet have the magic number for GNP for next year, and indeed we won't climb out on that limb until we have to do it in our annual report, which appears, by law, on January 20. But we do feel confident on present evidence that it is much the most reasonable expectation now that expansion will continue through all of 1966. And there is no reason now obvious why next year's expansion should not match this year's gain.

Nor does this expansion show any of the signs of tiredness which have characterized periods just prior to the peaks in previous expansions. The expansion of the last 5 years has not been accompanied by imbalances that might herald an early departure from sustained further expansion.

Our excellent price record of the past 5 years is not hard to understand. Output per manhour rose on the average by 3.2 percent a year in the period 1959–64, while compensation per manhour rose 3.5 percent a year. As a result, labor costs per unit of output were no higher in 1964 than in 1960; and the evidence suggests that average labor costs in 1965 will be no higher than in 1964. In the preceding 12 years, a period of substantially rising costs and prices, productivity rose by an average of 2.4 percent a year, and compensation per man-hour by 6 percent. We have not had cost pressure on prices this time.

On the demand side of the price equation, there is now little evidence of demand exceeding productive potential. Planned increases in Government spending for Vietnam buildup will add to demand in 1966, but sharply higher payroll taxes starting in January will work in the opposite direction. Overall fiscal policy will make full allowance for these factors.

INFORMATION BASE FOR BALANCED AND SUSTAINED EXPANSION IN PROSPERITY

With unemployment down to 4.4 percent and the operating rates of industry continuing to be close to 90 percent, the task and challenge of policy takes on some new perspectives. As long as the central problem of policy was to stimulate demand to close the gap between actual and potential production, global measures and projections were generally sufficient to chart our course. Some gap between production and capacity remains. Unemployment at 4.4 percent is not full employment. But the margins have narrowed. We are entering a new environment, and we must reshape our thinking accordingly.

We will need new information if we are to thread our way successfully. Let me indicate to you some of the challenges of this new environment and some of the new needs for information.

First, we must learn to live with balanced, high-level expansion. We must become accustomed to sustained periods in which our industry operates at 90 percent or even a bit higher. We must become accustomed to high rates of investment, investment which introduces new technology and advances workers' productivity, and which expands industry's capacity to produce. At this time, industrial capacity is rising at 5 to 6 percent a year and there is every reason to think that next year's capacity growth will be as great. We must strive to keep operating rates of industry at high but not excessive levels, to have demand for industrial products grow with capacity. It has been over 5 years since we last experienced an actual downturn in production. In the coming years our goal must not be just to avoid declines, but to assure, year after year, that actual production grows in line with productive potential.

Second, with the gains achieved by closing the gap more fully realized, we have to turn again to the classical question of achieving a high rate of growth of potential. Economic research has made great progress in identifying the sources of real growth. The new findings emphasize the role of education, training, and skill of the labor force as sources of productivity growth. Physical capital is essential, but it is not enough by itself. To accelerate or even to sustain our long-term rate of growth, this country must continue both to upgrade the quality of her labor force and to upgrade and expand the physical capital stock.

Third, at high employment, the dangers from sector imbalances become greater. We must be watchful not only that the overall level of demand remain within our productive potential, but also that bottlenecks are avoided, and that where they exist we do what we can to expand production.

Fourth, wage-price-cost balance must be preserved. Wage increases have to remain within the productivity trend if labor cost per unit of output is to remain stable. This is a necessary condition for stable prices. But in addition, price increases designed to widen profit margins or failure to share productivity gains with consumers through lower prices can upset stability both by directly raising the price level and by accelerating wage trends.

Fortunately, when it comes to stability there is nothing that succeeds like success. With a long period of balance behind us, our expectations have moved toward stability. Business is not investing today on the basis of inflationary expectations. The good productivity gain which has characterized this expansion and kept labor costs stable is itself the product of the stable growth, and should continue as long as the expansion itself retains its steadiness and continuity.

In this new phase of the expansion, we will no longer be able to rely as heavily on global measures alone. In the coming months and years, we will need to strengthen our knowledge substantially on many points. For example:

We need fuller, more comprehensive, and more detailed measures of productivity so that we will be able to estimate coming cost trends, as well as to search scientifically for the causes of productivity growth.

We need better estimates of the Nation's wealth. If we are to aim economic policy so that demand grows in line with potential supply, we need better estimates of the growth of that supply. And we will need to know how much capital is needed to augment capacity in different lines. The Joint Economic Committee, which has done so much to promote better statistics for this country through its Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, published an important report last year on this problem. We need to improve our price information. The United States has much the most comprehensive set of price measures of any country in the world. But our measures are not sufficiently sensitive, probably overstate price increases by inadequate allowance for quality improvement, and do not adequately reflect actual transaction prices or other aspects of total cost such as the period of delivery, freight absorption, etc. The report of the Stigler committee provides some important insights and suggestions.

We must continue to strengthen our unemployment statistics, and supplement them with figures on job vacancies. We need better information on compensation per manhour. With fringe benefits becoming an ever-larger share of total worker compensation, we should have regular, periodic information on fringes along with straight wages. Further, a larger part of the labor force consists of nonproduction workers, and is engaged in the tertiary industries. We need more thorough coverage for these types of workers and these sectors.

Finally, our statistical efforts must more fully serve this country's increased concern with its balance of payments.

We need to do a lot more work on indexes of export prices, both for ourselves and for our major competitors.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The Federal Statistics Users' Conference has been a source of great strength to the Federal statistical program. I have outlined to you tonight some of the changing needs for our information base for continued prosperity. We shall look to you in the future as we have in the past for advice and guidance and for support in keeping our programs up to the needs of the times. We are blessed that the challenges before us are the challenges of prosperity and not of depression. Speaking for those of us in the Government, let me express our gratitude for the support you have given us in the past and for the continued support I know you will give us in the future.

Thank you.

WISCONSIN'S DICK CUDAHY SHOWS HOW INITIATIVE STILL PAYS OFF

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I think we all would agree that loyalty, hard work, and initiative should be recognized. That is what I want to do today in a brief comment on a young man who restored to fiscal soundness an old and famous family firm.

The man is Richard D. Cudahy, a grandson of the founder of Patrick Cudahy, Inc., of Milwaukee.

Richard Cudahy chose a career outside the family business after World War II when he entered Yale University Law School, graduated, and began the practice of law in Chicago.

But by 1961, his grandfather was deceased and his father, Michael Cudahy, was ill.

Without hesitation, Richard Cudahy picked up the reins of leadership. With the cooperation of the United Packinghouse Workers, he initiated modern, efficient, and productive meatpacking practices. The success of his policies became evident by the next year.

His continued success is truly a tribute to those virtues of enterprise, imagination, and thrift which we hear too little of today.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article of this high example from Meat Processing magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHARD D. CUDAHY, YOUTHFUL LEADER OF PATRICK CUDAHY, INC., SWITCHES PROFESSIONS TO GUIDE 77-YEAR-OLD WISCONSIN PACKING FIRM

Five years ago Patrick Cudahy, Inc., was faced with a situation that has confronted many packers at one time or another. Rising labor costs, outdated production methods, and unprofitable operations posed serious financial problems for the Wisconsin firm. Since Patrick Cudahy founded the firm in the Milwaukee suburb that bears his name, things had never been quite so desperate.

Today, however, the 77-year-old firm is experiencing a relative prosperity that is surprising the industry.

Much of the credit for this turnabout can be traced to a new management team headed by the company's president, Richard D. Cudahy.

WEST POINT GRAD

Although a grandson of the founder, Richard Cudahy had severed direct relations with company operations early in life to pursue other career interests. In 1944 Cudahy joined the U.S. Army Air Force but shortly thereafter received an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy. After graduation from West Point, he served 4 years with the Air Force. Upon leaving the service in 1952, he attended the Yale University Law School where he received his LL.B. degree in 1955.

With this background, Cudahy spent several years in Government legal posts but in 1957 the Midwest beckoned and Cudahy joined a prominent Chicago law firm.

In 1961, Patrick Cudahy's plight came to a head. Michael Cudahy, president of the firm since the death of his father, was ill and unable to maintain effective company leadership. He summoned his son to take the helm—and that Richard Cudahy did.

UNION HARMONY

Cudahy explains that he rejoined the firm partly to carry on the family tradition as well as for the opportunity the new post presented. "Meat packing is a fascinating business," he says. "Certain managerial policies were not working out in the late fifties, but I felt that a new approach could help resolve the problems." Cudahy thus had the chance to exercise his own ideas in regard to labor relations, personnel, and marketing. "This approach," says Cudahy, "is by no means original—but our plans call for continued development and emphasis of our more distinctive and distinguishable products as opposed to our commodity products."

Cudahy became president in January of 1961. Through his efforts and with the cooperation of Local 40 of the United Packinghouse Workers, wage scales were realined and a long-range modernization of production practices was initiated. The first beneficial effects of these policies were evident by the end of 1962—and from then on the benefits have been snowballing.

Cudahy retains an active interest in the legal aspects of business. Associates reveal that when legal problems arise, it is altogether too easy to take them to Cudahy for solution—and if an answer is not readily apparent, he will research the problem until one can be found. In fact, Cudahy spends some of his leisure time as a lecturer in law at Marquette University Law School.

ACTIVE DEMOCRAT

In line with this legal background, he has been admitted to practice in three States and the District of Columbia and is a member of the American, Wisconsin, Chicago, and Milwaukee Bar Associations.

Cudahy is also on the Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners and active in affairs of the Cudahy Marine Bank, the Wisconsin Regional Export Expansion Council, and a State subcommittee on education. He is president of the Milwaukee Urban League and has been active in Democratic political circles including membership in the Wisconsin delegation to the last Democratic National Convention.

Still a young man at 39, Cudahy's prospects for the future are bright. Meanwhile, he is gaining valuable experience guiding Patrick Cudahy, Inc., on a new course.

HARVARD VERSUS OXFORD DEBATE ON VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the finest examples in recent years of debate in a free society took place less than a month ago. It was, in fact, an international debate between a trio at Harvard University and their opposite numbers in London. It was televised by CBS via satellite.

Laurence Tribe, one of the Harvard students, states the U.S. goal most eloquently when he said:

> The United States has no ambitions in South Vietnam. We have no interest in creating an outpost of American democracy there. Our purpose is not to impose a particular government on South Vietnam. Our purpose is only to give them a chance to choose.

The distinguished professor, Henry Kissinger, also contributed an eloquent summation when he said:

> I would like to emphasize that our goal is and should be freedom for the people of all of Vietnam to determine the future of their country. As Americans, we would far prefer to engage in tasks of construction. We would far prefer to do what President Kennedy said in his inaugural address, that to those people in the huts and villages of half the globe, we pledge our best efforts to help themselves. But we do not have the choice between defense and construction. Unless we can do both, we will not be able to do either.

I would like to emphasize that our continued efforts should be devoted to the goals so well stated by these two articulate and outstanding Americans.

Because television debates, despite their immense immediate impact, are perishable, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of that debate printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From "CBS Reports," as broadcast over the CBS television network, Dec. 21, 1965]

TOWN MEETING OF THE WORLD

(With CBS News Correspondent Charles Collingwood. Executive producer, Don Hewitt)

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Good evening. As part of our continuing special coverage of the war in Vietnam, this CBS News broadcast, "Town Meeting of the World," has arranged a transatlantic debate on the subject: "Resolved that the United States should carry out its commitment in Vietnam." The two debating teams, one in England and the other in the United States, are linked together via Early Bird satellite. They see each other. On this side of the Atlantic, two Harvard students and a distinguished Harvard professor; on the other side, two Oxford students and a famous Oxford graduate. At this time, I think I ought to introduce them to each other. First, on the subject, the debating side taking the affirmative side of this resolution, the team arguing that the United States should carry out its commitment, this is Robert Shrum, a student at Harvard Law School. Mr. Shrum was picked this year as the top debater at the National Intercollegiate Debate Tournament.

Next, Prof. Henry A. Kissinger, of Harvard. Professor Kissinger is a leading scholar and theoretician on defense and foreign policy in the nuclear age. He's been an adviser to the U.S. Government under four Presidents and has recently returned from Vietnam.

Mr. Laurence Tribe is, like Mr. Shrum, at Harvard Law School. He's also a notable college debater, his team having won the national championship in 1961.

Now, Messrs. Shrum, Kissinger, and Tribe, I'd like you to meet your opponents in England. Mr. Tariq Ali, of Lahore, Pakistan. A former president of the Union at Oxford, he's been quoted as predicting that he'll be president of Pakistan in 10 years. In the meantime, he's standing as candidate for Parliament in the radical alliance interest against British Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart. Mr. Michael Foot, who is presently a Member of Parliament and is generally regarded as the ablest and most articulate spokesman for the Labor Party's left. Mr. Foot has also had a brilliant career outside of Parliament as an author and journalist. Mr. Stephen Marks, a former chairman of the Oxford Labor Club, has been called the most formidable debater at Oxford.

Now, gentlemen, let me give you the ground rules of this debate of ours. We're going to start with 1½-minute arguments from the students on each team. You may find that a little constricting, but there'll be time later. They'll be followed by 2½ minutes by senior members, Professor Kissinger and Mr. Foot; and when your time is up, I'll ring a bell, like that, carried across the Atlantic via Early Bird. Now, after the opening statements, we'll open things up for a give-and-take discussion among the two teams and later we'll invite the audiences in London and New York to give questions to you, and incidentally, I think I'd better introduce the audiences. In London, students from Oxford, members of the Oxford Union. We're making no pretense, of course, that everyone at Oxford agrees with the view taken by the Oxford debaters; nor for that matter, that the American college students from the various schools in the New York area here all agree with the views taken by the Harvard debaters.

Now, after all that ado, but with no further, let's begin with the first American spokesman for the affirmative, Mr. Larry Tribe. One and a half minutes, Mr. Tribe.

Mr. TRIBE. Ladies and gentlemen, Asians and Americans are dying tonight in order to preserve a world in which each nation can shape its own future. Peace was preserved in Cuba and Berlin because no one doubted that we would carry out our pledge not to back down. We have made that pledge in Vietnam. Nowhere have we said more clearly, "We will stand." If we abandon that commitment, imagine a future confrontation and ask yourself, who would believe us then?

Vietnam was one country before it was divided; so was Korea, so was Germany. The issues are the same in Vietnam. There can be no peace when international lines of demarcation are challenged by military force, when the pen that draws those lines is challenged by the sword. Nor can there be peace so long as unrest and social revolution remains the prey of hostile powers, the focal point of global confrontation. We seek no military victory in Vietnam. We will withdraw when North Vietnam ceases its support and guidance of the South, ceases its support of the war. That will come about when Hanoi is convinced of our resolve. To retreat before she is convinced would tempt aggressors everywhere.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Thank you, Mr. Tribe. Now, for the negative. Mr. Tariq Ali, of Oxford.

Mr. ALI. I would like to pick up where Mr. Tribe left off on the subject of negotiations. The Hanoi regime, before the United States started bombing North Vietnam and increasing its buildup of troops, told the Secretary General of the United Nations that it was prepared to negotiate. This offer was not made clear to the American people, with the results that we have the situation—we have the situation as it is today. And this is basically the point, that you can't expect people to negotiate when you are bombing their cities, when you are destroying their villages. I think it is unfortunate, and I hope members—I hope members across the Atlantic forgive this callous remark that the United States and member citizens of the United States don't really know what bombing is. If they did, no decent U.S. citizen could support it. An American pilot told (a reporter) of the New York Times, "I don't like to hit a village. You know you're hitting women and children too, but you've got to decide that your cause is noble and that the work has to be done." This situation, as this statement, saddens me, as it should sadden every human being, as it should sadden Professor Kissinger, who just returned from South Vietnam and said that he was very worried that the South Vietnamese Government did not enjoy the support of the people; and that is why you cannot equate Germany and South Korea with Vietnam, because the majority of the people in South Vietnam support the Vietcong.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Thank you, Mr. Ali. And now, on the affirmative side of the argument, another student at Harvard, Mr. Robert Shrum.

Mr. SHRUM. Perhaps no nation in the history of warfare has ever known the horrors of bombing better than the United Kingdom, and yet the United Kingdom knew that in World War II, bombing was necessary to meet the Nazi threat, and if bombing is necessary in Vietnam to meet the Communist threat, then unpleasant as that course may be, it is the only real one that the United States can pursue. Why are we pursuing that course? Not because we seek a military victory, not because we seek an economic advantage, but because we seek to see to it that the people of South Vietnam are not forced to choose their way of life at the point of a gun. Rather we seek for them a free election under international auspices in which they can decide under what form of government they want to live. The form of negotiations proposed last year by Hanoi excluded the South Vietnamese Government. It's totally antithetical to the American commitment in Vietnam for we aren't fighting for ourselves. We're fighting for the principle that people shall not have to submit their wills to aggression. We're there, fighting for the South Vietnamese. We surely could not abandon them at a time when negotiations came about. Our principal purpose in South Vietnam is to repel aggression. When aggression is repelled, when the North Vietnamese cease their aggression against South Vietnam, then the bombing will no longer be necessary; then negotiations can take place, then the people of South Vietnam can decide their own future.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Thank you. And now, on the other side of the issue, once again from Oxford, Mr. Marks.

Mr. MARKS. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm very frightened by those last two speeches, very frightened indeed, and I'd like to try, in the short time I've got, to deal with some of the frightening misconceptions that lie behind them. First of all, Mr. Shrum's statements—no, I'll start first with Mr. Tribe. He talked about America's pledge. Who was that pledge made to? The pledge the United States is defending in Vietnam was made to a government the United States deliberately installed there in the first place with the intention of frustrating free elections as provided for in the Geneva agreement. That's how their government got there. It represents no one except American dollars. That is all that government is there for, and the commitment to that sort of government isn't worth the paper it's written on.

What other points did he make? Korea and Germany. Neither Korea nor Germany have specified for them in international treaties that they have to be reunited within a specified time under free elections. America agreed to that pledge in 1954 in Geneva. She's broken her word. That's why the comparison with Korea and Germany doesn't apply.

What other points were made? Support and guidance from the North. We're told when that stops, America has no quarrel with the South Vietnamese. Then why was America intervening, giving military help in contravention of the Geneva agreement to South Vietnam before they started getting help from the North. From—sorry—from the day the Geneva agreements were signed, America was helping the South Vietnamese Government and there's no reason to think they will stop because if they did stop that Government would fall. That's just the beginning.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Thank you, Mr. Marks. We'll hear from you later, but now we're going to hear from the two senior members of each team beginning with Prof. Henry Kissinger from Harvard. Two and a half minutes, Mr. Kissinger.

Mr. KISSINGER. Ladies and gentlemen, the subject we are discussing this evening is whether the United States should honor its commitment to Vietnam. Let me first answer the point about to whom this commitment was made. I take it that the commitment is made to the people of South Vietnam to give them an opportunity to choose their own future, free of outside interference. We have an obligation as well to the peoples of other new nations that the dislocations that are inseparable from the process of their development not be used by more powerful or better organized neighbors. We have a responsibility toward our friends all over the world that they can rely on our pledges. And finally we have an obligation to the peoples of the world to be in the pursuit of these obligations—will explore every avenue toward peace. If we withdraw from our commitment in Vietnam today, we will leave countless thousands to a brutal fate. We will strengthen all those in the Communist world who argue that war is a means for settling disputes. In the pursuit of our responsibilities, we have, of course, always to be careful that our measures reflect a political and moral purpose and not simply the momentum of past decisions. We are—we have a responsibility to see to it that political and military means reflect the proper priorities. Of course, the war in Vietnam is a grim and desperate struggle, but those who defend the principle of peaceful change will always be challenged in difficult situations. Of course, everyone watching the sacrifice and the suffering must suffer great anguish, most of all Americans whose sons are running—are risking their lives daily. But we are not in Vietnam because we want to stay. We are in Vietnam because we want to withdraw, and we will do so as soon as free choice is guaranteed to the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Thank you, Mr. Kissinger. And now, from England, Mr. Michael Foot.

Mr. FOOT. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm still not clear, despite the statements made by the three movers of this motion, exactly what is the commitment which the United States claims to be defending in Vietnam. We are told by Professor Kissinger that the commitment is made to the Government of South Vietnam, and, of course, it is true that the only possible excuse for the Americans having 170,000 troops or 180,000 troops on the other side of the world from the United States itself is that they should be there on the invitation of a foreign government. Now, of course, there will be many arguments, no doubt, in this debate as to who installed the government in South Vietnam and whether, in fact, the United States did not help to install the Government that has issued the invitation. There would be arguments about that. There may be arguments, also, as to whether in fact they are repelling aggression; but even if Americans sent troops—think they have the right to send troops to South Vietnam in response to an invitation from the South Vietnam Government, and even if we were to concede that, and even if we were to concede that the South had suffered aggression from the North—I concede none of these things; but even if we were to accept all those parts of the arguments put forward by those who sponsor this motion, it still remains the fact that the United States of America would not have the slightest right whatsoever, under the charter of the United Nations, in order to repel alleged aggression, to bomb indiscriminately a neighboring country; and if South Vietnam were subject to aggression, why did not the United States of America take this issue to the Security Council of the United Nations? Why did they not attempt to secure—why did they not attempt to secure the backing of other countries there? Why did they not go and put their case? Why did they not go and present their evidence to the other nations, or does the United States of America think that it has the right to decide these things for themselves on the other side of the world? Well, we contest that right. We contest that right partly because we don't think the American claims conform with the facts, but also because we do not believe that any single nation has the right to decide how it is going to respond to aggression, particularly when they're doing it on the other side of the planet.

Mr. Collingwood. Thank you, Mr. Foot. Now we have the outlines of the arguments between the two teams on each side of the Atlantic. Let's carry on from there. Who on the American side wishes to answer Mr. Foot and the British side? Mr. Shrum.

Mr. Shrum. Mr. Tribe.

Mr. Collingwood. Sorry, Mr. Tribe.

Mr. Tribe. Mr. Foot asks why did the United States not take the issue to the United Nations? In August of 1964, it was the United States that invited Hanoi to take part in Security Council discussions on the Gulf of Tonkin incident. Hanoi refused. It was in September of this year that the Government of North Vietnam said bluntly any United Nations resolutions in this area would be null and void. Under those circumstances, what sense would it make to go to the Security Council and simply make the motion of having been there? Secretary Goldberg—Ambassador Goldberg, in September of this year, pointed out the majority of the members of the Security Council are agreed that while the United Nations can be used in a conciliatory capacity in this area and that America has done on a number of occasions, it cannot effectively be used for anything other than quiet diplomacy.

Mr. Collingwood. How about that, Oxford? Who wants to reply to that?

Mr. Foot. Well, I don't know what right Mr. Goldberg has got to decide which matters should go to the United Nations. This is the charter that we all signed, that the U.S. Government signed as well. Their obligation under that charter is that if they think they or their allies are subject to aggression, we should take this matter to the United Nations to be judged. My answer to the reason why the United States didn't take this major matter to be decided at the United Nations is because they had no clear case. They had no clear case that in fact the cause of the war in Vietnam was an aggression by the North against the South. I haven't any doubt that the North has given assistance to the South during the course of the war, but that's not the origin of the war. If you're going to go to the origin of the war, you have to go back at least to 1954, when an agreement was signed as to how a settlement should be made in Vietnam, an agreement which, among other things, specified that there should be elections in the whole of Vietnam within a period of 2 years; and the U.S. forces in Vietnam and the U.S. policy in Vietnam has upset the demand and insistence of the Geneva Conference that there should be general elections in the whole of Vietnam, so I would like to ask the question: Do the sponsors of this motion, does the Government of the United States now accept the terms of the Geneva settlement of 1954?

Mr. Collingwood. Mr. Kissinger.

Mr. Kissinger. With respect to the United Nations Charter, article 51 specifically provides for the right of individual and collective self-defense.

Secondly, the view that Mr. Foot has just expressed does not seem to be shared by the Government of North Vietnam, which on September 23, 1965, stated as follows: "The U.S. authorities are feverishly trying by every means to secure a United Nations intervention in Vietnam. They have, quote, 'requested help from the United Nations membership at large in getting peace talks started.' This is a maneuver to use the United Nations to impose on the Vietnamese people negotiations under U.S. terms." There have been at least five other instances this year in which the North Vietnamese Government has asserted that the United Nations is not competent to enter the Vietnamese dispute. This is the primary reason why the United Nations has not been apprised of this problem.

Mr. Collingwood. Mr. Marks, you said at the end of your speech that that was "only the beginning." Do you have something that you'd like to address to the proposers of the resolution?

Mr. Marks. Yes, there are a number of points I'd like to add. I'm glad to get off the United Nations. The North Vietnamese don't think that it has much to offer and quite frankly, I agree with them.

I'd like to take up this point which I think Mr.—where are we?—I think Mr. Shrum made. He said—and the others. He said that America was in favor of the people of South Vietnam choosing their own government. Now, I remember reading a newspaper report on this. I'm afraid I don't have the detailed reference here, but I hope you'll take my word for it—of an interview recently with Vice President Humphrey, who said that the United States would not permit the Vietcong to take part in free elections in Vietnam. Now, I'd like to know if Mr. Shrum means the same thing by free elections as Vice President Humphrey, or whether he means the same thing as most Democrats mean by free elections. I'd also like to ask, since our own Foreign Secretary, Michael Stewart, who's usually an authoritative spokesman for the Washington line, tells us that there can be no free elections in Vietnam until there's been a period of classification—of pacification. I would like to know whether this pacification is a polite word for killing all the Communists, because I have a rather great suspicion that it is.

Mr. Collingwood. Mr. Shrum.

Mr. Shrum. Well, I—before answering this question about elections, I do want to say that the United Nations is available. It could be very fruitfully used in this problem. I think that if North Vietnam were only willing to accept the good offices of people like Secretary General U Thant, then much of the Vietnamese difficulties could be cleared up.

If Vice President Humphrey said that the United States should not allow the National Liberation Front of Vietcong to participate in elections, then I disagree with him. I very much doubt that he said it. I think that the U.S. aim in South Vietnam is to give these people any kind of government that they want as long as they freely choose that government in a ballot box rather than at the point of a gun.

By pacification, I would suggest Mr. Stewart probably means that the country must no longer be seething with violence and terrorism, because in that kind of atmosphere, free elections can never take place.

Mr. Collingwood. Now, let's have a question from the American side to the Oxford side. Mr. Tribe.

Mr. Tribe. It strikes us that the idea that the Americans should not carry out their commitment in Vietnam may differ greatly from the reality that the gentlemen from Oxford want to impose. We want to know whether they are advocating unilateral and immediate withdrawal. If not, are they simply advocating that we seek a negotiated end? If that's their point, I would like to remind them that the position of the U.S. Government has been and remains that we want peace in Vietnam, simply peace that will guarantee the right of self-determination to that wartorn country.

Mr. Collingwood. Mr. Ali?

Mr. Ali. Yes, I will reply to that, if I may. We have tried to point out, and not only us here in Britain this evening, but the North Vietnamese have been trying to point out that before the bombing of North Vietnam started, there were peace feelers from Hanoi via U Thant which said that Ho Chi Minh was prepared to go to Burma and discuss a negotiated peace with an American spokesman, but unfortunately, President Johnson was busy taking on Barry Goldwater and the elections, and Dean Rusk's sensitive mind thought that these offers were not sincere and, therefore, they were rejected.

As to the second part of your question—do I think that the United States should get out of Vietnam now, my answer is yes—without any qualifications, that the only way—it's made out very often that this is a very complicated issue. Perhaps I'm a bit naive, but to me it seems very simple. The United States is there, thousands of miles away from Washington. Surely you can't claim that this is self-defense and that the only way in which they can earn the respect of the world—better later than never—is by leaving Vietnam now, and this I think is the only alternative left to President Johnson. If De Gaulle can do it vis-a-vis Algeria, why not Johnson vis-a-vis Vietnam?

Mr. Collingwood. Professor Kissinger?

Mr. Kissinger. I would like to make a slight factual correction about the overture of U Thant. I'm not here to defend every action of the American Government and I have often been critical of it in other fields, but the facts of the situation seem to me to be as follows: There was a feeler through U Thant, which was very ambiguous and which required us to negotiate without the government to which we were committed in Saigon. We attempted to determine through other sources just exactly what Hanoi had in mind and received very inconclusive and rather negative answers and on the basis of this information, the Government decided that it would be better not to pursue this overture. But it is not correct to say that a clear offer to negotiate was rejected, and whatever one's judgment about that overture, there have been more than 15 American proposals since then which surely could have provided an opening for another conversation.

Mr. Collingwood. Mr. Shrum, you were bouncing around there in your chair. Do you want to reply to Mr. Ali?

Mr. Shrum. Mr. Ali said that he is in favor of complete withdrawal. Now, I think that he should probably discuss the implications of this, especially in light of the fact that people like Lin Piao, who is Chinese Defense Minister, have delivered statements—the one I'm specifically citing was on September 2, 1965—saying that the war in Vietnam is a test case and that if the Communists can win there, they can then begin and start wars of national liberation all over the world. Of course, wars of national liberation is a euphemism for Communist takeover in these underdeveloped countries. I want to know whether he wants to substitute a new form of colonialism and a more iron tyranny for the one these countries have just gotten rid of.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Mr. Ali, you'd better answer that.

Mr. ALI. Yes, I will answer both Professor Kissinger and Mr. Shrub—sorry, Mr. Shrum. Professor Kissinger, first. I would like to make this point again, Professor Kissinger, with due respect to you and public opinion in the United States, that really, when you are bombing a nation, you can't expect that nation to negotiate with you. If the Japs had asked you to negotiate immediately after they started bombing Pearl Harbor, what would your answer have been?

As far as Comrade Shrum's point is concerned—I don't accept that wars of national liberation all over the world result in Communist domination. The Sino-Soviet split has shown that communism too has its own nationalisms. And I would like to ask Mr. Shrum, that—does he really believe that 12 Communists in Santo Domingo constituted a national liberation movement and were sufficient reason for the United States to intervene in Santo Domingo? And another point I would like Mr. Shrum to answer, that what he quotes Marshal Lin Piao as saying, when responsible American generals like Curtis LeMay say that the only way we can win this war is to bomb North Vietnam back into the stone age, when other responsible American commentators say that this is America's test case, when they are treating Vietnam as a war laboratory with which to test new weapons, which could be used in the future in Latin America.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Well, we're getting a little far afield in Santo Domingo, but I think Mr. Shrum ought to have a chance to answer that.

Mr. SHRUM. I don't think 12—I don't think 12 Communists in Santo Domingo necessarily constitute a Communist national liberation front. I don't want to really talk about Santo Domingo, but I think that thousands of Communists in Vietnam do constitute a national liberation front, and a real threat to the peace and security of the United States and of southeast Asia. Yes, this is a test case for the United States of America, and it's a test case because the United States has to prove to aggression that it cannot succeed and that communism cannot expand all over the world, simply through wars of national liberation. Because someone like Gen. Curtis LeMay sometimes might make an irresponsible statement does not discount Lin Piao's statement when he said that wars of national liberation could begin all over the world, taking their inspiration from the war in Vietnam. I'm not here to defend Curtis LeMay; I'm here to defend American policy in Vietnam, because I think it's right.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Now from England—Michael Foot, we haven't heard from you for a while.

Mr. FOOT. We are told that the aim of the United States in Vietnam is to prove that aggression doesn't pay. First of all, as I have said, they haven't yet proved that it's aggression. They haven't attempted to prove that it's aggression before any independent tribunal. One of the reasons why they have not done so, is because they wish to draw a veil over what really happened, and what are the real origins of the war in Vietnam. This maybe is the reason why we have had no answer in this debate and no clear answer from the U.S. Government in all the negotiations over—and all the discussions over these years as to whether they accept in full the Geneva settlement of 1954. At the time, most of the other countries concerned accepted that agreement, with its commitment to free elections in the whole of Vietnam, which we were told by the spokesman here is what the United States is fighting for in Vietnam. But, we've never had from the statement from the American Government that they accepted in full the Geneva settlement of 1954. If they would say that, there would be some advance, but of course, if they accepted that, one of the difficulties is that it would destroy a large part of the American argument. Because the Geneva settlement also laid down that Vietnam is not two countries, there is one country, and therefore, what has been happening throughout these years in Vietnam is not a war of aggression, but a civil war, and what the United States is doing is to intervene in a civil war, intervene in a manner which they've certainly got no international claim under any international law to do. They intervene in a manner which they have not been prepared to put before any international tribunal. Now, this is a very serious matter indeed, and you cannot say that they are doing it in order to uphold international law when they are not prepared to apply international law to their own actions and moreover, it's no good to say that they are repelling aggression. That's what the people in North Vietnam think they are doing.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Mr. Tribe?

Mr. FOOT. The people in North Vietnam say they want the right to shape their own right and to shape their own destinies. So they're fighting and will continue to fight very hard for those same things. Somehow we have to overcome that barrier and if we're going to do that, the American Government, the most powerful government in the world, will have to retreat from its present position, and be prepared to make proposals for a settlement very much in advance of anything they've yet suggested.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. We'll give the American debating team an opportunity to answer the points made by Mr. Foot when we return with "Town Meeting of the World" after this message.

[Announcement]

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. In this transatlantic debate between students of Oxford and students at Harvard and Mr. Kissinger and Mr. Foot on both sides of the Atlantic via Early Bird, we've just heard a challenging statement on American policy, its defects, according to him, by Mr. Foot. Who on the American side would like to reply to that? Professor Kissinger?

Mr. KISSINGER. I would like to make—to reply both to Mr. Ali and to Mr. Foot, briefly. Mr. Ali presented the beginning of American bombing as if it were a decision that President Johnson took because he felt angry one Sunday morning and decided to proceed. I think the facts of the situation are that North Vietnamese — North Vietnam — had been encouraging, supporting and supplying an uprising in South Vietnam for 5 years; and it is not obvious to me what the moral distinction is between explosives carried on the back of foot soldiers and explosives carried by airplanes. Every argument that was made against negotiation on the part of Hanoi would apply equally well to negotiations on the part of Saigon, which has also been subject to attack. And I would say that the only way to escape this logjam, is to stop talking about the past and to try to see whether one can find comparable restraints on both sides to stop the shooting and to begin the negotiations.

Secondly, to Mr. Foot: It is not correct. I believe, to say that there were no international commitments in the case of other countries. At least in the case of Germany with which I am familiar, there was a commitment at the Summit Meeting of 1955, to settle—to achieve German unification on the basis of free elections, and no one would argue that the fact that no free elections have been held in East Germany, and that the government demonstrably does not enjoy the support of its population, that this entitles the West German Government to start a guerrilla movement in Eastern Germany.

Thirdly, it is the Geneva settlement. It is my belief that the United States should accept the Geneva settlement as a basis for the settlement of the present war in Vietnam, and it is my impression that the American Government has indicated its readiness to do so. The issue in South Vietnam with respect to pacification is not to kill every Communist. The issue is to induce the Communists in South Vietnam to accept the principle of free choice, and as soon as this is accepted, they should as individuals be permitted to participate in the political process.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. The audiences on both sides of the Atlantic have been following with great interest. Let's bring them into this discussion now. You may ask questions of either side or individuals on either side, no matter which side of the Atlantic you happen to be on. Let's begin though with the American audience. Dave Dugan, do you have someone who wants to ask a question?

Mr. DUGAN. Charles, we have lots of people who want to ask questions. It's a matter of getting as many in as we can. I think in section D, in the front row, there's a gentleman, third from the aisle, who has a question if we could get a microphone to him.

Question. Yes, I'd like to direct this question to Mr. Foot. Does he believe that the way to achieve peace is to allow the spread of international communism to go unchallenged, much as Prime Minister Chamberlain did in World War II, when he gave Adolf Hitler Czechoslovakia in return for peace in our time?

Mr. FOOT. The prewar situation was that governments in Britain and America were appeasing fascism, and I think it was a very dangerous policy to follow. But I don't believe there's any comparison between what is happening in Vietnam and what happened in Czechoslovakia before the war. You see, I think what the United States is doing in Vietnam, so far from resisting the spread of communism, is increasing the likelihood of the spread of communism. I think that the more the United States continues to bomb North Vietnam, the more they will rally support behind the Government of North Vietnam, the more they will drive the rest of Asia into the hands of China. If that's what they want, if the U.S. policy was designed for spreading communism, then I think it's carrying it out extremely efficiently.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Now—now let's have a question from the audience in London. Bob Trout, do you recognize someone?

Mr. TROUT. Yes, Charles. After listening so far in comparative silence, I'm sure that our 50-odd Oxford students are eager to join the fray. Who does have the first question? In the first row on the right side?

Question. Professor Kissinger, I find American intervention in Vietnam as immoral as Nazi and Italian intervention in Spain before the last war. Why don't you?

Mr. KISSINGER. I don't find the intervention in Vietnam immoral because our purpose is to give the people of South Vietnam a free choice. The Nazi intervention was to deprive the people of a free choice, and I would have thought that people in Britain should know the difference between American and Fascist motivations.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Another question now from the New York audience.

Mr. DUGAN. Yes, Charles, in section C there is a gentleman in the third row on the aisle—if we could get a microphone to him.

Question. This question is directed to Mr. Foot. If you so ably agree with Mr. Chamberlain, how else do you think communism would be able to be stopped throughout Asia if not by domination by the United States?

Mr. Foot. I think it is a great folly and indeed one of the—I think it is a great folly and indeed one of the great mistakes made by the Government of the United States, and one that we could all suffer for, to equate international communism or communism with prewar nazism. They're two very different institutions indeed; and indeed, international communism has not shown anything like the aggressive tendencies which were shown by fascism before the war. Indeed, the meaning of fascism was that it was aggressive in that sense. I don't think necessarily that the international communism is aggressive in that sense, although it sometimes is aggressive. But you know, the United States is sometimes aggressive, and you see the actions of the United States in Vietnam are not merely actions taken in response to aggression. We've been trying to get to the bottom of this matter, right since this dispute began—this argument began. We asked Mr. Kissinger whether the U.S. Government accepted the Geneva settlement. If they accepted it, the war might never have started.

There would be no necessity to resist international communism in Vietnam; and incidentally, what right has the United States to say that we're going to pick on Vietnam for carrying out your crusade against international communism. What right have you got to pick on Vietnam, only if you can claim that there was an aggression that you had every right to resist, but you've never been prepared to take this before any international tribunal whatsoever for them to judge. Moreover, Professor Kissinger would not tell us whether the U.S. Government, his own government, accepted the Geneva settlement or not. He said they should accept it. Well, I agree, they should. Why don't they? He said it was his impression that the U.S. Government does accept it. I think for an expert of Professor Kissinger's eminence to say that it's his impression that they accept it—why does not the United States say quite clearly they will accept the whole of the Geneva settlement. If they did that, then I think we would make progress toward real negotiations and an escape from the present confrontation, which certainly will spread international communism much more likely than it will kill it.

Mr. Collingwood. Now, I don't want to turn this into just a debate between Michael Foot and Henry Kissinger. I'd like to get some of the students in, but I think I really must let Professor Kissinger have a chance to answer that.

Mr. Kissinger. I used the words, "it is my impression" in deference to the debating skill of my British friends. I have every reason to believe that the American Government accepts the Geneva settlement, whatever may have happened in the past. I simply do not have the document in front of me in case I am challenged to produce the exact words.

Mr. Collingwood. Now let's have a question from the London studio, but let's address this one to one of the students and not to Professor Kissinger.

Mr. Trout. In the front right section, you have a question?

Question. I don't mind which of the American students answers this question. The government which invited the American troops into Vietnam in the first place was not a democratically elected government. The government which is now supported by the American troops in Vietnam is possibly even less democratic, since it was installed by a military coup d'etat. I should like to know the legalistic basis on which the American Government claims to be justified in sending troops to South Vietnam.

Mr. Collingwood. They're both law students, but let's have Mr. Tribe answer that.

Mr. Tribe. I think it's important to remember with regard to the particular governments in South Vietnam that our commitment is broader than a commitment to any one of them; but with regard to either the government of Diem or the government of Marshal Ky, Bernard Fall, recognized as an objective, impartial authority on this question, points out that at least 9 out of 10 of the member states of the United Nations have no greater a claim to legitimacy.

It is not our contention, and it is not the position of the United States, that any particular government of South Vietnam is the preordained and necessarily legitimate representative of the people. That is the contention of the North when it insists that no settlement can be reached which does not accept the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front as prima facie the representative of the people. What we want is to ask the people that question, and you cannot ask them that when the Vietcong are conducting terrorist raids within Vietnam. The only reason America is in Vietnam is to create a condition in which the people themselves can constitute a truly representative government.

Mr. Collingwood. Now, we have time for a very quick question from the American audience, and a very quick answer. Question from the New York audience, quickly.

Mr. Dugan. Yes, Charles, in section A, in the second row, can we get a microphone down to the second gentleman from the aisle, please.

Question. A question directed to the American team. They have said that it is our purpose to give a free choice to the Vietnamese people. Let us attempt to expose this hypocrisy. As long as there is a chance, which is now good, that we will lose those elections, we will not permit them.

Mr. Collingwood. Quick answer, Mr. Shrum.

Mr. Shrum. We're committed to democracy, and as long as we're committed to self-determination in Vietnam, all the North Vietnamese have to do is agree to free internationally supervised elections, and we will hold them.

Mr. Collingwood. Thank you very much. We'll be back with more of this transatlantic debate on "Town Meeting of the World" after this message.

[Announcement]

Mr. Collingwood. Let's have some more questions now from the audiences both in London and New York, addressed to the debaters on this "Town Meeting of the World." I think it's the London audience's turn. A questioner from London.

Mr. Trout. The gentleman in the——

Question. Would a member of the U.S. team like to state quite clearly whether or not the United States would accept a democratically elected Communist government in South Vietnam?

Mr. Collingwood. Mr. Tribe.

Mr. Tribe. The answer is yes. The United States has no ambitions in South Vietnam. We have no interest in creating an outpost of American democracy there. However, we think it is extremely unlikely that South Vietnam would be the first nation in the history of the world to accept in free elections a Communist government—unlikely not only because of the 1 million people who fled the Communist government from the north, but unlikely as well because of the fact that the basic traditions in Vietnam, the traditions of land ownership, of family and of religious belief, are inconsistent with the fundamental tenets of communism. Even if it were true that Ho Chi Minh had some popularity, it is certainly not demonstrable that the people of South Vietnam would, in any free election, elect a Communist regime. But I emphasize, our purpose is not to impose a particular government on South Vietnam. Our purpose is only to give them a chance to choose.

Mr. Collingwood. And now a question from the New York audience.

Mr. Dugan. Yes, Charles, in section A in the front row, we have a gentleman right by the aisle, if we can get a microphone to him.

Question. I address my question to Mr. Foot, who says the United States picks on Vietnam, and to Mr. Ali, who says the majority of the people in South Vietnam support the Vietcong. If this is true, how do you explain the half million South Vietnamese soldiers who have been fighting and dying, and often dying valiantly, for their country; and how do you explain the fact that there are 1 million North Vietnamese who have fled their country and are now living as refugees in Saigon?

Mr. Ali. Yes, I'll answer to all three of your points. Point No. 1, how do I say that the Vietcong is supported by the majority of the people in Vietnam? I say this because it has been admitted by every—almost every—newspaper correspondent in Saigon and, indeed, even admitted by Mr. Kissinger. When he returned from a visit from South Vietnam he said he was distressed to find that the gulf between the Government and the people was very large. There's more evidence for this: the whole attempt to herd people into concentration camps or strategic hamlets, as you euphemistically call them, was an attempt to separate people from the Vietcong, an attempt which did not succeed. And also, the North Vietnamese, according to every American reporter and the State Department——

Mr. Collingwood. At this moment, Mr. Ali, I must interrupt you because our time is running out and I want to ask the senior members of both teams for a brief summation of the debate so far. And let's begin with Mr. Foot.

Mr. Foot. Of course, all of us must be passionately concerned to see the end of this appalling war and I am glad that Professor Kissinger has said that the U.S. Government now accepts the Geneva settlement of 1954. I didn't ask him that as a kind of trick question. I wanted genuinely to know, and I think it is correct that they have said sometimes that they do accept the Geneva settlement. Unfortunately, they may have accepted it in the letter, but never in the spirit. This very weekend we have Mr. Rusk in Paris saying United States still wants peace talks on Vietnam, but only if South Vietnam's independence and territorial integrity are guaranteed. In other words, they are still saying two Vietnams. That is contrary to the Geneva settlement. The Americans refused free elections. That is contrary to the Geneva settlement. The Americans are obviously refusing to neutralize the area. That is contrary to the Geneva settlement. If the United States would come forward with proposals for genuinely seeking a settlement on the basis of the 1954 agreements, then we could begin to end this appalling horror which, if it continues, could drag not merely the United States but the whole world into nuclear catastrophe.

Mr. Collingwood. Sorry, Mr. Foot. And now, a last word, 1-minute summation from Professor Kissinger.

Mr. Kissinger. The war in Vietnam is a tragic and desperate effort. I'm distressed that so many of the questions seemed to challenge not the judgment but the motivation of American policy. I would like to emphasize that our goal is and should be freedom for the people of South Vietnam to chart their own future, and freedom for the people of all of Vietnam to determine the future of their country. As Americans, we would far prefer to engage in tasks of construction. We would far prefer to do what President Kennedy said in his inaugural address, that to those people in the huts and villages of half the globe, we pledge our best efforts to help themselves. But we do not have the choice between defense and construction. Unless we can do both, we will not be able to do either.

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Thank you very much. Thank you, gentlemen of Oxford and gentlemen from Harvard, for an hour's interesting and provocative debate. This is Charles Collingwood. Good night.

ANNOUNCER. This "Town Meeting of the World" was produced in cooperation with the British Broadcasting Corporation, using the facilities of the Early Bird communications satellite. The Oxford students and Mr. Foot were seen from a BBC studio in London. The two Harvard students and Professor Kissinger were seen from a CBS studio in New York. We wish to thank the Oxford Union and universities in the New York area for their cooperation in helping us to select the student audiences on both sides of the Atlantic.

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS FOR A NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending business, which is S. 1446.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1446), to reserve public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes.

THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the most pressing problem facing our Nation and the world today is the war in Vietnam. I hope our President will continue to strike out boldly for a peaceful settlement of this bitter conflict. Bona fide peace negotiations mean concessions by us, concessions by the Vietcong and a cease-fire with no one an abject loser and no one an arrogant winner. Unless there is a negotiated settlement, American GI's are likely to be fighting and dying in Vietnam until 1980.

President Johnson is to be commended for directing a pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. But standing alone, this is not enough.

In his outstanding state of the Union message, the President set forth our goals in Vietnam when he said:

> We seek neither territory nor bases, economic domination or military alliance in Vietnam. We fight for the principle of self-determination that the people of South Vietnam should be able to choose their own course, choose it in free elections without violence, without terror, and without fear. The people of all Vietnam should make a free decision on the great question of reunification.
>
> We have also made it clear from Hanoi to New York that there are no arbitrary limits to our search for peace. We stand by the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962. We will meet at any conference table. We will discuss any proposals—4 points or 14 or 40—and we will consider the views of any group. We will work for a cease-fire now, or once discussions have begun.

I wholeheartedly agree with the goals set by our President. However, because in the past there have been conflicting statements by our officials on our support for the Geneva accords, on negotiations with the Vietcong, and on free elections, we must further clarify our war aims and negotiating position.

We should clearly announce our willingness to seek a settlement based on the 1954 Geneva accords providing neutrality, self-determination, and free elections for Vietnam. The Geneva accords which we agreed to but did not sign state that "the military demarcation line at the 17th parallel is provisional and should not in any way be considered as constituting a political or territorial boundary." Historically, there is no North and South Vietnam.

We should indicate explicitly our readiness to participate in negotiations with all parties involved—I mean with delegates of the Vietcong, or National Liberation Front, so-called. We should agree to abide by the results of a peaceful, free election by the people of Vietnam of their own Government, their own leaders, and their own destiny. I know our CIA officials in Vietnam and Prime Minister Ky, of the Saigon government oppose an armistice at this time. Our President should overrule their views along with those of the Curtis LeMays.

If our President moves decisively for such peace our people will support him. If instead, he approves steadily expanding military involvement, he will please our militarists, and warhawks in Congress. Then in the 1966 congressional elections and in 1968, as casualty lists mount, some Republican politicians, now urging acceleration of the war by bombing Hanoi and Haiphong and even Red China, will be the first to denounce this as "Lyndon's war."

Were we to bomb Hanoi and Haiphong, thousands of Vietnamese civilians including women and children would be killed and wounded. If we failed to destroy all the war planes of North Vietnam some might bomb Saigon, and elements of the North Vietnamese army, numbering some 400,000, would cross the demilitarized zone and invade South Vietnam.

Pentagon gossip reports plans to bomb Haiphong and Hanoi followed by an amphibious landing at Haiphong and then "bombing Red China back into the stone age." That, to quote Gen. Curtis LeMay. Let us hope President Johnson rejects these proposals. Bombing Hanoi would be compared with the Nazi bombing of Guernica in the Spanish Civil War. Furthermore, no one can accurately forecast just how damaging the reaction would be. It would certainly at least outweigh any possible military gain.

From September 28 to last October 20 I was in southeast Asia most of the time. I went, looked, and listened. Very soon I learned we are involved in a civil war over there. In South Vietnam I was at every airbase except one—traveling through the entire area by helicopter, airplane, and jeep. It is my considered judgment that South Vietnam is of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States. Furthermore, the fact is that the conflict raging in Vietnam is a civil war. General Westmoreland stated to me that the bulk of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were born and reared in South Vietnam. General Stilwell, in Thailand, went further. He stated that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting in the Mekong Delta area south of Saigon, were born and reared in that area. They were not infiltrators or Communists from the North.

No matter how often we profess our intention to defend freedom in Vietnam, the increasing escalation of the war is raising grave doubts throughout Asia and elsewhere in the world as to the wisdom of our policy. Attacks with sophisticated weapons on unsophisticated and illiterate Asians are building a vast reservoir of anti-Americanism and misunderstanding of our country among the masses of the people in Asia.

A military surrender to the United States will never produce acceptance of American presence in Asia by most Asians. It would be a legacy of ill will which we should not leave to future generations of Americans. Until Asiatics show more interest in defending themselves, then unilateral American involvement in Asia is doomed to failure. The ugly reality is that for the most part it is American GI's who are fighting and dying in Vietnam for the alleged defense of freedom in Asia. Do we Americans have a mandate from Almighty God to police the entire world?

President John F. Kennedy said on September 3, 1963, shortly before his assassination:

> I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the Government to win popular support that the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists. We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort, and, in my opinion, in the last 2 months the Government has gotten out of touch with the people.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Is it not a fact that when President Kennedy made that statement in September of 1963, we had been in Vietnam for practically a decade?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRUENING. Yet, at the end of 10 years of assistance of all kinds, including vast sums of money, we had a situation that was deteriorating; and it was clear then, was it not, that the government of South Vietnam, either the puppet government that we had installed there, or its successors after various coups were out of touch with the needs of the people, were uninterested in those needs, and were doing little or nothing to bring about the reforms which President Eisenhower had made conditional upon our giving them aid for 10 years previously? Is that not a fact?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. That is true, of course.

Mr. GRUENING. Is that not a demonstration of the folly of our policies there?

Mr. **YOUNG** of Ohio. I agree with the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. **GRUENING**. I thank the Senator.

Mr. **YOUNG** of Ohio. Mr. President, on our initial commitment to South Vietnam made by President Eisenhower in 1954 in a letter to the President of South Vietnam stated:

> I am instructing the American Ambassador to examine with you how an intelligent program of American aid can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial.

He added:

> The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. The U.S. Government hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government.

That was a very "iffy" commitment made by President Eisenhower.

Can anyone claim that Prime Minister Ky, of South Vietnam, who himself was born and reared in Hanoi, heads a strong, viable state? He could not remain in power 1 week except for the operations of our Central Intelligence Agency and the support of our Armed Forces.

To justify sending a military advisory group to Vietnam and increasing its size from 327 in 1953 to 685 in 1961, President Eisenhower on April 7, 1954, said:

> The loss of Indochina will cause the fall of southeast Asia like a set of dominoes.

That was in the Stalin era. Today, there is no bitter cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States as when Stalin was dictator. The Soviet Union is no longer a "have not" nation. It is veering toward capitalism. Its leaders and the Russian people seek coexistence instead of coannihilation. Moscow and Peiping are now in bitter conflict. This domino theory has been completely discredited.

Red China is a paper dragon. It is overrated as a great power. It has crude nuclear capability, that is true. However, it will take at least 5 or 10 years before it will have the know-how to deliver any nuclear warheads on targets. Its air force is inferior. It has no surface navy except a few torpedo boats and gunboats—no modern transports—nothing except thousands of junks. It is an agrarian nation, with 85-percent of its population engaged in agriculture. On the Pacific, under the Pacific, and in the air, we have a more powerful Navy, submarine fleet, and Air Force than all the nations of the world combined.

Red China does have a huge land army. The elephant can fight neither the eagle nor the whale. As General MacArthur in his "Reminiscences" stated:

> Anyone in favor of sending American ground troops to fight on Chinese soil should have his head examined.

Can anyone claim that we would lose face and that our prestige in Asia would be damaged were we to withdraw from this conflict? France was bled white during the 8-year struggle to save her vast colonial empire in Indo-China. France became a greater and more powerful nation following her withdrawal from what is now North and South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. Furthermore, did De Gaulle lose face or prestige when he surrendered Algeria, that vast domain larger than France? A great nation like ours does not lose face by withdrawing from a miserable war. We have lost face by messing around with it in the first place.

The winds of freedom are blowing across the China Sea and elsewhere throughout the world in a manner and to an extent almost beyond belief. Surely we should not respond with our Armed Forces whenever the winds of change strike a country in southeast Asia or in Africa or elsewhere outside our hemisphere and sphere of influence. In Vietnam the security of the United States is not the issue. Saigon is not and never will be an outpost defending Seattle. Vietnam very definitely is of no strategic importance to the defense of the United States.

We should have long since learned that the outcome of a guerrilla war in the swamps, jungles, and highlands of southeast Asia does not threaten the security of the United States. We should, if we wish, give money, food, or guns, giving this aid from afar. We should withdraw from implicating ourselves so deeply into this conflict converting it into an American war.

This steaming jungle where thousands of American GI's have already been afflicted with malaria and other jungle diseases is the worst place in the world for us to wage a ground war.

Americans should not blindly accept the propaganda coming from Washington. If mistakes are compounded on mistakes, then the conflict will be expanded and escalated.

In my judgment, our national interest requires a redirection of our policy in Asia. We should not be the sole defenders of freedom as we define freedom in Asia. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and our CIA should take a back seat when it comes to formulating foreign policy. I hope that President Johnson will reassert that civilian authority must remain supreme over military authority. The men who wrote the Constitution of the United States provided that civilian authority in this Nation must always be supreme over the military. We should adhere to that.

Any forces we have in Vietnam should be only part of the forces of many nations under the United Nations and for peacekeeping and not warmaking purposes.

Vietnam is a land of breathtaking seacoasts, green jungles, fertile rice paddies, picturesque mountains—a lovely Garden of Eden converted into a hell on earth by man's inhumanity to man.

I have just quoted the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] who revisited the scene of his youth in the early part of World War II when he served as a marine in Vietnam.

Let it not be written by future historians that American boys died needlessly in far distant jungles because of weakness of diplomats and indifference of politicians. I wish I had as much confidence in the skill and intelligence of our diplomats in trying to settle this war as I do in the bravery and high competence of our soldiers fighting the war.

The primary reason for our being in Vietnam today is our stubborn refusal to admit a mistake in our attempt to make Vietnam a pro-American and an anti-Chinese state. More than anything else, we are fighting to avoid admitting failure. As Walter Lippmann bluntly put it, "We are fighting to save face."

The late President John F. Kennedy said, "Transforming Vietnam into a Western redoubt is ridiculous."

Sallust, the Roman historian, about 40 years before the birth of our Saviour wrote:

> It is always easy to begin a war, but very difficult to stop one, since its beginning and end are not under the control of the same man.

That is true now as it was then. President Johnson deserves praise for ordering a holiday in bombing North Vietnam while his executive department officials are seeking to secure an armistice and cease-fire at the conference table with representatives of the Vietcong or National Liberation Front, so-called, and Hanoi.

We Americans should not be so much interested in saving face as in saving lives.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Ohio on his forthright, penetrating speech. I think it is one of the most important statements that have been made in Congress on the war in Vietnam. It deserves the widest attention. I am happy to welcome the Senator from Ohio to the ranks of those of us who feel and for nearly 2 years have stated that our military involvement there is folly and represents a tragic mistake, perhaps the most tragic ever made by this country. As pointed out in the report of our distinguished majority leader, an expert on southeast Asia, and our colleagues who went to South Vietnam and other parts of the world, that unless we can bring the war to an end at the conference table there appears no prospect except more and more destruction and killing. I think we should get out in the best way possible and admit that we made a mistake. Individuals who do this are honored. Great nations find it harder to do.

I applaud President Johnson for the efforts he is making for peace, but I feel he is handicapped by some needlessly unqualified verbal commitments he has made.

Three Presidents did not, as President Johnson has indicated—I think he is mistaken in this—promise military aid and establish thereby a national pledge. President Eisenhower offered only economic aid, provided certain reforms were made. As the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] pointed out, it was a very "iffy" offer, and was contingent upon improvement and reforms in the then Diem government—reforms which never took place.

During the 6 years of President Eisenhower in the White House, there was no military involvement, that is, no Americans were sent into combat, only a military mission with an advisory role. Under President Kennedy, we sent military advisers, and President Kennedy continued to maintain that it was South Vietnam's war—and that they had to win it. It has been only in the past year that we have become involved with our troops in combat—a tragic mistake.

I hope the speech that the Senator from Ohio has delivered will have wide circulation.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska. Contrary to what we sometimes read in the press, the Vietnam issue was debated in the Senate during the past year; and as we settle down to the final session of the 89th Congress the debate is renewed. There is a great difference of opinion among Senators.

It is going to be a good thing that all Senators debate this pressing problem, the greatest problem before the country at this time, and express their views.

Mr. President, supplementary to what I have said, I have a letter from a constituent of mine, Thomas A. Gianfagna, of 841 Alhambra Road, Cleveland, a valiant young constituent of mine. I do not know him personally, but he wrote me as follows:

Dear Senator Young: I have followed with great interest your views on the situation in Vietnam. As an ex-GI just recently granted the blessing of rebirth into civilian life and as a veteran of 2 months service in the central highlands of Vietnam with the 1st Cavalry Division, I want you to know that I agree with you 99 percent.

As you say, we are not the policeman of the world. As you say, the situation in Vietnam is more a civil war than a war of aggression or subversion. Thank you for saying it so loudly.

Thank you again.

Yours truly,

Thomas A. Gianfagna.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe I heard the distinguished Senator from Ohio state that the senior Senator from Maryland had visited Vietnam during World War II.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I did so—inadvertently. I meant Okinawa.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator, because I was in Vietnam only with the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], where the three of us spent some time. My world war service took me to Espiritu Santos, Guadalcanal, Ulithi, Eniwetok, Guam, and Okinawa, but not until recently was I in Vietnam.

My own observations are somewhat different from those of the Senator from Ohio, but I appreciate the deep sincerity with which the Senator from Ohio has expressed his point of view.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I greatly respect the Senator from Maryland who is a great Senator. He is one of the heroes of World War II, and he has a fine record in the Senate. It was a slip of the tongue when I used the word "Vietnam" for "Okinawa," because I knew he was with the Marines who conquered Okinawa in World War II.

I had two sons, both of whom served in the Pacific, and I know something about the hardships of those fine young men who, some 22 and 23 years ago, fought for their country in the Pacific.

Whenever I see a marine like Dan Brewster, of Maryland, who fought there, I feel like taking off my hat to him. Of course, I readily accept the fact that both he and Senator Cannon have views and conclusions somewhat different from mine. I know both of them and many other Senators will express those views later this year.

It was not a correct statement for anyone to assert that the Vietnam situation and the conflict there had not been debated in the last Congress; and it is fair to assume that it will be fully debated in the final session of this Congress. It deserves to receive more attention and no doubt will receive more attention, than any other issue.

I yield the floor.

BILLBOARDS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, last year Congress enacted the so-called billboard bill, or highway beautification bill, which many of us criticized vigorously and tried to correct in many different ways in order to make it a workable law.

I do not believe the purpose of anyone in this area is too different. My own record in that regard, when this first matter came up, with the Senator from Oregon, Richard Neuberger, is very clear. The two of us supported the measure on the floor at that time.

However, as everyone knows, the bill was hastily rewritten over the weekend and did not reflect the bill which the committee had reported, nor did it reflect, in my opinion, the will of the majority of the Senate, although the majority of the Senate voted for it.

A tremendous amount of pressure was brought on the Senate from down the street, and it was changed when it was taken up. As a consequence, as I have pointed out many times since, it is filled with faults. It is filled with errors, and it will have to be rewritten completely someday.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point an article written by William Logan and appearing in the Rocky Mountain News of December 10, 1965, which points out a few of the problems that are beginning to rise in our own State, although it refers to other States in this, as a result of the hasty and ill-considered action that was taken on that bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Proxmire in the chair). Without objection, the article will be printed in the Record.

The article is as follows:

Colorado Billboard Controls Examined by Federal Courts

(By William Logan, Rocky Mountain News writer)

The courts are going to have to decide whether Colorado and 21 other States that have championed highway billboard controls now face a prospect of being penalized in Federal funds for their efforts, State highway department officials believe.

Colorado was among States that agreed under the original 1958 Federal law to use its police powers to control signboards under Federal standards. Last spring's legislature enacted a law to control billboards that became effective July 1.

The new highway beauty bill of the Johnson administration, enacted after the Colorado law became effective, requires "just compensation" be paid to billboard owners when signs are removed.

The Federal Government will pay 75 percent of the cost of removing signs and States must pay 25 percent, under the Federal law.

CAN BE PENALIZED

Any State that refuses to pay—or that refuses to control billboards—can be penalized up to 10 percent of its Federal road funds, under the new U.S. law.

Many of the States that earlier enacted antibillboard legislation have listed the signs as public nuisances and have laws that prohibit payments to owners for removal of nuisances.

Colorado, in a series of notices just going into the mails to owners of signs found in violation by the highway department, is directing the owners to remove them.

The State isn't planning to pay costs for removal, but isn't terming them nuisances either. The notices merely state the signs are in violation of the new State law and ask their removal.

MOST NOTICES

Darrell Vail, highway department maintenance engineer, said most of the notices mailed thus far concern signboards erected since the law took effect "and are clearly in violation."

Notices will be mailed shortly to owners of signs put up earlier, ordering their removal, he said. Each highway department maintenance district is charged with enforcing the law in its territory.

Vail believes the fact Colorado is just beginning to enforce its law probably will mean the State can receive 75 percent of sign removal costs from the Federal Government.

But it's up to the courts to decide the whole course of the antibillboard legislation, he said.

A test case is pending in Denver District Court involving a sign on Interstate Highway 80S, about 5 miles northeast of Brush, a section of interstate highway that opened this fall along new right of way.

UNREASONABLE?

Fred Efken, motel operator and plaintiff, represented by Denver Lawyer C. Hamilton Evans, charges the State's antibillboard law is an unreasonable invasion of private rights, deprives persons of use of property without due process of law, is unconstitutional and is an unlawful delegation of legislative power to an administrative body.

Vail said the question of whether the highway department will have to compensate owners for their costs of removing signs also is raised through the suit.

ELIMINATE PROBLEM

The Wisconsin Highway Commission brought up the compensation problem recently when it asked the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads if Wisconsin would be penalized for not compensating sign owners whose billboards were scheduled for removal before the new Federal law went into effect.

BPR assured Wisconsin that billboards termed illegal under State law can be torn down without any compensation to their owners.

Wisconsin Democratic Senators William Proxmire and Gaylord Nelson are planning to try to eliminate the problem by introducing amendments to kill out the compensation provisions in the Federal law.

A BPR official told reporters in Washington the new Federal law shatters State police powers.

If a State must pay for removal of a sign termed a nuisance, he asked, why shouldn't it pay the owner to close a house of prostitution, also a public nuisance?

Other States with billboard control laws are Ohio, Illinois, New Hampshire, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia.

Vail said although the 1958 Federal law paid States a bonus of one-half of 1 percent of its Federal highway funds for enacting billboard control laws, Colorado didn't remove any billboards before the new Federal law replaced it.

EARLIER ESTIMATES

There earlier were estimates the State could receive $400,000 to $1 million for controlling billboards, but this is now eliminated, Vail said.

He said, however, BPR officials have told the highway department the present Colorado law appears sufficient to prevent the State from being penalized in highway funds under the new Federal statute.

Enforcement of the Colorado law is placed with the highway commission. It has declared all 948 miles of the State's Interstate Highway System and about half the State's 9,000 miles of State highways as scenic areas from which billboards must be removed.

After the commission's declaration, the highway department surveyed all highways in the State, listing signboards in violation. An injunction following filing of the suit halted all enforcement operations for several weeks, but now has been lifted.

Mr. ALLOTT. I quote particularly one paragraph.

> A BPR official told reporters in Washington the new Federal law shatters State police powers.

There is no question in my mind that parts of the bill are flatly and uncontradictorily unconstitutional, and we shall have to do on this bill the same thing that we will have to do on much of the legislation passed by the Congress last session, and that is to rewrite it at a slower pace so that it can be made workable.

NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1446) to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to prove a procedure for adding public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the pending bill before the Senate is S. 1446. May I inquire if the Senate is now out of the morning hour?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. The pending legislation is S. 1446, and it pertains to national wild rivers. The title is, "To reserve certain public lands for a national wild rivers system, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes."

This comes in the same category as much legislation we have had during the past year. The bill is cosponsored by quite a number of Senators. I have not stopped to count them but it is cosponsored by a significant number of Senators. It follows, generally, the concept of the wilderness measure, as it proposes to set aside certain areas of the country which have rivers running through them which are essentially of the wilderness type, or primitive type areas—and I am using those words in a broad general sense—and to retain such river areas in that fashion in the future.

I do not believe any member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has any quarrel with the desirability of, setting aside certain areas for this purpose. But since nearly all of the areas in the West have generally the same burden, I believe it pertinent to point out the problems which have afflicted the West for many years with respect to water, with which the eastern part of the country is just now becoming fully acquainted. Because there are problems in this bill which should be explored and discussed, and because it is necessary for the senior Senator from Colorado to be in his own State next week on official business—commitments that have been made for some time—I wish to discuss one or two of these matters very briefly today.

On page 14 of the bill, section 2(b) reads:

> DEFINITION OF WILD RIVER AREA
>
> (b) A wild river area eligible to be included in the System is a stream or section of a stream, tributary, or river—and the related adjacent land area—that should be left in its free-flowing condition, or that should be restored to such condition, in order to promote sound water conservation, and promote the public use and enjoyment of the scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values.

It will be seen that this is a definition of a wild river area; and no matter what language occurs in connection with wild rivers subsequently in the bill, we cannot avoid the definition of a wild river area as set forth in section 2(b) in these words—"that should be left in its free-flowing condition or that should be restored to such condition."

That is a cloud on anything inserted in the bill subsequently as an invasion of property rights in water and the ownership of water or the personal property or real property rights of an individual in the right to use that water.

This matter was discussed at some length in the committee, and when I say this I am not attempting in any way to try to belittle the efforts of the other members of the committee who wholeheartedly supported this bill. But the cold facts are that the problems involved concern not only all of the national water laws that we have or laws pertaining to water, but they involve the water laws of each and every State in the reclamation States particularly, which will be involved.

It might be significant to point out generally where these are.

Section 3(a) sets up five areas, two in Idaho, one in Oregon, one in New Mexico, and one in Missouri.

Then as we read through the bill, we find that other areas are set up for study; namely, Tennessee, West Virginia, Wyoming, New York, Montana, Nebraska, Washington, New York, and Pennsylvania in one section, Wisconsin, Georgia, and Florida together, and Maryland and Pennsylvania again together. So as this subject and concept progress, it is evident that a good portion of the country will be involved in the questions that are raised concerning wild river areas. As I say, they are raised immediately by the definition of "wild river areas," to which I have just referred.

I shall read the two clauses in the bill that create the major problem, because I think they are highly important. The first is section 5(d), which is as follows:

> The jurisdiction of the States and the United States over waters of any stream included in a wild river area shall be determined by established principles of law.

That is the jurisdiction. I continue to read:

> Under the provisions of this Act, any taking by the United States of a water right which is vested under either State or Federal law at the time such river is included in the Wild Rivers System shall entitle the owner thereof to just compensation. Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

Section 5(h) reads as follows:

> Designation of any stream or portion thereof shall not be construed as a reservation of the waters of such streams for purposes other than those specified in this Act, or in quantities greater than necessary to accomplish these purposes.

Minority views were filed with respect to the bill. The minority stated:

> The jurisdiction of the States over waters of any stream included in a Wild River area should not be affected by the passage of this bill. The Federal Government should be required to comply with State laws when acquiring water rights or vested interests therein.

It is true that each State has its own provisions. I am speaking particularly of, and my discussion will relate particularly and solely to, the Western States, not to the water law, generally, of the Eastern States or the South.

The bill, especially the two paragraphs which I have just read, together with the definition, constitutes an imposition of new Federal law upon water rights in the river or rivers in which the Federal Government may establish a wild river area. I should like to cite an example, because I want to be exact as to what will happen or what could happen under the bill as it is now constituted.

Assume an average virgin riverflow of 1,000 cubic feet of water per second and perfected diversion water rights above the designated wild river area of 300 cubic feet per second of consumptive use, including credit for return flow. Assume that the Secretary makes a reservation of 700 cubic feet of water per second for the wild river area. Of course, that would be below the prescribed diversion rights. What would happen in a year of water shortage?

Let us assume that the riverflow is only 600 cubic feet per second in a particular year of shortage. The purpose of section 5(h) of the bill, on page 27, is to make certain that the Secretary will not reserve more water than is necessary, and that the water will be open to appropriation once it has left the wild river area.

Let us assume that the Secretary has made a finding that 700 cubic feet a second is necessary for the purposes of the act. Obviously, under the example I have given, where the river has a flow of only 600 cubic feet a second, it is already short 100 cubic feet per second. Inasmuch as the wild river area was established by Federal law, which has declared certain policies relative to the maintenance of free-flowing streams, the courts would most likely determine that a superior right had been vested in the Secretary, or the United States, despite the fact that the irrigators have had rights adjudicated and decreed for many years. Therefore, the irrigators upstream from the wild river area would not be permitted to divert water, since their diversion of water would further diminish the flow through the wild river area, which is already below what the Secretary had determined to be the necessary flow through the wild river.

However, because of section 5(h), the irrigator downstream from the wild river would still be able to divert the full flow of the river coming out of the wild river area. The decreed rights of the irrigators upstream, or at least a part of them, may be senior to the decreed rights of those downstream from the wild river; yet in operation, their rights are made junior to all the irrigators downstream. However, they are not actually made junior by the provisions of the bill. The bill is drafted and written in such a way that there is a grave question whether a court could so find, if the question came before it.

From what I have said, it is evident that the enactment of the bill in its present form would do tremendous mischief to established water law and could do irreparable damage to vested water rights—damage which may or may not be compensable. Most likely it would not be compensable, since a drought is an act of God.

Furthermore, the downstream irrigator would have his water right improved by the operation of law, if the bill became law.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am much interested in what the Senator from Colorado is saying about the bill. As he knows, we have worked together on it in committee.

Would it not be the interpretation of the Senator from Colorado that any commitments made against our river streams in Colorado and Wyoming would be subject to the wild river bill, even though there is a commitment for delivery of water at Lee Ferry under the Colorado River compact?

Mr. ALLOTT. I believe they would. Actually, if there should be an attempt to establish wild river areas in any of the tributaries of the Colorado River, the effect, in my opinion, would be to rewrite not only the Colorado River compact, but also the Upper Colorado River Basin compact, without benefit of the participation of the States which are parties to them.

Mr. SIMPSON. I agree with the Senator's statement. I wanted to be certain that that was made adequately plain for the RECORD.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. He is a valued Member of this body. He has practiced law in Wyoming for many years, and besides having had a distinguished career as Governor of his State and as Senator, he is one of the most knowledgeable and capable lawyers, not only in Wyoming, but in the West, particularly with respect to water law, which he knows so well. Therefore, his remarks are well founded and are of great help to me.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from California offered an amendment which I understand is satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior. I can understand fully why the Secretary of the Interior would be satisfied with this particular amendment.

In my opinion—and I have discussed this with the senior Senator from California—this amendment does not meet the very objection that the senior Senator from California raised repeatedly in committee, and about which he is concerned. He believes that this amendment, if agreed to, would remove his problems, which are the problems I have just been discussing.

The amendment which, I believe, is printed, or, perhaps it will be offered and printed Monday, is as follows:

On page 27, line 9, add a new subsection (1), as follows:

"The jurisdiction of the States over the waters of any stream included in a wild river area shall be unaffected by this Act to the extent that such jurisdiction may be exercised without impairing the objectives of this Act or its administration."

Mr. President, I have been a lawyer concerned with water matters for over 35 years. I must confess that this particular section leaves me in a total state of confusion. I do not know what it means. Of one thing I am reasonably certain, and that is that the objectives which the senior Senator from California wants to accomplish, which are also my objectives, would not be accomplished by this section. This amendment would only serve, in my opinion, to further complicate the problems that will now arise as we discuss this matter.

Therefore, Mr. President, at this point I send to the desk an amendment which would provide as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 475

On page 27, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following new subsection:

"(1) Other provisions of this Act notwithstanding, whenever either Secretary shall reserve any portion of the waters of a stream for the purposes of this Act he shall comply with the laws of the State with respect to water and water rights, and any rights perfected under the applicable State laws shall be subject to State law with respect to the allocation of waters in years of shortage."

Mr. President, this amendment would clear up the mumbo jumbo that is now in the bill. I do not say this disrespectfully in the least, but I believe that the confusion would be added to by the amendment offered by the senior Senator from California.

I have submitted this amendment to clear the matter up and to make it crystal clear that the Federal Government cannot by this act come in and usurp water which has already been placed to a consumptive, beneficial use, and which is now being used, and on which persons and residents of that State have already perfected their property rights.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I compliment the Senator again with respect to the amendment. I should like to be considered a cosponsor of the amendment along with the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should be very happy to have the distinguished Senator from Wyoming listed as a cosponsor of the amendment.

I send to the desk the amendment and ask that it may be printed and lie on the desk today for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The amendment will be received, and, as requested, will lie on the desk.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I believe that this amendment is absolutely necessary to determine the rights of the Federal Government and State governments with respect to water.

The Senator from Colorado is giving a very clear dissertation on all aspects of the question.

Did I understand the Senator to say that he would not be present during the ensuing week?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SIMPSON. Would it be permissible for me to call up the amendment?

Mr. ALLOTT. It would be entirely agreeable.

Mr. SIMPSON. The Green River in Wyoming was originally included in the bill. It was eliminated in the committee due to my protest. We are just as vitally interested in the question now because we go on the assumption that the Federal agencies cannot outwit us, but they can outwait us.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. If the bill were to be passed in its present form, I believe that, rather than accomplish the purpose which most of us have, of preserving the State law and rights with respect to these rivers, we shall have given the Secretary of the Interior an opening in which to place a great big foot leading toward the establishment of the kind of rights that the administration wants over the river systems of this country.

This is a very important point. I am afraid that with this bill as it now stands, even with the amendment of the Senator from California, we would be actually increasing and strengthening the position of the Secretary of the Interior on the claim of the United States to these waters, rather than keeping them under the jurisdiction of the State law, where they belong by virtue of the approval of the constitutions of the States of Colorado, Wyoming, and other Western States, all of which constitutions have specific provisions, supported by statute, as to where the ownership of the water lies, and how the water shall be administered and handled.

Mr. President, I believe that I have stated the case reasonably well. It was necessary that such a statement be made at this time.

The incursions of the Federal Government on our water system and our water courses in the West have been constant. The attempts to control them have been constant.

I am sorry to say that the attempted controls have not always been wise. However, at any rate, we in Colorado feel, as do most Westerners, that the administration of the water and the ownership of the water belong to the State, and that if the Federal Government wants to acquire title to or use of the water, as would be the case under this bill, it should comply with the laws of the State, as any other person would have to do.

There is no valid reason, except the pride of the executive department, the Department of the Interior, and the Attorney General, why they should not do so.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance at the sessions of the Senate during the ensuing week so that I may attend to official business in the State of Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERAN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE EMPLOYEE RETIRES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the recess of Congress it was announced in Montana that one of the veterans in the electric cooperative movement was retiring. Max Mathews managed the Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative for 25 years and was a true pioneer in the movement before that time.

Max Mathews has been a friend for many years and it was a great pleasure working with him on matters of importance to the rural electric cooperative movement and issues of general importance to the State. In the instance of one cooperative its total investment has grown from $200,000 to over $3 million under the guidance of Max Mathews.

I wish Max and his wife every success in their retirement, knowing full well that they will continue their active interests particularly in programs involving the youth of our State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial appearing in the November 1965 Pacific Northwest Public Power Bulletin.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAX MATHEWS RETIRES

Max Mathews, manager of Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative since 1940 and a member of Northwest Public Power Association's board of trustees since 1961, retired October 1, 1965.

Honoring Mathew's long service, the Montana Associated Utilities annual meeting in Missoula, October 6–7, adopted a resolution recognizing Max as "dean of Montana rural electric cooperative managers."

One of the organizers of MAU and long active in NRECA Mathews is devoted to rural electrification and has offered his services to the AID program. He says he wants to go wherever coal-oil lamps are used—and watch the countryside light up as it has in Montana.

Max pioneered in the rural electric cooperative movement, setting the first pole for rural electricity in Montana in 1937. As REA construction superintendent he helped build the first four electric cooperatives in Montana: Yellowstone Valley, Lower Yellowstone, Vigilante, and Park.

During the 25 years Max has managed Yellowstone Valley, the co-op has grown from 990 consumers and 337 miles of line to 3,300 consumers and 1,275 miles of line. Total investment has grown from $200,000 to $3,376,242.

Max has always taken a keen interest in youth programs and the cooperative has sponsored Future Farmers of America and 4–H Clubs. It was one of the organizers of Montana Youth Electric Fair. Since 1947 the co-op has hired four college students during the summer months each year.

We join in the MAU resolution as it closes with "heartfelt thanks and best wishes for the future" to Max and Mrs. Mathews.

REPLY TO CRITICISM OF CIA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, for some years now I have been privileged to sit on the special subcommittee which deals with the work of the CIA. Throughout my service on the subcommittee I have been impressed by the dedication of the people working in that agency and by the skill with which they have carried out their very difficult and important jobs. We know that from time to time criticism of the CIA is heard. Unfortunately the many successes of the agency are seldom mentioned in the press and often are not even known since publicity might endanger the success of future programs and even the lives of those carrying them out. On the other hand, when the CIA's judgment appears faulty, sharp criticism sometimes follows.

A recent article which appeared in the Washington Star and other newspapers seems to me to outline very well some of the special problems which face the agency. It was written by one of the persons most knowledgeable about the work of the CIA, Carl Rowan, former Director of the USIA and former Ambassador to Finland, who has now returned to his earlier occupation as a syndicated columnist. As Ambassador Rowan points out:

> A good intelligence system has become as crucial to national security as an army, or air force, or an arsenal of powerful weapons.

I think we should recognize the important role which the CIA has played in our national security. I think, too, that we should give credit where credit is due: Over the years the CIA has done a good job in carrying out the tasks assigned to it. I hope it will continue to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Rowan's article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Dec. 19, 1965]

REPLY TO CRITICISM OF CIA

(By Carl T. Rowan)

Pity the poor old Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). It is the perennial whipping boy of the columnists and Congressmen and of just about every foreign dictator seeking to divert attention from his own crookedness or ineptitude.

As one who knows a bit about CIA (which most of its critics decidedly do not), I get a little sick of seeing it badgered and abused by just about everybody capable of scratching out a sentence or calling a press conference.

Now this may be interpreted as my being in favor of sin (which most people are) but put me on record as saying CIA does a pretty darned good job of protecting not only U.S. security but that of many weaker countries all over the world as well.

True, it makes mistakes. Big ones. But only at about the same rate that the State Department, the Defense Department, the White House or my old agency, the U.S. Information Agency makes booboos.

And you'd be hard pressed to convince me that CIA's ratio of incompetents is any higher than that of the U.S. Senate.

Those who leap to the firing line when they discover it's always open season on CIA seem to ignore one inescapable fact: A good intelligence system has become as crucial to national security as an army, or air force, or an arsenal of powerful weapons.

The foreigners criticizing CIA most (the Russians, President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, etc.) know this and nobody expends more effort than they do trying to perfect their cloak and dagger operations.

What we ought not forget is that in many critical situations these last few years, the United States has been able to make the correct decision to guarantee our security because CIA had secured information that our enemies thought we could not possibly possess. The Cuban missiles crisis is an example.

Having said all this, I must concede that CIA is at a critical point in its history. Not only is it scorned the world over, but the standard device for discrediting the Peace Corps, USIA and other American agencies is to link them to the CIA.

During the recent tour of East Africa and southeast Asia, it was made clear to me that suspicion and fear of "the CIA" has become a sort of Achilles heel of American foreign policy.

This may seem to justify the attacks on CIA in Congress and elsewhere but the truth is just the opposite. The home-grown critics are 100 times more to blame for the wild and irrational foreign fear of CIA than is the agency itself.

A Ghana official recently was lamenting the fact that the United States denied a food request because Nkrumah published a book attacking CIA and labeling just about every American who ever put foot in Ghana as a "CIA spy."

"Are you surprised that Americans would react unfavorably to this kind of attack?" I asked.

"We are surprised that you would direct your anger at us," said the Ghana envoy.

"Our President took practically everything he wrote out of American books and other publications."

At a dinner in Lusaka, the Vice President of Zambia began conversation by asking me to give him an appraisal of "The Invisible Government," a book by two of my journalistic colleagues about so-called CIA cloak-and-dagger operations abroad.

I ducked the question by commenting: "I only wish CIA were capable of half the things for which it is blamed or praised."

Several Zambian Cabinet members refused to let me duck, however, and I soon found myself caught in a wild discussion with people who believe fervently that CIA is in the business of overthrowing and installing governments all over the world—without the approval or knowledge of the Secretary of State or the President.

I later learned that every top and middle-level Zambian official had been instructed to read "The Invisible Government," Andrew Tully's book "The CIA," and Morris West's new book "The Ambassador."

I'm not naive enough to suggest that newsmen and authors stop writing about CIA. Our society is naturally intolerant of secrecy (which any good intelligence operation requires), so the questioning and criticism will go on.

But it would sure help if some of the critics conceded that, whether we like clandestine intelligence operations or not, they are indispensable in this crazy, crooked, bellicose world in which we live.

IRON HOSS SHAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Sunday Gazette-Mail State magazine, published in Charleston, W. Va., is a weekly treasure trove of news for and about the Mountain State. The January 2 edition carried an article that is a commentary on past transportation glories in the United States. Entitled "The Wonderful Iron Horse Shay" it delves into the history of the Shay engine used to haul passengers on the Cass Scenic Railroad, originating in Cass, W. Va.

I ask unanimous consent to have this newspaper article by Mr. William C. Blizzard printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Wonderful Iron Horse Shay—Built for Mountain Climbing, It's Slow, Mighty Slow on the Overland Trips

(By William C. Blizzard)

This year the Elkins Forest Festival, plagued by rain and dismal weather, was pulled out of the slough of despond by one of the powerful little logging locomotives admirers call the Wonderful Iron-Hoss Shay.

During the 3-day festival over 4,000 passengers, despite a cold and persistent rain, paid money to take short rides behind the 80-ton Shay locomotive, an antique vehicle which ordinarily chugs up Bald Knob on the Cass Scenic Railroad. Although the miserable weather may have halved the number of paying customers, the little Shay remained a stellar attraction.

It was difficult not to notice the locomotive, for its shrill and penetrating steam whistle bent more eardrums and cleared more sinuses in 3 days than could be inspected by a dozen otolaryngologists in a year of practice. How do you ignore a festival attraction with a sort of built-in calliope which can be heard for 5 miles? You don't, especially if the calliope has only one note, or, at most, two.

There were those who, in self-defense, hauled out midwinter ear muffs; others merely gritted their teeth in silent protest against the dawn-to-dark steam-siren symphony. But most people accepted the locomotive whistle as a mild nuisance indicative of a strong benefit, and were glad the Shay was in town.

Few towns in the United States can boast of the presence of a Shay engine at any time of the year. Informed sources estimate that not more than 40 of the old steam locomotives exist in the United States today, and few of these are any longer able to shake, rattle, and roll. How did such a rare antique happen to be hauling passengers in Elkins during the Forest Festival?

It happened partly because rail lines belonging to the Chesapeake & Ohio and Western Maryland Railroads exist between Cass and Elkins. Four Shay engines are at Cass. During the summer months they (the three that operate) snort and puff on the Cass Scenic Railroad, this season hauling 38,857 paying customers up Bald Knob for 4 miles and back again.

Last year, someone had the idea of bringing one of the Cass Shays to Elkins for the Forest Festival, where the public would be treated to short rides for a small fee. The idea was a happy one: The Shay was a sooty Cinderella who became the belle of the ball.

It was decided to repeat the Shay performance for the 1965 Elkins Forest Festival, and the department of natural resources, which owns the Shays, agreed. Further, someone thought it might be a good idea to invite the press and other guests for the 60-mile ride, as the Shay shimmies, from Cass to Elkins.

This was done. About 2 dozen passengers accompanied Shay No. 4, followed by several passenger flatcars and a caboose, as it left Cass about 9:30 on the morning of October 6.

The ride, interrupted by three watering stops (for the locomotive, not the passengers) and another stop for minor repairs, took a bit longer than anticipated. It was about 6:30, and getting dark, when the little Shay crept into Elkins. Maximum speed had been about 8 miles an hour.

The 2 dozen who had started the trip at Cass had, at the Elkins finish line, dwindled to something less than half that number. Of those who stayed all the way with the Shay, four were women. They were Mrs. Violet Snedegar of Elkins; Mrs. Mabel Fretwell of Buckhannon; Katherine McMullen of Milwaukee, Wis., editor of Better Camping magazine; and Rosemary Entringer, also of Milwaukee, managing editor of Trains magazine.

Inasmuch as the 60-mile trip from Cass to Elkins took about 9 hours, it may fairly be deduced that the Shay is the tortoise of the locomotive world. What, then are its virtues?

Its principal virtue today is its remarkable popularity as a novelty railroad tourist attraction. In West Virginia, North Carolina (where one Shay still serves as a common carrier), South Dakota, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and, possibly, elsewhere, Shays and similar, geared-type locomotives built to compete with the Shay operate on tourist railroads. Shay production, begun in 1879, ceased in 1945.

The principal virtues of the Shay in its heyday were its traction and power, its safety, and its economy. Authorities in the field agree that the Shay would haul greater tonnage at a smaller operating expense, with less original cost per unit of power, than any other locomotive ever built.

The little engines were named for Ephriam Shay of Haring, Mich. Shay was a 19th-century Michigan lumberman who sought better ways of geting timber out of the woods. In his seeking, he invented and built the locomotive that bears his name. His crude prototype worked so well at his own operations that he took his plans and patents to the Lima (pronounced lime-uh) Machine Works of Lima, Ohio, urging that company to make such locomotives for widespread use in the timbering business.

Shay's visit was fortunate for the Lima Machine Works. The company made the first Shay in 1879 for the J. Alley Co. of Michigan. The Alley machine was narrow gage, but as demand for the Shays increased, Lima made them bigger and better. By 1900, Lima had quite general machine production and was concentrating on locomotives. The company changed its name to Lima Locomotive Works, Inc.

Lima made conventional locomotives as well as the Shays, increasing work in the former field as the lumbering industry demand declined in importance. Lima produced its last Shay, the 2,761st, in 1945.

The Shay engine had competitors built on similar "geared" principles. The major ones were the Heisler and the Climax.

The last Heisler, a locomotive invented by a Cornell engineer named Charles Heisler, was manufactured in 1941, and Climax went out of business in 1929.

The Shay and its imitators differed from conventional steam locomotives in that they were designed to haul heavy loads on steep grades. Called geared engines, as opposed to general-purpose, main-line locomotives which used connecting rods from drive wheels to pistons, the Shay had a number of small wheels which afforded great traction because each was a driving wheel.

On main-line engines, the number of drive wheels varied, but they were relatively large in diameter, heavy, and demanded smooth track which in turn required constant maintenance. Additional small wheels on the big steamers held up weight and served as rail guides, but otherwise were functionless.

Not so on the Shay. The wheel sets (called trucks) under both locomotive and tender are connected to steam cylinders transmitting power through a crankshaft and flexible couplings. Every wheel does work.

The Shay is easy to get around curves, is easy on track, and can adapt to rough roadbeds that would stall or wreck conventional locomotives. The Shay is slow, but it could pull tons of logs up a grade three times as steep as a rod-engine locomotive could ascend, and safely get the same tonnage down the steep grade on the other side of the hill.

With the demise of the U.S. logging industry as it was in its heyday, the Shay virtues found no niche they could fill, and manufacture ceased.

According to John P. Killoran of the department of natural resources, who has made himself an authority in such matters (and who furnished the technical data for this article), the last three geared locomotives ever built spent their entire work careers in West Virginia, and all three still exist.

They are not now, however, in the Mountain State. One, a Shay that was operated by the Western Maryland on a steep coal-haul in Tucker County, is now displayed at the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad's Transportation Museum in Baltimore, Md.

The last Climax to be manufactured now hauls passengers on the Carroll Park and Western tourist railroad at Bloomsburg, Pa. It was an iron-horse work horse for the Elk River Coal & Lumber Co. out of Swandale, Clay County.

The last Heisler locomotive ever built is now on display in the public park of Washington, N.C., Charles Heisler's hometown, but it spent its working career as No. 6 of the Middle Fork Railroad at Ellamore, in Randolph County.

Of the four Shays at Cass Nos. 5 and 1 were built in 1905, No. 7 was built in 1920, and No. 4 in 1923. The Lima Locomotive Works, merged with the huge Baldwin Locomotive

Works of Philadelphia in 1950, not only has quit making Shays, but no longer builds locomotives of any kind.

Lima now builds power shovels, an adjustment to market conditions which are a reflection of the changed manner in which many men wrest a livelihood from their environment.

The few operating Shays which yet exist at Cass and elsewhere carry not only tourist passengers. For old loggers and railroad men they also carry endless vivid memories of a vanished past.

DEATH OF FOREIGN CORRESPONDENT MARGUERITE HIGGINS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the well-known foreign correspondent, Miss Marguerite Higgins, who died in Walter Reed Hospital on Monday, January 3.

I consider Miss Higgins one of the greatest foreign correspondents of our time.

For me, Miss Higgins' passing is a personal loss which leaves the world a much emptier place.

I first came to know her during the Nuremburg trial, when she was covering Germany for the New York Herald Tribune. Although she was then very young as foreign correspondents go, even at that early date she commanded recognition as one of the ablest members of the American press corps in Germany.

In the 20-odd years that have elapsed since the Nuremberg trial she has many times covered herself with glory and brought credit to her profession.

Miss Higgins was not merely a correspondent with rare powers of observation and political understanding. She was a person of absolute integrity, who somehow managed to retain both her warm heart and her idealism in a profession that all too frequently makes for cynicism.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert into the RECORD the obituary article on Miss Marguerite Higgins which appeared in the New York Times for January 4, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARGUERITE HIGGINS DIES AT 45—REPORTER WON 1951 PULITZER PRIZE—KOREA CORRESPONDENT WON FAME FOR STORIES FROM FRONT—SYNDICATED COLUMNIST

WASHINGTON, January 3.—Marguerite Higgins, the columnist and war correspondent who won a Pulitzer Prize in 1951 for her frontline reports from Korea, died today in Walter Reed Army Hospital. She was 45 years old.

Miss Higgins had been confined to the hospital for 2 months, suffering from a rare tropical ailment she picked up on a recent tour of Vietnam, Pakistan, and India. Doctors said she had died of complications apparently caused by a tropical parasite.

She was the wife of Lieut. Gen. William E. Hall, USAF, retired.

She also leaves a son, Lawrence O'Higgins Hall, a daughter, Linda Marguerite Hall, and her mother, Mrs. Marguerite Higgins, of Oakland, Calif.

A funeral service will be held Friday at 10:45 a.m. at the Fort Myer Chapel, Arlington, Va. Burial will be in Arlington National Cemetery.

SCORED IN A MAN'S WORLD

Marguerite Higgins got stories other reporters didn't get.

She did it with a combination of masculine drive, feminine wiles, and professional pride. She had brass and she had charm, and she used them to shoot right to the top of a profession that usually relegates women to the softie beats of cooking, clothes, and society.

Miss Higgins made it big in a way any man would be proud of. She won a Pulitzer Prize for her reports from the Korean warfronts for the New York Herald Tribune, after she fought her way into that war over the objections of an American general.

She sat across the polished desks in the world's capitals and crossed ideas with De Gaulle, Khrushchev, Chiang-Kai-shek, and Tito.

She was with the Allied troops in Europe in World War II, and sometimes in advance of them, to cover the liberation of the concentration camps at Buchenwald and Dachau and the capture of Hitler's mountaintop hideaway at Berchtesgaden.

And in the final illness of her life, despite raging fevers and a debilitating blood ailment, she continued to turn out her three-times-a-week column for Newsday and 92 other newspapers. She agreed to cut her work to one column a week only in the last 2 weeks of her illness.

There was steel in Marguerite Higgins' character, but it was concealed in a feminine figure, and the femininity always showed, even when she was slogging along the muddy roads of Korea in baggy pants and a man's shirt with her blond curls tucked into an Army fatigue hat.

A colleague who remembered Miss Higgins as a cub reporter at the Herald Tribune said she had often endured broken fingernails, torn stockings, and carbon paper smudges on her nose, but what he remembered best was her bright blue eyes.

Miss Higgins won her job at the Herald Tribune in a characteristic way. She was a student at Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism in 1942 and at the same time was hoping for a job while serving as the newspaper's campus correspondent.

INTERVIEWED MRS. CHIANG

She heard that Mrs. Chiang Kai-shek was a patient at the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center and had refused to see reporters or grant interviews. Miss Higgins got to Mrs. Chiang's room, got her story—and her job.

Miss Higgins was born in Hong Kong in 1920. Her father was Larry Daniel Higgins, a veteran of the Army Flying Corps. Her mother was a Frenchwoman, the former Marguerite Goddard. The family lived abroad for many years and Miss Higgins obtained her early education in French and English schools.

She was graduated with honors from the University of California in 1941 and then worked briefly for the Vallejo (Calif.) Times-Herald.

This first brush with journalism confirmed her intention to become a reporter. She enrolled at Columbia and received a master's degree in 1942.

During the next 2 years, Miss Higgins covered fires in New Jersey, circus disasters in Connecticut, and women's war efforts in New York. All the time, she begged for a chance to cover the war overseas. Her chance came in 1944, when she was sent to the Herald Tribune's London bureau and then to Paris because of her fluency in French.

It was in this period that Miss Higgins' bylines began appearing in New York over stories on the triumphant march of the Allied armies across Europe to Berlin. In 1945, at the age of 25, she was appointed chief of her newspaper's Berlin bureau.

But it was her reports on the Korean war that made her a national figure. Miss Higgins was sent to Japan as the Herald Tribune's Far Eastern correspondent in 1950, shortly before North Korean troops crossed into South Korea and began their drive to Seoul.

ORDERED OUT OF COUNTRY

She was ordered to leave Korea, along with all other American women, by Lt. Gen. Walton H. Walker. The general explained "This is just not the type of war where women ought to be running around the front lines."

Miss Higgins was outraged. She put her case to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and he rescinded the order the next day. Miss Higgins returned to Korea and began filing the stories that won her the Pulitzer Prize. Later, she wrote a bestselling book on her experiences, "War in Korea: The Report of a Woman Combat Correspondent."

She did not forget her brushes with the military. "I have observed that the main effect of military public relations officers is to hamper correspondents," she said in her book.

Miss Higgins remained in the Far East until 1958, when she returned to this country to be a diplomatic correspondent in Washington. She became a columnist for Newsday, the Long Island daily newspaper, in 1962 and her syndicated reports began appearing from trouble spots all over the world.

In her last column, published on Friday, Miss Higgins criticized President Johnson for treating the war in Vietnam as a "pesky but peripheral one in an atmosphere of business as usual."

"What now seems to have dawned on the President and his advisers," she wrote, "is that Hanoi is in the south for keeps. An awareness of this within the administration has led to the unhappy conclusion that priorities must be established and that many elaborate hopes of the Great Society have to be minimized."

In 1952 she was married to General Hall. In recent years they made their home in the Georgetown section of Washington.

Miss Higgins won a flood of awards during her career. Ten years ago, on the publication of another book, "News Is a Singular Thing," she added up the plaques, certificates and prizes that had been awarded to her and found they came to 50. After that she stopped counting.

Perhaps the best tribute to her came in a letter of complaint about one of her stories from Korea. The story was incomplete, an Army colonel wrote, because it did not mention Miss Higgins' personal activities.

"Completely disregarding her own personal safety [she] voluntarily assisted by administering blood plasma to the many wounded as they were carried into the temporary aid station. This aid station was subjected to small-arms fire throughout the attack.

"The regimental combat team considers Miss Higgins' actions on that day as heroic, but even more important is the gratitude felt by members of the command toward the selfless devotion of Miss Higgins in saving the lives of many grievously wounded men."

A FOUR-POINT POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on January 10, I issued a statement in which I proposed a four-point legislative program to help salvage the war on poverty. I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR HUGH SCOTT, JANUARY 10, 1966

America is the richest Nation history has known, yet millions of Americans are trapped in the dead end street of poverty through illiteracy, lack of basic skills, racial discrimination, broken homes, age, and ill health. Such conditions are hardly touched by the general economic growth and affluence of our society.

That is why I supported the war on poverty.

I voted for the declaration of war against poverty in 1964, and I voted to escalate that war last year.

I supported that effort because, despite our enormous agricultural surpluses, about 2,000 Americans still die yearly from diseases of malnutrition, and many American children still go to bed with empty stomachs.

I supported that effort because more than 34 million Americans have been estimated as living in poverty or near poverty. Fifteen million of them are children and over 5 million are old people.

From the wornout country hollows of Appalachia to the gray slums of our big cities, America's poor huddle in hopelessness and despair, and many Americans do not even know they are there.

Poverty is the real trojan horse in our midst. It insidiously gnaws away at our ideals of equality and often makes a mockery of American democracy in the eyes of a watching world.

Our battle with communism in Vietnam dominates the headlines today, and is consuming American lives and resources. But it would be an empty victory if we won the war against communism overseas and lost the war on poverty here at home.

And I fear that we are losing the war on poverty.

The war on poverty, as administered from Washington by the Office of Economic Opportunity and implemented at the local level by community groups, is distinguished today not for its accomplishments, but for its failures. The war on poverty has degenerated into a nightmare of bureaucratic bungling, overly paid administrators, poorly organized fieldworkers, and partisan politics.

These developments would be serious enough in any Federal program. But its real tragedy is that in this program money that should be going to the poor is not reaching the poor, because the principal concern among too many people in the war on poverty today is simply: Who is going to control the loot?

This was expressed most poignantly by the Reverend Lynward Stevenson, head of a local community organization in Chicago, who said:

"The records are full of direct political patronage. How do you think we poor feel when we know that men who drive Cadillacs, eat 3-inch steaks, and sip champagne at luncheon meetings, discuss our future while we are pushed off the highways of self-help and told to keep our hats in hand?"

THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

The Economic Opportunity Act is administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), whose Director is Sargent Shriver. The original legislation enacted in August 1964, authorized appropriations of $947.5 million for fiscal 1965. It was extended in August of last year through fiscal 1968 and appropriations of $1,785 million for fiscal 1966 were authorized.

Key sections of the act authorize: (1) the OEO to operate a Job Corps to provide work experience and training to youths in conservation camps and urban and rural residential training centers; (2) the domestic peace corps, called the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA); and (3) the community action program under which the Federal Government financially and technically assists a variety of local "human development" efforts.

I hesitate to place all the blame for the problems of the war on poverty on the shoulders of Sargent Shriver, because he is an able and well-motivated administrator. But since he has retained his position as Director of the Peace Corps, the war on poverty has been run by a part-time general.

Moreover, as the minority members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee pointed out, in the OEO there is 1 supergrade (highly paid) official for every 18 ordinary Government employees. For purposes of comparison, there is 1 supergrade employee for every 1,000 Government employees in the Department of Defense, and 1 supergrade for every 500 employees in the Department of Agriculture.

With all these chiefs to supervise so few "Indians" it is unfortunate that they have not found more time to supervise some of the projects in various other parts of the country which have been using Federal money to implement the war on poverty.

For instance, I have never seen an explanation for this type of lopsided development in the Job Corps:

One of two brothers from an Indiana community, recently was serving under enemy fire in Vietnam, while the other brother became a school dropout, having beat up his mother and his teacher. The brother in Vietnam was being paid $78 per month, while the dropout was being given $200 monthly by the Job Corps for running a lawnmower.

Nor for these costly attempts at news management:

Jack Steele of the Scripps-Howard newspapers reported that in the St. Petersburg Women's Job Corps Center no officer may talk to the press without reporting the conversation by long-distance telephone to Washington.

LEGISLATION

However, it serves little purpose to cite isolated instances of problems in the war on poverty. Nor would one accomplish much merely by suggesting that some vague changes in the administration of the programs would end the turmoil.

Rather, I propose to discuss specific faults within the war on poverty and make legislative recommendations which might bring the war back to its main objective: defeating poverty which besets so much of America.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

The most frequent problems in the war on poverty seem to occur in the community action program. The CAP has as its functions to (1) coordinate and utilize a broad variety of resources available within a community; (2) provide—through these varied services—projects and assistance to those in need of them; (3) combine in its structure "the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served;" and (4) be run by either a public or a private nonprofit agency.

But from one end of the Nation to the other there are reports of turmoil in the community action program.

In my own city of Philadelphia, the program first foundered, then floundered, and is still not fully underway.

Community action program agencies come in three basic varieties: (1) existing municipal governments which take on poverty war functions, (2) foundation structures, and (3) nonprofit corporations. Philadelphia tried them all.

First, something called human renewal was set up with 13 city officials as members. It was a paper plan designed to give the mayor control of Federal antipoverty money so it could be used to finance existing municipal departments. When funds were requested, Washington saw through the scheme and said no.

Second, Philadelphia's mayor tried the foundation approach and attempted to work through the Ford Foundation sponsored Philadelphia Council for Community Advancement. But that group had already reduced its staff from 35 to 9, and, despite maneuvers to restaff the organization from city agencies and to use another name, Washington again said no.

Private groups next attempted to set up an agency, but the city government met that threat to their own power by declaring that a nonprofit community action corporation unconnected with city hall would be illegal. This was done despite the fact that such groups were operating and receiving funds in Pittsburgh and Washington, D.C.

Finally, a community action program agency called the Philadelphia Antipoverty Action Committee was established.

Among the first 16 group leaders hired under Philadelphia's poverty program to work with youngsters in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, 13 had arrest records which included larceny, assault and battery, and morals counts involving minors.

In the words of the Greater Philadelphia magazine, "until Philadelphia's poverty program is completely extracted from politics and patronage, the most likely gainers will not be the poor."

Los Angeles furnishes a most tragic example of the ineptitude of the community action program. The mayor has charged that one of the causes of last summer's riot in the Watts district was the "deliberate and well-publicized cutting off of poverty funds to this city, pending our efforts to reorganize the youth opportunities board to meet the chameleonic OEO criteria."

Sargent Shriver responded that "a few local officials have made it extremely difficult for the private agencies, minority groups, and the poor to join in the war."

Then the nonpartisan commission to investigate the Los Angeles riots concluded that one cause of the riots was the widespread publicity about Federal antipoverty funds that for various reasons "did not live up to their press notices" in Los Angeles. Prior to the riots the war on poverty received much publicity but the Watts district had received no aid.

In Chicago, city hall controls the appointment of 42 representatives out of a total of 75 on the committee that operates the local community action program. This has enabled the mayor to maintain iron control over the $21 million which has been received and, in the words of one observer, to use those funds to "oil his political machine."

In New York City, Harlem's poverty agency, Haryou-Act is reportedly unable to account for up to $2 million of the funds it has received in the past year. Its executive director has stepped down temporarily, ostensibly to work full time on the agency's books.

Newark, N.J.'s city councilmen fear that that city's independent community action agency—the United Community Corp.—poses a political threat to them. As of December 7 they were trying to place it under a politically appointed commission. In retaliation, the corporation's president has vowed that the agency "would alter the power structure of the city." While the battle for control in Newark rages on, the poor remain poor.

For whatever the reasons, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been unable to find the answer to these and other problems that plague the community action program. Therefore, I propose that the community action program be removed from that agency and placed in the newly created Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development. Special provisions should be made to protect the interests of rural communities with community action programs.

Administration of this program by the new Cabinet-level Federal Department would take the program out of the "crisis to crisis" and often overly political atmosphere of the OEO and bring its administration into the mainstream of urban planning, development, and renewal.

POLITICS

One of the most prevalent problems in the war on poverty has been its intermixture with partisan political activity. Money designed to help the poor has been diverted instead into helping the "poor" politician.

Early in the program's conception, the Johnson administration delivered to each Democratic Congressman's office a "poverty kit" for use in the 1964 elections. Chairman Adam Clayton Powell of the House Education and Labor Committee has described the program as "giant fiestas of political patronage."

A director of the privately sponsored Woodlawn Organization of Chicago said during hearings that the list of those running the war on poverty in Chicago read "like a fundraising committee for the Democratic Party."

Syracuse University received a grant to train students who would then organize low-income groups into what have been termed "politically effective citizens." A New York Times writer said the program turned into a pretty specific effort to organize "the poor to fight city hall." Antipoverty funds were used to pay babysitters and hire taxis to register voters in a heavily Democratic public housing area and to transport people to heckle Syracuse Mayor William F. Walsh during his reelection campaign.

Therefore I propose that legislation be enacted that would put under the Hatch Act—and thereby prohibit partisan political activity—those employees of private organizations conducting community action programs whose salaries are in principal part paid from Federal funds.

The Hatch Act already covers the employees of State and local governments who administer programs financed by Federal funds. If we put under the Hatch Act employees being paid through the war on poverty, it would make some of the pork-barrel aspects in the present arrangement far less attractive to the big city political bosses who now tend to confuse the U.S. Treasury Department with their county campaign finance committees.

GOVERNOR'S VETO

The original act of 1964 provided that no community action program, adult basic education program or Neighborhood Youth Corps project could be undertaken in a State if the Governor of that State disapproved the program within 30 days of its submission to him.

Last year the Congress, in a move that I opposed very strongly, emasculated that provision to the effect that the Governors no longer have a veto.

This action was taken despite the fact that the Governors of 49 out of the 50 States opposed such a change. Its net effect was to reduce still further the controls on war on poverty programs, increase the instability of existing local programs, and encourage duplication and waste. In other words, the majority in Congress took the war on poverty one step still further away from helping the poor.

I propose that the Governors be given back the veto power as originally provided in the law.

SALARIES OF POVERTY OFFICIALS

Finally, the salaries paid some officials of the war on poverty have been scandalously high.

One of Chicago's top poverty officials who had previously made $14,000 jumped to $22,500 when he enlisted in the war on poverty. It was recently revealed that the New Jersey director of the program was being paid $25,000 annually, more than any member of the Governor's cabinet. In Washington, D.C., the local poverty war director has been getting $25,000 annually, which is the same amount received by two of the three District Commissioners. Just prior to the riots in the Watts district of Los Angeles, the head of Los Angeles' poverty effort was drawing a salary of $25,000 and his two top assistants were receiving $25,000 and $21,000. But the Watts district had received no aid.

I therefore propose that legislation be enacted that would put reasonable ceilings on all salaries paid under the war on poverty.

NEED FOR ACTION

I do not believe that these legislative proposals are the only ones needed, nor that they, of themselves, will radically change a situation that has deteriorated so seriously. But I believe that the Congress has an obligation to deal forthrightly with problems that are very important to the welfare of our Nation.

There was an inadvertent deception involved in the publicity buildup for the war on poverty. There are many people who, throughout their lives, have been waiting for someone to come along and give them a helping hand.

In the war on poverty they saw hope for the first time, an opportunity to pull themselves up out of the mire of hopelessness—a chance to learn a new trade, give their children a better start than they had themselves, hold their heads a little higher.

But disillusion followed the early promises and—as we saw in the Watts riots—for some this bitter disappointment led to violence and bloodshed. For many others it merely meant a return to the old and bitter ways, back to the alleys that have no exits.

For the sake of these individuals and for the sake of society itself, we must rectify the wrongs done by the maladministration on all levels of the war on poverty, and we must do so promptly.

A GREAT APPOINTMENT—THAT OF ROBERT C. WEAVER, TO HEAD THE NEW DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. GRUENING. President Johnson is to be commended on the excellence of his nomination of Robert C. Weaver as the head of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development. Not only is it an excellent appointment but it is also the best possible choice that could have been made. It happens that I have known Robert Weaver during the somewhat more than 30 years since he first came into the Federal Government. The periods of our public service more or less coincide. For it was in 1934 that he began to work in the Interior Department, shortly before I was appointed the first Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions. I became acquainted with Dr. Weaver at that time. Since then, Dr. Weaver, who acquired his doctorate in economics from Harvard University in 1934, has been a specialist in housing and related activities. So he brings to his new and important Cabinet post not only nearly a third of a century of intensive and pertinent experience, but also a record of dedicated and effective performance. The long delay in making this appointment since the Congress created the Department which he is to head, had left some of us who were fully aware of Dr. Weaver's outstanding qualifications of this post troubled at the possibility that he might not be named. Obviously, there were reports and rumors to the effect that President Johnson was looking elsewhere. Fortunately, this suspense which President Johnson apparently enjoys creating has now been happily ended.

We can look forward to a continuation of the outstanding service on the part of Dr. Weaver he has rendered in the past and feel the administration and the Nation are to be warmly congratulated on this choice.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from this morning's January 13 New York Times, entitled "New Man in Cabinet," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New Man in Cabinet: Robert Clifton Weaver

Washington, January 13.—If the bald, mustached man in the neat gray suit had trouble concealing his pride and pleasure as he walked into the Fish Room of the White House late this afternoon, it was hardly surprising. At his side was the President of the United States and behind him, to a rising murmur of surprise and comprehension from the press corps, walked the members of the President's Cabinet, one by one.

For Robert Clifton Weaver, it was the end of a long, long road, the full measure of recognition for which he had worked and fought, as a Negro, for most of his 58 years in the largely white and often hostile worlds of Government and politics.

After President Johnson described the intricate problems implicit in the new Department of Housing and Urban Development, he turned to the man he had chosen as its first Secretary, grinned and said:

"May the good Lord have mercy on you."

HARDLY NEEDS HELP

Dr. Weaver did not appear in need of such assistance. He seemed, in fact, to be enjoying hugely the fact that he had finally won the highest governmental office ever held by a member of his race—an office that much of official Washington believed he had long since lost any chance at.

In the months that the new Cabinet post was under discussion and the weeks that it remained unfilled, the name of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency had been moved from the top of the eligible list to the bottom and then stricken off by most students of Johnsonian politics—but never by Dr. Weaver himself.

"Bob Weaver is the smartest politician in Washington who doesn't live in the White House," said one of his jubilant friends after the word was out. "Do you know anybody else who ever turned L.B.J. around?"

The smiling, genial, heavy-set man who stood at the President's right today was the Robert Weaver of warmth and friendly grace who inhabits the social world.

SELF-MADE EXPERT

There is another Dr. Weaver, the Government professional who virtually made himself the urban affairs expert of both his race and his party. That man is a loner, who does not draw his associates close around him, a sort of self-insulated leader.

Often he has needed that insulation to protect himself from his so-called friends. In recent years, ambitious Negro politicians, riding the rising tide of equality, have tried in vain to promote him into a series of elective offices he did not want.

Dr. Weaver's aids pay the highest tribute to his intense personal discipline and dedication to work.

For the new Secretary-designate, service in Washington is an old story. He first came here, with two fresh Harvard degrees, in 1933 to work under Harold L. Ickes in the Department of the Interior.

His job was adviser on Negro affairs to the Secretary, but his activities were far ranging. They included desegregating the employees' cafeteria in the Interior Department with a group of his friends.

Having acquired his doctor's degree in economics from Harvard in 1934, Dr. Weaver worked as a special assistant in the Federal Housing Authority from 1937 to 1940 and with the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission during World War II.

TAUGHT IN COLLEGE HERE

After the war he taught at Columbia and New York Universities. When W. Averell Harriman was elected Governor of New York in 1956, he first named Dr. Weaver as a deputy State housing commissioner, and later to be State rent administrator.

In the last post, Dr. Weaver became the first Negro to sit in a New York Governor's cabinet.

OF MIDDLE CLASS FAMILY

Dr. Weaver is the product of a tidy, careful, conservative middle-class family. He was born December 29, 1907, in the Brookland outskirts of Washington, the son of a postal clerk. He learned the electrician's trade as a young man and still takes on wiring jobs.

In 1935 he married the former Ella Haith, a drama student at Carnegie Institute of Technology. She is now a teacher and speech therapist at Brooklyn College. Their 22-year-old adopted son, Robert, Jr., shot himself fatally in an apparent accident in 1962.

His friends report that Dr. Weaver turned down two attractive academic job offers while the secretaryship was hanging fire in the White House.

"He could have told the President to go to hell, but he stuck it out and won," a friend said with satisfaction.

WEST VIRGINIA, A GARDEN OF EDEN

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in the midst of the winter weather which is to be the lot of our Nation for the next few weeks, Americans may wish to think ahead to a vacation this spring in the mountains of West Virginia. Perhaps the traveling public will be interested in knowing that at one time West Virginia was believed to be the site of the Garden of Eden by some people.

While as a Mountain-State Senator I do not wish to be so immodest as to claim that my State is a Garden of Eden, I do wish to point out that its attractions have in the past moved some people to so characterize it, as discussed in the November 28, 1965, issue of the Sunday (Charleston, W. Va.) Gazette-Mail State magazine.

I ask unanimous consent to have this newspaper article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GARDEN OF EDEN (REDISCOVERED) IN FAYETTE COUNTY—ABOUT MIDDLE OF 19TH CENTURY SPIRIT MESSAGE SENT RELIGIOUS SECT TO FIND EDEN HERE

(By Roger Morris)

The West Virginia Progress Corps will have to get down to its press releases if it expects to keep the pace that a group of settlers established over 100 years ago in promoting the State as a heaven on earth.

While the modern-day boosters resort to such paradisiacal praise as referring to West Virginia as the Mountain State and Little Switzerland of America, their predecessors worked on a larger scale. West Virginia (then a part of Virginia), they said, was the site of the original Garden of Eden. Fayette County to be exact.

Although such a contention might cause skeptical eyes to be raised today, it was not too unusual for its time, which was the 1st half of the 19th century.

This period between 1800–60 witnessed a good deal of what might be termed "mildly original" religious thought. During this time Joseph Smith was visited by the angel Moroni and told where to find the golden plates which were later to form the genesis of the Mormon Church; the Shakers were establishing colonies from New England to Missouri; and Horace Greeley was expounding the tenets of fourierism when he wasn't advising young men to hie themselves west.

Most of these religious sects either were ostracized or willingly isolated themselves from the more sedate elements which dominated the old frontier. As a result, religious colonies sprang up in most regions of the American Midwest.

Many if not most of these religious sects and colonies originated in upstate New York in such cities as Rochester, Palmyra, Auburn, and Batavia. After this rather frequent experience, this section has never been the same and has voted conservative Republican in penance ever since.

It was in Auburn that the idea of West Virginia as the site of the Garden of Eden took hold among the Spiritualists. There is a Biblical saying that "God works in mysterious ways," and the Spiritualists believed that He spoke through a knocking or rapping.

The way that this would work was that a religious person would be "visited" by rapping spirits, who would knock in a certain cadence on some wooden object, usually a table that was being used at the time. The person would then interpret this message, which was usually some commandment to action. (These people should not be confused with the followers of George Rapp, the Rappites, who were also prominent at this time.)

A group of Spiritualists under the leadership of Thomas Lake Harris were visited by the rappings in 1851 which told them to go to Virginia to await the millennium in the Garden of Eden which they would rediscover there.

John Humphrey Noyes in his book, "History of American Socialisms," quotes a letter sent to the Oneida Circular in which it was published November 16, 1851. In one part the writer refers to a letter he had seen from one of the founders of the Virginia move, Ira S. Hitchcock:

"Yesterday in their (the New York Spiritualists) meeting, I heard extracts of letters from Mr. Hitchcock written from Virginia; in which he states that they have found the Garden of Eden, the identical spot where our first parents sinned, and on which no human foot has trod since Adam and Eve were driven out; that himself, Ira S. Hitchcock, was the first who had been permitted to set foot upon it; and further, that in all the convulsions of nature, the upheavals and depressions, this spot has remained undisturbed as it originally appeared. This is the spot that is to form the center in the redemption now at hand; and the parts adjacent are, by convulsions and the reverse process, to be restored to their primeval state. This is the substance of what I heard read. The revelation was said to have been spelled out to them by raps from Paul."

About a month later, the same writer told of receiving a copy of the message which had been dictated by St. Paul "in this manner, viz: the words were written in a vision, printed in space, one at a time, declared off by him (a Mr. Scott, one of the leaders), and written down by someone else."

The message said in part:

"Go. Scarcely let time intervene. Escape the vales of death. Pass from beneath the cloud of magnetic human glory. Flee to the mountains whither I direct.

"The city of refuge is builded as a hiding place and a shelter; as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land; as an asylum for the afflicted; a safety for those fleeing from the power of sin which pursueth to destroy. In that mountain my people shall rest secure. Above it the cloud of glory descendeth. Thence it encompasseth the saints. The angels shall ascend and descend. There the soul shall feast and be satisfied. There is the bread and the water of life. 'And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wine on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined.* * *' "

With this commandment in mind, over 100 people migrated to Fayette County and set up a spiritualist community at Mountain Cove along the old James and Kanawha Turnpike. Although the town of Mountain Cove is not on today's road maps, Fayette County historian, the Reverend C. S. Donnelly, identifies the site of the "Garden of Eden" as Hico and Lookout. Only the mountain lying along U.S. 60 between Cove magisterial district retains the name now.

Practically nothing was written (or at least reached the hands of the historians) about how the community was established and subsequently operated.

However, we do know that it was largely self-sufficient, and its members included farmers, blacksmiths and assorted craftsmen. One source suggests that some members of the colony were held in slave status, but this may not have been the case.

The pride and joy of the community was the Mountain Cove Journal and the Spiritual Harbinger, a newspaper which was for all intent and purposes a running spiritual tract. Although it gives much insight into the beliefs of the spiritualists, such as communication with the dead, it neglects all comment on daily life in Mountain Cove.

In any event, Mountain Cove became divided over the issues of property and government. Noyes cites a letter from a disgruntled former Mountain Cove citizen:

"The principal mediums, James L. Scott and Thomas L. Harris, profess absolute Divine inspiration, and entire infallibility; that the infinite God communicates with them directly, without intermediate agency; and that by him they are preserved from the possibility of error in any of their dictations which claim a spiritual origin.

"By virtue of these assumptions * * * all the principles and rules of practice, whether of a spiritual or temporal nature * * * are dictated by the individuals mentioned above. Among the communications thus received, which are usually in the form of arbitrary decrees, are requirements which positively forbid those who have once formed a belief in the divinity of the movement, the privilege of criticizing, or * * * having any reason or conscience at all, except that which is prescribed to them by this oracle."

Scott himself replied to the charge referring to himself and Harris as the "human viceregents of God" who neither owned property at Mountain Cove or had any "pecuniary supporters there," men who were "surrounded by circumstances calculated to try men's souls."

After about 2 years of existence, the colony proper broke up in 1853 and its members for the most part scattered to other parts. Some of them went to other Spiritualists communities, most of which met with less success than the one at Mountain Cove.

Reverend Donnelly states that some of the colonists stayed on and fought on the side of the Union in the Civil War less than 10 years later. A few scattered descendants of the community live today in Fayette County, and Reverend Donnelly says that two of the original houses are still standing.

Thus the Mountain Cove community came to a quick end with the later denizens of the Garden of Eden proving no more able to live there than their predecessors. They discovered that although Adam and Eve had left the Garden, the snake lingered on.

THE FBI'S SECRET WAR

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a fine article in the January 1966, issue of the Reader's Digest entitled "The FBI's Secret War Against the Ku Klux Klan." This article clearly demonstrates the dogged determination and outstanding achievements of the FBI in carrying out its responsibilities—this time in the field of civil rights.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the RECORD, and hope that every American would read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FBI'S SECRET WAR AGAINST THE KU KLUX KLAN—BEHIND THE SCENES OF RACIAL TUMULT, FBI AGENTS ARE FIGHTING A DESPERATE AND THANKLESS BATTLE AGAINST KLANSMEN, COMMUNISTS, AND KILLERS

(By John Barron)

The FBI is "following the path of appeasement" of segregationists, said Martin Luther King, Jr., president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

"For Negroes, the FBI has become part of the oppression of the South," said the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee.

"Little or nothing is done to hunt down and prosecute the bombers, the burners and the killers," said Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., vice chairman of Americans for Democratic Action.

Such has been the litany of abuse heaped upon the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The truth is, however, that nearly 2,000 FBI agents are today risking their lives to defend the legitimate cause of civil rights against terror, subversion and anarchy. At this very moment they are desperately engaged in a deadly, secret war that rages from dark thickets in Mississippi to fiery streets in Los Angeles to packed slums in northern cities. Their mission is the most difficult and thankless in FBI history.

At midnight, two Ku Klux Klansmen steal across the campus of a Negro college in Little Rock. Against a dormitory wall they lay a black box containing 40 sticks of dynamite and a fuse attached to a candle. Suddenly flashlight beams strike from the darkness. "FBI. You're under arrest."

Dumbfounded, the klansmen find themselves surrounded by agents. The klansmen know that they have been betrayed. What they will never know is how the FBI succeeded in putting an informant into their midst.

A group of furtive men crowd into a New York City hotel suite, lock the door and draw the blinds. For 3 chilling days they plot a campaign to exploit racial hatred and to undermine the American defense of South Vietnam, in the name of civil rights. Each conspirator is a Communist Party boss. One, though, is also an undercover agent of the FBI. Less than 2 hours after the Communists abandon the suite, he dictates a detailed report which is flown by courier to Washington.

Two agents lie listening in a Georgia field as klansmen discuss plans to shoot down the first Negroes who attempt to enter a theater in the town of Covington. Next night, when carloads of heavily armed klansmen pour into Covington, alerted Georgia State troopers and local police fill the main street. The would-be killers can only look on sullenly as 18 Negroes enter the theater, sit through the show and leave without incident.

These cases from recent FBI experience are typical, but they only hint at what the FBI men must contend with.

In Mississippi, search for a Klan hideout led two agents to a darkened cellar. "Watch out, Bob," one yelled. "This place is full of snakes." Slowly and fearfully, the agents backed away from a writhing sea of rattlesnakes and moccasins that klansmen had collected to slip into the FBI men's cars and homes.

In Alabama, an agent was photographing hoodlums who were threatening the participants in civil rights demonstration. Suddenly a rubber hose whipped across the back of his neck. Lying on the sidewalk, he groggily reached out for his camera. A foot stomped down. Then there was only blackness.

In a Mississippi town, a cross was burned on the lawn of an agent 1 week after he had been transferred there with his family. The phone rang with obscene, threatening calls to his wife. "Sure is a pretty little girl you've got, honey. Be a shame if something happened to her. If you want to keep them kids, honey, you'd better get out of here." Once, while the agent was away on assignment, a call awakened his wife late at night. "This is the State highway patrol," a voice said. "Your husband was killed a while ago in a car accident. Where shall we deliver the body?" The wife was still in tears when FBI headquarters assured her that she had just been the victim of a macabre Klan hoax—her husband was all right.

These barbarous tactics remind one of the Ku Klux Klan in its heyday. Actually, the organization is a far cry from what it was then. During the 1920's, membership topped 4 million and extended into such States as Indiana, Kansas, and Colorado. Many southern officeholders owed their success at the polls to the bloc votes of the Klan. But over the years corruption and senseless violence proved to be the organization's undoing, and it was reduced to little more than a nuisance—until 1954, when a concerted revival effort began pushing Klan membership toward 10,000, with many other active sympathizers. Today the membership—most strongly concentrated in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana—is well past 10,000, and is growing.

These hard core fanatics can and do cause a lot of misery to the fighters for civil rights. And aggravating the FBI's problems are Communists and riffraff who are determined to stir up disorder and racial hatred through infiltration of civil rights organizations.

In defense of civil rights, the FBI has developed four basic tactics:

MASSIVE INVESTIGATION

In emergencies, as many as 250 agents are assigned to investigate a civil rights crime. Minutes after Washington headquarters decides that more men are needed, agents around the country are likely to receive the order that FBI wives dread: "You will report immediately to the special agent in charge (name of the city) for a special assignment of undetermined duration."

Such immediate action often detects vital clues before they vanish. A country church in Georgia was set afire with kerosene shortly after midnight. By 2 a.m., a dozen agents were blanketing the vicinity. Shortly after sunrise, at a house less than a mile from the church, one of the investigators smelled spilled kerosene. Had the agents delayed, the telltale odor would have disappeared, and the guilt of the occupants might never have been established.

RECRUITMENT OF ALLIES

Agents strive by personal example to enlist local authorities as allies in upholding Federal civil-rights laws. In September 1964, two agents, local policemen, a sheriff and his deputies gathered in front of a grocery store in the Negro section of Canton, Miss. A bomb composed of eight sticks of dynamite had just been discovered against the store's foundation.

The agents did not have to tell each other that they were on trial before the sheriff and local officers, whose support they had been trying to win. Though admittedly afraid, they crawled under the store, defused the bomb and brought it out.

On a rainy morning 7 months later, when 55 Negroes marched on the courthouse to register to vote, this same sheriff greeted the leaders with, "There's no use you getting wet out here. Make yourself at home inside while your people are registering."

An important turning point in the war against the Klan in Mississippi came when J. Edgar Hoover personally enlisted the cooperation of Gov. Paul B. Johnson, Jr. At a private conference, Hoover declared that the FBI was determined to uphold the civil-rights law and suppress Klan activities. Although a segregationist, Johnson agreed to help. The two then worked out an arrangement whereby the FBI is training large numbers of Mississippi State policemen and sharing with them secrets about terroristic activities. Now Johnson has purged the State police of all Klansmen and let it be known that any State employee found to be a member of the Klan will be summarily fired. A result: the incidence of racial violence in Mississippi has been steadily declining.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE

Soon after a man joins the Klan, an FBI agent visits him. "If anything happens around here, you're automatically a suspect so long as you stay in the Klan," the agent tells him. When a Klan attempted to organize in Mississippi last year, 45 men attended the first meeting. Within 3 days agents called on all of them. At the next meeting, only five showed up.

Agents take up every challenge the Klansmen issue. As a Klan meeting broke up, one Klansman boasted, "First time I catch one of them nigger-loving FBI's, I'm going to kick his ribs in so he won't breathe right for a month."

The next morning, an agent strode into the railroad yard where the Klansman worked and tapped him on the shoulder. "I'm from the FBI. I hear you've been looking for somebody like me."

"I ain't been looking for no one," the Klansman answered.

"Hey, boys, here's a Kluxer who says he's going to beat up the FBI," the agent called to workmen nearby. "Come watch."

The Klansman backed away.

The agent said, "I guess we can't expect any guts from a man who has to hide behind a sheet, can we?"

COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

The most important tactic of all is infiltration of Klans and Communist cells with informants—patriotic men who risk death to forewarn of subversion and violence, who identify terrorists and gather evidence against them.

One Sunday morning an agent invited a young farmer for an auto ride. In the car he handed the farmer some photographs—bloated bodies of two teenagers, a man almost decapitated by a shotgun blast.

Later he stopped at what had been a farmhouse until set afire a few hours earlier. In the one remaining room, a fearful Negro woman was trying to feed a squalling baby and two small children while her husband searched the ruins for the few belongings not charred beyond use. "The Klan was here last night," the agent said. "I need to talk to these people a few minutes more. Look around."

As they drove away, the agent asked, "Wouldn't you like to help us put a stop to this?"

"What do you want me to do?" asked the farmer.

"Have you ever thought about joining the Klan?" the agent asked.

In the next days, the farmer was taught how to apply for Klan membership, how to survive screening by the "Klan Bureau of Investigation," how to act at meetings, how to communicate secretly with the FBI, and what to do in emergencies. Ever since, he has been a courageous and valuable source. Today, because of the FBI, every Klan group is infiltrated with such loyal Americans.

All four of the foregoing tactics had to be used in the infamous civil-rights case which began when two shotgun blasts struck a car traveling through Georgia in predawn darkness. The driver, Lt. Col. Lemuel A. Penn, a Negro educator from Washington, D.C., who had just finished Army Reserve duty at Fort Benning, slumped over dead.

FBI Director Hoover was aboard a plane when the report of the murder was radioed to him. "If they get away with this, they'll think they can get away with anything," Hoover said to his assistant, Clyde Tolson. "Ask Atlanta how many extra agents they need. I want them all to report there today."

By nightfall, 78 agents were at the murder scene and combing the countryside. At Atlanta headquarters, analysis pored over 1,214 confidential dossiers. Working around the clock, they compiled a list of 14 Klansmen considered most likely to commit such wanton murder. Then, with the help of informants and cooperating Georgia authorities, they checked where each of the 14 had been when Penn was shot. When the whereabouts of three could not be established, agents started visiting them with questions, each time making it clearer that the FBI knew their alibis to be lies.

Less than a month later, one of the Klansmen talked. He signed a detailed confession revealing how he had driven the car from which the other two suspects had fired the fatal blasts. Hours later, a fourth Klansman signed a statement saying that these same two suspects told him they had killed Penn.

The FBI could scarcely be blamed for the tragic aftermath. At the resulting trial, the Klansmen repudiated their statements. The jurors returned a verdict of not guilty, then some shook hands with elated Klansmen. Imperial Wizard James Venable chortled, "You'll never be able to convict a white man that kills a nigger what encroaches on the southern way of life."

An even more shocking case was that of Mrs. Viola Liuzzo. On the night of last March 25, four Alabama Klansmen overtook Mrs. Liuzzo, mother of five, as she was driving from Selma to Montgomery with a 19-year-old Negro boy to pick up civil rights demonstrators. Guns flashed, and Mrs. Liuzzo fell dead against the steering wheel.

"Let's go by the Dragon's house and tell him what a good job we did," said one of the Klansmen. But another occupant of the car, Gary Thomas Rowe, was thinking only of how to get to a phone. Rowe, an FBI informant since 1960, had been powerless to prevent the murder, but by 2 a.m. the FBI in Mobile reported to Washington: "We've got an eyewitness to the Liuzzo murder. Three Klansmen did it. We'll move as soon as we get warrants."

The trial of Klansman Collie Leroy Wilkins, Jr., resulted in a hung jury, although Rowe was so impressive on the stand that 10 jurors voted for conviction. Last October, at the retrial, Wilkins was acquitted as courtroom spectators cheered. Still, the glare of publicity has helped further reduce Klan effectiveness.

By the record, the FBI has handled 14,000 civil rights cases in the last 4 years, more than a third of them outside the South. In just one case, the murder of three civil rights workers near Philadelphia, Miss., it spent $768,000 and more than 175,000 man-hours before arresting 19 suspects as conspirators in the plot. And, at the same time, agents have quietly passed on intelligence which has enabled loyal civil rights leaders to thwart Communist attempts to subvert their organizations.

Through their thousands of investigations, agents have identified the persons responsible for virtually every major racial crime—even though it may be a long time before the guilty pay. For instance, they have put the finger on those responsible for the bombing of a Birmingham Negro church 2 years ago in which four small girls were killed. Director Hoover ordered them to keep building this case until it is so strong that no jury in the land could refuse to convict. Thus, ever since, wherever the killers have gone, agents have haunted them, watching for chances to add more evidence against them.

Yet there is no end to the abuse being heaped on the agents who fight daily in the frontlines of the sinister and shadowy civil rights war. Hoover is philosophical about this. Recently he said to a group of his men, "If we do our job right and impartially, the extremists on both sides are going to scream at us. In fact, the louder they scream, maybe the better we're doing the job."

LET US KEEP THE SCHOOL AID PROGRAM INTACT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the first session of this 89th Congress has been credited with doing more to further the general education of Americans than any Congress in our history. This is a matter of great personal satisfaction to those of us who supported the basic assistance measures that emerged as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act.

The first fruits of those bills are now being harvested in thousands of school districts across the country. But none of these bills was designed to be the panacea for all financial ills in education, nor were they intended to replace essential special assistance programs previously in effect.

It is for this reason that I find it exceedingly disturbing to hear reports that the Public Law 874 program, which provides financial assistance to school districts in federally impacted areas, may be scheduled for sharp curtailment.

I speak now, not just for the school districts in my own State, but for every small school in the country that finds itself inundated by a wave of children coming from a nearby military installation or other Federal facility.

Public Law 874 was specifically written to provide needed financial assistance to these schools, since the transient nature of the Federal population does not sufficiently contribute to the regular tax sources of the school district. Without this assistance, many of the schools would have been unable to function. Nothing in recent legislation has changed that situation.

While there are many benefits to be realized under the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Act, nothing can replace Public Law 874 funds which are based on an actual pupil count. Many of our large military bases, by their very nature, are best located in isolated rural areas with sparse indigenous populations. This does not imply that the school districts were impoverished prior to the establishment of the governmental installation. They were just small—big enough to meet local needs and to be supported by local and State finances. Accordingly, these schools do not have a large underprivileged student population. What they do have is a large student population resulting from a nearby Federal installation, and one which does not contribute fully to local school revenues.

Any attempt to cut back this kind of Federal assistance could be disastrous for hundreds of small school districts throughout the country.

Let me illustrate with some financial facts on schools and property revenues in my own State of Idaho. These figures will compare with those of other Western States where the Federal Government owns most of the land.

Idaho has 53,476,480 acres of land. The Federal Government owns more than 33 million acres, or 64 percent of the land in Idaho, while the State owns more than 3 million acres. In other words, Mr. President, in one of the larger States in the Union, less than 30 percent of the land area is available for property taxation. It is from this limited tax base that 626 elementary and secondary schools must draw their principal revenue.

There are more than 170,000 youngsters in our Idaho elementary and secondary schools. Of this total, Mr. President, nearly 15,000 children come from families employed by the Federal Government in impacted areas. They represent 9 percent of our total school population and, in the last fiscal year, the Federal Government contributed $2,337,553 to their schools.

There are 116 operating school districts in my State. Last year 51 of these districts received Public Law 874 funds. Let us also bear in mind that Public Law 874 covers only maintenance and operation. Its companion measure, Public Law 815, supplies funds for construction of necessary facilities to house the children in schools in federally impacted areas. Since Public Law 815 became law, 55 of Idaho's 116 school districts have received construction funds resulting in 467 classrooms to house 13,230 pupils.

Again, Mr. President, let me repeat that the majority of school districts in Idaho which qualify for assistance under both Public Law 874 and 815 are in rural areas. I feel sure that this is the case in most sections of the country. The loss of this Federal assistance, while the pupil loads from federally employed families remain, will cause severe financial distress within these small districts.

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that I will oppose any effort to repeal or curtail the Public Law 874 and 815 programs. I urge my colleagues to join in giving continued support to this most necessary educational program.

A 35-YEAR WATCH OVER THE NATION'S RESOURCES BY THEODORE C. FEARNOW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is with a complete sense of pride that I speak today of the service performed to the United States by Mr. Theodore C. Fearnow, of West Virginia. A sportsman, naturalist, dedicated conservationist, and public servant, Ted retired from the Forest Service, USDA, on December 30 after more than 35 years of employment with the Federal Government. But those who have known and worked with Ted over the years are well aware that his active interest in the out-of-doors will not diminish with his retirement. Ted has lived and breathed conservation for as long as he can remember.

Born in Berkeley Springs, W. Va., where he still makes his home, Ted served an apprenticeship at the U.S. Fisheries Station at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., while still in high school, accepting employment soon after graduation as West Virginia State fish culturist. Within a year he was promoted to chief of the West Virginia Department of Fisheries, and, in 1934, he was employed by the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries as stream improvement supervisor. The following year he entered the Forest Service to serve as assistant conservationist and aquatic biologist, principally in the Allegheny National Forest in Pennsylvania.

During his early years with the Forest Service, Mr. Fearnow designed and supervised the construction of an experimental unit for transporting live fish from hatcheries for stocking National Forest streams and lakes; undertook biological surveys on Forest fishing waters; and headed up a Forest Service deer study project in the Allegheny National Forest, in cooperation with the U.S. Biological Survey.

In 1939, he moved to the Jefferson National Forest in Virginia where he not only handled game and fish management, but also took over information work for the forest. Three years later he transferred to the regional office in Upper Darby, Pa., as wildlife specialist and regional biologist. Promoted in 1958 to assistant regional forester, Mr. Fearnow served for his last 7 years with the Forest Service as Chief of the Division of Information and Education for all Forest Service work in the Northeast.

In recent years Ted Fearnow has taken active part in the development of the Mount Rogers Scenic Area in the Jefferson National Forest in Virginia and the Spruce Knob and Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in the Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia, where his enthusiasm and know-how have been a vital contributing factor to their general success and continuing popularity. A tireless public speaker on his favorite subject of national forest conservation, Ted has also published a number of papers in this field and was winner of the Nash Conservation Award in 1955.

An ardent partisan of the West Virginia countryside, Ted is familiar with every hill and hollow in his corner of the State and is continually concerned with projects for the preservation of some and the better use of others. From a lifetime of close association, Ted knows his West Virginia neighbors—their present needs and their accomplishments. He is at present engaged in writing a history of his section of West Virginia.

THE NATIONAL CITIZENSHIP TEST

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, an eloquent and articulate Farm Bureau member from Wyoming, Mrs. Pegge A. Cooksley, has authored an excellent comment on the recent national citizenship test conducted through the services of the Columbia Broadcasting System. I believe her comment, released through the Sheridan County Farm Bureau last December 3, will be of interest to my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask that it be printed therein.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY PEGGE A. COOKSLEY

The recent CBS citizenship survey revealed much about the Americans serious lacking of knowledge of the affairs of their government and responsibilities of the individual citizen. It indicates that the voter had better shape up before they place their little x's on the next election ballots.

To add fire to these findings is the fact that we are finding more of our citizens who are proposing that socialism or communism is the only thing for us. Such people's minds are working in a whirl of materialistic ideology, not stopping to give credence to capitalism for the materialism it has not only offered or promised but given its people. Let us remember that government did not give us the things we value but, instead, it was the system. We have become a great nation not by reason of what government has done for us but by reason of what it has allowed us to do for ourselves.

For the benefit of those who have lost interest in and loyalty for our form of constitutional government we might ask: Why has our country never suffered a famine? Why do Americans enjoy the highest of living standards? Why is it that communistic forms of government have been unable to survive without the assistance of capitalistic nations (such as the assistance we have given Russia since the 1890's)?

Then we should point out to our nonbelievers that to place the United States on the same progressive plateau as those governments they admire we would have to: eliminate freedom to travel when, where, and how we chose; eliminate privacy of home and personal papers and right to own and bear arms; eliminate rights to work where we please at the occupations of our own choice, private ownership of property and business, right to study the trade or profession of our dreams and ambitions, right to live as a family unit and rear our own children; right to religious worship and to govern ourselves.

Among the material things we would have to destroy would be: three-fifths of our steel capacity, two-thirds of our petroleum, 95 percent of our electric motor output, two of every three hydroelectric plants, all but one-tenth of our natural gas, 14 out of every 15 miles of paved highways, 2 out of every 3 miles of main-line railway tracks, 8 out of every 9 oceangoing ships (plus our inland boats and yachts), 19 out of every 20 cars and trucks (plus our ski-doos and motorbikes), and reduce our civilian air fleet to a shadow of its present size. We would have to cut our living standard by three-fourths. destroy 40 million TV sets, 9 out of every 10 telephones, and 7 out of every 10 houses. Then we would have to put 60 million people back on the farms.

Now, really, does this make sense?

EXPERIMENTS IN FEEDLOT CONSTRUCTION LOOK PROMISING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the livestock industry is one of the most important elements in the economy of the State of Montana. A great deal of the progress and improvements in ranching today are the result of research and experiments. It is in this area that Montana has also contributed a great deal. Considerable research is now underway in our schools and on our ranches.

Just recently I was told about new experiments taking place at Montana State University in Bozeman, Mont., which might change the feeding habits of cattle throughout the Nation. This experiment will also improve the market for concrete. The campus at Bozeman has the first all-concrete model feedlot. The all-concrete feedlot can handle up to three times as many cattle as can be accommodated on a dirt surface feedlot the same size. In brief it will take some of the risk out of cattle feeding.

Mr. President, the December 1965 issue of This Earth published by the Kaiser Cement and Gypsum Corp. discusses this development in more detail. I think the article will be of great interest to my colleagues from livestock-producing States.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPERIMENTS IN FEEDLOT CONSTRUCTION LOOK PROMISING—MONTANA CATTLE GET FAT ON CONCRETE

New experiments taking place at Montana State University in Bozeman, Mont., could possibly change the feeding habits of cattle throughout the Nation and substantially increase the farm market for concrete.

Last spring, ranchers and farmers attending a special beef cattle program at the Bozeman campus were shown for the first time an all-concrete model feedlot, complete with a feed alley, concrete feed bunks and an automatic system for the disposal of manure. A feedlot is a confined cattle feeding operation, as opposed to open range grazing, and is used extensively in California and other areas where cattle are finished off for the market.

The Montana ranchers were surprised to hear from university officials that an all-concrete feedlot can handle up to three times as many cattle as can be accommodated on a dirt-surface feedlot the same size. The reason? Concrete is far easier to maintain and keep clean, allowing for the feeding of more cattle in the same area without increasing the health hazard.

This is good news, indeed, for cattlemen whose biggest worry, outside of prices, is the health of their animals. As Henry Schacht, agricultural columnist for the San Francisco Chronicle put it: "Cattle feeding is no business for the nervous man; the danger of sickness can eat up potential profits like a harvest hand goes through hotcakes."

Bozeman University officials feel that all-concrete feedlots could take some of this risk out of cattle feeding.

Since manure disposal is obviously a major problem in confined feeding operations, one feature of the university's feedlot which will be followed with interest by ranchers is the simplified manure disposal system.

Constructed parallel to the feed bunk is a 9-foot-wide, 8-foot-deep pit covered with prestressed concrete slats. This is where the cattle must stand while feeding, and this is

> where most of the manure accumulates. As the cattle move, the manure is ground through the spaces between the slats to the pit below.
>
> A pumping system keeps water circulating in the pit and liquidizes the manure. The next step in the operation is to pump this liquid fertilizer into a tank truck and spread it on the fields. Pit dimensions also allow for the movement of small tractors for scoop manure disposal.
>
> The slat arrangement apparently poses no problem for the cattle. As one rancher points out, they move over far worse terrain than slotted floors to feed on the open range.
>
> New to the United States, this ingenious system has been used for cattle, sheep, and hogs in Europe for a number of years, with great economic success. A common term in such countries as England, Sweden, Norway, Germany, and Australia is "beef parlor"—a complete slotted floor, total confinement house.
>
> Kaiser Cement & Gypsum Corp. donated Permanente cement for the construction of the experimental feedlot. In addition, the company produced a program—complete with the set of plans used to construct the feedlot, information on practical concreting and a file folder—for distribution in its Rocky Mountain division.
>
> The Bozeman University experiment and the Kaiser Cement program have been enthusiastically received in the area, where more than 140,000 farms and ranches obtain 50 percent or more of their income from cattle.

RETIREMENT OF U.S. FOREST SUPERVISOR ALFRED H. ANDERSON

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate the retirement of Alfred H. "Andy" Anderson, forest supervisor of the George Washington National Forest, which is located in West Virginia and Virginia. Mr. Anderson retired from Government service at the end of December, terminating 37 long and fruitful years with the U.S. Forest Service.

"Andy" started his forestry career back in 1928 with a job on the Pedlar Ranger District of the old Natural Bridge National Forest—now part of the George Washington National Forest. Later he served as district forest ranger on the Ouachita National Forest in Arkansas and on the Cumberland National Forest in Kentucky. In 1941 he transferred to the Monongahela National Forest in Elkins, W. Va., where he served as assistant supervisor, subsequently serving in a similar position on the White Mountain National Forest in New Hampshire. Then came a year of administrative work in the Forest Service Regional Office in Upper Darby, Pa.

In 1946, he was appointed forest supervisor of the Allegheny National Forest in Pennsylvania. Three years later he was promoted to supervisor of the Monongahela National Forest and in August 1952 he moved to his present position in Harrisonburg, Va.

As supervisor of the national forest closest to the District of Columbia, Anderson has contributed greatly to public understanding of the Forest Service management for multiple use. He has helped make the 1.8-million-acre George Washington accessible to active recreationists through development of scenic trails and hunter access roads, and has supervised the placing of innumerable waterholes for wildlife throughout the forest.

Mr. Anderson played a prominent role in the recent expansion of the Elizabeth Furnace camp and picnic area to include the Pig Iron Trail and an amphitheater where the visitor can learn all about the old iron furnaces and how they operated.

One of his most noteworthy accomplishments has been the rehabilitation of streams and hillsides which were seriously ravaged by the floods of 1949. Under his supervision, eroded hillsides were seeded with cover crops and trees were planted. Through the construction of little dams, dikes, and retaining walls, streams were directed back into their channels. "Andy's" notable work with streamflow includes the pioneer use, in the East, of gabions to stabilize stream banks and control the flow of the waters. Another first—at least for eastern U.S. forests—was aerial tree seeding, done under Anderson's supervision.

For the past several years, he has served as chairman of the Recreation Committee for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac. He has continued to take an active part in civic organizations wherever he has been stationed. "Andy" and his wife, Virginia, plan to continue to live in Harrisonburg, Va.

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, during my recent trip abroad, I was afforded the opportunity of looking over the programs and activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in many countries. Prior to departure, I received extensive briefings from the Agency and during my trip talked in detail with all Agency representatives in the country in question, as has been my custom in past years when visiting abroad.

All felt the latter's programs were fully coordinated with U.S. policy of the Agency with every Ambassador. In every case, no exception, the Ambassador expressed his complete approval of the functioning of the Agency.

I found no instances of any kind where CIA activities were uncontrolled, or contrary to U.S. policy. Indeed it would appear difficult, if not impossible, for such uncontrolled activities to occur. This belief is based on existing coordination procedures and policy directives stemming from the Washington level, plus the controls applicable to field activities.

I have always been impressed, in my contacts with the Agency, with the integrity and professional competence of its representatives. Only twice, in over 10 years, have I found anything to the contrary. Based on the present rules, I doubt if those cases of disagreement could now be duplicated.

It is a pleasure, therefore, to present to the Senate the fact that I agree with Secretary Rusk who, in talking about CIA people, stated:

> There is a good deal of gallantry and a high degree of competence in those who have to help us deal with that part of the struggle for freedom.

The Central Intelligence Agency has a difficult, and at times a very dangerous mission to perform. Not all men, or women, of this or any other agency, are perfect, and it is easy to criticize any group which cannot defend itself because of the nature of its work. Nevertheless it is my considered judgment that the American public should be proud of this organization and its people, a group who serve our country with unstinting devotion.

In addition to this brief report, which of necessity must be general, I am also reporting my findings and conclusions in more detail to Chairman RUSSELL and the Subcommittee for the CIA of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S HIGHWAY SAFETY PROPOSAL RECEIVES ENDORSEMENT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, President Johnson's call in his state of the Union message for a new national effort to reduce the tragedy and loss resulting from highway accidents coincides with a rapidly developing public consciousness on this issue.

Since so much attention was focused on highway safety in the last session of Congress, a groundswell of support for a major highway safety program has been developing all across the Nation.

Our leading auto manufacturers, foundations, and civic-minded organizations are teaming up with universities in various States to set up research centers and far-reaching studies in this field.

The Federal Government has a responsibility to provide leadership and resources to support such efforts.

The cooperative model that the States and the Federal Government have developed in building highways shows us the job can be done.

It is now time to begin. I am sure the Congress and all Americans will rally around the President on this issue.

CHICAGO'S MIRACLE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, of great interest to me was an article which appeared in the January issue of Harper's entitled "Chicago's Commuter Railroad Miracle."

It is a brief description of the successful effort that has been made to restore satisfactory and profitable commuter railroad service in our Nation's third largest city.

And more importantly, it is the story of how bold, creative thinking and work can overcome great odds.

So many people, railroad men, public officials, and the general public, throw up their hands in despair over the seeming hopelessness of the commuter problem.

Obviously if people in the business and public officials are resigned to not solving commuter problems, nothing constructive will be done, or even tried.

I hope some of the commuter train "Cassandras" will read this article, for which I now ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Chicago's Miracle: How a Unique Railroad Man Is Making Money out of Commuters—and Makes Them Like It

(By Andrew Schiller)

The poor and the wealthy sleep side by side in the cities; the middle classes run back and forth to suburbia. The only trouble with the arrangement is that the cities are being strangled in ribbons of concrete and choked by automobiles. For most Americans, the really dramatic challenge of the 20th century is not how to establish a colony on Mars but how to find a parking space downtown; the threat that hangs over us is not instant annihilation by the atom but slow strangulation by the auto. Commuter railroads, instead of expanding prosperously to meet the burgeoning need for transportation, are collapsing one by one, victims of the automobile, the bus, the tides of history, and sometimes of downright mismanagement. The plight of the New Haven Railroad (and of its passengers) epitomizes the problem. Without transportation a city perishes. If private industry cannot do the job profitably, must the Government take it upon itself, as it must provide water and collect garbage?

The answer almost everywhere is yes. But in the generally dismal scene there is a bit of cheer. One commuter line—only one—has transformed itself in a few years from a hopeless loser into a profitable business which is a model for the railroad industry. And the man who did it, Ben W. Heineman, was no railroad man at all but a successful corporation lawyer who fell into the job almost by accident. How was this miracle accomplished? Was it a freak, or is it possible that commuter traffic can make money, and nearly all the railroad presidents have been wrong all the time?

Ben Walter Heineman, boss of the Chicago & North Western Railroad, is a complicated man who fits no stereotypes. He is balding, middle-aged, pleasant of face, but in no way striking. Ben Heineman is not obviously anything. He could be your corner druggist, but he happens to be the most successful railroad executive in the United States. But to say so does not describe him. His colleague, Wayne Johnston, president of the Illinois Central, is as archetypal a railroad tycoon as Everett Dirksen is a Senator. He travels about in his private railroad car—a relic of Chester A. Arthurian splendor—and in his office, encrusted with railroading prints and equipped with a working cuspidor, he is attended by a solicitous Negro in a white porter's jacket. (I waited to hear Mr. Johnston call him George, but it never happened.) The Heineman office bespeaks the longhair—sleek furniture, abstract and impressionist paintings, an astounding collection of pipes.

He is an authentic intellectual, a trustee of the University of Chicago, and chairman of the State board of higher education, not to mention an impressive catalog of civic responsibilities for which he somehow makes time. He lives in Kenwood, an integrated neighborhood in the University of Chicago area, in a handsomely restored old brick mansion. He is even a Democrat, who served as a special prosecuting attorney under Governor Stevenson and later as an organizer in his presidential campaigns. There is a persistent, uncontradicted rumor that he was offered, and refused, a high post in the Kennedy administration.

But he eludes the stereotype of the intellectual Democrat. In command of the North Western he has behaved, at times, more like old Commodore Vanderbilt than W. Averell Harriman. He has slashed ruthlessly at payrolls and he shows little sympathy for workers whose jobs have become obsolete. "The unions claim that the fireman is necessary for safety. But in the old days, when the fireman had his head down shoveling coal, he wasn't a lookout. And you have only one man in the cab of a subway, or an electric train. Nobody complains about that."

When I asked him what, if anything, the Government ought to do to help the North Western, his answer was quick and sharp. "Get off my back." He is a man who, as the saying goes, would rather do it himself. And when he took over the line in its bleakest days he proved that private enterprise could go it alone.

SHE WAS DYING UNLOVED

A decade ago the CNW commuter line was like an alcoholic duchess expiring on skid row, still attired in silks and tiara. Riders with a taste for the antique loved the ancient intercity cars. The comfortable plush seats were stuffed with real horsehair, and through crazed, glass-thick varnish one could still see faintly the original walls, an exquisite mosaic of inlaid woods. Up ahead, a venerable coal burner huffed and puffed grandly through the suburbs.

But most commuters were not nostalgic rail fans, and the old lady was dying ignominiously. Over the generations the car interiors had absorbed a hopeless quantity of soot and cinders. The windows were broken and the doors came off in your hand. The sheet-metal roofs were cracked. On a rainy day passengers sat under umbrellas—or if they had none, huddled miserably in the wet green velvet. Timetables were a gallant fiction. The first snowfall each year was enough to cause operations to collapse into a snarl. But in any weather, scheduled runs would simply be scratched because the engines could not be repaired in time. Nor did departure guarantee return. The leaking locomotives ("Old Soaks" the crews called them) would fall apart so regularly that the enginemen carried baling wire to hold the machinery together. On one famous day the cab fell off, leaving the engineer and fireman naked to the world.

The North Western was not a carefree, romantic, bohemian railroad. The keynote was irritation and surliness, shared alike by passengers, crews, and management. When a train was canceled the next would be so crowded that the conductors couldn't get through the crowds in time to collect all the fares. Some of the conductors, in any case, were pocketing fares and the management was quite helpless to do anything about it. Morale was low. Trainmen didn't bother to wear white shirts; their vests were unbuttoned and their uniforms unpressed. Sometimes there were fistfights among the crewmen, and between passengers and crew. Unexplained stops were commonplace. Passengers were so accustomed to them that they didn't even bother to ask why the train wasn't going anywhere. But on one occasion, in 1952, after half-an-hour, even the North Western commuters began to wonder. Passengers wandered out to investigate and discovered that the cab was empty. The engineer and fireman were finally discovered in a nearby diner, eating their dinner. They explained to the angry passengers that, according to their contract, they were entitled to a bean hour and, by God, they were going to have it. The fact that they were only 20 minutes from the end of their run was just tough. The train could wait. The fury of the passengers was matched by the management, and the union as well, when the story broke. But what was there to do? The whole line was on the verge of collapse.

By 1956, bankruptcy was imminent. The North Western was $212 million in debt while its common equity was worth only $22 million. Cash was draining out by unaccountable millions each month. At this desperate point a group of investors, who held among them 30 percent of C. & N.W. voting shares, demanded representation on the board of directors. To this end, they engaged a young lawyer, Ben W. Heineman, who had made a reputation for himself in railroad circles by having won, 2 years earlier, an unprecedented victory in a proxy fight against the Minneapolis & St. Louis. ("Misery and Still Limping," they called that one.) When, in January of 1956, Heineman walked into the boardroom the stage was set for an explosive meeting and the beginning of a bitter battle for control of the dying railroad. Incredibly, no such thing happened. Heineman was able to convince the board of directors that he did not represent a group of financial ghouls who wanted only to pick the bones of the business before abandoning it—"special-situation men" is the euphemism of the trade—but a group, rather, which intended to revitalize the road. Adding conviction to the argument was Heineman's own astute management during the past 2 years of the M. & St. L. By the time he walked out of the room, the attorney had brought the board and his group to come to a final agreement; the investors were to get 5 of the 17 directors' seats, and Ben W. Heineman was named chairman of the board on April 1. He was just 42.

FIRST, TURN OFF THE FAUCETS

Things began to happen fast. Heineman's first step was to bring in as president and chief of operations Clyde J. Fitzpatrick, a veteran of 31 years on the Illinois Central, but himself only 47 years old. Together they went on a 6-week inspection tour. They looked, listened, and learned that the railroad was in an unbelievable mess. The patient, they decided, could be saved—but only if major surgery were performed immediately.

Close to home was the sprawling Proviso freight yard. A sign boasted that it was the largest in the world. The new boss said, "Tear it down." He didn't want the biggest yard, but the most efficient. Part of the yard was dismantled, and the scrap brought in welcome cash. More important, 74 acres were released for valuable industrial development. But that was only the beginning. The North Western, since its chartering in 1836 (it is Chicago's oldest railroad), had acquired a considerable amount of real estate. The new management instituted a survey to find out just what they had (nobody really knew) and how to convert land holdings from taxeaters to income producers.

The repair facilities were as outmoded as outhouses. Of 14 repair shops, only 2 were roofed. Expensive mechanics had to shovel snow to get to their work and then lie down in the slush to do it. In one shop the new managers found that the pistons of a diesel were being overhauled, even though they were barely broken in, simply because the company policy was to overhaul the engines every 3 years. Maintenance was promptly changed from a calendar to a mileage basis, and the scattering of inadequate repair facilities was scrapped. At a cost of $6 million, a modern assemblyline shop was built in Clinton, Iowa. The investment yielded a quick return. The new shop could do everything, from overhauling the delicate watchlike mechanisms of air brakes to building entire freight cars. Cars came out worth more than when new. There was even a school for mechanics.

As for organization, Heineman's comment was succinct: "Too damned much management." The North Western was the last major railroad which still retained a departmental structure. Under this system, if a section of track in Wyoming, let us say, needed repair it would be reported to the head of maintenance-of-way in Chicago, and not to the local superintendent who was responsible for getting trains over that track. Heineman reorganized the railroad on a divisional system, in which the superintendent of each geographical division was totally responsible for everything within his purview. Whole echelons of administration were eliminated and control was tightly centralized. There was bloodletting on the bottom as well as the top. By the end of a year, one out of every six employees had been dropped from the payroll. One of the survivors, an engineer, put it this way, "It was a quick, rough change. We cant get away with what we used to."

In those first few months, Heineman and Fitzpatrick were busy diagnosing the North Western's ailments and making long-range plans. But the urgent need was to stay alive long enough to put the plans into effect, running around and turning off faucets. The railroad, in those dying days, was so close to the bone of bankruptcy that the new management was reduced to selling rails for scrap simply to meet the payroll, which is like a starving man amputating his own leg and eating it.

In this appalling situation, the new management decided to invest $50 million—much of it borrowed from the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.—to acquire new equipment for the commuter service. On the face of it, this was a lunatic act. No railroad had ever succeeded in making suburban service profitable. Even the North Western's prosperous neighbors—the Burlington, and the Illinois Central—were just breaking even on commuters. But for Heineman it was an inevitable decision. He gave his staff three alternatives. First: Get out of commuter service. But this was politically almost impossible, and socially unthinkable. Second: Go on as before. But this was economically impossible. Third: Since you're stuck with the job, do it right. It was a daring gamble.

At the time of the takeover, suburban equipment consisted of cars and locomotives which had been demoted from the intercity trains. Scarcely anything was less than 30 years old and some cars were of turn-of-the-century vintage. Every major railroad had been dieselized by 1956—but not the North Western. Or so it seemed. But the fact was, as President Fitzpatrick put it, "They were dieselized and didn't know it." Diesel locomotives were laid up in the shops; two or three were being used as switch engines where one could have done the job. By keeping them running around the clock and using the rest elsewhere, by more efficient servicing and assignment, the line was dieselized in 40 days without buying a single locomotive.

Even the old steam locomotives turned out to be an asset. Each one represented about $6,000 in scrap. But the old iron mastadons were relics, too, with a cash value to sentimentalists. The bells were advertised for sale—about 250 of them—and they can be seen and heard now all over the world; one, for example, became a dinner bell in a Michigan hunting lodge, another went to a bombed-out church in Greece.

HOW TO IMPRESS A COMMUTER

But you can't attract commuters simply by switching from coal to oil. You have to offer them transportation attractive enough to get them out of their automobiles. The odds against it are admittedly enormous. A recent Harris survey revealed that 90 percent of the Nation's commuters actually preferred to drive, even when public means were available. Heineman's gamble (and what would a horseplayer say of a $50 million bet against such odds?) was that commuter tickets can be sold by vigorous merchandising, just like soap flakes. But where the contents of one box of soap is largely indistinguishable from another, the commuter knows precisely what he is getting for his dollar. Trains either do or do not run on time; they are air-conditioned or they are not. All the services are tangible. "To make matters more difficult," as Ben Heineman points out, "we get the commuter at the two worst times of his day—early in the morning when he's grouchy, and in the evening when he's tired. How do you impress a commuter?"

You give him swift, unobtrusive, and dependable service, more comfortable than his own car, and cheaper. And how do you achieve that? In the first place, it is necessary to decide what a commuter line is not. It is not, for example, a city bus or streetcar. It is not designed to stop every half-mile, nor to service in-city passengers. Accordingly, the North Western eliminated 22 of its local stations, almost all of them inside Chicago, over the objections of the affected neighborhoods. Merchants lost money and their aldermen made speeches, but Heineman got away with it. Why should his railroad, he asked, do the work of the Chicago Transit Authority? The North Western quite deliberately gave up 3,000 riders in order to give better service to the suburbs.

A simple innovation—Clyde Fitzpatrick's idea—added trains to the timetable without buying a single car. Once a train had pulled into the final station, the "relay" operation to get it headed out again required a switch engine, a turnaround, and a five-man crew working for half an hour. Why not equip the cars with little cabs for the engineers, like subway trains, with remote controls? Today the locomotive always stays at one end of the train, pulling on the trip out, pushing on the trip in. When the train gets to the station, or the end of the line, it's ready to go again in 10 minutes, and the relaying requires no switch engine or extra crew. The same number of trains are now able to make extra runs during the peak hours.

The old coaches, too, were discarded, and new ones were designed to North Western specifications. They were double-decked, air conditioned, well lighted, comfortable, and meticulously clean. A typical 6-car train has 960 seats; it had required a 10-car train of the old coaches to provide the same number. And—very important—the dead weight per train was decreased by about 130 tons. In short, these new trains were hauling not equipment, but people.

But would the people pay to ride these splendid new trains? In the age of the freeway, railroads have a precarious hold on their commuters. With each fare increase a certain number of passengers abandon the train for the highway, and the attempt to raise fares to a profitable level becomes a self-defeating treadmill. Once again, Ben Heineman took a step which flew in the face of all past experience. He raised the price of commutation tickets, not inch by inch over a period of years, but in one bold thrust.

The pricing system is an antique—in fact, an accident. A century ago the railroads, which were then entirely in the business of hauling freight and intercity passengers, began the practice of picking up passengers at nearby stops as they approached the cities. The fare was set at an appropriate fraction of the distance traveled by the through passengers, and hence very low. But as the metropolises grew, two things happened. The little town became a suburb, and the casual pickup became a scheduled stop. During the same period, the private auto virtually destroyed the intercity passenger business.

And so it came about that commuter service, which had begun as a bit of frosting on the cake, turned out to be the whole meal. And the railroads got sick on the diet. The fares had been frozen into a basic-price structure which now turned out to be inadequate. What Heineman asked—and in December of 1958, got—from the Illinois Commerce Commission, was not merely a fare hike but a fundamental change in the concept of what a commuter is supposed to get for his money. The decision marked a turning point in the historic function of the railroad as a passenger carrier. It is a revolutionary change which most of the railroads and the State regulatory bodies of this country do not yet grasp.

SEATS BY THE MONTH

Traditionally, when the passenger bought a ticket he was paying for a ride, and the cost of the ride (setting aside class) depended simply upon distance. But this won't work for a commuter line for the simple reason that every morning you must carry a great number of passengers into the city, and back again every evening—but in between, and on weekends, most of the equipment is doing nothing but adding to the total cost. The North Western's innovation was not to sell rides by the mile, but transportation by the month. When a man owns an apartment house he figures his total operating cost, and with this as a base he determines what a monthly rent must be. It is none of his business whether his tenants occupy their apartments constantly or leave them empty part of the time. And so when the North Western commuter buys a monthly ticket, he is entitled to unlimited access. He has rented a seat for the month.

The theory is logical, but the question was, could the riders be persuaded to buy it? Heineman bet all the stockholders' money that they could. In the first place, he sought to stabilize the price charged for a ride. Since December 1963 the commuters have found Christmas cards on their seats each year, telling them that their Christmas present from the line was that there would be no rise in fares for the coming year. Furthermore, he promised that the money would be used to improve equipment and service; and that promise was kept. Finally, the new ticketing system turned out to be irresistibly convenient. If you are a North Western commuter, the mailman brings you your ticket a few days before the beginning of each month (and you have until the 10th to pay for it). The ticket has your name, address, and phone number on it, in case of loss. (One lady brought in a wad of gooey pulp, which was all that was left after her baby had chewed up her ticket. The ticket agent decided it was the right kind of paper and issued her a replacement. The ticket itself is an IBM card, part of which goes into a computer. You merely show it to the conductor, who has no tickets to punch, no stubs to count. Now a train with 1,400 passengers can be operated by a few crew members. Some conductors resisted the change to flash tickets, not because it threatened technological unemployment but because the ticket punch (and the calloused hand) had been a status symbol.

Aggressive advertising brought in new riders. For example, the North Western sponsored the traffic helicopter on radio station WGN. Twice a day the motorist, inching along miserably in a solid mass of metal from his suburb to the Loop, is given a collision-by-collision analysis of the tangle, followed by a suggestion that he'd really be better out of it if he rode the train. Many, in this period of maximum frustration, got the message.

And the passengers were courted. Trainmen, who had to lose their old churlish ways, were sent through "charm school." There is no advertising in any North Western train. There isn't even an advertising slogan on the outside of the train for the line itself. There is no piped-in music, either in the train or in the stations. Each rider, having rented his space, is entitled to privacy, and to being treated like a trusted member of the family. For instance, on rainy days a cart full of umbrellas is set out in the center of the North Western station—"Rainstick Junction"—and any passenger is entitled to help himself. Also, he is expected to return it some sunny day. Only 1 out of 20 does so. Since these are unclaimed umbrellas from lost and found (and hence in endless supply), the company doesn't worry about it overmuch. "Look at it this way," one official told me. "These people are stealing their own umbrellas. Maybe the fact that we stamp them makes them souvenirs, like hotel towels."

But the North Western steadfastly held to its policy of acting toward its patrons like a well-bred chauffeur rather than an ill-tempered landlord. It was a daring gamble—the $50 million invested was an important outlay—but it paid off. North Western riders today are like members of a club. Talk to any of them and they have nothing but admiration and praise for Ben Heineman. He runs their railroad.

And it all translated into money. In 1956, the suburban service had a deficit of $2.1 million, but in 1964 it made a net profit of $706,000, and it is expected to earn over a million for 1965. This has happened despite the fact that in 1960 Chicago opened two major expressways, now called the Eisenhower and the Kennedy, each of which parallels the North Western tracks. As a result, revenues dropped sharply in 1961. Then, in 1962, just when the railroad was winning back some of its lost passengers, the telegraphers struck. Ben Heineman, despite his politics, behaved exactly like a railroad executive. He stubbornly refused to give in to telegraphers who, he said, had no messages to send, and he endured a 30-day shutdown. During this period he was cheered by letters of support from his suburban Republican patrons. He won the strike but lost the revenues.

He also lost some of his employees' good will. Efficiency, like all beautiful things, has a sad underside. You don't hear it from the crewmen—not at first. Fremont Schultz (his real name), an engineer in whose cab I rode, admitted that the Heineman regime was tough and uncompromising. But he said it proudly; it reflected his own professional code. He understood that the rules of survival were stern. And, like Heineman himself, he saw things from the top. Engineers are the leading tenors of the company. But the chorus of lesser employees is all but mute.

Although 1962 was a bad year, it was not altogether unlucky for Heineman and the stockholders. The expressways which hurt the North Western were actually fatal for two small commuter lines, the North Shore, and the Chicago, Aurora and Elgin. Upon their demise, the North Western inherited most of their passengers. Since 1963 the news has been progressively more cheerful. While the profits have been modest—and by General Motors standards even minuscule—the importance of this success story is not to be measured in money. Commuter rail transportation is the only basic industry in the United States which is actually going out of business. As our country is becoming more urbanized, transportation—upon which urban living utterly depends—is collapsing. Railroad men everywhere have given it up as hopeless and, as in the case of the Long Island and the New Haven, have sought Government support. If in a single case anyone can demonstrate that hauling passengers can be made profitable—as Ben Heineman has—then this is news of acute importance, not just for the railroads but for all of America, and indeed the world. Perhaps it is possible for cities to break free of the concrete noose in which they have been strangling themselves and to breathe again.

With this in mind, I asked Mr. Heineman if the unprecedented success of the North Western suggested some formula that all other railroads could apply. Had he, in short, found "the answer"? He looked amused at the question. (He has a reputation for business, in railroad circles, and of being overquick with advice. But this time—perhaps because he was speaking to an innocent layman—his answers were undogmatic.)

"No," he said. "There is no easy answer. No formula. What we've done here has worked here. It might be all wrong someplace else. For example, you couldn't use our double-decker coaches in New York. They wouldn't fit through most of the tunnels."

And what, I asked, about intercity passenger trains? Could the same good management revitalize that part of the industry? Here the answer was a flat "No". "Ninety-one percent of all intercity travel today is by automobile, so that the whole transportation industry is fighting over just 9 percent. Airplanes are faster, buses are cheaper. All we have to offer is standby service. There's no future in the intercity train."

It was the only gloomy statement I heard from the lips of Ben Heineman—and history may soon prove him to be wrong. The new Tokyo-Osaka train, which attains speeds up to 130 mph, may yet find its counterpart in a Boston-Washington train. The U.S. Government, at any rate, has allocated funds to study the feasibility of such a project. The significance of such superspeed trains is clear: just as the commuter train satisfied a need in the metropolis of connecting the city with its outlying suburbs, so the trains of the future must satisfy a similar need for the megalopolis. A half-century ago it was unthinkable to commute from 30 miles out; in a few decades people who live in, say, the Gary-Chicago-Milwaukee area, or the Boston-New York-Washington area, will be commuters within those complexes.

But if time proves Heineman wrong in this, he will admit it very quickly, and go on to profit by his error. "We examine postulates," he once said. "We don't fall in love with them." He is the kind of realist who wasn't too proud to buy a couple of airplanes in order to run his railroad.

Despite his hopeless view of intercity train travel, Ben Heineman is a practical visionary. "It isn't enough to run a railroad well," he said. "The average rider lives within two-and-a-half miles from the station. When he gets to the city, he probably needs to ride a bus or a subway to get to his office. We need a transportation system that interlocks. We should have feeder buses, taxi stands and parking lots at each suburban station. In the city, we need a subway belt that connects all the railroad stations. Ideally, there should be a transfer system so that a single fare takes a man from end to end with no fuss."

"Can we do this in Chicago?"

"Absolutely. In fact we must. The mayor is for it. It's just a matter of getting moving."

As it turned out, this was no idle talk. Shortly after our interview, in October 1965, Mayor Richard Daley announced that the Federal Government had granted the city a million dollars to study a plan to tear down the elevated (that famous Loop) and to rebuild the subway so that it would link all the city's railroad stations. Ben Heineman had been preaching this for years.

COULD WE JUNK IT ALL?

And so I asked him: If he had it in his power to build a dream railroad, what would it be like?

"Go to San Francisco," he said, "and you'll see it coming into being." I did. The Bay Area Rapid Transit is fantastic. Trains will run (controlled by radar and computer only) at 80 miles per hour, 90 seconds apart. There are no straps to hang from because every passenger is guaranteed a seat (and a bucket seat at that). You will insert your credit card into the gate when you enter and again when you leave. At the end of the month the computer will mail you your transportation bill—like any other utility. The system will make every other line in the United States seem ancient and obsolete, for the excellent reason that it is. BART is the first transportation system to be designed, from the ground up, in half a century. Since the city of Philadelphia in 1907 designed its rapid transit system, there have only been additions and extensions to existing facilities.

"Why can't we do it in Chicago?" I asked Mr. Heineman.

"Because we already have existing rail transportation. We simply can't afford to junk all of it. San Francisco, luckily, had next to nothing. And that's not the whole story, either. We could do a great deal with automation. Modern technology is very sophisticated. But the unions would never let us get away with it."

"Then what is the answer to the problem in those cities where there are existing, inadequate, or poorly patronized railroads? In short, how do you run a railroad?"

"Don't ask me. I don't know how to run a railroad; I know how to run this railroad. There are no problems in general, just specific problems."

"All right—specifically. Do you think that government subsidies are a bad thing?"

"Not necessarily. If in a specific case it's the only thing to do." He finished with a wave of his hand.

"In short, you are a pragmatist."

The tycoon smiled. "Is there any other way to be?"

SALUTE TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHAD

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to offer my compliments and best wishes to the people of the Republic of Chad who this week celebrated their national holiday. More than 5 years ago, on August 11, these people achieved their national independence, and they have set aside January 11 as their special day for national celebration.

To a nation such as ours which cherishes the principle of national self-determination, it is a pleasure to witness the growth and progressive fulfillment of the national aspirations of the Chadian people.

Under the dedicated leadership of President Francois Tombalbaye, Chad is striving for economic and social advancement, emphasizing education and technical training, improved internal transportation, local processing industries, and tourist facilities for developing the economic potential of tourist trade for which their climate and natural landscape are admirably suited.

In the international community Chad has earnestly undertaken her responsibilities as a sovereign state, actively participating in the United Nations and other international institutions including the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. She maintains close and fruitful ties with France and enjoys warm and friendly relations with the United States.

Mr. President, I join with well-wishers throughout the world in saluting the people of Chad on this special occasion. I know that my colleagues join with me in extending hearty congratulations to President Tombalbaye and to His Excellency Boukar Abdoul, Ambassador to the United States.

SKIING IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, our Chief Executive has asked that patriotic Americans help resolve our Nation's balance-of-payments problem by refraining from traveling abroad and planning to "Travel America" instead. I wish to support him by suggesting that all who are lovers of winter sports, winter mountain scenery, and relaxation in a beautiful, peaceful, and unspoiled mountainous clime should visit Davis, Blackwater Falls State Park, and Weiss Knob in West Virginia, the State which is often called "America's Little Switzerland."

The Weekender section of the Evening Star—Washington, D.C.—provides a lively account of the resort area's attractions and makes enthusiastic suggestions for winter pleasure in and around Blackwater Falls State Park, in the Saturday, January 8, issue. Believing it will be helpful to potential mountain travelers to clip it for handy reference in making future winter travel plans, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Winter Wonderland Isn't Far Away

(By Marj Hoskin)

Now is the time for you to pack flannel pajamas, even for those family members belonging to the antipajama cult, and take a midwinter jaunt to West Virginia's mountains.

Your destination: the 1,600-acre Blackwater Falls State Park in Davis, W. Va., about 180 miles from Washington, via U.S. Routes 50 and 219, and West Virginia Route 32.

In the summertime, the park reverberates with the yells of West Virginians reveling in a myriad of outdoor activities. It is almost impossible for an out-of-Stater to reserve a housekeeping cabin or a room in the lodge.

But in winter, the park becomes a quiet haven for couples or families. There are no scheduled activities; do-it-yourself fun is the order of the day. If you are lucky, you may be in the park during a snowstorm, a likely possibility at this time of the year.

Ranging in elevation from 2,500 to 3,400 feet, Blackwater Falls State Park is within 30 miles of the highest points in both West Virginia and Maryland. (Spruce Knob, 4,860 feet, West Virginia; Backbone Mountain, 3,360 feet, Maryland.)

The amber-colored waters of the Blackwater River gush through a deep, narrow gorge within the park. It is difficult—in fact, impossible—to resist engaging in a snowball rolling contest down the canyon's 500-foot sides to see whose snowball travels farthest.

But the delight is the falls where the river drops 63 feet over a sandstone ledge. Most of the cataract is frozen now in a delicate, lovely sculpture even a Michelangelo would admire.

HAVEN FOR WILDLIFE

The park is surrounded by the Monongahela National Forest, home of bear, deer, and other wildlife. But the tracks leading to and from the trash can on the cabin back stoop are most likely those of the inquisitive rabbit or unpopular skunk.

While you can stay at the lodge (from $12 double, European plan), be an adventurer in 1 of the 25 woodpaneled housekeeping cabins. They accommodate two, four, or eight persons, but rented cots or cribs increase sleeping facilities.

The cabins, with sturdy, modern furniture in the interior, are seasonally decorated on the exterior by hundreds of sparkling icicles clinging to the roof edges. Each cabin has an electric refrigerator, kitchen range, water heater, and bath with shower. The rustic stone fireplace is backstopped by a forced-air furnace. All cooking and eating utensils, and bed, bath and kitchen linens are furnished.

A 3-night stay for four in a two-person cabin (one double bed, two cots) costs $35.50.

To keep your youngsters (or yourselves) amused, bring sleds or rent them at the lodge. A ride down the 1,500-foot sled run, within walking distance of the cabins, is an invigorating thrill for the young, or the young at heart.

The gentle slope is also ideal for beginning skiers. Those more experienced drive 12 miles to Canaan Valley, where privately operated ski areas with tow lifts are usually open into March.

Ice skating can be enjoyed in Canaan Valley as well as in Davis.

There is a television set in the lodge lounge, but transistor radio broadcasts in your own cabin can be more fascinating. (Bring your own radio.) The darkness encourages transmissions from Chicago and points west, Canada, and even Cuba.

LOCAL PROVENDER

Grocery stores in Davis amply supply your pantry provisions. Local ham and homemade sausage are tasty, but if you cannot exist without filet mignon, you better bring it from home.

If you tire of your own cooking, the lodge has a dining room perched on the edge of the canyon. On your way, you may be sidetracked by the sparkle of West Virginia glassware in the gift shop.

You can take a trip to see this glass made. It is less than 75 miles to the Morgantown Glassware Guild, Inc., blowers of the official crystal service at the White House. The West Virginia Glass Specialty Co., Inc., noted for its stemware as well as apothecary jars, hurricane lamp shades, candy jars, and the like, is in Weston, a drive of about 80 miles.

When you tire of your private ice and snow carnival, drive back to Washington via U.S. Route 33 and the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks area. The U.S. Forest Service is leading the way here to the establishment of a new national recreation area that encompasses some 100,000 acres. Sheer 3,500-foot drops and the 1,000-foot towering rocks made this Swiss-like region one of the most impressive in the East.

Skittery about driving in the mountains in winter? Snow removal crews efficiently and faithfully tend the major highways. Traffic is light, and you need have no fear of that malady known as Washington Snow Panic.

For Lodge reservations, write to Blackwater Lodge, Davis, W. Va.; for cabin reservations, Division of Parks and Recreation, Department of Natural Resources, Charleston, W. Va.

THE ALBUQUERQUE SUNPORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, it was my pleasure last November 12 to be present in Albuquerque, N. Mex., for the dedication of the new Albuquerque Sunport. The main speaker at the dedication ceremony was Mr. J. L. Atwood, president of North American Aviation. Mr. Atwood's presence in Albuquerque that day was somewhat of a homecoming for him since he had spent his early school days there.

Mr. Atwood has an outstanding record as a leader in the aerospace industry. Before joining the aviation industry in 1928, Mr. Atwood served in the Army Air Corps. In 1948 he was elected president of North American. In 1960 he became chief executive officer, and chairman in 1962.

In 1949 Mr. Atwood was awarded the Presidential Certificate of Merit for his contributions to the war effort during World War II, and in 1955 the Republic of Italy conferred upon him the Commander of Merit decoration for his personal contribution to the aviation industry.

Mr. Atwood is a member of the board of governors and executive committee of the Aerospace Industries Association and is also a fellow of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astrophysics. In 1958, as chairman of the Industry Consulting Committee of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Mr. Atwood contributed to the creation of NASA.

Throughout his career Mr. Atwood has been an asset to his profession and to his country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of J. L. Atwood, President of North American Aviation, Inc., at the Dedication of the Albuquerque Sunport, Albuquerque, N. Mex., November 12, 1965

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, the dedication of this fine new Albuquerque Sunport is a great occasion for your city and for the Southwest, and I am delighted to be here to enjoy it with you. Although I cannot claim to be a native son, I did spend about 7 happy years of my boyhood here, attending the old Third Ward School and Albuquerque High School. In fact, I lived in various parts of the Southwestern United States for most of my youth, and received all my education in the Southwest. So it has always been very close to my heart.

We are here tonight to celebrate another step forward in that remarkable human enterprise called aviation. You and I have seen aviation change the world, and indeed, make its share of changes in New Mexico.

As we think back to 1928, and remember the small adobe building and the dirt runway that became Albuquerque Airport in that year, we cannot help being astonished at what has grown from the small beginning, and how much aviation has changed our lives in the 37 years since then. Few of us who were alive then would have guessed that by 1965 there would be 4 airlines serving this community with 635 takeoffs and landings every day; that transcontinental jetliners would be carrying passengers from here to either coast in a few hours, and onward to all parts of the world overnight.

Nor could we have foreseen that aircraft would be flying several times each day from here to a place called Los Alamos, half an hour away by airliner. We could scarcely have guessed that there would be huge places hereabouts called Kirtland Air Force Base, and Sandia Base, and White Sands Missile Range. We could scarcely have imagined that this same White Sands would be the scene of equipment testing for a manned flight to the moon. We could not have known that there would be a Lovelace Clinic pioneering in something called aerospace medicine, and making examinations to help select explorers called astronauts. All this has happened because of aviation.

We all know that the history of mankind reached a turning point south of here near Alamogordo on a July morning in 1945. We have seen how the work accomplished there shortened a tremendous world conflict, created an entirely different pattern of international relations, and led us into a new era of atomic energy with possibilities of future change still unimaginable. Albuquerque has come to be called heart of the nuclear space age, and with good reason. All these dramatic changes, too, have been spurred along by aviation.

As we think back over all that we have experienced in the past 37 years, I ask you to consider whether anything like this scientific and economic transformation has ever occurred before in human history. What other major historic change has been as rapid, as sweeping, and as deep?

There have been creative revolutions before; at the beginning of recorded history, there was the great agricultural revolution that made civilization possible. In the 18th century there began the industrial revolution that started the long process of elevating the standard of living in the Western World. But these and other lesser revolutions like them, took centuries to produce their great transformations. Whereas the revolution of aviation and aerospace has taken place in a lifetime, in the lifetime of men and women now sitting in this room.

Many of us here tonight were actually around when aviation began. The Wright brothers' flight at Kitty Hawk occurred before I was born, but I must admit it was not very long before. As a boy I was one of many who were fascinated with the new adventure called aviation. But in those days, when I rode my bicycle as far out as Tijeras Canyon and played in the sand dunes, I certainly did not dream that the coming aviation revolution would be chiefly responsible for filling the canyon and the sand dunes with new homes during my own lifetime.

Many people in this room saw Charles Lindbergh fly into Albuquerque on his way across the continent; saw Art Goebel, winner of the Dole Prize for the first flight to Honolulu, land here; saw the arrival of the first airmail flights, and the opening of the Western Air Express ticket offices for the first passenger flights.

Some of you were at White Sands in 1946 when men began launching experimental rocket engines—the first engines that are not earthbound, since they do not depend on oxygen in the earth's atmosphere. You have seen White Sands helping the Nation develop rocket engines that now can propel a giant missile 6,000 miles in 35 minutes, or send astronauts orbiting around the earth at 300 miles per minute.

We have watched the aviation industry grow great from small beginnings, to the point where it has outgrown its own definition and has changed its name to the aerospace industry. And we know that this industry has changed the shape and size of the world we live on. Our own continent of North America was 5 days wide in the 1920's. Now it is 5 hours wide. Not so long ago the cities of Asia were half a world away and so far out of reach that we scarcely ever thought of them. Today those cities are much nearer to us in Albuquerque than was New York in 1928. By the 1970's there will be supersonic transports that can fly us across the Atlantic in 2 hours.

And in the 5 hours that we need to cross the continent today, we will be able to go to New Delhi, to Zanzibar, to Rio, to Tokyo, or to Melbourne on the other side of the earth.

Witnessing these changes, we have an exhilarating sense of progress. It is good to see a new industry create jobs for 800,000 people and contribute some $6½ billion per year to the gross national product. It is good to have swift transportation for New Mexico's products to buyers all over the Nation and abroad.

But we are perhaps so close to this aviation revolution that we have difficulty realizing its deeper significance. The swiftness of all these changes may make them more dramatic but may also blur their broader impact. Having lived through this exciting period ourselves, we know that something unprecedented, something overwhelmingly important, has happened to mankind in our lifetime. But we find it hard to see exactly what is really happening.

To approach such an understanding, we would do well to isolate a major aspect of this change—improvement in transportation—and then consider the role that transportation has played in the epic of mankind. In a sense, man's progress can be measured by his progress in transportation. Remarkable as all our subsequent innovations have been, there is good reason why historians still regard the invention of the wheel as one of the genuine milestones in the rise of civilization. Another giant stride was the development of sailing vessels that enabled Mediterranean peoples to venture beyond the Straits of Gibraltar and into the oceans of the world.

The first result of these new transportation modes was improved trade with other peoples. Local artisans could manufacture new and useful goods, but it was transportation that introduced these goods to the markets of the known world. With this came an exchange of goods, rewarding each locality by enabling it to specialize in the products that it could make better or cheaper than any other locality. This division of labor—first between individuals and then between whole settlements—has been cited by historians as one of the requisites in the elevation of man. It was—and still is—made possible by transportation.

Another obvious outgrowth of transportation has been the carrying of civilization to remote and primitive corners of the world. One of the most recent of world history books to challenge the thinking of historians is "The Rise of the West," by William McNeill. Instead of the more accepted view of history as an inevitable cycle of rising and falling civilizations, his theme is the gradual rise of the Western World in competition with other cultures, culminating in the exploration and colonization of all the primitive lands on the globe by Western peoples.

This theme is not diminished by the emergence in our time of independent nations out of former colonies.

The success with which they have built their independence has been in direct proportion to their absorption of Western culture. They emerge now in a framework of values and ideals brought to them by the former colonists. The very freedom they now achieve is a Western concept. Their educated leaders have done their homework in the writings of Jean Jacques Rousseau, John Locke, and Thomas Jefferson. And they have seen the fruits of liberty in the Western lands they have visited.

The point I wish to make is that the spread of civilization to the ends of the earth could not have been accomplished without great improvements in transportation. More than material goods have been carried by the vehicle and the ship. They have also carried knowledge and ideas.

Indeed, we hardly need to call upon world history and geography to grasp the importance of travel and commerce. New Mexico knows something about the history of transportation. It was the Santa Fe trade that opened the Southwest to American influence. The Santa Fe and Southern Pacific Railroads brought markets and population to what had formerly been a vast cattle range. Beginning in the 1920's, surfaced highways around the southern end of the Rockies brought an even larger movement of families by automobile.

In this sense, New Mexico's history is the history of its transportation. This State presents a classic example of the progress achieved by the movement of goods, people, and ideas.

In our time, this same progress is conveyed not only by the older forms of transportation, but also by the newer form that takes to the air. And this form has brought, in the span of two generations, an acceleration of progress undreamed in centuries past. If the exchange of cultures and of knowledge has been facilitated by earlier modes of travel, it is vastly advanced by our own. I have already touched upon the incredible velocities by which we are transported from one country to another—close to the speed of sound today, three times the speed of sound tomorrow. In fact, the triple-sonic XB–70 research aircraft that North American Aviation has developed is of a comparable size and weight to the planned supersonic transports. It has already flown at its design speed of 2,000 miles per hour, and is scheduled later for long distance cruises at the same speed.

Traveling in supersonic transports at this velocity, we will easily surpass the rotation of the earth if we fly westward. Among the curious results of such travel will be to see the sun appear to move backward in its path, rising in the west and setting in the east. Another will be to reverse the order of our meals—having dinner in London, lunch in New York, and breakfast in Los Angeles, all in the same day.

What is the significance of such speeds? For one thing, offering fast and convenient transportation to more distant points, they increase the volume of travel. This has been the pattern of air transportation since its beginning not long before the original Albuquerque airport was established.

In just 35 years—from 1929 to 1964—the number of passenger-miles traveled annually on the world's civil airlines increased from 105 million to more than 105 billion—almost a thousandfold. This figure is derived, of course, from both increased passengers and longer routes flown. If such a number is too staggering to imagine, perhaps my point could be made just as well by considering only the increase in number of passengers per year, and within a shorter time period. In only 15 years, between 1949 and 1964, the annual number of passengers on world civil airlines increased from 27 million to 154 million—nearly sixfold.

Moreover, equally dramatic figures emerge when we forecast future airline traffic. A Stanford Research Institute study predicts that passenger-miles on the free world's scheduled airlines—which were 105 billion in 1964—will reach approximately 229 billion in 1975, only a decade from now.

Not to be overlooked is the continued rise of general aviation, which includes business, private, and training aviation. At major American airports having control towers, such as this one, general aviation constitutes two-thirds of the landing and takeoff activity. And bear in mind that these airports make up only 3 percent of the more than 8,000 airports in this country. At the rest, virtually all airport activity is in the category of general aviation.

The trend of this type of flying in the United States alone may be gaged by the estimated miles flown per year—94 million in 1931, more than 2 billion in the latest available estimate. Just in the decade between 1955 and 1965, the number of aircraft operated in general aviation increased 55 percent.

Admittedly, it is more difficult to project the future of private flying than of commercial aviation. Much depends on technical innovation, family income levels, and the development of appropriate traffic control systems. I do not maintain that we are on the brink of an age of flying flivvers, with a pilot in every family. But we are already in an age where prophets tend to fall short of the actual fulfillment. I may remind you that when the railroads came into New Mexico in the 1880's with mass, scheduled transportation, few would have predicted that within 40 years, people would be driving into New Mexico and from coast to coast in their own powered conveyances. Nowadays, the riskiest statement of all is to say that something is impossible.

Nor do these observations really cover the impact of an aerospace industry that embraces not only transportation, but also advanced communication, navigation, atomic power, and space exploration. The Telstar satellite is already a means by which the arts of communication and transportation are combined to bring the people of the world closer together in knowledge and in cultural expression. The achievements that lie ahead in the realm of space are no longer visionary, but are being pursued at the level of practical engineering. This year the Apollo program, in which North American is a major participant, passed important milestones with the successful testing of key structures and equipment. We are more confident than ever of achieving the dramatic objective of sending Americans to the moon and back.

Beyond this, we are already studying the application of Apollo technology and the adaptation of Apollo equipment to other uses in space. These will add immeasurably to man's knowledge of his environment, and should lead to new and now unimaginable uses of that environment.

We are finding, moreover, that the management of technical programs on such a scale has given American industry a capability that it did not have before. Designing such complex systems and managing such vast development projects has provided techniques for solving other human problems, from controlling our weather to managing the use of our natural resources.

These are some of the further developments that are growing out of what was once called the aviation industry. That industry has found more ways to apply its technical and managerial abilities than in transportation alone, and these new activities continue to promote the progress, the elevation, and the cultivation of man. If early forms of transportation played their part in the exchange of goods and knowledge, travel by air has added to that the ability of millions to travel among other peoples and to understand their ways. If early transportation once enabled Western nations to explore the world, modern transportation and communication enables Western businessmen to help raise living standards around the world through foreign investment.

The result is to multiply the ties and the contacts that the people of the world have with one another. It is human nature to distrust strangers. But the more we see and understand others, the more we realize that they are basically like us, and the more we care what they think about us. A world that was once full of strangers can take no better example of mutual trust than the thousand miles of unfortified border that lie between two neighbors and friends, the United States and Mexico.

These are some of the considerations that come to mind with the dedication of this fine new Albuquerque Sunport. Your city's airport development is symbolic of these dynamic changes wrought by aviation. In 1928, when air travel was still in its youth, two far-sighted citizens of Albuquerque borrowed city road equipment and worked evenings and weekends to build the first municipal flying field. That pioneer airport was improved over the years to match the dramatic strides being made in aviation. Today the people of Albuquerque have committed $2.5 million to this jet-age airport that will match any in the world for cities of comparable size.

I congratulate you on your foresight and your enterprise. I note that this is the beginning of a $6 million airport improvement program over the next 10 years. And I predict that even this magnificent Albuquerque Sunport is not an end to your city's response to the age of flight.

POLICE HEROISM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, during late December, a letter came to me from a resident of the District of Columbia, providing a newspaper clipping reporting on an outstanding act of heroism by members of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department. I have concurred with the writer's conviction that some congressional recognition of the bravery and service performed by Pvt. Timothy C. Voellinger and Pvt. George J. Pagac should be rendered.

I, therefore, wish to commend these young officers upon their bravery and to call to the attention of the Members of this body the report of the action which these policemen took in saving the lives of District residents from fire.

I ask unanimous consent to have the newspaper article from the December 22 edition of the Washington (D.C.) Star, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TWO POLICEMEN HELP DOZENS FLEE BLAZE—BOTH ARE INJURED IN RESCUE EFFORT ON SECOND STREET NW.

(By Walter Gold)

More than 2 dozen residents of a burning Northwest Washington rooming house were led to safety uninjured last night by a pair of District policemen. Both of the policemen were injured and one was hospitalized.

The officers about 7 p.m. rushed into the rooming house at 745 Second Street NW, after seeing flames spurting from the building's second floor.

While searching for stragglers, one patrolman became trapped by smoke and flames and had to be rescued himself.

The rescuers are Pvt. Timothy C. Voellinger, 27, and his partner, Pvt. George J. Pagac, 24, both of the first precinct. The men were to be nominated for their department's Policemen of the Month Award, officials said.

TWO OTHERS TREATED

Voellinger was described in fair condition today at the Washington Hospital Center with third-degree hand burns, first-degree face burns, and numerous cuts and bruises. He was burned after being trapped on the third floor of the rooming house.

Pagac was treated at the Hospital Center for smoke inhalation and later released.

Another policeman and a fireman were treated for minor injuries at the Hospital Center and also released.

The fire destroyed several second-floor rooms in the three-story red brick rooming house. The cause of the blaze is under investigation.

After the policemen spotted the flames, Voellinger used their police car short-wave radio to call for firemen and Pagac drove alongside the burning house, sounding the car's siren and flashing its emergency lights to alert the occupants.

Voellinger then ran into the house while Pagac climbed up a fire escape and assisted more than a dozen men, women and children down from the second floor.

Inside, Voellinger kicked in doors on the second floor and led confused residents to the building's lone center stairway.

GOES TO THIRD FLOOR

"People were in one of the burning rooms yelling, 'Help me, help me,' " Voellinger said later from his hospital bed.

After satisfying himself that everyone was off the second floor of the house, Voellinger went upstairs looking for more residents.

"Suddenly, I was surrounded by smoke, so I thought the fire had burned up to where I was on the third floor," Voellinger said. "I kicked out a window and leaned outside for fresh air. There was no fire escape * * * I couldn't get down."

Unknown to Voellinger, his partner had helped firemen get water hose lines into the second floor, then went upstairs to search further. Although the two policemen probably were only a few feet apart on the third floor, neither saw the other while searching for a way out because of the thick smoke.

Eventually, Pagac found his way back to the fire escape and descended to the sidewalk. But when he learned that his partner was still inside, he ran up the building's stairway back to the third floor, where Voellinger had returned to the broken window in desperation.

HANGS OUT WINDOW

Firemen, meanwhile, had raised a portable ladder to the third-floor window where Voellinger was awaiting rescue. The police officer, however, is a big man—about 250 pounds, his colleagues reported—and fire officials were afraid to lower him on the ladder.

So for about 10 minutes, Voellinger hung with his body draped over the ladder and supported by firemen, and his feet on the window ledge.

After extinguishing the fire, firemen made their way to the third floor. Voellinger was brought inside the building again, led down the charred stairway to safety, and taken, with Pagac, to the hospital.

Police Pvt. Jackie D. Atkins was treated for smoke inhalation and Pvt. George Kenney, of the fire department, was treated for a cut hand at the Hospital Center. Both were later released.

Traffic in the area of Second and H Streets NW was rerouted for about an hour.

Police Inspector Karol L. Kratochvil said Voellinger and Pagac "risked their lives to save a number of persons."

AMERICANS SHOULD SPEAK UP FOR FREEDOM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the congressional recess while many misguided and ill-advised college professors and students were organizing movements designed to give aid and comfort to militaristic communism and to provide foreign agitators with a distorted image of this country's determination to resist and repel the Communist invaders of South Vietnam, one of South Dakota's highly respected radio spokesmen and managers delivered an editorial of the air which won wide acclaim throughout the State. I refer to the October 27 commentary of Ross E. Case of KWAT, Watertown, S. Dak., which he entitled, "Comments On Americanism."

Mr. President, the commentary of General Manager Ross E. Case of Radio Station KWAT, Watertown, S. Dak., so favorably impressed the listeners of this station that it was necessary to prepare several editions of reprints to reply to the many requests for copies which were received by the station.

For the information of the Congress and the country, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the commentary by Ross Case be printed at this point in the Record as a part of my remarks. I do so in the hope other commentators and editors will devote their talents to expanding on the patriotic theme so dramatically developed by Mr. Case.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Comments on Americanism

(By Ross E. Case)

The following should be considered a KWAT editorial, perhaps it sounds more like it might be a sermon. This is Ross Case speaking. These comments are brought about because of the story that I read on my noon newscast of yesterday, which I hope that many of you heard. I'd like to repeat that story first of all:

"The New York World-Telegram said today an antidraft group known as the May Second Movement is sending blood, first aid supplies and money to the Communist Vietcong. The movement was among those involved in recent demonstrations against the war in Vietnam. The report said a blood donor drive has been organized in the movement's west coast chapter, and blood and first aid material already has been shipped to North Vietnam. The paper said the New York chapter plans to send blood donated by its members and send the money to the Vietcong through the Algerian National Liberation Front. The report said the movement has 17 chapters across the country, with the New York City chapter having 200 members.

"The paper also quoted one Columbia University student—identified as a member of the May Second Movement—as indicating that the movement in Michigan is training volunteers to join the Communist forces in Vietnam. The student, when asked about the report, was quoted as saying: 'That's not far from the truth.' "

So much for the story. It's time for the average, decent, red-blooded American to stand up and be counted. Do you or do you not believe in the concept of liberty and justice, tempered with faith in those who lead our country and have the authority to direct our actions? Isn't it time to quit snickering about being a flag waver and really show our patriotism?

I challenge every veteran's organization to become militantly aggressive in the purpose of bringing home to the people, especially our younger people, the need for military preparedness. I challenge the fraternal organizations such as the Elks, the Masons, the Eagles, and others who stress Americanism in their rituals, to give it more than lipservice. I challenge the civic organizations, business firms and individuals of this community, to put God and country above business in observance of patriotic holidays, to help drive home the principles of democracy that guide our country. I challenge the churches to preach to their congregations why the need for belief in what our country stands for. I challenge the youth group leaders; such as Scouting, FFA, YCL, Hi-Y1 and all the rest, to make Americanism and an understanding of loyalty to country and constituted authority, a major portion of its regular programing and instruction. I challenge the teachers to educate our students from the very beginning about our country and what it represents. I challenge the young people of our area to think clearly and honestly about their future. They have no place to go if they don't believe in the principles of the American way that history and tradition have created. And, most of all, I challenge you parents to undertake the task that is your most solemn obligation—that of guiding your youngsters by experience and example. If you don't believe in what our flag stands for, if you don't participate to the fullest extent in the practice of democracy, if you let someone else do the job of protecting your rights; then don't expect your youngsters to be any different than you. Someone has got to tell these young people why they have to expect to face sacrifices in behalf of their country. Someone has got to get across to them the reasons for respecting authority and discipline. Someone has got to give them enough faith and belief in that which is right so that they can't be hookwinked and misled by fuzzy thinking and deliberate subterfuge. And, parents, that someone has got to be you.

Patriotism, love of our flag and country, respect for the rights of others, these are the lessons that must be taught at home. They have to be started young and they have to be told often. The attitude and approach to thinking on the matter of serving our country and accepting our responsibilities has sunk to a new low. Our apathy and evasive stand on the problems facing the United States in our conflict with our enemies are hard to comprehend.

Somebody, somewhere has got to start the ball rolling. Somebody, somewhere has got to fire up a very tiny flame that at one time was bright enough and warm enough to create the greatest country in the history of the world. There's no reason why that somebody can't be you and I. There's no reason why that somebody must not be you and I.

Take the time to think about it and you'll suddenly realize that time is running out on our way of life. If that's the way you want it to be, keep on doing what you've been doing. As for me, I'm joining the parades—I'm going to wave the flag—I'm going to sing the "Star Spangled Banner." Are you ashamed to join me? I don't believe so. But, just nodding your head in agreement, talking about it over the coffee cup this morning and forgetting it—that's not going to improve the situation. You've got organizations you belong to. There are people who will listen to you. Most of all, you have kids that need your instruction and example. Let's get on with our job of being acting, active, aggressive, and proud Americans. And, let's show the light of truth to those around us who aren't too sure about it all.

Finally, here's a comment written by a Peter E. Gianutsos, an American officer serving in Vietnam. I'd like to read his comments:

"A legacy of ignorance: Time was when a boy when to college to study law, medicine, engineering or one of the arts. And girls went to get their Mrs. degree. But, that was in the past. Today's crop of college cut-ups are no longer content to swallow goldfish, crowd themselves into telephone booths, or foreign cars. They now insist on dictating Government policies and are ready to parade, demonstrate or sit-in at the drop of a cause.

"The latest gimmick among these intellectual midgets is a campaign to urge all members of the Armed Forces to desert their posts rather than serve in Vietnam.

"As a member of the race that started this democracy kick (quick, Socrates, the hemlock!), I have no quarrel with the right of the individual to voice his opinions. However, the hysterical babbling of these burgeois boors, borders on sedition if not treason. I leave that to the legal eagles in the Justice Department. It is a sad day indeed when the words honor, duty, and country have come to mean so little. As a member of the military family, I have spent the better part of my adult life in the Saigons of the world. It never occurred to me to disobey an order, to question the right of my Government to send me anywhere to protect and preserve its interests.

"Like a lot of us here, I have had occasion to be at the base theater during one of the daily memorial services, and I have witnessed the loud music, the slow walking, and heard the soft prayers for those to whom fygmo charts and rotation dates are no longer important. I muttered my own prayer, as well as giving silent thanks that it was not me inside that metal box. As I stood there, I remembered the preachings of these mentally retarded adults and my compassion for a dead man turned to shame, and finally anger, that they dared to ask me to prostitute my profession, ask me to bring dishonor to myself, to my service, and to my country.

"It is difficult enough to understand when the more learned citizenry take the rostrum to rant and rave against our Government, and thereby feed the propaganda mills to the north, but to be subjected to the meaningless chatter of many of these imbecilic sloths, whose idea of bravery is to lead a panty raid, is more than human dignity can bear.

"It has been suggested that they all be drafted and brought to Vietnam. I could not agree less. To put these morons in a uniform is to insult the memory of those who never came back from Guadalcanal, Pork Chop Hill, or, those who did not survive the Brinks BOQ bombing or the VC attack on the Embassy. Instead, clean them up, cut their hair, take away their sweat shirts, and sneakers and bring them to Vietnam to live among the people. Let them expound their theories about the kind, gentle misunderstood VC among the villagers whose homes were destroyed and their meager rice crop stolen. Let them talk about war mongering to the widow of a Vietnamese Army private who earns her rice and fish as a prostitute, or, with the village woman who lost a hand, one finger at a time, to Vietcong terrorists because she dared to stand up for what she believed was right.

"Draft them into the military? Never. Ours is a proud organization, made up of men and women who have ideals and principles, and what's even more important, men and women who have the courage and the will to live up to those beliefs. They take great pride in themselves, in their uniforms and in their Nation, qualities that campus cuties have yet to acquire. Until they do, they will never belong. Their voice will be that of the semieducated half-baked idiot and the fool who will leave behind only a legacy of shame, dishonor and disgrace."

These last comments by Peter E. Gianutson, an American officer serving in Vietnam.

And this is the sermon for this morning.

BERKELEY SPRINGS, W. VA.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Sunday magazine section of the November 21, 1965, Washington, D.C., Star carried an article by Benjamin Ruhe on historic Berkeley Springs, W. Va. The author pointed out the scenic appeal of the springs as well as the therapeutic value of the waters of this spa, which has been termed the first health resort in the American Colonies. A list of its visitors and residents during the early years of its development is reported as "almost amounting to a registry of famous Americans in all walks of life." As examples, George and Martha Washington were devotees of the waters and visited on varied occasions, accompanied by friends and relatives, and

James Madison once came to recover from "a fit of despondency." It is reported that he did indeed recover his good spirits.

So widely known was the Berkeley Springs reputation for gaiety that Francis Asbury, the renowned Methodist evangelist, came to preach in the village in thundering condemnation of the social life, which included gambling, dancing, and sporting games.

A charming remnant of the past is the castle on the hillside overlooking the village square. Now used as a museum, it was once the residence of a wealthy and prominent eastern family.

The castle and the springs themselves are attractions for thousands of visitors annually; however, it is believed that the area's full recreational potentials are only partially known. Recently, a technical assistance project was undertaken by Wheeling College, in Wheeling, W. Va., under a grant from the Area Redevelopment Administration, for the purpose of selecting archeological and historical sites in West Virginia for development of tourist and recreational possibilities. Among those surveyed and strongly recommended for intensive development was Berkeley Springs, with it historical attributes and scenic attractions.

In order that the general public may learn more of the spa, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Benjamin Ruhe's article reprinted in the Record.

There being no objection, the newspaper article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Berkeley Springs: West Virginia's Famous Old Spa Is Once Again Stirring to Life

(By Benjamin Ruhe)

Taking the waters at Berkeley Springs, W. Va., has been a way of seeking health and happiness for two centuries. Today, more than 200 years after Lord Fairfax, a sufferer from gout, deeded the mineral springs "to be forever free to the publick for the welfare of suffering humanity," the spa continues to exert its quiet charm on visitors, while its curative waters rehabilitate the sick, the lame, the tired, and the old. A gay health resort in post-Revolutionary War times ("Sadly dissipated," said George Washington), the town continued to grow in favor through most of the 1800's only to decline at the turn of the century under the impact of new medical ideas and changes in American holiday habits. The springs themselves, though, never ceased to pour forth their daily 3 million gallons of 74° alkaline water and now the spa is having a resurgence. Business has increased significantly in the last decade. Supt. Henry Lawyer attributes the swing of the pendulum to a growing recognition that the water has therapeutic effects in the treatment of nervous disorders.

That the water helps arthritics, often magically, has always been obvious. Six thousand people come yearly to drink the waters and bathe in them and many more come just to see the sights. Pleasant, sleepy Berkeley, with its lofty trees, graceful Victorian mansions, its castle on the hill and rambling hotels, is the perfect setting for the outdoor springs and interesting bathhouses. State-run, the spa is open the year around. It is reached from Washington via Interstate 70S to Frederick, west on U.S. 40 to Hancock and left again to Route 522, a total distance of 109 miles. The charge for the baths is nominal and the water itself is free—many people cart it away in jugs. Some may even find true a saying about the aqua vitae of an ancient spa: "Whosoever drinks thereof shall find their wits more quick and themselves of better conceit than before."

A MEDIC IN VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a few months ago, I received a letter from a Connecticut high school teacher, enclosing a letter which he had received from a former student, Robert Tillquist.

At the time the letter was written, Mr. Tillquist was stationed in Vietnam as a member of the Armed Forces. A few days afterward, Robert A. Tillquist was killed in action.

I was deeply moved by this letter which so clearly voiced the young man's patriotic feeling for his country, and which expressed his reasons, and those of other American boys, for risking their lives in a far-off land.

It was Mr. Tillquist's hope that the maximum number of Americans would read his words so that they might realize the importance of supporting the men who are fighting for our ideals.

I would therefore like to share this letter with you, knowing that you will be proud to hear the words of such a fine, young American.

I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Record at this point:

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

(Note.—This letter was written by Robert Tillquist, a former student at Wilbur Cross High School who was killed in Vietnam, November 4, 1965, to Mr. Ted Astarita, a member of the faculty at Cross High School. As a favor, I ask that you read this to as many students as possible.)

B Company, 2d Battalion,
12th Cavalry,
1st Cavalry Division (AM),
APO San Francisco, Calif., 96490, November 2, 1965.

Hello, remember me? The umbrella kid. I don't know whether an old married (?) (congratulations) man such as yourself can remember back that far. This is to inform you, however, if you haven't been reading the papers lately, that your favorite (huh?) student (past tense) is now in Vietnam. Below I will try and explain the reason I am writing.

Just as other young men are afraid of dying, so am I. This to me was sufficient reason for my concern, for my personal welfare when I was ordered over here with the Airmobile Division by President Johnson. A fear of dying is a great burden to a young man who has not fully tasted all that life has to offer.

So I came over here with many misgivings. I didn't want to come over here, I didn't want to leave the security of my nice comfortable home, or of America. Why should I give up the luxurious life I knew in the States, to come over here and fight, fight for something I didn't really care about?

After only a few weeks here, these and many other questions were answered. Just being here and having contact with these people can tell you many things.

When you see children 6 or 7 years old, with one or more of their limbs brutally amputated. Or orphanages overcrowded with young boys and girls who were forced to watch the massacre of their parents. Or fertile fields that would grow almost any crop, ravaged and destroyed (with the harvest that would have fed the people of the village, laying in the ruins), just to deprive the people of subsistence. When you see this and much more (things to make even the strongest of men cry out in anger, at the outrage of it all) then you understand the reason for your being here.

I came here afraid for my life. Now I would gladly lay down my life for these little—but only in stature—people. They have brave hearts and fight on against a terrible foe. A man who is not proud and willing to help these people, after seeing what they have to fight against, is not much of a man, not much of an American.

The morale of the men—the U.S. forces here—is high. The men want to help these people, and are doing a good job of it. We are like the forces of Lafayette. We too have come to a country fighting for its freedom. And like the men of LaFayette we will be able to go home—when the job is done—knowing that we did the job we came to do.

One of the prime factors in the morale of the troops is the news from home. A staggering blow, to the men fighting for this cause, was the headlines concerning the demonstrations in protest to our Vietnam policy. It might be a blow to the morale of the protesters that the men in Vietnam think that our policy in Vietnam is not strict enough. We think that the Government is being too lenient with the Vietcong.

Being born and raised in Connecticut, I know that the people there are behind our boys here 100 percent. I know that I'm not the most patriotic person from our State, so I know if I feel the way I do that the rest of the people feel even more strongly.

I hope that in writing this I have accomplished my purpose. To instill in you the students of Cross, the school to which my heart belongs, a more accurate knowledge of what one GI of many who think alike, feels about Vietnam.

I close now asking that you remember, it's American boys fighting here. Remember that and the fact that they are fighting for you. Maybe then it will be easier for you to understand what is really going on.

A fellow Crossite,

Robert A. Tillquist,
A Medic in Vietnam.

WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT TO BE SERVED BY JET TRANSPORT PLANES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am pleased to note that the Washington National Airport will be opened to jet service beginning April 24. The Federal Aviation Agency deserves commendation for this decision because it will benefit the millions of passengers who use the National Airport, which is so convenient to downtown Washington, D.C.

Our Nation's Capital deserves the best possible air transportation and in opening National to jet service, the FAA has indicated that they plan to keep this facility at the forefront of important air hubs in the United States. It is now the fourth busiest airport in our country and the introduction of the new, 2- and 3-engine jets will insure increased usefulness in the years ahead.

One reason why National Airport is being opened to smaller jets is that airlines have demonstrated considerable interest in acquiring these comfortable and convenient aircraft. Carriers serving the airport have almost 200 of the small jets in their fleets now and have ordered more than 300. Total cost of these modern planes will exceed $2 billion.

The Administrator of the FAA, William F. McKee, and his associates are to be congratulated for taking this forward-looking step in the strengthening of one of the Nation's most useful assets: air transportation.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON MEETS THE POPULATION CRISIS SQUARELY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in his state of the Union address Wednesday, the President continued his superlative leadership in the face of the population crisis. He forthrightly announced that the United States of America is ready to help nations trying to control population growth by increasing our research and by earmarking funds to help their efforts.

The President asked us "to give a new and daring direction to our foreign aid program, designed to make a maximum attack on hunger, disease, and ignorance in those countries determined to help themselves—and to help those nations trying to control population growth."

Minutes later in his state of the Union message the President said he would propose the International Health Act of 1966, "to strike at disease by a new effort to bring modern skills and knowledge to the uncared-for suffering of the world—and by wiping out smallpox, malaria, and controlling yellow fever over most of the world in this decade," and "to help countries trying to control population growth, by increasing our research—and by earmarking funds to help their efforts."

The President is properly concerned. Family planning information should be available to all people upon request. And all the people in the United States and in other nations should know such information is available.

Man's right to knowledge is the basis of freedom of thought. That knowledge will be widened by increased research.

President Johnson's concern has been expressed on previous occasions. Clearly he has given a mandate to the various offices of the executive agencies to meet the challenges of the population explosion.

Let us hope with all our hearts that the urgent and important work necessary is to accelerate. It is pertinent to repeat the previous pronouncements by President Johnson in 1965 which concern the population explosion.

In his state of the Union address before Congress on January 4, 1965, he said:

> I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources.

When the 20th anniversary of the United Nations was observed in San Francisco on June 25, he said:

> Let us in all our lands—including this land—face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations and seek the answers to this most profound challenge to the future of all the world. Let us act on the fact that less than $5 invested in population control is worth $100 invested in economic growth.

When John W. Gardner was sworn in as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Rose Garden at the White House on August 18, the President said:

> This administration is seeking new ideas and it is certainly not going to discourage any new solutions to the problems of population growth and distribution.

And when the Second United Nations World Population Conference opened in Belgrade on August 30, the President addressed the following letter to U.N. Secretary General U Thant:

> MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY GENERAL: The U.S. Government recognizes the singular importance of the meeting of the Second United Nations World Population Conference and pledges its full support to your great undertaking.
>
> As I said to the United Nations in San Francisco, we must now begin to face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying population. Our Government assures your conference of our wholehearted support to the United Nations and its agencies in their efforts to achieve a better world through bringing into balance the world's resources and the world's population.
>
> In extending my best wishes for the success of your conference, it is my fervent hope that your great assemblage of population experts will contribute significantly to the knowledge necessary to solve this transcendent problem. Second only to the search for peace, it is humanity's greatest challenge. This week, the meeting in Belgrade carries with it the hopes of mankind.

In this past session of the 89th Congress the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures has held 15 public hearings on S. 1676, my bill to coordinate and disseminate birth control information upon request. Twelve of my colleagues in this Chamber have joined as cosponsors of this proposed legislation which would make possible the coordination and dissemination upon request of information available on birth control in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. An Assistant Secretary would head an Office for Population Problems in each department. The bill also authorizes the President to call a White House Conference on Population to be preceded by State conferences if the States so desire.

When S. 1676 was introduced on April 1, 1965, joining me as cosponsors were the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

Since S. 1676 was introduced the following colleagues have requested that their names be added as cosponsors. They are the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN].

On October 1, 1965, I reported on the progress of hearings on S. 1676. The Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures had ended hearings for the first session of the 89th Congress on September 22. The hearings had brought out the crucial relationship between the dissemination of birth control information as lack of that information relates to proverty, health, educational needs, quality of life, responsible parenthood, broken homes, national economy, natural resources, crime and juvenile delinquency—to name but a few of the immediate findings. The hearings covered many aspects of these vital problems both at home and abroad. Already requests for printed copies of the hearings number approximately 4,000.

Very distinguished witnesses have testified and this session of Congress others will add their contribution to the population dialog when public hearings on S. 1676 resume next week on Wednesday, January 19, at 10 a.m. in room 3302 of the New Senate Office Building.

The hearing witnesses next Wednesday, January 19, will be Nobel Prize laureates representing the 83 who appealed to Pope Paul VI last year to urge him to reconsider the church's position on birth control. Dr. E. L. Tatum, 1958 Nobel Prize winner for medicine and physiology, who now is associated with the Rockefeller Institute, has handled arrangements to assemble the panel.

The other panelists are Dr. Dickenson W. Richards, Jr., physician, 1956 Nobel Prize winner in medicine and physiology; Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, physician, 1937 Nobel Prize winner in medicine; and Dr. Polykarp Kusch, physicist, 1955 Nobel Prize winner in physics.

These men share President Johnson's concern about the dangers caused or created by the population explosion. They are prepared to do whatever they can to bring to the attention of the world the urgency for solution. Certainly the President has made it abundantly clear that our Government will, if requested, help other nations. Now is the time to disseminate his mandate.

I am encouraged by a news story appearing in the New York Times for January 14, 1966, written by Mr. John W. Finney and datelined Washington. In his article Mr. Finney offers an informal outline of forthcoming requests which the administration will send to the Congress in its new foreign-aid bill. The requests, according to the news item, will include one for "about $10 million to help other countries curb their population growth." Now this is a very modest sum, but it is a start and it shall have my support because we will make no progress with our foreign-aid program until the population explosion is recognized by us and by other nations. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Finney's article appear as exhibit 1 at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, earlier this month, on Sunday, January 9, the New York Times magazine section contained an excellent article written by Mr. David E. Lilienthal, chairman of the Development and Resources Corp., and former Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Atomic Energy Commission, entitled "Three Hundred Million Americans Would Be Wrong."

I have excerpted two brief comments by the author. Mr. Lilienthal writes:

> But if our resources are mainly spent to survive, to cope with life in a congested America, then where is the enjoyment of living? Our teeming cities are not pleasant places today; imagine them by the middle of the next century when the areas of some might be 100 times larger than they are now.

And:

> Even today, most of the Nation's most serious problems are caused largely by the pressures of a too rapidly rising population. In the next generation, the problems may become unmanageable. Take four basic needs: education, water, air, and power.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Lilienthal's article be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks as exhibit 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the January 9 edition of the New York Times also carried a full-page message addressed to President Lyndon B. Johnson submitted by the Hugh Moore Fund of New York City and headed "Famine Stalks the Earth." The message was signed by 83 individuals who are concerned about the inadequacy of the world's food supply today and tomorrow. The message concludes:

> There will be 300 million more mouths to feed in the world 5 years from now—most of them hungry. Hunger brings turmoil—and turmoil, as we have learned, creates the atmosphere in which the Communists seek to conquer the earth.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the message and the names of the persons who have signed it appear at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

AID BILL TO SPUR POPULATION CURBS—UNITED STATES TAKING LESS CAUTIOUS STAND—TO ASK $10 MILLION

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, January 13.—The administration will shortly ask Congress in its new foreign aid bill for about $10 million to help other countries curb their population growth.

The amount will more than double American assistance for foreign population control programs and will mark the first time the administration has specifically requested money to support such programs.

A step in the administration's approach to the politically sensitive problem was taken by President Johnson last night in his state of the Union message. In discussing major new directions in the foreign aid program, the President said he would offer proposals "to help countries trying to control population growth by increasing our research and we will earmark funds to help their efforts."

While seemingly a passing reference in a lengthy address, the statement reflected a deliberate yet still cautious effort to involve the Government directly in a global population problem that associates say greatly concerns the President.

MANNER IS CAREFUL

In a careful, step-by-step manner over the last few years so as not to arouse political opposition, the administration has begun offering foreign governments technical and financial assistance to undertake demographic studies and organize population control programs.

A year ago, in the first reference to population control in a state of the Union message, President Johnson said:

"I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and growing scarcity in world resources."

Now the President is talking specifically of providing population control assistance and earmarking funds for it.

With as little publicity as possible, the Agency for International Development has been spending small amounts of money for foreign population control programs, largely for demographic studies thus far.

In the fiscal year 1965, the agency spent about $2 million, about half of which went to Latin American countries. In the current fiscal year, the spending is expected to total slightly more than $4 million.

The money has previously come from general purpose funds, enabling the administration to avoid possible political reactions by asking Congress for appropriations for population control. In now proposing specific funds for such a program, the administration is likely to raise an issue on Capitol Hill, where there already are signs the policy will run into opposition.

A QUESTION IS RAISED

One influential Catholic member of the House Appropriations Committee, for example, has been asking how AID was spending money for population control programs.

The President's open declaration, however, is expected by administration officials to have two important psychological effects. One is to encourage AID officials to stand up to opposition on Capitol Hill. The other is to encourage foreign countries to come to the United States for assistance.

After the President's state of the Union message last year, AID informed its foreign missions that the United States was perpared to entertain requests for technical and financial assistance in family planning programs.

Partly because of the lack of publicity, the response has been limited. The only official request has come from Turkey, which wants a $3 million low-interest loan. Informal, preliminary requests have been received from India and Pakistan, and one is expected shortly from Honduras.

Many Government officials believe the Catholic hierarchy in the United States will not openly oppose the program. On the basis of private soundings, officials are convinced the Catholic hierarchy in Latin America will tacitly support many government-sponsored birth control programs.

EXHIBIT 2

THREE HUNDRED MILLION AMERICANS WOULD BE WRONG

(By David E. Lilienthal)

By the year 2000, just one generation away, the population of the United States will probably be about 300 million—100 million higher than it is now and 200 million higher than it was in 1920. Yet, in comparison with many underdeveloped nations, population growth would not seem to be a serious problem in America.

Certainly this vastly increased population will not lack for food. While population growth in Latin America, for example, has brought per capita food production below pre-World War II levels, we in the United States worry about overweight, spend huge sums to restrict farm production and give away enough food to prevent famine in poor nations throughout the world. In contrast to less developed nations, we have enough space, too. Just fly over this country and see the huge, sparsely populated areas that could easily accommodate additional tens of millions.

Great differences in resources, technology and education help explain why Americans regard overpopulation as a menace only to other peoples. It can't happen here, they think. I used to think so, too; I don't any more.

During the past 10 years, much of it spent overseas, I came to the easy conclusion that if we succeeded in tripling or quadrupling food production in hungry nations—and in some areas in which I worked we did just that—the problem of overpopulation could be solved. But gradually I learned I was mistaken to believe that increased food production was the complete answer to the crisis of population abroad. Gradually, I also learned that America's overflowing cornucopia has obscured a deeper crisis developing here: a population of at least 300 million by 2000 will, I now believe, threaten the very quality of life of individual Americans.

An additional 100 million people will undermine our most cherished traditions, erode our public services and impose a rate of taxation that will make current taxes seem tame. The new masses, concentrated (as they will be) in the already strangling urban centers, cannot avoid creating conditions that will make city life almost unbearable. San Francisco, to take a still tolerable example, once was one of my favorite cities—cosmopolitan, comfortable, lovely. Now the high-rise buildings have sprouted like weeds and suburban blight is advancing on the Golden Gate. The value of real estate has increased while people's enjoyment of life declines.

Historically the United States owes much of its vigor and power to population growth. (Only 50 million people rattled around in America in 1880.) Large markets, skilled manpower, huge factories, a country able to spend billions on war, space, and social welfare—all this, plus 75 million passenger cars—is surely a consequence of rising population. But no economy and no physical environment can sustain infinite population growth. There comes a point at which a change in quantity becomes a change in quality—when we can no longer speak of "more of the same." And another 100 million people will, I fear, make just that change in the joy of life in America.

It is probably true that as the population will grow, so will the dollar value of our output. U.S. wealth, measured by gross national product, is now $670 billion; barring a major economic setback, total output will be doubled in about two decades. With GNP climbing at the rate of $40 billion a year, the United States probably can afford to build the schools, housing projects, roads, and other necessities of life for 300 million Americans.

But if our resources are mainly spent merely to survive, to cope with life in a congested America, then where is the enjoyment of living? Our teeming cities are not pleasant places today; imagine them by the middle of the next century when the areas of some might be 100 times larger than they are now. This is the real possibility envisioned by Roger Revelle, director of the newly established Center for Population Studies at the Harvard School of Public Health. And it will be to the cities that tomorrow's millions will flock. Or consider the picture, drawn with characteristic wit, by Economist John Kenneth Galbraith: "It is hard to suppose that penultimate Western man, stalled in the ultimate traffic jam and slowly succumbing to carbon monoxide will be especially enchanted to hear from the last survivor that in the preceding year gross national product went up by a record amount."

Nor does the nightmare consist only of traffic jams and a bumper-to-bumper way of life. As we have seen in the history of the last 25 years, public services only the Federal Government can provide will continue to expand. Moreover, State governments until now unable (or unwilling) to pay their share of the bills, show signs of awakening to their responsibilities. But bigger government efforts do not produce better results for human beings; they are simply a way of getting a job done when no more feasible methods exist.

Even today most of the Nation's most serious problems are caused largely by the pressures of a too rapidly rising population. In the next generation, the problems may become unmanageable. Take four basic needs: education, water, air, and power.

The quality of education is closely related to the problem of numbers. Within the next 5 years, we are told the number of high school students will rise to 15 million (a 50-percent increase over 1960), forcing hundreds of communities to consider imposing stiff new taxes. Many taxpayers will refuse to accept the added burden and their children will attend even more crowded classes. Farsighted citizens will approve new school bond issues, but the increased financial drain probably will not result in an improved education.

Our standard of democracy entitles everyone to free schooling through high school. But our educational standards are rising. Two-year junior colleges, many of them supported by cities and States, loom as the next step in our system of free, universal education. Along with the surge in enrollment at traditional 4-year colleges and universities, higher education is expected to attract about 12 million students in 1980 (triple the 1960 figure).

Merely building the physical facilities for such huge increases is a formidable prospect. Creating a sympathetic atmosphere for education, and filling the need for qualified teachers is a much more staggering problem. Of course, we may argue for the radical reform of U.S. education. We may plead for overhauling the existing system of teacher training, as James B. Conant has eloquently done. But I see few signs we are about to undertake such vast changes in the machinery of U.S. education; nor does it seem possible, even if the mood for drastic reform was overwhelming, simply to order new procedures, new goals and new solutions and then put them into practice. Good teachers cannot be turned out by fiat. We do not live in a planner's paradise. Ask Robert Moses.

With increased urbanization and industrialization, demands on the water supply will be much greater than most Americans have remotely imagined. The drought in the northeast United States last summer was an indication of shortages even greater to come. And though engineers and scientists can, and will, tap new sources of water and devise ways to purify polluted rivers like the Hudson, the cost will be fantastic—hundreds of billions of dollars. Add to the current strain the pressure of a 50-percent increase in population and the result may well be a chronic water shortage that can hardly be solved at any tolerable price.

Imaginative but impractical water schemes have been proposed, such as one to bring to the United States the almost limitless supply of far northern water, carrying it a thousand miles and more to our own boundaries. Assuming that Canada would agree to the politically prickly diversion of her waters, the cost is estimated in the neighborhood of $100 billion. But it has taken more than a generation of hot dispute and interminable litigation to decide priorities of water among our own sister States of the West. How much greater the difficulties of diverting Canada's water to care for U.S. needs?

As for nuclear-powered desalination plants, quite apart from the cost of constructing the huge installations we would need and the pipelines to carry the water inland, there is the additional problem of safety in disposing of radioactive waste. Technicians may solve the problem, but at what social cost? The conversion of precious open spaces into atomic garbage dumps?

Just as easily accessible water supplies dwindle, air pollution will increase. Air pollution is the result of congestion, industrialization, and the multiplication of automobiles—factors in direct relation to population density in urban areas. Los Angeles is not an industrial city, yet at times its air is hardly fit to breathe. And with the spread of industry in the sprawling cities of the Nation, more and more places will be Los Angelized.

We have long assumed that at least the air we breathe is free. It won't be for much longer as we expand our efforts to purify the atmosphere. In California, for example, an aroused public finally insisted that automobile manufacturers install exhaust filters to trap toxic chemicals. Keeping automobile fumes and industrial poisons out of the air we breathe is going to be an increasingly costly business. By the year 2000 the high cost of breathing will be a real issue, not just a phrase.

Packing too many people into an urban area increases the cost of providing still another essential of everyday living: electric power. Even more serious, such concentrations of people may make absolutely reliable electric service more and more difficult to maintain. I doubt if it was a mere coincidence, for example, that New York City needed 10 hours to restore electricity after the recent Northeast power failure while smaller communities were able to turn on their lights in a much shorter time. Growth is desirable up to a point; then the advantage of size diminishes and the multiplication of complexity multiplies the headaches. And by 1980 we can expect at least a 300-percent increase in the Nation's electrical energy needs. Most of this will flow into urban areas. The present difficulties of maintaining absolutely reliable service to such concentrations of people and industry, and holding down costs, will thus be magnified.

As chairman of TVA and the Atomic Energy Commission, and in my present work in Asia and Latin America, I have become familiar with the problems of producing and distributing electricity on a large scale. Indeed, it was TVA a generation ago that pioneered the concept that the greater the use of electricity the lower the cost per kilowatt-hour. This is still generally true. But for great cities the exact contrary is coming to pass. To distribute electricity in a large, densely populated area such as New York is more costly than in smaller urban markets. Huge generating powerplants produce ever lower generating costs; but to bring this power to the consumer in massive concentrations of population grows more and more expensive. Consequently, the price of this essential of modern life probably will go up in the great cities as population growth continues.

Without realizing it, we are fast approaching what may be called the population barrier beyond which lie unpredictability and, I fear, problems of unmanageable size. Consider, for example, the relationship between population growth and the poor.

The Federal aid to dependent children program has doubled to more than 4 million cases during the last decade, while the costs have soared from about $600 million to more than $1.8 billion. Even more depressing than the numbers of families who cannot survive without welfare assistance is the phenomenon known as the cycle of dependency.

More than 40 percent of parents whose children receive ADC funds themselves had parents who received relief checks. This cycle is sad but not surprising. Poor people tend to have more children than they want or can afford, and the children have less chance to receive the education and training they need to break the pattern. Thus, even the third generation appears on relief rolls in the United States, the most socially mobile nation in the world. In America, reports the National Academy of Sciences in a recent study, "The Growth of U.S. Population," "the burden of unwanted children among impoverished and uneducated mothers * * * is much like that experienced by mothers in underdeveloped countries."

Since the poor cannot contribute their share of the mounting costs of education, medical care, public housing, and similar necessary Government enterprises, the money must be supplied by the rest of the population through taxation. But the most painful loss is not measured in dollars but in human resources. And one measure of the potential loss is the fact that one-fourth of America's children are the offspring of poor parents.

Belatedly, we are helping poor couples who need and want financial and medical help in family planning. The White House Conference on Health in November gave high priority to birth control as part of Federal efforts to halt the cycle of dependency and poverty. Tax-supported activities in 40 States, combined with such large-scale private efforts as Harvard's Center for Population Studies and the $14.5 million grant by the Ford Foundation for basic research by the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center and the Population Council, herald new progress in a long-neglected field.

We tend to patronize the poor by preaching to them about birth control; though poverty-stricken parents with four, five, or six children are the most publicized aspect of population growth, they are by no means the most important numerical aspect of the problem. As a matter of simple arithmetic, the four-fifths of the Nation's families who earn more than the poverty-line income of $3,000 a year—and who can afford two, three, or four children—produce a greater total of children than the one poor couple out of five which may have six youngsters.

In fact, the latest census information reveals that though poor families may have more children than do better off families, the difference is much smaller than many people believe. According to the National Academy of Sciences analysis, in 1960 married women 40 to 44 years old in families with incomes below $4,000 and above $4,000 differed in the average number of children by less than one. The postwar baby boom, for example, was more pronounced among middle and upper income families than among the poor.

Thus, these relatively well off families are the ones mainly responsible for our rapidly rising population curve. They and their children are the ones who will account for most of the 100 million additional Americans by the end of the century.

How many children a couple should have is a decision only they should make; a government inducement or deterrent—a tax, for example—is morally repugnant and politically impossible. We cannot penalize the poor in order to limit the size of their families while we allow more prosperous parents to have as many children as they want. The large majority of middle- and upper-class parents need no birth control help from government, nor will they welcome outside advice on so personal a matter. Yet it is this group of families who will want to have three, four, or more children for the very natural reason that they like children and can afford to support them. The question is, Can the country support them?

Any notion that the pill or some other scientific device is the sole and complete answer is very dubious. At a symposium on birth control not long ago, Dr. Stephen J. Plank, a professor in the Harvard School of

Public Health, cautioned against "the facile assumption * * * that we may be able to contracept our way to the Great Society." Birth control, he said, is a question of motivation rather than technology alone.

The neglected arithmetic of the population problem facing us is depressing. Look at this table showing the birth and death rates over the past quarter century in the United States:

Year	Births	Rate (per 1,000 population)	Deaths	Rate (per 1,000 population)
1940..	2,360,399	17.9	1,417,269	10.8
1945..	2,735,456	9.5	1,401,719	10.6
1950..	3,554,149	23.6	1,452,454	9.6
1955..	4,047,295	24.6	1,528,717	9.3
1960..	4,257,850	23.7	1,711,982	9.5
1964..	4,027,490	21.0	1,798,051	9.4

Although the birth rate has been declining since the mid-1950's, while the death rate has remained relatively stable, the drop in the birth rate is too little and too late to prevent an oversized population. The surge in the number of births over deaths continues (2.3 million were added to the population in 1964).

Or examine these low and high population projections prepared by the Census Bureau:

	Low	*High*
1970	206,000,000	211,000,000
1985	248,000,000	276,000,000
2010	322,000,000	438,000,000

The high figure would be reached if birth rates returned to the levels of the early 1950's. The low estimate—enormous as it is—is based on the possibility that the rates may decline by 1985 to the comparatively low levels of the early World War II years.

One theoretical way out of the dilemma would be to say that since America can no longer sustain complete "family freedom," some form of compulsory birth control is, regrettably, necessary. It would not be the first time in our history that government intervened to restrain individual impulse in the name of collective welfare. Yet, where children and parents are concerned, I do not believe we can yet advocate the sacrifice of one freedom for the sake of preserving another. Such a "solution" would make no sense at all, theoretically, practically, or ethically.

Government policies and private programs must make plain the kind of life we all face if economically comfortable families reproduce at rates they personally can afford. With equal urgency we must make plain the dangers if poor families have children in numbers they cannot afford.

Obviously, a stationary population—one in which the birth rate matches the death rate—is out of the question for many years to come. It is probably not feasible, nor even desirable. All we can hope to achieve is a slower rise in the size of our population rather than the present steep increase. What is needed is a far more drastic cut in the birth rate—a voluntary curtailment of the right to breed. It is needed, but I have no great conviction that it will happen.

For though scientific ingenuity may be able to solve many of the technological problems we are only beginning to understand people always change more slowly than technology. It is easier, after all, to design a new industrial process than redesign a cultural tradition. Yet that is the order of change we face if we are to preserve life's dignity and quality. Confronted by the crisis of population growth, we must, at present, appeal to private conscience for the sake of the general good.

FECUND FUTURE

At the estimated 1965 U.S. birth rate of 19.5 per 1,000 of population, a woman who reaches the age of 45 will have an average of 3 children. To achieve a stationary population, in which parents only replace themselves, the average number of children would have to drop to about 2.1. If childbearing gradually declined to this level by 1980—a highly unlikely possibility—the U.S. population would then be about 250 million, and by 2020 the population would hit 300 million and remain unchanged thereafter. At that point the birth rate would have declined to 14 per 1,000 and the death rate would have climbed to 14 per 1,000 (because a nongrowing population includes a much higher percentage of the aged).

On the other hand, if present fertility and mortality trends continue, a long-range projection by the National Academy of Sciences foresees that in about 650 years there will be one person per square foot throughout the United States, and in less than 1,500 years the weight of the U.S. population will exceed the mass of the earth—that is, 6,588,000,000,000,000,000,000 tons.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Jan. 9, 1966]

FAMINE STALKS THE EARTH—TOO MANY PEOPLE

To President LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

"The world is on the threshold of the biggest famine in history," according to Dr. Raymond Ewell, former adviser to the Government of India. "If present trends continue, it seems likely that famine will reach serious proportions in India, Pakistan, and China in the early 1970's. Latin America will fall in this category by 1980. Such a famine will be of massive proportions, affecting hundreds of millions, possibly billions of persons."

The Director-General of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, Mr. Binay Sen, said recently: "Either we take the fullest measures both to raise productivity and to stabilize population growth, or we face a disaster of unprecedented magnitude. In some of the most heavily populated areas the outbreak of serious famines in the next 5 to 10 years cannot be excluded. Problems of hunger and malnutrition which afflict more than a half of the world's population, apart from the human suffering and human degradation that they involve pose a serious threat to peace."

U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Orville L. Freeman, said: "Problems of staggering proportions face the densely populated underdeveloped countries of the world in their effort to keep food production in pace with population growth. Both land and time are running out for those countries. In the past, increases in food output were achieved by putting new land under cultivation. But now the supply of readily cultivatable land is nearly exhausted in many of those countries, and new land can be brought under cultivation only at high cost."

A generation ago Latin America, Asia and Africa were regions with food surpluses. They exported grain to the industrialized countries, especially to Europe. Now the food flow is reversed and they must import food.

FOOD INTO A BOTTOMLESS PIT

The United States has shipped abroad, since Congress enacted the so-called food-for-peace law in 1954, food products amounting to the gigantic sum of $12 billion, mostly on a giveaway basis.

Our food warehouses that were bursting at the seams a few years ago are now largely down to a normal inventory required for reserves. Congress recently authorized Secretary Freeman to go into the open market and buy dried milk to keep up our lunch program for overseas children.

India receives from the United States more than a half of its wheat at the present rate of 20,000 tons a day. Observers believe that this assistance is the only barrier against large scale famine and open rebellion.

With all this outpouring of American resources we are not making a dent at solving the problem. Even if we were to continue such a program on a vastly stepped up basis, as some suggest, until American farmlands were exhausted, we still could not feed the burgeoning billions of people.

BASIC PROBLEM: SKYROCKETING POPULATION

Everything possible, of course, should be done to increase the food supply, but it is the skyrocketing population that menaces today's world. Latin America, as an example, increased its total production of food over the last 5 years, but with 25 million more people, the average individual had 7 percent less to eat. And in another 5 years at the present rate of increase there will be 35 million more people living south of the Rio Grande.

Mr. President, we applaud your statement to the United Nations last June in which you said "Let us in all our lands—including this land—face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations and seek the answers to this most profound challenge to the future of all the world."

But the fact remains that to date the manpower and resources of the various agencies of the Government committed to meet this transcendent challenge rank below a hundred less important projects.

Every day lost in tackling this matter on a massive scale will compound your problems and those of your successors. For you were right, Mr. President, when you said:

"I do not believe that our island of abundance will be finally secure in a sea of despair and unrest, or in a world where even the oppressed may one day have access to the engines of modern destruction."

There will be 300 million more mouths to feed in the world 5 years from now—most of them hungry. Hunger brings turmoil—and turmoil, as we have learned, creates the atmosphere in which the Communists seek to conquer the earth.

Frank W. Abrams, former chairman, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

Theodore Achilles, former Ambassador to Peru.

Winthrop W. Aldrich, former Ambassador to Court of St. James.

George V. Allen, former Director, U.S. Information Agency.

Jacques Barzun, provost, Columbia University.

Russell H. Bennett, mining engineering.

Walter J. Bergman, chairman, Lily-Tulip Cup Corp.

James Biddle, curator, Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Eugene R. Black.

Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, president, Rockefeller University.

Percival F. Brundage, former Director, Bureau of the Budget.

James Cagney, president, Cagney-Montgomery Productions.

Cass Canfield, chairman, executive committee, Harper & Row.

George Champion, chairman, the Chase Manhattan Bank.

Will L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State.

Lammot duPont Copeland, president, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Dr. Leslie Corsa, Jr., director, Center for Population Planning, University of Michigan.

John Cowles, president, Minneapolis Star and Tribune.

Dr. James A. Crabtree, dean, Graduate School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh.

Virginius Dabney, editor, Richmond Times-Dispatch.

Dr. William V. D'Antonio, department of sociology, University of Notre Dame.

Donald K. David.

James E. Davis, chairman, Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc.

August Derleth, author.

Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., national chairman, Population Crisis Committee.

Dr. Louis Dupre, department of philosophy and theology, Georgetown University.

Marriner S. Eccles, former head, Federal Reserve System.

Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath, president, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Dr. James Faulkner, former medical director, MIT.

Morris Forgash, president, U.S. Freight Co.

Dr. L. H. Foster, president, Tuskegee Institute.

Arthur B. Foye, president, Haskins & Sells Foundation.

Dr. Philip M. Hauser, director, Population Research and Training Center, University of Chicago.

William Randolph Hearst, Jr., chairman, the Hearst Corp.

F. Peavey Heffelfinger, chairman, executive committee, Peavey Co.

H. E. Humphreys, Jr., vice chairman, executive committee, United States Rubber Co.

Fannie Hurst, author.

Henry Ittleson, Jr., chairman, CIT Financial Corp.

Dr. Ancel P. Keys, laboratory of physiological hygiene, University of Minnesota.

Rabbi Edward E. Klein, Stephen Wise Free Synagogue.

Sherman R. Knapp, president, Connecticut Light & Power Co.

Thomas S. Lamont, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.

Mrs. Albert D. Lasker.

Dr. Chauncey D. Leake, School of Medicine, University of California.

Rt. Rev. Arthur Lichtenberger, former presiding bishop, Episcopal Church.

David E. Lilienthal, former Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority.

Dr. C. C. Little, director emeritus, Jackson Laboratory.

John L. Loeb, senior partner, Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co.

Dr. Arnaud C. Marts, chairman, Marts & Lundy, Inc.

Mrs. Cordelia Scaife May, chairman, Laurel Foundation.

Mrs. Stanley McCormick.

Ashley Montagu, anthropologist.

Dr. William E. Moran, Jr., dean, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University.

Dr. Hermann J. Muller, City of Hope; Nobel Prize winner.

Allan Nevins, president, American Academy of Arts & Letters.

Dr. John H. Northrop, research biophysicist, Donner Laboratory; Nobel Prize winner.

John Nuveen, John Nuveen & Co.

Fairfield Osborn, president, New York Zoological Society.

Rt. Rev. James Pike, bishop, the Episcopal Church, California.

Francis T. P. Plimpton, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

Rockefeller Prentice, chairman, American Breeder's Service.

Adm. Arthur W. Radford, former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Edward V. Rickenbacker, chairman, Eastern Air Lines, Inc.

Dr. John Rock, professor of gynecology emeritus, Harvard University.

Lessing Rosenwald, former chairman, Sears, Roebuck & Co.

Dr. Albert E. Sabin, distinguished service professor, University of Cincinnati.

Adolph W. Schmidt, governor, T. K. Mellon & Sons.

Charles E. Scripps, chairman, Scripps-Howard Newspapers.

Dr. George Cheever Shattuck, Harvard Medical School.

Rt. Rev. Henry Knox Sherrill, former president, World Council of Churches.

Dr. John Crayton Snyder, Henry Pickering Walcott, professor of public health, Harvard.

Dr. Ernest L. Stebbins, dean, School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins.

Leopold Stokowski, music director, American Symphony Orchestra.

Lewis L. Strauss, former secretary of Commerce.

Sidney A. Swensrud, former chairman, Gulf Oil Corp.

Charles P. Taft, former mayor of Cincinnati.

Rev. John L. Thomas, S.J., Cambridge Center for Social Studies.

Dr. Harold C. Urey, professor chemistry-at-large, University of California; Nobel Prize winner.

William H. Vanderbilt, former Governor of Rhode Island.

Mark Van Doren, author.

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, dean, School of Science, MIT.

Lawrence Wilkinson, executive vice president, Continental Can Co.

Dr. Don M. Yost, California Institute of Technology.

PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, this past fall I traveled throughout a great many of the counties of West Virginia, participating in various community activities and discussing problems of local, State, and National concern with the citizenry of my State.

While in Madison, W.Va., for the inauguration of the Department of Agriculture food stamp program for Boone County, I noticed an editorial by Luther R. Jones in the Coal Valley News concerning parental responsibility for the rising rate of juvenile delinquency and crime among America's youth. The editorial was in two parts, and I, believing that the editor's views are worthy of note, ask unanimous consent to have the two editorials printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the newspaper articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARENTS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR YOUTH

(Article 1)

There is more and more talk about the crimes of young people. J. Edgar Hoover has been saying for quite some time that the number of such crimes are on the increase. And furthermore these hoodlum crimes are on the increase.

There are no crimes the criminal youth of the Nation will not attempt. The problem is generally ignored, because the ones most responsible do not want to take a close look at their handiwork.

Who are responsible?

There is no question about the sources of responsibility, although this responsibility cannot be fixed completely as the failure of parents.

Suppose we try to arrive at some conclusions based on changes which have occurred in the last 50 years (or perhaps 55 to 65 years).

Say in 1910.

Then there were no movies for young people to attend, no cars or highways to take them over the countryside, to stop at roadside beer joints, motels, drive-in theaters, or various and, in toto, countless and nameless attractions that wait for them today.

Oh, what a dull time young people must have had. But we did not. In general, parents provided something for children to do. Of course, school lasted only from 5 to 6 months, which meant that young people had more than half the year out of school.

This editor does not undertake to speak for city life, only for the days and nights of boys and girls of the county. This last I remember.

And this life was on the background of certain facts:

In 1900, the population of the Nation was 76 million and in 1910 92 million against a population of 192 million today; there were no highways and no automobiles; there were no movies, radio or television; there were no world wars; there were no airplanes; and in 1900, the railroad up Guyan and Coal Rivers had not been built.

What did young people do for entertainment and to pass away the time? Why, things were not bad at all.

To start with, as a very pertinent observation—young people of that seemingly distant age did not know what they were missing, so they did not worry about it.

But let us consider the country boy during the months when he went to school. There were other things which had not materialized: buses, for instances, and consolidated schools. And parents did not drive their children to school in automobiles or any other vehicle.

We walked to school, pupils 6 or 7 years old and up. School opened at 9 in the morning and dismissed at 4 in the afternoon. Then we walked back home, from a hundred yards or so to 3 miles or more. Children in my father's family walked to 5 or 6 schools during our earliest school years, about 3 miles to and from school. We started these earliest years of our schooling when my brother, Virgil, was 6, I was 8 and our sister, Gracie, was 10.

This meant that our school day extended approximately from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. After which, there were chores to do:

Two cows, ordinarily, had to be found and driven home.

Cows and hogs had to be fed.

Wood had to be gathered and chopped and brought in for cooking and, in cold months, coal had to be brought in for the fireplace.

Of course, my sister, Gracie, helped her mother in the house. And getting ready for breakfast, doing the morning chores, eating the morning meal, and preparing for school occupied the morning from the time we got up until we headed for school. I can assure you that after some studying perhaps and the day's activities and chores were done, we were ready to go to bed.

But what about other days of the week during school time? I assure you that these days were occupied, especially Saturday. Our father never failed to find something for us to do when necessary.

But—well, we can talk about the leisure time later. What about the almost 7 months in between school terms?

Most parents in the country, and especially ours, had plenty for us to do, in the garden and in the fields. I can assure you that we did not worry about missing a lot of automobiles and night life. We just never worried or longed for a lot of things which we did not know about.

And this continued generally so after we had moved to Bald Knob. Except for a term or two that we went to school to our father at Bothwell, school was closer. And we attended church and Sunday school in the church still standing at Bald Knob.

But, as we very slowly grew toward maturity, we took part in neighborhood social life, participating in bean stringings, apple peelings, molasses making, and frequent visitations. We never missed revivals or Fourth of July celebrations. And we boys could and did devise a lot of things for our own adventures. Snowball and wet cob fights, chestnut gatherings, hottie, five-marble games, tree climbing, singing, wrestling, running, hunting (night as well as day), rare campouts and story-telling; and at school, roundtown, base, stink base, bull pen, and anthony-over.

Yes, life was different then, and parents almost invariably knew where their children were, what they were doing, and when they would be back home—if they went out on visits or otherwise.

This is sufficient for pointing out the changes which have taken place—that parents have difficulty facing up to. Understanding these changes and adjusting to them is costing society dearly, while the failure of families to adjust for their children's sake is resulting in a harvest of crime and death.

Parents Are Responsible for Youth

(Article 2)

(Correcting an error in last week's editorial. Apple pealings should have been apple peelings—one can speak of pealing of the bells.)

A few ideas might have been gleaned from last week's column here—

The children of yesterdays did not miss the automobile and asphalt highways or roadside joints, movies and drive-in theaters, radio, and TV, or even the sort of literature which can be found for sale—for they cannot miss that which they know nothing about.

Parents generally had little reason to worry about where their children were at night—for they knew.

Most parents taught their children to work.

Life and earning a livelihood was generally much simpler than today.

The situation has changed almost beyond comparison in the half century which has just passed. Children of today are more familiar with the changes, which have come about than are the parents. Many parents are finding it very difficult to keep up with their children, much less to advise and control them.

Even so, parents are responsible for their children. Parents brought them into this world. No matter what happens, they cannot divest themselves of their obligations and responsibilities merely by refusing to acknowledge them or to see them. And they cannot divest themselves of the responsibility for the life that we live and the things that influence and mold the habits of youth.

Let's look at a few of the basic changes which have taken place in our world today—in four generations—thrust from the wagon crawl at 3 miles an hour into jet flight at 600 miles an hour.

While the original intent of legislation which took children out of factory sweatshops was humane and good, our society today to a very dangerous and most regrettable extent has lost the art of teaching the youth the value and habits of work. Many parents find little or nothing for their children to do. While school takes up much of the time of children through grades and high school, what happens to them when school closes at the end of the day and at the end of the week and term?

Many things have happened which make the parents' responsibilities to their children more difficult * * * and there seems not to be any relief in sight.

Suppose we name a few of the things which have occurred—that unquestionably have projected the parents into an age for which so many are in no way prepared.

Population: Doubled and trebled in this century, making it imperative that the children be provided schooling in consolidated schools, and be transported miles from home—to buildings housing from 100 to 1,000 pupils—where they learn more not only from books under guidance of instructors but from associations.

War: Impelled by war and the urgent necessity of survival and the maintenance of a free world, not only have millions of the successive generations of our country's youth been transported to the furthermost reaches of our globe but, like the Roman legions of old, our youth have become the police power of the civilized and semicivilized lands of the earth.

Invention: Again, impelled by war and the urgent necessity of survival, the discoveries in all realms of man's need in the last half century have outdistanced 8,000 years of the rise of civilization.

These discoveries cover such a vast field that in the lifetime of a man 50 years old, he has been thrust from a life of simplicity into a complex world of fantasy that beggars description and the reality he and his forebears had known:

The telegraph, telephone, and phonograph were marvels of the previous centuries, but youth have since seen moving, talking pictures become a common source of entertainment, followed by radio and television—while radar is used to locate submarines or measure the speed of cars and determine the distance to the moon.

The marvels of medicine have made many deadly diseases obsolete; but consider how far we have advanced from turpentine, Sayman's salve, alcohol and iodine, to penicillin and other biotics, and from operations with the knife and scalpel to operations with a laser beam (closely akin to light beams); and consider also the use of an artificial heart to pump blood through the body while a diseased heart is repaired, and the substitution of plastic arteries for worn-out, diseased blood vessels of the human circulatory system.

Consider how this man of 50 has seen the hand shovel and pick by which he earned his livelihood 30 years ago have been displaced by augers that bore 300 feet into the mountain and shovels that move a few tons of material up to 80 tons.

Note how a plant that once was run by numerous foremen and overseers and the employees under them may now be run by a trained man or two at a central control of dials, clocks, recorders, tapes, wires, and computers.

And don't overlook the computers that more and more are being constructed out of hundreds and thousands of parts and fed facts and figures from which they compute, confute, compose, contrive, connote, and conclude a thousand and tens of thousands of answers and conclusions of every sort and degree of complexity; and, even, with the very little interference from human hands and supervision, proceed to operate machinery of precise and intricate production. Consider, too, how such computers will not only change our world but advance our journey to the stars.

Observe that nuclear power unleashed for destruction, electronics, and supersonics are capable of vast unlimited undertakings, which will open up infinite exploration and development for man's use in the submicroscopic world, the lands under the sea, space about the earth, the moon, and worlds beyond.

There is so much more that when we think about it we become confused, intrigued, puzzled, worried, excited, and even very much afraid of where we are going and what is going to happen to us.

In the face of these tremendous changes and the speed with which change is enveloping our lives and thrusting us into the unknown and uncertain future, is it any wonder that many parents lose complete control of their children, especially when they themselves are no longer able to hold down jobs in this complex, industrial age, or to advise their children?

Yet these same parents are nevertheless responsible.

When it takes parents with understanding and will to keep the have-nots among our youth in school—rather than on highways day and night in search of adventure—is it any wonder that so many children become dropouts?

When you think about it this is a most wonderful age of adventure for our youth, but not in a motorcycle gang, or in a used, rebuilt or souped-up car, or robbing or pilfering, or engaged in other criminal activity.

But who is there to convince our wayward and confused youth that the road to a profitable income and adventurous life, and to outstanding, worthy and worthwhile citizenship is by way of education and special training?

Any of us should know that the increase in crimes by juveniles and later of the adults that juveniles make, results chiefly from failure of parents to understand why, and their inability to properly guide and control their children.

But our schools are also failing. How many teachers are qualified to meet the needs of youth seeking adventure? How many are qualified to tell them about the strange and exciting worlds opening up about us for the youth who prepares? Who can sit down with a room full of boys and open up for them an understanding of the strange and exciting worlds in industry, science, electronics, jet travel, space exploration, and a multitude of other interests? Do you believe that many parents or teachers can reveal to the minds of youth accurate and exciting answers and reasons why many of them should study and learn English, mathematics, chemistry, physics, and electronics to enable them to live an adventurous, exciting, and wondrous life, with unlimited opportunity for high-paid income?

THE PENKOVSKY PAPERS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a famous American who has long been intimately associated with efforts to combat the encroachments of communism in the United States has said that today's headlines remind us there has been no basic change in Communist imperialism and that the danger which world communism presents to the free nations has not abated, but, if anything, has increased.

And he has rhetorically stated the question, "Why is our free society inherently superior to communism?" and answered by pointing out that, among other vital principles, in our American society freedom of speech, the press, and assembly are protected not only in constitutional guarantees but in practice and that media of mass communication are free to praise or criticize without fear of Government control or governmental retaliation. By contrast, under communism, freedom of speech, the press, and assembly are permitted only to the extent that they support official policy, and media of mass communication—such as newspapers, magazines, radio, and television—are strictly controlled by the government.

Late in 1965, an event occurred in Soviet Russia which is a classic example of this cardinal Communist tenet—that freedom of the press is permitted only to the extent that it supports that nation's official policy and the privilege of serving as a member of the press in the U.S.S.R. is strictly controlled by that government. Any so-called violation—failure to support or cater to the party line—brings swift retaliation.

On November 25, 1965, the Soviet Union ordered the closing of the Moscow Bureau of the Washington, D.C., Post and the expulsion of that newspaper's correspondent, Mr. Stephen S. Rosenfeld, because of the publication by the Washington Post of portions of the Penkovsky papers. It is noteworthy that a number of other newspapers have published or reported in detail on the contents of those papers.

Believing firmly in the right of freedom of speech for all mankind, the right of the press, radio, and television to freely and objectively report news and facts to those interested in learning the facts, and the right of responsible men to express their views and opinions openly and without fear of retaliation, I wish to express strong personal censure of the punitive action by the U.S.S.R. against the free American press.

I wish to point out that the Post, in publishing the Penkovsky papers excerpts, reported fairly critiques which questioned the authenticity of the papers, or portions thereof, so that the reading public might have access to available facts and expressions of views both in support of and in opposition to the contents of the papers. Indeed, as recently as this past Sunday, January 9, the Parade—magazine section—of the Washington Post carried statements which critically appraised the contents of these papers.

I shall not attempt to evaluate the contents of the Penkovsky papers; however, I do wish strongly to affirm the right of American newspapers to publish openly and in an unbiased manner material which throws light on the political structure of one of the world's great powers, believing that wisdom in conduct of our national affairs arises from knowledge of governments, whether free or totalitarian in nature.

I do not personally always agree with editorial policies of various newspapers, but as a citizen of a free nation, I am proud to affirm that right of disagreement and the right to express it openly. I shall continue to defend to the fullest extent in my power the right of the American press to report fairly, objectively, and openly that which is newsworthy.

I desire to encourage those who direct our media of communications to continue to provide such material as reveals the world behind the Iron Curtain to the citizenry of the United States so that judgments may be openly derived based on the widest range of fact and opinion which can be made available. I believe that the entire episode of the publication of portions of the Penkovsky papers by the Washington Post, and the retaliatory action by the Soviet Russian Government, deserves national review.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the collections which I have amassed of Washington Post articles, editorials thereon, and pertinent material from other sources such as the New York Times.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 31, 1965]

WHEN WEST HAD A MAN IN KREMLIN—A RED WAR HERO PREPARED UNITED STATES FOR ITS CONFRONTATION WITH MR. K. ON CUBAN MISSILES

(By Frank Gibney)

On April 12, 1961, at an unobtrusive meeting in Moscow, a high Russian official quietly handed a double-wrapped, double-sealed envelope to an English acquaintance. He asked that it be given to "interested parties" in the West.

Later that same month, the Russian said, he would himself be in London. He wanted to talk to people in the West "to tell them what conditions in the Soviet Union are really like." The time was short, he said, and it was a critical time.

With this action, Col. Oleg Penkovsky, Russian war hero, senior officer in Soviet military intelligence, graduate of the Staff College and the Missile Academy, friend and confidant of Soviet marshals and generals, began his secret career as a volunteer spy for the West.

A SCIENTIFIC COVER

Greville Wynne, the British businessman to whom Penkovsky entrusted his message, knew Penkovsky only in his capacity as an official of the Soviet State Committee for Coordination of Scientific Research, the huge subministry in charge of all Soviet business and technical exchanges with foreigners. He had then little idea of Penkovsky's true function and the importance of his action to the West.

Penkovsky's work as deputy chief of the committee's foreign department was merely a cover for his function as a general staff intelligence officer. And as a former aide and confidant of the chief marshal of Soviet tactical missile forces, Marshal Sergei Varentsov, Penkovsky was privy to the most intimate details of high Russian military and political planning.

For the next 16 months, Penkovsky conducted the most amazing singlehanded campaign of espionage in modern history. He rocked Nikita Khrushchev's policy to its foundations. For 1961 and 1962, the 2 years in which Penkovsky worked for British and United States, when Khrushchev almost threw the world into total war.

In June, 1961, Khrushchev risked war with his decision to force an Allied retreat in Berlin. In August, he put up the Berlin Wall. In September 1961, he resumed nuclear testing, breaking agreements with the United States. His missile buildup of 1962 was climaxed in the Cuban confrontation with the United States, when Krushchev almost threw the world into total war.

Throughout this time, Penkovsky furnished the West with high-priority information on Soviet missile strength, Soviet nuclear capabilities and the Soviet plans for a localized shooting war in Germany. Ultimately, he was a key factor in our ability to identify so swiftly the configurations of Soviet missile installations on Cuban soil. He also prepared American intelligence for Khrushchev's decision to use them.

THREE LONDON VISITS

Three times Penkovsky made his way to London and Paris, ironically using his confidential Soviet intelligence assignments as a cover for his real espionage work with American and British officers. Three times he went back to Moscow to get further information for the West. In October 1962 he was finally detected and arrested by the Soviet secret police, the State Security.

How badly he hurt Moscow's plans for an aggressive breakthrough against the West in those two critical years can be gathered from the public aftermath of his arrest; one chief marshal of the Soviet Union demoted and disgraced; the chief of Soviet military intelligence, Gen. Ivan Serov (the "Hangman of Hungary" in 1956) demoted; some 300 Soviet intelligence officers recalled to Moscow from their foreign posts.

Penkovsky had exposed them all. Soviet military intelligence has not yet recovered from the blow.

The recapitulation of matters covered in Penkovsky's Soviet indictment suggests the extent of his intelligence achievement: "Top secret information; documents of great value; of an economic, political and military nature; Soviet space secrets; material on Soviet troops in the German Democratic Republic; new Soviet war material; command personnel of the antiaircraft defenses; (material on) atomic energy, rocket technology and the exploration of outer space."

The trial of Colonel Penkovsky and his British contact, Greville Wynne, began in Moscow May 7, 1963, and lasted 4 days. It was carefully organized by the Soviet authorities.

Penkovsky and Wynne had been under interrogation in Lubianka Prison for 6 months preceding it. Both prisoners admitted their "guilt." Penkovsky apparently did so in an effort to secure decent treatment for his family.

Wynne was sentenced to a long prison term but was released in 1964 in exchange for the Soviet spy Konon Molody, who had been arrested by the British under the name of Gordon Lonsdale. Penkovsky was sentenced to death. Soviet authorities said he was shot May 16, 1963.

Until now, Penkovsky's remarkable feat was a secret, locked in the intelligence files of three countries. The Penkovsky Papers, excerpts of which begin here today, were smuggled out to the West 2 years ago and translated by Peter Deriabin, himself an escaped Soviet state security officer.

The papers have never before appeared anywhere. They will be published in book form by Doubleday November 19.

The Penkovsky papers comprise a strange, arresting document—partly a day by day account of Penkovsky's personal struggle against the Soviet regime; partly a running fever chart of Khrushchev's drive for aggression in Berlin and Cuba. They were written at great personal risk while Penkovsky was living his double life as a secret agent for the West.

He wrote them because he was not content merely with transmitting his intelligence reports. Colonel Penkovsky was a single-minded zealot who hated the Khrushchev regime because he feared that Khrushchev was leading the world into a nuclear war. He wanted ordinary people in the West, not just intelligence officers, to hear his story and his reasons for breaking with a lifetime of service to the Soviet regime.

In a real sense of the word, for the brief 16 months in which he worked, Oleg Penkovsky was our man in the Kremlin. Without his guidance and information, Washington could not have acted in either Berlin or Cuba with the sureness it did.

Only by reading Penkovsky can Americans finally understand the pressures and tensions that were driving the Soviet leadership to risk war in 1961 and 1962, 2 years when the cold war almost became hot.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 31, 1965]

WHY THE SOVIET COLONEL CHANGED HIS COLORS—THE PENKOVSKY PAPERS

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

My name is Oleg Vladimirovich Penkovsky. I was born April 23, 1919, in the Caucasus, in the city of Ordzhonikidze (formerly Vladikavkaz), in the family of a salaried worker;

Russian by nationality, by profession an officer of military intelligence with the rank of colonel.

I have received higher education. I have been a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union since March 1940. I am married; as dependents I have my wife, one daughter and my mother.

I have never been on trial for criminal or political offense. I have been awarded 13 government decorations (5 orders and 8 medals). I am a resident of the city of Moscow and live on Marxim Gorky Embankment, House No. 36, Apartment 59.

I am beginning the notes that follow to explain my thoughts about the system in which I live and my revolt against this system. I am fully aware of what I am setting out to do. I ask that you believe in my sincerity, in my dedication to the real struggle for peace.

I must write hurriedly, hoping that I will some day have the time to elaborate or explain. I am unable to do this all at once—or to write all I know and feel—for the simple physical lack of time and space.

When I write at home, I disturb my family's sleep (our apartment is only two rooms and typing is very noisy). During working hours, I am always busy, running like a madman between the visiting (foreign) delegations and military intelligence headquarters and the offices of my committee.

My evenings are generally occupied; it is part of my job. When I visit my friends in the country, it is worse. Someone may always ask what I am doing. Here at home, at least I have a hiding place in my desk. My family could not find it even if they knew. And they know nothing.

It is a lonely struggle. As I sit here in Moscow in my apartment and write down my thoughts and observations, I can only hope that the persons in whose hands they eventually fall will find them of interest and use them for the truth they say.

WHITE RUSSIAN PARENTAGE

I was born in the thick of the civil war, during which my father was lost. Mother told me that my father saw me for the first and last time when I was only 4 months old.

My father was a lieutenant in the white army. I learned this only recently. My father fought against the Soviets. I still do not think they know the whole truth about him. If the state security forces had known all along that he was in the white army (although I was only a few months old at the time), every door would have been closed to me: for an officer's career, for membership in the party and especially for the intelligence service.

Yet I began my life as a believer in the Soviet system. I was brought up in a Soviet environment and from the very first, when I went at 18 to the Second Kiev Artillery School, I wanted to be a commander in the Soviet Army.

During the war, I commanded a battalion. By the end of the war, I was a lieutenant colonel. After one action, Marshal Konev recommended me for the Military Staff College.

In 1945, I began the 3-year course at the Frunze Military Academy and in 1948 I pinned on my chest the diamond-shaped insigna of a Frunze graduate. At the end of 1949, I was transferred to the Military Diplomatic Academy, the training school for the military intelligence service.

I learned how to conduct military espionage and completed a 3-year course in the English language, which I mastered, I believe, fairly well. In September 1958, after serving as assistant military attaché in Turkey, I was sent to the Dzerbhinsky Military Engineering Academy to attend a 9-month academic course for the study of missile weapons.

DEEDS BELIED WORDS

It was during the struggles of World War II that I first became convinced that it was not the Communist Party which moved and inspired us all to walk the fighting road from Stalingrad to Berlin. There was something else behind us: Russia.

Even more than the war itself, my eyes were opened by my work with the higher authorities and general officers of the Soviet Army. I happened to marry a general's daughter and quickly found myself in a society of the Soviet upper class. I was one of the privileged.

But I soon realized that their praise of the party and communism was only in words. In their private lives, they lie, deceive, scheme against each other, intrigue, inform, cut each other's throats. In pursuit of more money and advancement for themselves, they become informants for the state security on their friends and fellow workers. Their children despise everything Soviet, watch only foreign movie films and look down on ordinary people.

Our communism, which we have been building for 45 years, is a fraud. I myself am a part of this fraud. Some disease or infection is gnawing and eating at our country from within.

The ideals that so many of our fathers and brothers died for have turned out to be nothing more than a bluff and a deceit. I know the army and there are many of us in the officer corps who feel the same way. But they are afraid to unite for action. So we all work separately. Each man here is alone.

GOVERNMENT OF ADVENTURERS

I associate with highly placed, important people: ministers and marshals, general and senior officers, members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. I praise our leaders, but inside me I wish them death.

Khrushchev's is a government of adventurers covering themselves with the banner of the struggle for peace. But Khrushchev has not renounced war. He is quite prepared to begin a war if circumstances turn favorable to him. This he must not be permitted to do.

In the past, our general staff and our foreign representatives condemned the concept of surprise attack such as Hitler used. Now they have come around to the viewpoint that there is great advantage to the side which makes a sudden massive attack first.

From what I have learned and what I have heard, I know now that the leaders of our Soviet state are the willing provocateurs of an atomic war. At one time or another they may lose their heads entirely and start an atomic war. See what Khrushchev is doing over Berlin?

In Moscow, I have lived a nuclear nightmare. I know the extent of their preparations. I know the poison of the new military doctrine as outlined in the top-secret special collection—the plan to strike first at any cost.

I know the design of the new missiles and their warheads. I am decribing them to my friends in the West. Imagine the horror of a 50-megaton bomb with an explosive force almost twice what one expects. The people of Moscow congratulated themselves on this.

USING THE PEACELOVERS

The Soviet leaders know that the Western world, and especially the Americans, do not wish an atomic war. They try to use the Western desire for peace to their own advantage.

It is necessary somehow to drain the energy and to divert the great material and living strength of the Soviet Union to peaceful purposes—not to bring about a great world conflict. I think it is necessary to have meetings secretly conducted, not summit meeting. Those Khrushchev welcomes. He will use the decisions reached at summit meetings to increase his own prestige.

This you must understand. That is why I write these observations of mine to the people of the United States and Britain. I ask only that you believe the sincerity of my thoughts. Henceforth I am your soldier, pledged to carry out everything which is entrusted to me.

In presenting the above, I want to say that I have not begun work for my new cause with empty hands. I understand perfectly well that to correct words and thoughts, one must add concrete proof confirming these words. I have had and do have now a definite capability for doing this.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 31, 1965]

A KREMLINOLOGIST TRIES TO STRIKE A BALANCE

(By Edward Crankshaw)

(The following is a condensation of the foreword to "The Penkovsky Papers" by the British journalist and expert on Soviet Russia.)

I imagine that the general reader will be most fascinated by Penkovsky's inside account of the workings of the Soviet intelligence system. He may very well be appalled and dismayed by their scope and sheer magnitude. But I think we should try to keep a sense of proportion here.

I am not for a moment suggesting that neither the British nor the American secret services are anything like so heavily staffed as the KGB and GRU. The Russians, not to put too fine a point on it, have always been nuts about espionage and counterespionage and they have always been hair-raisingly reckless in the expenditure of manpower.

I am quite sure that the material the Russians receive from their agents is not worth anything like the expenditure of manpower, ingenuity and cash which they consider an appropriate price. I am not an expert in these matters, but there is one thing that stands out even to a layman; that is, that some of the most valuable intelligence coups ever achieved by the Russians have fallen into their laps, contributed by oddities like Nunn-May and Fuchs, acting from individual conviction.

Conversely, invaluable information presented to us by Penkovsky was obtained not as a result of the efficiency of our own secret services but as a free gift arising from the idiosyncratic behavior of an individual Russian.

Penkovsky was shocked by the size and magnitude and malevolence of the secret service of which he formed a part. He was also shocked by the behavior of Khrushchev and others. Here, I think, he can be very misleading.

He was brought up as a young Communist and developed into an eager careerist in the regular army, on the lookout for patronage, keen for promotion, cultivating the sort of gifts which enabled him quite naturally and easily to make an extremely useful marriage, one of the privileged new class and enjoying it. It is impossible to decide from his papers the precise point at which the whole thing went sour, and why.

That he took violently against the whole system, for the reasons he gives is entirely understandable; tens of thousands of intelligent Russians—hundreds of thousands, indeed—feel the same way. But this does not lead them to spy on their own country for the benefit of the West.

One thing is very clear—and this should be borne in mind constantly when considering Penkovsky's indictment of Khrushchev as a man actively preparing to launch a nuclear war—and that is that, like so many defectors from the West, this Soviet army colonel was in some measure unbalanced. (A man who will take it upon himself to betray his government because he is uniquely convinced that he is right and it is wrong is by definition unbalanced, although he may also be a martyr.) And almost certainly, this lack of balance made it impossible for him to distinguish between government intentions and government precautions. Or, like so many others, he confused loose, menacing talk with tight-lipped calculation; contingency planning with purposive strategy.

Having said all this, read Penkovsky also for the light he throws on the Soviet world, which is an illumination rarely vouchsafed foreigners.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 1, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—SECRET POLICE, SPYING DOMINATE REGIME AND ALL AGENCIES ABROAD

(By Frank Gibney)

By mid-April 1961, Greville Wynne, the British businessman in whom Colonel Penkovsky confided, had taken Penkovsky's letter to British and American intelligence officers in London. In it, the Soviet General Staff officer described in detail his position in Moscow, together with his motives of volunteering to spy against the Soviet regime.

He promised to arrive in London later that month, in charge of a visiting Soviet delegation of technical and industrial experts. Many of these were in fact intelligence specialists from Penkovsky's own committee, the State Committee for Coordination of Scientific Research, which regulated all contacts and exchanges between foreign and Soviet scientists and businessmen.

Penkovsky's own record and position were quickly checked out in London and Washington—and if Western intelligence had dreamed up the perfect man to penetrate the Kremlin's secrets, it could hardly have done better.

He was then 43 years old. Made a full colonel in the Soviet Army at 31, he had graduated both from the Frunze Military Academy (the Soviet staff college) and the Military-Diplomatic Academy—cover name for the 3-year Soviet military intelligence school. He had served as assistant military attaché in Turkey in 1956, run an area desk in Soviet intelligence headquarters, and helped select and train intelligence officer candidates—one of the most sensitive jobs in the Soviet system.

The colonel was also a veteran artilleryman who had taken the special Soviet Army course in military missilery at the Dzherzhinsky artillery school. He was the former aide and still the confidant of Chief Marshal Varentsov, who commanded the Soviet tactical missile troops.

In almost every respect Penkovsky was wired into the Soviet hierarchy. His great uncle, Valentin Penkovsky was a lieutenant general; his wife was a general's daughter. Penkovsky was on the friendliest of terms with his boss, Gen. Ivan Serov, Khrushchev's secret police expert, who now commanded Military Intelligence. Through Serov and Marshal Varentsov, he had pipelines to the highest levels of the Soviet regime and almost unlimited access to secret files and documents.

Other Soviet officers had defected to the West, over the years, but never anyone this high up in the Kremlin's operating command structure. In his own biography, he gave one big reason for his anger at the Soviet regime. Only a year or two before the state security had discovered that Penkovsky's father had been a White officer in 1919—thus putting a sudden black mark on his record (and probably blocking his promotion to general).

As a professional soldier and general staff officer, also, Penkovsky was increasingly appalled by the network of spies and informers he found throughout his own government—fully 8 years after de-Stalinization has supposedly thawed Soviet society.

In the following excerpt from "The Penkovsky Papers," he writes about the secret police dominance over the Soviet regime:

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

The Soviet Government goes in force for espionage on such a gigantic scale that an outsider has difficulty in fully comprehending it. Daily we expand our already swollen spy apparatus. That is what Khrushchev's "peaceful coexistence" and "struggle for peace" really mean. We are all spies.

Any Soviet citizen who has anything at all to do with the work of foreign countries or who is connected with foreigners in the course of his work, is perforce engaged in intelligence work. There is no institution in the U.S.S.R. that does not have in it an intelligence officer or agent.

Here are some of the Soviet ministers and committees through which we conduct intelligence: Intourist and the International Book Association (almost 100 percent state security); Ministry of Foreign Trade; Council for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church; The Academy of Sciences; Union of the Red Cross; State Committee for Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries. * * * The list is almost endless.

State security officers and agents are everywhere, literally everywhere. I saw fewer of them under Stalin than now. They control our whole army and military intelligence, too. These security police scoundrels even forced my aunt to be an informer. She worked for them the whole time she was a housekeeper in the Afghan and the Italian Embassies in Moscow.

My poor aunt often came to my mother, crying and complaining about the degrading and dishonest things she had to do. She eavesdropped, stole documents, cleaned out waste baskets, wrote reports on diplomats, helped with provocations against them. Many time she complained to me. But this was before I began working for military intelligence. I could give her no advice only sympathy.

Khrushchev himself directly supervises the work of the state security. In this matter he trusts no one else; he controls the state security as first secretary of the Communist Party. It is said that Shelepin, the state security boss, spends more time in Khrushchev's office than in his own headquarters on Dzerzhinsky Square. If it were not for the state security police and General Serov, Khrushchev could never have become the "supreme commander in chief."

SPIES ABROAD

The majority of the personnel in Soviet embassies abroad are military intelligence or state security employees. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Foreign Trade exist as such only in Moscow. Abroad everything is controlled by us. Three out of five Soviet embassy officers are either from state security or military intelligence. Thus, it can be stated without error that 60 percent of Soviet embassy personnel are serving officers in intelligence. In Soviet consulates the figure is almost 100 percent.

In an embassy the state security spies on everyone, including us in military intelligence. Security police watch absolutely everything that goes on: the purchases people make, how they live and whether it accords with their salary, where they go, which doctors they visit, how much drinking they do, their morals. Meanwhile we in military intelligence watch the security police in return. We want to establish which of our own men are connected with them or work as their informants.

A Soviet Ambassador is first of all an employee of the central committee of the party, only secondly of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Often he is himself part of the military intelligence or the state security police. A great many of the Soviet Ambassadors in foreign countries are intelligence officers.

Before my duty in the Embassy in Turkey, I thought that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the embassies were important organizations with authority. Now I know there is only the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the two intelligence organizations.

To process people traveling abroad, there is a special commission for trips abroad under the central committee. It consists entirely of state security officers. Any person, even a tourist, going overseas comes for a conference to the central committee.

When I was leaving, this scoundrel Daluda from the state security poked through my file for 2 hours. What was he looking for? He questioned me about all my relatives, living and dead, about my family life, whether I drink, quarrel with my wife, etc. He also asked me about international problems. This was done to me, an officer of the general staff and the military intelligence.

INDISCRIMINATE ESPIONAGE

We are engaged in espionage against every country in the world. And this includes our friends, the countries of the peoples' democracies. Who knows, some fine day they may become our enemies. Look what happened with China. Months before the break with China became clear, instructions came direct from the central committee to being intensive intelligence activity against China. Quietly, the Chinese section was transferred from the directorate dealing with peoples' democracies to that for neutral or enemy countries in the Far East.

Col. Pavel Demetriyevich Yerzin was formerly the state security resident in Turkey, where I knew him. Later he was promoted to the rank of brigadier general and appointed pro rector of the Patrice Lumumba Friendship University in Moscow.

The entire faculty of this Lumumba Friendship University is made up of state security police—even the people in charge of dormitories. Only a few professors are there as "co-optees," i.e., people who have agreed to work with the state security. The basic task of the Friendship University is to prepare a fifth column for the African countries.

Many of the African students there have already been recruited. They are now working for the Soviet intelligence. They are studying Marxism and Leninism, preparing to become the future leaders of the African countries.

As a first step, after their return from Moscow, they are directed to organize strikes, demonstrations to overthrow governments, etc. At the university they live better than the average Soviet student. Almost everything is paid for.

SPIES IN WASHINGTON

The Soviet strategic intelligence service alone has special "residencies" (i.e. self-contained operative units) on the territory of the United States. One is in Washington, D.C.—"residency" personnel include individual Soviet Embassy secretaries, commercial representatives, and other employees.

There are two "residencies" in New York, one under the cover of the U.N. (The other, the "illegal residency," has direct independent contact with Moscow.)

The Washington "residency" has a great many Soviet operations officers and an insignificant number of agents; these are basically "oldtimers" who were recruited a long time ago.

The New York "residencies" are of greater strength. They have new agents from whose ranks they build up the "illegal residency." Among the agents are many foreigners who reside and work in the United States.

Intelligence officers of legal "residencies" (i.e. officers who have legally entered the United States with an official "cover" position) always use their cover, such as: Tass correspondent, Aeroflot representative, merchant marine, member of a trade mission.

Sometimes, in order to evade FBI surveillance, Soviet intelligence officers stay in the embassy overnight, sleeping on desks, then get up early in the morning to leave the embassy unnoticed. In this way, they manage sometimes to avoid surveillance.

After the Powers affair (the U-2 incident of May 1960) Khrushchev issued an order to all units of the intelligence service, especially those in the United States, to cease their active work temporarily—in order to take no chance of putting into enemy hands any evidence pointing to Soviet espionage against the United States and other countries. In November 1960, this order was rescinded. Intelligence activities began again in full swing. Recent directives have ordered establishment of social contacts with as many Americans as possible.

Ivan Yakovkavich Melekh is a Soviet intelligence officer with the military rank of lieutenant colonel. He knows English very well. At one time he was an instructor of English at the Military Diplomatic Academy, which trains officers for Military Intelligence. After special training, Melekh was sent under the cover of the United Nations secretariat in New York to carry out his intelligence missions. That was in 1955. On October 27, 1960, he was arrested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on charges of espionage. In April 1961, the U.S. Government dropped its charges on condition that Melekh leave the United States before April 17. This should help us to judge the value of Soviet protests and declarations at the U.N.

FRIEND OF SEROV

The present Chief of Military Intelligence, Gen. Alexander I. Serov, is not the most brilliant of men. He knows how to interrogate people, imprison them, and shoot them. In sophisticated intelligence matters, he is not so skilled. Serov was a Beria man. Beria took a liking to him and pushed him to the top quickly.

Before coming to Military Intelligence, Serov was Chairman of the State Security. After his appointment to Military Intelligence, he remembered my name from my Turkish assignment and became personally interested in my work. Eventually a certain degree of friendship developed between us and I visited him several times at his apartment and his country house. My personal relationship with Serov placed me in the forefront of Military Intelligence officers.

Serov lives on Granovsky Street. Many ministers, members of the Central Committee, and marshals live there. Rudenko, the Chief Prosecutor of the U.S.S.R. lives on the same floor as Serov. When Serov was chairman of the state security, he arrested people and Rudenko signed the death sentence. One would drop into the other's place in the evening for a drink and they together would decide who should be put in jail and who should be shot. Very convenient.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 2, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—KHRUSHCHEV'S POLICIES COULD HAVE MEANT WAR

(By Frank Gibney)

On April 20, 1961, at 11 p.m. a trimly dressed foreign gentleman, handsome, red haired, and of medium height, walked without notice through the lobby of the Mount Royal Hotel in London and made his way to an inconspicuous suite upstairs.

The door was quickly opened. Inside the room, Col. Oleg Penkovsky had his first face-to-face meeting with British and American intelligence officers, the "interested parties" in the West whom he had been trying to contact for almost a year.

For hours, Penkovsky talked. He had brought with him from Moscow two packets of handwritten notes and documents, materials taken from Soviet top-secret files. The range of his information was almost encyclopedic—the design of new missiles, names of Soviet undercover intelligence agents in Europe, troop deployments in East Germany.

As the intelligence officers talked with him, they began to grasp not only the breadth of his knowledge about Soviet plans, but the intensity of his conviction that Moscow's dangerous brinkmanship in 1961 could well lead to war.

A lonely idealist, Penkovsky wanted neither money nor immediate asylum. Of the intelligence officers in London he asked only that he be given either British or American citizenship and some employment commensurate with his experience, if circumstances ever compelled him to flee the Soviet Union.

On another floor of the Mount Royal Hotel, Penkovsky had housed members of the 45-man Soviet delegation he headed. The delegation had been sent to London ostensibly to discuss trade prospects, but actually to gather intelligence, of an industrial and military nature. It was a sign of the Communist regime's trust in Penkovsky that he was assigned to lead it.

Throughout this first 2-week visit to London, Penkovsky continued to hold night meetings with the British and American intelligence officers, whom he knew only by their code names, the British intelligence officers called "Grille" and "Miles" and the Americans, "Alexander" and "Oslav."

Since the U-2 surveillance flights had been abandoned in 1960, the West badly needed fresh information on Soviet work in missilery and new rocket technology. As a missile specialist himself, Penkovsky had a wealth of technical background on the state of Soviet missile readiness—and most importantly, plans for missile production and deployment. The configuration of missile sites, the type of troops used, warheads, performance details—all this information Penkovsky possessed, from his own experience and his close association as aide to Marshal Varentsov, the Soviet tactical missile commander. In that London hotel room Penkovsky began the vital flow of information which, barely a year later, enabled the West to understand the seriousness of Khrushchev's threat in Cuba, as well as recognize the exact nature of his missile weapons there.

In the following excerpt from the papers, Penkovsky outlines the real facts behind the Soviet missile effort. These notes represent only a tiny portion of the information Penkovsky revealed in this area. For 16 months he produced a stream of reliable intelligence, technical and strategic, on Khrushchev's missile buildup. His guidance lay behind the quick identification of the Cuba-based missiles in aerial photographs. Also, his reports of Khrushchev's lagging production on long-range missiles explained the reasoning behind the risky shipment of medium-range Soviet missiles to Cuba.

Millions breathed a sigh of relief over President Kennedy's facedown of Khrushchev's Cuban threat in October 1962. But until now only a small group of intelligence experts knew the great contribution made by Colonel Penkovsky to this U.S. victory.

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

Khrushchev is blabbing that we are ready, we have everything. That is so much idle talk. He talks about the Soviet Union's capability to send missiles to every corner of the world, but he has not done anything about it, because he knows that we are actually not ready.

Of course we can send our big missiles in different directions, as far as the United States or Cuba. But we are not yet capable of launching a planned missile attack to destroy definite targets long range. As Marshal Varentsov, who commands the ground missile forces, tells me: "We still have a long way to go before we actually achieve the things about which Khrushchev keeps talking and boasting."

Of course, there have been fine achievements in developing tactical and operational short-range missiles. But it is too early to speak of our strategic missiles as perfected. Many of the big ones are still on the drawing boards, in the prototype stage or undergoing tests. There are altogether not more than a few dozen of these—not the "shower" of missiles with which Khrushchev has been threatening the West.

Only the smaller (IRBM) missiles are in production. The R-12 missile, now being mass produced, has a range of 2,500 kilometers (1,550 miles). Our "cruise" missile has been adopted for use by the submarine fleet as well as ground troops. But our big R-14 missile is only in the development stage. The range of the R-14 with a nuclear warhead is 4,500 kilometers (2,800 miles).

Often a new model missile is still only in the testing stage—in fact the tests may have proved unsuccessful. But there is Khrushchev, already screaming to the entire world about his "achievements" in new types of Soviet weapons.

COSMONAUTS DIE

All the money made available from the military reorganization is put into missile production, and sputnik required the combined efforts of all available Soviet scientists and technical personnel, with the entire technological capacity of the country at their disposal.

Marshal Varentsov warns in private conversations that we do not have enough qualified people in the missile and sputnik programs, that training is inadequate, the quality of production poor. Quantity is inadequate, also. Accidents and all sorts of troubles are daily occurrences. In this connection, there is much talk about shortcomings in the field of electronics.

There have been many cases during the test launchings of missiles when they have hit inhabited areas, railroad tracks, etc., instead of the designated targets, after deviating several hundred kilometers from their prescribed course.

Sometimes Khrushchev's pushing for premature achievement in missiles and sputniks has disastrous results.

Several sputniks were launched into the stratosphere and never heard from again. They took the lives of several specially trained cosmonauts.

The sudden death of Marshal Nedelin, former chief of our missile forces, was another case in point.

Khrushchev had been demanding that his specialists create a missile engine powered by nuclear energy. The laboratory work for such an engine had even been completed prior to the 43d Anniversary of the October Revolution in 1960, and the people involved wanted to give Khrushchev a "present" on this anniversary—a missile powered by nuclear energy.

Present during the tests on this new engine were Marshal Nedelin, many specialists on nuclear equipment, and representatives of several government committees. When the countdown was completed, the missile failed to leave the launching pad. After 15 to 20 minutes had passed, Nedelin came out of the shelter, followed by the others. Suddenly there was an explosion caused by the mixture of the nuclear substance and other components. Over 300 people were killed.

A few people miraculously survived, but all of them were in deep shock. Some of them died soon afterward. What was brought to Moscow were not Nedelin's and other victims' remains, but urns filled with dirt. Yet we all had read in the "truthful" official government statements printed in the newspaper Pravda and Izvestiya only that Nedelin died, "* * * in the line of duty—in an air accident," and we also read about how these bodies were cremated, as well as other details about the funeral.

MORE SPACE FAILURES

This is not the first time that a missile accident took place. There had been others before this, but the government keeps silent about them.

When Khrushchev announced at the beginning of 1960 that the Soviet Union possessed a completely new and terrifying type of ballistic missile, he actually had in mind the order he had issued to invent or prepare this new type of propellant based on nuclear energy. Some of the work in this direction proved quite successful, even after Nedelin's accident, but it is still far from what Khrushchev had in mind. There is a big lag in electronics.

There were more accidents during tests. In this respect my sympathies are with the Americans. If they have an accident, it is all in the papers; everyone knows about it. But in our country everything is kept secret.

For example: There were several unsuccessful launchings of sputniks with men killed prior to Gagarin's flight. Either the missile would explode on the launching pad, or it would go up and never return.

When Gagarin made his flight, it was said officially that there was not a single camera in his sputnik. This was a big lie. There was a whole system of cameras with different lenses for taking pictures and for intersection. The photographic equipment was turned on and off during the flight by the astronaut. But Khrushchev tells everybody that nothing was photographed. Photographic equipment has been installed on all sputniks, but this has been denied in order to prevent the Americans from launching espionage sputniks, or as we call them: "spies in the sky."

Right now we have a certain number of missiles with nuclear warheads capable of reaching the United States or South America; but these are single missiles, not in mass production, and they are far from perfect. Every possible measure is taken to improve the missiles and their production.

Money is saved everywhere and allocated to the building of kindergartens. That is the slang expression we use for missile production. Many different towns have been specially built for these scientists and the technical and engineering personnel. Scientists and engineers not only have been awarded decorations and medals, but some have been awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labor three or four times.

They have received the Lenin Prize, and other prizes. The work of these people is not publicized and their pictures do not appear in the newspapers.

I have already heard some talk about a woman astronaut being readied for a flight into the stratosphere in a sputnik for propaganda purposes. All the higher commanders think that such a flight will have a strong propaganda effect. The launching is planned for the beginning of 1963.

The vigilance of the Western powers must not be weakened by the shortcomings mentioned above. If at the present time the Soviet ballistic missiles are still far from being perfect, in 2 or 3 years—perhaps even sooner—Khrushchev will have achieved his goal.

In 1961, a firm directive was issued to equip the satellite countries with missile weapons. This was by a special decision of the Central Committee CPSU. Marshal Varentsov made the following comment: "They say we must give our brother Slavs missile weapons. So we give them missiles now, and later they will stick a knife in our back."

In my opinion as a general staff officer, it will take a year or a year and a half for us to be able to equip all the Eastern European countries with missiles. In order to stop this armament of Khrushchev's and his attempts to launch an attack, the Western countries must triple both their efforts at unity and increase their armaments. Only then will Khrushchev realize that he is dealing with a strong adversary.

[From The Washington Post, Nov. 3, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—TRICKERY USED BY RUSSIAN INTELLIGENCE AGAINST WEST REVEALED BY PENKOVSKY

(By Frank Gibney)

Col. Oleg Penkovsky, the brilliant Soviet general staff officer who volunteered to spy for the West, was almost the exact opposite of the drab, mousy professional spy, as celebrated in current "realistic" espionage novels. A sociable man who liked good food and good conversation, he had a ready wit and was prone to parlor card tricks.

When he arrived in London, in late April 1961, he was consciously setting out to play an incredibly dangerous game of espionage against his own regime. But he managed to enjoy his stay, at least ostensibly, as thoroughly as any tourist.

The colonel took long walks through the city, visited department stores, restaurants and theaters, generally in the company of Greville Wynne, his British businessman friend. The obvious freedom of the British people delighted him. He told Wynne, again and again, how different it was from the closed society of Moscow.

Personally, he was manifestly relieved for once to be out of the orbit of Soviet secret police surveillance. He even managed some discreet nightclubbing and a few dancing lessons. (Soviet intelligence circles in London, assumed that Penkovsky, a trusted officer, was attempting to "recruit" Wynne as a Soviet agent. So his association with Wynne was not under suspicion.)

Penkovsky also did some guide work of his own, which considerably helped his standing in Soviet military intelligence. Shortly before he left Moscow, General Seroy, the chief of military intelligence, had called him into his office and informed him that his wife and daughter were also flying to London for an unofficial tourist visit. He asked Penkovsky to look after them and give them any help they needed in getting around in a strange city.

Accordingly, the colonel helped Mrs. Serov and her attractive daughter Svetlana make their purchases (with money drawn from local Soviet intelligence funds). He even managed to take Svetlana on a tour of the better London night spots without arousing undue attention.

Beneath this facade of socializing, however, Penkovsky's new work continued in earnest. On the basis of the information he had submitted, the British and American intelligence officers were now convinced that his desire to work with them was genuine.

In their nocturnal meetings, they gave the Soviet colonel a complete short course in clandestine radio communications, as well as a small Minox camera for photographing documents. It was arranged to make contact with him through Wynne or another Western emissary, if he found it impossible to return to Western Europe in the near future. If necessary, instructions would be transmitted to him by radio.

When he finally left London on May 6, Penkovsky carried with him presents for his highly placed Soviet friends, including General Serov, a full report of the trade and technical mission (which Moscow judged a great success) and a complete set of instructions and equipment for getting further espionage information out of his "new friends" in the West.

In the following excerpt from the papers, Penkovsky has some more to say about the real nature of his own Soviet delegation—and the stern ground rules still laid down to cover all Soviet contacts with foreigners.

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

The State Committee for Coordination of Scientific Research Work is like a ministry. Our chairman, Rudnev, enjoys all the privileges of a minister in the U.S.S.R. The committee is in charge of all scientific and technical exchanges with foreigners, both in the Soviet Union and abroad. In fact, it is a large espionage apparatus, which not only collects scientific and technical information, but tries to recruit Western technical specialists.

When I began my work in the committee, I was myself astounded by the number of intelligence officers working there. Eighty or ninety senior intelligence officers work in the foreign relations section alone. When one walks down the halls in our offices, one can see some of them saluting each other in the military manner. They have conspicuous difficulty getting away from military habits, even getting used to their civilian clothes.

The friendly contacts and "services" we provide visiting foreign delegations we might better call "friendly deceit." Often we military intelligence officers cannot understand ourselves why the foreigners believe us. Do they not understand that we show them in the U.S.S.R. only those things which are well known to everybody? If there is something new at a plant which foreigners are about to visit, we simply give orders to its director: "Show them everything, but have shops 1 and 5 closed for repairs." That is all.

On my desk I have a list of pretexts and alternate proposals which we use to keep foreigners out of certain areas of the U.S.S.R.:

1. The plant is under repair.
2. A bridge is closed.
3. There is no airport and the railroad tracks have been damaged by recent frost; therefore, for the time being there are no trains.
4. The local hotel is not ready for guests.
5. All hotels are completely filled with tourists, etc.

Sometimes we take foreign delegates through museums and parks in Moscow until the members are so tired they themselves call off the trip to a factory, preferring to rest. Or, instead of taking the delegation by plane, we put them on a train. As a result, the delegation has enough time to see only one or two installations in which they are interested, instead of five or six. Their visas expire and they have to leave after having seen nothing but vodka and caviar.

RECRUITING TASKS

In Moscow our main task as intelligence officers inside the committee it to recruit agents among the foreigners visiting the U.S.S.R. Of course, this does not often happen. But we collect information by personal conversations, eavesdropping, examining baggage, literally stealing secrets from the visitors' pockets.

I have been assigned to British delegations visiting Moscow. My job is to establish friendly relations with these men, assess their intelligence possibilities, then write a report on each to our intelligence people in London. It will be up to them to collect enough compromising information on these men—family problems, amorous adventures, personal finances, etc.—to secure their recruitment.

We are also to obtain as much scientific and technical information as possible of value to our Soviet industry—everything from cheaper methods of getting fresh water from sea water to the manufacture of artificial fur. Thanks to visits to our country by foreign delegations, we obtain vast quantities of extremely valuable information.

By contrast, all members of Soviet delegations traveling abroad are carefully instructed how to answer questions that might be put to them. I can honestly say that there is nothing new that Western scientists and specialists could learn from the Soviet specialists—or Soviet exhibitions abroad. For example, the exhibits to be shown at our London exhibition in 1961 were first carefully checked by intelligence technicians to make sure there was nothing new which foreign scientists could see or steal. Some exhibits were purposely put together in a distorted way; the cone of the sputnik on display was not built that way, the spheres were of another type.

Trips of Soviet delegations to foreign countries require special preparation. The departure of any delegation requires a separate decree from the Communist Party Central Committee. And no delegation ever goes abroad without some form of state security involvement.

After a Soviet delegation has been formed, we select certain scientists, engineers or other suitable members and instruct them individually on the type of information we need. Take my own 45-man delegation to London. Five of its members were employees of the Communist Central Committee. Ten military intelligence officers left for London at the same time in the guise of delegation members or tourists. There were also three other military intelligence colonels in the delegation, besides myself.

As a rule, Soviet scientists and technicians in missile production work are not allowed to go abroad. But lately, because these scientists must learn something about missile work in the United States, a few have been given permission to travel—provided they have not participated in any missile production work for the last 2 years. Thus, if they defected to the West, their knowledge would not be so fresh.

TOURING INSTRUCTIONS

Our intelligence instructions to traveling Soviet delegates are very specific. How many forms and autobiographies must be filled out before a trip abroad is processed. All of them in four or five copies. I myself had to submit 18 photographs before a single trip. What are they going to do with them? Marinate them? My wife and I worked on them for 2 days, and still could not finish all the forms.

Instructions we give to Soviet travelers stipulate that when traveling by train, you should always be seated with your own sex. Do not drink, do not talk too much and report any incidents on the trip to the consul or Soviet Embassy representatives. Do not carry any confidential materials with you, do not leave your hotel room, do not make any notes, but if this is unavoidable, keep them on your person.

I remember early in 1961 we sent a delegation to the Federal Republic of Germany. An engineer from Leningrad went with this delegation. He was co-opted, i.e., forcibly recruited by military intelligence. He had a notebook for making notes on the information he gathered. He left the notebook in a raincoat, then it disappeared. A search was conducted. We found nothing. The engineer became so upset that when his comrades went out shopping, he hanged himself in his hotel room. He used the cord of an electric iron which he found attached to the light fixture in the ceiling. (The delegation had taken the electric iron with them to save money on pressing.)

The engineer's body was sent to Leningrad by plane. Later, at the enterprise where he worked, it was announced that he was not normal and suffered from constant headaches. That is how things are done in our country.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 4, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—UNITED STATES GOT TRUE ACCOUNT OF U-2 PLANE INCIDENT

(By Frank Gibney)

Col. Oleg Penkovsky returned to Moscow on May 6, 1961, from his first visit to London and set about in earnest to gather more information for Western intelligence.

Some of this intelligence turned out to be the first accurate account of two troubling incidents on the Soviet-American policy frontiers—the downing of the U-2 reconnaissance plane in 1960 and the later Soviet attack on another American aircraft off the coast of Siberia.

When he returned to Moscow, he stored his new camera, film, radio receiver and frequency instructions in a secret drawer in the apartment which he and his family occupied on the Maxim Gorky Embankment. But he kept all knowledge of his new espionage role from them.

As far as Vera Penkovsky was concerned, her husband was busy at his normal confidential talks. Her own background as the daughter of a "political" general conditioned her against asking too many questions about his late hours or unexplained absences. The best Vera hoped for was another attaché's assignment abroad, like their 1956 post in Turkey, where she could practice her French and enjoy the better clothes and companionship of a foreign society.

Greville Wynne flew back into Moscow on May 27, to resume business negotiations with Penkovsky's committee on behalf of the British firms he represented. Penkovsky met him with a car at Sheremetevo Airport. On the way into the city, "Alex," as Wynne called him, handed the Englishman a packet of some 20 exposed films and other documents, including his own reports, for delivery to British and American intelligence.

The same evening Penkovsky visited Wynne in his room at the Metropol Hotel. Taking care to keep their conversation innocuous (the room of a foreign visitor like Wynne would probably be wired), Wynne gave Penkovsky a package containing 30 fresh rolls of film and further instructions from the Anglo-American intelligence team in London.

Far from suspecting anything strange in Penkovsky's meetings with Wynne, his superiors in Soviet military intelligence continued to think that he was "developing" a promising British contact. Penkovsky's work with the Soviet delegation in London was so highly regarded, in fact, that his pleased superiors arranged to send him there again in July, to attend the opening of a Soviet Industrial Exhibition. This time he was to travel alone, without any delegation. American and British intelligence could hardly have wished for such a nice arrangement.

One presumes that Western intelligence found intensely valuable not only Penkovsky's estimates of future Soviet plans, but his reconstruction of recent events in Soviet-American relations—most of which served only to underline his warnings about Khrushchev's new policy of aggression.

For Penkovsky the intelligence information he gave was only a means to an end. His real purpose was to alert the American and British people to the danger of Khrushchev's "adventurist" tactics.

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

The American U-2 Pilot Gary Powers was shot down on May 1, 1960. Prior to the Powers flight, other U-2 flights had been made over the Kiev and Kharkov, but Khrushchev kept his mouth shut, because at that time there were no missiles that could be effective at the altitudes where the U-2 aircraft were flying.

When Powers was shot down over Sverdlovsk, it was not a direct hit but rather the shock wave that did it. The aircraft simply fell apart from it. During his descent Powers lost consciousness several times. He was unconscious when they picked him up from the ground; therefore, he was helpless to do anything and did not put up any resistance. On May 1 when this incident happened, I was duty officer at GRU (military intelligence) headquarters. I was the first one to report it to the GRU officials.

At that moment, the KGB did not have an English interpreter. I was supposed to talk to him because I was the only one around who had some understanding of English—I had already reported the incident to some generals. If they had not found a KGB interpreter at the last minute, I would have been the first one to interview Powers.

Ultimately, they called up to say that I was not needed. It seems that the KGB (state security) chief, this young fellow Shelepin, who used to run the Komsomol (he replaced Serov at the KGB), wanted to make the report to Khrushchev personally. So he got an interpreter and picked Powers up himself. But the military had knocked Powers down and Powers was considered to be a military prisoner. He should have been turned over to the General Staff. Nonetheless, the KGB seized him, took him to Dzerzhinskiy Square, and made their own report. He needed medical treatment, because he was still in shock.

NEW ROCKETS

Earlier, when a U-2 flight came over in the direction of Kiev-Kharkov, there had been nothing to shoot with. As soon as the new rockets appeared, Khrushchev gave the order to use them. So they fired at Powers on May 1, 1960. Of course, we had antiaircraft defenses before, but not in quantity, and they were not able to go into action so quickly.

Marshal Biryuzov, then commander-in-chief of missile forces, was reprimanded because he had not correcty estimated the probable direction of the U-2 flights—he misgaged the importance of the targets. His forces wanted to fire when the aircraft from Turkey flew over Kiev, but there was nothing to fire with and the aircraft escaped. Powers would have escaped if he had flown one or one and a half kilometers to the right of his flight path.

On May 5, after Powers was knocked down, Khrushchev ordered a suspension of (secret) agent operations to avoid the risk of being caught by a Western provocation or, possibly, of further material for Western counterpropaganda. There were many protests about dropping scheduled meetings and other contacts, but it had to be done.

The resident in Pakistan decided on his own to pick up material from a dead drop which was already loaded, in order to avoid possible compromise to the agent. For this he was severely reprimanded by his superior at the GRU even though he did the right thing. Thus, despite the damage it did to the agent network, Khrushchev ordered cessation of agent contacts during the period when he was going to capitalize on the Powers incident.

KHRUSHCHEV LIED

Khrushchev followed Powers' investigation and trial with great interest. He personally conducted the propaganda activity connected with the case. He was the first who began to shout about the direct hit, although actually there had been no such thing. Khrushchev wanted to brag about his missiles.

Khrushchev lied when he says that Powers was shot down by the first missile fired. Actually, 14 missiles were fired at his plane. The shock wave produced by the bursts caused his plane to disintegrate. The examination of Powers' plane produced no evidence of a direct hit; nor were there any missile fragments found on it. One of the 14 missiles fired at Powers' plane shot down a Soviet MIG–19 which went up to pursue Powers. Its pilot, a junior lieutenant, perished.

The U.S. aircraft RB–47 shot down on Khrushchev's order (in July 1960) was not flying over Soviet territory; it was flying over neutral waters. Pinpointed by radar, it was shot down by Khrushchev's personal order. When the true facts were reported to Khrushchev, he said: "Well done, boys, keep them from even flying close."

Such is our way of observing international law. Yet Khrushchev was afraid to admit what had actually happened. Lies and deceit are all around us. There is no truth anywhere. I know for a fact that our military leaders had a note prepared with apologies for the incident, but Khrushchev said: "No, let them know that we are strong."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 5, 1965]

Our Man in the Kremlin—Penkovsky Fed Data To Keep Bosses Happy

(By Frank Gibney)

Between July 15 and August 10, 1961, Col. Oleg Penkovsky played out the second round of his harrowing espionage game in London. He spent part of each day working with Soviet delegates to the trade exhibition, or running through plans for Soviet espionage work in Britain with other Russian intelligence officers in the soundproofed basement room used by the intelligence "president" (i.e., the officer in charge) of the Soviet Embassy at 48 Kensington Gardens.

At night, or during other off-hours, he would meet with the four American and British intelligence officers assigned to him in one of MI–6's safe houses for his real intelligence mission—explaining the documents he had obtained from the secret files in Moscow, exposing further Soviet intelligence missions in the West, elaborating on technical aspects of the Soviet missile program as well as information on Khrushchev's political and diplomatic strategy. Rarely in the history of espionage has any country's high command been so thoroughly penetrated as the Kremlin was during the critical 16 months when Colonel Penkovsky worked for the West.

Since Penkovsky had come to Britain again on a Soviet spying mission, it was necessary for the British and Americans to give him some intelligence material of apparent value to forward to his superiors in Moscow. This was provided. Penkovsky thus kept sending reports to Moscow of ostensibly new information on military as well as political objectives (e.g. "In traveling from London to Sheffield I observed for the second time in the southern outskirts of the city of Stamford a military airfield, on which British air force planes were based. I had the opportunity to study more carefully the indicated objectives"). Such reports kept Penkovsky's superiors in Moscow happy and unsuspecting.

AMAZING COOLNESS

With amazing coolness, the volunteer spy for the West also went on to advance his standing as a loyal Communist Party man with Moscow in other ways. One quiet morning he and Greville Wynne took a trip to see Karl Marx's grave in Highgate Cemetery and discovered it was in a bad state of neglect. Penkovsky wrote a letter of protest directly to the First Secretary of the Central Committee in Moscow. In the letter, Comrade Penkovsky told Comrade Khrushchev that, as a loyal Marxist he found such neglect an appalling reflection on communism and the Soviet Union.

Moscow took swift action. The London Embassy was ordered to set things right immediately and Penkovsky was commended for his socialist vigilance.

All the while new assignments for Penkovsky came from Washington. It was a tense summer in Europe. The continent still shook from Khrushchev's threats to sign a treaty with East Germany and force the Western allies out of Berlin. If anything, the Vienna meeting of Krushchev and President Kennedy had increased the political electricity. It was absolutely vital that the White House and Whitehall have every available piece of information on the extent of Khruschev's military preparations and his political planning. Above all, they needed to know how far Khruschev was prepared to go in pursuit of his German objective.

Some of Penkovsky's sessions with the Anglo-American team lasted as long as 10 hours at a stretch. Now that he had switched his allegiance, his dedication to the West was a single-minded as his youthful allegiance to communism. As a literal sign that he was now your colonel, he asked his contacts to provide him with both a British and an American colonel's uniform. They did so. Pleased as punch, he had his picture taken in both.

As the following excerpt from the Papers indicates, Penkovsky was amazed that both the Western peoples and their governments seemed disposed to accept Khrushchev's boasts at face value. This only made Khrushchev's brinkmanship or adventurism grow more dangerous. A firm Western stand was needed, particularly in the case of Berlin.

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

In my considered opinion, as an officer of the general staff, I do not believe Khrushchev is too anxious for a general war at the present time. But he is preparing earnestly. If the situation is ripe for war he will start it first in order to catch the probable enemy (the United States and Western States) unawares. He would of course like to reach the level of producing missiles by the tens of thousands, launch them like a rainstorm against the West, and, as he calls it, "bury capitalism." In this respect even our marshals and generals consider him to be a provocateur, the one who incites war.

The Western powers must do something to stop him. Today he will not start a war. Today the Soviet Union is not ready for war. Today he is playing with missiles, but this is playing with fire, and one of these days he will start a real slaughter.

Look what happened during the Hungarian events and Suez crisis in 1956. We in Moscow felt as if we were sitting on a powderkeg. Everyone in the general staff was against the "Khrushchev adventure." It was better to lose Hungary, as they said, than to lose everything.

THANKS TO KHRUSHCHEV

But what did the West do? Nothing. It was asleep. This gave Khrushchev confidence, and after Hungary he began to scream: "I was right." After the Hungarian incident he dismissed many generals who had spoken out against him. If the West had slapped Khrushchev down hard then, he would not be in power today and all of Eastern Europe could be free.

Kennedy must carry out a firm and consistent policy in regard to Khrushchev. There is nothing to fear. Khrushchev is not ready for war. He has to be slapped down again and again every time he gets ready to set off on one of his adventures.

Kennedy has just as much right to help the patriots of Cuba as we had when we helped the Hungarians.

This is not just my opinion. Everyone at the general staff said this. It was said in Marshal Varentosv's home, even on the streetcars in Moscow. If the West does not maintain a firm policy, then Khrushchev's position will become stronger, he will think even more about his might and right, and in this case he might strike.

The people are very unhappy with Khrushchev's militant speeches. One can hear this everywhere, listening to conversations. Now, at least, one can breathe a little easier than in Beria's time. So one can hear and say a few things.

On the other hand, the world can be thankful to Khrushchev for his militant words. They forced Kennedy, Macmillan, and De Gaulle to double or triple their military budgets and defense preparedness. If Stalin were alive he would have done all this quietly, but this fool Khrushchev's loudmouthed. He himself forces the Western powers to strengthen their defense weapons and military potential.

The generals on the general staff have no love for Khrushchev. They say that he is working to his own detriment. Why is this bald devil allowed to do as he pleases? He blabs too much about Soviet military successes in order to frighten the West, but the West is not stupid, they are also getting ready. What else can they do?

I believe Marshal Varentosv and Khrushchev's assistant Churayev; it was they who claimed that Khrushchev said, "I will drop a hail of missiles on them."

At the Soviet Embassy in London I saw a short comment on Mr. Kennedy's recent speech. The speech was called "the militant speech of the President of the United States." That is all we say officially. The Tass intercepts, however, contain the entire speech point by point: first, second, third. First, Kennedy's references to the increase in the budget, next, the increase in the strength of the Armed Forces, in connection with the new Army draft, then the new specific categories of naval flyers, etc. If necessary, the increases must be even greater.

But when we speak privately, it is a different story. At our Embassy, I heard many good comments on Kennedy's speech. It was excellent. Everyone criticized Khrushchev, including the military intelligence and the security police "residents": "There is no reason to be surprised." They all said, "Kennedy's speech is the answer to Khrushchev's saber rattling."

WEST MUST PREPARE

The West must be ready. They must be prepared to retaliate with tank and antitank forces, in the event of trouble over Berlin. The troops must be trained as well as possible. The Soviet plan to create a conflict in Berlin is simply a bid to win without a fight, but to be ready for a fight if it comes. When the time for a showdown comes, it is planned to use tanks to close all the roads and thus cut off all routes to East Germany and to Berlin.

The first echelon will consist of East German troops, the second of Soviet troops. As a whole, the plan provides for combined operations by Soviet and East German troops. If the first echelon is defeated, the second echelon advances, and so on. Khrushchev hopes that before events have reached the phase of the second echelon, the West will start negotiations in which East Germany will also participate. This will result in recognition of East Germany.

The Soviet and German troops will participate jointly in this operation because the Germans cannot be trusted to act independently. In the first place, the East German Army is poorly equipped and insufficiently prepared because we are afraid to supply them with everything. The Germans have no love of us, and there is always a chance that in the future they may turn against us, as it happened with the Hungarians.

Volodya Khoroshilov came home on leave. He is chief of the artillery staff of the tank army in Dresden under General Kupin. He was called back to duty, however, 2 weeks ahead of time. Before his departure, we went to a restaurant for dinner and he spelled it out for me:

"As soon as the treaty with Germany is signed, an alert will be declared immediately, and the troops in East Germany will occupy all the control points and will take over their defense and support. Our troops will stand by on alert, but they will not occupy these routes immediately because this might be considered a provocation. We will simply say, 'Please, Americans, British, and French, go to Berlin, but you must request permission from East Germany.'

"If the Americans, British, and French do not want to confer with the East Germans and try to use force, the Germans will open fire. Of course, the Germans do not have enough strength, and then our tanks will move directly into Berlin."

I heard this from many officers, specifically from General Pozovny, and also from Fedorov and Marshall Varentsov. Varentsov, however, added, "We are taking a risk, a big risk."

IMPORTANCE OF TANKS

In 1961, when Khrushchev decided to resolve the Berlin question, a tank echelon was brought to combat readiness on the border in the U.S.S.R., as well as in Czechoslovakia and Poland. That is the truth.

The NATO countries should give particular attention to antitank weapons. Why? Because East Germany has two tank armies in full readiness; this is in addition to the tank armies which are part of the second echelon located on the territories of the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, and Poland.

Khrushchev personally attached a great deal of importance to tank troops, especially in the fight for Berlin. So much importance is attached to tanks in connection with the Berlin crisis, that controversies have already broken out in the general staff regarding finances. They are afraid that too much money has been allotted for the tank troops and that there will not be enough for missiles, electronics, and other types of equipment.

Khrushchev has lately become confused on the Berlin matter, particularly because he has realized that the West is firm there. He would like to pursue a hard policy and rattle his saber, but our country suffers from a great many shortages and difficulties which must be eliminated before the West is to be frightened further.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 7, 1965]

Our Man in the Kremlin—Immorality of Russian Elite Disgusted Penkovsky

(By Frank Gibney)

Late in the afternoon, one bright September day in 1961, a smiling Russian gentleman stopped to watch three English children playing by a sandbox along Tsvetnoy Boulevard in Moscow.

He handed them a small box of candy, which the children brought obediently to their mother, who was sitting nearby.

The Russian gentleman was Col. Oleg Penkovsky, the English mother Janet Anne Chisholm, wife of a British Embassy attaché.

Concealed in the innocent-looking candy box was a package of exposed film, which Penkovsky urgently wanted to put in the hands of British and American intelligence, in the course of his extraordinary voluntary spy mission for the West.

The bizarre meeting with the children was of course carefully planned. Penkovsky had met Mrs. Chisholm during his second trip to London and he had been drilled in this procedure by his Western intelligence contacts.

A few weeks before, the British businessman, Greville Wynne, Penkovsky's original contact with the West, had arrived again in Moscow to attend the French industrial fair.

In Wynne's room at the Metropol, Penkovsky had turned over the film and several packets of highly classified information from the Kremlin files, as well as a broken Minox camera—he had dropped it during one of his nocturnal photograpy sessions. Wynne had given him a replacement camera and the little box of candy lozenges to use in the contact with Mrs. Chisholm.

RISKY FOR FOREIGNERS

The meeting with Mrs. Chisholm was risky in a city where foreigners are as closely watched as they are in Moscow. Wynne, however, and Penkovsky continued to meet with impunity, because of Penkovsky's official dealings with him. When Penkovsky saw Wynne, he told him that he was about to take a trip to Paris himself with another Soviet trade delegation, for the purpose of attending the Soviet industrial fair there.

As Wynne later recalled, Penkovsky seemed cool, self-possessed and happy in their conversation at that time. He was cheered by the way his intelligence information was registering with London and Washington and buoyed up, against the hazards of his lonely espionage mission, by the thought that he was materially damaging the Moscow regime which he hated so bitterly.

In the following excerpts from the papers, he emphasized his disgust at the immorality of the Kremlin hierarchy.

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

It is interesting to observe our prominent Soviet personages. What a difference there is between them when they are on the speaker's platform and when they are in their family circles with a glass of vodka in their hands.

They become entirely different types. They are very much like the personalities which are portrayed by Gogol in "Deal Souls" and "The Inspector General."

In writing these notes, I have intentionally omitted the subject of moral degradation and drunkenness among the top military personnel—because there are already too many dirty stories on this subject. I know one thing for sure, though: all our generals have mistresses and some have two or more.

Family fights and divorces are a usual occurrence, and nobody tries to keep them secret.

IMMORAL BEHAVIOR

Every month at our party meetings in the GRU we examine three or four cases of so-called immoral behavior and lack of discipline among our officers.

The party committee and the chief political directorate of the GRU examine the cases involving generals and colonels, while those cases involving marshals are examined by the Central Committee CPSU. The Central Committee naturally discusses such matters behind closed doors, in order to conceal from the general public and the rank and file officers the dirt in which our high command personnel is involved.

Besides, marshals are not punished so severely as others. In most cases they are just given a warning.

The explanation for this given by the Central Committee is the same simple answer once given by Stalin:

"A marshal and his services are more valuable than a female sex organ."

Khrushchev has shown special favor to our Minister of Culture, the lady Furtseva. In the anti-party fight against Bulganin and the others in 1957 Furtseva helped him a great deal; she worked day and night dispatching planes, and some say that she herself made some of the flights campaigning for support for Khrushchev. She is power-mad, everybody in Moscow calls her "Catherine the Third."

Later Furtseva fell from favor. After the party congress in 1960, Furtseva was ousted from the Presidium of the Central Committee CPSU. As a result of this, her husband Firyubin was unable to go to the United States as the Soviet Ambassador.

OUSTER PLEASED ARMY

The entire Army was happy about the news of Furtseva's ouster from the Presidium.

At one of the Presidium meetings, she had proposed that the additional pay the Soviet army officers get for their respective ranks be discontinued. The answer to her was: "What is the matter with you? You want to leave them without pants?"

What a fool. And yet there she was, occupying the post of Minister of Culture. How can such a person carry culture to the masses.

Take my friend Brig. Gen. Ivan Vladimirovich Kupin. He is Marshal Varentsov's protege and a distant relative of his; Varentsov's daughter Yelena is married to Kupin's nephew.

Kupin is the commander of artillery and missile troops of the Moscow Military District. Prior to this post, Kupin served in the German Democratic Republic as commander of artillery of the 1st Tank Army.

AMOROUS ESCAPADES

He was in a lot of trouble due to his amorous escapades. While in Germany, he lived with his cipher clerk Zaytseva. After Kupin's departure from Germany, she hanged herself because Kupin had left her pregnant. During the investigation, a photograph of Kupin had been found among her belongings.

Kupin confessed that he had lived with Zaytseva while concealing this fact from his wife; he admitted that he promised Zaytseva to marry her.

When he arrived in Moscow, General Krylov, commander of the Moscow Military District, refused to see him, but, because the decision concerning Kupin's assignment had already been approved by the Central Committee CPSU, the case was hushed up. Varentsov persuaded Krylov to forget the whole thing.

This is the way it goes in our country. As long as the Central Committee approves, as long as one has connections, one can get away with anything, even crimes; but if a similar incident happens to an ordinary officer without any connections, he is punished immediately—either his rank is reduced, or he is discharged from the army entirely.

Look at Krupchinskiy, head of the School for Nurses, and a friend of General Smolikov. They drink together and indulge in sexual orgies with girls attending the school. Krupchinskiy also provides girls for other generals of the general staff.

Khrushchev's son-in-law Adzhubei got himself so deeply involved with some actress that it almost led to divorce. He was given a warning by Khrushchev himself to be more careful in his adventures. Adzhubei is the chief editor of the newspaper Izvestia, and every day he writes articles about Communist morality.

Yet, look at his own behavior. All the other journalists hate him.

Even Satyukov, the editor of Pravda, has slid down to second place after Izvestia. Adzhubei received a Lenin prize for his so-called work about Khrushchev's trip to the United States. This work was compiled and written by the Central Committee. All Adzhubei did was put his signature to it as its editor.

In our own committee in Moscow, Yevgeniy Ilich Levin, secret police (KGB) worker and Gvishiani's deputy, is a drunkard and dissolute man. The stories he tells about the cheap dives he frequents are hardly consonant with what the party tells us about Socialist morality.

After his nightly drunken escapades and amorous adventures, Levin invariably sleeps until noon. Almost every morning Gvishiani looks for him:

"Where is my deputy?" Someone says: "He has not arrived yet. Probably he is at his other office (that is, KGB)." Gvishiani is afraid of Levin. He knows very well that Levin is at home sleeping off his rough night, but he will do nothing.

The relatives of the highly placed do very well in our Socialist society. Almost all of the marshals' sons have finished the Military Diplomatic Academy. All of them would like to be sent abroad to work, but the Government will not let them.

There is a special decree of the Central Committee CPSU forbidding the sons of marshals to go abroad. Many of them tried, but to no avail.

Marshal Sokolovskiy's son was given a 25-year prison term. He belonged to a large group of sons of marshals and ministers—some of our so-called golden youth—who had organized drunken orgies at their country houses outside Moscow.

At one of these orgies, a girl who had just come to Moscow from Leningrad was raped by the gang. She happened to be the niece of some minister.

After she was raped, the girl was placed in a car and taken somewhere behind the Byelorussian Railroad Station, where they dumped her. Because the whole gang was drunk, the driver of the car was driving very poorly. A militiaman noticed this and blocked the car. One of the boys in the car grabbed a pistol and fired a blank shot. The car was stopped.

TWENTY-FIVE-YEAR TERM GIVEN

This happened under Stalin, and he said, "I respect Sokolovskiy very much, but there will be a trial just the same." And so a trial was held, and Sokolovskiy's son was given a 25-year prison term. He stayed in jail only 3 years, however, and then he "became ill," allegedly suffering from an ulcer or something of that sort. He was released.

Marshal Konev's son, Geliy Ivanovich Konev, is a woman-chaser and a drunkard. He also is a member of that same group of sons of marshals and other high officials. He is a motorcycle enthusiast, and he loves to play the horses.

I studied with Geliy at the Military Academy. During that time Geliy had an accident while riding his motorcycle. He hit a man who later died. Papa, however, took care of everything and Geliy was not jailed. He was graduated from the academy in 1953, and is now working in the Information Directorate of the GRU, on the American desk. He knows English well.

Gorkin, chairman of the supreme court, has a son-in-law named Lieutenant Commander Ivanov, a GRU military intelligence employee. (This is the same Ivanov who was connected with the Profumo scandal in England.) He and I studied together at the Military Diplomatic Academy. At present he is the Assistant Naval Attaché in Great Britain. His wife is one of Gorkin's daughters. Ivanov loves going to night clubs in London.

As one can well see, all the sons and relatives of our Soviet leaders and high-level personnel are well taken care of. I have told only about those who work in the GRU. But the same thing may be said about those who are in the Central Committee, the Council of Ministers, the KGB and various other ministries.

All roads are open for them. They are the first ones who get promoted to higher ranks and better jobs. Everything is done by pull, through friends and family connections.

The newspapers scream that a struggle must be waged against such practices. But what happens? They punish some factory director for giving a job to his niece, and he is criticized for it in the newspapers. But we must look higher and see what is going on at the top level. That is where all the big crimes are committed. It is they who set the example for the others to follow.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 8, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—SPY'S CHOICE: HOME OR SAFETY

(By Frank Gibney)

Colonel Penkovsky arrived at LeBourget Airport, near Paris, on September 20, 1961. His British friend, Greville Wynne, met him at the airport.

Penkovsky obviously could not have informed Wynne of his exact arrival time without arousing suspicion among his superiors in Moscow. At the request of the British and American intelligence team, Wynne, still Penkovsky's safest contact, had flown to Paris and gone to the airport every day for 2 weeks, watching the arrivals on each flight from Moscow.

From the standpoint of Western intelligence, his vigil was well spent. The brilliant Soviet volunteer spy had brought a huge quantity of exposed film out with him—photographs of secret intelligence documents, technical processes, order of battle information on Soviet dispositions in Germany, and—most important of all—more top-secret details of the Kremlin's missile production and deployment.

As usual, Penkovsky checked in promptly with the Paris "resident" of the Soviet military intelligence and went over details of the Soviet intelligence assignment given him in Moscow as well as his cover job of looking after the Soviet exhibition in Paris.

Three days after his arrival, however, the colonel began the real business of his trip. Wynne drove him to one of the Seine River bridges, where he met the members of the British and American intelligence team who had worked with him in London.

Through the next month he continued his secret conferences with them at various safe apartments in the city. As before in London, Penkovsky gave them a vast store of military and political information, supplementing the documents he had photographed with his own informed analyses of current Soviet plans and military preparations.

He also laid the groundwork for an even more widespread network of communications with Western agents in Moscow which would allow him to continue his secret communications with Washington and London with a minimum of risk.

FRESH AIR

When he was not engaged with either set of intelligence officers, Penkovsky again turned tourist, with his British friend, Greville Wynne, acting as guide. The paintings at the Louvre and the night club extravaganzas at the Lido, Penkovsky viewed with apparently equal interest. Once again, he acted like a man who had suddenly been exposed to a draft of fresh air after long confinement in a closed place.

Without constant Soviet surveillance to worry about, occasionally he lost his normal caution. Once, when he and Wynne stumbled on an emigre Russian restaurant in Paris, Penkovsky could hardly be restrained from staying far into the night, singing and talking Russian with the proprietor—hardly the safe thing for a visiting Soviet intelligence officer to do, especially when he was actually working for the West.

Penkovsky liked London better, however. In Paris, also, he faced what he must have suspected was a final decision: to go back or remain in the West.

The American and British intelligence officers were perfectly willing to have Penkovsky remain then and there, to receive asylum and a job suitable to his talents in Europe or the United States.

The information he had already given on Khrushchev's missile and Berlin offensives was so important that they were concerned about his future personal security.

For days before his departure Oleg Penkovsky debated with himself as he walked the streets of Paris. He had pressing family considerations at home—a pregnant wife, a mother, a teenage daughter? Could he cut them from his life forever? And to leave the familiar world of Russia, much as he hated the Soviet regime, meant a cruel wrench. Yet everything in his immediate surroundings argued that he stay.

He almost did. The plane for Moscow was delayed by fog and the omen did not escape him. For hours he paced the floor of the waiting room at Orly Airport, virtually arguing out loud with himself, as Wynne patiently listened. He hesitated, literally at the customs barrier, but at the last minute he said goodby to Wynne and marched back into a world from which he had long since emigrated in spirit.

Penkovsky explained his decision later in the papers, when he wrote shortly after his return to Moscow: "I feel that for another year or two I must continue in the general staff of the U.S.S.R. in order to reveal all the villainous plans and plottings of our common enemy; i.e., I consider myself as a soldier of the West, so my place during these troubled times is on the frontline. I must remain on this frontline in order to be your eyes and ears, and my opportunities for this are great. God grant only that my modest efforts be useful in the fight for our high ideals for mankind."

The following excerpt from the Penkovsky papers suggests how powerful some of Penkovsky's immediate efforts were. He discusses the extent of the Soviet intelligence network operating out of the Paris embassy. It is now clear that Penkovsky exposed most of the Soviet spy network in Western Europe to United States and British intelligence during the same month when he was a temporary member of Soviet Military Intelligence in Paris.

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

During my trips to England and France during 1961, I was given the mission, just as other military intelligence officers, of collecting information of a military and scientific nature.

As I was in charge of the delegation, I did not participate in "active operational work," as we call it. It established contacts, made acquaintances, collected literature which would be of interest to Soviet intelligence.

In France and England people talked to me freely, invited me to their homes, restaurants and offices. I was astonished by this because at intelligence staff school in Moscow I was taught entirely different things about the French and British "secret police."

After spending some time in those two countries I saw how natural and unaffected the people behaved, as though there were no such thing as the secret police. Even our military intelligence officer in London, Shapovalov, loves England—"Mother England," as he calls it.

While I was in London, I asked about the Cosmonaut Yuri Gargarin's visit to England. Gargarin does not speak English, but he had some excellent translators. Everyone assigned to him was selected from our "neighbors," the secret police. Shapovalov told me that it was uncomfortable to see so many state security police surrounding Gargarin.

While he was in London, he lived in House No. 13, on the second floor (Kensington Palace Gardens). People by the hundreds stood in the streets in order to see him, and one British girl waited 18 hours to catch a glimpse of him. When Gargarin was told about this, he said, "What a fool. It would have been better if she had shared my bed for a couple of hours." Here is the new historical personality for you.

BERLIN CRISIS?

During my second trip to London in July 1961, there were a few representatives of the Central Committee CPSU in my delegation. They had a lengthy conference with Ambassador Soldatov. Later I was told by our deputy resident, Pavlov and Shapovalov, that they had brought money and special instructions for the British Communist Party.

Khrushchev had personally ordered Soldatov to meet with certain leaders of the British Communist Party in the expectation of obtaining information on the Berlin situation and on the probable reaction of the British Government in case of a Berlin crisis.

Pavlov, Shapovalov and Milovidov also said that a directive had been received from the Central Committee and military intelligence to employ all agents and friendly contacts in England in order to collect information. The Ambassador had a conference with the intelligence residents and gave them instructions from the center.

Shortly after this all the officers in the embassy took off in various directions all over England to gather the needed information. The entire force of operational, strategic, and political intelligence services was mobilized for this.

I cannot understand at all why the Communists are permitted to operate so freely in England and France. Why are they not shown who is boss? Where are the counterintelligence services of the Western countries? What are they doing?

COMMUNIST CONTACTS

Ananyev, our officer in Paris, told me that Soviet intelligence has very close working relations with Communists, especially those who work in the government, Army, and NATO. Ananyev and Prokhorov had both told me that it was very easy to carry on illegal operations in France, especially in Paris.

It is true that if we approach an ordinary Frenchman, and he learns that he is speaking with Russians, he will immediately run and report the contact to the police. But French Communists, generally speaking, readily agree to work for us, asking only directions on how and what to do. They act as spotters and obtain military information.

According to Prokhorov, we could not work so well in France without Communist help. He actually made the statement that we bought France easily, and for a cheap price. "We bought the harlot cheap"—those were the words he used.

Military intelligence has levied a requirement on all residencies, especially those in France, to obtain information on the new models of NATO weapons. They are to use all possible contacts, including all the representatives of the countries of the people's democracies, acquaintances and Communists.

There were many other requirements regarding the collection of information of various sorts, including approximately 20 to 25 items directly concerned with electronics, especially electronic technology as used by missile troops of the American and British Armies. We were also directed to obtain information about certain kinds of small American missiles launched from aircraft, which create various forms of interference in the air and disrupt radar scanning.

All operational intelligence officers were assigned the task of visiting chemical enterprises in France, America, and England in order to learn the process and ingredients of solid fuel for missiles.

Information was desired on heat-resisting steel; there seemed to be some reason to believe that the United States had done some very good work in this field. The GRU considers that the French have an excellent solid fuel for missiles and have made great progress in this direction.

I told the resident in Paris that I would be traveling through France and could select suitable sites for dead drops. The resident replied that they had all the dead drop sites needed. He told me not to waste my time on this.

The resident also said that it was very easy to arrange agent meetings in France, to transmit and receive materials, etc. He even indicated that dead drops were seldom used because it was simple to arrange direct meetings with agents. These are not set up very frequently, however, only when necessary.

At the embassies in Paris and London, Tass intercepts and prints all communications which do not find their way into the Soviet press. This is done for all the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Deputy Ministers. In military intelligence they are read by everyone down to and including the chief of a directorate. This is how they learn about everything that goes on in the world but does not get into their own press.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 9, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—DEAD DROPS AND RED SURVEILLANCE

(By Frank Gibney)

Colonel Penkovsky's Paris visit was his last to the West. Although his superiors in military intelligence later made several proposals to send him on foreign assignments, it became clear that the state security police were watching him, for some reason. Penkovsky himself believed that the state security's surveillance arose from the belated discovery that his father had been a White officer in the revolution. He correctly believed that they did not suspect the real truth: that he had volunteered to do espionage for the West.

Back in Moscow, he cooly continued to deliver information to his American and British contacts. He used three standard intelligence methods: (1) Carefully arranged "chance encounters"; (2) meetings at the homes of British or Americans he might normally be expected to visit; (3) the device of the "dead drop," the inconspicuous hiding place where a package can be left for a later pick up, without the need for either party to the transaction to meet face to face.

On October 21, just 2 weeks after his return from Paris, Penkovsky had his first meeting with one of his contacts. At 9 p.m. he was walking near the Balchug Hotel, smoking a cigarette and holding in his hand a package wrapped in white paper. A man walked up to him, wearing an overcoat, unbuttoned, and also smoking a cigarette. "Mr. Alex," he said in English, "I am from your two friends who send you a big, big welcome." The package changed hands. Another hoard of documents and observations on Soviet military preparations was on its way westward.

"Alex," for such was his code name, kept on collecting and transmitting information, without skimping on his normal daily rounds. More than ever, he maintained contacts with his friends in the Army. He exuded confidence.

In December Penkovsky resumed meetings with his Western contacts, but the risks involved grew ever more apparent. On January 5, after he had passed some more film to Mrs. Janet Anne Chisholm, wife of a British Embassy attaché, in an elaborately casual encounter, he noticed a small car violating traffic regulations, had swung around to observe them.

Later that month the same car appeared again at one of his meetings, a small brown sedan with the license plate SHA 61–45, driven by a man in a black overcoat. Penkovsky wrote a letter to a prearranged address in London, advising that no further meetings with Mrs. Chisholm be attempted.

From that time on, Penkovsky relied on the two remaining methods of communication. He either handed over material in the houses of Westerners, to which he was invited in the course of his duties, or relied on the relative anonymity of dead drops which were, of course, the safest way to communicate. But they had their own peculiar suspenses and horrors. In effect, an agent working through dead drops finds himself playing a grown-up game of blindman's buff.

Through the spring of 1962 Penkovsky's existence was bounded by a collection of these inconspicuous hiding places. Drop No. 1 was located in the doorway of No. 5–6 Pushkin Street, behind a radiator painted dark green. Messages to be sent were placed in a matchbox wrapped in light blue paper, bound with cellophane tape and wire, and hung on a certain hook behind the radiator.

When Penkovsky had something to leave there, he was to make a black mark on Post No. 35 on the Kutuzov Prospect. He would then put the materials in the drop, and make two telephone calls to numbers G 3–26–87 and G 3–26–94, each with a set number of rings. And so it went. Such are the complexities of a working intelligence operation.

Through it all, Penkovsky continued to jot down his observations and his own warning to the West. The following excerpt discusses one of the most chilling aspects of Soviet war preparation: unrestricted chemical warfare.

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

It is not enough for Krushchev to prepare for atomic and hydrogen warfare. He is also preparing for chemical warfare. A special 7th Directorate in the general staff is involved in working out methods of chemical and bacteriological warfare.

The Chief Chemical Directorate of the Ministry of Defense is also concerned with the problems of chemical and bacteriological warfare. We also have the Voroshilov Military Academy of Chemical Defense, several military-chemical schools and scientific research institutes and laboratories in the field of chemistry and bacteriology. They are all working on these military projects.

Near Moscow there is a special proving ground for chemical defense. I know a new gas has been invented which is colorless, tasteless, and without odor. The gas is avowed to be very effective and highly toxic. The secret of the gas is not known to me. It has been named "American." Why this name was chosen, I can only guess.

Many places in the country have experimental centers for testing various chemical and bacteriological devices. One such base is in Kaluga. The commanding officer of this base is Nikolay Varentsov, the brother of Marshal Varentsov.

Near the city of Kalinin, on a small island in the Volga, there is a special bacteriological storage place. Here they keep large containers with bacilli of plagues and other contagious diseases. The entire island is surrounded by barbed wire and is very securely guarded. But my readers in the West must not be under any illusions. This is not the only place where there are such containers.

ARTILLERY EQUIPPED

Soviet artillery units all are regularly equipped with chemical warfare shells. They are at the gunsights, and our artillery is routinely trained in their use. And let there be no doubt: If hostilities should erupt, the Soviet Army would use chemical weapons against its opponents. The political decision has already been made and our strategic military planners have developed a doctrine which permits the commander in the field to decide whether to use chemical weapons, and when and where.

I recently read an article entitled "Principles of the Employment of Chemical Missiles" of the top secret military publication "Information Collection of Missile Units and Artillery." It is being distributed this month, August 1961. (This publication is intended to explain the latest in tactical and operational doctrine to the highest ranking officers, i.e., major general and above.)

The article wastes no time and minces no words. It opens with the statement that under modern conditions highly toxic chemical agents are one of the most powerful means of destroying the enemy.

There is no mention made of waiting until the enemy uses chemical weapons; there is no reference to the need for a high-level political decision for the use of such weapons.

From the start to finish the article makes it clear that this decision has been made, that chemical shells and missiles may be considered just ordinary weapons available to the military commander, to be used routinely by him when the situation calls for it. The article specifically states, "The commander of the army (front) makes the decision to use chemical weapons."

The authors add that one of the most important uses for chemical missiles will be the destruction of the enemy's nuclear strike capability. Specific mention is made of the Little John, Honest John, Lacrosse, Corporal, Redstone, and Sergeant units, the width and depth of their dispersed formations under tactical conditions, and their vulnerabilities to the chemical attack. Also American cruise missile and atomic artillery units. The article contains the usual precautions about the necessity to prevent damage to friendly troops, and discussed the operational situations in which chemical weapons could be used to greatest advantage. This is how it concludes:

"The purpose of this article is to present the main fundamental principles of using chemical missiles: Those principles should not, under any circumstances, be considered as firmly established, because they can be defined with greater precision as practical experience is accumulated."

Soviet officers generally consider Americans to be extremely lax in matters of training and discipline for defense against chemical attack. I have heard that American soldiers even boast of throwing away their gas masks and other protective equipment, claiming they have lost them. I can hardly believe this, but even if it is only partly true, it is a training deficiency which must be corrected immediately. Such crucial flaws in an enemy's defensive armor are not overlooked by Soviet planners.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 10, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—PENKOVSKY ON LAST ARRIVAL IN MOSCOW KNEW SOVIET NET WAS CLOSING ON HIM

(By Frank Gibney)

"I am under observation," Colonel Penkovsky said, when his British businessman contact, Greville Wynne, arrived in Moscow for what proved to be his last visit before Penkovsky's arrest. It was July 1962.

Penkovsky had continued to produce tremendous quantities of information for American and British intelligence, but by now he was considering means of making his escape.

He still could not be sure what the state security police suspected, but he realized that a net of surveillance was tightening around him.

A less bold or zealous man would have curtailed his activities. But Penkovsky knew the extent of Khrushchev's buildup in missiles, as well as his continued plans for military provocation over Berlin. He sacrificed caution in his effort to get his warning across to Washington and London.

Wynne brought Penkovsky letters from his contacts in the West, which improved his spirits. Western intelligence officers had forged a new passport for Penkovsky to use within the Soviet Union in case surveillance increased to the danger point. He had previously discussed the possibility of leaving Moscow for Leningrad and somehow making a rendezvous with a submarine in the Baltic. However farfetched the plan seemed, he was also thinking of some way to get his family out as well.

On the fourth of July 1962, Penkovsky attended a reception at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, where he apparently succeeded in turning over information on the Soviet missile buildup to U.S. officers. On July 5, he and Wynne had a last meeting, at dinner, at the Peiping Restaurant in Moscow. There they ran into the most obvious kind of surveillance by the state security.

Penkovsky wrote down this account of the event after it happened. "On approaching the Peiping I noticed surveillance of Wynne. I decided to go away without approaching him. Then I became afraid that he might have some return material for me before his departure from Moscow. I decided to enter the restaurant and to have dinner with Wynne in plain sight of everyone.

"Entering the vestibule I saw that Wynne was surrounded (and that surveillance was either a demonstrative or an inept one). Having seen that there were no free tables, I decided to leave, knowing that Wynne would follow me. I only wanted to find out if he had material for me and then to part with him until morning, having told him that I would see him off. I went 100 to 150 meters beyond into a large, through courtyard with a garden. Wynne followed me, and the two of us immediately saw the two detectives following us. Exchanging a few words, we separated.

"I was very indignant about this insolence, and on the following day, I reported officially to my superiors that state security workers had prevented me from dining with a foreigner whom we respect, have known for a long time, with whom we have relations of mutual trust, with whom I have been working for a long time, etc. I said that our guest felt uncomfortable when he saw that he was being tendered such attention.

"My superiors agreed with me that this was a disgrace, and Levin (the state security representative) was equally indignant about the surveillance. Levin said that the committee and I as its representative, granted the necessary courtesies to Wynne and that we (state security) do not have any claims on him."

Penkovsky's cool-headed bluff bought him time—almost 3 months' worth. He continued to photograph secret documents in the general staff library, relying on his good connections in Soviet military circles to hold off further action by the state security police.

Later, the Moscow press strenuously attempted to play down Penkovsky's influence and associations with Soviet generals and marshals.

Izvestia, for example, called him "a rank and file official whose contacts and acquaintances did not go beyond a limited circle of restaurant habitues, drunkards, and philanderers."

How true this characterization was may be gaged from the papers themselves, a record of which the regime was, of course, ignorant. In the following excerpt, Penkovsky describes one of the many intimate gatherings at which he hobnobbed with the Kremlin hierarchy: Marshal Varenstov's birthday party in September 1961.

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

Marshal Varentsov's birthday party was held at his country home. Many guests were invited, including the minister of defense, Marshal Malinovsky. My whole family, including even my mother, was invited long in advance. Yekaterina Karpovna, Varentsov's wife, asked me to be master of ceremonies (temadan).

On the evening of September 16, 1961, the guests began to arrive: Marshal Malinovsky with his wife; Chruayev, Khrushchev's right-hand man in the Central Committee Bureau for the Russian Republic (R.S.F.S.R.); Lieutenant Ryabchikov; Major General Semenov, and many others.

All the military were in civilian clothes with the exception of Malinovsky, who came wearing his uniform. Some of those invited could not come because they were busy, many of them out of town on business trips. The most important guests, of course, were Malinovsky and Churayev. Both arrived in Chaikas (the largest Soviet luxury car).

Malinovsky presented Varentsov with a large (3-liter) bottle of champagne, Churayev gave him a large wooden carved eagle, someone even gave Sergey Sergeyevich a black dog. The best and the most original presents were those from me and my family.

They were the things I had bought in London. Varentsov openly admitted it by declaring loudly: "My boy has really outdone himself this time." And my presents went from one guest to another. Everyone asked where and how I managed to get such beautiful things. Mrs. Varentsov and my wife quietly explained to the guests about my latest trip to London. The answer was always the same: "Oh, well, that of course explains it."

MOTHER'S QUESTION

At some point, while the party was in full swing, my mother approached Malinovsky and out of a clear sky asked him: "Forgive me, an old woman, Comrade Minister, my dear Rodion Yakovlevich, tell me please will there be a war? This question worries all of us so much."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 11, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—HOW PENKOVSKY WAS SEIZED—AIDED IN FLIGHT OF ENGLISH ASSOCIATE

(By Frank Gibney)

Early in the morning of July 6, 1962, Colonel Penkovsky drove to Sheremetevo airport and met Greville Wynne in the passenger waiting room.

Using his Party card to overawe customs and security personnel, Penkovsky changed Wynne's tickets, rushed him through the departure formalities, and saw him aboard the first westbound plane, an S.A.S. flight headed for Copenhagen.

Coming on the heels of their surveillance at the Peking Restaurant the night before, the hasty departure must inevitably have deepened the suspicions of the state security police. But Penkovsky knew that Wynne was in some danger.

Heedless of his own risk, he wanted at all costs to assure Wynne's safety.

Over the next three months the colonel succeeded in getting several packets of information out to his Western contacts, mostly through the use of "dead drops" and prearranged messages.

On September 5, he brought some film to an American Embassy reception, but he could find no safe opportunity to transfer it.

The next day he tried to establish contact with one of his British sources. That effort, too, proved fruitless. The net had tightened.

On October 22, according to official Soviet record, Col. Oleg Penkovsky was arrested by representatives of the state security, in Moscow, and taken to Lubianka Prison. On November 2, Greville Wynne was kidnaped in Budapest, where he had gone to make preliminary arrangements for a mobile trade exhibition in Eastern Europe. He was flown to Moscow in an aircraft commanded by a state security general and thrown into Lubianka for interrogation.

The "interrogation" of Penkovsky and Wynne was to last fully six months.

What finally betrayed Penkovsky? It was certainly not the result of a long cat-and-mouse game played by an all-seeing state security. Penkovsky's high rank and access to the Kremlin's secrets made him far too dangerous an enemy for the Soviet high command to temporize with, in an effort to learn more about his contacts, sources, etc.

The minute his spying was discovered, it would have to be stopped. So the discovery must have been made just before his arrest.

The state security's original discovery that Penkovsky's father was a White Russian officer—a damaging item in any Soviet file—undoubtedly started an investigation. In the course of the investigation, the state security police noticed Penkovsky's frequent meetings with foreigners.

Even though Penkovsky's position in Intelligence permitted such associations, there must have been a great many dangerous foreign contact reports in his security file.

The expensive gifts he brought back from the West, for high army and party officials, also aroused some suspicion. Wynne still believes that Penkovsky was first suspected of blackmarketeering—not an unusual crime among Soviet officials.

There was another important factor. Through the spring and summer of 1962, as tension with the West was built up by Khrushchev, the state security had been ordered to tighten its surveillance on all foreigners—and Russians who associated with them.

Ironically, the same "collision course for war" which Penkovsky warned about was responsible for the intensified surveillance that brought on his arrest.

At some point the state security searched Penkovsky's apartment. Once the searchers found the secret drawer with Penkovsky's espionage apparatus—cameras, radio and instructions for Western contacts—the colonel's doom was sealed.

Could Penkovsky have saved himself before that time? Probably yes. In July, for instance, after Wynne's return to London, Penkovsky could have sent a message to London announcing that he was breaking off communication, temporarily cut his Western contacts and, above all, destroyed the incriminating materials in his desk drawer.

He did not do this precisely because he thought it necessary, to the very last, to continue his warnings about Khrushchev's political adventurism and its danger to the world.

In the following excerpt from the papers, one of the last he wrote, he discusses the Soviet nuclear menace—and Khrushchev's disregard of any test ban in 1961 and 1962.

(We must remember that Khrushchev agreed to a test ban in 1963, only after the United States faced him down in Cuba.)

(By Oleg Penkovsky)

Many of our nuclear explosions (tests) have been conducted in the central part of the U.S.S.R., mostly in Kazakhstan. Some of the smaller tests were not noticed at all and were not recorded by the Western states.

The large nuclear explosions are reported by Tass and the Soviet press, but nothing is ever said about the smaller ones. At the general staff we sometimes know of tests being conducted on a certain type of nuclear weapon, and we wait to see what Tass will say about this. If Tass keeps silent, then we keep silent, too.

Tests of various new types of nuclear weapons are conducted daily. Nuclear test explosions take place more often than reported by Tass or the Soviet press. All this talk about the Soviet Union advocating the prohibition of nuclear tests is nothing but lies.

Khrushchev will fire anyone who mentions complete suspension of nuclear tests. He is not ready for it.

He will sign an agreement prohibiting nuclear tests only after he becomes convinced that the U.S.S.R. is ahead of the United States in the use of nuclear energy for military purposes. The negotiations could last another 10 years without any results.

There is a shortage of atomic raw materials needed for the atom bombs and missiles with nuclear warheads. Almost all the ore containing uranium comes to the Soviet Union from Czechoslovakia.

Recently some uranium ore deposits have been found in China, but they are very insignificant. Soviet monazite sands and ore deposits are not particularly rich either in elements necessary for atomic energy.

In views of this shortage of atomic raw materials, it is small wonder that our government is so interested in establishing Soviet control in the Congo. The largest uranium ore deposits are in the Congo.

When Lumumba was temporarily in power in the Congo, the Soviets sent 23 planeloads of officers (including generals) there via Egypt and Sudan. The aircraft were of the IL–14 and IL–18 types; heavier types could not land on the Sudanese airfield, and other countries would not give permission for the Soviet aircraft to land for refueling.

A good friend of mine, Maj. Aleksey Guryev, was the first one to fly to the Congo with the Soviet generals. The primary task of this mission was to establish Soviet control over the uranium ore in the Congo.

On September 8, 1961, there was a regular experimental atomic explosion of a 16-megaton bomb. This was the first test explosion of a bomb of such force in the Soviet Union. An R–12 missile was used in this test. The missile was launched from the base at Kapustin Yar. Varentsov was present when the missile was launched.

Later, when a 50-megaton bomb was tested, to everybody's surprise the explosion's actual force equaled that of 80 megatons. Such great force was not expected.

It was believed that some unforeseen chemical changes in the charge must have taken place after it was prepared. It is now thought that such a bomb with a calculated force of 100 megatons may actually produce an explosion equaling that of 150 or 160 megatons.

Why did Khrushchev unexpectedly begin to conduct new nuclear tests?

(The Soviets resumed nuclear testing on September 1, 1961. They continued the practice until the nuclear test-ban treaty of 1963.)

All nuclear tests have had and some still have two phases. The first phase deals with the explosive force in TNT equivalents.

In these tests the bombs were dropped from aircraft or from special masts. The second phase tests nuclear payloads lifted by missiles.

The present tests are almost exclusively on the second phase type. Almost all of them are conducted with missiles.

Why is Khrushchev pushing these nuclear tests? Why is he unwilling to sign the agreement forbidding nuclear weapons tests? Because most of our missiles have not even passed the necessary tests, let alone of missile production, as regards quality and there have been many instances of missiles and satellites exploding in the air or disappearing completely.

But Khrushchev persistently does everything possible to improve missile weapons. He wants to seize the initiative and to show the West that he is ahead in the field of missile production, as regards quality as well as quantity.

Khrushchev and our scientists are still quite far from being able to prove such a superiority; but they are working hard to improve all types of missile weapons.

General Kupin says there are insufficient defense facilities in case of war, particularly as regards defense against radioactive substances.

Although we tell our people working in defense plants that everything is under control and that there is no danger of contamination, they are still afraid.

Many become ill, after working for 6 months or a year. Even our nuclear-powered icebreaker *Lenin* is a floating deathtrap because of its badly designed valves which allow radioactive leakage.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—On August 25, 1962, Colonel Penkovsky added the following personal note to the Papers. It was one of the few entries with a date affixed. It was the last thing ever received from him.)

I have already grown used to the fact that I note periodically some degree of surveillance and control over my movements. The "neighbors" continue to study me. There is some reason for this KGB activity. I confuse and lose myself in guesses and suppositions. I am very far from exaggerating the dangers. Still, I am an optimist and I try to evaluate the situation objectively.

I am not disappointed in my life or my work. The most important thing is that I remain full of strength and desire to continue this work. To tell the truth about the Soviet system—it is the goal of my life. And if I succeed in contributing my little bricks to this great cause, there can be no greater satisfaction.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 12, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—PENKOVSKY FATE NEVER IN DOUBT

(By Frank Gibney)

"On May 7, 1963, in Moscow in the Court of Session Hall of the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R., there began an open trial in the criminal case of the agent of the British and American intelligence services and citizens of the U.S.S.R. O. V. Penkovsky and the subject of Britain and spy go-between, Greville Wynne." (Information release, Military Collegium of the Soviet Supreme Court.)

The trial of Colonel Penkovsky and Greville Wynne lasted all of 4 days, and one of these days was occupied by a closed session. The verdict was never in doubt. Penkovsky was sentenced to death, Wynne to 16 years' imprisonment.

Both defendants confessed their guilt, as agreed on during the long months of brutal state security interrogation. Wynne displayed some obvious reservations, however, and he left little doubt about the extent of his coaching and coercion.

Penkovsky had agreed to the humiliation of a Soviet "show" trial for only one reason: to safeguard the lives of his family.

As Wynne later said, it was clear that he had made a bargain with his state security interrogators. If he played the game, as they ordered it, his wife and children would be spared the imprisonment they might ordinarily have expected, as close relatives of an enemy of the state.

He was probably safe in assuming the bargain would be kept. The Stalinist terror has left such a bad taste in the mouth of all Russians that reprisals against a political prisoner's family are generally unpopular. Penkovsky's wife and children never suspected the dangerous crusade to which he had committed himself. He naturally wanted to spare them the worst of its consequences.

WYNNE FREED IN EXCHANGE

Wynne was released in 1964, in exchange for the Soviet spy Konon Melody, who under the name of Gordon Lonsdale had been passing information to Moscow from London. Although "Lonsdale's" espionage against the British can hardly be compared to the magnitude of Penkovsky's disclosures to the West, he was a professional Soviet intelligence officer and they wanted him back in Moscow.

The very fact that a trial had to be held must have been embarrassing to the Kremlin. But Penkovsky had to have a public trial. Eight British and U.S. diplomats in Moscow had been declared persona non grata for their connections with him. A foreign national, Wynne was directly implicated.

But Penkovsky himself was too big a fish to dismiss with the minimal notice reserved for most such offenses. The wave of transfers and demotions in the Soviet intelligence service and the army, following Penkovsky's arrest, was too large to avoid explaining. (Some 300 intelligence officers alone were hastily recalled to Moscow.)

Finally Penkovsky's associates in the army were too highly placed to avoid the most public sort of warning.

TRIAL PLANNED 6 MONTHS

For 6 months the prosecution had worked out the details of those 4 days in court. Wynne was interrogated steadily, since the day—November 3, 1962, when he was flown to Moscow after his abduction in Budapest by Soviet and Hungarian security men.

Inside the Lubianka Prison, the state security arranged a meeting with both Penkovsky and Wynne. There Penkovsky begged Wynne to cooperate in a public trial. Wynne agreed to cooperate within limits. After 6 helpless months in a solitary cell of the Lubianka, there was little option left to him. He feared also, that without a public trial, nothing would be known of his fate.

In the pretrial interrogations Penkovsky, who had a rough time of it, made no attempt to disguise his motives and actions. He told his interrogators that he had acted not primarily to help the West, but in the best interests of his own people, the Russians. This was hardly a defense which a Soviet court would permit him to repeat in public. (It is of interest that the final statements of both defendants were made in a closed court session.)

The two defense attorneys assigned to Wynne and Penkovsky went through the motions of talking to their "clients," but only after the interrogators had finished. (Wynne's attorney, who spent most of his time in court agreeing with the prosecution, later presented him with a capitalist-sized bill.)

DEFENDANTS REHEARSED

When the trial was finally staged, both defendants had been rehearsed thoroughly, even to the point of visiting the courtroom in advance. The military court, presided over by Lt. Gen. V. V. Borisoglebskiy, called four witnesses, two of them acquaintances of Penkovsky's, and produced nine experts to certify the equipment found in Penkovsky's apartment, the security nature of the information which he gave, and other things.

In the orderly process of question and answer the whole story of Penkovsky's espionage against the Soviet Union was repeated, from the first meeting with Wynne in Moscow and the confrontation with the British and American intelligence officers in London.

Lt. Gen. A. G. Gornyy, the chief military prosecutor, summarized it at the outset: "* * * the accused Penkovsky is an opportunist, a careerist and a morally decayed person who took the road of treason and betrayal of his country and was employed by imperialist intelligence services.

"By the end of 1960 he attempted to get in touch with the American intelligence service, further exploiting the undeserved trust placed in him and his position as deputy head of the Foreign Department of the State Committee for the Coordination of Scientific Research Work—having, through the nature of his work, the opportunity to meet foreigners visiting the Soviet Union as members of the various scientific and cultural delegations."

NO DOUBT OF GUILT

There was no doubt that Penkovsky had engaged in the most serious sort of espionage. The catalog of material confiscated in his apartment as read off at the Soviet trial would in itself offer ample grounds for an espionage conviction.

"During the search at Penkovsky's apartment, in addition to the already mentioned records with the telephone numbers of the foreign intelligence officers, six message postcards with instructions for them, the report and the exposed rolls of film, the following articles were discovered in a secret hiding place installed in his desk, and were attached to the file as tangible evidence: a forged passport, six cipher pads, three Minox cameras and a description of them, two sheets of specially treated paper for writing secret text, a memorandum with an indication of the frequencies on which Penkovsky received instructional radio transmission from the foreign intelligence services, the draft of a report from Penkovsky to the intelligence headquarters, the article which Penkovsky had received from the foreign intelligence services and which he intended to publish in the Soviet Union, 15 unexposed rolls of film for the Minox camera, and various instruction manuals provided by the foreign intelligence services—the Soniya (Sony) radio receiver which he had received from the foreign intelligence services and which he used to receive enciphered radio messages from the intelligence headquarters, and the typewriter on which Penkovsky typed his reports."

There was no doubt, either, whom Penkovsky had been dealing with. Witness the prosecutor's angry tirade:

"A leading role in this belongs to the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States—the support of the most adventurist circles in the United States. Like a giant octopus it extends its tentacles into all corners of the earth, supports a tremendous number of spies and secret informants, continually organizes plots and murders, provocations and diversions. Modern techniques are put to the service of espionage: from the miniature Minox cameras which you see before you up to space satellites, spies in the sky."

IMPORTANT FACTS HIDDEN

But what the Soviet prosecutors could not do was admit the two most important facts in the whole case: (1) Penkovsky's real identity as a colonel in military intelligence and the real extent of his contacts with the Soviet hierarchy; and (2) Penkovsky's real motive in betraying the Soviet regime.

In the Soviet record, he could be a drunkard, a philanderer, greedy, and a girl chaser—all these motives the prosecution clumsily attempted to adduce. But the Communist system is too brittle and insubstantial to admit that such a highly placed official could revolt against it because he thought the system was bad and wrong.

As a result the trial showed up as a farce. (Even witnesses from military intelligence had to be disguised as officers from the educational branch of the Ministry of Defense.) The Soviet prosecutors left only an agonizing question mark, when they tried to show how such a brilliant and promising officer had gone wrong.

Time and time again Penkovsky's past credentials were certified: a war hero, a brilliant officer (and even more brilliant if one included his real record in intelligence), and a responsible Soviet official.

Then suddenly came the fall in 1960. Despite all the prosecutor's attempts to trace the beginning of careerism, it was, as they depicted it, a fall as abrupt as original sin and about as rationally explainable. An extraordinary gap yawned between the able, hardworking, trusted Soviet official and the cringing specimen of "moral depravity" which General Gornyy presented, in a summation titled "Penkovsky's path from careerism and moral degradation to treachery."

"Penkovsky is dead," the prosecutor told Izvestia and the world, a few days after the trial ended. "The sentence was carried out on May 16, in the second half of the day. When it was announced to him that the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. had denied his petition for mercy and he was to be executed, there was not a trace of the poseur's manner which he had maintained in court. He met death like a despicable coward."

So ended the career of the most extraordinary volunteer spy of this century.

The free world is forever in his debt.

(By Greville Wynne)

(The following description of Oleg Penkovsky was written after Wynne returned from Soviet captivity. Wynne was the last westerner to see Penkovsky alive.)

Oleg Penkovsky was a most extraordinary man. It was an unforgettable experience to accompany him, particularly during his first visits to London and Paris, and to see the tremendous impact of our free society on a decent, and by Soviet standards, sophisticated man, but a man who had been sheltered all his life inside the prison of the Soviet system.

It was the people in the West who impressed him most. He was amazed, for example, to find that the assistants in department stores were clean, neat in dress and well groomed, that nearly all the young ladies there were attractive, smiling and anxious to please.

I had often visited the gloomy GUM department store in Moscow and the drab shops in Gorky street with their drab, surly attendants. So I had some idea of the mental contrast he must have been making.

He was interested in religion. He had indeed been baptized himself by his pious mother. In London one day we were passing the Brompton Oratory. He asked me whether it was a church and whether he could go in to look around.

He was fascinated. "This is good," he said. "Perhaps the religious doctrine is not entirely correct, but at least it gives us a principle to guide our life. At home in the Soviet Union we have nothing. There are no principles—only what the Party tells us."

Wherever we went he was accepted as my friend. This first amazed him, but also pleased him immensely. Such a terrific contrast from the Soviet system where it is still highly dangerous for citizens to mix socially with Westerners.

He was bitter about the Soviet regime. He would weep, quite literally, when he talked about its misdeeds and the sufferings or unhappiness of his friends in the Soviet Union.

At the very end of his Paris trip he worried about going back. He knew he could stay. I shall never forget that day when I picked up Oleg in the early morning for a drive to the airport in thick fog. Then we waited for over 4 hours for the plane to take off. He almost stayed. His face was tense with his decision. Finally he made up his mind, turned to me and said, "Oh Greville, I must go back. I have more work to do."

KNEW HE WAS WATCHED

It was then July 1962, and he knew that the state security was watching him. He was a lonely man in those last months in Moscow. What a burden he carried.

The more I knew him, the more I realized that Penkovsky was an extraordinarily high-minded man. He did what he did because it was the one way he, as an individual, could strike back at a system that had debased his country. I never saw him waiver from this basic decision from the moment we first met.

He had thought things through many months before I first made contact with him. He was willing to put up with the basic deceptions of spying and the tremendous strain of this lonely life, because he believed in a cause. He believed simply that a free society should emerge in the Soviet Union, and that it could only come by toppling the only government he knew. He was a heroic figure.

I shall never forget him.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 14, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—SPY LECTURE BROUGHT OUT—PENKOVSKY SMUGGLED TRAINING DATA TO WARN AMERICA

(By Frank Gibney)

(A Soviet Spy's Guidebook to the United States: a top-secret lecture, given to Soviet intelligence officers in Moscow at the Military-Diplomatic Academy, by Lt. Col. I. E. Prikhodko, officially titled: "Characteristics of Agent Communications and of Agent Handling in the U.S.A.").

In the vast amount of intelligence material which Col. Oleg Penkovsky smuggled out of Moscow—Soviet prosecutors at his trial in 1963 themselves admitted he had passed on 5,000 separate photographed items—Penkovsky apparently thought this one item, in particular, should receive the widest distribution.

This training lecture was given in 1961 to acquaint Soviet intelligence officers with some of the problems and opportunities of espionage in the United States.

SERVED IN THE UNITED STATES

Its author, Lt. Col. I. E. Prikhodko, had himself served as an intelligence officer in New York, from 1952 to 1955, under "cover" of a post with the Soviet Mission to the United Nations.

Penkovsky first read it in the course of a briefing session in Moscow while preparing for a mission to the United States, which was later canceled. He sent it along, with the papers, as "a warning to the American people" of the extent to which Soviet espionage has expanded, in fact, formalized, its widespread undercover activities in the United States.

Although the language of the Prikhodko lecture is professorial, its content is hair raising. It is literally a professional working manual for Soviet intelligence officers in the United States, complete with instructions on how to recruit American agents to do their spying work—a most sinister variety of how-to-do-it book.

As his first step, Colonel Prikhodko tried to give his pupils—most of them Soviet intelligence officers of major's or lieutenant colonel's rank—an objective introduction to the strange ways and customs of Americans, regarded in his Soviet classroom as virtually citizens of another world.

COMMUNIST CONTACT

Although Col. Prikhodko was trying to be objective, his guidebook is a weird article with observed reality constantly being confused with the necessity to interpret everything in a Communist context. While the colonel finds the Americans, on the one hand, energetic, enterprising, and open people, resourceful, courageous and industrious, they are at the same time demoralized by bourgeois society and constantly diverted by "monopolists" into spending their time in silly amusements instead of "meditative and deliberative activity."

They have a natural love of freedom and independence, but they are always swayed by money and indifferent to anything not connected with business.

If this clinical Soviet appraisal of Americans is unintentionally funny, it is also frightening. For the Soviet intelligence officers who study lectures like this are the very men the Kremlin relies on to make estimates of American responses to Soviet actions.

THE LECTURE

Agent communications and agent handling involve first and last working with people, as a rule from the bourgeois world. For this work to be successful, it is necessary that Soviet officers know these people well, their characteristics and their personality traits, and the political and economic circumstances which condition their behavior.

In the recruitment of agents, preference should be given to Americans because they are highly trusted both in the United States and in the countries of Europe. It is much easier for an American agent to deliver mail for the "Center" "i.e., intelligence headquarters in Moscow" from the United States to one of the West European countries (a neutral country or an ally of the United States) and mail to our residencies in the United States.

An intelligence officer, however, who does not know the characteristics of the American way of life or who neglects those aspects cannot be trusted to handle and control American agents working for us.

TRAITS STUDIED

The way of life, customs, temper, demeanor, and personality traits of Americans have specific significance. Most Americans are energetic, enterprising, and open people, with a great sense of humor.

They can be described as having business acumen and as being resourceful, courageous, and industrious.

The overall situation and the absolute power of money in the United States arouses just one desire in many people—to make more money.

In describing a person, Americans often use the expression, "He knows how to make money," which means that such a person has a lot of money.

The other side of the question, specifically where the money comes from or how it is "made," is not, as a rule, of interest to anybody.

It can be said that Americans encourage any method of getting rich.

American bourgeois propaganda tries in every way to convince the population that anyone can make money if he is sufficiently resourceful.

Such a one-sided upbringing engenders in some of the people an indifference to everything unconnected with business, profits, and gain. The American love of money can be exploited by paying an agent for his work in order to increase his personal interest in working for us.

Payments must be prompt and equitable. This disciplines the agent and improves the Soviet officer's authority.

To encourage an agent, monthly payments are increased or bonuses, awards, or valuable gifts are given.

Thus, for example, agent B, who was on a monthly salary, reduced his production appreciably. His attendance at meetings and visits to dead drops were irregular. Despite rebukes by the intelligence officer, the agent's work did not improve.

The intelligence officer decided that he would have to use material inducement. With the Center's permission he began to pay the agent only for those months during which the agent actually worked and performed his operational activities.

Soon B realized that further backsliding would result only in the loss of all his extra income. He began to perform his tasks more efficiently.

An American's circle of interests is often rather small. Many Americans do not read books. Their main interest lies in advertisements, sports news, and cartoons; on the front pages they only glance at the large sensational headlines.

Generally speaking, bourgeois society demoralizes people.

Every American family tries to save money for a rainy day; therefore a certain amount is set aside from each pay check.

Wall Street does everything possible to keep Americans from devoting their free time to meditation and deliberation. Movies, cheap concerts, boxing, parks, horse races, baseball, football, restaurants—all these are used to divert the masses from the realities around them.

In general, an American's wants consist of having his own automobile, a comfortable apartment, and a good time. Most Americans, both men and women, smoke.

CONCERNED OVER CLOTHES

Americans are very concerned about clothes and outward appearances. They try always to have a clean suit, well pressed with a good crease in the trousers, a clean shirt, and shoes well polished. They send their suits regularly to the cleaner and their shirts to the laundry, both of which are everywhere in the United States. It is customary to change white shirts and socks daily.

It should be noted, therefore, than an intelligence officer who has an outwardly slovenly appearance will not command respect from an American agent.

In American clothing, light colors predominate. Americans like loose-fitting shoes, as a rule one or two sizes larger than necessary.

In his free time, when not at work, and especially during the summer, the American wears sports clothes: light trousers, short-sleeved shirts, no necktie. Sunglasses are in common use.

Outside the office an American's behavior is free and relaxed. Many Americans like to keep their hands in their pockets and chew gum.

Americans listen to the weather forecast and, if bad weather is predicted, they take an umbrella and raincoat; Americans do not wear rubbers. Both men and women use umbrellas. Thus, before going to a meeting, an intelligence officer should listen to the weather forecast and, if necessary, take an umbrella or a raincoat.

TIME SPENT IN BARS

Americans like to spend their time in bars. Many bars have no tables. Customers sit on high round stools next to the bar. As a rule, bars do not provide snacks or hot dishes. One can order only drinks: whisky, gin, beer, etc.

In order not to attract undue attention, the intelligence officer must know how to order sufficiently well. It is not enough, for example, to ask, "Give me a glass of beer." It is also necessary to name the brand of beer, "Schlitz," "Rheingold," etc. For the customers' amusement, most proprietors install a television set in a corner above the bar. Customers often sit over a single glass of beer for several hours watching television programs.

American drugstores, especially in large cities, have almost become department stores. Therefore they are never without customers. Drugstores can be used to hold short meetings with agents, as well as for other agent activities, e.g., signaling, clandestine phone calls.

Even American movie theaters are distinctive. Most movie theaters in large cities are open from 12 noon to 1 a.m. Moviegoers enter as soon as they get their tickets, and they may take any unoccupied seat. Films are shown continuously. Americans are not content with only a single feature. Therefore, movie theater proprietors show two films, one after the other, which last 3 to 4 hours.

Intelligence officers can make extensive use of movie theaters when organizing agent communications by spending a certain amount of time in them before a meeting. The fact is that there are few people in most movie theaters, especially on weekdays during working hours.

GOLF COURSE MEETINGS

Golf is the most popular sport among the well to do in the United States. Agent meetings can be held at golf courses as easily as in other athletic clubs. During the week there are very few people at the golf courses. On weekdays the intelligence officer and his agent can arrive at the golf course (preferably at different times, 20 to 30 minutes apart), each can begin to play alone, and at a previously designated time can meet at, let us say, the 16th hole or at some other hole (there is a total of 18 holes).

Saturdays and Sundays are less suitable days for holding agent meetings at golf courses because on these days many players gather, tournaments are held, and single play is not permitted. Golf courses are found on the edges of wooded areas or parks in broken terrain where there are many hidden areas. These hidden areas are the best places for holding meetings. In some cases, meetings can be held in clubhouse restaurants.

To hold successful meetings at a golf course, one should learn the conditions there ahead of time. A basic requirement is to know the game and how to play it. Therefore students should learn this game while still here in Moscow at the academy.

Golf club membership is rather expensive, however. Also, not all clubs are equally accessible to our intelligence officers. It is even difficult for local residents, to say nothing of foreigners, to get into some golf clubs, if they do not have a certain position in society.

With club memberships so difficult to obtain it is advisable to use public golf courses.

The technical knowledge of the average American is rather high. In his everyday life he makes wide use of machines, equipment, and instruments. Therefore the training of an American agent in operational technology is all the easier.

Yet it should be emphasized that the national characteristics of American agents are such that they are often careless in their operations. Americans make poor conspirators. They therefore need extremely careful briefing.

When necessary, the intelligence officer must brief the agent on how to smuggle material out of an installation, how to return it undetected, and how to reproduce the material at home or at work. It is very important that our American agents know how to develop proper and plausible cover stories for their extra income and for their periodic absences.

The Soviet intelligence officer can skillfully put to use such American traits as efficiency, resourcefulness, boldness, and perseverance. These will help an American agent to carry out operational tasks and to exploit his operational capabilities fully.

Americans, to a larger degree than representatives of many other peoples, have a natural love of freedom and independence, and do not like discipline. The officer must respect this characteristic and not resort to open pressure on the agent.

Realizing that the majority of Americans are open, straightforward, and happy people with a great sense of humor, the intelligence officer can prepare for and conduct a conversation with an agent that is not dull but lively and witty.

When preparing for a meeting he must try to anticipate the agent's questions, prepare good answers to them, and at the meeting to answer the agent in such a manner that the agent will feel that the intelligence officer is being frank with him.

Americans, like other people, are patriots. They are proud of their country's achievements; they honor their national heroes, and value their cultural monuments.

Therefore the intelligence officer must be careful not to indiscriminately criticize things American, but must remember that an unfortunate statement, for example, about some popular U.S. President (George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson) might offend the agent. A negative result might also come from an officer's underrating American culture.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 15, 1965]

OUR MAN IN THE KREMLIN—HOW RUSSIAN AGENTS COMMUNICATE WITH SPIES IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Frank Gibney)

One of the most significant documents which Col. Oleg Penkovsky managed to smuggle out of Moscow to the West was the top-secret lecture given by Lt. Col. I. E. Prikhodko to a select audience of Soviet intelligence officers in Moscow, in 1961.

Titled "Characteristics of Agent Communications and Agent Handling in the United States," the lecture is nothing less than a detailed instruction manual for the use of Soviet spies and their American agents, in spying on U.S. secrets.

Probably never in the history of espionage has a document like this ever been surfaced to public view.

In yesterday's excerpt from the Prikhodko lecture, the Soviet "American expert," who had once done spying work in New York under cover of his nominal work as a Soviet U.N. delegation member, gave his Moscow listeners an outline of American national characteristics, with special reference to the virtues and defects of Americans in espionage work.

The following excerpt goes into the details of how Soviet intelligence spies in the United States, the signals Soviet officers use, the places they like to meet their agents, the methods they use to avoid surveillance and detection by the FBI.

THE LECTURE

Under modern conditions, when the U.S.A., as the principal imperialist power, is preparing to unleash a surprise war with the mass employment of nuclear/missile weapons, the basic task of our strategic agent intelligence is to give early warning of U.S. preparations for an armed attack against the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries.

In view of the probable nature of a future war, an important task is the systematic collection of the most complete data on the following questions:

1. The locations of U.S. missile bases, depots for nuclear weapons, plants producing atomic weapons and missiles of various designations, scientific research institutes, and laboratories developing and perfecting weapons of mass destruction.
2. Information as to the nature and results of scientific research work in the field of creating new models of nuclear and missile weapons and improving existing ones.
3. The status of antiaircraft defense, including the entire radar detection and warning system.
4. The plans of U.S. military commanders on the use of nuclear/missile weapons.
5. U.S. military preparations in the various theaters of operations.

If the imperialists unleash a war, the United States will be the target of a crushing retaliatory strike causing damage to all the most important political and economic centers of that country. The most important tack of intelligence is the prompt reporting of objectives in the United States against which we plan to carry out the first strikes.

Soviet intelligence, therefore, should adopt timely measures to guarantee the security of its intelligence net. To achieve this it is necessary to disperse our operating "residences" and to move some valuable single agents some distance outside the limits of large cities. As for agent nets engaged in collecting intelligence on atomic and missile bases, they should preferably consist of individual sources equipped with radio having direct communications with the "Center" in Moscow.

MEETING VULNERABLE

A meeting between intelligence officer and agent is one of the most vulnerable means of communications. Therefore, in organizing meetings, our intelligence officers must anticipate everything in order to guarantee security.

In the United States where the counterintelligence effort of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is highly developed, planning and preparation for a meeting are of the greatest importance. In planning a meeting one should give the greatest consideration to the characteristics of the American people and of the country, which we have already mentioned, the working and family situation of the agent, his capabilities, etc.

Meetings should be varied as to time of day, days of the week, and dates of the month. For example, meetings should not be held on the fifth day of each month, on Wednesday of every week, or consistently at 8 p.m., because such consistency in the activities of an intelligence officer makes the work of American counterintelligence easier.

Under present working conditions in the United States, one should start for a meeting not later than 2 to 3 hours before the scheduled time, and establish a good "cover" story for the meeting.

For example: An intelligence officer in the United States had a Sunday meeting scheduled for the latter part of the day. After breakfast he took his family for a walk in the park. He usually took such a walk every Sunday. On the way, he invited a friend.

The two families chose some benches in the park and talked and glanced through newspapers and magazines which they had bought at a stand while the children played nearby. They all visited the zoo together, and they also looked at some monuments.

While passing a movie theater, they looked at the advertising display and decided to see the new film. They all went inside. The intelligence officer, who had a meeting scheduled with an agent, quickly departed through a side door and left for the meeting site along a previously selected route. The meeting was successful. Toward evening the intelligence officer and his family returned home after a restful Sunday.

RENDEZVOUS AT NIGHT

Most meetings are held in the evening, however. As a rule, the agent does not work in the evening and does not have to ask permission of his boss to leave. In addition, evenings provide the greatest security. It is not recommended, however, to hold meetings in a park, because, unlike Europeans, Americans visit parks only during the day.

At the approach of darkness nobody uses the parks. At that time of the day only criminal elements and persons who are mentally ill can be found in the parks. In the press one can find special warnings concerning the danger in going to parks in the evening. It is not unusual for the newspapers to publish detailed accounts of rapes and murders which were committed in the parks during the night.

In choosing a meeting place, it is necessary of course to consider the character of the country as a whole and, above all, the characteristics of the area. As a whole, conditions in the cities of New York and Washington, for example, are favorable for the organization of agent communications.

The existence of a subway in New York helps in locating different places in the city. It should be borne in mind, however, that the subway system there is quite complicated and it should be studied carefully before planning to use it for operational purposes.

In New York it is easy to establish a cover story for going downtown either during the day or at night, because New York has many public places. Skillful use of transportation facilities makes it possible to make a good check for the detection of surveillance. Finally, an intelligence officer who speaks with an accent in New York is quite acceptable since a large segment of the city's population speaks with an accent.

On the other hand the organization and utilization of agent communications in Washington are full of difficulties because of the city's small size, its limited number of public places, no subways, and an inadequate public transportation system, especially in the suburbs.

NEW YORK PROBLEMS

Differences exist not only among the sections and cities of the United States, but also among different sections of cities, often within the very same borough or area.

For example, let us take Manhattan, which is the business area of New York. Negro Harlem is unsuitable for the organization of agent communications in Manhattan. It is located north of Central Park, and the Chinese quarter, located downtown, is also difficult for agents. Extreme squalor distinguishes the Chinese quarter. A properly dressed person will stand out sharply there.

As for Negro Harlem, white people cross it only by automobile. A white person is unsafe there, because the Negroes regard every white person who comes there as a curiosity seeker who came to view them much as people go to the zoo to view the animals in cages.

We do not recommend that meetings be held in the area between 42d and 34th Streets. This is the busiest part of midtown and therefore has the widest coverage by the police and by counterintelligence.

Likewise, it is unadvisable to hold meetings in the vicinity of the U.N. Building (along the shore of the East River, between 42d and 48th Streets), near buildings of the permanent representations of various countries to the U.N. and, above all, the delegations to the U.N. of representations of Socialist countries (the representation of the U.S.S.R. to the United Nations is located at 680 Park Avenue), nor in the vicinity of large banks, jewelry stores, etc.

WASHINGTON DETAILS

In Washington, meetings should not be held in the central part of the city, where congressional buildings, the White House, departmental buildings, and other governmental offices, large banks, stores, and restaurants are located. Neither should they be held on the main streets of the city or in areas where foreign embassies and, especially, the embassies of the U.S.S.R. and other countries of the Socialist camp are located. Meetings should also not be held in areas near military objectives or in the Negro district.

Generally, an operation can be compromised through the improper selection of a meeting site. For example, an intelligence officer, who did not know the city well, once selected a meeting place with an agent on a street corner in the evening. A large bank stood on this corner.

The intelligence officer arrive for the meeting exactly at the appointed time. The agent was late. The intelligence officer was there for less than 2 minutes when a policeman approached, asked him what he was doing there, and requested him to move along. The intelligence officer had to leave quickly. In addition, two plainclothesmen followed him until he entered a subway station. The meeting was not held.

New York and Washington have numerous restaurants, many of them representing different nationalities. Each restaurant has its own distinctive characteristics. One may specialize in steaks (the most expensive steaks are sirloin and T-bone steak) another is seafood; some restaurants have orchestras, others have not. Before selecting a certain restaurant as a meeting site, one should learn everything about the restaurant; the system of service, the type of customers, whether it has a bad reputation with the police, etc.

It is the practice in all restaurants to tip the waitress 10 percent of the amount shown on the check.

Depending on the nature of the agent operation, the officer and agent may sit at the same table and hold the meeting during dinner. Or they may sit at separate tables, keeping only visual contact, for the purpose of exchanging prearranged signals.

AVOID THE PRESS

American stores periodically hold sales of their merchandise at lowered prices. At the beginning of the sale a large number of people usually gather at the store. In their efforts to advertise the sale, the proprietors invite newspaper photographers to the opening of the sale. To avoid being caught by the photographer's lens, our intelligence officers and members of their families should not visit the store during the beginning of the sale.

In New York there are no ticket collectors on the subway. The ticket office does not sell tickets but only metal tokens which cost 15 cents. In passing through the revolving gate at the entrance, the passenger inserts the token in a special slot.

An intelligence officer should always have several tokens with him, especially on the day of a meeting, so as not to waste any time in buying them at the subway entrance.

It is hard to imagine how agent communications would be conducted in New York without using the subway, which, despite its complexity, facilitates one's orientation in the city. It also affords a convenient place to check on the existence or absence of surveillance. In some cases, inadequate knowledge of the subway system has forced officers to cancel meetings with their agents.

Buses also operate without conductors. The driver allows the entrance and departure of passengers, makes change, and hands out transfers (at the request of the passenger). He gives change for bills but only up to $5. Thus the intelligence officer must always be certain that he has small change or $1 bills.

A taxi can be stopped anywhere; this is done merely by waving the hand or by loudly shouting. "Taxi" when an empty one passes.

The driver writes in his log the place a fare entered the taxi, the place he got out, and the time. Therefore, an intelligence officer must never take a taxi directly to the meeting place.

There are many companies in the United States which rent cars. Use of rented cars in the organization of agent communications is recommended, because this has a number of advantages. For instance, an intelligence officer can drive to the city in his own car, check for surveillance, and then leave it in a suitable area or in a parking lot. He can then complete his job in a rented car. This makes the work of the American counterintelligence service more difficult.

USE OF DEAD DROPS

Dead drops (i.e., hiding places where material can be left for prearranged pickups) are extensively used for communication within agent nets, or with individual agents.

Stationary dead drops are selected or specially prepared in parks and squares, in trees, in the ground, in fences, in benches, in monuments, in public buildings, and beyond populated places such as forests, fields, seashores, riverbanks, etc.

In selecting and preparing a "dead drop" in a park, one must bear in mind that a number of American parks (for example, Central Park in New York) have many squirrels which can destroy the "dead drop" (especially in hollow trees) and carry off our material.

The United States has up to 2,000 daily newspapers with a circulation of about 57 million and more than 7,000 magazines. Both newspapers and magazines give considerable space to advertisements and all kinds of announcements. Newspaper companies receive sizable profits from advertisements and announcements and therefore accept them very readily.

Advertisements published in American newspapers differ greatly in content and in length. The most common ones deal with the sale and rental of living quarters, the sale of personal effects, employment opportunities, announcements of weddings, divorces, births, and deaths, the loss of valuables and pets, etc. Below are several samples of advertisements which could be used in intelligence work. (Following samples appear in English.)

"POSITION WANTED

"Housework: Mature Colombian maid speaking a little English will give considerable care to children or invalid lady; do efficient general housework, $25–$30 per week. Exeter 4–0482, 7–10 p.m.

"DOMESTIC EMPLOYMENT

"Chauffeur, white—wanted. Age 35, married. 12 years experience. Intelligent, alert, neat. Fordham 4–7457 before noon."

"PUBLIC NOTICES AND COMMERCIAL NOTICES

"My wife, Jane Smith Doe, has left my bed and board. I am no longer responsible for her debts. John Doe, 17 Leslie Lane, Dobbs Ferry, N.Y."

One can see from these examples that many advertisements can be adapted quite easily to the transmittal of information. Among the code words which can be used are: the names or description of a lost article; a description of the circumstances; the place and time it was lost; the size of the reward for returning the valuable or pet; etc.

Illegal residences have a greater opportunity to make use of the press in arranging agent communications. Residences under cover may use the press on a lesser scale, primarily to transmit information or signals from agent to intelligence officer. On the whole, the United States presents favorable conditions for the use of the press for intelligence work.

A sum of money is paid to place an advertisement or some kind of announcement in the press. The text of these advertisements will contain a prearranged coded secret message.

A thorough study of the specific features of the country enables one to select the most natural signals. For example one of our intelligence officers called an agent for an introductory meeting by sending the newspaper Washington Daily News to his apartment. The intelligence officer went to the city, made a careful check, and then called the newspaper office from a public telephone and asked them to start delivery on the next day to the address he gave them (the agent's address). A week after delivery started, the agent appeared at the prearranged meeting place.

Radio communications provide the most rapid means for transmitting orders and instruction from the center.

Because of our distance from the United States, should the need arise, we can set up radio relay stations which can be located on ships, submarines, and aircraft. We also must not exclude the possibility that in the not too distant future we can install a radio station on an earth satellite.

In certain special situations, we might consider the possibility of getting a courier to the American mainland by submarine. It must be remembered, however, that the United States shore defenses are stronger than those of other countries of the American continent. Therefore one should not always attempt to land an agent directly in the United States. At times it is possible to send mail to a third country (for example, Mexico) and then deliver it overland to the

United States. Mail sent in this manner can be placed in the center's dead drops.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 12, 1965]

West's Spies Active, Wynne Hints

(By Flora Lewis)

NEW YORK, November 11.—The Englishman who was freed from a Moscow jail in exchange for Soviet Spy Gordon Lonsdale today indicated that there are top Western spies now functioning in the Soviet Union.

Greville Wynne, who served as contact for Western intelligence with Soviet State Security Col. Oleg Penkovsky, appeared at a press conference here to help launch the "Penkovsky Papers." The book, now being serialized in the Washington Post, is said to be Penkovsky's memoirs smuggled to the West before the writer was convicted of spying and executed in Russia.

Wynne was arrested in Hungary 10 days after Penkovsky was arrested in Moscow. The Englishman was taken to Russia immediately, tried, sentenced to 8 years in prison but sent home after 18 months in return for Lonsdale.

He spoke with ardent admiration for Penkovsky, whose main aim in providing valuable information to the West was "to prevent a war," Wynne said.

"There are other people like him," he said, "But, of course, you don't hear about them until they get caught."

Penkovsky "was in the holy of holies and he blew it sky high," Wynne said, describing his late friend's importance. "They (the Russians) haven't recovered yet and they won't for a long time." Wynne said he did not believe that Russians were aware of his own real role in the espionage link despite his prison interrogation and learned the story only when he came back and made public disclosures. He is writing his own book about the affair.

Lonsdale, now back in Russia has also published a book about his activities in the West. Wynne said this extraordinary change in Soviet policy against discussing Moscow's intelligence activities was almost certainly provoked by word that the "Penkovsky Papers" would be published.

Lonsdale's book naturally puts Soviet espionage in a good light while the "Penkovsky Papers" does exactly the opposite.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 12, 1965]

Penkovsky's Fellow Spy Hails His Service to West

(By Max Frankel)

Oleg V. Penkovsky's service to the capitalist world—considerable while he lived and still unfinished in death—reached a pecuniary culmination here yesterday.

The mysterious forces of espionage and the obvious forces of commerce joined to promote a book that purports to be the secret journal of Colonel Penkovsky, the West's best-placed Moscow spy in memory. Thus they produced yet another extraordinary chapter in an extraordinary but slippery tale.

With an expression of regret that the executed colonel was unfortunately "not with us," the publishers of the book, Doubleday & Co., presented the next best pitchman, Greville Wynne, just 19 months out of a Soviet jail for his contact work with Penkovsky in 1961 and 1962.

Mr. Wynne, whose dark hair and curled mustache make him look a little like the actor Terry-Thomas in repose, showed a certain flair for dramatic narrative but, so as not to spoil his own, as yet unwritten book, held back most of his own story of 7 years of business journeys in Communist Europe.

PENKOVSKY'S FEAT PRAISED

He was happy, however, to have flown the Atlantic to help drum up business for the Penkovsky papers, to be published Friday, because, he said, he wished to call attention to a courageous man, to his warning that the West must show strength to the Soviet Union and to the importance of their joint venture in espionage.

"If it hadn't been for Penkovsky, you would have had more than a blackout in this fine city," Mr. Wynne remarked. "Penkovsky saved a war, in my opinion."

The evidence for this judgment could not be drawn from Mr. Wynne or Frank Gibney, the papers' editor, except for vague suggestions that Penkovsky passed along very important information during a time of crisis in Germany and Cuba. The judgment greatly exceeds even the most generous appreciation of Penkovsky ever heard in Washington.

At a news conference in the Doubleday offices, Mr. Wynne also hinted that he had gone to Moscow with the express purpose of appraising Penkovsky after the colonel had twice tried to make contact with Western intelligence. Soviet efforts to recruit Mr. Wynne for espionage and Western efforts to make their contacts appear like a back-market conspiracy, at worst, also figured somehow in the story, Mr. Wynne suggested, but he kept plugging his own book whenever the interview threatened to become interesting.

Neither Mr. Wynne nor Mr. Gibney said enough to dispel the widespread doubts about the origin of the Penkovsky journal. It is said to have been smuggled out of Moscow just before the colonel's arrest October 22, 1962. Mr. Wynne said that, in more than 50 meetings with Penkovsky, the colonel never mentioned the secret diary by which he allegedly wanted one day to reveal and justify his treason to the world.

The book, called "The Penkovsky Papers," says nothing more about how it came to be published. "Penkovskiy" is a more literal rendering a final double vowel in Russion under a transliteration system preferred by the U.S. Government, including the Central Intelligence Agency.

Without necessarily questioning that Penkovsky was the author of most of the book's anti-Soviet information, speculation and gossip, many Soviet specialists in Washington doubt that he actually duplicated many of his reports to the West in a secret diary. Some officials believe that British and American intelligence services created the memoir from the record of their three interrogations of Penkovsky in London and Paris during his 16-month career as a spy.

The CIA is known to have checked the book for security, and, according to Mr. Gibney, "took out a few things, I assume." Mr. Gibney said he had obtained the papers already translated from Peter Deriabin, a defector from Soviet intelligence, whose present job and whereabouts are secret.

Mr. Gibney would not describe the original manuscript except to say that it consisted of several hundred pages, mostly typewritten, plus pictures of Penkovsky and photocopies of personal documents, including his Communist Party membership card, which appear in the book.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 14, 1965]

Soviet Foreign Ministry Protests Publication of Penkovsky Papers

The Soviet Foreign Ministry yesterday called in Stephen S. Rosenfeld, Moscow correspondent of the Washington Post, and protested this newspaper's publication of the Penkovsky Papers.

F. M. Simonov, deputy head of the Ministry's press department, read the following statement to Rosenfeld:

"The Washington Post began on October 31 the publication of so-called Penkovsky Papers. The claimed author is allegedly Penkovsky, who was condemned for espionage and high treason in 1963 for American and British intelligence services.

"The papers are a falsified story, a mixture of anti-Soviet inventions and slander which are put into the mouth of a demasked spy, provocatory claims whose purpose is to denigrate the Soviet Union, poison the international atmosphere, and make difficult a search for ways to improve relations between states.

"Publication of the Penkovsky Papers cannot be understood otherwise than as an intentional act in the spirit of the worst traditions of the cold war, which cannot but inflict damage on Soviet-American relations.

"The press department of the Foreign Ministry is authorized to invite the attention of the editorial board of the Washington Post to the provocative character of this publication. It is clear that responsibility for this is shared by anybody who has anything to do with the publication of the Penkovsky Papers.

"We expect that measures will be taken so that no articles and materials of such kind will be published in the Washington Post in the future."

In answer to a question, Simonov added:

"We shall pay attention not only to the continued publication (of the Penkovsky Papers) but to comments and articles in connection with it. We do not want to foretell events, but if publication continues we reserve the right for ourselves to take necessary measures."

The Washington Post on October 31 commenced publication of a syndicated version of "The Penkovsky Papers" distributed by Publishers Syndicate (The New York Herald Tribune-Chicago Sun Times). The final installment will appear as scheduled on Monday, November 15.

The excerpts from the papers have created much controversy among Soviet experts. The papers have been credited by Edward Crankshaw, writer on Soviet affairs for the London Observer, as being the authentic narrative and comment of one of the West's major intelligence sources. They are criticized for defects in translation and attacked as part forgery by Victor Zorza of the Manchester Guardian.

The first article of Zorza's critique of the papers will be printed in the Washington Post on Monday, as previously scheduled, and the second article on Tuesday.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 14, 1965]

The Penkovsky Papers

On Monday, the Washington Post will print, as scheduled, the concluding installment of syndicated excerpts from the book the "Penkovsky Papers." They have aroused a great deal of discussion among American and British experts on Soviet affairs with competent opinion divided as to the form in which the papers were released and as to the extent to which they were wholly in the words of Penkovsky. No one has challenged the essential point that Penkovsky was for a time a spectacularly successful intelligence source of the West.

It would not be conceivable that responsible newspapers in this country would suppress notice of a book of this significance in history or of such consequence in foreign affairs. The Washington Post, as one of the newspapers which have published excerpts from the papers, has unsuccessfully solicited criticism and comment on them from the Soviet Embassy and will publish Monday a critique by Victor Zorza of the Manchester Guardian, who doubts that the papers originated in the form in which they are presented in the book and who suspects the intrusion of material not originating with Penkovsky. No doubt this will long remain an interesting subject of conjecture and speculation, and the Washington Post will try to present opposing views as they appear.

The readers of this newspaper should know that the Washington Post's Moscow correspondent was summoned to the Soviet Foreign Ministry at 5 o'clock on Saturday afternoon and told that "we expect that measures will be taken so that no articles and materials of such kind will be published in the Washington Post in the future." He was further told that "if publication continues we reserve the right for ourselves to take necessary measures."

What those measures are we cannot know. They will not cause the Washington Post to alter its intent regarding this series of articles or any subsequent publication. We refuse to accept the inadmissible suggestion that this newspaper must not print material which the Soviet Government may find inacceptable.

It will fulfill its responsibilities as it sees them, whatever "necessary measures" of intimidation and censorship Moscow undertakes to prevent it. Newspapers in the United States, the Soviet Government should know by this time, are not to be told by governments, either foreign or domestic, what they must print or must not print.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 14, 1965]

CRANKSHAW ON PENKOVSKY

In his foreword to "The Penkovsky Papers" which you published with the first installment on October 21, Edward Crankshaw makes one peculiar assertion, namely that Col. Oleg Penkovsky was "in some measure unbalanced." He supports this contention with another sweeping assertion that "a man who will take it upon himself to betray his Government because he is uniquely convinced that he is right and it is wrong is by definition unbalanced."

Having thus laid a foundation for his argument, Mr. Crankshaw implies that Penkovsky's indictment of Khrushchev as a man actively preparing to launch a nuclear war is false because the presumably mentally disordered colonel of the Soviet military intelligence could not possibly "distinguish between government intentions and government precautions" and that he almost certainly "confused loose, menacing talk with tight-lipped calculation; contingency planning with purposive strategy."

The so far published summaries by Frank Gibney and excerpts from the book fail to give the faintest evidence that Oleg Penkovsky was in any way mentally unbalanced. Mr. Crankshaw's contention that anyone who betrays his Government because he is convinced that his Government is wrong "is by definition unbalanced" is ridiculous on the face of it. Whatever the British Kremlinologist might think of Benedict Arnold, the participants in the July 20, 1944, anti-Hitler plot, the Rosenbergs, Alger Hiss, Burgess and MacLean, Igor Gouzenko and the host of others, these men were not mentally sick either in the legal or clinical sense.

Another point is that Mr. Crankshaw—who does not for a moment question the authenticity of "The Penkovsky Papers"—presumes to know actual intentions of the Kremlin leadership better than a Soviet officer who directly and on a high level participated in the development of his Government's strategic moves.

In fact, the reason for Mr. Crankshaw's warning not to trust Penkovsky is transparent to those familiar with the tenor of his many writings: Penkovsky's revelations run contrary to that line of thought which Mr. Crankshaw represents and which stubbornly insists that the Soviet Government under Khrushchev genuinely wished to become friendly with the West.

With all due respect for Mr. Crankshaw's concern in preserving his reputation as a Soviet expert, one cannot escape the conclusion that the technique he chose to employ to that end—that of discrediting Penkovsky's testimony by implying that the man was essentially insane—serves no good purpose. It does not mean that "The Penkovsky Papers" should be accepted uncritically. But it does mean that any serious critical analysis of them must be based on a much more solid foundation than that laid by Edward Crankshaw.

K. L. LONDON,
V. PETROV,
Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, the George Washington University.
WASHINGTON.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 15, 1965]

A COMMUNICATION FROM PRESS DEPARTMENT OF THE SOVIET EMBASSY

Recently the Washington Post and some other American newspapers have started publishing the so-called Penkovsky Papers. The authorship of these papers is attributed to the person of Penkovskiy—the man who in May of 1963 was convicted in the U.S.S.R. of treason and espionage on behalf of the United States and British intelligence services.

In fact, the so-called Penkovsky Papers is nothing but a crude forgery cooked up 2 years after Penkovskiy's conviction by those whom the exposed spy served.

The authors of the papers stuffed them with stereotyped anti-Soviet insinuations. Using Penkovsky's name, they ascribe to the Soviet Union such concepts as, for instance, the concept of preventive war, which in reality is hatched by certain quarters in the West. The authors of the papers apparently assume that any sort of slander might be put into the traitor's mouth and that they could easily get away with that.

The provocative cooking entitled "The Penkovsky Papers" no doubt deserves serious analysis. This is not the first case of publishing slanderous stuff about the U.S.S.R. and it has the only purpose—to smear the Soviet Union, to poison international atmosphere, to hinder the search for ways of improving relations between nations.

The publication of the "Penkovsky Papers" is to be regarded as nothing but a premeditated act in the worst traditions of the cold war. Such actions cannot but damage the interests of the development of friendly relations between the American and the Soviet peoples. And if those who are directly or indirectly associated with the publication of the papers pretend that they do not understand it, they only reveal the insincerity of their statements about their desire to improve relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 15, 1965]

ON SEVERAL FRONTS—PENKOVSKY DISPUTE CONTINUES TO BOIL

The Washington Post today concludes publication of the "Penkovsky Papers" around which has swirled much controversy as to their source and authenticity.

The Soviet Union on Saturday protested the publication. In addition, a letter to the editor of the Washington Post from the Soviet Embassy, printed today on page A21, calls the papers "a crude forgery cooked up 2 years after Penkovsky's conviction by those whom the exposed spy served."

The Washington Post also is printing, on page A22, the first of two articles by Victor Zorza, Soviet affairs expert of the Manchester Guardian, analyzing the papers. He writes that "the book itself contains the evidence showing certain parts of it to be a forgery even though other sections of the book are evidently made up of intelligence information provided by Penkovsky long before his arrest."

Last month Zorza had written Vladimir E. Semichastny, chairman of the Soviet State Security Committee, asking for evidence to support the charge that the papers were forgeries. On Saturday an official from the Soviet Embassy in London asked to meet Zorza and declared that the book is "a fabrication from beginning to end."

Zorza said the official gave only one piece of evidence—an inconsistency of dates. At one point Penkovsky had said that recruitment of Communist Party members in the West for work with Soviet intelligence had resumed in 1956–57. At another point it said this occurred in 1960.

Officials at the Central Intelligence Agency, whose agents dealt with and interrogated Penkovsky before his arrest, say that they read the papers only to determine whether their publication would compromise intelligence sources. They refuse to pass judgment for the press on authenticity.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 15, 1965]

PENKOVSKY PAPERS STIR SOVIET PROTEST

WASHINGTON, November 14.—The Soviet Embassy, through its press department, issued a statement tonight attacking the Penkovsky papers.

The statement was handed to several news bureaus here. It was in the form of a communication to the editor of the Washington Post, which the Embassy noted, along with other U.S. newspapers had been publishing the so-called Penkovsky papers.

The statement said that authorship of the papers was attributed to "the person of Penkovsky—the man who in May of 1963 was convicted in the U.S.S.R. of treason and espionage on behalf of the United States and British intelligence services." Col. Oleg V. Penkovsky was arrested in October 1962 and was executed after conviction.

The Soviet Embassy statement also said:

"In fact, the so-called Penkovsky papers is nothing but a crude forgery cooked up, 2 years after Penkovsky's conviction, by those whom the exposed spy had served. * * *

"This is not the first case of publishing slanderous stuff about the U.S.S.R. and it has the only purpose—to smear the Soviet Union, to poison the international atmosphere, to hinder the search for ways of improving relations between nations.

"The publication of the Penkovsky papers is to be regarded as nothing but a premeditated act in the worst traditions of the cold war. Such actions cannot but damage the interests of the development of friendly relations between the American and the Soviet peoples."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 15, 1965]

SOVIET EXPERT THINKS PENKOVSKY PAPERS ARE A FORGERY

(By Victor Zorza)

LONDON.—"Their authenticity," say the introduction to the "Penkovsky Papers," the memoirs of the Anglo-American spy in Russia, "is beyond question." It is not.

Indeed, the book itself contains the evidence showing certain parts of it to be a forgery, even though other sections of the book are evidently made up of intelligence information provided by Penkovsky before his arrest.

But the book does not, in fact, claim to be made up of Penkovsky's intelligence reports to the West. On the contrary, it is said to be quite distinct from them, and to consist of notes, sketches and comments accumulated by him during his spying career in 1961–62 and smuggled out of the Soviet Union only in the autumn of 1962, at the time of his arrest. It is said that Penkovsky hoped that they might eventually be published to clarify his motives and to clear his name beyond question. It is curious that a work with so noble a purpose should include so much purely military and political intelligence.

THE LOWDOWN

Much of the book seems calculated to show the Soviet system in the worst possible light, but this would be consistent with Penkovsky's attempt to justify his defection. It is even possible to stretch this interpretation to explain the "lowdown"—and it really is low—on the sexual mores, the drunkenness and cupidity of some of the people he knew in the higher ranks of the political, military and intelligence quarters. "I have absolutely no intention of defaming the marshals and generals," he says, after giving some particularly choice details.

He adds that he had "intentionally omitted the subject of moral degradation and drunkenness"—which he had not. "I know one thing for sure, though: all our generals have mistresses, and some have two or more." All? For sure?

It is conceivable that Western intelligence organizations might have been interested in the peccadilloes of members of the Soviet General Staff, just as Soviet intelligence would be interested in their Western opposite numbers, and that Penkovsky thought it right to supply this information. But he would hardly write it all down for posterity.

INTELLIGENCE FEAT

The introduction says that the extent and ingenuity of Penkovsky's work add up perhaps to the most extraordinary intelligence feat of this century. If there is no Soviet spy now working at an even higher level in the West, then this claim may well be valid. Much of the intelligence information reproduced in the book is obviously genuine.

Western government experts revealed their knowledge of it some time ago in the course of discussion about Soviet affairs. Penkovsky's information about the ignominious failure of Khrushchev's "secret weapon," which blew up on the launching pad, enabled the Western leaders to treat Soviet threats and boasts with composure. Penkovsky's information about Khrushchev's plans during the German crisis of 1961 enabled the West to make the dispositions which warded off the Soviet threat to Berlin.

Penkovsky sent reports on the bickering over the building up of the Soviet missile force, favored by Khrushchev, and the maintenance of adequate conventional forces, favored by the marshals.

DISPUTE IN KREMLIN

This gave Western intelligence analysts the clues that helped them to study between the lines of the Soviet press the most important political dispute that raged in the Soviet leadership in recent years—on the allocation of resources between civilian and military needs, within the military field itself.

This contributed greatly to the Western governments' understanding of the factors that caused the fall of Khrushchev, even though this occurred some 2 years after Penkovsky's arrest.

For some months before the Cuban missile crisis, Penkovsky and his Western masters knew that he was being watched by Soviet counterintelligence. He could therefore neither acquire nor send any intelligence on what was to prove the most fateful confrontation between East and West, and suggestions that he was asked to report on Soviet operations in Cuba just before the crisis would appear to be without foundation. Yet paradoxically, his contribution was probably decisive.

He had sent out, earlier, details of the deployment pattern of Soviet missiles. This enabled U.S. air reconnaissance experts to identify the missile sites at an early stage of construction. The early warning made it possible for President Kennedy to make in secret the preparations that played so major a part in his later management of the crisis, and in compelling Khrushchev to withdraw.

LACK OF TIME

The most important part of the information he sent out consisted of some 5,000 photographs of documents, sketches, etc., taken with a miniature camera. Yet we are asked to believe that this highly professional and valuable spy added to the great risks he was already running by keeping a detailed account of his activities and views, virtually every page of which contained enough secret information to send him straight to the firing squad.

In the foreword we are told that "throughout the period during which Penkovsky was turning over information to the West, he sat up night after night composing a journal." Yet in a passage that has the ring of truth Penkovsky himself makes it clear that this is just what he could not do. He has to write hurriedly, he says, "for the simple lack of time and space."

When he writes at night in his two-room flat he disturbs his family's sleep: typing is very noisy. During the day he is always busy, "running like a madman," in a typically Russian phrase, between the offices of his two employers, the Committee for the Coordination of Scientific Research, and the Military Intelligence Headquarters. His evenings are generally occupied, nor can he write while visiting his friends in the country. "Someone may always ask what I am doing." At home, at least, "I have a hiding place in my desk." On his own showing, he is hardly likely to have produced in these circumstances the manuscript of what is now a sizable book.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY QUESTIONED

The description of his domestic circumstances comes from Penkovsky's autobiographical outline, of a kind that any intelligence service would require from a prospective spy, so that it could check his credentials before employing him.

Penkovsky passed a paper of this kind to an American Embassy official in Moscow, together with an offer of his service, but this was not taken up because it was thought that he had been put up to it by Soviet counterintelligence. Only 6 months later, when he made another approach to the British, was his offer accepted.

But even the autobiography is not wholly genuine. The description of Penkovsky's own war service is woven into a three-page potted history of the war in Russia. A man of Penkovsky's intelligence would not have thought it necessary to waste his time on supplying this kind of "background."

A Western compiler of the Penkovsky papers, on the other hand, might have thought it useful to provide the wide readership of the book with a historical sketch that would have made Penkovsky's war career more meaningful.

KHRUSHCHEV IN UKRAINE

However, it is not safe to sketch in the background without being familiar with the details of which it is composed. Penkovsky spent the last 2 years before the war in a military school and then in an artillery unit in the Ukraine, to which he was posted as a political officer.

On one occasion the unit was visited by a number of Soviet military leaders, whom Penkovsky recognized, but there was one person "whom I had never seen before." He was told later that this was a certain N. S. Khrushchev. Yet for the past 2 years Khrushchev had been the first secretary of the Ukrainian Party, carrying out a ruthless and bloody purge, feared and hated by all—the virtual master of the Ukraine, the "Little Stalin," with his picture frequently displayed in public places and in the newspapers which would have been obligatory reading for an aspiring political officer.

No doubt the account of the incident was inserted into the papers to make them appear more authentic, but the result, as happens so often when enthusiasm outruns good judgment, is the opposite of what was intended.

There is much tedious repetition which is hardly accounted for by the explanation that the papers are arranged with little attempt at order and none at literary style. That this is so is painfully obvious, but it still does not explain why the book should contain several accounts of Khrushchev's intended strategy for the Berlin confrontation, all more or less the same, and two of them separated by only one page—a curious waste of time and space by one so short of both.

Nor can these be the written reports sent out by Penkovsky at the time, re-edited, and put together in a book. He was clearly much too intelligent and efficient a spy to waste his efforts on writing down laboriously, in minute detail, and repetitively, the views, impressions and facts which would have sufficed in much shorter outline.

Yet sometimes the book arouses the reader's curiosity, only to frustrate it with lack of detail. The introduction makes for Penkovsky the claim that among the "thousands of pieces of information" swept up by him was "the exact planned dimensions of the Berlin wall."

RESPONSE TO WALL

If true this is very important, for it may cause trouble between Washington and London on the one hand, and Berlin on the other—something that the compilers of the book can hardly have intended.

It has always been assumed that the slow and fumbling nature of the Western response to the wall was due in large measure to the lack of any warning. Even so, the West German Government has not wholly forgiven its allies for the indecision they displayed at that time.

But had Penkovsky told them? In the text, he is made to say that "I learned about the Berlin wall 4 days before the Soviet Government actually closed it off." Yet the account of his travels given in the book, and the record of his trial, makes it clear that "4 days before" that date Penkovsky was still in London, on one of those extended duty trips on which he took time off from shepherding Soviet delegations—the official reasons for his visits to the West—to spend long hours with the special Anglo-American team of four intelligence officers who used every available minute to milk him of any information he might have.

UNLIKELY ANSWERS

In the extremely unlikely event that he had learned about the Berlin wall while still in London, would he have gone back to Moscow and reported later to his masters that he had known about the wall 4 days in advance? Why would he do that—to show them after the event how well-informed he was?

Or, it the book is a genuine collection of notes he kept in Moscow, would he simply have made a bald statement of fact like that, almost conversationally, and then gone on with his discussion of Khrushchev's tactics on Berlin? Neither explanation seems credible, and no other offers itself. The only logical answer is that the words attributed to Penkovsky were written by someone else—unless this was a remark he made in one of his subsequent conversations with a member of the Anglo-American team, who took it down, filed it, and it was then seen and used by the compiler of the papers.

Indeed, the style of the memoirs is often discursive, verbose, almost conversational—the very opposite of what one would expect from a man writing in Penkovsky's difficult circumstances. At one point, when discussing Soviet military maneuvers, he is made to ask, "What is the point of these exercises"—and then proceeds to give a detailed reply.

Would he really write like that, whether in an intelligence report or in his memoirs? Or was it perhaps, a question put to Penkovsky by one of his interrogators, and then, inadvertently, allowed to remain in the edited transcript of the conversation that might have formed the basis of this passage in the book?

The conversational origin of a number of passages is betrayed in similar ways, thus giving the lie to the claim that the book is made up of Penkovsky's written notes. This, however, does not mean that the book as a whole may be regarded as a genuine edited transcript of Penkovsky's conversations with Western intelligence officers. There are many other passages, and sometimes whole sections, which betray the alien hand—or tongue.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 16, 1965]

Soviet Expert Doubts Validity of Controversial Papers—Usage in Penkovsky Said To Prove Forgery

(By Victor Zorza)

LONDON.—So far as can be established, the Russian manuscript of Penkovsky's memoirs just does not exist.

When news of the imminent publication of the Penkovsky Papers was reported in the world press, the American publishers of the book were inundated with requests for permission to serialize the story in newspapers and to publish it in foreign languages.

Among these requests was one from a small Russian emigre publishing house in West Germany. All it could offer was $250. This was accepted without any haggling, since all the proceeds from the book are to go to the Penkovsky Foundation, formed in the United States for this purpose.

That the American publishers had accepted the book for publication in good faith is shown by their willingness to procure the Russian text for the emigre publishing house. But after several weeks and repeated requests to the Penkovsky Foundation, the Russian text has not been made available, and it looks as if it never will be.

On Monday, the Russian emigre publisher made a telephone call from Frankfurt to Doubleday, the New York publishers, to get the final answer which had been promised for the beginning of this week. He was told by R. E. Banker, for Doubleday, that they were still unable to provide a Russian text. However, they were prepared to let the Russian publisher go ahead—if he was prepared to retranslate the Penkovsky text from English back into Russian. As for the Russian "original," Banker said, they had twice asked the State Department about it, but were still not able to provide it.

STRANGE PHRASES

The English text is peppered with words and phrases that no man with Penkovsky's Soviet background would use. He is made to refer repeatedly to Soviet Russians or to Soviets in describing his countrymen. These terms would sound as strange in Russian as United States Americans or British Englishman would sound in ordinary English usage.

These are not mistakes in translation, but they arise from ignorance of Soviet terminology. The stock Soviet phrase for the kind of political deviation for which Marshal Zhukov, the Defense Minister, was purged in 1957, is "Bonapartist tendencies." Yet Penkovsky is made to report Khrushchev as saying that Marshal Zhukov was displaying Napoleonic characteristics. No translator would depart so far from the original. But if the remark was inserted in English by someone writing sometime after he had read an account of the Zhukov affair, a faulty memory for phrases might have easily led him to use the associated but, incorrect, term.

Penkovsky is made to illustrate the change in Sino-Soviet relations by remarking that the phrase "great China" has now been replaced in official terminology by unadorned "China." However, the official usage was never "great China"—it was "the great Chinese people."

Penkovsky is made to refer to a high party official as an "R.S.F.S.R. Communist Party leader"—a phrase that would never be used by a Soviet official, who would know that the R.S.F.S.R.—the initials of the Russian Republic—has no Communist Party distinct from the Soviet Party. One of the chapters begins with a reference by Penkovsky to his recent trip to "Europe"—although a Russian returning to Moscow would speak of a visit to the "West." But the reference to a trip to "Europe" would have come naturally to an American compiler of the papers.

Among Penkovsky's many unlikely digressions, his excursion into the history of the party appears particularly improbable—and factually wrong. He provides a long list of party leaders over the years who, as successive editions of the party history went to press, were purged and described variously as enemies of the people, traitors, and imperialist hirelings. This is an exercise beloved by anti-Communist propagandists, and figures in many of their tracts. But a true professional would never make the mistake of listing Marshal Zhukov as "Khrushchev's enemy"—a phrase that would never be used in an official Soviet textbook. Penkovsky would certainly have known it to be wrong.

MEANINGLESS TITLES

In listing the official functions of high Soviet officers, he often describes them as "deputies of the Supreme Soviet"—a meaningless dignity on which the good spy that he was would not waste his breath. However, a Western compiler might well have taken these and other details from any good reference book, just to fill out the picture for the inexpert reader.

Penkovsky is made to show his indignation at Khrushchev's recklessness in 1961 in testing a 50-megaton bomb which he describes as having a yield of 80 and, elsewhere, of 100 megatons—although the accurate measurements taken by Western experts have put it at under 60 megatons. Similarly, he reports that several Soviet launches of manned sputniks took the lives of their crews. In fact, all Russian launchings have been monitored by Western radio and radar tracking devices which would have revealed beyond any doubt, through the nature of the communications passing between the satellite and the base, the presence of a human being aboard. Western experts have repeatedly dismissed this particular rumor.

CONFUSION OVER EVENTS

The report attributed to Penkovsky that Marshal Chuikov, the commander in chief of the ground forces, was dismissed from this post in 1961 and appointed chief of civil defense is wrong. It is true that he got the civil defense job at that time, but he continued as the commander of the ground forces—and the Soviet military press referred to him repeatedly as such.

It was only in 1964 that he lost this post, nearly 2 years after Penkovsky's arrest. It would appear that someone compiling the "papers" more recently has confused the two events and dates, making Penkovsky report something that occurred after he was executed in 1963. Similar confusion is evident in Penkovsky's references to the removal by Khrushchev in 1957 of the antiparty group of Molotov, Malenkov, and Bulganin—although Bulganin remained Prime Minister until 1958, without at first being charged with membership in the group.

Virtually the whole section on the Soviet military doctrine appears to have been written by a Western pen. It is here that the references to "Soviets" and "Soviet Russians" are most obtrusive. Penkovsky is made to explain that he had sent out the full text of the "special collection" on military doctrine to the West—and at the same time to go on for pages on end, giving long quotations from it.

Would Penkovsky really have bothered to write out long passages from a publication which he had photographed and dispatched to his Western masters? This whole section, and a number of others in the book, is accompanied by repeated warnings from Penkovsky about the Soviet determination to acquire a first-strike posture, and to launch a surprise nuclear attack on the West.

The chapter on strategy is made the main vehicle for the message, and the long quotations from the "Special Collection" are designed to give it an air of authority. But the impression is false, for General Gastilovich, on whose contribution the compiler relies to drive the first strike lesson home, was strongly contradicted by equally authoritative contributors to the "Special Collection." But the Penkovsky Papers give no hint of this.

UNDOUBTED FORGERY

General Kurochkin, a respected Soviet strategist, went so far as to describe some of the more extreme views as anti-Marxist. This is the chapter that can be described without any hesitation as forged. The compiler of the book adds insult to injury by making Penkovsky say that "I am sorry that I cannot copy here the entire 'Special Collection' "—or is it, perhaps, a private joke inserted for the entertainment of the compiler's colleagues? The use—or misuse—of the "Special Collection" in this way is a great pity. Its publication in full would have added greatly to the understanding of Soviet strategy among students in the West. But there is now reason to fear that the account given in the papers will prevent the full publication which would inevitably show up the imbalance of the Penkovsky book.

It may be that some of the errors pinpointed in this article are not necessarily evidence of forgery, but the cumulative weight of the evidence is too great to support any other interpretation.

WORK OF CIA

The book could have been compiled only by the Central Intelligence Agency. No other organization in the West, apart from British Intelligence, and certainly no individual, could have had access to the information of which the book is made up. British Intelligence officers did at one time entertain the idea of building Penkovsky up posthumously as something of a hero, but permission to proceed was withheld.

The CIA has been repeatedly stung and provoked by the attempts of the Disinformation Department of the Soviet intelligence organization to discredit its activities throughout the world. The "Penkovsky Papers" are the CIA's answer. But in psychological warfare of this kind the intelligence agencies of the democratic countries suffer from the grave disadvantage that in attempting to damage the adversary they must also deceive their own public. It is the function of a free press to uncover such deception. Some of my best friends are in the CIA, but if they want their psychological warfare efforts to remain undiscovered, they must do better than this.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 17, 1965]

Gibney Defends Penkovsky Papers

On two separate occasions the Soviet Government has attacked the authorship and the authenticity of "The Penkovsky Papers." Both the Soviet Foreign Ministry and the press department of the Soviet Embassy in Washington have commented predictably.

Such terms as "anti-Soviet invention and slander," "provocative character," and "crude forgery" are commonplace in most efforts of the Soviet regime to discredit anyone who disagrees with it. It is typical of this approach that the Washington Post and other newspapers running the papers were threatened by unspecified forms of Soviet retaliation, if publication continued.

Actually, there is no better evidence of the papers' honesty, accuracy and authenticity than this loud, almost unprecedented protest from Moscow. As I said in the introduction to the papers, the continuing power of state security apparatus over Soviet citizens is the greatest problem in the way of any real rapprochement between the West and the Russians.

Penkovsky felt this strongly himself, as the papers reveal. The sharp protest of the Moscow leadership suggests that his arrow struck home.

A further charge of "forgery"—or partial forgery, if I interpret his article correctly—was made by Victor Zorza, of the Manchester Guardian. His comment relies on conjectures about what Penkovsky would or should have done. It abounds in phrases like "would hardly write," "it is curious that," "it is conceivable that," or "he is hardly likely to have produced."

This is understandable. I am sure that if Mr. Zorza had been in Colonel Penkovsky's shoes, he would have behaved differently; and if a panel of Western Soviet experts had written the papers for Penkovsky, they would have undoubtedly written them differently. The fact is that Colonel Penkovsky was very much his own man. He was a zealot and an individualist who lived with risk and whose desire to have his views known drove him to take even more risks.

Mr. Zorza does have one point of factual criticism, which he interpreted incorrectly, however. He asserts that the acocunt of Colonel Penkovsky's movements which I gave in my introduction to the papers and "the record of his trial" show that he was in London on August 9, 1961, the day he found out about the proposed erection of the Berlin wall. Mr. Zorza understandably questions why Penkovsky did not warn his Western contacts then about the building of the wall, since he had free access to them in London. From this he somehow concludes that "The Penkovsky Papers" are not genuine.

I owe him and other readers an apology for this confusion. In the process of editing, I incorrectly gave the date for Penkovsky's arrival in Moscow at that time as August 10, 1961. Actually, it was August 8—and I have since asked the publisher to correct this error in subsequent editions.

If Mr. Zorza rereads the October 1963 transcript of Penkovsky's Soviet trial—one of the principal sources of this book—he will discover that the correct date was August 8. Hence, Penkovsky was in Moscow at the time he found out about the Berlin wall—and unable to communicate immediately with the West.

Mr. Zorza points out that Penkovsky's writings were often discursive, verbose, almost conversational. I am sure any expert on Russian-English translation would have his own pet way of rendering them into English—just as Mr. Deriabin, the translator, and I have ours. But this discursiveness hardly detracts from their authenticity.

On the contrary, I deliberately held all editing down to an absolute minimum. Neither Mr. Deriabin nor I felt we had the right to add any literary or factual embellishments to the words of a brave man, who wanted to get his own language out to the world.

FRANK GIBNEY.

NEW YORK CITY.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 18, 1965]

His Greatest Service—Penkovsky Unmasked Three Soviet Spies in West

(By Don Cook)

PARIS, November 17.—Whatever the value of the spy papers of Col. Oleg Penkovsky, or even their validity, which is being questioned by some experts on Soviet affairs, his greatest service to the West was the unmasking of key Russian agents in Paris, London, and Stockholm.

The three most important espionage cases in the West in the last 5 years were all broken by counterintelligence services on the basis of information passed to Britain and the United States by Penkovsky. The cases involved:

Georges Paques, a senior French civil servant who spied for the Russians in the Ministry of National Defense and later in NATO headquarters in Paris. He was caught and sentenced to life imprisonment in July of 1964.

Col. Stig Wennerstrom of the Swedish Army, who spied for the Russians in the Swedish Defense Ministry and also while serving as Swedish military attaché in Washington. He was caught and sentenced to life imprisonment in July 1963, at about the same time that Penkovsky went on trial in Moscow with his British contact, Greville Wynne.

William J. C. Vassall, a senior clerk in the British Admiralty, who had been recruited by the Russians through homosexual blackmail during a tour of duty in Moscow. He was apprehended and sentenced to 18 years in prison in September 1962.

Penkovsky did not finger these Russian agents directly. But he did pass to the British and American intelligence services information that enabled them to trap the three spies.

A Penkovsky speciality was sending the identity numbers on Western documents that were reaching the Russians. The identity numbers were sufficient to start the counterintelligence search for the spies in the West who were passing the documents to Soviet intelligence.

In the case of the British Admiralty documents and the Swedish Defense Ministry documents, the work of isolating Vassall and Wennerstrom went fairly rapidly. But the apprehension of Georges Paques was more complicated and took more time.

Partly this was because many hundreds of documents had to be sifted and checked. Partly it was because the French counterintelligence services, which are highly effective, do not as a rule respond very swiftly to information provided from American or British sources.

In the end, the break in the Paques case came as a result of the assiduous espionage the Frenchman had done. Paques served from 1958 to 1962 in the private office of French Defense Minister Pierre Messmer. He later became chief press officer at NATO with a "cosmic top secret" clearance, NATO's highest security classification.

Among the document identity numbers Penkovsky sent to the West was one with a very unusual and limited classification. It was a French NATO standing group document—in other words, a French position paper prepared for the NATO military standing group in Washington. When the French checked on the document, they discovered that it was the draft of a French position that eventually was altered and renumbered before it was actually submitted to the standing group.

The document, therefore, had received very limited circulation. It had been prepared in Washington by the French element on the standing group and sent to Paris for clearance at the Ministry of Defense. Only six persons signed for it at the Ministry when it was discussed, altered and sent back to Washington. One of these was Georges Paques.

Had Paques limited his activities to general Ministry of Defense documents or NATO documents, with much wider circulation, it might have taken months to narrow the search. But in the brief period of approximately 36 hours in which that particular French standing group document was in Paris for clearance, he took it home, photographed it and returned it to its proper place next day.

When the French identified the document on the basis of the number transmitted from Moscow to the British and Americans by Penkovsky, they immediately put a 24-hour tail on each of the six who had signed for it—including the Minister of Defense. In about 10 days, Paques was seen in contact with a member of the Soviet Embassy staff in Paris whom the French knew to be a KGB agent.

His arrest followed swiftly, and he confessed promptly. At his trial, he testified in words reminiscent of some of the Penkovsky papers that he spied for Russia because he felt that it would help preserve peace if the Russians were fully informed of NATO plans.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 19, 1965]

Penkovsky Papers Defended

As the translator of "The Penkovsky Papers," I would like to make some comments on Victor Zorza's review. I do not want to get involved in polemics with Mr. Zorza, whose previous work I have admired. I know, better than anyone, that the papers are genuine, but I also know that there is no way to prove this to the satisfaction of those determined to degrade Penkovsky's legacy as the Soviets sought to degrade Penkovsky.

I find it surprising that Mr. Zorza has made up his mind that "the Russian manuscript of the Penkovsky memoirs just does not exist" simply because I do not wish to release it in its original form. The published format is as true to Penkovsky's notes as it could be, even though Mr. Gibney and I inevitably had to translate, select, and edit them for publication. I will not, however, reveal how the papers came to me.

Let me cite details from Mr. Zorza's critique. He says that "the English text is prepared with words and phrases no man with Penkovsky's Soviet background would use," i.e. he cites the terms "Soviet Russians" or "Soviets" in describing his countrymen. Mr. Zorza's quotes are in English, thus they are my translations. But Penkovsky clearly distinguished between the Russian people and the Soviet regime. In the papers, Penkovsky used a variety of terms: "Soviet citizens," "the Soviet people," "Russians," etc. In translating I used the term "Soviet Russian" or "Soviet" for purposes of simplicity and consistency.

Penkovsky referred to Marshal Zhukov's removal because of his "Napoleonic characteristics." Mr. Zorza thinks that this should read "Bonapartist tendencies" and concludes that "no translator would depart so far from the original." The exact Russian term used by Penkovsky was "Khrushchev ego ubral za napoleonovskiye zamashki." Colonel Penkovsky evidently knew Bonaparte's first name and preferred to use the term "napoleonovskiye zamashki."

Mr. Zorza also finds fault with the expression "Great China." Obviously, Penkovsky was not writing an editorial for Pravda. "Velikiy Kitay" was what he wrote and that's how I translated it.

In Mr. Zorza's opinion no Soviet official would refer to a high party official as an RSFSR Communist Party leader. Colonel Penkovsky was well aware that there is no separate Communist Party of the RSFSR. The Russian original of the line on page 207 is, however, "tak nazyvayemyy partiynyy vozhd RSFSR."

With regard to Penkovsky's statement that several Soviet cosmonauts had lost their lives, I can only repeat that I merely translated what Penkovsky wrote—that some of them lost their lives.

About Marshal Chuykov: Mr. Zorza is correct in saying that Penkovsky was in error when he wrote that Chuykov was relieved of his duties when he took over the civilian defense command. However, I have simply translated what he wrote.

With regard to the antiparty group: again I simply translated what Penkovsky wrote. It is the Kremlinologist who is concerned with precision in the matter of dates of ousters; for Penkovsky, as for most Soviet citizens, it was apparently of little importance that Bulganin managed to hang on until 1958.

Mr. Zorza shows a lack of knowledge of the everyday Soviet language when he claims that a "Russian returning to Moscow would speak of a visit to the West, not to Europe." Penkovsky wrote "Yevropa" which means "Europe." Soviet intelligence officers do not normally talk of their travels to European countries as to "the West"; they refer to "Yevropa" or the country which they visited.

As far as the 50-80-100 megaton bomb is concerned, Penkovsky was apparently not in a position to measure the bomb's yield as accurately as Western experts or Mr. Zorza. If Western experts wrote "The Penkovsky Papers," as Mr. Zorza seems to believe, why did they not use the correct figures?

PETER DERIABIN.

New York City.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 21, 1965]

PENKOVSKY'S SPY-CATCHING ROLE DENIED

Reports that Col. Oleg Penkovsky supplied materials that led to the detection and arrest of the Swedish master spy, Col. Stig Wennerstrom, are flatly denied by sources close to the case.

Wennerstrom reportedly first came under suspicion in 1959—2 years before Penkovsky started assisting the West.

The Swedish officer had served as air attaché in Moscow and Washington before returning to the Defense Ministry and Foreign Ministry in Stockholm.

Arrested in June 1963, he was sentenced last year to life imprisonment. He could be released after 10 years and it is understood that he, too, is writing his memoirs.

PENKOVSKY PROTEST

In another development, the State Department disclosed yesterday that it has received a protest from the Soviet Union about publication of papers attributed to Penkovsky. He became a spy for the West in 1961 and was later caught and executed.

The Penkovsky papers were serialized in newspapers, including the Washington Post and are now out in book form.

A State Department spokesman said that Soviet Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin expressed concern last Monday in a talk with Russian affairs expert Llewellyn E. Thompson.

Later, the spokesman said, Thompson replied that the Government "had no responsibility in the matter."

CIA CONCOCTION

In the first report on the Penkovsky papers in the Russian press, the Communist Party newspaper Pravda referred to them yesterday as "another anti-Soviet concoction of the American Central Intelligence Agency and apparently of its British associates."

While not further explaining what was in the papers, Pravda said that "this fabrication does not deserve analysis."

A Moscow dispatch from the Washington Post's Stephen Rosenfeld said the bulk of the article was devoted to unflattering reflections on the character of Greville Wynne, the British businessman convicted with Penkovsky and later exchanged for Gordon Lonsdale, a Soviet spy caught in England.

Last week, a news story from Paris linked the work of Penkovsky with the uncovering of three Westerners spying for the Soviet Union. These were listed as:

Wennerstrom; George Paques, a senior French civil servant who worked in NATO, and William J. C. Vassall, a British Admiralty clerk. Other sources have denied that information furnished by Penkovsky led to the apprehension of any of the three.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 20, 1965]

PENKOVSKY BOOK SCORED BY SOVIET—ANTI-RUSSIAN PAPERS CALLED CONCOCTION OF CIA

MOSCOW, November 20.—Soviet authorities, apparently embarrassed by the publication in the West of "The Penkovsky Papers," are strongly denouncing the controversial book as a forgery of the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States.

The papers, published this month in London and New York, are a compilation of anti-Soviet information, speculation, and gossip purported to have been supplied to Western intelligence agencies by Oleg V. Penkovsky, who was executed by the Russians in 1963 as a spy for the West.

Pravda, the Communist Party newspaper, described the volume today as the "latest anti-Soviet concoction of the CIA and evidently its British associates."

In an article by V. Golubov, the newspaper said the book "does not deserve analysis," and added: "It has been compiled so crudely that self-respecting British newspapers at very first glance could not but expose its authors."

Pravda went on to quote from British press comment that cast doubt on the authenticity of the alleged memoir.

DERIABIN CITED

Soviet sources have suggested privately that the book, even if based in part on intelligence supplied by Penkovsky to the West, was embroidered with information already in the hands of Western agencies.

It was noted that a Soviet defector, Peter S. Deriabin, was identified as the translator of material from the Russian-language original that allegedly was used in the volume.

Mr. Deriabin, a former official in the Okhrana, the secret service responsible for guarding Soviet leaders, has refused to make the Russian manuscript public and has declined to say how it came into his possession.

In testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, made public in March 1959, Mr. Deriabin gave a detailed view of what he described as the high living of Soviet leaders. A large amount of material on the private lives of the Kremlin leaders is also contained in "The Penkovsky Papers."

According to reports from Washington, the CIA said its representatives had read the book to guard against "security violations," but the Agency disclaimed responsibility for publication and refused to vouch for the papers' accuracy.

WYNNE IS DENOUNCED

The Soviet denunciations of "The Penkovsky Papers" have also been directed against Greville M. Wynne, a British businessman who was Penkovsky's codefendant at a partly public trial in Moscow 2 years ago. Wynne allegedly was Penkovsky's principal Western contact.

Wynne was sentenced to 8 years in jail but was released in April 1964 in exchange for Gordon A. Lonsdale, who had been convicted as a Soviet spy in Britain. Pravda alluded to the exchange today by saying Wynne had been freed under certain circumstances.

Lonsdale's purported memoirs, titled "Spy," were published last month in London.

Pravda assailed Wynne for promoting "The Penkovsky Papers" by holding widely publicized news conferences in London and New York.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 21, 1965]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: HOW JAMES BOND GOT STARTED

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—"Any fiction spy story you have ever read pales in comparison with Oleg Penkovsky's dramatic account of his extraordinary personal adventure," says the advertisement of an American best seller. Simultaneously, English readers are offered memoirs called "Spy" by a Soviet agent known in London as Gordon Lonsdale until his arrest for espionage and really named Konon Trofimovitch Molody. Molody-Lonsdale was subsequently exchanged for Greville Wynne, a British associate of Penkovsky imprisoned in the U.S.S.R. Wynne has not yet published a book.

A CIA PRODUCT?

Victor Zorza, the (Manchester) Guardian's Kremlinologist, believes "The Penkovsky Papers" are not wholly genuine. He contends no Russian text has been produced and the English version is peppered with words and phrases no man with Penkovsky's Soviet background would use. Zorza adduces errors in dates and facts, asserting much of Penkovsky's memoir must have been written "by a Western pen." He concludes: "The book could have been compiled only by the Central Intelligence Agency."

The genesis of Penkovsky's papers seems valid but whether part of the work is fake cannot be judged. Whatever its origin, the work provides juicy reading and embarrasses Moscow just as Lonsdale's possibly spurious work embarrasses Washington. Penkovsky was undoubtedly an efficient Western agent in the Soviet hierarchy where his boss was Kosygin's son-in-law. After Penkovsky's arrest in 1962, almost 300 Soviet intelligence officers were recalled as intelligence networks were overhauled.

SPIES, FORGERIES, AND FAKES

The period since World War II has been gaudy with spies, forgeries, and fakes. Indeed some spies have been widely publicized—like Col. Rudolf Abel, traded for U-2 Pilot Gary Powers; Lonsdale; Ivan Egorov, a Soviet official in the U.N.; Giuseppe Martelli, an Italian who spied for Moscow in hollow-heeled shoes; Burgess, Maclean, and Philby, who skipped to Russia when their cover wore thin.

Yet intelligence services don't limit themselves to ferreting out secrets; they calumniate each other whenever possible. Moscow's KGB has its disinformation section with a subsidiary branch in East Germany that disseminates false papers. Some of these have included crude documents bearing U.S. Cabinet or CIA signatures.

Four years ago the CIA claimed it had uncovered 32 such forgeries in 4 years. British counterintelligence is equally alert. Some documents are sold and others merely given to naive newspapers.

The befuddled public derives particular entertainment from the cold war's fake literary productions. Among these Prof. Paul W. Blackstock of the University of South Carolina lists: the purported diary of Maxim Litvinov, late Soviet Foreign Minister; the strategic thesis of Marshal Bulganin; memoirs of General Vlassov, who organized an army of Russian prisoners for Hitler and was later hanged; and two volumes of fascinating recollections by a nonexistent nephew of Stalin, Budu Svanidze.

Excellent works in this category—including those of Litvinov and "Svanidze"—were apparently manufactured in Paris by the literary artel of a refugee Soviet diplomat named Grigori Bessedovsky. In 1929 Bessedovsky, then counselor at the Russian Embassy in Paris, sought political asylum.

WRITTEN FOR IDIOTS

According to Blackstock, Bessedovsky, a gentleman of talent and imagination, once wrote a fellow emigré from Poland: "Sir, I write books for idiots. Do you imagine that anyone in the West would read what you call my apocryphal works if, in quoting Kaganovich, Zhukov, Mikoyan or Bulganin, I tried to be faithful to the manner, sense and form of their speeches?

"But when I portray Stalin or Molotov in pajamas, when I tell the dirtiest possible stories about them—never mind whether they are true or invented—rest assured that not only all intellectuals will read me, but also the most important capitalist statesman, on his way to a peace conference, will pick up my book before going to sleep in his pullman. Allah has given money to the stupid in order that the intelligent can live easily."

Facts, fiction, half-truths and distortions are mixed together in the strange game played by competing intelligence services and ambitious entrepreneurs. When an American military attaché in Moscow lost his diary, Russian security officials published it with falsified inserts such as: "War. As soon as possible. Now.

SOME EXPERTS FOOLED

Among amateur factories, Bessedovsky's ranks high. He fooled some of the most pretentious Kremlinologists. Even General Bedell Smith, former U.S. Ambassador to Moscow and CIA boss, was persuaded to write an "introductory note" for the highly suspect Litvinov "memoirs."

Penkovsky and Molody may be genuine authors but, at any rate, the late Ian Fleming had many unannounced anonymous cold war competitors. Like Fleming's works, they are pleasant bedside reading.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 23, 1965]

Around the World: Wife of Penkovsky Is Reported To Doubt He Authored Papers

Moscow.—The wife of Col. Oleg Penkovsky was reported yesterday as saying she did not believe her husband, executed in 1963 for spying for the West, could have authored "The Penkovsky Papers." The papers, serialized by the Washington Post, have been denounced by Soviet news media as CIA forgeries.

Mrs. Vera Penkovsky told Viktor Louis, a Soviet citizen who works for a London daily newspaper, that her husband was lazy about writing, never kept a diary, and typed laboriously with one finger. Mrs. Penkovsky still lives in the apartment she shared with her husband and works as a French-language translator. Her 65-year-old mother-in-law and her two daughters live with her.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1965]

Anti-Soviet Campaign Charged—Russia Expels Post Correspondent Over "Penkovsky Papers" Series

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The Soviet Union yesterday ordered the closing of the Moscow bureau of the Washington Post and the expulsion of this newspaper's correspondent, Stephen S. Rosenfeld, because of the publication of "The Penkovsky Papers."

Rosenfeld, 33, was given 7 days to leave with his wife, Barbara, and their two children, David, 16 months old, and Rebecca, born in Moscow 3 months ago. He opened the Washington Post's bureau there on November 12, 1964.

Rosenfeld was called to the Foreign Ministry's press department at noon and was read a statement charging that the Washington Post had engaged in "an anti-Soviet campaign" around "The Penkovsky Papers" and that it had refused to halt their publication after a warning on November 13.

Oleg Penkovsky was a Soviet colonel executed by his government for serving as a spy for the West. The papers, serialized to newspapers from a just published book, purport to be his diary smuggled out of the Soviet Union. There has been considerable controversy as to the paper's authenticity but the value of Penkovsky's work for the West was acknowledged at his trial.

An editorial in the Washington Post today states that Rosenfeld's expulsion is a deplorable exercise of arbitrary power and an attempt by the Soviet Government "to impose on the press of other countries, by treating the correspondents from these countries as virtual hostages, a control and dictation to which no reputable newspaper can submit."

The editorial also terms "a remarkable hallucination" the charge that the newspaper had launched a "campaign" against the Soviet Union, adding that it "will not be plunged" into any "campaign of denigration" because of the expulsion.

Rosenfeld is the third American correspondent to be expelled from Russia this year. American officials view the action as part of the hardening Soviet attitude toward the United States over the war in Vietnam, an attitude not unrelated to the bitter Chinese Communist charges that Moscow has not acted firmly enough on the Communist side in that conflict.

It also was felt here that one chapter of "The Penkovsky Papers," commenting unfavorably on personal habits of high Soviet officials and officers, was particularly offensive to Moscow, which has always been highly sensitive about such criticism.

The most recent correspondent expelled this year was Sam Jaffe, of the American Broadcasting Co., who was ordered out in September because of a report by ABC's Washington diplomatic correspondent on possible changes in the Kremlin. Adam Clymer of the Baltimore Sun was expelled last February after being accused of striking a Soviet policeman during a demonstration by Asian students in Moscow outside the U.S. Embassy protesting American policy in Vietnam.

A Newsweek correspondent was expelled in 1962, a National Broadcasting Co. reporter was ordered out in 1963 and Time magazine's Moscow bureau was closed in 1964. Newsweek and NBC have since been allowed to reopen their bureaus.

Here is the chronology of the current case:

The Washington Post began publication of the Penkovsky Papers on October 31. The last of 14 installments ran on November 15. On November 2 it was reported to this newspaper that Soviet Embassy officials were saying the papers were a forgery. A Washington Post representative called on Embassy Counselor Alexander I. Zinchuk, by appointment, the following day to ask any proof of the accusation. Zinchuk was told that the Washington Post would publish any such proof. His reply was that he would look into it and he asked and was told how long the series would run.

On November 5, at the Embassy's national day party, a representative of the newspaper was told by another Soviet official that he expected "a strong reaction" to the publication very shortly. He was told that the Washington Post would publish the reaction.

The reaction did not come until November 13. On that day Rosenfeld was called to the Foreign Ministry's press department in Moscow. F. M. Simonov, a department deputy, read him a statement describing the "Penkovsky Papers" as a falsified story, a mixture of anti-Soviet inventions and slander and stating that their publication "cannot be considered otherwise than as an intentional act in the spirit of the worst traditions of the cold war."

Simonov said the press department was "authorized to invite the attention of the editorial board of the Washington Post to the provocative character of this publication," adding that "we expect that measures will be taken so that no articles and materials of such a kind will be published in the Washington Post in the future."

Simonov added to this threat by saying that "if publication continues we reserve the right for ourselves to take necessary measures." The text of the complaint was published in the Washington Post the next day.

The same day it commented editorially that it would complete publication of the papers, adding that "we refuse to accept the inadmissible suggestion that this newspaper must not print material which the Soviet Government may find unacceptable."

On November 15 the newspaper published a communication from the Embassy's press department condemning the papers as a forgery and a scar on the Soviet Union. It also published, as previously scheduled, the first of two articles by Victor Zorza, Soviet specialist of the Manchester Guardian, analyzing the papers. He questioned their authenticity and suggested they had been written in part by the Central Intelligence Agency.

On November 18, Rosenfeld was told by a Soviet friend in Moscow that a decision had been taken to expel him. He also was told that the Central Committee of the Communist Party had given the Foreign Ministry permission to threaten Rosenfeld with expulsion unless the Washington Post ceased publication of the papers.

UNDER PARTY PRESSURE

After the newspaper ran the two concluding articles, the Central Committee was reported to have asked the Foreign Ministry why it had not expelled Rosenfeld. The informant said that the Ministry would have liked to forget the affair but that it was under Communist Party pressure and so agreed to the expulsion.

It was reported here in Washington to the Post that the Embassy had recommended expulsion. Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin formally protested publication of the papers to the State Department, and in London the Soviet Ambassador called at the Foreign Office to complain about publication of the Penkovsky Papers in Britain. The London Observer serialized the papers as did more than 30 papers in the United States and elsewhere.

Then yesterday Rosenfeld was again called to the Soviet Foreign Ministry's press department to be read the following statement by deputy chief Pyatisnev:

"On November 13 you were asked to the press department and the attention of the editorial board of the Washington Post was invited to the provocative character of the publication of the anti-Soviet entitled the so-called Penkovsky Papers.

"In our statement we pointed out that these so-called papers were a coarse fraud, a mixture of provocative invention and anti-Soviet slander. Publication of these notes in the Washington Post cannot be considered other than as premeditated action in the worst traditions of the cold war, which cannot but harm Soviet-American relations.

DEMAND REJECTED

"In a statement the press department expressed the hope that measures would be taken so that no such articles and materials of this kind would appear in this newspaper in the future. Despite that * * * the Washington Post continued to publish the notes and other material which popularized this fraud.

"Considering such a position of the editorial board of your newspaper, which continued an anti-Soviet campaign around the so-called Penkovsky Papers, the press department is authorized to state that your future stay in the Soviet Union as correspondent of the Washington Post is undesirable and it is proposed that you leave the territory of the Soviet Union."

Pyatisnev, after reading the prepared statement, told Rosenfeld that "we would like to add that this measure is not directed against you personally but was made necessary by actions of the editorial board of your newspaper."

Rosenfeld asked how much time he had to leave. Pyatisnev inquired as to how much time he would need. When Rosenfeld suggested 2 or 3 weeks, Pyatisnev replied that he could have 5 to 7 days. They agreed on 7.

Tass, the Soviet news agency, then made public the action. It included the statement that the papers "are an obvious forgery, fabricated by the U.S. intelligence service which the exposed spy had served."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1965]

PENKOVSKY REGRETS

The decision of the Government of the Soviet Union to close the Moscow Bureau of the Washington Post and to expel this newspaper's correspondent in reprisal for the publication of the Penkovsky Papers is a deplorable exercise of arbitrary power.

It is to be regretted on many counts. Chiefly it is to be regretted because it indicates that the short-lived relaxation following the death of Stalin has indeed proved to be a reversible process. Instead of loosening the rigorous and inhibiting control of its own writers, the Soviet Government now attempts to impose upon the press of other countries, by treating correspondents from these countries as virtual hostages, a control and dictation to which no reputable newspaper can submit.

This decision also is to be regretted because it will diminish the access of the readers of the Washington Post and of other newspapers in which Stephen Rosenfeld's objective accounts have appeared, of his lucid reporting. (It is to be noted that the Soviet Government has specifically declared Mr. Rosenfeld in no way to blame for this act of reprisal against the Washington Post.)

The Soviet action also is to be regretted because this drastic course seems to be premised upon the erroneous notion that the Washington Post has launched a campaign against the Soviet Union. That is a remarkable hallucination, but probably one that is inevitable in rulers who have grown so accustomed to utter immunity to internal criticism that any reproach appears to them to take on the aspects of deliberate persecution.

The Washington Post published excerpts from the Penkovsky Papers, which were distributed to it as a conventional syndicated newspaper feature, just as did more than 30 other newspapers. The publishing company (Doubleday) that produced the book is a responsible firm. The editor of the papers (Frank Gibney) is a man of sound reputation. We have no reason to believe, and no one has produced evidence to show, that the published matter did not represent the views and opinions of Penkovsky.

In conformity with the best prevailing American newspaper practice, the Washington Post also published attacks on the views of Penkovsky and on the authenticity of the papers, including the criticisms by the Soviet Embassy in Washington. It proposes to deal in the same way with interesting and significant material about the Soviet Union that may come to hand in the future, but it is not in the midst of any campaign of denigration aimed at the Soviet Union and will not be plunged into one by this misguided effort at press coercion by Soviet officials.

The Soviet Government's action, also, is to be regretted, because it is bound to result in future interruptions and obstructions to a flow of information between the two countries that already is frighteningly disproportionate to their need to know more of each other. American newspapers inclined to establish correspondents in the Soviet Union will be made hesitant by the knowledge that the Communist government there not only asserts the right to obstruct, censor, and punish the correspondent for acts of his own, but also reserves the right to take reprisal against him for publications in which he is not at all involved.

There also will be a strong impulse in many governmental quarters in the United States to imitate the reactionary notions of press freedom that possessed the Soviet Government. We hope that this impulse will be resisted, because not a single Soviet correspondent would remain in America if the United States embraced this theory of reprisal in order to punish Soviet publications for the ceaseless flow of libel and slander about this country that is daily fare in the Soviet press.

Many as are the regrets over this incident, the Washington Post, for all the inconveniences and unhappy consequences, cannot regret its refusal to bow to the demands of the Soviet Government that it suspend publication of the installments of the Penkovsky papers still unpublished when Soviet officials first threatened reprisal. No free and responsible newspaper in this country could submit to such imperious dictation by any government.

The repressive policies of the Soviet Union are not going to alter the principles of the free press in this country; but we hope that, in time, the survival of the Government of the United States, despite the continuous and unrelenting criticisms by the press, may persuade the Soviet Union to abandon its paranoiac and lunatic apprehension that every unfriendly printed word is an assault upon the foundation of the regime. Perhaps, on that happy day, the Washington Post will be able again to establish a bureau in Moscow. Until then it will cheerfully rely upon the excellent services that previously provided it with coverage of the Soviet Union.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 26, 1965]

MOSCOW EXPELS A U.S. REPORTER—RETALIATES FOR WASHINGTON POST'S PENKOVSKY SERIES

Moscow, November 25.—The Soviet Union today ordered the expulsion of the Washington Post's Moscow correspondent in retaliation for the newspaper's refusal to cease publication of the purported memoirs of Oleg V. Penkovsky, a convicted Soviet spy.

The Foreign Ministry accused the editorial board of the Post of conducting an anti-Soviet campaign in publishing the Penkovsky Papers, a "premeditated action in the worst traditions of the cold war which cannot but harm Soviet-American relations."

Stephen Rosenfeld, correspondent here since the Washington Post opened its bureau a year ago, was summoned to the Foreign Ministry to receive the expulsion order. He was given 7 days to leave the country.

The U.S. Embassy expressed regret at the Soviet move. A spokesman said no official protest was planned since such representations were not considered likely to reverse the decision.

THIRD EXPULSION THIS YEAR

Mr. Rosenfeld is the third American correspondent to be expelled this year. The representative of the Baltimore Sun, Adam Clymer, was ordered to leave in February. He was charged with having struck a policeman during an anti-American student demonstration.

In September, Sam Jaffe, the American Broadcasting Co.'s correspondent, was expelled because of a news report originating in the network's Washington bureau that a shakeup in the Kremlin leadership was imminent.

As in Mr. Jaffe's case, the Foreign Ministry made it clear that the action against Mr. Rosenfeld was not directed against the correspondent personally for anything he had reported under a Moscow dateline.

It was rather a punitive action—apparently the most direct one open to the Soviet Government—aimed at the newspaper.

"The Penkovsky Papers," published as a book in London and New York this month, are random notes critical of the leadership of former Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev. They allegedly disclose details of the operations of Soviet intelligence organizations.

The publishers described the material as the informal comments of Mr. Penkovsky, smuggled out of the Soviet Union shortly before he was convicted as a spy for the West and shot in 1963. The name is spelled in the book with a literal rendering of the Russian final vowel.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 3, 1965]

PENKOVSKY REACTION

I share your regrets over the obtuseness of the Soviet authorities in matters pertaining to freedom of the press. Obviously, you are under no obligation to show a correct point of view and are even perfectly at liberty to print anything that fills the empty spaces between chuck roast ads. However, it is regrettable that the expulsion of your able and amiable Moscow correspondent should have resulted from the publication of so unworthy material as "The Penkovsky Papers."

At best, the papers are worthless as a source of insight into Soviet intentions; at worst, they tend to arouse the suspicions of the Soviet authorities that the timing of the publication was "not accidental."

The issue is not really the authenticity of the papers (although I personally consider them, on the internal evidence of the text, a rather substandard forgery or a doctored version of oral remarks by Penkovsky recorded on tape by his London contacts).

The business of spies is to forward factual information and leave analysis to others. As Edward Crankshaw so ably pointed out in the remarks which you used as a scanty figleaf for the papers, Penkovsky confused capabilities with intentions, a cardinal sin in intelligence analysis. The papers also confuse contingency reasoning with evidence of planning. It is interesting and important to know that there exists somewhere in Moscow a staff paper arguing the merits of surprise attack or preventive war or bacteriological warfare. Such contingency papers are produced by the dozens in Washington and elsewhere and they are the legitimate province of strategic military thinking. But it is the business of political analysts to assign to them the exact weight they deserve.

The publication of the papers comes at a time when the Soviet Union is in an extremely delicate position with respect to the outside world, pressured by the Chinese as virtually a lackey of Wall Street and at the same time charged with responsibility for real or imaginary disturbances in places far removed from Moscow's influence. It takes little to generate in the minds of the Soviet leaders the notion that someone was trying deliberately to complicate still further the otherwise delicate relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

It would, of course, be of help if the Soviet leaders or their advisers knew more about the free-wheeling habits of the American publishing industry. At the very least, the customary delay between the acceptance of a manuscript and its actual appearance in print should seriously impair the "curious timing" theory. On the other hand, once the editors of the Washington Post have digested their indignation, they might take some time to ponder this friendly suggestion: The publication of drivel, while admittedly a matter of right—is not the best way of discharging the precious responsibilities of a free press.

SAMUEL L. SHARP,
Professor of International Relations, American University.
WASHINGTON.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 4, 1965]

Expelled Newsman Back in the United States

New York, December 3.—Stephen S. Rosenfeld, expelled Moscow correspondent of the Washington Post, said on his arrival today at Kennedy Airport that the Russians apparently regard foreign correspondents as "hostages" for the performances of the organization they represent.

If a newspaper or a network does something the Russians don't like "the correspondent is the hostage and out he goes," Rosenfeld said, adding:

"It's a silly idea and they (the Russians) don't seem to learn. They don't have a free press themselves and by using foreign correspondents as hostages they attempt to control the foreign press, but of course they can't."

Rosenfeld was given 7 days to leave Russia after he was asked to have his newspaper halt the publication of the last 2 installments of a series of 14 from "The Penkovsky Papers," reputedly the notes of Col. Oleg Penkovsky, a Soviet intelligence officer executed for spying for the West.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 26, 1965]

Penkovsky's Role: A British Review

(The Times literary supplement)

Not so long ago "banned in Boston" used to be one of the most valuable puffs a book could earn. "Protested against in Downing Street" is less promising in one respect, but Messrs. Collins (British publishers of the Penkovsky papers) must be profoundly grateful for the publicity which the Soviet Government has given to a book which, by reason of a rather scrappy composition and alien subject, might otherwise not have received the attention it richly deserves.

But for the opportune diplomatic intervention many people might have remained under the impression, which was pretty general at the time of the trial in May 1963, that Penkovsky was a mere accessory to the case against the British businessman, Greville Wynne, framed to justify the latter's kidnaping in Hungary. This book reveals the real seriousness of the affair. The trial and conviction of Penkovsky was to the Soviet Establishment as damaging a blow as was the Hiss case to America. The repercussions were of seismic intensity.

It is precisely because Penkovsky was so highly placed that these papers are of such interest * * *. From a material point of view Penkovsky was thoroughly well off and to all appearances an efficient and convinced member of the ruling class when he voluntarily got in touch with British Intelligence and during a short run of 16 months handed over to them more than 5,000 items of information of political, military and economic matters (the figures come from the indictment at this trial) * * *. What were his motives?

At the trial he was made out to be a dissolute playboy. The usual antisemitic overtones were also brought in. The importance of his position was minimized, though scarcely consistently with the details of the indictment, and this is still the official line. From the Communist point of view it is difficult to see why this should be found necessary: after all, nothing in the history of treachery can equal the record of the Russian ruling class since the revolution, if the official version is to be believed.

Why should it be surprising that a colonel should be in touch for 16 months with British Intelligence when the faithful are still required to believe that Beria, a marshal of the Soviet Union, was a paid employee of the same service for 36 years, from 1917 to 1953? Perhaps it is the difference between truth and official truth that calls for concealment on the Government's part; and his realization of the same difference clearly inspired Penkovsky to make sure the reason for his action were recorded.

His first motive was revulsion against the organization of Soviet society. The disillusioned aristocrat is a well-known phenomenon in all regimes based on privilege. Penkovsky thought it shocking that while he was being entertained by his friend Marshal Varentsov at a table collapsing with food, "salmon, fish in aspic, sprats, cheese, 10 different kinds of sausage, over 50 bottles of vodka and cognac, champagne, cakes, pastry, ice cream and so on," people in Voronezh were queueing for horsemeat. He was scandalized by the behavior of some of his fellow aristocrats, their dissolute private lives, their immunity from the law.

His second motive was fear of nuclear war. He evidently hated and distrusted Khrushchev—there may have been something personal in this—and seriously believed that he was an adventurer. After the removal of Zhukov, for whom many Russian officers had a high respect, it appeared to Penkovsky that Khrushchev was surrounded only by military yes-men. He reproduces extracts from theoretical military studies which show a dangerous indifference to the possibility of world destruction.

It may well be, as Mr. Edward Crankshaw says in a sympathetic and entertaining foreword, that Penkovsky confused contingency planning with purposeful strategy, but he was close to the source of danger, and he believed it real.

The book is made up partly of documents attributed to Penkovsky himself and partly of a connecting narrative. American editing and adaptation have been responsible for attracting some attacks on the authenticity of the former, unjustified except possibly in matters of detail; certain verbal infelicities may be attributable to the same cause. Some have also found it inconceivable that Penkovsky could have committed so much to paper; but it is clear from the evidence of the book and of the trial that he was madly reckless, and his record of success shows him skilled at directing material in bulk to the correct address. As a whole, what is presented here has the stamp of genuineness.

[From Parade Magazine section, the Washington Post, Jan. 9, 1966]

Question. In "The Penkovsky Papers," allegedly the diary of a Russian agent who defected, there is a statement to the effect that Yekaterina Furtseva, the Soviet Minister of Culture, was Khrushchev's mistress. Is there any truth to that statement? Is there any truth to the book? Penkovsky must have been a stupid secret agent to keep a diary.—Allen James, New York, N.Y.

Answer. Penkovsky probably never kept a diary. Intelligence agents suggest that the book consists of transcribed reports from tape recordings he made for British Intelligence and the CIA. Khrushchev and Furtseva were close friends, but she was never his mistress.

THE UNPRECEDENTED SUPPORT FOR A WAR AGAINST WANT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, at the opening of this session of Congress I am gratified to report to the Senate the remarkably widespread support expressed during the congressional recess for revision and expansion of our food-for-peace effort into an international food program that will close the world food gap. Many thoughtful people see such a program, as I do, as an opportunity to reduce hunger in the world while opening up new production and income benefits to the American farmer and our economy as a whole.

Before I report further concerning the reaction which has been pouring into my office concerning this proposal for the last few months, I should like to digress for a moment to congratulate President Johnson on what I regard as a superb state of the Union message. It was a message of peace and progress for our country.

I was especially pleased with the President's call for a "maximum attack," as he called it, on hunger and disease and ignorance in the world.

The President's vigorous espousal of a "worldwide attack" on human hunger and misery has my strong support. I believe that is the kind of war that most Americans want our Nation to wage. It is the kind of war that will win unanimous and enthusiastic support across this land.

Near the end of the previous session of Congress, on September 23, 1965, I addressed the Senate in regard to my proposed International Food and Nutrition Act, embodied in S. 2157, describing a war against want on this planet as "the most important war."

Since that time I have had a very large, steady volume of mail from all over the United States, and from foreign lands, about it, or requesting copies of the bill. The demand and the interest has not diminished over a period now of nearly 4 months.

It has been a very gratifying experience, for I have a deep personal belief that we must do our utmost to end starvation and malnutrition on this planet, and that growing population makes it urgent that we start at once to balance population and food supplies. Letters, resolutions, articles, and editorial endorsements reflect an unprecedented degree of support for a stepped-up war against hunger.

Support for a world food program comes from all of the major farm organizations, the National Farmers Union, the Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Farmers Organization. I mention them first because Members of Congress are aware that agreement among them is rare indeed. They will differ on some of the details of an international effort, but they are agreed on the basic proposition that America should use more of her productive capacity and her highly advanced knowledge of food production to help to end malnutrition on this planet.

Our major church organizations have given strong support. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the cooperatives, our labor organizations are affirmative and favorable.

Groups representing women as professional people, as voters, as consumers, as mothers, and as citizens are in the army of supporters of our expanded world food effort.

The university community, engineers, doctors, bankers, agri-business, merchants, industrialists, and labor leaders have all assured me of their support.

Unquestionably, the extensive national press coverage of the subject which has occurred, including several United Press and Associated Press articles, major treatment in the news magazines and farm papers, radio and TV, as well as many favorable editorials, has stimulated the unusually extensive mail and the endorsements which have come to my attention.

It is reported that the President has before him an administrative interagency task force report on world food policy which may lead soon to recommendations by the President to the Congress when he feels it appropriate. Administration officials have shown a growing support for U.S. food assistance on helping the developing countries make their own agriculture most productive, and on improving the nutritional quality of foods we supply other nations.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record a few significant newspaper and magazine articles, and editorials—a cross section of the materials which my office has received in recent weeks—for the information of the Members. I have selected about a dozen articles which have had national impact, and a dozen editorials more or less at random from among the many which have been sent to me.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a list of sponsors of a new World Food Crisis Committee. The nine-page list of people who offered to serve as sponsors of the committee prior to the organizational meeting on December 9, indicates the breadth of support for an adequate world food effort by our country. I understand that many more have gone on the list since the December 9 meeting here in Washington.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Sponsors of the Committee on the World Food Crisis Through December 7, 1965

R. L. Clodius, vice president, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Pat DuBois, president, First State Bank, Sauk Centre, Minn.

Clifford R. Hope, Box 1093, Garden City, Kans.

Rev. Lonzinas Jankus, executive director, United Lithuanian Relief, 105 Grand Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Carl J. Megel, American Federation of Teachers, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

William E. Moran, Jr., dean, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Jacob S. Potofsky, general president Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.

Arthur Rosenstock, president, American Newspaper Guild of D.C., 390 East 153d Street, New York, N.Y.

H. A. Schneider, general secretary and treasurer, American Federation of Grain Millers, 4949 Olson Memorial Highway, Minneapolis, Minn.

Alvin Shapiro, executive vice president, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Paul H. Tidwell, manager, Meriwether-Lewis Electric Co-op, 114 North Central Avenue, Centerville, Tenn.

Jerry Voorhis, Cooperative League of U.S.A., 59 East Van Buren, Chicago, Ill.

Harold Russell, chairman, the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Washington, D.C.

Brooks Hays, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

Dr. Grace A. Goldsmith, professor of medicine, Tulane University School of Medicine, 1430 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La.

Edmund G. Brown, Governor of California, Sacramento, Calif.

C. C. Murray, dean and coordinator, College of Agriculture, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.

Edward F. Snyder, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 2d Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Spielman, dean and director, College of Agriculture, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.

Oliver S. Willham, president, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla.

Glen Leet, executive director, Save the Children Federation, Boston Post Road, Norwalk, Conn.

Flemmie P. Kittrell, Department of Home Economics, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

E. W. Aiton, director, Extension Service, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

N. C. Brady, director of research, New York State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

F. P. Longeway, Jr., executive director, National Fisheries Institute, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Louis McLean, secretary, Velsicol Chemical Corporation, 341 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

Mrs. Olya Margolin, National Council of Jewish Women, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 924, Washington, D.C.

Karl F. Rolvaag, Governor of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.

Parke C. Brinkley, president, National Agriculture Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Robert L. Bull, director, Food Business Institute, University of Delaware.

Marion S. Monk, president, The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Batchelor, La.

Rev. Frederick A. McGuire, C.M., executive secretary-Mission Secretariat, 1212 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. and Mrs. Hubert W. Baker, president, Soybean Growers of America, P.O. Box 276, Mount Zion, Ill.

Jack R. Smith, president, Rice Millers' Association, 1048 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

J. P. Gaines, executive vice president, Rice Millers' Association, 1048 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Teymuraz K. Bagration, Tolstoy Foundation, Inc., 989 Eighth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Frank Beck, Tippecanoe Press, 14 West Hendricks, Shelbyville, Ind.

R. C. Bacote, Box 191, Moucks Corner, S.C.

Hayes Beall, 103 West Greenfield, Avenue, Lombard, Ill.

Norman J. Baugher, 1451 Dundee Avenue, Elgin, Ill.

Charles F. Brannan, (former Secretary of Agriculture), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

Homer L. Brinkley, 6551 Brooks Place, Falls Church, Va.

Mrs. Maurice H. Brown, 612 North 18th Street, Box 3348, Waco, Tex.

Mrs. Sidney Burkland, McVille, N. Dak.

Jacob Clayman, administrative director, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Howard A. Cowden, 908 Commerce Trust Building, Kansas City, Mo.

Edwin Christianson, 1275 University Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.

W. L. Davis, Route 1, Box 66, Kress, Tex.

Elmer Ellis, president, Missouri State University, Columbia, Mo.

Judson, Fiebiger, 820 Locust Street, Des Moines, Iowa

O. Henry Engendorff, commissioner of agriculture, Department of Agriculture, State of Wyoming, Cheyenne, Wyo.

Arthur S. Flemming, president, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg.

Mrs. Daisy S. George, 952 East 223d Street, Bronx, N.Y.

Mrs. Velma Good, 608 7th Avenue, North, Great Falls, Mont.

J. Peter Grace, 7 Hanover Square, New York, N.Y.

Harold K. Hill, 414 Franklin Avenue, Madison, Wis.

Mrs. Robert C. Hoagland, 907 Waynoka, Hastings, Nebr.

Clyde T. Jarvis, Montana Farmers Union News, Post Office Box 2447, Great Falls, Mont.

R. L. Johansen, 1667 North Snillers Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.

Frank W. Johnson, Route 1, Box 27, Emmett, N. Dak.

Mrs. William C. Johnston, Jr., 3065 University Terrace NW., Washington, D.C.

Harold E. Jones, Director, Extension Division—Umberger Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans.

Marvin Jones, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C.

Robert E. Jones, Unitarian Universalist Association, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Frank Lassey, Cartwright, N. Dak.

Benson, Y. Landis, 124 Bramball Road, Dearsdale, N.Y.

Arthur S. Link, Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

C. J. McCormick, Rural Route 4, Vincennes, Ind.

Wiley F. Martin, Center Star Route 4, Russellville, Ky.

Robert N. Mason, Rocky Mountain Farmers Union, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

William E. Morgan, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.

Harry R. Poole, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.

H. Wayne Pritchard, Executive Secretary, Soil Conservation Society of America, 7516 NE. Ankeng Road, Ankeng, Iowa.

Ben H. Radcliffe, P.O. Box 1388, Huron, S. Dak.

William V. Rawlings, Capron, Va.

Walter P. Reuther, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

Prof. John E. Ross, 101 Agriculture Hall, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

P. W. Seitz, P.O. Box 2927, Fort Wayne, Ind.

J. S. Thisttethwaite, R.D. No. 1, Jefferson, Pa.

Granville Turner. Route 2. Toney, Ala.

Jessie S. Tuttle, Castle Dale, Utah.

Bishop W. J. Walls, A.M.E. Zion Church, 4736 South Parkway, Chicago, Ill.

Everett White, State senator, Russellville, Ky.

Leland Wilson, Church of the Brethren, 1451 Dundee Avenue, Elgin, Ill.

William C. Wise, Esq., 615 Perpetual Building, Washington, D.C.

George A. Zeigler, 310 Upper College Terrace, Frederick, Md.

Oscar W. Zetter, 2818 Bosworth Lane, Bowie, Md.

Jack Beidler, legislative director, Industrial Union Department AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Henry T. Blewer, 476 Exchange Street, Rochester, N.Y.

Leonard Kenfield, 819 19th Street, South, Great Falls, Mont.

Pat J. Nash, Co-operative Marketing Association, 740 Board of Trade Building, Kansas City, Mo.

Barney Hopkins, 716 Lothrop, Detroit, Mich.

Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, 2027 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Rabbi Israel Miller, 2619 Davidson Avenue, Bronx, N.Y.

J. Elliott Corbett, Methodist Church, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE., Washington, D.C.

Lucian W. Hills, R.D. No. 1, Wayland, N.Y.

Phil Campbell, commissioner, Department of Agriculture, Capitol Square, Atlanta, Ga.

Reverend William Crittenden, DD., LL.D., Bishop of Erie, Ward Diocesan House, 329 West Sixth Street, Erie, Pa.

James Milholland, Jr., president, Home State Farm Publications, Inc., 9800 Detroit Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

M. D. Mobley, executive secretary, American Vocational Association, Inc., 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

John Perryman, executive director, American School Food Service Association, Post Office Box 10095, Denver, Colo.

James D. Taylor, executive secretary, South Dakota Association of Cooperatives, Post Office Box 102, Huron, S. Dak.

J. C. Turner, president, Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, 1311 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Kenneth W. Fitzgerald, editor, Oregon-Washington Farmers Union, Box 94, Tolovana Park, Salem, Oreg.

Norman E. Olsen, Canton, S. Dak.

J. J. Sugden, chairman, New York ASCS State Committee, Four Chimneys Farm on Seneca Lake, Himrod, N.Y.

Dallas K. Ferry, executive director, 910 South Wakefield, U.S. Poultry & Egg Producers Association, Arlington, Va.

Edison W. Osborne, Cornwall Farm, Peach Bottom, Pa.

Maurice O'Reilly, Barnum, Iowa.

Lenard C. Pound, chairman, Indiana Street ASC Committee—USDA, Room 110, 311 West Washington Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

George Harada, Post Office Box 55, Holualoa, Hawaii.

Floyd Andre, Farmhouse on Campus, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

Floyd Black, 503 New England Building, Topeka, Kans.

Paul B. Hastings, Rural Delivery 3, Box 130, Georgetown, Del.

Moe Hoffman, 1627 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Robert G. Houghtlin, National Soybean Processors Association, 141 West Jackson, Chicago, Ill.

Hans O. Jensen, 1711 M Street, Aurora, Nebr.

Phillip E. Jones, U.S. Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

Lloyd Kontny, Julesburg, Colo.

Norman H. Muck, Rocky Ford Limestone Co., Rural Route No. 1, Lincoln, Ill.

Edward F. Snyder, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

Mrs. George L. Bell, 4706 Essex Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

H. Ryland Heflin, Ruby, Va.

Nicholas Kominos, United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Herman Will, 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

George Bradford Reeves, Chapitco, Md.

J. C. Portis, Luponto, Ark.

Mrs. W. Eugene Pharis, 156 Helfenstein Avenue, Webster Groves, Mo.

Dr. Jimmye S. Hillman, head, department of agricultural economics, the University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.

Rev. Sidney Lovett, pastor, Rock Spring Congressional Church, Arlington, Va.

Rabbi Hyman S. Krash, 141 Xenia Street SW., Washington, D.C.

John W. Ball, R.F.D. 2, New Berlin, N.Y.

Rabbi Sholem B. Kowalsky, 73–50 173d Street, Flushing, N.Y.

Robert Hoffman, Alden, Iowa.

Tom Gill, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Wallace J. Campbell, Foundation for Cooperative Housing, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Paul W. Opsahl, 705 North Third Street, Aberdeen, S. Dak.

Dr. Henry A. McCanna, 475 Riverside Drive, room 510, New York, N.Y.

W. J. H. McKnight, 475 Riverside Drive, room 1020, New York, N.Y.

Robert D. McMillen, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Arthur C. Ringland, 4722 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

Mrs. Murry M. Schott, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Jack Sampier, editor and publisher, National Livestock Producer, Chicago, Ill.

Kenny Schuman, Iowa Farmers Union, 2302 University Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa.

Lionel Steinberg, Box 501, Thermal, Calif.

D. Wynne Thorne, Utah State University, Logan, Utah.

Mrs. Wallace Mason Yater, 4907 Indian Lane, Washington, D.C.

Ross B. Talbot, professor of government, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

Lyle Gottschalk, Route 2, Palouse, Wash.

V. T. Hanlon, East River Electric Corp., Madison, S. Dak.

Mrs. Duncan Howlett, 3710 Ingomar Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. Thomas Kouzes, 3524 Barkley Drive, Fairfax, Va.

Jay I. Naman, president, Texas Farmers Union, 834 North Valley Mills Drive, Waco, Tex.

Mrs. Andrew G. Prandoni, 5016 Lowell Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Robert Grayson McGuire, Jr., 1611 Crittenden Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Clay L. Cochran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Vernon Ferwerda, National Council of Churches, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

Burnett J. Bergeson, 920 North Shore Drive, Detroit Lakes, Minn.

Dr. Russell Coleman, The Sulphur Institute, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

William C. Eckles, General Manager Pine Milk Products Corp., 500 North Park Ave., Fond du Lac, Wis.

Harry Edell, 5601 River Road NW., Washington, D.C.

George M. Elsey, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. Lee Feller, president, Fellmen & Alliance Association, Inc., 605 West Chicago St., Coldwater, Mich.

Joseph W. Fichter, 28 East Vine St., Oxford, Ohio.

A. Jack Hall, Virginia Farmers Union, Hotel Jefferson, Richmond, Va.

Daniel J. Carey, R.D. No. 2, Groton, N.Y.

R. S. Dunbar, Jr., dean, College of Agriculture & Forestry, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.

Robert Handschin, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.

Oscar Heline, president, Iowa Farmer Grain Dealers Association, Marcus, Iowa.

Leon H. Keyserling, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Robert L. Lamkin, 2106 North Huntington Street, Arlington, Va.

Rabbi Sidney M. Lefkowitz, 1708 Mallory Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

Mrs. Esther Murray, director, eastern area, Women's Activities Department of COPE–AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

George E. Nettels, Jr., Post Office Box 7, Girard, Kans.

Thomas E. Quigley, 1212 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Arthur H. Schulz, dean and director, State University Agriculture Station, Fargo, N. Dak.

E. V. Smith, Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.

George S. Weigold, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Arnie W. Agnew, Milton Junction, Wis.

Claude R. Wickard, former Secretary of Agriculture, Camden, Ind.

A. F. Troyer, president, Indiana Farmers Union, 1331 North Delaware Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

Maurice D. Atkin, Robert R. Nathan Associates, 1218 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Pat Greathouse, vice president, United Automobile Workers, AFL–CIO, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Robert M. Koch, president, National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Robert C. Liebenow, president, Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Herschel D. Newsom, master, National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Governor William Avery, State Capitol, Topeka, Kans.

Dwayne O. Andreas, executive vice president, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.

James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, Denver, Colo.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer, Dec. 28, 1965]

FOOD: IT MIGHT PROVE AT ONCE THE MOST EFFECTIVE AND LEAST COSTLY FOREIGN AID

Senator George S. McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, has high hopes for a bill he has prepared for the upcoming session of Congress that would change drastically two major public policies—foreign aid and agricultural adjustment.

Under terms of the McGovern bill Congress would appropriate $500 million to buy food on the open market for distribution among the needy of underdeveloped countries, build ports and facilities for handling the produce and conduct programs in the improvement of food production methods in the lands involved. The program would be accelerated at the rate of $500 million each year for 7 years, then continue for 3 more years at the $3.5 billion level.

This might seem the most inopportune of all times to launch anything so ambitious and costly as the McGovern plan. With another multi-billion dollar deficit in the making, the already staggering public debt reaching new heights, a costly war to finance and a domestic program of unprecedented proportions just getting underway, Washington has a sufficiently difficult fiscal problem to solve without taking on anything new. Present indications, according to the best advices from official quarters, are that only through the exercise of strict economy will it be possible to keep the budget under $110 billion and to meet commitments without a tax increase.

What chance, then, would something like the McGovern proposal have of acceptance and why should it be seriously considered?

It may be that the exigencies of the times will argue against the McGovern bill. But it should not be dismissed out-of-hand. Its plus factors should be considered along with the minus.

For one thing, the purchases contemplated should make possible the relaxation of crop and acreage controls. Indeed, this revolutionary shift in foreign aid could lead to complete abandonment of our farm relief program, restoring agriculture to a condition of complete independence. This alone would save the $2½ to $3 billion the Government now pays farmers to restrict their production, to say nothing of the cost of storage and various administrative expenses associated with crop control. Indeed, it seems reasonable to say that the saving in farm subsidies, etc., would more than provide the $3.5 billion McGovern is talking about.

Then there is foreign aid. The actual distribution of food and the operation of an intensive program of education in better farming methods, plus provision of tools and other equipment would constitute foreign aid of a far more practicable character than that now being provided. If efficiently implemented such a system would make possible the reduction if not complete elimination of the economic phase of our foreign aid program. And in the long run it might go a long way toward establishing peaceful relations that would lead to the abandonment of most of our military aid as well.

Finally, there is to consider the fact that we are just beginning to realize the gravity of the world food shortage. Those in best position to judge such things believe that unless a way is found soon to increase very materially the production and distribution of food on a world basis, actual starvation will be the lot of millions, privation and suffering of the sort capable of triggering massive and bloody revolt of many millions more.

Here in the United States we have a capacity for food production unapproached anywhere in the world. Not only is our land fertile, but our ability to put this fertility to use unique. What better disposition can we make of our abundance and know-how than in relieving want among others, not merely in the form of the food itself, but also and of greater importance in showing them how to make better use of their own resources? This would be something worthy of our best thought and best efforts, even were the cost greater on balance than probably is the case. When it is considered that we might accomplish what Senator McGovern and those who have been working with him on this project have in mind at an actual saving of money, the prospect becomes even more pleasing.

Senator McGovern's figures may need adjustment. The scope of the program and the rate of development might require paring down to meet our own immediate fiscal needs. But the idea, we think, is basically sound. At the very least it deserves the sympathetic consideration of the Congress and the American people.

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Daily News, Dec. 2, 1965]

Food Surpluses Dwindling Away

There is startling news from the farm front.

U.S. stocks of surplus foodstuffs are no longer the seemingly inexhaustible mountains of yesteryear, when a prime headache for Government was finding ways to dispose of them or at least to curtail further accumulation.

To the citizen long accustomed to thinking of the farm surplus as not only a fixed feature but a chronic problem in American life, the news may come with something of the shock of another sign of changing times. This was the realization not so long ago that the Nation's vast gold hoard, far from being a built-in feature of the supersuccessful economy, was actually dwindling away.

Now it appears we may be facing a somewhat similar situation on the food front. Stocks of many basic commodities are no longer unmanageable, but have been worked down to about what is prudent for national reserves.

In wheat, for example, there are something like 800 million bushels in storage. It may look like plenty, but in fact it would meet U.S. requirements for only some 8 months in the event of a serious crop failure.

Such a crisis may appear unlikely, but another crisis is actually upon us. This is the growing food shortage in much of the rest of the world, in countries squeezed between mushrooming populations and virtually stationary food output.

Economists are warning that if a worldwide famine in the foreseeable future is to be averted, ever greater demands will have to be made upon the United States, Canada, Australia, portions of Western Europe and the other, very few, surplus food areas. These would be demands for which there is now no guarantee those nations would be able to meet.

This development comes after years of American farm policies designed to reduce production. Some 50 million acres have been taken out of cultivation and we currently are reimbursing farmers for retiring cropland and cutting production to the tune of something like $2 billion annually.

One concerned observer suggests that the time may have come to reverse U.S. policy, to begin stepping up production.

"I cannot believe the American people want to leave good cropland idle at public expense while hunger spreads across the world," says Senator George McGovern, of South Dakota, former food-for-peace Director.

It may be difficult to condition the American public to such a radical reversal. But that it may be necessary is one more indication that in a rapidly changing world nothing can be taken for granted, not even Fort Knox and ever-normal granaries.

[From the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic, Nov. 24, 1965]

Preventing World Famine

Kansas GOP Senator Frank Carlson the other day predicted a worldwide famine of incomprehensible magnitude and devastation "unless the world food output in the next 35 years is doubled." Carlson cautioned that people will not continue to starve quietly, "and Communist China will have her eyes on them. She boasts that she will encircle the capitalist world, and this could be if more food is not produced to fight the war of hunger.

"If what I have said becomes a prophecy, the chaos that would result could make Vietnam look like a neighborhood argument," the Senator said.

What most of us do not realize is that the old bugaboo of farm surpluses is no longer with us. Senator Carlson reported that the United States is experiencing a shortage of dried milk, rice, "and everything containing protein—except soybeans, of which we have a carryover of perhaps a hundred million bushels."

Between now and the end of the century, the world populatoin is expected to double—to reach the figure of 6 billion people. This sobering estimate requires the United States to lose no time in examining closely its entire national agricultural policy. The United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization—currently meeting in Rome—says that half of the world's population is now suffering some degree of hunger. Merely to maintain present inadequate dietary levels, FAO says, will require the doubling of food supplies by the year 2000, when the 6 billion population figure is reached.

In noting the growing demands on foodstuffs, the Washington Post suggests that any real improvement cannot be realized until the food-deficit countries "abandon their infatuation with industrialization as a quick and exclusive formula for development." These nations must put themselves hard at work developing their every agricultural potential.

The Post has given strong endorsement to a bill introduced by Senator George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, first Director of the food for peace program under President Kennedy. Entitled the "International Food and Nutrition Act," McGovern's measure would provide funds to purchase food for shipment abroad, "but, more important, to improve storage and distribution facilities and strengthen the productive capacity in needy nations. This would be a useful complement to President Johnson's suggestion for a national strategic food reserve. Lord Boyd-Orr's idea of a world food bank also could well be looked at anew."

The Nation's farmers have the capacity to produce far more than U.S. requirements. Surpluses have been easy to come by, even in the face of cutting back the number of tilled acres. We can expect them to be called upon shortly to increase their output, not only to meet the needs of a burgeoning America, but to alleviate the hunger pangs of those in other lands. At the same time we must help these needy nations develop their agricultural technology to its utmost, to reduce the drain on the productive capacity of today's major food-producing nations.

[From the Nebraska Farmer of Sept. 18, 1965]

Are We Headed Toward All-Out Production?—A Plan Is Being Made That Would Urge Farmers To Produce All They Can—Objective: To Head Off Starvation

(By Marvin Russell)

Last April, the Nebraska Farmer said in an editorial: "We've been hearing a lot lately about the world's population explosion, and apparently it really is exploding. Does this mean that sometime soon farmers in the United States will need to take off their handcuffs and shift to all-out production? It might."

Now there are straws in the wind that indicate our national policy is trending in exactly that direction.

We are told that plans are being made right now under which the United States will attempt to do two things: (1) Get food in much greater quantities than ever before to starving people in many areas of the world; and (2) carry our agricultural know-how to these same people so that they may help themselves close the ever-widening gap between world food production and world population.

These plans are being pushed in high places, all the way up to the White House. Vice President Humphrey, long identified with the food for peace program, is much involved. In fact, that's what it really is—a food for peace program—but with one great difference. It no longer would be a halfhearted program to dispose of surpluses. It would be a program to use our great food production potential as a powerful tool in achieving our worldwide objectives. What are these objectives? You might term them containment of communism, world peace, and prosperity, and just plain humanitarianism that makes it unacceptable to us to let anyone starve if we can help it.

Legislation which would be a beginning on such a program already has been introduced in Congress. Bill Hosokawa of the Denver Post's Empire magazine, in an article titled "The Coming War on Hunger," tells of a bill introduced last June by Senator George McGovern, of South Dakota, "to provide for United States participation and leadership in an international effort to end malnutrition and human want."

After interviewing Senator McGovern and others in Washington, Hosokawa declared: "The implications of such a program on the American economy are tremendous, keeping in mind the fact that most of our surplus food is gone. In effect, such a program would be a green light to American farmers to grow all they can, with their produce to be used overseas because it is needed rather than because it is surplus.

McGovern said to close the food gap American farmers would have to produce one-third more wheat, increase milk output 50 percent, raise 25 percent more soybeans and step up production of vegetable oils by a third. The South Dakota Senator imparts a sense of urgency to the matter. Need for great increases in our food production is here right now, he declares, and will reach the crisis stage before the end of the 1960's—not the year 2000.

An official at the U.S. Department of Agriculture told Hosokawa something that farmers already know—that we can increase farm output vastly without taxing our resources or going back to tilling marginal land.

McGOVERN said "American farmers could fill this order by putting land and resources now idle into productive use again. Only about 75 percent of our agricultural capacity is being used today."

Present plans leave a lot of questions unanswered.

Would acreage restrictions go completely out the window? Would farmers be encouraged to plant fenceline to fenceline?

What would happen to present price support and loan programs?

Would the Government buy produce directly from farmers for shipment overseas? Or would it enter established market channels and buy processed food in many cases? If so, would there be any Government influence on price at which processors buy their raw materials from the farm?

What will a shift to all-out production mean to the small farmer as compared to the large farmer?

What would the complications be in world trade in agricultural products? Particularly, what would an expanded food for peace program do to our own cash trade and that of other nations who are our friends?

But despite all the unanswered questions, one thing seems sure. It will mean great change on the farms of Nebraska and the Nation. It will put the farmer in the frontline of a Peace Army that can have vast influence on the world's future.

And it would seem to forecast an agriculture more prosperous than it has been for many years.

[From the Binghampton (N.Y.) Press, November 1965]

HUNGER IN HALF OF WORLD

Most Americans will sit down to a Thanksgiving dinner on Thursday grateful, in the words of the President's proclamation, for "much more than an abundant harvest." This will be a rich Thanksgiving for most Americans, but with the war in Vietnam coming ever closer to those they cherish, it will be a thoughtful day, too.

It may be a thoughtful occasion in another sense. While we are well fed, half the world's people suffer a degree of hunger. The situation soon will become acute. Richard W. gram, says that we face "a crisis of monu- Reuter, Director of the food-for-peace pro- mental proportions."

Famine on an extensive scale in underdeveloped regions appears inevitable unless the poor nations soon begin to produce food as fast as they produce people. Underdeveloped nations in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America are near the threshold of starvation.

Merely to keep up the present inadequate dietary levels would mean doubling world food production by the year 2000, when world population is expected to reach 6 billion.

The United States and a few other food-surplus countries have been able to stave off disaster up to this time, but studies indicate that large-scale famine may ensue within 5 years if underdeveloped countries do not produce more food for themselves. The United States is nearing the end of its food surpluses.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said on November 15 that our carryover stocks of farm commodities are at their lowest level in 8 years, with grain surpluses nearly eliminated.

Raymond A. Iaones, Agriculture Department foreign trade chief, said on November 15 that U.S. farm exports will reach a new high of $6,200 million this year, with new peaks of $7 and $8 billion expected within the next few years.

Since 1954 the United States has sent more than $12 billion in surplus farm commodities to needy countries under the food for peace program, paid for either in their currencies or given in outright relief. Donations worth $1,700 million are donated annually.

The enabling legislation for the food for peace program (Public Law 480) expires at the end of 1966. Congress in 1966 will have to face an extension and probably a reorientation of foreign aid in the form of food. Also necessary will be a rethinking of agriculture policies in the absence of old premises of surplus.

The United States can increase production acreages, but there are limits to what can be done to head off world famine. Some experts even argue that food aid serves only to delay the day of reckoning and to make it severer. U.S. food has permitted various countries to delay decisions on agricultural and population problems. Availability of free U.S. food has disrupted domestic markets in some countries and discouraged production.

Underdeveloped nations must be wooed away from their preoccupation with industrialization at the expense of gains in agriculture. Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, Democrat, S. Dak., a former director of the food for peace program, introduced a bill this year that would combine efforts to increase U.S. farm production with renewed and greater efforts to help farmers in the poorer countries to increase their yields per acre.

The World Food Bank is promising. So are the newer programs aimed at population control. The White House Conference next week on health is bound to give much consideration to food-population control questions.

[From the Washington Post, November 1965]

OUTLOOK: HUNGER

Concern over the effect of the diminution of American farm surpluses upon mounting world food needs is causing a welcome and overdue reexamination of national policy. Whatever the future availability of additional food from the United States, patently there must be very much greater emphasis upon expanded local food production in the needy countries themselves.

World needs are staggering. Half the world's people now suffer from some degree of hunger, according to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. Merely to maintain present inadequate dietary levels will require the doubling of food supplies by the year 2000, when population is expected to reach 6 billion. In critical areas populations is outstripping food, as Malthus predicted. Per capita food production in Latin America has declined 5 percent in the last 5 years. Population growth there is 3 percent annually.

In dietary terms needs are even starker. Research now shows a correlation between protein deficiency and mental development. Damage sustained during the critical 1- to 6-age span is irreparable later. There is reason to think that this factor alone may account for much of the lethargy observed in some underdeveloped countries.

If there is to be any real improvement, a first requirement will be to persuade food-deficit countries to abandon their infatuation with industrialization as a quick and exclusive formula for development. Thanks in part to Marxist notions there has been a tendency in some countries to regard a steel mill as more important than adequate investment in agriculture. That is part of the difficulty in India as well as in many Communist countries.

For their part, Americans will have to recognize that shipment of their own surpluses abroad is only a partial and temporary answer to the problem. This realization may come hard to persons whose charitable instincts are affronted by the paradox of superabundance here and empty bellies elsewhere. Even though the gift or sale of food for local currency helps solve an American economic problem and may relieve some immediate hunger, it seldom contributes much productive capacity in the needy countries. In the absence of expanded local storage and distribution facilities, it sometimes merely aggravates the overall problem of postponing the reckoning.

So long as surpluses have dominated our consideration it has been difficult to focus on the more basic problem. In 1965–66 some $3.5 billion is appropriated for the food-for-peace program; but this year only $212 million is available for all forms of aid to agricultural production abroad including technical assistance and loans from local currency. Happily, the emphasis is changing to encourage far more attention to farm technology in Latin America and now in India.

In this connection Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, first Director of the food-for-peace program, recently introduced a bill that deserves widespread support. His International Food and Nutrition Act would provide funds to purchase food for shipment abroad but, more important, to improve storage and distribution facilities and strengthen productive capacity in needy countries. This would be a useful complement to President Johnson's suggestion for a national strategic food reserve. Lord Boyd-Orr's idea of a world food bank also could well be looked at anew.

Whatever is done, American production obviously will play a vital part. Soybeans and fishmeal, produced either here or abroad, are among the cheapest sources of proteins. With new hybrid wheat and corn the capacity for expanded American production is enormous, and balance will be imperative to avoid the creation of embarrassing new surpluses. We shall have to continue to donate large quantities of food for children's programs abroad while assisting other countries to increase their domestic production and finding better means of helping them bridge the gap between need and ability to pay.

Stress on agriculture alone will not suffice. Birth control, education, rural development, and industrialization all are necessary counterparts of more attention to farm technology and local food production. But the lesson of this century is that none of these other measures will succeed without primary stress on expanded food supplies. To meet the food needs now looming will necessitate changes in thinking and direction of effort altogether as radical as any revolution the world has ever known.

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Leader-Press, Nov. 26, 1965]

FOOD VERSUS PEOPLE

After years of being damned for his burdensome, price-depressing surpluses, the American farmer is beginning to come into his own as our agricultural production pattern adjusts to levels somewhat compatible with demand.

This is due to expanding foreign markets, in no small part to better Federal farm programs, and to farmers learning to curtail at least some of their output for better prices.

As a result, farmers' net income this year will be higher than it has been for a long time, and agricultural economists are almost unanimous in agreeing that 1966 farm income will be better yet.

Tragic as it may be for the world in general, the American farmer must be happy to learn at last that somewhere people need and want what he grows, even though that means that large areas of the world now contain peoples who cannot produce their own needs so that hunger is a constant companion and starvation a ubiquitous threat.

Odd as it may seem, this poses a new farm problem—this one for our Federal Government more than for the farmer, however. The problem: Should American aid to those hungry nations be in the form of food or in technical aid in home food production?

There is a sharp cleavage developing in the Johnson administration over which approach to take.

As a spokesman for technical aid—training foreign nations to raise their own food—Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has some telling points. America, the Secretary points out, cannot possibly hope to feed the whole world, therefore the only solution to hunger lies within the hungry countries themselves. Mr. Freeman also fears that the other answer—the end of all curbs on American farm output and a green light for production—will wipe out all the gains of recent years in curbing production, and again put the American farmer in jeopardy.

On the other side of the fence, leading spokesman is Democratic Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, of South Dakota, who contends that world famine isn't merely a fear of the future, it's actually a tragedy of the present. There is no time, the Senator declares—we must act now.

McGOVERN believes that "the most challenging crisis for the rest of this century will be the accelerating race between food and people."

Another Senator, now touring Asia to see for himself, is proposing a middle ground. Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, said this week that he would substitute food for dollar aid so that the money a nation like India, for example, spends for food may go into plants for manufacturing fertilizers and modern farm equipment.

But in this changed policy, Senator HARTKE would provide safeguards: only nations that would agree to modernize agriculture, and actually do it, would receive such aid. If they balk or fail to live up to their word, he'd cut them off so that they cannot "live on our handouts."

As Representative DURWARD HALL said here last week, there is plenty of land to raise the food the world needs; it's not the land, but the know-how, that's decisive.

No doubt the Congressman is right—to illustrate how right, Venezuela produces an average of 2 bushels of corn per acre as compared with 67 bushels to the acre as our national average.

So here it would appear, lies the answer: the middle road between the two extremes.

The choice isn't immediately at hand—the 1966 farm program is already laid out and it's too late to change—but this is a problem Congress must tackle in the year ahead. With hunger outracing production of food, there is no time to waste.

[From the Farm Journal, November 1965]

NEXT: THE WAR ON HUNGER

If you haven't read the article on page 33 (not printed in the RECORD), stop right now and do it. It reports the frightening prospect that the threat of starvation lies not far ahead for multitudes in vast regions of the world.

How can we help prevent it?

Well first we can't solve the problem just by sending food from here, although we'll have to send even more than now. Largely it must be solved where the problem exists. Let's consider both aspects.

The very label "Food for Peace" quite unintentionally gives us a false sense of comfort. It implies that if we'll just write a big enough check, and send enough food somewhere we will somehow have peace, and all will be well. Perhaps we ought to discard this lulling phrase for something that really pictures the emergency, like "The war on hunger," or "The fight for food."

To fight this war successfully we've got to be a lot tougher than we have been. We've handed out $21 billion worth of food in the last 10 years, too often saying, "Here it is, do what you want with it," simply because our overcautious State Department has been scared witless for fear of offending somebody.

Many a hard-pressed government, figuring we would continue to take care of the food problem, has diverted scarce resources away from agriculture to industrial or military uses. This only perpetuates their food problem.

Tying strings to our aid will win us no popularity contests, but if we are to continue to buy time for hungry countries, we'll have to require that they turn their own energies to their first need—food. We'll be glad to help them do it if they will.

Second, we could use our food in the war on communism much more effectively than we're doing. Wars aren't gentle. Food is a mighty potent weapon. It's one we have in abundance and one that the Communists lack and cannot get.

Why not use it instead of meekly handing it out to those who tell us to go jump in the sea? When a hungry man comes to our door we feed him, but we can let him chop a little wood first.

The food we do send can well be directed chiefly to feeding young children, and for charitable purposes, and for emergencies. Nutritionists say that a child seriously malnourished up to age 6 is maimed for life, mentally as well as physically.

We're currently fortifying the dried milk we send with vitamins A and D, and we're mixing protein concentrates and vitamins with native grains.

These things we can do, and need do in even greater measure, but having done them we will have met but a small part of the problem. We can't dump much more food on needy countries—we're sending about all they can take in and distribute now. Suddenly to flood them with more would demoralize their own struggling agriculture and compete with our own dollar sales.

What, then, can be done on the spot? Two things, neither of them quick or simple but both absolutely imperative: increase yields per acre (since these regions can't bring in many new acres) and slow down the birthrate. Farm Journal will soon report further on some new developments that will sharply affect the world's population problem.

What can be done to step up crop yields?

Not much can happen without such basics as stable government, education, and a system of incentives that lets a man keep enough of what he earns.

Farmers anywhere need good seed, fertilizers, pesticides, machinery, experiment stations, extension services, good farm magazines and farm radio, good roads, farm credit, and a system of markets that lets them sell something, rather than just feed themselves.

We've done quite a bit about some of these, but this is the area where we need to step up our efforts sharply. Sending food is a necessary emergency aid. Helping build agriculture on the spot is the only real solution.

There will doubtless be times when we will wonder whether anybody could help such people, or should try. But we'll have to try, and keep trying. We're spending decades—and $20 billion—to put a man on the moon. It seems at least as important to help the human race eat.

[From the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Journal, Oct. 3, 1965]

SURPLUS FOODS SHOULD BE USED

What to plant and how much is the problem plaguing legislators and farmers. The 4-year proposal now approved in Washington is a temporary, patched job which seems to have appeased very few.

It is known the United States can produce more food, whatever the crop or animals might be, on fewer acres than ever before. For those in the cities, it is difficult to understand why millions of dollars are paid each year to store more grain, bury more lard, give away butter, fail to process cotton for fabric or oil.

It is equally difficult for millions of Americans to understand why other peoples on this globe go hungry.

South Dakota's Senator GEORGE McGOVERN offers a solution which could head off world famine and aid the cause of world peace. On September 20, Senator McGOVERN told a regional Methodist conference in Sioux Falls:

"Food is a better form of aid than guns, and a whole lot safer for the world." He suggested hunger is a focal point where the United States can earn good will, rather than ill will.

Carl A. Quarnberg, Rapid City businessman with wide interests as operator of a flour mill and feed, seed, and grain buyer, processor, and distributor, wrote the following letter to Senator McGOVERN:

"Press reports on your address greatly intrigue me.

"You are right. 'Food is a better form of aid than guns, and a whole lot safer for the world.' In that statement, you may have uncovered a really great idea that can be of real service to wheat farmers as well as starving people of the world.

"Wheat programs of the past have not been fully acceptable to farmers of South Dakota. And wheat farmers of western South Dakota are even more independent than those living on the east side of the river. Western ranchers and farmers are definitely individualistic. They like standing on their own feet. They definitely resent the idea that a Government employee sitting at a mahogany desk in Washington, D.C., must tell them what to plant and how much. They want their independence back. They want to use their own judgment as to what and how much.

"Again you are right. 'It is time to tell the world that we have a great unused farm capacity and that America is going to use it to help end hunger in the world.'

"Over the past many years, the United States has continually reduced wheat production while at the same time and under the same world conditions, Canada, Australia, and Argentina (even Germany and France) has encouraged increased wheat production, much to the benefit of their farmers as well as consumers.

"Again you are right when you say, 'If we spend as much money purchasing and distributing our farm surplus production as we now spend paying farmers not to produce, we would lay a foundation for a greater farm prosperity at home and much less hunger abroad.' You have expressed a perfect two-point idea: Food for starving millions of the world; and in the very same breath, a possible answer to the ever-present but still unsolved farm problem.

"Your experience as Director of food for peace points to you as better informed on world food problems than any man in public life today. I urge you to pursue your idea to final conclusion. Laying all politics aside, I pledge my personal support to this end."

The capacity to produce seemingly unlimited supplies of commodities for citizens of the United States has been challenged by the farm bills. More production results on fewer acres. Subsidies for unplanted acres merely add to the total cost for taxpayers.

McGOVERN served as Director of the food-for-peace program under the late President Kennedy. Subsequently he was elected U.S. Senator from South Dakota.

McGovern and Senator Karl Mundt do not see eye to eye on the farm bills, nor on how best the surpluses might be utilized. Senator Mundt does not believe in giving aid and comfort to the Communist enemy in any manner. Yet it seems there should be a way to win good will.

What better way to win than with our surplus foods?

[From the Orlando (Fla.), Evening Star, Jan. 4, 1966]

More Bread and Fewer Guns

More food for the starving millions of the world is the goal of a bill by Senator George S. McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, which the midwesterner expects to get favorable consideration by the new Congress which meets next month.

The aim of the South Dakotan is to reverse the Nation's present policy of paying farmers not to grow crops and to use the $3 billion or so to buy food to help feed a hungry world.

Under this reversal of philosophy farm prices would be maintained by buying the surpluses under stepped-up production for shipment overseas.

And some of the money saved from the present payments for not planting would be used to stimulate increased food production in other countries by providing technical help and better seed and crop selection.

Senator McGovern believes, with considerable commonsense, that America can make more friends and do more good in the world by spending less for military aid and more for food for the hungry. He would eliminate military aid for such countries as India and Pakistan and those in the Middle East, Africa and Latin America, and spend the millions for food and technical aid for the farmers.

McGovern should get support for his bill, for it makes a lot of sense.

[From the Farmers Union Herald, Nov. 16, 1965]

The Race Between Man and Famine

As one of its major themes, the great convention of cooperative farmers going on this week in St. Paul—the 28th annual meeting of Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association—is discussing the century's most challenging crisis, the race bteween man and his food supply.

Never before in the history of mankind have the citizens of the world faced a problem of such magnitude. It is a problem we cannot escape. There is no rathole of smugness into which we can leap and then pull the hole in after us. The plain arithmetic of available food supply and the algebra of a growing world population are inexorable.

We must prepare now to meet and close the enormous food gap that looms on the horizon.

In only three regions of the world—the United States and Canada; Western Europe; and Australia-New Zealand plus parts of southeast Asia—are there adequate food supplies. In these areas, modern technology, concerned government, and economic incentives have combined to increase the productivity of the land at a rate faster than the population growth.

But the combined population of these food surplus regions includes only one-fifth of the world's people. The other four-fifths live in Asia, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East. These areas are increasing their populations faster than the productivity of their cultivated acreage.

It is a highly significant fact that in the 1930's, for example, Latin America exported more grain than any other region of the world, including North America. Today, 30 years later, Latin America imports more grain than it exports.

Considering the combination of inadequate arable land, low agricultural productivity, and swift population growth in the underdeveloped areas, the prospect of providing an adequate food supply in those regions is not encouraging.

For several very important reasons, we must help these people.

To be brutally frank, there could come a time when if we do not help these hungry people with food they will try their best to take ours away. A hollow belly does not contain the milk of human kindness.

Second, the great contest of our time now turns upon whether we or the Communists can develop the most effective pattern for meeting the hunger and misery of an uncommitted world.

Third, there is the pure responsibility of brotherhood and mercy, the obligation which one man has to another.

"The quality of mercy is not strain'd.
It dropeth as the gentle rain from heaven
Upon the place beneath. It is twice bless'd:
It blesseth him that gives and him that takes.
'Tis mightiest in the mightiest. * * *"

This is what concerned farm leaders, like Senator George McGovern and Vice President Hubert Humphrey, are talking about when they plead for a more widespread recognition of the problem.

This is what concerned farm leaders, like M. W. Thatcher of GTA, are talking about when they urge all-out production on American farms so that the Nation's abundance of food and fiber can be used as a weapon for peace.

In a recent speech to his colleagues in the Senate, Senator McGovern described the challenge of world hunger and what he believes should be the proper American response.

In that speech, the Senator said, in part:

"I believe that we ought to declare an all-out war against hunger for the balance of this century. We should call on our farmers and our agricultural technicians to enlist for the duration in the war against want. We should announce to the world now that we have an unused food producing capacity which we are willing and anxious to use to its fullest potential. Our Government should leave no doubt that we will bend every effort to see that no nation—friend or foe—starves while we permit land and surpluses to remain idle."

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Sept. 22, 1965]

Food for Peace Can Be a Potent Tool

With much of the world hungry and with excess agricultural capacity here at home, the United States has available to it a significant tool with which to encourage economic development abroad—economic development that can both serve humanitarian and social ends and also make our side stronger in the cold war.

The U.S. food-for-peace program was established in 1954, mainly as a device to dispose of our unwanted crop surpluses. Lately, more and more Americans, including Vice President Humphrey, have spoken out that food for peace should increasingly be used as a tool to aid and spur foreign economic development.

The announcement this month of a $35 million food-for-peace pact with a Spanish co-op group seems to be just the kind of creative project for which Humphrey and others have been arguing. The Spanish organization, representing 900 local groups and some 250,000 farm families, will acquire 600,000 tons of American feed grains over the next 3 years under long-term credit. In turn, the organization will sell the grain to its members, with the proceeds to be used to finance a network of grain-shipping and livestock-marketing facilities, including trucks, refrigeration equipment, elevators, slaughterhouses, etc.

If this scheme works, Spain, which is a meat deficit country, will build up a substantial beef industry—and will become an important importer of U.S. feed grains for cash. And Spain will have been aided in its economic growth.

The agreement is only the third such deal with a private foreign group (the other two deals were also made this year), but it is by far the largest. It clearly illustrates some of the potential ahead for the food-for-peace program.

[Editorial from the Cooperative Consumer, Sept. 15, 1965]

American Agriculture Can Look Forward to New World Demands

If American agriculture is as efficient as we all say it is, then why don't we make greater use of it?

That question is suddenly coming into the public consciousness. There are three reasons:

1. An increasingly realistic attitude toward foreign aid.
2. The growing realization that this Nation has reduced agricultural surpluses to the point some commodities are in such short supply that we would be hard put in case of a national emergency.
3. Repeated predictions of dire famine in parts of the world where populations are growing much faster than food supplies.

So-called insiders in Washington are saying that the Department of Agriculture and the White House are laying plans now for measures that will lead to letup in restrictions on land use and on the production of certain crops.

A move in the direction of greater use of food in foreign relations would come from a bill introduced during the summer by Senator McGovern of South Dakota. It would provide for stepping up shipments of surplus foodstuffs, along with technical assistance for developing countries.

Bill Hosokawa, associate editor of the Denver Post, went to Washington during the summer to study the food situation for himself, and in the Empire section of the Post he wrote:

"What troubles the food experts in Washington is that the enormous U.S. surpluses that helped feed the famished for a decade are now largely gone. Remember those pictures showing great mountains of wheat piled along railroad sidings of the West? You haven't seen any lately, partly because of the success of Federal restrictions on farm production, and partly because of massive shipments of food sent overseas.

"The question now is not how to curtail output, but how to make American farms produce more to help fill empty stomachs in India and South America and Africa and other undernourished areas of the world. Congress is likely to be hearing a great deal about this problem before long."

Hosokawa quotes Thomas M. Ware, chairman of the Freedom From Hunger Foundation and a man he describes as a hard-headed industrialist:

"There is a global food catastrophe building up on the horizon which threatens to engulf the free world and the Communist world alike.

We have been reminded for many years that American foodstuffs, properly used, could be more effective than guns in helping the developing countries attain stability. We have been reminded, too, that food can be more effective than guns or propaganda in the campaign against the Communist infiltrators who are competing with the forces of democracy in all of the new countries and some of the older ones.

But the argument for use of more food in foreign relations is heard today in a more favorable climate than has existed in the past.

Congress has faced this year's foreign aid bill without anywhere near the dissent that has marked debate of every foreign aid bill since Harry Truman launched the Marshall plan and followed it with the Point Four program.

Time magazine, which has never hesitated to criticize various aspects of foreign aid, takes a look at the broad sweep of events since the end of World War II and concludes that "Americans think the world a little healthier with U.S. help and think the United States a little healthier, too."

(Time also reported that President Johnson looks to few people for advice in foreign affairs with more trust and confidence than he looks to Barbara Ward, the brilliant British economist. Miss Ward argues with eloquence and logic that there is no hope for a world divided between rich nations and poor nations, and Lyndon Johnson seems to listen.)

The National Broadcasting Co. took a full evening on September 7 to look at foreign policy from every possible angle. While this was essentially a reporting program, it was presented in a tone generally approving the directions of those who would make liberal use of our surplus food production as an implement of diplomacy.

What we see, in effect, is a sort of coming of age of the whole concept of foreign aid and a growing acceptance that American agriculture can and should be called on for a bigger role in it.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 4, 1965]

UNITED STATES URGED TO DECLARE WORLD WAR ON FAMINE

(By Saville R. Davis, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

WASHINGTON, October 4, 1965.—"We ought to declare an all-out war against hunger on this planet," says South Dakota's Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, "and do it now."

"The number of people is outracing the amount of food available at an almost unbelievable rate," he says. "In the next 35 years the population of the world will double—from 3 billion to 6 billion. And the food supply is not going up significantly.

"The enormous food gap in prospect is the No. 1 problem of the last third of the 20th century," the Senator contends.

"Hunger and malnutrition are serious enough today. But major starvation will be the most painful fact of life on this planet within 10 years, unless we start today to tackle it."

The American people are not aware of the facts, Senator MCGOVERN said in an interview. They still think of large American surpluses when in fact these are sharply reduced and approaching dangerously low levels. They see great efforts being made to produce birth-control programs, but these cannot be expected to solve the problem in time.

"Our position of moral leadership will not permit us to turn our backs on this problem. Nor will our national security. Much of the tension and unrest that open the way for violent upheavals and Communist inroads have their roots in hunger and misery."

Senator MCGOVERN has a bill before Congress to attack this problem. It would turn American farms back from crop controls to deliberately stimulated production.

"If we begin now to divert a portion of the $2 billion annual farm control budget into the purchase, shipment, and distribution of farm commodities abroad, where they are needed, we could double our food-for-peace effort with little increase in overall expense."

The McGovern bill would spend $500 million next year for three purposes:

To purchase needed nutritious foods in the United States for distribution abroad.

To help the receiving countries to store and distribute the food more efficiently, with better facilities.

Greatly to strengthen the food-producing capacity of farm people in the underdeveloped world, by all available technical and educational means.

A similar sum would be added each year for 6 years. The total would then equal the amount spent on foreign aid of all sorts by the United States in the coming year.

FARMERS CORPS SUGGESTED

But the switch from negative cropland restriction to a program of stimulating production in the United States would be a strong stimulus to the American economy, Mr. MCGOVERN said.

One of the Senator's more intriguing suggestions is that of an American farmers corps, not unlike the Peace Corps except that its members would have high professional ability.

It would consist of "retired farmers or working farmers willing to take leave of their own farms for a time."

They would go out like the highly successful agricultural county agents in the United States, as teachers who can show how as well as tell how, and who know how to combine new technology with old skills.

"When I was food-for-peace director under President Kennedy," he recalled, "I reached the conviction that the most overwhelming paradox of our time was to permit half the human race to be hungry while we struggle to cut back on surplus production.

"The sciences have broken the space barrier, at a cost heading toward $20 billion, but not the bonds of hunger."

The Senator based many of his facts on the rapidly enlarging hunger gap on a new official study of the situation by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

It compared for the first time, it is said, comprehensive figures on population growth with similarly careful figures on expectable food production.

OWN RESERVES CHECKED

A typical conclusion: In Asia, merely to maintain present meager diets, yields per acre must increase by more than 50 percent between now and 1980. This would require an annual use of an additional amount of fertilizer that would nearly equal the world's entire output of fertilizer today.

For many Americans, however, the Senator's account of the present state of American farm surpluses will be equally surprising.

"They are not much above the level, now, that is needed for our own national reserves," he said. For example: Wheat stocks have been worked down from 1.4 billion bushels at the start of this decade to 800 million bushels today. Corn and other feed grain supplies have been sharply reduced.

The present composite reserve of wheat and feed grains is scarcely equal to 6 months' consumption in the United States.

Senator MCGOVERN recalled that President Johnson recently suggested that Congress build a food reserve. If this were done on a 6-month supply basis, the present food-for-peace program of American aid abroad would have to be eliminated, or American farm production sharply enlarged.

Senator MCGOVERN wants the United States to work with and through the United Nations, as well as on its own, in the big enterprise that he recommends. The effort will have to be cooperative and international, he said.

Senator MCGOVERN, coming from a farm State as he does, is aware of the great complexity of the task of helping other countries with their farm production. The collapse of the high hopes for technical assistance after the last world war, he agrees, are illustration enough.

He mentions, as reasons why these hopes were not justified, the lack of an all-round approach to the problem: lack of rural education, adequate credit, forms of land ownership that reward incentive, rural extension services, farm-to-market roads or cash markets for produce. He blames the shortage of fertilizer, pesticides, good irrigation facilities, and methods, hybrid seed and feed-mixing equipment—and the knowledge to apply them.

UNITED STATES SEEN DISCARDING FARM CURBS TO FEED WORLD POPULATION GAIN—DEERE OFFICIAL EXPECTS MUCH OF RISE IN NEXT 15 YEARS TO COME IN LEAST PRODUCTIVE AREAS

CHICAGO.—World geographic factors may cause the United States to discard agricultural restraints and gear up to help feed a 40 percent increase in world population expected in the next 15 years, William A. Hewitt, chairman of Deere & Co., said.

"Never before has world agriculture faced such a challenge in providing the basic necessities of food and fiber as it will in the next 15 years," Mr. Hewitt said in a talk before the American Agricultural Editors' Association. "The challenge is unprecedented because the world has reached a turning point in land availability and use."

Mr. Hewitt, recently named to President Johnson's National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber, said one of the most alarming facts of the population explosion is that a major portion of the increase is coming in the very regions that are least equipped to feed themselves.

"Asia, Africa and Latin America were all net exporters of grain prior to World War II. Now they are net importers. Ultimately less-developed countries must raise their agricultural yields. But it will require time, the infusion of large amounts of capital they don't have now and such new technology as desalinization of sea water. In the meantime, they face a severe threat of famine unless they have outside help."

He said a combination of soil, climate and technological development will force upon the United States, Canada and Western Europe a major responsibility for feeding the world's burgeoning population.

"The most productive agricultural regions in the world fall between the 30th and 55th parallels. Outside those latitudes, productive agricultural capacity falls off sharply due to inadequate soils or climate, or both,' Mr. Hewitt said.

Within the Communist world in the favorable latitudes, only Eastern Europe, the Russian Ukraine and limited parts of Red China approach comparable agricultural potential, and they have been unable even to provide enough food for the Communist world, he said. Major portions of Asia, in these latitudes, have inadequate rainfall or poor-quality soils or are rough or mountainous. And even some of the Asian areas with reasonably productive soils and climate are severely limited in agricultural capacity by lack of capital and technology and by a whole host of constraining traditions and institutions, he noted.

"Adding up the primary land for farm production, we arrive at this startling conclusion: The world must depend for a major portion of its agricultural production, at least in the next 15 years, primarily on 4 percent of the earth's total land area, and very little of this 4 percent is in regions where population is growing most rapidly," Mr. Hewitt said.

He went on: "It could be that within the next 15 years American agriculture may even have to discard some of the restraints built up by our continuing struggle with surpluses over the years and instead gear up to help feed the world." While noting that exporting food and fiber is a complex matter involving world politics, diplomacy and other considerations, he said the Nation should evaluate its tremendous agricultural productive capacity as a "potential new diplomatic tool for human relief."

The Deere chairman said U.S. economic and military aid has already done much, first to rebuild the war-torn countries after World War II and more recently to defend the free world against communism's inroads. "But hunger still abounds and threatens to grow worse. For the future, food, more than guns, promises to become our major weapon for peace—a weapon the Communist world cannot hope to match," he added.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 5, 1965]

United States Urged To Spur Farm Output To Alleviate World Food Crisis

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, December 4.—A dramatic reversal of national agricultural policy is urged in a report by a select panel of businessmen, educators, economists, nutritionists, and Federal officials.

The panel recommends that farmers produce more, instead of less, to help meet the world food crisis.

The report, now quietly making the rounds of top Government levels, proposes a direct linking up of the productive capacity of American agriculture—the most efficient farm system in the world—to the Nation's foreign policy objectives, including economic aid to underdeveloped countries.

Several months in preparation, the report calls for the return to cultivation of all or part of 50 million idle acres capable of producing 40 million tons of grain that farmers now are being induced not to plant.

The report looks to a gradual phasing out of the present complicated system of price supports and other subsidies and to eventual reliance on the marketplace for producer rewards.

Existing price support programs would be retained during an indefinite transition period to keep a floor under farm income.

But the $1.7 billion annual cost of the food-for-peace program, which disposes of surplus commodities abroad for local currencies, would be assigned to the foreign policy budget instead of the domestic farm policy budget as at present, along with any additional costs.

The report attempts to define the elements of a U.S. food policy in relation to world food needs. It had its inception in a week-long seminar last July at the Center for Research and Education at Estes Park, Colo.

FINANCED BY FOUNDATION

Cochairmen of these sessions were Prof. Roger Revelle, director of the Harvard Center for Population Studies, and Richard W. Reuter; special assistant to the President and Director of the Office of Food for Peace, which was recently transferred to the State Department.

Thirty other representatives of various disciplines took part in the study, which was financed by the Rockefeller Foundation.

In terms of food and mouths to feed, the report reached these overall conclusions:

"1. Under any circumstances, the population of the developing countries is destined to increase very rapidly for at least the next 10 to 15 years. To meet this rapid increase in population, efforts in food production both in the Western countries and the developing countries, must be dramatically increased.

"2. The reproductive potential will rise so high by 1980 that a continuing rate of reproduction at present levels would presage worldwide disaster.

"3. It is essential that means be found to reduce the rate of population growth drastically in two-thirds of the world. Unless this is done, there is scant possibility that the food crisis can be resolved.

"4. A massive and intensive parallel campaign, both in food production and in population control, is essential to the future peace and welfare of mankind."

Such arrangements, it said, should require increased food production by recipient countries, including more intensive use of fertilizers and pesticides and the introduction of new lands into cultivation.

The report urged a tougher approach by this Government in negotiating agreements, through the food-for-peace program, to ship food abroad at bargain prices.

Negotiators for the United States should insist on greater use of fertilizer whether locally manufactured or imported, the report said, and should demand that the price policies of recipient underdeveloped countries be revised where necessary to provide greater incentives to food producers and distributors.

The report cited United Nations estimates that the world's population, now about 3.5 billion, would increase to 4.6 billion by 1980 and to some 6 billion by the year 2000. About 85 percent of this increase would be in the underdeveloped countries.

Projecting present average food production into the immediate future and without allowing for any increase in nutritional standards, the report estimated the food deficit of developing countries at 30 million tons in 1970 and 48 million tons in 1980. The estimated deficit takes into account mainland China.

The panel made no finding as to the amount by which nutritional standards should be increased in the developing countries.

But it said that if there was no increase, there would be a significant rise in the number of children, now put at 3 million, who die every year from protein-calorie malnutrition and in "the many more millions who are retarded in the physiological development by this condition."

"These malnourished, retarded survivors are major deterrents to the future social and economic development of their countries," the report said. "They will be the retarded young adults of 1985."

The study made the point, in stressing the need for increased local food production and for population control, that even if the more advanced nations had supplies available "the world's shipping and distribution facilities are inadequate for the large food transfers that would be needed.

"U.S. surplus today more and more exists in its capacity to produce than in accumulated stocks," the panel said. To harness the capacity of the American farm plant to the Nation's foreign policy objectives, it argued, would only give official recognition to the facts as they are.

"As far as the future is concerned," it said, "surplus disposal is not the real problem; rather it is a distraction from the real problem—how can American agriculture aid in meeting the needs of the less-developed countries?"

"Certainly American agriculture can help meet this challenge," the panel declared. "It can do it primarily by planning production, not on the basis of what is easy to produce, but on the basis of what the world needs."

[From the New York Times, Dec. 5, 1965]

India Tells of Rising Need

NEW DELHI, INDIA, December 4.—A delegation of U.S. Congressmen has been told that India will need a substantial increase in imported food grains to meet its food crisis following a disastrous drought.

Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin, told a news conference here this evening that the delegation was informed India might need about 12 million tons of wheat and rice next year, compared with present annual imports of about 8 million tons.

[From Business Week, Dec. 18, 1965]

United States Shapes Fight on World Hunger: Threatened Famines in India and Other Hungry Nations Have Long-Term Implications for American Foreign Policy, International Politics, Farm Economy and for Businessmen

The ugly threat of famine in India this winter is bringing to a head pressures in Washington for a radically new approach to the world food problem.

It is now almost certain that these pressures will shift the philosophy of the food-for-peace program from the negative one of surplus disposal to the positive one of producing to fill world needs. Tied to that will be a much more hard-headed effort to use U.S. food as a prod and a lure to induce food-hungry nations to boost their own output.

Implications: Immediate impact of the shift in food strategy probably won't be great. It will take time to turn the food-for-peace program around, to gear it into the foreign aid program, to retool domestic farm policies to mesh with world needs. It will take money, too. And President Johnson's hand is tightening on the Federal pursestrings as economic demands of the war in Vietnam mount.

Longer term though, the burgeoning world food crisis and the probable U.S. response to it will have profound implications for U.S. foreign policy, for international politics, for the American farm economy, and—not least—for U.S. business.

Focus point: There is no doubt that the Indian emergency has dramatized the long-recognized threat of an impending world food crisis and created a new sense of urgency—and hope—in Washington about meeting it.

Johnson is moving fast to try to head off mass starvation in India. Last week, he authorized shipment of 1.5 million tons of food grains from surplus stocks. That's three times average recent monthly shipments to India. It is expected that more will be made available as needed—and as Indian ports and distribution facilities are able to handle it.

Linked to the speedup in surplus food deliveries was a $50 million long-term U.S. loan to India to buy U.S. fertilizer. This was tied to an Indian government agreement to spend a matching $50 million of its own scarce foreign exchange to buy more fertilizer on the world market. This transfusion of fertilizer could boost India's grain output by as much as 3 to 4 million tons next year.

I. INDIA'S CRISIS

Millions of people may starve in India this winter despite the best efforts of the United States and Indian Governments. The estimated shortfall of grain production is 10 to 12 million tons—about twice normal U.S. annual food-for-peace shipments. Normal capacity of Indian ports to handle food deliveries is about 700,000 tons—though that has been boosted on a crash basis to as much as 900,000 tons during past food crises. The internal distribution system also is overloaded, with surpluses in some places and famine in others. Hoarding as usual is adding to the grim prospect.

This year, a drought caught India by surprise. It is said to be the worst of the century and is ruining what had promised to be a good harvest. But the longer term outlook is alarming. India still is supplying only 90 percent of its food needs. It already is consuming 20 percent of the U.S. wheat crop. With population expanding at a rate of more than 11 million a year, by 1970 that percentage could rise to 50 percent if drastic action isn't taken.

Fertilizer is first: To meet this longer term threat, Washington is stepping up the pressure—using India's mounting food needs as a lever—on New Delhi to overhaul its agricultural system. That means greatly increased storage—insects and rodents consume 20 percent of India's grain—use of pesticides, transportation, price reform to give farmers incentives and credit to permit them to respond to them.

Most important, it means fertilizer. Washington is pressing New Delhi hard to relax further its insistence on government control of the industry—and its prices—in order to encourage private foreign investors to build the capacity India desperately needs and can't afford to buy on its own account.

Fertilizer is the most urgent single need to boost India's farm output. India uses only 2.6 pounds per acre per year compared to 10 pounds in Russia, 36 pounds in the United States, and 246 pounds in Japan. It takes 5 to 9 years for the Indian Government to bring a plant into operation, compared to an average 18 months in the United States. And existing state-owned plants are operating at only 63 percent of capacity.

Two years ago, Bechtel Corp. approached the Indian Government with a package offer to build four of five fertilizer plants in India. The deal fell through when New Delhi refused to assure the U.S. companies of the price flexibility they felt they needed to make a reasonable profit.

Now India's thinking is changing under the threat of famine and United States urging. Agreement is reported near on parts of the original Bechtel package. But India's need for fertilizer is so big that the country may have to go further than it is yet willing to go.

II. DWINDLING STOCKS

The threat of famine in India comes at what is already a time of decision for Washington on international food policy. Public Law 480, under which the food-for-peace program is operated, expires at the end of next year. Meanwhile, once bulging U.S. surpluses are rapidly disappearing. Indeed, surpluses of most of those farm commodities that the hungry nations need are down to or below levels that the Agriculture Department deems "prudent" to maintain as national reserves.

Some action thus is demanded next year. The United States obviously cannot and will not taper off food shipments as the need is growing desperate. But with the food-for-peace program scraping the bottom of the surplus bins, the program clearly will have to be put on a new basis.

Alternatives: A recent, still secret U.S. Government study indicates that even on the optimistic assumption that developing countries can slow their population growth rate by one-third by 1975, they are almost certain to face widespread starvation during the coming decade unless drastic steps are taken to redress the balance between food and people.

This week, Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which represents nearly half of the Nation's farmers, seized upon the Indian famine to call for a greatly expanded food-for-peace program.

Last week Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, powerful chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, made a similar plea in Washington to the just formed Committee on the World Food Crisis. The committee includes leaders of the National Farmers Union and the National Grange.

COOLEY pledged to call hearings of his committee early next year to study expanded U.S. farm production to meet food needs abroad.

Earlier, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had scheduled hearings on a bill introduced this year by Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, former food-for-peace director. This would call for scrapping the present food-for-peace program and launching a new program based on the Government buying in the marketplace foods needed abroad.

President's plan: Johnson's position at this point is not clear. Last month, he was on the point of announcing an expansion and overhaul of the food-for-peace program. But, angered by a news leak the day before he planned to make the announcement, he delayed making it.

His program at that time called for integrating the food-for-peace program tightly into the overall U.S. foreign aid program. It would have linked food for peace more closely to self-help measures to improve farm production in receiving nations. Food would be withheld from governments that failed to launch effective agricultural development programs.

At the same time, proceeds of sales of U.S. food would be channeled into technical assistance for agriculture, use of food for wages in farm development programs would be stepped up. U.S. food could be used to cushion reforms in pricing and marketing policies, or given to farmers to induce them to take the risks of trying new methods.

Vietnam problem: There are reports too, that the mounting costs of the war in Vietnam are giving Johnson pause before embarking upon a potentially costly expansion of the food-for-peace program. COOLEY hopes and Shuman asserts that such an expanded effort could be financed largely out of savings of funds now spent for curtailing farm production. COOLEY points out, for example, that under the new farm bill as much as $900 million could be spent over the next 4 years by the Federal Government for retiring cropland from production.

But many USDA officials are skeptical. And McGOVERN sets the cost of his program at $500 million a year initially, rising by that sum each year to a ceiling of $3.5 billion.

Officials have only begun to look closely at the problems that would be posed by the sort of expanded food-for-peace program being suggested by McGOVERN. But they clearly would not be simple to resolve.

[From the London Times, Nov. 23, 1965]

FAO GETS WARNING ON WORLD HUNGER—NEXT DECADE THE VITAL PERIOD

Mr. B. R. Sen, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization's director-general, and Professor Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish economist, warned the FAO conference here today of the urgent need to avert the increase in hunger that was threatening to arise in the next decade or so. The distant future, Professor Myrdal pointed out, would probably take care of itself but the next few years were the ones which worried him.

Mr. Sen said the situation in general was alarming. Drawing attention to the obvious gap between the FAO's objectives and the realities of the world situation, he stated that in some of the most heavily populated areas the outbreak of serious famines within the next 5 to 6 years could not be excluded.

LAWLESS HUNTING

The answer might eventually be found in technological advance. It was known that yields could be multiplied many times if existing knowledge in agricultural sciences could be even partially adapted and applied to tropical conditions.

Besides this, large resources of land and water still remained unexploited. The oceans continued to be subject to lawless hunting by man, though, properly husbanded, they could provide rich and inexhaustible harvests. The scientists were holding out vistas of practically limitless food supplies at some future time from such new sources as chemical synthesis, fermentation and micro-organisms.

These glittering prospects should not blind us to the realities of the immediate situation. Today 10 to 15 percent of the world's population was undernourished and up to half suffered from hunger, malnutrition or both, and the numbers were increasing daily. The necessary rate of increase in food production to avoid serious breakdown had not been reached in the underdeveloped regions during the past decade.

Measures covering a wide field of economic and social policy would have to be taken to break the cycle of self-perpetuating poverty. In assessing priorities, agriculture must be given first place—crash programs of industrialization, however attractive politically, could not meet the essential conditions for economic growth unless based on a parallel development in agriculture. The main aim should be a higher rate of agricultural productivity in the developing countries.

Explaining the reasons for agriculture's disappointing performance, Mr. Sen said the greatest single obstacle to increased farm production in developing countries was the lack of any real incentives to farmers. Increased production often seemed to the farmers too risky to justify additional effort and costs. Especially serious was the instability of farm prices, particularly after the harvest when most farmers had to sell their surplus to pay off debts.

Professor Myrdal, delivering the McDougall lecture, knocked home some of Mr. Sen's points with vigor. He estimated the sum spent on armaments and war preparations throughout the world, largely by the advanced countries, at more than $200,000 million. This was larger than the total national incomes of all non-Communist underdeveloped countries. Contrary to expectations 10 years ago, not only grants and concessional loans but also the total flow of financial resources had leveled off. The situation had grown tighter because the rich countries could not agree among themselves on how to secure exchange stability and world liquidity.

They create for themselves the illusion of being short of international funds by lack of proper planning in their internal affairs and inadequacy of their own central banking and monetary cooperation. The preservation of internal and external balance in the economic development of rich countries does not, in my opinion, constitute insoluble technical problems. This is a field where policies are dangerously lagging behind our available knowledge.

What the underdeveloped countries could demand was not only freer access to markets but a discrimination in their favor. "Such a discrimination would only tend to restore a measure of world balance."

EQUALIZATION AT HOME

There was a growing popular apathy toward a more generous policy to benefit poor countries. This was partly caused by success in spreading knowledge of the problems. It had been simplified to the extent of becoming "coined into commonplaces." There was also the feeling that the spokesmen for the poor countries, who mostly belonged to the privileged strata, "should do some equalization at home before they appeal for more international solidarity."

On land tenure, he said a substantial and rapid increase in agriculture yields has rarely if ever occurred in traditional self-sufficiency farming where illiteracy was prevalent and the relation between the farmer and his land was such that he had little possibility and little incentive to exert himself.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 14, 1965]

Farm Group Urges End To Use of U.S. Food Surplus as Foreign Aid—Instead, Farm Bureau Head Says, Government Should Buy Such Hunger Relief on Open Market

Chicago.—The Government should purchase food for overseas hunger relief on the open market at going prices, rather than using Federal farm surpluses, the head of the Nation's largest farmers' organization suggested.

In a speech to the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation here, Charles B. Shuman, president of the 1.7-million-member organization, noted that the U.S. food-for-peace program will be up for congressional review next year.

In this revision, the surplus-disposal aspect should be discontinued," he said, "and the food-aid needs should be purchased on the domestic market at the going market price. These purchases of grain, cotton, dairy, livestock, fruit, and vegetable products would quickly strengthen market prices and assure the resource adjustments needed," Mr. Shuman said.

The food-for-peace program, enacted in 1954, has been primarily a surplus-disposal device, but "it has been increasingly used for foreign aid," Mr. Shuman said.

Changes in the food-for-peace plan could lead to the farm bureau's long-sought goal of scrapping Federal programs to control farm output, Mr. Shuman said. "If the market price is given the opportunity to respond to foreign-aid demand, it should be possible to discontinue the present control programs and price supports could be used only as originally intended—to stabilize marketing, not to fix prices," he said.

Other results of such a change in food for peace, Mr. Shuman suggested, could be "huge reductions in farm program costs," an elimination of losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Agriculture Department's marketing arm, and large cuts in administrative expenses.

The Government also should tie its food aid to an international promotion of capitalism, Mr. Shuman said. Asserting that "socialism and hunger are irrevocably associated," he said, "the world desn't need to starve if the underdeveloped areas can be induced to accept the incentive method of capital formation—competitive capitalism."

He said, "Further extension of food aid by the United States should be conditioned upon the willingness of the recipient country to replace government management of agriculture with a market-price system."

Despite its farm abundance, "the United States can't feed the world. We need to inquire into the causes of hunger in a world that has ample resources to feed any foreseeable population level," Mr. Shuman said. He concluded that socialism must be blamed for world hunger because it is "the one common denominator" that applies to nearly all hungry nations.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 17, 1965]

Repercussions Hinted in U.S. Food Plan

(By Josephine Ripley)

Washington.—An expansion of the food-for-peace program, such as President Johnson is reported to have in mind, could have major repercussions down on the farm, and even in the kitchen, in the opinion of authorities here.

They admit that it could, and may well, result in a radical change in the present far-flung farm program and even raise prices to the consumer.

If the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture is authorized to go into the open market to buy the food required for expanded foreign assistance, as contemplated, in all probability it would bid up the price.

"Yes, I would say it would affect consumer prices to some extent, though not radically," acknowledged one authority close to the scene.

For the Secretary of Agriculture to buy in the open market instead of reaching for Government surpluses is a sensational new development.

But the fact is, surpluses in most commodities have been reduced to the point where they are hardly more than those necessary for a strategic reserve.

As an example, the Commodity Credit Corporation had a carryover of 1,400 million bushels of wheat in 1961. It is down to 800,000 bushels now.

The Secretary has already been given authority, under the farm bill of 1965, to buy dairy products for domestic and foreign assistance programs in the market.

A bill introduced last summer by Senator George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, would give the Secretary added authority to buy needed food products in the open market if Government-held surpluses are not sufficient for domestic and foreign-aid distribution.

FOREIGN POLICY INSTRUMENT

This same bill also authorizes the adjustment of production controls so that farmers could put more land into crops, if needed.

All this represents a sudden and dramatic reversal of farm policy, one which could shake American agriculture to its foundations.

Behind it is an inner council decision to make far more extensive use of food as an instrument of foreign policy.

The President's plan—withheld from announcement when it was divulged prematurely in a newspaper story—would, in effect, integrate the food-for-peace program with other economic aid.

It would call for increased efforts to encourage agricultural development in the food-deficient countries.

Food for peace now is paid for in the currency of the receiving country, although some is purchased with dollars. The President would like to see more dollar payments and hopes to encourage that through making long-term credit available.

The long-term objective is to stimulate the economies of these less-developed countries and create new customers for U.S. products.

STIMULATION SOUGHT

A recent study shows that "when per capita income in the less-developed countries increases 10 percent, dollar sales of U.S. farm products go up 21 percent."

As for a possible "food shortage" in the United States as a result of reduced surpluses, Secretary Freeman recently termed that suggestion "silly."

At the same time, it is recalled by others that the President said last January he would send up a bill to establish security reserves for food. He did not follow through, however, because, as one authority explained, "he discovered if we put aside substantial reserves, there would not be any surplus to be used for food for peace."

TASK FORCE SET UP

The President, in his plans for a bigger, broader food for peace drive, is acting on the advice of a task force composed of representatives of the Department of Agriculture, Food for Peace, and the Agency for International Development.

The task force is understood to "lean toward the McGovern bill." However, the President will send up his own legislation, possibly preceded by a special message to Congress.

A special committee on the world food crises now is being formed, headed by James Patton, head of the National Farmers Union. It will have its first meeting here early in December. The committee's purpose—to work for the passage of the President's food for peace program.

[From the Kansas City Star, Oct. 13, 1965]

Farm Output Crucial: Senator Frank Carlson of Kansas Tells FFA Session That World Agriculture Is Shrinking in Face of Expanding Population

Senator Frank Carlson, Republican, of Kansas, told the Nation's future food producers here today that agriculture now faces history's most crucial problems—an expanding population and shrinking food supply.

He told the young farmers that substantial increases in food production will be required in all parts of the world to feed a doubled world citizenry expected within 35 years.

AT FFA SESSION

Carlson spoke at the opening session of the 38th convention of the Future Farmers of America at the municipal auditorium.

"The population of the world is growing even more rapidly than ever and it is very uncertain at this stage whether the world will be able to feed its increasing population in the next 10 to 15 years," the speaker said.

He said, however, that the problem should be attacked on two fronts—sharing the U.S. food abundance abroad, and increasing production in underdeveloped countries.

Carlson said sharing this country's food more effectively should be a short-term effort over the next 10 or 15 years.

"This will require," he said, "not only stepping up our production at home—which is the easy part of the task—it will require more technical guidance to the receiving countries in building up their port unloading and handling facilities—their storage structures and the entire system of food distribution.

"I believe we can profitably double our existing programs of food production for export."

FARM PICTURE BRIGHT

Carlson called the U.S. farm production and export situation "the most encouraging agricultural picture we have had in many years."

He said the second front in the war on hunger is the urgent need for rapid acceleration of food production abroad.

"We must assist the underdeveloped countries in the world to undertake the kind of agricultural revolution which we have experienced in the last 100 years," he said. "There is an urgent need for the knowledge and skills of our agricultural technicians—research scientists—extension workers and experienced farmers."

He said although such aid is not cheap, it is "less costly than military hardware."

A POWERFUL TOOL

"Food abundance is a powerful instrument capable of replacing despair with hope and converting the seeds of violence into the foundations of peace.

"It is a matter of concern to us," he said, "because a hungry world is a world of turbulence, fraught with danger. It is a world of instability and unrest and breeds wars.

"Our Nation," the speaker concluded, "has never had a greater opportunity to demonstrate its Christian principles."

[From the Enid Morning News, Nov. 14, 1965]

Population Explosion May Cause Food Shortage Soon

In 1789 England's Rev. Thomas R. Malthus stated as part of his premise that trouble for the world was ahead in this manner:

"First, that food is necessary to the existence of man. Second, that the passion between the sexes is necessary, and will remain nearly in its present state."

For 150 years, most of the world scoffed at his warning that man would outpropagate his capacity to feed himself. But today there is chilling evidence that that time has arrived.

Consider: Almost one-half of the world's 3.3 billion people go to bed each night either hungry or grossly ill fed. By the year 2000, before today's children have reached middle age, that 3.3 billion will have multiplied to 7.4 billion. The Population Reference Bureau views this as calamitous.

More than 85 percent of those new 4.1 billion will be born in Africa, Asia, and Latin America which now suffer the greatest food deficiencies. And today's well-fed world, western Europe and North America, will continue in a lopsided advantageous position. Three million children die each year because inadequate food spawns or encourages fatal diseases. Concerned officials are just beginning to find out to what extent. Latin America, Africa, and Asia all are hollow shells of food production. The entire world's expandable arable land area is estimated at only about 5 percent.

Russia, potentially one of the world's great food producers, now has a potential desert of millions of acres as a result of former Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's disastrous virgin lands program. Those lands were suited only for light grazing but plowing loosened to the winds the irreplaceable layers of topsoil.

VOICES OF CONCERN

The strokes for this bleak picture come from the Food for Peace Office, the Agriculture Department, the Population Reference Bureau, and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

Others are added by Senator George S. McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, advocate of a tangible program to feed the world's people; Thomas Ware, chairman of the Freedom From Hunger Foundation, and Prof. Nevin S. Scrimshaw, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The so-called developed countries—North America, Europe, the Soviet Union, Japan, and Oceania—are blessed with two vital factors in the face of survival: control of fertility and ability to produce food.

In those countries the balance between births and deaths has resulted in a relatively slower rate of population growth. Their birth rates range from 17 to 25 for each 1,000 persons.

But in the "developing" countries the birth rate runs from 39 to 50 for each 1,000.

"It is the 2.4 billion people in these countries who are most acutely caught in the looming population crisis," the Population Reference Bureau, a non-Government agency, said. "There is an ardent hope that general decline in fertility is imminent in the developing countries. New fertility-control techniques enhance this possibility."

LATIN AMERICAN RATE HIGHEST

Latin America's annual population growth rate of almost 2.5 percent is the highest for a single area. At that pace its 248 million people will double in 29 years.

By comparison, Europe's rate has been only 0.7 percent for 35 years, and the same rate is expected for the next 35 years.

Asia's annual growth rate of 1.4 percent is expected to rise to 2.5 by 2000, giving it an overall population of about 4 billion—a billion more than the present entire world population.

It is too early to tell what results birth control programs will produce. Japan, with legalized abortions, has brought its growth rate under some degree of control. Nationalist China and South Korea are well along that road. India is beginning.

Whatever happens, overall population growth is not expected to be stopped, short of a nuclear war involving most of the major countries.

With the acceptance as fact that more and more people are coming, the next question is, Where will they get food?

Thomas Ware told a Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee in June that only 3.5 percent, or less than 4 billion acres of the world surface, is capable of growing food. And that land is constantly threatened by erosion from deforestation, exhaustion, war, and unscientific use.

Ware urged more use of fertilizer, better seeds and tools, weed and pest controls, better distribution systems and greater use of the sea as a source of food.

Most of all, Ware urged concerted action—by governments, private agencies, and individuals.

INTERNATIONAL HEAD PROPOSED

McGovern, backed by Senator Gaylord Nelson, Democrat, of Wisconsin, has offered a beginning—a bill to establish an international food and nutrition director.

The measure, which McGovern terms a 10-year war against want, would authorize $500 million annually with which the President would buy U.S. foods to be sold, exchanged, or donated to needy nations.

The legislation has been assigned to the Foreign Relations Committee. A companion measure has been introduced in the House.

McGovern estimates that only about 75 percent of U.S. cropland capacity is in use but yields per acre continue to rise. Feed grains now need only 2 acres for the same yields that required 3 acres just 5 years ago. Similar increases have been made for wheat and rice.

No one believes the United States can feed all of the hungry world. But it can contribute and, with other governments, can provide the food. But quantity is not enough.

The food-for-peace office tells of a Guatemalan girl who was so ill nourished that she weighed only 55 pounds at age of 11. A baby in Colombia reached only 5 pounds in 9 months.

Professor Scrimshaw said that malnutritions kills one-third to one-half or more of the children before age 5 in many developing countries. He said that nutritional advances must accompany greater food output if starvation is not to be replaced only by illness and disease.

Fear of World Famine Is Voiced by Food Expert

(Note.—While America cuts food production, hundreds of millions in the world are starving. Former Food-for-Peace Director George McGovern, now a U.S. Senator, warns that if a crash program is not developed to greatly raise world food output, mass famine will occur in the next decade.)

Pullman, Wash., November 21, 1965.—Mass starvation on a scale never before experienced by the human race will stalk undeveloped nations by 1975 unless drastic steps are taken immediately to increase world food production.

That is not rhetoric. It is the sober prediction of a well-informed man, Senator George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota.

McGovern was U.S. Food-for-Peace Director before his election to the Senate in 1962. He has continued to take a close personal interest in the developing world food gap and probably knows as much about it as any man alive. He is greatly troubled by what he knows.

"Unless we do a great deal more than we're now doing to increase food production in this country and abroad," he said, "mass starvation will be the most painful fact of life on this planet within 10 years."

PROBLEM STRESSED

The South Dakota Senator said hunger is already a much more serious problem than most well-fed Americans realize.

"Half a billion people go hungry every day of their lives," he said. "Another billion are undernourished, because of a shortage of protein in their diet. At least 3 million children die of malnutrition every year."

You don't see much of this in America. This country, Canada, Western Europe, Australia, New Zealand, and parts of Argentina and southeast Asia have adequate food supplies. But in other parts of Asia, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East, there simply is not enough food to go around.

Moreover, the situation in these areas is growing steadily worse, because population is growing much faster than food production.

NEED TO PERSIST

Even if the undeveloped nations should begin tomorrow to take drastic and effective measures to curb population growth, their need for increased food supplies would remain desperate.

Consider India for example. It has already launched a vigorous birth control program. But by the most conservative estimates, its population can be expected to increase during the next 15 years from 450 million to more than 600 million. Yet India's food production is already inadequate for the existing population—and is increasing hardly at all.

Can't we ship some of our surplus U.S. farm commodities over there to feed the hungry Indians?

"We're already doing that on a substantial scale," McGovern said. "But food reserves in the United States and other food surplus countries are by no means as large as commonly believed. Our national farm policies have been aimed for years at reducing production. We've taken 50 million acres of cropland out of cultivation. As a result of Government controls, we have worked down our farm surplus stocks to a level little above that needed for our own national reserves.

"For example, we now have only 800 million bushels of wheat in storage. That wouldn't meet our own requirements for 8 months if we had a crop failure. And it wouldn't be a drop in the bucket if we began to encounter worldwide famine."

McGovern said the time has come to reverse the direction of U.S. farm policy and begin "stepping up production instead of cutting it down."

"I think we ought to be deliberately producing surplus farm commodities for shipment overseas," he said. "I cannot believe the American people want to leave good cropland idle at public expense while hunger spreads across the world."

But American farms at best can satisfy only a fraction of the world's food needs, he said. "The most urgent need is for a rapid acceleration of food production abroad."

He proposed that the United States organize a farmers corps, rather like the Peace Corps, to show undeveloped countries how to get greater production per acre.

He said the United States should also provide funds for fertilizer, pesticides, irrigation development, hybrid seed, farm-to-market roads and other things which undeveloped nations need in order to carry out "an agricultural revolution like the one we've had during the last century."

"This type of aid is not cheap," he conceded. "But we are now spending more than $2 billion a year to reimburse farmers for retiring cropland and reducing production. If we began to divert a portion of that farm budget into the purchase, shipment and distribution of farm commodities abroad, we could double our food-for-peace effort with little increase in overall expenditures.

"And the impact on the American economy would be much better than our present programs. Full farm production leads to the purchase of more farm machinery, more gasoline and tires, more trucks, more seed, fertilizer, and so on."

LEGISLATION OFFERED

McGovern has put his ideas into a bill which he calls "the international food and nutrition act." It would authorize a gradual increase in expenditures, reaching a maximum of $3.5 billion a year after 6 years, to purchase nutritious foods in U.S. markets for shipment overseas, and to undertake projects aimed at increasing food production in undeveloped countries.

Although he would prefer that Americans support such a program out of simple humanitarian concern for starving people, McGovern points out that a case can also be made for his bill as a weapon against Communist expansion.

"The unrest that opens the way for Communist inroads often has its roots in hunger," he said. "Helping poor countries raise their food production would be less expensive and much more constructive than shipping them arms."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 7, 1965]

A Hungry World's Biting Deep Into Our Surpluses

(By Carroll Kilpatrick, Washington Post staffwriter)

A subtle change in America's agriculture, combined with the rapid increase in world population, has created a problem that could be the principal issue in the next session of Congress. President Johnson has ordered a governmentwide study of the subject and is expected to make his recommendations a major part of his 1966 legislative program.

In simple terms, America's food surpluses—once a major political and economic problem—are being depleted while the demand for food elsewhere in the world is multiplying at an alarming rate.

Some experts think that the greatest issue the world faces for the remainder of this century is how to feed the hungry and to prevent a Malthusian calamity. Richard W. Reuter, director of the food-for-peace program, says that we face "a crisis of monumental proportions."

For years, America has thought of itself in terms of enormous food stocks: bulging wheat bins and mountains of potatoes, dairy products and feed grains.

But in recent years, commercial exports have risen, food-for-peace programs have expanded and the school lunch and acreage reduction programs have proved effective.

Reuter points out that many commodities are no longer in surplus, or at least not in "unlimited" surplus as they were a few years ago.

Cotton and tobacco now account for 40 percent of the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. The major food item we have had in surplus—grains—has been reduced from 4.1 billion bushels 4 years ago to about 2.6 billion today. Rice, beans, vegetable oils, and butter are in such limited supply that they are no longer available for foreign donation programs.

There is one new surplus—a surplus of storage space. And there is a surplus of agricultural capacity.

The administration is tightlipped about its plans. But there is activity in half a dozen agencies in an attempt to devise proposals that the President can ask Congress to act on next year.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk addressed a private meeting of the Government's farm advisers the other day and warned them that the Nation's foreign and defense policies were involved in the food challenge.

The stark fact is that "the less-developed world is losing the ability to feed itself," Reuter says. Because of the huge population growth, "the underdeveloped countries are slipping backward in food production."

Unless the trend can be reversed, he warns, "there will be widespread starvation in little more than a decade. At this point in history, the struggle to overcome hunger in the world is a losing battle."

For the last 7 years, the growth of world population has been at a rate of about 2 percent annually. The growth of food production has been about 1 percent.

Malthus warned a century and a half ago of precisely this kind of threat. He believed that population tends to multiply faster than food supplies and that the inevitable result is more poverty, disease, and death.

America, Japan, and Europe may have escaped the Malthusian threat; most of the rest of the world has not. As Lester R. Brown has noted in a series of Agriculture Department reports, the problem is growing worse every year because the underdeveloped countries have run out of arable land.

There are new acres in this country that could be put into production if needed, whereas in many underdeveloped countries, especially in Asia, virtually all the arable land is in production now. The task in those lands is to increase yield, but more fertilizer, new methods, better seeds are needed.

In the United States, the need for more food has been met in recent years by an expanding yield per acre, not in finding new acres. One American farmer produces enough food for himself and 30 other persons; many farmers elsewhere do not produce enough to feed themselves.

The most far-reaching American proposals to meet the problem were put forward last summer by Senators George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, and Gaylord Nelson, Democrat, of Wisconsin. McGovern is a former director of the food-for-peace program. They would combine an effort to increase American production with a new attempt to help farmers in underdeveloped lands learn how to increase the yield per acre.

If American farmers would put into production land and resources now idle, they could produce a third more wheat, 25 percent more soybeans and 50 percent more milk, McGovern says. This added production could be used overseas where most needed without a drain on America's gold and dollar resources, McGovern believes.

Underdeveloped countries would pay the United States for these commodities with local currencies, and McGovern's plan would finance an intensive program to assist them to bring their productivity and populations into balance—thus defeating Malthus's law.

[From the New Haven Register, Aug. 29, 1965]

U.S. Farm Surplus for World's Hungry?

Washington.—For years, a bountiful America has struggled—and spent millions—to control its farm surpluses.

Now a farm State senator wants an about-face which would let farmers grow more food on more land and would distribute more of it to the world's hungry millions.

Led by Senator George S. McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, a group of midwestern Democrats in Congress contend it is neither sensible nor moral for the United States to follow a program of sharply curtailed food production when every day half a billion people go to bed hungry.

And they warn that strict Federal controls have reduced the Nation's food stockpiles to such a low point, that there are not enough of some of basic commodities to maintain a 6-month reserve for home consumption.

They admit that the problems in their plan could be many and complicated. But they argue that the results would be good for American farmers as well as for international relations. They believe President Johnson agrees.

The roots of the food-for-peace (FFP) program lie in a 1954 law which provides for the distribution of surplus U.S. crops to have-not nations. The food may be given, bartered, sold for the currency of the receiving nation, or bought through a 40-year American loan plan.

In 1961 the program was designated food for peace, with McGovern as its first director. But he found his office carried little authority. He resigned in 1962 to run for the Senate. But his 18-month exposure to FFP left its mark.

On one side of the world he had seen mass graves of those who had starved to death; children whose gaunt limbs and distended stomachs testified to their hunger, and some blind from lack of proper nourishment.

At home were millions of acres taken out of production in a continuing battle against too much food, even while farmers declared that their private economic depression could eventually engulf the cities.

President Johnson suggested in his farm message to Congress establishment of strategic reserves of food but he submitted no bill to accomplish this.

Representative Clair A. Callan, Democrat, of Nebraska, did so June 3 with a measure which called for reserves of food equal to half a year's requirements. According to his calculations, this would wreck the FFP program.

Under his proposal, for example, 600 million bushels of wheat would be kept on hand. That would leave only 41 million for distribution abroad.

Two weeks later McGovern submitted to the Senate an "International Food and Nutrition Act of 1965." It would authorize an additional $500 million of foods of all kinds, not merely those now surplus, for distribution to hungry nations.

The program would be increased at the rate of $500 million a year until it reached $3.5 billion in 10 years.

His bill went to the Foreign Relations Committee whose chairman, Senator J. W. Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, has indicated he believes FFP should be stepped up from the mere dumping of surplus foods to providing the vitamins and proteins which hungry children require.

Support for his plan was forthcoming.

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey promised whatever help he could give. Senator Walter F. Mondale, Democrat, of Minnesota, claimed that McGovern's plan would work for this country's own interests.

"For every 10 percent the less developed countries increase their income level, they expand their dollar purchases of our farm products by 16 percent," he said. "Italy, Japan, and Nationalist China have moved from the status of food aid recipients to major dollar customers for our farm exports." But some Members of Congress doubt that McGovern's proposal would do the job.

[From the Southwestern Miller, Dec. 14, 1965]

Urge Larger Food Crops—U.S. Hesitates—Committee on the World Food Crisis, Formed in Washington, Seeks Return to Production of 55 Million Acres Now Withdrawn—Plan National Campaign for Change—Under Secretary of Agriculture Schnittker Sees No Need for Present Policy Reversal

Washington, December 13.—Foundations were laid in Washington Thursday for a national campaign to bring about a reversal in the present American Government policy of food crop controls that would release to production 55 million acres now withdrawn through Federal payments and also halt further land retirement from food raising. The week also witnessed an assertion by Under Secretary of Agriculture John A. Schnittker that the Agriculture Department is well aware of the international food situation but sees no reason for relaxing the acreage limitations now in effect. The demand for acreage freeing for food was launched at a meeting at the Washington Hilton hotel which brought about the formation of the Committee on the World Food Crisis.

COOLEY DECLARES FOR CROP RISE

Representative Harold D. Cooley, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, a speaker at the Thursday meeting, supported the objectives of the return of farmland now withdrawn from food production. It is time for "an about-face" on domestic farm policy, Mr. Cooley, a powerful figure on agriculture in Congress, declared at the meeting. Not only the 55 million acres, but land to be retired under the adjustment program of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 should come under the changes proposed. Mr. Cooley said that the new land retirement plan, if not altered, could bring about the withdrawal of 40 million more acres of land in the next 10 years.

Mr. Cooley also reported that he had informed President Johnson that he plans to hold hearings early in the next session of Congress on the development of a new program to expand production in the interest of the needy nations of the free world.

M'GOVERN FOR LESS CROP CONTROL

Senator George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, former director of the food-for-peace program, who spoke at the afternoon session of the Thursday meeting, called for increased supplies of food for the needy over the world and outlined the legislation that he is sponsoring for the easing of crop controls with that objective. Hearings will be held early in January on this measure, he stated.

"There is no doubt in my mind that we can win the race against population and famine in the years ahead," Senator McGovern said at the luncheon gathering of the organization meeting in introducing Paul Hoffman, who will head the new United Nations development program starting January 1. Mr. Hoffman addressed the luncheon.

"We have the tools and the knowledge to drive hunger from the earth within the next decade," Mr. McGovern also said. "We can end this century with a better fed world than we have today in spite of population growth if we conduct the war against hunger with a fraction of the zeal and resources we now bring to military conflict."

SCHNITTKER POINTS TO LIMITATIONS

The Cooley declarations, in line with the general tenor of the speakers at the organization's meeting of the Committee on the World Food Crisis, were followed by a statement by Under Secretary Schnittker, in which he asserted that he saw no reason for a change in administration crop control policy at this time. Mr. Schnittker said in part:

"There are vast needs for American grains abroad, particularly in India, but there are limitations on the quantity we are able to supply. The major limitation is the ability of many needy countries, and this includes India, to handle, process, and distribute supplies."

FAILS TO BRING DELAY ON MEETING

It is reported that Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman had suggested that the meeting which formed the Committee on the World Food Crisis be delayed until a later date, or abandoned, pending the formulation of national administration policies now under study. The Agriculture Department was not represented at the meeting.

GRANGE MASTER IS CHAIRMAN

The meeting elected Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, as chairman of the new committee. James J. O'Connor of St. Joseph's College in Philadelphia, was named vice chairman. Mr. O'Connor is president of the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation.

Robert M. Koch, president of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., was named executive director.

Dr. Flemmie Kittrell of the home economics department of Howard University was elected secretary.

The organization also includes a board of 30 members, among whom are Dwayne Andreas, head of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association in St. Paul, and Robert C. Liebenow, former president of the Chicago Board of Trade, and now with the Corn Industries Research Foundation in Washington.

CAUTION IS ADVISED ON PROGRAM

Gov. William H. Avery of Kansas, who participated in the meeting, urged caution in developing the program to the extent of assurance of reasonable profits from expanded production.

Representative Paul Findley, Republican, of Illinois, cautioned against any announcement to the world that the United States plans a massive, worldwide feeding program. He added that "it is a mistake to assume that we can feed all the hungry."

Louis H. Bean, noted agricultural economist long in the Department of Agriculture, now retired, asserted that it would be a mistake to encourage emphasis on livestock production in the developing countries because vegetable proteins can be more economically used for food than in the form of meat.

Representative Paul H. Todd, Jr., Democrat, of Michigan, declared that any effort to enlarge food supplies would fail to relieve hunger unless strong family planning controls are initiated and assiduously followed.

Hope was held out by K. S. Sundra Rajan, a member of the Board of the World Bank for India, that his country may become self-sufficient in food by 1971, but now is in urgent need of food.

The meeting brought a number of suggestions that American food aid should extend not only to food itself but to the solution of the problem of deliveries and processing. Senator McGovern even mentioned assistance in building roads.

FOR EVENTUAL FREEING OF PRICES

Washington, December 13.—A program for the eventual freeing of market prices and the return to cultivation of all or part of the 55 million acres now withdrawn from production has been submitted to the Department of Agriculture by a panel of businessmen, educators, nutritionists and Federal officials. The report urges a massive and intensive campaign to increase food production and to control population. A gradual phasing out of the present system of price supports and other subsidies and eventual reliance on markets is urged. The present food-for-peace program, announcing to $1.7 billion a year, would be transferred to the foreign policy budget instead of the domestic farm program.

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 1965]

U.S. REPORT WARNS OF WORLD FOOD DILEMMA

(By Gaylord P. Godwin, United Press International)

Countries containing two-thirds of the world's people are losing the capacity to feed themselves and have little chance of ever doing so, the Agriculture Department reported yesterday.

Nearly all the major rice-producing countries of Asia face this problem.

A report issued by the Agriculture Department's Economic Research Service said the problem is that many of the densely populated, less developed countries have just about exhausted the supply of new land that can be readily brought into production.

Their only recourse is to increase the yield per acre as North America and Western Europe have done, and their hopes of doing this are not good, the report said.

In releasing the report, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said problems of staggering proportions face the underdeveloped countries in trying to keep food production anywhere near the rapid growth in population.

"Both land and time are running out for these countries," he said.

The report said that most of the countries in trouble had raised yields at very modest rates over the past 25 years by putting more men to work in the fields as the population grew.

[From the Chemical and Engineering News, Dec. 27, 1965]

UNITED STATES SEEKS NEW MEANS TO AID WORLD'S HUNGRY—CONGRESS, AGRICULTURAL EXPERTS, AND RESEARCH WORKERS ARE EVOLVING WAYS TO SPEED AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN POOR NATIONS

The United States is getting set to revamp its efforts to feed the world's hungry and speed the growth of agriculture in underdeveloped countries. For the past several months American nutritional and agricultural leaders have been helping the administration sculpture new shapes for and give new directions to the Food for Peace Act (which expires a year hence) and other forms of agricultural foreign aid.

On a basic research level, efforts are being made to recruit industrial and university help in setting up laboraory facilities for studying land and climatic factors which prevent effective adaptability of American techniques to the problems of underdeveloped countries.

Meanwhile, congressional leaders are themselves fashioning legislation broadly aimed at returning retired cropland to use for growing food for hungry nations, and establishing incentives for the poor nations to elevate yields per acre to boost their overall economies. The results of all the activity are bound to be of production and marketing significance to the U.S. food, fertilizer, and pesticide industries, as well as to Federal and university research programs.

Representative Harold D. Cooley, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Agricultural Committee, plans hearings on Capitol Hill in January on the possibility of expanding American farm output for feeding the hungry. Also slated for considerable attention by Mr. Cooley's committee are ways of easing food distribution problems.

The committee intends to give ear, moreover, to criticisms such as those voiced by Cocommitteeman Paul Findley, Republican, of Illinois. Representative Findley thinks overemphasis on American food shipments would cut into potential foreign markets of developing countries and thwart their chances of expanding trade. "We can help developing countries learn the techniques of modern production," adds Mr. Findley, "by establishing, for example, a 'capitalist corps' as counterpart to the Peace Corps, composed of people with firsthand experience with our system of raising capital and satisfying consumer demands."

The Food for Peace Act, while never intended as primarily a humanitarian venture, is nevertheless criticized because it isn't sufficiently charitable, tough-fisted, and relevant to a country's food needs. Passed in 1954 and amended frequently since then, it was instituted ostensibly to help the United States get rid of its surplus crops while salvaging as much of their market value as possible. Its critics contend, too, that it hasn't really been used to prop the developing nations firmly on their agricultural feet.

On the other side of the Capitol, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee plans hearings early next year on Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN's, Democrat, of South Dakota, international food and nutrition bill, essentially a replacement for the Food for Peace Act. The bill would provide $500 million over each of the next 7 years to purchase critical foods pinpointed to nutritional needs on a country-by-country basis; improve reception and distribution facilities; and improve crop yields.

The administration, spurred by overpopulation awareness and India's potential famine, has taken many steps to start its own ball rolling. Last month President Johnson moved the food-for-peace program from the Agriculture to the State Department, where it could mesh rather than clash with the economic development plans of the Agency for International Development. AID has shifted focus building firm agricultural bases in developing countries as preludes to the growth of capital goods economies.

Much of the current agricultural and fizz in the State Department is about feeding the preschool child. AID during the past few weeks has begun a pilot program to test the effects of adding appropriate vitamins and minerals to dried milk and fish-vegetable proteins shipped abroad for young children, pregnant women, and lactating mothers. AID is beginning an attempt to get U.S. companies interested in producing and packaging these new, inexpensive foods, as the beginning of what would hopefully be a mildly booming industry.

One needn't look far to comprehend why American free enterprise hasn't rushed in to take part in the opportunity in the developing nations. A recent report of businessmen to AID sums up the situation in these countries: "Inflation, to greater or lesser degrees, is common to nearly all developing nations. Systems of business, law, and regulation are outmoded; capital markets are rudimentary, and there is, nearly everywhere, political risk."

Among the report's recommendations, two stand out:

Amendment to tax laws so that losses suffered by American-owned subsidiaries in developing countries can be offset by profits earned elsewhere.

Reduction of the cost of selected risk guarantees against inconvertibility of currencies, nationalization and confiscation, and losses from war and revolution. Overall, the panel recommended agricultural vigor before industrial venture.

POTENTIAL

It isn't possible to estimate in dollars the industrial potential of the evolving program. But in the words of one agricultural industry executive, "The impact could be tremendous all across the board." Any degree of extra crop growth would mean more production of fertilizers and pesticides. Moreover, as the investment climate in the developing nations improves, the same industries—with food processing firms—would be expected to move in to take part (for profit), in self-help policies of these countries. Benefits to American industry could accrue in the long run, too. For example, Japan, now self-sufficient in agriculture, is buying more American foods than ever before.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 4, 1965]

THE WORLD'S BIGGEST PROBLEM: HOW EXPERTS SEE IT

How can the world feed all its people, at the rate the population is growing? That is becoming the world's No. 1 problem.

A look at what's happening shows why experts are worried. The human race is doubling in numbers every 35 years. That means the food supply must be doubled, too—in just 35 years.

Can that be done? Or is famine ahead? For United States, it means a new challenge. And officials already are moving to meet it.

The population explosion: Worldwide world's population now 3.3 billion. World's population by year 2000 6 billion, up 83 percent, almost doubled in just 35 years.

Problem: Growth will be biggest in areas already short of food.

North America: Now 214 million, by 2000 350 million, up 64 percent.

Latin America: Now 245 million, by 2000 630 million, up 157 percent.

Europe: Now 678 million, by 2000 780 million, up 15 percent.

Africa: Now 309 million, by 2000 775 million, up 151 percent.

Asia: Now 1.8 billion, by 2000 3.4 billion, up 89 percent.

Oceania: Now 18 million, by 2000 30 million, up 68 percent.

Startling facts that dramatize the world's biggest problem are brought to light by an international industrial conference sponsored by Stanford Research Institute and the National Industrial Conference Board.

The problem is this:

In the next 35 years, the world's population, now about 3.3 billion, will skyrocket to about 6 million—almost doubling by the year 2000.

Biggest population increases—more than 100 percent—will come in the less developed nations, where population already is pressing severely against food supply.

Smallest increases—about 40 percent—will come in the well-fed, industrial nations best able to handle growth.

These United Nations estimates of future population are conservative. Actual increases may prove to be much higher.

The story of what these figures mean was reported by experts at the conference, held in San Francisco in September.

NEEDED: TWICE AS MUCH FOOD

The drama of the population story is this:

The world, even now, is facing a food problem. Diets are inadequate in the huge underdeveloped areas of the world, which include almost all of Asia and Africa and most of Latin America.

Just to maintain the present inadequate level of diet will require a virtual doubling of the world's output of food in the next 35 years.

This vast increase in food production must be achieved at a time when nearly all of the virgin lands of the world already have been brought into production.

There is no assurance that the job can be done in time.

Great famine, as a result, could be the outlook.

This warning is voiced by Dr. Earl L. Butz, dean of agriculture at Purdue University and onetime chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations:

"The world is on a collision course. When the massive force of an exploding world population meets the much more stable trend line of world food production, something must give. Unless we give increased attention now to the softening of the impending collision, many parts of the world within a decade will be skirting a disaster of such proportion as to threaten the peace and stability of the Western World."

SPEEDUP IN POPULATION GROWTH

But, it is asked: Hasn't the world always found a way to feed its ever-growing population?

The answer, according to the experts, is that the problem today is far more complex than at any time in the past.

For one thing, population growth is faster now—and getting faster all the time. Dr. Butz paints this picture:

"At the beginning of the Christian era, world population was estimated to have numbered around 250 million.

"In the next 16 centuries it doubled, reaching 500 million by 1600.

"Three centuries later, by 1900, world population had tripled, and stood at about 1.5 billion.

"In the less than two-thirds of a century since 1900, world population has approximately doubled again.

"Reliable estimates indicate that in the little over one-third of a century remaining until the year 2000, it will double again.

"The astonishing fact is that the human race is currently doubling in numbers every 35 years.

"Obviously, this rate of growth cannot persist indefinitely, because of the sheer limitation of space and food."

Complicating the problem is the fact that food production is not increasing as fast as the population. Dr. Butz reports this:

"The man-food ratio around the world, never high enough to be very exciting to two-thirds of the world's population, has actually been in a decline the last half dozen years.

"Total food output has increased during those years, to be sure, but at a slower rate than population increase. In many of the world's underdeveloped areas, the man-food ratio is in a serious decline."

WHERE FOOD CRISES LOOM

The drama of the food problem that lies ahead will center in the following areas: Latin America, Asia, Africa.

Latin America's population in the next 35 years will zoom 157 percent—from 245 million people now to 630 million people by the year 2000.

Even now, Latin America as a whole is compelled to import food to feed its own people. The only Latin American countries classified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as having adequate diets are Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. Ahead, for Latin America, is the problem of finding food for 385 million more people within 35 years.

Asia, which already holds 55 percent of the world's population, is expected to show a rise of 89 percent in population in the next 35 years—up from 1.8 billion now to about 3.4 billion in the year 2000.

Here, too, is an area that must import food to live. Today Red China is forced to buy grain in large quantities. The millions of India are heavily dependent on food supplies from the United States. Few Asian nations are able to provide their people an adequate diet.

Asia's problem, loaded with potential for future tragedy, is where to find food for the 1.6 billion additional people that it must feed 35 years hence.

Or take the case of Africa, heading for a population growth of 151 percent in the remainder of this century. Only South Africa, in this whole vast continent, is classified as having an adequate diet today. Africa, already importing food, faces the problem of feeding 466 added millions by 2000.

Taken all together, the hungry countries of the world—those considered by experts to have deficient diets—now contain about two-thirds of the world's population but produce only about one-third of the world's food. And it is almost exactly these hungry areas that face the biggest population growth in the years ahead.

A TURN IN THE FOOD FLOW

What makes the food problem even worse is the decline of underdeveloped areas as food producers. Only a generation ago, Asia, Africa, and Latin America were regions with food surpluses. They exported grain to the more advanced countries, especially to Europe.

Now the food flow is reversed. The underdeveloped areas that once grew more food than they ate now must import food from the developed nations.

The reason is that food production in those hungry, underdeveloped areas is not increasing fast enough to keep pace with the increase in population. From 1953 to 1963, there was an actual drop in the amount of food produced locally per person in the underdeveloped regions.

DILEMMA OF THE WEST

Here's a problem for the free world: Communist countries, including Red China, face a smaller population explosion than non-Communist countries.

The outlook, as analyzed by the experts, is that the population in the Communist world will grow about 49 percent while the population in the free world will grow about 98 percent between now and the year 2000.

What this means is that growing food problems could fan agitation for revolution in areas not now Communist.

OVERCROWDING

Not only food but living space will become a serious problem in the population explosion ahead.

Even now, many parts of the world are overcrowded. The following figures show the density of population in 1965 and the density expected by 2000.

Population per square mile

	1965	*2000*
Asia	108	202
Africa	26	65
Europe	167	192
Latin America	31	78
North America	26	41
Oceania (Australia, New Zealand, etc.)	5	10

As these figures show, North America will continue to be a part of the world that offers its inhabitants the most elbowroom. But even Americans will begin to feel crowded.

NOTE OF HOPE, TOO

One hopeful note is sounded by the experts: The world is not likely to run out of essential fuels or industrial materials in this century.

Sir John Cockcroft, winner of the Nobel Prize for physics in 1951 and now master of Churchill College at Cambridge, England, told the conference:

Reserves of coal, oil, gas and uranium will be adequate to provide increasing amounts of power for many years.

By the time uranium supplies run out—if they ever do—man will know how to extract energy from water.

Industry will have to turn to lower grade sources of raw materials. But the ocean floor may yield large quantities of manganeses, copper, nickel and cobalt. And plastics will be improved to replace metals in many uses.

A WATER SHORTAGE?

Water, in the crowded world of the future, looms as a problem almost as serious as that of food. Sir John Cockcroft discusses the water situation in these words:

"Water supplies could be a limitation on the development of the economy, especially water supplies for industrial and agricultural use, since requirements are likely to double in the next 20 years. The future of Asia, Africa and Australia could be vitally affected by water shortage, and even in some parts of the United States this is becoming a problem.

"Desalination of brackish and sea water may help in some areas of the world, especially if combined with less wasteful methods of using water for agriculture and the development of plant varieties which require less water."

WHAT EXPERTS BELIEVE

Is there an answer to the world's biggest problem? Two things must be done, say the experts:

1. Increase food production greatly.
2. Reduce the world's birth rate.

"In the long run," says Dr. Butz, "say by the close of this century, birth control is the only solution."

But Dr. Shiroshi Nasu of Tokyo University warns:

"The control of population growth, although it might become a kind of necessity in the future, cannot be depended upon too much now as the major means of adjusting the unbalanced food and population relationship.

"As the adoption of birth control among the developing nations will presuppose a raised standard of living, a wider diffusion of general education as well as a changed mental outlook, it will certainly take many years to come. During this time, the predicted crisis will not stop approaching.

"It will be a race between the two, and our prospect of winning the race is not too bright at present.

"So we have to turn our attention toward the increase of food production."

U.S. ROLE IN FOOD BATTLE

The United States, it is clear, will play a leading role in the coming battle to feed the world.

This country produces so much surplus food that the official policy has been to limit grain production.

Now official thinking is beginning to change.

On September 23, a new policy was proposed by Senator George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, former director of the food for peace program. He told the U.S. Senate:

"The most overwhelming paradox of our time is to permit half the human race to be hungry while we struggle to cut back on surplus production.

"I believe that we ought to declare an all-out war against hunger. We should announce to the world now that we have an unused food-producing capacity which we are willing and anxious to use to its fullest potential."

A bill has been introduced by Senator McGovern which would authorize the Federal Government to buy American-produced food to give to hungry nations or to sell to them at bargain prices. Other countries also would be given help in improving their own food production.

President Johnson is known to be thinking about the world food problem. He has expressed the conviction that the United States cannot remain secure as an "island of abundance" in a world full of starving people.

The time is seen approaching when U.S. farmers will be asked to spur food production—instead of curb it.

THE CHALLENGE FOR AMERICA

Can the United States really feed the world of the future?

"The opportunity for increased food production on the North American continent is tremendous," says Dr. Butz, a former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

However, he points out: "We can add only a limited supply of additional arable land. We can get some additional food from the sea—but here again we face practical limits.

"The only practical alternative available to us is the accelerated application of capital and technology to our own agricultural system in an effort substantially to increase output per acre and per man."

This also is pointed out by the experts: United States and Canada themselves face a population growth of about 64 percent in the next 35 years. Those additional people will take a large part of any increase in production.

Feeding a population the size of that foreseen by 2000 is going to be a job too big for any one country. Yet, for the United States, says Dr. Butz: "There is no realistic alternative for us except to gear up to meet this challenge."

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Jan. 4, 1966]

Food—Key 1966 Issue

(Note.—After years of putting the brake on farm production, Congress may soon tell American farmers to step on the gas. There isn't enough food in the world for hungry peoples. This may bring about a major step-up in the food-for-peace program due to expire at the end of 1966. A clash between farm policy and foreign policy could touch off sparks of controversy.)

(By Josephine Ripley)

Washington.—After the Vietnam war, food for peace may be one of the big issues before the 89th Congress.

It is a worldwide problem. Final decision on the U.S. role in the international food crisis will have impact on farm policies at home and foreign policy touching many lands.

The present food-for-peace legislation, known as Public Law 480, expires at the end of the year.

EFFECTIVENESS SEEN

Congress will be asked to expand and extend this program. Famine is imminent in India; it hangs like a threatening cloud over many other lands.

"The world food crisis" is a matter of deep concern and discussion here and abroad.

Thus the U.S. food-for-peace program becomes extraordinarily significant.

Senator George D. Aiken, Republican, reached by telephone in Vermont, said he favors an expanded program adapted to world problems.

"I think food is an effective force in the world today," he said.

"It is cheaper than missiles and bombs—and probably more effective in the long run."

Then, too, he added, "as nations of the world become more interdependent, the chances of war become less, automatically. You can't go to war with someone you are dependent on," he argues.

Senator Aiken speaks from firsthand impressions, having just returned from Vietnam and other Far East countries.

But the shrewd Vermonter is not for tipping the American horn of plenty recklessly.

"We should help the food-short nations to produce their own food supplies," he explained. "Until they do, we should help to tide them over. They need technical help in improving their production in order to feed their own people."

Some countries challenged to produce sufficient food of their own are not doing so. He mentioned India and the Philippines. The tendency of these and other governments has been to concentrate on industrial rather than agricultural production.

VIEWS ON INDIA

Senator Aiken says: "As far as India, we should give immediate help to prevent famine. But we should not enter into any long-term arrangement with India."

Under the present food for peace program, the United States is providing about $1,700 million a year in surplus food crops to food-deficit nations.

There are three methods of distribution:

1. In exchange for foreign currencies;
2. When sold for dollars on a long-term credit basis;
3. Food donated free in cases of disaster.

The largest distribution, by far, comes under the foreign-currencies category. These currencies have only limited use; they cannot be converted into dollars.

To expand and revise the food for peace program to any extent would call for an American farm policy switch with profound grassroots implications.

SURPLUSES USED

The world's hunger has practically eaten up those burdensome farm surpluses. The basic purpose of food for peace in the beginning was to help dispose of these surpluses.

Now, except for cotton and tobacco, they have practically disappeared.

This could mean that farmers instead of cutting back on production may be encouraged to step it up.

What the experts are saying, in effect, is that if there is a population explosion, there must be some kind of a food explosion, too.

Even so, many farm authorities here would oppose any move to do away with production controls entirely.

GAINS SIGHTED

Senator Aiken is one of these. He thinks it is time "for our producers to be given a little freer hand." But he would be for continuation of a realistic price-support program and flexible controls.

One Member of Congress who is giving a great deal of thought to all this is Representative Harold D. Cooley, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Reached by telephone in North Carolina, Mr. Cooley said he was in favor of the food-for-peace program.

"I think it has accomplished a lot," he said, "in relieving hunger for millions of people."

He will hold hearings on the world food crisis early in the year. He feels "we are going to have to continue the program." However, he anticipates "controversy in committee."

There are Members of Congress who consider food for peace "just a giveaway program. That's where the rub comes," he said frankly. "The cost of it."

"And as for giving away food, it is not as easy as one would think," said the legislator. "In one case, we wanted to send in food supplies where people were starving. We found there were no roads to transport this food to the people. We talked about an airlift, but found they had no airports near enough to the area."

The new food and peace bill will have to take these things into consideration, Mr. Cooley pointed out. Also, he added, the effect of any increased movement of American farm products on other exporting nations.

BILL INTRODUCED

One of the most vigorous advocates of more food for peace is Senator George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota. The Senator has his own food for peace bill, introduced during the first session.

It is a matter of great urgency, as he sees it.

"I think by the end of this decade the food crisis is going to be the overwhelming problem of the world," he told this correspondent.

"There is no time to lose. We should begin right now to forestall it.

"If it were not for the food for peace shipments to South Vietnam today, the shortage of food would bring on an inflation that would topple the government there in 30 days," he said.

He recently returned from a tour of that country.

The United States is sending some 300,000 tons of rice a year to South Vietnam. North Vietnam, the land of the rice paddies, is exporting rice to obtain currency for war materials, he reported.

Senator McGovern's bill would authorize funds to break what he calls the "bottleneck" to distribution. That is, to help build warehouses for storage and facilities for food distribution.

FUNDS SPOTLIGHTED

It would authorize funds to purchase nutritious foods for the various assistance programs in the open U.S. market, if necessary—foods such as milk, rice, and other nutritional commodities. These purchases would be made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In the last session of Congress, the Secretary was authorized to purchase dairy products in the open market. Senator McGovern would expand this authority to cover other commodities.

At present, all food commodities for the special aid programs except dairy products must come from Government-held surpluses.

His bill also provides for an increase in Agency for International Development (AID) operations, and for technical assistance to help nations increase their own production.

The administration proposals, not yet announced, are understood to follow these same lines in general. Except, perhaps, for the outright purchases by the Government in the open market in competition with the trade—a move which it is admitted is almost certain to bid up prices, temporarily at least.

PROGRAM OPPOSED

Senator Allen J. Ellender, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee which would normally consider such legislation, does not favor the program.

He considers it essentially "a giveaway program."

"Will you vote for it?" he was asked by this reporter.

"It depends on what it does," was his reply. "If it is to continue as a program of enlarged foreign aid, I would be against it."

His well-known opposition prompted the assignment of the McGovern bill to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee rather than Senator Ellender's agriculture committee.

In fact, one of the most controversial aspects of the food-for-peace program centers around jurisdiction. Not only in Congress, but between Government agencies.

The food-for-peace office was recently moved from the Executive Office of the President to the State Department.

Senator Aiken and Mr. Cooley were both against the State Department's taking over the program.

"The State Department is no qualified judge on the adequacy of food supplies in this country," declared Senator Aiken.

Mr. Cooley called it "absurd to put this program under the jurisdiction of the State Department. It would be like the tail wagging the dog. The State Department has a legitimate say with regard to foreign policy implications, but this is primarily an agricultural problem," he asserted.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 5, 1966]

Congress To Press Farm Aid Revision—World Needs Spur Doubts About Price Supports

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

Washington, January 4.—With administration approval or without it, a determined effort will be made in Congress to change the direction of domestic farm programs toward expanded production of major food crops.

The paradox of spending more than $4 billion a year to hold down surplus farm production and to study the effects of overeating at home—while half the human race goes hungry and undernourished—is causing some second thoughts within the administration as well as on Capitol Hill.

Two White House study groups and a succession of privately financed investigations have called for a change. So have the national farm organizations.

There is general agreement that it is morally and politically untenable for the United States to go on curbing food output while increasing populations in developing countries face mass starvation in this century.

COSTS ARE SOUGHT

The White House studies were not made public. One reason was the Budget Bureau's insistence that there should be a reasonably accurate estimate of costs involved before the President lent his name to recommendations that would reshape existing programs.

A preliminary estimate by Government experts suggested that it would cost about 25 percent more than present control and price-support programs if farmers were allowed to plant at will and the food was given away to the needy in underdeveloped countries.

Advocates of expansion insist that this 25 percent need not be a net addition to the current outlay for acreage control. They believe that with producers organized into marketing cooperatives the rewards of the marketplace could eventually replace price supports and other Government subsidies.

In any case, the combination of humanitarian and economic arguments has produced an emotional crusade among farm organization and development leaders that the administration has been hard put to control. Given the natural instinct of farmers to produce more rather than less, and the obvious incentive of farm equipment and fertilizer manufacturers, the question arises whether the drive can be checked.

M'GOVERN PRESSING BILL

The chief legislative vehicle of the expansionist concept is a bill prepared by Senator George McGovern, Democrat of South Dakota. It would provide up to $3.5 billion a year to the President to finance open-market purchases of food for the needy overseas, to improve port facilities, storage and distribution facilities in developing countries, and to help them increase their own food output.

The legislation would authorize and appropriate $500 million the first year and provide for increasing this amount by $500 million each year for 7 years.

The President would be authorized under the bill to create an international food and nutrition office to administer the new program. This would give an expanded role and permanent status to the existing Office of Food for Peace, which was recently transferred from the White House to the State Department under Richard W. Reuter, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State.

GRADUAL RELAXATION CITED

The measure contemplates a continuation of some acreage-control and price-support program pending the development of greatly improved storage and distribution facilities in the food-deficit countries. It also looks to a gradual relaxation of controls on domestic production until a major part of the 50 million acres now untilled are returned to production.

Hearings on the legislation already have been assured by House and Senate committees. Harold D. Cooley, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, has notified President Johnson of his intention to end the present system of acreage controls as soon as possible.

In the Senate, J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has assured Mr. MCGOVERN that his group would consider the measure on foreign policy grounds even if this means duplicating in part hearings held by the Senate Agriculture Committee.

Humanitarian considerations aside, cosponsors of the bill—of whom there are more than 30 in both Houses—have weighty arguments to support their position. Food, they point out, is the one form of foreign aid that can be provided without any transfer of the Nation's physical resources or effect on its balance of international payments.

It makes no sense to them to curb the world's most efficient farm plant while 70 percent of the 670 million children in developing countries suffer malnutrition that leaves half their number stunted both mentally and physically and presents hazards to economic progress as well as political stability.

Those in charge of food and farm policies have no quarrel with these arguments. But they are greatly concerned that the mounting clamor for increased production may result in trying to do too much too soon. Their primary concern is the maintenance of relative stability in farm prices and income.

If acreage controls were abandoned too soon, they say, the result might be food supplies far beyond the effective domestic and foreign demand and, as a result, depressed prices and farm income.

The Department of Agriculture says the United States has the farm capacity and the reserve food stocks to meet any sharp increase in demand for food. But this does not take into account the possibility of a crop failure or other disaster affecting farm output.

CONSUMPTION LEVELS LISTED

At current consumption levels, the Nation will hold about 700 million bushels of wheat at the end of the current crop year. The past average domestic requirement has been about 600 million bushels. Past average commercial sales for dollars abroad have been about 200 million bushels.

On top of this cash demand for wheat food-for-peace shipments have been running about 550 million bushels a year.

In the context of an abundant supply of feed grains and a prospective wheat crop in the current year indicated at about 1.3 billion bushels, the department's view is that the wheat carryover is ample. The feed grain supply at the end of the crop year in October will be about 59 million bushels. This compares with a prudent reserve figured at about 45 million bushels.

SENATOR WARNS OF CRISIS

It is at this point that the advocates of expansion part company with the departmental experts. As Senator MCGOVERN puts it:

"The composite wheat and feed grain reserve of the United States would scarcely meet our own consumption needs for 6 months if a catastrophe should wipe out our crops in a single growing year.

"And if we were to carry out President Johnson's suggestion and establish food reserves sufficient for 6 months' consumption, we would have to end our food-for-peace program immediately or launch much greater production."

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman has said that total crop production could be increased at least 20 percent in the next 2 or 3 years by returning the 50 million untilled acres to production, by increasing the use of fertilizers, by wider use of improved seed varieties, and by employing better technology more intensively.

A DOUBLED WHEAT CROP

If all idle acreage were planted to wheat, that crop could be doubled in 2 years, according to this estimate, with most of the increase coming in the first year.

If the currently diverted 50 million acres were put back into the same crops as they produced formerly, the resulting output over harvests in 1965 would be 450 million more bushels of wheat, 125 million more bushels of soybeans, 1.8 billion more bushels of corn, and 275 million more bushels of grain sorghums.

The advocates of increased production are saying in effect, "Let's do it."

Every study thus far agrees that the United States and the other advanced nations combined cannot close the prospective gap between food supplies and increasing population in the needy developing countries.

For one thing, there are not enough ships to deliver the additional food if it were produced. It is agreed that the needy nations themselves must make up the the major part of their deficit.

However, supporters of the McGovern bill insist that hunger and malnutrition will not wait until developing countries acquire the know-how and the equipment needed to do the job for themselves.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the next printing of S. 2157 the names of the Senators from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE and Mr. BAYH], the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] be added to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, no day passes which does not bring new evidence of national and international concern with the world food problem.

Shortly after I introduced the International Food and Nutrition Act, the Rockefeller Foundation sponsored a seminar at Estes Park, Colo., on "U.S. Food Policy in Relation to World Food Needs." Dr. Roger Revelle, director of the Center for Population Studies at Harvard University, and Richard W. Reuter, director of food for peace, served as cochairmen. There was 30 eminent participants—a cross section of Americans—including such men as Dr. Louis H. Bean and Dr. Don Paarlberg, both former economic advisers to Secretaries of Agriculture, Dr. Bean served in a series of Democratic administrations and Dr. Paarlberg during the Eisenhower administration. Others included Dr. C. Clement French, president of Washington State University, R. L. Clodius, vice president of the University of Wisconsin, Dr. Theodore W. Schultz of the University of Chicago, Mr. Harry Graham of the National Grange, Mr. Paul Cifrino of Supreme Markets in Dorchester, Mass., Felix Belair of the New York Times editorial staff, and Maurice D. Atkin of Robert Nathan Associates, economic consultants here in Washington who do a great deal of work in the international field.

The Rockefeller Foundation group was in session 5 days. I would like to read just the final, short paragraph, after recommending the whole volume to my colleagues. Their report said:

> In conclusion, a clear transition period is at hand both with regard to the purpose of Public Law 480 and with regard to the recognition of new and growing needs and opportunities. A new approach to world food shortages and food production policy is required which recognizes the dynamic possibilities of shifting from surplus commodity disposal to one predicated on meeting human needs through a rational exploitation of the U.S. capacity for agricultural production.

The Agricultural Research Institute of the National Academy of Sciences and National Research Council devoted its meeting October 18–19, 1965—about 4 months ago—to "World Food Needs and Production—Present and Future." The report of the proceedings is now available. In the foreword to that volume, it is explained:

> It was decided to contrast agricultural production in the United States, as the most technologically advanced nation in the world, with that of newly developing nations. This juxtaposition brings into sharper focus the problems facing the United States in its world responsibilities, both in supplying human foods directly, and in undertaking to provide the skills of our specialists and certain resources for improving production in the needy nations themselves. The presentations contained herein indicate the magnitude of problems for which adequate answers have yet to be found.

Besides reports of their business sessions, the volume contains 17 papers by the most eminent scientists in their fields on world food production, protein deficiency, and potentialities in seed crops and ocean fish resources for meeting that deficiency, problems of mechanization of agriculture in various areas of the world, soil management in the United States contrasted with food-deficit tropical areas, insect, pest and disease control, and weed control problems here and around the world.

The volume gives insight not only into the magnitude of problems of world food supply and the grasp which our scientists have of these problems, but also into the awareness and the preoccupation of our scientists with the fact that those of us who inhabit this ark hurtling through space, as Adlai Stevenson described it, must be about the task of matching food production with population growth, stimulating the former and retarding the latter, if we can.

In every walk of life in America, from farms to scientific circles, this world food problem is at the top of the agenda of problems to be met, and of things to be done.

This is also true throughout the world.

During the recess, I had the honor of being a Senate Member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization meeting in Rome, Italy.

The world food crisis topped the agenda there. The great world economist Gunar Myrdal dealt with it in the keynote address at the meeting. I was honored with an invitation from Director General B. R. Sen to address the meeting on the world food problem because of my past service as President John F. Kennedy's food for peace director here in the United States and because, as such, I had been authorized to submit on behalf of the United States to the FAO meeting in 1961, the proposal for a world freedom from hunger program. It was adopted on a trial basis with a $100 million annual budget. That program was unanimously voted to be continued and expanded by the nations represented at the Rome meeting, concluded in December.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Dorothy Jacobsen, who headed the U.S. delegation, made valuable contributions to the discussion of world food efforts in their addresses. The meeting demonstrated both the breadth and depth of worldwide concern with food and fiber problems, and again demonstrated to me the unusual opportunity our Nation has, as the world leader in agricultural production and agricultural production technology, to show all mankind that America seeks a great international society, as well as a Great Society domestically, in which all men live in dignity and in peace.

There is no question that the overwhelming majority of the people of this Nation, and world leaders, wish to see the war against want given new force just as we hope that the shooting war can be ended.

It is my truly fervent hope that during this session of Congress we will join with the President and the administration in escalating the war against hunger to the limit of our capability and to the limit of the absorptive capacity of areas of need and that we will support this constructive effort just as unstintingly as we support defense against any military threat to our national security.

The United States needs to have its world neighbors know that we regard the croplands, the grazing areas, the fisheries, the scientific laboratories, the farm supply and the farm machinery industries of the world as the most important battlefields of our time.

Every day our military men issue a communique giving a count of the dead bodies of enemy soldiers known to have resulted from the operations of our troops and allied forces. It is intended to discourage our foes and reassure our people and our partisans. But this also tends to create an image of America none of us desires, an image of a nation preoccupied with killing and destruction.

It is a false image, as the response to proposals to close the world food gap which I have experienced and reported to you today very eloquently testifies.

We need to have daily communiques on lives saved in the world by American food aid; daily bulletins on how many hundreds or thousands more children have been reached with the calories, the proteins and the vitamins they have lacked for sound, healthy bodies, and how the war against want is progressing.

Such communiques would project not only a far better image of America in the world than the daily body counts, but a far truer one.

Our Government must this year, without regard to demands on us from other activities or excusing ourselves on fiscal grounds, do what the Estes Park conferees so well summarized for all Americans, when they reported:

> A new approach to world food shortages and food production policy is required which recognizes the dynamic possibilities of shifting from surplus commodity disposal to one predicated on meeting human food needs through a rational exploitation of the U.S. capacity for agricultural production.

Mr. President, at the time the proposed legislation was introduced, there was understandably some question as to which committee would have primary jurisdiction. Because very clearly the bill has far-ranging foreign policy implications, it may have led one to think that it ought to be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, the measure also has very important significance in terms of our domestic agricultural problems. There has been some understandable and sincere differences of opinion as to which committee should have jurisdiction. The Parliamentarian, I believe on perfectly sound grounds, recommended that the bill be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Since that time, following discussions with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], there seems to be some reason for thinking that perhaps his committee should have jurisdiction over the legislation.

I hope to discuss this subject further with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], and be prepared, next week, to address a unanimous-consent request to the Senate that the proposed legislation be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 175) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to as follows:

S. Res. 175

Resolved, That Mr. Long of Louisiana be, and he is hereby, elected Chairman of the Committee on Finance, in lieu of Mr. Harry F. Byrd, Sr., of Virginia, resigned from the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect of the memory of the late distinguished Representative from North Carolina, Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 17, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 14, 1966:

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Robert C. Weaver, of New York, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Robert C. Wood, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Council of Economic Advisers

James S. Duesenbery, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Council of Economic Advisers, vice Otto Eckstein.

Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia

George A. Avery, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years expiring June 30, 1968.

Commissioner of Education

Harold Howe II, of North Carolina, to be Commissioner of Education, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Office of Economic Opportunity

Franklyn A. Johnson, of California, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service

Dr. William B. Bean, of Iowa, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term expiring August 3, 1969, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Dr. Stewart G. Wolf, Jr., of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term expiring August 3, 1969, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Community Relations Service

Roger W. Wilkins, of the District of Columbia, to be Director, Community Relations Service, for a term of 4 years.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Nathan M. Koffsky, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

William Gorham, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Bureau of Mines

Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., of New York, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

U.S. Tariff Commission

Paul Kaplowitz, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1967, vice Ben David Dorfman.

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission

Theodore Jaffe, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for a term of 3 years from October 22, 1965, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

U.S. Attorney

Cecil F. Poole, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of California for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

U.S. Marshals

William H. Terrill, of Colorado, to be U.S. marshal for the District of Colorado for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

George E. O'Brien, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of California for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Archie Craft, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Joseph F. Novak, of Delaware, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Delaware for the term of 4 years, vice Edward J. Hussey, deceased.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Charles F. Baird, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, vice Victor M. Longstreet, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

Charles Hartwell Bonesteel III, O18655, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Andrew Jackson Boyle, O19924, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general,

Maj. Gen. James Benjamin Lampert, O20147, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Marshall P. Jones, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malawi;

Cecil B. Lyon, of New Hampshire, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ceylon, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Maldive Islands.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America: Leon E. Woods, of Maryland.

Now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a counsel general of the United States of America: Magdalen G. H. Flexner, of Florida.

Now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America: W. Graham Metson, Jr., of California.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Robert J. Baker, of the District of Columbia.
Ronald B. Casagrande, of New York.
Michael K. Consedine, of New York.
Charles N. Dudley, of Florida.
Charles Edward Emmons, of California.
Peter T. Hansen, of Florida.
Brooke C. Holmes, of California.
Darryl N. Johnson, of Washington.
Raymond C. Jorgenson, of North Dakota.
John M. Joyce, of Colorado.
Ira H. Levy, of Missouri.
Robert L. Michael, of Ohio.
David F. Moore, of North Carolina.
Gary G. Morley, of Arkansas.
Donald R. Niemi, of Wisconsin.
Richard T. Scully, of Virginia.
Phillips S. Waller, of California.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Charles L. Bell, of Ohio.
David H. Burns, of Massachusetts.
Michael P. Canning, of North Dakota.
Emil Castro, of New York.
Miss Victoria R. Cordova, of Washington.
Robert A. Desmuke, of California.
A. Lester Glad, of California.
Scott S. Hallford, of Tennessee.
Hugh J. Ivory, of New York.
John P. Leonard, of New York.
Larrie D. Loehr, of California.
Clyde V. Prestowitz, Jr., of Delaware.
Herman J. Rossi III, of Washington.
Michael M. Skol, of Illinois.
Seton Stapleton, of New Jersey.
Donald B. Westmore, of Washington.
James Alan Williams, of Virginia.
Donald J. Yellman, of Iowa.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Monroe E. Aderhold, of Michigan.
Willard W. Angel, of Idaho.
Ralph L. Boyce, of Virginia.
Peter F. Brescia, of Maryland.
I. Paul de Pedraza, of Florida.
Charles B. Dickens, of Wisconsin.
Charles R. Doscher, of California.
George L. Gaddie, of Florida.
Francis V. Gardner, of Virginia.
R. Laurence Garufi, of New Jersey.
James R. Graham, of Wisconsin.
Miss Barbara A. Hutchison, of Delaware.
Miss Tana M. Mayland, of California.
Miss Marion M. Montague, of the District of Columbia.
Arthur R. Nayer, of New Jersey.
Edward Melvin Starr, Jr., of Maryland.
Joe B. Vogel, of Florida.
Lindsay H. White, of New York.
John Z. Williams, of New Jersey.

A Foreign Service Reserve officer to be a consul and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America: John R. Cassidy, of Missouri.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Glenn O. Brown, of Illinois.
Adrian B. Giazza, of Nebraska.
Warren S. Hawley, of Maryland.
Andre J. Le Gallo, of New Jersey.
Joseph M. Medich, of Indiana.
Francisco X. Mendoza, of Virginia.
Lawrence A. Penn, of New York.
William E. Spruce, of Maryland.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Mrs. Miña Shayne Goldberg, of Virginia.
Miss Margaret Ann Murphy, of California.
John J. Reed, of California.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

William Astill, of Rhode Island.
Richard K. Cooke, of Texas.
Lawrence R. Devlin, of California.
Bertram F. Dunn, of West Virginia.
Peter K. Heimann, of the District of Columbia.
David B. Kelly, of Virginia.
John E. MacDonald, of the District of Columbia.
William D. Miller, of Pennsylvania.
Oscar F. Morrison, of the District of Columbia.
William E. Nelson, of New York.
Frank Rettenberg, of New York.
James N. Tull, of Virginia.
John D. Walker, of the District of Columbia.
Morris Weisz, of Maryland.
Ralph R. Westfall, of Virginia.
William H. Wright, of the District of Columbia.
David C. L. Yu, of California.

Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Leroy C. Aycock, of Texas.
Harold T. Christie, of New York.
John C. Gilmore, of Massachusetts.
James M. Hall, of Washington.
Benjamin C. Hillard 3d, of Nevada.
John L. Leader, of New York.
W. Lehman Smith, of Pennsylvania.
Ancel N. Taylor, of Idaho.
Paul A. Terry, of California.
Anthony S. Vitale, of Virginia.
Robert D. White, of the District of Columbia.
Sidney L. Woollons, of California.

The following-named persons to the offices indicated, pursuant to section 517 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended:

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 1, consul general, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Burnett F. Anderson, of the District of Columbia.
Henry F. Arnold, of New Jersey.
Alfred V. Boerner, of California.
Saxton Bradford, of Arizona.
Leslie S. Brady, of Maryland.
Edgar D. Brooke, of Virginia.
Kermit K. Brown, of Virginia.
W. Kenneth Bunce, of Virginia.
Jacob Canter, of the District of Columbia.
Alan Carter, of Maryland.
Richard G. Cushing, of California.
G. Huntington Damon, of New Hampshire.
Gordon A. Ewing, of the District of Columbia.
William J. Handley, of the District of Columbia.
Albert Harkness, Jr., of Rhode Island.
George M. Hellyer, of Washington.
James E. Hoofnagle, of Virginia.
Arthur W. Hummel, Jr., of Maryland.
William E. Hutchinson, of Maryland.
Harold Kaplan, of New Jersey.
William B. King, of the District of Columbia.
Mark B. Lewis, of the District of Columbia.
Robert A. Lincoln, of the District of Columbia.
Sanford S. Marlowe, of Texas.
John P. McKnight, of Virginia.
N. Paul Neilson, of Pennsylvania.
John R. O'Brien, of the District of Columbia.
Daniel P. Oleksiw, of Pennsylvania.
Frank H. Oram, of Maryland.
Hewson A. Ryan, of Massachusetts.
G. Lewis Schmidt, of California.
Leslie Albion Squires, of Hawaii.
Mrs. Patricia G. van Delden, of California.
William H. Weathersby, of California.
William E. Weld, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Barry Zorthian, of Virginia.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Martin Ackerman, of the District of Columbia.
Keith E. Adamson, of Kansas.
O. Rudolph Aggrey, of the District of Columbia.
Robert C. Amerson, of Minnesota.
John M. Anspacher, of the District of Columbia.
Gilbert F. Austin, of Washington.
Stephen W. Baldanza, of New Jersey.
Arthur A. Bardos, of Maryland.
Walter M. Bastian, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Bryan M. Battey, of Maryland.
Robert A. Bauer, of California.
Herbert Baumgartner, of Florida.
Stephen P. Belcher, of the District of Columbia.
Barry L. Bishop, of Texas.
Charles B. Blosser, of the District of Columbia.
Heath Bowman, of Florida.
Kenneth R. Boyle, of Alabama.
David C. Briggs, of Virginia.
Thomas J. Carolan, of Maryland.
Darrell D. Carter, of Illinois.
Terrence F. Catherman, of the District of Columbia.
Everett G. Chapman, of California.
Robert J. Clarke, of Pennsylvania.
Blake Cochran, of Maryland.
Philip J. Conley, of Maine.

Laurence P. Dalcher, of Michigan.
Wilson P. Dizard, of the District of Columbia.
Frank D. Dorey, of the District of Columbia.
Jerry C. Doster, of Virginia.
Henry A. Dunlap, of Maryland.
James R. Echols, of Maryland.
Richard Erstein, of Minnesota.
John H. Esterline, of California.
Alan Fisher, of the District of Columbia.
Gerard M. Gert, of California.
Jay W. Gildner, of the District of Columbia.
Lemuel E. Graves, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Fitzhugh Green, of New York.
Lawrence J. Hall, of Texas.
James J. Halsema, of Pennsylvania.
Richard T. Hamilton, of Virginia.
Robert C. Haney, of California.
Albert E. Hemsing, of New York.
John E. Higgins, of Pennsylvania.
Arthur S. Hoffman, of Virginia.
John F. Hogan, Jr., of Maine.
William C. Holcombe, of Virginia.
John N. Hutchison, of California.
Edward J. Joyce, of Virginia.
James Vincent Joyce, of Virginia.
Stanley E. Kalish, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph A. Kitchin, of Virginia.
Alexander A. Klieforth, of Virginia.
Joseph C. Kolarek, of the District of Columbia.
Arthur R. Lee, of Idaho.
Sam H. Linch, of Maryland.
Herbert F. Linneman, of Florida.
Wallace W. Littell, of Maryland.
Robert H. Lochner, of New Jersey.
Jack Masey, of the District of Columbia.
Richard M. McCarthy, of Virginia.
James H. McGillivray, of California.
Burtt F. McKee, of Alabama.
Henry L. Miller, of New York.
James Moceri, of Washington.
G. Richard Monsen, of Utah.
Daniel E. Moore, of Virginia.
Paul K. Morris, of Virginia.
John W. Mowinckel, of the District of Columbia.
Edmund R. Murphy, of California.
David Nalle, of the District of Columbia.
John P. Nevins, of Vermont.
Edward P. Nickel, of Connecticut.
John A. Noon, of New Jersey.
Renzo Pagin, of Virginia.
William E. Phipps, of California.
Darrell M. Price, of Virginia.
John T. Reid, of the District of Columbia.
John E. Reinhardt, of Tennessee.
Eugene Rosenfeld, of Virginia.
George A. Rylance, of Arizona.
Richard C. Salvatierra, of Arizona.
Edmund Schechter, of the District of Columbia.
Duncan N. Scott, Jr., of Texas.
Norman P. Scott, of Colorado.
Donald T. Shea, of Virginia.
David P. Sheppard, of the District of Columbia.
Abraham M. Sirkin, of Maryland.
L. Clyde Slaton, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
John J. Slocum, of Rhode Island.
Glenn Lee Smith, of California.
Robert D. Smith, of California.
Edward Stansbury, of Connecticut.
John C. Stoddard, of Connecticut.
John McH. Stuart, of New York.
Hugh B. Sutherland, of the District of Columbia.
Donald K. Taylor, of Maryland.
Francis B. Tenny, of Virginia.
Hans N. Tuch, of Illinois.
James N. Tull, of Virginia.
Harold E. Urist, of Virginia.
Serban Vallimarescu, of the District of Columbia.
Hoyt N. Ware, of Georgia.
James R. West, of California.
Michael Weyl, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph C. Wheeler, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Barbara M. White, of the District of Columbia.
Ernest G. Wiener, of the District of Columbia.
Donald E. Wilson, of Maryland.
Earl J. Wilson, of Texas.
Richard C. Wooton, of Virginia.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Edward Alexander, of New York.
Wilfred P. Allard, of Virginia.
James F. Anderson, of the District of Columbia.
William H. Anthony, of California.
William Astill, of Rhode Island.
Carl F. Bartz, Jr., of Virginia.
Robert H. Behrens, of Maryland.
William A. Bell, of the District of Columbia.
Raymond E. Benson, of New York.
K. Marshall Berg, of Iowa.
Royal D. Bisbee, of Illinois.
Robert J. Boylan, of the District of Columbia.
James E. Boyle, of Maryland.
William K. Braun, of Ohio.
Peter F. Brescia, of Maryland.
Hedin Bronner, of Illinois.
John F. Buckley, of New Jersey.
James F. Byrne, of New Jersey.
Stephen M. Carney, of Florida.
Frederick J. Cavanaugh, of Massachusetts.
Nelson Chipchin, of Maryland.
Dean O. Claussen, of Washington.
Thomas S. Cleveland, of Maryland.
Alvin H. Cohen, of Massachusetts.
John D. Congleton, of Virginia.
James D. Conley, of Illinois.
Dewey W. Conner, of Kansas.
Lyle D. Copmann, of Nebraska.
Miss Frances E. Coughlin, of California.
Robert T. Curran, of Michigan.
Miss Anne M. Davis, of California.
Carl E. Davis, of California.
Henry L. Davis, of Florida.
Miss Stella E. Davis, of Georgia.
John L. De Witt, of Pennsylvania.
Fred W. Dickens, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Richard F. Dienelt, of Pennsylvania.
Arthur V. Diggle, of Illinois.
Alan H. Dodds, of California.
Gerard A. Donohue, of Illinois.
Philip F. Dorman, of California.
Gerhard J. Drechsler, of the District of Columbia.
Darrell I. Drucker, Jr., of Maine.
David J. DuBois, of the District of Columbia.
Frank Eakin, Jr., of New Jersey.
Miss Ann Eckstein, of California.
Horace Y. Edwards, of Texas.
N. Marbury Efimenco, of Maryland.
Miss Mary M. Eich, of Pennsylvania.
Douglas A. Elleby, of Maryland.
James A. Elliot, of the District of Columbia.
Walter Engel, of New York.
Harold E. Engle, of Kansas.
F. Bowen Evans, of Maryland.
E. Lee Fairley, of New York.
A. Alexander Fanelli, of Virginia.
Eric Feiler, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Marjorie F. Ferguson, of the District of Columbia.
Lyne S. Few, of North Carolina.
Clifton B. Forster, of Maryland.
Morton F. Fosberg, of Maryland.
Abol F. Fotouhi, of North Carolina.
Eugene J. Friedmann, of Ohio.
Daniel Garcia, of the District of Columbia.
Fentress Gardner, of Florida.
Homer G. Gayne, of Virginia.
Carl L. Gebuhr, of Maryland.
John S. Getchell of the District of Columbia.
Donald Y. Gilmore, of Maryland.
Henry H. Gosho, of Maryland.
Donald G. Gould, of Maine.
James R. Graham, of Wisconsin.
William F. Gresham, of Illinois.
Miss Margaret R. Hafered, of Ohio.
Miss Elinor Halle, of Ohio.
William G. Hamilton, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Arnold C. Hanson, of Maine.
Richard P. Harris, of Maryland.
William M. Hart, of Florida.
John L. Hedges, of Illinois.
Peter J. Heller, of California.
Sherwin P. Helms, of Virginia.
Miss E. Audrey Henriksen, of Oregon.
George D. Henry, of Pennsylvania.
Daniel J. Herget, of California.
Clyde G. Hess, of Vermont.
Lawrence M. Howes, of Oregon.
Theodore R. Hupper, of Virginia.
Fredric B. Irvin, of Pennsylvania.
Alfred Jacobson, of Virginia.
Robert B. Jaffe, of California.
Robert A. Jellison, of Indiana.
Alfred N. Johnson, of North Carolina.
John A. Jones, Jr., of Virginia.
Harry Keith, of Maryland.
Daniel M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts.
Stepney C. Kibble, of the District of Columbia.
William D. Killea, of Pennsylvania.
Howard E. Kirchwehm, of Illinois.
Joseph I. Krene, of California.
Ernest G. Land, of the District of Columbia.
Robert E. Lasher, of Maryland.
Bernard J. Lavin, of Hawaii.
Leopold J. LeClair, of Virginia.
Maurice E. Lee, of Pennsylvania.
Robert Don Levine, of the District of Columbia.
Irving S. Lewis, of Maryland.
E. Russell Linch, of California.
Roman L. Lotsberg, of Maryland.
Roger M. Lydon, of California.
Kenneth J. MacCormac, of California.
John L. Maddux, of Virginia.
Haynes R. Mahoney, of Florida.
C. Conrad Manley, of Texas.
Pietro V. Marchetti, of Illinois.
Francis S. Mason, Jr., of Florida.
William C. Mateer, of Ohio.
John R. McCarthy, of Florida.
Richard G. McCloskey, of Washington.
A. Marvin McClure, of South Carolina.
Brooks McClure, of Maryland.
Harold G. McConeghey, of Virginia.
Miss Honor C. McCusker, of Maine.
James M. McDonald, Jr., of New Jersey.
James C. McIntosh, of Massachusetts.
Malcolm McLean, of Minnesota.
George E. Miller, of Pennsylvania.
James B. Miller, of Tennessee.
William J. Miller, of Maryland.
Paul A. Modic, of the District of Columbia.
Reuben M. Monson, of Texas.
Stefan P. Munsing, of Michigan.
Clifton B. Naughton, of California.
Edwin J. Neumann, of Maryland.
Patrick E. Nieburg, of New York.
Lynn H. Noah, of Vermont.
Stuart P. Olsen, of Washington.
Harold M. Otwell, of California.
Edwin C. Pancoast, of California.
Barrett Parker, of Maryland.
Lewis W. Pate, of Nebraska.
William K. Payeff, of South Carolina.
F. Taylor Peck, of the District of Columbia.
Harris Peel, of Vermont.
Perry L. Peterson, of Nebraska.
James T. Pettus, Jr., of Missouri.
Timothy A. Pfeiffer, of Maine.
J. Paul Phillips, II, of Maryland.
Richard B. Phillips, of Colorado.
Leon Picon, of North Dakota.
Edward E. Post, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
W. Clinton Powell, of Hawaii.
Paul J. Rappaport, of North Carolina.
W. Wolf Reade, of the District of Columbia.
E. Lewis Revey, of Florida.
Yale W. Richmond, of Virginia.
William H. Rodgers, of Maryland.
Roger P. Ross, of California.

Nicholas Ruggieri, of Rhode Island.

John W. L. Russell, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

William J. Sailer, of Illinois.

Cecil L. Sanford, Jr., of North Carolina.

Edward J. Savage, of the District of Columbia.

Clement G. Scerback, of Maryland.

Harold F. Schneidman, of Pennsylvania.

Frank A. Scott, of New Jersey.

Charles D. Searles, of Maine.

Jack H. Shellenberger, of Maryland.

Leon A. Shelnutt, of Alabama.

Howard R. Simpson, of California.

P. Warren Simpson, of Maryland.

Morton S. Smith, of Maryland.

Ralph Stuart Smith, of Maryland.

C. Kenneth Snyder, of Florida.

Marvin Sorkin, of the District of Columbia.

Clifford E. Southard, of Maryland.

William Lloyd Stearman, of the District of Columbia.

Henry H. Stephen, of Florida.

Victor L. Stier, of California.

Howard E. Stingle, of the District of Columbia.

Jerome A. Stone, of Florida.

G. Scott Sugden, of Maine.

Marshall W. S. Swan, of Maryland.

Joseph W. Thoman, of Virginia.

Don R. Torrey, of New Jersey.

Argus J. Tresidder, of Kentucky.

Neely G. Turner, of California.

Philip A. Turner, of Virginia.

Charles K. Waters, of Minnesota.

Merle M. Werner, of Nebraska.

Paul E. Wheeler, of Maryland.

Robert L. White, of Colorado.

Walter P. White, Jr., of Alabama.

Ernest H. Wiener, Jr., of Pennsylvania.

John Z. Williams, of New Jersey.

Harold O. Wright, of Illinois.

Jack R. Zeller, of Ohio.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Thomas G. Allen, of New Hampshire.

Richard T. Arndt, of New Jersey.

Theophilus E. Ashford, of New Jersey.

Norman C. Barnes, of New York.

David H. Barnhart, of Arizona.

Myron A. Baskin, of Virginia.

Edmund A. Bator, of Georgia.

Charles R. Beecham, of California.

Holley Mack Bell, of North Carolina.

Charles W. Bergstrom, of the District of Columbia.

Herbert K. Berthold, of Virginia.

Peter P. Bielak, of Connecticut.

Howard E. Biggerstaff, of California.

Stuart J. Bohacek, of Nebraska.

Edgar S. Borup, of Illinois.

James E. Bradshaw, of Tennessee.

William D. Bristow, of California.

Harry P. Britton, of California.

Richard C. Brower, of California.

Michael D. Brown, of New York.

Ivan M. Campbell, of California.

Lawrence O. Carlson, of Maryland.

Martin C. Carroll, Jr., of New York.

Miss Elizabeth Carver, of North Carolina.

Bernard Casper, of California.

R. Dabney Chapman, of Maryland.

Thomas G. Charouhas, of Washington.

Milton M. Chase, of Ohio.

Neale E. Clark, of Nebraska.

Fred A. Coffey, Jr., of Texas.

Edward J. Conlon, of the District of Columbia.

Edward F. Conyngham, of Oregon.

Francis A. Cooke, of Virginia.

A. Speight Cooper, of Georgia.

Joe B. Cox, of Ohio.

James F. Crane, of California.

William T. Crocker, of Massachusetts.

Robert D. Cross, of Colorado.

Richard H. Curtiss, of Virginia.

George T. Czuczka, of New York.

John J. Daly, Jr., of Pennsylvania.

Philip A. Damon, Jr., of Virginia.

William B. Davis, of Michigan.

William F. DeMyer, of New York.

John DeNoia, of New Jersey.

Miss Joy A. Dickens, of the District of Columbia.

William S. Dickson, of New Jersey.

William E. Dietz, of the District of Columbia.

Philip DiTommaso, of Pennsylvania.

Mason C. Dobson, of Illinois.

Francis T. Donovan, of Pennsylvania.

Thomas C. Dove, Jr., of North Carolina.

Miss Nancy R. Downing, of Illinois.

Miss Elizabeth R. Earle, of the District of Columbia.

John J. Ewing, of the District of Columbia.

Jack B. Fawcett, of Colorado.

Harold W. Fellman, of Pennsylvania.

Edward J. Findlay, of Maryland.

Frederic A. Fisher, of Michigan.

John C. Fiske, of Iowa.

Donald R. Ford, of Hawaii.

Ben F. Fordney, of Virginia.

Evan Fotos, of Massachusetts.

Robert V. Gildea, of Maryland.

Robert C. Goodman, of California.

Orville H. Coplen, of Washington.

Richard J. Gordon, of Maryland.

Clifford P. Hackett, of Connecticut.

Ben H. Hall, of Maryland.

Allen C. Hansen, of New Jersey.

Miss Carol V. Harford, of California.

Theodore G. Hartry, of California.

Richard W. Helgerson, of South Dakota.

Miss Shirley B. Hendsch, of the District of Columbia.

David I. Hitchcock, of Connecticut..

James Hoyt, of California.

Benjamin H. Jackson, of Ohio.

Theodore R. Jaeckel, of the District of Columbia.

Charles A. Johnson, of Virginia.

Roy W. Johnson, of New Jersey.

Stanton Jue, of California.

Jack W. Juergens, of Kansas.

William J. Karppi, of Michigan.

Harry H. Kendall, of Maryland.

Donald J. Kent, of Maryland.

William H. Keogh, of Maryland.

Richard M. Key, of Maryland.

Ivan T. Klecka, of Illinois.

Kenneth D. Koch, of Michigan.

Miss Garnetta Kramer, of Illinois.

Thomas R. Kruse, of Iowa.

Miss Ethel A. Kuhn, of Washington.

Charles J. Lahey, of Maryland.

Gilbert I. Laskowski, of Texas.

Milton Leavitt, of Massachusetts.

Robert H. Leeper, of Pennsylvania.

Ralph Lewis, of the District of Columbia.

Theodore M. Liu, of Michigan.

Frenise A. Logan, of North Carolina.

Miss Margaret F. MacKellar, of California.

Herbert C. Madison, of the District of Columbia.

Harrington E. Manville, of Colorado.

John A. Mason, Jr., of Pennsylvania.

James O. Mays, of Georgia.

Miss Ellen Irene McCullough, of New Jersey.

Charles A. McGinley, Jr., of Maryland.

James A. McGinley III, of Florida.

Donald E. McNertney, of Iowa.

Charles L. Medd, of New York.

Mrs. Aileen S. Miles, of Virginia.

Ainslie B. Minor, of Florida.

Miss Theresa C. Mravintz, of California.

Arthur R. Nayer, of New Jersey.

Howard F. Needham, of Maryland.

Allan Nelson, of California.

Robert L. M. Nevitt, of Pennsylvania.

Robert L. Nichols, of New Hampshire.

Tom A. Noonan, of the District of Columbia.

Flemming E. Nyrop, of Virginia.

Victor B. Olason, of Washington.

Blanchard K. Parsons, of New York.

Wilbert C. Petty, of the District of Columbia.

Edward T. Pinch, of Florida.

Milos O. Ptak, of Ohio.

William H. Pugh, of New Jersey.

Edward T. Purcell, of Maryland.

R. Randolph Raven, of California.

Mrs. Katharine D. Ray, of Tennessee.

James M. Rentschler, of Pennsylvania.

William H. Riddell, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

David L. Roberts, Jr., of New York.

Blake W. Robinson, Jr., of Massachusetts.

Edward L. Robinson, of the District of Columbia.

Leonard I. Robock, of Ohio.

Robert A. Rockweiler, of Wisconsin.

James G. Rogers, of California.

Robert N. Rogers, of Illinois.

Gunther K. Rosinus, of Indiana.

Phifer P. Rothman, of Florida.

Vincent Rotundo, of New Jersey.

Howard H. Russell, Jr., of North Dakota.

Irving L. Sablosky, of Illinois.

John H. Scanlon, of California.

Eugene M. Schaeffer, of Tennessee.

Miss Catherine S. Scott, of the District of Columbia.

Harry E. Sedgley, of California.

Laurence Sharpe, of Maryland.

John W. Shirley, of the District of Columbia.

David W. Smith, of Utah.

Douglas H. Smith, of the District of Columbia.

Norris P. Smith, of California.

Donald E. Soergel, of Maryland.

Bart N. Stephens, of Florida.

Perry J. Stieglitz, of New York.

Miss Constance E. Stone, of Vermont.

David L. Stratmon, Sr., of Indiana.

G. Frederick Stutz, of Massachusetts.

Richard J. Sullivan, of Iowa.

Ted M. G. Tanen, of California.

Vernon R. Telford, of Georgia.

George R. Thompson, of New Jersey.

Eugene B. Thomson, of Maryland.

Miss Myrtle E. Thorne, of the District of Columbia.

Francis E. Townsend, of Washington.

Fred W. Trembour, of Virginia.

Graham Tucker, of Virginia.

Richard E. Underland, of Nebraska.

Frank D. Underwood, of Maryland.

Hal W. Vaughan, of Florida.

G. Claude Villarreal, of Texas.

John W. Vonier, of Virginia.

Robert C. Voth, of California.

William N. Wagley, of the District of Columbia.

Wilbur F. Weeks, of Connecticut.

James K. Welsh, Jr., of New York.

Miss Dorothea Western, of Wisconsin.

Ralph R. White, of Maine.

Lloyd H. Wilkins, of California.

Arthur K. Willey, Jr., of Virginia.

Jack E. Wyant, of Washington.

George G. Wynne, of North Carolina.

Douglas A. Zischke, of Minnesota.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Miss Denise M. Abbey, of Washington.

Sime H. Adelman, of Ohio.

Donald H. Albright, of Arkansas.

Philip W. Arnold, of New York.

James M. Ascher, of Illinois.

Rexford L. Baer, of California.

Miss Ruth Banonis, of Michigan.

Miss Margaret K. Beadles, of Kentucky.

Miss Evelyn M. Blickensderfer, of New York.

Edward R. Brandt, of Maryland.

Melvyn R. Brokenshire, Jr., of Texas.

Arthur L. Bunn, of Florida.

John R. Campbell, of California.

Robert A. Cattelli, of the District of Columbia.

John R. Challinor, of Illinois.

Robert L. Chatten, of Kentucky.

Gerald L. Clay, of Nevada.

John D. Clayton, of Virginia.

Frank Darlington, of Texas.

Miss Dora Dean, of Pennsylvania.

James H. De Cou, of California.

Dolf M. Droge, of Indiana.

William M. Dunn, of the District of Columbia.

Robert F. Ebersole, of Florida.

G. Michael Eisenstadt, of New York.

James Flood, of Pennsylvania.

George L. Gaddie, of Florida.

Norris D. Garnett, of California.

R. Laurence Garufi, of New Jersey.

Arthur S. Giuliano, of New Jersey.

Robert E. Goodenough, of Indiana.

Henry O. Green, Jr., of Arkansas.

John L. Griffiths, of California.

Howard W. Hardy, Jr., of New Jersey.

Miss Barbara S. Harvey, of Pennsylvania.

Harry L. Hughes, of the District of Columbia.

Miss Barbara A. Hutchison, of Delaware.

Jerry L. Inman, of California.

Anton N. Kasanof, of Florida.

Sean Kennedy Kelly, of Nevada.

Edward J. Killeen, of California.

Franz E. Krell, of Illinois.

Arthur D. Lefkowitz, of New York.

William R. Lenderking, Jr., of Connecticut.

Miss Joann Lewinsohn, of Oklahoma.

Frank A. Magary, of California.

Charles M. Magee, of Louisiana.

Miss Tana M. Mayland, of California.

John F. McDonald, of Maine.

James D. McHale, of Massachusetts.

Miss Gabriella E. Metcalf, of the District of Columbia.

Daniel L. Miller, of California.

Gordon W. Murchie, of California.

Edgar E. Noel, of the District of Columbia.

Michael T. F. Pistor, of Arizona.

Eugene Frederick Quinn, of Pennsylvania.

J. Thomas Rimer III, of Pennsylvania.

Ismael Rivera, of Maryland.

Miss Elizabeth K. Rousseau, of the District of Columbia.

Robert R. Ruggiero, of Rhode Island.

Philip W. Shepherdson, of Illinois.

Christopher L. Sholes, of New Jersey.

Edward J. Slack, of South Dakota.

Miss Dorothy M. Slak, of Ohio.

James F. Smith, of Ohio.

Peter N. Synodis, of California.

Miss Margaret V. Taylor, of California.

Jaroslav J. Verner, of Minnesota.

Nicholas Volk, Jr., of New Jersey.

Robert E. Zimmerman, of Illinois.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Dino J. Caterini, of Ohio.

Allan B. Croghan, of California.

Neal T. Donnelly, of New York.

Edward A. Elly, of Michigan.

Lawrence B. Flood, of California.

C. M. Fry, of Missouri.

Jack Golden, of Georgia.

Thompson A. Grunwald, of California.

Thomas J. Gunning, of Illinois.

Miss Helen S. Hanson, of California.

Peter J. Hickman, of Texas.

Talbott W. Huey, of Maryland.

Robert E. Knopes, of Wisconsin.

Bruce R. Koch, of Pennsylvania.

Robert F. Krill, of Pennsylvania.

David J. Levin, of Pennsylvania.

Donald E. Mathes, of Missouri.

John R. McLean, of Michigan.

Merrill S. Miller, of Virginia.

James L. Morad, of California.

Howard G. Neuberg, of California.

Edward T. Penney, of Illinois.

Charles R. Raisner, of Florida.

Donald E. Reilly, of California.

John F. Ritchotte, of Pennsylvania.

Sanders F. Rosenblum, of Michigan.

Robert H. Ruffner, of Michigan.

Henry B. Ryan, of Illinois.

James H. Sease, of Michigan.

Miss Barbara M. Shelby, of New Jersey.

John E. Slavick, of Ohio.

Robert S. Snow, of California.

Frank F. Starbuck, of Florida.

William Stephens, Jr., of Pennsylvania.

Conrad Stolzenbach, of Ohio.

V. Jordan Tanner, of Utah.

Miss Marie Louise Telich, of California.

Jeremy W. Tryon, of Massachusetts.

Alfred J. Waddell, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons to the offices indicated, pursuant to section 516 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended:

For appointment as Foreign Service officers or class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Barry E. Ballow, of California.

Robert K. Baron, of Pennsylvania.

Louis A. Barraza, of California.

Donald S. Birn, of New York.

Richard Birn, of New York.

Richard A. Boardman, of New York.

John T. Burns, of Florida.

Thomas A. Calhoun, of California.

James B. Carroll, of Illinois.

Miss Ruth Marie Connolly, of Massachusetts.

Miss Eleanor M. De Selms, of the District of Columbia.

Miss Joan L. Dickie, of New York.

Warren J. Dunn, of Virginia.

Miss Joan R. Edmonds, of California.

Philip W. Ernst, of Minnesota.

Thomas E. Finnerty, of Michigan.

Joel Anthony Fischman, of Massachusetts

Eli Flam, of Virginia.

Robert S. Fletcher, of California.

Edward D. Franco, of Colorado.

John D. Garner, of Oklahoma.

Robert K. Geis, of Texas.

Paul L. Good, of Oregon.

John J. Harrigan, of Illinois.

Donald W. Hauger, of Florida.

Miss Corinne A. Heditsian, of New York.

Raburn L. Howland, of Ohio.

Miss Suzanne Hutchison, of Ohio.

Miss Mary Roberta Jones, of Montana.

John M. Keller, of Minnesota.

David Kuryk, of New Jersey.

Jerry E. Kyle, of California.

Robert R. LaGamma, of New York.

Alfred A. Laun III, of Wisconsin.

Leon Lederer II, of Virginia.

John R. Lepperd, of Virginia.

Malcolm A. McConnell, of Wisconsin.

Jerome K. McDonough, of Massachusetts.

John H. Melton, of Montana.

Robert S. Meyers, of California.

Miss Christine Morrissette, of Massachusetts.

Peter Cary Muncie, of Maryland.

J. Richard Overturf, of California.

Cecil E. Pollard, of California.

Douglas R. Price, of Virginia.

Miss Jeanne M. Pryor, of Arizona.

Harold F. Radday, of California.

Miss Karla Reed, of New York.

John M. Reid, of Virginia.

Peter J. Reuss, of Florida.

Joel W. Rochow, of Illinois.

Michael A. Rockland, of New York.

A. Rexford Rorex, of Florida.

Michael G. Roskin, of California.

Richard F. Ross, of Florida.

William A. Rugh, of New York.

Michael D. Schneider, of New Jersey.

Arnold J. Silverman, of California.

Leon M. S. Slawecki, of Pennsylvania.

Christopher Snow, of Utah.

Jon W. Stewart, of Arizona.

Wesley D. Stewart, of Ohio.

William F. Thompson, of Minnesota.

Franklin J. Tonini, of Florida.

Stewart A. Toy, of California.

Daniel L. Traub, of California.

David M. Wilson, of Massachusetts.

Kenneth C. Wimmel, of Ohio.

Peter C. Wolcott, of New York.

Robert J. Wozniak, of Michigan.

William M. Zavis, of Illinois.

Jan R. Zehner, of Ohio.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Thomas Hardy Crawford, of the District of Columbia.

Alan L. Gilbert, of the District of Columbia.

Charles R. Gostlin, of Ohio.

Miss Mary Anne Hammons, of Tennessee.

John F. Kordek, of Illinois.

Miss Jean Elizabeth Mammen, of New York.

Kent D. Obee, of Idaho.

Miss Mary E. Proctor, of Massachusetts.

Peter L. Quasius, of Wisconsin.

Miss Edith E. Russo, of Maryland.

Richard W. Schmidt, of Massachusetts.

Richard C. Schoonover, of California.

William Merrell Stott, of New York.

John E. Stuckey, Jr., of Kansas.

Miss Laurelane E. Vincent, of Oregon.

James L. Meyer, of California, for reappointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America, pursuant to section 520(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Senator Muskie Urges Citizen Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 14, 1966

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President—

In a free society, there is really no way to achieve a more beautiful environment unless each individual citizen makes national beautification his personal responsibility.

Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, who spoke those words, has himself practiced what he preaches. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, he has led the way to enactment of legislation to control the poisoning of air and water, and he has pointed toward further progress by emphasizing intergovernmental cooperation and citizen participation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an interview with Senator MUSKIE entitled "This Must Be a Citizen Action Program," appearing in the General Electric Forum for October-December, be printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS MUST BE A CITIZEN ACTION PROGRAM—AN INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Question. To be truly effective, any national program must ultimately have the support and understanding of the individual citizen. In your view, why is a program of natural beautification important to the American people? What are some of the problems we face in this area?

The preservation of America's natural beauty really boils down to proper resource development and use. And within this subject there are no more pressing issues today than the twin problems of air and water pollution.

Not too many years ago, the demand of conservationists for water pollution abatement was greeted with the remark: "What do you want, payrolls or pickerel?" The answer, of course, was and is: "Both." We need ample supplies of high quality water for life, health, recreation, and industry. And, fortunately, more and more of our citizens recognize it.

The major difficulty is that air and water are limited resources. We have only so much of each, and we must find ways of reducing the pollution if we are to survive.

When our Nation was founded, the abundant supplies of clean water seemed limitless. They became our highways, sources of power and irrigation, and refuge for fish and wildlife. Unfortunately, the waterways also became an easy place to dump waste products, without thought to the consequences to future generations.

On a national scale the problem of water resources today has grown into one of major dimension. Every day we make more demands on our water supplies—for industrial, agricultural, personal, and recreational uses.

Within just 15 years, our requirements for water in the United States will outstrip supplies by at least 85 billion gallons per day. By the year 2000, the daily demand is expected to be 350 billion gallons greater than the supply. This means that we must accelerate our efforts to clean up fouled waters and to reuse water wherever possible, not only for swimming and fishing, but for drinking and industry as well.

Under these circumstances, making sure that enough water is available to everyone, everywhere, at all times will tax our technical skills, our ingenuity, and our capital resources, both public and private. There is, unfortunately, no cheap and easy solution to the problem of water pollution control and abatement.

INDUSTRY DEPENDS ON QUALITY WATER

There is a very close relationship between water quality and industrial development. In fact, water quality is at the heart of this Nation's future economic growth. Industry cannot flourish without quality water, and some cannot even exist without it.

In an economically distressed area in Maine, for example, a cannery was nearly forced to cancel plans for a new plant because no oxygen was left in the stream from which the cannery was to draw water for its processing. The problems were worked out, but this is a good example of how one area could have lost 300 jobs because of the condition of the river.

The problem is not limited, by the way, to surface water pollution. There are similar examples of industrial location decisions which were affected one way or another by the quality of underground water for wells.

On the east coast of the United States, the severe drought conditions which have plagued some areas for as much as 4 years have served to make everyone more aware than ever before of the difficult problems we have in managing water resources.

Air pollution is also becoming an economic problem of serious proportions. Its effects on health have, of course, been well documented and publicized. The most distressing example was the London smog of 1952, in which air pollution was blamed for some 4,000 deaths. Many respiratory diseases are being linked closely to air pollution by health authorities.

And air pollution also is responsible for roughly $11 billion a year in property damage to agriculture, city buildings and monuments, and individual homes.

Question. What challenges to Government—at all levels—are posed by problems of national beautification?

Because this is a national problem, there are naturally a number of legislative measures which have been enacted by Congress or which will be voted upon in the near future.

In 1963, Congress passed the Clean Air Act to stimulate the national effort to abate and control air pollution. This year Congress amended this legislation to require all new automobile engines to be equipped with devices or modified to control engine exhausts. Automobiles are the single largest source of air pollution, and the new requirements should reduce harmful emission from automobiles by up to 80 percent.

The amendments also accelerate research on the whole range of air pollution sources, and encourage municipalities to reduce air pollution from solid waste disposal facilities.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 has been enacted to amend the basic Water Pollution Control and Abatement Act, which was passed in 1961. The Water Quality Act provides for an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to supervise water pollution control activities. It also makes possible grants for additional pollution research and development, increases grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, and authorizes establishment of water quality standards on interstate waterways.

One of the key measures in the President's natural beauty program is the Highway Beautification Act which was passed by Congress this fall. This legislation authorizes use of Federal funds to help States control outdoor advertising and junkyards along 41,000 miles of interstate highways and 224,000 miles of primary roads.

In short, the Federal Government has a substantial role to play in research in encouraging cooperative programs, stimulating and supporting interstate, State and local programs, in encouraging compliance with quality standards, and in enforcement in such areas as interstate navigable streams where there has been a refusal to accept public responsibility.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION NEEDED

However, one of the most important challenges to government, in general, is to improve the coordination between Federal, State, and local government units. Much of the beautification effort is tied closely to governmental problems of metropolitan areas, where more than two-thirds of our citizens now live.

In most of these areas, there is a great problem of numerous, overlapping, and competing jurisdictions of local government. The average number of independent units of government per metropolitan area is 87. There are 1,060 in the Chicago area, and 1,400 in the greater New York region.

The State government also bears a responsibility for strengthening the basis of regional cooperation. Some States have reacted to this problem in a positive, forward-looking fashion, but many others have largely ignored it.

Question. How confident are you that the American public can be sufficiently aroused to make national and local beautification programs work effectively?

I think a great deal can be accomplished. We obviously need public support—for the same reason that we need such support for any legislative program. But outside the field of legislation, we must have public support because beautification is the responsibility of each citizen. Unless the individual accepts that responsibility in his daily life, we cannot possibly achieve a more beautiful environment.

Support comes easier for programs which are related to health or economics, such as air and water pollution control. I think the public is well aware of the seriousness of this situation.

But in the case of other beautification, the health and economic issues are not as clear-cut. Billboard legislation, for example, involves cross currents of various benefits and disadvantages. Many motorists value highly the information on fuel, food, and lodgings which they read on billboards. Others say they want the scenic beauty unblemished by man-made structures. So we must balance the many interests of the casual motorists, the small businessmen, and the conservationists to work out practical compromises.

It may be that in the future, health and economic reasons for beautification efforts will be secondary. The quality of the life we lead may itself become the strongest motivating force for natural beauty programs.

Question. What are some of the gains which can be made in the next 10 years in pollution control and other beautification efforts?

We are making a good start in the control of air pollution through legislation passed this year which requires exhaust control on all cars beginning with the 1968 models. Of course, even if 70 to 80 percent of the hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide that an auto discharges into the air is reduced, there is still not likely to be any visible change in the atmosphere of our cities by 1975. There will simply be so many more cars by then that the gains will be offset by the sheer numbers of vehicles. On the other hand, if we do not achieve significant exhaust control, I do not like to think what our urban atmosphere will be like 10 years from now.

In the case of water pollution, over the next 10 years we ought to be able to achieve very dramatic gains in the appearance and quality of our rivers and waterways. It doesn't take long for streams to cleanse themselves, if there is a fast enough current flow, once the pollutants cease to enter them. This is going to mean a massive investment by Federal, State, and local governments in order to build the great numbers of sewage treatment plants needed.

Certainly, if we succeed in effectively controlling outdoor advertising on our streets and highways, there can be a dramatic improvement over a 10-year period. Tree and flower planting, various forms of landscaping, can produce dramatic changes in very short times, as already can be noted here in the Washington area.

But whatever beautification is accomplished cannot come by law or force from above. This must be a citizen action program. If each individual would take it upon himself to conduct a one-man crusade against litter and dirt, that alone would bring a startling change in the appearance of our cities—not in 10 years, but in 1 year.

In a free society, there is really no way to achieve a more beautiful environment unless each individual citizen makes national beautification his personal responsibility.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., chose this verse of Scripture: St. Matthew 28: 20: *Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.*

Almighty God, in whose presence is our peace and whose mind is far wiser than our own, inspire us with that faith, which looks beyond the shadows and darkness of these days.

Help us to understand how sacred and wonderful it is to worship Thee and work with Thee to build Thy kingdom and to be brought home from a strange and far country to our better and nobler selves.

Lift us from our troubled lower nature to those heights whence cometh the strength and joy of new visions and hopes.

Give us calm and courageous hearts and may we always walk without fear, knowing that we never are unattended, for in Thy fellowship our every step is guided and every duty is made plain.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 13, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution as follows:

S. RES. 176

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn until Monday next.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title:

S.J. Res. 125. Joint resolution extending the date for transmission of the economic report.

INVESTIGATION OF THE KU KLUX KLAN

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which is investigating the Ku Klux Klan, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an article by Louis Harris which appeared in the Washington Post this morning. Mr. Harris pointed out that, in a poll which he conducted, the people of the United States by a margin of 7 to 1 view the Ku Klux Klan as a harmful influence. The poll also shows that the people of the South by a margin of 3 to 1 disapprove of the Klan.

We on the committee consider the findings of this poll to be an unqualified indication of the people's approval of our investigation and of the remedial legislation which will ensue. Our committee has compiled a mass of evidence indicting the Klan and its organizers. We have exposed their habits of violence and unlawful conspiracy, as well as the way their leaders have hoodwinked and defrauded the rank and file members.

I am sure that the majority of Members of Congress likewise support our investigation. We are bringing the basic facts and evidence to the American people with the belief that destroying the secrecy that has always been the Klan's main bulwark of strength will cause its ultimate downfall.

The above-mentioned article follows:

THE HARRIS SURVEY—KLAN VIEWED HARMFUL INFLUENCE IN U.S. LIFE BY MARGIN OF 7 TO 1

(By Louis Harris)

By a 7-to-1 margin, the people of the United States regard the Ku Klux Klan as a harmful influence in our national life. White southerners go along by a 3-to-1 ratio with that general view of the Klan.

The Klan is seen as an extremist, revolutionary organization whose principal design is to stir up trouble for Negroes and other minority groups. When asked the type of people from which the KKK draws its support, the public chooses such labels as "terrorists," "sick people," "poor white trash" and "Communists." A majority of Negroes, however, tends to lump the Klan and white southerners together, despite evidence to the contrary.

Rarely has a home-grown organization been so widely denounced and rejected as the Klan is today.

A carefully drawn cross section of adults was asked:

"Do you feel the KKK (Ku Klux Klan) does more good than harm in America, more harm than good or doesn't it matter much one way or the other?"

More harm or more good?

[In percent]

	More good than harm	More harm than good	Does not matter
Nation	11	77	12
East	8	83	9
Midwest	11	80	9
South	19	63	81
West	10	83	7

During recent months, Klan members have conducted a number of public demonstrations, sometimes attended by thousands. In order to determine the impact of this show of strength, the Harris Survey asked two questions:

"Here is a list of words. Which two or three do you think best describe the kind of people who support the KKK?"

"Now, from the same list, which two or three words do you feel best describe the people who are most against the KKK?"

Who supports the KKK?

[In percent]

	Nation	South	Negroes
Terrorists	48	31	54
White southerners	41	34	55
Sick people	31	25	43
Communists	29	24	43
Poor white trash	23	24	42
Bad people	19	21	38
Bigots	16	5	24
Red-blooded Americans	5	11	3
Patriots	4	6	5
Good people	4	9	1
Negroes	2	5	1
None or not sure	14	28	8

Who opposes the KKK?

[In percent]

	Nation	South	Negroes
Red-blooded Americans	50	35	52
Good people	50	39	70
Negroes	49	49	74
Patriots	37	21	36
White southerners	5	8	3
Communists	4	10	2
Sick people	2	3	5
Poor white trash	2	2	5
Bad people	2	4	2
Terrorists	1	3	1
Bigots	1		4
None or not sure	13	25	9

(Percentages add to more than 100 because people named more than one descriptive word.)

In the South the survey reveals a broad consensus in opposition to the Klan and in favor of those who openly question its purposes. Doubt and confusion run highest there—1 in 4 southerners is loath to commit himself on the issue. But the significant fact is that the KKK is now on the defensive there as well as elsewhere.

THE MOST POPULAR CONGRESS IN MODERN TIMES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include the Harris poll.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you have all heard some of the remarks made by the critics of the 89th Congress. They have referred to it as the "me too" Congress, the "rubberstamp Congress," the "subservient" Congress.

Probably no better and certainly no more effective answer to this carping could be furnished than the results of the Harris poll published a few days ago.

In sum, the Harris poll indicates that the great majority of the American public does not share this view of the critics.

In the words of the poll:

When Congress reconvenes this week, it will be riding the crest of the highest public approval registered in modern times. Fully 71 percent of the American electorate gives a favorable rating to the job done by Congress in 1965.

I include the Harris poll at the conclusion of my remarks in order that Members who may not have seen it may know the evaluation of their work by the American people.

I should like to add that I feel that the tremendous expression of confidence given this Congress is due to one fact. This Congress has been a responsive and a responsible Congress. It has considered the problems of this country and its people, and it has acted accordingly.

Although there may be those who continue to think this is a "subservient" Congress, I hope that we in this House will nevertheless continue to show the same compassionate attribute toward the needs of the people in such a manner that we will continue to merit their support and compliance.

THE HARRIS SURVEY

(By Louis Harris)

When Congress reconvenes this week, it will be riding the crest of the highest public approval registered in modern times. Fully 71 percent of the American electorate gives a favorable rating to the job done by Congress in 1965. This compares with only 35 percent who felt this way 2 years ago, shortly after the death of President John F. Kennedy.

The reason for the increase is the widespread and almost uniform praise that now abounds in the country for the legislative program adopted after President Johnson took office. Medical care for the aged, considered by the public the most important to them personally, now is backed by 82 percent. Federal aid to education, judged the second most important piece of new legislation, is supported by 90 percent. Cutting excise taxes, third in the list of popular priorities, is looked on favorably by 92 percent. And the voting rights bill, ranked No. 4 by the public, is now supported by 95 percent.

It is evident that many of last year's most controversial measures have been accepted and even become popular. This is the case for revision of the immigration regulations, support prices and payments to farmers and the antipoverty program—all of which were the subject of vigorous disagreement and debate.

In fact, Congress has impressed the people so much that it is more popular than the President—four points higher than the Chief Executive's last recorded positive rating of 67 percent.

A carefully drawn cross section of the public was asked:

"How would you rate the job Congress did this past year in 1965—excellent, pretty good, only fair, or poor?"

Rating of Congress

	Excellent to pretty good	Fair to poor
	Percent	*Percent*
December 1965	71	29
December 1964	64	36
December 1963	35	65

The most dramatic gain in popularity for Congress was recorded in the South, while its top overall rating continues to be in the East.

Regional ratings of Congress

	December 1965	December 1964
Rate Congress positively: Nationwide	71	64
East	79	69
Midwest	66	65
South	66	49
West	66	62

In 1964, the South was still smarting over the civil rights legislation which had been a major issue in the presidential election. A year later, the South is still not happy about civil rights bills, but the pulling power of other legislation apparently has rehabilitated Congress reputation.

The public was also asked:

"Now I want to hand you a list of bills passed by this last Congress. For each, tell me if you approve or disapprove of that bill from what you know or have heard of it."

Opinion about specific legislation

	Approve	Disapprove
	Percent	*Percent*
Voting rights for Negroes	95	5
Cutting excise taxes	92	8
Federal aid to education	90	10
College scholarships	89	11
Medical care for the aged	82	18
Highway beauty	79	21
Antipoverty program	73	27
Immigration, based on individual skill rather than country quota	70	30
New Cabinet post, Secretary of Urban Affairs	67	33
Supports and payments for farmers	62	38

Not only is there solid endorsement of the major bills passed by Congress, but those with the highest public approval also tend to be considered the more important to voters personally. The cross section was asked:

"If you had to choose one bill, which one would you say is most important to you personally?"

Most important bill:	Percent
Medical care for the aged	28
Federal aid to education	21
Cutting excise taxes	18
Voting rights for Negroes	14
The antipoverty program	8
Immigration revision	3
College scholarships	3
Farm program	2
Department of Urban Affairs	2
Highway beauty	1

The widespread public approval of the 1965 congressional record could have important implications for the 1966 off-year elections. Despite new-found levels of confidence, however, the Democrats cannot count on any automatic repeat of 1964's smashing victories in the House and Senate. Congressional political prospects for 1966 will be explored in tomorrow's column.

RENEWAL OF THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a speech by Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare John Gardner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, Friday, January 14, 1966, I was privileged to hear Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner deliver the following speech at the civil service anniversary in the departmental auditorium in Washington, D.C. For the benefit of my colleagues who could not be present, and others in Government service, I feel Secretary Gardner's remarks should have broader publication. His speech follows:

RENEWAL OF THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

(By John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

We are here to commemorate an important beginning and to honor a fine tradition. The civil service is one of our noblest social institutions and I am proud to have a part in this tribute to it.

But I have learned from long experience that it is not really necessary to congratulate institutions. They have built-in mechanisms for self-congratulation that are marvelously effective. Having participated intimately in the life of Government agencies, the military services, business firms, and universities, I feel that I can make that generalization on the basis of fairly comprehensive experience.

So I am going to honor the civil service by talking about the goals ahead rather than the laurels already won.

First let me clear away some general questions. Is the Federal Government bureaucratic? It is indeed. But so are business firms, colleges and universities, the military services, State and local governments, and philanthropic organizations.

Is the Federal Government in danger of going to seed? It is in the gravest danger. But so are all other organizations large and small.

I think most of you know my views on the decay and renewal of organizations.

Briefly, I believe that most human organizations that fail in their missions or fall short of their goals do so not because of stupidity, not because of faulty doctrines, but because of the internal decay and rigidification to which they are all subject. They get stiff in the joints. They get in a rut. They go to seed.

I know that many of you are familiar with my diagnosis of what brings that condition about. So I am going to limit myself today to a few brief comments on what I regard as the most important single line of therapy for moribund organizations.

Organizations go to seed when the people in them go to seed. And they awaken when the people awaken. The renewal of organizations and societies starts with people. And since the first and last business of the civil service is people, this seems an appropriate occasion to examine the problem.

Specifically, I want to talk about what the Federal Government does to develop talent—after recruitment. Recruitment itself is worthy of discussion, and there is a vastly better job to be done on that front, but that is not the problem that interests me at the moment.

As a society, we are pursuing energetically, almost feverishly, the identification and nurture of gifted young people in our schools and colleges. In contrast, we are quite haphazard about the provisions for their continuing growth after formal education ceases. Almost all organizations in our society today are competing desperately to get their share of the flow of talent. But few are developing that talent properly after they get it.

The still untapped source of human vitality, the real unmined reservoir of talent is in those people already recruited and thereafter neglected.

The quickest and most effective road to renewal of the Federal service is the mining of that untapped resource. It is not only a means of tapping unused talent and opening up new stores of vitality, it is a solution to the old, old problem of developing a Government service that is responsive—responsibly responsive—to changing top leadership. Vital people, using their gifts to the full, are naturally responsive. People who have stopped growing, defeated people, people who no longer have confidence in the use of their own powers, build bastions of procedure between themselves and any vital leadership.

Now how does one go about renewing the people in the Government service—or anywhere else for that matter? There are many sources of renewal, of course. One is the uninvited crisis. Wars and depressions bring a certain amount of renewal, though the price is far higher than sensible people are willing to pay.

Another source is challenge and competition, and in this respect our Constitution has built-in provisions for the renewal of elected officials. But appointive officials, not facing the challenge of an election, are denied that stimulus.

Another source of renewal is rapid growth. Very rapid expansion of an agency is apt to have a highly stimulating effect upon the people within it.

Still another source of renewal is the sheer vitality of top leadership. I think, for example, that President Johnson has been as vigorous, if not cyclonic, a force for renewal as we have seen in this Government.

But what about the more mundane things that good Government administrators can do to renew their organizations? What about the good personnel practices and procedures that will insure renewal? I'm going to give you an oversimplified answer, but an oversimplification based on having observed the personnel field with a professional eye for 30 years.

I am going to assert that the best means of inducing growth, developing talent, and insuring continued vitality in the individual is change. The change may take many forms—a change of troubles, a change of assignment, promotion, living in different parts of the country, moving in and out of Government, sampling the different worlds that make up this society, serving abroad, serving in an organization that is itself rapidly changing.

It follows, I believe, that the single condition that would contribute most to greater vitality in the Government service today is flexibility of reassignment. In his state of the Union message, President Johnson pledged bold leadership to bring this about.

The size of the Federal Establishment and the diversity of activities it encompasses offer unexampled opportunities for imaginative reassignment. With such an array of possibilities it is unforgivable that any reasonably competent Government servant should suffer in a job that does not suit his talents.

It is unforgivable that any Government servant should lack the stimulus to personal growth that comes with change. The individual should be allowed to move and the agency should be allowed to move him without damage to his status or his feelings.

Free, frequent, and fluid movement among all the agencies of Government should be the accepted rule. The ambitious or merely restless young person who wants to sample several different lines of work should not be punished or penalized. Restlessness and vitality go together. And especially promising young people should be systematically reassigned through several agencies to insure their growth.

Beyond that there should be a great increase in the planned movement of individuals between the Federal Government and the other worlds that make up American life—the world of business, the military, the universities, the labor unions, agriculture, State and local government. I have moved in several of these worlds, and I am continually shocked at their mutual ignorance of one another. That ignorance breeds both complacency and paranoia. Each of these worlds imagines that it is uniquely close to the moral center of American life, and believes that the other worlds aren't really quite to be trusted with the American future.

Of all these worlds, the Government service has the least excuse for being provincial. It should have the capacity to understand all of the other segments of society. Without that understanding it will not be able to serve them effectively.

I would also favor an overseas assignment early in the career of those young Government people who seek to rise to the top. We have gotten past the day when only those individuals who have an explicit international interest should think of going overseas. The work of Government at home and abroad needs the breadth of perspective acquired by experience overseas. Such experience is valuable any time during one's career, but the earlier it comes the better.

All the processes of refreshment I've mentioned are particularly needed in the case of professional, scientific, technical, and scholarly people. Government needs such people more and more. But it will neither get them nor keep them if it doesn't provide the opportunities for further growth that they value so highly.

There is no excuse for Government to lose out in the competition for talent. It has a built-in advantage over every other employer. The cynics would deny this but the truth is that talented people are attracted to Government because it gives them an opportunity to render service to the entire Nation. They come with the highest motives. They leave when their purpose is thwarted or when they begin to feel trapped. Government cannot afford to be inhospitable to these people.

The administration of the affairs of this Nation are complex and dynamic. They are going to become increasingly so. The Congress has just enacted a staggering amount of legislation which must now be translated into action. It would be hard to overstate either the magnitude of the tasks ahead or their importance to the Nation.

President Johnson made this abundantly clear in his state of the Union message on Wednesday.

Now, let me ask these questions:

Is the Federal service capable of meeting this challenge? Of course, but to do so it must take some significant steps to renew its spirit and its people.

Is renewal compatible with the Federal merit system? It most certainly is. The merit system, now in its 83d year, represents a great advance in the personnel practices of government. We are not about to return to a spoils system.

But tenure was not designed to trap people, to make them inert. It was designed to free them from the capriciousness of politics. They need both the protection of a career system and opportunities for growth.

We can preserve all the great traditions of the system and still maintain the vitality that is so essential in this rapidly changing and infinitely challenging moment of history.

Recognizing that the very size and nature of the system make it particularly susceptible to stagnation, we can make special efforts to build in arrangements for renewal. Through some of the devices I have mentioned we can turn the concept of tenure into a positive asset rather than a deterrent to the full use of our talent.

The momentum generated by the President and the flood of legislation enacted by the Congress have given us unparalled opportunities to create new patterns of work and to bring new strength and vitality to the career service.

I am optimistic that we will do so, and that optimism is based in no small measure on the fact that one of the boldest innovators in Government today, John Macy, is also Chairman of this Commission.

John Macy introduced this session with some kind remarks about me and I want to end it with a tribute to him. I think he is a superb example of the best that the Federal service can produce, and I am proud to have shared this platform with him.

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN'S BAFFLING COLUMN ON FARM LABOR

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to comment on John Chamberlain's baffling column on farm labor which appeared in the Washington Post on January 8, 1966.

I am sure that this column was well intentioned but it distorts the facts and shows a lack of homework by the author.

While wrongly implying we cannot get by without the mass importation of foreign farmworkers, Mr. Chamberlain misses one of the most salient points about California agriculture in 1965:

It was a banner year—a year in which the State's farm income hit an alltime high of $3.7 billion, 2 percent higher than the previous record of 1964.

And it was, as I have asserted on other occasions, a highly successful year in agriculture in my State for all concerned—grower, consumer, and domestic farmworker.

I believe that he makes a terribly unjust indictment of Americans who choose to toil in the fields, orchards, and groves for a living by saying:

> The fact is that American citizens do not like to pick lemons and apples or harvest lettuce, no matter what the financial inducement.

The record shows he is dead wrong on this score.

In 1965, Americans worked in vastly increased numbers, in the harvest of lemons, apples, lettuce, and the full range of agricultural commodities that formerly used foreign abor.

In California alone, domestic farm employment was up about 20,000 last summer and fall over the same time a year ago.

As a result, domestic workers accounted for 97.3 percent of the man-years of labor in California's seasonal hired farm employment in 1965, compared to only 2.7 percent for contract foreign labor.

The importance of this data is that, in the years 1959–64, domestic labor averaged just 73.7 percent of total seasonal man-years, while foreign labor totaled 26.3 percent.

That is quite an improvement for domestic workers; yet Mr. Chamberlain's column attempts to discount this by implying that Mexican immigrants—so-called green-card workers—accounted for a large share of this increase in domestic employment.

This simply is not true. Between January 1 and October of 1965, only 56 Mexican green-card workers were approved for admission into this country for agriculture. And, since July 1963, only 7,755 green-card holders have been authorized for agriculture. It is interesting to note, I believe, that, on January 11, 1966, there were 16,609 green-card holders in California—only 10,464 in agriculture.

It should be noted that these workers have been entering the country from Mexico for many years and have indeed been counted as part of our domestic labor force. Green-carders have all the rights and privileges of American citizens except the right to vote or hold elective office.

The column also mentions wetbacks—Mexican nationals who enter the country illegally—as a sizable factor in computations of domestic employment. In 1965, 31,162 wetbacks were apprehended by American officials. This is nearly 16,000 more than the number caught in 1964.

If there are, as Mr. Chamberlain's column alleges, large numbers of these illegal entrants from Mexico working on U.S. farms, I think there is either a need for tighter enforcement or possibly for new legislation which would make it unlawful for an employer, agricultural or otherwise, to hire such a person. It is quite feasible to determine if a person is an American citizen or if he has entered the country legally. A simple check at the time of hiring can determine this.

I certainly would be more than happy to explore the needs for legislation along these lines if it is found that persons entering America illegally are being employed.

Mr. Speaker, the column implies, and again erroneously, that the end of the mass importation of braceros has led to, first, serious crop losses; second, thousands of acres of vegetables going unplanted; third, an exodus of many farmers to Mexico; and fourth, an increase in wholesale and retail prices of farm products.

None of these charges is based on fact. Let us examine them one by one.

Crop losses: In California, there were no serious crop losses due to labor shortages. Some losses resulting from labor shortages occurred in strawberries and asparagus, but it should be pointed out that extremely low wages were paid in both of these crops and growers stubbornly refused to increase piece rates to a reasonable level. Makeup pay was required in both crops to bring wages to the $1.40-an-hour guarantee level. Nevertheless, strawberry and asparagus growers both grossed more income in 1965 than the 1959–64 average.

Unplanted acreage: Acreage was down in some crops in 1965, but, significantly, California farm production hit 37.3 million tons last year—just 2 percent below the record 38.2 million tons in 1964 and an impressive 10 percent above the 1959–63 average. Furthermore, the California Department of Agriculture reports that the principal crops harvested in 1965 totaled 8 million acres, 11,000 more than in 1964.

It now appears that a majority of growers in California view the future with considerable optimism. In America's leading agricultural county, Fresno County, growers are reducing cotton acreage to increase their lettuce and tomato acreage, two crops which growers had previously insisted required braceros. It is reported by the Federal Farm Labor Service that:

First. Fresno County's spring lettuce will increase from 700 to 4,000 acres.

Second. The Mendota area's 1,700 acres of fall lettuce will increase to 6,000 acres.

Third. Cannery tomato acreage in the Mendota-Firebaugh-Huron area is expected to rise from approximately 3,000 acres in 1965 to between 15,000 and 20,000 acres in 1966.

Exodus to Mexico: The U.S. Department of Agriculture reports little movement of American farmers to Mexico other than members of religious groups who have immigrated to that country to become citizens. The Agriculture Department pointed out that some American capital has moved to Mexico in the past couple of years for processing and freezing plants but there are no facts linking this movement with termination of Public Law 78 on December 31, 1964.

Price increases: Both the retail and wholesale prices of fresh fruits and vegetables have remained generally steady in 1965. In November, the consumer price index revealed that prices of fresh fruits and vegetables were 2.7 percent lower than a year earlier. In October, they were 3.9 percent lower, in September, 3.8 percent lower and in August 1.5 percent lower than in 1964. As for wholesale prices, the latest data shows that prices of fresh and dried fruits and vegetables were 12 percent lower in November than in 1964 and 5 percent below their 1957–59 average.

Mr. Chamberlain also mentions farm wage differentials—$1.40 an hour for California farmworkers compared with $1.15 an hour in Texas and Arizona. The implication is, I think, that my State was singled out for higher wage rates. This just is not factual.

Identical wage rates were set for California and seven other States under the regulations announced by the Labor Department for the terms and conditions governing applications for foreign workers engaged in temporary agricultural employment. In specifying these rates, account was taken of the different levels of wages in the various States when the regulations were issued in December 1964.

This column covers, in much less detail, farm labor matters in other States. Because of the inaccuracies in the discussion of California agriculture, I would be skeptical, at best, about the treatment given other regions of the country.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated over and over, one of our great national challenges is to insure that agriculture is drawn into the mainstream of American economic life. Farm employers must compete for workers just as employers in other industries have traditionally done. When they do, when they offer reasonable wages and working conditions, the record shows that American workers are available. Only when they do can American farmworkers become first-class American citizens.

NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT C. WEAVER AS SECRETARY OF THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to commend President Johnson for two outstanding appointments—Robert C. Weaver as Secretary of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development and Robert C. Wood, Under Secretary of the same Department.

Both nominations were unanimously approved this morning by the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate. This rapid action by the committee clearly confirmed the universal acclaim that both nominations have received.

Despite what some pundits and columnists have written, there was no questioning by those who really knew that Robert C. Weaver would be President Johnson's choice for this tremendously important new Cabinet post. President Johnson was convinced, even before the post was created, that the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Mr. Weaver, was the best man for the new, taxing, and complex position. He never waivered from this belief. No one knew better than the President that the new Cabinet chair had to be filled by one who possessed an abundance of knowledge, skill, and intelligence in dealing with the ever-growing and constantly perplexing problems of housing and urban development. This task demanded the best man available and President Johnson knew he had him in the person of Dr. Weaver.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally delighted with the appointment. I came to know Dr. Weaver when he was appointed by President Kennedy as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in 1961. May I say and recall that President Kennedy would have appointed him to the same Cabinet post, if it had been created during his Presidency.

My appraisal of Dr. Weaver has been gleaned from the many appearances he has made before the Subcommittee on Appropriations that deals with the budget of the housing agency. It is further buttressed by the manner in which he had handled the myriad tasks and problems that have centered in the agency. All of this leads me to say that President Johnson has selected one of the most outstanding men in this field in the Nation to preside over the new department. He could not have made a better choice.

Mr. Speaker, in designating Robert C. Wood to be the No. 2 man in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, President Johnson again has underscored his desire to bring talent and excellence into this administration. Dr. Wood's wide range of activities and his particular interest in the field of metropolitan problems make him an ideal choice as Under Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the Department of Housing and Urban Development under the skillful direction of Dr. Weaver and Dr. Wood will be headed in the direction of resolving the many problems that plague the Nation's urban growth and development. The Department of Housing and Urban Development was created by the Congress to get to the core of the difficulties that have marred and threatened the existence of our cities and towns.

I know the Members of this House wish Dr. Weaver and Dr. Wood well as they join together in the herculean task that will be theirs.

Mr. Speaker, I include with these remarks some biographical information:

ROBERT C. WEAVER

Mr. Robert C. Weaver was born in Washington, D.C. on December 29, 1907. He was educated at Harvard University, receiving a B.S. in 1929, an M.A. in 1931, and a Ph. D. in 1934.

From 1933 to 1937 he was the Adviser for Negro Affairs, Department of the Interior, and from 1937 to 1940 he served as the Special Assistant to the Administrator, U.S. Housing Authority. He also worked from 1940 to 1944 as an official on the War Production Board, where he became chief of the Minority Group Service Division. From 1945 to 1948 Mr. Weaver was a member of the American Council on Race Relations.

After teaching at Northwestern University, Columbia Teachers College, and New York University, Mr. Weaver became the director of opportunity fellowships, John Hay Whitney Foundation, a position he held until 1954.

In 1954, Mr. Weaver was named the deputy commissioner of the New York State Division of Housing and from 1955 to 1959 served as the State rent administrator, New York. From 1960 to 1961 he was the vice chairman of the New York City Housing and Redevelopment Board.

Mr. Weaver became the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in 1961, a position he has held since that time.

He is the author of "Negro Labor, A National Problem" (1946), "The Negro Ghetto" (1948), and "The Urban Complex" (1964).

He lives at 4600 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Mr. Weaver is married to the former Ella V. Haith.

PROF. ROBERT C. WOOD

Prof. Robert C. Wood, a native of Jacksonville, Fla., is chairman of the Political Science Department at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Born in St. Louis, Mo., on September 16, 1923, he served with the 76th Infantry during World War II. He received an A.B. from Princeton University in 1946. At Harvard University, he was awarded an M.A. in 1947, a master of public administration in 1948, and a Ph. D. in 1950.

From 1949 to 1951 he was associate director, Legislative Reference Bureau of the State of Florida. At the U.S. Bureau of the Budget from 1951 to 1954, Mr. Wood served as a management organization expert in the housing field.

Mr. Wood became a lecturer and then an assistant professor of government at Harvard University in 1954. In 1957, he left Harvard to join the faculty at MIT where he taught as an assistant professor of political science from 1957 to 1959, and as an associate professor from 1959 to 1962. In 1962, Mr. Wood was named professor of political science; and in 1965, he became the chairman of the Political Science Department at MIT.

He is a member of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency, the Committee for Economic Development, and the American Academy for Arts and Sciences. He was elected to Phi Beta Kappa while at Princeton.

He is the author of "Suburbia, Its People and Their Politics" (1958); "Metropolis Against Itself" (1959); "1,400 Governments, the Political Economy of the New York Region" (1960); and the coauthor of "School Men and Politics" (1962); and "Government and Politics of the U.S." (1965).

Mr. Wood lives on Trapelo Road, Lincoln, Mass., with his wife, the former Margaret Byers, and three children, Francis, Margaret, and Frank.

UNANIMOUS ELECTION OF GEORGE J. TITLER AS NEW INTERNATIONAL VICE PRESIDENT OF UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I take delight in sharing with my colleagues the good news of the unanimous election of my valued friend, Mr. George J. Titler, of Beckley, W. Va., as the new international vice president of the United Mine Workers of America by the international executive board last Saturday.

A veteran of World War I, Mr. Titler has devoted his entire life working on behalf of the members of the United Mine Workers.

I first met Mr. Titler in 1942 at the time he assumed the responsibilities as the president of district No. 29 of the United Mine Workers, with headquarters in Beckley.

During these years, I have, with my own eyes, observed his dedicated work and outstanding contributions to the men who mine our coal. He is well known and unchallenged as an unsurpassed speaker for the principles in which he so firmly believes.

He has been a true friend and I highly commend President W. A. "Tony" Boyle and the members of the executive board for their wise selection.

In his new post of added responsibilities, I am firmly convinced that the coal miners of our Nation will benefit from his experience and his continuing dedication to duty.

ELIMINATE THE MEDICARE DISCLAIMER

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this session of Congress I introduced a bill (H.R. 11922) that would strike out provisions in the Social Security Amendments of 1965—the medicare bill—on which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has based a decision to require some 2 million Americans, aged 65 and over, to sign and file a disclaimer of membership in the last 12 months in any organization required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950.

H.R. 11922 amends the Social Security Amendments of 1965 by eliminating the provisions which deny hospital insurance benefits to uninsured individuals who are members of certain organizations and by eliminating the provisions which deny supplementary insurance benefits to persons who have been convicted of certain offenses.

It is my belief that disclaimer affidavits and loyalty oaths are an infringement of the rights of free Americans.

I am delighted that the New York Times, in an editorial published today, vigorously supports this legislation. I commend to my colleagues the New York Times editorial, which follows:

LOYALTY OATHS AGAIN

The Federal requirement that certain elderly people take loyalty oaths as a condition for obtaining medicare benefits is repugnant and should be rescinded. The provision affects the 2 million uninsured by social security who will receive aid from the general fund rather than from the social security tax fund, and applies only to those receiving hospital care, not the separate voluntary medical insurance that helps pay doctors' bills.

In a democratic society where free thought and speech are constitutionally guaranteed, loyalty oaths—as distinct from the normal oath of office taken traditionally by public officials—are an affront to individual dignity, carrying the implication of disloyalty unless one makes the special affirmation.

Furthermore, they are useless; for what genuine subversive would hesitate to swear loyalty if to do so served his purpose? Only the conscientious are likely to be the victims. A byproduct in the McCarthy heyday of loyalty oaths was that many thinking people in such fields as teaching and the sciences simply bowed out rather than subject themselves to this humiliation.

Communist disclaimers have been incorporated time and again in all manner of programs for the granting of privileges, awards, and employment, yet to this day there remains no evidence that they have safeguarded the Nation from subversion. Representative WILLIAM F. RYAN, of New York, has introduced legislation which would strike them permanently from the medicare machinery. His bill should be passed while the program is taking shape for its launching July 1. The noninsured elderly are already enrolling and taking loyalty oaths; the fewer who must be subjected to this discriminatory obligation, the better for all of us.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House on the 25th and 26th of this month, during the meetings of the Scientific Panel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ASIAN BANK DEVELOPMENT BILL BEING INTRODUCED IN HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing in the House an Asian Development Bank Act which provides for the participation of the United States in the proposed Asian Development Bank. It is as follows:

H.R. —

A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congresss assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Asian Development Bank Act."

ACCEPTANCE OF MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the Asian Development Bank (hereinafter referred to as the "Bank") provided for by the agreement establishing the Bank (hereinafter referred to as the "agreement") deposited in the archives of the United Nations.

SEC. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a Governor of the Bank, an alternate for the Governor, and a Director of the Bank.

(b) No person shall be entitled to receive any salary or other compensation from the United States for services as a Governor or Alternate Governor. The Director may, in the discretion of the President, receive such compensation, allowances, and other benefits as, together with those received by him from the Bank, will equal those authorized for a Chief of Mission, Class 2, within the meaning of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

SEC. 4. (a) The policies and operations of the representatives of the United States on the Bank shall be coordinated with other United States policies in such manner as the President shall direct.

(b) An annual report with respect to United States participation in the Bank shall be submitted to the Congress by such agency or officer as the President shall designate.

SEC. 5. Unless the Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall, on behalf of the United States, (a) subscribe to additional shares of stock of the Bank; (b) vote for or agree to any amendment of the agreement which increases the obligations of the United States, or which would change the purpose or functions of the Bank; or (c) make a loan or provide other financing to the Bank, except that loans or other financing may be provided to the Bank by a United States agency created pursuant to an Act of Congress which is authorized by law to make loans or provide other financing to international organizations.

DEPOSITORIES

SEC. 6. Any Federal Reserve bank which is requested to do so by the Bank shall act as its depository or as its fiscal agent, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall supervise and direct the carrying out of these functions by the Federal Reserve banks.

PAYMENT OF SUBSCRIPTION

SEC. 7. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, for the purchase of 20,000 shares of capital stock of the Bank, $200 million.

(b) Any payment made to the United States by the Bank as a distribution of net income shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE OF ACTIONS

SEC. 8. For the purpose of any civil action which may be brought within the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, by or against the Bank in accordance with the agreement, the Bank shall be deeemd to be an inhabitant of the Federal judicial district in which its principal office or agency in the United States is located, and any such action to which the Bank shall be a party shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States, and the district courts of the United States, including the courts enumerated in Title 28, sec. 460, United States Code, shall have original jurisdiction of any such action. When the Bank is a defendant in any action in a State court, it may, at any time before the trial thereof, remove such action into the district court of the United States for the proper district by following the procedure for removal of causes otherwise provided by law.

STATUS, IMMUNITIES AND PRIVILEGES

SEC. 9. The agreement, and particularly Articles 49 through 56, shall have full force and effect in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Pureto Rico, upon acceptance of membership by the United States in, and the establishment of, the Bank. The President, at the time of deposit of the instrument of acceptance of membership by the United States in the Bank, shall also deposit a declaration that the United States retains for itself and its political subdivisions the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to its citizens or nationals.

SECURITIES ISSUED BY BANK AS INVESTMENT SECURITIES FOR NATIONAL BANKS

SEC. 10. The last sentence of paragraph 7 of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 24), is amended by striking the word "or" after the words "International Bank for Reconstruction and Development" and inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and by inserting after the words "the Inter-American Development Bank" the words "or the Asian Development Bank".

SECURITIES ISSUED BY BANK AS EXEMPT SECURITIES; REPORT FILED WITH SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SEC. 11. (a) Any securities issued by the Bank (including any guarantee by the Bank, whether or not limited in scope) in connection with raising of funds for inclusion in the Bank's ordinary capital resources as defined in article 7 of the agreement and any securities guaranteed by the Bank as to both principal and interest to which the commitment in article 6, section 5, of the agreement is expressly applicable, shall be deemed to be exempted securities within the meaning of paragraph (a) (2) of section 3 of the Act of May 27, 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77c), and paragraph (a) (12) of section 3 of the Act of June 6, 1934, as amended (15 U.S.C. 78c). The Bank shall file with the Securities and Exchange Commission such annual and other reports with regard to such securities as the Commission shall determine to be appropriate in view of the special character of the Bank and its operations and necessary in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

(b) The Securities and Exchange Commission, acting in consultation with such agency or officer as the President shall designate, is authorized to suspend the provisions of subsection (a) at any time as to any or all securities issued or guaranteed by the Bank during the period of such suspension. The Commission shall include in its annual reports to Congress such information as it shall deem advisable with regard to the operations and effect of this section and in connection therewith shall include any views submitted for such purpose by any association of dealers registered with the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the House Banking and Currency Committee will consider this legislation as its next item of business.

"THE 'VOICE' SPEAKS: ALL MUST PAY MORE FOR THE BANKERS' PRODUCT"—AN ANALYSIS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD'S INTEREST RATE HIKE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague in the House, Jerry Voorhis, has distinguished himself as a champion of the consumer for many years. Jerry Voorhis was an outstanding spokesman and fighter for the consumer when he served as a Congressman from California, and he has continued his invaluable service to the "little man" of the country as executive secretary of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A.

He has been a consistent opponent of the consumer's No. 1 enemy—high interest rates. Following the Federal Reserve Board's decision to raise interest rates on December 3, Jerry Voorhis analyzed in dramatic and eloquent terms what this action means to the consumer and to the economy as a whole.

The analysis appeared in "The People's Business," a feature service distributed by the Cooperative News Service. I insert a copy of this excellent document in the RECORD:

THE "VOICE" SPEAKS: ALL MUST PAY MORE FOR THE BANKERS' PRODUCT—I

(By Jerry Voorhis)

Once more the voice has been heard in the land.

It is the voice of the greatest special privilege ever granted by any nation to any group of private citizens in all history.

It is a voice to which the wise men of the country, almost all the newspapers and commentators, the Secretary of the Treasury, and even the President of the United States listen and bow their heads and genuflect.

The voice says:

"This country is too prosperous."

"There is too much money in circulation."

"Unemployment has been reduced and some industries are producing at or near capacity."

"The value of money has been going slowly down and the money value of goods and services has been going slowly up."

"These things must not be." So sounds the voice, the voice of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

From one point of view, these things which have been happening are bad. From every other point of view they are good.

They are bad from the point of view of the banks, which have—wrongly—been given the privilege of creating the money of this supposedly "sovereign" nation.

They are good from the point of view of the workers who were unemployed but who now have jobs again. They are good from the point of view of farmers, manufacturers, merchants, everybody that produces or sells goods.

But as has happened so often when the single interest of the private creators of money clashes with the interest of all the rest of the people in the country, the interest of the bankers has prevailed.

It has prevailed not through any act of Congress or the President or the Secretary of Treasury or anybody else who is responsible to the people of this country.

The bankers have prevailed because their own private "government," the Federal Reserve Board, which is accountable to no one but itself and the private banks which own the Federal Reserve Banks, has so decreed. (The only sense in which the Federal Reserve Board can be said to be accountable to any public body is that Congress could, of course, amend or repeal the law that created the Federal Reserve System.)

Even the Federal Reserve Board voted only 4 to 3 for the increase in interest rates.

Four-sevenths of a group of private bankers responsible to nobody but private bankers for their actions has decided that:

1. Interest rates throughout the country shall be about 10 percent higher than they are now. (They increased the Federal Reserve's discount rate from 4 to 4½ percent—an 11-percent increase.)

2. Every home shall cost about 10 percent more than it does now.

3. Every farmer must repay his debts in money that is about 10 percent harder to get and worth 10 percent more than when he borrowed it.

4. The cost of everything we buy or use shall go up about 10 percent because the cost of money or credit is the one element that enters into the cost of almost everything we buy or use in all our economic life.

5. The taxpayers of the Nation shall be forced to pay at least $1 billion more in interest on the national debt than they do now.

6. And every piece of household furniture, every washing machine, every automobile, every other thing bought on credit shall cost the family that buys it—rich or poor—some 10 percent more than it does now. And this will happen not because any of these goods are actually worth a single penny more than they were before, but solely because four private bankers say it must—four out of seven on a Federal Reserve Board which can control the whole Nation's economic fate.

Reserve Board's Action Makes Money-lending More Profitable—II

(By Jerry Voorhis)

William McChesney Martin, Jr., who has just told the President of the United States to go sit in a corner, has an excuse. Yes. The four out of seven members of Mr. Martin's Federal Reserve Board have their standard excuse for the blow they have struck at the Nation's economy.

It is the same excuse that the Federal Reserve Board used in May of 1920 when it deliberately caused a deflation of the currency so severe that America's agriculture was plunged into a depression from which it did not recover until the middle of World War II.

It is the same excuse that was used in 1938 when most of the gains in economic activity which had been accomplished during the preceding 5 years of the Roosevelt administration were wiped out in a couple of months.

It is the excuse that "We must curb inflation."

Everybody is supposed to remember the disastrous inflation that took place in Germany after World War I. And the inflation recently suffered in Brazil. Then everybody is supposed to become frightened and to say, "Oh, yes. By all means we must curb inflation."

But still it seems a bit odd, if we really wish to "curb inflation," to adopt measures that will absolutely assure the sharp inflation of every price and cost in the entire economy of the Nation.

This hardly seems a sensible way to prevent inflation of prices or costs.

But it does make money more valuable in terms of all real wealth. And it will make all real wealth less valuable in terms of money.

Which is the real reason why it is done.

But it is a reason involving so many undesirable implications that hardly anyone—least of all the Federal Reserve Board—ever talks about it.

Another reason is being alleged. It is being suggested that the raising of interest rates will discourage American investors from investing their money abroad and cause them to invest at home, thus correcting the balance of payments. But the result, the immediate result of the action, has been to cause a slump in the stock market and in the value of almost all American securities. This is a strange way indeed to encourage investment in these sound American securities.

No. The reason for this Federal Reserve Board action is rather simple. It is taken to increase the value of money and reduce the value of everything else in our economy.

Who would want to do such a thing?

The people who deal in money, who have money to sell at interest, who indeed have the privilege of creating new money and drawing upon the credit of the entire Nation and all its people to give value to that newly created money.

If you are in the business of creating and lending money, as the commercial banks and the Federal Reserve banks are, then quite obviously if you can get a 4-to-3 decision to increase your income by 10 percent, all of a sudden, it's a very good thing to get done for you.

But from the viewpoint of the Nation as a whole, one or two sobering thoughts occur.

One is that every single depression or recession which we have ever suffered has been preceded by a period of shortage in the money supply. And many people believe that, far from having increased too rapidly, our money supply in very recent years has not been increasing fast enough and that this is the reason for our persistent unemployment, for the failure of many industries to operate at anywhere near their capacity, and for the flow of investment funds out of the country.

Another thought is that a number of other countries, notably Japan and Western Europe, have experienced much more rapid growth rates since the close of World War II than has the United States. And in every one of those countries the key to that rapid growth has been monetary policies which have assured a growth in the money supply which was always a little ahead of the growth of industry and commerce. In other words, these countries have brought about, quite deliberately, a controlled expansion of their money.

Some people—four-sevenths of the Federal Reserve Board among them, no doubt—might call this an inflation. But certainly it has not been a harmful inflation. Indeed, the question arises as to whether the price our country is being asked to pay to curb a bogey of inflation may not be altogether too great a price. And whether, from the point of view of everyone except the dealers in money, it might not have been better to reduce the rates of interest instead of increasing them.

The Bankers Had a Better, Safer Choice—III

(By Jerry Voorhis)

To understand the full significance of the recent action of four-sevenths of the Federal Reserve Board in boosting interest rates, it is necessary to examine the strange phenomena of what is called the monetary system of the United States.

It hardly deserves the name of a "system," for it is based upon no reason or logic or justice or economic wisdom.

Most of the so-called money of the United States consists of what we call bank credit. Most of our business transactions are carried on not by exchange of cash but by the drawing of checks. "Money in circulation" is regularly defined as "cash plus demand bank deposits." And seldom does the cash amount to more than a fifth or a quarter of the "demand bank deposits." In December 1964, for example, our total money supply as reported by the Federal Reserve Board consisted of $34.2 billion of currency and $125.2 billion of demand deposits.

But the really important factor is how our money is created. For it is obvious that as our economy grows and our production and commerce increase, there must be additional money brought into circulation to accommodate the increased volume of business. And indeed this was the stated purpose of Congress when it passed the Federal Reserve Act in the administration of Woodrow Wilson.

Many people think the Government of the United States creates the money of our Nation—as indeed it should and as the Constitution provides.

But the Government does no such thing—except for the pennies and dimes and quarters which we use for change.

All the rest of our money is created by the private banking system. It is possible for the private banks to create money in the form of demand bank deposits because of what is called the fractional reserve system.

This means that if a bank has $10 million of demand deposits on its books—that is, if it owes its depositors $10 million which they think they have in the bank—then the bank is required to have in actual cash money not $10 million but only perhaps $1 million or $1,500,000 or at most $2 million. The exact amount of cash reserves which banks must have behind the demand deposits on their books is decided by the Federal Reserve Board and is called the reserve requirement. It may be 10 or 13 or 15 or 20 percent. It is never more than 20 percent, usually much less.

Consequently, if a bank has actual cash deposits in its vaults of $1 million and the reserve requirement is 10 percent, it can have on its books as much as $10 million to the credit of holders of its "demand bank deposits." In such a case it can create some $9 million of new money that did not exist before. It can do this by giving the borrowers checking accounts and entering on its books demand deposit credits for those borrowers. Furthermore, if it finds itself in need of additional reserves it can usually borrow them from the Federal Reserve bank in its district.

Now the proper definition of money inflation, as distinguished from price or cost inflation is this: Monetary inflation takes place when the amount of money in circulation is increasing faster than the flow of goods and services to be bought with money is increasing.

And under our so-called fractional reserve system, the way we get inflation is that the banks create more new demand deposits than are needed to keep up with the growth of the economy and the flow of trade.

The theory then of curbing inflation by increasing interest rates is that if the interest rates are higher fewer borrowers will borrow from the banks and the banks will therefore create less new money in the form of demand deposits.

But even if this works, it involves so many undesirable effects that a very heavy burden of proof should rest upon anyone taking such a step. It should be taken only by a body which has a direct responsibility to the American people and which is subject to the duly elected representatives of the people.

The Federal Reserve Board is neither so responsible nor so subject. And this is why Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives, has introduced legislation which would make the Federal Reserve banks national institutions as they should be and make the Federal Reserve Board a body responsible to the Nation's duly elected administration.

Furthermore, even assuming that there is a real danger of inflation—a thesis far from proved at present—there is another very obvious remedy available to the Federal Reserve Board. This remedy is to increase the reserve requirements in the banks.

Such action would have the immediate effect of reducing the ability of the banks to create money. If they had to have, let us say, a 20-percent reserve instead of a 10-percent reserve, this would mean that their ability to create new demand deposit, or checkbook, money would be cut in two.

Why is this remedy not used by Mr. Martin and his three companions? Only they can answer that question. But increasing reserve requirements would be even more certain to curb any threat of monetary inflation that might possibly exist. The one thing, however, which it would not do would be to cause the value of money to go up and the monetary value of real wealth to go down. It, therefore, would not give the kind of bonanza to the creators of our money supply which increasing interest rates gives.

Could this be the reason why the four did not choose this course?

One additional question arises. How long should we wait to establish for our country a sound, effective monetary system, one wherein money would be created by the only agency which has a right to exercise that power—the Government of the Nation—and one wherein the possibility of either inflation or deflation could be forever prevented?

COOPERATIVES KEEP INTEREST DOWN, HELP WHOLE ECONOMY—IV

(By Jerry Voorhis)

Certain financial institutions in the United States probably won't raise their interest rates even though the Federal Reserve Board has given them an excuse to do so.

The ones that won't raise their rates if they possibly can avoid it are cooperative financial institutions—the ones that belong to their borrowers.

The reason they won't raise their rates is that they will not want to. They'd hurt their owners if they did.

Credit unions, cooperative farm credit institutions, and mutual savings banks are in business to reduce the burden of debt, not to increase it. They exist because groups of people have created them to help each other by owning together the savings and lending institutions they need. These consumers of credit are not interested in raising interest rates to make more money for investors.

Credit unions did not raise their interest rates a few years ago when the Federal Reserve Board took action similar to that recently taken. This was because credit unions are in business to help their members reduce the burden of debt—not to increase it. Their motive is different.

Banks for cooperatives and other cooperative farm credit institutions raised their rates only slightly—because they get part of their money for making loans by sale of debentures in the money market. But even if cooperative farm credit institutions do raise interest rates somewhat, the net effect upon their owner-borrowers may not be to increase the cost of credit at all. For if as a result of the higher rates a bank for cooperatives, production credit association, or Federal land bank association increases its earnings, those earnings all belong to the borrower-owners and will be returned to them in patronage refunds. So the net interest rate may not be increased at all.

The difference lies in motive. If the motive, the reason for being in business is service and mutual aid, then a financial institution will keep its interest rates as reasonable as it can. And in so doing, such institutions are certain to exert a very beneficial competitive influence—for the protection of all borrowers, even those who borrow from investor-owned institutions.

The very fact that cooperative financial institutions are in existence provides our entire Nation with the best protection it can have at present against really extortionate interest rates. And they provide that protection in the best way it can be provided in a supposedly "free" economic order. That way is by the competition of businesses whose motive is mutual aid and the service of people.

HOUSING GROUPS EXPRESS BITTER DISAGREEMENT WITH FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee conducted an important hearing into the effects of rising interest costs on home buyers and home builders. My good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, BILL BARRETT, who is chairman of the subcommittee, is to be commended for undertaking a study of an issue so vitally affecting millions of Americans.

Without question, the homeowners and would-be homeowners were a forgotten group when the Federal Reserve Board decided in secret on December 3 to raise interest rates. The Federal Reserve's action threatens to place a massive veto on the Nation's housing programs and threatens to place decent housing out of the reach of many citizens.

Rising interest costs and a tightening money supply always hit the home buyer and the building industry hard. For example, a 1-percent increase in the interest rate on a $20,000 home adds more than $4,700 in interest costs over the life of a 30-year loan. With the national median income at $4,600, this means that many wage earners will have to contribute a year's income just to pay the added interest costs.

Nearly everyone in the housing field is deeply concerned about the implications of the Federal Reserve's recent action. The National Housing Conference has denounced the Federal Reserve Board's action in forthright terms. I place in the RECORD a copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the National Housing Conference on December 13, 1965:

> *Resolved*, That the Board of Directors of the National Housing Conference in regular quarterly meeting assembled on December 13, 1965, shares the concern expressed by President Johnson on the impact of the Federal Reserve Board's action in increasing the discount rate, particularly on the housing economy.
>
> This further impetus to rising interest rates cannot fail to have an adverse effect on housing production and financing. It will mean increased costs to the consumer and a tighter mortgage market, and could result in a serious slowdown in homebuilding in the coming year.
>
> This is no time to allow housing production to drag. Congress has given the President a far-reaching set of programs to bring our production of good housing closer to our rising needs and to speed up the improvement and redemption of our urban areas. It has established a consolidated agency to effectuate this mission by creating the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
>
> We must not now erase these hopes by diverting and denying adequate financing to the housing market and the people who need housing. Already, as interest rates have risen, the annual homebuilding rate by October had declined to the lowest point since January 1963. We must reverse this trend, not accelerate it.
>
> We urge the President and the Congress to take such actions as may be necessary to assure an ample flow of mortgage financing at reasonable rates into housing production. We recommend that the President make full use of the new and expanded programs for housing for the low- and moderate-income group, as contemplated in the 1965 legislation, and to implement these programs administratively as quickly and fully as possible. We recommend also that the Congress, as it did in 1958, give the President standby authorization for the purchase of mortgages on the private market at the present interest rates through the Federal National Mortgage Association to counter any decline in housing production as the spring building season gets underway. Any setback in the housing economy at this time would have serious and costly consequences for the Nation for years to come.

LEADING EDUCATOR, DR. ROBERT M. HUTCHINS, WARNS THAT "INDEPENDENT" FED LIMITS DEMOCRACY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, many important voices are being raised against the Federal Reserve Board's unwarranted action of December 3, 1965, which imposed another round of high interest costs on the country. Among these is the distinguished and highly respected educator Robert M. Hutchins, former chancellor of the University of Chicago who is now head of the Fund for the Republic, Inc. His remarks appeared in a recent issue of the Los Angeles Times, entitled "Another Look at Interest Rates." His column follows:

ANOTHER LOOK AT INTEREST RATES

(By Robert M. Hutchins)

Three courses, I have suggested, are open to the country if it wants to prevent the economy from overheating as a result of the war in Vietnam.

The first is to stop the war. The second is to raise taxes. The third is to increase interest rates by the action of the Federal Reserve.

If it is impossible to stop the war, the equitable and democratic procedure is to raise taxes. This can be done only by the elected representatives of the people. It can be done with a view to the just distribution of burdens. The rate and incidence of taxation can be made a matter of intense public debate.

Nothing of this sort applies to the increase of interest rates by the Federal Reserve. The board is not responsible to the people. It is not elected by them. No President can be sure it will follow the policies of the Government; and it may make the execution of those policies impossible. It may prevent the adoption of an integrated economic program. It may disregard public discussion of fiscal problems and public criticism of its decision.

Yet these decisions are vital to the well-being of the people. To deny the representatives of the people a voice in them is to limit the scope of democracy.

The only certain beneficiaries of an increase in interest rates are the banks. They benefit by a higher price for what they have to sell. The losers are those who need what the banks have to sell, those who need money to build something, to develop something, or simply to live.

It must be more than a coincidence that on one day it was announced that construction permits had taken the severest downturn in 10 months and on the next Standard & Poor's predicted an average increase of 6 percent in the earnings of major banks.

No doubt there may be times at which a country will have to raise interest rates and taxes simultaneously. This may be one. The representatives of the people should decide. But in any case the agency fixing interest rates should be in fact a part of the Government and not a paragovernmental, nonresponsible group of experts.

All this seems clear enough, so clear that the bankers who have attacked me for saying it have not cared to argue these points. They have contented themselves with claiming that the Federal Reserve System has worked very well, forgetting that in 1933 it stopped working altogether. They say it has generated prosperity, a perfect example of the Chanticleer fallacy—the rooster believes the sun rises because he crows.

My friend Louis Lancaster, of the Santa Barbara National Bank, says of the Federal Reserve, "It has produced enough surplus wealth to relieve Mr. Hutchins of working with pick and shovel."

Two hundred years ago, long before the Federal Reserve was invented, Penuel Hutchins left the ancestral farm in Connecticut and became a doctor. Ever since that time his descendants have lived by their wits.

After the Federal Reserve was established, my Uncle Grosvenor became a banker. We were very polite to him: he was the most prosperous member of the family.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO ALLOW CREDIT AGAINST INCOME TAX TO CORPORATIONS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation which would allow a credit against income tax to corporations for contributions to colleges and universities.

This proposal is designed to encourage greater financial support for our higher educational institutions without Federal interference and control. The need for such financial support, in the face of booming enrollments, is obvious.

I introduce this legislation in order that it may receive the full attention of the Nation and the Congress; that it may be studied and discussed; that it may be considered by appropriate committees; and then I would hope that the Congress will act favorably on the legislation.

Whenever the Nation can afford to act again in the field of higher education assistance, I feel that the approach embodied in this bill should be incorporated into our programs.

The Congress has already authorized corporations to contribute up to 5 percent of their income for, among other purposes, educational purposes as a tax deduction. Unfortunately, this has not met the problem; it does not provide the needed remedy. It has not induced that level of corporate giving that is demanded. The reason is obvious. Under this legislation, the corporation actually receives credit for only one-half of its gifts.

I propose that, instead of permitting a mere income deduction, the corporation be given full credit against its tax bill for all gifts for educational purposes up to 2½ percent of its tax liability. This is what the Congress has already authorized, except that there must be a matching by the corporation. Under this proposal of mine, the matching requirement is eliminated. And since the gift is treated as a credit against the tax itself, the corporation has every incentive to make the gift. It actually loses nothing from the making of the gift. It either pays the sum in taxes to the Government or it gives it to an educational institution of its own choosing for a purpose determined by it. It is difficult to see why any corporation will elect not to exercise this choice.

It is thus reasonable to believe that practically every corporation will avail itself of this right. At present levels of corporate income, this would mean a fund of about three-quarters of a billion dollars annually available from private giving for the benefit of the educational institutions of this Nation.

And since such fund will be contributed by private corporations, it will be free from constitutional objectives or reservations about the separation of church and state. It will involve no threat of governmental control of an educational institution. The separation of church and state will not be violated. The argument over governmental support of a sectarian institution will be avoided.

So I offer it as a means of giving to the colleges and universities in this Nation more options and broader opportunities, free from conscientious objections entertained by many.

GREAT WASTE OF MONEY IN PRINTING OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the 1st session of the 89th Congress many records were set. While many Members will point with pride to some of these records, I believe there is one record, however, that few Members would care to share the responsibility for, or to advocate that this second session should surpass. I am referring to the great waste of money in the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which, over the years, has deteriorated to the extent that it is no longer an accurate record of proceedings and debates of the Congress. No longer can any reader be assured that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflects what actually occurs in either Chamber of Congress. The body of the RECORD has become the dumping ground for material that I once described as "trash, tripe, and trivia," which found its way into the Appendix of the RECORD by unanimous consent. There are apparently no rules of reasonableness, which once prevailed. While I deplore the great waste of public funds, which amounted to roughly $3½ million for the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the 1st session of this 89th Congress, I have an ever greater interest in attempting to restore the accuracy and dignity which once prevailed in the preparation of this official publication of worldwide distribution.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the individual Members have an obligation to protect and defend the integrity of Congress, and certainly the least we can do is to insist that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be a true and accurate record of what actually happens in the Congress. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that 2 years ago I waged a one-man campaign, of short duration and highly unsuccessful, by resorting to the unpopular procedure of objecting to many unanimous-consent requests, in order to emphasize the point I am trying to make today. I was not successful then, and have little reason to believe that I will be any more successful today, but I hope that those who share my views that we should strive for accuracy, integrity, and economy, and who are opposed to fraud and deception, will understand that these remarks are intended to be constructive, and will lend their cooperation in restoring accuracy and sanity to the RECORD.

VIETNAM COSTS VERSUS DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson indicated in his state of the Union message that the war in Vietnam is no reason to hold the line on spending for domestic programs. He inferred that those of us who have a concern about increased spending at this time for domestic programs that can be deferred are calloused in our concern for human needs.

The Defense Department for years has indicated to Congress the continuing need for military family housing. Defense Department testimony before our Military Construction Appropriation Subcommittee indicates we have several thousand military families living in substandard housing, some in deplorable condition.

In spite of these facts the Defense Department deferred construction of the 8,500 military family houses approved by this Congress last year. Obviously this was done because of our increasing requirements for expenditures in South Vietnam.

The policy appears to be guns and whipping cream for the civilian economy but only guns with a little skimmed milk for our military families.

Why this obvious discrimination, Mr. President?

If pressing housing needs for military families can be deferred, is it unreasonable to expect similar restraint be required of the rest of our economy?

NEW YORK'S TRANSIT CRISIS: THE COSTLY POLITICS OF L.B.J.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, this morning's papers carry an estimate by the Commerce and Industry Association of New York City that the recent illegal transit strike in that metropolitan area cost $1 billion, and less than 25 percent of that will never be recovered. The majority of this cost fell upon those businesses who had to pay for work never performed since their employees could not get to work and those employees who lost wages during the 12-day period because they could not get to work, plus the hundreds of small retail establishments. In all cases, the greatest burden will have fallen on those least able to afford it: the low-income worker and the small businessman.

Nor does this take into account the future cost as a result of the strike settlement, a settlement that the New York Times has correctly called "a compromise accommodation made under duress" on the part of city officials. Someone is going to have to pay for the settlement, and it will either have to come out of the fare box, in which case it will be paid for by those who have suffered the most from the strike already, or through some kind of public subsidy. The latter, if it occurs, will probably be shared by the taxpayers of the city, State, and Nation.

It is an unfortunate fact that the President of the United States, after making no effort to prevent the damage, has broadened its impact by his after-the-fact lament condemning the final settlement. It will be recalled that at no time during the 12-day strike was there a word from the President, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, or the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Gardner Ackley, condemning the wage demands of the transit union as out of line with the administration's own wage-price guidelines as has so firmly been done with price increase proposals on the part of business. At no time did any Johnson administration figure speak out against the union defiance of the laws and the courts of the State of New York. Then, in what the New York Times has described as a "blatantly political" comment, the President took the city of New York to task without one word about the cause of it all.

It may be possible to assess the damage this strike caused to the people of New York and the surrounding metropolitan area, and to estimate the future costs of the settlement. The damage to the judicial and moral structure of the Nation's largest city and second largest State, and the injury to the image, prestige, and effectiveness of the Presidency as an unbiased umpire in the economic arena, however, are incalculable. I hesitate to even mention the possible impact on the national interest should the New York transit strike be used as an example and as a signal for similar crisis in other parts of the country.

I include at this point an editorial from the New York Times of January 15, 1966, an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of January 15, 1966, and an article from the New York Times of January 17, 1966. I would also like to call attention to the press release that follows these newspaper articles which contains the joint statement by Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, and myself, calling on the President to take a firm position on the demands and actions of the union, which is dated January 9, 1966, several days before the settlement.

The articles and release follow:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 15, 1966]

POLITICS, THE L.B.J. WAY

Through all the 12 days that New York was crippled by a transit strike called in defiance of law and court order President Johnson had not a word of condemnation for the union leaders responsible for the exercise in economic blackmail of a city. Now that the siege has been lifted with a costly settlement, Mr. Johnson suddenly finds his voice, and censures New York for paying too high a price for its freedom.

The President is quite right in stating that the peace terms breach his anti-inflation guidelines. As we observed in these columns yesterday, none of the adroit arguments advanced in support of the pact by Dr. Nathan P. Feinsinger, chairman of Mayor Lindsay's special mediation board, could make it fit inside even an elastic interpretation of the guidelines. It was a compromise accommodation made under duress; and only the mayor's resolve not to "capitulate before the lawless demands of a single power group" prevented outright surrender.

If Mr. Johnson had seriously wanted to act against an inflationary settlement, he had ample opportunity to do so. On any one of the 12 days he could have denounced the strike as a threat to the national interest—which the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Gardner Ackley, now acknowledges it was—and he could have supported Mr. Lindsay in the mayor's unheeded call for arbitration, factfinding, or a retroactive contract extension. But the President did not choose to do so.

Such help from Mr. Johnson would have been doubly meaningful in the light of attempts by some elements in the old-time Democratic-labor cabal in this city to exploit the strike as an instrument for humiliating the new Republican-fusion mayor, thus hoping to kill his future political career.

Now that Mr. Lindsay and the city have survived the strike, the President contributes his meed toward discrediting the settlement. The blatantly political character of his comment is underscored by the continued absence of any direct criticism of the Transport Workers Union for its coercion of the community. He declares himself "quite disturbed that essential services could be paralyzed for so long"; but there is not a hint of who is to blame. Not a word about flouting the law and the courts, not a syllable about the damage to the moral and judicial structure of this, the largest city in the United States.

The President's remarks provide a discouraging setting for the recommendations he has promised to send to Congress to protect the public interest against such strikes. Reports from Washington indicate that his state of the Union pledge of tighter strike curbs was toned down before delivery in response to objections voiced by George Meany. If even the promise must be diluted before it gets to Capitol Hill, what real hope is there in this administration for effective protection for the public against public-service strikes?

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan 15, 1966]

A BIT LATE, MR. PRESIDENT

New York's transit strike was barely ended when President Johnson pronounced his anathema: "Candor requires me to say that I am quite disturbed that essential services could be paralyzed for so long, and I am equally concerned by the cost of the settlement (which) violates our national guideposts for noninflationary wage increases. I do not believe that any settlement that violates the guideposts to this extent is in the national interest."

We agree. But that bit of Presidential candor would have come with better grace and more effect a few days earlier. Soldiers who shun the battle make poor critics of its loss.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 17, 1966]

Strike Loss Here Put at $1 Billion by Business Unit—Commerce Association Asks for a Raise in Fare To Pay for Transit Settlement—Mayor Backed on Pact—Johnson's Criticism Termed Unfair by Javits—Wirtz Assailed by Gilhooley

(By Emanuel Perlmutter)

The Commerce & Industry Association estimated yesterday that the 12-day transit strike cost New Yorkers $1 billion and that "less than 25 percent will be recovered."

The association asked that the 15-cent fare be increased to help pay for the strike settlement, which has been estimated as costing between $52 and $70 million. The group also said it would ask Governor Rockefeller today to sponsor three tougher measures to bar strikes by public employees.

Ralph C. Gross, executive vice president of the association, outlined the group's stand during the WCBS–TV "Newsmakers" program and in an interview afterward.

JAVITS DEFENDS PACT

Meanwhile, two Republicans came to the defense of Mayor Lindsay in his controversy with the Democratic national administration over the strike settlement.

The agreement has been defended by Mr. Lindsay. But President Johnson and Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz have criticized it for being in excess of the 3.2 percent wage-increase guideline that the Federal administration deemed necessary to prevent inflation.

Senator Jacob K. Javits, of New York, just back from a 6-day day trip to South Vietnam, said that the President's criticism "wasn't fair." He made this comment after an appearance on the WABC–TV "Page One" program.

John J. Gilhooley, the only Republican on the three-man transit authority, restricted his criticism to Secretary Wirtz.

"I must say, as far as I'm concerned, it was not the bravest act of Mr. Wirtz's career to shoot our young mayor in the back after he'd made the difficult decision to raise New York from it knees," Mr. Gilhooley said on the WNBC–TV "Searchlight" program.

In discussing the Commerce and Industry Association's legislative request, Mr. Gross said the group would ask for three measures to amend or replace the Condon-Wadlin law, which he said had proved ineffective in barring strikes by public employees.

"We will ask for laws penalizing the leaders of a public union who call a strike, penalties against them if they threaten one and escalating fines against the union treasury if a strike takes place," Mr. Gross said.

The Condon-Wadlin law imposes job penalties against striking employees, but none against their union or its leaders. The leaders and union may however, be punished for violating court orders based on the law.

On the question of the strike losses, Mr. Gross said the major costs were in wages paid to workers who could not come in to work, to employees who received no pay because they did not work and to the hundreds of small retail establishments that lost purchases that would not be made later.

He estimated that more than 185 million man-hours of employment had been lost.

Mr. Gross said after the television program that the association believed that a fare increase was necessary to pay for the new transit contract.

"I personally believe it should be 25 cents, and that an increase to 20 cents would only meet the transit deficit for about 2 years," he added.

Senator Javits, in defending the size of the strike settlement, said that Mayor Lindsay "did all he could, he handled himself well." The Republican legislator said the strike resulted from "the failure of laws in State and Nation to deal with a situation of this kind."

Governor Rockefeller has promised to ask the legislature to provide $100 million in aid to New York City quickly to help it pay for transit needs.

However, legislation will be needed to give the city permission to transfer funds to the autonomous transit authority. Mr. Gilhooley said yesterday that he was convinced that such legislation would be passed.

Widnall and Curtis Challenge Administration To Act in New York Transit Strike: Call for Congressional Involvement

Two senior Republican Members of Congress, Representatives William B. Widnall, of New Jersey, and Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri, challenged the Johnson administration to go on record in favor of a noninflationary wage settlement in the New York transit strike. They said the President's efforts to date would be of no help to the harrassed millions in the metropolitan area of New Jersey, Connecticut, and New York. Widnall, the ranking Republican on the House Banking and Currency Committee and cosponsor of the Mass Transportation Act of 1964, and Curtis, the senior House Republican on the Joint Economic Committee, who both represent urban areas, said that the outcome of this strike could break the Johnson administration's own wage-price guidelines, and would have repercussions in Greater St. Louis and other metropolitan areas throughout the country where transportation is a problem. They called for congressional observers at the collective bargaining table to speed settlement, to check on the usefulness of the wage-price guidelines, and to seek possible legislative solutions to future collective-bargaining problems.

The text of their statement follows:

"The announcement by President Johnson that, as a result of the New York transit strike, he has urged Federal agencies to help relieve the suffering involved is nothing but a consolation prize for the harassed millions of Americans in the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut metropolitan area. In the first place, the programs he suggests using, the poverty program's small business loans, the regular small business loan and disaster loan program, home mortgages, and depressed areas legislation have the end result of only postponing or increasing an individual's debts. In the case of the small business loan program, it is so short of funds, and in such a state of chaos itself, despite a year's effort on our part to correct this situation, that it is doubtful if it can be of any immediate significant assistance. More importantly, however, the President's announcement completely ignores the basic problem which is to end an illegal strike by a union which has been demanding an excessive wage increase of 15 percent which would make a mockery of the President's own 3.2-percent wage-price guidelines.

"The same Johnson administration that made front page headlines by denouncing attempts by business to raise prices is strangely and mysteriously silent when it comes to excessive demands by labor. Apparently the guidelines are important, depending upon who they are supposed to guide. National labor leaders, who are so fond of lecturing Congress on excessive business profits, on mass transportation needs, on the problems of the workingman and the poor have not been heard from either. Yet here is a strike that materially hurts millions of other workers, that breaks the wage-price guidelines, that punishes the public, that is particularly hard on the low-income citizen who more than anyone else depends upon public transportation, and that is illegal to boot. We would challenge these labor leaders to use their influence to assist in obtaining a prompt, noninflationary settlement and a return to a rule of law and not of men.

"U.S. Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz has indicated to the press that there are few legal tools the President can use to push a responsible settlement. We agree that Congress has provided little authority for the President to act to control wages and prices, but that didn't bother the administration any when it used stockpile metal to roll back aluminum prices and threatened the shifting of defense contracts to force the so-called steel price compromise. Secretary Wirtz is obviously trying to set up the public to buy the idea that President Johnson's personal action will have generated a strike settlement even though it involves a wage contract in excess of the administration's own guideposts. Such a settlement would aversely affect millions of Americans in the New York, New Jersey, Connecticut metropolitan area who rely on adequate and inexpensive public transportation. If this can happen in New York, it can happen in greater St. Louis or any metropolitan area in the Nation.

"We believe the President, Secretary Wirtz, and the Council of Economic Advisers, headed by Chairman Gardner Ackley, have a responsibility to go on record immediately in favor of holding the line on inflation in the greater New York transit dispute, acting with the same vigor previously reserved only for the Nation's business community. In addition, we suggest that bipartisan congressional observers from the appropriate committees be invited to the negotiation sessions to see the wage-price guidelines in action and to learn what may need to be done in the way of legislation to break such impasses in the collective bargaining process. The congressional group could include, for example, members from committees involved in labor and transportation matters, as well as from the Joint Economic Committee. The mere presence of Members of Congress, should hasten a responsible settlement, which is what harassed Greater New York metropolitan area residents want most of all.

ANNUAL REPORT ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

To the Congress of the United States:

The annual report on the foreign assistance program of the United States for fiscal year 1965, which I here transmit, shows what Americans have done during the past 12 months to help other people help themselves.

The record of these months offers new testimony to our continuing conviction that our own peace and prosperity here at home depend on continued progress toward a better life for people everywhere.

In pursuit of that goal, we have, during this past year, placed new emphasis on the basic problem of securing more food for the world's population.

We have agreed to extend technical assistance to countries asking for help on population programs. At the same time, our overseas missions have been directed to give priorities to projects for achieving better agriculture. Additional resources of our great universities have been applied to rural development efforts abroad, and we have moved to increase the nutritional value of food shipped overseas for children.

During these past 12 months we have also:

Begun to make education a more vital part of our assistance to other nations. Today, 70 American universities are engaged in the development of 39 Asian, African, and Latin American countries through this program.

Given our full support to development of a new life for the people of southeast Asia through a regional development program—a true and hopeful alternative to profitless aggression. We have made progress toward the establishment of an Asian Development Bank, and accelerated plans for development of the critical Mekong River Basin.

The 12 months covered by this report also reflect our progress toward making our aid programs both more realistic, and more efficient. For example:

Foreign assistance has become a smaller factor in our balance of payments. In fiscal year 1965, more than 80 cents of every AID dollar was spent for the purchase of American goods and services. American products and skills went overseas as aid; most of the dollars which paid for them stayed in this country.

Foreign aid has become a smaller burden on our resources. The $3.5 billion committed for military and economic assistance in fiscal year 1965 represented 3.5 percent of the Federal budget and one-half of 1 percent of the U.S. gross national product.

At the height of the Marshall plan, in comparison, foreign aid accounted for more than 11 percent of the Federal budget and nearly 2 percent of our gross national product.

Perhaps the most important single change in our AID programs has been the shift from simply helping other countries stay afloat to helping them become self-supporting, so that our assistance will no longer be needed.

Three-fourths of our AID program in fiscal year 1965 was devoted to development assistance: programs of technical and capital assistance in agriculture, industry, health and education that strengthen the ability of other nations to use their own resources.

Finally, private participation in AID programs is at an alltime high. Through contracts with American universities, business firms, labor unions, cooperatives, and other private groups, AID has sharply increased the involvement of nongovernmental resources in international development.

Two of every five AID-financed technicians in the field today are not Federal employees, but experts from private American institutions.

There is much in the less-developed world that causes us deep concern today: enmity between neighbor nations that threatens the hard-won gains of years of development effort; reluctance to move rapidly on needed internal reforms; political unrest that delays constructive programs to help the people; an uncertain race between food supplies and population.

We are right to be concerned for the present. But we are also right to be hopeful for the future. In this report are recorded some of the solid, human achievements on which our future hopes are based.

Whether it provides strength for threatened peoples like those in southeast Asia, or support for the self-help of millions on the move in Latin America, in Africa, in the Near East and South Asia, our foreign assistance program remains an investment of critical and promising importance to our own national future.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 17, 1966.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:

This is the first annual report on the operation of the International Coffee Agreement required by section 5 of the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–23).

The International Coffee Agreement represents an important element of our foreign economic policy, especially as that policy is directed towards the problems of the less developed countries. Our participation in the agreement should help make it possible to avoid the sharp rises and falls in coffee prices that have adversely affected U.S. consumers and growers of coffee in foreign countries alike. Stability of prices will help those countries heavily dependent on coffee exports to plan for and carry out their economic development and diversification programs. The steady economic progress of these countries is, in turn, an important stimulus to a healthier and more stable political climate in each.

I believe that during 1965 the dual aims of the agreement—adequate supplies of coffee to consumers and markets for coffee to producers at equitable prices—have been met. I am also confident that the Congress will view with satisfaction the spirit of international cooperation that has increasingly come to characterize the operation of this agreement. The passage of the International Coffee Agreement Act permitted its implementation for the year that began October 1, 1965. The results to date justify our confidence that the agreement will further advance the national interest of the United States.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1966.*

THE PRESIDENT'S 1966 ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 125, which passed the Senate on Friday last.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should merely like to make two observations. First, it does not seem to me that the proposed action is necessary. Second, laws are made to be obeyed and not to have exceptions constantly made. I do not know why this administration cannot conform to the law. I understand the argument advanced is that without the proposed action the economic report would precede the budget report.

This could occur without creating any great difficulty. Furthermore, the proposed delay puts the Joint Economic Committee in a position of having to delay its report to the Congress too.

Essentially, I wish that the administration would make a greater effort to abide by the laws we have written. If the laws are inadequate, let us change them. But let us not change these dates, put in after consideration and made a part of a law.

I know that the economic report is presently available. It could come out by January 20. But, as I say, I will not object, because I believe this a housekeeping matter. The administration should have this authority, if it wants it; but I should like to grant this reqest for delay with a little bit of rebuke.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield under his reservation?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I should like to ask my distinguished colleague from Missouri, a member of the Joint Economic Committee as well as the Ways and Means Committee, and whose opinion I hold most highly, two questions:

First. I should like to know if there is any particular reason why the resolution should not be read in full instead of just by a title, and why in fact there should not be colloquy and debate on the value of such a resolution, albeit already passed by the other body of this Congress.

Second. I should like to know whether, in the gentleman's opinion, which as I say I value; this would have any adverse effect on our economy—for example, the stock market—if we should reverse the order of reporting the budget and the economic report.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question, of course I am always in favor of colloquy and discussion. I believe that is good at any time an issue is up, no matter what the substance may be.

Let me restate what I understand to be the reason for the request.

The Congress did not convene until January 10. The budget message is required, I believe, 15 days after the convening of the Congress. The economic report has a day certain, January 20. So the fact that we convened about a week later does throw the budget message back a week, while it does not throw the economic report back a week, and so there is a basis for arguing we should throw the economic report back.

This is also going to throw back the report of the Economic Committee to the Congress on the President's economic report another week.

I, myself, do not believe that the need for the budget message to come first, ahead of the economic report, is of substance.

Answering the second question, I do not believe that this would have any impact on the stock market, in respect to timing of these messages.

I believe the regrettable thing is that the budget has been delayed. I have seen no reason for that. The longer it is delayed, even though just a day, the longer there is an element of uncertainty as to what the President will actually propose in the budget, and this does have unsettling economic consequences.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like very much to ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to explain further the need for immediate consideration of this joint House-Senate resolution and, second, I should like to have his estimate of the effect it might have on the economy of the country, or the stock market specifically, if we simply take time to debate the resolution.

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to try to reply to the gentleman from Missouri.

I do not believe it would affect the stock market, or securities of any kind. This is not what I would call an earthshaking deal at all. It is very minor. I do not believe it will cause any disturbance of any kind in the market. There is no reason why it should.

This started back when we passed a resolution, during the first session, authorizing the Congress to meet at a later date. Under the Constitution we were required to meet on January 3, but we passed a resolution, which we had a right to do, making the commencement date of the second session January 10. That made it 1 week later.

That, of course, put this report in a squeeze. The difference of a week makes a lot of difference when there are only a few days involved. Therefore, this resolution is to take care of meeting 1 week later and to give the President that much longer, as contemplated in the original act.

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, does the distinguished chairman mean to say that the committee is not ready to make the report?

Mr. **PATMAN**. Of course we are ready to start working on it. Under the law the President, as the gentleman realizes, must first make the report to the Congress.

Mr. **HALL**. But one of the other speakers in the colloquy here today said that he had knowledge that the report was ready to be made by the President and the executive branch.

Mr. **PATMAN**. That is not my understanding, sir. I was told it would not be ready until——

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it is of little consequence, I object.

Mr. **PATMAN**. Will the gentleman reserve that until I can make another statement?

Mr. **HALL**. Yes. I will accommodate the gentleman and will withdraw my objection temporarily.

Mr. **PATMAN**. The Joint Economic Committee, feeling sure that there would be no objection to this 1 week's delay caused by the Congress meeting 1 week later, went ahead and arranged a program with the concurrence of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], and also the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If this is not passed, we will have to rearrange the program entirely. I hope under those circumstances that the gentleman will not object to it, because I personally can see no reason why it should not be granted. Of course, though, if there is a good reason, naturally, we should debate it.

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, I wish only to make one comment, and then I will be glad to yield further. If it is of consequence, then no one appreciates the further delay in the reconvening of the second session more than I do, but I see no reason why we cannot keep to the stipulated dates when the report is ready and it is of no earthshaking consequence to the Nation or our economic sinews. Some program that has been arranged out of context certainly does not obviate the need for colloquy and debate on the floor before we change these matters, just as indeed we did have debate on the floor of the House with respect to the reconvening date of the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **HALL**. I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. **CURTIS**. I would simply like to observe that the gentleman from Texas is correct in describing the manner in which we have worked out the hearings to be conducted by the Joint Economic Committee on the President's Economic Report. However, I would further observe that the time of the filing of the report has no bearing on that schedule. If anything, if we were to adhere to the law and have the report on January 20, it would facilitate those hearings. This week's delay actually complicates the schedule that we have. So I think the gentleman from Texas did not answer to the essence of the question raised. I would emphasize again, however, that to a large degree this is a housekeeping item, I believe. I must say, though, it appears to me the real reason behind this delay is that the President, for his own reasons of public relations, and affording the information to the people of this country, for his own personal reasons just wants to have his budget message before the Economic Report. Frankly, that is not a very compelling reason to me to simply subvert a law which makes perfectly good sense. I will reiterate that I think these reports are printed. The way we have done it in the past, with witnesses who have to appear before us, we get the reports 3 or 4 days sometimes ahead of the press. They will have a hold order on them. They are complicated documents for the purposes of printing, because they have all sorts of economic tables and charts in them. Of course, they have to be printed ahead of time. I am satisfied that the documents are actually there. In fact, I think the budget is compiled and printed. I regret that the Congress is not acting in a more independent manner and insisting that these laws are upheld that are written to spell out the relationship of the executive to the legislative branch of the Government. These laws are not being observed and the President is continually asking the Congress to accede to his accommodation with no basic reasons that I can see behind it.

Mr. **HALL**. I thank the gentleman for his further comments, and I will ask him two additional questions. First, if the committee is ready to have the hearings, would it not be better to have the President's economic report at the earliest possible moment?

Mr. **CURTIS**. Yes. That is what I said and what I observed with respect to the gentleman from Texas' comments. We had worked out a schedule, with very fine cooperation, as usual, with the gentleman from Texas. However, actually, far from being a reason for delaying it a week, it is all the more reason, as the gentleman from Missouri mentioned, to adhere to the January 20 date. I want to emphasize that I was not myself objecting, and I would urge the gentleman from Missouri, inasmuch as we have had this colloquy, not to object. With this record made here, we have brought out the points that need to be brought out. It has been healthy to do this, but it is largely a housekeeping item.

Mr. **HALL**. I wish to ask the gentleman one other question. Does the gentleman have any information as to when the request for the so-called South Vietnam accelerated or escalated war funds will be here as a supplementary or deficiency budget in addition to the regular budget, as the President said it would in his state of the Union message?

Mr. **CURTIS**. No, I do not, but I want to say it is certainly a crucial point and something we in the Joint Economic Committee are going to have to consider and will have to have knowledge of. I hope, as the gentleman mentioned, that we are not going to go ahead and start holding hearings on the economic report and the budget only to find this crucial area of additional expenditure policy is not public information and therefore not subject to inquiry by the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. HALL. It is even the understanding of this gentleman from Missouri that

there is a certain movement going on between the joint bodies of the Committees on Appropriations to obviate and expedite this supplementary or deficiency appropriation, and I certainly suggest that it should not be considered out of context with the overall spending of the obligatory parts of the President's report, or the report of the President's Committee on Joint Economics of the two bodies.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I might say in further reply to the gentleman from Missouri that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has just issued a statement with reference to hearings on the President's request for tax increases next week. We expect to hear further from the Secretary of the Treasury and other administration witnesses as to the impact of the budget on our needs for revenues, and we are going to have to have that additional budget material before the Committee on Ways and Means. Mr. Speaker, indeed we must have it if we are going to make any intelligent decision on how much we should be paying these bills through increased taxes and how much we are going to have to pay for through floating additional Government bonds, which has a serious impact upon the monetary market, and which also has other serious economic consequences.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri, and I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. I am not clear as to when the President's Economic Report will be made available to Congress, if this resolution is adopted.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Iowa I want to say that Senator Joint Resolution 125, which has just been messaged over and is now pending before the House of Representatives under a unanimous consent request, and of which I have taken observation, says in the final sentence that the President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 27, 1966, the 1966 Economic Report.

This would allow the budget to be transmitted during the requisite 15 days after the opening of Congress, on the 25th of January, and the President's 1966 Economic Report to follow it by 2 days. Apparently, for public relations they want this secret.

Mr. GROSS. And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Missouri will yield further, the only excuse for the failure to meet the January 20 deadline is that the President wants to submit his Economic Report to the Nation after the budget is submitted? Is that the answer?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa it seems that that certainly is the only evidence that has been brought forth on the floor in this colloquy. It has been stated that, first, it is of little consequence; it is not earth shaking, it will not upset the general market or the economic sinews of the Government; and, second, it has been said that there is no need for speed and that the colloquy is worth while.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall], will yield further, it is necessary that arrangements be made for the appearance of these witnesses who are necessary to testify before the Joint Economic Committee, of course, and the traditional first witness is the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers of the President. Then, after we hear from the Council, we then hear from the Secretary of the Treasury and we then hear from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Those three witnesses are very busy on the Hill.

I believe the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] brought out the fact that his committee expects to hear one or more of these witnesses some time soon in an effort to work out these arrangements and dates which will be mutually satisfactory. We have already agreed upon the time. This would not upset that timing. We could not have had it before, I do not believe, anyway, unless the other committees would yield. Naturally, we would not expect them to yield under those circumstances.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will take this into consideration.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman, and I assure the chairman on Banking and Currency that I shall take that into consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I had not finished, but if the gentleman from Missouri will yield to me after he yields to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], I shall appreciate it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, there is another point, now that this colloquy has developed, which I believe should be mentioned. In fact, I had planned to make a speech on the floor of the House with respect thereto. I was very disturbed last December when the Joint Economic Committee conducted public hearings on the interest rate rise by the Federal Reserve Board.

We called before us the Federal Reserve Board and I had thought there was a clear understanding that the Government witnesses, particularly the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers of the President and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who have been criticizing this action of the Federal Reserve in public statements, would be called as witnesses. They were not called as witnesses. We finally put the matter to a vote and by a very narrow and, I regret to say, completely party vote, they were not formally invited to appear.

We have gone—and by "we" I mean this country and the Congress—have gone on now for over a month without having the opportunity of hearing from these three important Federal officials, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Budget, and the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, with reference to this important economic factor. And this delay that we are experiencing here in receiving the President's Economic Report keeps us that much further from getting into and examining these matters. I am talking about the Congress now and the responsibility of the Congress of getting into and examining these economic factors that mean so much to our country and to our economy. This is not a dictatorship and I think it is time that the executive branch of the Government begin bringing these matters forthrightly before the Congress so that the appropriate committees of the Congress can get into these matters in a timely manner and not be confronted with so many of these faits accompli.

The sooner the Joint Economic Committee gets into this area, the better off we will be.

I want to say, as I understand the request for a 7-day delay here, it is not going to delay the Joint Economic Committee hearings because they are set. Actually, I think it would be better if there were no delay because it would enable our witnesses to have that much more chance to review the President's Economic Report. I again would urge my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, in the light of this colloquy which I think has been very good and healthy, to take into consideration the fact that this is essentially a housekeeping matter and I hope that the gentleman would not object.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I must state that I did not intend, and state with all of the comity and equity and justice that I can summon from southwest Missouri, to interrupt the gentleman from the Southwest United States. I can only plead that there was a long Texas pause between the time that he completed his last sentence before he was about to start the next sentence, when I yielded to the other gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I would want the gentleman to consider this point which has not been mentioned—the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], mentioned it—that we are not through with the administration witnesses, that is, the three named by me a few minutes ago, when they testify on the Economic Report of the President for 1966. We are obligated to continue the investigation that was commenced in the early part of December with reference to the increase in interest rates, that is, the rediscount rate; and on the 30 to 90 day bills; and on the longer term cash deposits, which is an increase of 12½ percent in one case; 22.2 percent in another case, and 37.5 percent in another case.

We are going to go into that.

As the gentleman suggested the minority wanted to hear the administration witnesses. Of course the majority Members took the position that it was close to Christmas and that people wanted to go home. We did not want to stay there and conduct the investigation at that time and they preferred to have those witnesses appear in January and interrogate them on these questions at that time.

Of course, that contemplates that after we got through with them, we probably would have to have the Federal Reserve Board back again. We are going to have more work this year than we have had before but we cannot start it earlier, I will state to the gentleman, and since this is only a matter of 7 days and inasmuch as it is only a matter of a later meeting of the Congress to put the situation in the same comparable position with reference to the time of submitting the Economic Report, I hope the gentleman will not object to this because it would cause us considerable trouble in trying to rearrange our hearings and our witnesses—if it is possible—and I do not think it is possible. And if it is not, of course it could not happen any earlier anyway. I hope under the circumstances the gentleman will not object.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the chairman's statement that the majority of his committee voted not to hear the administration witnesses, but wanted to have Christmas at home with Santa Claus instead plus the fact that time has overtaken events and proved the Fed's prompt action saved the administration embarrassment; and in view of the statements made here by my colleague from Missouri urging that we have these hearings as early as possible yet not to make a mountain out of a molehill although apparently opposite points of view; and in view of this established record and colloquy, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 125

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the Act of February 20, 1946, as amended (15 U.S.C. 1022), the President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 27, 1966, the 1966 Economic Report.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESIDENT'S REFERENCE TO FARM INCOME MISLEADING

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson omitted a vital word and at the same time leaned on a thin statistical stalk in his state of the Union reference to farm income. As a consequence, he conveyed a highly misleading impression. In his message he said "and average farm income is higher than ever—up 40 percent over the past 5 years and last year up 22 percent."

The figures he used were based on net income per farm, not total net farm income. With the important word "per" omitted, the statement was ambiguous, and the President was relieved of the necessity of taking note of the 16-percent drop in farm numbers which has occurred since 1960. In 1960 the number of farms was 3,956,000 and the 1966 figure is 3,286,000.

Even if the word "per" had been included, the statement would still have been misleading. It could be supported only by using obscure statistics which reflect abnormal differences in farm inventories. In speaking of farm income, administration officials usually do not include inventory changes. By including them, President Johnson came up with figures which make farmers look more prosperous than they really are. The sharp rise in livestock values during the past year, and a short corn corp in 1964 combined to make President Johnson's point of reference—1965—badly distorted in regard to inventories. In fairness, inventories should have been ignored or adjusted.

The President did not explain that the income figures he used included direct Government payments to farmers. These have climbed steadily from a grand total of $693 million 5 years ago to $3.4 billion officially estimated for 1966.

If Government payments are excluded, official estimates of total farm income in 1966 are almost precisely the same as income 5 years ago. Meanwhile, the purchasing power of the dollar has gone down. When adjustments are made for cost-of-living increases, it is obvious that farm income in constant dollars derived from the marketplace has gone down, not up.

The President did not mention that Agriculture Secretary Freeman has forecast a drop in total farm income after 1966. On November 17 he estimated it will average only $13.5 billion until 1970—down from the present $14 billion level. And here the Secretary was including Government payments.

So the official outlook is for lower income, not higher income, in the future.

Had the President cited the usual yardsticks of farm prosperity, the report would have been far different.

Realized net farm income, the usual point of reference, was up only 8 percent in 1965 over the year before, and USDA freely acknowledges this increase was due largely to the rise in livestock prices. It is noteworthy that livestock commodities are free of Government controls and price supports, and it would therefore be inappropriate for the Administration to claim credit for the modest increase in net farm income that did occur during the past year.

Perhaps the best indicator of farm prosperity is parity ratio—which relates prices received by farmers to prices they pay. Parity ratio, as reported by USDA, in 1964 averaged 74, lowest since the depression thirties. Better livestock prices brought it up to a modest 77 last year. In 1960 it was 81.

L.B.J.'S OWN PARTY SHOWS NEED FOR CAMPAIGN MONEY REFORM

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, rising public concern over the way the Democratic National Committee and its cousins—the $1,000-a-clip President's Club and the Johnson-Humphrey Committee—handle finances may account for President Johnson's unexpected proposals to deal legislatively with political financing.

In politics, as in football, a good offense is generally considered to be the best defense. Therefore, the President's proposals to clean up campaign financing may be an attempt to put himself on the side of the angels in dealing with a situation in which Democratic Party finances seem to be highly questionable.

Some especially strange events were noted in an article in the Washington Sunday Star, January 16, written by Staff Writer Walter Pincus.

Certainly, the way in which money is raised and spent by the President's own party gives sufficient cause for tightening up laws and law enforcement. In his state of the Union message, the President proposed "strong teeth and severe penalties to the requirement of full disclosure of contributions" and also asked for legislation to "prohibit the endless proliferation of committees" which handle campaign money.

Excellent suggestions. When hearings begin the witnesses should include Richard McGuire—until recently treasurer of the Democratic National Committee—the treasurer of the President's Club, the treasurer of the Johnson-Humphrey Committee and the other officials and individuals alluded to in Mr. Pincus' article, which is reprinted below:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Jan. 16, 1966]

DEMOCRATS' CAMPAIGN FUND REPORTS PUZZLING

(By Walter Pincus)

The Democrats are using previously unreported funds—some of which came in as loans, some as cash donations—to pay off bills from the 1964 presidential campaign.

As a result, Democratic committee reports filed pursuant to Federal law with the Clerk of the House show inconsistent entries.

Paradoxically, such entries in reports from President Johnson's own party highlight the need the "strong teeth and severe penalties to the requirement of full disclosure of contributions" that the Chief Executive mentioned Wednesday during his state of the Union message in declaring his decision to seek campaign fund legislation reform.

The President's Club—the fund-raising organization supported by Democratic donors of $1,000 or more—reported 1965 receipts totaling $378,244. The club ended 1964, its first reporting year, with a surplus of some $3,000, giving it $381,000 in reported 1965 receipts.

However, the club's 1965 yearend filing itemized disbursements adding up to $939,238.75 for the entire 12 months, with almost

$870,000 of that amount being spent between September 1 and September 15 last year.

Democratic officials were unable last week to explain how the President's Club report could show payments exceeding receipts by $560,000.

However, a former party aid disclosed that large amounts of cash which the club received during the 1964 Johnson-Humphrey campaign were not reported officially as being received.

During the 1964 campaign, Democratic workers in Washington were given per diem payments of $20 a day before taking trips outside the city. In almost every case, such advance funds were paid in cash. Even White House staff members were reimbursed in cash by the Democratic National Committee for campaign travel with the President last year.

Most of the excess President's Club payments went to printers, ad agencies, and Washington hotels to satisfy bills run up during the campaign year.

SECOND SUCH REPORT

The President's Club filing marks the second time a Democratic group reported spending far in excess of the funds it said it had collected. In its second-quarter filing in 1965, the Democratic National Committee reported it paid out over $900,000 more than it previously had reported receiving. Though officials at the time said this represented a "deficit," the amounts involved were payments made rather than bills still remaining to be satisfied.

Several other types of discrepancies marked the most recent Democratic filings.

Another fund-raising group—the Johnson-Humphrey committee—closed out its activities last November 17, according to its filing with the House Clerk. On that day it reported transferring $8,000 to the Democratic National Committee.

That committee's report, however, fails to record receipt of the $8,000 in November or December, although both committees were operated out of the office of Democratic National Committee Treasurer Richard Maguire. Maguire recently resigned his post to enter private law practice.

In a similar transaction, the Democratic National Committee reported it transferred $6,524.69 on December 1 to the President's Club.

The President's Club, in turn, reported on December 1, it received exactly $500 less—$6,024.29—from "Salute to L.B.J." housed at the Democratic National Committee.

What happened to the $500 and where "Salute to L.B.J." fits into the fund-raising picture remain unanswered.

Such transactions, however, are seen as illustrating the need for another of the President's campaign reform proposals—action "to prohibit the endless proliferation of committees" which obscure the handling of campaign funds.

Another inconsistency within the recent Democratic report involves the date of alleged payments. The President's Club report listed a September 14 payment of $12,480 to Volpe Construction Co., Washington, D.C., which built the stage and platform at the Democrats' January 1965 inaugural gala in the D.C. Armory. But a Volpe official said last week the check was received in June rather than September.

Similarly, Turnpike Press of Annandale, Va., which produced a series of campaign flyers for the Democrats, received a $5,807.04 check in July rather than September, as the Democrats reported.

By postponing the reporting date of payments, the Democrats can attempt to keep their publicly filed figures of receipts and expenditures balanced and thus give the impression of solvency at all times.

Another entry which has puzzled inquirers lists a payment late in November of $2,407 as "reimbursement of expenses" to a former employee of the White House travel section.

This now-retired, longtime civil service employee said last week he could not recall ever having received any funds or checks from the Democratic National Committee. He said, however, the committee called him last fall and asked him his home address, which was part of the report filed.

There has been no official explanation as to why, almost a year after the campaign, the Democrats decided to pay off several of their largest outstanding debts and report those payments as part of the President's Club filing. Recent stories have referred to an alleged $1.7 million party deficit.

The recent filings would indicate the party still has unrecorded financial resources available to meet its financial needs.

One Democratic aid last week suggested President Johnson, faced with the need to replace retiring treasurer, Maguire, had taken new interest in the party's finances. It also was speculated that criticism of the Democrats' $15,000 a page ad book to raise funds for this year's congressional elections had stirred Johnson to action.

SECRET CORRESPONDENCE WITH TURKEY RAISES DISTURBING QUESTIONS

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, secret correspondence released last Saturday by the White House at the request of the Government of Turkey gives notice of a major new limitation in U.S. commitment to the North Atlantic Treaty, and therefore raises disturbing questions about the credibility of pledges to our allies.

In a letter sent June 5, 1964 to Prime Minister Inonu, President Johnson in effect sharply qualified our solemn pledge to defend Turkey against Soviet attack. This forced Turkey to drop plans for military intervention in Cyprus.

The merits of the Turkish problem in Cyprus are completely beside the point. The basic question is one of treaty obligation. In the North Atlantic Treaty the United States was committed without qualification to defend Turkey from aggression.

Here is the pertinent language:

> Article 5. The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all, and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in connection with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

The language, you will note, pledges action automatically to assist any member nation that is attacked.

The key sentence in Mr. Johnson's letter was:

> I hope you will understand that your NATO allies have not had a chance to consider whether they have an obligation to protect Turkey against the Soviet Union if Turkey takes a step which results in Soviet intervention without the full consent and understanding of its NATO Allies.

In other words, U.S. action to defend Turkey against Soviet attack would be conditional—not automatic. The United States would first decide whether the attack was provoked, and then make up its mind on defending Turkey.

So far as I can determine, this is the first time any member of the NATO alliance has questioned the automatic character of the mutual defense pact.

The automatic character of allied response was absolutely clear in the treaty, so the NATO Council would have no reason to consider whether they have an obligation to protect Turkey against the Soviet Union. So far as I can learn, the NATO Council did not at any time authorize President Johnson to be the alliance spokesman in regard to Turkey's action in Cyprus.

In his reply, Mr. Inonu hit the issue squarely when he wrote:

> Our understanding is that the North Atlantic Treaty imposes upon all member states the obligation to come forthwith to the assistance of any member victim of aggression. The only point left to the discretion of the member states is the nature and the scale of this assistance.
>
> If NATO members should start discussing the right and wrong of the situation of their fellow-member victim of a Soviet aggression—the very foundations of the alliance would be shaken.

Since the affair, Mr. Inonu has been replaced in office, United States-Turkish relations have been chilly and Turkey has been quietly trying to improve its relations with the Soviet Union.

This major treaty qualification in regard to Turkey—previously unannounced—may raise questions about the credibility of our commitments to other allies. No doubt Soviet leaders will read with intense interest the texts of these letters.

If, in a tight and tense minor crisis, the most powerful member of the alliance will qualify its obligation to one of the less powerful and most vulnerable, what may be expected if a major crisis arises?

How would we feel if the situation were reversed, and our plan to protect U.S. interests—in the Dominican Republic for example—were checkmated by a more powerful ally?

WHITE HOUSE STATEMENT

At the request of the Government of Turkey, the White House is today releasing the texts of letters exchanged on June 5, 1964, between President Johnson and the then Prime Minister of Turkey, Ismet Inonu, on the Cyprus crisis. Steps subsequent to this exchange of letters led to the visit of Prime Minister Inonu to Washington later in that month and constructive discussions by the President and the Prime Minister of the issues involved.

A joint communique released at the conclusion of those discussions welcomed the opportunity for a full exchange of views by the two leaders and the occasion to consider ways in which the two countries could strengthen the efforts of the United Nations with respect to the safety and security of Cyprus. The communique noted that "the cordial and candid conversations of the two leaders strengthened the broad understanding already existing between Turkey and the United States."

The United States continues to value highly the close and friendly relations we maintain with Turkey.

President Johnson's Letter to Prime Minister Inonu

June 5, 1964.

Dear Mr. Prime Minister: I am gravely concerned by the information which I have had through Ambassador Hare from you and your Foreign Minister that the Turkish Government is contemplating a decision to intervene by military force to occupy a portion of Cyprus. I wish to emphasize, in the fullest friendship and frankness, that I do not consider that such a course of action by Turkey, fraught with such far-reaching consequences, is consistent with the commitment of your Government to consult fully in advance with us. Ambassador Hare has indicated that you have postponed your decision for a few hours in order to obtain my views. I put to you personally whether you really believe that it is appropriate for your Government, in effect, to present a unilateral decision of such consequence to an ally who has demonstrated such stanch support over the years as has the United States for Turkey. I must, therefore, first urge you to accept the responsibility for complete consultation with the United States before any such action is taken.

It is my impression that you believe that such intervention by Turkey is permissible under the provisions of the treaty of guarantee of 1960. I must call your attention, however, to our understanding that the proposed intervention by Turkey would be for the purpose of effecting a form of partition of the island, a solution which is specifically excluded by the treaty of guarantee. Further, that treaty requires consultation among the guarantor powers. It is the view of the United States that the possibilities of such consultation have by no means been exhausted in this situation and that, therefore, the reservation of the right to take unilateral action is not yet applicable.

I must call to your attention, also, Mr. Prime Minister, the obligations of NATO. There can be no question in your mind that a Turkish intervention in Cyprus would lead to a military engagement between Turkish and Greek forces. Secretary of State Rusk declared at the recent meeting of the Ministerial Council of NATO in The Hague that war between Turkey and Greece must be considered as literally unthinkable. Adhesion to NATO, in its very essence, means that NATO countries will not wage war on each other. Germany and France have buried centuries of animosity and hostility in becoming NATO allies; nothing less can be expected from Greece and Turkey. Furthermore, a military intervention in Cyprus by Turkey could lead to a direct involvement by the Soviet Union. I hope you will understand that your NATO allies have not had a chance to consider whether they have an obligation to protect Turkey against the Soviet Union if Turkey takes a step which results in Soviet intervention without the full consent and understanding of its NATO allies.

Further, Mr. Prime Minister, I am concerned about the obligations of Turkey as a member of the United Nations. The United Nations has provided forces on the island to keep the peace. Their task has been difficult but, during the past several weeks, they have been progressively successful in reducing the incidents of violence on that island. The United Nations mediator has not yet completed his work. I have no doubt that the general membership of the United Nations would react in the strongest terms to unilateral action by Turkey which would defy the efforts of the United Nations and destroy any prospect that the United Nations could assist in obtaining a reasonable and peaceful settlement of this difficult problem.

I wish also, Mr. Prime Minister, to call your attention to the bilateral agreement between the United States and Turkey in the field of military assistance. Under article IV of the agreement with Turkey of July 1947, your Government is required to obtain U.S. consent for the use of military assistance for purposes other than those for which such assistance was furnished. Your Government has on several occasions acknowledged to the United States that you fully understand this condition. I must tell you in all candor that the United States cannot agree to the use of any United States supplied military equipment for a Turkish intervention in Cyprus under present circumstances.

Moving to the practical results of the contemplated Turkish move, I feel obligated to call to your attention in the most friendly fashion the fact that such a Turkish move could lead to the slaughter of tens of thousands of Turkish Cypriots on the Island of Cyprus. Such an action on your part would unleash the furies and there is no way by which military action on your part could be sufficiently effective to prevent wholesale destruction of many of those whom you are trying to protect. The presence of United Nation forces could not prevent such a catastrophe.

You may consider that what I have said is much too severe and that we are disregardful of Turkish interests in the Cyprus situation. I should like to assure you that this is not the case. We have exerted ourselves both publicly and privately to assure the safety of Turkish Cypriots and to insist that a final solution of the Cyprus problem should rest upon the consent of the parties most directly concerned. It is possible that you feel in Ankara that the United States has not been sufficiently active in your behalf. But surely you know that our policy has caused the liveliest resentments in Athens (where demonstrations have been aimed against us) and has led to a basic alienation between the United States and Archbishop Makarios. As I said to your Foreign Minister in our conversation just a few weeks ago, we value very highly our relations with Turkey. We have considered you as a great ally with fundamental common interests. Your security and prosperity have been a deep concern of the American people and we have expressed that concern in the most practical terms. You and we have fought together to resist the ambitions of the Communist world revolution. This solidarity has meant a great deal to us and I would hope that it means a great deal to your Government and to your people. We have no intention of lending any support to any solution of Cyprus which endangers the Turkish Cypriot community. We have not been able to find a final solution because this is, admittedly, one of the most complex problems on earth. But I wish to assure you that we have been deeply concerned about the interests of Turkey and of the Turkish Cypriots and will remain so.

Finally, Mr. Prime Minister I must tell you that you have posed the gravest issues of war and peace. These are issues which go far beyond the bilateral relations between Turkey and the United States. They not only will certainly involve war between Turkey and Greece but could involve wider hostilities because of the unpredictable consequences which a unilateral intervention in Cyprus could produce. You have your reponsibilities as Chief of the Government of Turkey; I also have mine as President of the United States. I must, therefore, inform you in the deepest friendship that unless I can have your assurance that you will not take such action without further and fullest consultation I cannot accept your injunction to Ambassador Hare of secrecy and must immediately ask for emergency meetings of the NATO Council and of the United Nations Security Council.

I wish it were possible for us to have a personal discussion of this situation. Unfortunately, because of the special circumstances of our present constitutional position, I am not able to leave the United States. If you could come here for a full discussion I would welcome it. I do feel that you and I carry a very heavy responsibility for the general peace and for the possibilities of a sane and peaceful resolution of the Cyprus problem. I ask you, therefore, to delay any decisions which you and your colleagues might have in mind until you and I have had the fullest and frankest consultation.

Sincerely,

Lyndon B. Johnson.

Prime Minister Inonu's Response to the President

June 13, 1964.

His Excellency The President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I have received your message of June 5, 1964, through Ambassador Hare. We have, upon your request, postponed our decision to exercise our right of unilateral action in Cyprus conferred to us by the treaty of guarantee. With due regard to the spirit of candor and friendship in which your message is meant to be written, I will, in my reply, try also to explain to you in full frankness my views about the situation.

Mr. President, your message, both in wording and content, has been disappointing for an ally like Turkey who has always been giving the most serious attention to its relations of alliance with the United States and has brought to the fore substantial divergences of opinion in various fundamental matters pertaining to these relations.

It is my sincere hope that both these divergences and the general tone of your message are due to the haste in which a representation made in good-will was, under pressure of time, based on data hurriedly collected.

In the first place, it is being emphasized in your message that we have failed to consult with the United States when a military intervention in Cyprus was deemed indispensable by virtue of the treaty of guarantee. The necessity of a military intervention in Cyprus has been felt four times since the closing days of 1963. From the outset we have taken a special care to consult the United States on this matter. Soon after the outbreak of the crisis, on December 25, 1963 we have immediately informed the United States of our contacts with the other guaranteeing powers only to be answered that the United States was not a party to this issue. We then negotiated with the United Kingdom and Greece for intervention and, as you know, a tripartite military administration under British command was set up on December 26, 1963. Upon the failure of the London conference and of the joint Anglo-American proposals, due to the attitude of Makarios and in the face of continuing assaults in the island against the Turkish Cypriots, we lived through very critical days in February and taking advantage of the visit of Mr. George Ball to Ankara, we informed again the United States of the gravity of the situation. We tried to explain to you that the necessity of intervention to restore order in the island might arise in view of the vacuum caused by the rejection of the Anglo-American proposals and we informed you that we might have to intervene at any time. We even requested guarantees from you on specific issues and your answers were in the affirmative. However, you asked us not to intervene and assured us that Makarios would get at the United Nations a severe lesson while all the Turkish rights and interests would be preserved.

We complied with your request without any satisfactory result being secured at the United Nations. Moreover the creation of the United Nations force, decided upon by the Security Council, became a problem. The necessity for intervention was felt for the third time to protect the Turkish community against the assaults of the terrorists in Cyprus who were encouraged by the doubts as to whether the United Nations forces would be set up immediately after the adoption of the Security Council resolution of March 4, 1964. But assuring us that the force would be set up very shortly, you insisted again that we refrain from intervening. Thereupon we postponed our intervention once again, awaiting the United Nations forces to assume their duty.

Dear Mr. President, the era of terror in Cyprus has a particular character which rendered ineffective all measures taken so far. From the very outset, the negotiations held to restore security and the temporary setups have all helped only to increase the aggressiveness and the destructiveness of the Makarios administration. The Greek Cypriots have lately started to arm themselves overtly and considered the United Nations as an additional instrument to back up their ruthless and unconstitutional rule. It has become quite obvious that the United Nations have neither the authority nor the intent to intervene for the restoration of constitutional order and to put an end to aggression. You are well aware of the instigative attitude of the Greek Government toward the Greek Cypriots. During the talks held in your office, in the United States, we informed you that under the circumstances we would eventually be compelled to intervene in order to put an end to the atrocities in Cyprus. We also asked your Secretary of State at The Hague whether the United States would support us in such an eventuality and we received no answer. I think, I have thus reminded you how many times and under what circumstances we informed you of the necessity for intervention in Cyprus. I do remember having emphasized to your high level officials our due appreciation of the special responsibilities incumbent upon the United States within the alliance and of the necessity to be particularly careful and helpful to enable her to maintain solidarity within the alliance. As you see, we never had the intention to confront you with a unilateral decision on our part. Our grievance stems from our inability to explain to you a problem which caused us for months utmost distress and from your refusal to take a frank and firm stand on the issue as to which party is on the right side in the dispute between two allies; namely, Turkey and Greece.

Mr. President, in your message you further emphasize the obligation of Turkey, under the provisions of the treaty, to consult with the other two guaranteeing powers, before taking any unilateral action. Turkey is fully aware of this obligation. For the past 6 months we have indeed complied with the requirements of this obligation. But Greece has, not only thwarted all the attempts made by Turkey to seek jointly the ways and means to stop Greek Cypriots from repudiating international treaties, but has also supported their unlawful and inhuman acts and has even encouraged them.

The Greek Government itself has not hesitated to declare publicly that the international agreements it signed with us were no longer in force. Various examples to that effect were, in due course, communicated in detail, orally and in writing, to your State Department.

We have likewise fulfilled our obligation of constant consultation with the Government of the United Kingdom, the other guaranteeing power.

In several instances we have jointly with the Government of the United Kingdom, made representations to the Greek Cypriots with a view to restoring constitutional order. But unfortunately, these representations were of no avail due to the negative attitude of the Greek Cypriot authorities.

As you see, Turkey has earnestly explored every avenue of consulting continuously and acting jointly with the other two guaranteeing powers. This being the fact, it cannot be asserted that Turkey has failed to abide by her obligation of consulting with the other two guaranteeing powers before taking unilateral action.

I put it to you, Mr. President, whether the U.S. Government which has felt the need to draw the attention of Turkey to her obligation of consultation, yet earnestly and faithfully fulfilled by the latter, should not have reminded Greece, who repudiates treaties signed by herself, of the necessity to abide by the precept "pacta sunt servanda" which is the fundamental rule of international law. This precept which, only a fortnight ago, was most eloquently characterized as the basis of survival by your Secretary of State himself in his speech at the American Law Institute, is now being completely and contemptuously ignored by Greece, our NATO ally and by Greek Cypriots.

Dear Mr. President, as implied in your message, by virtue of the provisions of article 4 of the treaty of guarantee, the three guaranteeing powers have, in the event of a breach of the provisions of that treaty, the right to take concerted action and, if that proves impossible, unilateral action with the sole aim of reestablishing the state of affairs created by the said treaty. The treaty of guarantee was signed with this understanding being shared by all parties thereto. The "gentleman's agreement" signed on February 19, 1959, by the Foreign Ministers of Turkey and Greece, is an evidence of that common understanding.

On the other hand, at the time of the admission of the Republic of Cyprus to the United Nations, the members of the organization were fully acquainted with all the international commitments and obligations of the said Republic and no objections were raised in this respect.

Furthermore, in the course of the discussions on Cyprus leading to the resolution adopted on March 4, 1964, by the Security Council, the U.S. delegates, among others, explicitly declared that the United Nations had no power to annul or amend international treaties.

The understanding in your message that the intervention by Turkey in Cyprus would be for the purposes of effecting the partition of the island has caused me great surprise and profound sorrow. My surprise stems from the fact that the data furnished to you about the intentions of Turkey could be so remote from the realities repeatedly proclaimed by us. The reason of my sorrow is that our ally, the Government of the United States, could think that Turkey might lay aside the principle constituting the foundation of her foreign policy, i.e., absolute loyalty to international law, commitments and obligations, as factually evidenced in many circumstances well known to the United States.

I would like to assure you most categorically and most sincerely that if ever Turkey finds herself forced to intervene militarily in Cyprus this will be done in full conformity with the provisions and aims of international agreements.

In this connection, allow me to stress, Mr. President, that the postponement of our decision does naturally, in no way affect the rights conferred to Turkey by article 4 of the treaty of guarantee.

Mr. President, referring to NATO obligations, you state in your message that the very essence of NATO requires that allies should not wage war on each other and that a Turkish intervention in Cyprus would lead to a military engagement between Turkish and Greek forces.

I am in full agreement with the first part of your statement, but the obligation for the NATO allies to respect international agreements concluded among themselves as well as their mutual treaty rights and commitments is an equally vital requisite of the alliance. An alliance among states which ignore their mutual contractual obligations and commitments is unthinkable.

As to the concern you expressed over the outbreak of a Turko-Greek war in case of Turkey's intervention in Cyprus in conformity with her rights and obligations stipulated in international agreements, I would like to stress that Turkey would undertake a "military operation" in Cyprus exclusively under the conditions and for the purpose set forth in the agreements. Therefore, a Turko-Greek war so properly described as "literally unthinkable" by the Honorable Dean Rusk could only occur in case of Greece's aggression against Turkey.

Our view, in case of such intervention, is to invite to an effective collaboration, with the aim of restoring the constitutional order in Cyprus, both Greece and the United Kingdom in their capacity as guaranteeing powers. If despite this invitation and its contractual obligations Greece were to attack Turkey, we could in no way be held responsible of the consequences of such an action. I would like to hope that you have already seriously drawn the Greek Government's attention on these matters.

The part of your message expressing doubts as to the obligation of the NATO allies to protect Turkey in case she becomes directly involved with the U.S.S.R. as a result of an action initiated in Cyprus, gives me the impression that there are as between us wide divergence of views as to the nature and basic principles of the North Atlantic Alliance. I must confess that this has been to us the source of great sorrow and grave concern. Any aggression against a member of NATO will naturally call from the aggressor an effort of justification. If NATO's structure is so weak as to give credit to the aggressor's allegations, then it means that this defect of NATO needs really to be remedied. Our understanding is that the North Atlantic Treaty imposes upon all member states the obligation to come forthwith to the assistance of any member victim of an aggression. The only point left to the discretion of the member states is the nature and the scale of this assistance. If NATO members should start discussing the right and wrong of the situation of their fellow-member victim of a Soviet aggression, whether this aggression was provoked or not and if the decision on whether they have an obligation to assist the member should be made to depend on the issue of such a discussion, the very foundations of the Alliance would be shaken and it would lose its meaning. An obligation of assistance, if it is to carry any weight, should come into being immediately upon the observance of aggression. That is why Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty considers an attack against one of the member states as an attack against them all and makes it imperative for them to assist the party so attacked by taking forthwith such action as they deem necessary. In this connection I would like to further point out that the agreements on Cyprus have met with the approval of the North Atlantic Council, as early as the stage of the United Nations debate on the problem, i.e., even prior to the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus, hence long before the occurrence of the events of December 1963.

As you will recall, at the meeting of the NATO Ministerial Council held 3 weeks ago at The Hague, it was acknowledged that the treaties continued to be the basis for legality as regards the situation in the island and the status of Cyprus. The fact that these agreements have been violated as a result of the flagrantly unlawful acts of one of the parties on the island should in no way mean that the said agreements are no longer in force and that the rights and obligations of Turkey by virtue of these agreements should be ignored. Such an understanding would mean that as long as no difficulties arise, the agreements are considered as valid and they are no longer in force when difficulties occur. I am sure you will agree with me that such an understanding of law cannot be accepted. I am equally convinced that there could be no shadow of doubt about the obligation to protect Turkey within the NATO alliance in a situation that can, by no means, be attributed to an arbitrary act of Turkey. An opposite way of thinking would lead to the repudiation and denial of the concept of law and of article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

In your message, concern has been expressed about the commitments of Turkey as a member of the United Nations. I am sure, Mr. President, you will agree with me if I say that such a concern, which I do not share, is groundless especially for the following reasons: Turkey has distinguished herself as one of the most loyal members of the United Nations ever since its foundation. The Turkish people has spared no effort to safeguard the principles of the United Nations Charter, and has even sacrificed her sons for this cause. Turkey has never failed in supporting this organization and, in order to secure its proper functioning, has borne great moral and material sacrifices even when she had most pressing financial difficulties. Despite the explicit rights conferred to Turkey by the Treaty of Guarantee, my Government's respect for and adherence to the United Nations have recently been demonstrated once more by its acceptance of the Security Council resolution of March 4, 1964, as well as by the priority it has given to the said resolution.

Should the United Nations have been progressively successful in carrying out their task as pointed out in your message, a situation which is of such grave concern for both you and I, would never have arisen. It is a fact that the United Nations' operations in the island have proved unable to put an end to the oppression.

The relative calm which has apparently prevailed in the island for the past few weeks marks the beginning of preparations of the Greek Cypriots for further tyranny. Villages are still under siege. The United Nations forces, assuaging Turkish Cypriots, enable the Greeks to gather their crops; but they do not try to stop the Greeks when the crops of Turks are at stake and they act as mere spectators to Greek assaults. These vitally important details may not well reach you, whereas we live in the atmosphere created by the daily reports of such tragic events.

The report of the Secretary General will be submitted to the United Nations on June 15, 1964. I am seriously concerned that we may face yet another defeat similar to the one we all suffered on March 4, 1964. The session of March 4 had further convinced Makarios that the Treaty of Guarantee did not exist for him and thereupon he took the liberty of actually placing the United Nations forces under his control and direction. From then on the assassination of hostages and the besieging of villages have considerably increased.

Dear Mr. President, our allies who are in a position to arbiter in the Cyprus issue and to orient it in the right direction have so far been unable to disentangle the problem from a substantial error. The Cyprus tragedy has been engendered by the deliberate policy of the Republic of Cyprus aimed at annuling the treaties and abrogating the constitution. Security can be established in the island only through the proper functioning of an authority above the Government of Cyprus. Yet only the measures acceptable to the Cypriot Government are being sought to restore security in Cyprus. The British administration set up following the December events, the Anglo-American proposals and finally the United Nations command have all been founded on this unsound basis and consequently every measure acceptable to Makarios has proved futile and has, in general, encouraged oppression and aggression.

Dear Mr. President, you put forward in your message the resentment caused in Greece by the policy pursued by your government. Within the context of the Cyprus issues, the nature of the Greek policy and the course of action undertaken by Greece indicate that she is apt to resort to every means within her power to secure the complete annulment of the existing treaties. We are at pains to make our allies understand the sufferings we bear in our rightful cause and the irretrievable plight in which the Turkish Cypriots are living. On the other hand, it is not the character of our nation to exploit demonstrations of resentment. I assure you that our distress is deeply rooted since we cannot make you understand our rightful position and convince you of the necessity of spending every effort and making use of all your authority to avert the perils inherent in the Cyprus problem by attaching to it the importance it well deserves.

That France and Germany have buried their animosity is indeed a good example. However, our nation had already given such an example 40 years ago by establishing friendly relations with Greece, right after the ruthless devastation of the whole Anatolia by the armies of that country.

Dear Mr. President, as a member of the alliance our nation is fully conscious of her duties and rights. We do not pursue any aim other than the settlement of the Cyprus problem in compliance with the provisions of the existing treaties. Such a settlement is likely to be reached if you lend your support and give effect with your supreme authority to the sense of justice inherent in the character of the American Nation.

Mr. President, I thank you for your statement emphasizing the value attached by the United States to the relations of alliance with Turkey and for your kind words about the Turkish nation. I shall be happy to come to the United States to talk over the Cypress problem with you. The United Nations Security Council will meet on June 17. In the meantime, Mr. Dirk Stikker, Secretary General of NATO, will have paid a visit to Turkey. Furthermore, the United Nations Mediator Mr. Tuemioja will have submitted his report to the Secretary-General. These developments may lead to the emergence of a new situation. It will be possible for me to go abroad to join you, at a date convenient for you, immediately after June 20.

It will be most helpful for me if you would let me know of any defined views and designs you may have on the Cyprus question so that I may be able to study them thoroughly before my departure for Washington.

Finally, I would like to express my satisfaction for the frank, fruitful, and promising talks we had with Mr. G. Ball, in Ankara just before forwarding this message to you.

Sincerely,

Ismet Inonu,
Prime Minister of Turkey.

INTRODUCES BILL FOR VIETNAM VETERANS

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to extend GI educational benefits to veterans of the Vietnam war. In my judgment, this is must legislation and should be favorably considered by this body at the earliest possible time.

As I speak, over 190,000 American men are serving their country in Vietnam and thousands of others are supporting these men in various capacities. Many have delayed their education in order to serve their country. Others have had their education interrupted. Although this country can never repay these valiant men for the precious time they have lost—lost, I might add, during the most productive years of their lives—it can help them either begin, continue or further their educational pursuits upon their return to civilian life.

This mighty Nation has always recognized and met its obligations to its fighting men. This has been true in two World Wars and Korea. Hopefully, it will be equally true today.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that it was deeply disturbing to me that the President, in his state of the Union message, made only passing reference to the need for this type of legislation while not hesitating to ask, with great specificity, for the Congress to continue appropriating billions of dollars for some of the administration's wholly discredited programs. Hopefully such slight reference is not a reflection of the administration's lack of true support for our Vietnam veterans and that the White House will indicate to the Congress the President's support for adequate legislation to benefit these men.

My bill provides for education or training at the rate of 1½ days of education for each day of military service. The period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled shall not exceed 36 months.

Education or training must be initiated within 3 years after the veterans' discharge or release from active duty or 3 years from date of enactment, whichever is later. Under special circumstances, these limitations may be waived.

THE GREAT SOCIETY NEGLECTS THOSE WHO DEFEND IT

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gurney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, in the endless and ever-increasing money spending programs of the Great Society our young soldiers, who by their sacrifices have most earned their country's help, have been sadly overlooked.

Since 1955 nearly 6 million men have served America in her tasks as protector of freedom. Scores of thousands are even now risking their lives in the war in southeast Asia.

Yet in all the discussion in the state of the Union message of America's role in Vietnam, the debt owed the GI's was accorded only an oblique reference. This was the same speech that called for a plan to educate the children of the world—the very same world these young GI's have been fighting to save and protect.

To serve in the Armed Forces these young men have interrupted college and careers. For many of them, the place they left is no longer open, but is filled by another young man who was not called upon to serve. They are 2 or 3 years behind their contemporaries and find that those they left behind are now busy with the professions the GI is not even trained for.

Young people in the Job Corps are paid more money—and even received free trips home for the holidays while returning GI's slept in airports waiting and hoping for the leftover seats to carry them home to their families.

With all this in mind it is inconceivable that an administration spokesman testified before the Veterans' Affairs Committee last year that a cold war GI bill was inconsistent with administration objectives. Whatever these objectives may have been, in a proud and just nation they ought to include a measure of gratitude to those young men whose lives have been so affected for our sake.

At the present time the Government does not offer these young men any help other than unemployment compensation as they return to seek jobs and education. They are accorded none of the considerations that the veterans of World War II or the Korean war were given.

The bill which I am introducing today will help in some may to express the gratitude of a nation for the sacrifice these men have made. It will provide them with a modest income to help cover the costs of the education and training they could have obtained in the years they gave to their country.

It has long been the goal of this Nation to encourage young people to pursue whatever educational advances they can master. The World War II and Korean GI bills have proven to be a great step in making higher education available to all.

After World War II, educators agreed that the entire face of higher education in this land had been changed. The veterans brought a seriousness of purpose and an appreciation for the opportunities to obtain it. The educational level of the Nation was raised as a result—more of our citizens had better educations than ever before.

Had it not been for this program, the shortages of highly trained men in essential occupations would have plagued the Nation's economy even more seriously. The GI bills contributed immeasurably to our present scientific and technical proficiency. The dividends of this national investment are still flowing into our economy.

To those who cry that the program is too expensive, I need only to point to the record of the previous bills. The $14.5 billion in cost to the Treasury has been more than recouped in additional tax revenue from young men whose earning power was multiplied by education. And it continues to pay for itself at a rate of $1 billion a year.

Which of the Great Society programs can claim or ever even hope to claim such a record?

The bill I have introduced provides, in brief, as follows:

This bill, entitled the "Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 1966," will provide a program of education and training for veterans of current service.

Service requirements: At least 6 months military service between February 1, 1955, and the date of termination of compulsory military service.

Duration of education or training: Education or training time shall be earned at the rate of 1½ days of education for each day of military service during the specified period. The period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled shall not exceed 36 months.

Time limitations: Education or training must be initiated within 3 years after the veteran's discharge or release from active duty or 3 years from date of enactment, whichever is later. Veterans, who have been unable to initiate programs of study within 3 years of separation because of the nature of their discharge shall be permitted to initiate a program of education or training within 3 years after the nature of the discharge was corrected or changed to make him eligible.

Expiration of education and training: No education or training shall be afforded an eligible veteran beyond 8 years from discharge from active duty or 8 years from enactment of this law, whichever is later. The entire program of education and training shall terminate 8 years after the date of termination of compulsory military service.

Payments to veterans: Each eligible veteran pursuing a program of education or training shall receive an education and training allowance to meet in part the expenses of his subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment. The following allowances are payable.

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION TRAINING

Full time, 14 semester hours: $130 monthly, no dependents; $160 monthly, one dependent; $190 monthly, two or more dependents.

Three-quarters time: $95 monthly, no dependents; $120 monthly, one dependent; $140 monthly, two or more dependents.

Half time: $60 monthly, no dependents; $75 monthly, one dependent; $90 monthly, two or more dependents.

Less than halftime: Allowance computed at the rate of the established charges or $130 per month for full-time course, whichever is the lesser.

Institutional and on-the-job training: $105 monthly, no dependents; $130 monthly, one dependent; $150 monthly, two or more dependents.

Apprenticeship or on-the-job training; $80 monthly, no dependents; $100 monthly, one dependent; $125 monthly, two or more dependents.

Institutional on-farm training: $110 monthly, no dependents; $130 monthly, one dependent; $150 monthly, two or more dependents.

Miscellaneous provisions: Educational institutions which qualify to participate in this program include public or private elementary school, secondary school, vocational school, correspondence school, business school, junior college, teachers college, college, normal school, professional school, university, scientific or technical institution or other institutions furnishing education for adults.

Surely no better investment can be made than in lives and education of youth. And no group is more deserving to receive these benefits than the young men who are returning every day from the battlefields.

FEAA HONORS MR. MORRIS B. BESCHLOSS

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc., is an organization dedicated to promoting incentive and championing the cause of the American democratic system.

In its 14th annual American Success Story Awards ceremony the FEAA honored a constituent of mine, Mr. Morris B. Beschloss, president of Hammond Valve Corp., Hammond, Ind.

Mr. Beschloss was a Berlin immigrant raised in a small Illinois town. He earned his B.S. degree at the University of Illinois where he was sports editor of the Daily Illini and a member of Sigma Delta Chi Fraternity. He was a captain in the Army and taught military science at the University of Illinois and the Army Psychological Warfare Division.

In Hammond, Mr. Beschloss started his career as advertising manager and worked his way to president in 1956. His leadership sparked sales, new products, and expansion. He originated overnight delivery service centers. He then entered the competitive industrial valve field, broadened line of gate, globe, and check valves to make Hammond a leading supplier to the plumbing and other industries selling over 800 items with multimillions in sales through distributors. A new $1 million, 2-acre addition will expand the Hammond Valve Corp.'s 125,000-square-foot plant.

Mr. Beschloss' success is typical of the great examples that have made America the successful Nation that it is, and I am pleased to have a constituent who serves as a source of inspiration and provides the leadership that has always been the American trademark.

H.R. 11897—HORTON BILL TO PROTECT AND RESTORE VETERAN PENSIONS CUT BY SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this second session, I introduced H.R. 11897, a bill to exclude the increase in social security benefits from the determination of income for veteran pension purposes.

When we enacted the badly needed increase in cash social security benefit payments last year we inflicted an unintentional but nevertheless very real hardship and injustice upon certain veterans, their dependents, and survivors. Some of the veterans or widows of veterans who received both social security benefits and veterans' pensions were moved into a higher income bracket by this increase, with the unfortunate consequence that their pensions from the Veterans' Administration have been reduced or entirely terminated.

The income test for pension purposes is made up of only a few broad income brackets with very sharp drops in pension amounts as one moves to a higher bracket. The result is that the additional money received from the higher social security payment does not come close to offsetting the loss in pension payments suffered by those pushed into a higher income bracket, to say nothing of those whose pensions were terminated entirely. Their total income, therefore, is lower than before we passed the Social Security Amendments of 1965.

Let us look at the group whose incomes have been cut. Not only is it composed of veterans—or widows of veterans—whom we at one time asked to risk their lives for us but they are pensioners. So by definition they are disabled, they have very limited incomes, and in many cases they are old.

Cutting the income of such a group is intolerable. The situation must be corrected. I ask my colleagues full support for this bill.

SOCIAL PROGRAMS AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Record an editorial which appeared in the December 20, 1965, issue of the Christian Science Monitor and which draws attention to the too often ignored fact that Government press releases and slogans alone cannot conquer poverty. There is a deeper dimension to social progress which involves the spiritual and moral fiber of a nation:

Social Programs and Social Progress

This newspaper is currently publishing a series of interviews with leading Presidential advisers, designed to throw light on where the Great Society program is heading and what it implies for the future of America. These advisers are among the architects of the President's program, and the interviews explore their long-range thinking, their ideas, and goals.

Any such survey is bound to convey something of the enormous scope of the administration's program. Whatever one may think of President Johnson's approach, it may be conceded that his program has thrown the spotlight of national attention, as never before, on poverty, ignorance, discrimination, child neglect, and physical disability. Long-submerged conditions are coming to the surface to be dealt with. Surely it is true, too, that the Great Society approach expresses a humanitarian concern for the deprived, and a growing conviction that suffering and degradation are not really necessary and must be challenged. All of this is good. But amid the discussion of social programing and the laborious paraphernalia of national welfare efforts, it needs to be remembered that social progress has a deeper dimension. Practical programs to relieve suffering and end degrading conditions are necessary. But their success is in direct proportion to the improvement in human thinking that accompanies them. Poverty and crime can be expunged from our cities only as poverty and crime are removed from men's thinking.

It is the moral fiber and spiritual energies of a nation that lift it to a better way of life. This is true in a high-speed modern society just as much as it was in an agrarian era. Without moral fiber—expressed in honesty, respect for law, moral courage, and the like—there is no cement to hold society together. Without spiritual energies—shown in individual initiative and enterprise, aspiration, faith, the motivation to conquer adversity, and so on—there is little incentive to make the sacrifices of self-indulgence which progress demands.

Too little attention is being given today to this basic aspect of human progress. A cornucopia of industrial gadgets will not by itself give meaning to life. Expensive social programs will not, by themselves, end degradation. The triumph over ignorance and crime must still take place, basically and primarily, in the minds of men. Triumph over poverty comes only as men rise above poverty of thinking; the best charity still is to enable a man to live without dependence on charity.

Helpful as social programs are, the basic need is for the spiritual enlightenment and awakening which will inspire men to strive for better goals in life and will motivate them to obey the canons of decent and civilized living. Much more attention needs to be given to this need. Here is a challenge for the individual, the church, the community organization, and our regional and national leadership.

AIDING THE ENEMY

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harsha] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, this administration has been giving a lot of lipservice to the proposition that it will provide whatever is necessary for American boys who are serving in Vietnam. Yet, it persists in doing nothing to halt the flow of supplies and munitions to our enemy in North Vietnam by our so-called friends and allies. This administration has available to it sufficient economic weapons to halt the flow of these supplies and munitions from the so-called free world, if it only had the courage to employ them.

I am getting sick and tired of bailing out the English pound everytime it gets into trouble, then have the British ship supplies to our enemies to be used in killing our American boys. There are many other free nations whose economies we have either rebuilt, such as Japan, or otherwise sustained, who persist in shipping supplies into North Vietnam. This should be halted.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this administration should make its gutless wonders in the State Department stop issuing foreign aid to any other nation who continues to ship supplies into North Vietnam to be used against us.

How this Nation can continue to aid, support, and enhance the economies of those nations who are providing our enemy with the means to maim, cripple, and kill American boys is beyond my comprehension. If supply lines and munitions are cut off to the Communists, the fighting will soon cease in Vietnam.

THE GREAT BOSTON POWER PLAY

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wydler] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, in the January 1966 edition of Reader's Digest, pages 99–104, there is a shocking story entitled, "The Great Boston Power Play." In this article Mr. William Hines, science editor of the Washington Star and a nationally syndicated columnist specializing in space exploration, charges and documents what he describes as a banding "together in a unique alliance, NASA and the Urban Renewal Administration" to deliver the goods:

> The goal: a grandiose space center. The cost: the rights of several thousand citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter in the Record the story of this event. The story has as yet no ending. Not all the facts concerning it have yet been made public.

As one who objected to and fought this urban development device from the start and who tried to have NASA choose a different site, I believe we should act now.

I ask my colleagues to weigh the need to spend $100 million to construct this center.

At a time when budgets are being cut and programs reduced, I seriously question the wisdom of this project. Its priority is out of all proportion to its usefulness.

The Congress should consider if in this time of national crisis it wishes to throw good money after bad.

The article follows:

The Great Boston Power Play

(Note.—Banded together in a unique alliance, NASA and the Urban Renewal Administration are delivering the goods. The goal: a grandiose space center. The cost: the rights of several thousand citizens.)

(By William Hines)

One of the more appalling chapters in the long annals of government empire-building can now be told. It is the classic case of how two tax-fed bureaucracies, one supposedly concerned with slums, the other aiming at the moon, have made a bizarre rendezvous in Boston, Mass. It typifies what can happen in America today under the banners of technology and progress.

The action began in the fall of 1962 when Edward "Teddy" Kennedy was elected to the U.S. Senate on the slogan, "He Can Do More for Massachusetts." Shortly afterward, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) delivered the "more": the space agency announced that it would construct a $50-million Electronics Research Center (ERC) in the Boston area. The Center, which was to be one of a dozen test-and-research installations, would in 10 years employ 2,100 persons and would boast a $77-million annual budget. The need, argued NASA, was urgent.

But some things didn't ring true. Urgent? No such center had been advocated publicly prior to the election. Further, numerous experts were quick to note that the job proposed for the ERC could easily be carried out at existing Government installations. A Senate committee passed a motion eliminating the Center, but the vote was quickly reversed amid reports of phone calls from the White House. Most curious, NASA never bothered to send a site-selection board around the country before picking Metropolitan Boston. With this knowledge the House Space Committee in late 1963 decided that the Center's need was "not conclusively proven" and held up funds until further site studies could be furnished.

To no one's surprise, NASA bounced back in February 1964 with a thick volume favoring Boston over eight rival regions. "The decision was not intended to be changed, and it was not changed," snapped Ohio Senator Frank Lausche. With the new NASA justification, the project was quickly nourished by a preliminary $3,900,000 allocation.

Now events took an even more curious turn. Originally, NASA had proposed payment of $3 million for 1,000 acres somewhere in Boston's suburbs. This would save the taxpayers the cost of a split operation, since there would be room within the Center for the 400-acre testing ground that was needed. But, as summer approached, NASA was found to be hungrily eyeing an area called Kendall Square in Cambridge, directly across the Charles River from Boston proper.

ENTER URBAN RENEWAL

Crammed with industry and business concerns, Kendall Square lies at the back of the sprawling campus of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, one of the world's leading scientific universities. Since World War II, more White House science advisers have come from M.I.T. than from any other school. One of these is Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., its current chairman.

In the spring of 1964, three Boston urban renewal officials came to Killian to discuss a seductive idea. Why not clear out a 42-acre tract in Kendall Square with urban renewal funds and sell most of the property to NASA for its electronics center? Not long after, behind closed doors, Cambridge Mayor Edward A. Crane and the city council listened to the same scheme, while Killian, whose name carries tremendous weight in Cambridge, sat by.

The action quickened. On July 2, NASA Chief James E. Webb let it be known that he thought Kendall Square had "the greatest potential" of all the sites NASA had seen. On July 27, the Cambridge city council decided to apply for Federal urban renewal planning funds for the 42 acres and to offer 29 of those acres to NASA. That very day, Urban Renewal Administrator William Slayton gave his "preliminary approval" to the site as "an urban renewal project." And on August 19 NASA formally accepted Cambridge's offer on the condition that it "provide cleared land to NASA under the Federal urban renewal procedures."

It was a splendid arrangement. The glamour of a Federal space center would grease the way for urban renewal which, realistically, didn't otherwise stand a chance of tearing up this thriving industrial area. NASA had captured a prize piece of real estate at a bargain-basement price—roughly $4 million—thanks to the fact that urban renewal would pay most of the "real" cost of the land and would take on the expense and dirty work of removing the occupants. And the Cambridge-Boston area was going to have all that money spent there.

FLY IN THE OINTMENT

There was only one catch: nobody had bothered to ask the opinion of the 94 businessmen and their 3,500 employees who were on the Kendall Square chopping block. Most didn't realize what had happened until they read the newspaper headlines on August 21: "$60-Million NASA Plant To Be Built in Kendall Square."[1] Thus began a nightmare.

Arthur B. Kettle, Sr., executive vice president and general manager of the Austin-Hastings Co., Inc., a supplier of machinery and metal piping, was one of hundreds caught by surprise. He knew that his company could suffer a half-million-dollar loss just trying to move, and that wasn't the worst of it. Ninety-five percent of his orders had to be shipped within 24 hours for him to compete. Yet it would take at least 2 years to move inventory while trucks tried to run back and forth between two plants. "How many customers will we lose in a changeover?" he found himself wondering.

Then there was the problem of the company's employees. Austin-Hastings had a $750,000 yearly payroll of 100 employes and a record of never having laid off a worker. Kettle knew that 3 out of every 10 firms uprooted by urban renewal never reopen. Other executives all over Kendall Square began to face similar harrowing realities.

Taken together, these taxpaying companies (NASA wouldn't pay a cent of taxes) compose one of the most productive industrial areas in Massachusetts. More than two dozen have been in business for 30 years, many for five decades. They have an annual sales volume of $75 million, a $40-million plant-and-equipment value, payrolls of $18 million a year.

But there was more to it than valued businesses. There were people—individuals who would suffer if the businesses moved or collapsed. Among them were refugees from previous urban renewal projects in Cambridge and Boston who had relocated in Kendall Square in the certainty that it was safe. One filling station operator, for instance, had finally built up steady customers after years of sweat. "No one can compensate me for that," he says. Or take the elderly owner of a wrought iron equipment firm—too discouraged and too far in the hole to make a second move because of urban renewal.

VOICE OF DISSENT

Still, because NASA was coming to town, they were supposed to give in meekly. But the planners, politicians, and university titans had miscalculated. Shortly after Labor Day, 1964, the businessmen of Kendall Square formed a Committee for the Preservation of Cambridge Industry. Dr. John Brennan, vice president of the Electronics Corp. of America, was named chairman, and the battle was on.

"The use of the urban renewal statutes to allow NASA in here is a flagrant distortion of the fundamental purpose of the law," Brennan declared. He and others were shocked because, with 29 acres going to NASA (70 percent of the tract),[2] the deal made a mockery of Massachusetts law, which says that urban renewal must give maximum opportunity to privately financed development. The dissenters also fiercely contended that Kendall Square's industrial area, while no garden spot, was far from a decadent area, as local urban renewal authorities desperately tried to prove. The single fact that the 94 concerns were doing $75 million a year worth of business raised grave questions as to the morality of bringing in the Federal bulldozer.

Confronted by organized opposition, NASA mounted a high-powered campaign to promote the space center. It set up temporary headquarters in an office building (partly owned by MIT), next to the proposed site. And Edward Martin, a former Teddy Kennedy aid, was hired to handle public relations. Added to this was a never-ending string of local speaking engagements by ERC officials. These talks oozed with juicy statistics. The Center would bring 5,800 jobs to the area and $450 million in buying power. That didn't count oodles of construction jobs over a 5-year period. And out of a $35 million budget for operating costs, much would be contracted to local industries.

LET THERE BE BLIGHT

Meanwhile, the urban-renewal forces moved in for the kill. Late in 1964, a press release from Washington announced a $100,000 feasibility survey to determine whether Kendall Square was eligible for urban renewal. There was no pretense as to the outcome, however: the release sweepingly labeled the area as blighted.

As this campaign of disparagement went on, debate raged over how much the land taking and clearance would cost. The industrialists contended that the total expense could easily climb over $40 million. Urban-renewal authorities stuck to a ridiculously low $20-million figure. Only one thing was sure: U.S. taxpayers would ultimately have to pick up most of the bill, whatever it turned out to be. And the 400 acres of testing ground still had to be purchased somewhere in the suburbs.

In explaining just why the Kendall Square location was so vital, NASA outdid itself. The ERC should be within walking distance of MIT, it pointed out. An extra inducement was needed to draw some 450 junior scientists to NASA for work at $6,000 to $9,000 a year. With this location, said NASA, these young men could, if they wished to study for an advanced degree, get to graduate-school classes at MIT and Harvard with a minimum of lost time.

---

[1] The project's pricetag had already risen by $10 million.

[2] MIT had already said it would be "willing" to help develop the other 13 acres—set aside for private (nonindustrial) use.

To businessmen who saw generations of enterprise going down the drain, this was almost the last straw. Why, they asked, should 3,500 persons be uprooted to pamper 450 junior scientists?

It was all the more preposterous because a mere 3 miles down the Charles River from MIT the Defense Department's 119-acre Watertown Arsenal was in the process of being closed down. A simple solution was apparent to every rational mind: let the Army move out and NASA move in. But simple solutions are not Washington solutions. NASA rejected Watertown, giving as its main argument that the arsenal was too far from MIT. By private auto it is 10 minutes away; by public transportation (20 cents), no more than 20 minutes. No go: apparently the public-transportation problem—one transfer—was too complex. (For an electronics engineer?)

Representative SILVIO CONTE, of Massachusetts, angrily observed: "Any private business that bungled its affairs in this way would go bankrupt."

SMEAR TACTICS

In April 1965, another announcement issued from urban-renewal headquarters. Surprise. The $100,000 feasibility study showed that the Kendall Square site was "an eligible urban-renewal area." So $401,200 more was funneled out "to begin survey and planning activities." Now a tax-fed smear of Kendall Square was a simple matter. Owners complained that urban-renewal investigators tried to muscle their way into buildings with city fire inspectors to look for "defects" in order to make the area appear "decadent." One owner discovered a photographer on his property attempting to get an unfavorable angle on a warehouse behind his parking lot.

The going was to get even rougher. During congressional testimony, Housing and Home Finance Chieftain Robert Weaver dropped the remark that if NASA didn't get the Center in Kendall Square, "they will not do it in Massachusetts at all." Protesting businessmen suddenly discovered that friends and colleagues considered them "unpatriotic" and "selfish" for standing in the way of the space program.

MOMENT OF TRUTH

Finally, on August 30, a public hearing on the urban-renewal plan was held in the Cambridge City Council building. Just days before, NASA unveiled a model of the Center's 26-story building, and one newspaper reported that space officials "beamed like players on a winning football team." Then, at the meeting, ERC Deputy Director Albert Kelley, leading off for NASA, delivered the familiar sales pitch: the center would create at least $450 million of "induced income" in the area over the next 10 years.

Dr. Brennan arose. "Our companies exist now," he replied. Nathan Matz, president of Automotive Warehouse, stood up. "Not one of you has ever visited us," he told the council. "No one has taken the time to come in and see what this is all about."

Then an outraged citizen, John L. Warden, spoke: "Fixing up neighborhoods is one thing. But destroying the property of one person so that another may have it for his own use is immoral, unconstitutional, and detrimental to our city. If this sort of program is allowed, it will not stop until people who want to build new buildings at the public expense have taken every acre they happen to desire."

Minutes later, the council voted 6 to 3 in favor of the urban-renewal plan. Another community had succumbed to the lure of the Federal dollar—and the space age. A month passed, and the property owners, vowing to take their case to the courts, made one last presentation to the Division of Urban Renewal of the Massachusetts Department of Commerce and Development, which must pass on all urban-renewal plans. This agency held a hearing, but on the same day word was let out by urban-renewal officials in Washington that Cambridge had received approval of $15,330,000 for the Kendall Square project. The onrushing Federal bureaucracy had not even bothered to wait for the State's rubberstamp. (The State agency approved the plan on October 8, and the Kendall Square property owners have gone to court.)

"This approval," proclaimed the Urban Renewal Administration, "will permit the start of land acquisition, relocation of site occupants, and site clearance and preparation."

Then came these words: "The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has expressed interest in building a new space center in the major part of the area."

Surely that will go down as the understatement of the year.

MAJ. GEN. IRVING LEWIS BRANCH

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, "Twig" Branch is gone. He died as he had lived: in the service of his country.

His full name was Irving Lewis Branch, but few knew him by his real given names, for he loved to be known as "Twig." Statistics could be recited ad infinitum about the life of Maj. Gen. "Twig" Branch. Statistics, though, are meaningless and not long remembered.

The man himself will be remembered fondly by his many friends for his humility and compassion as well as his outstanding military accomplishments long after it is forgotten that he was born in Iowa, or that he became an aviation cadet upon his graduation in 1934 from Norwich University, or that he became commander of the Air Force Flight Test Center at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., in July of 1961.

"Twig" loved to fly, and had over 7,000 hours to his credit. About to finish out his lifetime of service, "Twig" had given more than 30 years to his countrymen. Less than a year ago, they had honored him with the rank of major general in the U.S. Air Force. In a few short months he could look forward to well-deserved years of retirement in California's beautiful Antelope Valley.

But now, God has willed otherwise, so we pay tribute to his memory and ask God to give courage to his wife of 27 years and to his two sons, who can take pride and comfort in knowing that, in every way "Twig" Branch was a man whose life was a symbol of greatness.

NEED FOR FURTHER REVISION OF IMMIGRATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, shortly before the Christmas holidays I was pleased to accept an official invitation from the Polish Government to attend dedication ceremonies of a new children's hospital in the city of Krakow, Poland. The new hospital, at the moment probably the finest of its kind in the world, was financed largely through U.S. counterpart funds in Poland and through direct foreign aid appropriations of some $2.2 million. It was therefore deemed fitting and proper for a delegation of U.S. officials, including Members of this and the other body, to participate in the formal dedication of the facility. I was most honored to be a member of that delegation along with my distinguished colleague from the Second Congressional District of Massachusetts, Representative ED BOLAND.

Not only was the trip a most worthwhile gesture of our personal interest in the people of Poland, it also proved to be informative in a way that no book or news story could be by providing insights into the mood and feeling of the Polish nation, as well as the facts of its present status.

The hospital itself is one of the soundest investments we could possibly make in the interests of better understanding between ourselves and the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain. I have no doubt whatsoever that the dividends from the Krakow Children's Hospital will be immeasurably greater than those we stand to gain from our investment of military equipment to some of our less stable and insecure allies.

The fact that it is a children's hospital makes it all the more fitting in view of the innate devotion of the Polish people to home and family. In spite of the cruel treatment the Polish people have endured over the last several generations, they remain strong in their faith in God and in the tenets of a God-fearing society. I am, and I am sure I can speak for my friend and colleague as well, grateful that this trip gave us the opportunity to renew our acquaintance with these freedom-loving people and to reaffirm the kinship which has existed between Poland and the United States since the birth of this republic.

Bearing these thoughts in mind, the American traveler in Poland is more acutely aware of the paradox of a nation of people so closely resembling our own with many identical ideals and beliefs being held captive by a totalitarian regime; a foreign government for all practical purposes, since the policies of Warsaw are clearly drafted in Moscow.

It is shocking for us to realize and difficult for us to accept the fact, for example, that here is a government that can and will forbid a holy pilgrimage by a prelate of the Catholic Church, as the Warsaw Government recently denied a travel visa to Rome for Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski.

We had the good fortune to be in Warsaw when Cardinal Wyszynski first returned from the Ecumenical Council meetings at the Vatican. The cardinal was in ill favor with the Warsaw Government even prior to the council meetings. But his return to Warsaw in December was a triumph. We had hoped to attend the mass he scheduled the evening we were there, but we were unable to get near the church through the throngs of loyal Polish citizens. In spite of the obvious displeasure of their government, an estimated 10,000 people gathered in the streets around the church. There were no microphones or public address broadcasts of the mass. These people, unable to hear a word, just wanted to be near him. It was an overwhelming example of support for their cardinal and their church.

Although arbitrary edicts by the Communist government are an obvious effort to subordinate all things to the will of the state, it is equally clear that they have so far failed to subordinate the spirit of the Polish people.

Certainly it as our recognition of this kinship, this similar spirit between the United States and God-fearing, freedom-loving peoples all over the world that encouraged this Congress to enact sweeping reforms in our immigration and naturalization code last year. The changes made in the code by the 1965 amendments were long overdue and necessary.

But as comprehensive and forward-looking as these revisions have been, they cannot be regarded as the last word. They are an important step forward, a giant stride in the direction of a more realistic, responsive, and economically sound immigration code.

But because such laws influence the lives of thousands of human beings every day, they must never be frozen or solidified into a rigid standard that would apply the same specific criteria to all with no chance for appeal and no recourse. Such laws must always be pliable. They must be altered and changed to meet the requirements of a specific time and a specific group. They must be responsive to the needs of the situation for which they are implemented.

It is in this spirit and attitude that I am today introducing legislation to eliminate what I feel is a serious flaw in the present law; an inequity that works to the disadvantage of the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain—the very people we should bend every effort to help.

The legislation I am introducing today is the direct result of facts and personal impressions which we gained during our brief visit in Poland. It is in response to our commitment to the principles of freedom and dignity for all men that I lay these bills before the Congress and urge their prompt and favorable consideration.

The first proposal would amend section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to waive the requirement for specific certification by the Secretary of Labor that admission of unskilled or otherwise nonpreference aliens from Communist or Communist-dominated countries will not effect a labor-surplus area or situation.

As the law now states, the Secretary of Labor must certify, first, that there are not sufficient workers in the area to which the immigrant worker plans to go; and second, that his presence in that labor market will not adversely affect wages and working conditions there.

Unless this provision is amended, issuance of nonpreference visas to Poles will drop to virtually nothing since the majority of applicants are in the class of workers covered by section 212(a)(14).

My bill would amend the provisions only with respect to Communist or Communist-dominated countries. It would not affect workers in the unskilled or nonpreference category from other countries. I feel on the whole that the provision is a necessary safeguard against needless adulteration of the American labor market. I do not suggest we should tamper with this section beyond the scope I have mentioned.

The second bill I am offering would amend section 201(d) of the same code to allow quota numbers which have been transferred to the immigration pool, under terms of the 1965 amendments, to be made available for issuance of visas to nonpreference immigrant aliens.

Of course, such nonpreference aliens would still be subject to the other restrictions and qualifications in the law, such as section 212(a)(14) which I have just discussed. It seems to me that if a nonpreference alien could pass all the other necessary and worthwhile tests, he should not be penalized simply because he had no legal access to unused quota numbers.

I supported wholeheartedly the enactment of our amendments to the immigration code last year. I had even introduced legislation of my own which was very similar to the bill that finally passed the House and Senate and was signed into law by President Johnson. I feel that the two amendments I have proposed today would further strengthen our immigration code by making it more realistic and more responsive.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts, my distinguished colleague, Congressman CONTE, on his statement to the House. I join him in the sentiments he has expressed about the Polish people, and I have cosponsored with Mr. CONTE the needed corrective amendments to the 1965 Immigration Act to help captive peoples, such as those in Poland.

Mr. Speaker, both Congressman CONTE and I were members of an official delegation from the Congress of the United States to attend the dedication of the magnificent new children's hospital in Prokocim, a suburb of Krakow, Poland. The delegation was headed by the distinguished House chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, THOMAS E. MORGAN, and included Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Congressmen JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, ALVIN O'KONSKI, EDNA F. KELLY, CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, HENRY HELSTOSKI, ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, JAMES FULTON, LUCIEN NEDZI, and CHARLES A. VANIK.

The idea of constructing a children's hospital in Krakow originated in 1958 with Mr. Wladek Biernacki-Poray, a Polish-born American architect from New Jersey. Legislation to accomplish this end was filed in 1959 by Congressman ZABLOCKI and supported in the Senate by the then Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. The proposal permitted the use of foreign currencies generated from the sales of surplus foods, to be used abroad for the support of research hospitals sponsored by American citizens. The U.S. Government has millions of dollars of Polish zlotys resulting from such sales. These are known as counterpart funds.

The 311-bed hospital will have a staff of about 650 doctors, nurses, and medical technicians. The U.S. Government contribution is in two parts, $8.2 million in Polish zlotys and $2.2 million in dollars for the purchase of equipment in the United States. The Government of Poland contributed about $1 million in land and services. The Committee for the American Research Hospital for Children in Poland contributed $1 million in services, supplies, and equipment. The Medical Academy of the Jagiellonian University in Krakow will administer the hospital. This academy is one of the finest in Europe and is over 600 years old.

Congressman CONTE and I and the entire delegation agree that this hospital is a magnificent expression of the American peoples' continuing good will to the people of Poland. The gratitude of the Medical Academy and the ordinary Polish citizen was generously reflected in the dedication ceremonies. Even those in official position with the Polish Government who attended the dedication were moved to praise the building of the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, all of us hope that it augurs well for future relations between the United States and Poland. The dedication date came at a particularly propitious time. Ambassador John A. Gronouski arrived in Poland as the representative of the United States just 2 weeks before and as he put it:

> I'm the only Ambassador that I can recall who has been in his assigned post such a short period of time and presented such a splendid expression of my Government's affection and good will.

As we left the hospital grounds, hundreds of people had gathered around the gate forcing Ambassador Gronouski to stop his car to receive their flowers, to grasp their hands and to listen to their warmhearted greetings. It was a sight to behold and one that will always be remembered. The flags of the United States and Poland were flying at equal height on two separate staffs as a further and emphatic example of the bond of friendship that exists between the peoples of these two countries.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman CONTE, has just told you how we had the good fortune to be in Warsaw on Cardinal Wyszynski's triumphal return to his episcopal see following the close of the Roman Catholic Church's Ecumenical Council, Vatican II, in Rome. The brilliant and holy archbishop of Warsaw and cardinal-primate of Poland has frequently clashed with the Communist-dominated government over the Roman Catholic Church freedom and position in Poland. But now the government was about to impose new and harsher edicts on the cardinal's freedom of movement because he had joined the Polish bishops in inviting the German Roman Catholic bishops to

Warsaw for the celebration this year of the millennium of the founding of Christianity in Poland. The Polish Government last week refused to let Cardinal Wyszynski journey to Rome to join Pope Paul VI for the solemn pontifical mass in the Vatican last Thursday marking the opening of the millenium observances which will last through 1966. This action of Polish Government against their spiritual leader certainly will not be condoned by the average Polish citizens who revere Cardinal Wyszynski. As the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman CONTE, pointed out, some 10,000 Polish citizens stood outside his cathedral, without the benefit of public address system, just to be near the cardinal as he sang solemn pontifical mass on his return from the Ecumenical Council.

Mr. Speaker, the need for the legislation the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman CONTE, and I introduced today was pointed out in a news story from Warsaw by David Halberstam in the New York Times on February 10, 1965, before the Immigration Act of 1965 was enacted by Congress last year. Under previous permission I include this article with my remarks at this point:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1965]

VISAS TO THE UNITED STATES STILL ARE A DREAM FOR MANY POLES—LONG LINES FORM BEFORE THE U.S. EMBASSY, BUT RESTRICTIONS BAR MOST WHO APPLY

(By David Halberstam)

WARSAW, February 9.—The trains from the country generally arrive in the early morning. Consequently, the lines of country people begin forming outside the U.S. Embassy about 6 a.m. There the people wait patiently, in their Sunday best, often with packed lunches and dinners until the Embassy opens at 8 a.m.

They come because they hope this trip from the country will be the first step on a longer journey to the United States. Although the great waves of immigration have ended, for many Poles, America is as much as ever the promised land.

Their numbers far exceed the places for them. Only about 7,500 Poles can be admitted to the United States each year, but last year about 20,000 registered for visas.

Americans here believe that if the requirement for American sponsorship of Polish immigrants were dropped and if the Polish Government would let more Poles go, the emigration rate might be astronomical.

EIGHTY THOUSAND ARE WAITING

Right now 80,000 Poles are registered and waiting for visas. Papers of those who registered in 1959 are only now being processed by American consular officers.

It is believed here that even if President Johnson's new immigration proposals are passed by Congress, they would have little immediate effect on Poles. The Johnson proposals would strip the national origins basis from immigration, allowing applicants to be judged primarily on the basis of their skills and their ties to families already in the United States.

While this would eventually help Poland, countries such as Italy, Greece, and Portugal have even greater emigration backlogs and they would be the more immediate beneficiaries. After about 5 years, however, the new rules might give Poland up to 10 percent of the overall quota of 165,000—or 16,500—a year.

This, however, would probably only bring a marked increase in the number of applicants for visas. Periodically rumors spread that immigration requirements have been eased, and the U.S. Embassy on such occasions is beseiged with potential applicants.

While many of those wanting to leave have reasons based in politics or religion, the major reason seems to be simply desire for a better life, more economic advantages. In many villages it is a time honored idea that the best thing a family can work toward is emigration to America.

One Pole explained to a consular officer that he wanted to emigrate to the United States "because if you please, sir, they have got it better there."

Another explained that he had been forced to sell two horses this winter because there was no fodder to be bought to feed them. A third said that he rose and went to work at 5 a.m., worked until midnight, "and for this I want more than just a piece of bread."

Ironically, the very hardship of the lives of country folk makes it easier for them to get passports. The Government is less willing to allow trained and skilled people to leave the country. Many of those who are trained and educated are hesitant to apply for emigration for fear that they will be turned down and that their futures here will be hampered.

Those who do leave come, as did Poles at the turn of the century, from two main areas—Bialystock in the northeast and Rzeszow in the southeast.

These areas lack industries. The people in these areas know many Poles in the United States, and they can find sponsors.

THE URBAN TRANSIT CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment generally on the growing crisis facing urban commuter travel, hoping that it will help to awaken the Congress and every national segment to the dire urgency which exists.

Our cities are fast approaching a state of total paralysis in the day-to-day movement of people and goods. Moreover, as urban centers absorb an increasing percentage of the Nation's population, this problem of transportation will grow more acute, unless local authorities, State governments, and in turn the Federal preserve can move intelligently to encourage the resurrection of efficient transit systems.

Although specifics vary, most of the country's large cities confont a similar dilemma. The rub is providing access to the urban core where people journey every day to earn a living, and where additional thousands are attracted to cultural and entertainment establishments. To move people where they want to go, we rely on the automobile, bigger and better highways, and forms of public, mass transportation.

These persons, who are growing in numbers, descend upon a geographic radius of business concentration which does not appreciably expand. Commuter lines are strained to the limit.

Business, culture, and retail outlets in our cities are becoming inaccessible.

Modes of travel to the city proper have not kept pace with commuter demand. The result is chaos during the two periods of the day when people are traveling to and from work.

This brief dichotomy may seem overly simplistic. The problem per se is not difficult to grasp. But to solve it is very challenging indeed; witness, if you will, the many divergent proposals of planning committees all across the country which conflict on the means to employ.

Nevertheless, they have done us a great service by clarifying the complexities involved. Private research groups have often proved to be years ahead of stubborn local authorities, competing with one another, suspicious of schemes which may circumvent or undermine their powers, all the while subverting the public interest by providing us with less than the best. With respect to my own great city of New York, the Regional Plan Association has made a handsome contribution in this field.

Urban downtown areas are losing commerce and industry. The New York Times reported on August 4 of 1964 that 34 companies left New York City during the previous 4 years, relocating on nearby Long Island. Parking problems, traffic congestion, and other transport inconveniences were quoted as prime factors.

While all this has been taking place, highway construction in and around our great cities has multiplied.

The vast Federal outlays for highway construction contrasts sharply with the gloomy transit picture. In transportation the overriding Federal emphasis has been directed toward facilitating automobile travel, improving road access to the Nation's cities. It is no wonder that city streets are clogged with cars.

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1964 authorized $2 billion from the highway trust fund for primary and secondary road systems. This authorization does not include sums earmarked for the Interstate System. For fiscal year 1966, $250 million was authorized for urban highway construction. For New York State in fiscal year 1967, more than $28 million is apportioned for urban highways.

I thoroughly agree that we must continuously enlarge and better our primary and secondary roads, including those in and around the Nation's urban centers. I have no argument against the Federal highway program. It has been a necessary project.

But mass transit has deteriorated in comparison.

There has been no coincident pumping of funds into public transportation. Bigger and better expressways have lured commuters away from public transit, which goes deeper and deeper into debt as service declines. During peak hours, cars carry an average of only 1.3 to 1.5 occupants. At high cost, additional freeway lanes are built onto existing arteries, utilized fully at rush hour only. Because of the highway's limited peak-hour capacity, the automobile is the least efficient means of transporting multitudes to and from small geographic areas.

The transit problems afflicting Queens Borough of New York City are indicative of the worsening trend. In the subway system, the Main Street, Flushing, station is one of the few points to show a constant gain in passengers since World War II. Citywide, subway commutation decreased 13.4 percent from 1953 to 1963; Flushing riders increased by almost 11 percent. Queens, of course, is increasing in population; Manhattan is losing it to suburban and semisuburban communities. People have taken to their automobiles.

The overcrowding on Flushing and Jamaica subway trains is monstrous, a clear indictment of the negligence and inaction which has characterized the execution of policy in a great metropolis. The City Planning Commission stated in 1963 that in the Flushing IRT line and the Queens Boulevard IND line, subway trains between 8 and 9 a.m. daily carry 22,000 more commuters than can be considered a reasonable level of crowding. This is expected to triple in the next 20 years.

I know these problems are not unique. They are problems which face every major American city to some extent.

I think we need better roads, and plans for the future cannot exclude further highway construction where it is needed and when it is rationally allied with a coordinated metropolitan transit program. The answer in New York, however, is not to spend public moneys widening the West Side Highway to the disadvantage of better mass public transport; in the same context, although I favor an additional Queens midtown tunnel tube, it is a costly venture and should not be undertaken without insuring simultaneously that forms of public transport are improved in speed, access, safety, cleanliness, and capacity.

The dividends of improving commuter rail service are much greater than building additional access roads; urban freeways are attractive solutions because of Federal assistance, of course, but in the absence of this incentive the urban freeway mile averages about $3,700,000. In Boston, 1½ miles of urban freeway through a downtown area cost $40 million. Some have estimated that a crosstown artery in Manhattan would cost $100 million per mile. Urban freeways, moreover, bite into local tax rolls by swallowing valuable land. In comparison, San Francisco's modern rapid transit plan cost $13 million per mile, and has a rush-hour capacity of 30,000 seater passengers, as against a hypothetical 8-lane freeway which could only accommodate a maximum of 8,000 cars with 12,000 rides. This kind of transit system, naturally, required a narrower right-of-way and no downtown parking outlets.

I am convinced that solution to our hard-pressed commuter problem does not lie exclusively with expanding road approaches to urban centers. Without improving mass transit, furthermore, such imbalance will exacerbate the mid-town traffic problem by beckoning more commuters to use the new roads, sending public transportation further into debt and flooding city streets with more automobiles.

We can similarly apply this formula to intercity travel. The New Jersey Turnpike Authority is planning to sell a $623 million bond issue to finance widening of the approach to New York. Considering the volume of traffic, this is not unjustifiable. But it will attract more cars to New York City. It seems to me that at the same time, the affected States must join together to speed the development of fast rail service between Washington and New York.

The New York situation has been highlighted by a recent costly transit strike, freezing all modes of public transport. Millions of dollars have been lost because of the impasse. The inconvenience to traditional bus and subway users is indescribable.

The experience reminds us in shocking detail of the vulnerability of giant urban communities. Without means of access they are isolated; business collapses and people simply cannot get to work. Cities are literally defenseless against colossal organizations which represent an essential commodity. The power failure which blacked out New York is not unlike our more recent adventure with the transport shutdown.

It seems to me that we can do something to assist in solving the acute urban transit problems. This remains an area of local and State jurisdiction. It is not the prerogative of the Federal Government to dictate solutions to local transportation authorities. But we can make available financial assistance which will rectify the existing imbalance in favor of highway travel, and furnish some of the means necessary for research and improvement.

The Congress must act speedily to pass two bills which I am privileged to cosponsor in the House. One of them, H.R. 10172, first introduced by Senator TYDINGS, permits States to direct part of their Federal highway allocations toward mass transit systems. This will hopefully restore some equity to the Federal Government's approach to transportation.

Second, I am sponsoring H.R. 9997, first proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], amending the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for technological research into new, streamlined forms of commuter service. We need this desperately. It will not be good enough to rely solely upon conventional bus and rail facilities in the decades ahead. To attract riders away from the automobile must constitute our principal objective, in order to untangle the urban traffic jams and make modernized public transport reasonably self-sufficient. We need research to hatch new concepts of commuter travel that can compete effectively with the relative comfort and convenience of the family car.

I am certain, however, that further assistance is needed. I welcome President Johnson's proposal for a new Federal Department of Transportation. Additional legislation should be drafted to assist urban transit systems in meeting part of their operating deficit on a matching basis. This can only be viewed as a stopgap measure, of course; it is self-defeating and unproductive to subsidize urban transportation systems when too often these systems lack any prospect for technical advancement or self-betterment. Without providing the means toward improving conditions, a subsidy would merely perpetuate inadequacy.

Hence we need legislation which authorizes increased assistance toward urban mass transit systems for modernization of facilities. This should be made available to municipalities, contingent upon two assurances: first, that all autonomous urban units dealing with transportation are integrated into one authority; and second, that this authority demonstrate the will and ability to come forward with long-range, comprehensive programing to meet the city's present and anticipated transportation demands.

I emphasize this latter point because one mode of travel affects every other. A new, urban freeway will enhance automobile traffic on city streets, but it may also attract subway riders and add to the line's operating loss. All this must be properly coordinated by a single unit where finances are pooled for the benefit of all commuters. I suggest that we should expect coordination and intelligent planning before the Congress commits additional revenue.

We cannot afford to cater to one group of commuters while ignoring others. What, for instance, will be the impact of constructing a crosstown automobile artery in mid-Manhattan? Will the bridges and tunnels be capable of handling the new flow? What will happen to access roads leading to this new artery? Will not traditional subway and bus routes be disadvantaged, and, if so, to what extent? Is this the best way to improve short-haul travel in midtown? Does this artery represent a priority claim on public funds?

I submit that these questions are very much in order in any rational planning undertaking for transportation. Only a citywide, coordinated transportation authority can initiate the long-range planning of commuter services in an honest and forthright fashion, without prejudice, without haphazard commitments, without waste of public funds. City governments which have not yet done so must move to merge funds and jurisdiction in the field of transportation.

The Congress must encourage the modernization of mass transit, making it swift, clean, safe, and comfortable. I hope that we can produce new programs that will help arrest the tide that is making urban transit a monstrous failure in this scientific age.

BALTIC STATES CONTINUE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on November 13 I had the honor and privilege of addressing the Baltic States Freedom Rally at Madison Square Garden in New York City. More than 25 years ago, the Russian Communist Government moved its military might into these three tiny, but proud states—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—to liberate them. As always, the Russian liberation meant an end to freedom and the beginning of a nightmare of tyranny, terror, and godless totalitarianism. Despite overwhelming odds and a Western indifference that leaves the soul cold, these people have not quit the battle—as witness, the 13,000 who filled Madison Square Garden at noon on November 13. In their honor, I would like to have included in the RECORD the brief remarks I made on that occasion. While these remarks do not offer the solution to the problems of these fine people they do serve to show that their fight has not been forgotten by this country, President Johnson and U.N. Ambassador Goldberg. The American people join with freedom loving people the world over in praying that true liberation and freedom will be returned once again to the Baltic States.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN J. ROONEY, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, AT THE BALTIC STATES FREEDOM RALLY, MADISON SQUARE GARDEN, NEW YORK CITY, NOVEMBER 13, 1965

Mr. Chairman, Reverend Fathers, and my friends, I want you to know at the outset that I count it a real honor to be invited to address this distinguished audience and to participate in this historic event. It is heart-warming to be among so many of my old friends. It is with sincere pride that I join with you, my local fellow Americans, in your battle for the freedom of your oppressed countrymen. This is indeed a battle for the peace of the world.

You are in the forefront of the same dedicated cause to which His Holiness Pope Paul is so devoted. I am sure that all of you received from His Holiness Pope Paul on his recent visit to this country tremendous encouragement to continue your efforts in behalf of others less fortunate than ourselves. One of my most gratifying and impressive experiences was to participate in the historic meeting of our President with His Holiness at the Waldorf Astoria Towers on October 4. Today, as I take a part in this moving demonstration with you who have come from all over the country, I feel more of an American than ever.

My friends, it is important that Americans be stimulated to keep fresh in their minds the tragic fate which befell your fathers and mothers, your brothers and sisters, your kinsmen, and your friends when the Soviet Union committed one of the blackest crimes in the history of mankind. What greater example of deceit was the purported liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia when in 1940 the Russians moved their military might into those small liberty-loving countries.

What a mockery of justice and what a prostitution of common decency was that illegal act of a mighty nation in swallowing up a small suffering wartorn one. Significant as was the savagery of the initial act of occupation, but it was to be exceeded by even more ruthless acts of Communist oppression. It was the forerunner of suffering, injustice and a shocking loss of life. But it gave advance warning of the rule of terror, the forced subjugation of proud people and the mass deportation of loyal citizens.

I am proud not only that my country has continuously condemned the atrocious act of the Russians in their illegal annexation of Lithuania and her sister Baltic States, but that the United States has been steadfast in refusing to recognize any Soviet interests in these states.

I am proud that I have been permitted to introduce and support legislative measures to secure remedial action through international tribunals.

I continue to join with those who today seek to obtain consideration of this tragic problem by the United Nations. I plan to discuss with the distinguished Ambassador to the United Nations, Hon. Arthur J. Goldberg, certain positive approaches which should be made to accomplish maximum results from any United Nations action.

For 25 years your kinsmen and your friends have suffered at the hands of their Communist slave masters. But in spite of deprivations, in spite of the loss of self-determination, the people of Lithuania, of Estonia, and of Latvia with your help and encouragement, have preserved an undying desire to live as free men. They have nourished and kept vibrantly alive a national spirit predicated on the dignity of man. But they need our encouragement to carry on. They need the help of the free and independent countries of the world to help them to preserve the ideals which they hold dear and to preserve for posterity the culture and traditions which you and they value almost as much as life itself.

They need more radio broadcasts by American facilities to give them in their own tongue by their own countrymen a continuous program of truth and factual information to offset the effects of a Communist-controlled press. They need the maximum in our continued flow of gifts of food, medicines, and clothing. These vital essentials of life must get to them without the loathesome tax which you might now pay before shipment and delivery to the addressee can be assured. I am asking our Department of State to give this matter priority attention.

America can be grateful for the glorious contributions made to this country by those who were successful in fleeing the oppression of both the Nazis and the Reds. You, through whose veins flow the proud blood of Lithuania have enriched America by your industry, your culture, your art, and most significantly your passionate love of independence.

I am proud that only a few weeks ago it was my honor to serve as Chairman of the Whole House on the State of the Union and guide our great immigration bill through to sucessful enactment. I rejoice that this country can now extend the hand of welcome to those who like so many of you, can and will contribute greatly to America's growth and success.

I feel it is important to remind you that we who can enjoy unfettered freedom should rejoice and be ever grateful for it. Whenever we as Americans start taking our liberty and our independence for granted, even then freedom may begin to vanish. Whenever we become complacent about the denial of freedom to our fellow men regardless of nationality or race or color, and whenever we cease to fight all types of enslavement and oppression, even then we are guilty of a devaluation of our own freedom.

It is important for all Americans and particularly those of us assembled here today to be reminded of what our great President, Lyndon B. Johnson, said with regard to our precious commodity, freedom, and our personal responsibilities for the preservation of liberty.

Speaking before a distinguished group assembled on Liberty Island to witness his signing of the historic new immigration bill, the President stated, "When the earliest settlers poured into a wild continent there was no one to ask them where they came from. The only question was: Were they sturdy enough to make the journey, were they strong enough to clear the land, were they enduring enough to make a home for freedom, and were they brave enough to die for liberty if it became necessary to do so."

It is important that every American ask himself time and time again the President's questions: "What am I doing to make a home for freedom?" And, "Am I brave enough to die for liberty if it becomes necessary to do so?" All of us can rejoice that millions of Americans can and do answer both of these questions in the affirmative.

It is important that your fine Lithuanian American organizations and those serving Latvian and Estonian interests as well as so many of you as individuals are dedicated to the task of restoring independence and sovereignty to the country of your birth. I am sure that Americans everywhere are impressed by your devotion to the cause which you espouse. America recognizes, too, the depth of your loyalty to this your adopted country. As one of these Americans I congratulate you on your great work and on your zeal to have a massive wrong righted. To the maximum extent of my ability I pledge to support your efforts and the efforts of others to achieve independence and the opportunity to enjoy a democratic way of life for all peoples who today are enslaved.

May God grant us all the wisdom and will to erase soon one of the horrible blots on the pages of history. With His help may we bring to the saddened and discouraged grownups and to the eager aspiring youth of your homelands the golden light of freedom. May we return to them the glorious vision of a land of opportunity and hope for themselves and their children, and may we forever help them to banish the blackness and despair of perpetual night and live again in the light and warmth of independence.

LET US STOP ALLIED SHIPMENTS TO NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last April, following the President's historic address at Johns Hopkins University, I called for a greater commitment in southeast Asia by our allies, especially Great Britain and France. Not only have our allies failed to make such a commitment, but they have been continuing to make shipments of cargoes essential to the economy of North Vietnam.

I am certain that all Americans want a meaningful and honorable peace to be achieved in Vietnam. I believe the President has made a supreme effort toward that goal. However, the fact remains that we are at war with North Vietnam and American boys—husbands and fathers—are being killed in increasing numbers in that war.

Although allied shipping to North Vietnamese ports has declined during the past year, from 7 to 15 British-flag vessels a month land such vital supplies as oil at Haiphong and other ports. More than half the free-world ships which sent cargoes to North Vietnam in the first 6 months of 1965 were British.

This deplorable situation must not be permitted to continue. I am well aware that allies shipping to North Vietnam has declined steadily and that U.S. diplomats are continuing their efforts to effect further reductions. But this is not enough. As long as American soldiers are fighting and dying in Vietnam, no nation of the free world must be permitted to send supplies to their killers. If it takes more than diplomatic representations, even if it takes an outright embargo on allied shipments to North Vietnam, then we must take that step.

If the lives and safety of Americans mean anything to the administration, it will take the necessary steps to stop allied shipping to North Vietnam at once.

I therefore urge my colleagues to join me in requesting President Johnson to put an end to the free world supply line into North Vietnam.

IMPROVING THE SMALL BUSINESS LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the small businessmen of our Nation are now facing a grave crisis in securing credit to expand and strengthen their firms.

The action of the Federal Reserve Board in raising the rediscount rate is already resulting in higher credit costs for small businessmen. Ordinarily, some relief would be available through the programs of the Small Business Administration. However, the SBA has been forced to resort to the drastic alternative of not accepting applications for loans either under the regular business loan program or loans under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This crisis has been precipitated by the drain on loan funds caused by the earthquake in Alaska, the Mississippi River floods in the Midwest, and Hurricane Betsy. Certainly everyone would agree that disaster loans should continue to be available in areas where they are needed. But, the extension of disaster loans should not be permitted to cause a breakdown of the regular loan programs throughout the Nation.

Therefore, I am pleased to join with Senator PROXMIRE of Wisconsin in introducing legislation which will provide for separate revolving funds rather than the present combined fund. Three funds will be created. The first fund will be used for loans under the regular business loan program and economic opportunity loans. The second fund will support the disaster loan program. The third revolving fund will be used for programs under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. This legislation is designed to provide a simple and effective preventive to future dislocations of the loan programs by natural disasters.

The small businessman is faced by a crisis in credit and not the least of his worries is the present paralysis of the SBA loan program. The reform and reinvigoration of that vital Government service for business demands the immediate attention of this Congress.

SECRETARY ROBERT C. WEAVER

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, this body responded to the needs of our cities by supporting the President's request for the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Last week the President announced his choice of Robert C. Weaver to head this new Department. President Johnson is to be commended and congratulated on his choice.

Dr. Weaver brings to this vital and challenging task experience and expertise which are unequaled. His record of Government service started almost immediately after leaving Harvard in 1933. He became an adviser to Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes.

In 1934 he received his doctorate in economics from Harvard and assumed the position of special assistant in the Federal Housing Authority which he held from 1937 to 1940. During World War II he was with the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission.

During the postwar period he held teaching positions at Columbia and New York Universities.

In 1956 he was named New York State's deputy housing commissioner and later State rent administrator by then Gov. W. Averell Harriman.

Dr. Weaver became the first Negro to serve on a New York Governor's cabinet. He becomes the first Negro in the history of the Nation to serve in the Presidential Cabinet.

The President's choice of Dr. Weaver reflects the esteem in which he is held.

It is a tribute to Dr. Weaver that the President chose him to head the Department which must deal with one of our Nation's most pressing and vital domestic problems—our cities.

To Dr. Weaver I can only express my personal gratification at his appointment and my pledge of support in his efforts.

GRAND JURY INDICTMENT CHARGING VIOLATION OF NATIONAL SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing and reading so much about draft card burnings, so-called conscientious objection to serving in our Armed Forces, and efforts to circumvent our selective service law that I am sure the general membership would be interested in a specific grand jury indictment charging violation of the national selective service law and how the case was disposed of.

In the case of the *United States of America* v. *Murphy Paul Dowonis*, No. 30216 of the criminal docket of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, Judge Robert A. Ainsworth, Jr., made such a clear statement of the issues and gave such convincing reasons for imposition of sentence that I make it a part of the extension of these remarks in the RECORD and commend it to my colleagues:

[U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana—Civil action No. 30216, criminal]

STATEMENT BY THE COURT IN CONNECTION WITH IMPOSITION OF SENTENCE ON DEFENDANT FOR SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW VIOLATIONS, JANUARY 12, 1966

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *v.* MURPHY PAUL DOWOUIS

AINSWORTH, ROBERT A., JR., Judge: You have been indicted by the grand jury and have pled guilty to four counts charging violation of the national selective service law, in that you failed to keep your draft card in your possession, failed to advise your draft board of your home address, did not keep your draft board advised of your mailing address, and failed to report to the board when so directed.

You have stated that your violation of the selective service law is pursuant to a policy of noncooperation with your draft board, and that you have refused to comply because you believed that the entire conception of universal military training was an unjust law. That you had no responsibility to cooperate with that law. That you are free not to follow any law if it runs against your personal views or if your conscience is pushing you to act that way. You announce that you believe that as a Catholic you are acting in the Catholic tradition. You state that a person's conscience overrides anything that the Government orders him to do.

In passing the present Universal Training Act, Congress wisely foresaw that there would be cases where individuals subject to combatant service in the Armed Forces of the United States would, because of religious training and belief, be conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. The act allows such a person to claim exemption from combatant service. If the draft board upholds the claim for exemption the individual is assigned to noncombatant service, or if then conscientiously opposed to participation in noncombatant service, in lieu of such induction he may be ordered to perform certain civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety or interest as the local board may deem appropriate.

The record discloses that your religious and conscientious scruples were duly noted by your local board, reviewed by the State general counsel, and held to be in fact conscientious and sincere; that you were then tendered an exemption from both combatant and noncombatant military service, and offered an opportunity to satisfy your draft obligation by a 2-year tour of duty at the Lighthouse for the Blind, an institution dedicated to the welfare of blind persons, at New Orleans. You declined and refused, pursuant to your policy of noncooperation, returned your draft card to your local board stating in a letter to the board that you would not carry such a card because to do so would display an agreement with the principle of conscription, and that you would not submit voluntarily to further military classification even though you fully realized that the consequences of such a decision would be imprisonment.

The presentence investigation which we ordered in this matter discloses that you are 24 years of age, have completed 1 year of college, that you are a person of talent and intelligence and that your record is free of felony convictions. You have apparently dedicated yourself to a life of service to your fellowman, particularly the poor and downtrodden, most recently having worked for the Catholic Worker in New York City as a volunteer staff employee, receiving no compensation, only room and board.

Justice Frankfurter, speaking for the U.S. Supreme Court in *Minersville School District v. Gobitis*, in 1940, wrote that "the affirmative pursuit of one's convictions about the ultimate mystery of the universe and man's relation to it is placed beyond the reach of law. Government may not interfere with organized or individual expression of belief or disbelief. Propagation of belief—or even of disbelief in the supernatural—is protected, whether in church or chapel, mosque or synagogue, tabernacle or meetinghouse." The Justice also said that "no single principle can answer all of life's complexities. The right to freedom of religious belief, however dissident and however obnoxious to the cherished beliefs of others—even of a majority—is itself the denial of an absolute. But to affirm that the freedom to follow conscience has itself no limits in the life of a society would deny that very plurality of principles which, as a matter of history, underlies protection of religious toleration." He concludes in his opinion that "Conscientious scruples have not, in the course of the long struggle for religious toleration, relieved the individual from obedience to a general law not aimed at the promotion or restriction of religious beliefs. The mere possession of religious convictions which contradict the relevant concerns of a political society does not relieve the citizen from the discharge of political responsibilities. The necessity for this adjustment has again and again been recognized."

The United States could not long remain the great Nation it is today if its citizens could refuse with impunity to obey the laws of the land, dependent upon their personal scruples or opposition to them. No person has the right to set himself above the law, for respect for law is the foundation for liberty. The law must have an authority supreme over the individual.

Selective service laws are founded on the constitutional power to declare war, to raise and support armies, and to make rules for the government and regulation of land and naval forces. Compulsive military service is neither repugnant to a free government nor in conflict with the constitutional guarantee of individual liberty.

The selective service law is absolutely indispensable to the defense and safety of this country. There can be little doubt that we could not long survive the forces of international communism if we did not have a strong military defense organization. Nor can anyone seriously question what would happen to the freedoms we cherish and enjoy were we not so powerful militarily as to maintain them. It is the undoubted policy of this Nation, as stated by President Johnson and supported by the Congress, that the United States does not desire war, seeks no foreign conquests, would subjugate no peoples, and desires only peace in the world. We fight because we want to live.

The conscientious scruples of the individual who is opposed in principle to the selective service law must therefore yield to the common good if we are to have respect for law and maintenance of our national security.

The sentence which we decree today is imposed for the protection and best interests of the public, for this is the prime consideration in proper sentencing. We are cognizant in this case of the necessity of furnishing an effective deterrent to others. It is the duty of a judge of the U.S. courts to enforce congressional policy as reflected by the selective service law.

I have been interested in your statement that you are acting in what you believe to be the Catholic tradition. As a member of the same religious faith, educated in a Catholic high school and college, I regret with equal sincerity that I do not agree. Military service in the Armed Forces of the United States has had no religious denominator. Catholics, as well as those of other religious beliefs, have had records of valor and bravery in all of the great wars in which our Nation has been involved. Catholics have not felt circumscribed by their religious beliefs in fighting for the people of America. The Vatican Council, in its recent pastoral "Constitution on the Church in the Modern World," furnishes an effective modern guideline for purely Catholic belief. Though the Council states that it "cannot fail to praise those who renounce the use of violence in the vindication of their rights," it acknowledges that "war has not been rooted out of human affairs," and comments that "as long as the danger of war remains and there is no competent and sufficiently powerful authority at the international level, governments cannot be denied the right to legitimate defense once every means of peaceful settlement has been exhausted."

The Council document points out that "those, too, who devote themselves to the military service of their country should regard themselves as the agents of the security and freedom of peoples. As long as they fulfill this role properly they are making a genuine contribution to the establishment of peace."

I have no doubt of the sincerity of our Government in its fervent desire and search for peace in the world; that the military actions which it takes now, particularly in Vietnam, are defensive to prevent the spread of godless communism in the attempted subjugation of peoples with the consequent deprivation of their freedom. Americans are, of course, free to disagree and to express their disagreement with American foreign policy. But the American right to dissent does not carry with it immunity for willful violation of the laws of the land. Our national security, both internal and external, could not long survive such lawlessness.

Obedience to and respect of the law can mean the difference between freedom and political slavery, between the democratic way of life as we know it, and mere existence under the iron grip of dictatorship; it is the difference between civilization and chaos.

A citizen's first duty, therefore, is to uphold the law. We are rightly proud of our great Nation and of our priceless heritage of individual opportunity, liberty and justice. But hand in hand with these basic rights go the parallel duties of every citizen to obey the law. Every right presupposes a duty. Consequently, if we are to enjoy the cherished rights of free speech, press and assembly, the right to worship in the church of our choice, the right to privacy, to due process, to vote—in summary the right to be an American citizen—we must accept certain responsibilities, the most important of which is to obey the law.

I say to the draft card burners and draft evaders and noncooperators that your actions in willfully violating the national selective service law unwittingly give aid and comfort to the enemies of this Nation. The North Vietnamese dictator takes support and encouragement from such actions and though it is within his power to do so, he denies the people of his nation and of the world an honorable peace much desired and prayed for by all right-thinking people. As a member of the judicial branch of this Government, I cannot countenance the violation of a law as important as the Selective Service Act under the serious conditions which prevail today in the world, particularly as they apply to the American people.

The court sentences you to the custody of the Attorney General for imprisonment in such place as he may designate, on count 1, for a period of 2 years; count 2, 2 years; count 3, 2 years; and count 4, 2 years; said sentences to run concurrently.

FOUND: ONE GENIUS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest benefits to be derived from the Johnson administration's war on poverty is the turning of useless, hopeless lives into productive, hopeful ones which contribute an individual's fullest potential to his society, his family, and himself.

On December 25, 1965, there appeared in the Tampa Times an outstanding article dealing with one individual's experience as a participant in a program of adult basic education through Operation Hopeful run in Tampa by the local State welfare agency. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD. I commend it to my colleagues:

FOUND: ONE GENIUS

A 33-year-old mother of two who dropped out of school in the eighth grade was given a high school diploma last week by Principal F. H. Thomas at the Albany Street quarters of Project Hopeful.

Mrs. Patricia Newell, of 3508 Avon Avenue, has been an enrollee in the State welfare department sponsored poverty project since October. Now she hopes to go on to college.

"To my knowledge," Principal Thomas said, "this is the first diploma issued to a student in an adult basic education program in the entire United States."

Throughout the country, he explained, adult basic education programs are set up to provide academic training for adults at about the eighth grade level.

When she enrolled in Hopeful in October, Mrs. Newell had an interview with the project's work placement specialist, retired Army Lt. Col. Russell F. McCallister.

Initial tests revealed that Mrs. Newell had attained a ninth grade educational level. She told McCallister that her hobbies were reading and music, and that more than anything else, she longed to be an anthropologist.

"I felt right then and there," McCallister noted, "that this girl had something different. I had a tiger by the tail, so to speak."

Mrs. Newell started classes in the project's Albany Street classrooms. Less than a month later, another test indicated her educational level had advanced to a 12.7 rating. In other words, she had surpassed the 12th grade level.

Next she took an IQ test. Her 148 score on that classified her as a genius.

Now Mrs. Newell is filling out her application for entrance to the University of South Florida. She'd like to be admitted there in January, and begin studying history.

"I'd like to get started," she said.

Mrs. Newell was lavish in her praise of the project.

"I think it's wonderful," she replied when asked her evaluation of Hopeful. "I know several of the girls—well, it's really helped them a lot," she explained.

Only 3 months ago, when she first heard about the project, however, Mrs. Newell wasn't as sold on it.

"I wasn't too sure," she pointed out. "You know how Government things are."

But now, even her children share her enthusiasm.

"They think it's great," she said. "I think they've spread it all through the neighborhood that 'Mommy's graduated from high school.' "

THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday evening, President Johnson, in delivering his annual state of the Union message to the Congress, set forth both clearly and forcefully the goals and ambitions of the United States. Each of us is aware of the pressures on the President. Each of us is aware of how easy it would have been for him to simply say to the Congress, "We must lay strong emphasis on our foreign relations, so I propose that we hold our program for domestic progress in abeyance."

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, we have a courageous President who knows history. He realizes only too well that unless we move forward with our domestic program while we are at our economic best, the dreams and hopes so long nurtured will be put in mothballs for another generation.

The conflict in Vietnam must be prosecuted forcefully. This is self-evident. Equally self-evident is the fact that here at home the many pronged war against privation, discrimination, and lack of opportunity must likewise be prosecuted.

Mr. Speaker, our President could have come up here and said that we had worked hard enough last session, now take a break. He could have acknowledged the accomplishments of the first session with no request that Congress continue the battle. That might have been the easiest route, from a standpoint of mental and physical pressure. Our President, though, chose to set before us the unfinished business of the land. We are fortunate for his candor.

When I was elected to this body in 1964, I realized that the job involved many personal sacrifices and long months of hard work. Still, if our President is willing to make these same sacrifices, then I submit that each of us in Congress must be willing to assume his share of the burden.

The task of securing honor abroad and progress at home is a difficult one. We must join with our President in performing that task.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, in his state of the Union address, eloquently gave Congress and the Nation a detailed plan aimed at keeping our international commitments while increasing the opportunities and raising the standards of health and education of many Americans. His belief, which I share, is that despite enormous difficulties, the richest Nation in the world, can accomplish these aims.

The President has, quite justifiably, told the American people that the brutal and bitter conflict in Vietnam must of necessity be the center of our concerns.

But at the same time, President Johnson was equally correct when he said that this country is strong enough to pursue its goals in the rest of the world while still building a Great Society here at home.

We are that strong. We are that capable. And I have no doubt but that the American people are that determined.

I remind my colleagues that history has recorded time and time again that "when there is no vision, the people perish."

The recommendations which the President has presented represent that vision. Ours is a vital, moving, and dynamic society. As such, it must either move ahead or stagnate from inactivity.

We would do well, I think, to consider these recommendations seriously and thoughtfully.

Many of my colleagues are heartened by the President's proposal that the Congress take additional far-reaching steps to insure equal justice to all of our people by effectively enforcing nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection. Recent events in the news have proved the wisdom of that consideration. We must make sure, through whatever legislation is necessary, that the intent of the people and of this Congress are not circumvented to the great detriment of the rights provided each individual by the Constitution.

In my opinion, attention also must be given to the President's proposal that the obstruction of public and private efforts to secure civil rights should be made a serious Federal crime.

I also endorse the President's recommendation of streamlining the Federal Government through the creation of a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation. The lack of effective transportation planning has turned out to be one of the most seriously persistent problems of a country that is on the move, and is a problem which continues to plague great cities like Cincinnati.

My colleagues have every reason to be heartened by the President's restatement that the executive branch will attack waste and inefficiency. The President could not have phrased his comment more aptly when he said:

> We will make sure that every dollar is spent with the thrift and with the common sense which recognizes how hard the taxpayer worked in order to earn it.

The President has left us with magnificent challenges. It is well that he has done so. The great task before this Congress is that of implementation. I feel that at the end of this session we shall be able to give to the American people a satisfactory rendering of our stewardship.

A BILL GUARANTEEING THE RIGHT TO WORK

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about the so-called right to work, but not much has been done about the real right to work. I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to guarantee to each American able, ready, and willing to work, the right to work. My bill would make it the continuing obligation of the Federal Government, through amendments to the Employment Act of 1946, to take such action as would assure that each member of the American labor force has a job either in private industry or with the Government at some level, Federal, State, or local. The bill may be cited as the right-to-work law.

The guarantee of the right to work would be accomplished by a requirement for a detailed plan under a national employment and production budget of our short-range and long-range prospects for employment and production. This plan would be coupled with a full employment Federal budget which would indicate the level and direction of Federal spending necessary to assure the right to work under the indicated conditions for employment shown by the plan. The bill would make appropriate allowance for necessary turnover in employment because of persons going in and out of the labor market, what is usually called frictional unemployment. But beyond this, each American wishing to work would have an opportunity for employment either in private industry or for the Government. There would be no involuntary unemployment.

Adequate flexibility would be provided in the act by safeguards to assure reasonable price stability. An interim goal of maximum employment would be established of not less than 96 percent of the labor force until June 30, 1968. Thereafter, the goal would be increased to 97 percent, leaving 3 percent unemployment as the maximum permissive gap between employment and unemployment.

What we are doing under this bill is first, improving, updating, and strengthening the economic planning apparatus envisioned in the Employment Act of 1946, and second, committing the Federal Government to a program of action to realize the national plan, or to assure full employment.

It should be added that under the Employment Act of 1946 the Federal Government adopted the goal of maximum employment. Unfortunately, this worthy objective has not been attained. Unemployment in the past has reached what I consider astronomical proportions, although the rate has been declining in recent years. Still, the toll of joblessness in terms of human waste and human misery is unacceptable. How can this tragedy be justified or even explained in a society as affluent and powerful as America.

I urge upon this body, Mr. Speaker, the early consideration of this bill. By this measure guaranteeing every American the right to work, we will enable our businessmen to plan for the future knowing the size of their markets and the income of their customers. It will enable our farmers and ranchers to plan their production against a guaranteed domestic market. This bill means that all Americans, regardless of age, race, religion, national origin, or sex, will always have a job suitable to their ability. The bill will end involuntary unemployment forever. It will bring to America what Americans want above all else, the right to a job opportunity, the right to work.

For these reasons, I have titled my bill, the right to work law. I had, however, another reason. One of the most flagrant deceptions visited upon Americans in recent years has been the misappropriation by certain segments of our society of the phrase "right to work" as a propaganda cover for the passage of legislation prohibiting collective bargaining agreements between labor unions and management. Despite this deception, "right to work" is a phrase with a real meaning, the right to a job, the right to earn one's livelihood for oneself and one's family. This phrase strikes a responsive chord of deep-felt human need, the need for economic security. This need underlies all the social legislation enacted into law by Congress under the last four Democratic administrations. From the social security program to the war against poverty enlightened legislators have sought to grant to Americans some degree of economic security.

A poor man has but one genuine material possession, his job. Take that away from him and he is soon helpless and liable to be thrown on the economic scrapheap. It is thus also my hope that by this bill the phrase "right to work" will be reclaimed by those with a genuine concern for the workingman from those who mock him, and that it will be restored to its original and true meaning.

I sincerely hope that many other Members of this body will join me in introducing this legislation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. Quie, for January 19, 20, and 21, on account of official business, investigating poverty program in Los Angeles, Calif.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Conte, today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. McDade), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mr. Quie (at the request of Mr. McDade), for 60 minutes, on January 20; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mr. Rooney of New York (at the request of Mr. Gibbons), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mr. Flood (at the request of Mr. Gibbons), for 1 hour, on January 25; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mr. Flood (at the request of Mr. Gibbons), for 1 hour, on February 16; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Miller and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McDade) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Martin of Alabama in two instances.

Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gibbons) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Todd.

Mr. St. Onge in two instances.

Mr. Abbitt.

Mr. McGrath.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 774. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 18, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1884. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force transmitting a report of the aggregate number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force at the seat of government, pursuant to the provisions of section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1885. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize a dislocation allowance for travel performed under orders that are later canceled, revoked, or modified; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1886. A letter from the Executive Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1887. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of disposal of excess foreign property in foreign countries, for calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1888. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the expenditure of appropriated funds for insurance covering the operation of motor vehicles in foreign countries; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1889. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

1890. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket Nos. 88, 330, and 330-A, *The Southern Paiute Nation, et al., Petitioners*, v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055: 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1891. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 205, *The Seminole Nation, Petitioner*, v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055: 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1892. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket Nos. 138 and 339, *The Iowa Tribe of the Iowa Reservation in Kansas and Nebraska, the Iowa Tribe of the Iowa Reservation in Oklahoma, et al., Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, et al., the Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, the Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri, Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa, et al., Petitioners*, v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1893. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting copies of all laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, in its 1965 regular and special sessions, pursuant to the provisions of section 9(g) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1894. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1821 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem, mileage, and subsistence allowances of witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1895. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General for Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report of total number of positions in GS-16 and GS-17, during calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 1105a; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 12069. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to corporations for contributions to colleges and universities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 12070. A bill to amend section 201(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that quota numbers transferred to the immigration pool shall be available for issuance of visas to nonpreference immigrant aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12071. A bill to amend section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to waive the labor certification requirement with respect to nonpreference immigrant aliens from any Communist or Communist-dominated country or area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 12072. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

H.R. 12073. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize issuance and sale of participation interests based on certain pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 12074. A bill to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1965 to eliminate the provision which denies hospital insurance benefits to uninsured individuals who are members of certain organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 12075. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 12076. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease surplus land to the county of Orange for fair market value and to permit a credit against rental payments thereunder for the amortized cost of a county constructed bypass channel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 12077. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration hospital located in Clarksburg, W. Va., the Louis A. Johnson Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 12078. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAIRD (by request):

H.R. 12079. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a pension under title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 12080. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to protect any veteran against a loss of pension as a result of enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 12081. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for the payment of annuities thereunder to children over 18 and under 22 who are full-time students; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 12082. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to claim a personal exemption for his spouse, where such spouse is a student being supported by the taxpayer, regardless of such spouse's gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 12083. A bill to provide a system for the return of Federal income tax revenues to the States to be used exclusively for educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 12084. A bill to amend section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to waive the labor certification requirement with respect to nonpreference immigrant aliens from any Communist or Communist-dominated country or area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12085. A bill to amend section 201(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that quota numbers transferred to the immigration pool shall be available for issuance of visas to nonpreference immigrant aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 12086. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, to provide additional protection for civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, to prescribe additional penalties for violations of civil rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12087. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 12088. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat sintering or burning as a mining process in the case of shale, clay, and slate used or sold for use, as lightweight concrete aggregates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 12089. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 12090. A bill to guarantee the right to work; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 12091. A bill to require that the net seigniorage on coins issued under authority of the Coinage Act of 1965 shall be used for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 12092. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall acquire additional land for the Beverly National Cemetery, N.J; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 12093. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that employers having pension plans under which payments are correlated with social security benefits shall be subject to an additional tax in cases where increases in such benefits result in a reduction in their own contributions under such plans and are not passed on to their retired employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 12094. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 12095. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1930 (popularly known as the Capper-Cramton Act), to authorize the National Capital Planning Commission to accept the donation of scenic easements over certain real property between the George Washington Memorial Parkway and the Potomac River in Prince Georges County, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 12096. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12097. A bill to amend section 5(1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide benefits for children of deceased railroad employees who are over the age of 18 and below the age of 22 and are attending an educational institution as full-time students; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 12098. A bill to provide additional benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for certain disabled former employees of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12099. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 12100. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 12101. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide that wherever possible owners shall be notified of condemnation proceedings instituted against their property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 12102. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.J. Res. 803. Joint resolution extending the date for transmission of the Economic Report; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H. Con. Res. 533. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to modification of the extradition treaty between the United States and Italy so as to include narcotics violations within the provisions of such treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Con. Res. 534. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. Con. Res. 535. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H. Con. Res. 536. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 537. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 538. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 539. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 540. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POFF:

H. Res. 664. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the

Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Res. 665. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

386. By the Speaker: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to the adoption of truth-in-packaging legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

387. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to Senate Resolution 7 requesting the U.S. Supreme Court not to interfere with the qualifications of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H.R. 12103. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fernande M. Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 12104. A bill for the relief of Nicholas A. Panousiaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 12105. A bill for the relief of Bian-Djoen Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 12106. A bill for the relief of Mirko Gros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 12107. A bill for the relief of Anthony Di Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12108. A bill for the relief of Dr. Renato R. Espina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12109. A bill for the relief of Hideo Uchiyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 12110. A bill to provide for the free entry of one ship model for the use of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Mapel Heights, Ohio; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 12111. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Franciszek Bugajski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 12112. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Mario Buraglia and their children, Concetta and Giuseppe Buraglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary

H.R.12113. A bill for the relief of Dr. Petra Elena Parrenas Banogon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12114. A bill for the relief of Mario Veneziano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.Res. 666. Resolution honoring the late Rossell G. O'Brien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

314. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to the term of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives; to the Committee on Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

This, too, O Lord, is a day which Thou hast made; we will rejoice and be glad in it. For though there is darkness at noon, and men and nations have lost their way, we know that we are not God forsaken. Thou art still the light of those who turn to Thee, and Thy way can still be known among men.

Thou hast sustained and delivered our beloved country in other days of darkness. Now, again, we lift our prayer with confidence: God bless America.

Guide us through the darkness of our day. Deliver us, we pray, from the dangers that beset us. Enable us to communicate to the wide world our sincere desire for a prosperity shared by all mankind.

Because our hope is in Thee, Our Fathers' God, we are not despairing. We are confident that a better way than we have ever known may yet be found by Thy guidance.

To this end grant to every Senator, this day, the light of Thy presence. Bless and strengthen every attitude expressed in support of that righteousness which exalteth a nation, every effort put forth to extend the reach of that aggressive good will that may yet find the way to an honorable and lasting peace. In His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 14, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Annual Report on the Foreign Assistance Program of the United States for fiscal year 1965, which I here transmit, shows what Americans have done during the past 12 months to help other people help themselves.

The record of these months offers new testimony to our continuing conviction that our own peace and prosperity here at home depends on continued progress toward a better life for people everywhere.

In pursuit of that goal, we have, during this past year, placed new emphasis on the basic problem of securing more food for the world's population.

We have agreed to extend technical assistance to countries asking for help on population programs. At the same time, our overseas missions have been directed to give priority to projects for achieving better agriculture. Additional resources of our great universities have been applied to rural development efforts abroad, and we have moved to increase the nutritional value of food shipped overseas for children.

During these past 12 months we have also:

Begun to make education a more vital part of our assistance to other nations. Today, 70 American universities are engaged in the development of 39 Asian, African, and Latin American countries through this program.

Given our full support to development of a new life for the people of southeast Asia through a regional development program—a true and hopeful alternative to profitless aggression. We have made progress toward the establishment of an Asian Development Bank, and accelerated plans for development of the critical Mekong River Basin.

The 12 months covered by this report also reflect our progress toward making our aid programs both more realistic, and more efficient. For example:

Foreign assistance has become a smaller factor in our balance of payments. In fiscal year 1965, more than 80 cents of every AID dollar was spent for the purchase of American goods and services. American products and skills went overseas as aid; most of the dollars which paid for them stayed in this country.

Foreign aid has become a smaller burden on our resources. The $3.5 billion committed for military and economic assistance in fiscal year 1965 represented 3.5 percent of the Federal budget and one-half of 1 percent of the U.S. gross national product.

At the height of the Marshall plan, in comparison, foreign aid accounted for more than 11 percent of the Federal budget and nearly 2 percent of our gross national product.

Perhaps the most important single change in our AID programs has been the shift from simply helping other countries stay afloat to helping them become self-supporting, so that our assistance will no longer be needed.

Three-fourths of our AID program in fiscal year 1965 was devoted to development assistance: programs of technical and capital assistance in agriculture, industry, health, and education that strengthen the ability of other nations to use their own resources.

Finally, private participation in AID programs is at an alltime high. Through contracts with American universities, business firms, labor unions, cooperatives, and other private groups, AID has sharply increased the involvement of nongovernmental resources in international development.

Two of every five AID-financed technicians in the field today are not Federal employees, but experts from private American institutions.

There is much in the less-developed world that causes us deep concern today: enmity between neighbor nations that threatens the hard-won gains of years of development effort; reluctance to move rapidly on needed internal reforms; political unrest that delays constructive programs to help the people; an uncertain race between food supplies and population.

We are right to be concerned for the present. But we are also right to be hopeful for the future. In this report are recorded some of the solid, human achievements on which our future hopes are based.

Whether it provides strength for threatened peoples like those in southeast Asia, or support for the self-help of millions on the move in Latin America, in Africa, in the Near East and South Asia, our foreign assistance program remains an investment of critical and promising importance to our own national future.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 17, 1966.

WAIVER OF CALL OF CALENDAR UNDER RULE VIII

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar under rule VIII, for the consideration of unobjected-to measures be waived.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

MONTANA PIONEER DIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the final days of 1965, I was saddened to learn of the death of one of Montana's pioneers and finest citizens. The passing of Tom Stout brought to a close a most colorful and accomplished career.

Tom Stout was a politician, editor, and publisher in the finest tradition. He was active in Democratic politics and served the State of Montana in the House of Representatives for two terms. Interestingly, he was sworn in standing between Sam Rayburn and John Nance Garner. The vast majority of Tom Stout's life was devoted to journalism. He started as a reporter and then became editor and publisher of the Fergus County Democrat in Lewiston. In his later years, he was editorial writer for the Billings Gazette.

Tom Stout has a long and full life, one to which we can all aspire. He was a good friend and one who will be missed. Mr. President, I ask that two editorials and a news story be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Great Falls Tribune, Dec. 29, 1965]

WE HONOR THOMAS H. (TOM) STOUT

In 1902, a 22-year-old ex-teacher who had just been admitted to practice law in Missouri, asked a railway agent at Hannibal, Mo., how far he could get for $25.

The homesteaders' rail fare to Billings happened to be $21.85 so Thomas H. (Tom) Stout arrived in Billings on Easter Sunday of 1902.

Tom Stout made many contributions to Montana before he died at Billings Sunday night. He served two terms in Congress, several terms in the Montana Senate and also the house of representatives and was a member of the Montana Railroad and Public Service Commission. He also was a distinguished newspaper publisher, a prominent Democrat and a Montana historian.

While he was a State senator in 1913, Stout introduced a resolution which paved the way for women to get the right to vote in Montana.

Above all, Tom Stout was a charming, witty, and gracious Montanan.

[From the Lewistown Democrat News, Dec. 28, 1965]

TOM STOUT, FAREWELL

The death of Tom Stout marks the end of a brilliant career of a man who called Lewistown home for 45 years but was acclaimed all over Montana for his achievements in newspaper, political, and literary fields.

Hailed as one of the founders of this newspaper, he was known and loved by the residents of this area who appreciated his warm, genuine style of writing and his friendly, gentle manner.

Above all else, Tom Stout was acclaimed for his outstanding editorials. While he was never one to shy away from taking a stand and was noted for the many issues for which he crusaded, still he was always fair and his editorials reflected his own qualities of kindness and consideration for others.

Described by one of his many friends as a highly intellectual student, Tom Stout is also remembered for his three-volume "History of Montana," standard equipment in newspaper offices for almost half a century.

Not only was he acclaimed for his accomplishments in the newspaper world, but Tom Stout was also active in politics and served in both the State legislature and the U.S. Congress, as well as on the Montana Railroad and Public Service Commission.

Words are ineffectual to describe the contribution made by Tom Stout to this newspaper, this community, and the State of Montana. Suffice it to say he will be sadly missed by all those who cherished his friendship and by the wider circle of those who admired and enjoyed the fruits of his talents.

[From the Lewistown Democrat News, Dec. 28, 1965]

TOM STOUT, EARLY-DAY PUBLISHER AND EDITOR, DIES IN BILLINGS SUNDAY

Tom Stout, 86, founder of this newspaper, and one of central Montana's most prominent figures for half a century, died Sunday in Billings. Funeral services have been set for Wednesday at 2:30 p.m. at the Settergen-Carey Funeral Home in Billings.

Stout first came to Lewistown in November 1902, to accept a job as a reporter on John Vrooman's newspaper, the Fergus County Argus. In 1904 he and Harry J. Kelly started the Fergus County Democrat, later buying the Lewistown Democrat News.

Stout was especially well known throughout the State for his excellent editorials. He served as editor and publisher of the Lewistown Democrat News until he sold the paper in 1946. During the years 1947–60 he wrote editorials for the Billings Gazette.

Active in Democratic politics from the time he came to Montana, Stout was elected State senator from Fergus County in 1911 and again in 1913. He resigned as State senator in 1913 to become Representative at Large in the U.S. Congress. He was sworn in standing between Sam Rayburn and John Nance Garner, both of whom were also starting their term in the Legislature. He was reelected to another term at the next election, but did not seek reelection in 1916, and returned to the newspaper in Lewistown.

In 1930 he was elected to the Montana Railroad and Public Service Commission. He was a candidate to the Democratic national convention in 1908 and to all State conventions from 1904 to 1946.

Stout was elected a Fergus County State representative in 1942 and was reelected in 1944 and 1946.

Not only prominent for his achievements in the newspaper field and politics, Stout also gained recognition as a writer with his three-volume "History of Montana" published in 1922. The history was considered standard equipment in newspaper offices all over the State.

Stout was one of 13 charter members of the Lewistown Rotary organized in 1916 and served as its first president. When he left Lewistown he continued as an honorary member of the Lewistown organization until the time of his death.

Tom Stout was born May 20, 1879, at New London, Mo., a son of Mr. and Mrs. Jacob E. Stout. He received his formal education at Warrensburg State Normal School and the University of Missouri at Columbia. He studied law and was admitted to the Missouri bar in 1901 and to the Montana bar in 1913, but never practiced.

In 1904 he married Lelah Wunderlin of Lewistown, who preceded him in death.

He married Sibyl Sherlock in Helena on August 12, 1936. Besides the widow, he is survived by a son, Coleman Stout, city editor of the Current-Argus at Carlsbad, N. Mex.; two daughters, Mrs. Maxine Vincent of Boston and Mrs. Barbara Shloss of Levittown, N.Y.; two step daughters, Mrs. Edward Rech of Greybull, Wyo., and Mrs. Lawrence Knopp of Utrecht, Holland; eight grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

The Rev. Jess McGuire will officiate at the funeral service with burial following in Mountview Cemetery.

Active pallbearers will be Glen Carney, J. Strand Hilleboe, Harold Seipp, Ross Bowman, Wilbur Pique, and William Buckley.

Honorary pallbearers include former Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, W. C. Rae, J. H. Dickey, Jr., Harry E. Lay, Earl McGinnis, Dan Whetstone, J. Rusty Larcombe, A. E. Wilkinson, E. K. Cheadle, Joe Montgomery, William Schmidlapp, Erwin Judd, and A. S. d'Autremont.

THE DANGEROUS SITUATION ALONG THE VIETNAMESE-CAMBODIAN BORDER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a recent editorial in the New York Times which refers to the highly dangerous situation along the Vietnamese-Cambodian border. It discusses the threat by Cambodian Prince Sihanouk to ask for foreign help—presumably from Communist China—if American commanders launch attacks into the northeastern part of his country. The editorial states:

> The answer to the Cambodian problem cannot be found through wider war, but only through widening the present Vietnamese peace offensive.

This problem is touched on in the report to the Senate by Senators Aiken, Muskie, Inouye, Boggs, and myself which was made after our recent tour of southeast Asia. The report states the following:

> Cambodia, in a different manner and to a much lesser extent than Laos, is already directly touched by the fighting in Vietnam. There are repeated charges that Cambodian territory is being used as a base for Vietcong operations. That is possible in view of the remoteness and obscurity of the border but there is no firm evidence of any such organized usage and no evidence whatsoever that any alleged usage of Cambodian soil is with the sanction, much less the assistance, of the Cambodian Government. Prince Sihanouk responded immediately to a recent allegation that the Cambodian port of Sihanoukville is being used to transship supplies to the Vietcong by calling for an investigation by the International Control Commission which was set up under the Geneva Accords of 1954.
>
> Cambodia's overwhelming concern is the preservation of its national integrity which, in times past, has been repeatedly violated by more powerful neighbors and is still subject to occasional forays from a minor dissident movement (the Khmer Serai) which has been allowed to base itself in the neighboring nations. Cambodia seeks recognition and respect of its borders by all parties to the conflict. It asks to be left to live in peace so that it may concentrate on its own problems and internal development. The Cambodians have made great internal progress, largely through their own efforts supplemented by a judicious use of aid from the United States in the past and from other nations both in the past and at the present time. They have a peaceful and productive nation with an intense sense of national unity and loyalty to Prince Sihanouk.
>
> The fact that fighting in South Vietnam has raged close to the border and there have, as a result, been occasional border incursions and bombing of Cambodian territory has caused the deepest concern to the Cambodian Government. Cambodia can be expected to make the most vigorous efforts to resist becoming directly involved in the struggle surging through South Vietnam and to repel to the best of its capability direct and organized invasions of its territory which may stem from the mounting tempo of the war.

Prince Sihanouk has suggested a way to settlement of this explosive problem which should receive the most careful consideration from all concerned. He has asked for expanded observer patrols in the area under the auspices of the International Control Commission. U.S. funds would probably be necessary to carry out this suggestion. But the ultimate cost to this Nation of such a venture would be infinitesimal compared to that of expanded conflict beyond Vietnam into northeastern Cambodia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the January 5 issue of the New York Times be included at this point in the Congressional Record. In addition I ask that three articles by Stanley Karnow which portray the current situation in Cambodia, with emphasis on the border question, also be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 5, 1966]

The Cambodian Border

The authorization to American commanders in Vietnam to launch attacks into northeastern Cambodia in "self-defense" has now brought notice to the United Nations from Prince Sihanouk that if this happens he will seek foreign military assistance—presumably from Communist China—for reprisal raids.

This warning deserves to be taken seriously, much as Cambodia's ruler may hesitate to endanger his country's future independence by inviting in Chinese "volunteers." The lesson of the past 5 years in Vietnam is that every measure of escalation leads to another, each matched successively by the other side. Cambodia is not likely to be an exception.

The answer to the Cambodian problem cannot be found through wider war, but only through widening the present Vietnam peace offensive—which should continue, despite the initially negative response yesterday from Hanoi.

In giving notice to the United Nations, Prince Sihanouk renewed his proposal for expanded observer patrols by the International Control Commission, as set up under the 1954 Geneva accords. This proposal—for which the Prince asks American contributions of funds and equipment—involves monitoring arms shipments to Cambodian forces through the southern Cambodian port of Sihanoukville.

To extend this project to cover the rugged jungle terrain of northeastern Cambodia, as the United Nations Secretariat reportedly is urging, would be a task of much greater difficulty. Many hundreds of observers might be needed. But it would be well worth the cost to the United States if an effective system could be established to reduce incidents. A far larger operation than this will be necessary to police a South Vietnamese peace settlement when one is reached. The experience and training gained in Cambodia would be invaluable.

Vietcong and North Vietnamese units reportedly regrouped in northeastern Cambodia for renewed attack during the Iadrang Valley battle in November, but this evidently was an unusual event. Repeated investigations by Western newsmen as well as by the ICC have failed to turn up proof that the Communists make major use of Cambodia either as a sanctuary or as an infiltration route for men and supplies into South Vietnam. The route through Laos is shorter and there are plenty of isolated areas in South Vietnam itself in which to cache supplies.

The limited importance of Cambodia to either side in Vietnam should make it far easier to reach a Cambodian agreement than a Vietnam settlement. Yet the use of the Geneva machinery for this purpose might help both sides ease into preliminary discussions on ending the war in Vietnam itself.

The dispute with Cambodia calls attention again to the absence of direct American contact with Phnom Penh. When Prince Sihanouk broke diplomatic relations, he indicated willingness to continue consular relations with the United States, but the State Department decided to withdraw completely. An offer to reestablish an American consulate in Phnom Penh would be an act of wise diplomacy.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 28, 1965]

Tranquil Nation Fears War—Trek Finds Cambodia No Vietcong Haven

(The writer has just returned from a 10-day trip, covering 3,000 miles through Cambodia by jeep, helicopter, and on foot. Further reports will follow.)

(By Stanley Karnow)

Hong Kong, December 27.—Reminiscent of a French prefecture, the Cambodian capital of Phnom Penh is a pleasant town of handsome villas and luxuriant gardens and people who doze through their afternoons—as if the turbulence of southeast Asia were light years away.

The peace that pervades Phnom Penh and the rest of the land is the most striking achievement of Cambodia's Chief of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk. It is an achievement he repeatedly stresses in his ceaseless stream of oratory.

In the 12 years since it won independence from France,. Sihanouk asserts, Cambodia's neutrality has saved it from the fate of its neighbors.

It is not, like Laos, torn by civil strife. In contrast to Vietnam, it is not being destroyed by war. Unlike Thailand, it has not become the site of foreign bases that invite Communist subversion.

Over the years, Sihanouk has preserved peace in Cambodia by tactics so flexible as to have made him appear whimsical.

After a decade of dependence on American aid, he broke diplomatic ties with the United States last May and veered sharply toward Communist China, irritating the Soviet Union in the process. At the same time, he has strived to strengthen his bonds with France, and he is currently trying to improve his relations with Australia, Great Britain, and Japan.

Shifty as they seem, however, Shihanouk's moves have been basically motivated by a clear, consistent aim. Playing for time, he has hoped to spare his people repetition of the ruinous history that nearly reduced them to extinction. In his view, communism is a less appalling prospect.

But if Sihanouk's adroit vamping for time has thus far given Cambodia its years of calm, his time may be running out. And the capital's air of tranquility often appears betrayed by the perceptible feeling that Cambodia faces bitter days ahead.

WAR'S SPREAD FEARED

This mood of pessimism reflects the fear that the war in Vietnam may spill over Cambodia's borders.

Within recent days, American commanders in Vietnam have been advised that they have the "inherent right of self defense" to enter Cambodia in pursuit of their enemy. For months, American press dispatches have dramatized allegations that Cambodia is a base and sanctuary for Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops.

Mindful of their history, Cambodians see this growing danger as a signal that the hated Vietnamese, who invaded their land in the past, have found a new pretext for aggression.

Time and again within recent years, Sihanouk has sought to protect himself against the threat of war. Time and again he has met with disappointments.

His request 3 years ago for an international conference to guarantee his neutrality was rebuffed by the United States, reticent to acknowledge a formula applicable to South Vietnam. But later, when the idea seemed more plausible to Washington, it was rejected by Peiping.

BORDERS UNDEFINED

His efforts to define his borders with Vietnam, in talks with Saigon as well as Hanoi and Vietcong representatives, have been unsuccessful.

At the Communist-dominated "Indochinese Peoples Conference," in Cambodia last March, Sihanouk was not permitted to deliver a speech pleading for a negotiated peace in Vietnam. Instead, he had the speech printed and quietly distributed.

But while emphasizing his neutrality, Sihanouk often acts, perhaps impulsively, to undo the effect he creates, frequently leaving his most ardent admirers bewildered.

He has denied giving material aid to the Vietcong. Yet in a public ceremony here last September he affirmed his political support for them, matching his statement with a "humanitarian" gift of 40 cases of medicine.

INVITED INSPECTION

Since then he has disclosed that he is considering the sale of Cambodian rice to the Vietcong. Says his Prime Minister, Prince Norodom Kantol: "We will sell rice to whoever pays us the best price—in hard currency."

Though they strenuously deny that supply routes pass from Cambodia into the Vietcong-held areas of Vietnam, Cambodian officials decline to reveal how their gift of medicines reach the Vietcong belligerents.

With all this, however, Sihanouk is almost desperately anxious to disprove charges that Cambodia is a significant source of backing for the Vietcong. And in this effort he has displayed considerable good faith.

Earlier this month, for example, he invited the International Control Commission, composed of Indian, Canadian, and Polish delegates, to inspect as thoroughly as they wished the port of Sihanoukville, alleged to be the entry point for weapons destined for the Vietcong.

On December 13, moreover, Sihanouk authorized the Control Commission to follow weapons shipments, due to arrive from China, to Cambodian army barracks and arsenals, and to register their further movements. The Commission will also be allowed to record activities at a Chinese-built weapons repair factory south of Phnompenh.

Such freedom of movement, say Commission officials, has not been accorded elsewhere in Indochina.

LETS IN CORRESPONDENTS

Concurrently, Sihanouk has invited selected American newspaper correspondents into Cambodia to determine whether it is being used as a Vietcong sanctuary or base. Such an invitation was extended to the New York Times in September. A similar invitation was sent to the Washington Post 3 weeks ago. I arrived on December 13, after stopping in Saigon for a briefing on the suspicious areas to note inside Cambodia.

Accompanied by a Cambodian official, but free to choose my itinerary—or improvise it en route—I covered much of the Vietnam border, often landing along the way in remote outposts. In addition, I spent a day in Sihanoukville.

Proving this negative charge of border violations is difficult, particularly where unmarked frontiers stretch for miles under a canopy of vegetation. It would take thousands of men several years to examine every foot of the Cambodian border area adjacent to Vietnam.

IMPLAUSIBLE ACCUSATIONS

However, it was possible to measure certain charges against firsthand observations—and in every case the accusations turned out to be implausible.

The charge made by Thailand's Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman last September, that 27,000 Chinese were learning guerrilla tactics at Sihanoukville, seemed to lack any shred of credibility. Nor does Sihanoukville, which abounds with Western shipping agents, appear a satisfactory landing place for Vietcong weapons when compared to the coasts of Vietnam itself.

The charge that Cambodia's roads and rivers are used as Vietcong supply routes appears equally unlikely. Highway 19, which once ran into Vietnam's highlands, now ends abruptly at a river whose bridge was destroyed a decade ago. Highway 14, in southeast Cambodia, fades into jungle 2 miles from the Vietnam border.

NO RED CAMPS FOUND

Another charge published is that Vietcong training camps, with Vietcong flags flying, dot the Cambodian countryside. But a cruise around the region at an altitude of 100 feet revealed no such camps. There was a charge that the hospital at Kampot, not far from Sihanoukville, is used by the Vietcong. Within the past 2 months, about 20 Cambodian refugees from Vietnam have been brought into the hospital, suffering from gunshot wounds.

Many of the border villages within Cambodia have markets stocked with Vietnamese merchandise, from plastic toys and soap to cigarettes and pans. This suggests a lively smuggling trade between the two countries.

Some 300,000 Chinese and 400,000 Vietnamese reside in Cambodia, and some of these are known to profit handsomely from smuggling.

Furthermore, it is difficult to believe the official Cambodian assertion that Vietcong operatives do not cross into Cambodia to tax local Vietnamese residents or recruit them. After all, the Vietcong official, Tran Buu Kien, turns up in Phnom Penh occasionally while the Australian Communist journalist Wilfred Burchette, who resides in Phnom Penh, frequently crosses the border to interview Vietcong leaders in Vietnam's Tayninh Province.

DIFFICULT SANCTUARY

Beyond these details, however, the key question is whether Cambodia is a significant sanctuary for the Vietcong.

In the judgment of Western analysts here, northeast Cambodia, supposedly the strongest base region for the Vietcong and North Vietnamese, is deficient in rice, supporting its own scarce population with great difficulty.

Moreover, it would seem very much against Communist guerrilla strategy to build a "hard base" in an uncontrolled foreign land governed by a chief of state whose political sentiments are variable.

And finally, it is doubtful that the Cambodians, who passionately hate Vietnamese of any ideology, would knowingly make their country vulnerable to American attack for the sake of sheltering a traditional enemy.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 30, 1965]

Proving Neutrality Is Task—War Fears Terrify Cambodia as Leader Struggles for Peace

(By Stanley Karnow)

Hong Kong, December 29.—The Vietnam conflict, already extended into North Vietnam and southern Laos, now appears to be approaching the edge of further expansion—into adjacent Cambodia.

The prospects terrifies Cambodians. They foresee their peaceful land transformed, like Vietnam, into a frightful battlefield. But to avoid that catastrophe, their chief of state, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, may have to perform something like a legal miracle.

Beyond press dispatches, no official evidence has been advanced to substantiate charges that Cambodia serves as a sanctuary for Vietnam's Communist troops. Nevertheless, Sihanouk is under pressure to prove that his country does not willfully or even inadvertently aid the Communists. If he fails, Cambodia could suffer the consequences.

Against such odds, Sihanouk has been desperately trying to demonstrate his innocence.

INVESTIGATIONS INVITED

Early this month he invited the Indian, Canadian and Polish delegates of the International Control Commission, created by the 1954 Geneva accords, to inspect Cambodia thoroughly.

At the same time, Sihanouk asked the Washington Post to pursue a parallel investigation. The Post said it was not equipped to investigate such a complex problem but welcomed an opportunity for a trained reporter to see for himself. As the Post's correspondent for southeast Asia, I was selected for the assignment.

From the start I realized that it would be a delicate and unenviable task—if only because the whole issue of alleged Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia has become politically loaded.

COMMENTS HEIGHTEN TENSION

For one thing, Sihanouk has prejudiced himself by heightening tensions with his provocative rhetoric. He extols Red China, proclaims his sympathy for the Vietcong, likens President Johnson to Hitler, and then expects frustrated American commanders in Vietnam to believe he is "100 percent neutral."

The issue has been further complicated by divergent attitudes within the U.S. mission in Saigon. Many diplomats, wary of the political implications of an enlarged war, are restrained in their charges against Cambodia. Thus far their views seem to have prevailed over those of their most daring military colleagues.

The region's historic rivalries also confuse and aggravate the situation. Vietnamese and Thai accusations against Cambodia, their traditional enemy, are often as fantastic as Cambodia's countercharges.

Added to these abstract complexities is the physical terrain I was invited to examine.

DIFFICULT BORDER REGION

The Cambodia-Vietnam border region comprises thousands of miles of highland jungle, lowland swamp, lofty mountains and rolling hills, much of it sparsely inhabited by primitive tribes that barely speak Cambodian.

Obviously I could not poke into every thatched hut in each forest clearing. I could not be sure that frontier guards, customs officers, provincial officials and others would speak the truth. I was not even certain that my interpreter would translate my questions faithfully.

Yet I had, from the Cambodian Government, striking evidence of cooperation—an Alouette helicopter, tireless pilot, and total freedom to travel when and where I wished. Thus I was clearly not the victim of a gigantic conspiracy contrived to mislead me.

In Saigon, where I stopped before going to Cambodia, military and civilian officials seemed far less dogmatic in their charges against Cambodia than many press reports bearing Saigon datelines.

SUSPICION OF ARSENALS

These officials suggested that the arsenal of 7.62 millimeter Chinese Communist weapons now used by the Vietcong may have been introduced from Cambodia into South Vietnam about 2 years ago and hidden in caches until recently. Indicated that stocks of Vietcong explosives, lately uncovered in South Vietnam's delta, might have been manufactured from nitrates and other chemicals transported down the Mekong River from Cambodia.

Beyond these details, offered with some reservation, Saigon sources appeared unable, or perhaps unwilling, to extend firmer intelligence on Vietcong activities in Cambodia.

The morning of my arrival in Phnom Penh, Cambodia's capital, Sihanouk had publicly invited the ICC to keep permanent inspection teams at the port of Sihanoukville and control weapons shipments to Cambodian army barracks, headquarters and supply centers.

Western diplomats in Phnom Penh considered Sihanouk's offer a welcome gesture of good faith, but whether the ICC was equipped for the job aroused some doubt.

The Commission's dozen officials in Cambodia cannot conceivably keep watch on 30,000 Cambodian troops, much less control the country's borders. To expand the ICC effectively would require years of financial negotiations and organization.

But by the time I reached Sihanoukville, 145 miles south of Phnom Penh, three ICC colonels had manfully begun to inspect cargo manifests. The Canadian delegate struck pay dirt: The movie unit that filmed "Lord Jim" in Cambodia last year had imported a case of rifles.

Built by the French within recent years, Sihanoukville is a small port and relatively easy to examine. During November, two Chinese Communist ships had unloaded cargo there. Inside the port's single warehouse I examined the Chinese merchandise—herbs, paper, honey candy, and assorted pots and pans.

A shipment of Chinese weapons had reached Sihanoukville last spring, Cambodian port officials told me. One of them said: "Why should we give them to the Vietcong when we need them for our own soldiers?"

SMUGGLING IS COMMON

Though the coast is patrolled by United States and South Vietnamese vessels based at the Vietnamese island of Phuquoc, smuggling is common. I learned, however, that most of the contraband consists of beer, cigarettes and nylon fishing nets brought from Vietnam and Thailand and exchanged for Cambodian fish and soybeans. Authorities apparently tolerate this traffic.

I did not observe the 27,000 Chinese Communist guerrillas, alleged by Thailand's Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman to be training at Sihanoukville. Nor did I feel that the port, whatever its past, is currently on the Vietcong supply route.

At the nearby town of Kampot, however, I encountered evidence that the Vietnam border, 30 miles away, is not hermetically sealed. Within a recent 2-month period, about 20 Cambodian refugees from Vietnam were brought into the local hospital, suffering from gunshot wounds.

Conjecture in Saigon had suggested that the Kampot hospital was used by the Vietcong. The resident physician, a Paris-educated Chinese, did not know his patients' political persuasions, but said they all spoke Cambodian. They had been discharged or transferred to Phnom Penh by the time of my visit.

MONDULKIRI VISITED

On the morning of December 16, aboard a vintage Cambodian Army DC–3, I flew east to Senmonorum, the capital of Mondulkiri province. I was accompanied by Ches San, a former Cambodian diplomat now serving at Secretary of State for Information.

Bordering the Vietnamese provinces of Darlac and Quangduc, Mondulkiri was created only 5 years ago in an effort to populate and fortify Cambodia's eastern frontier region in line with the historic fear of Vietnamese intrusion. None of Cambodia's 400,000 Vietnamese residents is permitted to reside in the area.

It is an uninviting region of rolling, treeless hills, so poor that it must import rice. Apart from primitive tribes, its population is composed of only 1,000 families, half of them dependents of a local battalion, half of them "pioneers." Its military governor, Maj. Khieu Boun, is a former French Army sergeant who fought against the Vietminh when it unsuccessfully attempted to invade Cambodia in March 1954.

FEW SIGNS OF LIFE

This area has been considered a southernmost extension of the "Ho Chi Minh trail." His leathery face wrinkling into an ironic smile, Boun scoffed at the allegation: "If we are so poor ourselves, how could we nourish the Vietcong?"

I suggested a closer look at the neighborhood, and we climbed into Boun's Landrover, heading southeast over what maps generously call National Highway 14. Actually it is a narrow dirt road that parallels the Vietnam border as it winds through barren hills. The only sign of life we saw in 2 hours was a truckdriver changing a tire on his gravel truck.

We passed a scarred hillside where 2 years ago, a U.S. transport airplane crashed, killing its eight crewmen. Though American sources believe the aircraft suffered from mechanical failure, Boun proudly explained that his men had brought down the intruder with submachinegun fire.

Finally we reached Camp Le Rolland, a former French outpost sometimes cited as a Vietcong base. I had expected a romantic fort in Beau Geste style. Instead I found a bleak square of earthworks garrisoned by a handful of shabby Cambodian provincial guards.

From the camp I could look into Vietnam, observing through binoculars an American special force outpost at Buprang 4 miles away. The bucolic scene seemed as peaceful as a Sunday in New England.

Did traffic pass into Vietnam? We pushed on along Highway 14. Within 50 yards it dwindled into a weedy path. Within a mile it stopped at a wall of jungle.

It was near there that, by chance, we met a typical Cambodian frontier patrol—four barefoot tribesmen with filed teeth and distended earlobes, three of them carrying ancient French or British rifles. They could not recall seeing Vietnamese in the area. But then, one of them volunteered, he would not recognize a Vietnamese if he saw one.

Familiar as they are with the countryside, such tribesmen seem a woefully inadequate force. Moreover, Cambodia's entire military strength in its eastern border area is fewer than four battalions, most of them working on farms, roads and rubber plantations.

After spending the night at Lomphat, the mosquito-infested capital of Rattanakiri Province, we set out by helicopter to cover the more sensitive northeastern frontier sector.

It is here that the Vietcong is said to be flying its flags brazenly over training camps. It is here that Communist supply trucks are supposed to ply highways. It is here that North Vietnam's elusive 325th Division allegedly has its headquarters, and it is here that its troops are reported to retreat to rest and regroup.

Flying at about 100 feet, we cruised over Highway 19, barren except for a few bicycles. Along the way we observed Bo Kheo, described in some press reports as a key Communist post. It is a sprawling village whose alleged "radio antennae" are primitive bamboo and rope contraptions used in its local zircon mines.

At Oyadao Highway 19 ends abruptly at a river whose bridge was destroyed over a decade ago in the Indochina war. Here we found some 400 Vietnamese refugees who fled into Cambodia last August. In the opinion of Chea San, the Cambodian official with me, however, these miserable peasants were potential aggressors who had no business in his country.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 31, 1965]

South Cambodia Seems Likelier Vietcong Arena

(By Stanley Karnow)

Hong Kong, December 30.—Cambodia's southern border with Vietnam would seem a more propitious sector for minor Vietcong activities than its impoverished eastern frontier, where my trip by helicopter and plane turned up no solid evidence that the Vietcong have established a "hard base" there.

From my 2-day tour of the southern zone I could not determine whether the Vietcong used it as extensively as they did some years ago. In September 1961, for example, the Cambodian Army discovered 500 guerrillas camped in Svay Rieng Province, driving them back into Vietnam after a 2-hour battle.

I could deduce, however, that this stretch of the border is far leakier than Cambodian officials would publicly acknowledge—although one official privately admitted, "What we don't see, we don't know."

AS LOW AS 100 FEET

Before examining the southeastern border I completed my tour of the northeast frontier, helicoptering over many areas at altitudes as low as 100 feet.

I noted that an apparently uninhabited plateau of jungle interspersed with swamps extends far into Vietnamese territory before it reaches the Annamite Mountains. This contradicts some press accounts that describe the Vietcong "disappearing over the mountains into Cambodia."

At Lom Kom, a lonely outpost 3 miles inside the border, a young Cambodian lieutenant said he had never seen Vietcong or Vietnamese Government troops cross the frontier. "I am not saying they are not here," he added carefully. "I have just never met them."

TRIBESMEN CONCUR

Tribesmen who patrol the region concurred. As to local natives giving rice to Vietnamese, they said, "We cannot feed outsiders. We are short of food ourselves."

We then wound down the serpentine Iadrang Valley, and saw nothing stir except a frightened deer. We touched down at Voeune Sai, another alleged Vietcong camp, and found a sleepy riverside settlement preoccupied with its experiments to improve rice production.

That the Vietcong may slip in and out of the eastern border region, I cannot doubt. But unless they have miraculous means for getting food, I find it hard to imagine that the sector could constitute what guerrillas call a "hard base."

RIVERS DESERTED

That the area serves as a significant Communist supply route seems to me unlikely. Its rivers were deserted. Except for the Mekong River, the region's roads and waterways runs east-west rather than north-south. When the Vietminh invaded Cambodia in 1954, they came down the Mekong Valley, an impossibility for them at present.

The southern area, by contrast, is lush, abundant in rice and other food. On the Cambodian side it is largely populated by Vietnamese who, denied Cambodian citizenship even by birth, are politically unreliable. It is also a region in which smuggling continues, much like the free trade of French colonial days.

Legal commerce between Cambodia and South Vietnam has been severely curtailed since the two countries broke diplomatic relations. Truck traffic has ceased between Phnom Penh and Saigon, and even a secondary road from Phnom Den over the border to Apannong has been blocked. Cambodian river barges cannot enter Vietnam, and Vietnamese barges are barred from Cambodia.

Nevertheless, Vietnamese goods are widely available, especially in border areas.

SHOPS OVERFLOWING

At the village of Phnom Den, for instance, I found local shops overflowing with plastic toys, soap, shirts, and kitchen utensils, all made in Saigon. Everywhere in Cambodia I encountered Saigon beer, which Cambodians prefer to the heavy brews imported from Eastern Europe.

Some of this merchandise enters Cambodia through frontier barter markets tolerated by both governments. But most of it appears to be handled by well organized Chinese and Vietnamese smugglers. And it seems plausible that, for strictly commercial motives, they sell rice, chemicals and other products to the Vietcong.

After all, even Cambodia's Prime Minister, Prince Norodom Kantol, told me that he would sell rice to the Vietcong—if they paid a top price in hard currency.

Though roads and waterways are officially closed, merchandise may cross the border aboard nocturnal sampans or on coolie's backs. When Chief of State Norodom Sihanouk gave 40 cases of medicine to the Vietcong last September, there was no doubt they would find their way into Vietnam. In a similar manner, Vietcong agents traverse the frontier.

At Bavet, a border post in Svay Rieng province, I asked the local governor where the frontier might be crossed illegally. Such crossings, he replied, were "formally prohibited." He declined to clarify, however, how the Australian Communist writer, Wilfred Burchett and various Vietcong representatives travel back and forth to Vietnam. He also refused to point out where two American prisoners, released by the Vietcong in Cambodia last month, were taken across the border.

A RING OF TRUTH

With all this, there is a ring of truth to the tales of wounded Vietcong seeking refuge over the border, or Vietcong agents entering Cambodia to recruit skilled Vietnamese workers.

In a broader sense, however, it remains to be judged whether these details, deductions and suppositions add up to a significant indictment of Cambodia. Moreover, the Cambodians must apparently produce evidence of their innocence while their accusers have yet to offer firm evidence of Cambodian guilt.

Thus the possible extension of the Vietnam war into Cambodia, while serious, seems bewildering—and dangerous.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. **ROBERTSON**, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. Res. 173. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations, and to provide additional funds therefor (Rept. No. 941); referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. **SPARKMAN**, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. Res. 172. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Banking and Currency (Rept. No. 940); referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (REPT. NO. 942)

Mr. **ROBERTSON**. Mr. President, I submit the 15th annual report of the activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, with material on mobilization from departments and agencies, and ask that it may be printed. I ask unanimous consent that a release, prepared by me, relating to the report, may be printed in the Record.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The report will be received and printed; and, without objection, the release will be printed in the Record.

The release is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, ON ANNUAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Senator A. Willis Robertson, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, in releasing the committee's 15th annual report, called attention to the fact that the report discloses increasing use of priority assistance for critical materials and military items, upward pressures on prices, and increasing demands similiar to those which led to the necessity for price controls, industrywide allocations of material and products, and other emergency measures of a wartime nature during World War II and Korea.

Adequate fiscal and monetary policies are necessary, Senator Robertson stressed, in order to reduce the danger that such direct controls may have to be imposed.

The Joint Committee on Defense Production has the responsibility for reviewing programs under the Defense Production Act, which provides the authority currently being used to insure timely production for the Vietnam conflict. It was under the Defense Production Act that American productive capacity of critical materials and products was greatly increased during the Korean war and that the economy was regulated through price controls and allocations.

In releasing the report, Chairman Robertson stated:

"The report indicates that the economy is beginning to show the impact of the Vietnam buildup and that in areas of heavy defense production the already short supply of manpower may get serious. Some shortages of capacity have developed and other industries are operating at or near capacity."

The authority for priorities and allocations of materials provided in the Defense Production Act has become increasingly important to insuring the delivery of weapons to Vietnam. The report states:

"As the Vietnam situation became intensified and our commitments became heavier, the use of priority ratings has become absolutely vital to delivery of end items."

Senator Robertson pointed out that recent increases in the price of materials have almost wiped out the book loss of over $1.2 billion in Government inventories of critical materials which has been widely publicized in the recent past. These book losses resulted from declines in market prices of materials from the high prices paid for such materials during the Korean war. Senator Robertson stated:

"The elimination of $1.2 billion in book losses during a 2-year period provides additional evidence that inflation is with us. The materials markets cannot be separated from the remainder of the economy. As the cost of inflation passes on to the producers of materials, the resulting price increases will be reflected in every segment of the economy. Materials are required to build and to operate the assembly lines that supply the needs of both the military and the civilian economy."

With regard to the effect of these price increases, Senator Robertson said:

"While the United States may recover losses or make substantial profits on its inventory of materials during this inflationary period, the buying public will not have a similar offset against inflation."

Much of the national stockpile was acquired through purchases of materials from expanded production authorized in the Defense Product Act. Senator Robertson further stated:

"The emergency needs of the Vietnam war again demonstrate the necessity for maintaining adequate quantities of essential materials to meet any emergency and the need for carrying out long range programs for the sale of surplus materials, while giving due consideration to market conditions, in order that the right materials will be available in the right quantities at the right time.

"Unneeded materials, such as excesses purchased under Public Law 206 contrary to the views of this committee for non-defense purposes, do not help us solve the copper shortage."

In further commenting on emergency needs for materials, Senator Robertson said:

"I favor an up-to-date review of the emergency needs for each strategic and critical material, with due regard to our dependence on foreign sources, population changes, production methods, total commitments, and related factors. Such study should give consideration to expediting requirements figures from the military services and improving the methods for translating weapons requirements into materials requirements promptly and without delay."

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. **ROBERTSON**, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Robert C. Weaver, of New York, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; and

Robert C. Wood, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. **LAUSCHE**:

S. 2771. A bill for the relief of Hazel Louise Schuman Strunk; and

S. 2772. A bill for the relief of Bozica Pucnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. **NEUBERGER** (for herself and Mr. Morse):

S. 2773. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Olalla division of the Umpqua project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Br. Mr. **THURMOND** (for himself and Mr. Russell of South Carolina):

S. 2774. A bill to grant the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across the Savannah River between South Carolina and Georgia; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Thurmond when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **McCARTHY**:

S. 2775. A bill to provide for payment of survivor annuities to the widows of certain former Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. **JAVITS** (for himself, Mr. Kennedy of New York, and Mr. Morse):

S. 2776. A bill to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1965 so as to eliminate therefrom certain provisions which deny hospital insurance benefits to certain individuals otherwise eligible therefor because of their membership in certain subversive organizations or their prior conviction of crimes involving subversive activities; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **LONG** of Missouri:

S. 2777. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which deny social security and hospital insurance benefits to uninsured individuals who are employees or members of certain organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Missouri when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

Mr. **MONTOYA** (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 2778. A bill to amend the act providing financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families in order to provide financial assistance for the education of orphans and other children lacking parental support; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONTOYA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **PEARSON**:

S. 2779. A bill for the relief of Maria Lourdes Sunga Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. PEARSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana:

S. 2780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an optional simplified tax method, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **MORSE** (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 2781. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Monmouth-Dallas division, Willamette River project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. **MONRONEY** submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 69

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, established by Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to March 11, 1965, is hereby authorized, from February 1, 1966, through December 31, 1966, to expend not to exceed $140,000 from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PLACING OF BUST OF CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI IN THE CAPITOL

Mr. **DOUGLAS** (for himself, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, and Mr. CLARK) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) authorizing the placing of a bust of Constantino Brumidi in the Capitol, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. **SPARKMAN** (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 178); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 178

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, as amended and supplemented, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committee of the Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $145,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION BY DUKE POWER CO. OF A DAM ON THE SAVANNAH RIVER

Mr. **THURMOND**. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], I send to the desk a bill to authorize the construction of a small retaining dam across the Savannah River by the Duke Power Co. I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

This bill is similar to legislation I joined in introducing on May 3, 1961, and again on May 11, 1964. The only change in the bill this year from the one introduced in 1964, is at the end of section 1 where minimum water releases from Hartwell Reservoir, upstream from the site of the Duke power dam, are provided for. The nature of the facility proposed to be constructed and operated by Duke Power Co. requires that a minimum weekly water release from Hartwell averaging 1,500 cubic feet per second be assured.

Mr. President, the economic advantages of the States of South Carolina and Georgia, the local communities involved and to the Nation as a whole which would result from this project are beyond compare. The initial capital expenditures for the construction of the proposed facility on the part of Duke Power Co. would be $210 million. According to the latest figures available, the facility would require approximately $24 million worth of coal per year since it is a steam generating plant, and not a hydroelectric project. Other operation and maintenance costs, exclusive of fuel, would be approximately $3 million per year. It must be noted that these enormous sums are all private money. Not a cent of public funds are authorized to be expended by this legislation.

In addition to these expenditures channeled into the local and national economy, the local, State, and National Governments will benefit from tax revenue in the amount of $13.3 million per year, according to the latest figures available. The Duke Power project would pay annual local and State taxes to the extent of $5,950,000 and annual Federal income tax in the amount of $7,400,000. These are, once again, the latest figures available as to the tax revenue which would be derived from this facility.

Mr. President, on January 6 of this year the General Assembly of South Carolina adopted a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of this dam. I send this resolution to the desk, ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, and appropriately referred.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2774) to grant the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Savannah River between South Carolina and Georgia, introduced by Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION —

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of a dam across the Savannah River and Duke Power Co. to construct an electric generating plant on the Savannah River

Whereas Duke Power Co. announced plans more than 4 years ago to construct a giant 2-million-kilowatt steam electric generating plant on the Savannah River in Anderson County, S.C.; and

Whereas the subject plant will cost in excess of $210 million and would be the largest steamplant for the generation of electricity in the entire world; and

Whereas to date 55 percent of all industry locating in the two Carolinas has located in the area served by the Duke Power Co.; and

Whereas such a plant as envisioned by Duke is one of the most desirable single industries that could come, not only to Anderson County, but to South Carolina; and

Whereas it is estimated that by the year 1985 the demand for electricity will exceed four times the present requirement; and

Whereas this development would require virtually no investment by the local community for service facilities nor would it require a great expenditure for water lines, sewerage, access roads, or public facilities; and

Whereas the Duke Power Co. is merely seeking permission to build a steamplant which would furnish an abundance of inexpensive electricity and pay to Anderson County more than a million dollars each year in tax revenue and to the State of South Carolina over $5 million dollars annually; and

Whereas this plant would provide permanent employment for a goodly number of people and during construction would provide jobs for over a thousand persons for a number of years; and

Whereas the experience of investment in those areas served by the Duke Power Co. has reflected $3 in either new or expansion of old industry for each dollar invested in the generation of electricity; and

Whereas the members of the General Assembly recognize the tremendous asset such a plant would be for the future development and prosperity of the State and of its people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring: That for the above reasons the members of the General Assembly wish to record themselves as favoring the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary in order that the Duke Power Co. may construct a dam across the Savannah River and proceed with the construction of the plant; be it

Further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the president of the Duke Power Co. and to the following officers and Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress; the Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives, each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, it is with a sense of complete propriety and enthusiasm that I join today in sponsoring legislation which will permit the construction of a large and modern power installation in South Carolina on the banks of the Savannah River.

Duke Power Co. has signified its intention to construct one of the world's largest steam generating plants at Middleton Shoals in Anderson County in order to help meet the future power needs of a rich and prospering section of South Carolina and the Southeast.

While I am aware of the controversy which has surrounded certain aspects of the development of the Savannah River, I feel that the construction of the Duke steamplant at this time will not adversely affect any project, hydroelectric or industrial, which might be contemplated now or in the foreseeable future for the Savannah River and that it will bring much positive good to South Carolina and to the Federal Government. Such being the case, it should be judged on its merits, which are considerable.

The most recent estimates indicate that the Middleton Shoals steamplant will remit to local and State governments in taxes approximately $5,950,000. The Federal Government will realize $7,400,000 in income taxes from Duke Power Co. as a result of expanded operations from this installation. It is estimated that Anderson County will realize several million in property taxes alone, a sum which will contribute immeasurably to the improvement of the system of public education in that county, supported as it is in large measure by property taxes.

Viewing these benefits, I believe that the Congress should allow private enterprise, willing and prepared to move promptly, to undertake this project.

Duke Power Co. President William B. McGuire informs me that he feels it is important to have this steamplant authorized for construction in early 1966 in order to be assured that that fine company can meet its 1971 power requirements in South Carolina.

There are ample safeguards written into the legislation to preserve the public interest and the interest of the U.S. Government in the development of the Savannah River.

I hope that the Congress will move promptly and expeditiously to authorize this power development in our State, one which will mean much economically and industrially to South Carolina and the entire Southeast.

ELIMINATION FROM SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE LAWS PROVISIONS DISQUALIFYING INDIVIDUALS BECAUSE THEY BELONG TO, OR WORK FOR, CERTAIN POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, we have come a long way since the 1950's when, during the height of McCarthyism, we were often guided by emotion and terror rather than logic and reason. But, occasionally a measure, though conceived in good will and with good intentions, contains an odious provision. One such provision can be found in the new Medicare Act, which the Congress passed last year.

There are presently in the United States about 2 million persons who are not eligible to receive social security benefits for one reason or another. But the Congress wanted to insure that most of these individuals would at least receive the new hospital insurance benefits to be financed from General Treasury funds. In so providing, however, the new law excludes these uninsured if they are members of a Communist or Communist-front organization.

The Social Security Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, based on this provision, now requires these 2 million elderly persons to answer the following question before they may qualify for medicare benefits:

> Are you now, or have you been during the last 12 months a member of any organization which is required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950 as a Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization, or a Communist-infiltrated organization?

As a practical matter, the applicant probably has absolutely no knowledge as to which organizations are required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950, since no list is attached to the application form. Thus, he has no way of knowing how to answer the question conscientiously.

This requirement in the new law stems directly from a 1956 amendment to the social security laws which excluded from social security coverage that period of time in which an individual was employed by any organization registered under the Internal Security Act as a Communist-action organization, Communist-front organization, or communist-infiltrated organization. The effect of this amendment was to prohibit the accrual of social security coverage to employees during the period of their employment with the Communist Party.

The net result of these two provisions has been to create a remarkable distinction in the law, and one which makes no real sense. On the one hand, employees of the Communist Party—excluded from social security coverage—are eligible for hospital and medical benefits if they are not members of the party. Members of the Communist Party, on the other hand, are eligible for social security coverage as well as hospital and medical benefits, providing they are not employees of the party.

Let me stress here that members of the Communist Party itself are not excluded from social security coverage—only employees of the party and associated organizations. Thus, if Gus Hall or any other bigwig in the party worked for General Electric or General Motors or any other firm, they would be covered under social security.

Yet, the little old lady down the street, who is a good member of the Republican Party but who is not eligible for social security for some reason, may think she is not eligible for medicare because she does not know about the organizations to which she belongs. At the same time, the Communist who has been covered under social security will get his Medicare benefits without further ado.

It is inconceivable that the Congress intended to draw this line between employees and members, granting benefits to the latter but denying the former.

Mr. President, it is high time for the Congress of the United States to remove from the statute books these remaining vestiges of the 1950's, an era in American history which can best be described as McCarthyism. Loyalty oaths, disclaimer affidavits and similar disqualifications based upon organizational membership, advocacy and even employment, infringe upon the rights of all individuals to freely associate under the first amendment. They should not be condoned. Indeed, the Congress just last year eliminated similar disclaimers as requirements for Job Corps enrollees and Vista Volunteers under the antipoverty program—Public Law 89-253. Yet, as a result of language in the Medicare Act, 2 million Americans are now required to attest to the Social Security Administration that they are not now, nor have not been during the previous 12 months, a member of certain forbidden organizations.

One of the few joys of many of our elderly citizens is the comfort and the companionship which they obtain from their various organizations and associations. But our elderly citizens are also in need of their hospitalization and medical benefits.

I am deeply concerned that the effect of the above-mentioned provisions in our social security laws will be to deter the elderly from joining political or quasi-political groups—whether they be controversial or not.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to eliminate from our social security and medicare laws those provisions which disqualify individuals merely because they belong to, or work for, certain political organizations. It is a shocking indictment on America that some of our elderly and our infirm must be deprived of their social security, medical and hospitalization benefits for no other reason than political retribution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2777) to amend the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which deny social security and hospital insurance benefits to uninsured individuals who are employees or members of certain organizations, introduced by Mr. LONG of Missouri, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY-SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the Elementary-Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-10, was the most progressive piece of legislation in this field that has ever been adopted by the Congress.

Already, provisions of this law have been of great benefit to local education, and the benefits will multiply as the years go on.

However, like everything else in this world, the Elementary-Secondary Education Act falls short of perfection, and I conceive it to be one of our duties in this second session of the 89th Congress to make appropriate amendments as the need comes to light.

With that in mind, I am today introducing an amendment to title I of this act, to provide for per pupil aid to school districts which are educating children who are not being supported by their own families.

Under terms of the act as now written, per pupil grants to local school districts are based on the number of children who come from families with less than $2,000 annual income. There is no provision for counting children who are under public care—orphans, abandoned children, and so forth, and are lacking in parental support.

Yet many, if not all, of these youngsters come from backgrounds just as deprived as those who come from impoverished families with $2,000 annual income, and we should therefore provide school assistance for them also.

This matter came to my attention through Mr. Firman Haynie, superintendent of the Portales Municipal School District.

Portales, located in Roosevelt County in east-central New Mexico, is responsible for the education of some 150 youngsters living in two facilities for orphaned and dependent children there.

Mr. Haynie pointed out that the full financial burden of these children's education falls on the local school system. This is a burden that they gladly accept, but Mr. Haynie feels, and I agree with him, these these youngsters should be included in the Office of Education's calculation of the Federal payment under title I.

The bill which I am introducing today will accomplish that purpose.

It will eliminate a serious inequity in the law, not only in Portales but in school systems throughout the United States which are educating dependent and orphaned youngsters.

Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk, for appropriate reference, and ask that the bill lie on the desk for 5 days for the purpose of additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 2778) to amend the act providing financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families in order to provide financial assistance for the education of orphans and other children lacking parental support introduced by Mr. MONTOYA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MARIA LOURDES SUNGA GARCIA

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I am today introducing a private bill in behalf of Maria Lourdes Sunga Garcia, which requests that this young Philippine girl be permitted to waive the 2-year residency requirement as an exchange student and remain in this country as a citizen of the United States. Miss Garcia has an outstanding record of service and study while in this country as an exchange student.

She has attended training courses conducted by the Communicable Disease Center of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at Atlanta, Ga. She is a member of the American Society of Medical Technologists, is included on the Registry of Medical Technologists of the American Society of Clinical Pathologists, has completed the prescribed training as a technologist of Kansas City, Kans., and has received her bachelor of science degree in medical technology from the University of Missouri at Kansas City. Two hospitals in the Kansas City, Kans., area presently have first preference visa petitions in her behalf. She has indicated a willingness to remain in the field of medical technology and, as you can understand from her background, she will be a credit to the field and an able aid in any medical department with which she chooses to associate. Prior to the time she arrived in this country she had 5 years of medicine and premedicine in Manila, and still hopes to obtain her doctor of pathology degree from a university in the United States.

Miss Garcia has many friends in Kansas who have written in her behalf urging that some means be used to give this fine young woman an opportunity to continue her studies and thereby contribute to the medical profession in this country.

Also I do not want to overlook Miss Garcia's extreme interest in the field of cancer research, which is being developed through the private auspices of the Andres Soriano Cancer Research Fund in Boston, Mass. Miss Garcia was a personal friend of Colonel Soriano and has personally helped the fund grow with the financial assistance she could provide. This fund now amounts to approximately $125,000 and it is expected that by December of this year considerable funds will be available to initiate the Andres Soriano cancer research program at Massachusetts General Hospital. Again, I believe this is an indication of Miss Garcia's devotion to her work and to her fellow man.

Mr. President, I submit this private bill for Maria Lourdes Sunga Garcia and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2779) for the relief of Maria Lourdes Sunga Garcia, introduced by Mr. PEARSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SIMPLIFIED TAX REFORM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is with considerable pride that I make the statement that in the previous session of Congress there was not a single recommendation of the President which did not receive consideration in the Finance Committee. Every presidential recommendation was considered, and the committee acted on it. Insofar as the committee may not have agreed with some of them, the Senate had an opportunity to vote on those matters. The workload of the committee was great, and recommendations in great numbers were before the committee. Almost without exception the Senate supported the committee's judgment. As acting head of the committee, I was extremely proud of that record.

I have reason to believe that the President will send to the Finance Committee proposals in which he will recommend measures for tax simplification, tax equity, and tax reforms. So I hope we will have success similar to that which we had last year in the fiscal field.

I introduce a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an optional simplified tax method, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an optional simplified tax method, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr.

LONG of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on October 2, 1964, I introduced a bill to simplify and greatly improve the equity of our individual income tax system. The bill is a modified, strengthened version of the measure which was tentatively approved by the Senate Finance Committee as an amendment to the Revenue Act of 1964, although this action was later rescinded. I introduced the bill then so that it could be studied by the members of the Finance Committee, other Senators, the Treasury, the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and other interested parties. I now reintroduce the bill for congressional action.

ADVANTAGES OF THE BILL: SIMPLICITY AND EQUITY

The objectives of the bill are twofold: to simplify the computation of tax liabilities and to reduce inequitable disparities between the tax liabilities of individuals with like incomes.

The need for a simplified tax law is widely acknowledged but rarely answered. This bill does answer the need. Its chief feature is an optional, simplified tax procedure for persons with middle and upper incomes. These are the taxpayers who generally have the most complicated tax problems and who find it prohibitively expensive to avail themselves of the standard deduction, which is the major simplification measure now in the law. A special scale of tax rates which rise in intervals of 5 percentage points from 20 to 50 percent will be available to those who elect to compute their tax without regard to most of the special deductions and exclusions now in the law. The bill offers high income taxpayers an alternative similar in nature, but much broader in scope, to the choice between itemized and standard deduction which is now open to persons with lower incomes. The Treasury some time ago estimated, conservatively in my opinion, that some 300,000 taxpayers would elect this option if it were available today.

Further simplification is provided by those sections of the bill which increase the minimum standard deduction and the 10-percent standard deduction. The minimum standard deduction is increased by $100 per family. This would, according to those same earlier estimates, relieve 700,000 persons of tax liability. The bill also raises the limit to the 10-percent standard deduction from $1,000 to $2,000. This feature makes the advantages of the 10-percent standard deduction alternative more readily available to taxpayers with incomes of from $10,000 to $20,000. Many taxpayers will switch from the time-consuming business of itemizing deductions to the use of the standard deduction, including some taxpayers with incomes of more than $20,000. The 1 million taxpayers who would switch back to the standard deduction will bring to an estimated 2 million the number of taxpayers whose tax computation chores would be simplified by this bill.

The bill also represents a significant improvement in tax equity. A look at the tax liabilities of various taxpayers with high incomes shows that very wide disparities exist between the tax burdens of similarly situated individuals. Treasury data show that effective tax rates—the ratio of Federal individual income tax payments to income—ranged from zero to nearly 85 percent among the 1,002 returns which in 1959 listed an adjusted gross income of $500,000 or more. Twenty of these returns, including five with adjusted gross incomes of $5 million or more, actually paid no tax at all while 56 paid a total tax equivalent to 70 percent or more of their entire income. The fact that as a group the 1,002 taxpayers had an average liability equal to 46 percent of their adjusted gross income masks the fact that some of them paid far less tax than the average and some paid far more.

Those high-income taxpayers who pay very low rates of tax are in a position to utilize such features of the law as those relating to capital gains, the unlimited charitable contributions deduction, percentage depletion, intangible drilling expenditures, and the deductions for interest, taxes, and medical expenses. Thus they are able to avoid paying the high rates of tax the statutory rate scale might seem to require. These special provisions are not available to all taxpayers, however, and those whose special circumstances are not recognized in the tax law must pay tax at the full rates.

I do not mean to castigate the various special deductions as tax gimmicks. Indeed, my bill does not prevent a taxpayer from claiming any of the present deductions and exclusions. It does reduce the potential tax avoidance value of such provisions by providing a lower alternative rate scale for those who forgo them.

The standard deduction and minimum standard deduction provisions augment the tax equity features of the bill. They, too, reduce the disparity between the liabilities of those who can take advantage of the various deductions and the liabilities of those who cannot. They do so at the lower and middle income levels. Furthermore, they reduce the tax burdens of those with the lowest incomes.

Simplified procedures and improved equity will lift taxpayer morale. The high tax rates of present law combined with the obvious tax avoidance avenues open to some have no doubt led a number of taxpayers to conclude that the tax system operates in an arbitrary and unfair manner. Others have been induced to devote much time and energy to the pursuit of special tax advantages and still others have turned to sharp practice and evasion. By rewarding those who forgo the use of special deductions and exclusions with a lower tax rate than that generally applied, the bill will improve taxpayer morale greatly. It will reduce potential discontent by narrowing the possible gap between the tax burdens of similarly situated taxpayers. Pressures on Congress for special tax treatment of various kinds will be diminished. Morale will also be improved by reducing the Government's share of anyone's income to a maximum of 50 percent. There will be less reason to feel that the Government is a silent partner when it comes to the management of a business enterprise but a senior partner when it comes time to share the profits.

This bill will also conserve and promote the efficient use of our most valuable national resource, the skill and ability of our citizens. There are taxpayers who now reluctantly spend long hours arranging their tax affairs because they find that if they do not exploit the various special provisions in the tax law they will have to bear disproportionately heavy tax burdens. This bill will free them to devote more time to their principal job.

REPLIES TO CRITICS

Not all those who have read or discussed this bill agree with my analysis of its advantages. Some have asserted that the name "simplified" is misleading. They say taxpayers would have to compute their tax in both the regular manner and the simplified manner to find out which way was best for them. This criticism is surely exaggerated. The simplified tax plan has a close parallel in the standard deduction. How many taxpayers today compute their tax using first the standard deduction and then itemizing their deductions? Once the initial determination is made, which rarely requires more than a cursory examination, the election is adhered to year after year unless there is a major change in the taxpayer's financial situation. In a similar fashion, most taxpayers would be able to determine rapidly and easily whether it would be to their advantage to elect the simplified tax option. Indeed, I believe some people will take the option even though their tax might be somewhat higher than if they employed all the special provisions of present law. They simply would not feel the added effort trying to beat the tax system is worth the relatively small tax saving.

Furthermore, the simplified tax option, once elected, binds the taxpayer for 5 years under most conditions. In the last 4 years of the election period, then, taxpayers would have no choice to make under normal conditions.

I have also heard it said that this bill is primarily designed to benefit well-to-do taxpayers and therefore does not improve the equity of the tax system. First of all, this charge ignores the fact that two of the three principal features of the bill are designed specifically to benefit lower and middle income taxpayers. One-third of the revenue loss comes from increasing the minimum standard deduction, a provision which would help only those single taxpayers with incomes of less than $1,000 and only those married couples with correspondingly low incomes. A further one-third of the revenue loss results from doubling the present maximum to the 10-percent standard deduction, a revision which will be of primary benefit to middle income taxpayers. In other words, two-thirds of the tax reduction provided by this bill goes to low and middle income taxpayers.

In the second place, the criticism overlooks the fact that the problem this bill is addressed to is equity between persons with like incomes. This problem is most acute at the middle and upper income levels. While some might prefer to solve it by increasing the tax liabilities of those who now pay relatively little tax, as a practical matter such a course offers little hope of success. The Members of Congress, as was all too evident in the deliberations on the Revenue Act of 1964, find it extremely difficult to remove so-called tax gimmicks or tax shelters because each one of these provisions is vigorously supported by an active group of citizens who feels it is necessary and desirable. Is it not then grossly unfair to those who now pay disproportionately high taxes to deny them just relief on the grounds that we would prefer to achieve equity through an approach that has little or no chance of ever being accepted? Lowering somewhat the tax burdens of those who pay way above average taxes will have little effect on the way the total tax burden is distributed among broad income classes. It will, however, bring the liabilities of those few taxpayers who are unable or unwilling to make use of the host of special provisions down closer to the average tax paid by others in their income class.

In the third place, this bill should be welcomed by those who are interested in a thorough-going reform of our tax system as an important first step. The concept of simplified taxable income does not reflect the special deductions and exclusions deplored by many would-be reformers. The simplified tax option will acquaint the public at large with the potential advantages of the universal application of such a concept of income. It should thus provide a better opportunity for the public to evaluate the merits of reform proposals. Moreover, the existence of the lower tax rates available under the option will reduce the relative tax benefits derived from the various special provisions, thereby reducing the strength of the forces interested in retaining or extending them.

Finally, other groups will object to particular aspects of my plan. To critics of any of the details of the optional tax plan, let me say that I am not wedded to the specifics of the plan I am today introducing. If the tax committees and the Congress, after considering the bill I am introducing, oppose any particular features of the bill on the grounds that deductions are not allowed but should be or income is included which should not be, I can only say that these are all matters which can be considered by the tax committees and the Congress itself. They can be modified if after further study this proves to be desirable.

DESCRIPTION OF THE BILL

The bill has three principal components. The first is the simplified tax option. A taxpayer electing this option would be taxed under a separate rate schedule with lower rates than those now in the law for taxpayers in general. For a single person the tax rate under the option would rise from 20 percent of the first $10,000 of simplified taxable income to 50 percent of simplified taxable income in excess of $50,000. At present the marginal tax rate for a single person with an income of $10,000 can be as high as 25 percent while the marginal rate on an income of over $50,000 ranges up to 70 percent. For married couples, the simplified taxable income brackets would be twice as wide as those of single people. Thus married couples would not reach to 50-percent rate until their combined simplified taxable income reached $100,000. A head of household rate scale is also provided under the option.

To qualify for the lower tax rates a taxpayer would have to compute his income without resorting to many of the deductions and exclusions granted under existing law. Compared to present law simplified taxable income includes: The full amount of the excess of net long-term capital gains over net short-term capital losses, workman's compensation payments, sick pay, the value to an employee of employer contributions to accident and health plans, certain employer-financed death benefits, the value to the lessor of improvements made by a lessee, the full amount of dividends received, the full value of scholarship and fellowship grants, the value of meals or lodging furnished at the convenience of the employer, and any gain realized on the sale of a personal residence by a taxpayer 65 years of age or over to the extent not reinvested in a new residence.

It also includes now excludable amounts of income earned in foreign countries and U.S. possessions and cost of living and other allowances. Two-thirds of amounts received as a pension or annuity under the Social Security or Railroad Retirement Acts would be included in simplified taxable income, as would unemployment benefits, amounts equal to the cost of employer-financed group term life insurance, the difference between the fair market value and the purchase price of option stock at the time of exercise, the amount of employer payments for pension and profit-sharing plans, if the rights are nonforfeitable, and certain other amounts. Tax-exempt interest also would be included in simplified taxable income.

Under the simplified option, deductions would be allowed for personal exemptions other than those for age or blindness, certain employee business expenses, the expenses of producing income, trade or business expenses other than those noted below and alimony. Deductions would not be allowed for charitable contributions, taxes paid on nonbusiness property or on income, interest payments other than those considered business expenses, the excess of percentage over cost depletion, exploration costs and intangible drilling expenses—such expenses would be capitalized—and contributions by self-employed persons to qualified retirement plans. Any net operating loss carried forward or back to a year in which the simplified tax option was in effect would be recomputed under the definition of simplified taxable income.

The retirement income credit and the credit for partially tax exempt interest would not be available under the option.

Once the simplified tax election were made, it would generally be followed for a period of 5 years, when the election could be repeated. The taxpayer would be free to revoke the election at any time during the 5 years if he is willing to accept a slight penalty. Tax would be recomputed under the regular provisions for the years the election had been in effect and if tax paid was less than the tax that would have been paid if the election has not been taken, the taxpayer will be assessed this amount plus interest. In addition, a penalty tax equal to 5 percent of the full recomputed tax liability will be imposed.

The election can be revoked without penalty when the taxpayer becomes disabled, or is discharged in bankruptcy. The election can also be revoked if a change in the law is judged by the Secretary or his delegate to eliminate the difference between the liabilities of taxpayers who use the optional method and those who do not. The election is terminated when the taxpayer marries. When the election is revoked, it cannot be elected again for 5 years without the permission of the Secretary.

The 5-year election period is necessary to prevent taxpayers from bunching their deductions in years in which they do not employ the option and then using the option in low-deduction years. At the same time, the 5-year period in combination with the termination and revocation provisions does not impose a hardship and will not prevent taxpayers from making use of the option. A substantial number of taxpayers will find the plan advantageous.

Electing taxpayers will be allowed the benefits of the income-averaging provisions, but these will be modified so that income for years during which the simplified tax option is in effect cannot be averaged with income from other years.

The other principal sections of this bill increase the standard deduction and the minimum standard deduction. The maximum limit of the standard deduction would be raised from $1,000 to $2,000 for single persons, married couples filing joint returns, and heads of households. The maximum limit would be raised from $500 to $1,000 on the returns of married couples filing separate returns. Thus the 10-percent standard deduction would be available for taxpayers with incomes ranging up to $20,000 instead of the present $10,000.

The minimum standard deduction would be increased by $100 for each single person, married couple, and head of a household. The minimum standard deduction on the return of a married person filing separately would be raised by $50. Thus a single person would not be taxed until his income exceeded $1,000. A married couple with no children would be nontaxable until their income reached $1,700 and a married couple with two children, until their income reached $3,100.

I ask unanimous consent that certain tables relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE 1.—*Optional rate schedules under the Long proposal and under present law*

SCHEDULE I. LONG PROPOSAL: (A) SINGLE TAXPAYERS WHO DO NOT QUALIFY FOR RATES IN SCHEDULES II AND III AND (B) MARRIED PERSONS FILING SEPARATE RETURNS

If the amount of simplified taxable income [1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but over $10,000	Enter 0 plus 20 percent of excess over 0.
Over $10,000 but not over $14,000	Enter $2,000 plus 25 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $18,000	Enter $3,000 plus 30 percent of excess over $14,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $32,000	Enter $4,200 plus 35 percent of excess over $18,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $50,000	Enter $9,100 plus 40 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $50,000	Enter $16,300 plus 50 percent of excess over $50,000.

SCHEDULE II. LONG PROPOSAL: (A) MARRIED TAXPAYERS FILING JOINT RETURNS AND (B) CERTAIN WIDOWS AND WIDOWERS

If the amount of simplified taxable income [1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but not over $20,000	Enter 0 plus 20 percent of excess over 0.
Over $20,000 but not over $28,000	Enter $4,000 plus 25 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $36,000	Enter $6,000 plus 30 percent of excess over $28,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $64,000	Enter $8,400 plus 35 percent of excess over $36,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $100,000	Enter $18,200 plus 40 percent of excess over $64,000.
Over $100,000	Enter $32,600 plus 50 percent of excess over $100,000.

SCHEDULE III. LONG PROPOSAL: UNMARRIED (OR LEGALLY SEPARATED) TAXPAYERS WHO QUALIFY AS HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

If the amount of simplified taxable income [1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but not over $10,000	Enter 0 plus 20 percent of excess over 0.
Over $10,000 but not over $14,000	Enter $2,000 plus 22.5 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $18,000	Enter $2,900 plus 25 percent of excess over $14,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	Enter $3,900 plus 27.5 percent of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $28,000	Enter $4,450 plus 30 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	Enter $6,850 plus 32.5 percent of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	Enter $8,150 plus 35 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $50,000	Enter $9,550 plus 37.5 percent of excess over $36,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $64,000	Enter $14,800 plus 42.5 percent of excess over $50,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $100,000	Enter $20,750 plus 45 percent of excess over $64,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000	Enter $36,950 plus 50 percent of excess over $100,000.

SCHEDULE IV. RATES UNDER PRESENT LAW: (A) SINGLE TAXPAYERS WHO DO NOT QUALIFY FOR RATES IN SCHEDULES V AND VI AND (B) MARRIED PERSONS FILING SEPARATE RETURN

If the amount of taxable income [1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but not over $500	Enter 0 plus 14 percent of excess over 0.
Over $500 but not over $1,000	Enter $70 plus 15 percent of excess over $500.
Over $1,000 but not over $1,500	Enter $145 plus 16 percent of excess over $1,000.
Over $1,500 but not over $2,000	Enter $225 plus 17 percent of excess over $1,500.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	Enter $310 plus 19 percent of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	Enter $690 plus 22 percent of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	Enter $1,130 plus 25 percent of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	Enter $1,630 plus 28 percent of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	Enter $2,190 plus 32 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	Enter $2,830 plus 36 percent of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	Enter $3,550 plus 39 percent of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	Enter $4,330 plus 42 percent of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	Enter $5,170 plus 45 percent of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	Enter $6,070 plus 48 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000	Enter $7,030 plus 50 percent of excess over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000	Enter $9,030 plus 53 percent of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000	Enter $12,210 plus 55 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000	Enter $15,510 plus 58 percent of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	Enter $18,990 plus 60 percent of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000	Enter $22,590 plus 62 percent of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000	Enter $28,790 plus 64 percent of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000	Enter $35,190 plus 66 percent of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000	Enter $41,790 plus 68 percent of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000	Enter $48,590 plus 69 percent of excess over $90,000.
Over $100,000	Enter $55,490 plus 70 percent of excess over $100,000.

SCHEDULE V. RATES UNDER PRESENT LAW: (A) MARRIED TAXPAYERS FILING JOINT RETURNS AND (B) CERTAIN WIDOWS AND WIDOWERS

If the amount of taxable income [1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but not over $1,000	Enter 0 plus 14 percent of excess over 0.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000	Enter $140 plus 15 percent of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $3,000	Enter $290 plus 16 percent of excess over $2,000
Over $3,000 but not over $4,000	Enter $450 plus 17 percent of excess over $3,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $8,000	Enter $620, plus 19 percent of excess over $4,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $12,000	Enter $1,380 plus 22 percent of excess over $8,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $16,000	Enter $2,260 plus 25 percent of excess over $12,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $20,000	Enter $3,260 plus 28 percent of excess over $16,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $24,000	Enter $4,380 plus 32 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $28,000	Enter $5,660 plus 36 percent of excess over $24,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	Enter $7,100 plus 39 percent of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	Enter $8,660 plus 42 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $40,000	Enter $10,340 plus 45 percent of excess over $36,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $44,000	Enter $12,140 plus 48 percent of excess over $40,000.
Over $44,000 but not oer $52,000	Enter $14,060 plus 50 percent of excess over $44,000.
Over $52,000 but not over $64,000	Enter $18,060 plus 53 percent of excess over $52,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $76,000	Enter $24,420 plus 55 percent of excess over $64,000.
Over $76,000 but not over $88,000	Enter $31,020 plus 58 percent of excess over $76,000.
Over $88,000 but not over $100,000	Enter $37,980 plus 60 percent of excess over $88,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000	Enter $45,180 plus 62 percent of excess over $100,000.
Over $120,000 but not over $140,000	Enter $57,580 plus 64 percent of excess over $120,000.
Over $140,000 but not over $160,000	Enter $70,380 plus 66 percent of excess over $140,000.
Over $160,000 but not over $180,000	Enter $83,580 plus 68 percent of excess over $160,000.
Over $180,000 but not over $200,000	Enter $97,180 plus 69 percent of excess over $180,000.
Over $200,000	Enter $110,980 plus 70 percent of excess over $200,000.

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Optional rate schedules under the Long proposal and under present law*—Continued

SCHEDULE VI. RATES UNDER PRESENT LAW: UNMARRIED (OR LEGALLY SEPARATED) TAXPAYERS WHO QUALIFY AS HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

If the amount of taxable income [1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but not over $1,000	Enter 0 plus 14 percent of excess over 0.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000	Enter $140 plus 16 percent of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	Enter $300 plus 18 percent of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	Enter $660 plus 20 percent of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	Enter $1,060 plus 22 percent of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	Enter $1,500 plus 25 percent of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	Enter $2,000 plus 27 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	Enter $2,540 plus 31 percent of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	Enter $3,160 plus 32 percent of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	Enter $3,800 plus 35 percent of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	Enter $4,500 plus 36 percent of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	Enter $5,220 plus 40 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $24,000	Enter $6,020 plus 41 percent of excess over $22,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $26,000	Enter $6,840 plus 43 percent of excess over $24,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $28,000	Enter $7,700 plus 45 percent of excess over $26,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	Enter $8,600 plus 46 percent of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	Enter $10,440 plus 48 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $38,000	Enter $12,360 plus 50 percent of excess over $36,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $40,000	Enter $13,360 plus 52 percent of excess over $38,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $44,000	Enter $14,400 plus 53 percent of excess over $40,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	Enter $16,520 plus 55 percent of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $52,000	Enter $19,820 plus 56 percent of excess over $50,000.
Over $52,000 but not over $64,000	Enter $20,940 plus 58 percent of excess over $52,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $70,000	Enter $27,900 plus 59 percent of excess over $64,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $76,000	Enter $31,440 plus 61 percent of excess over $70,000.
Over $76,000 but not over $80,000	Enter $35,100 plus 62 percent of excess over $76,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $88,000	Enter $37,580 plus 63 percent of excess over $80,000.
Over $88,000 but not over $100,000	Enter $42,620 plus 64 percent of excess over $88,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000	Enter $50,300 plus 66 percent of excess over $100,000
Over $120,000 but not over $140,000	Enter $63,500 plus 67 percent of excess over $120,000·
Over $140,000 but not over $160,000	Enter $76,900 plus 68 percent of excess over $140,000·
Over $160,000 but not over $180,000	Enter $90,500 plus 69 percent of excess over $160,000·
Over $180,000	Enter $104,300 plus 70 percent of excess over $180,000.

---

[1] Under the Long proposal tax is computed on "simplified taxable income" rather than "taxable income" as under present law. Simplified taxable income includes certain types of income not taxable under present law and is computed without any deduction for personal expenses (interest, taxes, contributions, etc.) and certain other items.

TABLE 2.—*Capital gains, by income levels*

Returns with adjusted gross income of—	Comprise this percentage of all taxpayers—	But receive this percentage of all capital gains
$200,000 and over	0.0096 of 1 percent	16
$100,000 and over	0.04 of 1 percent	24
$50,000 and over	0,2 of 1 percent	35
$10,000 and over	8.7 percent	69
Less than $5,000	57.8 percent	17

Published in Senate Finance Committee's Report on the Revenue Act of 1964, Jan. 28, 1964, p. 162.

TABLE 3.—*Effective tax rates under present law for high-income taxpayers with low, medium, and high proportions of capital gains*

Adjusted gross income	Tax as percent of total income [1]	Adjusted gross income	Tax as percent of total income [1]
High proportion of capital gains:		Medium proportion of capital gains—Continued	
$120,000	25.9	$700,000	25.4
$170,000	24.5	$2,000,000	28.0
$300,000	22.3	Low proportion of capital gains:	
$700,000	21.0	$120,000	34.9
$2,000,000	21.4	$170,000	37.2
Medium proportion of capital gains:		$300,000	41.6
$120,000	29.1	$700,000	40.6
$170,000	29.2	$2,000,000	46.4
$300,000	28.7		

[1] Total income is adjusted gross income plus capital gains excludable from adjusted gross income.

TABLE 4.—*Revenue effect of Long proposal*[1]

AGI class	Present law tax	Tax change
Under $10,000	$18,355,000,000	−$270,000,000
$10,000 to $20,000	10,550,000,000	−140,000,000
$20,000 to $50,000	5,785,000,000	−150,000,000
$50,000 and over	4,730,000,000	−145,000,000
Total	30,420,000,000	−705,000,000

[1] Proposal would provide an optional rate schedule, extend the standard deduction ceiling to $2,000, and raise the minimum standard deduction to $400 and $100 for spouse and each dependent, 1964 estimate.

TABLE 5.—*Number of tax returns benefiting and revenue loss from the increased standard deduction ceiling of $2,000, increased minimum standard deduction, or optional feature of the Long proposal*

[Number of returns in thousands and dollar amount in millions]

AGI class	Increased ceiling		Increased minimum standard deduction		Option		Long proposal	
	Number of returns [1]	Revenue loss	Number of returns [2]	Revenue loss	Number of returns	Revenue loss	Number of returns	Revenue loss
0 to $10,000	27	(3)	11,000	$270			11,027	$270
$10,000 to $20,000	2,305	$140			10	(3)	2,315	140
$20,000 to $50,000	152	65			240	$85	392	150
$50,000 to $100,000	1	5			55	85	56	90
$100,000 and over	(4)	(3)			8	55	8	55
Total	2,485	210	11,000	270	313	225	13,798	705

[1] Benefiting only from the increased standard deduction ceiling of $2,000.

[2] Benefiting only from raising minimum standard deduction to $400 and $100 for spouse and each dependent. About 700,000 returns would become nontaxable.

[3] Less than $2,500,000.

[4] Less than 500.

NOTE.—1964 estimate.

TABLE 6.—*Number of returns benefiting from the increased standard deduction ceiling of $2,000, increased minimum standard deduction or optional feature of the Long proposal*

[Number in thousands]

Adjusted gross income class (thousand)	Number of taxable returns [1] present law	Number benefiting only from ceiling increase		Number benefiting only from increased minimum standard deduction [2]		Number choosing the option		Total Long proposal	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All returns:									
Under $10	41,621	27	0.1	11,000	26.4			11,027	26.5
$10 to $20	6,709	2,305	34.4			10	0.1	2,315	34.5
$20 to $50	1,042	152	14.6			240	23.0	392	37.6
$50 and over	152	1	.7			63	41.4	64	42.1
Total	49,524	2,485	5.0	11,000	22.2	313	.6	13,798	27.9
Standard deduction:									
Under $10	23,327	25	.1	10,700	45.9			10,725	46.0
$10 to $20	1,762	1,757	99.7			5	.3	1,762	100.0
$20 to $50	98	38	38.8			60	61.2	98	100.0
$50 and over	4	1	25.0			3	75.0	4	100.0
Total	25,191	1,821	7.2	10,700	42.5	68	.3	12,589	50.0
Itemized deductions:									
Under $10	18,294	2	(3)	300	1.6			302	1.7
$10 to $20	4,947	548	11.1			5	.1	553	11.2
$20 to $50	944	114	12.1			180	19.1	294	31.1
$50 and over	148	(4)				60	40.5	60	40.5
Total	24,333	664	2.7	300	1.2	245	1.0	1,209	5.0

[1] At calendar year 1963 levels of income.

[2] Includes 700,000 returns which would become nontaxable.

[3] Less than 0.05 percent.

[4] Less than 500.

TABLE 7.—*Number of returns benefiting from simplification*

[Number in thousands]

Adjusted gross income class	Number of taxable returns present law [1]	Number benefiting from ceiling increase		Number benefiting from increased minimum standard deduction [2]		Number benefing from option		Total, Long proposal	
		Number	Percent of class	Number	Percent of class	Number	Percent of class	Number	Percent of class
Under 10,000	41,621	2	(3)	[2] 300	0.7			[2] 302	0.7
10,000 to 20,000	6,709	548	8.2			10	0.1	558	8.3
20,000 to 50,000	1,042	114	10.9			240	23.0	354	34.0
50,000 and over	152	(4)				63	41.4	63	41.4
Total	49,524	664	1.3	[2] 300	.6	313	.6	[2] 1,277	2.6

[1] At calendar year 1963 levels of income.

[2] Also 700,000 would become nontaxable.

[3] Less than 0.05 percent.

[4] Less than 500.

TABLE 8.—*Example of tax disparity. Case A is an example of a high income taxpayer who would not use the Long proposal. Case B is an example of a high income taxpayer who would probably use the Long proposal*

	Present law		Case A using Long option	Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B		
Wages and salaries	$90,000	$50,000	$90,000	$50,000
Dividends	50,000	150,000	50,000	150,000
Interest (tax exempt)	150,000		150,000	
Capital gains (100 percent)	700,000	100,000	700,000	100,000
Other income (net)	10,000	[1] 700,000	10,000	700,000
Income	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Wages and salaries	90,000	50,000		
Dividends less exclusion	49,800	149,800		
Interest (tax exempt)				
Capital gains (50 percent)	350,000	50,000		
Other income (net)	10,000	700,000		
Adjusted gross income	499,800	949,800		

[1] Partnership income.

	Present law		Case A using Long option	Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B		
Exemptions	$2,400	$2,400	$2,400	$2,400
Deductions	300,000	30,000		
Contributions	10,000	5,000		
Interest	200,000	2,000		
Taxes	80,000	20,000		
Medical	5,000	2,000		
Other	5,000	1,000		
Tax	[3] 175,000	603,160	481,400	481,400
Tax as percent of income	17.5	60.3	48.1	48.1

[3] Alternative capital gains tax of 25 percent only.

TABLE 9.—*Example of tax disparity of actual taxpayers and effect of Long proposal*

Item	Present law		Case D using Long option
	Case C	Case D	
Wages and salaries	$17,708	$201,436	$201,436
Dividends	258,089	30,612	30,612
Interest	69,394		
Capital gains (100 percent) [1]	561,995	4,728	4,728
Other income (net)	28,595	117,548	117,548
Income	935,781	354,324	354,324
Wages and salaries	17,708	201,436	
Dividends less exclusion	257,889	30,512	
Interest	69,394		
Capital gains (50 percent)	286,287	2,364	
Other income (net)	28,595	117,548	
Adjusted gross income	659,873	351,860	

[1] Includes net short-term gain of $10,579.

Item	Present law		Case D using Long option
	Case C	Case D	
Exemptions	$2,400	$3,000	$3,000
Deductions	396,108	23,665	
Contributions	120,330	5,299	
Interest	247,809	937	
Taxes	14,629	13,025	
Medical			
Other	13,340	4,404	
Tax	137,854	198,144	158,262
Tax as percent of income	14.7	55.9	44.7

TABLE 10.—*Example of tax disparity of actual taxpayers and effect of Long proposal*

Item	Present law		Case F using LONG option
	Case E	Case F	
Wages and salaries	$20,000	$201,916	$201,916
Dividends	76,318	34,994	34,994
Interest	206	1,174	1,174
Capital gains (100 percent)	1,210,426	−4,491	−1,000
Other income (net)	−22,283	345,275	345,275
Income	1,284,667	578,868	582,359
Wages and salaries	20,000	201,916	
Dividends less exclusion	76,218	34,894	
Interest	206	1,174	
Capital gains (50 percent)	605,213	−1,000	
Other income (net)	−$22,283	$345,275	
Adjusted gross income	679,354	582,259	

Item	Present law		Case F using LONG option
	Case E	Case F	
Exemptions	$1,200	$1,800	$1,800
Deductions	676,419	62,403	
Contributions	463	43,155	
Interest	587,693	3,168	
Taxes	85,401	11,072	
Medical	2,500		
Other	362	5,008	
Tax	265	333,619	272,880
Tax as percent of income	.02	57.6	47

TABLE 11.—*Example of tax disparity of actual taxpayers and effect of Long proposal*

Item	Present law		Case H using Long option
	Case G	Case H	
Wages and salaries	$28,580	$198,243	$198,243
Dividends	115,675		
Interest	13,367	4,455	4,455
Capital gains (100 percent)	27,584		
Other income (net)	45,703	−4,619	−4,619
Income	230,909	198,079	198,079
Wages and salaries	28,580	198,243	
Dividends less exclusion	115,475		
Interest	13,367	4,455	
Capital gains (50 percent)	13,792		
Other income (net)	$45,703	−$4,619	
Adjusted gross income	216,917	198,079	

Item	Present law		Case H using Long option
	Case G	Case H	
Exemptions	2,400	600	600
Deductions	149,820	12,912	
Contributions	63,105	6,050	
Interest	37,237	3,097	
Taxes	17,566	3,764	
Medical	4,207		
Other	27,705		
Tax	24,408	114,687	90,040
Tax as percent of income	10.6	57.9	45.5

CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI—MICHELANGELO OF THE U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution providing for a bust of the noted artist, Constantino Brumidi, to be placed in the Nation's Capitol. I previously announced in Chicago on December 10, 1965, that I would introduce such legislation honoring Constantino Brumidi who for a quarter of a century, from 1855 to 1880, labored to decorate the U.S. Capitol with his murals and other paintings.

His genius has thrilled millions of the visitors to the Capitol who have walked its spacious halls and historic rooms and viewed the beauty of its painted walls, particularly in the Senate hallway appropriately titled the "Brumidi Corridor."

Constantino Brumidi, often termed the "Michelangelo of the U.S. Capitol," was born in Rome, Italy, July 26, 1805, and was one of the three Roman artists in his native Italy commissioned to restore Raphael frescoes in the Vatican loggia in Vatican City. He was exiled to America because of political activities in 1852 and was hired by Capt. Montgomery C. Meigs to decorate the Agricultural Committee room at the Capitol in 1855. After he was commissioned Brumidi remarked:

> I no longer have any desire for fame or fortune. My one ambition and my daily prayer is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country on earth in which there is liberty.

His brush was busy in succeeding years, and the Nation's Capitol was his canvas. His work included the Senate reception room, Senate Appropriations Committee room, the President's room in the Senate extension, the Senate floor corridors, the House of Representatives Chamber, the House of Representatives committee room, the Capitol rotunda, containing his magnificent frescoes frieze of 15 historical groupings and capped by his huge frescoed canopy in the eye of the Capitol dome, measuring some 4,664 square feet of concave fresco. His work flourished until his tragic fall while working on the rotunda frieze terminated his labors. He died in 1880 and was buried in an unmarked grave in Washington's Glenwood Cemetery, and it took 72 years for a grateful Nation to acknowledge its debt to this man. Led by persistence of Dr. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, wife of the then Congressman Murdock, Democrat, of Arizona, Congress, authorized a bronze marker for Brumidi's grave in Glenwood Cemetery.

Some 86 years have passed since Constantino completed his final act of love in gracing the walls of the most important citadel of freedom in the world, the U.S. Capitol, and not a single bust or statue of him is to be found in our Capitol. It is certainly the least we can do for a man who signed his work with pride as "C. Brumidi, artist, citizen of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 70

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Library is authorized and directed to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi, and to cause such bust to be placed in the corridor, known as the Brumidi corridor, on the first floor of the Senate wing of the Capitol.

SEC. 2. Expenses incurred by the Joint Committee on the Library in carrying out this concurrent resolution, which shall not exceed $2,500, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Joint Committee.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MINIMUM WAGE LAW—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 476

Mr. DOMINICK submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8126) to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 477, 478, AND 479

Mr. PROUTY submitted three amendments, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 8126, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 480

Mr. MORSE proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1446) to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following executive message—a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to furnish assistance to certain disabled veterans of the induction period in the purchase of an automobile or other conveyance, with accompanying papers referred to Committee on Finance on May 4, 1965, be rereferred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 2097, TO PROVIDE FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF GRANTS OR LOANS UNDER CERTAIN ACTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I wish to announce that hearings will be held by this subcommittee on S. 2097, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, Senator MORSE, and cosponsored by Senators CLARK and YARBOROUGH, and myself. This bill provides for judicial review to determine the constitutionality of grants or loans under certain acts.

The hearings are scheduled for February 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, and 10, at 10:30 a.m. each day, in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building. Any person who wishes to testify or submit statements pertaining to this bill should communicate with the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

POSTPONEMENT AND RESCHEDULING OF HEARING BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS ON S. 2729, TO AMEND THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to announce the postponement of the hearing on S. 2729, a bill to amend the Small Business Act, with respect to provisions of the act relating to the revolving fund, which was originally scheduled by the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Banking and Currency Committee for 10 a.m. Tuesday, January 18, 1966.

The hearing has been rescheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1966, at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with this bill are requested to notify Reginald Barnes, assistant counsel, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-3921.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that on January 14 the Senate received the nominations of Marshall P. Jones, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to Malawi, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, and Cecil B. Lyon, of New Hampshire, now serving as Ambassador to Ceylon, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Maldive Islands, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

HEARINGS ON NOMINATION OF JAMES S. DUESENBERRY TO THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a public hearing at 10 a.m. on Thursday, January 20, 1966, on the nomination of Prof. James S. Duesenberry, of Massachusetts—of the Harvard faculty—to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, in place of Mr. Otto Eckstein.

The hearing will be held in room 5302, New Senate Office Building. The nominee will be present. Any persons who wish to testify or to submit a report should write or telephone Mr. Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, 5300 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., CA 5-3921.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 125) extending the date for transmission of the Economic Report.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

Statement by him on the Brooklyn Public Library preschool program.

By Mr. CASE:

Telegram sent by him on the occasion of the testimonial dinner to the Honorable Julius Foster, Jr., and a press release in connection therewith.

ATTACK ON HON. J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I had intended, during the morning hour on last Friday, to discuss this subject, and to put in the RECORD a letter dealing with it. However, I was not on the floor when the Senate suddenly adjourned and I did not reach the Chamber quite in time.

The information contained in the letter did leak out in some way, however. For the RECORD I wish to do now what I had intended to do last Friday.

About 10 days ago, I received a scurrilous anonymous letter, mailed from Baltimore, alleged to contain a photostatic copy of a letter which was alleged by the writer of the anonymous letter to have been written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to Walter Jenkins.

The alleged photostatic copy of the letter is so scurrilous and putrid that I do not intend to put it in the RECORD.

I sent the anonymous letter to Mr. Hoover for his information and for whatever aid and assistance it might be.

Mr. Hoover wrote me a letter, stating that he had received the anonymous letter with the alleged copy of a letter which he was supposed to have written, according to the anonymous letter.

He states categorically that he never wrote such a letter. For the information of Senators who are present, perhaps I should read the letter into the RECORD, instead of merely putting it in the RECORD.

The letter is dated January 11, 1966, and reads as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1966.
Hon. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is to acknowledge your request for the complete facts as known to this Bureau concerning the anonymous letter you received containing what purports to be a copy of a personal letter to former White House aid Walter Jenkins over my signature.

I am pleased to comply with your request and will begin first by stating without any equivocation that I never wrote such a letter.

The letter you received is one of many anonymous mailings sent to various Senators, Congressmen, and other prominent Government officials within the past week. They are part of a concerted Communist smear campaign which was launched a year ago.

The campaign began in January 1965, when several letters of this type were received by individuals who also brought them to my attention. Several more were brought to my attention by individuals who received them in April 1965.

Upon examination, the copy of the letter supposedly signed by me was determined to be a crude forgery. Comparison of all the letters disclosed they had all been prepared by the same person or persons. Further comparison with other letters circulated in the past in this and other countries by the Soviet Disinformation Department proved irrefutably that this was a Communist scheme.

You may recall that the nefarious schemes of the Soviet Disinformation Department were exposed in a report prepared by the Central Intelligence Agency last year, The details of that Agency's study were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 28, 1965.

The study revealed that the Soviet Disinformation Department of the KGB, the Soviet Committee for State Security, wages a broad-scaled propaganda offensive against U.S. agencies and pointed out that I and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are priority targets for attacks. It also disclosed that the overall objective is to discredit U.S. agencies here and abroad and emphasized that a preferred instrument used by the Soviets in their attacks is the forged document.

Typical of the tactics used in such efforts was the circulation of letters in South America in the summer of 1964. In that case, too, my name had been forged on the letters. They were designed to make it appear that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency had something to do with the Brazilian revolution of April 1964. The intricacies of that Communist scheme became further apparent when we determined that my signature has been forged from a letter stolen by Cubans in Havana in 1960.

I trust that in making these facts available to you I have satisfied any and all questions which the scurrilous anonymous communication you received may have raised. If not, do not hesitate to call on me again.

In conclusion, I would like to express my appreciation to you for bringing the letter to my attention. It provides another link in the chain of evidence being put together to complete the picture of this Soviet smear campaign, which amounts to character assassination.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me conclude by saying, with respect to the suggestion in Mr. Hoover's letter that I might have some question about this matter, that, the letter was so crude and so scurrilous that on its face it was a forgery. At no time have I had any question as to the truth or falsity of the letter. It is false on its face. I merely wish to clear the matter up so that all may know that these things are constantly going on as attacks are made against our law enforcement agencies.

VISIT TO SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to supplement briefly the remarks which have been made by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Let me say, first, that the mission which was undertaken under the leadership of the Senator from Montana met with courtesy and hospitality everywhere the group went, even where the country visited took exception to our position in southeast Asia.

The Senator from Montana is greatly respected around the world. This was quite apparent, previous to our call at Cambodia. When the announcement of our coming was made, the Senator from Montana was described as "a man of great justice."

As I have stated, we had been hospitably received everywhere, but I believe that all of us were unprepared for the warmth of the reception which we received in Cambodia, the government of which is headed by Prime Minister Sihanouk, who relinquished a kingdom to take a position which he felt would be more helpful to his people.

Prime Minister Sihanouk did not mention some of the complaints which have been attributed to him in reports which have been spread around the world. He is more concerned over trespassing on the area of Cambodia by others. If there is trespassing, I would say that it probably is not confined to one side of the South Vietnamese controversy. Any such trespassing, I would presume, is done without the consent of the Government of Cambodia.

As the Senator from Montana has stated, Prime Minister Sihanouk has requested that the International Control Commission do what it can to control the situation and to enforce respect for the boundaries of his country.

Prime Minister Sihanouk has also requested inspection by others of the charges which have been made against his government that the country harbors the Vietcong and others who are hostile to us.

It was quite apparent to me that the Government of Cambodia desires, above all else, to be let alone, not to be dragged into anyone's war, not to be dominated by any country either within Asia or outside Asia. As I see it the fear of domination exists not only in this country, but also in all the other countries of southeast Asia as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. One thing that is very much apparent is that Chinese propaganda is blanketing most of southeast Asia. The Chinese are not inhibited by the truth. It is quite apparent that they concoct stories to spread all over southeast Asia with the purpose of keeping the people disturbed and to incite them, if possible, to hate Americans and everything connected with America.

As I have stated, Cambodia gives full credit for the assistance we have given it in the past. We have been advised that Americans will be welcome to come to Cambodia at any time, to visit that country, I believe that American visitors would be perfectly safe in going there, and would be well received.

But, carrying on their business and holding on to their neutral position, where they have resisted communism in spite of the many pressures which have been placed upon them, is not easy for them.

Cambodia has plenty of resources for its people. It is making economic progress. It has shown no inclination to go Communist. We were pleasantly surprised at the turnout of the people who came to welcome our group. The capital of Phnom Penh looked almost like Constitution Avenue on Inaugural Day and it appeared to me that their welcome was quite sincere.

MORE SCHOOLCHILDREN WANT MORE MILK, BUT SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM IS BEING CUT BACK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is another in a series of statements I intend to make in the Senate as a result of the action of the Bureau of the Budget in prohibiting the Department of Agriculture from spending appropriated funds for the special milk program for schoolchildren—an action which means no real saving of tax dollars.

Today, I examine the great increase in program participation that has taken place in the past, and the even greater increase we could expect in the future if the Federal share were not being ruthlessly cut. Of course, a cut in the Federal share means that the State, the local school district, or the child will have to assume the added costs. This will not only dampen program growth but may even lead to a program cutback in many States.

In 1955, 41,094 outlets participated in the school milk program. Over 449 million half pints were distributed. In 1964, program participation had increased to 91,890 outlets—in other words, over 100 percent—while more than 2,917 million half pints were distributed—a phenomenal increase of almost 650 percent. The 1965 estimate is for 94,000 outlets distributing 3,093 million half pints. In 1966, the figures estimated are 96,000 outlets distribute over 3,278 million half pints.

What has the Bureau of the Budget done in the face of this unprecedented growth? Despite a projected growth of 6 percent in half pints distributed in fiscal 1966, the Bureau has cut back program funds by 3 percent. Every penny of this cut means less money to the States. Not one cent, according to the budget estimates submitted to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees last year, will be absorbed by decreased Federal operating expenses in Washington.

If we follow the Budget Bureau's logic, I suppose that a projected growth in enrollment in public and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools of more than 6½ million students, or almost 14 percent between 1965 and 1975 will mean a cutback of at least 7 percent in the school milk program. I profoundly hope, Mr. President, that the Bureau of the Budget does not continue to apply this twisted logic. Certainly if it does, Congress should speak out in no uncertain terms, as I am doing today, and intend to do on this floor for as long as it takes to get a policy change.

Let us never forget, Mr. President, that this cutback is a phony, fake, paper economy. Federal funds not spent on school milk will be spent under price support laws to buy and store the same quantity of milk.

THE PRESIDENT'S HARD DECISION

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Walter Lippmann, the great and internationally admired columnist, in Newsweek of January 17, wrote an excellent column regarding our situation in Vietnam. These are important conclusions of facts I feel should be brought to the attention of American citizens and to all Members of the Congress who may not have read his exceedingly important and factually correct statement. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this column may be printed at this point in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Walter Lippmann on the President's Hard Decision

After his most recent trip to South Vietnam, Secretary McNamara ventured to say that, as a result of our efforts, we have stopped losing the war. Perhaps he was referring to the fact that at the beginning of 1965 not only had the Saigonese army lost control of the countryside with the exception of five or six cities, but the government in Saigon was disintegrating and was on the verge of making a deal with Hanoi.

During the past year there has been no significant improvement in the military situation. Once the American soldiers retire, the villages which are recovered from the Vietcong are quickly lost again. The balance of military power has not been changed in our favor. For as we have increased our own army, the adversary has increased his army, both by stepping up the infiltration from the north and by greater recruitment in the south. The one real change has been that the government in Saigon is now a dictatorship of four generals who are fully aware that personally they have every reason to avoid a truce and to continue the war.

So, the President finds himself no nearer, and almost certainly further away from, his avowed objectives in Vietnam. He has been confronted with what he now describes, quite correctly, as "hard decisions." What are the hard decisions? At bottom, the President has to choose between a bigger war and an unattractive peace. He must decide either to launch a big American war in Asia, a war which could easily be bigger than the Korean war because it could so quickly involve both China and the Soviet Union, or to cut our losses by reducing his political and military objectives.

EXTEND THE WAR, OR SETTLE FOR LESS?

This is indeed a hard choice. A long war means heavy casualties. It means the disruption of the lives of another generation of young men. It means that the Nation will be distracted from the attempt to solve its own problems—such as the problems of the cities and the problems of the Negroes and the problems of industrial peace. It means once again, for the fourth time in this century, that the Nation will turn its attention from its own urgent affairs to a war abroad. It means also that this country will be diverted from the development of the Americas and from its vital national interests in Europe and Australasia.

The other choice open to the President is also a hard one, especially for a proud man who wants to be universally popular. For there is no disguising the fact that a negotiated truce can be had only by settling for a good deal less than a victory, and this means that the President must expect to be denounced by many, and to have his pride wounded. It takes great political strength and a high degree of moral courage for the head of a state to make the kind of peace which may now be possible in the Vietnamese mess. General Eisenhower, the victorious commander of the allied armies, was able to make a settlement in Korea which President Truman would never have dared to make. General Eisenhower had at that time an invulnerable prestige.

An even more pertinent analogy is to be found in the way General de Gaulle liquidated the messy war in Algeria. The President would do well to study and ponder what happened, how General de Gaulle extricated France from a war which she had not lost but could not win, how he negotiated with his adversaries in the field, the Algerian counterpart of the Vietcong, and made with them a "peace of the brave," how he outwitted and defied the extremists at the risk of his life—and how, having devoted himself unflinchingly to the true interest of France, which was peace with Algeria, he won the gratitude and esteem of his countrymen, including almost all of those who voted against him in the recent election.

PAYING THE PRICE

The hard decision the President has to make is whether he can accept the political and psychological risks of dealing with Vietnam as General Eisenhower dealt with Korea and as General de Gaulle dealt with North Africa. For President Johnson will have to pay a heavy price for the historical mistake of involving the United States in a land war against Asians in Asia. The alternative to paying a price for peace is to pay the enormous price of a great war which threatens to expand into a world war.

The President has made it quite clear that he realizes the hard choice which is before him. Naturally enough, he is looking for some easier way out of his dilemma. If only he could find one. But by his decisions in 1964, he rejected the warning by men in a position to know that there was not much time left to negotiate an arrangement. He has come very near to locking and bolting the door. He has raised the stakes so high that easy solutions are most improbable and only the hard choices remain.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of this morning there appeared an extremely noteworthy news article entitled "Gavin Says Hanoi Bomb Could Bring in Peiping Units," reporting on a letter of Gen. James Gavin which will appear in the February issue of Harper's magazine.

General Gavin, former chief of Army research and development, is one of our Nation's most outstanding military officers and a former Ambassador to France. The article reports General Gavin's warning that a massive buildup of U.S. forces in Vietnam may cause the Communist Chinese to send troops there and reopen the Korean war as well.

It is interesting to note that General Gavin disagrees with former Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Curtis Lemay, and other war hawks who are urging the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong. General Gavin, who was chief of U.S. Army plans and operations at the time of the French military disaster at Dienbienphu, certainly speaks with as much—and I for one feel a great deal more—authority than do those militarists who demand expansion and escalation of our fighting in Asia without giving consideration to the consequences involved. His statements also discredits the so-called domino theory, which has no validity whatever.

I believe that General Gavin's comments are of great importance and ask unanimous consent that the article reporting them be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAVIN SAYS HANOI BOMBING COULD BRING IN PEIPING UNITS

NEW YORK, January 16.—Gen. James M. Gavin declared today a massive buildup of U.S. forces in Vietnam may prompt Red China to send troops there and reopen the Korean war as well.

The 58-year-old former chief of U.S. Army research and development suggested that America concentrate instead on holding major bases along the South Vietnam coast while diplomats seek an end to the fighting.

In a letter appearing in the February issue of Harper's magazine, Gavin said:

"To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnam troops into the South.

"Also, if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese volunteers and the reopening of the Korean front.

ESCALATION SEEN LIKELY

"This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course that we are now on."

Gavin said the 190,000 U.S. troops already in the Vietnam theater would suffice "if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks on North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva."

He asserted that an attempt to make all of South Vietnam secure from the Communists "would take many times as much force as we now have in Vietnam"—and risk a fresh outbreak of Red Chinese aggression in the Korean pattern.

"I do not for a moment think that if we should withdraw from Vietnam the next stop would be Waikiki," Gavin said. "The Kra Peninsula, Thailand and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontiers of Thailand."

Emphasizing that he spoke "solely from a military-technical point of view," Gavin recalled that he was chief of U.S. Army plans and operations at the time of the French military disaster in Dien Bien Phu.

He said Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, then Chief of Staff, "directed that we go into the situation quite thoroughly in case a decision should be made to send U.S. forces into the Hanoi delta."

"The more we studied the situation," Gavin wrote, "the more we realized that we were, in fact, considering going to war with China, since she was supplying all the arms, ammunition, medical, and other supplies to Ho Chi Minh.

"If we would be, in fact, fighting China, then we were fighting her in the wrong place on terms entirely to her advantage."

Gavin said southeast Asia is no place to take on Red China in military combat.

"Manchuria, with its vast industrial complex, coal, and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its warmaking capacity," he said. "There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged, if at all."

SHOWDOWN NOT YET DUE

Gavin added that if Red China continues aggression and arms itself with nuclear weapons "the time may come when China will bring upon herself a nuclear war. But that time is not here yet."

Gavin, a paratroop commander in World War II, retired from the Army in 1958 because of differences with the Eisenhower administration over modernizing the Armed Forces. He was a particularly strong exponent of more aerial mobility for ground troops.

Gavin called this "the sky cavalry concept, which we are now employing in South Vietnam" and commented.

"When I retired in 1958, I said that I would be happy to serve as a private in the Army if it were the kind of an army that I wanted it to be.

I think it is that kind of an army now * * *."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider two nominations which are at the desk. It will require unanimous consent, because they have not lain over for a day, but by unanimous consent they can be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the first nomination will be stated.

ROBERT C. WEAVER, SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert C. Weaver, of New York, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, let the RECORD show that the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which the nomination was referred, has unanimously approved it. History is made today as the Senate of the United States, with no opposition—indeed, with unanimity—will seat as a member of the Cabinet of the President a distinguished American citizen, a Negro, whose labors in the Federal Government thus far have stamped him as one in whom Members of the Senate who have dealt with him have complete respect and faith. I congratulate Dr. Robert C. Weaver on the great challenge he now faces to help in improving urban America.

The leader of the Republican Party in the Senate, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has publicly expressed his approval of the nomination. I rise to say that, not merely the leader of our party in the Senate, but the Members of the minority party on the committee who participated in the hearing and the rest of us shall shortly join in approval of the nomination of an able fellow citizen to vast new responsibility.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I take only a moment to express my support of the nomination of Robert C. Weaver to be head of a department that will be concerned with urban problems. I have known of his work on a good many occasions. It was my privilege to have him as a member of the delegation which went to Peru for the inauguration of the democratic President, Mr. Belaunde. It was my privilege to serve as chairman of that delegation during that trip to Latin America. I came to know Mr. Weaver even better than I had known him before.

I congratulate Mr. Weaver, but congratulations are even more due to the President. I not only congratulate the President, but highly commend him for his wise selection of a great American to head an important post which will deal with domestic problems, related to that post, in the years ahead. The President could not have made a choice that demonstrated greater wisdom than the selection of Mr. Weaver to be the head of that Department.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, together with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], had the privilege of appearing before the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I was a member, 2 years ago, to urge confirmation of the nomination of Dr. Weaver for this post. The Nation is fortunate to have produced such a son, who, at long last, has been chosen to sit in the Cabinet of the President.

I had the privilege of being a member of the cabinet when Mr. Harriman was Governor of New York. I was attorney general. At that time, Dr. Weaver was a member of the cabinet on housing. Because of his skill, competence, and integrity, he has made a landmark in terms of minorities. Senator KENNEDY and I have testified fully before the Banking and Currency Committee. I said previously in the committee that, while Dr. Weaver was a Negro, he would not use that fact to practice reverse discrimination in legislation; that he would call decisions as he saw them; that he would not be obsessed by the fact that he was of a minority group, but that he would make the correct decision as an American. Therefore, I know that Dr. Weaver will serve in his new post with distinction and will make great contributions in that new duty.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, and as a member of the Subcommittee on Housing, I am delighted to rise in support of the nomination of Robert C. Weaver, who is eminently qualified for this position. He was an undergraduate of and received a Ph. D. from Harvard University. He has had excellent background and experience in this field. He has had a peculiar opportunity to learn the business during his duties in Washington.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that some members of the Committee on Banking and Currency who would oppose Mr. Weaver and certain Senators who opposed him when his nomination as Administrator was under consideration will support him now because they have seen him in action. They know him as competent and able. On the basis of this excellent experience he will render a fine service in this completely new department of our Government.

It is a great honor for me to endorse the nomination of Robert C. Weaver. I support him wholeheartedly.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is my privilege to rise in support of the nomination of Robert C. Weaver for this important position in Housing and Urban Development.

I believe I have known Robert C. Weaver longer than has any other Member of this body. We came into Government service at about the same time, some 32 years ago. He had just received his Ph. D. in economics from Harvard University, and came to the Interior Department as an adviser to the Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes.

At the same time I had been appointed director of a new agency, the Division of Territories and Island Possessions. Our fields were separate, but we came to know each other well.

At that time I was able to appreciate the sterling qualities, integrity, and ability of Robert C. Weaver. I have known him for 30 years. I am confident that the President could have made no better appointment for this position.

It is a great privilege for me to endorse this nomination. I commend the President for having come to the conclusion after some delay and after searching throughout the country, that no other man could fill this post as well as Robert C. Weaver.

Mr. President, it gives me pleasure to ask unanimous consent for the insertion of two excellent editorials commending the appointment of Robert C. Weaver as Secretary of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development. One is from the New York Times of Sunday, January 16, 1966, and the other from yesterday morning's Washington Post.

I also ask unanimous consent that another article, entitled: "Weaver in Cabinet but Job is Unclear," by Robert B. Semple, Jr., from the New York Times of January 16, be likewise printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

It is obvious that President Johnson's appointment of Weaver is being widely hailed, as it should be, as the best possible appointment that he could have made.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 16, 1966]

THE WEAVER APPOINTMENT

President Johnson's appointment of Robert C. Weaver as Secretary of the new Department of Housing and Urban Renewal has been long expected.

A Harvard-trained economist, Dr. Weaver has government experience dating from the early days of the Roosevelt Administration. He is dedicated and knows the field to which he has been assigned; he was Deputy State Housing Commissioner and later New York State Rent Administrator under Governor Harriman. President Kennedy subsequently named him to the top housing post in the country. He has attained Cabinet level—first Negro in American history to do so—despite some criticism of his abilities and his imagination.

If the appointment of Robert Weaver to his new post is the end of the road in the sense that the struggle to put a Negro in the Cabinet is won, so is it the beginning of another road along which vast new strides must be taken toward better living conditions. "In some of our urban areas we must help rebuild entire sections and neighborhoods containing as many as a 100,000 people," the President said in his state of the Union message. "Working together, private enterprise and government must press forward with the task of providing homes and shops, parks and hospitals, and all the other necessary parts of a flourishing community where our people can come to live the good life." It is Robert Weaver's task to direct and coordinate such an ambitious effort, and we wish him the best of luck in this monumental job.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 16, 1966]

SECRETARY WEAVER

In appointing Dr. Robert Clifton Weaver to serve as the first Secretary of Housing and Urban Development President Johnson chose the best available man for a difficult post. A pioneer in public housing whose experience goes back to the early days of the New Deal, Dr. Weaver served with distinction as the rent administrator in New York City, housing commissioner for the State of New York, and finally as the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The fact that Dr. Weaver is the great-grandson of a slave will irk those whose prejudices are blinding where men of color, no matter how talented, are concerned. And it will by the same token enlist the equally biased support of those who hold that the new Cabinet post should have gone to a Negro irrespective of his capabilities. Fair-minded Americans applaud the appointment of a great authority on urban affairs and housing who happens to be a Negro. And they are equally delighted by the appointment of Robert C. Wood as Under Secretary. Dr. Wood, a native of Florida and professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has gained an enviable reputation in the field of urban affairs at the age of 42.

After describing the problems with which the new Department will be confronted, President Johnson turned to Dr. Weaver and said, "May the good Lord have mercy on you." The new Secretary's legion of admirers share that sentiment, and have confidence in his ability to build an effective Department.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 16, 1966]

WEAVER IN CABINET BUT JOB IS UNCLEAR

(By Robert B. Semple, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, Jan. 15.—At a surprise news conference Thursday, President Johnson said to the assembled reporters:

"I think you are all aware of the thorough search I have made to find the best man to lead the new Department of Housing and Urban Development. No man is going to have a more difficult but challenging job—and no man is going to be better able to leave a mark on generations of Americans to come—than the man who takes this vital task."

The President said he had looked over 300 potential candidates. But in the end, he selected a man who was there all the time—Robert C. Weaver. The announcement of Mr. Weaver's appointment ended a period of speculation that began as soon as Congress approved creation of the Department last year.

HOUSING EXPERT

Mr. Weaver, 58, has been Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency since the beginning of the Kennedy administration in 1961. The Agency, a conglomeration of various housing agencies, is likely to form the core of the new Department.

If approved by Congress, Mr. Weaver will be the first Negro in history to become a member of the Cabinet. This, of course, is arresting news in itself, but the real question now is whether Mr. Weaver's appointment heralds the beginning of a new era in the relationship between the Federal Government and the cities, or whether it is merely a continuation of the old.

The answer depends, in part on whether Mr. Johnson accepts the recommendations of a special task force that he put to work on urban problems last fall.

The task force recommended that a number of Government programs involving aid to the cities—programs now lodged in other agencies—be transferred to the new Department. If these recommendations are accepted, Mr. Weaver will have much greater power than ever before, and, some people believe, he will also be in a better position to coordinate Federal efforts to solve urban problems.

POVERTY ROLE?

But the task force recommendations appear to have been greeted with less than total enthusiasm at the White House. A proposal to transfer some important functions of the poverty program to the new Department has apparently been turned down, although Mr. Johnson denied this at a news conference this week.

A suggestion that antipollution efforts of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be transferred is still in a state of suspension; and efforts to enlarge the responsibilities of the new Department in the field of transportation have apparently been sidetracked by the President's own proposal to establish a Department of Transportation.

Therefore, Mr. Weaver's domain may wind up being no larger than the empire over which he currently presides in the housing agency. However, there will be changes.

In the first place, the legislation creating the new Department made sure that Mr. Weaver had more than nominal control over the constituent agencies of his Department, which is the situation today. He will have direct control over the new Assistant Secretary for the Federal Housing Administration—a post that replaces that of FHA Commissioner, over whom he now has little statutory authority—and he can do whatever he likes with the Community Facilities Administration, the Urban Renewal Administration, and the Public Housing Administration.

Secondly, the act creating the Department suggests, rather vaguely, that the new Secretary of H.U.D.—now known as "HUD" in Washington parlance—do what he can to coordinate the efforts of other agencies, including his own, to keep the cities from falling into complete chaos. Thus the post of "urban coordinator" will be important. This post was established in the act to help pull together Federal urban programs into one smoothly orchestrated operation.

So the new Secretary will have some important powers, whatever Mr. Johnson does with the task force recommendations. But there is one fly in the ointment. If the Secretary acquires no new functions other than the housing function over which he has ruled since 1961, then his power will depend on his ability to make other Government agencies with urban programs coordinate. And this, in turn, will depend on whether or not the President supports him.

This issue, too, is in doubt. Mr. Johnson kept Mr. Weaver hanging for 4 months while he searched for somebody else to head the Department. Mr. Weaver is a very good man, but the President's long talent hunt suggested that the White House felt there was somebody, somewhere, who was better.

POWERS

Then, too, Mr. Weaver had managed to anger many powerful special interest groups in the urban field, although it is hard to contemplate a housing administrator who would not. The mayors, for example, complained that they could not get the necessary funds for urban renewal, and that the processing of their urban renewal plans got caught up in all kinds of unnecessary redtape.

The upshot of all this is that Mr. Weaver—who turned down several excellent offers while waiting for the President to make up his mind—comes to his new post under rather unfavorable auspices.

With the President's support he can be an excellent administrator, an innovator, and a salesman with Congress. He can transform a housing agency into a creative and powerful force in American life. Without the President's support, he may end up being just another housing administrator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe it appropriate to point out that we have heard discussions of discrimination in the consideration of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Civil Rights Act of 1965. It is worth noting that the Senate discriminated in favor of Mr. Weaver.

The Senate came to the unanimous conclusion that the nomination should be considered without lying over for 1 day as the rules require. A single objection, of course, would have delayed the nomination.

The reason that the Senate saw fit to act in this regard as to Robert C. Weaver is that he has performed well in his present position many functions he will have as a member of the President's Cabinet. He performed those functions.

I have heard no charge or suggestion that he would do anything other than his duty as the merciful God permits him to do that duty and to see the facts as they come before him.

On that basis, just as the Senate gave its consent that the nomination be considered, I urge that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ROBERT C. WOOD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert C. Wood to be Undersecretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to morning hour business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MANSFIELD-AIKEN MISSION REPORT

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, an excellent article has been written on the Mansfield-Aiken mission and on the report of that extremely important and carefully selected "blue ribbon" senatorial group. It is an article by Vic Maerki in the January 10, 1966, issue of the Burlington Free Press. Mr. Maerki knows whereof he speaks because he is no stranger to the Washington scene as he has delved deeply into the legislative operations of our Federal Government from both the aspect of a working member of the press and a hard working legislative staff assistant.

He accords to the Mansfield-Aiken mission and its report the seriousness, dignity, and recognition it so richly merits. I call the attention of the Senate particularly to the last paragraph of his article in which he states:

> Whether the conclusions by these two distinguished national leaders are valid or not, they have done the United States a service by voicing their opinions on the eve of the opening of a session of the Congress that will surely be the forum for a widening—and perhaps, climactic—national dialog on the subject.

To this I would add my own personal comment that whether one agrees with the findings, conclusions, and opinions expressed in the Mansfield-Aiken mission report or subscribes to their position, it must be recognized that this is the deadly serious work of respected, eminently capable, and dedicated national leaders.

I ask unanimous consent that the Maerki article be placed in the Record at this point and invite the attention of all Senators to it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Once Over Lightly

(By Vic Maerki)

In the 74th year of a life that has spanned two world wars and a series of smaller conflicts, U.S. Senator George D. Aiken, Republican, of Vermont, is trying his hardest to help his country prevent world war III.

To that end, the wise old Vermonter has joined in a grim report to President Johnson that warns the only alternative to a general war in Asia may be an unpopular and unsatisfactory negotiated settlement of the conflict in Vietnam.

It has become apparent in recent days that Aiken has become convinced that the United States will have to strike some painful bargain in Vietnam to reduce the danger of that war spreading into a world conflict.

The grim substance of Aiken's feelings have already been made public by U.S. Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, the Senate majority leader.

Aiken was one of four Senators who accompanied Mansfield on a world mission whose major purpose was to compile facts on the war in Vietnam and on the world attitude toward the war.

The formal report of the Mansfield mission was made public this week, but the Nation and the world have had little word on the private, oral report Mansfield gave the President on December 19, the day after the five Senators returned to this country.

But Aiken and others close to Mansfield have suggested the Senator majority leader's report to the President was even grimmer than the formal report, if that is possible.

The evidence is that Mansfield told the President that there is very little hope that the United States will be able to negotiate the kind of settlement in Vietnam that all Americans are hoping for.

Aiken has already suggested that he and Mansfield feel the best the United States can hope for is a kind of settlement that will provide a limited type of "peace" in South Vietnam.

Mansfield and Aiken appear to agree that that prompt efforts by the United States might lead to a negotiated settlement of the widening conflict between the United States and regular North Vietnamese troops who take their orders from Hanoi.

At the same time, the two Senate leaders are making it clear that they feel that kind of settlement would do little, if anything, to end the war of terror being waged against the South Vietnamese Government by the Vietcong guerrillas.

That suggestion, of course, is not the kind of proposal that either President Johnson or his key advisers want to make to this Nation or to the world. It is not the kind of "peace" that Americans—including Mansfield and Aiken—want to accept.

But, Aiken and Mansfield have—in the strongest possible terms—warned the President that the United States is nearing the point of no return to Vietnam, a point at which the alternative to an unsatisfactory negotiated settlement may be a general war in Asia.

Aiken has made it clear to friends that he has given his unqualified support to all the private recommendations Mansfield has given to the President, and Johnson is aware of that support.

There have also been growing indications that the Mansfield report to President Johnson on December 19 may have contributed substantially to Johnson's decision to suspend the bombing raids against North Vietnam.

Aiken and Mansfield are old friends. Aiken and Johnson are old friends and the President, at Aiken's birthday party last year, called the Vermont Senator "a great American" and a colleague whose wisdom and counsel he valued highly.

Neither Mansfield or Aiken have taken an extreme position in the Vietnam dilemma. Unlike some of the other leaders in Washington, Mansfield and Aiken have not pretended their suggestions can guarantee a solution to the struggle in southeast Asia.

Mansfield and Aiken have been in the center of the moderate position in the Vietnam debate, and their major contribution to that debate so far has been to make it clear that there can be no simple solution to the complex problem.

Neither Mansfield or Aiken is willing to sacrifice the honor of the United States in Asia, and they have made it clear despite the suggestions of some of their critics to the contrary.

But, they have warned that insistence on unconditional surrender in Vietnam is not consistent with the facts they found unless the United States is prepared to risk general war in Asia.

In short, AIKEN and his old friend MANSFIELD are arguing that this Nation should face the prospect that there can be no clean, simple solution to a dirty, complicated situation.

Whether the conclusions by these two distinguished national leaders are valid or not, they have done the United States a service by voicing their opinions on the eve of the opening of a session of the Congress that will surely be the forum for a widening—and perhaps, climatic—national dialog on the subject.

PEACE OFFENSIVE IN VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, all of us must continue to hope and pray that the peace offensive for Vietnam, instituted by the President, will be successful. My concern today is over what appears to be a difference of opinion at lower levels in the administration as to what the United States should do in the event the current effort to stop the killing and to begin the talking around the conference table, should be unsuccessful.

In this connection, I believe an extremely important editorial, entitled "After the Pause," was published in the Washington Post yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial may be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this editorial expresses in large part my own view, to the effect that we should avoid, at almost any cost, continuing an escalation of the war; that if we are unable to persuade Hanoi and perhaps Peiping to come to the conference table or, in the alternative, gradually to ease off their attacks, we should hole up in the major cities; that our policy should be not to escalate, but to defend the strongholds. In my opinion, that is a far wiser plan than the one which is reported on the first page of the New York Times this morning, under the headline "United States Is Reported To Set Deadline for Peace Drive. Washington's View Growing Pessimistic in Absence of Reply From Hanoi. Limit Put Near January 24. Bombing of North Vietnam Might Resume at Closing of Lunar New Year."

The source of this statement is anonymous. I do not know where this statement originated, but I hope it is not true. I strongly support the President in his efforts to get to the conference table, and in his efforts to keep the war in Vietnam from accelerating into world war III.

Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks an excellent column along these lines, entitled "L.B.J.: Searching Out of the Trap," written by Marquis Childs, and published in the Washington Post of January 17.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I further call the attention of Senators and to readers of the RECORD generally to an excellent statement by Gen. James M. Gavin, which was published in the newspapers this morning, during the course of which he said:

> To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the pentrations of North Vietnam troops into the South.

Further, the article reads:

> Gavin said the 190,000 U.S. troops already in the Vietnam theater would suffice "if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks on North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete statement published in the Washington Post this morning, summarizing General Gavin's letter to Harpers magazine, may be printed at the end of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. I am not of the view, as expressed in the Post editorial, that a large majority of the Members of Congress are in favor of starting to bomb North Vietnam, or to destroy Hanoi, or to attack the Chinese nuclear capability wherever it may be found. I am of the view that there is a majority in Congress who are behind the President in his commonsense efforts to find peace in Vietnam. I hope that this expression of my view may persuade other Members of the Senate who feel as I do to speak up for commonsense and for peace.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Sunday, Jan. 16, 1966]

AFTER THE PAUSE

The President very wisely has put no terminal date on his peace offensive or on the pause in air operations against the north while the peace efforts go forward. Since there has been no known response from Hanoi, either affirmative or negative, it is too early to say whether there will be any results. Sooner or later, if there are no negotiations at all, consideration will have to be given to the next military moves.

There is a powerful impulse in the Congress, in the country, and in some places in the executive department, for a resumption of air activity and for an initiation of full-scale warfare against the north to put a speedy end to a disagreeable war. Powerful as this impulse is, and strong as the support may be for the use of more military muscle, it is to be hoped that the President will reject the counsels of those who wish to escalate the war. There is not much reason to believe that an unlimited air war would achieve decisive results. North Vietnam does not present the kind of industrial targets that are peculiarly vulnerable to mass bombing. Even if the United States were indifferent to the moral arguments against mass bombing (and it is not indifferent), the practical results probably would not be any more decisive than were the results of area bombing in World War II. While stepped-up interdiction of communications might further diminish the ability of North Vietnam to give logistic support to a conventional military invasion, there is not much hope that it would stop infiltration of troops in small units. And even if the bombing succeeded in all these counts, the Chinese Communist support of North Vietnam might make the results indecisive. As long as air operations are directed at North Vietnam (and not China), we are embarked upon the task of kicking the cart until the horse cries for mercy.

The unconditional withdrawal of U.S. forces is a course for which there is little responsible support in the country. And the primary reason is that no one can give any assurance that this policy would be any more successful as a means of ending the war in southeast Asia than the policy of escalating the conflict. Escalation might simply move the war to another and larger theater. Withdrawal also would be likely to move the conflict to another theater in another country.

To continue or expand the present offensive against the Vietcong in the south, by the employment of the tactics now being pursued, is going to involve a heavier commitment than we have so far made if it is to have any reasonable prospect for success. Such an expanding commitment, accompanied by rising commitments of North Vietnam and China and Russia, might easily produce another stalemate at a higher level.

The facts of the situation seem to argue strongly for a somewhat different application of the military power we feel we can appropriately commit to the area. No doubt it is an alternative that already has been explored—and perhaps even rejected. But it can be argued quite persuasively that in the next phase of the war, the United States and its allies might wisely alter the character of the war in the direction of a more economical and efficient deployment. At present, we are engaged in an offensive-defense, employing both ground and air forces in the hot pursuit of Vietcong elements into terrain offering the greatest advantages of concealment and the most serious hazards to pursuing forces. To seek out and destroy a guerrilla force by such tactics, overwhelming force is required on a ratio of at least 10 to 1. The present ratio, counting all South Vietnam and American and allied forces is 826,000 to 230,000 according to the Mansfield report—and the rate of North Vietnam infiltration is on the order of 1,500 a month. So the possibility or feasibility of achieving antiguerrilla ratios like those in Malaysia and the Philippines is remote.

If it is difficult or impossible for us to annihilate the Vietcong without a military investment that looks excessive, it can be made impossible for the Vietcong to achieve their objectives without a deployment beyond their means. Were our tactics to alter from pursuit to a take-and-hold basis, the burden for the offensive could be shifted to the Vietcong. It is our purpose to deny North Vietnam the fruits of a war of "national liberation," and we can do that by successfully holding the areas now occupied and slowly and persistently enlarging them by territorial sweeps instead of jungle pursuit. The American and South Vietnam forces, while steadily expanding the occupied areas and pushing out their defense perimeters, would be chiefly engaged in garrison operations. These, of course, are wasteful in terms of manpower employed but economical in terms of manpower expended. They are less hazardous and more feasible for a country in command of air power and thus able to maintain communications with scattered garrisons than they were for the French. Within the areas occupied by the South Vietnamese and by our forces, a program of rehabilitation and reconstruction could be pushed forward, once it becomes possible to afford the peasants and villagers security.

The military priorities under such a strategy, would be (1) securing of areas already held, (2) expansion of that territory only as rapidly as we are prepared to take and hold new real estate, (3) pursuit operations only where they can be carried out with greatest economy of force, (4) air operations chiefly in close support of territorial enlargement, and, as indicated, against large and vulnerable enemy concentrations, (5) air interdiction of routes from the north, scaled to the degree of infiltration, (6) no air attack on North Vietnam for the time being or unless surveillance discloses massing for offensive operations against the south.

This is no quick and easy formula for an offensive military success in conventional military terms. It contemplates neither the annihilation of enemy forces, the crushing of the enemy's will to resist, or the solid gains of invasion and quick occupation. It projects the steady, slow, and patient pacification and reconstruction of South Vietnam. It must be acknowledged that success will consist of denying the victory of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong in all the territory we are prepared to take and hold and then rebuilding that occupied area and providing the inhabitants with a higher standard of living. The forces required will be quite large; but the losses in combat should be much smaller with the defending forces enjoying the advantages of well-equipped men in strong defensive positions. It will cost more money but it should cost fewer lives. It will take more time—but we should not be in a hurry.

Away from the combat areas, the strategy has the virtue of making it clear to the world that our role is purely defensive. The war in South Vietnam will come to a stop if the forces of the National Liberation Front quit their attacks. Every dispatch from the war areas will make it plain that it is the Communists who are responsible for loss of life and destruction of property. In the absence of negotiated peace there can be, under this formula, a tacit peace, whenever the Vietcong wish it.

This is no blueprint for either victory or peace in a hurry. But it is a blueprint that involves the surrender of no principle; it makes possible the de-escalation of the conflict; it contemplates the confinement of the war to the area now involved. It does not have the simplicity of victory or surrender. It plainly looks forward to an admittedly remote date when enough of the territory of South Vietnam will be secure so that there can be normal elections under which the people can pick a government of their own choice—and decide for themselves whether they wish to affiliate with North Vietnam or retain their independence.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 17, 1966]

L.B.J.: SEARCHING OUT OF THE TRAP

(By Marquis Childs)

As cruel a choice as any President ever faced—that is the prospect for Lyndon Johnson at the start of the second year of his first full term as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief. In any objective view of where we stand today the President is seen, in fact, to have no choice.

The guns-versus-butter argument is almost wholly meaningless. It implies that by trimming off a little fat the Nation can devote itself to winning the war in Vietnam. As Chief Executive, Mr. Johnson knows how false this is.

He had had on his desk for some time a report still classified secret showing 21 "high tension" cities where there is steady deterioration in the Negro ghettos. To ignore this and postpone or abandon the programs for making at least a start at correcting a century of injustice is to risk disaster. Violence and rioting on the scale of Watts could break out in any one of these cities in coming months.

But as Commander in Chief he has come to understand the nature of the trap that is Vietnam. This was the great service performed by his own chief inspector, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the Senate's majority leader. When Senator MANSFIELD and his four colleagues returned from the round-the-world trip on which the President had sent them he made clear without any sugarcoating the consequences of an open-ended land war in Asia.

The Mansfield report is believed to have been the most important factor in the commonsense decision the President has for the time being arrived at. That is to make Vietnam a holding operation while a new and revitalized attempt is underwritten to win the villages and pacify the areas held by the South Vietnamese with American help.

This comes belatedly after the tragic errors of the past have been compounded. The so-called hamlet program was little more than a system of armed stockades within which helpless villagers were confined often at the mercy of returning Vietcong. The new program is inspired by Maj. Gen. Edward C. Lansdale, consistent advocate of the vital need to win the allegiance of the Vietnamese people.

Part of the new program is to try to broaden the base of the government in Saigon. It is today hardly more than a shadow government with Premier Nguyen Cao Ky representing a dominant military faction. The critics of negotiation make a powerful point when they say that any agreement to end the war would almost inevitably result in a takeover by the Communists in South Vietnam in a relatively short time. But the more the government slips into the role of American puppet the less likely it is that any independent regime can ever be established, with South Vietnam becoming an American protectorate into the indefinite future.

As head of his political party, the third horse he must ride in a race with odds that the Founding Fathers could hardly have conceived, the President understandably did not show his entire hand. And it is here in the weeks just ahead that the testing will come. For a large part of the military, conspicuously the Air Force, and their spokesmen will fight what appears to be a holding operation looking to an eventual settlement. Balked of their goal their shrill cries promise to become hysterical.

That goal is in one disguise or another a preventive war against Communist China. Their case sounds very much like the argument for a preventive war against the Soviet Union in the late 1940's.

As politician, compelled to tailor his decision to clients covering the entire spectrum, the President runs his greatest risks in the year ahead. Trying to please everyone—to keep his consensus—he will end by pleasing no one. Merely cutting up the conventional pie, in deference to the threat of inflation, will not be enough if the cities are really to be made over. Holding the line may prove militarily impossible and if the Communist enemy gives him no quarter, in response to all his efforts to find an honorable way out, he will have to take the steps toward escalation and the prospect of a greatly enlarged war that he so dreads.

To ridicule the President's peace offensive is easy enough. The conventional diplomat shudders in distaste. But there is increasing evidence that it has had a marked effect in both the allied and nonalined worlds, and no one can say what may be the results behind the Communist barriers. Here is a man determined to find his way out of the trap who will not stand on the conventional wisdom.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 17, 1966]

GAVIN SAYS HANOI BOMBING COULD BRING IN PEIPING UNITS

NEW YORK, January 16—Gen. James M. Gavin declared today a massive buildup of U.S. forces in Vietnam may prompt Red China to send troops there and reopen the Korean war as well.

The 58-year-old former chief of U.S. Army research and development suggested that America concentrate instead on holding major bases along the South Vietnam coast while diplomats seek an end to the fighting.

In a letter appearing in the February issue of Harper's magazine, Gavin said:

"To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnam troops into the south.

"Also, if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese 'volunteers' and the reopening of the Korean front.

"ESCALATION SEEN LIKELY

"This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course that we are now on."

Gavin said the 190,000 U.S. troops already in the Vietnam theater would suffice "if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks on North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva."

He asserted that an attempt to make all of South Vietnam secure from the Communists "would take many times as much force as we now have in Vietnam"—and risk a fresh outbreak of Red Chinese aggression in the Korean pattern.

"I do not for a moment think that if we should withdraw from Vietnam the next stop would be Waikiki," Gavin said. "The Kra Peninsula, Thailand, and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontiers of Thailand."

Emphasizing that he spoke "solely from a military-technical point of view," Gavin recalled that he was Chief of U.S. Army Plans and Operations at the time of the French military disaster in Dienbienphu.

He said Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, then Chief of Staff, "directed that we go into the situation quite thoroughly in case a decision should be made to send U.S. forces into the Hanoi Delta."

"The more we studied the situation," Gavin wrote, "the more we realized that we were, in fact, considering going to war with China, since she was supplying all the arms, ammunition, medical, and other supplies to Ho Chi Minh.

"If we would be, in fact, fighting China, then we were fighting her in the wrong place on terms entirely to her advantage."

Gavin said southeast Asia is no place to take on Red China in military combat.

"Manchuria, with its vast industrial complex, coal and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its warmaking capacity," he said. "There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged, if at all."

SHOWDOWN NOT YET DUE

Gavin added that if Red China continues aggression and arms itself with nuclear weapons "the time may come when China will bring upon herself a nuclear war. But that time is not here yet."

Gavin, a paratroop commander in World War II, retired from the Army in 1958 because of differences with the Eisenhower administration over modernizing the Armed Forces. He was a particularly strong exponent of more aerial mobility for ground troops.

Gavin called the sky cavalry concept, which we are now employing in South Vietnam, and commented:

"When I retired in 1958, I said that I would be happy to serve as a private in the Army if it were the kind of an army that I wanted it to be.

"I think it is that kind of an army now * * *."

INTENTION OF SENATOR JAVITS TO REPORT TO SENATE ON HIS VISIT TO VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have just returned from Vietnam and intend in due course to report to the Senate thereon. Therefore, I shall not make any statement on that subject on the Senate floor today.

REPEAL OF NONCOMMUNIST AFFIDAVIT REQUIREMENT FROM MEDICARE AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague from New York [Mr. Kennedy], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the repeal of the non-Communist affidavit required by Public Law 89–97, the so-called medicare amendments to the Social Security Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 2776) to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1965 so as to eliminate therefrom certain provisions which deny hospital insurance benefits to certain individuals otherwise eligible therefor because of their membership in certain subversive organizations or their prior conviction of crimes involving subversive activities, introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] was kind enough during my absence in Vietnam to announce at the opening of the Senate last Monday that I would introduce this bill, as I had announced during the adjournment of Congress I would do.

As one of the early sponsors of the legislation to provide medical insurance to older Americans, and as the author of that section of the act which blankets in all citizens who are over 65, whether or not they are social security beneficiaries, I am particularly concerned that the new law contains a provision disqualifying additional participants from medical benefits if they have belonged to certain organizations. It will be remembered that many of us on the Republican side of the aisle, including the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smith], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the former Senator from New York, Mr. Keating, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], spoke emphatically in favor of the whole program for medical care.

Thus, I am particularly concerned that the very persons whom we worked so hard to include will be disqualified unless the requirement for this particular kind of affidavit shall be removed. The section objected to—and quite properly so—does not affect 17 million Americans covered by social security, but only the 2 million who are not otherwise beneficiaries of the system.

Mr. President, I know a good deal about this subject; that is why I am introducing the bill and making a statement today. At the time the original medicare proposals were drafted—and I was one of the draftsmen—this kind of disqualification was contained in other Federal statutes—specifically, the National Defense Education Act and the National Science Foundation Act—and was apparently included in the medical care bill solely as "boiler plate" language in the course of its drafting. It was not discussed on the floor of the Senate; it was not discussed in committee.

Recent changes in both National Defense Education Act and the National Science Foundation Act, however, clearly indicate that congressional sentiment is against such oaths.

It is my personal belief that Congress did not intend, in passing the medicare bill, to incorporate such a provision in the language of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from New York is offering an amendment to the act that seeks to——

Mr. JAVITS. To excise that language.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from New York honor me by permitting me to be joined as a cosponsor of his proposal?

Mr. JAVITS. I would be honored.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New York is quite correct. We were not aware that that language would be a part of the bill. After all, we probably should have had knowledge, but we did not have knowledge of it because most of us were busy with other matters. Its inclusion in the Act came as a complete surprise to me to understand that, in fact, it had found its way into the bill at a level other than the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. I may tell the Senator from Oregon that I, as one of the bill's draftsmen, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], and other Senators who participated were as much surprised. The bill was long and complicated. I thought I had read every word of it, but apparently I had not, and the language crept in because other Acts were being used as models. The language should be excised as quickly as possible, because Americans over 65 should not be denied the medical benefits available under the act because of past associations. Nor should the 2 million Americans affected by this provision be subject to a loyalty oath to establish eligibility.

As I pointed out during the debate on the National Defense Education Act amendment, no farmer is asked to sign a loyalty oath to obtain a crop subsidy; no small businessman is asked to sign a loyalty oath when he seeks financial help from the Government; and the officers of no shipline are asked to sign such an oath when they seek a ship subsidy.

I urge other Senators to join me in cosponsorship so that this last vestige of the demeaning test oath will be removed from our statute books.

I am grateful to my colleague from Oregon [Mr. Morse] who honors me and this endeavor by joining me as a cosponsor.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, confronting the Senate in a few weeks will be a question of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I know that before that question comes to the floor there will be much discussion of it. There has been already. As is so often the case when division is deep and feelings are strong, some of the statements are something less than helpful.

I found it very helpful to read an article by Prof. Leroy S. Merrifield in the George Washington University magazine.

Here is an academician of distinction and one who is experienced in labor-management relations speaking his point of view with relation to this question. As is not surprising, since I share his point of view, I think it is an excellent article. I believe that even those who do not see it the way we do will recognize that Professor Merrifield furnishes a balance which is sometimes lacking in our debates. Because it is a matter of concern to all of us, and because I believe the article is very worthwhile, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The Union Shop and the National Labor Policy," written by Prof. Leroy S. Merrifield, and published in the George Washington University magazine in the fall 1965 issue be printed at this point in the Record, but that preceding the printing of the article, there be printed in the Record a brief biographical sketch of Prof. Leroy S. Merrifield as it appears in this excellent issue of the George Washington University magazine.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Prof. Leroy S. Merrifield

Leroy S. Merrifield, professor of law, has made a career of labor law as teacher, author, research scholar, and arbitrator. He holds the bachelor of arts in political science and history and the bachelor of laws from the University of Minnesota and the master of public administration from Harvard. After serving as Navy communications officer in World War II, Professor Merrifield spent a year as an attorney with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. As a specialist on international cartels, he assisted in the famous dyestuffs case and the General Electric light bulb case. Named to the university law faculty in 1947, Professor Merrifield taught and served as acting dean before returning to Harvard for specialized study of labor law and jurisprudence and the completion of his doctoral degree. Later he was granted a Fulbright fellowship and studied at the University of Sydney in Australia, that country's unique system of settling labor disputes by compulsory arbitration. In 1963 he was named Ford Foundation fellow for studies in Switzerland and Belgium of the labor laws of the European Common Market and the work of the International Labor Office. He has served as impartial referee for the National Railroad Adjustment Board and is a member of the labor arbitration panel of the American Arbitration Association. He has acted as consultant to various Government agencies on labor relations law problems. His 1960 casebook, with Prof. Russell Smith of the University of Michigan, is a standard text in the labor law field, and a new edition is now being prepared. Professor Merrifield is a member of Phi Beta Kappa as well as Phi Delta Phi, professional legal fraternity, and the American Society of International Law. He has been president of the University Chapter of Order of the Coif, whose members are law graduates standing in the high 10 percent of their classes.

THE UNION SHOP AND THE NATIONAL LABOR POLICY

(by Leroy S. Merrifield)

The bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which permits individual States to prohibit the union shop, has been blocked in the 1965 session of Congress. Although it passed the House of Representatives and appeared to have the support of a majority in the Senate, a successful filibuster by a coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats, organized and led by Senator DIRKSEN, prevented the Senate from taking it up. The two-thirds majority needed to invoke cloture could not be found. Since the bill may be considered earlier in the 1966 session of Congress, when the Senators are not so anxious to go home, some discussion of the background of the issue may be useful.

EARLY BACKGROUND

The effort of organized workmen to achieve 100 percent membership by concerted action goes back to early days of American history; in fact, the first reported labor law case involved this issue. A group of shoemakers in Philadelphia refused to work for any master who employed a nonmember at a wage below the rate agreed upon by the members of the association. The court found this conduct to be a criminal conspiracy.

Later in the 19th century, the doctrine of criminal conspiracy fell into disuse and was succeeded by tort actions, usually for an injunction, which turned on the court's judgment as to the propriety of the union's means and objectives. There was considerable variation among the State judges as to whether an agreement with the employer to hire only union men was a proper or a wrongful objective. The tendency, before the advent of legislation, was in the direction of approval; and the experts of the American Law Institute, in restating the common law of the States in the mid-1930's, concluded: "restriction of employment by an employer throughout his business, or on specified jobs within it, to workers who are members of a labor union, or of a particular labor union, is a proper object of concerted action by his employees."

As a practical matter, however, strong campaigns by employers in the 1920's were rather successful in preserving the open shop, which was explained as follows by Finley Peter Dunn's famous character, Mr. Dooley, in the Literary Digest of 1920:

"Really, I'm surprized at yer ignorance, Hinnissey. What is the open shop? Sure, 'tis where they kape the doors open to accommodate th' constant stream av min coming' in t' take jobs cheaper than th' min what has the jobs. Tis like this, Hinnissey: Suppose wan av these freeborn citizens is workin' in an open shop f'r th' princely wage av wan large iron dollar a day av tin hour. Along comes anither son-av-gun and he sez t' th' boss, "Oi think Oi could handle th' job nicely f'r ninety cints." "Sure," sez th' boss, and th' wan dollar man gets out into th' crool woruld t' exercise hiz inalienable roights as a freeborn American citizen an' scab on some other poor devil. An' so it goes on, Hinnissey."

During the great depression, the National Industrial Recovery Act provided for codes of fair competition which contained the famous section 7a declaring that workers had the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. There was some doubt whether this right to have a representative of their own choosing would be violated by union shop agreements requiring membership in a particular union as a condition of employment. Before this controversy could be resolved, the NIRA was held unconstitutional and was superseded by the National Labor Relations Act, more commonly known as the Wagner Act.

THE WAGNER ACT

The Wagner Act of 1935, in section 8(3), prohibited an employer from discriminating against employees to encourage or discourage union membership. Because it was feared that this might be interpreted as outlawing union security agreements such as the closed shop and the union shop, the following proviso was added:

"*Provided,* That nothing in this act * * * or in any other statute of the United States, shall preclude an employer from making an agreement with a labor organization * * * to require as a condition of employment membership therein, if such labor organization is the representative of the employees as provided in section 9(a)."

Opponents of the Wagner bill alleged that this proviso would legalize the closed shop even in States which at that time regarded it as illegal. Senator Wagner declared that this allegation was false—that the only intention of the proviso was to make sure that the new Federal legislation was not interpreted as outlawing such agreements in States which allowed them.

During World War II, the War Labor Board frequently settled labor disputes over union security by ordering the inclusion of "maintenance of membership" clauses in collective agreements, thus overriding any State laws under the war power.

After the war, the Supreme Court, relying on the 1935 legislative statements of Senator Wagner, held that the Wagner Act proviso allowing agreements making union membership a condition of employment did not override more stringent regulation of them by a State. (Wisconsin, in this case, required a two-thirds vote to validate such an agreement.)

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Meanwhile, in the Taft-Hartley amendments of 1947, Congress outlawed the closed shop (an agreement that a person must be a union member to obtain a job) on grounds that it was subject to abuse in choking off free entry into employment. Congress retained the proviso allowing the union shop (an agreement that an employee must join the union within 30 days to retain his job), but added two safeguards against abuse: (1) union membership must be available on the same terms and conditions generally applicable to other members and the initiation fees must not be excessive or discriminatory, and (2) no employee may be fired under a union shop for any reason other than the failure to tender the periodic dues and initiation fees uniformly required. Thus Congress recognized the legitimacy of collective bargaining agreements requiring potential free riders to pay their way, but Congress prohibited the discharge of an employee for not joining the union, as long as he tendered his dues or equivalent support money.

In addition, the 80th Congress in the 1947 Taft-Hartley amendments provided that no union shop agreement could be put into effect unless a majority of the eligible employees voted in an NLRB secret ballot election to authorize the union to negotiate such a contract. However, experience during the next 4 years resulted in 97 percent of the elections going in favor of authorizing a union shop, and this requirement was repealed by the Taft-Humphrey bill in 1951. The law still provides for an NLRB deauthorization election upon petition of 30 percent of the employees, but such petitions are seldom filed.

Thus it appears that Congress in 1947, under the leadership of Senator Taft, legislated a carefully worked out accommodation of the interests involved in the union shop controversy. The reasonableness of the unions' free-rider argument was given recognition, but Congress provided safeguards so that union membership could not be made a condition of obtaining a job, and the individual worker who incurred the union's wrath could not be fired for any reason other than nonpayment of dues.

However, the 1947 amendments also included section 14(b), saying that nothing in the Federal law should authorize union shop agreements in a State which prohibits them.

COMMENT

It is understandable how Senator Wagner would make the concession he did in 1935. His main problem was to get a bill enacted which would provide basic protection for the right to organize, free of employer interference, restraint, coercion, and discrimination, in the face of the prevailing climate of Supreme Court opinion at the time that the Federal constitutional power under the commerce clause did not extend to the regulation of labor relations in industry.

But a lot of water has gone over the dam since 1935; the power of the Federal Government to regulate labor relations under the commerce clause has become firmly established, and the Supreme Court has gone very far in the development of the doctrine of Federal preemption. Section 14(b) stands today as an anomaly. In all other areas of national labor policy, where Congress has thoroughly legislated a Federal rule and given jurisdiction to the NLRB to carry out the congressional mandate, State law has been superseded. Congress is regarded as having occupied the field, and conflicting State laws have been invalidated by the Supreme Court. For example, where Congress has legislated in great detail on organizational picketing and secondary boycotts, the NLRB has exclusive jurisdiction and the States are ousted from jurisdiction in the interest of a uniform application of the national labor policy. Section 14(b) is the only exception, and even here, the Supreme Court has held that State power under antiunion shop laws come into effect only upon the signing of a union shop agreement. The regulation of strikes and picketing to obtain a union shop agreement is still subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the NLRB. This awkward division of jurisdiction would be eliminated if section 14(b) were repealed.

Senator Taft's Senate bill in 1947 did not contain a section 14(b); the Hartley House bill did; and Senator Taft went along with it, believing that it merely declared the preexisting law under the Wagner Act. It has been argued that Senator Taft was under the impression that section 14(b) would only apply to State regulation of intrastate commerce and would not override the Federal rule in interstate commerce. In opposing the Ball-Byrd amendment to the Senate bill, he said, "We considered the arguments very carefully in the committee and I myself came to the conclusion that since there had been for such a long time so many union shops in the United States, since in many trades it was entirely customary and worked satisfactorily, I at least was unwilling to go to the extent of abolishing the possibility of a union shop contract * * *. So I think it would be a mistake to go to the extreme of absolutely outlawing a contract which provides for a union shop, requiring all employees to join the union, if that arrangement meets with the approval of the employer and meets with the approval of a majority of the employees, and is embodied in a written contract."

Senators MORSE, PEPPER, and Barkley strongly opposed section 14(b). Senator Barkley said, "I object to this measure because it does what we have seldom, if ever, done before: it leaves to the determination of the local authorities in a State the question whether a Federal law shall be in effect in that State * * *. We might just as well pass an act of Congress against counterfeiting the currency of the United States, but in it provide that if any State legislature authorizes counterfeiting, then the Federal law shall be null and void in that State."

A distinguished independent study group on "The Public Interest in National Labor Policy" sponsored by the Committee for Economic Development (CED) and including such labor relations experts as Clark Kerr, John Dunlop, and George Taylor, concluded in 1961: "We believe that management and labor should have the right to bargain over and negotiate for a union shop. Because our national labor policy is predicated on the trade union as the exclusive representative of all the members of the bargaining unit and because we feel that the participation of all the members of the bargaining unit would improve the quality of such representation, we urge the elimination of the right of States to go beyond the restrictions contained in the Federal law."

Section 14(b) was a political compromise hammered out in a conference committee; its roots go back to a day in which Federal power to regulate labor relations under the commerce clause had not yet been recognized by the Supreme Court. Today it stands as an isolated exception to the rule that Federal labor law is supreme over conflicting State laws. As Prof. Michael Sovern, of Columbia University, has said: "Permitting the States to enact right-to-work legislation is fundamentally anomalous; it subverts the Federal policy favoring uniform regulation of labor-management relations; and it could seriously weaken collective bargaining, an institution that the Congress has repeatedly undertaken to foster."

CONCLUSION

In this day and age, when so much business cuts across State lines, it is undesirable to have the law on such an important part of labor law vary from State to State, especially when Congress has "taken hold" of the subject matter and legislated a carefully reasoned out body of law, giving recognition to the need to balance and accommodate the conflicting interests involved. If that accommodation does not work well, Congress should itself make the needed adjustments within the rational scheme of the national labor policy. Congress has already taken the proper action in the 1951 amendments to the Railway Labor Act governing the railroad and airline industries, where the union shop, with safeguards against abuse, is allowed, "notwithstanding any other law of any State." If a uniform Federal rule is sound policy in these industries, it is also sound policy in other industries affecting interstate commerce.

There will be problems of adjustment, such as what to do about religious conscientious objectors and what to do about relieving political dissenters from the use of part of their dues money for political purposes not germane to collective bargaining. If experience shows that individual workers' interests are not being adequately safeguarded under union shop agreements, Congress should take the responsibility of reform. If further regulation or prohibition of the union shop is needed, it is needed nationally—not just in the largely regional groupings of States with antiunion shop laws.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR AN EFFECTIVE CONGRESS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on December 28 the National Committee for an Effective Congress issued its annual report on domestic and international issues and problems.

The National Committee for an Effective Congress is a bipartisan organization. Among the members of the NCEC are: Sidney H. Scheuer, chairman of the executive committee; George R. Donahue, vice chairman; Susan M. Lee, secretary; Charles Rose, treasurer; Hannah Arendt; George Backer, George Biddle; George Combs; Stephen R. Currier; Tom Fizdale; Alan Green; Alvin H. Hansen; Mark De Wolfe Howe; S. Jay Levy; Isidore Lipschutz; Marshall MacDuffie; Archibald MacLeish; Hans J. Morgenthau; John Nuveen; George E. Outland; Duncan Phillips; James A. Pike; George D. Pratt, Jr.; Robert W. Ruhl; Thibaut de Saint Phalle; Francis B. Sayre, Jr.; David E. Scoll; Edward S. Skillin; Michael Straight; Telford Taylor and Gerhard P. Van Arkel. The chairman of the board of advisers is Maurice Rosenblatt and its executive director is George E. Agree.

I ask unanimous consent that the thoughtful and provocative statement of the committee be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR AN EFFECTIVE CONGRESS

I. WORLD NEED FOR PRODUCTIVITY GIVES NEW DIMENSION FOR AMERICAN STRENGTH

As costly, intensive, and bloody as the Vietnam war could yet become, it is merely a ripple on the tidal wave of change sweeping the world. The real issues will not be settled there—and both sides know it. They are fighting merely for leverage in more decisive arenas and toward more fundamental objectives.

It has become fashionable to assert that American power and influence are declining relative to the rest of the world. But there is little justification for bearish opinion about our future role in world affairs.

Fundamental trends will greatly increase our influence during the next decade:

The overriding factor in world politics today is the growing gap between population and productivity. The 3 billion people in the world will be 6 billion in 35 years. World ability to produce food and other material necessities is failing to keep pace, and threatens to fall further and further behind. Worst of all, the greatest increases in population are occurring in those underdeveloped areas in Africa, Asia, and Latin America which are least able to raise their own productivity—and which, not incidentally, are considered to be the battleground for the political future of mankind.

The overriding factor in America's relationship to this world is our own enormous and quite unmatched productivity. Our gross national product, having almost tripled since 1950, is in the neighborhood of $673 billion this year and promises to exceed $710 billion in 1966.

Whether we are wise or foolish, whether our motives are noble or mean, our relationship to a hungry world inevitably will revolve around these two factors—our productivity and the world's need.

As the dependence of the underdeveloped areas upon our productivity increases, our influence over the decisions that will determine the course of their future development will also increase—whether we want it to or not. It is essential that we prepare to use that influence to help people in these areas learn the techniques and acquire the tools to provide for themselves in the long run. Their very dependence upon us may be the best impetus to that learning.

Given the unparalleled heights of our productivity, it is fair to assume that we must be doing something right.

We must not be shy about communicating the things we have learned during the past few hundred years of Western history. Other people may not want to be like us in their culture, their art, their philosophy, or their values; but it is beyond doubt that they do want and need to be like us in their command of modern technology and in their ability to produce the necessities, and even the amenities, of modern life. It will not be presumptuous or overbearing of us to insist, as we must if we are to help them achieve this objective, that it can be achieved only under conditions of widespread literacy, freedom of expression and political action, and a system of work and production incentives that reward initiative and enterprise.

The hard realities of the need for production—and especially food production—are everywhere and increasingly evident.

The Russians—their fantasy of overtaking America gone glimmering—are being forced out of international competition to a significant degree. They paid the economic cost of inefficient agriculture in order to maintain authoritarian political control over Russian farmers. Now this is becoming a political cost as well. A country which still has 40 percent of its work force on some of the most extensive and richest farmland in the world is reduced to the status of a chronic food importer. Their example has no enticement for nations needing to increase their own food production. To import food the Russians are compelled to spend hard currency that they would rather use for industrial and military development. Their agricultural incapacity deprives them of significant leverage over governments whose survival may depend upon delivery from abroad of millions of tons of wheat per annum.

In the underdeveloped world, two wars have been stopped in recent months—in Yemen and the India-Pakistan conflict—largely in consideration of the need for Western economic aid. This inhibition on military adventure can become one of America's most effective deterrents in a hungry world.

Even Red China will soon have to face the fundamental fallacy in its world strategy as articulated by Marshal Lin. The fond dream of an underdeveloped world countryside throttling the cities of Western Europe and North America is just that. The United States is no Shanghai, Europe no Nanking, to be starved out by Mao Tse-tung. These cities feed the marshal's countryside, not the other way around—and the country folk know it. This is why the Maoist revolution has slight political or economic muscle and must confine its expression to military means—and that only in an area so marginal that it was hoped we would not respond.

This picture confronts President Johnson at the same time that he must find a way to articulate to the American people the purposes for which we have been fighting in Vietnam. America must state its purpose in southeast Asia and the world in terms large enough to warrant the heart-breaking sacrifices the Vietnam war will entail if it continues. Holding the line against Ho Chi Minh or Mao Tse-tung can only be justified to the extent that we mean to do something worthwhile behind that line.

Of critical, and perhaps decisive, importance in this regard is the need to mobilize American agricultural production to meet the world food shortage. Until recently, our food-for-peace program was essentially a device for disposing of unwanted American surpluses without disturbing world markets. Now the surpluses are almost gone, and the demands are enormously greater. (India, which took 3 million tons of wheat in 1962 and 6 million tons last year, needs 14 million tons in 1966.) The situation has been under top level review by State Department, AID, and Agriculture Department officials, and there are strong pressures for the food-for-peace program to be revamped and greatly enlarged along lines urged by its former director, Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, of South Dakota.

Among the steps advocated in this program are a gradual reduction in acreage and production controls and a deliberate stimulation of surpluses which the Federal Government would buy for distribution overseas. It is not lost on political observers, and possibly not on President Johnson either, that such a program for increased agricultural production would be of greatest benefit to precisely those rural areas which tend to be most isolationist and most likely to react adversely to the fact of fighting overseas.

In the long run, the underdeveloped countries will have to raise their own food production. An important component of any American program must be to help them acquire the necessary technological and economic base. This means fertilizer and insecticide production, credit and marketing systems, and—above all—literacy. Farmers need to know how to read a seed catalog and the directions on the fertilizer bag, and heavy attention to education must be an indispensable part of an effective American aid program. Administration planners have been projecting major programs, but how heavy an investment is made in education overseas and how soon it is made will depend on the duration of the war.

II. VIETNAM RECASTS ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM AND DOMESTIC POLITICS

Will 1966 see the launching of the Great Society around the world, or will world troubles sink the Great Society at home? The Members of Congress and heads of the administrative departments are forced to make their plans for next year on the assumption of continuing war.

If the war should end quickly, an across the board reorientation will be necessary. Peace would bring a revival of emphasis on the Great Society programs now being curtailed or abandoned. A decline in military emphasis would also mean more vigorous application of present plans for international development aid—perhaps under the slogan, "A Great Society for the World." On the other hand, a succession of maneuvers which raise peace hopes without success would compound the President's difficulties at home and abroad.

But, as long as Americans are fighting and dying overseas, public attention inevitably focuses on Vietnam—and with it the center of political gravity. Administration supporters in and out of Congress are concerned that many of the fresh starts and bright hopes of the Great Society may be casualties in the Vietnam struggle. If the war escalates, the fate of the Great Society and its congressional supporters will be determined by the balance between public distress over the fact of the war and public conviction that the war is necessary.

As the President repositions himself to face the world and its troubles, he cannot turn his back on the foundations he has laid for the Great Society. It is more than ever apparent that domestic and foreign policy are parts of a single fabric, and one cannot be frayed without the other coming apart.

Vietnam is costing American lives, and this fact will reach almost every phase of our public policy as long as it continues. Political leaders are already subjected to multiplying pressures as the impact of war in Asia produces difficult and widely ramified effects on Main Street. Vietnam is the focus from which almost all other concerns radiate, and about which they orbit.

The budget is being reshaped, priorities reshuffled. Congressional campaigns are groping for new themes, as even psychological factors become politically important. The dominant mood of confidence has given way to malaise, and the Democratic majority has been uneasy.

An early peace would be taken as a vindication of President Johnson's leadership and would bring credit and euphoria to the Democrats.

How big the pie and how to slice it

Critical to the success of what Johnson must try to do at home and abroad is the capacity of our economy to bear the double burden of guns and butter. Already scraping the bottom of the manpower and equipment barrel, the Johnson boom must now provide an intensive military buildup. The question boils down to a race between our growing productive capacity and our increasing needs.

Voluntary maintenance of wage and price levels, and sales from stockpiles of aluminum, copper, and wheat have held the economic line thus far. But there are doubts as to whether persuasion and manipulation will be enough in the event of real shortages or a need for production priorities to insure strategic materials for the expanded military effort. Whether the economy will overheat and require more drastic management is doubted by most, but some businessmen feel the administration has already taken the first steps toward wartime production and price controls.

A yearly increase of 3 percent in our standard of living can be cut in half next year to pay for the war without anyone feeling deprived of anything. But economists believe that administration budget specialists must accomplish this trick without accelerating the rise in the supply of money and credit, which would tip the present delicate balance into an inflationary spiral. This money problem stems from the fact that an additional $10 billion is estimated for the military effort. This could go higher by the last quarter of 1966, as the Vietnam war has proved to be one of the most expensive in history, per bomb dropped and soldier deployed.

Where will the money come from? Eight to ten billion dollars additional in Federal revenues are anticipated as an automatic result of the growth in national income. Other billions will result from the excess of increased social security payments over decreased excise taxes. The total could be enough to finance the war, but not if the Great Society programs enacted last year are to be budgeted on the originally expected scale.

Some conservatives are predicting that a tax rise will be necessary by spring. But the predominant view is that the President will be able to cut back existing and projected expenditures by an amount sufficient to tide him over. Mr. McNamara's announced plans to eliminate 800 military bases is a first step in this direction. The word is out that cutback is the order of the day. HEW, Commerce, and other departments are rife with rumors of preliminary drafts of new proposals, as thick as telephone books a few weeks ago, now pared down to a few sheets. Few Presidents have had more knowledge than Mr. Johnson of where to find the fat in the governmental corpus when a reducing program is necessary.

Easing the administration's problems is the fact that manpower requirements of industry and the military are reducing the need for many of the projected poverty and rehabilitation programs. There is no reason to make jobs for people who already have them, and training programs to upgrade skills are being undertaken increasingly by private industry itself, since it has hired the unskilled and semiskilled workers and wants to get the most out of them.

However he may succeed in limiting expenditures for the Great Society, President Johnson is likely to find that Congress will limit them even further. The "funding of the Great Society" was scheduled to be one of the key issues in the pending session anyhow. Escalation in Vietnam would place a new and sharper knife in the hand of the economy bloc.

Congress and the elections

The Johnson leadership drove the first session of the 89th Congress at a sprinter's pace for a marathon 10 months. This may have been done simply to get while the getting was good, to make possible a short session in the 1966 election year, or "so I could give more time to foreign problems"—as the President recently said. It may have been all three. Whether due to luck or design, he now is free to address world problems. He will need every bit of this political elbow room.

In addition to bringing the war to an early and acceptable conclusion, the President must see to the reelection of as many as possible of the new Democratic Congressmen garnered in the Goldwater windfall. The Senate poses no problem. It would take three successive landslides for the Republicans to regain control of the upper body. But the House represents a real danger to whatever future Mr. Johnson has in mind.

Even during the spectacular first session, the major elements of Mr. Johnson's program were carried only by an average 235 to 200 vote in the House. This majority was composed of 213 Democrats who supported the President at least 70 percent of the time and 22 Republicans who supported him at least 55 percent of the time. A shift of a mere 18 votes—just half of the Democrats' net gain in 1964—would have meant the failure of much of the program.

Even more important, a shift of only 11 votes (among Republicans alone) would have meant the failure of the rules changes which made it possible to bring the program to the floor. Thus, conceivably, a loss of only 11 seats in 1966 could restore the old pattern of domination by the conservative coalition when the rules changes come up for review in January 1967. The normal off year rebound of the minority party would more than account for these 11 votes.

The Democrats' hopes for holding onto their gains are gravely jeopardized by the Vietnam war. The war has effects on two levels—the legislative and the political. In the legislative arena there is the impact on what remains of the Great Society's domestic legislative program. Those things costing money will either not be offered or will suffer rough going in a Congress looking for excuses to assert some independence of a President who is beleaguered overseas. But the developing cost of living issue (the index rose from 103 to over 110 in the last 5 years) may encourage introduction and assure passage of so-called consumer bills such as those for truth in packaging, truth in lending, and tighter regulation of medicinal drugs. These programs do not cost money.

The political arena may prove much more important than the legislative. Republican challengers may not be able to score many debating points about Vietnam, but Democrats who must face the voters next fall are on the defensive and fervently hoping that the fighting ends before November. The war is not a political issue yet, according to most reports from Congressmen now touching their home bases. The great majority of voters appear to be supporting the President. But the people are nervous, and it is thought that deep misgivings could spread rapidly if the war takes a bad, unexpected turn. "Right now there are no votes in it," said one. "It has not yet crystallized into blame."

Another Democrat reports that at the beginning of the escalation he heard mostly from angry left-wing opponents of the war, and soon thereafter from right-wing advocates of all-out bombing. Now he is hearing from more moderate citizens who do not advocate anything, but ask serious questions he finds difficult to answer.

But even this uncrystallized condition hurts the Democrats. Partly it is the automatic disruption caused by any new issue injected into a painstakingly balanced "consensus." Special attention is always directed to the newest and most controversial factor. When that factor is as serious as war, it overreaches and overshadows all others.

Even if the 1966 campaign should be relatively free of the angry charges and bitter recriminations of the Korean period, voters may very quietly take out their frustration on the Democrats. As one Congressman put it, "They will be angry and wanting to throw a rock at someone. Mao and Ho won't be on the ballot. Neither will Johnson. So they'll throw the rock at me."

There will be other reflections of what one candidate described as a mood of "part of the way with L.B.J." According to a Democratic freshman, constituents say, "You're a good Congressman and I like you. I voted for you last time. But I believe in the two-party system, so I will probably vote for a Republican next year." Against this cry of "one-party monopoly" there is no direct rebuttal. Each of the 61 freshmen Democrats will have to depend upon his own popularity and personal distinction to provide special arguments for his reelection.

Return of psychopolitics—A potential danger

The specter of Korea looms over all speculation as to the political effects of the Vietnam war. Both Democratic and Republican thinking about the 1966 election tends automatically to assume a repetition of some of the phenomena of 1950 and 1952.

The big question is whether and to what degree the repetition will include the radical right psychopolitics of the McCarthy period. If more men die and others are taken from schools, jobs, and families, emotion will charge the political atmosphere. It will replace reason, and even interest, as a basis for political action. The cries of "murderer" and "traitor," already directed at President Johnson from extreme left and right, evoke vivid and foreboding memories of McCarthyism. The concern now felt in political circles is not so much over the all-out or pull-out extremists themselves, as over the possible effect of wartime anger and frustration upon normally rational voters.

The radicals of the right have potentially more influence that those of the left. They are better organized and more wholeheartedly reject the Johnson administration and all its works. In addition, no matter how the war may escalate, their shout for more will find easier echo from an angry public than any appeal for something that looks like surrender.

Though the peace movement will be running its own candidates for Congress wherever possible, the get-tougher disciples of Barry Goldwater have a much more potent political base in the candidacies of Senators like Strom Thurmond, John Tower, Milward Simpson, and Carl Curtis, as well as dozens of Representatives.

Nevertheless, the climate will be very different than that of the Korean war. At that time, the wrenching reorientation from wartime friendship with Russia to postwar enmity, the reverberations of the Hiss case and the Wallace candidacy, the antics of Joe McCarthy, Bill Jenner, and other extremist members of the Senate class of 1946, and the wideranging influence of the China lobby, all combined to instill widespread doubt as to the motives and security of our own leadership. This doubt was heightened by Gen. Douglas MacArthur's deliberate public revelation of his disagreement with the President on the conduct of the war.

Few of these factors seem likely to be present in 1966. None but the Birchers, and perhaps not all of them, believe that Lyndon Johnson is either a traitor or a tool of traitors. The Red scare as it applies to government is dead; and even rightwing revulsion at bearded peace marchers is not likely to revive it. There is as yet no sign of an active military leader likely to take public issue with the President on combat strategy. Richard Nixon, Barry Goldwater, and Ronald Reagan, however slashing they may be, are not as frenzied as Joe McCarthy and Bill Jenner. The China lobby is today reduced to a rearguard operation to maintain Taiwan's position in the U.N. Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen will not hit too hard at President Johnson; and House Minority Leader Gerald Ford will try to keep his rightwing responsible.

In sum, not only is there a difference between Korea and Vietnam; there is a difference between the America of 1950 and of today. The American political system had a recent inoculation of McCarthyism and does not seem likely to come down with a serious case of the disease this soon.

Constructive republicanism threatened

Chairman Ray Bliss' prescription for the Republican Party is a slow knitting together of the wounded members. Professional care is the watchword. And Mr. Bliss has been reasonably successful in suppressing at least the surface symptoms of ideological infection.

Now the possibility of a war-dominated political year threatens to send party temperatures rising, and to give some members the fits again. Moderates and responsible conservatives are voicing urgent concern over the possibility of the Goldwaterites gaining new strength from Vietnam and taking the party back down the 1964 road. They report strenuous argument, as yet behind closed doors, for all-out exploitation of the war issue.

This development comes at a time when some sections of the party were orienting successfully to the effects of urbanization and redistricting. At issue is whether the party will be misled down a bypath which cannot extend forever, and conceivably could come to abrupt termination even before the next election—or whether the party will continue its painful adjustment to fundamental 20th century realties.

The war-stimulated rightwing is bound to have some influence. But officeholding moderates are proportionately more numerous than at any other time in the past two decades, especially in the Senate and statehouses—thanks to the 1964 decimation of Goldwaterites. The individual campaigns of incumbents like Caleb Boggs, Clifford Case, John Sherman Cooper, and George Romney, and challengers like Charles Percy, will exert a steadying influence.

The biggest tangible stakes within the party are the congressional nominations in the windfall districts marginally won by Democrats last year. Most of these were previously held by Goldwaterites. Some will be regained by Republicans next fall. Party leaders in many of these districts learned the lesson of 1964 and have been shopping around for more presentable political images.

The prospect has been for an increased number of moderate Republicans running for Congress and other offices. The party has achieved some success in groping for a viable and responsible alternative to the Johnsonian consensus. There could be a shift in the balance of power among Republicans in the House that would bring it more into line with the relatively moderate image of Republican Senators and Governors. But the war might reverse this trend, and the search for a Republican identity could be another Vietnam casualty.

The movement moves from street to booth

In 1966, the self-styled peace movement will make a maximum electoral effort if the war continues. Their premise is that only they want peace. Their objective, which they will fall far short of reaching, will be to match the proportions of the Henry Wallace campaign for President in 1948.

After years of dormancy, the movement ran a few of its own candidates for Congress in 1962, and supported some others. But its line was undercut by the Cuban missile crisis on the eve of the election, and its showing was dismal. In 1964, with its adherents passionately anti-Goldwater and supporting Johnson, the "movement" did not emerge as a separate force.

Now, with Johnson having gone the road of escalation in the Vietnam war, conditions exist for an intensive and highly emotional separatist campaign. Based on already indicated attitudes, some dozen or 15 House Democrats are likely to encourage and receive ardent peace movement support. Third party candidacies will be mounted in other districts—perhaps to make a total of 25 or 30 in all.

It is difficult to project the effect of these candidacies. On one hand, House Democratic strategists are worried that in marginal districts a drain of even 3 or 4 percent of the vote away from incumbent Democrats would throw those districts to the Republicans. On the other, the opposition of the peace movement could well strengthen some Democrats in their appeal to the undecided middle voter—just as Henry Wallace strengthened President Truman.

More dangerous from the Democratic point of view is the prospect of another form of separatism—independent candidacies mounted by the left wing of the civil rights movement. This threat has already been articulated in Chicago and some other areas. It reflects a deep split in the civil rights movement between those who are trying to proceed toward attainable goals and those whose anger at American society verges almost on rejecting it altogether.

The split over how to handle the effort to seat representatives of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party in Congress, and more recently the lack of communication evident in the White House Conference on Civil Rights, indicate the dimensions this movement may reach. It is far more worrisome to the Democrats than the peace movement. For, its potential goes beyond a mere 3 or 4 percent to a possibility of 20, 30, and even 40 percent in certain urban districts.

It is almost inevitable that the peace movement will support such civil rights separatists with both money and effort, thus magnifying the image of both. This would be to the ultimate detriment of American Negroes, whose further progress, most observers believe, is dependent upon not allowing their cause to become confused with other issues. And many procivil rights white and Negro Americans who disagree with the peace movement are bound to resent any appearance of civil rights affiliation with it.

III. THE JOHNSON WAY

In building the domestic Great Society, President Johnson was working familiar ground, coping with problems in which he had long congressional experience and where his own zest and enthusiasm were readily communicated to others. His genius has been to satisfy material needs, using the powers of Government to deal directly and practically with the tangible problems confronting citizens in their daily lives.

Now Mr. Johnson must find a way to apply these skills to the international arena. And, though many have thought his rhetoric faulty, it may be that a talent for reducing problems to their political components can be more effective than words. Finding fulcrums and applying leverage is probably as central to change in the workaday world of international relations as it is in the management of home affairs.

FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS PAY OFF

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on December 12, 1965, in the Long Beach Independent Press-Telegram, which is one of the distinguished California newspapers, an excellent article appears. The article is entitled "Flood Control Projects Pay Off—Record Rains in November but Damage Held Low."

The article describes how, in the area of the State from which I come, the work of a Los Angeles flood control district prevented widespread devastation and damage from the recent torrential downpours in that area of the State. The Government of the United States played its part in those labors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of this article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Flood Control Projects Pay Off—Record Rains in November but Damage Held Low

(By Bob Sanders)

Last month was the wettest November on record in southern California. December already has a good start toward a record-setting wet month.

In Long Beach 7.69 inches of rainfall fell from three major storms that raged across the area; 9.68 inches fell at the Los Angeles Civic Center, and other measurements varied from 5 inches along some areas of the coast to a whopping 35 inches at Long Beach unified school district's Camp Hi Hill near Mount Wilson.

You don't have to be an old-time resident to remember when a storm of lesser proportions would have caused swirling waters in hundreds of major intersections, cold running water in the front and back yards of thousands of homes and several hundred thousand dollars worth of damage reported.

None of this happened. Sure, there were mudslides in some sections of Los Angeles County and some canyons in both Los Angeles and Orange Counties were declared "peril" and even "disaster" areas.

But it wasn't like the "old days."

Why?

The main reason is the Los Angeles County flood control district, which is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year.

Historians will tell you that periodic floods have been part of the history of southern California since way back in 1815. In fact, since 1862, 23 major storms have produced major flooding in the area, according to the flood control district.

After a major flood in 1914 which caused more than $10 million worth of property damage the Los Angeles Flood Control District was created by the State legislature.

Its purpose was, and still is, twofold: One to control, prevent if possible, floods, and, two, to conserve water.

Almost a billion dollars has been spent since that time from local, State, and Federal funds and the fruit of these expenditures is now beginning to be realized.

The fact that last month's storms caused no more damage than they did is proof.

In the last 5 years more than $30 million has been spent in the Greater Long Beach area alone on flood control and drainage projects.

The area's four major drainage courses, the San Gabriel River, the Los Angeles River, the Dominguez Channel and the Los Cerritos Channel, all have been improved by either the Los Angeles Flood Control District or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

An elaborate network of storm drains has been constructed in the area, with funds provided from bond issues approved in 1952, 1958, and 1964 for a total of $679 million, to drain off potential floodwaters from the streets and other areas into the major channels.

Flood control engineers can see no end to storm drain construction. They say that a 1958 survey showed that if all the storm drains needed at that time were built they would number 2,000 and cost almost a billion dollars.

Of course, all the storm drains in the area would be useless if it weren't for the system of reservoirs, dams, and catch basins that stop the flow of water from the mountains and store it for later use.

From Sepulveda Basin on the northwest to Prado Basin on the southeast, these artificial bodies not only help control floods by stopping the torrential waters but they also hold the fresh rainwater from running off into the sea and being wasted.

In fact, Walter J. Wood, chief engineer for the Los Angeles Flood Control District, estimated that water tables had been replenished during November by about 14,825 acre-feet, representing a dollar value of about $300,000.

This is a sort of bonus for not having a flood.

Of course, all is not as rosy as it sounds. The people who were victims of the slides last month are not happy. But the flood control people hope eventually, in future years, to be able to take care of their problems, too.

Also, it has been pointed out that while last month set a record for rainfall the rain was not of a high intensity. If it had been, it might have been a different story.

However, there are very few people these days who feel that the flood control program, as expensive as it has been and as expensive as it will be in the future, is not worth it.

ACADEMIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last month on the campus of the University of Southern California, a conference was held on "Academic Involvement in the Republican Party." Participating in that conference was my legislative assistant, Mr. Stephen Horn, who spoke on: "Ideas in Action: The Relations Between the Academic Community and Elected Representatives."

Mr. President, I commend the thoughtful, penetrating comments which my legislative assistant has made to my Republican colleagues. However, beyond that, I commend it to all other Senators, because there is a great and growing need for the academic community to participate with greater vigor and growing strength in the political and governmental affairs of the Nation. There is a need for them to express themselves, I should hope, as members of both our national political parties.

In a portion of his comments, Mr. Horn said, in part:

> Too often we have heard that the Republican Party must come up with constructive alternatives. This is not enough. The Republican Party must devise progressive initiatives.

How true that is. Great men in the history of the Republican Party stand out today as beacons for progress in this Nation.

I am one of those who devoutly believe in two great political parties endeavoring to demonstrate to the people their own complete dedication to trying to solve the problems which plague our fellow citizens, great and small.

We need to attract into the Republican Party our full share of the academic and scientific community of this country.

That is in part the theme of this excellent presentation. I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the presentation be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ideas in Action: The Relations Between the Academic Community and Elected Representatives

(Remarks by Stephen Horn, legislative assistant to U.S. Senator Thomas H. Kuchel before conference on "Academic Involvement in the Republican Party" sponsored by the Arts and Sciences Committee of the Republican State Central Committee, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif., Dec. 4, 1965)

By and large, the American intellectual—as is true of most Americans whether they be politicians, labor leaders, or farmers—has not been ideologically oriented. He has sought, as those in other occupations have sought, to bring to bear on a given problem all relevant facts before reaching his final conclusion. He has sought to solve problems. If he has developed theories to unify our knowledge in a given field, those theories have usually been immersed in reality rather than in pure abstraction. There are some in both the world of the intellect and in the world of politics in both parties who prefer to weave abstractions and discover "theories" of politics and society, such as "conservatism" and "liberalism" which have little grounding in fact and little applicability to our times, if they ever had relevance in any time. We do not address ourselves to this small handful today.

Instead, our concern is with the great number of politicians and intellectuals who need to be brought together in a wedding of fact and ideas if we are to attack, with freshness and with vigor, the problems that abound in our society. If we are to be successful in this endeavor, there is a need for combining the best that can be offered by men of thought and men of action. It is not impossible to serve in both worlds. It is not incompatible. While it might be at times frustrating, it is also necessary and rewarding.

One of the most moving murals I have ever seen was completed in the early thirties by Jose Orozco and is in the Baker Library at Dartmouth College. There, in a powerful panel entitled "Gods of the Modern World," Orozco has portrayed, standing in front of a world aflame, six skeletons gowned in the doctoral robes of leading American and European universities. In front of them another robed skeleton receives stillborn knowledge delivered from a skeleton parent who is couched on ponderous tomes. Other, smaller skeletons in academic gown are locked in bottles which are strewn among piles and rows of books. Here, Orozco has registered an eternal protest against dead knowledge and intellectual bondage and called for a new creativity in the use of knowledge.

Henry Adams once gloomily noted that "Practical politics consists in ignoring facts." If that were true in the 19th century, it is seldom true in the 20th. But there are facts and there are facts. Elected officeholders and their staffs are overwhelmed with information—the need is to apply what is meaningful to the task at hand. We need your help. You can help us not only with the "answers" but with the "questions," since knowing the correct question is half the battle if the data is to be brought to bear on the problem at hand.

Yet, what condition largely prevails today? A longtime and astute observer of Congress, Neil MacNeil, chief congressional correspondent for Time magazine, recently had this to say with reference to my own profession:

"Members of Congress, as a whole, normally do not listen to the political scientists, and the political scientists do not listen to the politicians on Capitol Hill. This has produced the long estrangement between Congress and the intellectual community * * *. The hostility is at every hand, in speeches in the House and Senate, as well as newspaper editorials and the books of political scientists. * * * The Congressman repays the intellectual in kind for his hostility. It's a natural response. If the intellectual regards the word 'politician' as an epithet, the typical Congressman equates the professor with the pedant. If there is justice in both views, at least in some cases, the effect is to impede any real communication between Capitol Hill and the academic world. And this, in turn, has created that dangerous chasm between Congress and the intellectual community. In plain terms, they do not understand each other, and too frequently they do not bother to try to understand each other.

"The loss is the Nation's loss, for Congress needs help in meeting the challenges of today and the promise of America's future. Congress needs the help of the academic world: the imagination, the skill, and the talents of men and women who can help Congress fathom the depths of its institutional needs, and then bring forward viable remedies to meet them."

In 1959, the Brookings Institution sponsored a roundtable conference on Congress in which between 30 and 40 Members of the House of Representatives from both parties participated. Dr. Charles L. Clapp, then of Brookings and now legislative assistant to Senator SALTONSTALL, wrote "The Congressman: His Work as He Sees It" as a result of these meetings. That book has done much to overcome the estrangement Mr. MacNeil notes.

Although some of the panelists said that they had profited from contacts with the academic community, and both parties have called on experts for committee testimony and occasionally made use of them on party policy committees, the consensus of the group was that:

"The influence of the academician on individual Members of Congress both in the formation of decisions and in serving as a source of ideas and advice is generally regarded as negligible, both within the academic community and on Capitol Hill. His role is thought to be greater with committees than with individual legislators and stronger in the Senate than in the House."

No doubt mutual suspicion does exist between some politicians and some members of the academic community. Neither feels that the other understands his problems. But this is not unique and certainly not insurmountable. Individuals in both groups feel that their own colleagues do not understand their problems.

I suspect some in the intellectual community would agree with Robert Louis Stevenson, who said that "Politics is perhaps the only profession for which no preparation is thought necessary." But this is not the case.

Of course, some politicians believe that members of the intellectual community, scientists in particular, have gone beyond legitimate bounds in transferring the prestige of their particular discipline to the conclusions they voice on public policy. These conclusions are frequently on matters of value on which good men can disagree rather than the obvious conclusions of so-called objective scientific facts. In the Senate hearings on the nuclear test ban treaty, equally eminent scientists testified for and against the treaty. Who is the nonscientific legislator to believe? But then the "halo effect" is not new, nor limited, to either members of the academic or political communities.

Some members of the academic community believe—as I suspect from reading the incoming mail do many other constituents—that politicians really are not much better at making judgments on matters of public policy than any citizen who reads the morning newspaper or listens to the evening news on television. That attitude also needs correction.

There is, of course, a difference between a strictly "scientific" judgment and the questions of political and social policy which daily must be decided by an officeholder even on matters of science and technology.

This does not mean that the natural, physical, or social scientist cannot have judgments on matters of public policy just as every citizen in a free society has a right to voice his opinions, but it does mean that both scholar and politician should be aware of the limitations of where objective analysis ends and subjective conclusion begins.

The jargon of modern physical and social science requires as perhaps never before that "scientific" conclusions receive a full airing among professional peers and that many minds compete on the solution to a given problem in free and open debate. Secrecy requirements, which are often too easily imposed, discourage, rather than encourage, this free and open debate.

Certainly an interdisciplinary perspective is helpful as we bring the various fields of knowledge together on a given problem. But let the scholar recall that the politician is an integrator of knowledge and an amalgamator of ideas. In fact, the politician was an "interdisciplinarian" long before the word came into popular and sophisticated usage in the intellectual community.

In a complex and always changing world, the basis a politician uses for his judgment is only as good as the information which he gathers on his own initiative from his staff and those who have something worthwhile to contribute in the field.

Too often have our colleagues in the intellectual community provided panaceas for all the ills of society while failing to analyze with care the malfunctions of its parts which immediately surround them.

Too often, the politician reacts to past events rather than initiates in terms of the present and the future. Too often—and this is a plague which confronts not only public officials but indeed all of organized society—we feel we have accomplished something when we have merely maintained the flow of "busywork" which constantly demands our attention.

Too often, the politician has failed to realize that when the scholar seeks to apply new knowledge to old problems, he is asking that we challenge, encounter, and overcome myth, tradition, and inertia. But the breakthrough must be made and understood if we are to survive.

The private sector of our economy has long realized the need to call for the services of the scholar. So has the executive branch of our Government. While the international businessman or banker might give lipservice at his luncheon club to Adam Smith, in his office he usually bases his operating decisions on economic analysis as expounded by John Maynard Keynes and his successors.

The administrator in the executive branch has at his beck and call devoted and highly trained professionals with appropriate academic credentials who are on his permanent staff, consultants, and ad hoc and permanent advisory committees. For the party in power this apparatus of skilled manpower is an intellectual community in being waiting to be tapped, as well as a potential transmission belt to likeminded colleagues in cities beyond the seat of Government.

What is true in the potential capacity of the Federal executive branch to utilize intellectual resources is true all the way down the line through the myriad levels and layers of governmental jurisdictions. Recently the State of California has sought to apply the techniques of operations research to the social problems of this State. This is long overdue.

But, what of Congress and, in particular, the party out of power for which there is some slight expectation in the civic books and in popular mythology that we are to be, in the first instance, a coequal branch of the Government and, in the second, a party of creative opposition?

Some of us, in both parties, at the staff level are seeking to apply the concepts of operations research to the legislative work of Congress. Unless this is done the Congress will continue to shrink even further in its capacity to pass judgment on executive-sponsored programs and their implementation. Even now, with the exception of the creativity demonstrated in the rewriting of the medicare legislation and in writing of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Congress power is all too often apparent rather than real, potential rather than actual.

The House Republican Policy Committee and the Democratic Study Group have at times sought to utilize the brainpower of the intellectual community. So have various congressional committees and individual legislators on occasion.

The work of the Joint Economic Committee provides an institutionalized focal point for the legislative branch so that relevant economic information and viewpoints can be brought together. Regrettably, because of the volume of material presented and released by this committee, its publications go largely unread and undigested by most Members of Congress and their staffs. In addition, because of the composition of the committee, the most influential members of the committees in both Houses having jurisdiction over revenue and appropriations as well as such areas of great economic impact as defense and public works are not represented. Thus, the economic ideas and data, though voiced in the Halls of Congress, fail to get into the bloodstream of Congress.

Yet, in the executive branch, economics and science have been institutionalized at the highest level in the Council of Economic Advisers and in the Office of Science and Technology which are part of the Executive Office of the President.

Walter Lippmann was profoundly correct when he noted that the alienation of the intellectual community more than any other event meant the steady decline of the Republican Party. When the Republican Party was founded it was the party not only of the urban businessman who wanted honest government instead of the corruption of machine politics, the free farmer tilling new lands in the West, the free laborer seeking to earn his living at a trade, but also of the intellectual. For 50 years after its founding the Republican Party offered to the American people such politician-statesman-author combinations as Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Cabot Lodge, and Albert J. Beveridge. In California, Chester Rowell, one of the keenest minds in the history of this State, put together a combination of men of ideas and men of affairs in the Lincoln-Roosevelt Republican League which led, in 1910, to breaking the grip of the Southern Pacific political machine and the installation of progressive ideals in our State government.

These men sought, each in his own way, to meet the problems of his time. If the Republican Party is to survive that is exactly what it must do today. It will only be successful in this effort if first there is a receptiveness by Republican officeholders to welcome and, indeed, to encourage new ideas and then a will to carry them out if they are in the public interest. So, too, there must be an awareness in the intellectual community that America's challenges at home and abroad will only be met if there is a competition of ideas.

Too often we have heard that the Republican Party must come up with constructive alternatives. That is not enough. The Republican Party must devise progressive initiatives. It is not enough to rewrite the manpower training legislation as a group of Republicans did in the House in 1962 to make some sense out of it. It is not enough to rewrite the medicare proposals of the administration as Senator JAVITS and Senator KUCHEL did in 1962 and 1964 to make some sense out of them. Let us through a melding of intellectual and political resources at all levels of government bring the best minds together to work on such problems as international, national, and urban growth. There is a need for give and take and for understanding of the realities of a situation, not so that ideas will be diluted in principle, but rather so they will be implemented in practice.

How can this be done? There is no single way. There are many ways. For those politicians who want to do more than serve as a mere errand boy for their constituents where through the distribution of agricultural yearbooks and the handling of casework they give the illusion of accomplishment, there is a need to ask people to help. A politician asks for money to run a campaign, he asks for votes to win a campaign, can he not ask for ideas?

For those who are asked, let them help if it is for a good cause. Party affiliation should not matter. An opportunity to be heard should be the criterion. Each day many of us on individual and committee staffs consult experts in the intellectual community to secure their advice. But the need is not merely for opinion and snap information. The need is for creative thinking in handling the difficult problems—the problems which are often hard to formulate, but which we feel are there. This is a matter of communication and an understanding of the operational needs of each other.

In some congressional districts, Republican Congressmen have a faculty contact at the local university who attempts to pull his colleagues together to furnish relevant information and ideas. In other cases, it is a matter of consulting recognized experts for a private paper or arranging for them to testify at a hearing on the subject where their knowledge can be shared with those who will make the initial decision as to the success or failure of a particular bill.

For those who are members of the intellectual community, there is a need to sit down with your Representative and seek to know him and the problems which he is facing on your behalf. Establish an interest in his work and he will establish an interest in yours. For if politicians share at least one basic characteristic among themselves, it is that they tend to enjoy talking to a wide range of people. I have often thought that a most useful foundation program which would aid in advancing the state of public affairs in our land would be to finance quiet luncheons where one, or two, or three elected officials could sit down and discuss matters with the visiting academician when he comes to Washington.

For over 5 years, the Republican National Committee has had a functioning Arts and Sciences Division. They have compiled the names of those in the university and college communities who want to help and what type of help they would like to give. There have been some takers, but with the exception of securing help for an occasional speech now and then, or utilizing a few of the many on the list for national party task forces on various public problems, the fact remains that if help is to be secured from a community of scholars, it is the State chairman, the county chairman, and the local elected officeholders who have the proximity to the campus to develop such a worthwhile relationship.

One of the most successful initiatives in bridging the apparent gap between the political world and the world of the intellect has been carried on by Republicans for Progress, a committee set up on a permanent basis following the debacle of 1964. An active research group sponsored by this committee has been working for several months in New York; additional groups are being formed in Washington and St. Louis. They meet regularly. They work individually and in teams. They are independents as well as Republicans. They consist of young men and women who are not only in the universities, but also in the research and operations divisions of major banks, corporations, and labor unions. They seek one thing: an outlet for their ideas in the Republican Party. Their work has been eagerly utilized by numerous Congressmen and Senators. They are helping the Republican Governors, some of the House Republican task forces, some of the task forces set up under the Republican Coordinating Committee, and groups of progressive Congressmen such as those in the Wednesday Club. They contributed to white papers on recreation, crime, transportation, health and other areas which were issued during the recent successful campaign of John V. Lindsay for mayor of New York. These were ideas in action. They have dealt with the balance of payments, with new approaches to Canadian affairs, with new ideas for dealing with the Dominican Republic, and a host of other projects.

Another group which has made an excellent contribution to raising the quality and tone of American political debate is the Ripon Society and similar groups such as the Advance at Yale and the Jonathan Trumbull Society at Columbia. The Ripon group, appropriately named after the birthplace of the Republican Party, is composed primarily of young intellectuals and professionals in the Harvard-MIT complex. Both professors and graduate students have actively participated. They have rendered an outstanding service in issuing papers which needed to be issued and in calling upon Republicans as well as Democrats to face up to some of the overriding problems of our times.

As these examples suggest, the community of the intellect is not limited by the boundaries of the college or university campus. Creative talent knows no boundaries. Another good example of this fact occurred in the Lindsay campaign. Young architects concerned about the demise of New York as a decent place to live flocked to the Lindsay headquarters to volunteer their services. Instead of merely releasing the usual short press release announcing that a Committee of Architects had been formed which endorsed John Lindsay, somebody, using imagination, decided to put this architectural talent to good use. They were sent as teams into various neighborhoods to find out how these areas could be improved. The architects talked to shopkeepers and apartment dwellers, to people in the streets, as well as to the policeman on the beat. They found little things such as traffic patterns which made no sense but had long existed. With a few changes that an architect could visualize, such a pattern could be revised to relieve the frustrations encountered by both motorists and pedestrians. They found unused areas which could be cleaned up and made into parks where Sunday strollers might enjoy the outdoors. When John Lindsay went to these neighborhoods, he mentioned these needs and, as a result of the architects' work, was able to tell the people specifically what he would do. These were ideas in action.

But more is needed than part-time campaign efforts or even semipermanent groups working for different volunteer organizations in the party. The need is also for the Republican Party itself to devote the necessary resources to begin and to revitalize research staffs at the National and State levels which will not merely compile and analyze election statistics and clip the more embarrassing comments of the opposition, but which will truly serve as a focal point for integrating creative thought on issues of importance to the body politic.

So much for some of the possible institutional groupings of intellectuals in politics. What about the individual? How does he go about it? Often, rightly or wrongly, as we have noted, there is a need for overcoming some mutual suspicion between "the pol" and "the thinker." With good will and with a realization that each needs the other, if the public interest is to be advanced, this seeming mutual suspicion can be overcome.

Let the politician ask. Let the intellectual not wait, but volunteer. Perhaps at first neither will know what to do with each other. But slowly, as an understanding is increased of the perspective and vitality which each can bring to the political process, the value of the interchange, provided that there is mutual give-and-take, will become obvious. Conceivably having tasted political fire, the intellectual might even desire to be a candidate for office himself. This is all to the good.

Such action can begin at home. In meeting urban problems and offering attractive candidates who know how to solve these problems at the local level, the Republican Party has an untold opportunity as we attempt to give responsible, progressive government to our cities which have wallowed so long in apathy and machine politics.

Our Nation teems with problems. Let us note a few.

How do we build an effective world community where diversity of political institutions and culture can be maintained considering the more than 125 nation-states now in existence and the tribes and ethnic groupings too numerous to count?

How do we use American technology to back a world view for freedom? It is now possible, with satellites, to have a worldwide television system. Think what this would mean in removing the blight of illiteracy, in educating people of diverse language and culture in their native tongue, and in inculcating values of independence.

How do we redress the economic imbalance, growing daily, between the nations which are becoming richer and the nations which are becoming poorer?

How do we provide sound economic development in countries so similar, yet so different in development as Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic? What could we have done to provide for the progressive economic development which has occurred in Puerto Rico as opposed to the adrupt explosion in Cuba and the tragic situation in the Dominican Republic?

How do we meet the food requirements of an expanding world population and overcome the nutritional deficiencies evident in our own land and which predominate in most countries of the world?

How do we develop and utilize the resources of the sea?

How do we preserve independence of mind in a free society when broad political and social goals compel, indeed, divert intellectual resources into purely technological directions?

How do we attain excellence, self-renewal, and happiness—those Grecian ideals we so frequently note and then equally ignore as we immerse ourselves in our daily tasks? The problems of science, as we know only too well are uniquely simple compared to the human problems which presumedly are the politician's daily fare.

How do we educate men not only in the ever-changing fundamentals of their chosen field, but reeducate them and each generation in new knowledge? How do we provide insight for them into the policy-formulation processes so that their knowledge can be effectively utilized?

How do we encourage thinking uncontaminated by expediency in the intellectual community yet intrude thinking on the apparent expediency in the political community—a subject with which we are dealing, in part, today?

How do we decentralize decision making in our society—in the case of Government, for example, perhaps regional decisions on air and water pollution—while preserving national unity?

How do we decentralize industry and move the factories to the fields so that rural unemployment can be remedied, our cultural opportunities expanded, and a better life provided for many who now live in stifling cities?

How do we control man's physical environment, water pollution and smog, for example, to advance the common good? As one person said: "The air is fine as long as you don't inhale it."

How do we remedy water shortages not merely in the semiarid West, but across the land and to utilize the millions of acre-feet of precious water now wasting into the sea not to mention the effective desalting of the sea itself?

How do we dignify physical labor in an advanced industrial nation so that not all will aspire to be white collar workers? How do we provide incentives for industry to employ those without training and train them on the job in a land where equality of opportunity is too often but a hollow phrase?

How do we reduce the incentive not to work encouraged by some types of welfare payments, yet make adequate payments to meet social needs and prevent human catastrophe?

How do we improve the moral, esthetic and philosophical quality of urban life so people of all races can live, in peace and harmony, where each desires?

How do we reduce crime, delinquency, and narcotics addiction, eliminate poor educational and housing facilities, and provide the necessary fiscal resources for our supposedly ungovernable cities to meet their needs if they are to survive? In the urban cities of this land and this State, as I noted earlier, the Republican Party has a unique opportunity to provide the innovators, the doers, and the sound administrative talent to break the stranglehold of Democratic machines and citizen apathy, helplessness, and hopelessness.

How do we break down our cities into neighborhoods where there is a coming together of the political, social, educational, health, and professional life of a community? Sadly, our cities are not something to be aspired to like a medieval cathedral, but rather they are a necessity to be tolerated.

How do we find new governmental units at the local level which will meet the people's needs and bring some order and efficiency and some compassion to the administration of local affairs? Perhaps the problems created by the rapid spread of our people should be approached as we have the spread of disease and a national or a State institute of urban life be established which could combine public resources and private effort in analyzing and recommending solutions for the various facets of urban sprawl, solid waste disposal, polluted streams and air, unemployed workers. Perhaps we should devise a modified version of the so-called Heller plan to rebate a portion of Federal taxes to the States and, instead, rebate them to regional conglomerations of governmental units who are cooperating together to attack these problems which know no State boundaries.

How do we in an age of television with the atomization of society, enable a political party to reach the people in a meaningful and continuing way in order to discover their needs and their views?

How do we encourage qualified individuals, unless they are born rich or beholden to interests which ought not to bind them, to seek political office in a society where a campaign for Governor or Senator in a large urban State such as California costs $1, $2, or even $3 million?

These are the problems which a political party to be worthy of the name and its tradition must seek answers to if it is to survive in 20th century America.

But, let us remember, that however we attack these problems—however we attempt to secure the application of the best minds to the most longstanding problems—there is a need to provide an institutional framework from the very beginning in the planning and formulation stage. There, whether it be under auspices of the Government or of the political party or just independently by an individual officeholder, the politican and the intellectual can come to know each other. There, they can bring their varying perspectives to bear on a common problem so that the end product will be implemented by an aroused citizenry, not filed by a weary librarian.

All too often the attitude has been: "Let the Government give a grant to the planner and the problem will be solved." The grants continue—and the problems continue. The need is for an awareness by politician and planner of what each can offer the other. For some it will be power. Hopefully, for most, it will be results. It will mean better Government because both have truly participated. It will mean ideas in action.

Let Republican politicians, however, make no mistake. Intellectuals will not work for a party or a man merely for the sake of work.

The recent debacle in New Jersey following the effort by some Republicans to limit academic freedom should bury that misguided type of campaign issue for all time, not only in New Jersey, but also in California, and, hopefully, in any part of this Nation. So, too, with the meaningless cries of States rights and fiscal responsibility which we perennially hear. Let us talk, instead, of State and individual responsibility and initiative. Let us remember that we believe in freedom but it is freedom for human beings not freedom for the State to oppress human beings. In this belief the intellectual community and the Republican Party share a common tradition. Let us remember that we believe in responsibility but that fiscal responsibility is not refusing to spend the money needed to do a given job when the legitimate political organs of society have agreed, by majority vote, that the job should be done.

There is no inexorable law of political life which says that the Republican Party will some day regain political power. In the age of apparent consensus we could be in for many years of one party government. The danger, of course, will be increasing extremist fragmentation in both parties with the greatest havoc taking place in the Republican Party unless a new and viable majority can be produced by offering candidates and issues that deserve to win the faith of the people.

As a party, we must not seek final answers. But we must seek workable answers recognizing always that the world in which we live is in constant flux and that the answer for today will not be sufficient for the morrow.

The proper utilization of knowledge will hopefully lead to more alternatives before reaching a given decision. As never before in this complex age not only of the nuclear bomb but of teeming and sprawling cities, there is need for informed choice before public decisions are made which will affect our own and future generations.

As members of the intellectual community, you have a duty not merely to educate politicians and to educate yourselves, but also to educate society. Indeed, there is a responsibility in our universities and in all components of our educational system to educate not only our youth but to re-educate each generation, a task one distinguished scholar has called the need "to reeducate the educated." There is a responsibility of Government and political leaders to take advantage of this opportunity.

There is need for scholars to make a commitment to the party of their choice and the candidate who welcomes new ideas. Our political system is founded on two broad-based parties with competition between each and within each. For ideas to be utilized effectively there is little other alternative.

The late John Maynard Keynes noted in the concluding pages of his classic work, "The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money":

> The ideas of economists and political philosophers, both when they are right and when they are wrong, are more powerful than is commonly understood. Indeed the world is ruled by little else. Practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influences, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist. Madmen in authority, who hear voices in the air, are distilling their frenzy from some academic scribbler of a few years back. I am sure that the power of vested interests is vastly exaggerated compared with the gradual encroachment of ideas * * * soon or late, it is ideas, not vested interests, which are dangerous for good or evil."

Ideas, as it has been wisely said, are weapons. I hope that you, politicians and scholars, will use ideas, in action, for the common good.

The answer you make to this challenge and to those issues will largely determine the future of the Republican Party. It is up to you.

LET'S GO SLOW ON REIMPOSING OBNOXIOUS EXCISE TAXES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, President Johnson in his somber state of the Union message, indicated that we are likely to be involved in the Vietnam war for a long, long time.

Frankly, any time that American GI's spend in fighting and dying in the steaming jungles, bogged down in this hideous terrorist war in southeast Asia, is too long.

The President proposed restoration of the obnoxious sales or excise taxes on telephone service and automobile sales. Those taxes were imposed in 1942 as temporary or wartime taxes. I remember the occasion very well, as I was a Member of the House of Representatives at that time.

Nothing seems so permanent as a temporary tax.

It was not until 1965 that Congress repealed those taxes. There is now a call for more taxes. Automobiles are absolutely necessary to many families. Certainly telephone service is essential to businessmen and to families. Such sales or excise taxes burden most those who have the least. They are regressive, unfair, obnoxious, and atrocious. They violate every principle of just taxation—that taxes should be levied according to ability to pay. Such taxes should not be reimposed. If, because of waging a major war in Vietnam, increased taxes become necessary, let us start with taxes on liquor and tobacco, instead of taxing telephone calls and adding to the cost of automobiles.

Furthermore, the cost of our huge war efforts in Vietnam should not be paid for by depriving the underprivileged, uneducated, and the unemployed of Federal aid to furnish them educational and employment opportunities. We should go forward with what President Johnson terms his Great Society program. Taxes should not be increased before every effort is first made to eliminate waste and duplication in Government, particularly in the Department of Defense, which spends over half our national budget.

Do-nothing little bureaucratic empires which abound in Federal agencies and which have over the years grown "like Topsy" should be rooted out and abolished.

For example, if Secretary McNamara really wishes to impose economy in his Department, the place to begin is in the worthless, boondoggling Civil Defense Division. Of its 779 employees, half receive more than $13,800 a year and do very little for their money except to concoct plans and send messages to each other, plan shelter spaces in public buildings, and buy what they call survival biscuits which will soon rot. The average salary of Defense Department civil defense employees is $11,500 a year. Contrast that with FBI officials and employees average salaries of $8,500 a year; and with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, where many scientists are employed, the average salary approximates $10,000 a year.

Defense Secretary McNamara should remove from the public trough these civil defense boondogglers in his own Department with salaries ranging from $27,000 per annum for Director William P. Durkee right down the line, including 2 at $25,382; 7 at $24,135; 21 at $21,220; 92 at $18,650; 158 at $15,950 and 110 at $13,800. The truth is most of these are castoffs from other departments whose heads desired to be rid of them but because of civil service rules or personal reasons felt they could not fire them. They should all be removed from the public trough.

It is a certainty that the silly civil defense schemes concocted by these bureaucrats would be of no use whatever in event of nuclear war. More to the point, what nation is threatening us with nuclear attack today? Do the civil defense bureaucrats feel that Red China, which has exploded a primitive atomic device and has no delivery capability, is *threatening us with a nuclear attack?* Or, are they afraid of Indonesia, or Egypt, or India or *some other nation still* in the infancy stage of nuclear development?

The Soviet Union, the only nation with the capability of hurling nuclear warheads on airfields and cities in the United States, is no longer a serious nuclear menace. It is a "have" nation instead of a "have not" nation. Its leaders seek to raise the standard of living of the Russian people. The Soviet Union dictators have been veering toward capitalism. Hostility between Moscow and Peiping is very evident.

By eliminating expenditures for this useless agency, millions of taxpayers' dollars would be saved and could be diverted to help defray the cost of the Vietnam war. Certainly, there is no justification whatever for curtailing antipoverty programs while the civil defense boondoggle continues. Last year alone, $105,200,000 was appropriated, and, in my view, completely wasted on civil defense.

Mr. President, the billions of dollars cost of the Vietnam conflict should be shared, and citizens in moderate or humble circumstances should not bear the greater part of the burden.

TRIBUTE TO ANTONIO J. BERMUDEZ

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations has advised me recently that one of the great friends of the United States, from the Government of Mexico, Senator Antonio Bermudez, has just retired from his latest governmental assignment as chairman and director of the so-called Frontier project.

Senator Antonio Bermudez served his country with great distinction as a Senator in the Mexican Parliament. He was then appointed as the Director for Pemex, which is the petroleum organization of the Government of Mexico. This organization administers the development of the oil facilities of Mexico. It was in that connection that I first came to know Senator Bermudez.

In 1949 former President Harry Truman sent me on a special mission to Mexico to look into some of the problems connected with Pemex, as he wished to have the facts before he made a judgment with regard to whether the United States should give consideration to granting a loan to the Government of Mexico for use in helping to develop its oil facilities.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and Chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I have had occasion from time to time to work with Senator Bermudez in connection with United States-Mexican programs, particularly with respect to the development of the great Mexican border program.

The staff of the Foreign Relations Committee has called my attention to an article which appeared in a great Mexican newspaper, the News, on November 22, 1965, while I was out of the country. I was not aware of it until my return. It was written by one of the best known columnists in Mexico, Pepe Romero. It pays high tribute to Senator Bermudez in regard *to his statesmanship with respect* to his fine work as Director of the Mexican border program, and also his statesmanship in connection with his directorship of Pemex.

I associate myself with every comment and word of praise of Senator Bermudez in this very fine article by Mr. Romero. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Un Momentito With Pepe Romero

Mexico D.F.—The self-publicized degree of patriotism, can be worked to futile nonsignificance, because patriotism is achieved by a long trajectory of constructive and valorous intercessions in behalf of one's country, most always in silence. The man who blows to the four winds how patriotic he is, always proves in the end to be full of bull. That is why today I am proud to be writing about a man who is acknowledged during his life, as a true patriot of Mexico. About his person, his worth, and his erudition—he is humble; in anything that has to do with the slightest threat of his country—he is a fighting cock. His brain works like lightning, and yet he is slow, measured and never impulsive in his criticism of others. I am talking about a great Mexican—Antonio J. Bermudez, who a few days ago resigned as Mandamas of Mexico's National Border program (Programa Nacional Fronterizo). All of us know that the Mexican border has been for untold number of years a source of shame and embarrassment to Mexico. Amigos, let's stand at attention to salute don Antonio who in only 4 years of tireless efforts "to clean up the border" has converted it to something all of us can be proud of. Don Antonio awakened interest and preoccupation among the high oligarchy of government and evoked civic response from the people throughout the republic. Senator Bermudez' fight to eradicate the slum atmosphere of our border towns did magic in giving not only a face-bath and a new look to these ports of entry and departure, but increased the business life along the entire border by an increase of a thousand million pesos of sales of articles made in Mexico.

There definitely, thanks to Don Antonio's determination, foresight, experience as a national administrator, and extraordinary leadership, he created new golden doors to Mexico in Tijuana, Nogales, Piedras Negras, and Matamoros. All who pass these doors receive a new clean impression and a truer picture of what to expect in the interior, besides they will find new modern buildings, shopping centers, supermarkets, arts and craft, etc., as an introduct of still greater cultural and commercial activity in the heart of Mexico. His collaborators feel privileged to have worked with Don Antonio. One said, "It has been an honor for us to have worked for a man of such dignity, so clean and tireless worker, who has no watch when anything must be done for the good of Mexico."

Antonio J. Bermudez hails from Chihuahua. A handsome, hard-working and smart youth he became a selfmade success in business. Money no longer an object, he dedicated time and money to serve others. For two terms he was prexy of the Chamber of Commerce of Ciudad Juarez, ditto of the Rotary, and soon after began his political career when he was elected Presidente Municipal (mayor) of Ciudad Juarez in 1941. After that, he became treasurer of the State of Chihuahua, and then Senator of the Republic. In 1946 Don Antonio was brought to national prominence by President Miguel Aleman who appointed him director general of Pemex in order to help resurrect the then-agonizing Mexican oil industry. By 1952 Pemex was already Mexico's No. 1 taxpayer—$1,780,000 pesos for every working day. The legend then was that at the time he took over the job, Don Antonio didn't know the difference between a "Christmas tree" and a string of casing, but that before a roughneck could say parangaricutiro the Senator knew how to differentiate between a wildcat and a duster. If he caught anyone taking or offering a bribe he rubbed them off his list and put them on a black one. Books will be written about his work at Pemex, so much so that when Don Adolfo Ruiz Cortines became President, Don Antonio was held over for another 6-year term. What was a great item for me in those days, was when I reported as did the entire press, that Antonio J. Bermudez had donated his salary during his 12 years as head to Pemex, mostly to educate young men to become oil technicians. During President Adolfo Lopez Mateos' administration A.J.B. was his Ambassador Plenipotentiary to the Middle East, until it became imperative to bring him back to march in front of the national border program—now a national pride.

PIONEERING BY OREGON BUSINESSMEN IN ASIAN WHEAT EXPORT MARKET INDICATES VALUE OF SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE WORK ON BEEF EXPORTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the past several years our Asian neighbors and their economic and political significance to the United States have been the subject of increasing attention.

A recent issue of the magazine, Foreign Agriculture, contains several articles which describe the early recognition of this situation by a group of Oregon businessmen and summarize the large dividends which are being reaped, as a result of their efforts.

The articles picture the growth of U.S. feed grain exports and point out that, in 1956, the Oregon wheat growers organization took the initiative in developing the Japanese market by opening an office in Tokyo for the purpose of promoting the sale of American wheat and wheat products. Mr. Richard K. Baum of Portland, Oreg., was the executive vice president of the Oregon wheat growers at the time, and in cooperation with the officials of the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture, played a key role in the establishment of this operation. In 1959, the wheat growers associations of Washington and Idaho came into this program, and during the same year, the Great Plains Wheat Association also began its participation in the Japan program. At that time, the name of the office was changed to Wheat Associates to reflect the joint nature of the enterprise.

The group's market development activities included a kitchen bus project, assistance with school lunch programs, bakery training schools, and technical assistance to other end-user groups.

As a result during the ensuing decade, wheat dollar sales exports to Japan have increased about sixfold, from $22 to $120 million. We have established U.S. wheat as the supplier for 50 percent of the growing Japanese market.

In 1965, this single export market accounted for 62 million bushels or 43 percent of all U.S. wheat exports. It is estimated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture that our dollar sales have resulted in balance of payment credits of $650 million the past decade. In addition, sales to the Philippines and other Far Eastern markets have been increasing.

An article entitled "Japanese Businessman Successfully Promotes Wheat Foods" illustrates the benefits of the Oregon and successor programs to Japanese economy also. It reviews the career of a Japanese businessman, who began 15 years ago with a family bakery and then became affiliated with the Oregon Wheat Growers program as a consultant. This small businessman has now built a modern bakery, which is the second largest in Osaka, servicing 20 retail outlets, using a fleet of 70 trucks, and turning out 27,000 loaves of bread and 120,000 pieces of Western style pastry per day. The figures illustrate the potential for Western tastes and fashions in food, which are more fully described in a third article "Economist Predicts Japan Will Mirror Western Food Ways by 1985." It is pertinent to note the economist's statement that:

> While consumption of rice in 1985 * * * will drop to 80 percent of its current level, intake of animal flesh will be 6.3 times that of 1961. * * * To meet the need for more animal flesh, 27.5 million cows—or an average of 1 for every 5 men—will be needed.

This movement has already begun, as indicated by an Agriculture dispatch of December 13, 1965, which tells of three increases in the Japanese meat import quota during the past year, and the specific interest in high quality American beef.

This information, I feel, deserves consideration by the American beef and cattle industries. It is particularly relevant in the light of the work currently being done by the Select Committee on Small Business in reducing freight rate and trade barriers and encouraging the exports of U.S. beef, cattle, and beef products.

The history of the Japanese wheat trade shows reductions in rail freight rates beginning in 1962 have been a key factor in the introduction of certain types of U.S. wheat into Japanese and other Asian markets. In fact, during the first year when the rate cut had an effect, fiscal year 1962, cash wheat sales to Japan rose more than 18 percent. The Agriculture Department has been kind enough to furnish me with an article dated June 28, 1965, and other data which gives the details of this development.

As a result of the Small Business Committee's activities of the past year, the U.S. beef industry can now benefit from average reductions in ocean freight rates of 25 percent and air freight rates cuts of 25 to 30 percent. The committee filed an interim report in October on this subject, which I feel is a useful contribution for those who are interested in the prospect for exports of all agricultural commodities, particularly beef. It is expected that the committee hearings on this subject will be reconvened in order to make the most of the opportunities presented.

Meanwhile, I feel that the Nation can be grateful for the pioneering work done by the Oregon wheatgrowers in combining the best traditions of the free enterprise system with outstanding service to the national interest. It is the hope of Senator SPARKMAN, and members of the Small Business Committee such as myself, that the work now being done in the area of beef exports will contribute to similar developments in this field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles and materials to which I referred be reprinted following my remarks in order that they may be available to those interested in this field.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Foreign Agriculture, Jan. 3, 1966]

A GRAPHIC PICTURE OF GROWTH IN U.S. FEED GRAIN EXPORTS

One of the most dramatic farm-trade success stories of the past decade has been the phenomenal growth in U.S. and world exports of feed grains. This growth, which parallels the worldwide spurt in demand for those reflectors of better living, animal products, is graphically shown in the charts below.

U.S. exports of feed grains during the past 9 years moved in a succession of records to a level nearly triple that of fiscal 1957. This rise has placed feed grains in the position of third biggest agricultural export and second largest dollar earner for fiscal 1965. And all indications are that the chain of record exports will be extended for another year, with the U.S. export earnings from feed grains in fiscal year 1966 surpassing the billion-dollar mark.

Combining to bring these results have been the increased efficiency of our feed grain producers: Europe's and Japan's rapid economic growth, allowing more indirect consumption of grains through animal products; and aggressive U.S. market promotion abroad. A large part of our increased exports are going into production of mixed feed, which is spiraling as a result of the development of large-scale poultry and livestock industries in Western Europe and in Japan.

As in the past, the majority of these customers are in Western Europe, with the United Kingdom and the Netherlands maintaining their long-time positions as major buyers and Italy and Spain emerging as new ones of importance. Japan, however, is the most dramatic example of market growth in a single country, its purchases of U.S. feed grains tripling since fiscal 1957 and today exceeding those of any other country.

Also, numerous of the so-called emerging countries are beginning to develop large-scale livestock industries, especially poultry enterprises, and could well become our feed grain markets of tomorrow.

Competitors abroad have not been able to keep pace with our rapid export growth rate, and today this country accounts for about half the world exports against only about a third in fiscal 1957. Competition remains keen, however, in the foreign markets for corn—by far our largest feed grain export—with several newcomers, such as Thailand, Brazil, and Mexico, moving in to capitalize on the buoyant world demand. In the exports of the other big gainer of recent years, grain sorghums, the United States has had the overseas market largely to itself. But for this commodity also, at least one country—Argentina—is stepping up production and exports.

[From Foreign Agriculture, Jan. 3, 1966]

Japanese Businessman Successfully Promotes Wheat Foods

(How a Japanese businessman—formerly a representative of the U.S. wheat cooperator in Japan—capitalized on his knowledge of U.S. wheats and his country's interest in Western foods is told here by Clancy Jean, FAS marketing specialist.)

Ryoichi Sugano returned to Japan after World War II from China where he had been an overseas member of a Japanese trading company. He advised his brother and widowed mother that he wanted to go into the bakery business because he believed the baking business would have a good future in the Japanese market. This was not a very popular decision because no one in the family had ever been in the bakery business, and at that time bakeries (pan-ya) were mostly small, one-man shops.

In 1950, Mr. Sugano opened his first small bakery as a family venture with his brother and a few employees, only one of whom had any experience in the bakery business. About this time he read in U.S. magazines about the (U.S.) Wheat Flour Institute of the Millers National Federation and the bakery service department of General Mills, Inc. He believed that by studying magazines and books he could gain information about American food habits. This would be very important to him as he had very little experience in the baking business and wished to expand his business in the future. He wrote to the Wheat Flour Institute and General Mills for information and literature on the promotion of wheat foods. He established his bakery under the name of Maru-S Baking Co. (Maru means circle, and S from his name is a shape considered attractive by Japanese people.)

OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE

In 1956 when the Oregon Wheat Growers League opened an office in Tokyo, Mr. Sugano became local assistant to the Far East representative. After helping with the Oregon Wheat League exhibit at the Osaka International Trade Fair, Mr. Sugano move to Tokyo. On weekends he commuted to Osaka and continued to manage the baking and other business.

For nearly 5 years, Mr. Sugano assisted with the U.S. wheat market development program, first under the Oregon Wheat Growers League program and later under Wheat Associates, the successor organization. During this time, market development activities included inaugurating the popular kitchen bus project, assisting with school lunch programs, participation in bakery training schools, and technical assistance to other end-user groups.

Mr. Sugano accompanied the first Japanese wheat team brought to the United States in 1957. In 1959, he again came to the United States as interpreter for a biscuit and cracker technician who spent a month in a concentrated study of the U.S. industry. In 1961, increased pressures from his growing business, plus growing activity in the wheat cooperator office made it necessary for Mr. Sugano to resign in order to devote full time to his own affairs.

GROWTH OF BAKING BUSINESS

In the past 15 years, the Maru-S Baking Co. has grown from an idea to the second largest, and most modern bakery in the Osaka area (by general definition this includes about six prefectures). There is also a sandwich and coffee shop business which has grown so large that it has become an independent company.

In the spring of 1964, he opened a new bakery plant with a capacity of 500 50-pound sacks of flour for an 8-hour shift. At present, bread production consumes 320 sacks per day in turning out 27,000 loaves of bread.

Bun and sweet roll production runs 120,000 pieces per day and uses 180 sacks of flour. A second production line for buns and rolls will go into operation this month.

Maru-S Bakery has 50 large trucks and some 20 smaller trucks. The bakery is integrated with another corporation which Mr. Sugano owns, encompassing about 20 retail shops which sell such things as bread, rolls, and doughnuts, and five hotdog-sandwich and coffee shops. These retail outlets consume about 20 percent of the output of the Maru-S Baking Co.

Prior to opening his new bakery plant 15 months ago Mr. Sugano's operation consisted of his original bakery plant with a capacity of 250 sacks per 18-hour day (2 shifts). At this time he was only the fifth or sixth largest baker in Osaka.

It was in the second plant that Mr. Sugano developed his own public relations program. In this plant he included a lecture room which is used not only to train his own personnel, but for cooking classes for housewives.

Major emphasis is given to sandwich preparation in the classes. From those who attended he formed the Maru-S Friends Society and today there are 3,500 housewives registered.

Mr. Sugano relates how he has asked the housewives how many sandwiches they knew how to make. "Only two or three—they don't even use up the fingers of one hand to count the sandwiches they know how to make. So I tell them, there are 1,000 sandwiches, but I can tell you 2 more—Sukiyaki and fishcake—at which all the housewives laugh, saying, whoever heard of a s'kyaki sandwich? But later on some housewives write me that they have tried s'kyaki as a sandwich and their families like it very much."

SMALL RETAIL SPECIALTY SHOPS

The retail shops selling baked goods vary from very small stands which might sell only doughnuts to those selling all types of bread and other baked goods. Others specialize in hot dogs or pancakes. These retail outlets are located mainly in the food departments of large department stores and gross from $100 to $500 per day.

His most recent venture is the Gourmet Sandwich Shop, an elegant place located in an underground arcade in Osaka, which seats 22 customers. The location appears excellent—on a corner in one of the busiest shopping areas in Japan.

Mr. Sugano observes that 90 percent of his customers at the Gourmet are women, most of whom are in the 18–22 year age group. They frequently bring their mothers or boy friends when stopping in for a sandwich.

Near the Gourmet are other restaurants, specializing in noodles, curry dishes, and other foods. Mr. Sugano observes that noodles are preferred mostly by older men and women while younger men are the most frequent customers at the curry shops.

When Su-san, as he is known to his friends, opened the Gourmet, his business associates told him it could not succeed if he limited his menu to sandwiches. Most shops that sell sandwiches also offer many other dishes. Mr. Sugano persisted and the sandwich has remained king. Seldom are any of the 22 seats vacant and it is not uncommon to see two or three ojo-san (young ladies) waiting to be seated.

The decor is in excellent taste and on the walls are two large framed sandwich promotion posters secured from the U.S. Wheat Flour Institute of Chicago. Each year these posters are replaced with the latest version from the institute.

Mr. Sugano is one of several progressive food merchants in urban Japan who are developing the image of the sandwich as a meal, not just a snack.

Mr. Sugano has definite criteria for a Western-style sandwich. The bread slices must be of a conventional thickness and the filling must be at least the thickness of one slice of bread. This is in contrast to the traditional sandwich in Japan—two very thin slices of bread and an even thinner filling. His menu lists about 50 different kinds of sandwiches.

Mr. Sugano also has a pancake stand in a large department store, which he claims is the busiest shop of its kind, not only in the Osaka area, but in all of Japan. At this stand he sells seven different varieties of pancakes. As much maple sirup as the customer wants is served with the pancakes. The sirup is also made by Sugano's firm. Business is rather dull in the summer, he states, because pancakes are hot food, but in other seasons business is wonderful. At peak seasons as many as 1,600 customers will be served at the pancake stand each day, although it has only 25 seats. The customers like being able to get a regular pancake with maple sirup and butter for 17 cents.

WESTERN-STYLE FOOD LEADERS

Pancakes, doughnuts, sandwiches, and other wheat foods are emerging as sales leaders in the Western-style food sector of the Japanese market.

The United States supplies about 50 percent of Japan's wheat imports—in fiscal 1965 about 62 million bushels—mainly Hard Red Winter, Western White, Hard Red Spring, and small amounts of Durum. Japan accounted for 43 percent of U.S. commercial wheat export business in 1965.

[From Foreign Agriculture, Jan. 3, 1966]

Economist Predicts Japan Will Mirror Western Food Ways by 1985

In 20 years, the Japanese will be living and eating in the Euro-American fashion—earning an average of $2,000 a year and consuming more livestock products, milk, dairy products, and vegetables.

Population will have risen 1.3 percent annually to a total of 129.6 million, individual ability will receive higher recognition in the labor market, and college education will be universal.

This blueprint of the future was drawn recently by Yujiro Hayashi, prominent economist in Japan's Economic Planning Agency. Following a liberal analysis of the country's economy, Mr. Hayashi predicted that by 1985, the physical constitution, working conditions, and living standards of the Japanese people will be substantially improved.

CALORIE INTAKE TO RISE

The improved physical constitution will result from a dramatic change in eating habits, with calorie intake expected to reach the Western level of 3,000 per day. While consumption of rice—predicted at 9.8 million tons annually in 1985—will drop to 80 percent of the current level, intake of animal flesh will be 6.3 times that of 1961. People will be eating 4.7 times more milk and dairy products, 1.9 times more eggs, and 1.1 times more vegetables.

To meet the need for more animal flesh, 27.5 million cows—or an average of 1 for every 5 men—will be needed. A total of

1.75 million tons of cow milk will be required in the Tokyo area alone.

The change in living standards and food intake will have a considerable effect on the makeup of the population. With a longer life span, the number of people over 34 will rise to 46 percent of the population as against 34 percent in 1960. Marriageable age will advance, and 43 percent of the women between 20 and 24 will be married, compared with 31 percent in 1960. Wives will find jobs more readily available, and differences in wages for men and women will diminish.

Along with the $1,400 rise in per capita national income, Mr. Hayashi predicts a full-employment economy with a 5-day, 40-hour workweek, a high wage level, and complete security against risk and damage. The percentage of blue-collar workers (including farmers) in the labor force will decline to 47 percent from 65 percent in 1960, while the farm population—forecast at 13 million—will be a mere 10 percent of the nation's total.

CHANGE IN FARM MANAGEMENT

Income differences between agricultural and nonagricultural labor will drop to the Western level, although Mr. Hayashi does not see farm relief and other social security measures as implements of raising farm incomes. Per family arable land will increase and farm management will undergo substantial change; under the present system, a population decline by itself would not automatically raise per capita output.

While changes in farm management figure highly in Mr. Hayashi's forecasts, he stresses the development of industries—electronics, rocketry, and nucleonics—commensurate with Japan's geographical conditions. Among his expectations are practical use of nuclear energy, electric automobiles, hovercraft, and televised telephones.

Chief stumbling blocks in Japan's growth during the next 20 years will be the problems of water supply and waste disposal. More than 13.1 million tons of water will be needed daily—3.8 times current consumption—making desalination of sea water a practical necessity. The volume of refuse will amount to about three times its current level.

[From the Foreign Agriculture, June 28, 1965]

New Rail Rates for U.S. Spring Wheats To Permit Competitive Pricing of Exports to Important Asian Markets

Reduced rail rates on U.S. Hard Spring and Durum wheats that became effective earlier this month will enable the United States to make these wheats available to the important Asian markets on a regular basis—and at competitive prices—off the Pacific coast.

The reduction in summer rates from June through October amount to as much as 15 cents a bushel, with those on winter traffic to be lowered by an additional 6 cents for some points.

Approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission was granted on June 11, following a 30-day waiting period for receiving comments from interested parties on the reductions asked by the Northern Pacific, the Great Northern, and the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific railroads. Also actively supporting the revised rate schedule have been the North and South Dakota State Wheat Commissions which are members of Great Plains Wheat, Inc., an FAS cooperator in overseas market development programs.

The new rates—applying to an area in the Dakotas and Montana that produces the bulk of this country's Hard Spring and Durum wheats—are designed to pull more of these wheats westward, but at the same time not to disrupt traditional marketing patterns.

Prior to this month, existing rail rates—originally set up in 1934 and increased many times since—prohibited rail movement to the west of quantities adequate to meet the requirements of dollar markets in Asia, and buyers were not interested in shipments from Gulf and Atlantic ports because of the added ocean freight cost.

In addition to the saving on ocean transportation, the new rates mean that it now costs no more to send spring wheats by rail to the west coast than by combination rail and barge to the gulf, or by rail to Atlantic ports. The rates are calculated on the basis of the standard gathering rate from the point of shipment to Minneapolis, Minn., plus the barge rate to New Orleans of 18.6 cents per bushel.

The new rates generally become progressively lower as the distance increases between each shipping point and the west coast, ranging from 42 cents per bushel from Grand Forks in eastern North Dakota to 54 cents per bushel from Wolf Point in eastern Montana.

But the minimum price of the wheat once it arrives on the coast will vary according to the county of origin and the loan support price guaranteed the producers under the Federal farm price-support program. Adding the support price to the Grand Forks rate, for example, the minimum price at Portland, Oreg. is $1.76 a bushel; that for wheat from Wolf Point is $1.67. These prices do not include handling charges (loading and unloading) and premiums offered for higher protein content, nor do they reflect the strength of the domestic wheat market at the time.

It was a 1962 freight rate reduction on U.S. Hard Red Winter wheat westbound from the southern Great Plains area that permitted the U.S. wheat industry to break into the Asian market in a big way. Hard Winter this past Japanese fiscal year (April 1964–March 1965) accounted for roughly 60 percent of total U.S. wheat shipments to Japan of 1.6 million metric tons.

Assessing the impact of the new rates for Spring and Durum wheats to Japan, USDA officials are estimating sales of at least 200,000 tons of Hard Spring wheat during the 1965–66 marketing year. The Japanese Food Agency has been importing a total of some 1.4 million tons of spring wheat annually, all of which has been supplied by Canada.

In anticipation of the rate reductions, the food agency in late May and early June bought 40,500 tons of U.S. Hard Spring, following trial imports of 1,200 tons of U.S. No. 2 Dark Northern Spring wheat. In addition, a trial shipment of 770 tons of No. 2 Hard Amber Durum was purchased by the food agency—a wheat that is entirely new to the Japanese market. The Durum wheat is presently being test-milled into semolina by the food agency to determine the wheat's acceptability and to establish domestic retail prices.

The new rail rates will also strengthen the U.S. competitive position in the Philippines, a more than 400,000-ton wheat buyer. About 70 percent is high protein wheat.

U.S. Department of Agriculture Dispatch—Foreign Agricultural Service, December 13, 1965

From: Agricultural Attaché, Tokyo.
To: Department of Agriculture, Washington.
Subject: Japan: Japan import quota for beef announced.

(Prepared by J. D. Minyard.)

The Ministry of International Trade and Industry recently announced an additional import quota for beef. The quota will be for 2,800 metric tons on a global basis. Of the total 2,800 metric tons, 2,500 tons will be allocated to regular importers through the Livestock Development Corp. (LDC), a quasi-governmental organization responsible for carrying out some of the livestock development and price stabilization functions of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.

The LDC will, for the first time, import 300 metric tons of beef for its own account. According to a LDC official, some of the 300 metric tons will be loin strips, hind quarters, and forequarters.

This quota is in addition to the previously announced quotas of 5,000 metric tons in April 1965 and 2,000 tons in August 1965 (see AGR–323, Apr. 22, 1965, and AGR–25, Sept. 2, 1965). There is a strong possibility that an additional quota will be issued before the end of the current Japanese fiscal year ending March 31, 1966.

Although doubtful, the LDC may purchase a small volume of high quality U.S. beef. In discussions with the LDC, interest has been shown in supplies of beef from different countries suitable for high quality demand.

According to an MAF announcement, 80 yen[1] per kilogram will be collected on the 2,500 metric tons of beef imported by trade firms. The money will be divided between the LDC and the Beef Wholesalers Association. LDC will get 50 yen per kilogram to promote the domestic livestock industry, and the wholesalers will have 30 yen to improve meat marketing facilities.

Elmer W. Hallowell,
Agricultural Attaché.

GENERAL GAVIN WARNS AGAINST FURTHER INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this morning's papers carry a report of a letter sent by retired Gen. James J. Gavin, formerly chief of the Army's research and development program, who served as U.S. Ambassador to France upon his retirement and who is now chairman of the board of Arthur D. Little, Inc., warning against further escalation of the war in Vietnam.

The reports state in part:

> To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnamese troops into the south. Also, if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese volunteers and the reopening of the Korean front.
>
> This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course we are on now.

I ask unanimous consent that the account of this warning contained in the New York Times this morning, January 17, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

General Gavin Terms War Effort Too Costly and Risky To Pursue

(By Jack Raymond)

Washington, January 16.—James J. Gavin, a retired lieutenant general and former Ambassador to France, has declared that U.S. military objectives in South Vietnam are stretching the resources of American forces "beyond reason."

To shield all of South Vietnam against the Vietcong insurgency, he said, would require many times as much force as is being employed.

Yet, he warned, if the United States applies the force needed to attain its military goals, it must expect Communist China to enter the war in South Vietnam and reopen the Korean front as well.

General Gavin offered his military-technical opinion of the Vietnamese situation in a letter to Harper's magazine, published today in the February issue.

---

[1] Three hundred and sixty yen equal one dollar.

Discussing alternatives, the general proposed a permanent end to bombing of North Vietnam and a decision to limit U.S. military operations to holding coastal enclaves in South Vietnam. Meanwhile, an ultimate solution should be sought at the United Nations or in a Geneva conference, he said.

With his letter, General Gavin became the first well-known military professional to dispute the "falling domino" theory—the contention that an American withdrawal from Vietnam would set off widening Communist takeovers, each southeast Asian nation pushing the next one into communism until the threat reached Hawaii.

"I do not for a moment think that if we should withdraw from Vietnam the next stop would be Waikiki," General Gavin wrote. "The Kra [Malay] Peninsula, Thailand, and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontier of Thailand."

Withdrawal from Vietnam would pose serious problems, the general wrote, "but the problems that we would then have to deal with would be far less serious than those associated with an expression of the conflict."

General Gavin, 58 years old, is board chairman and chief executive officer of Arthur D. Little, Inc., an industrial research concern in Cambridge, Mass. A well-known combat commander in Europe in World War II and in Korea, he retired from the Army in 1951 as chief of research and development after having criticized restrictions put on the Army in missile development. He was Ambassador to France in 1961 and 1962 under President Kennedy.

In his letter on the Vietnamese war, General Gavin recalled that he was the Army's chief of plans and operations in the 1950's when the United States was considering entering the war against the Vietminh forces of Ho Chi Minh, now President of the North Vietnam. The Vietminh defeated the French in 1954.

"We were talking about the possibility of sending 8 divisions plus 35 engineer battalions and other auxiliary units into the Hanoi delta," General Gavin wrote. He indicated a planned initial commitment of 200,000 men, compared with 190,000 American troops now in Vietnam.

"We had one or two old China hands on the staff at the time," the General recalled, "and the more we studied the situation the more we realized that we were in fact considering going to war with China, since she was supplying all the arms, ammunition, medical and other supplies to Ho Chi Minh."

The General added: "If we would be in fact fighting China, then we were fighting her in the wrong place, on terms entirely to her advantage. Manchuria, with its vast industrial complex coal, and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its warmaking capacity. There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged if at all."

General Gavin recalled that it was Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, the Army Chief of Staff, who dissuaded President Dwight D. Eisenhower from committing troops to Indochina.

"The time has come," General Gavin said, "when we simply have to make up our mind what we want to do and then provide the resources necessary to do it. If our objective is to secure all of South Vietnam, then forces should be deployed on the 17th Parallel and along the Cambodian border adequate to do this.

"In view of the nature of the terrain, it might be necessary to extend our defenses on the 17th Parallel to the Mekong River and across part of Thailand. Such a course would take many times as much force as we now have in Vietnam.

"To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnamese troops into the South. Also, if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese 'volunteers' and the reopening of the Korean front.

"This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course we are on now."

GOVERNMENT ACCESS TO PRIVATE RECORDS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, a very able young lawyer on the staff of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, Mr. Charles Helein, had an article printed in the St. Louis Bar Journal—Winter 1965—entitled "Government Access to Private Records—Ignoring the Fourth and Fifth Amendments."

As this very good article is of immediate interest to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT ACCESS TO PRIVATE RECORDS—IGNORING THE FOURTH AND FIFTH AMENDMENTS

(By Charles H. Helein)

Few of us conduct our lives without the compilation of a variety of records detailing our activities, associations, financial dealings, health, education, etc. Few of these records are created upon a voluntary basis. More often, records are required to be kept either by government mandate or the necessities of commerce. The shift of the credit-based economy and the increased involvement of government in the health, education, welfare, and economy of the Nation underlie the growth and detailed scope of records.

Today, a credit check of the exact financial status of almost any American can be obtained in a relatively short period of time. The amount of insurance a man carries, how he invests his money, his business or profession, or the religion he follows may be determined through the various companies engaged in the gathering and exchange of information.[1]

The Federal Government maintains a vast compilation of records on its citizens—tax returns, census forms, insurance and loan applications, military service records, civil service forms, investigative reports, securities registrations, etc. To a greater or less degree, all of these records, as well as those maintained by private firms, are accessible to Federal investigators and inspectors.[2] Congress has granted broad authority to various Federal agents to subpena other records of private firms and individuals.[3] Judicial decisions have upheld these powers of inquiry and in some cases bestowed the power of inquisition.[4] The courts usually find such a broad power necessary to the effectuation and maintenance of some governmental program.[5]

The purpose of this article is twofold. A review of some of the statutory and court decisions granting or denying access to the Government to records will be made. The dangers to the full realization of the guarantees of the fourth [6] and fifth [7] amendments due to the compilation and availability of records will be outlined.

The Supreme Court first approached the issue of the proper scope of governmental access to private papers and records in the landmark case of *Boyd* v. *United States*.[8] The Government filed a suit for the forfeiture of goods for fraudulent nonpayment of customs duties. The Government had to prove the value of the goods. To do so, it sought the production of the defendant's invoices on goods previously shipped into the United States. The lower court ruled that failure to produce the invoices would render confessed the allegations of the Government. After registering strenuous objections, the defendant produced his invoices.[9]

Speaking for the majority, Mr. Justice Bradley held that the compulsory production of the defendant's books and records violative of the guarantees of both the fourth and fifth amendments.

"A compulsory production of man's private papers to establish a criminal charge against him, or to forfeit his property is within the scope of the fourth amendment to the Constitution, in all cases in which a search and seizure would be; because it is a material ingredient, and effects the sole object and purpose of the search and seizure." [10]

The compulsory production of incriminating documents by an illegal search and seizure was cut from the same mold as compelling incriminating testimony; "in this regard the fourth and fifth amendments run almost into each other." [11]

The Court was aware of the insidious nature of slight encroachments by the Government under legal guise and swiftly and decisively moved to place itself foursquare against such activity.[12] Such action was viewed as an affront not only to freedom-loving Americans, but also to all men of liberty.[12]

---

[1] Packard, "The Naked Society" (1964).

[2] There is a vast difference between the training and competency of an investigator, such as an FBI agent, and an inspector, such as a Food and Drug Administration inspector. Cf. Hearings on Invasions of Privacy Before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965).

[3] Int. Rev. Code of 1954 § 7602; The Federal Trade Commission Act § 9, 38 Stat. 722, 15 U.S.C. § 49 (1914); Interstate Commerce Act, pt. I, § 1, 62 Stat. 909, 49 U.S.C. § 12 (1948).

[4] *United States* v. *Powell*, 379 U.S. 48 (1964) (Internal Revenue summons); *United States* v. *Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 633 (1950) (Federal Trade Commission subpena); *Endicott Johnson Corp.* v. *Perkins*, 317 U.S. 501 (1943) (Department of Labor subpena).

[5] Ibid.

[6] U.S. Constitution amend. IV. The fourth amendment provides: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized."

[7] U.S. Constitution amend. V. The pertinent provisions of the fifth amendment provides: "No person shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself."

[8] 116 U.S. 616 (1886).

[9] The compulsory production of the invoices in effect incriminated the defendant though the action was in the nature of a civil proceeding for forfeiture of goods. Mr. Justice Bradley wrote: "We are also clearly of the opinion that proceedings instituted for the purpose of declaring the forfeiture of a man's property by reason of offenses committed by him, though they may be civil in form, are in their nature criminal." Id. at 633.

[10] Id. at 622.

[11] Id. at 630.

[12] "Illegitimate and unconstitutional practices get their first footing * * * by silent approaches and slight deviations from the legal modes of procedure. This can only be obviated by adhering to the rule that constitutional provisions for the security of person and property should be liberally construed." Id. at 635.

"Any compulsory discovery by extorting the party's oath, or compelling the production of his private books and papers, to convict him of crime, or to forfeit his property, is contrary to the principles of a free government—it is abhorrent to the instincts of an American. It may suit the purposes of despotic power; but it cannot abide the pure atmosphere of political liberty and personal freedom." [13]

Eight years later, the Supreme Court reviewed a case in which a similar issue was raised.[14] The Interstate Commerce Commission was granted power to compel testimony, the appearance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, etc.[15] The power was to be exercised pursuant to the Commission's duty to regulate the common carriers under their jurisdiction. The Commission wished to question the defendant about the reasonableness of his rates. He refused to testify or to produce his books or other records. The Court did not reach the merits in the case, but remanded it to the Commission for further hearings. The Court did reaffirm their position taken in Boyd.[16] Mr. Justice Harlan stated the majority's opposition to the exercise of a general power of inquiry into the private affairs of citizens by an administrative agency.[17]

After the early 1900's, the advent of a more complex society and the necessity for an increased governmental role in that society's well-being caused the Court to retreat somewhat from their positions taken in Boyd and Brimson. The chipping away of the rigid adherence to the inviolability of private records enunciated in the two cases began in 1911.

In *Flint* v. *Stone Tracy*,[18] a unanimous Court upheld the constitutionality of a tax law that provided that returns, when initially filed with the Internal Revenue Service, would be treated as public records. After a period of time the returns would be open to inspection under rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and approved by the President.[19]

Another unanimous decision, handed down the same year, upheld the Interstate Commerce Commission's power to require common carriers to submit monthly reports under oath.[20] The reports contained the occasions on which the carriers' employees remained on duty for a period in excess of that allowed by congressional mandate.[21] The carrier raised the objection that such reports violated the fourth and fifth amendments; but to no avail.

In holding that there was no violation of the fourth amendment, the Court found the order of the Commission to be suitably specific and reasonable, ruling that there could not be, in such case, an unreasonable search and seizure. Disposing of the carrier's fifth amendment objections, the Court relied upon *Hale* v. *Henkel*.[22] This case established the personal nature of the privilege against self-incrimination and that as such, the privilege could not be invoked by officers of a corporation in favor of the corporation.

A decade later, the Federal Trade Commission sought to compel the production of a corporation's records, contracts, memorandums, and correspondence for an entire year.[23]
The FTC's statutory granted the unlimited access to all records of a corporation under its jurisdiction.[24] This time the agency did not prevail.

Mr. Justice Holmes expressed the views of a unanimous Court condemning the broad inquisitorial nature of the FTC's order.

"Anyone who respects the spirit as well as the letter of the fourth amendment would be loath to believe that Congress intended to authorize one of its subordinate agencies to sweep all our traditions into the fire * * * and to direct fishing expeditions into private papers on the possibility that they may disclose evidence of a crime. The interruption of business, the possible revelation of trade secrets and the expense compliance with the Commission's wholesale demand would cause are the least considerations. It is contrary to the first principles of justice to allow a search through all the respondent's records, relevant or irrelevant, in the hope that something will turn up." [25]

It should be noted that the American Tobacco case enjoys only limited precedential value as protection against administrative harassment. Decisions handed down after the Second World War have all but emasculated the rule against fishing expeditions.

In *Oklahoma Press Publishing Co.* v. *Walling*,[26] guidelines were set forth governing the right to inspect and require production of records kept pursuant to a statutory program.[27] The Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor issued a subpena duces tecum for the company's records to determine if there had been a violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act.[28] In sustaining the subpena, the Court set the following standards: (1) No specific charge or complaint of violation of law need be pending in order to keep the demand of the agency within the bounds of the fourth amendment; (2) it is sufficient if the investigation be for a lawfully authorized purpose within the power of Congress to command and that the records sought be relevant to the inquiry; (3) adequate, but not excessive, specification of documents to be produced.[29]

Mr. Justice Murphy dissented.[30] He was unable to approve the use of nonjudicial subpenas issued by administrative agents.

"Administrative law has increased greatly in the past few years and seems destined to be augmented even further in the future. But attending the growth should be a new and broader sense of responsibility on the part of administrative agencies and officials. Excessive use or abuse of authority can not only destroy man's instinct for liberty, but will eventually undo the administrative processes themselves. Our history is not without a precedent of a successful revolt against a ruler who sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people." [31]

The guidelines issued by the Court are also subject to criticism. To state, that an administrative order to produce books and papers is valid though it is not as specific as a warrant under the fourth amendment, and that the order is legal if the investigation be for a lawfully authorized purpose within the power of Congress to command, is to assume that Congress has the power to authorize investigations in which the means by which it is conducted do not have to comply with the fourth and fifth amendments. But that is precisely the question. May Congress, much less an administrative agency, order production of private papers without complying with the dictates of the Bill of Rights?

Relying upon precedents, the Supreme Court enunciated its "public records" doctrine the same year it decided the Oklahoma Press Publishing case.[32] In this case, the defendant was convicted of possessing gasoline ration coupons above his allotted share. Inspector of the Office of Price Administration had kept the defendant under observation for a period of time. At an opportune moment, the inspectors accosted the defendant and made him open a door to a backroom in his gas station.[33] The inspectors found coupons in excess of the gas defendant had in his tanks.

Upholding the legality of the seizure of the coupons, the Court in a 5 to 3 decision relied heavily upon the public nature (a business place) of the area searched and the public property nature of the articles seized (coupons). The coupons were determined to be the property of the Government, and as such, the inspectors had a claim of right to them.

---

[13] Id. at 631.

[14] *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Brimson*, 154 U.S. 447 (1894).

[15] Interstate Commerce Act, pt. I, ch. 104, § 12, 24 Stat. 383 (1887).

[16] *Boyd* v. *United States, supra* note 8.

[17] *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Brimson, supra* note 14 at 478.

[18] 220 U.S. 107 (1911).

[19] The Court did not decide the issue of whether the fifth amendment had been violated as that issue was not raised. The Court did explicitly hold that the fourth amendment was not violated. Ibid.

[20] *Baltimore & Ohio R.R.* v. *Interstate Commerce Commission*, 221 U.S. 612 (1911); *Cf. Wilson* v. *United States*, 221 U.S. 361 (1911).

[21] Interstate Commerce Act, pt. I, § 7-9, 63 Stat. 486, 49 U.S.C. § 20 (1949). Section 20 sets out the type of reports that may be required by the Commission to be kept and which the Commission can inspect.

[22] 201 U.S. 43 (1906). Defendant Hale was subpenaed to appear before a grand jury to testify on the conduct of his company in relation to the anti-trust laws. Hale refused to testify or to produce his books and papers. In a seven to two decision, Mr. Justice Brown pronounced the personal nature of the privilege against self-incrimination. In addition, a corporation as a creature of the state, depending on the state for its existence, must submit to an inquiry when the state sought to elicit whether or not the corporation had violated its privileged status bestowed by the state. *Cf. Foster* v. *United States*, 265 F. 2d 183 (2d Cir. 1959), cert. denied 360 U.S. 912 (1959) wherein the taxpayer and his bank were not allowed to raise the fourth amendment as protection against examination of the bank's records pertaining to the taxpayer; *Zimmerman* v. *Wilson*, 105 F. 2d 583 (3rd Cir. 1939).

[23] *Federal Trade Commission* v. *American Tobacco Co.*, 264 U.S. 298 (1924).

[24] Federal Trade Commission Act § 9, 38 Stat. 722, 15 U.S.C. § 49 (1914).

[25] *Federal Trade Commission* v. *American Tobacco Co.*, supra note 23 at 305, 306.

[26] 327 U.S. 186 (1946).

[27] The decision was handed down 5 years after *United States* v. *Darby*, 312 U.S. 100 (1941) which held that Congress can require records to be maintained as a means of enforcing an otherwise invalid law. The records were kept pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

[28] 52 Stat. 1060, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 et seq. (1938).

[29] Mr. Justice Rutledge, writing for the majority, did caution against excessive inquiries by administrative agencies: "Officious examination can be expensive, so much so, that it eats up men's substance. It can be time consuming, clogging the processes of business. It can become persecution when carried beyond reason." *Oklahoma Press Publishing Co.* v. *Walling*, supra note 26 at 213.

[30] *Oklahoma Press Publishing Co.* v. *Walling*, supra note 26 at 218.

[31] Id. at 219.

[32] *Davis* v. *United States*, 28 U.S. 582 (1946). Cf. *Harris* v. *United States*, 331 U.S. 145, rehearing denied, 331 U.S. 867 (1947). The Harris case involved the illegal possession of draft cards which were discovered by FBI agents while conducting a general search of defendant's room pursuant to arrest warrants for forgery.

[33] The legality of the seizure rose because the inspectors did not possess a search warrant and the disputed evidence of coercion of the defendant in opening the door to the back room.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter in a vigorous dissent denounced the principle of public records as an exception to constitutional guarantees.

"Merely because there may be the duty to make documents available for litigation does not mean that police officers may forcibly or fraudulently obtain them. This protection of the right to be let alone, except under responsible judicial compulsion, is precisely what the fourth amendment meant to express and to safeguard." [34]

Two years after the decision on public records, administrative agencies were granted even greater power to inquire into private records. *Shapiro* v. *United States*,[35] denied the protection of the fifth amendment against self-incrimination for those papers, books, and records which were required to be kept to show compliance with lawful regulations.

Shapiro had his sales records subpenaed by the Office of Price Administration pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act.[36] Shapiro complied with the subpena on the understanding that he would be granted immunity for so doing. The records were later used to convict him of violations of the regulations issued pursuant to the act. The Supreme Court split 5 to 4 to uphold its public records doctrine. In effect the decision allowed Congress, by simple legislative fiat to turn customarily private records into public records and thereby place them outside the protection of the fifth amendment.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter once again dissented, joined by Justices Jackson, Murphy, and Rutledge. Speaking against what he viewed as the majority's abdication of fifth amendment guarantees, Justice Frankfurter wrote:

"The Court has misconstrued the fifth amendment by narrowing the range and scope of the protection it was intended to afford. The privilege against self-incrimination is, after all 'as broad as the mischief against which it seeks to guard' * * * If Congress by the easy device of requiring a man to keep the private papers he has customarily kept can render such papers public and nonprivileged, there is little left to either the right of privacy or the constitutional privilege." [37]

In *United States* v. *Kahringer*, the Court held that it does not violate the fifth amendment to require persons to register that they were engaged in gambling.[38] The Court relied on *United States* v. *Sullivan* which held it no violation of the fifth amendment to be required to file an income tax return.[39]

Justices Black, Douglas, and Frankfurter dissented in Kahringer.[40] The statutory provision of the Internal Revenue Code simply amounted to the coercion of confessions and a squeeze play that "put a man in Federal prison if he refuses to confess himself into a State prison." [41]

Perhaps the broadest power of access to individuals' records lies in the Internal Revenue Service's summons power.[42] In 1964, the Supreme Court ascribed the inquisitorial nature of the grand jury to the investigations made by IRS agents with the aid of their summons.[43] The Court relied on its decision in *United States* v. *Morton Salt Co.*, handed down 14 years earlier.[44]

"In *United States* v. *Morton Salt Co.*, the Court said of the Federal Trade Commission, 'It has a power of inquisition, if one chooses to call it that, which is not derived from the judicial function. It is more analogous to the grand jury, which does not depend on suspicion that the law is being violated or just because it wants assurance it is not.' While the power of the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service derives from a different body of statutes, we do not think the analogies to other agency situations are without force when the scope of the Commissioner's power is called in question." [45]

The summons power extends not only to the taxpayer under investigation, but also to third parties.[46] For example, the IRS may serve its summons on the taxpayer's bank or broker or insurance company.[47] Moreover, neither the taxpayer nor his bank can invoke the fourth or fifth amendments as defense to the summons.[48] Since the records are not the property of the taxpayer he cannot object to their inspection and seizure. Since the privileges of these amendments are personal, the banks, brokers, and insurance firms cannot invoke the amendments for the taxpayer. By this neat proposition, every person who files any sort of financial record in an effort to conduct his affairs is potentially incriminating himself and waiving his right to be secure in his person and effects.

The problem created by access to private records by Government agents is not such as to admit of any easy solution. To deny the Government access in all instances would undoubtedly impair, if not destroy, the operation of certain Government programs. Yet, on the other hand, to invest inquisitorial powers in every Federal agent or agency or even in only a few, creates grave threats to the full and meaningful realization of constitutional guarantees. Grand juries are usually composed of from 12 to 20 members, the clerk of the court at the instance of the grand jurors issues the subpena, and all jurors consider the evidence obtained by the subpena. Disinterest, impartiality, and variety of opinion are more easily checked and preserved in the case of grand juries. In contast, administrative summons or orders to produce records may be issued by a variety of subordinate officials and even investigating officers.[49] No independent scrutiny is made of the summons or other process until ample opportunity has been afforded to scare the information out of the person or gain access to the information due to the ignorance of the person or the inability to hire a lawyer and fight the case in court. Even if the person chooses to go to court, the decisions are generally in favor of liberal construction of the statutory powers.

In regard to the Internal Revenue summons, while the party may refuse to disclose his records on the grounds that they might incriminate him,[50] he is not relieved from the duty to bring his records to the place designated in the summons.[51] If the taxpayer wishes to cooperate, he runs the risk of waiving his constitutional privilege. Further there is no safeguard against the unscrupulous agent who may disguise his criminal investigation under the guise of a routine civil check. The citizen is thus duped into giving evidence against himself all the while believing he is simply doing his duty as an American citizen in cooperating with his government. Short of refusing a demand for records and being branded with the stigma of being uncooperative, there is little anyone can do to protect himself against excessive demands of overzealous agents.[52]

In conclusion, this whole area of governmental access to private records should be reviewed. Congress should limit the power it has granted to all sorts of people within the Federal bureaucracy. The Supreme Court with its assiduous protection of the guarantees of other provisions of the Bill of Rights [53] has totally ignored the danger presented by the excessive and abusive use of inquisitorial investigative powers it has allowed to Federal agents and agencies. Evidence is being presented to the Congress, at this writing, documenting the abuses of power perpetrated by Federal agents in their zeal to make a case. Some of these abuses have totally disregarded not only constitutional rights of citizens, but have brazenly ignored the criminal laws and limitations upon the agencies' jurisdiction imposed by Congress.[54]

"The people's desire to cooperate with the enforcement of a statute is in direct proportion to the respect for individual rights shown in the enforcement process. Liberty is too priceless to be forfeited through the zeal of an administrative agent." [55]

---

[34] *Davis* v. *United States*, supra note 32 at 596 (dissenting opinion).

[35] *Shapiro* v. *United States*, 335 U.S. 1 (1948).

[36] Emergency Price Control Act, ch. 361, §§ 101 et seq., 61 Stat. 610 (1947).

[37] *Shapiro* v. *United States*, supra note 35 to 70.

[38] 345 U.S. 22 (1953).

[39] 274 U.S. 259 (1927). However the Court did say that persons could refuse to answer any incriminating questions in the return.

[40] *United States* v. *Kahringer*, supra note 38 to 36.

[41] Id. at 37.

[42] Internal Revenue Code of 1954 § 7602 et seq.

[43] *United States* v. *Powell*, 379 U.S. 48 (1964).

[44] 338 U.S. 633 (1950); Cf. *Endicott Johnson Corporation* v. *Perkins*, 317 U.S. 501. (1943).

[45] *United States* v. *Powell*, supra note 43 at 57.

[46] *Sale* v. *United States*, 228 F. 2d 682 (8th Cir. 1956), cert. denied, 350 U.S. 1006 (1956); *Hubner* v. *Tucker*, 245 F. 2d 35 (9th Cir. 1957); *Local 174, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America* v. *United States*, 240 F. 2d 387 (9th Cir. 1956).

[47] *DeMasters* v. *Arend*, 313 F. 2d 79 (9th Cir. 1963), cert. denied, 375 U.S. 936 (1963); *First National City Bank of New York* v. *Internal Revenue Service*, 271 F. 2d 616 (2d Cir. 1959), cert. denied, 361 U.S. 948, rehearing denied, 362 U.S. 906 (1959).

[48] *Lovette* v. *United States*, 230 F. 2d 263 (5th Cir. 1956); Compare, *McMann* v. *Securities and Exchange Commission*, 87 F. 2d 377 (2d Cir. 1936), cert. denied, *McMann* v. *Engle*, 301 U.S. 684 (1936); *Newfield* v. *Ryan*, 91 F. 2d 700 (2d Cir. 1938); cert. denied, 302 U.S. 729 (1938). See also *Zimmerman* v. *Wilson*, 81 F. 2d 847 (3d Cir. 1931) and *Zimmerman* v. *Wilson*, 105 F. 2d 583 (3d Cir. 1939).

[49] Internal Revenue Code of 1954 § 7601; Treasury Regulation § 301.7601–1(c) (1954); Interstate Commerce Act, part I, § 8, 63 Stat. 486, 49 U.S.C. § 20(5) (1949).

[50] *Blau* v. *United States*, 340 U.S. 159 (1950); *Bauschor* v. *United States*, 316 F. 2d 451 (8th Cir. 1963); *Brody* v. *United States*, 243 F. 2d 378 (1st Cir. 1957), cert. denied, 354 U.S. 923 (1957).

[51] Internal Revenue Code of 1954 §§ 7604, 7605; *Chapman* v. *Goodman*, 319 F. 802 (9th Cir. 1955).

[52] *First National Bank of Mobile* v. *United States*, 160 F. 2d 532 (5th Cir. 1947) (IRS agents attempted to force the bank to reproduce over 6,000,000 items on its Recordax machine); *Martin* v. *Chandis Securities*, 33 F. Supp. 478 (S.D. Calif. 7940).

[53] *Griswold* v. *Connecticut*, 33 U.S.L. Week 4587 (U.S. June 7, 1965) (No. 496); *Lamont* v. *Gronouski*, 33 U.S.L. Week 4489 (U.S. May 24, 1965) (Nos. 491 and 848); *Jacobellis* v. *Ohio*, 378 U.S. 184 (1964); *A Quantity of Books* v. *Kansas*, 378 U.S. 205 (1964); *Gibson* v. *Florida Legislative Committee*, 372 U.S. 539 (1963).

[54] Hearings on invasions of privacy before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., (1965).

[55] *Oklahoma Press Publishing Co.* v. *Walling*, 327 U.S. 186 (*946) (dissenting opinion).

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NEW JERSEY CHAPTER OF THE FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY ASSOCIATES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a resolution of the New Jersey chapter of the FBI National Academy Associates, together with the text of the letter transmitting the resolution to me.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY ASSOCIATES, NEW JERSEY CHAPTER,
October 25, 1965.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Enclosed copy of resolution submitted this date to Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on behalf of the FBI National Academy Associates, New Jersey Chapter.

As one of the representatives of one of the many municipal police departments of the State of New Jersey, we are proud of our association with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and will be fully aware at all times of the pride and responsibility of the police profession to which we are all dedicated.

Yours respectfully,
ROBERT J. MCGONIGEL,
President.

RESOLUTION OF FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY ASSOCIATES, NEW JERSEY CHAPTER, OCTOBER 22, 1965

Whereas the New Jersey chapter, FBI National Academy Associates had the honor of holding their annual retraining seminar at the FBI National Academy, Quantico, Va., and Washington, D.C., on October 17, 18, 19, and 20, 1965, through the courtesy of John Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

Whereas it was made possible by Director Hoover to have Special Agent in Charge Ralph W. Bachman and Special Agent James J. Tracey, of the Newark field office, present with the New Jersey graduates during this retraining program to assist in facilitating the attainment of our objectives; and

Whereas through the courtesies and cooperation of Director J. Edgar Hoover, the members of the New Jersey chapter, FBI National Academy Associates, were afforded an opportunity to meet with the Director during this retraining seminar, who saw fit to take time out from his arduous and numerous duties to extend his greetings to us: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the New Jersey chapter of the FBI National Academy Associates would like to take this opportunity to express to Director Hoover our sincere thanks and appreciation for making the National Academy facilities available to us and for his cooperation in making it possible for Mr. Bachman and Mr. Tracey to attend this training program with us. We feel certain that the ideas expressed by the presence of the Bureau executives, Bureau officials, and various lecturers will be of great value to both the FBI and the law enforcement agencies which we represent.

LT. ROBERT J. MCGONIGAL,
President.

"LET YOUR LIGHT SO SHINE"—A SERMON

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, we hear a great deal these days about mediocrity and the passion of people to conform to the general level of attainment, to shun causes and repress their emotions. In a sermon preached recently in my own church in Laramie, Wyo., the Union Presbyterian Church, Rev. James H. Glassman, the pastor, pleaded with his congregation to let their light shine.

Reverend Glassman spoke mostly in terms of religion, but his message is equally valid in all walks of life, it seems to me. Indeed, I am deeply honored in that my own words are quoted in this excellent sermon, which presents a message all of us in this body, and all Americans should well heed. I ask unanimous consent that Reverend Glassman's sermon, "Let Your Light So Shine," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET YOUR LIGHT SO SHINE

(By James H. Glassman)

One of the common objections to the institutionalized form of religion as we know it in our day is that it lends itself so readily to hypocrisy. As religion organizes its fellowship into churches, its thought into creeds, its worship into rituals, these outward exhibitions and professions of religion can easily be assumed by anyone. So someone says, "You go through the formality of joining the church; you subscribe to the sacraments; you recite the creeds; you observe the customs; you do and say what you are supposed to do and say; and what have you done? What have you said?" Well, what have we done? We have put ourselves at the disposal of every conceivable implement of seeming to be religious, indeed, perhaps of seeming more religious than we really are. In consequence we often hear it said, "Hypocrites in the church. What I look for from the pulpit and the people is sincerity and genuineness." As if to say dignity and formality usually are insincere.

Admittedly there are hypocrites in the church. Maybe we are all hypocrites of a sort. From the days of the Hebrew prophets to Jesus' time and onward we have been told in effect: Be genuine. Be true. Do what you say. Practice what you preach. That runs all the way through the Sacred Book.

But that is not the whole story of hypocrisy and its meaning. The New Testament meaning of the word that is translated hypocrite or hypocrisy is "to act," "to play a role." Based upon Greek usage we could say that an actor, Hollywood or otherwise, is a hypocrite. But now see this, while it is possible to act, to play a role, to pretend to be more Christian than we are, it is also possible to act, to play a role, to pretend to be less religious than we really are. It seems to me there are hypocrites today who are not only making a pretense of being religious, but also those who are making a pretense of not being religious at all. There are two sides to the coin: those who make a high profession of faith they are not living up to, and those, increasing in number, it seems to me, who are not advertising anything in their show windows they do not have on their shelves, which is to say, they have so reduced religious profession to such a negligible quantity that there is little to live up to; and yet, deep within themselves have religious convictions they are not showing. Between the two I am not sure which is the most hypocritical. In any event I want to put my finger on the latter this morning, because we may not have recognized this type of role playing for what it is.

The principal of a leading boys' school once addressed a group of freshmen entering Harvard. In effect, he said this: "If I were speaking on any other campus I probably would not say what I am going to say to you. But I know Harvard. I am a Harvard man myself and I understand the sophisticated atmosphere into which you freshmen now are venturing, so that while on any other campus I might say to you, "Be as religious as you seem. I say to you, seem as religious as you are."

The sophisticated atmosphere of Harvard a half century ago has become general today. What that educator said at Harvard then could as appropriately be said at Wyoming today. We distrust pretensions in religion. We lean over backward to be fair and objective. We are reticent about wearing our hearts religiously upon our sleeves. One thing we do not want to be is emotional about religion. Strong enthusiasm is taboo.

But is this altogether honest? We are incurably religious by nature and instinctively emotional. Yesterday there was a football game played here to the great excitement of all who attended and others who listened. It would have been a strange sight to have seen someone sitting in the stands passively rooting for Wyoming when most of the fans were on their feet and shouting at the top of their voices: "Go Cowboys. Go." We get excited. We are instinctively emotional and this is a natural response. We are not averse to cheerleaders and others playing upon our emotions and any coach will tell you that it is the emotional, the psychological preparation of his players for the game that is important. If they are not ready emotionally there is litle hope for success. Many teams have done way beyond their physical capacities because they were ready, laid hold upon and driven by something beyond themselves.

Carry the thought further. Life itself is the result of the interchange of emotional passion without which, male with female, there is no life. Do not misunderstand me. I am not appealing for license. I am not appealing for fanaticism, or enthusiasm carried to excess, but I am appealing for honesty when it comes to that which is deepest within mankind.

Burl Ives popularized a song a few years ago that went in part this way:

"A little bitty tear let me down,
Spoiled my act as a clown,
I had it made up not to make a frown,
But a little bitty tear let me down."

We are emotional creatures. From this there is no escape. If you do not like the hypocrite who is pretending to be something he is not, do you dislike equally the hypocrite who is pretending not to be something he instinctively is?

There are two things Jesus could not endure: cruelty and sham. We are familiar with those passages where he assailed sham, all the way from the mild ones like, "Sound not a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men," to the terrible ones like, "whited sepulchres, which outwardly appear beautiful, but inwardly are full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness."

So someone says, that is what hypocrisy meant to Jesus—trying to appear better than we are. Yes, it did. But listen to him on the other side of the question: "Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works." Let your light so shine that others might see. To have light and keep it dark, to have some radiance in you though it be but a slender flame, and hide it, to refuse to set it out where a generation that so desperately needs light can get its full effect—that too is hypocrisy.

A number of years ago, I talked with two girls in a church I formerly served. These girls were intelligent. They were straight "A" students and it surprised me when on this occasion they made the pretense before the rest of the young people of being only average. I knew something about their work. They had no "B's" or "C's". They had "A's" in everything and yet they pretended they were "C" pupils. Later I asked them why they did this and they said: "Well, it just isn't the thing anymore to be above the others. You're out if you're up here. You've got to be down here with the rest of them." They wanted to be a part of the gang so they graded themselves down accordingly. For this and other reasons we sometimes try to appear worse than we are.

Some of you have heard the song, "Paper tiger, your bark is much worse than your bite." I suppose we all like to be tigers. George Raft, whose image in the movies has been through the years, that of the tough guy, recently broke down in court and cried because the judge did not send him to prison for tax evasion. Who among us has not tried to appear to be something he really is not.

On the other hand, Jesus would tell us, "Let your light shine." Be careful about grading yourself down—your opinions, your skills, your religion.

There is something to be said for people who succeed in publishing their light rather than their darkness, their faith rather than their doubts, their courage rather than their fears, their best rather than their worst. In a time when we are instinctively negative in our approach to life we could use a little more positive thinking, or, to use the words of Senator **Gale McGee**, who is a member of this church, Americans should "stop being against everything and try to be for some things."

Dr. Fosdick tells of a British captain in the trenches during World War I who, when the zero hour struck and he led his men to the attack, stepped forward with a light mackintosh over his left arm and an ordinary walking stick in his right hand, and, as nonchalantly as though he were starting for a stroll, beckoned his men to follow. Was he frightened? He was petrified with fear. Yet he seemed as calm and unafraid as though "no man's land" were Picadilly Circus. One could say he was a hypocrite of the usual sort then, pretending to be strong and courageous when down underneath he was afraid. And yet, that he had found the capacity to go down into that strange medley which is oneself, with its mingled qualities of good and evil, faith and doubt, courage and weakness, and let the best rather than the worst show itself, to me that is letting one's light shine.

What shall we say further, about all the men and women through the ages who, like that British captain, appeared better than they were, and yet at the same time allowed what was also there to shine out before men. Think of some of them: blind people, who must have had terrible times inside themselves with bafflement and rebellion, but who so kept that to themselves and let their radiance and hopefulness and undiscourageable faith appear that we have gone to them for help and cheer; bereaved people whose real life stopped with the death of another, and yet, translating their experience into sympathy and insight and understanding have been able to inspire and encourage others; or poor people, unemployed, humiliated, and tired, who have been able to go on against overwhelming odds and even smile through the shadows.

There is enough of the worst in the world, cowardice and despair, fear and doubt, anti-Christ and paganism, so that if a man does have any light, it seems to me he would do well to let it shine.

My heart goes out especially to you young people as the rapid changes of our day add confusion and bewilderment to the possibility of asserting a positive and sincere Christian faith. The impressions of our age are largely negative. "We don't know." "We're not sure." "We doubt that it is so." It is far easier to "knock down" and emphasize the things we do not believe. For many of us, we have talked our way out of any kind of vital faith. With many people to be irreligious is in. Yet deep within us, too, are reservoirs of conviction that are more than doubt, which show themselves in bull sessions, at the coffee house, and in other ways. Clearly there is something deeper. Religion is not altogether lost. And while one may not believe everything, he ought at least to say as much as he does believe.

I wish that here this morning somebody's candle would come out from under a bushel and be set upon the stand. Be sure of this: what we do not express tends to die and what we do express tends to live. This is true of music, writing, sports, character, love, any gift or talent. If we minimize the force of expression we will in time lose the power to express, the skill and refinement of play, the capacity to love. If it is not expressed it tends to die. Put a candle under a bushel and keep it there too long and it will go out for lack of oxygen.

Today, as ever, we need light. Long ago Christ came into a generation which needed light. Under his influence fell a little group of ordinary men persuaded by him to take such light as they had and put it on a candlestick, and with what revolutionary consequences. Can we do less than this in our generation and in this our day?

A MATTER OF PRINCIPLE—THE ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the director of vocational education for the State of Ohio, Dr. Byrl R. Shoemaker, has authored an articulate and timely warning on the dangers along the path which lies ahead under education programs that erode the powers and prerogatives of the States in favor of the Federal Government.

The article, "A Matter of Principle," which appeared in the October 1965 American Vocational Journal, gives us Dr. Shoemaker's observation that:

> The answer (to upgrading unfortunates) lies in enabling people to achieve for themselves a part in society in which they can earn their share of the modern benefits.

In regard to the relationship of the States and the Federal Government under the new outpouring of social legislation, Dr. Shoemaker observes that:

> There is little evidence that State and local educational agencies cannot or will not do the job of social and educational development if funds adequate for the problem at hand are provided to them. Some may argue that it's the end that counts, not the means. It is my contention, however, that the end is a product of the means, and that the end product of any massive movement of the Federal Government in the direct operation or control of programs in the field of education can lead to the possible enslavement of the minds of men. It's matter of principle.

I ask, Mr. President, that Dr. Shoemaker's article, which was brought to my attention by Wyoming's superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Cecil Shaw, be printed in the Congressional Record with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Matter of Principle

(By Byrl R. Shoemaker)

Today, we face problems common to all of the great civilizations that have existed down through the centuries. I believe it is fair to state that no civilization has ever solved the problems which confront us. I refer to such problems as increased welfare rolls; the growth in the number of people who, through lack of education and lack of training, do not fit into the changing world; the growing ranks who have become wards of the state through aid and assistance, and the increased numbers who have, perhaps, lost the ability or desire to participate in the productive element of our life.

Moreover, the problems of this civilization have been compounded by the rate of change through industrialization and automation.

For the first time in the history of mankind, a massive effort is being made to eradicate poverty at all levels, both within our Nation and throughout the world. Our leaders in Government are taking seriously the Biblical saying, "You are your brother's keeper" and they are mindful of the poetic lines, "Ask not for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee"—words which point up the fact that the advantages of our modern technological society cannot be reserved for one part of the population and unattainable for another. This is true even though part of the population may not have the educational background, the drives, or goal structure to desire to participate in the benefits.

HANDOUTS NOT THE ANSWER

As attempts are made to upgrade the less fortunate persons in our society, it becomes more and more obvious that the answer is not the distribution of funds for food, clothing and shelter. The answer lies in enabling people to achieve for themselves a part in society in which they can earn their share of the modern benefits. Education, therefore, becomes the means of providing people with a ladder to climb out of their area of poverty and frustration. Education is a vehicle to a better way of life, but impeded in many cases by the loss of desire on the part of people to invest themselves in the educational process.

I believe that there is no question of the good intent of the Great Society or that the goals are sound. Legislation provided in the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Appalachian Act, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, passed in this session of Congress, are all intended to eradicate the ills of a great civilization.

Three of these acts, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Appalachian Act, and the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act, recognize clearly the leadership role of the State and local educational agencies in the field of education. The Manpower Revelopment and Training Act also recognizes this role, but for the first time imposes Federal approval upon individual educational programs operated within the States. The Appalachian Act and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are concerned only in part with the area of education.

TRADITIONAL LINES IGNORED

The Economic Opportunity Act clearly establishes a direct relationship between the local community and Federal Government, ignoring the position of existing agencies at the State level. It is recognized that very little of the Economic Opportunity Act is concerned with the educational field; however, such programs as the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the work experience program, and the work-study program have relationships with the field of education. The Economic Opportunity Act is the act which most clearly violates the accepted principle that State and local agencies should be developed, improved, and encouraged to offer educational services to youth and adults.

The greatest concern among vocational educators in relation to the Economic Opportunity Act centers on the Job Corps activities. Clearly, the Job Corps camps involved with skill training are in competition with efforts to expand vocational education programs within the States.

While such camps may not exist at the present time under State and local control, an experimental residential job training center at Mahoning Valley Air Force Base in Ohio has proved that States, with assistance from manpower development and training funds, can operate such programs effectively. In many different ways, the State and local communities have proved their ability to organize and operate sound vocational education programs.

INTERAGENCY COMPETITION

It is my belief that the Job Corps camps should be organized through the existing-Federal-State-local relationships. I see a possible conflict between the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the manpower development and training classes growing from the fact that the money earned in the Youth Corps exceeds the sum that a youth can receive while enrolled in manpower development and training classes to learn a skill. Why should youth become involved in an educational program to prepare them for future work, when they can earn more money now through their efforts in a Neighborhood Youth Corps program? In recent months, as agencies have begun to compete for available youth, we have seen approved manpower development and training programs start without the full enrollment authorized.

Technically, there is every possibility for a cooperative effort between such agencies, but no real basis for such cooperation when the Manpower Development and Training Act is administered through the State and local levels and the Economic Opportunity Act is administered by the local community in a direct relationship with the Federal Government.

The intent here is not a long harangue about the existing problems between vocational education at the State and local levels and educational activities fostered through Federal and local relationships, for most of the acts are too new for any history of continuing problems or conflicts to become evident. But I am concerned that we examine any legislation or any program, no matter how well-meaning, in light of the future effect of such legislation upon our total educational program.

A LOOK AT THE RECORD

Federal agencies may at times be impatient with the speed at which States move and operate, and they may sometimes feel that the States cannot or will not organize to do the job. But, let's look at the record in terms of the ability of the States to accept a challenge and move with this challenge to solve a problem.

The development of land grant colleges in our Nation was the result of certainly one of our finest Federal-State efforts. These land grant colleges have stimulated a growth of education at the collegiate level that has been responsive to the changing educational needs wrought by technological change and to the need for expansion to meet the demands of an increased population.

The Vocational Education Acts that have been passed since 1918, including the Smith-Hughes, George-Barden Acts, and the new Vocational Education Act of 1963, have demonstrated the effectiveness of a sound Federal-State-local relationship, particularly when one recognizes that, in the attempt to achieve the goals of the act of 1963, Federal funds invested in vocational education throughout the States are matched in a ratio of more than four State and local dollars to one Federal dollar. The growth of vocational and technical education for youth and adults in the States has closely paralleled the availability of Federal dollars to stimulate additional expenditures within the States.

A study of the war production training activities of the public schools would point to their ability to adapt to an immediate need and to mount a massive effort when dollars are made available. The Federal-State-local relationships that served vocational education so well were the basis for the mounting of an effort which saw educational programs operating, in many cases, around the clock. The success of this effort can best be judged by the size of the arsenal that grew out of our increased industrial production.

STATE-CONTROLLED EXPERIMENT

Following the war, a Federal-State-local relationship, with the control of educational activities resting with the States, again proved successful when the massive veterans training and educational program was initiated. This program was perhaps the greatest educational experiment ever conducted in the history of the world. Approximately $19 billion was spent for the education and training of about 10 million veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. I believe that, without question, this program accounts for our economic growth and success following World War II, and I would point out again that this effort, extending over a number of years, expending $19 billion, serving 10 million people, was carried on under the direction of State and local agencies.

There is no question of goals; there is no question of motives, nor of the importance of education in achieving the goals of a Great Society. The really important problems we face in our life are never black or white. Too often, the problem is a choice between two rights. It is obvious that the need is great and that immediate action is important. It is also obvious that working with 50 States will not simplify the task.

The cost may be too great, however, if we seek to achieve these goals through direct Federal intervention into activities which should be channeled so as to strengthen activities of existing agencies in the States. The cost will be too great if, in the process, we kill State initiative; if we destroy existing organizations planned to serve similar needs by establishing competitive organizations through direct Federal-local relationships; if we teach our communities to look first to Washington; if we destroy the insulation of education from Federal control.

MOTIVES NOT IN QUESTION

There is absolutely no question that the present leadership in the Federal Government is working zealously to overcome the ills of our civilization. We would only plead that, in this massive effort, the Federal Government not make inroads into the field of education which could be used by future governmental groups to open a way into men's minds for less worthy purposes.

There is little evidence that State and local educational agencies cannot or will not do the job of social and educational development if funds adequate for the problem at hand are provided to them. Some may argue that it's the end that counts, not the means. It is my contention, however, that the end is a product of the means, and that the end product of any massive movement of the Federal Government in the direct operation or control of programs in the field of education can lead to the possible enslavement of the minds of men. It's a matter of principle.

TOWARD COEXISTENCE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter to the editor, entitled "Toward Coexistence," written by Cyril A. Zebot, professor of economics, Georgetown University in Washington, D.C.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 13, 1966]

TOWARD COEXISTENCE

Your editorial "Communist Liberation" of December 29, refuting a letter on the same subject by a visiting Soviet political commentator, exposed the mythological basis, aggressive substance, and deceptive appearance of this newest in the changing sequence of Communist schemes for its further territorial expansion. Has not communism changed since Stalin?

Three changes distinguish the contemporary communism from its predecessor: the Khrushchev doctrine of peaceful coexistence, the evolving polycentric structure of the Socialist camp (yesterday's Soviet bloc) and, most recently, the contagious eagerness to reform Communist economic systems.

Khrushchev's doctrine of peaceful coexistence has been hailed as a radical departure from Stalinism in Soviet international relations. Yet, it may better be described as an updated version of the capitalist encirclement doctrine of Stalin's origin.

By explicitly including into the concept of peaceful coexistence the deceptive idea of wars of national liberation, Khrushchev somewhat embellished the Stalinist practice or threat of direct aggression but, in exchange, increased the strategy options for further worldwide attempts at Communist takeover. The new polycentric structure of the Socialist camp has added further flexibility to this policy.

The strategy of wars of national liberation has been devised for use against weak governments in underdeveloped countries. But that covers most of the world. In the pilot case of South Vietnam, the strategy has so far failed only because the outside Communist intervention in organization, arms, supplies, and men has been contained by direct American engagement.

If there still is honest disagreement concerning our policy in Vietnam, it cannot any longer be about the real nature of that war of national liberation. Can there be an informed American who does not know that the Communists have yet to invent competitive elections for any public decision, let alone for national self-determination? Americans who still oppose our stand in Vietnam can honestly do so only on the supposition that Vietnam is not the right place to stop Communist aggression. Which is to say that this new issue in fact reverts to the old one: where to draw the line?

Somewhere the line must be drawn—or we will invite ever more wars of national liberation. But if we stand firm where the real line is, there is now a new hope that the decentralizing tendencies, not alone in relations among the various Communist governments, but within their domestic systems as well, will gradually so tame communism itself that it may indeed cease to be a danger to world peace.

It has taken European Communist regimes 20 years since World War II to succumb to the evolving forces of decentralization and humanization within their own social systems. Outside Europe it will take longer. And this is another reason why it is in the interest of world peace that further Communist aggression be stopped lest it set back the incipient transition to a better and freer life inside the Communist-dominated countries.

Only in this way will our pluralistic world enjoy a truly peaceful coexistence.

CYRIL A. ZEBOT,
Professor of Economics, Georgetown University.
WASHINGTON.

GOOD TIDINGS AT CHRISTMAS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, each year during the Christmas season several newspapers throughout our country print a guest editorial written by Mrs. Virginia Weldon Kelly. It was my privilege this year to receive a copy of Mrs. Kelly's special message, which appeared in the Press Telegram of Long Beach, Calif., and other newspapers on December 24, 1965. The splendid and timely message it brings is of such special significance to us all that I believe each Member of Congress and the people of the Nation should have the opportunity to read it. I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Kelly's editorial be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

If the thoughts expressed by Mrs. Kelly could pervade all nations, we could truly live in a world of peace and in harmony with our fellow man. I highly commend Mrs. Kelly for her excellent editorial and the contribution she has made through this, as well as many of her other writings.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD TIDINGS

As additional revelation of God's love, angels announced Jesus' birth as good tidings of great joy.

Despite His earthly agony, Jesus preached joy and hope as did Isaiah, David, and other prophets.

Jesus said that man must love God with all his heart, soul, and mind. Only by total love can man receive grace, faith, and courage to face life and eternity joyously.

That is why early Christians viewed dejection as the eighth deadly sin, because it signifies separation from God.

In every era, many have cried, "Lord help Thou my unbelief."

In the 15th century, Thomas Kempis said faith comes from grace, the supernatural light, God's special gift, the pledge of eternal salvation. He said all men experience times of spiritual dryness when recognition of God's presence must be sought by humble prayer.

In the Middle Ages, spiritual alienation or acedia was widespread, with loss of faith, morbid introspection, and estrangement from God and man. The only cure was prayer.

In the last two centuries, sufferers from this malaise have seen no hope, for they believe spiritual alienation is inherent in modern society. Nietsche said, "God is dead."

Theologian Thomas J. J. Altizer, Emory University, asserts, "God has died in our time, in our history, in our existence."

Fortunately, others have disagreed. Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr sees God as the ground of being, and faith as trust in human existence. Dr. Paul Tillich said salvation's key is the courage to be faced by dread possibilities.

Admonishing us to put on a heart of compassion, kindness, and long suffering, but above all, to put on love, St. Paul said, "Rejoice in the Lord always."

Our Christmas wish is that, knowing God's presence, you will think Jesus' thoughts, speak His words, emulate His deeds, that He may set your heart on fire to the glory of God and the joy of all men.

JUNK AUTO BURIAL FUND

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has recently commented succinctly on some of the problems and challenges associated with beautifying our highways. In remarks before the annual convention of the Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Senator RANDOLPH referred to the problems posed by the ugly accumulation of junked cars throughout the Nation, and endorsed my proposal for the establishment of an auto burial and beautification fund. Such a fund would make the effective disposal of the growing number of worn and discarded automobiles economically feasible. I want to thank the distinguished Senator for his pledge of support for my proposal when it is considered during the current session of Congress, and for the most conscientious and able manner in which his subcommittee considered my auto burial proposal during hearings on the Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, INSTITUTE OF SCRAP IRON & STEEL CONVENTION, JANUARY 11, 1966

This opportunity is appreciated to counsel with you on matters of mutual interest, and I shall speak briefly on two or three points without being repetitious of prior remarks.

First, however, I commend your industry and your representatives in Washington for the cooperative and positive approach adopted in relation to the Senate Public Works Committee during our handling of the difficult and complex Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

It was largely through the testimony and pictures submitted by your president, Harry Marley, and the supplementary staff conferences with executive vice president, Bill Story, that our subcommittee became informed on the distinctions between junkyards and scrap processors. As you are aware, this distinction was made in the Senate report that accompanied S. 2084. The original draft bill proposed by the administration was amended in recognition of this distinction.

This is not to imply that the Highway Beautification Act is a perfect example of legislative draftsmanship. But it does provide the structure for attacking a serious problem of the American landscape. And I believe the Congress was successful in holding to the original esthetic purposes of the act while preventing inequitable and injurious economic loss to the small businessman.

There are, however, areas of ambiguity that remain. We will not know the impact of titles I and II—regarding removal of nonconforming advertising structures and scrap facilities—until the Department of Commerce conducts its hearings in each of the States, as required by the Congress. These hearings are the first priority of business in administering the act, and they should be completed by midspring. For this reason, we will maintain a close observation of the administration of the act to assure that the intent of the Congress is fulfilled.

Of course, the members of your industry are even more cognizant than those of us in Government that no amount of landscaping or relocation will attack the basic problem of the accumulation of scrapped automobiles at the rate of several millions a year. Especially is this true under the present market conditions for scrap iron and steel. It was the recognition of this condition that prompted Senator PAUL DOUGLAS to sponsor his amendment to the Highway Beautification Act. His testimony and that of your industry representatives, among others, persuaded me to move the adoption of the Douglas amendment in the subcommittee.

However, some Senators felt rather strongly that since the Douglas amendment was directed toward the general problem of moving all scrapped automobiles into the scrap market it went beyond the province of the Highway Beautification Act, which was directed only toward interstate and primary and secondary roads. For this reason, I acceded to cropping the amendment in the full committee, but only after gaining the assurance that Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, chairman of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, would join with me in supporting the Douglas measure as an amendment to the Solid Waste Disposal Act. It is my hope that hearings will be conducted on this important measure early this spring and that we will have affirmative action in the Congress this year.

I need not emphasize, however, that your industry does not have to wait for Federal or State action to help in the beautification of America. Indeed, the problem of unsightly scrap facilities was a concern to you even before it came to the attention of this Congress. You are to be commended for your voluntary "green screen" program, and I urge each of you to join in this effort. With this kind of voluntary effort on the part of private enterprise, and with the cooperative approach with Government which your industry has already demonstrated, I have every confidence that we will all move forward toward a greater appreciation for the scenic and recreational values of the American landscape.

ALASKAN MINING PROSPECTS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, among the plans for development of the rich natural resources in the State of Alaska some of the more important are those of the State and the mining industry for hard rock mining.

In past years the gold mines of Alaska produced great wealth and, in many ways, provided a foundation for development of other resources. The colorful history of the gold mines in Alaska has also produced a rich fortune of folklore and fame for Alaskans.

Unfortunately, in recent years the gold resource development of Alaska has come to a virtual standstill. The price for gold of $35 an ounce which was set by President Roosevelt's Executive order in 1934 was most helpful to the gold mining industry. It gave the gold mining industry a tremendous lift not only in Alaska but in other gold mining areas in the West. Regrettably, the price has remained at that level. It has proved impossible to change it or to achieve alternative forms of relief for the gold mining industry despite repeated demonstration of the obvious fact that the cost of producing gold has increased far beyond the 1934 level and it has therefore become increasingly unprofitable to mine gold. Indeed, the Consumer Price Index of the Department of Labor shows that index has risen 126 percent since January 1, 1940, the year in greatest volume of gold production in the United States. Added to this was the War Production Board Order No. 208 which ordered the closing of gold mines of the United States during World War II—an action not taken by any of our allies which had gold mines. It was a ruinous discrimination imposed uniquely on the American gold mining industry by the Federal Government. Despite this, gold miners have sought to continue to explore Alaska for the precious metal and they maintain the hope that one day gold mining will again resume its important place as a major industry. Wise Federal policy would bring that about. To achieve this desirable objective, however, an intelligent and receptive attitude on the part of the Treasury Department is required. Under both Republican and Democratic administrations, the illusion prevails in that Department that any effort to assist the gold mining industry by subsidization or other methods similar to those applied by the Federal Government to agriculture or even within the mining industry to lead and zinc, will somewhat cause a panic in international monetary circles and shake confidence in the stability of the dollar. This mistaken attitude persists despite the fact that all proposed legislative remedies—made during the last 6 years in both Senate and House—emphasize that they neither seek nor imply any purpose to change the price of gold and to affect its role in monetary affairs.

Alaska has rich resources of other minerals besides gold and we should be able to expect that the greater application of modern exploration methods, the developing knowledge of mineral resources and improved transportation will make mining an even more productive source for Alaska and of the Nation. The increasing shortage of important strategic minerals should make such prospect more likely.

An interesting commentary on the state of the mining industry in Alaska was recently presented at a meeting of the Northwest Mining Association by James A. Williams, the able director of the Division of Mines and Minerals, Department of Natural Resources of the State of Alaska. Mr. Williams called attention to the increased activity and interest in mineral development in Alaska during the last year including important operations taking place in the remote northwest part of the State—in the Kobuk—where the Kennecott Copper Co. is exploring for copper; other copper prospecting north of the Denali Highway and north of the Denali Highway and north of Iliamna Lake; significant prospecting efforts for tin in the Seward Peninsula; as well as geological and geochemical reconnaissance taking place in other parts of Alaska.

Although th[illegible]ook should be optimistic, Mr. W[illegible] reminds us that important chang[illegible] Federal land policy are necessary if Alaska is to make its rightful contribution as an important mining State. For example, although Alaska is the site of more than half the acreage of land in the public domain, not one Alaskan has been appointed to serve on the Public Land Law Review Commission or even on its Advisory Committee established by legislation of the 88th Congress. Particularly unjust is the fact that of its 18 members, 12 come from 6 States. In other words, while Alaska with more public lands than all other States combined has none. New York and Pennsylvania with no public lands have two representatives, and the States of Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Idaho also have two each. This disparity is further increased by the absence of any Alaskans on the Commission's Advisory Board.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Williams' statement be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINING DEVELOPMENTS AND FUTURE NEEDS OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

(By James A. Williams)

Alaska's traditional reputation as a country of high costs is not as justified as it once was and is becoming less justified all the time. A steady improvement in Alaska's transportation facilities has had much to do with this. Costs in the other States and Canada are gaining on Alaskan costs. In the annual report of the Division of Mines and Minerals for 1964, we published an article containing estimates which show that overall costs of a mining operation would be only 15 percent higher in southeast Alaska than in British Columbia. Estimated cost comparisons under the headings of mining, milling, surface, services, administration, and shipping are made. No one has rebutted this article to date.

Our cost comparison also shows how the greater depletion allowances under American tax law are more favorable for ultimate profits for a long-lived mining operation than is the tax-free period for new mines in Canada. I was recently pleased to see this fact briefly recognized in a mining economics paper by Mr. Edgar Scholz which was presented at the 1964 CIM meeting at Vancouver. Also, more than one able operator with Alaskan experience has been quoted as saying that reconnaissance exploration in Alaska need not cost more than in other States or Canada when properly planned and arranged for in advance.

As for ore hunting, the odds are as favorable in Alaska as anywhere. This will be proven when exploration effort comparable to that presently going on in British Columbia is expended in Alaska. The same favorable geology that extends along the Pacific fringe of the South and North American Continents passes from the Western States through British Columbia and up into Alaska. Mr. Thomas Elliott of Vancouver presented a paper at the 1964 Alaska AIME Conference in which he reported on a compilation of answers to a questionnaire sent to numerous active Canadian mining companies requesting their comments on exploration in Alaska. Their reasons for not working in Alaska varied widely, but nearly every company stated that Alaskan geology is as favorable for ore deposits as that in Canada. Not one of them stated otherwise.

At the same conference, Mr. Charles F. Herbert in his paper entitled "A Possible Guide to Metal Deposits in Alaska" pointed out that the 1962 metal production, exclusive of iron of the 11 Western States was 60 times that of Alaska measured in dollars per square mile. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that Alaskan metal production will eventually be many times what it is now. Obviously, the odds are very favorable for finding ore bodies in Alaska. It seems certain that the industry has hardly begun to investigate Alaska's excellent possibilities.

MINING DEVELOPMENTS

We turn now to the more important hard rock mineral developments in Alaska during 1965. The level of activity and interest rose sharply from that of 1964. Since most of our developments are in the reconnaissance stage and thus may not be discussed by wish of the companies concerned, I cannot give you the complete picture of all that is happening.

Alaska's biggest mining development is taking place in the remote northwest part of the State north of the Kobuk River where Kennecott recently started to sink an exploration shaft on a deep copper deposit. The village of Bornite has been established there. Production plans are indefinite because of the unknown nature of the rock and magnitude of the pumping problems. Several drill holes are artesian wells. The operation will be underground. The exploration shaft will go to a depth of 1,100 feet, according to present plans. Drifting will be done on two levels and further diamond drilling will be pursued from these levels.

Three active drilling projects this year were those of the United States Steel Corp. in one of the tin areas of the Seward Peninsula, Dome Mining Co. of Canada on a copper prospect north of the Denali Highway, and Falconbridge on the Kasna Creek copper claims north of Iliamna Lake. Sinclair Oil & Gas was reported drilling limestone on Heceta Island in southeast Alaska.

Dome Mining Co. also had a prospecting crew doing recon work in central Alaska, and recon geological and geochemical work was done in various areas by United States Steel and Bear Creek Mining Co. A program of crash proportions involving drilling, recon work, and claim staking was carried out by Pan American Petroleum Corp. Pan Am reportedly used some 60 men and 6 helicopters, and worked along the Alaskan Peninsula from the Chenik Mountain iron deposits to the Chignik Bay gold, silver, copper, and lead prospects. Prospects in those two areas were staked by Pan American in 1964. A local group called Davis Mining Co. prospected in the same area with a small crew and one or two "choppers."

A Pacific Northwest mining company carried out large scale investigation of lead-silver prospects in one district. Climax showed a renewed interested in molybdenum possibilities by some field investigations. Two Canadian prospecting syndicates operated in southeast Alaska with boats and crews. Atlantic Refining Co., a major oil firm, staked a new iron show found this year by the U.S. Geological Survey. A trio of Alaskan prospectors developed a lead-silver prospect found in 1963 by a State division of mines and minerals geologist. Incidentally, the promising Denali copper prospect being drilled by Dome was also discovered by a division geologist.

A new Anchorage group investigated some copper shows on the west side of Cook Inlet and an old Ketchikan group continued investigations of various prospects in southeast Alaska. Asbestos Corp., A.S. & R. Co., and Anaconda American Brass, all of Vancouver, investigated Alaskan possibilities on a limited scale. Wrangell Mountain Mining Co., a Cordova group, prepared to concentrate copper-bearing talus at the old Kennecott property in the McCarthy district, and Harry B. Cannon & Associates of Florida had a crew on the Martin Radovan copper prospect in the same district. H. Hill & Associates of Vancouver did some development work on one or more antimony prospects in the Fairbanks district, and a local Seward group drilled a gold vein inside the Seward city limits.

Offshore prospecting and mining has not progressed as rapidly as we had hoped, but it is moving ahead. Offshore prospecting permits are held in a great many places along Alaska's 35,000 miles of coastline, but the best chances for early production seem to be along the south side of the Seward Peninsula, and off the platinum area at Goodnews Bay. Shell Oil did sparker seismic work in 1963 and drilled from the ice over an area several miles long parallel to the beaches of Nome in the winter of 1963–64. Shell has acquired exploration rights on a number of permits. The Thompson group, of Denver, has recently acquired prospecting rights on a large number of permits in several areas, and the Ocean Sciences organization carried out work in contouring and sampling various offshore bottoms in 1965.

We estimate expenditures for mining exploration in Alaska in 1965 to total about $2½ million. This is a small figure compared to that for British Columbia, but as noted earlier, it represents a sharp upturn from the previous year.

OIL DEVELOPMENTS

Since we are concerned here primarily with mining, my remarks on oil development will be very brief compared to the importance of these developments. The big news in Alaska oil development during 1965 was twofold: (1) The discovery of three new offshore oil fields in Cook Inlet and (2) erection of the first permanent platforms for drilling and production in the inlet.

Offshore drilling discovered three new offshore oil fields in Cook Inlet and extended the previously discovered Middle Ground Shoal field to perhaps double its known size. This gives us five known fields in the inlet, all with huge potential, and there is good reason to expect more. We are now in 10th place for proven reserves among the 33 oil producing States, and as the new fields come into production, we will be climbing the ladder from our present position of 20th in annual production. Our present production is still limited to the Swanson River oil field and the Kenai gas field, both on the Kenai Peninsula.

Cook Inlet has the most severe ice conditions of any place in the world where offshore drilling has thus far been done. Tides of up to 30 feet create currents which sweep large ice floes back and forth at speeds up to 7 knots. In the colder winters, this ice reaches thicknesses approaching 4 feet. Until this year, drilling in the Inlet has been done from floating rigs, a jack-up barge, and temporary platforms not designed to withstand moving ice. Shell Oil completed the first permanent platform early in the year on the Middle Ground Shoal structure and has drilled three wells from it to date. A Pan American Petroleum Corp. permanent platform on the same structure will be completed before the year's end. A double 8-inch pipeline has just been laid from the east side of the Inlet to these two platforms. Announcements by various oil companies late in the year indicate that at least six more permanent platforms will be erected as soon as possible on the newly discovered oil fields. These platforms cost $6 or $7 million each.

Several gas fields have been discovered in the Cook Inlet area but are shut in for lack of market. Plans have been in motion for quite some time to build a liquification plant on the Kenai Peninsula and a suitable ship to supply the Japanese market with liquid gas.

Extensive seismic exploration and some drilling is continuing on the Arctic Slope. Much interest is in evidence there and large acreages have been leased, but development is understandably slow Production would presumably have to be transported by pipeline some 700 miles south to Fairbanks. No roads exist north of the Yukon River.

A glance at the economic impact of Alaska's new oil industry is as follows: Alaska is now producing $35 million worth of oil and gas per year. From this annual production the State is receiving directly about $4 million in taxes and royalties. This will increase in succeeding years. Several more millions of dollars are received each year from competitive lease sales and rentals. Currently, the industry is providing directly about 700 jobs and is spending annually $65 to $70 million in exploration, development, production, and construction. A further benefit not recognized by many is the road building which helps to open up inaccessible areas. During each of the last 3 years the oil industry has built over 300 miles of heavy duty roads over which to haul the heavy drill rigs to new drill sites.

NEEDS OF THE STATE TO STIMULATE DEVELOPMENT

Probably the two most important needs that can be at least partly met to increase exploration in Alaska are the need to know more about the geology and geochemistry of the State and the need to show mining people that costs in Alaska are not necessarily as high as is popularly believed. A mining company or a knowledgeable prospector always wants to study the geology of an area before going into it, and the more detailed the geology, the better it usually is for exploration purposes. Also, it has been found that geochemical maps stir up a great deal of interest and activity. The USGS is mapping geology at a reconnaissance scale of 4 miles to the inch, but is not expending as much of its geological effort as it should in Alaska relative to the size, amount of public domain, and mineral potential of the State. The three mining geologists of the division of mines and minerals are mapping favorable areas at a scale of 1 mile to the inch or larger as rapidly as possible, but our 300 to 400 square miles of mapping per year is considerably less than one-thousandth of Alaska's total area.

Having discussed costs to some extent earlier, I will not got back to that subject.

As with other public land States, Alaska needs less restrictive interpretation of mining laws where there is no other actual need for the land. This seems particularly important in Alaska where there is so little basic industry and the proportion of public domain is so high. A case in point is the U.S. Forest Service's current protest against issuance of patent for the Snettisham iron claims. The application has been pending for several years. The claims cover a well-known large iron prospect that will eventually be commercial, if the claims can be kept valid. The land is not needed for anything else, and claims on a similar deposit were patented recently after years of arguing. One of the Forest Service examiners at the Snettisham hearing said that if he had been on the other case, that patent would not have been issued. We need less of this sort of discouragement.

We can hope and try for help from the newly created Public Land Law Review Commission, but it is an unfortunate fact that Alaska, with a little more than one-half the total Federal lands over which the Commission will be deliberating, has not a single member on the Commission nor even on the Commission's Advisory Council. We need representation on this Commission.

We need fewer withdrawals. The most recent proposal includes the Kantishna mining district so that it may be added to Mount McKinley National Park. The reason for the proposal is apparently stated officially as the need to create a new camping area that is near, but not in sight of, Wonder Lake in which the famous reflection of the Mountain is seen. Various other theories have been voiced about the need to help save the caribou which migrate through the district on the way to and from the park and the need to remove from adjacent to the park's boundaries the buildings and other structures that are associated with mining and the trade and manufacturing sites which are in existence there.

The Kantishna district has produced Alaska's most important, though small, shipments of silver ore in the past and is one of the most likely future sources of silver. As is only too well known, silver is in such short supply that the Nation has had to delete it from part of our coinage. Yet, the Department of the Interior proposes to add this potentially productive area to a national park which already contains nearly 2 million acres and whose only road runs part of the way across its north side. This is certainly holding up any risk capital that might otherwise be spent there, and does nothing to inspire exploration work anywhere near the park. No notice of a public hearing was published with the notice of the proposed withdrawal and no further official word has been received on the matter other than routine acknowledgment of the protests which have been sent to the BLM.

Obviously we need a healthy raise in the price of gold or some other measure to make gold mining again reasonably profitable. Alaska has hundreds of gold placer and lode deposits which are idle only because costs have more than tripled since the price of gold was pegged. Alaska has a large belt of mercury prospects that should be receiving more attention.

In spite of the more favorable U.S. depletion allowances mentioned earlier, we need a Federal tax moratorium similar to that in Canada for new mining operations. The Canadian tax-free period is unquestionably the biggest single attraction to investment in Canada's mining possibilities.

DIVISION OF MINES AND MINERALS

I was asked to summarize briefly the activities and functions of my agency in fulfilling the needs for stimulation of mining in Alaska. Our geological work has been mentioned. Using the USGS reconnaissance geology as a base, we are selecting areas that indicate the most promise and investigating them by detailed mapping methods and stream sediment geochemistry.

The second full season of this work has just been completed. The total field crew consists of three mining geologists, four mining engineers, and three summer geologic field assistants. Geochemical sampling is done in the areas of the geological investigations and also in other areas separately from the geologic work. One of our hopes is to publish geochemical maps of large areas of the State. For example, we are working presently toward one of southeast Alaska. Geochemanamolies have been found in places where no known prospecting has been done. It is expected that prospectors and exploration companies will follow up our work in greater detail and thoroughly check out the possibilities.

We insist that our geologists prepare their reports for publication prior to the following field season so that others may use the information gained without delay. I suspect that my whipcracking is not too popular with the geologists, for it may cause errors in judgment to be made when a geological field project is not completed. However, corrections can always be made the following season. It seems more important to us to make the work immediately available than to delay publication until we are sure that all details are technically correct.

Other functions of the Division aimed at stimulating mining in Alaska include (1) Kardex inventory of all prospects and known mineral occurrences with up-to-date claim ownership information and references to known unpublished reports and USGS and USBM publications referring to the property or occurrences, (2) free public mineral identification and assaying of samples and ores for bona fide prospectors, (3) property examinations and reports where deemed warranted and the claim holder cannot afford a consultant, (4) a monthly bulletin and annual report of wide circulation, and (5) answering inquiries by correspondence and assisting visitors at our various offices with all manner of mineral information, including making our Juneau files of unpublished individual property reports available to visitors.

PORNOGRAPHY BECOMES BRAZEN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the past 6 months I have received more complaints from fellow South Dakotans about the problem of smut advertising than I have about almost any other national or international problem.

It became apparent to me in late summer that the professional dirt peddlers had picked South Dakota as their target for advertising obscene materials. Since that time, hardly a day goes by that I do not get complaints from people who have received unsolicited advertising for off-color pictures, books, and other materials.

My mail leads me to the conclusion that other areas of the Nation have also been cursed with this flood of advertising from these firms soliciting sales of movies and pictures of an obviously pornographic nature.

I believe that the time has come for Congress to act. It is my hope that we can again pass S. 309, the bill which I have introduced to set up a Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials. The Senate has twice approved this legislation.

The House Education and Labor Committee has held hearings on a companion bill, H.R. 7465, introduced by Congressman DOMINICK DANIELS. I am encouraged by reports from the House side that this bill may be favorably reported soon.

I have received a very fine editorial from the Shreveport Journal, of Shreveport, La., for January 8, 1966. I believe this editorial points out some helpful approaches to the problems of pornography, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WAR ON PORNOGRAPHY

Congress this coming session will consider several bills to curb the distribution of pornography through public channels. Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of North Dakota, and Representative DOMINICK DANIELS, Democrat, of New Jersey, are expected to urge the establishment of a presidential commission to investigate the whole business in smut literature.

Certainly, a commission is not needed to determine that it is a thriving business. Books and magazines containing material of a lascivious nature can be obtained either at newsstands in towns and cities all over the country or else through the mail.

Publishers of filth, just as do the narcotics rackets, make a strong appeal to children. Their aim, of course, is to create lifelong customers regardless of what effects obscene pictures and reading matter may have on impressionable young minds.

Increasing numbers of communities are trying to stop the tide, both by law and by enlisting the cooperation of local newsstand and bookdealers. But Supreme Court rulings have greatly weakened legal controls, and in consequence, law enforcement agencies have less authority on which to act.

The Wanderer, a national Catholic weekly published in St. Paul, Minn., is calling for a war on smut. It asks individuals and organizations throughout the Nation to appeal to President Johnson to use all resources at his command to stop the inundation of obscene literature.

No matter what action may be taken in Washington, the campaign can begin in every home where there are children. In supervising the reading done by sons and daughters, parents can take a constructive approach. Never before have so many beautiful books for children been available. Children need to be encouraged to read fine books as well as to be protected from trash.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have also read a very fine presentation of the entire problem of increased activities on the part of the smut peddlers in an article from the official publication of the Knights of Columbus, Columbia, in the January issue. This article, entitled "Pornography Becomes Brazen," by Al Antczak, outlines the broad picture of the threat of the obscenity market. I ask, also, that this article be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORNOGRAPHY BECOMES BRAZEN

(By Al Antczak)

(NOTE.—Popular unconcern and baffling court decisions have permitted pornography to become a multi-billion-dollar business in the United States, posing an insidious threat to the Nation's young. This is the first of three Columbia articles on the menacing problem.)

Total nudity, straight on and unretouched, is now the main content of smut magazines on sale somewhere near you.

Pornography now has reached a point where American smut publishers are replacing their girlie magazines with outright nudist publications.

They feature mixed groups. They make little pretense of advocating sun worship or catering to nature faddists.

They show nudity frankly and suggestively.

They encourage it as yet another new freedom.

They illustrate it boldly, often in full color layouts. Topics range from crudely suggestive poses to apartment house parties that include dancing.

Such magazines now have a circulation in the millions. They are produced in a number of American cities. They are on display near you and your children selling at prices from $1.50 to $5.50.

The current social contagion of pornography is comparable in many respects to the rat-borne bubonic plague of the middle ages. Pornography has become the new American plague.

No undercover police investigation is needed to verify this. It's in the open.

In downtown Los Angeles you'll find all this material, and more, at a newsstand half a block from fashionable Bullocks department store and at many other newsstands in the area.

Stores dealing almost exclusively in smut material operate along Main Street, which is in back of Spring Street, the financial center of Los Angeles.

If you never go downtown you're still not insulated from this material. One of the worst smut shops in San Fernando Valley is near a corner bus stop used by teenagers from various public and private neighborhood schools.

Photo magazines are only one part of the country's pornographic output. There are also pornographic records and pornographic 8 mm. films depicting a whole range of normal and abnormal sexual activity. Police say that girls used in these films are paid $25 for appearing. The film, in turn, may make $25,000 for the producer.

One of the largest, most lucrative categories of smut is paperback books specializing in the whole spectrum of human aberrations from adultery to transvestism.

The new paperbacks do not contain anything as simple as heavily sexual romance. Read this excerpt from a letter sent by a California publisher to prospective authors:

"The paperback picture has been changing month to month and we need tough, strong, hard-hitting, sex-action-filled books geared to the demands of today's and tomorrow's highly competitive market rather than the standards of even a few months ago. What we basically seek is off-beat sex with emphasis on deviations. Some of the things to write on are: (There follow specific delineations of every known form of unnatural activity). The plot is secondary. We do not want complex sex plots, naive sex adventure stories, detective stories spiced with sex, no pages of rambling, pointless dialog. I need more descriptions, more characters per book."

'Naturally," concluded the publisher's letter, "I expect the descriptions of these various things to be in good taste * * * we don't want four-letter words * * * but within these standards it must be as strong and as offbeat as possible. The mere fact that some of these themes are used will sell our books."

As of autumn 1965 the leading marketable theme for these paperbacks was incest.

Obscenity is big business. Law enforcement people and citizens' decency groups say that a total gross of $3 billion a year seems a realistic estimate.

Information from studies of court cases and from newspaper files gives an indication of the tremendous output of a few publishers in Los Angeles only.

One Los Angeles printer publishes 20 to 30 smut-type titles a month and makes 25,000 copies of each for a total of 500,000 to 750,000 paperbacks monthly.

Another Los Angeles publisher prints 250,000 girlie and nudist magazines a month.

Printing costs come to about 10 percent of the book's selling price. The cut on the sale is a 50-25-25 percent split between the publisher, distributor, and retailer.

Records show that the typical big publisher grosses $3 million yearly in the girlie field alone. Then there is his paperback output which totals about 2 million copies selling for 75 to 90 cents each.

Within California there are approximately 20 to 30 corporations publishing smut-type publications.

The magnitude of the resources and operations of some of these firms is evidenced from such records as U.S. Bankruptcy Court proceedings against a publisher in California. Involved were a two-unit web offset press; four shoe-fed offset presses; three letter presses; a complete composing room; assorted handling and storage units. The firm employed 66 persons. In 1959 it reportedly did $376,000 in sales. In 1963 sales were estimated at $1,300,000.

During the past 5 years the smut publishers have become bolder and their production and profit figures have spiraled.

One typical Los Angeles publisher began in 1958 with three titles. In 1964 he was publishing 43 girlie magazines and 14 nudist magazines.

Other publishers show comparable gains in volume and profit. Obscenity is big business and big money.

The perverting power of smut money is evident not only in terms of the commercial exhibitionists who pose for the photos, but also in other ways. One large west coast firm is now headed by a father and son. The son asked to come into the business because of the money. He is not yet 25.

Another, different father and son relationship was recounted by Dr. Don Cortum, Torrance, Calif., physician who is national cochairman of Citizens for Decent Literature, a countrywide group that is combating obscenity through education and support of law enforcement and court actions.

At the CDL national convention in New York City last October Dr. Cortum and some delegates were inspecting smut shops in the Times Square area. The group of men began to question the operator of the shop as to why he was in such a sordid business. He justified himself by saying he needed the money to put his 17-year-old son through college.

"Would you bring him in here and let him see all this stuff?" the operator was asked.

"Of course not," he snapped.

Unconcern and irresponsibility for other people and their children is the most vicious characteristics of the smut peddler. He disclaims any responsibility for corrupting the Nation.

So serious is pornography and its effects that in California alone several concurrent campaigns are being waged to fight the plague.

Last September California Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch appointed an advisory committee on obscenity. Its members are city and district attorneys and law enforcement officers from throughout the State. Purpose of the attorney general's committee is to investigate the sources of obscene materials in the State, to provide data for more anti-obscenity legislation, to assist law enforcement officers in legal proceedings against pornography and to explore possibilities of legal actions against purveyors of obscene materials.

Officer Lou McClary is a perceptive, dedicated young policeman. His beat: pornography.

He has been assigned to this for the past 5 years and works out of the Administrative Vice Division of the Los Angeles Police Department.

Currently he is on loan from the department to serve as investigator for the State attorney general's advisory committee on obscenity. McClary knows the publishers, the retailers and their operations.

He tells you flatly that Los Angeles is one of the major producers of smut—girlie magazines, paperbacks, nudist magazines, films, the combined field.

He puts the number of major firms in the Los Angeles area at four—with subsidiaries. Other big cities also have heavy producers of objectionable material.

One thing Los Angeles police have been successful in curtailing is the peep show arcades with their 8 mm. films and also nude photography studios.

In the past several years 26 nude photo studios were closed by police. Arrests were being made in them weekly for lewd conduct and pictures, for prostitution and other violations of the law.

One means of enforcement against the peep show operators is the denial of permits by police to any potential operators with police records.

Officer McClary will not estimate the dollar volume nationally of the smut industry.

"I know I've never seen a poor man in this field. One operator will tell you his competitor is worth a million dollars in cash."

McClary cites as evidence of high profits the fact that litigation and court costs are accepted by operators as a normal, constant item of overhead. These costs are high.

The operators hire lawyers who specialize in the law on obscenity, who command high fees and who have at their disposal "experts" in literature, art, and even in the ministry—all retained for fees as high as $150 a day.

The police, McClary emphasizes are not censors, nor is it their function to act as the conscience of their community. Their usual procedure in this field is to investigate a complaint and take it to the city attorney. The city attorney decides whether or not prosecution is possible.

In California the prosecutor must prove that the matter in question is obscene and that the purveyor had knowledge that it was obscene.

This is not easy. Right off, McClary says, the retailers, the clerks in the shops often have oral instructions from their attorneys on what to say to anyone they suspect is trying to get them to admit to knowledge of the nature of what they are selling.

Capt. Harry A. Nelson is commander of the Administrative Vice Division of the Los Angeles Police Department. A reflective, analytical man, he elaborates on the knotty problem that Officer McClary described.

"There is no field of law enforcement in which a policeman is so frustrated as in obscenity matters.

"If I had to choose a point of controversy, I honestly believe that 'obscenity' has generated more disagreement and ambiguity than any other point of contention brought before our court system.

"Everyone knows what murder is, what robbery is. But what is obscene? What is hard core pornography?"

Captain Nelson says that during the past year civic and religious groups have been more active than ever before in their concern over pornography.

He also reports that the constant pressure and clamor have had little or no effect on legislation or court decisions.

"With the civic groups on one side and the courts on the other, a virtual battlefield is created, with the police officer in 'no man's land.'

"One of the latest U.S. Supreme Court decisions removed the prerogative of local jurisdictions to determine obscenity and created a national conscience which is impossible to identify," he pointed out.

Captain Nelson said numerous moral definitions of obscenity exist, but there does not appear to be a single workable legal definition.

He emphasized the point that a gap exists between the moral and the legal. What is morally offensive is not necessarily legally prosecutable.

"The enforcement officer must comply at all times with statutory requirements, as translated from the will of the people through legislative process. The judicial body possessing the right of final review need not reflect the will of the people. Herein rests a major conflict with regard to pornography."

Continuing his explanation of police frustration in attempts to clear objectionable printed matter from a community, Captain Nelson said a recent California Supreme Court decision has resulted in chaos.

In the decision, he said, obscenity is related to "hard core" only, but the phrase was not defined. "This leaves all the gray area material, e.g., sunbathers' magazines, girlie books and magazines and girlie snapshots readily available," he said. "As a result, mail order companies are springing up in large numbers. An abundance of complaints regarding their wares are received daily from irate citizens throughout the country."

Prior to 1961 enactment of present obscenity laws, courts had defined obscenity as: "Whether to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interest."

New laws went further. They required that proof be given that the person charged had knowledge that the matter was obscene. They added the condition that the matter be "utterly without redeeming social importance."

Captain Nelson said numerous complaints are received regarding nudist magazines published and distributed in the Los Angeles area. Nudity, per se, is of course not legally obscene.

"The latest known figures disclose that the southern California area has approximately 4,500 registered nudists. However, there are in excess of 100,000 copies of nudist magazines sold in this area each month," Nelson said.

"The market for these magazines is obviously not among nudists. The nudist magazines are distributed and sold through the same outlets as the girlie magazines and borderline paperbacks. The appeal of these publications is shown by their proximity to other borderline materials, but their content cannot be declared obscene."

The captain said many paperbacks take advantage of the fact that "sex is not synonymous with obscenity" and therefore enter into graphic descriptions of sex acts.

Los Angeles City Attorney Roger Arnebergh said: "I receive more complaints about pornography than any other matter." Arnebergh bluntly blames the courts. He says he is up against something like Justice Potter Stewart's dictum that only hard core pornography is prosecutable and, though he doesn't define it, he'll know it when he sees it.

Arnebergh contends that even though lower courts in some areas do find books obscene, there is always appeal and enough reversals in higher courts to make local prosecution difficult.

On a national scale the Post Office Department records a volume of complaints that has increased 200 percent since 1957. Complaints against obscene mail in 1957 totaled

40,000. In 1965 complaints reached 128,000. Convictions in these same 2 years increased from 175 to 696.

Postal inspectors at Los Angeles say that what the general public complains about is the borderline gray area material.

It is lucrative for dealers to have a Hollywood address, hence much mail-order business in objectionable materials originates here.

Henry B. Montague, chief U.S. postal inspector, told the General Federation of Women's Clubs in New Orleans last June that "the continuous flow of obscenity in this country is a serious problem and one of grave concern. We in the postal inspection service are convinced that the availability of lewd and suggestive matter is one of the contributing factors to the increase in crime. Pornography which concentrates on masochistic or sadistic practices is very potent in this respect."

Inspector Montague also observed that "one of the features of greatest concern to us is the continually increasing volume of pornography relating to homosexuality."

James J. Clancy is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, a veteran of World War II submarine duty and of destroyer service in the Korean war. He is a lawyer and now full-time legal counsel for Citizens for Decent Literature. Prior to that he served for 1 year as a special counsel in the Los Angeles County district attorney's office for work on obscenity cases.

Blue-eyed, genial Clancy is straight business when it comes to discussing this subject. His analysis is as taut and clear cut as a battle plan.

His appraisal:

"The situation has gotten worse in the past 5 years. We don't accept that nothing can be done about it.

"The major problem is the legal complexity of obscenity and the unwillingness of public attorneys to take on challenges, especially when they seem insurmountable.

"Basically the fight can be won by insisting that the law be enforced, by insisting that arrests be made and that prosecutors carefully prepare their cases and secure expert advice." Clancy does not agree with prosecutors who claim action against obscenity is hopeless.

Clancy refers to a statement by Chief Justice Earl Warren that "courts are often presented with procedurally bad cases and, in dealing with them, appear to be acquiescing in the dissemination of obscenity. But if cases were well prepared and were conducted with the appropriate concern for constitutional safeguards, courts would not hesitate to enforce the laws against obscenity."

Clancy believes the tide can be turned against the pornographers for two reasons:

"1. People are becoming incensed. People are looking at this material now and there is a tremendous reaction.

"2. The material has gotten so bad that the publishers are hanging themselves. You can't push this stuff on a community without having reaction."

THE UNITED NATIONS AND PEACEKEEPING

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the 20th General Assembly of the United Nations concluded its business on December 22. By any standard of measurement, it has been quite a session. Perhaps the most important development for the U.N. in 1965 was normalization of the Assembly which was paralyzed during the previous session by the argument over article 19. The 20th General Assembly was thus enabled to meet and function normally. Resolutions were produced and voted upon, and the largest number of items in the history of the Organization were debated, covering economic problems, trust territories, human rights, disarmament, financing, and peacekeeping. But, as Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg noted, in addressing the U.N. Special Political Committee:

> Peacekeeping is at the heart of this Organization's work. For, if the United Nations failed to fulfill its responsibilities under the charter for the maintenance of peace and security, there would be little hope for the other noble aims of the charter.

Fortunately, Mr. President, 1966 will see the United Nations renew its continuing effort to keep peace. I ask unanimous consent to have Ambassador Goldberg's fine statement printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, in the Special Political Committee, on the Question of Peacekeeping Operations

Mr. Chairman, the item before us, the "Comprehensive Review of the Whole Question of Peacekeeping," is surely one of the key items before this General Assembly.

Peacekeeping is at the heart of this Organization's work. For if the United Nations failed to fulfill its responsibilities under the charter for the maintenance of peace and security, there would be little hope for the other noble aims of the charter. Prospects for peace in the world and a better life for men everywhere would be immeasurably darkened.

It might be well at this point to define exactly what the term "United Nations peacekeeping" means.

The Secretary General has provided us with a useful definition. "Peacekeeping forces," he told the Harvard Alumni in 1963, "are of a very different kind and have little in common with the forces foreseen in chapter VII—but their existence is not in conflict with chapter VII. They are essentially peace and not fighting forces and they operate only with the consent of the parties directly concerned."

The United Nations has a long history of establishing such peacekeeping forces—in Greece, in 1947; in Kashmir, in 1948; along the borders of Israel, in 1949; in the Gaza Strip, in 1956; in Lebanon, in 1958; in the Congo, in 1960; in West Iran, in 1962; in Yemen, in 1963; in Cyprus, in 1964; and in India and Pakistan in 1965.

The report of the Secretary General and the President of the General Assembly to the Committee of 33, and the discussion in that committee, have helped to define the nature of these peacekeeping operations. Unlike enforcement actions, they are voluntary in two fundamental respects:

They do not place obligations on member states to contribute personnel, materials, or services.

They are introduced into the territory of a country only with the consent of that country.

Such operations have taken various forms—observers on a frontier; supervision of a cease-fire line; factfinding and observation to clarify a factual situation or to investigate charges of interference and infiltration from the outside; and assistance to a country to maintain or restore law and order where requested by that country and in conditions in which international peace and security might otherwise be threatened.

It is remarkable—and heartening to my Government—that U.N. peacekeeping operations of all these kinds have gone forward even in the face of deep differences over issues of principle. This is a tribute to the diplomatic and executive talents of the Secretary General and to the generosity and dedication of participating countries. Above all, it is a tribute to the underlying good sense of the overwhelming majority of member states which have insisted that the U.N. carry out its responsibilities, though none of us may have been fully satisfied with all the arrangements for initiating, supervising, and financing a particular operation.

Mr. Chairman, this success, this partial success, is instructive for our deliberations on the peacekeeping issue. We must avoid the fallacy of assuming that total agreement on all issues of principle is a precondition of cooperating in U.N. activities. Here, as elsewhere, the pragmatic adaptation of arrangements on a case-by-case basis may offer the best hope of progress.

In any event, we must not allow our search for new and improved ground rules to impair the procedures and arrangements that we already have.

Nor should we permit the considerable progress already made in developing peacekeeping procedures to be frustrated by a small minority. As we said to the Committee of 33 on August 16: "My Government * * * is not prepared to accept a situation in which the capacity of the United Nations to act for peace could be stopped by the negative vote of a single member. Nor should the effectiveness of this Organization be determined by the level of support forthcoming from its least cooperative members."

What are the ground rules for authorizing, supervising and financing peacekeeping operations which have developed in the past—and which can guide us in the future?

From the statements of delegations in this and recent General Assemblies, from the deliberations in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, from the report jointly submitted to that Committee by the Secretary General and the President of the 19th General Assembly, and from the comments of governments on that report, there appears to be widespread support for the following major principles:

First, the Security Council has the primary responsibility for initiating and supervising peacekeeping operations—and everything should be done to enable it to exercise that responsibility.

Certainly there is widespread agreement—in which my Government strongly concurs—that the maximum possible use should be made of the Security Council.

Recent experience—in the Congo, in Cyprus, in Kashmir—has demonstrated that the Council can meet its responsibilities for dealing with threats to international peace and security. The enlargement of the Council to make it more representative of the membership as a whole should encourage the further strengthening of its peacekeeping work.

The United States continues to favor the suggestion we submitted in September 1964 to the Working Group of 21 that all proposals to initiate peacekeeping operations should be considered first in the Security Council. The Assembly would not authorize or assume control of such operations unless the Council had demonstrated its inability to act.

Second, the General Assembly has authority to initiate and supervise peacekeeping operations where the Security Council is unable to act.

Everyone apparently agrees that the General Assembly can make recommendations to the Security Council with respect to peacekeeping in the event the Council is unable to act. But the real question is whether, in the face of veto by a permanent member, the Assembly can authorize the establishment of such operations.

From the comments made by member states in recent months, it appears that the overwhelming majority of U.N. members answer this question in the affirmative. Only a small minority of members continue to insist that the negative vote of one permanent member can prevent 116 other members of the organization from initiating voluntary action to protect their common interests in the maintenance of peace.

I will not repeat here all the arguments—fully confirmed by the International Court of Justice—in support of the complementary powers of the Assembly pursuant to various articles of the charter. I wish only to emphasize, as so many others have already done, that the acceptance of the minority view on this subject would be absurd in theory and intolerable in practice.

All of our countries, in accepting membership in the U.N., agreed to refrain from the use of force save in self-defense, in support of U.N. action, and pursuant to chapter VIII of the charter. These charter restraints were undertaken on the assumption that the United Nations could act successfully when peace and security—and hence our common interests—were seriously threatened. It would be unreasonable to expect members to entrust peacekeeping responsibility to a U.N. which could be rendered impotent by the intransigence of a single member. Such an interpretation would do violence to the charter and would disappoint the legitimate hopes in this organization of the peoples of the world.

The United States, though itself a permanent member of the Security Council, has never considered that any one member should have the power unilaterally, and without recourse, to frustrate the initiation of peacekeeping operations not involving enforcement action. Some have argued that, on a narrow calculation of our interests and having regard to the fact that we have but 1 vote of 117 while paying 32 percent of the regular budget, we should be disposed to do so.

Nevertheless, we have defended the authority of the Assembly to undertake peacekeeping operations free from veto by ourselves or others because we recognize the long-term interest of all mankind in developing this means of containing violence in the nuclear age. We have not considered that our interests require us to have a veto over recommendations to members that they contribute to U.N. operations taking place on the territory of a state with its consent. We appeal to others to take the same long view of their own interests.

Third, the General Assembly has the exclusive authority under the charter to apportion the expenses of peacekeeping operations among the members of the United Nations.

This principle, like those I have mentioned earlier, is supported by a large majority of United Nations members. It is fully confirmed by the language of article 17, by 20 years of practice in the United Nations, and by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice accepted by the General Assembly. With respect to financing as well as authorization, the powers of the Assembly should be preserved. No member should have the right to veto a financial plan accepted by everyone else.

Fourth, the expenses of U.N. peacekeeping operations should be, so far as possible, the collective financial responsibility of the entire membership.

This principle, asserted without any qualification in General Assembly Resolution 1874 (S–IV), has been supported by the United States and a majority of other members for very practical reasons:

It offers the best way of sharing the financial burden fairly among the membership.

It recognizes that every member has an interest in the preservation of peace and should therefore pay something—no matter how little—toward its preservation.

It takes account of the fact that member states will be more likely to contribute military contingents for an operation when it has broad political support as reflected in widely shared financial participation.

Many, to be sure, have expressed optimism that voluntary financing of peacekeeping can do the job. The voluntary method of financing certainly offers one possibility to be considered on a case-by-case basis. But experience indicates that it often places unfair burdens on troop-supplying countries and may even fail to produce sufficient funds to assure the continuance of the operation.

At this very moment the Secretary General is short some $7 million for the United Nations operation in Cyprus. Those who believe voluntary financing is the answer have an obligation to demonstrate that it can work in specific situations. As Ambassador Stevenson once said, it would be irresponsible for the members to sit back while the Secretary General has to search for funds like a beggar on the street.

Fifth, the cost of peacekeeping operations should be shared fairly among the members in accordance with their capacity to pay and with due regard for the international character of these operations.

General Assembly Resolution 1874 (S–IV) included two propositions on which there is broad support—that economically developed countries are in a position to make relatively larger contributions than countries that are economically less developed and that the special responsibilities of the permanent members of the Security Council should be borne in mind in connection with their contributions to financing. There is widespread support for the concept of a special scale of assessment for peacekeeping operations which could give effect to these propositions.

The United States has already expressed support for a special scale. We reaffirm that support today.

Sixth, General Assembly procedures for authorizing, supervising, and financing peacekeeping operations should provide an appropriate voice for those members which bear the principal responsibility for supporting them.

With this in mind, we included in our submission to the Committee of 21 in September, a proposal for a Special Finance Committee of the General Assembly. This Committee would include the permanent members of the Security Council and a relatively high percentage of those member states in each geographic area that are large contributors. The General Assembly, in approving financial arrangements for peacekeeping operations, would act only on recommendations from this Committee passed by a two-thirds majority of the Committee's membership.

The United States is not irrevocably wedded to this particular proposal. We note that other proposals addressed to this same problem have been put forward by the delegations of Nigeria and France. Here, as in the case of other principles I have mentioned, we are prepared to consider any reasonable procedure for implementing the overall objective.

Seventh, the Secretary General is the most appropriate executive agent for managing peacekeeping operations, and should be given every support within the scope of his mandate.

As the chief executive officer of the United Nations, the Secretary General has the right and the duty to implement the directives of the Security Council, the General Assembly, and other organs. At various times in the past two decades he has carried out this responsibility under broad mandates in United Nations peacekeeping operations in the Middle East, the Congo, Cyprus, and Kashmir. We are of the firm conviction that he should continue to exercise this responsibility in the best interest of effective United Nations peacekeeping.

These, then, are the general principles which we believe should guide this organization in dealing with the peacekeeping problem. These principles are broadly compatible with the guideline set forth in paragraph 52 of the report submitted by the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly to the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations—guidelines which have had the widespread support of the members of the United Nations.

The tide of historical evolution of this organization which is reflected in these principles cannot be reversed by a few recalcitrant members. The peacekeeping work of the United Nations must continue and it will continue.

I turn now to the concrete proposal put forward initially by the Government of Ireland.

First, I should like to express our appreciation to the Irish Government and, in particular, to Foreign Minister Aiken, for taking the initiative in this vital area. Theirs is a concrete proposal, carefully worked out. It is designed to preserve and strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to undertake peacekeeping operations. It makes a sincere effort to do this while accommodating the legitimate interests of all members.

This proposal is a challenge to every member of this Assembly to rethink its position on peacekeeping operations in precise detail. How we respond to this challenge—what we say in this debate on peacekeeping—what we do at the end of it all—will profoundly affect the future capacity of our organization to perform its principal responsibility under the charter.

As for the United States, we have a number of reservations about the proposal. We expect that other delegations may have reservations as well. It would be surprising if this were not the case, since at this point in the history of the United Nations no proposal would be fully consistent with the viewpoints of every member.

Turning to specifics, we note with satisfaction that some of the principles I have outlined are reflected in the proposal put before us by the delegations of Ceylon, Ghana, Ireland, the Ivory Coast, Liberia, and Nepal.

The proposal recognizes the special responsibility of the Security Council to initiate and supervise peacekeeping operations. It affirms the authority of the General Assembly to initiate and supervise such operations where the Council is unable to act. It maintains the right of the General Assembly to assess the membership for the expenses of peacekeeping operations.

It also calls for collective fiscal responsibility, subject to a right of opting out to be accorded by the General Assembly to the five permanent members of the Security Council, which right is coupled with certain increased financial responsibilities by the permanent members.

We believe that full collective fiscal responsibility is the first choice. But we have also to recognize that it cannot be achieved in practice until there is a change in the attitudes of certain permanent members.

For these reasons, we are prepared to accept such an opting out arrangement for permanent members as an interim measure if that is the wish of the majority of the Assembly. If we cannot have full collective responsibility, let us achieve as much shared responsibility as we can. We certainly do not believe that, simply because some permanent members are not prepared to be assessed against their will for peacekeeping operations, no member should be assessed at all.

As we stated before the Special Peacekeeping Committee on August 16: "We look forward * * * to the not too distant day when the entire membership will resume its full range of collective responsibility for maintaining world peace. In the meantime, it is all the more important for the membership, though unready to apply article 19, to solve the United Nations financial problems and to continue to support in practice the sound principle of collective financial responsibility, and to adopt practical and equitable means by which those willing to share the responsibility for peace can act in concert to maintain and strengthen the indispensable peacekeeping capacity of the United Nations."

The proposal also embodies the concept of a special scale of assessment. It must make certain observations, however, on the way it seeks to implement that concept.

The resolution seeks to apply a fixed scale to all operations regardless of their size and regardless of the special circumstances that may be involved. We believe, in accordance with the practice of the United Nations, that the regular scale of assessment is appropriate for relatively small peacekeeping operations and for a small portion of larger operations.

The United States also has reservations about a proposal that one country might have to pay as much as 50 percent of the cost of any operation for which it cast an affirmative vote. Under existing legislation, the U.S. legation is not authorized to vote for an assessment in which the U.S. share is more than 33⅓ percent.

The proposal now before us would also lay down new procedures for the initiation of peacekeeping operation by the General Assembly. My delegation reserves the right to return to a discussion of the proposal after other delegations have had an opportunity to be heard.

At this point I shall simply express our reservations on that procedural change which would have the effect of counting abstentions as a negative vote. Such a change could result in the failure of a peacekeeping operation favored by a very substantial majority of members—by a vote, for example, of 77 in favor, 10 against, and 30 abstentions.

These remarks have concentrated on the vital issues of initiating, supervising, and financing of peacekeeping operations. But our review of peacekeeping operations would not be comprehensive if we stopped here.

Recent experience has revealed a number of shortcomings in United Nations peacekeeping operations. Some of these shortcomings are inherent in any international peacekeeping system. But others may be remediable by better advance planning. We need to consider additional steps which can be taken now to enable the United Nations to carry out future peacekeeping missions with greater speed and effectiveness.

The Secretary General has urged United Nations members to earmark military units which they might make available on request to the United Nations. Such earmarking has already been undertaken by Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iran, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and New Zealand.

Earmarking has very practical advantages. It signifies a serious intention by nations to participate under certain circumstances; units or resources are identified; they prepare and train in terms of probable United Nations needs. The availability of units is, of course, subject to a national decision to participate in each particular case. But there is more than a psychological advantage to the United Nations in having identified, trained, and committed units available for United Nations service.

This flexible United Nations callup system could be strengthened in a number of different ways:

Within the Secretariat itself, there should be contingency planning on how to meet possible future peacekeeping emergencies. Based on such planning, the United Nations could identify the personnel, equipment and services which peacekeeping operations might require. It could also solicit the earmarking of the necessary personnel, equipment and services from various member States—encouraging contributions from countries in all geographic areas.

The units thus earmarked could be trained in the specialized skills and unique problems involved in United Nations peacekeeping operations. The United Nations could prepare training manuals and encourage standardized equipment and military procedures.

Some countries may be unable to assume the full burdens of training and equipping units for United Nations service. A program might be organized to train officers and those types of specialized personnel—for example, communications specialists—whose scarcity has hampered previous peacekeeping operations. Aid to earmarking countries could be made available through the United Nations or through members.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, the crucial ingredient in the United Nations capacity to keep the peace does not lie in particular arrangements. The crucial ingredient is political and moral. It is our determination to rely on the United Nations, to use the United Nations, to have confidence in the United Nations operating capacity. The stakes are so high that we should be willing to take chances on the United Nations capacity to act, and to back it up even when some of its particular decisions go against our immediate national desires. For the risks of a United Nations without the capacity to act are far greater than the risks of a United Nations with that capacity.

Let us put our faith in this Organization's ability to take on increasingly difficult peacekeeping tasks around the globe. It will make mistakes. It will annoy all of us some time, and some of us all the time. Despite these frustrations, we should be willing to risk reliance on United Nations peacekeeping, because the alternative—of immobilizing the United Nations in one of its key areas of activity—is too great a risk for us to take. It conjures up the specter of uncontained disorder and violence which could escalate into a world holocaust.

For this reason we share the view already expressed by other delegations that this Assembly should seek to crystallize the broad measure of agreement that already exists on the initiating, supervising, and financing of peacekeeping operations. We cannot permit the interests of the cooperative many in a workable system of peacekeeping to be frustrated by the demands of a reluctant few.

This committee bears a special responsibility at this critical period in the life of our organization to preserve and strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to discharge its principal responsibility contained in the charter. As Ambassador Adlai Stevenson put it less than 1 year ago in his address to the General Assembly: "I, for one, cannot escape the deep sense that the peoples of the world are looking over our shoulders—waiting to see whether we can overcome our present problem and take up with fresh vigor and renewed resolution the great unfinished job of peace."

RESTORING PARCEL POST DELIVERIES AND OTHER ESSENTIAL POSTAL SERVICES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to extend my heartfelt congratulations to the new Postmaster General, Lawrence F. O'Brien, and to President Lyndon B. Johnson, for their courageous decision to seek funds from Congress to restore parcel post deliveries and other essential postal services throughout the country.

This action marks the first time in modern times—the first time, indeed, in at least the last half century—that a Postmaster General of the United States has had the courage to petition Congress for funds to improve the postal service.

Every other Postmaster General in the last 50 years has either reduced the service through administrative actions—or accepted with docility cuts imposed upon the service by reason of inadequate appropriations—or has been content to ride along with the status quo.

When Larry O'Brien appeared before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on September 1 of last year, seeking confirmation of his appointment, he assured us that his principal objective as Postmaster General would be to improve the rapidly deteriorating postal service. Of course, there is nothing unusual about that. Every candidate for the position of Postmaster General says that. But Larry O'Brien is unique in that he obviously meant what he said—and had the intestinal fortitude and the wisdom to try to do something about it.

The cuts in service which the Postmaster General and the President are seeking to restore were ordered back in May 1964. As many Senators will recall, I was sharply critical of this setback to the postal service then—and I have remained sharply critical ever since.

I would be less than fair, Mr. President, if I did not pay tribute at this time, also, to the leadership and membership of the National Association of Letter Carriers who have carried on an effective and unremitting campaign for the past 20 months to have these unwarranted reductions in service canceled.

One objective of the Postmaster General—backed by the President of the United States—is to restore 6-day delivery of parcel post in 6,091 cities where delivery was cut back to only 5 days a week. This reduction caused an unconscionable bottleneck in many communities and reduced parcel post, which already was in poor shape, to a national laughing stock.

Another objective is to increase window service in post offices and postal station in 15,000 locations throughout the Nation. The reductions in window service ordered in May 1964, have been causing a completely unwarranted hardship on the patrons of the Post Office Department. In some areas they were making it hard to do business with the local post office.

The Postmaster General's request will also permit post offices to sell money orders on Saturdays—a necessary convenience that the order of May 1964 eliminated.

I might add, Mr. President, that when the cuts were originally ordered, claims were made that they would effect a significant reduction in postal expenditures and would, thereby, reduce the so-called postal deficit by a large amount. Of course, the savings never came anywhere near the prediction. Savings resulting from service curtailments never do. Whenever the postal service is curtailed, we do a disservice not only to the American people, but also invariably fail to accomplish savings proportionate to the trouble and anguish caused.

Mr. President, when the curtailment order was issued in May 1964, I was one of the first to criticize the move. Now that the new Postmaster General has shown the courage to ask for a restoration of service, I wish to be one of the first to congratulate him and to pledge him my support.

I sincerely hope that Congress will accede to his wishes and will grant the funds necessary for a complete restoration of service.

THE NORTH TONGASS TIMBER SALE, LARGEST IN THE HISTORY OF THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, 3 weeks ago, when I was in Alaska, I had the privilege of attending the auction incidental to the largest sale of timber ever conducted by the U.S. Forest Service. It dealt with a tremendous area of forest cover in the Tongass National Forest, which blankets nearly all of southeastern Alaska.

This was an important event for the economy of Alaska and disposes of most of the remaining timber resources in that national forest. Previous sales have provided the timber resources for two great pulp mills, one at Ketchikan, established 12 years ago, and another subsequently established at Sitka. For many years these vast timber resources were neglected, were dying on the stump, and were thereby violating basic conservation principles. In the last 12 years, a more enlightened attitude has prevailed. These resources are now being utilized and will be enhanced by the scientific cutting which the Forest Service prescribes.

An excellent account of this occasion, written by Vern Metcalfe, of Juneau, radio commentator, reporter, and former member of the Alaska Legislature, appears in the January issue of American Forests, entitled, "North Tongass Timber Sale," and I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

North Tongass Timber Sale

(By Vern Metcalfe)

Juneau, Alaska.—A timber auction, pitting 2 of the top companies in the United States against each other, held some 100 residents of Alaska riveted to their seats for a grand total of 31 minutes before the St. Regis Paper Co. emerged as the ultimate winner. They were arrayed against the Champion Paper Co. in a spirited contest that saw each nickel increment bid cost the bidders $43,750—had they been successful.

At stake was a 50-year contract to harvest some 8,750 million board feet of timber over that period but the auction conducted in Juneau on December 17, 1965, actually covered only 10 percent of the timber and for a 5-year period. St. Regis finally brought the bidding to a halt with a bid of $5.65 per thousand board feet of stumpage after the Government opened the contest by noting that a minimum bid of $3.30 would be acceptable.

St. Regis won the contest and agreed that they would pay the Government a total of $4,943,750 for cutting the first 5-year increment on the largest sale ever conducted by the U.S. Forest Service in their long history. Russ Lockhart, chief of the branch of timber management for region 10 of the Service, was the auctioneer during the hectic 31-minute bidding period.

Lockhart announced at the beginning that the Government's minimum price on stumpage was the aforementioned $3.30 per thousand board feet and then opened bids from St. Regis and Champion. Both were an identical $3.30 and then Lockhart announced that the competitive auction would get underway with each bid being an additional 5 cents, providing both companies agreed. Jerry Jackson, a vice president of Champion, and Paul M. Dunn, a vice president of St. Regis, agreed to this stipulation.

The bidding was brisk and rapidly hit the $3.60 mark when reporters noted that both teams of bidders were doing rapid calculations with pencils. When St. Regis finally hit the $4.10 mark, Jackson called for an extension on the blackboard and a Forest Service accountant ran one up on the calculator he had on a desk. The figure read $3,500,000 and bidding resumed. Champion bid $4.75 after Jackson conferred with C. Girard "Jebby" Davidson, who heads up the Alaska Pacific Timber Co. of Wrangell. Davidson, a former Under Secretary of the Interior under President Truman, was seated directly behind Jackson throughout the bidding and they conferred frequently.

After St. Regis hit the $5.00 mark, Champion again called for an extension, which by now had reached $4,375,000 and following a short recess the Champion company broke the nickel mark for the first time by bidding $5.10. St. Regis, who never once called for an extension or a recess, immediately bid $5.15 and the bidding continued. Champion bid $5.20 and then immediately called for a 5-minute recess after which St. Regis bid $5.25. The bidding continued until St. Regis, never missing a new bid by more than seconds, hit the $5.55 mark and at this injuncture Champion again called for a recess and an extension. The latter indicated that $4,812,500 was riding on the line.

After the recess Champion bid one more time and when St. Regis came in with $5.65, the Hamilton, Ohio company threw in the competitive sponge. Jackson, who has spent a considerable amount of time in Alaska, noted that his company and several others had spent several hundreds of thousands of dollars on researching the sale and that he felt they could go no further. He congratulated St. Regis and added, "Champion will be back in Alaska again."

The St. Regis company was the second highest in gross sales last year of all domestic U.S. timber companies with sales of $617 million.

The sale was greeted with enthusiasm by the staff of region 10, headed by Regional Forester W. Howard Johnson. Johnson had, before the bids were received, told the crowded auction room that, "this is another milestone in the history of Alaska * * * it is a most important and serious business for everyone concerned."

The sale attracted any number of State and municipal officials including U.S. Senator Ernest Gruening, at home for the Christmas holidays. His teammate in the Senate, E. L. Bartlett, missed the auction only because of a flight delay into the capital city caused by inclement weather. Also in attendance were three mayors, including two from the immediate area—Lauris S. Parker of Juneau and Guy Russo, from neighboring Douglas. Both communities figure to be in the center of any timber industry complex since the entire sale is such that the Juneau-Douglas area would be in the middle of the operation. Also on hand, though, was Mayor John O'Connell, a member of the State house of representatives, of Sitka, which is presently the site of a huge Japanese pulpmill.

Dunn indicated to reporters that the millsite was still not pinned down and that the mill would be a kraft paper type of operation. He also indicated that there would quite possibly be other operations involved since the utilization of the resource would indicate that the hemlock and spruce would also support a sawmill, a veneer plant, and, quite possibly, a chip type of operation.

Dunn was joined in the bidding by R. L. Martin who is the St. Regis manager of logging and forestry operations out of Tacoma. In fact, Martin did the actual bidding while Dunn sat at the same table and utilized a pencil to make his own extensions of cost. Also in attendance were numerous logging and timber company leaders from throughout southeast Alaska including representatives of both Ketchikan Pulp and Alaska Timber & Pulp Co. (Sitka).

Forest Service officials indicated they were not only delighted by the results but more than slightly surprised by the price garnered in the auction. Conservative figures indicate that if the entire project is carried out as envisioned by the Forest Service planners, the Greater Juneau area might well receive over $200 million in plant and service facilities over a period of 10 years.

WYOMING—HOME ON THE RANGE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, my State, Wyoming, celebrated in the year just past its 75th anniversary as a member of the Union of States. It was a great event, chronicled in many publications. Among these was the Reclamation Era, the quarterly publication of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Reclamation Era's article deserves special note, for it is a concise history of Wyoming, written by the acknowledged authority, Dr. T. A. Larson, head of the Department of History and Director of the School of American Studies at the University of Wyoming. His definitive History of Wyoming has recently been published by the University of Nebraska Press and has, despite its newness, already achieved its place as the standard reference on Wyoming's past.

For the people of Wyoming, I want to thank the Bureau of Reclamation and Department of Interior for the fine lead article by Dr. Larson in the November Reclamation Era. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Seventy-five Years of Statehood for Wyoming, "Home on the Range"

(By Dr. T. A. Larson)

When statehood for Wyoming passed the U.S. House of Representatives in March 1890, almost 2,000 miles west of Washington, D.C., jubilation erupted in all towns of the would-be State. Church bells rang, firebells clanged, train whistles shrieked, trumpets blared, bonfires blazed, and citizens cheered.

A former Governor, George W. Baxter, declared: "It means the dawning of a brighter day, the beginning of an era of unparalleled prosperity."

That Wyoming should have achieved statehood so soon after the winter of 1886–87 bordered on the miraculous. In that bitterly cold and blustery winter 3 years earlier, Wyoming ranchers had suffered cattle losses variously estimated at from 15 to 75 percent. Many, of course, were wiped out; most of them stoically started to rebuild their herds, exhibiting that rugged perseverance and pride which have since become trademarks of the Equality State and its people.

The admission to the Union of Wyoming as a State at such a low ebb of its economy, as well as the admission of the Dakotas and Montana the previous year, is said to have been due to political considerations. However, the politics were far away in Washington, and did nothing to dampen the enthusiasm of the settlers on the plains who celebrated the great event in 1890.

This year, three-quarters of a century later, the descendants of those first Wyomingites are again exhibiting the same colorful and lusty pioneer spirit.

The State has traveled a long road since statehood.

During much of the 19th century, Wyoming was "a thoroughfare rather than a destination." It is true that trappers had lingered while they pursued beaver in lush and beautiful valleys, but with the decline of the fur trade, people passed through as quickly as possible on their way to Oregon and California.

While large areas of sagebrush and outcrops of barren rock repelled farming in many locations, other areas were fertile and rewarding to the sturdy and resourceful hand. And while prospectors searched, mostly in vain, for valuable deposits of precious metals, wild game and spectacular mountain scenery intrigued sportsmen and attracted a few permanent settlers.

REACHED BY RAILROAD

The laying of the rails for the Union Pacific Railroad across the area led Congress to establish Wyoming territory in 1868.

Thus, people who considered themselves pioneers rode to their frontier homes in Wyoming, not in covered wagons, but in railway coaches or Pullman cars.

As the railroad advanced, several towns—Cheyenne, Laramie, Rawlins, Green River, and Evanston—were strung like beads on a string across the southern part of the territory. Then completion of the railroad was followed by an economic setback which threatened to erase the young territory; even President U. S. Grant, in December 1872, favored distributing the land among surrounding territories and States.

This debacle was averted, however, and the population increased to 20,000 by 1880, enough to keep the struggling territory from being sidelined. Then in the 1880's came a spectacular boom in the open-range cattle business, as hundreds of entrepreneurs arrived with vast herds from Texas and other places. Where there had been only 450,000 cattle in 1879 there were 1,500,000 in 1885. As the range became overcrowded, the cattlemen, who had been depending almost entirely on public land, realized that they must acquire title to more of the land they used. More land was filed on in 1884—549,386 acres—than in all the previous 14 years taken together, and the number of filings in 1885 and 1886 approached those of 1884. The picture in the middle 1880's was one of big cattlemen grabbing up what land they could by fair means or foul.

Winter losses were a part of the open-range cattle business. The common view, said a Laramie editor in 1876, was that it is cheaper to lose 3 or 4 percent than to put up hay, provide shelter, and hire herders. Ten years later, the winter of 1886–87 took its grim toll and picking up the pieces afterward took time. Genuine rehabilitation would take many years and would involve smaller herds, improved management, and greater attention to the need for shelter, feed, and water.

Statehood brought with it almost universal optimism. In the newborn State of 62,555 people (including 1,850 Indians on the Wind River Reservation) joy soon gave way to gloom, as economic growth proved elusive. The State's property valuation for tax purposes held steady at about $30 million every year in the period 1890–98. No important industrial development occurred, although there was a small expansion in coal mining. Delegate to Congress Joseph M. Carey had assured the U.S. House of Representatives in 1890 that Wyoming had unsurpassed mineral resources, but nevertheless most of the State's minerals were what economists call "neutral stuff" which could not, for the time being at least, be marketed at a profit.

RECLAMATION POSSIBILITIES

At first Mr. Carey also was overoptimistic about the possibilities of reclamation. When private enterprise irrigated only hay meadowland near streams, Wyoming's first State engineer Elwood Mead and his close associates Senators Francis E. Warren and Carey turned to the State and Federal Governments for aid.

In 1894, Congress passed the famous Carey Act, which was named after its author. Several years later, dissatisfied with the slow progress under the Carey Act, irrigation promoters went again to the Federal Government. Wyoming's Senator Warren and Representative Frank W. Mondell worked hard for passage of the Newlands Act of 1902. Soon reclamation claimed the combined interest of private, State, and Federal effort.

Wyoming's first Federal project, the Shoshone in 1904, took over a stalled Carey Act project which had been started by William F. Cody. By 1910, Buffalo Bill Dam was completed and crops were growing on 15,000 acres of the project in the vicinity of Ralston, Powell, and Garland. Completion of the State's second Federal project, the North Platte, soon followed, involving construction of the Pathfinder Dam, 40 miles southwest of Casper.

As reclamation was pushed with vigor in the years just before the First World War, so also was dryfarming. "All crops must be irrigated," the station agriculturist at the University of Wyoming Experiment Station had warned in 1891. Yet the temptation to try dryfarming proved irresistible, and where only a few bold spirits had tried it before 1900, a few thousand set to work in the next decade, especially in the eastern counties where normal rainfall approached 16 inches annually.

After the legislature in 1907 appropriated $5,000 for dryfarming experiments, the State employed a director of dryfarming experiments, who traveled all over the State giving advice and assistance. Congressman Mondell aided the cause by introducing and ushering through Congress the 320-acre homestead law of February 1909. Unhappily, in 1910 and 1911 came drought, widespread crop failures, and reduced dryfarming acreages.

LAND PATENTING

Inflation and prosperity in 1917 and 1918 persuaded many rural people to enlarge their holdings by exhausting whatever unused rights they had under the various land laws, and townspeople joined in the homesteading spree. Almost 10 million acres of land were patented in the 1920's, nearly doubling the amount in private ownership, and bringing the total up to 40 percent of the State's area. Another million and a half acres passed to patent in the 1930's before vacant, unreserved, and unappropriated lands were withdrawn by Executive order in 1934.

Despite the land rush of the 1920's, the number of farm and ranch units and the rural farm and ranch population increased only slightly. People already on the land in 1919 sooner or later came into possession of most of the newly homesteaded land. Moreover, they did not plow up much of the newly acquired land. Cropland harvested increased only from 1,153,624 acres in 1919 to 2,007,751 acres in 1929. The acreage harvested in 1929 represented only 3 percent of the State's area, illustrating once again the persistent dominance of livestock.

Congress frowned on new reclamation starts in the 1920's as emphasis shifted to salvaging old projects. In 1920 the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation was persuaded to try rehabilitating the Riverton project. After much pleading, Senator John B. Kendrick in 1933 won President Franklin D. Roosevelt's approval for the Casper-Alcova project, known as the Kendrick project after 1937.

In the 20 years since World War II, Wyoming people have enjoyed good times. And yet there has been no spectacular economic growth. The State's increase in population in the decade 1950–60 was only 13.6 percent, which may be compared with 18.5 percent for the United States. In 1965 the State is what it has always been, mainly a producer of raw materials to be exported for processing elsewhere.

In terms of present cash receipts, production of minerals is the leading industry, agriculture-livestock is second, and tourism is third. Oil and gas (mostly piped out) bring in as much money as agriculture-livestock and tourism taken together, while uranium, coal, trona, and iron ore bring in additional millions.

Cash value of product, however, does not tell the whole story. Economic multiplier studies suggest that the minerals dollar has less impact on the State than the agriculture or tourist dollar, since so many of the minerals dollars go to outside owners. A University of Wyoming economist has calculated that minerals in 1963 were responsible for 30.9 percent of the State's total economic activity; agriculture-livestock, 20.3 percent; the Federal Government, 11.5 percent; out-of-State travelers, 10.1 percent; investment in construction including that of the Federal Government, 8.6 percent, and manufacturing, 5.9 percent.

RESULTS OF MULTIPLE PURPOSE

In postwar years the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has spent more than $150 million on multiple-purpose projects in the State. These projects provide power, recreation, supplementary irrigation water, and a small number of new irrigated farms. About [illegible] million acres of the State's 62 million acres are irrigated, the main crops being hay, sugarbeets, and dry edible beans.

Outstanding among the newer reclamation projects are Glendo and Boysen. Also the Flaming Gorge Dam in Utah has made a reservoir which extends almost as far north as Wyoming's city of Green River.

Wyoming became a great oil producing State in the years after the Second World War, as production rose fourfold, leveling off at about 140 million barrels annually in the 1960's. Unhampered by proration, Wyoming rank fifth among the States in petroleum production.

The fastest growing industry in the 1960's is tourism, with Grand Teton National Park and Yellowstone National Park each welcoming about 2 million visitors annually.

Expanded iron ore output, production of trona and uranium, two huge coal-burning steam powerplants at Glenrock and Kemmerer, and installation of intercontinental missiles around Cheyenne have bolstered the economy without satisfying the urge for faster growth. Various State and local agencies have been trying to diversify the economy and to reduce the considerable loss in employment which comes in winter. At present, the State has the smallest manufacturing employment of the 50 States (6,500 in April 1965).

Industrialization and diversification (and court-ordered reapportionment), if they come, could weaken the influence of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, which has always been very powerful in the State's politics. Conceivably the State might then even lose its Cowboy State image.

Wyoming has another name besides that of Cowboy State. It is also called the Equality State because it was first among the States to give women full rights to vote and hold office. Although all States are now equality States, Wyoming will ever keep fresh the memory of its pioneering in the realm of women's rights.

Meanwhile, the people of Wyoming continue to be fiercely proud of the record they have made in the face of obstacles which would have stopped less energetic, less hard working folk. Until new payrolls come and bring great changes, the 350,000 people of the Cowboy State will treasure the privilege of living in an uncrowded Commonwealth—the Old West's home on the range.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES OPPOSES DIRKSEN AMENDMENT TO REVERSE SUPREME COURT ON ONE-MAN, ONE-VOTE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on January 12, the League of Women Voters announced, in effect, its opposition to the Dirksen amendment to reverse the Supreme Court on State legislative reapportionment. National League President Mrs. Robert J. Stuart said that the Court's decision that the equal protection of the laws requires both houses of a State legislature to be based substantially on population should be maintained and that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended in any way which would allow consideration of factors other than population. The league, she announced, will oppose any such amendments introduced in this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, this is one of the most encouraging developments since the Court acted in June of 1964 to enforce this guarantee of the Constitution. Mrs. Stuart described the league position as reflecting a "truly nationwide consensus" of the league's 145,550 members in some 1,200 chapters throughout the country. Further, Mrs. Stuart said that the national league had received local consensus reports on this issue from leagues in all sections of the country and that there was no evidence of a rural-urban or geographic split. I think the Nation owes the League of Women Voters its highest commendation for undertaking a thorough study of this fundamental question nationwide. Its effort and its report are in the highest tradition of the league's civic leadership, and its long-standing interest in more effective State governments.

I ask unanimous consent that the league's "Statement of Position of Apportionment of State Legislatures" along with the text of a new release, both dated January 12, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and news release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF POSITION ON APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES AS ANNOUNCED BY THE NATIONAL BOARD OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 12, 1966

The members of the League of Women Voters of the United States believe that both houses of State legislatures should be apportioned substantially on population. The league is convinced that this standard, established by recent apportionment decisions of the Supreme Court, should be maintained and that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended to allow for consideration of factors other than population in apportioning either or both houses of State legislatures.

Of overriding importance to the league in coming to this decision is the conviction that a population standard is the fairest and most equitable way of assuring that each man's vote is of equal value in a democratic and representative system of government. Other considerations influencing league decisions are that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended hastily or without due consideration because of an unpopular Court decision, and that individual rights now protected by the Constitution should not be weakened or abridged.

Against the background of its long-standing interest in State government, the league also hopes that by maintaining a population standard State government may be strengthened by insuring that State legislatures are more representative of people wherever they live. Finally, the league feels certain that the term "substantially" used in Supreme Court decisions allows adequate leeway for districting to provide for any necessary local diversities.

LEAGUE FAVORS ONE-MAN, ONE-VOTE

WASHINGTON, D.C., January 12.—The League of Women Voters of the United States today came out in favor of the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision.

National League President Mrs. Robert J. Stuart said league members are convinced that the Court's standard for apportioning both houses of State legislatures substantially on population should be maintained and that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended in any way which would allow consideration of factors other than population. Any such amendments introduced in this session of Congress, she went on to say, will be opposed by the League of Women Voters.

According to the league president, the overriding consideration influencing the league decision was the conviction that population is the "fairest and most equitable way of assuring that each man's vote is of equal value."

The new league position was announced at the close of a 5-day meeting of the organization's 17-member national board of directors.

Other considerations taken into account by the league in reaching its conclusions were the beliefs that the Constitution "should not be amended hastily or without due consideration because of an unpopular Court decision and that individual rights now protected by the Constitution should not be weakened or abridged."

By supporting the population standard, Mrs. Stuart said league members hoped to insure more representative legislatures and thus stronger and more effective State governments, a long-standing interest of the League of Women Voters.

Mrs. Stuart described the league position as reflecting a "truly nationwide consensus" for upholding the population standard. She said the national league had received local consensus reports from leagues in all sections of the country and that there was no evidence of a rural-urban or geographic split.

Although 30 State leagues had been active in the apportionment field within their own States, no effort was made to reach nationwide agreement until last May.

In light of congressional developments at that time, league delegates from all 50 States and the District of Columbia voted at a Washington meeting to take up a study of apportionment with the goal of reaching a nationwide agreement by January 1966. (According to league procedures, no action either supporting or opposing specific legislation can be taken until a consensus of members has been reached at the appropriate organizational level.)

League members studied the issues involved during the summer and fall and last month sent their conclusions to the national office.

During this week's meeting, board members also discussed plans for the league's convention in Denver May 2 through 6 and proposed a 1966–68 program developed from recommendations reported by local leagues.

This proposed program will be announced in the National Voter, copies of which are sent to the league's 145,550 members, and will be voted on by delegates to the national convention.

National officers and directors attending the meeting were:

President: Mrs. Robert J. Stuart, Spokane, Wash.

First vice president: Mrs. William H. Wood, Bladensburg, Md.

Second vice president: Mrs. William S. Morgan, Norman, Okla.

Secretary: Mrs. Tyler Shinn, Fairfield, Conn.

Treasurer: Mrs. Hans-Arnold Fraenkel, Hartsdale, N.Y.

Directors: Mrs. Bruce B. Benson, Amherst, Mass.; Mrs. John A. Campbell, Indianapolis, Ind.; Mrs. William N. Christopherson, Louisville, Ky.; Mrs. Louis Hirsch, Tucson, Ariz.; Mrs. John D. Kenderdine, Holtwood, Pa.; Mrs. Colin J. Macdonald, Dallas, Tex.; Mrs. K. E. Montgomery, Eugene, Oreg.; Mrs. W. Eugene Pharis, Webster Groves, Mo.; Mrs. Haskell Rosenblum, Washington, D.C.; Mrs. Vernon C. Stoneman, Belmont, Mass.; Mrs. John F. Toomey, Narragansett, R.I.; Mrs. Robert Zurbach, Pasadena, Calif.

Mrs. George A. Little, of Old Greenwich, Conn., league observer to the United Nations, also attended.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

WILD RIVERS ACT

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 1446.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 1446, to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the System, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the approval of the majority leader, the acting majority leader, and the acting minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a speech on a nongermane subject for such a period of time as may be required by me to make the speech.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALLOWABLE TIMBER CUTS ON FEDERAL LANDS IN OREGON—A TEMPEST IN A TEAPOT

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few minutes on the subject of allowable timber cuts on Federal lands in Oregon, a tempest in a teapot. The speech deals with a subject matter which has given rise to a controversy in my State.

In my judgment there is a great deal of misunderstanding in regard to the report that was prepared in 1960, on a confidential basis, for the Department of Agriculture. It was never prepared for publication purposes, but to advise the Department of Agriculture and its forestry officials on the view of this recognized expert on forestry problems, Professor Duerr, of Syracuse University.

Mr. President, in fairness to Professor Duerr and all others concerned, inasmuch as I represent the State in which the controversy has developed, I believe I should make the following statement:

Mr. President, this fall an Oregon State Legislative Interim Committee headed by Republican State Senator Robert Smith announced in the Oregon newspapers that some Forest Service working papers styled as the "Duerr report" should be released for the purpose of "starting a brush fire" in the national forests in the State of Oregon.

I would describe this proposal for a brush fire as a proposal for a political brush fire.

The national forests and the Forest Service are a part of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, a Federal agency under the supervision of the able Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman. Legislative oversight with respect to this agency is exercised by the committees of the U.S. Congress including, but not limited to, the Committees on Appropriations, Agriculture and Forestry, Interior and Insular Affairs, Public Works, Government Operations, and Small Business.

I am not aware that the Constitution has vested any powers in, nor reserved to the States, any authority to investigate the activities of a Federal department such as Agriculture or a subordinate Federal agency such as the Forest Service. Nor am I aware that the Public Land Review Commission, a Federal congressional entity, has requested the Oregon State Legislative Committee or any State official to prowl into the subject of allowable Federal timber cuts. The Governor of Oregon, too, is expressing an interest in this subject and, at the close of my remarks, I shall include his letter of January 4 to Secretary Freeman along with other items for the RECORD.

The Governor's statement, in part, is:

> It is anticipated that the committee's findings and recommendations will be useful to the Public Land Law Review Commission created by Public Law 88-606, as well as in establishing guidelines and recommendations for future public land management by all levels of government in Oregon.
>
> As always, officials of the Forest Service in Oregon have been most cooperative during the current interim committee study and we are deeply appreciative of the continually cordial attitude displayed.
>
> Because knowledge of the Duerr report has become widespread, there is obvious concern over the fact certain portions remain unavailable for public review. I am told those sections which are being withheld deal with data on possible cutting practice changes, and that the reason for nonpublication is that the Service wishes to further evaluate such data in the light of agency experience and other factors. This is certainly understandable and, were it not for the fact that many Oregonians, within and without the timber industry, have expressed an interest in this matter, there would be little public attention. As it is, a considerable amount of adverse criticism and resentment is being directed toward the Forest Service. Some have even suggested a need for congressional action.
>
> In making this request, I am mindful of the possibility of politically inspired actions, but I can assure you my office will not be a party to any move to discredit the Forest Service or to any attempt to capitalize at the expense of dedicated public servants.

I want to make a few observations which Governor Hatfield may find of value. First, responsible people tell me that the text the Governor wants released has been available to him and others for 2 months. I know why some want it released and these same people know why they want it released. Because the Forest Service has it stamped as not for publication, they think it can be used to force an increase in the allowable cuts.

Let me say—let us see if it can be done. I have enough faith in the leaders of the Oregon timber industry, in Oregon's conservationists, in Oregon's Governor, in the Forest Service and the Secretary of Agriculture to know that an increase in allowable cuts will be permitted only if sound conservation practice warrants an increase. If some in the lumber industry seek to increase the allowable cut to the detriment of sound forestry and conservation, I say to them, softly and quietly, beware.

Dr. Duerr, in a letter to Republican State Senator Smith, made these observations in describing his paper: He called it "a manuscript, an office report—written for fellow foresters in the Forest Service, not for publication—a technical, in-service office report." In fact, it is headed, "Unpublished excerpts from a preliminary," not final, a "preliminary review draft," not finished, a "draft of a manuscript entitled, 'Timber Trends in Western Oregon, dated August 1960'."

Dr. William A. Duerr, according to press reports, is a forester, on the faculty of the College of Forestry at Syracuse. He served for a number of years in the Forest Service and some time prior to 1960 was a consultant to the Forest Service at Portland, Oreg.

Those who now seek to create the impression that this good professor issued a final report—no this is incorrect. In fact, Professor Duerr, in his letter to State Senator Smith, says he was not even the sole author.

The Secretary of Agriculture has been kind enough to let me read this preliminary review draft, a courtesy that he and the Forest Service have extended to anyone who wanted to do so. I have been one of the last to read it.

The Secretary has also authorized me to insert today into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the heretofore unpublished portion of the Forest Service draft into the RECORD. I think a reading will cause responsible people to realize that the text is a draft of ideas and not a finished work.

I think also that responsible people will agree with Professor Duerr, whose name has been so bandied about, that before his ideas could be actually applied, a great deal needs to be done in the field of forest research on regeneration and reforestation of conifers.

The State of Oregon owns over three-fourths of a million acres of commercial forest land; its counties own close to 300,000 acres and private owners own almost 10 million acres of forest land; a total of 11 million of non-Federal forest in my State.

If the Oregon Legislative Interim Committee wants to try out new and novel ideas, untested ideas, they can start on State of Oregon lands.

On the roughly 15 million acres of Federal commercial land, the Federal Departments, competently staffed and well operated, can make their own decisions as they have in the past, using sound technical judgment. I repeat again what I said on November 16 to Secretary Freeman:

> I am not going to let anyone set a brush fire in our national forests.

Now there are three areas where real progress is vitally needed; cooperative, shared, planned, nonoverlapping research. Here the State and Federal effort can and should mesh. Here the Governor and the Secretary of Agriculture can join hands.

A second area is in a greater reforestation effort that embraces all private and publically held lands. Here again the State has a responsibility.

A third area is in the reduction of the annual losses. This involves the wise construction of forest access roads, and a more comprehensive forest management program.

Over the last few weeks, I have had an opportunity to discuss broad conservation needs with Department of Agriculture officials.

They have discussed with me the published report, "Timber Trends in Western Oregon and Washington," which includes an estimate of the longrun level of timber cutting that would be possible in this area under the foreseeable economic factors and the established policies of the public timber managing agencies.

I note with particular interest that the initial draft of the manuscript also contained a final section on possible alternative trends in timber cutting if: First, forest management were intensified much more rapidly than recent trends suggest, and, second, old-growth timber were converted to young growth on public lands much more rapidly than now planned. This second assumption necessarily would involve a large immediate increase in cutting on the national forests and other public lands, followed by a major drop in output and a short rotation cutting age for second-growth stands.

The Forest Service says this section of the manuscript was not published, because it was a preliminary analysis not prepared for publication and because of the lack of information on the many technical, economic, and social impacts that would result from drastic changes in allowable cut policies on Federal timberlands.

I have found this unpublished manuscript to be stimulating and challenging; yet I can understand why the Forest Service has declined to sponsor its publication prior to this date.

In the Douglas-fir region of western Oregon and Washington, we are blessed with tremendous forests of high-grade old-growth timber. Total saw timber volume was estimated in 1962 to be 702 million board feet, which is more than one-fourth of the Nation's entire saw timber volume. Slightly more than one-third of the saw timber of the Douglas-fir region is in private ownership, and almost two-thirds is in public ownership. About seven-tenths of the public timber ownership is in the national forests. Almost nine-tenths is in Federal ownership and one-tenth is in State and county ownership.

In 1962, 13.8 billion board feet of saw timber was cut in the Douglas-fir region. This is more than one-quarter of the national saw timber cut of 48.4 billion board feet in that year. Approximately two-thirds of the cut of the Douglas-fir region comes from my State of Oregon.

Sound and proper management of this great storehouse of forest resources is of major import to Oregon and Washington and to the Nation as a whole. Under the act of June 12, 1960 (16 U.S.C. 528–531), the management of the national forests is committed to the principle of sustained yield and multiple use.

Under these principles, the mature timber on the Federal lands is being converted to young growth at cutting rates which can be permanently maintained. When the old growth is gone, the second-growth stands will be ready for harvest at approximately the same rate of cutting. This, as I understand it is the concept of providing an even flow of raw materials for forest industry from decade to decade. This is the concept Gifford Pinchot built. This is the concept of forest conservation the people of Oregon believe in.

This is the concept of forest conservation for which I have fought for 20 years in the Senate. Let me make clear to every person and every group in the State of Oregon that I do not intend to let up one iota in my stanch defense of a sound conservation program in connection with timber cutting in our State and elsewhere in the Nation.

Estimates of the age at which second-growth stands will be ready for cutting, and the volume which can be recovered when they are cut, are the major factors foresters tell me they use to determine the rate of liquidation of old-growth timber. Timing and amount of restocking and its subsequent development and protection will determine the volume of second growth. Assumptions as to the sizes of trees which will be utilized and what foresters call the felling-age objective for second-growth harvesting also affect the determination of the old-growth liquidation period.

Holding back old-growth timber so that industry will have an even flow of raw material until second growth is ready for cutting unavoidably means that some trees in the old-growth stands will die before they are harvested. Fortunately, Douglas fir is an extremely long-lived species. It can be stored on the stump for 40 to 50 years. However, in mature forests there is little, if any, net growth because of individual tree mortality. Building roads in advance of harvest cutting can provide the means to salvage a sizable part of such losses, although complete salvage is a practical impossibility. Thus, these losses in the old-growth stands can be reduced. If the old growth is cut too rapidly, the price we will pay is the disruption of the even flow of raw materials from the Federal forests for the forest product industries of the Pacific Northwest.

I want to reemphasize that there are two important premises in the unpublished manuscript which I am inserting in the Record today. First is a more rapid intensification of forest management, and the second is an acceleration of old-growth cutting. The first premise has received little or no attention to date in public discussions and press reports on this unused and unpublished draft manuscript.

The basic intensification required in forest management is prompt and adequate restocking of cutovers and burns. Delays in the restocking of areas cut or burned in the past result in serious losses of productive potentials. An honest determination of allowable cutting rates must take into account the lack of restocking on many areas, which is inherent with management intensity now possible.

Good progress has been made by foresters in improving their know-how in reforestation and, in the last 15 years, the rate of reforestation has increased. The proportion of successful planting effort has also increased. Procedures to get conifer trees to grow on dry, hot slopes have been developed. The effects of five decades of fire protection are now showing up at long last in natural reforestation of older burns. On the national forests in Oregon, the backlog of nonforested commercial timberlands has shrunk from 393,000 acres in 1950 to 138,500 acres in 1965. In 1950, 2,542 acres outside of timber sale areas were planted, and in 1965, 9,302 acres.

This is good progress, but much more still remains to be done if allowable cuts are to be increased significantly above present levels.

Further intensification of management to utilize thinnings and to salvage mortality and logging residues is also essential to support an accelerated cut.

Cutting rates on the national forests in Oregon already have been increased substantially in the last 15 years. Listen to the facts, Mr. President. In fiscal year 1952, the allowable cutting rate for the national forests in Oregon was 1,694 million board feet. The actual cut was 67 percent of the allowable, or 1,155 million board feet. In fiscal 1965, the allowable cut for the Oregon national forests was 2,948 million board feet. The actual cut was 120 percent, or 3,540 million board feet.

I am told that the actual cut exceeded the average allowable rate because: first, a backlog of undercuts in prior years was being liquidated; second, accelerated cutting to complete the salvage from the October 12, 1962, windstorm was still underway; and third, the total cut includes salvage and thinning which are not chargeable against the allowable cut.

Thus, in this 13-year interval, the allowable cut has increased by 74 percent and the actual cut has increased by 218 percent. These increases have been made possible by fuller utilization of the forests, ability to log in more remote portions of the forest, and intensification of forest management practices. Further increases in cutting rates would be fully justified when based on further advances in management and utilization.

The national forests occupy the most rugged and mountainous portions of the States of Oregon and Washington. These lands have great value as watersheds and for recreational use. It is essential that timber harvesting be conducted to preserve these watershed and recreational values. Provision for maintenance of natural beauty has been made in the Forest Service high mountain policy which guides cutting at the higher elevations. This policy, which brings alive the real meaning of multiple use, came about because Secretary Freeman, Chief Forester Cliff, and Dr. George Selke agreed with Senator Jackson and me that the growing needs of forests for people—a growing need for forests for many uses—must be met.

So I take some pride that we joined together to push forward the concept of quality in conservation as advocated by President Johnson if we are to advance and protect the best conservation interests of the Nation.

There are promising leads to more efficient logging methods with less disturbance to soil and scenery in the use of balloons and helicopters for logging. Accelerated research in the application of these new logging tools is urgently needed. Successful development to put these methods into widespread use could well open up possibilities for some expansion of old-growth timber cutting rates. Until such developments become a well-established practicality, the rate of clear-cutting on steep mountainous slopes must be limited by watershed and recreational use conservation needs.

This work, too, as the Secretary of Agriculture knows, has been accelerated because the senior Senator from Oregon has been urging it for the past several years. Oregonians like Glenn Jackson and Faye Sewart, who have stimulated my thinking with their quiet, constructive presentations on the subject of aerial logging, deserve a large share of the credit.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter I addressed to Secretary Freeman and his response of January 11 dealing with balloon and aerial logging.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 9, 1965.

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Early this year when the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, 1966, was under consideration in the Senate, I urged the Appropriations Committee to give serious consideration to the approval of forest engineering research funds for aerial logging, with particular reference to research in the field of helicopter logging. In my statement of March 9, 1965, which I presented to the committee I mentioned that demonstrations of balloon logging were being conducted in national forest areas of Oregon.

It was with a great deal of satisfaction that I learned of the favorable action taken by the Senate Appropriations Committee under which $200,000 was recommended for fiscal 1966 for balloon logging research and an equal amount for research on helicopter logging in the Pacific Northwest. I regarded the action of the committee and the Senate approval of both research items as offering great promise in fostering forest and soil conservation, orderly harvesting of timber, preservation of young trees and greater utilization of land which would otherwise be devoted to access road uses.

Unfortunately, the research items for balloon and helicopter logging were not retained in the conference between the Senate and House.

In 1966 I intend to make a strong presentation on behalf of adequate appropriations for the Forest Service to be used for research in the field of aerial type logging, and particularly balloon logging. I am convinced that early perfection of these systems of logging would advance the harvest of trees on a sound conservation basis, especially in the rugged terrains of the Pacific Northwest, where logging by conventional methods cannot be carried out feasibly.

To advance the case effectively it would be helpful if the Department of Agriculture would supply specific information on potential advantages to be derived from research and operations in the field of aerial logging. The answers to the questions listed below with appropriate reference to the use and possible application of helicopter, balloon or other aerial techniques, would assist me materially in making the case for accelerating this type of research.

I would appreciate it very much if you could supply answers to these questions by January 10, 1966:

1. What are the current annual losses in terms of annual allowable cut from various sources in the public and private forests of the Pacific Northwest Douglas-fir region?

2. Kindly relate the data in question 1, above, to timber trend data and the probable demand upon public and private timber in 1975 and 1985.

3. What is your estimate of the possible increase in allowable cut in the Douglas-fir region of the Pacific Northwest that could be derived through the successful development of new aerial logging systems, such as cable, skyline and balloon and helicopter logging?

4. What would be the anticipated increased revenue to the counties and to the Federal Government incident to an increase in allowable cut mentioned in connection with your answer to question No. 3?

5. What are the anticipated end product revenues to our economy through any benefits you find possible under aerial logging including balloon logging?

6. What effects would aerial logging have in combating soil erosion including the prevention of landslides caused through conventional logging or access road construction?

7. What change in access road costs could be anticipated through the use of a successful method of aerial logging?

8. Please indicate the number of acres of the Douglas fir region of the Pacific Northwest, taken out of production for each mile of access road construction in rugged terrain of that area, which could be retained in production under a successful aerial logging system.

9. How many miles of access road system have been constructed on national forest land in the Douglas-fir region? How many additional miles are estimated to be needed? How many acres and how much additional timber would be added to allowable cuts through substitution of aerial logging?

10. What is the anticipated additional timber recovery per acre in both old growth and second growth stands of timber in the Pacific Northwest both in dollars and volume which could be achieved through a successful system of aerial logging? What would be the total for the Pacific Northwest?

11. How would aerial logging systems advance the concept of multiple use of our national forest lands?

In the light of my letter of November 16 to you on allowable cuts, I cannot stress too strongly my genuine interest in seeking every possible means to legitimately increase the harvest of timber now lost to insects and disease—the loss of productivity due to excessive roads taking land out of timber growing and thus the allowable cut—and production and soil and watershed losses due to erosion.

Failure to act wisely now—delay—will prove costly to the forest resources and those dependent upon its multiple uses. Failure to use all proper means to attain full forest productivity will intensify pressures on the allowable cuts.

While this pressure cannot be avoided, there is a public responsibility to enable these public forest resources to fulfill their ability to do their proper part so that these pressures can be mitigated.

I am equally sure you will appreciate that I continue of the view that it is essential that the construction of mainline access roads under the biennial authorizations from Congress continue to grow. Aerial logging can be an important change which will reduce the need for the so-called spur roads and skid tracts. A general improvement in forest access seems to me to be one of the most important steps that the administration can take now for forest conservation.

In view of the importance of this subject I am directing my office to also send a copy of this letter to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and I suggest that you discuss this matter with him.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is in reply to your letter of December 9, 1965, to which an acknowledgment was sent December 17, 1965, regarding the potential advantages of operational aerial logging systems being developed by Forest Engineering Research. Aerial logging systems as discussed in our comments below include skyline cables, balloon and helicopter systems and, in fact, any system which results in radical reduction of road mileage and surface operated yarding operations. Information on your 11 items are as follows:

1. The allowable cut of timber in the Pacific Northwest is reduced below potential levels by several types of losses including:

(a) Mortality from fire, insects, blowdown, and other destructive agents. Annual mortality from all causes in recent years has averaged about 5 billion board feet of sawtimber in the Douglas-fir region, plus additional losses of growth in damaged trees and stands. An estimated 3.4 billion board feet of mortality occurs on public lands and 1.6 billion on private lands. A substantial part of those losses is now being salvaged, but the timber harvest in old-growth stands could be further increased through such measures as construction of roads and intensified protection and salvage programs.

(b) Lack of thinning and other cultural practices in young-growth stands. Thinning efforts to date have been limited by such factors as inadequate road systems and lack of local markets for thinnings. The potential increase in timber harvests from intermediate cuttings and other timber stand improvement work on the 18.8 million acres of young forests, and ultimately on the 26 million acres of commercial forest land in the Douglas-fir region, will in time add several billion board feet annually to the region's allowable cut.

(c) Loss of growth on nonstocked and poorly stocked forest lands. Approximately 1.2 million acres of forest land in the Douglas-fir region were classed as nonstocked and 3.5 million acres as poorly stocked with timber in 1962. Replanting of these nonstocked and poorly stocked lands, although difficult and costly in many areas, would permit some immediate increase in allowable cut, and could in time increase the allowable cut of the region by roughly 1.5 billion board feet annually, or the equivalent of 11 percent of the total current cut of 13.8 billion board feet.

(d) Incomplete utilization of timber on logged over areas. Logging residues, including broken sections of trees, cull logs and small diameter material, amounted to nearly 900 million board feet in the Douglas-fir region in 1963, or about 6.5 percent of the total sawtimber cut. Industry has made substantial progress in reducing logging residues, and utilization might be further increased through research, road construction, and salvage programs.

(e) Inability to harvest timber on areas that are inoperable under present logging technology. Currently about 4 million acres of old-growth timber in the Douglas-fir region of western Washington and Oregon cannot be economically harvested under present logging technology. This land cannot be logged for a variety of reasons—steep terrain, unstable soil conditions, low timber values, or the need to protect esthetic and recreational values. About 90 percent of this acreage is administered by various public agencies; about 10 percent is privately owned. In addition, there are some 2.6 million acres of young-growth timber on terrain where thinnings are impractical under present logging techniques. Prior logging on these areas was by clear cutting but thinning operations are made more difficult by the necessity of removing selected trees in such a way as to avoid damage to the residual stand. The loss of allowable cut through inability to harvest timber on nonoperable areas is estimated at about 507 million board feet annually.

2. A recent analysis of the Nation's timber supply and demand situation and outlook indicates that demands for timber products may increase by possibly 40 percent by 1985 and roughly 80 percent by the year 2000. During the next two or three decades, total timber supplies appear adequate to meet those projected demands, although higher

quality softwoods are expected to be in increasingly short supply. Forests in the Douglas-fir region are in a particularly favorable situation because of such factors as timber species and quality and development of strong forest industries in the region. It seems likely, therefore, that increases in allowable cut in the Douglas-fir region from the sources enumerated above would find a market.

3. Advanced aerial logging systems could probably economically log about three-quarters of the currently inoperable old growth and about one-half of the inoperable young growth stands in the Douglas-fir region. This would mean an additional cut annually of approximately 507 million board feet from the region's commercial forest lands which is the figure stated in item 1(e) above.

4. Total stumpage receipts in the region might be increased about $5 million annually by new logging technology. This might include as much as $2.9 million from sales on lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. The portion of receipts going to counties in such case would amount to about $835,000 annually, and the portion of receipts retained in the U.S. Treasury about $2.1 million annually.

5. It is estimated that for each dollar of stumpage value derived from increased cutting on areas opened up by aerial logging total incomes of possibly $9 might be generated in the Douglas-fir region and $20 in the United States as a whole. Assuming that the increased timber cut could be absorbed by the expanding U.S. economy, as seems likely, the total contribution to the Nation's gross national product might thus exceed $100 million annually.

6. Logging road construction is responsible for much of the soil erosion and land movement associated with logging. Because aerial logging systems reduce the mileage of roads needed to log a particular watershed, aerial systems represent an important means to combat soil erosion and landslides in the Douglas-fir region.

Research findings provide some idea of the erosion problems stemming from access road construction. The results of one study in western Oregon showed the concentration of soil particles in stream runoff from the first rain storm after road construction to be 250 times that carried in an adjacent undisturbed watershed. Although there was evidence that the erosion caused by a particular road would subside in time, sediment concentrations for the subsequent 2-year period were significantly higher than pre-road construction levels. A recent study on the H. J. Andrews Experimental Forest in Oregon also showed that 72 percent of the landslides occurring during the severe storms in December 1964 were directly associated with logging road construction.

Not all soil erosion associated with logging stems from road construction. Soil disturbance throughout the cutting area may contribute to erosion. Although we can't evaluate aerial systems as yet undeveloped, a study in Washington disclosed that soil disturbance to the watershed was almost three times greater in the case of tractor logging than with a skyline crane. With the development of more advanced aerial systems, we could perhaps expect to see an even greater contrast.

7. Experience to date has shown that aerial logging systems could considerably reduce the mileage of roads required to log timber products from national forests in the Douglas-fir region. In one test on the Willamette National Forest using the Wyseen system, only 0.7 mile of logging road per section was required where conventional logging techniques would have required 7.7 miles. Another aerial system, the Sgagit sky car, was tested on the Cascade Head Experimental Forest. Here, conventional methods would have required 5.19 miles of road per section; the Skagit sky car system needed only 1.59 miles per section.

It seems reasonable to assume that logging road construction in mountainous areas could be reduced by 50 percent as compared to conventional methods through the use of aerial systems. The type of roads which aerial systems will supplant cost approximately $10,000 per mile, so even this conservative estimate of 50-percent reduction could result in remarkable savings with consequently larger income to the Government from timber sales. Savings in road costs may be partially offset by higher logging costs of aerial systems. Even though the unit costs of harvesting may not be reduced in all cases, more land will be open for logging, thus raising the total profit opportunity, and erosion prevention and other esthetic benefits will be realized.

8. For each mile of road constructed in the rugged terrain of the Douglas-fir region, about 5.5 acres of timberland are taken out of production.

9. To date 15,203 miles of access roads have been constructed on the national forests of the Douglas-fir region. On the currently loggable areas an estimated 23,713 miles of roads are still needed under conventional methods. In addition to these access roads which are maintained permanently as a part of the transportation system, a considerably greater mileage of logging roads is needed. These roads amount to from 10 to 20 miles per square mile depending upon topography. It is largely these roads which will be reduced rather than the main timber haul roads. It is conceivable that the mileage per square mile of these logging roads could be reduced over 50 percent. The use of aerial logging systems on all remaining unroaded areas to be logged would permit an estimated 61,860 acres of forest land to remain in production which under full management would produce about 31 million board feet of timber per year.

10. A significant volume of wood fiber in the form of broken tops and chunks, small diameter pieces, and defective cull material is left on the ground after a logging operation. In 1963 for instance, it was estimated that nearly 900 million board feet of sawtimber, or 6.5 percent of the total sawtimber cut in the Douglas-fir region, was left on the ground. However, industry is at present unable to economically use this cull, small sized material, and breakage resulting from tree felling. Aerial systems could reduce breakage associated with yarding, but other research efforts are needed to make more of these logging residues economically available.

11. Development of advanced aerial logging systems will undoubtedly result in multiple-use of more acres in the Douglas-fir region. Aerial methods make it feasible to log in many sensitive areas without major impacts on esthetic, soil, and water values.

Although your questions referred to the Douglas-fir region, the problem of logging difficult areas exists throughout the West. Alaska is particularly plagued with these problems, yet needs added timber production as a basis for economic development. We estimate that in Alaska there are 1,574,500 acres containing 45 billion board feet of timber that are now economically inoperable but which could be logged by advanced aerial logging systems. Assuming that approximately 1 percent of this inventory would be cut annually, advanced aerial systems would make available an additional cut of 450 million board feet per year. (We must admit, however, that there has not been sufficient manufacturing capacity in Alaska to utilize all the currently economically available allowable cut. With the recent preliminary award of a large pulp timber sale to St. Regis Pulp & Paper Co., this situation seems well on the way to resolution.) At a stumpage value of $2.50 per thousand board feet, an additional $1.1 million per year in stumpage receipts would be generated by advanced aerial logging systems. Of this about $280,000 would be returned to the State for the use of local government in financing roads and schools. Even more important would be the many new jobs in Alaska and an increased tax base that would result from harvesting and processing this extra cut into primary products.

An estimated 60 out of a total of 90 miles of temporary roads constructed annually also could be eliminated by using aerial logging systems in Alaska. Costs for the kinds of roads eliminated by aerial systems average about $32,000 per mile and thus a total of $1.9 million per year could be saved for use in further development of the needed multiple-use roads.

We appreciate your interest in this promising part of our research program and the opportunity to respond to your request for the information.

Sincerely yours,

Orville S. Freeman.

Mr. MORSE. I digress to say I intend to push for progress in this great step forward in conservation logging.

Secretary Freeman's letter contains clear evidence on how forest allowable cuts can be increased by such means. It refutes the need to engage in mathematical hocus-pocus to increase allowable cuts.

To all who live conservation, it is disturbing that the initial cut in a Douglas-fir forest is unavoidably a severe treatment. The trees are large and heavy and contain much cull material. To obtain efficient regeneration of healthy new stands, clear cutting is silviculturally necessary. Much of this large timber is on steep and broken ground. The Forest Service makes its clear cuts in a patchwise fashion. Conservationists are pleased that foresters recognize that large continuous clear cuts are no longer acceptable from a scenic, watershed, or recreational use standpoint.

My friends from the Middle West and East who frequently visit the great forest areas of Oregon and Washington know whereof I speak when I point out that this selective patchwise cutting that is authorized by the Forest Service should be continued.

I wish to pay my respects to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, and to Mr. Cliff and his associates for the sound conservation policy that they have developed in respect to the cutting of old growth timber and the so-called mountainside stands of timber.

I say to my friends from the Middle West and East who have come to my State to see its beauties that there was a time when the so-called clear cutting of the mountainsides was complete clear cutting. They mowed the trees down, and left not only the ugly views that resulted from such a practice and waste of God's gifts of these great cathedrals of forests to our people, but they did great damage to the watershed; they did great damage to the soil. The conservationists, under the leadership of such great men as Gifford Pinchot, one of the greatest conservationists of our time, brought to an end this ravaging of so-called clear cut or old growth timber on the forests of the Pacific Northwest.

I am sorry to say that there are still those who would put profit above their obligations as trustees of God's gift of natural resources to our people.

Mr. President, we can operate a profitable forest industry without forest rape. We can operate a profitable forest industry and keep faith with future generations of American boys and girls by following the sound conservation programs that our Forest Service defends, suports, and advances.

Therefore, I say most respectfully to those in my State who are eager to increase the allowable cut for old growth timber, "Go slow; get your facts; get ready to meet those of us who will oppose any wasteful policy of timber clearcutting that may be proposed, no matter what semantics may be used by those who rightly have as their ultimate design and desire the making of a profit from a conservation resource program. They must not forget that these forests, after all, belong to all the people and not merely some selfish segment of the lumber industry."

Let me make it very clear, that the lumber industry as a whole has to be classified among the sound conservationists of our land.

I know the great change that has taken place in the past quarter of a century within the lumber industry in regard to the entire matter of sustained yield, reforestation, and the use of our forests for multiple-use purposes.

Those who seek to make a "fast buck" out of a program, who would ravage the mountainsides of our great Pacific Northwest where they are taking large stands of old growth timber, do not represent the economic statesmanship characterized by the overwhelming majority of the lumbermen of the Pacific Northwest.

Ability to distribute clearcutting patches over the commercial timber area is dependent upon progress in development of forest roads. Roads make it possible to schedule cutting in the most mature stands and to obtain timber from two sources of additional volume. These are thinnings from second-growth stands, and salvage of dead and dying trees in mature stands.

Most of the Senators in the Pacific Northwest joined together in 1955, with like-minded colleagues in the House, to start the acceleration of the authorizations for forest roads. The authorizations have tripled and today are at $85 million a year. I would remind those who now take this for granted that we made many of these increases over the opposition of the administration then in power.

Foresters now appreciate that the amount of timber which must be reserved from cutting to meet scenic, watershed, and recreational use needs in Oregon quite possibly is greater than present allowances. Increasing population pressures and expanding concepts of natural beauty and watershed management may require classification of additional commercial forest land in areas where the other uses should take priority over timber harvesting and growing. I believe we can accomplish these changes and accelerate forestry practices so that the allowable cut will not suffer substantially.

There is no doubt that the development of timber management plans and the determination of allowable cut for our Federal forest lands will be a continuing effort which takes into account the expected impact of new developments over the period when the next generation of trees will be grown.

The future of the forests of the Pacific Northwest depends in a large measure on accelerating youth-growth management. This means restocking promptly on all commercial forest lands which have been cut over, burned, or otherwise deforested. It means thinning of second-growth timber, both commercially to obtain additional yields which otherwise would be wasted, and non-commercially, in overcrowded juvenile stands. Progress in both second-growth and old-growth management is dependent on development of road systems to permit distribution of the old-growth harvest areas and to enable widespread salvage of dead and dying trees in advance of the entry of clearcutting operations in old-growth areas. Finally, the development of new practical methods of harvesting the old-growth timber without the soil and scenic disturbances of conventional logging methods will affect both the volume and the rate of cutting at which this old growth can be converted into new thrifty stands of second-growth timber.

These are the three major avenues for work by all concerned to increase the economic opportunities of the forest products industries in the Pacific Northwest. As progress is made, foresters can adjust allowable cuts accordingly. However, arithmetic speculation in accelerating the liquidation of the old-growth timber on the Federal lands without provision for the means to increase utilization, to accelerate growth, and to meet the impacts of accelerated cutting on other uses is not a sound basis for allowable revision.

Over nearly seven decades, public foresters have demonstrated time and time again their dedication to the public welfare and dedication to the cause of conservation. They have much support based on their record. I, too, intend to serve the cause of conservation as an elected official. I intend to serve this cause by protecting it from forest destroyers who want to peddle their forest-raiding nostrum by labeling it "conservation." To them I say: "Take note that Dr. Duerr wisely labeled his experimental effort in effect, 'Read instructions clearly—not to be consumed until tested'."

Dr. Duerr, in his November 2 letter to Republican State Senator Smith, clearly told all interested individuals to read the label again. I make the entire record available for all to evaluate. In particular, I call to their attention three exhibits: my letter of November 16 to Secretary Udall, a response from the Secretary, and one from his Assistant Secretary, Harry Anderson.

There are those, too, who are chafing to get a new allowable cut on the valuable Bureau of Land Management timberlands, as well as Forest Service lands, in Oregon. Conservationists in Oregon had better take notice of this fact.

As I have said to many of them in person, I now say to them from the floor of the Senate, as I raise this warning to conservationists: Watch out for those who seek to attempt to rationalize, those who seek justification for increasing the allowable cut on timber in Oregon.

I am gratified and pleased that Assistant Secretary Anderson agrees that any increase in the allowable cut should receive review by the O. & C. advisory boards and various conservation groups prior to adoption.

Those in my State who have a deep interest in conservation should be pleased that the Bureau of Land Management is making a comprehensive review of procedures and standards used in determining the amount of timber available annually.

I am aware that there may be subtle and not so subtle pressures applied to the Bureau and to the Assistant Secretary. I am sure that we in the Oregon delegation will look forward to counseling with Assistant Secretary Anderson and Director Stoddard and their staffs when this proposal reaches the point of requiring initial public discussion.

To those who want a quick unplanned increase in allowable cuts, I serve notice that I do not intend to harry or hurry the Assistant Secretary or this fine Bureau as it proceeds with the comprehensive review now underway. I believe it is sound and wise for the Department to complete its review before it releases its proposal for public comment.

Since the matter of allowable cuts on the national forests has been of interest to some State officials, the thought occurs to me that this interest may be translated into an interest in the Bureau of Land Management's allowable cut. The senior Senator from Oregon would consider this an unfortunate development, akin to a congressional investigation of the Oregon State Board of Forestry's responsibilities in managing State forests. I would consider this an unwarranted intrusion of the Federal Government into the affairs solely committed to the sovereign State of Oregon. Of course, I would oppose it.

The letters and other items I shall place in the RECORD at the close of my remarks are being made available in order that there will be ample notice given that the Department of the Interior has consultative machinery available to it which is quite adequate to assure wide public information on its proposals after the Department has completed its own comprehensive reviews. Since the Department intends to use its proper consultative machinery, I trust that this will allay any unnecessary concerns.

Every 100 million board feet of timber cut and manufactured in Oregon accounts for about 900 jobs a year. Some may contend that this is the reason to up an allowable cut.

The issue is jobs in perpetuity under sustained yield compared to overcutting which is a "cut out and get out" policy. Today, unfortunately, most of the private timber in Oregon is being cut at a far greater rate than its sustained yield.

To overcut the public timber without a full assessment of what is happening to private timber would be the height of folly.

When we talk about allowable cut we are not just talking about sawmills. We are talking about whole towns, about homes carrying mortgages, we are talking about schools, we are talking about roads, we are talking about the condition of every business on Main Street.

When we talk about allowable cut we are talking about the future. If a gain of 900 jobs now will be more than offset by a loss of jobs in the future, we are talking about a mortgage on the future that never will be repaid.

The inexorable pressures that have marked the cutting of timber in every State show that after the peak years of false glory, the forests of that State have never again cut as much timber. This happened in Washington, in Wisconsin and Minnesota, in Maine and Michigan.

It will happen in Oregon only over my politically dead body; and I never felt more politically healthy than at the present time.

Mr. President, those who tell us now we can cut more timber carry a heavy burden to show that it can be done on a permanent long-term basis.

The conservation and wise use of Oregon's forest resources is vital to Oregon's welfare. Oregon's political leaders have a responsibility to the present and to the unborn generations. We cannot evade or shirk this obligation. A sound sustained yield, conservation, recreational multiuse of our national forests impose upon all Americans a solemn trust to leave our forests in a better condition for the welfare of future generations than that in which we found them. Our Federal public policy should always make clear to those who would ravage our forests that they do not belong to commercial interests but to all of the American people.

The pressure on our forests is increasing on all sides. The clamor to adopt panaceas and rationalizations of selfish groups to ravage our forests will increase unless we are willing to stand up and be counted as trustees of God's gift of these natural lumber resources and succeeding generations. We owe it to our country to be conservationists first. I want there to be no doubt where I stand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the close of my remarks 16 items relating to the topics I have just discussed.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF OREGON, LEGISLATIVE INTERIM COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, STATE CAPITOL BUILDING,
Salem, Oreg., October 27, 1965.

DR. WILLIAM A. DUERR,
College of Forestry,
Syracuse University,
Syracuse, N.Y.

DEAR DR. DUERR: Pursuant to our recent telephone conversation, I am pleased to be able to invite you to attend a meeting of the Interim Committee on Public Lands.

As you may know, we have been hearing witnesses and discussing your study of timber trends in western Oregon and Washington. Several of the Forest Service personnel have testified before our committee explaining in their terms and word usage the philosophy and intent of your report. Our committee members felt that because of the importance of this subject to the economy of the West, it would only be fair and reasonable to request that the author of this important document be called to interpret its many facets.

The timber industry to the State of Oregon and to the West plays a vital role in the lives and economic future of this area. Our purpose is to guarantee that progress is being made in the area of study and research to provide maximum usage from our timber resources.

I can assure you this committee is not politically oriented nor on any kind of venture to embarrass a public agency or any individual. Your presence and learned testimony would be of incalculable value.

Our committee can meet at any time that is convenient to you and your schedule. Our next scheduled meeting is November 12 and 13. However, should this not be feasible, our plans will be made flexible to fit your schedule. Your expenses plus an honorarium will be made available to defray traveling costs.

I would hope for the sake of proper interpretation of your report and the wealth of knowledge you could present to my committee, you will accept this offer.

Thanking you for your consideration, I am
Sincerely,

ROBERT F. SMITH,
Chairman, Interim Committee on Public Lands.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.,
November 2, 1965.

Hon. ROBERT F. SMITH,
Chairman, Legislative Interim Committee on Public Lands, State Capitol Building, Salem, Oreg.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Your letter of October 27 was here when I got back yesterday from a week out of town. I was at the Society of American Foresters annual meeting in Detroit.

Ever since your phone call, I have been mulling over your invitation to come out to Oregon and meet with your committee. Incidentally, I want you to know that I appreciate the invitation and that I am glad to receive such a courteous and understanding letter as yours of October 27.

It looks to me as though your committee has two areas of interest that are my concern also. One of these is the well-being of forest-based Oregon communities: You want the most reliable information you can get on the forestry situation and prospects so that you can form sound judgments about public policies and programs. The other is the factualness of the record: You want the truth about the position of the agencies and individuals concerned in your inquiries, and I enter here because I'm one of the individuals.

When I look at the first area of interest, I come unhesitatingly to the conclusion that I can be of little help to you. The men who are knowledgeable on Oregon forestry are out there in the State right now: Forest Service and State and academic research and administrative people, Bureau of Land Management foresters, industry folks, landowners, and consultants. Through them you have access to the facts and the wisdom.

(If I may enjoy an aside with you, the terms in which I have been characterized in the papers as a superauthority are hilariously ridiculous. They could have been inspired only by someone who thought I would express the right opinion when asked. If I had been suspected of favoring a doubling of wilderness withdrawals, I would quickly have earned the title of callow, addleheaded easterner.)

Now to come to the second area of interest, that of setting the record straight, it strikes me that so far as I am concerned this can be done very simply. Indeed, I can do it right here in this letter and save you and me the expense and time of my coming all the way out across the country.

1. There is no such thing as a "Duerr report." There is a manuscript—and I understand you have a copy—that was produced by a team. You will find their names in the preface.

2. This manuscript is an office report: It was written for fellow foresters in the Forest Service, not for publication. In fact, the preface says that "translating" would be needed before release—presumably to avoid public misinterpretation. (And I guess that warning might well have been put on the outside cover, too, in red letters.)

3. When I turned the manuscript over to the Forest Service in August 1960, my job and my connection with the project were finished. So far as I was concerned, the manuscript became the property of the Forest Service. It was a technical, in-service, office report (with policy implications, yes; but in this respect no different from many research manuscripts), and the Forest Service was at liberty to dispose of it as they thought best: File it; or pass it around for discussion (actually its greatest value has been just here); or "translate" and publish all or parts of it.

4. The manuscript considers at some length the question of old-growth timber liquidation rates. But it makes no recommendation about the rate, and I myself have given out no recommendation or advice or proposal on this subject. The manuscript explores two outside possibilities respecting old-growth conversion. Just as a warship will try to bracket a target between a long shot and a short one, so we tried to explore the consequences of a long conversion period and a short one, with some confidence that the truth lies within our range.

Now, sir, if there is anything that you and your committee can do to make these facts known and to substitute them for the fiction that has gotten around, I will be in your debt personally and professionally.

I am grateful for your understanding and your tactfulness in my behalf. I hope that I can meet you some day. I have been through Burns on several occasions and have admired the friendliness of the people and the beauty of the countryside.

Best of success to you and your committee.
Most sincerely,

WILLIAM A. DUERR.

NOVEMBER 16, 1965.

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The enclosed report from the Oregonian of October 21 on allowable cuts greatly disturbs me. In particular, while I recognize that State and local governments have a stake in Federal forest operations—they have no direct responsibility and this is especially true of their legislative committees. I am disturbed by this report on several grounds, one of which is the extent to which matters of such significance became public knowledge prior to any advice to the Oregon delegation.

I want you to know that if, as reported in the press, an Oregon State legislator wants to expose Mr. Duerr's report "to begin a brush fire" you will have my help in putting it out. I'm not going to let anyone set a brush fire in our national forests.

We in Congress have a legitimate right of inquiry—I have exercised it in the past and

I shall in the future. However, if I've learned one thing over the years it is how to detect a special interest effort to overcut our forests, under the guise of technical forestry, by recognizing the technique used to put the proposition forward—in this case by resort to a State legislative committee. There is no doubt whatsoever as to the goal—to pressure you and the Forest Service into figuring today's allowable cuts on the uncharted future.

Those who seek to pressure you are afraid to come out in the open and state their case—they seek premature release of studies in forums that lack responsibility or authority. Frankly, I suspect that this Mr. Duerr has been badly used "in absentia" by these tree burners. On this point, I'd be delighted to have any comments Mr. Duerr might make to you on this issue.

Several years ago, when I found millions of board feet of allowable cut in the national forests unavailable because of the access road policy then applied by the Forest Service, you heard from me. The policy change which resulted was in the public interest. Those who wanted to keep this forest cut unavailable argued that the lack of access didn't exist. They were wrong.

Due to the change in access road policy, we got more timber to market—to the lumber mills that needed it—without tinkering with allowable cuts. In fact, we helped forestry because we got the entire area in forest operating circles under active forest management. Policies which afford the maximum opportunity to give your foresters the full kit of tools they need to practice sustained yield will always have my support.

Similarly, your high mountain policy for recreation came about after you, Dr. Selke, Justice Douglas, Senator Jackson, and I conferred on the need to give proper attention to long-term conservation requirements. Obviously, there will always be policy areas for legitimate inquiry.

The question of the level of yearly cuttings and long-term allowable cut calculations, however, I consider to be a technical matter. Foresters owe us the obligation of explaining what they are doing and why they are doing it in terms we laymen can understand.

Foresters are like the physician to whom we entrust a critical operation. While we don't know what they do in the operating room we give them our confidence and trust in their training and ability. In turn, foresters have an obligation, not unlike the physician's—that of assuring the American people that our forests will be adequate to the needs of our children. As I see it, they do this by arranging to cut trees no faster than they grow. Their basic obligation, however, is to replenish our forest stocks so as to meet adequately the needs of the future. But even more, they must be committed to doing this in a manner that protects the soil, water, and wildlife in our great forests so they can provide properly and perpetually for multiple use and preservation of these resources.

Conservation is too important to America's future to be delivered into the hands of special interest pleaders. As long as I hold a position of responsibility in public life you can count on my active support in the never ending battle to maintain a sound sustained yield program.

Sincerely yours,

Wayne Morse.

State of Oregon, Legislative Interim Committee on Public Lands, State Capitol Building,
Salem, Oreg., November 26, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We are writing to you in regard to the question that has come before the Interim Committee on Public Lands with respect to a report written in 1960 by Dr. William Duerr, of Syracuse University.

Dr. Duerr was appointed by the Forest Service and spent a sabbatical year in Oregon and Washington studying timber trends in those two States. As a result of his study, the Forest Service published a portion of that work called "Timber Trends in Oregon and Washington."

A portion of the Duerr report was never published and was only included in the original manuscript which was submitted recently to our interim committee.

We have been persistent in our requests to the Forest Service to publish the complete document since one portion introduces an alternative of accelerated allowable cut which we believe important enough for further study. Many people in the State of Oregon have shown an interest in examining the total report, although we have been restricted by the Forest Service to only interim committee use.

Our hope is that you will intervene on our behalf in requesting the Forest Service to allow the complete Duerr report to be released in quantity and that you will assist us in following through if necessary with a congressional level study of the allowable cut policy for timber on public lands in the Northwest.

The pressures from foreign and domestic competition are such today that many of our domestic companies are being priced out of the market and many of our smaller companies are not buying because of the uneconomic timber stumpage price.

Timber and lumber comprise the No. 1 industry in the State of Oregon, providing many payrolls and tremendous investments; therefore the importance of this subject is foremost in our minds.

Even though we believe our evidence is only upon the fringe of the subject, we have reached a definite conclusion that there is a drastic need for further investigation of the alternative of the even flow theory envisioned by Dr. Duerr's report of 1960.

Respectfully,

Robert F. Smith,
Chairman, Interim Committee on Public Lands.

Ted Hallock,
State Senator.

December 1, 1965.

Mr. Robert F. Smith,
Chairman, Interim Committee on Public Lands.
Ted Hallock,
State Senator, Legislative Interim Committee on Public Lands, State Capitol Building, Salem, Oreg.

Dear Representative Smith and Senator Hallock: Senator Morse is now overseas where he is serving as chairman of an interparliamentary delegation meeting with representatives of Japan, India, and Pakistan. Therefore I am taking the liberty of supplying this interim acknowledgment on behalf of the Senator.

In view of the importance of your request concerning the Duerr report I am communicating with the Chief of the Forest Service and I am expressing Senator Morse's interest in prompt and thorough consideration concerning the proposed release of the Duerr report.

As soon as our office receives a reply from the Forest Service I shall get in touch with you promptly.

Sincerely yours,

William Berg, Jr.,
Administrative Assistant to Senator Wayne Morse.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Commerce,
December 1, 1965.

Hon. Edward P. Cliff,
Chief, Forest Service,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Cliff: The enclosed letter from the Oregon Legislative Interim Committee on Public Lands reveals an interest in distribution of material from a manuscript prepared for the Forest Service by Dr. William Duerr, of Syracuse University. In recognition of the fact that widely divergent views are held on forest management policies, perhaps the Forest Service will want to publish the entire contents of Dr. Duerr's manuscript, with appropriate Forest Service explanatory material, as an aid to those interested in objective analysis of public land policy.

Sincerely,

Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator.
Maurine B. Neuberger,
U.S. Senator.

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., December 9, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is in reply to your letter of November 16 regarding hearings of the Oregon Legislative Interim Committee on Public Lands relating to allowable cut on national forests.

I want to thank you for your forthright position in support of a sound sustained yield program for the national forests.

The level at which allowable cuts are set on the national forests is, of course, a matter of important public concern. We are keenly aware of this fact. We have consequently given a great deal of attention to the methods used for determining allowable cuts, especially over the last 10 years. We have put into effect and are following a 10-year cycle of reinventories and revisions of management plans to provide current and adequate guides to the determination of allowable cuts. We are doing what we can to encourage more sales of thinnings. Three years ago we arranged for a special review of the methods used for calculating allowable cuts on the western national forests that are important timber producers. This review was made by a committee of recognized experts, chaired by Prof. Kenneth Davis, of the Department of Forestry at the University of Michigan.

We are following a philosophy that the national forests should be so managed as to provide a reasonably even flow of timber offered for sale. Except for the one cooperative sustained yield unit that was established under the act of March 29, 1944, we do not consider it proper to base the management of national forest lands on what happens on private lands in the region. This could easily result in overcutting the national forest lands to the disadvantage of the United States and without offsetting advantages.

People may properly argue a bit about how even the flow must be in order to be even flow. On working circles that experience serious volume losses because of fire, windthrow, disease, or other such causes, it often is good business and good forest management to have a period of increased harvest to salvage what otherwise would be a complete loss. When this is necessary, we would expect to make a smooth transition from one level of cutting to the other to minimize the timing impacts. But except for situations of this sort, we consider that the basic concept of even flow is proper public policy and that our timber management planning should be done accordingly.

The so-called Duerr report on timber trends in western Oregon and Washington was prepared in the period 1958–62 by a research team of the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station in Portland. The study was conducted under the leadership of Dr. William A. Duerr who was employed as a member of the Forest Service while on leave from the New York State College of Forestry in Syracuse. The major part of the research done by this team was published in 1963 in a report entitled "Timber Trends in Western Oregon and Western Washington," a copy of which is enclosed.

This Forest Service study dealt mainly with the various economic factors that influence rotation age and management investments by major categories of ownership, the longrun level of timber cutting that would be possible in the Pacific Northwest under the influence of these economic factors, and the problems of reaching the potential during the conversion of old-growth to a young-growth timber economy.

A major part of the study was devoted to an appraisal of the influence that the rate of interest may have on total output, primarily through its effect on length of rotation. Other factors such as costs of regeneration and timber stand improvement, timber quality differentials, and trends in timber values also were analyzed in terms of impacts on economic rotation age and allowable cut. This analysis provided a basis for estimating a potential level of long-run timber output in the Douglas-fir region.

Another part of the report analyzed the probable course of events over the next several decades, and progress toward the longrun yield potential under prospective management policies and investment programs.

The initial review draft of this study also contained a final section on trends in possible timber cutting in future decades if (1) forest management were intensified much more rapidly than recent trends suggest, and (2) if old-growth timber were converted to young growth much more rapidly than now planned. The one alternative described in the final section of this initial draft considered a large immediate increase in cutting of the national forests followed by a major drop in output after some years and a shift to short rotation operation of second-growth stands. Such a system might provide a higher rate of return on timber capital but would have obvious drawbacks such as community instability, depressing effects on timber prices, and a gradual shift to small sizes of timber.

The published report provided a springboard for more analyses by recognizing that what happens in the future could differ from the trends mentioned in the report. One example of an alternative projection which assumed a greatly stepped-up cutting rate was made, but this did not include an appraisal of many factors that are important for determining public policy on this subject, such as how serious would be the price changes and the changes in employment that would accompany a sharp increase and then a sharp drop in volume cut. Although this section was included as part of the review draft, it was not published because it was incompleted work.

The Forest Service is, however, continuing to follow up this initial appraisal of timber trends with studies relating to such matters as the economics of advance roading, regeneration, and thinning in the Douglas-fir region, and continuing improvements in the resource data related to allowable cut.

In addition, we are making every effort possible to increase allowable cuts on the national forests to levels permitted under sound principles of forest management. This means more sales based on thinning, for example, more federally financed roads to reach all stands suitable for cutting, full consideration of the place of other resources as well as timber in the multiple-use management of these public properties, and continued studies of techniques for calculating allowable cut within the policies outlined in this letter.

As further background, you may be interested in the attached copy of correspondence between Dr. Duerr and Mr. Robert Smith, chairman of the Interim Committee on Public Lands, in which Duerr attempts to clarify the record and his role in the timber trends study.

We will be very happy to review these matters further with you should you so desire.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Baker,
Assistant Secretary.

U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Forest Service,
Washington, D.C., December 20, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Morse: This is in reply to the joint letter of December 1 from you and Senator Neuberger regarding publication of a manuscript on "Timber Trends in Oregon and Washington," prepared by Dr. William A. Duerr and other members of our Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station.

The Secretary's letter of December 9 in response to your letter of November 16 outlined the background of this study and action taken with regard to release of the information developed. In order to provide a complete record on this study, I would like to repeat some of the statements made in the Secretary's letter.

This report on timber trends in western Oregon and Washington was prepared in the period 1958–62 by a research team of the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station in Portland. The study was conducted under the leadership of Dr. William A. Duerr who was employed as a member of the Forest Service while on leave from the New York State College of Forestry in Syracuse. The major part of the research done by this team was published in 1963 in a report entitled "Timber Trends in Western Oregon and Western Washington." A copy of this has been sent you and additional copies may be obtained from the Pacific Northwest Station in Portland.

This publication on timber trends dealt mainly with the various economic factors that influence rotation age and management investments by various categories of forest owners, and the long-run level of timber cutting that would be possible in the Pacific Northwest under the influence of these economic factors. This analysis included an appraisal of the influence that the rate of interest may have on total output of timber, primarily through its effect on the length of rotations. Other factors such as costs of regeneration and timber stand improvement, timber quality differentials, and trends in timber values also were evaluated in terms of impacts on rotation age and allowable cut. A final part of the publication analyzed the probable course of events over the next several decades and progress toward the longrun yield potential under prospective management policies and timber investment programs.

The initial review draft of this study also contained a final section on alternative trends in timber cutting in future decades if (1) forest management were intensified much more rapidly than recent trends suggest, and (2) old-growth timber were converted to young growth much more rapidly than now planned. The one alternative described in the final section of this initial draft assumed a large immediate increase in cutting on the national forests, followed by a major drop in output after some years and a shift to short rotation operation of second-growth stands. This alternative was not presented as a proposal, but as a first step in analyzing impacts of changes in current management policies. Such possibilities of modifying current programs are specifically recognized on pages 102–103 of the published report in a condensation of the final section of the preliminary manuscript.

The final section of the initial report was not published because of the lack of information on the many technical, economic, and social impacts that would result from drastic changes in allowable cut policies. These relate to such questions as the effect on the region's economy of an expansion of timber harvesting followed by a marked reduction of log supplies and employment in future years, effects on prices of public and private timber of accelerated liquidation of old-growth stands, the feasibility and costs of an expanded program of forest regeneration and thinning of young stands, and the feasibility and costs of increasing log harvests through timber salvage programs.

A big increase followed by a major drop in cutting could also have major effects on other uses of forest lands, notably water production, recreation, and scenic attractiveness. The impact of these effects should also be analyzed in a complete treatment of management alternatives.

Because of the interest in the subject of this report, we have made a copy of the preliminary draft available to the Oregon Legislative Interim Committee on Public Lands. We have also made office copies of the manuscript available at our Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station to others having an interest in this study. I am also enclosing a copy of the final section of the initial manuscript for your information.

Also enclosed with this letter as further background are copies of correspondence between Dr. Duerr and Mr. Robert Smith, chairman of the Interim Committee on Public Lands. In his letter Dr. Duerr emphasizes the fact that this was a technical inservice office report that would need translating before release to avoid misinterpretation.

It seems to us that the issue that has been raised by the interim committee and others does not relate to the so-called Duerr report as such, but rather to the basic issue of what allowable cut policies should be on the national forests of the Pacific Northwest. The Oregon Interim Legislative Committee has received a copy of the original manuscript. Members of our Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station have discussed the initial report at some length with Mr. Smith and other members of the interim committee, and with other industrial and forestry representatives. The ideas presented in the final chapter of the manuscript also have been widely publicized in the press of the Pacific Northwest.

Hence, the question being raised does not appear to be one of secrecy of research materials, but rather of what our management and harvesting policies should be on the national forests. I believe this is the issue that should be squarely faced.

The level at which allowable cuts are set on the national forests is, of course, a matter of important public concern. We are keenly aware of this fact. We have consequently given a great deal of attention to the basis and the methods used for determining allowable cuts, especially over the last 10 years. We have put into effect and are following a 10-year cycle of reinventories and revisions in management plans to provide current and adequate guides to the determination of allowable cuts. We are doing what we can to encourage more sale of thinnings. Three years ago we arranged for a special review of the methods used for calculating allowable cuts on those western national forests that are important timber producers.

This review was made by a committee of recognized experts, chaired by Prof. Kenneth Davis, of the Department of Forestry at the University of Michigan.

We are following the philosophy that the national forests should be so managed as to provide a reasonably even flow of timber offered for sale. Except for one cooperative sustained yield unit established under the act of March 29, 1944, we do not consider it proper to base the management of national forest lands on what happens on private lands in the region. This could easily result in overcutting the national forests to the disadvantage of the United States and without offsetting advantages.

People may properly argue over how even the flow must be in order to be even flow. On working circles that experience serious volume losses because of fire, windthrow, disease, or other such causes, it often is good business and good forest management to have a period of increased harvest to salvage what otherwise would be a complete loss. When this is necessary, we would expect to make a smooth transition from one level of cutting to the other to minimize the timing impacts. But except for situations of this sort, we consider that the basic concept of even flow is proper public policy and that our timber management planning should be done accordingly.

We are making every effort possible to increase allowable cuts on the national forests to levels permitted under sound principles of forest management. This means more sales based on thinnings, for example, more federally financed roads to reach all stands suitable for cutting, and full consideration of the place of other resources as well as timber in the multiple-use management of these public properties.

We are also continuing to follow up the 1963 study of timber trends in the Douglas-fir region with research on alternative management programs and continuing studies of techniques for calculating allowable cuts within the policies outlined in this letter. In developing future policies and programs, we shall also consider most carefully the analyses and recommendations made by other groups such as the Oregon Legislative Interim Committee on Public Lands.

We will be happy to review this matter further with you should you so desire.

A similar letter is being sent to Senator NEUBERGER.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD P. CLIFF,
Chief.

DECEMBER 22, 1965.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH,
Chairman, Interim Committee on Public Lands,
Mr. TED HALLOCK,
State Senator, Legislative Interim Committee on Public Lands, State Capitol Building, Salem, Oreg.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH AND SENATOR HALLOCK: This supplements the recent letters you received from our offices in which we informed you that we would take up with the appropriate Federal officials your inquiry concerning publication of a manuscript on "Timber Trends in Oregon and Washington" prepared by Dr. William A. Duerr and other members of the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station.

Today we received the enclosed report dated December 20 supplied by the Chief of the Forest Service. As you will note, the report discusses in some detail the current policy of the Forest Service with respect to allowable cuts. With specific reference to the Duerr report the Chief of the Forest Service states:

"Because of the interest in the subject of this report, we have made a copy of the preliminary draft available to the Oregon Legislative Interim Committee on Public Lands. We have also made office copies of the manuscript available at our Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station to others having an interest in this study."

Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER are not in Washington, D.C., at present, but when they return to Washington we shall bring to their personal attention the December 20 report of the Forest Service. In the meantime, we hope that the statements contained in the enclosure will prove to be helpful.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM BERG, Jr.,
Administrative Assistant to Senator Wayne Morse.
LLOYD TUPLING,
Administrative Assistant to Senator Maurine B. Neuberger.

JANUARY 4, 1966.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This will acknowledge Chief Forester Cliff's excellent letter of December 20 addressed to me setting forth, in detail, additional views of the Forest Service, supplementing those outlined in your December 9 letter to me.

I have had an opportunity to review the office study conducted by Dr. Duerr which has been the cause of so much excitement among certain people in Oregon.

Of special interest to me was the abundance of caution Dr. Duerr utilized in expressing his opinion that there were other alternatives to the present consumption of evenflow in forest sustained yield program. I was even more impressed by Dr. Duerr's observation at the conclusion of his draft that, "there may be strong elements of exaggeration in the alternative I had just discussed." He cautioned that the exaggeration might be "based on the assumption of successful conifer-forest regeneration," and he added: "To make good on this assumption in the near future will take more research than is being done now, and more effective action. In any case, the conversion to a yield-growth timber economy can be speeded up only when foresters can promptly reestablish productive forests on current cutovers and other nonstocked lands."

On the basis of this observation, it seems apparent to me that no matter what is to be done in the future about allowable cuts, this is a sizable problem which is not being successfully met. I would therefore like to have your assessment of the steps that are underway now to solve these critical problems and the additional research, including the cost thereof, that should be undertaken to improve conifer-forest regeneration.

In view of Dr. Duerr's personal expressions of reservations regarding the one that he participated in 5 years ago as a consultant, and recognizing that in this period changes may have been made and improvements found in forest regeneration, a full report and recommendations on the current situation would be extremely helpful. I, of course, would be prepared, and would hope to have your support, in discussing this matter before the Committee on Appropriations, should this be the wisest course of action to follow.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

COUNTY OF WASHINGTON
PLANNING DEPARTMENT,
Hillsboro, Oreg., January 3, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: The enclosed letter to Representative Smith was precipitated by our concern over timber industry trends and by the December 22, 1965, Oregonian article, also enclosed.

As planners, we like to think we have some influence in suggesting plans, programs, and expenditures to serve the existing and anticipated future public. And in order to understand reasonably well the public our communities will serve in the future, we must understand how each contributor to local employment and tax base may be expected to decline or prosper—including the timber industry.

We ask for any information you may have which will increase our understanding of the Duerr report, the problem in general, and present Forest Service policy particularly. We also ask that you continue your work in bringing such issues as this to public attention.

Thank you for your assistance.

CARL HEFFLEY,
Planning Director.
PAT L. GORDON,
Senior Planner.

DECEMBER 29, 1965.

Representative ROBERT F. SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MR. SMITH: A story in the December 22, 1965, Oregonian indicates that you are concerned with the timber industry in Oregon and Washington.

We, too, are concerned, both with overall trends in the industry and with possible changes proposed in the Duerr report as they affect our county's future growth.

We have virtually every report published by the Forest Service on this subject but would request copies of additional research or other information gathered by your interim Committee on Public Lands.

Please be assured that we in local government who want recommended plans, programs, and expenditures to serve future population growth, are vitally concerned with this industry which has so direct an impact on our future. Please continue your effort on our behalf in the following subject areas:

1. It is vital that we understand fully the overall supply and demand factors in the industry for the entire region.

2. It is vital that we secure an improved understanding of the impact of each of these overall factors on the constituent parts of the industry under existing harvesting and management policies.

3. It is essential that the implications of changing timber management and harvesting policies be fully explored and exposed to public view.

4. And finally, from the local government point of view, it is vital that changes, particularly in employment and plant location, be understood both under present timber management policies and under proposed changes as they may affect local economies.

We wish to cite examples of how useful the above information would be to local government. In the urban portion of our county, with its relatively diverse industrial base, timber industry (particularly sawmill) employment declines which have been forecast will probably be of relatively minor significance. However, in the western portion of our county a larger segment of the population relies on timber industry employment. We have just received an inquiry from a local school district which must plan ahead for possible expansion. They inquire into whether their assessed valuation will continue to rise approximately 6 percent per year. What can we tell them when we know the Forest Service forecasts that because of accelerated competition from pulp and plywood mills for raw timber, some of their sawmills may close in the next 15 years and that the assessed valuation of their timber lands may fluctuate substantially if major changes are made in timber management practices as suggested in the more controversial sections of the Duerr report? Even if their mills do not close, how many millworkers, whose children they serve, will leave their district as a result of automation? Without some reasonable assurance of continued employment stability of the population they serve, and the related stability of the tax base which must finance that service, how can responsible school officials plan ahead in their programs?

These same questions clearly make both metropolitan and countywide planning more difficult.

We hope to press for a Portland SMSA economic base study before 1970 and it is obviously necessary that these forest industry questions be resolved for such an economic base study to be of maximum usefulness to us.

Thank you for any assistance you may be able to extend to us.

WASHINGTON COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT,
CARL HEFFLEY,
Planning Director.

[From the Portland Oregonian, Dec. 22, 1965]

SOLON SLAPS TIMBER VOTE

Surprise and shock were registered Tuesday at a report from Washington, D.C., that the U.S. Forest Service has rejected a proposal to step up the cut of old growth timber in Oregon and Washington.

This response to the report came from Representative Robert F. Smith, Republican, of Burns, chairman of the Legislative Public Lands Interim Committee which has been investigating forest cutting practices of various agencies.

Smith said the Forest Service had promised his committee to give further study to the recommendations of the Duerr report, a controversial document written in 1960 by Dr. William Duerr, of Syracuse University, part of which was suppressed from publication by the Forest Service.

"My Interim Committee on Public Lands has been studying the allowable cut and the Duerr report for some 4 months. We believe the Forest Service should keep their promise to study the report's ramifications."

He said the legislators had concluded that the Duerr report should not be rejected until fully studied.

"We recognize this is a public document, paid for by the taxpayers, and is most important to the economy of the Northwest," Smith told the Oregonian Tuesday upon reading an article written by the newspaper's Washington correspondent, A. Robert Smith.

"Our brief study," Smith said, "indicates there is a vast difference between the percentage of inventory cut by each public agency."

He said, "No one wants to clear cut all of our forests. Our purpose is to harvest our tremendous natural resources of timber in order to maximize returns while protecting our forests for the unlimited future."

Smith said he was heartened by letters sent to the Forest Service by Congressmen AL ULLMAN and WENDELL WYATT, who "are attempting to assist our interim committee in making public the Duerr report if for no other reason than to reject it."

This statement was in reply to Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, who was quoted in the Smith article as supporting the Forest Service policy and accusing a legislator of wanting "to begin a brush fire" with the Duerr report.

SALEM, *January 4, 1966.*

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As a part of its studies authorized under House Joint Resolution 60 of the 53d Oregon Assembly, the legislative interim committee on public lands is considering the impact of Federal land ownership and management upon the social and economic well-being of this State. It is anticipated that the committee's findings and recommendations will be useful to the Public Land Law Review Commission created by Public Law 88–606, as well as in establishing guidelines and recommendations for future public land management by all levels of government in Oregon.

Since the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, is a major landholder in this State, it is obvious operations of that agency are of interest, both to the interim committee and the public. Particularly pertinent is the question of how Forest Service management may now or in the future affect the supply of raw materials which help sustain our major economic base, the forest products industry.

As always, officials of the Forest Service in Oregon, have been most cooperative during the current interim committee study and we are deeply appreciative of the continually cordial attitude displayed. Some idea of this attitude is seen in willingness to share with the committee for its own use the complete text of a 1960 study on "Timber Trends in Western Washington and Oregon," compiled by a group under the direction of Dr. William A. Duerr, of Syracuse University. Members of the committee advise that this material may eventually make a significant contribution to the final committee report.

Because knowledge of the Duerr report has become widespread, there is obvious concern over the fact certain portions remain unavailable for public review. I am told those sections which are being withheld deal with data on possible cutting practice changes, and that the reason for nonpublication is that the Service wishes to further evaluate such data in the light of agency experience and other factors. This is certainly understandable, and, were it not for the fact many Oregonians, within and without the timber industry, have expressed an interest in this matter, there would be little public attention. As it is, a considerable amount of adverse criticism and resentment is being directed toward the Forest Service. Some have even suggested a need for congressional action.

I have no wish to add my voice to those berating the Service, and I hope you will convey to the Chief and his associates my strong and continuing support of this agency—an agency which I feel has done an outstanding job of conserving the forests and other resources under its control. I would suggest, however, that the interests of both the Forest Service and the public might be better served at this time were the entire Duerr report made available for public discussion. Certainly if there are compelling reasons why this cannot be done, no one should object. On the other hand, if withholding of pertinent information is simply based on a desire to avoid criticism, I believe valued consideration of the alternatives may result in full disclosure.

For these reasons, I am hopeful your office and the Forest Service may reconsider the current position concerning publication of the full Duerr report, and that it may be made available in quantity to those in Oregon and elsewhere for study and comment. In making this request, I am mindful of the possibility of politically inspired actions, but I can assure you my office will not be a party to any move to discredit the Forest Service or to any attempt to capitalize at the expense of dedicated public servants.

Your favorable response will be appreciated.

With warmest personal regards and best wishes for a wonderful new year.

Sincerely yours,

MARK O. HATFIELD,
Governor.

(Unpublished excerpts from a preliminary review draft of a manuscript entitled "Timber Trends in Western Oregon and Western Washington," dated August 1960, prepared by the Division of Forest Economics at the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station in Portland, Oreg.)

YIELDS UNDER ACCELERATED PROGRAM

It is possible to turn, now, to the third of the five questions listed in the introduction to this chapter: If forest management were intensified faster than present trends suggest, and if the subregion's old-growth timber were converted to young growth more rapidly than is now intended, how would the consequences differ from those of a continuation of present trends?

In order to study the consequences of an accelerated timber program, timber inventory and cut were again projected into the future—in detail through the four decades 1960–2000, in summary through one forest rotation thereafter. In these projections, the concept of an accelerated program was introduced by means of three key assumptions about forest management, chosen so as to contrast clearly and strongly with the assumptions made in projecting present trends. First, and most significantly, it was assumed that public old-growth timber would be liquidated relatively fast: It would take only about 40 years on national forests to remove four-fifths of the timber older than rotation age, and about 40 years on other public properties to cut all such timber—as against the nearly 100 years implied in the present-trends projection. Second, nonstocked forest lands would be reforested more promptly. Third, thinning, salvage cutting, prelogging, relogging, and other types of cutting associated with intensive management would be stepped up. For example, by 1990, a thinning regime would be extended to 50 percent of all young public forests on type-sites 1 and 2 (in contrast to 25 percent under present trends); and to 80 percent (as compared with 50) of young forests on large private holdings. Furthermore, thinning would be started on forest type-sites 3 and 4 in all classes of ownership.

Details of the procedure for the accelerated program projection, and of the findings, are to be found in appendix C.

GENERAL TREND IN YIELD

Annual yields projected under the accelerated program total not far from 17 billion board feet throughout the period 1960–2000. Yields commence at some 17.8 billion board feet per year and drift downward thereafter, all during the period (table 25), in the general direction of the 13.2 billion board foot longrun potential.

The yields of table 25 average about 30-percent higher than actual yields during the 1950's. The yields are high mainly because overage forests are assumed to be opened up promptly and cleared out of the way fairly fast. As a matter of practical possibility, there is, of course, some question whether forest access could be improved so quickly, or the industry expanded, or the markets realined. In any case, the projected yields for the decade of 1960's are clearly not realizable: The large changes necessary could not be made that soon.

At the least, one needs to interpret the projected yield data of table 25. One needs to imagine that the 40-year aggregate output of 685 billion board feet represented there is distributed over time with a little bit smoother transition from current outputs. Moreover, one needs to realize that the main point of the projection is not to make a forecast but to analyze an alternative forest policy, using for this purpose a clearly and strongly contrasting case. In this analysis it is the contrasts that are most important. Between the extremes presented, one can always interpolate if he wants to.

TABLE 25.—*Prospective annual yield of timber in the Douglas-fir subregion under an accelerated management program, by decade, ownership class, and source of yield, 1960–2000*

[In millions of board feet]

Source of yield	Private holdings				Public holdings				All holdings
	Large	Medium	Small	All	National forest	Other Federal	Other	All	
DECADE OF 1960's									
Inventory	1,372	503	1,154	3,029	4,927	976	351	6,254	9,283
Growth	2,886	206	998	4,090	1,983	439	660	3,082	7,172
Salvage	422	55	22	499	589	221	61	871	1,370
All	4,680	764	2,174	7,618	7,499	1,636	1,072	10,207	17,825
DECADE OF 1970's									
Inventory	563	331	985	1,859	5,307	810	322	6,448	8,307
Growth	3,624	262	842	4,728	1,239	614	855	2,708	7,436
Salvage	326	22	----------	348	563	278	62	903	1,251
All	4,513	615	1,807	6,935	7,109	1,711	1,239	10,059	16,994
DECADE OF 1980's									
Inventory	244	176	812	1,232	5,612	872	532	7,016	8,248
Growth	4,413	288	524	5,226	895	628	830	2,353	7,579
Salvage	282	18	1	301	491	175	68	734	1,034
All	4,939	482	1,337	6,758	6,998	1,675	1,430	10,103	16,861
DECADE OF 1990's									
Inventory	1,025	97	568	1,690	4,957	970	612	6,539	8,229
Growth	4,213	365	361	4,939	1,299	608	899	2,806	7,745
Salvage	258	16	1	275	407	110	52	569	844
All	5,496	478	930	6,904	6,663	1,668	1,563	9,914	16,818

On the other hand, the short transition period assumed in the projection is not, prima facie, outlandish or extraordinary. It is one often discussed in forestry and wood-industry circles. The results of the present projection, detailed and methodical as it is, are of very great interest in their own right, in an absolute sense.

It was remarked that the projected total yields for the Douglas-fir subregion drift, decade by decade, in the direction of the longrun potential output. The same is true, taking the subregion as a whole, of most individual classes of forest holdings. A comparison of table 25 with table 19 (p. 122) [not shown in RECORD] reveals this fact. And again the same steady drift toward the longrun potential yield is to be observed within the districts. Their long-run potentials are:

	Billion board feet
Puget Sound district	3.5
Columbia River district	6.3
Southwest Oregon	3.4

An examination of tables 48–50, Appendix C, discloses that the projected outputs drift toward the above potentials except in the Puget Sound district, where the current distribution of stand-age classes produces a temporarily rising yield during the remainder of the century.

The gentle drift toward the potential is partial evidence of freedom from the threat of serious gaps in yield—deep valleys in the output curve—under an accelerated timber program. The summary projection beyond 2000 will furnish more evidence.

SUBDIVISION OF THE YIELD

Government timber makes up about 60 percent of the projected total output of the whole subregion in each of the four decades, 1960–2000. The percentage is a little higher in southwest Oregon, a little lower in the Puget Sound district, but everywhere it shows a considerable tendency to hold steady over the four decades. Considering that in the long run, public timber output is not expected to amount to more than about 45 percent of the total (table 19) [not shown in RECORD], it is evident that the dominance of public sources is to be regarded as temporary, and that it is peculiar to an accelerated program of old-growth liquidation.

And yet the extent of the public-private readjustment in output between an accelerated transition and the long run must not be overstated. Total subregional timber output from private lands under the accelerated program is just about equal to the longrun potential. That from public lands is, on the whole, two-thirds more than the longrun potential. These two-thirds represent the whole extent of necessary readjustment. They are made up entirely of a temporary flow of unproductive capital into competitive uses.

Heavy as is the projected cut of timber under the accelerated program, a great deal of it, nevertheless, is replaced by current growth. In the 1960's decade the projection shows about four-tenths of the cut replaced by growth. By the 1990's, with cut smaller and growth larger, the latter is replacing nearly half of the former. As in the projection of present trends, so in the accelerated projection, it is obvious how heavily the growth of new timber affects the forest development. The part played by growth in sustaining the harvest will become most clear when trends are traced beyond the year 2000. In the period 1960–2000, the growth potentialities of the forest are still largely masked in the fact that overage timber—which, though not growing very efficiently, is still increasing in volume—is being rapidly replaced by forests still too young to be credited with any sawtimber growth at all. It is this fact which minimizes the advantage of the accelerated management program over present trends in terms of growth percent during the four decades. The following figures are growth in percent of growing stock, grand averages for the Douglas-fir subregion:

Decade	Present trends	Accelerated program
1960's	1.2	1.3
1970's	1.3	1.6
1980's	1.5	1.9
1990's	1.6	2.5

If these growth projections for an accelerated program are in error, then surely it is that they are too conservative. However, the percentages exhibit a rapid increase.

THE FOREST AFTER 40 YEARS

In any case, the accelerated program does promise to reduce excess, underproductive growing stocks very substantially within 40 years. The sawtimber inventory projected for the year 2000 is 274 billion board feet altogether, only about one-third over the longrun requirement of 203 billion feet There is still a great surplus of timber above rotation age on the national forests, and on the other hand there is some shortage of timber just below rotation age on some categories of ownership.

The distribution of forests by age class at the beginning and end of the first 40 years under an accelerated management program is the subject of figure 14 [not shown in RECORD]. This figure treats of the Douglas-fir subregion as a whole. Distributions within the three districts are displayed in figures 20–25, appendix C [not shown in RECORD].

When one compares the forest-age distributions in 2000 under an accelerated program with those obtained by projecting present trends and with the ideal distributions specified on page 153, he finds that on private lands the accelerated program promises to produce an age-class arrangement about as close to the ideal as that to be expected if present trends continue. On public lands, because of the shorter old-growth conversion period assumed under an accelerated program, the age-class frequencies are a good deal different in the two projections. In some respects, the accelerated program makes for less desirable age distributions. Certainly it tends to place a very high proportion of forest into the youngest age classes. This happens both because old-growth timber is assumed to be removed so fast and because the immense challenge of reforesting cutovers and burns is assumed to be successfully met. However, in other respects, the accelerated program on public lands produces the more desirable age distributions. At least it largely eliminates the underproductive excess of older timber and arranges the forest for high growth. By the year 2000 in the whole Douglas-fir subregion under an accelerated program forests from 1 to 40 years old are expected to occupy the following percentages of area in each ownership class:

Small private holdings	90
National forests	70
Medium private holdings	65
Other Federal holdings	63
Large private holdings	61
Other public holdings	56

PROSPECTS BEYOND YEAR 2000

What is the Douglas-fir subregion's potential timber yield in the decades after 2000 if an accelerated management program is pursued? Data from a summary projection are set forth in table 26, where they are combined with figures for earlier decades from table 25. These are raw data, the result of following the procedures described in appendix C untempered by any smoothing or other adjustment of the series. They are not, it must be remembered forecasts of output. Rather, they are estimates of the potential output under the assumptions that have been specified.

TABLE 26.—*Prospective annual yield of timber in the Douglas-fir subregion under an accelerated management program, by ownership class and decade, 1960–2070*

[In billion board feet]

Decade of	Private holdings				Public holdings				All holdings
	Large	Medium	Small	All	National forest	Other Federal	Other	All	
1960's	4.7	0.7	2.2	7.6	7.5	1.6	1.1	10.2	17.8
1970's	4.5	.6	1.8	6.9	7.1	1.7	1.3	10.1	17.0
1980's	5.0	.5	1.3	6.8	7.0	1.7	1.4	10.1	16.9
1990's	5.5	.5	.9	6.9	6.6	1.7	1.6	9.9	16.8
2000's	5.4	.5	.8	6.7	3.7	1.3	1.1	6.1	12.8
2010's	5.3	.4	.8	6.5	2.0	1.0	1.0	4.0	10.5
2020's	5.5	.4	.7	6.6	1.5	1.1	.8	3.4	10.0
2030's	5.8	.4	.5	6.7	2.2	1.3	1.0	4.5	11.2
2040's	5.5	.4	.8	6.7	3.4	1.4	1.0	5.8	12.5
2050's	5.8	.3	.7	6.8	3.3	1.3	1.3	5.9	12.7
2060's	5.5	.4	.7	6.6	3.5	1.3	1.3	6.1	12.7

For private lands, the projected series are not significantly different from those derived as a continuation of present trends (table 24). For public lands, the projected yields are comparatively high during the first half of the 110-year period, a direct consequence of the assumption that old-growth timber would be converted in about this length of time. Also as a result of this assumption and of some adverse age-class distributions, the public series sag noticeably during one to three decades just after the middle of the 110 years. Aside from this sag on public lands, all series trend generally toward the longrun potential, and the public series reach it by the end of the era. Like all the timber-output series considered in this study, the present ones change in composition from decade to decade. The proportion of thinnings in the total harvest, negligible at the start, rises at a fairly uniform rate, to above four-tenths at the end. At the same time, the proportion of old growth in the harvest from public lands falls from almost all to almost none.

Policies for the transition

The purpose of this final section is to compare alternative timber policies for the transition period. Especially it is to compare the consequences of an accelerated timber program with those of continuing present trends. The comparison will suggest some answers to the last two of the questions with which this chapter was begun.

It was remarked earlier that the rate of converting old-growth timber into young growth is a major forestry issue in Douglas-fir country today. Without question it is the central issue regarding the transition period. Therefore to draw comparisons between the two projections that have been worked out and described on foregoing pages is exceedingly helpful: The two projections illustrate alternative conversion rates, and the rates they represent are such that the two cases throw a great deal of light on the whole range of practical possibilities in regard to speed of conversion. Essentially, the alternatives requiring study are (1) to continue the transition from old- to young-growth forests at about the current pace or (2) to increase the annual cut, primarily of old growth on public forests; to sweep away the old timber correspondingly faster, developing the forest areas apace and tightening the timber utilization; and to step up young-growth management programs—regeneration, intermediate cutting, protection, and seasonable harvest cutting—so as to get the wood increment needed to keep the timber economy afloat.

Liquidating old timber

One respect in which the two policy alternatives sharply differ is the rate of clearing out excess timber capital and thus of stimulating timber growth. To take as cases in point the two projections examined in this chapter, they suggest that under present policies it would require something more than 100 years to cut out the timber older than rotation age, whereas under an accelerated program the period would be closer to 50 years. Where old timber is converted twice as fast, the attendant forest developments can take place twice as fast: establishing new stands, raising the growth therefrom, and increasing the yield from thinnings. The regeneration of the forest is a problem not yet fully solved. This analysis assumes that it can and will be solved speedily enough to permit gaining any advantages that accelerated old-growth conversion may offer.

Surely it is a goal of public policy to make our capital resources—our funds gathered at the cost of great exertion, and the factories, forests, and other material things in which we have invested funds—earn a reasonably good return. To succeed in the effort is to raise the national income: the national revenue, including the flow of imponderables. A goal of public policy is to push up the national income: not necessarily the gross income, but the net—the revenue left over after the deductions on account of winning it have been allowed for.

Now of course the composition of the national revenue matters as well as the amount. It matters that there is just a very small proportion of forest products in the total, or a relatively large proportion, or whatever. Or at least it matters in the short run, while consumers' habits and tastes are hard to change. How much it matters in the long run no one knows, though surely it matters less.

At any rate, to the extent that it matters, society registers the fact in its market demand for the product and thus in the market price and thus in the value which forms a part of the national income. And so it is not very far from the truth, especially as it relates to time beyond the immediate future, to speak simply and generally of high national revenue as a goal of public policy.

It follows that the goal of public policy is to liquidate excess capital (so judged from its below-par earnings) in any industry and transfer it to uses, in that industry or others, where it can contribute its par share toward national revenue.

It appears to follow that excess timber capital should be shifted to new uses, and that this should be done just as speedily as possible without working incidental damage to the national revenue. That is to say, the only limitations to a desirable rate of shifting are the absorptive capacity of the new uses and the need to avoid depressing timber prices so much that returns in the new uses turn out to be less than those in the old. Considering how long the conversion period would be even if it were shortened as much as technology allowed, the only practical limitation is the latter, the effect on timber prices. And when the timber capital to be shifted is earning nothing—which is exactly what a lot of it is earning—then one wonders whether either limitation amounts to much.

The prices that faster conversion would threaten to depress are, first of all, the prices of stumpage in the open market—that is, notably the prices of public standing timber. For these prices (and not, it will be noted, the total of government receipts) to fall may well be seen as a desirable aspect of the general loosening of timber supplies. High timber prices, though understandably a source of passing amazement and pride for the forest manager and the managing agency, are yet in the last analysis merely evidence of scarcity and thus of managerial failure.

A well publicized intention on the part of the government to unload more timber and thus allow prices of all timber to fall off may influence the management practices of private timber sellers. However, the effect would last only so long as further price changes remained in prospect. The mere depression of the price level could not be expected to influence forest practice very much. This is the positive and desirable aspect of the weak price-output relationship illustrated in figure 9. [Not shown in RECORD].

A softening of the stumpage market need not spread into the markets for end products. Everything depends on how the timber harvest as a whole is affected. This matter was touched upon in the description, earlier in this chapter, of the accelerated-program projection. It will be held aside now for later discussion. However, one point regarding end-product prices is worth considering here. This is that a moderate price reduction accompanying increases in output would in some ways be much in the interest of both the industry and the general public. It would help the former to rebuild deteriorating consumer relations. It would permit the latter a wider enjoyment of an abundant raw material.

Striving for even flow

Besides the rate or removing old-growth timber, another aspect in which the transition's two cardinal alternatives differ is in their proneness to departure from even flow. By even flow is meant a constant or increasing periodic output of timber, a freedom from prolonged declines in yield, notably those caused by timber-supply conditions. In the projection of present trends for the Douglas-fir subregion, it was discovered that on each class of public holdings the prospective 10-year timber yield gradually increases each decade toward the longrun potential. The increase is enough to insure even flow—or close to it—also for all forests as a group, even though private forests on the whole show declining output. On the other hand, the accelerated projection reveals the possibility that shortening the transition may increase the cut of public timber above the longrun potential rate and thus force departure, sooner or later, from even flow, at least on the public holdings, perhaps on the forest at large.

Is an even flow of timber a sensible aim of public policy? What is there to recommend the even-flow principle? May even flow be expected to have at least two desirable consequences: one, to feed and sustain the general consumption of timber and thus the national real income; two, to stabilize the economy of woodworking communities?

Suppose, for the moment, that it is in fact desirable to stabilize forest-based income and the woodworking economy. Then one is immediately struck by the question how a stable flow of wood measured in board feet—or, for that matter, in cubic feet—could be expected to produce such a result. These physical units of output vary hugely over time—often over short periods—in their significance to human life. They vary with changes in the species, size, and quality of the timber, in the technology of production, and in the manner of utilization. A cubic foot of wood used for paper is an entirely different thing, economically, from the same cubic foot used for lumber. Even the employment and income per wood unit devoted to a particular use changes as extraction, manufacturing, and marketing processes change, which they are doing all the time.

But beyond this, is it desirable to stabilize or increase forest-based income? Is it a good thing to stabilize the woodworking economy?

As for the first, the national income does, of course, comprise the returns from various lines of effort, the various industries, such as steel and petroleum, farming and forestry. Other things equal, the greater the return from forestry and forest industry, the greater the national income. The trouble is, other things are seldom equal: the effects of the different industries are interrelated.

It is perhaps nice, and certainly it is easy, to think of the forest economy—forestry and wood-using industry—as a tight system for which decisions can properly be made on the basis of internal considerations alone. It is tempting to suppose that, if investments and output of the forest economy are to change at all, they should increase. This is the doctrine of even flow of timber. Under it, one views with equanimity shifts of capital from the buggy into the automobile industry, from coal into aluminum, and from farming into merchandising; but shifts out of forestry are quite another matter.

It is difficult, however, to escape the reality that society's concern is for its whole revenue, largely irrespective of source, and that excess capital which is earning below par is best shifted to more efficient uses, regardless of the uses from which it is taken away. The public interest is not necessarily to even out, any more than it is to maximize, the long-term flow of national revenue from the steel industry or any other particular industry—even the forest industry. In view of the fact that resources are limited, such evening or maximizing may reduce national revenue by holding down disproportionately the flow of revenue from other industries.

So far as the second argument for even flow is concerned—that it stabilizes the economy of woodworking communities—here is one of the most basic and respectable pieces of forestry lore. It comes to the United States from Europe, where it is founded on the experience of communities whose sustained-yield forests have helped sustain also employment and income over the years. It seems to be underscored by experience in many parts of the United States during the 1930's, when the disappearance of local timber and wood-using plants was followed by loss of employment and income.

Nevertheless, reflection suggests that nothing that is known of community experience, with even flow or with uneven, clearly recommends either policy as invariably wise.

Even flow was a success in some European communities at a time when economic opportunity and change were so meager as to put a premium on continuity and stability. Contemporary America, however, commits itself, happily or unhappily, to change and innovation in economic life. It casts aside all those restrictive rules that call for sameness of either production or consumption over time. It thrives on incessant shifting of immediate economic aims and of resources. It achieved growth by means of such shifting. In its actions it implies the rejection of even-flow doctrine for individual sectors of the economy.

Uneven flow, on the other hand, was a failure in some U.S. communities at a time when the whole economy was depressed and any policy would have appeared to fail. The relevant question concerning uneven flow—concerning, for example, a program of liquidating old-growth timber so fast that output drifts downward decade by decade, either on certain classes of holding or on all—is not whether it will forerun the loss of employment and income in time of general depression. One knows that it will. The relevant question is the relation between uneven flow and community employment and income in time of general prosperity.

What happens, in generally prosperous times, when a community faces the shrinkage of one of its major industries? Experience in the Douglas-fir counties suggests that the community may contract to suit its shrinkage base as families and facilities move away to find work in other, growing communities. Or the community may substitute a new activity for the old one. It may bring in pulp mills to take the place—and actually more than take the place—of its sawmills. This sort of substitution has occurred in Grays Harbor and Snohomish Counties, Wash., and elsewhere in the Douglas-fir subregion. Or the community may shift its emphasis from forest to nonforest activities. In Washington during the years since World War II, while employment in the forest industries was sliding from about 70,000 to about 60, total manufacturing employment was raising from the neighborhood of 175,000 to nearly 225,000. And nonmanufacturing employment was increasing even more steeply.

Whatever new directions the communities take, the capital released through timber liquidation goes to build grander and more rewarding resources. Notably, it goes to help develop and industrialize the region. And the greater the timber reserves to be tapped, the more substantial the help afforded by liquidation.

Coordinating public and private programs

In the past, the help that the economy has received through old-growth timber liquidation has come very largely from private forest lands. In the future, however, it will be chiefly the public lands which can furnish such help in economic development. The greatest effects will undoubtedly be felt outside forestry and forest industry. But there will be effects inside forestry, too—beyond those that change the wood-utilization mix: (1) effects upon timber values and prices, (2) effects upon the output of timber from private forests.

The faster the conversion of old-growth timber into young growth on public lands, the greater will be the tendency for the value and price of timber to be depressed—and the greater the incentive for private forest owners to reduce their own cuts and use more public timber instead. Thus under an accelerated program of conversion, private growing stocks of young timber may be expected to accumulate somewhat, and to be available for sustaining the total cut subsequently if public outputs should dip. Here is a form of coordination between public and private forest management that will work consistently to lower the peaks of timber cutting and to raise the troughs, so as to reduce departures from even flow.

Such coordination of public and private management is not contractual, as in a sustained-yield forest unit. Indeed it requires no contract, but is automatic in its operation, through the means of the market, and consequently is more simple and more certain than a contract. Its effect seems likely to be that of lessening some of the differences in annual timber harvest between present trends and an accelerated program.

Using timber and having it too

However, there appears still to be one great difference between the two cardinal alternatives for the transition, beyond those already considered. This difference lies in the aggregate quantity of timber likely to be produced in the Douglas-fir subregion over a span of future years—say, the next 100 years or so. If one adds together the 110 total annual outputs implied in table 24 for a continuation of present trends, he gets an aggregate yield from all holdings for the entire period amounting to 1,346 billion board feet. A similar totaling of outputs under the accelerated program of table 26 reveals an aggregate of 1,509 billion board feet: 163 billion, or 12 percent, more. Here is a measure of the productive superiority of young-growth management over old, arising mainly from superior anticipation and salvage of mortality, anticipation of decay, and utilization of the forest site. When old timber is replaced by young, there is very possibly more growth of wood and quite surely more harvestable growth. The 163 billion board feet more growth realized in the circumstances postulated here are distributed as follows by class of ownership:

	Billion board feet
Private holdings:	
Large	82
Medium	2
Small	2
Public holdings:	
National forest	101
Other Federal	21
Other	9

The 131 billion board feet (21 percent) excess yield of an accelerated program on public lands represents an advantage of the program amounting to about 1.2 billion per year—or, on the 12 million acres of public forest lands, an average of 100 board feet per acre annually. Here is a substantial yield, amounting to a fifth of the total longrun potential of public lands. If the cubic-foot volume of useful timber smaller than sawlog size had been included in the projections and resultant series of yields, the contrast between the two series would loom larger still.

It was pointed out earlier that the yield series in table 24 is in part arbitrary as to timing, being simply the result of the assumptions adopted regarding the schedule of old-growth conversion. Within limits, a part of the old-timber yield can be harvested earlier or later without appreciably affecting the aggregate yield over the years. The same is true of the series in table 26, representing an accelerated program. Figure 15 illustrates a present-trends series and an accelerated series for public lands, adapted from tables 24 and 26 by retiming and smoothing so as to eliminate (1) sudden changes in output and (2) instances of yield under the accelerated program falling below that of the present-trends projection. The accelerated program of figure 15 peaks more slowly and later than that of table 26, and thus represents a somewhat longer liquidation period for old-growth timber. The extra aggregate yield of the accelerated program, in this case amounting to about 125 billion board feet, is plainly depicted as the area between the two output curves.

If present policy on public forests is generally to maximize physical output, then figure 15 [not shown in the RECORD] illustrates this interesting alternative: with shorter rotations and faster old-growth conversion, to produce an output greater than maximums.

A temporary bulge in the yield of public forests, such as that illustrated in figure 15, would probably be offset in part by a corresponding reduction and postponement of harvests from private lands, as described earlier. The result would be to spread the increased output over a greater span of years. The tendency would be to lend the total output potential to both the short and the long variations in demand that can be expected in any case to cause large changes in the rate of timber production.

It will perhaps bear repeating that the projections made in this study are not predictions. They merely describe the outcome of various programs. Figure 15 is most useful if it is regarded simply as symbolizing the gains in physical output that may be achieved on public forests under some accelerated management program planned out to meet the community, market, and silvicultural opportunites and limitations of the various forests. The planning in question is on-the-ground, forest-by-forest planning. All that the present analysis can do is to indicate quite clearly the general nature of the changes that such planning may be expected to produce.

The thinking that has gone into this study, concerning the timber potentialities of the Douglas-fir subregion, is necessarily confined and circumscribed and thus conservative, being overinfluenced by the vision of today's silviculture and today's production technology. Every unforeseen significant improvement that may be made in woods practice or in wood utilization will enlarge the prospects of the future beyond those envisaged here. Plans for forestry and forest industry must always be held flexible enough to accommodate new and unsuspected opportunities.

On the other hand, the conclusions of this study are in one respect not conservative and even run the risk of exaggeration. This is that they are based on the assumption of successful conifer-forest regeneration. To make good on this assumption in the near future will take more research than is being done now, and more effective action. In any case, the conversion to a young-growth timber economy can be speeded up only when foresters can promptly reestablish productive forests on current cutovers and other nonstocked lands.

November 16, 1965.

Hon. Stewart Udall,
Secretary of the Interior
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I addressed to Secretary Freeman today. I would be remiss if I did not advise you of coinciding disturbing reports from Oregon about the Bureau of Land Management on its allowable cuts. The gist of these reports in that your Oregon BLM has under consideration a proposal to raise its O. & C. allowable cut, particularly in southern Oregon. You ought to know that these reports include the observation that certain interests are spreading the word that they now have the way paved to obtain your approval.

It is my recollection that BLM last raised its allowable cut in the summer of 1962. Since that date the terrible 1962 Columbus Day windstorm hit these forests and this was followed by considerable damage to trees. Then there were the floods of last winter. Overall, it is my understanding that the current official allowable cut has been exceeded for the last few years.

Under these circumstances you can appreciate, I am sure, that many people would be interested in why it is suggested that the allowable cut should be again raised rather than reduced.

You may be certain that any proposed increase in allowable cuts is a matter which I would wish to scrutinize very thoroughly. If these reports of a proposed change and of these interests are in error, I would appreciate information to that effect.

If the reports are correct, I trust that you will deem it advisable to give me full assurance before any action is taken that the action proposed involves absolutely sound conversation.

In fact, this subject would be of such wide interest to all Oregonians that I would even venture to urge that prior to the adoption of an increase in allowable cut, it should receive very careful explanation to and study by various conservation groups such as the Izaak Walton League and the Associations of County officials. Also, I would recommend that your forest advisory boards such as the ones in Eugene and Medford and your full O. & C. board be given advance explanation and an adequate opportunity to study the matter.

Finally, it would seem to me that the proper forum for initial public discussion of these matters is with members of the Oregon Congressional delegation and the appropriate Congressional committees. I trust you are aware of my concern that State legislative committees and other State officials seem to obtain more facts about Department of the Interior operations in Oregon, and obtain them earlier than members of the Oregon delegation.

I shall await a report from you on the issues which I have raised in this letter.

Sincerely yours,
Wayne Morse.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., November 20, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am acknowledging your letter of November 16 with which you enclose a copy of your letter addressed to Secretary Freeman concerning allowable cuts of timber on Bureau of Land Management lands in Oregon.

We shall be writing you further on this subject in the near future.

Sincerely yours,
Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., December 23, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is further response to your letter of November 16 concerning the allowable cut of timber from lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management in western Oregon.

The Bureau is making a comprehensive review of procedures and standards used in determining the amount of timber available annually and no final determination will be made until this review is completed.

We agree with your observation that any increase in allowable cut should receive review by the O. & C. advisory boards and various conservation groups, prior to adoption.

The Oregon congressional delegation will be fully informed on this proposal when it reaches the point of requiring initial public discussion.

Sincerely yours,
Harry R. Anderson,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from Oregon for discussing the vital subject of preserving timberlands for future generations. He just mentioned a number of States which have found that their lands have become denuded of coverage, with the damage that results to the economy and to the enjoyment of life by the inhabitants of the particular States. The Senator did not mention Ohio. Ohio is not known as a timber State. Whether Ohio is a timber State or not, we do know that all the richness and beauty provided by nature, that existed years ago, is gradually being eroded.

I do not say this vainly, but in 1953 Ohio celebrated its 150th anniversary of Statehood. The question to be determined at that time was: How can the State most constructively look back to the memories of our ancestors and try to render constructive services for the future generations?

The conclusion reached by the Sesquicentennial Commission was to inaugurate a program to plant trees upon the denuded lands of the State. The slogan was: "Plant a tree in 1953."

The point I wish to make is that what the Senator from Oregon is now speaking about is what the members of the Ohio Sesquicentennial Commission thought was most important.

We are witnessing the removal of shrubs and grasses and trees, and their substitution by concrete and macadam beds. Foliage, grasses, hedges, and trees gradually are going away.

As Governor, I tried to study those States in which the greatest legislative progress was made in an effort to protect the arbors of the State. The State of Oregon was in the advanced position of doing beneficial work in preserving the State timber lands.

I do not know what its state of progress is at this time, or about what the Senator is mainly talking, except the general import that I gained from what he said.

I wish that, each of the 535 Representatives would devote himself to this problem. We know that lands throughout the world which were once rich with vegetation are now dead, sterile, and lifeless. We have no greater task and no greater responsibility than to cope with this problem.

I commend the Senator from Oregon. I am glad that I came to the Chamber to hear at least a part of what the Senator has to say. I assure the Senator that I shall join in whatever fight he makes toward this objective that he is presenting to the Senate today.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want the Record to show that I appreciate very much the comments just made by the Senator from Ohio. I know of his years of dedicated public service in respect to sound conservation programs. He did not mention it, but I want to mention it.

The Senator from Ohio has been one of the great leaders in the Senate in trying to do something to resolve the policy being followed by certain economic groups in his State and elsewhere in scarring the landscape without taking the necessary restoration and beautification steps afterward, in connection with strip mining operations. How well I remember the position that the Senator from Ohio took on the floor 2 years ago, and last year. That involves a conservation program. That is a vital conservation program. I was proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with him, as I shall continue to stand shoulder to shoulder with him with regard to any new proposal which may come before us in legislative form.

The Senator from Ohio has also given consistent support to the conservation program in respect to our other natural resources, including timber, and the need for necessary flood control programs and sound programs for erosion control.

The Senator in his speech said in effect that we all know that there are many parts of the world in which a program of devastation has been followed, as a result of which there are now large areas which were once rich in forests and other natural resources, but which are now eroded areas, in which the country has not followed a sound conservation program.

Mr. President, at a later date, and in another format, and in connection with an entirely different subject, I shall comment upon the debt that I owe to the Senator from Ohio for his cooperation and advice and never-failing assistance in connection with the parliamentary tour that we took for 5 weeks this fall to Japan, India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Israel, with a stopoff for a briefing in Madrid, Spain.

I believe that there is no denying the observation that the Senator from Ohio made in regard to what has been an exceedingly wasteful policy in many parts of the world, in regard to a failure on the part of the peoples of those countries to follow a sound conservation program.

I do not say that critically. I just mention it factually. Let us not forget that there was a time when most of China was a surplus food area. However, it was not an eroded China, or a deforested China.

One cannot go through the parts of India which I observed with my own eyes and not recognize that one of the needs of India is for the development of a greatly improved conservation program.

They have a need to conserve water and to develop their water resources. They have a need for reforestation projects. They have a need for erosion control in many parts of India, for there is no doubt that there has been great waste of the natural resources in India by past generations. It is vital, in my judgment, to maintain a sound economy for its masses. The same situation is true in Pakistan and in Afghanistan.

Mr. President, it was rather dramatic to go to Israel and see what dedication, hard work, and recognition of the importance of the development of the natural resources of the country are doing in Israel.

I could hardly believe my eyes when, flying over a large desert area, I saw the desert area pock-marked with forests. They have a recognition that they must plant forests in order to develop and protect their soil from erosion, to supply the necessary base for the maintenance and preservation of a watershed, and to conserve and store water.

I saw the well-known conservation fact demonstrated that if the necessary things are done to get water into even that kind of desert, the area will flower in vegetation.

I do not know of a better example that I could cite offhand than the conservation and natural resources development program which I observed in Israel.

I did not mean to speak for so long, but the Senator from Ohio inspired me to call attention not only to his work in this field, but also to relate it to some of the things we saw on our trip through Asia and into a part of the Middle East.

WILD RIVERS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1446) to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, pending before the Senate is S. 1446, a bill to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes.

It is my understanding that the bill contemplates preserving certain remaining areas which still have their pristine attributes uncontaminated by the invasion of human beings.

The bill is intended primarily to deal with certain river basins in the West. The bill contains one title which would authorize a study of other river basins to determine whether they might have the characteristics which I have just mentioned.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 1446, which, if accepted, would authorize a study of what is known in Ohio as the Little Miami River basin and the Little Beaver River basin, for inclusion in the final draft of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the desk.

Mr. CHURCH obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator suggest the absence of a quorum? I believe that some of the leaders wish to be called back to the floor.

Mr. CHURCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, S. 1446, the bill to create a National Wild Rivers System is landmark legislation. With it, we can save for ourselves and our descendants some of that delight and stimulation former generations have known in America's unspoiled and unsurpassed wild rivers. The bill initially designates segments of five magnificent streams to be preserved in their natural, free-flowing condition. No dams could be licensed for construction upon them. The bill also provides, for study and possible later inclusion, segments of 11 other rivers—and outlines procedures by which these and additional streams may be added to the system in the future.

Only congressional action can adequately protect the remnants of America's great, rushing stretches of white water; the salmon-spawning rivers, and those rare waterways of pure, clean current which mirror banks and foliage almost as old as time itself.

As President Johnson said in his message on natural beauty, the time has come "to identify and preserve free-flowing stretches of our great scenic rivers before growth and development make the beauty of the unspoiled waterway a memory."

And as Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall wrote in his report to the Congress on the bill, "the time to act is now, before it is too late."

Mr. President, this feeling of urgency is reflected in a tremendous volume of mail I have received from throughout the country since my introduction of S. 1446. There is a groundswell of public concern for the fate of these majestic streams, many of them threatened by dams which would forever destroy their beauty and ecology.

Only a few rivers in the continental United States remain untamed. And nowhere are there left such jewels of wild rivers as the Salmon and Clearwater systems in my own State of Idaho. Anyone who has known the pristine mystique of the Clearwater's tributaries, the Lochsa and the Selway, or has rafted down the rampaging torrents of the Salmon, or has pulled a fighting steelhead trout from its depths, will appreciate how supremely these rivers qualify as the lead-off rivers in this bill. The Salmon would be included from the town of North Fork downstream to its confluence with the Snake, along with its entire Middle Fork. The Clearwater segment would include its Middle Fork, Lochsa and Selway tributaries.

Several years ago, I set out to prevent the construction of dams on the Salmon by proposing the Salmon River preservation bill. My primary purpose was to save the Salmon's nursery for the great anadromous fish runs of the Pacific Northwest. How acute this problem has become, involving millions of dollars in both sport and commercial fishing is indicated by the complete closure of salmon fishing in Idaho last year by the State fish and game department, due to lessened runs. Oregon also placed a closure on commercial fishing in the Columbia. Downstream dams, off-reservation Indian fishing guaranteed by treaty, and other factors which need to be better understood, have reduced the upstream migration. S. 1446, by preventing the licensing of dams on both the Salmon and the Clearwater, will help keep open the vital water courses which lead to the spawning grounds high in the heart of Idaho's uplands. This bill alone cannot guarantee the preservation of the salmon migration, but it is an indispensable part of any salvage program worthy of the name.

The other three river segments in the initial system would be 95 miles of the Rogue in Oregon, from the Applegate River to the Route 101 highway bridge above Gold Beach; 50 miles of the Rio Grande in New Mexico, from the Colorado State line downstream to near the town of Pilar, and the lower 4 miles of its tributary, the Red River; and 37 miles of the Eleven Point in Missouri from a point near Greer Spring downstream to State Highway 142.

These are all fabulous rivers. The Rogue is famous for its white water, and rich in salmon and steelhead. The Rio Grande segment passes through a deep and colorful canyon dissecting ancient lava flows, and serves up some of the finest brown trout in the Nation. The Eleven Point is renowned for its crystal clear springs, Ozark's scenery and smallmouth bass fishing.

Rivers to be studied for possible future inclusion are segments of the Suwanee in Georgia and Florida, the Green in Wyoming, the Buffalo in Tennessee, the Cacapon in West Virginia, the upper Hudson in New York, the Missouri in Montana, the Niobrara in Nebraska, the Skagit in Washington, the Susquehanna in New York and Pennsylvania, the Wolf in Wisconsin, and the Youghiogheny in Maryland and in Pennsylvania.

The rivers in the initial system flow mainly through the public domain. Accordingly, they would be managed by either the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of Interior, or jointly, based upon the extent of their administrative areas in the river sectors involved. Rivers added in the future might also be managed in cooperation with States, or States and local governmental agencies, or by the States exclusively.

Mr. President, the weight of evidence, in terms of what best serves the public good, overwhelmingly favors saving, unobstructed, these particular rivers so that we might preserve and promote their great recreational value, now and in the years ahead. If we fail to give these rivers, which are assets of unique and incomparable value, statutory protection now, while there is still time, we shall have only ourselves to blame later, when time has run out. It is not enough, for instance, to say that we can settle whether or not to build dams on the rivers when the question arises; that is, when an application is filed with the Federal Power Commission.

Under present law, once an application is filed, who will do the deciding? Not the people of the particular States involved, for there will be no public referendum. Not the State agencies, for they lack the jurisdiction to decide. Not the State delegations in Congress, for they lack the numbers to guarantee the outcome of any vote. Not, indeed, the Congress itself, for Congress is loath to wrest jurisdiction from the Federal Power Commission, once an application for a license has been duly brought before it.

The wild rivers bill is necessary, if jurisdiction is to be taken from the Federal Power Commission to license dams within the protected system which the proposed legislation would create.

Some sections of the United States, such as my own State, are blessed with an abundance of water, much of which we shall want to harness behind dams for such purposes as reclamation, flood control, navigation, and the generation of hydroelectric power. Fortunately, these areas are also favored with many potential damsites. But if all of them, on each and every river, remain open for dam building, we shall have relinquished our entire river system to these particular uses, and these alone. Other public uses, equally important to our economy and to the preservation of a wholesome outdoor life for our people, will be left without statutory protection. In this situation, since the licensing of dams is left up to public agencies which exist for this purpose, the end result is perfectly predictable: In the absence of a national wild rivers system, every feasible site will eventually be used for dam construction. The past 50 years offer no evidence whatever that dam builders will voluntarily stop building dams. Unless laws are enacted to save some of our remaining free-flowing rivers in their natural untamed state, wild rivers will vanish from our land.

Mr. President, the proposed legislation reaches the floor of the Senate after extensive hearings and thorough consideration by the Senate Interior Committee—and a history of much earlier study by other expert groups.

In 1961, the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources recommended that certain streams be preserved in their free-flowing condition because their natural scenic, scientific, esthetic, and recreational value outweigh their value for water development and control purposes now and in the future.

In 1962, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended that certain rivers of unusual scientific, esthetic, and recreational value be allowed to remain in their natural free-flowing state without man-made obstructions. In 1963, the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture appointed a special wild rivers study team. Over an 18-month period, the team identified 73 rivers meriting attention for preservation and studied 22 of these in some detail. The bill the Senate is considering today is based upon the results of this study.

I introduced S. 1446 10 months ago, on March 8, 1965. Thirty-one Senators joined in cosponsorship. Hearings by the full Interior and Insular Affairs Committee were conducted April 22 and 23. A special task force of the committee conducted field hearings at Green River, Wyo., May 17 and at Boise, Idaho, May 18. On September 15 of last year, the committee voted to favorably report the bill to the Senate, with minority views.

As reported, S. 1446 may well be regarded as a corollary to the Wilderness Act, but it is very different in concept and application. A limited area along the banks of the rivers would be included in the system, which would be administered to promote maximum public use and enjoyment. Unlike the restrictions on use in a wilderness area, this bill would recognize and adopt the multiple-use principle on the public lands concerned. Timber harvesting and livestock grazing which do not substantially interfere with the use and enjoyment of the river would continue along the federally owned banklands. Mining would also be allowed, although claims on such banklands, located after the effective date of the act, would be subject to reasonable regulation to protect the river against pollution. The bill also contains no prohibition against the construction of needed roads or bridges.

Where the rivers flow through lands which are more than 75-percent publicly owned, thus assuring adequate banklands for public access, campgrounds and recreational facilities, condemnation of private land is permitted for scenic easements only, not for fee title. Where the power of general condemnation is conferred, the Government is still limited in its use to acquiring no more than 300 feet on either side of the river in fee title, and may not, in any case, condemn for scenic easements an area which extends more than 1,320 feet from either riverbank.

Precaution has been taken to fully protect established water rights, and to make certain that State water laws are not infringed in any way. The Senate Interior Committee hammered out amendments to the original language to make doubly sure that the status quo with respect to water law remains unchanged. These amendments are in section 5 of the bill, and are spelled out in the committee report.

Nothing in the bill affects the jurisdiction or administration authority of the States with respect to fish and wildlife.

Obstruction of wild rivers by damming normally accomplished through construction or licensing by Federal agencies would be prohibited, except as expressly authorized by Congress.

There is also an amendment adopted in the closing session of the Interior Committee which would establish a National Wild Rivers Review Commission to inform the Congress whenever changing public needs indicate that revisions should be made in the wild rivers system. This amendment was proposed by my colleague, Senator JORDAN, and I supported it.

The amendment contemplates a continuing review and evaluation of the system which could lead to the removal of a river, if a greater public need for a different use should later develop. However, I think it should be stressed that even without the amendment, it would always be open to Congress to remove rivers from the system, should changing conditions make this desirable. In brief, we can place these segments of wild rivers within the protection of the bill now, and still admit to the possibility that a higher public need for turning them to some other use might conceivably emerge in the future. But we cannot have it the other way around. Once a dam is built, a wild river is lost forevermore.

The committee majority resisted attempts to move the Salmon and Clearwater back into the study group of rivers because they typify, more than any others, the national wild rivers concept of streams that should become portions of the initial system. Keeping these rivers in the first group has been endorsed by the major newspapers of Idaho, by our Governor, the Idaho Fish and Game Commission, and numerous Idaho sport and wildlife organizations. The introduction of the bill resulted in a tremendous outpouring of mail from the citizens of Idaho in support of it.

Other changes made in committee include the moving of the Suwannee and Green from the initial group back to the study group of rivers, and the Eleven Point from the study group up to the initial group. The committee felt both the Suwannee and Green should have additional consideration because of problems peculiar to each area. On the other hand, the Eleven Point was moved to the initial group at the request of the Missouri Senators and the Governor of that State.

The reported bill was scheduled to be taken up by the Senate near the close of the last session. It was at this time that the Idaho Water Resorces Board, a newly created Idaho State agency, called a public hearing on the ultimate uses of the Clearwater and the Salmon. Out of deference to the board, which had scheduled its hearing for a date after adjournment, the Senate leadership agreed to my request to delay consideration of this bill until now.

No doubt, popular support for this bill in Idaho has been occasioned, in part, by a realization of the growing importance of outdoor recreation to the economy of our State. Tourism—hunting, fishing, the burgeoning numbers of summer vacationers seeking escape from the confinement of megalopolis—is the most dynamic force at work in creating new income for the people of the Mountain West. Ten years ago, for example, tourism was a $48 million annual business in Idaho. In 1965, the figure is expected to surpass $175 million. In less than two handfuls of years, tourism his spiraled upward to become Idaho's third most important source of revenue.

And the expansion has just begun. In the next 35 years, the population of this country will double. The demand for outdoor recreation will triple. The great majority of Americans will be more affluent and have more time for recreation than they do today. Projections indicate that they will have more than twice as much disposable per capita income and paid-vacation time as in 1960. Their average workweek will have decreased from 39 to 32 hours. Obviously, the future of America's vacationlands is filled with promise.

What we make of that future, and how successfully we pass along to posterity the enjoyment of these scenic and recreational resources, depends upon how well we husband them. It depends, in short, upon how farsighted we are in insisting upon a wisely balanced development of our natural endowment. In places where the terrain permits—as in southern Idaho—we shall want to use unappropriated water for new reclamation projects; in other places, on rivers already obstructed, we shall want to build new power dams; but in still other places, in areas of mountain-locked grandeur where the water still runs pure and free, we should seek to preserve our finest untamed streams by including them with a national wild rivers system.

Mr. President, the cause I plead is not only that of those of us who sponsor this bill. It is that of the foremost conservationists of this country; it is that of the people, the large majority of whom, I am persuaded, earnestly favor the passage of this bill.

And it is that of the President of the United States, who has said that if future generations are to remember us more with gratitude than sorrow, we must leave more than a legacy of technology.

"We must also leave them," Lyndon Johnson has said, with "a glimpse of the world as God really made it, not just as it looked when we got through with it."

Let us pass this bill, and assure those future generations that they, too, may know and enjoy these wonderful rivers as God made them.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the wild rivers proposal now pending before the Senate. I think we can all agree that great strides have been made in recent years to meet the increasing outdoor recreation demands of the American people. I am proud to be chairman of the legislative committee in the Senate which has had initial responsibility for processing these great measures, affecting the well-being of all of our citizens. Several important additions have been made to our national park system since 1961. Also enacted into law have been such historic conservation measures as the Wilderness Preservation System, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, and the Organic Recreation Act, giving statutory guidelines to the operation of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Although much has been accomplished, much more needs to be done to meet the obligation which the Congress must meet to fulfill the needs of our Great Society. The bill before us today is a fitting addition to the long list of accomplishments in the field of conservation and wise utilization of a portion of our national heritage.

Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 1446, the wild rivers bill—and as chairman of the committee which reported it after extensive deliberations—I want to stress that I believe this legislation is imperative.

It is imperative if we are to preserve these remarkable remnants of the original American landscape, for without such protection they are subject to possible destruction. Once gone, they are lost forever.

The two leadoff rivers in the bill, segments of the Salmon and Clearwater in Idaho, are also the major spawning grounds on the Columbia River system for salmon and steelhead trout. These nurseries are invaluable to Pacific Northwest sport and commercial fisheries. Placing them in the National Wild Rivers System will prevent the destruction and elimination of the nurseries and the runs.

Preservation of wild streams is also urgent because industrial and other pressures will not relent, but rather increase with each passing year. We must act now to save some of the river segments which so vividly illustrate the original majesty of America's untamed waterways.

The bill which the committee reports to the floor, even with its minority report, was hammered out in full agreement that a National Wild Rivers System is needed. Numerous amendments were adopted to protect water and other rights. The final amendment, unanimously agreed upon in committee, is one which establishes a review commission to assure that if a greater public need occurs in the future, the commission could recommend to Congress the removal of a river from the system.

Mr. President, I am particularly proud of my committee in its handling of this bill. Members devoted long hours to discussion and analysis of its every aspect at a time when the pressure of their office and floor work was tremendous. As evidenced by the minority report, there was disagreement over some of the bill's provisions, but none as to the objective and the necessity of the legislation. Indeed, the minority report states:

> This is a highly praiseworthy use of America's dwindling resources to meet the ever-increasing demand of our pleasure-seeking population and has its rightful place in the overall plan of national outdoor recreation.

I am sure we all agree on the need to act on the measure without delay.

Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to all members of the committee, those who agreed as well as those who disagreed with some provisions in the bill, as indicated in the majority and minority reports.

I wish to pay special tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho for his conscientious efforts in regard to this bill and the many hours he spent going over the amendments. He has been thoughtful throughout. I believe that the bill before the Senate is the product of the give and take of the committee process to an extent I have not seen in a long, long time.

I commend the bill to the Senate and urge its early passage.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I oppose the bill in its present form, although I hope amendments can be adopted that will make it possible for me to support the bill.

I have two questions to ask the Senator from Washington at this time.

The bill, S. 1446, at page 17 contains an item, No. 17, which places the proposed Skagit Wild Rivers Area under the study section of the bill. Will the Senator from Washington advise me as to why the Skagit area was not placed under the so-called instant wild rivers area section of the bill?

Mr. JACKSON. The Skagit River came in the study provision of the bill because it was recommended in that way.

After long and careful study by those in the Department of Interior it was not found to be one of the rivers recommended for immediate inclusion. It was one of the rivers included in the study category from the very beginning.

The chairman of the committee did not change this item, nor did he previously consult with the Department or ask that it be changed from the form in which it was submitted. It came to the committee in that form.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator from Washington any objection to removing the Rogue River, item No. 3 of the so-called instant wild river section of the bill, and having that project placed in the study section?

Mr. JACKSON. I say to my good friend that it was my definite impression that there was no opposition to the Rogue River in the Wild Rivers System.

It was my definite understanding that there was general agreement on this item, and I hope it will be kept in the bill.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator should know, before I get down to my opposition to the bill in its present form, that there is no agreement on the Rogue River. There is great disagreement in my State.

I assume responsibility for the fact that I was not aware of the action of the committee and the fact that legislation of this type comes as a great surprise to the senior Senator from Oregon.

I respectfully suggest that both the Department of the Interior and the committee should have delayed, and perhaps make the senior Senator from Oregon aware of what is proposed in the bill in relation to the Rogue River. They should have advised and consulted with me.

The present provision with regard to the Rogue River is totally unacceptable to the senior Senator from Oregon, and I shall oppose that section of the bill.

Mr. JACKSON. I appreciate and respect the comments of the Senator. I will await with interest his reasons for the objection or inclusion of the river in the regular part of the bill.

We received letters from Oregon. There was a statement by the county commissioner of Josephine County in Oregon, as I recall, in support of it, and another letter from the parks service of Josephine County, Oreg., dated April 19, in support of it, and other letters which were included in the record.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I had the distinct impression—I do not know what impression other Senators had at the time—that the inclusion of the Rogue River was acceptable. I can understand that obviously there may be reasons for objection. I shall await and listen with interest, of course, to the debate on this point.

Mr. MORSE. I will comment in some detail later. I wish to say in passing that it would be a great mistake to assume unanimity in my State in regard to including it prior to putting in the study program.

Mr. JACKSON. I appreciate that, and I shall await with interest the discussion on this point.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for the statement he made and also for the encouragement he gave to members of the committee in the course of the extensive hearings that were held. I have referred to those hearings, some of which were held in Washington, and some in the West.

I wish to underline what the Senator from Washington has said. The evidence coming to the committee from Oregon was largely favorable. We did not know, at any time during the past year while the bill was before the committee, of any serious objection to the inclusion of the Rogue River from within the State of Oregon.

However, as the Senator from Oregon knows, I shall try to reach a satisfactory arrangement with him, if at all possible, provided we do not emasculate the bill or destroy the efficacy of the system it creates.

Again, I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho; and I express again to him my personal appreciation for the fine way in which he handled the hearing for the chairman.

TRUTH IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, when the President delivered his state of the Union message to Congress last Wednesday night, he advocated legislation to provide truth in packaging and truth in lending.

Both proposals were recommended as being necessary to protect American consumers from misrepresentation in the cost of interest and to require proper labeling in the quality and quantity of groceries.

To supplement those two proposals I am today recommending that a third step be taken—that is, more truth in government. I am hoping that the President will lend his support to this third proposal, which is most essential to protect American taxpayers from misrepresentation with respect to the true costs of some of the legislative proposals of the Great Society, and the true facts as to the actual deficits that are being incurred under this administration.

I make this appeal for truth in government because I believe the American people have a right to know that the expenditures under this administration are the most extravagant of any administration heretofore in the history of our country.

During the past 5 years the deficits of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have exceeded $31,500 million. This does not take into account the deficit which is expected and projected for June 30 of this year. This amount is equivalent to $6 billion a year more than is taken in. It represents $500 million every month beyond our income.

This spending beyond our income and assuming the Government is on a 5-day workweek means that we have been living $25 million a day beyond our income for the past 5 years.

The deficits of the past 5 years alone have exceeded the total cost of all Government expenditures during the 5 years between 1914 and 1919, a period which included the total cost of World War I. This compares the deficits of this administration with the total cost of Government expenditures, including the cost of World War I, between 1914 and 1919.

The deficits of the Great Society in the past 5 years exceed the total expenditures of the New Deal administration in the 5 years between 1933 and 1938. All these deficits have been created in the midst of the flowery speeches and promises about how the budget is being balanced. We are always looking forward to the future, to that great day when the country will be living within its income.

Frankly, I am wondering if the only hope of ever balancing the budget is the hope of the administration that some day the Republican Party will take over and restore some degree of fiscal responsibility.

Anyway, let us go back to the statements that have been made in the past. Let us go back to January 30, 1961, when President Kennedy, in his state of the Union message, told Congress:

> It is my current intention to advocate a program of expenditures which with resulting revenues from a stimulation of the economy will not of and by themselves unbalance the budget.

The deficit for fiscal 1962—that same years—was $6,378 million, or more than $500 million a month.

The following year, 1962, President Kennedy addressed a joint session of Congress on January 11. He said:

> I am submitting for fiscal 1963 a balanced Federal budget.

The deficit for fiscal 1963 was $6,266 million.

The following year, 1963, President Kennedy in his message to Congress on January 14 said:

> I will shortly submit a fiscal 1964 administrative budget which, while allowing for needed rises in defense, space, and fixed interest charges, holds total expenditures for all other purposes below this year's level.

The deficit for that year jumped to $8,226 million, or an average monthly rate of almost $700 million a month beyond income.

On January 21, 1964, President Johnson, in his first state of the Union message to Congress, said:

> My proposals call for administrative budget expenditures in 1965 of $97.9 billion—$900 million less than requested in the 1964 budget.

Continuing, he said:

> This marks an important first step toward a balanced budget.

The deficit for this fiscal year was $6.281 billion, or again more than $500 million a month.

The following year, on January 4, 1965, President Johnson, in his state of the Union message, said:

> We will continue along the path toward a balanced budget in a balanced economy.

The policy of a deficit was continued. The deficit for fiscal 1966 is estimated to be about $7 billion, and that does not include the $2.687 billion which represents the results of the accelerated corporate tax approved last year, a subject which I shall discuss in a moment.

By the administration's own figures, the deficit for 1966 will be $9.687 billion; yet last week President Johnson, in his state of the Union message to a joint session of Congress, said he would reduce the deficit for fiscal 1967 to $1.8 billion.

I say that a program of truth in government is needed. The American taxpayers have a right to know whether the labels being put on the Government's financial package are accurate, true descriptions, because based on the Treasury Department's own figures, the estimated deficit for fiscal 1967 is not $1.8 billion, but $9.2 billion.

I shall explain that point.

Last year Congress passed a tax revision bill, although it was called a tax cut—by the way, it was the shortest tax cut in the history of the country. It has been referred to as a Texas crew-style tax cut. The American people hardly had a chance to think about it before the proposal to repeal it was made. It reminds one of the shell game—now you see it; now you do not.

Under the President's proposal the rate at which Americans will pay their taxes will again be accelerated. Last year Congress advanced corporate payments into the 1966 fiscal year in the amount of $1.260 billion, and under the same proposal $1.340 billion was moved into the 1967 fiscal year.

In addition the Government is now coining new silver quarters and half dollars having a lower content of silver. As a result, the seigniorage from these new coins is estimated to enable the Government to make a profit in the next fiscal year of $2.5 billion over and above what it would have received if the coinage of full content silver coins had been continued. This extra profit is being included as a part of the general revenue. It is nonrecurring revenue, but it is being included as though it were additional or continuing revenue.

In the 1966 fiscal year the Government sold copper and other material from its stockpiles to the value of $332 million. This, too, was included in fiscal 1966 income, although it is a nonrecurring item.

In the President's message of last Wednesday night a further acceleration of the corporate tax payments was recommended. If Congress accedes to the President's request the Government will collect in fiscal 1967 an additional $3.2 billion in taxes from the corporations. This is not counting increased taxes to be received from the reinstated telephone and automobile taxes. I am speaking now only of the accelerated corporation taxes under the President's request. It would move forward $1 billion extra of the corporate taxes into fiscal 1966 and into fiscal 1967, another $3.2 billion.

The withholding tax acceleration for individuals recommended by the Treasury Department would bring another $95 million into fiscal 1966 and $400 million in the next fiscal year.

Stated otherwise, this is the same as borrowing on next week's salary to pay this week's grocery bills—and that is exactly what it is. By accelerating the payment of corporate taxes plus the profit on the coinage of the new silver coins the Government will collect in the fiscal year 1966 an extra $2.687 billion and $7.440 billion in fiscal year 1967. These are nonrecurring items.

If we add this $7.4 billion to the $1.8 billion deficit predicted by the President we find that they will be spending $9.240 billion more in fiscal 1967 than they are taking in. When we reach the point next year where we shall not have a chance to include nonrecurring items we will be confronted overnight with a drastic proposal to raise the taxes to finance such proposals or we will have a tremendous increase in the deficit and the resulting wild inflation.

The only thing the administration's proposal for accelerated payments would do would be to postpone the day when we must tell the American people the truth, which the administration probably hopes will not be until after the 1966 congressional elections.

We need a truth in government program, and I hope that the administration will support this new plan. Let us label it "Truth in Government." We certainly do not want the LBJ brand, which is being put on so many of the programs, ever to become synonymous with the slogan, "Little Budget Juggling." Surely such a slogan would not please the President. To prevent this I hope that he will lend his support toward telling the American people the truth as to exactly what the administration is spending. Let the administration tell the taxpayers it is spending in excess of its income at the rate of $500 to $600 million per month and that the deficit is continuing to rise.

In addition, there is no provision in last year's budget as it was submitted to the Congress—and we are told that it will not be in the budget which will come to us next month—for the approximately $14 billion that the administration will ask for in the way of supplemental appropriations to finance the war in Vietnam.

Certainly, we will appropriate this money to finance the Vietnam war. With our boys dying on the foreign battlefield, none of us, regardless of how we may feel concerning economy in Government, will try to curtail expenditures in that particular field. Nevertheless, let us tell the American people the truth as to what this war is costing. This $14 billion is the taxpayers' money, and either taxes will be raised or it will further increase the debt. To finance all these expenditures by debt would only be accelerating the inflation in this country.

The President in his message on last Wednesday night referred to the fact that the cash flow of the Government will actually exceed expenditures, as though that were something great and unusual.

When we discuss the cash flow of the Government we are including in that figure all of the money that is collected under social security, the money that is collected for the medicare program—which does not go into effect until later this year—the railroad retirement fund collections, and all of the civil service retirement deductions.

These are trust fund receipts and are in no way, to be confused with the administrative budget. To quote such figures as an indication of a balanced budget is misleading and does not represent truth in government.

Certainly no man, not even the President of the United States, is going to recommend the commingling of all of these trust funds, or the liquidating of those trust funds to pay for the Great Society programs. If that is being recommended let it be known.

The only way that we can finance the deficit is by borrowing money and charging it up to our grandchildren, as we have been doing. The Government of the United States does not have access to any mysterious source of income, contrary to what many people think. The only source of revenue of the Federal Government is the money which has first been taken, either directly or indirectly, out of the pockets of the taxpayers. Otherwise we create a deficit, borrow the money, and charge it up to the generations to come. This is what this administration has been doing.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] just suggested that they may be planning to print the money, and that would mean a complete breakdown of our currency.

This administration, which has shed so many crocodile tears as to how they sympathize and respect the plight of the aged, has been doing more to pauperize the aged in this country than any administration in the history of America. This administration through its inflationary policies has destroyed the life savings of the retired people by destroying the purchasing power of their pensions, their life insurance policies, their savings accounts, and their savings bonds. Many are finding today that they cannot make both ends meet because of inflation. This is a planned inflation of this administration. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget boasted to the Committee on Finance that these deficits were planned and that they actually thought there was virtue in them. Now that inflation appears to be getting out of hand they are beginning to panic and to suggest numerous one-shot remedies to correct the deficits. They still have not demonstrated the courage to advocate a program of reducing expenditures or raising taxes.

If any man wants to discover what inflation means in America, he can take a Series E bond. Eight or ten years ago one paid $75 to get back $100 today. The Government is paying the $100. However, one cannot buy with the $100 today what he could have purchased with $50 eight or ten years ago when he purchased the bond. This has been caused by the inflation which has destroyed not only the earned interest on the bond but also a part of the principle.

There are many retired schoolteachers today and retired workers from private industry and government who have discovered that their pensions are not adequate to take care of their needs.

As a result of this planned inflation the aged have been pauperized to the extent that they cannot buy their groceries and necessities of life. Many now find it necessary to appeal for public charity. And the spendthrift policies of the Great Society are responsible for this gradual erosion of the value of the dollar.

This Government cannot spend itself into prosperity on borrowed money any more than a man can go out on Monday morning and drink himself sober. One is as ridiculous as the other.

The Great Society must accept the full responsibility of the inflation which they have deliberately planned.

If we study the history of inflation in any country we will find that inflation does not hurt the big man. Most of the investments owned by such people consist of fixed assets, stocks, securities, or perhaps television stations. The more wealthy own X percent of America, whether it is valued at $1 million or $2 million. It would not make any difference. He would still own X percent of America, and as inflation expands, his net worth increases.

However, a workingman or a man who is trying to live on a fixed salary or a pension is the one who really suffers under inflation, and he is the man who cannot afford it.

I believe that it is high time that we have a true truth-in-government policy and that this administration should stop trying to camouflage the costs of its program with a lot of fancy labels in an attempt to deceive the American people.

The administration should tell the people exactly what these programs cost and what the deficit is. Instead they are pauperizing the aged in this country and promoting a policy by which the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

The administration is pauperizing the very people for whom they are expressing sympathy and shedding crocodile tears.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated in the RECORD a statement by the Secretary of the Treasury showing how these accelerated payments on the corporate taxes and graduated withholding will increase the tax revenues in the fiscal years 1966 and 1967. These are the figures which I have just outlined. In addition, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a letter signed by the Secretary of the Treasury under the date of December 17, signed by Joseph W. Barr, Acting Secretary, in which he outlines the $2.5 billion profit that can accrue as a result of the so-called seigniorage, or the changing of the silver content of the coins. I also ask unanimous consent that a statement dated January 6, 1966, by the Joint Committee on Taxation showing the result of acceleration of the corporate taxes under the 1964 law. The first chart shows the results of the suggestion contained in the President's message.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated revenue effects on President's tax proposals (assuming Mar. 15, 1966 enactment)

[In millions of dollars]

	Receipts increase	
	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967
1. Excises:		
Local and long-distance telephone, and teletypewriter service (if effective Apr. 1, 1976)		790
Automobiles (if effective Mar. 15, 1966)	60	420
2. Corporate income taxpayment speedup (if effective Apr. 15, 1966)	1,000	3,200
3. Graduated withholding system for individual income taxes (if effective May 1, 1966)	95	400
Total (administrative budget effect)	1,155	4,810
4. Self-employment tax, social security quarterly payment (if effective June 15, 1966) [1]	100	100

[1] Estimate refers to effect upon cash budget receipts.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis, January 1966.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, December 17, 1965.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: The following information is supplied in response to your letter of December 3, which was previously acknowledged.

1. The acceleration of corporate tax payments provided in the Revenue Act of 1964 produced estimated additional receipts of approximately one and a quarter billion dollars during fiscal years 1964 and 1965 combined.

2. Seigniorage profits on the new coinage will depend upon the production necessary to catch up with current demands and meet future demands for coins. Seigniorage in fiscal years 1966 and 1967 combined has been estimated at from under $1.5 to $2.5 billion. These estimates are under review in connection with the 1967 budget. Beyond these years, after the backlog in demand has been met, seigniorage receipts can be expected to fall sharply, perhaps to $200 to $300 million per year.

Seigniorage profits are covered into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous budget receipts. Minor amounts are automatically appropriated for expenses of coinage distribution and wastage, and the costs of alloy metals used in subsidiary silver coins, but otherwise seigniorage is not earmarked for specific purposes. Again, in connection with the 1967 budget, President Johnson has requested Secretary Fowler, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to study the accounting treatment accorded seigniorage and to make appropriate recommendations.

Whether seigniorage is an artificial receipt or not, is, of course, a matter of definition. Seigniorage from coinage has always been a continuing, although minor, receipt item. The bulge in seigniorage receipts expected in fiscal years 1966 and 1967 represents largely a catching up on the sharp rise in demands for coins in the past several years.

3. Profits from the sale of silver bullion amounted to about $13 million during the fiscal years 1961–65. Receipts from this source are covered into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous budget receipts.

4. Proceeds from the sales or disposition from the strategic and critical materials stockpile during the fiscal years 1961–1965 amounted to $595.5 million. This was covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous budget receipts. Of the total amount, $49.9 million was set aside in a special fund to cover the major portion of the costs of acquisition and operations of the strategic and critical materials stockpile. The remainder, $545.6 million, was used to support general fund expenditures. The year-by-year receipts were as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

1961	80.1
1962	53.4
1963	74.0
1964	129.5
1965	258.5

The original purchases of materials in the national stockpile were reflected as budget expenditures at the time the purchase transactions took place. The proceeds from subsequent disposal of surplus materials from the stockpile are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Inventories accumulated under provision of the Defense Production Act of 1950, while separate from the strategic and critical materials stockpile (national stockpile) discussed above, are reflected in the determination of total stockpile objectives and as such are included by some in their definition of national stockpile. Proceeds from the sales from the Defense Production Act inventory during fiscal years 1961–65 amounted to $192.3 million. These proceeds are treated as income to a public enterprise revolving fund and are thus deducted from the funds expenses in arriving at net budget expenditures. The year-by-year sales the Defense Production Act inventory were as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

1961	34.0
1962	37.8
1963	14.5
1964	31.6
1965	74.4

5. The Treasury gold stock on December 31, 1964, amounted to $15,388 million. On December 6, 1965, the total was $13,809 million. The decrease is principally the result of foreign purchases of gold although total sales included moderate domestic sales for industrial and artistic purposes.

Sales (or purchases) of gold, whether domestic or foreign, are treated as exchanges of assets; i.e., the reduction in the Treasurer's gold is offset by an increase (decrease) in his deposit balances. For this reason, these sales do not affect budget expenditures nor the deficit. Sales of gold, of course, reduce our total gold reserves.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. BARR,
Acting Secretary.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL
REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, January 6, 1966.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your request to Mr. Vail, chief clerk of the Senate Committee on Finance, for estimates of the effect of the acceleration of corporate tax payments enacted in 1964.

At the time the bill was being considered we prepared estimates of the effect of the acceleration, assuming that corporate profits continued at the 1963 levels. These estimates are as follows:

Effect of acceleration of corporate tax payment

	Millions
1964	+$230
1965	+710
1966	+1,260
1967	+1,340
1968	+1,340
1969	+890
1970	+800
1971	+130
1972	0

The actual level of corporate profits increased in 1964 and again in 1965. The tax collections reported by the Internal Revenue do not separate the accelerated payments, but from the collections as reported we estimate that the effect of the acceleration in the fiscal year 1965 was close to $1 billion. For the current fiscal year, 1966, we now expect that the speedup will increase receipts by an amount between $1½ and $2 billion. We use a range for this year because we do not have a firm figure for corporate profits in 1966, and we have not carried the revision through the years beyond 1966.

I hope this information meets your needs.

Sincerely yours,

LAURENCE N. WOODWORTH,
Chief of Staff.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr President, I wish to make one further comment about truth in government. That pertains to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation has borrowing authority up to $14.5 billion. As of their most recent statement they owed the U.S. Government $12,129,383,000.

On that same date, the investment that was in inventory and loans to Commodity Credit Corporation was only $6,233,896,646. If the Government were able to liquidate its entire holdings of agricultural commodities and obtain in return therefor the full investment plus all storage costs—which we do not believe they can do—it would amount to $6.233 billion, or a deficit of $5.895 billion.

This actual loss has not been faced by the administration in its budgetary requests, with the result that a true picture of our deficit is reduced by that amount.

A truth-in-government policy would correct this misleading information.

This nearly $6 billion does not consist entirely of last year's deficit. Part of it is last year's, and part of it is from the year before. It relates to the last 2 or 3 years. However, they are deficits which have been realized but not written off.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] last year tried to get Congress to recognize that method as being unrealistic and unfair, and tried to get Congress to appropriate money so that we could show the true cost.

I supported the Senator on that proposal, and I complimented him on his effort. However, we were not successful because the administration did not want the American people to know that there is another $5 billion that has been spent. The administration did not want to admit the true deficit.

Mr. President, we need truth in government. While the administration has this subject on its mind and is advocating the need for truth in lending and packaging all I ask is that it start practicing what it is preaching and give us some truth in government. The administration should tell the American people just exactly what these programs will cost and what will happen to the American dollar if spendthrift policies of this administration are continued.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I compliment the Senator from Delaware on the excellent presentation that he has made to the Senate today. It is very important that this subject be taken into consideration during our deliberations in the Senate.

It is my understanding that the national payroll of Federal employees will exceed more than 2½ million this year. The administration has already confessed that bills passed in the last session will call for the employment of an additional 100,000 employees. Does the Senator know what that would add to the deficit?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not have the exact figures, but the amount would be substantial, I assure the Senator. There is no question that those extra people will be employed. As I said before, the Government has access to no mysterious sources of income. It distributes back to the taxpayers a part of what it takes from them in the first instance. As we establish these new programs we inevitably establish a new bureaucracy.

That is why I say that the taxpayers are bound to lose in connection with these Federal aid programs. About 20 percent of the amount involved will be used to pay the salaries of the bureaucracy which will be set up here in Washington to distribute the money to the taxpayers. This bureaucracy will be set up for the purpose of distributing the money back to the taxpayers and telling them how to spend it.

No one gets anything for nothing out of the Federal Government. Some day we will wake up to that truth.

LETTERS TO VIETNAM SOLDIERS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, some fine young students at Woodrow Wilson High School, Beckley, W. Va., recently wrote open letters to American soldiers in Vietnam, and the letters were published in the Beckley Raleigh Register.

The letters bear evidence of the fine spirit which I believe is more prevalent among American youth than is the regrettable attitude shown by a small minority of students, which has been given wide and damaging publicity as a result of the demonstrations and protest marches against our Nation's role in southeast Asia.

I commend the Junior Historian Club of Woodrow Wilson High School for its activities in this sphere, and for the breadth of vision shown by initiating this correspondence, and I particularly congratulate Nicky Joe Rahall, Cheryl Toombs, Mike Griffith, and Peggy McGowan for their forthright and articulate patriotic expressions. It is interesting to note that Nicky Joe Rahall won top honor in the 1965 "Voice of Democracy" contest in Raleigh County and went on to compete for the district title. He is an example of the worthwhile young people coming to maturity in my State. The son of a prominent Beckley, W. Va., businessman, he is also the grandson of an immigrant from Lebanon who over 50 years ago peddled merchandise over the hills and among the coal-mining community in the Beckley area of West Virginia and who, in later years, made significant contributions to the community life of the region.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letters, as published by the newspaper, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the published letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Beckley (W. Va.) Raleigh Register, Nov. 7, 1965]

BECKLEY, W. VA.,
November 1963.

DEAR SOLDIERS IN VIETNAM: The members of our club, as citizens of the great country you are fighting for, wish to thank you for all you are doing for us in Vietnam.

Our country was established by people who were deeply concerned that the rights of men should not be violated. The United States has always stood for these rights. This Nation has waged great wars to protect our own people and people of other nations from despotic rulers. Is this country to change its policy now?

No, now more than ever before, the United States is needed to combat communism and preserve the American tradition. Now, more than ever before, the individual soldier is important in defending this tradition which millions in years past have lived and died to defend. Mere numbers of troops cannot win this war, only the determination of every man to do his duty.

We are concerned about every American soldier in Vietnam. Through newspapers and television we see the kind of life you must live. We hope that through this short message we can show just a small amount of appreciation for the work you must do. We also wish that each and every American would express to you the thankfulness we feel as you defend our homes, families, and countries on the other side of the world.

Again thank you. May God grant to you a safe and speedy return to America.

JUNIOR HISTORIAN CLUB,
Woodrow Wilson High School.

The Junior Historian Club of Woodrow Wilson High School has gone on record as supporting the U.S. role in Vietnam in contrast with many extremist youths throughout the country who are staging organized protest.

The junior historians state their policy in the above letter.

A series of four articles written by junior historians on the war will appear in this week's Register.

[From the Beckley (W. Va.) Raleigh Register, Nov. 8, 1965]

DEAR VIETNAM SOLDIER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the first of a series of four letters supporting America's role in Vietnam. The articles are written by members of the Junior Historian Club at Woodrow Wilson High School.)

TO AMERICAN MEN IN VIETNAM: OUR prayers are with you and our praise is for you. America stands tall because of your courage.

As you probably know there have been demonstrations here in the United States against the American policy in Vietnam and against our very presence in Asia. Please rest assured that this is a minority movement, the work of what you might call "extremists," who you will probably find have been against everything that is done by the United States.

These groups, in my opinion, are uneducated as to why we are fighting in Vietnam and they do not realize that the future of the United States is indirectly involved. They should realize that the failure or withdrawal of American troops would be disastrous for democracy and help establish a larger Communist foothold in the world with the next step coming down on the United States directly.

When my military career approaches, as it soon will, I would not hesitate to fight in Vietnam for my country.

Most of the American hearts are with you in Vietnam.

Men, thanks for doing your best, and I hope you can feel the support of the American people behind you. We want to see you in the near future living here in the United States and enjoying the fruits of your labor. Upon you, our men in Vietnam, rests the destiny of the United States of America.

Sincerely,

NICKY JOE RAHALL.

[From the Beckley (W. Va.) Raleigh Register, Nov. 9, 1965]

DEAR VIETNAM SOLDIER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the second in a series of letters written by members of the Junior Historians Club of Woodrow Wilson High School to servicemen in Vietnam.)

TO OUR BRAVE FIGHTING MEN: Your purpose in Vietnam, your being in that strange country, is one of today's most honorable duties; you are protecting the freedom of the entire world, as well as that of your own country. Without you, communism would take over and then spread like a horrible plague all over the world. You are guarding our very lives as freemen, and yet some condemn you for it.

I wonder if they ever really thought about what living under a tyrannical government such as that of Russia would mean. Do they realize that, without our boys in Vietnam, Russia's communism would sweep over America, and future generations would be brought up knowing freedom no more—except as something that existed long ago?

This letter is to let you know that I, for one, am very grateful that you are there to insure freedom, and highly commend you for your part in the preservation of democracy for mankind.

Sincerely,

MISS CHERYL TOOMBS.

[From the Beckley (W. Va.) Raleigh Register, Nov. 10, 1965]

DEAR VIETNAM SOLDIER

TO OUR BOYS IN VIETNAM: Our efforts in Vietnam have recently been questioned by an organized protest from some of the students in the United States. These groups have been proven to be a minority group. The predominate feeling, however, is backing fullheartedly the administration's present policy in Vietnam.

We realize that we have to stop Communist oppression now, for the consequences for delaying our actions against these aggressors will be much worse than our casualties now.

We owe a great deal of gratitude to you who are defending our principles in Vietnam. The United States was founded and has survived because of our determination to preserve democracy. Only by this same determination can the United States survive in the future. Your supreme effort in Vietnam could possibly be rewarded by the establishment of a free and peaceful world with no fear of aggression.

Sincerely,

MIKE GRIFFITH.

[From the Beckley (W. Va.) Raleigh Register, Nov. 12, 1965]

DEAR VIETNAM SOLDIER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the last of four letters, written by members of the Woodrow Wilson Junior Historian Club, dedicated to fighting men in Vietnam.)

DEAR SOLDIERS: Keep fighting. The heavy burden of preserving our democracy falls on your shoulders. In your hands, you hold the weapons to destroy the communism that is slowly devouring our democracy. We have spoken our policies. Now, we must fight for them.

It was nearly two centuries ago when this country was established. The world has since wondered how long a democracy can exist? Is it strong enough to back its policies by force?

Up to this time, America has stunned the world. She is a living example of a democracy, surviving in a world of communism.

Today, however, we face entirely new conditions. Western Europe has recovered its economic strength and military potential. Russia commands a vast war machine with a full nuclear arsenal. Can our country stand up to these powers?

America is not an imperialistic nation. Her aim is to defend the rights of people in Vietnam and to stop the spread of communism.

Many Americans are against our policy in Vietnam. They burn their draft cards, and many go as far as to burn themselves. What purpose does this accomplish?

Meanwhile in Vietnam, soliders trudge through the hot sun for 21 cents an hour. They face such problems as hunger, leeches, disease and bullets. These men really stand for something. They make me proud to be an American.

Thank you, soldiers, for your outstanding example and the great courage you have displayed in Vietnam. May God bless you and bring you safely home to our beloved America.

A loyal West Virginian,

PEGGY MCGOWAN.

RETIREMENT OF DR. HUGH ELSBREE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it was with regret that I learned that Hugh L. Elsbree, Director of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress, will retire from that position in February.

Dr. Elsbree has served the Federal Government with distinction for more than 21 years—19 of them in the Library of Congress and the last 7 of them in his present position. A political scientist of wide repute and a dedicated public official, Dr. Elsbree has earned the respect and the confidence of the Congress through his skillful and competent leadership of the Legislative Reference Service in a period when Congress has experienced its greatest need for research assistance.

L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, in announcing Dr. Elsbree's forthcoming retirement, paid tribute to the standards of excellence that Dr. Elsbree has set for the analytical studies and reports produced for Congress.

Dr. Elsbree came to the Library in 1945 as research counsel in the Legislative Reference Service. He was already splendidly equipped to take on the responsible task of providing consultative assistance to Members of the Congress. A graduate of Harvard University, where he received his B.A., M.A., and Ph. D. degrees in political science, he was also a Sheldon traveling fellow in Paris and Geneva. He joined the Harvard faculty in 1928 and taught government there until 1933.

In 1931 the Harvard University Press published his study, "Interstate Transmission of Electric Power," and in 1934 he had his first experience in public service, acting for several months as a research specialist for the Federal Power Commission. From 1933 until 1943 he was on the faculty of Dartmouth College, holding the position of chairman of the political science department from 1937 to 1941. He became a war service employee in 1943, serving as principal business economist at the Office of Price Administration until 1945, when he joined the staff of the Bureau of the Budget as administrative analyst. In November of that year he went to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

In 1946, Dr. Elsbree was promoted to senior specialist in American government and public administration, the highest research position in that subject in the Legislative Reference Service, a position, incidentally, created by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide Congress with the highest level of staff assistance. His expert analyses, his thorough background briefings, his penetrating studies of legislative issues, especially in the fields of governmental reorganization and executive-legislative relations, were models of professional staff competence. His work was so highly regarded that several congressional committees sought to borrow him for extended periods. In 1951–52 Dr. Elsbree served as Acting Assistant Director of the Service.

In 1954 the newly created Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—the well-known "Kestnbaum Commission"—pressed the Library for his services and he was released on loan. As its deputy research director, Dr. Elsbree provided unusual skill and leadership for the Commission's complex task, and he was highly praised for his role in the successful conclusion of the study. When he returned to the Library in October 1955, he was appointed Deputy Director of the Legislative Reference Service. He left the Service for a brief period in 1957 to accept the chairmanship of the political science department at Wayne State University. In 1958 he came back to the Library to be Director of the Legislative Reference Service, and he has served in that capacity since that time.

Dr. Elsbree has shaped and reshaped the Legislative Reference Service to meet Congress always changing and, it seems, ever-enlarging needs. A recent example of this administrative sensitivity has been demonstrated when Dr. Elsbree advocated and the Library obtained congressional authorization to establish a Science Policy Research Division within the Service. This is now providing assistance in the fields of science and public policy, fields of intense governmental involvement where choices involving billions of Federal dollars are made each session.

Under Dr. Elsbree's guidance, the work of the Service has had a profound, although usually unpublicized, effect on the legislation enacted by the Congress. The Legislative Reference Service researcher provides much basic information and many analyses which clarify the problems and the issues, pinpoint the strengths or weaknesses of proposed solutions, evaluate the alternatives, and assist in many other ways in facilitating the legislative process. If the work of the researcher for Congress is normally confidential, it is nevertheless real and substantial, and the many commendations which Dr. Elsbree and his able staff have received from Members and committees of Congress attest to it.

Fortunately for us in the Congress and for the Library, Lester S. Jayson, who has served as Dr. Elsbree's deputy for 4 years and who came to the Library as chief of Legislative Reference Service's American Law Division from the U.S. Department of Justice where he had served in various capacities for 10 years, has been appointed as director of the Service. I am confident that he will carry on the traditions of the Service.

I know that my colleagues in the Congress wish Dr. Elsbree well as he retires and want to thank him for his selfless and dedicated service to this body. It is my information that January 27 will be his last day of active duty.

MR. GEORGE J. TITLER—NEW UMWA VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the United Mine Workers of America has just chosen as its new vice president Mr. George J. Titler of Beckley, W. Va., a man who, in the truest sense of the statement, "came up through the ranks." From the days when he labored as a coal miner, following World War I, in the State of Iowa, on through the years in which he subsequently served as head of UMWA District 29 at Beckley, he has been a dedicated advocate of measures to protect and advance the interests of our Nation's coal miners.

He is well known for his acts of humanitarianism and generosity, such as personally providing a year of financial assistance for various college freshmen.

The Beckley, W. Va., Post Herald and Register on January 16 reported the appointment of Mr. Titler as UMWA vice president, and I request unanimous consent to have this newspaper article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> WASHINGTON.—George J. Titler, of Beckley, W. Va., was chosen Saturday as the new vice president of the United Mine Workers Union.
>
> The $40,000-a-year job in the past has been a steppingstone to the presidency of the independent union, now held by W. A. (Tony) Boyle.
>
> Titler, 70, at present is head of UMW District 29, at Beckley.
>
> His selection as vice president was by unanimous approval of the executive board, a UMW spokesman said.
>
> The board had been considering the selection of a vice president for the past week. The post became vacant with the retirement of Raymond O. Lewis, brother of former UMW President John L. Lewis.
>
> Titler, a native of Pennsylvania, served in World War I. After that he worked in the coal mines of Iowa for 15 years. In 1937 he was sent by the UMW to Harlan County, Ky., where he was head of an organizing drive which ended in 1941. He transferred that year to West Virginia where he has lived ever since.
>
> Others in the running were Joe Yablonski, president of district 5 in western Pennsylvania; Harrison Combs, assistant director of the union's legal department; and John M. Kmetz of Nanticoke, Pa., director of the union.
>
> Titler became president of district 29 in 1942.
>
> Although considered the dark horse candidate this year, Titler is no stranger to the political wars of the UMW.
>
> In 1947 he was mentioned as a possible successor to John O'Leary, UMW vice president, who died of a heart attack. And in 1953 he was named by Coal Age magazine as one of the five strongest contenders to take the chair of UMW President John L. Lewis.
>
> Since his election as secretary-treasurer of district 17 of the UMW in 1942, Titler has been a controversial figure.
>
> He was noted as vehemently opposed to the Taft-Hartley bill, which, he charged, was written to destroy the union.
>
> In 1946 he lashed out at the Fayette County political "machine," charging that it would never carry a coal miner on its ticket, except for an occasional candidate for the house of delegates.
>
> In 1947 he spoke out against a plan to cut miners' overtime pay to 96 cents an hour. He labeled the proposal "a screwy idea."
>
> Yet the coal official also was viewed as a man who could lend support, shown during World War II when he urged unity between miners and operators, with high wages for miners, so more defense bonds could be purchased to aid in the national crisis. And during late Gov. William Marland's administration Titler supported the chief executive's proposed severance tax on West Virginia coal.

WEST VIRGINIA POSTMASTER HONORED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Thursday, January 20, Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien will present special merit citations to 14 postmasters in the United States who have significantly improved the exterior and grounds of their post office buildings as part of President Lyndon B. Johnson's natural beauty program. The award presentation will take place in the Postmaster General's reception room in Washington, D.C.

Among the postmasters to be so honored is Mr. James Dinsmoore of St. Marys, W. Va., who has been postmaster of the second-class post office there since 1956. His work in improving the grounds surrounding the postal facility, at no cost to the Federal Government, has been recognized by the Post Office Department. As Postmaster General O'Brien said in announcing the award:

> Post offices across the Nation are becoming leaders in President Johnson's natural beauty program. Postmasters, local postal employee groups, flower and garden clubs, and individual citizens are all cooperating in the project. The post offices have become local showplaces.

I am pleased that Postmaster James Dinsmoore is to receive a merit citation for participation in this program, and I am sure that the St. Marys post office is a true source of civic pride for the citizens of that community and surrounding area.

WILD RIVERS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1446) to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I sent to the desk an amendment contemplating the incorporation into the pending bill, for study as prospective inclusion in the final draft of the bill, two rivers in Ohio. They are the Little Miami River and the Little Beaver River.

Up to this time these two rivers have not been despoiled of their natural richness by the invasion by human beings. They are still substantially in their pristine condition. The streams are clear streams. Their borders are lined with trees in great abundance. This natural beauty should be protected against future spoliation. The rivers should be protected from the contamination that results from the invasion by industry and an increasing population.

One of these rivers, the Little Miami River, runs through Clark County of which Springfield is the county seat; through Greene County, of which Xenia is the county seat; through Warren County, of which Lebanon is the county seat; and through Clermont County, of which Batavia is the county seat. It begins in the vicinity of Clifton, Ohio, in Montgomery County.

The Little Beaver River, with its north and middle forks in Columbiana County, runs from a point in the vicinity of Negly and Elkton, Ohio, downstream to a point in the vicinity of East Liverpool, Ohio, where it runs into the Ohio River.

In my judgment these rivers should be included in the bill.

The rivers are rich in gorges. Although from a comparative standpoint the gorges are small, as one enters the area, one feels that he is in some remote region still possessed of its pristine natural beauty.

I believe that these streams should be included in the bill. I therefore call up my amendment for consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17 in the committee amendment between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

> (12) Little Miami, Ohio—the segment of the Little Miami River in Clark, Greene, Warren, and Clermont Counties from a point in the vicinity of Clifton, Ohio, downstream to a point in the vicinity of Morrow, Ohio.
>
> (13) Little Beaver, Ohio—the segment of the north and middle forks of the Little Beaver River, in Columbiana County, from a point in the vicinity of Negly and Elkton, Ohio, downstream to a point in the vicinity of East Liverpool, Ohio.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in the light of what the distinguished Senator from Ohio has said about the two rivers in Ohio, they would seem to fall within the description of rivers which further study might well disclose are qualified for inclusion in the Wild Rivers System.

Therefore, I am happy to accept the amendment, to add these two streams to the list of rivers that will be considered within the study category of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to have a study made, to determine whether these rivers possess the characteristics which would qualify them for inclusion in the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. I commend the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to be sure that I understand what the Senator from Ohio is proposing. The Senator from Ohio would add two rivers in Ohio to the bill, to be included in the study section of the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection to adding any rivers to the study section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 28, line 12, in the committee amendment, beginning after the semicolon, strike all language down through line 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> Projected, national, regional, or local demand for additional electrical generating capacity, particularly as related to existence or possibility of declarations of national emergency; and Federal or State legislative changes which affect the financing of river or reclamation development projects, including basin account authorizations relative to any basin in which wild rivers are designated. The National Wild Rivers Review Board is authorized and directed to conduct continuing comparative studies which would measure the balance of benefits and detriments of each wild river to the State in which it is located, and to report to Congress, as appropriate, recommendations to assure that, wherever it is found that the reclamation of arid land would better serve the public interest of such State, the same shall not be prejudiced by the wild rivers status of any stream.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, this is a simple amendment, which would add one sentence to the bill. However, before I discuss the amendment, I should like to pay my very best compliments to my colleague [Mr. CHURCH] for his diligence and skill in handling the proposed legislation in the committee, and also for his patience and willingness to hold hearings in the State of Idaho. I commend my colleagues of the minority whose combined efforts and constructive amendments have made this a much improved bill.

Also I commend the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], for his fine cooperation in the thorough discussion and airing of our differences of opinion in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. What differences we have had are not differences of purpose, not differences of goal, they are merely differences of procedure.

The amendment which I offer today would expand the authority of the National Wild Rivers Review Board to conduct continuing comparative studies with particular attention to the benefits or the detriments of each wild river to the State in which it is located and to report to Congress as appropriate recommendations to assure that wherever it is found that the reclamation of arid land would better serve the public interest of such State, the same shall not be prejudiced by the wild river status of any stream.

By way of background, let me explain why this amendment is essential.

Two of the wild rivers, Idaho's Salmon and Clearwater, are in section 3(a) of the bill which makes them "instant" wild rivers upon the passage of this bill and its approval by the President.

In committee, I sought unsuccessfully to have these two rivers transferred to section 3(b) of the bill, in order to provide time for further study, while still maintaining these rivers in a free-flowing condition. The amendment I offer today asks only that any river, once committed to the National Wild Rivers System, shall be subject to continuing comparative study by the review board to insure that no State shall be required to make unwarranted economic sacrifices in order to accommodate a national purpose, however deisrable that national purpose may be.

In Idaho, we have a double loyalty in our great love for our vast forests, mountain meadows, open ranges, lakes, and streams. We are determined to protect our great wild life and recreation resources and we are equally determined to utilize the natural resources of these areas to help us grow and develop fully our industrial and agricultural potential. I believe that these objectives are not incompatible.

Sixty-nine million acre feet of water flows out of Idaho. Of this amount, about one-half originates in Idaho's own watersheds. Putting major segments of the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers in the Wild Rivers System will require about 50 percent of this water that originates on Idaho's watersheds to preserve the free-flowing status of these rivers for a national purpose.

We in Idaho agree that our two rivers do have wild characteristics in abundance. We are not unmindful of the need to preserve these values through a program that will guarantee America her heritage of unspoiled, unpolluted, free-flowing rivers. We know, too, that two-thirds of the State of Idaho is federally owned, and that of all the States in the Union, Idaho has the largest area set aside for a single purpose, the wilderness, in the National Wilderness System.

Perhaps no other State has as many persons who know firsthand the thrill of stalking big game in a wilderness area, taking the wily trout from a clear mountain stream, or just enjoying the exhilarating experience of life in the great outdoors. Idahoans are pleased to preserve areas so that they may share these benefits of nature with those of other areas and future generations who have an appreciation of wilderness, forests, and streams.

Idaho boasts of its 1,000 lakes and 30,000 miles of fishing streams. I am pleased that Idaho can contribute for the Nation to share so much in wild beauty, spawning grounds, wildlife and recreation areas, but frankly I believe that someplace in this whole picture there should be a measure of reciprocity. Other States with rivers that might also add to the wild rivers system will more freely do so if some thought of just compensation for the economic loss or dislocation is provided for in the measure now before the Senate.

Some of the points raised in the minority report on this measure clearly outline the problem I am concerned with in this measure. I quote from portions of that report which outline the problem:

> We agree with the concept that certain of our Nation's great scenic rivers should be preserved in their free-flowing condition. We agree that such rivers should be set aside to promote sound water conservation and the public use and enjoyment of the scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values. We agree that "the policy of the Congress to preserve, develop, reclaim, and make accessible for the benefit of all the people selected parts of the Nation's free-flowing rivers" is a commendable objective. This is a highly praiseworthy use of America's dwindling resources to meet the ever-increasing demand of our pleasure-seeking population and has its rightful place in the overall plan of national outdoor recreation.
>
> A river or rivers should not be included in the wild river system if such inclusion would seriously disrupt the present or potential higher beneficial use of the river or the economy of the area through which the river flows or which it serves. No river should be set aside in perpetuity from future harnessing to supply water for our cities, for agriculture, for flood control, to generate hydroelectric power, or to aid navigation without careful and thorough study to determine whether it is feasible and desirable in the public interest. Review should be made of all comprehensive river basin plans, and potential alternative uses of the water and related land resources involved must be evaluated.
>
> Section 3(b) and following, of S. 1446, provide the procedure whereby certain designated and new rivers may be added to the wild river system. Such additions are subjected to a more thorough study and evaluation at all levels of government and by any

> and all agencies which may profess an interest. This is not so with respect to those rivers designated in section 3(a). The rivers listed in section 3(a) become "instant" wild rivers upon the signing of the legislation, notwithstanding the fact that such rivers may be part of a comprehensive river basin plan, or subject to future study under State or Federal laws.
>
> The economic effect of an abrupt change for the Salmon and Clearwater from the plan adopted in House Document 531 is a subject of great concern. A Columbia Basin account does not exist. Thus the full economic shock of this change from full development to free-flowing status will be borne by Idaho alone. This is unwarranted, unnecessary and inequitable. Idaho's greatest resource is water—it has no fossil fuels. To deprive one State of the right to evaluate the economic potential of two great rivers with a combined value equal to that of a fully developed Grand Coulee with its million-acre reclamation project or the equivalent of a fully developed Colorado River is the greatest inequity in this bill.
>
> This present bill creates a national wild rivers system. But there is no language in the bill that would provide even partial compensation to a State for economic losses resulting from a change of plans from full development to free-flowing status of its rivers. Surely it is not intended to penalize one State excessively.

In his letter to the President of the Senate endorsing the National Wild Rivers System, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall had this to say:

> The President, in his state of the Union message of January 4, 1965, called attention to the need to protect the beauty of America, which he noted has sustained our spirit and enlarged our vision for more than three centuries.
>
> He expressed the hope that some of the unspoiled stretches of our waterways will be preserved under a wild rivers bill. There is a need to act now to protect this part of our heritage.
>
> In his February 8 message on natural beauty the President recommended the establishment of a national wild rivers system. The enactment of the draft bill enclosed with this letter will carry out that recommendation. The bill is designed to preserve, reclaim, and make available for the benefit of all the American people specifically chosen segments of the Nation's diminishing resources of free-flowing rivers.
>
> While river flows have been harnessed to aid navigation, control floods, increase farm productivity, and hydroelectric power, too little attention has been given to the importance of protecting the very water we drink and the values of fish and wildlife, scenic, and outdoor recreation resources. These values, although often measureless in commercial terms, should be preserved by a program that will guarantee America her heritage of unspoiled, unpolluted, free-flowing rivers. Our belief is shared by a wide range of public and private authorities, and the time to act is now, before it is too late.

These remarks of Secretary Udall outline a truly worthy national goal, with which I am in full accord.

So, I repeat that I do not disagree in principle with the purpose and objectives of a National Wild Rivers System. I repeat also from the language of the minority views that no provision is made to compensate a State for economic losses resulting in a change of plans from full development of its rivers to less than full development in order to provide free-flowing wild rivers "for the benefit of all the American people."

I believe that the Wild Rivers bill, S. 1446, should be amended to correct what obviously might be an unreasonable diminution of a State's natural resource potential for a single national purpose, natural free-flowing streams.

Idaho's 3 million acres of irrigated land can be increased 50 percent or more provided a "paying partner" is available to share the cost. That "paying partner" is power revenues. In effect, the output of the watersheds becomes the cash box for further reclamation. To change a plan of development thus conceived could prevent the reclamation of arid lands.

What could be so unfair in recognizing the need to compensate a State if certain of its resources are taken for all the people of the Nation—resources, which under alternate development, would enrich the economy of the State concerned?

S. 1446 provides for a review board consisting of the Secretary of the Interior, who shall be its chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of the Army, the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and the Governors of the several States.

The purpose of this board is to consider the change of circumstances of the status of any river included within the National Wild Rivers System and to report to each Congress any significant changes that might call for legislative action.

The duties of this review board could be expanded to include making a determination of losses to a State arising from inclusion of a river or rivers in the National Wild Rivers System for the benefit of all the people. Restitution could be provided for such water development assistance as the preempted resources might have made to the State's economy under an alternate plan of development.

Future reclamation in Idaho depends on developing a reliable paying partner to supplement user payments. States must look to the output of their own watershed for this source. This is their entitlement—their resource heritage.

This bill has stirred many mixed feelings in Idaho. At times debate became acrimonious. But the debate has been productive. Many misunderstandings on the measure and various points of view have been dispelled. These discussions, as I have stated earlier, have resulted in many improvements in the measure. I hope those who have criticized me for delaying the bill, or worse, will now see that I seek only improvements that will allow everyone an opportunity to unite behind a wild rivers measure. I seek a bill that will enable us to preserve large segments of our Nation's rivers with provision to assure that one State alone will not have to pay the potential economic losses that might become evident in the future because 50 percent of the water that originates on its watershed is committed to preserving two great and beautiful rivers to their natural free-flowing state. My amendment is essential to this bill, and I hope the Senator in charge of the bill will consider it favorably.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, let me say, at the outset, that although the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] and I have had our differences on this bill, we have sought to adjust them in a reasonable way. I have always appreciated the gentlemanly manner of my colleague in his dealings with me on all issues which relate to Idaho.

Section 6 of the bill resulted from the committee's adoption of an amendment that Senator JORDAN and I cosponsored to establish a National Wild Rivers Review Board.

The pending amendment would perfect the original effort by expressly including within the responsibilities of the National Wild Rivers Review Board the duty of making a continuing review of rivers within the system to make certain that changing developments do not result in unduly prejudicing the economic development of a State within which a wild river might lie.

I ask the Senator if it is not true that the new language to be added consists of a single sentence?

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. That is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. For the RECORD, I shall read the new language.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. It is only one sentence.

Mr. CHURCH. Yes. The new language reads as follows:

> The National Wild Rivers Review Board is authorized and directed to conduct continuing comparative studies which would measure the balance of benefits and detriments of each wild river to the State in which it is located, and to report to Congress, as appropriate, recommendations to assure that, wherever it is found that the reclamation of arid land would better serve the public interest of such State, the same shall not be prejudiced by the wild rivers status of any stream.

This is the language which would be added if the Senate were to adopt the amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. That is the only new language in the amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. I have worked with Senator JORDAN in trying to find suitable language that would cover the responsibilities that such a review board ought to have anyway, making it clear that if the Board were to find in the future, for example, that the public interest of Idaho would best be served by new reclamation in the southern part of the State and that such reclamation depended on financial help that could come only through construction of dams on the Salmon or Clearwater in northern Idaho, it would be the duty of the Board to make recommendations to the Congress for such revision of the wild rivers system as would not prejudice future reclamation in southern Idaho. This is the intent of the language.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of making a little legislative history?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Idaho is the most important Senator on the floor with respect to making legislative history on this bill.

Am I to understand that if the review board provided for in section 6 of the bill, which is a result of the amendment the Senator from Idaho offered in committee, should decide to conduct a study in regard to *x* river, by way of a review, and should find, as a result of the study, that some arid land should be developed for reclamation purposes in respect to the wisest use of water and land, this amendment would authorize the review board to make such a study and so recommend to the Congress if that is its finding?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Oregon correct, however, that it would require legislative action by the Congress to authorize the construction of such reclamation project?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes. Congress would have to act upon the recommendation, making revision in the system which would permit the construction of dams in the situation the Senator has described.

Mr. MORSE. I believe that the next question I ask needs to be asked of the Senator from Idaho to make crystal clear in the RECORD what the effect of the statute would be if the bill should be passed in its present form, in regard to the authority of the Federal officials who will administer the implementation of the act.

The Senator from Oregon wants to know whether, if the bill is passed, it would have the effect of freezing the uses of land in the areas covered by the bill to their present use until Congress in the future authorizes other uses.

Mr. CHURCH. The answer to that question is no, if I understand the question correctly. The system, to begin with, consists of the river itself and bank land which is designated by reference to certain maps on deposit at the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

For the most part, this includes bank lands that extend back not more than 300 feet. The power of condemnation contained in the bill, with respect to which I know the Senator has reservations, is limited to acquisition of private holdings extending not more than 300 feet back from the riverbank.

As for the public land, land that may now be under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management, the bill would not prohibit grazing or lumbering, or even mining.

All this may take place on the bank lands within the system, provided that such uses are conducted in a way that does not pollute the river, or obstruct the river, or otherwise interfere with the objectives of the bill.

The restrictions on the use of public land within the corridor through which the wild river runs are not in any way to be compared with the restrictions on use in, say, a wilderness area.

On the contrary, the bill expressly recognizes the multiple-use principle and seeks to make the administration of a wild river area conform as closely as possible to principles of ordinary administration that obtain in the national forests.

I would say only one other thing in response to the Senator. It is true that the bill contains a provision to allow for the acquisition of what are called scenic easements.

The reason for this provision is to protect the view from the river, and also to prevent a private landholder from subdividing a river bank or from establishing a hamburger or hotdog stand along the river front, or putting a wharf into the river in such a way as to destroy the natural character of the river. Therefore, the bill contains authority to acquire scenic easements. The definition of scenic easement is spelled out in the bill.

I invite the attention of the Senator to the exact language found on page 23 of the bill, beginning on line 2:

> As used in this Act the term "scenic easement" means the right to control the use of land (including the air space above such land) for the purpose of protecting the scenic view from the river for the purposes of this Act, but such control shall not affect any regular use exercised prior to the acquisition of the easement.

Our purpose is to interfere as little as possible with the private landholdings along the river banks. There is no reason whatever to interfere with the customary uses, pastoral uses, or farming uses; but unless we confer some right to protect against commercialization of the river, we have not established a wild river system worthy of the name.

This is the best answer I can give the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has made a very clear statement. I hope that he will bear with me while I offer a hypothetical that I believe will give us a better chance of making the statement perfectly clear to those who may not be as familiar with the bill and the objectives the committee has in mind.

Let us take the hypothetical where, within the 300-foot corridor area, we have public land which at this time is used for pasture and grazing purposes under a grant of grazing rights to the Diamond D Ranch.

Would the bill, if passed, in any way affect the grazing rights of the Diamond D Ranch, in that the Secretary could come in and in effect condemn his rights and say, "We do not have to give him grazing rights; we want to use it for a playground area, picnic area, and strict recreational area"?

Mr. CHURCH. The best answer I can give is to be found in the bill itself, on page 24, beginning with line 6. The bill reads:

> (g) A wild river area shall be administered for the purposes of water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values contributing to public enjoyment, but without limitation on other uses, including timber harvesting and livestock grazing, that do not substantially interfere with these purposes.

As the distinguished Senator from Oregon knows, present grazing in national forest lands or grazing on other Federal lands are privileges that are administered with the discretion of the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior.

What we have attempted to do is not to change the practice with respect to the power of these Secretaries to regulate grazing on the public domain. Rather, we have tried to make it clear that this bill is to be administered, as far as possible, on a multiple-use principle, expressly providing that there should be continued grazing wherever, within the system, it does not substantially interfere with the river.

I cannot envision a case in which grazing would interfere, because, like other pastural uses, grazing is not contradictory to the objectives of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon will submit another hypothetical. Along this corridor X owns a farm, farm buildings, and house, all stretched out along the bank of the stream. The evidence shows that there is no pollution, no interference in any way with the stream; that there is some recreational use along the stream; and that all the people who live along the stream participate in boating and private fishing with their own small, private fishing boats, maintaining a dock down into a stream.

If the bill were passed, would it give the Secretary authority to condemn that farm? And by doing so, would we have decided to do away with the farm and set up a type of recreation project in the area now occupied by the farm?

Mr. CHURCH. The condemnation powers in the bill are limited. In some cases, where there is an abundance of public land—that is to say, where 75 percent or more of the land is publicly owned—the bill does not provide for any condemnation of fee title that would permit the Government to forcibly acquire private holdings. The reason why the committee adopted this formula was that it seemed to us that wherever that much of the land within the corridor was publicly owned, there was ample space to provide for public access, for recreational facilities, or for camping grounds on the public domain. Therefore, there was no justification for conferring the power of condemnation for use against private landowners.

We might, of course, have adopted a different formula or a different percentage. But I wanted the Senator from Oregon to understand the reasoning behind the adoption of this formula. Where a lesser amount of the land within the corridor is publicly owned, the committee could see situations in which it might be necessary to acquire some private land in order to insure adequate public access and the necessary public recreational facilities. In such cases, the bill would permit condemnation limited to an area extending no more than 300 feet back from the river bank. There is no limitation, however, upon condemnation for purposes of scenic easements, except that wherever this power is used, the bill limits the distance to a quarter of a mile, or 1,320 feet back from the bank, to protect the view from the river.

That is the clearest exposition I can give of the treatment of condemnation in the bill. It is the best answer I can furnish in response to the Senator's question.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as the Senate is about to adopt this amendment, I wish to pay tribute, not merely to this contribution today on the part of the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], but also to those excellent recommendations which in great part he fashioned in our committee, as phrase by phrase, sentence by sentence, and paragraph by paragraph we were able to find, to use a word that is bandied about today, a consensus, in which the Republican minority, in my judgment, acquitted itself with great devotion to the public trust.

In this case, when the Senate is about to accept one more recommendation, I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Idaho on presenting, in the legislative process, the amendment which is before us today. I am sure that the able Senator in charge of the bill, the senior Senator from Idaho, will agree, that this amendment makes the bill a far better piece of legislation by reason of our action upon it.

Mr. CHURCH. I do, indeed. I join wholeheartedly in the fine sentiments that have been expressed by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may we have the Senate act on this amendment prior to the presentation of the next amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I turn to page 13 of the bill and read a portion of the statement of policy:

> SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that some of the free-flowing rivers of the United States possess unique water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values of present and potential benefit to the American people. The Congress also finds that our established national policy of dam and other construction at appropriate sections of the rivers of the United States needs to be complemented by a policy that would preserve other selected rivers or sections thereof in their free-flowing condition to protect the water quality of such rivers and to fulfill other vital national conservation purposes. It is the policy of Congress to preserve, develop, reclaim, and make accessible for the benefit of all of the American people selected parts of the Nation's diminishing resource of free-flowing rivers.

I believe that that represents a statement of policy with which no Senator could disagree. Specifically, if I may refer briefly to the views of the minority members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I read in part from those views:

> We agree with the concept that certain of our Nation's great scenic rivers should be preserved in their free-flowing condition. We agree that such rivers should be set aside to promote sound water conservation and the public use and enjoyment of the scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values. We agree that "the policy of the Congress to preserve, develop, reclaim, and make accessible for the benefit of all the people selected parts of the Nation's free-flowing rivers" is a commendable objective. This is a highly praiseworthy use of America's dwindling resources to meet the ever-increasing demand of our pleasure-seeking population and has its rightful place in the overall plan of national outdoor recreation.

If I may be permitted to speak for the minority on this occasion, I wish to say that the members of the minority assiduously endeavored to remove from the verbiage of the bill those deeply felt apprehensions which could be allayed or swept aside only by changes in the language.

There has been in our country for many years a controversy between representatives of the Federal Government and of the States of the American Union with respect to water rights in streams, particularly, but not entirely, with respect to interstate streams. Some of us have joined in sponsoring legislation, again in this Congress, as well as in several prior Congresses, designed to set at rest much, if not all, of the needless controversy which from time to time, in our view, has impeded Congress in carrying out its function in this unique Government of ours, where there are two areas of sovereignty.

I shall turn particularly to section 5, because I think it is of vast importance to have it spread out on the RECORD. In a few minutes I shall offer an amendment. I read from page 26, subdivision (d) of the committee amendment to the bill as it is now before the Senate:

> (d) The jurisdiction of the States and the United States over waters of any stream included in a wild river area shall be determined by established principles of law.

That does lay down, in enacting this legislation, if it is to be enacted, Congress' determination that established principles of water law shall govern the problems of the jurisdiction of the two systems.

I continue to read:

> Under the provisions of this Act, any taking by the United States of a water right which is vested under either State or Federal law at the time such river is included in the Wild Rivers System shall entitle the owner thereof to just compensation.

I cannot overestimate the importance of that contribution to this legislation. In that connection, I salute the members of the minority, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], all of whom substantially contributed to improving this bill. This is not a partisan question at all. On many occasions, I have talked with my able friend the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill, and others on this continuing gnawing problem of the Federal-State jurisdiction in the water field.

The fact remains that we were able carefully, concisely, and specifically to provide that if there is a taking by the Federal Government of property which can be described as a vested water right, the Federal Government will pay for it. The bill recognizes that when one's property is taken from him by the Federal Government, he shall be compensated for it. That is rather different from the views on this subject which have been advanced at times by some in the executive branch.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Is it not correct that, with respect to the proposition that the Senator has just laid down; namely, that any Federal taking of a water right shall be fully compensated, it is a principle that is supported wholeheartedly by both the Democrats and the Republicans on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs?

Mr. KUCHEL. Indeed it is.

Mr. CHURCH. Certainly this is not a point of controversy between us.

Mr. KUCHEL. Indeed not, I regret to say, however, that whether the President of the United States is a member of the Democratic Party, the party of my able friend the Senator in charge of the bill, or a member of my party, the Republican Party, we shall still have individuals, as we do today, and as we had 13 years ago, in our executive branch who deny what the Senator and I have just agreed upon.

I continue to read:

> Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

I believe that also constitutes a matter of considerable importance, if we consider that we will support this legislation, and I am very glad that it is made clear in the bill now before us.

I quote subsections (e) and (f):

> (e) Nothing in this Act shall affect the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the States under other provisions of law with respect to fish and wildlife.
>
> (f) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify or be in conflict with any interstate compact made by any States which contain any portion of the National Wild Rivers.

That is a provision of inestimable importance because in the development of our country's future there will be a continuing, growing problem of a plentiful water supply for the needs of an ever-increasing American population. This is a matter on which many of us have satisfied our judgment in the approval of agreements made among the States in the form of compacts.

Here again, it is made abundantly clear and no attempt is made in this legislation, to bruise or modify those agreements.

During the discussion in committee, there were some other questions which were raised and dealt with by committee action. Some questions were raised, for example, as to whether if this legislation were enacted, it would have the effect of legally appropriating unappropriated water in a given State by the Federal Government. That is not so.

In order that there may be complete clarity about the legislative intent of this legislation, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read and made the pending business. I then intend to ask the able Senator in charge of the bill some questions concerning it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. The Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] proposes an amendment as follows:

> On page 27, line 9, in the committee amendment, add a new subsection as follows:
>
> (i) The jurisdiction of the States over waters of any stream included in a wild river area shall be unaffected by this Act to the extent that such jurisdiction may be exercised without impairing the purposes of this Act or its administration.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have changed the word "objectives" to the word "purposes." I believe that the words "objectives" and "purposes" are substantially the same. However, I wanted to use the word "purposes" because that word is repeatedly used in the bill.

The amendment which I offer was arrived at in the previous session. So that the Record may be clear on this point, it has the approval of the Department of the Interior and the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a copy of the departmental letter pertaining to this amendment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> U.S. Department
> of the Interior,
> Office of the Secretary,
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> Hon. Frank Church,
> *Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear Senator Church: You have inquired whether, in the event S. 1446 (the wild rivers bill) becomes law, the United States would be required to apply to State agencies for permits in order for a wild river to be maintained in its free-flowing condition as against subsequent appropriators. It is understood that the question arises in the light of the addition of proposed subsection (i) on page 27, after line 8, of Committee Print No. 3.
>
> As you know, by our letter of September 24 to Mr. Ward, we advised that the Department has no objection to the addition of that proposed amendment.
>
> We do not read the proposed subsection (i) as subjecting the United States to a requirement that it obtain a State permit for the maintenance of a stream or stretch of a stream established by the Congress as a wild river in the free-flowing condition contemplated thereby.
>
> The maintenance of the flow of a stream without diversion, impoundment, or other depletion is probably not an "appropriation" or "use" as is contemplated by the laws of many of the Western States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or disposition of water. The maintenance of a free-flowing condition would appear to be more akin to a "riparian" right than to an "appropriative" right.
>
> The foregoing is not to say that if the creation of a wild river results in the taking by the United States of a water right which is vested under State law, the owner thereof would not be entitled to compensation. On the contrary, subsection (d) of section 5 of Committee Print No. 3 would require compensation in that event, and, in that respect, subsection (d) is expressive of the same policy that is applicable under section 8 of the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902. See *Gerlach Livestock* v. *United States,* 339 U.S. 725 (1950).
>
> Sincerely yours,
> Max N. Edwards,
> *Assistant to the Secretary and Legislative Counsel.*

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, some questions were raised in the discussion in the committee as to whether the Federal Government would be given an alleged Federal right of appropriation under this bill, whether it would be given some type of Federal riparian right under this bill. The purpose of the bill is set forth expressly in the first section, which I have read.

That purpose is approved by the committee members, and I believe by Senators generally. However, because those questions were asked, a number of problems arose in our committee discussion. I have a series of questions that I should now like to ask the Senator from Idaho in order to get his view with respect to making legislative history.

My first question is: With the adoption of sections 5(d), 5(h), and 5(i), is it now the understanding of the Senator that there has been no substantive change in the presently established principles of Federal and State water rights law?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct. The whole purpose of the language in the sections to which the Senator has referred—sections, incidentally, which include the amendment the Senator proposes as subsection (i) under section 5 of the bill—was to maintain the status quo with respect to the whole complicated structure of water law.

We have tried diligently to write language which would not embark us upon any new departure in the field of water law.

We seek to leave the law as it stands, to establish a wild rivers system which will not impair or alter or in any way change existing State or Federal laws concerning water rights.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator. Is it the understanding of the Senator in charge of the bill that if there is any taking by the U.S. Government of a water right which is vested under State or Federal law at the time any river is included in a wild river area, the owner of such vested water right is entitled to just compensation from the Federal Government?

Mr. CHURCH. I believe there can be no question about that. The principle, in my judgment, would apply by reason of the force of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. However, beyond that, the bill expressly sets out that any taking by the United States of a water right which is vested under either Federal or State law at the time a river is included in a wild river area, entitles the owner of such vested water right to just compensation from the Federal Government.

This makes it perfectly clear that the congressional intent in this matter is consistent with our past practices, with the provisions of the Reclamation Act; and, as I say, in the judgment of the senior Senator from Idaho, with the requirements of the Constitution itself.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend. The third question I have is this: Assuming that the bill is enacted into law and that a river or a segment of a river is made a part of the wild river system, is it correct to say that there will not be, under the terms and the intent of the bill, a reservation or appropriation of all of the unappropriated water of the river included in the system?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct. That fact is established in subsection (h) of section 5 of the committee amendment, which reads as follows:

> (h) Designation of any stream or portion thereof shall not be construed as a reservation of the waters of such streams for purposes other than those specified in this Act, or in quantities greater than necessary to accomplish these purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend. In other words, is it not true that authority is sought to be delegated to the executive branch of the Government to provide for free-flowing water in a given area, rather than to attempt to create any new or additional type of water rights on the part of the Federal Government?

Mr. CHURCH. This is a congressional declaration that the Federal Power Commission may not license dams on rivers which are included within the system; also, it is an affirmative statement by Congress that the purpose of the act is to maintain such rivers in their natural, free-flowing condition.

As the Senator knows, this is not an appropriation of water in the usual sense, because the appropriation of water under various State water laws ordinarily requires a diversion of the water and its placement to some consumptive beneficial use, which is recognized under the applicable State statutes.

Therefore, there is not contemplated the kind of appropriation that takes place under State water laws, under which water is diverted, in the first instance, and then put to the consumptive uses these laws prescribe. Rather, the bill contemplates maintaining the water in the natural bed of the streams within the system established by the proposed legislation, so that the river can be preserved in its pristine, free-flowing and natural state.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank my friend. I join his colleague from Idaho in congratulating him on the excellent manner in which he has brought the bill to the floor of the Senate, with such changes as we believe the public interest warrants.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from California. His amendment makes still clearer what was the intended purpose of the members of the committee, in trying to leave our water laws in status quo.

I am happy to accept the amendment of the Senator, and I urge the Senate to approve it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I assume that it is clear now in the legislative history that has been made that the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from California, particularly with reference to the Federal Government is that no change is contemplated under the bill with respect to the water rights of the States. I believe that the Senator from California has made it clear that it seeks the preservation of the status quo.

So that there will be no possible basis for confusion, I ask this question of the Senator from California: Does the Senator from California seek to obtain for the States, in any fact situation, through his amendment, water rights which they do not now possess?

Mr. KUCHEL. No. I say to my friend that a number of us on both sides of the aisle, as my friend knows, introduced a bill last year dealing specifically with this subject.

I almost interrupted the Senator from Idaho to say that we shall await another day for disposal of that problem.

A simple answer to the Senator's question is: No; it does not.

Mr. MORSE. My next question is this: Does the Senator from California, through his amendment, intend in any degree whatever to estop the Federal Government from bringing to issue any controversy that the Federal Government may have with any State in respect to claims dealing with water rights as between a State and the Federal Government, which may be in conflict or in dispute?

Mr. KUCHEL. Not at all.

Mr. MORSE. I understand, then, that the Senator's amendment does not in any way propose any restriction upon either the Federal Government or a State government to pursue to juridical determination or, where it is in the administration of an administrative body, an administrative determination, the respective rights of the Federal Government and the States in connection with any contested issue. Is that correct?

Mr. KUCHEL. I agree with what the Senator has said. I would put it in this fashion: What is sought to be done is to create a wild rivers system, without attempting to legislate in the field of water law; to the contrary, to maintain the status quo as we believe it should be maintained.

Mr. MORSE. I thought that was what the Senator intended to do, but I wished to make it crystal clear in the Record that that is what he intends to do.

I also wish the legislative history to be perfectly clear that the Senator's amendment is not intended to serve as the basis, at any time, for an argument that the passage of the bill in effect would wash out the right of either the State or the Federal Government to press for a determination of the program for the difference of opinion between them as to the respective water rights of the State vis-a-vis the Government, or vice versa.

Mr. KUCHEL. In my opinion, the Senator from Oregon need have no apprehension on that score.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I believe that it might be well to read into the Record at this point the language of the committee on the question of water rights, which appears on page 5 of the report.

Under the caption "Water Rights," the committee report reads as follows:

> The language contained in subsection 5(d) is intended by the committee to preserve the status quo with respect to the law of water rights. No change is intended. The first sentence states that established principles of law will determine the Federal and State jurisdiction over the waters of a stream that is included in a wild river area. Those established principles of law are not modified. The third sentence states that with respect to possible exemption of the Federal Government from State water laws the act is neither a claim nor a denial of exemption. Any issue relating to exemption will be determined by established principles of law as provided in the first sentence. The second sentence would apply to this legislation the principle of compensation embraced by section 8 of the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, 390, found in 43 U.S.C. 383). This means that the Government must pay just compensation for a water right taken for wild river purposes if the water right is a vested property right under established principles of State or Federal law. See *U.S.* v. *Gerlach* (339 U.S. 725).
>
> Subsection 5(h) makes it clear that designation of a stream or its portion thereof is not to be considered a reservation of unappropriated waters other than for the purposes of this act—and in no greater quantities than are necessary for those purposes.

The Senator from California has added one further section which should remove any element of doubt on the question of water law, and I would therefore urge that the Senate adopt the amendment to the committee amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 475

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 475 to the committee amendment, and ask that it be stated. It is short, and I should like to have it read.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The **Legislative Clerk.** Amendment 475 proposes that:

> (i) Other provisions of this Act notwithstanding, whenever either Secretary shall reserve any portion of the waters of a stream for the purposes of this Act he shall comply with the laws of the State with respect to water and water rights, and any rights perfected under the applicable State laws shall be subject to State law with respect to the allocation of waters in years of shortage.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, last Friday, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] introduced an amendment to S. 1446, amendment No. 475, and discussed it at some length. His remarks can be found in the Record of January 14, on pages 245 and 246.

Simply stated, this amendment to the committee amendment would require the Federal Government to secure any water rights that it might need to carry out the purposes of the Wild Rivers System Act, under State law.

The Senator from Colorado has discussed a point which needs to be considered and which this bill, as presently drafted, does not anticipate. That is the case where the Federal Government preempts the State law and secures for wild river purposes more water than may be found in the river during some dry years.

What, then, happens to those holders of water rights above the designated wild river area? I believe, under the existing language, that they would be denied their earlier appropriated water rights and would suffer the consequences as a result of the Federal Government's desire to use the limited water for recreational purposes rather than for beneficial consumptive use.

The amendment to the committee amendment of the Senator from Colorado would protect those prior rights filed on lands above the designated area. I think it is a necessity, and urge the Senate to adopt our amendment to the committee amendment, No. 475.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Wyoming and wish to say to him that I am a cosponsor of the amendment. I discussed it with my colleague, Mr. Allott, who, unfortunately, is unable to be in the Chamber today. I have also discussed it with the Senator from Wyoming. I have read the language carefully. I have read the bill and I have read the report.

Originally, I had not been under the concept that the bill constituted a taking of water by the Federal Government, but, as seems obvious to me upon reading it, it does exactly that. It does it not in the form of an appropriation but apparently it does it in the form of a reservation—whatever a reservation of water may be. There is certainly little or no doubt in my mind that a reservation of water, if enacted into law by Congress, would have a powerful and potent effect if we should have a water shortage and the conflicting rights of the owners of vested water rights, under State law, should come into conflict with this reservation of water under the Federal system that we have put into effect.

Consequently, it would seem to me only equitable to try to include in the bill some amendment of the kind now pending. It seems to me that this is an excellent amendment which would preserve the very livelihood of those persons who have protected their waterrights over a period of years and are relying on them to preserve their own property.

Granted that these exist—as the distinguished Senator from California pointed out—the provision that they will be paid compensation for any water right which is taken and which has previously been vested under either State or Federal law. But this does not really solve the problem. If one does not have any water, they can pay him for the water right which has been taken, but he will be out of operation. If one lives on a ranch, or is engaged in some kind of recreational sport which is dependent upon water for its business, it would seem to me that he would be in very bad shape.

Thus, it would seem to me that when we run into a water shortage period, we should go back to the law of the State where the problem is involved to determine the priority rights of the persons on the streams with respect to their water.

I am happy that the Senator from Wyoming has brought this subject up. I sincerely hope that the Senator in charge of the bill will accept the amendment to the committee amendment. It is not an effort, as I understand it, to inject into the bill a change in water rights. It is not a question of trying to say that it will be State or Federal, one side or the other—it is merely suggesting that in the event of a shortage we should go under State law to determine what is going to happen in that particular area.

Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. SIMPSON. I certainly agree with the Senator from Colorado. I believe that he is correct. Let me say to him that the House has been strong for this kind of amendment on bills of this nature—especially this one. We must find some extra leeway in the House in order to get the bill passed, because I am certain that it will pass the Senate. I would like to urge upon the Senator in charge of the bill that the amendment to the committee amendment be adopted.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I should like very much to oblige my good friends, but we have gone through this matter in considerable detail in committee before. It is an old, old problem. The committee has placed language in the bill which it was felt would preserve the status quo with respect to water rights.

I cannot accept this amendment because it would mean the writing of new water laws. It could have many ramifications impossible now to foresee.

When I was advised that this amendment would be pressed, I asked the Department of the Interior to prepare an analysis of its impact on the general proposition of the water law involved. The Department has done an excellent job in stating the case against the amendment, and I believe that I could do no better than to enumerate the several reasons why it would be a serious error to adopt such an amendment to this bill.

First of all, let me read the amendment:

> Whenever either Secretary shall reserve any portion of the waters of a stream for the purposes of this Act he shall comply with the laws of the State with respect to water and water rights, and any rights perfected under the applicable State laws shall be subject to State law with respect to the allocation of waters in years of shortage.

Mr. President, the amendment should be rejected for the following reasons as stated in the Department's reply:

> 1. The amendment assumes erroneously that under the terms of the bill the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture is required to take some affirmative action in order to reserve water for the purpose of the act. The bill neither requires nor permits the Secretary to take such action. The enactment of the bill is itself a reservation of the water needed to carry out its purposes.
>
> 2. The amendment assumes that a water right could be perfected under State law for the purposes of the wild rivers program. In fact, however, State laws do not provide for the appropriation of water for the purpose of maintaining the natural flow of a stream. It would therefore normally not be possible to comply with State law, and the amendment would defeat the purpose of the Federal legislation.
>
> 3. It is settled law that Federal legislation authorizing Federal lands to be used for a particular purpose reserves sufficient unappropriated water flowing through the Federal lands to accomplish that purpose. This reservation does not affect prior valid rights under State law, but it does establish a priority that is good against subsequent appropriators. This principle of law is recognized and applied by section 5(h) of the bill which provides——

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I shall be glad to yield in a moment, as soon as I complete my statement.

Mr. SIMPSON. Is the Senator reading from the Department's reply?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. SIMPSON. I wanted the RECORD to show that.

> This principle of law is recognized and applied by section 5(h) of the bill which provides:
>
> "Designation of any stream or portion thereof shall not be construed as a reservation of the waters of such stream for purposes other than those specified in this Act, or in quantities greater than necessary to accomplish these purposes."
>
> The amendment would reverse this established principle of law by requiring the Secretary to acquire an appropriation right under State law to carry out the Federal program—a requirement with which it would probably be impossible to comply.
>
> 4. One of the major premises of the wild rivers bill, as stated in section 5(d) is that "the jurisdiction of the States and the United States over waters of any stream included in a wild river area shall be determined by established principles of law." The amendment is inconsistent with this premise and purports to write new water law. The wild rivers bill is not an appropriate vehicle for undertaking a major revision of Federal-State water jurisdiction. The wild rivers bill maintains the status quo with respect to water law, and we believe that such action is highly desirable. It would be a mistake, in our judgment, to imperil the wild rivers program by injecting a new and highly controversial change in established water law.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I will yield in a moment.

I continue reading:

> For purposes of emphasis, the comment should be repeated that the establishment of a wild river area by legislation will not affect or impair any existing valid water right under State law. In the event of a water shortage, priorities among prior appropriators will be determined according to State law. The establishment of the wild river will not affect those priorities. If the United States needs to acquire a water right that is vested under State law, section 5(d) specifically provides that the United States must pay for it.

I think these reasons are ample, indeed, to make a case against adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I have only two comments to make. The last reference is very interesting to me, on the basis, if I understood the Senator correctly, that water rights vested under State laws in a wild river area would be recognized under State laws. Is that correct?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes. Let me read the sentence:

> In the event of a water shortage priorities among prior appropriators will be determined according to State law.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is very interesting. I hope that remains part and parcel of this RECORD, because it bears exactly on the point the amendment was intended to clarify.

The other point I wish to make concerns that portion of the memorandum the Senator read which states that nothing in the bill has to do with acquisition of a water right. In technical, legal language that may be correct, but it appears that there is a reservation of water made by the Federal Government by the enactment of the bill. If that is not a right, it is at least some kind of claim on the water in the rivers included in the bill, which is going to have an effect on the water rights in these rivers. That is exactely what we are trying to clarify by the amendment. I do not think the memorandum in that particular is dealing with the point which we are trying to clarify.

Mr. CHURCH. I disagree. It seems to me that it is exactly on the point. The pertinent part of the memorandum reads as follows:

> It is settled law that Federal legislation authorizing Federal lands to be used for a particular purpose reserves sufficient unappropriated water flowing through the Federal lands to accomplish that purpose. This reservation does not affect prior valid rights under State law, but it does establish a priority that is good against subsequent appropriators. This principle of law is recognized and applied by section 5(h) of the bill.

That is exactly relevant, and is a complete answer to the argument that has been presented here in favor of the proposed amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Is not that principle also recognized under State law?

Mr. CHURCH. It is.

Mr. DOMINICK. So we would be adding nothing new by the language.

Mr. CHURCH. With that I cannot agree. The various objections raised to the amendment make clear the mischief that would result if it were adopted. The amendment is unnecessary and ought not, in any case, be adopted without a thorough investigation of its ramifications.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator for the way he conducted the subcommittee. I would be remiss in my duty if I did not compliment the Senator for the way in which he conducted the hearing on the

Green River as well as the one in Boise, Idaho. Since I became a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, no bill has received more consideration than this bill. I am sorry I cannot convince the Senator to adopt the amendment which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] presented and which the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and I have cosponsored. I think its adoption would be helpful in getting the bill through the House, where I think our difficulties are going to lie.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] to the committee amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, first, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his generous remarks. I wish I could oblige him. I always prefer to do so when I can. The Senator has performed a very real service to his colleague from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] in advocating the adoption of his amendment in his absence. I know that all concerned appreciate the courtesy which the Senator from Wyoming has extended in this regard.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. A few moments ago the Senator from Idaho, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and I sought to make a legislative record in respect to the import and intent of the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

I believe the RECORD will show in essence that legislative history records that there is no intention whatsoever on the part of the amendment offered by the Senator from California and agreed to by all of us to in any way change the legal water rights of the State or the Federal Government, or in any way to estop or stay the Federal Government from bringing any action that either party deems would be within its legal rights to bring in preparing for an adjudication of any existing dispute. The amendment seeks only to extend and perpetuate the status quo in regard to State and Federal water rights.

In other words, if a controversy exists or should develop as to what those water rights are in regard to a specific case, either the State or Federal Government would be perfectly free, irrespective of the adoption of the amendment, to pursue an adjudication of a legal right.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. The pending amendment gives me great concern because it seems to me that the pending amendment does exactly the opposite. The pending amendment would have the effect of changing existing water right law, in that it seeks to give preference, a priority of right, to the State law in respect to what could very well be, if we started to enumerate the hypotheticals, almost an innumerable number of prodigious situations.

Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. CHURCH. I agree.

Mr. MORSE. Therefore, if we wish to change existing water right law by giving greater claims to the States than they now possess, that situation should be handled by a separate bill on which hearings would be held and testimony would be taken.

Mr. CHURCH. There is no question that such would be the only sound legislative procedure.

Mr. MORSE. I have not had time to do more than scan the hearings, checking the index.

I judge that the senior Senator from Idaho, as chairman of the committee, did not conduct exhaustive inquiries into the important consequence of such an amendment as is offered now by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CHURCH. Certainly not, for our purpose was to preserve the status quo, and that alone, respecting water laws.

Mr. MORSE. I will not vote for the bill unless it can be changed to correct some holes in it with respect to the rights of my State.

But I join the Senator from Idaho in his objection to the amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. The minority views state on page 16:

> The jurisdiction of the States over waters of any stream included in a wild river area should not be affected by the passage of this bill. The Federal Government should be required to comply with State laws when acquiring water rights or vested interests therein.

So the Senator was on notice that this was a part of the principle, minority members thought should be incorporated in the bill.

The interesting thing is that almost all of the principles have been adopted by consent except this one. I am not sure why the objection arose to this one.

I want to reiterate that the last section of that memorandum stated that in times of water shortage priority of rights would be determined under the vested rights and the priorities of time, as I understand.

Is that correct?

Mr. CHURCH. I am sorry. Will the Senator restate his question?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am talking about the last portion of the memorandum. In times of shortage whatever rights the Federal Government might acquire by passage of the bill would be considered subordinated to those who had rights in the stream before this date.

Mr. CHURCH. Yes. That is the existing law and practice of the Federal Government, and would continue to be the practice. Nothing in the bill would change that practice in any way.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is the basic issue we are trying to solve.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHURCH. By way of further response to the Senator, the substance of the Allott-Simpson amendment was discussed in executive sessions of the Interior Committee, for a considerable length of time, and it was rejected.

The position I take on the floor today is consistent with that taken by the committee when the question was raised previously.

Mr. President, for these reasons I hope the Senate will see fit to reject the pending amendment.

I ask for a vote on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I would like to comment on the bill, S. 1446, which would establish a National Wild Rivers System.

This proposal has received a great deal of attention in the State of Wyoming, and was the subject of committee hearings in Green River, Wyo.—which hearings were well attended, and demonstrated the allout opposition in Wyoming to the inclusion of the Green River in the Wild Rivers System.

The bill was introduced on March 10, 1965, by my colleague from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. I was surprised, as were the Governor and other Wyoming officials, to learn that the Green River, one of Wyoming's major rivers, was designated in the proposal to be a part of the Wild Rivers System.

Since that day in March, I have worked untold hours with Department of the Interior people, Senators JORDAN and CHURCH and other members of the Senate Interior Committee, and with Governor Hansen and other Wyoming officials, in an effort to have the Green River stricken from that portion of the bill which would make it a part of the Wild Rivers System.

We have been successful in eliminating it from the "instant" section of the bill. The Green River is now listed in the bill as one of those rivers which should be studied more extensively before it would be added to the System by congressional action. For this, I thank my colleagues in the Senate Interior Committee. Irreparable damage could have been done to the State of Wyoming, had this river been permanently placed in the Wild Rivers System.

For purposes of creating legislative history, which may be relied upon in later years, when studies are made of the Green River, I would like to make some comments about this most important river.

The Department of the Interior had recommended in the legislation as originally introduced that the upper 84 miles of the Green River be incorporated in the Wild Rivers System. This would begin at the river's source, in the Three Forks Park of the Bridger Wilderness Area, and extend downstream to the mouth of Horse Creek, which is 2 miles east of the town of Daniel.

The upper 12 miles of the Green River are in the Bridger Wilderness Area. The next 34 miles flow through the National Forest Service land, and Bureau of Land Management land. The remaining 38 miles are in private and State ownership.

I do not believe there is anyone who would contend that the Green River is not a beautiful and scenic river and, in fact, truly a wild river. The question to which the committee addressed itself, and to which we must address ourselves in considering other rivers, is whether or not the river itself will add to the value of the National Wild Rivers System, and whether or not the river area will be aided by incorporation in the Wild Rivers System.

What will be best for preservation of nature's beautiful streams, the animal habitat, and the greatest fishing country in the world? And, particularly, those of us from Wyoming are interested in determining the future utilization of Wyoming's water rights, as set forth in the Upper Colorado River Compact. We need to determine whether Wyoming could be fully developed industrially and economically, with large portions of our land area taken out of productive use and managed on a one-use basis, rather than under the multiple-use concept.

These were the questions that were raised when we considered the incorporation of the Green River in this system.

Quite frankly, there is not enough information available at this time to answer these questions. In order to provide for good management of our natural resources and our limited supplies of water in the West, those questions must be answered before legislation such as we are considering today encompasses our rivers and streams.

One of the reasons why I was so shocked to learn that the bill as originally introduced in March included the Green River, was that the Department of the Interior had promised to supply the Governor of our State with a report prepared by the field teams, appointed by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. These teams were to make detailed studies of the effects, the advantages and the disadvantages of making a river a part of the proposed Wild Rivers System. That report was not furnished to our Governor prior to introduction of this legislation, and it has not been given to him, to this date.

For purposes of the record and legislative history, I would like to refer interested persons to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 4, page 4291, and the Senate committee hearings on this bill, so that the full history can be seen on the manner in which this Green River situation was handled. I do not propose to take the Senate's time, now, to review this, because I testified at some length about it. However, I do want to say that the Department of the Interior did not deal fairly with Governor Hansen in handling this matter. On several occasions, Department officials promised him and me that the Green River would not be included in the wild rivers proposal. Then, at the last moment, it was inserted, without proper notification to him or me.

My position has been, and still is, that the Federal Government of the United States must be honest and truthful with its people, and that it is the duty of the Congress to reassert that integrity when it is breached by any Government official.

In this instance, Secretary Udall acknowledges the breach, and apologizes for it. That is one of the reasons why the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee was willing to strike the Green River from the bill, as I proposed.

With respect to the land, I believe that the Wilderness System does preserve, in conjunction with the Forest Service, a sufficient quantity of the Green River to assure that we will always have a truly wild river. I do not think that at this time more land should be acquired by the Federal Government. The history and the evidence clearly show that the private users have not and will not abuse the land. It is open to the public for fishing and tourism.

I believe in the right of private property, as guaranteed to us in the Constitution; and whenever possible, the Federal Government should work to see that the management of its lands is carried out so that it complements private ownership. If that is done, the public will benefit.

I agree with the concept that certain of our Nation's great scenic rivers should be preserved in their free-flowing condition. We need to promote sound water conservation and public use and enjoyment of the scenic, fish and wildlife, and outdoor recreation values. But before we set rivers aside and use them for a single purpose, I think we must make a thorough and exhaustive study and review of the whole river basin, so that we can know what effect the designation of that river as a "wild river" will have upon the water uses and the economy of the area affected.

This bill has been reworked and reworded, after several meetings of the Interior Committee. We Republicans offered many amendments, and the committee considered them and adopted the greatest proportion of them. I compliment the committee chairman and the committee members, for this piece of legislation has received more attention in its detail and wording than any other piece of legislation that has been considered by this committee since I have served on it. The committee was responsive to my urging that the Green River be eliminated, and for this I am grateful.

I think it is important that the basic principles we adopt in this bill be carried out. I believe that when water rights are acquired for wild river purposes, the rights must be established under existing principles of State and Federal water law, and that just compensation must be paid. We must provide that the jurisdiction of the States over waters of any stream included in the Wild Rivers System shall not be affected by the passage of this bill; and, further, that the Federal Government be required to comply with State laws when acquiring water rights or vested interest therein. It is important that it be understood that there will not be a reservation or appropriation of all unappropriated water of the rivers and streams included in the Wild Rivers System, and that the reservation of water will be only for the purposes outlined in the bill, and only in quantities necessary to accomplish these purposes.

The bill is a great improvement over that which was introduced a year ago. We have tightened up the language and given protection to the State of Wyoming and to our ranchers by eliminating the Green River from the bill and by guaranteeing our State water rights. I am hopeful that the House committee will take a close and careful look at it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 25, between lines 3 and 4, in the committee amendment, insert the following new subsection:

"(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, neither the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture shall be authorized to acquire, by condemnation or exchange, any lands, waters, nor interests therein (including scenic easements), located in the State of Oregon, for the purpose of administering such lands, waters, or interests as a part of the National Wild Rivers System."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Idaho. It is not the plan of the Senator from Oregon to pursue this amendment to a vote tonight. It is my intention, however, to use the amendment as a basis for a rather lengthy speech that I wish to make on the bill, setting forth my reasons for opposing the bill in its present form. At the appropriate time tomorrow, meeting with the pleasure of the leadership of the Senate and of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], we can come to a vote on the bill. I shall want a yea-and-nay vote on the bill. I have been advised, I say to the Senator from Idaho, that it probably would not be the most considerate thing the senior Senator from Oregon could do to press for a yea-and-nay vote on the bill tonight. As the Senator knows, I always seek to oblige my leadership in matters that involve parliamentary courtesy. But it will take me probably a good part of an hour to present my speech on the bill, and I shall use this amendment as the basis for that discussion, although I shall discuss a good many other subjects that will involve other amendments that I shall offer subsequently.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Oregon follow the premise that what is good for Oregon is good for other States?

Mr. MORSE. I say that what is bad for Oregon, I have an obligation to prevent from occurring. I hope that the discussion I engage in may elicit some support from the Senator from Vermont, so that if he agrees with me that the bill would be bad for Vermont, too, I would join with him in seeking to protect Vermont. But my present duty is to do what I can to prevent wrong being done to my State.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont, while in full sympathy with what the Senator from Idaho is seeking to accomplish, is at the same time rather apprehensive as to the possible effect on other States and other programs.

In Vermont, the State is doing exceptionally good work with the soil and water conservation fund and other funds, and is making great progress. I really do not like the idea of having that progress disturbed by any further legislation. If the bill were to apply only to the States which the Senator from Idaho has in mind, I could probably support it. But not knowing exactly what the effect would be, I feel that I must be a little careful.

Mr. MORSE. That is one reason, I say to the Senator from Vermont, why I wish to present a general discussion tonight. It will be in the RECORD, so that we can all consider the different points of view that exist between the Senator from Idaho and those who believe the bill ought to be amended in some particulars.

As Senators will learn, as they listen to my speech, I do not find myself in any conflict with the Senator from Idaho; I merely find myself in a position where I cannot accept the language of the bill in some particulars, in view of what I know the effects of it would be on my State. I may tomorrow withdraw this amendment and seek to have another amendment considered first, if as a result of our discussions we think we may have a better meeting of minds in reaching agreement on the bill. However, I am using this amendment to bring the question before the Senate. I shall move tomorrow, if I decide that it is in the best interests of my State to do so, under the circumstances that exist then, to seek to have the Rogue River included in a study program, and not included in this bill, for the application of the terms of the bill.

I shall be completely flexible in regard to the position I take tomorrow in trying to get the bill into a form that I believe would protect the particular principles that I believe, in the interests of conservation and the development of our rivers. These principles ought to be protected, whether they relate to Oregon, Vermont, or any other State.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Oregon. My own apprehensions were aroused by the fact that my State acquires access for the public on land and on rivers in every area of the State, but we depend heavily on private development, which makes it possible for the State to buy more public land.

So I repeat: The idea of the Senator from Idaho is good. However, I am still apprehensive about spreading any more programs throughout the whole country.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I hope the Senator from Vermont and I may have an opportunity to review the bill. I know that he has not had a full opportunity to study it carefully.

Mr. AIKEN. I never saw it until this morning.

Mr. CHURCH. For that reason, I should like to discuss the bill with the Senator, because I am hopeful that any ground for apprehension might be removed by fuller discussion.

Mr. AIKEN. It might be removed by a careful discussion of the subject of public use.

Mr. CHURCH. Yes. I look forward to an opportunity to discuss the bill with the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. With the cooperation of the Senator from Oregon, it is possible that something may be worked out.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon proposes and hopes that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the Senator from Oregon will be able to reach a comity of agreement with regard to the final form that the bill will take in the Senate, before it comes to a vote. It is my hope that the members of the committee who have reported the bill to the Senate will give careful consideration to the suggestions for changes in the bill that I shall raise tonight. I do not believe that the bill in its present form, for the reasons I shall set forth, is fair to the State of Oregon.

My amendment deals only with the portion of S. 1446 which relates to the Rogue River segment of the proposed National Wild Rivers System. The Rogue River is a stream in my State.

CONCEPT OF NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM ENDORSED

Let me make it very clear to the Senator from Idaho and to my other Senate colleagues that I endorse the concept of a National Wild Rivers System because it is designed to preserve for the people of this Nation and for future generations of Americans certain of the free-flowing rivers of the United States for recreational use and for the preservation of scenic, wildlife, and fishery benefits. We live in an industrial age, a space age, in which our people are being compressed into large metropolitan areas remote from open spaces of mountains, seashore, and streamside. The accelerated pace of our lives today calls for compensatory rest and recreation in areas of natural beauty such as those designated as wild rivers in S. 1446. We have only a few years to plan now for the future, and it is important that we take action promptly to establish a National Wild Rivers System throughout the United States providing that Congress, in its judgment, finds that such use of these areas will be the best use in the public interest.

Let me assure Senators that my concern at this time relates not to the concept of a national wild rivers system, but to certain provisions of the pending legislative proposal which I believe are not in the public interest, or which seriously invade private property interests that are deserving of the utmost protection under our system of government.

That causes me to come to a discussion of condemnation of private property interests in the Rogue River section of Oregon.

For many years, I have expressed in Senate committees and on the floor of the Senate my firm opposition to the condemnation of private property for Federal park purposes in areas in which there are abundant Federal, State, or county recreational lands readily accessible to the public. For several years I have voiced my opposition to the inclusion of a private property condemnation provision in the Oregon Dunes National Seashore legislation.

On many occasions I have pointed out that in cases of this type, Congress should respect the time-honored right of American citizens to own land in fee simple for "themselves, their heirs and assigns."

In Oregon more than 50 percent of the land of my State is in fact owned by all the people of the United States from coast to coast.

I have been informed that in the Rogue River segment of the National Wild Rivers System covered by S. 1446 that an even larger percentage of the land is owned by the Federal Government or other public bodies.

I say now, as I have said in connection with the Dunes legislation, that no private property should be condemned unless it can be shown that such property is essential to the project as a matter of public necessity.

Every lawyer in the Senate knows that public necessity is a phrase of legal art. For years I taught the law of eminent domain. I know what the common law provides in regard to the law of eminent domain; and I know that it has always been inherent in, and carefully guarded by, Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence that property shall not be taken from the fee simple owner, no matter what the compensation is, except upon a clear showing of public necessity.

Before I go further in my discussion of this matter of the law of eminent domain and condemnation, I should like to have the Senate recognize that if we should give the blanket authority that is proposed in this bill to be given to the two Secretaries, their findings would become final. If they were to decree that a piece of property should be condemned, we would have practically no chance at all of setting aside their finding unless there could be a showing of some clear, arbitrary, or capricious conduct on their part.

My opposition to the condemnation provisions that the Secretary of the Interior seeks in the Oregon dunes legislation is known. I have sought to take the committee through the law of eminent domain in a rather long discourse on the legal aspects of the matter in the Senate committee. I shall, if necessary, tomorrow, or the next day, repeat that discussion on the floor of the Senate.

I am not opposed to the taking of property for park purposes when public necessity requires it. However, I am opposed, in the dunes bill and in this bill, to giving blanket authority to the two Secretaries under the formula set up in the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am not in disagreement with respect to the proposition that general condemnation authority should not be granted for recreational purposes in areas in which there is already sufficient public land. It was this very consideration that led the committee to adopt the formula now contained in the bill.

That formula appears at the bottom of page 21 and the top of page 22 and reads:

> *Provided*, That neither Secretary may acquire lands, waters, or interests therein by condemnation without the owner's consent when 75 per centum or more of the acreage or stream bank within the entire wild river area is owned by Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, but this limitation shall not apply to the acquisition of scenic easements.

We were attempting, in drafting this formula, to exclude from the reach of condemnation those regions in which there was obviously enough public land, that is, where no need or justification existed for condemning private property in order to assure the necessary public access to the river, the necessary recreational facilities, or public camp grounds, that may be reasonably required to implement the objectives of the bill.

It may be that, with respect to the 75-percent requirement, the committee decision erred on the side of too much leniency, but the reasoning that led the committee to adopt this formula stems from the basic proposition that the Senator from Oregon has expressed on the floor today.

Mr. MORSE. I understand what the committee tried to do, and I want the Senator from Idaho to know that I appreciate the fact that it is not a carte blanche authority to take whatever property they want; at least there is some limitation, in the 75-percent requirement.

There still remains a great difference between the senior Senator from Oregon and the committee formula. I do not find myself able to agree that we should give to the Secretaries involved here, or in the Dunes bill, or in any other bill that involves a fact situation which I shall describe in a moment, the authority to condemn property without a showing of public necessity. We are confronted with the situation in many park bills in which we have no recourse if we grant blanket authority to the Secretaries to condemn property. That is why, to return to the Oregon Dunes bill for a moment, as I have said, there is a substantial amount of Federal property, and the State is willing to commingle some of the property in that Dunes park. We have plenty of land to start a park.

If the Secretary can then show, within the next 2 years after the bill has been passed, that he is unable to negotiate the purchase of parcels X, Y, and Z, or any other number of parcels, for a fair price, and that that property is needed on the ground of public necessity, he shall then come to Congress, and a bill will be offered in regard to those parcels, in connection with which he shall show a public necessity.

That is quite a different procedure than the procedure the Secretaries want. They want blanket authority in a park bill to condemn property. There would not be anything that we could do if there were an honest difference of opinion as to whether the property fell under the common law doctrine of public necessity. Common law cases which, as precedents, have binding effect in common law States in the absence of State statute, have modified the common law doctrine, and make it perfectly clear that one of the reasons for the great contest that developed in Great Britain, and particularly in the Colonies against the Crown, was a fixed and arbitrary power in the field of eminent domain.

A clear showing of public necessity is all the Senator from Oregon has been pleading for in regard to parks in his State. As I have said, over 50 percent of the land in Oregon is owned by the Federal Government. Over 50 percent of my State is owned by the Federal Government.

We must then add to that percentage the large acreage that is owned by the State government. This is a matter of great concern to the senior Senator from Oregon.

I have just returned from 3 days in my State. I met with group after group. They left no room for doubt as to what they thought my obligations were in connection with this bill. They had me on the spot, so to speak, as we politicians say. They said:

> What is your position?

I said:

> My position is a matter of record. I am not going to support the bill unless we can arrive at an adjustment in connection with condemnation and land exchange.

I shall discuss that point to some degree tonight, but at much greater length tomorrow when I offer another amendment to this bill in regard to land exchanges.

I state once more for the record what the position of the senior Senator from Oregon has been over the years with regard to condemnation in respect to the establishment of parks. There are those who, if they can seek to create the impression that an officeholder is inconsistent, can blow up a great balloon of alleged inconsistency on the part of that officeholder and create the impression that the officeholder is one way on one bill and another way on another bill.

That has been done in my State on the part of some who do not wish me well politically in regard to some of my votes on park bills.

Let me enumerate two or three of them. The Cape Cod bill is one. The Senator from Oregon voted for the Cape Cod bill and supported the Cape Cod bill.

I was satisfied that the showing was made that the elements of public necessity were established. We were dealing with private land. If we were to have any park at all in the Cape Cod area, we had to have a bill which permitted the condemnation of that land.

The boundaries of that land were set out with clarity within the bill. Every Senator, before he voted on the bill, knew exactly what property was to be condemned. In the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon the hearings left no room for doubt that the Secretary had met the established criteria required under the law of public necessity. I voted for the bill.

They do not discuss the factual situation that I have explained. When I say "they," I mean those who are trying to give the false impression that the senior Senator from Oregon has not followed clear, logical lines in every park case that has come before the Senate.

It is said that the senior Senator from Oregon is a cosponsor of the Douglas Indiana Dunes bill. I certainly am. I believe it is a very sad thing indeed that those dunes, privately owned, cannot, to the extent of the acreage called for by the Senator's bill, be set aside as a public park for the enjoyment of the people in that heavily populated area of our country.

Mr. President, we cannot have a park in the Dunes area of Indiana without taking private property. So the question is raised, Does the taking meet the criteria of public necessity?

Before the senior Senator from Oregon became a cosponsor of the Douglas bill, he made a careful analysis of the need for the park and the justification for the park, and the fact that this privately owned land had to be taken before we could have a park. Therefore, we had a case in which the common law criteria of the law of public necessity were fully met.

The Senate will recall that 2 or 3 years ago there was before us the Sleeping Bear Park in Michigan. The senior Senator from Oregon sought to persuade the Senators from Michigan to drop the condemnation section with respect to private property. They refused to do so. The senior Senator from Oregon voted against the Sleeping Bear bill. Why? I ask Senators to read the record of my analysis of that bill.

The analysis which I presented to the Senate—not denied by the proponents of the bill—showed that we could have a huge park in the form of the Sleeping

Bear Park without taking an acre of private land.

Therefore, I took the same position that I am taking now with regard to the Oregon Dunes. I say that we should establish a park with Federal property; then, if the Secretary of the Interior cannot negotiate the purchase of the pieces of privately owned property that he says are required as a matter of public necessity, and cannot do it within 2 years, let him come to Congress with a special bill to establish the public necessity.

In other words, in the Sleeping Bear case I was satisfied that the Secretary of the Interior fell flat on his face when it came to demonstrating in advance why he needed the private property to be incorporated in the bill as a part of the Sleeping Bear Park.

This has been the suggestion of the senior Senator from Oregon with regard to the proposal for an Oregon Dunes bill. I have opposed it for some years, and I shall continue to oppose it again this year, unless we can arrive at a negotiated settlement with the Department of the Interior which will give protection to the owners of private property in that area in those cases in which the Secretary of the Interior wants a given piece of property and cannot negotiate the purchase of it. In such cases he ought to be required to come before Congress to prove, with respect to each parcel that he seeks, that it meets the common law criteria of public necessity. The common law criteria of public necessity happen to be the criteria of public necessity in the law of my State.

The position of the senior Senator from Oregon has been crystal clear and completely logical from the beginning to the end of the consideration of all the park bills.

Now we have a little modification of the formula with regard to the present bill.

However, as I shall point out momentarily, the best information I can receive is that the Federal Government owns 60 percent of the land in the Rogue River area. That is 15 percent less than the 75 percent exemption formula provided in the bill. Under the bill, if the Federal Government owns 75 percent of the land, the Secretaries would not have condemnation authority. However, that will not apply to the Rogue River area, because it is only in the neighborhood of 60 percent. Furthermore, when we have that much less land, or even if we have less land than 60 percent, used by the Federal Government, we do not destroy the objectives of the bill by the requirement that if the Federal property cannot be bought under the wild rivers program, the Secretary shall then be obliged to try to purchase other land, owned by private owners; and if he cannot purchase it after a reasonable period of time—I have said 2 years, but I am not wedded to 2 years, but a reasonable period of time—he should be required to come to Congress and say that he needs X pieces of property as a matter of public necessity in order to carry out the objectives of the bill.

I am at a loss to understand the trend, which I have seen develop in the 20 years I have been in the Senate, which gives more and more arbitrary discretionary power to the administrators of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, let me say, most respectfully, that in my judgment this is another example of Congress' delegating its powers, powers it should exercise itself. When we give blanket authority to the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to condemn property, we know that their findings become final.

I wish to keep the authority in Congress to pass judgment upon pieces of land which the Secretary wishes to condemn. I happen to believe that our constituents are entitled to that kind of protection from Congress.

Mr. President, I shall be discussing at great length, whenever it reaches the floor of the Senate—if it does—the factual situation in the Oregon Dunes Park case. Tonight, I do not propose to go into that subject in any detail, except to say that, as the Senator from Oregon, I do not intend to ignore the very strong opposition to the Dunes Park. I fully appreciate that there is also strong support for it.

However, when as Senators we are met with this kind of conflict in our States, it is our duty to analyze all the facts, circumstances, and legal problems connected with the case, and to reach a judgment.

For years, my judgment has been that the Secretary of the Interior should reach an adjustment whereby we can resolve this difference and bring an end to the controversial conflict which has developed over the Oregon Dunes Park, by going ahead and establishing the park on the thousands of acres of land that the Federal Government owns and then, with respect to specific parcels of land, putting the burden upon the Secretary of the Interior to show that he really needs that land by way of public necessity.

Let me tell the Senate what will happen: He will have a hard time showing that he needs any of the parcels of land he is now trying to get by blanket condemnation authority.

However, I shall discuss that subject some time in the future when it is before the Senate, by bringing in maps which will show whereof I speak.

In this particular instance, the State of Oregon owns every single square inch of the shoreline. It is all public property. We have no problem of access to the ocean, or to the dunes from the ocean.

We had a very wise democratic Governor of Oregon many years ago, Oswald West, who succeeded in establishing in our State—and it is now a matter of law—that the shoreline belongs to the people through their State government.

Consequently, this is a fact situation completely different from the fact situation existing in the Cape Cod Park, the Indiana Dunes Park, or Sleeping Bear Park.

Mr. President, I consider myself to be completely right in my insistence on urging modification of the condemnation procedures of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore bill. Likewise, in this case, for reasons which I shall now proceed to set forth, I believe that we should have a modification of the condemnation features of the bill.

Under S. 1446 the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture would be given blanket authority to render judgment in the name of Congress as to whether a piece of privately owned land in the Rogue River area should be condemned. This grant of power to the Secretaries is, indeed, formidable. It places in them complete discretion as to whether a piece of land should be taken away from a private owner and money compensation substituted for his former ownership rights. It makes the Secretaries, in effect, courts of last resort, because once their discretion has been exercised the private property owner's land has been lost beyond recall. This deplorable situation would not exist in the State of Idaho under S. 1446; it should not exist in Oregon. So far as other States for which wild rivers areas will be designated under this bill are concerned, I leave it to the Senators of those States to determine whether the public interest demands the inclusion of condemnation power with respect to private lands in those areas.

Mr. President, let me say for the RECORD that I particularly emphasize that sentence for the benefit of my good friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], because I believe it is very important that he consider the import and the meaning of that sentence when he comes to read and analyze my speech between now and the vote on my amendment to the committee amendment.

If any Senator should find that same problem exists in his State in regard to any river, I would expect him to do what he can to protect the interests of the citizenry of his State.

However, I am confronted with what I know to be the factual situation along the Rogue River. In my judgment, the grant of this condemnation power is entirely too broad.

The first portion of my amendment would eliminate the use of condemnation in acquiring private lands and scenic easements in the Rogue River wild rivers area. S. 1446, as reported, provides that where "75 percent or more of the acreage or stream bank within the entire wild river is owned by Federal, State, or local governmental agencies," neither Secretary may acquire fee simple interests in lands, waters, or interests therein by condemnation without the owner's consent. However, either Secretary may acquire scenic easement by condemnation.

The staff of the Senate Interior Committee has informed my office that the Rogue River segment of the national wild rivers system is approximately 60 percent publicly owned. Thus, condemnation of private lands in this area would be authorized under the bill. Apparently the Clearwater and Salmon wild rivers areas of Idaho are over 75 percent federally owned, thus condemnation of private lands would not be permitted.

Let me make clear that I do not make that observation with any innuendo or implication that the Senator from Idaho, the Senator in charge of the bill, has exempted Idaho rivers because of any selfish interest on the part of Idaho. I know the Senator from Idaho too well for that. He does not engage in carrying out such motives.

I know the reason why Idaho is exempted. It is the formula to which I am objecting, which I believe will result in an unfair advantage to fee simple owners in Idaho in relationship to fee simple owners elsewhere.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. MORSE. One more sentence, and then I shall be glad to yield.

I believe it is grossly unfair to have the fee simple rights of the people of my State along the Rogue River determined by such a formula. Fee simple rights are just as precious to an Oregonian living along the Rogue River as they are to someone in Idaho living along the Clearwater or Salmon Rivers. That is why I wish at least to press for favorable consideration by the Senate, to require the Secretary to prove, in regard to individual parcels of private land that, in fact, the criteria of the law of private necessity are present.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. First, let me say that in reaching a decision in the committee as to how condemnation powers should be limited, several methods were adopted. The bill contains several limitations. There is the 75 percent limitation to which the Senator has referred. There is the 300-foot limitation. There is also the further provision that condemnation may not be exercised in any village, borough, city, or county where adequate zoning ordinances are already in effect.

Therefore, the committee has attempted, in good faith, to establish definite statutory limitations on the exercise of the condemnation power, while still leaving in the bill sufficient power to safeguard the character of a wild river once it is included within the system.

Nevertheless, I believe that the Senator makes a strong point when he states that, whatever limitation on condemnation may exist in the bill, it should confer upon the property owners of Oregon the same measure of protection that it confers upon the property owners of Idaho.

I merely wish to indicate to the Senator that, on this point, we are not in dispute. I believe that simple equity requires us to try to arrive at whatever alteration in the statutory formula as will assure that Oregon property owners will get the same measure of protection as Idaho property owners receive under the bill.

But, I say to the Senator that the form that his amendment now takes is not acceptable, because it would confer special treatment to Oregon, and there is no end once we start down that road, each State becomes a special pleader.

I believe the objective the Senator is seeking could be attained through the modification of the statutory formula itself. Then we would have one standard that would apply to all the States within the system. This is imperative, in the interests of obtaining uniform treatment. I would like to accommodate the Senator, but in a manner which will avoid discriminating in favor of one State as against the others.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the Senator. He gives further proof of what I have said many times outside his presence. The Senator from Idaho is always motivated by a desire to be fair and just. That does not mean, in spite of his good faith, that it always results in a uniformity of justice to the people who fall within the purview of the policy he may advocate.

When it comes to the question of whether or not I am trying to obtain something for the benefit of the people of Oregon, let me say that I do not want a benefit for the people of my State that people of other States under the same fact situation do not receive. I want the same advantages and benefits to go to all people in our Republic, so they will receive uniformity of treatment.

One reason why I have offered the amendment in its present form is to emphasize the point I am making, and that is that, from the standpoint of the people of my State, they are receiving discriminatory treatment to their disadvantage.

I hope we can arrive at some resolution of the problem. One place where we may end in disagreement is over the question of the power that may be vested in the Secretaries. Irrespective of what the formula is, percentagewise or otherwise, I do not want to give to the Secretaries blanket authority to condemn personal property for the alleged purpose of the objectives of the wild rivers bill without some check upon them.

The proposal which I shall offer tomorrow, and allude to tonight, which is not included in this amendment, will not be language that will be to the benefit of the Secretaries, but it is our clear duty to make our system of checks and balances apply in relation to the executive branch of Government, just as it has checks on the legislative branch.

I do not like what I think is the basic power that is given to the Secretaries herein to condemn without a showing in fact under the criterion of public necessity with respect to the property proposed to be condemned.

Whenever either Secretary has made a good faith effort to purchase property, when they can show that the property sought is essential to the successful operation of the Rogue River portion of the National Wild Rivers System, and can demonstrate that the property cannot be acquired for a fair and reasonable price, the Senator from Oregon would be willing to assist them in every way possible to obtain passage of the requisite specific condemnation authority.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at the close of my remarks a report from the Acting Comptroller General, dated December 28, 1965, which shows the extent to which the Government has used condemnation and exchange, plus donation and purchase, on all 45 national park or recreational areas created since 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, condemnation has been used only five times. The circumstances are such as to raise a most serious doubt as to its immediate need in the Rogue River area.

On December 30, 1965, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Anderson advised me:

> With respect to the Rogue River Wild River area which would be authorized by S. 1446 as reported to the Senate, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has identified 136 private tracts in the section of the wild river which would be administered by the Bureau of Land Management. The particular uses are set forth in attachment B.
>
> A total of 984 acres of private land is involved. Land values along this reach of the Rogue are now computed by the front foot. According to a recent estimate by the Bureau of Land Management, $40 a front foot is the current value for the fee title. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in cooperation with the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service is reexamining the land acquisition costs for the proposed Rogue River Wild River. When this reexamination is completed we will inform you * * *.

The Secretary continues:

> In sending the executive communication of March 3, 1965, which became S. 1446, we attached "Wild River Summary Statistics (Tentative)" found on page 12 of the hearings. On April 22, 1965, Secretary Udall testified. He also filed a prepared statement, the Rogue River portion of which appears on pages 66 and 67.
>
> Please disregard any breakdown of the figures in these two documents respecting mode of acquisition, particularly those pertaining to exchanges. The acreages identified for exchanges were field estimates of the possible acreage that might be acquired by exchange. They have no reference to any specific tracts. To our knowledge no persons have approached Interior officials regarding exchanges nor have any officials of the Department discussed with landowners whether exchanges would be sought.

Thus, the plans for private land acquisition in the Rogue River area are not firm, and with about 60 percent of the river already in public ownership, I am convinced that the donation and purchase authorities are adequate for the present.

I would be willing, when the studies are complete, when a full report has been made to the Congress, and after purchase efforts have been undertaken unsuccessfully, to consider condemnation for the acquisition of essential fee simple titles in such cases.

Section 4(f) of S. 1446 provides that either Secretary may:

> Acquire by condemnation for scenic easements * * * an area which extends no

more than 1,320 feet from either side of the stream, tributary, or river.

The term "scenic easement" is described in general terms under section 4(c) of S. 1446, but, its precise nature is not disclosed as it relates to the Rogue River. Whatever a scenic easement is, it withdraws from the owner of the land one of the sticks comprising the "bundle of sticks" which the lawyers use to characterize fee simple ownership. Therefore, my amendment would prohibit the condemnation of scenic easement of the type described in section 4(f) and would relegate the parties to arms length negotiations over such interests in privately owned land.

This concludes my remarks on the first portion of my amendment, namely, that which relates to the issue of condemnation. My plea is that we eliminate, at least for the time being, any power of condemnation for the Rogue River segment of the National Wild Rivers System and that we eliminate it as effectively as condemnation has been eliminated for the Idaho segment. There is no doubt that condemnation may be undertaken for public necessity purposes, but it is my contention that we have not demonstrated that public necessity at this time in connection with S. 1446 really is established. It is always an issue of fact as to whether under a given set of operative facts there is a public necessity for condemnation. I respectfully submit that public necessity has not been demonstrated in this case with respect to the Rogue River area at this time. Therefore, I urge that condemnation not be permitted in acquiring private lands in the Rogue River segment of the Wild Rivers area and that my amendment prohibiting condemnation be adopted to protect private property ownership interests in the area until such time as compelling and urgent necessity for condemnation has been demonstrated.

I discussed, at length, the issue of condemnation, as it applies to Federal park projects, when I appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation on July 20, 1965.

Mr. President, I believe it should be in the RECORD at the close of my speech today, and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD my testimony before the Senate committee of some months ago in regard to my views on condemnation, relating at that time to the problem of condemnation in relation to the Oregon Dunes Park bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to discuss the exchange section of the bill so it will be in the RECORD for review by Senators tomorrow.

EXCHANGE

The second portion of my amendment would exclude the use of land exchanges in the Rogue River area. Again, the Comptroller General's report which I have inserted in the RECORD, shows very limited use of this authority. Only two instances are noted.

The exchange provisions of S. 1446, as set forth in section 4(c), are extremely broad. They would encompass O. & C., national forest, and public domain timberlands in Oregon.

Recent events in Oregon regarding a proposal to consider an exchange of Bureau of Land Management public domain timberland for private lands within the boundaries of the Point Reyes National Seashore in California lead me to conclude that inclusion of this provision will only produce endless and needless controversy in my State. In fact, the Department of the Interior has become involved in my State in a most disruptive political controversy with leaders of the Republican Party, as well as with many leaders of the Democratic Party, over some very serious charges that have been hurled against the Department of the Interior on the subject of a suggested proposal to trade Federal public domain lands in Oregon for private lands within the boundaries of the Point Reyes National Seashore Park in California.

To date, I have not reached any final conclusion in respect to the very serious charges that certain political leaders in my State have made against the Department of the Interior. When this political storm broke on April 26, 1965, in Oregon, I called upon the Secretary of the Interior to submit a memorandum to me setting forth the Department of the Interior's answers to the serious allegations that were being made against the Department's handling of the Point Reyes National Seashore land exchange negotiations.

On May 12, 1965, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the memorandum supplied by the Secretary of the Interior. At that time, I said that I thought the memorandum showed that the Department had acted in good faith. I indicated that I had received no evidence substantiating any allegation that the Department had acted in bad faith. I closed my observations on the memorandum by stating that there was no basis for trying to compare this exchange matter with the notorious Al Sarena case of a decade ago.

The memorandum of the Secretary of the Interior did not satisfy the critics of the Department of the Interior in Oregon and they have continued to criticize the Department of the Interior in relation to this land exchange problem. They have threatened to make the land exchange policies of the Department of the Interior a political issue in the 1966 campaign. After I had received a number of communications from Oregon in regard to this controversy, I asked the Acting Comptroller General of the United States in a letter dated October 15, 1965, to make an investigation for me of the very serious charges that are being made against the Department of the Interior in Oregon in regard to the Point Reyes National Seashore exchange problem. That study is being made. When I receive the study from the General Accounting Office, I intend to submit it to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the Secretary of the Interior, the Governor of Oregon and, of course, I shall make it a public document in my State.

At the present time, while a controversy on land exchanges is raging in my State, I think it would be most unwise for the Senate to pass a bill containing a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make land exchanges involving Public Domain, Forest Service, and O. & C. lands.

As the Senate knows, O. & C. lands are of vital importance to every county of my State in which they are located because these lands are a source of revenue for those counties.

I respectfully warn the Senate today that if this bill becomes law with the land exchange provisions in it, prior to the time that the present serious controversy in my State regarding land exchange policies of the Department of the Interior has been resolved, the Senate, through this bill, will do naught but throw political gasoline on an already spreading political fire. My amendment might be described as a "political fire extinguisher" which is very much needed in Oregon.

In my opinion, the present controversy in my State over Department of Interior land exchange policies can be resolved amicably, but the passage of this bill, with the proposal to broaden the land exchange policies of the Secretaries, will serve only to raise serious doubts in my State as to the wisdom of leaving present land exchange authority of the Secretaries as it is now, without any further check, to say nothing about adding to their land exchange authority which would be achieved under this bill.

This type of exchange provision entered park legislation for the first time in 1962 as part of the Point Reyes Act. It has not worked well there and it has not been used in the other acts to any extent.

We have a pressing need for a review of how this exchange provision is operating under the existing acts and how it can be used before we load up other bills with it. So for Oregon, I want this provision out.

On the subject of the land exchange provisions of this bill, I take the same position I did with respect to condemnation. When the facts are in, the studies are complete and purchase and donation efforts have been properly applied, there may be instances where exchange authority would prove useful.

The Bureau of Land Management is undertaking an extensive classification of all of its lands as a result of the Classification and Multiple Use Act passed last year. This will help reach a determination of disposable public land, but in my opinion we would be acting prematurely if we were to authorize extremely broad exchange authority in this bill prior to the completion of the classification studies.

I supported the classification and multiple use bill and I support this concept of classification. I am confident that if the Secretary finds that some land falling in the disposal group is desirable for exchange, he has ample authority to hold the land in status quo, providing he has a bona fide exchange opportunity, until the authority can be obtained.

On December 17, Secretary Udall wrote to me at length on this subject. He said he has a very negative attitude toward exchanges for Oregon Dunes. He told me he needs "an exchange provision in the wild rivers bill because section 8—of the Taylor Grazing Act—is inapplicable to many areas involved." I presume he refers to the Eleven Point River since all the other rivers are in public land States.

The Secretary also indicates he will not exchange any needed timber lands, and this is what he has in the vicinity of the Rogue. The Secretary may not, by a committee amendment appearing in section 4(c), exchange National Park or Wildlife Refuge lands. The Secretary says he will not exchange O. & C. lands although this bill does not prohibit such exchanges. However, an exchange of public domain timber land would produce equal problems because their allowable timber cut is tied together. There is no language in the bill which prevents the Secretary of the Interior from exchanging O. & C. lands; on the contrary it gives him the authority to do so. When I make this comment I am not speaking about Secretary Udall as an individual, but I am speaking about the Office of the Secretary of the Interior.

Every Senator knows that Cabinet officers and other public officials in policy making positions frequently change their minds. Furthermore the proposal is to adopt the exchange provisions of the pending bill, not for the term of office of Secretary Udall, but as permanent legislation. Therefore, I respectfully submit that Secretary Udall's letter where he says what he will not do under the bill is completely irrelevant to the question at hand; namely, should these condemnation and land exchange authorities vested in the Secretary of the Interior be written into the law of the land?

The Secretary of the Interior himself has, on occasion, changed his mind in regard to public land policies, as he has a perfect right to do. Under our system of checks and balances, it is clearly the duty of Congress to so write legislation that it leaves no room for doubt as to the limitations of an executive officer's authority under the law.

In a press release issued by the Secretary of the Interior on January 7, 1966, he announced a change of Department of Interior policy with respect to land acquisitions on the Grand Teton National Park. I highly approve of the decision he reached in respect to this matter, but Congress never should have put him in the position where he could exercise unchecked condemnation power. What he has done on January 7, 1966, his successor can undo or for that matter he can change his mind again at some time in the future. As I have said many times in the Senate, Congress should be very wary of granting in legislation broad arbitrary discretionary powers to administrative officials in the executive branch of the Government.

It is leading to government by executive supremacy in this Republic.

Let me read from Secretary Udall's press release of January 7:

Land Acquisition Policy Approved for Grand Teton National Park

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall approved today a land acquisition policy governing purchase of privately owned land within the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park in Wyoming.

This policy is designed to protect the interests of the owners of private lands in the park, while, at the same time, affording greater economy to the Government and insuring the preservation of the incomparable beauty of the park. Under this new policy the National Park Service will not seek to acquire private lands within the park, without consent of the owner, so long as the lands continue in the same use as is now being made of them. The lands may be sold with the new owners assured of this same privilege.

The policy assures landowners that they and their successors may continue to use their properties in substantially the same manner as they have in the past.

Under this new policy, condemnation proceedings will be instituted to acquire lands within the park only if it becomes necessary to prevent a change in the use of the lands that would be detrimental to the park values.

Grand Teton National Park was established in 1929 and enlarged in 1950 to preserve the Jackson Hole country, a region rich in the traditions of the Old West and unsurpassed in scenic grandeur.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the explanatory material of January 5, 1966, accompanying Secretary Udall's January 7 press release, entitled "Land Acquisition Policy at Grand Teton National Park" be inserted in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Land Acquisition Policy at Grand Teton National Park

Grand Teton National Park was established in 1929 and enlarged in 1950 to preserve the scenic, scientific and historic resources of Jackson's Hole, a region rich in human history and unsurpassed in scenic grandeur.

Since its establishment, many parcels of privately owned property have been acquired by the Federal Government to facilitate the development, management, and interpretation of the park for increasing thousands of annual visitors. Today, only about 7,500 acres of land remain in non-Federal ownership within the exterior boundaries of the park.

The present uses of this privately owned land, such as for modest homesites, ranches, limited eating establishments, dude ranches, etc., are historical in the development of the valley and these should be allowed to continue until such time as there is a desire on the part of the owners to dispose of their holdings, or until there are plans to alter or change present uses so significantly as to make them incompatible with the primary purposes for which the park was established.

Accordingly, so that present and future owners of private property within the park may be fully advised of the policy of the United States with respect to its land acquisition program in Grand Teton National Park, this statement of policy is issued as a public document:

The National Park Service will not seek to acquire private inholdings within Grand Teton National Park without the consent of the owner, so long as the lands continue to be devoted to the uses now being made of the lands. This applies to the present owners and to any future owners of the property. The present owners are at liberty to dispose of their property just as a private landowner anywhere else may do. Subsequent owners may be assured that the National Park Service will take no action with regard to acquiring the properties without their consent so long as the properties continue to be used for the same purposes as at the time of this statement.

The National Park Service will continue to welcome offers from the owners to sell privately owned properties to the United States, and it is hoped that the owners will give the Service the first opportunity to purchase them. If an owner wishes to sell his property outright, the Service would be glad to negotiate on that basis. On the other hand, if an owner wishes to retain use and occupancy rights for a given number of years or for the remainder of his life and that of his spouse, this can be negotiated. The latter situation will enable people who desire to obtain money in hand today for their property, with occupancy rights for a term of years or for their lifetimes, to work out a negotiated contract on this basis.

If present uses of properties are to be changed and the properties are to be devoted to new and different uses not compatible with the primary purpose for which the park was established, the National Park Service will attempt to negotiate with the owner for the acquisition of the property in order to avoid the development of a use adverse to the management of the park. In the event all reasonable efforts at negotiation fail and the owner persists in his effort to devote the property to a use deemed by the National Park Service to be adverse to the primary purpose for which the park was established, the United States will institute eminent domain proceedings to acquire the property and prevent such development.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when I testified before the Senate committee, not only during the past year, but even before that, I discussed at some length the ownership of private property in national park after national park. I discussed the ownership of private property to the extent of many thousands of acres within the boundaries of so-called public domain reservations.

I have always been at a loss to understand why there is such strong opposition on the part of some to my proposal to limit the Secretary of the Interior in the case of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore bill to the taking by purchase of private land, and if he fails to negotiate the purchase of private land, to require him to ask for specific legislation governing the specific pieces of private property for acquisition by way of condemnation, which places upon him the burden of proof of establishing public necessity.

I speak respectfully and impersonally about an office, not about an individual. We make a great mistake in public policy when we give to any agency in the executive branch of the Government blanket authority to condemn property without requiring the holder of that office to establish, in the specific case involving a specific piece of property, that the criteria of the law of public necessity are present. I do not believe we should give such sweeping powers to the Secretary of the Interior in this case, in the Oregon Dunes case, or in any other case.

Therefore, a change in the formula so far as its percentage is concerned does not meet the essence of the objection of the Senator from Oregon in regard to condemnation. But adopting the suggestion I make by way of a limitation upon the two Secretaries in respect to denying them blanket condemnation authority in no way denies the adoption of a wild rivers program. I am for a wild rivers program; but I believe we ought to plan its administration without granting blanket exchange or condemnation authority to either of the Secretaries involved. Therein lies the difference with the committee.

I may say, as a special pleader, but as one who has a right to plead specially, because of the special circumstances that exist in my State, that when I am dealing with a serious public question in my State that is hinged on the undeniable fact that more than 50 percent of the real estate in my State is owned by the Federal Government, it is important that the type of protection I seek in regard to fee simple rights be recognized by the Senate, and that consideration be given to the amendments I offer. Oregon is a special case in relationship to a majority of the States of the Union. In most States of the Union, the percentage of public domain Federal ownership of the real estate of my State does not exist. That is why I make the plea.

If it were a case of the Senator from Oregon being opposed to parks; if it were a case in which the Senator from Oregon were opposed to any and all land exchanges under any and all circumstances; if it were a case in which the Senator from Oregon said that under no circumstances should the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture ever be given authority to condemn property, I ought to be out of court, looking upon the Senate as a court in that sense. But that is not my position.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the Secretary of the Interior in the Dunes case, and the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture in this case would ultimately be able to get every acre of land that they really need with which to carry out the laudable objectives of both bills if they could establish a case. However, I do not intend to vote to give them the arbitrary and discretionary power to say that they made the findings and that we do not have the authority to do anything about it. The courts have held time and time again that the decision of administrative officers in such cases are final.

I have already obtained consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my major remarks, the testimony that I presented to the Senate committee, setting forth the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court and other courts, sustaining the point I have just made.

There is no question about my position on the law in respect to this matter. I am only asking for the protection that many in my State want to obtain. It is my duty to represent them, and it is my duty to try to get it in the way of legislation, if possible.

Mr. President, denying the senior Senator from Oregon the changes in this bill and in the Oregon Dunes bill, thinking that they have been swept under the rug by passing the legislation denying me those changes will not settle this controversy in the State of Oregon. I want to settle that controversy.

I say most respectfully to the Members of both parties in the Senate that I just do not think it is in the public interest for this controversy to continue to rage, as it will continue to rage unless we can work out an equitable solution that will give to these fee simple title owners the protection I seek.

I have no doubt whatsoever that if the Secretary of the Interior in regard to the Dunes matter, and both Secretaries in regard to this bill, would relax a bit in regard to their apparent insistence that they be given this blanket authority and recognize that they, too, owe a responsibility to this administration and this country to try to resolve this matter on a more friendly and equitable basis, and would sit down with those of us who hold to the point of view I have expressed, we could work out a condemnation and exchange procedure and formula that would protect the public interest in the laudable objectives of this bill and the Dunes bill.

That has been my plea. It will continue to be my plea. I will plead for it on the floor of the legislative body. However, if I find that there is no alternative but to plead for it also on the political platforms of my State, I will do that, too.

I believe in the basic, inherent right of the people of the States to govern themselves and determine their own policies and elect those who follow a course of action that will protect what the people want.

I have no doubt that in the campaign coming on in 1966, there will be those who will make political issue of a good many facets of these controversies. To avoid that and get the facts before my people, I asked the Comptroller General of the United States to look into the matter of exchanges. That is why I have worked as long and hard in trying to reach a satisfactory compromise, a conscionable compromise on the condemnation problem involved in the Dunes case. The question now rears its head to a certain degree in this case. That will continue to be my record. I do not believe that these are problems that ought to be forced to solution on the political platforms of my State.

I believe, as the senior Senator from Oregon, that careful consideration should be given to the plea I am making for an acceptable solution.

When I say what I say now, I imply no criticism. Senators know the pace of work that I accomplish. When the matter involving the Rogue River was under consideration, I did not know about it. I was never consulted by the Department of the Interior or by the Department of Agriculture. I was unaware that the matter was being considered by the committee. It can be said that someone ought to have told me. However, I am only looking at the fact that they did not.

There were field hearings in some States. I found out last week, when critics in my State talked to me about this bill, that there were no hearings in Oregon. They are rather critical of the fact that the opposition to the bill with respect to the Rogue River issue was never put to public hearing in my State.

There were hearings in most of the other States. I understand that there were public hearings back here for 2 days. They came and went without the senior Senator from Oregon knowing about it.

I am not criticizing anyone. I know what my record is on committees. I know, as a committee member, that I would want to know what the views of the elected officials of the State of Oregon or any other State were in regard to any issue as controversial in nature as this one.

I am in a very difficult position in Oregon, as I found out last week, to understand why a record was not made against the authority which is sought to be given to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, which I have protested here tonight.

I have faith in my colleagues. I refuse to believe that those in charge of the bill and the leadership of the Senate will let this matter pass the Senate without reaching a satisfactory and conscionable adjustment of the problems that are being raised by my constituents, pleading for a change in the language of the bill.

I believe the sound course in Oregon is to eliminate exchanges for the time being. As I have already explained, because of events that transpired early last year on an exchange proposal in Oregon, involving Point Reyes and Curry County lands, and because of an investigation of the facts of this case by the General Accounting Office which was undertaken at my request, we should let the atmosphere clear before taking an important step in Oregon in the field of Federal land-private land exchanges. The GAO report will, I hope, give us the facts of the Point Reyes-Curry County land exchange proposal, in contrast to the serious charges that were disseminated in the daily press of Portland and other parts of Oregon.

It is also important to note that the same arguments about the weakness of figures apply in the matter of land exchanges cited by Assistant Secretary Anderson in his letter of December 30.

As I mentioned above, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior stated that no specific tracts have been identified for exchanges; no persons have approached Interior officials and no Interior officials have approached landowners regarding exchanges.

But even more significant is the fact that the figures supplied to the committee are meaningless estimates and we are asked to disregard them. Thus, the Department does not even know what it may want to exchange. Nor does the Department know which of its valuable lands someone will seek out via exchange.

A CAVEAT FOR THE CONSERVATIONISTS

Let me emphasize that this concept of exchanging public domain and other lands for parks started only in 1962.

Well what does it mean? It is a "pig in a poke" for conservationists and in short order they may be saying that its use is only a little better than getting "a stick stuck in the eye."

What is wrong with the idea that it is based on the thin concept that all the public lands are exchangeable. They are not. Some are timbered and thus essential to the allowable cut; others are grasslands or important water holes and vital to a grazing leasee. Others are key parts of a watershed, or vital hunting access lands. In short, the fact is that the public lands are being used and events that unsettle these uses can create great problems.

Now it is one thing to exchange timber land for timber land, or grazing land for grazing land. But this bill proposes bartering land for parks.

The Oregon Multiple Use Advisory Board of the BLM addressed itself to the subject last August 4 and resolved to oppose exchanges. It indicated it wants lands for parks acquired by purchase, not by exchange.

I say most respectfully that my good friend the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, was a little surprised to find that there was opposition in my State to this bill. The Oregon Multiple-Use Advisory Board of the BLM addressed itself in opposition last August 4 to the whole concept of exchange.

With few exceptions it thinks exchanges should be "for lands of like kind and character." It wants lands classified for disposal and it wants exchanges to improve the land pattern. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be inserted in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution of Oregon Multiple-Use Advisory Board, August 1965

To respond to Senator Morse: Be it

Resolved by the Oregon Multiple-Use Advisory Board, That, this board opposes the unlimited power granted the Secretary of the Interior to exchange without limitation BLM land for lands within the boundaries of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore as proposed by the addition of section 2B to Senate bill 250;

That this multiple-use board opposes in principle the removal of any public timberland from sustained yield either in the county where the Oregon Dunes National Seashore is proposed, or elsewhere; be it further

Resolved by this multiple-use advisory board, That in the event any sustained yield forest area be exchanged for dunes lands that such forest lands be required to be maintained on a sustained yield basis of production;

That in explanation of the foregoing resolution said Oregon Multiple-Use Board resolves as follows:

That national parks and other areas of single purpose use, in general, be acquired by purchase and not by exchange and that any exchange in connection with the acquisition of lands devoted to a single purpose be accomplished only after approval of the people in the area affected;

That this board is dedicated to the principle of multiple use on all publicly owned lands and that with rare exception this board believes that each acre of publicly owned lands should provide the greatest possible diversity of uses;

That this board does not oppose all exchanges as such but recognizes that some exchanges may be in the public interest and in the interest of the owners of non-Federal lands offered for exchange;

Further that each proposed exchange must be fairly examined and the impact on the economics of the area from which the non-Federal lands shall come, shall be considered along with the impact upon the area from which the Federal lands shall come;

That generally and with few exceptions, the exchange of lands shall be for lands of like kind and character;

That no exchange shall be across State lines;

That of the lands finally classified for disposal they shall be first used in exchanges for non-Federal lands which will best improve the public land pattern and its uses before public sale is considered;

That in the event of public sale the owner of adjoining or adjacent lands shall be given the privilege of meeting the high bid; be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished the Secretary of the Interior, the Oregon congressional delegation, the O. & C. advisory board and the Public Lands Committee of the Oregon State Legislature.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Max Ruge of the Weyerhaeuser Co., Klamath Falls, sent me a very comprehensive statement on exchange and I ask unanimous consent that his letter be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Weyerhaeuser Co.,
Klamath Falls, Oreg., January 10, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: BLM State Director Russell Getty has asked that I personally express to you my thoughts on your letter to him dated October 21, relative to exchange provision of two bills affecting Oregon which are currently before the Congress.

First I want to point out that in the past, exchanges of forest land in this region have been used primarily for the purposes of mutual consolidation for more efficient forest management. In these types of exchanges the private owner, the Federal agency and the public can all gain.

The types of exchanges as outlined in the Oregon Dunes and wild rivers bills are somewhat different in that they permit a public agency to exchange Federal land for putting together parks and recreational areas which limit or prohibit any commercial use.

Many people feel that public agencies should not use the exchange process to avoid the appropriation process. Is there not some danger in bypassing congressional scrutiny by the exchange route instead of purchasing the lands? If, however, the exchange method is used it should be mandatory that the lands be replaced by publicly owned lands of equivalent value.

The amendatory language of section 2(b) of S. 250 excepts O. & C. and Coos Bay Wagon Road lands from being exchanged. This is an attempt to prevent disposing of public lands which are under sustained yield management. This motive, we agree, is laudable but in reality this would leave principally public domain lands available for exchange.

The public domain lands in western Oregon are presently managed the same as O. & C. lands and their timber is included in computing the allowable cut. Therefore, any disposition of public domain lands would also affect the allowable cut from public lands. In many cases this may mean merely transferring lands from public sustained yield to private sustained yield but this may not always be the case. The hard fact is, that in making recreational "set-asides" from commercial forest land, some impact will be made on the local economy. Whether the recreational facility so established will balance out this loss is a decision that must be carefully weighed by the Federal agencies and local governments.

I would suggest that a provision be made in the language of S. 250 to include that the county commissioners of the counties involved also be consulted. Also, provisions should be made for public hearings to be held in the local area.

As to S. 1446, the wild rivers bill, this proposal would give exchange authority to the Secretary of Agriculture as well as to the Secretary of the Interior. Exempting O. & C. lands alone would not prevent possible allowable-cut reducing exchanges if national forest lands were still included. If both types of land were exempted, here again about the only lands available would be public domain. The same comments made about public domain lands in S. 250 would apply here also. Here again the basic fact remains that if managed forest lands are removed from multiple use and dedicated to single-use recreation areas, some decrease in the allowable cut will occur.

Here also it would be well to make provisions for public hearings and consultation with county commissioners and advisory boards. This would help insure that whatever decision is made on an exchange will be equitable and have the minimum effect on the local economy.

As to the question of what effect there would be on the allowable cut if the Rogue River were to be designated as a wild river, you might not know that the Medford district of the BLM, which has jurisdiction over much of the land bordering the Rogue in the Galice area, has already withdrawn from timber cutting a strip of land along the river. They did this with the concurrence of their local advisory board and the county commissioners. This withdrawal meant a reduction in the district's allowable cut of 2 million feet a year.

On the lower river the U.S. Forest Service has consummated trades with U.S. Plywood in order to consolidate the U.S. Forest Service lands bordering the river. They have also created a scenic strip along the river which I believe is excluded from their allowable cut. So, actually designating the Rogue as a wild river would probably not have a significant effect on the allowable cut over what has already taken place.

In conclusion, Senator, it seems to me that both the dunes and the Rogue are adequately protected and managed for recreation now. In a State with almost 56 percent of its land area in public ownership, why risk upsetting both private and public sustained yield plans to do something which is already being done?

Very truly yours,

Max Ruge,
Member O. & C. Advisory Board.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I note that his view differs from that of another Weyerhaeuser man, Mr. Bernard Orell, whose statement in support of exchanges appears on page 168 of the hearings of

April 22, 1965 on the Wild Rivers bill. He was testifying as chairman of the Forest Industries Council. The council, according to Mr. Orell, wants to require exchanges for land acquisition, where feasible, to help keep down the cost of Federal acquisitions, protect the tax base and assure a continued supply of forest products.

On the other hand, Mr. Ruge points out that forest land exchanges for more efficient management have been used advantageously in the past.

He questioned their use in the wild rivers situation, as well as in Oregon Dunes.

He stated well the case for review and report to the Congress on the exact impacts of this proposal that will authorize the bartering away all manner of Federal lands for parks.

As the Department submitted its bill the Secretary could have traded off part of Crater Lake Park to create the wild river.

The committee wisely reduced his authority by knocking out parks and wildlife refuges.

But in Oregon, this is not enough. The O. & C. lands, the public domain and the national forests bring more benefits to Oregon and mean more to our economic and our recreation growth, than do parks.

So conservationists should take very careful note, in their enthusiasm for parks, that the Nation's great conservation base, the national forests, public lands and O. & C. lands with their multiple-use programs are not traded away for parks.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat what I have been heard to say before; namely, that I am in favor of parks. However, let us buy them. Let the Federal Government pay for them out of the Federal Treasury. Then we will know what we are getting and what we are paying for. Then we will avoid the type of explosive controversy that has broken out across my State as a result of the differences that have developed over the Point Reyes Park exchange.

I am glad to have Secretary Udall say to me, in a letter, that he is not enthusiastic about land exchange in connection with the Dunes Park.

I judge that there is some waning of enthusiasm in the Department of the Interior for land exchanges generally. I hope so. All I am interested in is a policy. What I am interested in is that the Department of the Interior, through its Secretary, be willing to write into the law the protection that these fee simple owners are entitled to.

NEED FOR THE BILL

To me the important thing is to pass a bill with sufficient authority to establish the wild rivers concept.

The committee has done an excellent job with a difficult situation. I want to vote for the bill because I support its broad recreation and conservation principles. I do not want to ask the manager of the bill to take an amendment that affects wild rivers areas in other States.

The Senator from Idaho has my pledge of support for the inclusion of these two minor acquisition authorities—condemnation and exchange—at the proper time, if needed and if the circumstances warrant.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, various items which show the concern that exists in my State on these two issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe I owe it, not only to the Senator in charge of the bill and the chairman of the full committee and the members of the committee, to the minority, which has filed its reasons for opposing the bill, and to the leadership of the Senate also, to say that tomorrow—I hope we can dispose of it tomorrow, because I have no disposition to prolong the debate on the bill beyond the time necessary to make the RECORD—we can reach some adjustment of our differences.

If it should come to the point where we cannot, I do not want anyone to say that I did not tell in advance what I believe to be my clear duty, as the senior Senator from Oregon, to do parliamentarily in trying to protect the interests of the people of my State—I and those opposed to the bill—unless it is changed to protect the interests involved.

I shall offer an amendment, if it is necessary, to place the Rogue River under the study program.

In view of the controversy that exists, and in view of the great differences of opinion that exist in my State over condemnation and exchanges, the Rogue River ought to be included among other rivers that have been included in the section of the bill that calls for a study.

It has been done in connection with the Green River in Wyoming. It has been done with regard to the Skagit River. As the Senator from Washington has said, he had nothing to do with it. I did not say he had anything to do with it. I did not mean to imply that he had anything to do with it.

Nevertheless, the Rogue River should go into the study section of the bill.

Mr. President, I say most respectfully that I do not know of any river that calls for being placed under the study program more than the Rogue River.

I would prefer to eliminate the exchange and condemnation provisions so as to protect the rights of my constituents, without having to go to a study program; but, Mr. President, we cannot separate the Rogue River from the need for more careful analysis of such condemnation problems. Also, I believe that much can be said for putting the Rogue River under a study project, in view of the very heated political furnace which is being stoked in my State by those seeking to attack the administration on the basis of certain charges that they have made against the administration and in regard to which I have asked for the proof.

To date, I have not received the proof, and for that reason I have asked the Comptroller General to investigate the whole exchange problem involved in the Point Reyes-Curry County situation and to see whether there is any proof of any malfeasance on the part of any Federal official of the Department of the Interior who was involved in the matter of exchanges in connection with the Point Reyes Park issue.

Mr. President, I am sorry to have taken so much time, but it is better to take the time tonight so that the information will be available to Senators tomorrow, when—I am hoping, at least—it will expedite the handling of the case tomorrow.

Let me say to my good friend the Senator from Idaho, as I stated in the beginning, that I shall not ask for any action on my amendment to the committee amendment tonight. Rather, I prefer that some time elapse so that Senators can read the statements I have made on behalf of the people of my State, in the hope that we can come to a common understanding and make it possible for me ultimately to vote for a revised bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I also hope that it will be possible for us to make some adjustments in the bill, to reach what the Senator from Oregon has described as a conscionable compromise as to the issues he has raised on the floor of the Senate this evening.

The Senator from Oregon can be assured of my best effort in this regard, and I hope that some agreement can be reached.

EXHIBIT 1

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., December 28, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Herewith is the information you requested in your letter of November 15, 1965, concerning the land acquired for each national park or recreation area created since January 1, 1955.

From January 1, 1955, to September 30, 1965, 45 areas administered by the National Park Service (NPS) were created. The areas were created either by statute, by Presidential Proclamation, or by order of the Secretary of the Interior. For areas which were authorized by statute, the gross acreage in all cases was limited to either a specific number of acres, a maximum number of acres, a specific site and adjacent lands, or a defined boundary. For areas designated by Presidential proclamation, or by an order of the Secretary of the Interior, the gross acreage was specified in the authorization.

The information contained in the attached schedules was obtained from the latest information available from the records of the National Park Service in Washington, D.C. To ascertain that title had passed to the United States for lands listed as federally owned, deed files or other authenticating documents were examined. In instances where such files were not available in Washington, statements of responsible Park Service officials were accepted. In several instances, the gross acreage reported is based on estimates made by the National Park Service.

As stated in your request, we did not reveal to officials of the National Park Service our purpose for gathering the information you requested. We trust that the information furnished will serve your purposes.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

Areas administered by the National Park Service created during the period from Jan. 1, 1955, to Sept. 30, 1965

Name of area and State	Date of authorization	Acreage at Sept. 30, 1965			At the date of authorization by Congress			Acres acquired since date of authorization				
		Gross	Federal	Non-Federal	Gross acreage	General description of land	Acres non-federally owned	Donation	Purchase	Condemnation	Exchange	Total
NATIONAL PARKS												
Canyonlands National Park, Utah	Sept. 12, 1964 (Public Law 88-590).	257,640.00	257,640.00	----------	257,640.00	The land consists of weirdly, eroded rocks, towering spires, and mesas rising more than 7,800 feet.	20,976.40	----------	----------	----------	[1] 20,976.40	20,976.40
Haleakala National Park, Hawaii	Sept. 13, 1960 (Public Law 86-744).	26,402.78	17,130.00	9,272.78	26,402.78	The park area includes the 10,023 foot Haleakala volcano and crater located on the island of Maui.	9,272.78	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Virgin Islands National Park, V.I.	Aug. 2, 1956 (Public Law 84-925).	[2] 15,150.00	11,018.08	4,131.92	[3] 9,500.00	The park is located on the island of St. John with lands consisting of hills, sandy beaches, and tropical plants.	9,500.00	5,086.41	281.67	----------	----------	5,368.08
NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD PARKS												
Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park, Mo.	Apr. 22, 1960 (Public Law 86-434).	1,730.00	1,007.96	722.04	(4)	The land consists of trails, roads, markers, and buildings from a Civil War battle.	----------	1,007.96	----------	----------	----------	1,007.96
NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARKS												
City of Refuge National Historical Park, Hawaii.	July 26, 1955 (Public Law 84-177).	181.85	180.83	1.02	[5] 181.87	A site consisting of prehistoric houses, royal fish ponds, coconut groves, and shore scenery.	181.87	180.83	----------	----------	----------	180.83
Minute Man National Historical Park, Mass.	Sept. 21, 1959 (Public Law 86-321).	750.00	288.76	461.24	[6] 750.00	A tract of land containing the stone walls, boulders, and other features where the British troops were fired on by the Colonial Minute Men.	741.17	.33	270.42	[7] 9.18	----------	279.93
Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho.	May 15, 1965 (Public Law 89-19).	----------	----------	----------	[8] 3,000.00	This designated land of the Nez Perce Indian country of northern Idaho is to be established as a historical park to commemorate the early Indian culture and the Lewis and Clark Expedition through the area.	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
NATIONAL MONUMENTS												
Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, Nebr.	June 5, 1965 (Public Law 89-33).	3,105.00	----------	3,150.01	3,150.00	The land consists of numerous well-preserved Miocene mammal fossils.	3,150.00	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument, Tex.	Aug. 31, 1965 (Public Law 89-154).	----------	----------	----------	(8)	The land consists of flint used by early man to make arrowheads and weapons.	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Booker T. Washington National Monument, Va.	Apr. 2, 1956 (Public Law 84-464).	217.93	217.93	----------	(8)	Site of the birthplace and childhood home of Booker T. Washington, a Negro leader and educator.	----------	199.73	.10	[9] 18.10	----------	217.93
Buck Island Reef National Monument, V.I.	Dec. 28, 1961. Established by Presidential Proclamation No. 3443.	[10] 850.00	850.00	----------	----------	The land consists of a tropical island with a surrounding coral reef.	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Pecos National Monument, N. Mex.	June 28, 1965 (Public Law 89-54).	342.00	----------	342.00	342.00	The land consists of a monument in the headwaters valley of the Pecos River commemorating the Spanish exploration and settlement of the Southwest.	342.00	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Russell Cave National Monument, Ala.	May 11, 1961. Designated by Presidential Proclamation No. 3413.	[10] 310.45	310.45	----------	----------	The cave contains almost continuous archeological records of human habitation from at least 6000 B.C. to about A.D. 1650.	----------	310.45	----------	----------	----------	310.45
NATIONAL MILITARY PARKS												
Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, Ala.	July 25, 1956. (Public Law 84-800).	2,040.00	2,040.00	----------	(11)	The site of the battle of Mar. 27, 1814, on the Tallapoosa River when Gen. Andrew Jackson's forces broke the power of the Creek Indian Confederacy, resulting in white settlement of Alabama.	----------	2,040.00	----------	----------	----------	2,040.00
Pea Ridge National Military Park, Ark.	July 20, 1956. (Public Law 84-744).	4,283.40	4,278.75	4.65	(12)	The scene of one of the largest engagements of the Civil War west of the Mississippi River which occurred on Mar. 7-8, 1862.	----------	4,274.15	4.60	----------	----------	4,278.75
NATIONAL RECREATION AREAS												
Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, Pa.-N.J.	Sept. 1, 1965 (Public Law 89-158).	----------	----------	----------	(13)	The land at the site consists of area of and adjacent to the proposed Tock's Island Reservoir project.	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, Ariz.-Utah.[14]	April 18, 1958. Interbureau agreement.	1,239,985.16	1,217,078.84	22,906.32	----------	The 3d highest dam in the world, which forms Lake Powell is located at this site.	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

See footnotes at end of table.

Areas administered by the National Park Service created during the period from Jan. 1, 1955, to Sept. 30, 1965—Continued

Name of area and State	Date of authorization	Acreage at Sept. 30, 1965			At the date of authorization by Congress			Acres acquired since date of authorization				
		Gross	Federal	Non-Federal	Gross acreage	General description of land	Acres non-federally owned	Donation	Purchase	Condemnation	Exchange	Total
NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES												
Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site, Pa.	Aug. 31, 1964 (Public Law 88-546).	950.00		950.00	[6] 950.00	The project consists of remnants of the Allegheny Railroad of the Pennsylvania Canal which connected the eastern division of the canal (Columbia to Hollidaysburg) to the western division (Johnstown to Pittsburgh).	950.00					
Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site, Colo.	June 3, 1960 (Public Law 86-487).	178.00	178.00		([15])	The site was the principal outpost of civilization on the southern plains. The area is gently sloping Arkansas River Valley land.		5.08	172.92			178.00
Chimney Rock National Historic Site, Nebr.	Aug. 9, 1956. Designated by Secretary's order.	83.36		[16] 83.36	83.36	The area includes a campsite and 500-foot spire of rock used by early settlers on the Oregon Trail.	83.36					
Edison National Historic Site, N.J.	Sept. 5, 1962 (Public Law 87-628).	20.46	17.96	2.50	[17] 18.26	Land consists of the buildings and equipment used by Edison, which includes his library, papers, and models of some of his inventions. Site also includes Glenmont, the 23-room home of Edison, completely furnished.	2.50	2.20				2.20
Fort Bowie National Historic Site, Ariz.	Aug. 30, 1964 (Public Law 88-510).	900.00	[18] 630.00	270.00	[6] 1,000.00	The site consists of the remaining historic structures of the old Fort Bowie in Cochise County.						
Fort Davis National Historic Site, Tex.	Sept. 8, 1961 (Public Law 87-213).	460.00	447.36	12.64	[6] 460.00	The site was once a key post in the west Texas defensive system, which guarded immigrants on the San Antonio-El Paso road.	460.00	447.36				447.36
Fort Larned National Historic Site, Kans.	Aug. 31, 1964 (Public Law 88-541).	750.00		750.00	[6] 750.00	The area consists of the site and remaining historic structures of Fort Larned in Pawnee County and the nearby remains of the Santa Fe Trail.	750.00					
Fort St. Marks National Historic Site, Fla.	Oct. 10, 1962 (Public Law 87-789).	([19])	([19])									
Fort Smith National Historic Site, Ark.	Sept. 13, 1961 (Public Law 87-214)	14.00	12.35	1.65	[5] 14.00	One of the first U.S. military posts in the Louisiana Territory, the fort was a center of law and order for the lawless regions to the west.	14.00	10.07	2.28			12.35
Golden Spike National Historic Site, Utah.	July 30, 1965 (Public Law 89-162).	2,176.00		2,176.00	[13] 2,176.00	The site of the golden spike ceremony on May 10, 1869, where the Union Pacific and Central Pacific Railroads met to complete the first transcontinental railroad.	2,176.00					
Herbert Hoover National Historic Site, Iowa.	Aug. 12, 1965 (Public Law 89-119).	200.00	28.00	172.00	200.00	The land consists of the birthplace, boyhood home, and burial place of the 31st President of the United States.	172.00					
Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, Ariz.	Aug. 28, 1965 (Public Law 89-148).	160.00		160.00	[6] 160.00	The site was once a trading post used by the reservation traders.	160.00					
John Muir National Historic Site, Calif.	Aug. 31, 1964 (Public Law 88-547).	9.20		9.20	9.20	The site is a national memorial to John Muir in recognition of his efforts as a conservationist and a crusader for national parks and reservations.	9.20					
Sagamore Hill National Historic Site, N.Y.	July 25, 1962 (Public Law 87-547).	85.00	85.00		[6] 90.00	The site was the home of Theodore Roosevelt from 1885 until death.	90.00	85.00				85.00
Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, N.H.	Aug. 31, 1964 (Public Law 88-543).[20]					The land consists of the home, studio, and gardens of Augustus Saint-Gaudens, a foremost American sculptor.						
St. Thomas National Historic Site, V.I.	Jan. 19, 1961.[21] Designated by Secretary's order.	1.66	1.66			The site consists of Fort Christian, the oldest standing structure in the Virgin Islands. The fort remains essentially the same as when it served as the hub of the early Danish settlement.						
Theodore Roosevelt Birthplace National Historic Site, N.Y.	July 25, 1962 (Public Law 87-547).	.11	.11		[6] .11	The birthplace of the 26th President of the United States.	.11	.11				.11

NATIONAL MEMORIALS												
Arkansas Post National Memorial, Arkansas.	July 6, 1960 (Public Law 86-595).	220.60	220.60	----------	([22])	The site consists of land known as the Arkansas Post State Park donated by the State of Arkansas.	----------	220.60	----------	----------	----------	220.60
Fort Clatsop National Memorial, Oregon.	May 29, 1958 (Public Law 85-435).	125.00	124.97	.03	[6] 125.00	The site of the winter encampment of the Lewis and Clark Expedition.	125.00	21.20	103.77	----------	----------	124.97
General Grant National Memorial, N.Y.	Aug. 14, 1958 (Public Law 85-459).	.76	.76	----------	.76	The land consists of a memorial to Gen. Ulysses S. Grant. The tombs of General and Mrs. Grant are located here.	.76	.76	----------	----------	----------	.76
Hamilton Grange National Memorial, N.Y.	Apr. 27, 1962 (Public Law 87-438).	.70	.70	----------	[23] .70	The home of Alexander Hamilton known as the Grange located on 140th St., New York, N.Y.	.70	.70	----------	----------	----------	.70
Johnstown Flood National Memorial, Pa.	Aug. 31, 1964 (Public Law 88-546).	55.00	----------	55.00	[6] 55.00	The land consists of the 2 abutments of the South Fork Dam, east of South Fork and adjacent lands. The area commemorates the Johnstown Flood and the Pennsylvania Canal.	55.00	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial, Ind.	Feb. 19, 1962 (Public Law 87-407).	200.00	116.39	83.61	[6] 200.00	The southern Indiana farm on which Abraham Lincoln grew from youth into manhood.	200.00	114.49	1.90	----------	----------	116.39
NATIONAL SEASHORES												
Assateague Island National Seashore, Md.-Va.	Sept. 21, 1965 (Public Law 89-195).	39,630.00	9,448.00	30,182.00	[13] 39,630.00	The land consists of the area within Assateague Island and the small marsh islands adjacent to the island.	30,182.00	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Cape Cod National Seashore, Mass.	Aug 7, 1961 (Public Law 87-126)	44,600.00	1,739.65	42,860.35	[5] 44,600.00	The land consists of ocean beaches, dunes, woodlands, freshwater ponds, and marshes on outer Cape Cod.	44,600.00	----------	----------	[9] 3.07 [24] 1,736.58	----------	1,739.65
Fire Island National Seashore, N.Y.	Sept. 11, 1964 (Public Law 88-587)	18,700.00	145.66	18,554.34	[13] 18,700.00	The land consists of a barrier island east of Moriches Inlet and several small islands nearby with dunes, marshes, and beaches.	18,700.00	----------	----------	[9] 145.66	----------	145.66
Padre Island National Seashore, Tex.	Sept. 28, 1962 (Public Law 87-712)	[3] 133,918.23	56,225.56	77,692.67	[5] 133,918.23	The land consists of an 80-mile stretch of barrier island along the gulf coast, with wide sandy beaches.	133,918.23	33,545.41	----------	[9] 22,680.15	----------	56,225.56
Point Reyes National Seashore, Calif.	Sept. 13, 1962 (Public Law 87-657)	64,546.00	23,196.74	41,349.26	[13] 64,546.00	The land consists of beaches backed by tall cliffs; lagoons and esteros; and forested ridges on a peninsula north of San Francisco.	64,546.00	10,410.00	11,379.74	----------	[25] 1,407.00	23,196.74

---

[1] In the exchange, 21,126.01 acres were given. The land obtained was generally rocky-type land. A description of the land given was not contained in the deed file, but it was required to be comparable to the land obtained.

[2] Pursuant to Public Law 87-750, the boundary of the park increased by 5,650 acres.

[3] The maximum acreage provided for in the original statute.

[4] The statute provided for the acquisition of lands comprising the Wilson's Creek Battlefield site and other adjacent lands.

[5] The boundary of the area was stated in the statute.

[6] The maximum acreage provided for in the statute.

[7] Friendly.

[8] In the statute, the land to be acquired was designated by the name of the site.

[9] Adversary.

[10] Gross acreage provided for in the Presidential proclamation.

[11] The statute limited the acquisition of lands to certain areas in the Horseshoe Bend Battlegrounds.

[12] The statute limited the acquisition of lands to certain areas in the Pea Ridge Battlefield.

[13] Gross acreage was to be determined from a map as provided for in the statute.

[14] This area was referred to as the Glen Canyon Unit (70 Stat. 105) prior to being established as a national recreation area.

[15] A geographical location of the area was provided for in the statute.

[16] A national historic site not owned by the Federal Government, but the area is administered by the National Park Service.

[17] The Edison National Historic Site was created by the merger of the Edison Laboratory National Monument and the Edison Home National Historic Site.

[18] The land was withdrawn from the public domain.

[19] According to the National Park Service, the State of Florida rescinded its intention to donate the land provided for in the statute.

[20] The statute provided for the acquisition by donation, Saint-Gaudens Memorial and by purchase or donation, not more than 3 acres of adjacent lands.

[21] The government of the Virgin Islands transferred the site to the United States on Jan. 19, 1961.

[22] The statute provided for the acquisition of the lands known as the Arkansas Post State Park and other land adjacent to the park.

[23] The statute provided for the establishment of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton located in New York, N.Y., as a national memorial.

[24] According to the National Park Service, no final court action has been taken.

[25] The acreage given in the exchange included 6,839.75 acres of ranch-type land near Phoenix, Ariz., which was under the control of the Bureau of Land Management. The acreage obtained was ranch-type land.

Exhibit 2

Statement of Hon. Wayne Morse, a U.S. Senator From the State of Oregon

Senator Morse. Mr. Chairman, I have been chairing the meetings on the higher education bill, but I have made arrangements for Senator Randolph to be my proxy and proceed.

I wish to talk about procedure with the committee for just one moment. Of course, I will abide by the decision of the committee.

I have a matter here that is of major importance to the senior Senator from Oregon, a matter which is highly controversial in my State. I propose to treat it as a strictly legal problem. For, Mr. Chairman, I am actually appearing before the court of last resort in this matter, and the cases that I cite in my argument leave no doubt of this so far as the law is concerned.

It is a matter, in my opinion, of great importance both to my State and also to the future congressional policy in regard to the whole question of condemnation and eminent domain. Time consuming as it will be, I would like to make the record on this question, and I would like to make it a public record, in accordance with a detailed statement that I have worked on for some time, which consists, may I say, of 32 pages. And I am willing to accommodate myself to the pleasure of this committee. I will present it today, tomorrow, next week, or whenever you want it presented. But I want to say, gentlemen, that I do not think that I would be carrying out my responsibilities to the people of my State if I did not present this statement in detail. I say most respectfully, in my judgment this committee would not be carrying out its responsibilities to the people of my State if it did not hear the statement in detail.

Senator Gruening. Senator Morse, speaking for the chairman of the subcommittee, we would be glad to hear you at any length you may desire, anything that you have to say whether long or short is of great importance to this committee.

Senator Morse. Very well, I shall proceed.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I greatly appreciate the opportunity you have afforded me to submit my views on S. 250, to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Park.

The obligation which I must carry out today, in all good conscience, is one which is not easy to assume. Although my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon, and I agree on the great majority of issues which come before the Senate, I regret that I must oppose my colleague on the issue of the power of condemnation which is inherent in the provisions of S. 250. This power to condemn private property for dunes seashore purposes was also an essential feature of my colleague's bill, S. 1137, of the last Congress.

Let me make it very clear at the beginning of my testimony that the senior Senator from Oregon wants a dunes seashore park in the State of Oregon. His major thesis is simply that not a single square inch of private property needs to be taken to have a most adequate dunes park in my State.

And I think the committee can well understand that because I do not endorse the bill in its present form, the erroneous representation has been made in Oregon that I am against a dunes park. In my judgment, we will have a better dunes park with the condemnation provision eliminated. Such a dunes park in my judgment will be more acceptable to more people in Oregon because it will eliminate the controversial features of this park. I think it is very desirable that we have a park for which there can be overwhelming support, rather than a park which, in my judgment, would cause disagreement and controversy and political difficulties for some time to come.

Mr. Chairman, on December 3, 1963, I announced to the Senate that I would oppose S. 1137 as reported. My primary objection to the bill related to the very broad power of condemnation that would be conferred to the Secretary of the Interior—a power which, in the present form of the Oregon Dunes bill, is far more comprehensive than that which would have been conferred under S. 1137 of the 88th Congress, as it was introduced by my colleague on March 19, 1963. In fact, in my judgment this bill is worse than the last one in regard to the condemnation provision.

It is a most unpleasant task, I assure my colleagues, to oppose a bill such as S. 250 which is designed to foster and promote recreational values, not only for Oregonians, but for all Americans, for generations to come. The bill has much merit and a great appeal to all of us, particularly those of us who love the great outdoors and the incomparably beautiful coast of Oregon. But the establishment of this marvelous recreation area—undoubtedly in the interest of the public—should not be effected through a plan that takes away from many individuals one of the most cherished rights enjoyed by freeman under our constitutional system of government. I refer to the time-honored and respected right of American citizens to own land in fee simple for "themselves, their heirs, and assigns."

If we were dealing with a proposed national park in the East or Midwest or possibly in some other part of Oregon, we might be able to find a very heavy measure of public interest in the scales wherein we balance public versus private interests on the question of condemnation. As I said in the Senate on December 3, 1963:

"I have heard many Senators compare the situation in Oregon with the dunes situation in Indiana, the Cape Cod situation in New England, and some other park proposals elsewhere in the country. There is little resemblance, if any, between the Oregon situation and the situation in those other States."

Senator Simpson. Will the Senator yield?

Senator Morse. Yes; I yield.

Senator Simpson. Could the reporter read back the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin? I want the Senator from Oregon to hear it.

(The statement of Senator Nelson referred to was read by the reporter.)

Senator Simpson. Does the senior Senator from Oregon wish to make any comment with respect to that statement?

Senator Morse. I have pages of comment on it.

May I say also, as we lawyers know, it is necessary to qualify a witness from time to time. And if you will permit me to qualify myself on the subject of eminent domain and condemnation, I might say that I taught all of the real property courses at the University of Oregon for some years, including, of course, the legal subject of eminent domain.

Mr. Chairman, in my State, some of the newspapers which have not been friendly to me on the issue of the dunes park, tried to misrepresent my position by alleging an inconsistency. They pointed out that I support the Indiana Dunes Park. In fact, I am one of the cosponsors of that bill. They also pointed out that I voted for the Cape Cod Park. And I certainly did. And in the next section of my brief, I deal with my position with regard to those parks and their great differences in respect to the proposed park in Oregon.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore bill when it passed the Senate last month, and I supported the Cape Cod Seashore legislation, even though both of these projects involve condemnation of private property. Because I have repeatedly objected to such provisions in the Oregon Dunes bill, I cannot let this occasion pass without differentiating once again between the Oregon Dunes proposal and the Indiana and Cape Cod situation.

The difference, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, is quite simple. As I indicated to the Senate in 1963 (Congressional Record, vol. 109, pt. 19, pp. 25164-25166), in the Indiana Dunes Park area there is very little public land available for use in a national park. Of the 11,292 acres which the proposed Indiana Dunes Park would include, only a little over 2,000 acres in the area is public land, and that is contained in the Indiana Dunes State Park. We are dealing, gentlemen, except for a State park within the area, with all private land.

The legal question of public necessity is then presented. If you are going to have a park in this area you have to condemn. And there is no question, as you will see from the the authorities I shall subsequently cite, that the law is crystal clear on the point that you can condemn for public necessity purposes. But there is always an issue of fact as to whether in a given set of operative facts there is a public necessity for condemnation. If that public necessity does not exist, then I respectfully submit that condemnations should not flow.

As you will also see from the authorities I shall subsequently cite, the Congress is the court that weighs these facts. Once the Congress determines this question of public necessity, no court will set the condemnation action aside unless it can be shown—which is almost impossible—that there is corruption or arbitrary, capricious conduct on the part of the finders of the fact. Under our judicial system, the body which you gentlemen on the subcommittee symbolize, namely, the Congress, will constitute the court of last resort, as the cases I wish to cite will demonstrate.

So in regard to the Indiana dunes, all of the remaining land in the area is privately owned lands or noncontiguous wetland. Consequently, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to have an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore at all, we must have condemnation. This conclusion conforms fully to the principles of public necessity and the correlative right of eminent domain.

But let me point out, Mr. Chairman, that the case is entirely different with the proposed Oregon Dunes National Seashore. Let the record be perfectly clear that in Oregon it is not necessary to condemn a square foot of property in order to have more park area than we can use. There is absolutely no need to condemn private property in the case of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore.

On December 19, 1963, I took the same position with respect to S. 792 of the 88th Congress, to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Mich. I voted against S. 792 because, as in the case of the present bill, the power to condemn private land was inherent in the bill. In discussing this case in the Senate, I said:

"My understanding is that even in the Sleeping Bear area there could be quite a large park if there were not a requirement of condemnation of the relatively small number of private holdings which are to be condemned." (Congressional Record, vol. 109, pt. 19, p. 25166.)

"The only objection I raise to the Michigan bill is that we should eliminate the condemnation sections in the bill and see what can be arrived at by way of Sleeping Bear Park on the basis of negotiation and purchase. Later, if a set of facts develops, that will stop them from having the park; if they find that later a situation should develop which, in order to get a certain piece of property from the standpoint of public necessity, would require action of the kind proposed, we can then enact special legislation providing for condemnation for those essential areas, and those areas alone." (Ibid. 25165.)

And that same principle you will find in the Morse amendment which I shall offer before I close my testimony on the Oregon dunes bill.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I contrast the Michigan and Indiana Dunes cases in order to reemphasize that where ample public lands are available with which to establish a dunes park, we should not invade private property ownership rights until we can demonstrate beyond a reasonable doubt that the park will fail in its purposes and objectives unless additional specific private lands are acquired through condemnation.

In Oregon, more than 50 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government. And yet there is pending before this subcommittee a measure for the establishment of an Oregon Dunes Park which would involve the condemnation of private property for use in the park. Now, these three words "the public necessity" are words of art in the law which are misunderstood by many laymen in a controversy such as this. It is very easy for them to criticize one such as the senior Senator from Oregon who is holding strictly to the law in the position that he has taken on this matter. All I have said, and say now, is that no private property should be condemned unless it can be shown that this piece of property is needed as a matter of "public necessity." And that is quite a different thing from giving to the Secretary of the Interior a blanket authority, as is given to him in this bill, to render the judgment in the name of the Congress as to whether or not a piece of property should be condemned. You give him that authority and you can't take it away from him, Mr. Chairman, unless you pass another statute to do it.

Senator Simpson. Does the Senator from Oregon agree with the Senator from Wyoming that under this procedure it is a taking of the property as soon as the petition is filed in the district court in the region where the land lies?

Senator Morse. That is right.

This power to condemn must be used only with extreme care and only where there is no other way to satisfy the public necessity. This is not the case in the Oregon Dunes, for ample public lands are already available.

This consideration applies with even greater force when the question of public beach lands is the issue at hand. As I shall point out later on in this speech, years ago, through the foresight of a great Oregon Governor, Oswald West, the State of Oregon completed the task of preserving for public use the Pacific Ocean beaches from the Columbia River in the north to the Oregon-California border in the south. These beaches were declared by the Oregon General Assembly to be vested in the State of Oregon as a public highway. That is, in Oregon every square inch of beach from the Columbia River to the California boundary, from between high and extreme low tide is owned by the State of Oregon. And I want you to keep that in mind as we consider the physical nature of this proposed park.

Consequently, between 300 and 400 miles of Pacific Ocean beach in Oregon is in public ownership. No impertinent signs reading "No Trespassing," "Keep Out," "Private Beach," or "Reserved for Guests," confront visitors desiring to enjoy the Pacific Ocean beaches of Oregon. Persons of all races and colors may use the beach and are welcomed there by Oregon and her people. This right of the public to enjoy the seashore of Oregon in perpetuity stands in marked contrast with the many instances wherein the Atlantic beach areas are restricted to use by a privileged few. It also stands in marked contrast to the beach areas that are available to the public in the Midwest and other parts of our Nation.

These are facts that we must keep in mind, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, when we weigh the private property interests of individuals who own land within the boundaries of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore, against the public interest involved in an acquisition of private lands for park and recreational purposes.

The private property within the proposed boundaries of the seashore cannot be dismissed as an insignificant element of this project. The committee's report on S. 1137 of the 88th Congress, a bill which, as reported, was essentially the same as S. 250, contains the statement on page 3 that "the new boundaries include an estimated 15 private residential properties and 2 commercial enterprises."

The report also states on page 4, "authority has been given by the adoption of a new section 4(d), for acquisition of scenic easements covering private property for 500 feet on both sides of U.S. Highway 101 to protect the national seashore against deleterious developments on such adjacent lands."

At page 5 the report indicates that about one-sixth of the proposed dunes seashore area—a total of 4,242 acres—is in private ownership. It is quite obvious, therefore, that private ownership rights are a significant element in the project, and cannot be disposed of on any de minimis considerations.

It has been pointed out that only 15 residences are involved, and that therefore the senior Senator from Oregon should not be so concerned. I would be just as concerned if only one residence was involved. Because, let me point out to this committee, that one residence is pretty precious under this juridical system of ours. Just one citizen, no matter how lowly or how small his property interest may be, is entitled to the same protection as someone with 500 or 5,000 or 50,000 acres. We are dealing here with a juridical concept. We are dealing here, in my judgment, with a matter of the interest of the individual against that of the Government. The bill is not improved by taking fee simple away from 15 parties, as far as their residences are concerned. There are, moreover, other fee simple owners of private property involved in this area who don't have residences on them, but it is still private property.

And so I repeat, I am interested only in the protection of individuals in their fee simple rights in the absence of a showing, on the facts, that fee simple must be taken away from them as a matter of public necessity. That is the issue.

And let me say, passing a bill won't settle that issue. Passing a bill isn't going to satisfy the individual who knows that the bill took property away from him when no essential public necessity in fact was involved. That is the issue. The question now is whether the Congress wants to work out an accommodation in connection with this bill that has been needed for years. Such an accommodation must be worked out now to protect what I think is one of the most precious liberties and freedoms the American citizen has; namely, the right to own property in fee simple, not to be taken away from him by the Government in the absence of a public necessity in respect to the use of that particular piece of property.

You see, gentlemen, you must think of this park as a blanket. We are trying to stretch out a blanket which we are going to call a park. But under that blanket, there are some privately owned fee simple titles. And there is no public necessity in some instances for taking those fee simple titles to individual parcels of land. But you will never know until the owner of that land has an opportunity to have a hearing on whether or not the doctrine of public necessity ought to be applied to his particular piece of property. That is what I am urging.

This involves, you see, the consideration of many abstract principles of law. You have heard me say in my battles on the floor of the Senate during the past 20 years that we don't have rights, any rights as free men and women, except in relation to the abstract principles of law. But it is hard work to deal with abstractions, and not very dramatic. It is easy to forget their concrete application to our daily lives.

But consider these 15 private landowners, some of whom have built their houses as retirees practically with their own hands. They are beautiful houses, though they would not look very good in Spring Valley in Washington, D.C. But in the Great Cathedral area of nature which God has given them for a surrounding they are wonderful homes. And I don't propose to take them away from those fee simple owners unless it can be shown that each individual parcel is needed as a matter of public necessity.

And let me tell you, you can take judicial notice that the Secretary of the Interior could not show public necessity in case after case. There is more public domain surrounding that area than you would ever include in the park.

As you will see in another subsection of my argument, Mr. Chairman, there has already been eliminated from this bill the best dunes in the area. If you gentlemen think that the bill you have before you is the bill that has the best dunes, come on, and I will take you out there. I will show you the best dunes They are not even included in this bill. They have already been excluded. They were in the original Neuberger bill, but they are not in it now. The arguments advanced by some attempt to explain why they have been excluded. Well, they are public lands, and I want to say that in my judgment you cannot justify excluding the best dunes while at the same time you are condemning these private holdings. In my judgment it is not necessary to take them in order to have a wonderful park.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said, some of the finest dunes land of the entire area is that which is located immediately south of Tenmile Creek extending to a point in the vicinity north of Coos Bay. This area was included in Senator Neuberger's bill, S. 1137 of the 88th Congress, but was eliminated by the Senate Interior Committee when it reported on S. 1137. It is interesting and significant that it was not included in H.R. 7524, which is the bill of the Congressman from this area of Oregon. It is my understanding that S. 250 also excludes the dunes area south of Tenmile Creek.

There are a number of private ownerships in the area just mentioned south of Tenmile Creek, but I noted upon reviewing Senate Report No. 674 of the 88th Congress that this 9-mile stretch of land was eliminated from the reported bill, S. 1137, because "developments of the next few years should determine whether this area is required exclusively for water supply and industrial expansion near Coos Bay, or if a considerable part of it can be used for seashore recreational purposes or dual uses if it is needed to accommodate visitors to the seashore" (S. Rept. No. 674, p. 3).

Let the record be perfectly clear. The Senator from Oregon would not want any of the private property in the so-called south of the Tenmile Creek area taken by way of condemnation unless there could be shown an essential public necessity. But also I want to point out that most of the very best dunes south of the Tenmile Creek area are already public lands. And I am at a loss to understand why they should be excluded on the basis of any argument that a great paper-producing company and various commercial companies in that area may need water. Why, Mr. Chairman, we give water easements in connection with public land all over this country to private enterprise. And I would support it. Mr. Chairman, a water easement does not in any way diminish the use of the property for park purposes.

Now, granted that there is enough land north of Tenmile Creek for an adequate park, the senior Senator still raises the question, why, however, should we exclude what the recreationalists tell me happen to be some of the best dunes for park purposes?

This is a most interesting situation. It indicates that the committee does give cognizance to private property interests, but that its major concern relates to potential industrial uses of privately owned property in this impressive 9-mile dune area. If industrial private property ownership is important, I feel that personal private property ownership is equally important and I do not believe that we should give favored consideration to one type of private ownership as contrasted with another. But I repeat, if any of this property south of Tenmile Creek that is privately owned is desirable for private industrial uses, then I do not want it taken away from them unless it can be shown that a given piece of property ought to be taken from the standpoint of public necessity, not under a blanket bill, but in connection with the facts relating to the fee-simple rights of the owner of that specific piece of property. This is quite a different approach, as you can see.

In regard to the public land south of Tenmile Creek on which some of the best dunes in the area are located, let me say that there is no justification for excluding that land when industrial sites are available for building various industries in the Coos Bay area and I am for the building of these industries. In fact, no one has been a greater supporter of the development of the private industry in that part of the State than the senior Senator from Oregon. But I am not in favor of saying that we can't have parklands there because water is needed that may be taken from under that land. Give them a water easement. That is all you need to do. We follow that procedure all over the country.

The members of the subcommittee have the solemn obligation to weigh carefully the interests of these property owners in the scales of legislative justice. For we of the Congress are truly and effectively the "court of last resort" for the individuals who own 4,000 acres of land in this proposed seashore park area. As I shall point out later, these landowners would have no appeal from our decision if we should conclude that their landownership rights are to be destroyed by a grant to the Secretary of the Interior of the power to deprive them of their land within the boundaries of the seashore project. That is what I call the blanket approach to this park problem.

We cannot shrug off the problems by saying "Let the courts decide the issue." The courts have made it clear to us in many cases, both at the State and Federal levels, that they will not review cases of this type once a finding is made that the lands to be acquired for the recreational area are for public use. There is no doubt that the lands to be used in this case will be devoted for public use. Thus, we of the Congress are, in fact and in effect, the highest court to which these private landowners may appeal. Once we have rendered our decision, the rights of these landowners on this issue are adjudicated for all time.

Of course, the owners of these lands will be afforded the protection of just compensation under the fifth amendment of the Constitution, but we all know that money compensation is a very poor substitute for the ownership of land which a man has acquired through his own foresight and wishes to retain for his own purposes as a free American citizen.

We have no way of knowing the specific intentions of the affected landowners as to the future use of their private property lying within the boundaries of the proposed Dunes Seashore project. I can assure my colleagues that scores of people who have written to me on this subject over the years are deeply apprehensive. Beyond a doubt, many plans for the future use of these privately owned lands will have to be abandoned and cherished hopes will be dashed if we grant the power of condemnation that is implicit in S. 250.

In order that we may have a clear understanding of the legal principles applicable to the condemnation provisions of S. 250, I believe a discussion of those principles is merited at this point.

At my request the Library of Congress supplied a very helpful analysis of the constitutional basis upon which private property may be condemned for park and recreational area purposes. I have not only checked their cases, but I have run the citations. The analysis made these pertinent observations concerning State and Federal law applicable to this question:

"A. CONDEMNATION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY FOR PUBLIC PARKS AND RECREATION AREAS

"It is apparently well settled that it is constitutional to condemn private property for the purpose of providing public parks, playgrounds, outdoor scenic spots, and public recreational areas. Vast tracts of uninhabited woodlands, or spots made beautiful by nature may be taken for State or National parks. (Nichols, one of our great authors on the subject 'The Law of Eminent Domain.' 3d ed., 1950 (1962 Supp.), sec. 7.5151.) In *Adirondack Railway* v. *New York State*, 176 U.S. 335 (1900), the State of New York condemned property of a railroad to provide a public preserve of wild forest lands for the public pleasure and health, to preserve the headwaters of important rivers, and to maintain an adequate stand of timber. The State courts upheld this taking and the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed, saying the purpose of the talking was a matter for legislative discretion of which judicial cognizance would not be taken.

"In *Bunyon* v. *Palisades Park Commrs.*, 153 N.Y.S. 622, it was held that it was for the public use to take land used for a quarry in order to preserve the scenic beauty of a river and a park. In *United States* v. *Gettysburg Electric R'y*, 160 U.S. 668 (1896), the Supreme Court upheld an act of Congress providing for the condemnation of private property for a national historic site at the Gettysburg battlefield, stating that the preservation of a great national site in order to promote feelings of patriotism and loyalty is a proper public use for which private property may be taken. The only State case on the condemnation of historic battlefields is *State ex rel. Smith* v. *Kemp*, 261 p. 556 (Kansas), where the taking was also upheld.

"Nichols, in the work cited, concludes that 'It is apparent that pleasure and sentiment must be the principal factors in justifying the taking of property for such purposes (scenic natural areas, woodlands, et cetera),' whereas the taking of land for city parks and playgrounds for active use is usually based on the public health and safety.

"As to the public taking of private property for park purposes, Nichols states that this is a comparatively recent thing in American life, but that such taking has uniformly been held constitutional usually on the ground of public health and morals. Numerous cases are cited on such takings; among the important Federal cases are the following:

"*Shoemaker* v. *United States* (147 U.S. 282 (1893)), upheld the taking of private land in the District of Columbia for Rock Creek Park, with which we are all familiar.

"*Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company* v. *City of Minneapolis* (232 U.S. 439 (1914)) upheld the taking by the city of Minneapolis of the shorelines of several lakes located in the city, together with adjacent lands, for public park purposes.

"In *Rindge Co.* v. *Los Angeles* (262 U.S. 700 (1923)), an owner of property situated along the Pacific coast near Los Angeles resisted the taking of his property for a public highway on the grounds that it was to be only a scenic route and that few people would use it. The Court held that an authorized public use in condemnation cases was properly met by a road affording mainly scenic beauty: 'Public uses are not limited, in the modern view, to matters of mere business necessity and ordinary convenience, but may extend to matters of public health, recreation, and enjoyment * * *. A road need not be for a purpose of business to create a public exigency; air, exercise, and recreation are important to the general health and welfare; pleasure travel may be accommodated as well as business travel; and highways may be condemned to places of pleasing natural scenery. *Higginson* v. *Nahant* (11 Allen (Mass. 530, 536)).' The Court also stated that it is not necessary that the entire community, nor even any considerable portion of it, should directly enjoy or participate in an improvement in order to constitute it a public use."

May I say to the committee that it will be observed that the court decisions spend very little time in discussing the source of the power of the Federal Government to acquire private lands for public park or recreational purposes. Perhaps some of the courts assume that the acquisition of land is an attribute of sovereignty. However, I would prefer to place the power of the Federal Government to take private land for public purposes on a more solid constitutional basis. This is the doctrine that I have never seen successfully rebutted in any of the legal literature. It is the doctrine that I expressed in my course on real property when we got to the subject of eminent domain.

The Federal Government, it has been observed in many Supreme Court decisions, is a Government of delegated powers. One might engage in philosophical-legal discussions at some length in searching out the basic delegated power under which the authority to acquire land for Federal recreation purposes is derived, but there seems to be little doubt, under the adjudicated cases involving condemnation of private land for park and recreation purposes, that the root source of such power is article I, section 8, of the Constitution, the so-called spending power. This is a power that is corollary to that given Congress to "lay and collect taxes, duties, and imposts to * * * provide for * * * the general welfare."

In *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U.S. 1 (1936)), the Supreme Court emphasized that the Federal power to tax includes the Federal power to expend funds to promote the general welfare. The Court said:

"The Congress is expressly empowered to lay taxes to provide for the general welfare. Funds in the Treasury as a result of taxation may be expended only through appropriation (art. I, sec. 9, cl. 7). They can never accomplish the objects for which they were collected, unless the power to appropriate is as broad as the power to tax. The necessary implication from the terms of the grant is that the public funds may be appropriated 'to provide for the general welfare of the United States.'"

Obviously, the spending of Federal funds for a public purpose is a spending for the general welfare. The objective of the spending may be carried out under the implementing clause of the Constitution which says:

"The Congress shall have power * * * to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States * * * (art. I, sec. 18)."

In view of the foregoing, I do not believe it can be questioned today that the Federal

Government has the authority to acquire private lands for public park and recreational purposes and that it may acquire such lands through condemnation proceedings. Condemnation is but one method of carrying out the law which authorizes the acquisition of private property for public uses.

If the issue were to be decided for the first time in the courts of our country today, I believe a strong case could be made for the proposition that in passing upon the right of the Federal Government to take private property for public use, the courts should weigh carefully the Government's power of condemnation against the individual's right to peaceful and uninterrupted property ownership. If the issue had not been settled in courts long ago, I think it could be argued with a great deal of logic that in each case courts should "balance the interests" to determine whether the power of condemnation for public purposes outweighs the private property ownership rights in each case under consideration. However, the issue was resolved long ago. And therefore, gentlemen, if you give this blanket authority to the Secretary of the Interior, the private property owners have no successful recourse.

This blanket authority under S. 250 is just what the Secretary of the Interior is after, and that is why he has been adamant in any suggestion that the senior Senator from Oregon has made to him about working out the kind of a compromise I shall propose before I finish this testimony. He wants the power, and I just do not believe in giving him any bureaucratic power he does not need. He does not need this power in this set of facts to establish a highly desirable park in the State of Oregon, and help us avoid what is going to be a controversy in our State that in my judgment should not be raised. It is not necessary to raise such a controversy in order to have a beautiful dunes park that will meet all the recreational needs that any park proposed under this bill, with or without condemnation procedure given to the Secretary of the Interior, will provide.

Therefore, I think we ought to think about these private property owners. I think we ought to provide the necessary language in this bill to protect their fee simple titles from being taken away from them unless the Secretary of the Interior can be made to show in each individual case that public necessity calls for condemnation. I have an amendment, as you will see before I finish, that will provide that protection to these private property owners.

And so I say, the general proposition of the law is well established. When the taking is found to be for public use, the extent of the taking is within the discretion of the legislature, subject to the constitutional requirement of just compensation for the property taken.

On the subject of the possible weighing of public and private interests in considering whether a particular condemnation should be allowed, the Library of Congress provided me with these comments:

"This is the question of the public necessity for a taking and is discussed in some of the cases. It appears to be settled that this is a political question not appropriate for judicial consideration. 'The necessity for appropriating private property for public use is not a judicial question. This power resides in the legislature * * *.' *Rindge* case, supra. 'Where the intended use is public, the necessity and expedience of the taking may be determined by such agency and in such mode as the State may designate. They are legislative questions, no matter who may be charged with their decision, and a hearing thereon is not essential to due process in the sense of the 14th amendment.' *Bragg* v. *Weaver*, 251 U.S. 57, 58. See also *Joslin Mfg. Co.* v. *Providence*, 262 U.S. 668. This point will be discussed in subsequent paragraphs.

"To resume with the list of Federal cases bearing on public takings for park purposes, we have *Suncrest Lumber Co.* v. *North Carolina Park Commission*, 30 F. 2d 121 (1929). In this case the condemnation of private property in North Carolina was upheld where it was taken by the State, in conformity with an act of Congress, to form part of the projected Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

"In *Dalche* v. *Board of Com'rs. of Orleans Levee Board*, 49 F. 2d 374 (1931), the Court considered the levee board's condemnation of extensive land on the shores of Lake Pontchartrain and adjacent thereto for the purpose of draining it and turning it into parks, playgrounds, boulevards, amusement parks, beach areas, general recreation areas, and like purposes. The Court held that, considering the conditions prevailing in the area involved (low, swampy area, unsuited for anything but muskrat trapping), such purposes were properly public uses and thus the condemnation did not violate the 14th amendment. As to the necessity of the taking in the first place, the Court said it could not inquire into such a matter, which was exclusively for the State legislature. Thus, once again the Court refused to weigh the public interest against the private interest on the question of the necessity of the taking. Its only consideration was to the public character of the use intended for the property. As stated, it easily found such a public use in the intended use of the property.

"In *Via* v. *State Commission on Conservation, et cetera*, 9 F. Supp. 556 (1935), the Court upheld the condemnation of private property for a public park (here the State of Virginia took private lands to make up part of the proposed Shenandoah National Park in conjunction with an act of Congress for that purpose. The Court stated that it must be conceded 'That the furtherance of the health, pleasure, and recreational facilities of its people is a function of the State.'

"In *United States* v. *Southerly Portion of Bodie Island, N.C.*, 114 F. Supp. 427 (1953) the United States sought to condemn certain private property in North Carolina for use in connection with the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. Against an allegation by the defendant that the proposed taking was not for a public purpose, the Court replied that 'it is nevertheless well settled that the condemnation of property for park purposes is a taking for a public use and is constitutional,' citing the Shoemaker and Rindge cases, supra. The defendant further contended that his property was not necessary for the projected seashore area. The Court replied that this allegation was directed really to the wisdom of the Secretary of the Interior in deciding to include defendant's land: 'In the absence of bad faith and nonpublic use, it would seem that the wisdom of a Government officer authorized to commence condemnation proceedings does not present a judicial question and is not subject to judicial review * * *. It is his opinion and not the opinion of the Court that is controlling.' The Court pointed out that actual malevolence on the part of the Government would have to be shown, before the courts could inquire into the wisdom or necessity for a particular taking. This is directly in line with the repeated position of the courts that they will not weigh the necessity of a taking; that is, balance private interests; their only concern is with the public use character of a condemnation. See also *United States* v. *Certain Parcels of Land*, 141 F. Supp. 300, 305 (1956): 'If there is any reasonable basis for the exercise of a power granted by Congress to an administrative officer in eminent domain proceedings, it is beyond the jurisdiction of the Court to review his determination, at least in the absence of bad faith.'

"Some selected State cases on the taking of private property for parks and public recreational areas are:

"In *City of Beverly Hills* v. *Anger*, 127 Cal. App. 223 (1932) the court upheld the taking of private property for a city park. The court stated that an owner may not question in the courts the public interest and necessity for a taking. Accord, *Village of Depue* v. *Banschbach*, 273, Ill. 574 (1916).

"Opinion of the Justices to the Senate, 297 Mass. 567 (1937) upheld the taking of land in the old port of Salem to be used as a memorial to sailors of that port and as a marine park for the public benefit and as a national historic monument.

"In *Bunyan* v. *Com'rs. of Palisades Interstate Park*, 153 N.Y.S. 622 (1915), the court upheld the taking of a stone quarry along the Palisades of the Hudson River and adjoining the State park to preserve the scenic beauty of the river and park, even though some of the land was too rugged for use, against the contention that the State could not exercise eminent domain merely to acquire land for its esthetic merits and scenic beauty: this in itself is a public use. Again, the court refused to consider the necessity for the taking because 'such a challenge would open a tremendous field for irrelevant discussion' (p. 628).

"As to the weighing of public and private interests in a taking, the Illinois Supreme Court in *Deerfield Park District* v. *Progress Devel. Corp.*, 174 N.E. 2d 850 (1961), permitted a condemnee to inquire into the ultimate purpose of the park board in the acquisition of its land for a park, even though the court said the general rule forbade judicial inquiry into the condemnor's motives. Perhaps the facts of the case are decisive: Progress charged that the park board was only condemning its property because Progress was selling its houses to Negroes. Insofar as this case allows the courts to examine the necessity for a taking, as distinct from its public purpose, it is against the weight of authority.

"Taking the opposite view of much the same facts is *State* v. *Weinstein* (St. Louis Court of Appeals; 329 S.W. 2d 399 (1959)). Here the court refused to examine the motives of the condemning body so long as the taking was for a public use (a park). (The property sought to be condemned was owned by Negroes who charged the city was persecuting them; the court would allow no proof of this question.) Accord, *In re Opening and Extending Palisade Ave.*, 1955 N.Y.S. 2d 585 (1956).

"In *Bushard* v. *Washoe County*, 68 Nev. 222 (1951) the court held that the taking of wild woodlands 22 miles from Reno as a public recreational area was for a proper public use.

"In *Brande* v. *Oconto County*, 109 N.W. 2d 105 (1961), the Supreme Court of Wisconsin said courts may not weigh the necessity for a taking, except where the condemnation is arbitrary, unreasonable, or in bad faith.

"In *Salisbury Land & Imp. Co.* v. *Commonwealth* (215 Mass. 369), it was held that private land may be taken for a city bathhouse or public bathing beach.

"Additional Federal cases holding that the determination of the necessity for a taking is for the legislature and will not be examined by the courts: *Brooks* v. *Shepard* (157 F. Supp. 379); *United States* v. *70.39 Acres of Land, More or Less in San Diego County* (164 F. Supp. 451); *District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency* v. *70 Parcels of Land in Square 541 in the District of Columbia* (153 F. Supp. 840); *Berman* v. *Parker* (348 U.S. 26) (holding that the legislature and not the judiciary is the main guardian of public needs to be served by social legislation, including the power of eminent domain, and the role of the courts in determining whether that power is being exercised for a public purpose is an extremely narrow one—the legislative determination of necessity is 'well nigh conclusive')."

One of the leading U.S. Supreme Court cases supporting the proposition that the courts will not review the necessity of the taking, once it has been established that the taking is for a public purpose, is *Shoemaker* v. *United States* (147 U.S. 282 (1893)). In that case the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the condemnation of certain lands in the District of Columbia, pursuant to an act of Congress, for the purpose of creating a park in the Rock Creek area. Without dwelling upon the obvious fact that the taking of the property for park purposes was a taking for a public use, the Supreme Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Shiras, said:

"The adjudicated cases likewise establish the proposition that while the courts have the power to determine whether the use for which private property is authorized by the legislature to be taken, is, in fact, a public use, yet, if this question is decided in the affirmative, the judicial function is exhausted; that the extent to what such property shall be taken for such use rests wholly in the legislative discretion, subject only to the restraint that just compensation must be made."

In *Adirondack Railway* v. *New York State* (176 U.S. 335 (1900)), the State of New York condemned property of a railroad to provide a public preserve of wild forest lands for the public pleasure and health, to preserve the headwaters of important rivers, and to maintain an adequate stand of timber. The State courts upheld this taking and the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed, saying that the purpose of the taking was a matter for legislative discretion of which judicial cognizance would not be taken. Speaking for the Supreme Court, Mr. Chief Justice Fuller said:

"The lands taken for the park were thereby dedicated to a public use regarded by the State as of such vital importance to the people that they were expressly put by the Constitution beyond the reach of any other destination. The general rule is that the necessity or expediency of appropriating particular property of public use is not a matter of judicial cognizance but one of the determination of the legislative branch of the Government."

These cases show that the courts will not go into the question of necessity once the Congress and the State passes the legislation. The court only makes an inquiry as to whether or not the use is public. There is no question about the use in S. 250 being public, it is for a park. And the cases are legion.

And so the issue that the Senator from Oregon raises again is whether you are going to give discretionary power to the Secretary of the Interior with no check, or whether you are going to give us a bill that gives us all the lands we need for a dunes park without condemnation provisions. For there is much more public land that can be included in the bill. That is all you have to do. You can go down there to Coos County and take acre after acre of the best dunes on the whole coast and put them back in the bill. You had them there once. But it is my position that these private holdings should not be taken under a blanket act. My plea is that you follow a procedure that the senior Senator from Oregon will recommend shortly: to place a check upon the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the law makes it clear that the Federal Government has the power to acquire privately owned lands for public park and recreation purposes. We know that once a decision has been made authorizing or calling for the acquisition of private property by the Federal Government for such purposes, the courts will not question the taking. We, as legislators, have the solemn duty of determining whether these private land owners are to be subjected to the condemnation of their lands within the dunes park area. They have no appeal from the decision of the Congress or from the action that the Secretary may take pursuant to that decision.

Condemnation of private land is a power which should be used sparingly; it should never be used unless a demonstrated essential public necessity demands it. Has there been a demonstration of real public necessity in this case? I submit that there has not been any such demonstration.

As I mentioned heretofore, the Pacific Ocean beaches on the coast of Oregon belong to the general public and are available the year around for public use. I am satisfied that these beaches will remain in this status in perpetuity. This dedication of the Oregon beaches to the general public is now found in the Oregon Revised Statutes, section 274,070. This section reads:

"Ownership of the shore of the Pacific Ocean between ordinary high tide and extreme low tide and from the Columbia River on the north to the Oregon and California State line on the south, excepting such portion or portions as may have been disposed by the State prior to July 5, 1947, hereby is declared vested in the State of Oregon, and hereby is declared to be a public highway. No portion of such shore shall be alienated by any of the agencies of the State."

This admirable law had its origin, in part, in 1899. It was extended through the efforts of a great public servant, the late Gov. Oswald West, to preserve for posterity the entire length of our incomparable Oregon beaches. The original statute, which was enacted in the Oregon legislative session of 1899 (Oregon Laws, 1899, p. 3), declared the Oregon Pacific Ocean beaches to be a State highway from the Columbia River at the north to the Clatsop County south boundary. In 1913 the boundary was extended south to the Oregon-California boundary line. This Oregon statute stands as a living monument to a great man who had remarkable foresight—Oswald West.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that in the case of the Oregon Dunes project, the public necessity does not require the condemnation of a single piece of private property at this time. I submit that the power of condemnation implicit in the Oregon Dunes bill as it now stands before this subcommittee, would represent an unjustifiable use of the power of eminent domain by the Government of the United States.

Senator Simpson. Would the Senator yield?

Senator Morse. Yes.

Senator Simpson. In a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting on the bill in the 88th Congress these words are found, "property should be acquired 'only with the consent of the owner.'" Does the Senator from Oregon, who is importuning to leave it out, have any knowledge of why the Secretary put these words in the report and then asked for condemnation rights in this bill?

Senator Morse. No; I would not have any such knowledge. But I want to say most respectfully, of course, that if Congress gives him this power of eminent domain, he can use it in the exercise of discretionary power. And if he can't reach a settlement with the owner, he can condemn. And that is what the proponents of the bill want. That is what they are seeking.

Therefore, Mr Chairman, I have prepared an amendment to S. 250 which expressly prohibits condemnation of private property within the Oregon Dunes National Seashore project area.

In submitting this amendment, I am not asking the Congress to take a radical new step by allowing private tracts to remain within boundaries of Federal lands. Mr. Chairman, the fact is that there are millions of acres of land—I did not misspeak here, there are millions of acres of land, private land, within our Federal parks and forests across the country which remain in private ownership. It is not now, nor ever has been necessary to use condemnation in order to acquire every last acre of private land in our Federal parks and forests. For the information of the subcommittee, I have taken the trouble to find out just what the facts are in regard to this question.

In response to an inquiry to the Department of the Interior on this matter, Secretary Udall made the following comments in a letter of last year:

"The National Park Service has never obtained a complete breakdown of the owners of private lands within the authorized exterior boundaries of the areas it administers. Such a compilation would be a monumental task. There are, however, many of such private inholders, some of whom own very small tracts of land, while others own many thousands of acres. Land use by these private inholders range from commercial enterprises, such as service stations, motels, ranches, et cetera, while others use land for summer cottages or agricultural purposes. Many areas have private inholders who have subdivided their lands, which are in a constant state of flux due to selloffs."

As of January 1, 1965, Mr. Chairman, such privately owned lands within our national parks amounted to 598,283.03 acres—more than half a million acres. Quite evidently there is no strident rule that the Federal Government must condemn all private property in establishing its national parks.

I have also received from the Department of the Interior a breakdown on private properties in several of our better known national parks. I think the subcommittee would be interested to know just how much private land is still to be found in these parks.

(The breakdown referred to is as follows:)

Summary of State-owned lands within National Park Service areas, Jan. 1, 1965

Area	State	Private	Total non-Federal
Antietam National Battlefield Site, Md	[1] 1.50	6.83	8.33
Canyonlands National Park, Utah	20,976.40	21,152.60	42,129.00
Capulin Mountain National Monument, N. Mex	55.00	40.00	95.00
Carlsbad Caverns National Park, N. Mex	2,171.12	640.00	3,361.12
Death Valley National Monument, Calif.-Nev	9,512.49	15,489.95	25,002.44
Dinosaur National Monument, Utah-Colo	2,153.68	9,348.65	11,502.33
Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, Ariz.-Utah	22,704.32	202.00	22,906.32
Grand Teton National Park, Wyo	1,411.91	6,410.10	7,822.01
Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev.-Ariz	[1] 4,813.00	28,887.00	33,700.00
Natural Bridges National Monument, Utah	473.84	0	473.84
Olympic National Park, Wash	[1] 540.00	7,501.31	8,041.31
Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, Ariz	1,280.00	903.24	2,183.24
Point Reyes National Seashore, Calif	220.00	46,921.72	47,141.72
Saratoga National Historical Park, N.Y	13.30	3,054.35	3,067.65
White Sands National Monument, N. Mex	6,142.42	145.88	6,288.30
Zion National Park, Utah	1,987.91	10,973.59	12,961.50
Total	75,006.89	151,677.22	226,684.11

[1] Estimated.

Senator Simpson. Would the senior Senator from Oregon like to put in the areas of land in the Grand Teton National Park in Wyoming which are owned by the State?

Senator Morse. I have, Grand Teton National Park area, 1,411.91 acres.

Senator Simpson. I see you have put it in. I might observe, just as an aside to the Senator from Oregon, that there was an attempt on the part of the Park Service to condemn and take inholdings in that area just recently. The people, of course, after the petition was filed had only the question of compensation to determine. That was determined in the Federal court. The appraisers were very liberal, the park appraisers, they gave $1,800 an acre. But the jury evidently was incensed at this sum and raised it to $4,800 an acre in the judicial proceeding.

That is the type of things that we run into. And it engenders hatred within the people in the area.

Senator Morse. I am so glad the Senator made the statement he did. What we ought to do is try to avoid this kind of conflict between the Government and our people. We ought to try to avoid it.

I am pointing out here that all this private land exists in many of these parks. And let me make it perfectly clear, in these instances the Federal Government could come in and condemn if it wanted to. There is not any doubt as to what they intend to do with these pieces of land in S. 250. You could not have had the conferences that I have had with the authors of this bill and with the Department of the Interior without knowing what they intend to do. They intend to condemn. And that is why I think the Government must have the kind of a check that I propose in here.

But I want to say, I think the kind of amendment that I am going to propose will avoid just the kind of a controversy that you have mentioned in regard to the Grand Teton. Any time they can show a public necessity, let them show it.

I am using these figures at this point in my argument as a two-edged argumentative sword. The first edge cuts through what I think has been a failure on the part of the Department of the Interior, until I smoked it out, to make it perfectly clear that there exist these large holdings of private land within the Federal public domain, including Federal parks, and that they have not interfered at all with the use of those parks by the public. That is my present point. You can have the private holdings in a park, and still have the park fully enjoyed by the public.

I am going to have some suggestions before I get through with respect to protecting the public interest against misuses of private property that would interfere with the area for park purposes. We have that, may I say, in every municipality and county which I know of in the country.

Senator Simpson. Will the Senator yield there?

Senator Morse. Yes, I yield.

Senator Simpson. I would like to call the attention of the committee and the Senator from Oregon to the situation that exists in Yellowstone National Park. We have some 2,200,000 acres in that area, and we have some 25,000 visitors per day. We are only able to accommodate 8,000 of them overnight. The interesting part of it is that out of the entire acreage of over 2 million, less than 4 percent is utilized by the Park Service in placing facilities within the area.

Senator Morse. Of course.

May I say most respectfully, that if there were only a will and a desire to resolve this controversy that ought to be resolved, and to set, I think, a very healthful precedent, then here is a chance to do it in S. 250.

Now, let me say, again, you cannot talk to the Department of the Interior without realizing that what you are running up against is a vested bureaucratic power that the Department does not want to relinquish one iota. And that is what we need to watch out for. You men have heard me speak ad infinitum in the Senate about the great danger of transferring this country from a Government of three coordinate and coequal branches of Government into a Government by the executive. When you run into the stubborn, adamant attitude of the Department of the Interior, you know whereof I speak. They do not want any diminution of the power they think has been given them. But it happens to be for us to decide whether past Congresses have given them a power which when applied today can result in the exercise of abusive discretion. And in my judgment, that is what you run into in the Department of the Interior in a good many respects, may I say.

But I limit my criticism of the Department today to this matter. Let me warn the Department of the Interior that this is not the last point I am going to raise in criticism of the policies of the Department which I have found not in the public interest.

I refer now to the table inserted above:

Dinosaur National Monument. You have private property in there of 9,348 acres in round numbers against a public property of 2,000 in round numbers. Out of a total of 11,000 acres, you have 9,000 that are private.

Take the Canyonlands National Park in Utah. Out of 42,129 acres, you have 21,152 acres of private land. In the Canyonlands, you have 20,000 in public land, and 21,000 in private land.

You go on over to the Olympic National Park in Washington, you have 540 acres of State land, and 7,500 acres of private land.

We have Point Reyes in here. This Point Reyes Park, I tell you, is a firecracker that fused out in my State recently. But this is an interesting statistic. In the Point Reyes National Seashore Park, you have 220 acres of State land, and 46,921 acres of private land.

I just mention Point Reyes Park in passing, gentlemen, because I have something to say about land exchanges at the very end of my testimony. I have a protective clause in my amendment with regard to land exchanges. Some people in my State are very much concerned with land exchange in connection with Point Reyes, and I think they have cause to be. But they do not seem to be very much concerned about land exchanges in connection with dunes park. The shoe is on the other foot, I guess.

Mr. Chairman, now that the whole table is in, I want to say that it speaks for itself, and loudly for itself, on the point that I made. Private ownership within a park, we know from years and years of experience, does not interfere with the use of the land for park purposes.

In yet another report which I received from the National Forest Service on December 2, 1963, I obtained the following ownership figures:

"The total acreage of land within established national forests and related approved national forest purchase units is 221,434,180. Of this area, 39,216,638 acres do not have national forest status. An accurate breakdown of this nonnational forest land between private, State, and other governmental ownerships is not available. We would estimate, however, that at least 95 percent of it is privately owned."

Thus, Mr. Chairman, there are approximately 38 million acres of privately owned lands in our national forests throughout the country. The report goes on to say that "in the national forests of the Pacific Northwest there are estimated to be over 4,000 ownerships of private lands, of which about 6 percent are in tracts of over 1,000 acres."

The meaning of these facts is obvious. They show beyond a shadow of a doubt that there is no absolute and urgent requirement to condemnation of private lands in order to establish and administer our national parks and forests, except where there is so little public land available that condemnation must be used in order to have any public park at all. Such was the case with Cape Cod and the Indiana Dunes, which as I say, I support. Above all, it is clear that over the years, private and public ownerships have existed in apparent harmony within our Federal forests and parks.

As I have pointed out, publicly owned lands are not in short supply in the case of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore project. There is no need for the Federal Government to acquire all the land within the seashore, any more than there was such a need in the case of the Teton National Park or Zion National Park or any number of such fine national parks. Condemnation must be used only where absolutely necessary. In a case such as the Oregon Dunes the tremendous power of condemnation should be held in abeyance.

It is for this reason that I submit this amendment to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from using condemnation in the Oregon Dunes National Seashore project. I ask that this amendment be considered by the subcommittee, and be included in the printed record of the hearings on S. 250 at the close of my statement.

Senator Jordan (presiding). It is so ordered.

Senator Morse. I direct the subcommittee's attention to two important features of my amendment. First, my amendment is so phrased as to eliminate the word "exchange" in dealing with authority to be conferred upon the Secretary to acquire private lands for inclusion in the park.

In recent weeks a very serious controversy erupted in the State of Oregon over inquiries that were made by the Bureau of Land Management concerning the feasibility and desirability of negotiating the exchange of certain public domain lands in Oregon for privately owned lands in the Point Reyes Park. Because of this controversy, I doubt seriously that exchanges of Federal lands for private lands will be considered in connection with any dunes park that may be established in Oregon. Therefore, I have deleted from my amendment any reference to land exchanges in acquiring privately owned lands for inclusion in the dunes park.

If the subcommittee should decide to retain such authority to exchange Federal for private lands, I hope the subcommittee will include language in its bill or in its report which will make it clear that exchanges should be initiated only at the direction of the Secretary of the Interior in close consultation with the appropriate advisory board of the Department of the Interior and should be consummated only with the specific approval of the Secretary.

Let me digress just a moment to make it perfectly clear to the people of my State, in case any question is raised about my testimony here this morning, that the senior Senator from Oregon is not opposed to land exchanges whenever it can be shown on the facts that the land exchanges are in the public interest. There is often a public interest to be supported when there is a land exchange that is in the interest of a private industry and not to the disadvantage of the public.

Mr. Chairman, land exchanges in connection with timberland is not new in the administration of public lands by either the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service. I do not want this record to cause anyone to think that the senior Senator from Oregon is against any land exchanges. I am not. But there are some problems connected with land exchanges that were brought out by the Point Reyes controversy of a few weeks ago, and in the interest of caution I have eliminated land exchanges from my amendment. If, however, they can show that any proposed land exchange would be in the public interest, I would not oppose it, provided the two safeguards I mentioned above are guaranteed.

These conditions are, No. 1, that there be no land exchange in the dunes park area except after consultation with the so-called advisory board. These advisory boards consist of lay citizens who advise the Federal Government concerning the feasibility, justification, and public interest questions that may be inherent in the proposed land exchange.

The second point is that any proposed land exchange should not interfere with the so-called O. & C. formula. This formula has existed for many, many years. It is an equitable formula whereby the Federal Government pays into the county a certain amount of money in lieu of taxes to support the necessary county governmental operation, particularly in connection with the building of access roads and highways into our forests in connection with our fire protection. When over 50 percent of the land in a State is owned by the Federal Government, the nontaxability of that land creates a good many problems in one county after another.

No one can appreciate that fact more than your witness this morning, who happens to be chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education. In all our education bills we have to meet this problem of ever-increasing real estate taxes to support the schools, until in many parts of the country we are at the point where the real estate taxes just can't justifiably be increased any more for the schools.

The point of this digression is to make certain that if there is any land exchange carried out under this bill, that it will not in any way diminish the rights of the counties in connection with a return from the O. & C. formula, and that the advisory boards will be consulted and have an opportunity to be heard. I don't need to tell the members of this committee that in a democracy there is no substitute for a full public disclosure of the public's business. We would not have had the Point Reyes controversy, at least to the intensity it has developed, in my judgment, if there had been in advance more public disclosures of the public's business. And I am criticizing no individual. It is just one of these things that developed. And I want to say at the end, as I have said on the floor of the Senate, that no evidence has been presented to me to date to support the allegations made against the Department of the Interior in the Point Reyes case. There are some members of the public in the room who have made the allegation that the Department of the Interior acted in bad faith, but they have not supported it with good evidence. I have said to the Secretary of the Interior and others, including the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, that they could have greatly improved their status procedurally in regard to this controversy if there had been more public disclosure. But I have had no showing of bad faith, just allegations.

And in this regard, I happen to think that the Department of the Interior and the Secretary of the Interior can be sustained as acting in good faith. That has not anything to do, however, with my other comment, to the effect that they ought to have disclosed the facts about the case. That would have prevented the suspicions from having developed into such a white heat.

Now, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my amendment also contains in the last paragraph thereof the requirement that the Secretary shall report to the Congress on or before January 31, 1967, concerning the results of his efforts to acquire essential private property by purchase or negotiation.

Under this section, if the Secretary should report to us that certain essential property can be acquired only through condemnation, I would be glad to give consideration to legislation specifically authorizing the condemnation of such private property. But again, let me emphasize, condemnation of private property interests should be pursued only as a last resort and when an urgent need has been demonstrated. Let me take you through the application of my amendment. I have mentioned these 15 private holdings. Do not forget that there is a lot of private property here that does not happen to be residential, and its fee simple title is just as precious to the owner as one which has a piece of property with a house on it.

Let me assume that you pass the bill with the condemnation provision out, and the Secretary of the Interior decides that he wants to have a piece of property because he thinks public necessity makes it essential for the park purpose. He then goes to the owner of the property and he tries between now and January 31, 1967, to negotiate a purchase. And the owner says, "I will not sell under any circumstances at any price." The Secretary of the Interior only has the right to offer him a fair market value for the property. But the owner simply says, "Even if you offered me more, I would not sell."

Now, we know that in making such offers, cities and States and the Federal Government take into account the cost to the city, State, or Federal Government of a condemnation proceeding. That is recognized by the courts to be within the framework of a fair market value for the property.

But let's assume that the Secretary just can't buy it. What can he do under my amendment? He can come to the Congress, and he can offer a bill calling for the condemnation of that particular piece of property.

Now, don't give me the argument that it is cumbersome to pass private bills. All of us on the committee, including the senior Senator from Oregon, pass judgment on many private bills each year. We know that it is not difficult to get a private bill through if it is meritorious. But under this procedure there is protection for the fee simple owner. If the Secretary can really show that this particular residence in the dunes area, for example, ought to be taken from the standpoint of public necessity, let the Secretary convince you gentlemen. He can do it in a couple of hours or less in a hearing. Let him convince you, and we will pass the bill.

This is not going to give you a great flood of bills. I will tell you what I think will happen. In 95 percent of the cases, the Secretary can negotiate in that period of time the purchase of the property.

And lastly, may I say, I want to thank the subcommittee for this opportunity to discuss my views on the question of condemnation in relation to the otherwise highly commendable Oregon Dunes National Seashore project. I hope that the subcommittee will see fit to adopt my amendment to S. 250 on behalf of the private landowners of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to discuss briefly a provision in this bill which has been designed, I am sure, to reduce the effects of condemnation in the Oregon Dunes on the private property owners. Although I appreciate the efforts of my colleague to moderate the impact of the condemnation provisions of this legislation, I do not feel that the provision to which I am about to allude is sufficient to justify condemning all private properties in the seashore.

This provision is found in section 4(a)(1) of the bill. It provides that:

"Any owner or owners (hereinafter in this section referred to as 'owner') of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition of such acquisition, retain the right of use and occupancy of such property for noncommercial residential purposes for a term not to exceed 25 years, or for a term ending at the death of such owner, the death of his spouse, or the day his last surviving child reaches the age of 21, whichever is the latest. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved."

I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that this provision still amounts to a serious reduction of the fee simple rights of the property owners in the area, and eliminates a very important aspect of the "bundle of rights" that constitute traditional fee simply ownership. To my mind, such a provision is not an adequate substitute for the prohibition of condemnation which is included in my amendment.

In paragraph (c) of this same section, the bill provides for what amounts to zoning restrictions on the lands retained for use under the provision which I just cited. This paragraph provides in part that:

"The term 'improved property,' whenever used in this act, shall mean a detached, one-family dwelling the construction of which was begun before March 19, 1963 (hereinafter referred to as 'dwelling'), together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the land so designated. The amount of the land so designated shall in every case be at least 3 acres in area, or all of such lesser amount as may be held in the same ownership as the dwelling."

I would like to make it perfectly clear to the committee that I am not opposed to local zoning restrictions on private properties held within the park. But the zoning should be worked out at the local, not the Federal level. So long as such local zoning provisions are consistent with the principle of fee simple ownership and are necessary to preserve the beauty and public usefulness of the park, I support them.

Does anyone think that the Department of the Interior would have any trouble with a local zoning board with regard to a necessary zoning regulation to protect the public park purpose? That public park purpose will be the greatest commercial asset of the area.

But here again, why do we want to deal on the basis that you cannot rely upon our own people at the grassroots of America?

Of course, we can.

And I want to say that I have provided amendments here that, in my judgment, will make this bill one which will be highly acceptable in my State, that will bring to an end a controversy which, in my opinion, will never be brought to an end by the passage of S. 250 in its present form.

(The amendments referred to are as follows:)

"[S. 250, 89th Cong., 1st sess.]

"AMENDMENTS

"Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 250) to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, viz:

"On page 2, line 5, immediately after 'SEC. 2.', insert '(a)'.

"On page 2, line 12, beginning with 'exchange', strike out all through 'the' on line 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'donation, or purchase with donated or appropriated funds, such lands, submerged lands, waters, or interests therein, as he considers commensurate with the adaptability of such lands and waters to the purposes of this Act, but in no case shall (1) the Secretary have the authority, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, to acquire, for the purposes of this Act, any such lands, waters, or interests by condemnation, and (2) any lands, submerged lands, waters, or interests therein, be administered under this Act as a part of the seashore, if such lands, waters, or interests were acquired by the State of Oregon under its power of condemnation for the specific purpose of making such lands, waters, or interests a part of the seashore. The'.

"On page 3, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following new subsections:

"'(b) In any case where the owner and the United States agree, the power of condemnation may be used as a means of acquiring a clear and marketable title, free of any and all encumbrances.

"'(c) As soon as practicable following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall offer to enter into negotiations with the owner of any property which the Secretary is authorized to acquire under the provisions of this section with a view to acquiring such property by purchase (but not by condemnation) or by donation, but in no case shall the Secretary be authorized to pay more than the appraised fair market value of that property.'

"On page 5, beginning with line 6, strike out all through line 13.

"On page 5, line 14, strike out '(c)' and insert in lieu thereof '(b)'.

"On page 6, line 21, beginning with the colon, strike out all through line 2 on page 7 and insert in lieu thereof a period and the following:

"'In no case shall the Secretary have authority to acquire any such scenic easements or other less-than-fee interests by condemnation.'

"On page 7, beginning with line 3, strike out all through line 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"'SEC. 5. The Secretary shall, on or before January 31, 1967, submit to the Congress a report containing the results of his efforts pursuant to section 2(c) to acquire, by negotiations, the property authorized to be acquired under section 2 of this Act, including his views as to whether (1) any such property with respect to which he has been unable to acquire by negotiations can be acquired only by condemnation, and (2) the acquisition of such property is essential to the operation of the seashore.'"

Senator MORSE. I ask now to put in the record at the end of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, a very interesting memorandum that I have received from the Department of the Interior on the subject of scenic easements, because the bill refers to the scenic easement. As a lawyer, I am still very much in doubt as to what a scenic easement is. Under the language of the Department of the Interior, this document would be an excellent examination question to give on real property in a course in a law school. And the assignment would be to make reason out of this document. I would be very much interested in the examination answers. I cannot make reason out of it, but if any of you lawyers on the committee can help me reach a conclusion as to what the law of a scenic easement is via the Department of the Interior, let me in on the secret.

I do think that you should not leave this bill in such doubt as to what the legal meaning of a scenic easement is.

And I want to thank you for your patience and your kindness and courtesy. I rest my case before the court of the last resort.

Senator JORDAN. The memorandum will be included in the record.

I wish to commend the senior Senator from Oregon on the testimony he has presented to this subcommittee this morning. In my opinion, we had the finest discussion on private property and the question of condemnation as it relates to the acquisition of private property for recreation purposes that has ever been presented before this committee during my service.

Senator MORSE. Thank you, Senator.

Senator JORDAN. I am proud of the fact that all the members of the minority are here to hear this learned dissertation. And I regret very much that none of the members of the majority are here. I urge that they read the statement of the distinguished Senator from the record.

Senator SIMPSON?

Senator SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with you in your remarks about this presentation. I think it is a monumental thing.

I think you have done something here that will give guidelines for the future that we have been looking for. I think this differentiates between the necessity for condemnation in a place like Cape Cod and these areas out in the far and mighty West where there is a lot of territory and that is something we have been groping for. I hope that the Interior Department will look at this with a great deal of concern and dedicate itself to an adoption of it, because I think it is what has been needed. I certainly want to compliment you on that score.

Now, going from the sublime to the ridiculous, Senator MORSE—and not so ridiculous—I notice that there are a lot of oil and gas leases off the shore of a portion of this proposed seashore park. Will those be locked up in this matter?

Senator MORSE. No; they are beyond high tide, they will not be locked up at all. There will be access to them.

Senator SIMPSON. Are they within the area that will come under the jurisdiction of the Interior?

Senator MORSE. Yes, if they find any oil beyond the high tide off the shore. But the State retains jurisdiction, you see.

Senator SIMPSON. These are Department of Interior leases?

Senator MORSE. They are beyond the State beaches. My recollection is that they are being administered by the Department of the Interior.

Senator SIMPSON. I take it, Senator MORSE, that the present proposal as to the boundaries is agreeable to you provided the amendments are made?

Senator MORSE. Yes. I have poured over these maps by the hour, although I did not bring them with me. I was going to hang them up and discuss them, but I did not think that was necessary. I know this committee has worked on this matter, and that you know the area pretty well. If you sit any six people down at a table, they might vary as to where they personally think the boundary should be. But I am perfectly willing to take the boundaries where they are, excluding the condemnation of the private property therein.

Senator SIMPSON. I certainly want to compliment you on this consideration, because you have made a "corker" here, I want to tell you that.

Senator MORSE. I want to thank you and Senator Jordan for your kind remarks.

And I want Senator FANNIN to know how much I appreciate his being present this morning.

Senator JORDAN. Senator FANNIN?

Senator FANNIN. I would like to concur with my colleagues, Mr. Chairman. I concur with them wholeheartedly.

I feel that you have added a great precept here, Senator MORSE, in the protection of private property rights. And I have been very much impressed with your coverage of this subject. You are to be commended for that.

And I would like to ask just one question in relationship to the 30,000 acres of land that is involved in this particular project. I notice that there are 6,000 acres of water. And I am wondering, is that 6,000 acres of water in an area where it would be used for recreation purposes?

Senator MORSE. Yes, some of it would be lake water.

Senator FANNIN. Would the private property be very much involved around the shore of that body of water?

Senator MORSE. The authors of the bill have done their very best, in my judgment, to reduce any interference with the private ownership around the lakes, although some private property around the lakes has to be taken. But there is clear accessibility to the lakes on the other side of the highway. There was some talk for a while that the highway should be used as the dividing line, and the question was raised as to whether or not there would be sufficient accessibility to fresh water.

Senator FANNIN. But you don't know what percentage of the shoreline of the lake is owned by——

Senator MORSE. I don't know it, but I will supply it for the record, if I can find it.

Senator FANNIN. Thank you.

(The information requested follows:)

"Upon reviewing my maps in response to Senator FANNIN's question, I obtained the following approximate figures concerning ownership of lake frontage lands included in S. 250:

"1. Woahink Lake: all public land (State park).

"2. Siltcoos Lake: all private land (tree farms: Crown-Zellerbach and Sparrow-Pacific).

"3. Tahkenitch Lake: all private (Crown-Zellerbach and Sparrow-Pacific).

"4. Threemile Lakes: approximately 50 percent private unimproved tracts; 50 percent National Forest Service.

"5. Clear Lake: all public (State park)."

Senator MORSE. I want to thank you very much, gentlemen. It is very kind of you.

(The memorandum referred to follows:)

"The first use by the National Park Service of scenic easements was in connection with the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways. Records of the National Park Service indicate that scenic easements have been imposed on somewhat more than 4,500 acres along the right-of-way of the Natchez Trace Parkway and over somewhat more than 1,200 acres of the Blue Ridge Parkway. The restrictive provisions comprising these easements are relatively simple and provide for the retention of the existing agricultural or wooded scene.

"The Service also has a scenic easement on 48 acres of land at Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, with restrictions similar to those used on the parkways. A copy of the Cumberland Gap deed is enclosed.

"Scenic easements are held on 46 acres at Harpers Ferry National Monument and on 21 acres at Manassas National Battlefield Park for the purpose of preserving important historical scenes. A copy of the Manassas deed is enclosed.

"The scenic easement imposed on the 47-acre Merrywood tract in Fairfax County, Va., along the Potomac River through judicial proceedings contained the following restrictions:

"1. That buildings, utility pole lines and structures may be erected on said land only for farm or single-family residential purposes. No commercial buildings, multi-family residential buildings or other industrial or commercial structures shall be erected on said land, and not more than one residential dwelling with appropriate accessory structures shall be constructed on a given lot. No building or structure of any type may be erected on said land to a height of more than 40 feet measured from the natural grade at the middle of the front of the building or structure to the highest point of the roof or parapet.

"2. That said land shall not be used for any professional or commercial activities except such as can be and are in fact conducted from a residential dwelling without alteration of the dwelling.

"3. That all trees may be removed from such land where reasonably necessary for the construction of streets, driveways, utility pole lines, and structures for farm or single-family residential purposes; but that, in order to preserve the scenic easement acquired in the public interest, except for such designated purposes, no tree larger than 8 inches in diameter and more than 30 feet in height shall be removed from such land or destroyed without the written permission of the Secretary of the Interior or his designee.

"4. That no utility transmission lines may be erected on such lands and no interests in such land shall be granted for this purpose without written permission of the Secretary of the Interior or his designee.

"5. That no dump of ashes, trash, sawdust, or any unsightly or offensive material shall be placed upon the land at any point where such dump can be viewed from the river or public road.

"6. That no sign, billboard, or advertisement shall be displayed or placed upon such land, except one sign not greater than 36 inches by 24 inches may be placed upon an owner's property advertising the sale of the property. This limitation shall in no event preclude the placing on such land of a sign stating solely the name of the owner of such land and/or the address of the property.

"7. That no part of any of such land shall be sold in lots smaller than 1 acre or which will leave a remaining parcel of less than 1 acre.

"In the Piscataway Park area authorized by Public Law 87-362 to be established to protect the view from Mount Vernon, the National Park Service has acquired by donation scenic easements over some 65 parcels of 5 acres each. A copy of the deed form used for this purpose is enclosed.

"The Service has been authorized to acquire scenic easements at Antietam National Battlefield Site and has drawn up a document especially for this purpose. The Service has not, however, been fortunate enough to secure any of these easements. A copy of this form is enclosed.

"For further information references may be made to Technical Bulletin 36 of the Urban Land Institute entitled 'Securing Open Space of Urban America: Conservation Easements' for a very comprehensive discussion of this entire subject. The address of the institute is 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C."

EXHIBIT 3

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., December 17, 1965.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: Replying to your November 8 letter, so far as the Oregon Dunes legislation is concerned, I want to make it clear that my letter of October 15 to Senator JACKSON was sent to advise the Senate Interior Committee of identical recommendations sent the same day to the House Interior Committee, in keeping with customary practice.

I participated directly in deciding upon the content of the October 15 letter, and I want now to describe its background to you and to make crystal clear to you our present position on the Oregon Dunes land exchange issue, taking into account your letters.

When I testified before the House committee on July 19, the land exchange issue at Oregon Dunes was raised very directly by Congressman WYATT. It was obvious to me that further effort to proceed with a land exchange provision would only fan anew the flames of the earlier controversy concerning proposed Point Reyes exchanges. After the hearing, I told Congressman WYATT and my staff associates that I favored dropping the land exchange provision completely from the bill. Later Congressman DUNCAN came to my office and expressed a conviction that a land exchange provision should be retained. I reiterated my position, but suggested to BOB that he work with my legislative counsel and with Congressman WYATT in an effort to develop language that would be acceptable to the Oregon delegation and others who were concerned—including members of the O. & C. advisory board.

When I signed the October 15 letter, I naturally presumed that the newly developed land exchange language worked out with BOB DUNCAN represented a solution satisfactory to all concerned. My regret now is that my people did not consult specifically with you and your staff people prior to submitting the letter. Knowing of your direct interest, had I personally participated in the followup discussions with BOB DUNCAN I would have insisted that your views on the newly proposed language be ascertained before the letter was prepared.

Fortunately, time permits full consideration of your views before the committees resume their work.

A matter raised in your July 27 letter that I want to clarify is that we do not regard the land exchange provision of the Point Reyes Act as a directive to approve exchanges that ought not to be approved or a license to pursue exchanges carelessly, without due process, or in a manner contrary to the public interest. We do regard the provision as a statutory directive to give careful consideration to land exchanges under the exchange authority embodied in the act or other available authority as a supplement to the land purchase provisions of the act. The Point Reyes, Oregon Dunes, and wild rivers land exchange provisions, like that in section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act, are, by their own terms, limited delegations of legislative discretion, including discretion to refuse to make an exchange that is found to the unwise. Full opportunity to weigh public interest and other aspects of each exchange is provided. This is far different from the "blank check" phraseology used by some to describe it.

As you can gather from the tenor of this letter, I have a very negative attitude at present toward the wisdom of any Oregon Dunes exchanges involving any public land under the present and proposed legislation. If we should go ahead, however, the principles intended in our presently recommended language would eliminate the revested O. & C. Railroad lands and the reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands from selection in exchange for Oregon Dunes lands. Public domain chiefly valuable for forest management would be excluded. Exchange could be made only of so-called vacant public domain that is classifiable as (1) required for the orderly growth and development of a community, or (2) chiefly valuable for residential, commercial, agricultural, grazing, or industrial uses or development. The Department would be restricted to this particular exchange authorization only, ruling out exchanges under statutes of general applicability such as section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act. Further study since October 15 has indicated to us that the language needs perfection to accomplish this intention with precision.

I feel there is no need to comment on most of the timber management questions raised in your letters because, under the principles of our amendment, authority to exchange lands chiefly valuable for forest management would not be delegated to the Department and existing authority to exchange public domain chiefly valuable for forest management would be withdrawn.

With regard to the so-called unreserved public domain in western Oregon, the pending withdrawal application has not been finally acted upon. I think it should be disposed of soon. While it is pending the lands are segregated from agricultural entry and scrip selection only. They are not segregated from State selection or exchange on the motion of the Government. The commitment of these lands to sustained yield management has never gone to the point of negating future exchanges generally. One reason for this is that exchanges to rectify land patterns are a tool of forest management itself.

You are fully justified in raising the problem of inconsistency between land exchange aspects of Oregon Dunes and wild rivers. In wild rivers we are dealing with a much wider range of situations but I'm confident we can work out a solution that is agreeable.

You are also correct in concluding that the Classification and Multiple Use Act of 1964 is not a vehicle for classifying lands for exchange. This has been made plain in regulations I signed on October 5 (copy enclosed). Under the regulations at 43 CFR 2410.0-3(j), lands may be determined suitable for sale only under the disposal provision of the Classification and Multiple Use Act. Our October 15 exchange language needs correction in this regard.

At this point in time, the issue is clearly before the Congress whether to broaden the existing authority of the Department to make exchanges at Oregon Dunes, and if so, to what extent; or to strike out the land exchange provision. To be blunt about it, if inclusion of land exchange principles such as BOB DUNCAN and I have suggested continues to raise serious reservations, I think the thing to do is to strike the provision entirely.

What we all need to realize is that there can never be more than a probability that land exchanges can be effected to supplement land purchases. For this reason our preference is to have appropriation authorization and appropriated funds available for the entire cost of purchase. Still, there may be instances where land exchanges could be beneficial to the Government and private parties. Appropriated funds could be saved. Thus we prefer to have land exchange authority available and that it be broader than section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act. We especially need an exchange provision in the wild rivers bill because section 8 is inapplicable to many of the areas involved.

In summary, I can give you assurance that I will do my best to see that all aspects of public interest and concern in exchange cases will be fully considered in the administrative process. On the basis of our fine relationship over the past 5 years, I am confident we can move ahead without arousing unnecessary and untoward arguments among all land users and conservationists in your State. I'm sure you and I and BOB DUNCAN can work out a sound solution.

Other letters are being prepared and will go forward to you shortly. These include:

1. Letters by Mr. Getty in response to your letters to him of October 21 and November 15 on land exchanges.

2. Letters by Director Stoddard in response to your letters of November 15 and 16 on road restoration and State land selections.

3. Letters by Assistant Secretary Anderson in response to your letter of November 16 on allowable cuts, and in further response to your November 8 letter providing information on landownership and attitudes of landowners in the areas affected by the Oregon Dunes and Rogue River portions of the wild rivers bill.

I hope we can have a candid conference at your earliest convenience after your return.

Most sincerely,

STUART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., December 30, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is the further response which Secretary Udall mentioned under item 3 at the end of his letter of December 17. It covers information on land ownership and values in connection with the Oregon Dunes National Seashores (S. 250) and the portions of the Rogue River Wild River area which the Bureau of Land Management would manage (S. 1446).

With respect to Oregon Dunes, attachment A recapitulates the information you requested about ownership, type, and value of land. It should be read with the understanding that the National Park Service estimates the value of the private land to be $1,452,000, assuming the passage of S. 250 as recommended by this Department. We reported an acquisition cost of $2 million to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which includes $1,452,000 plus the margin for contingency and administrative overhead in effecting the acquisition.

These acquisitions could, of course, be funded from the land and water conservation fund were Congress to appropriate from it.

The National Park Service has not identified the persons who might be interested in transferring their land by exchange. The National Park Service does not approach landowners for the acquisition of their land until after authorizing legislation has been passed. At the hearings Crown-Zellerbach and Sparrow Pacific indicated interest in exchanges involving forested land.

With respect to the Rogue River Wild River area which would be authorized by S. 1446 as reported to the Senate, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has identified 136 private tracts in the section of the wild river which would be administered by the Bureau of Land Management. The particular uses are set forth in attachment B.

A total of 984 acres of private land is involved. Land values along this reach of the Rogue are now computed by the front foot. According to a recent estimate by the Bureau of Land Management, $40 a front foot is the current value for the fee title. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in cooperation with the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service is reexamining the land acquisition costs for the proposed Rogue River wild river. When this reexamination is completed we will inform you.

Until the reexamination is completed we will be unable to give you a definitive answer to your question "If all the requisite private lands for the Rogue Wild River area come from O. & C. land exchanges, what volume and value of timber would be involved and what would be the reduction in allowable cut?"

With respect to timber on the private holdings within the area which BLM would administer, it informs us that none of the private lands carries a significant volume of commercial timber.

With respect to the public timber we see only a minor, if any reduction of allowable cut because of the enactment of S. 1446. In 1958 the Department issued Public Land Order No. 1726 commonly referred to as the Rogue River Recreational Withdrawal. In 1961, after recommendation from the O. & C. Advisory Board, the State director reduced the allowable cut by 2 million board feet. This reduction includes the commercially significant timber which would be affected by enactment of S. 1446.

Within the area authorized by S. 1446 as reported, the BLM estimates the present timber values in round figures at $290,000 the volume approximately 11 million. If an allowable cut were applicable it would be on the order of 190,000 board feet.

In sending the executive communication of March 3, 1965, which became S. 1446 we attached "Wild River Summary Statistics (tentative)" found on page 12 of the hearings. On April 22, 1965, Secretary Udall testified. He also filed a prepared statement, the Rogue River portion of which appears on pages 66 and 67.

Please disregard any breakdown of the figures in these two documents respecting mode of acquisition, particularly those pertaining to exchanges. The acreages identified for exchanges were field estimates of the possible acreage that might be acquired by exchange. They have no reference to any specific tracts. To our knowledge no persons have approached Interior officials regarding exchanges nor have any officials of the Department discussed with landowners whether exchanges would be sought.

As in the case of Oregon Dunes any land acquisitions could be financed from the Land and Water Conservation Fund were Congress to so appropriate from it.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY R. ANDERSON,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Attachments.

ATTACHMENT A

Private holdings in proposed Oregon Dunes National Seashore

Private ownerships	46
Improved residential properties	19
Improved commercial properties	5
Tree farms	2
Other improved properties	20
Type of private land (acres)	4,125.20
Unimproved lands	3,757.60
Woodland	1,067.27
Tree farms	2,690.35
Improved land	367.58
Residential	269.07
Commercial	92.61
Boy Scouts	5.90
Value of private land (estimated fair market value)	$1,452,000
Improved properties	235,000
Unimproved properties	1,216,650

ATTACHMENT B

Private holdings in BLM portion Rogue River Wild River area

Farm units	57
Residential	46
Unimproved	24
Industrial (power)	2
Resorts and lodges	5
Gravel operation	1
Mining development (abandoned)	1
Total	136

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Nation's conservationists are indebted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and its able chairman for having brought forth for the consideration of this body a wild rivers bill. They salute the senior Senator from Idaho for having introduced and worked so hard for favorable consideration of this bill. No need in the conservation of our natural resources is more pressing than the need to preserve for all time representative stretches of our free-flowing rivers essentially in the same condition as our furtrapper and explorer forebears found them, for the inspiration of future generations of Americans.

Truly wild rivers are in danger of becoming extinct, thanks to overdevelopment, pollution, and impoundments. Unless we do something now before it is too late, coming generations of Americans will never know the meaning of a stream whose purity of water and whose freedom from encroachment and exploitation should be part of our heritage.

Therefore, I say to you, let us get on with the job of establishing a National Wild Rivers System. Let us take steps to do the job right, for a national heritage is at stake. What I am referring to is the need at an appropriate time to incorporate into this legislation a river classification system to save the few truly wild streams in this country from being lumped with those of lesser quality and threatened with shortsighted developments which will bring them down to the level of less wild, more civilized, and less valuable streams.

Call them what you will—primitive, pastoral, and developed, or wild, semiharnessed, and harnessed—we must make provision for the protection of such truly wild rivers as the Salmon, the Flathead, the Yellowstone, and the Snake in their wilderness state, as well as save in their free-flowing condition such less wild but still valuable waterways as the Susquehanna and the Potomac.

They should be protected not only with some manner of classification system but also by the acquisition of a generous width of streambank on either side, where the land is not already in Government hands. Condemnation may be necessary to proceed effectively with this program.

Whether an advisory board would be a help or a hindrance in furthering the objectives of this legislation is open to question, I think.

But let us proceed now to establish a Wild Rivers System through passage of this measure.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have spoken many times from this floor in support of conservation measures for this is a subject close to my heart. Today I am happy to have an opportunity to do so again.

We have before us in S. 1446, the National Wild Rivers System bill, legislation which in principal is vitally needed and which, with appropriate provisions to safeguard the rights of the various States by way of constant review of the best utilization of the streams in question with respect to the public interest of the individual States, is, I believe, acceptable to our governmental system. The bill establishes a national wild river system which initially comprises segments of 5 rivers and provisions are made for future study, and possibly subsequent inclusion, of 11 additional rivers.

These designated rivers have been selected because they are of unusual scientific, esthetic, and recreational value;

and it is hoped that by establishing such a system such rivers and the features that made them worthy of inclusion will be saved for future generations to enjoy as our generation and the generations that preceded us have enjoyed them. Such an objective, I believe, is worthy of our support.

We are privileged to live in a country that was abundantly blessed with natural resources. We also are fortunate in that the American people have had the courage, the initiative, and the perseverance to utilize many of these natural resources while conquering the wilderness, settling the land, and bringing a strong, viable economy to this Nation. This has enabled the United States to progress and grow until we have become the wealthiest, most powerful nation in the world.

This growth, however, has taken its toll. In harnessing and developing our rivers so that they serve mankind we have, out of necessity, drastically changed most of them from their original status. Only a very few worthy of preserving in their natural state remain. The rest have fallen prey to the march of civilization.

Today we have an opportunity to see to it that this legacy of beauty, which all generations owe to this that follow, is not dissipated forever. Today we have an opportunity to provide needed recreational outlets of a unique nature for our children and our children's children.

I must admit that I am always personally reluctant to see nature sacrificed on the altar of progress, although I realize that it is necessary. My feelings on this matter go back many years, even before I had the privilege to serve as State president of the Izaak Walton League in South Dakota in 1929 and subsequently to serve as national vice president of that splendid organization in 1937. My long association with this and other similarly oriented conservation and sportsmen's groups, however, has fortified my belief in the need for strong conservation measures.

With this in mind, I have strived to bring about legislation that I believe is essential to preserve our wildlife and recreation resources, for once we have lost them they can never be reclaimed. To help accomplish this I fought for and was successful in obtaining an amendment to the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1966 to provide a program for endangered wildlife research. Such a program is now, I am happy to say, a reality and is located at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center in Laurel, Md.

That program was to preserve and protect those species of wildlife that are in danger of becoming extinct. This bill, S. 1446, is similar in purpose; for it attempts to preserve and protect not wildlife, but certainly the habitat of wildlife and, just as important, the beauty of our countryside.

We must realize that this God-given beauty is not inexhaustible. It is, in fact, a dwindling resource. In much of the heavily populated area of the United States, it has been supplanted by a megalopolis constructed of cement and steel. In my home State of South Dakota we are still fortunate in having thousands of acres of land that still respose in their natural setting. None of it will be included in this bill but the principle of preservation and the love of beauty remains the same nonetheless.

In addition, this bill includes the important feature of setting aside rivers that have unique recreation potential. Recreation has taken on added significance during the past decade. It is only natural to assume this trend will continue. To future generations the opportunity to fish, to boat, or to enjoy water sports in an unspoiled, unpolluted, free-flowing river will become more and more important.

In discussing this subject I am reminded of a statement that was contained on a sign erected above the roof of my hometown Izaak Walton League Clubhouse. It said simply:

> Saving nature serves humanity.
> Let us serve humanity.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am pleased to support the wild rivers bill. It is a historic milestone in a long history of conservation legislation stretching back to the days of Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot.

The wild rivers of America symbolize American life itself. The rugged, dynamic, unfettered freedom of the wild rivers churning to the sea exemplify American freedom, American energy, and American progress.

We who came to this land only three centuries ago have been profligate with our natural heritage. Too few of America's wild rivers systems remain after just 300 years of "civilization." Too many of our rivers have been soiled, polluted, and poisoned by greed and carelessness. Too many other streams have been recklessly dammed or diverted to serve some immediate, short-term goal.

The wild rivers bill will save for our generation and for the generations to come some of the few remaining free-flowing wild rivers and river sections which are left us today.

I am particularly pleased that the beautiful Youghiogheny River, which flows through Garrett County in my own State of Maryland, has been included in the bill among the 11 rivers to be studied for eventual incorporation into the Wild Rivers System. The winding, turbulent Youghiogheny, bounded by high cliffs and white pine eminently deserves to be included in the Wild Rivers System.

I want to thank the distinguished members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who at my request included the Youghiogheny in the bill. I also want to acknowledge the work of Mr. George B. Shields, director of the Maryland Game and Inland Fish Commission, who worked closely with my staff in securing the Youghiogheny's inclusion.

The preservation of the five rivers initially constituting the Wild Rivers System the bill creates, and the eventual inclusion of the 11 rivers, including the Youghiogheny, to be studied for future incorporation in the system is a significant step forward in our efforts to preserve America's inheritance of natural beauty.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the committee, its distinguished chairman, and the senior Senator from Idaho are owed the thanks of all of us for bringing S. 1446, the wild rivers bill, before us today. This bill, which would establish a National Wild Rivers System, represents a great step forward in protecting and enhancing some of America's outstanding, free-flowing rivers so present and future generations may use and enjoy them. This basic conservation legislation comes none too soon, for already we have seen in our own time that truly wild rivers have become a rarity.

I strongly support this bill. It would be remiss of me, however, to say that this measure has all that I would like to see in it. Indeed, I would be most happy if the bill contained a provision that would place each stream or segment of stream in the Wild Rivers System in one of three broad categories: primitive, pastoral, or developed. I believe that by classifying the rivers in at least these three categories, Congress would be giving greater guidance to the agencies in their management of our wild rivers. One of the principal objectives of this bill, as I see it, is to preserve as much as possible of the high recreation, scenic, and other values of natural streams placed in the system, and to restore and enhance those that have suffered some impairment by the hand of man, such as pollution or other unwise use. A provision that would require the classification of each stream or stream segments and spell out the kind of management desired in each instance would, I feel certain, be of great help in administering these rivers and their streambank environments.

I would like also to have the bill provide for wider streamside zones to give greater protection to the wild river environments against the possibility of scenic impairment or improper land use.

I fail to recognize that any effective purpose can be served by the National Wild Rivers Review Board which the bill proposes. The work proposed for it can be adequately met by the administering agencies.

But I repeat, this bill represents a great step in the right direction. It represents landmark legislation aimed at preserving our disappearing wild rivers, as the Wilderness Act before it represented landmark legislation in the protection of our vanishing wild lands.

Early passage of the wild rivers bill will increase the opportunity for the House to consider the improvements I have indicated many of us would welcome.

WILD RIVERS BILL SHOULD PASS—NEEDS IMPROVEMENTS IN HOUSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the 89th Congress is sure to go into the history books as a conservation Congress. The luster of its conservation bill passage record, well polished by farsighted action in the first session, will glow even brighter when the Congress passes legislation to establish a National Wild Rivers Preservation System.

The wild rivers bill is a landmark piece of legislation, recognizing for the first time in Federal law the need to keep some of our Nation's rivers intact and undammed, their beauty preserved or restored, their waters clean and pure. Such action comes almost too late—very few rivers have escaped man's attempts to improve on nature—and much credit must go to the committee which gave the bill its thorough study, and which recommends it to our consideration for passage today. I commend both the able chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Idaho, and other sponsors of the bill, for jobs well done on behalf of the preservation of our Nation's heritage of natural beauty.

A Wild Rivers System is urgently needed to protect a unique, irreplaceable, and dwindling natural resource. We must not allow our free-flowing rivers to go the way of the passenger pigeon. And, yet, I suggest that the present legislation is wanting in one important respect. We will be remiss if we do not make certain that this bill actually will preserve some rivers in their primitive condition for future generations. The present language gives no assurance that such will be the case.

I submit that this legislation, to really meet the need it was designed to fill, must have more specific objectives, better definitions, and—above all—a river classification structure. This structure would provide criteria by which free-flowing rivers would be divided into such groups as primitive, pastoral, and developed. The purpose of such categorization is obvious; without it, a truly wild river such as the Salmon—the "river of no return"—would be lumped with pastoral, semideveloped eastern rivers and possibly subjected to the same kind of civilized developments that might be justified for such already-harnessed streams. The results would be tragic. It would be like including Rock Creek Park in the Wilderness System, the implication of which would be that we could have a parkway for automobiles through the heart of every wilderness area.

While urging passage of the pending legislation, I would also raise these questions: Need there be a board of review composed of representatives of diverse interests established to oversee—and complicate—the creation and administration of this Wild River System? Need there be positive prohibition of the use of condemnation proceedings to acquire key river bank property vital to the success of particular projects? And might not the width of the riverbank zones to be set aside be somewhat deeper, to assure adequate long-term protection of the beauty of the rivers?

With these comments made part of the record, I suggest that it is time this body affirm its support of the creation of a National Wild Rivers System. I urge passage of this measure without delay. It is my hope that the recommendations I have offered will be given consideration when this legislation is taken up by the House.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 18, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 17, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Lisle C. Carter, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

U.S. MARSHAL

James J. Moos, of Illinois, to be U.S. marshall for the southern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

The following to be members of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency:

Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke, U.S. Army. (New position.)

Paul L. Sitton, of the District of Columbia. (New position.)

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment in the Air Force Reserve to the grade indicated, under the provisions of chapter 35 and sections 8373 and 8376 title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major generals

*Brig. Gen. Howard W. Cannon, FV383170, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. J. Clarence Davies, Jr., FV904230, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Donald S. Dawson, FV582705, Air Force Reserve.

*Brig. Gen. Benjamin W. Fridge, FV365107, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Richard C. Hagan, FV307796, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. William C. Lewis, Jr., FV944440, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. William D. Price, FV86176, Air Force Reserve.

To be brigadier generals

*Col. Earl O. Anderson, FV705280, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Joseph W. Barron, FV423421, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Richard T. Cella, FV378228, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Stanley J. Czyzak, FV364077, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. Dan B. Dyer, FV2212700, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Samuel P. Goddard, Jr., FV561102, Air Force Reserve.

Col. William R. Harpster, FV662780, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Herman L. Harris, FV344153, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. John W. Hoff, FV828596, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. Joseph S. Hoover, FV907184, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Joe M. Kilgore, FV437412, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Tom E. Marchbanks, Jr., FV669752, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Maurice I. Marks, FV367334, Air Force Reserve.

Col. James L. Murray, FV386624, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Gwynn H. Robinson, FV791240, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. Martin H. Scharlemann, FV402684, Air Force Reserve.

Col. John H. Stembler, FV342806, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Evelle J. Younger, FV391177, Air Force Reserve.

The following officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force to the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 8218, 8351, 8363, and 8392, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Joseph P. Gentile, FG384460, Massachusetts Air National Guard.

To be brigadier general

Col. Raymond A. Fortin, FG420587, Maine Air National Guard.

Col. Roy A. Jacobson, FG2054045, Arizona Air National Guard.

Col. Raymond J. Kopecky, FG740462, California Air National Guard.

Col. Michael C. Malone, FG1849428, New York Air National Guard.

Col. William D. Prescott, FG484947, Pennsylvania Air National Guard.

Col. Valentine A. Siefermann, FG794707, Hawaii Air National Guard.

Col. Walter E. Williams, Jr., FG766815, Colorado Air National Guard.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 835, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Jack N. Donohew, FR1319 (brigadier, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas B. Whitehouse, FR1677 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Milton B. Adams, FR1712 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles R. Bond, Jr., FR1937 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Horace A. Hanes, FR2060 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas K. McGehee, FR3809 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Fred J. Ascani, FR4036 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert W. Burns, FR4142 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James C. Sherrill, FR4910 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Abe J. Beck, FR5831 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Gordon M. Graham, FR7761 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Harry E. Goldsworthy, FR1631 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William B. Campbell, FR2000 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John D. Lavelle, FR4359 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Donald W. Graham, FR4361 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Otto J. Glasser, FR4368 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Duward L. Crow, FR18061 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William J. Crumm, FR8663 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John W. Vogt, Jr., FR8709 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

---

*Selected by 1963 selection board and submission provided for in section 8373(d), title 10, United States Code.

Maj. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Jr., FR8956 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James W. Humphreys, Jr., FR19928 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force, Medical) U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Manson, FR1800 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert L. Delashaw, FR1913 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Alvan N. Moore, FR2062 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Ernest A. Pinson, FR3117 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell, Jr., FR4063 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert W. Paulson, FR3871 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John L. Locke, FR4042 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Evans, Jr., FR4072 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Harrison R. Thyng, FR4414 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard A. Yudkin, FR4480 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth C. Dempster, FR4633 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Albert W. Schinz, FR4646 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Frank B. Elliott, FR4681 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gordon F. Blood, FR4766 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Sam J. Byerley, FR4875 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edward H. Nigro, FR4889 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Worley, FR4906 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William Burke, FR4950 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William C. Lindley, Jr., FR5006 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John M. McNabb, FR5037 (colonel Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William B. Kyes, FR5064 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert L. Petit, FR5213 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Glen J. McClernon, FR5217 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas N. Wilson, FR5255 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John L. Martin, Jr., FR7556 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Ralph G. Taylor, Jr., FR8660 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lee V. Gossick, FR8679 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James T. Stewart, FR8692 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William H. Reddell, FR8874 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Andrew S. Low, Jr., FR8890 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard D. Reinbold, FR8927 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William C. Garland, FR8934 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Howard E. Kreidler, FR9177 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George B. Simler, FR9236 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Norman S. Orwat, FR9489 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John W. Baer, FR9820 (colonel Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. David C. Jones, FR9887 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William W. Berg, FR9961 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Russell E. Dougherty, FR9985 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard F. Shaefer, FR10096 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles H. Roadman, FR3379 (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Archie A. Hoffman, FR19222 (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical) U.S. Air Force.

The following Air Force officer for appointment as permanent professor, U.S. Air Force Academy, under the provisions of section 9333(b), title 10, United States Code:

Robert G. Taylor, FR15116.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be majors, USAF (Medical)

Mason C. Reddix, FV3167934.
Donald E. Rice, FV3001332.

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Martin T. Abrams, FV3140041.
Fritz A. Byrum, FV3114213.

To be captain, USAF (Dental)

Ronald W. Bailey, FV3113979.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

Charles W. Chalfin, FV3140850.
Joseph M. Cusimano.
Kenton S. Hartman, FV3165175.
Ralph P. Marra, FV3165178.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of captain, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Lewis G. Aufdemorte, Jr., FV3036412.
James M. Cooper, FV3056262.
Neal P. Crosson, FV3008334.
Francis P. Dube, FV3058187.
Howard E. Hunt, FV2101082.
Jimmy A. Ifland, FV3056165.
William E. Lawson III, FV3056919.
William B. Lemmon, FV3040434.
Paul W. Martin, FV1855183.
Charles F. Popenoe, FV3056340.
Philip S. Prince, FV3040733.
Abner Prophett, FV3058685.
John B. Rosenow, FV2204488.
Joseph G. Tuner, Jr., FV3008539.
Clarence E. Vogelgesang, FV2254928.
Jerdy A. Wright, Jr., FV3080629.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of 2d lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Distinguished officer training school graduates

Dennis L. Andersen, FV3153158.
Roger L. Anderson, FV3168953.
Clayton M. Babbitt, Jr., FV3170534.
William A. Baker, FV3153227.
David L. Barrow, FV3170538.
Gerald M. Bergeman, FV3153406.
Donald J. Bergstrom, FV3170539.
Richard D. Binkowski, FV3170540.
George R. Blair, Jr., FV3151044.
Norris A. Bohm, FV3153387.
Martin J. Brakas, FV3170542.
David P. Brokaw, FV3153296.
Glenn H. Bryner, FV3170546.
Jerry G. Burrow, FV3170509.
Randolph E. Butler, FV3168928.
Newton I. Carpenter, Jr., FV3153576.
Frederick D. Chamberlin, FV3170551.
Wayne C. Coakley, FV3151669.
John H. Crews III, FV3153586.
Willie J. Dean, Jr., FV3153340.
Charles W. Dillard, FV3170559.
Richard E. Ducharme, FV3170563.
Jerald M. Dveirin, FV3153277.
Richard C. Elliott, FV3153249.
Roy M. Engelke, FV3170568.
Robert W. Fritz, FV3170573.
Daniel E. Gill, FV3170577.
Ellis E. Grace, FV3170578.
Robert E. Guy II, FV3153341.
James L. Hane, FV3170513.
Roger A. Hatfield, FV3170582.
David E. Hedgecock, FV3153103.
Lawrence R. Hedges, Jr., FV3170585.
John E. Horner, FV3153304.
Danny D. Howard, FV3153539.
Donald J. Izbicki, FV3170589.
Eldon L. Janssen, FV3170514.
Kay L. Johnson, FV3170590.
Richard E. Jonas, FV3153346.
Wayne T. Kanemasu, FV3153106.
Ronald L. Kerlin, FV3153389.
Richard E. Kizis, FV3151026.
Gordon R. Knutson, FV3170645.
Patrick J. Larkin, FV3170595.
Arnold T. Leachman, FV3170596.
Monte T. Lorrigan, FV3170600.
Robert T. Malmgren, FV3153119.
Stephen Mardenka, Jr., FV3151249.
Daniel A. Matuska, FV3170687.
Ralph D. Maynard, FV3153246.
Harry T. McCardell, FV3170607.
Richard P. McElveen, FV3170523.
George McKenzie, FV3153281.
Larry A. Myers, FV3170611.
Paul A. Nafziger, FV3170525.
Stephen B. Normand, FV3153368.
Robert C. Osterhout, FV3151165.
David R. Pitts, FV3170618.
John E. Poast II, FV3153486.
Dennis H. Quine, FV3170526.
Michael Saitta, FV3153226.
Donald M. Sartori, FV3170621.
George L. Schenck, Jr., FV3150941.
Peter J. Skeffington, FV3153121.
Robert D. Smith, FV3170529.
Stanley W. Stock, FV3153305.
John W. Swanson, FV3153110.
John R. Sweeney, FV3153140.
George J. Terry, Jr., FV3153198.
Wayne A. Tongue, FV3170635.
Richard L. Vergauwen, FV3170637.
Robert E. Walkup, FV3153222.
George W. Watt, FV3170638.
Douglas A. Weaver, FV3170639.

The following distinguished military graduates of the Air Force precommission schools for appointment in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Abbott, Fred L., FV3160104.
Adams, Robert D., FV3153062.
Adams, Thomas R., FV3150377.
Ahern, Donald E., FV3152017.
Alenduff, Joseph R., FV3158691.
Alexander, Jon R., FV3152643.
Aliano, Joseph D., FV3150374.
Allbritton, Leland J., Jr., FV3152818.
Andersen, David M., FV3151447.
Anderson, Norman S., FV3161130.
Anderson, Reed M., FV3151301.
Anderson, Robert J., FV3168813.
Anthony, John T., FV3152015.
Aplin, Charles C., FV3151341.
Arbuckle, James H., FV3161596.
Archey, Walter J., Jr., FV3163540.
Astor, Wally G., FV3168941.
Atwood, Argyle P., Jr., FV3148836.
Austin, Charles D., FV3148607.
Baker, Dan S., FV3157487.
Ball, James A., FV3161598.
Barber, John E., FV3161040.
Barker, John K., FV3152991.
Barker, Ralph E., FV3168943.
Barkman, Larry R., FV3149531.
Barnes, Albert M., FV3159819.
Barnes, Peter A., FV3161548.
Barres, Robert B., FV3152082.
Bartlett, Dennis R., FV3152141.
Bartlett, William E., Jr., FV3157304.
Barton, Robert A., FV3151550.
Bates, Gaylon M., FV3152287.
Bearry, Tommy B.. FV3153086.
Beck, Louis R., FV3168816.
Belden, William J., FV3160062.
Berg, John A., FV3152762.
Bergeron, Howard P., FV3159296.

Berka, James W., FV3160037.
Best, Donald L., FV3172912.
Bettis, Jerry D., FV3152414.
Bettis, Jerry R., FV3161344.
Beveridge, John W., FV3161432.
Billingsley, Charles E., FV3163586.
Billingsley, Roy C., FV3151394.
Bixler, Christie E., II, FV3151700.
Black, Robert L., FV3152493.
Blackford, Charles W., Jr., FV3168946.
Blomberg, Dale R., FV3168819.
Blomquist, Graham W., Jr., FV3152293.
Bluford, Guion S., Jr., FV3161602.
Bocook, Charles R., Jr., FV3168820.
Boles, John H., FV3160522.
Bolte, Barbara A., FV3152192.
Borchert, William R., FV3163125.
Bortnem, Lorn S., FV3162078.
Bost, James W., FV3151430.
Boston, William E., III, FV3152587.
Bowler, Patrick E., FV3152361.
Boyd, Leon A., FV3151197.
Bradley, Roger C., FV3153047.
Brauer, Richard F., Jr., FV3159551.
Brister, Robert P., FV3168821.
Britton, Jimmy, FV3150358.
Brown, Barry L., FV3158599.
Brown, Daniel F., III, FV3162189.
Bruce, William C., Jr., FV3168823.
Brustad, Westley O., FV3153004.
Bryan, Dale K., FV3151625.
Bryant, William L., FV3150610.
Buchholtz, Jeffrey L., FV3151225.
Bukauskas, Louis J., Jr., FV3168926.
Bullock, Glen F., FV3161606.
Burgin, Charles W., FV3157310.
Burks, Jacquelin E., FV3152187.
Bush, Norman L., FV3158510.
Butler, Thomas W., FV3158033.
Butler, Viggo M., FV3152646.
Byars, Henry W., FV3168910.
Cain, Joel M., FV3163929.
Camburn, Gilbert L., FV3168950.
Campbell, Jennings B., III, FV3151398.
Cantrell, Richard R., FV3149791.
Cantwell. John L., FV3158664.
Carlson, Bruce F., FV3152300.
Carlson, James F., FV3151457.
Casper, Paul W., FV3158219.
Chapman, Buddy W., FV3168930.
Chapman, Wilbur E., FV3168825.
Chepolis, William M., FV3152452.
Chesley, Larry J., FV3147498.
Clark, James C., FV3157311.
Clark, James I., FV3157724.
Claussen, Fredric L., FV3150497.
Cliver, Jeffrey G., FV3160188.
Cody, William C., FV3161877.
Colby, Richard E., FV3157312.
Cole, Clarence W., FV3156712.
Colligan, James M., FV3160973.
Colmer, Gerald K., FV3151840.
Colwell, Robert F., FV3163029.
Commander, John B., Jr., FV3161966.
Conaway, Carlton D., FV3152862.
Conklin, Howard L., FV3151174.
Conklin, James J., FV3160260.
Constable, Wi P, III, FV3158221.
Cook, Robert O., FV3150500.
Cooney, John J., Jr., FV3133661.
Cooper, Henry F., Jr., FV3186544.
Corea, Anthony N., FV3157492.
Cosgrove, Michael J., FV3152629.
Cotton, Clifford W., FV3151206.
Craig, Dale A., FV3158787.
Crawford, Charles K., FV3168826.
Crawford, Robert K., FV3152463.
Crowder, Arnold G., FV3168912.
Crowell, Gary A., FV3152354.
Crump, Edward G., FV3152085.
Cullers, Herbert W., Jr., FV3151925.
Cybulski, Frank J., FV3168828.
Davis, Thomas I., FV3168831.
Dawson, Charles N., FV3158007.
Deatherage, Fred S., FV3163403.
Delaporte, Chris T., FV3163419.
Demchak, Michael T., FV3168956.
Dettmar, Robert L., Jr., FV3162906.
Dewey, George R., FV3151477.
Distelzweig, Louis V., Jr., FV3149818.
Dodd, John F., FV3152367.
Dodrill, Reginald M., FV3152310.
Dorris, Gary A., FV3158607.
Dorsey, David T., FV3151970.
Dothard, Raymond D., Jr., FV3157437
Dougan, John W., FV3152559.
Downing, Neil L., FV3157670.
Druckenmiller, Arthur E., FV3168959
Duggan, Patrick J., Jr., FV3160268.
Dunlap, Gary J., FV3163088.
Duresky, Neil L., FV3152343.
Dusek, Eugene A., FV3168835.
Duty, John W., FV3148136.
Dyar, Lance P., FV3159723.
Eddings, James A., FV3118706.
Edelstein, Charle S., FV3149479.
Edgeman, Larry J., FV3162625.
Edney, Frederick M., FV3173087.
Edwards, Wayne B., FV3163796.
Eggleston Tony E., FV3151775.
Eiber, Gary F., Jr., FV3157912.
Eiff, Arthur D., FV3152667.
Einertson, Arlen T., FV3151886.
Ellsworth, Roger W., FV3158708.
Evans, John D., FV3159402.
Everard, Jerold V., FV3168836.
Fanthorpe, Robert J., FV3158523.
Farmer, Bufford D., FV3168837.
Farney, Gerald R., FV3162576.
Fenn, Fred H., Jr., FV3159303.
Fenton, David S., FV3152826.
Ferebee, George W., FV3151273.
Fergusson, John W., Jr., FV3168960.
Fethke, William F., FV3151737.
Feutz, Richard F., FV3152308.
Fiore, Joseph C., FV3151217.
Fisher, Douglas H., FV3154488.
Foraker, Larry E., FV3161057.
Forbes, James A., FV3152599.
Fowler, Henry P., Jr., FV3148574.
Fowler, John W., FV3150357.
Fowler, Julian L., FV3168839.
Francis John E., FV3151635.
Francois, Larry D., FV3159899.
Frank, Jon D., FV3150365.
Franklin, Carl E., FV3162577.
Franklin, Eldon G., FV3159109.
Franklin, Joseph C., FV3133273.
Fria, Robert A., FV3157827.
Fulghum, Jon F., FV3162200.
Gallice, Joseph L., FV3152204.
Gallina, Frank A., FV3150644.
Gamble, Samuel O., FV3158361.
Garza, Frank D., FV3168962.
Gaul, James F., FV3153055.
Gay, Eugene P., FV3152963.
Geiger, Keith W., FV3152157.
Geil, Earl H., FV3152175.
Gerken, Kenneth L., FV3151981.
Gerleman, Phillip D., FV3152355.
Gibson, Thomas G., FV3152118.
Giese, Allen C., FV3152408.
Giesen, James L., FV3149976.
Giffin, Barry M., FV3152362.
Giglio, Thomas L., FV3152497.
Gilbert, Mark B., FV3161290.
Gill, Timothy D., FV3161722.
Gillogly, Harry I., III, FV3151493.
Giroux, Hans D., FV3171337.
Gissendanner, Dean A., FV3156437.
Gittins, James R., FV3161150.
Glamser, Francis D., FV3152061.
Glawe, Benoid E., Jr., FV3151865.
Gocke, Virginia M., FV3152214.
Goldman, Arthur E., FV3151401.
Goldstein, Neal A. L., FV3152234.
Gonzalez, Gerald T. E., FV3152423.
Grace, Paul J., FV3159516.
Grandia, Dwight E., FV3158904.
Greene, Louis E., Jr., FV3168963.
Grignot, Paul J., Jr., FV3150717.
Grimsley, Frank, Jr., FV3168845.
Groeneweg, John F., FV3099433.
Grothe, William V., Jr., FV3168964.
Guthrie, James W., FV3152107.
Guthrie, Peter W., FV3153009.
Haddon, Robert W., FV3168965.
Haegele, James A., FV3150048.
Halford, Harold D., FV3168966.
Hall, Dean G., FV3150611.
Hall, Lester M., III, FV3168847.
Hammer, David M., FV3151350.
Hammond, Donald H., FV3168967.
Hanna, John W., FV3133563.
Hansen, Craig O., FV3151283.
Harden, Jack E., FV3168969.
Harper, Steven V., FV3150719.
Harrier, Lamar C., FV3162044.
Harris, Frank W., FV3151303.
Hart, Warren L., FV3151182.
Harter, Gerald R., FV3168848.
Hartung, James R., Jr., FV3158232.
Hawkins, John E., FV3159212.
Heady, Mark A., FV3159336.
Healy, David M., FV3159906.
Heideman, David A., FV3158613.
Heifferon, John C., FV3163771.
Heldstab, Dale B., FV3151153.
Henderson, Joe C., FV3162690.
Henson, Douglas C., FV3152433.
Hiday, Paul W., FV3152507.
Highsmith, Marshall W., FV3158615.
Hill, James A., FV3151233.
Hinneburg, Patricia A., FV3152197.
Holland, James D., FV3168975.
Holt, Peter L., FV3161724.
Honchell, William F., FV3168914.
Horner, Louis E., FV3159701.
Howard, Glen L., FV3152939.
Howard, Lloyd V., FV3151686.
Howard, Rogers W., FV3161632.
Huber, Edward D., FV3158617.
Hudson, Brian D., FV3152546.
Hultman, John H., FV3168851.
Hurlburt, Randall L., FV3152838.
Hyman, Wallace R., FV3168932.
Iverson, Ronald W., FV3158462.
Jaensch, Peter J., FV3151838.
Jensen, John R., FV3152329.
Jerkins, James D., FV3157334.
Jerome, Jerome O., FV3168853.
Johnson, Jon R., FV3149675.
Johnson, John A., III, FV3168933.
Johnson, Thomas A., FV3152620.
Jones, Dale H., FV3152477.
Jones, Hollis D., FV3150721.
Jones, Larry P., FV3151403.
Jones, Robert E., FV3161444.
Jordana, Modesto, FV3168934.
Kahrs, George W., FV3163656.
Katz, Martin E., Jr., FV3163544.
Keel, Nicholas N., FV3152765.
Keiser, John L., FV3151717.
Kelly, Kraig K., FV3150613.
Kelly, Thomas J., FV3148378.
Kenne, Don E., FV316070.
Kent, David A., FV3152683.
Kercher, David H., FV3151344.
Kidd, George R., FV3151752.
King, Dwight E., FV3161072.
King, George S., Jr., FV3151188.
King, John W., FV3159868.
Kirschenmann, Kenneth D., FV3162089.
Kiser, Rex C., FV3152388.
Klick, Jean E., FV3151992.
Klumas, Lawrence J., FV3168857.
Knight, Robert H., FV3163101.
Knoth, Henry W., FV3150614.
Kunz, Eric G., FV3155311.
Kyle, Richard M., FV3157697.
Lake, Robin M., FV3168922.
Lane, Edward A., FV3150675.
Lang, Jack D., FV3149252.
Latourrette, Robert W., FV3160371.
Lau, Earl S. C., FV3152686.
Lauchner, Ronald E., FV3151796.
Layton, James F., FV3149041.
Lee, John W., Jr., FV3133345.
Leithiser, Christopher, FV3161917.
Lengyel, William A., Jr., FV3161704.
Leonhard, William E., Jr., FV3152257.
Levi, Paul L., FV3163657.
Lewis, James R., FV3154398.
Lickman, George L., FV3168862.
Linden, Robert B., FV3151304.
Lithgow, David P., FV3152352.
Lloyd, Dennis E., FV3151150.
Luken, Lawrence D., FV3168863.
Lutz, Otis P., FV3161995.
Lynch, Don R., FV3168864.
Lyon, Andrew G., Jr., FV3162935.
Mack, William B., FV3152576.
Mackta, Fred K., FV3152209.

Maddox, Charles R., FV3151874.
Main, Davis L., FV3150363.
Malatesta, Alfred V., FV3159268.
Malinsky, Joseph G., FV3150619.
Mallon, Richard J., FV3161496.
Mange, John P., Jr., FV3161647.
Markiewicz, Donald, FV3150381.
Markline, Charles K., FV3159434.
Marley, William F., Jr., FV3162939.
Marsh, Royden W., FV3151302.
Martin, Jim I., FV3151380.
Martin, Wilco A., FV3160829.
Martula, Richard J., FV3152069.
Massey, Harmon O., Jr., FV3159833.
Mathews, Kenneth W., FV3160557.
May, Richard M., Jr., FV3157982.
Mayes, Lewis F., II, FV3153044.
McAdam, Paul A., FV3152307.
McBride, Donald L., FV3168865.
McClintock, William D., FV3162694.
McCuen, Douglas R., FV3152501.
McCullough, Robert I., FV3133646.
McHugh, Michael B., FV3152337.
McIntosh, William H., FV3163302.
McKinley, Charles M., FV3151531.
McKnight, Ronald H., FV3105070.
McLean, Terrence M., FV3161079.
McMaster, David K., FV3168866.
McMinds, Donald L., FV3151729.
McNulty, Donald E., FV3160899.
Meeks, Bobby R., FV3168867.
Melrose, Mark W., FV3152489.
Meunier, Barry, FV3151351.
Meyers, Donald S., FV3151741.
Miller, David L., FV3152356.
Miller, David W., FV3152018.
Miller, Harlan L., Jr., FV3157851.
Miller, John M., FV3151897.
Miller, Kenneth L., FV3168869.
Miller, Stephen H., FV3159438.
Miller, Thomas E., FV3163798.
Mitcheltree, William H., FV3152799.
Moe, John N., FV3152647.
Mollenkopf, Dale L., FV3150380.
Moore, Edwin H., FV3152240.
Morrison, John R., Jr., FV3150696.
Mueller, William L., FV3152039.
Mulready, Michael J., FV3152221.
Munroe, Dale W., FV3151491.
Murray, Calvin M., Jr., FV3152467.
Musselman, Gerald W., FV3151156.
Myers, Kenneth A., FV3163373.
Myers, Richard A., FV3149360.
Myles, Ronald L., FV3155971.
Nagy, Ronald L., FV3161654.
Neisius, Leon J., FV3163457.
Nelson, Clarke A., FV3160088.
Nelson, Terry A., FV3152759.
Nelson, Wilbur O., III, FV3151965.
Nenner, Paul E., FV3149310.
Nicholson, Jon E., FV3148096.
Noble, Phillip B., FV3159872.
Noble, Thomas L., FV3161083.
Norris, Richard H., FV3168872.
Norvelle, Frederick D., FV3168873.
Nugent, Edmund B., Jr., FV3151441.
O'Chab, Robert, FV3152261.
O'Connor, Denis L., FV3152545.
O'Connor, Francis W., FV3151537.
Offley, Ronald D., FV3152140.
Olds, David R., FV3151628.
Olson, Edwin A., FV3158919.
Oltmans, Samuel J., FV3151544.
Opperman, James W., FV3168874.
Osborne, Peter R., FV3151650.
Ostro, Hans, FV3152346.
Ourada, Laurence E., FV3160090.
Ouye, Randolph K., FV3158440.
Pace, Charles M., FV3152791.
Padgett, Jerry L., FV3159836.
Palmer, Michael E., FV3147296.
Palucci, Kenneth J., FV3159922.
Panza, Joseph A., Jr., FV3157636.
Paolucci, John F., FV3151572.
Parish, Jerry G., FV3150698.
Parisi, Philip J., FV3152555.
Parsons, Jimmy D., FV3152417.
Parsons, Robert J., FV3153020.
Patterson, Aubrey B., Jr., FV3159874
Pavola, Eugene H., FV3151667.
Pearson, James K., Jr., FV3152461.
Pennycuff, John A., FV3152230.
Penton, Leonard W., FV3168984.
Perry, William J., FV3151327.
Peterson, Charles P., FV3159748.
Peterson, Dwight G., FV3152548.
Peterson, Lawrence D., FV3152050.
Petritsch, Warren E. J., FV3152840.
Petsch, Mark P., FV3152274.
Petteway, Guy N., FV3152253.
Pettigrew, Thomas P., Jr., FV3151513.
Petty, George K., Jr., FV3160375.
Petty, Lasalle, Jr., FV3163254.
Pfeifer, Ludvik, FV3168876.
Pfister, Robert W., FV3151469.
Pichard, James B., FV3133740.
Pickens, Thomas A., FV3151928.
Pike, Dennis S., FV3157512.
Pollari, Ray W., FV3151654.
Porter, Donald D., FV3151870.
Porter, James M., FV3157414.
Potts, Roy V. FV3158395.
Powell, Charles T., FV3162315.
Powers, Steven T., FV3168849.
Preble, Danny R., FV3151536.
Price, Simon G., FV3149142.
Pritchard, Harley H. Jr., FV3150616.
Putnam, John C., FV3152524.
Quigley, James C., FV3151750.
Rawlings, George L., Jr., FV3162010.
Reckling, Larry E., FV3151881.
Reed, Clyde S., III., FV3168988.
Reedy, Milton G., FV3148078.
Reese, George W., Jr., FV3161236.
Reitenbaugh, Howard T., FV3159927.
Reynolds, James E., FV3161320.
Reynolds, Patrick J., FV3151859.
Reznick, John C., FV3151496.
Rhoades, John W., FV3168878.
Rhodes, Kenneth R., FV3161237.
Richardson, Charles L.. FV3151165.
Richardson, Roger E., FV3168879.
Ridgeway, Dale N., FV3152801.
Ritter, David E., FV3153078.
Rizzi, Anthony, FV3151817.
Roberts, William E., Jr., FV3152409.
Robinson, James E., FV3150654.
Robinson, Ronald W., FV3151411.
Rocap, Pember W., FV3151210.
Roche, James J., FV3152208.
Rogness, Norman D., FV3163799.
Rohrbach, Marjorie A., FV3152188.
Romine, Janet C., FV3152116.
Rook, Thomas C., FV3152648.
Roysden, Henry C., Jr., FV3168937.
Rubinow, Jay, FV3152095.
Rucoba, Reginald, FV3168881.
Russell, Rodney O., FV3162963.
Rye, Gilbert D., FV3168882.
Saline, Joseph P., Jr., FV3164816.
Sample, James I., FV3151162.
Santee, Joe F., II, FV3161321.
Sawdon, William J., FV3158741.
Schattner, Elisabeth, FV3168883.
Scheibel, Robert L., FV3163245.
Schmid, Michael E., FV3152320.
Schoeninger, John W., Jr., FV3152658.
Schorzman, Craig A.. FV3163042.
Seale, Benajah E., Jr., FV3168884.
Seiler, Peter F., FV3152998.
Sellers. Donald R., FV3151381.
Sewell, James T., FV3151646.
Seymour, John C., FV3158744.
Shallenberger, Edward L., FV3152706.
Shamblin, Ronald G., FV3163142.
Shanafelt, Ronald L., FV3163773.
Shannon, Jack D., FV3163423.
Shaw, William F., FV3152491.
Sheehy, Paul J., FV3152395.
Shepard, Gary D., FV3157863.
Shulmister, Morris R., FV3152795.
Simmons, Ross L., Jr., FV3158467.
Sisk, Donald E., FV3168887.
Smith, David C., FV3152499.
Smith, Frederick C., III, FV3161028.
Smith, Gary F., FV3151407.
Smith, Michael W., FV3168994.
Smith, Randolph M., FV3151664.
Smith, Ronald C., FV3152695.
Snyder, Derle M., FV3161673.
Sopko, John, FV3160321.
Sosalla, Phillip M., FV3163461.
Sower, William A., FV3168995.
Spadinger, Jay J., FV3168888.
Sparks, Charles T., FV3151962.
Spear, Robert C., FV3151657.
Spencer, Richard A., FV3168889.
Sroga, James J., FV3152715.
Stallins, Floyd H., FV3170530.
Stayton, William H., FV3152008.
Stearns, David J., FV3151151.
Steinmann, James W., Jr., FV3162222.
Stellbrink, William C., FV3152488.
Stephenson, Jacland M., FV3151569.
Stevens, Alexander M., FV3151733.
Stevens, Richard L., FV3163469.
Stevenson, David L., FV3152487.
Stewart, Alvin E., FV3168938.
Stewart, Dorothy L., FV3152189.
Stewart, James M., FV3152360.
Stewart, Robert W., FV3151748.
Stigers, Joe D., FV3152625.
Stultz, Richard M., FV3157683.
Sullivan, Michael F., FV3168891.
Summerville, Rett S., FV3152584.
Suter, George H., FV3161459.
Swartzmeyer, Elmer G., FV3168892.
Swope, Richard T., FV3161793.
Taber, Lynville E., FV3151522.
Taylor, Elden C., FV3163801.
Teipe, Myrna R., FV3152185.
Thede, Allen L., FV3168895.
Thompson, Lowell W., Jr., FV3168897.
Throckmorton, George E., FV3168810.
Thurgood, John W., Jr., FV3134137.
Tigue, Dennis H., FV3168939.
Tolson, Jerome F., Jr., FV3151963.
Town, Edward A., FV3163802.
Traynor, Patrick J., FV3153018.
Troeber, David J., FV3160241.
Troutman, Vance G., FV3168901.
True, Herbert R., FV3151755.
Tucker, Jerome W., FV3168902.
Tucker, John E., FV3161329.
Turnley, Thomas E., Jr., FV3152427.
Ubl, Marlowe E., FV3168903.
Uridel, Richard K., FV3151284.
Valente, George A., Jr., FV3161683.
Vanderpool, Travis E., FV3162767.
Vannorsrand, William S., FV3162560.
Vicente, Frank R., FV3161684.
Vick, Jonathan C., FV3151558.
Viviano, Joseph L., FV3159289.
Wachob, Charles M., FV3161949.
Waddington, William J., FV3168904.
Wakeham, Ernest W., FV3161460.
Waldon, Jesse J., Jr., FV3151275.
Wall, Steven E., FV3168808.
Wallace, Luther E., FV3151690.
Wallace, Stephen L., FV3133397.
Walston, Gary R., FV3157527.
Wanless, Ronald H., FV3161101.
Waters, Joseph G., FV3151529.
Weathers, Morris E., FV3153033.
Webb, Michael S., FV3152776.
Weeks, Thomas R., FV3176137.
Wees, Edward L., FV3163803.
Wells, Hewett S., Jr., FV3151786.
Welshan, John T., FV3168907.
Wendt, Glenn W., FV3148780.
Western, Robert W., FV3157451.
Weston, Dale E., FV3161204.
Wheeler, James C., FV3152029.
Whitley, David L., FV3159880.
Wick, James R., FV3163120.
Wilbert, Jan J., FV3151742.
Williams, Clois E., FV3157360.
Williams, David M., Jr., FV3161796.
Williams, Donald E., FV3151237.
Williams, Ronald W., FV3163003.
Williamson, Gary E., FV3152096.
Willis, Albert H., FV3152710.
Wilson, Alexander G., FV3157529.
Wilson, David E., FV3154511.
Wilson, Dennis C., FV3151649.
Wilson, George E., FV3151333.
Wilson, Hugh H., Jr., FV3159850.

Wilson, William H., Jr., FV3162225.
Wimer, James K., FV3152062.
Winchester, Robert O., FV3168999.
Winn, Robert W., FV3168908.
Winter, James W., FV3163409.
Winter, Warren R., FV3160168.
Wittel, Charles R., Jr., FV3152518.
Witten, James P., FV3152447.
Wodstrchill, Daniel L., FV3158926.
Wood, Bruce D., FV3157530.
Wood, Ronald L., FV3152635.
Woods, Paul T., FV3152144.
Wright, Gareth W., FV3152495.
Wright, Tilden P., III, FV3151712.
Wurzburger, Nils L., FV3158580.
Wyckoff, Michael R., FV3151668.
Wycoff, Earl N., FV3146921.
Yonker, Dale B., FV3152713.
York, James E., FV3151262.
Yuknas, Joseph A., FV3168909.
Zebley, Frederick L., Jr., FV3160868.
Ziemniak, Edward M., FV3163804.
Zutell, Eugene G., FV3151154.

The following distinguished military graduates of Air Force precommission schools for appointment in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation to perform the duties of Medical Service Corps officers, under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

Davis, Douglas J., FV3168830.
Rouland, Donald L., FV3169005.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3306 and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. George Ruhlen, O19733, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Autrey Joseph Maroun, O19865, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Hamilton Austin Twitchell, O19843, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joseph Rieber Russ, O19860, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Hart Caughey, O19885, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Roy Lassetter, Junior, O51714, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Edward Landrum, Junior, O20216, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert George Fergusson, O20267, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Pelham Yarborough, O20362, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Evans, Jr., O20368, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Charles Haneke, O20263, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Arthur William Oberbeck, O20569, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Francis Seedlock, O20609, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Alexander Day Surles, Jr., O20622, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Albert Ollie Connor, O20699, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ferdinand Thomas Unger, O20734, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Taylor, O20779, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joe Stallings Lawrie, O20914, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. David Bennett Parker, O20571, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Chester Lee Johnson, O20681, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Jarvis Tolson III, O20826, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Donald Ralph Pierce, O43332, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Wayne Whitney, O31855, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard Giles Stilwell, O21065, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Gregory Wickham, O21073, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Walter Edward Lotz, Jr., O21090, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Claire Elwood Hutchin, Jr., O21092, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Fillmore Kennady Mearns, O21106, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Welby Beverley, O21107, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Roland Bennett Anderson, O21108, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frank Wade Norris, O21110, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Braden Latta, O21119, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Samuel Knox Eaton, O21132, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ferdinand Joseph Chesarek, O21177, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Jaroslav Thayer Folda, Jr., O21193, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Charles Fremont Tillson III, O21196, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Milton Finn, O21252, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Arthur Sylvester Collins, Jr., O21260, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ben Sternberg, O21286, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Joseph Denholm, O21293, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Howard York, O21341, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Raymond Peers, O21366, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Peter Stone, O21376, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Carroll Hilton Dunn, O21427, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, O21739, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frederic William Boye, Jr., O21891, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Raymond Bradner Marlin, O21899, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen, George Edward Pickett, O21938, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Walter Thomas Kerwin, Jr., O21963, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Welborn Griffin Dolvin, O21980, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, O21990, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Frank Thomas Mildren, O21992, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Henry Schellman, O22002, Army of the United States (colonel. U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Michael Shannon Davison, O22051, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Stanley Robert Larsen, O22094, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Augustine Kenan, 022670, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Allen Corcoran, O31721, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles William Eifler, O32614, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Charles Joseph Denholm, O21293, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Patrick Francis Cassidy, O32809, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Norton, O23858, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Leland George Cagwin, O23200, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Charles Gribble, Jr., O23695, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Eugene DePuy, O34710, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Irvin Forsythe, O24510, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Henry Augustine Miley, Jr., O22993, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles William Eifler, O32614, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Vincent Wilson, O23564, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Milton Hightower, O23531, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Jaroslav Thayer Folda, Jr., O21193, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Samuel Knox Eaton, O21132, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Fillmore Kennady Mearns, O21106, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Walter Edward Letz, Jr., O21090, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Pershing Brown, O23544, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Keith Lincoln Ware, O33181, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Woodrow Wilson Vaughan, O23004, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Raymond Bradner Marlin, O21899, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Roderick Wetherill, O23158, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Bibb Pickett, Jr., O23932, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Carroll Hilton Dunn, O21427, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Wayne Whitney, O31855, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Braden Latta, O21119, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Thomas Cassidy, O23213, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Howard Bayer, O23551, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Arthur Lorenzo West, Jr., O25269, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Dayton Willis Eddy, O24565, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Augustine Kenan, O22670, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Raymond Chandler Conroy, O33276, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard George Ciccolella, O34117, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Allen Corcoran, O31721, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Donald Ralph Pierce, O43332, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Hancock Hay, Jr., O25290, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. James Joseph Gibbons, O25355, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Francis Hollingsworth, O34155, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Mulford Van Harlingen, Jr., O22016, U.S. Army.

Col. Donald Hugh McGovern, O36851, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Burbank Webster, Jr., O23425, U.S. Army.

Col. William John Durrenberger, O25099, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Orwin Clark Talbott, O24617, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Burnside Elijah Huffman, Jr., O23759, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Mace Gonseth, O24417, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Lawson Johnson, O36285, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Warren Kennedy Bennett, O35691, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Arthur Lionel Friedman, O32474, U.S. Army.

Col. Willis Dale Crittenberger, Jr., O24893, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Haywood Young, Jr., O36242, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Thomas Bradley, O21768, U.S. Army.

Col. John Relley Guthrie, O36240, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Salve Hugo Matheson, O36253, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edwin I. Donley, O34887, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Harris Whitton Hollis, O53724, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James McMenamin Shepherd, O21063, U.S. Army.

Col. Thomas Matthew Rienzi, O24715, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Joseph Kenney, Jr., O23114, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Murphy Williams, O22206, U.S. Army.

Col. C. Craig Cannon, O39008, U.S. Army.

Col. Allan Langdon Leonard, Jr., O32898, U.S. Army.

Col. Wallace Leo Clement, O23167, U.S. Army.

Col. Bernard Richard Luczak, O22196, U.S. Army.

Col. Frederick Charles Roecker, Jr., O24681, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Albert Ray Brownfield, Jr., O21905, U.S. Army.

Col. Daniel Arthur Raymond, O24670, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Leo Bond Jones, O24255, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Alden Burke, O46646, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Francis Paul Koisch, O24669, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Leon Baldwin, O36864, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Alfred Judson Force Moody, O23685, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Davis Terry, O24739, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Albert Becker, O24267, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edward Bautz, Jr., O34750, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William McKinney Mantz, O33403, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Howard Keller, O21671, U.S. Army.

Col. Morgan Garratt Roseborough, O22681, U.S. Army.

Col. Karl William Gustafson, O45560, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles George Fredericks, O22092, U.S. Army.

Col. James Kyle Terry, O33375, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Henry Alfred Rasmussen, O40502 (U.S. Army).

Col. Glen Carl Long, O24170, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Robertson Desobry, O24262, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Felix John Gerace, O23954, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thomas Harwell Barfield, O35425, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Edgar Shedd III, O24971, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Ivey Oscar Drewry, Jr., O33224 (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Pershing Traylor, O25060, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Samuel Blanchard, O26737, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel) U.S. Army.

Col. John Louis Klinghenhagen, O39223, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Earl Franklin Cole, O64999, Army of the United States (major, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3306:

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Conn Lewis Milburn, Jr., O20405, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Thomas McGibony, O20406, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

Col. Clare Thomas Budge, O21050, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Robert Estes Blount, O19612, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Harold Gingles, O20920, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joe Morris Blumberg, O29332, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Col. Robert Lee Rhea, Jr., O29285, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. James Arista Wier, O26416, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 17, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Robert C. Weaver, of New York, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Robert C. Wood, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

President Johnson's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS WALKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, during the President's state of the Union message before this body, I was reminded of a Texas horsetrader, who brought horses into our community when I was a boy. He was always quick to tell you all about the horse's good qualities, but deliberately omitted the faults that might cause disaster later on.

Mr. Johnson told of all of the magnificent accomplishments of his so-called Great Society during 1965, and of the great period of prosperity that our country is supposed to be enjoying. But, there are some points of the so-called Great Society administration that Mr. Johnson did not mention in his annual report.

One of the many facts that he did not discuss was our Nation's cost of living. On two different occasions, once in July and again in December our cost of living jumped to alltime highs. In telling how good our economy is, Mr. Johnson did not bring up anything about the condition of our gold reserves and how our gold stockpiles in Fort Knox reached a new record low this past summer. He did not tell us it was not the taxpayers but the "States' liabilities" that want home rule in the District of Columbia.

President Johnson asked Congress to take away the individual's freedom of choice, the freedom he has to choose whether or not he wants to join a labor union. He failed to mention that last year, the Supreme Court of our land, that applauded his every action, ruled that an individual could be a Communist and still be the head of a labor union in America. And, he forgot to tell us that strikes during 1 month alone last year, in the same unions we would be strengthening, put over 220,000 workers out of work.

President Johnson told us in his report how great our farm policy is, and how much better off the farmer is today than ever before. I have never seen the farmer making less profit and more dissatisfied than he is today. You heard nothing about how our farm debt has jumped up nearly 50 percent since 1961—or that our Department of Agriculture is spending more tax dollars to serve less farms today than ever before.

When he talked about Vietnam, President Johnson forgot to mention that combat casualties over there last year amounted to over 5,500 men—or that we had 1,365 servicemen killed in action. The bad thing about the so-called Great Society's Vietnam policy is that we are exactly where we were 1 year ago. He is still operating on the policy of containing and appeasing communism. We're still not winning in Vietnam, and he made no claim that we intend to win.

The five-point foreign policy as outlined in the state of the Union message expanded beyond reason our present policy of appeasement at the cost of the American taxpayer. At one point the President said "The fifth and most important principle of our foreign policy is support of national independence." But he made no mention whatsoever about why we haven't followed this policy with regard to Rhodesia—where we have done just the opposite.

In all of this, I come to one conclusion, it is not only what President Johnson said in his state of the Union message but what he did not say that is frightening to me.

After 1 year of the so-called Great Society, with the increases in crime, immorality, bitterness, and insecurity, I think the citizenship of our Nation will admit that our society is in worse shape now than ever before in the history of our Nation.

Brooklyn Public Library Preschool Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this year the Congress will be considering renewal of the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964—Public Law 88-269. In this connection it is of interest to note the use the Brooklyn Public Library has made of these funds through its preschool programs.

From the start of the Brooklyn project in mid-February of last year to the end of October, a total of 2.442 programs had been presented for 36,217 children between the ages of 3 and 5. The programs were presented at day care centers, public and parochial schools, housing projects, community centers, churches, and libraries throughout Brooklyn.

The sessions have been conducted by preschool library aids, college graduates interested in working with young children. These aids have been given intensive training to introduce them to the Brooklyn Public Library's philosophy of service, the selection of materials for youngsters, as well as the techniques of presentation. There are 16 of these library aids and they present an average of 70 to 73 programs weekly.

A typical preschool program may be divided into two parts and last approximately an hour. The first and formal half is devoted to telling stories, separated either by poetry, songs, finger games, or imaginative play. During the second, or browsing part, the storyteller distributes books used in the program as well as others she has brought for the children.

Programs such as this play a constructive role in orienting young children toward learning and are illustrative of the dividends from Public Law 88-269, the Library Services and Construction Act.

Testimonial Dinner to the Honorable Julius Foster, Jr., of Point Pleasant Beach, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a few days ago the Honorable Julius Foster, Jr., of Point Pleasant Beach, N.J., was honored at a dinner on the occasion of his retirement as tax collector in the borough of Bay Head. This was an unusual tribute on several counts, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the release announcing the event and the text of a telegram I sent to him.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONIAL DINNER TO HON. JULIUS FOSTER, JR., CARE OF BEACON MANOR HOTEL, POINT PLEASANT BEACH, N.J.

I wish I could be with you tonight as you gather in tribute to Julius Foster, who is retiring after 64 years as tax collector in the Borough of Bay Head. There is no question but that Mr. Foster has achieved some kind of record for longevity in a post that might have made any other person holding it very unpopular with fellow townsmen. Mr. Foster has managed to extract "Caesar's due" from the citizens of Bay Head in steadily increasing amounts over the decades he has served as tax collector without any ensuing loss of friendships. The salute to him this evening is an indication of the esteem and affection in which he is held by fellow residents. I can only wish for him many more years of satisfaction and happiness, surrounded by the friends and neighbors who have come to mean so much in the life of this public-spirited individual.

CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator.

BAY HEAD, N.J.—The man who has made a business of collecting money during working hours longer than anybody else in the United States is calling it quits the first of the year.

Julius Foster, Jr., tax collector in the Borough of Bay Head since 1900, resigns the end of this year with the longest record in the Nation of continuous service as a municipal tax collector.

Foster, 88 years old, will be honored for his 64 years in office at a testimonial dinner given Saturday, January 8, 1966, by the official family of the borough and friends and relatives, at the Beacon Manor Hotel, Point Pleasant Beach.

Having collected millions of dollars during his career, Foster surpasses the previous record of 57 years in office, held by a fellow

New Jerseyite, Walter C. Black, tax collector of East Windsor Township, who retired in 1959.

The business of collecting taxes in Bay Head has increased many times since Foster took office on May 7, 1900. In his first year, he took in a total of $5,005 in tax dollars; in 1965, he collected $455,348.17.

When he first got the job, he was told it was temporary "until someone permanent can be found to do the work." He was appointed to complete the unexpired term of his grandfather, Daniel T. Staniford, who moved out of the town to Brielle, N.J. In 1901, Foster was elected by fellow townsmen, a habit which was continued by the three following generations. He can't remember when anybody opposed him at the polls. "Surely, nobody ran against me seriously," he recalls.

Oldtimers here remember that Foster's father was tax assessor when his son became collector. The family team conducted the borough's tax business for more than a quarter century, from 1900 to 1927 when Julius Foster, Sr., died.

During his 64 years as tax collector, Foster took care of his full-time job without extra help.

The next few days, before the year's end and retirement, he will rise as usual at 6 a.m., putter around his home until 9 o'clock, and then spend his customary 6-hour day in the tax office in the Borough Hall.

Over 40 years, Foster was in the plumbing business here. He was one of the pioneers in Bay Head who designed and produced the borough's sewerage system, built in 1911 far ahead of other local municipalities. He is a charter member of the Bay Head Fire Department and served as its treasurer from 1936 to 1958.

Foster was never married. He lives today with two of his sisters, Miss Ruth C. Foster and Miss Esther Foster, in their home at 501 West Lake Avenue here. His brother, Samuel F. Foster, lives in Springfield, Mass., and another sister, Mrs. Roy F. Striffler, lives in Berkey, Ohio.

The veteran municipal official was born in Jackson Township in 1877, and moved to Bay Head early in his youth. He attended school here and in West Point Pleasant. When he was sworn in as tax collector for the first time, he recalls that Charles L. Clayton was mayor and John J. Forsythe was borough clerk.

In 1961, Foster was named senior tax collector of New Jersey and received honors given him by the Municipal Receivers, Tax Collectors and Treasurers Association at the annual meeting of the New Jersey State League of Municipalities.

Foster is a lifelong Republican. His record in office has been praised by Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, who plans to cite the veteran tax collector officially next month before the U.S. Senate.

Similar expressions of congratulations for Foster's achievements have come from the Federation of Tax Administrators, the International Association of Assessing Officers, and the National Institute of Municipal Clerks.

A special citation will be presented to Foster by the Ocean County Board of Chosen Freeholders.

In reminiscing about his early days in Bay Head, Foster said: "The borough didn't amount to much in the way of houses around 1900 although it was a popular resort. When I first took over the collector's job, the total assessment was $215,000. The biggest place in town was the Bluff's Hotel on East Avenue. I guess it was built in 1898 or 1899, but it seems like it was always there.

"I was here during the blizzard of 1888. That was really something. We were snowed in for a week. There wasn't any train service from a Monday to a Friday. I think some of the drifts must have been 8 to 10 feet high."

When he moved here there were only 10 houses in the borough, he recalls. Most of them were summer homes, he said, and the now fully developed bayfront on Barnegat Bay was then "inhabited by mosquitoes."

Foster has a good word for his fellow townsmen as taxpayers. "Most of them pay their taxes with no trouble," he said. "And, besides, the law has a way of dealing with those who don't."

Have We Stopped Losing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a Member of the House just back from a tour of southeast Asia told me the other day that there were reasons to doubt that McNamara was correct when he said last November that the United States had stopped losing the war in Vietnam.

Of course the Secretary of Defense has done more to confuse the American people as to the true situation in Vietnam than almost seems possible.

In 1962 he was quoted as saying he was tremendously encouraged. In October 1963 he gave as his judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task could be completed by the end of 1965. And a month later in Honolulu, he announced that American troops would start being withdrawn before yearend.

On March 17, 1964, he said the situation could be significantly improved in the coming months. A few days later he repeated that the situation in South Vietnam had worsened.

In May, however, he reported excellent progress, but 1 day later told a congressional committee that anti-Vietcong efforts had deteriorated.

In February 1965 he summed up his views saying that the past year had brought some encouraging developments. Last November after a sixth visit, he told the press, as I said at the start, "We are no longer losing."

Mr. Speaker, let me get back to the statement of the Member of Congress whom I cited at the outset as telling me he had reasons to question that we have stopped losing the war. This was from a Congressman fresh back from southeast Asia.

Since I quoted this in a House speech recently, I have been pressed for further details.

I do not know the final answer, of course, but I am told Americans and that United States and South Vietnam forces hold less territory now than they did a year ago. In the past it has always been the practice to gage victory in war, on the basis of which force won and held territory.

However, it looks like ultimate defeat or victory in Vietnam will come, not on the battlefield, but rather at a peace conference. If this holds true, politics being what it is with the President and his party urgently needing a settlement before the next election, many people fear defeat could come at any time because Johnson and his advisers would sign on any terms. That is why I have so consistently called for all facts to be given to the American people. Otherwise, if the people are misinformed and confused, public opinion will have no bearing on the outcome, which could be disastrous.

A Congressman recently told the Wall Street Journal that the thing that scares him is the President signing his name to almost anything in order to get a settlement. My point is, no such thing will happen if the American people are told the full story because public opinion is a powerful influence.

Meanwhile, in spite of McNamara's statement that we have stopped losing the war, here are a few facts from Senator MANSFIELD's report which could contradict this.

> The Vietcong force in South Vietnam is double that of 3 years ago. Their strength is steadily increasing.
>
> Introduction of U.S. forces—

The report says—

> have blunted but not turned back the Vietcong drive. The lines remain drawn in South Vietnam in substantially the same pattern as when the United States increased its commitment.

The Mansfield report frankly admits that the war has expanded into Laos and is beginning to lap over the Cambodian border. Worst of all, it concludes that there are no grounds for optimism that the end is likely to be reached within the confines of South Vietnam or within the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, if these facts make it appear as though we have stopped losing, there is something wrong with my eyesight. Especially this opinion should be considered in the light of the fact that the Vietcong, as I have pointed out before, hold more territory today than they did a year ago. The picture is not bright and the people should know it.

Chad Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, Chad celebrated its Independence Day. I believe it appropriate for the House to take note of this fact and to extend its good wishes to the people of Chad.

Although facing extreme economic difficulties entailed by its landlocked position and its large desert area, the people of Chad have worked hard and efficiently to develop their economy. The country is self-sufficient in food production and exports have reached a new high.

Chad has played a responsible role not only as a member of the French community and as an associate member of the European Economic Community, but also through its participation in a number of United Nations activities.

On this day, let us offer the people of Chad our best wishes for continuing their successful development and our congratulations on their day of independence.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include my report to the people of the Seventh District of Alabama for January 17, 1966:

PRESIDENT NOT QUITE SURE OF THE STATE OF THE UNION

The best summary of Lyndon Johnson's state of the Union message was that it was delivered and received with a complete lack of enthusiasm. It seemed the President himself did not quite believe what he was saying. It demonstrated a lack of imaginative leadership at a time when the Nation needs inspired leadership. It was just a replay of the same old tired tune of spend and tax, more Federal control over the States and the people, and a promise of a war in Vietnam that will "last for years."

ON VIETNAM

The biggest letdown for the American people was the failure of the President to offer any positive program for ending or winning the war in Vietnam. He seemed to be willing to let the Communists decide on how the war will be fought and on what terms it will be negotiated. He failed to explain why we refuse to cut off the supply lines of the enemy by blockading the Haiphong Harbor and the Mekong River. He has no plans, evidently, for bombing strategic military targets such as the two rail lines from Red China into North Vietnam where many tons of war materiel is coming into the country, missile bases, military airfields, military fuel dumps and oil depots or ammunition plants. He made no mention of the fact that he and his political advisers are tying the hands of the military which prevents action needed to end the war in the shortest possible time.

RENEWED ATTACK ON SOUTH

In the best Johnson demagogic style he promised new attacks on the South under the guise of civil rights legislation. The effort will now be directed toward control of the jury system. This is a most dangerous area to be made subject to Federal control because the whole foundation of our judicial system with its guarantees of a fair trial for anyone accused of a crime, rests with the right of the accused to be tried by a "jury of his peers" selected without prejudice and subject to no pressures. Now the President wants to invade the jury box by giving control of the selection of jurors to Nicholas Katzenbach.

ASSAULT ON OWNERSHIP OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

He made a direct assault on the ownership and control of private property by promising to push for legislation to give "the Federal Government power to prohibit racial discrimination in the sale or renting of housing." In plain language this means "open housing," which only a year ago was rejected in California by a vote of the people. Under this program Robert Weaver, head of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Nicholas Katzenbach will tell you to whom you may sell or rent your house or who is going to live next door to you. This is not a racial question. It deprives any individual of his fundamental right to manage his own property and to choose his own neighbors.

ECONOMIC FIGURES JUGGLED

The President's announcement that the Federal deficit will be only $1.8 billion next year was met with amazed silence by both Democrats and Republicans. It was the general consensus of Members of Congress that this is a mere juggling of figures and a bookkeeping transaction. Planned expenditures for the poverty office alone will cause a greater actual deficit than the figure quoted by the President, and the cost of the war in Vietnam cannot even be estimated.

In promising to push for funds for rent subsidies, the President provides for another open-end raid on the Treasury. Operating under regulations laid down by Robert Weaver's new Department many Government agencies and boards are already planning to move poor families into better residential neighborhoods by renting single houses at the going rate and having the Government make up the difference in what a poor family can pay and the actual rent of the house. This is integration by economics.

PAVING WAY FOR ONE-WORLD GOVERNMENT

Suspicions were aroused by the President's proposal to demand an International Education Act for 1966 and an International Health Act for 1966 in which the United States will finance education and health on a worldwide basis before we have even implemented the programs passed last year to solve these problems in this country. The suspicion is that this program is advocated by the proponents of one-world government as a first step toward eliminating national sovereignty and placing authority in the hands of an international tribunal. Perhaps it was more than significant that the President used the term "supreme association" in referring to the United Nations. America has always placed its faith in the Supreme Being and our national life has been guided by an adherence to religious principles. Now it seems we are being moved in a subtle way to accept an organization of men as the "supreme" influence and inspiration by which we are to live.

GREAT SOCIETY PROMISES UNFULFILLED

The rosy promises of the President last year for achievement by his Great Society were exposed for what they are, empty promises. The much publicized war on poverty to date has been a failure. Although hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by the taxpayers in the hope the poor would be helped, the sad truth is that most of the money has been wasted or has gone into the hands of a few selected and highly paid political appointees. The newspapers have been filled almost daily with stories of intradepartment squabbling, waste and corruption. The only solution the President offered in his state of the Union message was to expand the program, hire more political people, spend more money, encourage more indolence by enlarging the welfare programs. He offered no positive approach to unleashing the tremendous power of the private enterprise system which alone will provide the jobs, the wages, and the incentive to put an end to poverty.

ECONOMIC PERIL TO THE SOUTH

In several key areas the President threatens the economy of the South. His demand, under pressure by northern big city bosses, that State right-to-work laws be repealed, is a prime example. While talking out of one side of his mouth about "individual freedom" at the same time he calls for depriving the right of the workers of Alabama to decide for themselves whether or not they want to repeal these laws.

His demand for an increase in unemployment compensation and an increase in minimum wage is another move, according to the Chicago Daily News, for slowing down the movement of industry to the South. This will mean fewer jobs for our workers and greater unemployment. As the Chicago Daily News puts it: "There's more bad news for the South in the program of the 2d session of the 89th Congress. The Johnson administration is pushing three proposals that, if enacted, would seriously crimp the sales talk used by the South in recruiting new industry * * * this phase of the Great Society could inhibit the industrial growth rate of the South." The three proposals are repeal of 14(b), increase in minimum wages, and Federal standards for unemployment compensation.

A NEGATIVE MESSAGE

A disappointment in the message was that it was so completely negative. The President tried to tell us that we are enjoying the greatest prosperity ever and at the same time he said we must spend more millions on more welfare programs because our people are in such a poor and miserable situation. He made no mention of the promise that we would get more tax cuts—instead he asked that excise taxes which have been in effect only 2 weeks, be put back on. He ignored the inflation caused by big Government spending which is robbing all of our citizens of the purchasing power of the dollars in their pockets. People do not have more money because a dollar buys so much less than it did a year ago when you go to the grocery store or when you buy shoes and clothes for your children.

America needs positive leadership to free up the tremendous forces of the private enterprise system. It was through the operation of this system with its incentives to get ahead that we reached this point in history where our people enjoy the highest rate of employment and the highest standard of living for more people than any other nation in the history of mankind. Lyndon Johnson has failed to provide the kind of leadership necessary to meet the dynamic challenges of the sixties. It is now up to the Republicans in Congress, supported by those in the other party who have faith in America and its people, to provide the positive programs we need. That will be the purpose of our party and my own purpose in the session of Congress which is just beginning.

Educational Benefits for Our New Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, more than 21 years ago—on June 22, 1944—President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed into law one of our Nation's most successful acts of legislation: The GI bill of rights. Perhaps the most valuable and imaginative portions of this measure were its provisions for educational assistance. Among its beneficiaries are Members of this House, several Senators, Governors, and even Cabinet members. Those who took advantage of the GI bill of rights know personally its great worth; the benefits it afforded the Nation as a whole have been no less valuable, nor in any manner less dramatic.

The United States today possesses some 450,000 engineers; 180,000 doctors, dentists, and nurses; 360,000 schoolteachers; and 150,000 scientists, educated with the assistance of the GI bill. It helped to finance the college expenses of 2.2 million veterans of World War II; moreover, it assisted 2.1 million GI's in paying for on-the-job training. A total of 7.8 million veterans benefited from the legislation. The quality of America, therefore, increased as almost a generation of its people was educated through the GI bill.

The total cost of this portion of the bill was unquestionably great: $13 billion. The cost has, however, already been paid in full as approximately $1 billion in tax revenues is gained annually from the increased earnings of those aided by the GI bill. The expense was, therefore, a well-justified loan to our own people—a wager on the future of our servicemen.

The GI bill enhanced the moral, as well as the material, condition of our country. It fulfilled a nationwide obligation to compensate servicemen for sacrifices on behalf of their Nation. It reemphasized our belief in the promise of our Nation's future. And, above all, it dramatized our faith in democratic values by expressing the primacy of our concern for the human quality of our citizens. It has been rightfully pointed out that the cost of this program can be counted in dollars, but there is no way to set a value on the far-reaching influence for good it has exerted in the course of our national life.

Unfortunately, the educational benefits under this act have been terminated for veterans who have served since 1955. A generation of veterans of the cold war, namely, those who have served during the past 11 years, are being deprived of the benefits of this inspired legislation. There is no reason in the world that this should be so.

As in the years of World War II, we are engaged in a protracted struggle with an alien, ruthless, and totalitarian ideology. Our servicemen in Vietnam today are fully as important as were those of 20 years ago. The battle they wage is equally as essential to the security of our Nation. Today's conflict demands from its participants what was required of the military of the Second World War: readiness to sacrifice one's life, if necessary, for the protection of our country.

Hundreds of Americans have died in South Vietnam in the last few years. American servicemen were killed in recent years in Panama, in the Dominican Republic, in Lebanon, and Berlin. In these and other places, our military has demonstrated its readiness to sacrifice their lives for our Nation. We are therefore as indebted to them as we were to the soldiers of World War II. We would be derelict in the fulfillment of our obligations were we to deprive them of the educational benefits of the GI bill to which they are rightfully entitled.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I introduce a bill to continue the educational provisions of the act of 1944. It is known as the Cold War Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act. An identical measure has been sponsored by Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, of Texas, and 38 other Members of the Senate. I urge that we in the House join our colleagues in the other body in renewing this imaginative, valuable, and eminently successful piece of legislation.

As a result of the benefits provided by the GI bill of rights, most of the veterans of World War II have been restored to the mainstream of the Nation's life and activities, they are better off in terms of health and education, they enjoy better housing and higher incomes than the nonveterans. It is no more than fair for the Nation to provide the same or similar benefits to those who have served in our Armed Forces in the past decade and those who are serving in Vietnam and will be the veterans of tomorrow. They must be given the same opportunity to acquire an education and specialized training that would not be otherwise available to them.

Mr. Speaker, I have obtained some interesting figures from the Veterans' Administration on the educational benefits as provided under the GI bill during the years it was in effect. They are as follows:

Seven million eight hundred thousand veterans took advantage of these provisions at a total cost of $13 billion: First, almost 2.2 million enrolled in colleges; second, 3.5 million enrolled in other schools; and third, 2.1 million received on-the-job training.

The following specialists were developed as a result of the opportunities furnished by the GI bill:

First, 450,000 engineers; second, 180,000 doctors, dentists, and nurses; third, 360,000 schoolteachers; fourth, 150,000 scientists; fifth, 243,000 accountants; sixth, 711,000 mechanics; seventh, 383,000 construction workers; eighth, 138,000 electricians; and ninth, 288,000 metalworkers.

The Bureau of the Census reports that an extra $1 billion per year is gained in tax revenue due to the higher earning power of those educated through the GI bill. College graduates earn nearly twice as much in a lifetime as do graduates of high school.

Of the 5.5 million veterans of the Korean war, 2.3 million took advantage of this portion of the act.

Nonstatistical benefits of the GI bill, as analyzed in a study made in 1956 by a committee under Gen. Omar Bradley:

First. Economic effects: The GI bill helped to avoid the predicted postwar recession by increasing earning and purchasing power and by creating credit for capital investment.

Second. Political effects: The GI bill avoided economic, social, and therefore political postwar dislocations by assimilating military personnel into civilian life. Insofar as it created and fulfilled optimistic expectations of civilian life on the part of American servicemen, it aided the process of successful demobilization. The bill also created new sources of leadership.

Third. The bill paid a nationwide debt owed to the servicemen for their personal sacrifices on behalf of the country.

Fourth. The bill was a dramatic demonstration of democratic values as it represented an investment in human value.

WHY COVER COLD WAR VETERANS?

First. About 5 million military personnel are not covered by the GI bill. These are the men who have enlisted since the Korean war and are the so-called veterans of the cold war.

Second. Despite the fact that the United States is not officially at war, the same sacrifices are required of today's servicemen as were made by those in World War II and the Korean war. American soldiers have been killed in Vietnam and other places. The same is demanded of today's soldiers as was demanded in former times: that they be prepared to die for the sake of national security. It must also be remembered that only a small portion of the 11 million men who served in World War II saw action, but all received the benefits of the GI bill.

Third. As in the time of World War II, it is necessary that today's servicemen not be excluded from the benefits of civilian life. With the high educational requirements necessary for employment, it is especially necessary that veterans be afforded educational opportunities after their period of service.

Fourth. The GI bill should be extended to help remedy the inequities of the current selective service system.

Zero Defects Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in October 1964, I was invited to speak at a ceremony in San Leandro, Calif., when Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp. dedicated a new numerical control machining plant.

In December 1965, I returned to the same plant to take part in another ceremony when the plant manager was presented with the coveted U.S. Air Force Zero Defects Achievement Award.

Such a fine achievement in so short a time is, I believe, worth bringing to your attention. It illustrates pride of workmanship among aerospace craftsmen. Such a pride is essential not only for the defense of our country but also for the success of our exploration of outer space.

As we rely more and more on missiles to provide the major deterrent to a nuclear attack, we are utterly dependent on the craftsmanship and dedication of all the thousands of men and women who make the components that fit into a missile. After a missile or spaceship leaves the launch pad, it cannot be repaired like the car that breaks down on a freeway.

The zero defects program aims at improving workmanship and stimulating a feeling of personal responsibility in all aerospace personnel. The program was implemented by the Air Force in February 1965, and has already saved the taxpayers thousands of dollars by reducing waste and scrap.

The program is based on the principle of defect prevention through inducement and motivation and is designed to encourage members of the defense industry to promote programs of efficiency and perfection through individuals.

Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics was one of 229 companies which pioneered the program, and on June 2, 1965, the corporation was presented with a participation award, which recognizes those companies who voluntarily agree to join the program.

The citation on the participation award reads:

> The Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp., an Air Force prime contractor and subcontractor, and its employees voluntarily established and agreed to participate in the U.S. Air Force zero defects program. Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp. initiated the program on October 1, 1964, and more than 95 percent of the employees freely pledged themselves to strive constantly for improved quality of workmanship. Measurement provisions were established in three areas, and the performances record from point of inception has been fully validated.
>
> In recognition of Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp. employees who participated in the contractor-sponsored zero defects program and who met or exceeded those parameters established for the award, their contribution in the defense preparedness effort entitles them to the U.S. Air Force Zero Defects Program Participation Award.

Of the 259 defense contractors who have joined the zero defects program, only 65 have qualified for the participation award, and 17 for the achievement award.

The achievement award is presented to those plants which have demonstrated significant achievements or improvements against contractor-established goals.

The citation for Kaiser reads:

> Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp. employees have distinguished themselves by attainment of significant achievements during the period October 1, 1964, to June 30, 1965.
>
> During this period the combined efforts of management, engineering and administration employees have significantly contributed to the achievement of a 36-percent improvement in manufacturing areas. A cost savings and cost avoidance of $169,000 was realized through the reduction of defects and the improvements in work performance.
>
> These noteworthy achievements are recognized as significant milestones in furtherance of the Air Force zero defects program objective of efficiency and perfection through people. The distinctive accomplishments by the employees of Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp. have reflected great credit upon themselves and have identified their corporation as a vital Air Force partner in the defense industry.

The award and citation were presented to Plant Manager Thomas W. Lee at a ceremony in San Leandro on December 21, attended by employees of the morning and afternoon shifts.

Clay P. Bedford, president of Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp., congratulated his San Leandro employees on their achievement and read a poem—a favorite of Henry J. Kaiser, the distinguished founder and head of the Kaiser enterprises. He said this caught the spirit of the vast Kaiser organization:

> All have a share in the beauty,
>   All have a part in the plan.
> What does it matter what duty
>   Falls to the lot of man?
>
> Someone has blended the plaster,
>   And someone has carried the stone;
> Neither the man nor the master
>   Ever has builded alone.
>
> Making a roof from the weather,
>   Or building a house for the king,
> Only by working together
>   Have men accomplished a thing.

Thomas Lee outlined the slogan contest which is held every month at the plant to popularize the zero defects program. An electric carving knife is presented to the family which suggests the best slogan. Four wives and one daughter won the first prizes, and this illustrates that the families of the employees are backing the program as well as the employees themselves.

In September, Mrs. Clara Harris, wife of Machinist Leon Harris, won the prize with the slogan: "Be it big or be it small; do it right or not at all."

In October, the best slogan of: "If perfection is the game; zero defects is the aim" won a prize for Mrs. Helen Stayrook, wife of Machinist Roy Stayrook.

In November, it was Mrs. Brigida Valle, wife of Inspector Juaquin Valle, who won with the slogan: "Zero defects is our goal; full speed ahead let her roll."

The December award was won jointly by Miss Dixie Ding, daughter of Helen Ding, and Mrs. Jeanne Turnage, wife of Materials Manager William Turnage. Miss Ding's slogan was: "Get in the groove and really swing; go zero defects in everything."

And Mrs. Turnage coined:

> "To stop those little defects,
>   To stop those big ones too,
> To prevent all of the rejects
>   Zero Defects is the clue."

Col. W. K. Ashby, director of quality assurance and head of the zero defects program for the San Francisco region, pointed out that Kaiser won the achievement award in record time.

Brig. Gen. Daniel E. Riley, U.S. Air Force, commanding general of Air Force Contracts Management Division at Los Angeles, presented the award, congratulated Kaiser employees and said it was a fine example of team spirit.

> We all benefit from your work—

He said.

> There comes a moment of truth during the blastoff of a missile, when the value of zero defects comes home to us.
>
> This award is to recognize the part you all play in the defense of our country. Do not relax now. When we say "zero defects," we really mean zero. That is our aim. That is what we are training our sights on.
>
> I would like to challenge you all to go one stage further and make a bid for the craftsmanship award—the highest in the zero defects program.
>
> This will be presented to the contractor and his employees for a combination of sustained performance and outstanding achievements in such activities as cost reduction, product reliability, safety, reduction of errors, and amount of scrap.

In my brief remarks, I observed:

> If we can be sure that each missile is so constructed that it contains no defects, and if every plane that flies through the skies is flawless because every man, who helped to make the parts, gave of his best, then we would be a happy nation.
>
> The Kaiser organization can be proud of you. I want to thank you all on behalf of the Government.

In addition to its production of aircraft parts, solid rocket nozzles for the Minuteman and Polaris programs and spaceship components, Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp. produces the Kaiser Flite-Path system—an advanced system of aircraft cockpit instrumentation—at Palo Alto, Calif., for Grumman Aircraft Corp., for use in Navy planes.

The company has an electronics plant at Phoenix, Ariz., which produces ground support equipment for the Kaiser Flite-Path and has recently entered a new field, community antenna television equipment.

Speaker McCormack Looks at the 1966 Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the monthly publication New Englander, a business news magazine published by the New England Council, contains in its January 1966 issue a well-written and informative article by our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. The article is entitled "Congressional Legislative Outlook for 1966."

It provides us with an excellent insight into the current session of Congress as seen by a man who has been a Member of Congress for more than 47 years, served for many years as majority leader and for the past 4 years as Speaker of the House. Although the article was written before the session started, I am sure my colleagues will find it of great interest.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert this article into the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATIVE OUTLOOK FOR 1966

(By JOHN W. MCCORMACK)

While my assigned topic is to set forth the likely congressional legislative program for the upcoming year with particular reference to its effect on New England, I feel, as the Congress which will meet in January is the same Congress which adjourned in October, a brief backward glance, by way of introduction, at what the 89th Congress did during its 1st session might provide valuable clues as to its likely course of action during its 2d session. The 89th Congress responded in a responsible and humanitarian manner to the complex economic and social problems with which mid-20th century American society is faced. The legislation passed by this Congress has already produced a robust and expanding national economy, and it acted in a statesmanlike manner to carry out our military and moral commitments as the leader of the free world and thus help maintain peace.

It is unnecessary to belabor the point that the maintenance of national prosperity and world peace is of overriding concern to New England as it is to every other region of this country, dwarfing into insignificance any purely regional matters.

In cooperation with the splendid leadership of President Johnson, this Congress has written the most outstanding record of legislative achievement in American history. In its deliberations and actions in the domestic area it has been the coauthor with the President in formulating a whole battery of programs which, by aiding and uplifting our less-fortunate fellow citizens, will make this country truly a more perfect democracy and thus bring us closer to the attainment of those ideals set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. I feel certain that in broad general terms the 89th Congress will in its 2d session continue to move in this same progressive, humanitarian direction.

As to specifics, it would be impossible and I feel most inappropriate for me at this time to try to set forth in any detail next year's congressional legislative program. Shortly after the first of the year, I am certain the President will hold a meeting with the Democratic congressional leadership at the White House, outline his legislative objectives for the upcoming congressional session and submit them to the leadership for tactical advice and guidance. Only then would I be in a position to enumerate at any length the bills which the Congress will be likely to act on during 1966.

VITAL INTEREST TO NEW ENGLAND

Nevertheless, we shall be required to take action in a number of areas all of which I feel certain will be of vital interest to New England. First, it is mandatory that the several Great Society programs enacted during 1965 be adequately funded in 1966. Many of these programs were long-term in nature, providing for a relatively small beginning initially but authorizing a greatly accelerated operation in future years. Because of this, in many cases they will require substantially larger appropriations for fiscal year 1967 than were provided in last year's Appropriation Acts.

Included among such programs are those authorizing Federal assistance to combat air and water pollution, highway beautification, urban renewal and planning, grants for community facilities, mass transportation, antipoverty, and Federal aid to education, higher, secondary, and primary. The primary thrust of many of these programs will be in the urban areas. New England, being almost exclusively urban, therefore has an important interest in their successful long-term implementation.

In addition, two of the truly great social reform measures enacted during the 1st session of the 89th Congress—namely, rent supplements and the Teacher Training Corps—were not provided with any funds prior to adjournment. The Teacher Training Corps would provide Federal financial assistance to send specially trained experienced teachers into poor areas, both rural and urban, to enable those areas to uplift the quality of their teaching. Complete control of educational policy would, of course, continue to reside in the local communities. Both private and public schools would be eligible for this aid.

The rent supplement program would afford private enterprise an opportunity to rehouse our poorest citizens in decent housing; it would be in addition to and not replace the existing public housing program. The importance to the New England States of these worthy programs is, I believe, self-evident and it is imperative that both be adequately funded by the Congress early next year.

SEVERAL BILLS PENDING

Despite the unprecedented legislative output during the past session, several vital bills remained pending before the Congress when the first session ended. A proposal to strengthen fair employment practices has been reported by the House Education and Labor Committee and made in order for consideration by the House under the 21-day rule. It will be programed for early floor action in 1966.

Another measure raising the minimum wage and broadening its coverage has likewise been favorably reported by the House Education and Labor Committee. I have always strongly supported minimum wage legislation, having helped pass the original Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938 and voted for every subsequent improvement in that law. I shall therefore, of course, give my full support to legislation to raise the minimum wage and expand its coverage when the measure is considered by the House early next year.

President Johnson has strongly recommended to the Congress that our unemployment insurance system, which has not been substantially modified since its inception 30 years ago, be updated so as to better implement its objective of strengthening our family life. A bill to carry out the President's recommendations is now pending before the House Ways and Means Committee, and it will be quickly programed for action in the House as soon as it is reported by that committee.

NEW ENGLAND CAN GAIN A GREAT DEAL

I am firmly convinced that the New England economy has a great deal to gain from the passage of all of this legislation as indeed it has benefited from the Great Society laws already passed. The enactment of all three measures will result in increasing the purchasing power of the great mass of American workers who then in turn will be good customers from New England's manufactured products. Legislation such as FEPC, minimum wage, and unemployment insurance are sometimes pictured by their opponents as antibusiness proposals. Nothing could be further from the truth. Quite the contrary, they are truly probusiness measures of the most basic nature because they provide social justice.

It behooves the New England business community as well as all business to give its support to this type of legislation, not only because such legislation is morally right and strengthens the social fabric of this Nation, but because the prosperity and welfare of business in the last analysis always rests upon the availability of customers with adequate purchasing power. It is upon mass effective demand that continued business expansion is dependent, and the only way such mass demand can be sustained over any period of time is to make sure that this country has full employment for all of its citizens without regard to creed or color, at adequate wages and enjoying the type of economic security which a modernized unemployment insurance system would provide.

In conclusion, I would state that our economy is now a truly integrated one. New England as a region, while of course possessing unique assets and problems, can only prosper and flourish as a part of an overall dynamic national economy. The policies and programs being pursued by President Johnson's administration and the 89th Congress are without doubt those best suited to the continued expansion and health of that national economy.

Remarks of Congressman William M. Tuck, Democrat, of Virginia, at the Annual Meeting of the Virginia Association of Soil and Water District Supervisors at Richmond, Va., January 11, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday, January 11, the Honorable WILLIAM M. TUCK, of the Fifth District of Virginia, addressed the annual meeting of soil conservationists in Virginia and made a splendid address.

Congressman TUCK served as Governor of Virginia from 1946 until 1950 and has an intimate knowledge of the problems of water and soil conservation not only in our State but throughout the Nation. His remarks are so timely and so interesting that I would like to commend them to the reading of the Members of the House.

I take pleasure in inserting his address in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM M. TUCK, DEMOCRAT OF VIRGINIA, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER DISTRICT SUPERVISORS AT RICHMOND, VA., JANUARY 11, 1966

It is a pleasure to participate in your annual meeting, and to meet with you experts in the conservation and development of our land and water resources. There is nothing more basic to our economy and welfare than our natural resources. It is an inescapable fact that what we do with our natural resources will not only affect our social and economic welfare of today, but also pave the way for future developments.

Although I am not a conservation expert, I am well acquainted with the soil conservation movement. I am aware of the need for a technically sound conservation plan on all land, whether it is farmland or not. I am proud to say that my own farm is a better one for the use of the technical know-how that has been developed in the last 30 years.

I am not a stranger to the soil conservation movement in Virginia. I have followed it as a member of the general assembly, as Governor, and as a Member of Congress. I have noted with great interest the concern of the people of Virginia in our great land and water resources. I have seen interest in soil conservation grow through the expanded soil conservation district programs. I believe in these programs and have expressed my support of them in the Congress.

In Virginia, we have already come face to face with soil and water problems that every community faces today.

The rapid growth of population demands space for homes, industries, highways, schools and playgrounds, shopping centers, and recreation areas, as well as the water, sewerage, and other facilities that must accompany this growth. While in Virginia the expansion is most noticeable near the large metropolitan areas like Washington, Norfolk, Richmond, Roanoke, and Petersburg, it is by no means confined to them. Practically every small city and town is experiencing this growth. The State is actively encouraging industry to move in. The highway system is being improved and linked into the interstate systems. Tourism is big business and is growing. State and local planning groups and commissions are working on long-range land-use plans. Health and sanitary agencies, county planning and zoning boards, housing developers, and county governing bodies are becoming aware that we need careful, long-term planning if we are to make the best use of our land and water.

Our internationally famed Dulles Airport in Virginia near Washington is a showcase for aviation industry. It is also a showcase for conservation and its part in developing land to protect a community during and after construction. It reflects credit on the work that soil conservation districts are doing, and the tremendous part they can and should plan in nonagricultural development of rural land. It is an example of teamwork between a soil conservation district and Federal agencies.

The Potomac River is another of our attractions. What is done on much of our northern Virginia land contributes either to the beauty and usefulness of this great river or to its pollution.

I know that the soil conservation districts within the Potomac River Basin have been working in the hope of making this stream a model of scenic and recreational values. I believe the work they are doing to keep the soil on the land is one of the important phases of our program to beautify the Potomac. Nearer Washington, urban development and other problems are going to have to be dealt with also. I hope that you as experts in conservation and development of our land and water resources will make yourselves heard and be a part of the campaign to clean up this historic river that has the potential to provide beauty, pleasure, and relaxation to those who live nearby and to those who come from all over the world.

The Potomac River and the Dulles Airport are showcases that are open to view by visitors from far and wide. However, the conservation work that you are doing throughout Virginia is no less vital to the health of our natural resources, to the economy of the State, and to the welfare of its people.

Congress, since it set up the mechanism through which the soil conservation movement began over 30 years ago, has continued to add tools for use in resource conservation. It has supported sound conservation programs.

In this decade, the U.S. Congress has broadened the soil and water conservation program by new legislation and by amendments to the old.

The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act has been amended to strengthen the assistance available from the Federal Government in order to make the program more effective. A 1962 amendment provided for Federal assistance in developing public recreation facilities and water storage for future municipal or industrial use. The amendment enables local communities to make greater use of the multiple-purpose principle.

Fortunately, one resource can often be put to many uses. And when local people and public agencies work together, the results are far better than those obtained when development is piecemeal or through programs with single-purpose objectives.

Our growing population and the complexity of our economy are adding new dimensions to the problem of resource management in this Nation. There are more claimants for natural resources and resource products, and the result is conflict and competition. This increases the need for multiple use so that several needs can be satisfied from a given source. It creates the need for coordination so that waste and mismanagement can be prevented.

The small watershed program provides for the multiple-use concept and it adds some other highly important ingredients—local leadership, local coordination, and local participation. Undoubtedly the involvement of local people is the reason the program has been so effective.

Our Mountain Run watershed project in Culpeper County has gained nationwide attention since it was dedicated in 1961. I am very proud of it. It is an example of the economic benefits a community can obtain through a multiple-purpose project that provides a dependable water supply and overcomes the threat of flood damages.

I am told that, since the national small watershed program began, reservoirs that have been built, or that have been authorized, will provide water to more than 100 cities and towns ranging in population from a few hundred to about 70,000, and totaling over 624,000. Since the 1962 amendment, interest in including water supply in watershed projects has increased considerably.

Development of public recreation facilities in watershed projects has also been stepped up considerably since the 1962 amendment. I understand that recreation is included in 67 of the projects designed since 1962, and that they will provide over 4 million visitor-days of recreation annually when completed.

I am well pleased that Virginia has taken advantage of the provisions of these amendments. Ten of the 25 watershed projects you are installing are multiple purpose. Nine of them include municipal water supply and one of these also includes recreation. More than 100,500 people in Culpeper, Keysville, Madison, Staunton, Luray, Drakes Branch, Chatham, Louisa, and Mineral and in Albemarle and Augusta Counties will benefit from the water supplied from reservoirs in these projects.

During the calendar year 1965, congressional committees approved for operations 99 projects—the largest number in any 1 year since the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act was passed in 1954. About 65 percent of these projects were designed for municipal water supply, recreation, or agricultural water management, in addition to flood prevention.

For this fiscal year, the Congress has increased the watershed protection appropriation to relieve the backlog of worthy watershed projects that have been planned and are ready to move ahead.

The drought conditions in the eastern United States during the last 3 years has made us all more conscious of the need to plan carefully for water supply. It has generated interest in local water problems. It has also brought farm and nonfarm people together to work out long-term plans and come up with something that is beneficial to all segments of the community.

Demands for land and water are increasing so rapidly that only by this type of teamwork can the available resources satisfy the needs. There is just so much land and water. We have to make the best use of it. This requires careful planning. You are experts in the conservation field. Your experience, your know-how, is sorely needed in resource planning. I urge that your soil conservation district programs include plans to make the best use possible of land and water resources to enhance the economy of the entire community.

We cannot afford to waste water in our homes, in industry, or on our farms. We cannot afford to let good usable water run off to waste, eroding our farmlands, flooding our valleys, and silting up our reservoirs and waterways in the process.

In 1965, the Congress added other tools through which the Nation's water and other resource problems can be evaluated and relieved.

The Rural Water and Sanitation Facilities Act, for example, provides loans and grants to plan and construct community water supply and sanitation facilities in rural communities not in excess of 5,500 population.

The Water Quality Act provides for the establishment and enforcement of water quality standards for interstate streams. It increased Federal grants for construction of community sewage projects.

The Water Resources Planning Act provides for Federal and regional coordination of plans for water resources development. It authorized Federal matching grants for the States for development of water resource programs.

The Federal Water Projects Recreation Act provides uniform policies for fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation in Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects.

Other legislation is aimed at creating more jobs and economic opportunities in hard-pressed areas through resource development. The Appalachian Regional Development Act and the Public Works and Economic Development Act both provide for stepped up or expanded resource development activities.

The cropland adjustment program, aimed at removing surplus production, emphasizes shifting land into public benefit uses that also conserve soil and water to meet future needs. It also offers opportunity for landowners to receive increased payments if they open their land to the public for recreation uses such as fishing, hunting, hiking, and trapping.

Future legislation will continue to reflect the needs and wants of the people. It will reflect the changes of the time—changes in resource demands and conservation and development problems, expanded population, changes in land use, leisure time, and the affluency of the Nation.

I consider resource conservation and development an important part of making rural America a place of opportunity for all who dwell there. I consider it extremely worthy of support by the U.S. Congress, by State legislatures, by cities, and by counties, and by the people—all the people, for they are the beneficiaries.

This year the Congress increased Soil Conservation Service funds $9.5 million over last year. The SCS contribution to soil and water conservation activities in Virginia during fiscal year 1966 will amount to an estimated $4.5 million. This is more than double the 1960 figure.

The Virginia State Legislature appropriated $232,600 for soil and water conservation work in fiscal year 1966. This includes $93,075 for planning watershed projects and $14,520 for installing projects. It also includes $80,000 to help speed up completion of soil surveys in counties that have urban conservation problems or where problems are anticipated.

The value of local governmental contributions to help carry out the program of local soil conservation districts in Virginia for fiscal year 1966 is approximately $69,715.

One of the most important ingredients to the success of the conservation program is local financial support. As the conservation job becomes more complex, the State and local funds will need to be increased—not to take the place of Federal funds, but to supplement them or to extend their effectiveness.

Of the 25 million acres within the boundaries of the 31 soil conservation districts in Virginia, I note that basic conservation plans have been made on only 5.5 million acres. The plans have been fully carried out on only 2.4 million acres.

I realize that not as much technical help is available as needed. I know that Federal technical assistance in planning and applying conservation measures is limited. That is why government at all levels must give financial support to the conservation program. That is why I opposed the proposal before Congress last year that required farmers to pay part of the cost of the technical assistance that has been free from the Federal Government. I believe that it would curtail conservation work that benefits the farmers and the whole community. I believe that it would have set conservation back 30 years and have laid us wide open to future conservation problems.

The demands on our land and water resources in the next few decades will grow tremendously. To meet the requirements for food, for recreation, for industry, for places for an expanding population to live, work, and to go to school, for highways, reservoirs, forest products, will call for wise planning and efficient management of our resources. We will need to prevent erosion and flood damages to our valuable land. We will need to improve water resources, to prevent water shortages, and to avoid water waste.

I think we have an excellent team. There is no doubt that we can do it. But it will take the involvement of both land users and consumers, both rural and urban people. Only then will we be able to go full steam ahead.

South Jersey Troops in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, during my Christmastime tour of Vietnamese fighting areas, I was fortunate in meeting a number of fighting men from several services. The high state of their morale and training, their understanding of their mission, their respect for the Vietnamese people, and their eagerness to do the job they are in Vietnam to do was, I found, typical of all the American military men—officers and enlisted men of all services—with whom I spoke while in Vietnam.

Therefore, I feel it might be of interest to my colleagues to read of the reactions of the soldiers, sailors, and marines from New Jersey's Second District, which I enumerated in a news release which I have sent to newspapers and radio stations in my district. The news release reads as follows:

Washington, D.C.—Servicemen from the Second District fighting in Vietnam, visited by Representative Thomas C. McGrath, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, at Christmastime, "were all in high spirits and grateful for letters of encouragement and gifts from the folks back home," the Congressman said upon his return here.

During his tour of the fighting areas last month, Representative McGrath visited installations of the 1st Air Cavalry Division, the 3d Marine Division, the Rung Sat Special Zone River Attack Group, a special forces fort near the Cambodia border, flew with the Air Force, and went aboard the nuclear carrier USS *Enterprise* in the South China Sea.

"At each stop on my inspection tour I looked for men from Atlantic, Cape May, and Cumberland Counties, and did locate eight of them and narrowly missed two others, for whom I left messages," the Congressman said.

"Without exception, I found them all in fine health and at the peak of training, their morale was high, and they were, to a man, fully aware of the reasons they were in Vietnam and eager to do their part to end this terrible warfare against the Vietcong," Representative McGrath declared.

Serving with 3d Marines at Chu Lai, the Congressman talked with Sgt. Larry Mullin, son of Mr. and Mrs. George Mullin of 124 East Edgewater Avenue, Pleasantville, and Sgt. William B. McLaughlin, son of Mrs. W. McLaughlin of 224 North Dudley Avenue, Ventnor, and husband of Mrs. Diane Gruhler McLaughlin of 520 Broad Street, Pleasantville.

Sergeant McLaughlin said that since his unit, the 4th Marine Regiment, landed at Chu Lai in early August, "we can see a definite improvement in the situation." Sergeant Mullin told the Congressman, "There's no question that we're doing a lot of good here."

Lt. Larry Letzer of 341 31st Street, South, Brigantine, had just arrived in Vietnam when he encountered Representative McGrath at Tan Son Nhut Air Base near Saigon. Serving with a photo reconnaissance outfit, Lieutenant Letzer noted that he and all the other members of his unit had volunteered for duty in Vietnam. "It's a job that has to be done," he told his Congressman.

Aboard the *Enterprise*, Representative McGrath met Aviation Machinist's Mate 3c James B. Hill, son of Mr. and Mrs. James S. Hill of 412 Mulberry Avenue, Pleasantville, who has been aboard the "Big E" for 2½ years and was spending his fourth consecutive Christmas season away from hime.

Attached to a reconnaissance attack squadron, Hill said "our morale has taken an upward turn in the past month or so, and we realize now that the draft card burners in the States are just a small group of immature adults."

Marine Pvt. G. M. Sorg, Jr., of 807 White Horse Pike, Egg Harbor, was on patrol when Representative McGrath visited the 4th Marine Regiment at Chu Lai, but the traveling Congressman left a message for the home district fighting man.

Two Infantry sergeants from Cumberland County, both serving with the 1st Air Cavalry Division at An Khe, were awaiting Representative McGrath when he arrived at that well-fortified enclave guarding Highway 19 from the coast to Pleiku.

Sgt. Frank C. Giordano, of 510 Oxford Street, Vineland, a squad leader in the 1st Platoon of C Company, 1st Battalion, had served 3 years with the Marines before joining the Army 3 years ago. He told his Congressman "there's plenty of fighting here, but it's not as bad as I'd imagined it would be."

Sgt. Paul J. Maines of Bridgeton, although he has no address there at present, is serving in C Company of the 2d Battalion, at An Khe. He told Representative McGrath that "we're doing a job that must be done and getting it done the best we can."

"He told me he feels the main thing is to give the Vietnamese a chance to live the way we do," the Congressman recounted. "Sergeant Maines said he's sure the Vietnamese will build a great democracy and they're very curious about life in the States."

Another Vinelander, Marine Pvt. Eugene Lewis of 505 North Third Street, was on duty when Representative McGrath toured the Chu Lai installation and, here, too, the Congressman left a message for the leatherneck.

Lt. Col. James D. Kennedy, son of Mrs. Irene E. Kennedy, of 1022 Maryland Avenue, Cape May City, was in Saigon on a supply mission for his special forces unit when Representative McGrath met him. Colonel Kennedy is with an Army concept team, doing research and development work on concepts and equipment used by the special forces all over the fighting area.

"Jim said he thinks the military situation is improving in Vietnam, and the morale of the Army of Vietnam (ARVIN) forces has gone sky high recently due to military successes against the Cong," the Congressman said. "He added our own soldiers are learning how to fight this strange type of war, and the planning and crash work which has gone into better preparing U.S. forces for this kind of warfare amazes even an old soldier like him."

At Chu Lai, Representative McGrath met Marine Pvt. G. A. Defero of 1400 West Glenwood, Wildwood, who serves with the 4th Marine Regiment. Defero told the Congressman many men in his unit have been receiving anonymous mail from antidraft people in the States and added many of his buddies would like to go to the States and tell them off.

"I was tremendously proud of the job the men from our district are doing in the various branches of the military service in which they're serving in Vietnam," Representative McGrath said upon his return.

"As 'Christmas gifts,' I gave each of the fellows I met from home, and lots of other U.S. servicemen with whom I talked, ballpoint pens and urged them all to write home and tell their folks and friends just what the war is like in Vietnam and what we're attempting to do there. They know people stateside read a great deal about opposition to our involvement in Vietnam and I said they'd be happy to know the morale among our troops is so high. They all seemed eager to write home," Representative McGrath said.

"I was sorry I couldn't meet more of our second district fighting men, but at some of the installations I visited there were only a handful of American advisers, and none from our district among them.

"It struck me that if every American could see, as I saw, the conditions under which they're fighting, and learn first hand some of the civil complications and the psychological problems of the Vietnamese, our efforts to maintain the freedom of South Vietnam would have even greater support here," he added.

Representative McGrath visited Vietnam during the Christmas holidays at his own expense, and while there toured some of the U.S. installations in the midst of Vietcong territory. While leaving the special forces fortress at Minh Thanh, the helicopter carrying the Congressman sustained two rifle hits from Cong guns, narrowly escaping injury or worse.

"Compared to what our troops face every day and night, my close call was nothing," he said. "It only served to make me more proud and more appreciative of the job our men are doing there," he declared.

Report on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, following the adjournment of Congress it was my privilege to make a study tour of southeast Asia, including Vietnam. This trip was not made as a part of any committee, but at my own expense so that I could report to the people of the Seventh District of Alabama, the situation in Vietnam as I saw it from firsthand inspection.

Upon my return I issued a report to my constituents on Vietnam and, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include that report. Of course, there have been later developments since my return from Vietnam, including the massive peace drive launched by the President over the Christmas period.

I believe we should do all possible to seek a peaceful solution to the war in Vietnam and I find no fault in the efforts to do so. My concern is, that in our intense desire for peace that we may settle for less than victory. I would hate to think that Vietnam will become another Korea and that 12 years from now we will still have thousands of American boys still stationed in those jungles to maintain a peace that is not really a peace, but rather a stalemate. I would hate to think that we would get a peace in Vietnam by giving in to the Communists as we did in Laos and permit a Communist takeover under the guise of a coalition government.

We should be prepared to negotiate, but at the same time we should maintain our strength, our capacity for victory and make sure that the enemy knows we have that capacity and will use it if forced to do so by their failure to end their aggression.

My report on Vietnam, which was released in December, follows:

SPECIAL REPORT ON VIETNAM

(By JIM MARTIN, Member of Congress)

The cold war between the Communist conspiracy and the free world has become a hot and blazing war in Vietnam. Contrary to the statements of the pacifist and pro-Communist demonstrators, the war in South Vietnam is not a civil war against a tyrannical government. It is naked aggression of South Vietnam by Communist North Vietnam, encouraged and supported by Red China and Soviet Russia. I have just traveled more than 20,000 miles through all of Asia and into the Middle East for a firsthand investigation. This report is based on conditions as I found them in my tours of the villages of Korea, Taiwan, South Vietnam, Thailand, and India; through briefings by our civilian and military leaders and through lengthy conversations with the businessmen, industrialists, political leaders, and the people of all the countries I visited.

Any study of the war in Vietnam must begin with the stated creed of the Communist leaders of Red China. Mao Tse-tung, head of the Communist Party in China, has stated:

"Every Communist must grasp the truths. Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun. Whoever has an army has power, for war settles everything. The theory of war and strategy is the core of everything."

Every action of Red China has been based on that creed. They have attempted to stir up discontent and revolution in both Africa and Asia and where subversion did not work, they resorted to upright aggression as in Korea and now in Vietnam. This is the enemy we face, and the Communist goal of world domination has never changed. Even now the only differences between Red China and Soviet Russia is on how to accomplish the goal. The Russian leaders believe the world can be subverted through subtle means while the Chinese leaders believe in the hard core Communist line of Lenin and Stalin, that the world must be conquered through war.

My first impression in my travel through Asia was the lesson of Korea. We may be making the same mistake in Vietnam. Twelve years after the armistice in Korea, the United States still has 50,000 American soldiers there facing the Communist enemy eyeball to eyeball across the 38th parallel. Our military was prevented from winning the war in Korea because of political decisions which gave enemy forces a safe sanctuary in Chinese territory across the Yalu River and because they were prevented from bombing the supply lines leading into North Korea from Red China.

Today, in Vietnam our military forces are facing many of the same restrictions. We cannot win the war in Vietnam by sending American boys into the gristmill formed by the countless thousands of North Vietnamese and Red Chinese which can be thrown against them from safe sanctuaries in Red China, Cambodia, and Laos. It is clear to me, and I am convinced my views are shared by our generals and commanding officers in Vietnam, that we should win the war and then negotiate the political problems.

We can win the war if we give the military the authority to win it. First. We should blockade the harbor at Hai Phong, mining it if necessary and warning all nations that no more material of war will be permitted. Second. We should authorize the Air Force to bomb strategic military targets such as the two railroads and mountain passes in North Vietnam which are direct routes for shipping war supplies into North Vietnam from China. We should also bomb military airfields, actual missile sites wherever they are located even within the safe sanctuary around Hanoi. Bombing targets should also include munitions factories as well as gasoline and fuel storage tanks, all of which are now out of bounds for our Air Force within certain restricted areas. Third. We should make clear to any enemy troops threatening the South Vietnamese that there will be no sanctuary from which they may safely invade. The United States has the potential forces to smash the Communist enemy in Vietnam, and we should assure our commanding general there that he will be given whatever forces and supplies necessary to win. The military is ready—the American people are in support of a policy to win—it is up to the administration to give the word.

CLEAR POLICY BACKED BY DEEDS IS NEEDED

While the hot war is in Vietnam, we cannot isolate one single country in Asia. The target of Red China is all of Asia, then Africa, and finally, the world. Like it or not, the United States is looked to for leadership by those nations and those people who still hope to remain free. From my conversations with people in all walks of life in the countries I visited, I find that the people of Asia are concerned about our intentions and our willingness to back our words with deeds. They are not sure we will stick with them when the chips are down. They are afraid of another stalemate such as Korea. They are afraid we may withdraw our troops before the victory is won. The statement by the Secretary of Defense prior to the last election that "we will bring the boys home from Vietnam by Christmas," caused a shattering blow to the morale of the South Vietnamese. Feeling that we were getting ready to pull out, many of the village chiefs and others in South Vietnam prepared to make peace with the Vietcong. Sharing the belief that we would not stay, the Vietcong were able to consolidate their hold on nearly 80 percent of the land and the people of South Vietnam. In addition, American mothers were given the false hope that their boys would not have to fight. We are paying in blood for this mistake in judgment.

We must make it clear that the United States stands with all those who want to be free and are determined to fight for their freedom. Then we must show by deed, that is by force of arms and determination, that we are prepared to win the war in Vietnam and meet head on any future Communist aggression.

TRIP NO EXPENSE TO GOVERNMENT

In the months ahead I will report to you in greater detail on my tour of inspection. I would like to make two things clear. This trip was made at my expense. My administrative assistant accompanied me and he, too, paid his own way—as did Mr. Wallace Malone of Dothan. The trip was made with the encouragement of the Department of State and the commanding officers in the field because they feel it is most important that Members of Congress see at first hand actual conditions in Vietnam, the need for all-out effort, and the manner in which our troops are meeting the challenge.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who didst raise up strong and good men to design and defend this Nation: grant that this land of the free may ever be led by men empowered by Thy grace to maintain the moral foundations of our country, and, together with other men of good will throughout all lands, to build a thoroughfare for freedom across the world for the blessing of all kinds and conditions of men and the generations yet to be; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PROXMIRE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 17, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was

communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 361)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend that the Congress promptly approve U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank.

This new institution expresses the will of Asia to develop her manifold human and natural resources, and thereby to lift the burden of poverty that has been the lot of her people since ancient times.

Conceived and sponsored by Asians, the Bank is open to all countries in that region, regardless of ideology, who are members of the United Nations or its specialized agencies. Of its $1 billion authorized capital, 65 percent is to be subscribed by nations in the Asian area.

U.S. representatives—led by Mr. Eugene Black and a distinguished congressional delegation—signed the charter of the Asian Development Bank at Manila last December 4. But only the Congress itself can authorize the final acceptance of U.S. membership.

That is the action I request today.

I

I take this step because of my urgent belief that the works of peace in Asia—the building of roads, dams, harbors, powerplants, and all the other public and private facilities essential to a modern economy—are vital to peace in the entire world.

An Asia torn by conflict, depressed by hunger, disease and illiteracy, deprived of the means and the institutions that alone can offer hope to her people, must ever be a source of turmoil and anxiety for nations beyond her borders, as well as those within. Because this is so—and because we have recognized our moral obligation to our brothers on this earth—the United States has committed itself over a decade and a half to major assistance programs in Asia, making food, development loans, and technical assistance available to those who required our aid.

We have sought no American empire. Our purpose has never been to exploit, but to encourage; not to master, but to magnify the works of those who truly served the Asian people.

Now the Asians themselves have formed an institution by whose hand new works of peace may be accomplished. They have committed precious resources to that institution. They are determined to join in a cooperative endeavor, uniting the talents and resources of diverse cultures in pursuit of a common vision of progress.

They have asked us to join with them—to subscribe 20 percent of the institution's total capital—and thus to help make that vision a reality.

I recommend that we respond quickly and affirmatively.

II

This proposal is neither utopian nor vague. It is the product of careful deliberation by the foremost experts in international finance. It rests solidly on the lessons learned in building the World Bank, and other organs of international finance, into the powerful forces for good they are today. It will take its place among regional financial institutions alongside the Inter-American Development Bank and the newly formed African Development Bank.

Loan terms will be similar to those offered by the World Bank. Project justifications will be as rigorous as prudent management requires. Special efforts will be made to develop and finance projects involving more than one country, so that the Bank may be an agent of unity as well as development.

The Bank will reinforce existing aid programs in Asia, and thereby multiply their effectiveness. It will link its resources—financial and human—to such institutions as the Mekong Coordinating Committee, already joining the countries of the Mekong River Basin in major water resource projects.

Its charter permits it to administer special development funds, contributed by either member or nonmember countries. Thus it will serve as a channel for funds beyond its own resources.

These advantages are developed further in the special report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the Asian Development Bank which accompanies this message.

III

The largest share of the Bank's subscriptions will be provided by Asians themselves.

The United States has been asked to pledge $200 million, equally divided between paid-in and callable shares. The paid-in shares are payable in five equal annual installments of $20 million each, half of which will be in cash, half in the form of a letter of credit.

The callable shares will constitute a guarantee for borrowings by the Bank in private capital markets. They would be drawn on only in the unlikely event that the Bank was unable to meet its commitments.

Our pledge is equaled by that of Japan. India has pledged $93 million; Australia another $85 million. More than $100 million has already been pledged by European countries and Canada, and further pledges may be made.

Joint action with these major subscribers provides another instrument of cooperation between the donors of aid. That is a long-sought goal of the United States, for it offers the most efficient use of all the free world's aid resources.

Finally, our commitment to the Asian Bank should have little negative effect on our balance of payments. Procurement financed through the Bank's regular capital will normally be limited to member countries. Purchases of U.S. goods and services will approximately offset the dollar outflow occasioned by our $10 million annual cash subscription.

IV

The Asian Development Bank is a necessity—not a luxury.

It was needed yesterday. It is needed even more today. Tomorrow, when the demands of Asia's millions on her struggling economies are more pressing still, it can mean the difference between opportunity and chaos.

Is is practical and imaginative. It is the product of Asian initiative, and it offers the nucleus around which Asians can make a cooperative response to the most critical economic problems—national and regional.

Because it is all these things, it is also an avenue of good will and sound policy for the United States. For our destination is a world where the instinct for oppression has been vanquished in the heart of man. Given the means to work, to build, to teach, to heal, to nourish his family, man may yet achieve such a world—if not in our time, then in the generations that will succeed us on this planet. I believe the Asian Development Bank is an essential tool in providing the means of life for hundreds of millions of human beings who live between the Caspian Sea and the South Pacific.

It will become a reality when 15 signatories, 10 of them Asian, have ratified the charter. It appears now that this will be achieved by early spring. Our own constructive influence in the organization and management of the Bank will be increased if we can become active at its very beginning.

Last April in Baltimore I spoke of our dream of a world "where all are fed and charged with hope." I promised that "we will help to make it so." Our partnership in the Asian Bank is a step in keeping that pledge. It brings us nearer that day when our resources—and the world's—can be devoted to the constructive works of peace, not the destructive forces of war.

I urge the Congress to adopt the Asian Development Bank Act. Asia's future—and the world's—requires it.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1966.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 125) extending the date for transmission of the economic report, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Internal Security and the Subcommittee on Constitutional

Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, notwithstanding the agreement just entered into, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] may speak for 6 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR SENATOR PASTORE TO BE RECOGNIZED AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour the Senator from Rhode Island be recognized for——

Mr. PASTORE. For whatever time is necessary. I ask that I may be permitted to speak for whatever time is necessary to make my own remarks and also for the remarks that my colleagues in the Senate may wish to make with reference to the subject matter that I shall bring up this afternoon.

Mr. KUCHEL. For the benefit of the Senate, about how long does the Senator intend to speak?

Mr. PASTORE. Without interruption, my remarks might take almost an hour. The comments of my colleagues in the Senate, I would expect, would take perhaps 2 or 3 hours.

THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am confident that no measure concerned with the foreign affairs of the United States that comes before the Senate in its present session will command a larger measure of support on all sides than will the Asian Development Bank.

The Asian Development Bank recommends itself for the fact that it has great aims, but makes only modest claims. The purposes of the Asian Development Bank are set forth in the first article of its charter, agreed upon at Manila last December 4 by the United States and 21 other nations, from which I quote:

> The purpose of the Bank shall be to foster economic growth and cooperation in the region of Asia and the Far East and to contribute to the acceleration of the process of economic development.

To foster, to contribute, to accelerate: there is a realism—and a prudent recognition of the awesome dimensions of Asia's needs—in this statement suggesting that the Asian Development Bank will set out to do what it can do, and that it will know how to do what it sets out to do.

The Asian Development Bank recommends itself, further, for the approach it makes to its tasks, again in the very first of its articles of agreement. It will "foster economic growth and cooperation—among—the developing member countries in the region, collectively and individually."

The Asian Development Bank is the first occasion in the long history of the Asian Continent when a voluntary effort has been made to pool the rich talents—and to pool the resources for economic development—of so many of the peoples of the continent, and to dedicate those talents and resources to the idea that the greatest good for each can be found in the greatest good of all. This is an unprecedented coming together of Asian nations, holding within itself a potential for the economic betterment of a third of the human race—a billion people—from the Caspian Sea to the islands of the South Pacific.

The fact that the member Asian nations have populations totaling a billion people points to a further element of realism and determination in the Asian Development Bank's organization that I think deserves our attention and commands our respect. It is setting forth upon its mission in Asia with capital of no more than $1 billion—a dollar per head of its constituents. This is courage, and courage that will succeed only if it is backed with good judgment.

The Asian nations themselves are to supply 65 percent of the Bank's authorized capital, and they have already subscribed nearly that entire amount. Half of their subscriptions are in dollars or other convertible funds: the Asian Development Bank is to be a genuine banking institution, lending and managing its funds on the prudent, practical, and ingenious pattern developed in the past two decades by the World Bank. Japan has pledged $200 million—the same as the amount pledged by the United States. This leadership by the most economically developed Asian nation, and the high rate of contribution by other Asians, show a deep commitment among the Asian nations to this unprecedented effort on their continent to make common cause, with their common resources, in a long term attack upon Asia's poverty.

But the Asians have not waited for a development bank with capital equal to their needs. They begin, instead, with a dollar per head. This forces a hard selectivity in the use of the Bank's resources which, hopefully, will result in high yields where the new Bank puts its plow to the ground. The Asian Development Bank can afford no prestige projects, and it will only be able to spread its benefits to each—as each of its members will want and insist—by finding projects that benefit the many, the most.

Without reservation, I suggest that the Senate give its support to U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank.

I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the subscriptions to the Asian Development Bank be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Subscriptions to Asian Development Bank capital stock*

[Based on pledges as of Dec. 4, 1965, as shown in annex A of articles of agreement]

Country	In millions	Percent of total subscriptions	Percent of developed country subscriptions	Percent of regional country subscriptions
Regional:				
Afghanistan	$3.36	0.4	--------	0.5
Australia	85.00	9.1	14.1	13.2
Cambodia	3.00	.3	--------	.5
Ceylon	8.52	.9	--------	1.3
Republic of China	16.00	1.7	--------	2.5
India	93.00	9.9	--------	14.5
Iran	60.00	6.4	--------	9.3
Japan	200.00	21.3	33.1	31.1
Korea	30.00	3.2	--------	4.7
Laos	.42	--------	--------	--------
Malaysia	20.00	2.1	--------	3.1
Nepal	2.16	.2	--------	.3
New Zealand	22.56	2.4	3.7	3.5
Pakistan	32.00	3.4	--------	5.0
Philippines	35.00	3.7	--------	5.5
Vietnam	7.00	.7	--------	1.1
Singapore	4.00	.4	--------	.6
Thailand	20.00	2.1	--------	3.1
Western Samoa	.06	--------	--------	--------
Subtotal	642.08	68.2	50.9	100.0
Nonregional:				
Belgium	5.00	.5	.8	--------
Canada	25.00	2.7	4.1	--------
Denmark	5.00	.5	.8	--------
Germany, Federal Republic of	30.00	3.2	5.0	--------
Italy	10.00	1.1	1.7	--------
Netherlands	11.00	1.2	1.8	--------
United Kingdom	10.00	1.1	1.7	--------
United States	200.00	21.3	33.1	--------
Subtotal	296.00	31.6	49.0	--------
Grand total	938.08	100.0	100.0	100.0

NOTE.—Totals may not add due to rounding.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE FOR CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN STUDIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 943)

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 180), and submitted a report thereon; which report was ordered to be printed, and the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 180

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and conduct such studies as may be deemed necessary with respect to any and all aspects of—

(1) the postal service, including determinations of the desirability and feasibility of utilizing to a greater degree modernized equipment and processing techniques in order to improve and perfect the basic functions of the postal delivery service;

(2) postal rates, including ascertainment of the costs of postal service, adjustments in fourth-class postal rates in order to maintain a proper balance between costs and

revenue, and further study into the area of parcel post service as provided by Public Laws 82–199 and 88–51;

(3) the Federal civil service, including basic compensation adjustments in compliance with the policy of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, fringe-benefit compensation, particularly in the areas of health and life insurance and retirement annuities, and careful consideration of proposals to improve the overall quality of Federal civilian employment policies, practices, and personnel administration; and

(4) committee jurisdiction extending into the census and the collection of statistics generally.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, until January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments and agencies concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., of New York, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 2782. A bill to authorize disaster loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 and under section 325 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2783. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to permit for a temporary period the duty-free entry of bona fide gifts not exceeding $50 in retail value from members of the Armed Forces stationed outside the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOWER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2784. A bill for the relief of Doreen-Delmege Willis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 2785. A bill to increase the minimum price at which wheat may be sold by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 2786. A bill relating to the carryover of net operating losses of certain railroad corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 2787. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sang Won Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2788. A bill to amend the Revenue Act of 1964; to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTIONS

NONPROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. PASTORE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BASS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 179) nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, which was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and ordered further that when reported the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. PASTORE, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE FOR CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN STUDIES

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 180) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for continuation of certain studies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MONRONEY, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.)

DUTY-FREE GIFTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES NOT EXCEEDING $50

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, under present law, members of our Armed Forces serving overseas are subject, as any other tourist or overseas resident, to the $10 duty-free limitation on gifts sent to this country.

Certainly it may be difficult for our servicemen to find in a number of cases a suitable $10 gift, to send to their loved ones.

Until just a few years ago, our service personnel were entitled to a $50 gift mailing custom exemption. The effect of this legislation I am introducing today would simply reinstate such $50 limitation.

I ask consent that this bill lie on the table for 1 week so that others may cosponsor it with me if they so desire.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection the bill will lie on the table as requested.

The bill (S. 2783) to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to permit for a temporary period the duty-free entry of bona fide gifts not exceeding $50 in retail value from members of the Armed Forces stationed outside the United States, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF RAIL MERGERS BY LIBERALIZING THE EXTENT TO WHICH NEW OPERATING LOSSES COULD BE CARRIED OVER IN CASE OF MERGER OR REORGANIZATION

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, until recently it appeared that America's railroad system was doomed to a future of stagnation and decline. Year after year would witness new losses in the relative share of traffic formerly carried by the railroads to other competing forms of transportation. And the enormous deficits incurred each year in rail passenger operations by many roads threatened not only the future of rail passenger service in general, but often the financial viability of those roads which provided the service.

This historical decline of the railroads as an attractive and profitable mode of transportation has been attributed to numerous causes: poor management; the failure of the railroads to invest in research and development; competitive imbalances created by governmental transportation policies toward competing forms of transportation which placed the railroad at an unfair disadvantage. But whatever the reasons in individual cases, the general malaise within the industry was apparent.

Within the last few years, however, there has been a startling change in the situation. The railroad industry has itself recognized the need for dramatic steps to modernize equipment and management techniques in order to cut costs and offer more attractive service. New management in many of our largest railroads has infused the industry with new ideas and great vigor. And governmental authorities at all levels, recognizing the important role a modern, efficient railroad system can play in our future growth and prosperity, are for the first time in history providing the rail industry with some of the assistance so vitally needed to rationalize, restructure, and revitalize outmoded plants and techniques.

Perhaps the most dramatic indication of the changing future of the railroad industry is the recent trend toward mergers and consolidations. The trend is based on the railroad's recognition that the elimination of unneeded duplicate facilities and services is necessary if operating expenses are to be cut back enough to permit railroad management to introduce vital changes in plant and in techniques. In my judgment, such consolidations, if they are soundly conceived and implemented, will contribute to the development of a modern rail system.

This is not to say that all railroad mergers should be encouraged and supported. Mergers which would seriously reduce competition and jeopardize the firm position of existing lines in any particular region obviously are not in the public interest.

Whether a specific rail merger should be approved must be decided by the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the public interest criterion laid down by Congress. But I think that the Commission's power of decision, if wisely exercised, could encourage important new mergers which would revolutionize rail transportation.

To bring about this revolution and to best serve the public interest, the railroad consolidation movement should strive for balanced competitive rail systems throughout the Nation. These systems must include the smaller independent railroads which, while they provide vitally needed services to the communities they reach, could not survive against the larger, stronger lines created by mergers.

In the East three self-sufficient systems are emerging. Two of them, the Norfolk & Western and the Chesapeake & Ohio-Baltimore & Ohio, have received ICC approval. The third, the Penn-Central, is now being considered by the Commission. These three systems represent the most practical merger choices for smaller loss line carriers in the East.

And yet, current tax law does not encourage the larger systems to include these struggling smaller lines in their merger plans.

This is because current law does not allow the net operating losses of two merged railways to be carried over from the acquired to the acquiring carrier, unless the two systems are of comparably equal size or unless the stockholders of the loss carrier received not less than 20 percent in fair market value of the combined company's stock. Size alone prohibits these small carriers of the Northeastern United States from meeting this requirement.

Significantly, the three major systems have now become so large that none of the smaller loss carriers can hope to approximate the 20 percent stock requirement. And yet the economic plight of many of these small carriers is so acute and the debt loads so heavy that a larger carrier is reluctant to take over the property and thus become liable for the debts.

The bill I am introducing today would liberalize the extent to which net operating losses might be carried over in cases of mergers or other reorganizations of railroad corporations. Its primary objective is to induce acquisition or control of smaller loss railroads by larger, more profitable ones.

This bill would make such acquisition more attractive by allowing larger railroads to use net operating losses of an acquired railroad upon joinder for tax purposes, provided: First, that both parties are railroad corporations; second, that the effected reorganization receives ICC approval; and third, that the reorganization occurs in a taxable year after the date of enactment of the bill.

These railway combinations would also be accorded the same carryover benefits available to other reorganizations. All operating loss carryovers would be extended for a period of from 7 to 11 years, applying to both acquisition and reorganization of larger, profitable railroads and loss carriers. In certain cases, weak railway lines have affiliated with or given over control to larger, more viable systems. This bill affords relief of carryover benefits and allows the filing of consolidated income tax returns in those cases where consolidated control, rather than merger, has been accomplished.

The legislation which I propose should make several small loss carriers more attractive as merger partners than they are now, and contribute to a merger movement which I feel would benefit our national transportation policy.

The tax relief afforded by carryover loss benefits would make it economically realistic for larger carriers to absorb weak ones, and thus preserve uninterrupted rail service to vital segments of the country. At the same time, it would provide the incentive for the vast outlays of capital needed if these railroads are to become modern, competitive systems with adequate motive power and rolling stock. And, it would protect the livelihood of some 200,000 people whose work is directly connected with the operation of the small loss line carriers.

In my own area of New England, for instance, the legislation has direct and immediate relevance. The economy of New England relies heavily upon the continuation of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, and especially upon its commuter service.

The public interest demands that this rail passenger service continue. And this means that the pending Penn-Central merger should include the New England railroads' basic freight and passenger operation. Yet the ICC hearing examiner has recommended that the New Haven's passenger service not be included in the Penn-Central merger, if such inclusion would burden the merger company with deficit passenger operations.

The New Haven, obviously, will have to become a more attractive merger partner. To make it more attractive is in part the responsibility of State and local authorities, who should determine just what part of these passenger operations are essential and then agree on a plan for bearing their fair share of the costs.

The proposal I offer today is the contribution Congress could make to the task, encouraging the continuation of New Haven's passenger operations by making acquisition and control of such operations less burdensome to the acquiring road.

In exactly the same way this bill would make inclusion of the Erie & Lackawanna, the Delaware & Hudson and the Boston & Maine railroads more attractive to the larger roads. If these lines are not included they cannot survive. And their future affects the jobs of more than 40,000 workers with a total payroll of nearly $280 million, the revenues of many small communities, and the access of many shippers to important markets.

Because the future of these lines is so important, I do not believe the tax relief afforded in this bill is excessive.

My bill would apply equally to all rail carriers which fall within its scope. There are three lines at present which possess sufficiently substantial unused net operating losses to be particularly interested in it. They are the Erie & Lackawanna, the Boston & Maine, and the New Haven. I submit for the record the financial statistics taken from their Federal income tax returns for the past 9 years. The total net operating losses for these lines are nearly $260 million.

There being no objection, the statistics were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Net operating losses of 3 loss line carriers from 1956 to 1964

Year	Erie Lackawanna	New Haven	Boston & Maine	Total
1956	$1,044,020	$6,699,341		$7,743,361.00
1957	7,421,250	1,529,960	$1,212,782.80	10,163,992.80
1958	11,467,170	3,544,195	7,539,959.52	22,551,324.52
1959	5,887,660	10,070,452	15,844,473.83	31,802,585.83
1960	22,012,550	12,909,345	11,805,434.91	46,727,329.91
1961	28,295,440	19,421,608	7,038,180.36	54,755,228.36
1962	16,657,560	12,893,130	1,787,902.75	31,338,592.75
1963	15,970,310	9,209,029	279,132.08	25,458,471.08
1964 [1]	8,268,194	15,262,688	5,164,997.00	28,695,879.00
Total	117,024,154	91,539,748	50,672,863.25	259,236,765.25

[1] Data taken from schedule 300, p. 301A of form A filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, under my bill the tax relief period has been extended from a 7- to a 10-year cycle, with no relief provided for taxable years ending prior to the enactment of the measure. The total loss deduction for these three railroads would be around $260 million. On this the current corporation rate of tax is 48 percent. But, with various limitations on this rate due to the operation of the investment credit, the actual tax rate varies from 36 to 48 percent. This means tax benefits varying from $93,600,000 to $123,800,000.

But this ostensible loss of revenues must be balanced against the economic advantages flowing from continuation of the operations of these carriers. Let me point out that in any merger with the Erie & Lackawanna alone, the merger partner would have to assume minimum wage costs of at least $254,240,000, a sum far in excess of the relief afforded by this legislation. In addition, the continued operation of these small railroads will mean that the gross income of the affected employees will be liable for Federal income tax levies.

It should also be noted that the U.S. Government is liable for certain loans against the three carriers guaranteed by the ICC, which total nearly $65 million. If these lines are absorbed by larger carriers and are retained in operation, there is a strong possibility that the railways themselves will be able to repay the loans. The Treasury will then be freed of the obligation to make good on the guarantees.

In my judgment, the continuation and rehabilitation of these loss carriers as a result of their inclusion in the giant emerging rail systems would lead to the preservation of essential rail services in the public interest. This bill would help to accomplish this objective.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2786) relating to the carryover of net operating losses of certain railroad corporations, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TYDINGS subsequently said: Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2786), introduced by him earlier today, be held at the desk for 10 days for additional cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COSPONSORSHIP OF S. 2776, REPEAL OF NONCOMMUNIST AFFIDAVIT REQUIREMENT FOR MEDICARE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, yesterday the two Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KENNEDY], introduced legislation to strike from the medicare legislation passed last year language which would deny hospital insurance benefits for noncompliance with a non-Communist affidavit requirement.

In my judgment this is an excellent bill, and I ask unanimous consent to have my name added as a cosponsor. This degrading loyalty oath provision is a sorry relic of the bad old days of McCarthyism. I do not believe there is much sympathy for this sort of thing in the Senate nowadays, and I am quite confident that most, if not all, of the Senators who voted for passage of the medicare bill did not intend to resurrect it. The non-Communist affidavit requirement in the medicare law should be deleted, and the sooner the better.

For years the late President Kennedy and I worked together and sponsored legislation jointly to wipe out these iniquitous loyalty oath requirements in a variety of programs, among them, the National Defense Education Act student loan program. I am genuinely pleased to note his brother, the junior Senator from New York, has picked up this torch.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania is granted.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2769) relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia, introduced by me on January 14, 1966.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON THE U.S. COMMISSIONER SYSTEM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce that further hearings to explore the present operation of the U.S. Commissioner system will be held on February 8 and 9, 1966, at 9:30 a.m. each day, in Room 6226 of the New Senate Office Building.

The subcommittee has already held two sessions of hearings on the U.S. Commissioner system, the first on October 13, 1965, and the second on December 14 and 15, 1965. The February hearings probably will conclude the introductory phase of the subcommittee's study, and the next step will be to analyze in depth the testimony and other information that has been procured in order to determine what remedial legislation, if any, is necessary in order to enhance the effectiveness of the commissioner system.

Any person who wishes to testify on February 8 or 9, or who desires to submit a statement for inclusion in the record, should communicate with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, Room 6308, New Senate Office Building.

NOBEL PRIZE WINNERS TO TESTIFY WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 19, WHEN PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE POPULATION CRISIS RESUME IN ROOM 3302, NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING AT 10:30 A.M.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a panel of four Nobel Prize winners will testify tomorrow, Wednesday, January 19, when public hearings on the population explosion resume at 10:30 a.m. in Room 3302, New Senate Office Building. The Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures hearing will start immediately following the Government Operations Committee meeting.

The Nobel laureates have been asked to testify because they are concerned about the population explosion. Eighty-three Nobel laureates expressed their concern by appealing to Pope Paul VI last year to urge him to reconsider the church's position on birth control.

The Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures held 15 hearings on S. 1676, my bill to coordinate and disseminate birth control information upon request, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress. Printed copies of the first series of hearings on S. 1676 will be available shortly. They are extensive. They tell only part of the story. For this reason the subcommittee will continue hearings this session to examine what the President has described as "the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations." Like the President, we want to see the answers "to this most profound challenge to the future of all the world."

Nobel Prize winners who will appear in person tomorrow at the hearing are:

First. Dr. E. L. Tatum, 1958 Nobel Prize winner for medicine and physiology, who is associated with the Rockefeller Institute. Dr. Tatum handled arrangements for the panel.

Dr. Tatum was honored for his pioneering work in what is now called biochemical genetics. The work was concentrated on a pink bread mold, the biochemistry of which Dr. Tatum and two other Nobel winners were able to manipulate by modifying the genes. Experts at the time said the finding would be valuable in cancer research.

Second. Dr. Dickenson W. Richards, Jr., physician, 1956 Nobel Prize winner in medicine and physiology. Dr. Richards of Columbia University is one of three Nobel laureates credited with providing a new technique for cardiology, including the diagnosis and treatment of heart disease. The official citation said the recipients were being honored for their "discoveries concerning heart catheterization and pathological changes in the circulatory systems." These investigations have meant that diagnosis can now be made earlier and with great certainty than before.

Third. Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, physician, 1937 Nobel Prize winner in medicine, who works at the Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole, Mass. While a medical research worker at Szeged University in Hungary, Professor Szent-Gyorgyi received the Nobel Prize "for his discoveries on the biological process of combustion, especially in relation to vitamins A and C." He had noticed a relation between the scurvy-preventing properties of vegetables and fruits on the one hand and the adrenal glands of men and animals on the other. In Szeged, the heart of the paprika-growing district of Hungary, he extracted half a pound of pure vitamin C, or ascorbic acid, from paprika. Medical tests made of isolated ascorbic acid found that it had many healing qualities.

Fourth. Dr. Polykarp Kusch, physicist, 1955 Nobel Prize winner in physics. Dr. Kusch is a member of the faculty of Columbia University. Dr. Kusch shared the Nobel Prize in physics given for a major advance toward learning what goes on inside the atom which enabled scientists to calculate correctly the properties of some of the component parts of the atom.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 18, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 125) extending the date for transmission of the Economic Report.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Address entitled "Renewal of the Government Service," delivered by John W. Garner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare at the U.S. Civil Service Commission anniversary ceremony in Washington, D.C., on January 14, 1966.

THE ROLE OF THE STATES IN THE GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE—CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during recent years there has been a trend in our Nation toward ever increasing power of the Federal Government and quite often at the expense of our State and local governments.

It is my opinion that the future of State and local governments and their participation in the governmental affairs of our Nation must be strengthened. It is essential that State and local governments keep pace with the changing times and they need rethinking and research of the role of the States in the government structure.

A new organization, known as the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, with headquarters in Kansas City, is now working in this field. The purpose of the organization is to do research and educational work, with the aim of improving the status and the function of our State legislatures.

This Citizens Conference was fortunate to secure the services of John Anderson, Jr., a two-term Governor of the State of Kansas and past chairman of the Governor's Conference, as executive director.

The Kansas City Star, issue of Sunday, January 16, carried an article, written by John Anderson, Jr., on the role of the States. I ask unanimous consent that this article be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDWESTERN PERSPECTIVE: ROLE OF THE STATES—REVITALIZATION THE GOAL OF A LEADER

(By John Anderson, Jr.)

This is a period in history of change in the American system of government. The American system was adapted from the best of English and other experiences with prudent innovations to provide a diverse frontier country with a balance of functions for local, regional, and Federal units of government. Especially for the Federal unit, the original American system was based on the principle, "the government which governs least, governs best."

Because the American system has, on the whole, functioned well and because it has permitted and nourished an economy which provides an abundant life for the great majority, the American people tend to take their system of government for granted. Yet, the respective roles of the Federal, State, and local units of government have undergone sweeping changes in the last few decades, and will continue to do so.

It is no exaggeration to predict that the future of State and local government will be decided in our lifetime. Let us not take it for granted the State and local governments will continue, as in the past, nor should we assume that decline is inevitable.

DIFFERENT ROLE NOW

This is a time to assess the changes underway in the American system and to give realistic direction to the changes. On the one hand, full recognition should be given to the changes in the national and international affairs which require a far more extensive Federal Government than was required in the early days of the Republic—rapid communication and transportation, the growth of metropolitan areas, the emergence of large and powerful national interest groups and the burdens and responsibilities of national defense and of world problems.

On the other hand, before the States are allowed to wither away, we should consider carefully a wide range of problems. How would Congress and the Federal Government behave if the States did not perform a check and balance function, including the influence that Governors and State political parties exert on Senators and Representatives and sometimes on the President—especially before elections.

How would cities and public school districts fare if all of their dealings were with the Federal Government? Above all, what are the implications for the future of democratic government if we cannot make democracy work at the State level?

MUST FACE URBAN WOES

Certainly the future of city government and the future of State government are intimately related. Unless the States are able to deal effectively with the problems of metropolitan areas, State government inevitably will decline.

Since metropolitan areas are typically fragmented into dozens of governmental jurisdictions, the solution of metropolitan problems increasingly depends upon State action—either on direct State action or on State legislation creating or permitting some larger governmental authority or planning body. The alternative, of course, is that metropolitan and regional problems be resolved through Federal action.

In the latter half of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th century, State governments functioned as effective instruments within the Federal system. Among other things, the States developed and nourished our great State universities, our public school system, and other institutions to serve the public welfare. They established most of the laws which govern our daily lives and the legal framework for the operation of the free enterprise economy. Let us not forget that State government has been an important institution and still is.

Although the States carry a big and important load and although they have been doing a fairly good job in many areas, we should not attempt to shovel the shortcomings under the rug. There is a great inconsistency and spottiness in the program of the 50 States. Some have been outstanding in higher education, others in highways, others in penal systems and welfare services. My own State of Kansas has developed a national reputation in mental health. This has been due in part to the special availability of knowledgeable professional personnel in the Menninger Foundation in Topeka.

States, like cities and school districts, can experiment with new programs and methods. But many programs which have been tried and tested in a few States have not been implemented in even a majority of the remaining States.

In this connection, it should not be assumed that the poorer States always lag. Some very large and comparatively wealthy States in the Northeast have lagged very badly in developing the State college and university systems which have long been taken for granted in the rest of the country.

In addition to the continued importance of State government from the standpoint of laws and programs, there is another matter which should be considered about State legislatures. I should like to quote the late Roger V. Shumate who for many years served as director of research for the Nebraska Legislative Council, as well as professor at the university:

"No student of modern American Government and politics can be blind to the fault of our State legislatures, but to admit that they have failed comes perilously close to admitting that popular government in the United States has failed. That in turn, would be to admit that what was regarded in foreign lands as the 'American experiment' had failed, and this we are not prepared to do.

"If we will free our legislatures from their constitutional hobbles, pay them decently, organize them so that they can serve adequately and create a vigilant public opinion which insists upon responsible service of high caliber (these are not simple reforms to be sure) there is no inherent reason why they cannot assume the rightful place of representative assemblies in a representative government."

CONCERNS 30 YEARS AGO

It is interesting that these comments were made 30 years ago, both from the standpoint that State government might wither away and from the standpoint of the improvements suggested.

What is different today is that the need for State government is being questioned quite openly. I have encountered this since I have been director of the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures. Some ask, "Isn't it too late?" and some take the position that State government cannot possibly solve or even substantially assist with the complex problems of the modern urban industrial age.

The controversy over reapportionment has brought State legislatures to the public's attention as never before in the past—and not in a very attractive light. However you may stand on the "one-man, one-vote" principle for both houses, the big public issue is that most legislatures were not apportioned according to their own constitutions.

This public issue, along with the Federal Government's greater ability and willingness—under Republican and Democratic administrations—to assume responsibilities for modern problems have combined to put the future of State government in some jeopardy.

A shrewd and competent national political writer I know thinks the States are fast becoming rather insignificant political subdivisions of an all-pervasive Federal Government. A prominent network television newscaster told a college commencement class earlier this year that State government will fade away in our lifetime and he seemed to be saying good riddance.

NEED OF REVITALIZATION

I am convinced that there is a growing concern throughout the country that State governments be revitalized to do their share in meeting the problems of our times. This is not confined to either political party; it is bipartisan and nonpartisan. Whatever may be the interpretation of the recent past, few people yet advocate that State governments be dissolved or allowed to atrophy, to dry on the vine.

Few relish the thought, for example, that the educational system or the police system be fully nationalized. The issue is not one of State's rights but of State's responsibilities, but instead of a realistic balance of governmental functions to serve a highly mobile modern industrial society—and to serve a people who, I am convinced, want, above all, a voice in their government. The American people want representative democracy and they want things done. This is our challenge.

State legislatures are now undergoing agony and humiliation over reapportionment. Out of this can arise a great revitalization of legislatures and of State government. What we need to consider now is how this can come about.

I am sure that no one knows the answers. Certainly, I do not. I have accepted the position of director of the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures because I very sincerely believe that State legislatures are extremely important, because I believe they can be revitalized and because I believe that the support of citizens groups is necessary to that effort.

SHOULD BE PAID MORE

Although the measures required to improve the legislative process are complex and although there is great variation among the States, it is clear that most legislatures in the country are badly in need of better compensation, more research and staff services, improved informational services, more adequate office facilities and better organizational procedures. We need research and imaginative thinking about more complicated issues, such as conditions for recruiting and retraining the most competent men and women in the legislatures.

We need healthy legislatures, and alert, well-balanced, public-serving legislators. Legislators should be paid in accord with the importance of their responsibilities—and paid only by the public. They should have private offices so that they can meet constituents and lobbyists in a businesslike fashion. (It makes quite a difference when you deal with someone from across your desk rather than in a corridor or across a bar.) Legislators need independent sources of data; they need research and staff resources. They also need time to study problems and issues.

The provision for salaries, staff, research, offices, etc., is not a minor matter. Our research in the Citizens Conference indicates that the cost of operating the U.S. Congress is more than twice that of operating all 50 legislatures combined. Among other things, this is symbolic of the significance the country has come to attach to State government.

Nor, indeed, do the States get the credit they deserve for noteworthy accomplishments.

We have to find ways—solid and effective ways—to improve the posture and image of legislatures with the public, with a public which is becoming more knowledgeable and better educated—in largest part because the States have sponsored and nourished a great public educational system.

We have to find ways to improve the status and functioning of our legislative bodies in the public interest.

We have to find ways of equipping legislators to deal effectively and knowledgeably in the public interest with the volume of legislation on which they are called upon to act.

We have to find ways, with the support and help of citizen groups, to compensate legislators in accordance with the importance of their jobs and to provide them with offices and staff services.

We have to find ways to improve communication between the Governor and the legislature in such a way as to improve the effectiveness of State government and to preserve the check and balance system.

We have to find ways to improve communication between the legislator and his constituents as a means of enhancing the democratic process in this complicated society.

State government must further develop its role both in responding to and in helping to shape the society of the future.

A REACTIONARY IMAGE

Let me especially emphasize that the revitalization of State legislatures must be a bipartisan and nonpartisan effort.

Among other problems, it seems to me that State legislatures have not served as effectively as they should as agencies for increasing understanding between—and developing the mutual interests of—rural and urban sections of the population. As farming becomes more professionalized, as city folks slash into the countryside for recreation, as metropolitan regions spread along interstate highways—with these developments rural-urban conflict should decline.

But let me also stress to you that city interests and city dwellers, including suburbanites, have not been sufficiently interested in statewide problems. Too often their view of State government and State legislatures seems to be confined to their own special interests—efforts to get kickbacks from State revenue (some of which they may deserve) or efforts to get the State, in effect, to let them alone.

When we get some good opinion surveys of public attitudes toward State legislatures, I suspect we shall find that rural and small-town people (of comparable education) have greater knowledge about State government, that they are more likely to know their legislators and that they are better informed about the operations of the legislature.

BASE FOR UNDERSTANDING

The role our large cities once had in sociopolitical assimilation is being filled less and less effectively. Until or unless effective metropolitan government is developed (including the unlikely prospect that its boundaries could be expanded rapidly enough to keep up with the spread of the metropolitan regions), State legislatures also need to serve as a meeting place, a place of negotiation, and (I would hope) a place for developing understanding among suburbanites and city dwellers, among socio-economic classes, and among racial and ethnic groups.

It is unfortunate that partisan political debate in recent decades has had the effect of identifying the interests of the States as opposed to the interests of the Federal Government, and, to a considerable extent, as opposed to or blocking, the proper development of the cities and the metropolitan areas. There must be reasonable, rational and constructive ways to define and develop the appropriate roles of various units of government and of the relationship among them. We need far less head and far more brains applied to these problems.

We need the applied knowledge of the experts but more than that we need the application of the public interest to these problems. Only then can we have confidence that the democratic process will be continued.

INTERAMA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Pell in the chair). The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the leadership has stated that it would call up for consideration the bill known as Interama, pending before the Senate since last year. Interama is a program promoted in Florida, contemplating the elimination of a swamp and the construction of buildings for what is supposed to be a Western Hemisphere permanent exposition.

The project has been in progress for about 15 years. It floundered. When it did not meet with success, it was finally conceived that the promoters would come to the U.S. Government for aid in the development of the enterprise. It was decided that the Community Facilities Administration would be asked for a loan of $22 million for the construction of buildings and the improvement of the land. In addition to the $22 million to be provided by the Community Facilities Administration, it was proposed that the Government of the United States spend $11 million, to provide a permanent exhibition in the project.

In addition to the $11 million, the United States is asked to give $1 million a year for the purpose of operating the exhibition for 4 years.

The aggregate sum originally asked of the U.S. Government was $22 million in loans and $15 million in grants.

This concept of asking the U.S. Government for such aid had its beginning in Seattle, Wash. Our Government put up $10 million for an auditorium in the Seattle Exhibition.

The concept then moved on to New York, where the New Yorkers originally asked for $25 million for an exposition building. We finally gave them $17½ million.

From New York it moved on into Alaska, where the Government was asked for $7½ million for auditoriums. We finally gave them $3 million. Then from Alaska it moved into Texas. Texas is asking for $10 million, for an auditorium

It has now moved into Florida.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Not at this time. It was finally proposed that we give them 7½ million, plus $2 million.

This is a new type of pork barrel. It has been developed in the past 5 years. In other words, a scheme is concocted for setting up an exposition and asking the Government for millions of dollars for auditoriums, which, under normal circumstances, would be built with contributions from local taxpayers.

The odd aspect of Interama is that the Federal Government is opposing it.

The Foreign Relations Committee sent the Interama bill to the Senate without recommendation. It did so solely on the basis of giving the Senators from Florida an opportunity to present their bill to the Senate.

I ask all Senators, if we had taken the $10 million that went to Washington, the $17.5 million that went to New York, the $10 million that will go to Texas, the $3 million to Alaska, and the $1.5 million to Florida and put that money to work in antistream pollution and the promotion of health, how much better the service would have been to the people of our country.

I cannot go back to Ohio and tell its citizens to put up $9.5 million for Florida, while Toledo, Cincinnati, Cleveland,

and other cities in the State have put and are putting up their own money to build their auditoriums.

Mr. President, let me read briefly what was said by the Bureau of the Budget with respect to this program:

> Interama differs from usual world fairs in that it is intended to be a permanent fair rather than one of a 1- or 2-year duration normally associated with world fairs. Thus it will be in continuing competition with other fairs. We believe that the information presented to date does not allow us to determine whether this activity is of sufficiently high priority to warrant the investment of $22 million of a community facilities loan and an additional $15 million for the initial creation and operation of a Federal exhibit.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 more minutes.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, may we know the request? Is it for 15 minutes?

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Three more minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator requests 3 more minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. In the report on Interama, it is set forth how the expenditures will be made.

A million dollars a year maintenance cost to be borne by the Federal Government for the first 2 years of operation.

To the resident commissioner's office, $60,000.

To the program director's office, $60,000.

Fees for industrial and exhibit designers, at 10 percent, $520,000.

Special consultants, $280,000.

Demonstration, electronic, stage personnel, and exhibit maintenance, $300,000. There are other itemizations that I do not have time to mention.

Mr. President, it is contemplated by the officials who will operate the show that their salaries will be in excess of what Members of the Cabinet are now being paid.

There has been talk on television and radio, especially last night, as to the need to stop foolish spending.

I shall watch with great interest to see what the deeds will be respecting the implementation of the argument which has been made to the people of the United States that we had better retrench in our spending during this period when the demands of the Vietnam war and the demands of the Great Society program are so great in the spending of dollars.

Mr. President, I shall have more to say on this subject, but I conclude by stating that it will be stealing from every taxpayer in the country to promote this new kind of pork barrel, because it will never end. Today, it is Texas and Florida. Tomorrow it will be another State. Following that, it will be another State and still another without end.

The bill cannot and should not be supported either in sound reason or good conscience.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks:

First. An article out of the Miami News of December 15, 1965.

Second. An article out of the Washington Post of November 16, 1965.

Third. A copy of the letter written by Mr. Phillip S. Hughes, Assistant Director of Legislative Reference.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Miami News, Dec. 15, 1965]

Suit Says Interama Broke Freedom Tower Agreement

Interama is being sued for allegedly breaking a lease agreement for a 1,000-foot Freedom Tower, proposed centerpiece of the cultural and trade center.

Freedom Tower Inc. accused Interama of backing out of a deal that, according to the suit, would have brought operators of the tower a profit of at least $96 million over 40 years.

The suit, filed in Dade Circuit Court yesterday, said Interama broke an agreement to authorize $15 million in revenue bonds to finance the tower, which Interama officials hope someday will rival the Statue of Liberty.

The corporation said that under the agreement, the firm would arrange to sell the bonds—then would pay off both principal and interest over the years, as well as return to Interama 40 percent of the tower's profits.

The suit charged that Interama then broke the agreement on December 14, 1962, "without just cause of legal excuse." The suit does not ask a specific amount of damages.

William Gibbs, Interama attorney, said the lease and escrow agreement was never signed by either party. A photostat of the agreement, attached to the suit, had no signatures.

But the firm said the 11-man Interama board passed a resolution authorizing the agreements.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 16, 1965]

Hundred-Million-Dollar Disney Wonderland Planned in Florida Near Orlando

Orlando, Fla., November 15.—Master Showman Walt Disney disclosed today he will build a $100 million "Disney World" in Florida featuring a city of tomorrow and a city of yesterday.

Disney said it will take 3 years to complete the attraction on a 27,000-acre site south of this central Florida city, and that "we are ready to get started."

Gov. Haydon Burns, at a news conference at which Disney unveiled the plans, said the State government has pledged itself to the fullest cooperation with the new venture including the calling of a special session of the legislature if necessary to pass laws to bring the project into being.

Burns said he also has committed his administration to provide the roads to make the attraction planned for the site 12 miles south of Orlando accessible to the public.

Burns called the announcement "the most significant day in the history of the great State of Florida."

Disney declined to be too specific about the type and scope of the attraction, but said it will be principally "entertainment." He added, however, the area undoubtedly will include a number of major industrial plants.

Burns said that Disney has not asked for tax or other concessions. He said the type of legislation that might be required might be laws to protect Disney trademarks and to create two new municipalities in the Orlando-Kissimmee area.

Disney estimated the new attraction would employ about 4,000 persons.

The Governor predicted the project would double Florida's tourist count.

Executive Office of the President,
Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1965.

Hon. J. William Fulbright,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This is in reply to your letters of September 22 and 24, 1965, with regard to the position of the administration on S. 216 and H.R. 30.

These bills are not identical, but each would authorize U.S. participation in Interama, a permanent fair to be established in Miami, Fla., under the auspices of the Inter-American Center Authority, an agency in the State of Florida.

Interama is a most imaginative proposal which will be of undoubted benefit to the State of Florida and the city of Miami. However, the question of Federal participation as proposed in these bills is a complex and difficult one. Interama differs from the usual World's Fair in that it is intended to be a permanent fair rather than of the 1- or 2-year duration normally associated with World's Fairs. Thus, it will be in continuing competition with other fairs such as HemisFair, for the participation of the U.S. Government, Latin American governments, and United States and foreign industry. H.R. 30 provides for Federal participation for 4 years. Consequently, Federal involvement will not be on the usual 1- or 2-year basis. Furthermore, the fact that Interama is intended to be permanent could pose difficult questions as to what the Federal Government should do at the end of the 4-year period of participation or if Interama encountered financial or other difficulties in subsequent years.

We believe that the information presented to date does not allow us to determine whether this activity is of sufficiently high priority to warrant the investment of $22 million in the form of a community facilities loan and an additional $15 million for initial creation and operation of a Federal exhibit. We have had no real experience with permanent fairs like Interama.

If Interama is successful in obtaining Federal funds for its support, other cities of the United States might well seek support for more or less permanent ventures of the same kind. Thus Federal agreement to participate in Interama could constitute a significant precedent, and we believe its implications should be examined with great care.

The report of the State Department suggests further study of the interest of Latin American nations and United States and Latin American industries in participating on a permanent basis in a venture of this sort. We agree, since such participation is vital to the success of the enterprise.

In all the circumstances we are unable to recommend favorable action on this legislation pending further study of the matter.

Sincerely yours,
Phillip S. Hughes,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

Mr. **TOWER** subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to set the Record straight relative to the remarks which were made by the able and beloved distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] in his discussion of the Interama project. He mentioned an auditorium for San Antonio in the amount of $10 million. I should like to point out that Congress has not authorized any expenditure for an auditorium for San Antonio. Indeed, all we have authorized is an expenditure of $125,000 to study the feasibility of the appropriation of any money for the HemisFair in San Antonio. An auditorium is not necessarily contemplated for recommendation. It could be a building adapted to some other use. So there is no decision as to whether it would be for an auditorium or something else. So it should be made very clear here that San Antonio has not received $10 million. Instead, it has received $125,000 for a feasibility study.

Incidentally, the HemisFair will be a great promoter of trade between Latin America and the United States, and I think it would realize dividends which will exceed the amount of the investment made in the HemisFair.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement follow the remarks made by the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall not ask the Senator from Texas to yield at this time, because he has a limited time, but later I shall wish to make comments on his statement.

Mr. TOWER. Let me make it clear that I was not taking issue with the point made by the distinguished Senator, but was simply setting the amounts involved straight.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Ten million dollars was not authorized?

Mr. TOWER. One hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars was authorized for a feasibility study.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But they are asking for $10 million.

Mr. TOWER. But not necessarily for an auditorium.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ASPECTS OF THE STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I intend to file a resolution of disapproval when the President sends to the Congress his proposed plan to reorganize the Community Relations Service as a part of the Department of Justice. I also intend to introduce an alternative plan, placing the Service in the Executive Office of the President where it can operate as an autonomous body under the aegis of the President. I have already notified Senator RIBICOFF, the chairman of the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee, of my intention to offer this resolution and have asked that he schedule hearings as soon as the measure is sent to the Hill.

The proposed reorganization of the Community Relations Service is a matter of vital importance which the President failed to discuss in his state of the Union message. This office, which was created by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, was designed to offer mediation and conciliation service in communities across the land beset with racial discord. Its work is important, not only in the South—where compliance with the 1964 law may be slow—but in the North as well, where the law is observed but the spirit is often wanting.

It is important that the role of the Service as mediator, rather than prosecutor be preserved, and for this reason many civil rights groups have protested the proposed reorganization which would place the Service in the Department of Justice. Even though the Attorney General has let it be known that the Director of the Service will be elevated to the post of Assistant Attorney General and that the budget request for the Service will be doubled, its effectiveness as a peacemaker will be seriously jeopardized if it intervenes in racial situations as an arm of the Government prosecutor rather than as a conciliator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the New York Times this morning, written by John Herbers, and entitled "Rights Unit Shift Opposed by Cities." This article details the opposition to the reorganization which was expressed by the executive committee of the U.S. conference of mayors.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1966]

RIGHTS UNIT SHIFT OPPOSED BY CITIES—MAYORS REJECT JOHNSON PLAN FOR CONCILIATORY AGENCY

(By John Herbers)

WASHINGTON, January 27.—The executive committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors has expressed displeasure with the proposed transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice.

The Service, a conciliation agency in race relations, would be shifted under a reorganization bill that the administration is planning to send to Congress soon.

President Johnson announced the transfer plan last September as part of a realinement of civil rights functions and agencies. Under the new setup the Justice Department is to coordinate enforcement of all civil rights laws.

The mayors expressed their displeasure at a midwinter meeting here last Friday. In doing so, the executive committee acted on a recommendation of its community relations committee, headed by Mayor Herman Goldner of St. Petersburg.

There was no formal resolution. The committee issued a statement saying it "agreed that the conciliation functions of such agencies as the Federal Community Relations Service can best be handled in Government areas outside the law-enforcement jurisdiction of the Department of Justice."

The mayors were said to feel that a conciliation agency could function better divorced from the agency charged with enforcement of laws in the area of conciliation.

SERVICE WORKS IN CITIES

Opposition of the mayors to the transfer is significant because the main function of the Service is now to improve race relations in urban areas. In doing so, the Service works closely with city halls.

Some civil rights groups had privately expressed opposition to the transfer, saying the Service might be downgraded under the Justice Department. There also was opposition within the Service.

However, with the appointment of Roger W. Wilkins as Director last month, the administration promised to increase the staff of the Service and made Mr. Wilkins the equivalent of an Assistant Attorney General. Mr. Wilkins has said he believes the Service can work efficiently in the Justice Department.

The Service was created by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to achieve peaceful compliance with the act. Since then, its emphasis on conciliation has shifted from southern communities to northern cities.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the President's message as it related to civil rights contained two glaring defects, in my judgment. First, the President indicated that he intended to call upon the Congress for a new law banning discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. Along with a number of my colleagues, I believe this request is unnecessary and will only delay an effective Federal antidiscrimination policy in housing since the President has the power without further legislation to broaden by Executive order the existing 1962 Executive order against discrimination in housing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement I made on December 31, 1965, along with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], calling upon the President to issue a new Executive order rather than send a bill to Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are deeply concerned about the recent published reports that Attorney General Katzenbach has recommended to the President that he should not issue an Executive order expanding the coverage of the 1962 Executive order against discrimination in housing, and that the administration is now considering instead sending a bill to Congress for this purpose. In our view, such legislation is wholly unnecessary since the President has constitutional power to amend the Executive order already in effect. A request to Congress for such legislation would needlessly delay the development of an effective Federal policy against racial discrimination in housing.

Despite all our efforts up to now, racial ghettos continue undeniably to be a higher corrosive influence in our cities and towns and are to a significant extent the result of a racially discriminatory housing market. President Kennedy's 1962 housing order was a valuable first step forward, but because it covered only FHA- and VA-financed housing, built or contracted for after November 20, 1962, it presently reaches only approximately 25 percent of the Nation's federally assisted housing supply and only about 18 percent of the total new housing supply; the remainder includes a large percentage of conventional mortgages issued by lending institutions whose deposits are guaranteed by U.S. Government agencies.

A newly expanded housing order would have a significant impact only if it covered all housing assisted by the Federal Government, including housing conventionally financed through lending institutions whose accounts are guaranteed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or which are supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank System. Such a broadened order should also cover all federally aided housing built or contracted prior to the November 20, 1962, cutoff date in the present order.

The constitutional basis for reaching all Federal funding and support in housing by Executive order is the same as in the case of the existing Executive Order. The moral and constitutional bases for doing so are an integral part of the great civil rights reform of the last decade. It would be tragic to delay further the effectiveness of the Federal antidiscrimination policy in housing.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the other respect in which the President's message fell short in civil rights was his failure even to mention strengthening of title VII, the equal employment opportunity title of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. In its editorial on January 16 commenting on the state of the Union message, the New York Times noted this lack, stating:

> But he was silent on the strengthening of the fair employment practices provision of existing law. A bill which would give a Federal agency power to issue cease-and-desist orders against job discrimination is now pending in the House.

The House bill has been reported by the House Education and Labor Committee, and a bill which I introduced on June 14, 1965—S. 2134—is pending before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. These measures would put teeth in the Federal equal employment opportunity policy, not only by giving the Commission cease and desist power, which the other regulatory agencies have, but also by expanding the act's coverage and strengthening the Commission's investigatory powers.

This is a highly important aspect of the 1966 civil rights responsibility for Congress, and I believe that it must be pursued diligently along with the other civil rights proposals which the President mentioned.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION MUST SEEK SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS; PREPARE FOR EMERGENCIES SUCH AS THE NEW YORK TRANSIT STRIKE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the experience in New York City during the recent transit strike has pointed up the seriousness of the failure to give the Small Business Administration the needed resources to fulfill its obligations to maintain a viable direct loan program for small businessmen. I believe that we cannot afford to defer any longer supplemental appropriations for the SBA in order that the small businessmen of the Nation may have access to the financial assistance contemplated by law and policy.

On December 15, 1965, along with the other members of the Select Committee on Small Business, I questioned Ross D. Davis, Executive Administrator of the Small Business Administration, as to why that agency had suspended its direct loan program under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act. I felt at that time that the lack of funds could create an economic disaster should an emergency arise where direct loans to small businessmen would become a necessity to the continued livelihood of great numbers of the business community. Just such a situation arose in New York City where thousands of small businessmen have faced economic ruin due to the transit strike.

Instead of stepping quickly into the crisis, the SBA was forced to scurry around in an attempt to raise some money to make direct loans to these businessmen. To meet the exigencies of the situation, the Small Business Administration was able to come up with $20 million raised out of a revolving fund. It is not certain whether this sum will be sufficient to meet the need. In any event such scraping together of funds is not the kind of approach to the consideration of loans which is necessary or proper. The business loan program is considered by most experts to be the most essential section of the Small Business Act.

I want to make it clear that this is not only a New York City problem. The strike in New York City could have occurred just as easily in California or Michigian or Louisiana or in any other State. Since October 11 of last year, the SBA has not only failed to grant any further loans anywhere in the Nation but has also simply refused to accept any applications for direct financial assistance—regardless of need. On December 15, Mr. Davis stated:

> I cannot at this moment advise the committee when we will be able to lift this moratorium; nor can I tell you the conditions under which we will be able to resume our regular business lending operations.

Mr. Davis went on to say that a systematic approach should replace the existing ad hoc basis of making loans and that his agency is considering methods of better organizing the loan program.

All this is well and good; however, while such a study is being conducted the small businessmen of this country should not be made to suffer. Until a system is devised to more effectively deal with the scheme of direct loans to small businessmen the Administration cannot simply cut off the entire direct loan program. A request for supplemental appropriations should be made immediately.

It is not my intention to substitute the direct loan program for the disaster loan program of section 7(b) of the Small Business Act. In fact, section 7(b) cannot apply to a situation such as existed in New York City, for it does not satisfy the disaster requirements of that section. However, it is generally agreed that section 7(a) is properly suited to meet the economic situation which existed in New York City.

On January 5, 1966, I wrote to Mr. Davis urging him to take immediate action to make direct loans under section 7(a) available to the people of New York City out of any fund the agency might have or to seek additional appropriations when Congress reconvened. The Administration 2 days later made available the $20 million previously mentioned.

The SBA cannot be allowed to sit idly by and wait for these economic disasters to arise elsewhere. The agency must be prepared to meet any future contingency. Yet, I am aware of no action on the part of the SBA to seek supplemental appropriations at this time. Accordingly, as another step in the continuing effort to strengthen the small business loan program, I have advised the President of the seriousness of the situation and have asked his help in the matter.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in seeking prompt action by the Administration in order to place the small business direct loan program on its feet.

SARGENT SHRIVER'S IMPERISHABLE CONTRIBUTION TO THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the departure of Sargent Shriver from the Peace Corps is an appropriate time to remind the Senate of the remarkable contribution of this unusual man.

If any American program has clearly planted the taproots of peace in the world, it is the Peace Corps. Throughout the world and throughout America the Peace Corps is cheered as a happy combination of idealistic dedication and practical good sense.

It has not only been established on the basic principle of winning peace by helping people help themselves to a better life, but it has also been initiated and administered in a brilliant manner.

This is where Sargent Shriver comes in. How many beautiful and idealistic plans have foundered because of incompetent, feeble, and uninspired administration.

In an international world of jealous competition, featured by militant military competition, the Peace Corps might easily have become another casualty of the cold war and the cold heart.

But under Sargent Shriver's policies of discriminating and enthusiastic recruitment, his determination not to let his men become involved in diplomatic or intelligence activities overseas—their only job being to help people help themselves—the Peace Corps has become our great international asset.

As the Foreign Minister of Thailand said:

> This important idea, the most powerful idea in recent times, of a Peace Corps, of youth mingling, living, working with youth—and that it should come from the mightiest Nation on earth, the United States. Many of us who did not know about the United States thought of this great Nation, endowed with great material strength and many powerful weapons. But how many of us know that in the United States ideas and ideals are also powerful?

Sargent Shriver has served his nation—and, indeed, all mankind—well in the Peace Corps. As he departs it, he richly deserves his nation's grateful thanks.

DEATH OF GEN. COURTNEY HODGES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Gen. Courtney Hodges died on Sunday. I happen to have followed closely General Hodges' brilliant military career because he was the cousin of my wife, the former Ellen Hodges.

General Hodges, like so many of his close relatives, was a quiet, gentle person of strong character. As the New York Times said in its obituary, he was a southern gentleman.

General Hodges' career should inspire many Americans who encounter disappointments and setbacks in their lives. His dearest ambition was for a military career, and he enthusiastically accepted an appointment to West Point, but was forced to leave after a year, because of difficulties with the mysteries of geometry.

But Courtney Hodges refused to quit. He entered the Army as a private, and worked his way through the ranks to become a general and commanding officer of the 1st Army in World War II. He directed the brilliant campaign of that army from August 1, 1944, through some of the toughest fighting in World War II, juggling corps and divisions as he chased the enemy. Paris fell to the 1st Army, then it went across the Aisne and the Marne through Belgium. Hodges' army was the first U.S. troops to enter Germany. It captured Aachen, won the bloody battle of the Hurtgen Forest, marched through the ruins of Cologne, across the Rhine over the famous Remagen Bridge, and then joined the 9th Army, capturing 300,000 prisoners.

General Hodges retired as a full general in 1949. He has left his family and his Nation a proud legacy.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial on Courtney Hodges' career published in today's Washington Post, and an article from this morning's New York Times be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Jan. 18, 1966]

COURTNEY HICKS HODGES

Gen. Courtney H. Hodges, who died on Sunday at 79, will always occupy a place of high honor in the ranks of his country's military heroes. He assumed command of the great 1st Army in August 1944, shortly after the Normandy invasion, and led it to a series of dazzling victories. It was the first American force to enter Paris, the first to march on German soil, the first to cross the Rhine, and the first to make a juncture with the Russians at the Elbe.

At the age of 18 General Hodges was dropped from West Point because of difficulty with mathematics and told that he was not meant to be a soldier. Had he not ignored that judgment and enlisted in the Army as a private, the Nation would have lost one of its greatest infantry generals.

Perhaps the most fitting tribute to Courtney Hodges was paid by his wartime commander, Gen. Omar N. Bradley.

In "A Soldier's Story," Bradley writes of General Hodges as a "spare, soft-voiced Georgian without temper, drama or visible emotion" who tended to be "left behind in the European headline sweepstakes." Yet he emerges as "a general's general." "For Hodges," Bradley concludes, "successfully blended dexterity and commonsense in such equal portions as to produce a magnificently balanced command. I had implicit faith in his judgment, in his skill and restraint."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1966]

GEN. COURTNEY HODGES, 79, DIES—LED FIRST ARMY IN WORLD WAR II—HEADED DRIVE FROM NORMANDY THAT REACHED THE ELBE—WEST POINT DROPOUT

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., January 16.—Gen. Courtney H. Hodges, commander of the 1st Army in its victorious drive through France and Germany in World War II, died today at Brooke General Hospital. He was 79 years old.

A hospital spokesman said the retired general, who had lived here since 1949, died of a heart attack.

He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Mildred Lee Hodges; two brothers and five sisters, all of Georgia.

A SOUTHERN GENTLEMAN

Courtney Hicks Hodges rose from a private to general, after dropping out of the U.S. Military Academy in 1905 because he had difficulty with geometry. In more than 40 years of military duty that included service with Gen. John J. Pershing in Mexico and as commander of the 1st Army in Europe in 1944, General Hodges carved a distinguished career.

He was a small, spry, quiet Southern gentleman who called his officers by their first names, but still remained rather distant. "He isn't the kind of fellow who has a nickname," a longtime associate once said. "Nobody ever calls him anything but Courtney."

General Hodges was neither a backslapper nor a seeker of publicity. As a result, he usually came off second best in headlines, overshadowed by such colorful generals as George S. Patton, Jr., and Britain's Bernard Law Montgomery.

"Georgie and I were old friends," General Hodges once said. "He had one job with his army; the 1st had another. We were a zonal army. We just slugged. Publicity? Some people just naturally attract attention—and all my friends tell me I look more like a schoolteacher than a general."

It was on August 1, 1944, 2 months after participating in the D-day landings in Europe, that General Hodges took over the 1st Army. His drive into Germany was one of the most dramatic campaigns of the war and an example of unorthodox leadership, as the general juggled corps and divisions while chasing the enemy.

Paris fell to the 1st Army on August 25, 1944. Passing through and around the city, General Hodges' forces moved across the Aisne and the Marne and reached the Belgian frontier on September 2. They liberated Liège on the 8th, crossed Luxembourg and reached the German border on the 11th—the first U.S. troops to enter Germany.

HIS TROOPS ENTER GERMANY

The next stage of the offensive came in October with the capture of Aachen and the bloody battle of the Hürtgen Forest in November. The forest, a major element in Hitler's Siegfried line defense, was one point where the German Army turned and fought after the headlong retreat that followed the Normandy breakout.

From November 1944 to February 1945, General Hodges' 1st Army struggled to break the stubborn Wehrmacht resistance in the rugged, snow-covered forest. Seventeen American divisions were committed against a Wehrmacht force nearly as large. Seventy thousand German and American soldiers died in the woods.

"It was one of the most bitterly contested areas in the European theater," Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower wrote in his memoirs.

Meanwhile, in mid-December 1944, Field Marshal Gerd von Rundstedt breached the Allied positions in what became known as the Battle of the Bulge. After 2 weeks of bitter fighting in the Ardennes in freezing weather, the Germans' last-ditch offensive was thrown back and the 1st Army resumed its offensive.

On March 7, the 1st Army reached the Rhine through the ruins of Cologne. Then elements of the 9th Armored Division captured, intact, the Remagen Bridge over the Rhine, thus giving General Hodges a firm bridgehead on the east bank of the Rhine, without a bloody, contested crossing.

The 1st Army then moved east and north with a circling movement, and after joining forces with the 9th Army, captured 300,000 prisoners in the Ruhr. The 1st Army then drove to the Elbe, where it made the first contact with Soviet troops, at Torgau.

Born in Perry, Ga., on January 5, 1887, Courtney Hodges always wanted to be a military man. He was elated, after finishing high school, to get an appointment to West Point, the U.S. Military Academy. However, he had troubles with geometry and had to leave. After a year of clerking in a Georgia grocery store, he joined the Army in 1906 as a private.

Three years later, now a sergeant, he entered a competitive examination and was commissioned a second lieutenant. He served with General Pershing in Mexico from March 1916 to February 1917. In World War I, he served as regimental commander with the 6th Infantry Regiment and fought in the St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne offensives.

One source of great satisfaction to him was the fact that he returned to West Point as an instructor in the department of tactics in 1920. He was the first nongraduate to serve as an instructor.

SERVED IN PHILIPPINES

Between the wars he made several tours of duty at the Army's schools, including the War College in Washington. A short while later he was assigned to the 7th Infantry at Vancouver Barracks in the State of Washington. He next served in the Philippines and returned to the United States in 1938 to become assistant commandant and later commandant at the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga.

In 1941, then a brigadier general, he was assigned to the office of the chief of infantry in Washington. He became acting chief, then chief of infantry. In 1942 General Hodges activated the X Corps as a part of the 3d Army and later became 3d Army commander at Fort Sam Houston, Tex. A year later he was ordered abroad as deputy commander to Gen. Omar N. Bradley, who was then commander of the 1st Army. On August 1, 1944, the general took over 1st Army as General Bradley was put in command of the 12th Army group. General Hodges became a full general on April 15, 1945.

After World War II, General Hodges came with the 1st Army headquarters to Governors Island. He retired here January 31, 1949, and moved to San Antonio.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CUT IN SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM HAMPERS ONE OF GREAT SOCIETY'S NEW PROGRAMS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today in discussing the Bureau of the Budget's recent phony economy move cutting back funds for the special milk program for schoolchildren—funds appropriated by Congress—I would like to examine the cutback's impact on one very important new society program.

This Congress passed a revolutionary education bill last year—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The purpose of the act, and I quote, is to "provide financial assistance to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children."

Mr. President, this purpose is ill served by cutting back Federal funds for the special milk program. Studies show that when the price of milk to schoolchildren is increased by even 1 cent, and such an increase will occur in some areas because of the Federal cutback, it is the children of the poor who go without first. These are the very children which this Congress has done so much to help through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Some of my colleagues may say: "What does drinking 1 or 2 half pints of milk a day have to do with good grades"? Not much, is my answer, when the child eats well at home. But when the big meal of the day is eaten at school, when parents are too poor to afford milk for their children, then that extra half pint or two can make all the difference in the world in a child's ability to concentrate and learn.

In the words of Earl Langkop, director of the Legislative Committee of the American School Food Service Association:

> "You can't teach a hungry child" is no idle slogan. The furnishing of adequate and proper nutrition to schoolchildren is a vital part of any school program.

Mr. President, I hope the Bureau of the Budget takes this fact into account and frees the $3 million it has withheld from funds appropriated for the school milk program. But until these funds are used to put more of Nature's perfect food into the schooltime diet of our schoolchildren, especially those who are educationally deprived, this Senator will continue to daily discuss the foolishness of the Bureau's action.

And once again, Mr. President, do not forget that this cutback in funds does not save the taxpayer a penny. Money not spent to buy milk for schoolchildren will be spent to put the same milk in storage under price support laws.

VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on the subject of Vietnam, yesterday I had occasion to question whether the news story in the New York Times suggesting that the President was going to impose a deadline on his peace drive was accurate. I am glad to see today that Presidential Press Secretary Bill Moyers has denied this story, which was given currency by the faceless and anonymous sources at the intermediate levels of the Pentagon and the State Department who leak stories of this kind. This morning Mr. Moyers denied the truth of the story. The White House said that no deadline had been set for ending President Johnson's peace offensive.

One gentleman representing the administration who does not seek anonymity and does not object to being quoted is Mr. Arthur Goldberg, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, who is quoted in today's New York Times as saying that the peace drive will reach fruition. Our Ambassador to the United Nations, for whom I have almost unbounded admiration, is quoted in this article as saying the U.S. offensive for peace in Vietnam is "bound to reach fruition." He said that the U.S. peace offensive begun by President Johnson late last month had already succeeded in convincing the world that America wants peace. He said:

> I am convinced that it is bound to reach fruition, if not now, then in time to come.

He said that with patience peace can be attained if Americans endure the ordeal of patience. The United States, he said, has not yet received a response from Hanoi on proposals to end the war in Vietnam. In this respect, he said:

> We can still not report success or failure.

I still believe that all efforts to reach success must continue.

In this connection, James Reston, well-known associate editor for the New York Times, last night commented on our policy in Vietnam. He asserted that the war in Vietnam should be pursued as one of limited objectives, and that the correct way was the middle way—and I think he is correct—which rules out intensification of the war, or peace on terms that would lose the country.

Mr. Reston points out, as I have before, that the United States can defend the perimeter of Saigon and the coastal areas where most of the people of South Vietnam live. This is very different than searching out the enemy through the elephant grass.

As I have said before, I am unalterably opposed to trading American coffins for useless jungle real estate in Vietnam.

U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, tomorrow I shall make a major speech in opposition to our policy in Vietnam. I have noted the remarks of praise which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has just expressed concerning Ambassador Goldberg. Suffice it to say that I shall be filled with the same enthusiasm about the work of our Ambassador to the United Nations, Ambassador Goldberg, when he makes it perfectly clear that our policy is going to be one of seeking negotiations for peace in Vietnam not on a bilateral arrangement between the United States and our enemies in this unconstitutional war, but on the basis of sitting down at a negotiating table with representatives of noncombatants at the head of that table representing the United Nations.

Until that is done, I say to the Ambassador of the United States in the United Nations that I am not at all impressed by the discussion taking place behind the scenes in the United Nations. It is about time that we go to the United Nations directly on the issue of peace in Asia in accordance with the procedures set out in the charter.

NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I announce at this point that in respect to the debate which is to take place this afternoon in regard to the wild rivers bill, the Senator from Idaho and I have tentatively agreed to go along with a series of proposed amendments that will protect the objectives of the wild rivers bill and at the same time give my State the protection to which I think it is clearly entitled in respect to the matter of condemnation and exchange powers granted to the Secretaries. Also as to the matter of encouraging the counties to develop a county zoning program we will suggest a proposed amendment. I believe these amendments are vitally necessary to protect Federal interests as well as the interests of the people of Oregon in connection with sound public land policies in my State of Oregon.

I hope that before the afternoon is over our proposed amendments will be approved by the Senate.

I wish at this time to express my very deep appreciation to the Senator from Idaho for his fairness and willingness to accept amendments that will iron out in a fair and satisfactory manner the major objections I raised yesterday.

I believe that the last thing that the Senator from Idaho said in debate last night, as the RECORD will show, was that he hoped that the Senator from Oregon and he could reach a conscionable compromise. I believe we have one to offer this afternoon.

OUR COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I notice in today's press that it is the intention of the President and the Secretary of Defense to strengthen American forces in Vietnam.

It seems to me—and I believe the majority of Senators believe—that a part of a continuing struggle has been in existence for 20 years, and perhaps longer, if one considers it in a broader sense.

We propose to see that those who do not want to be enslaved by Communist aggression or any other kind of aggression are helped and supported when they seek to resist that type of aggression. It is our feeling that to permit aggression to succeed in a place of this sort is to set the stage for a bigger fight somewhere else.

Accordingly, when people seek to resist aggression and we give our commitment to help them, it seems important that the aggression should not be permitted to succeed, because to do so would mean an expansion, and in this case it would mean eventually the loss of southeast Asia, and eventually all of Asia, and eventually perhaps the loss of more than that.

We believe that the best hope for an honorable and lasting peace in the world is the stopping of aggression in the areas where it starts. That is what we are doing.

It is important that in undertaking that task we not encourage the aggressor by confronting him with less force than is needed to stop his aggression and throw it back. We are doing that. Perhaps we are not doing enough of it.

I am pleased that the President is determined to see that our efforts will succeed. An honorable peace is what we seek. But we do not seek any peace that would permit enslavement of those who would like to be on the side of the free world, and we do not propose to negotiate any sort of peace that would permit those who fight for freedom on our side to be hunted down and slaughtered, as we have seen happen when communism has taken over in other areas of the world.

TRIBUTE TO EVERARD H. SMITH

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to an editorial which appeared in the Hampton (N.H.) Union for January 13, entitled "Two Trillion Dollars and Everard H. Smith."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Two Trillion Dollars and Everard H. Smith

Two trillion dollars is still beyond the comprehension of most of us and there aren't many people in these parts who ever heard of Everard H. Smith.

Senators Aiken and Prouty could tell you who Smith is.

So could Senator Norris Cotton.

The late Senator Styles Bridges could have told you all about Smith just as he told you when he was alive that billions add up to trillions.

Smith retired from his job down in Washington the other day.

The Washington newspapers carried his picture and a little story about him. It is possible that some newspaper outside of Washington may have mentioned that Smith was getting through but we doubt it. They wouldn't know Smith and neither would they understand the importance of the work he has been doing under the dome of our National Capitol for 52 years.

This Mr. Smith went to Washington in 1913. That was before we were born. He went to work for the then U.S. Senator Martin, of Virginia, who was chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Martin hired Smith "to do some little odds and ends around the office for awhile." Smith stayed on to become chief clerk to the committee and in the course of 52 years handled appropriation bills totaling $2 trillion.

Smith was one of the ablest public servants we have ever known. He occupied his high place and did his important work humbly. He was respected by Senators of both political parties and it mattered not whether the chairman of the committee from time to time was Republican or Democrat, the chairman leaned heavily upon Smith and enjoyed Smith's allegiance.

We have a thought that Everard H. Smith will find his way up Capitol Hill many times in the future sort of by force of habit. We hope this will be the case. But whether he is at home with his slippers and pipe or basking in the friendships of the Hill, we send to Everard from the winter beauty of New England our commendation and best wishes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, this is a moving tribute to a loyal and dedicated public servant who gave 52 years of his life, as the writer suggests, in effective and yet unsung labor. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I share fully in this fine expression of commendation and good wishes.

INDIANA COLLEGE STUDENTS SUPPORT ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, college students of Indiana in large numbers recently have expressed strong approval of the administration's policies in Vietnam. A list signed by over 16,000 students certifying this support was presented to Governor Branigin late in December and a number of public rallies for the same purpose have been held on various campuses.

Typical of the latter was a gathering at Purdue University just before the Christmas holidays where more than 700 students and staff members assembled outdoors in freezing temperatures for an enthusiastic session. Professors Kenneth Kofmehl and James Dornan delivered well-received talks stressing the soundness of present policy and the dangers of appeasement. In order that other Members of Congress may read the descriptions of this important rally, I ask unanimous consent that articles from the Purdue Exponent, Lafayette Courier-Journal, Indianapolis Star, Indianapolis News, and the New York Times be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Purdue Exponent, Dec. 17, 1965]

Rally Supports U.S. Vietnam Stand—Professors Dornan, Kofmehl Lecture Torchlight Gathering

(By Joe Bankoff and Peter Wellman)

A frostbitten crowd of an estimated 700 students and staff last night cheered their approval of the U.S. policy in Vietnam at the State's first torchlight rally for that purpose. From a kerosene lighted stage just north of the campus armory Profs. James E. Dornan and Kenneth Kofmehl delivered proclamations of why the United States must remain in Vietnam.

VOLUNTEER BAND

A two-piece volunteer band played as the crowd began to gather at about 6:30 p.m. in spite of the freezing temperature and light snow.

Alan Brubaker, president of the university's Young Republican Club, opened the rally by informing the crowd that yesterday morning he had personally presented Indiana Gov. Roger Branigin with 16,000 signatures of Indiana college students who support the administration's current policy in Vietnam.

GOVERNOR SUPPORTS

"The Governor gave his complete support to this rally and to other similar activities," said Brubaker.

Prof. Kenneth Kofmehl told the crowd that for freedom of speech to work there must be full expression of diverse points of view. "We cannot permit an articulate minority to convey the impression that they represent the views of all."

In supporting the administration's policy in Vietnam, Professor Kofmehl noted that the Chinese Communists are looking next to Thailand where they have announced support for Thailand Patriotic Front's effort to liberate Thailand.

"We do not have to speculate about the plans of the Chinese Communists, they have obligingly provided us with a clear statement of their plans for world conquest. After Thailand will come other countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America until we are surrounded by Communist countries and ripe for this treatment ourselves," exclaimed Professor Kofmehl.

SOUND PREMISES

"The administration's policy in Vietnam is based on sound premises. Appeasement led to a world war in which 40 million people died. In executing current strategy, our administration has held out the carrot as well as used the stick.

"There is no guarantee that our policy will succeed. It requires wit and will to succeed. However, appeasement and peace at any price will surely fail and find us encircled and helpless," Professor Kofmehl declared.

STUDENTS APPLAUD

To the enthusiastic applause of his student audience he challenged, "Yours has been characterized as the committed generation, the generation seeking involvement. What nobler cause is there for you to commit yourselves to than freedom for ourselves and other freedom loving peoples of the world? Hence I urge you to support our administration's wise and brave effort to do this."

Professor Dornan opened by stating, "meetings of this kind constitute an important part of the decisionmaking process of a free society." He then switched to biting reprimands of such groups "of the far left as S.D.S., and the Dubois, and the May 3 movement."

Then delving directly into the war in Vietnam, Professor Dornan said, "since 1917 and Lenin's rise to power in the Soviet Union, Communist nations have waged unremitting war against freedom at home, and pursued unrelentlessly policies of expansionism abroad." Dornan continued, "the war in Vietnam may well be the most decisive struggle of the entire cold war period."

Professor Dornan concluded, "if we do not now raise the costs of guerrilla war, subversion, and indirect aggression to such a level that the Chinese find such activities unprofitable, then we can look for such conflicts to break out."

Dornan returned to the platform to state we must help the Vietnamese from "fearing the midnight knock on the door and the darkness at noon."

The rally was under the joint sponsorship of the Young Republicans, the Young Democrats and the Young Americans for Freedom.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 18, 1965]

War Role Backed at Purdue Rally—Students Cheer Professor Defending U.S. Policy

Lafayette, Ind., December 17.—About 750 Purdue University students gathered in freezing temperatures and light snow last night to back the U.S. policy in Vietnam.

The torchlight rally on a campus parking lot was sponsored by Young Republicans, Young Democrats and Young Americans for Freedom. Signs that sprinkled the rally read, "We Support the Policy in Vietnam" and "Stop the Red Tide."

Students cheered when a political science professor, James E. Dornan, said:

"We believe our effort in Vietnam is just, right, and necessary," Professor Dornan, faculty sponsor for the Young Republican chapter at Purdue, added:

"We will support the administration policy only as long as it remains faithful to our commitment in southeast Asia."

BRAVE AND WISE EFFORT

Kenneth Kofmehl, Young Democrats faculty sponsor, urged support of "our administration's brave and wise effort" in Vietnam. He said the lesson of the 1930's "proved we cannot avoid war by appeasement."

Meanwhile, Gov. Roger D. Branigin thanked the Indiana representatives of the National Student Committee for the Defense of Vietnam for the committee's efforts supporting America's position in Vietnam.

"You deserve a lot of credit," he told leaders in Indianapolis after they had shown him samples of petitions that about 16,000 students on Indiana campuses had signed.

Similar petitions gathered throughout the country will be sent to the White House.

[From the Lafayette (Ind.) Journal & Courier, Dec. 17, 1965]

Students Cheer U.S. Action in Vietnam at Torchlight Rally

A crowd of 750 Purdue University students cheered in support of U.S. action in Vietnam in a chilly, snow-flecked torchlight rally Thursday night.

"This is not a debate—this is to show how American students feel," said Alan Brubaker, Kokomo, president of the cosponsoring Purdue chapter of Young Republicans.

Brubaker said the rally had the support of Gov. Roger D. Branigin and Representative John Brademas, Democrat, of Indiana, and was the first such rally in Indiana.

Banners raised at the half-hour rally on a parking lot near the Purdue Armory said, "We Support the Policy in Vietnam" and "Stop the Red Tide."

Speaking from a torchlit platform on the parking lot, James E. Dornan, Purdue political science professor, said:

"We believe our effort in Vietnam is just, right, and necessary. But we will support the administration policy only as long as it remains faithful to our commitment in southeast Asia."

Unless communism's thrusts are stopped there, Dornan added, "wars could break out all over—even in our own backyard in Latin America."

Kenneth Kofmehl, another Purdue political science professor, told the rally that events of the 1930's proved "we cannot avoid world war by appeasement." He urged support of "our administration's brave and wise efforts."

Dornan is faculty sponsor of the Young Republicans. Kofmehl is sponsor of the Young Democrats, another sponsoring group, along with the Young Americans for Freedom.

PETITIONS PRESENTED

Meanwhile Thursday, Brubaker said he and James D. Blythe, Indiana chairman of the National Student Committee for the Defense of Vietnam, presented Governor Branigin with petitions signed by 16,000 Indiana college students supporting the Vietnam war.

Of this total, about 2,000 signatures were those of Purdue University students.

Four students met with Branigin for more than an hour at the statehouse at Indianapolis.

The petition read:

"We believe that the war in Vietnam is part of a general Communist effort to dominate all of southeast Asia.

"We believe that the cause of the war rests clearly with Communist leaders in Hanoi, Peiping, and among the Vietcong.

"We believe that the so-called peace demonstrators who are opposing our role in Vietnam are encouraging the Communists to continue their aggressive actions in South Vietnam and, in turn, all of southeast Asia.

"We believe that the overwhelming majority of young Americans join us in supporting the efforts of our Government to oppose Communist aggression in Vietnam."

[From the Indianapolis Star, Dec. 17, 1965]

Purdue Students Rally, Shiver, Back Viet Policy

West Lafayette, Ind.—Some 750 Purdue University students held a torchlight rally last night supporting U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

The rally, on a parking lot near the ROTC armory on campus, included students carrying banners, "We Support the Policy In Vietnam," "Stop the Red Tide," and others.

The students, shivering in the chilly weather and light snow cheered Purdue political science Prof. James E. Dornan, who said, "We believe our effort in Vietnam is just, right and necessary. We will support the administration policy only as long as it remains faithful to our commitment in southeast Asia."

Professor Dornan is faculty sponsor for the Young Republican chapter on campus, one of the rally sponsors.

Kenneth Kofmehl, faculty sponsor for the Young Democrats on campus, another sponsor of the rally, urged support of "our administration's brave and wise effort" in Vietnam and added the lesson of the 1930's "proved we cannot avoid war by appeasement."

Other sponsors of the rally were the Young Americans for Freedom. Alan Brubaker of Kokomo, president of the Young GOP chapter, presided at the rally and introduced speakers.

[From the Indianapolis News, Dec. 17, 1965]

Seven Hundred and Fifty Back Viet Policy at Rally

West Lafayette, Ind.—About 750 Purdue University students gathered in freezing temperatures and light snow last night to back U.S. policy in Vietnam.

The torchlight rally on a campus parking lot was sponsored by Young Republicans, Young Democrats, and Young Americans for Freedom.

Signs that sprinkled the rally read, "We Support the Policy in Vietnam" and "Stop the Red Tide."

Students cheered when one of the speakers, political science Prof. James E. Dornan, said:

"We believe our effort in Vietnam is just, right, and necessary."

Dornan, faculty sponsor for the Young GOP chapter at Purdue, added, "We will support the administration policy only as long as it remains faithful to our commitment in southeast Asia."

Kenneth Kofmehl, Young Democrats faculty sponsor, urged support of "our administration's brave and wise effort" in Vietnam. He said the lesson of the 1930's "proved we cannot avoid war by appeasement."

Meanwhile, Gov. Roger D. Branigan thanked Hoosier representatives of the National Student Committee for the Defense of Vietnam for their efforts supporting America's position in Vietnam.

"You deserve a lot of credit," he told leaders in Indianapolis after they showed him samples of petitions which about 16,000 students on Indiana campuses have signed.

Such petitions gathered throughout the country will be sent to the White House.

WALTER LIPPMANN'S ASTUTE ANALYSIS OF THE U.S. DILEMMA IN VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in a series of recent articles, Mr. Walter Lippmann, in his usual astute manner, has penetratingly analyzed the bases for U.S. involvement in Vietnam and the future ahead if escalation in our military commitment takes place.

Pointing out the hard decisions facing President Johnson, Mr. Lippmann stated on January 17, 1966, in Newsweek:

> A sine qua non for any possibility of bringing the undeclared war in Vietnam to the conference table is a continuation of the policy of not bombing North Vietnam. That policy should continue.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks the following articles by Walter Lippmann: an article entitled "The President in the Morass" which appeared in the Washington Post on January 4, 1966; an article entitled "The Mansfield Report" which appeared in the Washington Post on January 11, 1966; and, an article entitled "The Next Move," which appeared in the Washington Post on January 6, 1966; and, an article entitled "The President's Hard Decision," which appeared in Newsweek on January 17, 1966, and "The Guns-Versus-Butter Stereotype" which appeared in the Washington Post on January 18, 1966.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 11, 1966]

Today and Tomorrow: The Mansfield Report

(By Walter Lippmann)

The return of Congress marks the end of the period in which the President has had the unquestioning support of some 60 to 70 percent of the people. It has always been remarkable, as in law and public morals it has been unseemly, that this country should be committed to a war which has never been explained except in resounding generalities, and has never been debated seriously. This surreptitious war has been feasible because the people are disposed to trust the President and to assume that in a question of war and peace in a distant continent he is in a position to know more than they do.

But now there is a new element in the situation. His conduct of the war has been tested for a year on the battlefields of southeast Asia. What the public has been told about the strategy and the prospects of this war is now being measured by the actual results, which the people are beginning to find out about. The crucial turning point has come with the publication of the report which contains the findings of five Senators, led by Senator Mansfield and including Senators Aiken, Muskie, Boggs, and Inouye. Here for the first time we have a report on the war which is responsible, informed, and trustworthy. Except for the reports of a few enterprising and independent newspapermen, the American public has had to depend on information made available in official briefings in Saigon and Washington.

The contradictions between the briefings and the facts, as they have gradually become visible, have undermined public confidence. The grim fact is that by conducting the war furtively there has developed, as Ambassador Goldberg confessed only the other day, a crisis of credibility. People do not know what to believe about what they hear from the White House, the State Department, the Pentagon, and the public relations officers in Saigon. The only way to restore confidence in the truthfulness of officials is by subjecting the exercise to a thorough public debate. For such a debate the Mansfield report—which ought to have very much wider publication than it has yet had—supplies the material for opening the debate.

The main proposition which needs to be debated, and denied by the administration if it can deny it, is the finding of the Mansfield report that:

"The large-scale introduction of U.S. forces and their entry into combat has blunted but not turned back the drive of the Vietcong. The latter have responded to the increased American role with a further strengthening of their forces by local recruitment in the south and reinforcements from the north and a general stepping up of military activity. As a result the lines remain drawn in South Vietnam in substantially the same pattern as they were at the outset of the increased U.S. commitment."

After a year of escalated war, the results have brought the Senators to this reassertion of the classical American doctrine about Asian wars:

"If present trends continue, there is no assurance as to what ultimate increase in American military commitment will be required before the conflict is terminated. For the fact is that under present terms of reference and as the war has evolved, the question is not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation, but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open ended."

This is simply another statement, in the concrete terms of the war in southeast Asia, of the doctrine which has until recently been American military doctrine—that the United States should not engage in a land war on the Asian continent because such a war will be, as the Mansfield report calls it, open ended. For there will always be more Asians in Asia than there can be Americans.

Our people are coming to realize that the war is open ended, that no matter how many troops we put ashore there will always be enough troops on the other side to keep the war going.

Since this means that a negotiated peace cannot be the kind of dictated peace which Senator DIRKSEN is still dreaming about, the President is finding himself under heavy pressure to bomb and blockade Hanoi and Haiphong, and thus make a quick, clean end of it. On the subject of victory through air power, the American people have been dangerously misinformed.

I say dangerously because the advocates of bigger bombing do not seem to realize how vulnerable are Saigon and the other ports to reprisals. In the congested cities and harbors which we hold there are the makings of another Pearl Harbor, and none of us should discount the danger. There cannot be much doubt that this is one of the subjects that Mr. Shelepin has been discussing in Hanoi.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 6, 1966]

TODAY AND TOMORROW: THE NEXT MOVE?

(By Walter Lippmann)

Through the fog of war which lies so heavily upon the scene, there may be discernible a certain amount of movement which holds some promise. There is no certainty about it. But, remembering Mr. Joseph Kraft's well-informed observation that communications between Hanoi and Washington are clogged and slow, I think that the public reaction of Hanoi to the President's peace campaign which is just beginning to show above the surface, may at least indicate what the President might do next.

There are no indications that Hanoi will suddenly announce that it is ready for a peace conference. Nor is there any indication that Hanoi will withdraw its troops in the south or suspend the infiltration of more troops. We must expect that the Vietcong strength in the south will be maintained by Hanoi in a ratio suitable to successful guerrilla warfare. There may be a certain reduction in the tempo of violence, at least while the pause in the bombing continues. But there is nothing in the public record to indicate that a peace conference or a de facto truce is in sight.

What seems to be in sight is a period of diplomatic exchanges, carried on publicly at arm's length, carried on privately through intermediaries, and masked by bellicose rhetoric to appease and put off the opponents of a negotiated truce. The most interesting evidence here is, on our side, the letter from Ambassador Goldberg to the Secretary General of the United Nations; on the other side, there is the editorial which was published on January 3 in the North Vietnamese newspaper, Nhan Dan. This can be taken as an official commentary on the Johnson peace campaign.

The commentary is deliberately ambiguous, as must be expected of a government which has to maneuver between Peiping, Moscow, and Washington. But through the ambiguity, the commentary can be read as a challenge to the President to prove that he does not mean what Hanoi thinks he means on two cardinal points. The commentary challenges him to disprove that he means to establish "a new type colony and military base of the United States and perpetuating the partition of Vietnam."

He is asked to prove, second, that he is not asking "the Vietcong—South Vietnamese liberation forces—to lay down their arms * * * and be placed under the rule of the Saigon regime."

The President has done well, I believe, to look beyond the angry language of the past and to proceed with the discussion of war aims and peace terms, which he has been offering since his Baltimore speech last April. He can assume that what Mr. Goldberg described as "discussions or negotiations without any prior conditions whatsoever" have actually started, not yet in the form of a conference but at long distance and, in part at least, publicly.

If that is where we are, then the time has come to proceed from press conferences, briefings, and informal speeches to formal diplomatic notes. The cardinal issues, as described by the Hanoi commentary, are, one, the conditions under which we shall withdraw our military forces from South Vietnam—and, two, the conditions, if any, under which the Vietcong may participate in the government of the country.

Because Ambassador Goldberg leaves our position on these two basic issues uncertain, further official definition of our war aims is called for.

I do not know whether the administration can agree within itself on such a definition of its war aims. But I think I do know that such a definition of our war aims on the two cardinal points is now indispensable to the maintenance of confidence at home and abroad.

Whatever the first response in Hanoi, the act of clarifying and defining our aims is a necessary part of the effort to move the war from the battlefield to the conference table. Even if we assume, as we had better do, that Hanoi will reply scornfully, the nub of the matter is that it should reply and thus find itself in a discussion about the shape of things to come.

It has often been said in Washington during the past year that we are listening, with our antenna well polished, for some response from Hanoi, and that we have never had any response. This official stance, that it takes two to discuss anything, overlooks the fact that a great power like the United States with its worldwide connections can force discussions by beginning the discussions and making it increasingly impossible for the other party to break them off.

If the President wants seriously to have discussions, he has made a good beginning with the Goldberg letter. If he perseveres, he will not go very long unanswered. Indeed, judging by the first reactions of Hanoi to the current peace campaign, there are reasons for thinking that the public discussions have begun and the task now is to continue them.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 4, 1966]

TODAY AND TOMORROW: THE PRESIDENT IN THE MORASS

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is no reason to doubt that the President is sincere in proclaiming to the whole world his desire to negotiate a peace in Vietnam. But sincerity is not the crux of the matter. The question is whether he recognizes the strategic realities of the military situation and is prepared to negotiate a truce which conforms with them. It cannot be a glorious truce.

If the President is not prepared to make his terms of peace consistent with the reality in southeast Asia, he is likely to find that our friends and our adversaries alike regard the whole spectacular business not as the action of a statesman but as the device of a showman.

Nevertheless, for the President the peace offensive is a critical turning point. It is not true, as so many suppose, that, if Peiping and Hanoi reject the offer to negotiate, the way will therefore be cleared and open for a general escalation of the war. The President will find that, while the planes will fly and the troops will march and Congress will vote the money, confidence in his leadership, both at home and abroad, will be deeply weakened unless he has defined his terms of peace.

As seen through the murk of Secretary Rusk's on and off the record press conferences, the Johnson administration has no firm and clear position on the central issues of the war. I realize that industrious newspapermen have been able to glean a collection of remarks which relate to the central issues—such as, whether we are prepared to leave South Vietnam under any conditions which are in fact realizable in the foreseeable future, and whether we are in fact willing to negotiate a truce with the main adversary in the field, the Vietcong. If these central points have been clarified by Mr. Harriman and the other emissaries, a great deal will have been accomplished. If they have not been clarified, the effort is not sufficiently serious to comport with the dignity of a great power. For a power like the United States cannot lose face by liquidating a miserable war. But it can lose face by fooling around with it.

Mr. Johnson knows that he is in a very grave crisis. For as he admitted in his year-end remarks, his great domestic accomplishments are jeopardized by his failure to achieve peace in Vietnam. It is worse than that. He is on the verge of making the kind of ruinous historical mistake which the Athenians made when they attacked Syracuse, which Napoleon and Hitler made when they attacked Russia. He is on the verge of engaging this country in a war which can grow into a great war lasting for many years and promising no rational solution.

The President is in this predicament mainly because he has let himself be persuaded by very bad advice. The bad advice has been the argument that the expansion of Chinese communism will be halted or quickened by the outcome of the fighting in South Vietnam. The notion that revolutionary wars can be stopped by fighting it out in South Vietnam has been the cherished illusion of the President's two principal advisers. Both Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara have committed themselves to the fallacy that South Vietnam is the Armageddon of the conflict with communism.

This misconceived war has in fact boomeranged. Its effect has been quite the opposite from what it was supposed to be. The country has been told that by proving our determination and our willingness to fight, we are arousing resistance to the expansion of Chinese communism.

But are we? If China is to be contained it will have to be done not only by the United States but by the containing power of Asia; namely, Pakistan, India, Japan, and the Soviet Union. Yet not one of these great powers of Asia is alined with us. Quite the contrary. Our Vietnamese actions have driven the most powerful of all the containing states, the Soviet Union, into open opposition to us and, if we escalate enough, will drive it into some kind of military opposition.

Certainly it is essential that Communist China be contained until its revolutionary ardors have cooled and she has settled down to peaceable coexistence. But a serious policy of containing China would begin with a realization that China is a continental land power in Asia and if she is to be contained, it will have to be done primarily by the great powers of Asia, not by the United States alone.

What is more, serious policy for containing China would respect the basic geographical facts—that China is a land power and we are a sea power, that China is an elephant and we are a whale. During the past year or so China has had many failures and one conspicuous success. Geography was the determining factor in all of them. The Chinese failed in Africa, which is across the ocean and too far away. She outbluffed herself against India, which is also, in fact, too far away. She had a humiliating setback in Indonesia, which is separated from China by blue water and is not within her reach.

China's one great success has been that the greatest sea power has become bogged down in the morass of Indochina and would now be put to it to mount a counterrevolutionary effort anywhere else in this turbulent world. It is no wonder then that China will do all that she can to prevent us from extricating ourselves from the morass.

[From Newsweek, Jan. 17, 1966]

WALTER LIPPMANN ON THE PRESIDENT'S HARD DECISION

After his most recent trip to South Vietnam, Secretary McNamara ventured to say that, as a result of our efforts, we have stopped losing the war. Perhaps he was referring to the fact that at the beginning of 1965 not only had the Saigonese Army lost control of the countryside with the exception of five or six cities, but the government in Saigon was disintegrating and was on the verge of making a deal with Hanoi.

During the past year there has been no significant improvement in the military situation. Once the American soldiers retire, the villages which are recovered from the Vietcong are quickly lost again. The balance of military power has not been changed in our favor. For as we have increased our own army, the adversary has increased his army, both by stepping up the infiltration from the north and by greater recruitment in the south. The one real change has been that the government in Saigon is now a dictatorship of four generals who are fully aware that personally they have every reason to avoid a truce and to continue the war.

So, the President finds himself no nearer, and almost certainly further away from, his avowed objectives in Vietnam. He has been confronted with what he now describes, quite correctly, as "hard decisions." What are the hard decisions? At bottom, the President has to choose between a bigger war and an unattractive peace. He must decide either to launch a big American war in Asia, a war which could easily be bigger than the Korean war because it could so quickly involve both China and the Soviet Union, or to cut our losses by reducing his political and military objectives.

EXTEND THE WAR, OR SETTLE FOR LESS?

This is indeed a hard choice. A long war means heavy casualties. It means the disruption of the lives of another generation of young men. It means that the Nation will be distracted from the attempt to solve its own problems—such as the problems of the cities and the problems of the Negroes and the problems of industrial peace. It means once again, for the fourth time in this century, that the Nation will turn its attention from its own urgent affairs to a war abroad. It means also that this country will be diverted from the development of the Americas and from its vital national interests in Europe and Australasia.

The other choice open to the President is also a hard one, especially for a proud man who wants to be universally popular. For there is no disguising the fact that a negotiated truce can be had only by settling for a good deal less than a victory, and this means that the President must expect to be denounced by many, and to have his pride wounded. It takes great political strength and a high degree of moral courage for the head of a state to make the kind of peace which may now be possible in the Vietnamese mess. General Eisenhower, the victorious commander of the Allied armies, was able to make a settlement in Korea which President Truman would never have dared to make. General Eisenhower had at that time an invulnerable prestige.

An even more pertinent analogy is to be found in the way General de Gaulle liquidated the messy war in Algeria. The President would do well to study and ponder what happened, how General de Gaulle extricated France from a war which she had not lost but could not win, how he negotiated with his adversaries in the field, the Algerian counterpart of the Vietcong, and made with them a "peace of the brave," how he outwitted and defied the extremists at the risk of his life—and how, having devoted himself unflinchingly to the true interest of France, which was peace with Algeria, he won the gratitude and esteem of his countrymen, including almost all of those who voted against him in the recent election.

PAYING THE PRICE

The hard decision the President has to make is whether he can accept the political and psychological risks of dealing with Vietnam as General Eisenhower dealt with Korea and as General de Gaulle dealt with north Africa. For President Johnson will have to pay a heavy price for the historical mistake of involving the United States in a land war against Asians in Asia. The alternative to paying a price for peace is to pay the enormous price of a great war which threatens to expand into a world war.

The President has made it quite clear that he realizes the hard choice which is before him. Naturally enough, he is looking for some easier way out of his dilemma. If only he could find one. But by his decisions in 1964, he rejected the warning by men in a position to know that there was not much time left to negotiate an arrangement. He has come very near to locking and bolting the door. He has raised the stakes so high that easy solutions are most improbable and only the hard choices remain.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 18, 1966]

TODAY AND TOMORROW: THE GUNS-VERSUS-BUTTER STEREOTYPE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The almost inveterate tendency to fight again the battles of the last war has shown itself in the guns-versus-butter comment on the President's message. In the two World Wars each belligerent, including even the United States, had to reduce and ration civilian consumption in order to have the materials and the labor to produce the munitions of war. That is not, at least not yet, the U.S. problem in the Vietnamese war.

For the American economy is so enormously big, and relative to it the war is still so small, that the war can be conducted without any reduction in the existing standard of living. What is not currently possible is any significant improvement in the general standard of living. Otherwise there is every prospect of an inflationary boom.

But this is not the crux of the problem which confronts us. The problem today is not whether the standard of life goes up or down a bit. Our problem is to rebuild and remake the environment of our increasingly urbanized society. The solution of that problem cannot be suspended as we suspend reform and development in all the other wars of this century. And that is why the old guns-versus-butter stereotype masks the real problem of our day.

As I read the President's address, it seemed to me that he was oversimplifying and masking the real issue by referring to the internal development and reform as a kind of charity for the poor. Cannot this great Nation afford to be charitable to the poor? This entails a radical misconception of what is involved in the so-called Great Society. What is involved is a good deal more than charity to the poor. There is involved the epochal task of remaking the physical structure of American society in order to make it habitable by a radically changing population.

This will take a great deal of money. But it will also demand a vast application of brains, and a passionate concentration of attention and interest in the unsolved problems of the new American society. New York City has just had several omnibus signs of how vulnerable existing society is—the water shortage, the newspaper strike, the power failure, the transit strike. Los Angeles has had the Watts riots, and in so many places the pollution of water and air are reminders that we are confronted with something greater and essentially different than we were in the other wars.

On paper and with a certain amount of financial finagling, it can be made to appear that the war in Vietnam and the renewal at home can be carried on simultaneously. But in truth, as men are actually made, it is impossible for a people to keep going at the same time two such vastly different operations. War, with its horror and its fascination, is to internal reform and development as a public execution is to a parents' and teachers' meeting. That is why in every war of this century the internal movement of reform and development has been stopped and scattered by war. The First World War did that to Theodore Roosevelt's progressivism and Wilson's New Freedom. The Second World War did it to the New Deal. The Korean war did it to Truman's Fair Deal, and the Americanization of the Vietnamese war in 1965 is now doing that to Johnson's Great Society.

The guns-versus-butter stereotype masks, I repeat, the reality as we confront it today. Most of us could easily give up some butter, and perhaps be the better for it. But what we cannot give up is the modernization of the edifice in which an ever-increasing part of the Nation dwells. For the edifice is bursting at the seams and is falling apart.

What we need, I submit, is an antistereotype. We should remember the cavalry generals who did not like the tanks, we should remember the builders of the Maginot line, and the brass who would not believe in airplanes, and their successors who can believe in nothing else.

For the conduct of war and diplomacy, it is most important to cultivate antistereotypes to protect us from resorting to decaying and dead patterns of conduct. The appeasement of Hilter which culminated at Munich was the work of Englishmen and Frenchmen who could not believe that the Chancellor of Germany was a monster like Hitler. The frightful consequences of appeasing Hitler left behind them in the minds of men the great Munich stereotype. In the grip of this stereotype a British Prime Minister felt compelled to think that Suez was the Rhineland and Nasser was Hitler.

Mr. Dean Rusk is the current user of the Munich stereotype, possessed with the notion that in the divided territory of Vietnam there is being reenacted once again the drama of Munich. That drama was not reenacted at Suez. It is not being reenacted in

Saigon. For the world does change, and while the past is indeed prelude, the prelude is not the show itself.

AGRICULTURE IS UNDERPINNING OF OUR ECONOMY, DELAWARE GRANGE MASTER ASSERTS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the master of the Delaware State Grange, G. Wallace Caulk, of Woodside, is an experienced farmer and an able advocate of his organization's views.

The January issue of Diamond State Granger, a publication which he edits, includes a portion of Mr. Caulk's address at the recent 91st annual State session of the Delaware State Grange in Dover.

Because his remarks are both interesting and informative, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of his address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURE

Probably the foremost problem in the world today is hunger. Let us not treat this problem too lightly. Approximately half of the world's 3 billion suffer from malnutrition and the World's Food Congress was told in 1963 that around 10,000 persons die every day from starvation.

American agriculture will become increasingly vital in the future as the world's population explosion creates even larger demands for food and fiber. This alarming population expansion can be fully appreciated when it is realized that the population of the world, which reached the first billion by the year 1830, took only 100 years, 1830 to 1930, to reach 2 billion; and only 30 years, 1930 to 1960, to reach 3 billion. It is expected to exceed 6 billion people by the turn of the century. The population growth in the United States is more than keeping pace with world expansion.

Within the next decade, unless we continue to increase the efficiency of our farm production and provide the economic incentive to induce young and efficient producers to remain on the farm, food surpluses in the United States will likely disappear and the consumer will be faced with possible food shortages and much higher food costs. The recent census shows that some 17 percent of all farmers in the United States were 65 or older. An additional 22 percent were 55 to 65 years of age. By 1970, nearly half the farmers will be 55 years of age or over.

Despite the fact that surplus quantities of certain commodities have been produced in recent years because of the efficiency of agricultural production, it is important to note that supplies on hand are sufficient to meet domestic needs for only a short period of time in the event of a national emergency. For example, the 900 million bushels of wheat now on hand would meet domestic needs and dollar exports for about 1 year; or, if necessary, they would meet the domestic needs alone for nearly 2 years if exports were discontinued. The 1.2 billion bushels of corn on hand represent only a 3 or 4 months' supply for domestic use and export. The 13.6 million bales of cotton in stock would meet the normal annual domestic demand of 9 million bales, plus 1 year's export supply. For dairy products, the 5.2 billion pounds is only 5 percent of a full year's supply.

Agriculture is our largest industry. It is one of the major markets for the products of labor and industry. It uses more steel in a year than is used for a year's output of passenger cars. Agriculture uses more petroleum products than any other industry in the country. The inventory of machinery and equipment for the farms of our country exceeds the assets of the steel industry and is five times that of the automobile industry.

Urban workers benefit directly from this rural demand for machinery, equipment, supplies and other items used on the Nation's farms. Significant changes in this demand, therefore, have a direct effect on business and employment in urban areas.

Agriculture is the principal source of our wealth. It is the main supplier of basic raw materials, which support all segments of business and industry; about 65 percent of the basic raw materials used in industry comes from the farm. Reliable estimates indicate that each dollar of wealth taken from the soil generates $7 of income throughout the rest of our economy.

Ours is the only nation where the cost of food averages only 18 percent of individual income. The American standard of living is the highest of any nation in the world. We have consistently increased the number and availability of the good things of life, while our life expectancy has constantly increased. As management, machines, fertilizers and other chemicals have replaced manpower on our farms, 92 percent of our people have been freed from farm labor to provide the 1,001 things which make for our high standard of living.

There has never been a time in the history of this great country when farmers need to take more seriously their responsibilities in the general farm organizations. Farmers must realize that it is as important a part of their business to participate in activity for good legislation at the State and national level as it is to plow the ground or plant the seed. The time is gone when we can let "George" do it. To pay our dues in a farm organization is not enough. We must be active members, participating and voting in regards to the policy of the organization and electing the most capable members to responsible office. The young farmer should accept the fact that he should not be too busy with his on-the-farm jobs to accept his off-the-farm responsibility.

In my opinion, the revolution which has taken place in agriculture—the fact that the farmer is not only the owner but also the hired man—the fact that when the farmer gets off the tractor to go in town on business, farming operations cease—these facts have caused too many ambitious young farmers who are working so hard to establish their farming business that they cannot clearly see their responsibilities in regards to farm legislation.

DEATH OF CHARLES LEWIN, OF THE NEW BEDFORD STANDARD TIMES

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, last December 29 all of us in Massachusetts were deeply saddened to learn of the passing of one of the outstanding newspapermen of our State and of the United States—Mr. Charles Lewin, of the New Bedford Standard Times. Mr. Lewin was a newspaperman to the core—a veteran of over 40 years in the profession. He ran a highly respected and influential paper and trained countless others with his characteristic wisdom, kindness, and integrity.

But in the community of southeastern Massachusetts, he was much more than this. He was the preeminent citizen of the city of New Bedford. Through the paper he edited and the respect in which he was held, he had profound influence in his community, and he dedicated that influence to the civic betterment. He was a guiding force in the charities and the educational activities of New Bedford. He helped to encourage the New Bedford Symphony Orchestra. He helped to bring professional football to New Bedford. And he worked hard to make the Industrial Development League of that city a success. Indeed a good share of the progress New Bedford has made in recent years in industrial recovery and economic and civic progress can be traced to the leadership and influence of Charles Lewin.

I also know what a very strong and loyal friend Mr. Lewin was to President Kennedy and how highly the President valued his friendship and advice. I was fortunate to share that friendship. I can think of many occasions on which Mr. Lewin would contact me to ask assistance in a matter in which New Bedford was interested—or to participate in a community event. I always knew if Mr. Lewin felt it was important, it was, because it was in the interest of people in his area.

Charles J. Lewin will be greatly missed but the example he set—of sound professional journalism and dedication to the highest aims of the community will be an aspiration to all who knew him for years to come.

THE CAPITAL GAINS TAX

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, last year the New York Stock Exchange asked Louis Harris Associates, Inc., to undertake a survey to ascertain the economic effects of a reduction of the capital gains tax. The study found that a reduction would benefit the American economy by releasing for reinvestment billions of dollars of capital and would result in a substantial increase in Federal revenues.

It would seem, on the basis of this study, that a capital gains tax cut might be the best stimulus to continue the economy's present upward movement without additional long-term cost to the Federal Treasury. I suggest, therefore, that the Secretary of the Treasury and the appropriate committees of Congress seriously consider legislation to reduce the capital gains tax.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report on the Harris study be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A reduction in the capital gains tax rate would unlock billions of dollars of capital for reinvestment and substantially increase Federal revenues at the same time, the New York Stock Exchange said in a research study released today (November 4, 1965).

The new survey was conducted for the exchange by Louis Harris Associates, Inc., updating an earlier study made in 1960.

"The new data show that investors regard themselves more tightly locked in with their holdings in 1965 than in 1960," the study found.

From 1960 to the end of 1964, the study noted, total individual stockholdings increased by 50 percent to an estimated $387 billion, while total unrealized capital appreciation probably more than doubled to over $208 billion.

Lowering the maximum capital gains tax rate to 20 percent from the current 25 percent, the study found, would prompt investors with locked-in gains to release substantial amounts of capital for reinvestment.

> A reduction to 12.5 percent "would produce still more dramatic unlocking of capital," the report declared.
>
> The survey also found that these reductions would stimulate the flow of capital—after the initial investor response—to a consistently higher degree than at present.
>
> The study estimates the impact of a reduction of 5 percentage points in the capital gains tax to a maximum tax of 20 percent as follows:
>
> The market value of all sales of securities by investors would jump to $23 billion from $10.3 billion.
>
> Total capital appreciation of $10 billion would thereby become subject to the lower capital gains tax—more than three times as much as under the present rate.
>
> Nearly $13 billion more of capital would be freed for reinvestment.
>
> The U.S. Treasury would receive an estimated $700 million more than under present rates.
>
> The estimated impact of reducing the maximum capital gains tax rate to 12.5 percent would be:
>
> Sales of securities by individuals would increase to $67.3 billion.
>
> Total capital appreciation of $29.2 billion would thereby become subject to the lower capital gains tax.
>
> Some $57 billion more of capital would be freed for reinvestment than under present rates.
>
> The Treasury would receive an estimated $2 billion more than under present rates.
>
> Examining the long-range implications of a reduction in the capital gains tax, the study found:
>
> If the maximum tax rate were reduced to 20 percent, the ultimate leveling off of revenue to the Treasury would be more than one-quarter above present revenues.
>
> If the maximum tax rates were reduced to 12.5 percent, the ultimate leveling off of revenue to the Treasury would be nearly 75 percent more than present revenues.
>
> The Louis Harris survey reported that, during the course of interviews with investors, many of those questioned "felt strongly about being locked in with their present stockholdings," frequently regarding the capital gains tax as a key factor—along with the price level and outlook for a particular stock—in making any decisions to sell.
>
> Another recurrent attitude found in the interviews was that investors said they wished to reinvest their profits, indicating that a lower capital gains tax rate would provide the impetus for transferring part of their holdings into growth stocks.
>
> The survey findings were based on interviews with nearly 1,500 investors in 32 States and the District of Columbia.

L.B.J. INCONSISTENCY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD an excellent editorial, entitled "L.B.J. Inconsistency" which appeared in the Friday, January 14 issue of the Valley News, a daily newspaper published in Lebanon, N.H.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> ### L.B.J. INCONSISTENCY
>
> In the state of the Union message Wednesday evening, President Johnson within the same few minutes dwelt on the need for guaranteeing and enforcing civil rights and called for the repeal of 14(b) which allows States to have so-called right to work laws.
>
> It would seem to us that the most necessary civil rights should be the right to work, the right to refuse to join a union if a worker so chooses, without losing his job.
>
> Certainly one should have the right to join a union. Unions have played and must continue to play a vital role in labor-management relations, in securing and protecting rights and privileges for their members.
>
> But mandatory membership in a union if a worker is to continue in his job is a violation of a highly individual civil and human right—the right of a man to earn his and his family's daily bread.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the point is well made that the Federal Government should never deprive any State of the authority to take such steps as it deems necessary to preserve the civil and human rights of its people to have a full opportunity to earn their daily bread.

PROPOSED 25TH AMENDMENT IS MAKING PROGRESS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I would like to report to the Senate on the progress of the proposed 25th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

As you know, both the House and the Senate overwhelmingly approved the amendment, with more than 90 percent of the Members of each Chamber voting in favor of the proposal. The action of the Senate on July 6, 1965, sent the proposal to the several States for ratification.

The amendment would close existing serious loopholes in our fundamental law concerning the questions of presidential inability and vacancies in the Office of Vice President.

The amendment was submitted to the States at a time when relatively few were in session. And, because most State legislatures meet during odd-numbered years, it is not likely that the amendment will receive ratification by the necessary 38 States before the early months of 1967. Nonetheless, all of us who contributed to the amendment are gratified at the reception it has received thus far in the States.

Because of the many inquiries I have received on the progress of the amendment, I think it would be appropriate at this time to deliver this progress report to the Senate.

In 1965, 13 States ratified the amendment. They are, together with the dates of ratification: Nebraska, July 12; Wisconsin, July 13; Oklahoma, July 16; Massachusetts, August 9; Pennsylvania, August 15; Kentucky, September 15; Arizona, September 22; Michigan, October 5; Indiana, October 21; California, October 21; Arkansas, November 4; New Jersey, November 29; and Delaware, December 7. Yesterday, January 17, Utah became the 14th State to ratify the amendment, and the first in 1966.

The following State legislatures which have not yet ratified the amendment will meet in regular sessions this year: Alaska, Colorado, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Virginia, and West Virginia. Bar associations in 14 of those 15 States have endorsed the amendment.

States which may meet in special session in 1966 are Connecticut, Maine, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Vermont. Bar associations in four of those five States have endorsed the amendment, but only two of the States—Maine and Vermont—are known at this time to be considering action on the amendment should they meet in special session.

The remaining 16 States are not expected to meet before 1967. Bar associations in 11 of these 16 States have endorsed the amendment.

I would like at this time to express my gratitude to the American Bar Association which, in cooperation with the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, has been spending a great deal of time and effort to bring this amendment to the attention of lawyers and the general public and to answer questions about how the amendment, when ratified, will operate.

When the amendment becomes part of the Constitution of the United States, we will have greatly lessened the possibility of confusion, uncertainty and chaos among our people, should tragedy ever again strike those in executive leadership of our Nation.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT G. DUNPHY AS SERGEANT AT ARMS OF THE SENATE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the nomination and subsequent confirmation by the Senate of Robert G. Dunphy as Sergeant at Arms is an action which confirms a fact which we have all long known, that Bob Dunphy is a capable and efficient public servant. More importantly, he has the affection and respect of all of us who know him, either officially or personally.

My immediate predecessor in office, Senator Theodore Francis Green, together with my senior colleague, Senator PASTORE, sponsored Bob Dunphy as Deputy Sergeant at Arms in 1955. I am sure, too, that Senator Green is most pleased and proud by the recent action of the Senate. And as a Rhode Islander, I can only express the pride which our State feels in having one of its native sons in such a position of trust and responsibility.

Twelve years as deputy to the very capable Joseph C. Duke, whom we shall all miss, eminently qualifies Bob Dunphy for his present post.

When I first came to the Senate, I was helped immensely by Bob Dunphy, who gave much time and effort in helping my staff and myself settle into office. I know that his sister Helen, who worked on my staff, and contributed so much to it when I first came to the Senate must be very proud of her brother, as are we all.

I extend to Bob Dunphy my hearty congratulations and best wishes for a long tenure.

INFLATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, anticipating that the President's budget for fiscal 1967, which we now expect will be presented to the Congress early next week, would start a discussion of inflation, I asked the staff economist of the Banking and Currency Committee last week to prepare for me a definition of inflation. And, since some claim that the creeping inflation which always accompanies the type of business expansion we have enjoyed for the past 10 years, is a price that the Nation can afford to pay for economic growth, I asked Dr. Woodlief Thomas of our committee staff to indicate the difference, in his opinion, between creeping inflation and what all admit is harmful inflation. This is what he wrote:

> Inflation may be defined as a rise in the general level of prices of goods and services resulting from an expansion in the volume and use of money in excess of expansion in the volume of goods and services available for purchase.
>
> Sometimes inflation is defined simply as a rise in the general level of prices. Or it may be defined as expansion in money in excess of expansion in the volume of goods and services. Presumably neither one of these conditions can exist without the other.
>
> Creeping inflation may be defined as a slow process of monetary expansion in excess of production, probably, but not necessarily, accompanied by a moderate rise in prices. In other words, creeping inflation is the gradual building up of the elements of inflation, which if continued will lead to a breakout of active inflation.
>
> Harmful inflation may be said to occur when the processes of inflation become cumulative and self-induced. This takes place when prices rise so fast that the supply of money is not adequate to meet demands for current transactions. Not only is more money being issued but also the turnover of existing money accelerates because no one wants to hold the rapidly depreciating currency and shifts as quickly as possible into other assets that are rising in price. Inflation of this sort generally ends in a disastrous breakdown of the entire monetary system of the country.

In this week's issue of U.S. News & World Report I find an interesting article entitled "How Real Is Inflation in the United States?" That article shows that in the past 10 years, the purchasing power of our dollar has depreciated 15 percent and the article states that in the eyes of the Government planners that is price stability, not real inflation. Yet, the article goes on to point out what even that percentage of inflation—and certainly we may reasonably expect it to increase—means to the millions who buy bonds. One illustration is a 10-year E-bond that had a rated interest of 3¼ percent but inflation reduced the actual yield to 1½ percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, the full text of that article on inflation from U.S. News & World Report. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed, following that article, an editorial from the January 15, 1966, issue of Business Week entitled "Guidelines Won't Do It Alone."

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report]

HOW REAL IS INFLATION IN THE UNITED STATES?

(NOTE.—Prices of just about everything keep creeping higher—despite official assurance that the United States enjoys price stability. Your dollar today is worth only 85 cents in terms of what it would buy 10 years ago. It's an erosion that's still going on.)

People are starting to grumble about the higher cost of living, about how little a dollar will buy.

A pound of pork chops or of beefsteak now typically costs more than a dollar. The dollar will buy only four or five loaves of bread. A $20 bill no longer goes very far in the grocery store.

Shoes for the children as they started to school last autumn cost more than did shoes the year before. The same was true of many items of clothing.

Each year it seems to take more dollars to pay the rent. Yet building a home of your own doesn't seem to offer a way out, because the price of borrowed money is higher, and building costs keep going up.

ALARMING COSTS

The way medical costs are rising frightens many people. A semiprivate room in a hospital, on the average, costs $27 a day, nearly double the $15 rate of 10 years ago.

The cost of sending a youngster to college already is alarmingly high, and keeps climbing year by year.

There's a sharp new rise underway in the price of automobile insurance. Part of the reason for that rise is the steady increase in the cost of getting a damaged car repaired.

The dollar lacks the buying power in many fields that it had only a short time ago. All the while, however, officials insist that there is no real inflation in the United States, or at most only creeping inflation. The official claim is that prices, overall, have been stable and that the Government is determined to maintain stability.

But can this creeping inflation be real inflation? What if the rate of "creep" speeds up, as it is doing right now?

WHAT IS STABILITY?

In the eyes of Government planners, an upward creep of about 1.6 percent a year—the average rise in all consumer prices since 1955—is stability, not real inflation.

Yet a rise of that amount becomes very real to millions of pensioners and others who must live on fixed incomes. It becomes real enough to the millions who buy U.S. savings bonds and find that the purchasing power they expected to get back from the dollars they invested has tended to creep away.

People of all classes who buy bonds, put money in savings accounts, lend on mortgages or make personal loans find that creeping inflation is a hard fact over a period of years as it eats away at the value of the dollars that are paid back.

By the same token, debtors have the satisfaction of knowing that as prices creep upward under so-called stability, they are able to pay back their debts in dollars of lower value than those they borrowed. As the years go by in a period of creeping inflation, the return in the form of interest tends to be eroded.

WHERE IT HURTS

Consider the man who bought a $100 savings bond in January 1956, for $75. Over the 10 years that he has held the bond, he has earned an average of 3¼ percent interest a year, or a total of $28.08. Thus he can redeem his bond for $103.08.

But the upward creep of prices since 1956 has made his dollars worth less than they were worth 10 years ago. The money he gets for his bond will now buy goods and services that would have cost only $86.91 in 1956. So, in terms of real spending power, the bond has earned an average of only 1½ percent interest a year, or $11.91 over the 10-year period.

EROSION OF DOLLAR

Charts on these pages give you other examples of the effect of creeping inflation in a period of so-called price stability between 1955 and 1965. You can see what price increases did to the dollar's purchasing power in terms of overall costs of living, and in terms of some of the more common things people buy.

If the dollar of 1955 is taken as worth 100 cents, then the dollar of 1965 and early 1966, after 10 years of creeping inflation, is an 85-cent dollar, not a 100-cent dollar. In that period, 15 cents has been eaten away by inflation.

Look at what has happened to prices of goods and services in typical cities across the United States in the past 10 years:

A man's haircut in a union barbershop in San Francisco cost $1.50 in late 1955. Now the price is $2.50.

The doctor in San Francisco who charged $175 for an appendectomy in late 1955 now bills his patient for $300. A woman's coat that cost $60 at a San Francisco shop 10 years ago now is tagged $108.

In Chicago, a 4-mile taxi ride that cost $1.15 in 1955 now carries a tab of $1.60.

Milk at one food chain in Chicago sells today for 26 cents a quart, up from 20 cents a decade ago, and bacon is 89 cents a pound, compared with 39 cents a pound in 1955.

The restaurant dinner that brought a check for $6 to the Chicago diner-out 10 years ago now costs $7.50 to $8.

An automobile dealer in Washington, D.C., reports that he now charges $28.95 for a major tuneup on an eight-cylinder car. Ten years ago, his bill was about $24 for a similar job.

PRICES THAT ARE DOWN

There are a few exceptions to the general upward climb in prices. Typical household appliances such as refrigerators, washing machines and TV sets sell for less than they did 10 years ago. The reason is that a vast increase in sales volume has spurred competition and brought reductions in manufacturing expenses.

Prices on new cars have not risen as sharply as consumer prices in general.

Some farm products, notably chickens and eggs, are selling at lower prices now than 10 years ago. Some imported commodities—coffee and bananas, for example—also cost about the same, on the average, as in 1955, or less.

Still, the overall trend of prices has followed a steady upward track, and lately the erosion of the dollar has been speeding up.

Just in the past few weeks, some of the country's leading economists have warned that the U.S. economy is on the point of overheating, that the threat of a step-up in the rate of inflation is greater now than at any time since the Korean war period of the early 1950's.

OUTLOOK FOR 1975

Look ahead 10 years, to 1975. It's a safe assumption, based on what's happened in the past, that today's dollar will then be worth only about 70 cents, or less.

Experience with the creeping inflation of the past, and prospects for the future, can have great meaning for all people—for persons now retired, for young people getting started, for families with children to send to college later, for savers and investors, for those going into debt, for businessmen.

The wage earner or the man on salary usually can expect to see his yearly earnings rise more than enough to offset any creeping rate of inflation.

The typical factory worker, for example, has had a rise of more than 40 percent in hourly earnings in the past 10 years—far higher than the rise in consumer prices.

But in planning for retirement, today's workers need to give thought to the way the value of pension dollars—usually payable in a fixed amount—will tend to shrink as the price level rises.

RISE OF TUITION

The young couple, saving for the time when children will be going to college, needs to make sure that a margin for safety is included in savings that are set aside today to be drawn on later.

Many a family that managed in recent years to save $4,000 or $5,000 to see a child through college has been shocked to find that the money is not much more than enough to pay for a single year's college or university expenses, counting tuition, board and room, and miscellaneous items.

The investor who is laying money aside today to be drawn on in years ahead needs to decide whether his investments should not provide some chance for growth of capital, over and above an annual yield in the form of dividends or interest.

In general, any investment that returns a fixed number of dollars is likely to see the value of its yield eroded as the dollar declines in buying power. That is the case with interest paid on bonds, with cash in a savings account, with interest return on a mortgage.

By contrast, investments that have some prospect of growing in value offer chances to outdistance the tendency of dollars to depreciate over a period of years. For example, common stocks of sound, well-managed companies have been a good hedge against inflation in years past. But it's important to pick the right stocks. Not all stocks go up in value, even in a bull market.

Mutual funds or other investment companies that own shares in a wide range of industries generally in the past have offered a better-than-average return for the small investor.

PROBLEM OF HEDGING

Owners of homes, and of other well-located real estate, generally have found the value of their property rising faster, over the years, than the overall price level. Even so, property is not a foolproof hedge if it has to be sold in a hurry.

No one can count on escaping the effects of inflation. But the man who is aware of how the dollar has tended to lose buying power, even during relative stability, can take steps to try to protect his income and his savings.

In the last 10 years—

Your food dollar has lost 15 cents, now it's an 85-cent dollar.

Your rent dollar has lost 13 cents, now it's an 87-cent dollar.

Your apparel dollar has lost 7 cents, now it's a 93-cent dollar.

Your medical-care dollar has lost 27 cents, now it's a 73-cent dollar.

Your transportation dollar has lost 18 cents, now it's an 82-cent dollar.

Your homebuilding dollar has lost 20 cents, now it's an 80-cent dollar.

Your college-cost dollar has lost 24 cents, now it's a 76-cent dollar.

Your auto-repair dollar has lost 20 cents, now it's an 80-cent dollar.

Your auto-insurance dollar has lost 26 cents, now it's a 74-cent dollar. Basic data: U.S. Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

A sampling of what's happened to prices

[Average changes across the United States]

	10 years ago	Latest	Change (percent)
Loaf of bread	$0.18	$0.21	Up 17.
Round steak pound	.90	1.10	Up 22.
Bacon do	.66	1.06	Up 61.
Chicken do	.53	.39	Down 26.
Milk quart	.22	.25	Up 14.
Man's suit, wool	65.00	80.00	Up 23.
Woman's cotton housedress	10.00	11.00	Up 10.
Nylon stockings	.95	.88	Down 7.
Rug, wool	265.00	300.00	Up 13.
Refrigerator	225.00	150.00	Down 33.
Laundry, 10 pounds, finished	1.75	2.50	Up 43.
Doctor's fee, house visit	6.50	9.00	Up 38.
Hospital room, semiprivate	15.00	27.00	Up 80.
TV-set repair	12.00	14.00	Up 17.

Guidelines Won't Do It Alone

The rapid rise in the cost of the Vietnam war is relentlessly forcing the administration toward an agonizing reappraisal of the economic problems it faces.

Over the past decade, the principal threat to price stability was a rate of wage gains in excess of the rate of productivity gains. To deal with this continuing but relatively gentle inflationary push, the administration invented and refined a policy that was itself originally intended to be gentle: the wage-price guideposts. On the whole, this policy was successful in the situation for which it was designed.

The inflationary buildup that is now occurring is something totally different. For the first time since the early days of the Korean war, the United States is threatened by a classic inflation of the kind that occurs when total demand outruns available supply and drives prices up irresistibly.

The kind of self-restraint envisioned by the guidelines continues to have an important anti-inflationary role in the new situation. But the guidelines cannot be the chief safeguard against inflation in a period when the problem is a rapid buildup of demand rather than a slow rise in costs. Indeed, there is a danger that the guidelines are now having a pernicious effect: By restraining price increases for products that are in the spotlight, they may keep the public from realizing that we face a new situation that demands new and far more vigorous policies.

In an economy where demand is growing faster than supply, the guideposts actually have been transformed into an instrument of selective price control. First, strong Government pressure backed by the bludgeon of Federal stockpiles prevented price increases in aluminum, copper, and wheat. Then, last week, a deal between the steel industry and the White House almost halved an announced increase in the price of structural shapes.

All this may look good to the public, because it appears to be keeping prices down. But it has not solved any of the problems that have plagued selective price controls, at least since the days of the Roman Empire. It has not prevented price increases in uncontrolled areas. Nor has it checked the buildup of inflationary forces in the economy as a whole.

Even in copper, recent weeks have seen a sharp rise in the price of imports (p. 36). Over the past year, the wholesale price index for meat, poultry, and fish is up 17.4 percent over a year ago, hides and skins, up 39 percent, leather up 7.7 percent, shoes up 3.5 percent. There have been sharp increases in the cost of construction, and prices in the whole service sector have continued to increase—a trend that will intensify when medicare goes into effect in the latter half of this year.

In this situation, the appeal for self-restraint is not enough. The economy now is operating closer to effective capacity than at any time since the mid-1950's. Skilled labor shortages have become widespread and painful. Budget data and surveys of intentions point to record spending by Government, consumers, and business. The demand for credit is running far ahead of previous years.

CUTTING BACK DEMAND

In short, we now face a classic demand-pull inflation in which the aggregate demand of the economy is growing faster than goods and services can be made available to satisfy it.

The only way to deal with this kind of inflation is to adopt monetary and fiscal measures that will restrain the growth of demand:

The growth of the money supply must be held to a rate that approximately corresponds to the expected rate of growth in real output of goods and services. The money supply (including time deposits of commercial banks) has been expanding at a rate of about 8 percent a year. In the coming year, the Federal Reserve should plan to hold the growth to something on the order of 5 percent. Lately, the Fed has been trying to ease the impact of its move to a higher discount rate by supplying ample reserves to the commercial banks. Now that the holiday season is over, the appropriate target of monetary policy again is a negative free reserve position.

Federal spending for civilian purposes must be held to a practical minimum. High prosperity and labor shortages are in themselves potent weapons in the war against poverty. It should be possible to make a start toward many of the Great Society goals without undertaking major increases in spending.

Finally, if the Government finds that it cannot hold spending to levels that do not threaten to feed inflation, the administration must be prepared to grasp the nettle and recommend higher taxes.

The economic challenge that the administration faces today is the mirror image of the challenge that was presented in the early years of this decade. Then, the problem was to stimulate a stagnating economy; it was met by courageous, and at first unpopular, measures to increase demand. Now, the problem is to stabilize an economy threatened by overstimulation; it must be met by equally courageous, and even more unpopular, policies to restrain demand.

AN ALASKA POSTMASTER IS HONORED—CITATION OF MERIT IS CONFERRED ON "TONY" SCHWAMM OF ANCHORAGE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am happy to record that of the 14 postmasters in the Nation who are being honored this week with a citation of merit by Postmaster General O'Brien, one is from Alaska. He is George S. "Tony" Schwamm, the competent postmaster of Alaska's largest city, Anchorage.

The citation of merit is awarded because of the able way in which Postmaster Schwamm has carried out the President's natural beauty program by improving the appearance of the various post offices in his jurisdiction and their surrounding grounds.

Postmaster Schwamm is an outstanding Alaskan, a former World War II pilot who thereafter served with great ability as the head of the Territory's Department of Aeronautics. In that capacity he started a most effective airport construction program and built airfields which are still in use and have stood up under the wear and tear of service. He then became the manager of the International Airport at Anchorage, which, under his direction, became the air crossways of the Northern Hemisphere. It links the three great continents of that hemisphere. "Tony" Schwamm's dynamic leadership contributed substantially to this airport development. Today, the passengers from Europe and Asia have the opportunity to stop off at Anchorage and enjoy the outstanding scenic beauties of the last frontier.

It is a pleasure to salute "Tony" Schwamm for his outstanding performance in every position that he has occupied, and to congratulate Postmaster General Larry O'Brien for making this award.

EXPORT CONTROLS ON BLACK WALNUT LOGS

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the question of whether export controls should or should not be imposed on black walnut logs has been debated on Capitol Hill and in the appropriate downtown agencies for nearly 3½ years. The Department of Commerce did, in fact, impose controls between February 1964, and February 1965, when they were terminated.

On October 28, 1965, Mr. E. E. Freeman, Jr., president of the George E. Tomlinson Co., Winchester, Ky., presented a paper to the Ohio Valley section of the Forest Products Research Society on "Why Export Controls Are Not the Answer to the Walnut Conservation Problem."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Freeman's excellent presentation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the treatise was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY EXPORT CONTROLS ARE NOT THE ANSWER TO THE WALNUT CONSERVATION PROBLEM

(By E. E. Freeman, Jr.)

SUMMARY

The statistics on the growth and drain of walnut are extremely unreliable since this species accounts for such a small percentage of the total hardwood stands in the United States. Sampling errors are large as a result of the low volumes per acre and the scattered occurrence of the species. Log grades used in the U.S. Forest Service inventories, while suitable for most hardwoods, are almost meaningless for walnut due to length specifications and other requirements. Information on veneer log growth outside the Central States and in noncommercial forest areas is very limited.

Export controls were placed on walnut logs for a trial period of 1 year and they failed. Walnut consumption during the period of export controls was understated due to several factors, and it is possible that consumption of the highest quality walnut veneer logs reached its peak during the control period. Export controls were inequitable and difficult to administer. Reported log consumption during controls exceeded growth by approximately two-thirds, and domestic consumption was expanded rapidly at the end of the control period as new mills started operation and the furniture trade increased its acceptance and use of thinner veneers.

The answer to the problem lies in growing more walnut of higher quality and growing it faster. The use of other hardwood species and thinner veneers must increase in the coming years. Accelerated walnut forestry offers a unique opportunity for walnut manufacturers and forest-related agencies of the State and Federal Governments to combine in the best long-range interest of the wood industry.

INTRODUCTION

Walnut is our most popular fine hardwood, and there is little reasonable doubt that the best walnut timber is being consumed at a rate in excess of its annual growth. Although the extent of the problem is open to some question, continued consumption at present levels is likely to cause a supply problem in the future. The problem is not new, and the same problem exists with many other choice native hardwoods. The trends continue toward lower quality timber and greater demand. The program today on walnut is particularly important since what happens to walnut may happen to all of our most choice native hardwoods in the years to come.

All of us associated with the fine wood are interested in a long-term solution to the problem that will result in ample fine quality walnut for future generations. Personally, I feel that we cannot ask the Government to solve this problem for us, but rather it must be a joint effort among timber growers, veneer and lumber manufacturers, exporters, furniture manufacturers, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The solution should be based on the maximum allowable amount of individual freedom and on a competitive market in which supply and demand are the controlling factors. Statistical survey procedures related to walnut timber should be refined and improved. A solution to the problem should meet the needs of the ultimate consumer at the lowest possible cost.

THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

In 1960 domestic walnut veneer manufacturers became seriously concerned with finding a means of stopping or reducing the export of walnut logs. In this year, statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce indicated that approximately 10.2 million board feet of walnut logs of all classes were exported, equalling about 58 percent of the total walnut veneer logs consumed by the domestic walnut industry. After a steady decline of over 20 years, the demand for walnut products in the United States started rising in 1956, recently reaching its peak. With record domestic and export demand, there has been a fairly rapid ascendancy in prices and a possible (but less easily determined) decrease in average log quality.

The American Walnut Manufacturers Association exerted substantial pressure on the U.S. Department of Commerce to act under the short supply provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949 and place export controls on shipments of walnut logs abroad. Their work to this end was effective, and the export of walnut logs was under Federal control from February 14, 1964, to February 13, 1965.

To the domestic walnut veneer manufacturer, there are two natural objectives to be achieved by the reimposition of export control on logs. The first is an immediate economic objective of maintaining or increasing profits through the lessening of competition for logs. The second objective is to conserve good quality walnut logs so that there will be a perpetual supply of this timber available. Conservation is the only important area of concern to the public. Unless export controls will solve the conservation problem, they have no place of value in our economy.

There are still quite a few unanswered questions about the true nature of the walnut problem. On September 22, 1965, Secretary of Commerce Connor said, "Predicated on the U.S. Forest Service estimate of veneer grade walnut logs in our land classified as commercial forest and assuming current rates of consumption, there exists a 10- to 11-year supply in the United States. The extension of an annual export quota of 7.3 million board feet would not prevent ultimate exhaustion of walnut reserves since current domestic consumption alone exceeds estimated domestic growth on lands classified as commercial forest."

BACKGROUND RELATED TO THE PREVIOUS EXPORT CONTROLS

On February 14, 1964, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges placed short supply controls on exports of black walnut logs for a trial period of 1 year because a curb on exports could not achieve any meaningful conservation without a concurrent reduction in domestic consumption. Secretary Hodges expressly conditioned the export controls on a voluntary reduction in domestic consumption to approximately 15 million board feet during the trial period, February 1964 to February 1965. At the end of the trial period, annual domestic consumption was more than 25 percent in excess of the desired goal. Against this background, Secretary of Commerce John Connor announced on February 12, 1965, his decision not to extend the duration of the controls. On March 2, 1965, after examining once more the basic facts and arguments, he reaffirmed his decision of February 12, 1965.

At the request of the Commerce Committee of the U.S. Senate, the Department of Commerce kept the decision regarding log export controls under careful review. On September 22, 1965, Secretary Connor again reaffirmed his decision of February 12, 1965. His statement was approximately 1,000 words, but I will quote some of his comments:

"It is our judgment that a significant portion of this increased export activity during recent months has been prompted by the uncertainty as to whether export controls might be reimposed, particularly in view of the hearings of the Senate Commerce Committee as well as the announced reconsideration of my original decision."

"We have received confirmation from representatives of the domestic veneer and furniture industries that it is not possible in the foreseeable future to achieve any significant reduction in the domestic consumption through voluntary use of one thirty-sixth of an inch veneer.

"I am convinced that no meaningful conservation can be achieved without controlling domestic consumption of walnut logs.

"It is quite clear that our long-term forecasts as to rate of depletion of walnut resources are not and cannot be regarded as clearly reliable.

"With respect to the growers or producers of walnut logs, it is clear that the use of the export controls is contrary to their economic interests because of reduced demand and the depressant effect on the prices they can obtain for the logs.

"No meaningful conservation measure can be achieved without controlling domestic consumption and any export control measure adopted under the misconception that export control alone is sufficient would only delay our squarely facing the issue. I do not have the legal authority to impose regulations on domestic consumption, and voluntary control of domestic consumption does not appear feasible in the foreseeable future."

During the 1 year of controls there was an excess of consumption over growth exceeding 10 billion board feet, or approximately two-thirds more than the total amount of new growth estimated by the Forest Service. Had it not been for delays in starting new mills and temporary slowdowns in domestic veneer sales and production due to problems between veneer manufacturers and furniture buyers caused by thickness changes, the domestic log consumption in 1964 might have exceeded the previous year. Domestic veneer manufacturing increased substantially in the fourth quarter of 1964, as new manufacturers started production. The productive capacity of walnut veneer mills starting or increasing walnut production in the United States during the period of controls exceeded the footage reduction imposed on exporters of walnut logs.

Within the limits of the available statistics it appears that exports were cut back 51 percent while domestic consumption dropped 21 percent. It is obvious that the imposition of export controls in the absence of any effective domestic control was an inequitable situation for American exporters. Both furniture manufacturers and exporters were upset when they learned that there were no limitations on the export of walnut veneer in 1964. Government statistics reveal that the logs used for uncontrolled veneer exports were equal to about 25 percent of the total 1964 export log quota. This consumption would have been substantially larger, except for the time lag necessary to develop this new business and start new veneer mills in this country.

Although the figures on walnut veneer consumption in 1964 appear factual, in reality they are unsound and misleading. Several things happened that worked to defeat the conservation objectives of the controls. Since exporters were sharply curtailed in the volume that could be exported, they shifted to exporting only the best logs from the best areas. Log buyers have reported cases where portions of good veneer quality logs were left in the woods to decay or rot. For example, a veneer log 12 feet in length with a knot on one side might be cut off with a saw and exported as an 8-foot log to increase log quality while abiding by the restrictions of the export regulations. The portion remaining in the woods does not show in any consumption figures, but it was "consumed" without resulting in a useful product.

Export controls and the voluntary domestic controls were based on Doyle Scale log measurement. A 1-inch reduction in Doyle Scale measurement is often equivalent to 20- to 25-percent reduction in footage. Since there are no industry-accepted standard ways of measuring logs and the Department of Commerce chose not to control this aspect, it is logical to believe that much of the reduced conservation in 1964 was only "paper" conservation rather than a real reduction in wood volume consumed.

In years before the controls, walnut lumber logs and burls, as well as veneer logs, were exported. A steady volume of west coast Clara walnut was exported. All walnut exports in years prior to controls were considered to be veneer quality in the Forest Service statistical presentation. The fact that this was incorrect has caused an improper picture to be painted. If we count as 1964 consumption the parts of logs left in the woods, the logs consumed but not reported due to changes in measuring techniques, and the shift from low quality veneer logs and lumber logs to high quality veneer logs, it is very probable that there was a greater consumption of high quality veneer logs in 1964 than in any previous year.

To get a clearer perspective of the inequitable situation that existed for exporters in 1964, I will refer to the problems created for our company. The George E. Tomlinson Co. is one of the largest producers of quality walnut lumber, with a band mill in Winchester, Ky. Due to our location, most of our logs are bought in competition with veneer manufacturers from Indiana and surrounding States. Logs of both veneer and lumber quality must be bought together, and since we do not manufacture veneer it was impossible to compete successfully on good quality logs until we developed an export market. Within about 4 years after developing an export market we were able to increase our total employment from 25 to 60 people, triple our walnut lumber production, build a new walnut lumber sawmill, and increase substantially our total operations and profits.

The imposition of export controls on walnut logs came to us as a complete surprise since we did not know that the Department of Commerce had been holding hearings with the American Walnut Manufacturers Association in months immediately preceding the imposition of controls. Because the exporters were relatively disorganized and had little effective representation in Washington, it is my feeling that the controls were applied on the basis of a one-sided presentation of the facts of the matter. Many American log exporters were disappointed because the control provisions allowed foreign buyers to control a substantial percentage of the total export licenses. Because of the definition of the term "exporters," many American export firms were bypassed. This allowed foreign buyers holding quotas to profit without making any effort or economic contribution, while many American suffered from the restrictive or monopoly effects of the situation. The U.S. Treasury lost, too, since these foreign buyers paid income taxes abroad on profits that American exporters would have paid in the United States.

Since our company's exports had grown more rapidly than total log exports during the base period, the method of establishing export quotas reduced our veneer log exports to less than 30 percent of the volume we were exporting immediately prior to the controls. Logs could not be shipped after February 13, 1964, without an export license, but there was a delay of several months before licenses were issued. During this period, we lost thousands of dollars on log demurrage and a larger but undetermined amount of loss was absorbed by our customer due to stain and splitting of logs delayed in transit.

Since our company needed to buy veneer logs to compete in our trading area, abstract arguments became very real to us. At the time of export controls, we had over one-half million feet of walnut sawmill logs on our yard in Winchester. We had a brand new mill in which we invested substantially and which needed a regular log supply in order to keep our people at work. Export controls made us noncompetitive after a reduced volume of logs was purchased, so within 4 months we found it necessary to discharge six of our log buyers working in Applachian areas and other areas where needed but less desirable logs were produced. By August, the inventory of walnut logs for our sawmill was zero, and our production went to a part-time basis. Our log buying territory was switched almost entirely to the Central States, abandoning east Kentucky, Virginia, West Virginia, and most of Tennessee.

While the people at the office of export control did the best possible job of administering the control program, they were generally not in favor of the program because of its inequities. They soon found that it was impossible to effectively and equitably control walnut log exports and they had doubts as to the effectiveness of the program for conservation.

For a short period after controls, domestic veneer manufacturers had reduced business because of difficulties in selling thinner veneer. As thicker veneer inventories dwindled, this problem largely was overcome and business as normal resumed. It was reported to me during the fall of 1964 that many Indiana veneer mills were operating on an overtime basis with full log yards and substantial profits. Since our mill was shut down much of the time due to the results of the export controls, we were very vexed at this condition. We were even more disturbed when our observations indicated that there was no substantial change in the growth-drain pattern of the walnut supply.

Most exporters have many customers, but our company supplies the walnut needs for one European veneer manufacturer. This customer was cut back to less than 30 percent of his required walnut log volume, and he had to reduce employment and suffer a financial burden by this control program. During this time one of the large U.S. veneer manufacturers wrote our customer and other foreign veneer firms offering to sell them walnut veneer logs. The sales agreement required cutting these logs into veneer for the foreign market at their American mill, with the veneer to be exported. Similar situations multiplied rapidly, further limiting possibilities for effective conservation.

It is my opinion that during the period of export controls there was questionable conservation and that the major result was a Government allocation of profits through the licensing provisions of the U.S. Department of Commerce. On the positive side, much good was accomplished by publicizing the need for an effective walnut reforestation program.

Another positive result of the export controls has been the shift to thinner veneers on walnut and other fine hardwoods. The use of thinner veneers is absolutely necessary to conserve such a valuable species, and the practicality of this has been proven by European use of one-fiftieth-inch walnut veneer for several years. An inequity to exporters and farmers has been ended. The cost of the control program was high, both in consideration of the salaries of people involved in Washington and the time and money spent by companies to meet the needed regulations. I feel that the return to a free market has set in motion certain patterns that ultimately will solve the problem.

THE CASE FOR UNCONTROLLED WALNUT EXPORTS

The use of Federal power to control the prices and allocate the consumption of walnut logs establishes a dangerous precedent. It is logical to ask questions such as, What effect does this policy have on the overall export program of the United States? How does this program affect our trade relations with other countries under the GATT? Is limiting of competition and allocation of profits to a small sector of the economy in the best interest of a free competitive society? If the Government controls exports of walnut logs, will they not soon be controlling the exports of other species such as Douglas-fir, cherry, maple, white oak, pecan, and gum? If our Government places controls on the export of walnut logs, is it not reasonable to expect governments of other countries to place higher duties or restrictions on American exports of commodities such as tobacco, furniture, and feed grains? Is the cost of bureaucratic restrictions on exports greater than the positive results obtained from such controls?

If the problem is conservation, obvious steps must be taken. Certainly, the natural reaction to higher prices has been demonstrated. If the problem is competition, the farmer should reap the gain. If the problem is taste or fad, the public will change that quickly enough.

The net result of export controls was to reduce the market for veneer logs in the southern and eastern parts of the commercial range of this species. At the same time, competition was increased in the Central States for the logs of higher quality. On medium- and low-quality walnut veneer logs, the farmers, and loggers in the Central States and other areas lost their export outlets and found themselves at the mercy of the domestic veneer manufacturers.

The Department of Commerce has an obligation to look at the total trade picture of the United States, and not just circumstances that relate to the export of walnut logs. The export market has to be serviced and handled much like the domestic market. Once customers are developed for U.S. products, these customers must be respected just as customers in the United States are respected. It is not reasonable to subject them to the type of pressures that we have had in the past 2 years without expecting that this will adversely affect our total trade picture.

The total consumption of walnut timber in the United States is estimated at 150 million board feet annually. It is important that this timber be placed in products giving the highest value. Under controls, many logs of lower veneer quality were sawn into lumber. This amounts to substantial waste and is the antithesis of conservation. During the control period our own mill sawed into lumber some logs of a type that had previously been exported for veneer purposes. Figures gathered by the Department of Commerce do not reflect this, and it is again obvious that the conservation picture under controls is less satisfactory than painted by the official statistics.

Now that free competition has again become the order of the day, U.S. firms are finally making a more substantial effort to compete with Europeans in the sale of walnut veneer on the European market. Their success is reflected in figures showing that exports of walnut veneer have been increasing rapidly over the last 2 years.

WALNUT GROWTH AND DRAIN—THE STATISTICAL JUNGLE

A very small percentage of our total hardwood resource is walnut. At the time of export controls the only U.S. Forest Service surveys classifying walnut separately were in the Central States. Sampling errors on walnut are large as a result of the low volumes per acre and the scattered occurrence of this species. This is especially true for the estimates of veneer quality material. Only walnut occurring in areas classified as commercial forest land was included in the walnut statistics for the Central States.

According to current statistics of the U.S. Forest Service, the present volume of walnut timber is greater than it was at the end of World War II. The truth of the matter is that no one has enough information to make a reasonably accurate estimate of the number of walnut trees (in particular, trees of veneer quality) now standing in the United States. A long-range forecast cannot be made for walnut to standards of reliability expected in other species. An additional complication is the fact that Forest Service grades do not fit walnut veneer logs. In many cases, the best export veneer logs would be graded as low quality lumber logs under the Forest Service grades because of length and other requirements of the grade.

The Forest Service statistics assume that all exports of walnut are veneer quality logs. However, the Bureau of the Census figures on walnut log exports also include lumber logs and west coast walnut logs and root stock. In 1963 I saw at Norfolk, Va., substantial quantities of walnut lumber logs ready for export. I am acquainted with Italian buyers in California who have been exporting logs there for 8 to 10 years. Since the end of controls those nonveneer log exports have resumed. To this extent, the consumption of walnut veneer logs is overstated, and the inventory is understated.

Although it is generally agreed that figures on walnut veneer log growth and drain in the Central States do not show the entire picture, an even bigger question mark occurs in such States as Kansas, Virginia, Tennessee, Maryland, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, and North Carolina. In projecting walnut veneer log growth and drain, the Forest Service made the assumption that all logs in grade No. 1 and grade No. 2 trees 15 inches and larger diameter at breast height were veneer quality in the Central States, but only 10 percent to 15 percent in all other regions. Other figures provided by the Central States Forest Experiment Station refute this assumption.

In Department of Agriculture Bulletin No. 909, the most complete study ever made of the species, an estimate was made that 46 percent of the standing walnut 12 inches and over grows outside of the Central States. In 1960, 46.5 percent of the stratified nuts distributed under the tree planting program were sent outside of the Central States. The Central States Forest Experiment Station Technical Paper No. 189, dated May 1962, showed that (converted to Doyle Scale) approximately 16 million board feet of walnut veneer logs were produced in the Central States. The total commercial drain in 1960, again quoting Central States Forest Experiment Station figures, was approximately 28 million board feet. By simple arithmetic, it is evident from the Forest Service figures that approximately 43 percent of walnut veneer log production in 1960 was outside the Central States.

Further confusing the statistical picture during controls was the fact that reporting procedures were not uniform for exporters or for domestic veneer producers. Early in the control phase, a member of the American Walnut Manufacturers Association told me that an adjustment for veneer backing boards was allowed in domestic veneer log consumption calculations. The effect of this, of course, would be to show domestic consumption at much less than the true picture. With no uniform instructions regarding the measurements of logs, I have been told that many exporters and domestic producers changed to measuring logs the narrow way, reducing 15 percent to 25 percent the footage reported over previous measurement practices. I understand further that procedures varied in reporting lumber logs that were found to contain veneer flitches at the saw, as well as logs that were partial veneer quality with part of the log going into lumber.

It is of interest to look further at some figures used by the U.S. Department of Commerce (growing on commercial forest lands, only) as a basis for controls. They are as follows:

[Million board feet, Doyle scale]

	Timber volume at the start of year	Growth and ingrowth during year
1954	213.00	15.71
1963	213.59	15.81

In 1965, the figures for 1963 were revised upwards approximately 30 percent.

VENEER THICKNESSES—FACTS AND FANCIES

Under the Export Control Act of 1949, restrictions could not be placed on the export of walnut logs unless a reduction in consumption could also be shown for the domestic walnut veneer industry. Secretary of Commerce Hodges accepted a suggestion that the domestic industry voluntarily reduce the thickness of walnut veneers from one-twenty-eighth inch to one-thirty-sixth inch. It is my understanding that Secretary Hodges assumed that 28 sheets of veneer then were being cut to the inch and after controls 36 sheets would be cut for each inch. This would stretch the yield from each inch of walnut veneer sliced by eight-twenty-eighths, or approximately 29 percent. With 29 percent more veneer produced from each log in the United States, the domestic industry should have little trouble continuing to supply its customers while conserving a valuable natural resource.

The true picture on walnut veneer thicknesses is somewhat different than that presented to the Department of Commerce. Prior to controls, veneer was one-twenty-eighth inch nominal thickness, and the actual dry measurement generally averaged from one-thirtieth inch to one-thirty-second inch. After controls, some manufacturers did not change their veneer thickness. The majority changed to producing thinner veneer, but it could not be called one-thirty-sixth-inch veneer on a basis comparable to the prior one-twenty-eighth-inch veneer. The gambit by which the thinner veneer was reported by many domestic veneer manufacturers was to set a minimum dry thickness of one-thirty-sixth of an inch. The average dry thickness was generally one-thirty-fourth of an inch. The usual average green thickness of veneers before controls was in a narrow range, averaging about .033 inch. After controls, it was often .030 to .031 inch, increasing yield about 9 percent rather than 29 percent. On this basis alone, a reduction in domestic walnut veneer log consumption to the target figure was doomed.

The domestic veneer manufacturers have made much of the lower wage rates in Europe, but the fact is that the added cost of transporting bulky logs all the way from the United States to Europe more than offsets the differential labor rates. Europeans can pay more for good walnut logs because they do a better job of production and marketing, utilizing the skills necessary to make high quality furniture from thinner veneers.

The standard dry thickness of walnut veneer now being cut in the United States is between one-thirty-fourth- and one-thirty-sixth-inch dry measurement. The standard in Germany and Italy is one-fifty-one of an inch. Furniture quality in Europe equals or exceeds the quality manufactured in the United States. By the difference in veneer thickness alone, the European manufacturers get approximately 30 percent more yield out of each log. It is no wonder that they can pay higher prices for the best logs when they can do this and sell the veneer at prices based on surface measurement that equal or exceed American prices.

Domestic reduction in veneer log consumption was voluntary, and domestic veneer manufacturers were asked to report to the Department of Commerce their consumption of logs. The questionnaire asked about the veneer manufactured to a thickness of one-thirty-sixth of an inch, but it did not specify whether this was wet or dry measurement. No instructions were given whether to use average thickness or the lower thickness limit. For effective control, further instructions and definitions would have been required, and measurement should have been specified in decimal form.

In recent months I have asked knowledgeable people at every opportunity why thinner veneers cannot be used in this country to the same extent they are used in Europe. Usually, the answer is that thinner veneers can be used in the United States provided that core stock is of high quality, sanding equipment is of modern design and operators are trained to use care in their work. Neither gluing nor finishing is said to cause serious problems with European thickness. Sometimes it is costly to convert to the use of thinner veneers, but in light of the long-range trends in hardwood consumption it is vital that the furniture industry improve its efficiency in the use of thinner veneers to stretch our supply.

Even though export controls have been discarded, a very worthwhile accomplishment has been achieved by getting the furniture industry to accept thinner veneers. Older heads in the veneer industry tell me there was the same cry of distress when veneer thickness was changed from one-sixteenth to one-twentieth of an inch and subsequently to one-twenty-eighth of an inch. With certain limitations on species and uses, they tell me it is technically feasible to use veneers of a thickness as little as one-one-hundredth of an inch with no sacrifice in quality. Methods, material, equipment and training of operators must be improved before this is practical.

THE CASE AGAINST FURTHER CONTROLS ON WALNUT LOGS

Looking at the big picture all of us are aware of the present gold drain and the need of the United States for exports. Given our serious foreign exchange difficulties, it is probable that many foreign countries would limit the consumption of logs by their domestic veneer manufacturers in order to enable them to increase the export of logs and thereby improve their trade balance. In recent years efforts have been made to export furniture, with little success. Total U.S. furniture exports run under $10 million per year. Style differences, freight, high-priced labor content, and marketing problems seem to make it impossible to export furniture in the place of logs.

At this time, imports of all timber products exceed exports by hundreds of millions of cubic feet. Here in Louisville and across the river in New Albany there would be substantial log shortages if foreign exporters curtailed their shipments to the United States as the domestic industry advocates for walnut logs.

Domestic veneer manufacturers have complained that they were treated unfairly during the trial period since they were charged with the logs consumed at American mills for export veneer. They have no reason to complain, however, since this condition was known from the beginning. To quote from a statement by Under Secretary of Commerce Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., made on July 21, 1964, "We believe the program to limit the domestic use of walnut logs for the production of veneer to 15 million feet annually will in itself prevent any material increase in the annual exports of walnut veneer." Export controls on walnut logs were imposed for a trial period of 1 year and their renewal was expressly dependent on conditions with respect to domestic consumption which were not fulfilled.

To quote from the mid-March 1964 issue of Plywood magazine: "The Government is interested in no policing. The veneer industry must control itself. If it fails, export restrictions will disappear." Kentucky's outstanding U.S. Senator, the Honorable THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Louisville, commented that in Western European countries walnut furniture has become a prestige item. He noted that in a free market price will go up if the supply is limited and the demand continues to increase. There will come a point when the prestige is not worth the price. Then, we are going to take mahogany or another wood rather than walnut.

One of the largest manufacturers of walnut veneer is the Wood-Mosaic Corp. of Louisville, Ky. Mr. Paul R. MacLean, president of Wood-Mosaic, testified in March before the Senate Commerce Committee: "Walnut, like any other species, produces an annual crop for harvesting. If the demand for this annual crop exceeds the supply, the price goes up just as it would with oak, teak, or any commodity. If the price exceeds market acceptance, then the users turn to other species. There is no reason to single out walnut for deification among woods. It is only since 1957 it has assumed worldwide popularity. No one knows when this popularity will wane in favor of other woods as has happened so many times in the history of the veneer business. Frankly I feel we have a tempest in a teapot."

Senator HARTKE introduced in June of 1965, S. 1896, a bill amending the Export Control Act of 1949 to allow export controls or an embargo on walnut log shipments abroad. Senator HARTKE was quoted in Home Furnishings Daily as requesting a complete embargo on walnut log exports. The result of this and the continuing study of controls by the Secretary of Commerce was substantial speculation in walnut exports. I feel this was a major reason that exports reached extremely high levels in months immediately following the end of controls.

The heaviest demand for walnut veneer logs is domestic. During the 1961–63 period, domestic consumption was 65 percent of the total. In 1964 it rose to 73 percent of the total. Secretary Connor stated this year that "export controls are not an effective means to conserve a resource such as walnut when the major part of the demand is domestic rather than foreign, and only voluntary efforts can be relied upon to curb domestic use. We should not try to use export controls for a job they were not meant to do."

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, stated in July, "Now the veneer manufacturers say, of course, they are concerned with conserving the supply. If you don't send any abroad and just let them use what they want to use, you would conserve the rest of it. However, I have a feeling that if the price wasn't involved, they wouldn't be quite so interested in this proposal." Senator ROBERTSON referred to the fact that there is a fashion in furniture as well as in clothes. He spoke of a use of walnut in the early Colonies until Americans became more affluent and sophisticated. Then, they emulated the example of Great Britain and imported mahogany. Later we had a period of golden oak. When this got to be commonplace, nobody wanted golden oak anymore and they turned to maple. He said that everybody wants walnut all of a sudden. He referred to the availability of mahogany in the Amazon Valley of Brazil, saying that mahogany down there is plentiful but that it is just a question of getting it out. Senator ROBERTSON said that he was not worried about the supply of walnut. He said, "Unless we kill the price of them, there are going to be a lot more trees planted on the assumption that walnut will for a long time be in strong demand."

Secretary Connor stated before the Senate Commerce Committee in March: "I think if the Congress is serious about getting the level of consumption down to the annual growth rate, then this would become an item in great market demand, so that I would assume that if the supply of veneer were allocated fairly as between export and domestic use, then it would have to be accompanied by some kind of export control. So we would be looking at controls comparable to what we had in WPB and OPA during World War II." He stated that "up to the present time we have not attempted to have under such close regulation an industry like this walnut industry and the related uses in peace time." In answer to a question by Senator BREWSTER, Secretary Connor stated that in his opinion "The limitations on exports would not really solve the conservation problem that we are all interested in."

If conservation is the objective of export controls, concurrent enforced domestic controls on walnut log consumption are imperative. The American Farm Bureau has taken a very strong position opposing log controls on walnut. Their reasoning is sound, and much of it is based upon problems with controls applied in recent years to many agricultural products.

The economy of Kentucky and other tobacco raising States is affected by the extent of tobacco exports. Conceivably, restrictions on log exports could be subject to retaliation by foreign countries in the form of higher tariffs on tobacco. This is one of the important objections of the Farm Bureau, but their most important objection is because they feel that if the market is limited for walnut logs, the price paid to farmers will be reduced.

Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, of Oregon, referred to the bill of Senator HARTKE which would amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to allow continuing controls on walnut logs. She said of this measure, "I am always concerned with stifling competition, and I feel this amendment does this."

Even from the standpoint of the domestic veneer manufacturers, controls appear to be undesirable. It is obvious that any new controls will involve compulsory restrictions on veneer production. As a practical matter, there can be no complete embargo on walnut logs without seriously affecting our trade with foreign countries. Thus, assuming continued exports on a limited scale, there will be a greater concentration of export buying in the Central States. This will thwart the objectives of the domestic walnut manufacturers to conserve walnut timber in this area. Whether or not there are restrictions on the export of veneer, new controls will result in new veneer mills being built in this country. For example, our company is one that is prepared to do this in the event of renewed export controls—in order to protect our existing position in the industry.

TRENDS IN THE WALNUT INDUSTRY

Over the last 20 years, the prices of high-quality hardwoods have not risen to the same extent as most other raw materials. Many in the veneer industry feel that walnut is just now reaching an equitable level when quality and supply are considered.

Since the end of export controls, there has been a substantial increase in the export of walnut logs. A fairly large percentage of this increase has been in lumber logs and low-quality veneer logs that were unsuitable for export during the period of controls. Our company's European customer projects that walnut consumption in Europe has reached a peak and will be declining in 1966.

Less than a week ago I visited exhibits of furniture manufacturers at the High Point Fall Furniture Market. There was a substantial reduction in the number of walnut suites shown on this market. In place of walnut, there is a great increase in oak in Spanish designs. French designs in the country style, using no walnut, are receiving a great play. There is a noticeable increase in hickory, ash, and other hardwoods that were being shown in limited volume only a few years ago.

Two weeks ago I spoke to a prominent Indiana walnut specialist who predicted that American walnut veneer manufacturers will become more competitive in selling veneer overseas. He felt there would be pressure on American furniture manufacturers to accept walnut of increasingly thin measurement, possibly as thin as one forty-second of an inch, by next spring. He predicted a lessening of the competitive gap between the United States and Europe due to better U.S. methods now in development in the furniture, veneer, and plywood industries. He felt that even now American veneer manufacturing firms could sell all of the veneer they wanted in Europe at good prices.

The English Timber Trades Journal of September 25, 1965, reported on a discussion at the London Hardwood Club. Mr. Thomas A. Dean, president of Dean Industries, Inc., of Chicago, was a guest at this program. When asked whether there was likely to be any relieving factor in the way of a change in fashion away from walnut, Mr. Dean said they found in the States that these cycles usually ran for about 7 years. In African mahogany it had run from 1940 to 1957, which was a long run, and then walnut came in. Walnut had now been in the chair for over 7 years, and usually after that period designers started to grow tired of a species, and might go back to oak or cherry or something else. At the moment, walnut appeared to have reached a plateau, it was not expanding, and that usually meant it would strike downward. He thought walnut would start declining in the United States in the next few years.

A POSITIVE APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM

The real answer to increased consumption of walnut products is not export controls. The answer lies in growing more walnut timber of higher quality and growing it faster. It lies in increased use of other woods, and it lies in the use of thinner veneer in the furniture industry of the United States.

If it were possible within the next 2 or 3 years for the U.S. furniture industry to use European veneer thicknesses, any gap between growth and drain might be offset, with no controls placed on log exports. At present, with or without controls on exports, the furniture industry's only alternative is to pay the price required to meet foreign competition for logs. The American Walnut Manufacturers Association makes the case that only 2 to 3 percent of the price of furniture is in veneer. This being the case, it appears that domestic veneer manufacturers could pay more than the present price for walnut logs if this is necessary to meet export competition. If thinner veneer were used, this alternative might not be required.

Many furniture manufacturers do not have the type equipment needed to use thinner veneers. There is no more justification for shielding these firms from the necessity of replacing their obsolete equipment than in going back to the days of the horse and buggy. While there is undoubtedly a substantial increase in the demand for walnut veneer logs at this time, it is logical that an increase in production of this renewable natural resource, the availability of other woods, good nonwood substitutes, and increased efficiency will bring about a new balance between supply and demand.

Our company feels that positive action is needed rather than the negative alternative of restoring unworkable export controls. Although our company's walnut forestry and conservation record will compare favorably with others in the industry, we admit that the industry is doing far too little to promote good walnut forestry. Realizing this, the George E. Tomlinson Co. has recently taken steps that we hope will provide some leadership to the industry in this field.

It is technically feasible to grow high quality walnut in much greater volume with a substantially increased annual growth rate. This makes it economically attractive to encourage large scale planting of walnut seedling or seeds. Starting immediately, our company is going to provide the services of a graduate forester for the purpose of encouraging walnut reforestation in our log buying territories.

In the coming months we plan to plant walnut seedlings on several Blue Grass farms. These will be cultivated, fertilized, thinned, pruned, and carefully managed. The sites will be available for demonstration purposes. The consulting services of our staff forester will be available to landowners who desire to join this walnut planting program. We hope to work closely with the Kentucky Division of Forestry and the Central States Forest Experiment Station in this task. If the project works out successfully, we hope that this may be the start of a perpetual supply of walnut timber of our operations 30 to 35 years hence.

With the recent publicity given to "The Walnut Problem," there is a great incentive for an immediate increase in reforestation activities. Mr. Kenneth Quigley of the Central States Forest Experiment Station is working on an economic study of the return on investment from planting walnuts on suitable sites of good farmland. I believe the study will show amazing potential results, and that many people will find it attractive to plant at least a few acres of their farms in walnut.

If the walnut industry will spend an amount equal to that spent in the last 2 years in lawyers' fees, time of company people, portions of logs left in woods, stained and split logs, losses to railroad companies, Government expenses of controls, expenses of hearings with Senators and Congressmen, and all of the other expenses related to controlling log exports on an accelerated walnut forestry program, an extremely effective job can be done. This is the American way, and it offers the walnut industry the opportunity to provide a showcase to the rest of the world on what can be done in conserving and increasing the growth of fine hardwoods. The quality of all of our hardwoods is known to have been declining for many years, but no really effective action on a large scale has been taken to reverse the trend. The hour is getting late, and action, not words, is the answer.

With the technical advances in growing walnut faster, a new publication is needed to inform landowners how to grow, cultivate, and fertilize walnut plantations. I am hopeful that the Central States Forest Experiment Station can provide this service before the 1966 planting season.

CONCLUSION

Effective reforestation programs now will not solve the immediate problem, although they will reduce it by improving growing and harvesting practices on nearly mature walnut timber. In the next few years, it is my belief that we will have higher prices for walnut logs, lower veneer sales volumes, and probably a continuing drain on the supply of high quality walnut timber. I hope that we will make better use of the existing supply of good walnut trees through production of thinner veneer and more efficient manufacturing techniques.

It can be expected that there will be an increased amount of log imports from other countries, particularly Latin America. Not to be discounted, however, is the tremendous supply of native hardwoods including Red oak, hickory, hackberry, and other species that are in reasonably long supply.

The walnut veneer manufacturer can no longer expect a complete seller's market, and he must make adjustments accordingly. For the next 30 to 35 years no solution is possible that will allow walnut to be cut in unlimited quantities. The economic solution offered by a competitive society will be much better than socialistic imposition of export controls that merely skirt the true problem.

The greatest opportunity for industry and Government is to inspire a real interest in walnut reforestation on privately owned farm woodlots. This is a big task, but by concerted efforts and careful attention substantial accomplishments can be made. Much of the land area within the commercial range of walnut was covered by vast hardwood stands originally. In recent years insufficient attention and promotion has been given to planting walnut on good sites in this land area, and this must be remedied. It is obvious that we are seeing the error of our ways and that changes will be made rapidly. I hope that this meeting will mark the beginning of a new era in walnut forestry.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ROBERT WEAVER, SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the recent nomination by President Johnson of Dr. Robert Clifton Weaver as Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is indeed one of which our Nation can be proud. That the grandson of a slave would one day become a Cabinet member, demonstrates that even with the problems which are continually being pointed out to us, our country is a land of opportunity and one which holds promise for all.

To Dr. Weaver, this nomination must bring great personal pride. Intermittently since 1933, he has served the Federal Government. Through the years he has demonstrated again and again the knowledge, experience, and expert knowledge which identifies him as the one logical man for the job. As Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, a post he has held since 1961, he has directed a large and important agency, with purpose and a high sense of duty.

This nomination not only recognizes the ability of one man, but manifests the growing concern which our Federal Government has for the well-being of our Nation's great urban areas. And here I speak as a Senator from an urban State. As our cities grow larger, the problems which beset them grow more myriad. It is hoped that with a Cabinet-level department, whose primary responsibility is urban affairs, more imaginative and meaningful programs will be instituted which will not only benefit, but enhance life for city dwellers.

As a cosponsor of the legislation which established the Department of Housing and Urban Development, I am especially proud, and I can think of no nomination which would so perfectly meld an outstanding authority on urban affairs and housing with a new agency primarily concerned with those interests. Dr. Robert Clifton Weaver truly has great tasks ahead of him, but we may rest assured that they will be met and surmounted.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on January 22, we will have the honor of joining the courageous people of the Ukraine in celebrating the 48th anniversary of their all too short-lived deliverance from the yoke of foreign subjugation. On January 22, 1918, this largest non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe declared its independence, established a free, democratic state, only to be subjected to the same basic Russian techniques of "civil war," "liberation front," "guerrilla warfare," and propaganda observed now in Vietnam. Yet the proud Ukrainians have never lost sight of their goal or faith in their country's destiny.

It is only fitting, Mr. President, that we commemorate this occasion with particular solemnity. Within my own State of Indiana reside many persons of Ukrainian extraction. We Hoosiers prize these industrious, honorable, and proud people. They in turn rejoice in a freedom which is denied their brethren in the Ukraine.

These noble Ukrainians, while concerned about their homeland, are even more concerned about the broader interrelated facts of Sino-Soviet imperialism and colonialism—the struggle in Vietnam. Let us remember the 45 million Ukrainians on January 22, the day of the anniversary of their independence, and rededicate ourselves to stopping such future conquests of free peoples.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, during the period when Congress was in recess Mrs. Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, addressed the National Auxiliaries of the AFL–CIO in San Francisco.

Mrs. Peterson cited examples that emphasize the continuing need for regulations in packaging and labeling of many consumer items:

> Continuously, day after day, my office receives a steady stream of letters from consumers complaining of packaging abuses.

Members of Congress who are sponsors of the fair packaging and labeling bill noted with special interest the state of the Union message in which the President said:

> We must also act to prevent the deception of the American consumer, requiring all packages to state clearly and truthfully their contents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mrs. Peterson's speech be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Excerpts From Address by Mrs. Esther Peterson Before the National Auxiliaries of the AFL–CIO, San Francisco, Calif., December 10, 1965

"Cleaning up abuses in packaging by passage of the fair packaging and labeling bill can save the consumer a significant amount of money," Mrs. Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, today told the National Auxilaries of the AFL–CIO in San Francisco.

"Sly practices such as packaging goods in odd weights and fractionalized ounces prevent the consumer from making cost comparisons and thus nibble away his pennies," Mrs. Peterson said. "Before long, the pennies mount up to dollars and begin having a significant effect on family budgets."

Mrs. Peterson cited a survey that was made at Eastern Michigan University. "Thirty-three college-educated wives were given a list of 20 common items to buy at a supermarket. They were asked to perform one seemingly simple task: To buy the most economical package of each of the 20 products, that is, to get the largest quantity for the lowest price."

"Out of the 660 buying decisions these women made, 43 percent were wrong. On the average, the women spent 11 cents more out of each shopping dollar than they needed to. If this extra expenditure were extended over the course of a year, it would mean that the budgets of these women would be increased 9 percent."

Mrs. Peterson noted that "Some women may prefer to spend more for an item, if they feel they are getting increased quality. But, generally speaking, this survey shows the potential for savings that exist if packaging abuses are eliminated. Everyone is concerned about the rise in the Consumer Price Index. Yet the recent Consumer Price Index rise is insignificant compared to the savings that appear possible through more rational packaging."

Mrs. Peterson said packaging is the predominant subject among all the thousands of letters her office has received from consumers in the 23 months of its existence. "Continuously, day after day, my office receives a steady stream of letters from consumers complaining of packaging abuses."

Mrs. Peterson gave numerous recent examples including the following:

"One woman sent me the wrapper from a package of frozen shrimp. Pictured on the carton were plump, luscious-looking shrimp about an inch and a half big. When she opened the carton, she discovered the shrimp were about a half inch big. 'I never knew shrimp came so small,' she said.

"A man wrote that the size of a facial tissue had recently been reduced two-tenths of an inch. 'Two-tenths of an inch may not seem like very much,' he said, 'just a little less on which to blow your nose.' But he calculated that it made a 2-percent reduction in what the consumer was getting while he continued to pay the old price.

"Another common complaint concerns serving standards. One woman told me a can of pears she bought said it contained 'five to seven servings.' When she opened the can, she found six pear halves. "How,' she asked, 'do I serve the seventh member at the dinner table?' "

The fair packaging and labeling bill, sponsored by Senator PHILIP HART, of Michigan, would end each of these abuses, Mrs. Peterson said. If enacted, the bill would require the net weight of a product to be prominently displayed on the front panel of the package and would ban deceptive package illustrations and meaningless "cents off" deals.

In addition, the bill would, under certain conditions, and after due process of law, give the Government discretionary authority to establish reasonable weights and measures for products, prevent deceptive package sizes or shapes, determine what size packages deserve such designations as "small," "medium," or "large," and establish meaningful serving standards.

Mrs. Peterson also had these comments:

"The industry argues that changes necessitated by passage of the Hart bill would force them to increase the prices of consumer goods. Everyone knows how frequently packaging changes are now made. Many of these changes, in fact, are made specifically to reduce the size of the package and thus increase the price of the product.

"Unions devote most of their energy to gaining better wages and benefits for their members. This is a proper goal. But I think unions should devote most energy to improving consumer practices, for it is well known that what is won at the bargaining table can easily be lost at the bargain counter.

"Packagers have had 4 years to improve the confusion in packaging since the fair packaging and labeling bill was introduced in 1961," Mrs. Peterson said. "Yet the industry has done little to restore fair packaging. As a result, I think we must pass the fair packaging bill and set legal groundrules for honesty in this field.

"Many opponents of consumer progress try to flatter us housewives into a state of inaction. They say, 'The modern housewife is too intelligent and wise to fall for that stuff.' Of course, the modern housewife is intelligent, and she is wise to the ways of in the marketplace. That is why she is determined to clean up some of the practices that have grown out of hand."

THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN, THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in 2 short months, Postmaster General Larry O'Brien has come up with first, a program to improve the mail service; and now, second, a broad scope program to carry out improvement of the mail service in the Nation's postal system. I congratulate the Postmaster General—these are important steps in providing the American people with the kind of mail service they need and deserve.

AMBASSADOR CLARK SPEAKS TO AUSTRALIA ON THE GOALS OF THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Honorable Edward Clark, American Ambassador to Australia, has proven himself to be an outstanding representative of the U.S. Government in less than a year as our Ambassador to the land "down under."

In his short period of service, Ambassador Clark has received the warm praise and respect of the Australian people both personally and as an official of the U.S. Government.

Last October 29, 1965, Ambassador Clark demonstrated his ability as a diplomat when he brought the goals of the Great Society to the attention of the Australian people in a speech before the Australian Association of Advertising Agencies in Canberra, Australia. In his speech, Ambassador Clark described the Great Society and its aims, both for the United States and for the world. The inspiration which Ed Clark promotes by extending the goodwill of this Nation to the nations of the world is apparent from this heart-warming speech.

To illustrate the ability and understanding of Ambassador Clark, I ask unanimous consent that his speech of October 29, 1965, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Great Society

(An address given by the American Ambassador, the Honorable Edward Clark, to the convention of the Australian Association of Advertising Agencies in Canberra, October 29, 1965)

I consider it a signal honor, Mr. Federal Director, to be asked to address the convention of the Australian Association of Advertising Agencies on the subject of the Great Society. I noted with some interest that the theme of this convention has been "Social Responsibility." As I remarked to you when I accepted your invitation to speak to the members of your association on the Great Society, this is a subject that I will have no difficulty warming up to.

The theme of your convention and the Great Society are subjects intimately related to one another and I welcome the opportunity to address you on this subject.

Now, just what is the Great Society?

How does it differ from a number of other schemes and slogans and political promises?

Where does it differ from the affluent society or the New Deal or the New Frontier?

What are the goals of the new society?

Does it affect only the United States?

As the fellow said when he saw a pretty lively brawl going on, "Is this a private fight, or can anybody get in?"

Well, this is a fight in which we're all involved. In a way it's a revolution—a planned revolution. And in some ways it goes back 32 years to when the New Dealers under the inspirational leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt talked revolution against the tyranny of poverty, ignorance, insecurity, prejudice and fear.

President Lyndon Baines Johnson in 1932 was a young New Dealer on the staff of a Texas Congressman. Today he is fighting hard to bring to reality some of the dreams which he and fellow New Dealers shared a generation ago.

Addressing a group of students on the south lawn of the White House a little over 2 months ago, the President said: "As it was 189 years ago, so today, the American cause is a revolutionary cause. And I am proud to salute you as fellow revolutionaries. We want change. We want progress. We want it both at home and abroad—and we aim to get it."

We hope that in our fight to achieve the Great Society cities will be rebuilt, whole areas will be redeveloped, floods will be controlled, pollution of our air and water will be checked, educational facilities will be improved and expanded, medical care will be provided to all at a cost within the range of all, and discrimination of all kinds will become a thing of the past.

But let me describe the concept of the Great Society in President Johnson's own words. On May 22, 1964, speaking at the University of Michigan, the President said:

"For half a century, we called upon unbounded invention and untiring industry to create an order of plenty for all of our people. The challenge of the next half century is whether we have the wisdom to use that wealth to enrich and elevate our national life, and to advance the quality of our American civilization. Your imagination, your initiative and you indignation will determine whether we build a society where old values and new visions are buried under unbridled growth. For in your time we have the opportunity to move not only toward the rich society and the powerful society, but upward to the Great Society. The Great Society rests on abundance and liberty for all. It demands an end to poverty and racial injustice, to which we are totally committed in our time. But that is just the beginning. The Great Society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and to enlarge his talents. It is a place where leisure is a welcome chance to build and reflect, not a feared cause of boredom and restlessness. It is a place where the city of man serves not only the needs of the body and the demands of commerce, but the desire for beauty and the hunger for community.

"It is a place where man can renew contact with nature. It is a place which honors creation for its own sake and for what it adds to the understanding of the race. It is a place where men are more concerned with the quality of their goals than the quantity of their goods. But most of all, the Great Society is not a safe harbor, a resting place, a final objective, a finished work. It is a challenge constantly renewed, beckoning us toward a destiny where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labor."

Not a safe harbor; not a final objective; not a finished work. The Great Society is none of these.

It is a statement of new goals to be achieved. A whole new range of goals. National and international in scope. Broader and more far-reaching than any previous administration has dared set for itself.

Not merely concerned with economic strength and military power, not only the preservation of individual liberties and the elimination of specific social evils, but vitally concerned with improving and advancing the quality of our civilization, with enriching our lives.

The Great Society is the good society, where people have the right to be individuals. Where imagination and initiative and indignation are attributes to be admired and encouraged. Where the individual citizen has the opportunity to achieve temporal and spiritual fulfillment. Where the pursuit of happiness, which Thomas Jefferson considered one of man's inalienable rights, and which was written into the preamble to our Declaration of Independence, is not just a vague, high-sounding phrase.

Basically, after all, all of us human beings, no matter how primitive or sophisticated the society we represent, want the same things for ourselves and our children:

A roof over our heads and enough to eat.

Equality of opportunity.

Equal justice under the law.

Opportunity to work and improve our status in life.

Freedom from anxiety in our working life time and in our old age.

A better world for ourselves and our children.

Is it strange, is it naive, that the leader of a great nation should recognize these aspirations and try to do something about them? That he should marshal the forces of his administration toward achieving new visions while at the same time preserving old values?

The Great Society has set many goals for itself. Education has always been considered the bulwark of a nation's enlightenment and development. And education, formal education, is becoming more important in today's era of rapid technological growth, international tensions and great opportunities for social and economic progress. The President has made it clear that he regards education as the key to the achievement of the Great Society's objectives.

Federal financial aid would be provided to local school districts with large numbers of children from low-income families. Increased educational research and new types of educational services would be made available to the rising generation to help them deal with the problems and opportunities of modern society. Special help would be provided preschool children from culturally impoverished homes to help these youngsters overcome the disadvantages of their environment. More aid would be supplied to university students and to scientists to help supply brainpower needed to maintain the tempo of technical, economic, and social progress.

The ending of racial injustice is one of the cardinal aims of the Great Society. By this we mean equal treatment in all aspects of American life—in access to restaurants and hotels, in employment, in voting rights.

The struggle against official discrimination can already be counted as won. Court decisions and a series of progressively tougher Federal laws have made it clear that State and local governments will not be allowed to use their powers and evasion to deny equal rights to minority groups.

But the social and economic problems of minority groups, and chief among these is, of course, the Negro, will not be solved in a year or two. These are difficult, human problems, much more difficult to solve than engineering problems. Much more intricate than developing a spaceship for the moon. But one of the great promises of the Great Society is the fact that many Americans—Government leaders, social scientists, Negro leaders, educators—are hard at work searching for the best answers. The ultimate objective is not only to assure that equal opportunities are available to members of minority groups, but also that they have equal chance to take advantage of the opportunities that are rapidly being opened up to them.

But even if all forms of minority group and racial discrimination were eliminated, the economic progress of the poorer members of the group would still be held back by their heritage of poverty and its related handicaps.

To cope with this, the new war on poverty proclaimed by President Johnson is one of the main roads to the Great Society. Now this, you all will agree, is a pretty big order. The Good Book, St. Matthew I believe, tells us that the poor will always be with us.

Now, economic growth alone will not cure poverty. Giving workers a greater share of income at the expense of capital will not cure poverty. For many people simply do not have the skills required for the jobs available in our modern economy. The war on poverty begins, then, with the rehabilitation of older people and the training and education of the younger. These are problems that require adventuring into new ground in the search for effective ways to deal with them. New methods of teaching are being tried. New methods of reaching those who have been discouraged, beaten down by life. The "nohopers" who are convinced that their future is behind then.

New hope must be given to these people, new incentives, new assurance.

Under the administration of our beloved President, an all-out effort is being made to find ways to assist these people. A Neighborhood Youth Corps has been organized. This Neighborhood Youth Corps seeks to prevent school drop-outs by finding ways to keep young people in school. The Job Corps helps needy young people who have already dropped out of school. Training, technical education, as well as other types of formal education, are being made available. The emphasis is on personal initiative and insistence on participation by the individuals themselves in some kind of gainful activity.

The Great Society seeks to improve the quality of urban life. In the United States, as in many other parts of the world, a growing proportion of the population is living in large cities and their suburbs. President Johnson proposes that the Great Society give more attention to making these metropolises better places in which to live and work. Coordinated regional planning, better transportation systems, air pollution control, better housing for low, and middle income families, more civic, and State beautification projects—these are some of the ways in which we propose to brighten up and improve the lives of the people who live in great cities.

The Great Society will also strive to preserve the natural beauty of our country. The national parks, national monuments, and the natural beauty of the remaining wild rivers, forests, and seashores. All these things must be preserved for ourselves and for future generations.

Included also in the plan for the Great Society is support for the arts and sciences; for artistic achievement, for scientific research, and discovery.

The President has proposed a bill which recommends the establishment of a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. The Federal, State, and civic governments will be encouraged to endow and subsidize not only such traditional arts as painting, sculpture, music, theater, dance, and creative writing but also television, motion pictures, radio, photography, and costume and fashion design. The scope is broad and the aim an ambitious one. But certainly calculated to contribute to a fuller, richer life.

Now these are only some of the aims and aspirations of the Great Society in the United States. I haven't mentioned medicare, the program which will provide doctor's care and hospitalization to people 65 years of age and older; nor the creation of a new Department of Housing and Urban Affairs with a Secretary who will be a member of the President's Cabinet. This is the first new Cabinet addition since the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1953. There are other aspects to the program but I believe I have covered the principal ones.

But, to again use the President's own words: "The dream of a Great Society does not stop at the water's edge. All are welcome to share in it. All are invited to contribute to it."

We hope that other nations will hear the President's rallying cry and join us in this noble adventure. Together we can do much:

To assist the education effort of the developing nations and developing regions. Through its Colombo plan activities Australia already is making an enviable and most substantial contribution to this area.

To help our schools and universities increase their knowledge of the world and those who inhabit it.

To advance the exchange of students and teachers who travel and work outside their native lands.

To share with our less advanced neighbors our scientific and technical knowledge in many fields—conservation of water resources peaceful uses of the might of the atom, the marvels of the upper atmosphere, and of space itself.

To increase the free flow of books and ideas and art—the works of the people with imagination and great dreams.

To counsel and advise and assist wherever we are invited in order to bring the benefits of the good society to our friends and neighbors around the world.

So, the Great Society is a revolution designed to assure permanent prosperity and growth. To make sure that as many citizens as possible receive some of the benefits of this prosperity.

Utopia? I don't think so. It wasn't so many years ago that people stood on the footpath jeering at passing automobiles and telling the driver to "get a horse."

Impossible to achieve? In its entirety perhaps, but still very much worth aspiring to. Wasn't it Robert Browning who said that "Mans' aims must exceed his grasp—or what's a heaven for?"

If you feel that the aspirations of the Great Society are high, you are right. Its goals are not the sort that can be achieved quickly. But the Great Society aspires to all these things.

It is truly a new dimension in national and international goals.

DEVELOPMENT OF POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, last week Secretary Udall presented an interim report to the President concerning the Potomac River. It contained the recommendations of the Federal Interdepartmental Task Force on the Potomac headed by Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of Interior and the Governors' Advisory Committee under the very able leadership of James O'Donnell, Director of Maryland's State Planning Department.

The eight recommendations made to the President were of special significance because they represent those projects on which everyone can agree.

I was especially pleased at their recommendation not to build a high dam at Seneca. Since such a dam was proposed on the main stream of the Potomac above Washington, I have consistently voiced my opposition to the idea.

In the future, we will not be able to rely on diluting our industrial and municipal wastes—we will have to clean them up. This is the only sound approach to our water pollution problem.

The recommendations in the interim report sparked a great number of comments from many people in the Potomac River area. Among those commenting were some of the areas leading newspapers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record these editorials from the Baltimore Sun, the Washington Post, the Evening Star, and the Bethesda Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun,
Jan. 10, 1966]

Potomac Plan

The plan put forward by the Department of the Interior for the rehabilitation of the Potomac River Basin differs widely from the one drafted several years ago by the Army Corps of Engineers. The latter, as initially drawn, called for the construction of 16 big dams, including a highly controversial one at Seneca. There can be no doubt that the basic goal of the Engineers, even after they later dropped Seneca, was assurance that the rapidly growing population in the Potomac Valley, and particularly in the Washington metropolitan area, would have an adequate water supply in the years to come.

The rehabilitation plan sponsored by the Department calls for the construction of only four big dams. And here it is interesting to note that while Seneca is not one of the four dams, steps are urged to give positive assurance that if Seneca is required in the future the way will be kept open for its construction and not barred in the meantime by ill-advised land uses and developments.

Outsiders will wonder whether the far fewer dams recommended by the Department can in fact assure the meeting of future water needs. But on the other side is the fact that the extensive park and recreation areas urged by the Department should eliminate much of the opposition that has so far blocked steps for wide-scale rehabilitation. Further, the preservation of those extensive areas would leave the door open not only for the construction of Seneca in the future but also most of the other dams proposed by the Army Engineers.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 10, 1966]

The Valley of the Potomac

The Potomac interim report to the President presents eight essential recommendations with most of which there will be widespread agreement by those who see the great watershed as a resource of many values, no one of which they are willing to sacrifice.

There will be especial satisfaction with the flat recommendation that the Seneca Dam and Reservoir on the main stem of the Potomac not be constructed at this time and the corollary advice that the area be confined to its present economic uses and withheld from intensive development that would preclude water storage purposes later on. There will be differences over the proposal that Bloomington Reservoir's construction go forward at once and even more over the proposal that three added reservoirs be authorized. If they are authorized, no construction irreversibly altering the environment should be initiated until alternative methods of supplying water have been more fully examined. The establishment of a Potomac Valley Historical Park in order to insure a "green sheath" of recreational land along the Potomac will accomplish most for the areas of most concentrated population, and acquisition should commence there first. The inclusion of the Cacapon in the wild rivers bill is a good idea. Measures of water and soil conservation proposed in the report ought to be hastened by all appropriate action. The George Washington Memorial Parkway certainly ought to be extended to link Mount Vernon and Yorktown and complete a net of parkways in the river basin.

The search for sources of water alternative to the construction of huge reservoirs with their attendant destruction of recreational lands should be pressed with great energy. The country needs to know the comparative costs and utility of measures such as the Susquehanna diversion, desalination, reclamation and recirculation of waste water and utilization of the upper estuary. The time is past when urban communities could be coerced into vast programs of construction and impoundment on the supposition that the choice lay only between water shortage and reservoir building. But unless there is an energetic pursuit of the alternative sources of water, the President's committee will have made proposals that will only defer and not prevent the eventual resort to large scale impoundment of waters and wholesale flooding of recreational and agricultural lands. The time gained by the temporary measures forestalling any immediate irreversible alteration of the Potomac Basin must be used to assure future water wants of the area.

The great valley of the Potomac like other great river valleys of the country must not be monopolized to meet the water hunger of urban cities arising in great part out of the infamous pollution of streams, the increasing waste of existing water supplies and the utter failure to exploit the gains of science.

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 10, 1966]

Action on the Potomac

No one should look for total solutions in Secretary Udall's "interim" report to the President on the Potomac River. Some of the most crucial problems, the cleansing of the river as it passes Washington and the rejuvenation of the estuary below the city, for example, await another full year's study. Many of the positive proposals it makes are drawn in broad strokes, with important details of implementation left for later development.

Yet the report is a notable success. The chunks it bites off, considering the magnitude of the total problem, are quite enough to digest at one time.

The decision to set aside the Army Engineers' plan for a huge multi-purpose dam at Seneca, Md., should be applauded by everyone. Moreover, the alternative water-supply approach proposed—the early construction of four smaller dams far upriver—is extremely modest. No doubt there will be a temptation within the conservationist ranks to protest even these dams. We hope that urge is resisted. The realities of steadily increasing water demands to serve the metropolitan area during the next few decades are inescapable. Indeed, the four dams suggested by Mr. Udall may well prove insufficient to meet the needs of 1985, less than 20 years away.

And while the Seneca Dam is clearly unwarranted now, it would be a tragic mistake to permit shoreline development to occur which would preclude the possible use of this unique location for such a purpose for all time in the future. Hence the report's intriguing proposal to preserve these shorelines, from Great Falls all the way to Cumberland, in a Potomac Valley Historical Park. The means of preservation present an enormous challenge. Surely this vast acreage cannot all be purchased. Scenic easements and other techniques would have to be employed. While large amounts of Federal money would be required, part of the burden would fall on States and localities, involving massive teamwork.

Fortunately, in the matter of teamwork, the report itself is a landmark of sorts. The fact that its conclusions represent a consensus not only of four Federal agencies which are frequently at odds on river development policy, but also of top-level representatives of four States and the District of Columbia, is an extraordinary accomplishment, offering substantial hope for the future.

The most crucial next steps, of course, in implementing the whole raft of proposals, now depend upon the President. The strong initiative which launched this effort to make the Potomac Basin a model for the Nation came largely from Mr. Johnson himself, and the rate of progress during the coming year is apt to be in direct ratio to his continued interest and strength of leadership.

The Governors of the basin States, as well as the State legislatures convening this month, should lose no time assessing their roles, and stimulating programs of support. And, with positive proposals to react to, the time has come at last for active citizen participation. A primary goal of the Potomac task force was to avoid another study which would merely gather dust on the shelf, and to concentrate on feasible, practical proposals. In large measure that difficult standard has been met.

[From the Bethesda (Md.) Tribune, Jan. 14, 1966]

For a Beautiful Potomac

The Potomac interim report to the President paints a picture of a beautiful river valley, much of which is preserved in a state of nature, providing great opportunities for recreation as well as a steady water supply.

We are pleased that it recommends against the high dam at Seneca, which has been suggested as necessary to provide adequate water supplies for the Washington area.

The Seneca dam would mean impounding huge quantities of water by flooding a very large area of the county. The opinion of the interim report is that other avenues should be pursued in the quest for water.

The possibilities include reclamation and recirculation of waste water, desalinization, diversion from the Susquehanna River, and utilization of the upper estuary.

Still the report suggests that the area be confined to its present uses and withheld from intensive development that would preclude water storage purposes in the future.

The establishment of a Potomac Valley Historic Park is also to be applauded.

It is very pleasing to be told that we can maintain the beauty of the river valley and still find adequate water sources if we are diligent and inventive.

PROGRESSING TUNISIA: A BRIGHT SPOT IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, 10 years ago, when I completed a study of the foreign aid program in 10 Middle Eastern countries for the Committee on Government Operations, my findings in the case of Tunisia began with the following recommendation:

IV. Findings and Recommendations

U.S. FINANCIAL AID TO TUNISIA SHOULD BE CONTINUED AT THE SAME OR HIGHER RATE

Findings: Tunisia, under the vigorous leadership of President Bourguiba, and with the wise guidance of Ambassador Francis H. Russell, offers a favorable and stable political climate, progressive in outlook and purpose, in which to bring about economic development. With its leadership dedicated to that end there is a real opportunity to make economic progress. * * *

It is, therefore, recommended that, the U.S. economic assistance program for Tunisia be continued at the same level, or, if it is determined that it would not encourage Tunisia to overextend itself, at a higher level.

It is gratifying that my estimate and recommendations find ample confirmation in the Atlantic's report on Tunisia which appeared in its November issue. Here is a country that stands out among the Moslem nations as being friendly to the West, free, eager for self-improvement, and, under the enlightened leadership of President Bourguiba and with the wise counselling of our Ambassador Russell, is making up for its lack of natural resources through effort and sustained purpose. In the last year President Bourguiba has further distinguished himself by sounding a new note among the Moslem nations in wanting to put an end to the shameful boycott and hostility which the others, under the leadership of Gamal Abdel Nasser, have continued to direct against Israel.

Tunisia is a nation that deserves all the aid which the United States has given it and merits favorable consideration for its needs in the future. If all the recipients did as well as Tunisia, our foreign aid program would be a success and not subject to the valid criticisms which those who have studied it are justified in making.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Atlantic report on Tunisia be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Atlantic Report—Tunisia

At home, Tunisian President Habib Bourguiba is immensely popular, while in the rest of the Arab world, he is all too frequently berated as a colonialist jackal or a tool of Zionism. The ostensible reason for the name-calling is that last March, Bourguiba suggested negotiations with Israel based on the 1947 and 1948 United Nations resolutions on Palestine. However, Nasser has on several occasions made similar suggestions without being called any nasty names by his Arab brethren. Therefore, something else about Bourguiba rankles. It is probably that at heart he considers Tunisia a Western nation, part of the Arab world by geographical accident rather than vocation. He said in a speech last June: "Tunisia freed herself centuries ago from the ties that bound her to Baghdad, Damascus, and Istanbul."

Tunisia has also been freed from the Islamic mystique which other Arab leaders use to stay in power, Nasser most of all. Its basic elements are demagoguery, religious fanaticism, and prestige politics. The great demagogic hoax is that the Arab world is going to rise as one to reconquer Palestine. As Bourguiba points out, the anti-Israel crusade has been imminent for 17 years.

In reality, the Arab leaders are bent on preserving the status quo which keeps them in power. The liberation of Palestine, far from being a program of action, becomes nothing more than a propaganda device to maintain the illusion of Arab unity. If it went beyond that the illusion would crumble under the weight of Arab differences and lack of preparedness.

What most annoys Bourguiba about his fellow leaders is their hypocrisy. Publicly they attack his Palestine position, but privately they admit he is right. King Hussein of Jordan told Bourguiba last April: "Our great mistake was to ask for Britain's departure from Palestine. At least then Jewish immigration was limited and the Palestinians remained on their land." Bourguiba replied, "So now we have come to the point of regretting British colonialism in Palestine."

Religious fanaticism is another Arab instrument of political control which Bourguiba has scorned. In most Arab countries, the Muslim festival of Ramadan (which celebrates the revelation of the Koran in the 9th month of the lunar year) is strictly observed. Anyone who breaks the daylight fast, even by smoking a cigarette, can be fined or arrested. The result is serious absenteeism in factories and offices. Last year, on the third day of Ramadan, Bourguiba drank a glass of orange juice in the middle of a speech to a group of workers. "Eat or fast," he said, "take your choice, as long as production does not suffer." He has also advised his people against making the annual pilgrimage to Mecca because it affects the country's balance of payments.

FAMILY PLANNING

And while other overpopulated Arab countries prohibit birth control (in Morocco and Algeria the French colonial anticontraceptive laws are still enforced), Bourguiba began a highly successful family-planning experiment a year ago. The strong opposition in Muslim families to contraception had to be overcome. The man considers a large number of children the tangible expression of his masculinity as well as an eventual source of wealth. For the woman, the birth of a child is a festive event which all her female relatives attend.

The Tunisian experiment began with the administration of contraceptives to women volunteers. It was found that abortion caused guilt feelings, that mechanical contraceptives and vaginal jellies were psychologically unpleasant, and that the pill required too much remembering and was too costly. The method finally adopted was the Lippes loop, a 4-inch-long plastic wire named for its inventor, Buffalo Doctor Jack Lippes. The loop fits in the woman's uterus and acts in a way not entirely understood by doctors. It is, however, 98 percent effective, simple to insert, inexpensive, safe, and it lasts for years.

After a year-long propaganda program which reminded Tunisian women that there is nothing in the Koran against birth control, family resistance is weakening. Health officials plan to administer the loop to 50,000 women a year for the next 4 years. They hope to treat most Tunisian women who have had more than three children and keep the population under 5 million.

UNDER NOBODY'S THUMB

Unlike his Arab neighbors, Bourguiba is not interested in military might. Tunisia's 1965 budget spends 6 percent on defense and 25 percent on education, while it costs Nasser half a million dollars a day to finance his military expedition in the Yemen, and Algeria earmarks one-fifth of its budget for its army. "If Tunisia were attacked," says a Western ambassador, "its 18,000-man army would be able to resist just long enough for Bourguiba to lodge a complaint with the Security Council."

Nor does Bourguiba see much point in prestige industries. Nasser has poured millions of dollars into the production of an Egyptian automobile, the Ramses, and has to import steel to manufacture it. Tunisia imports cars, but has just opened a steel mill to process its small quantity of highgrade iron ore. Habib Bourguiba, Jr., Tunisian Foreign Minister, says, "We would be happy to sell Nasser our steel for the production of his car."

Despite all this unorthodox behavior, Bourguiba has shown that he is the only Arab leader with a strong enough political base to challenge Nasser's oracular commands. When Nasser broke diplomatic relations with West Germany, he naturally expected the rest of the Arab world to emulate him. Only Bourguiba did not comply, because preserving the trade agreements Tunisia has with West Germany was more important to him than placating Nasser.

Indeed, it can be said that aside from Egypt, Tunisia is the only viable Arab state. The regimes of Syria, Iraq, and Yemen exist only with the support of Nasser; Kings Hassan of Morocco, Hussein of Jordan, and Mohamed Idris of Libya are forced to aline themselves with Nasser because they cannot count on the complete allegiance of their own people. In Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, political stability is bound to oil interests. Algeria has yet to show that it can escape what its own leaders disparagingly call "Congolization." And Lebanon's pluralist society is under constant pressure from a pro-Nasser minority.

And yet, what is Tunisia? A country which seems to have been created to prove Arnold Toynbee's theory that civilizations are founded in defiance of nature—small, underdeveloped, half Saharan waste and half coastal farmland. "Tunisia," a foreign ministry official explained, "has no oil, no minerals, no coal, no gas, 22 kinds of poisonous snakes, and 4 kinds of scorpions." Its annual budget, $160 million, is less than what General Motors spends on advertising.

It is not powerful enough to play Eastern and Western blocs against each other for aid, as Egypt has done. Its weight is scarcely felt in the international scale. Its importance lies, perhaps, in the fact that a country which has been independent for 10 years can point to political stability and economic improvement instead of chaos, coups, corruption, and economic bewilderment, the lot of too many other emerging nations.

A FAMILY BUSINESS

Tunisia's progress is related to its manageable size, which has made it possible for Bourguiba to operate the country like a family business. No aspect of national life is unworthy of his paternal attention. On a recent Sunday afternoon he scolded Tunisia's two best soccer teams after a championship match. "The game was faulty because of lack of coordination," he said. "The play was disjointed and choppy. I hope the quality of the playing will improve and that in the future you will play with your heads as well as your legs."

Bourguiba spends 3 months of each year inspecting his domain. In each town and village, he knows the principal families by name. He listens to grievances and suggests improvements. Bourguiba's visits have been as responsible for slum clearance and school construction as have his economic programs. The other side of the "supreme combatant's" personality is that he cannot tolerate resistance to the team spirit.

CONTROLLED SOCIALISM

Bourguiba also keeps tight control over the Socialist Destourian Party, the country's only legal political party. Its 300,000 members spread his gospel, give the good example, and denounce heretics. The gospel is socialism, but it is less a doctrine than the answer of a pragmatist to the aspirations of the masses. Bourguiba's socialism is simply the belief that the state must step in where the individual falters. Thus, he does not recognize the absolute right to private property. "It's a way of saying that society respects your right as long as you don't abuse it," he says. "No one will take your property as long as you are working."

State departments control mining, industry, agriculture, fishing, and tourism, and in the last few months there has been a tendency to increase state control in other areas. Bourguiba does not want a strong labor union questioning his decisions and disrupting his 4-year economic plans with demands for higher wages. He is encouraging the development of party cells in factories and offices to sap the authority of the union.

At the same time, Bourguiba's state-controlled economy is trying hard to attract private capital, with some success. Krupp is interested in building a shipyard, and in the last year, a Danish factory for diesel engines and a Swedish factory for superphosphates have opened. In underdeveloped countries, the borders of capitalism and socialism are often blurred. When Tunisia sought a long-term loan from the International Monetary Fund in 1964, the loan was granted on the condition that the dinar be devaluated and that wages be kept at the same level; this was not socialist but banker's dirigisme.

Tunisia's main economic problem is that it has little to export besides wine, olives, wheat, vegetables, and flowers; it finds it difficult to sell its products to European countries which already have Common Market agricultural agreements. Until last year, Tunisia could sell its wine and its wheat to France at the interior French market price. But in May 1964, Bourguiba abruptly nationalized 850,000 acres of foreign-owned land, 90 percent of which belonged to the French. France suspended its $20-million-a-year aid and its preferential trade agreements. It was a serious blow to the economy, for wine makes up one-fifth of Tunisia's exports. In 1964 it brought in more than $20 million, but by the first quarter of 1965, only 10 percent of the 1964 vintage had been sold, and there is no market for wine in a Muslim country.

AMERICAN AID

Because it has to import such staples as dairy products, meat, and most manufactured goods, Tunisia has an unfavorable trade balance. In 1964, for example, it imported $220 million worth of goods and exported about half that much. It will be years before Tunisia can successfully diversify the colonial, one-market economy inherited from the French, and in the meantime, the economy is relying heavily upon American aid. As President Johnson has noted, two-thirds of U.S. aid goes to seven countries, and Tunisia is one of them. Since the beginning of the aid program in 1957, Tunisia has received a total of $413,800,000. The gross aid in 1964 was about $100 per capita, the highest in Africa, although lower than Jordan ($192) and Israel ($450).

Bourguiba's Secretary of State for Planning and the Economy, Ahmed Ben Salah, left for Washington last May 9 and returned to Tunis 11 days later with assurances that the level of U.S. aid would be maintained. Tunisia then embarked on an $800 million 4-year plan, about 40 percent of which will be financed by foreign (mainly U.S.) aid. Tunisia hopes to maintain a rate of growth of 6.5 percent a year and raise the per capita income from $77 to $100 a year by 1970.

U.S. aid pays for such varied projects as the construction of a law school and a long-range reforestation program; 45 million trees have already been planted, mainly Aleppo pines and eucalyptus, in the hope of restoring Tunisia to the fertile times when north Africa could be crossed in the shade.

Tunisia also has the largest Peace Corps contingent of any African country. Its director is Richard Graham, a Wisconsin businessman who was the butt of some ridicule when he arrived 2 years ago because he insisted on riding a bicycle everywhere, which the Tunisians interpreted as a concession to their underdevelopment. "What we need is assistance, not acrobatics," as one Tunisian put it. After showing what it can do, however, the Peace Corps has been given high marks, and its tractor-repair teams have been particularly successful.

AWAY FROM MARX

Skeptics attribute Bourguiba's solid pro-Western stance to the amount of aid he receives from Washington. But beyond the helping hand it offers, Bourguiba has been drawn to the West out of disappointment with its alternatives. He turned away from communism when he was a young revolutionary struggling against French colonialism.

"What Marx wrote was true of the 19th century industrial revolution in England and France," he says. "It was true in that conjuncture. But afterward, things were not that way. His provisions for the proletarian revolution were not realized. There was no class struggle. I saw man as a moral being who escapes the laws of rank. I wanted to lift him in a climate where there would be no oppression and no chaos, where the balance between liberty and anarchy would be kept."

Bourguiba has also found pan-Arabism and pan-Africanism a burden. Those of his policies which have been prompted by the fear that he was not keeping up with the revolutionary pace of his neighbors, such as nationalization of foreign-owned lands, have proved economically disastrous. In many instances, Tunisia's efforts to maintain Arab or African solidarity have backfired. "Since we are no longer able to use ships on the Arab League blacklist," an official explained, "we have to pay more for freight, which often has to change ships at Genoa."

When Nasser calls him an American stooge, Bourguiba replies: "Don't tell me that to be a good Arab I have to fight America." While other Arab leaders visit Moscow for guidance, Bourguiba visits Scandinavia. He finds that the Scandinavian countries have problems similar to his own and practice the kind of socialism he would like to adopt.

OUR BEST FRIEND IN AFRICA

Bourguiba is fond of saying that Tunisia is at the same time nonalined and "the best friend the United States has in Africa." An interesting example of this pro-Western nonalinement is Tunisia's position toward Red China. When Premier Chou En-lai came unexpectedly to Tunis in the middle of his 1964 African trip, Bourguiba recognized Red China. But at the banquet of recognition, he denounced Chinese foreign policy. Last March Tunisia rejected a Red Chinese note on Vietnam as "discourteous and unacceptable." "China," Bourguiba said, "is trying to extend its influence in Asia—some countries forget that the United States intervened after a request from an independent state which did not want to be under Communist rule."

Bourguiba's son, familiarly known as Bibi, is a resolutely pro-Western Foreign Minister. He was Ambassador to Washington during the New Frontier and was admitted into the privileged circle of President Kennedy's personal friends. He was impressed on a visit to Washington last spring that President Johnson took the trouble to receive him at the height of the Dominican crisis.

American diplomats in Tunis work in a climate of warm friendliness. Ambassador Francis Henry Russell is a career diplomat whose last post was Accra. In comparing Bourguiba's Tunisia with Nkrumah's Ghana, he has drawn some interesting conclusions about one-party, one-man systems in emerging countries, and why they sometimes succeed and sometimes fail.

HAROLD HOWE II

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Office of Education holds the key to millions of our young people's futures. The way this office is administered may mean the difference between a school generation that is educated for the years ahead, and a generation of young people soon to find themselves living in a world they are not prepared for.

The President has chosen wisely a U.S. Commissioner of Education, for Harold Howe II is well acquainted with the whole spectrum of American education. From a family of well-known educators, Howe's broad experience in the field has prepared him well for the many challenges he must meet in his new office.

Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure and pride to welcome this Hartford-born educator to his new Washington job.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Record at this point an article entitled "Hartford's Howe Top Educator," which recently appeared in the Hartford Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Hartford Times, Dec. 20, 1965]

Hartford's Howe Top Educator

In his new job as U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe, will have a broad stage to display his many roles—the administrator, the ad-libbing television performer, the woodsman, the innovator, the cabinetmaker, the educational reformer, the fisherman.

The Office of Education, which Howe will lead begining next month, has become in the last 2 years the hinge on which President Johnson's Great Society program swings.

It is a measure of the tremendous growth of the Federal role in education that the agency will dole out more than $3 billion this fiscal year to public and private school systems. The Office of Education is also a key element in the war on poverty and in enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

President Johnson's announcement Saturday that Howe had been named to suceed Francis Keppel came as no surprise to Howe's friends. The 47-year-old educator has risen steadily, from prep school history teacher to his present post as director of the experimental Learning Institute of North Carolina. Howe, born in Hartford, Conn., on August 17, 1918, comes by his interest in education naturally. A grandfather, Samuel Chapman Armstrong, who was also a Union general, was a founder of the Hampton Institute, a Negro college in Virginia. Howe's father, a Presbyterian minister, was a professor at Dartmouth and president of Hampton Institute.

Howe was graduated from Yale in 1940. He played freshman football and was a defenseman on the varsity hockey team.

He likes to ski, climb mountains, hunt, and camp out. He has two ways of working out frustrations—fly fishing and cabinetmaking.

After service as a Navy lieutenant during World War II, Howe held teaching and administrative positions at Phillips Academy in Andover, Mass.; Andover High School; Walnut Hills High School in Cincinnati, and Newton (Mass.) High School.

He was appointed superintendent of schools in Scarsdale, N.Y., in 1960. He left last year to become the first director of the Learning Institute of North Carolina. This nonprofit organization, formed with support from public schools and private universities, concentrates on educational problems related to poverty and on advanced learning for gifted children.

He is a trustee of Yale University and Vassar College and the College Entrance Examination Board. He writes frequently on education and is in demand as a speaker.

In a recent article, Howe said "a radical change" was needed in American education. "The schools of the future will inherit much from the past but they should question all past practice before adopting any of it," he wrote.

Howe is married to the former Priscilla Foster Lamb of New York City. They have a married daughter, another daughter at Wellesley College, and a 13-year-old son. Howe is the second Hartford man to become U.S. Education Commissioner. Henry Barnard (1811–1900) was the first.

POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN'S NEW PROGRAM FOR COMPREHENSIVE MODERNIZATION OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT IS SUPPORTED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, although there are no West Virginia post office locations listed for accelerated mechanization and modernization in the report issued yesterday, I nevertheless commend Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien's massive program to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the Post Office Department.

Modern mail handling equipment will be installed in 109 post offices which handle approximately 60 percent of the Nation's mail. Among this equipment will be high-speed letter sorters and machines geared to "read" ZIP-coded addresses at speeds up to 36,000 an hour.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and a student of the subject, I feel this needed transition will achieve our goal in providing the best possible service for this vital communications network. Our postal system handles a larger volume of mail than any other in the world, and its responsibilities are increasing daily. We must utilize the most modern procedures and equipment if we are to continue to provide acceptable service at reasonable cost.

I am confident that the Postmaster General shares my belief that, in the final analysis, the effectiveness of our postal system depends on the skills and dedication of the individual letter carrier, mail clerk, and postmaster, as well as employees, whose dependability is recognized as the backbone of the Department.

Mr. O'Brien is to be commended for initiating this timely effort to facilitate the delivery of the mails. I applaud his cogent comments and announcements made earlier today during his press conference. He is also to be commended for the decision announced Saturday reinstating 6-day parcel post deliveries in over 6,000 cities, of which nearly 70 are West Virginia cities.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WILD RIVERS ACT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1446) to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes.

NONPROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR AND THERMONUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. Do I correctly understand that a unanimous-consent agreement is in effect?

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which reads as follows:

> Whereas the spread of nuclear weapons constitutes a grave threat to the security and peace of all nations; and
>
> Whereas the knowledge and ability to design and manufacture nuclear weapons is becoming more universally known; and
>
> Whereas the danger of nuclear war becomes greater as additional nations achieve independent nuclear weapon capability; and
>
> Whereas it is the policy of the United States, as stated by President Johnson, "to seek agreements that will limit the perilous spread of nuclear weapons, and make it possible for all countries to refrain without fear from entering the nuclear arms race": Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved,* That the Senate commends the President's serious and urgent efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons and supports the principle of additional efforts by the President which are appropriate and necessary in the interest of peace for the solution of nuclear proliferation problems.

Mr. President, I am honored to say that at this time 51 Senators are sponsors of the resolution. I ask unanimous consent that a list of their names be printed at this point in the RECORD and that the resolution lie on the desk for 5 days, for additional cosponsors.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The resolution (S. Res. 179) was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and by unanimous consent, when reported by that committee, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the list of sponsors was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COSPONSORS OF THE RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE TO END NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

Senator JOHN O. PASTORE.
Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN.
Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON.
Senator E. L. BARTLETT.
Senator ROSS BASS.
Senator BIRCH BAYH.
Senator ALAN BIBLE.
Senator DANIEL B. BREWSTER.
Senator QUENTIN N. BURDICK.
Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE.
Senator FRANK CHURCH.
Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK.
Senator ERNEST GRUENING.
Senator PHILIP A. HART.
Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.
Senator VANCE HARTKE.
Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE.
Senator JACOB JAVITS.
Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN.
Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY.
Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY.
Senator EDWARD V. LONG.
Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON.
Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY.
Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN.

Senator Gale W. McGee.
Senator George McGovern.
Senator Thomas J. McIntyre.
Senator Lee Metcalf.
Senator Walter F. Mondale.
Senator A. S. Mike Monroney.
Senator Joseph M. Montoya.
Senator Wayne Morse.
Senator Frank E. Moss.
Senator Edmund S. Muskie.
Senator Gaylord Nelson.
Senator Maurine B. Neuberger.
Senator Claiborne Pell.
Senator William Proxmire.
Senator Jennings Randolph.
Senator Abraham Ribicoff.
Senator Leverett Saltonstall.
Senator Hugh Scott.
Senator George A. Smathers.
Senator John Sparkman.
Senator Stuart Symington.
Senator Herman E. Talmadge.
Senator Joseph D. Tydings.
Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr.
Senator Ralph Yarborough.
Senator Stephen M. Young.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a number of Senators have indicated to me their desire to be in the Chamber when the resolution was discussed by me this afternoon. I realize that this is the lunch hour; therefore, my speech comes at a time more or less inconvenient to them. I ask unanimous consent that, without losing my right to the floor, I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution just submitted by me remain on the desk for a period of 5 days for the convenience of Senators who desire to become cosponsors of the resolution.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy so that it may consider the resolution, hold hearings thereon, and render a report, on the condition that the resolution be returned to the Senate to be rereferred to the Committee on Foreign Relations for its consideration.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senators from Florida [Mr. Holland and Mr. Smathers] be added as cosponsors of the resolution, raising the number of cosponsors to 51.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I rise to speak for myself and 50 other cosponsors of the resolution which I sent to the desk a short while ago. I begin by saying that last Wednesday night, we—and the whole world with us—listened and looked on as the President of the United States delivered to us his message on the state of the Union.

We share with him a most earnest hope that his efforts and the efforts of all men of good will—both here and abroad—will prove successful in securing peace to the war-torn land of Vietnam—and peace throughout the rest of the world.

We know, however, that if peace were to settle on Vietnam with today's sunset—the night would be filled with an even greater danger.

The dictionary of mortal danger has given us a fresh word—"proliferation." It means the bearing of offspring—the growth by rapid production of new parts—the spreading of new cells.

By proliferation we mean the peril of nuclear proliferation—the expansion of the nuclear club so-called—the spread of atomic capability beyond the five nations that already possess it—and amplification of the "over kill" even in the hands of the titanic two—the Soviets and the United States.

Nuclear proliferation is not a peril that we need not recognize until tomorrow.

The responsibility is now. It is not a problem to which we need not give thought until the day after.

The responsibility is now. We must stop it now. Now is the time for decision. Now is the time for us to meet our challenge. Now is the time for us to move. Now is the time for us to go forward.

In his state of the Union message President Johnson named nuclear control as the No. 2 principle in shaping the decisions and destiny of this land of ours.

The President declared that for the security of America he would continue to follow the five lines of policy followed by the four Presidents who had preceded him: Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and our beloved John F. Kennedy.

The first principle, he stated, is strength. We mean the strength to meet all our national commitments of courage and conscience at home and abroad, and I am sure Congress will support him in achieving this goal.

The second principle of policy—

President Johnson declared—

is the effort to control and reduce—and ultimately eliminate—modern engines of destruction.

He said:

We will vigorously pursue existing proposals—and seek new ones—to control arms and stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

And I am sure that Congress will support him in achieving that goal, too.

So, Mr. President, I rise today to introduce and speak on a resolution that would give recognition to the purposes of the President. It would give recognition to the announced policy of the United States: "to seek agreements that will limit the perilous spread of nuclear weapons, and make it possible for all countries to refrain without fear from entering the nuclear arms race."

It would commend President Johnson for his past efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons, and it would support additional future efforts to solve nuclear proliferation problems.

On December 8 of last year I sent to each of my colleagues in the Senate a draft copy of my proposed resolution and advised them how pleased I would be if they would join me in its cosponsorship.

Mr. President, I am privileged to say that today, besides myself, 50 of my colleagues have advised me of their desire to join, and have joined, in cosponsoring the resolution.

In expectation that others will wish to join us, I have already requested unanimous consent that this resolution lie before the Senate for 5 days before being referred to committee, in order that those desiring may have opportunity to add their names as cosponsors.

Such a resolution is not superfluous—it is salutary. It means a major step toward national security. It means treaties we will have to appraise here—and to approve here.

I want no misunderstanding on the interpretation of the wording of the resolving clause of this resolution. There is no intent—and surely no interpretation can be given—that the Congress of the United States shall be precluded from its constitutional responsibilities with reference to any agreement if the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for making that statement. I had signified my approval of the resolution.

I realize there was apprehension in view of previous experience that the wording could be such that it would be interpreted as endorsing whatever acts the President might see fit to perform in this field and possibly stray over the line into other fields also.

My purpose in joining the Senator from Rhode Island is that I feel that we must take action against proliferation of nuclear weapons. The world is extremely apprehensive that other countries besides those now possessing them may get the right not only to possess nuclear weapons but to decide when to use them. That fear is perhaps causing almost as much apprehension in some parts of the world that I have been in recently as the southeast Asia situation.

I believe the Senator from Rhode Island is performing a real public service in bringing this issue to the forefront, because it must be faced up to.

We cannot say that we will let any one country have our missiles and perhaps share with us the decision as to when they shall be used. That cannot be done with one country, because sooner or later it will go on to other countries and before we know it the manufacture of nuclear bombs could be a big international commercial business and a major threat to our very existence.

I hope that the objective of the Senator from Rhode Island, which is my objective, too, will be achieved.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy that the Senator from Rhode Island took time to point out that his resolution does not commit the Congress to a future course of action. It is important that we do not try to tie ourselves up. The Senator has by his statement pointed out what the confines are. I am happy that he has done that.

Mr. AIKEN. It might be proper, because so many countries of the world are so fearful that other countries will get atomic weapons and the right to use them that they are willing to enter into a collective agreement to guarantee the security of the country that might otherwise undertake to secure its nuclear means. We might get better understanding among the nations of the world in that respect.

Mr. PASTORE. As I proceed with my remarks, I will point out the foundation and the substance of the fear of the world with reference to nuclear and thermonuclear weapons of which the Senator became so aware in his recent journey.

It is a reminder to ourselves and the whole world that we of the Congress—and I say that advisedly—have been prime movers for peace.

The Congress is a part of the voice of the people of the United States. They are the elected representatives of the people. The people of America and the people of the world are entitled to know how Congress feels with reference to proliferation of nuclear weapons. For we, like the executive department, must be prime movers in our search for peace.

We created a special agency of this Government for peace through armament control, and in that Disarmament Act we spelled out our purposes: that the ultimate goal is a world which is free from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of armament—in which the use of force has been subordinated to the rule of law—and in which international adjustments in a changing world are achieved peacefully.

That is what we did when we established that agency.

The resolution means that we have not lost sight of our purposes—that we bear a share of the responsibility in meeting the peril and in solving the problem. It will mean appreciation and encouragement to our responsible officials in taking every step toward curbing the nuclear club. It is a mighty step toward honorable, lasting peace in this world.

Let us review the state of that world.

In this quarter of a century we of the Congress have witnessed the creation of miracles for the well-being of mankind.

We have shared in it—we have helped to promote it. We have speeded the jet and made the world smaller; we have put communication satellites in orbit and made the world more understanding; we have invaded space and now earth and gravity no longer hold man prisoner.

We have improved on nature's gifts to us and have made them gifts to a needy world. We have voted food and help and hope to the underprivileged at home and abroad, and we have challenged every plague and malady and virus that attacks the health of mankind here and everywhere.

Yes, the mind of man has achieved miracles to enrich the life of man. But the science of man has also achieved the means of man's utter destruction.

Man can be the architect today of his own annihilation, the disappearance of all civilization, of all that man has attained from the time of beginning. I mean our atomic dilemma.

Today two nations between them possess the nuclear power to destroy man's world many, many times over.

That is only two nations, mind you.

But there are today five nations with nuclear capability—and there will be more tomorrow and tomorrow if we do not do something about it.

For science cannot be repealed nor long concealed.

What one man creates today another will imitate and emulate tomorrow.

Any nation willing to pay the price can achieve nuclear capability.

That is the peril of proliferation.

Tomorrow a mind that is mistaken, or mischievous, or even mad might have its finger on a 20-megaton bomb.

He would be toying with the equivalent of 20 million tons of TNT power—a thousand times the devastation of the Hiroshima bomb.

And it all began with a whisper.

Those whispers were here in Washington—in a classroom of George Washington University—at a meeting of scientists—one January day of 1939.

One whisperer was Niels Bohr of Copenhagen—he of a Jewish mother.

The other whisperer was Enrico Fermi—Europe's foremost atomic scientist—an exile from Mussolini's Italy—because of his Jewish wife.

What they whispered was the secret of the possibility of uranium fission—the splitting of the atom.

As you know the word "atom" comes from the Greeks, and is a derivative from the Greek language meaning indivisible. We are in this dilemma today because man, through his God-given creative advances, not only refuted the derivation of the word, but indeed split the atom.

It had been achieved in German laboratories—but the Germans did not understand it.

Now the exiles in America had it—knew what it meant—and they aroused America to its peril. They practically forced us to race Germany for the atomic bomb.

We won that race in deepest secrecy. Fermi achieved the first controlled atomic reaction on December 2, 1942.

Monday, August 6, 1945, brought the bomb to Hiroshima.

But many scientists look back to January 15, 1939—the day of the tests in the laboratory of Niels Bohr. They say that is the day the atomic age was born.

I recount all this this afternoon to recall just how personal—and perilous—and then how miraculous—that we and not Hitler had priority of the bomb.

If Hitler had had it—then the V-2's that fell upon Britain might have carried atomic warheads.

Britain might have been just a blazing Hiroshima from one land's end to the other.

Hitler's boast of a Nazi empire lasting a thousand years might have reached fulfillment—and there would be no free world centered here today.

We are grateful that America's freedoms brought to our shores such minds as Einstein, Bohr, Fermi, Szilard, Teller, Bethe, Von Neumann, and others.

What if these great minds had, instead, chosen communism, and had given their devoted services to Moscow?

If, instead of the United States, a militant Soviet Union, under the leadership of Stalin, had had a 4-year lead in atomic weapons, the Iron Curtain might now be stretching not only through Germany but along the western shore of Europe. That curtain might also have enveloped the Near and Far East and all of South America. We might have been forced into a confrontation from which we could not withdraw. It might have left us badly defeated.

These speculations are frightening to consider. They were possibilities which we did not have to face.

Fortunately for the United States—fortunately for the peace of the free world—the United States was the first nation to develop the atomic bomb and subsequently the hydrogen bomb.

But times have changed since those days when the United States was the sole possessor of nuclear weapons. In the past 20 years other nations have unlocked the secrets of the tremendous forces of the atom and have developed independent nuclear weapon capability. In 1949 the Soviet Union achieved the bomb; then in 1952 the United Kingdom. Next came the French in 1960. Then on October 16, 1964, Communist China became the fifth member of the club.

I may say, parenthetically, that not too long ago it was my privilege to be at the White House to witness the signing of a bill in the Cabinet Room when President Kennedy was our President. I was ready to leave that meeting when he called me to one side and said, JOHN, may I talk with you about atomic weapons and atomic energy? Can you come back this afternoon?"

I looked him straight in the face, with a smile on my own, and said, "You are the President. You tell me when to come, and I will be here."

So he went into an anteroom, to Mrs. Lincoln, and asked, "When will I have free time this afternoon?"

She said, "5 o'clock."

I was back at the White House at 5 o'clock that afternoon. The President and I began to speak about atomic energy and the situation in the world, and what it meant.

I had a question in my mind.

I asked it: "Mr. President, what are we going to do when Red China gets the bomb?"

President Kennedy looked me straight in the face and in the eye, and said, "At that time we shall have to reappraise the balance of power in the world."

Mr. President, the future has its own fear. In the next 10 or 20 years many more nations may have stockpiled these weapons of mass destruction. They will have the power to precipitate nuclear war.

Times will continue to change in the future, and we must be prepared to modify our thinking with changes in time. As President Johnson expressed it in his state of the Union message:

> We must change to master change.

Let there be no doubt that as more nations obtain nuclear weapons, the greater will be the chances of a nuclear war. Prevention of nuclear war is the great challenge of our time. The destructive forces that would be unleashed in an all-out nuclear war are beyond the human mind to comprehend.

In 1959 the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held detailed hearings on "The Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War." In an introduction to a report issued by the committee, summarizing those hearings, the committee pointed out the terrifying threat that now faces our Nation by stating:

> For the first time in history American communities have become a part of the main battlefield of a possible future war. Only on few occasions in the past have American homes and civilians been endangered by armed conflict, and never has there been a threat of wholesale destruction and loss of life such as that now posed by a powerful and ruthless adversary armed with nuclear weapons.

Nearly 7 years ago, the committee considered what would be the effect of a war involving the detonations of approximately 4,000 megatons, of which approximately 1,500 megatons were detonated on 224 targets within the United States of America.

Expert testimony and supporting scientific data estimated that such an attack would cost the lives of approximately 50 million Americans with some 20 million others sustaining serious injuries. Over one-fourth of all buildings in the United States would have been completely destroyed and approximately one-fourth more badly damaged.

It is difficult to imagine such carnage and such destruction. But mind you, those were figures developed nearly 7 years ago. Compared with the total number of nuclear weapons currently in the stockpiles of the United States and the Soviet Union, these figures today would be considered low.

President Kennedy in 1963 pointed out:

> A full-scale nuclear exchange, lasting less than 60 minutes, with the weapons now in existence, could wipe out more than 300 million Americans, Europeans, and Russians, as well as untold numbers elsewhere.

How can the mind comprehend such vast destruction? How can the mind conceive of such horrors?

Yet there are people today who talk about nuclear weapons in the megaton range without comprehension of what is involved.

I might say, if I could speak in lighter vein, that they talk about them as if they were lollipops.

Mr. President, let us stop and consider what is involved in nuclear weapons in the megaton range. As I have pointed out numerous times before, if a 20-megaton bomb were to be compared with an equivalent force of dynamite and TNT, and were begun to be lifted onto freight cars, how long do you think that freight train would be? It has been calculated that it would be the equivalent to the explosive force of TNT carried by a train of railroad freight cars stretching diagonally across the United States from New England to California. That freight train would extend from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean.

The Hiroshima bomb was less than 20 kilotons of TNT power. It resulted in the death or injury of 256,000 people and accounted for the destruction of the entire city.

I was in Hiroshima in 1955. I was shown what had happened. I was shown the two lone buildings that remained standing after the explosion. Everything else was burned and destroyed.

One 20-megaton weapon is more than 1,000 times greater in force than the weapon that destroyed Hiroshima.

When we refer to a 20-megaton, a 60-megaton, or a 100-megaton weapon, let us realize what we are talking about. The total bombs and shells, the explosive forces employed by all combatants in World War II, is estimated to have been less than 3 megatons. That means the explosive forces employed by all sides. Everything that was used in World War II is estimated to have been less than 3 megatons. In the stockpiles of the world today, we have bombs that are six or seven times greater in force than that.

One weapon today, therefore, is significantly greater in destructive force than all the weapons exploded in World War II. It is difficult for the mind to contemplate the destructive forces that are available today in the nuclear stockpiles of the Soviet Union and the United States.

The challenge of our times is not how many more nuclear warheads we can produce or stockpile, but rather how can we prevent their proliferation and how can we prevent their use.

The paradox of our time is that, as we and the Soviet Union have developed larger stockpiles of nuclear weapons, the relative defensive posture of both nations has diminished.

Throughout the years since Hiroshima we have made every effort to establish international control of nuclear weapons. The history is clear for all to see.

In 1946, under President Truman, we proposed to give up our atomic monopoly and share our knowledge with the rest of the world. In June of that year, Bernard Baruch presented our plan to the Atomic Energy Control Commission of the United Nations. That Commission had been set up the previous December by Anglo-American-Soviet agreement.

A suspicious and secretive Soviet would not accept international inspection. After 2 years, acknowledging the impasse, the Commission ceased to exist.

In 1953 President Eisenhower offered his "Atoms for Peace." He would create an international organization with a policy of controlled nuclear assistance for peaceful projects on a world-wide scale.

We are told that his address to the United Nations was written and rewritten 33 times in its preparation.

So, let us have patience and caution in our consideration of our proposals.

Let us even have optimism. Because we remember that even after the dark hour of the Cuban crisis, President Kennedy did achieve the nuclear test ban treaty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a chronology setting forth significant events in the development of atomic energy and attempts to control the testing and use of nuclear weapons.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I want to say at this juncture that it is an impressive chronology. I invite all my colleagues to read it very carefully. Let no one doubt the sincerity, the anxiety, the enthusiasm and the exertions of this Government to bring about some international understanding.

This chronology was prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and summarizes the long history of efforts by our Nation to reach agreement in the control of nuclear weapons and in the discontinuance of nuclear weapon testing.

We have not succeeded in reaching agreement on most of the points in issue. We have, of course, reached agreement and signed a limited test ban treaty prohibiting atmospheric, underwater, and outer space nuclear tests. However, in those areas where assurance of compliance would require on-site inspection, we have not succeeded in obtaining agreement with the Soviet Union.

We must nevertheless continue our efforts to reach agreement and not become discouraged to the point where we abandon negotiations or foreclose future discussions. Our goal is too important and the alternatives are all too frightening.

In the meantime, while we continue to seek workable solutions to the nuclear arms race, while we continue to explore methods of arms control and disarmament among the nuclear powers, we must bend every effort to discouraging additional nations from joining the nuclear weapons club. The problems we face in seeking agreements among the existing nuclear powers, difficult as they have been, will be greatly magnified as additional nations become possessors of nuclear weapons. If we are ever to succeed in securing workable agreements for nuclear weapons arms control and disarmament, we must, first, succeed in obtaining workable agreements for nonproliferation.

On August 17, 1965, the U.S. delegate to the Geneva Disarmament Conference, Mr. William C. Foster, presented to the Conference a proposed nonproliferation treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. This treaty was the product of close collaboration among a number of our allies, including Canada, Italy, and the United Kingdom.

Under this proposed treaty, countries having nuclear weapons would be obligated not to transfer nuclear weapons into the national control of nations not having nuclear weapons and would agree not to assist any such country in their manufacture. They would also agree not to take any other action that would increase the number of countries in the world that would have independent power to use nuclear weapons.

In addition, the proposed treaty would impose obligations upon countries not now having nuclear weapons. First, these countries would agree not to seek or obtain national control of nuclear weapons directly or indirectly. In addition, they would agree not to manufacture or obtain assistance in the manufacture of nuclear weapons. They would also agree not to take any action which might cause an increase in the number of independent nuclear powers in the world. All parties to the treaty would undertake to cooperate in facilitating the application of peaceful nuclear activities within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

There are many who did not think it possible for the United States to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on a limited nuclear test ban treaty, but we did. That was a first step. A treaty designed to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons could be another step. I believe it would be a most important step.

To date, the Soviet Union has not been willing to agree to the provisions of this treaty and it remains tabled at the Geneva Conference. I am hopeful, when the Conference resumes this month on January 27, that some headway may be made in reaching agreement and that the coming year will see a nonproliferation treaty agreed to by the many nations of the world

I would recommend, however, that any agreement the United States may reach with our allies and the Soviet Union in the nonproliferation of weapons will include a provision that the nuclear powers will not transfer fissionable material or equipment to other nations for civilian purposes unless the recipient nations are willing to place the material and equipment under International Agency or similar international safeguards inspection. Similarly, I would recommend that any such agreement would be joined by all the nonnuclear powers of the world and they, in turn, would agree not to seek or obtain nuclear equipment or material except under International Agency or similar international safeguards.

I am most concerned that the proposed treaty now at Geneva, proposed by the United States of America, does not contain such provisions. Instead, article III in the treaty as now written would merely require:

> Each of the states party to this treaty undertakes to cooperate in facilitating the application of International Atomic Energy Agency or equivalent international safeguards on all peaceful nuclear activities.

I would not accept that noncommittal phrasing. If we really believe—and I know that we do—that the application of international controls are necessary and we intend to support international safeguards—let us say so. Let us say so in clear, explicit, definite, unequivocal language. I strongly recommend that when our delegation returns to Geneva on January 27 it be given specific instructions to amend article III of the proposed treaty and substitute the following or similar language:

> 1. Each of the nonnuclear states party to this treaty undertakes to accept International Atomic Energy Agency or similar international safeguards on all of their nuclear activities.
>
> 2. Each of the states party to this treaty undertakes to provide source or fissionable material, or specialized equipment or nonnuclear material for the processing or use of source or fissionable material or for the production of fissionable material, to other states for peaceful purposes only if such material and equipment will be subject to International Atomic Energy Agency or similar international safeguards.

What am I saying? I am saying that it ought to be a part of our proposal that any nation that gives fissionable material for civilian use shall make sure that the recipient of such material agrees to international inspection, and that all those who receive it, in turn, agree that they will subscribe to international inspection. If we mean nonproliferation, let us mean nonproliferation.

We should make every effort to convince our allies and other nations of the world of the importance of supporting International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards.

Incidentally, I am refreshed and honored today to have present in the Chamber the former chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, our distinguished colleague from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who does me the kindness of listening to this speech. Also present in the Chamber is the present chairman of our Joint Committee, the distinguished Member of the House, CHET HOLIFIELD, who is listening to my remarks. I know how important this responsibility weighs on the minds and hearts of those two devoted gentlemen.

As past chairman and long-time member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have closely followed and supported the International Atomic Energy Agency and particularly the established safeguards system whereby inspectors of the Agency verify that equipment and fissionable materials are not being converted from civilian to military purposes.

I well remember the day when President Eisenhower appeared before the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 8, 1953, and proposed the establishment of an International Atomic Energy Agency and when in his words he pledged the United States:

> To help solve the fearful atomic dilemma—to devote its entire heart and mind to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life.

In 1955 I was appointed a delegate to the General Assembly of United Nations by President Eisenhower and I helped in the drafting of the U.S. resolution which sponsored the International Atomic Energy Agency.

I was there when the U.S. Government proposed a draft for the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency. I am proud to say this afternoon that I assisted in drafting that proposal. I was selected to present that draft before the First Political Committee of the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations. I remember how keenly interested the representatives of those nations were in the International Agency.

I have seen the International Agency grow from what was merely an idea in the minds of a few to what it is today—an important organization with a membership of 94 nations. It has been growing these past 10 years and it includes nations behind the Iron Curtain, as well as those of the free world. The United States and the Soviet Union have permanent membership on the Board of Governors.

In 1960 an international inspection system was approved by the Board of Governors and adopted by the General Conference of the IAEA. At first this system was limited to the control of fissionable material and equipment of small research-type reactors of less than 100 thermal megawatts. Significant advancement has been made however this past year. The IAEA formally extended its system to include reactors larger than 100 thermal megawatts. Although the Soviet Union originally did not support the safeguards system for the last several years, it has voted for the more enlarged safeguards system.

As the United States has made significant advancements in developing civilian nuclear power and other civil uses of atomic energy, we have been willing to share our advancements with the rest of the world. In furtherance of our atoms for peace program, the United States has entered into civilian agreements for cooperation with 48 countries, as well as with the International Atomic Energy Agency and Euratom. A standard provision of bilateral agreements requires that all material and equipment which we furnish for civil uses be subject to inspection.

Originally our bilaterals provided for U.S. inspection. However, since 1963 it has been our policy as these bilaterals come up for amendment or renewal to substitute IAEA inspection. To date 13 countries have agreed to International Atomic Energy Agency inspection of equipment or material which we supply for civilian purposes.

Eight of these agreements are now in effect. These are: Australia, China, Japan, the Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Thailand, and Vietnam. Five additional agreements have been signed but are not yet in effect. These are: Argentina, Greece, Israel, Iran, and Norway. An additional two more with Indonesia and Spain are expected to be signed soon.

What we are interested in accomplishing, of course, is to assure that fissionable weapons-grade material will not be diverted from peaceful to military uses and that the civilian nuclear programs of various nations will not become the steppingstones from which they will develop nuclear weapon capability. Fissionable weapons-grade material consists of either uranium, highly enriched in the isotope U^{235}, or plutonium—a man-made element which is a byproduct of a nuclear reactor.

The slightly enriched uranium which the United States makes available both here and abroad for civilian purposes and which is what normally is used in civilian reactors is not weapon-grade material. However, after it has been placed in a civilian reactor and that reactor begins operation, plutonium begins to be produced. When the highly radioactive fuel elements subsequently are removed for reprocessing, they contain plutonium as well as unused uranium.

Access to the reactor and the records of the reactor, as well as the right to on-site inspection of the facility and fuel elements by an International Atomic Energy Agency inspection team, assure that the material is being used for peaceful purposes and that the material and equipment is not being diverted to other uses.

However, before the plutonium can be used in weapons it must be separated from the uranium in the fuel elements through chemical reprocessing. This is necessary before the plutonium can be used in weapons. The plutonium produced by civilian nuclear plants as a byproduct must be safeguarded if we hope to keep additional nations from developing their own weapons. It is important, therefore, that plants where plutonium is separated from the irradiated fuel elements be subject to international inspection.

Other than those nations that now possess nuclear weapons, only one country at present in the world today is known to have an operating chemical reprocessing plant. This past year, India began operation of such a plant and presently is recovering plutonium from irradiated fuel elements. However, additional nations and groups of nations are presently constructing or planning to construct chemical reprocessing facilities. And I repeat—it is important, therefore, that chemical reprocessing plants be subject to inspection.

For example, Japan has contracted for detailed design of such a plant and although construction as yet has not begun, plans to have such a facility in operation in 1970 are underway. West Germany is actively considering the construction of such a plant, and in Italy a specialized pilot plant is now under construction and an additional plant is being considered.

Of particular importance is the Eurochemic plant located at Mol, Belgium, which has been under construction since 1959 under the auspices of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. When completed, this plant will be internationally owned and operated.

None of these plants presently are under or scheduled to be placed under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. The Eurochemic plant, however, is under Euratom safeguards and inspectors from the five member nations—France, West Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, and Italy—this will assure that the fissionable material separated at this plant will not be diverted to military uses.

There has been some criticism that Euratom as an organization has not to date placed any of its facilities within the International Atomic Energy Agency's safeguards system. It does, however, within the six-nation organization have an international inspection system, which on a technical level, has been cooperating with the International Atomic Energy Agency system.

Within the United States, the first privately owned plutonium separation facility will begin operation within the next several months. This facility will be operated by Nuclear Fuel Services, Inc., at the Western New York Nuclear Services Center near Buffalo, N.Y., and will recover uranium and plutonium from spent fuel elements coming from our rapidly growing electric power industry.

I believe it is of utmost importance to bring chemical reprocessing facilities under international inspection as soon as possible—whether they be American or foreign. Today only a limited number are in operation. Within the next decade, many more will come into operation. It is important to set a precedent and to obtain acceptance of international inspection of these facilities. If we wait too long, it may be impossible to accomplish later on.

Accordingly, I make the following recommendations:

First. The United States offer to place the Nuclear Fuel Services' chemical reprocessing facility under the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards system.

Second. The United States propose that India place its chemical reprocessing plant within the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards system.

Third. The United States propose that as other nations establish facilities for reprocessing civilian nuclear fuel, these facilities be subject to IAEA inspection; and,

Fourth. Euratom explore the possibility of greater cooperation and coordination with IAEA. In this connection, it would be desirable, I believe, if Euratom were accepted for membership in the IAEA and the Eurochemic plant be brought within the IAEA system.

I have asked the Atomic Energy Commission to examine the possibility of having a reprocessing facility owned and operated by a private company in the United States of America placed under international inspection in order to see if there are any technical or legal problems. I have had the staff of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy informally discuss this matter with officials of the Nuclear Fuel Services and have been assured of their willingness to place their facility under international inspection.

If the above recommendations are adopted and paragraph 3 of the draft treaty on nonproliferation is strengthened, I believe that our chances for success in nonproliferation will be increased. However, we must search for additional ways of discouraging nonnuclear nations from becoming nuclear powers. We must explore ways in which those nations who voluntarily deny themselves nuclear weapons are not subject to nuclear blackmail by those that possess these weapons. Together with other nuclear nations including the U.S.S.R. we should explore possible arrangements whereby those nations who place themselves under the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards system and who do not develop nuclear weapon capability will be assisted in the event they are subjected to nuclear intimidation by others.

Also, to those nations which cooperate with the United States in the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and which are technically ready, the United States should give special assistance in developing their civilian nuclear capabilities.

On the other hand, we should be less willing to be of assistance in the civil uses of atomic energy to those nonnuclear nations who are not willing to sign a nonproliferation treaty or place all their civilian facilities under international inspection.

As I conclude, I fully realize that the name of China has been largely missing from my remarks, but not from my concern, for surely we cannot rule out Peiping from any discussions on world disarmament. No disarmament agreement will have real effect unless it is universal in scope, and nonproliferation is only a steppingstone to such disarmament agreement, not that we haven't made approaches to Peiping in the past. We have had more than 100 talks with Peiping on serious subjects. Our Warsaw talks as late as last December did not accomplish much—and future talks may well be as fruitless.

But we must not stop trying. We must not stop inviting. Let China on her own demand impossible conditions. Let China on her own stay away and let the sting of world opinion be on her and not on us.

What I am talking about today is the survival of mankind—all mankind—the Chinese people, the Russian people, and the American people. This means, indeed, all the peoples of the world.

Nations do not have to love one another in order to live in the same world with one another; and no nation—not even China—can afford to retreat from the road to reason if they and we are to live at all.

Nations can keep their individual sovereignty—they can pursue a rational national purpose—and yet participate in international undertakings for food and health and economic help.

It would not serve any purpose for China—any more than for the rest of us—to promote a world toward health and happiness, the well-being of their own people too, and yet hold over its people the shadow of atomic extinction.

So wherever there is a disarmament conference, wherever peace is the topic, let China be invited to come. I commend the United Nations for its bold resolution for a World Disarmament Conference to which all nations would be invited. I am sure that that does not mean only members of the United Nations. I am sure it is broad enough to include China as well. That would all be for the best and I trust that Ambassador Goldberg means to see that China gets the challenge.

Let every disarmament conference hold an open door for all nations be it 100 or 18 nations—whether it is planned for 1967 or for January 27. Let humanity catch a second breath in our efforts of 20 years.

Let us have some of the pioneering enthusiasm of President Truman and Bernard Baruch. Let us have some of the initiative of President Eisenhower.

Let us have some of the impetus, the devotion, the desire, the great-heartedness of President Kennedy—and let us have some of the dedicated drive and vigor of President Johnson.

We shall subscribe to the five principles of policy of the United States that have lifted us above the woes and wars of this generation—though today we address ourselves particularly to only the first two.

Building upon the strength that fortifies our commitments as a Nation devoted to peace, we shall work for those nuclear controls that command our conscience, and our consciousness of national security.

We will always keep in mind a creed we learned one cold January day on Capitol Hill. That voice is stilled—but our hearts still thrill to John F. Kennedy's call to counsel and courage:

> We shall never negotiate through fear—but we shall never fear to negotiate.

Exhibit No. 1

Appendix—Significant Dates in Atomic Weapons Development and Subsequent Test Ban and Nonproliferation Negotiations

DATES OF CERTAIN NUCLEAR WEAPONS EXPLOSIONS

July 16, 1945: First U.S. nuclear device test, Alamogordo, N. Mex.

August 6, 1945: First atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima.

August 9, 1945: Second atomic bomb dropped on Nagasaki.

August 29, 1949: First Soviet atomic test.

October 3, 1952: First nuclear bomb test by the United Kingdom.

November 1, 1952: Hydrogen device fired at Eniwetok by United States.

August 21, 1953: First hydrogen device tested by U.S.S.R. detected by United States.

February 13, 1960: First French atomic test.

October 16, 1964: First Chinese atomic test.

DATES OF NEGOTIATIONS ON DISCONTINUANCE OF NUCLEAR WEAPON TESTS

June 14, 1946: U.S. proposal for international control of atomic energy (Baruch plan).

June 19, 1946: U.S.S.R. proposed alternate plan including insistence on retention of Security Council veto power over any control system.

March 24, 1957: Bermuda declaration—joint declaration by the United States and the United Kingdom to conduct nuclear tests in such a manner as to keep world radiation from rising to more than a small fraction of the level that might be hazardous to continue to announce test series, also expressed willingness to announce tests to the U.N. and permit international observation if the U.S.S.R. would do the same.

November 14, 1957: General Assembly Resolution 1148 (XII): Regulation, limitation, and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments; conclusion of an international convention (treaty) on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen, and other weapons of mass destruction. Among its provisions, this resolution urged the immediate suspension of testing of nuclear weapons with prompt installation of effective international control, including inspection posts equipped with appropriate scientific instruments located in the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom and at other points as required.

December 10, 1957: Soviet proposal that U.S.S.R., United States, and United Kingdom discontinue all tests as of January 1, 1958.

March 31, 1958: Decree of the Supreme Soviet concerning the discontinuance of Soviet atomic and hydrogen weapons test.

April 28, 1958: President Eisenhower by letter to Khrushchev proposed that both nations have the technical experts start to work on the practical problems involved in disarmament, particularly working toward the suspension of nuclear testing. President Eisenhower stated: "I reemphasize that these studies are without prejudice to our respective positions on the timing and interdependence or various aspects of disarmament."

May 9, 1958: Letter from Khrushchev accepting Eisenhower's proposal of April 28 to have experts study the problems involved in an agreement on the cessation of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests as far as inspection and control are concerned.

July 1, 1958: Conference of Experts from the West (United States, United Kingdom, Canada, and France) and East (U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Rumania) met in Geneva.

August 21, 1958: Conference of Experts adopted a final report for consideration by governments. Conference of Experts recommended the so-called "Geneva system" of detecting nuclear explosions. This system recommended a network of 180 control points. It should be noted that the American representatives, during this conference, had taken the position that 650 control points would be necessary to have adequate protection down to 1 kiloton. Through compromise with the Soviets, they settled on the 180 stations, but then had to point out the weakness between the area of 1 kiloton and 5 kilotons.

August 22, 1958: President Eisenhower announced that based on the Conference of Experts' report, the United States was prepared to negotiate an agreement with other nations which have tested nuclear weapons for suspension of nuclear weapons tests and the establishment of an international control system.

The President also indicated that the United States would withhold further testing on its part of atomic and hydrogen weapons for a period of 1 year from the beginning of the negotiations unless testing is resumed by the Soviet Union.

October 31, 1958: First meeting in Geneva of the Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests.

November 4, 1958: General Assembly Resolution 1252 (XIII): The discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests. Among its provisions, this resolution urged the parties involved in the test-ban negotiations not to undertake further testing of nuclear weapons while these negotiations are in progress. It expressed the hope that the Geneva Test-Ban Conference would be successful and lead to an agreement acceptable to all. It also requested the parties concerned to report to the General Assembly the agreement that might be the result of their negotiations; and requested the Secretary General to render such assistance and provide such services as might be asked for by the conference commencing at Geneva on October 31, 1958.

November 7, 1958: President Eisenhower announced that the United States had detected additional tests by the Soviets subsequent to October 31, 1958.

December 28, 1958: The President appointed a panel on seismic improvement to review technical problems and to recommend methods of improving seismic detection.

January 5, 1959: United States released data showing many underground tests could not be detected by Geneva experts system recommended in 1958. Indicated Geneva system applicable at 20 kiloton rather than 5 kiloton threshold.

February 22, 1959 to March 2, 1959: Macmillan meeting with Khrushchev. During this meeting Macmillan and Khrushchev discussed the establishment of quotas for numbers of onsite inspections in countries where suspicious events have taken place.

April 13, 1959: United States proposed phased testing ban limited in first phase to atmospheric tests below 50 kilometers, with simplified control system, if Soviet Union continued to insist on veto for onsite inspections.

April 23, 1959: Soviets reject U.S. proposal to stop only atmospheric tests and said numerous onsite inspections would not be necessary for complete ban.

June 22, 1959 to July 10, 1959: Technical Working Group No. 1 met in Geneva to study high-altitude detection problems. On July 10 Geneva Technical Working Group I proposed establishment of system of earth satellites and installations of additional equipment at control posts to detect high-altitude explosions.

August 26, 1959: United States extended unilateral suspension to end of 1959.

August 27, 1959: United Kingdom said it would not resume tests as long as Geneva negotiations showed prospect of success.

August 28, 1959: U.S.S.R. pledged not to resume testing unless Western Powers did so.

November 21, 1959: General Assembly Resolution 1402 (XIV): Suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. Among its provisions this resolution expressed the hope that the countries involved in the test-ban negotiations at Geneva would intensify their efforts to reach an agreement at an early date; it further urged the countries concerned in these negotiations to continue their voluntary ban on testing nuclear weapons; it also requested the countries concerned to report to the General Assembly the results of their negotiations.

November 25, 1959: Technical Working Group II met in Geneva with the Soviets and the British. This group met to consider data from the Hardtack series of nuclear explosions and the findings of the Berkner panel. On December 18, 1959, at the conclusion of the meetings held by Technical Working Group II, U.S. members of Geneva

Technical Working Group II reported that a large number of seismic events could not be identified without on-site inspection, even with improved techniques. The Soviet members of Geneva Technical Working Group II disagreed with U.S. finding.

December 29, 1959: United States said it was free to resume testing after end of 1959 but would not do so without giving advance notice.

February 11, 1960: United States proposed phased agreement, first phase to provide for cessation of tests in atmosphere, oceans, and outer space, to greatest height that could be effectively controlled; underground tests above 4.75 seismic magnitude (estimated by United States to equal explosion of about 20 kilotons) would also be covered; the 4.75 threshold would be lowered as capabilities of detections system were improved, 20 or 30 percent of unidentified seismic events above threshold should be inspected. United States experts estimated that this would mean about 20 inspections per year in U.S.S.R.

March 19, 1960: Soviets offered to conclude treaty on cessation of tests, together with moratorium on underground tests below magnitude 4.75, and to agree to joint research program on understanding that weapons tests would be halted during program.

March 29, 1960: United States and United Kingdom said they would agree to voluntary moratorium on underground weapons tests below magnitude 4.75 after treaty was signed and arrangements were made for coordinated research program.

December 20, 1960: General Assembly Resolution 1577 (XV): Suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. This resolution urges the countries involved in the Geneva test ban negotiations to seek a solution for the few remaining questions so that a test ban agreement could be achieved at an early date; it further urges the countries concerned in these negotiations to continue their present voluntary suspension of the testing of nuclear weapons; it also requests the countries concerned to report the results of their negotiations to the Disarmament Commission and the General Assembly.

March 21, 1961: First meeting under the new administration of the Geneva Conference on Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests. United States proposal presented by Ambassador Arthur H. Dean, Soviet Union introduced its troika proposal on this date.

April 18, 1961: United States and United Kingdom introduced draft treaty to the Geneva Conference.

May 5, 1961: Statement by President Kennedy on the Geneva test ban negotiations made at his news conference. Mention is made of the new United States and United Kingdom proposals and the introduction of the troika proposal by Russia.

June 4, 1961: Khrushchev delivers Soviet aide-memoire concerning disarmament and nuclear weapons tests to President Kennedy at Vienna. Insists the question of control hinges on Western Powers accepting proposals on general and complete disarmament.

June 6, 1961: Kennedy reports to American people on his Vienna talks with Khrushchev.

June 6, 1961: Khurshchev reports to Russian people on his talks with President Kennedy. (Tass report topics covered:) General and complete disarmament, banning of nuclear weapons, cessation of tests, question of control. Hammarskjold, the German question (peace treaty).

June 17, 1961: U.S. aide-memoire to Soviet Russia concerning Geneva test-ban negotiations. Repeated new proposals offered by the United States and the United Kingdom on March 21, 1961.

June 28, 1961: President Kennedy announces appointment of Committee of Scientific Experts to advise him on test-ban problem.

July 5, 1961: Soviet note replying to U.S. note of June 17, 1961, concerning suspension of nuclear weapon tests. Says Soviet proposals have been distorted. Brings up again supervision of inspection and control by equal representatives of three basic groups: Socialist states, capitalist states in Western military bloc, and neutral states (troika).

July 15, 1961: U.S. note to Soviet Union referring to the Soviet note of July 5, 1961, on the Geneva test-ban negotiations. Says Soviet note contains a multitude of irrelevant and unwarranted comments. Confines its reply to the central issue: Is the Soviet Union prepared to reach an accord which would halt nuclear tests under effective international control?

July 15, 1961: United States and United Kingdom request to United Nations to place on the agenda the 16th General Assembly an item entitled "The Urgent Need for a Treaty To Ban Nuclear Weapons Tests Under Effective International Control."

July 20, 1961: President announces membership of nuclear test study group.

August 10, 1961: President announces he has reviewed report of Scientific Committee and is sending Ambassador Dean back to Geneva.

August 30, 1961: Soviets announce plans to resume nuclear testing. Among the reasons cited by the Soviets for taking this step were the turn-down of the troika proposal, the nuclear tests carried out by the French beginning February 13, 1960, and the Berlin situation.

August 30, 1961: White House statement on the Soviet's announcement that they planned to resume nuclear testing. This statement expressed concern and resentment in regard to the Soviet decision to resume nuclear testing. It added that the Soviet decision presented a threat to the entire world. It denounced the Soviet pretext for resumption of weapons testing by mentioning that the Berlin crisis was created by the Soviets themselves. It also mentioned that the Soviet Union bears heavy responsibility before all humanity for this decision which was made in complete disregard of the United Nations. It concluded by announcing that Ambassador Arthur Dean was being recalled immediately from his post as chief negotiator at the nuclear test-ban meetings.

September 1, 1961–November 4, 1961: The Soviet Union conducted a series of approximately 50 atmospheric nuclear tests with a total yield of about 120 megatons. The tests were conducted at three different locations in the Soviet Union: Semipalatinsk, Novaya Zemlya, and east of Stalingrad. The series was highlighted by a 55–60 megaton detonation on October 31, 1961, despite a resolution adopted October 27, 1961, by the United Nations appealing to the U.S.S.R. to refrain from carrying out their stated intention to explode a device of this yield.

September 3, 1961: President Kennedy, in a joint statement with British Prime Minister Macmillan, proposed that the Soviet Union agree immediately to discontinuing testing nuclear weapons in the atmosphere. The note suggested that the United States, United Kingdom, and U.S.S.R. representatives meet in Geneva not later than September 9 to record the agreement to cease nuclear testing in the atmosphere and report it to the United Nations.

September 5, 1961: President Kennedy announced that the United States would resume nuclear testing. He ordered the tests carried out in the laboratory and underground "with no fallout." This decision was made after the Soviets set off their third nuclear test in the atmosphere in 5 days. President Kennedy, in referring to the Kennedy-Macmillan statement of September 3 on banning nuclear testing in the atmosphere, said the offer remains open until September 9, 1961.

September 15, 1961: The United States detonates its first underground nuclear device since the end of the test moratorium at the Nevada test site.

November 2, 1961: The President announces that the policy of the United States will be to proceed in developing nuclear weapons to maintain a superior capability for the defense of the free world against any aggressor. This statement indicated that the United States would make necessary preparations in case it becomes necessary to test in the atmosphere.

December 22, 1961: A joint communique was issued by President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan following a 2-day meeting in Bermuda. They agreed that it was necessary "as a matter of prudent planning for the future, that pending the final decision [to resume atmospheric testing] preparations should be made for atmospheric testing to maintain the effectiveness of the deterrent."

January 29, 1962: Geneva Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests breaks up at the 353d meeting. The United States proposed an adjournment, and Soviet negotiator Tsarapkin said, "This is the end."

February 7, 1962: President Kennedy and British Prime Minister MacMillan said they have proposed to Soviet Premier Khrushchev that another supreme effort to halt the nuclear arms race be made by raising next month's 18-nation general disarmament conference to the Foreign Ministers' level.

February 14, 1962: President Kennedy urged Premier Khrushchev not to press his proposal for an 18-nation summit meeting on disarmament. However, he assured the Soviet leader that he was ready to participate "at any stage of the conference when it appears that such participation could positively affect the chances of success."

February 21, 1962: Premier Khrushchev replied to President Kennedy's letter of February 14 still insisting on a summit conference on disarmament.

February 24, 1962: Letter from President Kennedy to Premier Khrushchev. President Kennedy replied to Premier Khrushchev's letter of February 21, 1962, stressing that heads-of-state participation at the Geneva Conference should be reserved until a later stage in the negotiations after preliminary agreements have been reached at the Foreign Ministers' level.

March 2, 1962: President Kennedy announced that he had ordered a resumption of nuclear tests in the atmosphere in late April unless the Soviet Union agrees before then to an "ironclad" treaty banning all tests. The President held out to Khrushchev the promise of a summit conference at which such a treaty could be signed, and also said that a satisfactory treaty would be offered by the West at the disarmament conference opening in Geneva on March 14, 1962.

March 4, 1962: The Soviet Government sent the United States a message delivered to the State Department advising that Foreign Minister Gromyko would go to Geneva. The Kremlin message was reported to have said that Khrushchev had reluctantly accepted the Foreign Minister proposal.

March 14, 1962: 17-nation disarmament conference opened in Geneva. (Originally 18-nation conference, but France did not attend.)

March 15, 1962: The United States, during the Geneva Disarmament Conference, clearly indicated its willingness to drop the 4.75 threshold and to make the test ban treaty, from the outset, complete in its coverage by banning all tests in the atmosphere, outer space, underground, and in the oceans. The response of the Soviet Union to this proposal indicated an unwillingness on their part to accept a treaty with or without the United States proposed amendment.

March 16, 1962: Premier Khrushchev announced that Soviet scientists had developed a "global rocket" invulnerable to antimissile weapons and that it rendered obsolete the early warning system of the United States.

April 10, 1962: The White House released a joint United States-United Kingdom statement on nuclear testing appealing to the Soviet Union to agree to a nuclear test ban with adequate safeguards including the principle of international verification. This statement indicated that if such an agreement was not successful then the test series scheduled by the United States for the latter part of April would go forward.

April 10, 1962: Prime Minister Macmillan added a personal message to the joint Anglo-American note to Premier Khrushchev on a nuclear test ban asking him to accept an inspection procedure and "fill all the peoples of the world with a new sense of hope."

April 12, 1962: Premier Khrushchev rejects the Kennedy-Macmillan joint statement on nuclear testing.

April 16, 1962: Eight neutral nations appealed to the nuclear powers to persist in their efforts to reach agreement on prohibiting nuclear weapons testing for all time. They suggested establishing a system for continuous observation and control on a scientific and nonpolitical basis, built on existing national network of observation posts.

April 18, 1962: United States offered a three-stage plan for disarmament having as its goals general and complete disarmament and gradual replacement of the armed power of single nations by a strengthened United Nations. The disarming process would be balanced to prevent any state from gaining a military advantage, and compliance with all obligations would be effectively verified.

April 22, 1962: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in summary-analysis of 1961 Vela hearing, reports that nearly 3 years of research had brought no material progress toward an effective method of detecting clandestine underground tests.

April 25, 1962: First 1962 U.S. nuclear test in the atmosphere. This test was of an intermediate yield from a plane near Christmas Island. The President approved the resumption on nuclear testing after repeated unsuccessful attempts by the United States to get the U.S.S.R. to agree to a nuclear test ban treaty with adequate safeguards.

April 26, 1962: Secretary of State Rusk justified the new series of tests on the basis of refusal of the Soviet Union to accept the kind of international verification necessary for a test ban agreement. The Secretary of State referred to President Kennedy's address of March 2 in which he set forth the reasons why a certain number of tests would be necessary in the absence of an international agreement banning nuclear tests with adequate assurances; and, secondly, that it is a major objective of American policy to bring an end to testing immediately and permanently when we were assured that testing had been abolished.

May 1, 1962: France conducts underground explosion of nuclear device in Algerian Sahara.

May 2, 1962: Disarmament talks were resumed at Geneva. British Minister of State John Godber said U.S.S.R. must change its attitude toward verification measures if the world is to have general and complete disarmament.

May 16, 1962: Premier Khrushchev confirmed U.S.S.R. determination to test. He based his decision on the fact that the United States had resumed testing in the Pacific.

June 14, 1962: The Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference[1] recesses.

July 12, 1962: Secretary of State Dean Rusk reports that the preliminary Vela results, released by the Defense Department on July 7, offer some promising signs for detecting and identifying nuclear tests but emphasized the new findings cannot be considered a substitute for control posts or onsite inspections.

July 13, 1962: Soviet Union served official notice that it claims the right to be the last nation to carry out nuclear weapon tests.

July 16, 1962: The 18 Nation Disarmament Conference reconvenes in Geneva. The United States proposes discussion of scientific findings, particularly from Project Vela.

July 21, 1962: The Soviet Government announces its decision to resume nuclear tests.

August 1, 1962: President Kennedy stated at his news conference that on the basis of recent technical assessments, the United States can work toward an internationally supervised system of detection and verification for underground testing which will be simpler and more economical than the system which was contained in the treaty which we tabled in Geneva in April 1961. He emphasized that these new assessments do not affect the requirement that any system must include provision for onsite inspection of unidentified underground events.

August 5, 1962: The Soviet Union detonates a nuclear explosion in the atmosphere in the order of magnitude of 30 megatons. This is the first of some 40 tests, continuing until December 25.

August 8, 1962: U.S. Delegate Dean proposed reducing the number of control posts to something like 80—a reduction of more than half. He offered this concession in view of his contention that detecting devices have gone ahead rapidly. Thus, our techniques for detecting sneak tests are much better.

August 9, 1962: Ambassador Dean formally introduces a new proposal for a comprehensive test ban treaty based on a worldwide network of internationally supervised, nationally manned control posts. Provided the Soviets agree to the principle of obligatory onsite inspection, the numbers of control posts and onsite inspections would be substantially reduced from previous U.S. proposals. Ambassador Zorin immediately rejects the new proposal.

August 20, 1962: The U.S.S.R. rejected proposals for a partial nuclear test ban treaty. The idea of a halfway treaty was advanced by Brazil, Sweden, and Italy. The proposed treaty would stop atmospheric tests immediately to ease fallout dangers.

August 27, 1962: The United States and Great Britain offered the Soviet Union the choice of an internationally inspected total ban on nuclear weapons tests or an uninspected limited ban. The limited ban would cover tests in the atmosphere, in space and underwater pending further negotiations for a treaty to include underground tests, the most difficult to identify.

August 29, 1962: The U.S.S.R. submitted to the disarmament conference a formula for halting nuclear weapons tests that the United States and Britain have repeatedly termed unacceptable because of inadequate guarantees and safeguards for inspection of suspicious events.

August 29, 1962: President Kennedy welcomed a Soviet proposal that all nuclear testing cease by January 1. But he reiterated the Western position that an enforcible treaty, complete with inspection provisions, be signed first.

September 7, 1962: The 18-Nation Disarmament Conference recesses, but the Test Ban Subcommittee remains in session.

October 24, 1962: At the United Nations, Brazil proposes denuclearization of Latin America and Africa which would include a ban on nuclear weapon tests in these continents.

November 4, 1962: President Kennedy announces the end of the current series of atmospheric nuclear tests, but states that underground tests will be continued in Nevada. The last atmospheric detonation was November 4, 1962.

November 6, 1962: The General Assembly adopts a two-part resolution on nuclear tests. Part (A), sponsored by 37 powers and approved by a vote of 75 to 0 with 21 abstentions, calls for the cessation of testing by January 1, 1963, and an interim arrangement with certain assurances if no final agreement is achieved by that date. Part (B), sponsored by the United States and the United Kingdom and approved by a vote of 51 to 10 with 40 abstentions, urges the early conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty with effective international verification. The United States and the U.S.S.R. abstain on part (A), and the U.S.S.R. opposes part (B).

November 13, 1962: At Geneva, Ambassador Tsarapkin suggests that unmanned seismic stations be employed as an addition to existing national detection stations to monitor a test ban.

November 26, 1962: The 18-Nation Disarmament Conference reconvenes for the third session.

November 28, 1962: In an attempt to end the deadlock at Geneva, Swedish Delegate Rolf Edberg proposed a moratorium on all nuclear tests while an international group of scientists works out underground control methods satisfactory to both the West and the Soviet Union.

December 3, 1962: The U.S.S.R. rejected the proposal for setting up a nuclear test ban put forth by the Indian-Swedish delegations.

December 4, 1962: The Soviet Union told the United States and Great Britain that as long as they insisted on on-site inspection there would never be any agreement to end nuclear testing. Joseph B. Godber of Britain declared the dismissal of the neutralist efforts to break the test ban stalemate was "not the action of a responsible government."

December 4, 1962: Arthur H. Dean told the Soviet Union that unmanned seismic stations—the so-called black boxes—cannot serve as a sole guardian of a nuclear test ban.

December 10, 1962: In the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference, Ambassador Tsarapkin formally proposes the establishment of two or three unmanned seismic stations on the territories of states possessing nuclear weapons. Locations by zones for those to be placed in the Soviet Union are named. This proposal is conditioned on the abandonment by the West of its insistence on international control and obligatory on-site inspection.

December 19, 1962: Premier Khrushchev, in a letter to President Kennedy, states that the Soviet Union is now prepared to accept two or three on-site inspections per year on Soviet territory. In addition, he says there could be three unmanned seismic stations on Soviet territory. The final location of the stations is left open.

December 20, 1962: The 18-Nation Disarmament Conference recesses.

December 28, 1962: President Kennedy, in reply to Premier Khrushchev, indicates encouragement that the Soviets have now accepted the principle of on-site inspection, but states that the figure of two or three on-site inspections is not sufficient, nor are three unmanned seismic stations. He denies that the United States offered to agree on three inspections. The United States has reduced number of on-site inspections to 8 to 10.

January 4, 1963: Arthur H. Dean announced that he had submitted his resignation on December 27, 1962, as chief U.S. negotiator at the Disarmament Conference at Geneva.

January 7, 1963: In a letter to President Kennedy, in further exchange on the subject of on-site inspection, Premier Khrushchev holds to his contention that an annual quota of two or three inspections is sufficient. He emphasizes that he considers agreement in principle a great unilateral concession, and he agrees to further discussion on the questions between United States and U.S.S.R. representatives.

---

[1] Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference now composed of 17 nations. France, an original member, withdrew at the beginning of the Conference.

January 14, 1963: United States and Soviet representatives meet in New York. The United States is represented by William C. Foster, Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and the U.S.S.R. is represented by N. T. Fedorenko, Soviet Ambassador to the U.N. and S. K. Tsarapkin, chairman of the Soviet delegation to the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference. Discussions continue in New York until January 22 when they are moved to Washington.

January 26, 1963: President Kennedy orders that preparations for underground testing in Nevada be suspended in the hope that the Western-Soviet discussions presently taking place in New York and Washington would materially enhance the prospects for an effective agreement on a test ban.

February 1, 1963: The New York and Washington, D.C., discussions on a test ban are slated to be taken up at the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference scheduled to be resumed on February 12. In a press conference, Secretary of State Rusk expressed the disappointment of the United States that the position of the Soviet Union appeared to have hardened into a take-it-or-leave-it attitude on their offer for two or three on-site inspections per year. The Secretary states, "* * * the idea of on-site inspection is not simply a political question involving the acceptance of on-site inspection in principle, but is the practical problem of establishing arrangements which in fact do provide assurance that agreements are being complied with."

February 1, 1963: President Kennedy orders resumption of the preparations for underground testing in Nevada.

February 8, 1963: The scheduled series of underground tests is begun in Nevada.

February 12, 1963: The 18-Nation Disarmament Conference reconvenes at Geneva.

February 22, 1963: The ACDA announces in Washington that the United States is willing to consider possible acceptance of seven onsite inspections, providing the modalities of inspection can be agreed upon.

February 28, 1963: In a Moscow election meeting speech, Premier Khrushchev reaffirms his refusal to consider anything but three on-site inspections per year.

April 1, 1963: The United States and United Kingdom delegations table a memorandum of position concerning the cessation of nuclear weapon tests. This memorandum sums up the Western position on general principles of agreement, on-site inspection and automatic seismic station arrangements, and includes specific proposals submitted to date.

August 5, 1963: Limited test ban treaty is signed in Moscow.

August 31, 1963: Hotline teletype system between Washington and Moscow becomes operational.

October 7, 1963: President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, signs the Limited Test Ban Treaty.

October 10, 1963: The Limited Test Ban Treaty enters into force.

December 31, 1963: Premier Khrushchev calls on all states to conclude an international agreement "for the renunciation by the states of the use of force for the settlement of territorial disputes and boundary questions."

January 8, 1964: In his state of the Union message, President Johnson announces that U.S. production of enriched uranium will be reduced by 25 percent and that the Atomic Energy Commission will close down 4 of its 14 reactors producing plutonium for weapons. The President calls on the Soviet Union to take similar steps.

January 18, 1964: President Johnson, in his reply to Premier Khrushchev's letter of December 31, 1963, appeals to the Soviet Union to support concrete steps to strengthen peace, by urging that both nations present new proposals at Geneva on the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons, cessation of the production of fissionable materials for weapons uses, the transfer of large amounts of fissionable materials to peaceful uses, the prohibition of all nuclear tests, limitations on nuclear weapons systems, reduction of all risk of war by accident or design, and progress toward general disarmament.

January 21, 1964: The Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee (ENDC) reconvenes in Geneva.

In a message to the ENDC, President Johnson submitted proposals designed to: prohibit the use of force, achieve a verified freeze of nuclear delivery vehicles, achieve a verified agreement on the cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons, reduce the danger of accidental war and surprise attack, and halt the spread of atomic weapons.

April 20, 1964: President Johnson announces that he has ordered "a further substantial reduction" in the production of enriched uranium. Combined with the reduction announced last January, the overall reduction in the production of enriched uranium will be 40 percent over a 4-year period.

Premier Khrushchev announces discontinuance of the construction of two new reactors for the production of plutonium and that the production of uranium 235 would be substantially reduced over the next several years. (On November 24, 1965, in Khrushchev's statement of April 20, 1964, the AEC stated "there is no evidence to confirm that the Soviets have indeed done what they stated they would do.")

April 21, 1964: Prime Minister Douglas-Home announces that United Kingdom production of military plutonium will gradually be terminated.

April 28, 1964: The ENDC recesses.

June 9, 1964: The ENDC reconvenes.

June 11, 1964: The IAEA Board of Governors approves an agreement between the United States and the Agency whereby four U.S. reactors will be placed under Agency safeguards against diversion to nonpeaceful ends.

June 25, 1964: At the ENDC, the United States presents a plan to provide verification for a cutoff in the production of fissionable materials for weapons.

August 27, 1964: At the ENDC the Indian representative states that under no circumstances will his country use its nuclear capabilities for nonpeaceful purposes.

September 17, 1964: The ENDC adjourns.

October 16, 1964: Communist China explodes its first atom bomb.

October 24, 1964: The chairman of India's Atomic Energy Commission states that India might be compelled to manufacture nuclear weapons unless some important and tangible steps are made toward general disarmament.

November 1, 1964: The White House announces that former Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell L. Gilpatric has been appointed by the President to head a special panel to study ways and means of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons.

December 8, 1964: Following their Washington conference, President Johnson and United Kingdom Prime Minister Wilson issued a communique in which they express agreement on the urgency of a worldwide effort to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons.

December 30, 1964: In a New Year's greeting to Premier Kosygin, President Johnson expresses the hope that practical agreements can be reached soon in the area of arms control.

January 19, 1965: AEC announces that the United States has detected venting from the Soviet underground test of January 15.

January 26, 1965: In a statement before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, ACDA Director Foster states that the Soviet test of January 15 may have been a technical violation of the limited test ban treaty.

February 15, 1965: AEC announces it will further reduce the rate of production of enriched uranium. The new reduction will be gradually carried out from 1966 to 1969.

May 14, 1965: Communist China explodes its second atomic bomb.

May 17, 1965: In the Disarmament Commission, ACDA Director Foster suggests a broad program of measures to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

July 27, 1965: ENDC convenes at Geneva. In a message to the delegates, President Johnson states that the American delegation is instructed to seek "agreements that will limit the perilous spread of nuclear weapons, and make it possible for all countries to refrain without fear from entering the nuclear arms race," "effective limitation of nuclear weapons and nuclear delivery systems * * *" and a "truly comprehensive test ban treaty."

August 8, 1965: Pope Paul VI urges mankind to renounce forever use of atomic weapons and prays that men will "no longer place their trust, their calculations, and their prestige in such fatal and dishonoring weapons."

August 17, 1965: At the ENDC, the United States presents a draft nonproliferation treaty.

August 31, 1965: At the ENDC the Soviet Union rejects the U.S. draft nonproliferation treaty of August 17.

September 16, 1965: The Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament (ENDC) adjourns following the conclusion of its 234th plenary meeting.

September 23, 1965: In a speech at the United Nations, Ambassador Goldberg stresses that the first priority toward the goal of general and complete disarmament "must be given to halting the spread of nuclear weapons."

September 24, 1965: Soviet draft treaty on nonproliferation presented to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

October 17, 1965: William Foster, Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, in a speech at the United Nations calls for the resumption of the ENDC at Geneva.

November 25, 1965: At the United Nations 26 nations present a draft resolution on the "urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests." This draft resolution was subsequently sponsored by nine other nations.

December 3, 1965: The 35-nation draft resolution of November 25, 1965, approved by the General Assembly by a vote of 92 to 1 with 14 abstentions. Albania votes against the resolution. The following countries abstain: Algeria, Bulgaria, Byleroussian S.S.R., Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Guinea, Hungary, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian S.S.R., and the Soviet Union.

December 28, 1965: Ambassador at Large Averell Harriman leaves Washington to visit Eastern Europe on a peace mission for President Johnson.

January 27, 1966: Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee is scheduled to reconvene in Geneva.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I would like to commend the Senator from Rhode Island for the very powerful address which he has just made, and one of the most important addresses we could listen to today.

I was particularly concerned with his description of the power for destruction which is contained in a modern atomic bomb. I am afraid people have gotten rather careless in their feeling about the destructive power of the atomic bomb. Possibly they have become more calloused since the approval of the limited test ban treaty, although I think that was an extremely important step to take.

But, speaking of the power of the modern bomb, I recall the testimony given by Dr. Edward Teller before our committee on August 20, 1963.

Although he was not in favor of the limited test ban treaty, he wound up his testimony by saying:

> We are living in a dangerous world. The United States may become the frontline of the battle. The United States, if we are not careful, may cease to exist, but the human race will continue to exist. About that, there is no question in my mind.

I think Dr. Teller thought it was an optimistic statement when he said he felt the human race would continue to exist and also said he did not think the weapon could be developed to destroy all human life, although there are those who have been working toward that end.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I remember the time when the Senator from Rhode Island came on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to take the place of the then Senator Lyndon Johnson.

Mr. PASTORE. As a matter of fact, he resigned from the committee so I could get on.

Mr. ANDERSON. He has been a very helpful and distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the senior Senator from Rhode Island for the excellent statement which he has made and to associate myself with it and with him. I was very pleased to add my name as a cosponsor to his resolution.

On June 23, 1965, I pointed out on the floor of the Senate a number of recommendations the Joint Committee had made to the President over the years in the control of nuclear weapons and in furtherance of nonproliferation. As I pointed out then much of our work over the years involved highly classified matters and which we could not at the time bring out in the open. Senator PASTORE, as past chairman of the Joint Committee and current vice chairman, and as a long time member of the Joint Committee, has been most active in supporting the International Atomic Energy Agency and in furthering international safeguards. On June 23, I introduced into the record a copy of a letter which the senior Senator from Rhode Island, as chairman of the Joint Committee, had sent to the Secretary of State and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission at a time when the executive branch was about to enter into an agreement with the Indian Government which would not have guaranteed IAEA inspection rights to the civilian Tarapur reactor, which the United States was helping India construct. As I pointed out at that time the State Department was willing to agree to some loose language which the senior Senator from Rhode Island, in his own forthright manner, characterized as "pussy footing" language.

Now, the senior Senator from Rhode Island is too modest to discuss more recent efforts that he and other members of the Joint Committee have undertaken in order to strengthen the International Agency inspection system. For example, last year the State Department and the AEC had all but agreed to a request of the United Kingdom for a significant amount of enriched material—uranium 235—for use in their civilian nuclear program but which they were not willing to place under International Agency controls. The senior Senator from Rhode Island, as vice chairman of the Joint Committee, and CHET HOLIFIELD, the chairman of the Joint Committee, together with other members of the committee, strongly objected just like they did in the Tarapur matter. Because of the Joint Committee's strong position, the State Department and AEC went back and have been holding further negotiations with the United Kingdom.

This past 2 weeks negotiations have been proceeding on this point and I understand, although they have not as yet reached full accord, the United Kingdom is now coming around to accepting International Agency safeguard inspection on material which we will furnish for their civilian reactor program.

I might also note in passing that for many years leaders of the United Kingdom civilian power program were critical of the technical route the United States was taking in using slightly enriched uranium 235 and preferred the so-called natural uranium type of reactor. They are apparently coming around to our approach and now are reactivating their own reprocessing plant and requesting assistance from the United States in obtaining enriched uranium 235 for their civilian program.

The senior Senator from Rhode Island is to be congratulated for his long service in the support of the International Atomic Energy Agency and in his support of international inspection. I wish to congratulate him for his very fine statement today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. From the standpoint of my evaluation, the Senator from Rhode Island has made one of the three historic speeches I have heard in the Senate on the whole matter of nuclear power and its control and the related subject of disarmament. How well can I remember the day the Senator from Connecticut, Brien McMahon made his historic speech of February 2, 1950, here in the Senate on the importance of disarmament in the face of a growing threat of an atomic war.

I think the speech of the Senator from Rhode Island today will occupy an equally important place in the history of Senate discussion of the great issue of war and peace as determined by the policies the nations of the world adopt in the field of nuclear power.

The third speech I wanted to refer to in the trilogy of historic speeches on the subject was the one that was made by the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] shortly prior to adjournment in the last term of this Congress.

Those three speeches, I may say, will be read for many years to come by students of history. In my judgment, they are going to find that those three speeches point toward a policy on the part of the United States and on the part of all nations of the world that recognize the thesis that we must bring under common control and administration atomic power if we are to control the problems which the Senator from Rhode Island has so forcefully pointed out today.

I particularly compliment the Senator from Rhode Island for his willingness to face up to the China issue, just as the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] faced up to that issue in his great speech on the proliferation of nuclear power. The Senator from Rhode Island has pointed out that China is a living, thriving, sovereign reality in the world.

As the Senator has pointed out, it is up to China to decide whether she is going to sit down at the council of peaceful nations and live up to her clear obligation to see to it that mankind is not plunged into nuclear war.

We, too, have an obligation to see to it that we do not treat her as an untouchable, so far as international conferences are concerned. We need to do whatever we can to keep the door open to China as the Senator from Rhode Island so eloquently pointed out today, so that we can sit down in council with all nations in respect to this great issue. Unless the nations of the world agree to a program of nuclear control along the lines of the speech of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] all nations are likely to be destroyed in a nuclear war.

I am highly appreciative of the courtesy which the Senator extended to me by sending a copy of his speech to my office in advance; and I shall always consider it a real privilege to have heard him today.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, for the speech which he just made, which I had the privilege of reading earlier.

The Senator from Rhode Island was a leading champion of the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and he has taken a leading role in the effort to halt the spread of nuclear weapons.

I am proud indeed to be a cosponsor of his resolution.

I believe it particularly important to emphasize the points in his address which deal with the strengthening of the powers of the International Atomic Energy Agency. I point out that that Agency, to which the Russians belong, has devised quite satisfactory methods of inspection which seem to be clearly relevant to the treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons which we are discussing today.

I am particularly anxious to join in the recommendation which Senator Pastore has made with respect to changes in our present draft nonproliferation treaty which will be taken up at the end of this month when the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference reconvenes at Geneva.

Especially I would join him in his recommendation that any agreement the United States may reach with our allies and the Soviet Union respecting the nonproliferation of weapons should include a provision to the effect that the nuclear powers will not contribute to the nuclear fissionable power of other nations unless the recipient nations are willing to place the material and equipment under the IAEA or a similar international standard of inspection.

The President's draft treaty does not contain such a provision. The language is fuzzy. I believe it should be amended along the lines recommended by the Senator from Rhode Island in his speech.

I am thoroughly in accord with his recommendation that the United States should offer to place the nuclear fuel services' chemical reprocessing facility under the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards system; second, that the United States propose that India place its chemical reprocessing plant within the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards system; third, that the United States propose that as other nations establish facilities for reprocessing civilian nuclear fuel, such facilities be subject to IAFA inspection; and fourth, that Euratom, another and smaller international atom energy association, explore the possibility of a greater cooperation and coordination with IAEA.

In this connection I invite attention to the recommendations made by the White House Conference on International Cooperation, which met in November and early December of last year. I had the privilege of attending this conference as a congressional delegate, and I spoke at a number of panel sessions.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to what I presume he already knows, and that is that the Citizens' Panel on Arms Control and Disarmament recommended the transfer of agreed quantities of nuclear materials to the IAEA for peaceful uses by the developing countries as a matter of U.S. policy; the elaboration and intensification of IAEA inspection, and the subordination of all transfers of fissionable material to IAEA controls; and opening of all U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States atomic energy plants to IAEA inspection.

It is important to note that the principal and, indeed, the chief recommendation of the Panel on Arms Control and Disarmament reads as follows:

> That the United States seek a nonproliferation treaty that prohibits the transfer by atomic powers of nuclear weapons and manufacturing capabilities and their acquisition or manufacture by nonnuclear powers.

In this connection, the report of this Committee clearly indicates that we are not going to get a nonproliferation treaty if we continue to insist on something like the multilateral force, which brings the West German finger closer to the nuclear trigger.

The members of the Panel on Arms Control and Disarmament are a distinguished group. The Chairman was Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, former dean, School of Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and former Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the members of that Committee and their titles and backgrounds be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE COMMITTEE ON ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT OF THE NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Chairman, dean, School of Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, former Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology.

Dr. Donald G. Brennan, Hudson Institute.

Fredrick M. Eaton, Esq., of the New York bar, former representative of the United States at the 10-Nation Disarmament Committee.

Dr. Vernon Ferwerda, assistant general secretary, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

Mr. John Fischer, editor, Harper's.

Roswell Gilpatric, Esq., of the New York bar, former Under Secretary of Defense.

Joseph J. Johnston, Esq., of the Montgomery, Ala., bar.

Dr. Carl Kaysen, Littauer professor of political economy, Harvard University, former Deputy Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

Dr. Robert Martin, professor of political science, Howard University.

Mr. John M. Mitchell, executive vice president, Aluminum Co. of America.

Dr. William V. O'Brien, chairman, Institute of World Polity, Georgetown University.

Mrs. Josephine Pomerance, civic leader, Cos Cob, Conn.

Rev. Richard Spillane, S.J., director, Center for Peace Research, the Creighton University.

Harold E. Stassen, Esq., of the Philadelphia Bar, former Special Assistant to the President and U.S. Representative to the Disarmament Subcommittee.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to note particularly that among the members is Mr. Roswell Gilpatric, former Under Secretary of Defense.

Similar recommendations were made by the Panel on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy of the White House Conference on International Cooperation. The first two recommendations of that committee were:

> 1. That the United States continue to press for the universal adoption of IAEA safeguards and be prepared to place an increasing number of its civil applications involving nuclear reactors and related fuel processing and reprocessing installations under IAEA safeguards as other nations reciprocate.
>
> 2. That the U.S. Government increase its efforts to persuade all other suppliers of nuclear assistance (raw materials and equipment) to insist on acceptance of IAEA safeguards as a condition of such assistance.

In my judgment, the IAEA, by expanding into the area of arms control and disarmament and putting its inspection capability to work, can be a real force for peace.

I stress again the importance of the fact that Russia is already a member of the IAEA.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the very able members of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy of the White House International Cooperation Conference be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY OF THE NATIONAL CITIZENS' COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Dr. I. I. Rabi, Chairman, professor of physics, Columbia University.

Mr. Alan F. Burch, director of safety, International Union of Operating Engineers, AFL–CIO.

Dr. Melvin Calvin, professor of chemistry, University of California.

Mr. W. Kenneth Davis, vice president, Bechtel Corp.

Dr. Robert J. Hasterlik, professor, Department of Medicine, University of Chicago.

Dr. Alexander Hollaender, director, Biology Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Mr. John R. Menke, member, Board of Directors, United Nuclear Corp.

Mr. Charles Robbins, executive manager and secretary, Atomic Industrial Forum.

Dr. Philip Sporn, chairman, System Division Committee, American Electric Power Service Corp.

Mr. William Webster, president, Yankee Atomic Electric Co.

Dr. Walter H. Zinn, director, Nuclear Division; vice president, Combustion Engineering Corp.

Mr. Aston J. O'Donnell, manager of development, Bechtel Corp., Committee Coordinator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I strongly commend the Senator from Rhode Island, as did the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], a moment ago, for that part of his address in which he said:

> Wherever there is a disarmament conference, wherever peace is the topic, let China be invited to come.

I am as aware as is any other Member of this body of the belligerence of the Red Chinese; of their intransigence; of their present unwillingness to sit down and talk sensibly about the many problems which divide our two countries. I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that we should hold open the door for all nations at all disarmament conferences, whether they be planned for 1967 or for January 27 of this year. I would hope that China would be invited to attend the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva. Suppose China did not come; at least, we would have made the effort; at least we would have shown our own peaceful intentions.

A few words more, and I shall be finished.

We should not delude ourselves about what the real issue is with respect to a nonproliferation treaty. This is not merely a matter of being against the proliferation of nuclear weapons. That is about as controversial as being against sin and in favor of motherhood.

The real issue is whether we are going to permit some half-baked plan for a new multination nuclear force in Europe to stand in the way of our efforts to obtain a nonproliferation treaty.

I again endorse the recommendations of the Wiesner committee, to which I have just referred, which stated:

> That the United States should lead its allies in the search for means to reduce, rather than increase, the buildup of nuclear weapons in and near central Europe. In this connection, solutions to the nuclear problem of the Alliance should be sought in arrangements that do not result in the creation of new nuclear forces.

On December 16, 1965, I sent identical letters to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, expressing concern about a report I had seen in the press, stating that the detailed planning for a joint NATO nuclear force with West German participation had already been agreed upon. The report also stated that the conflicting claims of a treaty with Russia on nuclear nonproliferation no longer seemed to impress American leaders. As is usual in such cases, nothing was quoted. It was another of those instances of which I spoke earlier today, in which faceless men, hiding behind the screen of anonymity, attempt to promote through the press a new policy for the U.S. Government for which they could not be held responsible because they would not tell anybody who they were.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It was reported in a dispatch by Anatole Shub in this morning's Washington Post under the headline "Accord Seen on Five-Nation Atom Force for NATO" that much of the detailed planning for a joint NATO nuclear force, of the MLF or ANF variety, has already been agreed to by Britain and West Germany, and that the creation of such a force with U.S. adherence is rated by U.S. diplomats as a 3-to-1 probability.

The article suggests that mixed manning of nuclear armed Polaris submarines would be an ultimate, although not an initial characteristic of the force. It also states that "another potential obstacle—the conflicting claims of a treaty with Russia on nuclear nonproliferation—no longer seems to impress American leaders," and goes on to assert that "the United States now has no intention of revising its basic draft for a nonproliferation accord—which leaves the possibility of such an allied nuclear force open."

As you will probably recall, the problem of nuclear proliferation and its relationship to proposals to create a joint NATO nuclear force was given particular consideration by the citizen panel on Arms Control and Disarmament of the recent White House Conference on International Cooperation. In its report that committee, headed by Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner and made up of such highly regarded experts as Roswell Gilpatric and Dr. Carl Kaysen, stated that "the United States should lead its allies in the search for means to reduce, rather than increase, the buildup of nuclear weapons in and near Central Europe. In this connection, solutions to the nuclear problem of the alliance should be sought in arrangements that do not result in the creation of new nuclear forces."

You have yourself pointed out on several occasions that the threat of further nuclear proliferation is one of the gravest our Nation faces. No one can say for certain whether the Soviets would be prepared to agree to a treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons if we were to agree to forgo the creation of a joint NATO nuclear force with West German participation, as they have said. But it is at least possible that by rushing into an agreement to create such a force we might well forfeit our last chance to obtain a nonproliferation pact.

In view of the responsibility of the Congress to assure the American people that a step of such magnitude—which could have the most serious consequences for our own security from nuclear attack and the peace and tranquility of all nations—will not be taken rashly, precipitously and without due deliberation, I would urge the administration to take no further steps toward the creation of such a force until Congress reconvenes in January. The committees concerned would then have an opportunity to explore in appropriate depth the questions raised by the creation of a joint nuclear force with West German participation and, in particular, its implications for the successful negotiation of a treaty to halt the further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH S. CLARK.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD replies that I have received from both Secretaries.

There being no objection, the replies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., January 9, 1966.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: I am glad to reply to your December letter about nuclear nonproliferation. There has been a considerable amount of press speculation on this subject but much of it misses the facts by wide margins.

I would suggest, first, that a supposed conflict between nuclear arrangements in the NATO alliance and a nonproliferation treaty is not a real one. No one in NATO has been talking about any arrangement which involves the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The United States is strongly opposed to such proliferation. So are the other members of the alliance. This is a settled policy, as far as we are concerned, and we see no prospect that it will change.

There is a nuclear problem in the alliance because of the hundreds of Soviet missiles targeted on Western Europe. This development on the Soviet side led our allies in Europe, at the end of the last decade, to be concerned about more adequate participation in nuclear matters. Living under the shadow of Soviet missiles, they are understandably concerned about what is going on in the nuclear field and desire to have a responsible part in the discussions and arrangements respecting defense. If any one of us were the chief of government of a state which could be destroyed in a matter of minutes, we would undoubtedly take the same view.

If the Soviet Union is interested solely in the issue of nonproliferation, it ought to be possible to move toward a treaty promptly. But if they have other objectives in mind and seek to accomplish these under the guise of nonproliferation, then there will continue to be difficulty. They object to the very existence of NATO. They object to any arrangements which tie the United States and Western Europe more closely together for defense purposes. They object to the Federal Republic of Germany as a fully equal partner in the Western community. If the Soviet Union would concentrate on the issue of nonproliferation, we could make some progress on that particular point.

I assure you that we are fully conscious of the responsibilities of the Congress in this field. I can also assure you that no commitments have been made which would tie the hands of the Congress. All of these matters are under continuing discussion within the alliance. These informal discussions have not yet led to a specific proposal but my colleagues and I are ready to discuss with you or the appropriate committees of Congress the present state of play.

Cordially yours,

DEAN RUSK.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, January 7, 1966.

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: Thank you for your letter of December 16, 1965, which Mr. Stempler acknowledged on my behalf on December 20.

In your letter you referred to a December 16 dispatch in the Washington Post under the headline "Accord Seen on Five-Nation Atom Force for NATO," and asked that the administration "take no further steps toward the creation of such a force until Congress reconvenes in January." By now you know, of course, from the communique issued by President Johnson and Chancellor Erhard on December 21 that no such steps have been taken. I think it also goes without saying that no fundamental steps of this kind would be taken at any time without participation by the Congress to the fullest extent of its authority.

I do not know the source of the news story to which you referred in your letter. I can tell you what we are doing. You will note from the communique that a number of my colleagues from the NATO countries and I have started discussions on the possibility of improving present nuclear arrangements within the alliance. We shall be discussing, in a committee consisting of the Defense Ministers of 10 NATO countries, the problems of participation by the members of the alliance in nuclear policymaking and planning, including consultation in emergencies, affecting the whole of the nuclear arsenal of the alliance. As you know, several of the allies have long wished to have more of a say in nuclear policy matters. The United States has long been committed to make efforts to bring this about. We are now engaged in doing so. I enclose for your convenience the relevant portions of the communique of December 21. I believe its terms should fully satisfy any concern on the part of the Congress or yourself regarding U.S. firmness in adhering to a policy of nonproliferation.

I shall, of course, be ready at any time to respond to any inquiries you or the Congress may have in this matter. I understand that hearings will, in the normal course of events, take place early in 1966, and I am confident that you and the Congress will remain fully informed.

Sincerely,

BOB.

Enclosure.

EXTRACT FROM JOINT COMMUNIQUE BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND CHANCELLOR ERHARD, DECEMBER 21, 1965

The President and the Chancellor gave close attention to the nuclear problems confronting the Alliance. They agreed that the Federal Republic of Germany and other interested partners in the Alliance should have an appropriate part in nuclear defense.

In this connection the Chancellor emphasized that the Federal Republic of Germany neither intended nor desired to acquire national control over nuclear weapons, that it had in 1954 given an undertaking to its allies not to produce such weapons in Germany, and that, finally, it is the only state in the world to have subjected itself to international supervision of such an obligation.

The President and the Chancellor noted with satisfaction that the Defense Ministers of a number of NATO countries have started discussions on the possibility of improving present nuclear arrangements within the Alliance.

The President, after noting that the deterrent power of the Alliance had proved completely effective and was being constantly modernized, stated the views of the United States that arrangements could be worked out to assure members of the Alliance not having nuclear weapons an appropriate share in nuclear defense. The President and the Chancellor agreed that discussion of such arrangements be continued between the two countries and with other interested allies.

The President and the Chancellor were in agreement in upholding the principle of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons into the national control of states. They were of the view that Alliance nuclear arrangements would not constitute proliferation of nuclear weapons and, in fact, should contribute to the goal of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. They stressed the importance of continuing efforts to reduce the threat of war and bring about effective arms control.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, with regard to the comment of the Secretary of State to the effect that a supposed conflict between nuclear arrangements in the NATO alliance and a nonproliferation treaty is not a real one, suffice it to say that reasonable men may differ. I differ, and many other Americans differ with the Secretary of State in this regard. It is a matter of record that the Russians have repeatedly asserted their willingness to sign a nonproliferation treaty which would prohibit the creation of a NATO nuclear force.

As evidence of this, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from a memorandum submitted by the Soviet Union to the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference at Geneva on January 28, 1964, and an excerpt from a statement delivered orally at the conference by Mr. Tsarapkin, the Soviet representative, on August 13, 1964.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF JANUARY 28, 1964

6. PREVENTION OF THE FURTHER SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

As the stocks of nuclear weapons increase, and the methods of manufacturing them are improved, and as every new type of such weapons are being devised, the question of preventing their further dissemination becomes increasingly important. A widening of the circle of states possessing nuclear weapons would increase many times over the danger of the outbreak of a thermonuclear war. At the same time a widening of the circle of nuclear states would also make it much more difficult to solve the problem of disarmament.

The Soviet Government notes that at present there is an increasing awareness throughout the world of the danger threatening mankind in connection with the further spread of nuclear weapons. It is the duty of all governments to make every effort to avert this danger before it is too late. It is particularly important from the point of view of the interests of peace to close all the channels, whether direct or indirect, through which nuclear weapons could come into the hands of those who twice during this century have caused the conflagration of a world war and who are now actively striving to obtain nuclear weapons.

In order to shut off all possibilities for the spread of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Government proposes that an agreement on this question should contain, besides the prohibition to transfer such weapons or to give information on their manufacture to any particular government, also provisions to guarantee that such a transfer of nuclear weapons or access to them shall not take place indirectly, through military blocs, for example, through the so-called multilateral nuclear force of NATO.

TSARAPKIN STATEMENT OF AUGUST 13, 1964

In concluding, I should like once again, on behalf of the Soviet delegation, to appeal to all members of the 18-Nation Committee on Disarmament to set to work without any further delay on a practical solution of the problem of the nondissemination of nuclear weapons—such a solution as would shut off all possibilities of access to nuclear weapons for those states which do not now possess them.

Such a solution should provide that the nuclear powers shall give an undertaking not to transfer to nonnuclear powers nuclear weapons and technical information necessary for their production.

Such a solution should also provide for a commitment by the nonnuclear powers not to manufacture and not to acquire nuclear weapons from other states, and also not to obtain technical information for their production.

Such a solution should also contain clear provisions precluding the possibility of granting access to nuclear weapons to states not possessing them, through military alliances, whether indirectly through the access of their military personnel to such weapons within the joint armed forces of such alliances, or through the participation of nonnuclear states in the possession, disposition, and control of such weapons.

That would be a comprehensive agreement on the prevention of the further spread of nuclear weapons, the conclusion of which is awaited with so much hope by the peoples of the world. The Soviet Union is prepared to sign such an agreement this very day. It is now up to the Western Powers and, above all, the United States, to take the next step.

Lastly, I should like to mention that we listened with great attention to the statement made today by the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Hassan, and were most interested in his ideas and suggestions. Above all we welcome, and we note with deep satisfaction, the decision taken by the leaders of the African States and governments at the Cairo Conference, at which the African States expressed themselves ready to conclude, under the aegis of the United Nations, an agreement renouncing the production of nuclear weapons and the acquisition of control over such weapons. There is no doubt that this resolution represents a substantial step forward on the road to the nondissemination of nuclear weapons and toward lessening the threat of thermonuclear war.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, no one can say with certainty whether the Russians really mean what they say. However, I do not believe it advances the argument very much to deny that the proposed nuclear force is an obstacle to the treaty, when the Russians have said over and over again that, so far as they are concerned, it is not only an obstacle, but that it would make a treaty impossible.

It is an open secret that the U.S. draft treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons was purposely written with a gaping loophole in it to permit the creation of a new NATO nuclear force of some sort. Time and again the Russians have declared their objection to this provision on the ground that it would permit the West Germans to get their fingers on the nuclear trigger—and well it might.

It is reassuring to know, from the letters of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, which I have just had placed in the RECORD, that no fundamental steps have yet been taken to create a NATO nuclear force. But what we must do now, if we are really serious about getting a treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons, is, first, to rewrite the treaty, emphasizing the role of the IAEA, as recommended by the Senator from Rhode Island, and secondly, as I have recommended in this talk, to close the loophole created for the proposed NATO nuclear force. We must do this so that we can have some chance, within our national security requirements, of coming to an agreement on a treaty to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear weapons which we all so fervently desire.

Again, I commend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for his substantial contribution this afternoon to the cause of peace.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, when the Senator from Rhode Island wrote to me and asked if I cared to join in sponsoring the resolution, I replied by saying that I would be glad to do so, because I believe we want to do everything we can to prohibit the spread of nuclear weapons. I commend the Senator from Rhode Island for the wording of the resolve. The wording to which I invite attention is that the resolution supports the principle of additional efforts by the President which are appropriate and necessary in the interest of peace for the solution of nuclear proliferation problems.

That means that we support the President in his attempts to take further steps toward a solution of the problems of reducing the proliferation of nuclear weapons, but at the same time it leaves wide open opportunities for the Senate to carry out its duties in deciding whether treaties or agreements that the President makes are satisfactory and proper for this Nation to consummate.

I commend the Senator from Rhode Island for the wording of the resolution and for the principle he has advocated.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators in commending the able and distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for what, in my opinion, could be the most important address made on the floor of the Senate during this session. The Senator from Rhode Island is not only able and industrious, but is one of the two foremost authorities on this subject in the Senate today.

I was especially impressed with what the Senator said about China. We should all give careful consideration to the short paragraph of the Senator from Rhode Island:

> Nations do not have to love one another in order to live in the same world with one another, and no nation, not even China, can afford to retreat from the road to reason, if they and we are to live at all.

I congratulate the able Senator for the fine, constructive message he presented today to the Senate and to the American people.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am extremely glad to have this opportunity to cosponsor and support the excellent and far-thinking resolution of my distinguished senior colleague and able friend [Mr. PASTORE] and congratulate him upon submitting it.

The problem of nuclear proliferation, a problem that becomes more acute with each passing year, is one that presently appears to be without solution.

The only way we can ever reach a solution is, at least, to set the stage, delineate our objectives and declare and reiterate our intents to achieve these objectives.

We must remember, too, that until every nation participates in a nonproliferation agreement as well as in agreements not to test and not to use these awesome weapons—no nation can feel itself secure. In this regard, I congratulate my colleague on his forthrightness in saying that Communist China must participate in any agreement, too, for it to be effective.

The resolution of my senior colleague leads the way to the solution of these problems.

Because of the wisdom and necessity of this resolution, I believe it should—and will—pass overwhelmingly. And that it will be the prelude of an actual, all embracing, and lasting agreement.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join with my capable colleagues from Rhode Island, Senators PASTORE and PELL, and with other Senators, in support of Senate Resolution 179, to limit the spread of nuclear weapons.

Along with other citizens, I have noted with increasing apprehension the interest in nuclear armaments which has been expressed by a number of nations which do not now have atomic capabilities. None can deny that as the membership in "the nuclear club" grows, the danger of accidental or ill-considered nuclear tragedy increases with it. We must take every reasonable and appropriate step to insure that the proliferation of these fearsome weapons is halted, and that workable international agreements are consummated which will limit their spread.

I commend the vigorous efforts of my cherished and effective friend, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for his energetic advocacy of this resolution as a step toward a world of safety and peace for all men. Likewise, I applaud the thoughtful and cogent arguments advanced by the diligent junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I address my warmest congratulations to the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island for what I regard as a statesmanlike address on what is perhaps the most important single subject that faces the nations of the world today.

I was particularly impressed by the way he struck at the heart of the matter with these two paragraphs. He said:

> The challenge of our times is not how many more nuclear warheads we can produce or stockpile, but rather how we can prevent their proliferation and how we can prevent their use.

He further said:

> The paradox of our time is that as we and the Soviet Union have developed larger stockpiles of nuclear weapons, the relative defensive posture of both nations has diminished.

Mr. President, if the people of this country could fully appreciate the significance of these truths, then how easily the whole issue posed by the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island would fall into proper prospective.

I shall distribute this speech to all the newspapers in my State in the hope that the publishers of those newspapers will give proper editorial attention to the content of the speech which the great senior Senator from Rhode Island has delivered today.

In my judgment, a nuclear weapons nonproliferation treaty is the No. 1 item on the world's diplomatic agenda. Certainly it must be viewed as a matter of prime importance to both the United States and the Soviet Union.

What a tragedy it is that circumstances of the times should so conspire against it, chief among which is the exacerbating war in southeast Asia.

The address which the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has delivered in the Senate today helps to underscore for the whole human race the importance of President Johnson's current efforts to attain a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

I commend the Senator for the important contribution he has made today on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I congratulate the senior Senator from Rhode Island for the speech he made in the Senate today.

I do not believe that there is anyone, in the U.S. Senate or within the Government of the United States, whether it be in the executive or the legislative branch, who knows more about the subject or is more firmly committed to finding a solution to the very difficult problem than is the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island.

He has had experience in this field. He has taken the initiative. He has not only influenced events in Congress, but has also had a major influence on the action taken by the executive branch of the Government over a period of the past 15 years.

I believe that the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] have shown initiative, and have had the imagination and courage to speak out on some very difficult problems.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] said, being against the spread of nuclear weapons is like being for motherhood. It requires much more effort to get at the intricate problems we face month after month and year after year.

The senior Senator from New Mexico and the senior Senator from Rhode Island have shown both initiative and leadership in this field. I agree, at least with part of what the Senator from Oregon said about the importance of the subject. However, I believe that this is merely a brick in a house that has been built by the senior Senator from Rhode Island over an extended period of time. This is merely one further contribution that he has made. As we look back, we note the initiative, imagination, and leadership that the Senator has shown in this field. I, as a U.S. Senator and as an American citizen, express my gratitude to him for what he has done. The speech of the senior Senator from Rhode Island was most informative.

I should like a little later in my talk to address a few questions to the senior Senator from Rhode Island.

This resolution and the number of Senators who have cosponsored it are a testament not only to the Senate's deep concern with the problem of nuclear weapons spread but also its esteem for the Senator from Rhode Island.

But this resolution is much more.

This resolution puts the Senate of the United States clearly on record in support of active initiative toward nuclear sanity and peace.

To the Soviet Union, and to the other nuclear powers, it is another indication in our commitment to destroy the weapons of war before those weapons destroy the societies they were designed to protect.

To the other nations of the world, this resolution is evidence that the United States maintains its commitment to a world order based not on force but on the rule of law.

And to the American people this is a call to continue the effort for which President Kennedy called in 1963—the effort to "reexamine our own attitude—as individuals and as a nation," to "begin by looking inward—by examining our own attitude toward the possibilities of peace, toward the Soviet Union, toward the course of the cold war."

There is a yet more important aspect of this resolution. This resolution should be interpreted by all agencies of the Government as a direction to pursue with increased vigor and increased commitment the efforts which will be necessary to make a nonproliferation agreement more than a scrap of paper.

For conclusion of a treaty with the Soviet Union will not, by itself, solve this difficult problem. As the Senator from Rhode Island said, other nations must be persuaded that it is in their interest to accede to the treaty, and to adhere to it once they do sign.

For we are concerned not just with preventing the spread of nuclear weapons this year, but next year, and 5 and 10 and more years from now.

Mr. President, we—you and I—have, after all, an awesome responsibility in this field to the next generation of mankind. That is why it is so important.

A nation's present government may sign the treaty, and another government, 5 years from now, may have a different assessment of the best interests of its nation.

But it is now within our power to affect the conditions—economic, political, and military—which will shape such decisions in the future.

If India, for example, does not succeed in its economic development, it may find internal pressures so serious in 5 years that a demagogic government would seek escape through nuclear posturing. However, what we do now can determine India's economic future. In my judgment, that action would have a major effect on our chances for preventing a nuclear war spread.

We should realize that dealing with this problem will require action not only by us, but also action in conjunction with our allies and with the Soviet Union, in that part of the world. It will require facing up to our relationship with Communist China, not merely now, but in the decade ahead.

What do we expect? What will be our role? As we fight the war in Vietnam, what do we expect will happen concerning China's relations with India? Where will India turn? What are we to do to affect that relationship?

All these questions must receive our utmost attention as we consider this most awesome responsibility of the control of nuclear weapons.

But the problem of making nuclear weapons unnecessary for the present nonnuclear powers is a different problem in various parts of the world.

In Latin America, the initiative must be taken by the nations themselves. Let them now demonstrate the leadership necessary to create a nuclear free zone in that hemisphere. Let us furnish our help, our technical assistance, and our active encouragement. That is what is needed now.

I think many Senators have made clear—and this resolution will make unmistakably clear—our expectation of action in the following areas.

First, our search for new approaches to the problems of European security must be intensified. That was gone into in some detail by the Senator from Pennsylvania today, and for a period of time last year.

Senators are aware that the greatest difference between the United States and the Soviet Union on a nonproliferation treaty is over the question of West German access to nuclear armament.

Unless we exercise fully our resources and our imagination, both technical and diplomatic, we will be faced with a choice between our alliance and a treaty—a choice which paralyzes action.

In this connection, I urge that we take this occasion to make every effort to reconcile our differences with France—differences which have in the past prevented possible progress in this area.

Some recent French Government officials have indicated that closer cooperation may be possible; our response to such indications should be swift and affirmative.

Furthermore, it should be clear to all that progress toward relaxation of nuclear tensions in Europe must go hand in hand with progress toward a general European settlement.

The will of the Senate, as expressed in this resolution, cannot be fully carried out if the executive departments ignore European questions because they are not presently in crisis.

I realize that it is difficult to turn attention from the immediate crisis of the war in Vietnam to what seems the less pressing issue of peace in Europe. But only by constant effort for a European solution can we make progress toward the lasting settlement on which the peace of the world ultimately depends.

In Europe, in Germany, we must reconcile and satisfy many seemingly conflicting interests, and make hard decisions among some of them. But we must have a program, a considered policy, for reaching a firm goal. A policy of drift and inaction, of self-satisfaction, of preserving the status quo, will, history has clearly shown us, be dealing a holocaust to the next generation of Europeans.

Second, we must intensify our efforts to insure adherence by present nonnuclear powers to any treaty which we reach, to make nuclear arms unnecessary, and abstention from other development as attractive as possible for all the nations of world.

In this connection, I would hope that the new look at foreign aid which the President has promised includes in its planning provision for encouraging all recipient nations to abstain from the development of nuclear weapons.

Third, it should also be clear to all that progress toward our goal of nonproliferation will be determined in large part by our success in reducing our own reliance on the control and use of nuclear weapons. Countries large and small will be reluctant to forgo these weapons if they feel them essential to their own national security and standing in the world. The more we rely on nuclear weapons, the more reluctant other nations will be to forgo them.

We should therefore continue to pursue President Johnson's initiative toward mutual reduction of nuclear stockpiles and arms with the Soviet Union; we should continue our efforts to assure that our conventional forces are adequate to any demand; and we should pursue with increased effort investigations of the possibility of preventing the use of nuclear weapons now in existence—such as the United Nations treaty prohibiting their placement in outer space.

All these, and other initiatives, will be necessary if we are to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

This resolution, which in my judgment represents a historic initiative on the part of the Senator from Rhode Island and all Senators who have joined with him, makes clear that these steps should be taken.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. With reference to the Senator's point that we should reappraise our relationship with France, it is significant to note at this time that France is not a party to the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. It is also significant to note that the 18-nation conference which is to resume in Geneva on January 27, has not been attended by France even though France has been invited to attend. There is an empty chair there awaiting the French representative.

Does not the Senator from New York agree with me that now is the time, in view of what has transpired in France recently at its general election, for our State Department or our responsible people in the White House to exert every possible effort to renew an invitation to France, to see if the representatives of France would not be willing to attend the meetings, and also begin talks again as to whether or not she should become a party to the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. What the Senator suggests is extremely important. There is a greater possibility now than there was prior to the recent election within France. We must once again sit down with our ancient ally and old friend and determine whether or not some of the differences can be adjusted, and whether we can reach an accommodation with France within the coverage of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Finally, I emphasize that the efforts for which this resolution calls will require the best brains and talent in the executive branch of the Government—indeed, in the entire Nation, and in all the nations of the world.

We cannot expect to solve these complex and difficult problems at the lower echelons of government.

This emergency—and it is the gravest emergency we face—must receive the same intense focus of attention, the same creativity and persistence, which we so easily assemble for crises like the Cuban naval confrontation of 1962, like the war in Vietnam now.

Only with the best talent and energy and brains and commitment in this country will the intent of this resolution be carried out.

For pious hopes—and speeches and declarations of position—are not enough.

What is necessary is action, and the will to action. What is necessary is action now. What is necessary, as the Senator from Rhode Island has shown, is a program of action, not 10 years from now, not 20 years from now, but now.

If these awesome weapons are ever unleashed—and their spread can only hasten such a day—the survivors will not be impressed with our words, however fine.

I believe that more can be done. More must be done. I believe this resolution will help insure that more will be done.

I compliment and thank the Senator from Rhode Island for the courage and leadership he has shown.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I express my complete agreement with the points made by the Senator from New York during his address, particularly with respect to the need for bringing France back to the conference table through some initiative on our part.

I also agree with the point he made that serious problems will not be solved at the intermediate levels of government. One of the most discouraging things with which I was confronted during the 3-day session of the White House Conference on International Cooperation was how far ahead of the State Department the able citizens who were members of the conference showed themselves to be.

I intend at a later date to take the floor to point this out, and to support it by chapter and verse. There were 29 such citizen groups, and there was hardly a recommendation that a citizen group made which was not at least a half generation ahead of the position of the intermediate group representing the State Department. There was such a negative attitude taken by the Department's representatives that one felt that they might have been studying Russian, and that the only word that they had learned was "nyet."

Probably, the Senator from New York would not wish to join me in this critical comment, but we must get this whole problem of a nonproliferation treaty, and all the other various measures which he and I have hinted at this afternoon with respect to an accommodation in Europe and elsewhere, out of bureaucracy and up into the hands of the policymaking officials and, hopefully, give them the opportunity to have such leisure from putting out one crisis after another, from putting out one brush war after another, so that they can give coherent attention to these major problems on which rests the peace of the world.

Let me say in conclusion that, in my opinion, the problem with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is that they are men of imagination and farsighted in that regard. The difficulty is between the military industrial complex in the Pentagon and the negative attitude of those below the top levels in the State Department. Thus, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency pretty well has its hands tied behind its back.

Again, I commend my friend the Senator from New York for the very real contribution he has made to this debate.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I have gone through all the events which led up to the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1963, beginning early in 1961, and without any question, if it had not been for the initiative taken in the highest ranks of government, such as the efforts which were personally made by President Kennedy, and then by Averell Harriman, supported by Secretary of Defense McNamara who showed great initiative and imagination in this field, we could not possibly have secured a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Of course, I do not mean to reflect upon the work and the great efforts made by all those committed to this kind of progress; but unless the work they can do, based upon past levels, is seized with some initiative, is given initiative, and is supported actively, nothing will be done.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say to my good friend the Senator from New York that modesty probably prevents him from adding that, as a former Attorney General of the United States, he was among those who made a very real contribution to this measure. Let me note that I, too, have read Arthur Schlesinger's "One Thousand Days."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from New York for the brilliant and eloquent addendum which he has just made to his great historic speech at the end of the previous session of Congress on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

His statement today is a fitting contribution to the historic speech that the Senator from Rhode Island has just made.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his remarks.

May I ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from New York certainly may do so.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. On page 10 of the Senator's speech, he states:

> I would recommend, however, that any agreement the United States may reach with our allies and the Soviet Union in the nonproliferation of weapons will include a provision that the nuclear powers will not transfer fissionable material or equipment to other nations for civilian purposes unless the recipient nations are willing to place the material and equipment under international agency or similar international safeguards inspection. Similarly, I would recommend that any such agreement would be joined by all the nonnuclear powers of the world and they, in turn, would agree not to seek or obtain nuclear equipment or material except under international agency or similar international safeguards.

What is the status of that agreement at the present time; and could the Senator from Rhode Island inform Senators what the situation now is, and what the prospects are so far as the future is concerned?

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator talking about the proposed treaty—that is, the proposed treaty which is now on the table in Geneva, or is he referring to the status with reference to the nations who receive nuclear material under the International Atomic Energy Agency?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am talking about the latter.

Mr. PASTORE. The fact remains that every nation which receives any fissionable material through the International Atomic Energy Agency is subject to the edict of that Agency. The problem we have had, in order to show the way in our bilateral agreements, is that we have insisted on United States' inspection before the IAEA inspection system was in operation and that there must be an accounting, for the reasons I have already given and later will repeat.

We have insisted upon inspection, but beginning with 1963, as we renew our bilateral agreements, we are now requiring that this inspection be made by the International Agency, which I believe is a step in the right direction.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Does that inspection always take place?

Mr. PASTORE. We required the right of our inspectors to have access to the facilities. It has to take place. Of course, it does.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If we are to furnish that kind of material to England or to France for civilian purposes, does it always come under inspection by the International Agency?

Mr. PASTORE. We are not furnishing a great deal to the United Kingdom as of now but the fact remains that, at the present time, a controversy is prevailing. I do not know how openly we should discuss this matter on the floor of the Senate today, but there is quite a controversy going on between the United States and Great Britain regarding a large amount of enriched U^{235} Great Britain would like to obtain in the future and also as to the wording of that particular provision in the draft treaty—article III—which has led me to the recommendation I have made today.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is the point I wished to get to. The reason I raise the question is that I am not on the Senator's committee, but I did read a newspaper article 4 or 5 days ago regarding this controversy.

Mr. PASTORE. Some time ago, when we involved ourselves in the civilian reactor in India, it was I who wrote the Commission and the Secretary of State and stated that I was absolutely dissatisfied with the position which was being taken by the Indian Government on international inspection because they were insisting on the sensitive point of sovereignty rights. They did not wish someone else to come in and inspect them.

I took a strong position, and finally we resolved it in that direction. That is the position which we on the Joint Committee have taken. At least, that is the position I have taken right along. When we talked informally about future U^{235} for the United Kingdom civilian program this controversy developed between us and Great Britain. I have taken a strong position on that as well, and I would hope that they would resolve it.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I can say without any question that if it had not been for the initiative of the Senator from Rhode Island, the nuclear plant with India would not have been under international control and international inspection. That does not reflect on the intent of the Government to take that action until the effort was made by the Senator from Rhode Island over a period—I believe of approximately a year.

Mr. PASTORE. We talk about proliferation as though it meant only if we take a completed bomb and pass it on to another party. We do not do that. Under the Atomic Energy Act we cannot do that. All we do today is establish a civilian reactor to manufacture electricity. The product which that reactor produces is plutonium. When and if someone separates that product—that is, from the uranium fuel element—we have weapons material, the material with which to make a bomb. We must realize that. Our negotiators must become firmer than they have been heretofore. I believe that our negotiators have been too soft on this point. I believe that we should take a firmer position. If the one thing that we fear is proliferation, if the one thing that we fear is an atomic holocaust, let us do the things that are needed to be done to prevent those fears from being realized.

I believe that the first ones who should fall into line should be our allies. Sometimes I become a little weary of the position taken by our friends on the question of inspection, such as now exists regarding the wording of the treaty.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I ask the Senator from Rhode Island another question?

Mr. PASTORE. Certainly.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I should like to support the Senator from Rhode Island in the efforts he is making in the controversy which is going on at the present time.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from New York will permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Rhode Island, Is it not true that Russia is a member in good standing of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and that, generally speaking, Russia has cooperated with the international effort to deal with inspection?

Mr. PASTORE. I cannot deny that statement. It is true. Although to date Russia has not placed any of her facilities under IAEA inspection. Coming back to the MLF, let me say that members of the Joint Committee, unofficially and officially, singularly and as a group, have told two Presidents that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy does not consider the multilateral force as an effective force. We have said so publicly and privately. One of the members said:

> Who came up with the "nutty" idea?

I believe that explains it.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Let me say that that "nutty" idea came up before 1961.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course it did.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I believe that we all have to take that——

Mr. PASTORE. Let me say to the Senator from New York that I hope he will understand that I did not say that, but I do concur in the characterization. It will not work. I believe that we are fooling no one. I am against it, the members of the Joint Committee have opposed it from its inception.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The prediction of the Senator from Rhode Island has been amply borne out over the period of the past 5 years.

Let me ask a further question of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Certainly.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I support the Senator from Rhode Island in the language he suggests on the top of page 11 of his speech dealing with the treaty.

Mr. PASTORE. What is the language?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Paragraphs 1 and 2, on page 11, makes some suggestions as to the kind of language dealing with international control, which I believe is most appropriate and which I should like to support.

However, let me ask the Senator from Rhode Island another question in connection with the International Atomic Energy Agency, on page 15 of his speech, his paragraph 4, wherein he makes the following recommendation:

> 4. Euratom explore the possibility of greater cooperation and coordination with IAEA. In this connection, it would be desirable, I believe, if Euratom were accepted for membership in the IAEA—

What does the Senator from Rhode Island feel about inspection by Euratom rather than the IAEA?

Mr. PASTORE. In some of the facilities within Europe, I believe it has a practical result. It accomplishes the same thing, because we do not involve the nationalistic monopoly; but, psychologically speaking, I believe that the six nations should agree. Like all the other nations, let us be first by putting our own reprocessing plant under international inspection.

We can still allow the international team to come in on four of the reactors. Let us set a base. We have to set the example. We should say to the six nations that Euratom should come in and subscribe to the International Agency. They inquired about coming in. I understand that the Russians do not like that, because they feel it is an organization within an organization.

Sometimes we become a trifle picayunish on some of the issues. We must realize the broad question involved. We are talking about life and death. We are talking about survival. We are talking about killing 300 million people in one blow. They would last less than 60 minutes.

The time has come to be realistic. We must recognize for what it is the idea of working so that someone can try to skirt under the agreement by some kind of subterfuge. We should insist on nations coming in and living up to international obligations. I realize that they are watching one another. One of the six nations is not going to let it happen. But, psychologically, we must realize that if we are to have disarmament, if we are to have peace, we must have international inspection. That is the reason why, when Great Britain wanted an exception, I said, "Now is the time to insist." We have not been able to come to an agreement with the Russians because they will not agree to on-site inspection. Are we to become a party to that kind of procedure? We ought to insist on inspection. Now is the time—not tomorrow. We cannot afford to wait. We either mean it or we do not mean it. If we mean it, let us say it.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I support the Senator from Rhode Island. With reference to Euratom and cooperation with IAEA, it is time to fish or cut bait.

Mr. PASTORE. I was trying to take a leaf out of the book of the Senator from New York. I was trying to be diplomatic.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thought so. I was trying to take a leaf out of the book of the Senator from Rhode Island.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for yielding.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am happy to join in the resolution supporting our Government's efforts to negotiate international agreements to prevent the acquisition and ownership of nuclear weapons by countries not presently having them. Any measure to reverse trends toward international anarchy merits support.

In sponsoring the resolution, I want to make it clear that I do not regard a nuclear nonproliferation treaty as the millenium in the evolution of a world order. This treaty can be a modest contribution to a more stable international environment. It could be more than that if those who encourage and thrive on political instability and heightened international tensions were profoundly to change their attitudes and policies.

To be really effective, a nuclear nonproliferation treaty should bind all nations, including especially the five nuclear powers. France and the Communist Chinese, unfortunately, have displayed no interest in such a treaty. A treaty binding all other nations can, nevertheless, be a useful measure. A bilateral Soviet-American nonproliferation treaty, on the other hand, would be superfluous since neither nuclear giant is about to transfer its nuclear weapons or nuclear production capability to any nonnuclear nation.

However, in our desire to conclude a multilateral nuclear nonproliferation treaty, we must be careful not to sacrifice the legitimate security interests of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Despite West Germany's apparent willingness to forgo its desire to establish and participate in a multilateral nuclear force or variant thereof, there remains a desire on the part of several of our European allies to participate actively in the planning and execution of NATO's nuclear defense. The United States should persevere in efforts to satisfy this legitimate aspiration. In my judgment, the defense of the North Atlantic region and Western Europe, the citadel of freedom, continues to merit top priority—higher even than a nonproliferation treaty. In saying this, I do not mean to downgrade the desirability of that treaty, but I do suggest the need of keeping our security priorities in proper perspective.

So, Mr. President, keeping in mind the foregoing considerations, I am pleased to associate myself as a cosponsor with my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who is the author of the resolution.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, once again the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has performed an act of the highest statesmanship in speaking out on what is surely the most fearful issue of our day. President Johnson has called the control of nuclear proliferation "the most important task on earth." In an impressive speech to the Senate last year, the junior Senator from New York called it "the most vital issue facing our Nation and the world." And that same day, Senator Pastore, in one of his many statements on this danger, said that our nuclear weapons are so powerful that "if we took the TNT power of 20 megatons and loaded it on a freight train, that freight train would extend from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean." He has repeated this frightful fact here today.

We can never afford to forget that we still live in the shadow of absolute destruction, in a world where all that man has painfully built over the centuries could be wiped away within a few hours. We can never afford to forget that each new nation that obtains these weapons multiplies the chances that some day one nation will strike out, and the nuclear holocaust will begin.

As Americans we face many painful problems—the grim necessity of our war effort in Vietnam, the continued prevalence of poverty and discrimination and lack of equal opportunity for all at home, the urgent call that we work together in building a great society. But only one problem threatens the world itself; only one endangers all human life.

So I must join with my fellow Senators, we must all join together, in urging the continuation of our Government's strongest efforts to reach agreement with all actual and potential nuclear powers on a treaty against nuclear proliferation. We must join together in intensifying our search for further agreements and understandings which could reduce, and perhaps finally eliminate, the threat which hangs still over us all, the threat which can only increase tomorrow if we pretend we can ignore it today.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of Senator Pastore's resolution on nonproliferation, and I hope that the Senate will give this resolution its early consideration and overwhelming approval.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am glad to cosponsor the resolution in support of efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons.

The dangers that prompt our concern are stated succinctly in the language of the resolution.

There is, however, another danger to which I wish to draw attention. We are now confronted in Vietnam with the most serious military conflict between Communist and free worlds since Korea, and the dynamics of this conflict point in the direction of increasing East-West tension.

Under these circumstances it is understandable that some Americans see no alternative but to blow up the few bridges that have been built between East and West since President Eisenhower secured a truce in Korea.

To do so, however, would be to ignore the realities of the nuclear era. The fact that the United States and the Soviet Union share a capability for mutual destruction establishes their common interest in avoiding such a fate. To that end we agreed to a limited test ban, and to that end we must seek other meaningful and mutually beneficial agreements such as a nonproliferation treaty.

Let us, above all, resist those emotional arguments grounded on the assumption that the alternatives before us are simple. They are not, nor have they been for a long time. If the true self-interest of the United States is to be served, we must continue to explore every avenue of common interest with our adversaries even as we stand firmly against Communist aggression in Vietnam. That is the meaning of the resolution I join in introducing today.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] by cosponsoring his resolution on nuclear proliferation.

As President Kennedy frequently reminded us, the nuclear sword of Damocles hangs over our heads. This sword can destroy in a few hours the works of man that have been painfully accumulated on this planet since the beginning of civilization. In one fatal nuclear exchange, we can reduce a large part of the world's cities, farms, and factories to rubble. In one nuclear blunder we can obliterate the works of art, the libraries and universities that record and preserve the experiences of all who have come before. We hold in our hands the power to bequeath to our children an earth strewn with smoking rubble and an atmosphere laden with nuclear poison.

This problem was made by man, and it can be solved by man. This resolution is, in my judgment, a useful step toward abating of the threat of nuclear war.

The brief history of the atomic age demonstrates that the two great nuclear powers, the United States and the U.S.S.R., can act responsibly in times of crisis. We are two great industrial powers. We are among the few nations of the world who can feed, clothe, and house our people, and provide some of the amenities of a good life. We each have a great deal to lose by mutual destruction.

So long as the ability to produce nuclear weapons rested solely in the hands of the United States and Russia, the world was precariously, but affirmatively protected by a mutual recognition of the impossibility of nuclear war. In Berlin, Cuba, Indochina, and other situations, both the United States and the U.S.S.R. drew back from the option of mutual destruction.

But this balance of terror is no longer effective to prevent the use of nuclear weapons. Other nations have joined the nuclear club and still others are knocking at the door. Some of these nations are so poor and overpopulated that they may feel they have little or nothing to lose by the use of nuclear weapons. Indeed, one of the principal sources of disagreement between China and Russia seems to be whether the use of atomic bombs is an acceptable exercise of national power.

As the nuclear art spreads from country to country and continent to continent, our security becomes increasingly tenuous. As more and more nations obtain nuclear weapons there is no assurance that they will not be used to try to resolve some local conflict in the Middle East, in the great subcontinent of Asia, or in Africa or Latin America, or that some nuclear adventurer will not try to blackmail even a great power with the threat to destroy one or more major cities.

We must bend every effort of national purpose to see that the threat of nuclear war is reduced. There is no more important step toward this goal than immediately to halt the spread of nuclear weapons to countries that do not now have this capability.

A nonproliferation agreement ratified by a large number of nations would help to reduce the likelihood of a nuclear war. By obligating nuclear powers not to spread their nuclear weapons to nonnuclear nations or to assist such nations in producing nuclear weapons, the chances of nuclear weapons being used in war would diminish.

A nonproliferation agreement would also reduce international tensions. It would help to reassure those nations which fear that a potential rival nation may be producing nuclear weapons secretly. When such fears are created tensions rise, especially when there is inadequate means to verify charges that a given power is building nuclear weapons.

I am pleased to note that negotiations for a nonproliferation treaty will continue late in January, when the 18 Nation Disarmament Conference reconvenes in Geneva, Switzerland. The United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and 14 nonnuclear powers will discuss the United States and Soviet draft treaties on nonproliferation agreements and will attempt to resolve their differences. The hopes for a treaty are greater today than at any time in the past 5 years.

I believe that this resolution will assist in the accomplishment of these objectives for the following reasons:

First. A resolution passed by the Senate supporting a halt in the spread of nuclear weapons will encourage the executive branch to drive for a treaty this year.

Second. A Senate resolution would be yet another indication of the peaceful intentions of the United States, of the pursuit of steps to reduce the danger of war, and of a willingness to reach mutually satisfactory agreements with other nations to end the arms race.

Third. A resolution would be an encouragement to those in other nations who want peace and an end to the arms race, to continue their efforts, sometimes against opposition in their own countries. Every nation has its zealots for nuclear weapons; a Senate declaration against proliferation will strengthen the position of those who are urging nonnuclear nations to remain that way.

Fourth. Senate debate and discussion of a nonproliferation treaty, leading to passage of a resolution on the subject, would become a source of information to the American people and it would demonstrate congressional concern about the issues of the arms race and the reduction of international tensions.

Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island on his leadership. I hope this resolution can be brought before the Senate for action in the near future.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I join with other Senators who have spoken in the Senate today in commending the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for his fine statement on the problems of nuclear proliferation. This resolution calling for and supporting the continuation of the President's efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons marks another important step in what remains America's greatest challenge and greatest responsibility. It is heartening to see that the resolution has the support of so many Members of this body.

Who can question the need for a halt to nuclear proliferation? Five nations already have the capacity to develop and use these destructive weapons. More than a dozen others will have this knowledge within a few years. And in areas of underlying tension and deepseated discontent, the nuclear capability of one nation places a pressure on surrounding states to develop an equal potential for self-defense. Thus as the number of nations possessing this capability increases, the difficulty of controlling its use grows faster still.

There is no doubt that we in America have a special responsibilty to channel the use of nuclear power toward peaceful ends. We were the first to discover the potential of the atom, the first to unleash its power in a bomb, the first to call for a test ban treaty. Now we stand foremost among world nuclear powers.

Yet, paradoxically, it is difficult to maintain the extreme sense of urgency which is necessary to cope with this, the most serious problem confronting mankind. Negotiating failures in Geneva lack the dramatic impact of battle losses in Vietnam, and the absence of significant progress does not bring daily newspaper headlines.

But we must not let our national preoccupation over the conflict in Vietnam divert our attention from this problem of nuclear spread. Our search for solutions must go on, for the danger grows greater with each day, and it does not await an end to the Vietnam hostilities.

For that reason I believe that Senator PASTORE's resolution serves an important purpose. It reminds all of us of our responsibilities. It reminds the Nation and the world of our commitment to peace and to a world free of the threat of nuclear holocaust. It gives the support and encouragement of this body to the efforts already initiated by President Johnson to seek and to carry forward all appropriate means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons in the interest of peace.

I again commend the Senator from Rhode Island on the farsighted initiative he has shown in introducing this resolution today. It is a pleasure to join with so many Senators in a united effort to bring the influence and experience of the U.S. Senate to bear on the negotiation of a nonproliferation treaty.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. **PASTORE**. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **CHURCH**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WILD RIVERS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1446) to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the System, and for other purposes.

Mr. **CHURCH**. Mr. President, a question has arisen.

Members of the Idaho Highway Board visited with me during the adjournment of Congress and raised the question as to whether the wild river bill (S. 1446) would forestall or prevent the construction and maintenance of needed roads and bridges in wild river areas.

Clearly, the question must be answered in the negative. The bill would not prevent the construction of needed roads and bridges in wild river areas.

Both the language of the bill and the committee report, Report 792 of the 89th Congress, 1st session, made clear this fact and the legislative intent with respect to it.

Section 2 of S. 1446 contains the statement on policy. It provides, in part:

> It is the policy of Congress to preserve, develop, reclaim, and make accessible for the benefit of all the American people selected parts of the Nation's diminishing resource of free-flowing rivers.

I emphasize the words "make accessible for the benefit of all of the American people" in the foregoing statement of policy.

Again, in the definition of wild river areas eligible to be included in the wild rivers system in section 2(b), we find one of the criteria is that it will promote "public use and enjoyment of the scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values."

Again, in subsection (g), section 5, page 26, we find the following affirmative provision:

> A State shall have such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access by such State to the beds of navigable streams, tributaries, or rivers (or segments thereof) which are vested in the State, in case such beds are located in a wild river area.

Turning to the committee report on S. 1446, page 2, there is set forth the following statement of legislative intent, as follows:

> It is also the intent of the committee that nothing in the bill should change existing laws with respect to the construction of bridges or needed roads. In given cases, the committee felt that property owners might need access to both sides of the river.

This, of course, envisions a situation in which a private property holding exists on both sides of the river and the necessity for access to both sides by the owner.

Again, in discussing the limitations on the power of condemnation which the committee wrote into the bill, the report explains that the committee was willing to approve such a limitation, because under it the administrative authorities "could amply provide bank land areas for public access."

This statement is further evidence of the committee's intent that wild river areas should be accessible to the public.

Moreover, nothing in the bill should be construed to constitute a prohibition against construction of needed public roads and bridges along such wild rivers or across them whenever the public necessity or convenience would thereby be served.

In sum, the specific language of S. 1446, the legislative intent as expressed in the committee report, and, I should hope, these remarks made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, will make it clear that the enactment of the bill would not forestall or prevent the construction of needed roads and bridges in a wild river area.

Mr. President, I understand that the pending business is the amendment offered last night by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, and that he would like to address himself to the amendment now.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment, because the Senator in charge of the bill and I discussed the major points I raised last night. We reached an agreement for modification of the bill in respect to two amendments which the Senator from Idaho will offer, and one amendment which I shall subsequently offer.

I withdraw my amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. **CHURCH**. Mr. President, I send to the desk the first of two amendments that I should like to offer, on my own behalf and on behalf of the senior Senator from Oregon, and I ask that it be read.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, line 1, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike the language "75 per centum or more" and in lieu thereof substitute "50 per centum or more".

Mr. **CHURCH**. Mr. President, following the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon made on the floor last night, it seemed to me that simple equity required a formula in the bill which would do equal justice to private property holders, whether they live in the State of Idaho, Oregon, or any other State, wherein wild rivers might be located.

The 75-percent limitation, when we compared the amount of public land in the various Western States affected, seemed to be too high, resulting in a discrimination against the State of Oregon, as the Senator from Oregon pointed out last evening, and quite possibly against other States.

It seemed to us that a 50-percent limitation would do more equal justice to all the western public-land States concerned, and still maintain the leeway needed for the administrators to acquire necessary public access, bankland for campgrounds, and other types of recreational facilities on the wild rivers within the system to be established by the bill.

For these reasons, it seems to me that the Senate should adopt this amendment, reducing the 75-percent figure to 50 percent. I urge the Senate to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a second amendment to the committee amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, line 12, following the word "System" it is proposed to insert a comma, and strike the word "or".

In line 13, after the word "System" it is proposed to insert the following: "or revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands."

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the particular lands involved in this amendment are of special value to the State of Oregon, in that they are not only rich timberlands, but in that 75 percent of the net proceeds of the sale of timber from such lands go to the respective counties, instead of the customary 25 percent that obtains on other national forest lands.

Therefore, if the Secretary were to include lands of this type in any exchange arrangement, the interests of the Oregon counties affected might be unduly prejudiced.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Idaho stated the situation. I will state this additional fact about the formula:

Out of the 75 percent that the counties receive, two-thirds goes back to the Federal Government to strengthen counties on access roads and timber roads. The result is that the net amount that goes to the county for other purposes in lieu of taxes is about the same as what goes to the county in connection with forest roads and other domain roads.

It is proper that O. & C. lands be protected so that the counties will not suffer great loss as a result of not putting into the bill the amendment which the Senator from Idaho has agreed to.

I do not say that they would suffer the loss, but the point is that the power to make the exchanges that could result in a loss would be present. Furthermore, the advisory boards in Oregon which advised the Department of the Interior and the Government in respect to public land have been made perfectly clear. They believe that any exchange policy should be one that is careful to protect county interest in O. & C. land.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up an amendment to the committee amendment which is at the desk, in behalf of myself and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, line 19, in the committee amendment immediately after the word "management," it is proposed to insert a comma and the word "zoning."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the net result of this amendment is that this part of the bill would read as follows:

> Neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the Secretary of Agriculture may exercise any authority to acquire county-owned lands within any wild river area without the consent of said county as long as the county is following a plan for the management, zoning, and protection of such lands that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

We are working hard in Oregon, through the counties, to develop a sensible program for the protection and beautification of our lands through zoning, so as to encourage the development of the necessary recreational facilities to attract recreationists to our State. I believe we ought to include along with the word "management" the word "zoning." The Senator from Idaho has agreed to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on the passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the adoption of these three amendments, I can support the bill with enthusiasm.

I express to the distinguished Senator from Idaho my deep appreciation for the cooperation and understanding he has extended to me in respect to the suggestions I made for the modification of the bill. That is typical of the Senator from Idaho, as I said in my main address yesterday. I sincerely thank him for his kindness.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his generous remarks, and also for his cooperative attitude in arriving at the kind of revision that would be acceptable.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the wild rivers bill, I am happy to support this first major legislation to pass the Senate in the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

The rivers of this great Nation have contributed to our industrial development in many ways. They provide power to turn great electrical turbines. They serve as broad highways along which the commodities of commerce move to their destinations. They have provided the water needed to make many items of manufacture. And, to our shame, they have been turned into sewers for the disposal of waste.

Our rivers serve us in another way, also. In their original state they are things of beauty. They offer man a place of retreat where he can find solitude and time for reflection. The sight of white water roaring through a mountain gorge takes us into another world, a world which may soon be forever lost to us if we do not act now to preserve it. For the exploitation of our rivers has greatly enriched our physical lives, but it threatens to impoverish our spiritual lives.

As with so many things, the best answer is moderation. All-out industrial exploitation of our rivers will in a few more generations leave us with little more than polluted rivulets. On the other hand, we do need the use of our rivers for industrial purposes. The task of public policy is to draw the line of moderation.

In recent years Congress has taken action to draw that line. The Wilderness Act of 1964 sets aside millions of acres of wilderness land for preservation in a natural wild state. The Water Quality Act of 1965 is intended for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution. The wild rivers bill is a natural companion to these measures.

While our long-term goal should be to have all our waters free from pollution, this alone is not enough. Before it is too late, we must set aside rivers for preservation in their natural state, free from the encroachments of man. This is what the wild rivers bill does; Congress declares its policy to be the preservation, development, and reclamation of selected parts of the Nation's diminishing resource of free-flowing rivers for the benefit of all American people.

The bill creates a National Wild Rivers System, made up of parts of five rivers, the Salmon and Clearwater in Idaho, the Rogue in Oregon, the Rio Grande in New Mexico, and the Eleven Point in Missouri. Eleven other rivers are listed for a combined Federal-State study to determine the feasibility and desirability of including these additional rivers. A procedure is also provided for future inclusion of other rivers in the system.

I sincerely entreat the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the exercise of their power of legislative oversight, to be vigorous in urging upon those who administer this act a policy of strong leadership in bringing additional areas under the coverage of the Wild Rivers System. I hope that soon some of our Texas rivers may be included in the Wild Rivers System. While we are making a good start here today, adequate protection of our wilderness calls for the inclusion of many more rivers than are now covered by the bill.

I feel confident that the committee will follow such a policy, because of the ability, dedication, and philosophy of the men who serve on it. There is no more courageous conservationist in the Senate than the floor manager and chief sponsor of the bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. Likewise, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. JACKSON], the distinguished former chairman [Mr. ANDERSON], and the distinguished chairman of the National Parks Subcommittee [Mr. BIBLE] are all dedicated to the preservation of our natural heritage. I feel confident that they will be vigilant in seeing to it that this act is implemented as Congress intended.

I commend especially the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who is in charge of the bill. There is no more ardent, courageous sponsor of the bill than he. Since the Senate reconvened, I had the privilege of being present at a large banquet at which the Senator from Idaho received a national award as the outstanding legislator in the Nation for his accomplishment in the past year in connection with the passage of wilderness legislation. It was a pleasure for me to see him receive that notable award, which was a beautiful sculpture piece by one of the great artists of wildlife in this country.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for his kind reference to me.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am pleased by the acceptance of the two amendments which have just been added to the wild rivers bill. After the extensive debate on the floor of the Senate yesterday, which I listened to carefully, I was concerned about some of the areas regarding the Rogue River, in my State. So I returned to my office and examined a map of the Rogue River, section by section. The change from the 75- to the 50-percent limitation relieves me concerning some of the problems we might have. My senior colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], has called attention to this situation, and it has now been resolved by cooperation.

I recall only one other bill that has been before the Senate that had so exciting a title as the title of the bill now before the Senate. It occurred before my time as a Member of the Senate, but it was a bill sponsored and carried through the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], at whose desk I am now standing. It was entitled "Oil for the Lamps of Learning." Think of the impressive message that that title carried.

We cannot read about a bill entitled "Wild Rivers" without calling up a picture of the very thing we seek to connote and suggest.

Mr. President, Oregon's Rogue River is singled out in the wild rivers bill now before the Senate as one of the five river segments in the entire United States worthy of inclusion in the initially protected system. Some 650 rivers were studied before the final judgment was made to give this outstanding recognition to the scenic, scientific, and recreational values of the Rogue River.

Recognition of the Rogue is well deserved. It cuts through some of the few areas of our Nation that are untrammeled by man. Its runs of salmon and steelhead are world famous in angling circles. Its white water rides are a source of excitement and adventure. The pristine beauty of its forested banks provides inspiration to those who seek solace outdoors.

I listened with much interest when the two Senators from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH and Mr. JORDAN] described the beautiful wild rivers in their State, which I also know very well. We who have rafted down those rivers or hiked along them take pride in talking about them. It is a nostalgic experience to recall jumping fish and wonderful white rivers.

The proposed legislation now before the Senate has widespread support in the State of Oregon.

The Oregon Fish Commission and the Oregon Game Commission support the concept of wild rivers as embodied in the Wild Rivers Act, S. 1446. The Oregon Wildlife Federation, composed of 43 member clubs throughout the State, advised the chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that it has gone on record "as favoring just such management as is outlined in S. 1446, for both the Salmon and Rogue River." I ask consent to include in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, the messages received from the Oregon State officials and the president of the Oregon Wildlife Federation.

Management policies will be of overriding importance in administration of the Wild Rivers Act if we are to pass along to future generations a meaningful conservation heritage. Some reasonable approaches must be developed to accommodate those river sections where commercial development has occurred. But, I feel some recognition must be given to the different categories of rivers and stream bank areas within the National Wild Rivers System. There must be uniformity in the policies if we are to avoid a crazy quilt of management under different jurisdictions. I stand with the Oregon Wildlife Federation and other conservation groups in support of the management provisions of S. 1446.

I wish to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the senior Senator from Idaho and other members of the Public Lands Subcommittee for bringing this measure before the Senate. It represents a great stride toward the protection of irreplaceable values of some of our Nation's great streams.

It provides for the first time a new and highly important policy for protection of free-flowing streams, an essential first step in gaining the preservation of the beauty and recreational benefits of some of our American rivers. It is a significant contribution to our national conservation policy which complements the historic conservation achievements of recent years—the Wilderness Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and Land and Water Conservation Act, the Water Resources Planning Act, and the Water Resources Research Act.

Passage of S. 1446 will give added luster to the accomplishments of the 89th Congress. I shall vote for its passage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed following my remarks certain documents I have received from people in Oregon.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISH COMMISSION OF OREGON,
Portland, Oreg., September 10, 1965.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

The Oregon State Game Commission and Fish Commission of Oregon support the concept of wild rivers as embodied in the Wild Rivers Act, S. 1446 particularly as it concerns conservation of anadromous fish resources. We urge inclusion by amendment of that portion of the Salmon River below Riggins, Idaho, because of the vital importance of the anadromous fish produced in this area and the entire Salmon River system to sport and commercial fisheries along the entire Pacific coast.

P. W. SCHNEIDER,
State Game Director.
ROBERT W. SCHONING,
State Fisheries Director.

OREGON WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Portland, Oreg., April 15, 1965.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: The executive board of the Oregon Wildlife Federation have, on this date of their executive board meeting, April 11, voted to support enactment of S. 1446, the national wild rivers bill.

The Oregon Wildlife Federation is a statewide conservation organization devoted to the conservation of the fish, game, and other recreational or natural resources of Oregon. Its membership is composed of 43 member clubs throughout the State. We are affiliated with the National Wildlife Federation.

For many years, this organization has been on record as favoring just such management as is outlined in S. 1446, for both the Salmon and Rogue Rivers. The measure will go a long way toward the protection of the valuable salmon and steelhead runs.

We hope for speedy enactment of this bill by the 89th Congress and that you will make our position known in hearings on this measure.

Sincerely,

OREGON WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
GEORGE REED, *President.*

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who has handled this measure so well. It provides, for the first time, a new and highly important policy for the protection of free flowing streams.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I am most happy that through the cooperation of the Senators [Mr. MORSE and Mrs. NEUBERGER] from Oregon the Rogue River has been left in the first group of wild rivers. This is one of the most colorful rivers on the North American Continent. It is famous for its white waters, striking scenery, and superb salmon and steelhead trout fishing. It is rich in history as well as in recreation assets, and is an ideal stream to be included in the National Wild Rivers System.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and myself, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

(14) Pine Creek, Pennsylvania, the segment from Ansonia, Pennsylvania, to Waterville, Pennsylvania.

(15) Delaware, Pennsylvania and New York, the segment from Hancock, New York, to Matamoras, Pennsylvania.

(16) Allegheny, Pennsylvania, the segment from the Allegheny Reservoir at Kinzua, Pennsylvania, to Tionesta, Pennsylvania, and then from Franklin, Pennsylvania, to East Brady, Pennsylvania.

(17) Clarion, Pennsylvania, the segment from where it enters the Allegheny River to Ridgway, Pennsylvania.

(18) West Branch Susquehanna, the segment of the West Branch Susquehanna from Clearfield, Pennsylvania to Lock Haven, Pennsylvania.

Mr. **CLARK.** Mr. President, this amendment, which I very much hope will be accepted by my very dear friend from Idaho, the Senator in charge of the bill, is intended to bring into the study section of the bill—that is, section 3(b), at the end, including the 11 stretches of river at present set forth on pages 16 and 17 of the bill—an additional 6 stretches of Pennsylvania water.

Many think that it is only in the West that there are wild rivers which are worthy of preservation. However, in and around our Allegheny Mountains in Pennsylvania we have some magnificent wild river scenery in our creeks and rivers. To the extent that they have not been polluted—and many of them have not been—there is some of the finest trout fishing to be found anywhere in the country.

We have magnificent opportunities in our Allegheny National Forest and along our State game and fish lands which the Commonwealth owns—hundreds of thousands of acres—some of the most magnificent opportunities for recreation to be found anywhere in the country.

My colleague and I have consulted with the very able Secretary for Forest and Waters, Mr. Maurice Goddard, who not only served in the Democratic administrations of Governors Leader and Lawrence, but was also held over and is now serving in the Republican administration of Governor Scranton.

We asked him to give us confirmation of our mutual views that these particular stretches of rivers were worthy of being studied under the terms of this bill in the hope that the study would reveal that they were appropriate stretches of water to qualify under the provisions of the bill.

I should like to say just a word with respect to each of these and shall then yield to my colleague, if I may, for appropriate comment.

The first one is Pine Creek in Tioga and Lycoming Counties. This river runs south from one of our northern tier of counties, abutting on New York, and eventually ends up in the Susquehanna River, the west branch.

We call the stretch of stream included in this amendment the Grand Canyon of Pennsylvania. While I would have to admit that as a Grand Canyon it has to yield a little to the grandeur and scope and everything else to the Grand Canyon of Colorado, nevertheless it is a magnificient stretch of wilderness with a stream flowing down the middle of a very steep valley. We believe that it falls well within the definitions of wild rivers contained in the bill.

The second area is partly in New York and partly in Pennsylvania. It is the upper reaches of the Delaware River from Hancock, N.Y., to Matamoras, Pa. It is the portion of the Delaware above the newly authorized Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.

This would give access to more recreational facilities than any other facility in our country, or even in the world. The upper reaches of the Delaware have long been famous for canoeing, boating, and fishing. This stretch of river will qualify, we believe, under the wild rivers program.

The third is the Clarion River, from where it enters the Allegheny River, running upstream to Ridgway, Pa. For most of this reach, the Clarion River flows along the border of the Allegheny National Forest. This area is very densely wooded. It is rather close to being a wilderness area. It is one of the most beautiful streams that I have ever had the privilege of exploring.

The fourth and fifth are two segments of the main stream of the Allegheny River. The first segment is a portion from the new Allegheny Reservoir at Kinzua to Tionesta, Pa. This segment also flows along the border of the Allegheny National Forest. Not too many people know that Pennsylvania has a very large and fine national forest, which is one of the few, and possibly the only one, east of the Mississippi.

The other segment is the portion of the Allegheny from Franklin, Pa., to East Brady, Pa. This is also well up-stream from Pittsburgh, in a wild area of our State, surrounded by two of the ridges of the Allegheny Mountains.

Finally, the amendment includes a portion of the west branch of the Susquehanna from Clearfield, Pa., to Lock Haven, Pa.

All these portions of rivers and streams are beautiful indeed.

I shall not impose upon the patience of my colleagues by describing them in further detail. I have traveled along most of the rivers to be studied. I can attest that they are worthy of serious consideration for the Wild Rivers System. They flow through public lands for much of the length to be studied. They are areas of great natural beauty that should be preserved for the future.

All these areas face considerable pressure from expanding urban and metropolitan areas. I believe that if we act in time, and the time to act is now, we will be able to save these areas from the kind of human activity which is contemplated by the purposes of this bill.

It is urgent that eastern rivers, including portions of the Susquehanna and the Youghiogheny already in the bill, be given legal protection.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of this amendment, which I hope my friend the senior Senator from Idaho will accept. Further, since I shall not speak again on this measure, I also urge passage of the bill.

I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. **SCOTT.** Mr. President, I thank my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

I welcome the opportunity to speak on behalf of this amendment, which I cosponsored, and particularly that language adding to the study section of the National Wild Rivers System bill some 100 miles of the west branch of the Susquehanna River in Pennsylvania.

Section 3(b) of this bill authorizes the Secretary of Interior to consult with State officials to determine if a joint Federal-State plan for the conservation of certain rivers and river segments is both feasible and desirable in the public interest. Eleven river segments are specifically identified, including a 233-mile stretch of the Susquehanna River from Cooperstown, N.Y., to Pittston, Pa. This amendment would bring into this section five additional river segments, including that portion of the west branch of the Susquehanna River running from its junction with Clearfield Creek, just below the town of Clearfield, on down to where the west branch bursts from its 100 miles of gorges into the Great Valley at Lock Haven.

Mr. President, this 100-mile waterway is one of the remaining river sections in the East that deserves consideration as a wild river. Pouring into this Allegheny waterway are its main tributaries, with their quaint and stirring names—Moshannon, Mosquito and Sinnemahoning Creeks, Kettle Creek and Lick and Trout runs. Almost all of these tributaries drain from thousands of acres of rough and rugged rock and forested ridges flanking the west branch.

Much of this forest is State-owned and, as the west branch of the Susquehanna cuts through it, 1,200-foot steep hillsides drop into the main gorge. This is a gorge whose rolling and tumbling waters once carried long pine spars down to Chesapeake Bay shipyards. Indians shunned the forbidding west branch gorge, fearful of the enclosing mountain sides, the huge boulders and deep woods that crowded to the water's edge. This stretch was much too wild for them, but not for herds of white-tailed deer, burly bruins and flocks of wild turkeys, which still abound here.

The wild west branch area today is a magnet that attracts thousands of outdoor sportsmen, not only for game, but for the thrilling sport of fishing for trout. Proof of the really enduring wildness of this part of the Susquehanna's west branch is the fact that this section of Penn's Wood was never more than touched by even the early settlers, and now today's homeseekers. It is still so thinly and sparsely populated that there are only two villages today along its banks. One is Karthaus, a small oldtime rafting village, and the other is Renovo, a small town at a railroad junction.

Mr. President, I reiterate once more my belief that this stretch of the west branch of the Susquehanna truly deserves consideration as a wild river. Similar consideration is due those other segments which this amendment identifies—Pine Creek and the Delaware, Allegheny, and Clarion Rivers. I urge favorable consideration of this amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I not only have no objection to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania, but I welcome it.

I think it is noteworthy that since this bill came to the floor yesterday, it has been significantly enlarged. In its original form, 11 rivers were listed in the study category of this bill. Now, by virtue of the 2 streams added by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the 5 streams that are now proposed to be added by this amendment, the total number of rivers included for study purposes has been extended from 11 to 18.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the numbers which appear in the amendment now pending be adjusted to appear in the proper sequence in the context of the bill, inasmuch as the Ohio streams have been added and the numbers as they now appear in the amendment are incorrect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, that is a technical matter and I am sure it can be handled by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senators from Pennsylvania to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend the senior Senator from Idaho for his kind consideration of this matter. I congratulate him for the excellent manner in which he is managing the bill. I hope that the Senate will overwhelmingly pass the measure today.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I join in the remarks of my colleague. We are most grateful that the Senate has cooperated with us.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to clarify some points. Why is it that the committee decided to name five rivers, as included in section 3, instead of allowing them to remain in the study category?

Mr. CHURCH. I would say to the Senator that the bill itself follows recommendations made by previous committees of the Senate studying water resources and by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission.

These study groups recommend that a Wild Rivers System be established. Following those recommendations, extensive studies were made by the Department of Interior. A Wild Rivers Study Team was established. Over an 18-month period, that team identified 73 rivers that merited attention for preservation and studied 22 of these in some detail.

Then the numbers were distilled further, and, in drafting the proposed legislation, we included the five rivers which seemed most clearly to qualify in all respects as initial rivers for a system which we hoped would be expanded by the Congress in the years ahead.

The other rivers were placed in the study category in order that we might give them further consideration, to make certain there were no particular problems that were not given full attention prior to their inclusion.

The bill is specific in regard to the fact that before any additions may be made to the system a recommendation, following a proper study, is necessary, and affirmative action by Congress is required.

Mr. ELLENDER. I realize that. That is why I was wondering why they were not all put in the category of study, as we did in connection with the wilderness bill last year. No forest, under that bill, could be taken in except after study.

Mr. CHURCH. In connection with the wilderness bill, the primitive areas in the National Forests that had already been studied and declared wilderness areas were included in the initial system, and the remainder were left for future study. We are trying to follow the same pattern in the pending bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I doubt that, for the simple reason that studies for dam authorizations have been made on the Salmon River for three projects, the Lower Canyon, the Freedom, and the Crevice.

In connection with these three projects, the annual power revenue for the Lower Canyon would amount to $19 million a year. On the Crevice, it would amount to $15 million a year. I am wondering if the Interior Department has looked into this subject, or whether it has abandoned the projects that were intended to be constructed.

Mr. CHURCH. The projects are in my own State, and I am quite familiar with them. They were specifically discussed in the hearings. They were taken into full account both in Boise, where the special task force of the committee held hearings on the bill, and also in Lewiston, Idaho, where a special hearing was conducted by the State water resources board. We know what has been planned for construction at the sites to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred. These plans were taken into full account in the public hearings held in my State. The decision that we make in the passage of the pending bill is what best serves the general public interest in Idaho in connection with these rivers.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, it means the abandonment of those three projects.

Mr. CHURCH. Yes. At least, the bill would deny the Federal Power Commission the right to license dams on those segments of the rivers included in the Wild River System. Otherwise, the wild, natural character of the rivers would be destroyed.

I must say, however, that it always lies within the province of Congress to authorize construction of any such dams at a later date if Congress decides to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who made the decision? Did the Interior Department make the decision not to pursue any further these three damsites?

Mr. CHURCH. The Interior Department has strongly recommended the passage of the bill, with full knowledge of the effect it would have upon future dam construction on these rivers. The bill also has the endorsement of the administration and of other departments of the Government. No department, including the Corps of Engineers, has objected to the passage of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I refer to the designation of the Middle Fork of the Clearwater River. That designation would prevent the construction of an economically feasible project at the Penny Clift site. Is that correct?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That has been under study. This project would involve 2,300,000 acre-feet of storage for power, navigation, and flood control. The estimated average annual benefit from this project would amount to between $13 to $15 million.

I am wondering if the committee gave consideration to that project, and whether the Interior Department is now willing to abandon any further study of this project, with a view of constructing it.

Mr. CHURCH. I assure the Senator that this project was also taken into full account, not only by the committee, but also by the Senators from Idaho, and that consideration of the project figured in the hearings that were held both in Idaho and in Washington.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are there any dams constructed, to the Senator's knowledge, on any of these five rivers that may be interfered with in the future?

Mr. CHURCH. The answer to that question is that there are no dams now in existence that would be interfered with by the passage of the pending bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. What about the Rogue River? We made studies on that one. As I understand it, there is a dam which has been authorized, I believe, on the lower reaches of that river. Are we to understand that the bill does not affect that dam in any manner?

Mr. CHURCH. We have been advised of no active plans for dams on the river area involved. To the best knowledge of the committee, no dam construction on the segment of the river to be included within the system would be interfered with.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that there is a provision in the bill to compensate the property owners, either the State or the Federal Government or some other agency, in the event a stream should be set aside as a wild river.

Mr. CHURCH. If the Senator will permit me to explain, that is not exactly the provision in the bill. I believe that he makes reference to that part of the bill which relates to the payment of full compensation in the event that a private property right were to be taken, including any vested water right.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. It is a water right under either State or Federal Government.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I really intended to say.

Mr. CHURCH. This has to do with private water holders, with private owners of established water rights. Where the Federal Government, for purposes of this act, finds it necessary to acquire some vested right, it will be necessary, as in the case of other kinds of property rights, for the Federal Government to pay full compensation to the owners.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is that compensation to be based on? Is that spelled out in the bill? I did not see it, if it is there. In some of the rivers where we may be able to utilize water for the benefit of the community, the revenues would amount, as I have indicated, to as much as $19 million per year. Does not the Senator envision that without any yardstick being placed in the bill, it could become costly to the Federal Government?

Mr. CHURCH. I would say to the Senator, in the first instance, that subsection (c) of section 4, to which our discussion is related, deals with privately owned water rights and not with the kind of public benefits which might be derived through construction of dams.

Where privately owned water rights are concerned, the compensation is governed by ordinary laws which apply wherever condemnation is used. We have made every effort in this bill to leave the water law alone. There is no provision in the bill which alters or modifies established water law as we know it in the West.

Therefore, I believe that no particular problem is involved with regard to the standard that would be used in appraising, or in paying for, any privately owned water right which may be taken.

Now, with respect to the second matter, the possible benefits which might flow to the entire community through the construction of a dam, we have acknowledged that—as we look to the future—changing public needs may make it advisable to build a dam across a wild river. In other words, that public requirements in the future may make it desirable to revise the Wild River System in order to make possible the construction of new dams.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would mean an amendment——

Mr. CHURCH. For this purpose, we have included section 6 in the bill, establishing a Wild Rivers Review Board to recommend to Congress revisions in the system whenever the highest public interest would seem to require construction of a dam otherwise prohibited by the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The point is, however, that any findings of the Board would have to receive the sanction of Congress, in order to permit the construction of such dams, or the utilization of the water.

Mr. CHURCH. That, of course, is true, inasmuch as the Board does not possess legislative power.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. CHURCH. It would have to recommend changes in the system to Congress, and Congress could then respond by legislative action.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is it that the committee makes it impossible for the States to participate in making a determination as to the wild rivers now being placed in the system by this legislation?

The present law provides as to any project, that after being studied by the Engineers, the Department of Interior, and other agencies of the Government, under the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment, with which I am sure the Senator is familiar, any determination made with regard to construction of a dam or utilization of the water in any river must be submitted to the Governors of all the States through which the rivers traverse. I noticed that in the study plans of the rivers mentioned—11 of them, the Senator added several others—the so-called O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment applies, but it does not apply to the 5 rivers which are being designated here. I therefore wonder why the States were left out?

Mr. CHURCH. I have tried to stress, in my responses to the Senator, that there have been a series of public hearings on the bill, so I am positive that every State involved has had full notice. To my knowledge, the States have not, through their Governors, or through the appropriate State agencies, registered objection.

In my own State, for example, the Governor, the State fish and game commission, and the State park board have endorsed the bill and have urged its enactment. I do not know of any Senator from any State in which any of the rivers to be included in the initial system lie who does not also give his approval. Therefore, I believe that we have tried to accommodate, in a proper manner, whatever State sentiments may exist, and we have given full opportunity for State governments to express any opposition to the inclusion of the rivers that are being made a part of the initial system in this bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Were the Governors of the States through which these rivers traverse notified of the five rivers and what would be done with them, and were they also notified or told that after the bill is enacted into law, any recommendations that they might make would be excluded?

Mr. CHURCH. I do not understand the latter part of the Senator's question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the present law, if any Federal use is made of a river for the purposes of constructing a dam, or, I presume, to designate it a wild river, the Governors of the States must be notified, and they may come in and state opposition, if they have any. In respect to the five designated rivers, there does not seem to be anything in the record that I can observe to indicate that the Governors of all the States through which these rivers traverse were notified. In other words, it would seem to me that the designation by Congress of the five rivers without proper notice to the Governors of the appropriate States would be in violation of the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment.

I wonder if the Senator will comment on that.

Mr. CHURCH. The O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment is not a part of this bill, and was not binding on the committee in its procedures when considering the bill. Nevertheless, every effort was made to circulate the bill to all interested parties, including the State governments. I am quite certain that no State government has been taken by surprise.

The bill has been under consideration for nearly a year. Hearings have been held both here and in the West. It has been a matter of considerable notice and publicity in the newspapers of the Western States.

As a result of such publicity, the Governor of Missouri, joined by the two distinguished Senators from Missouri, asked that the Eleven Point be removed from the study category of the bill and placed in the initial-inclusion category of the bill.

The point I wish to emphasize is that, after prolonged study and hearings, both in Washington and in the West, the committee chose five rivers for inclusion in the original system. We hope that the other rivers listed in the study category will eventually be added as parts of an expanded National Wild Rivers System worthy of the name.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we to understand that the Department of the Interior did make this study, and did present it to the committee? I am wondering about the extent to which these studies were made available to the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. CHURCH. I would say to the Senator——

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the Senator understands my point.

Mr. CHURCH. The Corps of Engineers made an appearance.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know.

Mr. CHURCH. A spokesman for the corps testified. I believe the record will disclose that the corps did not take a stand against the bill. It did, however, point out what projected dams were involved, and what their generating capacity might be. In the course of the testimony, the corps gave the figures to which the Senator has earlier referred, and they were spread upon the record.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall from reading the record, two dams were involved. As I understand, it is not the purpose of the bill in any manner to effect the utilization of any dam——

Mr. CHURCH. Of any constructed dam; that is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is certain of that?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes. I should say, further, that we have attempted to limit the segments of the rivers in such a way that no existing dam, upstream or downstream, would be interfered with or prejudiced in its normal operating functions.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator for answering the questions. I merely wished to make the record clear.

I wish to state also that, although the Millikin-O'Mahoney amendment is not specifically referred to in the bill, there is similar language in it, which would give the States through which any of these rivers under study would traverse the right to come and register such objections as they see fit.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct. We have also included a provision in the bill to permit a Governor to initiate a recommendation with respect to rivers which pass through State-owned lands, with the proviso that they may be administered by the State as a part of the Wild Rivers System. There is no intention to make this System one of exclusive Federal administration. We want to invite the States in, and hope that they will participate.

Mr. ELLENDER. To recapitulate, the Senator is representing to the Senate that the Department of the Interior has abandoned efforts to construct three damsites on the Salmon River.

Mr. CHURCH. I am representing to the Senate that the Department of the Interior has given its full endorsement and support to this bill. The effect of the bill is to bar dam construction, or at least the licensing of dam construction on the rivers involved.

Mr. ELLENDER. And have it be a wild river.

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, there is a provision in the bill which not only makes it possible for the rivers to remain in their natural state, but, if there are any changes to be made by any authority of the Federal or State Government, or in any other way, such a river shall be restored to its natural beauty. As I envision it, that would interfere with or perhaps affect dams already constructed. That is why I asked the Senator the question.

Mr. CHURCH. I hope I have clarified the point for the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is telling us that there is no intention in any manner to affect or change any——

Mr. CHURCH. Any existing dam.

Mr. ELLENDER. Or any works that have been constructed in the past. Am I correct?

Mr. CHURCH. That is my understanding. It is further my understanding that there are no dams presently constructed on any of the segments of the rivers to be included in the initial system.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the evidence so disclosed?

Mr. CHURCH. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. But was there one on the Rogue River? Is that correct?

Mr. CHURCH. There was testimony as to a dam on the Eleven Point; but we have defined the segment of the Eleven Point in such a way as to exclude that dam, with the objective of not interfering with its function.

Mr. ELLENDER. Therefore, so far as the Senator knows——

Mr. CHURCH. This was a projected dam which might be built, rather than a dam already built. Nevertheless, the segment of the Eleven Point that is included in the bill does not embrace the projected damsite.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, if the project were deemed feasible, it could be constructed even if the bill were enacted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who has done such admirable work in connection with his subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee in respect to great public works on our rivers, spoke to me this afternoon about his concern in regard to the bill in respect to the same question he has asked the Senator from Idaho.

I left the floor and consulted with my administrative assistant in regard to it, and I came back here to discuss the matter with the Senator from Idaho, because my assistant verified the statements that the Senator from Idaho just made in answer to the questions of the Senator from Louisiana.

We had already gone into this matter with the assistance of the Senator from Idaho, and he assured me that the bill carries exactly the meaning that the Senator from Idaho has just bespoken.

I wish to say to the Senator from Idaho that I believe the Senator from Idaho has made an important contribution to the legislative history of the bill.

My understanding is that the bill will not interfere with existing dams.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, it will not affect existing dams or any such dams as are to be constructed. But three dams which were recommended or studied by the Department of Interior have been abandoned.

As the Senator from Idaho stated, representatives of the Department of the Interior testified the three dams that I have mentioned which have been abandoned, one has the capability of producing $19 million of benefits per year, another, $15 million of benefits per year, and still another about $14 million a year.

Mr. MORSE. It did not involve Army Engineer projects.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. These were Interior Department projects.

Mr. CHURCH. I would say to the distinguished Senator that I appreciate his questions. I believe they help to clarify the purpose of the bill.

I certainly am a dam builder. The Senator may recall that when I first came to the Senate—certainly the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon recalls—my first major address in the Senate was on behalf of the construction of the Hells Canyon Dam.

Since that time, I have diligently worked for the authorization of numerous dams in the State of Idaho, and I have voted for many other dams elsewhere in the country. I strongly believe in dams. I know we shall need more of them in my State.

To better realize the full reclamation potential of southern Idaho, I shall be pressing in this session of the Congress for the authorization of a tremendous water development program for southwestern Idaho that will eventually involve the reclaiming of half a million acres of arid land and the construction of several major dams.

But I also recognize, much of a dam builder as I am, that there are portions of certain rivers having such great recreational value that, in the interests of the general well-being, we ought to safeguard them as natural wild rivers, because this is their highest use. If we do not establish congressional protection through a bill of this kind and continue instead to leave the question of dams to the dam-building agencies, and to them alone—which is the case under present law—eventually every feasible site will be utilized for dam construction.

This would commit our entire river system to a single use, and would not represent balanced development which takes into account other important public uses, including outdoor recreation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I say to my good friend that my only interest in the matter is to try to protect and preserve our water resources.

Long before I came to the Senate I devoted much of my time in that direction; hence my interest in the bill today.

I am glad that none of the dams studied by the Chief of Engineers are affected. I notice in the record, and the Senator so stated, that the three dams involved in the Salmon River and the Clearwater River were dams that were studied by the Department of the Interior.

Of course, they are interested in water resources and the construction of dams. I presume they propose as many dams as does the Corps of Engineers.

But the salutary thing is that the object of our discussion is an act of Congress. Of course, it can be amended at any time in the event that there is need.

Mr. CHURCH. This is true. Congress will always remain in complete control.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that. It is my belief that if in time, for the utilization of this water to make it work for the people, it may be necessary to construct the three dams on the Salmon River that have been abandoned by the Department of the Interior. Congress could repeal that part of the law affecting the Salmon River.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the same thing holds true for the Clearwater River.

Mr. CHURCH. It does, and should that occasion arise, and I still represent the people of Idaho in this Chamber, I will be the first to recommend any revision in the system that a greater future need may require.

Mr. ELLENDER. I appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Idaho. As I told the Senator before, I had no opposition, except that I found it strange that five rivers were designated wild rivers and others were put into the study category. I wondered why it was that all of them were not simply designated for study. It was something I could not understand. The Senator indicated to us that the Department of Interior has been dealing with this question and that the findings were presented to the Interior Committee. The Department more or less abandoned the construction of these particular dams.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH], I offer an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 14, line 18, beginning with "and", strike out all through the first quotation marks on line 19 and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "NWR–ELE–1000, NWR–CAP–1000, and NWR–SHE–1000".
>
> On page 15, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:
>
> "(6) Cacapon, West Virginia—entire river and its tributary, the Lost River.
>
> "(7) Shenandoah, West Virginia—the segment of the river located in the State of West Virginia."
>
> On page 16, strike out lines 9 and 10.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered on behalf of my colleague and myself is to upgrade the Cacapon River in West Virginia from title II, which is a study category, to title I, designating it as a wild river to carry out the recommendations of the President's study on the Potomac River Basin, and also to place the Shenandoah River, as it passes through West Virginia, in title I of the wild river bill, thereby designating it as a wild river.

This action was recommended in the President's study of the Potomac River Basin, and it was concurred in by the Governor's Advisory Committee for that study. By carrying out these recommendations, my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I believe that we are taking the first step to implement this report on the Potomac River Basin.

It is my understanding that the individual States were consulted when the wild rivers bill was drafted, and the Cacapon River was considered without opposition by the State of West Virginia. My colleague and I—and he will address himself to the amendment shortly—believe that the proposed legislation presents a workable formula to preserve the finest aspects of the Cacapon and the Shenandoah, and other natural resources of their type, and still permit the proper economic development of the areas.

As to the Cacapon, the wild flowers that bloom in spring and summer and the surrounding greenery which can be viewed from the Cacapon have been described as among the most outstanding in the country.

Historically, the Cacapon supplied the principal means of support for colonial outposts in the early French and Indian settlements. George Washington as an 18-year-old youth, in 1750, made surveys in the meadows leading to the river.

I believe—and my colleague from West Virginia shares this belief—that we should act now to protect and preserve these monuments to the beauty of nature and to the valor of our pioneers while we may still do so. We recognize that there may, at the moment, be some uncertainty about the plans to develop these areas as wild rivers. Persons owning land along the banks of the Cacapon and Shenandoah are certainly entitled to a hearing and to a detailed explanation. They should also have an opportunity to express their opinions and their viewpoints, whether in support of or in opposition to the plan.

This opportunity, we believe, will be available to them when hearings on the legislation and hearings on this amendment, which we hope will be included in the bill, are scheduled before committees of the House of Representatives.

Before my colleague addresses himself to the amendment, in which we have joined, I wish to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] for his consideration of the amendment. My colleague and I have discussed it with him and with members of his staff, and we hope that he will accept it. I also wish to commend the excellent leadership which the Senator from Idaho has shown in developing the proposed legislation and the excellent work he has done as manager of the bill on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from West Virginia very much for his comments.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], in his customary knowledgeable presentation, has enunciated valid reasoning for the amendment which is offered. I am grateful for the privilege of joining him in the presentation of this proposal to move the Cacapon river from a study category to an active planning category.

It has long been recognized that West Virginia is the mother of rivers. In my home county, some seven or eight rivers that flow to the sea have their headwaters. So we in West Virginia are cognizant of the natural beauties which exist, not only for our people but, increasingly, for the millions of men and women who visit our State for recreation and for rest.

As to the continuing value of wild rivers, I am appreciative of the colloquy which was conducted this afternoon by the able Senator from Idaho, who is the chief craftsman in the drafting of the bill which I am privileged to join as a cosponsor.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who has superior knowledge of rivers and harbors and watershed programs likewise has made substantial contributions to the legislative record on the pending wild rivers legislation.

In this connection, I ask that my esteemed friend from Idaho turn to page 4 of the report which he filed in connection with S. 1446. I am familiar with the provisions that would encompass condemnation and certain compensations. I am aware also of the provisions which would seem to protect the property rights of those who have made financial investment in property development, homesites, and campsites, along rivers specified in this legislation. But I refer particularly now to the language in paragraph 3, page 4, as follows:

> In most instances, the banklands of these segments—

And those are the segments that are to be studied—

> are largely in private ownership or there are other problems of determining boundaries, working out programs of management, or seeking cooperative agreements with State and local agencies.

If studies of the Cacapon River indicate that it is desirable to move this project from the second category into the first category, as Senator BYRD has indicated is desirable, would an opportunity be afforded individuals to be heard in reference to certain segments of that river? Some stretches of the Cacapon River are not involved by the property development and population problems, but other segments are, as my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has indicated. These are problems which we desire to have clarification, even as we think in terms of lifting the Cacapon from study phase to a more active wild rivers planning status.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, first, before the bill becomes law, the House of Representatives must consider it. Every indication I have suggests that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will not proceed with haste.

On the contrary, it is likely that consideration given to this bill will be very deliberate, and that future hearings will provide adequate opportunity for every interested party to make an appearance.

I assure the Senator that this is to be anticipated.

I should think, as the junior Senator from West Virginia has stressed, that this would give those concerned a forum to make whatever case they care to make, and to raise whatever questions they desire, prior to the time that this bill becomes law.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho has given an assurance which is helpful to me, as one who has been privileged to join in the sponsorship of the amendment with my colleague.

The RECORD should reflect, and I believe my colleague has so stated, that the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior will be concerned with doing a job, and that frankly they must not say to any individual: "Go into a corner; we don't want to hear what you have to say." I think they will be responsive to a valid presentation.

In the State of West Virginia, the Governor has indicated his approval of the amendment which has been offered by my colleague this afternoon. Other agencies within our State are also supporters of this proposal.

In this instance we are acting in the positive in reference to placing the State of West Virginia in active relationship to this program by bringing the Cacapon River and the Shenandoah River into the mainstream of the purposes of the legislation.

I am grateful to my colleague, who has given much study to this matter, that I am able to join with him in the presentation of the amendment. The senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who has had not only an understanding, but also a very real patience in this matter, deserves the commendation which I desire the RECORD to reflect at this time.

It is important in this Nation, in which we have a mobility of millions of people, as men and women, boys and girls, increasingly traveling from one area to another, to note that a change is taking place in our complex civilization which is recognizable. There are certain areas of the country needing the attention and preservation envisaged in the wilderness legislation which we had before us at an earlier date and in this wild rivers measure which we now have before us. Wild rivers are mighty, moving, living power.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his remarks. The two rivers involved in this amendment were a subject of the Potomac River Basin interim report, that is the President's special study of the overall plan for the Potomac.

In that report one of the recommendations relates directly to, and is certainly pertinent to this amendment. It reads:

> For the purpose of maintaining in its pristine condition the uniquely scenic and unspoiled Cacapon River, we recommend that it be declared a wild river under title I of the wild rivers bill and that the Federal Government and the State of West Virginia work promptly toward preserving in a natural state its entire narrow valley in its wild lower parts.
>
> Similarly, we recommend that the parts of the historic and meandering Shenandoah River which lies in West Virginia be given the same wild river status.

I stress this study because of the remarks I made earlier to the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana. The committee has striven to confine the initial system of wild rivers to those with respect to which studies have been previously made.

In light of the special Presidential study of the Potomac and the recommendations it contains, I believe that these two rivers qualify.

For that reason I believe that the amendment offered by the Senators from West Virginia should be agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as we think of the Potomac River as it flows in and by the Nation's Capital, we are faced with a highly polluted stream. We realize that the Potomac River, which has its headwaters in Tucker County, W. Va., is a river that begins in beauty and ends, to a degree, in ugliness.

As we think of the Cacapon and the Shenandoah Rivers, stretches of these rivers, and the adjacent woodlands and valleys, our pulse quickens because of their appeal to those of us who love sheer beauty.

I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Idaho has said, that there are in the environs of Washington, 1, 2, or 3 hours away from our Capital City, areas which will bring refreshment in the years to come to literally millions of people.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator. I stress that the Cacapon is one of the most beautiful of West Virginia's rivers. It is a relatively small stream and occupies a narrow valley, bordered on each side by high mountain ridges. In some places spectacular cliffs tower over the river to a height of hundreds of feet. The area is wild and unsettled and clothed by mixed hardwoods. Cultivated fields and pasture land border portions along the lower reaches. The river offers superior recreation opportunities. The water is clear and unpolluted and canoeing and swimming are excellent. Smallmouth bass, rock bass, pan fish, and an occasional trout provide angling sport. The smallmouth fishing excels. The nearby woods and mountains offer hunting for deer and many smaller species.

The Shenandoah is a major tributary to the Potomac River. The 20 miles included in West Virginia extend from the Virginia State line to its confluence with the Potomac River. The river here is mostly wide, shallow, and slow moving, ideal for float fishing and swimming. Smallmouth bass fishing is rated tops, as is fishing for channel catfish and sunfish. The wooded slopes and cultivated fields next to the river offer prime hunting opportunities for deer, grouse, and squirrel. The area is coming under increased pressure by recreationists from nearby urban centers.

Mr. President, for these reasons, I urge the Senate to agree to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I express my gratitude to the Senator from Idaho for his kindness in considering this amendment which was cosponsored by my colleague and myself.

I appreciate the remarks he has made in conjunction therewith.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain extracts from the committee report may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1446 will save for this and future generations certain unspoiled, free-flowing rivers or river sections that will symbolize and perpetuate this vanishing heritage of our original American landscape.

* * * * *

Administration of the rivers in the system would be by either the Secretary of Interior or Agriculture, or the Secretaries jointly, based upon their administrative areas; or jointly with the States, or States and local governmental agencies, or by the States exclusively. States would be encouraged to cooperate in the planning and administration of wild river areas which include State-owned or county-owned land.

Although the bill has been referred to as an extension or corollary of the Wilderness Act, its provisions are not nearly as restrictive. A wild river area will be administered for water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values, but without limitation on such other uses as timber harvesting and livestock grazing which do not interfere with these purposes. Mining will be allowed to continue, although claims located after the effective date of the act may be subject to regulation to conform to the system, particularly to prevent pollution.

It is also the intent of the committee that nothing in the bill should change existing laws with respect to the construction of bridges or needed roads. In given cases, the committee felt that property owners might need access to both sides of the river.

As used in this legislation, a wild river is a free-flowing stream in a pleasing and relatively unaltered environment, with outstanding scenic and recreational values.

NEED

* * * * *

Since the colonization of North America began, man has harnessed and developed our rivers. At first, they were pathways of exploration and settlement, then arteries of commerce, and finally sources of power, irrigation, and other benefits. In the course of this development, most of America's great natural rivers have drastically changed, until only a few outstanding examples of rivers in their original state remain. The committee believes that future generations should have an opportunity to see, know, and enjoy the unique pleasures, recreational opportunities, and scientific advantages of such rivers. America is rich enough to set aside a few of our streams for this purpose.

As long ago as 1848, John Stuart Mill said in his "Principles of Political Economy":

"A population may be too crowded, though all be amply supplied with food and raiment. It is not good for man to be kept perforce at all times in the presence of his species. A world from which solitude is extirpated is a very poor ideal. Solitude, in the sense of being often alone, is essential to any depth of meditation or of character; and solitude in the presence of natural beauty and grandeur, is the cradle of thoughts and aspirations which are not only good for the individual, but which society could ill do without. Nor is there much satisfaction in contemplating the world with nothing left to the spontaneous activity of nature; with every rood of land brought into cultivation, which is capable of growing food for human beings; every flowery waste or natural pasture plowed up, all quadrupeds or birds which are not domesticated for man's use exterminated as his rivals for food, every hedgerow or superfluous tree rooted out, and scarcely a place left where a wild shrub or flower could grow without being eradicated as a weed in the name of improved agriculture."

Steps should be taken now to preserve the most significant of our dwindling group of wild streams, especially since committee amendments to the legislation would establish a National Wild Rivers Review Commission which will inform the Congress if changing public needs in the future require that wild river status be altered.

* * * * *

BACKGROUND

The President, in his natural beauty message to the Congress, called for wild rivers preservation. He expressed the view that the time has come to identify and preserve free-flowing stretches of our great scenic rivers before growth and development make the beauty of the unspoiled waterway only a memory.

* * * * *

CONDEMNATION

Section 4(c) places a limitation on condemnation, by providing that where 75 percent or more of the acreage within the entire wild river area is owned by Federal, State, or local governments, neither Secretary can condemn for acquisition of fee title, but may condemn for scenic easements. The committee approved this limitation because it believed that rivers flowing through this amount of public land could amply provide bank-land areas for public access and facilities without the need for forcible acquisition of property. In adopting this amendment, the committee wishes to stress that it is peculiar to the problems of the wild rivers system, and should not be regarded as a precedent limiting condemnation in other cases, where areas may be dedicated to public use and benefit.

Under section 4(f), wherever the power of condemnation is conferred, the Secretaries are limited to acquiring a maximum of 300 feet on either side of the stream, tributary, or river, in fee title, and may not exercise the power of condemnation for scenic easements in an area extending more than 1,320 feet from either side.

* * * * *

WATER RIGHTS

The language contained in subsection 5(d) is intended by the committee to preserve the status quo with respect to the law of water rights. No change is intended. The first sentence states that established principles of law will determine the Federal and State jurisdiction over the waters of a stream that is included in a wild river area. Those established principles of law are not modified. The third sentence states that with respect to possible exemption of the Federal Government from State water laws the act is neither a claim nor a denial of exemption. Any issue relating to exemption will be determined by established principles of law as provided in the first sentence. The second sentence would apply to this legislation the principle of compensation embraced by section 8 of the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, 390, found in 43 U.S.C. 383). This means that the Government must pay just compensation for a water right taken for wild river purposes if the water right is a vested property right under established principles of State or Federal law. See *U.S.* v. *Gerlach* (339 U.S. 725).

* * * * *

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., March 3, 1965.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The President, in his state of the Union message of January 4, 1965, called attention to the need to protect the beauty of America, which he noted has sustained our spirit and enlarged our vision for more than three centuries. He expressed the hope that some of the unspoiled stretches of our waterways will be preserved under a wild rivers bill. There is a need to act now to protect this part of our heritage.

* * * * *

The national wild rivers system is not confined to a wilderness type of river because in a strict sense a truly wild river is rare today. The term "wild river areas" is used in the bill in a special sense—to denote those segments of streams, tributaries, or rivers which are in a free-flowing condition, or which can be restored to that condition, and which should be preserved for sound water conservation and the public use and enjoyment of scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values.

* * * * *

The bill gives the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture authority, within the exterior boundaries of a wild river area or portion thereof under his administration, to acquire lands and waters or interests therein. The amount of land acquisition in connection with most of the areas included in the national wild rivers system by this bill, however, will be relatively small because such areas are already mostly in Federal ownership.

Some of the wild river areas added to the system by subsequent legislation may contain more State-owned or privately owned lands, and it will be necessary to acquire some land adjacent to the rivers in order to provide for their protection. Some portions of a wild river area will extend only slightly beyond the riverbanks. Others will include a wider strip of land along the river that will vary in width. The amount of adjacent land included in a wild river area will depend upon such factors as terrain, protection of scenic and natural values, vegetative cover, existing developments, the need for land-based activities associated with wild rivers, and the need for administrative sites.

The land acquisition authority with respect to each area will be circumscribed by the report submitted to the Congress. The bill requires these reports to show the extent to which land will need to be acquired by the Federal Government and by the State governments.

Some of the areas considered in the future may be planned for State ownership, and in those areas no Federal land acquisition will be involved.

The bill contemplates that the authority to acquire fee title will be utilized only in cases where the acquisition of a scenic easement or other interest in land is not adequate.

* * * * *

All basic wild river values are dependent upon appropriate stream conditions. In order to maintain an adequate streamflow, we believe that no dams or other structures should be built, or "channel improvements" undertaken within a wild river area. The bill therefore provides that the Federal Power Commission will not have authority to license the building of any dam or other structure within a segment of a river included in the system unless Congress enacts legislation approving the issuance of such a license. In the case of Federal construction, the Congress will have an opportunity to consider its effect upon the wild river area at the time of project authorization. Furthermore, the maintenance of a high quality water yield is dependent upon upstream developments. The bill therefore provides that the Federal agency which has responsibility for a wild river area shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and with appropriate State water pollution control agencies for the purpose of controlling upstream pollution.

Areas included in the National Wild River System will be administered for the purpose of water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values contributing to public enjoyment, but without limitation on other uses, including timber harvesting and livestock grazing, that are harmonious with these purposes.

We believe that mineral activity within a wild river area should not be precluded, but that it should be subject to sufficient controls to prevent mining from defeating the purposes of a wild river area. The bill therefore expressly continues the applicability of the mining and mineral leasing laws, but makes mining operations subject to regulations needed to safeguard the wild river values. Except for this modification, the present authorities regarding mining, mineral leasing, and public land withdrawals will remain unchanged.

* * * * *

The bill also explicitly preserves the jurisdiction which the States have over fish and wildlife, and makes no change in the State water laws.

This proposed legislation has been prepared in collaboration with the Secretary of Agriculture and has his approval.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that this proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior.

Minority Views of Senators Thomas H. Kuchel, Gordon Allott, Len B. Jordan, Milward L. Simpson, and Paul J. Fannin

WATER RIGHTS

During the consideration of this bill by the Interior Committee, certain amendments submitted by us were adopted by the committee and are a part of the bill as sections 5(d) and 5(h). These amendments clearly express the intent of the committee that, by the passage of this legislation there will be no change in the established principles of Federal-State water law.

There will not be a reservation or appropriation of all unappropriated water of the rivers and streams included in the wild river system areas. There will be a reservation of waters only for the purposes outlined in the bill and only in quantities necessary to accomplish these purposes.

When acquiring water rights for wild river purposes, rights which are vested under established principles of State or Federal law, just compensation shall be paid.

Thomas H. Kuchel.
Gordon Allott.
Len B. Jordan.
Milward L. Simpson.
Paul J. Fannin

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. The amendment is as follows:

> On page 25, line 20, strike out the last sentence, beginning with the words "Any portion". In lieu thereof substitute the following new subsection designated as subsection (c), as follows:
>
> "(c) Any portion of a wild river area that is within the National Wilderness Preservation System, as established by the Act of September 3, 1964 (Public Law 88–577) shall be subject to the provisions of both the Wilderness Act and this Act with respect to the preservation of such a wild river area, and in case of conflict between the provisions of these Acts the more restrictive provisions shall apply."
>
> Reletter the succeeding subsections accordingly.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the pending amendment is merely meant to perfect what the committee intended to do when it adopted the language that appears on page 25 of the bill. The sentence reads as follows:

> Any portion of a wild river area that is within the National Wilderness Preservation System shall be subject to mining and mineral leasing provisions of both the Wilderness Act and this Act, and in case of conflict the more restrictive provisions shall apply.

In the discussion in committee, the question arose as to what would happen in the case of a segment of a wild river which flowed through a wilderness area. Considered in that context were the mining laws, but other uses were also considered. Inasmuch as the wilderness bill imposes certain restrictions on the use of a wilderness area, which are not to be found in the proposed legislation, it was never intended that the provisions of the Wilderness Act, which now form a part of the law of the land, should be supplanted by any provision of the pending bill.

Therefore this language was added:

> In case of conflict * * * the more restrictive provisions shall apply.

The amendment at the desk merely makes this language generally applicable and does not confine the matter to mining alone.

I believe the amendment at the desk conforms with the intention of the committee, and therefore I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I believe this is an appropriate time to express my appreciation to the Interior Department and the Senate Interior Committee for the excellent work they did on this bill.

I think a word of appreciation is particularly due such people in the Interior Department as Edward C. Crafts, director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; his assistant director, Dr. A. Heaton Underhill; Max N. Edwards, legislative counsel, and his assistant counsel, Lewis A. Sigler, and Stanford Young of the Division of Special Area Studies.

The chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Senator Jackson, is to be complimented for his competence and fairness in presiding at both hearings and executive sessions of the bill. Staff members, in particular the staff director, Jerry T. Verkler; the chief counsel, Stewart French, and professional staff member Porter Ward, dedicated long hours of research and work to further the bill's progress.

Mr. President, these are the people who helped us in the preparation and refinement of this legislation, and I, for one, would like to commend them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed here in the Record a list of the dams in Idaho, approved by the Senate, that I have sponsored during the years I have been a Member of this body. This list, which does not include my proposed southwest Idaho water development project, should, nevertheless, illustrate the zeal with which I have worked for desirable dam construction in Idaho during the past 9 years.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LIST OF MAJOR DAMS IN IDAHO SPONSORED BY SENATOR FRANK CHURCH AND APPROVED BY THE SENATE

Hells Canyon Dam: 722 feet in height, 1,733 feet in length, with a power capacity of 900,000 kilowatts. The dam would have created a reservoir of 4,400,000 acre-feet and have cost $311 million. Site: Hells Canyon in the Middle Snake.

Burns Creek Dam: 176 feet in height, 1,900 feet in length, this rolled earth-filled dam would provide reregulation for Palisades Dam, storage for 234,000 acre-feet and 90,000 kilowatts of power. Cost estimate: $45,500,000. Site: South Fork of the Snake.

Dworshak Dam: 600 feet in height, 2,400 feet in length, this dam, now in construction, will impound 1,433,000 acre-feet of water and generate 244,000 kilowatts of power at a construction cost of $210 million. Site: North Fork of the Clearwater.

Asotin Dam: 200 feet high and 2,900 feet long, Asotin would generate 288,000 kilowatts of power. Its construction, at a site on the Snake below Lewiston, has been authorized at a cost of $100 million.

Fremont Dam: 300 feet high, 2,800 feet long, the dam would provide flood control and reclamation benefits at a total cost of $52 million; 315,000 acre-feet would be impounded on the Teton River and 22,000 kilowatts of power generated. Has been authorized by the Congress.

Ririe Dam: Primarily a flood control project, this 230-foot-high, 580-foot-long dam would impound 135,000 acre-feet at a cost of $7 million. Has been authorized by Congress. Site: Willow Creek near Ririe.

Blackfoot Dam: Another flood control project authorized by Congress would raise the dam on the Blackfoot River 52 feet in height, 370 feet in length, impounding 451,000 acre-feet.

Mann Creek Dam: The $3.5 million project, money appropriated by Congress, will build a dam on the Weiser River 133 feet high, 1,133 feet long with a reservoir capacity of 13,000 acre-feet.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to include in the Record a statement I made before the Idaho Water Resources Board held in Lewiston, Idaho, on October 25, 1965, in support of the bill under consideration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR FRANK CHURCH, DEMOCRAT, OF IDAHO, CHAIRMAN OF THE PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE U.S. SENATE INTERIOR COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE IDAHO WATER RESOURCES BOARD, HELD IN LEWISTON, IDAHO, OCTOBER 25, 1965, RELATIVE TO S. 1446—THE WILD RIVERS BILL

Gentlemen, I am happy to appear before you to testify on behalf of the wild rivers bill. I am the sponsor of this bill. Eight months ago, on March 8, 1965, I introduced the measure in the U.S. Senate. Thirty-one Senators joined me in cosponsorship.

This is the second public hearing to be held in Idaho on the wild rivers bill. The first was held in Boise, on May 18, by a special Senate subcommittee, on which I served as chairman. My colleague, Senator Len Jordan, was also a member of this subcommittee, as was Senator Milward Simpson, of Wyoming. Fifty-four witnesses testified at the Boise hearing. Written statements were submitted by 119 others who were unable to appear personally. Of those who took a position, 141 generally favored enactment of the wild rivers bill, while 26 either opposed it, or objected to certain of its provisions. Altogether, 129 printed pages of testimony were taken at the Boise hearing. This testimony has been published in full, forming part of the public record of the extensive hearings conducted in each State requesting them, as well as in Washington D.C. I have asked that a set of these published hearings be sent to each member of this board, so that you may review all of the evidence before the Senate Interior Committee, when it devoted 6 days of executive sessions to the markup of the bill, and then, by a vote of 11 to 5, reported the bill favorably to the Senate itself.

A week ago today, the wild rivers bill was scheduled by the leadership to be taken up in the Senate. I have no doubt it would have passed by a lopsided majority, with strong support coming from both sides of the aisle.

However, in deference to this board, and in order that every possible opportunity might be extended to Idahoans desiring to be heard, I asked Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, to defer action on the bill. He consented to my request. As a consequence, it will not be possible for the Senate to consider the Wild Rivers bill until it reconvenes next year.

The record, then, on the question of timing, is quite incontrovertible. The supporters of this measure have never urged hasty or ill-considered action. By the time the bill comes to a vote on its merits in the Senate, it will have been scrutinized by the Senate Interior Committee for nearly a full year. A series of public hearings will have been held, at which a total of 156 witnesses will have personally testified, with a record compiled of some 611 printed pages. In Idaho itself, two full-dress public hearings will have been completed, one under the auspices of the Senate committee having jurisdiction, and the other under the direction of this board. To my recollection, this, in itself, is unprecedented.

I, myself, welcome all the attention that can be focused on the wild rivers bill. I am glad that this board is placing its sights on the "ultimate uses of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers." "Ultimate" is the right word, for it suggests that we adhere to a common purpose: assigning these two magnificent mountain rivers to a use most beneficial to the economy of Idaho and the general well-being of her people.

We in Idaho are blessed with an abundance of water, much of which we shall want to harness behind dams. Fortunately, we are also favored with a great many potential damsites. If all of them, on each and every river, remain open for dam building, we shall have relinquished our entire river system to this particular use. Other public uses, equally important to our economy and to the preservation of a wholesome outdoor life for our people, will be left without statutory protection. In this situation, since the licensing of dams is left up to public agencies which exist for this purpose, the end result is perfectly evident: Ultimately, in the absence of a National Wild Rivers System which the bill in question would create, every feasible site will eventually be used for dam construction. The past 50 years offers no evidence whatever that dam builders will voluntarily stop building dams. Unless laws are enacted to save some of our remaining free-flowing rivers in their natural, untamed state, wild rivers shall vanish from our land.

I recognize that it is the purpose of this board to plan for the utilization of Idaho water. Necessarily, you have become a part of the dam building business, even though the money to finance future dams in Idaho will continue to come—owing to the lack of adequate local means—mainly from Federal, rather than State, revenues.

I say this because we must be candid with one another. In no sense do I deprecate the importance of dams. I have been a devoted advocate of dams for Idaho, throughout my tenure in the Senate. When the Hells Canyon Dam was made a scare word in southern Idaho, I fought for its authorization, because it seemed to me inexcusable to squander so monumental a site on an insufficient development.

In the same manner, I worked doggedly for congressional approval of the Dworshak Dam, threatening a one-man filibuster in the Senate in the closing hours of the session. This $200 million dam, the highest in the Northwest, which we renamed in memory of my former colleague, the late Senator Henry Dworshak, is now building on the North Fork of the Clearwater.

Coming up the Snake, like mighty steps on a giant's staircase, is a whole set of Federal dams—Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, Little Goose, Lower Granite, and Asotin—for which I have sought appropriations in the Senate each year. We have kept the building of this massive network on schedule, with the result that Lewiston, Idaho, will become a port, with direct access to the Pacific, by the end of the decade.

Other dams I have favored will soon be built in this great region, High Mountain Sheep to the south of us, and Libby Dam to the north. Bills which I sponsored to authorize the Fremont Dam, the Lower Teton Dam, and the Ririe Dam in southern Idaho, have been approved by Congress and signed into law by the President. Just a few weeks ago, Congressman Compton I. White and I announced a joint plan to seek authorization of a southwest Idaho water development project, the largest in the history of the State, which would ultimately reclaim 500,000 acres of desert land, and generate more than half a million kilowatts of electricity.

This plan calls for an unprecedented half-billion dollar investment in Idaho's future development. I urge you, as members of this Board, to give the same measure of interest to this vast dam-building program, as you have evidenced in your immediate concern over the wild rivers bill.

The record speaks for itself. I am anything but an enemy of dams. In the face of the most determined opposition of Idaho sportsmen, and fish and wildlife groups, I fought for the construction of Bruces Eddy, now the Dworshak Dam. Wherever the evidence shows that a proposed dam will do more good than harm, I shall work for it. But, by the same token, wherever the evidence shows that a dam will do more harm than good, I shall work against it—with equal fervor.

This brings me back to the wild rivers bill, and the reasons why I so strongly endorse it. Insofar as Idaho is concerned, the case for the wild rivers bill is simply the case against the building of the dams which are projected for construction on the Salmon and the Middle fork of the Clearwater Rivers. These dams have been planned, the sites for them have been designated; their dimensions, storage capacity, and the high and lower water elevations of their respective reservoirs, have been carefully calculated. We know how much electricity they will generate, for, apart from what they may contribute to flood control, these are single-purpose dams, designed to produce hydroelectric power. The dams are as follows:

On the Clearwater:

Penny Cliffs—to be located 4 miles upstream on the Middle Fork above Kooskia. Its reservoir would extend 19 miles up the Middle Fork to the junction of the Selway and Lochsa, then 29 miles on up the Selway, and 20 miles on up the Lochsa. The height of the dam, 620 feet.

On the Salmon:

Lower Canyon—to be located on the Salmon half a mile above its confluence with the Snake. The reservoir would extend upstream about 70 miles to the site of the proposed Freedom Dam. The height of the dam, 665 feet.

Freedom Dam—this would be about 17 miles downstream from Riggins and 3 miles above White Bird. At normal pool elevation, the reservoir would extend 24 miles up the Salmon to a point 7 miles above Riggins. The height of the dam, 300 feet.

Crevice Dam—to be located on the Salmon about 13 miles above Riggins, Idaho. The reservoir would extend 65 miles up the Salmon, and 10 miles up the South Fork of the Salmon. The height of the dam, 725 feet.

These specifications are the most authoritative available. They are taken from the Water Resource Development, Columbia River Basin Report of the Army Corps of Engineers, dated June 1958.

Under the law, as it now stands, the Federal Power Commission could license the construction of any or all of these dams, upon application of a private power company, or a combination of companies, just as the FPC recently issued a license to the Pacific Northwest Power Co., for construction of the High Mountain Sheep Dam on the Snake River.

There are those who believe that hydroelectric dams should be built wherever application is made to build them, and I would expect these people to oppose the enactment of a Wild Rivers bill. Certain private power companies (I am pleased to say that the Washington Water Power Co., is not among them) may prefer to see the damsites on the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers left open for their future use. The same may be true for certain public power groups.

On this question, we must simply choose sides. I have chosen mine. I think the weight of the evidence, in terms of what best serves the general public good, overwhelmingly favors saving, unobstructed, these particular rivers so that we might preserve and promote their great recreational value, now and in the years ahead. If we oppose giving these magnificient rivers, which are assets of unique and incomparable value to Idaho, statutory protection now, while there is still time, we shall have only ourselves to blame later, when time has run out. It is not enough to say, as some have contended, that we can settle whether or not to build the dams when the question arises; that is, when the application is filed.

Gentlemen, once an application is filed, who will do the deciding? Not the people of Idaho; there will be no public referendum. Not the members of this board, for you lack the jurisdiction to decide. Not the Idaho Delegation in Congress, for we lack the numbers to guarantee the outcome of any vote. Not, indeed, the Congress itself, for it has yet to wrest jurisdiction from the Federal Power Commission, once an application for a license has been duly brought before it.

Let's not fool ourselves. The wild rivers bill is necessary, if jurisdiction is to be taken from the Federal Power Commission to license dams within the system the legislation creates. Without the bill, once an application has been filed to construct a power dam on the Salmon or Clearwater Rivers, the decision will rest with the Federal Power Commission, and with that Commission alone. You may be satisfied to leave it that way. I am not.

Nor am I impressed with the argument that further study is needed before any judgment can be reached for or against the inclusion of the designated parts of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers in a national wild rivers system. What additional information, not now available, will more delay furnish? What facts are now lacking? For 50 years we have been accumulating exhaustive data on the whole Columbia-Snake River drainage. We have the complete record of the river flows, year by year, of the salmon runs, the flood cycles, and the navigational, irrigational, and hydroelectric potential of every river and tributary in the Northwest.

We have all the necessary information at hand. The issue should not be dodged on the flimsy pretext that more facts are needed. The question is simply whether we want to take timely action to give statutory protection to these segments of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers, or whether we do not. Placing these rivers in the study category of the bill, without any valid reason, would cut the heart out of the proposed wild river system, and leave the bill a shambles. This is why the Senate Interior Committee rejected the proposal, when it was offered as an amendment in the markup session.

I do not contend that the wild rivers bill will cost us nothing. Everything worth having has its price. In the case of this legislation, the price would entail some loss in optimum flood control, particularly as it might affect certain downstream areas in Oregon and Washington. There would also be the loss of the hydroelectric power potential at the sites I have mentioned. Again, the principal impact would be borne by Oregon and Washington, since most of the electricity generated at these dams would be siphoned off to meet the needs of these more highly industrialized and more densely populated neighbor States. In any event, we have scores of damsites on other Idaho rivers to meet our future power needs for as many years ahead as hydro-produced electricity is every likely to remain competitive with power generated at nuclear plants, where efficiency of operation steadily improves and costs continue to decline.

So the price we must pay for a wild rivers bill can hardly be regarded as onerous. The benefits, however, loading the opposite side of the scale, are very important indeed.

First of all, there is the preservation of the fishery itself, a perpetual source of wealth and pleasure, unless we permit its destruction, either through the erection of high dams, past which the fingerling salmon cannot successfully maneuver, or through our failure to properly regulate the capture of the parent fish on their upstream migration to the spawning beds in Idaho.

You have asked experts to testify on the fish problem, and they can best give you the impressive figures as to the value of this resource. My concern is that appropriate action be taken by the States, acting in concert with the Federal Government, to nourish and protect the migratory fish run mothered by the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers. To this end, very recently, I sought and obtained funds in the Senate to commence construction of a Federal salmon hatchery near Kooskia—a million dollar project.

I am advised by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that, if present plans for such hatcheries and other protective measures are fully implemented, the migratory runs on the Salmon and Clearwater can be doubled, provided, of course, that the rivers remain free flowing. This is the basic reason why the wild rivers bill has received such a positive endorsement by the Idaho Fish and Game Commission.

Other departments of the State government also join in support of this proposed legislation. Gov. Robert E. Smylie, who urges the enactment of the wild rivers bill, tells us that he conferred with the State forestry and reclamation agencies, which joined with the Idaho Fish and Game Commission in the preparation of the Governor's statement on behalf of the bill. Thus a Republican State administration has acted to demonstrate the broad, bipartisan support which the wild rivers proposal enjoys in Idaho.

No doubt this has been occasioned, in part, by a realization of the growing importance of outdoor recreation to the economy of Idaho. Tourism—the discovery of Idaho by the Nation, hunting, fishing, the burgeoning numbers of summer vacationers seeking escape from the confinement of megalopolis—this is the most dynamic force at work in creating new income for the people of our State. The figures are startling. Ten years ago, tourism was a $48-million annual business in Idaho. Last year, according to the figures of the Idaho Department of Commerce and Development, tourism accounted for $160 million in earned income for Idaho. This year, the figure is expected to rise above $175 million. In two handfuls of years, tourism has plunged upward to become Idaho's third most important source of revenue.

And the expansion has just begun. In the next 35 years, the population of this country will double. The demand for outdoor recreation will triple. The great majority of Americans will be more affluent and have more time for recreation. Projections indicate that they will have more than twice as much disposable per capita income and paid vacation time as in 1960. Their average work week will have decreased from 39 hours to 32 hours. Idaho's future as a vacationland is filled with promise.

What we make of it depends upon how well we husband our scenic and recreational resources. It depends, in short, upon how farsighted we are in insisting upon a wisely balanced development of our natural endowment. In places, where the terrain permits, we shall want to use unappropriated water for new reclamation projects; in other places, on rivers already obstructed, we shall want to build new power dams; but in still other places, in areas of mountain-locked grandeur where the water still runs fast, pure and free, we should seek to preserve our finest untamed streams by including them within a National Wild Rivers System.

Nowhere in America are there left such jewels, among our remaining wild rivers, as the Salmon and the Clearwater systems. An extensive survey by study teams substantiates that claim. Naturally, these should be the lead-off rivers in the bill. Anyone who has come to know the pristine mystique of the Selway, or the rampaging white waters of the Salmon, must appreciate how supremely these rivers qualify as the core for any wild rivers bill. To them, in the initial system established by the bill, we add segments of the Rogue in Oregon, the Rio Grande in New Mexico, and the Eleven Point in Missouri.

As the bill is now drawn, it includes the Salmon from the town of North Fork downstream to its confluence with the Snake, and the entire Middle Fork; the Middle Fork of the Clearwater from Kooskia upstream to Lowell; the Lochsa from Lowell to Powell Ranger Station, and the Selway from Lowell upstream to its origin.

Precaution has been taken to fully protect established water rights, and to make certain that State water laws are not infringed in any way. The Senate Interior Committee hammered out amendments to the original language to make doubly sure that the status quo with respect to water law remains unchanged. These amendments are in section 5 of the bill, and are spelled out in the committee report which urges enactment.

Although S. 1446 might be regarded as a corollary to the Wilderness Act, it is very different in concept and application. A limited area along the banks of the river would be included in the System, which would be administered to promote maximum public use and enjoyment. Unlike the restrictions on use in a wilderness area, this bill recognizes and adopts the multiple-use principle. Timber harvesting and livestock grazing which do not substantially interfere with the use and enjoyment of the river will continue along the banklands. Mining would also be allowed, although claims on the banklands located after the effective date of the act would be subject to reasonable regulation to protect the river against pollution. The bill also contains no prohibition against the construction of needed roads or bridges.

Except for the acquisition of scenic easements, the bill confers no power of condemnation of private property along the Salmon or Clearwater Rivers. An amendment I offered, prohibits condemnation where 75 percent or more of the acreage within the wild river area is publicly owned. Both Idaho rivers would fall in this category. The bill does allow for condemnation for scenic easements, where these may be needed.

Nothing in the bill affects the jurisdiction or administration authority of the States with respect to fish and wildlife.

Obstruction of wild rivers by damming normally accomplished through construction or licensing by Federal agencies would be prohibited, except as expressly authorized by Congress.

In addition to these several safeguards, there is also the amendment adopted in the closing session of the Interior Committee which would establish a National Wild Rivers Review Commission to inform the Congress if changing public needs dictate that wild river status should be altered. This amendment was proposed by my colleague, Senator JORDAN, and I supported it.

The Interior Committee, in its report to the Senate, pointed to this amendment as one which would allow a river to be removed from the system, if a greater public need for another use should later develop. However, even without the amendment, it would always be open to Congress to remove rivers from the system, should changing conditions make this desirable. In brief, we can place these segments of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers within the protection of the bill now, and still admit to the possibility that a higher public need for turning them to some other use might conceivably emerge in the future. But we can't have it the other way around. Once a dam is built, a wild river is lost forevermore.

The cause I plead for is not mine alone. It is that of the President of the United States, who has urged the enactment of this measure; it is that of the foremost conservationists of this country; it is that of the people of Idaho, the large majority of whom, I am persuaded, earnestly favor this bill.

But, I cannot say, with conviction, that the cause finds much support on this board. Before these hearings were called, before any of this testimony was given, I read in the newspapers that an informal poll had been taken among the members of this board on the wild rivers bill. The chairman, George L. Crookham, was reported to have disclosed that six members of the board opposed the bill, one member favored it, and one member took no position. Frankly, gentlemen, if I were accused of murder, and six of my eight judges had announced to the press, prior to my trial, that they believed me guilty, I wouldn't be very optimistic about my chances of being acquitted in their court.

Yet, I have come here to bear witness to my belief in your integrity and good faith. I recognize the importance which attaches to the responsibility you hold. I trust you will act with broad vision so that, in this State, conservation may be the companion of development. In the utilization of our water, I hope you will advocate a balanced program, where no one interest will dominate to the exclusion of others, neither the farmers' spade, the anglers' hook, nor "Reddy-Kilowatt's" switch.

A few months ago, Burton J. Rowles, a writer, movie producer, and lover of the great outdoors, spent some time on the Clearwater and the Salmon. He said they only ask "freedom to flow and to retain purity, in return for supporting life and providing pleasure." The defenses of such a river, he said, "are no stronger than man's concern for its vitality, expressed in his guardianship."

To guard the Salmon and the Clearwater, I am confident we shall find the needed sentinels, here in Idaho, and in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, as one who has long enjoyed our beautiful Texas rivers, I want to add my support to the wild rivers bill we are considering today.

Although no Texas rivers are included in the provisions of this legislation, I feel that as a Texan I can speak on the values and the beauty of our Nation's water resources and our wild river systems. We Texans appreciate fully the esthetic as well as the economic value of our rivers—especially when they are brim full. I commend those committee members who worked on this legislation, both majority and minority, for their farsightedness in drafting this measure, so that generations of Americans can enjoy the beauty of our Nation's clear and free-flowing rivers.

Mr. President, Texas itself has a number of very beautiful rivers. It takes three pages of the most recent Texas almanac to just list our rivers and streams.

I like to think Texans are a little more aware, and a little more appreciative of their water resources, and I think most agree that it would indeed be a tragedy if this Nation did not preserve its rich heritage of rivers in their natural wild state, before they are polluted, before the wildlife is gone, before their waters are tamed, before they are spoiled in any way. Certainly we all realize that such preservation must be accomplished without undue harm to the economy and to the industry in those areas affected.

I have long supported the dedicated efforts of those interested in the conservation of our natural heritage, Mr. President, because I appreciate the abundant recreational and scenic values of our vast wild lands. Future generations of Americans will thank us for this measure, and will be most appreciative of our efforts here today.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it was my privilege to have served as a member of the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources, which recommended 5 years ago "that certain streams be preserved in their free-flowing condition because of their natural scenic, scientific, esthetic, and recreational values."

We are all familiar, no matter what part of the United States we may call home, with great river systems which have been all but destroyed by pollution created, chiefly, by industrial and commercial development. I do not believe that there is a man or woman among us who would argue that this is desirable. Nor do I think there is anyone who would argue against the desirability of setting aside certain streams, or portions of them, for the purpose of retaining, while we can, some of nature's handiwork in its natural state.

Problems, of course, have arisen. Last April, in an appearance before the committee then considering this legislation, I, for one, asked for some substantial modifications in the bill to better spell out the powers it would confer upon the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture and to better protect the rights of landowners. The committee not only acted to improve the bill along these lines, Mr. President, but it went further and acceded to my request that the Green River between its origin in the Bridger Wilderness and its confluence with Horse Creek near the town of Daniel, Wyo., be removed from the classification of streams for which wild river designation is immediately sought and be further studied before action is taken on it.

In case, Mr. President, these actions may have led some to doubt my position, I want to make it clear that I remain a cosponsor of this legislation and a strong supporter of a National Wild Rivers System which, I hope, will one day encompass part of the Green River.

Now, the Green River is truly a thing of beauty, as Writer Berton Roueché pointed out in his article, "Something About a River," in the New Yorker for October 23, 1965. Indeed, it is even unique, if ever changing, for as Roueché's article points out, it is fed at one point by Warm Spring, which supports a species of dace, a small fish that is unique in itself and lives nowhere else. We, in Wyoming, are proud of the Green, as we are of our mountains and other streams, many of which remain in their natural state.

The Green River is something else, too. It is a major source of water and power for future development of a wide area of my State. We badly need development.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, it is my hope that the Green River can continue to fill both its roles in the future, playing its great part in the development of Wyoming and, at the same time, providing a natural, free-flowing stretch of water for the National Wild Rivers System. It is so that we can attempt to balance off these two roles and provide both for optimum utilization of the State's share of the water in the Green and yet protect for posterity a significant stretch of the river, that Wyoming has asked for further study of the wild rivers proposal as it affects this great river of our State.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. **KUCHEL**. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 2 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Aiken
Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—1

Simpson

NOT VOTING—28

Allott
Bartlett
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Cooper
Fulbright
Gore
Hayden
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Smathers
Sparkman
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.

So the bill (S. 1446) was passed.

Mr. **CHURCH**. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. **JACKSON**. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana obtained the floor.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. I understand that the distinguished acting leader is about to move to adjourn until tomorrow. I want to ask him his intention with respect to Calendar No. 917, H.R. 30, the so-called Interama bill.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I am planning to make that the pending business immediately after morning business tomorrow. My plan is to make it the pending business of the Senate at that time.

In the event the Senate should dispose of H.R. 30 tomorrow, we plan to call up Calendar No. 850, H.R. 8126, to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me so I may make an announcement?

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. I will have two rather formal amendments that simply bring the Interama bill into conformity with the fact that if it is passed, it will be passed as of this year rather than last year.

I have discussed the amendments with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. I find that they have no objection to them.

I give notice that I expect to call up those amendments at the same time the committee amendment is called up tomorrow.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Mr. President, will the Senator state again what he said about his hope of having the Interama bill passed tomorrow?

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I said I hoped the Senate would pass the bill, without any prejudice one way or the other to Senators interested in the bill.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Since I mentioned the name of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, I merely stated for his information, as well as the information of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and for all other Senators, that I expected to offer tomorrow two minor amendments, which I have already discussed with the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Delaware, and which make allowance for the fact that the bill, if passed, will be passed this year, instead of last year. It makes two minor adjustments in the bill.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. I yield to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for his comments on that statement. I know the Senator from Louisiana has the floor, but does he expect that the Interama bill will move through with great speed, as if on greased lines?

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. One thing this Senator never does is to predict what other Senators will do. I shall await with great interest to see what the Senate will do. If Senators want to debate the bill tonight, I will not insist on adjournment or recess at this time; but it seems appropriate to lay it down and take it up tomorrow.

RECESS

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 19, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: Isaiah 60: 12: *For the nation and kingdom that will not serve Thee shall perish.*

Almighty God, as we again invoke Thy blessing, grant that our faith may be increased, our hope renewed, and our wills strengthened toward goodness and righteousness.

We know that Thou art waiting to stir our dull hearts and to move us in patient obedience to what Thou dost command.

Help us to hasten the dawning of the day when trouble and tragedy shall be overcome and transformed into beauty and truth and our human life shall be better than it is.

May the cynicism of our time and the clouds of bitterness, which it casts over the earth, be dispelled.

Inspire us to believe that the liberty and brotherhood we seek and we strive for have a spiritual basis.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

LETTERS FOR VIETNAM PEACE

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, during the month of December 1965, I received some 526 letters from all over the Nation urging me to join with the President and with Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY in a strong, continuing effort to seek negotiations for peace in Vietnam.

Most of the letters requested an extension of the moratorium on the bombing of North Vietnam until such time as negotiations have actually begun—and, then, for an end to all warfare. Many of the letters I received were copies of those sent to the President. Some of the messages were on Christmas cards—sent before the holidays—asking for a Christmas cease-fire.

These messages are almost all couched in a language of moderation and express praise of the President's efforts for a peaceful settlement. Many of them are quite long and show the results of a great deal of time and thoughtfulness that went into well-planned suggestions.

I am impressed, Mr. Speaker, with the general tone of temperance and constructiveness embodied in this correspondence, and I am further impressed with the deep concern of many of our citizens for human beings on the other side of the world in Vietnam. I am also personally grateful for the continuing efforts being made by President Johnson to effect a settlement of hostilities in southeastern Asia.

CREATION OF A NUCLEAR NAVY

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an address by the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD and a telegram from the President.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, it was my privilege to be present at the keel-laying ceremony of our newest attack submarine, the U.S.S. *Narwhal*. This date also marked the 11th anniversary of the sailing of the world's first nuclear submarine, the U.S.S. *Nautilus*.

On this occasion, my distinguished colleague, CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, was the principal speaker. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to place in the RECORD the remarks made by Congressman HOLIFIELD, and have also requested permission to place in the RECORD a telegram from President Johnson—a former member of the Joint Committee—which was sent to Congressman HOLIFIELD praising the creation of a nuclear navy as an outstanding achievement.

I believe our country owes a debt of gratitude to the Congress and particularly to the Joint Committee for the consistent support the legislative branch gave to the then Capt. H. G. Rickover in his fight to keep our Navy second to none. That fight is still going on and I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by CHET HOLIFIELD yesterday—particularly when he said:

> I hope the day will soon come when the executive branch will accept the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy "that the United States adopt a policy of using nuclear propulsion in all future major surface warships," thus forging another link in the necessary chain from sail to coal, from coal to oil, and from oil to nuclear power. In future years, may it not be said of our Nation's leaders that they valued dollars more highly than the lives of our fighting men and our national security itself.

I commend this speech to all of us as an example of foresightedness and dedication to national security. The Congress must continue the fight for a nuclear-powered Navy.

The material referred to follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN CHET HOLIFIELD AT KEEL LAYING CEREMONY FOR U.S.S. "NARWHAL," SSN671, GROTON, CONN., JANUARY 17, 1966

Eleven years ago today the world's first nuclear powered ship, the attack submarine U.S.S. *Nautilus*, SSN571, sent her famous message, "Underway on nuclear power." Today we are here to lay the keel of our newest nuclear attack submarine, the U.S.S. *Narwhal*, SSN671. This submarine is designed to be technically superior in military effectiveness to all previous attack submarines.

I especially want to congratulate the employees and management of Electric Boat for the prominent part they have played in our Nation's attainment of a position of preeminence in the nuclear submarine field. Here the first one—the *Nautilus*—was laid down. The first Polaris submarine was also built in your yard in addition to the first ship of a number of new classes of nuclear submarines which have or are joining our nuclear fleet. Another major first assigned to Electric Boat is the design and construction of the first nuclear propelled oceanographic research submarine, called NR–1, which we look to as the vanguard of our advance into inner space. The primary mission of the NR–1 vehicle is to determine as quickly as possible the feasibility of nuclear propulsion for this application. Because of the vastly increased endurance made possible by nuclear power, the capability of NR–1 will be an order of magnitude greater than any other developed or planned to date.

Including the *Nautilus*, Congress has authorized 99 nuclear submarines. So you can see we have been proceeding with a vigorous development and construction program for nuclear-powered submarines. But it should be remembered that the necessary support for the nuclear submarine program had to be won by hard effort. The history of the early years of the naval nuclear propulsion program was marked by a reluctance within the Defense Department to use nuclear power for the propulsion of submarines.

Now that we have 56 nuclear submarines at sea;

Now that our Polaris-armed nuclear submarines stand their watchful guard hidden under the oceans of the world;

Now that our attack nuclear submarines provide our Navy with an indispensable antisubmarine warfare capability;

Now that our nuclear-powered surface warships *Enterprise* and *Bainbridge* have been committed to combat in Vietnam—few remember that it was the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that arranged to buy the nuclear powerplants for our first two nuclear submarines, the *Nautilus* and *Seawolf*, with Atomic Energy Commission funds, because the then Capt. H. G. Rickover was not able to get the necessary support in the Department of Defense for his project in the early 1950's.

Let us beware that history does not repeat itself.

We must be alert to assure that the reluctance of the Department of Defense to invest in surface warships does not let our Navy lapse into obsolescence. We must build modern warships for our future Navy—warships with the proven advantages of nuclear propulsion.

Those of you who were here on that day in 1952 when President Harry S. Truman laid the keel of the *Nautilus* will recall his warning, and I quote:

"All national security programs are expensive and we might as well face up to it.

"I think the efforts that are being made to sell the American people of the idea that there is some cutrate, bargain-counter route to national security are very dangerous. The

people of this country have faith and courage and patriotism enough to do what is required for our national survival. They are willing to do what is necessary even though the way may be long and hard.

"The difficulty is that the American people are getting all kinds of foolish advice from persons who ought to know better.

"We may have to live in a half-peace, half-war condition for a long time to come. We must lay our plans accordingly. If we are to maintain peace, we must be prepared to defeat aggression. And we must be prepared to make the long-term investment in national security that this requires."

I believe in getting a dollar's worth of value for every defense dollar we spend, but let us not be beguiled into believing that there is a new cutrate, bargain-counter route to national security. The factors of military effectiveness in the protection of our Nation's security must always be dominant over the factors of cost. In southeast Asia today the United States is once again faced with the bitter reality that what counts in war is military effectiveness—not cost effectiveness.

Cost effectiveness studies have been cited by the Defense Department to support the contention that the advantage of nuclear propulsion are not particularly significant for surface warships. These studies, however, contain a fundamental weakness that makes their conclusions wrong—they are based on false assumptions and do not place proper emphasis on military effectiveness.

These cost-effectiveness studies were based on—

The assumption that tankers and oilers needed to supply propulsion fuel for oil-fired warships will operate unhampered by the enemy and suffer no losses;

The assumption that the fuel oil needed to run our conventional surface warships will be readily available wherever and whenever needed; and

The assumption that no cost factor need be included in their studies for losses—or protection of our propulsion fuel oil supply lines.

These are dangerous assumptions to use in evaluating the cost and effectiveness of weapons of war. Most of you remember, as I do, when the beaches along our Atlantic coast were soaked with oil from sunken tankers and our ability to provide fuel for our fighting forces was seriously threatened. What price would Americans be willing to pay for nuclear powered warships under circumstances like those?

Congress has been told by the Department of Defense that the choice we face is between a given number of conventional ships and a smaller number of nuclear ships for the same total cost. In other words, to improve a weapon system, we are told that we must reduce the number of weapons to pay for it. We in Congress do not accept this cutrate bargain-counter reasoning. I might add that the President in his message to the Congress last Wednesday did not espouse such reasoning when he said:

"We will give our fighting men what they must have: Every gun and every dollar, and every decision—whatever the cost or whatever the challenge."

Our potential enemies may not use the same cost effectiveness criteria and thus may oppose us with the best weapons technology can provide them. This could create an intolerable peril to our national security.

Chairman L. MENDEL RIVERS, of the House Armed Services Committee, recently said, and I quote:

"I am convinced, and I think it is fair to say that the Congress as a body is convinced, that the Navy of the future must be nuclear powered. There is no reason why our future aircraft carriers, cruisers, frigates, and destroyers cannot be powered by nuclear energy. It is clear that continuing to build conventionally powered warships will, in the long run, be economically wasteful; it would be following a policy of built-in obsolescence."

I fully agree with this statement of my distinguished colleague from South Carolina. It is time to take advantage of one of the few areas in technology where we are significantly ahead of our antagonists. We should proceed with a vigorous program to build nuclear powered warships that can give the United States an unprecedented naval force to maintain the freedom of the seas and improve our ability to survive the half-peace, half-war condition as President Truman so aptly called it.

I have been privileged to be a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy since its inception 20 years ago and have the honor of being its current Chairman. The Joint Committee is charged, by law, with the responsibility for making continuing studies of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy. The Committee has historically played a creative role in fulfilling the declared statutory policy of the United States that the development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to make the "maximum contribution to the common defense and security."

The Joint Committee, from its inception, has been interested in and vigorously supported research and development in the field of naval nuclear propulsion: first, for submarines and then for surface warships.

Two years ago, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy made an exhaustive study of the subject of nuclear propulsion of surface warships. We concluded that "each new warship the United States decides to build for our first-line naval striking force should be the best that our technology will allow and should therefore have nuclear propulsion, even if a somewhat higher cost is incurred to pay for the increase in military capability."

We printed for the public record a report of these hearings in December 1963. In releasing this report, Chairman JOHN O. PASTORE, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, said, and I quote:

"The Joint Committee believes that cost cutting is important but it must eliminate the fat and not cut to the marrow.

"It is my earnest hope that we will never again be forced to go to war, but if we do, I want our equipment to be second to none."

Nuclear propulsion has the fundamental advantage of permitting our warships to go anywhere in the world, to deliver their combat load and to return—all without logistic support.

Oil-fired warships must be refueled every few days. This requires a vulnerable worldwide distribution system to provide fuel oil for conventional ships.

As the number of foreign nuclear submarines increases and as the air striking capabilities of our potential enemies increase, the difficulty of providing this logistic support will surely increase. The basic reason for developing nuclear power for surface warships is to reduce this logistic support—support which will be most difficult, if not impossible under some circumstances, to provide in wartime. Nuclear propulsion in combat ships will free the striking forces of our Navy from the obvious restrictions of reliance on a worldwide propulsion fuel distribution system.

We must plan for times of crisis. It is precisely in such situations that the superior mobility, maneuverability, and reliability of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled naval striking force.

In the 4 years, fiscal years 1960 through 1963, subsequent to authorization of the three nuclear powered surface ships now in the fleet, the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the cruiser *Long Beach*, and the frigate *Bainbridge*, the Department of Defense obtained authorization for 2 new aircraft carriers and 10 new frigates, all of which should have been nuclear powered. If these 12 ships had been provided nuclear propulsion, we would now have in being or under construction three nuclear powered carrier task forces for our Navy instead of the one we have. However, of these 12 ships, only one, the frigate *Truxtun* to be completed this year will have nuclear power.

And the *Truxtun* will be nuclear powered only because of the initiative taken by the Congress 5 years ago to authorize and appropriate the extra funds to change the U.S.S. *Truxtun* from an oil-fired frigate to be our fourth nuclear powered surface warship.

But in the past 3 years, the Department of Defense has not requested authorization for any surface warship of destroyer size or larger—nuclear or conventional. The surface Navy is aging rapidly and is even now faced with widespread obsolescence. In the late 1950's and early 1960's there was a vigorous warship construction program and the introduction of nuclear propulsion in surface warships. However, this has been followed by a long period with no surface warship construction of any kind. It is clear that this cannot go on much longer without the capability of the U.S. Navy sinking far below the needs of our national security.

It was Congress who took the lead in forcing the shift to nuclear power in submarines. It was Congress who took the lead in developing nuclear propulsion for surface warships. It was Congress who strongly supported the building of the three nuclear surface warships now in the fleet which have so ably demonstrated to the world the obvious capabilities of nuclear propulsion in warships.

Congress again took the initiative last year by authorizing construction of the fifth nuclear-powered surface warship—a guided-missile frigate. This ship was added to the Defense Department authorization even though the Secretary of Defense had overruled a Navy proposal to build it.

The members of our Committee were pleased to see the strong endorsements for building more nuclear-powered surface warships, and specifically the new nuclear frigate, given by the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. It is clear from the legislative history of this particular ship that it is the will of Congress that the long-leadtime items needed for construction of the nuclear frigate be procured in this fiscal year and that funds needed for its completion be included in the fiscal year 1967 appropriation.

However, to date there have been no indications that the Department of Defense intends to pay any attention whatsoever to this clear expression of the will of Congress. This, of course, will force us to consider what additional steps can be taken to insure that the Congress is not thwarted in its efforts to carry out its constitutional responsibility to the American People: "To provide and maintain a Navy." All thinking Americans know that the checks and balances in our form of government are intended to prevent the arbitrary exercise of power by anyone of the three branches of Government.

The new nuclear powered frigate authorized this year by Congress means a great deal more than a mere addition of a ship to the fleet. There can be no doubt of the wisdom of adding this vessel to the program, but this authorization by Congress goes well beyond that goal.

The Department of Defense has vacillated and procrastinated, studied, and restudied nuclear power for surface warships in what appears to me and to many of my fellow Members of Congress to be an attempt to kill nuclear power for the Navy by studying it to death.

A year ago the world's first nuclear powered task force consisting of the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the guided missile cruiser *Long Beach* and the guided missile frigate *Bainbridge* made an historic 300,000-mile cruise around the world without logistic support of any kind.

This cruise, named Operation Sea Orbit, proved conclusively the feasibility of operating nuclear surface ships throughout the oceans of the world on a self-sustaining basis.

It gave world leaders the opportunity to witness first hand the capability of the U.S. Navy to operate nuclear powered warships anywhere, independent of support ships—a feat out of the question for conventionally powered ships.

In the last 4 years the *Enterprise, Long Beach*, and *Bainbridge* have proved their outstanding reliability in steaming over 600,000 miles.

In October of last year the *Enterprise* escorted by *Bainbridge* left the east coast for the South China Sea. Both ships maintained a speed of advance in excess of 20 knots for the entire 16,000-mile trip and arrived on station ready to conduct combat operations. Oil burning ships attempting to accomplish the same transit in the same time span and conduct similar operations, would have consumed several million gallons of oil enroute. This would have necessitated prepositioning several oilers along the track to refuel these ships.

On the historic occasion of the first use of nuclear powered surface ships in combat, the *Enterprise* demonstrated her high state of readiness following this long transit by delivering, on her second day of operations—December 3, 1965—the highest number of total strikes per day for any aircraft carrier operating in South Vietnam. Each day since then the daily Defense Department communique on Vietnam has included the sorties from the *Enterprise* as she has set new records only to later exceed them herself.

Senator Henry M. Jackson, chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Applications and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has recently returned from a factfinding trip to southeast Asia during which he flew aboard the *Enterprise* to personally observe her combat operations. He regrets he could not be here with us on this occasion. He has asked me to tell you, and I quote:

"Under the rigorous test of combat, the *Enterprise* and the *Bainbridge* are daily proving the tremendous military advantages nuclear propulsion can provide our Navy's surface warships. The time has clearly come for us to stop these futile cost comparisons of nuclear and conventional surface warships and get on with fulfilling the Navy's urgent need for nuclear propulsion in the surface fleet."

In every operation in which they are engaged, the three nuclear powered surface ships now operating demonstrate the many advantages provided by nuclear propulsion. The United States Navy needs more warships with the unique capabilities provided by nuclear propulsion. The Department of Defense is remiss in not capitalizing on the major scientific and engineering effort which the Joint Committee has supported to achieve the capability to build such ships.

Today the U.S. Navy is preeminent in the field of nuclear propulsion throughout the world. We must take advantage of this lead by building more ships which have the tremendous advantages nuclear propulsion can give them.

The Congress was encouraged last year by testimony received from the Secretary of Defense to the effect that it is highly probable that a nuclear powered aircraft carrier will be requested this year. However, recent news reports indicate that even this nuclear ship may not be requested by the Department of Defense. That would be a sad mistake for the United States.

The argument used today against building nuclear powered surface warships is the same as that used a decade ago by those in the Defense Department who did not want to go to nuclear power in submarines. It was also the one used by those in authority a half-century ago who did not want to convert our warships from coal to oil, and by those a century ago who did not want to shift from sail to steam. This argument is that the new means of propulsion is more expensive than the old.

But, as President Truman so correctly said: "All national security programs are expensive and we might as well face up to it."

As we here today lay the keel of our latest nuclear submarine the *Narwhal*, I know that you, the men and women who will build her, will use all the skill and talent you have demonstrated in building the ships which are today guarding our freedom.

I hope the day will soon come when our Nation will accept the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy "that the United States adopt a policy of using nuclear propulsion in all future major surface warships" thus forging another link in the necessary chain from sail to coal, from coal to oil, and from oil to nuclear power. In future years, may it not be said of our Nation's leaders that they valued dollars more highly than the lives of our fighting men and our national security itself.

We should resolve this very day to support the pledge of our President when he said: "We will give our fighting men what they must have: Every gun and every dollar, and every decision—whatever the cost or whatever the challenge."

Thank you.

The White House,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1966.

Hon. Chet Holifield,
Chairman, Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, Groton, Conn.:

Today as you lay the keel of our Navy's newest nuclear-powered submarine, the U.S.S. *Narwhal*, you commemorate a significant event in our Navy's history. On this date 11 years ago the first nuclear-powered ship in the world, the U.S.S. *Nautilus*, commenced her sea trials. The development and application of nuclear propulsion for submarines and surface warships is an outstanding achievement. As a former member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I share with you the pride of the leading role you, Vice Chairman Senator Pastore, and the other members of the Committee have had in attaining preeminence for the United States in naval nuclear propulsion.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

THE NEW MATH AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS—FIRST PRINCIPLES

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, a resident in my district has conducted some studies of both the new mathematics and international affairs and their possible relation to each other. In view of the importance of both subjects at this time, I offer his first contribution in the hopes it may contribute to the deliberation of this body:

Lesson I—The New Math and International Affairs—First Principles

Once in the land of Pandemania lived a government secretary who believed sincerely in first principles. He believed in education and self-help. He knew that statistical surveys, computers, and automation, if properly used, could be a boon to mankind. His surveys, statistical, and cybernetic assistance told him many useful things.

(a) Fifty percent of the adult population of his country preferred electric ranges.

(b) Fifty percent of the populace preferred gasoline powered lawnmowers (but inexplicably each 50 percent was mutually exclusive).

(c) However, in a scientifically controlled survey, 100 percent of the people responded that they would prefer to pay under $5,000 for an automobile.

He decided, with electronic aid, that one could and should take advantage of these three factors. However, when he built an auto that (a) looked like an electric range, (b) ran like a power lawnmower, and (c) sold for under $5,000, no one would buy it.

He fed more data to his machines and learned of consumer resistance and something called an "image." To satisfy this he took advantage of his nation's love of education and respect for self-help. He called his car an Ed-Sel. (Also a fortuitous combination of the name and home of the man who had loaned him the money for his factory, Ed Glottz, who lived, briefly, in Selma, Ala.)

Still people would not buy his car. The secretary was not discouraged. He said, "I did not aim high enough. If I am more intelligent than most of our population," and no one disputed this fact, "I know what they need better than they do." He then became secretary of defense in Pandemania. He continued to believe sincerely in first principles.

Axiom: First principles are essential and it is important to be sincere.

Corollary: It is even better to be right.

WHY NOT BE PRACTICAL?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it has been my observation that more often than not, Congress, in accepting the recommendations of the executive department, finds itself involved in the most complicated procedures, rather than following what would appear to be a simple, practical solution.

We are all aware of the complications involved in attempting to amend our tax laws, particularly when excise taxes are involved. The President in his state of the Union message recommended that some of the excise taxes which were reduced during the first session, now be restored. His recommendation for the restoration came just 12 days after some of the reductions became effective.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a tax expert, but I have a suggestion which I would like to pass on to my colleagues which I think is practical, as well as offering the opportunity to increase revenues for specific purposes and to easily and quickly make reductions or eliminate the increases when the specific need no longer exists.

It is not easy to vote against proposed reductions in taxes, and it is just as difficult to vote for proposed increases. That probably accounts for the fact that there were only six Members of this House who voted against reduction and elimination of excise taxes last June 2. I did so, not because I favored the taxes, but because as I stated on this floor at that time, I thought it was a mistake to reduce revenues, with no provision to recoup those losses. Some might think that the logical thing for me to do now is to support the reinstatement of the taxes as proposed by the President. I realize the need for increased revenue to meet the cost of escalating the war in Vietnam, and I am ready to provide the additional $5.8 billion that the President says will be needed. However, I think there is a better way to secure this additional revenue, and that is by imposing what might be called an excise tax on income taxes. This tax would be for a specific purpose to meet a specific emergency, and when the emergency ended, the tax could and should be immediately discontinued.

My tax philosophy is quite simple. During times when this Nation is not facing an emergency, such as a war or a depression, and certainly in times of prosperity, we should impose taxes sufficient to maintain a balanced budget, and not go deeper into debt. I have always been willing to vote any increase in taxes needed to finance any program which the public wants sufficiently enough to be willing to pay for. In my opinion taxes should be imposed most heavily upon those who can most easily bear the burden. This means the income tax is perhaps the most equitable.

Without oversimplifying the problem, it would seem that the most simple way to increase our national revenue in order to meet emergency and extraordinary expenses, such as we are experiencing in the Vietnam war, and which the President has stated will require an additional $5.8 billion during the next fiscal year, is to increase all income tax payments by a percentage sufficient to raise this amount of money. This could be done without disturbing the present formulas which are written into the law, and after computing the amount of income tax which an individual or corporation would ordinarily pay, that this amount be increased by the percentage necessary to raise the $5.8 billion additional needed. For instance, if it was determined that on the basis of last year's income tax revenue, it was necessary to increase this amount by 5 percent, then the individual who ordinarily would pay $1,000, would have his tax increased to $1,050. When the emergency was over the excise tax on income taxes could be repealed without the necessity of disturbing the tax base, presuming that it is as nearly equitable as Congress has been able to determine over the years. Sounds too simple to be practical? Maybe.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the President has today forwarded legislation to permit U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank. The Asian Development Bank can become an institution that will make prudent but flexible and imaginative use of limited resources for Asia's unlimited development needs.

The proposed Bank will have authorized capital of $1 billion. Of this, 65 percent—$650 million—is to come from Asian nations, and nearly all of it is already pledged. The United States and Japan will be the two largest single subscribers, each pledging $200 million.

Half of all subscriptions must be in dollars or other convertible currency, and half may be in a member nation's own currency.

Half of each subscription is to be paid in over 4 years from the time the subscription becomes operative. The remainder will be callable capital of the Bank.

This arrangement, as is the case with most other provisions of the Asian Development Bank's charter, is like that in the World Bank. It is worth noting that the callable capital of the World Bank has never been required. The same is true of the callable capital that makes up half of subscriptions to the Inter-American Bank. The callable portion of subscriptions to the Asian Development Bank, as with the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank, would be required only in the unlikely event that the Bank were unable to meet its commitments.

The callable capital of the Bank would, meantime, provide backing against which the Bank could increase its cash resources by the sale of bonds in the world's capital markets. The Bank will be authorized to borrow in member or in nonmember countries. However, it will not be permitted to borrow in a member country without that country's approval. And, the Bank can further add to its lendable resources by selling portions of loans from its portfolio, again with the same provision that if this is done in a member country there must be prior approval.

The Bank will be authorized to establish special funds in two ways; by earmarking up to 10 percent of its own subscribed capital for this purpose, or by accepting resources proferred by member or nonmember countries, or other sources, for administration by the Bank.

Special funds derived from the Bank's resources may be used to guarantee, or to make, loans of a high developmental priority, with longer than normal maturities, longer initial periods before repayments begin, and with lower than ordinary interest rates. In short, this would be a clearly limited, soft loan, function by the Bank, intended to take account of the fact that projects with high potential development yields are found where ability to pay is severely limited until the developmental opportunity has been exploited or is being exploited.

Special funds received from members or others may be used for development purposes in Asia, and under conditions designated by the lender. This will make the Bank a channel for the use in Asia of development funds that could not be mustered through capital subscriptions or Bank borrowings.

The Bank's membership is open to members and associate members of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East—known as ECAFE—and by other Asian countries, as well as to non-Asian developed countries, that are members of the United Nations or of any of its specialized agencies. This excludes Communist China, North Korea, and North Vietnam.

Eligible countries that do not sign the Bank's charter by January 31—such as the Soviet Union and other developed Communist and non-Communist countries—can be admitted by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Governors representing not less than three-fourths of the total voting power.

Each member will have a Governor, and the Board of Governors will be the Bank's senior policymaking body. The day to day supervision of the Bank will be in the hands of a Board of Directors with 10 members, 7 Asian. The size of the U.S. subscription will entitle it to one of the three non-Asian directorships. The administration of the Bank will be in the hands of a President elected by the Board of Governors to a 5-year term. The President is to be a national of an Asian member country.

U.S. MARINE CORPS: REFLECTIONS ON 190 YEARS

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every thoughtful citizen of our country who has served in the Marine Corps is proud of this oldest service of our Armed Forces, its history and traditions. It was, therefore, with much satisfaction that I read in the November 1965 issue of Shipmate, the magazine of the U.S. Naval Academy Alumni Association, a thoughtful article reflecting on the 190 years of the Marine Corps' existence by Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., its able Commandant.

In order that this contribution by General Greene may be recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress, I include it as part of my remarks:

REFLECTIONS ON 190 YEARS

(By Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps)

It is reasonably certain that U.S. Marines will make a marked contribution to the economy of certain artists and tradesmen in the early winter of 1975. Butchers and bakers and candlestick makers all over the world will reap the benefit of the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of the Marine Corps. On the 10th of November 1975, marines will attend gigantic birthday banquets and parties and balls. Steak will be on the menu, and dessert will consist of huge birthday cakes, each decorated with 200 candles. The Marine Corps will enter its third century of existence.

The final decade of the first 200 years is now beginning. For 190 years, the Marine Corps has been performing the missions and carrying out the roles that are clearly specified in the law of the land. Forces of combined arms, ground, and air, are provided to seize and defend advanced naval bases. Marines, from the earliest days of the Corps, have served on the fighting ships of the Navy and provided security at naval bases and stations at home and abroad. The Corps has a responsibility to develop doctrine, tactics, techniques, and equipment for use in amphibious operations, the military specialty that has come to be the hallmark of marines. And finally, marines have a unique mission, in that the National Security Act specifies that unless otherwise engaged in their primary function, they "shall perform such other duties as the President may direct." This portion of the law allows the President to use marines for many purposes—the guarding of the mail train in the 1920's, Lebanon, the Dominican Republic are all examples of this authority.

In performing these tasks, over the years, the Marine Corps has remained closely entwined with its sister service, the U.S. Navy, and rightly so. Seagoing marines in the 19th century went everywhere the Navy went, storming ashore to protect American lives and property in far-off places. Toward the close of that century, the campaign at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, marked an operational high point, and also a beginning for the development of the amphibious operation that would reach its peak during World War II. Farsighted Marine Corps and Navy planners realized, during the 1930's, that the next war might well be an island-hopping campaign in the Pacific.

After a few years of ostensible peace, another landing, this time at Inchon, was required to break the back of the North Korean offensive. This was followed by land warfare that lasted 3 years. Portions of that campaign were merely prolog for the guerrilla hunt—the warfare against an elusive enemy now being waged in Vietnam.

Today's Navy-Marine Corps team is the strongest in the world, and one that possesses a greater striking power than ever before. The United States necessarily maintains the greatest arsenal for defense ever held in time of peace. The members of the naval profession, like their predecessors, will continue to be instrumental in meeting the challenge and helping to solve the many problems that are certain to arise.

The strategic military posture which can be forecast argues for substantial forward deployment of forces afloat, and suggests that the Navy-Marine Corps amphibious team will continue to be a vital element of military strength. The close partnership between the Navy and the Marine Corps will become even more necessary, in order to restrain the naval supremacy the United States now enjoys. This is true because the national strategy will continue to be peripheral and the ability to control the oceans a basic requirement.

There will be a need to project U.S. military and economic strength overseas, everywhere and anywhere, while establishing a perimeter defense of key overseas coastal areas. The littoral of the world will be the borders from which an offense may be launched if one is required and on this line the defense may be drawn in order to contain a continental enemy. In this peripheral strategy, an amphibious capability will be a crucial factor.

Within this strategy the Navy and the Marine Corps must continue to be prepared for a broad range of tasks. Many landings will control crises before they erupt. Other missions may require the application of major force, and if so, the conflict will be shorter, more lethal and more decisive than any in the past. All will require an understanding of political goals and a molding of these with the military objectives.

The seas will continue to be the main channels by which goods and people will move from continent to continent. For military use, the oceans will remain as vital as they have been in the past, both with respect to small wars which may erupt, and with respect to the national strategy of deterrence.

By the time present-day midshipmen are lieutenants in the Navy and Marine Corps, the capability will exist to mount out and deliver, wherever they may be required, up to two divisions of marines in 20-knot amphibious assault ships. New and important methods of horizontal and vertical envelopment will be doctrine. Amphibious power may be projected further inland then ever before. Assault troops will be preceded by greatly improved carrier striking forces, capable of maintaining antiair warfare defense of the objective area, thanks to improved ship-to-air and air-to-air missiles. Improved fire support of amphibious assaults will be a reality. New naval gunfire support ships and rocket-firing ships will be a part of the arsenal.

A great paradox exists in the world today, as this Nation seeks peace while preparing for war. The nuclear capability, with a capacity to destroy people and property in an instant, has, in itself, aroused new hopes of lasting peace. When victory can only mean a struggle for survival, a worldwide conflict with armed power measured in megatons has become unthinkable. Yet the security of this country and the free world absolutely requires a powerful national defense, prepared for warfare on any scale.

Careful examination of future trends and reflection on military history reveal the need for the versatile, flexible, mobile amphibious force-in-readiness that is the Navy-Marine team. Since 1775, when marines first took their places in the fighting tops of men-of-war, the Navy and Marine Corps have grown and improved together. They are an important and vital segment of this Nation's heritage of the past, its strength of the present, and its preparedness for the future.

THE LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Library Services Act is now almost 10 years old. As one of its original sponsors, I have viewed with great pleasure the growth of library programs and services made possible in my State as a result of this legislation. Throughout the Nation there has been a significant increase in the number of persons, approximately 15 million, who have for the first time achieved access to library resources. This program has awakened in communities an interest and a recognition of the great educational value of good public library services.

Since its original passage, the Library Services Act has been extended twice. Most recently, the act was amended to include construction funds and broaden the program to serve not only rural areas but also urban centers and suburban communities, as well.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD reports dated March 26, 1965, and November 19, 1965, regarding the progress being made in my own State with the assistance of the Library Services and Construction Act.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT SUMMARY FOR KENTUCKY, FISCAL YEAR 1965

In 1965 urban as well as rural libraries are benefiting from Federal funds under the Library Services and Construction Act. Federal funds are also being used for the first time for construction of library buildings.

The immediate aim of the Kentucky Department of Libraries is to extend library services to areas without public libraries and to improve services to those areas which are inadequately served. The long-range objective is to stimulate continuing and adequate local support for library services for all citizens in Kentucky.

Two service projects are being continued this year. Multicounty library regions are being expanded to provide better and more efficient service. At present there are 12 existing regional systems: Lake Cumberland, Valley of Parks, eastern Kentucky, Eden Shale, south central, Pennyrile, Oxbow, Green River, Audobon, Purchase, Buffalo Trace, and Pine Mountain. Four new counties are being added to these: Monroe, Knox, Laurel, and Knott; and two new regional systems are being developed in Lawrence County, and Franklin and Woodford Counties.

The department of libraries is being strengthened so that it may give greater assistance to the libraries and people of Kentucky. Some of the projects include: Upgrading of the reference and loan book collection, developing a reference collection on microfilm, expanding a centralized cataloging and processing center for libraries needing such service, employing necessary personnel to supervise the construction projects under title II of the Library Services and Construction Act, purchasing of 23 new large bookmobiles to replace the old panel truck small bookmobiles, and planning of a union catalog.

The Kentucky State plan for construction and five local construction projects have been approved. Four of these projects are for new buildings, three of which are headquarters libraries: The Henry County Library in Eminence, headquarters for the Eden Shale Regional Library; the Nicholas County Library in Carlisle, headquarters for the Buffalo Trace Regional Library; and the Ohio County Library in Hartford, headquarters for the Green River Regional Library. The fourth is a county library headquarters, the J. F. Kennedy Memorial Library in West Liberty in Morgan County. The other project is the renovation of the Lexington Public Library in Lexington. Two other local projects have just been approved but no payment made as yet. They are Letcher County Library in Whitesburg, headquarters for the Pine Mountain Regional Library; and the Green County Library at Greensburg.

The officer responsible for administering the Kentucky program is Miss Margaret Willis, State librarian, department of libraries, Frankfurt.

Title I, services, fiscal year 1965

Funds by source:	
State	[1] $649, 052
Local	0
Federal	429, 650
Total	1, 078, 702

[1] Federal funds overmatched by $415,355.

Title II, construction, fiscal year 1965

Federal allotment	$510, 842
State and local matching requirement	277, 860
Total	788, 702

PROGRESS REPORT ON KENTUCKY, FROM ELIZABETH L. HUGHEY, L.S.B., NOVEMBER 19, 1965

11 appropriations for construction approved and funds obligated	$604, 028
Local funds obligated	340, 554
Total	944, 582

There are additional projects underway now—11 construction projects, as follows:

1. Henry County Library, Eminence, Ky. (headquarters for Eden Shole Region): New.
2. John F. Kennedy Memorial Library, located at West Liberty, Morgan County, member of Eastern Kentucky Regional Library: New.
3. Nicholas County Memorial Library in Carlisle, Ky., regional headquarters for Buffalo Trace: New.
4. Ohio County Library, Hartford, headquarters for Green River Regional Library: New building.
5. Lexington Public Library in Lexington: Renovation.
6. Letcher County Public Library, Whitesburg, Ky., headquarters for Pine Mountain Region: Renovation.
7. Green County Public Library, Greensburg, Ky., member of Lake Cumberland Region Library: New.
8. Washington County Public Library, Springfield, Ky. (new region): New building.
9. Union County Public Library, Morganfield, Ky., county service: Addition to existing buildings.
10. Fleming County Public Library, Flemingsburg, Ky., countywide service: New.

Mr. Speaker, citizens in the 50 States and 5 territories have benefited since the original Library Services Act was passed. However, it is obvious that public libraries in general are still lacking in the necessary financial support to enable them to provide educational services to all or to provide anything but limited services to many millions.

Rapid advances in education, science, technology, business, culture, and everyday life have increased the importance of the public library as a basic service of knowledge and understanding for people of all ages and in all pursuits. At the same time, these rapid changes place greater financial burdens on public libraries in assuring the public ready access to current essential reference materials and books.

More than 15 million people in the United States still have no public library service, and it is estimated that more than 100 million persons are provided library services far below their actual needs.

At this point, I would like to insert in the RECORD a reprint from the National Inventory of Library Needs, 1965. It contains a discussion by Henry T. Drennan, Coordinator of Public Library Services Branch, U.S. Office of Education, entitled "The Public Library Service Gap." The reprint referred to follows:

[From the National Inventory of Library Needs, 1965]

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE GAP

(By Henry T. Drennan, Coordinator of Public Library Services, Library Services Branch, U.S. Office of Education)

Standards for the strengthening of library service have been developed continuously over the years by the American Library Association. Since World War II the library profession's concern for providing guidelines to library development for public libraries has been marked by the publication of "Postwar Standards for Public Libraries" [1] and "Public Library Service: A Guide to Evaluation With Minimum Standards." [2]

The present study, with its statistical presentation prepared by Mr. Emery M. Foster, a statistical consultant for the American Library Association, is the first effort to employ quantified standards derived from Public Library Service to obtain a national picture of the attainment of standards.

The statistical universe was the 7,257 public libraries included in the Office of Education survey, "Statistics of Public Libraries," 1962. Of these 7,257 public libraries, 668 failed to respond to requests for statistical information, or submitted returns not usable for the general tabulation. Thus the response rate upon which Mr. Foster's calculations were based was about 90 percent.

For libraries serving populations below 50,000 in 1962, a standard derived from "Interim Standards for Small Public Libraries." [3] was developed which range from 10,000 volumes for libraries serving less than 2,500 population or 2 books per capita for libraries serving populations between 25,000 and 49,999. The volume standard for public libraries serving populations 50,000 or above (derived from Public Library Service) sets the requirements at a basic collection of 100,000 volumes plus 1.5 volumes per capita over 50,000.

Dollar values necessary to correct the deficiency in book stock in libraries that failed to meet the above standards were expressed at two rates: at $4.63 a volume (obtained by using the average cost of a volume in 1962 less one-third discount) and at $8 a volume (the average cost plus the estimated cost of cataloging and processing the material).

For libraries serving populations below 50,000 a sliding scale of professional staff positions was developed ranging from one position (to be filled by a college graduate) for those serving under 2,500 population to two professional positions for libraries serving between 25,000 and 49,999. Libraries above 50,000 population were evaluated by a standard that called for six professional positions plus one additional position for each 7,500 persons over 50,000. All positions in the standard were for full-time equivalency.

The number of positions necessary to bring those below-standard libraries up to the standard was multiplied by $6,000, the standard annual salary rate for professional positions.

For libraries with service areas below 50,000 population, a series of floors were developed for general operating expenditures derived from the "Interim Standards for Small Public Libraries." These floors were based on the data produced by the survey, "Statistics of Public Libraries," 1962 and increased by 17 percent in order to reflect the increase in library costs from 1962 to 1964. The tentative support standards resulting were as follows:

Population of service area of public libraries:	*Floor*
Below 2,500	$14, 000. 00
2,500 to 4,999	22, 000. 00
5,000 to 9,999	38, 000. 00
10,000 to 24,999	66, 000. 00
25,000 to 49,999	127, 000. 00
50,000 and more (per capita of population served)	4. 47

For larger public libraries, those whose service areas contained populations of 50,000 and above, the standard of $4.47 in per capita operating expenditure was set. This sum was based upon the per capita expenditure of $3.82 mentioned in "Costs of Public Library Service," 1963,[4] a 1962 figure revised upward to $4.47 to meet 1964's higher operating costs. It should be noted when consulting tables 1–3 that these standard expenditures are composite figures that include current costs of staff and books but not cumulative costs of deficiencies in number of volumes.

Table 1 lists by State and for the Nation the number of libraries that do not meet the volume standard, and it estimates the sum of money necessary to purchase the necessary number of books and to place them upon the libraries' shelves. Nationally, nearly 69 percent of the libraries reporting did not qualify under the volume standard. There were two States and three outlying parts in which no public library met the standard.

In 6 States more than 50 percent of their libraries met the volume standard; in 44 States more than one-half of the libraries failed to meet this goal.

To bridge the volume gap would in 1964 require an expenditure of $472 million for books; to purchase the books and pay the costs of placing them on library shelves would require an estimated total expenditure of $816 million. Both amounts are above what was spent for all general operating expenditures in 1962.

A contributing factor to the large number of libraries that did not meet the standard for volumes was the rather large number of smaller public libraries involved, serving populations below 10,000. Of the 6,525 public libraries considered under the volume standard, 4,388 offered their services in communities below 10,000 persons and of these 65 percent were in communities of less than 3,000 persons. The large number of smaller libraries is illustrated in text table A.

---

[1] Committee on Postwar Planning of the American Library Association, "Postwar Standards for Public Libraries," Chicago, ALA, 1943.

[2] Coordinating Committee on Revision of Public Library Standards, Public Library Division, ALA, "Public Library Service: A Guide to Evaluation With Minimum Standards," Chicago, ALA, 1956.

[3] Public Library Association, a division of the American Library Association "Interim Standards for Small Public Libraries: Guidelines Toward Achieving the Goals of Public Library Service," Chicago, ALA, 1962.

[4] Committee of the Public Library Association of the ALA, "Costs of Public Library Service," 1963 (A Supplement to "Public Library Service: A Guide to Evaluation With Minimum Standards," Chicago, ALA, 1964).

Text table A—Number of public libraries serving populations below 10,000 (1962)

Population:	*Number of libraries*
0 to 999	1,054
1,000 to 2,999	1,686
3,000 to 5,999	957
6,000 to 9,999	691
Total	4,388

In table 2, of 6,318 libraries, 1,439 (nearly 23 percent) did not attain the standard for number of professional positions. This probably overstates the degree of attainment nationally. A large number of small libraries are staffed with one employee reported as occupying a professional position (although in reality, many of the incumbents may be untrained).

In the 1,439 libraries falling below the standard for professional positions in 1962, 6,205 professional positions were reported. To attain the standard would require an additional 6,378 positions or an increase of slightly over 100 percent in professional staff. To finance these added positions annually would require an additional 38.3 million.

Although there are no recent national figures for all professional positions in public libraries, there are some data available from the 1962 U.S. Office of Education study.[5] In 1962, public libraries serving populations of 35,000 and above paid their nonprofessional staff members an average of $3,410 annually and professional staff members an average of $5,748 annually. The latter is 4 percent below the standard used in the present study. Another source of information on salaries in public libraries is "State Distribution of Public Employment."[6] This U.S. Census study estimates the average monthly earnings of full-time public library employees in 1963 at $340. Local library employment ranked, for monthly earnings, next to the lowest paid category of public employment in a list of 30 local government jobs.

Ninety-seven percent of the public libraries failed to meet the standard for general operating expenditures. (See Table 3.) In 25 out of 50 States no public library met this standard. For the 6,396 public libraries that were substandard, an additional expenditure of 438.9 million over and above their 1962 expenditure of 260.8 million would be necessary to achieve the goal of 699.7 million. Libraries below standard would require an increase in excess of 100 percent in operating expenditures to meet this goal.

---

[5] U.S. Office of Education "Digest of Educational Statistics," 1964 edition p. 158.

[6] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census "State Distribution of Public Employment in 1962," p. 7.

TABLE 1.—*Most recent tabulation for national inventory of library needs—Public libraries*[1]

VOLUMES

State	Number of libraries		Volumes in libraries not meeting standard			Gap	
	Total number of libraries	Number not meeting volume standard	Total number of volumes	Number of volumes required to meet standard	Number of volumes (difference between cols. 4 and 5)	Dollar gap at $4.63 per volume	Dollar gap at $8 per volume
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Alabama	75	72	1,905,180	4,957,324	3,052,144	$14,131,427	$24,417,152
Alaska	26	23	181,110	347,511	166,401	770,437	1,331,208
Arizona	46	43	912,749	1,960,276	1,047,527	4,850,050	8,380,216
Arkansas	54	49	1,424,069	3,122,692	1,698,623	7,864,624	13,588,984
California	178	86	14,092,690	19,594,577	5,501,887	25,473,737	44,015,096
Colorado	95	70	1,103,109	2,248,632	1,145,523	5,303,771	9,164,184
Connecticut	198	104	1,833,907	2,517,146	683,239	3,163,397	5,465,912
Delaware	19	12	721,739	1,010,562	288,823	1,337,250	2,310,584
District of Columbia	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	131	110	2,574,306	5,498,076	2,923,770	13,537,055	23,390,160
Georgia	87	82	4,229,569	7,451,656	3,222,087	14,918,263	25,776,696
Hawaii	4	3	544,429	977,764	433,335	2,006,341	3,466,680
Idaho	81	57	390,477	742,278	351,801	1,628,839	2,814,408
Illinois	411	257	6,387,018	11,406,413	5,019,395	23,239,799	40,155,160
Indiana	241	113	2,408,522	3,566,468	1,157,946	5,361,290	9,263,568
Iowa	347	250	2,238,380	3,654,357	1,415,977	6,555,974	11,327,816
Kansas	217	147	1,508,849	2,845,371	1,336,522	6,188,097	10,692,176
Kentucky	76	76	1,795,065	4,527,456	2,732,391	12,650,970	21,859,128
Louisiana	55	55	2,893,660	5,361,160	2,467,500	11,424,525	19,740,000
Maine	202	124	878,995	1,467,328	588,333	2,723,982	4,706,664
Maryland	23	21	1,745,066	3,586,029	1,840,963	8,523,659	14,727,704
Massachusetts	360	133	1,737,986	2,686,162	948,176	4,390,055	7,585,408
Michigan	268	192	6,534,789	11,174,840	4,640,051	21,483,436	37,120,408
Minnesota	195	138	1,901,453	3,539,231	1,637,778	7,582,912	13,102,224
Mississippi	56	54	1,307,511	3,369.570	2,062,059	9,547,333	16,496,472
Missouri	150	83	2,509,004	3,658,447	1,149,443	5,321,921	9,195,544
Montana	47	26	639,654	848,032	208,378	964.790	1,667,024
Nebraska	183	144	1,408,303	2,337,589	929,286	3,302.594	7,434,288
Nevada	19	18	250,037	518,771	268,734	1,244.238	2,149,872
New Hampshire	216	151	806,625	1,556.780	750,155	3,473,218	6,001.240
New Jersey	305	215	3,859,009	7,110,152	3,251,143	15,052,792	26,009,144
New Mexico	39	35	632,167	1,397,103	764,936	3,541,654	6,119,488
New York	99	52	12,354,034	17,229,381	4,875,347	22,572,857	39,002,776
North Carolina	101	94	3,824,889	8,972,786	5,147,897	23,834.763	41,183,176
North Dakota	55	49	501,851	925.478	423,627	1,961.393	3,389,016
Ohio	250	98	6,156,653	12,954,794	6,798,141	31,475,393	54,385,128
Oklahoma	70	42	1,110,513	2,028,635	918,122	4,250,905	7,344,976
Oregon	95	64	844,925	1,490,301	645,376	2,988,091	5,163,008
Pennsylvania	312	249	6,980,379	13,445,697	6,465,318	29,934,422	51,722,544
Rhode Island	62	33	413,881	762,974	349,093	1,616,301	2,792,744
South Carolina	52	44	1,640,609	3,866,790	2,226,181	10,307,218	17,809,448
South Dakota	79	56	450,370	799,081	348,711	1,614,532	2,789,688
Tennessee	22	21	2,317,457	5,478,692	3,161,235	14,636,518	25,289,880
Texas	231	209	5,736,783	13,293,213	7,556,430	34,986,271	60,451,440
Utah	50	25	365,880	632,090	266,210	1,232,552	2,129,680
Vermont	157	123	500.483	1,224,854	724,371	3,353,838	5,794,986
Virginia	69	65	2,419,217	5,490,320	3,071,103	14,219,207	24,568,824
Washington	94	51	1,725,555	2,456,066	730,511	3,382,266	5,844,088
West Virginia	41	38	976,793	2,178,250	1,201,457	5,562,746	9,611,656
Wisconsin	290	192	1,993,094	3,354,965	1,361,871	6,305,463	10,894,968
Wyoming	21	6	205,242	310,452	105,210	487,122	841,680
Canal Zone	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	1	1	32,305	125,566	93,261	431,798	746,088
Puerto Rico	7	7	159,014	1,999,504	1,840,490	8,521,469	14,723,920
Virgin Islands	1	1	48,050	64,198	16,148	74.765	129,184
Grand total	6,565	4,463	122,113,404	224,123,840	102,010,436	472,308,320	816,083,488

[1] U.S. Office of Education, Statistics of Public Libraries, 1962.

TABLE 2.—*Tabulation for national inventory of library needs—Public libraries*

PROFESSIONAL STAFF AND SALARIES

State	Number of libraries		Professional staff in libraries not meeting standards		Gap	
	Total number of libraries	Number not meeting staff standard	1962–63 actual number of professional staff	Total number of professional staff required to meet standard	Number of professional staff (difference between cols. 4 and 5)	Dollar gap at $6,000 per staff member
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Alabama	74	45	141	318	177	$1,062,000
Alaska	11	2	2	7	5	30,000
Arizona	38	8	43	116	73	438,000
Arkansas	54	40	51	171	120	720,000
California	178	54	824	1,383	559	3,354,000
Colorado	92	20	42	95	53	318,000
Connecticut	191	17	30	55	25	150,000
Delaware	17	3	57	74	17	102,000
District of Columbia	1	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	116	46	134	288	154	924,000
Georgia	86	53	220	464	244	1,464,000
Hawaii	4	1	50	66	16	96,000
Idaho	70	3	3	6	3	18,000
Illinois	398	74	388	727	339	2,034,000
Indiana	241	27	121	189	68	408,000
Iowa	327	14	62	82	20	120,000
Kansas	197	11	52	94	42	252,000
Kentucky	76	46	142	282	140	840,000
Louisiana	53	48	130	332	202	1,212,000
Maine	179	6	7	14	7	42,000
Maryland	23	15	89	208	119	714,000
Massachusetts	354	36	52	105	53	318,000
Michigan	264	46	146	402	256	1,536,000
Minnesota	183	25	118	184	66	396,000
Mississippi	57	27	76	121	45	270,000
Missouri	150	42	181	262	81	486,000
Montana	47	7	15	26	11	66,000
Nebraska	180	9	36	71	35	210,000
Nevada	18	6	7	24	17	102,000
New Hampshire	211	4	1	5	4	24,000
New Jersey	288	82	143	298	155	930,000
New Mexico	38	20	33	83	50	300,000
New York	100	19	742	941	199	1,194,000
North Carolina	101	82	160	567	407	2,442,000
North Dakota	52	7	8	18	10	60,000
Ohio	249	64	268	866	598	3,588,000
Oklahoma	67	14	67	116	49	294,000
Oregon	94	11	77	113	36	216,000
Pennsylvania	303	112	484	870	386	2,316,000
Rhode Island	61	12	14	36	22	132,000
South Carolina	52	36	64	244	180	1,080,000
South Dakota	77	6	13	20	7	42,000
Tennessee	22	18	140	410	270	1,620,000
Texas	211	95	386	826	440	2,640,000
Utah	51	8	38	74	36	216,000
Vermont	157	2	2	6	4	24,000
Virginia	67	48	125	331	206	1,236,000
Washington	90	21	91	180	89	534,000
West Virginia	35	16	50	127	77	462,000
Wisconsin	282	22	55	95	40	240,000
Wyoming	21	4	6	12	6	36,000
Canal Zone	1	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	1	1	1	8	7	42,000
Puerto Rico	7	3	17	167	150	900,000
Virgin Islands	1	1	1	4	3	18,000
Grand total	6,318	1,439	6,205	12,583	6,378	$38,268,000

TABLE 3.—*Tabulation for national inventory of library needs—Public libraries*

EXPENDITURES

State	Number of libraries		Expenditures of libraries not meeting standards		
	Total number of libraries	Number not meeting expenditure standard	Current expenditures for operation of libraries	Standard expenditure, at $4.47 per capita served	Dollar gap (difference between cols. 4 and 5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Alabama	75	75	$1,755,992	$12,112,359	$10,356,367
Alaska	26	26	152,833	736,717	583,884
Arizona	43	43	1,346,766	4,918,252	3,571,486
Arkansas	54	54	1,266,428	6,731,646	5,465,218
California	179	145	35,690,576	63,868,959	28,178,383
Colorado	95	95	3,020,139	8,110,840	5,090,701
Connecticut	190	188	4,960,161	10,977,182	6,017,021
Delaware	19	18	949,089	2,957,740	2,008,651
District of Columbia	1	1	3,013,137	3,414,883	401,746
Florida	132	132	4,685,387	14,858,762	10,173,375
Georgia	88	87	4,260,489	18,335,106	14,074,617
Hawaii	4	3	1,321,623	2,637,982	1,316,359
Idaho	80	80	665,151	2,379,000	1,713,849
Illinois	412	405	15,047,368	36,312,357	21,264,989
Indiana	241	235	8,931,211	18,125,236	9,194,025
Iowa	350	350	4,184,814	11,681,773	7,496,959
Kansas	216	215	2,610,865	8,372,128	5,761,263
Kentucky	76	76	1,575,169	11,080,663	9,505,494
Louisiana	55	54	4,268,137	12,614,907	8,346,770

TABLE 3.—*Tabulation for national inventory of library needs—Public libraries*—Continued

EXPENDITURES

State	Number of libraries		Expenditures of libraries not meeting standards		
	Total number of libraries	Number not meeting expenditure standard	Current expenditures for operation of libraries	Standard expenditure, at $4.47 per capita served	Dollar gap (difference between cols. 4 and 5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Maine	203	202	$940,701	$5,343,370	$4,402,669
Maryland	23	23	6,606,106	13,460,352	6,854,246
Massachusetts	361	341	9,776,819	20,882,302	11,105,483
Michigan	268	260	12,802,915	32,491,755	19,688,840
Minnesota	198	195	4,086,470	10,852,611	6,766,141
Mississippi	60	60	1,345,666	7,261,350	5,915,684
Missouri	150	149	7,537,075	16,655,547	9,118,472
Montana	47	47	901,643	2,700,631	1,798,988
Nebraska	185	185	1,421,115	5,729,209	4,308,094
Nevada	19	19	351,119	1,228,691	877,572
New Hampshire	216	214	1,060,309	4,782,621	3,722,312
New Jersey	303	278	8,866,520	22,747,501	13,880,981
New Mexico	39	38	735,142	3,284,030	2,548,888
New York	101	91	33,235,362	58,141,173	24,905,811
North Carolina	101	100	3,691,200	20,719,745	17,028,545
North Dakota	56	55	446,569	1,726,000	1,279,431
Ohio	250	222	16,924,733	46,657,012	29,732,279
Oklahoma	70	70	1,293,075	5,990,848	4,697,773
Oregon	96	96	3,005,063	6,728,142	3,723,079
Pennsylvania	313	311	11,885,939	38,697,885	26,811,946
Rhode Island	62	62	1,307,896	3,773,590	2,465,694
South Carolina	52	52	1,532,059	9,200,294	7,668,235
South Dakota	79	79	646,574	2,365,633	1,719,059
Tennessee	22	22	2,836,903	15,047,620	12,210,717
Texas	223	223	7,836,686	34,470,898	26,634,212
Utah	51	51	1,262,471	3,977,418	2,714,947
Vermont	159	159	503,180	2,999,000	2,495,820
Virginia	68	67	2,856,123	12,147,585	9,291,462
Washington	94	88	6,588,253	12,110,800	5,522,547
West Virginia	41	41	826,520	5,342,099	4,515,579
Wisconsin	292	284	6,866,606	14,442,905	7,576,299
Wyoming	21	21	551,291	1,376,866	823,575
Canal Zone	1	0	0	0	0
Guam	1	1	46,139	299,687	253,548
Puerto Rico	7	7	456,604	5,777,078	5,320,474
Virgin Islands	1	1	87,718	127,000	39,282
Grand total	6,578	6,396	260,823,899	699,763,740	438,939,841

Mr. Speaker, the Library Services Act is scheduled to expire June 30 of this year, and I am today introducing legislation which will not only continue this important program but authorize its expansion to meet the obvious needs. In this connection, the legislation that I am introducing today would authorize grants to the States for library services under title I, $60 million for the fiscal year 1967, $80 million for fiscal year 1968, $100 million for fiscal year 1969, $120 million for fiscal year 1970 and $150 million for each fiscal year thereafter.

H.R. 12133 would authorize under title II grants to the States for the purpose of constructing library facilities in the amount of $75 million for fiscal year 1967, $100 million for fiscal year 1968, $125 million for each of the fiscal years 1969 and 1970 and $100 million for fiscal year 1971 in a 5-year construction program.

Mr. Speaker, these amounts are modest in view of the urgent national need for construction of library facilities. In this connection, I would like to insert estimates of public library construction needs calculated as of June 30, 1966:

PUBLIC LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION NEEDS

Projections based on reports from libraries serving 56 percent of the U.S. population having library service indicate that approximately 40.5 million square feet at an estimated cost of $941 million is needed to provide adequate public library facilities as of June 30, 1966.

Estimated construction activity, 1965–69, under title II of LSCA

	Number of project approvals	Total value (millions)	State and local matching funds (millions)
1965 [1]	363	$99.6	$69.8
1966	400	130.0	99.0
1967	500	160.0	130.0
1968	600	210.0	165.0
1969	700	250.0	200.0

[1] Actual budgeted figures.

1965 construction activity under title II, LSCA

	Number of projects	Population served (millions)	Square feet (millions)
New public libraries	233	12.5	3.6
Additions to existing public libraries	58	5.1	1.2
Remodeling and alteration of existing buildings	72	5.6	.6
Total	363	23.3	5.4

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12133 would add a new title to authorize grants to State library agencies in a 5-year program to develop cooperative library services and joint use of facilities which would involve public libraries, school libraries, higher education libraries, and research libraries in the States. It is felt that this program will assure maximum effective use of library resources and materials. Authorizations for this new title would amount to $5 million for fiscal year 1967, $7.5 million for fiscal year 1968, $10 million for fiscal year 1969, $12.5 million for fiscal year 1970 and $15 million for fiscal year 1971.

The concept of cooperative library services is based on the recognition that every person in the United States should have available to him, no matter where he is, library collections and services of high quality. No two people will need or want exactly the same kind of service. A person will need different kinds of services at various times in his life. At any given time, he may want more than one kind of service and material. Title III, in recognition of these needs, offers States the financial help in initiating the procedures to adapt library systems to better serve people.

In the development of coordinated services, the special purposes and functions of the various existing types of libraries—that is academic, public, school, special, and State—are recognized as essential. Title III will encourage and foster planning for such coordination of total services within the State.

Centralized planning may involve such matters as the development of cooperative purchase policies, interlibrary loan policies, and reciprocal borrowing arrangements. It will permit joint activities including such matters as centralized processing, equipment acquisition, film co-ops, inservice training, and rapid communication ranging from extended telephone and TWX service to information retrieval.

I am advised that thus far, the closing of the boundaries that separate types of libraries has been limited; that, for example, a number of public libraries will initiate and supply a TWX system. But only in relatively few instances thus far have such plans included other types of libraries as well. Moreover, relatively few States have taken advantage of the broadest possible use of library resources that can result from the extensive application of these cooperative techniques which title III will encourage.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that effective action will be taken at an early date to extend the Library Services and Construction Act.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 12133

A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966".

SEC. 2. Section 2(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and to promote interlibrary cooperation".

SEC. 3. Section 101(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1957, and for each of the next six fiscal years the sum of $7,500,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the sum of $25,000,000, and for each of the next two fiscal years such sums as the Congress may determine," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "June 30, 1967, $60,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $80,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $100,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $120,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each fiscal year thereafter, $150,000,000,".

SEC. 4. Section 102 of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

SEC. 5. Section 103(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (4), by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6), and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) provide assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that expenditures made for library services in the State in any fiscal year from funds derived from the State will not be less than such expenditures in the preceding fiscal year, and that no funds will be provided for library services to any local library or library system under the plan for any fiscal year if the State library administrative agency determines that the amount expended, or to be expended, for such library or library system during a fiscal year from funds derived from local sources is less than such expenditures in the preceding fiscal year; and".

SEC. 6. (a) Section 104(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "1963" both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1966", and by striking out "section 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 103".

(b) Section 104(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Commissioner shall from time to time estimate the amount to which each State will be entitled under subsection (a) and the amount so estimated shall be paid in installments in advance or by way of reimbursement, after necessary adjustment on account of any previously made overpayment or underpayment."

(c) Section 104(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "(1)", by striking out "to be effective until July 1, 1957", and by striking out paragraph (2) of such subsection.

SEC. 7. Section 201 of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1964, the sum of $20,000,000 and for each of the next two fiscal years such sums as the Congress may determine," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1967, $75,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $100,000,000; for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970, $125,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $100,000,000,".

SEC. 8. Section 202 of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "but only in the case of a State allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964)".

SEC. 9. (a) Section 204(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "From such allotment, there shall also be paid to each State for each such period the Federal share of the total of the sums expended by the State and its political subdivision during such period for administration of the plan of such States approved under section 203."

(b) Section 204(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after "in such installments" the following: "in advance or by way of reimbursement".

SEC. 10. The Library Services and Construction Act is amended by inserting after title II the following new title:

"TITLE III—INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 301. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $7,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $12,500,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $15,000,000; which shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner State plans for establishing and maintaining local, interlocal, regional, State, or interstate, cooperative networks of libraries.

"Allotments

"SEC. 302. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for each fiscal year the Commissioner shall allot $10,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and $40,000 to each of the other States, and shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of the United States according to the most recent decennial census.

"Payments to States

"SEC. 303. (a) From the allotments available therefor under section 302, the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time pay to each State which has a plan approved under section 304 an amount, computed as provided in subsection (b) of this section, equal to the Federal share of the total sums expended by the State and its political subdivisions under such plan.

"(b) For the purposes of this section the Federal share for any State shall be 50 per centum of the sums expended under the plan: *Provided,* That the Federal share for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, shall be 100 per centum.

"State plans for interlibrary cooperation

"SEC. 304. (a) To be approved for purposes of this title a State plan for interlibrary cooperation must—

"(1) meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103(a);

"(2) provide policies and objectives for the systematic and effective coordination of the resources of school, public, academic, and special libraries and special information centers for improved services of a supplementary nature to the special clienteles served by each type of library or center;

"(3) provide appropriate allocation by participating agencies of the total costs of the system;

"(4) provide assurance that every local or other public agency in the State is accorded an opportunity to participate in the system;

"(5) provide criteria which the State agency shall use in evaluating applications for funds under this title and in assigning priority to project proposals; and

"(6) establish a statewide council which should be broadly representative of professional library interests and of library users which shall act in an advisory capacity to the State agency.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan which meets the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section."

SEC. 11. (a) Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act is hereby redesignated as title IV.

(b) Sections 301 through 304 of the Library Services and Construction Act are hereby redesignated as sections 401 through 404.

(c) Section 402(d)(2) of such Act (as so designated by subsection (b)) is amended by striking out "or title II" and inserting in lieu thereof "title II or title III".

(d) Section 403 of such Act (as so designated by subsection (b)) is amended by striking out "or 202" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 202, or 302", by striking out "and section 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "203, and 303", and by striking out "or 202" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 202, or 302", by striking out "or 203", and inserting in lieu thereof ", 203, or 303,", by striking out "or 201" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 201, or 301", and by striking out "and 202" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 202, and 302".

(e) Section 404 of such Act (as so designated by subsection (b)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The term, 'interlibrary cooperation' means the establishment and operation of systems or networks of libraries, including State libraries, school libraries, college and university libraries, public libraries, and special libraries, working together to provide more effective and more economical services to all library users. Such systems may be designed to serve a community, a metropolitan area, a region within a State, or may serve a statewide or multistate area."

REINSTATING EXCISE TAXES

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to indicate my hearty support of President Johnson's proposal to reinstate excise taxes on selective items reduced by act of Congress on January 1 of this year. The recent budgetary requirements resulting from the demands of our defense and domestic efforts make this action both necessary and wise. From the standpoint of the consumer, the reduction of excise taxes has not produced the price stability which was hoped for and promised. Under the circumstances, these revenues should be returned to the Treasury where they serve a far more useful purpose.

In connection with President Johnson's request for a reinstatement of the excise tax reduction on automobiles and telephones in order to provide added resources necessary in the next year's budget, I urgently recommend that this Congress consider the reinstatement of the 8 percent excise tax on automobile parts and accessories. The repeal of this tax took place on January 1, 1966. This excise tax reduction does not apply to equipment factory installed by automobile manufacturers. It applies only to those automobile parts and equipment installed by automobile dealers. This reduction of the excise tax discriminates against factory-installed equipment and provides dealers with an unfair competitive advantage in this area of business activity.

Since more and more of the automobile parts manufacturing business is being transferred to Canada under recent agreements approved by Congress, it seems to me totally unfair to provide Canadian automobile parts manufacturers with special competitive advantages particularly since tax revenues are so urgently needed.

The reinstatement of the tax on automobile parts and accessories would increase tax revenues by a quarter of a billion dollars or more each year and would help considerably in meeting those obligations resulting from the current budget needs.

THE MATTER OF THE PROPOSED DISCONTINUANCE OF ALL INTERSTATE PASSENGER TRAIN OPERATIONS OF THE NEW HAVEN RAILROAD

Mr. **BURKE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BURKE**. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, hearings by the Interstate Commerce Commission which are currently being held at the State House, Boston, Mass., in the matter of the proposed discontinuance of all interstate passenger train operations by petition of the trustees of the New Haven Railroad. I have registered strong protest to this petition with Commissioner William H. Tucker, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and would like to point out to Members of this Congress the great need for passenger service in the New England area and the necessity of continuance of the New Haven Railroad. The failure of the New Haven line can only be attributed to gross mismanagement, improper handling of funds, poor service, dirty trains, late trains, cold trains in the wintertime, and a complete lack of imagination by those charged with the responsibility of providing proper service. The Interstate Commerce Commission must turn down this petition and, further, should thoroughly investigate the entire operation of the New Haven for a complete reappraisal and recommended maintenance of this much-needed service.

Mr. Richard D. Grant, author, of the American Public Service Bureau at 101 Tremont Street, Boston, made the following comments in his recent newsletter:

> I'd be more interested if President Johnson would recommend legal changes that would prevent buccaneers, like the crew that wrecked our New England railroads, from moving into a wholesome community and scuttling it.
>
> At the moment several defendants, in a case involving the Boston & Maine, are waiting disposition of appeals of convictions for offenses that are trifling, compared with the harm done to the people of New England by the murder of the mismanaged Boston & Maine and New Haven systems. Which is worse, a petty conversion of assets to personal gain, or the calculated ruin of an agency essential to the well-being of an entire regional area? Before Patrick B. McGinnis and associates moved into control of the New Haven Railroad through a vicious proxy fight, an ICC examiner had virtually accused this group of wrecking the Norfolk & Southern Railway for their own personal enrichment. In Washington, which yawns from one day's headlines to another's, this castigation had no practical value as far as keeping McGinnis out of the New Haven was concerned.
>
> The inadequacy of punishment for business conspiracies is one of the things that makes these railroad swindles inviting. President Johnson might look for a way to get at all who make them possible.
>
> This would include members of the boards of directors, the dummies who concur in the decisions of ringleaders, knowing their significance and purpose. If I get control of a railroad corporation through a proxy battle, substitute a working majority of my cronies as directors and then proceed to run the carrier into the ground through unconscionable payoffs to myself and my associates, I ought to be called strictly to account but so should the bums on the board that allowed me to do it. If the President could do something to curb this management evil, he would be helping his country but he won't get any cheers from my side of the aisle if he simply puts another yes-man in the Cabinet—somebody who can't tell a caboose from a roundhouse.
>
> How good was the New Haven?: As most people in this area know, the New Haven Railroad went through the wringer under section 77 of the National Bankruptcy Act about 25 years ago and was reorganized in 1948 under the presidency of the late Frederic C. Dumaine, long a power in the world of finance. The Dumaine management set to work at once to improve the physical condition of the railroad, spending $69.3 million over a period of little more than 5 years for new equipment and betterments, and approximately $10 million for rebuilding 400 miles of New Haven roadbed. The program of rehabilitation, begun under the elder Dumaine, was carried forward by his son and successor as president, Frederic C. Dumaine Jr., but it came to an abrupt end in 1954 when, after a tooth-and-nail proxy fight, Dumaine was deposed. The same crowd that had gone through the Norfolk & Southern not long before, took over the New Haven management and began to run it the McGinnis way.
>
> Nobody who lives in New Haven territory or has used its facilities needs to be told what happened after that. McGinnis, unable to keep his promises, was bounced and given the B. & M. presidency as a consolation.
>
> That was a bad day for the B. & M. However, there is a legend based upon the familiar premise that if you can lie convincingly and repeat your falsehood often enough, you eventually will find people who believe it, that the era of good New Haven management under the Dumaines, following the reorganization, was purely coincidental; that it was not the result of Dumaine skill and purpose and that the New Haven would have gone broke anyway when it did, even if "Buck" Dumaine had stayed on as president. If you want to believe such a thing you will have to write off the admitted competence of Pat McGinnis as a connoisseur of railroad values. Pat never was a fellow to waste time fighting over a dead horse.
>
> This story needs no fictional narrator nor biographer to tell the truth. It is told by the figures obtainable from the annual reports of the New Haven for the period the carrier was being run by the Dumaine management.
>
> For the 5 years and 5 months of this period, beginning in 1948, the New Haven had total operating revenues of $855,231,484. Net income during the same period was $34,058,000, during which time $5,262,689 was set aside for sinking fund requirements. Average earnings per share on preferred stock for 5 years were $12 per year. Paid out in preferred dividends for 2¼ years was $10,622,574.
>
> Notwithstanding a constant program of improvement of service and equipment, the Dumaines brought about a reduction in New Haven funded debt of $50,648,800, thus saving $1,895,000 in annual interest charges.
>
> Dumaine management brought into the treasury a total of $27,600,000 through sales of scrap, land and obsolete buildings—capital that might have been realized long before by energetic management. They completed 100-percent dieselization, introduced the "piggy-back" trailer as a spur to new business, bought 40 new Budd passenger cars, conceived and built the fabulously successful Route 128 suburban station and, when the McGinnis proxy fight stopped everything cold, had 100 new air-conditioned passenger cars on order. The only thing overlooked above is the Terminal Market, planned and developed by Dumaines in the Massachusetts Avenue-Southampton Street area, long since allowed to go by the board.
>
> Wouldn't you like to have a railroad like that to ride on and to ship your freight on today?

Mr. Speaker, Richard D. Grant is highly qualified to make this appraisal of the New Haven situation having served as commissioner for 5 years in the department of public utilities commission, State House, Boston, and as a prominent attorney and news analyst, knows this subject very well. His summation of the failure of the New Haven Railroad to operate, clearly indicates that a railroad can survive in the New England area with properly dedicated management interested in bringing a vibrant, successful passenger and freight service to the area. I respectfully urge every Member of Congress to join myself and persons in New England dependent upon their service in our efforts to maintain the passenger and freight rail service.

LOOKING AT MARBLE GORGE THROUGH THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. **SAYLOR**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times is to be commended for yesterday's editorial, "Choice for Grand Canyon," which effectively destroys the Department of Interior proposal to invest more than a quarter-billion dollars from the U.S. Treasury in construction of a hydroelectric dam at Marble Gorge on the Colorado River.

The Times correctly depicts the ruinous effect of the Interior project on the natural beauty of the Grand Canyon. The newspaper also emphasizes that the objective of the hydroplant—pumping water into central Arizona—would be served more efficiently through the use of coal-fired steamplants. Built and operated without Federal subsidy, these generating stations would not only create more tax revenues for the National, State, and local governments, but would also benefit Indians on reservations underlain with coal. Tribes would collect royalties from mining operations and at the same time find employment opportunities not now open to them.

I ask particularly that Members of Congress representing constituencies far removed from the Grand Canyon area note carefully the observations of this editorial. Through such newspaper comment, our citizenry in our own part of the country will come to understand that the Nation as a whole—not just populations within the immediate periphery of a Federal hydroelectric complex—have abiding concern about such proposals as Marble Gorge.

First, there is the very important realization that what Uncle Sam would invest in such an expensive absurdity comes from taxpayers all, not just the comparative few who would benefit from the project. Nor should any one of us be willing to accept the deliberate debilitation of the economy of any segment of the population by permitting extravagant bureaucratic capture of a private business function.

Residents of coal-producing areas of my State can appreciate the Indians' stake in the Marble Gorge versus steam-electric issues, Mr. Speaker. Three giant steam-powered electric plants in the 22d Congressional District will bring new economic potential to us, and—but for the threat of subsidized competition by the Federal Government in another power-consuming market—the fourth such facility would be a certainty.

Finally, the beauty of God's natural expositions and paintings along the twisting route of the Colorado River was not designed for the exclusivity of our friends in the West. The legacy must be preserved for perpetual sharing by everyone who may find it possible to enjoy the spiritual and cultural fruits of the magnificent display. If there still be some among us willing to sacrifice the natural grandeur for whatever materialistic advantage the hydroelectric dam may seem to offer, rational deliberation by the entire Congress is in order. And, as the Times concludes, the "choice seems clear."

I include the editorial in the Record, as follows:

Choice for Grand Canyon

The Johnson administration faces a decision that will critically affect the beauty and natural quality of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado. Under serious consideration in the Interior Department is a proposal to spend $239 million to build a dam across the canyon at Marble Gorge. At the dam itself, the canyon would be flooded to a depth of 300 feet, and a portion of the steep, spectacularly beautiful canyon walls would be below water for a distance of more than 50 miles.

If this dam is built, it will destroy irreplaceable scenic and archeological values (though not in the national park or monument). It might therefore be supposed that the arguments for building it are exceptionally strong. In fact, they are not. The dam is intended to generate electric power which would pump water into central Arizona as part of a huge water diversion and irrigation plan; some of the power would be sold to help finance the plan. But a strong argument can be made to show that power generated by a plant that burned coal would be cheaper. It would also prevent the large loss of water that occurs from evaporation of a dam-created reservoir. This has already proved a serious problem at Glen Canyon Dam, built a few years ago on the Colorado at the cost of some of the finest canyon scenery in the world.

Many engineers, remembering Grand Coulee, Hoover, Bonneville, and other monuments to their professional skill, have a romantic attachment to huge dams; but the truth is that it is becoming constantly harder to find sound reasons to build larger hydroelectric dams on new sites in the United States. Most of the good sites have already been used. Thermal plants can in many cases do the job cheaper for the immediate future; nuclear energy and solar energy will do it cheaper in the longer future.

Only public and congressional protests stopped the original Interior Department plan to build not one but two additional dams. The other, much larger and more costly, and one that would have flooded part of Grand Canyon National Monument, was to have been at Bridge Canyon; but it has been indefinitely postponed by the Budget Bureau. If both these dams were built, the magnificent Colorado River, creator of the canyon and for more than 7 million years its natural master, would become man's slowed, submissive servant.

If the Johnson administration clings stubbornly to the Interior Department's initial preference for a hydroelectric dam at Marble Gorge, it faces a long fight that will delay work on the central Arizona project indefinitely. If it proposes a coal-burning plant that would leave the Grand Canyon unimpaired, it would almost certainly gain congressional approval in 1966. For an administration that prides itself on not being doctrinaire, the choice seems clear.

THE OPPOSITION PARTY'S APPRAISAL OF THE STATE OF THE UNION TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, last night history was made once again in the Old Supreme Court and Senate Chamber here in the Capitol. For the first time since the founding of our country, the opposition party gave its appraisal of the state of the Union to the American people over nationwide television and radio. Under permission granted, I include at this point in the Record the address entitled "The State of the Union—A Republican Appraisal," delivered from the U.S. Capitol on January 17, 1966, by the Honorable Everett Dirksen, minority leader of the U.S. Senate, and the Honorable Gerald R. Ford, minority leader of the U.S. House of Representatives:

The State of the Union—A Republican Appraisal

(By Senator Dirksen)

Fellow citizens, I am Senator Dirksen, of Illinois, Republican floor leader in the U.S. Senate. With me on this program will be Congressman Ford, of Michigan, Republican floor leader in the U.S. House of Representatives. Each of us will have about 14 minutes to discuss the state of the Union. That is a short time for a gigantic task.

The President has a mandate under the Constitution to give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, together with his recommendations. We have no such mandate. We do believe we have a duty as elected representatives to present our views. Time will permit only a few basic highlights.

We are the legatees of a great, strong land. We received it from those who were here before us. The state of our land is too often measured in material terms—jobs, income, gross product, services, and goods. Actually it embraces much more. It includes the national mood, our capacity to live together, and our prestige. It includes our leadership of the free world, our relations with other lands, our respect for law, our devotion to peace, and our willingness to sacrifice even as others have done before us. It includes reason and realism in a world of tumult and confusion.

We are not only in this world but of it, and we shall be for ages to come.

Consider then our ties and relations with other lands. Twenty-one years ago, we pioneered the United Nations. Since then, we have developed regional groups throughout the world for specific purposes. We believed it would aid the cause of peace and tranquility and freedom.

In pursuit of these high purposes, we spent more than $120 billion of your money on foreign aid. We hoped that if we supplied the tools, other nations would supply the men on freedom's frontier. We fulfilled our pledges. They did so only in part and too often with ill grace.

Where needed, we supplied manpower also. The first feeble cries of "Yanki, go home" have become a chorus. Our prestige on the world thermometer of good will has dropped fast and far. Our billions have gained little respect, and even less appreciation. Every continent has its fevers and turmoil.

Two things are needed. The first is a careful, precise audit to see where our fleeting dollars went and what they really accomplished. The second, is a sustained and expert scrutiny of every estimate for foreign aid to determine how the aid requested will be used and whether there will be dividends in the form of good will and real devotion to peace and freedom. To accept less would be an injustice to the charity and sacrificial spirit of the American people.

Consider now the horsemen of despair who ride over the world—the population explosion, hunger, and poverty. They constitute a crisis already on our doorstep. We pay farmers to produce less. Industry forever seeks ways to produce more at less cost. Meanwhile, births continue to grow and hunger stalks many areas of the world Each year, the world gains 65 million persons. The number will grow. So will hunger. Can peace and hunger coexist?

Ages ago, Isaiah wrote, "And it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry, they shall fret themselves, and curse their King and their God." American agriculture is geared to high production. Better to pay for abundance than for scarcity.

In a few years, Red China will have 800 million people. Leaders can survive only when the urgent creature needs of the people are met. The ugly heads of aggression and conquest vanish when there is no need for new domains. Surely, within the genius of American enterprise, the way can be found for the produce of our fruited plains to reach the empty bellies of the world. The signs of trouble are already written in the firmament and there is no time to lose. This too with its vast potential impact on our future involves the state of the Union.

Consider now the grim struggle in which we are involved in Asia. Let us be crystal clear. Vietnam is not our war. But we pledged ourselves to help a small nation. Our word was given. We are there to keep our word.

For more than 90 years, Cambodia, Laos, and Indochina were under French tutelage. The Viet Minh—the north half—rebelled. It was a long, bloody struggle. The French were defeated. The conflict ended with an accord signed at Geneva. Laos and Cambodia achieved their independence. Indochina was divided in half with a nonmilitary zone between.

Our country did not sign that accord. But we had an interest. Hundreds of millions of your money was spent to aid the French. But it also involved our defense perimeter and our security. We pledged ourselves to aid Vietnam in preserving her integrity and independence.

Accordingly we were permitted to keep military advisers there. At first it was but a few hundred. Gradually the number grew into thousands. Today it approaches 200,000. It has become a grim, bloody, and costly business.

It is a war but not of our making. Young men with gay hearts go forth to Vietnam and lifeless young men in wooden boxes return. They fought, bled, died in the heat and mud of the jungles. All this is 12,000 miles from home. For a long time it seemed remote. But no longer. We become grimly aware that we are fighting a war to help a small land, so many of whose people can neither read nor write.

Eighteen months ago Congress enacted a joint resolution giving support and approval to the President as Commander in Chief to take all necessary steps including the use of force to repel attack on our forces and prevent further aggression. That resolution is still in effect. In both Houses of Congress the vote was 504 to 2. Every Republican present voted for it.

But as complications develop and the choice becomes guns or butter or both, groups and individuals become increasingly vocal. Let's get out. We must stay in. We must bomb Hanoi. We must not bomb. We must step up. We must hold back. We must negotiate. We must not negotiate.

To retreat and get out would be deemed a confession that we are a paper tiger. What a propaganda weapon that would be in Asia, Africa, and elsewhere.

To forsake our pledges would shatter confidence in us and further diminish our prestige.

To negotiate from weakness would mean defeat before we ever reach the negotiation table.

So what? Is there then a rational course to follow? I believe so. Let the peace efforts continue. Who can object to any honorable effort to secure peace where young blood is involved. Let the military effort continue. It demonstrates our determination to keep our word. Let it be intensified if necessary as sound military judgment dictates. There is, after all, no substitute for victory. Let the objective be kept crystal clear at all times, and that is guaranteed freedom and independence for the Vietnamese. How else could we keep faith with the young dead? How else do we redeem our word? How else do we regain our prestige? How else do we maintain our leadership in the free world? All this is part of the state of the Union.

THE STATE OF THE UNION—A REPUBLICAN APPRAISAL

(By Congressman GERALD R. FORD, Republican, of Michigan)

We are assembled tonight in a historic chamber—a chamber that has echoed the thunderous debate and vigorous dissent of some of our country's greatest leaders.

Daniel Webster here proclaimed the immortal words, "Liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

As a minority party, it is our task to carry the torch of dissent responsibly and constructively.

Tonight we look forward, not backward. Our people are restless and impatient with problems too long unsolved and too often compounded by bad laws and bureaucratic failings.

The Congress turns in 1966, as in the past, to its part in the always unfinished task of making America united, strong, and free.

These goals in their present setting point particularly to three types of problems in domestic policy: How to increase jobs and output without inflation; how to move ahead toward equality for all citizens; and how to improve government and its services.

While there are courses of action that strike at each of these problems, there is a common remedy that affects all three—education.

The problem of unemployment is particularly the problem of the young, inexperienced, unskilled person of inadequate schooling.

More and better schooling will reduce racial tensions and speed the Negro's economic and social progress.

Improved education will help to solve the problems of government by enlightening both the electors and the elected.

We believe every youth must be encouraged to pursue his education as far as his talents will take him.

Dropouts must be encouraged to go back to school for an education or training to fit their ability.

Curriculums must be enriched.

People already working should be given the chance to retrain and upgrade their skills and earning power.

Vocational rehabilitation for the handicapped must be expanded.

This cannot, and should not, be done by the Federal Government alone. But, there is much that the National Government can do to promote this effort without the heavy hand of Federal control.

For example, the Congress should ease the financial burden of going to college.

The door of education must be opened wide.

Therefore, we propose a Federal income tax credit for college students and their parents.

COMPASSION WITH COMPETENCE

We must liberate the war on poverty from waste, controversy, and the bad odor of political bossism.

We must combine compassion with competence. This Nation can afford what is necessary to help the less fortunate among us to help themselves. The children of the poor must have the highest priority. How many of the poor have actually received any of the twenty-three hundred million taxpayers' dollars from the present war on poverty? Tragically, very few.

The poor themselves must have an important role in policy decisions at the community level. The States should be partners in this war on poverty. It is time that the poverty fighters stopped fighting each other.

Republicans will offer specific proposals to redirect this program to achieve its goals without waste, scandal, and bureaucratic infighting. Without such changes, the good will fall with the bad under the fiscal pressures created by Vietnam and the massive new domestic spending programs.

America has long waged the most effective war on poverty in history through the genius of private enterprise cooperating with Government.

We urge the enactment of the Republican proposed Human Investment Act to bring private enterprise more effectively to bear on the problem of creating productive jobs for the poor. Through a 7-percent tax credit, this measure will encourage business and labor to employ and train people with limited skills and education.

EXECUTIVE REFORM

The executive branch of the Federal Government needs reform—not presidential repatching or piecemeal creation of new departments.

The proliferation of Federal programs, compounded by the mass production of laws in the last session of Congress, demands the attention of our people.

There are now 42 separate Federal agencies involved in education programs alone. There are at least 252 welfare programs today, including 52 separate Federal economic aid programs, 57 job training programs, and 65 Federal programs to improve health. In the 10 years since the second Hoover Commission made its report, during 5 Democratic-controlled Congresses, employees on the Federal payroll have increased 175,000 and Federal expenditures have increased by $57 billion.

The executive branch has become a bureaucratic jungle. The time has come to explore its wild growth and cut it back.

We urge a new independent bipartisan commission, patterned after the two distinguished Hoover Commissions, to recommend substantial reforms in the executive branch of our Government.

COST OF LIVING

To achieve a healthy and steady economic growth there must be price stability. Today this national goal is seriously endangered by the threat of inflation. The Eisenhower dollar is now worth 90 cents.

The cost of living is 2 percent higher than it was a year ago. At the current level of consumer spending, this price rise is the equivalent of a secret sales tax that silently steals some $8 billion annually from the pockets of the American people.

Inflationary policies of the President have a major impact on the cost of living. This administration uses a double standard. With one hand it creates upward pressure on prices and with the other bludgeons workers and businessmen for responding to that pressure. The real villain in this piece is the administration which will increase the cost of the Federal Government by $26 billion in a 2-year period.

The most direct and effective weapon the National Government has to halt inflation is to curb Federal spending. This requires the President and the Congress to set priorities. It is imperative that the President in his budget classify his spending proposals according to necessity and urgency. If he fails to do so, we call upon the Democrats in Congress to join us in eliminating, reducing, or deferring low priority items.

We learn now that expenditures in this fiscal year will be at least $8 billion more than we were told a year ago. Congress and the people have not been given a straightforward and realistic assessment of our Federal budget problems. Republicans intend to give the President's budget a searching examination.

Whatever is needed—really needed—for national security must be provided. Urgent domestic programs that truly help the needy, that contribute to real economic growth, that significantly advance the cause of equal opportunity, need not be sacrificed. Applying these tests, Republicans believe the $55 billion which the President will propose for nonmilitary spending can be and must be reduced.

TAXES

How many Americans know that the laws passed last year, supposedly reducing taxes, actually impose a net increase in Federal taxes for 1966 of $3½ billion? The President now advocates additional tax burdens to finance added costs both at home and abroad. With prudent restraint on spending, we believe no new taxes are now needed.

AGRICULTURE

The farm parity ratio in 1965 was below the level of 5 years ago. At home, we seek a free and prosperous agriculture by encouraging the operation of a healthy market economy. We will continue to resist administration efforts to artificially depress the market prices of farm commodities and to control the American farmers.

World population increases are adding a new dimension to the problems of American agriculture and demand new thinking. For our overseas programs, we urge the extension of Public Law 480, the Eisenhower food for peace program, and we urge the enactment of legislation, already introduced by 65 Republicans in the House, to establish a bipartisan United States-World Food Study and Coordinating Commission, in order to begin immediately the vital task of closing the growing food gap on our planet.

POLITICAL REFORMS

We were surprised and pleased that the President touched on the subject of reform of political campaigns and elections. His recommendations do not go far enough.

Ways must be found to eliminate vote fraud, curb the cost of political campaigns, and expand the franchise. Republicans will propose—

To guard against abuses in the raising and use of political funds;

To raise the ceiling on political expenditures to realistic levels;

To bar effectively political contributions from corporations and unions; and

To require meaningful reporting of political contributions and expenditures.

STATES OF THE UNION

Our Nation has thrived on the diversity and distribution of powers so wisely embedded in the Constitution. The administration believes in centralized authority, ignoring and bypassing and undermining State responsibilities in almost every law that is passed. As a result, our constitutional structure is today in dangerous disrepair. The States of the Union form a vital cornerstone of our Federal system, and the headlong plunge toward centralization of power in Washington must be halted.

All of us here tonight salute the gallant fight of Senator DIRKSEN against the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and for the reapportionment amendment.

We urge Congress to enact a system of tax sharing, long advocated by Republicans, to return to the States a fixed percentage of the personal income tax without Federal controls. Funds from this source will lighten the load of local taxation, spur solution of vexing urban problems, and revitalize programs in education, health, and welfare at the local level.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Changes in the system of unemployment compensation are needed, particularly to provide standby protection against the contingency of a substantial rise in the number of workers without jobs. We support the constructive suggestions worked out by the State unemployment compensation administrators to meet this problem. We oppose the administration's bill that would substitute Federal judgment for State determination in matters such as standards and benefits in this program.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Making real for all Americans the equality to which this Nation is committed remains an urgent national concern. Recent progress is encouraging, but not enough. No citizen should be satisfied merely with the expectation of a better tomorrow. It is only right to expect that the Constitution of the United States be put in force everywhere now.

The Congress has enacted four civil rights acts since 1957. There now is need to review these laws, and especially tighten those designed to prevent violence and intimidation of citizens who exercise their constitutional rights.

Hesitant administration of existing laws has made them less effective than they should be. The President has even failed to make the Community Relations Service the effective instrument which Congress intended it to be. Leaderless for half of last year, shunted off to an ambiguous position in the wrong Federal agency, this potentially valuable Service has suffered from neglect.

Let us make it clear to all—there cannot be two kinds of justice, one for whites, another for Negroes. Nor can there be tolerance of riots, looting, violence, and disorder. These impede the progress sought by the overwhelming majority of Americans.

THE PRESIDENT'S CHALLENGE

Last week the President chided Americans who believe, as I do, that we cannot fight a war 10,000 miles away without setting priorities at home. He asked: "Whom will they sacrifice—the poor?"

Our answer is a resounding "No."

We will not sacrifice poor people.

We will sacrifice poor programs, poorly conceived and poorly carried out.

We will sacrifice poor administrators.

We will sacrifice poor arithmetic in public accounting.

Any sacrifices we call for, cannot be compared with those being made by 190,000 Americans in Vietnam.

And what of the sacrifices of their families at home, who share inequally in the promises of the Great Society? We urge more adequate housing and benefits for our fighting men and their families. We urge a new GI bill of rights of veterans. We will not sacrifice their future.

Nor will we sacrifice the future of millions of Americans whose lifetime savings and modest pensions are being nibbled away by inflation.

We are outnumbered 2 to 1 in this Congress. But we will continue to speak out for the things in which we believe. We will not sacrifice the ideals that make us Republicans.

We will never sacrifice the sacred right, and the sacred value to our country, of loyal dissent.

This is our duty to all Americans.

A TRULY GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, last week the Chattanooga News-Free Press carried an editorial that is worth careful note. The editorial deals with a recent speech made by my very able colleague, Congressman BILL BROCK, of Tennessee, who describes the necessary ingredients of a truly Great Society. Congressman BROCK's point is well taken; that all solutions to America's problems do not lie in Washington, and that local governments and private groups must be allowed to do their jobs. I feel that each of us would do well to give careful thought to Congressman BROCK's proposals.

The editorial referred to follows:

WORTHY OF THOUGHT

If the American people needed any reminder of the greater centralization of power in Washington and the rapid growth of new programs to increase the dependency of the people on the Federal Government, often in direct disregard for the Constitution's division and limitation of powers and reservation of rights and responsibilities to the States and to the people, President Lyndon B. Johnson's state of the Union address this week certainly gave adequate warning. In the light of this trend, Representative BILL BROCK presented a rather unusual speech to the local Rotary Club this week, in which he called for the facing of some clear facts and some new approaches that deserve consideration.

A truly Great Society, Representative BROCK said, has many sources of strength, not just a centralized government. He mentioned numerous private organizations ranging from churches to charities to unions. Representative BROCK was generous toward his liberal political opponents by saying many of them, in advancing big government, are genuinely concerned about the problems of society and simply are seeking to solve them by centralized power. Many of the honest intellectuals of liberal persuasion, however, are beginning to admit that in some instances governmental action has merely institutionalized rather than solved our problems, the Congressman said.

He mentioned welfare programs that in some cases have reared three and four generations of dependents rather than providing a launching pad for individual independence. He noted aid to education that is being accompanied by stultifying controls. He mentioned socialized housing and urban renewal programs that have destroyed more low-cost housing than they have created. He mentioned aid to seekers of higher education that is far less productive and has far higher delinquencies than private programs.

Representative BROCK said there are distinct problems and he urged action toward their solution—but through private institutions with diversified leadership and control, and through healthier local government.

Naturally, financial ability is involved in both. When government takes half the earnings of free enterprise, both incentive to earn more and availability of funds for local application are reduced. When Federal Government imposes high taxation, and overspends even that, local communities are left with less to draw on for independent action.

On the local governmental level, Representative BROCK got into two areas he recognized as political minefields. One is the proposition of consolidated schools for counties and communities that have only small schools though larger ones are better able to provide advanced subjects that are essential in modern education if our children are to have the opportunities that are needed. The other is county consolidation so some of Tennessee's 95 counties that can hardly support local governmental functions might be made stronger by union with others.

Another proposition Representative BROCK made was for use of the Federal Government's highly effective tax collection system to gather funds for local government, with

Tennessee, for example, deciding what percentage of taxation it should add to Federal income tax take, the U.S. Internal Revenue Service collecting it and returning it to the State with no strings attached. As a matter of principle, we would much prefer State and local taxation completely independent from the Federal taxing operation, maintaining an absolute separation of central and local governmental powers as the Constitution provides. But as a practical matter, we must admit that the likelihood of a major redress of constitutional balance of powers is not likely.

Representative BROCK's remarks called attention to evidence that centralized Washington power is not the solution to everything, that independent agencies and local governments have a real challenge and that there are new approaches to be studied.

His suggestions will not bring immediate changes and magic solutions, but they are thought provoking and of constructive intent.

PARTNERSHIP WITH EUROPE NEEDS DEFINITION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times, with American boys fighting and dying in a strange distant jungle war and others at worldwide stations, all Americans are concerned about the future. They deserve full definition of our foreign policy objectives.

The late President Kennedy spoke of partnership with a united Europe as the eventual goal of our policy. Whether partnership was to mean anything more than informal arrangements between nation-states was not clear. President Johnson too has used the term partnership, but here again the meaning was not spelled out.

In an effort to get a definition, I addressed a letter recently to Secretary of State Dean Rusk. The reply, reprinted below, suggests that partnership, as used by the administration, is little more than a vague generality. Obviously, nothing beyond the traditional alliances between nation-states is contemplated. And yet Mr. Rusk himself has stated on several occasions that there is no national solution to our most important world problems. Perhaps, and here I speak hopefully, the President and other members of the administration will define our foreign policy goals in greater detail in the near future.

Certainly, a clear definition which sets forth long-range objectives worthy of the tremendous sacrifices being made in Vietnam would lift the spirits of the American people.

Here is the text of my request and the State Department response:

NOVEMBER 24, 1965.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State, State Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In studying the future course of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, I find ever-increasing use of the term "partnership," both here and abroad.

Although well understood in law as applied to business relations among certain individuals, there is nowhere to be found a formal or authoritative definition of it as applied to political relations among nations.

Since a future partnership between the United States and a united Europe is one of our official policies, it would seem that we should also have an official definition of this term. Is it an institution such as NATO or just a treaty uncomplemented with institutions?

Allied to this matter is the question of merging of national sovereignty. Our policy of encouraging European union implies a merging of national sovereignty there—and I understand that the constitutions of Germany, Italy and the Netherlands actually provide for such merging.

What is our position with respect to merging our sovereignty with Europe or even with all nations in the United Nations? If such a position does not exist, is the Department doing or sponsoring research on this?

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., December 10, 1965.

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY: I have been requested to reply to your letter of November 24, 1965, to the Secretary, in which you request a definition of the term "partnership" when used to describe U.S. policy toward Europe. You also inquire about our position on the merging of our sovereignty with that of other nations.

The Atlantic partnership which is the eventual goal of our policy toward Europe was described by President Kennedy in a speech at Philadelphia on July 4, 1962. I believe the portions of the speech which are quoted below will provide the definition which you have requested:

"The nations of Western Europe, long divided by feuds more bitter than any which existed among the Thirteen Colonies, are joining together * * * to find freedom in diversity and unity in strength.

"The United States looks on this vast new enterprise with hope and admiration. We do not regard a strong and united Europe as a rival but as a partner. To aid its progress has been the basic objective of our foreign policy for 17 years. We believe that a united Europe will be capable of playing a greater role in the common defense, of responding more generously to the needs of poorer nations, of joining with the United States and others in lowering trade barriers, resolving problems of currency and commodities, and developing coordinated policies in all other economic, diplomatic and political areas. We see in such a Europe a partner with whom we could deal on a basis of full equality in all the great and burdensome tasks of building and defending a community of free nations."

Undoubtedly the institutions of the eventual Atlantic partnership will be determined in large part by the experience gained in the progress toward a united Europe and in the development of Atlantic institutions such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. However, until such time as Europe is united and able to deal with the United States as an equal partner in an Atlantic relationship, any discussion of the specific institutions of partnership would be but speculation.

For this same reason, we have not inquired into the possibility of transforming such a partnership into an actual merger of sovereignties resulting in the creation of a new sovereign entity. Nor has the creation of a new sovereign entity been the subject of our planning with respect to any other group of nations. No negotiations or Government-sponsored efforts to this end are either contemplated or in progress.

I hope this information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR, II,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

NATO AND THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on page 334 of the January 17 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the full text of a secret letter President Johnson sent to the Prime Minister of Turkey June 5, 1964. At the request of Turkey it was released to news media last weekend.

In it, the President backed away from a solemn treaty commitment under which we were pledged to help Turkey automatically in the event of Soviet attack.

All of our allies are now on notice that the United States saw fit to qualify its pledge.

This was the first time, to my knowledge, that any member of the NATO alliance has questioned the automatic character of the mutual defense pact. It was a major setback to the alliance, and raises disturbing questions about the credibility of other pledges we have made to our allies.

President Johnson has the duty to do his best swiftly to repair this damage, and to assure our allies in every way possible that the United States henceforth will stand by the letter and spirit of the North Atlantic Treaty.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one of the few bright spots on the Asian scene is the organization of the Asian Development Bank. We tend to think of all Asians as being alike. Just the opposite is the truth. Asian cultures and historical ties, languages, dialects, and economies differ so greatly that the hallmark of Asian history—and the economic cross that Asia has borne—is disunity.

The Asian Development Bank makes a historic step in the direction of getting a great number of the Asian peoples to work together. It puts into practice in Asia the idea that has been such a dynamo of progress in the West: that it is no good simply dividing up what you have, and that real gains are to be sought in efforts to increase the size of the economic pie, so that all may have larger—not just different—shares. The proposed Bank also puts to work in Asia lands stretching from the borders of the Middle East to the South Pacific the idea that each country stands to reap the greatest individual gains out of working together for the greatest collective progress.

The new Bank is an Asian idea, brought to life by Asian efforts, and strongly backed by Asian resources. The Asian member nations have undertaken to supply no less than 65 percent of the Bank's authorized $1 billion capital, and they have already put up all but a small part of that sum. The leading industrialized Asian nation—Japan—is making a contribution to the Bank's capital of $200 million. That is the same as our own.

Our subscription, by the way, is the smallest that we have supplied to any of the other major development banks. Nevertheless, I think that we—and, indeed, the free world as a whole—stand to reap very great benefits from the better prospects for peace and stability that result from getting these countries to work together for their own good.

This is not to say that there will not be other, and more direct, benefits. The Asian Development Bank will be a mustering point for capital funds to be used for the purchase of capital goods and expert services. The United States, as a highly competitive exporter of both, can realistically expect a net gain in its foreign trade from the procurement flowing from Bank lending. Our goods and services connected with Bank procurement will go to all parts of the vast Asian reaches in which the Bank operates, for decades to come. And each placement of our capital exports will be the base for reorders stretching into the indefinite future. Since most procurement pursuant to Bank loans will be restricted to member countries, we would not get these orders if we were not in the Bank.

Finally, there is the fact that the operations of the Asian Development Bank will fit closely with the type of basic development assistance that the United States has been giving for many years unilaterally in Asia, and will continue to give. The Asian Development Bank will bring to this task—which can absorb almost any amount of capital that is extended in Asia—funds from countries that have never before accepted development responsibilities in Asia. It will increase the activities of many other countries whose role has been very small. The assistance of the Asian Development Bank will therefore not only be consistent with our own but will extend and reinforce it, as well.

I would for these as well as other reasons urge the House to give its approval to U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank, and authorize the proposed U.S. subscription of $200 million. I suggest that we should do so by an overwhelming majority that will demonstrate to Asians everywhere the deep interest—and the ready support—of the American people as a whole when Asians come together to help themselves.

TAX-SHARING LEGISLATION

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced a bill to provide for the sharing of Federal income tax revenues with the States, the money to be used by the States for support of education. There has been considerable interest in a proposal of this kind for many years among Members of both parties. My version of this plan would send 2 percent of Federal income tax levies to State and local governments, or approximately $1.5 billion a year under present conditions.

One of the great problems faced by our State and local governments is the lack of revenue available from existing local and State tax sources. At a time when the demand for these services is increasing tremendously, the Federal Government, by contrast, is raising an increasing amount of money through the combination of inflation and the graduated income tax. Estimates are for the revenue to jump $5 to $6 billion a year, or more. Many people in Government, myself included, are concerned about the trend toward centralization which inevitably results when the Federal Government is the only level having available to it rapidly increasing sums of money for the solution of the problems of the people.

Just a glance at the statistics on State and local governments reveals the need for helping these institutions obtain more tax revenues. Demands upon State and local governments have caused them to double the number of employees in the past 15 years and triple their expenditures to $75 billion annually. Half of the employees and expenditures are required for education. State and local governments now have three times as many civilian employees as the Federal Government.

Many types of Federal aid to States and localities exist, but one of the great dangers of Federal aid is the control which normally follows the flow of money to the other levels of government. My bill minimizes this control, since it imposes only the limitation that the money made available to the States through tax sharing must be used for education in substantially the same proportion in which the State is spending its own funds on the various levels of education.

I urge other Members to support this bill or a similar one. I hope that many, like myself, will agree that education is the key to the future, and increasing centralization one of the great threats to our freedoms.

Briefly, here are the major provisions of the bill I have introduced: An amount equal to 2 percent of Federal revenue from individual and corporate income taxes will be appropriated to the States for support of education; 50 percent of the funds will be allocated on the basis of population and the other half on a need formula giving greater amounts to the States with the lowest per capita income; the States to allocate the funds for elementary, secondary, and higher education in the same proportion in which they currently spend for the various branches of education.

The funds allocated under my proposal would comprise 2 percent of the individual and corporate income taxes collected in the previous fiscal year. At the current rate this would produce approximately $1.5 billion. The amounts would range from $1,791,660 for Alaska to $124,254,988 for California. My home State of New York would receive $124,118,768, the second largest amount.

The U.S. Office of Education has computed the estimated distribution of the funds among the States as follows:

Estimated distribution of $1,500,000,000 according to population and per capita income [1]

The 50 States and District of Columbia	$1, 500, 000, 000
Alabama	31, 368, 804
Alaska	1, 791, 660
Arizona	12, 715, 632
Arkansas	17, 672, 825
California	124, 254, 988
Colorado	15, 084, 341
Connecticut	18, 365, 559
Delaware	3, 184, 153
Florida	46, 973, 993
Georgia	37, 919, 010
Hawaii	5, 404, 735
Idaho	6, 023, 554
Illinois	74, 225, 887
Indiana	38, 076, 508
Iowa	22, 723, 511
Kansas	18, 243, 615
Kentucky	28, 315, 653
Louisiana	31, 020, 575
Maine	8, 545, 327
Maryland	25, 050, 047
Massachusetts	38, 703, 868
Michigan	63, 404, 048
Minnesota	28, 543, 446
Mississippi	21, 240, 843
Missouri	34, 628, 778
Montana	5, 869, 099
Nebraska	11, 951, 377
Nevada	2, 587, 932
New Hampshire	5, 262, 467
New Jersey	46, 946, 513
New Mexico	8, 658, 522
New York	124, 118, 768
North Carolina	43, 246, 667
North Dakota	5, 598, 736
Ohio	78, 885, 357
Oklahoma	21, 277, 921
Oregon	14, 634, 671
Pennsylvania	90, 836, 992
Rhode Island	7, 113, 378
South Carolina	23, 266, 438
South Dakota	6, 175, 503
Tennessee	34, 027, 375
Texas	87, 346, 040
Utah	8, 236, 499
Vermont	3, 445, 096
Virginia	6, 905, 803
Washington	23, 211, 588
West Virginia	16, 149, 166
Wisconsin	32, 794, 429
Wyoming	2, 678, 811
District of Columbia	5, 293, 652
American Samoa	------------
Canal Zone	------------
Guam	------------
Puerto Rico	------------
Virgin Islands	------------

[1] One-half distributed on the total resident population, July 1, 1963, and one-half distributed on the total resident population, July 1, 1963, and Federal allotment ratios, fiscal year 1966.

L.B.J.'S WHEELING AND DEALING

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD, and include an article by Mr. Arthur Krock in the January 9, 1966, issue of the New York Times in connection with the wheeling, dealing, and concealing that goes on in Washington.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WHEELING, DEALING, CONCEALING

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON.—A tissue of fibbing, finagling, and economic group favoritism, spun in the White House, was the political product of the administration this week. It was widely recognized and denounced as such by a popular consensus, in reverse of that overall support of the President's attitudes, acts, and policies to which the efforts of the administration's vast network of public relations officers are constantly directed.

But the American people notoriously have short memories in circumstances like these. The President has ample time and ex officio facilities to repair whatever damage may have been done to his national leadership. And the White House already has spread its lines of justification and explanation for the shabby contrast between the President's arraignment of industry in the area of prices, and his silence on organized labor's excessive wage demands and contemptuous violation of law and order in the New York community.

Some, mostly administration political affiliates, have swallowed a couple of these lines. One, that the President's first knowledge of the details of the new pricing schedules of the United States Steel Corp., came when they were announced on the White House news tickers. Two, that his silence on the outrage of the New York City transit strike was only a necessary cover for important, though mysterious, contributions to the relief of the stricken megalopolis and its millions.

DISCLOSURES OF RECORD

To credit these alibis, however, is a strain on the record of the events, and on the interim White House responses to press inquiries, that has proved too much for the national capacity, if the general comments of the press and private individuals are reliable indexes of public opinion. Among the disclosures of the record are these:

When price increases were announced by the aluminum industry the administration immediately countered by releasing great quantities of the metal from its defense stockpile for private purchase at the lesser price. Official statements from the President's economic advisers accused the industry not only of inflation in the interest of selfish materialism, but also of unpatriotic callousness to the sacrifices of the Americans fighting in Vietnam. This forced the abandonment of the price increase in an atmosphere of disrepute for its source.

When Bethlehem Steel, followed substantially by Inland, announced a price rise of $5 a ton for certain types of structural steel, the President, who had not publicly applied the pressure he ordered invoked against the aluminum industry, immediately denounced the steel price-rise in person. He was instantly joined by Gardner Ackley, Chairman of his Council of Economic Advisers, in the expression of the judgment that the action was inflationary, unwarranted and unjustified. And Ackley made a positive statement of the President's implication that price-increases go hand in hand with lack of patriotism in this time of war in Vietnam.

SHIFT OF ORDERS

Words were succeeded by an order to procurement officials from the Secretary of Defense to shift Government steel orders, and those from private subcontractors of Government programs, to whichever producers held the price line. This pressure, employed as a strong-arm substitute in a situation for which the Government has no warrant of law, was first effective in persuading other steel producers to drop their plans to follow Bethlehem and Inland. Second, it set the stage of the United States Steel Co. to play the prewritten role of peacemaker in what by then bore the marks of a phony Government-industry war. Phony, because the administration had committed itself to accepting some price rise by permitting a new steel rate contract which broke its own economic guidelines.

Big Steel played its part by announcing it would increase the price of structural steel, but only by $2.75 a ton, meanwhile reducing by $9 a ton the price of the sheet steel rolled at its west coast plant. Within minutes Ackley was out with an economic estimate which would have required hours to make if Big Steel's new schedules had not been cleared in advance with the administration. He termed this rise inconsequential, figuring it at about one-tenth of 1 percent in company's revenue.

Though obviously the administration had made a deal with the key company, later verified by the disclosure that Roger Blough had met secretly in Washington with a high official prior to Big Steel's announcement, officials brazenly prevaricated. They insisted that the only pressure used had been a telegram from the President to various steelmakers, that there had been no prior official contact with Blough, and that the announced details of the agreement with Big Steel were as much news to the President as to the public.

NEW YORK CITY STRIKE

Meanwhile, a protracted strike was still in progress at the Olin-Mathieson plant which produces the bulk of gunpowder for the Armed Forces. And in New York City, during this same period, the municipal employees engaged in transportation struck in a body, at the call of Michael Quill, their union leader, thereby paralyzing the daily life of a vital interstate area in violation of State law and in contempt of the courts, whose order to return Quill tore up before a national television audience.

But the administration which had quickly applied the stigma of unpatriotism to price increases in industry, had no such comment to make on the gunpowder and transportation strikes. Internally there was much attention given to such sordid concerns as how to insure that the President and not Lindsay get whatever political credit a strike settlement might provide, and how also to insure, against the "eagerness" of Ambassador Goldberg to officiate, that the subordinate hero would be Secretary of Labor Wirtz.

And President Johnson, who has equated moral with political and economic leadership of the Nation, had nothing to say of the disgrace imposed on the New York community and the Nation by the anarchy of Quill and his allies in organized labor.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 361)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend that the Congress promptly approve U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank.

This new institution expresses the will of Asia to develop her manifold human and natural resources, and thereby to lift the burden of poverty that has been the lot of her people since ancient times.

Conceived and sponsored by Asians, the Bank is open to all countries in that region, regardless of ideology, who are members of the United Nations or its specialized agencies. Of its $1 billion authorized capital, 65 percent is to be subscribed by nations in the Asian area.

U.S. representatives—led by Mr. Eugene Black and a distinguished congressional delegation—signed the Charter of the Asian Development Bank at Manila last December 4. But only the Congress itself can authorize the final acceptance of U.S. membership.

That is the action I request today.

I

I take this step because of my urgent belief that the works of peace in Asia—the building of roads, dams, harbors, powerplants, and all the other public and private facilities essential to a modern economy—are vital to peace in the entire world.

An Asia torn by conflict, depressed by hunger, disease, and illiteracy, deprived of the means and the institutions that alone can offer hope to her people, must ever be a source of turmoil and anxiety for nations beyond her borders, as well as those within. Because this is so—and because we have recognized our moral obligation to our brothers on this earth—the United States has committed itself over a decade and a half to major assistance programs in Asia, making food, development loans, and technical assistance available to those who required our aid.

We have sought no American empire. Our purpose has never been to exploit, but to encourage; not to master, but to magnify the works of those who truly served the Asian people.

Now the Asians themselves have formed an institution by whose hand new works of peace may be accomplished. They have committed precious resources to that institution. They are determined to join in a cooperative endeavor, uniting the talents and resources of diverse cultures in pursuit of a common vision of progress.

They have asked us to join with them—to subscribe 20 percent of the institution's total capital—and thus to help make that vision a reality.

I recommend that we respond quickly and affirmatively.

II

This proposal is neither utopian nor vague. It is the product of careful deliberation by the foremost experts in international finance. It rests solidly on the lessons learned in building the World Bank, and other organs of international finance, into the powerful forces for good they are today. It will take its place among regional financial institutions alongside the Inter-American Development Bank and the newly formed African Development Bank.

Loan terms will be similar to those offered by the World Bank. Project justifications will be as rigorous as prudent management requires. Special efforts will be made to develop and finance projects involving more than one country, so that the Bank may be an agent of unity as well as development.

The Bank will reinforce existing aid programs in Asia, and thereby multiply their effectiveness. It will link its resources—financial and human—to such institutions as the Mekong Coordinating Committee, already joining the countries of the Mekong River Basin in major water resource projects.

Its charter permits it to administer special development funds, contributed by either member or nonmember countries. Thus it will serve as a channel for funds beyond its own resources.

These advantages are developed further in the Special Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the Asian Development Bank which accompanies this message.

III

The largest share of the Bank's subscriptions will be provided by Asians themselves.

The United States has been asked to pledge $200 million, equally divided between paid-in and callable shares. The paid-in shares are payable in five equal annual installments of $20 million each, half of which will be in cash, half in the form of a letter of credit.

The callable shares will constitute a guarantee for borrowings by the Bank in private capital markets. They would be drawn on only in the unlikely event that the Bank were unable to meet its commitments.

Our pledge is equaled by that of Japan. India has pledged $93 million; Australia another $85 million. More than $100 million has already been pledged by European countries and Canada, and further pledges may be made.

Joint action with these major subscribers provides another instrument of cooperation between the donors of aid. That is a long-sought goal of the United States, for it offers the most efficient use of all the free world's aid resources.

Finally, our commitment to the Asian Bank should have little negative effect on our balance of payments. Procurement financed through the Bank's regular capital will normally be limited to member countries. Purchases of U.S. goods and services will approximately offset the dollar outflow occasioned by our $10 million annual cash subscription.

IV

The Asian Development Bank is a necessity—not a luxury.

It was needed yesterday. It is needed even more today. Tomorrow, when the demands of Asia's millions on her struggling economies are more pressing still, it can mean the difference between opportunity and chaos.

It is practical and imaginative. It is the product of Asian initiative, and it offers the nucleus around which Asians can make a cooperative response to the most critical economic problems—national and regional.

Because it is all these things, it is also an avenue of good will and sound policy for the United States. For our destination is a world where the instinct for oppression has been vanquished in the heart of man. Given the means to work, to build, to teach, to heal, to nourish his family, man may yet achieve such a world—if not in our time, then in the generations that will succeed us on this planet. I believe the Asian Development Bank is an essential tool in providing the means of life for hundreds of millions of human beings who live between the Caspian Sea and the South Pacific.

It will become a reality when 15 signatories, 10 of them Asian, have ratified the charter. It appears now that this will be achieved by early spring. Our own constructive influence in the organization and management of the Bank will be increased if we can become active at its very beginning.

Last April in Baltimore I spoke of our dream of a world "where all are fed and charged with hope." I promised that "we will help to make it so." Our partnership in the Asian Bank is a step in keeping that pledge. It brings us nearer that day when our resources—and the world's—can be devoted to the constructive works of peace, not the destructive forces of war.

I urge the Congress to adopt the Asian Development Bank Act. Asia's future—and the world's—requires it.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1966.*

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I do not regard the question of U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank as a matter for division of opinion in this House on party lines.

The question is not one that divides us; rather it is a question whether we shall, with a commitment of U.S. resources that is both modest and adequately protected, take a long step to unite Asia.

When we think of the immense resources—human and material—of the Asian nations it is almost unbelievable, but it is nevertheless true, that in the long history of that continent the idea has never before taken root, as it now has in the Asian Development Bank, that the maximum benefit of each is to be sought in the maximum benefit of all.

The Asian Development Bank seeks to build also upon a second idea, one that unfortunately is still not fully accepted and understood everywhere in either the Asian or the non-Asian world, but that is working a happy revolution in the lives of the people of the United States, Western Europe, Japan, and wherever else it is embraced. This is the idea—a very simple idea if arithmetic is consulted—that there can be no net gain from dividing existing resources, and that any net economic gain can proceed only from increasing the amount of resources available for use in bettering our lives.

There is no question in my mind that the benefits to the United States, and indeed to the entire free world, from the spread of these constructive and unifying ideas in Asia—and the demonstration of their worth that the Asian Development Bank will attempt—stand to be so great that this House should give its undivided support to the participation of the United States in the venture.

But the House should not only give its approval; it should give it early, for the following reasons:

Technically, the United States and the 21 other nations that signed the charter of the new Bank in Manila on December 4, as well as other nations that have made pledges and that sign by January 31, have until September 30 of this year to deposit instruments of ratification. However, there are strong reasons for us to move much earlier than that. Very bluntly, we should do so to make sure that we enter the Bank on the ground floor, and thereby participate fully in its initial, critical decisions, such as the election of its President, the selection of some key officials, and the establishment in the Bank's regulations of its operative concepts.

The inaugural meeting of the Board of Governors of the new Bank is to be held promptly after the Bank has entered into force. The Bank will become operative as soon as its charter has been ratified by 15 nations—10 of them Asian—representing $650 million of the Bank's authorized capital of $1 billion. Since pledges to the Bank's capital already exceed $950 million, it is clear that it would be possible for the Bank to enter into force without the United States if our action were delayed beyond early spring.

The voting procedure agreed upon for the Bank's Board of Governors, on the other hand, gives assurance that if we are present, we can protect the U.S. interest, which, as I view it, is simply an interest in seeing to it that the Bank follows those same rules of imaginative prudence that have guided the World Bank to such a high degree of success among the risks and uncertainties of development assistance.

We can discharge our responsibility in this matter despite the fact that we have only a minority position in the new Bank—with 20 percent of its authorized capital—because the charter requires votes of two-thirds or three-quarters on questions of principal importance. Thus, together with the votes of other developed nations also desirous of seeing the new Bank operate upon sound banking principles, such as Japan, Great Britain, West Germany, and others, we can be confident of mustering enough strength to turn aside any untoward suggestions for the use of the Bank's resources.

Let me emphasize that I say this in a spirit of precaution only. The history of the debates over the Bank's policies that produced its charter, the fact that the Economic Commission for the Far East and Asia is the Bank's progenitor and will be a guiding Asian influence in its development, and the fact that the new Bank is closely modeled on the World Bank, all these suggest strongly that the majority, at least, of its Asian members are together with us in realizing that the Bank can succeed only if it manages its resources with the utmost care and foresight.

The new Development Bank has been designed—with care and foresight—to carry out prudently its twofold mission of Asian economic development, and the development of Asian unity. If, as I urge, we authorize the U.S. Government to discharge its responsibilities in the Bank from its earliest days, we can be all the more certain that the Asian Development Bank's work will in no way fall short of its design.

STATEMENT CONCERNING PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I applaud President Johnson's message today requesting the Congress to authorize U.S. membership in the Asian Development Bank. Creation of this Bank, which will take its place at the side of other international financial organizations, is another step forward in this Nation's continuing effort to help those peoples of the world who want to help themselves.

As the President pointed out, for 15 years we have been committed to aiding our brothers in Asia through major assistance programs. In the Asian Development Bank we will be joining in a cooperative effort with the Asian people who will contribute 65 percent of the Bank's capital, to promote and develop those facilities and installations, public and private, vital to a modern economy.

We will unite our resources with the people of Asia in a common effort to achieve those goals which are the dream of all mankind.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the President's proposal in his message on the establishment of the Asian Development Bank, and I support our majority leader in his statement about the need for that Bank.

I have had the opportunity to go into the details of the proposal. I visited in Manila at the time of the signing of this charter. I agree that we should do everything that we can to support the President in this measure, which is a bipartisan measure as you have heard from Mr. WIDNALL. I feel that it is highly important for us to go along with this at the present time for one very important reason. We are waging a war. We are going to wage a successful war, but we also wish to tell the Asian countries that we are willing not only to give the arrows in the eagle's claws on our Great Seal, if necessary, but we are also willing to turn to the other claws and extend the olive branch so as to cooperate with them in peace to help them in their undeveloped condition.

I am entirely in accord with their views that the structure and management proposed for this new continental development bank are such as to inspire confidence in the constructive and prudent use of its resources for the economic development of Asia, and for the growth of unity in that continent, where lack of unity has for so long contributed so heavily to lack of development. And I am heartily in favor of the view expressed that this House not only should give its undivided support to this project but that if we are to approve U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank we should reinsure our investment by making it possible for the United States to discharge its responsibilities in the Bank from its inception.

I agree in the statements we have heard describing the great purposes of the Asian Development Bank. And, in my view, there is no doubt that this new institution for intercontinental economic cooperation and collaboration will have none but beneficial effects upon the position of the United States in the world, and upon the strength and viability of the free world as a whole.

However, great purposes are served by, and great benefits accrue from, everyday considerations. We can only be fully assured that the project we are called upon to approve will in fact stand a reasonable chance of achieving its highest purposes if it moves toward them in step with reality. I believe that the Asian Development Bank does so in the following critical respects, as, indeed, in others.

One of the most urgent and inflexible of our national aims at this time, and for the future, is the matter of bringing our international payments into equilibrium, and of being assured that we can sustain equilibrium, once attained. President Johnson has placed the whole resources of the U.S. Government behind the early achievement of this goal, and has called into being the voluntary support of the Nation's banks and other businesses with money flows abroad. This House, then, I am sure, would want to know that in approving U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank it is not opening seams that we are engaged upon making tight.

There are good reasons for believing that the balance-of-payments effects resulting from our participation in the Bank would probably be small, and that such balance-of-payments effects as there may be are likely to be favorable.

First. While half of our pledged subscription of $200 million is to be paid in over the 4 years following the U.S. acceptance of membership, no more than half of the total to be paid in—or, a quarter of our total subscription—need be paid in cash. That is, the total cash dollar outflow over the next few years resulting from our capital subscription in the Asian Development Bank will be $50 million. The other $50 million is to be paid in the form of non-interest-bearing letters of credit, until such time as the Bank needs further actual cash. Since the Bank will have to go through a period of study and preparation prior to the start of actual financing of projects, its needs for cash are not likely to exceed a quarter of its subscribed capital for some years, at the least.

This means a cash outflow in subscription payments not exceeding $20 million in the first year of U.S. membership, and $10 million a year in the next 3 years. While this very small balance-of-payment drain could result, it is more likely that there may be no actual drain resulting from subscription to the Asian Development Bank. This can be expected because there may be more than offsetting inflows of dollars from the Bank as it seeks sound investments for the approximately one-quarter of a billion dollars, or other convertible currencies, paid in to it during a time when it has little or no project financing to do.

Second. The Bank's charter provides that, although the Bank may increase its lendable funds by borrowing abroad, it may not borrow in a member country without that country's consent. This protects us from a dollar drain into the Bank, that we do not approve, over and above our subscription.

Third. Procurement pursuant to Bank loans may in all cases, except where the loan is financed by a nonmember, be made only in member countries, or for goods and services produced in member countries. Given the fact that the United States is a highly competitive producer of the capital goods, and of the expert services, that will for the most part be purchased with the proceeds of loans by the Asian Development Bank, we stand to see a net increase in our foreign sales result from our membership in the Bank. This gain, over the long run—perhaps the not overly long run, at that—should be such as to offset permanently any eventual net outflow of dollars from this country resulting from our subscription to the Bank's capital.

Permit me to mention just one other of the practical considerations that in my view strongly reinforce the case for U.S. participation in the proposed new Bank. That is the relation between Bank lending and our own development assistance in Asia. This has been closely examined, and the special report on the Asian Development Bank sent to the Congress together with President Johnson's message on the Bank states without reservation that the Bank's development aims and methods will not only be consistent with our own, but will extend and support them.

HUMAN INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, there is evidence of growing support throughout the country for the Human Investment Act which proposes that the 7-percent tax credit for new investment in plant and equipment be extended to investment in training programs for the unskilled. This is the Prouty-Curtis plan which has my full support as well as that of other Republican Members of Congress and which is recognized as a logical and effective means of creating job skills.

I am continuing to receive expressions of support for the plan from Illinois and would like to quote from a letter received from the chairman of the merit and fair employment committee of the Niles Township Human Relations Council:

> The merit and fair employment committee of the Niles Township Human Relations Council is very interested in this type of legislation. We believe it to be a very timely and progressive bill which, if passed, will substantially help the great pool of unskilled workers as well as the industry.

Mr. Roscoe Drummond has written two significant editorials pointing out the advantages of this plan which I commend to my colleagues. I am hopeful that the Committee on Ways and Means will give consideration to the proposal early in the session.

Mr. Drummond's articles follow:

Unemployment on Way Out?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Washington.—Get ready for a shock—a welcome one:

Conditions are ripe today for the nearly total elimination of unemployment. I'm not talking about make work. I'm talking about real jobs.

The key facts, which turn the unemployment problem upside down, are these:

For the first time since the industrial revolution there are more jobs in the United States looking for workers than there are workers to fill them.

Industry is so starved for qualified employees today that big firms send recruiting teams to scour the entire country for workers; they bribe and steal each other's workers and when a factory closes the recruitment teams swarm at the gates to hire the dismissed.

This is no exaggeration. It is visible all over the Nation. Auto companies have even been scouting the poverty pockets of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania signing up unemployed miners.

What we now have in the United States, on the basis of the latest studies, is this:

1. Nearly 3 million jobs seeking and searching for qualified workers.

2. Nearly 3 million unemployed, most of whom are not qualified—do not have the work skills—to take the jobs that are open.

This means that private industry can create and at this very moment is thirstily demanding an enlarged work force capable of wiping out almost completely the Nation's unemployment.

It means that the problem of erasing unemployment is not how to create the jobs—industry is doing that—but how the unemployed can be trained to man the jobs which are beckoning to them.

Here the situation cries out for a new approach to the central problem which creates present-day unemployment and which is now depriving industry of urgently needed workers. This is not to suggest that Government should do the job, but rather that Government should help create the conditions to enable industry to do the job.

For this purpose Congress will have before it next month a practical and constructive bill, developed by Senator Winston Prouty, Republican, of Vermont, and Representative Thomas Curtis, Republican, of Missouri, and supported by 105 Republican Members of Congress.

The Prouty-Curtis proposal goes to the heart of the problem: How best to provide the job skills so the unemployed can fill the jobs waiting for them. As Prouty puts it: "The most efficient and effective job training in this country is being done by the Nation's greatest job trainer—private industry."

But much more needs to be done to dent the number of unskilled jobless and to provide the work force industry urgently needs.

To encourage industry to mount new and expanded training programs the Prouty-Curtis bill provides that the same 7-percent tax credit for new investment in plant and equipment be extended to investment in human capital; that is, in developing the skills of present and future workers.

The value of this approach is that it uses the best instrument for job training—private enterprise—encourages doing a lot more and, in the judgment of many, may be much more efficient and economical than to have Government try to do so much itself.

The Johnson administration, which can say yea or nay to almost anything in Congress, ought, it seems to me, to welcome this Republican initiative in behalf of a better society.

A Clearer Perspective

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Washington.—The latest facts on jobs in the United States are the most promising the Nation has ever had.

I'm not referring only to the figure that unemployment is at the lowest point in nearly a decade—4.2 percent of the total work force.

That's good in itself. But there is something better, something even more important. It puts the whole problem of unemployment in clearer perspective and suggests what most needs to be done, what can be done.

THERE ARE JOBS

For the first time since reliable statistics have been available, they show that there are more jobs in the United States looking for workers than there are qualified workers to fill them.

This doesn't mean that the unemployment problem is solved, but it does mean that the way is clear to take the right steps to solve it.

Put these two facts together and they show that many have been looking through the wrong end of the telescope in search for the answer:

Fact No. 1: Nearly 3 million jobs today are searching for qualified workers.

Fact No. 2: Fewer than 3 million workers are searching to qualify for jobs. Most of them—the great majority of today's unemployed—simply do not have the work skills to fill the jobs that are open.

With all the prosperity and growth the Nation has had during the past 20 years, there has remained the haunting question whether private industry could create the jobs to put the unemployed to work or whether government in some way must take up the slack.

LOOKING FOR JOBS

The answer is that private enterprise has created the necessary jobs and now the problem is to create the qualified workers to take those jobs which already exist.

Today U.S. industry is famished for skilled and semiskilled employees. Big firms are sending recruiting teams to scour the entire country. Airplane and electronic companies in the West are looking for workers 3,000 miles away. Some automobile companies are scouting poverty pockets in Kentucky, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania to sign up unemployed miners. Employment advertising is at an all-time high.

Solving the unemployment problem no longer centers on how to create the necessary jobs—industry has already done that—but on how the unemployed can be trained—and retrained—in order to fit the jobs which are seeking them.

Surely the whole thrust of the antipoverty program ought to be toward developing among its participants the will and the capacity to acquire the skills without which future jobs will inevitably pass them by. Much of the program is geared to this end but undoubtedly more can be done.

But this is only in part the responsibility of Government. There is need for a new approach to the central problem which creates present-day unemployment and which is depriving industry of urgently needed workers.

GREAT JOB TRAINER

What better instrument for the training and retraining of workers than industry itself? This is the view of Senator Winston Prouty of Vermont, and Representative Thomas Curtis, of Missouri, who contend that "the most efficient and effective job training in this country is being done by the Nation's greatest job trainer—private industry."

Their view is that the Government should provide a tax incentive to encourage industry to do more to create the job skills so the unemployed can equip themselves to fill the jobs waiting for them.

Their proposal, which will come before Congress next month, is that the same 7-percent tax credit for new investment in plant and equipment be extended to human capital; that is, in the skills of present and future workers.

This would be the best kind of antipoverty measure.

CENTER FOR COMMUNITY ACTION EDUCATION

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Walker] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago there were complaints about Sargent Shriver being the guiding light in two Great Society attempts to buy friendship both at home and abroad. Evidently this is a man of unheard of ambitions. I was grateful to hear only last night that Mr. Shriver has been relieved of one of his positions. However, a little earlier, it was brought to our attention of a Shriver-Farmer coalition to form their own private Peace Corps here in America, with their funds being solicited from all sides. But, I think the American taxpayer should be informed that approval is almost at hand by Federal poverty officials of an $800,000 grant to an organization promoted through Sargent Shriver's office. This new project, called the Center for Community Action Education, is to be headed by James Farmer, radical leftwing admitted Socialist and pacifist, that has just resigned as national director of the Congress of Racial Equality.

James Farmer, last year while being interviewed on national television, when asked about Communist activities within his ranks, did not deny it and further stated that his movement was more important than to discuss communism. This coincides very closely with another statement from one of his associates, who recently stated that he did not want to win the war in Vietnam if it meant loss of the so-called war on poverty in America. And, James Farmer, as director of CORE has supported the gun-packing Deacons for Defense.

Farmer is not the only person involved in this new organization who would be considered a risk. His new successor in CORE, Floyd McKissick, has been listed as legal counsel for the proposed poverty group. According to Columnists Evans and Novak, writing in their Washington Post column, January 12, 1966, this is the same McKissick that caused the complete breakdown of last fall's White House Civil Rights Conference. And, it is the same McKissick that while aboard the Presidential yacht with Vice President HUMPHREY and other civil rights leaders caused untold disturbance. In addition to this, McKissick has been closely associated with the so-called Black Nationalist movement.

With James Farmer and Floyd McKissick at the helm of this new organization, I am very much afraid that it will be used to further racial tensions and anti-Vietnam demonstrations across this country. This organization could very well fall into the same category as a similar organization in New York City that received $40,000 of the taxpayers' money, and their one and only purpose has been to teach hatred of the white race.

I urge each of my colleagues to contact the Office of Economic Opportunity and to use every means at his disposal to encourage the rejection of the poverty grant to the Center for Community Action Education.

STAFFORD SPRINGS, MISS., GARDEN SPOT OF THE SOUTH

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WALKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that there will be no urgent legislation before this body for the remaining part of the week, for it will give me the opportunity to return to my district and visit the few remaining communities that I was unable to visit during the holidays. It will also give me the opportunity to visit the South Mississippi Fox Hunters Field Trials now being held at Stafford Springs, Miss. This organization is near and dear to the hearts of the Walker family. It was through this organization many years ago that we met many outstanding Americans that have been a real inspiration in our lives.

Stafford Springs, Miss., just a short time ago, was one of the most famous health resorts in the world. Noted for its miraculous mineral waters, doctors from all over the world have prescribed health visits to Stafford Springs for their patients. Even today, the Stafford Springs Water Department ships its mineral water to all parts of the country.

Today, Stafford Springs has come to life in a new image. The Stafford Springs Lodge and Dude Ranch, under the management of Mr. Johnny Blanks, offers one of the most unique vacation spots in the entire country. Horseback riding, golfing, fishing, hunting, swimming, hiking, and all sorts of other activities await the outdoorsman.

Each year the Mississippi Art Colony is held in this picturesque spot, where artists from all over the Southland gather to study and to paint the beautiful scenery. In the spring and fall, garden clubs make pilgrimages to the "garden spot" of Mississippi, to view the magnificent floral landscape. And, business groups find that Stafford Springs Lodge and Dude Ranch offers excellent facilities for business meetings and gatherings.

It is a supreme pleasure for me to have the opportunity to again visit with my friend Johnny Blanks in this, one of the most beautiful sections of the entire South.

DISABLED VETERANS LOSING BATTLE AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills to raise the unbelievably low outside income limits for veterans and widows receiving pensions. By liberalizing these limitations, many pensioners will receive higher pensions.

In addition, the legislation I propose will increase by 10 percent the amount of pension paid to a veteran's widow. These pensions, at their highest rate, for a widow with children amount to only $80 a month under present law.

With the continuing skyrocketing of prices showing no sign of a slowdown, and the administration showing no intention of changing its present inflationary fiscal policies, it is a miracle that people on a retirement or pension income can stretch their limited dollars to meet their endless needs.

The price tags on food, housing, medical care and clothing have risen steadily for the past few years and promise to keep right on going.

Anyone who has shopped in a supermarket over the past 5 years can tell that food does not sell at a 1960 price any more. Nor do the other necessities of life.

The most tragic consequences of this inflation falls upon those who must live on a fixed income. Although the dollar amount they receive is the same as it was a few years ago, they have considerably less to spend because their money will not buy as much as it used to.

Yet in spite of this, the disabled veteran who is no longer able to work, and the widow of a man killed defending his country in war, still have the same unrealistic limits set on their outside income that they had in 1960.

A disabled veteran with an outside income of $605 a year from his social security or retirement plan or modest investments, receives a pension of $75 a month, or $900 a year. His total yearly income then is $1,505. Here is real poverty.

A veteran with a wife and two children to support, who has a yearly income of only $1,005 from his wife's earnings or other sources, receives only $80 a month or $960 a year. The total is $1,965 a year for four people. Where can you live for that today in anything near decent conditions?

These men who have given so much to this Nation struggle on pittances, while the President tells us of his plans to extend the costly poverty war, which has accomplished so little here, to the rest of the world. Yet this administration has consistently opposed any liberalizing of the meager income limits for veterans' pensions.

The men who have fought our wars for us have been ignored by the Government that seems to be forever searching for someone else to give money to.

The bills which I am introducing today would ease the tremendous burden of inflation for these people.

The amount of a pension is determined by the amount of other income the veteran or widow receives. There are three income categories. Those whose income places them in the lowest of these, receives the largest pension.

By increasing the amounts of the limits, those in the lowest levels of each category will be included in the next group below them and hence receive a larger pension.

The limits would be increased on the following scale:

Veterans and widows without dependents

	New
Present income limit of $600	$800
Present income limit of $1,200	1,500
Present income limit of $1,800	2,400

Veterans and widows with dependents

Present income limit of $1,000	1,400
Present income limit of $2,000	2,500
Present income limit of $3,000	3,600

Under this legislation I am introducing, the veteran with an outside income of $605 a year would fall within the lowest limits and receive a pension of $100 a month, bringing his yearly income to the far from princely sum of $1,805. Not too much, but better by far than the $1,495 we allow him now.

The veteran with a wife and two children and an outside income of $1,005 would be able to draw $115 a month, for a total income of $2,385.

The time is long overdue for a reevaluation of these unfair low limits, which force our old and sick veterans to live on incomes far below our accepted levels of poverty.

COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 of last year I introduced a bill which is now popularly called the cold war GI bill, that would provide for those serving in combat zones the same benefits afforded veterans of other wars. It would of course include as beneficiaries those serving in Vietnam.

It is regrettable that the Congress has failed to act on this cold war GI bill, and I urge that the Veterans' Affairs Committee begin hearings immediately so that the Federal Government will meet its obligations to those veterans without further delay.

The American servicemen who have fought and are now fighting in Vietnam and other combat areas face the same hazards as their brothers in arms who served in World War II and Korea. The sacrifices of these men, who heroically carry the battle for freedom into the jungles and plains of Vietnam on behalf of all of their fellow Americans, entitle them to share in the same benefits accorded the veterans of World War II and Korea.

Since the Korean war the so-called GI bill has expired and service in the Armed Forces after that date is not legally considered wartime service. As the veterans benefit structure is based on the concept of wartime service and peacetime service, passage of the cold war GI bill is essential if we are to meet our obligations to our service men and women who have served in combat zones. I cannot too strongly urge immediate action on this legislation.

H.R. 11891—HORTON BILL TO PROVIDE TIRE SAFETY STANDARDS

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this congressional session, I was privileged to introduce legislation providing for safety standards in the manufacture of automobile tires. Two days later, I was pleased to hear the President endorse Federal automotive safety standards as part of his state of the Union address. It is my hope that his support for such measures extends to the intent of my bill, H.R. 11891.

Hearings by congressional committees are, we all recognize, one of the most important parts of the legislative process. All too often, however, the highly significant and vital information which is revealed at these hearings never is adequately publicized. A case in point is the highly illuminating hearings held by the Senate Commerce Committee for several months last year on automobile tire safety and grading. While there was a splash of publicity a few days, by and large they did not receive nearly the attention they deserved. These hearings made clearer than ever before the utterly chaotic situation prevailing with respect to the grades of automobile tires, with the inevitable consequence that the buyer enters the market arena with no way to make sound judgments as to the tires he should buy. And the purchase of these tires is in a most literal sense of a matter of life and death.

While we do not have accurate statistics as to the number of accidents in which tire failure or inadequacy was a major contributory factor, these hearings documented a situation where an unusual number of tires appear to be wearing out or failing at low mileage. The presumption that unsafe tires contribute substantially to the shocking carnage on our highways is very high.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which would attack this problem on several fronts. First and foremost it would establish minimum safety standards for new tires for passenger cars and station wagons. To begin with, the standards set by the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission would be effective, subject to revision by the Secretary of Commerce within 2 years. Secondly, my bill would provide for a 5-year research and development program to establish minimum new tire safety standards, retreading safety standards and a uniform grading system for tires. Third, my bill would prohibit the following acts: First, manufacture or sale of noncomplying tires; second, selling new cars with tires that do not comply with the tire load standards to be promulgated within 2 years; and, third, failure to permit inspection.

It is gratifying to note the increasing concern being shown in these matters by our Nation's automobile and tire manufacturers. In fact, the American Automobile Association already has endorsed this legislative proposal. I also want to make plain my awareness of the significant improvements which have been made in tire quality in recent years by the major rubber companies. Therefore, I am sure responsible tire manufacturers also will want to assure the public that they always get the uniformly higher quality tires which the industry has demonstrated it can make. With ever more traffic on our high speed Interstate Highway System and other major arterial roads, the need for standards which will assure every driver that his tires will in fact be safe under present driving conditions as well as under the new conditions presented by the Interstate Highway System becomes more urgent by the hour.

Our accident rate is a national catastrophe. We are being callous and craven for every day in which we delay action which will cut down on this traffic toll. My measure should do much to bring a halt to the rise in the senseless slaughter on our Nation's highways.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in joining Senator MAGNUSON in sponsoring this vital legislation and I am confident my colleagues in the House of Representatives will promptly and positively identify and act on the need for its passage.

A BILL TO PROHIBIT LARGE-SCALE FEEDING OF LIVESTOCK BY MEATPACKING FIRMS

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BANDSTRA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 so as to prohibit the large-scale feeding of livestock meatpacking firms.

After careful study, I have reached the conclusion that feedlot operations by large packing firms are a potential threat to the income of family sized farmers.

If packer-feeding expands in future years, and if firms engaged in buying livestock and retailing meat obtain control over a significant part of our livestock supply, the average farmer may find it difficult to get a fair price for the livestock he brings to market.

The bill I am introducing today would limit packer-feeding by means of three basic provisions.

First, it would ban livestock feeding by meatpacking firms with more than $1 million in annual gross sales. The same provision would apply to retail chainstores engaged in meatpacking operations.

Second, it would bar any officer or director of firms covered by the bill, or any owner of more than 5 percent of the stock in such a firm, from engaging in the livestock feeding business.

Third, it would prohibit these firms from purchasing livestock for slaughter through contracts with individual farmers, since this type of contract could give packers direct control over the flow of livestock to market.

The whole purpose of this legislation is to help assure farmers that they can sell their livestock on a market that is open and competitive and is based on supply and demand.

Over the last decade, there has been an unsteady but upward trend toward greater utilization of feedlot operations by meatpacking firms.

For example, U.S. Department of Agriculture figures for 1960 show about 1.7 million head of livestock were both fed and slaughtered by packing firms.

By 1964, the total number of packer-fed livestock reached nearly 2 million head, including more than a million head of cattle and nearly 900,000 head of sheep.

It should be noted that these figures do not take into account the feeding activities of officers or directors of packing firms, although such activities limit the competitive nature of the livestock market.

Furthermore, there are strong indications that livestock feeding by packers will expand in future years.

My home State of Iowa offers an example. At present, packer-feeding operations there are relatively limited. In 1964, according to the latest U.S. Department of Agriculture report, only 15,800 head of cattle and calves were fed in Iowa by packing firms.

Recently, however, one firm disclosed that it plans to utilize packer-feeding on a large scale and hopes to feed between 50,000 and 100,000 head of cattle annually within 2 years.

In addition, the Des Moines Sunday Register of November 7, 1965, reported that the firm's feedlot operation will be a pilot project, and that others will be started should the first one prove successful.

Packer-feeding on such a scale is unprecedented in Iowa, but the trend nationally has been toward more extensive use of such operations.

I have given this subject serious thought and study and have been unable to find any valid economic justification for feeding operations by meatpacking firms or chainstores with retail outlets.

But I do feel that it is vitally important to American farmers that packer-feeding does not interfere with a free and competitive livestock market.

I am therefore hopeful that hearings will be held soon on this legislation, and that it will receive favorable action by the Congress.

The article from the Des Moines Sunday Register, to which I referred earlier, may be of interest to my fellow Members, and I hereby include it in my remarks:

IOWA PACKER PLANS HUGE FEEDING SETUP

(By Ronald Harley)

Big league cattle feeding is coming to Iowa.

Iowa Beef Packers, Inc., Denison, plans to feed 50,000 to 100,000 head a year in a feedlot near Irvington. The cattle will be fed by "computer" and most of them will be housed in what officials described as controlled environment.

A feedlot with such a turnover would rank with the biggest lots in Colorado, Nebraska, Arizona, and California. It is expected to be the Nation's biggest inside cattle feeding operation.

And Iowa Beef Packers officials revealed last week that the Irvington feedlot is to be a pilot project. Others will be started if the first one is successful, they said.

The packing firm purchased 400 acres of land and feedlot facilities from Gerald Frankl of Irvington. Present capacity of the lot is about 4,000 head.

Within 2 years, officials expect capacity of the feeding operation to be at the point where they can turn out 50,000 to 100,000 head a year.

The firm has a slaughtering plant at Fort Dodge, only about 40 miles south of Irvington.

Establishment of the feeding operation will be another step by the firm toward a vertically integrated program. A slaughtering plant, now under construction at Dakota City, Nebr., will break carcasses. (Presently the firm markets only carcasses and quarters.)

Carcasses from the Fort Dodge and Denison plants will be shipped to Dakota City for breaking.

Frankl, who sold the land and feedlot facilities for an undisclosed amount of cash and Iowa Beef Packers stock, will join the organization.

He'll help set up the slaughter cattle procurement program at the Dakota City plant and eventually is expected to manage the feeding operation at Irvington, officials said.

The bulk of the feed for the proposed feedlot will be purchased locally.

Bill Conn, president of the Security State Bank in Algona, pointed out that such an operation would require several million bushels of corn and thousands of tons of silage a year.

"We have a lot of cash-grain farmers in Kossuth County and this fits in perfectly with the proposed feeding operation," he said. "It will cut hauling costs for grain farmers who want to supply corn to the operation."

(Average corn yield in the Irvington area is running over 100 bushels per acre this fall, according to Frankl.)

Conn, who is also an official of the Algona Industrial Development Corp., said "this factory is going to have a tremendous impact on the community."

Most of the cattle in the proposed operation will be housed in a series of buildings featuring slatted floors.

Frankl said the slated floors probably will be precast concrete over 8-foot pits. Much of the liquid manure probably will be marketed to farmers in the area, he said.

Frankl, 44, said Iowa Beef Packers would continue to use the present feeding facilities even after the new facilities are constructed.

"This will give us a chance to compare the efficiency of indoor and outdoor feeding," he said. "I think we'll find the energy loss in outside feeding yards is a bigger factor than most people realize."

Frankl pointed out that initial investment in an indoor feeding setup would be high, but said increased efficiency should compensate for this in a short time.

He said silage will be stored in bunker-type, roofed silos. A new feed mill will be constructed to handle the expanded operation.

"I don't think any place in the Nation will be able to compete with this area in controlled environment feeding," he said.

"We do not anticipate that this operation will be detrimental to Iowa cattle feeders in any way. In fact, we expect it to benefit them.

"If it is successful, it will demonstrate the efficient way of feeding cattle and should provide a good example."

McGill and other officials pointed out that detailed records will be kept on cost of gain, efficiency of gain, etc.

Arden Walker, another vice president, said, "There is a big lag between what is known about efficient cattle feeding and the way many cattle are actually fed. We want to close that gap."

Company officials said such an operation, by providing a steady volume of slaughter cattle, can help stabilize cattle prices.

But they pointed out that even after the Irvington feedlot is operating at maximum capacity, they will still be buying the biggest part of the cattle they need for slaughter.

After the Dakota City plant goes into operation next year, they expect to be slaughtering a total of about 25,000 head a week in the three plants. This would be about 5 percent of the Nation's federally inspected beef slaughter.

The Irvington feedlot will give farmers in the area an outlet for feeder cattle at various stages of growth and an outlet for locally grown feed, a vice president said.

Present plans call for about 1.5 million square feet of feeding area. A tremendous amount of liquid manure would be produced in the slatted-floor setup.

According to one source, steers averaging 800 pounds in weight will each produce 6.8 tons of liquid manure a year with a value of about $3.61 per ton.

The company plans to feed medium-quality feeders (mostly calves) and slaughter them at 1,000 to 1,150 pounds at Choice grade.

"There is a trend toward less fat and waste on slaughter animals and we'll produce cattle with a high degree of cutability," said Fred Haigler, who coordinates buying and selling activities.

The operation will require a lot of hired labor. A professional nutritionist, for example, will be hired to formulate feed rations.

The efficiency of various feed rations will be determined with the help of a computer. Rations will be punched out on computer cards, and feed will be weighed and mixed automatically.

Information will also be fed into a computer to help determine weight and kind of cattle to be fed.

Iowa Beef Packers was organized in 1960 and the Denison plant went into operation in 1961. The company's headquarters are also at Denison.

A. D. "Andy" Anderson is president of the company. Currier J. Holman is chairman of the board.

EDMUND JACKSON, JR.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about a great leader who recently died and who I was honored to call my friend.

Edmund Jackson, Jr. was the tribal chief of the Quechan Indian Tribe and president of the Inter-Tribal Council, Indians of Arizona. Moreover, Gov. Edmund G. Brown appointed him to the California Indian Education Board where he served with distinction until his death.

In Ed Jackson, no quality among the many he possessed surpassed his warmth and humanity toward his fellow man. I talked and worked with him on many occasions. Each time my respect for his sincere dedication to his work and his people increased. His contribution to his people and his community will long be remembered.

It was my privilege to have known Ed and I only regret that he could not have seen the fruition of many of his hopes and dreams. The things Ed Jackson worked so hard for must and will be continued.

I join the members of the Quechan Indian Tribe in their loss.

MILLENNIUM OF CHRISTIANITY OF THE POLISH NATION

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the millennium of Christianity of the Polish nation is being celebrated this year, not only in Poland itself, but all over the world, and in many cities of the United States. Great spiritual, cultural, and civic programs have been planned to commemorate this historic anniversary. The celebrations in our country will be climaxed by the visit of His Eminence, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, primate of Poland, late this summer or early fall.

There are over 30 million Poles in Poland and over 12 million Poles scattered throughout the world who will celebrate this 1,000th year anniversary of the Catholic baptism of Mieszko, Poland's first historical ruler. This baptism provided the way for the entry of all Polish people into the Catholic Church.

Christian Poland has produced poets and literary men highly motivated by Christian principles. From earliest times, Poland has had a procession of gifted artists, painters, educators, scientists, architects, and musicians, who glorified God in their works.

Mr. Speaker, to inaugurate this millennium year, to which Polish Christians the world over look with grateful hearts, a civic banquet was held by the diocese of Buffalo, in Buffalo, N.Y., on Saturday, January 8, 1966. The Vice President of the United States was the principal speaker at this banquet.

A descriptive story of the Vice President's visit to Buffalo on this significant occasion was written by a very able reporter of the Buffalo Evening News, Ed Kowalewski, whom I have known for many years. Because it so accurately highlights the Vice President's eloquent address and the events surrounding his visit, I wish to include Mr. Kowalewski's story, which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News on January 10, at this point in the RECORD:

UNITED STATES STRENGTHENS TIES WITH POLISH PEOPLE, HUMPHREY SAYS HERE

(By Ed Kowalewski)

America's world aim is peace and to help other people lead national lives of thier own choosing.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY stressed this as the basic U.S. policy before 1,100 persons in the Statler Hilton Saturday night. He was the principal speaker at a dinner marking the 1,000th anniversary of Polish Christianity.

The Vice President and his wife were introduced to a glittering audience that comprised leaders of the Polish-American community, high-ranking dignitaries from Catholic, Protestant and Jewish faiths, and men and women prominent in the economic, educational and political life of Buffalo and western New York.

LEAVES CAR TO GREET CROWDS

The dinner climaxed "a most delightful" Buffalo visit for the Vice President and Mrs. Humphrey.

They were greeted by about 150 persons when they arrived at Greater Buffalo International Airport and by crowd clusters, ranging from 25 to several hundred, along the route to the Statler Hilton.

Mr. HUMPHREY got out of his limousine several times to greet and be greeted by the excited, cheering crowds. Some had waited for 2 hours in the 11° weather.

DEPARTS FROM PREPARED TEXT

As the Humphreys entered the hotel, they were greeted by several hundred spectators and the St. Stanislaus Boys' Choir, accompanied by a band.

Mr. HUMPHREY remarked at the dinner that Buffalo's weather may be cold but "what a warm reception."

Departing from his text to touch on Vietnam, Mr. HUMPHREY declared:

"We seek to impose no burden or will on anyone. We seek to help people to build a nation and a life of their own."

He asserted that peace does not come "by hoping." It comes out of "sacrifice, pain, perserverance, even as you fight and die for it."

Since World War II, Mr. HUMPHREY reported, this dual national policy of peace and national self-determination has cost the United States 175,000 casualties and "billions of dollars."

POLAND'S WESTERN HERITAGE

"We have watched the tide of communism roll over people and we don't intend to have it done any more," Mr. HUMPHREY declared.

Devoting his speech largely to Poland and to the significance of its 1,000 years of Christianity, Mr. HUMPHREY called for further strengthening of the ties between Poland and the United States.

"Our ties with Poland and the Polish people are broad and deep and they are enduring," he said.

Since its acceptance of Christianity 1,000 years ago, Mr. HUMPHREY said, Poland has always been identified with the Western World, with independence and freedom.

"We must never give the Polish people any reason to believe that we have forsaken them," he warned.

POLISH-UNITED STATES TIES STRENGTHENED

Mr. HUMPHREY recalled President Kennedy's statement 5 years ago that "we must strive to restore the traditional identification which Poland and Eastern Europe have had with the European community instead of the Soviet empire."

"This," Mr. HUMPHREY declared, "is the policy of President Johnson and of his administration.

"It is for this reason that we have been building bridges to the Polish people to reopen their traditional communication in trade, people and ideas.

"We have strengthened the economic and cultural ties between Poland and the United States."

Mr. HUMPHREY enumerated steps taken by th United States to help the Polish people, including construction of a $10 million, 300-bed children's hospital in Krakow; use of Polish currency obtained from the sale of American farm products for other worthwhile projects, and trade expansion between the two countries.

"PEOPLE WILL PREVAIL"

Mr. HUMPHREY emphasized that America's ties with Poland are with the people and not with a Soviet-dominated government.

"The people will prevail ultimately in that country and elsewhere," he asserted.

America must continue building bridges between itself and Poland, Mr. HUMPHREY declared, and said that, in this effort, "in a very real sense, we are above politics."

One of the benefits of this bridge to Poland, Mr. HUMPHREY said, is that the United States has been to carry on dialogs with China there.

"I think we have something of a restraining and moderating influence on Peiping," Mr. HUMPHREY reported.

MUST PRESERVE TRADITIONS

In the course of his 48-minute talk, interspersed with folksy humor, Mr. HUMPHREY cited the gradual disappearance of prejudice against the foreign born and their descendants.

"There was a time—happily long past now—when the noble concept of the United States as a melting pot of nations was perversely misinterpreted to mean the obliteration of all distinctive national characteristics. This was the time when too many people spoke with scorn and even suspicion of so-called hyphenated Americans," he said.

POLISH SPIRIT UNBROKEN

"Fortunately, we have long since outgrown all that. We have learned that Irish-Americans and Italian-Americans and Polish-Americans and Scandinavian-Americans are not less than Americans—but Americans plus, with the rich heritage of their former national cultures and traditions."

He paid tribute to Poland's golden eras and its contributions to world and American culture.

"Tragically, the past two centuries have witnessed unparalleled disasters for Poland as a nation," he noted.

"But throughout these disasters, the spirit of the Polish people has remained unbowed and unbroken. United by their language and their faith, they have defied every effort to divide or destroy them."

Other speakers also stressed the significance and the challenge of Poland's Christian millennium.

The Most Reverend Stanislaus J. Brzana, auxiliary bishop of the Buffalo Catholic diocese and general chairman of the yearlong observance, urged that the millennium celebration "inspire us to a more faithful, more vigorous, and more fruitful life, according to the teachings of our Saviour, Jesus Christ.

"We pray that it may deepen the faith, promote ecumenical understanding, and increase the love which binds us together as children of the Heavenly Father."

PRAISES CARDINAL WYSZYNSKI

Christianity "does not merely accumulate years like an old monument," the bishop said.

"It lives and has the power of renewing itself. It is like a tree that buds in the spring and produces fruit each year. In this age of renewal, sparked by the Vatican Council, we recall the history of ancient Christianity, but at the same time we try to capture its youth and vigor."

The Most Reverend James A. McNulty, bishop of the Buffalo Diocese, paid tribute to His Eminence Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, primate of Poland, and recalled his promise that the "church in Poland will survive and with her, the freedom of my people."

Bishop McNulty described Poland as a "heroic and martyred nation.

"Poland has experienced the cruelties and treacheries of Godless neighbors, yet, in all of those years of strife and turmoil, her ancient title radiates so splendidly today, Poland ever faithful," Bishop McNulty said.

CITY'S "SPECIAL PRIDE"

Mayor Sedita described the Poland's Christian Millennium as of "monumental importance to all people throughout the world who live by or benefit from the Judeo-Christian ethic."

"It must be a source of comfort and encouragement for all people who live in oppression that, after all, permanence in this life resides only in those institutions which give place to the proper relationship of man to man and man to the Father," he said.

The mayor said the Niagara Frontier will take special pride this year in that 350,000 of the residents are of Polish descent.

"We may count the blessings they have brought to the church in America, and the skills, the strength and vitality they have brought to the communities where they reside," he asserted.

Supreme Court Justice Matthew J. Jasen was toastmaster and Supreme Court Justice Joseph P. Kuszynski was dinner chairman.

MINGLES WITH GUESTS

Henry J. Osinski, lay chairman of the diocesan observance committee, introduced the Vice President.

After a brief biographical sketch, Mr. Osinski related:

"If you had been traveling west in South Dakota in the 1930's, you would have come upon a highway sign which read: 'Welcome to Huron, S. Dak. You're among friends, 10,000 of 'em.' And right behind that sign was another sign which read: 'Humphrey wants to see you.' And if you had gone into that little town and stopped at Humphrey's drugstore, you would have discovered that it was true—Humphrey made you feel that he did want to see you.

"Well, Mr. Vice President, tonight we welcome you to Erie County. You're among friends, and we all came to see and hear you."

Between the main course and dessert, Mr. Humphrey insisted on leaving the speaker's table to mingle with the overflow guests. seated in the ballroom foyer and the Terrace Room.

SERENADED BY COMBINED SINGERS

Led by Representative Thaddeus J. Dulski, Democrat, of Buffalo, the guests toasted Mr. Humphrey and his wife with red burgundy and with raised glasses, sang the traditional Polish song, "Sto Lat," which entreats 100 years of health and happiness.

The Humphreys also were serenaded by combined singers of the Echo Society Chorus, Niagara Falls, and the Paderewski Singing Society, under the direction of Michael C. Slominski.

The invocation was by the Right Reverend Thaddeus F. Zielinski, bishop of the Buffalo-Pittsburgh Diocese of the Polish National Catholic Church, and the invocation by the Most Reverend Pius A. Benincasa, auxiliary bishop of the Buffalo Catholic Diocese.

Other religious leaders among the 32 persons at the speakers' table were the Right Reverend Lauriston L. Scaife, Episcopal bishop of western New York, and Dr. Martin L. Goldberg, rabbi of Temple Beth Zion.

An outstanding citizen of Buffalo, who cooperated with Mr. Henry J. Osinski in making the Vice President's visit possible, was Mr. Vincent Gaughan. He worked many hours behind the scenes which helped to make this civic celebration the great success that it was.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to include in the Record the speech delivered by the Vice President of the United States on January 8, 1966, at the civic banquet held by the Diocese of Buffalo at the Hotel Statler-Hilton:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, POLISH MILLENNIUM, BUFFALO, N.Y., JANUARY 8, 1966

I am proud and happy to join in this celebration of the Christian millennium of the Polish people, which began last summer and will come to a climax with the visit of Cardinal Wyszynski this October.

This double anniversary—commemorating the emergence of Poland as a nation and its acceptance of Christianity—is important to the Polish people, 30 million in Poland and 12 million more outside.

But it is also an important event for the whole of the Western World. For it marks a thousand years of Polish identification with the West.

When Duke Mieszko, the first historical ruler of Poland, was baptized in the year 966, he accepted for his people not only the Roman Catholic faith but the whole of the traditions and values of Western civilization.

Whenever Poland has been free, it has freely chosen to be part of the European community.

This millennium is an important occasion for all Americans as well. Our ties with Poland and the Polish people are broad and deep.

There is a visible, but not widely known, illustration of these ties in our Nation's Capital. If you visit the beautiful Jefferson Memorial, you will notice that his statue portrays him wearing a long fur-collared coat.

That coat, a favorite of Thomas Jefferson's, was given him by his good friend Thaddeus Kosciusko, a valiant fighter for freedom here and in his own country.

General Kosciusko received from our Government a large grant of land in recognition of his services in our War of Independence. When he returned to his native land, he left a testament with Jefferson, from which I quote:

"I * * * do hereby declare and direct that, should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States, I hereby authorize my friend Thomas Jefferson to employ the whole thereof on purchasing Negroes and giving them liberty in my name; in giving them an education in trade or otherwise; in having them instructed in their new conditions in the duties of morality, which may make them good neighbors, husbands, and wives, in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and their country, and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful."

Like his fellow countryman Casimir Pulaski, who gave his life in the cause of American independence, Kosciusko not only cherished freedom for himself, he sought to give it to others as well.

And the same spirit continues to animate the 7 million Americans of Polish descent.

They have played their full part in every aspect of our national life—from the hardest kind of work in our fields and factories to the highest levels of professional, intellectual, cultural and political achievement.

They have lived and worked for our country, and in time of war they have fought and died for it.

There was a time—happily long past now—when the noble concept of the United States as a melting pot of nations was perversely misinterpreted to mean the obliteration of all distinctive national characteristics. This was the time when too many people spoke with scorn and even suspicion of so-called hyphenated Americans.

Fortunately, we have long since outgrown all that. We have learned that Irish-Americans and Italian-Americans and Polish-Americans are not less than Americans, but Americans plus—plus the rich heritage of their former national cultures and traditions.

Regrettably, outworn prejudices and bigotries hung on in our immigration laws long after the overwhelming majority of Americans had rejected them.

It was a great day last year when President Johnson signed the Immigration Act of 1965 at the foot of the Statue of Liberty, thus righting what he forthrightly termed a "cruel and enduring wrong." On that occasion, he said: "Our beautiful America was built by a nation of strangers * * * the land flourishes, because it was fed from so many sources."

I myself am proud of my Norwegian heritage. And you are rightly proud of—and right to commemorate—your splendid Polish heritage.

I think of King Kasimir II, who founded the University of Krakow in 1364, and of the many hundreds of learned men—mathematicians, physicists, astronomers, physicians, historians, and philosophers—whom that university trained and gave to European culture.

I think of Poland's golden age of intellectual and cultural achievement in the 16th century, and of the splendid flowering of the Polish spirit in the latter half of the 18th century.

These centuries were centuries of greatness.

Tragically, the past two centuries have witnessed unparalleled disasters for Poland as a nation.

But throughout these disasters, the spirit of the Polish people has remained unbowed and unbroken. United by their language and their faith, they have defied all efforts to divide them.

And even during these hard years for the Polish people, they continued to produce, in rich abundance, poets, novelists, dramatists, painters, and above all masters of that universal language, music.

I think of Frederic Chopin, whose brilliance as a composer continues to astonish and delight us. I think of the supremely gifted performers in more recent times—Ignace Paderewski, Artur Rubinstein, and Wanda Landowska, and conductor Artur Rodzinski.

Five years ago President Kennedy declared: "We must strive to restore the traditional identification which Poland and Eastern Europe have had with the European community instead of the Soviet empire. For Poland back through the centuries has belonged to the European tradition of freedom and national independence. It has been a part of European culture, of European economy, and European history. And even the Soviet Union cannot rewrite that history."

This is the policy of President Johnson and of his administration.

It was for this reason that he sent my good friend John Gronouski to Poland as our Ambassador—back that is, to the birthplace of his parents.

And if any proof were needed of the warm and deep affection of the Polish people for America—and Americans—the reception they gave Ambassador Gronouski surely provided an exclamation point.

We have been busy building bridges to the Polish people to reopen their traditional communication in trade, people, and ideas with the West.

We have strengthened the economic and cultural ties between Poland and the United States.

And we are supporting Poland's application for membership in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva, the free world's principal forum for trade negotiations.

We have sold American farm products for Polish currency which, in turn, we have been able to spend on worthwhile projects for the promotion of friendship between our two peoples.

Only last month, for example, Congressman Zablocki headed an American delegation to the dedication of a 300-bed children's hospital and research center in Krakow—for whose construction, through the efforts of the Congressman and myself, the U.S. Government had provided more than $10 million.

There is much more to be done. We must never give the Polish people any reason to believe that we have forsaken them.

The bridges we have built to Poland can be of great value for world peace as well.

It is in Warsaw that we have maintained a continuing dialog with Communist China. By speaking frankly to the Chinese Communists about our interests and objectives, we have had—I think—a significant moderating and restraining effect upon Peiping.

Very recently my good friend Ambassador Harriman visited Poland for important discussions with Polish leaders as a significant part of President Johnson's all-out effort to get the dispute in Vietnam off the battlefield and on to the conference table.

I want also to pay tribute to a bold and generous initiative taken in November by the Polish Catholic Church. At the historic Vatican Council in Rome the Polish primates, headed by Cardinal Wyszynski himself, addressed a letter to the German bishops inviting them to join—in the spirit of reconciliation between the two nations—in the ecclesiastical celebrations of the Polish millenium.

I commend Cardinal Wyszynski's letter of invitation to the thoughtful attention of all Americans. It is a noble, dignified, and eloquent document worthy of the best traditions of the Polish Catholic Church.

The Polish bishops write candidly and gravely of the tragic chapters in the relations between Poland and Germany—notably the Nazi occupation—but they also record the happier and more fruitful relations of earlier centuries.

They speak of the great national saint of Poland, St. Jadwiga, and they say: "No one in Poland reproached (her) with being of German origin. On the contrary, with the exception of a few nationalistic fanatics, she is generally considered to be the best expression of Christian bridge-building between Poland and Germany * * *. It is just a fact that the best bridges between nations are built by holy people, by people who have a pure mind and pure hands."

I do not claim any special sanctity for the United States, but I do say that the bridges we have sought to build with the Polish people are built with pure friendship and respect, and with no motive but the motive of freemen reaching out to those in whom the free spirit burns.

May I conclude by wishing the Polish people, in their own homeland and throughout the world, a second Christian millenium worthy of the first—and a happier and more fortunate one.

We cannot give to Poland our boundaries made outwardly secure by great oceans. The Polish people must continue to live on a great plain, secured by no natural boundaries.

But, in this thermonucelar age, physical boundaries have lost their old meaning.

All of us in the world must look for our real and lasting security to the establishment of a world order of peace and law.

In such a world, which all of us must help to build, may the Polish people be free to live as they see fit.

May they be secure from aggression or external pressure in a world made safe, not for any single all-pervading ideology, but for all the rich diversity of human traditions and aspirations.

PROPOSED ALTERATION OF CERTAIN RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MEMBER BANKS AND THEIR AFFILIATES

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hanna] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to alter certain relationships between member banks and their affiliates.

United States Code, title 12, section 371(c) is the portion of the national banking laws which govern the extension of credit by member banks to affiliates and sets forth certain limitations and conditions relating thereto.

Subphrases 3 and 4 of the third paragraph of the section relate to transactions with Edge Act corporations and these are exempted from the general limitations. An exemption is also provided for subsidiaries of Edge Act corporations if 100-percent owned, except for directors' shares not in excess of 10 percent of the outstanding shares.

United States Code, title 12, section 221(a) defines as an affiliate, subsidiaries, where the parent owns more than 50 percent of the voting shares or of the shares voted for the election of directors at the preceding elections. Thus, a subsidiary of an Edge Act corporation which owns up to 50 percent of the shares—and does not otherwise have control—is not deemed to be an affiliate, and the member bank could deal with it and not be subject to the limitations of section 371(c). On the other hand, if the Edge Act corporation owns 51 percent or more of the shares of the subsidiary then the limitations apply from that point on to 100 percent. This does not seem to make any sense at all. In fact, it would appear that if the percentage of ownership increases the benefits of control increases and it would be more logical to eliminate the restrictions than to impose them. In other words, from 1 to 50 percent there are no limitations; from 50 to 99 percent there are limitations.

The proposed amendment to section 371(c) deletes from subphrases 3 and 4 the reference to 100-percent ownership.

The illogical nature of this statutory situation has been recognized for some time but nothing appears to have been done about it. In "National Banks and the Future," being a report of the Advisory Committee on Banking to the Comptroller of the Currency, on page 131, the following appears:

> A peculiar restriction on Edge Act activities of banks is found in section 23a of the Federal Reserve Act, which restricts a bank's power to make loans to subsidiaries of its Edge Act affiliates in which the Edge Act corporation has a controlling, but less than full, interest. Legislation has been introduced to remedy this unwarranted restriction and the passage of such legislation would clearly be in the best interests of our international economic policy.

A recent examination into what is going on in the areas of international finance indicates that there are many situations where, from an economic and business viewpoint, it is desirable for Edge Act corporations to invest in subsidiaries and to have more than 50 percent but less than 100 percent ownership. This permits a flexibility which appears to be very desirable.

NEWEST MEMBER OF PRESIDENT'S CABINET

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that a meeting this morning of the Committee on Banking and Currency, involving matters which go to the heart of the committee system and orderly procedure in the House, prevented my attendance this morning at the swearing-in of the newest member of the President's Cabinet, the Honorable Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of the newly created Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The legislation creating this Department originated, as is required by House rules, in the Committee on Government Operations, but the Banking and Currency Committee, having jurisdiction over housing legislation, was of course most interested in the proposal. We all look forward with great expectations to the successful operation of the new Department under Dr. Weaver.

During his years as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Dr. Weaver has favorably impressed all of us on the housing subcommittee with his grasp and understanding of housing and urban problems, and with his gentlemanly qualities. I congratulate him on this tremendous honor and I wish him all success in his important position—one which he has earned by ability and by his hard work and his devotion to good housing policies and practices.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Keith (at the request of Mr. Garmatz), for the week of January 17, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McDade) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dole.

Mr. Horton.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Fascell) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Callan.

Mr. William D. Ford.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 125. Joint resolution extending the date for transmission of the economic report.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 19, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1896. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1965, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 360); to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered printed.

1897. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of use of contractor-furnished personnel in violation of statutes governing Federal employment, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1898. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of hospital and surgical-medical insurance benefits available under Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans, Department of Public Health, District of Columbia government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 11006. A bill to extend the statutory burial allowance to certain veterans whose deaths occur as a result of a service-connected disability; without amendment (Rept. No. 1213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 11007. A bill to provide statutory authority for the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to assume the duties of Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator, or during a vacancy in that office, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 11747. A bill to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care; without amendment (Rept. No. 1215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 11748. A bill to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care; without amendment (Rept. No. 1216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BANDSTRA:

H.R. 12115. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, to prohibit feeding of livestock by certain packers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 12116. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 12117. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 12118. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 12119. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to reconstruct the substructure and to replace the superstructure of the existing 14th Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 12120. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 12121. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to grant a preference for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies to the sons of all members of the Armed Forces who are killed or die in line of duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 12122. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the basis on which pension is payable by providing that public or private retirement payments shall not be counted as income and that the income of the spouse shall be disregarded in the determination of annual income of a veteran; to eliminate the "net worth" eligibility test; and to repeal the requirement of reduction of pension during hospitalization for veterans with dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 12123. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase by 20 percent the income limitations imposed by that chapter on persons entitled to pensions thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 12124. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 12125. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12126. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat sintering or burning as a mining process in the case of shale, clay, and slate used, or sold for use, as lightweight concrete aggregates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 12127. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to raise the income limitations applicable with respect to pensions payable under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12128. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase by 10 percent the rate of pension payable to certain widows of veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; and to increase the income limitations applicable with respect to the payment of such pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 12129. A bill to provide for improved benefits under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, to strengthen the financial condition of the fund created by such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 12130. A bill to alter certain relationships between member banks and their affiliates; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 12131. A bill to establish a National Commission on Older Workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 12132. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the millennium of the Polish nation in the calendar year 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 12133. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 12134. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 12135. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the rates of pension payable under that title to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict and their widows by 10 percent and raise the income limitations applicable with respect to the payment of such pensions by $600 per annum; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 12136. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to do certain work for the control of beach erosion at Capitola, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 12137. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in Vietnam; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 12138. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, so as to authorize the establishment and operation of sea grant colleges and programs by initiating and supporting programs of education, training, and research in the marine sciences and a program of advisory services relating to activities in the marine sciences, to facilitate the use of the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf by participants carrying out these programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.J. Res. 804. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H. Con. Res. 541. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Con. Res. 542. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H. Con. Res. 543. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H. Con. Res. 544. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 545. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 667. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 80; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H. Res. 668. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 12139. A bill for the relief of Remedios Remigio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12140. A bill for the relief of Rosaria Grippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 12141. A bill for the relief of Pietro Cigno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12142. A bill for the relief of Antonino Ciulla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 12143. A bill for the relief of Tan Tze Tong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 12144. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manuel G. Pena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 12145. A bill for the relief of Gustavo Vazquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 12146. A bill for the relief of Huang Yue Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12147. A bill for the relief of Delvida White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12148. A bill for the relief of Charalambos Venetis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12149. A bill for the relief of Antonino Como; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12150. A bill for the relief of Pietro Cacciatore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 12151. A bill for the relief of Mostafa Mohamed Elhag-Ali and his wife, Tahani Elhag-Ali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Prime Minister Shastri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM D. FORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1966, death suddenly claimed a noble and dedicated statesman and leader of his people, Lal Bahadur Shastri, Prime Minister of India.

He was handed the reins of state in India under difficult and trying circumstances. There is no doubt as to his effectiveness and capacity as leader during his brief tenure as Prime Minister.

Beset by internal and international difficulties which might have caused a lesser man to waver, Mr. Shastri met each challenge with courage, conviction, and strength.

His wisdom and compassion in dealing with other nations was well known.

Death abruptly halted him in the pursuit of two goals he seemed to hold above all others: the quest for peace and the internal progress of India. The agreement he signed along with President Ayub Khan of Pakistan a few hours before his tragic death was his final act of service to his beloved country.

The burden of India's hundreds of millions is now on the shoulders of acting Prime Minister Gulzarilal Nanda. It is my sincere hope and belief that the people of India will unite behind him and assist him in providing Indians with the good life for which Mr. Shastri worked so hard.

Let all of us who are in positions of leadership pledge ourselves to bring to fruition the world without war to which Mr. Shastri's life was so firmly committed.

He rendered faithful and honorable service to India and to the world. His counsel and inspiration have left an aching void in the hall of the world's statesmen. I take this opportunity to join the many persons for whom his passing was a grievous and shocking blow.

People and Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR CALLAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is not often a Member of Congress has the opportunity and pleasure to discuss a concrete action program instituted by interested citizens because they saw a need and decided to meet it. I have that distinct pleasure today, Mr. Speaker.

A group of interested citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., have for some time been concerned with the phenomenal increase in crime in the United States and have decided that citizen action is one of the few really long-term, effective methods available to counteract this national disease.

Mr. Speaker, Lincoln, Nebr., is not faced with the massive increase in crime that has plagued other areas of the country. But any crime is too much and Lincoln is a growing city and planning for the future has always been one of its trademarks.

The Lincoln Junior Chamber of Commerce, led by a member of my human resources committee, Mr. Ben Goble, has devised PAL which stands for people and law. An individual citizen may become a member for a small membership fee and participate in the activities of the organization—all of which are supported by the dues and other donations.

PAL will publish periodic bulletins on law enforcement, crime statistics, how the individual citizen may aid law enforcement officials, and training programs. In addition, PAL will sponsor a monthly award to a local law enforcement official who has distinguished himself as an officer and a citizen, sponsor a scholarship fund to be used by a student in the field of law, criminology or other related fields, and act as a resource group to promote the coordination and dissemination of information pertaining to law enforcement activities to schools, civic, service, and religious groups.

I commend the idea to those in other areas who face far greater problems in the area of rising crime rates.

Congressman Horton Praises WBBF Editorial Reaction to State of the Union Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, again it is my pleasure to share with my congressional colleagues, through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the editorial expressions of radio station WBBF in Rochester, N.Y.

Robert S. Kieve, WBBF's general manager, has kindly made available to me the text of his station's two-editorial reaction to the state of the Union message. I believe these commentaries incisively and intelligently call attention to the recommendations by the President which will be crucial to the work of our second session.

Therefore, I take pride in offering these statements, and I also am including the text of my current weekly column as evidence of my parallel concern with the issues raised in the WBBF editorials:

The State of the Union Address

January 13, 14, 1966.—How did you like the President's state of the Union address?

Here are some of WBBF's reactions:

We approved of Mr. Johnson's combination of tough and conciliatory words on the subject of Vietnam.

We were dismayed, though not surprised, to see that he is still urging passage of a bill to prohibit State right-to-work laws, but we're pleased that he wants the Congress to consider measures to help the Nation deal with strikes that threaten the national interest.

We were pleasantly jolted by the President's suggestion that Congressmen's terms of office should be 4 years instead of 2—and we were amused by the thunderous applause the suggestion drew—but we believe the proposal is new enough to call for a lot of careful thought before we take action on it.

We are highly favorable to the President's suggestion that the Congress should establish tax incentives to stimulate small contributions to political parties and candidates.

We applaud the President's interest in urging "legislation to strengthen the authority of Federal courts to try those who murder, attack, or intimidate civil rights workers * * * and to increase penalties to a level equal to the nature of the crime."

And on the subject of the President's budget? We'd like to discuss that in a later editorial.

"Stringent, Cost-Conscious Economies"

January 14–15, 1966.—At one point in his state of the Union address, President Johnson told us: "While special Vietnam expenditures for the next fiscal year are estimated to increase by $5.8 billion, all the other expenditures in the entire Federal budget will rise by only $.6 billion."

We object to this way of describing the increase in the national budget. In the first place, "point six billion dollars" is really $600 million. It is $3 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It is $3 in addition to each individual's share of that $5.8 billion in military expenses. And $5.8 billion, incidentally, comes to $29 per man, woman, and child.

And all of this—the $3 per person, plus the $29 per person—comes on top of the amount spent by the Government last year. It is an additional expense.

And if this way of expressing the expenditures oversimplifies, at least it is more accurate than the President's way of saying it. The President, after all, keeps talking about "stringent, cost-conscious economies" as if they resulted in cutting costs rather than in increasing them.

Since military expenditures are increasing significantly, we urge the President to keep nonmilitary expenditures right where they were last year. That's the least we can expect from "stringent, cost-conscious economies."

Congress Reconvenes and State of the Union

(By Congressman Frank Horton)

One of the more eventful and event-filled weeks in Washington will be the subject of my report this week. Last week began with my returning to the Nation's Capital, after being home the week before to meet with the people I represent and tour the 36th Congressional District, and it ended with my departing from Capitol Hill for a round of weekend engagements in Rochester and our two counties of Monroe and Wayne. The days between held the reconvening of the 89th Congress for the 2d session, receiving the President's state of the Union message, the introduction of 16 new Horton bills, conferences with constituents, and answering much mail prompted by problems our country is facing.

Many of these problems were mentioned in President Johnson's address to the joint House-Senate session last Wednesday night. However, as you heard and read, the President went well beyond the war in Vietnam, devoting fully half of his speech to expansions and extensions of domestic programs.

The question then that confronts Congress—and I foresee a very lengthy session if we are to cover all this ground—is defining and refining. First, I think we have the obligation of establishing more precisely than did the President's remarks, where we are headed in southeast Asia. We need this in order to assess that which it is prudent and proper to provide on the homefront during a period of combat and conflict.

I certainly do not want to lose our forward movement in education, health and other areas of Federal encouragement and support for local and State programs. Therefore, I intend to direct much of my work at setting priorities for domestic needs, pushing ahead with the essentials and exercising restraint with those items the American people will be willing to curtail because of our defense costs in Vietnam.

By sharpening the appropriations pencil, I feel we can ward off, at least temporarily, the reimposition of telephone and new car excise taxes and the other stringent tax measures President Johnson is suggesting. I am especially opposed to excise taxes, which we fought so hard to remove last year, because they strike hardest at those least able to afford them, people with low incomes.

There are so many proposals the President offered that a full reaction would run as long as the Chief Executive's 55-minute speech did. Although, I do plan to refer to them in the weeks ahead through this report, the point about expanding trade with Communist countries has me very concerned. I already have brought this up to many of my colleagues and asked their support in seeking a detailed explanation of the proposal before we move any further.

The President said little that was new about our course in Vietnam. As I have indicated now for a number of weeks, this issue must be a central congressional concern and a full-scale debate is both desirable and demanded. The intensity of our involvement in Vietnam now must be matched by bringing this Communist confrontation into full view of the public.

Equity for Veterans Receiving Pension Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the plight of many veterans who are in receipt of both veterans' pension and monthly social security benefits. The recent modest increase in monthly social security payments has had the effect of reducing or terminating monthly pension benefits in approximately 29,000 of these cases.

These veterans, Mr. Speaker, in most instances, received a social security annuity that placed them slightly under one of the income limits established by law for entitlement to a certain rate of pension. When the President approved an increase in social security payments, though slight, it was sufficient to put the veteran in a higher income bracket, thus reducing or terminating his pension payments. Though the amount varied with the individual case, I understand that each of the 29,000 odd veterans affected lost considerably more in pension than they gained in social security. In a typical case, the veteran received an $8 monthly increase in social security and lost $48 monthly in veterans' pension benefits.

Now, I am fully aware of arguments being advanced that the 88th Congress authorized a 10-percent retirement income exclusion for pension purposes and that the pensioner is receiving more pension in 1966 than he did in 1964. The fact remains, however, that their pension payments for 1966 have been reduced substantially from the rate they received in 1965. It is also a fact that the increase over the 1964 rate resulted from a general increase in pension rates voted by the 88th Congress. This increase would have been received whether or not the social security increase had adversely affected veterans' pension. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, many of these veterans were not on the pension rolls in 1964. They became entitled to one rate of pension in 1965 and then, a few months later, it was reduced substantially because of the receipts of a few extra dollars in social security payments.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I believe this group of veterans and widows are deserving of consideration. I am, therefore, today introducing a bill authorizing a 20-percent increase in the income limits authorized by Public Law 86–211. This bill then will not only relieve the plight of those who were adversely affected by the social security increase, but will recognize that the spiraling cost of living also affects veteran pensioners. This bill will permit a modest increase in income without affecting pension entitlement. I am hopeful that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will give early consideration to this and similar proposals.

The text of my proposal is as follows:

H.R. 12123

A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase by 20 percent the income limitations imposed by that chapter on persons entitled to pensions thereunder

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) column I of the table in section 521(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I

Annual income More than— but	Equal to or less than—
	$720
$720	1,440
1,440	2,160"

(b) Column I of the table in section 521(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I	
Annual income	
More than— but	Equal to or less than—
	$1,200
$1,200	2,400
2,400	2,600"

SEC. 2. (a) Column I of the table in section 541(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I	
Annual income	
More than— but	Equal to or less than—
	$720
$720	1,440
1,440	2,100"

(b) Column I of the table in section 541(o) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I	
Annual income	
More than— but	Equal to or less than—
	$1,200
$1,200	2,400
2,400	3,600"

SEC. 3. Section 542(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$1,800" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,160".

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective the first day of the second calendar month following date of approval.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner Speaks on the Improvement of Government Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at a U.S. Civil Service Commission anniversary ceremony last Friday, January 14, 1966, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner delivered one of the finest speeches I have ever heard concerning the renewal of Federal service. This ceremony was to commemorate the 83d anniversary of the signing of the Civil Service Act by President Chester A. Arthur.

The understanding which Secretary Gardner has of our present civil service system is apparent, as well as his interest in improving it so that we may have an energetic, stimulated, growing Federal service system.

Because of the excellent recommendations which Secretary Gardner makes in his speech, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENEWAL OF THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE[1] BY JOHN W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

We are here to commemorate an important beginning and to honor a fine tradition. The Civil Service is one of our noblest social institutions and I am proud to have a part in this tribute to it.

But I have learned from long experience that it is not really necessary to congratulate institutions. They have built-in mechanisms for self-congratulation that are marvelously effective. Having participated intimately in the life of Government agencies, the military services, business firms and universities, I feel that I can make that generalization on the basis of fairly comprehensive experience.

So I am going to honor the Civil Service by talking about the goals ahead rather than the laurels already won.

First let me clear away some general questions. Is the Federal Government bureaucratic? It is indeed. But so are business firms, colleges and universities, the military services, State and local governments, and philanthropic organizations.

Is the Federal Government in danger of going to seed? It is in the gravest danger. But so are all other organizations large and small.

I think most of you know my views on the decay and renewal of organizations.

Briefly, I believe that most human organizations that fail in their missions or fall short of their goals do so not because of stupidity, not because of faulty doctrines, but because of the internal decay and rigidification to which they are all subject. They get stiff in the joints. They get in a rut. They go to seed.

I know that many of you are familiar with my diagnosis of what brings that condition about. So I am going to limit myself today to a few brief comments on what I regard as the most important single line of therapy for moribund organizations. (Please don't be alarmed by the word "moribund." I believe that in all large-scale organizations at all time the processes of decay are at work. If they are lucky, processes of rebirth and renewal are also at work.)

Organizations go to seed when the people in them go to seed. And they awaken when the people awaken. The renewal of organizations and societies starts with people. And since the first and last business of the Civil Service is people, this seems an appropriate occasion to examine the problem.

Specifically, I want to talk about what the Federal Government does to develop talent—after recruitment. Recruitment itself is worthy of discussion, and there is a vastly better job to be done on that front, but that is not the problem that interests me at the moment.

As a society, we are pursuing energetically, almost feverishly, the identification and nurture of gifted young people in our schools and colleges. In contrast, we are quite haphazard about the provisions for their continuing growth after formal education ceases. That is true in every segment of our national life. Almost all organizations in our society today are competing desperately to get their share of the flow of talent. But few are developing that talent properly after they get it.

The still untapped source of human vitality, the real unmined reservoir of talent is in those people already recruited and thereafter neglected.

The quickest and most effective road to renewal of the Federal service is the mining of that untapped resource. It is not only a means of tapping unused talent and opening up new stores of vitality, it is a solution to the old, old problem of developing a Government service that is responsive—responsibly responsive—to changing top leadership. Vital people, using their gifts to the full, are naturally responsive. People who have stopped growing, defeated people, people who no longer have confidence in the use of their own powers, build bastions of procedure between themselves and any vital leadership.

Now how does one go about renewing the people in the Government service—or anywhere else for that matter? There are many sources of renewal, of course. One is the uninvited crisis. Wars and depressions bring a certain amount of renewal, though the price is far higher than sensible people are willing to pay.

Another source is challenge and competition, and in this respect our Constitution has built-in provisions for the renewal of elected officials. But appointive officials, not facing the challenge of an election, are denied that stimulus.

Another source of renewal is rapid growth. Very rapid expansion of an agency is apt to have a highly stimulating effect upon the people within it.

Still another source of renewal is the sheer vitality of top leadership. I think, for example, that President Johnson has been as vigorous, if not cyclonic, a force for renewal as we have seen in this Government.

But what about the more mundane things that good government administrators can do to renew their organizations? What about the good personnel practices and procedures that will insure renewal? I'm going to give you an oversimplified answer, but an oversimplification based on having observed the personnel field with a professional eye for 30 years.

I am going to assert that the best means of inducing growth, developing talent, and insuring continued vitality in the individual is change. The change may take many forms—a change of troubles, a change of assignment, promotion, living in different parts of the country, moving in and out of Government, sampling the different worlds that make up this society, serving abroad, serving in an organization that is itself rapidly changing.

It follows, I believe, that the single condition that would contribute most to greater vitality in the Government service today is flexibility of reassignment. In his state of the Union message, President Johnson pledged bold leadership to bring this about.

The size of the Federal establishment and the diversity of activities it encompasses offer unexampled opportunities for imaginative reassignment. With such an array of possibilities it is unforgivable that any reasonably competent Government servant should suffer in a job that does not suit his talents.

It is unforgivable that any Government servant should lack the stimulus to personal growth that comes with change. The individual should be allowed to move and the agency should be allowed to move him without damage to his status or his feelings.

Free, frequent, and fluid movement among all the agencies of Government should be the accepted rule. The ambitious or merely restless young person who wants to sample several different lines of work should not be punished or penalized. Restlessness and vitality go together. And especially promising young people should be systematically reassigned through several agencies to insure their growth.

---

[1] As delivered at the U.S. Civil Service Commission anniversary ceremony, departmental auditorium, Washington, D.C., Jan. 14, 1966, 10 a.m.

Beyond that there should be a great increase in the planned movement of individuals between the Federal Government and the other worlds that make up American life—the world of business, the military, the universities, the labor unions, agriculture, State and local governments. I have moved in several of these worlds, and I am continually shocked at their mutual ignorance of one another. That ignorance breeds both complacency and paranoia. Each of these worlds imagines that it is uniquely close to the moral center of American life, and believes that the other worlds aren't really quite to be trusted with the American future.

Of all these worlds, the Government service has the least excuse for being provincial. It should have the capacity to understand all of the other segments of society. Without that understanding it will not be able to serve them effectively.

I would also favor an overseas assignment early in the career of those young Government people who seek to rise to the top. We have gotten past the day when only those individuals who have an explicit "international" interest should think of going overseas. The work of Government at home and abroad needs the breadth of perspective acquired by experience overseas. Such experience is valuable any time during one's career, but the earlier it comes the better.

All the processes of refreshment I've mentioned are particularly needed in the case of professional, scientific, technical, and scholarly people. Government needs such people more and more. But it will neither get them nor keep them if it doesn't provide the opportunities for further growth that they value so highly.

There is no excuse for Government to lose out in the competition for talent. It has a built-in advantage over every other employer. The cynics would deny this but the truth is that talented people are attracted to Government because it gives them an opportunity to render service to the entire Nation. They come with the highest motives. They leave when their purpose is thwarted or when they begin to feel trapped. Government cannot afford to be inhospitable to these people.

The administration of the affairs of this Nation are complex and dynamic. They are going to become increasingly so. The Congress has just enacted a staggering amount of legislation which must now be translated into action. It would be hard to overstate either the magnitude of the tasks ahead or their importance to the Nation.

President Johnson made this abundantly clear in his state of the Union message on Wednesday.

Now, let me ask these questions: Is the Federal service capable of meeting this challenge? Of course, but to do so it must take some significant steps to renew its spirit and its people.

Is renewal compatible with the Federal merit system? It most certainly is. The merit system, now in its 83d year, represents a great advance in the personnel practices of Government. We are not about to return to a spoils system.

But tenure was not designed to trap people, to make them inert. It was designed to free them from the capriciousness of politics. They need both the protection of a career system and opportunities for growth.

We can preserve all the great traditions of the system and still maintain the vitality that is so essential in this rapidly changing and infinitely challenging moment of history.

Recognizing that the very size and nature of the system make it particularly susceptible to stagnation, we can make special efforts to build in arrangements for renewal.

We can turn the concept of tenure into a positive asset rather than a deterrent to the full use of our talent.

The momentum generated by the President and the flood of legislation enacted by the Congress have given us unparalleled opportunities to create new patterns of work and to bring new strength and vitality to the career service.

I am optimistic that we will do so, and that optimism is based in no small measure on the fact that one of the boldest innovators in Government today, Mr. Macy, is also Chairman of this Commission.

John Macy introduced this session with some kind remarks about me and I want to end it with a tribute to him. I think he is a superb example of the best that the Federal service can produce, and I am proud to have shared this platform with him.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words of Scripture: Ezekiel 2: 1: *The Lord said unto me, son of man, stand upon thy feet, and I will speak unto thee.*

Almighty God, hitherto Thou hast blessed us and sustained us; continue to uphold us with Thy strengthening grace.

Whether our days be few or many, help us to live them radiantly and reverently, as those who abide in the truth, walk in the light and follow in Thy ways.

We offer upon the altar our common prayers, for we are united in our nature and need, seeking together those blessings which Thou alone canst give and which none can ever find or enjoy alone.

Be Thou our guide, our defense and refuge and may those who are sorely burdened receive strength to carry on and may the sorrowing be blessed with patience and perseverance.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

STRAIGHTENING OUT THE RECORD ON THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF TURKEY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I listened with some amazement, and read with even more amazement in the press, comments of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] on the President's letter of last June 5 to the Prime Minister of Turkey. Mr. FINDLEY accused the President of backing away from a solemn treaty commitment under which we were pledged to help Turkey automatically. I have been reading in the press that Mr. FINDLEY is—I do not know whether self-appointed or by whom appointed—the Republican spokesman on NATO. I cannot help but think his remarks yesterday came rather, I would hope, from a lack of information than from a desire to be mischievous. However, what the President really said to the Prime Minister of Turkey was—and I am condensing it, but it is in the RECORD of Tuesday—that you had better think before you move into Cyprus with troops and start a war, because Greece is also a NATO signatory and there is nothing in the charter which would call upon the other nations in NATO to intervene if one member of NATO attacks another member. He did point out that there might be a reevaluation necessary if Russia were drawn into this, because at that point Russia had said if the Turks moved against the Greeks they would come in. Rather than criticize the President, it seems to me everybody ought to be saying, "Well, if he stopped the war between two of the NATO allies, he ought to be congratulated." That is the way I feel about it, Mr. Speaker.

THANKS, MR. PRESIDENT, FOR RAISING THE INTEREST RATE ON SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely gratified when I was informed by the White House that President Johnson had instructed the Secretary of the Treasury to take the steps necessary to increase the interest rate paid on U.S. savings bonds.

I had myself requested the President to make just such a move. It was demonstrable that the low rate of interest paid to those patriotic Americans—most of them in the middle and lower income brackets—who have put their savings in U.S. savings bonds was unfair. At the same time, the rate discouraged further investment in these bonds, which have in the past done so much to counter inflation.

With unanimous consent, I would like to include a copy of my letter to the President, along with a copy of President Johnson's letter to Secretary Fowler. I cite this, Mr. Speaker, as a further example of the enlightened leadership we are receiving from the White House, which has shown itself so consistently sensitive to the needs of the average American, as well as to the enlightened best interests of the Nation.

JANUARY 18, 1966.

Hon. HENRY H. FOWLER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Over the years one of the strongest links between this Government and its citizenry has been the U.S. savings bond program. During the critical days before our entry into World War II, this program has been, for the Government, a vital source of noninflationary financing for needed Government programs. For the public it has provided a matchless means for accumulating savings with absolute safety and an attractive rate of return. A successful savings bond program is of particular urgency at this time facing as we do a firm commitment to the defense of freedom in Vietnam and a strongly rising economy at home. We must not and will not at this juncture permit our strength to be sapped by inflation.

Today, above all, is a time for all America to rededicate themselves to the spirit that animated the minutemen of Concord, who serve as the symbol of the savings bond program. For today, as at the founding of our Nation, it is freedom that is again at stake. Not all of us are called upon to fight in the jungle of Vietnam, but while our men are there in the frontlines of a distant land none of us can remain aloof on the sidelines. We must all do our share in every way we can to support our men in Vietnam. One sure way is open to all Americans through the savings bond program.

On several occasions during the postwar period it has been necessary to improve the rate of return on savings bonds in view of the higher rates available to many savers in various private savings accounts. The last change was made in 1959. To have failed to make those adjustments would have been a disservice both to the Government and to the public at large, risking inflationary dangers, complicating the task of managing our Government finances, and depriving millions of small savers of a reasonable rate of return for their funds entrusted to the Government.

We are again at a point where rates available on a variety of alternative forms of savings have moved above the rate now paid on U.S. savings bonds. At the same time we are at a point where maximum savings are vital to our national welfare, indeed to our national future. Another increase in the rate on those bonds is now timely.

In order to sustain and enlarge the vital role of the savings bond program I therefore direct you to set in motion the necessary machinery for raising the interest rate on these bonds as of the earliest feasible date. Please submit to me as soon as possible your specific recommendations.

As in any past rate changes, I would like you to make appropriate rate adjustments on outstanding savings bonds as well so that no current bondholder need cash in his current holdings in order to gain the advantage of the attractive new rate and no prospective buyer need feel that he should delay his purchase to await the higher rate.

Sincerely yours,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 11, 1966.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You no doubt are aware of the fact that the Treasury Department continues to pay just 3¾ percent interest on U.S. savings bonds. This is substantially below the return currently being given by commercial banks, other financial institutions and on most forms of commercial investment.

I do not think that these low rates are fair to savings bonds owners, most of whom are in the lower and middle income brackets. I think I speak for many of my constituents, to whom these bonds are the only savings, in asking for a more equitable return.

The recent decline in savings bond purchases suggests that the public has become aware of this inadequacy. Citizens who would prefer to invest their money with the Government, for patriotic or other reasons, are now dissuaded from doing so. Perhaps this money is not being saved at all and is contributing to inflation.

I believe that it is within your power to raise the interest rate as high as 4¼ percent. I think that your financial advisers would agree with me that some increase is warranted. I respectfully request that you give consideration to raising the interest rate on U.S. savings bonds to make them reasonably competitive with the return given for commercial deposits.

With warm regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

FIRST WOMAN PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA, MRS. INDIRA GANDHI

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, and in so doing I feel fully an inch taller, as I join the women of the world in expressing the great pride we all feel in the election yesterday of Mrs. Indira Gandhi as Prime Minister of India.

It would have been a tremendous feat had she been elected by the people of her country, but in my estimation to have been chosen by secret ballot by her own political peers in the Parliament of her country is an even more astounding tribute to her greatness and to her abilities as a leader. Mrs. Gandhi now heads the largest democracy in the world, and as the only woman head of government, she assumed her position with a strong statement for the cause of peace in these troubled times.

In the grave crises, both domestic and foreign, which India faces today, let no one doubt that Mrs. Gandhi's choice was because her political party and her colleagues in the Parliament believed that she could best serve to deliver her nation from these crises to a time of equanimity. India is one of the great nations of the world, and I have every confidence and trust that Mrs. Gandhi's portrayal of the hopes and aspirations of her people will contribute greatly to our own goals for a world united in the cause of peace.

Mrs. Gandhi has had a long and distinguished career as a public servant and political figure in India. She was born in Allahabad on November 19, 1917, the daughter of the late Prime Minister Pandit Nehru.

She was educated in India and Switzerland and at Oxford University. In March of 1942, she married Feroze Gandhi, an editor, publisher, and legislator with a long and distinguished career in his own right.

Among Mrs. Gandhi's many public causes, she was an early leader in India's drive for independence. She joined the Indian National Congress in 1938, and was imprisoned for 13 months in 1942–43 for her work in the independence movement. She has served on numerous committees and organizations to help the children and youth of India and represented India as a member of the UNESCO Executive Board.

Since 1964, Mrs. Gandhi served as Minister for Information and Broadcasting. After beginning her political career as a Member of the Indian National Congress in 1938, she subsequently served as a member of the Central Election Committee, President of the Women's Department of the All-India Congress Committee in 1955, and rose to the Presidency of the All-India Congress Party in 1959.

It is highly fitting, Mr. Speaker, that a woman with such an impressive record of accomplishments and devotion to her country and people should now be named to the highest office in her land. I join well-wishers the world over in extending to Mrs. Gandhi my sincere congratulations for the honor bestowed upon her as well as my warmest wishes for continued success in her dedicated service to her country and to the welfare of people everywhere.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MINK. I yield certainly to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to subscribe to the very fine statement that the gentlewoman from Hawaii has made on a most significant event in the history of a great country.

Mrs. MINK. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana very much.

CONSERVATION WORK PROVIDES WATER, PROSPERITY TO COMMUNITY

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has for a long time recognized that conservation and development of soil and water resources are important links in the economic growth and welfare of both rural and urban communities. It is encouraging to note the impressive results obtained where communities are developing the challenging opportunities the Congress has offered in recent resource legislation.

Mercer County in my congressional district in West Virginia is a good example. With the stimulation of broadened help provided by the Congress, local sponsors are developing public recreation and municipal water supply in addition to flood prevention in one of the two watershed projects in the area. They have been able to look ahead and to use valuable sites for multiple purposes that are boosting present economy and will serve generations to come.

Princeton—where water shortages required hauling water a few years ago—now is assured an adequate supply for economic expansion. Princeton received one of the first watershed project loans provided in support of the Appalachia program. The loan, for $1 million, will help pay for the municipal water storage planned in the watershed project and for a pumping plant and pipeline. New sewerage systems in Green Valley and on the outskirts of Princeton have also resulted from the watershed projects.

Some 1,500 acres of land at Princeton—protected from flood damages as a result of the projects—have opened up for development. A new $1 million industrial plant already completed employs over 300 people. Plans for other plants, a hospital, and a vocational school are actively underway.

Public recreation facilities in one of the projects will attract thousands of tourists to the area. The lakes created by both projects also offer opportunities to private owners to develop water-based recreation as a new source of income.

In other counties in my congressional district preliminary investigations are being completed in four watershed projects, two of which are making use of new features provided in recent legislation. One will include recreation. The other was made feasible by the recently increased limitation of floodwater detention reservoirs in small watershed projects from 5,000 to 12,000 acre-feet.

Interested citizens of Mercer and Summers Counties, W. Va., have joined with Tazewell, Bland, and Giles Counties in Virginia to initiate a resource conservation and development project that will focus attention on the full development of land and water resources.

All of these activities show the intense desire of local communities to help themselves. If they know what help is available, they will find ways to develop the economic potential of their natural resources. That is one of the reasons why last November I called together rural and urban leaders in my congressional district and representatives from Federal agencies to discuss and point out opportunities offered not only in conservation but other recent Federal legislation.

I salute the people of my congressional district and those across the Nation who are alive to these opportunities and who are overcoming obstacles to the well-being and growth of their community.

McCARTHY PROPOSES ESCALATION IN WAR ON WATER POLLUTION, REIMBURSEMENT TO STATES LIKE NEW YORK WHICH "PREFINANCE" FEDERAL SHARE OF CLEAN WATER EFFORT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, 1965, when we opened the door and invited each of the United States to participate in the fight against water pollution, we took a great stride in winning the battle. The bill we passed that day and which is now law provides that if a State will finance 30 percent of the cost of a waste treatment plant the Federal Government will lift the ceiling on the Federal share to a matching 30 percent. That means that the locality will have to provide only 40 percent of the total cost.

The people of the State of New York have accepted this challenge and have proved their concern over water conditions. Among all the propositions submitted to them on November 2, 1965, the proposal for a $1 billion bond issue to attack water pollution was the only one receiving overwhelming endorsement. Secretary Udall, when advised of the action of the people of New York, urged other States to follow suit.

The New York plan provides that the State will finance 30 percent of the cost of a pollution-abating waste treatment plant and prefinance the 30-percent Federal share.

I say "prefinance" because the State hopes to recoup the second 30 percent from Washington, but we are not now providing sufficient funds. Of the $150 million in Federal funds now earmarked for this vital purpose, New York's share is a scant $10 million. This is a veritable drop in the bucket.

As the law now stands, New York cannot claim the 30-percent Federal share it prefinances. I believe this neither fair nor just; nor is such an approach likely to inspire more States to join with the localities and the Federal Government in the war on water pollution.

So I am today introducing legislation that would permit the States to recapture half the funds on waste treatment projects where they provide 60 percent.

The legislation also substantially boosts the amount of Federal funds annually available to $900 million. At the present $150 million a year level, we just are not going to get this job done in time. Time is a vital factor for the galloping forces of decay are fast killing lakes like Lake Erie. If we do not act promptly on many of our lakes, it may be too late. They will be dead.

It has been estimated that it is going to cost $25 billion just to halt the present pollution of the Great Lakes. This is a huge job in itself. We obviously need to make a much bigger Federal commitment.

An additional factor of importance here is that up until enactment of the 1965 act, all funds for pollution-abating facilities were earmarked for the States on a population-plus-income formula that tended to discriminate against the larger States. On the fact that pollution occurs in an almost exact ratio with the number of people in a given area, we added an amendment that provides that any funds over $100 million a year will be allocated to the States on a strict population formula. This means that $800 million of the $900 million provided under my proposed legislation, would be allotted to the States on a straight population basis.

THE PRESIDENT'S APPOINTMENT OF JACK HOOD VAUGHN AS HEAD OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I noted with great interest the President's appointment of Jack Hood Vaughn as head of the Peace Corps. Mr. Vaughn certainly seems to be an ideal choice for this critical and necessary undertaking. The Peace Corps, unlike many of the staid and formalized agencies of our Government, still is new enough and young enough to need new and young ideals and to apply them with vigor and imagination.

These very words would seem uniquely descriptive of the splendid work performed by Mr. Vaughn in his position as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs.

In a period when understanding and cooperation between the republics of our Western Hemisphere have been desperately needed and when external and internal events could have strained our hemispheric relations fatally, Mr. Vaughn has demonstrated well the capacity to get understanding by the art of cultivating understanding of the problems of the other American states. He has been in the truest sense of that Latin American term, simpatico. He has shown a cultivated awareness of the axiom so often spoken by our late Speaker, Mr. Rayburn: "The way to have a friend is to be a friend."

These specific qualities and skills which he brought to the delicate job of promoting better relations within the hemisphere seem to be the very ones most needed in the critical and important role to which he now has been assigned. Many of us in the Congress heartily applaud his selection to this post, and I know that all of us in the Congress join in wishing him well as he assumes these duties.

ELECTION OF MADAM INDIRA GANDHI AS PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to congratulate the great nation of India upon the election of Madam Gandhi as Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the prayers and best wishes of all the world are with Madam Gandhi and India.

INTERNATIONAL PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday one of our colleagues in the other body, the distinguished senior Senator from

Rhode Island, introduced a resolution before that body which expressly registers the support of the U.S. Senate for President Johnson's "serious and urgent efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons."

Mr. Speaker, 53 Members of the other body, members of both parties and from every section of our Nation, joined the Senator as cosponsors of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the action of my colleague in the other body in his efforts to arrest the alarming spread of nuclear weapons and to remove the gravest threat to world peace.

Mr. Speaker, in his speech introducing his resolution, the Senator from Rhode Island accepted a fact all persons sincerely concerned with world peace have long known: there can be no meaningful nuclear ban or other control of armaments without the inclusion of China. As he said:

> So wherever there is a disarmament conference, wherever peace is the topic, let China be invited to come.

Of course, he is right; and any nuclear ban treaty executed without the inclusion of Red China would, in the long run, be useless.

Mr. Speaker, the alarming facts are these: Nuclear bomb technology is now widely known and largely accessible to all nations, large and small. It is only a matter of time before any nation determined to produce the means of mass annihilation can do so.

It is time we stop looking the other way and burying our head in the sand. It is time we face these alarming facts.

All nations must be included in a ban on the proliferation of nuclear weapons if there is to be at least a modicum of safety.

Mr. Speaker, I think the peoples of this earth desire that we move in this direction.

PROPOSED NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY AGENCY

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, last October 12 I said on the floor of this House:

> Congress should designate the motor vehicle accident as public enemy No. 1 and should mobilize all of the capabilities of our Federal Government to reduce the staggering losses of life and property on our Nation's roads and highways.

Since then I have had 3 months in which to talk to my constituents, to read the literature on the subject, and to read the mounting casualty lists which have been reported daily in my district, in my State of Georgia, and throughout the Nation.

The response to my appeal has been impressive. Citizens in my district and across America have written me that we have been negligent, that we have been overdue, and that we have been playing instead of working at the problem.

Aided by my staff and by the Fourth District Citizens Panel for Public Safety, I have decided, after intensive study, that we are taking pedestrian approaches to a high speed problem.

Therefore, on February 1, 1966, I intend to introduce a bill to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency in order to provide national leadership to attack what has indeed become a national scandal—one that cannot be successfully attacked by any one State or group of States no matter how diligently they try.

I propose that this Agency carry out research and then vigorously apply the fruits of this research as well as existing knowledge to improve safety on the Nation's traffic arteries.

I propose that there be an Administrator appointed by the President and approved by the Senate and that the office be comparable in status to that of the Federal Aviation Administrator.

I propose that there be a National Safety Testing Center which can become the focal point of all public and private study of the many complex elements which enter into a traffic accident.

I propose that the National Traffic Safety Agency have as its goal the significant reduction in the loss of life and property throughout the Nation resulting from traffic accidents.

I propose that it seek to do this through unprecedented leadership and action designed to achieve a uniform traffic environment—uniform rules of the road, much more adequate standards of safety in the manufacture of new vehicles and inspection of vehicles in use, much better definition of fitness to drive, and perhaps most important of all, uniform physical driving conditions.

This Agency would not seek to supplant existing public and private safety agencies at the National, State, or local level, but would provide aggressive leadership to achieve a concert of action.

Individual States cannot legislate many safety features into automobiles without creating chaos in the industry. The case for national safety standards is apparent.

Individual States cannot assure the presence of properly licensed drivers on their roadways unless there are national standards.

Individual States cannot design and build uniform highways, particularly uniform, clear, and understandable traffic markings and signals, unless there are national standards.

The automobile industry has recently emphasized traffic safety but it can handle only part of the problem—it has nothing to do with achieving uniform rules of the road or a uniform physical environment.

The handwriting is unmistakably on the wall. We either live together more safely through the leadership a National Traffic Safety Agency could give us or we die separately in traffic accidents which indiscriminately kill nearly 50,000 Americans, injure 3 million, and destroy $8 billion of our national wealth annually.

I invite cosponsorship of this legislation by all Members of the House who agree with the sentiments expressed in this statement.

I extend my remarks by including an editorial published on January 12, 1966, by the Geneva, N.Y., Times, which captures the spirit of what I am trying to say:

SO LARGE IT'S INVISIBLE

> By any test of sanity the top priority item on the agenda of the reconvening Congress, after national defense, should be an investigation into the carnage on our highways.
>
> This is, in fact, a matter of national defense—defense against an internal enemy which:
>
> Killed more Americans (1,780) in the 10-day span that included Christmas and New York's than have been lost in all the years of our engagement in Vietnam.
>
> Claimed 720 lives over the Christmas weekend alone, a record for any holiday of any duration.
>
> Set a new highwater mark of 47,000 deaths in the 1 year of 1965, 13,000 more than the battlefield total in the 3 years of the Korean war.
>
> One Congressman, indeed, has "blood in his eye" concerning this subject. "No death on the battlefields is more agonizing than the death of a loved one on the highway," said Representative JAMES A. MACKAY, of Georgia, the other day as he announced that he plans to introduce a bill to create a national traffic safety administration.
>
> We have a Federal Aviation Agency which employs 47,000 persons to handle the job of regulating traffic on the Nation's airways, he noted, yet "only 12 percent of the American population flies each year and only 40 percent has ever been in an airplane."
>
> MACKAY's projected administration would be a superagency designed to provide leadership for and coordinate the activities of 16 existing Federal agencies and some 45 private groups involved in traffic safety.
>
> He also proposes a national testing center to establish standards on such items of auto equipment as tires, lights, brakes, and horsepower, the last of which, he says "is now so far ahead of roads that it almost assures accidents."
>
> The Congressman's bill is undoubtedly not the best of all possible approaches to the problem but it seems to be the only proposal around. It must not be shoved into some corner pigeonhole under the pressure of more urgent business.
>
> Not many things are more urgent than the wiping out of a population the size of Newport, R.I., every 12 months.

THE NEW MATH AND THE GUERRILLA WAR

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I began a discussion of some studies by a resident in my district of the new mathematics and international affairs and their possible relation to each other. I should like to continue this and discuss the new math and the guerrilla war.

In the country of Pandemania there were 200 million people. The nation became involved in what most people called a "guerrilla war." The first axiom of "guerrilla warfare" is that to wage one successfully you should outnumber the guerrillas 10 or 12 to 1. Pandemania's adversary in guerrilla warfare had a population of 700 million. However, the secretary of defense of Pandemania was both clever and resourceful and adhered to first principles fervently—see lesson 1.

He declared that with the use of mechanization, automation, mobility, and increased firepower, his country's armed forces could control guerrillas with an advantage of only 5 to 1. Therefore while it would be ridiculous to expect a country of 200 million to outnumber 700 million guerrillas, 12 to 1 or 10 to 1—700 million will not divide into 200 million 12 times, or 10 times either for that matter.

Now with superior combat readiness, Pandemania only needs a 5-to-1 numerical superiority over the guerrillas. We all know that 5 times 700 million is 3,500 million, and I have told you Pandemania has 200 million people. Now for your first problem you are to write out and explain:

First, how and why 200 million is more than 3,500 million; second, how can you divide 700 million into 200 million so that it goes 5 times. This is called the new math.

HALTING THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message, the President outlined five lines of policy which the United States has followed in foreign affairs. He said:

> The first principle is strength.

Then he declared:

> A second principle of policy is the effort to control, and to reduce, and to ultimately eliminate the modern engines of destruction. We will vigorously pursue existing proposals—and seek new ones—to control arms—and to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

President Johnson recognizes the perils of the threat of nuclear weapons and is to be commended for his determination to pursue an agreement to prevent further nuclear proliferation.

Yesterday, in the other body, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Senator PASTORE, introduced a resolution, sponsored by 51 Senators, in support of the President's efforts to negotiate international agreements on the question of nuclear proliferation. I want to add my voice in congratulating Senator PASTORE for his leadership in the effort to halt the spread of nuclear weapons—which is a continuation of the important role he played in the achievement of the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

Today I am introducing in the House a similar resolution.

Mr. Speaker, no more important task confronts the Nation than achieving disarmament under effective international control. We have seen the establishment of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the limited test ban treaty. Unfortunately, these and other steps toward peace have not been sufficient. We live in an age in which nation-states have the capacity to destroy civilization as we know it. In President Kennedy's eloquent words, we live in a world in which "every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles."

Mr. Speaker, time is running out. President Johnson has stated:

> The time to halt nuclear spread is before its contagion takes root.

The adoption of these resolutions by the Congress will serve to strengthen the position of the United States when the 18-nation Disarmament Conference reconvenes in Geneva.

The text of the resolution follows:

H. RES. 676

Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons

Whereas the spread of nuclear weapons constitutes a grave threat to the security and peace of all nations; and

Whereas the knowledge and ability to design and manufacture nuclear weapons is becoming more universally known; and

Whereas the danger of nuclear war becomes greater as additional nations achieve independent nuclear weapon capability; and

Whereas it is the policy of the United States, as stated by President Johnson, "to seek agreements that will limit the perilous spread of nuclear weapons, and make it possible for all countries to refrain without fear from entering the nuclear arms race": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives commends the President's serious and urgent efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons and supports the principle of additional efforts by the President which are appropriate and necessary in the interest of peace for the solution of nuclear proliferation problems.

COMMENDATION OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S EFFORTS TO LIMIT THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to place before this House a resolution commending President Johnson's efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons.

I am joining with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, the Honorable JOHN PASTORE, who yesterday introduced a similar resolution in the Senate. At the present moment the eyes of the Nation are focused on the mortal danger of Vietnam. But even if we were to achieve peace in Vietnam today, mankind is not safe. The lexicon of our age has introduced a fearful word—"proliferation." The dictionaries tell us this word means the bearing of offspring—the spreading of new cells. In our time it has a fearful connotation—nuclear proliferation. By this we mean the spread of atomic capability beyond the five nations that already possess it. This problem must be faced today. To emphasize this point President Johnson pointed out in his state of the Union message that nuclear control is the number two principle in shaping the decisions and destiny of this country in the 20th century.

H. RES. 672

Whereas the spread of nuclear weapons constitute a grave threat to the security and peace of all nations; and

Whereas the knowledge and ability to design and manufacture nuclear weapons is becoming more universally known; and

Whereas the danger of nuclear war becomes greater as additional nations achieve independent nuclear weapon capability; and

Whereas it is the policy of the United States, as stated by President Johnson, "to seek agreements that will limit the perilous spread of nuclear weapons, and make it possible for all countries to refrain without fear from entering the nuclear arms race": Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House commends the President's serious and urgent efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons and supports the principle of additional efforts by the President which are appropriate and necessary in the interest of peace for the solution of nuclear proliferation problems.

IN SUPPORT OF THEIR COUNTRY

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, during the past year the question of Vietnam has, in all its aspects, been first in the press, and first in our minds. Regrettably, one of the aspects that has been given maximum coverage has been the anti-United States, anti-Vietnam demonstrations. But even more regrettable is the fact that while these events have been so widely publicized, thousands of Americans organizing projects to the service of our Nation and the support of our troops, have gone virtually unnoticed.

Over the next several days I intend to tell the stories of some of these dedicated groups and individuals from my own State of Georgia, feeling that the Congress and the Nation should know of these fine people and the work that they are doing in support of their country.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert in the RECORD a resolution by American Legion Post No. 3, Department of Georgia:

RESOLUTION BY AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA, JOSEPH N. NEEL, JR., POST NO. 3

Whereas the regular membership of the Joseph N. Neel, Jr., American Legion Post No. 3, Department of Georgia duly convened this 26th day of October 1965; and

Whereas the members of Joseph N. Neel, Jr., Post No. 3, have ever been alert to the internal forces who endanger the freedom of our country, the United States of America; and

Whereas recent demonstrations by various individuals, certain college groups, and others protesting our country's participation in the war in Vietnam, causing the burning of draft cards and creating an international image of refutation of our country's foreign policy thereby doubly jeopardizing our buddies in combat through an unnecessary prolongation of enemy resistance and giving moral aid and comfort to our enemies; and

Whereas we the members of the American Legion Joseph N. Neel, Jr., Post No. 3 abhor these demonstrations that so flagrantly violate paragraphs four and six of the preamble to the Constitution: be it hereby

Resolved, That this membership body goes on record rejecting said demonstrations and renouncing any participation in such activities that are so critically detrimental to the security of our country; and let it be further

Resolved, That we the members of the executive committee individually and collectively as attested by signature endorse the pursuit of our country's engagement in the war in Vietnam until it has reached a successful conclusion, compatible with the honor and the dignity of our country and the precepts enumerated in the preamble to the Constitution of the American Legion; and that the adjutant of Post No. 3 be duly instructed to forward appropriate copies of this resolution to each district commander, State commander, and editor of American Legion Georgia Legionnaire; all U.S. Congressmen and Senators from Georgia, the chairman of the National Americanism Commission for the American Legion, and others.

Unanimously adopted October 26, 1965 at regular post meeting of Joseph N. Neel, Jr., Post No. 3, American Legion, Department of Georgia.

J. CLYDE WILKES,
Post Commander.
LEON G. MYERS,
Post Adjutant.

Unanimously adopted December 5, 1965 by the Sixth District at Villa Rica, Ga.

WILLIAM L. BAXTER,
District Commander.
WILSON H. BIRD,
District Adjutant.

COMMENDATION OF PRESIDENT ON HIS APPOINTMENT OF JACK HOOD VAUGHN AS DIRECTOR OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the President on his appointment of Jack Hood Vaughn as Director of the Peace Corps. This man has done a great job in the Alliance for Progress. Vaughn is a forthright ex-boxer who is at home as much in the fields and in the jungles of Latin America as he is in the diplomatic drawing rooms. He is a commonsense diplomat of a type that we need more of.

I understand that Lincoln Gordon will be Vaughn's replacement at the State Department. He is also an extraordinary gentleman with wide understanding and an excellent background in Latin American affairs. I wish to commend the President on two very excellent choices.

COMMENDATION OF INDIA ON APPOINTMENT OF MRS. GANDHI AS PRIME MINISTER

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a very great pleasure and privilege for me to commend the great country of India for having the courage to break all precedent and have a woman as Prime Minister. We were all interested, some years ago, when India broke precedent and put Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit in as President of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Indian women are serving their country with great wisdom, with toleration, with compassion, and with understanding. They have been doing magnificent jobs all down the line. Now to have this recognition of the contribution that they are able to make to the world as well as to their own country is something that every woman everywhere can be very proud of.

Mrs. Gandhi is an extraordinarily fine person and a most able and charming woman.

We women Members of the House send her our felicitations, our congratulations, and hope for her a deeply satisfying experience. That her country will profit we are certain.

AN INVESTMENT IN HUMAN TALENT, DEMOCRACY

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, in light of the increased concern felt in this House and throughout the Nation about the war in Vietnam, I believe it is proper and necessary that I again urge adoption of a bill—H.R. 7034—I introduced April 1, 1965.

My GI cold war bill would take up where the GI bills of World War II and the Korean conflict ended.

It would continue benefits to members of our Armed Forces who have served from January 31, 1965, to July 1, 1967, when the present draft law ends.

The profits of the original GI bills to veterans and to the Nation, it seems to me, are now obvious and great.

I know few Americans who question the value of the programs. It is logical to continue such a program. It would provide a proper and just benefit to veterans and an immense profit to the Nation by providing a better educated public.

I recall the prophetic message in 1947 of the President's Commission on Education about GI bill values:

> Education is an investment, not a cost. It is an investment in free men.
>
> It is an investment in social welfare, better living standards, better health, and less crime. It is an investment in higher production, increased income, and great efficiency in agriculture, industry and government.
>
> It is an investment in a bulwark against garbled information, half truths, and untruths; against ignorance and intolerance. It is an investment in human talent, better human relationships, democracy and peace.

The GI bill has brought the Nation measureless benefits.

Some of the benefits that have been measured, however, were noted a year and a half ago on the 20th anniversary of the GI bill or Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944.

For a cost of $14.5 billion, 7.8 million veterans received educational benefits, and, according to Census Bureau estimates, those veterans now are paying an extra $1 billion a year in Federal income taxes. The added earnings of the veterans, of course, is directly traceable to their education made possible by the GI bill.

Veterans' Administration statistics show the GI bill helped produce 460,000 engineers, 360,000 teachers, 130,000 doctors and dentists, and 150,000 scientists.

A GI bill also serves notice that this Government offers something of lifelong value to the citizen who carries out an obligation to serve his country—whether in hot or cold war—and certainly Vietnam is a very hot war.

If my bill is enacted, it would serve notice to young people entering the service that this Government honors their commitment to the Nation at a time when a few of their contemporaries loudly claim they are unwilling to give up part of their lives to serve in this Nation's armed services.

A new GI bill also would offer a corrective medicine for the jobless illness which is at the center of so many of our civil rights problems.

Formal education and vocational training, which could be provided for veterans through my bill, is vital for men seeking jobs in this time of technological and scientific advance.

It has always seemed to me that it is wiser to spend national funds to help a man to an education than to give him a relief check later, when, because he is untrained or uneducated, he cannot get a job.

Many respected groups endorse enactment of a GI cold war bill. In my Cincinnati district, educators and labor leaders support the proposal. I also am pleased to note that just last week the press indicated my House colleague and Cincinnati fellow resident, Hon. DONALD CLANCY, now supports a GI cold war bill.

National organizations endorsing a GI cold war bill include the American Veterans Committee, the Fleet Reserve Association, American Federation of Teachers, National Association of Home Builders, National Education Association, Reserve Officers Association, and the American Association of Junior Colleges.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL POSITIONS IN THE OFFICES OF THE SPEAKER AND THE MINORITY LEADER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 669) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 669

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby created in the office of the Speaker an additional position the basic compensation of which shall be at a rate not to exceed $3,000 per annum.

(b) There is hereby created in the office of the minority leader an additional position the basic compensation of which shall be at a rate not to exceed $3,000 per annum.

(c) There shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, until otherwise provided by law, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this resolution.

(d) This resolution shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of adoption of this resolution.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 362)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

The White House,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1966.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sir: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1966. These appropriations, amounting to $12,760,719,000, are for the Department of Defense and for military and economic assistance primarily in support of our operations in southeast Asia. They are required to support our growing national activities in helping the people and Government of Vietnam as they face continuing aggression. I also transmit the necessary authorizing legislation.

I urge that Congress act promptly to provide these needed funds.

We are currently engaged in a major effort to open a road to a peaceful settlement. Whether the present effort is successful or not, our purpose of peace will be constant; we will continue to press on every door.

But until there is a response—and until the aggression ends—we must do all that is necessary to support our allies and our own fighting forces in Vietnam. That is the purpose of the present request.

The bulk of this request—$12.3 billion—is for a military appropriation. These funds will provide for the operations of our men in Vietnam and the weapons, ammunition, ports, and airfields which should be available to support them if the aggression continues.

We need about $4 billion of this amount for military expenditures such as ammunition and about $8 billion for items with a "long leadtime." Items with long leadtime (the time it takes the contractor to make the item once he receives the order) range from about a year for helicopters, to 14 to 18 months for jet aircraft like the A-4E "Sky Hawk" and the A-6A "Intruder," and up to 3 to 5 years for ships.

We hope the aggression will end; we must be prepared if it does not. This military appropriation request also includes about $200 million which will be applied to military assistance for the forces of South Vietnam and other allies fighting there. This method of appropriation will permit our commanders in Vietnam to simplify and expedite supply operations for all fighting forces there.

An additional sum of $415 million is requested for the Agency for International Development, again primarily for Vietnam. These economic appropriations are for import financing, for rural construction, for port expansion, for refugee relief and for development. They have an equal basic importance with our military effort itself. On the military side we do what aggression requires. On the economic and social side we work also for the true future of South Vietnam.

In the last 2 years, in repeated acts of authorization and appropriation, the Congress has provided continuing support for our national decision "to prevent further aggression" in southeast Asia. The quoted words come from the joint resolution of the Congress—Public Law 88-408—approved on August 10, 1964. It is in the letter and the spirit of the resolution that I request this supplementary appropriation. While that resolution remains in force, and until its obligations are discharged, we must persevere. I believe the resolution is right, and I believe the course we follow is necessary. I intend that those who must face danger and death as we follow that course shall be supported. I am confident that the Congress will agree.

This is an opportunity for us to demonstrate once again—to friend and foe alike—that there is no difference between one party and another or between the Congress and the executive branch when it comes to effective and sustained support of our fighting men and their allies. Whatever differences there are on other issues, we are as one in support of our men in Vietnam. As I said just 1 week ago, "Until peace comes, or if it does not come * * * we will give our fighting men what they must have: every gun, every dollar, and every decision—whatever the cost or whatever the challenge." And we will continue to help the people of South Vietnam and our allies in resisting aggression and in protecting the independence of that beleaguered country.

Sincerely,

Lyndon B. Johnson.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, it was well known in Congress last year that we did not appropriate fully adequate funds to finance the war in Vietnam for the full period of this current fiscal year 1966. For example, we have called into service many additional men, but up to date we have not provided pay for them. In addition, the rate of expenditure of ammunition and weapons of war has been such that a very considerable additional amount is needed to replenish stocks and provide for current rates of usage. I feel certain that these matters have been carefully reviewed by the Defense Department and by the Bureau of the Budget, and today we are presented with this request for additional funds for the cost of continuing to fight the war in Vietnam.

We are all aware of the fact that the major effort now is to bring this war to a conclusion. This has been the objective all along. Our objective has been to bring the war to a successful and honorable conclusion from the standpoint of the United States and the South Vietnamese people.

I for one heartily support the President's effort to bring about peace in southeast Asia. I believe the great rank and file of the American people share that view. However, while we are striving for peace, we must not be derelict in our duty to carry forward the program for military victory if that is the only recourse in Vietnam.

So, today we have this request for some $13 billion for the prosecution of the war in Vietnam. For this legislation to become effective, action will be required, of course, by the Committee on Appropriations, but before it is in order for us to act there must be certain additional authorizations from certain legislative committees of the House and Senate. In the House, the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs must first bring in the legislative authorizations.

I want to say to the Congress and to the President and to the Secretary of Defense, and to the whole wide world, that in my opinion Congress is ready to act and to act as quickly and as reasonably and as effectively as possible in this important matter. This can and should be done not only to provide the funds and weapons needed but also to show the world that we stand united as a people, Democrats and Republicans alike, on this issue of successfully prosecuting the war in Vietnam.

We on the Committee on Appropriations will move as promptly as possible. The Secretary of Defense is appearing before the appropriate committees of the other body tomorrow. I hope that he can appear before our committee as early next week as possible. I am sure that the other committees of the House will want to take action as soon as possible on this matter.

Mr. **BOW**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **MAHON**. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the gentleman from Texas in saying that whatever is necessary in Vietnam to achieve an honorable settlement of that war we will provide. I join with the gentleman in hoping that we may have early hearings on this supplemental request. I also urge, and I am sure that the gentleman agrees with me, that we must carefully consider each one of these appropriation bills which come up. We will give them everything that is needed to see that our men are properly armed and that our troops are supplied. However, it should not be taken for granted that we are going to hand it over without full and complete hearings. I agree with what the President has said, that there is no difference between one party and the other in the desire that we have a proper settlement in Vietnam or that our troops be properly armed.

May I ask the gentleman from Texas how soon we may expect to have hearings on this appropriation request?

Mr. MAHON. We have asked the Secretary of Defense to appear on Wednesday of next week. We will do the preliminary work before then. The Secretary is scheduled to be before committees of the other body this week and will no doubt be appearing before the other authorizing committees in the near future. We hope he can appear before us on Wednesday of next week. We shall move as rapidly as possible. I share the gentleman's thought that we must carefully screen these requests. I have known all along, as the gentleman and the other Members of the House have known, that additional funds would be required. I would be surprised to find excessive funds in this budget submission, but we will certainly carefully examine it.

Mr. BOW. I agree with that. May I ask one further question? I think the gentleman covered this. Although we may have our hearings and complete our hearings on this supplemental budget request, we still must have an authorization from the legislative committee of the House, the Committee on Armed Services, before we can bring the bill to the floor of the House. Is that not so?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. We could bring this bill to the floor of the House very quickly except for the authorization, and we hope that the authorization requirements will be met very soon.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, who has worked for so many years on matters relating to the funding of our military requirements, as I also commend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I support the President's request for a supplemental appropriation, and I urge bipartisan passage of the necessary legislation.

Support of this request is support of the clear and continuing policy of Congress to seek a meaningful peace in southeast Asia.

The mission of our forces there—and of our allies—is to resist aggression, and to secure for the people of South Vietnam the right freely to decide their own future.

That mission requires military support—but not military support alone.

It requires that while we resist aggression, we continue to provide the social and economic support that will guarantee a more decent life for a valiant people.

No nation prizes peace more than we. But no nation knows better than we that peace is not to be had merely for the wishing.

Peace—like every other rational good—must be sought, and once found, must be nurtured and developed.

Our enemies' complaint with democracy is that it is fundamentally decadent and divisive—that in a crisis it is slow to act, and in a struggle unlikely to persevere.

Let our action here in this Chamber be our reply to this charge.

This is more than a mere appropriation. This is an indication of our Nation's resolve to see this struggle through to the only meaningful peace that is possible: a peace founded on a people's right to decide freely its own future; a peace buttressed with the blueprint of a better life for all.

Our fighting men, and their allies, in southeast Asia are giving a superb account of themselves. They are doing their duty—without thought of themselves, without cavil, and without complaint.

We here in the Congress can do no less.

Let this not be the time or the place to display a petty partisanship, or a querulous questioning of unrelated matters.

When this matter comes up for a vote, it will not be a vote for an administration, or for a political platform. It will be a vote for our Nation's servicemen and their brave allies.

It will be a vote to give them the tools they need.

It will be a vote to assure them that we stand foursquare behind them.

Mr. Speaker, it will be a vote, when the matter is before us, to unite our own dedication and resolve with theirs.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, we have 190,000-plus American fighting men in South Vietnam. We in the Congress do not propose to let them down. We shall promptly take whatever action is necessary to uphold their hand in the fight which they are waging for the security and safety of the people of the United States and of free peoples everywhere.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on the last remark of the gentleman from Texas concerning the 190,000-plus men in Vietnam, is it not true that there are many more thousands committed to this war, our sea forces and the forces of our neighboring countries, perhaps?

Mr. MAHON. We have many more aiding in the prosecution of this war in the Pacific and elsewhere. Wherever our Military Establishment exists they are in a way in support of this effort. Our commitments are very heavy, much heavier than the figure indicated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, do I gather from the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] that the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations is going to proceed to hearings before the authorizing committee is able to hold any hearings?

Mr. MAHON. The request for appropriations is before us and we are going to proceed as rapidly as we can. If we are able to do so before the authorizing committees have heard witnesses, we shall proceed to hear witnesses. However, we cannot take action until action has been taken by the other committees. I see no basic conflict here.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, do I understand that the gentleman will start holding hearings on this next week?

Mr. MAHON. We certainly hope to.

Mr. GROSS. I have no information that the authorizing committee has even scheduled hearings on this matter.

Mr. MAHON. I am sure that the appropriate committees of the Congress will schedule hearings. We have not had the budget request until now. I am sure the appropriate leaders of the Congress will make certain——

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I hope and trust that under the circumstances there will be no conflict over the availability of witnesses as between the authorizing committee and the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. I believe there would be no contest over the witnesses. If there is a conflict, the Committee on Appropriations would yield to the authorizing committee, because they must act first officially, in their capacity.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the President, the Secretary of Defense, and all others that all of us on our side fully realize the critical nature of our problem in Vietnam today, and that we shall to the maximum support a policy of meeting the challenge of communism in Vietnam or any other place.

I do feel, however, that it is vitally important that this request for funds, or subsequent requests for funds, should be fully justified before the authorizing committee.

My long association with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], on the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations convinces me that this subcommittee will fully investigate the justification for these funds, and

I am certain that when that subcommittee and the full committee, under his leadership, take affirmative action the House as a whole can believe that the matter has been fully investigated and that the decisions are in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman very much for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that in the Committee on Appropriations we will have involved the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes], the Subcommittee on Military Construction. Mr. Speaker, in connection with that, a very important portion of the request will be for military construction. Then there is the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid, headed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman]—they will get into this picture. However, we shall not act as subcommittees in the final analysis. but of course as the Committee on Appropriations of 50 Members.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Construction, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, many of us have seen firsthand the problems with which we are confronted in Vietnam. I believe that those who are fully acquainted with those problems realize the enormity of the task there and the essentiality of moving as rapidly as we can, in good conscience and in proper order, on the request for a supplemental appropriation.

We in Congress have a very serious responsibility. Our people in Vietnam have a tremendous task ahead of them. They are performing magnificently but against great difficulties. We thought after the buildup of troop strength last summer and last fall that we would be in a position to seize and hold the initiative; to begin the takeover of terrain in Communist hands. But we did not reckon with the fact that the Communists were going to be building up their forces, proportionately, just as fast as we. We are still confronted, in that unhappy land, with what is essentially a stalemate. We have the very definite and the very difficult problem of providing adequate encampments for our forces, of providing enough airfields for essential operations, and sufficient ports at which to land supplies that must be provided if we are going to win this war—win it we must—if the peace offensive fails. We are concerned not just with doubling our forces in Vietnam; we must provide them with food, supplies, weapons, and bases from which to operate. Delays can be exceedingly damaging.

Let me comment also on the fact that the Congress has been asked by the President to give urgent consideration to a supplemental request for funds to support the war in Vietnam.

I am sure that there can be no question or debate about the funds requested for the Department of Defense to provide the men and the equipment which are needed by our military forces. I am convinced that the relatively small amount of the supplemental request which is needed by the Agency for International Development also is important.

The AID program is aimed at establishing a stable Vietnamese Government which will have the support of the people.

It is not enough for the people of Vietnam to fight against something. All the people—farmers, schoolteachers, merchants, workers, mothers, students, police, soldiers, and government officials—must know that the long struggle is more than worth their suffering and personal tragedies.

The first essential in Vietnam is security against Vietcong terror and murder. The second is a unifying spirit or cause to which the people can subscribe, in the hamlets and in the cities. In this spirit, the villager and his local leaders and the security forces can cooperate to build expanding areas of progress and resistance to Communist appeals and threats. In this spirit, the people of the cities can cooperate with their government in devoting their talents and efforts to strengthening the nation against those who would destroy or enslave it.

With our help the Government of Vietnam, in Saigon and in the countryside, is struggling to carry out this constructive effort. Without our assistance, the entire effort would quickly fail.

The expanded scale of Communist aggression and our countering military response have added new dimensions to the task of our Agency for International Development in Vietnam. The funds requested for economic assistance to Vietnam are a small but vital part of our contribution to winning the peace in southeast Asia. I hope that the Congress will act quickly on all phases of the supplemental request.

On all of this I think there is absolutely no choice. I am sure the Congress is going to support that viewpoint and I am confident that we will move as rapidly as we properly can to appropriately provide the funds necessary for the job ahead.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his very timely remarks.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice in support of this bill, not only because I believe that the funds are needed, but also because it is necessary that America reaffirm her determination to fulfill the commitments she has so solemnly made. For while we wish peace and offer to southeast Asia the blessings of prosperity and plenty we must face up to the demands of this war that is being waged against us.

The challenge must be met. Prompt passage of this bill will enable us to continue to meet it. We have an obligation to those whom we have committed, or might commit, to combat, and we must fulfill our obligation to them. The will of our country is clear. Our vision of the world has been a peaceful one throughout our history. But our determination for justice, our desire that the oppressed be helped, our willingness to honor our word, all are also clear.

Appropriations amounting to $12,760,719,000 are required to achieve these aims. The bulk of this request, $12,345,719,000, is needed to support operations of our fighting forces. The remainder, $415 million is sought for the Agency for International Development, primarily for its operations in Vietnam. These include such items as commodity imports to combat inflation, refugee relief, nonmilitary construction such as port facilities and rural development, among other economic and political support for that hard beset nation.

The Congress in the last 2 years has repeatedly, by its authorizations and appropriations, given continuing support for the national decision to halt further aggression in southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this bill be passed with a minimum of delay.

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN PAUL CULLEN, FRIEND OF WISCONSIN VETERANS

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, by proclamation of the Governor, the State of Wisconsin will observe Thursday, January 20, 1966, as J. P. Cullen Day in tribute to an outstanding public servant and a true friend of all Wisconsin veterans.

The name of J. P. Cullen is familiar to every veteran in the State of Wisconsin who has received any type of Federal benefit through the Veterans' Administration. For more than 20 years, before his retirement last month, J. P. Cullen has been manager of the Veterans' Administration regional office in Milwaukee.

A native of Janesville, Wis., he held such varied jobs as newsboy in his hometown, farmhand in the Dakotas, and waterboy and timekeeper on his father's construction projects before attending the University of Notre Dame Law School. He took a Federal civil service examination just before graduation in 1922 and shortly after this, he began his distinguished 40-year career in the Federal service.

Mr. Cullen has worked for the Veterans' Bureau, or Veterans' Administration in Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, and California, and in the central office in Washington, D.C. With a background of claims work and contact service as well as a job as legal consultant with the Board of Veterans' Appeals in Washington, and as manager of the Chicago VA area office, Mr. Cullen was eminently well qualified for the managership of the Milwaukee regional office, a job he assumed in 1945, at the time the regional office was being separated from the Veterans' Center at Wood.

Under his leadership, the Milwaukee VARO has received several national honors, among them selection in 1960 of its adjudication division as the best in the country. Last year the loan guarantee division was given an outstanding rating as the leading division in the Midwest area, one of only four such honors awarded regional loan guarantee divisions.

Under the vocational rehabilitation and education division, outstanding relationships were enjoyed with business, industry, and the colleges, universities, and schools in Wisconsin, and the 218,000 veterans and orphans who have been educated or trained in our State.

Highly rated also has been the legal service, the contact service, and the medical and dental service—including a mental hygiene clinic—in which 10,000 veterans are receiving treatment yearly. A further indication of Mr. Cullen's leadership is the large number of graduates of the regional office who have moved up in the VA to positions of responsibility elsewhere.

A World War I veteran, Mr. Cullen is a member of the American Legion. He is a member of the Ohio Bar and the University of Notre Dame Law Alumni Association. He is a charter member of the Rock County Historical Societies, as well as the Milwaukee Civil War Round Table.

He has been keenly interested in military and local history and is a member of numerous historical societies and of the Milwaukee Civil War Centennial Group. While in Washington, Mr. Cullen attended George Washington University and completed his liberal arts work for B.A. and M.A. degrees in literature. He has enjoyed creative writing and in 1931, he published a book of short stories and essays titled "Hello Wisconsin."

The Wisconsin Department of Veterans Affairs has enjoyed his warm friendship and cooperation through the years. Wisconsin's veterans have reason to be proud of him as a native son and fellow veterans and grateful to him for his effectve and sympathetic administration of the VA program and benefits.

Mr. Cullen and his wife, Mary, live at 9035 Jackson Park Boulevard, Milwaukee, Wis. They have three children, two of whom are in college and one in the Navy.

A testimonial dinner honoring John Paul Cullen upon his retirement will be held January 20 at the Milwaukee Elks Club. In behalf of the thousands of Wisconsin veterans and their dependents who will be unable to attend this dinner, I take this means to express their thanks for a job well done. In my own behalf, may I express my deep appreciation for his unfailing cooperation, understanding, and assistance and extend best wishes for many happy retirement years.

H.R. 11899—HORTON BILL FOR SMALL BUSINESS TAX ADJUSTMENT BENEFITS

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to introduce H.R. 11899 on the opening day of this session to provide a program of tax adjustment benefits for small business firms.

My bill proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by allowing any person, firm, or corporation engaged in a trade or business a deduction for Federal income tax purposes for the additional investment made during a taxable year for capital expenditures for plant, equipment, trucks, and so forth, for inventories, and for accounts receivable.

This measure imposes a limitation on the amount which may be deducted during any one year; no more than $30,000, or an amount equal to 20 percent of the taxable income of the business enterprise, whichever is the lesser.

My proposal is designed to give tax relief primarily to the small business concern. Despite some tax reductions which were achieved by the Revenue Act of 1964, still more action is required if many of these small firms are going to be able to continue operations. They are caught in a cycle of spiraling costs which must be paid for men and materials. In addition, high taxes and severe price competition have further reduced their profit margin, until today their very survival is threatened.

Latest statistics published by the Department of Commerce on industrial and commercial failures tell us that more than 1,000 of such enterprises are failing each month. At an annual rate, this number exceeds 13,000.

If American small business firms are to survive, they must have adequate capital not only to replace old plant and equipment, but also to take advantage of the latest technological improvements and cost-cutting devices. With significant amounts of their capital tied up in inventories and in credit extended, there is little left over after taxes and other expenses have been paid to plow back into the business for replacement, modernization, or expansion of facilities and equipment.

The financial plight of the small businessman is further aggravated by the fact that he must rely almost completely on retained earnings as his primary source of capital. He is not in a strong enough financial position, as are his larger competitors who are able to borrow large sums of money on a short-term basis at favorable rates of interest. The small, struggling businessman has already incurred too much debt, and is not considered a good enough credit risk to attract additional necessary capital from outside sources.

I believe that the salutary effect which enactment of this bill will have on small business will indeed be reflected throughout our entire American economy. Expansion of operations by the business community will increase production, create more jobs, and produce higher incomes and profits. I believe that even the Federal Government will stand to benefit over the long run, and any initial loss in revenues which will accompany enactment of this legislation will soon be offset by higher tax revenues generated by a more prosperous economy.

Thus small business firms would have a greater chance to continue operations, and the trend toward selling out or merging with their larger competitors and toward increasing concentration of economic power would be halted.

We in the Congress must do all that we can to foster, encourage, and protect our system of free, private, competitive enterprise. I, as a member of the House Small Business Committee, ask my colleagues' support for H.R. 11899 which will work toward this objective and which will produce a stronger and more vigorous American economy.

TIME FOR A HOUSECLEANING AT THE OEO

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gurney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to do more than just talk about the mess at the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I am today introducing a resolution to set the brooms in motion for a thorough housecleaning in the poverty program, by establishing a select investigating committee.

For the $2.3 billion it has already cost them, the American people have a right to expect more than this national disgrace shot through with waste, mismanagement, and shoddy jockeying for political power. No Government program in recent memory has been so wasteful of the taxpayers' money, with so little benefit to those it was designed to help.

It is not only the taxpayer that has been sold a bill of goods, but the poverty stricken who have seen their hopes for help lost in the plush offices of highly paid party men.

There is no need to catalog the abuses—the newspapers have done this very well nearly every day since the program began.

But there is a need to do something about them.

The resolution I am introducing establishes a select committee to conduct a thorough and bipartisan investigation of the structure and operations of the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964. The committee would consist of nine members appointed by the Speaker of the House and the minority leader.

It is modeled after the successful committee which cleaned up the abuses in the administration of the cold war GI bill after World War II.

This committee is the first of three steps in obtaining a complete and impartial examination of the poverty war. The other two should be an independent audit of the use of the $2.3 billion which we have appropriated for the poverty war, and a management survey by a first-class consultant firm.

The President said in his state of the Union message a week ago tonight that his administration would "ruthlessly attack waste and inefficiency" making sure that "every dollar is spent with the thrift and with the commonsense which recognizes how hard the taxpayer worked in order to earn it."

There is no better place to start in attacking waste and inefficiency than the poverty war.

FAILURE TO HALT FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO VIETNAM

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Dickinson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, in recent days I, and some of my Republican colleagues, have voiced deepening concern about the failure of this administration to halt British and other free world shipping to North Vietnam and Cuba while participating fully in the British-led blockade of Rhodesia.

The Nation's liberal press and the press in my own district have taken up the cudgels on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us on both sides of the aisle here regret continued free world shipping which strengthens the Communist enemies attacking our boys in Vietnam and the British-led merchant fleet which had carried hundreds of cargoes of oil, wheat, and other necessities into Cuba to strengthen that Communist springboard in this hemisphere. For my part, I resent this.

The official figures show 7 to 15 British ships a month entered Haiphong during much of 1965 and I am sad to learn of the State Department's attempt to play down these shipments, which are both sizable and crucial. All such shipping must be eliminated at once.

In this connection, under unanimous consent, I introduce in the Record an article from a recent issue of the New York Herald Tribune and articles published in the Luverne Journal and the Troy Messenger in Alabama:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 13, 1965]

Wilson to Wilson

Prime Minister Wilson, addressing the British Commonwealth conference in Lagos, reported on the success of economic sanctions being taken against Rhodesia. It is due, in no small measure, to support from the United States.

Another Wilson, this one a Republican Congressman, and five Republican colleagues reported in Washington at the same time on the violations of our economic sanctions against Communist North Vietnam. These are due, in large measure, to Britain.

The British, with logic which in other circumstances might be regarded as amusing, may argue that Rhodesia and North Vietnam are not comparable. It is true, of course, that one is in Africa and the other is not; that one directly concerns Britain and the other not nearly so much.

But is also true that there is such a thing as reciprocity; of one ally, the beneficiary of considerable help, helping another in turn. There is, furthermore, a limit to American patience; and that limit has been exceeded in the case of British shipping both to North Vietnam and to Cuba.

[From the Luverne (Ala.) Journal & News, Dec. 20, 1965]

U.S. Interference

The United States has joined England in an oil embargo on southern Rhodesia. This is a most peculiar action on the part of the United States.

Maybe for England it is in order. Rhodesia is declaring its independence from Great Britain. It seems no one would question British retaliation, even to the point of more serious acts as an oil embargo.

But Rhodesia is not declaring independence from the United States. In fact, this Nation has been doing all it could in the last several years creating an independence status for African nations. Now they are scrapping Rhodesia, which is a complete turnabout in that respect.

The United States in this strange action, deciding with Britain because they claim Rhodesia's Prime Minister, Ian Smith, is a white supremacist. Rhodesia is the most developed of all southern African nations. White man's leadership has put it miles ahead of other nations in that continent, so it seems that in this respect at least there is white supremacy in fact. But even so, it is not understandable here what business it is of the United States to be concerned, while the Rhodesian Government declares its independence, practices segregation, advocates white supremacy, or anything else they want to do as long as they leave us alone.

To make this action even stranger, look at the billions upon billions of dollars the U.S. Government is spending fighting communism. Most of the African nations are pro-Communist, or are unable to determine the difference between communism and other idealists while at the same time Rhodesia has taken a completely different stand—they are anti-Communist.

Based on this, it seems the United States should be supporting Rhodesia; thank her for the help she is giving us in fighting communism, and let her tend to her own internal affairs. Our Government's present policy toward this nation is absolutely hypocritical.

[From the Troy (Ala.) Messenger, Dec. 12, 1965]

Puzzling Actions

It's strange indeed that we rushed to boycott the Republic of South Rhodesia when so requested by Great Britain but the British are yet to respond affirmatively to pleas from us that they stop doing business with Castro's Cuba and North Vietnam.

Hardly had the British suggested that we cease trade with the Rhodesians before we canceled sugar shipments then on the high seas. Quicker response wasn't possible. On the other hand, we've been waiting since 1963 for the British to honor a request that they stop exports to Cuba. In fact, the situation is worse than that indicates. Where exports were $6 million worth in 1963, last year they had increased to $27 million.

About half the ships taking materials and supplies into the ports of North Vietnam are British.

Great Britain, of course, isn't as concerned as we are with events in Cuba and whether missiles are launched from sites on that island. Neither are the British as deeply involved in Vietnam. Yet, what happens in either of these hot spots could ultimately affect the British. On the other hand, what happens between the Rhodesians and British is an internal matter and strictly none of our business.

This attitude toward Britain is puzzling, especially when one considers the fact the Rhodesians aren't shooting at us but the North Vietnamese are. But there are so many things to be puzzled over these days. For instance, there is the matter of reconciling the no-win policy in Vietnam with this message that the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur gave West Point cadets in 1962: "All through this welter of change and development, your mission remains fixed, determined, inviolable—it is to win our wars."

Ronald Reagan brought this up to date a few weeks ago when, in a speech in San Diego, Calif., he said: "If your sons are asked to fight and die for their country, they should be allowed to win."

RESOLUTION TO CREATE A SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE OPERATION OF THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ayres] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk, for appropriate referral, a resolution to create a select committee of the House, composed of nine Members appointed by the Speaker, to investigate all phases of the operation of the Economic Opportunity Act. It is my sincere hope that this resolution will have overwhelming bipartisan support.

This resolution is not intended to impede the war on poverty, but to help it. It is not offered as a political gesture, but as a commonsense step we can all support.

Fifteen years ago the GI bill of rights, one of the greatest and most productive pieces of legislation ever enacted by the Congress, was in deep trouble. Thousands of our veterans were being victimized by fly-by-night schools and training facilities and by mismanaged and incompetent training programs. The administration of the act by the Veterans' Administration also appeared to many to be loose and disorganized. This House moved quickly to discharge its obvious responsibility to America's service men and women. A select committee was authorized, and our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. Teague] was named chairman. During 1950 and 1951 the Teague committee investigated every aspect of the operation of the GI bill, including a thorough examination of the organization of the Veterans' Administration, with outstanding results. That select committee produced lasting benefits, which we appreciate all the more as we move toward consideration of a cold war GI bill.

My resolution calls for the same approach to the war on poverty that this House successfully adopted to clean up abuses and mismanagement in the GI bill.

Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty is in deep trouble. It is mired down in controversy, politics, rumors of scandal, and inept administration. It is tangled up in an administrative jungle of overlapping responsibilities and duplication of effort. It is under divided and conflicting investigation by two committees of the House, each of which is overburdened with other responsibilities. Nearly $2½ billion have been appropriated to fight this domestic war with precious little tangible evidence that many poor people have been helped.

Vice President HUMPHREY recently stated that the war on poverty should be stepped up by appropriating even more money. A thorough investigation by Congress would do more to improve this program than all the billions we could appropriate. Any sensible person wants to know what he is getting for his money before he spends it.

President Johnson asked whether the Congress, in considering the conflicting needs of domestic programs and foreign conflicts, would sacrifice the poor. My answer is that the poor are being sacrificed by a mismanaged war on poverty which arouses hopes and expectations it cannot fulfill. The poor are being made the victims of the war on poverty as it is now waged. We have a clear responsibility to assure that the faults and abuses of the war on poverty are corrected. We have an inescapable obligation to make certain that there is an effective, intelligent, and coordinated Federal effort to help people escape from poverty.

The President has himself voiced similar concerns, most recently in his state of the Union message. His long-delayed action to limit the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to one job is a step in the right direction. I hope he will support this resolution as a necessary step toward putting the war on poverty on the right track. But the Congress has its own responsibilities as the legislative branch of Government, and a thorough, objective and bipartisan examination of the war on poverty is urgently needed to carry out our responsibility.

IMPROVING POSTAL SERVICE AT EXPENSE OF RURAL AMERICA

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, in suggestions for needed improvements in the U.S. postal service, why has rural America again been bypassed? This is the question I have posed to the President and the Postmaster General in a letter and is prompted by the President's endorsement of the Postmaster General's recommendations to restore some of the postal services that were curtailed in 6,000 cities during 1964 and 1965. Congress will be asked to provide the necessary funds to restore the service and study other improvements.

The Post Office Department should explore all the techniques available to modernize our postal service and to make certain that they are being used to provide the American people with the best postal system in the world at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayer. However, it is inconceivable that Congress should be asked to improve the postal services for only those who live in cities with a population of over 3,000. This is another direct slap at small towns and other rural areas where postal services have been curtailed to a critical level. Mr. Speaker, are these second-class citizens?

Many of us have labored diligently in an effort to restore needed postal services in the Nation and we welcome any and all improvements. However, these latest announcements by the Postmaster General and the President are indicative of the attitude the administration displays toward rural areas. It all sounds big in the headlines, but rural America again finds itself shortchanged when you read the fine print.

TELEVISION EQUIPMENT FOR VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday, January 17, an aircraft left Washington for Vietnam heavily loaded, not with bombs, but with television equipment. This opened a new chapter in a story which began for me last summer while I was in Saigon. After talking with a number of officials I discovered that the question of introducing television there had been considered for some time and was a subject of some controversy. Upon my return to Washington I made inquiries as to the status of this project.

I addressed a letter to the U.S. Information Agency last June asking for a comprehensive report outlining background studies already made, the estimated cost and the arguments both for and against establishing television in South Vietnam. Members of this body may recall the difficulty that was experienced in obtaining adequate information. At length through the good offices and interest of several distinguished Members of the House the reports were made available. They indicated to me that the project had definite merit.

Consequently just prior to his return to his post as Ambassador in Saigon a group of House Members consisting of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations; the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE]; the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD]; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY]; and myself, met with Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge to discuss this proposal. On August 24 the Ambassador informed us that the U.S. Mission Council had approved television for Vietnam. Last month I was informed by officials of the U.S. Information Agency in Saigon and here in Washington that broadcasts would begin on January 21, 1966.

Having placed in Ambassador Lodge's hands a brochure outlining the airborne educational television program which serves six Midwestern States, and with which Michigan State University is affiliated, I was particularly interested to learn that in the initial phases the television broadcasts will be transmitted from aircraft with the capability of originating or relaying, from the ground or satellite, two channel television broadcasts, and in addition are able to handle AM, FM, and short wave radio transmissions. Converted Lockheed constellations, these aircraft are a marvel of ingenuity as I personally discovered when I visited the naval air facility at Andrews Air Force Base last week where they were being outfitted.

Under the direction of Capt. George Dixon, crews have labored hard and long on an exceedingly modest budget to get these planes ready in the shortest possible time. I was pleased to note that the Washington Daily News on Tuesday, January 18 carried a story entitled, "Project Jenny Is Run on Captain Dixon's Shoestring," which tells something of the resourcefulness and dedication which have made this program possible. I insert this article immediately following my remarks. The extraordinary efforts of these men are to be commended and I know that the best possible reward they could receive is the satisfaction that what they have done may well contribute to saving the lives of Americans and Vietnamese.

According to information provided me by the USIA, these airborne transmitters will be used until ground facilities are constructed. After the Saigon ground installations are completed and broadcasts commence from these studios, the aircraft will continue to operate in other areas of South Vietnam. After engineering surveys have been completed, facility locations chosen, and studios become operational, it is anticipated that the airborne studios no longer will be required. In the early stages the Vietnamese will program approximately 1 hour a day on VHF channel 11. The United States will assist the Vietnamese in training production and technical personnel and, as programing materials become more abundant and facilities are developed the broadcast period will increase accordingly. It is hoped that by the end of 1966, eight transmitters and one relay station will be operational and reaching 80 to 90 percent of the population. The total cost is estimated to be $1.4 million.

Some may have wondered when they heard the first announcement of television for Vietnam, "Why should people be watching free television when there is a war being fought?" But strange as it may first appear the fact is many believe that in a country where there is no dependable means to quickly and accurately inform the people, and where the struggle is essentially one for the minds of men, that the development of television offers a great opportunity to combat Vietcong propaganda and to rally the war-weary South Vietnamese people to resist communism.

To those who might question the expense of distributing free television sets I would like to point out first of all that I have been informed that this program can be implemented without any new appropriations being required; that enough money can be found in existing funds. Secondly, I believe we would do well to compare its cost against the amount of money we are presently pouring into the purely military aspects of the situation. For example, basic equipment for one soldier amounts to $454. His M–14 rifle costs an additional $127. To maintain each soldier overseas for 1 year requires almost $8,000. If we multiply these figures times the 167,000 men we have sent to South Vietnam in 1965 we get an idea of the staggering size of our military commitment; and yet there is still no indication that we are on the way to winning the conflict.

It is clear that to do so we simply have to reach the Vietnamese people not with guns but with words and ideas. A story in the New York Times of Tuesday, January 18, tells of mass pamphlet bombings presently underway in South Vietnam which by itself is estimated to cost more than $250,000. In these terms television strikes me as being a substantial bargain to say nothing of its potential for informing public opinion and promoting education.

Certainly when we can install a television network, as well as give away the sets, for less than the cost of one load of bombs for our B–52's, I believe we have been failing to use a potent weapon that, without bloodshed, will help to defeat the Vietcong.

The article referred to above follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Jan. 18, 1966]

A Genius Behind Airborne TV: Project Jenny Is Run on Captain Dixon's Shoestring

(By Julian Morrison)

In an age of staggering military budgets—all too often followed by General Accounting Office reports of rampant waste—Capt. George C. Dixon is a paradox.

He is possibly the world's champion scrounger.

He certainly is an inventive genius, which keeps him stone broke and drives him to military junk piles and the ancient GI practice of "midnight requisition" to complete his projects.

Captain Dixon's boundless energy and a dream have given the United States a unique airborne communications system with almost endless possibilities—a little-known Navy program called Project Jenny.

REVAMPED CONNIES

He has torn the insides out of three old Super Constellations and made of them modern television and radio stations that can transmit sounds and pictures on any of the world's usually incompatible TV systems—Communists as well as free world.

(Since most nations use different combinations of scan rate and power supply, plus distinctive video and sound frequencies, receivers of one country cannot use signals transmitted in another.)

Captain Dixon's planes have superpowerful transmitters and receivers capable of adjustment for whatever signal needed.

INSTANT LANGUAGE

Each contains a studio where translators—for instance—can instantly convert programs into the language of any nation.

The latest television plane left Andrews Air Force Base yesterday, bound for South Vietnam, its transmitting equipment still being installed en route because of a sudden political decision to set up a TV propaganda network for that country.

Until that decision was made last month, the progress of Captain Dixon and his men was limited largely to what surplus equipment could be gleaned from the scrap pile or from "friends" among supply officers who could be conned out of equipment.

"If you've got it, and he finds out about it, he can get it away from you," a Dixon admirer says.

ON THE SPOT

Last Friday, in a half hour, the tireless Captain Dixon—who began his Navy career as apprentice seaman 27 years ago—located two essential pieces of equipment by telephone.

From an officer at the Bethesda Naval Hospital he obtained a key camera lens which he matched up with a borrowed movie projector part he heard was available at the Naval Photographic Center.

Without these, the Vietnam television network would not have been on the air on the "mandatory" Friday deadline date set by U.S. Government.

What he couldn't borrow for his project he bought—from such unorthodox military sources as Sears, Roebuck (hoist motors) and a Super Giant grocery store (a bicycle hub cap ornament he converted into a device to get rid of static electricity).

LOOT FOR A CHANGE

The crash nature of this propaganda network resulted in a sudden shower of Defense Department money for the threadbare project.

But Captain Dixon has no such assurance of funds for his next dream—an ambitious, far-ranging plan to take radio and television equipment the experts say can't be modified and turn a plane into a flying eye for Pentagon-bound strategists.

"I want to put a camera in the belly of this airplane, pointing forward, and another with an infrared lens, and modify the transmitters so they'll be compatible with a satellite," Captain Dixon said.

SUB SPOTTER

Then he waved his hand toward the Atlantic where Russian nuclear submarines are known to prowl, detectable by infrared devices.

"I can take that airplane out there where things are going on and I can scramble the pictures—encode them—and bounce them off a satellite right back to the President's desk.

It would take money, he admits and there are many similar projects with influential backers pushing them through the Pentagon corridors.

INCREASE IN THE INTEREST ON SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, yesterday addressed the New York State Industrial Payroll Savings Committee in New York City concerning the U.S. savings bonds program.

In the course of his address Secretary Fowler read a letter which he had just received from President Johnson in which the President pointed out that the country again is at a point where rates available on a variety of alternative forms of savings have moved above the rate now paid on savings bonds. The bonds themselves, however, maintain their position in the national economy of being vital to the success of Federal debt management and in averting inflation. The President, therefore, directed the Secretary to set in motion the machinery which is necessary for raising the interest rate on these bonds at the earliest feasible date.

As chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, I have been interested in the U.S. savings bonds program. From exchanges of correspondence with Secretary Fowler and other officials of the Treasury Department I had been assured that the matter of changing the return rate on savings bonds was one which the Treasury Department kept under constant scrutiny. The President has shown his concern for the financial well-being of the country and the small investor who purchases series E-bonds, often from no other motives than pure patriotism, and because his country has asked him to invest his surplus funds in its obligations.

I believe his letter should be given wide circulation, and I am therefore taking the liberty of inserting it in the Record:

Dear Mr. Secretary: Over the years, one of the strongest links between this Government and its citizenry has been the U.S. savings bonds program. Born in the critical days before our entry into the Second World War, this program has been, for the Government, a vital source of noninflationary financing for needed Government programs. For the public, it has provided a matchless means for accumulating savings with absolute safety, and with an attractive rate of return.

A successful savings bonds program is of particular urgency at this time—facing as we do a firm commitment to the defense of freedom in Vietnam and a strongly rising economy at home. We must not, and will not, at this juncture, permit our strength to be sapped by inflation.

Today, above all, is a time for all Americans to rededicate themselves to the spirit that animated the Minutemen of Concord—who serve as the symbol of the savings bonds program. For today, as at the founding of our Nation, it is freedom which is at stake. Not all of us are called upon to fight in the jungles of Vietnam—but while our men are there in the frontlines of a distant land, none of us can remain aloof on the sidelines. We must all do our share—in every way we can—to support our men in Vietnam. One sure way is open to all Americans through the savings bonds program.

On several occasions during the postwar period it has been necessary to improve the rate of return on savings bonds in view of the higher rates available to many savers in various private savings accounts. The last change was made in 1959. To have failed to make those adjustments would have been a disservice both to the Government and to the public at large—risking inflationary dangers, complicating the task of managing our Government finances, and depriving millions of small savers of a reasonable rate of return on their funds entrusted to the Government.

We are again at a point where rates available on a variety of alternative forms of savings have moved above the rate now paid on U.S. savings bonds. At the same time, we are at a point where maximum savings are vital to our national welfare—indeed, to our national future. Another increase in rate on those bonds is now timely.

In order to sustain and enlarge the vital role of the savings bonds program, I, therefore, direct you to set in motion the necessary machinery for raising the interest rate on these bonds as of the earliest feasible date. Please submit to me as soon as possible your specific recommendations.

As in past rate changes, I would like you to make appropriate rate adjustments on outstanding savings bonds as well, so that no current bondholder need cash in his current holdings in order to gain the advantage of the attractive new rate, and no prospective buyer need feel that he should delay his purchase to await the higher rate.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE VIETNAM GI BILL—A DEBT WE OWE OUR FIGHTING MEN

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill similar to that introduced to this distinguished body by my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] last week, which would extend to veterans of the Vietnam conflict educational benefits comparable to the World War II and Korean GI bills. There are presently upward of 200,000 young Americans serving in the mud and heat of Vietnam, daily risking their lives to bring peace and freedom in southeast Asia.

They are veterans of the age-old struggle against totalitarianism just as fully as were our young men of 20 years ago who returned victorious over facism, or our men of 10 years ago who returned from Korea. Some will not return from Vietnam.

I believe our Vietnam veterans deserve the same benefits as the veterans of other wars, and that is why I am joining other colleagues in introducing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, an ample education, commensurate with an individual's ability, is a basic requirement for success in the increasingly complex and technical business life of our society. We ask our young men to interrupt their lives at a time when getting an education is one of their most pressing concerns. In many cases, deferring further schooling in their early twenties means it will never be resumed because of financial and family considerations. Should our veterans, and succeeding generations, be penalized for their country's interests? This legislation would provide up to $130 per month for a period of 36 months to help veterans who have served in areas of special hazard, such as Vietnam, to meet the costs of either further education or vocational rehabilitation.

I believe we in Congress must meet our responsibilities to our returning veterans as earlier Congresses have done. The Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act is a partial payment of principle to those who risk their lives in our interests.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS — THE FATHER OF THE WESTERN WORLD

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the proposal that Columbus Day, October 12, be made a legal holiday throughout the United States has often been brought before this distinguished body. I believe the reasons why the anniversary of the birthday of the great discoverer of the Western World should be made a national holiday are just as compelling today as ever.

In an era when man has learned to circle the earth in space and is already reaching for the moon, the voyage of the intrepid Genoan explorer into the unknown, in defiance of the conventional wisdom of the times, surely ranks with space exploration for sheer audacity and courage. Columbus did not have a massive government agency behind him—only the support of the monarch of Spain and three tiny ships. Yet he opened the Western World to the forces of civilization, and helped dispel the fear and ignorance then gripping the known world. Thus, a brave Italian, backed by a farsighted Spanish Queen, discovered the New World for all other peoples to settle and develop into full partnership with Europe and the East.

The voyage of Christopher Columbus opened the New World to the forces of civilization, began an unparalleled period of exploration for which he deserves a place in the very forefront of man's great march toward knowledge of his world.

Columbus made it possible for the United States of America to develop into a nation made great by ethnic strands of many peoples. For these compelling reasons, for what this man means to America, and to honor one of the truly great men of history, I urge that October 12, Columbus Day, be made a legal holiday throughout our Nation.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 48th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. On January 22, 1918, the Ukraine—the largest non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe—declared its freedom and set up a free, democratic state. The freedom unfortunately was to be short lived, however, as the new Communist government, supposedly born in the name of freedom, quickly demonstrated its true rapacious nature.

The bayonet and truncheon became the law of the land in the Ukraine as the Communist bosses sought to eradicate the idea of freedom from the Ukrainian mind. Murder became commonplace, farms and villages were burned and Ukrainians by the hundreds of thousands were herded like cattle into boxcars and shipped off to the barren wastes of Siberia. Many never made it. In the end collectivism was forced upon the Ukraine. But the idea of freedom is a hard thing to wipe out, as dictators over the centuries have learned to their sorrow.

The 45 million people living in the Ukraine today still harbor the hope of freedom. The Ukrainians in this country and around the free world still fight for it and we join them in that fight. The Iron Curtain is not something new, nor is the slave state something new. We have only to look back to the very birth of communism to find such things being established as a matter of policy. We very often are inclined to think of the captive nation as something that came into being with the onset of World War II. The idea, unfortunately, is as old as communism itself.

Mr. Speaker, I pray along with millions of other Americans that freedom someday will be restored to the people of the Ukraine. In this anniversary month I think it would behoove all of us to look at the history of the Ukraine and the other captive states in order not to be misled into forgetting the true nature of communism.

TOWARD A HEALTHIER ENVIRONMENT

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at the White House Conference on Health in Washington, D.C., on November 4, 1965:

TOWARD A HEALTHIER ENVIRONMENT

(By Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, Member of the Congress from Rhode Island)

The distinguished audience here today, as well as the occasion for the meeting, makes this a very special pleasure for me.

You have heard yesterday and today a review of some of the accomplishments of our legislative branch in the field of health during the recent session of Congress and in the past decade. I am proud also to have participated in the remarkable progress we have made in recent years. And I take it as a direct tribute to those accomplishments that the Chief Executive has called together this gathering of the Nation's leaders in the field of health to review that progress and bring forth its best thinking on how we can consolidate these gains and move ahead to new goals.

I hope very much that you, the delegates to this conference, will indeed exert your best efforts to bring out the most knowledgeable judgments and the most imaginative new ideas you have; they will be valuable to the President, to our outstanding new Secretary and to our fine young Surgeon General as well as to the Congress.

In the need for broad and imaginative thinking, I am especially glad that in your panel discussions on the area of health protection, you are going to have the opportunity to look at this problem from the widest possible spectrum—ranging from water pollution to family planning.

Moreover, there is a connecting thread between all of our many and diverse efforts to protect the health of our people—and it is that there exists an interrelatedness and interdependence between every one of them.

None of us lives in a world of just auto exhaust, or just polluted water, or just pesticide residues in our food. We live, instead, in a total environment where we eat, breathe, work, play and remain in constant contact with an atmosphere that endlessly mixes and changes and presents to us the sum of every contaminant that is put into it.

To put it in another light, one of our national leaders in mental health has said, "If there is a single theme that runs throughout research in mental health, it is the essential unit of man's nature; an absolute composite of biological, psychological, social and cultural factors of human behavior."

A good example of the problems we have ahead in this broad area of health protection is the group of activities we usually lump together under the term "environmental health." Although all of the problems listed in your program for this morning are important, in my opinion non is more urgent and more complex—and in this field of environmental health we are, in the words of a distinguished expert committee, at least 10 years behind.

In many of the areas of accomplishment that Senator Hill described for you, we have in effect made the big breakthrough. We have done a good part of the research, we have achieved legislation necessary to put much of our new knowledge to work, and now the job ahead is to do it—even though we have many miles to go and many barriers to overcome.

In environmental health we are not even close to the big breakthrough because we have only just begun to clearly understand what research is necessary for the attack.

We have had to admit to ourselves that during recent history we were so intent on the pressing immediate needs that we neglected to give serious attention to the long-range problems of what the people of this Nation were doing to their own environment.

There has certainly been no lack of realization that we are a different nation from 30 years ago. The memory of the depression sharpens our appreciation of how the explosion of scientific knowledge and technology that began during World War II has showered us with benefits; consumer goods of every kind to make our lives more comfortable and enjoyable; medical progress to lengthen our life span and give us better health to enjoy the good life.

Equally well known to us are the figures showing how our population—exploding almost as fast as scientific knowledge—is ceaselessly migrating to live in the cities where the benefits of the good life allegedly are most attainable. And every sign available to us indicates that all of these trends will continue.

Neither has there been failure to appreciate—at least among knowledgeable people—the possibility that there might be untoward effects of these changes in our national life. It is not a news item to us that smoke, soot and noxious fumes billow forth from factories, apartment buildings, automobiles, and from burning garbage dumps in almost every city big enough to deserve the name. In New York City, some 60 tons of soot settles on every square mile in every month—damaging plant life, blackening buildings, and doing we know not what to the health of its citizens, mental as well as physical.

We have heard often enough the single shocking statistic that every major waterway in the Nation is now polluted—many almost to the point of uselessness.

There has been no secret about the fact that strong new chemical pesticides—not even invented until World War II—were being put into our environment to the tune of 900 million pounds per year.

These individual problems have commanded a good deal of attention and have, in fact, generated real national concern. But our concern with these separate, and urgent, aspects of environmental change has diverted us from the most fundamental question of all; that is, what is the total combined effect upon man of all these changes? Only during the past 5 years has discussion of environmental health begun to bring this larger question into clear focus.

In 1960, following completion of our appropriations bill, my subcommittee held a set of special hearings on environmental health. We received oral and written testimony outlining the considered opinions of more than two dozen experts in the field; 25,000 copies of the transcript of the hearings were distributed to health leaders of the Nation. The importance of the environment as a whole was repeatedly emphasized.

Since that time, at least three expert committees have made extensive studies which have contributed greatly to our understanding of the real nature of the problem. The distinguished committee headed by Dr. Paul Gross made some extraordinarily farseeing recommendations for catching up in our national program of controlling environmental hazards. They emphasized the importance of an integrated research approach to explore the basic mechanisms involved in human response to environmental stresses. At least two members of that committee, Dr. John Logan, of Illinois, and Mr. Dwight Metzler, of Kansas, are here in this audience, and I suspect both would agree with me when I say that today—4 years to the month since the issuance of their report—we have made very little progress on their recommendations.

Four years later, where are we? We are still laboring with the term "environmental health," for one thing. It is a term not yet fully understood even by some scientists who grew up in the school of "heredity versus environment" in personality development. There is also, of course, a political environment, an economic environment, and so on.

This lack of understanding may even have hurt the Public Health Service in its relations with Congress. Congressmen, you know, like to have things spelled out in black and white. And environmental health, in the minds of some of my colleagues, may have seemed at times a bit vague—vaguer, in fact, than air pollution, water pollution or many of its component parts.

But I think we are making real progress in achieving an understanding of the true meaning of environmental health as a scientific discipline in its own right rather than merely as an administrative tent covering a lot of categories. That discipline proceeds from the need to assess the total body burden of many contaminants.

Four years after the Gross report, I think we are also making progress in broadening the public understanding of environmental health. History has demonstrated repeatedly that citizens will not remain indifferent to threats to their health, provided they are given the facts.

We should remember, however, that the hazards to man's health from his environment are less dramatic than those which spring from a tragic episode such as the thalidomide case of a few years ago, or from an epidemic of measles, which every mother knows. Therefore, environmental health hazards of air and water pollution or radiation or those in the workplace can never expect to live in the daily headlines.

To be sure, there are some bright spots; but they are primarily in specific, categorical areas.

We have a fine Clean Air Act, and funds are available for a promising attack on this problem. The problem of air pollution, I might add, seems to be growing faster than any other in the whole area of health protection.

In the last few weeks, we have acquired a Solid Waste Disposal Act that will permit the immediate beginning of a research effort to solve this bothersome problem before it becomes a national crisis.

There are signs that the Nation as a whole has decided—after some years of being convinced—that it is ready to undertake and pay for the massive effort needed to abate the pollution of our streams.

These are encouraging marks of progress in our thinking, and I believe that they will bring us important advances in our efforts to create a healthier environment.

But even in our efforts to apply known remedies to our environmental ills, the road ahead is long. For example, our air pollution experts have demonstrated that automobile exhaust is very close to the top—if not at the top—among unhealthy pollutants of the air. One of the promising avenues of control is an exhaust device for each car. But under current projections the very best we can hope for is that by the end of the next 5 years we will have a fourth of all cars equipped with control devices that meet a proper standard. That's probably as fast as we can go—but it looks like a long time ahead before we see the end of this problem.

The weakness of even these important steps forward is that they are directed primarily at abatement of single sources of contamination. And vital as they are, they will still provide only partial solutions to separate aspects of the total problem.

In fact, the very progress we have made in defining the more obvious pollutants and hazards has brought into sharp relief the outline of the larger problem.

Although we can identify health damage related to single environmental hazards, we can only guess at the body's response to several of these interacting with each other. We know little about the actual nature of most environmental stresses and even less about the physiological or chemical mechanisms by which they affect the human organism. Every advance in specific knowledge, in fact, has served to underline the tremendous gaps in our fundamental understanding of this complex field.

Right now, we need a massive research effort to explore the basic biological mechanisms that are involved here and to discover what mysterious and complex effects all these environmental stresses exert on the health of man.

After several years of planning, this research attack is finally on the verge of a beginning. The new National Environmental Health Sciences Center, for which construction is now being planned, will begin work in temporary quarters this fiscal year. It will have the mission of doing research necessary to understand the long-term biological effects of the environment on man, and to maintain the overview of our total national effort in this field, to identify emerging problems, and to coordinate in a complete national research effort. With the right kind of leadership and support, I believe that we shall one day soon see this Center operating with the same effectiveness as the National Institutes of Health.

The mysteries of science which the new Center will undertake to solve are a part of the mystery of life itself, and they are vital to a real and complete understanding of man in relation to his environment.

While this research is underway, backing up the national programs in each categorical field, the corollary efforts of these programs themselves will have to be sizable. The research required in air pollution, water pollution, radiological health, etc., will complement and draw upon the more basic investigations conducted at the Center. The difference will lie in the fact that these efforts will be directed primarily at specific environmental problems and at the direct and immediate application of new knowledge to their control.

For example, the occupational and industrial health forces of our country have known for a long time that the toxic effects of new chemicals or new processes often show up first in the industrial environment—and that the data from these cases are valuable indeed. Yet at present there is not even any organized reporting of occupational morbidity and mortality. In this day of rapid machine calculation, of inputs and outputs and the stress on scientific communication, we are derelict indeed to lack the essential figures on accidents, illnesses, and deaths as they relate to the victims' occupations.

We will look forward—even though it will be several years—to the results of the research projects to study the long-term effects of pesticides in the living environment which have now been started in a dozen different locations of the country. We cannot settle the national policy issue that has been raised by the use of pesticides until we have done the research necessary to ascertain whether or not the residues in the environment are harmful, and if so, in what way.

We cannot build a beneficial environment without first laying for ourselves a strong foundation in basic biological research, but the foundation is not the whole house. If we are to finish the project and reach the goal we will also need the building blocks of categorical research into specific environmental problems.

This brings up a point fundamental to the environmental health program that is equally applicable to the broader area of health protection.

We must remember that we are building a single structure that consists of many parts. No matter how many separate and diverse problems we have—building sewage plants, preventing automobile accidents, creating new recreation areas, assuring pure food supplies, or promoting mental health—our final objective is better health for our citizens.

Thus, I am back to the point I mentioned at the beginning—the interrelatedness and interdependence of all of the things I have been talking about. I include the whole gamut of areas you are to discuss today—the relationship of a smoggy, noisy, crowded city environment to mental health, the relationship of mental health to recreation, the relationship of recreation areas to the planning of our teeming cities of the future, the relationship of those cities and their development to the need for family planning for the future, and the relationship of each to all of the others.

In concluding, I would like to quote this recent statement by Gershon Fishbein, publisher of Environmental Health Letter:

"Environmental health is as old as Hippocrates and as new as tomorrow's smog; as small as an atom and as big as all outdoors; as simple as air and as complex as a nuclear reactor.

"If its past is inglorious and its present uncertain, its future as an exciting dimension in health protection is assured as long as man continues to tamper with the tools of his technology."

FEDERAL AND CITIZEN ACTION FOR MENTAL HEALTH

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a speech which I delivered to the National Association for Mental Health, Inc., on November 18, 1965, at New York, N.Y.:

FEDERAL AND CITIZEN ACTION FOR MENTAL HEALTH

(By Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, Representative, Second Congressional District, Rhode Island)

It is a personal pleasure for me to be here with you this afternoon. Having had as one of my concerns the health needs of our people, I am very much aware of the vital role of volunteer health organizations such as the National Association for Mental Health.

We who are in Congress as representatives of the people must hear from the people, and I assure you that we do. We hear from the people on a private basis and we hear from the people through organizations they have formed—such as yours—to raise a strong, unified voice to problems they feel are deserving of national attention.

I have been in Washington for more than 25 years now, and I have seen that clear, united citizen action surrounding any problem does impress the councils of the Capital City. In our democratic way of life—despite the doubtings of the more cynical—there is no force greater than the concerted and collective voice of our citizens.

As chairman of the House subcommittee dealing with health matters, it has been my experience that the appearance of witnesses at congressional hearings is an important step toward the adoption of progressive health measures.

A good deal of any legislator's time is and must be devoted to getting at the facts of a situation. He must know and understand very thoroughly any problem he is called to act upon, and problems of health are no exception.

Representing as it does citizens and professionals very closely attuned to mental health needs in our States and communities, the National Association for Mental Health has become a highly valuable and most sensitive listening post. It is a listening post for those in legislative positions at all levels of government who must deal with the public health problem of mental illness.

But there is an important step beyond informing appropriate committees of national health needs. That is, the hard work of followup. Citizens who can follow through by getting the facts to their own Congressman, and to their State legislators, perform a vital service, both to the cause they espouse, and to the governing bodies who require elucidation.

One illustration of highly effective action by this association was the work done to bring before the Congress the need for Federal funds to aid in staffing the centers in their early years. Following a timely leadership conference held in Washington by the National Association for Mental Health, many members of the association apparently were in direct touch with their Congressmen. The result was that visibility was given to the need, and information helpful to their considerations was available.

Fortunately, every State in the Nation now has or is in the process of obtaining a record of facts about its mental health needs and capacities for care and treatment. With Federal aid, as part of the national mental health program, thousands upon thousands of volunteers and professional people have participated in frank review and mental health planning as a step upward and away from neglect and blighted conditions. These State plans will be a rich resource on which to draw for vital guidelines to citizen action for many years to come.

There is, indeed, so much to grasp and to act upon in this great work ahead of us, I hope that I may be pardoned for mixing a little business with the pleasure of being here. While I am more often in the position of absorbing facts about the health of our Nation, I should like to reverse that role for a moment, to convey to you some facts of interest in the current stage of our Nation's mental health drive.

The first fact is one I have already suggested—the high importance of citizen action as regards prevailing needs. I cannot stress too strongly the basic responsiveness of governing bodies—no matter where they are—to popular causes.

The second fact is that no Federal health measure—and this includes the vital provision of several key mental health bills—can ever be the final fruit of our considerations. The Federal Government can only seed developments. It cannot of itself produce the harvest. This is true in every aspect of our national life, and it pertains sharply to the advancement of health in America.

With Federal impetus, we can and have increased our health research activities and knowledge. With Federal impetus, we can and have greatly increased the Nation's supply of health professionals. With Federal impetus, we can and have augmented facilities for treatment and practice of preventive measures. Our goal, after all, is not only to improve treatment of mentally ill patients, but also to prevent the stains of disorder that can spread over man's mind and his emotions.

The key word here is "impetus." It does not mean power, it does not mean magic, or control, or supervision. It does not even mean "money," although some people may disagree with me on that. In Webster's dictionary, "impetus" means "a driving force," an "incentive." That is what it means in Congress, too.

When we vote for health measures and appropriations, we have a picture in our minds, a visualization. We visualize that the States and communities across the country will, with this incentive, go on to accomplish the goal of our efforts; that they will move ahead and actually implement the services, the programs, the work that is so vitally needed.

A case in point is the Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963. This act provides Federal aid for constructing community mental health centers during the next few years. It provides allotments to the States for centers given priority by the States and approved for construction or expansion of existing facilities.

But this aid can only seed a community mental health movement that has been long overdue in this country. The entire appropriation over the years for this purpose is limited to $150 million, and while this is a valuable incentive, it can be only that. The Federal funds must be matched and more than matched by support at the State level and in localities. State Community Mental Health Services Acts must be strengthened, if and where necessary. Local taxation must be reviewed and strengthened as a source of revenue for the mental health services, if and where necessary. Private sources for funds—such as voluntary health insurance plans and community chest activities—must be brought right up to the frontlines in the battle against mental illness and stagnant systems of treatment.

One of the great concerns of President Johnson as our national leader has been the health of our people. While the community mental health centers movement will and must revise old ways of caring for the mentally sick, its greatest promise is as an instrument for the positive protection and promotion of the mental health of citizens. The centers are to become part of the community's bastion against disease and disability and, as such, are integral to the new community and social actions programs of a Great Society.

The present Congress has recognized fully and acted upon many measures in light of our changing, expanding, and urbanizing society. One of these is the recent amendment to the Community Mental Health Centers Act. This new amendment provides Federal aid for staffing the centers in their initial years. But here again, this essential aid is and must be limited. It is to be made available on a percentage basis, and only in the early years of the centers, to help them get underway.

The third fact I should like to submit is, I fear, not quite as rousing as the one concerning the importance of citizen action. Nor is it quite as heartening as is the Federal impetus toward correctives in the mental health field. It is a truth grimmer, infinitely grimmer, than any recital of our mutual responsibilities.

The truth is that we in our affluence have simply not taken adequate care of our mentally and emotionally troubled citizens. We have not taken care of our disturbed children. We have not taken care of our troubled adolescents. We have not taken care of our elderly whose mental health may be failing. We have not taken care of the problems of alcoholism, of suicide, of drug addiction.

Now, we may assert, and properly so, that some problems of society and of the human being are and always have been universal. The shame is not that these problems are present, but that we have not exercised the use of our modern knowledge, the use of our modern prosperity, the use of our modern benefits either to reduce the incidence of these problems, or to take enlightened, humane care of them once they have had their dark influence.

It is sometimes useful to cite national statistics. Figures from the National Institute of Mental Health, for example, reveal an alarming national record on care of emotionally disturbed children and young people. Mental hospital statistics show a marked increase in the number of young patients. From 1950 to 1960 the first admission rates in State and county mental hospitals for children under 15 rose from 10.4 per 100,000 population to 21.5. The rates for youths between 15 and 24 rose from 58.8 per 100,000 to 79.3.

But stronger still than these figures is the sight of one child, one single family, one single person who needs care and treatment and who needs it badly and cannot get it because it is not to be had in his community.

Stronger still than the number 60,000, which represents the toll of drug addiction in our cities—and, incidentally, represents also an insidious crime potential—is the sight of one drug-ridden human being whose internal problems, often both mental and physical, are so complex as almost to defy real assistance. Yet, as with other areas of human breakdown, mental health authorities have advised us again and again that while services and treatments and help cannot be the ultimate and the perfect or a cure of magic, services can and do help to reduce disability and to reverse the tragic outcome of utter negligence.

For some mental health problems, figures are available in abundance, such as the rise in admissions to mental hospitals. Other problems do not lend themselves to national computerizing. In any case, it is the individual, the family who is affected by tragedies of mental and emotional disarray who supply the strongest evidence of our need for action.

Finally, I should like to submit for your consideration a brief review of the present opportunities to respond vigorously and courageously and effectively to our country's mental health needs.

The community mental health legislation to which I have referred is an opportunity and a challenge. It can be a driving force toward revolutionizing the care, treatment, and prevention of the mental illnesses in this country.

The new social security amendments known as medicare are an opportunity and a challenge. Under this law, persons over 65 can have within their reach the dignity of proper care in general or mental hospitals, and proper care in rehabilitative services. Benefits for the mental illnesses are provided through two plans—a basic plan and a voluntary insurance plan which may be chosen under medicare in addition to the basic coverage. I would urge all those who are working in the mental health field to acquaint themselves with these provisions fully.

And there are other Federal programs—such as those in the fields of education, of vocational rehabilitation, and of mental retardation—which when seen as a whole can be linked together in service to our people. They can be linked where it counts most—at the community level. They can be activated in harmony with one another. They can be implemented through the work and cooperation of all groups in the community—whether volunteer or professional, whether medical or religious or educational, whether welfare, public or private.

If there is one overriding fact I would leave with you today, it is that we have now, all of us, moved into a second stage, if you will, of our mental health developments. We have moved beyond single, unilateral considerations. To consider mental health today is to consider all of the community's opportunities and potentials. It is to work not only within one organization—vital as the work is—but to work hand in hand with whatever group and organization, whatever planners, legislators, and citizens can help bring about the kind of mental health care and services we all envision for our country.

I have presumed, with a quarter century of service in the Congress, to feel somewhat like a veteran as regards our Nation's mental health problems. But, in a sense, none of us are veterans—not even the National Association for Mental Health with its long, proud history of service to the American people. Even we are neophytes, newcomers in the growing movement to bring adequate mental health care to this Nation. We are novices in the ranks because our greatest challenges—as well as our greatest opportunities—still lie ahead; yet to be acted upon and yet to be achieved.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO PERMIT DEALERS TO DEDUCT A REASONABLE ADDITION TO RESERVE FOR BAD DEBTS

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. HUOT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, the policy of the Treasury Department in regard to the availability of a reserve for bad debts is, I feel, discriminatory in favor of large, well-financed businesses as opposed to smaller enterprises.

The Treasury takes the position that when a firm has sufficient reserves to hold its own receivables, and payments are made by the ultimate purchaser directly to that firm, the business may take a reserve for bad debts, and therefore be allowed an income tax deduction.

On the other hand, if a firm is small and has insufficient capital to hold its own receivables and so must discount its consumer paper with a lending agency even with full recourse, that firm may not take a reserve for bad debts against the then contingent liability because, according to the Treasury:

> No true debtor-creditor relationship exists between the dealer and consumer and the accounts are owing to the lending agency, not to the dealer.

This position completely ignores the fact that the ultimate risk of loss remains with the dealer who, as guarantor, is responsible to the lending agency for any defaults in terms of ultimate liability. The situation of the small business which factors its accounts receivable is then identical to the situation of large companies which can afford to hold their own receivables.

There is, therefore, no valid reason to disallow a bad debt reserve to small businesses.

I have today introduced a bill to amend section 166(C) of the Internal Revenue Code which will permit dealers to deduct a reasonable addition to reserve for bad debts based on the amounts of conditional sales contracts sold to lending agencies with recourse. I am hopeful that the proposal will receive early consideration.

TRIBUTE TO CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay my tributes to all civil service employees throughout the Nation in commemoration of the establishment of the Federal civil service system on January 16, 1883. I call upon all Americans to join me in an expression of gratitude to those dedicated and selfless career public servants who have contributed so much to the continued strength and vitality of our great Nation. I would also like to extend my praise to those Government employee organizations for their valuable contribution to the maintenance and strengthening of the civil service system. I urge all of my respected colleagues in the House of Representatives to pledge their support to working toward improved salaries and working conditions for our civil servants and to join with me in expanding the competitive merit system to many areas not now covered.

POSTAL BREAKTHROUGH

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, these last 5 days have marked such historic progress toward improved postal service that I think it appropriate for special note to be made in the records of the House of Representatives.

It is particularly significant—and a source of special gratification to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee—that President Johnson has personally endorsed and advocated the comprehensive and dynamic new plans and programs announced by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien on last Saturday and Tuesday. I have known for years of the President's informed interest in our vast postal establishment. His strong support of the Postmaster General's plans is timely evidence of his intent that the American public shall have the best postal service in the world.

Postmaster General O'Brien on Saturday announced restoration of window service in 15,000 post offices on Saturdays and as needed, on Sundays and during evening hours, and also reinstated 6-day-a-week parcel post delivery in over 6,000 places. These services are highly important to the public convenience and necessity, as well as the economic and cultural life of the Nation. I heartily approve.

Those sweeping advances in service to the public were followed by the Postmaster General's disclosure Tuesday of a four-point program to reform and strengthen management and long-range operational planning in the Post Office Department and the 31,000 post offices.

Perhaps the most needed advance is being made in the Department itself, by the establishment of the first Office of Planning "to chart postal service improvements for the immediate future and blueprint new programs to meet future service needs," in the words of the Postmaster General, who emphasized that the planners will have a "wide open field" to explore Department-wide problem areas. The Office of Planning also will maintain close liaison with research groups, interested associations, and management development in private industry.

The Office of Planning will consist of a small, hard-hitting, and highly professional staff of planners to sift various approaches and come up with the best solutions to problems. Day-to-day functions of postal bureaus, and their internal planning to meet their needs, will not be affected.

The second point in the program is directed squarely at the need to accelerate modernization and mechanization of the postal system. An immediate giant step in this program will be the installation of modern mail-handling equipment in 109 post offices, which handle about 60 percent of the Nation's mail. Mr. O'Brien noted that this is but the first measure in a continuing effort to improve operating conditions and give postal employees the tools needed to handle the skyrocketing mail volume so that the public may be given better service. The ultimate objective is to modernize the entire postal complex within the next few years. Investment in mechanization will be approximately $65 million between now and June 30.

Postmaster General O'Brien listed these hardware items for the initial phase of the mechanization:

High-speed letter sorters and machines geared to read ZIP coded addresses at speeds up to 36,000 per hour are among the equipment to be installed in major post offices across the Nation. Orders have been placed for 4,000 additional mailsters and orders will be placed for 100 new self-service post offices.

Facing and canceling machines, edger-stackers, huge automatic sack sorting machines, parcel post systems designed to sort packages at very high speeds, machines capable of removing odd-shaped items such as hotel keys from the mail stream, and closed circuit television to pinpoint problem areas in mechanical mail-handling systems.

Fifty-two letter sorters in 30 cities. This machine, weighing 14 tons, may be operated semiautomatically with 12 keyboard operators or fully automatic with the optical reading system and will sort mail to 279 separate destinations at a speed of 36,000 per hour.

Eight optical ZIP code readers in six cities. Attached to a letter sorter, the system is designed to read and sort incoming and outgoing machine printed ZIP coded mail at the same speed as the letter sorter.

Eighty facing and canceling machines in 19 cities. Photoelectric cells search out the stamps by contrast, cancel them at a speed of 30,000 per hour and place the addresses in the same direction.

One hundred and thirty edger-stacker machines in 80 cities. The machine unscrambles jumbled letters, places them on their edges and stacks them to be fed into the facer-canceler.

Six mail preparation lines for two cities. The machine is similar to the edger-stacker and removes odd-shaped mail such as rolls of film, hotel keys, and so forth, then automatically moves the standard pieces of mail to the high-speed facing and canceling machine for processing.

Eleven semiautomatic sack sorting machines for eight cities. The machine, through an overhead conveyor system, transports sacks of mail to an operator, who, by pressing a button, keys the sacks to the point in the post office where the mail is to be handled. The machine eliminates manual lifting of the 80-pound sacks from one area to another.

Seventeen parcel post sorting machines in three cities. An operator pushes a button which instructs the machine where each parcel is going.

Twenty-four overhead machine monitoring systems in 18 cities. This system utilizes closed circuit television to assist employees in regulating the flow of mail through machines and aids them in detecting jam-ups in overhead equipment. The system will be used to monitor machinery, not employees.

An order for 100 additional self-service post offices is being placed. The cities will be announced later. These units will not replace existing postal installations but will extend 24-hour service to more people without requiring additional personnel.

The Postmaster General has in effect guaranteed postal employees against loss of jobs through automation. He emphasized that his accelerated program is not an alternative for manpower, but is to assist employees in doing their jobs better.

To back up his planning and modernization programs, the Postmaster General has moved with typical vigor and foresight to strengthen postal personnel and to develop needed research source-material. He has placed in effect a six-point, long-range recruiting program highlighted by an unprecedented 5-year plan of college recruiting to infuse new blood into postal management. An immediate goal is the filling of between 20,000 and 30,000 gaps in postal ranks and the providing of new, high-potential talent for postal managers of the future. Fifty management trainees will be recruited each year for 5 years, and engineering trainees also will be enlisted starting with eight this year. Extensive use will be made of the Civil Service Commission's Federal service entrance examination and of management intern examinations.

Finally, as the last of his four-point program, to buttress the Post Office Department's own input of research facilities and professional and technical personnel, contracts are being negotiated to tap research capabilities in three leading educational institutions. Under these contracts, Dartmouth College's Thayer School of Engineering would study management of research and development programs and make appropriate physical science studies; Michigan State University would make specific studies of transportation systems; and Southern Methodist University would research monotony and fatigue as factors in efficiency, as well as personnel motivational areas.

As chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I sense in these actions by President Johnson and Postmaster General O'Brien the beginning of a new direction postal affairs that will bring the truly finest of postal service to the American people. The Postmaster General will have my wholehearted support in carrying out his programs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DYAL, for January 20 and 21, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BUCHANAN (at the request of Mr. McDADE), for 60 minutes, on Thursday, January 20.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. McDADE), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CALLAWAY (at the request of Mr. McDADE), for 30 minutes, on Thursday, January 20.

Mr. SIKES, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, January 20.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HALL and to include extraneous material.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. SCHEUER (at the request of Mr. FARNUM) and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $364.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McDADE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. DOLE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FARNUM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. ROYBAL.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 20, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1899. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1966 for the Department of Defense, and for military and economic assistance in support of our operations in southeast Asia (H. Doc. No. 362); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed with accompanying papers.

1900. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1965, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 363); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered printed.

1901. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment for the quarter ending December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and to the authority transferred to the Secretary of Defense by Executive Order 10952, effective August 1, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1902. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize additional appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, and for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1903. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report of procurement from small and other business firms for July–November 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1904. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise and modernize procedures relating to the licensing by the District of Columbia of persons engaged in certain occupations, professions, business, trades, and callings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1905. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of need for increased efforts to minimize rental delinquencies on acquired properties, Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1906. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of followup review of adjustments made in fees charged for summer-home sites on national forest lands, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1907. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of review of efforts to collect debts resulting from default of guaranteed housing loans, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1908. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of review of controls over utilization and procurement of photographic equipment at the Sandia Laboratory, Albuquerque, N. Mex., Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1909. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a report on matters contained in the Helium Act for the fiscal year 1965, pursuant to Public Law 86–777; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1910. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 157, *Shoshone Tribe of Indians of the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming, Petitioner* v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1911. A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Power Commission, transmitting withdrawal of support of H.R. 7776; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1912. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions that have been approved, according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification, approved prior to December 1, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1913. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18, for the calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 762; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 12152. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 12153. A bill to amend title XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to permit the Commissioner of Education to carry on institutes to improve the qualifications of junior college teachers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 12154. A bill to provide educational assistance for veterans who have served in the Armed Forces since October 1, 1963; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 12155. A bill to provide that Federal Housing Administration's new liberalized mortgage financing terms for veterans shall be available to qualified veterans without regard to whether or not they have previously used their Veterans' Administration home loan entitlement; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 12156. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase from $1,200 to $3,600 the amount of outside income which may be earned by a railroad worker who is retired by reason of disability without reduction of his annuity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 12157. A bill to amend section 5(1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide benefits for children of deceased railroad employees who are over the age of 18 and below the age of 22 and are attending an educational institution as full-time students; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 12158. A bill to amend section 407 of the Social Security Act to make permanent the existing temporary authority to provide aid to families with dependent children in cases where the parent is unemployed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 12159. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide educational assistance for combat veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 12160. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 12161. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 12162. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 7-percent increase in all annuities and pensions payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 12163. A bill to require certain standards of nonpersistence of synthetic pesticide chemicals (economic poisons) manufactured in the United States or imported into the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 12164. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice for an employer or a labor organization to discriminate unjustifiably on account of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 12165. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide education and training for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 12166. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase by $750 million the authorization of appropriation for the fiscal year of 1967, and to authorize payment to be made to States for retirement of certain bonds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 12167. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 12168. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 12169. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 12170. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to all unremarried widows and widowers and to all individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 3 years or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 12171. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12172. A bill to provide educational assistance for veterans who have served in the Armed Forces since October 1, 1963; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 12173. A bill to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 12174. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to provide for the issuance of sidearms to enlisted personnel serving in Vietnam and other combat areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 12175. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to place a memorial tablet in Woodlawn Memorial Cemetery, Carbondale, Ill., in commemoration of the memorial ceremonies held there on April 29, 1866; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 12176. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide an increase of 10 percent in all annuities and pensions payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 12177. A bill to provide for the issuance of a volunteer's medal to each individual who enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States during a period of war or armed conflict involving the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUOT:

H.R. 12178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 12179. A bill to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of this 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 12180. A bill to amend chapter 33, subtitle II, "Other Commercial Transactions," of title 28, District of Columbia Code, with respect to charging or deducting in advance interest on loans to be repaid in installments; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 12181. A bill to provide for the coinage and issuance of proofsets containing coins composed of 900 fine coin silver; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12182. A bill to provide equality of treatment under the postal laws for looseleaf materials containing legal and medical information; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 12183. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 12184. A bill relating to the construction, modification, alteration, repair, painting, or decoration of buildings leased for public purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 12185. A bill to provide for the designation of certain Veterans' Administration facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 12186. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.J. Res. 805. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1972 winter Olympic games in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H. Con. Res. 546. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 547. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H. Con. Res. 548. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DORN:

H. Con. Res. 549. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H. Con. Res. 550. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H. Con. Res. 551. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOORE:

H. Con. Res. 552. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the chartering by act of Congress of the Boy Scouts of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. Res. 670. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the operation of the Economic Opportunity Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H. Res. 671. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the operation of the Economic Opportunity Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H. Res. 672. Resolution in support of President Johnson's efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Res. 673. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 674. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Res. 675. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Res. 676. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H. Res. 677. Resolution to end nuclear proliferation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H. Res. 678. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that oppression of minorities in Rumania through a systematic plan launched by the Communist regime in control of Rumania be condemned and the President of the United States is requested to take appropriate steps in our relations with the Rumanian Government as are likely to bring relief to the persecuted minorities in the controversial Transylvania region of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

388. By the SPEAKER: a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to truth-in-lending legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

389. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, relative to requesting the Congress of the United States to urge that the provisions of Public Act 835, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, be enforced, and immediately to pursue every channel of such enforcement rigorously; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 12187. A bill for the relief of Julian Estrada Olivar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 12188. A bill to provide for the free entry of one set of musical hand bells for use of Emmanuel Lutheran Church, Rockford, Ill.; to the Committee on the Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 12189. A bill for the relief of George Pan (also known as Chang Chen Pan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 12190. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Gurciullo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12191. A bill for the relief of Mettello Zuccolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 12192. A bill for the relief of Sevasti Diakedes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12193. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wanda Donderowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 12194. A bill for the relief of Danillo Conti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 12195. A bill for the relief of Albert C. Arduini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12196. A bill for the relief of Howard Staub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 12197. A bill to provide for the free entry of one rheogoniometer for the use of Tufts University, Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 12198. A bill for the relief of Jessie Robertson Closs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 12199. A bill for the relief of George Berbakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 12200. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios J. Yiannakikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 12201. A bill for the relief of Lea Lai Harlan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

315. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, Assembly of Naha City, Ryukyu Islands, relative to the public election of the chief executive of the Government of the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

316. Also, petition of William N. Coffey, Dinuba, Calif., relative to the issuance of certain Congressional Medals of Honor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1966

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 18, 1966)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid:

Help us to live this day in the solemn consciousness that we are known to Thee—and, each one, accountable to Thee. In Thee we live and move and have our being; to Thee we return for that ultimate judgment upon our deeds and our purposes.

May we be deeply aware that "those in authority" in the sight of men, are also those under authority in the sight of God.

As every word spoken on the floor of this Chamber is printed and scattered abroad for all to read, so every word we speak and every secret purpose of our hearts is known to Thee. Before our words are spoken or our purposes pursued in this session, we call upon Thee for Thy mercy and Thy help this fateful day. And, one by one, in Thy presence, we make an ancient prayer our very own petition:

"Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 18, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

The following additional Senators attended the session of the Senate on Monday, January 17, 1966:

JACOB K. JAVITS, MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, NORRIS COTTON, PETER H. DOMINICK, and PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

The following additional Senators attended the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 18, 1966:

JAMES O. EASTLAND and HIRAM L. FONG.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LAUSCHE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the District of Columbia Committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HOLLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour, and that statements during the transaction of routine business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 767. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim National Ski Week (Rept. No. 944).

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 327. An act to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 945);

H.R. 8210. An act to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act with respect to the European Space Research Organization (Rept. No. 946); and

H.R. 8445. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States (Rept. No. 947).

STUDY OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 181); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 181

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(2) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills;

(3) the adequacy of present intergovernmental relationships between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member; and

(4) legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods, processes, and relationships.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one employee for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MAKE A STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO FOREIGN ASSISTANCE OPERATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 182); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 182

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the operation of foreign assistance activities by the Federal Government, with a view to determining the economy and efficiency of such activities.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $115,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MAKE INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF OPERATIONS OF ALL BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 183); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 183

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government, including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided,* That, in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee or any subcommittee thereof shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized and directed from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State and, further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on the Judiciary or by the Committee on Commerce of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 4. The Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1967, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

SEC. 5. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized, as it deems necessary and appropriate, to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) administer such oaths; (5) take such testimony, either orally or by sworn statement; (6) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (7) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and, further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee: *Provided further,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

(b) For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, or its chairman, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the chairman, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized, in its or his or their discretion, as may be deemed advisable, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents.

SEC. 6. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $435,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

TO PROVIDE FUNDS TO STUDY AND EVALUATE THE EFFECT OF LAWS PERTAINING TO PROPOSED REORGANIZATIONS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. RIBICOFF, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 186); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 186

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study for the purpose of evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, and to consider reorganizations proposed therein.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $120,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 187); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 187

Resolved, That the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

Sec. 2. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized, from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable, (2) employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

(b) The minority is authorized to select one person for appointment as an assistant or consultant, and the person so selected shall be appointed. No assistant or consultant may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $2,200 the annual gross rate of compensation of any person so selected by the minority.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ENTITLED "ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 948)

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, 89th Congress, 1st session, submitted an interim report entitled "Organization of Congress," which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2789. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alberto Oteiza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2790. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore the credit against income tax for dividends received by individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia (for himself and Mr. Saltonstall) (by request):

S. 2791. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

S. 2792. A bill to authorize certain construction in support of military activities in southeast Asia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Russell of Georgia when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 2793. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 2794. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO APPROVE SELECTION OF U.S. OLYMPIC COMMITTEE AND TO SUPPORT ITS RECOMMENDATIONS THAT UTAH BE DESIGNATED AS THE SITE FOR THE 1972 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. Bennett) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 71) to approve selecting of the U.S. Olympic Committee and to support its recommendations that the State of Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 Winter Olympic Games, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Moss, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

STUDY OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 181) to study certain aspects of national security and international operations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jackson, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MAKE A STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO FOREIGN ASSISTANCE OPERATIONS

Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 182) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of all matters pertaining to foreign assistance operations by the Federal Government, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Gruening, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MAKE INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF OPERATIONS OF ALL BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 183) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of Government, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McClellan, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "THE VIETNAM CONFLICT: THE SUBSTANCE AND THE SHADOW"

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Aiken) submitted an original resolution (S. Res. 184) to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "The Vietnam Conflict: The Substance and the Shadow," which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF A STUDY ENTITLED "REBELLION IN RUSSIA'S EUROPE: FACT AND FICTION"

Mr. DODD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 185); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary ten thousand copies of a study entitled "Rebellion in Russia's Europe: Fact and Fiction," prepared for its Internal Security Subcommittee during the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session.

TO PROVIDE FUNDS TO STUDY AND EVALUATE THE EFFECT OF LAWS PERTAINING TO PROPOSED REORGANIZATIONS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. RIBICOFF, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 186) to provide funds to study and evaluate the effects of laws pertaining to proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Ribicoff, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 187) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Anderson, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PROPOSED LEGISLATION PERTAINING TO THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, for myself and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], I introduce, by request, two bills to authorize additional appropriations during fiscal year 1966.

One of these bills relates to military construction and the other to procurement and research, development, test, and evaluation.

The total of the two bills is $4,807,750,000. This amount represents the part of the President's request for supplemental appropriations of $12,345,719,000 for the fiscal year 1966 program in southeast Asia requiring authorization.

I ask unanimous consent that letters of transmittal requesting introduction of these bills and explaining their purpose be printed in the Record immediately following the listing of the bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Proxmire in the chair). The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters accompanying the proposed legislation will be printed in the Record.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Russell of Georgia (for himself and Mr. Saltonstall), by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 2791. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 2791 is as follows:

The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C., *January 19, 1966*.

Hon. Hubert Humphrey,
President of the Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation "To authorize additional appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, and for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces and for other purposes." The proposal would also provide authority for appropriations of the Department of Defense to be made available for the support of the Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam. This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of the proposal would be in accord with the program of the President.

In essence, this proposal would provide for additional authorization of appropriations as needed in each of the categories of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for each of the military services to cover the amount of new obligational authority being requested for such purposes in the supplemental estimates for fiscal year 1966 submitted to the Congress by the President. In addition, the proposal would provide for the transfer of responsibility for financing the support and related costs of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam and other free world forces in Vietnam from the military assistance program to the military services and defense agencies programs and appropriations. This transfer is to be effective as soon as practicable in fiscal year 1966, at which time unexpended balances of funds supporting Vietnam military assistance programs would be transferred to, and merged with, appropriate military functions appropriations, all of which appropriations would then be made available for the use of these programs.

The Committees on Armed Services will be furnished, as in the past, information with respect to the program for which fund authorization is being requested in a form identical to that submitted in explanation and justification of the budget request. Additionally, the Department of Defense will be prepared to submit any other data required by the committees or their staffs.

It is expected that the Armed Services Committees will desire that top civilian and military officials of the Department of Defense be prepared to make presentations explaining and justifying their respective programs as in the past.

For ready reference, there is attached a table showing the results of previous congressional action on applicable fiscal year 1966 budget request, together with the amounts of new obligational authority being requested in the supplemental estimate.

Sincerely,

Robert S. McNamara.

Table of amounts requested for aircraft, missiles, ships, tracked combat vehicle procurement authorization in fiscal year 1966 supplemental request

[In thousands of dollars]

	Authorized [1] fiscal year 1966	Appropriated [1] fiscal year 1966	Supplemental (NOA) fiscal year 1966
Aircraft:			
Army	485,400	485,400	825,600
Navy and Marine Corps	2,100,400	2,104,500	738,300
Air Force	3,709,000	3,675,800	1,585,700
Missiles:			
Army	253,700	277,000	64,000
Navy	369,600	358,200	26,200
Marine Corps	15,200	15,200	27,500
Air Force	800,100	800,100	63,700
Naval vessels: Navy	1,721,000	1,590,500	----------
Tracked combat vehicles:			
Army	----------	----------	75,800
Marine Corps	----------	----------	10,900
Total	9,454,400	9,306,700	3,417,700

[1] Included amounts totaling $496,100,000 provided through emergency fund SEA, Public Law 89-213.

Table of amounts requested for R.D.T. & E. authorization in fiscal year 1966 supplemental request

[In thousands]

	Authorized, fiscal year 1966	Appropriated, fiscal year 1966	Supplemental, (NOA) fiscal year 1966
Research, development, test, and evaluation:			
Army	$1,406,400	$1,406,400	$27,995
Navy (including the Marine Corps)	1,439,200	1,439,200	52,570
Air Force	3,103,900	3,103,900	71,085
Defense agencies	495,000	495,000	0
Emergency fund	(1)	125,000	0
Total	6,444,500	6,569,500	151,650

[1] Not available.

S. 2792. A bill to authorize certain construction in support of military activities in southeast Asia, and for other purposes.

The letter of transmittal accompanying Senate bill 2792 is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To authorize certain construction in support of military activities in southeast Asia, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program. The Bureau of the Budget advises that its enactment would be in accordance with the program of the President.

This legislation would authorize urgently needed facilities and installations essential for U.S. activities related to our operations in this theater. Appropriations to implement this legislation are being requested in the fiscal year 1966 supplemental budget.

Section 1 of this proposal would authorize new construction totaling $1,038,400,000, of which $509,700,000 is for the Department of the Army, $254,600,000 is for the Department of the Navy, and $274,100,000 is for the Department of the Air Force. Section 2 would authorize new construction in the amount of $200 million for use as determined necessary by the Secretary of Defense for emergencies worldwide.

The total authorization requested in this legislative proposal is $1,238,400,000.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the administration and I am introducing in order that there may be a specific bill to which members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a section-by-section analysis of it.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2793) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2793

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out "$369,200,000" and substitute "$684,200,000".

(b) In the first sentence, after "President" insert ", without regard to section 649,".

SEC. 2. Section 451(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended by striking out "$50,000,000" and substituting "$150,000,000".

SEC. 3. Funds made available pursuant to section 1 of this Act shall be available for transfer for expenses authorized by section 637(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and incurred in connection with programs in the Republic of Vietnam.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED ACT TO AMEND THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961, AS AMENDED, TO AUTHORIZE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Purposes of the bill

The basic purpose of the proposed act (the bill) is to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (the act), in order to authorize supplemental appropriations urgently needed in connection with increased requirements for economic assistance in the Republic of Vietnam and elsewhere. In addition, the bill authorizes transfer of funds for administrative expenses incurred in connection with the increased economic assistance in the Republic of Vietnam.

2. Authorizations

	Authorization request	Appropriation request
PART I		
Ch. 4, "Supporting Assistance": Sec. 402, "Authorization"	$315,000,000	$315,000,000
Ch. 5, "Contingency fund": Sec. 451(a), "Authorization"	100,000,000	100,000,000
Total, pt. I	415,000,000	415,000,000
Total, all parts	415,000,000	415,000,000

In each case the bill provides for the new authorization by striking out the amount of the existing authorization and substituting a new amount, which figure is the sum of the present authorization for fiscal year 1966 and the supplemental request for fiscal year 1966.

I. PROVISION OF THE BILL

Part I

Chapter 4. Supporting Assistance Authorization

Section 1(a): Amends section 402 of the act, which relates to supporting assistance, by striking out the fiscal year 1966 authorization and substituting a figure ($684,200,000) which is the sum of the present authorization for fiscal year 1966 ($369,200,000) plus the additional amount now requested to be authorized ($315 million).

Section 1(b): Amends section 402 of the act to permit authorization of appropriations for expenses authorized by that section without regard to section 649 of the act. Section 649 of the act limits the aggregate of the total amounts authorized to be appropriated for use during fiscal year 1966 for furnishing assistance and for administrative expenses under the act to $3.360 billion. Of this amount, $3.218 billion has been appropriated for use during fiscal year 1966. Thus, this provision is required to authorize the additional appropriation for supporting assistance.

Chapter 5. Contingency Fund Authorization

Section 2: Amends section 451(a) of the act, which relates to the contingency fund, by striking out the fiscal year 1966 authorization and substituting a figure ($150 million) which is the sum of the present authorization for fiscal year 1966 ($50 million) plus the amount requested to be authorized at this time ($100 million).

Part III

Chapter 2. Administrative Provisions Administrative Expenses of AID

Section 3: This section authorizes use of supporting assistance funds made available pursuant to section 1 of the bill for administrative expenses authorized by section 637 (a) of the act which are incurred in connection with programs in the Republic of Vietnam. Absent this authority, section 610(b) of the act would not permit such a transfer. The Agency for International Development estimates that approximately $1.4 million will be needed in fiscal year 1966 to meet the additional administrative expenses arising from the increased economic assistance programs in the Republic of Vietnam. As required by section 610(a) of the act, a Presidential determination will be necessary to transfer funds from the supporting assistance account to the administrative expense account.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the President and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record at this point, together with the message from the President, dated January 18, 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and message from the President will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2794) to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2794

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

Sec. 1. This Act may be cited as the "Asian Development Bank Act."

ACCEPTANCE OF MEMBERSHIP

Sec. 2. The President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the Asian Development Bank (hereinafter referred to as the "Bank") provided for by the agreement establishing the Bank (hereinafter referred to as the "agreement") deposited in the archives of the United Nations.

Sec. 3. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a Governor of the Bank, an alternate for the Governor, and a Director of the Bank.

(b) No person shall be entitled to receive any salary or other compensation from the United States for services as a Governor or Alternate Governor. The Director may, in the discretion of the President, receive such compensation, allowances, and other benefits as, together with those received by him from the Bank, will equal those authorized for a Chief of Mission, Class 2, within the meaning of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

Sec. 4. (a) The policies and operations of the representatives of the United States on the Bank shall be coordinated with other United States policies in such manner as the President shall direct.

(b) An annual report with respect to United States participation in the Bank shall be submitted to the Congress by such agency or officer as the President shall designate.

Sec. 5. Unless the Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall, on behalf of the United States, (a) subscribe to additional shares of stock of the Bank; (b) vote for or agree to any amendment of the agreement which increases the obligations of the United States, or which would change the purpose or functions of the Bank; or (c) make a loan or provide other financing to the Bank, except that loans or other financing may be provided to the Bank by a United States agency created pursuant to an Act of Congress which is authorized by law to make loans or provide other financing to international organizations.

DEPOSITORIES

Sec. 6. Any Federal Reserve bank which is requested to do so by the Bank shall act as its depository or as its fiscal agent, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall supervise and direct the carrying out of these functions by the Federal Reserve banks.

PAYMENT OF SUBSCRIPTION

Sec. 7. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, for the purchase of 20,000 shares of capital stock of the Bank, $200 million.

(b) Any payment made to the United States by the Bank as a distribution of net income shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE OF ACTIONS

Sec. 8. For the purpose of any civil action which may be brought within the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, by or against the Bank in accordance with the agreement, the Bank shall be deemed to be an inhabitant of the Federal judicial district in which its principal office or agency in the United States is located, and any such action to which the Bank shall be a party shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States, and the district courts of the United States, including the courts enumerated in title 28, section 460, United States Code, shall have original jurisdiction of any such action. When the Bank is a defendant in any action in a State Court, it may, at any time before the trial thereof, remove such action into the district court of the United States for the proper district by following the procedure for removal of causes otherwise provided by law.

STATUS, IMMUNITIES, AND PRIVILEGES

Sec. 9. The agreement, and particularly Articles 49 through 56, shall have full force and effect in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, upon acceptance of membership by the United States in, and the establishment of, the Bank. The President, at the time of deposit of the instrument of acceptance of membership by the United States in the Bank, shall also deposit a declaration that the United States retains for itself and its political subdivisions the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to its citizens or nationals.

SECURITIES ISSUED BY BANK AS INVESTMENT SECURITIES FOR NATIONAL BANKS

Sec. 10. The last sentence of paragraph 7 of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 24), is amended by striking the word "or" after the words "International Bank for Reconstruction and Development" and inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and by inserting after the words "the Inter-American Development Bank" the words "or the Asian Development Bank".

SECURITIES ISSUED BY BANK AS EXEMPT SECURITIES; REPORT FILED WITH SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Sec. 11. (a) Any securities issued by the Bank (including any guarantee by the Bank, whether or not limited in scope) in connection with raising of funds for inclusion in the Bank's ordinary capital resources as defined in article 7 of the agreement and any securities guaranteed by the Bank as to both principal and interest to which the commitment in article 6, section 5, of the agreement is expressly applicable, shall be deemed to be exempted securities within the meaning of paragraph (a)(2) of section 3 of the Act of May 27, 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77c), and paragraph (a)(12) of section 3 of the Act of June 6, 1934, as amended (15 U.S.C. 78c). The Bank shall file with the Securities and Exchange Commission such annual and other reports with regard to such securities as the Commission shall determine to be appropriate in view of the special character of the Bank and its operations and necessary in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

(b) The Securities and Exchange Commission, acting in consultation with such agency or officer as the President shall designate, is authorized to suspend the provisions of subsection (a) at any time as to any or all securities issued or guaranteed by the Bank during the period of such suspension. The Commission shall include in its annual reports to Congress such information as it shall deem advisable with regard to the operations and effect of this section and in connection therewith shall include any views submitted for such purpose by any association of dealers registered with the Commission.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend that the Congress promptly approve U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank.

This new institution expresses the will of Asia to develop her manifold human and natural resources, and thereby to lift the burden of poverty that has been the lot of her people since ancient times.

Conceived and sponsored by Asians, the Bank is open to all countries in that region, regardless of ideology, who are members of the United Nations or its specialized agencies. Of its $1 billion authorized capital, 65 percent is to be subscribed by nations in the Asian area.

U.S. representatives—led by Mr. Eugene Black and a distinguished congressional delegation—signed the charter of the Asian Development Bank at Manila last December 4. But only the Congress itself can authorize the final acceptance of U.S. membership.

That is the action I request today.

I

I take this step because of my urgent belief that the works of peace in Asia—the building of roads, dams, harbors, powerplants, and all the other public and private facilities essential to a modern economy—are vital to peace in the entire world.

An Asia torn by conflict, depressed by hunger, disease and illiteracy, deprived of the means and the institutions that alone can offer hope to her people, must ever be a source of turmoil and anxiety for nations beyond her borders, as well as those within. Because this is so—and because we have recognized our moral obligation to our brothers on this earth—the United States has committed itself over a decade and a half to major assistance programs in Asia, making food, development loans, and technical assistance available to those who required our aid.

We have sought no American empire. Our purpose has never been to exploit, but to encourage; not to master, but to magnify the works of those who truly served the Asian people.

Now the Asians themselves have formed an institution by whose hand new works of peace may be accomplished. They have committed precious resources to that institution. They are determined to join in a cooperative endeavor, uniting the talents and resources of diverse cultures in pursuit of a common vision of progress.

They have asked us to join with them—to subscribe 20 percent of the institution's total capital—and thus to help make that vision a reality.

I recommend that we respond quickly and affirmatively.

II

This proposal is neither utopian nor vague. It is the product of careful deliberation by the foremost experts in international finance. It rests solidly on the lessons learned in building the World Bank, and other organs of international finance, into the powerful forces for good they are today. It will take its place among regional financial institutions alongside the Inter-American Development Bank and the newly formed African Development Bank.

Loan terms will be similar to those offered by the World Bank. Project justifications will be as rigorous as prudent management requires. Special efforts will be made to develop and finance projects involving more than one country, so that the

Bank may be an agent of unity as well as development.

The Bank will reinforce existing aid programs in Asia, and thereby multiply their effectiveness. It will link its resources—financial and human—to such institutions as the Mekong Coordinating Committee, already joining the countries of the Mekong River Basin in major water resource projects.

Its charter permits it to administer special development funds, contributed by either member of nonmember countries. Thus it will serve as a channel for funds beyond its own resources.

These advantages are developed further in the special report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the Asian Development Bank which accompanies this message.

III

The largest share of the Bank's subscriptions will be provided by Asians themselves.

The United States has been asked to pledge $200 million, equally divided between paid-in and callable shares. The paid-in shares are payable in five equal annual installments of $20 million each, half of which will be in cash, half in the form of a letter of credit.

The callable shares will constitute a guarantee for borrowings by the Bank in private capital markets. They would be drawn on only in the unlikely event that the Bank were unable to meet its commitments.

Our pledge is equaled by that of Japan. India has pledged $93 million; Australia another $85 million. More than $100 million has already been pledged by European countries and Canada, and further pledges may be made.

Joint action with these major subscribers provides another instrument of cooperation between the donors of aid. That is a long-sought goal of the United States, for it offers the most efficient use of all the free world's aid resources.

Finally, our commitment to the Asian Bank should have little negative effect on our balance of payments. Procurement financed through the Bank's regular capital will normally be limited to member countries. Purchases of U.S. goods and services will approximately offset the dollar outflow occasioned by our $10 million annual cash subscription.

IV

The Asian Development Bank is a necessity—not a luxury.

It was needed yesterday. It is needed even more today. Tomorrow, when the demands of Asia's millions on her struggling economies are more pressing still, it can mean the difference between opportunity and chaos.

It is practical and imaginative. It is the product of Asian initiative, and it offers the nucleus around which Asians can make a cooperative response to the most critical economic problems—national and regional.

Because it is all these things, it is also an avenue of good will and sound policy for the United States. For our destination is a world where the instinct for oppression has been vanquished in the heart of man. Given the means to work, to build, to teach, to heal, to nourish his family, man may yet achieve such a world—if not in our time, then in the generations that will succeed us on this planet. I believe the Asian Development Bank is an essential tool in providing the means of life for hundreds of millions of human beings who live between the Caspian Sea and the South Pacific.

It will become a reality when 15 signatories, 10 of them Asian, have ratified the charter. It appears now that this will be achieved by early spring. Our own constructive influence in the organization and management of the Bank will be increased if we can become active at its very beginning.

Last April in Baltimore I spoke of our dream of a world "where all are fed and charged with hope." I promised that "we will help to make it so." Our partnership in the Asian Bank is a step in keeping that pledge. It brings us nearer that day when our resources—and the world's—can be devoted to the constructive works of peace, not the destructive forces of war.

I urge the Congress to adopt the Asian Development Bank Act. Asia's future—and the world's—requires it.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1966.*

UTAH NOMINATED AS SITE FOR 1972 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of my colleague from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], I submit a concurrent resolution expressing congressional approval of the nomination of Utah by the U.S. Olympic Committee as the site of the 1972 winter Olympic games.

The U.S. Olympic Committee will recommend Utah at a meeting of the International Olympic Committee to be held in April in Italy. It is my hope that final action can be taken on this resolution before that time.

Utah is naturally endowed with some of the finest outdoor winter recreation facilities in America. The Wasatch Mountain ski complex, which involves several Utah counties and communities, can be tied together to present to the Olympic athletes one of the largest and best equipped series of ski courses available anywhere in the world. Utah was the overwhelming choice of the U.S. Olympic Committee for the 1972 games.

Mr. President, I send the concurrent resolution to the desk, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it lie on the desk for 10 days for cosponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Utah.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 71) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 71

Whereas Utah has been chosen by the United States Olympic Committee as the United States nominee for site of the 1972 winter Olympic games; and

Whereas broadened participation in winter Olympics by nearly all nations as well as the increasing attendance at winter Olympics by sports lovers from all over the world is serving to further international good will; and

Whereas Utah's spectacular natural and manmade winter sports facilities uniquely qualify it as the location of the winter Olympic games; and

Whereas Salt Lake City is both a national and international transportation hub; and

Whereas Salt Lake City also offers ample excellent hotel and motel accommodations only half an hour's drive on all-weather roads to several winter sports sites: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses its approval of the selection of the United States Olympic Committee and supports its recommendation to the International Olympic Committee meeting in April of this year in Italy, that the State of Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 winter Olympic games.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, my colleague from Utah [Mr. Moss] and I have cosponsored the resolution which he has just submitted. The purpose of the resolution is to express congressional approval of the nomination of Utah by the U.S. Olympic Committee as the site of the 1972 winter Olympic games.

This announcement comes at an interesting time this afternoon, as we have listened to a number of Senators tell the Senate what wonderful ski areas their States have. Now we can quietly inform our friends that the Olympic Committee feels that the State of Utah has the most desirable ski area. Utah has been selected as the U.S. nominee.

In previous years, under similar circumstances, before the selection of a State in the United States has been made, other representatives have offered resolutions, and the resolutions have been considered, recommending the selection of a particular State in competition. But we have withheld our request for a resolution until the competition has been resolved and we have received the nomination.

Of course, I enthusiastically endorse the nomination. The selection speaks highly of Utah's winter sports facilities and for the officials who put the State's presentation together. Like the other Senators who have spoken on behalf of their States on this subject this afternoon, I have long felt that Utah's skiing facilities are the world's best, and I am hopeful that by 1972 the world's best winter sports athletes, including those from all the other States which have been represented here today, will discover that when they have an opportunity to try out our slopes.

I hope the committee will give immediate and favorable consideration to the resolution that my colleague from Utah and I have cosponsored.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, early last summer I introduced the International Food and Nutrition Act, which would commit this country to an accelerated and expanded effort to close the world food gap, and to make greater use of our agricultural productivity at home, in attacking the problems of hunger that exist overseas.

It is quite clear that legislation of this kind would have far-reaching foreign policy significance as well as important implications for our domestic agriculture.

At the time the legislation was introduced last summer, the measure was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think it is understandable why that was done. But after discussions with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and also the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], of which committee I am a member, we reached the conclusion that it would be more feasible for legislation to be considered primarily by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

That action becomes more logical when we consider that Public Law 480, the program under which we have been carrying on most of our overseas operations, expires on December 31 of this year.

Hearings in connection with that legislation and doubtless other overseas food matters will be before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of the bill, S. 2157, to provide for U.S. participation and leadership in an international effort to end malnutrition and human want, and for related purposes, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I did not hear why it was requested that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged.

Mr. McGOVERN. After discussions with the chairman of that committee, as well as the Committee on Agriculture, it was felt it would be more proper for the legislation to have primary consideration before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because that committee will be holding hearings this year on Public Law 480, and related matters. I believe it logical that this bill be heard at the same time.

That does not mean that the Committee on Foreign Relations may not also take a careful look at it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What did the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations have to say about the matter?

Mr. McGOVERN. He concurred in the judgment that it should be sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McGOVERN. We have the assurance of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that early hearings will be scheduled. I hope they will be held some time during the month of February.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 58) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be added as cosponsors in connection with the bill (S. 2157) to provide for U.S. participation and leadership in an international effort to end malnutrition and human want, and for related purposes, at the next printing the names of the Senators from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE and Mr. BAYH], the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] has honored me by asking that his name be added to the distinguished list of cosponsors of S. 2532 at the time the bill is next printed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HARTKE's name be so added to the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I wish to announce forthcoming hearings on electoral college reform. The hearings are scheduled to begin at 10 a.m. on February 7. They will be conducted in room 318, Old Senate Office Building; on February 8 in room 1318 New Senate Office Building; on February 9 and 10 in room 31, Old Senate Office Building.

Any persons or organizations interested in presenting their views to the subcommittee should contact the subcommittee staff in room 419, Old Senate Office Building, phone extension 3018.

NORTH CASCADES HEARING

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hear public testimony on the North Cascades study team report and the recommendations of the Regional Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for revision of the boundaries of Olympic National Park in Seattle, Wash., on February 11 and 12. The hearing on Friday, February 11, will commence at 9 a.m. in the Olympic Bowl, Olympic Hotel. The hearing on Saturday, February 12, will commence at 9 a.m. in the Williamsburg Room, Olympic Hotel.

The North Cascades study team report was publicly released at a press conference in Seattle attended by Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman on January 6. Also presented at the press conference was a recommendation to the Secretary of Interior from Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Regional Director Fred Overly proposing changes in the boundaries of Olympic National Park.

I announced at the press conference my intention to call public hearings on the study team report and the Olympic Park proposal. Concurrently, I am urging the administration to present a specific legislative proposal to the Congress. When this proposal is received, I will introduce it as chairman of the committee and schedule legislative hearings on the bill, both in Washington, D.C., and in the field, in accordance with committee policy.

Any person desiring to submit a statement or testify at the Seattle hearing on February 11 or 12 should advise the committee in writing no later than February 5, 1966, if possible.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Jack Hood Vaughn, of Virginia, to be Director of the Peace Corps, vice Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

CUTBACK IN SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM A FALSE ECONOMY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have indicated over the past few days that the Bureau of the Budget's decision to slice $3 million from the funds appropriated by Congress for the special milk program for schoolchildren was a false economy move. I have then gone on to show why the cut was unwise from the standpoint of program growth and the needs of the schoolchildren themselves. I would now like to explore the economic aspects of this decision in more detail.

As I have indicated previously, the Bureau's action will mean a cut in the rate at which the Federal Government has normally reimbursed local school districts for expenditures on milk of 10 percent, effective February 1. Currently the reimbursement rate is 5 percent below normal because of insufficient funds. This additional 5-percent cutback will mean less milk consumed under the program because local school districts and the children themselves will in many instances be unable to assume the added costs. This means they will have to cut back the program in their areas.

What will happen to this milk that no longer is necessary to supply the needs of the school milk program? Directly or indirectly it will find its way into the Government's Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. It will be purchased at Government expense as a surplus commodity under the price support program. Thus the $3 million saved by the cutback will be spent to acquire the milk at 75 percent of parity and to store it in warehouses at Government expense in powdered form.

There is no doubt that milk is a surplus commodity. From July 1, 1965, to September 30, 1965, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased $18,960,831.69 of dried milk. Over the same period the CCC's net loss on commodity inventory operations in dried milk was $19,180,686.50. Of course part of this loss was on dried milk acquired prior to the beginning of the current fiscal year. However this figure serves to illustrate the illusory nature of any so-called savings as a result of the $3 million cutback in the school milk program.

Mr. President, last year the Congress decided in its wisdom that the milk represented by this $3 million should nourish schoolchildren. The Bureau of the Budget has said "No," this milk shall not go into children's stomachs, it shall go into Government warehouses. It shall not be given to children in its natural fluid state. It shall be powdered into cheaper manufactured milk and stored at Government expense.

What little sense this action makes from the standpoint of the children, the dairy farmer, or the taxpayer. I deeply hope the Bureau will reverse itself. Until it does I will continue to discuss this matter daily on the floor of the Senate.

PERSONAL STATEMENT OF SENATOR LONG OF LOUISIANA

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I desire to speak just a moment on a point of personal privilege.

The Senate is extremely fortunate in having one of the greatest majority leaders of all time, if not the greatest, to carry the workload of this body.

It has always seemed to me extremely unfair that the press would attempt to compare one great man with another, particularly in ways that might reflect upon either. We have been extremely fortunate to have had a great majority leader in the present President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, and we are extremely fortunate that his successor is a man whom he himself supported to be his assistant, MIKE MANSFIELD, who, in my judgment, has been a very great leader in the Senate.

About a year ago, give or take a month or two, when it appeared that there would be a vacancy in the office of assistant majority leader, which office had been so ably handled by our distinguished Vice President, I thought I might offer myself for that job, and I went to the majority leader and told him I would like to run for it. He told me that the selection of an assistant majority leader was up to the Democrats of the Senate, that he was not going to tell the Democrats whom they should elect or whom they should not elect.

Had he thought there was any objection whatever to my serving in that position, I certainly would not have run for it, because I wished to help the distinguished majority leader do his job the way I think an assistant to a majority leader should.

I seek to perform in that position, Mr. President, and I have been embarrassed from time to time by speculations in the press that I was not doing what I should be doing. I want it known that so far as I am concerned, I fully support the majority leader. I knew that the majority leader would be a candidate for the job when he was elected, first whip and later majority leader. I supported him. I was happy to support him then. I am very proud to support him now.

The record of the previous session of the Congress was the most productive in the history of the United States, in large measure due to the magnificent leadership of MIKE MANSFIELD. Every Senator, whether he was for or against any piece of legislation, and regardless of the position that the majority leader took in the matter, was given every consideration and every opportunity to explain his views, and every opportunity to propose or to oppose legislation, without any advantage whatever being taken of him by reason of the fact that the majority and its leader might not be in favor of his position.

That is the way it should be. On occasion I, as a Democrat, as the ranking member on the Committee on Finance, and as a Member of the Senate on the Democratic side of the aisle, with the assistance of the majority leader, have had an opportunity to express my views. I felt very happy about the fact that I was respected as a Senator of the United States and was not expected to be merely a rubber stamp, or to say that I agreed to something when I did not agree to it. I was very happy to be offered the opportunity to disagree. When I have disagreed, I have tried to disagree without being disagreeable. On those occasions my suggestions have been fairly considered. They have been given every consideration to which they were entitled.

On other occasions the majority leader, when his opinion had been asked by others who had decisions to make, took about the same approach. If he felt that he could not completely agree with the decision that was being made, he was man enough to say so or to offer his suggestions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This morning I read a speculation that there was something amiss because the junior Senator from Louisiana made a suggestion that we should do something for Charlie Jones, who has been working for the Senate since I first became a Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, there is nothing amiss about that. I felt that if I rose at a Democratic caucus and said something nice about Charlie Jones, Charlie Jones might get a pay raise. My understanding is that Charlie Jones will get a pay raise—a well-deserved pay raise. Charlie Jones will get a pay raise because the majority leader agreed that there was merit to the idea the moment the suggestion was made. Notwithstanding all the speculation of which the press is capable, I want it known that I am proud to support our majority leader. He is doing a magnificent job. He is a credit to the Senate. He is a credit to the U.S. Government. His performance has been such that not a single Senator, as long as I have served in this body, can say that the majority leader has broken his word or has treated him unfairly—certainly not intentionally. The majority leader has gone out of his way to lean over backward on occasion, sometimes to his own detriment, to consider the problems of Senators, to cooperate with them, to consider their feelings, and to see to it that they were offered every opportunity to serve the Senate to the utmost of their capacities.

Mr. President, there was speculation that there might be some hidden significance that the majority leader thought it might be well that he have available to him, and that I have available to me, four able Senators to help us do our jobs.

Those four fine Senators were helping us do our jobs all during the past year. We appreciate their help and their cooperation. Those Senators were filling positions created by Lyndon Johnson when he was majority leader in the Senate; namely, the so-called Calendar Committee, to sit in the majority leader's chair and help get on with the program of the Senate. Those Senators have been fulfilling that position, doing their jobs and acting in our absence whenever we could not be available to fill the leader's chair, because sometimes we are in conference committees, trying to make the will of the Senate prevail over the House, and sometimes we are necessarily absent from the Chamber seeing our constituents, or carrying out our duties somewhere else.

We appreciate the work of the four Senators.

The Senate caucus saw fit to give them well-deserved recognition by giving them a title to go with the work and the job that they are doing. I am proud that it should be that way.

A year prior to this, I suggested to the majority leader that we should recruit some Senators to serve in the capacity that these four Senators are now serving and helping us. They are great men, and I appreciate their help.

I regret that I found it necessary to say anything about this matter, but overzealous newspapermen, reporting on events which they were not privileged to witness, have engaged in speculation and let rumor pile upon rumor to the extent that I felt it necessary to express my extremely high regard for a man with whom it has been my privilege to work. I also know the regard of the Senate for a man who has been a great leader, not because he entirely calls the signals and says, "This is what we are going to do," but also because he considers all Senators, their feelings and their problems, helps to cooperate with them, and helps them to represent their States.

Mr. President, in the last analysis, it should be kept in mind that I do not work for the majority leader. I work for the State of Louisiana. The majority leader does not work for the President of the United States; he works for the great State of Montana, which he is privileged to serve. We have a responsibility of working for the people of our States, as the Constitution requires. We also have a responsibility to the Senators of our party and indeed to the entire Senate.

It is, therefore, unfortunate when persons seek to find differences that do not exist between Senators, that they fail to recognize that those Senators do not represent one another, but that they represent the people of their sovereign States, and are seeking to discharge their responsibilities as the merciful good Lord gives them the light to see.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the kind and sincere words of my good friend and distinguished associate, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long].

Speculative stories have appeared in the press ever since the Long-Mansfield team came into being. The Senator from Louisiana has come to me on occasion and stated that he felt he should say something to set the record straight. I have consistently advised him to shrug off speculative stories, that we knew where we stood in relation to each other and to our colleagues and that it was our business to get the job of the Senate done as expeditiously and as fairly as possible.

Mr. President, Russell Long has been a great deputy majority leader. He has stepped in at all times when called upon and has carried not only his share of the responsibilities, but also a good deal more.

I note that today he did not take my advice. I can understand that there is a boiling point, or a breaking point, when speculation of this nature builds up and up and when there is no justification whatsoever in fact.

I met with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] and was in telephone contact with the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the secretary of the conference, before we even considered offering a resolution to the conference of Democrats a week ago on Monday. The resolution dealing with the assistant whips was offered at the conference with their full approval and understanding. If my memory serves me correctly, I believe that we released a copy of the statement to the press after that meeting a week ago on Monday, which explained that the Democratic caucus had agreed to accept the four Senators who were on the Legislative Review Committee, as assistant whips—four Senators who sit with the policy committee in all of its meetings, four men who have proved themselves, not down through the months but down through the years, in holding that most responsible position.

Mr. President, nothing is ever done under the table so far as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] and I are concerned—and it never will be.

The facts must speak for themselves.

The thing that disturbs me most is not what was said about me or the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], but the factor which disturbs me most is when they take after staff members who are doing their jobs in a decent, fair, and impartial manner, and try to pillory them and make them, in effect, scapegoats.

We can shrug it off. We have to answer to our own people, but staff members have to answer to the entire Senate.

I do not care whether it is a Republican or a Democratic member of the staff who is involved. I believe that before this kind of story is printed, staff members should at least be given the courtesy of being asked what the actual situation is, instead of being pilloried because they are in a position from which they cannot fight back.

Thus, Mr. President, while I am sorry that the Senator from Louisiana reached the boiling point, in a sense I am glad, too. This should help to clear the air and emphasize once again that so far as Democrats are concerned, and so far as Republicans are concerned, and so far as the Senate as a whole is concerned, this body will be conducted in a fair, open, and judicious manner.

If anyone does not like that kind of operation, so far as I am concerned, at any time, I am willing to step down.

WILD RIVERS ACT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider its action taken yesterday, January 18, 1966, in ordering the bill (S. 1446) to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes, to a third reading, and passing the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed as follows:

On page 20, line 15, delete "(1) and (3)" and substitute "(1), (3), (6), and (7)".

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the amendment I now propose is wholly technical. It is to make a needed addition to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia for the inclusion of the Cacapon, with its tributary, the Lost River, and the Shenandoah in West Virginia in section 3(a) of the measure. As passed yesterday by the overwhelming vote of 71 to 1, a sentence was inadvertently omitted to make provision for the administration of the wild river areas created by the Senator's amendment. The amendment now proposed would make these West Virginia wild river areas subject to be administered in a manner to be agreed upon by the two Secretaries, or as directed by the President.

This change, of course, has the complete approval of the sponsor of the amendment, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1446) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BENNETT AT SENATORIAL PRAYER MEETING AND BREAKFAST

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, recently our colleague, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], delivered an address to a group of Senators assembled at a breakfast prayer meeting. The subject of the talk was "The Inevitability of Conflict."

I consider the address to be of such worth and value that it merits being printed in the Congressional Record, and I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Last week, when Senator Willis Robertson asked me for my reaction to his masterful talk—I responded with the phrase "the inevitability of conflict." Today I want to try to develop that theme from a slightly different point of view, changing the phrase to read "the necessity for opposition." I draw this alternate expression from a sentence in Mormon scripture which says, "For it must needs be that there is an opposition in all things."

Rather than to spend precious time seeking for a definition of "opposition" which would express all of its range of meanings, let me say that for my purpose today the word connotes the existence of an infinite variety of differences—as well as the reactions and counterreactions they produce in their interplay with each other—differences in men, in ideas, in motives, and in goals. If these differences did not exist—and react—the universe and everything in it would be dead.

Without opposites there could be no choice. Without choice, neither freedom nor happiness. Without the interaction between opposites, there would be no problems, and without problems, no challenge. Without challenge, no growth from within. Without human growth in capacity, no progress.

Without opposites, there would be no causes. Without causes, no loyalty, and no call to service. In the finest aspect of life—the spiritual—without sin, there would be no righteousness, and without righteousness, no salvation.

This necessitous relationship between opposition and growth is so fundamental that we could expand our examples to cover the whole range of human ideas and activities. In fact, it even goes beyond them into nature. You remember that Newton's third law, of motion written in 1686, says that "To every action there is always opposite in equal reaction." Or—For every action there is an equal and opposite reaction.

And since we are in the field of government and politics, we already know how vital it is here. The history of mankind is a record of the struggle for, and against, the personal freedom that rests on choice—which is impossible with opposites and alternatives. The men who built the structure of this unique government used the balancing interplay of opposites as their great protective mechanism against its decay and destruction. And while some well-meaning constituents demand that we, as Senators, take "all or nothing" positions, we know that legislation, like life, is never "all or nothing," but a mix or compound into which each of us hopes to get the greatest possible percentage of his ideas. Only on proposals without significance can, or should, there be a 100 percent agreement.

If conflict is inevitable and opposition is a necessary good, what moral obligation does this impose on us, and how can our religion help us? Let me suggest again a few obvious ones.

First. Each of us has the responsibility for developing the highest possible standard of personal values, both temporal and spiritual, so that every one of our own myriad choices will be as pure as possible in motive and philosophy. Only in our religion can we find the ultimate standards of righteousness, and for us Christians, the final authority is the words of God—given us by His prophets and His only begotten Son.

Second. We have the responsibility, both to ourselves and to God, to be active rather than passive in the inevitable conflict. There is another bit of Mormon scripture that describes this phase of our obligation as follows:

"For behold it is not meet that I (God) should command in all things, for he that is compelled in all things is a slothful and not a wise servant, wherefore he receiveth no reward. Verily I say, men should be anxiously engaged in a good cause, and do many things of their own free will, and bring to pass much righteousness for the power (to do so) is in them."

Third. There is a passage in the Book of Revelations which reminds us that it is not enough for us to engage in a good cause. We must also be concerned with the depth of our commitment.

"I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of My mouth." What a figure of speech. (Rev. 3: 15.)

Fourth. The next verse in Revelations leads us into another personal challenge and points up a weakness very common in our country today. Like men of Biblical times, there are many among us who say "I am rich and increased with goods and have need of nothing." (Rev. 3: 16.) Having read this passage, we are imperatively led to read the more familiar one found in Luke 12: 16-20:

"And he spoke a parable unto them saying, The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully and he thought within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits.

"And he said, this I will do. I will pull down my barns, and build greater, and there will I bestow all my fruits and my goods. (The first urban renewal project.) And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods, laid up for many years: take thine ease—eat, drink and be merry.

"But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee, and then those shall these things be, which thou hast provided?"

In many respects, the American people are like this rich man. They have an abundance, and a tendency to "take their ease." Can this mean that there is a chance that "our soul"—our existence as a nation—is thus also in danger?

Fifth. And as a final responsibility in the inevitable participation in conflict, we have the question of motive. In this context, the ultimate opposition is between selfishness and unselfishness—and here again we never react from either motive purely. Our motives are a mixture—and the measure of their evil or righteousness lies in the point of balance between these two. Also, the effect of our motive upon our choice is further complicated by the fact that pure motives are rewarded, paradoxically, by indirection.

There is no more profound truth about human motivation than that annunciated by Christ—and reported four times in the Gospels. To quote the version in Matthew (16: 25):

"For whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever shall lose his life for My sake shall find it."

Today, we here in this room face two special areas of conflict, two tests of our sense of values and our motives. The first is in our participation in this year's Senate program. The second involves our war in Vietnam. In many ways the problems created by conflict are different, in others they overlap.

Let's look at each separately and apply my general observations about conflict and opposition to each. Vietnam first:

Is this war necessary? To me it is, if we are to preserve the right of choice for the people of South Vietnam and, in a special sense, for ourselves. Since this philosophy of the Communists, if imposed on them, would extinguish that right for them and bring the day near when it might also be denied to us, our motives must obviously be a mixture of unselfish sacrifice (for the benefit of the Vietnamese) and self-interest. What about our sense of values? Where is the balancing point in this mixture? Some, including the President, apparently believe that we can put a determination to take our ease at home above victory in Vietnam. To me, this reveals a scale of values that puts material benefits ahead of spiritual ones, and is therefore bound to lead to trouble.

Applying the next test, we are active rather than passive, but essentially a little lukewarm: not yet having resolved the choice between being hot (going all out) and being cold (intending to close the conflict out without having achieved the goal to which we committed ourselves when we went into the fight). To me it was significant that even as late as last week, in his state of the Union message, the President claimed equal devotion to both alternatives and has since had to offset the inevitable confusion such as double-edged statement made by sending emissaries around the world to assure those of our friends who hold to one position rather than the other that what he really meant was devotion to their particular position. At least, that was why Secretary Rusk went to Vietnam.

And if war ends—either through victory or withdrawal—will this produce what we call peace? Wars always end, but conflict, opposition, and competition never do. Therefore, the real question is: When the actual fighting in Vietnam stops, will the sum total of the international political mix contain more or less personal freedom? For more or less people?

The direction in which this war moves mankind is infinitely more important than the fact that the conflict has been moved temporarily from the battlefield to the conference table, or to international trade.

And what of the Congress? Are conflict and opposition necessary and valuable here? Of course they are, and they must be strong enough to create the true balancing force which the writers of the Constitution conceived to be one of their most important roles. On the surface, this sounds like a partisan Republican statement, but you and I know that Jefferson's identification of a nonpartisan concurrent majority is accurate, and therefore it is equally accurate to recognize the existence of a similar concurrent opposition.

Since opposition is a basic and indispensable ingredient in the legislative process, each of us must face for himself all the questions I have raised as generalities today. Let me repeat them briefly.

First. Do you and I treasure the value of the right of opposition? Have all of us preserved our freedom to use our right to be in the opposition? Or have some of us committed ourselves in advance to positions we would not have chosen if free? If so, can those who have done this possibly be happy in their congressional service? Moreover, do our choices promote our personal growth and do they promote sound progress for the country as a whole, or do they preserve and increase the power of special interests?

Are the causes we support morally worthy? Do we believe in them for their value—or our own political benefit? Are we devoted and loyal to them to the point of spontaneous personal contribution and, if necessary, sacrifice? Or are we in them for what we can get?

And what about our reasons for taking a negative position? Are they soundly based? Or did Thomas Mann, the German novelist, describe us accurately when he wrote:

"We are most likely to get angry and excited in our opposition to some idea when we ourselves are not quite certain of our own position, and are inwardly tempted to take the other side."

How do our standards of value measure up against those presented in the Scriptures? In what proportion are we an active or passive participant in the legislative process? How much initiative and leadership do we show as contrasted with "followership"? Are we hot or cold in the legislative fields in which we have committee responsibilities, or just lukewarm? Do we feel that we "have it made" politically so we can say to ourselves "Take thine ease" or are we still "anxiously engaged in a good cause?"

In closing, one final observation—opposition and conflict are not only inevitable and necessary, but they occur in every law of nature, and in every aspect of human life. International opposition and war are dramatic—but in a sense they are only reflections of an even greater and more fundamental struggle—the one that goes on in the hearts and minds of every man. And until the majority of men can swing the balance of their separate internal personal battles to the side of the ultimate values of the great spiritual truths contained in the Gospel of Christ, there can never be any hope for a time when all conflicts will be waged to show who can do the most for human progress rather than for power and domination over mankind.

Before each of us can ask himself "How goes the battle in Vietnam, or the program in Congress," he needs to find out where he stands in the conflict that is taking place in his own heart. In that one, may all of us say, like Joshua: As for me and my house, we shall serve the Lord.

SENATOR JAMES B. PEARSON OF KANSAS LOOKS AT FEDERAL-STATE-LOCAL RELATIONS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, my friend and colleague from Kansas, Senator Pearson, delivered a speech at the Kansas Official Council Convention in Wichita last November 15 which is recognized as one of the most enlightened and perceptive views yet authored on Federal-State-local relations. The speech has since been reprinted in the January 1966 Kansas Government Journal.

In his speech, the learned and thoughtful Senator from Kansas has examined the dilemma of the separation of governmental powers among the Federal, State, and local entities from the inception of our Republic to the present. I ask that the Senator's speech be printed in the body of the Record where it will become a permanent part of the deliberations of this body and receive the wide attention it so richly deserves.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL-STATE-LOCAL RELATIONS

(By JAMES B. PEARSON, U.S. Senator, delivered at the Kansas Official Council Convention, Wichita, Nov. 15, 1965)

The American form of government is often symbolized as being a three-layer cake—the Federal, the State, and the local government. A far more accurate image is a marble cake characterized by an inseparable mingling of different colored ingredients—the colors appearing in vertical and diagonal strands. As these colors are mixed in the marble cake, so the governmental functions are mixed in the American Federal system.

The Federal grant-in-aid programs are the most obvious examples of these mixed functions. These money grants utilize the great tax-gathering abilities of the Federal Government and establish nationwide goals and standards. Yet, they are "in aid" of governmental responsibilities traditionally carried out under State law with considerable State and local discretion.

Even in the absence of joint financing, the Federal-State-local collaboration has been, and continues to be, the characteristic mode of Government action. Federal expertise is available to provide standards for State and local personnel in protecting housewives against dishonest butcher scales. States and localities, on the other hand, assume important formal responsibilities in the development of national programs for atomic energy, civil defense, the regulation of commerce, and the protection of purity in foods and drugs. Moreover, local political weight is always effective in the operation of a post office or even a military establishment.

But let me illustrate the point I seek to develop by describing what may seem to be an extreme case—the typical county health officer, for he, it seems to me, embodies the whole idea of the marble cake concept in government. For example, in many States he is appointed by the State under merit standards established by the Federal Government. His salary comes jointly from State and Federal funds and supplemented, in some cases, by municipal compensation. The county provides him with an office. He advises the cities within his county on subjects ranging from proper plumbing connections to sewage disposal. His work of inspecting the purity of foods is carried out under Federal standards, but he is enforcing State laws when inspecting these same commodities that have not been in interstate commerce.

So he is a Federal officer when impounding impure drugs shipped from a neighboring State; a Federal-State officer when distributing typhoid serum; a State officer when enforcing standards of industrial hygiene; a State-local officer when inspecting a city's water supply and to complete the circle, a local officer when insisting that the corner grocer adopt more hygienic methods of handling garbage.

SHARED FUNCTIONS

The point is that functions of government are not precisely and neatly parceled out among the many levels of government. They are shared functions and it is, I think, difficult to find any governmental activity which does not involve all three of the so-called levels of the Federal system.

Now, for many, the conditions just described represent an evil development. One authority has contended that the main tradition of American federalism is the tradition of separateness. Commissions and committees have in the past dozen years been established to reform and reorganize the Federal system. The plan was to establish "functional separateness," to parcel out governmental functions to each level of government which might be best suited and financially able to render a given public service.

Time will not permit, nor have I studied these reports in detail, to list the many recommendations made. Suffice it to note that none of them have been implemented by legislative, executive, or judicial action. The truth appears to be that, despite historic theories, the writings of authorities and the interpretations of judicial opinions, the American Federal system does not seem to have ever been a system of separated governmental activities.

Even before the Constitution, a statute, reenforced by the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, gave grants-in-land to the States for public schools. Thus, the National Government was a prime force in making possible what is now taken to be the most local function of all—primary and secondary education.

Lord Bryce in his classic, "The American Commonwealth," described the Federal and State governments in the 19th century as "distinct and separate in their actions." The system, he said, was "like a great factory wherein two sets of machinery were at work. Their revolving wheels apparently intermixed, their bands crossing one another, yet each set doing its own work without touching or hampering the other."

Moreover, throughout the 19th century the U.S. Supreme Court wrote many decisions referring to areas of exclusive action to be exercised by the Federal Government or the State government. These decisions referred to powers being "separate and distinct" and indicated that neither the Federal nor the State government should intrude within the jurisdiction of the other. Yet the real thrust of most of these decisions was designed to limit government rather than dealing directly with the issue of cooperation versus separation between the levels of government. And the Supreme Court within the 19th century refused to interfere with Federal grants-in-land or cash to the States. Even Chief Justice Marshall was willing to allow interstate commerce to be affected by the States in their use of the police power.

And so, throughout the 19th century, grants-in-land from the Federal Government went to the State governments and their local subsidiaries, not only for elementary education, as mentioned, but also for colleges, roads, canals, rivers, harbors, and railroads; for reclamation of desert and swamp lands; and for veterans' benefits.

PARTNERS WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Aid also went in the other direction. The Federal Government, theoretically in exclusive control of the Indian population, relied continuously on the experience and resources of State and local governments. State militias were an all-important ingredient in the Nation's Armed Forces. State governments became real partners in Federal programs for homesteading, reclamation, inland waterways, and the Nation's internal communications system, including highway and railroad routes.

At this point I am constrained to emphasize that I do not hold the concept of separation of powers in contempt, nor do I advocate the destruction of State and local governments in the Federal system. These are essential parts of the greatest system of government ever devised by the mind of man. What I think to be accurate is that what the Founding Fathers sought to create—the limitation of the power of government—has come about not so much by virtue of a separation of government activities at each level of government but by virtue of the dispersal or the sharing of a given power among the levels of government.

This sharing or dispersal has, I suggest, come about not only from a "handing down" process by the Federal Government, but also from a "reaching up" process by the State and local governments.

Yet there is little reason to fear, despite campaign oratories, the utter destruction of State and local governments in our Federal system. This is true for several reasons:

First, as stated, while governmental powers may not be precisely separated, they are shared and dispersed and the State and local units still have a vital role to play.

Second, there is the simple historic fact that the States existed before the Nation.

Third, there is an American creed that expresses distrust of centralized power and places great value in the strength and vitality of local units of government.

Fourth, there is a traditional pride in localities and States nurtured by the Nation's size and by the variations of regional and State history.

And last, decentralization of government can be maintained because of the sheer wealth of this Nation which permits experimentation—and even waste—and which can afford duplication of effort at least to some degree.

All that has been said is merely proof again that our Government is complex; that our politics operating in that structure are chaotic; and that simply to understand the Federal system is a difficult task. Yet, without understanding what we are as distinguished from what we think we are, there is little possibility of producing desired changes.

The recent major efforts to reform the Federal system aimed at separating functions and tax sources among the Federal Government, the States and the local governments have not been successful.

IMPROVE SYSTEM OF SHARING

What we need to achieve is an improvement of our system of shared government functions. If we can work out a more successful and economical manner of intergovernmental cooperation, if we can perfect the diffusion of governmental powers among the levels of government, we can still operate under limitations of and safeguards against arbitrary government power.

What improvements are needed? Perhaps a better question would be what improvements can be achieved?

1. In a governmental system of genuinely shared responsibilities, disagreements inevitably occur over "ends" and over "means." Such disagreements may be a mixture of personalities, politics, and opinions—men of good will with honest differences. (I should hope that the time might come when two men might disagree over a principle of government without both considering the other to be evil or subversive.) We need not avoid controversy. We simply need to control controversy so that it may be turned to constructive solutions.

2. We need some mechanism to review the patchwork of grants in terms of national goals and in terms of national priorities.

3. We need some procedure whereby Federal aid to States and municipalities will relate to the real and pressing problems of the local government. Uniformity of programs have been justified on the basis of fairness, but are such uniform programs really fair? And, even more importantly, do they uniformly solve a real and existing problem? Only a moment's contemplation is needed for one to recognize that the 50 different States have each, in response to public demand, emphasized, promoted, and financed different programs. One State, such as Kansas, may have emphasized a broad and excellent mental health program, another may have emphasized higher education, another a secondary road system, another a welfare program. The result is a view from Washington where the various States have reached various levels of achievement on a great variety of programs. The common result is that if a sufficient number of States have neglected to provide a public service in a given field, then the Federal Government

will institute a program and apply the grants-in-aid on a uniform basis. The end result is that the State which has moved forward in that given area is penalized for its past initiative, and the State which has neglected its responsibility is rewarded for its delinquency.

4. If "States' rights" is to have any meaning other than a political cliche, then there must develop "States' responsibilities." But this will require some readjustment of both the Federal and State tax structure. You are all aware the Governor's Conference has almost unanimously endorsed a proposal whereby the Federal Government would annually distribute back to the States a given sum of money without relating this grant to any specific program. This may be a partial solution, but many who are concerned about fiscal responsibility are also concerned about the results of separating the power to tax and the power to spend. Yet, tax reform and tax sharing will be, even under the best of systems, a constant need as life and the economy undergo a constant change.

5. The strength of States and localities would, it seems to me, be greater if so many of our States—the localities being a creation of the States—did not live with outmoded but self-imposed constitutions. Often these constitutional limitations make it difficult for the States and their localities to perform all of the services that their citizens require, or at least demand. This condition has often added to the Federal responsibility. States can move, through constitutional revision, in the direction of greater internal effectiveness.

6. The present system of shared responsibility and diffused power, rather than separateness, confuses rather than fixes responsibility. The people need to know where responsibility resides for policy, for administration, for financing—if we are to have effective self-government. As difficult as it may be, in a system of diffused and shared power, some means must be acquired to fix public responsibilities.

So for better or worse, right or wrong, this is one view of the Federal system in the United States.

Not all is right with our governments, but there is much that is very good. Whatever may be the form of the machinery, the paramount goal of this Nation was set long ago. It is to guard the right of the individual, to insure his development, and to enlarge his opportunity and his horizons of hope.

BAKER INDICTMENT A WILLIAMS VICTORY—A COLUMN BY PAUL HOPE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, when the grand jury, which for more than a year had been reviewing the fantastic rise in affluence of Bobby Baker, returned a nine-count indictment against the former protege of Lyndon Johnson, there were many conflicting emotions in Washington. But if one man could have allowed himself a modest measure of pride over the indictment, it was the Senator from Delaware, JOHN WILLIAMS, who braved the full power of the Federal Government, the skepticism of the press, and the scorn of a Senate committee functionary to bring the sordid Baker episode before the public.

Mr. Paul Hope, writing in the January 14 Washington Evening Star, commented on the Baker case and Senator WILLIAMS' role in it. As Mr. Hope asserted:

> It was WILLIAMS who initiated the Senate's inquiry into the activities of its free-wheeling former secretary to the Democratic majority.

And, as Mr. Hope also pointed out:

> The committee would have given up long before it did if WILLIAMS had not always been about six jumps ahead of it.

Mr. President, an indictment is not a conviction, but the fact that a grand jury could look at the same facts which were available to the Rules Committee and produce an indictment where a whitewash had existed, is not only a tribute to the objectivity of the grand jury, but a vindication of the Senator from Delaware.

It would seem incumbent also, Mr. President, that the Senate Rules Committee take steps to extract a public apology from its former paid counsel who called Senator WILLIAMS a liar last year. In my view, an apology should also come from the majority side of the committee which worked so assiduously to emulate the little apes of Nikko who felt constrained to hear no evil, see no evil, and speak no evil.

I ask unanimous consent that the Hope article, to which I alluded, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAKER INDICTMENT A WILLIAMS VICTORY

(By Paul Hope)

The indictment of Bobby Baker was another victory for Republican Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, the self-styled country boy from Delaware who figured from the beginning that Baker was involved in more than chickenfeed.

It was WILLIAMS who initiated the Senate's inquiry into the activities of its freewheeling former secretary to the Democratic majority. And it was he who kept prodding the Senate Rules Committee to delve deeper into the case of the $19,600-a-year employee who amassed, on paper at least, a $2.1 million fortune.

WILLIAMS fumed frequently in private and sometimes in public, about the way the Rules Committee kept brushing things under the rug. But he never gave up.

"Whitewash put on over dirt won't stick. We country boys know that," he once said.

The committee would have given up long before it did if WILLIAMS hadn't always been about six jumps ahead of it. It tried to quit several times but each time was embarrassed by some new disclosure by WILLIAMS.

Finally the committee did give up but not before the committee counsel called WILLIAMS a liar in public and implied in a confidential draft of a committee report that WILLIAMS had been less than honest with the committee.

It was ironic that the committee would treat WILLIAMS in such fashion. Many of the leads, indeed detailed accounts of some Baker transactions, were provided to the committee by WILLIAMS who thought at first that the committee intended to do a thorough job.

But it was soon apparent that many members of the Senate had little stomach for the task of exposing corruption in their midst. To WILLIAMS, however, the main issue was whether the Senate would put its own house in order.

When the indictment was handed down last week it was information supplied by WILLIAMS, not the Rules Committee, that formed the basis for the three counts that promise to be the most politically explosive of the nine against Baker. These involve the alleged transfer of $100,000 to Baker by three savings and loan officials from California, money that the grand jury charges Baker converted to his own use.

WILLIAMS had sat on the savings and loan story for months. He was first given a sketchy version of it some time after mid-1964. Its disclosure then would have made some headlines during the presidential campaign when Barry Goldwater and other Republicans were draping Baker around President Johnson's neck.

Like most Republicans, WILLIAMS is not averse to jabbing Democrats when he has the chance. But he is a cautious man, with a nonpartisan streak when it comes to seeking out corruption. He doesn't move until he gets his facts.

"You've got to be extremely careful," WILLIAMS once said. "With the power of the Senate you can destroy a man, so you've got to be right. I have cases here that are maybe going to explode some day, but until I can document them they stay right in that file. I'd rather let a dozen go than start a new one before it's ready."

When the Rules Committee closed up shop, WILLIAMS continued his own investigation and ultimately turned over the information he had on the savings and loan matter to the grand jury.

The savings and loan aspect of the indictment is important because it seems to offer the best avenue left to get at the basic issue of the Baker case: Was money used to try to influence legislation? The indictment doesn't say why the $100,000 was given to Baker in the first place or what he was supposed to do with it or what, in fact, he did with it.

An indictment is not a conviction. Nor does a trial necessarily mean a complete airing of circumstances surrounding a transaction. But as WILLIAMS said the other day in his only public comment on the indictment, "progress is being made."

For WILLIAMS the pursuit of the Baker case has not been easy. In addition to the abuse he took from the committee, his income tax returns were audited twice in the last 2 years; he claimed his mail to Government agencies was intercepted; attempts were made to blacken his character; and a parade of Democrats, including Johnson, invaded his State to try to defeat him for reelection in 1964.

But Whispering Will (as his colleagues call him because he's so hard to hear on the Senate floor) plods on. And the record of persons he helped send to jail since he left his Delaware chickenfeed business in 1947 to begin a one-man clean Government crusade would be the envy of many prosecuting attorneys.

THE SPIRIT OF MEXICO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a new spirit is growing in Mexico—a dynamic, vibrant spirit of a nation on the move, where hard work and self-confidence is beginning to show results. Today, our neighbor to the south stands at the head of the Alliance for Progress, a showcase of progress, proud of her accomplishments, impatient to get on with the job of economic and social development.

Mexico is moving ahead. The economic growth rate reached 10 percent last year, far exceeding the goal set by the Charter of Punta del Este in 1961; the Mexican peso is now officially accepted as a hard and convertible currency; Mexico's credit rating is excellent and her debt-servicing position is strong. The largest single component of the Mexican budget goes for education and today fully 85 percent of school-age children in the cities and more than 50 percent in rural areas go to school. The national literacy rate has reached an impressive 75 percent of the population.

Poverty has not disappeared in Mexico, neither has illiteracy—problems are not difficult to find, life in the cities and on the farms is still hard for many; many millions still live the barest existence—but Mexico is moving, responsibly and democratically, under the leadership of President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz to meet the challenge of development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles by James Nelson Goodsell which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of January 14 and 17, 1966, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 14, 1966]

Revolution Revitalizes Mexico

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

Mexico City.—A farmer on the other side of the mountains east of Mexico City has needed a regular flow of water onto his land for as long as he can remember.

Recently, the water system of the nearby town was extended to within 300 yards of his property. He found he could tie into the town system for the equivalent of about $500 in Mexican pesos.

Although he didn't have the money for such a project, he was able to get a loan for the amount at 7 percent interest from a Mexican bank. And today he has that long needed regular flow of water.

On the surface, this story may not appear important. But in Latin America, where small loans from banks are not too common, this farmer's story is real news.

Moreover, the loan tells a great deal about the Mexican economy, which is Latin America's strongest.

For Mexico is pioneering in many business and financial arrangements—long since found successful and profitable in the United States and Western Europe, but seldom tried in Latin America.

The farmer, whose plot of land lies in the rich corn-growing fields of the Valley of Puebla only 75 miles from Mexico City, is taking part in what amounts to a veritable revolution south of the border.

MAJOR FACTORS LISTED

Significant factors in this revolution:

A growing middle class, comprising at least a fourth of the nation's 41 million people, is providing stability in economic, social, and political activities.

A national growth rate which in 1964 registered 10 percent and in 1965 showed an estimated 8 percent. Prospects for 1966 are as good if not better.

The Mexican peso, worth 8 cents (United States) is officially rated as one of the world's hard currencies, the only such currency in Latin America.

Foreign-exchange reserves have never been higher—and the nation's credit never better. Mexico, moreover, is one of the 16 nations which have increased contributions to the International Monetary Fund beyond the obligatory 25 percent.

The foreign debt, much of it in long-term loans, is of manageable size and has increased far less than the national wealth even when the population increased, currently running at 3.1 percent annually and one of Latin America's largest, is taken into account.

But more important than these statistics is the new spirit in Mexico. A new class of managers, for example, handles much of the nation's business. Foreign investors find hard-headed and industrious Mexicans in the driver's seat in many industries.

There's a stepped-up tempo in a variety of fields.

But perhaps more important to Mexicans than anything else is their progress in education. They have talked much about a breakthrough in education for 40 years. But only in the past 10 has this penetration been successful all around.

RURAL AREAS STUDIED

In the big cities, 85 percent of school-age youngsters complete primary education. Most of them easily find jobs. And in the countryside, the children of the farmer with the loan are in school and will complete primary education also.

Poverty in Mexico is still a reality. Mexicans know this. But for the young of this nation, poverty is no longer the inevitable. It is something which can be and often is prevented.

In the countryside, where poverty has been a chronic factor, Mexico is now moving to bring more rural area people into the national economy. Half of the nation's population of 41 million lives on the land, yet the land produces only about 20 percent of Mexico's wealth.

With better farming, with more roads, with a greater emphasis on education in the rural areas, this 50 percent of the population could produce 35 percent or more of the wealth. The loan the smaller farmer east of Mexico City received is designed to increase his effectiveness.

Many such small loans are being made. Part of this comes under the Alliance for Progress umbrella.

A $20 million U.S. loan for agricultural credit, made in 1963, has now been followed by two additional loans for similar amounts—one more from the United States and one from the World Bank.

There are problems on the horizon, to be sure. The growth rate in 1965 was somewhat down from several previous years. But this was due more to an effort to correct some social-service imbalances than to any slowing down of the national economy.

In addition, the balance-of-payments picture is not as good as it was a few years ago. This is due to stepped-up capital goods purchases. But with the bountiful tourist trade, the "industry without chimneys" increasing at the rate of 14 percent per year, the payments picture is still one of substantial surplus.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 17, 1966]

Mexico: Hemisphere Leader

(Note.—Newly dynamic Mexico is personified in its middle class which has so heavily benefited from the nation's progress in the past several decades. This progress is mirrored in educational growth, the national growth rate, and political stability. Mexico could well serve as the model for the rest of the hemisphere.)

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

Mexico City.—This vast nation reaching great power status with 42 million people and a growth rate far outpacing much of the world, is the potential leader of Latin America.

No nation in Latin America has made as much progress in the past 25 years as Mexico. No Latin-American nation has so solid a middle class. No nation in the hemisphere is as much respected in Latin America and elsewhere.

Mexico's modern progress results directly from its cataclysmic social revolution at the start of this century. That revolution was one of the hemisphere's few valid revolutions. It broke Mexico's ties with its past and ushered in an era of change and reform which continues today.

This breaking with the past and this ushering in of the new are mirrored in the Gutiérrez family. They live in Puebla, an important agricultural and industrial city of 200,000. It is located in the highland valley of the same name about 90 miles east of Mexico City.

The Gutiérrez family is a large one. Rafael, the father, is in his 60's. Josefina, the mother, is in her mid-40's. Rafael married late—"in my 40's," he laughs with his booming voice, "because the minute I saw Josefina as a baby, I knew she was my woman, and that I would have to wait." Wait he did. But the real reason was that he had little money when he was in his 20's and 30's, when he was fighting with the revolutionaries and then wandering from place to place.

"It was worth waiting," Josefina says, smiling around the table at the eight Gutiérrez children—José who is 20, María, 18, Alicia, 16, Sonia, 12, Juan, 11, Roberto, 8, Ricardo, 6, and Rafaelito, 5.

Rafael owns a grocery store and a thriving animal-feed business. He makes a comfortable living—"never enough, but we really cannot complain," he says, gesturing with his hand toward the dining room and living room.

COMFORTABLE LOOK

There is a comfortable look about the Gutiérrez home. Little touches here and there indicate the care which Josefina and her older daughters take for their home. The handsome furniture is modern and was made in Mexico. This is true of almost every item in the home, including the appliances.

The Gutiérrez house is on the southwestern side of the city, on a slight rise which gives the family something of a view of the lovely Puebla Valley with its extensive corn fields ringed by some of the country's tallest mountains. The house was built 6 years ago on land that Rafael purchased 15 years before.

"You should have seen how we lived then—with only José and Maria," Josefina says. "It was in a room behind our store on Calle 6 Norte. We had water and little else. But we took our savings from the grocery store—it wasn't much—and started the animal-feed business. That was a good step. Look at all we have now. We never thought we would come this far."

That line—"We never thought we would come this far"—might be the theme song of modern Mexico. For 20 years ago, there were few who would have forecast the vast changes which have overtaken this nation and brought prosperity to millions of its citizens.

Today more than a quarter of all Mexicans like the Gutiérrez family are in the middle class. This was not the case 30 or 20, or even 10 years ago. Yet today there is a buoyant middle class, full of hope and assurance that they can go even further than they have already come.

That is the view in the Gutiérrez household. Their confidence in continuing progress is evidenced in so many ways. For example, Rafael is very proud of his oldest son, José, a good student of engineering at the University of Puebla.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

"He will have much more opportunity than I had. I went to school for only a few years, and then I picked up the rest of my education in working and traveling around Mexico. José will go on to school in the United States."

Indeed, José will. He is in the top 10 of his class of more than 550 at the university. He is working on two scholarship programs to pay a portion of his tuition at a university in California. His father will pay the rest.

And Rafael is not only eager to pay but, more importantly, able to pay.

"That's what surprises me all the time," he says. "You see, I come from a poor family in the little village of Apizaco (in the State of Tlaxcala). We never had much money and sometimes we didn't have enough to eat. Then the revolution came. We suffered.

"My father was killed in 1911. Or was it 1912? I don't remember, only I know he never came back from the revolution. Then my mother tried to help us. We were 11 in addition to my mother. We never thought of university. I don't recall ever hearing of a university until I was 20 or more. And then it was too late for me."

What pleases Rafael is that it is not going to be too late for any of his children. And it really hasn't been too late for him, either. Rafael's ability to provide for his family is a source of steady amazement to him. He remarked about it frequently at the dining table.

Rafael's story is in a sense illustrative of at least a portion of the Mexican story, an ever-increasing part of that story.

It was the revolution that Rafael talked about that made possible all the changes.

Alfonso Reyes, Mexico's grand old man of letters, once told this correspondent that the 1910 revolution "triumphed in an instant" and "broke our fetters." But it was to be many years before people like Rafael Gutiérrez were to profit from the struggle.

A SUBTLE QUALITY

The steps taken in the early days—many of them outright socialism—have been tempered with experience. For example, some of the eager enthusiasms for the parcelation of land into small patches has gone by the board; more constructive methods of distributing land have been implemented. Mistakes, and there were many in the early days, have been corrected.

But the original socialist plans serve as the groundwork for what has become Latin America's most successful democratic experiment.

There is something more: a certain subtle quality in the Mexican picture which is hard to fully assess. It has to do with patriotism, with being proud of nation. This is not unfamiliar in any Latin American land. But the Mexican in his patriotism seems to have gone a step further than his compatriots in other parts of Latin America.

The Mexican is proud of his land and his progress. But he is more. He is inordinately proud of his past.

And Mexico has a past of which to be proud. It is an Indian past which today is ennobled in many ways in the Mexican experience. The Mexican character is significantly shaped by it. The Aztecs and the Mayas are to Mexicans what the Pilgrim forefathers are to North Americans.

In a word, Mexico, unlike many of the other Latin lands, accepts and boasts of its past. This subtlety may help explain why Mexico is progressing so rapidly.

Observers say Mexico has come to terms with itself. It has accepted itself for what it is—and is building on that.

Whatever explains the Mexican experience, the indisputable fact remains that this Spanish-speaking land is Latin America's showcase of progress.

Just as Rafael and Josefina Gutiérrez have had significant success, so has Mexico. Here are some of the factors:

An annual growth rate of between 8 percent and 12 percent, maintained for a dozen years or so, is based on a steady growth of industry and exports. It is Latin America's steadiest economy.

AGRICULTURAL LAG?

A political stability, affording the climate for economic reform and social evolution, is based on a unique one-party arrangement and political enlightenment.

A growing pattern of literacy—with more than 75 percent of the population considered literate in the full sense of the world. Hardly any child in the cities lacks educational opportunity, and more than half in the countryside now have such opportunity. Education is the largest single item in the Mexican budget.

If anything has lagged over the years, it has been agriculture. Just under 55 percent of the population is engaged in some phase of farming, but only about 20 percent of the annual gross national product is derived from the farms.

Moreover, the people on the farms are the most unfortunate people in Mexico. They are the ones who still lack educational opportunity. They are the ones who have little opportunity to change their lot. They are the ones who, in the eyes of some observers, pose the most serious long-range threat to any Mexican Government.

Mexico has an odd stability. It is based on one-party government—hardly democratic in North American terms, but rather admirably suiting Mexican needs, as most observers of the nation agree. It stems directly from that revolution of 1910. It is sufficiently leftist to carry out its link with the revolution, yet it partakes of aspects of capitalism that would delight businessmen in the United States.

In a word, it is a part socialist, part capitalist government in which the two mingle rather well.

The single party, the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI) embraces most political thought in the country, from right to left. Nothing happens in Mexico which isn't approved by the PRI. Yet the PRI has given Mexico not only stability and progress but also growing evidence of individual freedom and action.

Is there much of a Communist threat? Hardly.

RECONCILIATION SOUGHT

Communism exists in Mexico and is included within the broad arms of the PRI. Certainly some Mexican leaders moved in the direction of Communist philosophy in the years after 1910 when the Mexican Revolution began. But the fears of outsiders about communism in Mexico have been largely misdirected.

Essentially, the PRI seeks reconciliation with all groups to effectively control them, but also to see what there is of worth in these various groups.

The Mexican Communist Party today is a pallid imitation of what Communist parties are in other parts of the world—including the United States. It exists, but it is a weak, disorganized, and middle-of-the-road party.

The party has limited influence in labor and education. Its greatest strength today appears to lie in the area of agricultural workers.

Mexico maintains relations with the Communist bloc countries. The Soviet and Cuban embassies as well as the Czech and Hungarian legations in Mexico City operate with precision and correctness.

On Cuba, Mexico maintains an official posture of hands off. But Mexico also watches very carefully what comes in and goes out via the Mexico entryway.

While maintaining diplomatic and trade relations with Cuba, because Mexico argues that the Organization of American States sanctions against Cuba are illegal, the Mexicans watch trade and travel carefully.

Mexican agents fingerprint, photograph, and investigate everyone going into and coming out of Cuba through Mexico's international airport, for example.

Observers say without equivocation that Mexico's leading politicians are openly anti-Communist, and the government is actively hostile to communism. But Mexico's Government also believes that maintaining relations with Cuba and the Soviet Union is correct, for to do otherwise would be to violate the traditions of nonintervention.

Failure to recognize a government is intervention, just as much as physical armed intervention, the Mexicans say.

YOUNG LEADERSHIP

Where do Rafael and Josefina fit into all this? Like the majority of Mexicans, they are solidly supporters of the PRI. But Rafael says the PRI has changed, and "I've changed with it."

"It was much more radical in its early days," he comments. "But that was necessary. Today, the PRI is a much less radical party. What happened was the replacement of the old revolutionaries like myself with the younger generation."

And it is the younger generation that today rules Mexico. Nothing in modern Mexico's makeup is more illustrative of the change in Mexico than the youthfulness of its leaders. This is a natural step, for 55 percent of all Mexicans are under 20 today, and just over 75 percent are under 30.

This has been both challenge and opportunity to Mexico. "We think it is opportunity," says President Diaz Ordaz.

This, then, is a young nation with a gloried past which "serves as underpinning not as entanglement," as a Mexican lawyer phrased it.

In the balance sheet of the hemisphere, Mexico is the most successful, most promising nation in Latin America. Its example could well be a pattern for the rest of Latin America to follow.

THE THREAT TO OUR WATERS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] who has been one of the national leaders in the fight against water pollution, was asked by the Milwaukee Journal recently to write a series of articles on our nationwide pollution problem.

This series of articles explains in terms the average citizen can understand the way in which pollution is ruining our fresh water assets, killing our fish, and threatening our municipal water supplies. The articles cover various types of pollution from municipal sewage, industrial wastes, pesticides, septic tanks, detergent chemicals, and ships. A final article in the series suggests a new approach to pollution prevention.

This series has reached a great number of readers through the Milwaukee Journal and has since been reprinted in the Waukegan News-Sun in my State and the Superior Evening Telegram in northern Wisconsin. The articles are among the most comprehensive articles on our pollution crisis that I have ever seen. I ask unamimous consent that the series be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Threat to Our Waters

Note.—A series of articles on our nationwide pollution problem by U.S. Senator Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, who has specialized in this field.

At the request of the Milwaukee Journal, Senator Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, recently prepared a series of five articles for newspaper publication, describing our nationwide pollution crisis in terms which the typical citizen is able to understand. The articles tell of the widespread pollution of American rivers and the alarming spread of pollution today into our Great Lakes and thousands of other small inland lakes.

One article outlines exactly how pollution ruins fresh water, kills its fish and aquatic life, and makes it difficult to purify again. This article also outlines in simple terms the operation of a city sewage treatment plant.

Subsequent articles describe in detail the pollution of Lake Erie and Lake Michigan; the dangers from pesticides, lakeshore septic tanks, ships and detergents. A final article suggests a new approach to pollution prevention which offers hope of meeting this crisis and saving these waters.

Senator NELSON was a member of the Wisconsin Legislature for 10 years and then served 4 years as Governor before being elected to the U.S. Senate in 1962. He has served on the Senate Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee and is the author of many bills in this field. As Governor, he won national recognition for a pioneering program to save natural resources. He has continued his efforts in this field as a Senator.

THE THREAT TO OUR WATERS—I

(By Senator GAYLORD NELSON)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The fresh water lakes of Wisconsin and the Nation—from the smallest glacial pool in our north woods to the 60-million-acre Great Lakes chain—are threatened with destruction.

A relentless river of pollution, surging up from our expanding cities and our booming industries, is oozing into these once clear waters, turning them from blue to gray, killing the life beneath their waves, and soiling their shores with filth and scum.

The tragedy of our lakes is taking place at a time when we need them as never before—as an irreplaceable supply of drinking water, as a matchless recreational outlet, and as a priceless resource in commerce and industry.

An embattled New York clubwoman said recently: "We Americans are standing ankle deep in sewage, shooting rockets to the moon."

We are fighting pollution today, but we are losing. Before long, we must make a great decision. We must decide whether we really want to save our lakes and our fresh blue waters. If we want to win this fight, we must take a historic turn. We must create new public agencies, accept new regulations, and make a massive investment in facilities to correct and prevent pollution.

Every major river system in America is seriously polluted, from the Androscoggin in Maine to the Columbia in the far Northwest. This alone is a great tragedy. The rivers of America were our first great highways. Along their shores our settlers built their homes, and there our cities grew and prospered.

These mighty river systems were an integral part of America the beautiful, celebrated in poetry and song—the Monongahela, the Cumberland, the Ohio, the Mississippi, the Hudson, the Delaware, the Rio Grande. Today we have blackened their waters and filled their valleys with sewage, chemicals, oil, and trash. Their beauty has turned to ugliness. Their fish have died. Their waters which once brought health and cleanliness are now filled with disease-producing germs.

Presidents once swam in the Potomac, just minutes from the White House. Today, in a hot and crowded city where children search for places to play, citizens are warned not to let Potomac waters contact their skin.

Even in Wisconsin, a prized vacationland rich in water resources, the rivers are dying. The Milwaukee, the Menomonee and the Kinnickinnic are little more than open sewers. The Fox River, a historic route through lovely cities and rural scenery, is seriously polluted by paper mill wastes. The Oconto and the Peshtigo are polluted. Even the mighty Mississippi, a paradise for boaters, hunters, and fishermen and one of the scenic wonders of the Nation, is succumbing to a sordid surge of pollution, much of it from the Minneapolis-St. Paul area.

With our rivers dead or dying, the next victims are our lakes.

No matter how big, how deep and blue they might be, lakes can be killed by pollution, too. In fact, we have made the shocking discovery that once damaged by pollution, some lakes may never be reclaimed, while even a badly polluted river can usually be flushed clean.

Once we chose to use our rivers as sewers, we designated our lakes as cesspools and began their slow destruction. Nature has made a gallant effort to absorb our filth, but even the miracles of nature cannot restore to purity the billions of gallons of sewage and chemicals which are presently ending up in our lakes.

Lake Erie, a 250-mile-long sea, is sick and dying. For years it has been the cesspool for Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, and dozens of other cities and industries on its banks or along its tributaries. It can absorb no more and still remain what it was—a beautiful blue, fresh water lake, a summer resort site, a source of millions of pounds of fish.

Lake Michigan is next. Its southern tip—the recreational front yard of millions, with curving beaches and rolling sand dunes—is so badly polluted with sewage, oil, chemicals, and iron slag that scientists doubt it can ever be reclaimed again.

Even our small inland lakes, although farther down the list, are marked for destruction. We no longer dump untreated sewage into them but a subtle mixture of treated effluent, septic-tank drainage, runoff water from fertilized lawns and farm fields, pesticides, weed killers, and silt are aging them, suffocating them, converting them from lakes to swamps.

Their clear waters are becoming turbid, their fish are declining, their surface and their shores are being spoiled by rotting algae.

Our prosperous Nation's thirst for water is increasing at the rate of 25,000 gallons per minute. We already are using almost as much water as the total supply available. Through better reservoirs and distribution systems we can increase that supply somewhat, but we cannot keep pace with our rate of consumption. By 1980 we will be using about 600 billion gallons a day against a supply of 515 billion. By the year 2000, we will be using 1,000 billion gallons compared with a maximum available supply of 650. The only answer is to guard every drop and develop ways to use water over and over again.

Pollution poisons the great natural reservoirs from which most of this water must come. It fouls the landscape and robs a growing nation of its most precious outdoor resources.

This series of articles will describe our nationwide pollution problem, separating it into parts which citizens can comprehend. Subsequent articles will explore just what pollution does to our waters; how sewage-treatment plants can make water sweet again; how municipal sewage and industrial wastes lead all other sources of pollution; how ships, septic tanks, pesticides, and other forces create special problems for our waters, and finally, what the public and our public agencies can do to fight this threat—and win.

The purpose is to educate, possibly to arouse, but not to panic. As shocking and widespread as it is, there is no reason why our pollution crisis cannot be solved. There is no reason why a prosperous nation which can shoot a rocket to the moon cannot assure itself of a drink of clear, clean water.

THE THREAT TO OUR WATERS—II

(By Senator GAYLORD NELSON)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Pollution is killing our lakes, our fish, occasionally our farm animals and even our fellow citizens. This is the story of how pollution kills, and of what we are doing about it.

First of all, pollution can kill by spreading disease, or by direct poisoning of water and food supplies.

Sewage pouring out of our cities in record quantities contains enormous numbers of intestinal bacteria which cause diseases such as diarrhea, dysentery, enteritis and typhoid fever. In Riverside, Calif., polluted drinking water recently killed 3 people and made more than 10,000 ill. In 1961, polluted oysters on the gulf coast touched off a hepatitis outbreak. Polluted clams did the same thing on the Atlantic coast. In Idaho and Washington, widespread intestinal disease was traced to irrigation water, contaminated with sewage.

Even more of a threat than city sewage are the wastes which pour from our expanding industries. In northern Illinois, five steers died from drinking Embarrass River water which had been poisoned by cyanide. The steel industry uses 30 tons of phenol a day—and one part phenol to a billion parts of water creates a health hazard. The Monongahela River draining the mining and industrial areas of West Virginia and Pennsylvania empties the equivalent of 200,000 tons of sulfuric acid each year into the Ohio River, the water supply for millions. The same water is used and reused as much as two or three times by the cities along the Ohio.

Some magnitude of the quantity of disease-causing bacteria and industrial poisons pouring into our waters can be learned from these figures:

Municipal sewage discharged into our waters—treated and untreated—is presently equal to the untreated sewage from a nation of 75 million people.

Industrial wastes discharged into our waters are presently equal to the untreated sewage from 165 million people.

Public health officers are alert to the danger that pollution will spread disease or poison our citizens. Drinking water is tested regularly. Strict standards are set by the Federal Government on the amount of pollutants it may contain. Chlorine is added to kill bacteria. If people become sick, prompt action usually is taken.

But there are limits to our ability to make polluted water pure again. Drinking water in our cities often has a stale and musty flavor, a bad odor, or the strong smell of chlorine. Meanwhile, even if our drinking water can be made safe, pollution goes right on killing in other ways.

It is killing our lakes by stealing their oxygen and by filling them with materials which will not decompose.

Water's cleansing and purifying quality—hailed by men ever since Biblical times—comes from the fact that it is a fluid, constantly moving and mixing, and is rich in oxygen.

Dump human sewage into water and nature's miracle begins. The sewage is mixed and diluted, spread over a wide area by winds and currents. Bacteria in the water attacks the sewage and consume it. With amazing swiftness, the water is pure again. Nature's sewage disposal plant is working its miracle. Oxygen is the fuel on which this system works.

But as is so often the case, man has taken advantage of this miracle of nature. He has dumped sewage and acids, poisons and garbage into our waters in such quantity that the lakes and streams cannot assimilate them.

Struggling to purify this torrent of filth, the bacteria in nature burn up all the oxygen in the water. Delicate mayflies and other forms of aquatic life quickly die from lack of oxygen. The trout, the pike, the bass and other game fish which feed on these delicate organisms—and which need oxygen themselves—roll over and die. Their rotting bodies further pollute the water, and the lake is fast dying. The Public Health Service documented the pollution deaths of 18 million fish last year, but says this is only a fraction of the real toll.

When water is completely devoid of oxygen, the bacteria attack anything they can find—even the lake bottom—in search of oxygen. This sets off a new chemical reaction which releases a putrid gas, hydrogen sulfide, which smells like rotten eggs and can even be fatal to humans in sufficient quantities.

In recent years, a dense fog of hydrogen sulfide gas rose up from the dead waters of the Oconto River in northeastern Wisconsin, sickening residents nearby and turning house paint brown. It was a dramatic example of the final death gasp of a body of water. St. Louis had a similar experience along the polluted Mississippi.

Not all our waters are being filled with raw sewage and industrial wastes. But many of them still are dying, even though more slowly, from a disease known as eutrophication or aging.

Even treated effluent from a modern sewage treatment plant is rich in nitrogen and phosphorus compounds, basic ingredients of fertilizer. Most of our lakes today receive great quantities of rich topsoil, fertilizer and other nutrients, draining from the subdivisions, farmlands, highways and drainage ditches all around them. Rich black silt covers their clean sandy bottoms. The water often becomes murky. Weeds and algae begin to thrive in the heavy fertilized waters, almost like cancer cells. As this unusual amount of plant growth matures and dies, it becomes like sewage. Bacteria use up oxygen trying to consume it, and the decaying mess floats ashore or drifts on the surface, giving off an unpleasant smell.

Our Nation has invested heavily in sewage treatment plants to protect our waters and the health of our people. Since a new Federal grant program was enacted in 1957, the Federal Government has provided $640 million and communities about $2.4 billion for a $3 billion sewage treatment expansion program.

The first step in sewage treatment is to screen out as much of the solid material as is possible. This material, the most objectionable part of sewage, is often disposed of by incineration or burying. Next, the sewage flows through a grit chamber, to remove sand and other hard particles which wash in from highways and from off the land. Then the sewage is kept for several hours in a settling tank where more solid material settles out in the form of sludge, which can be reclaimed for fertilizer, burned, or spread out over land adjacent to the sewage disposal plant.

This process is called primary treatment. But it is really only half the job. Disease-producing bacteria, dissolved salts and chemicals, detergents and many other pollutants are not removed. Yet many communities have no more than primary treatment facilities, although some of them chlorinate the discharge in an effort to kill the worst bacteria.

Every community should also provide "secondary treatment," which duplicates the purifying process which goes on in our lakes and streams. The sewage, following primary treatment, is placed in a large holding tank where bacteria have a chance to work. In some sewage plants, the sewage is constantly stirred up, brought into contact with air and biologically active sludge. In others it is sprayed out over a bed of gravel and recollected after trickling through. Finally, after passing through another settling tank, and sometimes after chlorine treatment, it is discharged into a lake or stream.

Even secondary treatment removes only about 80 to 90 percent of the material which consumes oxygen once it reaches our lakes. It removes only a small amount of the dissolved solids in sewage, and very little of some of the newer chemicals which do not decompose from bacterial action. Chicago, for instance, with a good secondary treatment plant, still discharges the equivalent of the raw sewage from 1 million people, including 1,800 tons of solids per day, into the Illinois waterway.

That is why a major part of our fight against pollution is directed toward persuading communities and industries to install vastly improved sewage treatment systems. Even the best systems available today are not good enough. We need greatly improved techniques which can remove a much greater percentage of the pollutants.

THE THREAT TO OUR WATERS—III

(By Senator GAYLORD NELSON)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—"To fly over Lake Erie and look down into the cloudy mess of murderous pollution * * * is like reading the flyleaf of a book on the end of civilization."

That was the chilling comment recently of Secretary of the Interior Udall, and it was no exaggeration. The Great Lakes are being destroyed by man's pollution, and nowhere is the tragedy deeper than in Lake Erie.

Here man has taken a sparkling blue lake, an irreplaceable water supply for 10 million people and a partner in the economic prosperity of our greatest American industries, and turned it into a primeval swamp.

In the 2,600-square-mile heart of the lake, all the oxygen is gone, all the fish and other desirable aquatic life are dead, and the only survivors are the lowly creatures that inhabited the earth before life sprang from its waters—bloodworms, sludgeworms, sowbugs, and bloodsuckers.

If the tragedy of Lake Erie is repeated in the other Great Lakes—as it well may be—the great industrial cities of America would be the victims of the greatest natural resource disaster in modern times.

To understand the way we have destroyed Lake Erie, you should travel down its tributaries with the U.S. Public Health Service, which is gathering facts in an 11th hour effort to save this dying water. The lake is a product of its tributaries, and they are sewers of filth and oily black scum.

Take the Maumee River, for instance, which flows from Fort Wayne, Ind., through Defiance and Napoleon, Ohio, and on to Toledo where it joins the lake.

Directly below Fort Wayne, the water has too little oxygen to support anything but trash fish and lower organisms. The concentration of the poisonous chemical phenol, a steel industry byproduct also known as carbolic acid, ranges anywhere from 3 to 137 times the amount prescribed in Federal drinking water standards. The count of coliform intestinal bacteria—which must not exceed 1,000 per 100 milliliters for recreational waters—ran as high as 24 million in the summer—24,000 times the allowable maximum.

"The stream bottom has heavy deposits of oily organic sludge and supports only a sparse population of pollution-tolerant sludgeworms and midge larvae," the Public Health Service reported.

A packing company dumps 136 pounds of oil per day into the river at this point. A plating company dumps 38 pounds of cyanide per day.

As this polluted river oozes along toward Defiance, Ohio, the oxygen in the water drops even further. Defiance has a sewage treatment plant but whenever the river is above a certain level it is simply closed down, and for 1 to 2 months of every year, the city's raw sewage goes directly into the Maumee, untreated. A fiberglass company dumps heavy quantities of phenol. Concentrations as high as 22,000 times above drinking water standards were discovered.

And on the river goes toward Lake Erie. Just below Defiance, an automobile foundry plant dumps cinders and ashes into the river. The Maumee is joined by the Auglaize River, which is even more grossly polluted than the Maumee. Finally we reach Napoleon, Ohio, which draws its drinking water from this polluted river. Here is how the Public Health Service describes the situation:

"Taste and odor problems are prevalent throughout most of the year in the water supplies at Defiance and Napoleon * * *. During late spring * * * the water was described variously as musty, moldy, earthy, fishy, and rotten. The taste and odor problems at Napoleon are similar to those in Defiance, with the exception of additional interference from ammonia compounds from the Auglaize River."

Here at Napoleon we suddenly encounter a nationally known firm which pumps 10 million gallons of water per day from the Maumee River for soup processing. The Public Health Service report said the plant has had to shut down at times because of its inability to produce taste and odor-free water.

I wrote to the firm and asked it to comment on this apparently serious problem. The firm replied that its modern water treatment plant, using carbon filters, can "polish the water to a high quality" at a cost of 10 cents to 20 cents per 1,000 gallons. It denied that it had ever shut down because of water quality problems, but its situation should provide a dramatic example of the water quality problems facing industries which must use our soiled rivers in the production of food products.

Below Napoleon, Ohio, the Maumee is severely polluted. Forty percent of samples taken showed presence of salmonella, an intestinal bacterium blamed for a recent outbreak of disease in Riverside, Calif.

When the Maumee reaches Toledo, near the shores of Lake Erie, it gets its final dose of pollution from the Toledo sewage treatment plant and local industries, including "oil, scum, metallic deposits, and toxic materials."

This is the story of the Maumee, and most of the other rivers which flow into our dying Lake Erie.

The Cuyahoga flows through a prosperous suburb and reaches Lake Erie at Cleveland. It is described as "debris filled, oil slicked, dirty looking" throughout, heavily loaded with coliform bacteria and salmonella. It carries so much oil that it sometimes catches fire and fire breaks have been built out into the river.

In the Cleveland Harbor, aquatic life is almost gone although sludgeworms, which thrive on organic matter, averaged 400,000 per square meter on the bottom. Along the Cleveland lakefront, there are 10 public beaches and the city follows a swim if you must policy because every beach shows high counts of intestinal bacteria.

Multiply this disgusting situation many times over and you have the problem of Lake Erie. The Detroit River, which supplies 1 percent of Lake Erie's water, receives 1.6 billion gallons of polluted water every day, a third of it from Detroit's primary sewage treatment plant and the rest from industry, such as our great automobile plants.

Lake Erie, shallowest of our Great Lakes, can simply take no more. It discharges some of its filth over scenic Niagara Falls, further soiling another great American resource, but it cannot purge itself. Its multimillion dollar fishing industry has been ruined. Its summer resorts have been damaged.

And within its waters, a cancer-like explosion of weeds and algae, blooming in a tank of liquid fertilizer, is sealing its doom.

Southern Lake Michigan faces the same crisis, with an added problem. Lake Erie water is replaced every 3 years. Lake Michigan takes 100 years to do the same thing. Meanwhile, 35 municipalities and 40 industries at its southern tip are dumping human sewage, acids, oil, flue dust, ammonia, phenols, and detergents into the lake in rapidly increasing quantities. For 64 days last year, Chicago's south side beaches were unsafe. Beaches at Hammond, Ind., have been closed for 15 years. Chicago's drinking water supply has been threatened.

The same explosion of underwater weeds and algae is forming in this area, too. Dense meadows of cladophora algae have been found along the shores of Milwaukee, Racine, Chicago, Gary, and Hammond. The algae has become so thick at times as to block the Chicago water intake.

Wisconsin cities and industries also contribute to the slow destruction of Lake Michigan. A number of our lakeshore cities have inadequate sewage treatment plants. Even those which are adequate usually are forced to discharge raw sewage into Lake Michigan during heavy rainstorms. Milwaukee area swimming beaches on the vast blue lake have been closed off and on since 1959.

One of Wisconsin's greatest recreational resources, the choice Door County Peninsula and its multimillion-dollar resort industry, is threatened by the tide of pollution creeping up from Green Bay.

Some of the first signs of pollution are being seen in the crystal clear, deep waters of Lake Superior. Substantial pollution is showing up where the lake flows through the St. Mary's River at Sault St. Marie.

The disease is spreading. Unless we can make a complete reversal of everything we have done in the past generation or two, the Great Lakes, largest reservoir of fresh water in the world, will soon be ruined.

THE THREAT TO OUR WATERS—IV

(By Senator GAYLORD NELSON)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The war against water pollution is mainly a battle to control and purify a flood of municipal sewage and industrial wastes.

But while fighting this main front battle, we face a growing number of other pollution problems which must be fought separately:

Household septic tanks, many of them poorly designed and overburdened, are leaking pollutants into some of our choicest lakes and wild rivers.

Ships and pleasure craft are discharging raw sewage, often in the worst places, close to water intakes and in some of our recreational harbors.

Pesticides, weed killers and other new chemicals are creeping into our lakes and streams, threatening fish and wildlife and even public health.

No matter how many billions we spend on new city and industrial waste treatment plants, we will not meet these threats. They must be fought separately. They should not be shrugged off merely because they are statistically small. If these special kinds of pollution were to destroy our 8,000 inland lakes in Wisconsin, our fish and wildlife, it would be no comfort to know that such pollution was only a trickle compared to the sewage New York dumps into the Hudson River. We must fight even a trickle of pollution from these sources at the same time that we fight the flood from cities and industries.

Septic tanks are one of our most serious pollution problems, as veteran Wisconsin Conservation Commissioner Guido Rahr, recently pointed out. This is a nationwide problem, involving roughly one-third of our population, but it is especially critical for our inland lakes.

In a septic tank, buried in the ground near a home or cottage, solids are supposed to settle to the bottom and bacteria are supposed to consume much of the waste. As the tank fills, liquid overflows through a drainage field of porous, underground pipes. The success of such a system depends on its size, design and construction, nature of the soil and water table, demands made upon it, and many other factors. But generally speaking, septic tanks spell trouble. They often are homemade or poorly built. They may have been built for an elderly couple and are now being used by a growing family using 10 times as much water in an age of automatic washing machines, dishwashers, and disposals. Time works against them. As an area builds up, as water use soars, there comes a time when the soil simply can absorb no more.

All these problems are magnified in a lakeshore setting where we usually find inexpensively constructed cottages, small lot sizes, and little governmental supervision of building practices or public health problems. And worst of all, a lake is the very place where septic tank wastes drain. This pollution may cause a real health hazard, but in any event it will fertilize the lake, causing algae and weeds to grow rapidly. Ultimately it will cause the lake's destruction. This tragedy is occurring rapidly in some of our most remote and unspoiled recreational areas.

Pleasure craft pollution of small inland lakes is being brought under control by strict State laws, with Wisconsin leading the way. But boat and ship pollution of the Great Lakes and their harbors, our river systems, and coastal harbors is growing. Residents in prize resort areas and some boaters are complaining about odors, ugly material in the water, and a possible threat to the health of swimmers. The boating boom and the practice of boats clustering together in marinas or in choice anchorages concentrates the problem.

Few commercial or military vessels have any facilities for waste retention or treatment. They discharge raw sewage, garbage, tin cans, paper cartons, lumber, old mattresses, and furniture. Worst of all, they discharge oil, which does not decompose as other wastes do, but which can ruin our waters, our beaches and our wildlife for years to come. Some ships, and the marine terminals which service them, deliberately dump oil into the water. Sometimes it happens by accident, when an oil tanker hose pulls lose from a shoreline storage tank. Some ships pump water into their oil tanks to stabilize the ship when it is empty, then pump out this oily and watery mixture before they refill.

In any form, oil is extremely damaging to our waters. Neither our laws nor facilities—aboard ship or at shore terminals—are presently adequate to control this problem.

But pesticides and other new chemicals are the gravest of all these special pollution problems. As the Senate Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee staff said in a recent report:

"Many of these (new chemical) compounds are not affected, or only partly so, by present-day water and sewage treatment processes. Some even interfere with these treatment processes, making them less effective in removing the ordinary wastes for which they were designed. Some synthetic chemical wastes cause tastes and odors. A large number are highly toxic to fish and aquatic life. Many do not respond to biological treatment and persist in streams for long distances * * *. We do not know the long-range toxic effects of these new synthetics on man."

The chemical industry is the fastest growing segment of American industry. Today's sales will double by 1975.

Much of the concern centers in bug and weed killers, such as DDT and 2-4D. We are now using more than 700 million pounds a year of synthetic pesticides and other agricultural chemicals of 45,000 different varieties. We expect to increase this quantity tenfold in the next 20 years. Each new pesticide is generally more toxic than its predecessor. They are being sprayed and dusted all across the landscape, and they are building up in our waters.

The Public Health Service has traced the death of 7 million fish in the Mississippi River to the pesticides, endrin and dieldrin, which washed into the river off the land or were discharged by industries producing them.

A Federal Food and Drug Administration official recently stated: "DDT is so prevalent around the globe that there is no way to prevent it from showing up in food or in living matter. The residue of DDT or its cousins has been found in penguins in Antarctica, in reindeer in Alaska, in seals, even in fish caught hundreds of miles from the Philippine Islands."

It also has been found in fish and wildlife in northern Wisconsin.

One part of DDT in 1 billion parts of water will kill blue crabs in 8 days.

Fish and other animals taking in such poisonous chemicals over a period of time build up a concentration within their bodies which is far greater than that in the water.

Detergents have posed another special problem. The most popular detergent chemical, alkyl benzene sulfonate, did not break down easily in sewage plants or in water supplies. It covered sewage plants, lakes and streams with mountains of foam, blighted recreational waters, and threatened aquatic life.

Under the pressure of Wisconsin legislation and bills introduced in the Congress, the soap and detergent industry has now changed over to a different chemical which it claims will decompose, at least in properly functioning sewage treatment plants. This is yet to be adequately demonstrated.

We still have much to learn about detergents and other new chemical compounds. To regulate their manufacture and their use in order to keep them out of the water, or to develop new ways to remove them once they get in, may require greatly expanded research and possibly new State and Federal legislation.

THE THREAT TO OUR WATERS—V

(By Senator GAYLORD NELSON)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—We are losing the battle today to save our lakes and streams—losing it to municipal, industrial, and commercial pesticide pollution, which we tolerated for all too long while it grew to monstrous proportions.

We can start to win that battle only when we stop tolerating pollution and make it our public policy to prevent it.

To make such a decision will be painful. It will cost money—perhaps $50 to $100 billion over the next decade and a half. It will be bitterly resisted by influential segments of industry and at many levels of government.

But a national policy of pollution prevention actually would eliminate many of the reasons why cities and industries resist efforts to clean up pollution. At present, they are afraid that the cost will put them at a competitive disadvantage. Competition exists today between the 50 States, hundreds of cities, and thousands of industries. Pollution control is a significant cost factor. An industry, or a city which wants to be a home to industry, finds it economically impossible to clean up its wastes unless its competitors clean up too.

Furthermore, a city such as St. Louis, on the Mississippi River, has little incentive to clean up the dirty water coming down from as far north as Minneapolis, when the main beneficiaries of this costly effort will be the cities to the south.

Our goal must be to prevent pollution, and our objective must be clean water. Our methods of the past are outmoded and have failed. Under our historical approach we have polluted every major river system in America. We have all but destroyed Lake Erie, and the rest of the Great Lakes are well on the way to destruction. Thousands of our inland lakes have been damaged by pollutants and nutrients draining into them, and most of the rest will join them in a relative handful of years.

Obviously, our approach to the problem must be altered and our effort enormously expanded.

The idea of punitive legislation and strict enforcement alone has simply failed. Technical assistance, substantial financial aids to industry and municipalities must be used. Direct grants, matching funds, and fast tax writeoffs to industry are necessary to accomplish our objective.

The difference between a policy of pollution prevention and our present policy is obvious if you look at what is now being done—by local governments, by industry, by the States and by the Federal Government.

Locally, our cities with Federal help have spent $1.5 billion in the past 2 years for new treatment facilities. Yet we are rapidly losing ground every day.

We have 1,500 communities with 13 million residents with no sewage treatment whatever, another 1,500 communities with 17 million residents with inadequate treatment. We have almost 60 million residents in communities with combined storm and sanitary sewers, which fill our lakes and streams with raw sewage during heavy rains. It is now clear that our rapidly growing cities will not move fast enough on their own to meet this problem and could not even if they wanted to.

Bad as the municipal sewage problem is, industrial pollution is far more serious, and industry is spending far less than cities to correct the problem.

The National Association of Manufacturers estimates that industry is spending $100 million a year on pollution control, although the total may be greater. Many industries have performed brilliantly. But the overall record is one of massive failure. Industry presently discharges twice as much waste into our waters as all our cities combined, and many of its wastes are especially deadly and hard to treat. By 1970, industrial wastes discharged into our waters—even after treatment—will have a pollution effect equal to the untreated raw sewage from 210 million people.

If our goal is to prevent pollution, industrial pollution must be fought with a carrot and a stick. Direct grants to industry or fast tax writeoffs for construction of pollution facilities seem fully justified. The cost of the cleanup of the waters of America is going to be paid for by the consumer, either in the price of the product he buys or the taxes he pays, or more likely in a combination of both.

At the same time, enforcement of laws against industrial pollution must be fair and firm. Since water travels across State boundaries underground and on the surface, we must establish sound water quality standards and enforce them at the local, State, and national level.

One of the more interesting new suggestions is a water-pollution tax, under which industries would be charged according to the quantity and the nature of the pollutants they discharge.

One vital step in fighting industrial pollution is to require industries to reveal the nature of their wastes. Many industries presently refuse to give this information to State or Federal officials.

The failure to control pollution at the State level is especially painful to admit. Our own State of Wisconsin was a pioneer in water pollution control, beginning in 1925. Progress has been made in controlling wastes from some of the major polluters but even more rapidly new polluters have come onto the scene. A veteran capital correspondent recently described our State machinery as "hopelessly inadequate." The chairman of our State committee on water pollution said recently: "In medicine and social problems, the general approach is to take preventive measures, but in pollution control we can't treat a given situation until after it occurs." A 1964 study described many of our loveliest historic rivers as "grossly polluted." Many of our choicest lakes and recreational rivers are turning up bad water samples. Our widely hailed State system, though led by conscientious men, is understaffed, underfinanced, and lacking adequate enforcement power. The system has failed to do the job as it has in every other State.

Even our Federal program is inadequate. We have recently centralized our Federal pollution fight in a new subcabinet officer, increased Federal grants for sewage facility construction, and greatly expanded research into water resources and pollution. But we still do not have a Federal program for preventing pollution. We have 175 pollution experts at work—conducting autopsies on dead or dying waters. We are devoting 6 years and $12 million to studying Great Lakes pollution. Yet it will be 25 or 50 years before we can get to the waters which today are still clean—by which time those waters will be ruined too.

Federal enforcement also is slow and weak. In 10 years, only one case has been taken to court, and then a court order to a community to build a treatment plant was nullified when the local voters turned down a bond issue to finance it. Federal action to clean up the Potomac began in 1957. A hopeful estimate now sets 1975 as the time when it might be fit for swimming again—a delay of 18 years.

Our newly expanded Federal grant program to help cities build treatment facilities will offer $43 million next year to the pollution-soaked Great Lakes States. Yet a Federal official estimates that it would cost $20 billion over 10 years to clean them up.

Even though the hour is late, I believe we can still reverse the trend and restore the fresh waters of America. We need new national programs and we need to coordinate them with a vigorous new effort by the States and private industry.

To summarize, here are some of the fundamental things we need:

EXPANDED FEDERAL GRANTS

It is roughly estimated that the pollution cleanup cost will be $50 to $100 billion. Over a 10- or 15-year period, we should make Federal grants, matching funds and rapid tax writeoffs available in such quantities to industry and municipalities. The return, economically and in recreational values, will be several hundred times that cost, which is one or two times the annual defense budget. Saving the quality of our environment is surely worth that investment.

COMPREHENSIVE FEDERAL WASTE DISPOSAL RESEARCH PROGRAM

Our present antiquated disposal system relies upon our waters to absorb the waste of modern society. Modern science and technology have never been brought fully to bear upon the problem. Substantial research grants should be made to private industry and universities to develop new methods and devices to refine, use, neutralize, or destroy pollutants. We must evaluate chemical pesticides and their effect upon the environment. Those which threaten to destroy our environment should be outlawed.

DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS BY USE OF COMPUTER TECHNIQUES

We need to develop programs that take into consideration the total problem of air, water, and soil pollution. Research contracts should be made with private industry to inventory and evaluate the whole waste management problem; and to compute waste management costs and propose alternative management plans to meet the problem.

RIVER AND LAKESHORE ZONING

At the State and local level, zoning to protect the beauty and integrity of the shoreline is crucial if we are to save our lakes from destruction by siltation and fertilization. Failure to act now will mark the end of our lakes in the next 20 or 30 years.

I am confident that the people across this country are prepared and anxious to support creative and constructive measures to enhance and preserve the quality of our environment. What is needed now is leadership and action by our legislative bodies at the local, State, and National level.

A SENATE NOR'EASTER: PELL OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, for the life stories of our colleagues of the Congress we are usually confined to the bare bones summary of the Congressional Directory.

We are deprived of the episodes of history, romance, and adventure attached to the careers of our everyday friends and associates.

Once in a while writers from "the outside world" are captivated by the thread of romance they perceive—and they are able to weave a true and entrancing story of the human history of those who share this Senate with us.

During the holiday season, two such writers, Francis M. Stephenson and Jerry Lisker, of the New York Sunday News, developed such a theme out of the life and times of my Rhode Island colleague and dear friend, Claiborne Pell.

I intend to trespass on the native modesty of the junior Senator by asking unanimous consent that their story—"A Senate Nor'easter: Pell of Rhode Island" be inserted in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this is not alone the story of a young man who for himself chose the strenuous path of political preferment and public service—but one who follows the "call of the blood" in carrying on a family tradition of such service.

It will give further understanding of the roots of my associate in our State of Rhode Island and explains something of the response of his fellow Rhode Islanders in rewarding Claiborne Pell with their support.

I could wish that the fine photographs that embellish the story might have been included—but the plain type provides a fascinating tale of wealth wisely used—of talents diligently developed—and of hard work willingly invested in what you and I know to be the grueling demands of the Senate day of duty.

Exhibit 1

A Senate Nor'easter: Pell of Rhode Island

(By Francis M. Stephenson and Jerry Lisker)

Socialite Claiborne Pell, of Newport, really meant business when he upset the politicians and got elected to the U.S. Senate from Rhode Island in 1960 in his first race for public office.

Wealthy and secure in his job for 6 years, the young Democratic Senator (now 47) might have settled naturally and easily into the social whirl of the Capital. He chose to work—just as he runs 2 to 5 miles at a stretch a couple or more times a week to keep in condition.

And so it came about this fall that the slender, 6-foot-1, brown-haired Pell, who has a touch of the Lincoln look, stood proudly by as President Johnson signed on successive days two important bills he had pioneered in Congress:

1. Authorization of a $90 million, 3-year program in high-speed rail transportation. The ailing Boston-New York-Washington rail lines serving this crowded northeast corridor of the Nation will be used as a pilot project with modern trains running up to 150 miles per hour.

2. Creation of a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities with $21 million a year in subsidies to artists, performers, and scholars.

The Senate also has passed another Pell bill with far-reaching potentialities, authorizing a $500,000 study of the desirability of converting U.S. weights and measures to the metric system. This has encountered a roadblock from Chairman Howard Smith, Democrat, of Virginia, of the House Rules Committee, who is nearly twice Pell's age. The antimetric Smith is 82.

For these rare achievements by a junior Senator, Pell heads back for the second session of the 89th Congress convening next month with a tribute from Senate Democratic Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, of Montana. The party pilot took note in the Congressional Record of Pell's "rare, two milestone" measures signed on successive days by the President.

During the current congressional recess the popular Senator and Mrs. Pell returned to Washington as guest of President and Mrs. Johnson at their White House dinner for Princess Margaret Rose, of Great Britain. It was the big social bash of the season, and the Pells were among the select 140 invited.

In this age of campaigning by TV, the tall, dark-haired, trim Senator and his beautiful blonde heiress wife certainly have all of the photogenic qualifications. Also, they have the desire, determination, energy and money to get their dreams accomplished. Quite a couple.

Agreeing that he had accomplished considerable (if not a record), for a first-term Senator, Pell commented to us: "I have been very fortunate." He is talking about more programs—increased college scholarships, sea studies, and a bridge connecting the tip of Long Island and either Rhode Island or Connecticut—if he is reelected next fall. His chances look good.

WED TO A. & P. HEIRESS

The personable, hard-working Senator is apparently as full of ideas and energy as he is of money and distinguished forebears. His own family was wealthy and belonged to the East's smart 400. He married Nuala O'Donnell, heiress to the Hartford family fortune of the A. & P. grocery chainstores. They have four children.

The Senator's persistence in maintaining close contact with his State probably aroused his interest in improving the railroad service along the east coast megalopolis between Washington and Boston. He travels home about every weekend, using what he calls the railroad "waker" (sleeper) one way, and the plane another.

In 1962 he proposed creation of an eight-State public authority to acquire, modernize and operate the railroad passenger facilities from Boston to Washington, a route of 456 miles with New York City midway.

In this megalopolis he said more than 37 million people live, almost 30 percent of the Nation's manufacturing is done and 21 percent of our retail establishments are located.

The idea provoked widespread attention and support and President Kennedy asked the Commerce Department to investigate the idea of improving the declining rail service. Last year Commerce decided to go ahead with a program, enlisting aid from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. President Johnson asked Congress this year for $20 million to push research into high-speed rail service for the East and Congress gave him $90 million for a 3-year program.

ONE-HUNDRED-FIFTY-MILE-PER-HOUR TRAINS READY

In signing the bill September 30 Johnson said new cars capable of up to 150-mile-an-hour speeds would be in service between New York and Washington by the fall of next year. These are expected to cut the present minimum time of 3 hours and 45 minutes under 3 hours.

On December 10 the Government gave a $952,000 contract to the Budd Co. of Philadelphia to construct four self-propelled test cars capable of traveling 150 miles per hour. By next fall, the Commerce Department said, the cars will be coupled together for a test run without passengers over a 17-mile stretch of the Pennsylvania Railroad between New Brunswick, and Trenton, N.J. The supertrain is on its way.

Similar faster service will be provided between Boston and Providence. The winding route of the New Haven along the coastline between New York and Providence hampers a speedup there.

Nevertheless, the United Aircraft Corp. has proposed building 160-mile-an-hour trains for the New York-Hartford run. The trains would use aircraft engines and a design technology capable of cutting the time for the 109-mile trip from the current 2½ hours to 1 hour and 40 minutes. Pell's bill got things going.

Senator Pell said, after the White House ceremony, "this will help us immediately." He insisted "we have to give our people what Japan and Europe provide." High-speed trains are operating there. He thought the benefits would aid the tottering bankrupt New Haven, on which Westchester and Connecticut depend as commuter regions.

The next day, October 1, President Johnson signed the arts bill, originally sponsored by Pell.

Although making his first run for elective office, Claiborne Pell was not exactly a political neophyte when he plunged into the Democratic primary in 1960 against former four-term Gov. Dennis Roberts, the organization candidate for the Senate. Making it a three-way race was an even more prominent Democrat, former Governor and Senator J. Howard McGrath, who had been Attorney General in President Truman's Cabinet. The fast-moving Pell—using his fluent command of the French, Italian, and Portuguese languages, his bulging purse, TV and radio, and his political blood—overwhelmed by almost 2 to 1 his two seasoned opponents. He became the first and only Democratic candidate in Rhode Island to win nomination without organization endorsement. On the Democratic ticket in November, Pell even outdistanced his friend, presidential choice, John F. Kennedy, in defeating his Republican foe, Raoul Archambault, Jr.

Pell won the Senate seat vacated by Theodore Francis Green who retired in 1960 at 93—the oldest man ever to serve in the Senate. Green observed his 98th birthday on October 2.

Actually, the bold young campaigner had been schooled in politics from childhood. His father, the late Herbert C. Pell, was elected to Congress just days before Claiborne was born here in New York City November 22, 1918.

Representative Pell was one of the few Democrats ever elected from Manhattan's "silk stocking" district. He served one term and then became Democratic State chairman for 4 years during the administration of Gov. Al Smith. President Roosevelt named the senior Pell Minister to Portugal in 1937 and then to Hungary in 1941. As American representative on the United Nations War Crimes Commission after the war he advocated hanging for all members of the Gestapo.

The Senator's great-grandfather, J. F. H. Claiborne, was a Congressman from Mississippi. Another relative, W. C. C. Claiborne, was first Governor of the Louisiana Territory, and another, George M. Dallas, was Democratic Vice President with President James K. Polk, 1845–49.

COAST GUARD VET

Pell once related he is also a descendant of an Indian chief. He told the Senate that an ancestor, Thomas Pell, married the daughter of a Siwanoy chief, Wampage, in about 1700. He was speaking for more generous treatment of the Seneca Indians in flooding of their lands in Pennsylvania for a dam.

It was natural that this son of political leaders turned to politics after the war. In 1952 and 1954 he was administrative assistant to the Rhode Island Democratic State chairman. He was a consultant to the Democratic National Committee from 1953 to 1960. In the 1956 presidential campaign he was Democratic national registration chairman. At the party's 1956 and 1960 national conventions he was chief delegation tally clerk. So, he was not exactly an amateur when he entered the 1960 Senate race.

Pell graduated (cum laude) from Princeton in 1940 and earned a master's degree at Columbia the next year. He then enlisted in the Coast Guard—4 months before Pearl Harbor.

After 4 years of war service, he spent 7 years in the U.S. State Department and Foreign Service, working behind the Iron Curtain in Czechoslovakia, in Genoa, Italy, and as Baltic desk officer in Washington. He resigned from the Foreign Service to help direct Averell Harriman's unsuccessful run for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1952. Later he was vice president of the International Rescue Committee and organized their Hungarian refugee relief program.

Franz Cardinal Koenig of Austria awarded him the Caritas Elizabeth Medal in 1957 for his dedicated work in setting up the IRC Hungarian refugee program and aiding thousands of refugees. He was made a Knight of the Crown of Italy for helping to restore the fishing industry of Sicily after the war.

Pell was a special assistant at the 1945 San Francisco U.N. charter conference.

In the Coast Guard he started out as a ship's cook and worked his way up to lieutenant by war's end. On convoy duty in the North Atlantic and the Mediterranean, he probably saw as much combat as any millionaire with the exception of John F. Kennedy. He was invalided home by hospital ship from Italy after contracting Malta fever in 1944.

FALLS IN LOVE

During treatment at Newport Naval Hospital he met his future wife, Nuala O'Donnell of Newport. Nuala's mother, Josephine Hartford O'Donnell Bryce, is a granddaughter of George Huntington Hartford, founder of the rich, vast A. & P. chain. Nuala's maternal grandmother was the late Princess Guido Pignatelli, a widow of Edward Hartford.

The wedding of Lieutenant Pell and Nuala O'Donnell on December 16, 1944, in St. James Episcopal Church here was one of the big society events of the season.

The Pells have two sons and two daughters. Herbert, 20, is at Princeton; Christopher, 17, at St. George's School in Middletown, R.I., which the Senator also attended. Nuala, 15, is in the Madiera School in Washington, D.C. Julia, 13, goes to St. Michael's School in Newport.

Mrs. Pell, who maintains the family home in Newport, Pelican Ledge on Ledge Road, is very interested and active in politics. She was chairwoman of the Newport County Democratic campaign headquarters from 1954 to 1958. She was 20 and, attending Bennington College when she was married.

Mindful that he was born in New York City, PELL emphasizes his close connections with Rhode Island, where a great grand uncle, Duncan Pell was a lieutenant governor. PELL lived most of his life in Rhode Island. He gets home almost every weekend—and about the State.

In Newport the Senator grew up with the family of Jacqueline Kennedy, widow of the assassinated President, and he and Mrs. Kennedy are close friends of long standing. He and J.F.K. were friends from college years. Since 1957 PELL has been a limited partner in the Washington investment banking firm of Mrs. Kennedy's stepfather, Hugh D. Auchincloss—Auchincloss, Parker & Redpath, Inc.

PELL'S family, as well as his wife's, was wealthy. He attributed much of the Pell fortune to "fortuitous investments" over the years. His father gave the family home and estate in Newport to the Catholic Archdiocese of Rhode Island "because he thought it was a nice thing to do." St. Catherine's Academy now occupies the house.

The Senator and Mrs. Pell designed and built their own home in 1951, hiring no architects; only carpenters. Their one-story (no basement) Cape Cod plain shingle 12-room house hugs the landscape at the entrance to Narragansett Bay on a point called Land's End. It is next to her ancestral home and contrasts with much larger elegant mansions nearby.

PELL was decorated by the Knights of Malta for his war service. He and Mrs. Pell are Episcopalians.

A Pell family tradition from Colonial times was the annual gift of a "fatte calfe" from the city of New Rochelle, N.Y. An early ancestor, Sir John Pell, gave 6,000 acres to the Huguenots on the understanding they would deliver a "fatte calfe" each year to his heirs. The land is now New Rochelle.

In 1956, as acting chairman of the Pell Family Association, he ended the traditional gift. But at the 275th anniversary in 1963, Mayor Andre Salardaine of La Rochelle, France, presented a Holstein to Senator PELL in New Rochelle. The mayor borrowed the 2-month-old calf for the ceremony.

The Senator is a trim 160 pounds and likes such sports as running, sailing, and tennis. He won his letter in cross country track at Princeton and he has kept up long distance running. He dons shorts and jogs around the Western High School track in Washington two or three times a week for 2 to 5 miles at a go. In Newport he trots along Cliff Walk, a well known promenade.

PLAYS TENNIS

Newport is regarded as the home of tennis in the United States. In earlier days the national championships were staged there and the Tennis Museum and Hall of Fame are located there. CLAIBORNE participates in the Newport tourney. He and a cousin, Clarence Pell, won the special Newport handicap meet this year.

In 1964 the Senator won a congressional bicycle race around the Washington Ellipse sponsored by Washington's Olympic Committee. He beat a field of seven riders in the mile event and received a bouquet of gladiolas.

He lists himself in the Congressional Directory as "business executive, investments." He has an office in Providence.

The PELLS maintain a Washington residence at 3425 Prospect Street, Georgetown. His mother, Mrs. Hugo Koehler, lives in New York at 115 E. 92d St. She moved here from Portsmouth, R.I., after the death of her husband. PELL'S father dropped dead on a street in Munich, Germany, July 17, 1961, while walking with grandson Herbert.

The Senator likes his Washington office. He says it gives him an opportunity "to translate ideas into production." As for his political success he attributed it to "hard work and successful timing." He is still working hard—and most of the time.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR HARRY FLOOD BYRD, SR., OF VIRGINIA—SELECTION OF HARRY FLOOD BYRD, JR., AS SUCCESSOR

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it was with profound regret that we learned during the adjournment period of the retirement of Harry Flood Byrd from the U.S. Senate.

With untiring devotion and exceptional ability, Senator Byrd served his State and Nation long and well. He is one of the few men I have known in public life who has never wavered in his convictions and who has always shown forthright courage in every issue under every circumstance. In the history of the American Republic, Virginia has produced many outstanding statesmen, but in my opinion, none greater than Harry Byrd. His presence will be sorely missed in this body, as well as on the Finance Committee on which I have been privileged to serve with Senator Byrd since coming to the Senate.

I have known HARRY F. BYRD, JR., for a number of years, and he is a man of great integrity and capabilities. I am pleased that he has been selected to replace his father in the Senate, and I wish him a long and distinguished career.

DELAWARE TRYING NEW BLUE SHIELD PLAN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the Blue Shield plan in Delaware is breaking new ground with a system which provides that doctors participating in Blue Cross set their own fees.

This prevailing fee system is apparently working out very satisfactorily and will likely be followed in other States.

An article by Jonathan Spivak describing how the system works is contained in Tuesday's issue of the Wall Street Journal. Because of its broad interest I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Blue Shield Test," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 18, 1966]

BLUE SHIELD TEST—HEALTH INSURER LETS DELAWARE DOCTORS SET THEIR OWN FEES

(By Jonathan Spivak)

WILMINGTON.—Most of Delaware's 480 physicians are participating in a nationally significant experiment in self-restraint.

Unlike their counterparts in most other States, doctors here are setting their own fees for Blue Shield health insurance provided by a big employer.

The Blue Shield plan covering the 5,700 workers at Chrysler Corp.'s auto assembly plant at nearby Newark provides that each doctor devise his own fee schedule for dozens of different medical services. If his charges fall within the range of those charged by 9 of every 10 of the rest of the State's physicians, he can count on payment in full by Blue Shield. Chrysler employees, in turn, can be confident that their employer-paid insurance will completely cover their doctor bills. All told, 22 specialty groups and more than 600 medical treatments are involved, ranging from sophisticated brain surgery to stitching a cut finger.

Individualized fee setting is also being tried on limited scale by Blue Shield plans in Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky. If no kinks develop, it is likely to spread, gradually replacing Blue Shield fixed-fee schedules which frequently pay only part of the doctor's bill. The first application would be to Blue Shield's large employer-employee negotiated health plans; the United Auto Workers and United Steelworkers Unions in particular are pressing for such full coverage of physicians' charges. Later, the approach might be adapted to other segments of Blue Shield's business.

Blue Shield's national leaders believe the new system, known as prevailing fee, offers a solution to one of the nonprofit organization's toughest problems—establishing doctors' charges which satisfy physicians, please patients, and protect the general public against undue inflation of medical costs.

Currently the Nation's 74 local Blue Shield plans, enrolling 52 million Americans, rely on fixed-fee schedules to hold premium costs in line. Only for low-income patients, however, do most doctor-members agree to accept these fees as full payment for their services. Medical men are free to bill other patients for additional sums and frequently do. In Delaware and some other States, most doctors have been unwilling to commit themselves to fixed-fee schedules at all, so that Blue Shield there couldn't assure any of its subscribers freedom from added doctor bills.

THE RISING INCOME LIMIT

Blue Shield plans have been steadily lifting the maximum annual income within which a family is guaranteed "full service" benefits; in two decades this has risen from $3,000 to about $6,000 per family. But even many blue-collar wages now exceed this ceiling, which explains why the steel and auto unions have become increasingly dissatisfied with Blue Shield.

Fixed-fee schedules pose some special problems. The charges require approval by the State medical society, but rarely do they satisfy all segments of the profession. The highly trained specialist wants more money than does the general practitioner—often for performing the same service, such as delivering a baby.

Also, the economics of medical practice vary greatly between low-cost rural areas and high-cost metropolitan centers. Fee schedules which are acceptable to the big city practitioners tend to inflate medical costs in the country. Lower rural charges, however, fail to satisfy the big city medical men who furnish the majority of services.

Thus, Blue Shield experts recognize a need for new and more flexible payment arrangements. Prevailing fee, it's hoped, will enable physicians to retain maximum control over their own charges, yet provide patients, regardless of income, with full coverage of physicians' fees.

A crucial question, of course, is whether such fee-setting freedom will unduly inflate medical costs. "There are intelligent people sincerely interested in medical care who feel we are opening a Pandora's box," concedes Dr. Lemuel McGee, chairman of the Delaware Medical Society's prepayment committee.

Prevailing fee's primary safeguard is the requirement that a doctor's charges fall within a range established by 90 percent of his associates. The cutoff point is intended to insure that obviously out-of-line charges are barred. Furthermore, it's hoped that, by closely following the present actual pattern of physician's fees, there will be no tendency to elevate charges in the lower cost areas of a State.

The first step in applying the prevailing-fee system is to find out what the doctors are actually charging. One approach is to take this information from claims already submitted by doctors under current Blue Shield plans. But sometimes a physician lists only the sum on the fee schedule and bills the patient separately for an added amount. So the Delaware Blue Shield decided to survey current real charges. Each doctor was mailed a fee questionnaire, assured that his individual "fee profile" would be kept in confidence at Blue Shield headquarters here.

FEES ARE WEIGHED

These fees have been grouped to establish a price range covering 90 percent of the doctors performing each service. Blue Shield administrators also take into account the frequency with which physicians perform a particular service. Thus the higher fees of a few specialists, who may provide most of a certain medical service in the community, are given greater weight than the lower charges of other doctors who are called on only occasionally for that service. The aim is to insure that the vast majority of patients will be able to select the physician of their choice, and be assured that Blue Shield will pay the full bill.

Once the prevailing range is established, an above-the-line doctor is invited to lower his rates in order to participate; a single extra-high fee can disqualify him. In Delaware, about one-third of the physicians surveyed started out proposing one or more fees above the cutoff point. "My first reaction was that it just wouldn't work," recalls a Blue Shield man. But when administrators suggested that the high charges be reduced and, on request, even told them just how much to trim, most of the doctors obliged, and now about 95 percent are participating.

Claims review involves matching a physician's request for payment against his filed fee. If the figures jibe, the claim is paid in full. On all but 18 of the 2,700 claims processed so far under the Delaware plan, the figures agreed. The handful of higher charges were referred to a review committee of the State medical society. Some of the physicians demonstrated that unusual difficulties justified the additional fee and were paid; other claims were rejected.

The prevailing-fee system also allows physicians to raise fees on 90 days' notice if the new charge doesn't exceed the original ceilings. Some critics fear a tendency for all doctors to move to the top of the range, once word of the maximum Blue Shield payment circulates through the medical community. Pressure then could arise to lift the ceiling, setting off another spiraling rise.

So far, this threat hasn't developed, at least in Delaware. Only two physicians have raised fees; a third acceded to a request to hold off for a while. The administrators may exert a little extra moral suasion in the future, by politely asking a doctor to explain the need for an increase. But, in the end, proponents say, the success of the prevailing-fee approach will depend almost entirely on the integrity of the individual physician.

MANNED BOMBERS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, two articles in the current issue of the publication, Armed Forces Management, raise vital questions and hint at possible answers which I believe all Members of the Senate will find interesting and helpful.

One deals with the recent action of the Secretary of Defense to phase out two-thirds of this Nation's long-range B-52 bomber force and all of our B-58 bomber force. This action is based on the theory of the Secretary of Defense that our major reliance for defense can be safely placed on ballistic missiles. The Secretary of Defense is relying on this theory in spite of the fact that none of these missiles has ever been tested under actual war conditions, that the operational testing of these missiles has been limited, and now under the ban on nuclear testing pursuant to the Test Ban Treaty, we are prohibited from further testing of the nuclear warheads of these missiles.

Mr. President, we are all familiar with the recent announcement of the Secretary of Defense to develop a bomber version of his pet project, the TFX or B-111 aircraft. Let us all hope and pray that it will perform better in this new mission than it has performed to date as a fighter aircraft for use by the Navy. It will be recalled that the Navy fighter version was one of the original missions of this aircraft.

During the hearings on the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1965, Gen. Curtis LeMay, then Chief of Staff of the Air Force, this Nation's leading authority on strategic forces, commented on the B-111 in the strategic role. General LeMay said:

> The main trouble with the TFX is that it is a small airplane, and it will not carry the things you need to penetrate modern defenses and still have enough range to do it. It is just not a big enough airplane to do this. It is going to do the job fine in a tactical role but in the strategic role it is just not big enough to do it.

Gen. John P. McConnell, the present Chief of Staff of the Air Force, has made his position clear on the bomber version of the TFX aircraft. During the hearings on the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1966, General McConnell said:

> As far as the F-111 being able to do the job which we have in mind for the advanced manned strategic aircraft, in my opinion it can't do that job because it is range-limited even when it is extended. It can't carry the same ordnance. It, of course, would require overseas bases for recovery. But I do believe it could carry on up to the point where we could put the advanced manned strategic aircraft into the inventory. I do not believe it could be a total replacement.

Mr. President, the record is clear. The fact that we must rely on a planned strategic aircraft that is considerably less than the best, is the result of a very unfortunate decision made by the Secretary of Defense. The Department of Defense Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1962 included $514.5 million for the continuation of production of long-range bombers. These funds had not been requested by the Department of Defense. However, during the hearings of the Department of Defense Subcommittee, of which I was the acting chairman during the absence of the late Senator Dennis Chavez, it was clearly proved that it was in the interest of this Nation to continue the production of these long-range bombers and the Committee on Appropriations recommended the allowance of the necessary additional funds.

In a letter addressed to the Honorable Dennis Chavez, chairman of the Department of Defense Subcommittee, dated October 27, 1961, the Secretary of Defense said:

> A decision has been reached regarding utilization of funds appropriated by the Congress for long-range bombers, the B-70 program, and the DYNA-SOAR program. This decision, approved by the President after an intensive review, is that the progress of the accelerated defense buildup makes unecessary the use of these funds above the amount requested by the President.

This was the decision to allow the production of long-range bombers to be terminated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, the letter from the Secretary of Defense addressed to the late Senator Dennis Chavez.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, *October 27, 1961.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of Defense, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: A decision has been reached regarding utilization of funds appropriated by the Congress for long-range bombers, the B-70 program, and the Dyna-Soar program. This decision, approved by the President after an intensive review, is that the progress of the accelerated defense buildup makes unnecessary the use of these funds above the amount requested by the President.

This decision in no way means that our bombers are becoming obsolete. Indeed, as the Stennis report pointed out, bombers can do things that the missiles cannot do. I am confident that our medium and heavy bombers will be able to penetrate to their targets, if the need should come. We now have a force of about 1,500 heavy and medium bombers, together with their accompanying refueling tankers. This is a very large bomber force which gives us more than enough capability to perform the tasks for which they are particularly suited. This force will have the potential to perform its mission through the late 1960's and into the early 1970's.

After weighing all the facts in detail, it is our best judgment that the B-70 program should continue as a development program. As you know, this program permits the continuation of essential technological development and retains the option to proceed with development of a complete weapons system at a later date, should this be determined necessary.

Regarding Dyna-Soar, our conclusion is that the $100 million funding requested by this administration will help us solve the difficult technical problems involved in launching a manned vehicle into suborbital or orbital flight and recovering it by normal landing at some preselected site. At the same time, we are reexamining the program and it may be reoriented so as to produce more rapidly the experience and technological capabilities relevant to presently unforeseeable military needs. This will enable us to react quickly should such needs appear. If this reorientation is feasible, proper scheduling of flights and use of launch vehicles should make it possible within the funds requested for fiscal year 1962. For the present it does not appear that expenditure of any additional funds in fiscal year 1962 above the $100 million we requested is necessary or desirable.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the other article deals with a recent modification of the old, slow-flying C–47 aircraft, now equipped with side-firing cannon and providing support to our ground forces in South Vietnam that no modern airplane has yet been able to supply. Prior to this modification of armament and employment, it would have been difficult to designate a plane more obsolete or less useful than the ancient, decrepit C–47.

I do not suggest that all our old airplanes have potentials for use in modern warfare comparable to this. I do think it might be well to reflect, however, on these points:

First. No computer yet devised can forecast accurately the equipment and techniques that may have to be developed to fight future wars, particularly unconventional "wars of liberation" that the Communists have proclaimed repeatedly that they will provoke and support.

Second. Those most likely to anticipate the tactics and weapons that will be employed in such wars are those who plan them.

Third. Since we have no aggressive designs on any other nation, we make no plans of attack, and often must modify and adapt our tactics to meet the situation thrust upon us.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the article in Armed Forces Management on page 15 of the January issue entitled "The B–111, Solution or Substitute," and the article from the same issue on page 18, entitled, "A Ghost From the Past."

RETIREMENT OF DR. M. D. MOBLEY AS EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, last December, a fellow Georgian and an outstanding citizen of my State, Dr. M. D. Mobley, retired as executive secretary of the American Vocational Association, culminating a distinguished career of 15 years in this position and almost half a century of devoted service to education.

In the December issue of the American Vocational Journal, which was dedicated almost entirely to saluting Dr. Mobley on the occasion of his retirement, there appears a number of tributes from Members of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record a brief summary of Dr. Mobley's career along with these tributes from Members of the House and Senate.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On his retirement as executive secretary of AVA, which becomes effective December 31, 1965, Dr. Mobley can look back over more than 40 years of service to vocational education—27 of them in Georgia.

He served his native State well in a career that began as a teacher of vocational agriculture in 1923 and culminated in his appointment as State director of vocational education in 1963. Georgia increased appropriations for vocational education from $50,000 to $5 million, became the fourth highest State in the Nation in total vocational education enrollment, and in 1940, passed a law authorizing the establishment of area vocational schools.

But even in these years, Dr. Mobley's influence was not restricted to State lines. The George-Deen Act, the George-Barden Act, the bill authorizing and appropriating funds for the training of war production workers, and the provision making Federal funds available for vocational education under the GI bill of rights—all bear his imprint.

His legislative accomplishments as executive secretary of AVA are well known. Less known, perhaps, but vitally important for vocational education has been his influence as a member of three national advisory committees—to the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education, and the Department of Labor.

Dr. Mobley is editor and co-author of 11 textbooks and the recipient of numerous State and national awards and citations. He holds a B.S.A. degree from the University of Georgia, an M.S. degree from Cornell University; and an LL.D. from Piedmont College.

TRIBUTES FROM MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Congressman Carl D. Perkins, of Kentucky: "M. D. Mobley stands out in my mind as one of the best informed men in America on educational matters, and, in particular, on the great system of vocational education.

"Members of the American Vocational Association can take great pride in the fact that their organization has been able to accomplish much in the advancement of American vocational education, attributable in large part to the tireless efforts of Dr. Mobley—not only in keeping abreast of developments, needs, and problems in the field of vocational education, but in making sure that agencies of local, State, and Federal Government were acquainted with those needs, developments and problems.

"I shall always treasure the memory of my contacts with Dr. Mobley in working on vocational education matters. Particularly was he helpful in pointing out the great needs of vocational education—which was indispensable in fashioning the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

"I hope M.D.'s retirement will not be taken literally and that his services to the profession he has represented so outstandingly will continue on a consultative basis. I strongly suspect that we will find Dr. Mobley, like the retired fire horse when the alarm bell sounds, in the front line fighting the battles for vocational education."

Congressman Philip M. Landrum, of Georgia: "I think no man has had greater understanding than M. D. Mobley of the values of, as well as the need for, vocational education. He has at all times recognized the necessity to keep vocational education as close to the liberal arts field as possible, realizing that the field of humanities is necessary to round out one's education and make him a complete citizen.

"At the same time he has developed an expertness in the drafting and planning of vocational programs that has rarely been equaled in our country. I saw this in Dr. Mobley's many activities before the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I was a member for 12 years. But I noticed it more particularly in 1963 when we were engaged in what I like to call 'taking vocational education out of its straitjacket.'

"He was of tremendous value in shaping the 1963 act and, moreover, has been extremely helpful to the administrative and executive branches of the Government in implementing it.

"Americans everywhere will be in eternal debt to M. D. Mobley for his services to vocational education and for his contribution, through these services, to our economic and culture welfare."

Congressman John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island: "Dr. Mobley's dedication to the cause he took long ago as his own is immeasurable. His concern for the individual, the community, the State, and the country enables him to gage objectively what goals vocational education should set. His determination enables him to work without deviation toward these goals.

"Few vocational educators are in a position to know how well M.D. has served them. I wish they all knew. I wish the country knew what it owes this man.

"Legislation is not the work of the elected Congressman alone. He must be able to depend on the honest judgment and counsel of a professional in the field under consideration. My colleagues in Congress and I knew we could look to M.D. for the background and evaluation that would allow us to provide the Nation with just and honorable legislation.

"I am eager to join in a tribute to a man who has spent his career in effectively serving others. He has not once stepped from the path he elected to follow when he was a young man in Georgia. He believed that the individual's right to be trained to work with honor and purpose was inviolate. He never thought otherwise."

Senator Lister Hill of Alabama: "As chairman of the Senate committees which have jurisdiction over vocational education and technical training programs, and appropriations for them, I have had an opportunity to observe firsthand the outstanding and effective work of M. D. Mobley as executive secretary of the American Vocational Association.

"When he took up his duties as executive secretary of your association in 1951, he had already served with distinction for some 15 years as State director of vocational education in Georgia.

"Recognizing the vital importance of business, trade, technical and vocational training to our country's security as well as to our Nation's economic strength and growth, he has always been in the frontlines fighting for programs to help increase the skill and productivity of our people.

"To our great and good friend, Dr. Mobley, may I say: 'I am proud to join your colleagues of the American Vocational Association, and the many thousands of men and women throughout our Nation who have been direct beneficiaries of your far-reaching vision and untiring work, in expressing deep appreciation for your devoted service.' "

Senator Richard B. Russell, of Georgia: "My best wishes and felicitations to my good friend and fellow Georgian, M. D. Mobley, on the occasion of his retirement as executive secretary of the American Vocational Association.

"I have had the privilege of knowing Dr. Mobley during most of his distinguished and dedicated career. He was, of course, a leader in the important field of vocational education in our State before his efforts were broadened to include the entire country through his work with your association.

"I know of no man, past or present, with prouder credentials in vocational education than Dr. Mobley. Untold numbers of young people have been guided into useful and fruitful lives through the skills and training he has helped to give them.

"He has richly earned his retirement, but he will be missed on the firing line of vocational education."

Senator Herman E. Talmadge, of Georgia: "For almost half a century, M. D. Mobley has devoted his time, energy, and talents to the education of young people in order to better prepare them for the complexities of a rapidly changing world.

"As the Atlanta Journal declared editorially in 1951 when Dr. Mobley left his State post to become executive secretary of the American Vocational Association—he is a man of vision who recognized before most of us the importance of vocational training, and who knew that no educational program was complete unless it offered to every young citizen the opportunity to develop his talents to the fullest degree, each according to his desire, ability, and resources.

"Dr. Mobley's achievements over the years stand as a monument to his good work. His career is truly an inspiration to all who are interested in the education of young Americans.

"As a Member of the U.S. Senate, I personally would like to thank him for his efforts toward the enactment of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, probably the most significant piece of legislation in this field since the Smith-Hughes Act."

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I traveled last fall to southeast Asia in order to gain a firsthand understanding of the situation in Vietnam.

Today, the President has forwarded a message to the Congress requesting the necessary additional funds to continue our efforts in the cause of freedom for these people.

President Johnson has spoken to our Nation about the three faces of war in Vietnam—military, political, and economic. In asking the Congress for additional funds to carry out our commitment in Vietnam, the President has included a relatively modest amount for the third face of the war—the economic battle.

The economic assistance given by the United States to Vietnam currently is the largest we give to any country. And it will grow larger.

One of the reasons is that Vietnam can no longer earn enough foreign exchange to buy essential imports. A shortage of consumer goods can mean additional suffering and inflation. To fight this, we have a commodity import program, whereby we use our funds to assure a supply of needed goods and use the Vietnamese money to support the nation's war effort.

Another reason for the size of the program is the struggle for the loyalty of the farmers. A new force in this struggle is the rural reconstruction program which will need AID funds and AID workers to succeed.

Here is the ultimate battle the Vietnamese Government is waging—to win the support of the farmers and villagers of Vietnam. The plan was designed by the Government of Vietnam to gain a firm foothold in these rural areas. It is now being carried on in a portion of the countryside now under harassment from the Vietcong.

In order to gain this foothold, the plan gives top priority to about 400 of the country's 2,500 villages.

To each of these 400 villages will go Vietnamese cadres who will work directly with People's Action Teams to place into operation the following four-point program:

First. The establishment of local security.

Second. The identification, isolation, and elimination of Vietcong cells that have been lurking and festering in these villages.

Third. The organization of a meaningful local government in each village and finally, the initiation of constructive work in the vital fields of agriculture, education, and health—in general, to bring the benefits of economic and social assistance to the people.

The Government of South Vietnam now has 12,000 members in these People's Action Teams and another 4,000 men working in a companion project.

The Vietnamese Government—by the end of the current calendar year—is aiming at increasing those totals to between 30,000 and 40,000.

The Agency for International Development's Mission in Vietnam already is the largest now operated by the Agency anywhere in the world.

It must grow still larger in order to support this rural reconstruction program. By the end of 1966 it expects to employ between 900 and 1,000 persons.

The rural reconstruction program—by moving into nearly 20 percent of the country's villages—will seek to win firm popular commitments in areas now either uncontrolled or dominated by the Vietcong.

United States and Vietnamese civilian personnel will not participate in this vital and difficult job without help. The military will provide an umbrella for all those working in the rural reconstruction program.

The cadres are local people and their job will be concerned with the tough problems of land tenure and rural development.

Rural reconstruction does not require money in the same quantities as the inflation-attacking commodity import program. But it will require additional funds.

This is an imaginative, but practical program. It gives hope for winning support for the Government of Vietnam. Certainly, we must give it every chance to succeed.

For success in the villages and hamlets of Vietnam means strength and support for free men everywhere.

This is a goal worth working for.

WILLIAMSON SYLVESTER STUCKEY, SR.—A FINE CITIZEN

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in the February premier edition of Southern Living magazine there appears an excellent profile of one of Georgia's outstanding citizens, Williamson Sylvester Stuckey, Sr.

This splendid article traces the career of Sylvester Stuckey, whose name and products are known to most people who have ever driven from New York to Florida. Stuckey's great success stands as a testimony to what can be accomplished by private initiative and hard work under the American free enterprise system. From humble beginning during the depression, Sylvester Stuckey's pecan business has grown into a large chain enterprise which dots the highways in the eastern part of the United States. The Southern Living article is a well-deserved tribute to a fine businessman, a good citizen who has served his State and local community in many ways, and my warm friend.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUCKEY—THE PECAN CANDY MAN

The red and yellow billboard alongside the two-lane, blacktop road in rural south Georgia announced it was only 7½ miles to Stuckey's.

Exactly that far down the road is tiny Eastman, Ga. There are two Stuckeys there—the shop and the man.

The shop is one of 176 pecans, candy, and gift shops that are landmarks across the country from Wisconsin to Florida, from the Pacific to the Atlantic.

The man is Williamson Sylvester Stuckey, Sr., whose last name is now as familiar to motoring Americans as Burma Shave was a generation ago.

The Stuckey's shop in Eastman is like all the other clean looking, plastic coated Stuckeys that coax travelers to stop for gasoline, a quick snack, some pecan candy, and a souvenir for the folks back home.

The shops and the series of effectively gaudy billboards have brought an uncommon familiarity to the Stuckey name.

Stuckey, the man, founded his farflung roadside stand empire in Eastman 34 years ago with a couple of sacks of pecans and a borrowed $35.

There's no room on the billboards or in Stuckey's personality for the Williamson Sylvester part of his famous name.

"He's just Stuckey to everybody," said a business associate.

When the family money ran out in depression-wracked 1931, young Stuckey dropped out of the University of Georgia and returned to his farm home to work. Then the cotton market went with the ill winds of the times, and Stuckey left the farm in search of a job in hometown Eastman.

"I went to a warehouseman here and asked him for a job. He didn't have anything. He said he could give me a job, but couldn't pay me.

"He told me I ought to go into the pecan business. He said, 'You've got a Ford coupe. Drive it around and buy pecans and sell them.'"

With $35 borrowed from his grandmother ("It was all she had"), an authentically archaic cotton scales ("Just a long stick with a weight tied on one end"), some bags of sample pecans ("The warehouseman gave me a couple of sacks with different types of pecans in them"), and gumption, Stuckey went into the pecan business.

"I would buy pecans after 3 o'clock when the bank closed so I could write checks; then I would sell enough to deposit the money the next morning to cover the checks."

Profit was marginal, but Stuckey kept at it. He put up a clapboard stand by the side of the road in Eastman and dispensed pecans by the bag to commuting New York-to-Florida vacationers.

"My wife started cooking chocolate fudge, maple divinity, and pralines. A nurse for our children lived on the farm with us, and my wife taught her how to cook the candy."

The tourists stopped at the pecan stand and bought candy by the bag. The candymaking operation grew. Stuckey branched out, opening two more stands on the highway to Florida.

With the coming of World War II, Stuckey retired momentarily from the nearly nonexistent tourist trade. But he stayed at candymaking by supplying it for the Armed Forces, and after the war when Americans began touring again, the Stuckey's Pecan Shoppe business resurged from its wartime hibernation. And Stuckey forged a chain of shops.

Now vacationers, Sunday drivers, and men on business trips stop at a Stuckey's and buy Stuckey's candy in attractive, quality-controlled gift boxes and cans to the sweet tune of millions of dollars a year.

His kid brother, Frank Stuckey, explained, "Stuckey has always worked on the principle that people just want a snack bar. Families with children don't want to spend $10 for lunch when they stop for gas. And they can't get anything but crackers and soft drinks at a service station."

New locations are selected regularly by Stuckey men who roam the interstates by car and plane for spots where motorists seem ready for a stop at a Stuckey's.

The Stuckey organization, now a division of the Pet Milk Co., in which Williamson Sylvester Stuckey has a healthy financial interest, is a growing, diversified business. Stuckey has expanded his interests to include plastic sign manufacturing, Christmas tree production, farming, and building a fat stock portfolio. Basically though, Stuckey's remains one of the Nation's major candymaking firms, and from the plant sprawled out behind the Eastman Stuckey's Pecan Shoppe come all those candies for all the Stuckeys.

Stuckey directs the business from Eastman, where he and his plant are very much a part of the town's being. The town limits sign, in fact, stands diminutively in the shadow of a red and yellow billboard which declares: "Welcome to Eastman, Ga., Home of Stuckey's."

At 56, Stuckey the pecan candy man looks healthy, wealthy, and wise.

He is proud of his deep roots in south Georgia. He works at his candy business and farming, and leaves management of the family's personal holdings to his son, Billy. Farming has become more than just an avocation for Stuckey, and while he entrusts his farm's daily operation to a team of experts, he spends his otherwise leisure time before and after office hours out on the farm keeping up with his land and its production.

"We grow practically everything that's grown in this part of Georgia," said Stuckey in the manner of an Atlanta businessman talking about his new Chris-Craft.

On an average day in his appropriately pecan-paneled, carpeted office that looks more Atlanta basic than Eastman primitive, Stuckey chats on the phone with a Pet Milk executive, talks to the doctor who tended him in a recent operation, retires to his mahoganied conference room for a meeting with some county politicians, and all the while stays on top of the candy trade. Around 5 o'clock he's off for the farm to see how things are going there.

Aside from his candymaking and pecan shop chain, Pet Milk vice-presidency, and farming operation, Stuckey is a director on the boards of two banks, an insurance company, and a cotton mill, and is a member of the Methodist church.

His son and daughter, with families of their own, live in Eastman and remain an integral part of family-oriented Stuckeyland.

Stuckey's wife, Ethel, has retired to the role of housewife now, though, as Stuckey notes with pride, "She was quite active in my pecan buying in the early stages of my business." And she did cook that first batch of pecan candy.

Stuckey still gets up as early as he ever did on his boyhood farm, and he holds to a philosophy that he long ago decided was basic: "You've got to be honest with the public. And you've got to work. Of course, good luck won't hurt."

Stuckey is a friendly, pleasant sort of man. In his company one senses Stuckey's business acumen is more natural than acquired.

At work he's a clean-desk man. And on an uncluttered table behind his desk are only several prayer books, a Bible, three volumes of "Who's Who," and a handsomely bound copy of the 1965 presidential inaugural program.

Stuckey wears blue suits and rides out to his pecan groves in a Cadillac. In Atlanta, he might appear as just another successful executive in the burgeoning ranks of blue-suited, plush-officed executives. In Eastman, Stuckey is a native son, a friend, the man who lives in the big white rambling house across from the service station at the edge of town.

"Basically," said brother, Frank, "Stuckey is a farmer. He was born on a farm; grew up on the farm. He just likes Eastman and Dodge County. He built the chain up from here. He still runs the company now like when he had just one store.

"You couldn't keep him in Atlanta 24 hours."

HUGH L. ELSBREE RETIRES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as most of you are aware, Hugh L. Elsbree, director of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress, will retire from that position in February of this year. Dr. Elsbree has had a long and distinguished career of Government service—21 years to be precise. Nineteen of these years have been in the Legislative Reference Service, the last seven and a half as its director .

Admirably qualified for this important position, Dr. Elsbree received his A.B., M.A., and Ph. D. degrees from Harvard University in 1925, 1927, and 1930, respectively. In 1927–28 he was a Sheldon Traveling Fellow in Paris and Geneva. He began his teaching career at Harvard as an instructor in government—1928–33. Except for a short period in 1934 as a research specialist for the Federal Power Commission, he was associated from 1933 to 1943 with Dartmouth College, where he served as assistant professor—1933–37—and professor—1937–43—of political science and as chairman of the Department of Political Science—1937–41. He left Dartmouth in 1943 to serve as principal economist for the Office of Price Administration, and then went to the Bureau of the Budget in 1945 as administrative analyst.

In November 1945 Dr. Elsbree joined the staff of the Library of Congress as research counsel in the Legislative Reference Service; on July 1, 1946, he became Senior Specialist in American Government and Public Administration. In 1954–55 he was lent to the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to serve as its deputy research director.

In October 1955 he was appointed deputy director of the Legislative Reference Service and he served in that capacity until he left the Library in March 1957 to be chairman of the Department of Political Science at Wayne State University in Detroit, Mich. He returned in September 1958 to serve as director of the Legislative Reference Service.

As the coauthor of the La Follette-Monroney Act, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which made the Legislative Reference Service a major research and reference arm of the Congress, as cochairman of the present Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization, and as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, I have had the opportunity to observe at close hand the development and operation of the Legislative Reference Service for over two decades. During this period the Service has been fortunate to have such able directors as Dr. Elsbree and his predecessor, Dr. Ernest Griffith.

In 1958, when Dr. Elsbree assumed the directorship of the Service, the Service answered about 68,000 congressional inquiries. During the first session of the 89th Congress, through the end of 1965, it responded to nearly 114,000. This almost phenomenal growth in the demands on the Service strikingly illustrates the ever-increasing research needs of the Congress. The Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization is seriously studying the effects of the expanding legislative program on the Legislative Reference Service and, as Dr. Elsbree will tell you, they have been both good and bad. The main adverse effect is that the constantly increasing workload makes it very difficult both to improve quality and to meet deadlines—goals which the Library is striving to attain.

At the same time, the increasing and changing needs of Congress have already led to certain desirable changes in the Legislative Reference Service to make it more responsive to congressional needs. For example, the newly created Science Policy Research Division, in which I have been especially interested, was established to assist the Congress in its important role in developing U.S. scientific and technological policy. Another important development has been the initiation of moves to separate the handling of reference-type requests, and particularly constituent requests from the answering of significant Member and committee research requests. I personally believe this type of administrative separation is essential so that the Service's many well-qualified specialists can devote their talents and energies to the complex legislative problems on which we all need help.

As each of you is well aware, it takes great administrative talent to recruit and to keep a highly talented staff. The staff of the Legislative Reference Service is indeed such a staff. Hugh Elsbree's scholarly reputation, his personal and intellectual integrity, and his unfailing interest in the welfare of those with whom he works, as well as his dedication to the public service, have contributed immeasurably to the morale of the staff and the high level of its performance.

Lester Jayson, who has served as Dr. Elsbree's Deputy for 4 years and who was previously with the U.S. Department of Justice, has been appointed as director of the Legislative Reference Service by the Librarian of Congress and I look forward to many years of association with him.

I want to express my personal appreciation as well as that of the Senate to Dr. Elsbree for his devoted service to the Congress during a period in which this body, because of its heavy legislative responsibilities, has placed great burdens on the Legislative Reference Service. I hope that his retirement will be a happy and fruitful one.

SIGNIFICANCE OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S SPEECH ON THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, 5 years ago Monday, President Eisenhower made his famous speech on the military-industrial complex. Many have forgotten that speech. But the American Veterans Committee has reminded us of the speech and of its significance.

I ask unanimous consent that their statement on this anniversay, which includes General Eisenhower's words, be printed at this point in the RECORD as a reminder to all of us of that speech.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S FAREWELL ADDRESS BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX OF THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE

Five years ago, last Monday—on January 17, 1961—President Dwight D. Eisenhower in his farewell radio and television address to the American people spoke out on a matter he considered of significant long-range consequence to this Nation. He coined the phrase, "the military-industrial complex."

General Eisenhower's entire life gave him a unique background to discuss this vital subject. Certainly, no one else in our recent history knows better, both from a military and a civilian vantage point, all the relationships involved in this area of national life.

Today, as 5 years ago, it would be well for the Nation to recall his words.

"A vital element in keeping the peace is our Military Establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

"Our military organization today bears little relation to that known by any of my predecessors in peacetime, or indeed by the fighting men of World War II or Korea.

"Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But now we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in the Defense Establishment. We annually spend on military security more than the net income of all U.S. corporations.

"This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every statehouse, every office of the Federal Government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

"In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

"We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

"Akin to, and largely responsible for the sweeping changes in our industrial-military posture, has been the technological revolution during recent decades.

"In this revolution, research has become central; it also becomes more formalized, complex, and costly. A steadily increasing share is conducted for, by or at the direction of, the Federal Government.

"Today, the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a Government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers.

"The prospect of domination of the Nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present—and is gravely to be regarded.

"Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

"It is the task of statesmanship to mold, to balance, and to integrate these and other forces, new and old, within the principles of our democratic system—ever aiming toward the supreme goals of our free society."

The American Veterans Committee wholeheartedly endorses General Eisenhower's remarks and intends to use its energy and resources to study the military-industrial complex in its many ramifications for the Nation.

REPUBLICAN STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE IS A GAIN FOR ALL AMERICA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, earlier this week the capable minority leader, Mr. DIRKSEN, and his colleague in the House, Mr. FORD, went before network television cameras in the Old Supreme Court Chamber to present the Republican appraisal of the state of the Union message.

It is not an exaggeration to say that the occasion was historic. For the first time, the leaders of the opposition party were formally presenting their own views of the state of the Union and offering their own proposals for progress.

The appearance was important in another sense. It reasserted the vitality of the two-party system. Thoughtful Members of both great political parties have shown increasing concern over the imbalance between the parties which now exists in the Congress today. Our system of government was designed to function best with only a narrow division in the strength of the parties.

This point is stressed in an assessment of the Dirksen-Ford appearance by the able columnist, Roscoe Drummond. He points to several gains for the Nation—more resourcefulness by the Republican Party in its public advocacy, a wider national audience for Republican views, and the fact that "Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. FORD spoke constructively without any outdated partisan opposition for the sake of opposition."

Mr. President, the texts of Senator DIRKSEN's and Representative FORD's remarks were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday and appear on pages 548 to 550 of the House proceedings. I commend their reading to all Americans, regardless of party.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have inserted in the RECORD Mr. Drummond's article which appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOP SPEAKS OUT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The voice of the Republican Party in Congress is being lifted to better effect than at any time since it lost the White House 6 years ago.

The very concept of a Republican state of the Union address—delivered on prime television time by Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN and Representative GERALD FORD—shows the GOP is becoming more resourceful in its public advocacy. That is a gain in itself.

Still anemic in its 1-to-2 minority status, the GOP voice may not be more widely heeded in Congress, but it is being more widely heard in the country. That's another gain.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. FORD spoke constructively and responsibly without any outdated partisan opposition for the sake of opposition. That's a third gain.

It seems to me that, in sum, that well served the interests of the country and of their own party by doing three things above all else:

1. They put the brand of "moderate Republicanism" on the whole range of party policy and thus prepared the way to make a political recovery in the elections this fall.

2. They identified the GOP unreservedly with the cause of racial justice and stricter enforcement of all civil rights laws.

3. They gave the President unwavering support—better support than he is getting from some highly placed Democrats—for the unyielding goals in Vietnam—securing the independence of South Vietnam by negotiation if possible and by military action if necessary.

As the Senate minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN clearly spoke for more than the minority in every crucial position he took on Vietnam. He spoke for the country and what he said cannot fail to be a source of strength to President Johnson, both in his conduct of the peace initiative and in his conduct of the war.

Mr. DIRKSEN gave to the Democratic administration reassuring evidence that it will continue to have Republican backing on these two vital prongs of U.S. policy. This was the heart of his assurance:

"Let the peace efforts continue. Who can object to any honorable effort to secure peace where young blood is involved?

"Let the military effort continue. It demonstrates our determination to keep our word. Let it be intensified, if necessary, as sound military judgment dictates."

On the whole front of the Vietnam peace effort and the Vietnam war effort, it is evident that Senator DIRKSEN is going to be an invaluable ally of the President—as long as the President, in Mr. DIRKSEN's words, keeps "the objective crystal clear at all times and that it guarantees freedom and independence for the Vietnamese."

The only way the administration can lose the indispensable support of Mr. DIRKSEN is to leave any impression that it will undercut this goal either through soft conduct of negotiations or soft conduct of the war.

My estimate is that Mr. Johnson and Mr. DIRKSEN will remain strong allies in this cause.

On domestic policy, Mr. FORD, the House minority leader, gave no all-embracing "me, too" to the Johnson 1966 blueprint. He challenged the President to cut enough from new Great Society programs to avoid new taxes. He urged the administration to put first things first—defraying the cost of the war without stimulating inflation and also doing well the many programs voted last year rather than adding so many new ones on top of them.

But Mr. FORD stressed two positive lines of Republican policy. On poverty he argued that "this Nation can afford what is necessary."

On civil rights he held that constitutional rights should "be put in force everywhere now * * * there cannot be two kinds of justice, one for white, another for Negroes."

The team of Dirksen and Ford is giving the Republican Party a new forward look.

HOWARD WILLIAMS, FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA PRESIDENT

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there appear in the Record a copy of an article in the current issue of the National Future Farmer entitled, "Howard Williams, Future Farmers of America President—A Study in Character."

The article is a very interesting and absorbing account of a young North Carolinian's dedication and determination to offer leadership in one of the Nation's most highly respected youth organizations.

I know the Members of the Senate and the public generally will find this article most inspiring and in the highest tradition of outstanding service by the youth of our Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Howard Williams, Future Farmers of America President

(By Len Richardson)

As a sophomore, Howard Williams, of Olin, N.C., was a typical Future Farmer. He seemed little fitted by circumstance for his future role as your national president and the energetic leader of nearly a half million farm boys.

During a visit to Mount Vernon, home of George Washington, Howard told of the spark that ignited his interest in becoming a national FFA officer, "I was a sophomore attending our State FFA convention as a participant in the public speaking contest. Richard Black, national FFA student secretary from Arkansas, was attending the convention and took some time to encourage me and offer advice on my speech. I have never forgotten that experience, even though I placed only fourth in the contest," Howard explained.

Black, of course, had no way of knowing that he was talking to a member who would go on to become FFA's national president. Like Washington, our country's first President, Williams' qualities of leadership were dormant until the opportunities came along that would reveal them.

One such quality is determination. It was this quality of character which proved invaluable to Howard during a number of retreats of his FFA career. Retreat best describes the events, since defeat is a word that doesn't fit the Howard Williams you elected president. In public speaking, for example, Howard was a two-time loser, and the third time didn't prove to be a charm. "After losing the first time, I reentered each year, but the best I could do was to place second," explained Howard. "Following a recent speech, however, a vo-ag teacher came up to me and asked if I had ever been in the public speaking contest. When I told him, 'Yes, but I have never won,' he replied, 'You have won more than you'll ever know.' "

Based on his own experience, Howard emphasized two points about FFA leadership and contest activities:

First, the speaking contest encouraged him to use his own judgment. He was interested in the judgment made by contest officials, but the basis of his evaluation was his own reaction to and appraisal of his speech. Winning was not as important as realizing the potentialities within himself.

Second, Howard sensed that FFA leaders wanted him to succeed. He singled out his meeting with Richard Black as an important factor in his becoming national president but added, "My vo-ag teacher and others have encouraged my interest and enthusiasm for FFA." This mutual interest among local, State and national FFA leaders is a key factor in a strong FFA. It is one of the reasons Howard is willing to give up a year of college to serve as your national president. It is further illustrated by the fact that Howard is the first member of the Harmony FFA chapter to ever be elected a State or national officer.

During the tour of Mount Vernon, the interview naturally shifted to farming. Williams has a 15-percent partnership in the 400-acre home dairy farm. His father rents an additional 100 acres, and the partners milk 70 cows. Howard personally owns 16 cows, and his crop enterprises include 12 acres of corn, 8 acres of cotton, and 4 acres of alfalfa.

"My farming program actually started when I was 11 years old," he explained. "Dad bought me a registered Holstein heifer as a birthday gift." In fact, young Williams was so enthusiastic about this first calf that he received another when he was 12, and his interest and farming program have both grown from this beginning.

When Howard enrolled in vocational agriculture, he already had a start consisting of 13 Holstein heifers. "I was really lucky," explains Howard. "For the first 3 years my foundation cows each had heifer calves. Since I didn't have money to buy more foundation stock, it was a good start."

Howard's farming success earned for him the American Farmer Degree. During his 4 years of vo-ag, their herd production average increased by 3,000 pounds of milk per cow. This record has been obtained in spite of the fact that dairying is a new enterprise for the Williams farm. "We switched to dairy from beef and cotton about the time I received my first two calves," he explained. "We started with 25 cows and 240 acres and have been building to where we are now. Our size is about right, so we will begin reaching for our quality potential." The big boost in production which has occurred in the Williams herd is credited to his introduction of registered stock and improved breeding.

Today Howard has a net worth of nearly $15,000 and his stake in farming is growing. He explains, "Ours is more than a partnership; it's a relationship. Land is being obtained from my father through rent. The rent which I pay is counting toward the purchase price of the land."

It would be wrong, however, to conclude that Howard has it made. An illness is making it increasingly difficult for his father to manage the farm. As national president, Howard has an almost continuous travel schedule. A trip to London and the FFA Goodwill Tour are on his immediate agenda. On top of all this, their full-time dairy worker has left the farm after 25 years. Attracting and retaining a qualified dairy worker in the textile labor market around Olin, N.C., won't be easy.

These problems, as big as they seem, serve only to point up another quality of your president. It's the ability to accept conflict and tension resulting from problems rather than to try to avoid them. For him problems seem to be the source of what one used to call "character" in George Washington's day.

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES ON VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the National Council of Churches is the responsible organization whose membership includes more than 30 Protestant and Orthodox denominations of the United States, with more than 90 percent of the total U.S. Protestant church membership. It has long been the council's policy to seek the best information, to study the situation, and to make considered statements on public matters in an effort to express a sound consensus of Christian conscience.

This they have now done in a "Policy Statement on Vietnam" and an accompanying "Message to the Churches on Vietnam." These were adopted at a meeting of the council's general board on December 3 by a vote of 93 to 10, with 6 abstaining. They grew out of a recommendation from the Sixth World Order Study Conference held in St. Louis last October, and involved thorough discussion both in the general board and beforehand. The policy statement was presented to the December meeting by the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, now president of the University of Oregon, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming. Dr. Flemming is first vice president of the National Council of Churches and chairman of a special advisory committee of that body on Vietnam.

We can all agree with the national council statement in holding that solution depends on moving action "from the battlefield to the conference table," and that "the application of the basic Christian ethic of love and reconciliation should be in our minds and wills as we try to find solutions to this problem." The seven specific recommendations for policy deserve the fullest consideration. Already, since adoption of these goals, the cessation of bombing called for by the council "to create more favorable circumstances for negotiations to begin" has occurred.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the National Council of Churches' policy statement on Vietnam and its accompanying message to the churches may appear in the Congressional Record. I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Vietnam Peace Action Suggested for Church Members," published in the Wabash Plain Dealer of December 20, 1965, may be printed in the Record. This editorial was among comments that appeared concerning the National Council of Churches documents.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Policy Statement on Vietnam

(Adopted by the General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. on December 3, 1965)

We confront with sorrow the profound and widespread war-suffering of the Vietnamese people both North and South and others who are involved in the conflict, including personnel in military and other forms of service and families of our own and other nations.

The issue in the war and possible solutions are very complex and there are sincere differences among us.

Some believe that the military effort should be continued and that unless the spread of communism by violent infiltration is checked by further military means, liberties of not only South Vietnam but of southeast Asia are imperiled. In this view the war must go on until the military results bring the Vietcong and North Vietnamese to the conference table.

Others believe that: A continuance of the fighting will not facilitate negotiations and will not serve the cause of peace or justice or freedom; it will mean a rising toll of death and sorrow for the Vietnamese people and increasing disillusionment and division on all sides; there is the grave possibility that a prolonged war will escalate further and spread, thus jeopardizing all of mankind; the struggle, and especially the bombing of North Vietnam may delay progress in improved relations with the Soviet Union and in agreements for arms control and disarmament; within the United States we also see, as associated with all wars, depersonalization of life and increase in immorality.

We hold that within the spectrum of their concern Christians can and do espouse one or the other of these views or still other views and should not have their integrity of conscience faulted because they do.

We note with approval that:

1. The President of the United States on April 7, 1965, and on other dates since then has publicly committed the administration to the principle of unconditional discussions leading to the negotiation of the cessation of hostilities and a peace settlement, has expressed readiness to utilize mediation efforts by United Nations members, and especially by United Nations Secretary-General U Thant; and that he has proposed a billion dollar development fund for southeast Asia.

2. The U.S. Armed Forces have sought to avoid bombing the population centers of North Vietnam.

3. The Secretary-General of the United Nations has indicated his readiness to use his good offices to bring about the cessation of hostilities.

We believe that a solution of the problem in Vietnam can be essentially advanced only when action is moved from the battlefield to the conference table. We pray that this may be speedily accomplished. We would also remind our people that the application of the basic Christian ethic of love and reconciliation should be in our minds and wills as we try to find solutions to this problem. We therefore recommend that the United States, in the interest of bringing peace and growing justice and freedom to the territories of Vietnam, should now consider the following suggestions:

1. Continue to reaffirm and manifest its readiness for unconditional discussion and negotiation in such manner as will remove any uncertainty about official policy relating to the termination of military action. Such reaffirmation might be strategically expressed by the cessation of all bombing of North Vietnam for a sufficient period to create more favorable circumstances for negotiations to begin and with a simultaneous effort to induce the North Vietnam Government to stop sending military personnel and materiel into South Vietnam.

2. Adhere strictly to the policy of avoiding the bombing of centers of population of North Vietnam.

3. Seek to alleviate the desperate plight of the noncombatants in South Vietnam by increased efforts to prevent their becoming the victims of the hostilities.

4. Request the United Nations to begin negotiations wherever and whenever possible for a cease-fire agreement (including cessation of terrorist activities) under United Nations supervision, among the governments of the United States, of North and South Vietnam, and other interested parties, including representatives from the National Liberation Front; such negotiations are imperative and may be possible on the basis of the mutual interest of sparing the population further and frightful suffering.

Request the United Nations, further, as soon as may be possible, to convene a peace conference regarding Vietnam, with participation of all interested governments and with representation for the National Liberation Front to explore the bases of a settlement of the long-term issues and the means to give such a settlement effective international guarantees.

5. Make clear that a primary objective of a settlement of the Vietnam conflict is the independence of South Vietnam from outside interference, with complete liberty to determine the character of its future government by the result of a peaceful, free, and verified choice of its people. The choices might include whether it wishes to establish a coalition of Nationalists and National Liberation Front, or whether it wishes to be united with North Vietnam (perhaps through a plebiscite), or to operate as an independent, neutral and nonalined state, or whether it wishes to constitute with Cambodia and Laos a buffer zone between the Communist and non-Communist spheres of influence, freely trading with both, or whether it wishes to join the Southern Asia Treaty Organization or the free states of southeast Asia or elsewhere.

6. Declare itself (the United States of America) in favor of the phased withdrawal of all its troops and bases from the Vietnamese territory, if and when they can be replaced by adequate international peacekeeping forces, composed of military contingents capable of maintaining order while the peace settlement is being carried out.

7. Make available, through Congress, in fulfillment of the President's proposal, immediate reconstruction assistance and long-range economic development funds for southeast Asia, including the several associated states of Indochina—this aid to be made available preferably through an effective international organization in which the beneficiary governments fully participate. In particular, the National Council of Churches requests that the U.S. Government take further appropriate actions through necessary congressional and executive measures to enable the United States to join the Asian Development Bank and to subscribe its full quota of capital.

In a world of revolution, rapid change, and sharp conflict of ideologies, Christians have an opportunity and duty to be a reconciling and healing force between nations and peoples and races where possible.

The churches and voluntary agencies in the United States should prepare to expand greatly their services to refugees and to those injured or affected by the war, and to play their full role in the gigantic task of reconstruction and reconciliation.

The general board herewith endorses the following recommendations of the Division of Christian Life and Mission adopted October 8, 1965, for action by the National Council of Churches.

1. To continue and increase major, high-level dialog between Asian and United States Christians in cooperation with the East Asia Christian Conference on the social, economic, and political questions affecting their respective countries.

2. To place in the crisis area of Asia a representative possessing political expertise as well as Christian understanding, to serve as a United States Christian presence in the area and to interpret Asian points of view to the churches in the United States of America.

3. To work directly and through the World Council of Churches on means for bringing about more meaningful and continuing relations with other churches across lines of political and cultural conflict. Looking to the future, the rebuilding of the Vietnam area calls for goals and programs big enough to enlist the support of all the people of Vietnam. The task of reconciliation and the maintenance of peace calls for statesmanship of the highest order on the part of both churches and governments.

The general board approves addressing the following message to the churches.

A MESSAGE TO THE CHURCHES ON VIETNAM

(Adopted by the General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. on December 3, 1965)

DEAR FELLOW CHRISTIANS: We address this message to you at this time because of our deep concern that Christians in the United States are failing thus far to make their specific contribution to the maintenance of peace in the world, having been almost silent while our Nation's involvement in Vietnam increases step by step.

Many voices are being heard: That of the administration, justifying each step of escalation as a rational and logical necessity of our longtime policy of the containment of communism; radical voices in the university community and elsewhere calling for withdrawal from southeast Asia and even sometimes for a victory for the Vietcong and North Vietnam; radically conservative and militaristic voices pressing the Government to unleash our bombers with their overwhelming power to blast Hanoi and even the Peoples Republic of China if necessary, their appeal becoming more palatable with the release of each casualty list of young Americans.

More and more the mass media begin to reflect a psychology of inevitable war, so that every criticism of U.S. policy from any quarter is made to sound like treason on the grounds that it gives aid and comfort to the enemy.

The reason Christians have a specific responsibility to speak and to criticize is that they have a loyalty to God which must transcend every other loyalty, and they belong to one family with all other Christians on all six continents. At the same time they seek to be loyal citizens of their Nation.

We of the general board support the Government and administration especially in the following aspects of its policy in Vietnam:

1. So far it has been a restrained policy even though great pressure has had to be resisted against the escalation into an all-out war.

2. We believe in the integrity of the administration as it has expressed publicly its willingness to negotiate unconditionally to find peace in Vietnam.

3. We support its willingness to give major leadership in financing with other nations massive economic and social development for all the peoples in the Mekong Valley, whether friendly or hostile to us today.

We have just passed a new policy statement on Vietnam which we believe deals intelligently and in Christian understanding with the complex issues which face our Nation there. We have commended this to you for study, but we must do more.

As Christian members of a worldwide Christian family we must remind ourselves and our Government of these convictions:

1. We believe that war in this nuclear age settles hardly anything and may destroy everything.

2. We believe that unilateral action by the United States in southeast Asia will not lead to peace. We must seek with new determination to unite our efforts through the United Nations and its concerned members.

3. We believe that if the United States follows a unilateral policy in Vietnam, no conceivable victory there can compensate for the distrust and hatred of the United States that is being generated each day throughout much of the world because we are seen as a predominantly white Nation using our overwhelming military strength to kill more and more Asians.

4. We believe that the loss of life and the indescribable sufferings of the civilian population of Vietnam over a period of more than 20 years of conflict and the increasing number of casualties in the Armed Forces together with the suffering accompanying this increasing loss of life should be such a matter of Christian conscience and concern that church members should give strong support to efforts to care for the people involved and to end the war as quickly as possible.

In view of these convictions we call upon Christians in the United States to do three things:

1. The first thing we must do, and perhaps the most difficult and most important, is to maintain our spiritual and ethical sensitivity and keep before us our awareness of the imperatives of the Christian gospel. In wartime this is often the first casualty. These imperatives we all know, for they are clearly written in the New Testament. "Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you. If your enemy is hungry, feed him. And He made from one every nation of men to live on all the face of the earth. Do not be conformed to this world but be transformed by the renewal of your mind. Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good."

2. Let peacemaking be the priority of our Christian witness so that we may be truly children of God in these difficult times.

3. Support the efforts of the National Council of Churches in an approach to the World Council of Churches and Pope Paul VI in a common attempt to mobilize the worldwide Christian community in support of a just alternative to war.

The General Board of the National Council of Churches adopts this message and directs that it be made widely available to the members of all of our constituent churches.

It further directs the officers of the National Council of Churches to take the initiative in seeking through the World Council of Churches in cooperation with the Roman Catholic Church to mobilize the worldwide Christian community to develop and support a just alternative to war.

[From the Wabash Plain Dealer, Dec. 20, 1965]

Vietnam Peace Action Suggested for Church Members

The Nation's major Protestant and Orthodox Church agency issued in Madison, Wis., a carefully weighed document aimed at creating a consensus among U.S. Christians in favor of a speedy negotiated peace in Vietnam.

Meeting for fall business sessions December 2-3, the General Board of the National Council of Churches adopted a five-page policy statement—together with a message to church members—which covered many aspects of the complex war situation, approved some of the administration's current policies, and suggested changes in others.

In the message to members of the council's 30 constituent communions, the board urged strong support for the earliest possible end to the war.

The message asked the Nation's Christian community to be more vocal on the war issue, pointing out that church members have been almost silent while our Nation's involvement in Vietnam increases step by step.

As a result of rationalizing voices from the administration and radical cries from both left and right, the mass media are beginning to reflect a "psychology of war, so that every criticism of U.S. policy from any quarter is made to sound like treason," the message declared.

It registered NCC support of the administration's restrained policies in the face of great pressure which has had to be resisted against the escalation into an all-out war.

Administration willingness to engage in unconditional negotiation and its offers to finance massive economic and social development for the Mekong Valley were also supported in the carefully considered and debated message, which passed by 93 votes with 10 against and 6 abstentions.

The board's message declared that "unilateral action by the United States in southeast Asia will not lead to peace," and that "war in this nuclear age settles hardly anything and may destroy everything."

Further, no conceivable unilateral victory in Vietnam "can compensate for the distrust and hatred of the United States that is being generated each day throughout much of the world, because we are seen as a predominantly white nation using our overwhelming military strength to kill more and more Asians."

The message, introduced by the Reverend Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, stated clerk (administrative head) of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., included a plea for "spiritual and ethical sensitivity," support for efforts to alleviate the suffering of all victims of the war—civilian and military alike—and action by the National Council of Churches to "mobilize the worldwide Christian community in support of a just alternative to war" in cooperation with the World Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church.

The board voted to adopt a policy statement on Vietnam which called for early negotiation under U.N. supervision; suggested that the cessation of all bombing in North Vietnam might create more favorable circumstances for negotiation; and urged the U.S. Government to approve phased withdrawal of its troops and bases if and when they can be replaced by adequate international peacekeeping forces, to refrain from bombing densely populated centers in North Vietnam, and try harder to avoid injury to noncombatants.

The statement, which grew out of recommendations from the Sixth World Order Study Conference, convened last October in St. Louis by the National Council, also called on churches and voluntary agencies in the United States to expand greatly their services to refugees and to those injured or affected by the war, and to play their full role in the gigantic task of reconstruction and reconciliation.

Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, who presented the policy statement on Vietnam to the board, later commented to the church leaders that "what we have done here will be used as a basis for dialogs throughout the country." The president of the University of Oregon deemed the statement a genuine contribution toward the working out of a solution to a serious matter. Dr. Flemming, formerly U.S. Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare, is the first vice president of the National Council of Churches and serves as chairman of a special N.C.C. advisory committee on Vietnam.

Church members, the policymaking general board of the National Council of Churches suggests for your conscience your strong support for the earliest possible peace in Vietnam.

You are urged to be more vocal on the issue and to register opposition to unilateral U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

You are urged to give prayerful consideration to this official policy statement on Vietnam that:

The United States should request early negotiation for peace under U.N. supervision.

A cease-fire could create more favorable circumstances for negotiation.

The United States should favor phased withdrawal of its troops and bases upon their replacement by adequate international forces.

The United States should refrain from bombing population centers in North Vietnam and try harder to avoid injury to noncombatants.

The churches should greatly expand their services to refugees and other victims of the war.

PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, people of the country have become greatly concerned in recent years, and with very good reason, about the rising crime rate in the United States. It has long been my view that crime and lawlessness will continue to increase until the people translate their concern into action and demand vigorous and certain law enforcement, with swift and meaningful punishment for those who violate the law, evade the law, or take the law into their own hands. One of the best ways in my opinion that the crime problem can be alleviated is through greater public support of our law enforcement officers. They stand ready and willing to do the job entrusted them by the public they serve, but all too often they are handstrung by public apathy and court decisions which are more concerned with legal abstractions than with the administration of justice. It is sad but virtually true that law enforcement is fast becoming a thankless struggle.

During the adjournment period, a policeman of Montezuma, Ga., Jack A. Park, sent me an essay he had written entitled "What Is a Policeman" which is an outstanding statement expressing the importance of the role played by policemen in our society and which I believe is deserving of wider dissemination.

I ask unanimous consent that this essay be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What Is a Policeman?

Policemen, believe it or not, are human. They come in both sexes, but are mostly male. They also come in different sizes. The size of one sometimes depends on whether you are looking for one or trying to hide from one. However, they are usually large.

Policemen are found everywhere, on land, on sea, in the air, on horses, and sometimes in your hair. In spite of the fact that you often can't find one when you want, they are usually there when it counts most. The best way to get one is to pick up a telephone and call one.

Policemen deliver many different things—lectures, babies, and bad news. They are required to have the wisdom of Solomon, the disposition of a lamb, and muscles of steel—and are necessarily steelhearted sometimes. A policeman is the one who rings the door bell, swallows real hard, and announces the passing of a loved one. Then the rest of the day he wonders why he ever took such a job.

On TV he is an oaf, who couldn't find a bull in a haystack. In real life he is expected to find a little boy or girl "about so high" who is lost in about half a million people. In fiction he gets his help from private eyes, reporters, and the ever-popular who-dun-it fans. In real life he gets mostly the same old answer from eyewitnesses, "We didn't see nothing."

Chances are that with a little cooperation from the general public, the crime rate would drop greatly, but the average citizen prefers to sit back and sulk and hack at the law, asking when the police are going to solve this or that horrible crime. People are afraid to go and testify in court about what they saw, even though the crime they witnessed may have endangered their own lives as well as others. They had rather keep their mouths shut and go on as though nothing had ever happened. Then after the trial is over, some wise guy comes by and says to one of the officers who was on the case, "Sorry you lost your case; wish I could have seen you before court; maybe I could have helped." This lack of interest and cooperation from the general public is the most demoralizing thing about being a policeman.

When he serves you with a summons to go to court, he is a monster, but when he lets you slide, he is a doll. To little kids, he is either a hero or a bogeyman, depending on how the parents of the kids feel about policemen.

He is the one who works around the clock on split shifts, Sundays, and holidays. It always gets him down for some joker to come up to him and say, "Hey—tomorrow is a holiday, I'm off; how about going fishing with me?" When all the time he knows it is the busiest time of the year. It just so happens that it is the Fourth of July, and everyone is trying to get where he is going in half the time. This sort of raw humor hurts a policeman, especially when he is working about 15 to 20 hours per day to help save the joker's life and maybe the lives of his children.

A policeman is like the little girl in the nursery rhyme—when she was good, she was very good, but when she was bad, she was horrid. When a policeman is good and does his job well the public takes it for granted. However, when he makes a mistake he is a grafter, a bum, and a crook; and furthermore, everybody knows then that all cops are crooked.

When he shoots a stickup man, he is a hero, except when the burglar is a teenager. Then the entire neighborhood starts saying, "Anybody could have seen he was only a kid." They never think that a kid pulling a stickup is just as dangerous as a grown man committing the same crime. They aren't interested in the policeman's life, they give their sympathy to the criminal even though the policeman may lose his life trying to do his job protecting their lives from a teenager and his gang of hoodlums only pulling a joke on some innocent bystander.

Some policemen manage to buy pretty homes. Some are covered with ivy, but most are covered with heavy mortgages. If a policeman who owns a nice home is young, his next door neighbor might say rather enviously, "You know, he won't be but 55 years old, and his home will be paid for." He doesn't stop to think that tonight while his family is sleeping the policeman could surprise some thug attempting to burglarize their home and get killed or maimed for life trying to make an arrest and thereby leave a widow and children without a home or lose it due to his total and permanent disability to work. The neighbors don't think of it that way as long as their houses are not burglarized.

Policemen get medals for saving lives, stopping runaway teenagers, and shooting it out with bank robbers, with the officers' widows sometimes collecting the medals. However, the most rewarding moment comes to a policeman when, after some small kindness shown to some older person, he feels a warm handclasp, receives an expression of appreciation from grateful eyes, gets a pat on the back, and hears the sofet spoken words, "Thank you, and may God bless you son, for a job well done."

Policemen like days off, vacations, and an occasional cup of coffee with some of the townfolks. They don't like auto horns, family fights, and anonymous letterwriters. They have associations, but they can't go on strike. They have to be impartial, courteous, and always remember their slogan, "At your service." This is sometimes especially hard to say when some character shouts, when he is given a ticket, "I'm a taxpayer, I pay your salary." Policemen pay taxes, too.

Policemen see many things the average person doesn't. They see more misery, bloodshed, trouble, and sunrises than the average citizen. The policeman is followed by one other person, the postman. They both have to go regardless of the weather.

A policeman's uniform changes with the weather, but his outlook remains the same. Although he is constantly looking for a brighter view of the world, he can't help but be a little pessimistic. Most citizens are so afraid that, if they help the law in any manner, they will have to go to court and maybe testify against their neighbors. They had rather keep quiet and let the monster, bogeyman, cop, or whatever his nickname may be do all the work of law enforcement. When, if they could supply only one clue, it might be the one needed so some arrests can be made and the case can be closed.

Sometimes a policeman has good credit, and it really helps because his salary surely isn't very good.

Some policemen help raise a lot of kids, and lots of these belong to other people. They help kids in many ways, but one very important way is by giving school lectures on general safety, fire prevention, safe driving, and lifesaving. They also help the kids by giving similar lectures to adults at civic club meetings.

A policeman is many things, and he is indispensable to any community.

WHO WANTS TO WIN?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the Reverend Daniel Lyons, S.J., has authored, for the January 9, 1966, edition of Our Sunday Visitor, a cogent commentary on the war in Vietnam.

Recalling the history of Asia since the end of World War II and the diplomatic maneuvering which led to the present conflict in southeast Asia, the Reverend Lyons observes that "people in foreign countries are astonished that America cannot seem to win a war against 180,000 invaders, even with the help of 600,000 South Vietnamese troops." He notes that it is basically the same kind of war fought in the Pacific during World War II. "The only real difference," he continues, "is that General MacArthur fought to win and he had the authority to do so; something that was denied him in Korea, something that is denied to the Joint Chiefs of Staff today."

I ask, Mr. President, that the article by the Reverend Lyons be printed in the body of the RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT OR WRONG: WHO WANTS TO WIN?

(By Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD praised the cease-fire on Christmas day, expressing the hope that "perhaps it could be stretched further." House Speaker JOHN McCORMACK expressed the hope that "the cessation will restore reason to the Communists * * *."

We hear a great deal about a cease-fire, about negotiations, about ending the war, and about getting out of Vietnam. Unfortunately, all four of these can be treacherous. The cease-fire, for example, has been a major Communist weapon in the cold war for a generation. When the Communist armies in China were weak, after World War II, Mao Tse-tung arranged for a temporary cease-fire on the mainland, with the United States serving as the moderator. Of course, the Communists could not be controlled, but General Marshall insisted that the Nationalist troops observe it.

When Chiang Kai-shek complained that the Communists were not observing the cease-fire, George Marshall replied: "Never mind, you keep it, so you can come to the conference table with your hands clean." Chiang's hands were clean, but the Chinese were cleaned right out of their country. The phony cease-fire enabled the Chinese Reds to arm themselves with former Japanese weapons, and to keep on conquering.

LEARN FROM MISTAKES

When the Communists faced defeat in Korea, they asked for truce talks. Because of the talks, the United States halted its big drive to the north. The Chinese talked and talked until they had built up their forces and reinforced their positions. The buildup meant that it would have been much more costly for the United States to resume fighting. Uncle Sam had been put in a much weaker bargaining position, and we ended up with an agreement so weak that the Communists broke it at will. One of the keenest and most experienced military minds in American history, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, had said repeatedly that there is "no substitute for victory," but our diplomats refused to listen.

How often must the American military shed their blood and give their lives in the defense of freedom throughout the world, only to have American statesmen fumble the peace through timidity and fear? Of the 33,000 American soldiers who died in Korea, two-thirds were killed after negotiations began. Yet our roving Ambassador, Averell Harriman, said he told the Russians last June that "we will not stop bombing the north until negotiations have started."

Shortly before Mr. Harriman went to represent the United States at the Geneva Conference over Laos in 1962, he told the Reverend Raymond J. deJaegher: "We have to give some places in the Laotian Government to the Communists." Mr. Harriman was trained at Yalta and has reflected that training ever since.

The negotiations over Laos were used by North Vietnam to strengthen its military positions. Harriman agreed, for some strange reason, to remove Laos from the protection of the SEATO Treaty. Had we not forced a coalition government on Laos, just as we had done on Nationalist China, there might well be no war in Vietnam today. We must learn from our mistakes, or we will keep on repeating them.

During the last 20 years the American Government seems to have taken military decisions almost entirely away from the military. In these same 20 years America has lost sight of victory. When the Secretary of Defense remarked recently from Saigon that he was "surprised" at what the Vietcong are doing, it is because he is not a military man and knows so little about how to win a war. The administration never talks about having the aggressor surrender. We only want him to talk to us, and we hold out concessions to encourage the enemy to "negotiate." Our policy is still one of weakness, instead of strength.

People in foreign countries are astonished that America cannot seem to win a war against 180,000 invaders, even with the help of 600,000 South Vietnamese troops. Our civilian strategists tell us we are not winning because it is a totally different kind of war. But it is basically the same type of war we fought during World War II in the

Pacific. Our enemy then was 50 times more formidable. The only real difference is that General MacArthur fought to win, and he had the authority to do so; something that was denied him in Korea, something that is denied to the Joint Chiefs of Staff today. For example, they wanted to blockade the harbor of Hanoi but were overruled.

WE CAN WIN

If MacArthur had been allowed to defeat the aggressor in Korea, the Communists in Asia would hardly have started another war so soon. They have never doubted we can beat them. They only doubt our intention to do so, and they have good reason to doubt it. In the past they have been able to influence us with their propaganda. Their approach has changed, but their propaganda is just as effective as ever.

A year ago our Commander in Chief made a statesmanlike decision when he decided to abolish our policy of sanctuary. His decision saved South Vietnam from being conquered, and for this he will go down in history. What is needed now is a decision to win the war. Not a cease-fire based on mutual concessions, as Senator FULBRIGHT has suggested; not negotiations based on a compromise of justice; not a bargaining away of the rights of others; but a just and lasting peace based on the surrender of the aggressor. In the words of Gen. Thomas A. Lane:

"The idea that forbearance increases the prospect of a negotiated settlement is an illusion. American lives are being squandered in Vietnam, just as they were in Korea. As in Korea, the Communists are quite satisfied to chew up American forces in a protracted war of attrition."

Can we win? Of course we can, and the Communists know it. But we never even talk about winning, and the Communists are not convinced we really want to. America has never lost a war, but for 20 years we have been vainly seeking substitutes for victory.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, each year it is important that we who are fortunately endowed with freedom remind ourselves of the great number of fellowmen throughout the world who do not enjoy the fruits of liberty that we have so abundantly been granted.

January 22 marks the 48th anniversary of the day that the Ukrainian Republic was established as an independent nation. The Ukrainian people's independence did not long endure. In 1920 they became the first to be engulfed in the brutal tide of Communist conquest.

We shall not forget that the citizens of the Ukraine still yearn for freedom and their right of self-determination.

Therefore, it is fitting that on January 22 we pause to reflect on the heroic struggle that these people are waging in their own manner to resist Communist domination. We again express our hope that at a future day these people will again be able to exercise their love of freedom and respect for the inherent dignity of man. In doing so, I am sure we are in a small measure helping to sustain and encourage the spirit of freedom among the Ukrainian people as well as all other captive nations.

CONNECTICUT RIVER VALLEY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, my bill—S. 2460—to establish a Connecticut River national parkway and recreation area is now pending before the Senate Interior Committee. Since I introduced the bill last fall, it has gathered an increasing amount of support from conservationists, newspapers, and interested citizens throughout New England.

On Monday, January 17, I addressed the Bristol Connecticut Jaycees, who asked me to explain the provisions of my bill. I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S CLEAN UP THE CONNECTICUT RIVER

(By Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF)

All of us are familiar with the Connecticut River Valley. We have driven along the River banks and seen its beauty. Many of us have boated or fished in the river. And there may be some here who even swam in it.

The Connecticut River is a precious asset to New England. It affords us many of the things we need desperately—open space, water, a place for recreation, and a space for relaxation. The river itself is filthy—and the Connecticut River is in many ways and in many places nothing more than an open sewer. We would be foolish not to admit this—but we would be equally foolish to turn our backs on the river. What the river needs, and needs desperately, is treatment. We must clean the river up, and we must preserve the beauty along its banks.

Flowing over 400 miles from its source near the Canadian border in New Hampshire to Old Saybrook, the river passes through some of the most beautiful scenery in the Northeast. Perhaps the most striking thing about the valley is that it is still so beautiful. As Ivan Robinson wrote in a special Hartford Times supplement about the Connecticut: "From the little mountainside pond near the Canadian border to Old Saybrook, the river rarely loses its charm." And in these days of rapid urbanization and population growth, we in New England are the beneficiaries of rare good fortune.

For many years, conservationists and enlightened groups have worked hard to save the valley. And nature has been on our side. Because of the flood plain that bounds the river through most of Connecticut, there has been relatively little development of the river banks. Only near the large cities—like Hartford, Springfield, and Holyoke—has there been industrial development on the river shore.

Last fall, I invited Secretary of the Interior Stuart Udall to take a trip up the river with me. The weather was as bad as it could be, but, as I told the Secretary, "It took the Interior Department to bring a good rain to Connecticut."

But the rain couldn't hide the character of the river valley. From Old Saybrook to Hartford, nearly 40 miles, we saw little but trees, pastures, and hills. It was easy to understand why the Connecticut has been compared with the Rhine Valley as one of the most beautiful in the world.

I think we will all agree that something that precious and that rare in our world deserves to be saved. And that is why I introduced my bill to establish a Connecticut River national parkway and recreation area.

My bill is a broad, flexible, and comprehensive measure. In one piece of legislation, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to:

1. Conduct a comprehensive study of the river and adjacent lands and determine the most suitable areas for inclusion in the park;
2. Notify State, local, and Federal officials of his recommendations;
3. Hold hearings on the proposed boundaries, and,
4. After final reviews by the Governors of the affected States, establish and administer the national parkway and recreation area.

But the bill does not crown the Secretary of the Interior king of the Connecticut River. Written into the bill are some basic declarations of congressional intent.

First, the bill clearly states the purpose of the park. "It shall be administered so as to protect its essential natural values. * * * It may include scenic roads or parkways to be used by passenger carrying vehicles, but shall not include high-speed highways."

This is important to remember—for in Connecticut, we often associate the word "parkway" with the Merritt Parkway, a high-speed, limited access highway. No such road is included in my bill and would, in fact, be prohibited. The roads I have in mind would be quiet, winding scenic drives with parking overlooks, or roads into picnic, boating, or recreation areas.

The language of the bill is clear. It states that the "area shall be administered for the preservation of natural beauty and for such forms of outdoor recreation as swimming, driving for pleasure, walking and hiking, picnicking, fish and wildlife management, scenic and historic site preservation, fishing, hunting, boating, camping, riding, bicycling, and winter sports."

There are additional safeguards built into the legislation. The Secretary of the Interior will make a study, but he is specifically directed to coordinate his study with other Federal and State programs and to take into account any other planning activities related to the region of the State, or to Federal highway programs.

There are important industries along the river, industries that have been there a long time and contribute a great deal to our economy in New England. My bill recognizes the importance of those industries, and directs the Secretary of the Interior to make due allowance for them in his planning. This is another, and most important, safeguard.

The bill also provides that the Secretary must hold public hearings on his plans so that everyone will have the chance to speak and make his views known. And after the establishment of the park, the Secretary is given authority to acquire land and interests in land only to accomplish the purposes of the law "with a minimum impact upon private property owners."

There is no question that the public has a right to a beautiful river valley. And there is also no question that the private property owner must be protected. There are new tools available for scenic preservation, tools which the Interior Department is using increasingly to protect the public's interest in the beauty of the countryside, but which allow the property owner to continue the use of his lands.

The most important new technique is the scenic easement whereby the property owner sells his right to change the scenery by constructing high-rise apartments, for example, or cutting down his trees. But he sells only that right and keeps possession and use of the land in every other respect. I expect that this tool will be an important one in the Connecticut River Valley for much of the scenic preservation could be done without acquiring title to the land itself.

In short, the bill is a comprehensive one and with good reason.

The time is far overdue when we in the eastern part of the United States reaped some of the benefits of Federal conservation efforts. For far too many years, our Federal policy has been to preserve the great open spaces of the West, and do little or nothing about the urgent needs of the East. As a result, the open spaces are where the people are not and the great urban East is sadly without Federal parks and recreation areas.

Our cities and towns need breathing space. Our children must have places to play, hills to climb, quiet woods and open spaces. If we are not to resign ourselves to a future paved with asphalt and concrete, the time to act is now.

We are now an urban Nation. Our population now numbers over 195 million. Two and a half million new Americans are born or come to our country every year. And all of us want, more and more, to live in the cities. While our total population has spiralled, our farm population has plummeted—from 23 million in 1950 to 13 million in 1964. Since 1960, 816,000 people have moved away from the farm each year.

The result? Seventy percent of the population of the United States now lives on 1 percent of the land. More than one-fifth of America's people are crowded into the strip of land that runs from southern New Hampshire through Connecticut and down to Washington, D.C.—a strip of land that contains less than 2 percent of the area of the United States.

The question is really a simple one, what should we do, what must we do to answer the legitimate needs of the people for open space?

All levels of government have a responsibility for local parks and playgrounds, for open space preserves, for State parks, and for broad Federal parks in areas like the Connecticut River Valley. We can be proud of our parks in Connecticut, and proud, too, of the far-sighted planning, like Connecticut's comprehensive outdoor recreation plan, which seeks to provide for the future. We are far ahead of most other States, some of whom have yet to even establish a State park system.

In the Connecticut River National Parkway, we have an opportunity to provide another model for the Nation. National parks and recreation areas are being set up in other parts of our country—from Oregon Dunes to Cape Hatteras. New England's two national parks—Acadia and the Cape Cod National Seashore—drew 4 million visitors last year. Acadia's attendance has gone up one-third in number since 1962. So there is a need, and there is, in the Connecticut River, a way to meet that need.

But I want to do more than save the beauty of the Connecticut River Valley. We must clean the river up, for we can take little pride in our efforts result in preserving "the world's most beautifully landscaped cesspool."

We must clean up the Connecticut River so that people can again swim in it, and use it for all the recreation potential it has. There's an old song that goes: "Wishing will make it so." But pollution will not just go away. Cleaning up the Connecticut River and all the other waterways of the Nation that are so badly polluted will take money.

I have proposed two bills in Congress to provide some of that money. The first would quadruple the Federal program for water pollution control and quadruple the amount of Federal funds to help in the construction of municipal waste treatment plants. Under the current law, Connecticut's share of the Federal funds amounts to less than $1,321,300 a year. Under my proposal, Connecticut would get $5,285,200 a year and we could work that much faster toward constructing the plants necessary to treat municipal and industrial wastes.

Municipal treatment plants are a necessity but industrial wastes are an equally important part of the problem. No one has the right to simply point a finger at industry and say: "You are causing part of the pollution, do something about it."

We must recognize that pollution control equipment costs money, large amounts of money. Unlike most capital expenditures, which produce new profits, pollution control equipment basically serves the interest of the health and safety of the public. We must have the cooperation of industry.

That is why I introduced a bill to permit taxpayers who buy expensive pollution control equipment to deduct the costs over 36 months, rather than the total life span of the equipment. Our tax laws already provide economic incentives in related areas, like developing mineral deposits. It is time we gave an incentive to improve the quality of our air and water and equalize the unfair burden on the businessman who installs pollution control equipment.

These two bills will go far toward giving us the funds and the incentive necessary to clean up pollution.

Together with my bill to establish the Connecticut River parkway and recreational area, they can provide a clean, beautiful and quiet Connecticut River Valley.

We have begun to recognize that the quality of our environment affects the quality of our lives. Just as no man is an island, no man can live apart from his surroundings.

The time of decision is at hand: Do we consign ourselves and our children to a future bounded by asphalt and concrete pavements, lighted by neon glare and filled with the wastes of our urban industrial society? Or do we **act**, and act now, to preserve what we have **left** of nature's beauty, and clean up what **we** have polluted?

I believe the choice is clear. Our woods and fields, our lakes and our rivers, are precious assets. The Connecticut River and its valley are priceless. They have been placed in this generation's care, and we are the stewards for the future. We must preserve what we have before it is too late, before we have lost our heritage and failed in our job as trustees.

URGENT NEED TO PROTECT WILDLIFE IN IMMINENT PERIL OF EXTERMINATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there is an expression that is well known to even those who have never lived on a farm: when the horse is out, it is too late to shut the barn door.

This elemental bit of wisdom argues well for the necessity of forethought to preserve that which one has. Yet self-evident as such wisdom may seem, man has a history of waiting until the horse is halfway or all the way out when it comes to the preservation of the invaluable and irreplaceable natural resources of wildlife that he has been given.

Immediate action to close the barn door to prevent extinction of many forms of animal life will not come too soon. When I first introduced a resolution calling for an international conference on wildlife preservation in 1963, as a companion to that of Congressman HENRY REUSS in the House of Representatives, the situation was critical. It has not improved. In August of last year, I introduced a similar resolution and in my introductory remarks pointed out that over 250 species of wildlife then faced extinction.

An article in the January 4 edition of the Washington Post confirms the extremity of the situation and describes in some detail the systematic destruction, now being carried out by profit-hungry poachers and exploiters, of species as familiar as the whale and the rhino.

When these and many other animals become extinct, all of the regrets and closing of barn doors in the world will be to no avail; the time for planning and action is before extinction, not after. Therefore I hope the Senate will act promptly this session on Senate Concurrent Resolution 52, a resolution that it be the sense of the Congress that the United States shall promote and take the necessary steps to convene an international conference on the conservation of wildlife under the sponsorship of the United Nations. The need for such united international planning and action is emphasized by Roy Brunton in the Post article, and I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 4, 1966]

IN IMMINENT PERIL OF EXTERMINATION

(By Roy Brunton)

GENEVA.—The tempo of extermination is rising. The World Wildlife Fund has, in its own fashion, declared a state of emergency. Of the 200 kinds of mammals and birds which have vanished from the face of the earth in the past 20 centuries, 70 percent have become extinct within the last 100 years, 40 percent within the last 50 years.

To save more than 1,000 species and races of animals and birds now threatened with extinction will cost about $5.5 billion a year, the World Wildlife Fund estimates, and the money must be used worldwide. How far it stands from attaining this target is shown by the fact that, in the 4 years since its inception, the Fund (which operates in conjunction with the International Union for the Conservation of Nature) has been able to collect no more than $1 million. From that it has financed some 70 projects.

One of the first grants made by the Fund was $56,000 for a white rhino conservation and antipoaching campaign in the then newly independent state of Uganda. The rhino, second largest land mammal after the elephant, was being decimated by highly organized poaching, not for food purposes but because powder made from its horn was, and still is, regarded in some parts of the world as an aphrodisiac. Aid came just in time, for the local population of those animals had dwindled by 1960 to fewer than 100.

Now threatened with extinction are whales in the Antarctic. They are being slaughtered at such a rate by the whaling fleets of Japan, the Soviet Union, and Norway that 3 years from now there will probably not be enough of certain species left for their propagation. The total population of the blue whale—largest living creature ever known and at least as intelligent as a dog—is now down to somewhat between 500 and 1,000. Whales find each other by shouting. If there are so few of them that they cannot hear each other and meet, the species cannot survive. The Fund is striving to secure the support of governments for a scheme whereby the whaling industry would be put under United Nations control with regard to the maximum catch in a single season. So far, the whaling fleets have opposed even the presence of inspectors.

The Fund collects money through the national appeals, now existing in six countries—United Kingdom, United States, Switzerland, Holland, Western Germany and Austria—with others about to be added. The Fund's charter expresses the conviction that this generation must not, by selfishness or neglect, whether wanton or unintentional, deprive posterity of the rich heritage of nature. It must insure that the phrase "dead as the dodo" is not replaced a few years hence by "dead as the panda" or "dead as the rhino."

Numerically, most of the projects are in southeast Asia, Central and Latin America, and in Africa. The largest yet accomplished, however, is in Europe: the Coto Donana

Nature Reserve, at the mouth of the Guadalquivir River in Andalusia. This is one of the few wildernesses left, a habitat or staging-post for an enormous variety of animals and birds, including the extremely rare Spanish lynx—its courting cries are said to be blood curdling.

The Fund's contribution for the purchase of 25 square miles of this area was more than $280,000. Three-quarters of this sum was made available as an interest-free loan by an anonymous Swiss nature lover. It was the Swiss National Appeal, too, that made a grant of £448 for the rebuilding of "flamingo island" in the Camargue the most exotic nature reserve in France. In nesting on the island, the birds eradicated all vegetation and the soil disappeared through erosion. When the island had gone, no breeding took place.

In the United Kingdom, one of the most interesting projects aided by the British National Appeal—whose president is the Duke of Edinburgh—is the ecological study of roe deer in an area of 15 to 20 square miles on the Glen Dye estate near Banchory, in Aberdeenshire. Miniature transmitters, sending out continuous signals for at least a year, are being placed on individual animals. There are already plans, for example, for plotting the movements of birds by this means from a satellite.

Officials are now busily preparing for a world conference on wildlife conservation, to be held at United Nations headquarters in New York in 1967. Many of its more ambitious projects can succeed only if they have the approval, and, if possible, the active support, of the governments concerned.

INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON THE PRESENT-DAY PROBLEMS OF PARLIAMENTS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, last November it was my privilege and pleasure to go to Geneva, Switzerland, where I participated in an observance of Interparliamentary Week which was conducted under the auspices of the Interparliamentary Union of which I now serve as president for the U.S. delegation.

Dr. George B. Galloway, executive secretary of the U.S. IPU group, has prepared a report on the proceedings of this week which were highlighted by the official inauguration of the headquarters for the IPU, and I ask unanimous consent that his report be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed, as follows:

International Symposium on the Present-Day Problems of Parliament

During the first week of November 1965, a unique Interparliamentary Week was held in Geneva under the auspices of the Interparliamentary Union. The occasion for the events of this week was the official inauguration of the Union's new headquarters: a handsome 18th century mansion located in a spacious park not far from the old League of Nations buildings. The mansion had been completely redecorated and modernized at a cost of upward of $200,000 by the city of Geneva for the use of the Union.

The outstanding feature of the week was a 3-day roundtable discussion on the problems of Parliament today. More than 50 parliamentary specialists from all over the world, with widely differing political and ideological points of view, were invited to debate many of the problems which Parliament has to face in the modern world. The United States was represented at the symposium by Senator Herman E. Talmadge, president of the U.S. group; Mrs. Katharine St. George, honorary member of the U.S. group, Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., Chief of the Science Policy Research Division of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress; and Dr. George B. Galloway, executive secretary of the U.S. group.

Mr. Giuseppe Codacci-Pisanelli, of Italy, presided over the symposium.

The topic of the first day's debate was the adaptation of parliamentary procedure to meet present-day needs. Three speakers introduced the discussion of this subject and made a number of suggestions based on the practice followed in their own assemblies. They were Mr. Macnaughton, Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons; Mr. de Stexhe, Senator and Minister of French Culture for Belgium, and Mr. Kaul, former clerk of the Indian Lok Sabha.

In the course of the ensuing discussion, two points attracted the particular attention of the participants: the rules governing the right of speech for Members of Parliament, and the nature and form of committees. While some of the delegates recommended the practice of ad hoc rather than permanent committees, the majority came out in favor of the latter. It was also suggested that the prestige and authority of the Chair as the guardian of the rights of Parliament should be strengthened.

The second day of the symposium raised the question of parliamentary influence over foreign policy. Several speakers explained the various procedures employed for the ratification of treaties in their countries. Dr. Wenk made an outstanding speech on the special situation of Parliament in a world increasingly governed by science. This stimulated a long discussion of the need for strict control of the increasingly complex scientific questions which come before representative assemblies. Most speakers recommended that national information and statistical services be placed at the disposal of Members of Parliament. Mrs. St. George spoke on "Parliament and the Information Explosion."

The last two sittings of the symposium on the third day were devoted to a study of relations between Parliament and the executive, on the basis of reports submitted by Mr. Wende, Vice President of the Polish Diet, and Max Beloff, professor of government and public administration at Oxford University. All the speakers agreed that the existing methods of control of the executive by the legislature must be extended, if necessary, by introducing new ones. The representatives of the Socialist regimes pointed out that, in their countries, a distribution of competences had been substituted for the traditional separation of powers; all the State organs were, however, subordinated to Parliament, they said.

The last official function of the Interparliamentary Week was the inauguration on November 6 of the Randal Cremer Parliamentary Library of the International Centre for Parliamentary Documentation. The ceremony was performed by Dr. Horace King, the newly elected Speaker of the British House of Commons. Located on the second floor of the new headquarters of the Union and presided over by a professional librarian, this Parliamentary Library hopes to assemble a complete collection of the modern literature on parliamentary government. With a small staff and a modest budget, it will depend in large part upon the gift of books and documents from scholars and libraries all over the world. It may well become in time a mecca for students of comparative representative government.

George B. Galloway,
Executive Secretary,
U.S. Group, Interparliamentary Union.

DEATH OF DR. HUGH DRYDEN

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, during December, when the Congress was recessed, our Nation lost one of its most distinguished pioneers and my State, one of its most distinguished citizens.

Dr. Hugh Dryden, deputy administrator, belonged to the Nation. But, he belonged also to Maryland. The citizens of Pocomoke City, on Maryland's Eastern Shore, will be everlastingly proud of the achievements and the leadership which Dr. Dryden gave to the exploration of space.

I ask unanimous consent that a biographical sketch noting Dr. Dryden's contributions be included at this point in the Record and that an editorial broadcasted by WDMV, the Eastern Shore Broadcasting Co. on December 17, also be included.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch and the radio editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hugh Latimer Dryden was born in Pocomoke City, Md., on July 2, 1898. The family moved to Baltimore in 1907, and Dryden, a gifted and precocious student, graduated in 1913 from the high school known as Baltimore City College, first in a class of 172, shortly before his 15th birthday.

Entering Johns Hopkins University with advanced standing, he completed a regular B.A. curriculum in 3 years, receiving his degree (with honors) in 1916, and his A.M. in 1918.

In June of 1918 he joined the staff of the National Bureau of Standards in Washington, D.C., as an inspector of munitions gages, intending to return to graduate school on a fellowship in the fall. However, with the encouragement of Dr. Joseph S. Ames, head of the Johns Hopkins Physics Department, his plans were changed. He soon obtained a transfer into the newly formed wind tunnel section, and after Dr. Ames arranged to give courses to a number of Hopkins graduate students at the Bureau, Dryden was able to complete his thesis work on experiments carried out after hours in the NBS wind tunnel. He was granted the Ph. D. in physics in 1919, while employed at the Bureau of Standards, when he was just under 21—youngest student ever to obtain a Ph. D. at Johns Hopkins.

Thus began a long and distinguished professional career, devoted in its entirety to public service. He remained in the Government civil service in spite of the fact that over the years there were many offers of highly paid positions in private industry, as his knowledge, talent, and administrative skill became increasingly well known in the world scientific community.

"The airplane and I grew up together," he once said. "I saw my first airplane, the Antoinette airplane, flown by Hubert Latham in Baltimore on November 7, 1910. I have had the good fortune to be associated with the great growth of aviation from that primitive vehicle to the jet liners of today and our beginning manned space flights in Mercury and Gemini. My education has been a continuing process ever since graduation and I hope that I may have the good fortune to witness the first landing of men on the moon within a very few years."

He married Mary Libbie Travers on January 29, 1920. Three children were born to the couple, a son and two daughters.

Their son, Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Jr., is an organic chemist, graduate of Johns Hopkins and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, now with G. D. Searle Co., Skokie, Ill. Their oldest daughter, Mary Ruth, graduated from Goucher College and married Dr. Andrew H. Van Tuyl, mathematician at the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Washington, D.C. Their youngest daughter, Nancy Travers, a graduate of American University, teaches school in Montgomery County, Md.

Not long after his marriage, Dryden was named Chief of the NBS aerodynamical physics section, in charge of wind tunnel research. Here he began the work on the problems of wind turbulence and boundary layer flow which later was to bring him international recognition. Many times during his career he was invited to attend international scientific meetings and to exchange his professional views with fellow experts from all over the world.

Some of his early basic research, which led to increased knowledge of aeronautical engineering and the design of improved airplanes, included: development of the compensated hot wire anemometer and associated equipment for quantitative measurement of the intensity and linear scale of wind tunnel turbulence; studies of the use of wire screens for increasing and decreasing the intensity of turbulence; the design and building of wind tunnels of very low turbulence; and measurements of the effects of turbulence on aerodynamic forces on models in wind tunnels. From this work Dryden and his collaborators were able to verify the correctness of a theory developed by Prandtl, Tollmien, and Schlichting many years earlier, but for which there had been no experimental evidence. This traced the onset of turbulence to the prior development of instability in the laminar flow.

The work of Dryden and his team on wind tunnel turbulence and boundary layer transition has been of great importance in all aeronautical developments. Predictions of the flight performance of our large military and transport aircraft is based on extrapolation of data obtained in wind tunnel tests of relatively small models. Dryden's work provided a basis for making this extrapolation intelligently and with good accuracy.

In collaboration with Dr. Lyman J. Briggs, Dryden made some of the earliest measurements of aerodynamic characteristics at high speeds. The first move in this area was dictated by an interest in the effects of the higher propeller rotational speeds and propeller diameters and consequently high tip velocities, which were required to absorb the increasing engine powers in the early 1920's.

These early measurements led to a later understanding of the limitation of the propeller as a means for driving airplanes. Propeller tip speeds greater than the speed of sound produced prohibitively large losses in efficiency and consequently all late propeller development has been confined toward the absorption of power by wide blades and a greater number of blades.

This work on propellers was extended to supersonic speeds as a natural evolution of interest. This early work was supported by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and published by it. The interest generated in the Langley staff led to the construction of a high-speed jet there and subsequently to the numerous high-speed wind tunnel facilities of today.

In the earliest tests, Briggs and Dryden measured the sharp increase in drag and decrease in lift that occurs as the speed of sound is approached in flight, and thus were among the first to discover the so-called transonic drag rise.

Dr. Dryden was also responsible for extensive investigations of the aerodynamics of aircraft bombs, and for the development of a practical method of designing the tail fins to insure stability. With E. J. Lorin, he standardized the design of a form of bomb which remained in use for many years, until airplanes eventually were able to approach the speed of sound.

His work in wind tunnel research and studies of aerodynamics, however, soon began to take in far more territory than the aircraft field alone. At the Chicago Century of Progress in 1933, he and his colleagues had an exhibit which demonstrated the effect of streamlining on automobiles—work which long preceded changes in design now thoroughly accepted in the automotive industry. Studies of the effects of hurricanes and high winds upon various types of building structures gradually led to more rational engineering design and improved building codes for materials and structures. His laboratory even helped resolve an argument between the National and American Leagues in 1938 over the standards for the liveliness of baseballs.

During World War II he became involved in the work of the National Defense Research Committee and its successor, the Office of Scientific Research and Development, under the leadership of Dr. Vannevar Bush. In Dryden's own words, "I headed an unusual group at the Bureau of Ordnance Experimental Unit, which developed the radar homing missile, Bat, which saw service during the Second World War. I also served as Deputy Scientific Director of the Army Air Force's Scientific Advisory Group headed by Theodore von Karman. The group was appointed by Gen. H. H. Arnold and many of us were in Europe on V–E day in uniform with simulated rank to study the use of science by the various European countries."

After his wartime work was completed, Dr. Dryden became Assistant Director of the National Bureau of Standards in 1946, and 6 months later, Associate Director. In September of the following year he transferred from NBS to become Director of Research of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA), and in 1949 Director of NACA, its top full-time official.

Under his leadership, the activities of NACA's three large research laboratories and two research stations were expanded, reaching some 8,000 employees and an annual budget of about $100 million. In 1947, NACA provided the technical foundation for the first manned supersonic flight in the history of aviation, an event which was the forerunner of present military airplanes which operate routinely at more than twice the speed of sound.

The first round of research planes was intended for studies of the problems of flying an airplane through the speed of sound. Under Dryden's leadership, more attention was turned to the problems of flight at very high speeds and very high altitudes and to the problems of space flight.

In 1954 Dryden became Chairman of the Air Force-Navy-NACA Research Airplane Committee formed to supervise the development of an airplane to explore some of the problems of space at the highest speeds and altitudes then feasible. The X–15 airplane developed for the task proved to be, and has continued to be, an extremely useful research tool for providing data for future space vehicles.

In October 1957, after the Soviet Union launched Sputnik I, Dr. Dryden took part in the activities of the executive branch and of the Congress which led to the formulation of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. As preparations were made for establishing a civilian agency to conduct the exploration of space for peaceful purposes, the NACA was selected as the largest building block of the new agency. Dr. Dryden helped to guide the program plans and the budgetary submission of the agency before its formal establishment. On August 8, 1958, President Eisenhower appointed Dr. Dryden as Deputy Administrator of the agency. He was confirmed by the Senate on August 13, and served during the remainder of the Eisenhower administration under Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator. His appointment was continued under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations under Mr. James E. Webb.

Project Mercury was developed and then organized with Dr. Dryden playing a major role. Dr. Dryden shared with the present NASA Administrator, Mr. James E. Webb, the top responsibility for management of a $5 billion a year program to explore space, to develop practical applications of space vehicles, to advance space science and technology, and to develop boosters, spacecraft, and associated materials, equipments, and techniques to enable American explorers to journey to the moon, perform scientific experiments there, and return safely to earth before the end of the present decade.

The importance of the lunar exploration mission, Project Apollo, and its underlying philosophy, was clearly stated by Dr. Dryden soon after President Kennedy announced his key decision in 1961. Dr. Dryden's work was prominent in the studies that led to that decision. In a letter dated June 22, 1961, to the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, Dr. Dryden said, in part:

"The setting of the difficult goal of landing a man on the moon and return to earth has the highly important role of accelerating the development of space science and technology, motivating the scientists and engineers who are engaged in this effort to move forward with urgency, and integrating their efforts in a way that cannot be accomplished by a disconnected series of research investigations in the several fields. It is important to realize, however, that the real values and purposes are not in the mere accomplishment of man setting foot on the moon but rather in the great cooperative national effort in the development of science and technology which is stimulated by this goal. The national enterprise involved in the goal of manned lunar landing and return within the decade is an activity of critical impact on the future of this Nation as an industrial and military power, and as a leader of a free world."

During recent years, international cooperation was one of the most important aspects of Dr. Dryden's work with the space program. In 1959 he was appointed as one of two men to assist Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge at the first meeting of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. It has been generally agreed that his efforts were largely responsible for a proposal by NASA, in December of that year, for joint research with other nations to promote international space cooperation.

In the years that followed, after an exchange of correspondence between Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and President Kennedy, Dr. Dryden was appointed by the President as the Nation's chief negotiator for peaceful space cooperation with the Soviet Union. Dryden engaged in a continuing series of talks with Academician Anatoli Blagonravov on the possibility of such cooperation; from these talks came agreements for limited, but nonetheless real, cooperation between the two countries, particularly in the fields of meteorology and communications.

Working toward international cooperation and world peace fitted in well with Dryden's philosophy. A man of deep and sincere religious faith, he was an ordained minister and a Bible teacher at the Calvary Methodist Church in Washington during most of his adult life. He found no conflict between science and religion. In one of his sermons, entitled "The Far Horizons," he said: "The horizons of our spiritual lives must be commensurate with the far horizons of our physical universe and of our intellectual and scientific accomplishments. In order to see the natural horizon around us it is necessary to rise above the ordinary level of things close to us. We must leave our ordinary surroundings and climb to the top of the hill or mountain, or better still to climb into the atmosphere in a balloon or airplane. The higher we climb, the farther away is the horizon, and the farther we can see if the air is clear."

And again:

"One characteristic of many persons of our present age is the stunted development of the spiritual life and the atrophy of spiritual strength. A man of the space age without religious faith is incomplete, crippled, deformed, as if he had lost his sight, his hearing or his hands. Many men intended for great souls, creative ideas, vision, and accomplishment dwarf their world and themselves.

"Even scientists have learned that while knowledge is power, it is not necessarily power for the good of mankind * * *. In the space age, as in every other age, the scientist, and every human being, whatever his profession, needs to develop his spiritual potentialities to make the horizons of his soul to be commensurate with the far horizons of the physical universe and of our scientific and intellectual accomplishments."

Looking to the future, Dr. Dryden said:

"None of us knows what the final destiny of man may be, or if there is any end to his capacity for growth and adaptation. Wherever this venture leads us, I am convinced that the power to leave the earth—to travel where we will in space and to return at will—marks the opening of a brilliant new stage in man's evolution."

Many honors, offices, and awards came to Dr. Dryden, including the following:

Home secretary of the National Academy of Sciences since 1955; charter member, honorary fellow and former president of the Institute of Aerospace Sciences; honorary fellow of the Royal Aeronautical Society, the British Interplanetary Society, and the Canadian Aeronautics and Space Institute; fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; foreign associate member of l'Academie des Sciences de l'Institut de France; honorary member, Herman Oberth-Gesellschaft; founding member, National Academy of Engineering; honorary member, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers; and a member of numerous other professional societies and organizations.

He was a trustee of the National Geographic Society.

First American to deliver the Wright Brothers annual lecture before the Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences (1938).

Sylvanus Albert Reed Award (1940).

U.S. Army Air Forces' Medal of Freedom (1946), the second highest U.S. award.

Presidential Certificate of Merit (1948).

Order of the British Empire (civilian division) (1948).

Thirty-seventh Wilbur Wright Memorial lecture before the Royal Aeronautical Society (1949).

Daniel Guggenheim Medal (1950).

Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy (1955).

Ludwig Prandtl Memorial lecture of the Wissenschaftliche Gesellschaft fur Luftfahrt (1958).

Career Service Award of the National Civil Service League (1958).

Baltimore City College Hall of Fame (1959).

President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service (1960).

Elliott Cresson Medal of the Franklin Institute (1961).

Langley Gold Medal of the Smithsonian Institution (1962).

First Theodore von Karman Lecture before the American Rocket Society (1962).

Rockefeller Public Service Award (1962).

John Fritz Medal (1963).

Gold Medal of the International Benjamin Franklin Society (1963).

First annual award Dr. Theodore von Karman Memorial Citation (1963).

Dr. Robert A. Goddard Memorial Trophy (1964).

Hill Space Transportation Award (1964).

Honorary degrees:

Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn (Sc. D., 1949).

New York University (D. Eng., 1950).

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (D. Eng., 1951).

University of Pennsylvania (Sc. D., 1951).

Western Maryland College (Sc. D., 1951).

Johns Hopkins University (LL. D., 1953).

University of Maryland (D. Eng., 1955).

Adelphi College (LL. D., 1959).

South Dakota School of Mines and Technology (D. Eng., 1961).

Case Institute of Technology (Sc. D., 1961).

American University (L.H.D., 1962).

Northwestern University (Sc. D., 1963).

Worcester Polytechnic Institute (Sc. D., 1964).

Politecnico de Milan (M.E., 1964).

Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (Sc. D., 1964).

Princeton University (Sc. D., 1965).

[From the Salisbury (Md.) Radio Station WDMV, Dec. 17, 1965]

(NOTE.—The following is a WDMV editorial broadcast in the public interest by the president of WDMV, Mr. Erny Tannen.)

This month, the Nation lost a great scientist and the Eastern Shore lost one of its most distinguished sons. Dr. Hugh Dryden of Pocomoke, one of America's truly great space pioneers, died. Across the Nation, editorial writers mourned his passing. His full contribution to the frontier of space exploration may never be measured. Gemini 6 and Gemini 7 are eloquent eulogies to the genius of Dr. Dryden. Because Dr. Dryden was a native of the Eastern Shore, we here at WDMV propose the perfect monument to his memory. We propose that Wallops Island be renamed Dryden Island, as an appropriate memorial to his immense contribution to space exploration. And we urge the support of every Delmarva citizen to this proposal.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the proposal made by Mr. Erny Tannen, president of WDMV, urging the renaming of Wallops Island in honor of Dr. Dryden deserves the consideration of every citizen. I have today written the NASA Administrator to solicit his views on this matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a tribute to Dr. Dryden, given by the Vice President on December 2, 1965, also appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY'S STATEMENT ON THE DEATH OF HUGH L. DRYDEN, GREAT FALLS, MONT., DECEMBER 2, 1965

The death of Dr. Hugh Dryden is a sad loss to all of us, and especially to those of us who have been guided by his wisdom, experience, and great commonsense in planning the Nation's space program.

We shall miss him sorely as we plot our course for the decade ahead. So much of what this Nation has been able to do in aeronautics and space over the past 40 years we owe to the creative science and the confident, skillful leadership of this great public servant.

I know of no finer example of modern man in all his versatility than Dr. Hugh Dryden, whose vision, courage, and lifetime of service have helped to lead the way into the space age.

In a biographic sketch written a short time ago for the program for the 50th reunion of his class at the Johns Hopkins University, Dr. Dryden said: "My education has been a continuing process ever since graduation, and I hope that I may have the good fortune to witness the first landing of men on the moon within a few years."

That wish has been denied him. But we shall all remember the decisive role he played in making this great dream of our time come true.

AUTOWORKERS LOSING JOBS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, when the Canadian-American auto parts agreement was before us last September I fought against its implementation as an inequitable arrangement which would cost us American jobs.

I opposed this action long before it came to the Senate. As long ago as June 3, 1964, I appealed to Secretary of the Treasury Dillon to invoke countervailing duties in response to the Canadian scheme which we have now, in many respects, legalized through the agreement. At the time I had received a petition with 10,000 signatures collected by members of Local No. 287 of the United Auto Workers.

At Christmas there came the word that the fears of Muncie workers had been fully justified. The Warner Gear Co., maker of automobile transmissions, gave notice to 400 workers that they would not be needed from that date. When orders slowed at American Motors, Warner Gear could not find other customers. Operation of the Canadian agreement, it should be noted, has spurred the shift of a considerable quantity of transmission production to Canada.

A release of January 5 concerning my views on the Munice job loss appeared in the press. One result was a letter from an autoworker in Pennsylvania, noting another instance of job reduction from 300 to 50 workers.

Mr. President, I have no doubt there will be more instances of the kind. I intend to call them to attention as I learn of them. Since the agreement will be subject to our review upon its expiration in 1968, we need to know how it is working.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Mullin may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 7, 1966.

Senator VANCE HARTKE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I saw a newspaper clipping today in which you had voiced your opposition to the United States-Canadian Trade Act whereby Warner Gear had lost jobs for approximately 400 men to our northern neighbors; and wish to commend you heartily on your stand against the present administration's handling of the situation.

We are in the same boat as the Warner Gear employees—as our job in the export department of the Ford Motor Co. at Pennsauken, N.J., is being closed out the end of January 1966. This department was originally started at Chester, Pa., in 1928, and now in a purely cost saving move on the part of the company is being moved. Also, to see the amount of material now being sent into this country by the auto manufacturers bodes ill for the American worker. The company now employs over 300 union workers at this location and the work force is to be cut to approximately 50 men to handle dealers' parts service only.

The newspapers in this area have been notified by us, and they called and quoted a company spokesman's ideas only.

Our great and powerful UAW-CIO missed the boat in handling this situation at the last contract bargaining table and advise us they are powerless as the company is following the contract to the letter.

So, it is refreshing to see you have come out in the mighty seats at Washington and maybe our small voice in the wilderness will finally get a champion in this sellout of American jobs.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. MULLIN.

MEDIA, PA.

COAL STUDY HOLDS KEY TO BETTER MINERS' HEALTH

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased to find that a public interest is developing in the efforts to improve the health of our country's coal miners. I was happy to secure a $100,000 appropriation which initiated the study of pulmonary diseases among coal miners by amending the fiscal year 1963 appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. I have given the study my full support and will continue to do so in the future because I believe it essential that we eliminate these hazards to the health of our coal miners.

A review of the work now underway in this field in West Virginia was presented recently in an article which appeared in the New York Times on January 11, 1966. I wish to commend the author, Mr. Evert Clark, for his observations and reporting, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MINERS AID STUDY THAT TRACES LUNG CASES TO BLOOD CIRCULATION

(By Evert Clark)

BECKLEY, W. VA., January 8.—Earl Stafford is a slender man with iron-gray, crew-cut hair and the unmistakable "miner's mascara" of soft-coal dust in the lashes around his hazel eyes.

He lay on a rolling stretcher recently in the Appalachian Regional Hospital, talking softly, as Dr. Donald L. Rasmussen inserted a small plastic tube into an artery of his left arm.

The white sheets and gowns made a stark contrast to the unbelievable blackness of the 3-foot-high "low-coal" tunnels along which two other doctors had crawled deep in the earth the day before.

"I just got short winded," Mr. Stafford explained. "I run a motor. There's not any straining work in it, but every trip of cars I pull up the hill I have to walk around them and I'd just run out of breath and have to sit down."

Mr. Stafford is a part of the so-called coal study—an ambitious attempt by the U.S. Public Health Service to explore and conquer miners' lung diseases.

AID IN LUNG DISEASES

The work here is already producing important clues to the way soft coal dust apparently affects both lung and heart actions. If this can be understood, the research will have a great impact on the dozens of other "dusty industries" and perhaps on emphysema, lung cancer, and air pollution work as well.

For 30 of his 47 years, Mr. Stafford has worked in the dusty caves far below the rugged beauty of the West Virginia mountaintops. Twenty-two of these years have been spent crouched low on an electric truck—"the motor"—hauling trains of 18-foot-long coal cars up a steep grade from 4 miles down in a drift mine in Red Jacket, W. Va.

In an 8½-hour day, Mr. Stafford may make 6 rattling, jolting trips up the slanting tracks, pulling 50 to 60 cars at a time. Before the long runs begin, he must walk, bent over in half to clear the tunnel roof, around the entire train, checking the couplings between cars.

COMPLAINTS UNHEEDED

Sand must be sprayed on the tracks just ahead of the motor's wheels for traction. The slope is unusually steep.

"I'd just about have to stay on sand going out and coming back, both," Mr. Stafford said.

For years, some older miners in this soft coal region have been complaining of shortness of breath. But chest X-rays and ordinary breathing tests showed none of the silicosis or other lung ailments common to hard-coal regions. Electrical traces of heart action were also normal.

State compensation laws deal only with silicosis, which ordinarily shows clearly on an X-ray plate. Sometimes, miners who complained repeatedly were put down as having ATS—anxiety tension state—or accused of simply having "compensationitis."

For years, some older miners in this soft coal region have complained of shortness of breath. In hard coal regions, where rock dust from quartz frequently causes a lung disease among miners called silicosis, this would have been expected.

However, silicosis—the only occupational lung ailment covered by State compensation laws—is not common in soft coal areas. When X-rays and heart and breathing tests showed no evidence of damage, a complaining soft coal miner was often diagnosed as having ATS—anxiety tension state—or accused of having "compensationitis."

Only the motor operators, who ride a few inches above the excellent rock-crushing device that steel wheels make as they grind sand against the steel track, were likely to show traces of the dreaded silicosis.

However, a few medical men who saw case after case of breathlessness among miners with other types of jobs were curious. They found the miners rugged, quiet men, not given to complaining without reason.

Several years ago, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, got a $100,000 appropriation through Congress for what has grown into "the coal study"—an investigation of all facets of the types of pneumoconiosis, or dust-induced lung disease, found in this region.

The research has grown into a series of studies sponsored by or handled by the U.S. Public Health Service's Division of Occupational Health, with the cooperation of miners, unions, and companies.

The work going on here has held perhaps the most surprises and created strong hope for important discoveries.

Until now, most studies of lung disease in this country have dealt with the body's breathing mechanism. Far less attention has been paid to the role of the circulatory system through which the blood gains vital oxygen from the lungs.

Mr. Stafford is a volunteer in this study. He sat bare-chested on a bicycle-like exerciser the other day, pedaling steadily and breathing into a complex device of metal tubes and rubber bags.

Another plastic tube, delicately pushed up his right arm through the heart and into his right lung, told an expensive electronic recorder what went on internally.

The doctors here measure heart and lung actions while the miner is exercising, rather than at rest. With new and sophisticated methods, they are seeking significant changes in heart action that had escaped more ordinary diagnostic techniques.

Because of earlier tests on Mr. Stafford, the doctors had not expected to see all they found today. After the first 6-minute ride he said that "the motor is a lot rougher ride than this."

After the second ride, he was exhausted. His heart had tripled the pressure required in a normal lung to circulate the blood in order to draw the needed oxygen.

"More and more this lends support to the belief that this is a vascular [circulatory] problem with these people," Dr. Rasmussen said. "It certainly implies there has been a tremendous vascular damage."

Dr. Hawley Wells, Jr., thinks it may be a problem of "a pile of coal heaped on the small arteries of the lung." He and Dr. William C. Lane, both Public Health officers, and Dr. Werner Laqueur of the hospital here are pathologists. They study the slices of blackened lungs of dead coal miners.

Dr. Lawrence S. Cohen, another Public Health officer, is a cardiologist. The entire coal study is directed by Dr. George H. L. Dillard of the Public Health office in Cincinnati.

Dr. Rasmussen is a civilian specialist in lung diseases, attached to the Public Health Service. Before the study began, he came to the hospital staff to follow pioneering work done by Dr. Albert D. Kistin, the hospital's chief of medicine; Dr. Robert E. Hyatt, now at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn., and Dr. Draper Warren of the Southern West Virginia Clinic here.

Mr. Stafford's problem is typical of those the team here believes must be solved. If his condition worsens, he must quit work. He has a wife and young son to support, and his $100 a month United Mine Workers' pension will not start until he is 55.

The couple also have a daughter, 25, as well as two older sons who are not miners by Mr. Stafford's choice.

"I took them away from the coal fields," he declared. "I got my back broken in 1944, so that kindly helped me a little to get them away."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE PROMOTES USE OF TOBACCO

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, 2 years ago I received a routine release from the Department of Agriculture which announced the shipment of a large quantity of tobacco to some of our friends in the underdeveloped countries under the food-for-peace program.

Since I had never heard even the members of the American Tobacco Co. make this claim for their product, I tried to find out what was going on. Since tobacco is one of the five basic crops which our Government agrees to support, it is eligible for such programs.

Now it is again called to my attention that we are warning of the danger to health by the use of cigarettes on this side of the ocean while we try to undermine the health of peoples across the vast Pacific.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Christian Science Monitor, January 14, which cites this anomaly, be printed in the RECORD.

In addition, I would like to include under the same request an article by Josephine Ripley in the Monitor for January

17, which is an interview with Surgeon General Stewart on the status of the Public Health Service report on smoking and health.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 14, 1966]

A SHAMEFUL CAMPAIGN

In a government as vast as America's, it is perhaps not surprising that the right hand may not always know what the left hand is doing. But when this ignorance involves human health and happiness, there is no excuse for such bureaucratic sloppiness.

It is now obligatory that cigarettes sold within the United States carry a warning that their use may be harmful to health. At the same time, Federal health officials continue to emphasize the risks which tobacco smoking entails.

Under such circumstances one would hardly expect to find another Government department spending considerable sums of money to promote the use of tobacco. But such, unhappily, is the case. Seeking to sell more American tobacco abroad, the U.S. Department of Agriculture is said by the Chicago Daily News wire service to be devoting $210,000 during 1966 to promote cigarette smoking in Austria, Japan, and Thailand.

This report says that the Department is producing a film called "World of Pleasure" and described as prosmoking. If this were not enough, among the Japanese cigarettes being pushed are those called Peace and Hope. It is hard to think of a greater travesty than these names.

It is interesting to note that nowhere on this film or in the newspaper and television advertisements used does the United States reveal that it is the sponsor. While the Department of Agriculture might claim that this is merely a good business practice, one cannot help wondering if some underlying sense of guilt about the whole campaign may not also play its part in this secrecy.

We hope that this campaign is merely one of those aberrations which occasionally slip through a sometimes somnolent officialdom. We trust that the Department of Agriculture will lose no time in bringing this insult to the good name of the United States to an immediate halt.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 17, 1966]

SURGEON GENERAL ACTS—ANTISMOKING DRIVE PUSHED

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—The public has not heard the last of the stern warning to cigarette smokers contained in the "smoking and health" report to the Public Health Service in 1964.

"We are bringing the 'smoking and health' report up to date with all the latest facts and findings on the subject," Dr. William H. Stewart, the Surgeon General, disclosed in an interview.

This revision is being undertaken in collaboration with the National Library of Medicine, located adjacent to the National Institute of Health.

It is one of the many ways in which the Public Health Service is pressing forward in its $3 million campaign of education on the health hazards involved in the smoking habit.

LONG-RANGE PLAN

Interviewed in his office at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Surgeon General said it would be unrealistic to expect immediate results from this campaign in the terms of national statistics.

"It is a long-range effort, and we don't know how long 'long-range' is," he explained.

In the end, he says, he is confident that "the education campaign will be effective." By that, he means that people, especially young people, will be dissuaded from taking up smoking and more will quit.

He is particularly interested in appealing to young people, in finding the right way to convince them they don't have to smoke to be "socially acceptable."

"I would like to see more of an effort to convince children not to take up smoking," he said. "It will take more than a folder or pamphlet, or a health warning on a cigarette package."

OFTEN STATUS SYMBOL

Most young people will not be deterred by health warnings, he says. With youth today, smoking is often a status symbol—of "doing what the gang does."

It has been estimated that about 30 percent—slightly less than 1 out of 3—of American teenagers smoke.

The tall, youthful-appearing physician who was appointed Surgeon General last October says that parents can exert a great influence on their children—by example.

Dr. Stewart has two teenage daughters, 15 and 17.

ADULT INFLUENCE NOTED

"I don't think they visualize smoking as something that might be a threat to health," he said thoughtfully. "They just don't want to smoke. So they don't. Their mother doesn't smoke. Her mother doesn't."

He says that "parents and adults have a lot of influence. Children imitate the behavior of older persons whom they know and admire."

As to the Surgeon General himself: "I smoke a pipe," he replied as if wishing the question hadn't been asked. But he doesn't see his daughters as likely to take up pipe smoking.

The original 387-page smoking and health report, long rumored to connect cigarette smoking with lung cancer, created a sensation when it was finally made public at a locked-door press conference.

The locked doors were to assure that no reporter could leave early with a tip off on the contents which had immediate impact on the multi-million-dollar tobacco industry.

Congress promptly passed legislation requiring a health-warning label on all cigarette packages. This labeling requirement has just become effective.

ADVERTISING CODE DRAFTED

The industry itself, under criticism for its sales pitch to youth in television commercials and other advertising, immediately adopted a voluntary code. It urged withdrawal of advertising from college publications and other special appeals to young people.

The Surgeon General was asked whether he thinks cigarette television commercials have an appeal to youth.

He replied: "Television advertising cigarettes is to sell cigarettes. I would assume it is having the effect they want or they wouldn't continue it."

STAFF BEING FORMED

Congress failed, in its health-warning legislation, to require this warning in cigarette advertising. Further efforts may be made in this direction, it is said, after Congress has in hand at the end of the year the report on cigarette consumption trends requested in the bill.

One of the most potentially effective Public Health Service programs is the establishment of a National Clearinghouse on Smoking.

This organization is being pulled together and staffed. It will work with other Government agencies and private organizations in coordinating research on the effects of smoking and in disseminating information.

It is making a survey to determine the present smoking habits of different age groups as a basis for comparison with future trends.

The Children's Bureau held a national conference on smoking and youth in May, 1964. It was attended by 125 young people.

Out of this came two pamphlets: "Smoking, Health, and You," for teenagers, and "Your Teenage Children and Smoking," for parents. Both were published by the Children's Bureau.

Nearly a million copies of these have been distributed and sold to date.

SERVICE GROWING RAPIDLY

The Surgeon General presides over a surprisingly diverse operation—and a rapidly growing one. The Public Health Service budget in 1948 was $191 million. By 1961 it had jumped to $1 billion. Its budget for 1966 is $2,225 million.

Dr. Stewart's chief problem is in attracting competent people to the Public Health Service because of the lure of higher salaries paid by private organizations.

MEXICO'S PROGRESS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an excellent report on our neighbor, Mexico, appeared in the November 1965, issue of the Atlantic. In view of the gratifying progress that Mexico has made and continues to make in contrast with much that is happening elsewhere in Latin America, I feel this objective estimate will be of interest.

We shall shortly be welcoming in Washington and elsewhere in the States the 24 Mexican delegates of the Interparliamentary Union with their wives and other members of their families. This extremely useful exchange between the elected representatives of our two nations is now in its sixth year.

The first meeting was held in Guadahajara in 1961 and set dazzling standards of generosity, friendliness, hospitality, and cordiality. If there has been one source of embarrassment to the American parliamentary members of the Senate and the House, it is that it has sometimes been difficult adequately to reciprocate the hospitality which we have been accorded. Our subsequent meetings in the United States have been held primarily in Washington with side trips for our visitors to New York, New Orleans, Los Angeles, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, and every effort is being made to vary the programs, to illustrate the diversity in their own country, as the Mexicans have so admirably done.

The second meeting in Mexico was held at Guanajuato with subsequent visits to the capital, Mexico City. Last year's trip began with a visit to the beautfiul city of Chihuahua, a cross-country train ride to Los Mochis on the coast, an evening at Mazatlan, and a ferry ride across the Gulf of Baja California, 2-day meetings at La Paz in Baja California and a subsequent visit to Mexico City, where we were cordially welcomed by Mexico's President.

I think that it may truly be said that these meetings have strengthened the bonds of friendship between our two neighboring nations and that our relations today are better than they have ever been in our history.

The two most serious obstacles that lay in the way to complete harmony have either been disposed or are on their way to disposition. One is the Chamizal settlement arranged by President Kennedy after remaining unresolved for half a century; the other is removing the salinity of Mexico's share of water from the Colorado River. The United States has agreed to solve this problem and it will be solved.

Another problem which I would like to see resolved is that of the braceros, Mexican workers who both wish to work in the United States and who our fruit and vegetable growers feel are needed. Mexico finds the program beneficial and helpful to its economy. The program was ended last year, but there is some justification for the belief that under further safeguards both in the matter of living conditions and wages to protect the Mexican as well as American workers, modified restoration of the bracero program may be possible.

In any event, we may be optimistic about the present status of United States-Mexico relationship and trust that it may be further strengthened as one by one whatever problems may arise are settled by amicable discussion, and friendly negotiation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article on Mexico in the Atlantic Report be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATLANTIC REPORT: MEXICO

While the world at large has suddenly become enthusiastic about the social and economic progress of Mexico, Mexicans themselves, like adolescents still doubtful of their powers, are sometimes subject to attacks of the jitters. During the first few months of the administration of Gustavo Díaz Ordaz, who took over last December, the economy slowed down, the stock market slumped, and there was a vague atmosphere of foreboding.

There are various reasons for this, but the one that immediately leaps to mind—that a change of helmsman produced doubts among the passengers—is less pertinent in Mexico than elsewhere. The whole government apparatus has been for decades in the hands of the Party of Revolutionary Institutions (PRI). While the President of Mexico appears as untouchable as the British monarch and as powerful as a czar, he must nevertheless work within the framework of his abiding party. Politics as a career is not an electoral obstacle race as in the United States, but an appointive zigzagging up through the ranks of government. Díaz Ordaz, formerly Minister of the Interior, came to the Presidency with the high regard of all Mexicans; since assuming office he has shown himself both firm and deft.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the chief reason for the slowdown is last year's prosperity. Outgoing Presidents in Mexico like to write large their names across the land, and President López Mateos outdid them all. Roads, dams, museums, schools, hospitals were inaugurated in 1964 in a breathtaking marathon. Officials, vying for the public eye in hopes of being tapped for the top job, threw fiscal caution to the winds. In the department of social security alone, the incoming administration found debts of $220 million, or nearly 75 percent of its annual income.

The new Government has had, therefore, to pay for the old one's prodigality before undertaking projects of its own. Because of a basically sound economy and a tax reform last year which raised revenues 10 percent above the budget estimate, it has evidently been able to do this in relatively short order. Díaz Ordaz, in his annual message to Congress on September 1, announced that the Government had already resumed its investment in public works.

A major reform in the technique of Government investment has also had a braking effect on the economy. Previously the decentralized agencies—the national oil company, the railroads, the electric power company, and so forth—borrowed and spent money as they saw fit. Now all their financial activities are channeled through the Treasury. This procedure guarantees future fiscal responsibility, but it has involved reexamination of old commitments before authorization of new ones. It may even clear up persistent accusations of corruption.

Furthermore, the slowdown has been, to some extent, induced. The influx of new money in 1964 generated inflationary pressures. The Díaz Ordaz administration, jealous, above all, of Mexico's reputation for monetary stability, took definite measures to cool off the economy, restricting credit and fixing maximum prices for basic commodities, both unpopular measures in business circles. Inflation has indeed been curbed: while prices rose 3.8 percent during the first 6 months of 1964, the increase this year is only 1 percent.

Finally, it should be emphasized that although Mexicans talk about a slowdown, this is by no means a recession. The growth rate during the first 6 months of 1965 was a healthy 6 percent. Only by comparison with last year's 10 percent is this growth rate disappointing.

THE BRACEROS STAY HOME

Internally this is a period of wholesome readjustment, but externally the picture is not quite so bright. The major adversity is the closing of the frontier to Mexican migrant laborers, the braceros, who harvested the fruit and vegetable crops in the border States of the United States for wages which, while low by American standards, seemed a bonanza to them. The sober Mexicans brought most of these dollars home, some $200 million annually in recent years. Mexicans have never been proud of the situation—the "export of poverty" they called it. Nevertheless, the decision not to renew the contracts leaves a gap in Mexico's foreign income, and a certain despair in the countryside, where a chance to earn American wages was almost as good as a winning lottery ticket.

World prices for many of Mexico's commodity exports are lower than last year. Also, the campaign to reduce the deficit in the American balance of payments is having an effect on Mexico's trade balance, although Mexico, as an underdeveloped country, should not be subject to investment restriction. American companies are, nevertheless, seeking to finance their activities in Mexico with local funds. Mexico's success in increasing agricultural production enough to permit the export of wheat and corn has led the U.S. Government to cancel food-for-peace shipments, worth some $20 million annually. Mexico plans to continue many of the food distribution programs itself, but will therefore have less grain to export.

DOLLARS FROM TOURISTS

There are, however, favorable factors. Mexico's chief source of foreign exchange has always been its industry without chimneys—tourism. And tourists are pouring in in ever increasing hordes. With new facilities planned to take care of the crowds expected for the 1968 Olympic games, and a new air treaty to augment the present overcrowded flights, the tourist dollar should continue to underwrite the economy. An increase in Mexico's sugar quota in the high-priced American market will help counteract the lower price for coffee. Furthermore, the growing success in the drive to export manufactured and semimanufactured goods will make the country less dependent on world commodity prices.

Mexico is one of the most fervent supporters of the Latin American Common Market. Its businessmen roam the continent looking for markets; the government has set up a credit agency to finance exports. The southern republics are now complaining that Mexico is reaping the lion's share of the benefits: its trade balance in the area is overwhelmingly favorable, and has been for the last 3 years.

Mexico's reserves have never been higher, nor its credit better. It was 1 of the 16 countries that increased its contribution to the International Monetary Fund beyond the obligatory 25 percent. The peso is officially ranked among the hard currencies of the world. The foreign debt, mostly in long-term loans, is of manageable size and has increased less than the national wealth.

THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY

Even if 1965 proves to be less brilliant than preceding years, there is nothing wrong with the economy except that so many Mexicans live outside it. Fifty-five percent of the population makes its living—if in many cases it can be so-called—from the land. While the factory workman and the office employee live in the modern world, people in the backlands have only a faint glimmer that it exists. Millions of them still speak an Indian tongue; many others who speak Spanish cannot read it. There are, indeed, many Mexicos and the essential problem is undoubtedly integration.

The previous philosophy has been, in some degree at least, to start at the top, building a modern industrial complex, with its attendant social and government services, in the hope that the benefits would filter down. They have to some extent, but the process is painfully slow. Only 15 percent of the people receive social security benefits; less than half have electric light. With Mexico's appalling birthrate (3.1 percent, higher than China's or India's), it sometimes seems that for every newly integrated Mexican, half a dozen more have sprung up in the mud huts back home.

Yet Mexico is making a gigantic effort to educate the people. In the last 6 years the sums spent on schooling have tripled—they represent more than a quarter of the budget—and a special 1-percent tax on salaries is devoted entirely to technical education. But education without opportunity is no solution either. Industrial jobs require immense investment, some $4,000 a job; Mexico needs to create 400,000 jobs a year.

The key to the problem of poverty thus remains the land. The government's 5-year development plan will not be ready until the end of this year, but certain new trends can be discerned.

Distribution of land is no longer considered a panacea in itself. After four decades of agrarian reform there remains very little to distribute to the millions still clamoring for land. More attention is, therefore, being paid to increasing production. Mexico's agricultural institute at Chapingo is one of the best in Latin America and has recently received various grants and loans to expand both its experimental work and its training of agronomists.

One of the most successful Alliance for Progress programs anywhere is a scheme to make credit for improvements available to small farmers through local banks, hitherto uninterested in the small change and big risks involved in such loans. The original $20 million invested in this project has recently been doubled. However, this program only reaches those who have something to mortgage. The communal ejiditario, forbidden by law to rent or sell his plot, is thus excluded. Furthermore, titles and boundaries, after years of revolution and sometimes haphazard distribution, are often muddled.

Basic, therefore, to rural development is the cadastration of all holdings which the Díaz Ordaz government has already undertaken, a gigantic and politically delicate task which will prudently proceed a region at a time. Even so, the holdings of individuals within the ejido will still be subject to local political influences, unless the much debated question of granting them title to their plots rather than simple membership in the ejido is resolved in favor of private property.

FREE FOOD FOR WORK

Community self-help programs have been strikingly successful. These give a modern twist to the ancestral tradition that members of a community should chip in with their labor to forward local projects—a road, a school, a water system. Since in many parts of Mexico men have work for only a hundred days a year, they have plenty of time to donate. The Government provides technical guidance, such building materials as are not available locally, and most important, food for a family for each day's labor. Last year, 8.5 million days of work were thus contributed.

Another development, which may prove as important as economic measures in furthering the participation of rural Mexico in national life, is the timid but evidently sincere effort of the ruling PRI to make local politics more democratic. One of the banes of the countryside has been the local political boss, or cacique, drawing his power from higher-ups in the party and wielding it quite untrammeled for his personal profit and that of his friends. Since the party candidate always wins, nominations are now supposed to be held by secret ballot instead of, as previously, by acclamation of a designated favorite. This reform is not likely to take place immediately, but the declaration of intent is an important straw in the wind.

Mexico's success in the first stages of building a modern nation has been spectacular. The next, imperative stage, that of enlarging it to include all the people, may be more difficult. But at least the foundations have been well laid, and there are not now any serious social or political tremors to hamper further construction.

THE AMERICAN PRESENCE

In the pretentious new Embassy Ambassador Fulton Freeman, a career diplomat with wide Latin-American experience, has been successfully pursuing the soft sell. Mexico disagrees entirely with our policies in Cuba and Santo Domingo. Yet, thanks to commendable restraint on both sides, the disagreement has never gone beyond an honest difference of opinion between friends. Our intervention in Santo Domingo aroused inflammatory denunciation elsewhere. In Mexico, except for one well-policed student march, it was merely deplored.

Two grave issues, festering for years, have been settled amicably: the border dispute about a plot of land in El Paso which the United States lost in arbitration 50 years ago and has hung on to until now; and the increased salinity of the Colorado River as it reaches Mexico's irrigation system, due to leaching desert land upstream in the United States.

Mexico has sometimes seemed to consider the Alliance for Progress a mere supererogation of its own blueprint for development. The phrase has been conspicuously absent from official pronouncements, to the annoyance of Washington. Diaz Ordaz broke precedent this year in his message to Congress by saying a kind word not only for the Alliance but also for the Community Development Foundation and for the now defunct food-for-peace program. Indeed, in spite of major policy differences, Mexican-American relations have never been better.

The American business community is perhaps not quite so happy. The automobile companies are displeased at what they feel to be an excess of Government controls, particularly in regard to production quotas and prices. And the sulfur mining companies were appalled to have a ceiling placed on their exports, a conservation measure to protect Mexican reserves and to encourage the manufacture in Mexico of sulfur compounds, particularly for fertilizer.

Owing to tax and other incentives, American companies are increasingly working in association with Mexicans. All public utilities have long since been Mexicanized, and the recent acquisition of a majority interest in the Mexican operations of American Smelting & Mining removes from American control another of the big companies exploiting what Mexicans call "nonrenewable resources." Such companies—"they leave us nothing but a hole in the ground"—are always a sore point in Latin America.

Mexicans, for their part, with only 5 percent of the huge capital investment last year coming from foreign sources, can afford to be relaxed, neither courting the almighty dollar nor snarling at its mightiness.

SERVICEMEN SUPPORT VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in recent weeks patriotic Americans have been shocked and dismayed by the disgraceful conduct of a number of groups protesting U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Like most of the country, I have been appalled at these people who turn on their own Government in this time of crisis and who in effect are giving aid and comfort to the enemy. In many instances, their shameful conduct has been an insult to the integrity and bravery of American men who are answering the call to duty in South Vietnam at this very time.

It has been frequently reported that the actions and mouthings of these so-called Vietniks are translated into propaganda for the Communist Vietcong, much of which shows up in captured leaflets and other such documents. Some of this recently came to my attention by way of a letter from one of my constituents, who is a member of the 101st Airborne Division and now serving in Vietnam. This soldier, Michael Flynn, of Atlanta, sent me a captured Vietcong document which exploits an anti-American policy petition that was circulated in New York City. In a letter accompanying the propaganda leaflet, Flynn wrote, in what is no doubt a vast understatement of the situation:

> To the men serving over here this type thing is not appreciated very much.

Mr. President, I call this matter to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that Flynn's letter and the Vietcong document be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 26, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: This is the first time I have ever written an individual such as you and I hope you'll overlook my high school typing. I have met you several times and your son and I are good friends. My name is Michael Flynn and presently I am with the 101st Airborne Division in Vietnam. I have always admired you for your political convictions. We serving in Vietnam understand the reasons for our being here. I welcome the privilege of being able to serve my country. You are familiar with the various groups who demonstrate against our policy in handling this situation. I have been astounded by the lack of patriotism that some of our fellow countrymen display. I have seen too many of my friends killed or wounded to let this go by unheeded. Recently, a friend of mine gave me a captured VC document. This would normally not affect me. But when I read the petition on the rear, I was sorry to realize Americans like these were allowed to abuse the basic freedoms. Inclosed is the document and I hope, sir, that you will bring it to the attention of the people and let them see what their demonstrations have brought. To the men serving over here this type thing is not appreciated very much. Please give my regards to your family. I sincerely hope all had a happy holiday season.

Thank you for your time.

I remain,

Respectfully,

MICHAEL FLYNN.

(NOTE.—This is a leaflet issued by the Youth Against War and Fascism organization in New York.)

We the undersigned are young Americans of draft age. We understand our obligations to defend our country and to serve in the Armed Forces but we object to being asked to support the war in South Vietnam.

Believing that U.S. participation in that war is for the suppression of the Vietnamese struggle for national independence, we see no justification for our involvement. We agree with Senator WAYNE MORSE, who said on the floor of the Senate on March 4, 1964, regarding South Vietnam, that "We should never have gone in. We should never have stayed in. We should get out."

Believing that we should not be asked to fight against the people of Vietnam, we herewith state our refusal to do so.

Kim Allen, Robert Apter, Peter Barnett, Lee Baxandall, Bernard Berman, Jacob Bernstein, Hugh Blachly, Harvey Blume, Stephen Bonne, Robert Bott, Jeff Briggs, Larry Brownstein, Charles Buchanan, James Bundy, Edward Campbell, B. Catalinotto, Thomas Christy, Kenneth Clouse, John Coatsworth, M. Covian, Salvatore Cucchiari, Doyle Davis, Roger Eaton, Robert Eisenberg, John Ewell, Joe Eyer, Shannon Ferguson, H. Quin Foreman, Robert Gallway.

James Gerahan, Jeremiah Gelles, Frank Ghigo, Mare Graham, Edmund Hamtard, Michael Hedgepeth, Robert Hume, Douglas Ireland, Lance Jackson, John Jaros, Dan Kalb, Martin Kanner, Robert Klein, David Koteen, Levi Lee Laub, E. Daniel Larkin, Edward Lemansky, Victor Lippit, Eric Loh, Phillip Abbott Luce, Shelbourne Lyman, Albert Maher, William Malandra, Robert Manoff, Richard Martin, Paul Mattick, Jr., Don McKelvey, John Meeks, Alvin Meyer.

Gerald Meyer, Paul Miller, Charles Mills, H. D. Muller, Anthony Mand, Martin Nichlaus, Theodore A. Ostrow, David W. Piger, Joseph Purvis III, David Rabey, David Raskin, Welter Read, R. M. Rhoads, Anthony Rosen, Jeffrey Rowen, Arnold Satterthwait, Larry Seigle, Russell Stether, Jr., Reed Straum, Roger Taus, John J. Thomson, Mark Tishman, Bruce Talloch, Richard Van Berg, Terry Van Brunt, David Watts, R. Wax, Jerry Weinberg, Allan Williamson.

If you are of draft age and agree with the above statement, sign below and return to Philip Abbott Luce, G.P.O. Box 981, New York, N.Y.

Demanded for Vietnam peace.

AMERICAN OFFICERS AND MEN IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The U.S. Government is waging an aggressive war against South Vietnam. It has spent billions of dollars and defamed the prestige and freedom-and-peace-loving traditions of the American people. It has caused the useless and pitiful deaths and maimings of thousands of American officers and men.

The U.S. Government has come to an impasse in South Vietnam. In order to evade the danger of a complete fiasco, it is venturing to spread the war, endangering your future more than ever.

The South Vietnamese people have won and will win.

The U.S. Government has been defeated and will be completely defeated.

Demand peace in Vietnam and your return to your homeland and families.

Demand that the U.S. Government withdraw all U.S. troops and arms from South Vietnam and let the Vietnamese people settle their own affairs themselves.

Refuse to obey all orders to carry out mopping-up operations to kill the Vietnamese people or attack their armed forces.

Sympathize with and support the just struggle of the South Vietnamese people.

THE SOUTH VIETNAM NATIONAL FRONT FOR LIBERATION.

FOUR-FIFTHS OF THE STATES HAVE ACTED ON LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, despite the wishful claim of supporters of the foreign aid bill rider in 1964 and of the substitute National American Legion Baseball Week resolution in 1965, the States of the Union have readily responded to the constitutional requirement of fair apportionment of the State legislatures. They have acted with dispatch and in an orderly fashion. There has been no chaos as a result of the enforcement of the equal protection of the laws and the return to representative government in the States.

Senators will be interested in the most recent report of the National Municipal League that 39 of the States have already completed the reapportionment of both houses of their legislatures, although in 24 of these the fairly apportioned legislature has yet to be elected in the 1966 elections. In another eight States, moreover, the legislatures are under orders to fairly apportion both houses and are taking action. In the remaining three States, the apportionment of two of the legislatures are now under challenge in the courts. In only one has no suit been filed.

In only 1 year and 7 months, since the June 15, 1964, decisions of the Supreme Court enforcing the equality of citizens before their legislatures, rottenboroughism in the State legislatures of this Nation has virtually been wiped out.

The only argument now left to those who would reverse the Supreme Court in this matter is the frank antidemocratic belief that people should not be equal in their citizenship. There is no justification for any constitutional amendment to reverse the Court.

I ask unanimous consent that a table printed in the January 1966 issue of the State Legislatures Progress Reporter, published by the National Municipal League, showing the progress made by the States in reapportionment, along with the brief explanation which accompanies the table, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table and explanation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOST STATES HAVE ACTED ON ONE MAN, ONE VOTE

Approximately two-thirds of the State legislatures will be meeting in regular, budgetary, or special sessions this month. For the overwhelming majority, the task of legislative reapportionment lies behind them but readjustments in accordance with further court orders will be necessary in several States.

At the time the Supreme Court ruled in the case of *Reynolds* v. *Sims* (June 15, 1964), five States already had apportioned their legislatures on the basis of population—Kentucky, Massachusetts, Oregon, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. Since then, 34 others have adopted new plans or have had court-ordered temporary plans put into effect. Followup litigation is in progress in many of these but, with only a few exceptions, the probable adjustments should be minor.

The 34 States are: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming.

Fifteen States used population-based plans in their last legislative elections. These include the 5 that used such systems before the *Reynolds* decision plus 10 of the 34 that have taken action since mid-1964. Some of the latter group must make additional changes. For example, Michigan's plan used in the 1964 election has been ruled provisional and the State's bipartisan reapportionment commission has been directed to devise a plan within 60 days.

Eight States are under court order to reapportion and some action has been taken in each to comply with court rulings—Hawaii, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and South Carolina.

Two additional States, Louisiana and Mississippi, are faced with lawsuits to compel reapportionment.

Only one State, Maine, has not completely reapportioned itself and has not faced any court action.

State legislative reapportionment—status as of Jan. 1, 1966

State	Population plan used in last election [1]	New plans adopted for next election [1]	Under orders to change and taking action	Challenge now in court	No suit filed
Alabama		X			
Alaska		X			
Arizona		X			
Arkansas		X			
California		X			
Colorado	X				
Connecticut		X			
Delaware	X				
Florida		X			
Georgia	X				
Hawaii			X		
Idaho		X			
Illinois		X			
Indiana		X			
Iowa	X				
Kansas			X		
Kentucky	X				
Louisiana				X	
Maine					X
Maryland		X			
Massachusetts	X				
Michigan	X				
Minnesota			X		
Mississippi				X	
Missouri			X		
Montana		X			
Nebraska		X			
Nevada		X			
New Hampshire		X			
New Jersey	X				
New Mexico		X			
New York	X				
North Carolina			X		
North Dakota		X			
Ohio		X			
Oklahoma	X				
Oregon	X				
Pennsylvania			X		
Rhode Island			X		
South Carolina			X		
South Dakota		X			
Tennessee		X			
Texas		X			
Utah		X			
Vermont	X				
Virginia	X				
Washington		X			
West Virginia	X				
Wisconsin	X				
Wyoming		X			
Totals	15	24	8	2	1

[1] Includes some States where further changes are necessary.

A FOOD-FOR-PEACE FILM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Bunge Corp., international grain dealers, have produced a 28-minute film depicting the role of grain merchants in the distribution of American food, including our food-for-peace shipments, in foreign countries. It contains a great deal of information on the need for our assistance and the worsening world food crisis.

Filmed in seven different countries, it portrays visually much that I have been attempting to describe in remarks supporting my proposed international food and nutrition bill, S. 2157.

Copies of the film are to be available here early in February. I am sure that Senators will have an opportunity to see it.

So that you may know the nature of the picture, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a review of the film carried in the Southwestern Miller on January 11, 1966, after a preview in Chicago.

I am sure that Members will find the picture well worth viewing for the information that it contains on issues that will come before us in this session.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FILM, "THE GRAIN MERCHANTS," SHOWN—NEW 28-MINUTE COLOR FILM, PRODUCED BY BUNGE CORP., TO SPUR PRODUCTION, APPRECIATION OF FOOD FOR PEACE PROGRAM AND GRAIN MARKETERS

CHICAGO, January 10.—America's great world role in grain production and distribution, including the food for peace program, promises to win added appreciation and stimulus from a new 28-minute color film, "The Grain Merchants," that was presented Thursday in Chicago for the first time. The film, produced by cameramen in Europe, the Middle East, India, Japan, Venezuela, Brazil, and points in the United States for the Bunge Corp., is an impressive portrayal of the important services of grain growers and grain marketers of America in the sustenance of multiplying populations of the world and in strengthening the economy of America.

Viewers of the film at its premiere were unanimous that it would exert highly constructive influences over the world by winning support for greater grain and other food production in the United States and for extension of food for peace program.

EVERY WEEK, 1,500,000 BABIES

The film opens with a view of a baby crying in the hands of a doctor, while the noted commentator, Bob Considine, announces: "During the next 28 minutes, throughout the world, the birth you have just seen will be duplicated under varying conditions 5,000 times." Then, as the film shows more and more babies in cribs, the commentator says: "If you can grasp the enormity of the figure, more than 1,500,000 new babies are being born every week."

In addition, the commentator, emphasizing the needs of the multiplying population, says as a view of an impoverished area in India with mothers and children is shown:

"All of them are born hungry, and the distressing thing, many of them are destined to remain hungry for the rest of their lives.

"Half the people of the world are underfed. With 57,000 new babies every day, India now has more people than Russia and the United States combined. And nearly half of India's population are children."

With a view of a little girl in India putting her finger to her mouth as if hungry, the commentator states: "One-third of the world must feed the other two-thirds, or face the inevitable."

FARM PRODUCTIVITY AND U.S. SHIPMENTS

With that outline of the expanding world needs, the film proceeds to present views on the phenomenal productivity of American farms with scarcely 8 percent of the population in the United States actually farming. Amid this American farm expansion, it is noted that food production in the world as a whole is not keeping pace with the number of people to be fed. In fact, the global population is growing at twice the rate of 1 percent that marks the annual increase in world food production.

With views of American shipments of grain to India, the commentator discloses that "under our Government, food-for-peace program, 20 percent of the entire American wheat crop goes to help feed India's millions—some 600,000 tons a month.

Following the presentation of the facts of American aid for India, the film turns to Latin America, "richly endowed with great untapped reservoirs of natural wealth, but bewildered by its population explosion." It shows some of the American food supplies in Brazil and notes that "within the next 30 years Latin America will have 600 million people. Somehow, they must be fed."

COMMERCIAL GRAIN TO ABUNDANT AREAS

Portraying the role of the grain exporter in finding and developing new markets and in serving them, the film draws attention to American shipments through commercial markets. With a closeup of a bakery plant in Holland and another showing flour being moved in trucks, and also of a ship unloading wheat from the United States in Venezuela, it is noted that "such cash customers for North American grain help make a sizable contribution in favor of our balance of payments."

NEARLY HALF OF FARM INCOME

To emphasize the importance of the export wheat trade, the film points to these facts:

"With so much U.S. wheat being sold abroad, the export market for American farm products represents the equivalent of everything that's grown in four of the largest midwestern farm States. The combined export market also represents nearly half of the American farmer's total income."

Views of American wheat production, including the operation of combines far into the night at the harvest season and the flow to elevators, are presented. The movement of the grain is traced from loading at local elevators up to barges on rivers, and finally at Destrehan, 15 miles above New Orleans, where Bunge operates a 6 million bushel elevator.

Views of the Bunge headquarters at 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza Building in New York City also are shown, including the president of Bunge in North America, Walter C. Klein. Another view is of the Bunge building in Amsterdam, "one of the 80 overseas affiliates contributing to the North American company's local operations." Another view is of the Rotterdam harbor in Holland with huge floating elevators.

Japan, now America's greatest cash market for agricultural exports, also receives attention and particular note is made of the great absorption of American soybeans by Japan.

"By telephone, sales are made involving entire shiploads," it is stated, with closeups of the telephone business. "Often a man's word, a verbal order, sets in motion the whole complex machinery through which grain is bought and sold abroad."

DEBT TO GRAIN FARMER, MERCHANT

This statement closes the presentation:

"People all over the world owe a great deal to the United States farmer.

"During the time it has taken you to view this film, 5,000 new babies have been born into the world—5,000 hungry new mouths dependent upon the grain merchant."

HALTING THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] introduced a Senate resolution commending "the President's serious and urgent efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons" and supporting "such additional efforts as the President deems appropriate and necessary in the interest of peace for the solution of nuclear proliferation problems." As one of the 52 cosponsors of the bill I wish to commend the Senator from Rhode Island for his leadership and for his remarks on the floor yesterday. In this age of potential nuclear peril there is no more urgent task than achieving international agreement on a workable plan for halting the spread of nuclear weapons.

THERE IS A NEW EMPHASIS ON THE SOCIAL OBLIGATIONS OF HIGHWAYS—TODAY THEY MUST BE LOCATED TO BE THE BEST ROUTES FROM ALL STANDPOINTS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton has given increasing emphasis to the social responsibilities of highways in the Nation's roadbuilding program. As he points out in an article in the current issue of the Highway User magazine, the best highway location today means best not only from the standpoint of cost, or for the highway user, but best for all interests—social, cultural, economic, and esthetic.

I believe my colleagues will be interested in Mr. Whitton's views on this important aspect of the highway program and ask unanimous consent that his article be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EVOLUTION IN ROADBUILDING—THERE IS A NEW EMPHASIS ON THE SOCIAL OBLIGATIONS OF HIGHWAYS—TODAY THEY MUST BE LOCATED TO BE THE BEST ROUTES FROM ALL STANDPOINTS

(By Rex M. Whitton)

Selecting the best location or route for a new highway is one of the highway builder's most vexing problems, especially since "best" means different things to different people and since the meaning of "best" keeps changing.

Today, it means not only best from the standpoint of cost or even for the highway user, but best for all interests—social, economic, cultural, and esthetic—of the areas the highway serves.

In the early days, highways developed along animal paths or wagon trails. Animal traces and Indian paths preceded the pioneer routes of wagon and stagecoach crossing the plains. And when, at the start of this century, efforts were launched to improve roads above a crude minimum, much of the work was undertaken on these existing roadbeds, partly because they were there, providing right-of-way, but also because they were demonstrated lines of enduring travel patterns.

Inadequate. In time, population growth and changes in population distribution, needs, and customs, as well as new requirements of agriculture, industry, and commerce, made many existing travel patterns inadequate; and new highways had to be built to meet the demands.

For many years, selection of a highway route was a relatively uncomplicated task for the competent engineer. He primarily had to pick the shortest line between two points consistent with the topography. He may not have had the help of photogrammetry, and sometimes he was frustrated because the shortest route involved too much excavating and hauling of earth—a costly procedure. But once adequate equipment was developed, consideration could be given to other criteria, and roads could be built according to the cost-benefit ratio test, whereby the cost of building and operating a route was matched against user benefits.

The cost-benefit ratio was a paramount consideration for years, but ultimately it was recognized to have shortcomings, too, because it failed to take into account the effects highways have on the cultural, historical, economic, and esthetic values of a community.

The evolution of America from a tightly contained horse-and-buggy, rural society to a mobile, urban, vibrant nation on wheels changed the economic and social fabric of our country, and revolutionized road construction. Highways with more than functional excellence were demanded, and highway builders became increasingly aware, about 20 years ago, that if highways were to serve the people for whom they were built to the fullest extent, new approaches to the problem of route selection had to be made.

NEW PROBLEMS

Roadbuilding was no longer a question of "getting the farmer out of the mud." It was a question of getting the Nation's ever-growing number of motor vehicles moving down highways between cities and within cities. And it became quickly apparent that before a route selection could be made in any urban area, it was vital to know what its effect would be on various neighborhoods, school districts, parks, church parishes, and historical buildings. In rural areas, the impact on places of recreation, scenic sites, wildlife preserves, and the landscape in general had to be assessed.

Many State highway departments which plan, design, and build the Nation's highways, have been giving close scrutiny today to these factors, but some have not paid the attention they should. More and more are becoming aware, however, that the highway built only on utilitarian considerations doesn't necessarily serve the best interests of the public.

A new concern for the appearance of highways and the roadsides flanking them has been stimulated by President Johnson's highway beautification program. Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor has directed that the resources of the Federal-aid highway program, administered by the Bureau of Public Roads, be utilized to implement the President's program, and that is being done.

SAFEGUARDS

Federal legislation has created other safeguards against the possible abuse of human values by stipulations that Federal-aid projects in urban areas can only be approved when they are based on a planning process that involves not only all types of transportation but also all aspects of community life. The process must take into consideration the existing amenities and the future hopes and aspirations of each community—thereby acknowledging that highways are not built as entities in themselves but are only one facet of the total community environment.

The new emphasis on the social obligations of roads doesn't mean that highway costs, capacity, safety, and convenience are to be ignored. The goal of a superbly engineered road to serve the Nation's transportation needs has never dimmed and, as a consequence, we have highways of an excellence found nowhere else in the world. The Nation's modern roads, such as those found on the Interstate System, are already saving 3,500 lives a year, and when the 41,000-mile Interstate is completed, 8,000 persons who would die, on conventional roads, will be spared annually.

At the same time, economic benefits to users of the system will total $11 billion a year through reduction in motor vehicle operating costs, time cost, and accident costs.

Neither does the emphasis now being given to humanizing highways diminish our desire to give the highway user the safest and finest systems of roads obtainable for his tax dollar. But what it does do, is upgrade the dimension of social responsibility in highway building to where it becomes a vital element in route selection and construction.

DECISIONS

Like many exercises of judgment, choosing the best routes for highways, nevertheless, involves many difficult decisions. When, for example, a State highway department is confronted with the choice of routing an essential highway through a park or dislocating hundreds of families, it is not an easy decision. Or, if it is necessary to disturb a wildlife preserve to eliminate a dangerous stretch of highway, this, too, can be a problem.

Regardless of the course pursued, every possible effort must be made to keep the impact of a new road to a minimum. To lessen the temporary hardship to those who may be displaced, relocation assistance must be provided. Before a highway touches a recreation area or a wildlife refuge, there must be consultation between State highway departments and other State agencies involved.

Many decisions face highway engineers who recognize the need to preserve and even enhance human values. They are decisions which often require the collaboration of planners, architects, and sociologists. More and more, highway engineers are calling on the talents of other disciplines to help in resolving conflicts posed by the many interests that must be considered.

Highway construction has come a long way since the days when the transportation of people and goods was a road's sole function. There is no doubt that while they continue to serve that purpose, highway builders, exercising social responsibility, will construct roads which are esthetically attractive and a force for improving the social and economic health of the American people.

SOUTH DAKOTAN RECEIVES 1965 AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY AWARD

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, each year the Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc., presents an American Success Story Award to 10 businessmen whose rise to success over obstacles and competition symbolizes the achievement that is possible to all of our citizens in the democratic society that we enjoy in the United States.

I was most pleased and proud to learn that one of the 1965 awards was recently presented to a personal friend and fellow South Dakotan, Mr. Paul C. Green, president of the Hub City Iron Co. in Aberdeen, S. Dak.

Risking his meager savings, Mr. Green took over his father's debt-ridden machine shop during the depression in 1932. Starting with 13 employees and after years of hard work, long hours, and many obstacles he built Hub City Iron Co. into one of Aberdeen's largest industries with a position of worldwide leadership.

The citation accompanying Mr. Green's award cited him for his vital contributions to his field, to American industry and our national defense. In accepting the award he said:

> My success in Aberdeen, S. Dak., is proof that under America's free enterprise system any U.S. area can supply loyal, skilled manpower and opportunities for worldwide expansion.

Mr. Green has always played an active and constructive role in both his community and his State. In addition to his other duties, he is a director of the Aberdeen National Bank, board president of the Aberdeen YMCA, and a director of Dakota Wesleyan University.

I know that all South Dakotans share the pride which I feel in the selection of Mr. Paul Green for this important award.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER IN DADE COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 917, H.R. 30. Before the question is put, may I say that this is fulfilling a commitment which was made on the last day of the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 30) to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments on page 4, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$11,000,000" and insert "$7,500,000"; on page 5, line 3, after "1967", to strike out the comma and insert "and"; and in line 4, after "1968", to strike out the comma and "1969, and 1970".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside for a moment, and that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nomination this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance:

William Gorham, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

Paul Kaplowitz, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

BUREAU OF MINES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., of New York, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate return to legislative session.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER IN DADE COUNTY, FLA.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 30) to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the first item of business will be consideration of the committee amendments. I have no preference as to how that should be done. I have two minor amendments, which I am willing to offer en bloc to the committee amendments. I am perfectly willing, if the Senate prefers, to have the committee amendments adopted as original text, subject to amendment, and then I will propose my amendments.

Mr. President, I stated yesterday to the Senate that these two amendments would merely make the bill conform to the fact that we thought the bill would be passed last year and had placed dates in the bill based on that assumption. Now if the bill be passed, it will require restating two of the dates stated in the bill.

I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. They, of course, may speak for themselves, but I understand that there is no opposition to these amendments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, for the time being, I will object to unanimous consent that these amendments be adopted. The probability is that before the debate is concluded I shall withdraw any objection to the proposal made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The fact is that, because the bill was not considered last year, the provisions of the bill have become outdated, and the Senator from Florida merely seeks to insert language in the bill that will make the provisions correspond with the time.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend for making that statement. I understand that the Senator from Delaware has no objection to the amendments.

May I ask my distinguished friend how he prefers me to proceed? I am willing to proceed, as I have stated, either way. If the Senator wishes to have the committee amendments adopted en bloc, with the understanding that they will be considered as original text, I can offer my amendments, and the Senator may take such course as he wishes to pursue.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the committee recommendations relative to the reduction of the amount are adopted, will the bill as amended be subject to further amendment on the item of the amounts allocated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be the case if the amendments were agreed to en bloc with the understanding that the bill as amended be treated as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It would be subject to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be subject to further amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that if he anticipates that some Senator may want to restore the amount of the original bill, if he is talking about Senators who may have that idea, I have the assurance from them that they will not offer such amendments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Some Senators might wish to reduce the amount below that recommended by the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that the distinguished Senator is willing for the committee amendments to be adopted en bloc with the understanding that the text will be considered henceforth as original text.

Mr. President, I ask that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the committee amendments will be agreed to en bloc, and the bill as amended will be treated as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I make a further parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That conforms to what the Parliamentarian says and will subject the bill to further amendments. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe it would be simpler to offer the two amendments as one. They relate to the same section. I believe it would be simpler to ask that they be considered en bloc when they are considered.

I now send to the desk an amendment which I understand will bring forth that kind of consideration later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] proposes an amendment as follows:

On page 2, line 20, strike out "February 15, 1966". And insert in lieu thereof "May 15, 1966".

On page 5, lines 3 and 4, strike out "1967 and 1968" and insert in lieu thereof "1968 and 1969".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I said a moment ago that I raised objection to unanimous consent for adoption of this amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood that completely and I shall not ask for the adoption.

I was preparing to make brief remarks on the bill. If the Senator wishes to speak first I shall be glad to yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments by the Senator from Florida have not been agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall not long delay the Senate with repetitious information with reference to the pending bill, H.R. 30, to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla.

This bill was passed by the House on September 22, 1965. It was reported out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee amended so as to reduce the total Federal commitment from $15 million to $9.5 million, the last day of the first session of this Congress on October 22, 1965. It is well known that our colleague from Delaware, Senator WILLIAMS, objected to its consideration as was his right under the rules. At that time my colleague, Senator SMATHERS, who, I regret, is unable because of illness to be here today, and myself pointed out at some length the great benefits this proposed international exhibit, Interama, would have in bettering our relations with our Latin American friends. The record made at that time speaks for itself and I, therefore, will not attempt to repeat what has been adequately covered.

I would, Mr. President, like to bring out several salient points that I believe are of importance and in which I believe my colleagues will be interested.

The first point is that the immediate construction cost of the Interama project is estimated to be $75,500,000. This is exclusive of and does not include the participation of the U.S. Government by the exhibits to be placed in a building to be constructed by Interama at Interama's cost. The immediate beginning of this construction will be triggered by the passage of the pending bill, so that construction may immediately go ahead.

This immediate cost, together with the financial resources and commitments and job employment are indicated in an exhibit entitled "Interama Jobs," which I ask be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Interama Jobs

Senate bill S. 216 provides for construction of a U.S. exhibit in Interama not to exceed $7.5 million. If an equivalent sum were spent for construction for south Florida, it would create 479 skilled and 718 unskilled man-year jobs.[1]

However, a $7.5 million authorization by the Senate for the U.S. exhibit in Interama will trigger $75 million of construction work[2] which will provide 10 times as many skilled and unskilled man-year jobs—4,790 skilled and 7,185 unskilled man-year jobs. Furthermore, construction of Interama will provide many additional thousands of jobs on a permanent basis.

Item	Financial resources and commitments (a)	Estimated construction cost (b)	Estimated start of construction (c)
Initial advances from State and local authorities	$882,000		
Value of land	54,000,000		
Validated bond issue	21,000,000		
Administration service buildings, landscaping, etc		$10,000,000	June 1966.
Grading and site work		200,000	February 1966.
State of Florida road commitment	6,000,000	6,000,000	Do.
Telephone and electric facilities	15,000,000	15,000,000	April 1966.
Water and sewage systems:			
Internal	1,800,000	1,800,000	Do.
External city of North Miami	2,000,000	2,000,000	
Community facilities			
Administration loan	22,000,000	18,500,000	July 1966.
Tower of Freedom	10,000,000	10,000,000	December 1966.
International Trade Mart	12,000,000	12,000,000	Do.
Total	144,682,000	75,500,000	

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe it is worthy of note that this construction program of Interama will require approximately 4,790 man-years of skilled labor and 7,185 man-years of unskilled labor spread over a 2-year period. These are the figures furnished me by the Dade County Planning Commission, as well as by the Interama Authority.

The total employment impact of Interama has been estimated by the Dade County Planning Department at 5,800 in 1966, 37,100 in 1967, 31,900 in 1968, and 27,900 in 1969.

Mr. President, these figures are most significant for several reasons other than the importance of the project from a national and international point of view. First, Florida has experienced a tremendous growth, requiring more job opportunities. In 1940, the population of Florida was 1,897,000; by 1950 the population grew to 2,771,305; in 1960 it was 4,952,000 and the Bureau of the Census estimate for July 1, 1965, was 5,805,000. Thus, population has increased threefold in the past 25 years. Similarly, Dade County, in which Interama is located, grew from a population in 1940 of 267,739 to an estimated population of 1,089,200 in 1965, or it increased fourfold in 25 years.

This rapid growth, together with the influx of Cuban refugees, has created a tremendous unemployment problem peculiar to that area. This is attested to by letters I have recently received.

Mr. President, I wish at this time to make it clear what the employment condition is in Florida. The only place we have an unemployment problem is Dade County, and it exists there largely because of the great influx of Cuban refugees, to which I shall refer in a moment.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record three letters. The first letter is from Mr. William Grogan, international vice president of the Transport Workers Union, Local 511, dated January 10, 1966. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Transport Workers Union of America,
Local 511,
Miami Springs, Fla., January 10, 1966.
Hon. Spessard L. Holland,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Holland: The resolution issued by the Dade County community task force on January 7, 1966, in support of enactment of Senate bill 216 to authorize a Federal exhibit in Interama—which will create thousands of new jobs in Dade County—to offset the influx of large numbers of Cubans, is of great interest to the Transport Workers Union of America.

We are in full agreement with the content and views expressed by this resolution. Construction of the Interama project is the best approach to create new jobs for the constantly increasing number of refugees arriving in Miami. It will also assist the U.S. nationals who have suffered loss of economic opportunity brought about by the competition for the limited number of jobs available in south Florida. It is obviously unfair that Dade County should be forced to cope with a problem which is clearly a national responsibility. An immediate solution to the unemployment problem can be created by the building of Interama.

In finding the means to solve the problem President Johnson has stated that he hopes to "maintain and stimulate economic growth in the Miami area and to avoid introducing an additional burden on the community as a result of the influx of refugees." Our entire community—in fact the entire State of Florida—believes the way to do it is to pass the authorization bill for Federal participation in Interama.

The approval of an exhibit to represent the Federal Government's participation in Interama will be the deciding factor in assuring the success of the entire project. There is considerable precedent for such participation. Since the turn of the century every international exposition in the United States has had a major Federal exhibit. Most recent examples include the Seattle World's Fair which had a $10 million U.S. Government exhibit and the New York World's Fair which had a $17 million exhibit and a $9 million exhibit is currently being built at Expo '67—the Canadian World's Fair in Montreal.

We would greatly appreciate your support for S. 216, which would authorize the U.S. Government to provide an exhibit which will attract millions of people who will come to see Interama from the United States and abroad and create employment for thousands of skilled and unskilled workers in Dade County.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
William Grogan,
International Vice President.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall read one paragraph of that letter:

> Construction of the Interama project is the best approach to create new jobs for the constantly increasing number of refugees arriving in Miami. It will also assist the U.S. nationals who have suffered loss of economic opportunity brought about by the competition for the limited number of jobs available in south Florida.

Mr. President, the second letter, which I received on January 12, 1966, is from Mr. Edward T. Stephenson, president of the Dade County Central Labor Union, AFL–CIO. I ask unanimous consent that his letter may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dade County Federation of Labor,
AFL–CIO,
Miami, Fla.

Hon. Spessard L. Holland,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Holland: The resolution issued by the Dade County community task force on January 7, 1966, in support of the enactment of Senate bill 216 (H.R. 30), in order to create new jobs in Dade County, to offset the influx of large numbers of Cubans, has been brought to our attention.

Senator Holland, the Dade County Federation of Labor of the AFL–CIO, is in full accord with the facts and principles expressed in this resolution. It is apparent to every serious observer, that the construction of the Interama project is the most immediate and practical approach in generating new jobs for the ever-increasing number of refugees coming to this area, and for displaced U.S. nationals who have borne the brunt of this unprecedented burden. This problem has been imposed on a single community despite the fact that it is recognized as a problem which should be national in scope; and the only apparent solution available to this community—short of direct funding—can be attained by the building of Interama.

---

[1] The relation of construction expenditure to direct and indirect jobs—both skilled and unskilled—is based on authoritative data for south Florida provided by the Dade County Planning Department.

[2] In the accompanying table are shown: (a) current Interama resources and commitments, (b) estimated construction to be released upon passage of the Senate bill, and (c) estimated time schedule for construction.

If President Johnson's objective is to be achieved, which is "to maintain and stimulate economic growth in the Miami area and to avoid introducing an additional burden on the community as a result of the influx of refugees" then it is our strong recommendation to the Senate to pass the authorization bill for participation of the Federal Government in Interama.

Sincerely,

EDWARD T. STEPHENSON,
President, Dade County Central Labor Union, AFL–CIO.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I read one sentence from Mr. Stephenson's letter:

> It is apparent to every serious observer, that the construction of the Interama project is the most immediate and practical approach in generating new jobs for the ever-increasing number of refugees coming to this area, and for displaced U.S. nationals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an extremely important resolution approved by the Dade County community task force on January 7, 1966, strongly urging favorable consideration of the pending bill, and to which the two letters previously placed in the RECORD, from the Transport Workers Union of America and the Dade County Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO, refer.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING ENACTMENT OF SENATE BILL 216 (H.R. 30) IN ORDER TO CREATE NEW JOBS IN DADE COUNTY, FLA.

Whereas the Dade County Community Task Force, organized at the request of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to cooperate with that Department, is charged with the duty of seeking all proper and justifiable means of attaining the objective of President Lyndon B. Johnson "to maintain and stimulate economic growth in the Miami area and to avoid introducing an additional burden on the community as a result of the influx of refugees"; and

Whereas, this task force has thoroughly reviewed all potential means available within this community of reaching the President's goal by generating new jobs to absorb the large and ever-increasing number of refugees in this area; and

Whereas during the course of this review it has become apparent to this task force that Interama offers the greatest and most immediate assurance of creating new employment—approximately 5,000 skilled and 7,000 unskilled man-year jobs during its initial construction phase—and that the construction of Interama will assure permanent employment for additional thousands thereafter; and

Whereas there is now pending in the U.S. Senate a bill, known as Senate bill 216 (H.R. 30) which would authorize Federal participation in Interama, and passage of this bill—vital to Interama's development—will trigger its construction, generate thousands of jobs and thus provide immediate means of attaining the President's goal in this community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Dade County Community Task Force, That this task force hereby records its strong support for enactment of Senate bill 216 (H.R. 30) and directs its chairman to inform the Federal interdepartmental task force in Washington of this resolution and request that agency to lend every effort to achieve the early passage of this legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe that the resolution is of particular importance, because the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Gardner, in order to have someone looking into the situation for him in that area, and also someone whom he could trust, selected this particular community task force. Their resolution, made so strongly, recommending as it does the immediate initiation of the Interama project, was really set in motion by the appointment of the task force by Mr. Gardner. I read two of the "whereas" clauses in the resolution. I am placing the whole communication in the RECORD, but am choosing for emphasis only those parts which I think are most important:

> Whereas, this task force has thoroughly reviewed all potential means available within this community of reaching the President's goal by generating new jobs to absorb the large and ever-increasing number of refugees in this area; and
>
> Whereas during the course of this review it has become apparent to this task force that Interama offers the greatest and most immediate assurance of creating new employment—approximately 5,000 skilled and 7,000 unskilled man-year jobs during its initial construction phase—and that the construction of Interama will assure permanent employment for additional thousands thereafter.

The task force, organized at the request of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to cooperate with that Department, is charged with the duty of seeking all proper and justifiable means of attaining the President's objective "to maintain and stimulate economic growth in the Miami area and to avoid introducing an additional burden on the economy as a result of the influx of refugees." I submit, Mr. President, the construction and development of Interama will assist in the acomplishment of this objective.

The third letter is from Mr. Donald Wheeler Jones, president, Miami Branch of the NAACP, dated October 13, 1965, wherein he points out the problem of unemployment created in the Negro populace as a result of the increase in the number of Cuban refugees in the Miami area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Jones be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIAMI, FLA.,
October 13, 1965.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are writing this letter in behalf of what we believe to be the best interests of the citizens and residents of Miami, Dade County, Fla., with particular emphasis on the problems that the Negro people here can be expected to face in view of the pending, additional influx of Cuban people to this community as refugees.

We have noted with great concern President Johnson's positive statements regarding an additional accommodation of Cuban refugees by this country. We feel that despite efforts at resettlement, a great majority of these newly arrived refugees will remain in the Miami, Dade County, area for reasons of kinship and proximity to their native country.

A cursory observation of the employment patterns of many Miami and Miami Beach hotels, restaurants, and other businesses will substantiate the fact that the Cuban has displaced the Negro and other personnel formerly employed there in many capacities such as waiters, bellhops, doormen, elevator operators and other similar occupations. There are many other categories of employment, almost too numerous to mention, that Negroes no longer enjoy as a direct result of the Cuban influx which apparently is about extended. In short, the Cuban influx immigrants to this country have had their most severe effect upon that group of citizens least able to afford it—the uneducated, nonhighly skilled, nonprofessional Negro who prior to the Cuban influx could eke out a fairly decent standard of living through menial, service type jobs that require a minimum of formal education or training.

We are aware that the exigencies of crucial situation following the rise of the Cuban dictatorship in Cuba did not allow sufficient time for the erection of all of the safeguards that perhaps the Federal, State, county, and municipal governments could have conceived to protect their citizens from the displacement in their jobs and the consequential economic wants.

We would like to make it abundantly clear that we are in favor of our national policy of admitting the oppressed of the Castro regime, and we will be among the first to be of whatever assistance we can in making the next arrival of Cuban refugees a pleasant one.

We are confident that the Cuban people and the Negroes of this community can live and work together as brothers.

We feel, however, that the Federal Government must exercise its responsibilities toward the economically oppressed of this community as well as toward the politically oppressed of Cuba.

The average Negro citizen of this community who lost his job to a Cuban has, by and large, borne his burden in silence as a sacrificial lamb for the extension of freedom and democracy to refugees from another land. I feel that the Negroes and other citizens of this community can always be depended upon to sacrifice a maximum amount to help fulfill the promises of our great Nation to the oppressed. However, it does seem, since the Federal Government, acting without the pressure of an immediate crisis in this area, but rather with great calmness and deliberation, has decided to further accommodate the Cuban people in their mass exodus from tyranny to freedom, that now is the time to look to the freedom of all of our citizens from economic oppression that will almost certainly be caused by this addition to our labor market.

This additional competition, we feel, will be felt most acutely at the menial level where too many of our Negro and other citizens have already been eliminated due to the previous admissions of Cubans to the Miami, Dade County, area.

We feel that now is the time when plans should be formulated to insure, as much as is practically possible, the economic stability of our community and the job security for all of our citizens, including Negroes, so that the extension of freedom to those from a foreign land does not result in the extension of poverty among our own citizens at home.

We feel that it is of equal importance that there be no ill will between the citizens of this community and the Cuban population. While there is only the slightest indication of such ill will at the present time, history has amply illustrated time and time again that when groups in want are involved in fierce competition for jobs, friction almost inevitably occurs. This seems to be true without regard to the racial, religious, and language differences or similarities that may be involved. While we of the local NAACP are always optimistic concerning the ability of Negroes to give additional forbearance in difficult times, it must be indicated that there is absolutely no basis for the bland assumption from any quarter that the seemingly inevitable friction, to which I have previously alluded, will not come to pass despite the best efforts of the local authorities and the general populace.

We ask that full consideration be given to the matters alluded to herein in the interests of all of our citizens.

Please be assured that we stand anxious to be of whatever service that we can in the formulation of meaning solutions in the hope that the reality of freedom for the Cuban and for Negroes in our community can be equal, free of oppression, economic or otherwise, and peaceful and harmonious.

Sincerely,
DONALD WHEELER JONES,
President,
Miami Branch, NAACP.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the letter just placed in the RECORD eloquently points out how the principal impact of the Cuban refugee problem has fallen upon modest people, particularly upon our Negro citizens, of whom many thousands have been displaced from modest employment, such as operators of elevators, maids in hotels, attendants in service stations, and in numerous other employment opportunities. It is made so clear by this communication from the NAACP that I feel that this letter, speaking for itself, shows how frustrated the Negro community has been by the refugee problem, and how long-suffering they have been.

Up to this time there has not been any open outbreak. They have really acted most commendably and as fine citizens. But Mr. Jones points out that the tension is growing, and that people are on the unemployment rolls by the thousands, as a result of Cuban refugees taking the employment opportunities from this group.

I believe that these letters and the task force resolution attest to the undoubted fact that the Cuban refugees have caused a severe impact on the unemployment problem in the Dade County area, and that that impact is growing worse every passing day.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service has advised me that some 227,000 refugees were given a haven of refuge in our country under the old program. That is the program that existed prior to Mr. Castro's preventing the emigration of the people of Cuba.

Since September 28, 1965, when the new program began, about 9,868 Cuban refugees have been admitted to this country, of whom approximately 4,924 came in by airlift, the remainder by boat. In addition, it is estimated that between 3,000 and 4,000 refugees will be admitted monthly until such time as the program may be terminated. No one knows when the program will be terminated; but the airlift, which is continuing daily, except Sundays, is bringing in about 190 refugees a day. Sometimes the number is nearer 200. My information from the Immigration and Naturalization Service is that the number of Cuban people who have applied for admission is almost 50,000. They are anxious to get out, in most instances to rejoin relatives, in many instances merely to get out of Cuba. So it can easily be seen that since Miami is the only port for the reception of those people, the problem is daily growing more serious.

Of the total number of refugees that have been admitted, it is estimated by the Immigration and Naturalization Service that some 95,288, or approximately 40 percent, have been resettled. It is impossible to obtain figures to show how many of those who were resettled returned to the Miami-Dade County area, and, as well, to show exactly how many are now in Miami, although certainly a majority of the total is still there or has returned.

I do not believe I have to plead the importance of doing something for this community, which has borne the brunt of a national program. Neither do I feel that any of us would want to change that program. We all realize that we should afford an opportunity to the Cuban refugees to breathe free air again. Yet the impact has fallen so heavily upon this community, ordinarily thought of merely as a great tourist center, that unemployment is very heavy there. The figures furnished to me by the Unemployment Service and by the authorities in Dade County show that the number goes up into many thousands, and that the services have difficulty in keeping up with the exact number.

I have purposely made small mention of the long-time objectives of Interama which, of course, are vastly more important than the matter which I have discussed in some detail, that is, the immediate beginning of construction, which will be made possible by the passage of this bill, of structures and facilities costing about $75 million. In closing I simply want to remind the Senate that Miami is almost at the geographic and population center of the Western Hemisphere; that it is the principal bottleneck through which travel to and from Latin America takes place; that it is closest to the three most troublesome spots in Latin America, namely, Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Haiti; that the city of Miami gave the Interama tract of 1,700 acres close to the city for its use in this important development, which tract is said to be worth $50 to $60 million; that 680 acres of this tract have already been reclaimed and are ready for immediate construction; that the State of Florida stands ready and has committed itself to put in the roads and bridges for a total estimated cost of $6 million; that the city of North Miami stands ready to install water and sewer connections at an estimated cost of $3,800,000; that the Florida Power & Light Co. and the Bell Telephone Co. stand ready to install all necessary public utility connections at an estimated cost of some $15 million; that the State of Florida has financed all costs of administration of the Interama Authority to date and that only $8 million has been spent out of the first mortgage bond issue of $21 million, leaving the rest available at once for construction; that the CFA loan of $22 million has been approved and stands ready for construction; that, too, is a secured loan; and that the whole project has been held up since last fall awaiting the passage of this bill which has already passed the House of Representatives by a large vote at a time when it contained a $15 million commitment of the Federal Government over 4 years to cover the costs of its exhibit, whereas the pending amended bill covers only $9.5 million at the most to be expended by the Federal Government over a period of 4 years which amount may be reduced by the finding of the President's Special Committee to supervise the cost of the Federal exhibit as provided in the bill.

Mr. President, we believe that we have made an extremely strong case for this project. We have been working on it for 25 years. The Federal Government, through the passage of a congressional resolution in 1950, endorsed the project and asked all of its agencies to aid in the project.

The State of Florida has certainly shown good faith, as has every local community, and as have the distinguished citizens who constitute the leadership, the board of directors, of Interama. We very much hope that the Senate will promptly pass this bill.

These facts, coupled with the great importance of the project to our Nation and the project's relation with our friends south of the border, I believe, make it most important that we promptly pass the pending bill.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I had the privilege of spending a few days in the great State of Florida just before returning to Washington.

I found a great deal of interest evidenced by citizens at the local level. I have discussed the project with them. I have heard the distinguished senior Senator from Florida discuss the project. I believe it is a worthy project.

I want the Senator to know, and the record to show, that I fully support the project and the passage of the pending legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my friend for his gracious remarks.

The Senator has mentioned that the citizens in Miami are interested. This is true not only in Miami, but also elsewhere in our State. Leading citizens have accepted appointments. Dr. Muskat, a distinguished citizen of that area, is now the chairman of the authority.

Mr. Smathers, the brother of my colleague, and one of the leading bankers of the community, is a member of the authority. The Governor of Florida, Mr. Haydon Burns, when he was the mayor of Jacksonville, was a member of the authority and participated actively in its work.

The State is behind the project.

I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to place the entire enterprise in perspective so that Senators will understand clearly what the project is and what its financing is proposed to be.

It is my understanding that the city of Miami owned a tract of land consisting of 1,716 acres which, up North, we might call swampland, that it felt could be filled in and made usable for various purposes, including the establishment of Interama.

Were those 1,716 acres all under water prior to the time that 700 of those acres were filled?

Mr. HOLLAND. Probably most of them were. It was a mangrove swamp. It was the same kind of swamp from which four-fifths of the city of Miami Beach has been developed.

If the Senator had been there in the early days, he would know that Miami Beach was a little strip of sand over coral rock, and, on the inland side, there was a great strip of mangrove swamp. The Senator knows that the land has all been developed. He would find that mangrove swamps were there, and islands have been built in Biscayne Bay and attached to the beach by bridges.

In addition, the Senator would have noted in the early days that most of the area comprising the city of Hollywood was of the same nature. Much of the area of the southern part of Fort Lauderdale was of the same type land. Mangrove swampland has been the source of much of the development along the gold coast of Florida.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I understand correctly that the Senator calculates that this particular land that would be used for Interama is worth conservatively $50 million?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have been so advised by the leading real estate experts in Miami. Some of them say $60 million.

I have already stated in the RECORD at an earlier time that when I served as Governor of Florida and was chairman of the board that controlled the underwater lands to a depth of 3 feet, such as the lands along the inside of Miami Beach, we sold many thousands of such acres to prospective developers at very high prices, sometimes at many thousands of dollars an acre. Prices have gone up since that time.

This is the largest tract of the same kind of land in the immediate vicinity. It is almost in Miami, as the Senator knows, if he has been there.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will step aside for the moment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It was my understanding that the $50 to $60 million valuation for the land was a valuation which was put on it after development, assuming it is developed. My understanding is that it is not the valuation that was put on it prior to its development. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand the statement that that value has been mentioned by people of great credibility, before any filling was done, because the filling is only a matter of detail, and some expense, but it can be done very easily, as was the case in connection with some 680 acres that has been filled, allowed to settle, and is now ready for construction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yesterday I was told by the Community Facilities Administrator, Mr. Still, that the Community Facilities Administration has committed itself to lend $22 million to be used for the construction of five buildings on the filled-in tract of 676 acres. Does the Senator understand that to be the fact?

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that to be the fact; and that out of that loan, which will then become the usable funds of the Interama Authority, there will be constructed a building for the Federal exhibit.

I know of no case heretofore in which any local group or State has erected a building for the Federal Government. They will also construct a building for the Latin American countries which will participate in this project. The $22 million is secured by a mortgage, which I understand will be a first mortgage as to a part of the area where the construction will take place for the Federal exhibit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is what I am coming to. The authority has authorized the issuance of $21 million worth of bonds, and has sold $8 million of that $21 million?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is true.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And with that $8 million, it has made the fill, primarily?

Mr. HOLLAND. The $8 million, or most of it, was used, as I understand, in the making of the fill of the 680 acres, or thereabouts, which has been fully reclaimed and allowed to settle.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. So they still have authority to sell another $13 million of the initially authorized $21 million worth of bonds.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. Goodbody & Co., which is the bonding firm that handled the issue, as I understand, does not wish to sell those additional bonds until after assurance is given that the Federal Government will participate with an exhibit. The passage of the pending bill would trigger the release of that $13 million, as a portion of the part that I have already stated would be released.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The finances will have been provided by $21 million, through the sale of private bonds?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And $22 million by a loan of the Community Facilities Administration, secured by a second mortgage, with the right to have a first mortgage on that part of the land on which the five buildings are situated to go along with the second mortgage, in the event there is a failure?

Mr. HOLLAND. Let us put it another way: As I understand, the acreage necessary for the construction of the building to house the Federal exhibit and the building will become subject to a first mortgage to the CFA. That is my understanding.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us put it this way: the $21 million mortgage of the private investors is on the entire 1,716 acres?

Mr. HOLLAND. The bond issue, as I understand, is on the entire amount.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the full acreage?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is my understanding.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And it has the first lien?

Mr. HOLLAND. The first lien, except for that portion upon which the construction will take place, and some additional acreage to become secured by a first mortgage lien to the CFA. My feeling is that if there were a second mortgage lien on the entire amount, it would be amply secured, because the property is certainly worth more than these two amounts.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us get this clear: $21 million will be the private borrowing?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will permit me to retract, I am advised by my able assistant that the bond issue is upon only 580 acres of the 680 acres. It is secured by a first mortgage on only 580 acres of that 680, and that 100 acres were retained by the authority. It does not have to be released from the first mortgage, but it has already been retained by the authority, so that it can become subject to a first mortgage to the CFA, which is stating in a different way what I have already stated for the RECORD I regret that I may have given an incorrect impression, but it does not amount to anything. In either case, the CFA receives a first mortgage on the 100 acres where the buildings will be, and the private lenders have a first mortgage on the 580 acres.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not understand that to be the fact. It is my understanding that the private investors will have a mortgage of $21 million on the tract of land, and that will be the first mortgage. The Federal Government, through the Community Facilities Administration, will have a $22 million second mortgage.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand now that the first mortgage securing the $21 million issue pertains only to 580 acres of the 680, and not to the reminder of the tract.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. Still said to me yesterday that the $21 million first mortgage lien will cover only the 676 acres which have thus far been filled. However, I do not believe that is important.

Mr. HOLLAND. Less 100 acres, I should have said.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I see; $21 million will be borrowed from private investors and $22 million from the Community Facilities Administration of the U.S. Government; and, according to the bill, $9.5 million will be given by the U.S. Government to install the exhibit and operate it for 2 years?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The installation of the exhibit will cost a maximum of $7.5 million. It may be that the President's Committee will see fit to reduce that amount. They have the right to do it under the terms of the bill. The additional $2 million is for the operation of the Federal exhibit for the first 2 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So $8 million is now invested by private individuals, with the authority to sell $13 million more of bonds to private individuals.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Twenty-two million dollars to be borrowed from Community Facilities, and $9½ million to be given by the Federal Government for the installation of the exhibit and the operation of the exhibit when it is completed?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is one way to state the situation. I believe the Senator is unintentionally forgetting, however, that the 1,700 acres is the basis of the real credit in this transaction, and that there is no question that it is a highly valuable tract and there is no question that both the individual lenders who are buying the Goodbody bonds and the CFA feel that they are well secured. I thoroughly agree with that conclusion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is to become of the other 1,100 acres after the fill is made, and $31,500,000 of Federal money goes into the project?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not have that information, and I doubt if anyone knows specifically. The land is available for further development, enlargement of the Interama or such other use as would conform to that use, and it belongs to the authority and certainly is not going to be used for any use whatever that does not conform to such use.

My understanding is that the grant of the city of Miami was for the specific purpose of developing Interama.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it possible that the other 1,100 acres may be developed as real estate, and made available for industry, buildings and other structures?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry, I cannot answer the Senator's question. Will the Senator permit me to answer that after I have conferred with the chairman of the Authority, who is present?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. All I can say is that both groups of investors, the Federal Government and the private investors, feel amply secured. I believe they are amply secured, and that the basic value which lies behind the entire enterprise is 1,700 acres of very valuable land, located on the gold coast of Florida, with no strings attached to it, so that it can be encumbered by a first mortgage or a second mortgage, as the case may be.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I regret very deeply that I am in disagreement with the Senator from Florida. He knows of the high regard in which I hold him.

I would feel much more comfortable if I were not compelled by my judgment and my conscience to oppose this program.

If the land is worth $60 million as a swamp, why is the Federal Government being asked to give $9.5 million to construct an exposition hall? Why cannot they finance it themselves?

Mr. HOLLAND. The authority knows perfectly well that they would not be adopting a course which would bring results if they asked and expected their Latin American neighbors to put their exhibits in buildings built for them if the U.S. Government would not put up an exhibit in a building built for it by the authority. Participation by the Federal Government is the first condition for devising a hemispheric program. That is what it is going to be.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that community facilities——

Mr. HOLLAND. I have just been reminded that the chairman of the authority has stated they could pick up the $22 million and the $21 million tomorrow if they wished to do it as Economic Research Associates, the organization which was agreed upon to be the referee by all persons concerned, has submitted a report showing that the project is not only feasible but will also produce much more revenue than is needed for complete retirement. However, the authority does not propose to do that, and cannot do that as a responsible body, unless it first knows that the Federal Government itself will make an exhibit.

It would be inconceivable to me that, in this place so properly located to do this great hemispheric job, the Federal Government would not wish to have representation or to be an exhibitor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I was told yesterday by Mr. Still that a tentative commitment of a $22 million loan has been made, but before any money is paid out on it they wish to know that there will be financing of the exhibit, financing either by a grant from the U.S. Government or financing through the $13 million of unexpended moneys which are authorized to be obtained under the initial bond issue.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not surprised that CFA wishes to know that the Federal Government will exhibit. That is exactly what I believe our Latin American countries will wish to know also, before they participate. However, let me say to the Senator that CFA is obligated today to put up the $22 million. The condition for its agreement was that the ERA—that is, Economic Research Associates—should approve this project as feasible. It agreed to the selection of that very well known body—it is a Los Angeles group—to make the survey.

My understanding is that they are obligated now, this very day, to put it up, but that the authority does not wish to demand either that $22 million, or the $13 million from Goodbody, which is equally committed, until it knows that the Federal Government is committed to going ahead with the exhibit, because it believes that that is the most important single detail in making the fair a successful hemispheric program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the exhibit of the Federal Government, which is now proposed to cost $9.5 million, can be financed either by the authority itself or by the taxpayers of the United States; is that not correct? The Community Facilities Agency does not say, "We will loan the $22 million only on condition that the Federal Government puts up the $9.5 million to finance the U.S. exhibit." They say, "Whoever puts it up, it is acceptable to us."

Mr. HOLLAND. I should think that the authority would not be interested in putting up that money unless it knew that the Federal Government was going to exhibit.

The purpose of the bill is to commit the Federal Government—as we hope it will be committed shortly, by passage of the bill—to exhibit. I believe that when a community has done as much as this one has, as the State has done, and as the public utilities have done—and the whole effort has been pushed thus far with the gifts which, in my opinion, have exceeded $100 million when all are added up—it would be inconceivable to me that the Federal Government, knowing full well the importance of establishing a better relationship and understanding, culturally and otherwise, with Latin America, would not desire to go ahead with this project and become an exhibitor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On that score, we might as well clear up this phase of it.

Mr. HOLLAND. By the way, the $7½ million would not be given to the authority. It would be used by the Federal Government for a special Presidential committee or commission which would be established under the bill to install that part of the exhibit, apart from the building itself, which the Federal Government would utilize.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I invite the attention of the Senator from Florida to page 3 of the report containing the letter written by Phillip S. Hughes, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference in the Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, dated October 13, 1965, third paragraph, beginning with the third sentence:

> Interama differs from the usual World's Fair in that it is intended to be a permanent fair rather than of the 1- or 2-year duration normally associated with World's Fairs. Thus, it will be in continuing competition with other fairs such as HemisFair, for the participation of the U.S. Government, Latin American governments, and United States and foreign industry. H.R. 30 provides for Federal participation for 4 years. Consequently, Federal involvement will not be on the usual 1- or 2-year basis. Furthermore, the fact that Interama is intended to be permanent could pose difficult questions as to what the Federal Government should do at the end of the 4-year period of participation or if Interama encountered financial or other difficulties in subsequent years.

I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the President's Office stated that this bill should not be approved, and that it opposes the bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is not a fact; and I believe that point might as well be cleared up right now.

In the first place, the Senator from Ohio has quoted from Mr. Hughes' letter, and one of his principal objections was that the bill committed the Government to 4 years instead of—and I quote from the letter—"1- or 2-year duration" as customary. Following receipt of that letter, as the Senator knows, because he was a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which considered the bill, the original House bill was amended to change the 4 years to 2 years, which means that the Federal Government will be committed for only 2 years and then will have complete freedom to decide what it wishes to do thereafter. That is the first point.

The second point to which I wish to call attention is the fact that Mr. Hughes' letter is not a complete turndown. I read the last sentence of that letter:

> In all the circumstances we are unable to recommend favorable action on this legislation pending further study of the matter.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I interrupt——

Mr. HOLLAND. I was with President Johnson in the city of Miami when he asked me why I had not announced the fact that the Federal Government was going along with Interama. I told him that I did not wish to make any such announcement until he personally authorized me to do so.

He personally authorized me to do so, and said that it would be well for me to do it at a press conference which was to be held within a few minutes after we had this discussion at the Dupont Plaza Hotel. After the President had covered other matters, he stated to the press that I had an announcement to make, and I made the announcement that the President had authorized me to say he was supporting Interama, and that I had not made the announcement heretofore because I had not had word from the "horse's mouth," so to speak.

That announcement was made at that time. I have never heard of any unwillingness on the part of the President to go ahead with the project. I am telling Senators, and placing it in the RECORD, that the President of the United States made that commitment to me, and then, through my announcement, backed it up and gave complete credibility to what I said in the course of the press conference. So there is much more to that picture than some Bureau of the Budget man saying that until further study is given to the matter he cannot approve it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So far as the record is concerned and so far as the Foreign Relations Committee members are concerned, the record still stands that the President's Office is opposed to this measure; but there has been a modification of the stand in what was supposed to be a private talk between the Senator from Florida and the President. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. No.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It was a public talk?

Mr. HOLLAND. The talk between the President of the United States and myself was in the presence of other members of the Florida delegation, including Senator SMATHERS, and several Members of the House. I see present on the floor of the Senate, Representative PEPPER, who was present. The Governor of our State, Mr. Farris Bryant, was present. We all went together to one of the upper floors of the Dupont Plaza, where there was a sizable auditorium or conference chamber. The members of the press were assembled there in large numbers, as happens in our State or other States when the President honors us with a visit.

After the President had made a statement on his own, he did exactly what I have stated on the record. He said I had an announcement to make. He yielded to me. I made the announcement. I stated the President had authorized me to make the announcement, and I was making it on behalf of the Florida delegation, the Governor, and the authority, all of whom had worked hard on the project, and all of whom were entitled to credit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When was the President there?

Mr. HOLLAND. That was last fall. I do not have the exact date.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This letter is dated——

Mr. HOLLAND. I mean October 1964.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The President was there in October 1964, and this letter is dated October 13, 1965, and the President's Office says it does not support the measure.

Mr. HOLLAND. No.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the record, so far as the Foreign Relations Committee is concerned, and so far as all the evidence it has is concerned, shows that the President's Office is against it. If that is not true, we ought to send the bill back to the committee to find out where the administration stands.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not made any secret of the fact that the President was in favor of the project. The Senator from Florida has repeatedly made that statement to Senators. He has made it repeatedly to the committee. He has made it repeatedly on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Florida calls attention to the fact that the Assistant Director for Legislative Reference of the Bureau of the Budget signed that letter, which ended with the statement, "In all the circumstances we are unable to recommend favorable action on this legislation pending further study of the matter."

This was based on the statement already made, that one of the principal objections was that it went beyond the 1 or 2 year commitment which was customary. The committee—of which I am not a member—for some reason cut the time from 4 to 2 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The time has been cut from 4 to 2 years, but the principle has not changed. The President's Office said, "We do not know what will happen at the end of 4 years." It seems to me that it implies also that they do not know what will happen at the end of 2 years, and that the Government may have to step into it and be in it interminably. The change from 4 to 2 years does not change the principle. The principle involved is that they cannot know what will happen at the end of the second year.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his courtesy. The change from 4 to 2 years was made to meet the objection of the Assistant Director for Legislative Reference; and it did meet his objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield now to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I regret to take exception to the position of the Senator from Florida. In doing so I want to make it clear that I do not question the accuracy of the statement he made about the President. I do not question that the President in October 1964 may have committed himself to this particular proposal; but in October 1965 the President's Office was against it.

I should like to read from a letter sent to our committee by the Bureau of the Budget, signed by Mr. Hughes. Congress obtains opinions of the President through letters sent under the name of the Bureau of the Budget. This is a customary procedure. So when we receive letters from the Budget Director we are dealing with the President of the United States, and the Budget Director's letter expresses strong opposition to the enactment of this bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. The very reason why I was not willing to make the announcement when we were informed by the Community Facilities Administration that it was ready to approve the project and make the loan was basically what the Senator has said. The Senator realizes that the Community Facilities Administration was acting in good faith, and that it could not act against what the President wanted. When the President asked me why I had not announced it, I told him I was unwilling to do so until he personally approved it. He did approve it, and the announcement was made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not talking about the Community Facilities loan. We are acting on a $7.5 million grant as provided for in this bill.

Let me read from the letter signed by Mr. Hughes:

> We believe that the information presented to date does not allow us to determine whether this activity is of sufficiently high priority to warrant the investment of $22 million in the form of a Community Facilities loan and an additional $15 million for initial creation and operation of a Federal exhibit. We have had no real experience with permanent fairs like Interama.

The letter continues:

> If Interama is successful in obtaining Federal funds for its support, other cities of the United States might well seek support for more or less permanent ventures of the same kind. Thus Federal agreement to participate in Interama could constitute a significant precedent, and we believe its implications should be examined with great care.
>
> The report of the State Department suggests further study of the interest of Latin American nations and United States and Latin American industries in participating on a permanent basis in a venture of this sort. We agree, since such participation is vital to the success of the enterprise.
>
> In all the circumstances we are unable to recommend favorable action on this legislation pending further study of the matter.

The letter is signed by Mr. Phillip S. Hughes, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference of the Bureau of the Budget.

If that is an endorsement I hope he does not endorse any bill of which I am in favor. This is a clear statement that the President is against the bill.

If he has changed his mind let us send the bill back to the committee and get another letter telling us so.

There has been a change in the circumstances between October 1964 and October 1965. We have an accelerated war on our hands. We face a deficit of seven to eight billion dollars this year based on the administration's own estimates, and many of us fear it will be more than that. We face an equally high or an even higher deficit next year. Many proposals which are not vital to the security of our country could be postponed, and they should not be acted on favorably at this time. The Director of the Budget writes a letter and gives the President's ideas on the project. We receive many such letters on various bills, and they are the expression of the President's wishes. If the President says we do not need the bill at this time, certainly it should be defeated. It is so seldom that we get administration's support in curtailing expenditures that Congress should jump at the opportunity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator, but first I wish to make one further comment.

In the first place, the Director of the Budget did not sign this letter. Next, the President stated what was said here. The Senator stated he would not question my credibility. He knows the position that I took. In the third place, the Assistant Director for Legislative Reference who did sign it suggested it be held up for further study. His principal reason was that he did not want the 4-year provision.

I note in the Chamber the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Delaware, who are able members of that committee. I also see in the Chamber the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

I notice that in their collective judgment they cut the time from 4 years to 2 years. I would assume they did that seeking to meet the objection of the Budget Bureau or the official in the Bureau of the Budget.

I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Florida referred to the fact that I have the privilege and honor of being the chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. It is in that capacity that I make these comments.

I heartily support this program. I am aware that there have been some problems connected with it. I am aware that in our committee hearings we deemed it necessary to recommend to the Senators from Florida some modifications in the program. We recommended such modifications.

The last point the Senator from Florida made is completely accurate. We did reduce the time to 2 years because we thought it met all of the implied objections that had been raised and, furthermore, provided a reasonable period for the program, so that if any problems developed in connection with it, there would be adequate time to make the corrections without perpetuating any mistake.

I wish to stress above everything else the basis for my support of the measure.

I believe that the Interama project, if wisely developed, can be one of the great cultural and economic projects, as well as educational projects, between the United States and Latin America. We need to build such bridges.

I would rather spend money in developing this type of community institution in Florida, as close to Latin America as it will be, than spend some of the millions of dollars we are now spending in Latin America, which are in my opinion 100 percent waste in some particulars.

I would rather build Interama than spend millions of dollars of military aid in Latin America. In my judgment, that will never bring stabilization to Latin America, but will go to help build revolutions, and in my judgment, place it in the hands of the Communist elements in Latin America.

This is one way to help beat communism in Latin America—by providing another cultural and educational center. Do not overlook the fact that it is planned and designed in this program to develop the center into one of the institutional bridges between the United States and Latin America.

The Senator from Florida knows that I cross-examined the director of the program about the plans for educational development. We talked about the building of a great college of the Americas, a great cultural center, where we can bring Latin-American and American students to learn together problems of the Western Hemisphere. I have no doubt that there are problems to work out. There must be a beginning—$7.5 million as a beginning, with a million dollars a year to meet maintenance costs for 2 years.

As the Senator from Florida knows, it was a little difficult to convince me that we should limit it to $7.5 million. My colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee know I thought it should be $12 million because I think that should be the minimum to do the job.

I agree with the critics of the program that there are going to have to be improvements in it. However, in my judgment, the objectives of this program are sound. The potentialities of the program are great. When I am urging adoption of the program this afternoon I am urging the building of a needed bridge between my country and Latin America on which there can be two-way traffic, whereby we take into Latin America the benefit of our cultural development, whereby we take into Latin America better understanding of the economic pressure we have in fighting communism.

But they will have to come to learn more about our economic system in the many places in Latin America where there will be commingling of citizens of the United States and Latin America; and better understanding of a common problem that faces us in years ahead.

It would also be a bridge over which we would be able to transport into Latin America a great many economic benefits that would flow from that institution.

I cannot think of anything more dramatic and vital than a bridge where young people from Latin America and the United States, as they interchange between the United States and Latin America, the young people of the next generation and generations to come, will learn the necessity of standing together in support of what we believe is the need of economic freedom in Latin America.

One may say that my approach is highly idealistic. I have been criticized for this before.

We have an opportunity to demonstrate in Latin America that we are willing to be of assistance in the type program the Interama institution seeks to inaugurate. I give it my enthusiastic support.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend from Oregon for his eloquent and factual consideration of this subject.

It seems to me that people have overlooked the fact that while we are in trouble in Vietnam and elsewhere, we are certainly not finding everything in good shape in our relations with our three closest neighbors, the ones causing us the most anxiety, close to Miami, Fla.; namely, Cuba, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic. Miami is the bottleneck through which many people are passing each year, between Latin America and this country. My information is that last year the number was 2 million.

I thank the Senator with all my heart for his eloquent statement on this subject.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish the Senator from Oregon would remain in the Chamber.

Mr. MORSE. I will. However, I must go to court. The Senator and I are lawyers, and he knows that we do not keep courts waiting. I will answer a question or two.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to answer the Senator's statement.

Mr. MORSE. I know what the answer will be. I shall read it when I get the RECORD.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon speaks as if he were the voice of the Foreign Relations Committee. There are 17 members on that committee. Those 17 members did not approve of the bill. They sent it to the floor without recommendation. In other words, they said, "We will not stain our hands with a recommendation."

Where in the committee report does the Foreign Relations Committee recommend passage of the bill?

We did not recommend passage of the bill because we were officially informed by the President's Office that the President's Office did not approve the measure.

The Senator from Oregon has made a statement about this medium being used to cement relations between the inhabitants of South and Central America and the United States.

In the Foreign Relations Committee his argument was that we should establish a university down there. He did not speak about the establishment of an exposition hall, which would profit the hotels, merchants, and businessmen of Florida. It was not contemplated, except as a convenient argument, that this proposal would produce the millennium; and that after the Interama was established all difficulties would vanish.

Now I put the question. San Antonio is asking for $15 million. San Antonio is celebrating its 250th anniversary. The argument is: "We are on the border of Mexico. We are next door to Central America and South America. If you will help us build a $15 million auditorium for our 250th anniversary, it will help to cement our relations with South America and Central America."

In 1962, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] came before the Senate and asked for $10 million to build an auditorium in Seattle. Congress granted the $10 million. The argument then was that that sum would cement relations between the Orient and the United States. Every time a bill of this type is brought before this body, that type of argument is made.

Congress pumped $17,500,000 into New York. The argument made in that case was that it was necessary for a great international exposition. It was said, "When we are through, friendship and tranquillity will prevail."

I regret that I have to lift my voice in this way, but this argument has been made. It is the basis of the new, indefensible, infamous pork-barrel program of the U.S. Congress.

I shall speak further on these matters later and show how these proposals were developed, and how finally a proposal was conceived to get the Federal Government to throw into Miami, with all its wealth and with its gold coast, $22 million plus $15 million of the ordinary taxpayers' money.

An attempt was made to promote the exposition privately, but it could not be done. Then some of the many lobbyists who are here—they have infested the halls of the Capitol, and they have contacted Senators. At least they have contacted me—bankers, lawyers, friends—asking me to lay off. I will not do it.

I should like to help Senator HOLLAND; I should like to help Senator SMATHERS; I should like to help Representative PEPPER. But I will not sell my conscience down the river merely for the gaining of friendship. I will pass on this proposal on its merits.

Let us consider what has happened: $17,500,000 was granted to New York; $10 million to Seattle; $15 million to San Antonio; and now it is proposed to grant $9,500,000 to Florida. Alaska asked for $7,500,000 of U.S. taxpayers' money to build an auditorium at Sitka, having 5,000 people, the auditorium to cost $1 million.

Each of these programs has the same facade and the same arguments, and ultimately makes the same draft on the taxpayers' money.

We are confronted today with a most novel situation. Seventeen members of the Committee on Foreign Relations read the documents from the President's Office. We were told that the President's Office did not support this proposal because of the uncertainties involved in it. But today, contrary to all practices—and I am not blaming the Senator from Florida for it—contrary to every principle which dictates hearings, we are asked to accept as an approval of the program conversations had between Senator HOLLAND, Representative PEPPER, the Governor of Florida, and the President, when he was in Florida on a tour in 1964, in which, it is said, he approved of the project, while on paper, from the White House, the Budget Office, in 1965, the word is given to us that they do not approve it.

The bill should be returned to the Committee on Foreign Relations. If the President approves the proposal, we ought to have a new letter from the Bureau of the Budget. The President need not express it; he never does, as the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has said.

Let us add up the cost of the several programs: $17.5 million for New York; finally, $3 million to Alaska, which makes a total of $20.5 million; $10 million to Seattle, which makes $30.5 million; $15 million to San Antonio, which will make a total of $45.5 million; and now, $9.5 million for Miami.

Miami, it is said, is suffering hunger and distress; the money is needed there. Ah, yes; the argument that Miami needs Federal aid is most appealing. Send it to the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York, and the argument would be just as sound.

Think of how much good could be done with this $50 million in different directions—much more than helping neighborhoods to build their auditoriums. Cleveland has built its own. So have Chicago, Houston, Pittsburgh, and Detroit. Auditoriums and stadiums have been built with State money. But now we have a new pork-barrel money proposal. That is all it is. It is a pork-barrel program, Representative PEPPER, nothing less.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, nobody could ever claim that my dear friend Senator LAUSCHE is not convinced of the soundness of his own position. However, votes taken in the Senate over a period of years would indicate that although he has frequently taken positions based on a sound conscience of his own, the Senate has rarely agreed with him, and I do not believe the Senate will agree with him today.

Of the 17 members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I notice that four joined in filing what they call minority views. In the interest of saving time, I shall read only one sentence from the minority views:

> There is no reason why the Senate should now be asked to judge this matter in the final hours of the session.

The minority views are signed by Senators LAUSCHE, FULBRIGHT, WILLIAMS, and CLARK, the last-named by Senator LAUSCHE.

My own feeling is that all the other members of that committee approve this measure. They will support it when the vote is taken. Senators will see for themselves how they feel about the measure.

Florida does not happen to be in the position of having to come here with hat extended for contributions. We are just now getting through with the first quadricentennial celebration in the Nation at St. Augustine. There is no Federal money involved in that project. No Federal money was granted for it. Spain built a fine building. The Catholic Church built various buildings. The State of Florida built a very fine building. Some unknown business donor built a building for the Pan American Union, the Organization of American States. But the Federal Government has no building there. We did not ask the Federal Government to put up a building there. So we are not exactly in the classification in which some of the other groups may have been, that have been cited by my dear friend, the Senator from Ohio.

Furthermore, I want to make it very clear that I know of no case in which the private community or the public—not the Federal Government—has offered to put up an exhibition building for the Federal Government. That is the case here. I know of no case in which as much has been given and as little asked in the way of Federal participation.

In my judgment, more than $100 million is involved, including the value of the land, and the Federal Government is asked to participate in the installation of its exhibit, which will be an outstanding one. It will be based mostly on electronics, sight and sound, in four languages, so that the races of this hemisphere can communicate with one another. The exhibit is to cost $9.5 million, including $2 million for 2 years' operation after its installation.

I do not believe that the Senate will find that the State of Florida, the Interama Authority, the city of Miami, and the other agencies have come here with their hats in hand.

We want the Federal Government to participate in an effort which we think is fraught with very great value for us and for all of this hemisphere.

I do not believe it is necessary to make any further comment at this time. Unless there are further questions, I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor I should like to ask him a couple of questions.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, would this 1,716 acres to be designated as the area for Interama be subject to a real estate tax by either the State of Florida or the local communities?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the State of Florida has no real estate tax, as my friend, the Senator from Delaware, may remember. We are one of the States that abolished that as a State tax a long time ago.

This property belongs to the State of Florida. The authority is an arm of the State of Florida. Any further use of the area, beyond this 680 acres, would have to be approved by the State of Florida. The State of Florida has a great interest in the entire program. It has already demonstrated that by the contributions made by the State itself and by various other lesser units of government. It is not proposed to lessen this effort now. Anything that the State of Florida would do with the remainder of that land would be commendable and would add to the value of this very fine project, the first construction of which will be on this first reclaimed 680 acres.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am asking the question merely for the purpose of information; we want this information as a part of the record. Would this property be taxable by the State of Florida, the city of Miami, or any other governmental subdivision?

Mr. HOLLAND. It would not; and neither was the 1,716 acres taxable when it did not belong to the city of Miami. It has not been taxable for a long time. I do not know when the city acquired it, but from the time that the public unit acquired it, the property has not been subject to any kind of taxation. That is not new.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand. In the committee hearing a letter was placed in the record by one of the citizens supporting the project. The letter outlined the fact that a part of the plan was to build some kind of spectacular tower on the Interama property. It was decribed as being greater perhaps than the Statue of Liberty.

I noticed that there was an article in the Miami press of December 15 to the effect that Interama is being sued by the group that proposed to build this tower.

What is the status of that suit, and how would it affect the equity in the project?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad to tell the distinguished Senator that, while the suit was brought because the Authority was not able to go forward at that very time, the suit has been dismissed since that time. Until the passage of this legislation, the Authority did not feel that it would be justified in building a great tower there with nothing else on the 680 acres.

I have before me a paper signed by Mr. William W. Gibbs, the attorney for the Interama Center Authority, under date of January 18, stating that on "January 11, 1966, the circuit court granted our motion to dismiss the complaint." So that is behind us.

I know that the Senator will be glad to have that information.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I merely wish to make it clear for the RECORD.

The Senator speaks of a $21 million bond issue which has been sold. As I understand it only $8 million of that bond issue has been sold and $13 million still remains to be sold.

Mr. HOLLAND. Eight million dollars has been delivered. Goodbody has contracted to take the entire amount. The Authority has not asked for the delivery of the remainder of this amount, awaiting the passage of this legislation.

The Authority is unwilling to ask them to take the remainder of those bonds until the Authority knows that this legislation has become law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Assume that this legislation does not become law and that the Authority decides to proceed anyway and asks the group to pick up the remainder of the bonds. Would they be bound to take those bonds, or are they merely selling them for a fee?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not able to say because I have not seen the contract. But my understanding is that they have obligated themselves to take the bonds, and that they have a first mortgage security on most of the 680 acres to completely secure the issuance of that bond issue.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We should have an answer to that question. We are speaking of $21 million as though it were already committed. Yet only approximately $8 million has been put up. Is the commitment to put up the other $13 million an irrevocable commitment?

Mr. HOLLAND. The $13 million is listed in the papers that I cited today, showing that that $13 million is available with which to start construction, along with other funds which have been mentioned. It would be available as soon as this legislation became law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But suppose that this does not become law. I should like to get it clear that there is an irrevocable commitment on the part of Goodbody that they will take these bonds regardless of any action of the Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is my belief. I shall be glad to see if I can get more accurate or more complete information. My assistant, who has gone into the matter fully, says that that is correct, that they are completely committed to complete the purchase of the bonds, and to that extent they are completely secured.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then further progress of this program is not entirely dependent upon the Senate giving its approval; the project could proceed without Federal approval?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, if we were foolish enough to do that. But does the Senator believe that the Latin American nations will put up their money—and they do not have much of it—if the U.S. Government is not sufficiently interested to do the same thing? The Senator from Florida does not think so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is my understanding that much of the loan to be provided by Community Facilities—an additional $22 million—is to be used to erect buildings for the Latin American countries. They are not going to build them anyway. Under the plans we are going to build them.

Mr. HOLLAND. With the $22 million and the $13 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is my understanding that this direct grant of $9.5 million and the $22 million from the Community Facilities will be used to finance our exhibit and the buildings that will be used, the Senator hopes, by the Latin American countries.

Uncle Sam will be paying for the buildings, either by grant or a 4-percent loan, second mortgage.

Mr. HOLLAND. All I know is that a group representing the Interama Authority, consisting of four distinguished architects, three of them of international reputation, who have been selected to do the architectural work, have recently returned from a trip through the principal nations of South America. It is their information that there is very great interest in those countries. They are only waiting until the Federal Government comes in and then they will be interested in coming in. This group of architects conferred not only with architects, but with officials, in one instance with the President of the country himself, and they have come back with the report that the Latin American countries are not only interested, but are hoping to move ahead just as soon as they know that the U.S. Government itself is willing to proceed with an exhibit.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Do I understand they are willing to put up the money to erect their buildings there if we do not do it

Mr. HOLLAND. No, no. The Authority is building the buildings, not only for the U.S. Government but also the other governments. Does the Senator know of any other exhibition in which this kind of treatment has been given to our own country and neighboring countries?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator now says that the State of Florida or the Authority is going to build all these buildings. What is this $22 million from the community facilities to be used for?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is a loan to the Authority, a secured loan, and it certainly will be within the power of the Authority to use as its own when the money is received.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. So the State of Florida is willing to build those buildings if the U.S. Government puts up through loans the money to pay for them, and the loans the Government will make, as I understand it, will bear an interest rate not to exceed 4 percent, secured by a second mortgage on the 1,700 acres while the first mortgage bonds, which will be tax exempt, are drawing 5¼ percent.

Mr. HOLLAND. All I can say is that the funds available will be used, both the funds coming from the Community Facilities Administration and what part is needed of the balance of the bond issue, for the construction of these buildings.

Evidently the people who are putting up the money, not only for the Federal Government but also those who represent the bond purchasers, feel that they are well secured, or they would not have committed themselves as they have. I believe they are perfectly secured.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I understand it, the Senator thinks the commitment is made, but he is not exactly positive. Assuming for the moment that it is, we still have this situation——

Mr. HOLLAND. Of what commitment is the Senator speaking?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The commitment to buy the first bonds issued.

Mr. HOLLAND. My assistant, who is in a position to know, assures me that that commitment has irrevocably been made, and the only reason the money has not been called for and delivered is that the Authority is not willing to start its construction program—and I commend it for that feeling of responsibility—until it knows that the Federal Government, in turn, is committed to becoming an exhibitor there.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The testimony before the committee was that the Authority allowed a 5-percent discount in selling the bonds, which means this 5¼-percent bond is being sold at 95. So we understand that these first mortgage bonds, with tax-exempt interest, are being sold on a 5¼-percent yield at 95 percent of par. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not able to say. The first mortgage covers only the 580 acres, the security that is given on that particular issue.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Well, now the Senator has me confused. What about the other 1,200 acres?

Mr. HOLLAND. The first mortgage on the 580 acres, which is the 680 acres that has been reclaimed, less the 100 acres on which construction is to take place.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But all of the 1,700 acres will be used as collateral for the first mortgage, will it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. Only the 580 acres, as I understand.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then the first mortgage holders will have claim only on the 580 acres and will not have claim on the other 1,100 acres. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is my latest understanding. I shall confirm that, and furnish the facts to the Senator and place them in the Record, so there can be no question left about that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish the Senator would, because the testimony before the committee was that the first mortgage would cover all of the 1,700 acres and the Government loan would be second.

Mr. HOLLAND. I had also understood it that way. I am informed this morning by my assistant that it was the other way. We will produce the facts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It does make a difference, particularly to the bondholders, whether they have a first mortgage on 580 acres or on 1,700 acres. My understanding of the testimony before the committee was that it was a mortgage on the entire area, that there would be a first mortgage drawing 5¼ percent interest, and that it would be sold at 95 percent of par. If the situation is otherwise and there is only a mortgage on the 680 acres then who claims the first mortgage on the 1,100 acres? We were told earlier this afternoon, or at least I understood it that way, that the Government would have a second mortgage on all of the 1,700 acres. Now, who does have the first mortgage on the 1,100 if we are second?

Mr. HOLLAND. We will have complete information on the subject in a few minutes. The chairman of the Authority is in the Chamber. We will have the information in such form that there cannot be any question about it. My information has already been stated for the Record, but I shall adjust that to meet the actual facts as soon as we have them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is my understanding, and apparently the Senator from Florida understood it the same way, that the CFA loan would have second mortgage on the entire 1,700 acres and that the first mortgage represents this $21 million that was sold earlier. We now understand that this was an irrevocable sale, $8 million of which has been distributed, with $13 million to go. These points should be clarified because confusion exists at present.

Mr. HOLLAND. I repeat, we shall place the full facts in the Record within a very few minutes. I have already stated my understanding of the situation.

I wish to state, before I sit down at this time, that there is no doubt about one thing, and that is that the people buying the bonds think they are 100 percent secure, or they would not be buying them; and there is no question about CFA feeling that they are 100 percent secured, or they would not have committed themselves to making that loan in the amount of $22 million. So I think we are doing a lot of talking about details here, which had better be cleared up simply by putting the facts in the Record, which we propose to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. President, I yield the floor at this time, but first I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point a letter dated October 18, 1965, addressed to the chairman of the committee, and signed by Peter MacGregor Fraser of the Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co., in which he stated that as a result of uncertainties surrounding the matter their group has disposed of its bonds and is withdrawing from participation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Connecticut Mutual Life
Insurance Co.,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. James W. Fulbright,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Fulbright: For many years I have been investing funds in Florida in my capacity as former president and chairman of the Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co. The investments were not only in utilities but, also, in groves, ranches, farms, highways, hotels, and hospitals, and I have just returned from Miami where I was instrumental in doing a large piece of financing for one of the hospitals.

Having read in the Miami paper that you were opposed to our Government making any additional contributions to Interama I thought I might tell you that I made a study of the Interama situation and recommended to my associates that we get rid of our bonds, which we did. This recommendation was made only after contacting many responsible and sound thinking people in the Miami area.

I just wanted to write and tell you how much I agree with you.

Sincerely,

Peter MacGregor Fraser.

Mr. HOLLAND. I expect that one of the uncertainties the writer of the letter is talking about was the passage of the pending legislation, which has a great deal to do with the entire program.

I yield the floor.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I object.

We are trying to acquaint the Members of the Senate with what I consider to be the bad features of the pending bill. We cannot hope to get any Senators on the floor if they are going to be in committee meetings. I have already consented to one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is a subcommittee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is folly for us to try to present our argument with nobody on the floor; in fact, it is insulting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withdraw his objection?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER IN DADE COUNTY, FLA.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 30) to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by Senator Smathers, who is necessarily absent, in support of the pending measure be inserted in the Record at this time.

Senator Smathers is currently recuperating from an illness, but he has still managed to keep in constant touch with me on this proposal. I am sure that all his colleagues here in the U.S. Senate sincerely trust and hope that he will have a speedy recovery.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Smathers

I am sure that all of us here in this body are familiar with the substance of the pending bill, and as a result I will not take the time of the Senate to go into a detailed explanation.

Briefly stated, the proposal was reported to the Senate on October 22, 1965, by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It would authorize the President, through such Federal department or agency as he may designate, to provide for U.S. participation in what is commonly referred to as Interama at Dade County, Fla.

The purpose of the measure is to provide for a permanent international center which will serve as a meeting ground for the governments and industries of the Western Hemisphere and other areas of the world; to facilitate prompt and continuous exchanges of ideas, persons, and products through cultural, educational, and other exchanges, and, by other appropriate means, to promote mutual understanding between the peoples of the Western Hemisphere to strengthen the ties which unite the United States with other nations of the free world.

In addition, it would authorize the President to invite participation by other States of the Union and by foreign countries of the free world.

A report would be made to the Congress with respect to the proposed nature, extent, and cost of U.S. participation and anticipated foreign and private industry participation.

The proposal would authorize an appropriation of $7½ million annually for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for maintenance of U.S. activities and installations at Interama.

I am of the strong view that the Senate language contained in the pending measure is reasonable and proper and that the sum authorized is adequate to carry forward the purposes of the legislation before us.

The Interama concept is not a new one. It dates back more than 2 decades. I note that in a report of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce dated November 15, 1965, executive vice president Harold Colee states that the Florida Chamber of Commerce has been on record in support of Interama since 1939.

The project has been endorsed by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, and by the Organization of American States. I might also point out that by a joint resolution adopted in 1950, Congress itself endorsed this proposal.

The State of Florida has given Interama its full support. In 1951, the State legislature created the Interama Authority as a corporate agency and in 1963 the legislature memorialized the President to lend his full support to the program.

The State road department has pledged the construction of interior and access highways for the 1,700-acre Interama site located near Miami. Revenue bonds have been validated and sold to finance basic improvements to the land.

The Interama Authority has obtained a commitment for a $22 million Community Facilities Administration loan to be used to construct the pavilions which will house the international exhibits, including that of the United States.

Interama is ready to proceed with the development of an international center which I believe will further the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

We are all aware that Latin America is in ferment today. It is a hemisphere of young people—with half of a population of 250 million under age 20.

Latin America is also experiencing unprecedented population growth of roughly 3 percent a year. By 1980 it is estimated that the population growth will reach 380 million.

The population increase, the high number of young people in the population, all point to the very pressing need for development of industry and a mature economy for an area which is rapidly urbanizing.

The population growth means the job force will swell to vast numbers—a growth of some 40 million persons by 1975, yet with only 5 million more jobs, based on the present employment rate.

I believe that Interama will be a valuable tool in advancing the cause of the free world. Its location in Florida will make it highly accessible to Latin America.

Furthermore, the establishment of Interama in Dade County, Fla., will help provide additional jobs for an area which ranks second to New York City in admission of aliens to these shores.

Most of these persons are Cuban refugees. Although more than 170,000 have entered the Miami area since 1961, the resumption of a Federal airlift on December 1, 1965, is once more bringing Cubans to the Miami area at the rate of 900 individuals per week. While many will be relocated, others will remain or return to Miami, either requiring Federal assistance or competing in the tourist and service industry economy for jobs.

There are many other reasons for supporting Interama. I believe it will be a useful and valid program which can lend valuable assistance to our national efforts to join hands with Latin America and find a better way of life for all Americans, North and South.

I urge the favorable consideration of the pending measure and feel confident the Senate will pass the bill by an overwhelming majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland].

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was this vote on the two amendments which I had proposed en bloc earlier in the day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote has been taken and the amendments en bloc have been approved.

Mr. MANSFIED. Mr. President, has third reading been ordered?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 3 Leg.]

Aiken
Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] are necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have been confronted with a very unpleasant duty today. I would feel much more comfortable if I could give support to the measure that is pending before the Senate. Because of my deep friendship with Senator Holland, Senator Smathers, and Representative Pepper, if the issue were to be decided on friendship and affection I would have to give it support. But I cannot give it support on the basis of its merits.

I have repeatedly pointed out on the floor of the Senate the new "pork barrel" technique that has been developed in the Congress in the last 5 years. The technique is that when there is wanted a stadium, and by coincidence there is a centennial or a sesquicentennial celebration, a program is developed where the local community says, "We will promote a civic center, and in the promotion of the civic center the State government, the county government, and the municipal government will invest. And inasmuch as these three governmental units are making investments we feel that the Government of the United States ought to come in and also participate."

To illustrate what I have in mind, I would invite the attention of Senators to the San Antonio program as it has been promoted. San Antonio will be celebrating its 250th anniversary within the next few years. The local civic leaders and government officials decided to establish a center. They submitted a bond issue in San Antonio for the approval of the people. I believe it was for $35 million. The citizens approved it. The State government decided that it would construct a $5 million building in the center.

When those two things were done they came to the Congress. My recollection is that they wanted $15 million originally, but that has not as yet been decided.

In the Committee on Foreign Relations hearings were held, I asked the witness: "This $35 million bond issue that you say the citizens of San Antonio approved and invested, what will it be used for?"

The answer was, "We intend to buy land; build a stadium and governmental structures for the housing of offices."

I asked, "What will the buildings that is to be constructed by the State at a cost of $5 million be used for?" The answer, "For State office buildings."

The question was asked, "That means that San Antonio will buy the land, construct needed public buildings, and become the owner of them," and the answer, of course, was "Yes."

The further question was asked, "The State of Texas will construct an office building that will be of utility and will be used in the future," and the answer was "Yes."

I asked the question, "What is the building that the U.S. Government is going to construct with the money of taxpayers to be used for?" The answer was "for an auditorium."

What use will the U.S. Government have of the auditorium after the exposition is completed? No use whatsoever.

Thus, the local and State money is being used for the acquisition of land and the construction of buildings that will permanently be used. But the money of the U.S. Government is being used for a structure that will be used by the U.S. Government for 1 or 2 years and then become the property, for use at least, of the local interests.

I have already made much about the argument that this proposal would cement relations between the people of the United States and Central and South America. This argument was made with respect to San Antonio. It is made now with respect to the Miami project. It was made with respect to the Seattle, Wash., project. It was made with regard to the New York exposition. It is an argument that supposedly has popular appeal—that if the Government puts in $10 or $15 million it will contribute to the development of amicable foreign relations.

This particular argument is one that is used for convenience; in fact, it has no relationship to the merits whatsoever. It is advanced in committees, advanced on the floor of the Senate, and by some seized as an excuse for giving support to the new pork barrel technique. I do not think I can overrepeat this proposal. If the Government contributes $9.5 million—instead of $15 million, after the amendment—to Florida, why does not the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] develop a project for an auditorium in New Mexico? Why does not the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] develop one for Delaware? The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has already developed one for Alaska. The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is in the process of developing one for Texas.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I am surprised that the distinguished Senator from Ohio used such a denunciatory term as "pork barrel" legislation. It is nothing of the kind, so far as Alaska is concerned. These are worthy, constructive projects incidental to the centennial celebration of the purchase of Alaska, projects desirable and needed by a State that during 92 years of its stepchildhood was neglected and excluded from many of the advantages that other States of the Union, including Ohio, enjoyed.

I noticed that in his previous attacks at the last session of Congress on the centennial fund the Senator from Ohio based his opposition on what he termed the small population of the city of Sitka, the city of Juneau, the city of Anchorage, and other Alaskan communities. But he did not make any reply when he was asked what was the population of Columbus, of Cleveland, and of Cincinnati at the time Ohio came into the Union. If the Senator from Ohio would only give Alaska a chance to grow, we might catch up with Ohio, or at least secure some of the advantages which Ohio has enjoyed for more than a century and a half but which Alaska has been denied.

In Alaska we do not indulge in the pollution of lakes and rivers, although Ohio has become conspicuous for its pollution of Lake Erie. We seek to keep our beautiful lakes and streams clear, pure, and undefiled.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am rather hesitant about pointing out these facts with respect to the Alaska proposal. Sitka, Alaska, having a population of 6,690, is planning the construction of a centennial center to be used primarily for the performance of the Alaska Day Pageant. The building will also be used as a convention and exhibit area.

Sitka, Alaska, has a population of 6,690. The money asked for is $1,660,000. That amount is asked to build an auditorium in a town having a population of 6,000. How can one justify an answer of affirmation to that proposal on the basis of reason and on the basis of proper, sound approach?

Let us look at the other requests for Alaska. Anchorage, Alaska, has a population of 66,550. The proposed auditorium is for convention purposes. The amount asked is $5 million. For the city of Anchorage, having a population of 66,000, the Federal Government is asked to build structures at a cost of $5 million.

How many towns in the country having populations of 6,000 would dare to say to the citizenry, "We are going to build an auditorium for convention purposes at a cost of $1,660,000?" Anyone who would make a proposal of that type to a community of 6,600 population would be challenged most vigorously by the people. That is why I challenged the program as it came before the Senate last fall.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator from Ohio understand that the people of Alaska are prepared to match the Federal contribution dollar for dollar, showing that they have a real concern and a real willingness to make sacrifices for these purposes?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would go to those 6,600 people who want a $1,660,000 auditorium and say to them, "You are not using good judgment. If the Federal Government puts up $1,600,000 and the community matches it with $1,660,000, what are they going to build in that town of 6,600 people:

The Senator from Alaska talks about Ohio being small at one time. We did not get any auditorium with taxpayers' money. Cleveland has an auditorium and a stadium; but the people of Cleveland paid for them with Cleveland taxpayers' money. We did not join the parade of glee and joy and come to Washington, knowing that there is a great propensity here to give money for any and every conceivable scheme that is concocted by fantastic minds in local communities.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. If I were a citizen of Cleveland, I would be so ashamed of the pollution of the lake front at my door that I would not oppose the efforts of other States to develop. I would ask, "Why have we not cleaned up this mess which man has created?"

The Senator speaks about the initiative of the people of Cleveland in building an auditorium. Why do they not show equal initiative in clearing up the pollution in Lake Erie?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad the Senator from Alaska asked that question. Cleveland has its sewage disposal plants.

It is proposed to pump $60 million into the construction of auditoriums. I suggest that it would be much better if the $60 million could have been distributed to Detroit, Chicago, Toledo, Sitka, and Fairbanks for the installation of sewage disposal plants. If priority is to be established, $60 million could better be used for constructive purposes, instead of for the building of convention halls.

Mr. GRUENING. These auditoriums are for the purpose of enlightening the people. They will be forums for public discussion, where good ideas the propagation of which is desirable might get larger audiences, than they might otherwise have.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I suppose so. Let us build auditoriums in every town and hamlet, and along every little stream in the country, with the taxpayers' money, which the Senator from Alaska so gladly wishes to pay out.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I have, of course, a strong distaste for disagreeing with my good and distinguished friend from Ohio, whose leadership I have followed on numerous occasions, and whose conviction and strength of conviction I have always admired. But I think I should be remiss if I did not point out that San Antonio has not promoted a federally financed auditorium for itself. San Antonio has obtained a grant of only $125,000 to study the feasibility of Federal participation in the HemisFair, which has already gained considerable financial support from private, State, and local sources.

I point out that whatever amount the Federal Government may spend in San Antonio for the HemisFair will be but a drop in the bucket, really, compared with what will be spent by private, State, and local sources.

State and local expenditures will be many times over whatever amount the Federal Government may spend. And, too, San Antonio did not ask for an auditorium. They asked for a feasibility study which they have gotten now. This would be to determine the extent of Federal participation in the HemisFair, which does not necessarily comprehend the construction of an auditorium, but a suitable building in which the United States may put its best face forward. It is an exposition that would involve all of the nations of this hemisphere. I think it would serve as a stimulus to trade in this hemisphere.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

I should like to point out to him that it is a fact that San Antonio came before the Senate and asked for a mere appropriation of $125,000.

Mr. TOWER. They asked for $250,000. And after conference with the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], my distinguished senior colleague, Senator YARBOROUGH, and I worked out an accord whereby $125,000 would be the amount.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The basis of that request, however, was the contemplation of the United States putting in at least $10 million.

Mr. TOWER. It could be that amount. It could be less or more. All we asked for was a feasibility study. We want the United States to look into the matter to see if it is feasible for the United States to participate, and to what extent. We did not ask for a certain amount.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator understand that Miami is asking for this money without a study?

Mr. TOWER. I am not addressing myself to the Miami issue. I am talking about San Antonio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Miami program came in here last January. It has been pressed. No request has been made that a study be had to ascertain whether the program is sound. In that respect, the San Antonio program is on a much healthier base than is the Florida program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in line with that, the Director of the Budget wrote a letter to our committee and recommended that the bill be postponed until such a study was made, as was done in the case of San Antonio.

I quote from the letter:

> In all the circumstances we are unable to recommend favorable action on this legislation pending further study of the matter.

I believe that in this instance we should send the bill back to the committee until such a study has been completed so that we may have a report on the feasibility. I repeat, it is the recommendation of the administration that no action be taken on this bill at this time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I do not care how vociferous the argument is made that these programs are not the consequence of a pork barrel operation. I followed the history of this program since the Seattle exhibit of 1962.

It would be interesting to get a little of the background of that exhibit. The bill came before the Committee on Foreign Relations. Fifteen million dollars was asked for the construction of an exposition hall. We insisted in the committee that the bill be amended so as to require the construction of a building that could be used for U.S. Government offices after the exposition.

The bill was so amended, as I thought. The exposition is completed. The building is now being rented for $1 a year for exposition purposes, after the Government put $10 million into it.

A very interesting and, to me, a perplexing and confusing problem has developed regarding this bill.

Bills that come before the Senate are referred to committees. The committees conduct hearings. They receive reports from various departments of the Federal Government and from the President's Office, expressing the attitude of the interested departments and the Bureau of the Budget concerning the virtue of the bill being considered.

With respect to the pending bill, we have received letters from various departments. I have here a letter, dated October 13, 1965, from the Executive Office of the President, the Bureau of the Budget. The letter is addressed to Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The letter states that the Bureau of the Budget, and the Executive Office of the President, cannot support the bill. Although this material has already been read, I wish to read it again. The letter states:

> We believe that the information presented to date does not allow us to determine whether this activity is of sufficiently high priority to warrant the investment of $22 million in the form of a community facilities loan and an additional $15 million for initial creation and operation of a Federal exhibit. We have had no real experience with permanent fairs like Interama.

Mr. President, I call particular attention to these words:

> If Interama is successful in obtaining Federal funds for its support, other cities of the United States might well seek support for more or less permanent ventures of the same kind.

I respectfully ask Senators who are present to ask themselves this question: If this bill is passed, is it not likely that other communities in the United States will be coming before the Congress, asking for gifts of money to build exposition halls? When they come before the Congress next year and in the years to follow, if this money is given to Miami, how are we going to turn down other communities?

Try as hard as I might to persuade myself otherwise, I can only, in good conscience, say that those questions must be answered in the affirmative. If we give Miami $9½ million, we will not be able to turn down anyone else asking for moneys to build exposition halls. That has been demonstrated since the argument that was made against the Washington exposition. It was argued by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself, when the $10 million was given to Washington, that if we give it to Seattle, we will have to give it to everyone else who comes to the Congress with similar requests.

How have they come in? I wish to repeat it. New York came in and wanted $25 million, and we gave it $17½ million. Seattle received $10 million. Florida wanted $15 million. Its request is now reduced to $9½ million.

With due deference to the argument of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], I am happy to commend him for the fact that he joins in asking for a study to determine whether the Federal Government should go into San Antonio. But not the Miami people. They want the money given to them without a study.

There was a study with respect to Seattle, Wash., also, and I believe with regard to New York.

But take a look at the New York exposition. It has proved to be the worst fiasco imaginable. I do not know how many millions of dollars of taxpayers' money have gone into the New York exposition. Everybody who has studied it describes it as an absolute failure. The underwriters of New York were supposed to be reimbursed. The city of New York was supposed to be reimbursed for the moneys which it put up. But the exposition proved a financial failure.

Now, the Miami people say, "Ours will be a financial success. You can take our word for it. Millions of people will come to Florida. The South American nations will give it exhibits, and fiscally, when it is all over, everybody will be happy."

One group will be happy, and that is the citizens of Florida who are in the vicinity of Interama, if it attracts people to visit or move into Florida. But I am not so sure that the taxpayers are going to be happy.

The prediction of great financial success is one which, by compulsion, they must present. Without that argument, their entire case would fail. With regard to every such request, the argument will be heard that it will promote trade, promote amicable international relations, and prove financially feasible. Those arguments have been made before, and I predict that they will be made in the years to come, unless we now stop this pork-barreling.

Mr. President, when the Alaska issue was before us last September, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I, and one or two other Senators argued against it, and we finally got the amount requested whittled down to $3 million. But while the Senator from Delaware and I were arguing, here was a reserve of Senators from interested States, standing side by side like football players waiting to jump into the fight.

Such support is being received by Florida today. Certainly it will get it, because this is a "you rub my back and I will rub yours" proposition. They begin with 10 votes—those of the five States which have already had these programs. And as time goes on, the situation will grow worse and worse, because everyone will want to get his ladle into the Federal Treasury.

We have a town by the name of Trenton, Ohio, which is celebrating its 150th anniversary. It, like Sitka, has about 5,000 people. I was thinking today that I should offer an amendment asking for a $2 million auditorium for Trenton, Ohio.

That is not funny. It falls completely within the principle of what is being argued with respect to these several exhibits. Probably I ought to do it.

I also remembered that 1967, next year, will be one of the anniversaries of the establishment of the Northwest Territory. Ohio was the first State carved out of that territory. We often speak about the beauty and strength of the language contained in the Northwest Territory resolution, that education and religion shall forever be promoted. The colleges and educators came across the Appalachians. They established their first two colleges West of the Appalachians in Ohio, one in Athens and the other in Oxford. Why should not I come in here and ask, in 1967, for an appropriation of $10 million to properly celebrate this important anniversary of the passing of the resolution on the Northwest Territory?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I think it will be 20 years before the Senator will need to come in with such a request, because the date of the Northwest Territory resolution was 1787.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. I said that next year would be one of the anniversaries. The Senator is correct.

The pioneers came down to Marietta. They brought with them their institutions, their courts, their churches, and their schools. They built a stockade, and within the stockade they established the homes, the churches, and the schools. Finally they went out some distance from Marietta, knelt on the ground, and said, "Here we will build our college. Here our youth will be educated."

Similar events happened in State after State, and I say that would be a very appropriate anniversary to celebrate, whether it is the 200th or the 180th, whichever it might be.

I was speaking about the perplexity of this conflict. The White House sent a letter here in October 1965, stating that it could not support this measure. It has now been argued on the floor that in October of 1964, the President, who was then in Florida, said that he would support the program.

The paradox is that the manner in which the President's endorsement is brought before the Senate is completely incompatible with normal processes. The 17 members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, if the White House has approved the program, were entitled to be informed through the normal processes as to the judgment of the White House.

Let me say to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] that I believe that still should be done; this measure should go back to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and we should hear in the normal way what the position of the White House is.

While I am discussing this peculiar situation, it would seem to me that on the ground of maintaining decorum and dignity alone, the measure should go back to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

With regard to the grant, why should we depart from all normal processes and have the Senate told that through a conversation the White House has approved the program, when the White House states by letter that it cannot support it?

Mr. President, how has this great program been developed?

I hold in my hand an article published in the Reporter of May 6, 1965, and written by Richard Harwood, entitled "The Miami Super-Lobby."

The lobbyists are here today. They were here in greater numbers last September.

This is the story:

> On January 4, the opening day of the 89th Congress, Representative Claude D. Pepper, of Miami, handed the Clerk of the House a bill "to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes." It was given a number, H.R. 30, and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. There it sits, a testimonial to one of the most intensive and imaginative lobbying operations Washington has witnessed in this decade.
>
> Over the years, the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center—better known in Government circles as Interama—has engaged the interest, energy, and political concern of Presidents, Cabinet officers, and Congressmen from 50 States. It has been the object of a prolonged internal debate by members of the White House staff, one of whom, Richard K. Donahue, has had a dual interest in the matter—a public interest as a Presidential assistant until 1963, and, more recently, a private one as a lobbyist engaged to ease Interama's way in Congress and within the administration.
>
> Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey became an Interama missionary in the course of a bumpy helicopter ride over Miami Beach last spring. President Lyndon B. Johnson embraced the project one afternoon last fall in the East Room of the White House.

That would be in October of 1964.

Continuing reading:

> The Commerce Department, the State Department, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency have been drawn into the affair. A sympathetic Congress has twice tailored laws to meet the needs of Interama lobbyists.
>
> Such widespread interest at such high levels of the Government is somewhat remarkable in view of the fact that there has been considerable confusion over what Interama is to be and why the Federal Government should be involved in it. On one occasion it was promoted as a worthy project for a $50 million investment by the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. President, I depart from reading and wish to comment on this aspect of the article, that they wished the Alliance for Progress to make a $50 million investment. I suppose that failed, or they may never have tried to go into it, realizing how inept it would be.

Continuing reading:

> On another it was presented as an antipoverty program, to be financed by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Let me comment on that method of financing. An antipoverty program for Miami Beach?

I made mention of that earlier today. I have never heard of Miami Beach being spoken of as an area of poverty. My information is completely to the contrary. Money is spent there lavishly. It is known as the gold coast of the United States.

Continuing reading:

> More recently, it has been in the category of a public works project in which the Community Facilities Administration of HHFA has tentatively agreed to invest $22 million.

That is its present status. I will later point out that this project has been promoted for the past 15 years. It was not able to get off the ground, and finally the Community Facilities Administration agreed to loan nearly $22 million on a second mortgage. But the Community Facilities Administration stated, "We will not give you the $22 million unless you have an exhibit of the U.S. Government" that will cost initially, it was said, $15 million—and it is now down to $9½ million.

Continuing reading:

> Walt Disney envisions Interama as an east coast Disneyland with ideological overtones.

A newspaper of approximately 2 weeks ago quoted Walt Disney as saying that it is proposed to establish a project in Orlando, and not in Miami. In establishing the project in Orlando, there has been no hint that the Federal Government is to be asked for a handout.

Reading further:

> Commercial promoters in Miami look on it as an economic catalyst that will add $1 billion a year to their revenue from tourists and create 100,000 new jobs.
>
> The definitive description, however, comes from Dr. Irving E. Muskat who, if fortune holds and history is kind, will one day be known as the "Father of Interama." He sees, rising out of a former swamp that lies in view of the towering luxury hotels of Miami Beach a $500 million permanent World's Fair and exposition center—with a difference.
>
> The unifying theme—expressed in the architecture, the cultural facilities, and the exhibits—will be frankly ideological, portraying "the American way of life—progress with freedom."

That is in quotation marks. I do not know whether they were uttered by Mr. Muskat or not.

The article goes on and labels this as "Dr. Muskat's Mudflat."

Continuing:

> Muskat has devoted nearly 8 years of his life to this dream. It has been a labor of love and has filled a void in his own career. His chemical discoveries as a teacher at the University of Chicago led him to abandon teaching for a career in industry. He moved to Miami in 1955, and in 1958 was appointed by Governor LeRoy Collins to serve as a member of the Interama Authority. Interama needed him, and 3 years later he was named chairman.

He went there in 1958. My recollection is that the Community Facilities Administration was not yet in existence in 1958. I feel I am quite right that Congress passed the Community Facilities Administration Act sometime later. The point, however, that I am trying to make is that the promoters of this program have been frantically running around trying to find ways and means of financing it.

I read further:

> For more than 40 years, merchants, innkeepers, and politicians in Miami had talked about an Inter-American trade center or merchandise mart but very little came of it. In the 1930's, a group of promoters set up a private corporation and tried to borrow capital for the project from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Government concluded that the project was largely—

I call specific attention to this—

> a land-speculation scheme and the loan was disapproved. Political interest was revived during the Truman administration and a resolution was put through Congress giving an endorsement but no material aid to the trade-center concept. But the resolution did encourage the State of Florida to create, as a State agency, the Inter-American Center Authority, which in the mid-1950's tried unsuccessfully to interest investors in a permanent exposition center in Miami.

That is, in the 1950's they tried to get private investors interested, but they did not succeed.

I continue to read:

> Muskat's first real accomplishment came in 1961 when he persuaded the city of Miami to turn over to the authority a 1,700-acre tract of swampland on Biscayne Bay, directly inland from the Miami Beach "gold coast." The city valued the land at $8.5 million, a sum that was to be repaid by the authority at an unspecified future time. With the land deed in his pocket, Muskat was in business. He arranged for the authority to issue $21 million in revenue bonds that were to be secured by a mortgage on the land and to be paid off—along with the $8.5 million debt to the city—out of revenues at the gate from the Interama exposition. Goodbody & Co. of New York underwrote and sold $8 million of the bonds. The remaining $13 million is unsold.
>
> With $8 million of capital, the authority drained and filled the Interama site and wound up with a piece of real estate valued at between $30 million and $40 million.

On the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] said it was valued at $60 million. I am going to take his word for it. When the 1,700 acres are filled, the value will probably be $150 million. Yet they are here asking for a gift of $9.5 million to finance the project.

> The problem was that nobody with private capital wanted to sink money into the Interama exposition. So in 1962, Muskat and the other Interama promoters turned their attention to the Federal government.

I wonder if the Senator from Delaware knows what finally prompted them to say, "Perhaps we can get it from the Federal Treasury." What occurred in 1962? How did it dawn upon them that the great Uncle Sam might have some money to give away? Was it that new laws had been passed? Was it that the lobbyists were acting with greater vigor and felt that they could get into the Federal Treasury?

At any rate, in 1962 they turned their attention to the Federal Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps it might be explained by the fact that it was in 1962 that Seattle came to the Federal Government and received $9.5 million. That started the parade. It was later followed by New York and other areas. It seems to be a part of a pattern. Whenever any celebration is planned, they expect to come to the Government and get a few million dollars.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Seattle fair was held in 1962. That probably started it. In one way or another word came to them that the Federal Government was building auditoriums, and they said, "Let us go down there and see what we can do."

Mr. President, what was one of their first acts?

One of their first acts was to hire at $1,200 a month a Washington lobbyist, Raymond M. Jacobson, a young lawyer active in Democratic politics. He shares office space with John J. Flynn, former legislative counsel to HUBERT HUMPHREY, and had worked in the 1960 Democratic national campaign as an advance man for Lyndon Johnson. With Jacobson and members of the Florida congressional delegation paving the way, Muskat began a political odyssey that has taken him to the pinnacles of power in the Federal Government.

In the summer of 1962, Muskat met with President John F. Kennedy at the White House where, for almost an hour, he held forth on Interama. Muskat had a very ambitious proposition. He wanted Kennedy to contribute $50 million to Interama out of Alliance for Progress funds to build pavilions and exhibit halls on the Interama site for all the nations of Latin America.

It is rather refreshing to note that nothing came of that effort.

Mr. President, that was not all that he was asking for at that time.

> He wanted an additional $25 million in the form of a direct appropriation from Congress for a U.S. Government pavilion. The President, the White House later reported, was both skeptical and noncommittal. He told Muskat to submit a formal proposal for the consideration of the State Department and the Bureau of International Business Operations of the Commerce Department.
>
> Out of this meeting came an elaborate brochure. It contained a feasibility study that predicted 15 million Interama visitors each year and revenues of such magnitude that within 16 years the Interama Authority would have a surplus of $175 million on its hands. This document was examined by both State and Commerce Department officials. The State Department rejected out of hand the proposal to use funds of the Alliance for Progress. The Commerce Department, it was later revealed by the Budget Bureau, advised against any Federal investment in what appeared to be little more than an elaborate tourist attraction whose primary beneficiary would be the commercial community of Miami.

I will pause for a moment in the reading of the document at this time.

I have mentioned that the primary beneficiary will be the commercial control of Miami. The burden of partially financing it will be upon the general taxpayers of the United States.

Earlier today the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] pointed out the change of our position in the world in the last year.

I believe the President is going to ask today for $12 billion or $14 billion to help finance the increased demands of the Vietnam war. The Great Society program is also going on in its normally designed plan. The newspapers are carrying the story about inflation and its dangers.

Can we, in the face of those facts not evaluate the priority that ought to be attached in the spending of the money of taxpayers? Cannot this project wait? Why should the Federal Government be saddled now with lending $22 million and giving $9.5 million, a total of $31.5 million for the promotion of this program?

The Senator from Oregon is now presiding. He did not hear my reply to his remarks earlier this afternoon. With respect to every exhibition hall that the Federal Government has built, the argument which the Senator from Oregon made so eloquently 2 hours ago was made by other Senators.

With regard to the Seattle exhibition, the argument was made that it will bring us closer together with the Orient. We were asked to put in $10 million and the orientals will come to Seattle. We will rub elbows. From those visits there will come improvement of the culture of the citizens of both the United States and the oriental countries.

The argument of the Senator from Oregon was very moving and eloquent. But other Senators made similarly eloquent arguments, not only on Interama, but on Seattle, the New York exposition, and the contemplated San Antonio exposition. Those familiar arguments were made on every occasion.

The Senator from Oregon will be here for a long time. I am glad he is presiding now, so that he cannot answer me. He will be here for a long time. I predict that the argument which flowed so mellifluously from his lips will be read on many occasions, and that those interested will read what was said by Senator MAGNUSON, Senator YARBOROUGH, Senator JAVITS, Senator Keating, Senator GRUENING, and Senator BARTLETT. If the arguments are laid side by side, it will be found that they are all the same color and the same fabric.

Mr. President, I shall not continue to read this article. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD in its entirety.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Reporter, May 6, 1965]

THE MIAMI SUPER-LOBBY

(By Richard Harwood)

On January 4, the opening day of the 89th Congress, Representative CLAUDE D. PEPPER, of Miami, handed the Clerk of the House a bill "to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes." It was given a number, H.R. 30, and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. There it sits, a testimonial to one of the most intensive and imaginative lobbying operations Washington has witnessed in this decade.

Over the years, the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center—better known in Government circles as Interama—has engaged the interest, energy, and political concern of Presidents, Cabinet officers, and Congressmen from 50 States. It has been the object of a prolonged internal debate by members of the White House staff, one of whom, Richard K. Donahue, has had a dual interest in the matter—a public interest as a Presidential assistant until 1963, and, more recently, a private one as a lobbyist engaged to ease Interama's way in Congress and within the administration.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY became an Interama missionary in the course of a bumpy helicopter ride over Miami Beach last spring. President Lyndon B. Johnson embraced the project one afternoon last fall in the East Room of the White House. The Commerce Department, the State Department, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency have been drawn into the affair. A sympathetic Congress has twice tailored laws to meet the needs of Interama lobbyists.

Such widespread interest at such high levels of the Government is somewhat remarkable in view of the fact that there has been considerable confusion over what Interama is to be and why the Federal Government should be involved in it. On one occasion it was promoted as a worthy project for a $50-million investment by the Alliance for Progress. On another it was presented as an antipoverty program to be financed by the Area Redevelopment Administration. More recently it has been in the category of a public works project in which the Community Facilities Administration of HHFA has tentatively agreed to invest $22 million. Walt Disney envisions Interama as an east coast Disneyland with ideological overtones. Commercial promoters in Miami look on it as an economic catalyst that will add $1 billion a year to their revenue from tourists and create 100,000 new jobs.

The definitive description, however, comes from Dr. Irving E. Muskat who, if fortune holds and history is kind, will one day be known as the "father of Interama." He sees, rising out of a former swamp that lies in view of the towering luxury hotels of Miami Beach, a $500 million permanent world's fair and exposition center—with a difference. The unifying theme—expressed in the architecture, the cultural facilities, and the exhibits—will be frankly ideological, portraying "the American way of life—progress with freedom" and showing "what the Americas (North and South) have achieved without the sacrifice of civil liberties and individual freedom—within the framework of democratic institutions." Thus, Interama is to be an instrument of American diplomacy, as well as a means of filling the cultural void in the lives of Miami's transient and permanent populations.

DR. MUSKAT'S MUDFLAT

Muskat has devoted nearly 8 years of his life to this dream. It has been a labor of love and has filled a void in his own career. His chemical discoveries as a teacher at the University of Chicago led him to abandon teaching for a career in industry. He moved to Miami in 1955, and in 1958 was appointed by Gov. LeRoy Collins to serve as a member of the Interama Authority. Interama needed him, and 3 years later he was named chairman.

For more than 40 years, merchants, innkeepers, and politicians in Miami had talked about an inter-American trade center or merchandise mart but very little came of it. In the 1930's, a group of promoters set up a private corporation and tried to borrow capital for the project from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Government concluded that the project was largely a land-speculation scheme and the loan was disapproved. Political interest was revived during the Truman administration and a resolution was put through Congress giving an endorsement but no material aid to the trade-center concept. But the resolution did encourage the State of Florida to create, as a State agency, the Inter-American Center Authority, which in the mid-1950's tried unsuccessfully to interest investors in a permanent exposition center in Miami.

Muskat's first real accomplishment came in 1961 when he persuaded the city of Miami to turn over to the authority a 1,700-acre tract of swampland on Biscayne Bay, directly inland from the Miami Beach gold coast. The city valued the land at $8.5 million, a sum that was to be repaid by the authority at an unspecified future time. With the land deed in his pocket, Muskat was in business. He arranged for the authority to issue $21 million in revenue bonds that were to be secured by a mortgage on the land and to be paid off—along with the $8.5 million debt to the city—out of revenues at the gate from the Interama exposition. Goodbody & Co. of New York underwrote and sold $8 million of the bonds. The remaining $13 million is unsold.

With $8 million of capital, the authority drained and filled the Interama site and wound up with a piece of real estate valued at between $30 million and $40 million. The problem was that nobody with private capital wanted to sink money into the Interama exposition. So in 1962, Muskat and the other Interama promoters turned their attention to the Federal Government.

One of their first acts was to hire at $1,200 a month a Washington lobbyist, Raymond M. Jacobson, a young lawyer active in Democratic politics. He shares office space with John J. Flynn, former legislative counsel to HUBERT HUMPHREY, and had worked in the 1960 Democratic national campaign as an advance man for Lyndon Johnson. With Jacobson and members of the Florida congressional delegation paving the way, Muskat began a political odyssey that has taken him to the pinnacles of power in the Federal Government.

In the summer of 1962, Muskat met with President John F. Kennedy at the White House where, for almost an hour, he held forth on Interama. Muskat had a very ambitious proposition. He wanted Kennedy to contribute $50 million to Interama out of Alliance for Progress funds to build pavilions and exhibit halls on the Interama site for all the nations of Latin America. He wanted an additional $25 million in the form of a direct appropriation from Congress for a U.S. Government pavilion. The President, the White House later reported, was both skeptical and noncommittal. He told Muskat to submit a formal proposal for the consideration of the State Department and the Bureau of International Business Operations of the Commerce Department.

Out of this meeting came an elaborate brochure. It contained a feasibility study that predicted 15 million Interama visitors each year and revenues of such magnitude that within 16 years the Interama authority would have a surplus of $175 million on its hands. This document was examined by both State and Commerce Department officials. The State Department rejected out of hand the proposal to use funds of the Alliance for Progress. The Commerce Department, it was later revealed by the Budget Bureau, advised against any Federal investment in what appeared to be little more than an elaborate tourist attraction whose primary beneficiary would be the commercial community of Miami.

A DEPRESSED AREA

This became the White House position, and it was communicated to Muskat. It proved to be merely a temporary setback. Muskat was soon back with a new proposal. It involved a $26-million loan to Interama from the Area Redevelopment Administration, created in 1961 to combat unemployment and poverty in depressed areas through redevelopment loans and financing for public facilities. Muskat, accompanied by PEPPER, FASCELL, and Senator HOLLAND, explored this new plan at the 2-hour meeting at the White House on April 22, 1963. The administration was represented by Presidential assistant Myer Feldman and William D. Carey of the Budget Bureau. There was no official statement on the administration's attitude that day, but Feldman later said that his reaction was "positive." On the face of it, this might seem curious. In the first place, ARA had been given only $100 million in 1961 for public facility loans for more than a thousand counties judged eligible for such aid. Interama wanted over a quarter of the total. Furthermore, Dade County, Fla., was not exactly a depressed area. In fact, it was quite ineligible for ARA help.

One of the principal Interama promoters has his own theory as to why the administration seemed to take a favorable view of the ARA proposition. "They were using us," he said recently. "By that time the ARA program was in trouble in Congress. The agency needed more money, and Kennedy didn't have the votes. He needed the Florida delegation, and one way to get them was to give them a stake in the bill." Whether or not this was the administration's strategy, it was a fact that in 1961 both Senators HOLLAND and GEORGE A. SMATHERS of Florida had voted against the ARA bill, along with four of the eight House members from Florida.

It also was a fact that the attitude of the Florida delegation on the ARA issue changed markedly after Interama entered the picture. On June 26, 1963, Senators HOLLAND and SMATHERS offered a small amendment to the pending ARA refinancing bill which provided that any area failing to meet the ARA eligibility requirements could, nevertheless, get ARA money if it contained, along with substantial unemployment, at least 50,000 Cuban refugees. Only one country in the United States met that description—Dade County, Fla.

The Senate accepted the Interama amendment, SMATHERS and HOLLAND voted for the ARA refinancing bill, and it passed. The next test would come in the House, where trouble was brewing.

Republican Representative Oliver P. Bolton, of Ohio, who had followed the progress of the Interama amendment in the Senate, announced that he would oppose it in the House because he suspected that Interama would become a center for legalized gambling. Muskat quickly went to Washington for a conference with Bolton. They met in Bolton's office, and when they came out Muskat announced with a smile that henceforward Bolton would be "a real friend of Interama." Bolton nodded his head. "That guy," he said of Muskat, "is a helluva salesman."

But neither Muskat nor White House aids could sell the House Rules Committee on Interama or on the need for new ARA funds. Accordingly, the bill died and the Interama scheme collapsed in the autumn of 1963.

But Muskat was unperturbed. Ten days before President Kennedy's assassination he was back in Washington with an entirely new scheme for financing Interama. By that time, he said, he had accepted the fact that without Federal money the Interama dream would never be realized. Only a large Federal investment would give private investors in this country and the governments of Latin America the assurances they required before making commitments to Interama. His new plan involved a $22 million public facility loan from the Community Facilities Administration, which would be supplemented by a gift from Congress of

$15 million to pay for a U.S. exhibit. The CFA money would finance the building to house the exhibit as well as the Latin American pavilions.

There was a problem, however, with CFA, just as there had been with the ARA. The public facility loan program was started by the Eisenhower administration mainly to help finance water and sewer systems in small towns, and no community with a population of more than 50,000 was eligible. This seemed to rule out Miami, which had a metropolitan population of more than a million.

There were a couple of other problems. Was Interama, with its Disneyland features, a "public facility" into which CFA could put money? In the past, CFA had been very restrictive in its definitions of "public facilities." About 75 percent of the program's funds had been loaned for water and sewer projects, and 90 percent of the projects had gone to towns of less than 5,000. There was also a question about the amount of the proposed Interama loan. Previous CFA public facility loans had averaged $125,000, and the biggest on record was $9 million for a water distribution system to serve Ute, Colo.

Sidney H. Woolner, who was the CFA commissioner at that time, pondered these matters for a long time. "I decided," he said, "that Interama probably qualified as a public facility. We had made other loans for public buildings. The amount of the loan was large but that was no disqualification. The real problem was over the population requirement in the law. That raised a lot of legal questions."

PUTTING THE ARM ON L.B.J.

Woolner didn't know it, but steps were underway to help resolve these doubts. HUMPHREY, who was then majority whip in the Senate, was being drawn into the matter. So were President Johnson, the Congress, and members of the Cabinet.

The push began early in 1964. On February 27, President Johnson flew to Miami for a fundraising dinner. This was an opportunity the Interama promoters were determined to exploit. Representative PEPPER was aboard the Presidential plane when it landed in Miami, and he was aboard the Presidential helicopter when it took off from the airport to deliver Johnson to his hotel. PEPPER saw to it that the helicopter detoured to the Interama site and, as they hovered over it, he gave the President a full-blown pep talk.

Within a week after Johnson's visit to Miami, Muskat, PEPPER, FASCELL, and Senator HOLLAND were back at the White House. This time they had a new recruit, Senator SMATHERS, who had previously taken only a passing interest in the problem. The delegation sat down with Feldman and Presidential Assistant Bill D. Moyers for 45 minutes. There were no commitments at this meeting, but Muskat and PEPPER detected a somewhat warmer atmosphere.

In the meantime, Senator HUMPHREY was beginning to develop an interest in Interama. On April 29, he showed up in Miami for a helicopter tour of the Interama site with Mrs. Humphrey, PEPPER, and Muskat. The view from the air and the persuasive fervor of PEPPER and Muskat had an effect. Upon landing, HUMPHREY held a press conference and gave an account of his airborne conversation with PEPPER:

"Take the whole delegation to see him [President Johnson]," HUMPHREY advised. "Get a half hour. Insist on it. Call on him yourself, CLAUDE. Put your arm on him good. He'll do it. I suggest you just raise the dickens about it and you'll get your money. Just keep pounding away at it."

The advice was heeded. PEPPER was hardly back in Washington before Lobbyist Jacobson was walking the corridors of Congress soliciting signatures on a petition to the President of the United States requesting that "the President approve as a policy decision a public facilities loan in the amount of $18,500,000 from the Community Facilities Administration * * * to the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center of Miami, Fla." By the middle of August, Jacobson had collected more than 260 signatures on the petition, including 51 Senators. Every State in the Union was represented.

A POLITICAL PARTNERSHIP

As the petition grew longer and longer, HOLLAND was busy in the Senate removing any legal barriers that might block the CFA loan. On July 31, the Senate took up the administration's omnibus housing bill which contained funds for CFA. In the middle of the debate, HOLLAND engaged in a discussion on the floor with Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat of Alabama, the principal sponsor of the bill. They established in a colloquy that filled close to a full page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that Interama would be eligible for a CFA public-facility loan. According to a source who knew the facts, the points they raised had been suggested by Jacobson. The housing bill passed, and on August 13, the House also approved it.

A week later a meeting was held in Senator HOLLAND's office. The participants were HOLLAND, PEPPER, FASCELL, Muskat, and a guest of honor—Clarence H. Osthagen, the new Commissioner of CFA, who had been on the job only a week. Osthagen assured his hosts that he would give his "personal attention" to the Interama loan application, which his predecessor, Woolner, had worried over for 9 months.

One of the Congressmen came out of the meeting to declare, off the record: "We got a new broom over there—at CFA—and started sweeping right away." PEPPER was so encouraged that he announced that "We may not have to go to the White House now, since we're doing so well in the Agency—CFA. I may not turn in the petition at all, unless some hitch develops."

A hitch did develop. On September 13, Budget Director Kermit Gordon submitted a confidential memorandum on Interama to Walter Jenkins, who was then President Johnson's chief assistant. Gordon was skeptical of the Interama plan. But the 1964 political campaign was already underway, and one of Vice Presidential candidate HUMPHREY's first stops was Florida. On September 18 in Miami, HUMPHREY made a political commitment to Interama.

"This project," he said, "represents the kind of partnership I have been talking about * * * a partnership with government and industry and private capital. * * * I have a feeling that in next year's budget, you will find that the Johnson-Humphrey administration is strongly in support of it—not just by word, but by deed."

By this time, Interama's chief lobbyist, Jacobson, had become HUMPHREY's advance man for the campaign—scheduling speeches, arranging for hotel accommodations, and lining up meetings with local political figures. By this time, too, the administration was decidedly interested in Interama. On October 13, Johnson received at the White House a large delegation of Interama promoters. They included the usual Congressmen and Senators, accompanied by Muskat, Haydon Burns, the Democratic nominee for Governor of Florida, and McGregor Smith, president of the Florida Power & Light Co. The President took them to the East Room for the discussion. Later they moved to the Blue Room for drinks and more conversation. During their talks, the President told his visitors:

"If I had to say today—but I don't want to, today—I would ask the Community Facilities Administration to give their sympathetic consideration to your request. I probably will do that later in the week, but I want to consult with one Cabinet officer first."

It is rare, to say the least, for a President to make a public statement on a loan application pending before a Federal agency. On the other hand, it is even more unusual to find the signatures of over 260 Congressmen on a public petition concerning a CFA loan.

These extraordinary pressures had an understandable effect on the agency involved. Milton Semer, Deputy Administrator of HHFA, announced on October 23: "So far as we're concerned—and that's within the confines of the public facilities loan program—I can say flatly that the loan will be approved." In the light of subsequent events, Semer's optimistic statement would prove somewhat premature.

In any event, by late October Interama seemed to be on the brink of victory in its long and frustrating fight for money from the Federal Treasury. President Johnson looked with increasing favor on the project, and during his last campaign swing through Florida—just 9 days before the election—made another public statement. After a speech in Miami on October 25, Johnson attended a small party given by the Interama promoters in the Terrace Room of the DuPont Plaza Hotel. He was presented with a handsome souvenir volume that related the Interama story. He expressed his thanks and added: "I know the deep interest that each of you have taken * * * I am happy that it seems to be on the way to a favorable solution. CLAUDE PEPPER talks to me about it every day, and I am going to have a little more time now to do something else. * * * I think this is not only going to be a wonderful thing for the U.S. Government, and all the Western Hemisphere, but I think it will be a great thing for the progressive and forward-looking State of Florida."

With the Democratic victory on November 4, the matter was apparently settled. The contract for the CFA loan still had not been signed but, as PEPPER said that fall, "All this is the haggling of lawyers over details of a contract after the principals have been told to sign it."

A NAME ON THE DOOR

Meanwhile, a personnel problem involving Lobbyist Jacobson had arisen. Though his contributions to the Interama blitz had been considerable, his absence from Washington as HUMPHREY's assistant was unsatisfactory to Muskat; on December 4 he announced that Jacobson had been replaced by Richard K. Donahue, who also had excellent political credentials.

Donahue was one of President Kennedy's favorites and was a member of the so-called Irish Mafia at the White House, where he had worked on Lawrence F. O'Brien's staff of congressional lobbyists. But his selection as the new Interama lobbyist had no political implications, Muskat told the Miami Herald. Donahue's job, he explained, would be to lobby in Congress for a direct appropriation to finance a U.S. exhibit at the Interama site.

Donahue's employment brought into the picture an organization that could boast of impressive connections with the managers of the National Democratic Party—Joseph Napolitan Associates, Inc., of Springfield, Mass. The Napolitan specialty is campaign management and political public relations. Chief White House Lobbyist O'Brien was a Napolitan vice president before joining Kennedy's staff. The company has conducted polls and filled other political assignments for the Democratic National Committee; in 1962 it managed successful campaigns for Senator GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, Senator THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, of New Hampshire, and former Gov. Endicott Peabody, of

Massachusetts. More recently, it has opened a public relations office in London to handle, among other things, British election campaigns. The relationship between Donahue and Napolitan Associates is best described as officially unofficial: though Donahue's name is on the door of Napolitan's Washington office, he is not a member of the firm.

When Donahue got the Interama contract, he hired Napolitan Associates to assist him. Napolitan's Washington office, which is run by Mrs. Caryl Conner, was given the assignment of working on Interama problems with Federal agencies other than the CFA and was also directed to line up support for Interama among the members of the Organization of American States.

"We do no lobbying," says Mrs. Conner. "And so far as I know, Dick Donahue is not lobbying, either. He was hired to work on the CFA loan as a lawyer for Interama."

Donahue's contract was, in fact, more demanding than that. It provided for him to bring his influence to bear across the whole range of the Federal bureaucracy and, when H.R. 30 was in a position to move, he was to turn his attention to the Congress. He says there has been no reason yet for him to register as a lobbyist with the Clerk of the House, that he hasn't been concerned with Congress up to this point, and that when and if his attention is focused on the legislative process he will sign up like any other lobbyist.

In any event, shortly after his employment, Donahue entered the negotiations with CFA. "He helped us on some important legal questions," said Richard L. Still, the CFA chief counsel. "He made a real contribution."

By the end of January, CFA was sufficiently satisfied with the Interama proposition that it announced its approval of a $22 million loan "to aid construction of exhibit pavilions at Miami, Fla., for a permanent international exposition."

This seemed to clinch the matter. Muskat interpreted the announcement to mean that Interama, in effect, had another $22 million in the bank. He moved ahead swiftly, traveling to Latin America to promote the project, and recently hired six prominent architects to design the international area pavilions. They included Marcel Breuer and Edward Durrell Stone.

But CFA was not ready to turn loose any money. As Still explained it: "Several things have got to happen before we put any money into this project. The feasibility of Interama must be certified by a management consultant Interama will hire with our approval. He is going to have to show us contractual commitments for private investment in Interama. Then Goodbody [the New York underwriters] is going to have to sell the remaining $13 million in bonds which Interama hasn't issued yet. After all this is done, we make our loan. We go when the whole works goes, not before."

None of these things has happened, and the Treasury still has its $22 million. In the meantime, Muskat, Napolitan Associates, Donahue, PEPPER, and the whole cast of characters in the Interama story are busy. H.R. 30 must be passed. The State Department is being urged to create an Interama desk to handle the international ramifications of the project. The Commerce Department is being pushed to give its blessing to Interama as a world's fair eligible for U.S. support. Walt Disney's possible role as an Interama investor must be explored. Enthusiasm must be generated in Latin America.

There is obviously much to be done because, as Muskat said last month: "We are going to open Interama at 10 o'clock on the morning of December 1, 1967." That's only 938 days from now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We have been arguing this question for approximately 3 hours. I do not believe that more than 10 Senators have heard the arguments.

The Foreign Relations Committee sent the bill to the floor of the Senate without recommendation. Probably this is not correct, but it strikes me that they said, as did Pontius Pilate, who said, in effect: "The blood of this man will not be on my hands; I will send Him to the people and let them determine what they shall do with Him."

The Foreign Relations Committee did not want to turn down the project, but it did not dare approve it. I wish to repeat that it was said: "Stain not my hands by asking me to approve it."

They may vote for it today, but they did not cast their votes affirmatively for it before the committee. That is another rather peculiar situation. This bill came from the Foreign Relations Committee without recommendation.

One might ask why it was sent in. I believe that a part of the answer is that some Senators wanted to accommodate the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. SMATHERS] and allow them to get the measure to the floor of the Senate last year. I am not casting any aspersions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator never casts aspersions, and I appreciate that.

I ask him, for the benefit of the record, if he did not raise a point of order twice shortly before our adjournment to prevent this matter from coming on for action of the committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But I finally relented in order to accommodate Senate SMATHERS and Senator HOLLAND and allowed it to be voted upon without committee hearing but by polling the members.

The Office of the President repudiates the bill. The Foreign Relations Committee members refused to endorse it.

I cannot see how I, at least on the basis of reasoning, can give my support to this measure. It is wrong. It would precipitate innumerable similar requests in the future. If there is any justification for the passage of the bill, it is not existent at this time. Our dollars are needed for far more serious expenditures.

Mr. President, unless it is done by some other Member of the Senate, I shall finally move that the bill be recommitted to the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Just before the Senator from Ohio started to speak, he and I retired to the antechamber and had a conference with Dr. Muskat, who is chairman of the authority, so that we might place in the RECORD a completely accurate report as to the 1,700 acres involved in the project, and how the acreage is divided among the various mortgages, and so forth. I satisfied myself that we obtained a correct story, and I believe the Senator from Ohio also had the same feeling. Here it is, for the RECORD.

Of the 1,700 acres, approximately 700 acres—a little less than that, I believe—have been developed—that is, by filling, and the fill has been stabilizing. Of those 700 acres, 600 acres are pledged to Goodbody as first mortgage security behind the $21 million bond issue. The other 100 acres of the 700 acres have been kept free and unencumbered, so that the buildings to house the U.S. exhibit and the Latin American exhibits may be built thereon, and the Community Facilities Administration enabled to take a first mortgage on that area with buildings on it, in support of its loan of $22 million.

The other 1,000 acres are undeveloped, and are divided as follows: 700 acres of the 1,000 acres were pledged to Goodbody as further security of the bond issue—that is, the first mortgage security. Three hundred acres of the 1,000 acres were kept unpledged for any use that they might be put to in the future.

I am satisfied that this is a completely accurate story of the matter which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and I received from Dr. Muskat. Both of us questioned him in some detail, and as much as we wished to. I am satisfied that this is the story.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This is the best information we have thus far had available on the status of the acreage.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Ohio. I believe that some of the confusion that has arisen heretofore has grown out of the fact that two areas of 700 acres are involved, one area of 700 acres, or substantially that much, which is developed, and the other 700 acres a part of the 1,000 acres that are undeveloped. Probably any confusion that has arisen heretofore has come from that fact. That is my own feeling. I believe that we now have the correct information.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, do I still have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor. He yielded to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I address one question to the Senator from Florida: Has Mr. Disney announced that he contemplates building his Disneyland at Orlando?

Mr. HOLLAND. Near Orlando. It would be southwest of Orlando. Mr. Disney has made an extensive purchase of many thousands of acres. In connection with his announcement, he said he wanted to control large areas of acreage around his development, wherever he put it, so that he would control the area. This would not be possible if he located his development at the Interama.

Mr. LAUSCHE. A statement is current that $100 million would be invested in the Disneyland project. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is a hopeful statement that is made in Florida. I hope it is supported by the facts. There is no doubt that Mr. Disney is contemplating a huge development there.

I have received a letter from General Potter, whom the Senator from Ohio will remember as the developing manager of the New York World's Fair, and who before that was Governor of the Canal Zone. He was a major general in the Corps of Engineers when he retired. He tells me that he is to be the manager of the development for Mr. Disney, but he has not given me any details of the development other than what has been covered by Mr. Disney's announcement and what the newspapers have said.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That takes another prop from under the whole program, because before our committee, and while this matter has been pending, the argument was made that Disney was going into Miami. But now he is planning to go into Orlando.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Morse in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I move that the pending measure be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations for further consideration.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on the motion to recommit, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I support the motion of the Senator from Ohio to send the bill back to the committee. I believe this is the proper step to be taken.

No one is questioning the accuracy of the statement of the Senator from Florida that in October 1964 he received the commitment of the President to support this measure. However, the fact is that in October 1965, last year, at the time the Committee on Foreign Relations was considering this bill, the President, through the Director of the Budget, sent a letter from the White House recommending against the enactment of this particular proposal.

It is true that during this interval there has been an acceleration of the war in Vietnam and an acceleration of the cost of that war with the result that we are having substantially larger deficits than anybody had anticipated a year or so ago. This is reason enough to postpone action.

Much has been said about the projects which we can postpone or curtail until after the war. Certainly this project is not essential in the face of an $8 to $10 billion deficit.

This project was first proposed in 1950. It has been batted around the Congress for the past several years. There is no urgency so far as its immediate enactment is concerned.

We should not lose sight of the fact that in the past 5 years we have been operating at an ever expanding deficit. As I pointed out a couple of days ago, the deficit for the past 5 years has averaged a little over $6 billion a year, or approximately $25 million a day figuring a 5-day workweek.

We cannot continue to pyramid these deficits on top of one another without the occurrence of catastrophic inflation.

The administration and most Senators have been giving much lipservice to the cutting back of nonessentials. This is a nonessential expenditure, and now is the time to start economizing.

The argument has been made that this bill, if enacted, would provide many jobs for the Miami area. I have as yet to hear that Miami is a poverty-stricken area. I have a great deal of respect for the people in that area. I like to visit there; but it is not my impression that they are walking the streets in poverty. That argument does not stand. If they need assistance under the poverty program let the request be on that basis, but let us not provide for a $30 million permanent exposition on the basis that it would cure poverty in the Miami area, an area which contains more riches than most other sections of the country.

We have helped Florida with its Cuban problem under other measures, and will continue to help it. But this is not a poverty program. Furthermore, if it were a poverty program the President certainly would not be objecting to the enactment of the bill.

We must remember as we vote on the bill that we are not merely voting $9.5 million. If we should approve the expenditure of this $9.5 million we would automatically trigger into operation $22 million from the community facilities program to erect some buildings for our Latin American neighbors so that they may participate in this exposition.

We are really voting on $31.5 million at a time when we do not have the money and when we are all bewailing the fact that we are running into deficits and wondering what we can do about it.

This is an opportunity to start economizing; if we are really trying to curtail expenditures, now is the time to do it. I point out to show the need for further study, that the $21 million in first mortgage bonds which are being sold privately are sold tax exempt. The first mortgage on the 1,716 acres of land is at 5¼ percent tax-exempt interest, and they sold at 95 percent of par.

In addition, it is proposed that we give them a $9.5 million grant and a $22 million 4 percent second mortgage loan. That is certainly not the proper way to finance a project if it is economically sound. There is still too much confusion as to the status of the various mortgages.

The administration, through the Budget Bureau, recommended that the bill be postponed until a complete study as to the feasibility of the project could be had and a report made to Congress. That is the very least we can do.

For that reason I hope that the motion of the Senator from Ohio to recommit the bill will be agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Senators are entitled to their day in court. They have had that day. This measure was sought to be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations on several occasions. On two occasions it was drawn out to the point at which there was not a majority present. That occurred just before the matter was considered by the Senate shortly before our adjournment last fall.

The Senator from Ohio, as was his complete right, made a point of order against the further continuance of the committee meeting and called off the meeting, which prevented consideration.

Then, when the bill finally came to the Senate without recommendation—and that was the only way it could have gotten out of the committee because of the situation there—the Senator from Delaware, as was his complete right, raised a point of order and would not permit it to be considered.

The measure had been argued at length on the floor of the Senate—I believe the Record will show—for some hours on that day and on preceding days. The measure was argued at some length yesterday by the Senator from Ohio. It has been argued today for 3 or 4 hours. It would be a travesty to recommit the measure under those conditions.

I shall not move to lay the motion on the table, but I hope that the Senate will not agree to the motion to recommit, so that we may proceed.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to recommit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MOSS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr.

RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would "yea."

Mr,. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 4 Leg.]

YEAS—20

Bennett
Boggs
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Douglas
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McIntyre
Mundt
Proxmire
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Williams, Del.

NAYS—57

Aiken
Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Murphy
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—23

Allott
Bartlett
Bible
Burdick
Cannon
Cooper
Dirksen
Gore
Inouye
Javits
Kennedy, N.Y.
Magnuson
McGee
McNamara
Miller
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Russell, S.C.
Smathers
Sparkman
Young, Ohio

So Mr. LAUSCHE's motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion to recommit was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. KUCHEL (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The position of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 18, as follows:

[No. 5 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Aiken
Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—18

Bennett
Boggs
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Douglas
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McIntyre
Moss
Proxmire
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—26

Allott
Bartlett
Bible
Burdick
Cannon
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Gore
Inouye
Javits
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Magnuson
McGee
McNamara
Miller
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Russell, S.C.
Smathers
Sparkman
Young, Ohio

So the bill (H.R. 30) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], without losing my right to the floor.

NATIONAL SKI WEEK

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up House

Joint Resolution 767 for immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (H.J. Res. 767) authorizing the President to proclaim National Ski Week.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, this is a very simple joint resolution, which proclaims January 21 to January 30, 1966, inclusive, as "National Ski Week."

It is in recognition of the tremendous growth in skiing all over the country. Skiing has great recreational value and is a family sport.

It has significant implications with respect to the Olympics and our ability to compete with other nations.

It has great economic value in many areas of our country which, if they did not have skiing facilities, might be marginal areas. I am happy to say that Steve Knowlton, president of Ski Country, U.S.A., recommended this recognition. The joint resolution has gone through the House. It is brought up in the Senate under the name of the minority leader [Mr. Dirksen]. It is something which we can encourage in keeping with our program of physical fitness, as well as trying to do something to encourage private enterprise and to provide needed economic resources in areas which otherwise would be marginal areas.

I am speaking of Colorado in particular, but I see standing on their feet the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], on my left, and, on my right, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson], and other Senators who are interested in skiing, so I am sure this joint resolution will be greeted with acclaim.

The Senator from Colorado has offered measures in an attempt to get this done. We now have succeeded. I am pleased that we in Colorado, as well as other sections of the country, have been able to sponsor and promote the sport of skiing.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am delighted to support this joint resolution. As everyone knows, my State of Vermont leads the Nation in skiing. Many devotees of the sport travel 600 miles or more just to spend a weekend on Vermont's snowy slopes. We have 42 ski areas in operation, with trails ranging from the gentle, for the beginner, to what I would consider terrifying, for the expert. Vermont is one of the few States east of the Mississippi that can boast areas of 150-inch annual snowfall, and over 90 percent of the State receives more than 60 inches a year.

As travel has become easier the number of skiers coming to Vermont has increased greatly. I understand the Greyhound Bus Co. offers special weekend "Ski Vermont" tours for extremely low fares, from New York City, and I suppose other companies and the railroads and airlines do the same. To cope with this influx of ski fans the people of Vermont have built some of the finest ski accommodations in the world. Vermont's ski lodges feature the rustic atmosphere of birch logs crackling in an open fireplace, and yet the lodging facilities are as modern as those to be found anywhere in the country. Excellent restaurants, good entertainment, and a wide range of gift and antique stores insure that the Vermont visitor has an unforgettable vacation, whether it be in ski season or at any other time of the year. Many Vermont visitors come home loaded down with bundles of Vermont maple products, Vermont cheese, Vermont handcrafts, and a whole host of Vermont-made products that make genuinely appreciated gifts.

Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of the Senate who has been to our Green Mountain State to ski, to fish, or just to loaf has experienced the subtle but compelling effect we sometimes call "Vermont narcosis." I believe it was Bernard DeVoto who once said words to the effect that: "Whenever I travel in Vermont, it is as if I were going to my own place." There is something about Vermont that brings an emotion to every visitor who drinks in our majestic mountain vistas, our sparkling lakes, the flaming colors of our maple, birch, and spruce forests in October, and—perhaps more than anything else—the simplicity and charm of the Vermont way of life. I know of many a man who, after his first visit to Vermont, vowed to come back and make it his home, enchanted by what he found there. Many of those who first come to ski Vermont's slopes decide to buy a cabin or an A frame or an old farmhouse, use it for all-season vacations, and later move in to enjoy the years of their retirement with the friends they have made.

Mr. President, the Vermont Development Department in Montpelier publishes a handy booklet called Vermont Skiing Guide, which describes all of Vermont's ski areas and the equipment at each one. I would be happy to make copies available to anyone interested in making a ski trip to my State this winter. There is also a magazine entitled Vermont Skiing, which features some excellent color photography along with complete Vermont ski information and a list of available accommodations. The winter 1965–66 issue can be obtained for 50 cents by writing to Vermont Skiing, Box 644, Montpelier, Vt. In Washington, snow information for a number of Vermont ski areas is available from the Ski Shop, located in the Hecht Co.

I again congratulate the distinguished Senator from Colorado, whose State is one of the leading ski States of the Rocky Mountain area, for permitting me to say these words in support of the National Ski Week joint resolution.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am delighted to have the Senator from Vermont make that statement. I do not know the facts when it comes to exact numbers, or anything else like that, but I am delighted by the fact that in sponsoring this resolution we are doing something to promote interest in skiing.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I encourage the Senate to consider and adopt the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 767, which would authorize the President to proclaim the week of January 21 through January 30 as National Ski Week.

Those of us from the State of Wyoming fully support this resolution, and urge all ski enthusiasts to come to Wyoming, the winter wonderland.

Big Wyoming has 12 major ski areas that are exciting to any skier, whether he be the expert or the novice. We have the facilities, the transportation, and the beauty that no other State has in offering skiing opportunities for sporting enthusiasts.

Wyoming's winter wonderland can make a complete and exciting winter vacation. While you are there skiing, you can see cutter racing in several of our Wyoming towns, where matched teams of expensive thoroughbreds pull streamlined cutters, at breakneck speeds, down the main streets—providing excitement and color.

If you so desire, you can go ice fishing, or go on a snapshoot, or you can rent a snow vehicle and go on excursions through the frosted land of fairytale beauty.

Wyoming offers big ski opportunities from November through April. Our slopes, offering incomparable conditions, are the biggest and newest in the United States. We have, in the Jackson Hole ski area, the greatest vertical rise in the country—4,135 feet.

Wyoming's abundant winter fun is provided in powder snow country at its greatest. The Tetons, the Big Horns, the Wind River, and the Snowy Range provide the greatest mountains for skiing in the world. I invite the Nation to ski where the choice of trails and slopes is as broad as the outdoors.

Wyoming is particularly proud of the skiing opportunities that have been added this year, in the beautiful and scenic area of Jackson Hole, which is surrounded by the rugged Grand Tetons, snowcapped the year around, awesome in size, and inspiring in beauty. And, towering 7,000 feet above the valley floor, is the majestic Grand Teton. You will find yourself thinking of the descriptive word, "breathtaking," and that is exactly what it is.

Eleven miles northwest of Jackson, Wyo., there has been built one of the world's largest and most attractive ski developments, Teton Village.

Here you will find an aerial tramway that is 2½ miles long, with a rise of 4,100 feet; a beginners' double chairlift, two other double chairlifts, 3,300 and 4,350 feet long, respectively. The total uphill capacity of this new ski area is 3,235 persons per hour. Here is skiing at its best, for the novice, the intermediate, the advanced, the expert, and for the one who seeks touring adventure.

No place else can you find the majestic beauty and the challenge of skiing in powder snow.

I invite the skiers throughout the Nation to come to Wyoming, to visit this new Teton Village or the other great skiing spots in Wyoming—whether it be at Teton Pass, Snow King, Medicine Bow, Sinks Canyon, Happy Jack, Snowy Range, Hogadon, Antelope Butte, Pinedale, Meadowlark, or the Sleeping Giant. If you want to ski, come to big Wyoming, the wonderful winter wonderland.

Last Sunday, the Washington Sunday Star featured a story on Wyoming's skiing opportunities in the "powdered snow." I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the January 16 story, "Jackson Hole Powder Makes Flier of Skier."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New Dimension—Jackson Hole Powder Makes Flier of Skier

(By Gladys Reckley)

Jackson Hole, Wyo.—Skiing powder, rather than packed slopes, is a new dimension in skiing. "It's like flying instead of driving," says Pepi Stiegler, Austria's gold medalist.

The world champion skier—he won the title in 1964 Olympic downhill competition—heads the ski school at one of the newest and most promising American areas, Jackson Hole, in Wyoming's Grand Teton Mountains.

Stiegler lights up when he talks about the powder that enticed him from his job as coach of Austria's 1966 Olympic team to the majestic Tetons.

He says skiing rules virtually don't apply to powder. "If it's very light you keep a normal position, and for heavier powder, you set back on your skis and keep the tips up. "You can make all kinds of turns * * * you can do everything in powder. The more it settles, the harder it is to turn," he says.

"A PARADISE"

The 28-year-old skimeister from Linz, Austria, says it takes a good parallel skier and some practice for powder. "It's a special kind of feeling. It's just a paradise."

Stiegler says about 95 percent of skiers don't like powder because the danger of injury is greater.

In powder, weight is on both skis, he explains. Momentum, terrain, and leg action are utilized instead of body action. Skis must remain parallel so they turn as one ski.

"The real fun of skiing is a steep mountain and powder," says Stiegler.

U.S. SKIERS IMPRESSING

He says America is developing some really good skiers. He's convinced the U.S. team "is going to do well" in this year's Olympics, but declines any predictions.

"Americans," he says, "want to win everything. You think you should be the best, but you have to work from the bottom up.

"In Austria, skiing is a volks sport * * * a sport of the people * * * everybody skis."

He classifies Jim Huega as one of America's excellent skiers, and, he says, American girl skiers have always been good.

He says easterners are good in slalom, but not as good downhill as westerners. Easterners don't have the terrain, he says.

Jackson Hole expects to offer the best terrain west of the Alps when its aerial tramway is completed. But, like any major project, this one has had its problems and they have cost two workmen their lives.

CONSTRUCTION DELAYED

The tram's construction hoist has failed twice, delaying completion of the job until March or April.

The tram will rocket 63 skiers 2½ miles to a Grand Teton peak with a vertical rise of 4,135 feet. The skiable terrain on packed and powdered snow should challenge and delight the most expert skiers.

The prospect of putting skiers on the loftiest of American ski slopes makes lesser slopes seem tame to Jackson Hole's developers.

Paul McCollister and Alex Morley, both enthusiastic skiers, shuss the slopes daily. But, they say the present Teton skiing serviced by a 2,200-foot double-chair lift, is no more than is available at any good ski area such as Aspen or Vail.

At the base of the slopes is the beginning of Teton Village. The self-contained village, with a modified Alpine motif, is expected to be completed within 5 years.

The Jackson Hole Corp. building and two lodges opened Saturday. But plenty of accommodations are available in the resort town of Jackson, 12 miles from the area.

McCollister says that when the village is completed it will be comprised of 35 commercial buildings, 20 condominiums, and 100 private homes.

Fifty percent of the facilities will be lodges, and the remainder will provide recreation and all community services.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I am happy to join the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] in supporting the joint resolution.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am sure that we would both want to be either in Wyoming or in Colorado right now. I am going in an hour.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I commend the Senator from Colorado. I am very happy that Vermont has been able to provide leadership for ski development in Colorado and Wyoming, and I am supporting the joint resolution offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]. I am sure my action will be heartily endorsed by the young men and women from Vermont who are now representing Colorado schools and institutions in national and international ski meets and winning laurels. I am sure that this resolution will also be supported by the countless thousands who patronize Vermont's 42 major ski resorts.

Mr. DOMINICK. We are happy to have them come to Colorado.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. I wish to associate myself with the Senators who have spoken with regard to the resolution. When it comes to numbers, perhaps Idaho cannot be counted as having too many, but when it comes to quality in skiing, Idaho stands very high.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. McINTYRE. New Hampshire would like to get into this act, too. We are very proud of all our ski resorts—Tuckerman's Ravine; Dartmouth College, the home of the first winter carnival; down in my own ski range of Gunstock in Gilford, N.H.; and many, many others.

I commend the Senator from Colorado and support the joint resolution.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate what the Senator has said.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, earlier in the day the Judiciary Committee reported favorably the resolution now pending, the Ski Week observance. With others on the committee, I was delighted that recognition of this sort was being given skiing, and I am pleased the Senate appears ready to act favorably on the resolution.

Many States in our Union are the scene of skiing activity; each State rightly prides itself on providing unique scenery, weather, and slopes for the skier. The army of skiers on the runs in Michigan is the clearest proof that Michigan provides skiing second to none in our country.

I hope many of you will find it possible to visit some of Michigan's ski centers. Whether within minutes' drive of our great cities or in the magnificence of our Upper Peninsula, one will be welcome. It is in Michigan you will find the National Ski Museum. The selection of the site for this museum reflects the high favor Michigan finds among the leading skiers of this country, and the rugged people of Ishpeming will delight in showing you the museum, and then its runs. The accuracy of Michigan's license plate boast—Winter Water Wonderland—will be confirmed and your visit will be rewarding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 767) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MINIMUM WAGE LAW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 850, H.R. 8126.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 8126) to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action will be taken on the bill tonight.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on

THE UNIVERSITY OF

the District of Columbia, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the District of Columbia minimum-wage law, approved September 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 960), as amended, is amended (except to the extent provided in section 2 of this Act) by striking out sections 1 through 23, inclusive, immediately following the designation "TITLE I—MINIMUM WAGES" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"FINDING AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SECTION 1. (a) The Congress hereby finds that there are persons employed in some occupations in the District of Columbia at wages insufficient to provide adequate maintenance and to protect health. Such employment impairs the health, efficiency, and well-being of the persons so employed, constitutes unfair competition against other employers and their employees, threatens the stability of industry, reduces the purchasing power of employees, and requires, in many instances, that their wages be supplemented by the payment of public moneys for relief or other public and private assistance. Employment of persons at these insufficient rates of pay threatens the health and well-being of the people of the District of Columbia and injures the overall economy.

"(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this Act to correct and as rapidly as practicable to eliminate the conditions referred to hereinabove.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

"(a) 'Commissioners' means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent or representative;

"(b) 'Wage' means compensation due to an employee by reason of his employment, payable in legal tender of the United States or checks on banks convertible into cash on demand at full face value, including such allowances as may be permitted by any order or regulation issued under section 3, 5, 6, or 7;

"(c) 'Employ' includes to suffer or permit to work;

"(d) 'Employer' includes any individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, or any person or group of persons, acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee, but shall not include the United States or the District of Columbia;

"(e) 'Employee' includes any individual employed by an employer but shall not include any (1) individual who, without payment and without expectation of any gain, directly or indirectly, volunteers to engage in the activities of an educational, charitable, religious, or nonprofit organization, or (2) lay member elected or appointed to office within the discipline of any religious organization and engaged in religious functions;

"(f) 'Occupation' means any occupation, service, trade, business, industry, or branch or group of occupations or industries, or employment or class of employment, in which employees are gainfully employed;

"(g) 'Gratuities' means voluntary monetary contributions received by an employee from a guest, patron, or customer for services rendered.

"MINIMUM WAGE AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

"SEC. 3. (a) Every employer (except as otherwise provided in this Act) shall pay to each of his employees wages at a rate of not less than the highest of the following:

"(1) $1.25 an hour;

"(2) such rate as may, from time to time be established by section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)); or

"(3) such rate of pay as is or may be established by any applicable wage order issued pursuant to this Act or preserved by section 2 of the Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965.

"(b) No employer (except as otherwise provided in this Act) shall employ any of his employees for a workweek longer than forty hours, unless such employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of the hours above specified at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed; except that no employer shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this subsection by employing any employee of a retail or service establishment for a workweek in excess of the workweek specified herein, if (1) the regular rate of pay of such employee is in excess of one and one-half times the minimum hourly rate specified in subsection (a) of this section or such higher rate as may be applicable to such employee under a wage order issued pursuant to this Act, and (2) more than half his compensation for a representative period (not less than one month) represents commissions on goods or services.

"(c) The minimum wage orders issued by the Commissioners prior to the effective date of the amendments made by the Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965 shall remain in full force and effect, except that they shall, subject to the provisions of section 2 of that Act, be modified, effective on such effective date, as follows:

"(1) any such order which does not provide for minimum wages at least equal to the rate established by subsection (a) of this section shall be modified by order of the Commissioners to provide for the payment of wages at such rate (except as otherwise provided in this Act);

"(2) all such orders shall be modified by order of the Commissioners to provide for the payment of overtime compensation as prescribed in subsection (b) of this section (except as otherwise provided in this Act); and

"(3) all such orders shall be modified by order of the Commissioners to apply to all employees without regard to the sex of any such employee.

"(d) For those occupations with respect to which, on the date of the enactment of the Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965, there is no existing minimum wage order, the Commissioners shall issue an order, effective on the effective date of the amendments made by such Act, providing for minimum wages at a rate not less than the rate prescribed by subsection (a) of this section and for the payment of overtime compensation as prescribed in subsection (b) of this section.

"(e) The minimum wage orders issued by the Commissioners prior to the date of the enactment of the Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965 shall be modified by the Commissioners on or after the enactment of the amendments made by such Act in order to accommodate, as the Commissioners deem necessary, the definitions and regulations of such orders to carry out the purposes of this Act, to prevent the circumvention or evasion thereof, and to safeguard the minimum wage rates and overtime provisions established therein. Such orders shall include such definitions and regulations as prescribed in section 7 as the Commissioners deem necessary. The wage orders containing such revisions of definitions and regulations shall take effect upon the expiration of thirty days after the date on which they were made by the Commissioners, but not before the effective date of the Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965.

"(f) For those occupations with respect to which on the date of the enactment of the Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965 there is no existing minimum wage order, the Commissioners shall, with or without reference to an ad hoc advisory committee as specified in section 5(a), make one or more wage orders which may include unrelated occupations. Such order or orders shall include the minimum wage and overtime provisions as prescribed in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and include such definitions and regulations as prescribed in section 7 as the Commissioners deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, to prevent the circumvention or evasion thereof, and to safeguard the minimum wage rates and overtime provisions established therein. The Commissioners shall publish a notice once a week, for four successive weeks, in a newspaper of general circulation printed in the District of Columbia, stating that they will, on a date and at a place named in the notice, hold a public hearing on such order or orders at which all interested persons will be given a reasonable opportunity to be heard. Such notice shall contain a summary of the major provisions of such order or orders. Within thirty days after such hearing, the Commissioners may make such order or orders as may be proper or necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act. Notice of such order or orders shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation printed in the District of Columbia and such order or orders shall take effect upon the expiration of sixty days after the date on which such order or orders were made by the Commissioners, but not before the effective date of the Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965.

"POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE COMMISSIONERS

"SEC. 4. The Commissioners or their authorized representative shall, in addition to the foregoing authority, have authority—

"(a) to investigate and ascertain the wages of persons employed in any occupation in the District of Columbia;

"(b) to enter and inspect the place of business or employment of any employer in the District of Columbia for the purpose of examining and inspecting any or all books, registers, payrolls, and other records of any such employer that in any way relate to or have a bearing upon the wages, hours, and other conditions of employment of any employees; to copy any or all of such books, registers, payrolls, and other records as the Commissioners or their authorized representative may deem necessary or appropriate, and question such employee for the purpose of ascertaining whether the provisions of this Act and the orders and regulations issued thereunder have been and are being complied with; and

"(c) to require from any such employer full and correct statements in writing, including sworn statements, with respect to wages, hours, names, addresses, and such other information pertaining to the employment of his employees as the Commissioners or their authorized representative may deem necessary or appropriate in carry out the purposes of this Act.

"REVISION OF WAGE ORDERS

"SEC. 5. (a) At any time after a wage order has been in effect for one year the Commissioners may on their own motion, or on the petition of fifty or more residents of the District of Columbia, reconsider the wage rates set therein. If, after investigation, the Commissioners are of the opinion that any substantial number of workers in the occupation covered by such wage order are receiving wages insufficient to provide adequate maintenance and to protect health they may convene an ad hoc advisory committee for the purpose of considering and inquiring into and reporting to the Commissioners on the subject investigated by the Commissioners and submitted by them to such committee.

"(b) The committee shall be composed of not more than three persons representing the employers in such occupation, of an equal number representing the employees in such occupation, of not more than three persons representing the public, and one or more representatives of the agency designated by the Commissioners to administer this Act. Such agency shall name and appoint all the members of the committee and designate the chairman thereof. Two-thirds of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum and the decision or recommendation or report of the committee on such subject submitted to it shall require an affirmative vote of not less than a majority of all its members.

"(c) The Commissioners shall present to the committee such information as they might have relating to the subject they submitted to the committee, and may cause to be brought before the committee any witnesses whose testimony the Commissioners consider material.

"(d) Within sixty days after the convening of the committee by the Commissioners, the committee shall make and transmit to the Commissioners a report containing its findings and recommendations on the subject submitted to it by the Commissioners, including recommendations as to minimum wages for employees in the occupation which will effectuate the purposes of this Act, taking into consideration the amount of wages sufficient to provide adequate maintenance and to protect health, the fair and reasonable value of the work performed, and the wages paid in the District of Columbia by fair employers for work of like or comparable character: *Provided*, That the wages recommended shall not be less than at the rate prescribed in subsection (a) of section 3 or the rate prescribed in the wage order then applicable to such occupation, whichever is higher.

"(e) The commitee report may include, but shall not be limited to, recommendations for permissible allowances for board, lodging, or other facilities or services, customarily furnished by the employer to the employees, or reasonable allowances for gratuities customarily received by employees in any occupation in which gratuities have customarily and usually constituted and have been recognized as a part of the remuneration for hiring purposes. The committee may make a separate inquiry into and report on any branch of any occupation and may recommend different minimum wages for such branch of employment in the same occuption.

"(f) In the event any such commitee fails to submit a report to the Commissioners within the period specified in subsection (d), the Commissioners may discharge such committee from further consideration of the subject submitted to it and convene a new committee for the purpose of considering such subject, or the Commissioners themselves may undertake to consider the subject and proceed to prepare and publish a revised wage order for the occupation in accordance with the procedure in section 6.

"ISSUANCE OF REVISED WAGE ORDERS

"Sec. 6. (a) Upon receipt of the report from any ad hoc advisory committee, or upon the discharge of such committee, in accordance with section 5(f), the Commissioners may prepare a proposed revised wage order for the occupation, giving due consideration to any recommendations contained in any report of such committee. In such order the Commissioners may provide, among other things, such allowances and classifications as are referred to in section 5(e). The Comissioners shall publish a notice once a week, for four successive weeks, in a newspaper of general circulation printed in the District of Columbia, stating that they will, on a date and at a place named in the notice, hold a public hearing at which all interested persons will be given a reasonable opportunity to be heard. Such notice shall contain a summary of the major provisions of the proposed revised wage order.

"(b) Within thirty days after such hearing, the Commissioners may make such an order as may be proper or necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act. Notice of such order shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation printed in the District of Columbia and such order shall take effect upon the expiration of sixty days after the date on which such order was made by the Commissioners.

"(c) Orders issued under this section shall define the occupation and classifications therein to which they are to apply, and shall contain such terms and conditions as the Commissioners find necessary to carry out the purposes of such orders, to prevent the circumvention or evasion thereof, and to safeguard the minimum wage rates and overtime compensation established therein.

"REGULATIONS

"SEC. 7. The Commissioners shall make and revise such regulations, including definition of terms, as they may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act or necessary to prevent the circumvention or evasion thereof and to safeguard the minimum wage rates and the overtime provisions thereby established. Such regulations may include regulations defining and governing learners and apprentices. their number, proportion, length of service and rates of pay (except that such rates shall be not less than 80 per centum of the minimum wage prescribed in section 3(a) of this Act), and regulations defining and governing the employment of handicapped workers and students. Such regulations may also include, but are not limited to, regulations governing piece rates, bonuses, and commissions in relation to time rates; part-time rates; minimum daily wages; wage provisions governing split shift and excessive spread of hours; provisions governing uniforms, tools, travel, and other items of expense incurred by employees as a condition of employment; permitted allowance for board, lodging, or services customarily furnished by employers to employees; allowances for gratuities in any occupation in which gratuities have customarily been recognized as a part of the remuneration for hiring purposes; or allowances for such other special conditions or circumstances which may be usual in a particular employer-employee relationship. Regulations or revisions thereof issued by the Commissioners pursuant to this section shall be made only after a public hearing by such Commissioners, subsequent to publication of a notice of the hearing at which interested persons may be heard. Such regulations or revisions shall, except as may otherwise be provided by such Commissioners, take effect upon the expiration of thirty days after the date on which such regulations and revisions were made by such Commissioners.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 8. (a) Any person aggrieved by an order of the Commissioners issued under this Act may obtain a review of such order in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals by filing in such court, within sixty days after the issuance of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Commissioners be modified or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such petition shall forthwith be transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioners, and thereupon the Commissioners shall file in the court the record upon which the order complained of was entered. Upon the filing of such petition such court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm, modify, or set aside such order in whole or in part, so far as it is applicable to the petitioner. The review by the court shall be limited to questions of law, and findings of fact by the Commissioners when supported by substantial evidence shall be conclusive. No objection to the order of the Commissioners shall be considered by the court unless such objection shall have been urged before the Commissioners or unless there were reasonable grounds for failure so to do. If application is made to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and it is shown to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence may materially affect the result of the proceeding and that there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence in the proceedings before the Commissioners, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken by the Commissioners and to be adduced upon the hearing in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The Commissioners may modify the initial findings by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and shall file with the court such modified or new findings which if supported by substantial evidence shall be conclusive, and shall also file their recommendation, if any, for the modification or setting aside of the original order.

"(b) The commencement of proceedings under subsection (a) shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioners' order. The court shall not grant any stay of the order unless the person complaining of such order shall file in court an undertaking with a surety or sureties satisfactory to the court for the payment to the employees affected by the order, in the event such order is affirmed, of the amount by which the compensation such employees are entitled to receive under the order exceeds the compensation they actually receive while such stay is in effect.

"AUTHORITY TO TAKE TESTIMONY AND ISSUE SUBPENAS

"SEC. 9. The Commissioners shall have power to administer oaths and to require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses, the production of all books, registers, and other evidence relative to any matters under investigation, at any public hearing or at any meeting of any committee or for the use of the Commissioners in securing compliance with this Act. In case of disobedience to a subpena the Commissioners may invoke the aid of the District of Columbia court of general sessions in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence. In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena the court may issue an order requiring appearance before the Commissioners, the production of documentary evidence, and the giving of evidence, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"EXEMPTIONS

"SEC. 10. (a) The minimum wage and overtime provisions of section 3 shall not apply with respect to—

"(1) any employee employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity, or in the capacity of outside salesman (as such terms are defined and delimited from time to time by regulations of the Commissioners);

"(2) any employee engaged in the delivery of newspapers to the home of the consumer; or

"(3) any salesman or mechanic who is employed by an establishment which is primarily engaged in a business of selling automobiles or trucks and whose rate of pay over a representative period (not less than one month) is at least one and one-half times the rate specified in section 3(a).

"(b) The overtime provisions of section 3(b) shall not apply with respect to—

"(1) any employee employed as a seaman; or

"(2) any employee employed by a railroad.

"(c) The minimum wage and overtime provisions of section 3 shall not apply with respect to any full-time student under eighteen years of age who works in and around the residence of the employer. As used in this subsection, the term 'full-time student' means a student who, when school is in session, is carrying a normal student workload, or when school is not in session, carried such a workload during the immediately preceding school semester.

"KEEPING OF RECORDS

"SEC. 11. (a) Every employer subject to any provision of this Act or of any regulation or order issued under this Act shall make, keep, and preserve for a period of not less than three years a record of the name, address, and occupation of each of his employees, a record of the date of birth of any employee under nineteen years of age, the rate of pay, and the amount paid each pay period to each such employee, the hours worked each day and each workweek by such employee, and such other records or information as the Commissioners shall prescribe by regulation as necessary or appropriate for the enforcement of the provisions of this Act or of the regulations or orders issued thereunder. Such records shall be open and made available for inspection or transcription by the Commissioners or their authorized representative at any reasonable time. Every such employer shall furnish to the Commissioners or to their authorized representative on demand a sworn statement of such records and information upon forms prescribed or approved by the Commissioners.

"(b) Every employer shall furnish to each employee at the time of payment of wages an itemized statement showing the date of the wage payment, gross wages paid, deductions from and additions to wages, net wages paid, hours worked during the pay period, and any other information as the Commissioners may prescribe by regulation.

"POSTING OF LAW AND WAGE ORDERS

"SEC. 12. Every employer subject to any provision of this Act or of any regulation or order issued under this Act shall keep a copy or summary of this Act and of any applicable wage order and regulation issued thereunder, in a form prescribed or approved by the Commissioners, posted in a conspicuous and accessible place in or about the premises wherein any employee covered thereby is employed. Employers shall be furnished such copies or summaries by the Commissioners on request without charge.

"PROHIBITED ACTS

"SEC. 13. It shall be unlawful for any employer—

"(a) to violate any of the provisions of section 3, or any of the provisions of any regulation or order issued under this Act, or any of the provisions of any regulation or order preserved by section 2 of the Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965;

"(b) to violate any of the provisions of section 11 or 12 or any regulation or order made or continued in effect under the provisions of section 7, or to make any statement, report, or record filed or kept pursuant to the provisions of such section or of any regulation or order issued thereunder, knowing such statement, report, or record to be false in a material respect;

"(c) to discharge or in any other manner discriminate against any employee because such employee has filed any complaint or instituted or caused to be instituted any proceeding under or related to this Act, or has testified or is about to testify in any such proceeding or has served or is about to serve on any ad hoc advisory committee;

"(d) to hinder or delay the Commissioners or their authorized representative in the performance of their duties in the enforcement of this Act, or to refuse to admit the Commissioners or their authorized representative to any place of employment, or to refuse to make available to the Commissioners or their authorized representative, upon demand, any record required to be made, kept, or preserved under this Act, or to fail to post a summary or copy of this Act or of any applicable regulation or order, as required under section 12.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 14. Any person who willfully violates any of the provisions of section 13 shall upon conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000, or to imprisonment of not more than six months, or both. No person shall be imprisoned under this section except for an offense committed after the conviction of such person for a prior offense under this section. Prosecution for violations of this Act shall be in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and shall be conducted by the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia.

"EMPLOYEE REMEDIES

SEC. 14. (a) Any employer who pays any employee less than the wage to which such employee is entitled under this Act or any order or regulation issued thereunder, shall be liable to such employee in the amount of such unpaid wages, and in an additional equal amount as liquidated damages, except that if, in any action commenced to recover such unpaid wages or liquidated damages, the employer shows to the satisfaction of the court that the act or omission giving rise to such action was in good faith and that he had reasonable grounds for believing that his act or omission was not a violation of this Act, the court may, in its sound discretion, award no liquidated damages, or award any amount thereof not to exceed the amount specified in this section. Action to recover such liability may be maintained in any court of competent jurisdiction in the District of Columbia by any one or more employees for and in behalf of himself or themselves and other employees similarly situated. No employee shall be a party plaintiff to any such action unless he gives his consent in writing to become such a party and such consent is filed in the court in which such action is brought. The court in such action shall allow a reasonable attorney's fee to be paid by the defendant, and costs of the action. Any agreement between an employer and an employee to work for less than the wages to which such employee is entitled under this Act or any order or regulation issued thereunder shall be no defense to any action to recover such unpaid wages or liquidated damages.

"(b) At the written request of any employee paid less than the wage to which such employee is entitled under this Act or any order or regulation issued thereunder, the Commissioners may take an assignment of such wage claim in trust for the assigning employee and may bring any legal action necessary to collect such claim. In such an action, the defendant shall be required to pay the costs and such reasonable attorney's fees as may be allowed by the court.

"(c) The Commissioners are authorized to supervise the payment of the unpaid wages owing to any employee under this Act or any order or regulation issued thereunder, and the agreement of any employee to accept such payment shall upon payment in full constitute a waiver by such employee of any right he may have under subsection (a) of this section to such unpaid wages and an additional equal amount as liquidated damages.

"STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 16. Any action commenced on or after the effective date of the Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965 to enforce any cause of action for unpaid wages or liquidated damages under this Act or any order or regulation issued thereunder may be commenced within three years after the cause of action accrued, and every such action shall be forever barred unless commenced within three years after the cause of action accrued.

"RIGHT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

"SEC. 17. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to interfere with, impede, or in any way diminish the right of employees to bargain collectively with their employers through representatives of their own choosing in order to establish wages or other conditions of work in excess of the standards applicable under the provisions of this Act.

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 18. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application thereof to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

PRESERVATION OF WAGE ORDERS ISSUED PRIOR TO THIS ACT

SEC. 2. No amendments made by this Act shall be deemed to amend, rescind, or otherwise affect any provision of law of the District of Columbia or any regulation or order issued thereunder which, on the date immediately prior to the effective date of the amendments made by this Act, prescribes additional or more favorable standards relating to minimum wages, maximum hours, overtime compensation, or other working conditions than those provided for by the amendments made by this Act or by any regulation or order issued thereunder. Any regulation or order preserved by this section may be revised from time to time under the procedures provided for by the amendments made by this Act. The enforcement procedures and penalties for violations prescribed in the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to violations of any regulation of order prescribed by this section.

AUTHORITY TO DELEGATE FUNCTIONS

SEC. 3. No amendments made by this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act or by amendments made by this Act in the Board of Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan, except the function of making and adopting regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act or of any amendment made by this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 4. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the amendments made by this Act shall take effect upon the expiration of one hundred and eighty days after the date of its enactment.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), the authority to promulgate necessary rules, regulations, and orders with regard to amendments made by this Act may be exercised by the Commissioners on and after the date of enactment of this Act.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOURS LAW

SEC. 5. The Act entitled "An Act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia", approved February 24, 1914 (38 Stat. 291), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 36-301), is amended by adding the following new section:

"SEC. 10. The requirements of sections 1, 3, and 4, and so much of section 5 as relates to keeping records of hours worked, shall not be applicable in the case of a person employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity, or in the capacity of an outside salesperson, as such terms may from time to time be defined in regulations which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to adopt and promulgate: *Provided*, That this sentence shall not be construed as relieving an employer from keeping records relating to the compensation paid any such person."

TITLE OF ACT

SEC. 6. This Act may be cited as the "Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965".

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "THE VIETNAM CONFLICT: THE SUBSTANCE AND THE SHADOW"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and myself, a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 184), as follows:

S. RES. 184

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations sixteen thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "The Vietnam Conflict: The Substance and the Shadow."

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], without losing the floor.

FREEDOM DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Communist Party is a devious organization.

Masters of opportunism, the Communist Party's leaders are at the same time clever and careful long-range planners. They are quick to take advantage of developing conditions which can be turned to the party's advantage. It is part of their philosophy to seek to capitalize on the very weaknesses of their position. And when subterfuge is called for, Communist strategians and tacticians have proved they can plan and develop the most ingenious subterfuges.

When it suits the party's purposes to move openly, no group is more brazen, or gives more outward evidence of self-assurance and confidence.

When it serves the party's objectives to move under cover, elaborate covers will be devised and used.

Dedicated as it is to the overthrow of the American Government by force and violence, dedicated as it is to the service of the Soviet Government, the Communist Party, U.S.A., finds itself held in deserved contempt by the great mass of the American people. This is not a new situation. There has never been a time when anything close to a majority of Americans would support the Communist Party as such.

The Communist Party and its supporters therefore have found themselves in political bankruptcy when they tried to operate politically under the Communist label; so they have made it part of their political strategy to set up stooge political parties behind which they operate.

Such organizations have included the Workers' Party, the Progressive Party, the American Labor Party, the People's Party, and more recently the so-called Freedom Democratic Party of Mississippi.

This so-called Freedom Democratic Party which is neither free nor democratic, held a statewide convention in Jackson, Miss., on Sunday, January 2, 1966, in the Masonic Temple on Lynch Street. After the meeting the press was given a statement about plans of this so-called party to enter candidates for congressional seats in the elections to be held this summer.

Spokesmen for the so-called Freedom Democratic Party carefully avoided any mention and secreted from the press any mention of two men who attended the statewide convention and participated in discussions, and who, behind the scenes, have wielded great power in shaping the so-called Freedom Party's policies and directing its activities.

One of these men is Carl Braden, who has a long record of subversive activities. In 1954, in Jefferson County, Ky., court proceedings, Carl Braden and his wife, Ann Braden, were identified by a former Communist as active members of the Communist Party in Louisville, Ky.

When questioned by the House Committee on Un-American Activities on July 30, 1958, as to whether he was a member of the Communist Party, Carl Braden refused to answer. In 1955, he was convicted by a Kentucky jury of sedition. This conviction was set aside by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1956, on a technicality. Both he and his wife were identified as members of the Communist Party in sworn testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on October 28, 1957.

This is the same Carl Braden who has served as field representative for the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., which has been cited as subversive by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. In March 1960, at a meeting sponsored by the SCEF in Orlando, Fla., Braden distributed Communist literature and was among those openly urging clemency for Morton Sobel, a convicted Communist spy. Braden served a Federal prison sentence for contempt of Congress. He was released in February 1962.

During the 20 years of its existence in New Orleans, the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc.—formerly known as the Southern Conference for Human Welfare—has so discredited itself that it has been forced to move to Louisville, Ky., which it will do on February 1, 1966. State Senater Jesse Knowles, chairman of the Louisiana Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities, has declared that "the constant pressure kept on the group since 1963, has been the outstanding factor to the out-of-State move."

James A. Dombrowski, executive director of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., has announced that he will retire on February 1, 1966, and that the work of the executive director will be taken over by Carl and Anne Braden, of Louisville. Mrs. Braden will continue to be the editor of the Southern Patriot, official organ of the SCEF.

In the course of its proceedings in Jackson, Miss., to which I referred earlier, the so-called Freedom Democratic Party, had as its guest Benjamin Smith, a New Orleans lawyer, and a member of the board of directors of the Southern Conference Educational Fund. Smith was introduced by Lawrence Guyot, nominal chairman of the so-called Freedom Party.

The Communist Daily Worker of October 20, 1954, showed Benjamin Smith as a signer of a petition to President Eisenhower, calling for amnesty for Communists convicted for violating the Smith—anti-Communist—Act. On April 6, 1956, Benjamin E. Smith appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and under oath denied Communist Party membership. In testimony before this subcommittee in 1954, Hunter Pitts O'Dell, a Communist organizer, had identified Benjamin E. Smith as "our attorney."

The Communist Worker of December 8, 1965, identified Benjamin E. Smith as "legal counsel for the Mississippi Freedom Party." On January 22, 1962, Benjamin E. Smith registered with the U.S. Department of Justice as representing the Communist government of Cuba. Benjamin Smith also is listed as a member of the executive committee of the National Lawyers Guild, which has been cited as "a legal bulwark of the Communist Party" by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. At one time he was treasurer of the Southern Conference Educational Fund. I have heretofore discussed the record of this man Benjamin Smith in more detail on the floor of the Senate, just as I have previously discussed, at greater length, the Communist ties of the so-called Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party.

Lawrence Guyot, who held a press conference as chairman of the so-called Freedom Democratic Party, did not reveal to the press either the presence or the influence of Carl Braden and Benjamin Smith; neither did he reveal that the convention accepted a suggestion from Guyot that an invitation to speak to the so-called Freedom Democratic Party be extended to Herbert Aptheker, a notorious Communist. This is the same Aptheker who recently violated State Department security regulations by making a trip to Communist-controlled Hanoi as part of a conspiracy to discredit U.S. policy with respect to Vietnam.

For some time Herbert Aptheker has been the editor of Political Affairs, theoretical organ of the Communist Party, U.S.A. In proceedings before the Subversive Activities Control Board in 1956, the CPUSA used Mr. Aptheker as its expert witness. He has been a prolific writer of Communist publications and an instructor in Communist training schools.

His daughter, Bettina Aptheker, recently made a public statement that she now is, and has been, a member of the Communist Party. Aptheker also has been active in organizing the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs, cited as Communist fronts by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

According to the New York Times of July 31, 1965, the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party urged its followers not to honor the draft in Mississippi. This is the "line" followed by various so-called pacifist organizations which are either Communist infiltrated or Communist controlled.

The Communist Worker of May 2, 1965, featured the activities of the so-called Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, and the Worker has continued to give that group and its activities frequent and favorable public mention.

I do not want to labor the point, Mr. President, and so I shall say no more at this time. But assuredly I shall have more to say later about the so-called Freedom Party and its activities.

I thank the Senator.

GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE—NOT SIMPLY OF THE PEOPLE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, my friend and colleague from Illinois, the minority leader [Mr. Dirksen], has today announced the renewal of his attack on the Supreme Court's decisions enforcing the rights to the equal citizenship of Americans before their State legislatures. Apparently the successor effort to the foreign aid rider campaign and the Baseball Week resolution is to be a well-financed, expertly directed public relations campaign under the aegis of the well-known public relations firm of Whitaker & Baxter and its front organization called the Committee for Government of the People.

This is indeed an appropriate title for such an organization and appears to be revealing of their basic attitudes in this matter. Apparently, there are still those who believe that government of the people is endurable, so long as it is not government by the people and for the people. All governments are governments of the people but it is the basic American doctrine that they are also, in Lincoln's phrase, governments by the people and for the people. I believe in Lincoln's doctrine as enunciated at Gettysburg. By their omissions, I infer that the sponsors of my colleague's amendment do not.

Senators may be interested in an analysis of this new campaign to reverse the Court and restore rotten boroughism written by the able Washington reporter, Charles Nicodemus, which appeared in the Chicago Daily News of January 8. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dirksen Planning New Remap Battle

(By Charles Nicodemus)

Washington.—In a dramatic new turn to the battle over State legislative apportionment, grandiloquent Everett Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois, will within 2 weeks take his bid for a constitutional amendment directly to the American people.

Having failed 2 years running to coax up the extraordinary Senate majority needed to overturn the U.S. Supreme Court's historic one-man, one-vote decision, the Senate minority leader is about to try a new approach.

An expensive national campaign of education and ballyhoo is being readied in the hope that homefront pressure can force the needed additional handful of Senators to switch to Dirksen's cause.

Kickoff of the campaign—heretofore secret—is expected in mid-January, after the reconvening of Congress and the state of the Union message have receded from the headlines.

Opponents of Dirksen's proposed amendment—in the dark, so far, on details of the upcoming effort—can be counted on to crank up an equally gusty countercampaign.

All this should make the legislative remapping issue—thus far confined primarily to the courts and the Congress—a hot topic on a par with the national debate stirred by proposals such as medicare.

These prospects are spiced by the expectation that a high-powered, high-priced public relations and political consulting firm, long-practiced in stirring national controversy, will play a central role in Dirksen's campaign.

Dirksen fell only seven votes short last summer in his second try at rounding up the requisite two-thirds Senate majority needed for passage of a constitutional amendment.

His proposal, which he will now ask the Nation to help him carry, would return to the State legislatures the right to organize one of their houses on the basis of geography or political subdivisions.

The Supreme Court, in its series of controversial apportionment decisions, decreed in June 1964 that districts in both houses of a bicameral legislature must be mapped according to population only.

This knocked out the "little federal system," which uses geographic area or political subdivisions as a criterion. It had been in use in some form in more than two-thirds of the States, including Illinois.

The high cost of financing a campaign broad enough to help upset those decisions in Congress doubtless will stir charges that special interest groups, which often were influential in rural-dominated legislatures, are attempting to buy back some of the power they stand to lose under reapportionment.

Similarly, Dirksen's forces can be expected to allege that the inevitable countercampaign is an effort by groups opposing him—such as labor, civil rights leaders, and big-city political organizations—to guarantee their takeover of legislatures under the one-man, one-vote decision.

Dirksen made clear last October much of what he hoped to accomplish.

"We must organize as our opponents have organized," he said, after again maneuvering his proposal into a position where it can go onto the Senate Calendar whenever he wishes this session.

"We must take this to the grassroots, in a campaign to mobilize the immense public support that we know is there. We must concentrate on the States where we believe we have a chance of switching some votes—particularly those where there is a Senator up for reelection."

CONSULTING FIRM HELPS DIRKSEN

Active in helping, Dirksen's supporters plan that campaign has been the nationally known consulting firm of Whitaker & Baxter, headquartered in San Francisco.

W. & B. has had a hand in the successful campaigns of such political figures as California Gov. Earl Warren and Goodwin Knight. They have backed an occasional loser, such as Richard Nixon in his 1960 presidential bid.

They also have played a central role in California's last three electoral battles over legislative redistricting—leading successful campaigns in 1948, 1960, and 1962 to defeat one-man, one-vote referendum proposals.

Their most renowned effort was on behalf of the American Medical Association in the late forties.

That's when President Harry Truman introduced the Nation's first plan for "socialized medicine," as the Whitaker & Baxter campaign succeeded in tabbing it.

Under W. & B. skillful director, Mr. Truman's pioneer medicine program was buried under a barrage of nationally disseminated red, white, and blue literature, along with radio and press attacks.

Since last fall, W. & B. has been providing organizational help behind the scenes for Dirksen and the groups that are supporting his proposal, such as the Farm Bureau, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and others.

W. & B. has also organized a number of unpublicized fund-raising dinners around the country to which well-heeled influentials have been invited to hear arguments on behalf of Dirksen's proposal. Then the hat is passed.

The campaign kickoff will be announced in about 2 weeks, to be followed by a blizzard-like educational campaign. This will peak sometime in March.

That's when Dirksen, most distinguished orator in the country, will move to center stage by having Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, call up for floor consideration Dirksen's Senate Resolution 103.

Says Dirksen, of his defeats and the upcoming battle:

"This is the basic constitutional crisis of our time. I don't relent. I don't compromise. This is a matter of principle. I am duty-bound to persevere, on behalf of the country and the people."

Dirksen's amendment would give a State the right to set up one house of its legislation on a nonpopulation basis—but only if such a plan is first approved at a referendum, at which a strict population plan also is on the ballot.

Such a little federal plan, if ratified, would have to be reapproved in a similar competitive referendum after every 10-year census.

"This merely returns to the States the historic right of the people to decide how they wish to govern themselves—without dictation by a narrow Supreme Court majority moved by changing whims," Dirksen declared.

So far, Dirksen's leading foes—Senators Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, William Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and Joseph Tydings, Democrat, of Maryland, the AFL–CIO, and civil rights groups—have heard few details of what the Dirksen forces are planning.

Dirksen's opponents contend they still have the votes to deny the minority leader his two-thirds margin. If any question crops up about that margin, the opponents say they will simply filibuster—as they did in 1964 to block Dirksen's first try.

If the Dirksen proposal foes win two-thirds endorsement by both Houses, it must still be ratified by three-quarters of the States within 7 years.

Prospects for such ratification once appeared certain. Now they are clouded. Many legislatures already have redistricted under the one-man one-vote decision. They might not be eager to ratify an amendment that could upset any resulting new balance of State power.

The National Municipal League reported that as of January 1, there were 15 State legislatures with both houses now apportioned according to one-man, one-vote standards; 24 States in which the next crop of legislators will be elected under such plans, most in November 1966; 8 States now under court order to change to population plans; 2 States in which nonpopulation plans are being challenged in the courts.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Senate will soon engage in a debate, which is to be an extended discussion, on the subject of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, the so-called right-to-work law.

In recent days there has been an exchange of views between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who represents the resistance to that path, and Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO.

During the exchange of views, Mr. Meany referred to the resistance on the part of the Senator from Illinois to the repeal as being an offense against the orderly process of Government. I feel certain that that subject and that particular topic will receive a great deal of attention as time goes on. But for the time being, I ask unanimous consent that two letters, one to the editor of the Washington Star and one to the editor of the Washington Post on that particular point, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 15, 1966]

FOR, DIRKSEN—AGAINST, MEANY

SIR: Your letter from George Meany was well timed. How the president of the AFL-CIO could have the nerve to demand a vote on repeal of 14(b) while the largest city in supposedly the greatest country of the world was in the stranglehold of a dictatorial labor leader, is beyond understanding. Maybe Mayor Lindsay now wishes he had voted against repeal of 14(b), since he has now come to personally know the ability of a labor leader to flout the law of his city.

Meany calls for democracy to act against the valiant Senator DIRKSEN. Is such really majority action? Check the record, Meany is calling for the majority States to impress their will on the minority States. Yet the majority of Congressmen elected by the people of the right-to-work States, in the House of Representatives, voted against repeal of 14(b). If labor is really so concerned with the rights of minority groups, how can Meany in good conscience suggest that such a crushing of the will of voters in right-to-work States be democratic? (Remember, the House vote for repeal of 14(b) was only 221 to 203. There are only 19 right-to-work States against 31 union shop States.)

Let us all pray that EVERETT DIRKSEN lives to 100. Thanks, EVERETT and happy 70th birthday. We hope Lindsay develops your intestinal fortitude. It appears he might now wish to change his vote.

R. L. PETERS.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 18, 1966]

MEANY REBUTTED

George Meany, the president of the AFL-CIO, stated in a letter to the editor that the efforts of Senator DIRKSEN toward keeping Taft-Hartley 14(b)—the right-to-work section—are an "offense against the orderly process of government."

What Mr. Meany failed to note was that the Senate rules specifically provide that a debate cannot be halted unless two-thirds of the Senators agree. When a two-thirds vote was sought in the last session of Congress, the Senate voted 47 to 45 not to consider the removal of Taft-Hartley 14(b). That is the orderly process of the U.S. Senate.

The basic issue is whether there is a public interest to be satisfied by the removal of the right-to-work section; and this has been answered by three respected public opinion polls: Gallup, Lubell, and Opinion Research. Every poll showed that the American public does not believe that employes should be required to join or pay dues to a union or lose their jobs.

WILLIAM J. FANNIN,
Secretary, Committee for Voluntary Unionism, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.
WASHINGTON.

SHAKEDOWN OF TULSA PIPELINE CONTRACTOR BY LAWRENCE L. CALLANAN, CONVICTED OFFICIAL OF ST. LOUIS STEAMFITTERS LOCAL 562

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I call attention to a strange series of events surrounding the case of Mr. Lawrence L. Callanan, a convicted official of the powerful St. Louis Steamfitters Local No. 562.

In 1954 Mr. Callanan as an official of this union was convicted of a $28,000 shakedown of a Tulsa pipeline contractor.

Federal Judge Rubey Hulen in sentencing Mr. Callanan described the case as a "more grievous and aggravated violation of the law" than any other racketeering case tried before him.

Continuing, Judge Hulen said:

> The evidence of merciless use and betrayal of people who labor for their livelihood and were members of unions supposed to be represented by these defendants, is shocking. Unless I had heard the facts under oath I would not have believed them.

The Judge further remarked that—

> Callanan hasn't shown one bit of remorse. Indifference to the welfare of union workmen is glaring.

He stated further:

> Callanan took from the funds of the union, of which he is an officer, funds to pay for his defense. Callanan was the brains of the racketeering conspiracy.

In 1960 after serving about half of a 12-year sentence Callanan was paroled.

Treasury Department records show that during the years 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1962 Mr. Callanan did not file any Federal income tax returns.

For the years 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954, Mr. Callanan created a delinquent tax liability, including penalty and interest, of $40,219.84. The Treasury filed a deficiency tax assessment as follows:

Taxable year	Tax	Penalty	Assessed interest	Accrued interest	Total
1950	0	$206.68	$755.47	$698.48	$1,660.63
1951	$1,222.00	1,048.54	604.97	898.36	3,773.87
1952	4,883.51	3,382.49	1,762.07	3,033.09	13,061.16
1953	4,861.95	3,414.20	1,462.57	2,945.57	12,684.29
1954	5,097.48	920.20	1,202.10	1,820.11	9,039.89
Total	16,064.94	8,972.11	5,787.18	9,395.61	40,219.84

On April 9, 1964, the Treasury Department accepted an offer in compromise whereby Mr. Callanan paid $17,000 in settlement of his $40,219.84 tax debt plus a graduated percentage of his income in excess of $7,500 for the years 1964 to 1974.

An Internal Revenue Service summary noted that he was then earning $150 a week as a steamfitter and added a doleful note that there are "no prospects of any material increase" in his income.

In the same month, April 1964, President Johnson commuted the sentence of this labor racketeer and thereby removed the legal blocks which had restricted his union activities.

The St. Louis Globe Democrat in its October 2–3, 1965, issue carried this interesting comment:

> Before his commutation was granted, Callanan faced legal blocks to resuming union-related activity until July 1971.
>
> He recently surfaced on the political high seas as the director of the lush voluntary political fund of Local 562, his salary reported in the $15,000 to $20,000 range.

Reports of campaign donations filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives January 12, 1965, show that on November 2, 1964, John A. Lawler, business manager of the Steamfitters Local No. 562, contributed $25,000 to Friends of L.B.J.

I quote section 608 of title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Limitations on political contributions and purchases:

> (a) Whoever, directly or indirectly, makes contributions in an aggregate amount in excess of $5,000 during any calendar year, or in connection with any campaign for nomination or election, to or on behalf of any candidate for an elective Federal office, including the offices of President of the United States and presidential and vice-presidential electors, or to or on behalf of any committee or other organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate for any such office or the success of any national political party, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

On June 2, 1965, Mr. L. L. Callanan, 10517 Lookaway, St. Louis, Mo.—his home address—made a $1,000 contribution to the Democratic National Committee.

On June 24, 1965, Mr. Lawrence Callanan, 1242 Pierce Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.—address of the union—made another $1,000 contribution to the Democratic National Committee.

These two $1,000 political contributions were made by the same man who just the year before had compromised a $40,000 tax obligation for $17,000.

On June 2, 1965, a $1,000 contribution to the Democratic National Committee was made in the name of E. Beck, 4317 Haven Street, St. Louis, Mo. Mr. Beck is listed as Mr. Callanan's son-in-law and according to press accounts, last year was made an assistant to Callanan in running the voluntary political fund of Local No. 562 members.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of these political contributions as appearing in the reports filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives under dates of January 12, 1965, and September 10, 1965.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT FILED JANUARY 12, 1965, BY FRIENDS OF L.B.J.

November 2, 1964: John L. Lawler, St. Louis, Mo., $25,000.

REPORT FILED SEPTEMBER 10, 1965, BY THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

June 2, 1965: L. L. Callahan, 10517 Lookaway, St. Louis, Mo., $1,000.

June 2, 1965: J. L. Lawler, 1242 Pierce Avenue, St. Louis, Mo., $1,000.

June 2, 1965: E. Beck, 4317 Haven Street, St. Louis, Mo., $1,000.

June 24, 1965: Lawrence Callahan (sic), 1242 Pierce Avenue, St. Louis, Mo., $1,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, next I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter signed by Mr. Sheldon S. Cohen, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as addressed to me under date of January 6, 1966, confirming Mr. Callanan's tax delinquency.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., January 6, 1966.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further response to your letters of October 6 and 12, 1965, in which you requested certain information regarding the compromise settlement of tax assessments by the Treasury Department with Mr. Lawrence L. Callanan, St. Louis, Mo.

Information furnished by the District Director in St. Louis, Mo., discloses that an offer in compromise from Mr. Callanan was accepted on April 9, 1964. The amount of the offer was $17,000, plus a future income collateral agreement providing for the payment of a graduated percentage of annual income in excess of $7,500 for the years 1964–74, inclusive. This is the only offer which has been accepted from Mr. Callanan over the past 30 years.

The following is a breakdown of the liability which was compromised:

Taxable year	Tax	Penalty	Assessed interest	Accrued interest	Total
1950	0	$206.68	$755.47	$698.48	$1,660.63
1951	$1,222.00	$1,048.54	604.97	898.36	3,773.87
1952	4,883.51	3,382.49	1,762.07	3,033.09	13,061.16
1953	4,861.95	3,414.20	1,462.57	2,945.57	12,684.29
1954	5,097.48	920.20	1,202.10	1,820.11	9,039.89
Total	16,064.94	8,972.11	5,787.18	9,395.61	40,219.84

You also requested to know whether Mr. Callanan has filed timely tax returns over the past 10 years. The records of our district director in St. Louis, Mo., disclose the filing of income tax returns by Mr. Callanan for the years 1955, 1960, 1961, 1963, and 1964. Up to this point we have been unable to find any record in the St. Louis office of returns filed by Mr. Callanan for 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1962. However, we would not want to say with any degree of finality that Mr. Callanan did not file for these years, since he could have filed in other district offices.

Of the returns on record in the St. Louis district, all were timely filed except the 1955 return which was received after the due date.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

SHELDON S. COHEN,
Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of articles which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat pertaining to this case.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Oct. 2–3, 1965]

DONATION OF $25,000 BY LAWLER FOR JOHNSON CAMPAIGN—STEAMFITTER AGENT'S ACTION APPEARS TO HAVE VIOLATED FEDERAL LAW

(By Al Delugach and Denny Walsh)

By far the handsomest gift to Friends of L.B.J. in the 1964 presidential campaign was the $25,000 it reported as a contribution from John L. Lawler. He is business manager of the powerful St. Louis Steamfitters Local No. 562, which pays him about that much annually.

On its face, the donation appears in violation of Federal law forbidding a contributor from giving over $5,000 to a single committee in a Federal election.

Friends of L.B.J. was a gilt-edge group of political insiders that raised campaign funds for President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The President, in April 1964, commuted the labor racketeering sentence of the local No. 562 strongman, Lawrence L. Callanan.

Other 1964 contributions listed as made by Lawler include $2,000 to the President's Club for Johnson Committee and $3,000 to the Democratic National Committee.

Callanan himself, as well as Lawler and other key local No. 562 figures, are also reported as having plunked out a total of $6,000 in contributions to the Democratic National Committee just last June.

LARGE DEBTS

The committee, which reported raising $1,330,640 between June 1 and August 31 this year, still has large debts from the 1964 campaign.

Callanan was convicted under a Republican administration in 1954 of the $28,000 shakedown of a Tulsa pipeline contractor. He was paroled in 1960 after serving nearly half of a 12-year sentence in Leavenworth.

A few days earlier, the Internal Revenue Service granted him a favorable settlement of his $40,000 tax debt from the kickback period.

Because of his allegedly modest finances, he was permitted to pay $17,000 cash and a percentage of anything he earned above $7,500 a year for 10 years. The IRS summary of the case noted he was then earning $150 a week as a steamfitter and added a doleful note:

There are no prospects of any material increase in his income.

Before his commutation was granted 8 days later, Callanan faced legal blocks to resuming union-related activity until July 1971.

SALARY HIKE

He recently surfaced on the political high seas as the director of the lush voluntary political fund of Local No. 562, his salary reported in the $15,000–$20,000 range.

The financial report of Friends of L.B.J. was filed with the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives in Washington, January 12, 1965.

It was sworn to by its treasurer, Paul A. Porter, and submitted on the letterhead of the high-powered Washington law firm of Arnold, Fortas, & Porter.

One partner, Abe Fortas, has recently been named to the Supreme Court bench. Another, Thurman Arnold, is former head of the Justice Department's antitrust division. Mr. Arnold was a defense attorney for Callanan in appeals of his conviction, to the Supreme Court in the 1950's.

The name of the chairman of Friends of L.B.J. was not in its report. A spokesman for the Democratic National Committee said he did not know the chairman's identity. Several attempts to contact Mr. Porter Friday about the report were unsuccessful, although he was in his office.

Among the $121,950 in contributions reported for 1964 was $25,000 on November 2 by Lawler, who was listed as a contributor. Although the law requires the name and address of contributors, the report gave only the name and city of each.

The Hatch Act states that whoever makes contributions of more than $5,000 to a political committee in a Federal election shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both. Committees as contributors are excepted.

U.S. LABOR LAW

Under Federal labor law, unions and corporations are not permitted to make political contributions on their own.

Lawler was said to be out of the city Friday and not available for comment about his reported contribution.

By comparison to the $25,000 gift, Henry Ford II, of Detroit, was down on the report for $3,000 and Hollywood star Gene Autry for $5,000.

According to the 1964 financial report of Steamfitter Local No. 562 to the Labor Department, Lawler was paid $19,960 salary, plus $1,500 allowances, and $4,136 expenses between October 1, 1963, and September 1, 1964.

The salary was $5,260 above Lawler's salary figure in the 1963 report filed.

The Democratic National Committee's report filed with the House Clerk showed a $1,000 contribution June 2, 1965, by L. L. Callanan, 10517 Lookaway Drive (his home address), and another $1,000 by Lawrence Callanan, 1242 Pierce Avenue (address of the union).

OTHER DONATIONS

Other $1,000 donations last June 2 were listed for J. L. Lawler, G. Seaton, and E. Steska, all of the union address, and E. Beck, 4317 Haven Street.

Steska is local No. 562 president and Seaton the vice president and business agent.

Beck, a steamfitter, is Callanan's son-in-law. He reportedly has been recently made assistant to Callanan in running the voluntary political fund, which is reputed to take in as much as $300,000 a year from local No. 562 members. The fund is quartered in union hall.

As revealed Tuesday by the Globe-Democrat, Beck showed up in State records as one of the licensed agents of an insurance firm about the time it began doing business with local No. 562's pension fund.

The fund's reports to the Labor Department do not list Beck as among those who were paid thousands of dollars in commissions on the deal.

Contributions to the Democratic committee from the Steamfitter elite appear munificent by comparison with many in the $200-to-$400 range from members of President Johnson's Cabinet and other Government officials.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Oct. 2–3, 1965]

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

It is revealed elsewhere in today's Globe-Democrat that John Lawler, business manager of Steamfitters Local No. 562, made a $25,000 campaign gift to Friends of L.B.J., $2,000 to the President's Club for Johnson Committee, and $3,000 to the Democratic National Committee, all in 1964.

Considering that Lawler's salary for 1964 was reported as $19,960, this is extremely generous giving, indeed.

The Globe-Democrat believes the Internal Revenue Service should make an investigation of Lawler's finances to determine whether he paid taxes on what must be a vast income above his stated salary to enable him to give so generously to President Johnson and the Democratic National Committee.

We think, too, that U.S. Attorney Richard D. FitzGibbon should investigate whether any Federal law has been violated by these gifts. Federal law forbids a contributor from giving over $5,000 to one committee in a Federal election.

This may be difficult for Mr. FitzGibbon since he was the Callanan-Lawler candidate for mayor until the steamfitter gang found that Alfonso J. Cervantes had too great a lead and switched their endorsement from FitzGibbon to Cervantes. Nevertheless, it is his duty and we expect Mr. FitzGibbon to do it.

We think that the Internal Revenue Service should also investigate the gift of Lawrence Callanan of $2,000 to the Democratic National Committee this year.

Callanan, convicted labor racketeer, was permitted to pay $17,000 cash in settlement of a bill of $40,219 for taxes, fraud, and other penalties and interest.

He is required, under terms of the settlement, to pay a percentage of future earnings in excess of $7,500 a year on the $23,219 balance of his tax liabilities.

If Callanan were so poor that the Internal Revenue Service had to compromise his debt to the Government, how could he contribute $2,000 to the Democratic Party?

Certainly the Internal Revenue Service, in view of Callanan's obvious affluence, should find adequate grounds for reopening its tax settlement.

Surely there can be no connection between the enormously generous gifts of Callanan and Lawler and President Johnson's commutation of Callanan's sentence, which enables him to go back into union activities.

Nevertheless, perhaps former Attorney General ROBERT KENNEDY—now Senator from New York—would care to comment on his recommending Callanan for a return to grace in view of the smelly record of the steamfitters as blocks to progress in St. Louis, Callanan's continuing to run the union, from his jail cell and most importantly, the remarks of the late Federal Judge Ruby Hulen who, in sentencing Callanan, described the case as a more grievous and aggravated violation of the law, than other racketeering cases tried before him.

"The evidence of merciless use and betrayal of people who labor for their livelihood, and were members of unions supposed to be represented by these defendants, is shocking," Judge Hulen stated at the time. "Unless I had heard the facts under oath I would not have believed them."

The judge remarked that Callanan "hasn't shown one bit of remorse. Indifference to the welfare of union workmen is glaring." Judge Hulen stated further: "Callanan took from the funds of the union, of which he is an officer, funds to pay for his defense. Callanan was the brains of the racketeering conspiracy."

Perhaps the White House itself would care to elaborate on the clean bill of health given Callanan last year.

It would be interesting to know, also, who urged Attorney General KENNEDY and President Johnson to pardon this notorious extortionist.

The evidence of law violation and the possibility, at least, of the illegal use of union funds cries aloud for investigation.

Everyone who believes in good government will not be content until strong affirmative action is taken in the cases of Lawler and Callanan and, if there are abuses of law and trust, as we strongly suspect, they are thoroughly aired and punished.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Oct. 6, 1965]

SEVEN ST. LOUISANS HELPED CALLANAN WIN CLEMENCY—GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS ALSO SUPPORTED COMMUTATION FOR STEAMFITTER LEADER

(By Al Delugach and Denny Walsh)

How did ex-convict Lawrence Callanan obtain the Presidential clemency that paved the way for his recent, open return as the dominant figure in the St. Louis Steamfitter Union's political empire?

An inquiry into the April 1964 commutation of the remainder of Callanan's two 12-year labor racketeering sentences by President Johnson has demonstrated this significant factor:

While on parole, after serving 6 years in prison, Callanan marshaled support from an imposing array of Government officials and local business and professional men in his fight for complete freedom. This accomplished what a long legal battle—carried three times to the U.S. Supreme Court—failed to do.

That is, to release Callanan from prohibitions by the sentencing judge in 1954 that were intended to keep him out of union-related activity until 1971.

KEY ROLE

Richard FitzGibbon, U.S. attorney here, had a key role in the process that led to the Presidential commutation.

He recommended approval of Callanan's petition after reviewing the case on request of the Justice Department's pardon attorney, Reed Cozart. The matter then was approved successively by Mr. Cozart and then Attorney General ROBERT KENNEDY. Any one of these recommendations automatically requires action by the President, Mr. FitzGibbon said.

President Johnson, who has sole authority to grant pardons or commutations, acted after a final review by his special counsel, Lee C. White, the Globe-Democrat was informed.

Files in the Justice Department show that Callanan's petition of September 30, 1963, was accompanied by letters of indorsement by 7 St. Louisans. They are:

Mark Eagleton, attorney and father of Missouri Lt. Gov. Thomas F. Eagleton.

Richard H. Kremer, president of Kremer-Hicks Co., a mechanical contractor and large employer of steamfitters.

The Reverand Thomas J. Hederman, pastor of St. Luke the Evangelist Catholic Church.

I. E. Millstone, president of Millstone Construction, Inc., a general contractor.

Harry T. Bussman, Jr., president of Supreme Express and Transfer Co.

John H. Londoff, operator of Johnny Londoff Chevrolet, Inc.

Morris Shenker, attorney, who represented Callanan in his trial and subsequent court appeals.

Callanan said in his petition, on which he noted he received assistance from Mr. Shenker, that he believed his sentence was unreasonably severe. He said he believed that in the interest of justice his sentence should be commuted to the time already served.

The indorsers' letters variously expressed the views that Callanan had been punished more than enough, that he had been completely rehabilitated and that he was living up to the conditions of his parole.

Callanan and four leaders of other construction unions had been found guilty of the $28,000 shakedown of a Tulsa pipeline contractor, as well as conspiring to extort the money.

Giving 12-year sentences on each charge, the late Federal Judge Rubey Hulen suspended the conspiracy sentences. He specified a 5-year probation period on the latter to begin after the completion of the first sentence. During the period, he ordered, the defendants could not hold office or represent any labor organization.

While Callanan was in prison, the Supreme Court twice rejected appeals.

Then, shortly before his release on parole in April 1960, the High Court agreed to rule on whether Callanan committed two separate crimes in the extortion case. The Supreme Court, in January 1961, upheld the two sentences in a 5-to-4 decision.

Although Callanan was then on parole, he was under supervision of probation officers and could not participate in union affairs.

He held jobs as a working steamfitter for several years before his commutation lifted restrictions that were due to continue 7 more years.

The Justice Department pardon attorney, Mr. Cozart, was asked this week if anyone had urged the commutation so that Callanan could go back into a union office.

NOT A FACTOR

He said no, adding that this was not considered by the Government as a factor in the case. Mr. Cozart also said his office had no contact from any politician or officeholder on Callanan's behalf.

"I had in mind he had already served 10 years," Mr. Cozart said. "He had been out on parole with a good record. Ten years is a pretty long time for a first offender."

Mr. Cozart said he asked John L. Brennan, Jr., chief Federal probation officer in St. Louis, for an opinion.

He quoted Mr. Brennan as saying in a letter that he had heard some vague reports Callanan might be running the steamfitter union but that a limited investigation did not turn up any basis for the rumors and that Callanan denied it.

Mr. Brennan said that since the original disposition of the case was in the Federal court here he did not feel he should make a recommendation on the commutation.

When the file was sent to the U.S. attorney here, Mr. FitzGibbon recommended approval of Callanan's petition.

He told reporters this week:

"It was my judgment the guy was deserving of a commutation at that point in light of all the factors involved."

He declined, however, to discuss the reasons he stated in making the recommendation. He said the matter was "confidential," adding:

"I don't think it would be proper for me to make any comment on that at this time."

Mr. FitzGibbon was the steamfitters' first choice to oppose Mayor Tucker for renomination in this year's Democratic primary. However, when sufficient support was not assured for Mr. FitzGibbon, the Callanan-Lawler forces switched at the last minute to Alfonso J. Cervantes.

Mr. Cervantes won the election with the aid of heavy steamfitter campaign contributions.

Letters of St. Louisans endorsing Callanan's petition for commutation included some glowing statements on behalf of the convicted labor racketeer.

Contractor Kremer's endorsement said he had known Callanan 25 years and employed him 21 months during his parole period. He referred to him as a good husband and father and said once more he is a useful citizen in society.

Mr. Kremer added he believed Callanan to have been more than sufficiently punished and declared:

"I have always known him to be dedicated to the betterment of the working classes generally, particularly to the pipefitters whom he represents."

Mr. Millstone's letter said Callanan and his family "have suffered more than enough for the crime he was convicted of." It said he had known Callanan 15 years and hired hundreds of his men. As far as he knew, the letter said, Callanan was living up to his parole conditions.

Stating he had known him for over 20 years, Mr. Bussmann said that since Callanan's release on parole he had shown himself to be "completely rehabilitated."

HIGH REGARD

Mr. Londoff's letter said he had known Callanan 12 years and had "high regard" for him. He said: "I welcome the opportunity to recommend him."

Letters of attorneys Shenker and Eagleton noted the severity of Callanan's sentence.

Mr. Eagleton was endorsed by Callanan in 1953 in an unsuccessful campaign for the Democratic nomination for mayor. He was narrowly defeated by Raymond R. Tucker.

Father Hederman told a reporter that Callanan was a parishioner of his when he wrote his letter.

Except for Mr. Kremer, who is abroad, each of the St. Louisans who wrote letters on Callanan's behalf were contacted by the Globe-Democrat and readily confirmed the endorsements.

Most indicated they did not recall the strong statements made by Judge Hulen about Callanan at the time of the sentencing in 1954 and a subsequent hearing on his motion for reduction of sentence.

Judge Hulen described the case as a more grievous and aggravated violation of the law than a previous labor racketeering case he had heard involving three of Callanan's codefendants, adding:

"The evidence of merciless abuse and betrayal of people who labor for their livelihood and were members of unions, supposed to be represented by these defendants, is shocking. Unless I had heard the facts under oath, I would not have believed them."

Singling out Callanan, Judge Hulen said:

"To add ignominy to the abuse of his power as an official of a labor union, defendant Callanan took from the funds of the union of which he is an officer to pay for his defense in this case, the very essence of the charge going to his deserting the cause of the members of the union that contributed and owned those funds."

Again, in February 1956, Judge Hulen said, in turning down his plea for a reduction in sentence:

"I feel that defendant Callanan was the brains of the conspiracy. The other defendants were dumb clucks who did not have brains enough to carry out the operation."

THE CASE AGAINST THE STEAMFITTERS

The individual steamfitter in this area is probably just as good an American as any other citizen, but his union—Local No. 562—has kept more business out of St. Louis than anyone else can bring in. It is a corrupting influence in the life of this city.

Businesses not already in St. Louis steer clear of us because they simply will not submit to the steamfitters gang, which has the highest wage scale in the Nation, but whose featherbedding and other practices exorbitantly hike the cost of doing business.

Contractors using steamfitters cannot even appoint their own union foremen. They have no voice in hiring their own union employees. They must take whomever the union gives them and have no control whatsoever over the job.

This is contrary to the universal practice of other unions. As a result, the steamfitters are regarded as the worst union in the area and, probably, in the country in terms of productivity and reasonable cooperative effort.

Some people may say, "Why worry about a small union of 1,200 members? A group that small, no matter how bad, cannot possibly do any harm." They could not be more wrong.

The power of the steamfitters is sheer money. Each union member is forced to contribute $1 a day, $2 for permit holders, to a voluntary fund for political education. It is voluntary only in the sense that he gives it or he doesn't work.

The $250 annually which a resident steamfitter must give is more than the average person in those circumstances contributes to his church, the United Fund, the Boy Scouts and all good causes combined; yet he has no choice.

The total in this one fund amounts to approximately $600,000 a year, which goes to political contributions known to be well up in six figures to at least one candidate and very well up in five figures to others.

In addition, this one small union takes in approximately $2,500,000 annually, paid solely by the employers at the rate of $10 per man-day worked, to a health and welfare fund. Benefits seeping down to the individual members from this fund seem curiously limited and accountability does not exist.

For example, several years ago the steamfitters canceled the group policy bought for their members with one of the best and most reputable insurance companies in America and took out policies with a small and little known company in Gary, Ind.

Curiously, this is the same company which sold 116,250 shares of stock with a market value of about $5 per share to interested St. Louisans with good union contacts at $1 per share. If this deal doesn't stink to high heaven, none ever did. It is currently being investigated by Federal authorities.

There is no applicable law governing the disbursement either of the $600,000 political slush fund or the $2,500,000 health and welfare plans. This is a shocking loophole and should be corrected at the Federal level.

Meanwhile, the union is controlled by Lawrence Callanan, who was convicted of extortion and served 6 years in a Federal prison, by his standby and lackey, John Lawler, who was indicted for extortion, but strangely never came to trial, and by Lawrence Thompson, a former teamster convicted of extortion who makes sure the boys give their $1-a-day political contribution.

Some questionable practices may have their root in the fact that Callanan, Lawler, and the like are able to make massive political contributions. Lawler recently contributed $31,000 to the Friends of L.B.J. and other Democratic committees. Callanan was able to compromise $40,219 in back taxes for $17,000 but still was able to give $2,000 to the Democratic National Committee. It probably was a coincidence, but not too long before that a Presidential commutation was issued for Callanan who promptly resumed his role in union affairs.

With the power afforded them by the members' voluntary gifts, the steamfitters can make quite some political hay. One of their members sits in the Missouri Senate and two are in the Missouri House of Representatives. There is talk that Lawler himself may, indeed, have the effrontery to run for a vacancy in the State senate for which he was beaten 3 years ago.

Attorneys or proteges have been appointed as chairman of the St. Louis Board of Election Commissioners and as a judge of a circuit court.

The Steamfitters are reaching for some of the highest offices in Missouri government and their influence for evil will expand unless checked in the public interest.

The entire matter cries aloud for ventilation and correction.

Specifically, the District Director of Internal Revenue should reopen the tax compromise of Callanan and investigate the amount paid on income taxes by Callanan, Lawler, and associates.

The International Steamfitters Union should investigate the abuses which have brought—and are bringing—the entire steamfitter trade, an honorable one outside this area, into disrepute. The International Meatcutters Union straightened out a far less dangerous situation with their local, and the Steamfitters can do no less.

We hope that Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, and Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, will investigate the entire mess in St. Louis and propose corrective Federal legislation.

The U.S. attorney, Richard D. FitzGibbon, has announced that he will investigate the Steamfitters before a Federal grand jury in Judge Roy Harper's court. We can think of no one less promising to conduct such an investigation.

FitzGibbon was a former law associate of Morris Shenker, who is in the steamfitter business up to his eyebrows. FitzGibbon was the steamfitters' choice as a candidate for mayor until they found they could not beat Al Cervantes in the primary. FitzGibbon himself represents a nice balance between ineptitude and laziness, a combination hard to beat.

We urge the Justice Department, considering the many ramifications of the insurance deal, to send in a highly qualified special prosecutor to replace FitzGibbon and run the investigation.

The steamfitters' union is of personal concern to every businessman and every citizen in this area. It can only be reformed by the good offices of the Justice Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Internal Revenue Service, courageous Senators, and a courageous grand jury in Judge Harper's court, and by an aroused public opinion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, perhaps there is a plausible explanation for the strange circumstances surrounding this case, but I fail to see it.

THE "YARMOUTH CASTLE" DISASTER

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, only 2 short months ago, a Panamanian cruise ship burned and sank off the coast of Florida. Eighty-nine lives were lost in this terrible disaster.

The *Yarmouth Castle* was not the Nation's first maritime disaster, and, unfortunately, it will not be the last. As long as man sails the seas for pleasure or for profit, he will face the inherent dangers of storm and tempest. Despite the advanced technical resources at our command, there is still little we can do to calm high seas or strong winds.

But many maritime disasters are caused—not by storms or high seas—but by fire and human negligence. And here there is much that can be done.

I mention only a few such disasters to make my point clear—the collision of the *Stockholm* and the *Andrea Doria*, the terrible fire on board the *Morro Castle*, the sinking of the *Lakonia* and, of course, the tragic fire on the *Yarmouth Castle* the night of November 13.

The Coast Guard is now completing a thorough investigation into the incidents surrounding the sinking of the *Yarmouth Castle* and has received testimony from countless witnesses. We will await the outcome of this investigation with great interest.

Several alarming facts concerning the *Yarmouth Castle* have already come to light. She was an old ship, built in 1927, and had seen long years of service under several flags.

Testimony before a subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee last summer revealed that much of the interior construction of cruise ships like the *Yarmouth Castle* consists of wood and other highly flammable materials.

It is my understanding that the Coast Guard investigation has uncovered many more deficiencies in the ship's hull construction and fittings.

And there is probably more about the condition of the *Yarmouth Castle* that will be revealed when the Coast Guard report is made public.

But it is important to note that it was fire and possible human negligence that caused the sinking of the ship—and not the forces of nature.

This makes it even more imperative that we seek to find the reasons why these disasters take place and then take whatever action is necessary to protect the lives of American passengers on ocean vessels.

Although the *Yarmouth Castle* disaster clearly demonstrates the urgent need for corrective measures, it is extremely unfortunate that it required the loss of 89 lives to awaken the Nation to the serious hazards of traveling on many of these older foreign ships.

There will still be some who will tell us that today's safety measures are adequate—that the *Yarmouth Castle* disaster was a freak accident. But you and I know that this is not true and that much remains to be done to make American passengers safe on the high seas.

If it requires strong measures to make our passengers safe, then we must take these measures.

If some ships must be put into mothballs, then they must be put into mothballs.

Mr. President, seldom has there been such clear evidence that, in many ways, the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, the agreement governing safety standards on passenger vessels, has failed to protect the American public.

I do not propose that the United States categorically denounce the International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea. That would not solve the problem.

But I do suggest that the United States seek to renegotiate that treaty.

I have received assurances from the Department of State that this suggestion is already under active consideration.

In a recent letter to me, the Department of State said:

> Immediately following the *Yarmouth Castle* disaster, the State Department undertook discussions with other interested agencies of the Government on additional measures that can be taken to improve the safety standards applicable to passenger ships leaving U.S. ports. We anticipate that these discussions, which are still going forward, will soon result in definite proposals.
>
> The possibility of renegotiating the Convention for Safety of Life at Sea is one of the proposals under consideration.

What exactly is wrong with the International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea?

The standards set out in the treaty, for the most part, are adequate. But what is inadequate is the application of these standards to older ships.

The 1960 Convention, for example, is only applicable to passenger vessels constructed after May 26, 1965. Ships built before that date do not have to comply with all the safety standards set forth in that treaty.

Because of our international commitments, the U.S. Coast Guard is required to issue certificates of safety to those older ships which are technically in compliance with the International Convention—even though they do not have to comply with the safety standards outlined in that agreement.

The State Department agrees with me that this is a serious shortcoming of the treaty.

I asked the Department if it believes that the safety standards outlined in the 1960 Convention—and the lack of application of these standards to ships constructed before May 26, 1965—provide adequate safety for American passengers traveling on foreign ships.

I received the following reply:

> On the question of the adequacy of Convention standards, we defer to the Coast Guard and would be guided by the Coast Guard's views. However, it is clear that one of the major problems is the fact that you point out, that the 1960 Convention does not apply to vessels constructed before it came into effect. The same is true of the earlier Convention of 1948.
>
> This probably is the most serious shortcoming of the Conventions.

Mr. President, I was certainly pleased to learn that the Department of State recognizes the shortcomings of this treaty and appears willing to take steps to seek negotiations with the 39 other governments involved.

Unwillingness on our part to urge other nations to join us at the conference table would only increase the danger of similar disasters in the near future.

Some ships, in due course, might have to be decommissioned.

But old airplanes are taken out of service, old automobiles are consigned to the junkyard, and unsafe bridges are razed and then replaced by modern spans.

Why should unsafe passenger vessels be permitted to remain on the high seas—at the mercy of a carelessly tossed cigarette, a crew unschooled in elementary firefighting procedures or a steamship line that shows little concern for its passenger safety?

Most American vessels are required to conform to strict safety regulations. But the Coast Guard should continually review its present regulations to make sure that they meet the requirements of optimum safety.

Our regulations must be strict, our policies must be firm, and our concern must be great when the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans are placed in our care.

The argument will no doubt be raised that some foreign passenger ships would have to be decommissioned, at great financial loss, if tough safety regulations were imposed on older ships.

But I say that it is better to suffer the loss of 10 ships than 10 lives.

It would be easy for us to absolve ourselves of any responsibility for the loss of the *Yarmouth Castle* by declaring that we must abide by our international agreements.

But when these agreements fail to protect the American passengers who sail on these ships, then we must do all that we can to insure their safety.

Of course, we must be realistic about what we can and cannot do to prevent another *Yarmouth Castle* disaster.

We cannot order foreign ships off the high seas; we cannot forbid American passengers to sail on these ships if they are willing to take the necessary risks; and we cannot simply denounce a treaty our Nation has signed in good faith.

We can, however, regulate the safety standards on our own ships.

I propose that the Coast Guard carefully examine its present safety regulations. And, if it finds, after close investigation, that these standards need to be upgraded, then I strongly urge that this be accomplished as soon as possible.

Thirty-five American passenger vessels which now hold active safety certificates were built before 1952. Of the 15 ships constructed before 1940, 12 were built before 1930, 5 before 1920, and 2 before 1910.

The Coast Guard should take special steps to insure that these older vessels provide entirely adequate protection for the passengers they carry.

There is absolutely no excuse for keeping a passenger ship in service if it constitutes a fire hazard or a safety hazard.

And we can officially warn Americans about the dangers of sailing on certain foreign ships which, in the expert judgment of the Coast Guard, are unsafe or hazardous.

I urge the Coast Guard to study the feasibility of publishing a list of those foreign ships which are technically in compliance with international agreements, but are actually unfit for service.

Such a warning might cause American passengers to reconsider before booking passage on these ships—and thereby exert financial pressure on the steamship lines that refuse to upgrade the safety standards on their ships.

We would be terribly remiss if we did not do all in our power to insure the safety of American passengers on foreign vessels.

Mr. President, the loss of the *Yarmouth Castle* has taught us a lesson and it has warned us that there is much that we have not done that we should have done. No single person is responsible; no single organization is to blame; and no single government is entirely at fault. The *Yarmouth Castle* disaster is a challenge to all of us to take immediate corrective action—action to insure that this type of accident never happens again.

It is my understanding that the Coast Guard, Senate Commerce Committee, and other interested parties realize the need for legislation that would require foreign steamship lines to warn passengers of fire and safety hazards on board their ships. This will go a long way toward alleviating hazardous conditions.

But the regulations themselves will have to be upgraded. And the only way that this can be done is through renegotiation of the International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea.

The most pressing need is to bring older ships into compliance with modern safety regulations. Every effort should be made to replace wood construction with accepted fireproof materials.

Where this is not possible, the ship should be taken out of service. This will undoubtedly cause economic hardship. But it might be possible for member governments to provide subsidies to their steamship lines when it becomes necessary to replace unsafe passenger vessels.

I strongly urge the State Department to use every means at its disposal to bring about a meeting with the other signatories of this international agreement in order to find ways to upgrade the general safety standards on all passenger vessels.

Only by forcing strict safety regulations on older ships—or by ordering them out of service if they are unable to comply—will the cause of passenger safety be served.

This must be done now, Mr. President, before another *Yarmouth Castle* disaster takes place.

THE STATE OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the state of the Union message heard in this Capitol last week outlined the current American situation and policy in Vietnam. But it must be called to the attention of the American people that it repeated many of the misrepresentations and inconsistencies that have led us to the brink of massive war in Asia.

This speech tonight is my answer to the foreign policy section of the President's state of the Union message.

The American people have often been disparaged with the characterization that in foreign policy they like simple situations with neat solutions, and are incapable of understanding complex events or of sustaining a policy that produces no fast results.

But the last 4 years have demonstrated that it is the executive branch—the State Department, the Defense Department, and the White House—that have oversimplified events and conditions in Asia. It is they who have sought to reduce all our difficulties there to the neat and understandable pattern of the 1930's. It is they who have tried to equate all of Asia with the analogy of Munich, and who have used a too-pat "devil" theory to arouse passions into a warlike stance against both North Vietnam and China.

And it is the executive branch that preached fast results from airpower as the neat solution for all our troubles.

The election of 1964 proved that Americans are more sophisticated than the administration. It is they who rejected the simple-sounding solution for Vietnam. It is the people who know better than to believe that American military power can produce freedom-loving defenders of democracy in places where American political and economic support have produced neither freedom nor democracy for a people.

It is weariness with the platitudinous preaching of an administration that seems not to understand the complexities of world affairs that is responsible for the dread and lack of enthusiasm for war in Asia that marks the American Nation today.

Yet we still hear the President tell us, as he did on January 12:

> Not too many years ago Vietnam was a peaceful if troubled land. In the north was an independent Communist government. In the south a people struggled to build a nation with the friendly help of the United States.

The President did not pinpoint the period he had in mind, but seemingly that would be after the 1954 Geneva Agreement. However, no independent Communist government in the north was created by that agreement, and in the south there was not supposed to be a separate nation being built, least of all with the help of the United States. The agreement divided Vietnam into two zones for purposes of controlling military forces; but no two separate nations were created by the Geneva accords of 1954.

But the President of the United States forgot to tell that to the American people in the state of the Union message the other night. The Secretary of State has never told that to the American people, in all the propaganda that he has issued from the State Department, as we have continued to conduct this illegal, unconstitutional war in South Vietnam.

Moreover, no part of Indochina was supposed to be alined in military pacts with other nations. Although it can be said that SEATO was within the permissible limits because it called itself a regional pact devoted to the purposes of the United Nations, we made South Vietnam a protocol area under SEATO for reasons that John Foster Dulles described as giving us a free hand to do what we thought necessary in South Vietnam.

For that reason, we endorsed the refusal of South Vietnam to participate in the talks of 1955 that were supposed to lead up to elections to restore all of Vietnam to a single political unit.

Yet the President in his state of the Union message omitted all mention of those events. He continued his description of that period:

> There were some in South Vietnam who wished to force Communist rule on their own people, but their progress was slight. Their hope of success was dim. Then little more than 6 years ago North Vietnam decided on conquest, and from that day to this, soldiers and supplies have moved from North to South in a swelling stream that is swallowing the remnants of revolution and aggression.

Not a word of the swollen stream of American equipment and American soldiers over the same period of time was mentioned by our President, not a word of the vast military aid program we had in South Vietnam, even before the Vietcong trouble broke out, some of it in clear violation of the Geneva Agreements of 1954. The white paper on Vietnam some months ago released by the State Department concealed from the American people the truth about our course of conduct in Vietnam. Not a word in that white paper pointed out the findings of the International Control Commission of the violation of the Geneva accords by the United States, along with the violations by the Communists.

The senior Senator from Oregon has spoken on this floor innumerable times in the past 2½ years, challenging the State Department to tell the American people the truth about America's sordid and shameful record in South Vietnam since we started violating the Geneva accords in 1954.

Mr. President, so it is that all our national leaders justify their actions, by telling our people only the news that justifies and explains the national policy that they are promulgating.

> We will stay—

Said the President—

> because a just nation cannot leave to the cruelty of its enemies a people who have staked their lives and independence on America's solemn pledge—a pledge which has grown through the commitments of three American Presidents.

The only people in South Vietnam who have staked their lives on American support have been the cliques and coteries of businessmen and military men of South Vietnam who have lived for 11 years off American money and support. That is why we hear Ky reject negotiations with the north; that is why this tyrannical little tinhorn dictator of South Vietnam—whom we financed and set up—is most eager that American bombing of North Vietnam be resumed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles printed in the Washington Daily News, of December 29, 1965, one entitled "Officialdom Seen Deepening the Crisis Confidence," and the other entitled "Saigon Nixes Formal Peace Talks," and another dated January 18, 1966, and entitled "U.S. Works To Keep Ky in Power."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Dec. 29, 1965]

ISN'T UNITED STATES AWARE KY CLOSES DOOR TO PEACE TALKS?—OFFICIALDOM SEEN DEEPENING THE CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE

(By R. H. Shackford, Scripps-Howard staff writer)

High Johnson administration officials fret about the "crisis of confidence" at home and abroad over U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Yet those same officials contribute almost daily to the lack of credibility of the official U.S. word on Vietnamese problems, especially on the desire of the United States to enter "unconditional negotiations" at once.

Dean Rusk's State Department is the latest contributor to growing doubts.

DENIES

His spokesman denies that the U.S. Government has received a communication from South Vietnamese Premier Nguyen Cao Ky opposing unconditional peace talks and insists there is no basic disagreement between Saigon and Washington.

However, Premier Ky repeatedly has publicly opposed negotiations now and has insisted that certain conditions be fulfilled before talks start.

Admittedly, the State Department's denial is a technical one. Neither the White House nor the State Department may have received a communication from Premier Ky on this subject. But it is inconceivable that the U.S. Government is not aware that Premier Ky and the 10-general council for which he is front man, are adamantly opposed to a political-diplomatic solution of the war.

Like U.S. military men, the South Vietnamese generals see only a "military solution" to the Vietnamese problem. The South Vietnamese generals, of course, have nothing to gain and everything to lose by a political solution.

"LIBERATING"

Premier Ky has gone farther than opposing negotiations. He long has been an advocate of "liberating" North Vietnam from its Communist regime—a policy that runs counter to U.S. statements of no desire to destroy the regime of Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi. Liberating North Vietnam would involve the same kind of near-disastrous mistake the United States made in Korea in trying to reunite the two Koreas by force—action that brought massive Chinese intervention into that war.

Much of what Premier Ky says publicly has to be discounted as studied belligerence. He is more conscious than most Americans that what he can do is limited by what the United States is willing to do.

The latest flap over Premier Ky's opposition to negotiations as a way to end the mess in Vietnam was provoked by Clayton Fritchey, a special assistant to the late United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson. Mr. Fritchey, now a newspaper columnist, accused the Johnson administration of concealing the fact that the South Vietnamese regime refuses to participate in unconditional negotiations—even if President Johnson can arrange them.

SUPPRESSED

Mr. Fritchey's column, published in Newsday, a Long Island newspaper, charged that the State Department had suppressed Premier Ky's declaration that he could not participate in peace talks and added:

"The evidence is that the South Vietnam Government is just as implacably against peace talks as Hanoi, if not more."

Mr. Rusk's spokesman, Robert J. McCloskey, denied that either the White House or the State Department had been informed by Premier Ky that peace negotiations were out of the question now. This incident occurs during another pause in U.S. bombing of North Vietnam and growing speculation that some diplomatic move is afoot.

CONTROVERSY

There long has been controversy within the U.S. Government over "unconditional negotiations." After months of pressure, during which Mr. Johnson also opposed peace talks, the President offered "unconditional discussions" on peace last April. In fact, he and his associates talked so much about that move for several weeks that U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, in Saigon, finally urged that the idea of peace talks be soft-pedaled because of adverse affect on South Vietnamese morale.

Now the situation seems reversed—growing doubt about the genuineness of the U.S. negotiating offer. Hanoi, of course, is aware of Premier Ky's negative attitude toward negotiations and, as Mr. Fritchey points out, perhaps that is why Hanoi remains skeptical of U.S. overtures.

The reverse, of course, could also be true. A growing body of American opinion believes Hanoi might like a negotiated "out" but that Peiping is blocking it.

[From the Washington Daily News, Dec. 29, 1965]

FOUR-DAY TRUCE DUE TO BE ACCEPTED—SAIGON NIXES FORMAL PEACE TALKS

SAIGON, December 29.—The South Vietnamese Government is opposed to a formal ceasefire or unconditional negotiations with the Communists, Foreign Minister Tran Van Do declared today.

Other Government sources said at the same time the Saigon Government will probably accept the Vietcong offer of a truce for 4 days next month during the Vietnamese lunar new year.

Mr. Do said his Government was not against informal discussions "in the corridor with the Communists, but was dead set against official peace talks under present conditions.

The Foreign Minister said the Vietcong would not negotiate in good faith unless they were first convinced they could not win on the battlefield. At present, he said, they still hope to win by military force.

The probability of a truce, as proposed by the Communists, from January 20–24, was almost certain, other Government officials said privately. There have been similar lunar new year truces in other years.

The sources said South Vietnamese troops probably would refrain from firing during the new year holiday but no official announcement will be made until or unless it is suggested by the Buddhist leadership.

The Buddhists are sensitive concerning anything which looks like Government favoritism toward the Roman Catholic religion. Since the Government announced a 30-hour Christmas truce, a cease-fire on the Buddhist new year becomes a political necessity.

Mr. Do said he did not think there was any contradiction between his Government's stand on negotiations and President Johnson's frequently expressed desire for "unconditional discussions."

He reiterated the Government position that discussions are all right on an informal basis but that "negotiations around a conference table are impossible at the present time."

As for a lengthy cease-fire, Mr. Do said, the Communists would only try to use it to send more men and equipment.

U.S. PEACE PROBE

The administration, behind a screen of secrecy, has been conducting a new probe of the possibilities for peace in Vietnam. So far there were no reports it would be a success.

Only a small part of the new effort was visible on the surface. This was the pause in the resumption of U.S. bombing of North Vietnam.

It was presumed that along with this Hanoi has been told through diplomatic channels the United States is looking for some corresponding step toward peace by the Communists. The United States would regard as significant any halt in North Vietnamese infiltration into South Vietnam, or withdrawal of forces.

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 18, 1966]

U.S. WORKS TO KEEP KY IN POWER

(By Ray Cromley)

U.S. officials in Saigon have been working behind the scenes to prevent a coup that would oust Premier Nguyen Cao Ky.

The man they've been worriedly watching is Paratrooper Brig. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi, commander in northern South Vietnam.

A few months back, key American officials in Saigon thought Ky would be out before spring. Now they think Ky will get by but they keep their fingers crossed.

THE WORD

In a quiet way, the Americans have been discouraging Thi. They've sent him word the United States wouldn't like a coup. When Thi cautiously put out feelers to determine how the Catholics would react to a Thi takeover, Americans made certain he had his answer quickly. (That answer: "The Catholics would be violently opposed.")

Ky has handled himself well in this give and take. He hasn't ousted the men plotting against him. Instead, he's quietly let them know he's aware of what they're doing.

On one occasion, Ky deliberately fixed the coupsters' timing by taking a key plotter with him on an out-of-town trip.

Ky recently informed one anti-Ky general (accurately) on how fellow plotters were using him and meanwhile attempting to stab him in the back. Ky proved his story to the general and won his loyalty, temporarily anyway.

TACTICS

Ky kids Thi about Thi's ambition to replace him. Ky tells Thi jokingly that if he wants the job he need not bother with a coup—that the post is a big headache anyway. He then proceeds to detail for Thi what a premier puts up with each day.

Ky has a purpose in all this. He knows that Thi is a theorist with big overall ideas on how things should be done—but impatient with the day-to-day problems, which involve compromises.

As a precaution, Ky keeps a takeoff strip free at a near-Saigon airfield. Planes are on the alert and ready. In case of a coup, they would be over Saigon within minutes to threaten the rebels.

To help Premier Ky keep his post, U.S. officials have decided not to push him too much—even on important matters. This policy is a reaction to the unhappy U.S. experience with Premier Phan Huy Quat. The United States pushed Quat hard to get rid of two weak cabinet ministers. Quat acquiesed; this led to a fight which gave pressure groups their opportunity to oust him.

American officials now say privately the United States would have been smarter to have been more patient and let Quat work things out his own way. They'll try this with Ky.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let the RECORD make perfectly clear that I do not propose to stand by in silence and permit these little military dictators in South Vietnam to determine for the American people how many American boys are going to be killed in South Vietnam.

I say to my President, to the Secretary of State, and to the Secretary of Defense, that that is a matter of policy to be determined by the U.S. Government and not by Ky, not by the Prime Minister of South Korea, and not by Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa.

Yet, without one word of opposition, without one word of repudiation from the President, from the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Defense, we have been bombarded with propaganda from military dictators who live, are supported, and have their being on the basis of American financing and American military aid. Those dictators object to negotiations which seek to lead toward peace. The American people should cry out for their repudiation. The American people should demand that the Government repudiate the policy of dictators who are obviously and openly propagandizing in this country and elsewhere in the world in opposition to a negotiated settlement of the war in Vietnam.

What do they want? It is perfectly obvious that they want the American people, through their Government, to continue the war, to continue the slaughter of American boys in South Vietnam until a surrender is forced which meets their satisfaction.

Mr. President, all that will lead to will be American occupation in large areas of Asia for the next 50 years.

I would have the American people recognize, before it is too late, what the administration is leading them into in connection with its Asiatic foreign policy.

As a result of the advice of a dangerous group of men in the Pentagon, the administration is leading the American people into a foreign policy in Asia which would keep thousands of American troops in Asia for decades to come. On any bilateral arrangement, the United States will never be able to negotiate a peace settlement with the Asiatics. It will be able to negotiate only a surrender.

I repeat, and I shall continue to repeat, that the course of action that my Government should be following in Asia is to recognize that unilateral American action in Asia will never produce a peace. At best, it will produce only a surrender and truce. Then we shall have to police the surrender and police the truce. Eventually, the Asiatics will throw the white man out, whether it be 25, 50, 75, or 100 years from now. It makes no difference so far as the time schedule of the Asiatics is concerned, but it makes all the difference in the world to us.

Mr. President, so long as I sit as a Member of this body, I do not propose, in the absence of a formal declaration of war, to leave that kind of legacy to future generations of American boys and girls.

Our Government should lay the issue of the threat to the peace in Asia where it belongs; namely, before the United Nations Security Council, and if it is vetoed there, then before the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Some of my friends say that we would lose face. The lives of thousands of American boys are more important to me than face. Instead of losing face, we would receive the applause of the world. Soon, we would find ourselves in the same position of enthusiastic acceptance in which France found herself after she had sacrificed the flower of French manhood.

Finally, the French people made clear to that government that it had lost the support of its people. France then followed a course of action of ending its war in Indochina—and John Foster Dulles proceeded to take up the war for the United States. Few are telling the story of the diplomacy of John Foster Dulles under the Eisenhower administration.

I am at a loss to understand why there is so much concern about saving the faces of those responsible for the war. I am interested in saving the lives of American boys.

I am sure that most Senators saw the photograph on the front page of a local newspaper last night of an American soldier just arrived in Saigon on his 18th birthday, conferring with General Westmoreland, the head of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam. I wish the RECORD to show my reaction: I thought it was a sad and tragic picture. It was a picture that clearly showed the bankruptcy of the foreign policy of the administration in Asia, to send an 18-year-old boy—and there are thousands of others like him—into the jungles of South Vietnam to fight a war in which, I say most respectfully, that boy and thousands of others like him actually have no interest.

The semantic propaganda coming out of the administration asserts that our boys are dying in South Vietnam in increasing numbers in defense of freedom. There has not been one hour of freedom in South Vietnam since the United States set up its first puppet there.

Eventually, the American people will have had enough. Eventually, the American people will make clear to the Johnson administration that they have had enough. I am trying to save my administration from that political accounting. As certain as I stand protesting here tonight on the floor of the Senate, that day will come, unless we change this course of action.

I also ask unanimous consent that an article from the Nation entitled "The People Beneath the War," by Raymond Coffey, appear at this point, for it depicts the wide difference between the officialdom in Saigon whom we support in office and the people of the country whose support we are not winning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nation, Jan. 17, 1966]

THE PEOPLE BENEATH THE WAR

(By Raymond R. Coffey)

Representative ROBERT McCLORY, Republican, of Illinois, was winding up a 2-day visit to Vietnam when he was encountered one afternoon armed with a movie camera and loping down Saigon's Le Loi Boulevard in a late November downpour. One of the more obscure Members of Illinois' congressional delegation, McCLORY had dropped in for a firsthand look at the war as it can be seen from the well-traveled VIP path being worn into the Vietnamese terrain these days.

"I find the [Vietnamese] people range from indifferent to hostile," McCLORY began as he came in out of the rain, joining a reporter in the shelter of an arcade. "But things are going well for us," he concluded. Though he appeared oblivious to the paradox in what he said, McCLORY had neatly stated one of the saddest facts of the war.

Everyone talks about this being a political war in which the key to victory is, as the weariest cliche in Saigon goes, to "win the hearts and minds of the people." And yet, as the fighting grows in scale and intensity, there appears to be more and more inclination to judge progress in military terms alone. What's happening to the Vietnamese people, what they're getting out of it all, and what they think about the war appears to be of ever diminishing concern.

The shooting war is coming to be such a full-time job that political and social problems get shuffled to the bottom of the pile. And, almost imperceptibly, people like McCLORY—and others with considerably more experience and responsibility in Saigon—develop the notion that the war can be going well even if the Vietnamese are indifferent, hostile, apathetic or unhappy. The fact is, the long-suffering people have been given little reason to support the government side of the war. The U.S. goal, supposedly, is to guarantee them liberty and an opportunity to establish some kind of free and representative government. But if the shooting stopped tomorrow, the populace of Vietnam would still be stuck with a military dictatorship, a system that is astonishingly corrupt and incompetent.

It's probably true, as U.S. officials in Saigon insist, that the military is the only organization in the country capable of running a government in the current situation. It is also perhaps true that the last thing the country needs for a while is another coup. But it does seem that, with all the leverage our economic and military presence gives us, the United States should be able to lean on the Saigon Government a lot harder to make it more responsive to and more concerned with the people.

The Vietcong are hardly popular heroes, despite what many of the antiwar demonstrators at home appear to think. They can be harsh and terroristic, they conscript labor and troops by force, they bleed the peasantry for rice and taxes. But they do, as one U.S. counterinsurgency expert in Saigon put it, have an image of morality and they do promise the people a better life, even if they haven't delivered. That puts them far ahead of the Saigon regime, with its generals roaring around in big black limousines and their wives getting rich by speculating in real estate near American bases.

Premier Nguyen Cao Ky, the jaunty little air force general who heads the present government, is considered to be personally honest and to have a genuine concern for his country. His own position, however, is precarious and he is trapped with very little personal power in a sick system that almost daily gives the people another reason to doubt in victory and its rewards.

Several weeks ago the U.S. mission pulled its aid representatives out of Binh Tuy Province on the basis of evidence that the province chief, a Lt. Col. Pham Dinh Chi, had diverted to his own uses a substantial amount of U.S. money. The aid men also had reportedly been threatened with death if they exposed the situation. Ky hemmed and hawed for weeks under U.S. pressures to oust Chi. Finally he did—but only to give him another post in the defense ministry, where the pickings may be even better.

The government also talks a good game of political freedom. Ky informs student groups, for example, that they are free to discuss and criticize the government. Anyone who takes him at his word is looking for trouble. "We are not going to have seminars (demonstrations) in the streets," Ky says. One of Saigon's English-language newspapers was recently slapped with a 5-day suspension because a censor decided that it was printing news stories comforting to the Vietcong. Anyone who shows promise of leadership or of developing a following is looked upon as a dangerous threat to the incumbents, instead of as an asset to a country that needs leaders as much as it needs peace.

Shortly before leaving Vietnam, I wrote a story about a political-social action project in one of Saigon's worst slum quarters. A small group of dedicated young army officers and Government officials had persuaded Ky to let them try a new approach among the poor who are most vulnerable to the Vietcong and have the least reason to believe in the Government. They had recruited hundreds of part-time student volunteers who were helping the people to build schools, establish dispensaries, organize hog-raising co-ops, even to hold unofficial hamlet elections to choose their own spokesmen. The project greatly interested the United States; it was a hopeful new effort to "win the hearts and minds of the people." Ky and U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge themselves had visited the project.

But less than 24 hours after the story about the project had gone through the Government-run cable office, a young army lieutenant, who is one of the leaders of the project, was called upon by a representative of the national police and reprimanded for getting "too much personal publicity."

The Vietcong promise the people land reform and a better break in life. Now and then the Ky government talks about reforms, too, but mostly it simply lectures the people sternly about how it is everyone's duty to support the war and the Government. No one bothers even to tell the people what they might expect in the way of improvement if and when the war ends.

"They [the Government] don't trust the people," the young lieutenant who was reprimanded said. "The crisis in our country is that no one has confidence in anyone any more. We cannot have a [social] revolution just by changing the actors in the scenario. We must start at the bottom with the people." The people, according to the lieutenant, don't believe anything the Government says. They want to see action—the kind of action they were getting from the student volunteers in the slum project—before they will start believing words again.

The most discouraging thing about the whole situation is that the government, from Saigon to the remotest district, is indifferent to what the people want or expect. Every province and district chief is appointed by Saigon and is a military man with command responsibilities as well as civilian administrative duties. U.S. military and civilian representatives out in the country complain that often they have a hard time even getting their Vietnamese counterparts to stand around and look interested in village civic action programs, such as visits by American medical teams. The U.S. representatives take great pains to make it appear that such aid comes from and is arranged by the Vietnamese Government. But their efforts are often futile because the local Vietnamese Government man makes plain that he knows nothing about the program and cares less.

A U.S. adviser, giving one typical example, said that his district chief agreed to take part in a food and clothing distribution program only after he was permitted to take for his wife a few of the surplus WAC blouses that were to be distributed among the needy women of a village.

If, then, the job is winning over the people, it is a job that is going very badly. And, despite McClory and the U.S. military brass whose opinions he was obviously echoing, the military side of the war is not going a great deal better. It's perhaps true, as Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara says, that we've "stopped losing," but we're still a long, long way from winning, even militarily.

Astonishment is sometimes expressed that Hanoi does not seem exactly panting for the chance to negotiate. The reason seems plain enough: the other side is nowhere near convinced that it has lost all chances for victory. American and Vietnamese troops are inflicting tremendous casualties on the enemy. But our own losses are mounting and, despite the thousands of enemy soldiers killed in the past year, enemy strength has grown. The Vietcong now control a greater part of the countryside than they did a year ago. Thus the Saigon government is invisible and unknown in many areas of the country. How can people be persuaded to support something they can't even see, a government that offers them no security against the Vietcong?

The U.S. forces in Vietnam, now totaling around 200,000 men, are performing splendidly. They are brave, tough, resourceful, well motivated in battle. Beyond that, they generally exhibit more interest in and compassion for the people they're living amongst than does the Vietnamese Government. The same, unhappily, cannot be said of the Vietnamese military. They continue to suffer many more casualties than do the Americans, and that indicates something about their willingness to fight. However, many of their casualties still result from an apathetic unwillingness to learn the lessons of guerrilla warfare, and from a lack of aggressiveness and leadership among their officers.

The officer corps is very weak, excessively occupied with keeping Saigon happy and inclined to duck a fight. Vietnamese commanders are always more than ready to break off an engagement in time to get back to camp for lunch. They tend to look upon their jeeps as something they have been given to get their kids to and from school. Beyond all this, it is a fact that Americans don't really trust the Vietnamese who fight beside them. American commanders privately complain that security is often compromised as soon as the Vietnamese are informed of a military operation.

Another factor that weighs against the "things are going well" judgment of McClory and others is the massive increase in enemy arms and men being infiltrated from the north. The enemy is no longer a ragtag bunch of poorly armed guerrillas wearing black pajamas and wondering where their next bowl of rice is coming from. In the recent major battles in the Ia Drang Valley, for example, the U.S. 1st Air Cavalry Division tangled with North Vietnamese regulars who were well equipped and well armed with Russian and Chinese weapons, including a high proportion of automatic weapons that can be deadly against low-flying aircraft. The enemy troops were carrying, in many cases, a basic load of 120 rounds of ammunition per man. That is more than a whole platoon of Vietcong guerrillas would often have in days not long past.

The one great weapon we have that the enemy still lacks is air power. But air power, the way it is being used in this war, is not always an asset. There have been many calls for an end to the bombing of North Vietnam, but it appeared to some in Vietnam that a more urgent problem was restricting the in-country bombing of South Vietnam.

Our pilots have done a magnificent job of providing close air support for troops engaged with the enemy on the ground. And no one argues with the use of air power in those situations. However, there are also hundreds of air strikes every day against villages and other targets suspected of harboring the Vietcong in cases where there is no ground engagement. Thus 1 day just outside Saigon six Vietcong were reported seen among a string of thatch huts lining a canal. Hours later, long after the enemy had left, I rode along with a forward air controller in a light Cessna who directed a flight of eight Skyraider dive bombers in an attack on the target. Four huts were destroyed, four were damaged, and huge black craters were torn in the surrounding rice paddies. Should it take eight airplanes and thousands of pounds of bombs to knock out eight flimsy huts? And what evidence was there really that the huts and rice paddies were owned by the Vietcong?

On another day, a paratroop unit approaching a small village drew half a dozen rounds of small-arms sniper fire. The unit halted and called in an air and artillery strike that leveled the village. It seemed an extraordinary response to a few rounds of sniper fire and one not likely to win the hearts and minds of any innocent civilians in the village.

Many of the Vietnamese jamming the refugee camps all over the country make clear that they came into the government areas not out of any particular fondness for the government and not to escape the Vietcong, but to get out from under our bombs. Top military authorities in Saigon say great care and discrimination is exercised in selecting targets. But some of the top counterinsurgency experts in the U.S. mission, and some of the advisers working out in the countryside, still believe the in-country bombings in some cases are hurting our cause among the uncommitted people.

But, as Congressman McClory's distressingly innocent comments made so discouragingly plain, there are people who somehow believe the war can be going well regardless of what the Vietnamese people think or feel or want.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say something about the sordid and sad and unfortunate condition of the mass of the people in South Vietnam. They are more than 90 percent illiterate. They have not the slightest idea about what the contest over political ideologies is all about. They have an average longevity of 30 to 35 years. Their infant mortality is exceedingly high. Disease is prevalent.

We talk as though we were in there defending an established society of free men and women who are being accosted so far as their rights are concerned. Yet all the historic record is against that propaganda of the White House and State Department and Defense Department.

NATURE OF OUR COMMITMENT

Moreover, the commitments referred to so frequently, besides being made to a series of governments we created ourselves, are not treaty commitments. President Eisenhower did not and could not commit the United States to go to war to save a government in Saigon. Nor did President Kennedy. Nor could President Kennedy. Congress and the Senate have never done it.

Can President Johnson make such a commitment? I say he cannot. The semantics he may devise will not fool the public into believing that 200,000 American soldiers in Vietnam and massive air raids by the Strategic Air Command are the result of anything more than an exchange of letters promising economic aid.

So far, we have an executive war in southeast Asia, carried on not under solemn treaty entered into by the U.S. Government but under the discretionary judgment of the White House.

The reasons for that judgment do not withstand analysis.

"We do not intend to abandon Asia to conquest," said the President in his state of the Union message.

Since when is Asia ours to abandon or not to abandon? Where are the hundreds of millions of people of India, Pakistan, Japan, Indonesia, Burma, Cambodia, none of which has joined us in Vietnam? Yet they are the people of Asia, not we Americans.

The President seeks again to create the image of falling dominoes, reaching not only across Asia, but throughout the world, if the United States fails to wage war in Vietnam. Listen to his words:

> We will stay because in Asia and around the world are countries whose independence rests in large measure on confidence in America's protection.

Such countries are not, I would remind the President, very independent. We have a good example in the Philippines. We are exerting considerable pressure on the Philippines to send armed forces to Vietnam, forces the United States will arm, equip, and pay. They are not allied forces; they are hired mercenaries.

I repeat, they are hired mercenaries. We once had something to say historically about the British mercenaries of the British Crown.

And what is worse, we are not only going to have to pay for them directly, but we are going to have to pay the Philippines for their use, too, through increased economic aid. That is her asking price. All the hundreds of millions the American taxpayers have already poured down the rathole of foreign aid to the Philippines have produced nothing more than another bankrupt country, ridden by corruption and described by its own President as one where the rich are growing richer and the poor are only growing poorer.

That is the fruit of the American aid program in the Philippines. So the solution is more of the same, only in exchange for it we will get the use of a few thousand Philippine soldiers to make it look as though we have allies in the Vietnam war.

These are not countries with which we are allied. They are dependencies of the American Treasury, and the American people know it. That is why all the repetition in the world does not convince them that we are fighting the free world's battle in South Vietnam.

PLEDGE TO GENEVA AGREEMENT AND TO AN INDEPENDENT VIETNAM CANNOT BE RECONCILED

The most flagrant inconsistency in the President's state of the Union speech is the one that has marked our Vietnam policy for 12 years. In one sentence he declared:

> We stand by the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962.

A few sentences later he said:

> We will act as we must to help protect the independence of the valiant people of South Vietnam.

To the extent that they are independent, it is only the extent to which we have made them so in violation of the Geneva agreement.

We cannot have it both ways, and every time the President and his high-ranking Cabinet officers try to have it both ways they lose support at home and abroad for their position and the American position.

UNITED NATIONS NEVER CONSULTED

So also did the President seek to leave the impression that this country has used the United Nations to solve the Vietnam dilemma. He said:

> We talked to the United Nations.

But he neglected to say that the way in which we have talked to the United Nations has been purely informal and personal. Never have we used the procedures of the United Nations as we are required to do by the U.N. Charter.

Never have we submitted that formal resolution calling upon the Security Council to take jurisdiction over the threat to peace in Asia. If it should be vetoed, as the Secretary of State keeps saying will happen, by either France or Russia, or both, we can go on with the rest of the procedures provided by the charter. It then becomes our treaty obligation to lay it before an extraordinary session of the General Assembly, if it is not in session at the time. We then would be back within the framework of both our Constitution and the framework of our treaty obligations as a signatory to the United Nations Charter.

These are the reasons why I am not impressed with the chances that the current peace offensive will culminate in anything but another escalation of the war. We are too committed to our own version of history, to our official pronouncements of American purity, and to our oversimplification of the situation to allow us the flexibility needed to reach a peace settlement.

And it is not the American people who are so committed, but the officials who have led the country into its predicament. Can the same men whose miscalculations and lack of understanding brought us to the brink of war lead us away from it under the same colors and the same reasoning that proved so fallacious from the beginning?

I speak respectfully, but I wish to say to my President again, as I have said at least a score of times on the floor of the Senate in 2½ years, "If you continue to follow the advice of McNamara and Rusk, you are going to lead this Republic into a major war in Asia."

McNamara and Rusk are exceedingly able men for the carrying out of our policies and my attack is not on them but their policies.

I say to my President, "You are not going to get a change of policy by way of the advice you get until you get rid of McNamara and Rusk, and the sooner you do the better for the interests of the American people."

Mr. President, the men in charge of our foreign and military policies have convinced themselves that they are the saviors of Asia. It is one of the great fallacies of our foreign policy, partly because no major country of Asia shares that estimate of our role. Nor have we always viewed it that way ourselves.

POSTWAR HISTORY IN ASIA

In 1951, the dismissal of General MacArthur by President Harry Truman set off the most intensive study and debate of American interests and objectives in the Far East that has ever been undertaken by the American Nation. It was debated and contested within official circles, then among Members of Congress, the body politic, and the public.

At that time, I was a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. In that capacity, I participated in the joint inquiry held by the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees that heard all the military and civilian officials who had anything to do with the issue.

If anything like a consensus could be said to have emerged from that experience, it is that a land war in Asia would be a colossal mistake for the United States. Even the advocates of expansion of the Korean war expected to make use of air and naval power, rather than land forces. Yet our bombing alone within Korea did not gain for us anything like control of the land. That still had to be determined acre for acre and man to man.

The war wing of the Republican Party, through some of its leading spokesmen, is coming forth these days with the war propaganda that we must have victory in South Vietnam. What do they mean by "victory"? Obviously, they mean surrender. They do not mean that we are going to go to a peace table, but to a surrender table, as I said in the beginning of my remarks. A surrender table will never produce peace.

The war wing of the Republican Party, through its spokesmen, is saying to the American people that we followed a wrong course in Korea because we did not insist on victory; we did not insist on surrender.

Mr. President, I do not intend to stand by in silence and see anyone propagandize the thinking of the American people with the point of view that we must go for victory, by that meaning surrender in South Vietnam, and using Korea as a precedent.

Any Senator can go to the floor below to the room of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and get from the safe the transcript of record which was made at the time of the MacArthur hearing and read the advice of every top military official of the Government, bar none—all of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State. Read the testimony of such great American statesmen as George Marshall, General Bradley, and General Vandenberg, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force. Read the advice President Truman received. I violate no secrecy when I say that that advice was: "See to it that we do not bomb beyond the Yalu, because if we bomb beyond the Yalu, Russia will then move in"; and Russia's air power dominated the skies over Manchuria.

That is what most Americans do not know. Most Americans do not know that at the time of the Korean war the United States controlled the air over North and South Korea, but not over China. Russia did.

President Truman was advised that if those Russian planes took to the air American troops by the thousands would be massacred in Korea because the only port of exit was Pusan.

Mr. President, it does not make me happy to say that. But I am not going to stand by. I have been in this body too long not to know that the American people are entitled to the facts, for the Government belongs to them and not to the White House.

I am not going to remain silent while this continued Republican war wing propaganda besmirches the great record of the great Harry Truman, who was Commander in Chief at the time of the Korea war, because in my opinion Harry Truman could not justify any other decision than the decision he made when he reversed the plans of MacArthur and made it perfectly clear there should be no bombing beyond the Yalu.

The argument of the war wing of the Republican Party seeking to draw an analogy between South Vietnam and Korea is a false analogy. It does not have any cause-to-effect relationship whatsoever.

It was in part from the lessons I thought the American people had learned from Korea that in 1954, I immediately opposed Vice President Nixon's trial balloon suggestion that American forces be sent to help the French salvage Indochina.

The next day I walked onto the floor of the Senate and made clear my unalterable opposition to the proposal of the Vice President. It is to the everlasting credit of the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, that he did not follow the proposal. Perhaps it was then that he formed the conclusion that he subsequently announced, in effect, that American ground forces should not fight a land war in Asia. That has been the overwhelming recommendation of the top military advisers of this Government for many years. It is still sound advice. Asia is no place in which to bog down American ground forces.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Is it the view of the Senator from Oregon that the request for a greatly increased appropriation for the Department of Defense—I do not recall whether it is $10 billion, $12 billion, or $14 billion—with which Congress is about to be faced is fundamentally for the purpose of increasing the American ability to fight a ground war on the land mass of Asia?

Mr. MORSE. I do not see how there can be any question about that.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator from Oregon believe that before Congress, particularly the Senate, gives a blank check for that purpose, the proposal ought to be fully and freely debated?

Mr. MORSE. There is no doubt about that; and I shall do my part to help bring about such a debate.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not the Senator's view that, under the circumstances, it would be a grave mistake to have a limitation of debate before the vote?

Mr. MORSE. I shall not agree to any limitation of time for debate.

Mr. CLARK. My view is that the Senator from Oregon is quite correct. I am not at all clear as to how I shall vote on this request, but I hope that it will be fully and completely debated by many Senators who are not fully in accord with escalating the war in Asia.

Did the Senator from Oregon happen to see in today's New York Times an article written by James Reston, entitled "The Two Concepts of China," and an article written by C. L. Sulzberger, entitled "What the Tet Will Bring"?

Mr. MORSE. I have not seen the articles.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder if the Senator from Oregon would permit me to ask unanimous consent that the two articles be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of his remarks under my name. I think the Senator would find them interesting.

Mr. Reston points out that there are two fundamentally different arguments about modern China. He says:

> One is that she means what she says and is now embarked on a worldwide revolutionary movement to weaken and, if possible, destroy Western authority in a series of guerrilla wars.
>
> The other is that she may mean what she says but does not have the power or influence to carry out her designs.

Mr. MORSE. I should be delighted to have the articles appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my speech.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Sulzberger points out that Americans should have patience with President Johnson's peace offensive, so that we will not come under the domination of the war hawks inside and outside Congress, and force the President into a position, or attempt to force him into a position, in which the escalation of the bombing of North Vietnam will continue. In my thinking, that would be a tragic mistake.

Mr. MORSE. I, too, think it would be a tragic mistake.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Oregon for his courtesy, and I ask unanimous consent that the articles may be printed in the RECORD as I have indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the time Vice President Nixon sent up his trial balloon, suggesting that American forces be sent into Indochina, the United States had financed France for 8 years in its effort to regain control over a major colony from they had been ousted by Japan. Few Americans realize today that one very serious drawback to the U.S. intervention in Vietnam today is our record of putting up the money and the military equipment for the 8 years of French warfare against much of the local population of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos.

But in 1954, there were still Americans who believed that active participation in the war by U.S. military forces could save Indochina for France. There were demands for air strikes from the U.S. 7th Fleet, based in the western Pacific. There were hints that U.S. troops might be landed. I was one of several Senators, many of them leading Democrats, who argued vigorously against such an extension of the U.S. involvement. The adverse reaction from so many in Congress and among the general public undoubtedly was a factor in President Eisenhower's rejection of U.S. military involvement in Indochina. The United States did not intervene militarily in 1954. The result was the Geneva conference which provided for the end of French rule over Indochina.

GENEVA SETTLEMENT

But we did pursue and continue U.S. aid directly to much of Indochina. We began extensive financial aid to Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam. In the South we established a government which we thought would be favorable to the United States. In fact, we handpicked from Washington and New York a South Vietnam exile named Diem who had never participated in his country's war against the French and we sent him to South Vietnam, financed him, militarized his regime, and proclaimed through our recognition of his administration that his was an independent government.

He became our agent in South Vietnam. In collaboration with his puppet government, we undertook military activities in South Vietnam that were in violation of the Geneva agreement. Some involved distribution of weapons, others the covert establishment of military installations.

The Geneva agreement had, in the words of the final interpretative declaration, been intended to settle the military hostilities in Indochina and, to quote: "create the necessary basis for the achievement in the near future of a political settlement in Vietnam." The political settlement was to follow in 1956, when the two military zones of North and South were to be politically united through general elections.

The final declaration of the Geneva Conference called for elections throughout Vietnam in July 1956, to be conducted under the supervision of the International Control Commission. The declaration further called upon officials from North and South to meet to arrange for the election. The specific language of the declaration said:

> 7. The conference declares that, so far as Vietnam is concerned, the settlement of political problems, effected on the basis of respect for the principles of independence, unity and territorial integrity, shall permit the Vietnamese people to enjoy the fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions established as a result of free general elections by secret ballot. In order to ensure that sufficient progress in the restoration of peace has been made, and that all the necessary conditions obtain for free expression of the national will, general elections shall be held in July 1956, under the supervision of an international commission composed of representatives of the Member States of the International Supervisory Commission, referred to in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities. Consultations will be held on this subject between the competent representative authorities of the two zones from 20 July 1955 onward.

However, the United States laid its groundwork for upsetting the elections by saying we would favor them only under the supervision of the United Nations. Since this was not what the agreement provided, we can hardly claim to have adhered either to its purpose or its letter.

By what authority did we propose to amend the unilateral Geneva accords which the signatories to it had agreed to, but which we refused to sign?

On January 22, 1955, C. L. Sulzberger, of the New York Times, reported:

> Ngo Dinh Diem has not yet demonstrated any political sex appeal. Foreign observers report with uniformity that he is neither popular nor yet of any apparent use to the cause we advocate. Nevertheless, the United States has decided it must take a calculated risk in Indochina and replace absence of policies with something positive. It is recognized that in July 1956, elections throughout Vietnam, including the populous North, are scheduled under the Geneva agreement. Therefore, desperate efforts must be made during the intervening period to check Ho Chi Minh's advances.

President Eisenhower reported in his "Mandate for Change" that every expert agreed that Ho's candidates would win at least 80 percent of the vote if the election was held.

As a result, when officials of North Vietnam asked Diem in the summer of 1955 to send representatives to arrange the election, he did not even respond, except to say that he, like the United States, favored only elections supervised by the United Nations.

It was also the intention of the agreement to remove all three states of Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam from cold war competition by forbidding foreign military bases in any of them, and forbidding interference in their internal affairs by any signatory of the Geneva Conference.

When it suited our purpose, we evaded these principles and provisions by pointing out that we did not sign the Geneva agreement. And when it suited other of our purposes, we protested loudly, as a rationalization for our own violation, that North Vietnam was violating it.

U.S. INTERVENTION

This was the situation that faced John Kennedy when he became President. The United States had a large economic and military aid program in South Vietnam. We had hundreds of military officers and noncoms there serving as so-called military advisers to the local forces of the South.

But despite the constant buildup of our military equipment and economic help, Diem was losing support and control. Finally, in the fall of 1963, he was judged totally incompetent to continue running the country, and a coup against him was encouraged, and perhaps even organized—as some claim—by American officials in Saigon.

President Johnson was confronted with the same deteriorating situation, but now there were more than 12,000 American military advisers on hand, and they were moving into the role of active participants. The Government in Saigon was a rotating one, and military faction after military faction succeeded each other in coup after coup until most of the world lost track entirely of who was in charge in South Vietnam.

The South Vietnamese generals, who were entirely the product of American military training and support, were joined by many Americans in believing that only a massive U.S. military effort could save the South from being taken over entirely by Communist-led rebels.

In August of 1964, in a naval action that still is veiled in considerable mystery, North Vietnamese PT boats fired upon U.S. destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin. The American response, however, was not only to fire back—which we had a right and a clear duty to do as a matter of self-defense—but also to send aircraft to raid the PT boat bases in North Vietnam, itself—which right we did not have under any tenet of international law.

At that time, the administration asked and received from Congress a resolution supporting and approving "all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression."

I opposed that resolution because the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, does not need any approval or authorization from Congress to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States. But if he wants to undertake a war to prevent what he believes may be outright aggression, he must have a declaration of war, specifying who the aggressor is.

Under the Constitution Congress has no authority by resolution to seek to give him the power to make war without a declaration of war.

If Congress is going to make war, Congress must declare war. It is not a power that Congress can delegate. The President has no power to make war under the Constitution in the absence of a declaration of war under article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

Yet that resolution was invoked 6 months later when the United States began regular and very large-scale air attacks against North Vietnam, attacks which continued on a wartime frequency for 11 months.

It was in August of 1964 that for the first time we introduced the subject of the Vietnam war in the United Nations. But it was not to seek U.N. jurisdiction over the entire dispute, as I believe we are obliged to do under the charter. We only accused North Vietnam of firing on U.S. vessels on the high seas. The charges we have made for years that North Vietnam was violating the Geneva agreement have never been brought before the U.N. at all, although they are what the war is supposed to be about, according to our official spokesmen. Yet we know that our own course of military action has also been in clear violation of the Geneva accords.

In the year and a half since the congressional resolution, the war in Vietnam has steadily risen in scope and intensity despite the many assurances that no important increase in our forces there was contemplated. American heavy bomber raids have expanded into Laos, although the news stories that report them also say that no official announcement of the raids can be made because they are forbidden under the 1962 agreement on Laos. We have officially announced a policy of pursuing Vietcong forces into Cambodia, thus completing the expansion of the war into all parts of Indochina.

What has happened since August 1964, is that the United States has effectively replaced France in Indochina.

We are doing indirectly what John Foster Dulles, in 1954, tried to get us to do directly, when he engaged in secret diplomacy by going to Prime Minister Churchill and Anthony Eden in London. He wanted them to enter into a deal whereby they would pledge British troops. Our Secretary of State, without even one second of consultation in advance with Congress, agreed to pledge American troops. Then he would go across the Channel to recommend to the French Government that it continue the war in Indochina with the support of British and American troops.

The American people were saved from that colossal mistake, not by the American Secretary of State, but by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Churchill rejected the proposal on its merits, and then said, in effect, to the American Secretary of State, "Do you not think that would be deceiving your Congress?" He knew what Dulles would then do. He would come to Congress and present to us the agreement, and tell us how difficult it was to negotiate and how hard he worked on the agreement; and, of course, we could not let him down.

That is the argument that we hear in the Foreign Relations Committee time and time again, when we are faced with an accomplished fact, after the State Department has engaged in one secret diplomatic act after another and then comes and tells us about it afterwards.

The American people are entitled to know in advance what their Secretary of State is up to.

Mr. President, our military forces, not those of South Vietnam, are the key military elements. It is our air power that rules the skies over North as well as South Vietnam, and over Laos; and it is our economic aid—now at a level of $600 million a year—that is keeping South Vietnam's economy afloat. The $12 billion American war effort in Vietnam is having the side effect of forcing us to double our economic aid to South Vietnam to keep inflation within bounds. But even so, disaffection for the Government is so extensive that most observers on all sides agree that a truce, a ceasefire, or any cessation of the war would cause its collapse by removing the necessity of military control of the country.

CURRENT PEACE EFFORTS

For the past several weeks, the administration has been sending emissaries to every corner of the world in an effort to develop peace negotiations. Air raids on the North have been halted; but there lurks the threat of what President Johnson has already called "hard new steps" to be taken by this country if no peace feelers are developed. Moreover, although Presidential emissaries have been sent to Europe and Africa and to some countries in Asia, none has been sent to North Vietnam or to China. We have no peace to seek in Europe or Africa. What we want those countries to do is to go to Hanoi and Peiping for us, and urge those countries to cease their support of the Vietcong or negotiate.

But we have not made use of the one international forum created for just such international problems—the United Nations. The fall session of the General Assembly came and went without a word from the United States about what action the Assembly might take in Vietnam.

The Security Council can be summoned overnight, and has been in other disputes involving other countries, and it can be summoned on the basis of only a letter from the United States asking that it meet to consider the threat to the peace in southeast Asia. It can take jurisdiction and it can act on such a threat even where nonmembers are concerned, as in this case.

No such letter or petition has ever been sent by the United States and until it is, it cannot be said that the United States has applied the treaty of the United Nations Charter to our dispute in Vietnam.

That is my answer to the President's reference to the United Nations in his state of the Union speech. I do not believe that he consciously sought to confuse, but his reference to the United Nations in his speech confused many, for many have said to me since, "Have we not taken the matter to the United Nations? The President said so."

I repeat; We have never taken to the United Nations, by the way of the action called for by the charter, the threat to the peace of the world in southeast Asia.

It is a simple thing to do. Many months ago, the President asked me to prepare a legal memorandum for him on this matter of law, and I prepared it for him, and set out, at his request, a set of alternatives that would meet our obligation under the United Nations Charter.

If any American thinks that we have used the procedures of the United Nations in connection with the Vietnam issue, he could not be more mistaken, for we have not. We have had informal discussions which our ambassador has carried on behind the scenes in the United Nations, under the direction of the President of the United States; but that ambassador, a former Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, knows that informal, behind-the-scenes discussions cannot replace the filing of a complaint, the filing of a petition, the filing of pleadings before a court which has the jurisdiction to adjudicate.

I have great respect and regard for Ambassador Goldberg, but I feel sorry for him. It is too bad that this great American is kept in a position by his Government where he cannot follow the juridical course of action clearly called for by the United Nations Charter.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

With each passing month, and with each escalation on land or by air, the United States is sinking deeper into the bottomless pit of a land war in Asia. Application of our unchallenged air power is not accomplishing what was advertised for it—it is not effectively crippling the rebel war effort and it is not driving the Vietcong or North Vietnam to the bargaining table. In fact, the Vietcong control more land area in South Vietnam today, in spite of all our military intervention, than they did a year ago today. A dispatch in the New York Times of January 2 tells us that after a year of constant bombing in South Vietnam, 83,000 individual aircraft missions were flown against targets in the South. The Defense Department will reveal no figures on the civilian casualties from these air sorties, but the story does report our officials as admitting that they are largely responsible for the 730,000 refugees now flooding into refugee camps in various parts of South Vietnam.

That needs to be stressed, because the American people are not fully aware of it. The State Department and the Defense Department, in the past, have propagandized the American people with regard to the tactics of the Vietcong—and they have been horrible, inexcusable tactics; I yield to no one in this administration in my criticism of Communist tactics. But, Mr. President, I do not like to see my country follow the same tactics, or similar tactics. The Pentagon has sought to leave the impression that the great refugee problem in southeast Asia is of Vietcong making. But now, at long last, the administration admits that the 730,000 refugees now flooding into refugee camps in South Vietnam are the product of American bombing in South Vietnam.

I digress for a moment to say that I shall never be able to understand how our country can support a scorched earth policy in South Vietnam.

As an American, I am ashamed that my Government is following a policy of burning and poisoning the ricefields of South Vietnam. I commend the group of American scientists which, in the last couple of days, issued a paper in protest against the military tactics of the United States in South Vietnam in using poison and other destructive means to destroy the rice crops of South Vietnam.

Mr. President, with that announcement, every church bell in America should have tolled. With that announcement, every clergyman in America should have called upon his congregation to drop to its knees. Much of the warmaking policies of the United States in South Vietnam cannot be reconciled with our religious principles. They violate morality. They represent a horrendous example of man's inhumanity to man.

Is it not interesting that we deplore the brutality of other forces, but forget what is being practiced by our own country?

Mr. President, it is not right. It is not necessary. It should be stopped. Instead of picking up the newspaper and reading that we are sending thousands more Americans to South Vietnam, we should be picking up the paper and reading that, at long last, the President of the United States has sent the formal resolution to the United Nations asking for multilateral action on South Vietnam in accordance with the rules and procedures of international law, the tenets of which we have pledged ourselves by our own signature to support.

Mr. President, the story to which I referred in the New York Times goes on to say:

> There are those who regret this, but there are also those who appear to believe that victory will depend on forcing large numbers of peasants to move from their ancestral homes in Vietcong-dominated areas to Government-dominated areas. A qualified source said that "victory will take place when the population turns against the enemy."

Five years ago, we tried herding the peasants into so-called strategic hamlets for much the same reason. The program was a total failure and resulted in greater animosity against the South Vietnamese Government and against the United States. Now we are going to try bombing them into loyalty and love for the United States and this little tyrant we are supporting called General Ky.

Whatever the limitations of the United Nations, it could hardly do worse in bringing peace or freedom to Vietnam than we have done alone.

Our problem in Vietnam is to stop the fighting. We cannot do that alone and the Communists cannot do it. I fear that the war will not stop there until some outside force is brought in to separate the parties, police a cease-fire, and take over responsibility for South Vietnam. This is a primary function of the United Nations, if not to organize such a force directly to direct some other international body to do it.

After all, the natural military disadvantages that recommend against a U.S. commitment on the mainland in Asia are compounded by the disaster of a white Western nation trying what all other white Western nations have abandoned, and this is fighting alone in a war against Asians. Asians are going to run their own affairs however long it may take, and whether doing so requires Communist or non-Communist leadership. In my opinion, we are making China's job easier by escalating the war and making China the defender of Asia against Western interests and claims.

And all the denials from the administration do not and cannot obscure the fact that we are in Vietnam today because we seek to maintain an American military position in southeast Asia.

AMERICAN SANCTUARY IN THAILAND

Let the administration tell the American people the facts about our installations in Thailand. Let the administration tell the American people the facts about our turning Thailand into an American sanctuary, a process which began in earnest in 1962.

The war wing of the Republican Party has a great deal to say in discussions on foreign policy about sanctuaries. What has the war wing of the Republican Party along with the war wing of the Democratic Party got to say about America's maintaining a military sanctuary in Thailand?

I shall be glad to have the administration meet that challenge, because the American people are entitled to know the minutiae of detail concerning American military policies in Thailand. This is undeniably true: Thailand has become a military dependency of the United States—and all of Asia knows it. The Asians know it, but the American people have had the facts kept from them.

WHAT IS VICTORY?

Our administration cannot justify bogging the Nation down in a 50-year war in Asia. That is the time it will take, if we continue to raise the level of the fighting in order to drive someone else to a surrrender table. If we ever do win the military victories necessary to force North Vietnam or China to a surrender table—I believe that we will, although some believe it is doubtful—we will then have to police Asia with tens of thousands of American soldiers and spend billions and billions of dollars enforcing the surrender for the next 50 years.

I shall continue opposing increases in the level of the war. I shall continue to oppose sending more troops, in the absence of a declaration of war, to fight and die in a dispute that has not yet been laid before the United Nations.

I am as much against communism as President Johnson. But war, killing, destruction, and foreign occupation of southeast Asia will not defeat communism there. A continued unilateral show of American military power will not produce peace; the best it will ever produce will be a stronger determination within Asia to drive us out.

Mr. President, recently, as chairman of a Senate parliamentary delegation, I returned to the United States after a 5-week tour through Asia. We visited Japan, India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Israel. Nowhere during my travels did I find real support for American policy in South Vietnam. Some lipservice, yes. The attitude was: It is your problem, we hope you will get it over with soon, and get it over with without involving China in a war. They have their eyes on the danger of a United States-Chinese war. They know very well—and the American people who seek to wave our flag into tatters in regard to encouraging a United States-Chinese war ought to recognize this—that a United States-Chinese war would be the beginning of world war III. It is my opinion that out of that war would come no victors.

Therefore, I shall continue to oppose the foreign policy of my Government in Vietnam unless and until a formal declaration of war is passed by the Congress. I take it for granted that the only country against which there could possibly be made even a prima facie case—and I doubt that—would be North Vietnam.

On the basis of the existing facts, I would vote against a declaration of war. But once declared, I would then join in insisting that the American people unite behind the President, because then it would become our duty to do so under the Constitution, and to try to get the war over as quickly as possible. Until then, I think it is our duty to seek the substitution of international law for the jungle law of military force.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain material referred to in my speech and bearing on certain points in my speech, consisting of newspaper and magazine articles and editorials, be inserted at the conclusion of my speech.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 3, 1966]

UNITED STATES DUE TO RAISE ITS AID TO SAIGON; ADDED ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE OF $200 MILLION NEEDED TO COMBAT INFLATION

(By Charles Mohr)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—The United States is expected to pump $200 million additional economic aid or more, into South Vietnam before the fiscal year ends June 30.

Informed sources said this would bring the economic-aid bill for the present fiscal year to a figure between $500 million and $600 million. Figures on current U.S. military expenditures, which are considerably larger, were not available.

The economic-aid request for South Vietnam for the fiscal year 1967, which begins July 1, is expected to be $600 million again.

The stepped-up American aid is considered necessary to try to block inflation, which is regarded as the greatest single political danger to the military government of South Vietnam.

It is also recognized that the spending associated with the American military buildup has been the major impulse toward inflation.

The U.S. military mission, for example, will pay a Vietnamese worker for labor on an airstrip or other military installation, but the product of his labors is not directly useful to him and it is not in any case for sale. A GI also pumps purchasing power at the rate of $60 a month into the rudimentary economy.

Meanwhile, the war has progressively restricted the domestic supply of rice and other necessary items. As a result, the number of piasters—the Vietnamese currency—has risen violently and the prices on a decreasing amount of necessary items have risen even faster.

The amount of piasters in circulation rose 39 percent in the last year and the price of rice, for example, rose 68 percent.

The major part of the U.S. economic aid is in the form of commodities. This brings in goods that, to some extent, meet demand and hold down prices.

The increase in the presently authorized aid program of $350 million for this fiscal year will have to be approved by Congress in a supplemental appropriation, the informed sources said.

A failure to take this action could, in the opinion of many experts, bring the risk of serious political consequences.

The most common complaint against the administration of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky by the urban population is that rents, prices and the cost of living have gone too high.

It is feared that an ambitious rival might attempt to capitalize on such discontent if it grew worse.

KY EFFORTS NOTED

The inflation is not actually considered to be the fault of the Ky government. In fact, most American authorities believe the Ky government has done its best job in the field of price control.

But the massive American military spending has been a most difficult problem.

With the aid of 250 tons of imported American rice and the use of American aircraft to carry the food about the country, rice prices have stabilized somewhat in recent months.

The South Vietnamese Government has, in the view of American officials, been extremely responsible in the preparation of this year's budget.

At Premier Ky's orders, it is reported, a budget of 60 to 65 billion piasters is being cut to 55 billion piasters, which is $7.5 million.

If achieved, this will keep the amount of money that must be printed in the next fiscal year to 10 billion piasters.

The revenue of the Government is only 25 billion piasters and the United States will contribute 80 million piasters to help meet the budget.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 1, 1966]

ALLIES' POSITION HELD WEAK FOR VIET TALKS—COULD PERIL SAIGON REGIME

SAIGON.—What would peace now mean in Vietnam? What would a truce or cease-fire bring? United States and Vietnamese officials alike are considering these questions as pressure mounts for negotiations to end the war.

These officials' views are known to be along these lines:

The allied side, as of today, is not in a strong position to go to a peace conference.

Even the start of peace talks could undermine or destroy the U.S.-backed government in Saigon.

There is no sign that Peiping and Hanoi are budging from their hard line, which in effect demands American capitulation as the price of peace.

In discussing the Washington initiatives, one U.S. source drew this careful distinction:

First there could be peace discussions, or talks on how to bring about peace discussions. Then, presumably, would come actual negotiations and a cease-fire.

Truce talks preceded the actual cease-fire in Korea by many months.

Knowledgeable men in Saigon say that if serious peace bargaining begins now the chances appear dim for the allies and Saigon to come out of some Geneva-style conference with an agreement they could live with.

Premier Nguyen Cao Ky is known to oppose strongly any negotiations at this time. He said recently that he wanted the United States to invade North Vietnam and Cambodia in order to press the war even more vigorously.

(In a New Delhi dispatch from Saigon, South Vietnamese Foreign Minister Tran Van Do was quoted as saying his government would not consider a cease-fire as long as North Vietnamese troops are in the south. He told an Indian news agency that about 80,000 such men were believed operating in South Vietnam.)

The massive U.S. buildup stopped a downhill plunge in the war fortunes of the Saigon government, but as military men here see it American might has not succeeded in reversing the war's trend.

Many in Saigon believe that the United States, when it goes to the conference table, wants to be in a position to convince the Communists they cannot win on the battlefield.

The Communists, who control more than one-half of the country and more than one-quarter of the population, apparently feel they can. North Vietnamese regulars still are pouring into the south.

The cease-fire presumably could not keep North Vietnam from moving troops and equipment through Laos and Cambodia, if it chose to consolidate its position in the countryside.

If a truce were established today no one knows who would hold what in the greater part of the country. The allied side controls the big towns, province capitals, and most district towns. But the Vietcong control most of the countryside.

Neither the United States nor the Vietnamese Government is believed to have any detailed plans for policing a truce or even setting up lines of control and buffer zones.

One source says it would take tens of thousands of inspectors to police the jungle and mountain vastness through which the Ho Chi Minh Trail passes. Communists control that portion of Laos through which the trail passes.

Because there are no trench lines to mark the limits of allied and Communist control, no one can guess how the problem of drawing cease-fire lines could be solved.

The Vietnam war essentially is a political struggle for allegiance of people rather than acquisition of territory. As Saigon authorities see it, a cease-fire would favor the Communists.

Doubt is expressed that the present government—a military dictatorship—could last long in an atmosphere of peace. Yet no one on the horizon favorable to the U.S. interests enjoys any measure of public support.

In fact, one of the most famed men in Vietnam is Ho Chi Minh, the man who kicked out the French and brought independence to the north. Many in the south are neither anti- nor pro-Communist but admire and respect Ho.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 15, 1966]

Diplomatic Fictions—Lack of Candor in Talk on Vietnam Confusing to Officials on Both Sides

(By Seymour Topping)

Hong Kong.—Scholarly analysts are complaining these days that few events in recent history have done so much to debase the language of diplomacy as has the war in Vietnam.

Government officials on all sides of the conflict have asserted that they are not sure who is speaking for whom and with what authority or degree of veracity. The problem is acute in the exchanges between Hanoi and Washington on terms for a peaceful settlement of the war.

Comparing the statements of the two Governments, diplomats who are in touch with both sides report that the sides are acting like radio operators who are in contact but are not speaking the same language. Each side is putting forward political definitions that are not recognized by the other.

HANOI DISCLAIMS AUTHORITY

North Vietnam is acting as chief spokesman in sparring with the United States about a settlement. Yet Hanoi insists that it is the National Liberation Front, parent movement of the Vietcong, that is the competent authority in South Vietnam and that has the decisive voice in all questions of peace and war.

The United States declines to recognize the Liberation Front in much the same way as Hanoi refuses to accept the South Vietnamese Government.

The United States insists that the South Vietnamese Government is sovereign in all matters; yet American military commanders are directing the main war effort, and in Saigon Premier Nugyen Cao Ky is privately saying that he disapproves of U.S. offers to negotiate with the Communists.

Informed diplomats assert that the United States and North Vietnam must come together on their terms of reference before any forum for peace negotiations can be agreed upon. Greater frankness on the part of all governments involved in the Vietnamese war will also be required if substantive issues are to be solved, the diplomats say.

Diplomats say it has become a common practice in southeast Asia for statesmen to sacrifice the truth to spare their governments embarrassment.

North Vietnam still insists that its soldiers are not infiltrating South Vietnam, although the presence of thousands of its troops belies solemn governmental pronouncements.

The North Vietnamese also deny that their troops operate in Laos, although battalions of their army are stationed in the Laotian corridor through which more than 1,000 infiltrators pass each month on their way to South Vietnam.

Thailand, an ally of the United States, publicly denies that American fighter-bombers are using her airfields to strike at North Vietnam and at Communist-held areas in Laos. But since February, the bulk of U.S. Air Force attacks on North Vietnam and Laos have come from bases in Thailand.

In Laos, the Government denies that U.S. planes are bombing the pro-Communist Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese troops operating in the country. Yet it is common knowledge that the Laotian Government has privately given its assent to these bombings.

The United States has never formally stated that it is using bases in Thailand for combat operations or that it is carrying out offensive air strikes against pro-Communists in Laos. Publicly the United States has received permission from the Laotian Government only to put suppressive fire on Communist positions when its reconnaissance planes are fired upon.

In the Vietnamese war, subterfuge is used for more than propaganda. The involved governments share a belief that it may be easier to arrive eventually at a settlement if there are no formal declarations of war and if everyone pretends that treaties are being respected.

The 1954 Geneva agreement which ended the French colonial war in Indochina, and the 1962 Geneva accord, which guaranteed the neutrality of Laos, are still looked upon as valid documents although their provisions are violated daily by both sides.

Under the two treaties, international control commissions comprising representatives of Poland, India, and Canada remain on duty in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia to enforce treaty clauses that bar violations of borders, illegal introduction of war material and foreign intervention.

In Indochina, there are no men more frustrated than the members of the international control commissions.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Jan. 1, 1966]

(By Peter Arnett)

Saigon.—In 1966 the Vietnamese war will become largely an American war, possibly spilling into neighboring countries and reaching a magnitude that only the most pessimistic would have forecast 1 year ago.

That is the feeling as the war slides into its 6th year.

The war began with bedraggled squads of guerrillas sniping at government outposts. Now, having implemented the insurgency textbook chapter by chapter, the Communists field divisions.

The United States began by sending in a handful of advisers to help fight a guerrilla war.

Now it fields everything in its military arsenal in Vietnam with the exception of atomic weapons. It has nearly 200,000 men on the ground, and by year's end may have as many men in Vietnam as in the peak days of Korea.

These men are here to fight a conventional war with increasing use of fighter-bombers and artillery.

By the nature of the war, Vietnamese casualties will probably remain higher than American. A large part of their half-million-strong army is dotted over the countryside in isolated positions often attacked by Vietcong.

But the American public will get more used to seeing sons and husbands on casualty lists.

It is an unfortunate fact that the Vietnamese army never really pressed the fight against enemy hardcore units. The United States and its allies are paying for it now.

As American troops meet the enemy in bigger fights, U.S. field commanders will grow less sensitive to what the Vietnamese military high command feels. Then the predominantly American character of the war will emerge, with U.S. generals calling the tune.

There is doubt that the Vietnamese army, badly mauled in a hard 2 years of fighting will ever be a match for the Vietcong. Some observers think large U.S. garrisons may be in Vietnam for 20 years.

Red China became more than a shadow over Vietnam in 1965, openly providing Ho Chi Minh with supplies and political support to keep the war going. But few forecasters, in southeast Asia feel that Red China will send troops into Vietnam in 1966, even if U.S. warplanes rip Hanoi apart and destroy the industrial complex around the Port of Haiphong.

Many feel Red China would act only if confronted by an American land invasion of North Vietnam. This has not been seriously contemplated.

Three other nations have become embroiled in the war.

Laos has seen the Communists punch a series of parallel roads down the Ho Chi Minh Trail in southern Laos to supply the Vietcong. The United States may have to block these with air strikes and ground troops, despite agreements governing Laos' neutrality.

The frontier between Laos and North Vietnam has virtually ceased to exist. So some are asking: Why quibble about the frontier with South Vietnam?

Cambodia, adjoining Vietnam to the west, has taken an adamant anti-American line. It broke relations with Washington last May because of alleged border violations. Cambodia has long been used by the Vietcong as a convenient sanctuary, but this may be disrupted in 1966 if U.S. field commanders chase the Communists in "hot pursuit."

The Cambodians probably won't mind if this happens in the wild jungle country beside Vietnam's central highlands. They can be expected to complain loudly if it happens along the populated Mekong Delta.

Thailand is the third nation pulled into the conflict because of proximity. Thailand has defied Communist warnings and backed the United States in the Vietnam war. Her role can be expected to increase in 1966.

The Thais have tacitly allowed U.S. planes to use bases for raids against the Communists—probably 60 percent of the strikes against North Vietnam take off from there. The percentage may rise as new American bases are completed.

The Philippines is considering a proposal to send 2,000 troops into Vietnam, but this proposal is ambiguous. Australia and New Zealand may increase their small forces here.

The rest of southeast Asia has its own problems.

Singapore is coping with its newly proclaimed independence, decided upon after a bitter, racially tinged feud with Malaysia. The island nation is open to fresh attempts at a Communist takeover.

Indonesia is torn after a Communist coup failed. President Sukarno faced the first serious challenge to his one-man rule since he took over after World War II. The nationalistic military is trying to come out on top.

Indonesia's problems took pressure off Malaysia.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 2, 1966]

U.S. War Toll in 1965 at 1,350; Saigon's Is Estimated at 11,100

Saigon, South Vietnam.—The toll of American fighting men during the intensified fighting in South Vietnam during 1965 was listed today by a senior U.S. official as more than 1,350 dead, more than 5,300 wounded, and 148 missing or captured.

American troops are expected to carry a greater share of the fighting in 1966 with a corresponding rise in casualties. But the main burden in 1965 fell on the steadily increasing armed forces of South Vietnam, and this is reflected in their casualty figures.

The South Vietnamese forces, it was disclosed today, lost 11,100 men killed, 22,600 wounded, and 7,400 missing in action.

When 1965 began there were only 23,000 U.S. troops here, all of them as "advisers" or "combat support" personnel. At the year's end, the total of American troops was more than 180,000 and the prospect was that by the end of 1966, unless peace is achieved, the total will have more than doubled.

Casualties among the Communist-led Vietcong for the year are officially listed as 34,585 killed in action and 5,746 captured. These are described here as "confirmed" figures but they are known to battlefield observers to be estimates.

A common joke among American soldiers is to refer to such enemy casualty estimates as "wegs," or wild-eyed guesses.

ENEMY STRENGTH UP SHARPLY

One sobering fact for American field commanders is that estimated enemy strength rose during 1965 from 103,000 to 230,000, an indication of the success of infiltration tactics from North Vietnam despite the almost daily bombing program that began last February.

The enemy's strength includes about 40,000 "political cadres" who do little fighting, and perhaps 40,000 North Vietnamese regulars.

About 4,500 North Vietnamese troops are believed to have infiltrated into South Vietnam in December alone. American commanders believe this is the maximum infiltration capacity at this time. If this rate were sustained through 1966, more than 50,000 fresh, well-trained regular troops of North Vietnam would be introduced into the battle.

The Americans brought a fearsome new firepower to the war in 1965, pounding North Vietnam guerrillas in the south with tens of thousands of tons of bombs, artillery rockets and fast-firing Gatling-gun cannons.

U.S. Navy and South Vietnamese aircraft have flown about 26,500 bombing sorties against targets in North Vietnam. A sortie is a single flight by a single plane.

The air effort within South Vietnam has been even greater. Some experts regard February 19, the day that jet fighter bombers were first used on South Vietnamese targets, as a date as important as February 7, when the raids on the North began.

More than 83,000 sorties were flown against targets in South Vietnam. This intense use of airpower often saved Government troop units from destruction, and it made it costly and difficult for the Vietcong to mass troops for attacks in regimental strength.

However, it also caused civilian casualties and was a major reason why 730,000 people fled into refugee camps.

There are those who regret this, but there are also those who appear to believe that victory will depend on forcing large numbers of peasants to move from their ancestral homes in Vietcong-dominated areas to Government-dominated areas.

A qualified source said today that "victory will take place when the population turns against the enemy."

He said that through much of 1965 a substantial part of the population had been neutral, had "bent with the wind, seeking the side of strength but sometimes finding it difficult to distinguish the strong side."

With an increasing intensity of warfare, this source said, "the peasant is going to have to choose sides if he stays alive."

This source indicated that the hard facts of life would increasingly force peasants to become refugees and to move to areas of Government control.

Other observers think this could backfire. They contend that the peasants may be irrevocably lost to the Government's political persuasion if they suffer too heavily from the hazards of Government and American firepower.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 24, 1965]

VIETCONG TERROR THWARTS SAIGON—FOE ABLE TO KEEP UP THREAT DESPITE AREA CONTROL

(By Charles Mohr)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—The series of terrorist incidents in the heart of Saigon and small guerrilla military attacks within the city limits this month illustrate that even in areas of Government "control" the Vietcong can still operate on a limited scale.

The reason for this is simple. It is that even Government-controlled areas like Saigon are riddled with active or passive Vietcong supporters who shield guerrilla cells operating there.

If the people were more overwhelmingly committed to the Government, they would inform on these cells, which everyone knows exist in every neighborhood.

A good deal of informing does go on and many guerrillas are picked up every week in Saigon, but not enough to break the back of a considerable clandestine political and terror organization. Nor is it enough to prevent the Vietcong from using cities such as Saigon and Danang as rest and recreation centers, according to informed sources.

ENEMY AT ONE'S ELBOW

The Saigon zoo is considered by some observers to be a particularly popular attraction for the Vietcong, who infiltrate the city on buses and other vehicles. Americans sometimes joke about sharing the city's sidewalks with their enemies.

According to official estimates, the Government of South Vietnam controls 57 percent of the nation's population of 14,804,000 people. The Vietcong are conceded to control 23 percent and 20 percent is described as "contested."

In terms of area, the Vietcong may control 70 to 90 percent of the land.

But all of this requires a great deal of qualification.

The word "control," as used in this case, is not a synonym for military security or for political allegiance. Although important visitors are not told unless they ask, which they seldom seem to do, control means a situation in which the Government operates effectively.

This in turn means that in a Government-controlled area the Government collects taxes, can conscript young men for military service and is reasonably secure from open military attack. In Vietcong areas the guerrillas collect taxes, conscript men and are only sporadically subjected to ground attack.

SECURITY IS DOUBTFUL

The word "security" is something else again. Nothing is absolutely secure from Vietcong military terrorist attack. This has been shown in successful attacks on American helicopters and airbases, American billets and police stations in Saigon.

The Vietcong's capability for terror and for close-in military attack is limited. If staged too frequently or without careful planning, these attacks would be too costly in losses of weapons and men to be sustained.

But in the case of Saigon itself, few people doubt that the Vietcong have not yet approached their full capability for terror incidents.

"I have often wondered why they don't do more here," one officer said.

A force of guerrillas can concentrate on any night of its choosing in a place of its choosing and make the words "control" and "security" meaningless. They can continue to do so as long as they are protected by an approving or a frightened population.

Twenty-three Vietnamese men and women working on a canal project in a pacified area of Longan Province learned this earlier this month when they were murdered in the night for helping on the Government project.

Yet, statistically, such areas remain in Government control. As 1965 draws to a close, there are other statistical anomalies.

Officials in Washington recently asserted that about 34,000 guerrillas and North Vietnamese troops had been killed in South Vietnam so far this year.

Although this figure is merely the innocent adding up of weekly figures for confirmed enemy deaths, the total assumes a greater impact than the parts, and many persons, including some hardbitten military professionals, do not believe such a figure is worthy of serious consideration.

NO FIGURES ON WOUNDED

They note that there are no figures on Vietcong wounded because almost all wounded are carried away. But they say that a conservative ratio of wounded to killed in action would be 2 to 1. Thus, if the Vietcong suffered 34,000 dead, they must have suffered about 70,000 wounded, some of whom would have died.

Not counted as confirmed dead are slain guerrillas whose bodies are dragged away or those estimated to have been killed in air raids (although it can be shown that the "confirmed" total does contain some such estimates) or a reasonable estimate of losses from artillery, sickness, and other miscellaneous causes.

If the base figure of 34,000 were correct, total guerrilla casualties would presumably be more than 100,000, probably well more than that figure.

That is about the same number of guerrillas, both "hard core" and "local," estimated to have been in South Vietnam at the start of the year.

Yet in their most recent estimate Washington officials put the total in Vietcong and infiltrated North Vietnamese ranks at about 200,000 men.

"This is the first war we ever tried to measure by body count," one official said. "I wish we could drop the whole thing."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 4, 1966]

CAMBODIA PLEDGES REPRISAL ATTACKS—TELLS U.N. SHE'LL RETALIATE IF UNITED STATES OR SOUTH VIETNAMESE FORCES INTRUDE AGAIN

(By Drew Middleton)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Cambodia informed the United Nations today that she would make armed attacks into South Vietnam if there were further violations of her territory or air space by United States or South Vietnamese forces.

The decision to respond to "an act of war by an act of war" was taken by the Cambodian Legislature on December 28 and was reported to Secretary General Thant in a letter December 30.

The Cambodian Government, in another letter, warned that it would not only respond to any further attacks on Cambodian territory by military means but also seek the help of countries prepared to assist it. This was interpreted by officials here as a threat to call on Communist China for help.

ATTACKS AT ISSUE

In a third letter to Mr. Thant, Cambodia said that the United States could easily prove its sincerity in regard to Cambodia by giving the International Control Commission the means and material necessary to make an investigation demanded by her Government.

The investigation would deal with reports of arms shipments from Cambodia to South Vietnam and with Cambodia's charges that American and South Vietnamese forces have made attacks on Cambodian villages along the border with South Vietnam. Cambodia broke diplomatic relations with the United States after one attack on a village in which a child was killed.

The Cambodian Government emphasized that supervision of the border areas must be left to the International Control Commission, which was established by the Geneva Conference of 1954 to supervise the accords reached at the end of the French-Indochinese war. The Commission is composed of Polish, Indian and Canadian delegates.

Any intervention by the United Nations would be rejected, the Cambodian letter declared.

The Cambodian letters arise from news reports last month that American commanders in South Vietnam had been empowered to pursue Communist soldiers into Cambodia in certain cases if they fled there.

A State Department statement on December 21 said that the commanders had authority to take actions essential to protect their forces in self-defense and that discretion to use this authority is lodged "at the highest levels of command."

The Secretariat of the United Nations, it is understood, strongly favors sending a Control Commission team to the frontier area, as proposed by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Cambodia's chief of state. Various members of the Secretariat have commented that the United States is dragging its heels on this issue.

The U.S. position a spokesman said, is that it is prepared to support any measure that deals with "the heart of the problem." This is described by the United States as activity of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops against South Vietnam.

The proposal by Prince Sihanouk that the International Control Commission assume a larger role in Cambodia is under consideration by the three governments that provide members for the Commission. But American officials pointed out that the United States did not sign the Geneva agreements and consequently was not directly involved in any discussions.

TWO POSITIONS SOUGHT

Cambodia, however, has asked the British and Soviet Foreign Ministers, as representatives of the two nations that were cochairmen of the Geneva Conference, to take a clear position on the U.S. decision to violate the frontiers of Cambodia and to say what the governments that signed the agreements will do in the event of such U.S. violations.

Upadit Pachariyangkum, Thailand's representative, recently accused Cambodia of "falsely accusing its neighbors while it is itself engaged in its own wrongful and shameful acts of harboring, abetting and assisting the forces which have been committing depredation and aggression against neighboring territories such as South Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand.

In a letter to the President of the Security Council on December 29, Thailand's representative said that although Cambodia had conceded only that she had provided medical supplies for the Vietcong she had in fact given other forms of help and "has indeed fed the war" in South Vietnam.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 10, 1966]

WAR IN VIETNAM CALLED INHUMAN—MCCRACKEN CALLS IT BURDEN ON CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCE

(By George Dugan)

The Reverend Dr. Robert J. McCracken said yesterday at the Riverside Church that the war in Vietnam has become a burden that weighs heavily on both the Christian conscience and the public conscience.

Those who approve the conflict in principle and those who seek an end to it, he said, are "deeply troubled" over its nature and its course. "For one thing," he declared, "there is the inhumanity of the war we, a civilized nation, are waging."

"War at any time is cruel," Dr. McCracken said, "but modern war is brutal and beastly. No matter how often we read about the type of war we are waging, we cannot become indifferent to the burning of whole villages, the bombing of unpredetermined targets and the spraying of chemicals from the air to destroy rice crops."

Also, Dr. McCracken said, "there is the ineffectiveness, some would say the futility, of the war we are waging."

FAILURE AND ESCALATION

"With each successive failure to subdue the Vietcong, the administration has sought a solution in escalating the war," he asserted.

"Having failed to win the war in South Vietnam we extended it to the north. We have halted bombing in the north and are pressing for negotiations and a peace conference.

"If our efforts fail, must we go on expanding the war on an even more massive scale—into North Vietnam, into Laos, into Cambodia?"

The minister declared: "As it is, all the evidence seems to show that as the bombing of Germany and Britain did not bring their governments to the peace table, and Pearl Harbor did not weaken America's resolve to resist, so every fresh bombing of the North will stiffen the resistance of Hanoi and weld the nation together.

"Should there be a further escalation, Hanoi will become far more dependent on Communist military assistance. China and Russia will almost inevitably be involved in the same kind of full-scale operation and world war might well be upon us."

A FEARSOME CROSSFIRE

Dr. McCracken described the "little people" of Vietnam as "caught in a fearsome crossfire—their land ravaged, their shops despoiled, their homes burned, their sons compelled to fight on one side or another.

"Their plight," he asserted, "is surely a burden on any conscience that calls itself Christian. But, it will be objected, we have to be realistic. If we get out of South Vietnam the North Vietnamese will move in and communism with them.

"If we fail to hold the line against communism in South Vietnam there will be new infiltrations and encroachments elsewhere in southeast Asia. Communism is a global movement and its aggressive, expansionist policy must be contained.

"And yet," Dr. McCracken said, "the question will not go down. Is the war we are waging—the inhumanity of it, the ineffectiveness of it, the deepening morass into which it is bringing us, the plight of the Vietnamese—really holding the line against communism? May it not be creating conditions fertile for communism?"

[From the New York Times, Dec. 1, 1965]

NEW YORK: THE QUIET DISASTERS

(By James Reston)

The critical periods of the Vietnamese war have often been the quietest. These have been the times when some official has come back from Saigon and persuaded the President, usually in the privacy of the White House, to increase the American commitment.

In such ways the Americans changed from a small force of 700 noncombatant "advisers" to a fighting expeditionary force of 165,000, and it is one of the oddities of the war that even many well-informed people cannot remember when these decisions were taken. They know where we are now, but they do not know how we got there.

THE COMING STEP

The answer is that we got there by stages in these quiet periods: the advisers in Vietnam became "assistants"; the "assistants" flew the planes but did not man the guns; then they manned the guns but used them only when attacked; then they "retaliated" against attacks on our own bases; then against attacks on the South Vietnamese bases; then they engaged in deep patrols to keep the enemy away from our bases; and finally, they were ordered to "search and destroy," to "find, fix and fight the enemy."

This is relevant now because General Westmoreland, our commander in Saigon, has asked for more troops, and Secretary of Defense McNamara is home from Saigon, preparing for another of those quiet talks with the President.

Mr. McNamara has defined the problem as he sees it quite succinctly: despite the U.S. victories of recent weeks and the severe losses of the enemy, the size and ferocity of the Communist forces have increased and, says Mr. McNamara, we will send whatever forces are required to deal with this situation.

A kind of melancholy fatalism seems to be taking over. The pattern of the war is becoming clear: more Vietcong, more Americans, more violence, more casualties, more replacements for the casualties, again more violence, and finally more replacements for the replacements.

This is now the vicious spiral of Vietnam. When we are winning, we will negotiate but the enemy won't, and when he is winning, the roles are reversed, and it is clear that we are now on the verge of another new commitment.

Maybe it is unavoidable, but at least this time it should be explained. Is it our policy now to commit anything and everything to win that ground war in Vietnam? Are our commitments of ground troops to be determined by the Communists, who have unlimited manpower for this kind of war? How many more men and planes can we send there without turning the war into an American war and destroying the country we are trying to save?

The original American policy in Vietnam was far easier to understand than the present one. We could help, we said, but the South Vietnamese themselves had to win the war and pacify the country. We can still help with bases and supplies. We can hold our bases without unacceptable casualties. We can bomb North Vietnam at least as much as we are now bombing South Vietnam, but a strategy of searching for the enemy in the jungles is a formula for a permanent war which will increasingly divide the country and the alliance, divert the Nation from its constructive purposes at home and abroad, and leave the Chinese free eventually to dominate the peninsula.

If this is wrong and victory is essential to "the vital interests" of the United States, then let us organize and live and fight the way men must when their "vital interests" are at stake.

We are certainly not living today like a nation engaged in a vital struggle. The contrast between prosperity at home and sacrifice in Vietnam is startling, and Secretary of the Treasury Fowler is almost apologizing to the people for not giving them another tax cut next year.

PROFITS AND CASUALTIES

In fact, the people who are telling us it is going to be a long, hard war are the same people who were telling us we were going to bring a lot of the boys home by this Christmas, are now planning another business-better-than-usual budget, and warning the Federal Reserve not to raise interest rates.

So something is out of kilter. A policy of more troops and more profits, draft the poor and reward the rich, more social security at home and less security in Vietnam is not easy to explain, but somebody who knows ought to try.

Either the war is vital or it is not. Either this is essentially a Vietnames war or essentially an American war. The impression is gaining that everybody is trapped by events and not quite sure of what to do, and it is this sense of stumbling deeper into the bog that is frustrating and dividing people.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 19, 1965]

SAIGON: ENDS AND MEANS

(By James Reston)

SAIGON.—One thing seems fairly clear in Saigon: The ends and means of American policy are out of balance. Washington's speeches are outrunning its supplies, and something is going to have to give. Either American objectives in Vietnam will have to be brought down into line with American power here, or American power will have to be increased to meet the objectives.

At the end of last summer, the United States had enough power here to deal with the Vietcong offensive, but the main new fact is that North Vietnam is now beginning to commit its regular divisions to the battle and the indications are that they will probably be able to supply five or even six divisions in Vietnam.

THE AMERICAN OBJECTIVE

The stated objective of American policy is to hunt out and destroy the main units of both the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong and either force a negotiated settlement or scatter the opposition enough to permit the pacification of the country.

There does not seem to be a single top American official here, however, civilian or military, who thinks this can be done with the present American and South Vietnamese force. To stop supplies in a nation with over 1,000 miles of coastline, to find, fight, and destroy the enemy in the jungle when he has the privileged sanctuary of neutral country at his back—this is quite an objective for 200,000 Americans or even 400,000.

"Despite our victories," one high officer said here yesterday, "the force ratios are running against us. They are replacing fighting units faster than we are. They are sending cadres of regular North Vietnamese officers and technicians to form new units out of the Vietcong, and at the present kill-rate this war could go on forever."

BOMBING NO HELP

The American officers here are at least not deceiving themselves. They don't think bombing Hanoi or Haiphong will enable them to avoid fighting the enemy on the ground and they concede that the only strategy they know for destroying the enemy's forces—that is, for achieving the objective they have been given—also happens to be the strategy that will cost the most American casualties.

"We can do it if we pay the price," one officer said here this week, and this is the central question. The administration is saying it will provide whatever forces are necessary, but it is not providing them. It knows that the most effective way to deal with its manpower problem here is to call for reserves, but that is politically awkward.

The Republican leaders are also avoiding the realities of the situation here. They want to bomb Haiphong without considering the vulnerability of Saigon. The docks here are full of ships and there are dozens more waiting their turn outside the mouth of the Saigon River. One merchant ship blown up in the channel of this river would block river traffic here for 6 weeks and this is the channel for over 80 percent of our fuel and ammunition.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 26, 1965]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: NO TIME FOR NEW RISKS

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—There are hints that the southeast Asian war may be geographically escalated even if the tempo of fighting in South Vietnam and the bombing of North Vietnam are not scaled upward. Leakage of Communist manpower and equipment through eastern Laos and, it is claimed, through Cambodia, plus use of both countries as safe havens for Vietcong units seem to be leading toward a new crisis.

The United States, operating primarily through the CIA, has sought to help Royal Laotion forces and to dam the flow of men and supplies from North to South Vietnam along the Ho Chi Minh Trail. Air operations against this Laotian corridor have been mounted both from South Vietnam and from Thailand where Thai and Lao pilots have aided American fliers. Small aircraft support agents and counterguerrilla forces in eastern Laos.

UNSUCCESSFUL EFFORTS

However, these efforts have not succeeded in choking off the "trail." As a consequence there is talk of sending American units into strategically important east Laos although, so far, there has been no known decision. Furthermore, our forces in Vietnam have seemingly been authorized to pursue the Vietcong across the Cambodian frontier if they retreat into that neutral territory.

There are evident dangers involved if the United States either decides to send regular military units into east Laos or to permit American or Saigon forces to carry the fighting to Cambodia. Militarily such actions may commend themselves but, in diplomatic and propaganda terms, is the game worth the candle?

PROVOCATION TO CHINA?

Extension of the formal operational theater might provoke China to launch massive guerrilla assaults against Thailand through Laos or northeastern Burma. Thailand has been developed as a base to support U.S. defense efforts in Laos and one may wonder whether it is useful to risk trouble there. Peiping already promotes a "Free Thai" movement and Chinese officers are undergoing mass training in the Thai language.

At some point, then, either the politicians or the soldiers are going to have to do some adjusting. If they will not provide the means, which means the lives, to destroy the enemy's forces, then they will have to limit their ends.

The vast majority of the South Vietnamese people live in the area of Saigon, in the cities of the northeast and the provincial capitals. These areas can be defended and fed without anything like the losses involved in trying to carry the battle to the enemy in the hills and rice paddies.

SAIGON PERIMETER

The estimates here are that a wide perimeter around Saigon, including from 6 to 8 million people, can be secured with three American divisions on the outer perimeter, five South Vietnamese divisions on the inner perimeter and a well-organized militia.

The task in the northeast around the Cha Lai-Danang area is perhaps easier, for there the Americans have the sea at their backs and sufficient firepower to protect themselves against almost anything that can be thrown against them.

This is certainly not a pleasant prospect, but it is one alternative and it is being discussed here. Everybody seems to have his own personal nightmare about Vietnam. Some fear the President will go to far, others that he will not go far enough to win.

THE THIRD ALTERNATIVE

But there is a third. This is that the President will adjust neither his ends nor his means or not adjust one or the other enough to produce a realistic balance. In that event, we could easily keep on trying to destroy the enemy's forces on the ground and take so many casualties in the process that the American people and politicians would force a withdrawal and we would not even save the cities.

In any event, the present situation cannot go on for very long. Honest men can easily differ both about the ends and the means of our policy here, but on this central point of the need to balance the one to the other, both the hawks and the doves ought to be able to agree.

The importance of Thailand in United States strategic planning is manifest. Air and port facilities are being steadily expanded and the brilliant Maj. Gen. Richard Stilwell, former chief of staff to the U.S. commander in chief in Saigon, has been posted as senior American officer in Thailand.

It is necessary to distinguish from each other the cases of Laos and Cambodia. North Vietnam has always disregarded the 1962 Geneva agreement to neutralize Laos, thus prompting Washington to strike back. Unfortunately, it was plain when the Geneva accord was still being negotiated that it would be valueless. It would have been wiser to partition Laos.

It is understandable that stepped-up operations should be contemplated by Washington for east Laos because the other side so blatantly violates its Geneva pledge; but it would be unwise to introduce regular American units.

The kind of operation in which we now engage in Laos could be improved without open intervention. The Communists, indeed, intervene there openly but North Vietnamese fade into the background easily. Americans would not.

THE CAMBODIAN PROBLEM

As for Cambodia, the doctrine of hot pursuit there could lead to unforeseeable repercussions. American commanders are convinced that Communist supplies and reinforcements come through Cambodia and that Sihanoukville in the south is a storage center for Vietcong arms unloaded from coastal junks. This is denied by Prince Sihanouk and American reporters who searched the area found nothing. Yet it is possible Sihanouk has lost administrative control of Cambodia's Vietnamese border area into which guerrillas appear to have been retreating and where hot pursuit is threatened.

MacArthur unsuccessfully sought permission to employ hot pursuit against the Chinese in Korea. French commanders fighting Algerian nationalists wanted authorization from Paris to invade Tunisia and Morocco to clean up regions where the Algerian forces were openly training. This was refused—although one air unit bombed a Tunisian town. The United States at that time strongly opposed French ideas of hot pursuit much as France today opposes our belligerent intimations vis-a-vis Laos and Cambodia.

OUR TARNISHED IMAGE

In pondering these problems we should study both military and diplomatic aspects. Our image, recently improved in Japan and Indonesia, still remains tarnished. We should not blacken it.

It is dangerous to allow field commanders to decide when to cross an international border. It would be wiser to accumulate evidence of frontier violations by Vietcong units and then apply pressure on Cambodia through the U.N. At least such a first step is not irrevocable.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 21, 1965]

AIKEN SAYS CHINESE ARE "WINNING" VIETNAM WAR

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON.—Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN of Vermont said today that "up to now Communist China is winning this war in Vietnam."

Mr. AIKEN, who is the second-ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, said that this was his view before his recent visit to Saigon and that nothing he had seen or heard there had given him any reason to alter it.

"Communist China is forcing us into a war against an ancient enemy (of China's)," he said. "For a thousand years the Vietnamese fought against China to prevent her overrunning southeast Asia. While we're seeking to eliminate China's old enemy, we are at the same time exhausting our own energies."

Senator AIKEN said Communist China was suffering "no losses at all" in the war.

The Senator was one of a five-member senatorial group headed by the Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, that made a 5-week trip covering Paris, Moscow, Teheran, and several capitals in southeast Asia.

VIETNAM ISSUE DOMINANT

The other Senators were DANIEL K. INOUYE, of Hawaii, and EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, both Democrats, and J. CALEB BOGGS, Republican, of Delaware. Mr. MANSFIELD undertook the factfinding trip at the request of President Johnson, and he chose his companions as being broadly representative of both parties in the Senate.

The group, which traveled on a White House jet aircraft, returned to Washington late last Saturday night. Yesterday Mr. MANSFIELD made an oral report to the President at a White House luncheon and gave him a written report which, he said today, ran to 32 or 33 pages.

Mr. MANSFIELD declined to describe the contents of the written report beyond saying that "to a large extent it was dominated by the Vietnam issue." He said the President went over it "very thoroughly."

The majority leader said that in the talks with government leaders in the Middle East, southeast Asia, and the Far East, the war in Vietnam was the principal issue discussed.

Mr. MANSFIELD said that he would report to the Senate on his trip "about January 10" and that this report would be made public.

As majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD has taken great care not to array himself publicly with such outspoken Democratic critics of the administration's policy in Vietnam as Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, and Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska.

On the other hand, he has told the President and his Senate colleagues that he believes it possible for the United States to win the war yet lose the country, and that the administration should seek peace through every conceivable channel.

Mr. MANSFIELD would not discuss what conclusions he formed on his most recent visit to Saigon, but gave no indication that his views had changed.

Referring to the trip, Senator AIKEN said that "as a factfinding committee, it was successful." The results he went on, "will depend on the extent to which the President makes use of the information placed in his hands by Senator MANSFIELD." The information, the Senator added, "tells a long, big story."

"One thing that was evident, is that Mr. MANSFIELD is respected all over the world," Senator AIKEN said. "He was graphically described in Cambodia, as 'a man of great justice.' We weren't insulted anywhere. Where they were officially cool, they were personally cordial."

[From the Miami News, Nov. 23, 1965]

ANOTHER KOREA?—OUR VIETNAM POSITION NEEDS A REVIEW

Mounting troop commitments, lengthening casualty lists and rumors of negotiations all suggest that what the public needs at this time is a review of the entire situation in Vietnam.

The Johnson administration, which sometimes seems to be playing the war by ear, needs to tell us where we are and where we are headed. We read reports that North Vietnam is pouring regular troops into South Vietnam at a rate which can only mean another big commitment of American forces.

Thus the war which President Kennedy once called a Vietnamese war, which the Vietnamese must fight and win, is becoming more and more an American war, and the casualties are beginning to underscore this point all too graphically.

Unfortunately, the administration has been less than candid in the past. Although the recently disclosed offer to negotiate by Hanoi came long before President Johnson's call for "unconditional negotiations," the impression has been fostered by Washington that North Vietnam has an unbroken history of intractability. That the Hanoi offer may or may not have been worth considering is beside the point.

It is too bad that so much of the opposition to the administration course in Vietnam has been taken over by kooks and fanatics. Thus anyone who questions the course of the war runs the risk of being categorized with the draft-card burners and other anarchic elements.

The fact is that as this war escalates, the possibility that we are headed for another Korea becomes inescapable. Maybe we need to run that risk, maybe not. We have the feeling that neither the risks nor the alternatives are being spelled out. And we think they should be.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 2, 1966]

OUR MISJUDGMENT IN VIETNAM

What we are demonstrating in Vietnam is that a powerful, highly industrialized nation can wreak havoc and carnage upon a small nation largely of peasants. What we shall gain by the demonstration remains to be seen.

What we are losing is already apparent—among other things, the greatest opportunity ever given to any people to bring into being a world in which the nations would be governed by a code of conduct applicable to all, that would promote the safety of all, and that all could accept without loss of self-respect. The cornerstone of any such code—the nearest thing to an international government of laws the human race is probably capable of establishing in the foreseeable future—would have to be the right of every nation to be master in its own house.

The alternative to a general respect for the right of every nation to be itself, free of outside coercion, is international anarchy or a new Pax Romana under a supernation, and it is this right as it pertains to Vietnam that we are violating. We have intervened by force in Vietnam with no mandate from the Vietnamese people or anyone who could conceivably be regarded as representing them. We have done so with the aim of endowing South Vietnam with the rights of independent nationhood, to be exercised by our proteges, without having shown on what basis it is entitled to such status.

That Vietnam is today divided de facto is owing entirely to France's postwar effort to hold on to its colonial empire. The Geneva agreement which provided for partition reflected a military situation.

It was not in the minds of the signatories that the division was natural or would endure. They provided, in fact, for elections to a national government, to be held by 1956. The United States, moreover, could hardly justify any of its actions in terms of an agreement that from the start it refused to honor.

Our claim is that we are in Vietnam to combat "Communist aggression," but the only Communist troops fighting in Vietnam are those of the Hanoi regime and its adherents in the South. The Hanoi regime is doing what any government in its position would be doing: trying to reunite the country under its control by such means as are open to it. And, although we choose to forget it, it is a Vietnamese Government with a far better claim to legitimacy than any other.

It is the lineal descendant of the government under Ho Chi Minh elected March 3, 1946, by a national assembly which itself had been elected in a nationwide referendum. How fair the elections were would be hard to determine today, but certainly Ho Chi Minh was revered as the George Washington of the country and his government came to power by indigenous processes.

It was this government, moreover, that France recognized in concluding with it the accord of March 6, 1946, which established Vietnam as "a free state within the French Union with its own government, parliament, army, and treasury."

Having come to this agreement in order to buy time while building up their military strength in Indochina, the French soon moved to cancel it by force of arms and reinstall their prewar regime, which Franklin Roosevelt had characterized as such that it had led the Indochinese to believe that "anything must be better than to live under French colonial rule." The Vietnamese Government, as Ho's regime was then universally termed, had the choice of being reduced to impotence or fighting back. It fought.

That it was to be war became clear in November 1946, when the French Navy, in order "to teach the Vietnamese Government a hard lesson," as the admiral in command put it, shelled Haiphong, killing between 6,000 and 10,000 men, women, and children. Thus began the war we have taken over, and the regime in Saigon, on whose behalf we claim to be fighting it, and which is quite incapable of governing even with our massive support, is the heir of the regime installed by the French in 1949 under the playboy ex-Emperor Bao Dai in the hope that it would attract support away from Ho's government and enable them to continue ruling Vietnam, albeit at second hand.

The French, let it be noted, moved against the Vietnamese Government not because it was Communist but because it was nationalist. Although Ho had spent years in the U.S.S.R. and his government certainly had a Communist coloration, there is little reason to doubt that the aim of that government, in which non-Communists were greatly predominant, was, as Ho stated, genuine independence. If later the non-Communists lost out to the Communists, the West itself must bear responsibility for having turned its back on them and abandoned the Vietnamese nationalist movement to French warplanes, napalm bombs, and tanks, most of them made in the United States.

If, as Dean Acheson says, there is no difference between the war in Korea and the war in Vietnam—and it is he who says this—then the shoes are on different feet this time and we are playing in Vietnam the role that Communist China played in Korea.

President Johnson says we are defending freedom in South Vietnam, but, as everyone must be thoroughly aware, the Hanoi regime, if it were anything but Communist, could be fully as authoritarian as it is and fully as ruthless in pursuit of its present course and we should never dream of intervening. We invoke a mastermind entity called international communism as the aggressor against which we are defending South Vietnam, but there is no such masterminded entity outside our own neurotic and unworthy apprehensions; the Communist nations are split into bitterly opposed camps.

We talk as if the Hanoi regime were the creature of Communist China, as the Pyongyang regime was the creature of the U.S.S.R. and doubtless is now of Communist China. But no Communist power was within a thousand miles of Vietnam when Ho's government was formed. As a matter of fact, the

Chinese nationalists were in occupation of North Vietnam at the time.

Peiping has no military formations in Vietnam. How then could it control the Hanoi regime? It could not unless the Hanoi regime felt dependent upon it for its future. And if it does, we can thank ourselves.

The most cursory reading of history can hardly fail to show that governments simply do not take orders from other governments unless they have to. And a reading of the history of Asia would surely show that in all probability, any Vietnamese Government, if given a chance, would act as a bar to Chinese expansion.

The truth is that we are fighting in Vietnam because we are opposed to the political orientation of the Hanoi regime and that, presumably, of the Vietcong. It is not because of what they are doing that we have gone to war but because of what they are, and if this is to be the basis of American interventions in the future, it is easy to see that we shall relieve the Communists of the odium in which they have been held and attach it to ourselves.

If the United States is to set itself up as the arbiter of what political forms and practices other peoples may adopt, it will make itself the most feared and hatred of nations, however dependent upon its largesse other peoples may be.

To say that we are prepared to negotiate with Hanoi sounds reasonable enough. But why, unless it is forced to it, should Hanoi agree to negotiate when to do so under the terms we set would concede the United States a crucial voice in the internal affairs of Vietnam? Would the United States, unless beaten to its knees, have agreed to negotiate with Britain in 1863 on the basis of the "security" of the South if the British had had a huge expeditionary force fighting in support of the Confederacy? And the Conferate States, as Gladstone pointed out, were actually possessed of those qualifications for nationhood that the Secretary of State would have us believe are possessed by South Vietnam when he refers to it as "a small nation," as if it were another Belgium.

The point is this: if we have had any hope of marshalling international opposition to great-power interventions such as could be expected to restrain the U.S.S.R. and Communist China—and without it, the prospects of civilization would appear to be poor—we are sacrificing it by arrogating the right to intervene in Vietnam. Hardly any mistake we could well make would be likely to produce more disastrous consequences than our believing that we can maintain one set of rules for ourselves and our allies and another for our opponents.

There are more immediate penalties we are paying for our misjudgment in Vietnam: the mountains of the dead on our consciences; the squandering of our resources; the repellent picture we are presenting of ourselves abroad; our dangerous and deepening embroilment in the continent of Asia. But the question is, what should we do?

If it is out of the question for us simply to disengage ourselves from Vietnam, as we are told by those who understand matters of face, the best solution, it seems to me, would be for us to go before the United Nations and deliver ourselves frankly and fairly to this effect:

"We intervened in Vietnam because we believe that communism is a deadly menace to human values. We still believe so. We are fully prepared to continue and strengthen our intervention, but the cost in blood and destruction is proving to be far heavier than we had anticipated. We are unwilling any longer to bear unilaterally the onus of this cost. If it is the consensus of the United Nations that we should continue our defense of South Vietnam, we shall do so regardless of costs until an acceptable settlement is reached. If such is not the consensus of the United Nations, we shall withdraw. It is up to you to say."

If the United Nations on balance approved of what we are doing, we should be able to proceed on a far sounder basis. If, as seems much more likely, it declined to do so, we should be brought to acknowledge what even our most militant interventionists must realize: that no nation, even one as powerful as ours, can save the world if the world refuses to subscribe to its conception of salvation.

CHARLTON OGBURN, Jr.

[From the Portland Oregonian, Jan. 10, 1966]

ASIANS, TOO, SPLIT IN VIEWS ON VIETNAM WAR

(By Daniel R. Southerland)

TOKYO.—Thousands of students and workers sit down in the middle of a key Tokyo intersection, blocking traffic from all directions chanting "Yankee go home," "America get out of Vietnam," and "We oppose the war."

Helmeted Japanese riot police, backed by water cannon and armored personnel cars, keep the demonstrators from marching on the U.S. Embassy. Demonstrators snake dance, wave banners, blow whistles. Marchers and police collide, push, shove. Tempers flare. The result: 21 arrests, many injuries.

To the west of Tokyo, across the Sea of Japan, a different scene: Park Chung Hee, President of South Korea, addresses 10,000 stern-faced young soldiers in battle dress. These are men of the South Korean Army's elite Tiger unit. The occasion is a farewell ceremony. They are going to fight in South Vietnam.

Park, a former army general, tells them: "I want to stress once again that should we fail to stop Communist aggression in Free (South) Vietnam, we will lose all of southeast Asia before long * * * then the Republic of Korea's security could not be guaranteed. This is why we say that the Vietnam front is directly connected with our military demarcation line."

JAPAN CAN'T SEE IT

Japan and South Korea are close neighbors, but their feelings couldn't be farther apart on the subject of the war in Vietnam. The Japanese see it as a civil war for national liberation, the outcome of which will not affect them unless it comes to a showdown between Red China and the United States. The South Koreans see it as Communist aggression that threatens their own security. Their two views represent the extreme difference in non-Communist Asians about the Vietnamese war.

Contrary to some expectations, the sight of Americans fighting against Asians in South Vietnam has not united all Asia in revulsion or turned former U.S. allies into enemies.

Some anti-Communist Asian countries, like South Korea, have been happy to see the Americans fighting alongside the South Vietnamese Government. These are the pro-Western governments of Thailand, Laos, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Nationalist China. Three have actively contributed aid to South Vietnam. Each has come to the conclusion that the outcome of the war could directly affect its national security and that consequently the Communists "must be stopped in Vietnam."

At the other end of the spectrum, Indonesia, the largest country in southeast Asia, and Cambodia, one of the smallest, see the United States as an "imperialist" aggressor in South Vietnam. In its view the South Vietnamese Government is a "puppet" regime and the Vietcong guerrillas are not only Communists but also Nationalists fighting for the independence and reunification of Vietnam. They consider a Communist takeover inevitable.

THREE DON'T CARE

Although Japan is officially on the record as a supporter of the United States and the South Vietnamese Government, the Japanese are reluctant allies. The majority of the Japanese would have to be listed as opponents of U.S. policies in Vietnam.

Three nations much less concerned with the Vietnam conflict than with their own regional and internal problems are India, Pakistan, and Burma. They have been critical of the U.S. escalation of the war, while remaining technically neutral toward the struggle.

The plight which all these countries share—despite a massive collective population of 900 million people and proximity to Vietnam—is an inability to take united action for or against the war. Their traditional feuds, political immaturity, and gnawing internal problems have kept them apart at a time when some kind of regional cooperation might help to stabilize the situation.

Age-old enmities sometimes seem much more important to them than the war in Vietnam.

The eight-nation Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), designed to counter Communist aggression, has been hamstrung by inner divisions. Pakistan, as a SEATO member, is technically committed under the treaty's charter to resist Communist aggression in countries such as South Vietnam that come under SEATO's protective umbrella. But Pakistan's leaders clearly say they would not agree to do so.

OPPONENTS DISAGREE

Pakistan's Foreign Minister Z. A. Bhutto told newsmen shortly after the 1964 SEATO meeting in Manila, "As long as we are badly menaced by India and our energies are spent meeting this menace, we would not be in a position to make any contribution to SEATO."

The opponents of U.S. policy in Vietnam are no more united than its allies.

In a speech on August 17, Indonesia President Sukarno spoke of building an axis linking Indonesia with North Vietnam, Red China, North Korea and Cambodia to check United States and British imperialism in Asia.

Cambodia's chief of state, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, still anxious to maintain his nation's neutrality, did not welcome Sukarno's suggestion. And not long after the idea was articulated, an abortive, Communist-backed coup in Djakarta soured relations between Indonesia and Communist China, thus snapping another link in the proposed axis.

Pro-Western friends of the United States in Asia—with the notable exceptions of Japan and India—have meanwhile reached a kind of unwritten consensus concerning Vietnam.

Thailand, Laos, South Korea, the Philippines, and Nationalist China favor a tough policy against the Communists in Vietnam, a conviction nurtured by each of these governments' experiences in fighting either Communist aggression or internal subversion.

The Nationalist Chinese openly call for a bigger and bigger war. As one official in Taipei put it: "Let's face it. Any war in Asia against communism is and will be a great help to this country."

President Johnson's call for unconditional discussions with the Communists caused shock and consternation in Taipei. The Nationalists have come out on the losing end in negotiations with the Red Chinese, and they are convinced that the Communists never keep their word. Instead of a peaceful settlement, the Nationalists would like to see a bigger war that might give them a chance to use their 600,000-man armed forces to realize lingering dreams of invading the China mainland and overthrowing the Peiping regime.

JAPAN DIFFERS

"No matter how many troops the United States pours into Vietnam, the war cannot be won there," Chiang Kai-shek said in a recent interview. "It must be won elsewhere."

Nowhere could there be more disagreement with that view than there is in Japan. Nowhere could there be more disagreement with South Korea's view that the loss of South Vietnam threatens other nations than there is in Tokyo.

One might expect a capitalistic society like Japan, for whom the United States is the No. 1 trading partner and source of military security, to be 100 percent behind the anti-Communist war effort in Vietnam. But although officially in favor of the U.S. role, the Japanese find themselves emotionally opposed.

Their defeat in World War II convinced many Japanese that any form of war is evil, and that compromise and negotiation should be used to secure peace, even at a price.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 21, 1965]

THE RECKONING BEGINS

(By Walter Lippmann)

In making the budget the President has come face to face with the reality of things—that he has overextended his commitments until they have outrun his power. It was the President who extended the intervention in support of the South Vietnamese Government into an American war which is rapidly involving most of Indochina; it was the President who expanded the reforms and welfare measures of the New Deal and the New Frontier into a war on poverty and a promise to reconstruct the country as a Great Society. Along with these two greatly expanded undertakings, we continue to pay the large costs of an accelerated race to the moon.

The President is now compelled to decide whether he will contract some of his undertakings or, in order to preserve them and yet keep the budget financially respectable, to raise taxes. Yet, though whichever course he chooses will be unpopular, the real problem for the country is not financial. The country can easily afford to pay for all these operations—Vietnam, poverty, moon. The real pinch comes from the fact that money will not buy enough technicians and trained men, qualified administrators and commanders, nor will it buy the morale and the attention and the variegated energy which would be needed to carry out effectively and successfully all the commitments at home and around the globe. Only those who suffer from the delusion of omnipotence will think that this country can reconstruct its own society, can fight a major war in Asia, and can police the world from Berlin to Korea from central Asia to South America.

The real budgetary problem is not in the amount of money expended and money received: it is that our commitments as compared with our intellectual and moral assets are grossly out of balance. That is the reason why the more the Asian war expands, the more the domestic war on poverty is bound to contract. There is an ominous portent in the evolution of the Johnson administration—the portent of failure after the bright hopes of its beginning, because the President has not taught himself to measure his ambitions and his abilities against his own and the Nation's capacity. In the past year since his inauguration, his commitments have become grossly overextended and something somewhere is going to have to give.

This is the crucial and the radical defect of policy making in this administration—an habitual lack of prudence in making policy and capacity agree with one another.

Secretary Rusk is a serious offender in this respect. Last week, for example, he was in Paris for a meeting with our allies in NATO, and he pled with them for help in the Vietnamese war. His central thesis was his well-known argument that, as he put it in a television interview on September 7, "the integrity of that commitment by the United States is of great importance to all of those to whom we have commitments." Secretary Rusk failed in his plea. He got no help, and his argument fell flat. Why? Because he had missed the point. Our European allies are not in doubt about our integrity. They are in doubt about our capacity to fight what may be a major war in Asia and simultaneously to fight a major war in Europe.

The Europeans are not sentimentalists. They know that the deeper Mr. Rusk takes us into Asia, the more certain it is that he must pull us back elsewhere. And so, however noble his protestations, the Europeans are concerned with what the United States can and will do, not with what it has promised to do.

Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara pled with our allies to realize that the war in Vietnam and the containment of China are vitally important to the security of Europe. So they proposed that in effect NATO be transformed from a regional alliance in Europe to a global alliance. Secretary Rusk neglected to notice that for such an enormous extension of the commitments of the European nations, a price would have to be paid in exchange. The price of a global alliance would be of course, a multilateral control of American military actions all over the globe, including Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

The same kind of softness and unrealism has brought the administration to the verge of what Ambassador Goldberg has just described as "a great crisis of confidence over whether we in the administration really are pursuing a path to peace." The President and Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara have said repeatedly that we are not fighting to establish a permanent military base in South Vietnam. Why then should there still be "great concern" about what we mean? Because Secretary Rusk has in effect made it a condition of our leaving South Vietnam that there be a government in Saigon which is stable and secure and has come to no agreement with the Vietcong who now occupy more than half the country. This condition is almost certainly equivalent to saying we shall never leave South Vietnam.

We are in deepening trouble because we are too proud to face up to the reality, too proud to recognize a mistake. It has been said that a sentimentalist is a man who knows the value of everything and the price of nothing. It must be said that high policy today is in the hands of men who know the value of freedom, peace, righteousness, and justice in human affairs but are all too little aware of the price that must be paid to defend them and promote them. For this there will be a reckoning.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 4, 1966]

THE PRESIDENT IN THE MORASS

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is no reason to doubt that the President is sincere in proclaiming to the whole world his desire to negotiate a peace in Vietnam. But sincerity is not the crux of the matter. The question is whether he recognizes the strategic realities of the military situation and is prepared to negotiate a truce which conforms with them. It cannot be a glorious truce.

If the President is not prepared to make his terms of peace consistent with the reality in southeast Asia, he is likely to find that our friends and our adversaries alike regard the whole spectacular business not as the action of a statesman but as the device of a showman.

Nevertheless, for the President the peace offensive is a critical turning point. It is not true, as so many suppose, that, if Peiping and Hanoi reject the offer to negotiate, the way will therefore be cleared and open for a general escalation of the war. The President will find that while the planes will fly and the troops will march and Congress will vote the money, confidence in his leadership, both at home and abroad, will be deeply weakened unless he has defined his terms of peace.

As seen through the murk of Secretary Rusk's on and off the record press conferences, the Johnson administration has no firm and clear position on the central issues of the war. I realize that industrious newspapermen have been able to glean a collection of remarks which relate to the central issues—such as, whether we are prepared to leave South Vietnam under any conditions which are in fact realizable in the foreseeable future, and whether we are in fact willing to negotiate a truce with the main adversary in the field, the Vietcong.

If these central points have been clarified by Mr. Harriman and the other emissaries, a great deal will have been accomplished. If they have not been clarified, the effort is not sufficiently serious to comport with the dignity of a great power. For a power like the United States cannot lose face by liquidating a miserable war. But it can lose face by fooling around with it.

Mr. Johnson knows that he is in a very grave crisis. For as he admitted in his year-end remarks, his great domestic accomplishments are jeopardized by his "failure" to achieve peace in Vietnam. It is worse than that. He is on the verge of making the kind of ruinous historical mistake which the Athenians made when they attacked Syracuse, which Napoleon and Hitler made when they attacked Russia. He is on the verge of engaging this country in a war which can grow into a great war lasting for many years and promising no rational solution.

The President is in this predicament mainly because he has let himself be persuaded by very bad advice. The bad advice has been the argument that the expansion of Chinese communism will be halted or quickened by the outcome of the fighting in South Vietnam. The notion that revolutionary wars can be stopped by fighting it out in South Vietnam has been the cherished illusion of the President's two principal advisers. Both Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara have committed themselves to the fallacy that South Vietnam is the Armageddon of the conflict with communism.

This misconceived war has in fact boomeranged. Its effect has been quite the opposite from what it was supposed to be. The country has been told that by proving our determination and our willingness to fight, we are arousing resistance to the expansion of Chinese communism.

But are we? If China is to be contained it will have to be done not only by the United States but by the containing powers of Asia; namely, Pakistan, India, Japan, and the Soviet Union. Yet not one of these great powers of Asia is aligned with us. Quite the contrary. Our Vietnamese actions have driven the most powerful of all the containing states, the Soviet Union, into open opposition to us and, if we escalate enough, will drive it into some kind of military opposition.

Certainly it is essential that Communist China be contained until its revolutionary ardors have cooled and she has settled down to a peaceable coexistence. But a serious policy of containing China would begin with a realization that China is a continental land power in Asia and if she is to be contained, it will have to be done primarily by the great powers of Asia, not by the United States alone.

What is more, a serious policy for containing China would respect the basic geographical facts—that China is a land power and we are a sea power, that China is an elephant

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and we are a whale. During the past year or so China has had many failures and one conspicuous success. Geography was the determining factor in all of them. The Chinese failed in Africa, which is across the ocean and too far away. She outbluffed herself against India, which is also in fact too far away. She had a humiliating setback in Indonesia, which is separated from China by blue water and is not within her reach.

China's one great success has been that the greatest sea power has become bogged down in the morass of Indochina and would now be put to it to mount a counterrevolutionary effort anywhere else in this turbulent world. It is no wonder then that China will do all that she can to prevent us from extricating ourselves from the morass.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 28, 1965]

DEFINING OUR WAR AIMS

(By Walter Lippmann)

On Monday morning we were offered reports by two distinguished newspapermen, each citing official estimates of the number of troops needed in Vietnam. One of the reporters said that the increase needed would be from a strength of 200,000 to a strength of 300,000 men. The other said that "it is estimated that at least 350,000 U.S. troops will be required and perhaps 400,000 to 500,000."

This discrepancy may be due to the fact that each of the reporters was speaking about a different period of time. I call attention to it only because I believe that the war has become unpredictable, that the President is caught in a vicious spiral. As each succeeding prediction and promise of the President's advisers has turned out to be wrong, the only remedy they have been able to offer the President is that he should send in more troops and do more bombing. The President, presumably because he could not think of anything else to do, has taken their advice and has been conducting the war like a gambler who, when he loses one round, doubles his bets in the hope of recovering what he has lost.

After a year of increasing escalation, the area controlled by the Vietcong is larger today than it was a year ago, and the North Vietnamese have replied to the bombing not by ceasing to intervene in South Vietnam, but by doing what it was plain that they would do if we bombed them—by sending in more and more of their trained troops. The result is that we do not have now, and there is not in sight, a decisive military superiority.

In order to break this vicious spiral, the President will have to begin by clearing up the confusion among his advisers about our own war aims. There are two basic questions which will have to be answered before we can be prepared to negotiate peace. The fact that there is a large faction which does not wish to negotiate peace and is expressing its views in the press is proof enough of the confusion.

The first and the biggest question is whether or not we are fighting to preserve an American military lodgement on the mainland of Asia.

The second, and closely related, question is whether or not we are prepared to negotiate the peace with all our adversaries, including the Vietcong.

On both of these questions there are deep differences of opinion in the country, in Congress, and I venture to say, within the intimate circle of the President's advisers. Unless these differences are resolved, we are not able to negotiate a settlement of the war. For they pertain to the fundamental issues about which the war is being fought.

On the face of the record the President, Secretary Rusk, and Secretary McNamara have publicly disclaimed any intention of establishing a permanent U.S. military base in South Vietnam. But these disclaimers are not believed by our adversaries nor even by many of our friends. For the disclaimers are vitiated by Secretary Rusk's statements that we shall not leave South Vietnam until and unless the government in Saigon has been stabilized and its independence is no longer in doubt. This condition of our military withdrawal is tantamount to saying that for the foreseeable and indefinite future we shall remain to protect, to foster, and to guard a South Vietnamese Government which suits us. For there is no prospect whatsoever that there will be the kind of government Secretary Rusk talks about if we are not in military possession of Saigon and some of the other towns.

Almost certainly, I am convinced, the fundamental conflict between China and the United States is over our military presence on the mainland of Asia. Only a small minority among us in this country have been willing even to consider the question of whether our military presence on the Asian mainland should be, needs to be, and can be made permanent. As one of this small minority, I believe it a grave mistake to attempt to make permanent our military presence on the Asian mainland. For I believe that our being there is abnormal—our military presence was never conceived as part of the national interest of the United States. It is an accidental and unplanned consequence of the Second World War. Making this artificial and ramshackle debris of the old empires permanent and committing our lives and fortunes to its maintenance means, I believe, unending war in Asia.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 27, 1965]

DOLLARS ARE PLAYTHING OF WAR PROFITEERS

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK.—We have shown the world that we mean business in Vietnam as far as the fighting is concerned. The next step is to show the world that we also mean business as far as the war business is concerned.

The French were once in our shoes. They remember how certain elements in Vietnam made a good thing out of the business of war. Neither the war profiteers in Vietnam nor their confederates in France, wanted the party to stop. They still don't especially now that we're paying for the party. Here's how the game works:

Step No. 1 calls for an outflow of American Government dollars to the Government of Vietnam earmarked for economic aid. Of the $600 million a year we have been remitting to Vietnam, nearly half has been allotted to the government for commercial imports. The Saigon government distributes these commercial dollars through an import licensing system. It sells them at the pegged exchange rate to worthy merchants who apply for import licenses and know how to get them.

Step No. 2 follows from the pegged exchange rate between the dollar and the Vietnam piaster. Officially, 60 of their buys 1 of ours. But the going rate on the black market is more like 160 to 1. The spread between the official rate and the down-on-the-corner real rate makes a profit on step No. 2 a sure thing. Let's say that Mr. X, a worthy merchant with connections, applies for a license to bring in a $10,000 shipment of something plausible and pedestrian—tires, or surgical instruments, or, maybe, champagne. He gets the license and pays for it with piasters at 60 to the dollar.

In order to move on to step No. 3, Mr. X needs a confederate in France, Switzerland, or wherever he plans to turn his bargain-basement dollars over. The confederate gets the order and the dollars. No one cares much about the order. It's Washington's give-away dollars, which turn into Saigon's bargain-basement dollars, that make the game irresistible, safe and—tragically—endless.

For the dollars triple, by way of the black market, and go back to Saigon. By the time champagne or munitions could get here, the dollars have made the round trip several times. All the importers need back from their overseas confederates who get the orders is the kind of documentation that will satisfy the licensing authorities in Saigon, plus, of course, the dollars.

Up to now, the idea had always been to sneak currency out from under the noses of the licensing authorities and to squirrel it away in Switzerland, Tangier, Panama, or Hong Kong. The new wrinkle is to bring it back and keep it in use. There's a great incentive in selling dollars worth an official rate of 60 to 1 at the black market rate of 160 to 1, and then turning these windfall piasters back to the money-manufacturing license bureau by the satchetful to start the game all over again.

It beats working, and it certainly beats importing. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's batteries of rapid-fire computers aren't needed to demonstrate that anyone who can turn over a triple three or four times a year will bat a thousand, and find the fun habit forming.

The oldtime war lords used to speak of silver bullets, meaning just this kind of racketeering traffic which thrives on war profiteering. We have set their present-day successors up in a better business, with bullets made of dollars, which are much more convenient to move around the world.

If we do mean business about the war business in Vietnam, we will slap a control on every dollar moving in and out of the place; and we'll mark each dollar "usable only in the United States of America." This is the kind of watchdog operation we set up during World War II in order to prevent dollars sent to French Africa from trickling through to Hitler's puppet regime in Vichy. We commanded respect then. We won't now until we earn it the same way today.

[From Newsweek, Jan. 10, 1966]

THE VIEW FROM THE BRINK

(By Emmet John Hughes)

Draw your chair up close to the edge of the precipice and I'll tell you a story.—F. SCOTT FITZGERALD.

A United States at war must greet 1966 with a taut sense of sitting on the edge of the unknowable: a Vietnam war in which 100,000 Americans could easily die or a Vietnam peace for which a few American diplomats may exhaustingly struggle. Whichever the event, there now can be no preposterous hope of simple solutions or stunning stratagems. For political extravagance must end like personal extravagance—with a reckoning of all the boldly penned promissory notes for which there is no cash. And at such a time—on the edge of decision—a nation, like a man, must weigh the haunting question: How did I ever get here?

The honest facing of the question demands an answer free of either whining or accusing. And the snarled factors shaping U.S. decision over the last year seem, above all, to be these:

1. The anxiety to save the South Vietnam Government from total collapse. The decision to hurl U.S. airpower across the 17th parallel was never so much an act of confident strategy as of presumed necessity. Throughout 1965, the private rationale of the highest U.S. officials was candid and unchanging: "We had no choice. Without such action, the Saigon regime would have crumbled." And this singular use of power—less to wound a foe than to exhilarate an ally—may have sealed the most awkward kind of compact. For the end of 1965 has found Saigon scorning any diplomatic negotiation that might threaten its imported military shield.

2. The fancy that U.S. airpower would erase all need for U.S. ground power. It is hard to believe that U.S. strategists, after Korea, suffered such illusion. But they did nothing whatsoever to discourage its easy acceptance by much of the citizenry. And they now must pay the price—in public confidence—for so unbravely letting the truth be blurred.

3. The persistence in trying to dictate a military answer to a political question. The distinction is not, of course, absolute: any properly aimed gun fires at a clear and precise political target. But it is just this vital relationship between armed weapon and ardent intent that U.S. policy in Vietnam has failed to define. Throughout 1965, the Washington planners freely conceded in private that they could see no happier end to it all than a neutralist Vietnam slightly free of Peiping. But they have been at a loss to explain how U.S. bombs could ever reach this political target. And this strategic illogic quite faithfully reflects the personal direction of the war as seen last spring by a veteran U.S. diplomat long watching the conflict fearfully. "Our three key planners here," he observed, "are exceptionally gifted men: Taylor, Bundy, and McNamara. They come from wholly different backgrounds: the military, the university, and the corporation. Yet they share one striking quality: all three totally lack in their past so much as a single day's living experience in national politics or international diplomacy. How can they help being drawn toward crisp military formulas—prepared like a seminar and persuasive as a profit margin?"

4. The preoccupation with the impact of events on domestic politics. All who have known President Johnson longest concede that he, too, has been able only to be himself: a President passionately covetous of massive popular support. Almost surely, however, he has misread his own polls—discovering deep and sturdy support in what seems, more and more, only a thin and helpless acquiescence. From the outset, moreover, he could appreciate a simpler equation: if he were to lead toward negotiation and compromise, he might be stung by G.O.P. warriors still brandishing the old tin sword of "soft on communism," but how could they ever hurt him if his own blade were steelier? And one of the huge, unpayable political obligations of these years must be the debt of L.B.J. to all Republicans lacking the wits a year ago to question the prudence—rather than the violence—of his acts.

The lessons from such lapses cannot quickly pacify Asia. But they could do something equally important. And this is to remind the Nation how each of these four giant steps toward the precipice was taken in defiance of four of the most basic rules of democratic leadership:

1. Do not let national policy become the prisoner of an ally, for then the strength of the mightiest is subverted to suit the need of the weakest.

2. Do not let the citizen beguile himself with dreams of triumph at bargain prices: the customer in this democratic mart is not always right, but he learns quickly to shun the panacea peddler.

3. Do not let military acts become unharnessed from political purposes, for then all bombs and fury will signify nothing.

4. Do not shy from the intrinsically right for the momentarily expedient, for the opportunist may clock the pulse of a people, but only a man of courage can touch its heart.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Dec. 27, 1965]

HARVEST OF HATRED PREDICTED

(By Robert Hutchins)

The approaching new year would look much brighter if it offered any prospect of peace in Vietnam.

Nobody in Washington has suggested what continuation or escalation of the war will accomplish. Undoubtedly, if the United States kills enough people and burns enough property, it can "defeat" the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

What will happen then? In 1952 the French held every village in the country. They had to withdraw in 1954. If the United States is more fortunate than France, if it is able to stay longer, it will reap a harvest of hatred that will make it necessary to maintain overwhelming military power in the country for many years to come.

Undoubtedly, the United States could conquer China. The effort would cost millions of lives; for there is no reason to suppose that the Chinese people are eagerly awaiting American aid in throwing off the yoke of their Communist oppressors.

Though the idea of defeating China is credible, that of occupying it is not. The sheer size of the job staggers the imagination; and occupying a country of these dimensions when the inhabitants regard the occupying power with loathing is a task that even the most bellicose war hawk could scarcely contemplate.

Nor can it be supposed that the Soviet Union will sit by and see both Vietnam and China brought under American domination. If we set out to conquer these countries, we must be prepared to take on and conquer the Russians, too.

A group of scholars, including David Cavers, of the Harvard Law School, Quincy Wright, of the University of Virginia, and Walter Millis, of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, has lately said: "A war in which enormous damage is being inflicted on the Vietnamese, both south and north, and which is likely to cause increased suffering to Americans, is the worst way to proceed to the negotiating table. It sows the seed of future dangerous rivalries and conflicts."

These critics also call attention to an aspect of this unfortunate affair that is consistently ignored in Washington and in the American press, the role of the United Nations.

They point out that the United States is not an ordinary U.N. member, but a permanent member of the Security Council. As such it has special responsibilities. Under the U.N. Charter, no member state may undertake military action against another country except in self-defense if an armed attack occurs. Even then it may do so only until the matter has been reported to the Security Council. The plain meaning of the charter is that the Security Council must be asked to take over.

The group concludes: "Certainly a permanent member of the council has a special responsibility to insure that the spirit and the letter of the charter are observed. It is difficult to see that the United States is setting an adequate standard of charter observance by continuing and extending its present military action in North Vietnam."

It is difficult to see what the United States thinks it is accomplishing by continuing and extending its present military action in North Vietnam.

[From Harper's magazine, February 1966]

A COMMUNICATION ON VIETNAM FROM GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN

(In the following letter General Gavin presents the first basic criticism of the administration's policy in Vietnam by a major military figure. As an alternative, he urges the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam, a halt in the escalation of the ground war, withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnam coast, and renewed efforts "to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva.

(General Gavin argues for such a change in policy on purely military grounds. His views on the Vietnam war cannot be taken lightly, since he has established a reputation during the last 30 years as one of America's leading strategic thinkers. At the time of the French defeat in Vietnam, he was Chief of Plans and Operations for the Department of the Army, and his advice is generally believed to be largely responsible for the U.S. refusal to enter the southeast Asian conflict on a large scale at that time. He enlisted in the Army as a private in 1924 and rose to the rank of lieutenant general before his retirement in 1958; he had a distinguished combat career as a paratroop commander in World War II; and he served for a time as Chief of Research and Development for the Army. After retirement he was Ambassador to France, and is now chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Arthur D. Little, Inc., an industrial research firm in Cambridge, Mass.

(He left the Pentagon because of disagreements on what was, in 1958, the basic military policy of the Eisenhower administration. His reasons for such disagreements were set forth in his book, "War and Peace in the Space Age," published by Harper & Row; as he indicates in the following letter, most of the changes he then urged have since been carried out.

(The editors hope that General Gavin's communication may stimulate a searching reexamination of American military and foreign policies by other public figures who are especially qualified by experience and training to discuss them. In the coming months Harper's hopes to publish further contributions to such a reappraisal.—THE EDITORS.)

Last November our Secretary of Defense, while in Vietnam, finally gave battlefield approval to the concept of Sky Cavalry. Harper's should take some pride in the fact that it published my article, "Cavalry, and I Don't Mean Horses," in 1954. That was the genesis of the idea for this new form of mobility for our ground forces. It was too revolutionary for acceptance in the Pentagon then, and Harper's performed a public service in helping advance the idea.

I would like to comment about the Vietnam situation further. I should emphasize at the outset that I am writing solely from a military-technical point of view. I was Chief of Plans and Operations in the Department of the Army when Dienbienphu brought the French endeavors in Vietnam to an end. The Chief of Staff, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, directed that we go into the situation quite thoroughly in case a decision should be made to send U.S. forces into the Hanoi Delta. As I recall, we were talking about the possibility of sending 8 divisions plus 35 engineer battalions and other auxiliary units. We had one or two old China hands on the staff at the time and the more we studied the situation the more we realized that we were, in fact, considering going to war with China, since she was supplying all the arms, ammunition, medical and other supplies to Ho Chi Minh. If we would be, in fact, fighting China, then we were fighting her in the wrong place on terms entirely to her advantage. Manchuria, with its vast industrial complex, coal, and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its warmaking capacity. There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged, if at all.

I should emphasize at the outset that there are philosophical and moral aspects of the war in southeast Asia that are understandably disturbing to every thoughtful person. My comments, however, are based entirely upon a tactical evaluation of our efforts there. At the time of the French defeat, it seemed to us military planners that if an effort were made by the United States to secure Vietnam from Chinese military exploitation, and that if force on the scale that we were talking about were to be employed, then the Chinese would very likely reopen the fighting in Korea.

At the time, General Ridgway thought it prudent to bring this situation directly to the attention of President Eisenhower, pointing out that we should be prepared for a large-scale war if we were to make the initial large-scale commitment to the Hanoi Delta that we were thinking about. I thought at the time that it took great moral courage for General Ridgway to take this action, but he has never been a man to lack such courage. The President decided not to make the commitment and in his book, "Mandate for Change," he commented that to have gone to war under those conditions would have been "like hitting the tail of the snake rather than the head," which is a good analogy.

Today we have sufficient force in South Vietnam to hold several enclaves on the coast, where sea and air power can be made fully effective. By enclaves I suggest Camranh Bay, Danang, and similar areas where American bases are being established. However, we are stretching these resources beyond reason in our endeavors to secure the entire country of South Vietnam from the Vietcong penetration. This situation, of course, is caused by the growing Vietcong strength.

The time has come, therefore, when we simply have to make up our minds what we want to do and then provide the resources necessary to do it. If our objective is to secure all of South Vietnam, then forces should be deployed on the 17th parallel and along the Cambodian border adequate to do this. In view of the nature of the terrain, it might be necessary to extend our defenses on the 17th parallel to the Mekong River and across part of Thailand. Such a course would take many times as much force as we now have in Vietnam.

To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnamese troops into the south. Also, if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese volunteers and the reopening of the Korean front. This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course that we are now on.

On the other hand, if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks in North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva, we could very likely do so with the forces now available. Maintaining such enclaves while an effort is being made to solve the internal situation in Vietnam, and in the face of the terroristic war that would be waged against them, poses some serious problems, and the retention of some of the enclaves may prove to be unwise, but the problems that we would then have to deal with would be far less serious than those associated with an expansion of the conflict.

I do not for a moment think that if we should withdraw from Vietnam the next stop would be Waikiki. The Kra Peninsula, Thailand, and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontiers of Thailand. But we should be realistic about the dangers of the course that we are now on. A straightforward escalation of our land power in southeast Asia to meet every land-based challenge, while at the same time we leave China and Cambodia immune from attack, poses some very forbidding prospects. I realize that our Secretary of State was recently quoted in the press as having said that the idea of sanctuary is out. However, the initiative is not ours and there is an abundance of evidence now that both China and Cambodia are sanctuaries for Communist military strength that is used to support the Vietcong.

To get to the heart of the problem, I doubt that world opinion would tolerate the bombing and seizure of Manchuria. If the Chinese Communists continue on their present course of aggression and, at the same time, continue to develop more devastating weapons—I refer to nuclear weapons—the time may come when China will bring upon herself a nuclear war. But that time is not here yet. In the meantime, we must do the best we can with the forces we have deployed to Vietnam, keeping in mind the true meaning of strategy in global affairs. Economics, science and technology, and world opinion will, in the long run, serve our strategic interests well if we handle our national resources wisely. On the other hand, tactical mistakes that are allowed to escalate at the initiative of an enemy could be disastrously costly. Since the advent of the space age, there has been a revolution in the nature of war and global conflict. The confrontation in Vietnam is the first test of our understanding of such change, or our lack of it. The measures that we now take in southeast Asia must stem from sagacity and thoughtfulness, and an awareness of the nature of strategy in this rapidly shrinking world.

Referring again to the sky cavalry concept, which we are now employing in South Vietnam, it is the kind of innovation that is generally unpopular in a conservative society, and in the military establishment of such a society. But many more innovations, both technical and in management methods, must be found if we are to continue to survive as a free people. Merely making bigger bombs or using more of them is not the answer. So I hope that Harper's will continue to support innovative methods when they are suggested, as you did when you first published the idea of sky cavalary in 1954.

When I retired in 1958, I said that I would be happy to serve as a private in the Army if it were the kind of an Army that I wanted it to be. I think it is that kind of an Army now, and I would be happy to serve in it in any grade in Vietnam or anywhere else. It is doing a splendid job in Vietnam and needs the support of all of our people.

JAMES M. GAVIN.

FIRST SECURITY CORP.,
Salt Lake City, Utah, December 27, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed herewith is a statement of my views relative to our position in Vietnam, which I realize is a very controversial issue. My concern has been so great about our situation there that I felt impelled to write this statement, hoping I could have some influence in bringing about immediate constructive action by the Congress before it is too late.

The American public is fast losing confidence in this administration, and I feel unless we soon get out of the Vietnam mess, it is likely to be repudiated.

Kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

MARRINER S. ECCLES.

STATEMENT OF U.S. POSITION IN VIETNAM BY MARRINER S. ECCLES, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, DECEMBER 22, 1965

Under no circumstance should we escalate the war in Vietnam. Our position there is indefensible. Contrary to Government propaganda we were not invited by, and have no commitment to any representative or responsible Government of South Vietnam. We are there as an aggressor in violation of our treaty obligation under the United Nations Charter. We have not observed either the letter or the spirit of our obligations with respect to our actions in Vietnam. As a result, we have the opposition of not only the entire Communist world but the rest of the world as well, with few minor exceptions.

The facts are, the Geneva Treaty of 1954, after the defeat of the French, affirmed the independence of the colonial Government of Vietnam and called for an end to hostilities. The British and the Russians were cochairmen of that Conference. An interim trusteeship was agreed upon whereby the French would preside in the south and the Viet Minh in the north for 2 years, ending in a national election in 1956 when the Vietnamese people would choose their own Government. The United States-Vietnam lobby did not permit that election to be held knowing that Ho Chi Minh, the Communist leader of the north, was so popular he would unquestionably win the election. As a matter of fact, John F. Kennedy, then Senator, in a major speech in the Senate in April 1954, warned against any negotiated solution that would allow participation in the Vietnamese Government by Ho Chi Minh. The Communists, he said, would eventually take over because they were so popular. In his memoirs Eisenhower stated that had an election been held in Vietnam, as provided in the Geneva accord, an estimated 80 percent would have voted for Communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader.

Diem was brought to the United States in 1950 from a 17-year self-imposed exile, under the auspices of Michigan State University, and here he found strong support in the hierarchy of the Catholic church, his brother being a Catholic bishop. Cardinal Spellman became a strong supporter, also Justice Douglas, Joseph Kennedy, and his son, John F. Kennedy, General Lansdale (the CIA man in Saigon), CIA Director Allen Dulles, General Donovan, and other strong anti-Communists. They were largely responsible for bringing about Diem's ascension to the Premiership of South Vietnam in July 1954.

From his first day in office he set about crushing opposition and concentrating power in small nepotist groups. Diem's targets included the private armies of the religious sects and the anti-Communist Vietnamese leaders, who were also anti-Diem. He wasn't looking for popularity. He knew his support was slim—that he would have trouble with the majority of the population who had been supporting the Viet Minh in the long war against the French; therefore, force was the only way he could effectively ready his people for the democratic alternative. Due to the paid propaganda of the United States-Vietnam lobby his dictatorial tactics were not widely reported in the American press until 8 years later when he fell from power and he and his brother were assassinated by the military within his own government. Since that time South Vietnam has been unable to develop a stable or responsible government, as evidence by the many changes in leadership.

The South Vietnamese Communists, with the help of the North Vietnamese, defeated the French. They are now fighting for the independence of their country against the non-Communist South Vietnamese. In short, it is a civil war with the Vietcong supported by North Vietnamese and the South Vietnamese held together and supported by the United States. The South Vietnamese Catholics (about 10 percent of the population), property owners and business interests in the large cities are the strong anti-Communist supporters of South Vietnam, and are the minority.

We have provided large amounts of military and economic aid and supplied them with military advisers, but until the present administration came into office we did not furnish American troops to help fight their war, until it was apparent they were being defeated. We have gradually taken over the direction of their Government as well as their war until now it has become an American war rather than a Vietnamese war. Why go to Vietnam to drive the Communists out when we can't get them out of Cuba, 90 miles from our shore?

The North Vietnamese supplied troops to the Vietcong only after American troops entered the war in large numbers and we commenced heavy bombing of North Vietnam and the Vietcong. It was then that China and Russia publicly announced they would give all the military and economic aid necessary to the North Vietnamese in order to defeat the U.S. aggressors. As a result, we now have alined against us the powerful countries of China and Russia, including all the Communist world, with practically no support from the rest of the world in spite of Rusk's and McNamara's recent appeals to NATO. Under these conditions we cannot win. You cannot defeat people in a jungle war where the majority is against you and it is impossible to tell your friends from your enemies.

We are rapidly destroying the very country we propose to save—South Vietnam—as well as killing hundreds of its men, women, and children by our incessant and heavy bombing of the Vietcong. We are adding to our burdens thousands of refugees that we must feed, clothe, and house. What would the situation be if North Vietnam, with the help of China and Russia, should retaliate by bombing Saigon and the other principal cities in South Vietnam? Even if we won their freedom and turned the country over to them they have no capacity for democracy or self-rule.

With a bigger war shaping up on the ground and fighting 9,000 miles away logistics are almost an insolvable problem. With troop strength only 158,000 in November our logistic needs shot up from 75,000 tons in February to 700,000 tons in November. The jet aircraft are burning more than a million gallons of fuel a month. Ports are clogged—ships wait 10 days to 2 months to unload cargoes. What will the situation be if we undertake to double or quadruple our fighting forces, planes, helicopters, et cetera?

Our sense of negotiating a peace reveals our total insensibility to the other parties' problem. Two antagonists cannot negotiate their own peace terms. The matter should be turned over to an impartial body, like the United Nations, each party agreeing to a cease-fire and to accept any terms decided upon by the impartial body.

If the war is escalated, before many months the United States will probably be required to go on a war footing and our present domestic prosperity will be ended. Inflationary pressures will greatly increase and the position of the dollar in the world market will be further jeopardized unless we bring about a balanced budget through increasing taxes and cutting back domestic programs.

It may be the North Vietnamese do not control the course of the war—it is now in the hands of the Chinese and the Russians. As cochairman of the Geneva Conference the Russians have refused to take any part in bringing about a peaceful settlement. They may be glad to have us tied down in a most unpopular war in Asia, which greatly weakens our position in NATO as well as throughout the world. They must avoid giving support to Peiping's charges that they are conniving with Mr. Johnson to end the war. To do otherwise would greatly weaken their own leadership in the Communist world. It would seem we have fallen into a trap that neither China nor Russia is willing to let us get out of with either face-saving or victory.

We could not have chosen anywhere in the world a more difficult place to challenge the Communists and more to the liking of China—on her border. How could we have been so blind and misinformed. The decisions were made by the President and a handful of advisers in the White House, State and Defense Departments, without debate or prior approval of the Congress. This is dictatorship that has no place in our democracy. The public has not been advised as to what was taking place. They have been misinformed and brainwashed to such an extent that opponents are accused of being disloyal and supporting the enemy and patriotism has come to mean unquestioning support of the administration. Blindly accepting the Government's position in Vietnam is more senseless than blindly accepting its domestic programs because mistakes in Vietnam can be far more disastrous. The real patriots today are the Members of Congress and other public leaders who have the courage to oppose the administration and urge it not to escalate the war but to get out of Vietnam at the earliest possible date. This would be the least costly from every standpoint—even our world prestige would be enhanced.

If our leaders insist on escalating this war to a finish it is likely to be the most disastrous of the wars we have fought, measured by cost, loss of life and prestige throughout the world, and the most futile. It could lead to World War III—the United States alone fighting the Communist world. This could trigger an atomic war which all the world dreads.

The real tragedy is the useless suffering of the millions of our people whose sons, husbands, and brothers are drawn into this conflict unwillingly and are killed or maimed for life, not in defense of their country but because of our incompetent leadership.

Peace in the world will never be brought about by aggression or by rash and inept remarks like McNamara made at the Paris Conference of NATO when he urged our European allies to plan now to meet a Chinese military threat to their own security within 5 years. We are justly accused of trying to utilize NATO as a tool for our anti-Chinese policy of aggression in Asia. Such remarks make it impossible for us to negotiate our way out of Vietnam.

The alternative is to recognize China and bring her into the United Nations before she becomes an atomic power in 3 to 5 years. Even her avowed enemies, India and Russia, have voted for her inclusion in the U.N.

With all our domestic problems—mass poverty, unemployment, riots in our cities and the highest rate of juvenile delinquency and crime throughout the world—who are we to be the world's policeman?

The billions being wasted on the war in Vietnam, if used to eliminate mass poverty and illiteracy in the undeveloped countries, would do far more than aggression to prevent the spread of communism.

We must recognize that it is just as important, if not more so, for the Communists to save face in Asia as it is for the United States. We should be less interested in saving face and more interested in saving lives. Great nations over the years have survived face-saving and withdrawing from an untenable position. It can be done with dignity. Certainly we are a sufficiently great nation to relieve the world of the fear of war that is so terrifying. Not only would we save face, but we would win approval of the world and gain in stature.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 16, 1966]

FOR THE UNITED STATES, THE ENDING OF ILLUSION

(By Eric Sevareid)

The second session of this Congress starts its work under the sign of the question mark, the rhetorical question, "Vietnam War or Great Society?" or, simply put, "guns or butter?" This may be the immediate, short range choice expressed in the documents that will be laid before this Congress, and if this were the totality of the American problem at home and abroad it would certainly be managed, one way or another.

But the choices we have to make are infinitely more complicated than that and they will require the understanding of this and many Congresses to come. The real truth is that we have reached a watershed in our history. The American age of euphoria is ending, the relatively short period of about two and a half decades in which America's mystique was richly colored by shining optimism about the capacity of one people to protect or alter the conditions of other peoples all around the globe.

In the years ahead, the dominant note is bound to be a far more sober sense of our limitations.

For our principal European peers, Britain and France, the period of euphoric illusion came to a much more abrupt ending, as their outrigging of secure sources of supply and secure markets folded up in the collapse of empire. Even then it required a subsequent series of painful object lessons before the British fully accepted the new age that had been thrust upon them.

They learned, with Suez, that they could no longer act with political independence on the world stage. They learned, when the meaning of their exclusion from the Common Market became clear, that they no longer had the means of independent economic life. They learned, with the Blue Streak episode and other incidents, that they oculd no longer independently provide for their own defense.

The source of their limitations, generally speaking, lay within themselves, in their lack of resources and therefore of power. For the United States, the ending of illusion has taken a rather different course, and the first line of limitations we confront lies not with ourselves but in the nature of the alien societies we try to affect.

What we have been discovering are the limitations of our good will, of our political ideals and—finally—of our power. We have learned the hard lesson that governments are not persons and that collective sentiments are not always collectively reciprocated.

In our honest attempts to provide other societies with the keys to affluence we have discovered the chasm between economic rehabilitation—as with Europe and Japan—and economic development of semiprimitive economic systems. We have discovered, certainly in the case of most of Latin America, that our sense of time has been preposterously sanguine, that what we wanted to do in a decade will require generations and may still fail in the end because the chief underlying force toward misery—the birth rate—continues stronger than the surface forces toward affluence.

We have learned in the effort that political democracy is not an exportable commodity, that it has profoundly to do with centuries-old concepts and habits of religion and ethics, that it is connected with the long, accumulated impact of Judaism and Christianity, and to some degree, very probably with the Protestant branch of Christianity.

In other words, it has to do with the idea of the individual's sanctity (not merely his rights) and with the absence of the hierarchical tradition. It should have been no surprise at all to us—yet it was—that the great majority of the new nations from southeast Asia, across the Middle East and up and down Africa have for all practical purposes abandoned attempts at democratic political institutions and moved toward directed government. In the last 6 months five more African regimes have fallen under the military.

It is the shock of the Vietnam war that completes the process of dissolving the American illusions. In this war we have learned that even our power, nakedly applied, is sharply and severely limited. It is not only limited by distance and terrain but by the psychology and historical experience of the Vietnamese people, by the powerful negative force of opinion in many other nations, and by the impossible alternatives to restraint presented by the existence of atomic weapons.

In Vietnam, indeed, every one of the American projections to the world—good will, ideals and power—is severely limited in its effectiveness. Not one of the three would have much of an immediate future there, even were the limitations on the other two absent.

So, by historical accident, it happens to be Vietnam that crystallizes and reveals in full context the limitations of American actions upon the rest of the world and therefore the real size of the United States on this globe. We are very big, indeed, but so was Gulliver when he set out to discover the earth.

Even this catalog of limitations does not tell the full story of the agonizing and complex series of choices this and future Congresses must make. For the dawning realization of the foreign realities comes simultaneously with the chill knowledge that the keys to domestic affluence have opened not the gates of paradise but a Pandora's chest of frightful physical and social problems, chiefly within the great cities.

The simple fact that in one more generation we will number 300 million bodies in this country should be enough to suggest the radical, painful acts of surgery that we must undergo if our children are to coexist in space and health and sanity. Vietnam is, or ought to be, only a footnote in the chapter now unfolding.

EXHIBIT 1

WASHINGTON: THE TWO CONCEPTS OF CHINA

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 18.—Behind the present debate on America's future strategy in Vietnam lie two fundamentally different arguments about modern China.

One is that she means what she says and is now embarked on a worldwide revolutionary movement to weaken and if possible destroy Western authority in a series of guerrilla wars.

The other is that she may mean what she says but does not have the power or influence to carry out her designs. Accordingly, the debate inside the Government here increasingly encompasses questions that extend well beyond the geographical confines of Vietnam and even beyond the confines of this decade.

THE QUESTIONS

Is China capable of conquering all of southeast Asia and threatening Japan and India? Is this her intention? If so, how can her expansion be contained and what nations, if any, will help take on the task?

The only thing that is clear is that this Government and the allies seldom face up to these questions and when even a few of the leaders do, they differ fundamentally in their answers.

Some of them read the writings of Mao Tse-tung and his defense minister, Marshal Lin Piao, as if they were as important as Hitler's Mein Kampf. America and Europe, according to Chinese Communist doctrine, are the central urban area of the world which can be destroyed in an endless series of guerrilla wars waged by the rural peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

THE APOCALYPTIC VIEW

"When the U.S. aggressors are hard pressed in one place," Marshal Lin writes, "they have no alternative but to loosen their grip on others. Therefore, the conditions become more favorable for the people elsewhere to wage struggles against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys."

Nobody in the West has been more frank about the objective of these Communist wars of national liberation. "Everything is divisible," says Lin, "and so is this colossus of U.S. imperialism. It can be split up and defeated. The peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and other regions can destroy it piece by piece, some striking at its head and others at its feet * * *."

The geopoliticians at the Pentagon and the State Department are fascinated by this sweeping and brutal call to war. Some of them take it seriously and would step up the war in Vietnam in order to demonstrate while China is comparatively weak that this doctrine cannot succeed.

Others take it seriously and would do exactly the opposite. That is to say, they would not risk war with China because they think China would fight rather than see the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese Army destroyed.

And there are experienced men in this Government and in the governments of our allies who think the whole vicious Chinese line is nothing more than a theoretical argument aimed at the Soviet Union, and/or a propaganda line designed to influence the Chinese workers.

The Premier of one of our Asian allies said to this reporter: "You Americans puzzle me. You taught us everything we know about pragmatism, but you are not approaching China pragmatically. You are operating on what China says and not on what China does."

He was not worried about China conquering southeast Asia or getting into the Vietnamese war unless faced with the imminent collapse of North Vietnam. China's problem is that she cannot conquer herself. She is not winning but losing the propaganda war with the more moderate Communists. She is not even convincing her own young people let alone the rest of the Communist world.

PROBLEMS AT HOME

Production is her problem and she is not doing very well at it. She is using the war in Vietnam to scare her own people into working harder. She may want to do all these revolutionary things in the world, but she cannot even deal with her problems at home.

There is very little clarity in the present debate in Washington because there is very little agreement on what the menace is, and until there is more clarity about modern China, the Vietnam debate is likely to remain in a state of confusion.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: WHAT THE TET WILL BRING

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—Americans are too impatient in love, war, and diplomacy. They expect maximum results in minimum time. This ingrained habit can often lead to divorce or disappointment and, both militarily and diplomatically, the latter is true of our approach to Vietnam.

Very soon after last year's decision to bomb the North some Americans began to grumble that the decision must have been wrong because Hanoi hadn't sued for peace. World War II experience was forgotten. Round the clock Anglo-American bombing of Germany didn't produce swift victory. Instead the Germans dug in and, indeed, by 1944 the Wehrmacht was getting more and better weapons than before the aerial offensive.

LONG-TERM EFFECTS

More and better weapons were obviously not a result of allied bombing; they came despite it. There would have been still greater quantities without the hampering air attacks. Likewise, there would undoubtedly have been more equipment for the Vietcong and more North Vietnamese reinforcements in South Vietnam had there been no bombing of northern communications and supply centers.

Neither militarily nor diplomatically does impatience pay off. A change of tactics on one side rarely produces immediate change of tactics on the other. President Johnson's decision to defer bombing in the North could not possibly be expected to inspire a prompt will for peace in Hanoi. The President's far-flying peace offensive was obviously not calculated to touch off instant negotiations.

The peace offensive has been unfairly criticized as being flamboyant and removed from customary diplomatic practice. This analysis is shallow and incorrect. Roving envoys accomplished the purpose of explaining American aims to doubters everywhere. They reassured American skeptics of the validity in Johnson's expressed desire for unconditional negotiation. But publicized journeys in no sense inhibit quiet, secret contacts of traditional diplomacy. On the contrary, new channels have opened, although it would be a mistake to disclose what passes through them.

It is quite as silly to expect immediate peace results from nonbombing as to expect immediate war results from bombing. In each case there are political overtones which require intensive study by our adversaries. Wars resemble icebergs. What appears on the surface as battles or propaganda is often less important than hidden military or political strategy. The present peace offensive seeks by sonar diplomacy to discern subsurface outlines.

AFTER THE HOLIDAYS

A time for new decisions may come after the 3-day period starting Thursday with a scheduled cease-fire honoring Tet, Vietnam's New Year holiday. Certainly, during recent weeks, the degree of fighting has subsided.

The Tet pause could conceivably develop into a parallel to the bombing pause. And, if not, post-Tet fighting may recommence on a relatively reduced level. These matters of degree are subtle and difficult to evaluate.

Nevertheless, there is a body of expert opinion which believes the Vietnamese war will not culminate either in a vast military escalation or in a formal peace conference. Such opinion simply anticipates gradual reduction in the degree and intensity of fighting which might ultimately bring de facto truce. This is an intricate maneuver in which explicit deeds and statements convey implicit meanings.

Furthermore, the main parties involved on each side do not control their allies. Washington cannot wholly impose its will on Saigon. Today's Saigon Government cannot be sure its decisions will be accepted by all internal rivals. Hanoi cannot always swiftly communicate with the Vietcong or dictate its decisions. And Hanoi itself is caught between Peiping's war-at-any-price and Moscow's more cautious attitude.

The 1965 bombing of the North checked the Vietcong when it seemed to be winning the conflict. It revived Saigon's hopes and provided enough stability to allow injection of U.S. military units. The recent bombing pause created the conditions for Shelepin's trip to Hanoi—although nobody yet knows what he achieved. And the peace offensive proved America's overseas diplomatic position while opening secret exploratory channels.

PUNCTUATING THE PROCESS

The scheduled Tet truce might punctuate this slow process although we don't know whether it will be a comma, a semicolon, or a period. And Moscow's attitude may prove more important than any other external factor. Here one recalls Churchill:

"I cannot forecast to you the action of Russia. It is a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma."

PROPOSED RELEASE OF RESTRICTIONS ON MORRO ROCK, CALIF.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Senate Report No. 863 accompanying H.R. 1582 indicates that Morro Rock, formerly the site of a Federal lighthouse in Morro Bay Harbor, Calif., was conveyed to the State of California by the United States for public park purposes by an act of May 28, 1935. The 1935 act required that the 30 acres so conveyed be used for a public park and that if the property were not so used it should revert to the Federal Government. In addition, the 1935 act gave the United States the right to resume ownership, possession, and control at any time and without the consent of the grantee.

In accordance with the ownership, possession, and control reservation the Federal Government has, from time to time, removed quarry stone from the face of Morro Rock. Apparently the stone removal threatens the esthetic value of the rock.

The State of California requested the legislation envisioned in H.R. 1582 in order to preserve the integrity of the site.

H.R. 1582 calls for deletion of the last sentence of section 36 of the act of May 28, 1935, insofar as that sentence relates to Morro Rock. According to page 9 of report No. 863, the following sentence would be deleted from the 1935 act:

> The United States reserves the right to resume ownership, possession, and control, for Government purposes, of any of the property so conveyed, at any time without the consent of the grantee.

The bill would not remove the requirement that the property be used for public park purposes. This is made clear from the following statement appearing at page 2 of report No. 863:

> The committee * * * notes with approval that the legislation as amended in the House would continue to require use of the property for public park purposes.

Under this bill, the Federal Government would be giving up its right to resume ownership, possession, and control of the property. However, the giving up of the right of the Federal Government to remove rock from the Morro Rock site alone would involve a substantial potential loss in quarry rock savings to the Government. This point is brought out in the letter of August 5 addressed by the Secretary of the Army to Chairman Bonner of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. A portion of the Secretary's letter appears at pages 3-4 of report No. 863:

> Over the course of years records indicate that approximately 1,200,000 tons of stone were removed at an estimated savings to the Government of $3 million. In connection with possible future development of several new projects in the area, additional savings to the Government as well as to local interests in financing their share of the costs might be realized if the stone required was obtained from Morro Rock. These savings are not determinable at this time because of the indefinite nature of the projects. However, if one or more of these projects should materialize the savings to the Government could range between $1½ million and $5 million.
>
> During the past year considerable public interest has been expressed in preserving Morro Rock in its present state as a public landmark attraction and park. Moreover, it is understood that the major objective of this bill is merely to preclude the further removal of stone by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army. In view of the extent of this public interest, it is recognized that any potential savings attributable to this rock as a source of stone may be more than offset by the value inherent in Morro Rock as a historical site and natural landmark. For this reason, the Department of the Army is willing to assure this committee, the State of California, and the local interests that it will forgo any further use of Morro Rock as a source of stone. Should this proposal satisfy the objectives of all parties concerned, there would be no necessity for enactment of this bill.

Apparently the Senate Commerce Committee would dispose of the quarry rights of the Federal Government on a de minimus basis. This is evidenced by the committee's conclusion set forth at page 2 of report No. 863 that "the Department of the Army—has indicated its intention to voluntarily abandon those rights." It was the committee's conclusion that it was not "appropriate to require any consideration for the release of the right of the Federal Government to resume possession and control of the property."

In its present form, H.R. 1582 violates the Morse formula because the Federal Government is required under this bill to give up a valuable right, including the right to quarry rock. The grantee should be required to pay for the giving up of that Federal right which, after all, belongs to all the taxpayers of the United States. It is immaterial that the Department of the Army has expressed willingness to retreat from its rock quarry right which, after all, is only a part of the property right which is being released by this bill; the important point to recall is that the Department has not declared the quarry rights to be excess to its needs and it has not indicated that it is ready to turn over its rock quarry rights to the General Services Administration for the normal disposal procedures.

This bill should be amended in both the House of Representatives and the Senate to require the payment of 50 percent of appraised fair market value of the property interest which the Federal Government is releasing to the State of California. The provisions in the 1935 act requiring the property to be used for public park purposes and providing for its reversion to the United States if it is not so used shall remain applicable to such property. I am not changing those provisions.

Of special interest is the following observation which appeared in GSA Administrator Knott's letter of July 27 addressed to Chairman Bonner of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

> With respect to consideration of the matter of requiring payment for the release, it may be noted that under existing law, in connection with disposals by GSA to States, payment of the estimated fair market value is required if no use restrictions are imposed, and payment of 50 percent of the fair value is required if the use is limited to public park or recreational purposes.

The analogy of the quoted paragraph to the requirement of the Morse formula in this instance, is obvious.

COMMUNICATION FROM GOVERNOR HATFIELD, OF OREGON, CONCERNING THE NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM BILL, S. 1446

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Honorable Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of Oregon, supplied his comments and those of the Oregon Natural Resources Committee yesterday on the subject of certain provisions of the National Wild Rivers System bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the wire be set forth in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Salem, Oreg.,
> *January 18, 1966.*
>
> Hon. Wayne Morse,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> State of Oregon warmly supports wild river concept of S. 1446. In discussion today our natural resources committee made the following suggestions: Importance and uniqueness of Rogue River warrants separate bill. If separate bill not feasible: (1) Either reduce present upstream boundary to Robertson Bridge and present downstream boundary to Lobster Creek, or (2) reduce from 75 to 50 percent present public ownership formula in section 4(c) to exempt O. & C. and Coos Bay wagon road lands, as well as Forest Service and public domain lands being administered on sustained yield basis and require advance consultation with local advisory boards before any exchange allowed by law; (3) more clearly spell out powers of Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of Interior in relation to State jurisdiction over water, fish and wildlife; (4) provide for appointment of local coordinating committee to represent county and State interests in management of the area. Details of amendatory language which we feel covers these points will follow.
>
> Mark O. Hatfield.

Mr. President, the Governor of Oregon and the Natural Resources Committee obviously share my deep concern over the condemnation authority with respect to the Rogue River wild river area which was contained in S. 1446, as reported by the Senate Interior Committee. The above-quoted wire expresses agreement with the concept of the 50 percent public ownership formula as it relates to condemnation cases, so I am sure that these Oregon public officials are highly pleased over the action that was taken yesterday under which the Senate adopted the Church-Morse 50-percent formula amendment.

In my speech on the National Wild Rivers System bill in the Senate on January 17 I referred to the apprehensions in the State of Oregon over the exchange authority that was set forth in the bill S. 1446, as reported. The Governor's wire indicates that he and the Natural Resources Committee share my view that O. & C., Forest Service, and public domain lands, which are important to our timber sustained yield program—including the allowable cut aspects of that program—should not be made available for exchanges for private lands lying within the boundaries of the Rogue River wild river area. We are grateful for the fact that O. & C. lands were withdrawn from the exchange provisions of S. 1446, but we are still apprehensive over the fact that exchange authority exists with respect to Forest Service and Federal public domain lands.

Although the Senate will not have an opportunity to act upon suggestions 3 and 4 as outlined in Governor Hatfield's wire, I trust that these suggestions will be given thorough consideration in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs before that committee takes action on the wild rivers bill.

LAND-GRANT COLLEGES RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was very pleased to receive recently a brochure which sets forth the recommendations for national action affecting higher education which was published by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

These recommendations are of particular interest to me as chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, since they concern legislation which will be under consideration by my subcommittee in the weeks and months ahead.

As an Oregonian, I am particularly proud that the president-elect of the association is my good friend, Dr. James H. Jensen, president of Oregon State University, which is located at Corvallis, Oreg. I wish to assure President Jensen and his colleagues that I, for one, will consider most carefully the recommendations which have been adopted by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges in their November meeting. While I cannot speak for all of my colleagues on the subcommittee as to the action we will take with respect to these recommendations, I can assure him that the recommendations and the logic upon which the recommendations are based will be given very careful and conscientious consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that materials appearing on pages 4 through 23 of the brochure, together with the listing of the members of the association which follows and the explanatory note on Federal aid which concludes the brochure be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATION FOR NATIONAL ACTION AFFECTING HIGHER EDUCATION BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges consists of 97 State and land-grant universities and colleges located in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico. Together, these institutions grant more than one-fourth of all baccalaureate degrees and almost three-fifths of all the doctoral degrees awarded by American institutions of higher education.

Founded in 1887, the association is the oldest organization of institutions of higher education in this country. It is a completely independent organization that determines its own policies and procedures by action of delegates representing all member institutions in annual convention.

The statement that follows, of policy positions concerning Federal relations to higher education, was adopted by the association at its 79th annual convention held November 14–17, 1965, at Minneapolis, Minn.

OFFICERS

Chairman of the executive committee: President David D. Henry, University of Illinois, Urbana.

President of the association: President Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

President-elect of the association: President James H. Jensen, Oregon State University, Corvallis.

Executive director: Russell I. Thackrey, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

I. SUPPORT FOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AS INSTITUTIONS

The universities and colleges of the United States are currently being called upon to expand their traditional educational programs in unprecedented dimensions and to enter new areas of service. Not only are high school graduating classes by far the largest—and best prepared—in the history of the country, but also the need for continuing education in a period of rapid change, technological and otherwise, is greater than ever before. So is the need for research on the frontiers of knowledge, which is the distinctive characteristic of the university and one it is uniquely qualified to carry on.

Not to meet these challenges would be to prejudice the future of the present generation. To attempt to meet them quantitatively at the sacrifice of the quality of educational experience would be equally disastrous, and fraudulent as well. Universities can and are increasing the efficiency of the educational process through research and experimentation in many ways. But the possibilities here are extremely limited in terms of the magnitude of today's challenges.

Financial needs and pressures are so great and resources so inadequate that universities and colleges have been steadily increasing charges to students at a rate which indicates a tendency on the part of the present adult generation to shirk the social responsibility of educating the coming generations. Huge loan programs have been created to "bridge the gap" between family incomes and college costs—a process which throws those costs on young people at a time when they are establishing families and can least afford it.

The association has supported the expansion of these programs and the provision of an interest-rate subsidy for those most in need of it to meet the situation as it exists. It has also supported the "educational opportunity grants" program designed to help those on the lowest rung of the financial ladder. Meanwhile, college charges continue to rise to the extent that even the relatively affluent are lured by proposals for individual relief through tax credits and similar devices which benefit selected groups at the expense of rising costs and higher financial barriers for others.

The real need is to treat the disease rather than its symptoms by increased support for our colleges and universities, through public and private channels, to enable them to keep down the charges to students and their families. It is only when these charges mount to the point of denying educational opportunity because of limited family and individual resources that the demand and necessity for individual financial relief rises to extreme proportions.

Controversy over how college and university operating costs may be supported by the Federal Government has continued to divide both educators and the general public. Recent adoption of this principle in the fields of medicine and public health and the century-old experience of the land-grant institutions indicate that methods can, and indeed must, be found to solve this first priority problem. The Canadian experience in Federal aid and the active interest in Federal-State tax sharing for educational and related purposes are examples in point.

Meanwhile, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges recommends the following revisions of well-established programs which help keep down the rising cost of college to students:

1. General aid for academic facilities, (a) Grants: The association commends the 89th Congress for removing categorical limitations on aid for academic facilities and for doubling authorizing funds available for matching grants for undergraduate and graduate facilities. It strongly recommends that the Federal portion of matching grants be raised to up to 75 percent of the cost of such facilities. Special attention should be given to encouraging the removal and replacement, or expansion and modernization, of obsolete facilities which make for inefficient use of space urgently needed for enrollment expansion. Funding authorization and appropriations should be increased in order to reflect the increased Federal percentage participation, and the expanded program of badly needed facilities construction this will make possible.

The grant program should continue to be based on the premise that substantial expansion of enrollment capacity within the context of maintenance of quality of instruction is the fundamental justification for this program of facilities aid.

2. College housing loan program: Perhaps no action of the 89th Congress has longer range significance for the good of higher education than its recognition of the fact that living costs are a substantial proportion of college costs, and its conversion of the college housing loan program from one which yielded a profit to the Treasury after all costs were paid, to one in which a very modest subsidy is provided students through the 3 percent limitation on interest rates. The association takes pride in its role, alone among national organizations, in urging this action which will be of particular benefit to students in relatively small residential colleges.

The association recommends:

(a) That a careful survey of anticipated loan needs at the present rate be made and the authorization be increased accordingly. Any system of "rationing" loan funds inevitably penalizes students for attending a particular type of institution. The revolving fund should at all times be available to fund new loans.

(b) That in the various studies underway as to possible conversion of direct Federal lending programs to private sources, careful attention be paid to the educational impact (i.e., the increase or decrease of effective educational opportunity) of resulting programs.

II. DIRECT SUPPORT OF GRADUATE INSTRUCTION AND RESEARCH

1. Graduate fellowships—Aid to graduate schools: Much has been done through the graduate fellowship program of the National Defense Education Act and through those administered by other Federal agencies to remove the economic barriers to graduate education for students of high ability and to make possible expansion of graduate programs in new areas. The 1964 amendments to the National Defense Education Act made possible action to assure that present resources in existing graduate schools of high quality be used. Two principles should be followed in administering the discretionary

authority given the Commissioner under the expanded program:

(a) Unused capacity of existing graduate schools should be used to the maximum.

(b) Additional concentration of fellowship holders in a very few institutions should be avoided.

2. Facilities grants to graduate schools: We urge the full implementation of the program of aid for graduate facilities provided in the Academic Facilities Act. The authorized amounts under this heading should also be increased to provide for Federal matching of up to 75 percent of facilities costs, rather than the present one-third.

3. Federal support of research: (a) Needed, a new program of institutional support in the sciences: Preface. The United States has achieved within the last two decades almost revolutionary advances in science as a result of the rapid expansion of Federal support for research activities. This advance has contributed significantly to the security of our Nation and its economic, social, and material progress. This support has greatly strengthened both the research and instructional capacities of those institutions participating in Federal programs, particularly at the graduate level.

The expansion of support in recent years has been largely through the project-grant and contract mechanism. Despite its accomplishments, as cited above, it has serious deficiencies when used as the sole means of Federal support of scientific and related activities of our colleges and universities. The project-grant system is highly effective as a mechanism for enlisting scientific resources of the colleges and universities in the solution of specific, short-term problems of national concern. Experience has also shown that it is inadequate as a means of making a national investment in scientific progress. It is now generally agreed that a substantial program of institutional grants is needed to complement, not supplant or diminish, present programs. This is necessary to protect the essential integrity of colleges and universities as such, and to enable additional institutions to develop the capacity to contribute more effectively to the achievement of national goals and objectives.

The proposed program: To satisfy this need, the association proposes a national institutional grants program for the support of deduction and research in the sciences, engineering, and mathematics in the colleges and universities on the basis of a three-part formula.

In this proposed program:

(1) One-third of the funds appropriated for the program would be distributed to the institutions as a graduated percentage of the total amount of project awards received by them from the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and the U.S. Office of Education. We suggest that the formula be so designed that all institutions receive 100 percent of the first $30,000 of this base and that no institution receive more than $300,000 in any one year.

(2) One-third of the funds would first be divided among the several States in proportion to the relative number of high school graduates in the States and then reallocated by the responsible Federal agency among the colleges and universities within a single State in proportion to the number of undergraduate semester credit-hours taught by each in accredited programs of instruction in the physical, biological, and social sciences, engineering, and mathematics.

(3) Finally, one-third would be allocated to the institutions in proportion to the number of advanced degrees (both masters and doctor) awarded by each institution during the immediately previous 3 years in the physical, biological, social sciences, engineering, and mathematics.

We suggest that the program be administered by the National Science Foundation with the counsel and guidance of a National University Science Council composed of one representative from each of the following national associations representing institutions of higher education: American Council on Education, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Association of American Universities, Association of American Colleges, Association of State Colleges and Universities, and American Association of Junior Colleges. The Directors of the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health and the U.S. Commissioner of Education would serve ex-officio.

Institutions may be required to report on their use of the funds. They would be encouraged to anticipate future funding in order to design long-range plans for the development of research and educational programs in the sciences emphasizing the achievement of national goals and objectives such as the expansion of educational opportunities and improvement in the quality of the programs offered.

Used in conjunction with present types of support, this program would, we believe, provide a sound mechanism for investing in the development of the Nation's potential for scientific progress.

A more extended justification for this program, citing findings of congressional committees, other study groups, and actions of Federal agencies, is available from the association.

(b) Indirect costs of research: The association commends the 89th Congress for its recognition of the fact that so-called indirect costs of research are real costs which, unless fully reimbursed by the sponsors of research constitute a serious drain on resources of our universities which are needed for performing their other functions both of instruction and of carrying on research in areas for which Federal support is limited or lacking. The additional funding needed to implement the new policy without cutting back on the volume of research supported should be provided at the earliest opportunity.

III. FEDERAL ACTION FOR SPECIALIZED EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

1. Education in health-related fields: The association commends the 89th Congress for its recognition of the need for substantial programs of support for education, extension activities, and library services in health-related fields. Legislation providing aid for the operation of educational programs, for library services, for scholarship support, for expansion of educational facilities, and for regional cooperative efforts for continuing education and the dissemination of the most advanced medical knowledge will make substantial contributions toward the expansion of professional education in these areas. However, we note with concern the omission of schools of veterinary medicine and pharmacy from the list of those eligible for aid under these various programs and urge corrective legislation to end this discrimination against two of the major health-related fields. The veterinary and pharmaceutical professions are vitally involved in the preservation of human health and should share fully with other health-related fields in Federal programs for aid in the training of professional personnel.

2. Increased Federal support for the humanities and arts: Establishment of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities is a welcome step toward correcting the imbalance which has long existed between Federal support of these important areas and that for science and related fields. We reiterate our belief that the emphasis of the new Foundation should be heavily on support of institutional programs in the humanities, rather than the individual project-grant system, the deficiencies of which are so apparent today. There is room and need for both, but we should learn from experience, rather than repeat the errors of the past.

3. ROTC programs and facilities—(a) Need for clear agreement on policies: The Reserve Officer Training Corps programs conducted by the several armed services in cooperation with the colleges and universities of this country have long been the chief source of officer personnel, both regular and reserve. While the Department of Defense and the several armed services have repeatedly asserted their great interest in these programs and their desire to increase the productivity of qualified officers from these sources, the association is concerned over the recent imposition of advanced-course enrollment quotas without prior consultation with established advisory committees; with other actions similarly taken without appropriate consultation; and with inconsistent policies among the several services, particularly the Army and Air Force. All these are the source of difficulties in effective operation of the programs on the campus and raise questions as to whether the actions and policies are compatible with the stated need for substantial increase in production of qualified officers through ROTC to fill national security requirements. That this is so at a time of substantial expansion in the armed services is most unfortunate. The association urges discussions between Department of Defense officials and representatives of the colleges and universities to resolve these difficulties and arrive at a clear statement of policies and commitments with respect to the ROTC programs at the earliest possible time.

(b) Financing ROTC programs: Colleges and universities have for many years contributed substantially to the support of ROTC programs. The cost of this continues to be burdensome on many campuses. The association continues to recommend that the Department of Defense provide more adequate assistance to colleges and universities in financing these costs.

(c) Faculty privileges for ROTC staffs: By mutual agreement with the armed services, colleges and universities have long recognized military personnel assigned to campuses in connection with the ROTC program as members of their faculty and staffs. The association recommends that the Department of Defense continue to allow military personnel assigned to colleges and universities to participate in those fringe benefits, pertinent to them, which are regularly available to the faculty and staffs of the various colleges and universities. Regulations clarifying the present confused situation should be issued at an early date.

4. Educational research and development program: The association supports the strengthening of the cooperative research program and the establishment of regional development centers by the U.S. Office of Education, which offer the prospect of undergirding educational practice with the research knowledge and tested leadership essential to progress. Attention should be drawn particularly to the important functions of higher educational institutions in these programs, both in affording the essential scholarly resources for significant educational research and in supplying, through the development programs, continuing study of the factors of sound change in education and improved training of educational leaders for the future. The strengthening of the regular programs of colleges and universities in educational research and training may prove to be as important to future results as presently appealing innovations in the schools.

5. Research in agriculture and related fields: The cooperative program of research

in agriculture and related fields between the Federal Government and the land-grant institutions has been conspicuously successful both in its results and in the absences from the relationship of many of the problems which characterize government-university relationships in other areas, where the emphasis is on project rather than university orientation. Federal support of the program has in recent years lagged substantially behind rising costs, requiring the States to carry an increasing proportion of the costs of even maintaining an ongoing program without needed expansion. Perhaps the fundamental cause of this unhappy situation is the fact that the consuming public, now substantially concentrated in urban areas, is not aware that the major benefits of agricultural research flow to the consumer in terms of relatively lower costs and improved quality.

The ample supply of food and fiber in this country has both provided for our own population and helped us contribute materially to the stability of the free world. With our own rapidly increasing population we must not, indeed we dare not, relax our research efforts in the areas of agriculture, home economics, forestry, and related fields. Substantially increased Federal support of these activities is required to bring the sources of cooperative support into balance. We commend the 89th Congress for moving in this direction.

6. Establishment of new Federal degree-granting authority and institutions: In recent years, many efforts have been made, some successfully, to authorize the granting of advanced academic degrees by Federal agencies or establishments. We believe these efforts arise from basic confusion as to the nature of a university, the significance and meaning of the academic degree, and the resources of the non-Federal academic establishment.

The basic characteristic of the university as a center for the advancement of knowledge is one of free inquiry, free exchange of the results of research with other scholars in the field, and free criticism. Another characteristic is the opportunity offered for educating young men and women in the processes and methods of research. The advanced academic degree is a recognition of educational attainment and research accomplishment under conditions of free inquiry, free exchange of results, and freedom of criticism. Its use by agencies or institutions which are not and cannot become universities in this sense of the term is a misuse which is both undesirable and unnecessary.

To clarify the situation, it is necessary to point out that the proposals for new degree-granting authority by nonuniversities arise from two basically different needs of the Federal establishment:

(a) Recruitment for specialized programs: Many proposals for new Federal academies stem from the difficulties of Federal agencies in recruiting new employees. Examples are the Foreign Service of the State Department, the Agency for International Development, the Federal research agencies, and the medical services of the Armed Forces. There is no lack of institutions qualified to offer the educational programs to meet these needs. If the inducements of subsidized education and advance commitment to Federal service are needed, these can be provided much more economically and efficiently through scholarship programs at non-Federal institutions than by the creation of new Federal academies. The ROTC programs of the armed services, the specialized military medical programs being operated through civilian medical schools, etc., are examples which might be adapted to other programs if and as the need is demonstrated. We also believe it desirable that the Federal establishment be staffed by persons from a wide variety of academic institutions truly representative of this country.

(b) Needs of in-house education: There are many instances in which it is essential that Federal agencies provide educational and training programs for their employees. Governmental activities in which the subject matter is highly classified or in which elements of military doctrine or established governmental policy are involved may require special in-house education. Neither the necessity nor the quality of such programs is questioned. The issue is whether or not an academic degree, and particularly an advanced degree, is appropriate as an evidence of successful completion of this education. We believe it is not. The academic degree represents, and should continue to represent, advanced study done in an environment of free inquiry by both faculty and students, freedom of expression, and freedom to publish results for the benefit of the academic community. The academic community has established standards by which the existence of these conditions may be judged and their violation brought to public attention. It is doubtful that these conditions can be met in programs in which an employer-employee or commander-subordinate relationship exists, and it is certain they cannot be met when highly classified subject matter is involved. To say this in no way reflects on the importance and necessity of these programs or the qualifications and motives of those conducting them. It is simply to say that other forms of recognition of accomplishment, rather than the academic degree, should be used. Where conditions exist, or are created, which make it possible for universities to assume responsibility for needed educational programs, universities should cooperate with Government in offering them and in awarding the academic degree as appropriate. But we reiterate that if conditions do not permit the awarding of the academic degree by universities operating in the best tradition of the university, it should not be conferred.

7. Proposal for research centers independent of universities: While this association recognizes that the problems of research in an extremely limited number of areas may require the establishment of research centers away from the site of a university, we believe that such action by Federal or State governments should be taken only when its necessity is unequivocally established. We believe graduate education of high quality is inseparable from basic research, that basic research flourishes best in the atmosphere of a university, and that any national policy of encouraging the establishment of new basic research institutes that are not university-related would be seriously detrimental to both basic research and graduate education.

8. Land-grant teaching funds, Morrill-Nelson Act: In the 10 years since the last revision and expansion of the authorization for annual grants for further endowment of instruction in the land-grant institutions there has been continued inflation and substantial population growth. The net result is that the purchasing power represented by these funds has decreased while demands have increased. The association supports the expansion of the authorization under this legislation to take account of inflation and population growth over the past decade.

IV. AID TO INDIVIDUALS IN OBTAINING A COLLEGE EDUCATION

The most effective and most urgently needed form of aid to individuals in obtaining a college education is a program of support for educational institutions which will enable them to keep charges to students low. Much of the present demand and need for individual assistance in financing college costs stems from failure to recognize and act on this fact. The association, however, recognizing the necessity of dealing with situations as they exist while working toward more fundamental solutions, commends the Congress for greatly expanding access to student loans at reasonable carrying charges, for its expansion of the work-study program, and for its provision of economic opportunity grants specifically designed to help the most needy gain access to higher education.

1. Federal scholarships: The association continues to oppose a general Federal scholarship program (a) in the absence of evidence that it would in fact assure college attendance for an appreciable number of students who cannot now enroll under existing programs and (b) in view of the higher priority needs for other forms of Federal aid to education.

We again call attention to the fact that neither the U.S. Office of Education nor any other agency, public or private, has sponsored needed research on the key question of the talent loss between high school and college in terms of ability and financial resources on a State-by-State basis. The percentage of high school graduates attending college by States apparently varies from as high as 81 percent to as low as 31 percent. Some relatively high income States are low in college attendance, and some relatively low income States are relatively high. National figures or even regional figures on talent loss between high school and college tell us little about where and why this occurs, or what type of action is needed to correct it.

If talent loss were relatively uniformly distributed among the States, a national program with State allocations would seem to be one possible answer. If the loss is concentrated in relatively high-income States which have done little to provide educational opportunity, another form of action is indicated. To the extent it occurs because certain States have made a strong effort to make opportunity available but lack the income base to do so effectively, still other solutions suggest themselves. A sound informational basis for making these judgments is badly needed. Despite these many reservations, the association believes that a national scholarship program is preferable to the tax-credit approach, discussed below, which has been aptly characterized as an upside down scholarship, giving the most aid to those with relatively less need, and penalizing those most in need of assistance.

2. Tax credit and related proposals: Proposals for a direct deduction from income taxes owed the Federal Government because of tuition and required fees paid colleges and universities have attracted substantial support because of several assumptions. The first is that they will provide relief to hard-pressed parents. A second is that they provide a way around the problems related to direct Federal aid to nonpublic institutions, and would, therefore, provide for a substantial flow of Federal tax dollars to these and other institutions. A third is that they are so devised as sharply to limit or eliminate aid to the most affluent, and give the greatest aid to those in lower income brackets (though admittedly none at all to those who pay no income tax). The first two assumptions are obviously contradictory. If institutions raise fees to collect tax dollars, parents will get no relief. If parents get substantial relief, institutions will not be aided. The third assumption is untrue. Despite limitations on benefits in terms of gross taxable income, the chief bill before Congress allows families with taxable incomes in excess of $50,000 to receive some benefits, those with capital gains incomes well in excess of that amount to receive some benefits, and those with incomes chiefly from tax-exempt sources to benefit without limitation as to total, as compared to taxable, income.

Although percentage benefits are higher for lower income families, dollar benefits are clearly higher as incomes rise up to $25,000, while benefits to those with lower incomes steadily decrease to the vanishing point. This association has consistently supported legislation giving Federal aid equitably to both public and nonpublic institutions of higher education. It views the tax-credit proposal as inequitable from every standpoint, and unsound from the standpoints of fiscal policy, educational policy, and national policy in general. The Treasury Department has ably stated the objections from the standpoint of national fiscal policy. Proponents of this legislation have made it clear that its essential purpose is to give tax support to educational institutions proportional, to some extent at least, to the fees charged students. Since the fees would have to be raised to provide the additional income desired, the benefit would flow to the college, not the taxpayer. To the extent that fees are raised, students from low-income families would find their educational costs increased rather than decreased. Institutions with low tuition charges would be placed under pressure to increase them in order to collect Federal aid by this route. Institutions which wish to engage in discriminatory practices and still enjoy Federal support would be encouraged to do so.

This association takes the position that, to the extent that Congress finds it in the national interest to provide either general or specific-purpose support from public funds for institutions of higher education, ways can and should be found for doing this which retain the principles of public accountability for the expenditure of public funds, which are fiscally and educationally sound, and which do not in their operation discriminate against large groups of students and institutions. The tax-credit approach does not meet these standards.

3. Work-study program: The association was first among national organizations in higher education to support enactment of a work-study program for college students, and welcomes the expansion of the program, inaugurated through the Economic Opportunity Act, by the Higher Education Act of 1965. It notes, however, that some institutions are finding it extremely difficult to meet both the objective of increasing opportunity for student employment and that of applying Federal minimum-wage standards of all such employment, as is administratively required. If both objectives are to be reached, a higher proportion of Federal investment, as contrasted with institutional investment, in the program will be necessary to avoid a drain on institutional resources needed for other purposes.

4. Economic Opportunity Act: Member institutions are playing an important role in many phases of the Economic Opportunity Act, and wish to do so with maximum effectiveness. At present, means of consultation and communication to this end leave much to be desired.

V. DISCRIMINATION IN THE USE OF PUBLIC FUNDS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Member institutions of the association believe that public policies against discrimination in the use of public funds for educational purposes should apply equally to their use by all types of educational institutions, public and private. They note with regret that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not uniformly apply this standard, because of the failure to include provision against discrimination because of religion in title VI of this act, which applies to nonpublic as well as public colleges and universities. They also note that title IV of the act, which requires a survey of the extent of discrimination in education to be made by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, applies only to public institutions at all levels, and not to discrimination in the use of public funds by other institutions receiving them.

It is therefore our position that the Civil Rights Act should be amended to ban use of public funds by institutions which discriminate in the admission of students or employment of staff because of religion, and that pending such amendment new educational legislation providing for the use of tax funds for education contain provision against use for purposes of discrimination because of religion. If there is reasonable ground for exception to this rule, such as might be involved in programs of a public welfare rather than an essentially educational character—such as the school lunch program—they should be made by explicit exemption from the general rule.

VI. DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVITS

Member institutions of the association have consistently opposed the requirement of negative disclaimer affidavits, or certificates of nonsubversion as a requirement for individuals taking part in nonsensitive Federal programs. Such requirements should not be confused, as they often are, with affirmative statements of loyalty to the United States and its institutions which may be properly required of those entering posts of public trust. The association welcomes the recent trend toward relaxation or elimination of such negative requirements. Experience has shown that while they involve extensive paperwork and recordkeeping and are a constant source of friction and controversy, they have no affirmative values.

VII. EXTENDING THE RESOURCES OF HIGHER EDUCATION BEYOND THE CAMPUS

Through title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the State Technical Services Act, the Regional Medical Programs Act, and title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964, the Congress recognized the urgent need for Federal aid to make available beyond the confines of the campus the great resources of our colleges and universities in the solution of problems of truly national concern.

Through expansion of programs of continuing education and extension authorized by these and earlier acts, universities will be enabled to bring their unique resources to bear, among other things, on the needs of communities for assistance in solving the multiple problems associated with rapid urbanization, technological unemployment, the needs of business and industry for effective access to and utilization of research information resulting from our great Federal programs, and needs of professionals in the health fields for the most advanced knowledge and equipment basic to improved services to their patients—the American people.

Organized labor has long shown its appreciation of the importance of education both by financing programs for its members and by giving wholehearted support to publicly and privately supported educational programs. The new legislation should make education much more widely available to workers, both organized and unorganized.

The enactment of these new programs was made possible to a substantial extent by the example of the Cooperative Extension Service through more than half a century of highly successful cooperative relationships between universities and the Federal Government. The competence and experience of this, the largest single adult-education activity in this country, should be fully and appropriately utilized in these new programs. The Presidential Advisory Committee which is asked to recommend more effective methods of coordinating Federal involvement in university-related extension programs must give careful attention to the necessity for strengthening existing programs while rapidly expanding the total range of university-related services available to the public.

Members of the association pledge their wholehearted support and cooperation to make these programs as effective as possible, and recommend full authorized funding of title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the State Technical Services Act, the Regional Medical Programs Act, and title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964.

Our member institutions, with long experience in operation of extension and continuing education programs, are fully aware of the necessity for using qualified people to maximum effectiveness and of avoiding duplication and overlapping of effort. We are concerned at the tendency in legislation to interpose new State agencies, without experience in university-related extension and continuing education programs, between the responsible Federal agency and colleges and universities which will be held responsible for successful program operation and which are already charged by their respective States with statewide or regional responsibilities for making university resources effectively available to the people. We shall exert every effort to make the new programs effective, and on the basis of experience to offer constructive suggestions for change if these are found necessary.

VIII. HUMANE TREATMENT OF EXPERIMENTAL ANIMALS

During the past decade, much progress has been made by all scientific personnel in providing adequate care of experimental animals. In recent years several legislative proposals have been made for Federal action to assure humane treatment of experimental animals in research projects wholly or partially financed by Federal funds. Nearly all these proposals would impose restrictions that would seriously impede progress in biological and medical research. Nor would the proposed legislation correct the examples frequently cited as justifying the need for such legislation, which are of the care and feeding of animals prior to their sale for research purposes. We therefore oppose the passage of restrictive Federal legislation in this area, while pledging our cooperation in affirmative measures to correct any evils which may exist.

IX. WATER RESOURCES

The association commends the Department of the Interior for the excellent way in which the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 has been implemented through its title I provisions. However, a viable title II program is judged to be essential for full realization of the goals of this legislation, and the association is concerned that such a program has not come into being. The reluctance of the executive branch to seek funding for title II in its present form is understood, and the association has therefore actively supported legislation along the lines of Senate bill 22, 89th Congress, 1st session, to clarify the procedures and institutional and other participation called for under title II. It is considered essential, however, that other avenues be explored for making a title II program operative through funded projects.

X. INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

The association expresses its appreciation to the officials of the Agency for International Development and the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the fine spirit of cooperation that continues to improve the working relationships with universities engaged in technical assistance programs overseas.

Because of the deep commitment of the State and land-grant institutions to international education and their concern for international development programs, the association was gratified by the President's Smithsonian bicentennial statement outlining national objectives for the achievement of effective international educational cooperation. The association and its member institutions pledge their support toward the realization of these objectives. In the consideration of specific proposals to attain them—whether by further implementation of existing legislation, new legislation, or administrative action—the association urges that recognition be given to the maintenance of three principles that must underlie effective university assistance in this and other programs of national importance:

1. Independence from political control: The States have generally recognized that their public institutions of higher education must be free of political control if they are to make maximum contributions to the education and welfare of the people. This principle is no less true in international affairs.

2. Sustained financing: Permanent, creative, and productive university programs in the international field require both additional funds and the assurance of long-term financial stability.

3. Opportunity for experimentation and innovation: The unique quality of university participation in international as well as other activities lies in the ability of the institutions to develop new ideas, to carry out research, and to adapt to local conditions. These cannot be accomplished under excessive bureaucratic control.

The association supported the McGovern bill (S. 1212) in the 1st session of the 89th Congress as a useful mechanism for the achievement of these principles in one aspect —that of development—of the broad international program outlined by the President, but urges that increased support and sustained funding should be made available for all aspects of international educational programs. As noted above, we hope that appropriate and soundly designed legislation will be introduced to achieve this objective and that Congress will enact such legislation. The association stands ready to help in the achievement of this goal in every way possible.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

Alabama: Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College, Auburn University, University of Alabama.

Alaska: University of Alaska.

Arizona: Arizona State University, University of Arizona.

Arkansas: Agricultural Mechanical and Normal College, University of Arkansas.

California: University of California.

Colorado: Colorado State University, University of Colorado.

Connecticut: University of Connecticut, Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station.

Delaware: Delaware State College, University of Delaware.

Florida: Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, Florida State University, University of Florida.

Georgia: Fort Valley State College, Georgia Institute of Technology, University of Georgia.

Hawaii: University of Hawaii.

Idaho: University of Idaho.

Illinois: Southern Illinois University, University of Illinois.

Indiana: Indiana University, Purdue University.

Iowa: Iowa State University, University of Iowa.

Kansas: Kansas State University, University of Kansas.

Kentucky: Kentucky State College, University of Kentucky.

Louisiana: Louisiana State University, Southern University.

Maine: University of Maine.

Maryland: Maryland State College, University of Maryland.

Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Massachusetts.

Michigan: Michigan State University, University of Michigan, Wayne State University.

Minnesota: University of Minnesota.

Mississippi: Alcorn Agricultural & Mechanical College, Mississippi State University, University of Mississippi.

Missouri: Lincoln University, University of Missouri.

Montana: Montana State University, University of Montana.

Nebraska: University of Nebraska.

Nevada: University of Nevada.

New Hampshire: University of New Hampshire.

New Jersey: Rutgers, the State University.

New Mexico: New Mexico State University, University of New Mexico.

New York: Cornell University, State University of New York.

North Carolina: Agricultural & Technical College of North Carolina, North Carolina State University, University of North Carolina.

North Dakota: North Dakota State University, University of North Dakota.

Ohio: Kent State University, Miami University, Ohio State University, Ohio University.

Oklahoma: Langston University, Oklahoma State University, University of Oklahoma.

Oregon: Oregon State University, University of Oregon.

Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University.

Puerto Rico: University of Puerto Rico.

Rhode Island: University of Rhode Island.

South Carolina: Clemson University, South Carolina State College, University of South Carolina.

South Dakota: South Dakota State University, State University of South Dakota.

Tennessee: Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University, University of Tennessee.

Texas: Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College, Texas A. & M. University, Texas Technological College, University of Texas.

Utah: Utah State University, University of Utah.

Vermont: University of Vermont.

Virginia: University of Virginia, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Virginia State College.

Washington: University of Washington, Washington State University.

West Virginia: West Virginia University.

Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin.

Wyoming: University of Wyoming.

A NOTE ON FEDERAL AID

The term "Federal aid" is commonly used, and is used in this document, as a general term covering all the multiplicity of purposes for which Federal funds flow to institutions of higher education or those attending them. The reader should keep in mind, however, that the term "Federal aid" is inaccurate and misleading as applied to many of these programs. Where the Federal Government, in fulfillment of a clearly defined and asserted national responsibility, uses the services, facilities, and personnel of colleges and universities to accomplish this purpose, the term "Federal aid" is not applicable. Indeed when the payment for this use is inadequate to cover its cost, as it frequently is, colleges and universities are supplying fiscal aid to the National Government rather than the reverse. Colleges and universities have a responsibility for the national welfare which exceeds that of most other institutions in our society, and on which they are uniquely able to discharge. The land-grant and State universities, whose founding was stimulated by national action, have always felt this responsibility with particular urgency and discharged it with particular pride. Willingness to give wholehearted cooperation in programs of national importance should not, however, obscure the fact that the flow of aid, both in terms of accomplishment and in fiscal terms, is a two-way flow. Cooperation in the national interest is a better word for it.

PROJECT HEAD START PROGRESS IN OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the January 3 issue of the publication of the Oregon Education Association there appeared a most interesting and informative article which summed up the response of Oregon school districts to the Project Head Start programs carried on in my State last year.

As Senators are aware, nationally during 1965 some 560,000 youngsters were involved in some 13,000 programs located in 2,500 communities. Nearly a million parents, one-half million volunteers, and 100,000 teachers, doctors, dentists, and neighborhood workers joined in helping to prepare these children—nearly all who came from impoverished families—for school entrance.

In Oregon, Project Head Start provided health, social services, and preschool learning experience for 1,500 youngsters and, as the article points out, the cost of this program, which came in total to $247,355, was mostly underwritten by a $219,317 grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Among the most important findings set forth in the article, in my judgment, are those which relate to the medical problems of these young citizens. It is shocking to me that "90 percent of the children enrolled in the 8-week program had never had medical examinations." This being so, it was not surprising perhaps to find as the result of the medical examinations of the children that cases of active tuberculosis were discovered, that partially blind children were found and that there was one instance of a deaf child who was previously incorrectly considered feebleminded. It is such shocking facts which prompt me to suggest that perhaps the major benefit to be derived from a preschool program such as Project Head Start may not be the educational advantage and enrichment given to the children themselves, important as this may be and as needed as this may be, but rather it may lie in the fact that we have been providing a tool to our dedicated teachers whereby the physical problems of the children may be early discovered so that remedial action can be taken in time to permit normal growth and development.

It is certainly my hope that through such activities in the future as Project Head Start and through programs undertaken by local school districts in connection with title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 that we can really obtain accurate data on the incidence of physically handicapped so that we can provide proper financing to overcome these conditions which interfere with educational achievement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Oregon Education Magazine, Jan. 3, 1966]

Educators Contribute to Project Head Start

Oregon public school districts, responding to a nationwide endeavor to help disadvantaged children prepare for the adventure of going to school, last summer sponsored 32 of 34 Project Head Start programs held during July and August.

Guided by 99 professional persons and enrolling an impressive army of volunteers—most of them unpaid, many of them students—Project Head Start provided health and social services and preschool learning experience for 1,500 Oregon children. The dollar cost of $247,355 was mostly underwritten by a $219,317 grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity, created as a result of war on poverty legislation.

The law that permits programs such as Project Head Start is not "education legislation." It is, as an NEA spokesman said when the Economic Opportunity Act was proposed, "legislation for 'poor people.'" But wherever children are involved, so is education.

CATCHUP SOUGHT

Project Head Start hopes to give children who are socially or economically disadvantaged an opportunity to catch up with their kindergarten and first-grade classmates. Early childhood years are the most critical in the poverty cycle, 175 Oregon and Washington teachers were told at an early summer training session directed by the National University Extension Association.

Faculty at the 6-day training session included specialists in preschool education, nutrition, sociology, psychology, medicine, dentistry and social work. The course also emphasized methods of working with volunteers and social agencies.

Project Head Start is intended to help children not ready for "show and tell"—they have nothing to show and are not adept at describing the things they do know about. Encouraging speech and acquainting them with the everyday vocabulary and habits previously learned by the middle class child is one of the major goals of the Head Start programs. Kindergarten and first-grade teachers know that many children are "disadvantaged" not only because of low income, but because of poor health and lack of simple but useful experiences that their middle class counterparts take for granted.

MEDICAL EXAMS

Persons active in Project Head Start estimate that 90 percent of the children enrolled in the 8-week program had never had medical examinations.

Medical examinations revealed active tuberculosis, a few partially blind children, some partially deaf children including one totally deaf child incorrectly considered feebleminded, and a few neglected children. As expected, many of the deprived children come from the urban areas. However, the program also pointed up substantial poverty in rural areas.

VOLUNTEERS VALUABLE

Project Head Start provided another important preschool ingredient—tender loving care—according to Dr. Jean Spaulding, elementary education consultant with the State Department of Education.

"Volunteers have been a vital part of most local Head Start programs," says Dr. Spaulding, "particularly young teenage boys. Young teenage boys have been perhaps the most successful father image kind of people many of these children have had." Aiding the 99 professional persons in Head Start summer programs were 138 paid volunteers. Some parents have worked as teacher aids.

LOCAL CONTROL

With little time for preparation, community action agencies worked with school districts, volunteer agencies and in some cases with churches to develop the 8-week programs. Responsibility for budgeting and for other detail has been that of the localities.

Guidelines and suggestions from the Office of Economic Opportunity were issued as helpful materials rather than as mandatory materials, says Dr. Spaulding. OEO required that regulation application blanks be completed and that test programs be followed through, but in other ways the program was clearly under local control.

More official evaluation was made than possibly was necessary, Dr. Spaulding indicated. Oregon's Head Start programs were evaluated by five agencies, she notes.

OTHER PROGRAMS

Project Head Start also provides a good background for other community action programs. The preschool programs are called "child development centers." Valuable as they may become, they are not district kindergartens, still a need in many parts of Oregon.

Reports from participants characterize Project Head Start as a success, based on the enrollment, the attitude of participants and the progress of many of the preschoolers.

Project Head Start centers were located in Canby, Roseburg, Portland, Hermiston, Pendleton, Eastern Oregon College, Lane County Intermediate Education Office (four centers at Creswell, Junction City, Bethel and Fern Ridge), Eugene, Central Linn (Halsey), Sweet Home, and Tigard. The Confederated Tribes in Warm Springs at Roseburg and Christian Pre-School in Portland, a private school, also sponsored Head Start programs.

"COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENROLLMENTS SOAR"—NOVEMBER 2 ISSUE OF OREGON EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the November 2, 1965, issue of Oregon Education, a publication of the Oregon Education Association, there appeared a very short article which dramatically illustrates the vitality and growth of the junior and community college.

This very important segment of the higher education community has increased in numbers and stature rapidly in the past few years; it is currently expanding at a phenomenal rate, as shown in the article; and it gives every promise of continuing to grow in enrollment and educational importance in the years ahead.

The article points out that in just 2 years the community colleges in my own State of Oregon have more than doubled in enrollment.

This 101-percent increase demonstrates, in my judgment, conclusively, that the steps we have taken in the Senate and in the Congress through enactment of educational legislation recognizing the importance of the service provided by the junior and community college were most amply justified. The questions it raises to my mind are: "Did we go far enough?" and "What is the next best step to take?"

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Community College Enrollments Soar

Oregon's community colleges have registered a more than 30-percent increase in enrollment this fall for the second straight year, according to figures released by the State department of education. Some 17,709 students had registered at the State's 9 community colleges by mid-October.

The new Lane Community College in Eugene registered a phenomenal 98-percent jump in registration over enrollment recorded last year by its predecessor, Eugene Vocational Technical School. An increase of nearly 70 percent was registered by Treasure Valley Community College in Ontario.

Dr. Robert Hatton, director of the State community college program, had a warning for burgeoning Portland Community College. The more than 8,000 students at that school represent 42.2 percent of total community college registration and Dr. Hatton says the college could well be crowded by the time it opens its new campus.

The State enrollment total represents a 101-percent increase over fall 1963 totals.

ROOSEVELT READIES SHOWCASE LIBRARY FROM THE PORTLAND OREGONIAN, DECEMBER 15, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, our school library resources, according to testimony presented to the Education Subcommittee, urgently need strengthening.

We have taken steps through the enactment of title II of Public Law 89–10 to begin to meet the most pressing needs in this area. We should not be content, however, with our progress in this area until such a time as almost every school will have available to it the type of a showcase library which is so well described in an article which appeared in the December 15, 1965, issue of the Portland Oregonian, under the byline of Mr. Malcolm Bauer, associate editor.

Too many of us, I feel, carry in our minds an outmoded stereotype of what is meant by the term, "school library." We think only and narrowly of a quiet place where students sit to read books taken from the shelves which line the wall. The excellent article by Mr. Bauer will help, I think, to bring this outdated picture into modern focus. I commend to Senators the article to which I have alluded, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in by remarks.

Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to commend the Portland public school system principal, Mr. Don W. James, and Librarian Lois Sayles, as well as Dr. Jerome E. Leavitt of Portland State College, for the work they have done in providing Roosevelt High School with this vital educational learning tool.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Dec. 15, 1965]

Roosevelt Readies Showcase Library

(By Malcolm Bauer, associate editor, the Oregonian)

In projecting a new, advanced set of standards for Oregon public school libraries, the

Oregon State Board of Education spotlights an aspect of education in the throes of major change.

Even the word "library" is outdated in referring to the school program that still goes by that name. Books are only one among many kinds of materials provided in "resource centers" making their appearance in some high schools. There are also films, slides, transparencies, microfilms, and tapes with the necessary projectors, tape recorders, record players, projection screens and television sets—some portable, some permanently installed.

Such centers may be located at several places in a high school, the materials of a subject, say English, grouped strategically for independent student study.

In addition, schools are developing their own production centers for the manufacture of plastic, photographic, and recorded instructional materials—many of them devised by teaching teams, teachers, and the students themselves.

Most of Oregon's major high schools have made at least a start in building such a modern research complex, some of them to the point of national example. One of them, in particular, Roosevelt High School in Portland, is developing a program which, in the coming year, will be used as a national showcase to demonstrate to school board members, administrators, teachers, and the general public the theory and practice of truly up-to-date school library service.

Roosevelt is one of only two senior high schools in the United States—the other is Oak Park and River Forest High School in plush suburban Chicago—to be chosen for demonstrations in the third phase of the Knapp school libraries project. A grant by the Knapp Foundation, Inc., administered by the American Library Association, has enabled the Portland School District, in professional cooperation with Portland State College, to establish such a center for the enlightenment of schoolmen in all parts of America. Knapp funds will help defray expenses of visitors who come from afar.

Another Northwest school, the Marcus Whitman Elementary School in Richland, Wash., selected for a similar role in an earlier phase of the Knapp project, entertained more than 1,000 visitors in a few months and is still a mecca for elementary school teachers and administrators.

Here are a few of the things that visitors to Roosevelt will see beginning early in 1966—

A library-research complex, supplied by the Portland public schools' central materials processing center and administered by Principal Don W. James and Librarian Lois Sayles, with a staff of 4 librarians, trained assistants, and more than 100 students actively engaged in study and practice of library science.

A central library (in a new Roosevelt wing) with 19,000 volumes and thousands of maps, prints, slides, transparencies, records, and filmstrips.

An independent study center imaginatively conceived in an abandoned cafeteria area to encourage individual study drawing on all materials available.

An English resource center with facilities for listening to related records and tapes and access to pamphlets, periodicals, etc.

A production center geared to the conception and manufacture of all kinds of plastic, photographic, and electronic study materials.

A professional link to the teacher-education program of Portland State College, through project "fieldworker" Dr. Jerome E. Leavitt of the P.S.C. faculty.

To appreciate the immense potential of the school library revolution, one has only to visit a Roosevelt class and witness for himself the enthusiastic student response to imaginative use of the great range of materials furnished through the library. The student who yawned through instruction amplified only by chalk and blackboard responds remarkably to creative instruction using films, transparencies, tapes, etc.

Sometime after the first of the year, Principal James and Librarian Sayles will hang out the "Come and see" sign. It is worth seeing.

STATEMENT BY HON. ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, ON PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an excellent statement made by the U.S. representative to the United Nations, Hon. Arthur J. Goldberg, on the peaceful settlement of disputes. In my opinion, Mr. Goldberg's speech makes a quite important contribution to the efforts to bring the United Nations into a position where it can be far more effective than it has been hitherto in settling disputes between sovereign states.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

(Statement by Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. representative to the United Nations, in the Special Political Committee, on Peaceful Settlement of Disputes, December 14, 1965)

I should like to begin by expressing our gratitude to the United Kingdom for placing on the agenda this item on the peaceful settlement of disputes.

We find it most appropriate that the United Kingdom should have taken this initiative. After all, the United Kingdom is the home of those concepts of due process of law which have been the firm foundation of the legal systems of many of us here, and the United Kingdom has played a leading role in the effort to bring the rule of law to the relations between states.

Some 45 years ago, for example, it was the United Kingdom which formally proposed the use of rapporteurs or conciliators in cases before the Council of the League of Nations. And some 15 years ago, it was the United Kingdom which proposed a procedure for conciliation in contentious questions before the United Nations.

The Government of the Netherlands, too, has made a major contribution by introducing its proposals on fact-finding. This is but the latest in a series of constructive proposals by a country whose name has become synonymous with international law and peaceful settlement.

It is certainly fitting that we should turn to the question of peaceful settlement before the close of International Cooperation Year. In the view of my delegation, there is no more important subject on the agenda of this General Assembly.

In world affairs, as in domestic affairs, there can be no lasting peace without institutions for peaceful settlement and peaceful change. When these do not exist, nations, like individuals, will take matters into their own hands.

The peaceful settlement of disputes, therefore, is not a Utopian dream. It is a practical necessity for the survival of mankind in the nuclear age. Unless man learns the art of peaceful settlement, his tenure on earth will be short indeed.

Peaceful settlement, in our view, is not only a requirement for survival. It is also, together with disarmament and peacekeeping, one of three interdependent elements of a decent world order.

History has demonstrated that nations will not be willing to disarm unless they have confidence that international disputes will be settled by peaceful means in accordance with justice and international law. This is why the United States made the strengthening of U.N. machinery for peaceful settlement a central element in our treaty outline for general and complete disarmament.

Progress in peaceful settlement is also essential to the success of this organization in containing violence through the use of United Nations peacekeeping forces.

In the last two decades the United Nations has learned to respond to peacekeeping emergencies by dispatching military observers, truce supervisors and armed forces. Once a peacekeeping operation is established, however, there has been an unfortunate tendency to forget about the underlying problem which made the operation necessary in the first place.

The resulting situation was described for us by the Secretary-General in his report issued last Friday on the U.N. operation in Cyprus. [S/7001, 10 December 1965.]

"It has become something of a pattern in United Nations peacekeeping operations," he said, "that although they are launched in the expectation that as emergency measures they will be of short duration, the harsh realities of the conflict situations in which they become involved quite often require them to be prolonged, more or less indefinitely."

And he added: "The Cyprus operation now tends to conform to this pattern."

Recent discussions in this Committee and in the Fifth Committee have reflected the growing concern of members with the problem of financing peacekeeping operations. Many members do not want to bear these financial burdens. But how can such costs be reduced or eliminated, if we do not all take responsibility for solving the political problems which make peacekeeping operations necessary?

Clearly peacekeeping operations should not be a sofa to provide a comfortable respite from efforts at peaceful settlement—they should be a springboard for accelerated efforts to eliminate the root causes of conflict. And no less clearly, we must develop the same sense of urgency in dealing with the causes of conflict that we have demonstrated in the containment of conflict.

To quote the Secretary-General once again:

"The Cyprus experience is by no means unique in this regard. The United Nations has learned from other experiences that time and even relative quiet alone do not necessarily in themselves induce or promote solutions of basic conflict situations.

"Persistent, determined effort is imperative on the part of the United Nations. But most of all, it is the parties themselves who have to show the necessary willingness to find an honorable and just solution."

In the view of my delegation, special and urgent efforts should be undertaken to attack the root causes of conflicts which have been temporarily arrested by the interposition of peacekeeping forces.

More should also be done through preventive diplomacy to anticipate and resolve situations which could lead to armed conflict. The burden on the U.N. fire department will become intolerable if we cannot do a better job of fire prevention.

Julius Nyerere, the distinguished President of Tanzania, has called on all of us to demonstrate what he so aptly describes as "the courage of reconciliation." The time has come to manifest that courage in the improvement of procedures for peaceful settlement and in the use of those procedures in concrete cases. After all, our organization was conceived as an instrument for the reconciliation of differences—not be merely as a forum in which they could manifest themselves.

Within our various countries, we have all seen the value of peaceful settlement procedures. These procedures can serve several purposes—

They can provide a "cooling off period" for the fever of controversy to subside.

They can help bring contending parties into touch with one another.

They can help find the facts.

They can help identify points of agreement.

They can introduce the calming effect of impartial judgment.

They can mobilize public opinion against excessive claims.

They can place responsibility on others for results for which the parties themselves could not accept responsibility.

In modern times, and particularly since the Hague Conferences of 1897 and 1907, enormous energy has been invested in the attempt to apply the arts of peaceful settlement to disputes between nations. As a result, there certainly is no lack of available machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes—

There are now some 300 treaties in force for the peaceful settlement of disputes through inquiry, mediation, conciliation arbitration, judicial settlement, or a combination of these methods.

There are now some 600 treaties in force which confer jurisdiction on the International Court of Justice to decide disputes as to their interpretation and application.

Most of these instruments for peaceful settlement have been concluded since the First World War. Many of them have been concluded since the Second World War.

It is tempting to conclude from these statistics that the international community is making great strides in the field. But the enormous increase in the institutions for peaceful settlement has not been accompanied by a similar increase in the actual resort to such institutions.

Does this mean that the renewed effort called for in the resolution now before us is doomed to failure? My delegation is not prepared to accept so pessimistic a conclusion. Indeed, we believe the resolution might spark a renaissance in the use of peaceful settlement procedures and thus be a step in the long road to a just and lasting peace.

We believe this resolution can serve this objective in at least three ways:

First, it can induce all of us to look again at our charter obligations to resort to peaceful settlement.

The Charter of the United Nations, in article 1, paragraph 1, declares that one of the purposes of our organization is "to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

It states in paragraph 4 of the same article that the U.N. is intended to be "a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends."

It commits all members, in article 2, paragraph 3, "to settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered."

And it further commits all members in article 33, in regard to any disputes the continuation of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, "first of all" to "seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice."

These provisions are the great underdeveloped areas of the charter. They are underdeveloped because none of us—and I specifically include my own country—has done enough to implement our solemn obligations in this field.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the work we are beginning here could help to recommit us all to the solemn obligations contained in these articles. And I would further suggest that it might also serve to impress us with one aspect of these obligations which is often overlooked and sometimes ignored.

It is quite clear that, while a dispute is still in a stage where it only threatens the maintenance of international peace, the parties are obliged to settle that dispute peacefully. But what happens if for any reason—whether through accident, miscalculation, or design—a dispute is not settled peacefully and the parties resort to force?

Quite clearly, when we look at the letter and spirit of the Charter, we see that the obligation of peaceful settlement does not end once conflict has broken out. Rather—and I think this point is worth emphasizing—the duty to settle a dispute peacefully is an obligation which continues from the moment the dispute first develops right through to the time when it is finally settled—even though armed conflict may have broken out.

As far as the United States is concerned, I can reaffirm today our unconditional commitment to this obligation. We seek the peaceful settlement of every dispute to which we are a party everywhere in the world—and this commitment most specifically applies to those disputes which, tragically and against our will, are being dealt with on the battlefield rather than in the conference room where they truly belong.

Second, the resolution now before us can encourage us all to make greater use of the machinery for peaceful settlement which we already have.

The study called for in this resolution can serve to inform us of the rich resources for peaceful settlement now existing both inside and outside the United Nations system. It can also stimulate the greater use of these resources.

In the United Nations itself, we have developed many facilities for peaceful settlement. The Secretary-General and his senior aids, as well as special United Nations mediators, have contributed to the cessation of hostilities or the achievement of political settlement in such far-flung places as Indonesia, West New Guinea, Kashmir, and the Middle East.

We support the continued expansion of this work—and the continued implementation of those fundamental Charter principles of the efficiency and impartiality of the Secretariat without which this work would not be possible.

We support the further development of the impressive resources for peaceful settlement which have been developed by the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations. I have in mind, for example, the procedures for inquiry and conciliation used by the International Labor Organization in the implementation of its members' commitments to fair labor standards; the methods employed by the International Telecommunication Union in resolving problems concerning the allocation of radio frequencies; and the techniques of arbitration and conciliation which the International Bank is just now making available for the settlement of investment disputes.

We also favor a substantial strengthening of the peaceful settlement procedures of regional agencies. Those of us who belong to regional organizations or who have observed their work know of the accomplishments in this field of the Organization of African Unity and the Organization of American States—and wish them to make further progress.

At the recent Rio Conference, my country, as well as others, put forth proposals for the further strengthening of OAS procedures in pacific settlement—and amendments to the OAS Charter will now be drafted with a view to strengthening these procedures.

While we place primary emphasis on institutions for third party settlement, we should not entirely ignore the resources available for bilateral settlement. For example, the United States has been participating with its immediate neighbors, Mexico and Canada, in joint international commissions dealing with specific types of disputes arising in our bilateral relations.

We believe, finally, that greater use can and should be made of the International Court of Justice as an instrument for pacific settlement. We have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

It is true that we have made a reservation concerning disputes which are within our domestic jurisdiction.

Let me emphasize today that this reservation means exactly what it says. It does not relate to disputes on matters of international law. I can state categorically that my Government stands ready to take to the International Court any outstanding dispute on any matter of international law with any other country which, like ourselves, has accepted the Court's compulsory jurisdiction.

Third, the resolution now before us can lead to improvements in our existing institutions for pacific settlement.

We have no illusions that institutions alone can solve the problem. We recognize—indeed we insist—that the central problem is one of national attitudes. The most important requirement for peaceful settlement is the willingness of nations to abide by the law and settle their differences in accordance with law.

But it does not follow from this that institutions make no difference. It is our view that institutions do matter and that the existing procedures for peaceful settlement can be improved.

Therefore we propose nothing less than the creation of a United Nations Peace Service—a flexible set of procedures so efficient and so comprehensive that it will provide an adequate substitute for armed conflict. In the opinion of my delegation, a U.N. Peace Service should include improvements in present procedures to meet three main needs:

In the first place, it should assure the greater availability of qualified persons for tasks of peaceful settlement. In all of our countries there are distinguished men whose personal qualities and practical experience enable them to discharge special responsibilities in the resolution of conflict. Let us find ways of making these men available to the U.N.—and to other international agencies.

In the second place, it should provide additional incentives for governments to resort to peaceful settlement. Nations will use available resources for peaceful settlement only as they are convinced of the benefits of cooperation—and of the costs of noncooperation.

In the third place, it should incorporate new approaches to dispute settlement whose utility has been demonstrated in recent experience.

It is now 15 years since the United Nations last engaged in a systematic study of this question. In that time the membership of the Organization has more than doubled and the U.N. has accumulated all kinds of new experience in the peaceful settlement of disputes. Surely we have learned something during these years about the settlement of conflict both within and between countries.

The lessons of this experience should be examined by the group which this resolution proposes to establish. It might also be studied simultaneously by the relevant professional organizations and the great centers of learning in all of our countries.

My Government has a number of specific ideas which we will make available to the proposed committee in due course. We are considering, for example, whether the existing United Nations panel for inquiry and conciliaton could be reconstructed on a new basis to make it a more efficient instrument for the performance of its tasks. We are also considering whether greater use could not be made of rapporteurs or conciliators on contentious matters before the Security Council and the General Assembly—with a view to bringing the parties together, finding the facts, and recommending possible solutions.

Our ideas of these and other subjects are not frozen. We are willing and anxious to examine each and every new proposal that may be made.

We are flexible about means. We are only inflexible about the end—a comprehensive peace service which can provide an effective substitute for armed conflict.

President John F. Kennedy declared, in his speech at American University in June 1963, that "peace is a process, a way of solving problems."

Mr. Chairman, we want to strengthen the process of peace. That is why we are proud to join with the United Kingdom in sponsoring this resolution. That is also why we pledge our cooperation to the proposed committee in the effort to find practical measures to improve the work of the United Nations in the peaceful settlement of disputes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 20, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 19 (legislative day of January 18), 1966:

THE JUDICIARY

William J. Lynch, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Illinois, vice Michael L. Igoe, retired.

Wilfred Feinberg, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge, second circuit, vice Thurgood Marshall.

James L. Watson, of New York, to be judge of the U.S. Customs Court, vice Jed Johnson, deceased.

William K. Thomas, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio, vice Paul Jones, deceased.

John P. Fullam, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice Abraham L. Freedman, elevated.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The following-named persons to be Assistant Secretaries of Housing and Urban Development:

Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland.
Charles M. Haar, of Massachusetts.

PEACE CORPS

Jack Hood Vaughn, of Virginia, to be Director of the Peace Corps, vice Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The following-named persons to be Members of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department:

Robert L. Sumwalt, of South Carolina. (New position.)

Victor Bussie, of Louisiana. (New position.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. William Wilson Quinn, O19283, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Ashton Herbert Manhart, O18773, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 19 (legislative day of January 18), 1966:

BUREAU OF MINES

Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., of New York, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Peace Corps Gains Able Leadership in Appointment of Jack Vaughn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance for Progress and Latin America lost the full-time services of one of its most able and stanch supporters last Monday when President Johnson announced the appointment of the Honorable Jack Hood Vaughn as the new Director of the Peace Corps. I am confident that his ability and total effort which he has always demonstrated will keep the Peace Corps at the same high level and fine caliber which it has enjoyed since its inception.

Director-designate Vaughn appeared probably in his last official capacity in the Congress a week ago today when he appeared in executive session before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. He explained in his modest and able manner the reasons why the Alliance for Progress is making great advances, and, contrary to many pessimistic viewpoints that we have heard predicted, 1966 is going to be the greatest year in history in terms of growth and improvement in Latin America. This enthusiasm which he displays is bound to be instilled in those with whom he will work in the Peace Corps.

Mr. Vaughn, in the 45 years of his life, has had a varied and superlative career. He served in the U.S. Marine Corps, was a university instructor, a professional boxer, served in the early days of the foreign-aid program, and was previously Assistant Director of the Peace Corps for Latin America before the President called him to be his right-hand man for the Alliance for Progress.

I am told that his short address before the U.S. delegation to the United Nations in December at the time when Ambassador Goldberg was inviting all the regional Assistant Secretaries to address that group, was one of the most sincere and honest evaluations of any situation that the delegation had heard.

I am sure my colleagues join me in wishing the new Director, Jack Vaughn, great success in his new assignment.

Administration Doing Masterful Job Withholding Information From the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the President's request for a supplemental appropriation of more than $12 billion for emergency financing of the war in Vietnam is evidence that the administration is doing a masterful job of figure juggling in withholding information from the American people.

The request for these essential, urgently needed funds was deliberately delayed until all the Great Society programs had been fully funded in the last session. Now we are handed the bill for our defense efforts, knowing it cannot be reduced.

The President's request for a speedup in tax collections in this election year is another example of his figure juggling. Corporate and personal income tax collections would be accelerated, self-employed individuals would be asked to pay Social Security taxes on a quarterly basis rather than annually as at present, which would thus provide an immediate increase in revenue and make the fiscal picture temporarily appear brighter.

Six-Day Postal Service Reinstated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to note that last weekend President Lyndon Johnson restored parcel post and postal window service on Saturdays. This action was taken by the President despite the many fiscal economy measures for which the President is well noted. I believe the President acted wisely and I believe that every citizen who uses the postal service will praise the President for these wise actions. The vast amount of mail which the Department now carries and which we have every reason to expect will increase greatly over the years, can only be carried efficiently by expanding the services of the Postal Department. I believe the President and Postmaster General O'Brien both recognize this very thoroughly. This is, I am sure, why they acted to reinstate these valuable services.

Economy cannot be practiced in the true sense of the word by decreasing services performed of such a vital nature. We all know that very many people who use the postal money order only have access to the post office conveniently on Saturdays. I am sure many people across the country are praising President Johnson for this action.

Lt. Gen. Robert W. Colglazier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1966, Lt. Gen. Robert W. Colglazier will retire, culminating a brilliant and distinguished career of more than 41 years service in the U.S. Army.

I rise today to congratulate and commend General Colglazier for his outstanding leadership and service to this Nation. He is admired and respected both on a national level and a local level for his contributions to his fellow man.

I am proud to say that General Colglazier is a product of San Antonio, having attended high school and later serving as president of the Colglazier McKennon Construction Co. there. It is fitting and proper that we should honor him upon the occasion of his retirement, for he deserves the gratitude of each of us.

In 1925 he graduated from Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College with a B.S. in Civil Engineering. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Officers Reserve Corps on October 26, 1925.

Prior to World War II, General Colglazier was an officer in the construction firm of Colglazier & Hoff, Inc., in San Antonio, Tex.

In May 1941, General Colglazier was called to extended active duty and assigned to the Office of the Quartermaster General as assistant executive officer in the engineering branch, construction division.

General Colglazier was transferred to the North Ireland Base Command in January 1942, and placed in charge of construction there. For his outstanding service at the North Ireland Base Command, he was awarded the Legion of Merit. In November 1942, he was assigned as assistant executive of the engineering section, Mediterranean Base section; the following February he became chief of staff of the Eastern Base section in the North African Theater of Operations. For his planning, organization, and direction of the numerous activities of the headquarters staff during and subsequent to the Tunisian campaign, General Colglazier was awarded his first Oak Leaf Cluster to the Legion of Merit. In October 1943 he was appointed assistant chief of staff for supply of the Peninsular Base section in Italy.

In July 1944, General Colglazier became Assistant Chief of Staff for supply of the Communications Zone, Mediterranean theater, and in November 1944 assumed that position with the headquarters of the southern line of communications, European theater. In order to meet the problems of the newly organized southern line of communications, he formulated the policies and procedures for assuring an adequate flow of supplies and services to the combat elements of 6th Army group under constantly changing circumstances caused by a rapidly moving tactical situation. For this significant contribution to the allied war effort, General Colglazier was awarded the Bronze Star Medal. From February to October 1945 he was Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff for supply of the Army Headquarters in the European theater. During this period he was awarded a second Oak Leaf Cluster for the Legion of Merit.

General Colglazier was relieved of active duty on March 1, 1946, and returned to San Antonio, where he became president of the Colglazier McKennon Construction Co.

In July 1951, after the start of the Korean war, General Colglazier was recalled to extended active duty and appointed Chief of the control office in the office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, G-4, Logistics, at Army headquarters. In July 1953 he was named Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, G-4, for plans and programs. He was appointed director of programs and budget, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics in September 1954 and was subsequently named as Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics.

In January 1956, he was assigned to headquarters, U.S. Army Europe, reporting in April 1956, as commanding general, U.S. Army Europe, Communications Zone.

General Colglazier returned to headquarters, Department of the Army, in December 1957 and was again designated the Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics. In July 1959 General Colglazier became the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, Department of the Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

It is significant to note that he has also been honored internationally. Among his citations and decorations for distinguished service are the Legion of Merit (with two Oak Leaf Clusters), the Bronze Star Medal, the Army Commendation Ribbon with metal pendant. The Legion of Honor and the Croix de Guerre were awarded him by France and in recognition of his outstanding service during World War II, the Honorary Officer of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, was awarded him by England.

Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, since the beginnings of our Republic, the people and their elected representatives in Congress have been engaged in a sort of ceremonial contest with the executive bureaucracy over the freedom of information issue. The dispute has, to date, failed to produce a practical result.

Government agencies and Federal officials have repeatedly refused to give individuals information to which they were entitled and the documentation of such unauthorized withholding—from the press, the public, and Congress—is voluminous. However, the continued recital of cases of secrecy will never determine the basic issue involved, for the point has already been more than proven. Any circumscription of the public's right to know cannot be arrived at by congressional committee compilations of instances of withholding, nor can it be fixed by Presidential fiat. At some point we must stop restating the problem, authorizing investigations, and holding hearings, and come to grips with the problem.

In a democracy, the public must be well informed if it is to intelligently exercise the franchise. Logically, there is little room for secrecy in a democracy. But, we must be realists as well as rationalists and recognize that certain government information must be protected and that the right of individual privacy must be respected. It is generally agreed that the public's knowledge of its government should be as complete as possible, consonant with the public interest and national security. The President by virtue of his constitutional powers in the fields of foreign affairs and national defense, without question, has some derived authority to keep secrets. But we cannot leave the determination of the answers to some arrogant or whimsical bureaucrat—they must be written into law.

To that end, I join other members of this House in introducing and supporting legislation to establish a Federal public records law and to permit court enforcement of the people's right to know.

The bill that I am introducing today would require every agency of the Federal Government to "make all its records promptly available to any person," and provides for court action to guarantee the right of access. The proposed law does, however, protect eight categories of sensitive Government information which would be exempted.

The protected categories are matters—

First, specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy;

Second, related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of any agency;

Third, specifically exempted from disclosure by statute;

Fourth, trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from the public and privileged or confidential;

Fifth, interagency or intra-agency memoranda or letters dealing solely with matters of law or policy;

Sixth, personnel and medical files and similar matters the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy;

Seventh, investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes except to the extent available by law to a private party; and

Eighth, contained in or related to examination, operating, or condition reports prepared by, on behalf of, or for the use of any agency responsible for the regulation or supervision of financial institutions.

The bill gives full recognition to the fact that the President must at times act in secret in the exercise of his constitutional duties when it exempts from availability to the public matters that are "specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy."

Thus, the bill takes into consideration the right to know of every citizen while affording the safeguards necessary to the effective functioning of government. The balances have too long been weighted in the direction of executive discretion and the need for clear guidelines is manifest. I am convinced that the answer lies in a clearly delineated and justiciable right to know.

A freedom of information bill passed the Senate in 1965 but the House has failed to act, perhaps because of opposition from the White House and other administration leaders in the executive branch. This legislation should be high on the priority list as the 2d session of the 89th Congress gets underway.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 48 years ago, the Ukraine declared its independence from the then-new nation of the U.S.S.R. This was done in good faith by the Rada, or central council, of the Ukraine, acting in accordance with the Soviet Government's proclamation of the right of self-determination for the peoples of the old Romanov empire of the tsars. As could be expected, however, the Communists soon proved how much their declarations were to be trusted, as they have many times since, by proclaiming that independence movements were bourgeois and counterrevolutionary. In the autumn of 1919, the Ukraine helpless against the onslaught of Soviet force, unwillingly became a Soviet Socialist Republic. Despite nearly a half century of Communist oppression, the Ukrainian people have maintained their unique and rich heritage, and their desire for freedom.

Indeed, the annals of Ukrainian Russia are older and more significant than those of any of the Soviet Republics, including the largest and most powerful—the R.S.F.S.R. In fact, the very history of Russia begins in the capital city of the Ukraine—Kiev. The city lent its name to an era—Kievan Russia—almost three centuries in duration, from the 900's to the 1100's A.D. The rich legacy which this Ukrainian period left to that part of the world is unmatched. The art, architecture, literature, public and private institutions, its society and culture have all had their impact on the Communist state which now occupies that unfortunate territory. History, 1,000 years hence, will tell which era—Kievan Russia or Communist Russia—is remembered for its greatness and its heritage.

Since the 12th century and the Mongol invasion, however, the Ukraine has been conquered and divided numerous times between its greedy neighbors, including the Soviet Union. Throughout these long centuries of oppression, the Ukrainian people have shown great fortitude, courage, and unity, and when the Rada proclaimed independence on January 22, 1918, these people could see a dream materialize, a dream of freedom and an end to long-endured sufferings. The Communists, however, soon smashed this dream and gave the rest of the world one of the first signs of how they were to behave in the international arena. The short-lived nation of the Ukraine was one of the first victims of Soviet aggression; aggression which has continued to the present day.

The Ukrainian experience cannot be considered in isolation to the events of today. Its connection with the current situation in Vietnam is aptly expressed by Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc.:

> Although Vietnam engrosses our national attention, we cannot ever afford to ignore the broader interrelated facts of Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, the syndicate of Red totalitarian regimes, their increasing psychopolitical warfare against the free world, and the underlying captive nations in the Red empire, including 17 million North Vietnamese. To divorce Vietnam from these basic facts would be the height of folly. The techniques of intensive revolution, the Russian-bred Hanoi elite, and Red objectives in Vietnam are no different from those witnessed in 46 years of cumulative Red conquest, commencing with the many non-Russian nations now held captive in the U.S.S.R. itself.

Mr. Speaker, we have forgotten neither the people of the Ukraine nor the people of other nations more recently victims of Communist imperialism. On this 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, let us not only think of the past, but also the future. History is not done with the Ukraine, nor its unfortunate sister republics, and someday, the Communist yoke of oppression will be broken and freedom will be established again.

The Bureaucracy and Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently I had occasion to call attention to a drastic change in policy by the Social Security Administration, in regard to establishing proof of eligibility for medicare enrollment, by senior citizens not already drawing social security. That change in policy, in essence, was forcing thousands of senior citizens who possessed so-called delayed birth certificates to first obtain a Bureau of Census records check and to pay \$5 for an expedited investigation. After my discussions with the Social Security Administration, I issued the following statement on January 6:

> HOW JOHNSON REDTAPE RAISES
> COST OF MEDICARE
>
> Congressman DURWARD G. HALL, Republican of Missouri, said today that several million senior citizens are being required to dig into their pockets to finance an administration change in policy which assumes that many older people were "hatched" instead of born.
>
> Hall said the new policy, which was made effective on November 22, but not published in the Federal Register until almost a month later, will add an immense ball of redtape to the procedures required for older citizens to qualify for medicare and other social security benefits. It also could take several million dollars out of the pockets of our senior citizens who can least afford it.
>
> Hall said the new policy could affect millions of older people who were born before there were established procedures in the various States for requiring birth certification. In many States, in fact in most of them, no birth records were kept before 1910, or even later. In the past, the Social Security Administration has accepted what are known as delayed birth certificates, affidavits signed by their parents or other knowledgeable people attesting to their date of birth. Under the new policy, these affidavits are no longer acceptable as proof of birth, either for medicare enrollees, or for anyone else reaching age 65 and applying for regular social security benefits.
>
> Before these delayed birth certificates will be accepted, the new Johnson policy, in essence, requires that the applicant or enrollee first request a check with the Bureau of the Census records, and for such an investigation at the present time there is a charge of \$5 for each inquiry.
>
> Its understandable to charge for such an investigation for the person's own use, but certainly, not when the Government policy, itself, may require it. That should be a service which the agency provides since they're the ones that require it.

Furthermore, there is no clear-cut policy at this time with regard to waiver of payment by the individual. At the moment, it's left to the discretion of each social security office, whether the individual or the agency will pay the cost, and none of the older citizens who have contacted me were advised of any possibility of waiver. Such a policy is fraught with possibilities of political favoritism. It ought to be revised.

The agency, itself, admits there has been a wave of protest as a result of the current procedure. Under such pressures, I believe the Social Security Administration will want to reverse its position.

In view of this fluid situation, I am advising my constituents, who do not have the newly required birth data, to make no further moves now, and certainly not to pay the $5 until the Social Security Administration has been given reasonable opportunity to reconsider its policy.

Hall said the new requirement will place a huge workload on the Census Bureau over the next few years, and there will certainly be an increase in administrative costs of the Bureau of Census.

Aside from the monetary consideration, there is the matter of considerable inconvenience, redtape, and exasperation for older people who had no idea that their delayed birth certificates would no longer suffice as proof they were indeed born.

Hall has filed a protest with the Social Security Administration, and has urged that the policy be relaxed or rescinded, until Congress has an opportunity for further investigation as to its propriety.

This new and largely unpublicized provision comes as a shock to many older citizens who have had to find out the hard way. Furthermore, this problem, if it is a problem, should and could have been anticipated, without causing the bureaucratic turmoil now evident. It's the type of thing that many Members of Congress warned about and I'm afraid only a forerunner of other problems, perhaps far more serious in the administration of the new program.

This example of expensive redtape is another reason why I thought eldercare was far preferable to medicare.

Shortly after I issued the foregoing statement to the news media, a representative of the Social Security Administration called at my office for a copy, which was provided.

In the Great Society, the first instinct of a bureaucrat is to protect his public image, and so it came as no great surprise to me that, like Pavlov's dogs, the Social Security Administration denied the charge and indicated they were following the same policy they had followed for years. The following is the Associated Press story, item 98 on the AP wire, which was carried at 1:45 p.m. on the afternoon of January 6. The wire story follows:

A Social Security Administration spokesman said the agency does not require use of census records to establish the age of persons who do not have a birth or baptismal document, though that is one of several ways suggested in such cases.

The spokesman said this procedure has been followed for years.

The only recent change in policy regarding proof of age, the spokesman said, puts emphasis on use of the earliest available documents, particularly those apparently establishing age before the person reached the age of 10.

When I was advised of this denial, which I knew to be false, I urged the wire services to keep me advised of any further statement on the subject that might be issued by the Social Security Administration. Not long afterward, I learned that another statement on the subject was to be issued by the Social Security Administrator. The next sequence of this incredible chain of events was recorded on UPI story No. 181, which was carried at 7:12 p.m. on the evening of January 6. The story speaks for itself and follows:

The Social Security Administration, which since November 22 has been asking benefit applicants for better proof of birth date, conceded today the new rules weren't working too well.

Commissioner Robert M. Ball announced, therefore, he was changing them to avert long delays in getting on to pension or medicare rolls. Hereafter the "best available proof" will be accepted, and verification sought later.

Ball made his announcement several hours after Representative DURWARD G. HALL, Republican, of Missouri, charged that the recent rule-tightening apparently was based on an assumption older people were "hatched" and not born.

Those affected are persons without formal birth certificates issued by local government authorities. At the time of birth of many of those now reaching age 65, birth certificates were not being issued.

In their absence the Social Security Administration always has accepted alternative evidence, including so-called "delayed birth certificates" based on affidavits of parents or other knowledgeable persons.

With increased benefits made available, by the medicare bill passed by Congress last year, Ball said the agency decided to tighten the procedures to make sure the public interest was protected.

Under the rule put into effect on November 22, where an alternative document was presented in lieu of a birth certificate, at least one supporting document was required. HALL, in his statement, said in effect this meant that applicants had to apply for a check of old census records. He said this kind of search takes as long as 2 or 3 months. The cost to the applicant, the Congressman said, was $5.

Ball said that under procedure announced today, the applicants evidence of birth date will be accepted and the applicant placed on the roll. Then the agency itself will check the Census Bureau and pay for the cost of the search.

In an event, an agency spokesman said, any applicant delayed in getting onto the benefit rolls will be paid retroactively once his claim is established.

Representative HALL said he was pleased. He said he will keep watch, however, to make sure the latest word gets out fast to all the Social Security offices over the country.

Subsequently, I issued the following statement:

GREAT SOCIETY PAIN RELIEVED—FAST

Representative DURWARD HALL, Republican, of Missouri, today stated that as a result of his protest, the Johnson administration has agreed to cut the miles of redtape entangling senior citizens in their efforts to participate in medicare and other social security benefits.

Representative HALL aired his views on "Comment," the weekly radio news program of the Republican National Committee.

The following is the text of the Congressman's remarks:

"Of course, it's a source of great satisfaction to me that the Social Security Commissioner has responded to my strong protest about the new rules which were forcing hundreds of thousands of our senior citizens to go to the extra expense and a great deal of inconvenience to establish their birth dates and thus qualify for medicare and other social security benefits.

"As a result of our protest, based on numerous complaints I received from older citizens, I am happy to say that the new rules which ruled out initial acceptance of the so-called delayed birth certificates, and usually required a $5 payment for a records examination by the Census Bureau, were rescinded.

"Meanwhile, I know that our senior citizens around the country, most of whom do not have an original birth certificate but are sure they were born and not hatched, simply because few States had such certificates back in the early 1900's, are happy to know that they will not have to undergo undue delay during the signup period. Nor will they have to pay for the Census Bureau examination, the cost of which will now be borne by the Social Security Administration, when and if they require it, albeit not the intent of the Congress."

As a footnote to all this, I might add a few comments. First, as of this date, I still have received no formal reply to my written inquiry of January 4 to Commissioner Ball. My last acknowledgment was an interim reply on January 12, indicating that my letter was receiving official attention. So far as I know, the social security announcement on the evening of January 6 gave no indication that the policy was being changed as a result of my complaint and some of the news stories carried by the local press left the implication that the administration was trying to make it easier for senior citizens to enroll for medicare, without any admission that they were reversing a previously imposed policy, which had made enrollment more difficult, costly, and exasperating for senior citizens. I believe the House will be interested in this article by Ralph de Toledano written for King Features Syndicate before he was aware of the agency response:

MEDICARE HAS BEGUN TO WRITE OFF THE SENIOR CITIZENS

(By Ralph de Toledano)

When medicare was dangled before the Nation's senior citizens, it was billed as a royal road to free hospital care. But the bureaucrats have moved in and made it a redtape snarl that will make it difficult for those without means to get the help they were promised.

Representative DURWARD G. HALL, who has been both literally and figuratively from Missouri on the issue, has discovered what the medicare division of social security has been quietly doing to make life difficult for the aged—and to extract several millions of dollars from their pockets.

Rules and regulations for receiving medicare benefits were quietly put into effect, without the usual publication in the Federal Register, much to the annoyance and chagrin of those who lined up at Social Security Administration offices to qualify for benefits. Only a month after these regulations were in force was it considered important to let the country in on the facts.

This is the background:

In the past, those seeking regular social security benefits were not required to present birth certificates. It was recognized by Federal authorities that most States did not keep birth records before 1910. Arizona did not become a State until 1912, and Territorial records were, to say the least, spotty. The Social Security Administration was perfectly satisfied with affidavits (known as delayed birth certificates) from responsible sources as to the age of the applicant.

Under the new policy, Representative HALL has pointed out, these affidavits are no longer acceptable as proof of birth—either for medicare enrollees or for anyone else reaching age 65 and applying for the regular social security to which he has been contributing.

"Before these delayed birth certificates will be accepted," "Doc" Hall points out, "the new Johnson policy in essence requires that the enrollee or applicant first request a check with the Census Bureau records, and for such a check at the present time there is a charge of $5 for each check."

Social Security Administration officials, moreover, have consistently failed to inform applicants without birth certificates that it may be possible to waive the $5 fee. Get the certificate and pay up the $5, or else, is the attitude of those administering the program. In instances where no birth certificate exists, the check by the Census Bureau will be meaningless—throwing a tremendous new workload on the Government.

The flood of applications, moreover, will delay payment of medicare and social security benefits to those in need who were presumably the thoughtful concern of Congress and the administration. The utter futility of the new regulations is patent since most of those applying for medicare can demonstrate that they are well past the age to qualify.

"This new and unpublicized provision comes as a shock to many older citizens who have had to find out the hard way," Representative Hall says, and he has formally protested to the Social Security Administration. "This problem should and could have been anticipated, without causing the bureaucratic turmoil now evident. It's the type of thing that many Members of Congress warned about, and I'm afraid only a forerunner of other problems, perhaps far more serious in the administration of the new program."

What remains to be determined is what great brain in the Federal bureaucracy thought of this new regulation and why it was not given the proper publicity. This touches on one aspect of Federal activity that is callously forgotten by those who pile law on law. Once a government enters into relations with the individual, rights and conveniences are forgotten. The bureaucracy thinks in terms of masses, and people are reduced to helpless statistics. Government funds to pay hospital bills for the aged, on its face, seems like a noble idea. But when you get right down to it, the individual finds himself standing on endless lines, at the disposal of harried and overworked people whose interest is more in the job than in those who are presumably its beneficiaries.

"Doc" Hall is right to be angered by this new piece of Federal redtape. Those who were led to believe that it would help them may learn there is a bill for everything—whether it be in money or in frustration.

An Action Program for Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention of the House to a report made by the Full Employment Steering Committee of the Democratic Study Group. This committee, composed of a group of freshmen Members of Congress, with myself as chairman and Mr. Reuss as adviser, includes Mr. Conyers, Mr. William Ford, Mr. Gilligan, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Irwin, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Krebs, and Mr. Schisler. While all these members concur with the basic approach of the report, not all of them agree with every one of the specific observations or proposals it contains, other than the employment program, in which they all concur.

The committee proposes the establishment of a program which would eventually provide perhaps 1 million "hard core" unemployed with basic education, training, and publicly financed employment in subprofessional jobs. These jobs would be in the nature of aids to doctors, nurses, laboratory personnel, and orderlies in hospitals, as assistants to home nurses and physical and occupational therapists, as helpers in libraries and assistants to teachers and administrative staff in schools, as museum aids and playground and recreation assistants, and as assistants to probation officers and those fighting crime and delinquency.

Further subprofessional aids could be employed to improve the beauty of our Nation by working on highway maintenance, waterfront cleanup, park construction as well as maintenance and groundskeeping. Urban life could be further improved by provision of aids to building inspectors, public health officials, sanitation officials, and water and air pollution control personnel.

The key goals of the program are:

First. Providing vitally needed assistance to the health care and educational institutions of our country which are at present sorely understaffed with professionals, many of whom must spend valuable time in tasks which could be performed by aids.

In the light of current programs for expansion of medical services and educational facilities, our health and education professionals will be in increasingly short supply in the future. These aids, by adding to our effective labor supply in urgently needed job categories, are a basic necessity now that rising demands of the war in Vietnam threaten to create inflationary pressures which will be aggravated in the months ahead by an increasingly tight labor market.

Second. Strengthening the system of voluntary health institutions which must rely in large part on the efforts of voluntary fundraising and volunteer services to supplement their incomes in order to meet their personnel and financial needs. The use of aids for whose salaries the local institutions will be reimbursed by the Federal Government, will not only permit the provision of better medical services by these institutions but will also reduce the fundraising burden of civic leaders.

Third. Lessening the drain on welfare and other supportive community services by providing a halfway house or way station for those who have never been a part of the employment pool and who, through the program, will for the first time find their way into the labor force.

Fourth. Recognizing that in 1966 jobs are at the heart of the civil rights struggle. The main lesson gained from the experience of the past year, particularly in recent months during which unrest has given vent to violence and near violence in urban centers throughout the country, is that the vital need for jobs lies at the heart of the despair, bitterness, and frustration breeding such explosions.

Investigators seeking the cause and prevention of Watts and similar destructive outbursts have universally reported the eagerness on the part of the poverty stricken to be gainfully employed. Efforts to convert the heretofore "untouchables" of our society into gainfully employed members of the labor force not only will enhance their status as human beings who can have pride in themselves as people but will also give them satisfaction that they are providing critically needed services for their communities and their country.

I would also like to call attention of the House to the perceptive and thoughtful editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on January 9, 1966. The editorial and the report follow:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 9, 1966]

TRAINING FOR STABILITY

The news that the unemployment rate fell to 4.1 percent in December underscores the relevance of a proposal made by the Democratic Study Group for providing 1 million of the hard-core unemployed with basic education and vocational training. There were nearly 2.9 million Americans without jobs in December. If the present economic expansion is to continue without creating additional inflationary pressures, a way must be found to add them and other disadvantaged people who will shortly enter the labor force to the ranks of the gainfully employed.

The Democratic Study Group report, prepared under the able chairmanship of Representative James H. Scheuer, of New York, envisions a public employment training program in which the unemployed would provide needed services in the fields of health, education, and urban improvement. Since the wages paid for such jobs would be at the low end of the wage scale, there would be a strong incentive for the better workers in the program to move into private industry.

This proposal effects a marriage between the need for more subprofessional service workers and the desirability of training those who tend to be disqualified for employment because of poor education. But it would better satisfy the demands of an economy that may soon be confronted with tight labor markets if the public employment program were tied to a parallel effort by private industry.

As the rate of employment falls below 4 percent of the labor force, private employers are going to encounter difficulties in filling positions on the lower rungs of the skill ladder. This squeeze on the supply side of the labor market might be eased by a cooperative arrangement under which the Government provides basic education in a public service-training program and private industry completes the task of selecting candidates for their own job-training programs.

Tight labor markets, as experience suggests, are the best antidotes to hard-core unemployment. But they are likely to intensify inflationary pressures unless steps are taken to augment the supply of basically educated labor. A program such as that suggested by Mr. Scheuer's group, coordinated with the efforts of private industry, would smooth the transition to a higher level of national employment.

AN ACTION PROGRAM FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT

(Issued January 6, 1966, by the Democratic Study Group Full Employment Steering Committee, Congressman JAMES H. SCHEUER, chairman)

Twenty years ago Congress declared "* * * that it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government * * * to create and maintain conditions which afford employment opportunities * * * for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." (Public Law 304, 79th Cong., Feb. 20, 1946, sec. 2.) This commitment to full employment and stable, noninflationary economic growth has been described by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress: "Full employment of labor and capital is a moving target; the labor force grows continuously; workers are released by laborsaving machinery and new techniques; new investment increases the capacity of farms and factories. Thus, total demand must expand rapidly just to keep from falling behind rising potential output." (Report of the Joint Economic Committee, March 1964.)

Federal policies carried out, in cooperation with "* * * industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, * * *" have been successful in avoiding a deep, prolonged postwar depression such as followed World War I and earlier conflicts. But in terms of achieving and maintaining full employment, the record is not good. In only 3 out of 20 years has unemployment averaged about 3 percent, and in only 5 out of 20 years has it been 4 percent or less. For the entire 20 years unemployment has averaged about 4.9 percent and for the last 5 years 5.6 percent. The latest figure is still slightly over 4 percent with a nonwhite male teenage unemployment rate of about 25 percent.

The Kennedy-Johnson administrations have had an interim target of 4 percent unemployment. This is a third above the 3 percent generally viewed as the acceptable long-term goal. It is far above the rates of 2 percent or less achieved during the post-World War II era in such other countries as Britain, France, Sweden, Japan, and Germany. With the interim target of 4 percent now in view, we should now begin to prepare for early achievement of an unemployment rate of 3 percent.

The setting of this 3-percent goal is no mere exercise in statistical definitions or abstract political philosophy. It is a vital necessity if we are to assure maximum efficiency in the use of our human resources—opening avenues for millions to escape poverty and overcome racial and social barriers to full participation in our society.

For our Negro citizens, disproportionately high unemployment and lack of opportunity for advancement to better paying jobs are basic reasons for their frustration and resentment. The high overall unemployment rates of recent years have also meant limited opportunities for young people seeking a start in the labor market. Their unemployment rate has been double or triple the national average, creating a dangerously discouraging atmosphere for the Nations most precious resource—its youth.

An unemployment rate of 3 percent or less continuously maintained over the years will open wide the doors of employment opportunity to Negroes. It will make it possible to hold unemployment among our youth to a minimum, providing maximum inducement for them to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to make their optimal contribution to our economy. Eliminating the hopelessness, disillusionment, and bitterness that is generated by high unemployment should do much to hold down crime rates, reduce delinquency, and direct energies in more constructive channels.

ACHIEVING FULL EMPLOYMENT

To achieve 3-percent unemployment in the next year or two we shall have to create over three-quarters of a million additional jobs and will have to produce a gross national product of over $900 billion by 1970.

In 1965, the gross national product will total about $670 billion with unemployment averaging about 4½ percent of the labor force. The Council of Economic Advisers has estimated that—at its 4-percent interim goal, now almost achieved—the economy in 1970 would produce about $895 billion of gross national product. We believe it is imperative that the Nation aim for a more defensible and healthy long-term goal of 3 percent. Even this figure would be well above that which has been achieved in a number of other industrial countries where 2 percent and below are the accepted rates of unemployment. At this level, in 1970, the economy would produce about $10–$15 billion more of GNP per year. At this level, the economy would create over 1.3 million new jobs per year to absorb the expected increase in the labor force as a result of the increasing population of working age, and at least 2 million new jobs per year to take the place of those eliminated by technological progress—a total of over 3½ million new jobs per year.[1]

If we were to average 3-percent unemployment rather than 4 percent between now and 1980 we would have to create about 1 million additional jobs; if we are to do it within the next year or two, as we should, we would have to add over three-quarters of a million additional jobs. We believe this is entirely possible and should be an immediate goal of public and private economic policies. This implies an economy which can support almost 81 million civilian jobs by 1970 and almost 96 million civilian jobs by 1980.

In setting these dimensions for the economic opportunities of a full-employment economy, we recognize that they are but informed estimates. But practical men cannot wait until 1980 to find out what their targets should be and we believe the estimates are sufficiently accurate for guiding thinking about how to achieve full employment in a year or two, and to maintain a vigorous economy. What is needed is an action program with a balanced combination of Government monetary and fiscal policies combined with improved public and private policies concerning wages, prices, and employment.

In addition, the general level of prices tends to go up about 1½ percent per year. (It appears that when wholesale prices are approximately constant, as in recent years, the average value per unit of gross national product (gross national product deflator) has risen about 1½ percent per year. The experts seem to believe that this reflects both imperfections in the measurement of quality changes in our price indexes and the treatment of Government wage increases as prices increase, though this is not the practice in regard to the private economy.) If we assume this will continue in the future as in the past, then in current prices gross national product would continue to increase at about 5½ percent per year at full employment and by 1980 would be more than double this year's output, or about $1½ trillion in 1980 dollars.

The population might reach 245 million by 1980, which means that the amount of goods and services produced would be about $6,200 per person in 1980 as compared to about $3,500 in 1965. This would mean that a 75-percent increase in the output of goods and services per capita, including the effects of continued modest price increases.

MONETARY POLICY

Monetary ease accompanied by relatively low interest rates is essential to a full-employment policy. Ready availability of credit alone cannot get us to full employment but tight money can make it impossible.

Achieving and maintaining stability in a growing economy requires that total demand of consumers, business, and Government should be equal to total output at full employment and that total demand and total supply should increase at the same rate from year to year. This is possible only if money and credit are continually available at reasonable rates of interest.

Although ready availability of funds at low interest rates will not cause business investment or expansion if demand is inadequate and profit expectations poor, more sanguine business expectations will fail to produce and maintain full employment if financial markets are tight and interest rates relatively high. Home building will be slowed if prospective purchasers find financing difficult and rates excessive. Small businesses, which are the first to be refused credit, must restrict output, employment, and new investment. State and local governments also find that financing of needed public facilities becomes more difficult or even impossible.

The financial system of the United States is so complex that it is easy to lose sight of the most important fact about monetary policy: it cannot guarantee full employment but it can either prevent it or facilitate it. Therefore, monetary policy must be coordinated with other policies if we are to respond adequately to unemployment, balance-of-payments problems and inflationary pressures.

A prime example is the recent action of the Federal Reserve Board who by raising the discount rate to 4½ percent, the highest level in 35 years, may impede our advance toward full employment and a sustained full-employment growth rate. This dramatically illustrates the need for coordination of monetary policy with fiscal policy. Therefore, we recommend that the President initiate whatever action is necessary to assure this policy coordination in order to guarantee the ready availability of credit so necessary to sustain high rates of economic growth.

FISCAL POLICY

Federal fiscal policies should contribute to achieving and maintaining full employment without inflation. Given the support of appropriate monetary policies, they can largely assure success.

The Federal Government's expenditures and tax policies affect every individual, business, and State and local government units. Only within the past 2 years have we begun to use these fiscal tools effectively to reduce unemployment. We have yet to demonstrate our willingness to use them to achieve and maintain full employment without inflation. In this case, the main task of fiscal policy is to stimulate the economy, either through expenditures or tax reduction, to grow rapidly enough to reduce existing unemployment and to absorb rising productivity and a growing labor force. This can be made more difficult by a number of considerations. A prime example is the problem of adjusting policies in the light of the possible inflationary impact of rising defense spending generated by the war in Vietnam. Another problem arises because with our progressive tax structure, as GNP grows, tax revenues grow even faster, thus tending to retard economic growth short of full employment. The first case may require reduction in non-defense spending and/or increased taxes. The second case would call for a reduction in taxes and/or increased public expenditures sufficiently large so as to stimulate growth and offset the fiscal drag. From this, it can be seen that fiscal policy involves carefully balancing Federal tax and expenditure policies. The essential question is one involving allocation of resources. Thus when stimulation is needed, fiscal policy should be based on expenditures when the social benefits from these expenditures in areas such as education, health, urban development and transportation exceed the social benefits from additional resources devoted to private expenditures.[2] The same question of priorities applies when fiscal policy is used to slow down an overheated economy.

---

[1] With the rate of technological progress remaining high, it would be a bold man indeed who concluded that we would increase our real output per worker any less rapidly in the 1970's than in recent years. This would mean that with employment rising at 1½ percent per year and output per worker at almost 3 percent per year, total real output of goods and services (real gross national product) would need to rise at least 4 percent per year during the 1970's if unemployment is to remain stable.

Tax reduction and reform are essential ingredients in a full employment program which will contribute to the elimination of poverty.

The Federal tax system is made up of a complex of levies, some falling on individual and corporate incomes, and others on specific transactions. In general, as the economy grows, the ratio of Federal revenues to the gross national product tends to rise. At the present time, the addition to Federal revenues is about $7 billion per year. Since expenditures are not necessarily related to the growth in gross national product, Federal revenues tend to rise faster than Federal expenditures leading to fiscal drag.

These features carry two implications for a full employment policy. First, the Federal tax system is the Nation's most powerful automatic stabilizer since any reduction in incomes or expenditures immediately results in a more than proportionate fall in Federal revenues. To maintain stability therefore it is important that the progressivity of the Federal tax system be maintained or increased, particularly since the State and local tax systems have very little cyclical flexibility.

Second, a Federal tax structure that provides a maximum of automatic stabilizing action will, at the same time, provide a maximum of fiscal drag if left alone for extensive periods of time. The amount by which Federal revenues increase will go up from year to year as the economy grows, creating larger and larger withdrawals of funds which may not necessarily be offset by increases in expenditures.

The Federal tax structure, therefore, can stabilize the economy at persistently high unemployment rates and, indeed, there are reasonable grounds to suspect that this is what happened in the late 1950's and early 1960's. Persistent and steady expansion of the economy toward full employment over the last several years is clearly related to the efforts of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations to reduce the drag of the Federal budget on private economic activity.

Another feature of the Federal tax system is the large number or loopholes or special exemptions and exemptions which are incorporated in the tax code and relieve certain forms of income—or portions of income—from taxation. These special features erode the tax base, resulting in higher rates on the remainder of taxable income. Serious attention should be given to correcting these inequities.

Finally, we must recognize that over the years ahead we shall have to face the problems created by the immense productivity of the Federal tax system as a generator of revenue while, at the same time, State and local governments struggle desperately to make their tax sources provide the revenue for skyrocketing social needs, especially in our growing metropolitan areas. Some way must be found to use the broad, general, nationally applicable Federal tax system as a means of solving some of the mounting problems of State and local governments.

We urge that our colleagues in deciding the form this program should take will assure that it meets at least the minimum criteria of diverting a portion of the increased revenues to aid the State and local governments in financing the public facilities and services—a task which they are finding increasingly difficult to do in an equitable manner.

PROVIDING A MINIMUM INCOME

The time has come when we must begin to provide a minimum income for everyone.

Although we cannot hope to return to the early American frontier society of individual independent family farmers, we can re-create in our modern industrial urban environment the economic conditions for that cherished independence and individualism. We can assure everyone an adequate minimum income.

Indeed, we now provide this after a fashion in a variety of programs that are too often subject to the indignities of a means test. Too often, it is also the case that these programs, hampered by inadequate funds and staff, perpetuate dependency and poverty rather than provide the means and motivation to break the cycle.

This goal could be implemented in two ways. First a floor could be provided through a negative tax on income. A scheme which could make an important contribution to the assurance of a living income can easily be devised. Second, our social insurance programs (OASDI, unemployment insurance, workman's compensation, etc.) could be improved and geared to provide a floor under individual and family incomes.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE DECISIONS

Decisions on government expenditures should take into consideration their consequences for stability and growth in our economy and their contribution to the elimination of poverty and the realization of opportunity for all.

Public expenditures—Federal, State, and local—must meet the test first of all that they provide services which individuals and private organizations cannot provide, or cannot provide efficiently and reliably. In addition, it is a first principle of sound programing of public expenditures that they should be as stable, predictable, and as closely geared to long-term needs as is feasible. Attempts to turn government expenditures on and off for purposes of stabilizing the economy inevitably run up against the hard fact that public spending is slow to start up and difficult to stop suddenly, unless we wish to build excessive waste into public budgets.

It is further characteristic of public expenditures that there must be continuing concern for the achievement of an appropriate balance between Federal responsibility for essential public services and the coordinate responsibility on the part of State and local units of government. Considerations both of economy and flexibility in adapting to differing local requirements call for decisionmaking at that level of government consistent with the character of the specified program. Thus, it is clear that national defense and the space program must be tasks of the Federal Government, while it is equally clear that such functions as police and fire protection are local matters. However, there are a number of important areas where there are strong arguments for coordinated actions by all levels of government. Familiar fields are education, health and welfare, conservation, housing, urban renewal, mass transit, and even encouragement of the arts and humanities.

If public expenditure programs are guided by considerations of long-term needs, then the Government programs at all levels will make a maximum contribution to economic stability. Undoubtedly, we will not be able to make every conceivable expenditure that might be in the public interest. There are limits to our resources, large as they are. But in an economy in which per capita gross national product is growing by 2½ percent per year in real terms, and is rapidly approaching a trillion dollars per year, we should certainly be able to afford sufficient public expenditures to meet many of these needs, providing a richer, and more interesting life to all and a minimum level of decency and comfort for every American.

ANTI-INFLATION POLICIES

We must maintain a stable general level of prices if our programs for a full employment economy are to succeed in the long run.

Inflation is not a pressing danger when there is substantial unemployment of labor, broad scale idle capacity in industry, and severe competition for customers and jobs. It is only when economic policy is successful enough to generate full employment of labor and capital that inflation offers any serious problem.[3]

Inflation encourages inefficiency in the allocation of resources; it leads to instability, recession, and unemployment; it contributes to balance-of-payments difficulties; and it jeopardizes the success of programs for income maintenance. It generally hits hardest those families and individuals who can least afford to bear its burdens.

Clearly, an appropriate balance between monetary and fiscal policies is the first prerequisite to an anti-inflation program.

Thus, to the extent that the war in Vietnam or other international developments require an increased proportion of our national resources, fiscal and monetary policies should be readjusted to insure that this does not produce inflation. In the process any curtailing of public programs or of private spending should be concentrated where they will reduce the competition for scarce labor, materials, and industrial capacity. At the same time, we must continue the drive against poverty by programs carefully designed to provide jobs for those whom the normal labor market processes leave without work opportunities.

Over and beyond government monetary and fiscal policies, it is necessary that business and labor cooperate in generating wages and prices that are consistent with a noninflationary, full employment economy. We believe that if labor and industry and government officials all understand the requirements of such a policy, they will find ways to operate a flexible and, at the same time, noninflationary system of price and wage adjustments without need for direct wage and price controls.

---

[2] This does not mean the relevant choice is between all public or all private expenditures. When public expenditures are used, the initial increase in output occurs in the public sector, but succeeding increases occur in the private sector. The real choice is, therefore, between whether the initial round of expenditures should occur in the private or public sector.

[3] In this country we are a good deal more sensitive to inflation than are other industrialized nations, including Japan and our West European allies. Over the past decade, our record of price stability has been unmatched by any of these nations. On the other hand, these countries are a good deal more sensitive to unemployment as shown by their unwillingness to accept unemployment above 2 percent.

The Council of Economic Advisers wage-price guidelines are a start in this direction and they have received Presidential endorsement as well as widespread congressional and public support. We should strengthen the existing wage-price guidelines activities of the President and his Council and should also investigate the possibilities for establishing procedures for making such judgments which allow the public, including industry and labor, to participate in their development. The possibility of regular congressional review of the guidelines and responses to them also merits analysis and consideration. Public hearings, giving the various interests a platform, might be another way to provide an atmosphere conducive to responsible decisionmaking.

In addition, it is necessary to preserve the benefits of free competition by vigorous governmental action, particularly antitrust action. Our living standards reflect our success in using free competition, decentralized, economic power, and marketplace allocation of goods and services. These have stimulated efficient production, technological progress, managerial innovations, and provided greater consumer choice than any other economic system known to man. Therefore, we urge the most vigorous efforts possible on the part of regulatory agencies to curb unfair business practices and to preserve the benefits of free competition.

EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATION, TRAINING: A WAY OUT OF POVERTY

Employment at a living wage plus basic education and training are needed by most of those now living in poverty. Full participation in American life and escape from poverty, discrimination and ghetto living require opportunities for jobs, education, and training far beyond those now being provided.

Poverty is not a homogeneous product, and the War on Poverty must use many weapons. In combating poverty, lasting benefits will come only from programs which enable the poor to take and keep themselves out of poverty. Any program which does not have this as a goal would require a continuation of the present and apparently unending flow of benefits to the same families, generation after generation.

For those for whom self-support is not possible, a comprehensive attack on poverty must be supported by other appropriate income-maintenance measures.

However, the primary emphasis in the comprehensive attack on poverty must be on programs designed to facilitate the escape from poverty by way of education, training, and employment. Progress will be facilitated in an economy where aggregate demand is adequate to provide a full employment environment. Changes in the level of demand have significant impact on the effectiveness of various components of the program. Thus, programs now underway to provide the basic and vocational skills required for successful entry into the labor market can only be effective if there are job openings. Since one of the primary goals has been to change hopelessness and despair into confidence and determination, if there are no jobs for those who have qualified themselves the programs may have negative effects. Our dynamic economy has never, even in the depression, been without job openings, and the notion of filling all of them is as absurd as the idea of eliminating all, even frictional, unemployment. Thus, even if the economy stimulated by an expanded war effort in Vietnam should produce 3-percent unemployment less than 10 percent of those families now in poverty would be lifted above the poverty line and the level of unemployment among Negroes would be unacceptably high. Thus it is clear that there will not be jobs for the people we are trying to help unless positive steps are taken.

In our economy, more than 14 million people experience unemployment every year. This year, 500,000 were unemployed for over 15 weeks, and about 300,000 for over 26 weeks. Perhaps the most discouraging fact is that 2 million family heads who worked full time do not earn enough to live above the poverty line. In addition, it is estimated that about 2 million poor people have given up looking for jobs and are not counted as unemployed in the statistics, though they could, if given the chance, be productive members of society.

Table I estimates the changes occurring in the poverty status of families and unrelated individuals as national unemployment decreases from the March 1964 rate of 5.4 percent to 3 percent. As can be seen the effects are impressive—over 2 million people would be released from the shackles of poverty.

However, even at this rate of unemployment there will remain many among the poor who lack the opportunity to assume a productive place in society. While this so-called hard core could be reduced by further increases in total demand through tax reduction or general expenditure increase the resultant inflationary pressures would be greater than we are able to assume. In these circumstances, creation of special programs to provide opportunities for about 1 million would be most effective particularly if in the process basic education and training are provided. Such an effort could, if necessary, be increased for as table II shows the potential for such jobs in our economy is very great. Such efforts would reduce unemployment while minimizing the risk of inflation. As a byproduct, we would have a more skilled and productive labor force. This is critical now, when rising demands of the Vietnam war threaten to create inflationary pressures and a tight labor market.

Therefore, we propose a public employment-training program stressing subprofessional and aid-type employment and training for jobs which serve the public interest.

TABLE I.—*Changes in poverty population with fall in national unemployment rates*

	Number of people in poverty in March 1964 at 5.4 percent unemployment rate	Estimated number of people moving out of poverty when unemployment rate falls from 5.4 to 4.5 percent	Estimated number of people moving out of poverty when unemployment rate falls from 5.4 to 3 percent
Members of male-headed families	22,100,000	[1] 612,000	1,600,000
Members of female-headed families	7,600,000	160,000	520,000
Unrelated individuals (females)	3,500,000	47,000	140,000
Unrelated individuals (males)	1,400,000	34,000	110,000
Total	34,600,000	853,000	2,350,000

[1] Including heads and children.

TABLE II.—*Potential for public jobs*

	Potential employment [1] *(in thousands)*
Great Society goals:	
Health	1,200
Education (including libraries)	2,000
Beautification and recreation	1,000
Urban improvement and development (including transportation)	600
Welfare and other public services (including control and prevention of crime and delinquency)	300
Total	5,100

[1] These figures are estimates and are used to illustrate orders of magnitude.

Such a public employment-training program could satisfy a coincidence of needs in our economy. The need for jobs for the poor, the need for better prepared workers, and the need for public services for the Nation are equally important and compelling justifications for this program. A program to expand the opportunities for useful jobs would (1) give many of the unemployed poor a chance to lift themselves out of poverty by work and training which better prepare them while providing satisfaction and adequate wages and (2) at the same time, provide services in areas where resources have not been developed or allocated to meet long recognized public needs.

The program would not have to create either the needs or the labor resources; they already exist. It would bring into the active labor market those who otherwise would be doomed to live out their lives outside of the economy. It would do this by providing Federal financial support for wages. The public has been crying for improved services in the fields of health, education, urban improvement, beautification, etc.

Under such a program, subprofessional jobs created in medical institutions could provide needed assistance to doctors and nurses. These jobs could include nurses' aids, physical therapy aids, dietitians' aids, and orderlies. It would also be possible to provide better nursing homes and care for the aged by training aids for the nurses and therapists for home visitation services.

In the schools, there are needs for teacher-aids, as well as for recreation and playground aids. Added personnel would enable us to open schools, libraries, museums, art galleries, and playgrounds on evenings and weekends and during summers.

Additional subprofessional help can improve the beauty of our Nation by working in highway maintenance and gardening, waterfront cleanup, groundskeeping, park construction and maintenance, slum cleanup, and minor repair of public buildings. Urban life could be further improved by the work of aids to building inspectors, public health officials, sanitation officials, air and water pollution control personnel.

Outreach service provided by aids could help our welfare and social service agencies to reach those whom we have failed in the past. Homemakers and other home helpers could mean needed services for the chronically ill and large families. The control and prevention of crime and delinquency could benefit from the insights and assistance provided by police and probation aids.

These are but a few examples; once the program is in operation private and public organizations will develop additional jobs of this type.

The ideal would be to furnish a job with basic education and training which could open opportunities in the public service for the poor. Ultimately, acquisition of education, work discipline and work experience will enable many to acquire upward mobility and make the shift into private employment.

The structure of the program should be one of direct employment by public and nonprofit private institutions receiving Federal reimbursement for the wages, supervision, and training expenses. A cash contribution (perhaps 10 percent) by the employing institution would insure that the new employees were performing useful and constructive function. There would need to be a maintenance effort provision to insure that the program was not used to avoid increases to meet normal increases in loads.

The public employees will be trained on the job by the institutions which hire them. This approach to training for subprofessional jobs is current practice. In some cases, more extensive vocational training may be necessary before the employee starts working on the job, and it is expected that this would be provided for by the hiring institution, or by Government-sponsored programs.

Success in breaking the poverty cycle will gradually reduce the number who cannot move up the vocational ladder for one reason or another. Hence, eventually the program should produce its own demise, out of its very success in reducing poverty.

A public employment-training program would have a number of spillover effects.

The program by increasing the demand for this type of labor would tend to reinforce existing statutory minimum wages. Since wages would be at the low end of the wage scale, there would be an incentive for workers to move into private sector employment. Further, the program could acquaint the employer with the advantages of nondiscriminatory hiring of persons willing to work and eager to acquire new skills. The program would not require the initiation of a large amount of supportive services but would draw upon already existing programs.

The program represents an investment in individuals who through experience have been convinced that little is expected of them and who fulfill this prophecy.

The philosophy of the program is simple: (1) The work to be performed is both useful and needed and (2) there is, among the poor, a tremendous reservoir of latent potential which can and must be tapped—for as a nation we cannot afford to forgo the fruits of their labor. In a real sense, we can draw an analogy between many of these individuals and our returning GI's after World War II. Just as the latter had been deprived of 2, 3, or 4 years of education and training at a vital juncture in their lives, the former have been deprived of the opportunity to enter the mainstream of American life. As the GI bill was, in large measure, an answer in the first instance; a well-balanced program of useful work, basic education, and training can be expected to assist the vast majority of the poor in finding a new sense of personal dignity and worth by making a substantial contribution to themselves and their society.

President Asks U.S. Part in Asian Development Bank as Another Constructive Effort Toward Lasting World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is highly significant that President Johnson chose to make his first special message to this session of Congress a request for approval of U.S. participation in the newly created Asian Development Bank.

It is significant in my opinion because it indicates the top priority that the President places on the search for peace, and his desire to demonstrate again that the United States would much rather spend money and exert our energies on peaceful economic development than on the requirements of military defense.

Californians, both for historic and geographic reasons, fully understand and appreciate the President's desire that America play an important leadership role in promoting the cause of international cooperation and in building the foundations for peace among the nations of the world.

Located as we are on the shore of the great Pacific Ocean, and with many of our citizens having close family ties with the people of other Pacific nations, we Californians have an immediate and personal interest in establishing good, constructive relations with our neighbors in the Pacific community and in doing our full part to promote their best interests.

But all Americans can agree with President Johnson when he spoke of his "urgent belief that the works of peace in Asia—the building of roads, dams, harbors, powerplants, and all the other public and private facilities essential to a modern economy—are vital to peace in the entire world."

And certainly no one would challenge the truth of the President's statement that—

> An Asia torn by conflict, depressed by hunger, disease, and illiteracy, deprived of the means and the institutions that alone can offer hope to her people, must ever be a source of turmoil and anxiety for nations beyond her borders, as well as those within.

But Congress, by acting promptly to approve our active participation in the Asian Development Bank, can help express "the will of Asia to develop her manifold human and natural resources, and thereby to lift the burden of poverty that has been the lot of her people since ancient times."

In his eloquent message, President Johnson described the Bank as "an avenue of good will and sound policy for the United States." He continued:

> For our destination is a world where the instinct for oppression has been vanquished in the heart of man. Given the means to work, to build, to teach, to heal, to nourish his family, man may yet achieve such a world—if not in our time, then in the generations that will succeed us on this planet.

Recalling his speech last April in Baltimore, the President spoke again of our dream of a world "where all are fed and charged with hope," and he repeated his promise that "we will help to make it so."

In urging the Congress to adopt his proposal, Mr. Johnson declared:

> Our partnership in the Asian Bank is a step in keeping that pledge. It brings us nearer that day when our resources—and the world's—can be devoted to the constructive works of peace, not the destructive forces of war.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the House and Senate act without delay to endorse American participation in this new self-help development effort—this unique adventure in international cooperation.

Sixty-five percent of the Bank's $1 billion capital is to be put up by 19 Asian countries, and the rest by the United States, Canada, Belguim, Denmark, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Britain.

The $200 million U.S. share is equal to that of Japan—the other largest single contributor.

In my opinion, the establishment of this Bank is an important step, because it will help create a nucleus around which Asian cooperation can grow. And it will follow in the successful footsteps of the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the recently formed African Development Bank.

We must not fail to take advantage of this golden opportunity to unite our resources with the people of Asia in a common effort to achieve those goals which are the dream of all mankind.

Because of its importance, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of President Johnson's special message to Congress on behalf of U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank.

The message follows:

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 361)

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend that the Congress promptly approve U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank.

This new institution expresses the will of Asia to develop her manifold human and natural resources, and thereby to lift the burden of poverty that has been the lot of her people since ancient times.

Conceived and sponsored by Asians, the Bank is open to all countries in that region, regardless of ideology, who are members of the United Nations or its specialized agencies. Of its $1 billion authorized capital, 65 percent is to be subscribed by nations in the Asian area.

U.S. representatives—led by Mr. Eugene Black and a distinguished congressional delegation—signed the Charter of the Asian Development Bank at Manila last December 4. But only the Congress itself can authorize the final acceptance of U.S. membership.

That is the action I request today.

I

I take this step because of my urgent belief that the works of peace in Asia—the building of roads, dams, harbors, powerplants, and all the other public and private facilities essential to a modern economy—are vital to peace in the entire world.

An Asia torn by conflict, depressed by hunger, disease, and illiteracy, deprived of the means and the institutions that alone can offer hope to her people, must ever be a source of turmoil and anxiety for nations beyond her borders, as well as those within. Because this is so—and because we have recognized our moral obligation to our brothers on this earth—the United States has committed itself over a decade and a half to major assistance programs in Asia, making food, development loans, and technical assistance available to those who required our aid.

We have sought no American empire. Our purpose has never been to exploit, but to encourage; not to master, but to magnify the works of those who truly served the Asian people.

Now the Asians themselves have formed an institution by whose hand new works of peace may be accomplished. They have committed precious resources to that institution. They are determined to join in a cooperative endeavor, uniting the talents and resources of diverse cultures in pursuit of a common vision of progress.

They have asked us to join with them—to subscribe 20 percent of the institution's total capital—and thus to help make that vision a reality.

I recommend that we respond quickly and affirmatively.

II

This proposal is neither utopian nor vague. It is the product of careful deliberation by the foremost experts in international finance. It rests solidly on the lessons learned in building the World Bank, and other organs of international finance, into the powerful forces for good they are today. It will take its place among regional financial institutions alongside the Inter-American Development Bank and the newly formed African Development Bank.

Loan terms will be similar to those offered by the World Bank. Project justifications will be as rigorous as prudent management requires. Special efforts will be made to develop and finance projects involving more than one country so that the Bank may be an agent of unity as well as development.

The Bank will reinforce existing aid programs in Asia, and thereby multiply their effectiveness. It will link its resources—financial and human—to such institutions as the Mekong Coordinating Committee, already joining the countries of the Mekong River Basin in major water resource projects.

Its charter permits it to administer special development funds, contributed by either member or nonmember countries. Thus it will serve as a channel for funds beyond its own resources.

These advantages are developed further in the Special Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the Asian Development Bank which accompanies this message.

III

The largest share of the Bank's subscriptions will be provided by Asians themselves.

The United States has been asked to pledge $200 million, equally divided between paid-in and callable shares. The paid-in shares are payable in five equal annual installments of $20 million each, half of which will be in cash, half in the form of a letter of credit.

The callable shares will constitute a guarantee for borrowings by the Bank in private capital markets. They would be drawn on only in the unlikely event that the Bank were unable to meet its commitments.

Our pledge is equaled by that of Japan. India has pledged $93 million; Australia another $85 million. More than $100 million has already been pledged by European countries and Canada, and further pledges may be made.

Joint action with these major subscribers provides another instrument of cooperation between the donors of aid. That is a long-sought goal of the United States, for it offers the most efficient use of all the free world's aid resources.

Finally, our commitment to the Asian Bank should have little negative effect on our balance of payments. Procurement financed through the Bank's regular capital will normally be limited to member countries. Purchases of U.S. goods and services will approximately offset the dollar outflow occasioned by our $10 million annual cash subscription.

IV

The Asian Development Bank is a necessity—not a luxury.

It was needed yesterday. It is needed even more today. Tomorrow, when the demands of Asia's millions on her struggling economies are more pressing still, it can mean the difference between opportunity and chaos.

It is practical and imaginative. It is the product of Asian initiative, and it offers the nucleus around which Asians can make a cooperative response to the most critical economic problems—national and regional.

Because it is all these things, it is also an avenue of good will and sound policy for the United States. For our destination is a world where the instinct for oppression has been vanquished in the heart of man. Given the means to work, to build, to teach, to heal, to nourish his family, man may yet achieve such a world—if not in our time, then in the generations that will succeed us on this planet. I believe the Asian Development Bank is an essential tool in providing the means of life for hundreds of millions of human beings who live between the Caspian Sea and the South Pacific.

It will become a reality when 15 signatories, 10 of them Asian, have ratified the charter. It appears now that this will be achieved by early spring. Our own constructive influence in the organization and management of the Bank will be increased if we can become active at its very beginning.

Last April in Baltimore I spoke of our dream of a world "where all are fed and charged with hope." I promised that "we will help to make it so." Our partnership in the Asian Bank is a step in keeping that pledge. It brings us nearer that day when our resources—and the world's—can be devoted to the constructive works of peace, not the destructive forces of war.

I urge the Congress to adopt the Asian Development Bank Act. Asia's future—and the world's—requires it.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1966.*

Cooley Introduces War on Hunger Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 12152, a bill establishing the legal basis and authority for a world war on hunger. This is a kind of war in which all Americans and millions of people around the world may join in common purpose. In view of the hope this legislation holds for hungry millions, and its direct relationship to the cause of peace, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with the consent of the House, a press statement I issued upon introducing the bill describing its provisions and its purpose. The statement follows:

COOLEY INTRODUCES WORLD WAR ON HUNGER BILL

Legislation opening the way for a world war on hunger, through extension and expansion of America's food-for-peace program, was introduced in the House today by Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

The Cooley bill (H.R. 12152) would authorize:

1. Deliberate use of the great agricultural production potential of the United States to help relieve hunger and malnutrition throughout the free world. Such relief no longer would be limited only to the distribution of U.S. surplus food and fiber.

2. Deliberate employment of the agricultural commodities exported under this program to assist and encourage other countries in solving their own food problems.

The legislation would authorize an increase of $1 billion a year over the next 5 years, including 1966, in the movement of food and fiber abroad under Public Law 480, the Food-for-Peace Act.

Under Public Law 480 the United States has been exporting about $1.6 billion a year of agricultural commodities, but such shipments have been limited to those commodities which were officially declared to be surplus under domestic farm programs designed to reduce the production of various crops.

"In the legislation I am offering," Mr. COOLEY said, "in order to undertake a world war on hunger, we would not limit our exports for foreign currencies under Public Law 480, or our donations to relieve immediate famine and other emergency, to surpluses. We would make available under these authorities any agricultural commodity which we have in adequate supply and which is needed in the recipient countries—and if necessary our farmers will be asked to produce these commodities deliberately for such export purposes.

"In order to make this changed emphasis possible, the basic provision of my bill is to strike out of Public Law 480 the word 'surplus,' in connection with agricultural commodities, whenever it occurs. This will make it possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to program for concessional sale or for donation, where necessary, any agricultural commodity grown in the United States, whether it is technically in surplus or not, and to adjust production of that commodity so as to provide an adequate supply for all purposes."

Public Law 480, which expires this year unless renewed, provides for sale of U.S. surplus food and fiber for the local currencies of the recipient countries, where such sale does not interfere with established world commerce or normal trade in such commodities. It provides also for sale of such commodities for dollars under long-term contracts, for barter, and for donations to relieve famine and other emergency.

"The objectives I propose in a world war on hunger," Mr. COOLEY said, "do not require a new law nor a new agency. They require only a change in emphasis under the existing law, Public Law 480, and increased activity on the part of agencies and programs already in operation.

"I am immensely pleased and encouraged that the President, in his state of the Union message to the Congress on January 12, so eloquently stated these objectives I have proposed, in these words:

" 'This year I propose major new directions in our program of foreign assistance to help those countries who will help themselves. We will conduct a worldwide attack on the problems of hunger and disease and ignorance. We will place the matchless skill and the resources of our own great America in farming and in fertilizers at the service of those countries committed to develop a modern agriculture.' "

Mr. COOLEY declared:

"Our humanitarian instincts, the world population explosion, and the cause of peace, demand imaginative, sound and positive action at this time. The bill I have introduced today will be the vehicle for public hearings before the House Committee on Agriculture, exploring the whole area of food policy, as it relates to (1) human hunger and starvation now prevalent around the world, (2) to the worsening outlook inherent in the world population explosion, and (3) to the opportunities for improving the agricultural output of those nations where human needs are most acute.

"I expect the President at an early date to elaborate upon his state of the Union message, by sending to the Congress specific recommendations on world food and fiber policy. The President's suggestions, when they arrive, will be given first priority in the considerations by our committee.

"I personally am convinced that our world superiority in the production of food and fiber can be used to encourage great masses of humanity into peaceful pursuits, moving them toward self reliance and self sufficiency in the production of food and fiber. This should strengthen the bonds of friendship among free nations. Moreover, as I have said on many occasions, I am convinced that in the end bread will be more important than bullets in bringing peace to the world."

Mr. COOLEY said the new emphasis upon world food and fiber policy he envisions through the bill introduced today not only would aid the recipients of our food and fiber but also would be beneficial to the economy and well-being of the people of the United States.

"I am not proposing," he said, "that we remove forthwith the restraints upon farm production now operating through voluntary farm programs. If we did this, we might again find ourselves buried in surpluses. Neither do I suppose that the United States can feed everyone who is hungry around the world. But our farmers have mastered the arts of abundance and they can produce food and fiber, beyond our own needs, that can build the physical strength and morale of the populations in many countries where these people work in the direction of self-sufficiency in agriculture.

"The United States would expect to receive as great a return from its augmented exports of agricultural commodities as is reasonable and possible under the circumstances of each particular country.

"Food would be donated, where necessary. If the country could pay for all or part of our exports in its local currency, it would be expected to do so. When its economy reached a level where it could pay in long-term dollar credits this would take the place of all or part of the local currency payments. From that it is to be hoped the country would develop into a commercial importer, as many of the countries which have received help under Public Law 480 have done.

"I expect this new emphasis I propose in the bill I have introduced to bring ultimately a substantial expansion of the production of America's farms, lessening the need for programs to repress production. Our farmers would be the key to the whole program I envision. I would hope that this new program would keep millions of acres in production and employ on our farms many thousands of people who would be dislocated and crowded into our cities if we proceed with further restrictions upon agricultural output.

"I can see that this new emphasis will develop for the United States broad commercial markets around the world for our food and fiber in the years ahead. Moreover, it has been demonstrated that those countries which have developed their agriculture to the highest degree are the best customers abroad of U.S. agriculture and industry."

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, surrounded by the symbols of the power and the glory of our beloved country, we remember before Thee the disorder and distress of so many in Thy human family.

We lift hands of prayer for our tortured world. The creation which Thou didst call good is marred by man's inhumanity to man. The blood of brother slain by brother cries unto Thee from the ground. And Thy rebuke troubles the conscience of sensitive souls throughout the earth.

In this day of balanced terror and unbalanced judgment, be Thou our stay; steady our minds, strengthen our wills. Restrain those who loose wild tongues that have not Thee in awe. Make strong the hands of those who seek peace and pursue it.

Make us, we pray, conscientious projectors, driven by an awakened conscience to support those many noble projects already underway for the peace of the world. Sustain, O Lord, those many leaders among us who pray and labor for the good of their fellow men; and bring in that kingdom without frontiers of which Thy prophets have dreamed across the long generations. In His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 19, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on January 19, 1966, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 125) extending the date for transmission of the Economic Report.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 364)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1816 Thomas Jefferson wrote:

> Some men ascribe to the men of a preceding age a wisdom more than human, and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment * * * I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions * * * But I know also, that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind.

I believe that in the interest of progress and sound modern government—and to nourish and strengthen our creative Federal system—we must amend our Constitution, to provide a 4-year term of office for Members of the House of Representatives.

I believe that for the same reasons we must also eliminate those defects in the electoral college system which make possible the frustration of the people's will in the election of their President and Vice President.

FOUR-YEAR TERM FOR HOUSE MEMBERS

I

Debate over the length of the House term is not new. It began in the Constitutional Convention, where those who thought annual elections were essential to freedom clashed with others, such as Madison, who held that 3 years were required "in a government so extensive, for members to form any knowledge of the various interests of the States to which they did not belong," and that without such knowledge "their trust could not be usefully discharged." Madison's thoughts are ruefully familiar to Members of the House today: he was certain that a 1-year term would be "almost consumed in preparing for and traveling to and from the seat of national business," and that even with a 2-year term none of the Representatives "who wished to be reelected would remain at the seat of government."

Between the advocates of a 1-year term—those who, bearing in mind recent English experience, feared the despotism of a government unchecked by the popular will—and those who saw a tenure of 3 years as necessary for wise administration, a compromise of 2 years was reached.

Thus there was little magic in the number 2, even in the year of its adoption. I am convinced there is even less magic today, and that the question of tenure should be reexamined in the light of our needs in the 20th century.

II

The authors of the Federalist Papers said about the House of Representatives:

> As it is essential to liberty that the Government in general should have a common interest with the people; so it is particularly essential that the branch of it under consideration should have an immediate dependence on, and an intimate sympathy with the people. Frequent elections are unquestionably the only policy by which this dependency and sympathy can be effectually secured. But what particular degree of frequency may be absolutely necessary for the purpose, does not appear to be susceptible of any precise calculation; and must depend on a variety of circumstances with which it may be connected.

The circumstances with which the 2-year term is presently connected are—

The accelerating volume of legislation on which Members are required to pass. In the first Congress, 142 bills were introduced, resulting in 108 public laws. In the 88th Congress, 15,299 bills were introduced, of which 666 were enacted into public law.

The increasingly complex problems that generate this flood of legislation, requiring Members to be familiar with an immense range of fact and opinion. It is no longer sufficient to develop solutions for an agricultural nation with few foreign responsibilities; now a man or woman chosen to represent his people in the House of Representatives must understand the consequences of our spiralling population growth, of urbanization, of the new scientific revolution, of our welfare and education requirements, and of our responsibilities as the world's most powerful democracy.

Longer sessions of Congress, made necessary by the burden of legislation and outstanding public issues. In less turbulent times, Members of Congress might conduct the public business with dispatch during election years, and spend the summer and autumn campaigning in their districts. Congress adjourned in April of 1904, June of 1906, May of 1908, and June of 1910. But increasing workloads have substantially extended the sessions. Thus it was in August of 1958 that Congress concluded its work, in September of 1960, October of 1962, and again in October of 1964. The competitive pressures imposed by the 2-year term, when the incumbent must remain in Washington into the fall to attend the public business, reduce his capacity to do either task—campaigning or legislating—with the complete attention his conscience and the public interest demand.

The increasing cost of campaigning that biennially impose heavy burdens on those who represent vigorously contested districts, and that magnify the influence of large contributors, pressure groups, and special interest lobbyists.

It may be said that every elected official confronts similar circumstances in the 1960's. Yet it can be said of none that his power for the public good or ill is both so great as the Congressman's, and so sharply pressed in time.

For this public servant—part judge and author of laws, part leader of his people, part mediator between the executive branch and those he represents—is scarcely permitted to take his seat in the historic Hall of the House, when he must begin once more to make his case to his constituency.

The Congressman's effectiveness as a legislator is reduced by this.

His district's right to be fully represented in Congress is diminished by this.

The Nation's need to be led by its best qualified men, giving their full attention to issues on which our security and progress depend, is ignored by this.

In the States, in private business, and indeed, in the Federal Government itself, the wisdom of longer terms for senior officials has come steadily to be recognized. State after State has adopted a 4-year gubernatorial term.

This administration has made every effort to extend ambassadorial tours of duty, to promote career civil servants to posts of higher responsibilities, and to retain Cabinet and sub-Cabinet officers on the job for longer periods than before. For we have learned that brief and uncertain periods in office contribute—not to the best interests of democracy—but to harassed inefficiency and the loss of invaluable experience.

III

Thus I recommend that the Congress adopt this amendment to the Constitution in the belief that it will—

Provide for each Member a sufficient period in which he can bring his best judgment to bear on the great questions of national survival, economic growth, and social welfare.

Free him from the inexorable pressures of biennial campaigning for reelection.

Reduce the cost—financial and political—of holding congressional office.

Attract the best men in private and public life into competition for this high public office.

I am mindful of the principal reason advanced for maintaining the 2-year term—that it is necessary if the voice of the people is to be heard, and changes in public opinion are to be registered on the conduct of public policy. My own experience in almost three decades in public office—and, I believe, the experience of Members of Congress today—is otherwise.

For we do not live in a day when news of congressional action requires weeks to reach our constituents, nor when public opinion is obscured by time and distance. Communications media rush the news to every home and shop within minutes of its occurrence. Public opinion polls, and mountains of mail, leave little doubt about what our people think of the issues most vital to them. I do not fear deafness on the part of those who will take their seats in Congress for a 4-year term.

It is also vital to recognize the effect of a longer term on the authority of the House in making known the will of the people. Established in office for 4 years, the weight of the House in the councils of government is certain to increase. For the sake of democracy, that is a development devoutly to be welcomed.

IV

I recommend that the amendment become effective no earlier than 1972.

It is imperative that each Member of the House have the opportunity of campaigning during a presidential election year. To divide the House into two classes, as some have proposed—one elected during the off year, one with the President—would create an unnecessary and wholly unfair division in that body. It would also create severe problems in every State: as reapportionment is ordered and redistricting takes place.

Off year elections are notorious for attracting far fewer voters—perhaps as much as 15 percent fewer—than presidential elections.

If our purpose is to serve the democratic ideal by making the people's House more effective in its performance of the people's business, then we must require that its Members be chosen by the largest electorate our democracy can produce. That, assuredly, is the electorate called into being during a presidential year.

I do not believe the Congress will wish to make the House the least representative of our three elective elements by perpetually condemning half its membership to a shrunken electorate. Such a body could not long sustain its claim to be an equal partner in the work of representative government.

V

If this amendment is to serve the public interest—if Members are to be free of campaigning for a period sufficiently long to enable them to master the work of the House—it is right that they should remain at that work during the entire term to which they are elected.

It would defeat the purpose of the amendment if a Member were free to campaign for the Senate without resigning his seat in the House. Because we seek to strengthen the House, and through it, representative government—not to provide a sanctuary and platform for further electoral contests—I recommend that no Member of either House be eligible for election as a Member of the other House until his own term has expired, unless, at least 30 days prior to that election, he submits his resignation from the office he holds.

VI

Our democracy cannot remain static, a prisoner to the past, if it is to enrich the lives of coming generations. Laws and institutions—to paraphrase Jefferson—must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind, and must respond to the changing conditions of life itself.

One law that should be changed limits the term of office for one of the great arms of our Government to a period too brief for the public good.

Let us no longer bind ourselves to it. Let us reform it. We shall better serve our people when we do.

Because I profoundly agree with former President Eisenhower, when he said, "Congressmen ought to be elected for 4 years, at the same time with the President," I urge the Congress promptly to consider a constitutional amendment extending the term of office for the House of Representatives to 4 years.

REFORM OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

In my special message to the Congress last January, I urged an amendment to the Constitution to reform the electoral college system. I renew this recommendation and strongly reaffirm the need to reform the electoral college system.

There are several major defects in the existing system. They should be eliminated in order to assure that the people's will shall not be frustrated in the choice of their President and Vice President.

First, there presently exists the possibility that the constitutional independence of unpledged electors will be exploited, and that their votes will be manipulated in a close presidential race to block the election of a major candidate in order to throw the election into the House of Representatives. This grave risk should be removed.

Second, if the election is thrown into the House of Representatives, the existing system suffers from other fundamental defects. In such an election, the House of Representatives would be empowered to elect a President from the three highest candidates. However, each State casts only one vote, with the result that the least populous States have the same vote in the election of the President as the most populous States.

As early as 1823, Madison reached the conclusion that—

> The present rule of voting for President by the House of Representatives is so great a departure from the republican principle of numerical equality, and even from the Federal rule, which qualifies the numerical by a State equality, and is so pregnant also, with a mischievous tendency in practice, that an amendment to the Constitution on this point is justly called for by all its considerate and best friends.

I firmly believe that we should put an end to this undemocratic procedure.

Third, if the electoral vote is indecisive under the existing system, the President is elected by the House of Representatives, but the Vice President is elected by the Senate. This creates the possibility of the election of a President and a Vice President from different parties. That possibility should not exist. To prevent its realization, the President and the Vice President should both be elected by the same body.

Fourth, the 23d amendment makes no provision for participation by the District of Columbia in an election of the President by the House of Representatives, or of the Vice President by the Senate.

I firmly believe that we should extend to the District of Columbia all the rights of participation in the election of a President and Vice President which the 50 States may exercise.

Fifth, existing law fails to provide for the death of the President-elect or Vice-President-elect between election day and the counting of the electoral votes in December. There is also no provision in the Constitution to cover the contingency presented by the death of a candidate for President or Vice President shortly before the popular election in November. These gaps should now be filled.

Elimination of these defects in our Constitution is long overdue. Our concepts of self-government and sound government require it.

Congress can now, in the words of Daniel Webster, "perform something worthy to be remembered," by uprooting the more objectionable features in the system of electing a President and Vice President, and thereby helping to preserve representative government and the two-party system.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 20, 1966*.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 767) authorizing the President to proclaim National Ski Week, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. PROXMIRE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

James S. Duesenberry, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Gorham, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul Kaplowitz, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1967.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GORE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 7723. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods; (Rept. No. 949).

By Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H.R. 7813. An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries; (Rept. No. 950).

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 190) to study administrative practice and procedure, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 190

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practices and procedures within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, investigatory, law enforcement, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee and; (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report is findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $175,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 191) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 191

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of unlawful restraints and monopolies, and of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—

(1) clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws; and

(3) supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $561,700.00 shall be paid from the contingent fund for the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO FEDERAL CHARTERS, HOLIDAYS, AND CELEBRATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 192) to consider matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 192

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to consider all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $7,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION OF STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 193) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 193

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its activities and findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $117,685.15, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 194) to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 194

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $195,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 195) to investigate criminal laws and procedures, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 195

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of criminal laws and procedures.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $120,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 196) to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 196

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $170,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 197) to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 197

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $431,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY AND EXAMINATION OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 198) to study and examine the Federal judicial system, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 198

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a study and examination of the administration, practice and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to improve the operations of the Federal courts in the just and expeditious adjudication of the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis professional, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of departments and agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $184,020.00, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 199) to investigate juvenile delinquency, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 199

Resolved, That the Committee of the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation, as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $260,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 200) to investigate national penitentiaries, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 200

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 201) to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 201

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $110,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS CREATED BY THE FLOW OF REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES FROM COMMUNISTIC TYRANNY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 202) to investigate problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from communistic tyranny, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 202

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from Communist tyranny.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $105,400, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF THE STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 203) to study revision and codification of the statutes of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 203

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $42,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated January 11, 1966, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2795. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio B. Donesa; and

S. 2796. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael Anrrich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2797. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and the Railway Labor Act with respect to emergency labor disputes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2798. A bill for the relief of CWO Glen Zeigler, U.S. Navy (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. Pearson):

S. 2799. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Carlos Roberta Estrada Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2800. A bill for the relief of George Joseph Saad; and

S. 2801. A bill for the relief of Helena Gilbert Maddagiri and Heather Gilbert Maddagiri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 2802. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGovern when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2803. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act to establish a program under which assistance may be furnished for the construction of standby electrical systems in existing or proposed hospitals; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2804. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2805. A bill to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the discontinuance or change of certain operations or services of common carriers by rail, in order to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to give full consideration to all financial assistance available before permitting any such discontinuance or change; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GORE:

S. 2806. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to terminate the credit for investment in depreciable property; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2807. A bill for the relief of Paul L. Finney; and

S. 2808. A bill for the relief of Phu Loc Ho Thi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. GORE when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. METCALF):

S.J. Res. 126. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BAYH when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE FOR FURTHER STUDY OF MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 188); which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. RES. 188

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor including, but not limited to, such matters as (a) the wages of migratory workers, their working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health, and educational opportunities for migrants and their children, (b) the nature of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory workers, (c) the effectiveness of pertinent programs established by the Economic Opportunity Act, and (d) the degree of additional Federal action necessary in this area.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

TO CONTINUE AND TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for Mr. SMATHERS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 189); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 189

Resolved, That the Special Committee on Aging established by S. Res. 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, agreed to on February 13, 1961, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extend through January 31, 1967.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to problems and opportunities of older people, including but not limited to, problems and opportunities of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, and, when necessary, of obtaining care or assistance. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

SEC. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 5. For purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized (1) to employ on a temporary basis from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants as it deems advisable: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (2) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $221,000 from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 7. The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on January 31, 1967.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 190) to study administrative practice and procedure, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 191) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO FEDERAL CHARTERS, HOLIDAYS, AND CELEBRATIONS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 192) to consider matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AUTHORIZATION OF STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 193) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committee.")

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 194) to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 195) to investigate criminal laws and procedures, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 196) to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 197) to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY AND EXAMINATION OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 198) to study and examine the Federal judicial system, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 199) to investigate juvenile delinquency, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 200) to investigate national penitentiaries, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 201) to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS CREATED BY THE FLOW OF REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES FROM COMMUNISTIC TYRANNY

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 202) to investigate problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from communistic tyranny, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF THE STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 203) to study revision and codification of the statutes of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC INTEREST IN LABOR DISPUTES WHICH IMPERIL THE PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to give the President new, and in my opinion, critically necessary powers to protect and assert the public interest not only in labor disputes of a national character but also in any labor dispute affecting commerce which imperils the public health or safety in any substantial part of the population or territory of the Nation, including labor controversies involving State or municipal employees engaged in transportation, transmission, or communication.

This proposed legislation, which is designed to protect the public interest in a wide variety of controversies ranging from city transit strikes, like the recent one in New York City, to steel labor crises, to rail work-rules disputes—all areas where existing laws have proven to be grossly inadequate—would:

First. Authorize the President to appoint a board of inquiry to make public recommendations for a settlement based on factfinding.

Second. Authorize the President to order a 30-day freeze, during which the parties would be under a duty to bargain upon the recommendations, although neither party would be required to accept the recommendations.

Third. Authorize the President to seek appointment by a Federal court of a special receiver to operate the struck facilities to the extent which, in the opinion of the court, is necessary to protect the public health and safety.

Fourth. Extend coverage of the emergency labor disputes provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act to controversies which, though they may not affect an entire industry nor imperil the health or safety of the Nation as a whole, do affect interstate commerce and do imperil the health or safety of a substantial part of the population or territory of the Nation, and cover employees of a State or political subdivision if they are engaged in transportation, transmission, or communication.

Fifth. The emergency labor disputes provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are not otherwise affected.

The crippling New York transit strike earlier this month was only one in a series of recent labor disputes and threatened labor disputes pointing up the inadequacy of existing laws to protect the public interest. The steel labor crisis last fall was resolved only after it brought the Nation to the brink of economic disaster—and then only after the President personally intervened and was forced to put the full prestige of his office behind a settlement which originated in the White House. And the 1963 rail crisis, which was suspended only by a special statute closely akin to compulsory arbitration—a procedure which failed to satisfy the parties then and may well erupt once more this spring when the 1963 statute expires—demonstrated with compelling force that what is needed is an established procedure which not only protects the public interest but also leaves the actual terms of the final settlement of the dispute to the parties themselves, to be reached by free collective bargaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. In my view, it is only a voluntary agreement which can both end a strike and also resolve the underlying controversy. It is for this reason that I believe the process of recommendations by a factfinding board appointed by the President, with a standstill period during which these recommendations must be considered, is the best plan. The element of compulsion is not involved except to the extent that public opinion—once advised of what constitutes a fair settlement—is able to bring its weight to bear on both management and labor to see that a settlement is made. When this is coupled with the ultimate right of seizure—insuring that the economy cannot be paralyzed—we have a plan which gives us the maximum protection of the public interest with the minimum interference with the fundamental freedoms of the parties. Under this proposal, the parties are left free to bargain as long as they deem it necessary to reach a freely bargained settlement. If receivership becomes necessary, both parties operate under a disability, for the union forfeits the right to strike, but the employer forfeits possession and operation of his facilities. The Federal Government has suggested what a fair settlement would be, but the parties are free under this procedure—unlike compulsory arbitration—to reject the Government's suggestion and bargain for something else. In short, this proposal produces the maximum protection of the public with the minimum of Government decision-making.

The proposal made here is in no way inconsistent with the efforts of New York's Mayor Lindsay, nor the efforts of other city and State officials, to develop better procedures to protect the public interest in labor disputes involving public employees. The procedures I propose would become operative only in the event that local procedures fail and the public health or safety is imperiled. But it is clear beyond question that when New York's mayor turned to Washington for help in the recent transit strike, the administration had no procedure it could invoke under the law.

In my view, we simply cannot afford to continue to contemplate major labor disputes which can jeopardize or threaten to jeopardize the public health and safety, without adequate statutory tools to protect the public interest.

I have urged the administration over and over again to support new legislation in this field. Last fall, at the height of the steel labor crisis, I sent a telegram to the President urging the administration to call for the enactment of new legislation to protect the public interest in such labor disputes.

But after the President succeeded in settling the steel crisis "at the 1-foot line" by the sheer weight of his personal prestige, I received a reply from the Secretary of Labor which denied any need for any new emergency strike legislation, stating:

> The resulting settlement has obviated the necessity for immediate consideration by Congress of legislative action as recommended in your telegram to the President.

I was dismayed by that response, for to say that the need for legislation ends when each labor crisis ends is to make adequate legislation unattainable.

I was therefore delighted to learn of the administration's change of position, as reflected in the President's state of the Union message, and I look forward to having the opportunity to evaluate the administration's specific proposals, as well as those I have just recommended, in the light of committee hearings on these measures which should, and hopefully will, be held without delay, so that we may expeditiously exact legislation which will insure, once and for all, that the public will not again stand helpless in the face of a paralyzing labor controversy.

Mr. President, I make this statement in introducing the bill for the appropriate committee which deals with labor in Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2797) to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and the Railway Labor Act with respect to emergency labor disputes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2797

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Emergency Labor Disputes Act of 1966".

SEC. 2. Section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 206. (a) Whenever in the opinion of the President of the United States, after consultation with the Director, a threatened or actual strike or lockout or other labor dispute in an industry affecting commerce may, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the health or safety of the Nation or a substantial part of the population or territory thereof, he may appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and to make a written report to him within such time as he shall prescribe. Such report shall include a statement of the facts with respect to the dispute, including each party's statement of its own position, and shall, if the President so directs at any time, make recommendations in such report or in a supplemental report for the settlement of some or all of the issues in dispute. The President shall file a copy of such report with the Service and shall make its contents available to the public.

"(b) Upon receiving a report or a supplemental report from a board of inquiry which contains recommendations for the settlement of some or all of the issues in dispute, the President may direct that for a specified period not to exceed thirty days no change in the conditions out of which the dispute arose shall be made by the parties to the dispute, except by agreement. During such period the parties to the dispute shall be under a duty to bargain collectively with respect to the recommendations for settlement of the board of inquiry, but neither party shall be under a duty to accept in whole or in part any such recommendations."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 208(a)(i) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(i) is in an industry affecting commerce; and".

(b) Section 208(a)(ii) of such Act is amended by striking out the words "national health or safety" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "health or safety of the Nation or a substantial part of the population or territory thereof".

(c) Section 209(a) of such Act is amended by striking out the words "national health or safety" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "health or safety of the Nation or a substantial part of the population or territory thereof".

(d) Section 209(b) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out the words "a sixty-day" and inserting in lieu thereof "an eighty-day"; and

(2) by striking out the last sentence in such section.

(e) Section 210 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out the words "certification of the results of such ballot" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "expiration of such eighty-day period"; and

(2) by striking out the words "and the ballot taken by the National Labor Relations Board".

SEC. 4. Such Act is further amended by inserting after section 210 thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 210A. At any time after receiving a report with respect to a labor dispute from a board of inquiry under section 206(a), the President is authorized to direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the employer, for the appointment of a special receiver to take immediate possession in the name of the United States of any plant, mine, or other facility which is the subject of such labor dispute and to use and operate such plant, mine, or other facility in the interests of the United States, and if the court finds that the exercise of the power and authority provided by this section is necessary to protect the health or safety of the Nation or any substantial part of the population or territory thereof, it shall have jurisdiction to appoint such a special receiver and to make such other orders as may be appropriate: *Provided, however,* That (1) at any time before directing the special receiver to take possession of such plant, mine, or other facility the court may direct the parties to the dispute to make every effort to agree to continue or resume such part of the operations of such plant, mine, or other facility as in the opinion of the court is necessary to protect the health or safety of the Nation or any substantial part of the population or territory thereof, and upon such continuance or resumption of operations may postpone the taking of possession by the special receiver so long as such operations continue; (2) such plant, mine, or other facility shall be operated by the special receiver only to the extent which in the opinion of the court is necessary to protect the health or safety of the Nation or of any substantial part of the population or territory thereof; (3) the possession and operation of such plant, mine, or other facility shall not render inapplicable any State or Federal law concerning health, safety, security, or employment standards, and the special receiver while operating such facility shall comply with such laws as if it were privately operated; (4) the wages, hours, conditions, and other terms of employment effective at the time of taking possession by the special receiver shall be maintained without change, except that the court may, if a board of inquiry appointed under section 206(a) shall have recommended changes in rates of pay, wages, hours, or other conditions of employment, direct the special receiver to make such recommendations effective in whole or in part in any plant, mine, or other facility which is being operated by the special receiver during such period of operation; (5) during the period of such possession by the special receiver and thereafter, the parties shall be encouraged to continue efforts to settle the dispute and the special receiver shall have no authority to negotiate a collective bargaining agreement with respect to rates of pay, wages, hours, or other conditions of employment; and the rates of pay, wages, hours, or other conditions of employment which have been made effective pursuant to the recommendation of a board of inquiry shall remain in effect for a period of ninety days after the possession or operation of such plant, mine, or other facility has been returned by the special receiver to the owner, unless in the meantime the parties concerned have entered into a collective bargaining agreement with respect to rates of pay, wages, hours, or other conditions of employment; (6) such plant, mine, or other facility shall be returned to the employer as soon as practicable, but in no event later than thirty days, after the restoration of such labor relations in such plant, mine, or other facility that the possession or operation thereof by the special receiver is no longer necessary to insure the operation thereof required for the protection of the health and safety of the Nation or of any substantial part of the population or territory thereof; (7) such plant, mine, or other facility shall be operated by the special receiver for the account of the employer: *Provided further*, That the employer shall have the right to elect, by written notice filed with the court within ten days of such taking of possession, to waive all claims to the proceeds of such operation and to receive in lieu thereof just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the period of such possession and operation by the special receiver, to be paid by the United States as follows: (A) The President shall ascertain the amount of just, fair, and reasonable compensation to be paid as rental for the appropriation and temporary use of such plant, mine, or other facility while in the possession of or operated by the special receiver in the interest of the United States, such determination to be made as of the time of the taking hereunder, and taking into account the existence of the labor dispute which interrupted or threatened to interrupt the operation of such plant, mine, or other facility and the effect of such interruption or threatened interruption upon the value to the employer of the use of such plant, mine, or other facility; (B) if the amount so ascertained is not acceptable to the employer as just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the appropriation and temporary use for the property taken hereunder and as full and complete compensation therefor, the employer shall be paid 75 per centum of such amount and shall be entitled to sue the United States in the Court of Claims or in any district court of the United States in the manner provided for by sections 1357 and 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code to recover such further sums as when added to the amount so paid shall constitute just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the appropriation and temporary use of the property so taken. In the event such notice of election is filed with the court, the special receiver shall pay over to the United States the proceeds of the operations of such plant, mine, or other facility while in his possession.

"SEC. 210B. The provisions of sections 206 to 210A, inclusive, shall not be inapplicable to any threatened or actual strike or lockout or other labor dispute in an industry engaged in transportation, transmission, or communication, because the employer involved in such strike, lockout, or dispute is a State or political subdivision thereof, if such industry is an industry affecting commerce."

SEC. 5. The Railway Labor Act, as amended, is amended by adding after section 10 a new section as follows:

"SEC. 10A. At any time after receiving a report with respect to a labor dispute from a board appointed under section 10, the President is authorized to direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the carrier for the appointment of a special receiver to take immediate possession in the name of the United States of the equipment and facilities of any carrier which is the subject of such dispute and to use and operate such equipment and facilities in the interest of the United States, and if the court finds that the exercise of the power and authority provided by this section is necessary to protect the health or safety of the Nation or of any substantial part of the population or territory thereof it shall have jurisdiction to appoint such a special receiver and to make such other orders as may be appropriate: *Provided, however*, That (1) at any time before directing the special receiver to take possession of such equipment and facilities, the court may direct the parties to the dispute to make every effort to agree to resume such part of the operations of such equipment and facilities as in the opinion of the court is necessary to protect the health or safety of the Nation or of any substantial part of the population or territory thereof, and upon such resumption of operations may postpone the taking of possession by the special receiver so long as such operations continue; (2) such equipment and facilities shall be operated by the special receiver only to the extent which in the opinion of the court is necessary to protect the health and safety of the Nation or of any substantial part of the population or territory thereof; (3) the possession and operation of such equipment and facilities shall not render inapplicable any State or Federal law concerning health, safety, security, or employment standards, and the special receiver while operating such equipment and facilities shall comply with such laws as if they were privately operated; (4) the wages, hours, conditions, and other terms of employment effective at the time of taking possession by the special receiver shall be maintained without change, provided that the court may, if a board appointed under section 10 shall have recommended changes in rates of pay, wages, hours, or other conditions of employment, direct the special receiver to make such recommendations effective in whole or in part with respect to the operation of equipment and facilities which are being operated by the special receiver during such period of operation, except that if no such board shall have been appointed, the President may in his discretion appoint a special board which shall be subject to the provisions of the first two paragraphs of section 10 and shall make such recommendations concerning changes in rates of pay, wages, hours, and other conditions of employment for the period of operation by the special receiver as it may deem appropriate and which the court may direct the special receiver to make effective in whole or in part with respect to the operation of any equipment or facilities which are being operated by the special receiver during such period of operation; (5) during the period of such possession by the special receiver and thereafter, the parties shall be encouraged to continue efforts to settle the dispute, and the special receiver shall have no authority to negotiate a collective bargaining agreement with respect to rates of pay, rules, or working conditions; and the rates of pay, rules, or working conditions which have been made effective pursuant to the recommendation of said board appointed under section 10 or said special board shall remain in effect for a period of ninety days after the possession or operation of such equipment and facilities has been returned by the special receiver to the owner, unless in the meantime the parties concerned have entered into a collective bargaining agreement with respect to rates of pay, rules, or working conditions, it being understood that in such negotiations between the parties concerned, involving proposals theretofore contained in any prior notices served pursuant to section 6 of this Act which resulted in the dispute, the parties shall be deemed to have complied with and have exhausted the procedures of the Act; (6) such equipment and facilities shall be returned to the carrier as soon as practicable, but in no event later than thirty days after the restoration of such labor relations between such carrier and its employees that the possession or operation thereof by the special receiver is no longer necessary to insure the operation thereof required for the protection and preservation of the health and safety of the Nation or of any substantial part of the population or territory thereof; (7) such equipment and facilities shall be operated by the special receiver for the account of the carrier: *Provided further*, That the carrier shall have the right to elect, by written notice filed with the court within ten days of such taking of possession, to waive all claims to the proceeds of such operation and to receive in lieu thereof just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the period of such possession and operation by the special receiver, to be paid by the United States as follows: (A) The President shall ascertain the amount of just, fair, and reasonable compensation to be paid as rental for the appropriation and temporary use of such equipment and facilities while in the possession of or operated by the special receiver in the interest of the United States, such determination to be made as of the time of the taking hereunder, and taking into account the existence of the labor dispute which interrupted or threatened to interrupt the operation of such equipment and facilities and the effect of such interruption or threatened interruption upon the value to the carrier of the use of such facilities; (B) if the amount so ascertained is not acceptable to the carrier as just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the appropriation and temporary use of the property taken hereunder and as full and complete compensation therefor, the carrier shall be paid 75 per centum of such amount and shall be entitled to sue the United States in the Court of Claims or in any district court of the United States in the manner provided for by sections 1357 and 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code to recover such further sums as when added to the amount so paid shall constitute just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the appropriation and temporary use of the property so taken. In the event such notice of election is filed with the court, the special receiver shall pay over to the United States the proceeds of the operations of such equipment and facilities while in his possession."

THE LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Library Services and Construction Act is scheduled to expire on June 30 of this year. This important legislation has made possible a considerable growth and improvement in the library programs and services in my State. Because of it, many South Dakotans now have access for the first time to library resources. This program has awakened in communities an interest and a recognition of the great educational value of good public library services.

I was most pleased when 2 years ago this legislation was amended to include construction funds.

In view of the urgent national need for construction of library facilities, we must act now to insure the continuance and expansion of this fine program. We must act now to insure that our public libraries can continue to provide their essential educational services to increasing numbers of American citizens. We must act now to insure that those communities in our various States which are currently planning for better library programs and facilities will be able to receive the financial support so necessary to them.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce today proposed legislation which will not only continue this program but will authorize its expansion to meet the obvious needs. This legislation would authorize grants to the States for library services under title I: $60 million for the fiscal year 1967; $80 million for fiscal year 1968; $100 million for fiscal year 1969; $120 million for fiscal year 1970; and $150 million for each fiscal year thereafter.

This bill would authorize under title II grants to the States for the purpose of constructing library facilities in the amount of $75 million for fiscal year 1967; $100 million for fiscal year 1968; $125 million for each of the fiscal years 1969 and 1970; and $100 million for fiscal year 1971, in a 5-year construction program.

In light of the fact that 15 million people in the United States still have no public library service and 100 million more are provided library services far below their actual needs, these amounts are modest enough.

The measure which I introduce would add a new title to authorize grants to State library agencies in a 5-year program to develop cooperative library services and joint use of facilities which would involve public libraries, school libraries, higher education libraries, and research libraries in the States. Authorizations for this new title would amount to $5 million for fiscal year 1967; $7.5 million for fiscal year 1968; $10 million for fiscal year 1969; $12.5 million for fiscal year 1970; and $15 million for fiscal year 1971.

The concept of cooperative library services is based on the recognition that every person in the United States should have available to him, no matter where he is, library collections and services of high quality. In recognition of the differing needs of every individual, title III of this bill offers States the financial help in initiating the procedures to adapt library systems to better serve people. Cooperative techniques will enable the States to take advantage of the broadest possible use of library resources.

The distinguished Representative from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] recently introduced similar legislation in the other body. It is my earnest hope that both Houses will take action at an early date to extend the Library Services and Construction Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill I have introduced be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2802) to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act, introduced by Mr. McGOVERN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2802

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966".

SEC. 2. Section 2(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and to promote interlibrary cooperation".

SEC. 3. Section 101(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1957, and for each of the next six fiscal years the sum of $7,500,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the sum of $25,000,000, and for each of the next two fiscal years such sums as the Congress may determine," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "June 30, 1967, $60,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $80,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $100,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $120,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each fiscal year thereafter, $150,000,000,".

SEC. 4. Section 102 of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

SEC. 5. Section 103(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (4), by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6), and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) provide assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that expenditures made for library services in the State in any fiscal year from funds derived from the State will not be less than such expenditures in the preceding fiscal year, and that no funds will be provided for library services to any local library or library system under the plan for any fiscal year if the State library administrative agency determines that the amount expended, or to be expended, for such library or library system during a fiscal year from funds derived from local sources is less than such expenditures in the preceding fiscal year; and".

SEC. 6. (a) Section 104(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "1963" both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1966", and by striking out "section 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 103".

(b) Section 104(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Commissioner shall from time to time estimate the amount to which each State will be entitled under subsection (a) and the amount so estimated shall be paid in installments in advance or by way of reimbursement, after necessary adjustment on account of any previously made overpayment or underpayment."

(c) Section 104(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "(1)", by striking out "to be effective until July 1, 1957", and by striking out paragraph (2) of such subsection.

SEC. 7. Section 201 of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1964, the sum of $20,000,000 and for each of the next two fiscal years such sums as the Congress may determine," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1967, $75,000,0000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $100,000,000; for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970, $125,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $100,000,000,".

SEC. 8. Section 202 of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out "(but only in the case of a State allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964)".

SEC. 9. (a) Section 204(a) of the Library Services and Construction Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "From such allotment, there shall also be paid to each State for each such period the Federal share of the total of the sums expended by the State and its political subdivision during such period for administration of the plan of such States approved under section 203."

(b) Section 204(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after "in such installments" the following: "in advance or by way of reimbursement".

SEC. 10. The Library Services and Construction Act is amended by inserting after title II the following new title:

"TITLE III—INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 301. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $7,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $12,500,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $15,000,000; which shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner State plans for establishing and maintaining local, interlocal, regional, State, or interstate, cooperative networks of libraries.

"Allotments

"SEC. 302. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for each fiscal year the Commissioner shall allot $10,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and $40,000 to each of the other States, and shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of the United States according to the most recent decennial census.

"Payments to States

"SEC. 303. (a) From the allotments available therefor under section 302, the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time pay to each State which has a plan approved under section 304 an amount, computed as provided in subsection (b) of this section, equal to the Federal share of the total sums expended by the State and its political subdivisions under such plan.

"(b) For the purposes of this section the Federal share for any State shall be 50 per centum of the sums expended under the plan: *Provided,* That the Federal share for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, shall be 100 per centum.

"State plans for interlibrary cooperation

"SEC. 304. (a) To be approved for purposes of this title a State plan for interlibrary cooperation must—

"(1) meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103(a);

"(2) provide policies and objectives for the systematic and effective coordination of the resources of school, public, academic, and special libraries and special information centers for improved services of a supplementary nature to the special clienteles served by each type of library or center;

"(3) provide appropriate allocation by participating agencies of the total costs of the system;

"(4) provide assurance that every local or other public agency in the State is accorded an opportunity to participate in the system;

"(5) provide criteria which the State agency shall use in evaluating applications for funds under this title and in assigning priority to project proposals; and

"(6) establish a statewide council which should be broadly representative of professional library interests and of library users which shall act in an advisory capacity to the State agency.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan which meets the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section."

SEC. 11. (a) Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act is hereby redesignated as title IV.

(b) Sections 301 through 304 of the Library Services and Construction Act are hereby redesignated as sections 401 through 404.

(c) Section 402(d)(2) of such Act (as so designated by subsection (b)) is amended by striking out "or title II" and inserting in lieu thereof "title II or title III".

(d) Section 403 of such Act (as so designated by subsection (b)) is amended by striking out "or 202" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 202, or 302", by striking out "and section 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "203, and 303" and by striking out "or 202" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 202, or 302", by striking out "or 203", and inserting in lieu thereof ", 203, or 303,", by striking out "or 201" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 201, or 301", and by striking out "and 202" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 202, and 302".

(e) Section 404 of such Act (as so designated by subsection (b)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The term, 'interlibrary cooperation', means the establishment and operation of systems or networks of libraries, including State libraries, school libraries, college and university libraries, public libraries, and special libraries, working together to provide more effective and more economical services to all library users. Such systems may be designed to serve a community, a metropolitan area, a region within a State, or may serve a statewide or multistate area."

STANDBY ELECTRIC POWER FOR HOSPITALS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the great power failure which darkened the Northeastern States last fall made dramatically clear the fallibility of the interconnecting power grid systems we had thought were infallible. Unexpected and defying the predictions of experts, the failure of the grid system found many vital services unprepared to cope with the sudden loss of all electric power.

As a member of the Health Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I was particularly concerned with the ability of the hospitals, whose lifesaving services and equipment depend on electricity, to deal with a power loss. While the man in the street can light a candle or buy a flashlight and endure the inconvenience, a power loss in hospitals can jeopardize an operation, shut down equipment vital to a life, or endanger supplies of drugs and blood which must be kept under refrigeration. The hospitals of the Northeast responded magnificently to the blackout but often by makeshifts and hurried improvisation. There were no reported deaths as a result of the blackout; this is a tribute to the skill and ingenuity of doctors and hospital staffs. But I do not believe that we can run this risk again or ask surgeons to operate by battery-powered emergency lights or hospital administrators to keep vital services in operation by the use of hastily rigged portable generators borrowed from the local police or fire departments. Every modern hospital should have a standby system which would automatically provide adequate and instantaneous power in case of a power failure. This was one of the recommendations made by the Federal Power Commission in its report to the President on the Northeast power failure, and I agree with it. In commenting on proposals for assistance to hospitals for "emergency power systems, hospitals," the Journal of the American Hospital Association, had this to say:

> Despite initial reports that hospitals in the blackout area generally were equipped to maintain services, later and more comprehensive investigations showed inadequate hospital standby power.

We have seen that great power failures can occur despite the foresight of engineers and the safeguards of human invention. Now is the time to make sure that our hospitals are adequately prepared to handle an emergency power failure.

Therefore, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, an amendment to the Hill-Burton program to establish a 3-year program of grants and loans to hospitals for the construction and improvement of standby electrical systems. This amendment to title VI of the Public Health Service Act would authorize the Surgeon General to make loans or grants totaling up to 75 percent of the construction cost of these systems to public or private nonprofit hospitals. The Surgeon General would be empowered to establish standards for emergency electrical systems for various classes of hospitals and would have to have assurance that there was adequate local financial support available for the completion of the construction of the system, and for its operation and maintenance once built. The cost of the loan would be one-fourth of 1 percent above the average borrowing cost of the Government. Applicants could receive a grant, a loan, or a combination of both up to 75 percent of the cost. A total of $30 million would be authorized to carry out this 3-year program: $5 million the first year, $10 million the second, and $15 million the third.

Mr. President, there is a clear need for this short-term program of aid to hospitals. According to estimates of the American Hospital Association, 25 percent of the Nation's hospitals do not have auxiliary generators or other satisfactory standby power supplies and another 25 percent have emergency power supplies which are inadequate. Thus, 50 percent of our hospitals are ill prepared to respond to massive power failures. This estimate has been confirmed by figures I have received from the Public Health Service. According to the Public Health Service, 1,977 or 37 percent of our hospitals require major improvements in their standby power systems and 1,242 or 24 percent need complete new systems.

It has been estimated by the Public Health Service that it would cost approximately $63 million to provide these hospitals with adequate standby power systems. This figure includes an estimate of $21.7 million to make substandard systems satisfactory sources of power and $41 million for the construction of new power systems. The bill I am introducing contains a 3-year authorization of $30 million by which the Federal Government could meet half the estimated total cost of giving the Nation's hospitals self-sufficient power supplies.

The Hill-Burton program has done a tremendous job in creating a hospital system second to none in the world. As we seek ways to improve our existing hospital system, I believe prompt attention should be given to a problem which can be quickly corrected at relatively small cost. The Northeast power blackout revealed one weakness in our hospital system; it can and should be corrected before a natural or manmade disaster again plunges a large section of the country into darkness. We can profit from the lessons learned last year by making sure that every hospital has the financial resources available to acquire a good system of standby power fully able to meet emergency needs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2803) to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act to establish a program under which assistance may be furnished for the construction of standby electrical systems in existing or proposed hospitals, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COMMUTER SERVICE BILLS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, for many years now, we have recognized that the Federal Government has a basic involvement in fulfilling this country's transportation needs. In our early days, we were concerned with building long-haul railroads and creating an adequate merchant marine. As our country has gone through different phases of its history, different modes of transportation became increasingly important and made their claims on the Government's help.

Understandably enough, as the United States grew industrially and great metropolitan areas became the commercial and social hub for large masses of people, the problem of urban transportation slowly came to the forefront of our national concern. By the end of World War II, it was becoming obvious to anyone who cared to look, that we were paying a disproportionate amount of money and attention to the private automobile and a multibillion-dollar highway network, and were almost ignoring the question of how to move large numbers of commuters and casual travellers into and out of large urban areas in an orderly, pleasant and economical manner.

Congress first faced up to its responsibilities in this area when, in the 1961 Housing Act, it authorized programs for mass transportation demonstration projects, loans, and planning. This was only a small start, however, and in 1964 we finally succeeded in getting the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 enacted into law. Under this act, $375 million was authorized and $320 million has been appropriated, to revitalize and expand all types of transit and commuter transportation systems.

However, I think it vital to keep clear in our minds just what major premises underlay the provisions of the act. Basically, the act operated on the theory that "fare box revenues could finance operation." Consequently, the grant provisions were designed to meet the heavy costs of new construction, new equipment, modernization, and the installation of new systems.

For many communities, this was just what the doctor ordered. The Memphis Transit Authority was able to purchase 75 new air-conditioned buses and complete a 3-year-old modernization program. The city of Minneapolis received a grant to develop a planned transitway and pedestrian mall along eight major downtown streets.

But it is essential to remember that the act was aimed at revamping and remodeling transportation systems which were already paying their own way out of the fare box or were receiving sufficient local subsidies to stay in business. Unfortunately, we have been somewhat beguiled by the "folklore of the fare box" and have tended to ignore the disconcerting fact that many public transportation systems—buses, subways, and commuter railroads—are simply not meeting their operational costs and consequently are in no position to take advantage of the capital grants under the Mass Transit Act.

I think that there is no longer any question that provision of adequate transit services has become a legitimate concern of government. Transportation has become as much of an essential public service as police protection or sanitation. Just as we now fully recognize that the local governments of large metropolitan areas have a responsibility for the health and safety of our cities, so we must face hard facts about our responsibilities throughout the whole broad field of commuter transportation.

The recent mass transit tieup in New York City presents a vivid and frightening example of the paralysis caused by a breakdown in transportation facilities: a city is brought to a standstill, incalculable losses are sustained by manufacturers and retailers, millions are kept from their jobs with resulting loss of pay, essential services are stymied, and virtual chaos develops on every alternate artery of transit.

This spectacle should serve as fair warning to all of us. Government is as directly concerned with the maintenance and functioning of an adequate transportation system as it is with maintenance and functioning of the power system which supplies electricity to a city.

In addition to a power failure and a disastrous mass transit labor dispute, the New York metropolitan region may well be on the verge of still another crisis which is merely indicative of that faced in other areas of the country. The commuter problem facing the tristate area of New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut—a problem which has been studied, discussed, analyzed, and argued about for over a decade—merely exemplifies that aspect of the commuter transit problem which we were not yet ready to deal with in the Mass Transit Act, and which is now staring us in the face. Many of the commuter lines—whether publicly owned subways in Boston or New York, privately owned railroads like the New Haven and Reading, or bus systems, simply cannot finance their operations out of the fare box and need immediate and direct cash grants merely to keep their heads above water.

There is no question at this point of the central role which commuter railroad service plays in every major metropolitan region. In a sense, this is a two-way relationship, for not only is the urban industrial complex dependent on those who commute into the city to perform their tasks, but the suburban, exurban, and rural communities which feed their residents into those commuter lines are even more dependent on the financial feedback from the cities.

For example, in my own State, where about 200,000 commuters daily pour into New York, it has been estimated that over $3 billion is generated by this employment for the benefit of New Jerseyites.

The time has now come for drastic action—for enactment of a carefully designed, long-range, commuter-service bill which looks forward to or envisions an eventual solution of the problem rather than the sporadic handouts which transit facilities receive each time they cry poverty and threaten stoppage of service.

For too long we have labored under the comfortable myth that provision of passenger service was strictly the concern of private enterprise and a simple matter of market economics. Because of that comforting myth—which enabled us to avoid an early and honest appraisal of the problem—we ignored the danger signals which have been sent up over the years.

For example, even though private companies did a superb job—often with generous Government contributions—of building and running a network of railroads linking every corner of our country, the events of the 20th century have drastically altered their ability to handle present needs. The reasons for this have by now become obvious to everyone.

First of all, the very nature of commuter service presents difficulties because it serves large masses of riders for only short periods of the workday and the workweek. The inroads made by the automobile and our strangulating highway network have severely curtailed railroad passenger and bus traffic. The high cost of labor and the large capital outlays required for new rolling stock, have also contributed to the woes of buses and railroads and breakdown of commuter service.

The railroads have made clear their present inability to operate their commuter operations on anything approaching a fiscally sound basis. The Erie-Lackawannna, the major commuter railroad for New Jerseyites, has estimated its losses at $63 million in the past decade and $8.2 million—before State subsidies—last year alone; the Jersey Central claims it has incurred deficits of $60 million in the past 10 years, and $6.5 million—before State subsidies—during 1964. The Regional Plan Association calculates the operating loss on all commuter operations in the metropolitan region at about $25 to $30 million annually.

Obviously, these losses cannot continue. Whether all possible efforts have been made over the years by railroad management to avoid them or to forestall them, is no longer the issue. At this time we must simply face the unpleasant facts of commuter life. The Erie-Lackawanna is reported to be preparing its application to the Interstate Commerce Commission to abandon service; the New Haven has been in bankruptcy for years; the Long Island Railroad has been virtually operated by the State of New York for over a decade.

Let me make one thing clear: I have talked in detailed terms of the problems in New Jersey and the entire New York region, but that is because, naturally, I know this area most intimately, and it is of most direct concern to me. However, the problems of this region of 17 million people are merely illustrative of the problems faced by failing commuter systems all over the country. Whether you look at the Boston area with its subway and Boston & Maine difficulties, or the current dispute right here in Washington, D.C., over a reasonable fare to be charged on the bus system, or at the remarkable progress made by the Chicago & Northwestern in serving the Chicago suburbs, the basic issue is the same. It is my strong belief that we must now make public our commitment that commuter lines—of all types—will be maintained in order to insure the continuing prosperity and well-being of the millions of people all over the country whose daily routine is so dependent on them.

Having made this policy decision, the question becomes one of how best to act. How are we going to keep these commuter facilities operating? Are we forced to accept the unpleasant notion of State or Federal ownership? I think not. Are we going to continue throwing them the bones of haphazard emergency subsidies and thinly disguised demonstration grants which demonstrate only the inadequacy of the funds granted? To me this is neither the rational nor the economic answer.

I would like to explain to you a program which I think presents an honest and well-thought-out plan for dealing with this situation. I say honest, because I think we must face squarely the financial magnitude of this problem and the funds which are needed to solve it, and we must no longer flinch at the application of some novel approaches which are necessary.

The program is relatively simple and embodies two major ideas: First, we must keep the commuter lines going. The danger on several railroad lines for example, is of immediate curtailment and abandonment or of mergers which will result in eventual abandonment. Consequently, the Federal Government must contribute a certain portion of Federal funds to keep our transit facilities running. Whether we term these temporary subsidies, interim relief, or grants to defray operating deficits, we must recognize that the first order of business is in the New York region, to transport 77,000 New Jerseyites daily to New York City and to make sure that the other 123,000 commuters from Connecticut and New York also make it to their jobs in the metropolitan region.

The concept of government subsidies for operating losses is hardly a new one. My own State has been paying out between $6 and $7 million a year for the last 6 years to the Erie-Lackawanna, the Jersey Central and the Pennsy. Connecticut has authorized a subsidy of up to $4½ million annually to keep the New Haven in operation. And New York set up a separate corporation, back in 1954, to run the Long Island Railroad rather than let it go out of service. New York City and Chicago have long realized the necessity of subsidizing their public transportation systems, and the Philadelphia area has established a transportation authority which is in the process of doing the same thing. In short, whatever long-term arrangements we make for the prosperity of commuter buses, subways, and railroads, our short-term problem is one of their continued existence, and for this the lines must have help to meet their day-to-day operating deficits.

The bill I am introducing squarely faces this portion of the problem and provides, on a two-thirds, one-third matching basis, for Federal funds to help defray the out-of-pocket operating losses of any transportation facility which provides commuter services in a metropolitan, urban area.

Second, to merely hand out, year after year, payments to meet deficits, would be throwing good money after bad. There must be a massive effort made to modernize equipment, to purchase great numbers of new cars and buses, to make service more efficient, to cut labor costs where possible, and to institute all possible economies in the running of the lines. Essentially, what is needed is a long-range capital improvement program which, once put into final effect, can either lessen deficits to the minimal level where they can be totally borne by the State or local governments, or can eliminate them entirely.

Under the provisions of the legislation I am introducing today, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would make these grants on a two-third, one-third matching basis, not to the operating applicant itself, but to a public transportation authority which has broad responsibilities for maintenance of commuter transportation. For example, the New York Metropolitan Commuter Transportation Authority, or Connecticut's Public Transportation Authority would be eligible for such aid. The excellent suggestion of Dwight Palmer, New Jersey's experienced and knowledgeable State highway commissioner, that his agency be expanded into a more comprehensive Department of Transportation would probably bring such a department under the provisions of this legislation. On a broader level, the existing Tri-State Transportation Commission could be given the powers and authority to take advantage of such assistance.

The central requirement of this bill is that no grant shall be made unless the public transportation body and the particular applicant to be assisted have submitted a "comprehensive commuter service improvement plan, which sets forth a program, for capital improvements to be undertaken by such railroad for the purpose of providing more efficient, economical, and convenient commuter service in an urban area, and for placing the commuter operations of such railroad on a sound financial basis."

In operation, a State or independent public body with transportation responsibilities, will submit to the new Department of Urban Affairs a complete, long-term program setting out a limited period of time in which its operating deficits must be met and a comprehensive schedule for capital improvements. I am hopeful that in addition to providing the benefits which I have outlined, this legislation will also stimulate creation of the broad regional transportation authorities which have proven so successful in dealing with the complex and interrelated problems of planning transportation for a particular metropolitan region. The Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority and the newly emerging Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority are outstanding examples of the successful use of these far-ranging public authorities.

In order to insure, so far as possible, that this will not turn into another never-ending program of Government subsidies, we have written a 10-year limit into the program and have given the Secretary discretion, when necessary, to extend individual grant programs for an additional 5 years.

As a piece of companion legislation, I am also introducing a bill which would forestall the kind of action which the management of certain railroad lines, like the Erie-Lackawanna, is so anxious to take. Instead of allowing abandonment of service on the grounds it currently does, which are mostly financial, the Interstate Commerce Commission must first require that a carrier have made good faith efforts to take full advantage of the provisions of the commuter service bill. In this way, commuter lines will not be allowed to totally abandon their responsibilities to the public without having made the attempt—requiring time and imagination and will—to arrive at sound constructive growth plans which will enable them to get on their feet again. In short, we will give all possible help to keep the railroads in business, but we will not tolerate their just walking out of the picture because that is the simple way out.

Finally, there is the question of a specific dollar figure to be assessed as the cost of this program. Here, confusion abounds, and estimates from even the most reliable parties have varied greatly. Just as an example, the Regional Plan Association in a recent study estimated that the cost of rehabilitating just the commuter railroad system in only one area of the country—the New York metropolitan area—would require roughly a billion dollars over a 10-year period, meaning $100 million a year. In New Jersey alone, it has been estimated by Commissioner Palmer that at least $150 million would be needed, although informed estimates have ranged as high as twice that figure, and those figures do not include the needs of buses and subways necessary to a balanced transportation system. That the total amount of money needed to be spent will be very large is inescapable. But I think one fact will serve as a vivid comparison: in the past decade, over $4 billion has been spent on the highway network encircling the New York region, and this pace for highway spending is expected to continue. I think it is time we started recognizing that comparable expenditures are going to have to be made for commuter and mass transit facilities.

Consequently, I think we would do better, at this juncture, to hold off on any specific price tag for this program. Instead, I would rather wait until we hold the thorough hearings which I know this legislation will entail, and then, during the course of those investigations, arrive at a realistic and practicable cost estimate.

Mr. President, I respectfully request unanimous consent for these bills to lie on the table for 1 week for additional cosponsors and for the RECORD to include the text of the legislation as well as a brief summary of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and summary will be printed in the RECORD, and the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bills, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, were received, read twice by their titles, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"S. 2804

"A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Congress finds—

"(1) that over 70 per centum of the Nation's population lives in urban areas, and it is anticipated that by 1986 80 per centum of the population will be concentrated in such areas;

"(2) that transportation is the life-blood of an urbanized society and the health and welfare of that society depends upon the provision of efficient, economical, and convenient transportation;

"(3) that for many years the mass transportation industry served capably and profitably the transportation needs of the urban areas of the country;

"(4) that in recent years the maintenance of even minimal commuter service in urban areas has become so financially burdensome as to threaten the continuation of this vital service;

"(5) that some mass transportation companies are now engaged in developing preliminary plans for, or are actually carrying out, comprehensive projects to revitalize their commuter operations; and

"(6) that immediate substantial Federal assistance is needed on an interim basis to enable many mass transportation companies to continue to provide vital commuter service during the period required to overhaul and revitalize commuter operations and to place such operations on a sound financial basis.

"SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 4(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows: 'In addition to amounts heretofore appropriated to finance grants under this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated for that purpose not to exceed $——— for fiscal year 1967; $——— for fiscal year 1968; $——— for fiscal year 1969; and $——— for fiscal year 1970.'

"SEC. 3. The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by redesignating sections 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 as sections 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, respectively, and by adding after section 5 a new section as follows:

"'Interim Assistance To Assure Adequate Commuter Service in Urban Areas

"'SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State or local public body or agency thereof to enable such State or public body or agency thereof to assist any mass transportation company which maintains commuter service in an urban area within the jurisdiction of such State or public body or agency thereof to defray operating deficits incurred as the result of providing such service to such areas. The amount of any grant made under this section to any State or local public body or agency thereof to assist any such company shall not exceed two-thirds of the annual net operating deficit of such company as certified by such State or public body or agency thereof and approved by the Secretary. No grant shall be provided under this section to any State or local public body or agency thereof to assist any mass transportation company unless such State or public body or agency thereof and such company have jointly submitted to the Secretary a comprehensive commuter service improvement plan which is approved by him and which sets forth a program, meeting criteria established by the Secretary, for capital improvements to be undertaken by such company for the purpose of providing more efficient, economical, and convenient commuter service in an urban area, and for placing the commuter operations of such company on a sound financial basis. No mass transportation company shall be eligible to receive assistance provided under this section for a period in excess of ten years, except that the Secretary may authorize such assistance for an additional period, not exceeding five years, if he determines that an extension is necessary in order to enable such company to carry out its commuter service improvement plan.

"'(b) Assistance provided under this section shall to the greatest extent practicable be coordinated with other assistance provided under this Act.'

"SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 7(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as redesignated by section 3 of this Act) is amended to read as follows: 'In addition to amounts heretofore made available to finance projects under this section, the Administrator may make available for that purpose from the mass transportation grant authorization provided in section 4(b) not to exceed $———, which limit shall be increased to $——— on July 1, 1967, to $——— on July 1, 1968, and to $——— on July 1, 1969.'

"SEC. 5. Section 10(c) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as redesignated by section 3 of this Act) is amended—

"(1) by striking out the semicolon at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof ', and the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;';

"(2) by striking out 'and' at the end of clause (4);

"(3) by striking out 'serving the general public' in clause (5) and inserting in lieu thereof 'serving commuters and others', and by striking out the period at the end of such clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '; and the term "mass transportation company" means any private company or public authority or agency providing mass transportation services; and'; and

"(4) by adding at the end thereof a new clause as follows:

"'(6) the term "annual net operating deficit" means that part of the annual operating costs of a mass transportation company which could reasonably have been avoided by the elimination of commuter service in an urban area, less the annual revenues derived by such company from the provision of such services.'

"SEC. 6. Section 13 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as redesignated by section 3 of this Act) is amended by striking out 'section 7(b)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 8(b)'."

To the Committee on Commerce:

"S. 2805

"A bill to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the discontinuance or change of certain operations or services of common carriers by rail, in order to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to give full consideration to all financial assistance available before permitting any such discontinuance or change

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 13a(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 13a(1)) is amended by inserting after 'If, after hearing in such investigation,' the following: 'including full consideration of any financial assistance available pursuant to the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 or any other law for the purpose of continuing such operation or service and the efforts of such carrier or carriers to obtain such assistance,'.

"SEC. 2. Section 13a(2) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 13a(2)) is amended by inserting after 'The Commission may grant such authority only after full hearing' a comma and the following: 'including full consideration of any financial assistance available pursuant to the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 or any other law for the purpose of continuing such operation or service and the efforts of such carrier or carriers to obtain such assistance,'."

The summary presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey is as follows:

SUMMARY OF COMMUTER SERVICE BILLS

1. The proposed legislation will amend the Mass Transportation Act in the following manner:

(a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development will be authorized to make grants to any State or local public body or agency thereof in an urban area to help meet up to two-thirds of the operating deficits incurred by railroads, subways, buses or any other mass transit facility which is supplying commuter services.

(b) Grants for operating subsidies will be given only to implement a comprehensive, long-range financial program, jointly submitted by the local public body and the applicant to be assisted. This program shall fully outline current operations (including a schedule of Federal contributions to the operating deficit) and a long-term capital improvement program which will be undertaken by the applicant in order to provide more efficient, economical, and convenient commuter service and to place the applicant's commuter operations on a sound financial basis.

(c) The Secretary will be authorized to make grants to any State or local public body or agency thereof to assist in the acquisition, construction, and improvement of facilities and equipment of railroads, subways, buses, or any other mass transit facility which is supplying commuter services. This provision clarifies the capital grant portions of the present Mass Transit Act by clearly extending its provisions to commuter railroads as well as more traditional mass transit facilities such as subways and buses.

(d) The assistance provided under both the operating subsidy and the capital grant provisions of the Mass Transit Act shall be extended for only 10 years. The Secretary shall have discretion to extend the program for an additional 5 years if necessary.

2. The proposed legislation will also amend both the interstate and intrastate provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act by requiring that the Interstate Commerce Commission fully consider, in any application for discontinuance or abandonment of commuter operations, whether the applicant made good faith efforts to place its commuter operations on a financially stable basis by utilizing the assistance provisions of the Mass Transit Act of 1964, as amended.

TERMINATION OF CREDIT FOR INVESTMENT IN DEPRECIABLE PROPERTY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to repeal the 7-percent investment credit which was incorporated into the Internal Revenue Code in 1962. Under conditions now existing, additional revenues must be raised. The President has made certain recommendations in this regard, but in my opinion, he has neither started at the right place nor gone far enough as I shall soon demonstrate.

Because of the big tax cut of 1964, and because of the high cost of the war in Vietnam, we are now confronted with the prospect of large and continuing deficits. The President has recognized this fact, although he seems to minimize both the extent and the seriousness of the situation. His budget figures for fiscal year 1967 are highly tentative and, in my view, quite low on the expenditure side.

A large supplemental bill for additional expenditures in Vietnam is now before us, and it is likely that the deficit for fiscal year 1966 may reach a level much higher than the presently estimated $6 to $7 billion. The deficit for fiscal year 1967 is almost certain to be higher than the $1.8 billion figure used by President Johnson in his state of the Union address. The Bureau of the Budget engaged in quite a bit of fancy figuring to arrive at this amount.

The fiscal dilemma in which we find ourselves, under conditions existing today, becomes an acute national economic problem. We are now in danger, if not on the verge, of an inflationary wave. All agree that runaway inflation must be avoided. Thus far, no really effective steps to control inflation have been taken or proposed. Thus far, the threat of inflation has served only to afford an excuse to run up interest rates and to tighten the supply of money.

The end result of this kind of effort to get out of the fiscal box in which we have placed ourselves will be an acceleration of the trend toward the 1929 pattern of maldistribution of income, national production, and wealth. This trend has been in evidence for some years, having been given a big boost by the Revenue Act of both 1962 and 1964, and by various administrative steps taken with respect to depreciation.

I shall not at this time discuss the Vietnamese war. Whether we like it or not, we are in Vietnam in force, and we are likely to be there for a long time. Our troops have been committed and must be supported. The prosecution of this war will require large sums of money. We may contemplate, then, additional supplementary appropriation requests.

At the same time, we are faced with vast unmet needs here at home. Because our unemployment statistics look better, and because there is generally an ebullient feeling among those elements of our society where public opinion is largely formulated, there is a tendency to forget the problems of education, health, poverty, retraining, community facilities, regional development, mass transit, highway improvement—just to mention a few which remain very much with us.

The solution of these pressing problems requires the expenditure of much money, although I very much fear that it will be these worthwhile programs which will suffer as they are ground between the millstones of the Vietnamese war and too-low governmental revenues. Indeed, vast cutbacks and slowdowns are already underway. Yet if the Federal Government, as the agent for society as a whole, carries out society's obligations to the poor and less fortunate among us, as well as to future generations, domestic expenditures must of necessity be increased, not decreased or held level.

Much of our current short-fall in revenues can be traced to the unwise and inequitable tax cut of 1964. That exercise in fiscal folly lost us some $12 billion per year in revenue we now badly need. The revenues were not only lost, but they were lost in such a way that the higher income groups benefited at the expense of those lower on the economic scale.

Our present predicament could have been foreseen, at least in part, in 1964. Let me suggest, however immodestly, that the Senate was not without forewarning.

In the minority views which I filed to accompany the Finance Committee report on the tax cut bill, H.R. 8363, 88th Congress, I pointed out three specific shortcomings of that legislation:

First. I classified it as "the embodiment of fiscal folly." It is now proven to be just that. I do not hold with the view, now generally discredited as being old fashioned, that the budget must be balanced every year. But I did point out in 1964 that we had already had "3 years of unprecedented prosperity, expansion, and growth," and that nearly all the important economic indicators then pointed upward. I went on to say that we "should not seek deliberately further to increase debt and deficit and to impair, for all foreseeable time, our capacity to meet pressing public problems by a drastic reduction of governmental revenue."

Now, this is exactly what we have done. Regardless of budget juggling, regardless of the numbers game, we are not now able to meet our obligations and commitments without large and, under existing circumstances dangerous, deficits.

The second specific fault I found with the tax cut was that it provided "no solution to our economic or social problems." I pointed out then that the private sector of our economy was prosperous and that most of our unfulfilled needs lay in the public sector: "better housing for low-income groups, better mass transit systems, better educational facilities at all levels, better highways, more and better hospitals and nursing homes, more clean drinking and industrial water."

These needs are still unmet and are becoming daily more critical. Now, with reduced revenues and even greater need for sharply increased expenditures, we find ourselves short of funds.

The third specific fault I found with the bill was the way in which taxes were reduced. As I pointed out in my minority views, "the tax reduction provided by this bill for the already very rich, through both a drastic reduction in high bracket personal income rates and a cut in corporate rates, is unconscionable." It may be recalled that I preferred a reduction of revenues, if the Congress was bent on such an unwise move, by raising the personal exemption rather than by reducing rates for the high brackets.

Pursuing this equity theme, I pointed out that an undesirable result of the tax cut bill would be "to transfer yet another large slice of national production and wealth from those who produce wealth to those who parasitically participate in its enjoyment."

I went on, also, to point out the dangers of inflation and the fact that the threat of inflation would give our money managers the excuse to raise interest rates and restrict the flow of money and credit. As I put it at that time:

> My fear is that, in attempting to guard against monetary inflation, the Federal Reserve Board will raise interest rates and restrict the supply of money so that, having rid our house of the supposed evil spirit of high taxes, we will find it filled with the even more malevolent spirits of high interest rates, tight money, restrictive debt management, and reduced spending.

The reduced spending to which I had reference was the type of cutback we are now facing on badly needed domestic programs of social action.

As a result of all these interacting factors, I pointed out that:

> The reconcentration of wealth directly attributable to the tax cuts as well as indirectly realized from increased interest payments—acting as transfer payments—which will be stepped up by virtue of the built-in deficits created or increased by this bill, poses grave dangers.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Tennessee was not alone in making a correct analysis of the bill and in accurately foreseeing its adverse effects. Many thoughtful citizens, scholars and economists took a similar view. Still other who knew better, nevertheless, gave rationale to an unsound act.

Mr. President, our situation is now clear. The causes are clear. What, then, is an appropriate solution?

The obvious first step is to increase taxes. The President is to be commended for recognizing this fact, but he must be encouraged to go a little further in some respects—and not so far in others.

The President has proposed to increase revenues by some $3.2 billion in fiscal year 1967 by accelerating the schedule adopted in 1964 for getting the larger corporations on a current payment basis, much as individuals are. This is a one-shot proposition, and merely robs revenues from fiscal years 1968 through 1970. I do not object to this procedure, but its limitations must be understood.

The President has proposed the reinstatement of excise taxes on automobiles and telephone service which were removed effective this year. I oppose this. Instead of relevying excise taxes, we must complete the job of ridding ourselves of these regressive Federal sales taxes. There are many more equitable ways of raising revenue than to lay a tax on rich and poor alike on means of transportation and communication.

The President has proposed graduated withholding tax rates. In principle, I favor this, but it must be fair and equitable. Overwithholding must be kept to a minimum, and I foresee many administrative complications when a salaried executive making $25,000 per year, and having sizable deductions because of, let us say, large interest payments, alimony, or bad debt cancellations, must file under the same rules followed by the man making the same salary but having only standard deductions. This proposal must be examined carefully.

The place to start with increased taxes is not on sales taxes levied on the poor and the rich alike, but to repeal the 7-percent investment credit. This credit is not now needed. It is harmful to the economy. This is an equitable and a proper step to take in the context of our current economy. This would be fairer, and far more beneficial than Federal sales taxes on automobiles and telephone calls.

The House Committee on Ways and Means began hearings yesterday on the President's tax recommendations. I hope action will not be unduly delayed, but, at the same time, the Committee on Finance and the Senate must examine with the greatest care whatever bill the House may pass.

I shall submit for the consideration of the Committee on Finance the proposal to repeal all the investment credit, which was always of questionable validity and which it is certainly unwise to allow to remain in the law now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2806) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to terminate the credit for investment on depreciable property, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED 4-YEAR TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the subject I wish to discuss is of particular relevance because the Senate has received a lengthy and detailed message from the President of the United States suggesting that the Constitution be amended to provide 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Judiciary Committee, on behalf of the administration, I send to the desk a Senate joint resolution designed to accomplish this purpose, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 126) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives shall be 4 years, introduced by Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. METCALF), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the matter to which the joint resolution refers has been the subject of discussion for a number of years. It has just been brought to my attention that the distinguished majority leader on January 29, 1959, introduced a resolution similar to the one which the junior Senator from Indiana has just had the privilege of introducing. A similar resolution was introduced in 1961, by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and in 1963, by the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. On April 29, 1965, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], joined in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 72, which has been referred to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments.

Let me take a few moments to amplify upon several points in the President's message.

The President, I believe, appropriately points out that there is little magic in the number 2 as far as the length of terms for Members of the House is concerned. The Articles of Confederation provided for Members of the Congress to be elected annually. I believe we are prone to overlook the fact that our first Congress did not provide for 2-year terms in its legislative body.

James Madison, the fourth President of the United States, and one of the founders of the Constitution, supported 3-year terms for Members of the House on the ground that "instability is one of the great vices of our Republic to be remedied."

John Dickinson, of Delaware, who Senators will remember was the only member of the Constitutional Convention to challenge the vague language dealing with Presidential inability, a matter to which Congress gave considerable attention during the last 2 years and which we hope will be remedied by the ratification of the proposed 25th amendment, said:

> The idea of annual elections was borrowed from ancient usage of England, a country much less extensive than ours.

Mr. Dickinson, who also foresaw the inconvenience of biennial elections, favored a 3-year term.

It is important to remember that when our Constitution was framed, and for 126 years thereafter, the Members of the Senate were far removed from the popular will. Until the 17th amendment was ratified in May 1913, Senators were legislative appointees for terms of 6 years. Thus, there was additional reason to keep the terms of Members of the House to a minimum, since the people had practically no personal voice in selecting their Senators.

The President also points out that a number of developments have transpired in the history of the Nation which, it seems to me, provide additional compelling reasons for extending the terms of Members of the House.

First and foremost is the very complexity of the legislation which Congress is asked to consider. As a relatively new Member of this body, it seems to me that the complexity of the issues confronting the Senate has increased in the short period since 1962. Not until I had served in this body for 10 months did I feel sufficiently accustomed to Senate procedures and knowledgeable enough about national issues to make my first major address.

This practice has been traditional in the Senate because it is those who have mastered the rules and procedures of this body and have studied thoroughly the matters under consideration who can make the greatest contributions to its work. Most of us weigh very carefully the moments that are presented to us when we have an opportunity to address the Senate.

It is extremely important to devote all the time necessary to investigate thoroughly public issues. This requires consultation not only with other Senators but also with legal authorities, interest groups and other experts. Still further, consultation is required with members of the executive branch who will be called upon to administer the laws.

I well recall another personal experience, if I may use one—the tragic day on which our great President, John F. Kennedy, was taken from us. At that time I was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, having recently been appointed to that post by the chairman of the committee. The subcommittee immediately began hearings on an amendment to provide for presidential succession. The subcommittee approved a proposal which was then adopted by the full Committee on the Judiciary. Later, the Senate itself passed this proposal. Because of the leadership of our majority leader in the last days of the session, we were finally able to find time to bring the matter before the Senate.

I know very well that if I had been a member of a legislative body with a 2-year term it is highly probable that I would not have been here, and the matter would have had to be deferred. I would in all probability have been out beating the precincts, seeking to be reelected. I do not make light of the necessity to campaign for reelection and to discuss issues of national importance with one's constituents. One of the important aspects of membership in Congress is to maintain communication with the people.

On the other hand, it is extremely important to make it possible for each Member of the House of Representatives to be a more effective legislator. This can be made more probable if they are not called upon to run for office every 2 years.

I shall close by saying that the major goal of the joint resolution is to make Members of the House more effective. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I believe that we must not necessarily be wedded to any specific language. The language of the joint resolution which has been submitted differs from the language of the proposals of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], both of whom I have consulted on this proposal. In the hearings which will follow on this joint resolution, we hope to draw on their counsel as well as the counsel of the distinguished majority leader, who has also expressed an interest in the subject.

I hope that the Senate will be tolerant and deliberate in its consideration, so that we may adopt a proposal which will be acceptable to both bodies and which will guarantee legislators an opportunity to be more effective. It is with that thought in mind that I suggest that the Senate deliberate this joint resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. BAYH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend the distinguished Senator from Indiana not only for the way in which he has grasped this presidential proposal, but also for the speed with which he is giving it consideration. I realize, as he does, that it is not merely a question of providing a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives; it is a question of how to establish a 4-year term so that there will be a retention of independence on the part of those in Congress who are closest to the people, namely, the Members of the House. That question, among others, will have to be considered. But I remind Senators that the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana did a remarkable job of guiding through the Senate the constitutional amendment which is now before the States. We look forward with anticipation to his doing the same kind of excellent, workmanlike job on this proposal and also on the proposal to reform the electoral college, which will likewise be before us.

We are delighted that he has taken the initiative on the proposal to lengthen the terms of Members of the House and look forward to action by the Senate before too many months have passed.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed at the conclusion of my remarks and that it lie over for 1 week, until January 27, to permit other Senators who may desire to do so to join as cosponsors.

I also ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] be included as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 126) is as follows:

S.J. RES. 126

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The terms of Representatives shall be four years and shall commence at noon on the 3d day of January of the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin.

"SEC. 2. No Member of a House of Congress shall be eligible for election as a Member of the other House for a term which is to begin before the expiration of the term of the office held by him unless, at least 30 days prior to such election, he shall have submitted a resignation from such office which shall become effective no later than the beginning of such term.

"SEC. 3. This article shall take effect on January 3, 1973, if it is ratified prior to January 1, 1972; otherwise, it shall take effect on January 3, 1977."

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BEFORE THE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to announce that public hearings will be held before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on Thursday, January 27, 1966, at 10 o'clock in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building to hear testimony on S. 1995 and H.R. 8030, similar bills, which would provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System. Persons wishing to testify on this legislation may arrange to do so by contacting the committee, telephone 225-5451.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OPPOSE CUT-RATE GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, quite often in efforts to get a cold war GI bill enacted for the benefit of our 5 million cold war veterans we have encountered opposition which completely misunderstands the underlying philosophy of the cold war GI bill.

As I have repeated time after time, this is not a bonus bill or a reward for hazardous duty. Those elements of military life are covered by hazardous duty pay and other pay which a military man receives. The cold war GI bill is a bill for readjustment of veterans to civilian life. It is essentially a civilians' bill, but a bill for civilians who have served their country in its Armed Forces. Readjustment to civilian life is needed by every veteran, no matter where or how long he serves in the military service.

A recently proposed bill—the so-called administration GI bill—suffers from this same misconception about readjustment benefits. This was adequately pointed out in a memorandum from the national legislative director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Francis W. Stover, dated January 18, 1966, which I recently received.

Because of the fine and thorough understanding of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the philosophy of a GI bill, I ask unanimous consent that this forceful and accurate memorandum be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
January 18, 1966.

To: National officers and members of the national legislative committee.

From: Francis W. Stover, director, National Legislative Service.

Subject: Administration cold war GI bill (H.R. 11985)—a cutrate proposal.

For the first time the administration is supporting a cold war GI bill. Being called the administration GI bill is H.R. 11985—cost $100 million. This hodgepodge bill is a hydraheaded proposal. It would scatter the training of cold war veterans by dividing those entitled into two groups. It is a cutrate bill. It is a radical departure from the philosophy of previous GI bills.

Only those who have served in the Armed Forces since October 1, 1963, would be entitled. There are no home or farm loan provisions in the bill. There are no on-the-job or on-the-farm training provisions in the bill. Only institutional-type training would be authorized at or above the high school level.

Two agencies will administer the provisions—VA and HEW.

If the veteran received a badge or medal and has served 2 or more years, or has a service-connected disability, he will be entitled to $130 a month to a maximum of 36 months. An estimated 6,000 veterans would be entitled under this section. This is the VA part of the bill.

If the veteran does not qualify for a medal, he will be entitled to a 1-year scholarship of $800 if he has served at least 2 years. If he served 2 to 3 years, he will be entitled to 18 months; 3 to 4 years, 27 months. If he has served over 4 or more years, he will be entitled to a maximum of 36 months. An estimated 120,000 would be entitled under this section. This is the HEW part of the bill.

The Bureau of the Budget must have had its hand in this proposal. It is another bold attempt to dismember the VA.

Where readjustment of the veteran to civil life was the underlying philosophy on previous GI bills, this one seems to have departed from that philosophy by offering a bonus or reward for having served since October 1, 1963.

Minimum service of 2 years is another defect of the bill, since there will be many with lesser service who will be excluded—including even those who received a medal.

By national mandate, approved at Chicago, VFW is supporting S. 9 and similar proposals which will provide readjustment assistance to all those who have worn the uniform since the end of the Korean conflict and are carrying out American commitments all over the world.

H.R. 11985 should be rejected by the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this memorandum shows that under that bill, only 126,000 veterans out of a total of 5 million would be entitled to go to school. It is a bill that would keep the veterans from going to school, instead of sending them to school.

TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE NEAR PHARR, TEX.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10779) to authorize the Pharr Municipal Bridge Corp. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Pharr, Tex., and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Messrs. FULBRIGHT, SPARKMAN, MORSE, HICKENLOOPER, and AIKEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

BUDGET CUT IN SCHOOL MILK FUND REDUCES CONSUMPTION BY SCHOOLCHILDREN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, once again I rise to discuss the Bureau of the Budget's recent action cutting $3 million from the funds appropriated for the special milk program for schoolchildren. As I have indicated before, this is a phony economy move because milk not used in the school milk program will have to be purchased under our price support laws.

Today, however, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention a study which indicates that a rise in the cost of milk to the schoolchild will result in a disproportionate drop in consumption. Of course such a price increase may very well result from the $3 million cut, for either the school district or the child will have to take up the slack caused by a withdrawal of Federal support.

I refer specifically to a study conducted by the Department of Agriculture in September 1955, titled "The Effect of School Milk Consumption of a Reduction in Price Charged to Children in Selected Connecticut Schools." This study made an analysis of the relative effects of price reductions of 2 cents per half pint of milk on consumption. It shows that when prices were reduced from 8 cents per half pint to 6 cents per half pint, or 25 percent, consumption rose by 42 percent.

Mr. President, we can safely assume that an increase in price will also have a disproportionate effect on consumption—reducing it substantially. Certainly the poorest children—those who can least afford to purchase milk—will stop drinking it first.

Consequently it seems particularly inappropriate to cut this all-important item at a time when programs such as Project Head Start are emphasizing the need for the round development of our educationally deprived children. In the words of Dr. Julius Richmond, Project Head Start program director, "studies indicate that poor nutrition during early childhood has an effect not only on physical growth but on the mental functioning of the child." The recent cut in the school milk program undoubtedly will contribute substantially to poor nutritional standards.

NOMINATION OF JAMES S. DUESENBERRY TO BE A MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am honored to have the opportunity to notify the Senate that this morning the Banking and Currency Committee unanimously approved the nomination of James S. Duesenberry to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. Mr. Duesenberry is one of the most distinguished economists in the Nation. He is a graduate of Michigan University, with a Ph. D. He has been an instructor at Harvard University and a professor at Harvard University. He has written a number of books on economics; and I can say, having talked with many economists about him, that he is widely recognized as a brilliant, eminent, extremely shrewd and able economist, who will be of great help to the President of the United States and to the Congress in his new position.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a short biography of Mr. Duesenberry.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA—JAMES S. DUESENBERRY

James S. Duesenberry was born on July 18, 1918, in Princeton, W. Va. He received his education at the University of Michigan, where he earned a bachelor's degree in 1939, a master's in 1941, and Ph. D. in 1948.

During World War II he served as a captain in the U.S. Air Force.

Prior to joining the faculty of Harvard University in 1946, he served as a teaching fellow at the University of Michigan and as an instructor at MIT. He became a full professor at Harvard in 1957, and in 1958–59 held a Ford Foundation research professorship. He has also served as Fulbright research professor at Cambridge University, England.

Professor Duesenberry is the author of a number of well-known books and articles in the field of economics, including "Income, Saving, and the Theory of Consumer Behavior," 1949; "Business Cycles and Economic Growth," 1958; "Money and Credit," 1964.

He has been a consultant for the Committee for Economic Development since 1956, for the Commission on Money and Credit in 1959–61, for the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System since 1964, and for the Department of the Treasury and the Council of Economic Advisers since 1961.

He is married to the former Margaret Torbert and is the father of four children. They currently reside at 25 Fairmont Street, Belmont, Mass.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH C. DUKE AS SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial in the form of a testimonial to Joe Duke, published in a newspaper which he probably never saw, the Montpelier-Barre Times-Argus.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the body of the RECORD, because it shows that Joe was appreciated far beyond the borders of Washington, D.C.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Montpelier-Barre Times-Argus, Jan. 18, 1966]

JOE DUKE RETIRES

The august U.S. Senate took time out the other day (Friday) to pay tribute to a departing friend, Joe Duke of Arizona, who resigned his job as Senate sergeant-at-arms because of his own poor health and that of his wife. It's a different picture than that of Bobby Baker.

Senator AIKEN: "We all regret the departure of Joe Duke * * *."

Senator KUCHEL: "Joe Duke has ministered to the wants and needs of Senators in a superb manner * * *."

Senator SALTONSTALL: "He was always fair, impartial, and helpful to every Member of the Senate no matter on which side of the aisle he sat * * *."

Senator MUNDT: "Joe Duke is the kind of Senate employee of whom every Member can be proud * * *."

Senator MCINTYRE: "Joe has been a friend to all of us and we junior Members of the Senate will never forget his great kindness and useful advice during our early days in these halls."

Senator CHURCH: "I, for one Senator, am much indebted to Joe Duke for the many kindnesses that he extended to me."

Senator MONTOYA: "I have known Joe Duke for 30 years, from the days when he was a Capitol policeman and I was a law student at Georgetown, and I am proud to say that we have been friends all those years. A lot of water has flowed under the bridge since that time, but Joe Duke has remained essentially the man I knew back in the 1930's—warmhearted, generous, intelligent, knowledgeable, efficient, and loyal."

Senator YOUNG of Ohio: "It was a matter of great regret to me when I read that Joseph C. Duke was retiring. For 15 years he has performed outstanding service in that important position. I consider that he is a fine public servant."

The excerpts are from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. So little news comes out of Washington in praise of public servants below Cabinet level that this bit seemed refreshing and wholesome, American in a truly fine sense. Somehow, Joe Duke sounds like a pretty good neighbor. We join with the Senators in wishing for him a happy retirement and good health for both him and Mrs. Duke.

THE OPERATIONS OF LYND, APTHEKER, AND HAYDEN

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the members of the Foreign Relations Committee of which I am a member should not and I am convinced will not grant the requests contained in the telegrams sent from Hanoi on January 5 and from New York on January 12 by Prof. Staughton Lynd of Yale University, speaking on behalf of himself and the U.S. Communist Party historian, Herbert Aptheker, and Thomas Hayden, the founder of the Students for a Democratic Society, asking for the right to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee and to give testimony and make arguments in behalf of the Communists of North Vietnam and the Ho Chi Minh Communists of South Vietnam.

Lynd, Aptheker, and Hayden are the three men who, several weeks ago, flew to Brussels by commercial airline and then obtained Communist transportation to Hanoi stopping off in Prague, Moscow, and Peiping. In going to Hanoi, they violated the laws of the United States. They are now back in this country and are asking the right to appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations to speak in behalf of the Communist cause of North Vietnam.

The journey was, according to reports, promoted by Herbert Aptheker and had its inception at a Communist-dominated Peace Conference in Helsinki in the summer of 1965.

In a recent issue of Newsweek, these men are described as follows:

> They are a motley threesome. Aptheker, 50, is a wheelhorse theoretician who enthusiastically supported Stalin and has for years been the leading party historian. For him the trip is already a triumph, if only by association. Never have such prominent New Leftists so openly associated themselves in a headline-grabbing affair with an old-guard Communist. Hayden's presence has a milder element of surprise; the Michigan University graduate has been concentrating on an SDS poverty project in New Jersey and several months ago told friends that the group he helped found was devoting too much time to Vietnam and too little to organizing the poor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 6 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we know how much time the Senator has been allowed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes was granted on request of the Senator from Ohio, there being no objection to the request.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Continuing the description by Newsweek, we now come to Mr. Lynd, the writer of the telegrams:

> At 36, Lynd is a true athlete of the left; he hasn't missed a major "cause" in years. After the Kennedy assassination, he wrote a highly involved and much quoted New Republic article casting doubt on Oswald's guilt.
>
> He was one of the chief organizers of the anti-Vietnam war march on Washington, D.C., last April and later wrote that "nothing could have stopped that crowd from taking possession of its Government."

That is, in the midst of the march and also at the end of it, he was convinced they could have taken hold of the Government, and obviously was proud of the position which they achieved.

A further study of the background of these men will strikingly emphasize the grave mistake that would be made by the members of the Foreign Relations Committee in the event these men were honored with the right to appear before the committee.

In September of 1965, at Columbia University in New York City, was held the first annual conference of Socialist Scholars of the United States. Lynd and Aptheker were in attendance and conspicuously vigorous participants. In attendance also was Eugene D. Genovese. Dr. Genovese is the man who, at Rutgers University's "teach-in on Vietnam" on April 23, 1965, made this shocking statement:

> Those of you who know me, know I am a Marxist and a Socialist. Therefore, unlike most of my distinguished colleagues here this morning, I do not fear or regret the impending Vietcong victory in Vietnam. I welcome it.

These are the words of Genovese at that conference of Socialist scholars attended by Aptheker and Lynd.

At this first annual conference of Socialist scholars, one of the topics discussed was "the future of American socialism." The panel discussion leader was Prof. Staughton Lynd of Yale University—one of the persons who unlawfully went to Hanoi and is asking to testify before the Foreign Relations Committee. He has been affiliated with the Socialist Workers Party and American Youth for Democracy, both of which were cited as subversive by a U.S. Attorney General.

Professor Lynd has publicly called for—and mark these words—"civil disobedience so persistent and so massive" that the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and other high U.S. Government officials would be compelled to resign.

At the Columbia University conference among other things, he put the question: "What is to be done?"

He answered his own question. He further stated that a Socialist scholar should be ready at any moment to put aside his books and devote himself "to the jugular."

Whose jugular, Mr. President? The jugular vein of the United States. That is what he meant. This is the man who is asking for the right to come before the Committee on Foreign Relations and obtain publicity and advocate the cause of the Communists and depreciate the cause of the United States.

To exert revolutionary means Professor Lynd urged: "daring and inventive use of civil disobedience." He further stated:

> I wonder whether every teacher who calls himself a Socialist doesn't have a duty to become a professional revolutionary.

After Lynd got through——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. **LAUSCHE.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **LAUSCHE.** Dr. Aptheker followed Professor Lynd and began his remarks with the statement:

> Not in 30 years has there been such interest in radicalism as there is today, such a sense of confidence of mass involvement in the radicalization of the United States.

Mr. President, what do these men have in mind? The answer is that their love is for Communist China and North Vietnam, and distrust and hatred for the United States.

Dr. Genovese of Rutgers, who I have previously mentioned, also spoke at this Columbia University meeting. He said that it would be a mistake for Socialist scholars to quit the campus too soon and indulge in active revolutionary activities because their services were needed in the universities.

There was present also a Mr. Sylvester Leaks, of the Harlem Writers Guild. Mr. Leaks made this statement:

> First of all, I am not nonviolent.

He meant by that, I suppose, that he believes in violence. And violence against whom? Against you and me and against the general citizenry of the United States and against the Government of the United States.

He went on to say, "My leader was assassinated."

He was speaking of Malcolm X of the Muhammads.

Then he said:

> I believe that slavery and racism are the sine qua non of American society.

He also urged that the lumpen-proletariat "Should go to war now"; and that the slogan should be, "Burn, Baby, Burn."

At this meeting at Columbia University, Aptheker seemed to have the final word. He took the rostrum and said:

> The problem is how do we move toward radicalization of America.

He answered his own question by saying that there should be a unification and consolidation of all the efforts of the leftwingers.

Now I come to the telegram sent to the Foreign Relations Committee, asking for the right of Aptheker, Lynd, and Hayden to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee members and expound to them the theories hereinbefore set forth in my statement.

I can suffer disagreements with the views that have been expressed by some of my colleagues and by individuals who have written letters to me with the course followed by the President of the United States in Vietnam. However, neither I nor any of the general citizenry, and particularly not the Members of the U.S. Senate, should give tolerance or sufferance to the persons who make statements hoping that the Communists of North Vietnam would be victorious and the United States vanquished in the troubles in our problem in South Vietnam.

These individuals—Aptheker, Lynd, and Hayden—are not promoting the cause of the United States. They are not friends of our country. Nor should they be listened to. Especially should they not be allowed to desecrate the chambers of this Capitol by their advocacy of conquest over our country in favor of communism.

They should not be recognized in their false colors, but their true colors should be revealed, showing their greater sympathy for the cause of our enemies than for the cause of our Nation.

Whether or not these gentlemen committed a crime when they went to Communist Hanoi without first obtaining proper authority from the State Department, I do not know. At least, I am not certain. However, from the statements that have been made, there appears to be a prima facie case of violation of the criminal laws of the United States. Therefore, it seems to me that the Attorney General of the United States should give vigorous attention to ascertaining whether our criminal laws have been violated; and if he finds that to be the fact, appropriate action should be taken against those men in the furtherance of justice.

Mr. President, the quotations which I have used in my talk have been taken primarily from an article from Barron's written by Alice Widener. I want to give her full credit.

I feel certain that the Foreign Relations Committee will not allow Lynd, Aptheker, and Hayden to come before our committee. However, speaking for myself, I would drop my head in shame and I would have hesitancy in looking into the eyes of an Ohioan if I countenanced the presence of those men in the chamber of the Foreign Relations Committee, advocating the cause of communism and deprecating the cause of our own Nation.

I yield the floor. I am grateful to Senators for allowing me to take this time.

VAUGHN TO THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. **JAVITS.** Mr. President, on January 17, President Johnson announced the appointment of former Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, Jack Hood Vaughn, as the new Director of the Peace Corps.

I take this opportunity to commend Mr. Vaughn for the outstanding job he has done as Assistant Secretary during a very difficult period in United States-Latin American relations. He brings to his new post a wealth of experience and understanding drawn from an outstanding academic background, a long association with our foreign aid program, as organizer of the Latin American programs for the Peace Corps, as Ambassador to Panama, and as Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs since April 1964.

I know Secretary Vaughn personally and find him to be a dedicated public servant of great ability, charm, and dedication. As Assistant Secretary he worked with great dedication to strengthen American relations with our Latin American neighbors during a very critical period following the eruption of the Dominican crisis, and worked hard to strengthen our common bonds through the Alliance for Progress.

I am pleased that the Peace Corps, such a vital and important element in our foreign relations, will be in the hands of such an effective director.

DEATH OF CHIEF JUSTICE FRANCIS B. CONDON, OF THE SUPREME COURT OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on November 23, 1965, Francis B. Condon, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Rhode Island passed away.

Frank Condon was a man of the common people with uncommon gifts and tremendous contributions to the betterment of his times.

A jurist of superlative attainments—a public servant whose lifetime encompassed multiple careers, a citizen held in the highest respect, a layman devoted to his faith and honored by that faith, a friend of infinite value—was Frank Condon.

We note his passing in these Halls because he was Congressman Condon of the 71st, 72d, 73d, and 74th Congresses. So—30 years ago—he had already achieved a name and place in history.

Thirty years ago Frank Condon had to make a choice and face a challenge. He was called upon to forsake one career and follow another. He loved the hustings, he relished the halls of legislation, he could have looked forward to future honors without limit on the national scene. He found himself drafted by his native State to return to serve upon that State's supreme court.

Let me note Frank Condon's career to that point—and I take it from our Congressional Directory of the American Congresses.

> Francis Bernard Condon, a Representative from Rhode Island, born in Central Falls, Providence County, R.I., November 11, 1891; attended the public schools; was graduated from Central Falls High School in 1910 and from Georgetown University Law School, Washington, D.C., in 1916.
>
> He was admitted to the bar in 1916 and commenced practice in Pawtucket, R.I. During the First World War he served as a sergeant in the 152d Regiment, Depot Brigade, 23d Company from May 1918 to June 1919; he was a member of the State house of representatives 1921–1926, serving as Democratic floor leader 1923–1926; he was a member of the Democratic State Committee 1924–1926 and 1928–1930, serving as a member of the executive committee 1928–1930; he was a candidate for Lieutenant Governor of Rhode Island in 1928; Rhode Island department commander of the American Legion in 1927 and 1928; elected as a Democrat to the 71st Congress to fill a vacancy and at the same time elected to the 72d Congress; reelected to the 73d and 74th Congresses and served from November 4, 1930 until his resignation on January 10, 1935, having been appointed an associate justice of the Rhode Island Supreme Court in which capacity he is now serving.

Now let us pick up the chapter of these 30 years from Justice Condon's biography in the Manual of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island:

> Francis B. Condon was associate justice of the supreme court from January 1935 to April 28, 1957—acting chief justice of the supreme court from April 28, 1957, to January 7, 1958. Has been chief justice since January 7, 1958, chairman of the Rhode Island Judicial Conference. Member of the American, Rhode Island and Pawtucket Bar Associations and the American Judicature Society.
>
> He received the Georgetown University John Carroll Award 1961; Mount Saint Mary's College (LL.D.) honorary; Providence College (LL.D.) University of Rhode Island (LL.D.). Trustee of the boys club and memorial hospital, Pawtucket; Knight Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great with Star by appointment of Pope John XXIII, 1961.

I would add the accolade of his faith, the Catholic Church speaking through the Providence Visitor, the voice of the Diocese of Providence:

> Chief Justice Francis B. Condon was one of the State's outstanding laymen. Honored many times, he was a motivating factor in diocesan affairs at the lay level. Long active in annual diocesan Catholic charity fund appeals, he will be remembered for his addresses to the clergy and outstanding businessmen at the kickoff meetings of the campaign drives. He was a former trustee of Holy Trinity Church, Central Falls, a trustee of St. Teresa's Church, Pawtucket.
>
> His affiliations included American Legion, Elks, Knights of Columbus, Ancient Order of Hibernians, National Conference of Chief Justices, the Serra Club of Providence, the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, and the Sons of Irish Kings.
>
> A son of Dennis Gerald Condon and Rose (Collette) Condon he was married to the former Lillian F. Jordan. Surviving in addition to Mrs. Condon are their children, Francis B. Condon, Jr., and Miss Rae B. Condon, a brother James Condon, two sisters, Miss Mary G. Condon and Mrs. John Quinn, a nephew Edward Condon M. M. and a niece Sister Mary Francis of the American Novitiate of Franciscan Sisters of Mary.

We have the tribute of the Rhode Island Bar Association speaking through its president, William R. Goldberg:

> It is with profound sorrow that we note the passing of our fellow member, Chief Justice Francis B. Condon.
>
> From the start his consideration for the lawyers, his keen attention to their arguments, and his incisive questions and logic gained the respect of all. His opinions were written with great care and will serve as a living memorial to him in our jurisprudence for all time.
>
> Upon his elevation in 1958 to Chief Justice of the Court his recognition of the problems of the lawyer whose client pressed him for prompt consideration of his cause, together with his concern for the litigants, brought about an acceleration of the Court's activity to such an extent that with the help of the entire Court as constituted from time to time, the decisions have been handed down at a pace that has been unprecedented in the history of the Court.
>
> He was keenly aware of the problems of the young lawyer and after careful consideration, our Supreme Court amended its rule requiring a 6 months' clerkship by reducing it to 3 months.
>
> His devotion and love for his family was equaled only by his love of country. Judge Condon's views of the sanctity of the home and the rights of the individual are reflected in his opinions time and again.
>
> Not only has his family lost a beloved and devoted father and husband and our State lost a great and wise chief of its judicial branch of the Government but we, members of the bar, have lost a brother devoted to all mankind.

Such has been the life and labors of Frank Condon in the three decades since he served on this Capitol Hill.

There are among us those of his colleagues of that day who carry on to this day. And one can only ponder on the part that the magnificent mind and powerful personality of Frank Condon might still be playing in the drama of our daily labors.

Consider who were his colleagues in the House, and the inspiration they might have given, and taken.

There were Lister Hill, John McClellan, Everett Dirksen, Frank Carlson, John McCormack, Joe Martin, Jennings Randolph, Willis Robertson, Steve Young, Sterling Cole, Emanuel Celler, James Wadsworth, Jr., Fiorello La Guardia, Sam Rayburn, and Tom Hennings were there. There was Richard M. Kleberg who had for his secretary a young Texan named Lyndon B. Johnson.

Much of this was in my mind as I was invited to participate in a special memorial service on November 29, 1965, in the Supreme Court of Rhode Island and I would conclude with the eulogy I was privileged to express for my dear friend and associate, Justice Condon on that occasion.

Eulogy Delivered by Senator John O. Pastore at Memorial Services in Tribute to Chief Justice Francis B. Condon, in Rhode Island Supreme Court Chambers, Monday, November 29, 1965

> In this setting we are a little lonely for the personality who lived and labored here for 30 mortal years.
>
> And, with all our faith in immortality, there is a sense of loss, of the victory of the grave, to realize that Francis Condon—to whom this scene meant so much, to whom this scene owed so much—moves among us no more.
>
> Great of mind, great of heart, greatest of soul was this kindly man it was a privilege to know and an honor to call friend.
>
> Chief justice of the State of his total loyalty, Frank Condon could well have worn an equal title of the country that he served so well as citizen, as soldier, and statesman.
>
> For Frank Condon went to Congress schooled with the experience of the Rhode Island General Assembly in historic days. Gifted of speech, skilled parliamentarian, with rare attractions of friendship, he was baptized in an era of evolution on our national scene that will ever bear the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. There is no honor or office in the gift of all our people that could not have been his.
>
> In an equal era of evolution on the Rhode Island scene—that will forever bear the label of our beloved Theodore Francis Green and Robert E. Quinn—Frank Condon made the sacrifice of turning his back on the broad page of national history to write the bright page of history which is the record of the Rhode Island Supreme Court in his time.
>
> Only in terms of political opportunity would I say "sacrifice." To Frank Condon it was no sacrifice to come back to this high service to the State of his birth.
>
> He has touched these 30 years with a courageous, correct and courteous application of justice and humanity, unsurpassed in equity and integrity.
>
> No one knows this better than a young prosecuting attorney, no one appreciates it more than a Governor leaning upon him amid the anxieties of office. No one is prouder of it than a Senator who rejoices in his own State's excellence among constitutional equals.
>
> This may be grand language to describe a man whose own language was simple and sincere, whether in his eloquence to an en-

raptured audience or in his quiet encouragement to a friend. A call, a message, a handclasp, a bit of spoken praise from Frank Condon was high satisfaction and inspiration.

The honors that came to him from his church were splendid. The honors that came from his people were sacred. The shadow that falls on his loved ones is our common sorrow.

A great American and a good man leaves us all the heritage of a life lived to its finest.

VIETNAM, PAST AND PROSPECT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in a series of four newspaper articles, Miss Beverly Deepe has recently reviewed the war as it has evolved in Vietnam during the past year. Miss Deepe is eminently qualified by experience to report on this critical area.

Miss Deepe writes from Vietnam, from the delta, from Saigon, from the coastal bases, from the highlands. And the picture which emerges from the four articles is a vivid and accurate summary of the situation which confronts us in Vietnam.

These articles, Mr. President, make highly informative and highly useful reading. For the benefit of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the four articles which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, in the issues of January 16–19 inclusive be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 16, 1966]

New Series: Vietnam, Past and Prospect

(By Beverly Deepe)

Pleiku, South Vietnam.—Amid mortar craters and charred aircraft here on the morning of February 7, 1965, three figures in the war against the Communist in South Vietnam met in a gleaming C–123 transport. Before they emerged, the nature of the war had changed.

One was McGeorge Bundy, special assistant to President Johnson for national security affairs, who took time before the meeting to survey Pleiku's blasted airplanes and helicopters and the billets where shortly before 8 Americans had died and 125 had been wounded in a Vietcong guerrilla raid.

With Mr. Bundy was Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the American commander, who provided the C–123, called the White Whale and the only wall-to-wall carpeted airplane in South Vietnam.

The Vietnamese commander in chief, Lt. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, had arrived earlier. Meanwhile, in Saigon U.S. Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor conferred by telephone with the highest ranking American officials in Washington.

General Khanh, Mr. Bundy, and General Westmoreland escaped inquisitive reporters inside the White Whale. Soon, the key decision was told to General Khanh and within hours 49 U.S. planes from three 7th Fleet aircraft carriers sped north of the 17th parallel to bomb the military barracks at the North Vietnamese city of Dong Hoi.

At first, the bombing of North Vietnam was a policy of tit for tat—if you destroy our installations, we'll destroy yours. But it soon gave way to general retaliation, and then to regular and continual bombing. In the beginning, the policy was officially proclaimed an inducement to the north to negotiate. High ranking American officials said hopefully: "We'll be at the conference table by September."

But Hanoi did not negotiate. The new official objective was to hit the military installations and the communication routes which allowed Hanoi to pour men and materiel into South Vietnam. By the year's end, however, official estimates said North Vietnamese infiltration had more than doubled—to 2,500 men a month.

Superficially, bombing North Vietnam failed. It did not force Hanoi to negotiate; it did not stop the infiltration. But actually, the policy half succeeded. By the end of the year, the bombing had partially paralyzed the economic capacity and manpower reserves of North Vietnam.

If the bombing did not stop Hanoi's aggression, in official eyes, it would at least make it more expensive and painful for North Vietnam to continue. Escalation was accompanied by a little noticed policy of expansion; Laos was known to be subject to American bombing raids throughout the past year. By the beginning of 1966, the air war threatened to spread to Cambodia, and then would engulf the whole Indochinese Peninsula.

GROUND WAR

The air war over North Vietnam, however, did not abate sharp deterioration in the allied ground efforts in South Vietnam, which had been worsening since the fall of the Ngo Dinh Diem regime in November 1963. The repercussions of the coup against Diem badly damaged the Government's administrative and intelligence apparatuses. Amid Government instability in Saigon swirled whirlwind changes of officials at every level. The strategic hamlet program, formulated and nurtured by the Diem regime, collapsed as the Vietcong regained one Government hamlet after another, leaving behind their own guerrilla bands and political machinery.

With some accuracy the situation in the countryside could be measured by statistics. Before the fall of Diem, the Saigon government claimed control of 8,000 of the 12,000 hamlets in the countryside. By the end of 1965, the most optimistic estimate put the number of "pacified," or pro-government, hamlets at 2,000.

After the fall of Diem, military commanders quickly began to change their "measle" maps. Pink contested areas became red; and white "measle pox"—which once had been government controlled—became contested "pink." By the middle of 1965, government provincial capitals and district headquarters were ringed by small oases of friendly villages, but otherwise were isolated by increasing Red pressure in the countryside. Then, in July 1964, the first North Vietnamese regular troops began appearing. These units, later to be designated as People's Army of North Vietnam (PAVN), solidified the growing Red strength.

By the end of 1965, military spokesmen said nine PAVN regiments had infiltrated from North Vietnam (American, Korean, and Australian ground units by late 1965 numbered 44 battalions—or roughly 15 regiments.)

On March 8, 1965, the first 3,500 U.S. marines came ashore and were welcomed by a bevy of girls.

The American and allied buildup continued throughout the year. It came part of the 3d Marine Division, and later the whole division, a brigade of the 101st Airborne Division, elements of the 1st Marine Division, the Republic of Korea's Tiger Regiment and Marine Division, an Australian regiment, and finally the entire U.S. 1st Cavalry Airmobile Division, with its more than 400 helicopters and 15,000 troops, many of them airborne. By the end of the year, American combat military personnel numbered 130,000. The outlook for 1966; the equivalent of at least 1 division a month for 12 months, or nearly 200,000 more troops.

MARINES

The 1st Marines officially were to provide "local, close-in security" for the Da Nang airbase, but soon they began what U.S. spokesmen called "offensive patrolling for defensive purposes." By mid-July, American troops went into unequivocal full combat with Communist forces for the first time since the Korean war—as the 173d Airborne Brigade went out on a search-and-destroy operation in the Red stronghold known as D-Zone.

With the new employment of ground and air forces, the U.S. role went through gradual metamorphosis. At the end of 1965 America was in a war it barely realized it had entered. The cold war had gone hot in the jungles of the Indochinese Peninsula.

Beyond the ideological conflict, the war dramatized and tested two systems of power. One, the massive physical power of America; the other, the power of the Communists to manipulate the masses, to incite uprisings labeled by the Chinese Communists as the "war of liberation." Washington and Peiping appeared to agree it was the "war of the future."

The essence of the war was described by a 20-year-old American private who saw the buildup in Da Nang:

"I can tell you when Uncle Sam moves in, there's no goofing around," he said. "There was nothing here. Then the Marines moved in and the buildings started going up. We got word an F–100 squadron was moving in here and we had 4 days to fill 200,000 bags of dirt to sandbag mortar defenses. Even the colonels were shoveling dirt.

"Now you can look down this runway and for 2 miles there are American jets wing tip to wing tip," he said. "That's real power."

The private, who had sat 14 hours a day for 13 months in a foxhole at the edge of the Da Nang runway, turned to the other side of the war.

INTELLIGENCE

"'The Vietcong know more about what's happening on this airbase than the base commander and the 20,000 American marines around it," he said. "There are 6,000 workers who come on here daily. We know some of them are Vietcong. If the Vietnamese security officer keeps them off, he and his family will be killed.

"The Vietcong can come on this base right under our noses—we don't know who's who. We saw an old woman carrying a bucket of drain oil into the gate. When we checked her, there was only an inch of oil and the rest of the bucket was a false bottom filled with plastic explosive. We captured one of the workers drawing diagrams of all the defense structures on the base. We captured one of the drivers of an American bus taking down the tail numbers of all the American aircraft on the base," the private went on.

"Once my unit was given 5 hours of leave to go to the commissary. When we returned, more than half of the 100 American foxholes around the base had small paper bags in them. Each bag had a poisonous krait snake in it. Some worker had just walked around and dropped a snake in each foxhole."

This conflict of the two systems of power—the old woman with a bucket of explosive and the double-the-speed-of sound Phantom jets—was the essence of America's inscrutable war, which one Western diplomat described as "the unholy trinity of terrorism, subversion, and guerrilla warfare."

America's inscrutable war in Vietnam had brush-fired into another area of the volatile, underdeveloped, uncommitted third world.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 17, 1966]

VIETNAM: PAST AND PROSPECT—SOUTH VIETS IDENTIFY GI'S WITH COLONIALISM

(By Beverly Deepe)

SAIGON.—The buildup of American combat troops in Vietnam during 1965 produced a visible buildup in anti-Americanism among the Vietnamese population.

A significant date between the February 7 bombing of North Vietnam and the March 8 arrival of the first American combat units was the February 20 mutiny against Commander-in-Chief Gen. Nguyen Khanh by his generals. The net effect of General Khanh's overthrow was to fragment the anti-Communist power in Saigon, while the Vietcong had seized partial control of the country at the village level.

As commander in chief, a more important post in wartime than that of Prime Minister, Generan Khanh had dominated the anti-Communist scene—and had been acclaimed by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara as America's strongman for Vietnam. But by late 1964, General Khanh grew bitter toward U.S. Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor, who demanded political stability, while General Khanh was aspiring to the presidency.

FALSE COUP

Twelve days after the bombing of North Vietnam, a false coup was led by Col. Pham Ngoc Thao, who was openly acknowledged to be associated with the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. The next day the generals forced General Khanh out of the country. The 600,000-man Vietnamese armed forces were turned over to a weak commander in chief. Finally, the post was abolished, leaving the armed forces virtually leaderless.

Prime Minister Phan Huy Quat ran into trouble. After 3 months in office he called for support from the Vietnamese generals, who promptly tossed him out of office. A Vietnamese military junta again took on the job of governing the country while attempting to defeat an enemy.

Amid instability on the anti-Communist side, the Reds could exploit the first American combat units—who arrived without solid political, economic, or social battle plans. The instincts of the Vietnamese, traditionally xenophobic, were to identify the American troops with the former French colonial masters. Better political and economic preparation of the American troops would have eased the situation considerably.

It was widely known in Saigon that the Vietnamese—including Prime Minister Phan Huy Quat—learned of the date of the arrival of the first marines in March from foreign press announcements made in Saigon and Washington. The Vietnamese feared they might win the war but lose their country. Outbursts from officers, students, and intellectuals charged that "the Americans were running the whole show."

THE DOLLAR

No sooner did the American troops land in the northern provinces than the medium of exchange became the U.S. dollar rather than the piaster. With no restrictions on the amount of available dollars, an American private had purchasing power once held only by Vietnamese generals. Cokes, beers, and wash basins were purchased in villages with nickels, dimes, and quarters. In at least one instance, a Vietnamese village chief, backed up by his popular force platoons, attempted to invade the village of another chief and to seize the villagers' American dollars at an unfair rate of exchange. Six months after the arrival of the first American units, American officials abolished the use of dollars in Vietnam. Replacing them was military scrip, which now has become another "floating currency."

The American troops quickly became the predominant possessors of one of the scarcest items in Vietnam. Women. Few Vietnamese appreciated the loss of their women—or the fact that illiterate females could earn 10 times a man's pay. Gradually, in any city or village bordering American units, drugstores, villas, and furniture stores quickly gave way to bars and brothels.

WAGES

The buildup of American forces also brought demands for more housing, runways, offices, and other facilities. Wages for skilled labor, and cost of building materials and transportation brought inflation. "The Vietnamese economy is in horrific shape. This could ruin the whole campaign against the Vietcong," one Western diplomat said recently.

The Vietcong sabotage of roads had also produced inflation on items such as rice, charcoal, and fish sauce. The American economic mission reacted by importing consumer goods to sop up the excess purchasing power—and financed the emergency import of 250,000 tons of rice. While the Saigon price of rice dropped, in the provinces rich merchants continued to charge what the traffic would bear.

The Vietnamese hurt most by the inflation were not the Communists, but the government's own officials and troops, paid mostly on fixed salaries.

In the city of Da Nang, an average of three or four fistfights a week break out between GI's and teenage Vietnamese gangs, popularly known as "cowboys." One American serviceman was beaten up and lay in a back alley for 2 days. Though Vietnamese shopkeepers saw the body, they did not report it to police. The American military police finally located it.

By the beginning of 1966, it became apparent that the Buddhist bonzes, as well as the Vietcong, could easily exploit Vietnamese nationalism and anti-Americanism.

One incident used by the Buddhists occurred when the American marines fired two tank rifle rounds into a pagoda from which they claimed a sniper was firing at them. The word immediately spread among Vietnamese peasants that the marines had maliciously fired into the pagoda. The marines also were accused of having deliberately broken a Buddhist statue and strewn human excrement around the pagoda.

The Buddhists, widely considered to include neutralists and pro-Communists, previously had successfully toppled two administrations in Vietnam: President Ngo Dinh Diem in November 1963, and General Khanh in August 1964.

"If the Buddhist priests do turn anti-American, the war will change into a new dimension which we can't even yet imagine," one source said, looking forward to 1966.

At the beginning of the year, rural Vietnam was half conquered by the Vietcong, and the urban portion was in a state of semi-insurrection. As more American troops arrived, resulting anti-Americanism vastly complicated the prospects for economic and political stability.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 18, 1966]

VIETNAM: PAST AND PROSPECT—SUBVERSION IN THE MEKONG DELTA

SA DEC, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Officially, the Mekong Delta south of Saigon—where no American combat units have yet been based—is one of the spots where the Vietnamese Government is progressing well. The simple tranquillity of fishing boats passing through canals, the hectic automobile traffic on the roads, the unbroken routine of peasant life would seem to confirm the official version.

But those who live in the villages say the Vietcong have seized virtual control of this rich rice bowl.

The process is not one of violent battles, but the invisible strangulation and isolation of government authority. It is a process of subversion which might be called termite warfare. Government authority has been squeezed into small rings of villages around provincial and district capitals, and into isolated outposts along the main roads and canals.

At Sa Dec is the headquarters of the Vietnamese 9th Infantry Division. Six miles away is the village complex of Nha Man. Two of its three villages are already controlled by the Communists. The third village, Tan Nhuan Dong, is protected by one company of about 100 paramilitary troops. An additional platoon is assigned to each of two smaller outposts—Ba Thien, 1 mile away, and Nga Ba, 2 miles off.

ENCIRCLED

The company at Tan Nhuan Dong lives in an old French fort. Its job is to protect the village and a bridge which stretches across a river flanked by several operating rice mills and brick factories.

The two outposts are encircled by Vietcong guerrillas. Last month they were totally isolated from the local population. To bring in supplies and support for these two posts, the government has to use 10 armored boats. On every voyage the boats and their complement of troops draw Communist sniper fire.

The platoons in each of the two small posts theoretically send out small, regular patrols to gather intelligence. They are called the "ears and eyes of the regular forces." But recently, a local villager described them as "blind men in a jail." For it is rare that a member of either platoon dares leave his compound, even to fetch water from the river 20 yards away.

Last week, one defender crossed the outpost's barbed wire fence for water. He was wounded by a sniper and fell on the river bank. No one dared rescue him. He died and his body was left on the same spot for three days. The commander asked headquarters for reinforcements, to pick up the body 20 yards away from his post. The request was refused.

The platoon was ordered to bury the corpse inside the post, but again the men refused to pick up the body. On repeated orders, they eventually brought in the corpse, but the outpost had no shovels, so they used knives to dig the grave. They had no lumber or nails, so they ripped wood from the walls of their outpost to make the coffin.

After the grotesque burial, morale was so low the company commander decided to transfer the platoon. The 100-man company ordered to relieve them refused to obey their transfer order and most of them defected to the Communists rather than man the Nga Ba outpost. Most returned after the province district chiefs were forced to visit the company of deserters, but the order to man the outpost was rescinded.

ISOLATION

The influence of the Communists goes, however, far beyond the terror built with sniper's bullets.

Last month, the Vietcong ordered peasants and businessmen working or living within a half mile of the Nga Ba outpost to move away. The word went out: No one was allowed to move inside the half mile limit. Rather than sail on the river 20 yards from the outposts, villagers' sampans were assigned to small canals.

One rice miller moved his mill brick-by-brick, machine-by-machine, to a new spot nearer government authority. One villager's reaction: "The Vietcong were very nice to give him the permission to move his rice mill. Otherwise, he would have starved to death. No one would have brought rice to him to be polished within the half mile radius of the post."

In monthly propaganda meetings with the villagers, Vietcong political agents claim "the Americans are waging an all-out war against the Vietnamese people. The people have to make a clear-cut choice between their friends and their enemies. Those who want to fight with the Americans can go to the government-controlled area. Those who want to fight against the Americans can stay with us. There is no third choice."

In Sa Dec, refugee villagers prefer to live in their sampans moored along the riverfront. They have refused to live in refugee housing provided by the government.

Many of the wealthier landowners already have been forced to flee to government-controlled zones, producing the effect of an economic purge of the area by the Communists. Their abandoned lands, especially fruit groves along the canals, have been boobytrapped and mined by Red guerrillas. The Vietcong have warned landowners that their lands will be confiscated if they allow their sons to become government soldiers.

The Vietcong forbid landowners to hire local labor, and terrorize potential workers—drying up the labor force from both ends. Once-wealthy landed proprietors must plant and harvest their own rice—backbreaking work.

VISITS HALTED

Within the last month, the Vietcong have withdrawn permission to local residents to visit friends or relatives in government-controlled areas. Even the father of one of the senior generals at the Vietnamese Army headquarters in Saigon—who previously had been allowed by the Vietcong to visit his son—now is forbidden to leave the Vietcong area.

But the Vietcong efforts are not all just erosive. They have established efficient—though unofficial and terroristic—taxation. Often using children as collectors, they force millers, small factory owners and businessmen to pay regular levies.

Peasants must turn over to the Reds 40 percent of the rice they grow above their own family's consumption. Any fish or grain grown in the Red-controlled area which is sent into government territory is taxed by the Vietcong—as if they maintained a national border.

So under the noses of government officials and a major army force, the Communists have established their own government in the Mekong Delta. It has almost eroded away the authority of the anti-Communist Saigon regime, and, perhaps more significantly, has taken major steps toward replacing it with an authority of their own.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 19, 1966]

VIETNAM: PAST AND PRESENT—MARINES' GREAT EFFORT: SECURING DA NANG

(By Beverly Deepe)

DA NANG, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Last fall, the battle cry of the U.S. Marines here was: "We'll be in Hoi An by New Year's Day 1966." Today, they estimate it will be New Year's 1968.

Hoi An is a provincial capital, only 15 miles south of the strategic airbase of Da Nang. The change in the marines' mood illustrates the changing role of American troops in Vietnam—and some of their problems.

"We could easily have fought our way to Hoi An," one marine said recently. "But then, we would have had to fight our way back. The essential problem of this war is not moving your front lines forward. It is keeping your rear covered."

The key to the problem lies in getting and keeping the support of the rural population. Without it, most authorities believe the war could go on for years.

So it was decided to halt the marines' advance until the Vietnamese could win over the local population. The decision brought dissent from within Marine Corps ranks and sneers from Army colonels, who claimed "the marines are afraid to go out and find the Vietcong." But gradually, the marine effort outside of Da Nang, under the direction of Marine Cmdr. Maj. Gen. Lewis Walt, began to dovetail with the work of the Vietnamese Government.

THIRD DIMENSION

"In a conventional war, progress is measured by an advancing front line," one official explained. "But in this war our outlying positions are constant. Progress must be measured in the third dimension. We must go down into the population to dig out the Vietcong infrastructure and then rebuild the local anti-Communist government."

The result of this coordinated effort was the Five Mountain Villages Campaign, less than 10 miles southwest of Da Nang and 15 miles from Hoi An. It is the principal current pacification program and a pilot case for the future.

"If this plan doesn't succeed here, it's not going to succeed anywhere else in the country," an official said. "We'll really be in serious trouble then."

The project already has run into some serious trouble.

The five villages of the campaign are subdivided into 19 hamlets, covering a 20-square-kilometer area. In the complex dwell 42,000 people, of whom about 7 percent are believed to be related to Vietcong. Snuggled among lush rice paddies, the villages are surrounded by the five peaks of mountains containing gray and salmon-colored marble. "These marble mountains would make a great tourist attraction, but you'd be killed going out there," one marine said.

The pacification campaign has three components: U.S. marines are assigned to secure the outer limits of the area, patrolling to prevent the invasion by Communist units; Vietnamese paramilitary troops maintain security in the villages; Vietnamese civilian teams distribute goods, wage psychological warfare, take censuses, and attempt to undo the Vietcong's existing political devices and to bring the villagers to the Government's side.

"The role of the U.S. Marines is like an egg," an official said. "Our front lines, on the rim of the area, are the shell—but like a shell, the lines can be broken. The vital installation—the Da Nang airbase—is the yolk, and we also defend that. The white is the countryside, which we are trying to pacify and solidify."

On October 18, the Vietnamese forces began their effort, using one headquarters company and four understrength line companies of the 59th Regional Forces Battalion. A civilian cadre of 327 persons was moved in from provincial headquarters. The Vietnamese commander put them through a 2-week retraining course. They were joined by five Vietnamese People's Action Teams (PATs), of 10 persons each, who were responsible for census taking and other activities.

To each village, the Vietnamese commander sent one Regional Forces company and one People's Action Team. In each of the 19 hamlets, he put a civilian cadre team.

"During the third week of the campaign, a 50-man Vietcong platoon broke through the marine blocking position. They were in our area shooting things up. They hit us hard," an official related.

"Five Regional Force troopers and several cadremen were killed. Each of our armed companies was understrength, so we had 15-man platoons where we should have had 35 men. Fighting against 50 Vietcong, of course, we lose against those odds.

"Until then we were just beginning to get the confidence of the people—but after that, the people clammed up and wouldn't tell us anything. And it also hurt the morale of our cadre. One whole 11-man team took off—but the district chief talked them into coming back," the official went on.

"Then, four nights later, the same Vietcong platoon hit us again. They slipped in between two marine patrols, attacked the regional force headquarters unit of 17 men, killed several civilian cadre and kidnaped 2 women working with a drama unit. We haven't seen the women since. One of the American marines saw action from 50 yards away—but he couldn't open up with his machinegun—he would have killed more friendlies than enemies.

"Of course, the marines can't stop all small-unit infiltration. It would take marines shoulder-to-shoulder to do that. And once you had that, the Vietcong would mortar them from across the river, which they've already started doing," he said.

Since the late November action, the Vietnamese and the marines have slightly reinforced the area. Now the marines are not only holding the outer perimeter by extensive patrolling, they also are responsible for the securing of the civilian cadre in 11 of the 19 hamlets. Vietnamese troops defend the remaining eight.

TRY AGAIN

By mid-December, "we started pacifying again and things were moving slow, but good," the official said. "The people began giving us good intelligence and were turning in some Vietcong. For the first time, on a Sunday afternoon, families from Da Nang would come to the villages to visit their relatives. More than 100 families moved back into the area—but none of the people were of draft age."

On one night in late December, however, the Vietcong launched four harassing attacks. They hit the central command post with mortars and struck another People's Action Team, killing several.

Gradually, the cadre force fell from 331 to 304. Besides attrition, there were substantial problems with the cadre because of inadequate training and the fact that they were not natives of the villages in which they were working.

The PAT's—equipped, paid, and trained for political activity and intelligence work by an arm of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency—had their own troubles. They were better armed than the Vietnamese troops, and the local commander wanted to use them for military security. They refused. One team defected and another had to be transferred because of local conflicts.

"The biggest headache is that we can't move our Vietnamese troops and cadre out of this 20-square-kilometer collection of hamlets until we have villagers here who can defend the area," the official said. "There's not one young man here between the ages of 10 and 38 whom we can recruit. We've lost the middle generation, and no one has begun to find an answer to that problem."

Before the marines reach Hoi An—with their backs protected—80 square kilometers of land must be pacified. At that, the marine estimate of New Year's Day, 1968, is not far away.

BASIN, WYO., POSTMASTER RECEIVES CITATION OF MERIT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, it was my most welcome privilege this morning to be present in the office of the Postmaster General when an old friend, the postmaster at Basin, Wyo., received a citation of merit for beautification of the post office building and grounds.

Postmaster R. J. O'Neill, in cooperation with J. E. Johnstone of the Denver regional post office, carried out a program which included planting of flowers and shrubbery, and had the cooperation of a number of the good people of Basin. Local organization assisted in this most worthwhile project by furnishing flowers and shrubbery.

Mr. O'Neill and 13 other postmasters met in the reception room of the Postmaster General's office at 11 this morning to receive the citations. I take this opportunity to felicitate Mr. O'Neill and the other postmasters, as well as other employees of the postal department and citizens of this Nation who are making the national beautification program a significant success.

THE NONPROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, we need swift action toward a nuclear nonproliferation treaty for the simple reason that we are running out of time. There is no other issue before the Senate this year—including even the war in Vietnam—which is of greater basic importance to the world and the nations.

The desperate importance of this question has been seen, and stated, for many years by noted scholars and political leaders. It was recognized by President John F. Kennedy, who told a press conference on March 21, 1963, that 15 or 20 countries might have nuclear weapons by 1975 and that he was haunted by this problem. A year and a half later, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara told an interviewer that in 10 to 20 years tens of nations would be capable of having nuclear weapons, and that the danger to the world increases geometrically with the increase in the number of nations possessing those warheads.

Secretary McNamara explained that American nuclear warheads then cost anywhere from roughly half a million dollars on up, perhaps to a million dollars. But in the years ahead he warned:

> Because of advances in nuclear technology, the cost of nuclear weapons will fall dramatically—

McNamara added—

> and as the technology becomes simpler, we can expect more and more nations to acquire capability for both developing and producing such weapons.

A year later President Johnson solemnly warned the world that the proliferation of nuclear weapons was the "gravest of all unresolved human issues" and he stated:

> The peace of the world requires firm limits upon the spread of nuclear weapons.

And as all Members of the Senate are well aware, the junior Senator from New York presented two brilliant analyses of these problems in June and October of last year.

Now Mr. President, I am not technically trained or knowledgeable in matters of producing nuclear weapons, and I do not know how fast this anticipated reduction in the cost and time required to produce nuclear weapons has taken place, or what the current figures are. But I did notice in an Associated Press dispatch dated October 7, 1965, from London a statement that the annual report of the British Atomic Energy Authority indirectly revealed that Britain has been working on research "which could lead to production of cut-price atomic and hydrogen bombs."

And I am aware that for many years scientists in a number of countries have been working on top-secret efforts to make the centrifuge method of uranium separation not only workable, but workable at a cost much reduced from the gaseous diffusion process used by the present nuclear powers.

Consequently, I have absolutely no reason to doubt, and have every reason to agree with, the startling statement made last June by the junior Senator from New York:

> Within a very few years, an investment of a few million dollars—well within the capacity even of private organizations—will produce nuclear weapons. Once such a capability is in being, weapons will probably be produced for costs in the hundreds of thousands of dollars each. Similarly, delivery systems are far cheaper than they once were.

One of the wonderful things about scientific technology is that it rapidly discovers cheaper production methods for even the most expensive items. Unhappily, this remarkable ability extends to nuclear weapons as well as tractors and gumdrops.

It is not too difficult to foresee the day when atomic bomb production will be within the ability of any nation that now possesses even the know-how to efficiently manufacture popguns.

In fact, if a nuclear entrepreneur could find a permissive host country, it is even conceivable that he could open an international fireworks stand that would sell to all comers.

We already have five nervous fellows holding shotguns on each other and a new influx of gunmen will do nothing to soothe that jittery feeling and calm the stomach.

This is not a problem for some future administration to deal with. It is not a problem for some future Senate to take seriously while today we satisfy ourselves with making brief speeches. This is a problem for this year, this month, this week, this very day.

The actual work being conducted on nuclear weapons development is naturally a closely guarded secret in this, as in other countries, but we do have some disturbing clues.

In the case of Israel, we know that there has been grave concern in that beleaguered country about the work for several years on rockets by Egypt, assisted by some West German engineers. And we know that Israel has been pushing for a good many years research and development on her own atomic reactors, with a considerable amount of assistance from France.

And as long ago as July 5, 1962, there was an article in the Washington Post reporting from Jerusalem that Israeli intellectuals were protesting the building of atomic weapons by their country. Perhaps Israel had not then in fact launched an actual atomic weapons program. But the fact remains that this is a country with a well-advanced reactor program, a country that is rich in technical personnel, a country determined to fight for its survival in a hostile environment—a country, in short, which might be pressed to develop its own nuclear weapons before much longer, if the present world nuclear anarchy continues.

In the case of India, we have had repeated public assurances first from Prime Minister Nehru and then from Prime Minister Shastri that India was not embarking on a nuclear weapons program. But such expressions of intent should not lull away our concern.

This is highly unlikely to remain India's policy indefinitely. During the September fighting with Pakistan, a large group of Parliament members petitioned the Government to begin atomic bomb production. Should conflict with her neighbors reerupt, such pressures might become irresistible.

And if India takes this fateful step, how great will be the pressures for Pakistan to draw scarce resources from its own urgent economic development efforts in order to follow suit.

And, of course, so, too, will Nasser's Egypt inevitably follow the same path if Israel does develop atomic weapons.

Within a few years more, with the price and difficulty of building these horror weapons reduced, we may expect such countries as Sweden, Italy, and Canada to follow. And, by this time, West Germany may have decided to break her 1954 treaty commitments in order to start on the road to becoming one of the most powerful of the burgeoning nuclear powers, while Japan will doubtless have redrafted her constitutional inhibitions and also taken the plunge.

Other countries listed by AEC Chairman Glenn Seaborg last summer as being capable of building their own bombs before too much longer included Switzerland, Brazil, Spain, and Yugoslavia.

Fortunately, if the need for constructive action to deal with this dread possibility is great, so too is the opportunity now a great one.

For many months, the United States and the Soviet Union have been at an impasse that, basically, involved West Germany's participation in a European nuclear defense.

I think Russia's nervousness about Germany is understandable to any student of modern history. Our problem is to give Germany the feeling of being a full-fledged member of the European defense team while, at the same time, providing Russia with positive assurances that West Germany will never be able to launch a nuclear attack on her own.

Hopefully, the United States will now be able to present new proposals to the Disarmament Conference which will accomplish both ends.

The preparation and negotiation of such a treaty should be a top priority item for the leadership of this country, and of all other countries as well. In addition, I would hope we would explore the idea of developing treaties establishing nuclear-free zones in Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East.

But we must not delude ourselves into thinking that such treaties will be easy to obtain, once agreement is reached between the Soviet Union and the United States. Nor should we imagine that such treaties will completely solve the problem of proliferation.

We have in fact been given ample warnings that to many of the nonnuclear countries such treaties appear to be designed by the present nuclear club to maintain its monopoly: denying entrance to any other countries, while refusing to make comparable sacrifices themselves.

Mr. William C. Foster, head of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, underlined this point in his noteworthy article in Foreign Affairs last July. Mr. Foster wrote:

> Unless the nonnuclear powers are persuaded that their interests are best served by not acquiring nuclear weapons they will ultimately acquire them. A necessary, though perhaps not sufficient, condition for so persuading them is to offer clear evidence that the Soviet Union and the United States are prepared to exercise leadership in the world on a basis of strength other than that inherent in their nuclear capabilities. It is for this reason that agreements to freeze production and to start reductions in fissionable materials and in nuclear delivery systems are so important.

Mr. President, over the past 20 years the United States and the Soviet Union made the possession of nuclear weapons the basic currency of major power status. Today, we have belatedly discovered that these awful weapons, especially when they are possessed by more than one nation, are not very useful as instruments of national policy.

If we now wish to halt the proliferation of these weapons, we need a nonproliferation treaty coupled with a concerted effort by the present nuclear powers to make significant steps toward nuclear disarmament.

And it should be supported by a declaration by all the present nuclear powers that they would never be the first to use these weapons—that such stocks as they would retain at least for the time being would be kept for only one single totally defensive purpose: to use in retaliation if any other nuclear power broke its pledge and initiated the use of these weapons.

But if this seems too great a hurdle to be taken, all at once, then a halfway measure would be better than none. The recent report of the Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament to the White House Conference on International Cooperation, popularly known as the Wiesner committee, proposed that "nuclear powers commit themselves to refrain from the use, or threat of use, of nuclear weapons against nonnuclear ones."

I would endorse this proposal by the Wiesner committee. Indeed, I support many others of the important recommendations made in this extremely thoughtful report and I urge my fellow Senators, and all concerned Americans, to read this report with great care.

In closing, Mr. President, let me say that there are indeed many partial steps which we can and should and must take to help halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The resolution offered on Tuesday by the Senator from Rhode Island, which I was delighted to cosponsor, is one of those steps and I urge its prompt and favorable consideration.

It seems to me that a truly meaningful treaty should be feasible because it would so clearly be in the best interests of everyone who signed—and that is the best assurance of success that any contract can have.

DAVID SQUIRE, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE JOB CORPS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I was pleased and proud to learn of the recent appointment of my friend, Mr. David Squire, as Deputy Director of the Job Corps. I take this opportunity to extend my heartiest congratulations to Mr. Squire on his new position and to applaud Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, for his outstanding selection.

A resident of Stamford, Conn., Mr. Squire has sacrificed a prominent position in industry in order to assume this new office. He expressed his reason for doing so in saying that he "wished to make a meaningful contribution to our society by taking on a responsible and challenging position."

The task he is about to undertake will provide him with that opportunity. The significance of the Job Corps, in attempting to aid young people between the ages of 16 and 21 who are unemployed due to their lack of education and suitable skills, cannot be questioned. Through the 84 corps centers, young men and women are able to develop new skills and habits, and to benefit from actual work experience.

A program such as this is vital in our efforts to uphold the principle of equality of opportunity. Its success is dependent upon capable and dedicated leaders.

Mr. David Squire is such a man, bringing to his new assignment a wealth of experience. A graduate of Dartmouth College, where he majored in sociology, Mr. Squire has been associated with Ansonia Mills, first as assistant treasurer and later in the capacity of president and chief executive officer. In 1963 he accepted, on behalf of Ansonia Mills, the President's E award for export excellence. As a member of the United Nations Association, the Connecticut Association for Mental Health, and the Urban Redevelopment Commission, Mr. Squire has an outstanding record of service to his community.

I wish Dave Squire all the best in his new endeavors. I know he will be successful.

PERILS OF A DOLLAR WALL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the New York Times on January 19.

The story reports the views of Prof. Peter B. Kenen of Columbia University, an authority on international monetary affairs, on the effects on world commerce of the restrictive balance-of-payments measures taken by the administration. His principal point is that, while these measures are steadily eliminating our balance-of-payments deficit, they are also causing a retreat from the objective of a freer and healthier world economy.

This has been the basis of my own opposition to many of the measures proposed by the administration and my support for the early reform of the international monetary system. It has been my view that we are sacrificing a very important long-term goal of American foreign economic policy; namely, the gradual elimination of barriers to trade and capital, for a conflicting short-term objective; namely, the complete elimination of our balance-of-payments deficit.

Professor Kenen believes that the administration is only partially to be blamed for the controls that it imposed. He places most of the blame on the existing international monetary system which, as Professor Kenen says, "is long on discipline and short on credit creation to aid deficit countries" so that it encourages "the use of trade controls, overt or covert, impairing economic efficiency in the world as a whole." This is well borne out by data issued a few days ago by the IMF which indicates that international reserves, which had grown steadily for years prior to 1965, have grown very little in 1965 and may have even stopped growing.

In this same connection, I noted with interest Secretary of Commerce Connor's announcement on Monday that the voluntary balance-of-payments program should be ended by February of next year. Whether or not this announcement means that the administration is coming around to the viewpoint that the continued imposition of these voluntary controls is harmful to the American economy or whether it has come to the realization that these voluntary controls, in the absence of full-scale exchange controls, will decrease in effectiveness, I am not in a position to say.

The fact that we have controls only strengthens the position of those countries who still maintain exchange controls, such as many of the continental European nations.

Now that the United States has demonstrated its ability and willingness to reduce its balance-of-payments deficit, our first and urgent priority should be the reform of the international monetary system and the devising of new mechanisms for the adequate creation of international reserves. Further restrictions by the United States and other developed nations can only lead to more restrictions and the eventual jeopardy of the existing economic order.

I ask unanimous consent to have articles from the New York Times pertaining to my statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 11, 1966]

LAG IN WORLD MONETARY GROWTH IN 1965 INDICATED BY IMF DATA

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, January 10.—The grand total of official monetary reserves in the non-Communist world rose in the third quarter of last year but remained below the level at the end of 1964, the International Monetary Fund reported today.

Total reserves, also known as international liquidity, were estimated at $68.88 billion at the end of September, compared with $68.37 billion at the end of June and $68.90 billion at the end of 1964.

These reserves are held by nations to finance actual and potential deficits in their international payments. They are composed of gold, dollars and pounds, as well as automatic drawing rights on the IMF.

Of the total of reserves at the end of September, $41.2 billion was in gold and $22.3 billion in dollars and pounds.

International liquidity had grown steadily for years prior to 1965. It now appears certain that the growth rate last year was very small or even zero.

LAG IN TRADE GROWTH

Today's report, contained in the monthly publication International Financial Statistics, was accompanied by a parallel report in the same publication showing a marked slowdown in the growth of world trade last year.

There is no necessary early or direct connection between a slower growth in liquidity and a parallel movement in trade though in the long run a lack of liquidity would almost certainly hamper trade since liquidity represents the wherewithal for conducting world commerce.

Officials have given three main reasons for the failure of international liquidity to rise in 1965.

First, some nations, led by France, cashed in dollars for gold in unusually large amounts. Such transactions reduce U.S. reserves without increasing the reserves of the nation making the conversion.

Second, the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit was smaller than in other recent years. This means fewer dollars were added to other nations' reserves.

Finally, there was an unusually large volume of gold hoarding and speculation, meaning that newly mined gold did not flow into official reserves. In the first three quarters of 1965, this caused entire output of about $1 billion of new gold to flow into private hands.

Today's report on world trade put total exports in the third quarter at an annual rate of $160.2 billion, down from a record $166 billion in the second quarter.

For the first three quarters, global exports were running at an annual rate of $159.6 billion. This was up from the 1964 total of $151.4 billion, but the rise was much less than the $16.6 billion growth from 1963 to 1964.

The report showed a growth of only $1.5 billion, in annual rate, in the exports of the less developed countries, to a rate of $34.7 billion in the first three quarters of 1964. The industrial countries were exporting at a rate of $114.3 billion in the first three quarters, up from $107.4 billion for all of 1964.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1966]

PAYMENTS CURBS MAY END IN 1967—COMMERCE SECRETARY SAYS PRESENT THINKING POINTS TO A CUTOFF NEXT YEAR—2-YEAR DURATION CITED—FURTHER DETAILS ARE GIVEN OF VOLUNTARY PROGRAM FOR COMPANIES THIS YEAR

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, January 17.—Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor said today the present thinking of the Government was that the voluntary balance-of-payments program should be ended by February of next year.

Mr. Connor told a news conference that he could make no definite commitment. But he said that current thinking within the administration put a 2-year duration on the program, which was begun in February of last year.

The news conference was held in connection with the release of further details on the voluntary program for this year as it affects business corporations. The program for banks has already been made public in detail.

The purpose of each is to curb the outflow of dollars abroad and to increase the inflow in order to improve the balance of payments, which has been in deficit since 1958.

MAJOR IMPROVEMENT

Mr. Connor said, "We expect to reach the targets for 1965 established at the outset of the program nearly a year ago." He said the deficit in the balance of payments for 1965 was $1.3 billion or less, marking a major improvement from the $2.8 billion deficit of 1964.

Today's releases included the new worksheets to be used by corporations this year in working out their own balance-of-payments plans and a letter sent by Mr. Connor to 400 companies that were not in the program last year, making a total of 900.

The main new feature in this year's program is a formula setting out both nationwide and individual company ceilings for the outflow of dollars for direct investment abroad.

BASIC FORMULA

The basic formula has already been made public. It permits investments in 1965 and 1966 combined of 90 percent of the total for 1962, 1963, and 1964.

The worksheets and the letter disclosed that companies would get credit against their ceilings for any borrowing they were able to do abroad. Thus, if a concern's ceiling under the formula for this year was a direct investment outlay of $10 million and it was able to borrow $5 million abroad, it could invest $15 million.

The direct investment ceiling covers the combined total of retained earnings abroad and dollars sent out of the United States.

Mr. Connor gave figures today indicating that the outflow of dollars for direct investment last year was probably less than the $3.4 billion estimated earlier. He said it now seemed likely that the outflow would be "closer to $3 billion than to $3.4 billion."

Under the new formula, this would mean a correspondingly smaller reduction in this outflow in 1966 and thus a smaller improvement in the balance of payments than had been counted on. Under the formula, assuming a $3.4-billion outflow in 1965, the outflow in 1966 would be about $2 billion, for an improvement of $1 billion.

Mr. Connor conceded that it now seemed probable that the formula alone would produce an improvement this year of less than $1 billion. But he said the target was still $1 billion because the Government hoped that many companies would invest less than the formula permitted.

The other elements of the voluntary program include expansion of exports, increases in the return flow of earnings on foreign investment, and repatriation of short-term assets held abroad.

Mr. Connor had optimistic reports on all of these elements for last year. He said corporations had repatriated about $500 million of liquid assets last year and probably brought back about $4.3 billion of earnings, compared with $3.7 billion in 1964.

He said exports for the year rose about 4 percent and exports of manufactured goods alone by 5.5 percent.

Overall, the 500 corporations in the program estimated an improvement in their balances of payments totaling $1.3 billion for 1965 over 1964, and Mr. Connor said today this target appears to have been "substantially achieved."

In discussing the ending of the program a year from now, Mr. Connor said the Government recognized that restraint on direct investment, in particular, was against the longer run interest of the Nation and of the balance of payments, because it would ultimately reduce both exports and income from investments.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 19, 1966]

PERILS OF A DOLLAR WALL—U.S. DRIVE TO PAYMENTS DEFICIT HELD OBSTACLE TO FREER WORLD TRADE

(By M. J. Rossant)

The Johnson administration is making slow but steady progress toward its goal of eliminating the chronic payments deficit that is the difference between what the Nation takes in from abroad and what goes out. But its efforts are also causing a retreat from the objective of a freer and healthier world economy.

This is the sobering thesis of Columbia University's Peter B. Kenen, one of the Nation's most scholarly authorities on international monetary affairs.

Professor Kenen raises the specter that the United States may be able to eliminate temporarily its deficit with the rest of the world through a network of controls over trade and capital movements that will be permanently harmful.

Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor's latest report on the balance of payments gives fresh support to Mr. Kenen's thesis.

CONNOR OPTIMISTIC

Like other administration officials, Mr. Connor was true to form in expressing optimism about the payments situation, holding out hope that the so-called voluntary program to cut corporate outflows of dollars for investment abroad would be relaxed or eliminated by 1967.

But ever since the program was first introduced, academic and business experts have predicted that its impact could not be expected to last longer than a year or two. So its demise is inevitable.

If the payments imbalance still is a serious problem in 1967, voluntary restraints probably will be replaced by mandatory controls.

Meanwhile, the voluntary program is being expanded, as well as extended. When the administration began asking for business cooperation, it limited its request to the 400 largest companies. Now, it is enlisting 900, which covers almost every American concern doing business abroad.

This continual expansion in controls is what worries Professor Kenen. He notes that in the last 5 years, Washington has put into effect a variety of restrictions, voluntary and involuntary, that reduce the outflow of dollars mainly by curtailing investment and trade.

The administration may have to add new barriers to its already formidable dollar wall if President Johnson is to make good his pledge to wipe out this balance of payments deficit altogether in the next year.

To be sure, the administration will explain that any new restrictions are strictly temporary, but all of the allegedly temporary controls that have been installed are beginning to take on a very permanent look.

Professor Kenen thinks that the administration is only partly responsible for its increasing reliance on controls. He puts most of the blame on the present international monetary system because, he explains, it "is long on discipline and short on credit creation to aid the deficit countries" so that it encourages "the use of trade controls, overt or covert, impairing economic efficiency in the world as a whole."

But the Columbia economist is against proposals for reforming the monetary system in order to provide payments-deficit nations with automatic credits because such plans would make things too easy.

AIMS OF REFORM

As he sees it, reform must prevent deficit nations from making use of controls. This calls for generous help from the surplus countries. But Mr. Kenen adds that credits must not be provided indiscriminately.

Instead, he calls on the major nations to determine what national economic policies are universally acceptable or unacceptable. Then credit can be extended or withheld on the basis of these new rules.

This is a tall order and one on which an early agreement is unlikely. But Professor Kenen insists that something must be done—and soon—to check the pushing up of monetary barriers around the world.

The fact is that the trend toward restrictions is becoming a race. Britain has its own sterling wall; the continental European nations, which have been in a payments-surplus position most of the time, still maintain many old controls and are erecting new ones. The United States was behind the pack but it is now making up for lost time.

But even if the administration in the race will end up as deficit, it will not be a winner. Professor Kenen predicts that by employing controls that curb trade and investment, the United States and every other nation in the race will end up as losers.

PUBLIC DOMAIN OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH RESULTS FROM FEDERALLY FINANCED PROJECTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on July 28, 1965, the Federal Register carried the following notice from the Office of Education:

> Material produced as a result of any research activity undertaken with any financial assistance through contract with or project grant from the Office of Education will be placed in the public domain. Materials so released will be available to conventional outlets of the private sector for their use.

In taking this action, the Office of Education was altering its previous policy of allowing researchers working under grants or contracts to copyright the results of their research. The change is based upon the idea that, first, if the public pays for research, it should have free access to the results of that research; and second, that the general welfare is best served through competition rather than monopoly. I wish to commend those in the Office of Education responsible for making this wise decision. In my opinion, it is a forward step both in education and in the protection of the public interest in public investments.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by Walter E. Mylecraine entitled "Public Domain" appearing in the November 1965 issue of American Education be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From American Education magazine, November 1965]

PUBLIC DOMAIN

(By Walter E. Mylecraine)

"Notice is hereby given of the following statement of policy of the Office of Education: 'Material produced as a result of any research activity undertaken with any financial assistance through contract with or project grant from the Office of Education will be placed in the public domain. Materials so released will be available to conventional outlets of the private sector for their use.'—Federal Register, July 28, 1965."

Education is America's largest industry. Last year, we spent about $39 billion on our schools * * * more than we spent for rockets, automobiles, or lipsticks.

But in contrast to many modern industries, which spend up to 10 percent of their gross revenues on research and development, Americans allocate less than one-tenth of 1 percent of their educational expenditures to research. We have courted obsolescence in the past by ignoring the future, and we are already reaping the skimpy harvest of our penny-wise, pound-foolish policy on educational research.

This pattern is changing. Since 1957, the Office of Education has financed 1,800 individual research projects designed to investigate the ways we teach and to improve them. From 1957 to 1965, the U.S. Government, through the Office of Education, invested $85 million on research, and the figure will rise sharply in years to come.

This increased expenditure has led the Office of Education to reexamine its publications policy, and to conclude that Office of Education regulations governing the publication of research financed by public funds were inadequate.

The result of this reappraisal is the statement of policy printed above. Its two sentences, while not examples of English prose at its most exhilarating, are the distillate of more than 2 years of discussion between Office of Education officials and outside legal counsel, representatives of universities and publishing houses, and the heads of other Federal agencies. Understanding the statement's importance requires some appreciation of the magnitude of educational publishing in the United States today and its relation to educational research.

Research emerges from the scholar's study or laboratory in a variety of forms. Some of the new knowledge he develops and refines is published in professional journals addressed to school administrators and teachers.

Much of it, however, takes such commercial forms as textbooks, curriculum guides, tape recordings, films, and even computer programs * * * in short, as tangible items susceptible of mass production and distribution at a profit.

Thus, the university scholar who develops an improved approach to teaching eighth-grade mathematics, tests his ideas, and embodies them in a manuscript may well have an item of interest to a publisher.

The interest of publishers in such educational materials has grown keener in recent years, owing in part to the stream of educational legislation that has flowed from Congress during the past two sessions. The current American concern about the state of our schools has brought about new legislative programs that have sharply increased the demand for new texts and the entire array of modern teaching tools. At the same time, the Federal funds allocated for these programs have sharply increased the purchasing power of the schools.

In consequence, the educational market has become extremely attractive. According to authoritative estimates, American public and private schools spent about $1 billion last year for teaching materials. Educational publishing is big business.

In years past, researchers working under Office of Education grants or contracts were permitted to copyright their research and the educational material stemming from it. In almost every case, however, the project agreement required the researcher to give the Government an irrevocable, royalty-free license to use his work as it chose and to authorize others so to do. As a legal entity, then, the copyright was a frail instrument.

But in practice, the Office of Education rarely exercised its licensing prerogative simply because its stewardship of educational research was a relatively minor responsibility. Thus a copyright, which was legally almost worthless, became in the minds of some researchers and publishers a valuable and binding assertion of private ownership.

No longer. The new public domain policy prohibits the copyrighting of research materials developed under projects financed by the Office of Education.

Before explaining the Office of Education's decision to change its publication policy, it is worth making two points: first, the new policy will not apply to research projects approved before its effective date (July 14, 1965) unless the researcher or his institution agree that it should. Previously funded projects that continue over a period of years and are subject to annual approval will be considered individually by the Office. We believe that in such cases we will be able to reach an agreement acceptable to everyone concerned.

The second point to be made is that the new public domain policy does not absolutely rule out copyrighting in connection with research materials financed by the Office of Education. A publisher can copyright significant revisions of public domain material or additions to it. In such cases, of course, the original research material remains in the public domain, so that the publisher would be wise to indicate which parts of a work have been copyrighted. Similarly, the researcher who subsequently improves materials originally delivered to the Office under the terms of his contract or grant can copyright those improvements.

Our basic reason for changing the policy was our conviction that research produced with public funds should become public property. The benefits incident to expressing this principle in a public domain policy begin with the total elimination of Federal control over research materials. The administrative effect of the policy is to take such materials out of the hands of the Government and turn them over to the public as soon as grants or contract terms have been met. Thus, it is not the Office of Education but the educational marketplace—publishers, superintendents, school purchasing agents, librarians, and the students themselves—that will evaluate these materials and decide how they can best be used.

Even more important, we believe the new policy will improve the quality of research supported by the Office of Education. We believe it will foster in educational research generally a creativity, a cooperation, and a competition that copyrighting can tend to discourage. The public domain policy not only permits a scholar to build on the foundation laid by another, but in fact encourages him to do so. He can retain some sections of a published work in their original form and adapt others.

He can, for example, apply techniques developed by another scholar for the teaching of English or physics to the teaching of foreign languages or biology. This kind of intellectual hitchhiking has always been basic to the advancement of knowledge, and there is no reason why it should not characterize research in education.

None of these statements should be interpreted as criticisms of copyrighting as such. The researcher who invests his own time at his own risk to develop an item of educational material has created a piece of private property just as surely as the man who builds his own home with his own funds. But the researcher working under OE grant or contract is using public funds, and he should no more have a legal monopoly over the fruits of that research than a roadbuilder should own the highway he has built under public contract.

Summing up, we believe the public domain policy not only expresses sound principle but carries with it distinct advantages.

Nevertheless, the policy has its critics. Their basic contention is that the policy will not work, and their reasoning goes more or less like this: No publisher will invest money in a text or other teaching device unless he can protect his investment with a copyright. Why should a publisher set up type, print a volume, and then promote its distribution when any teacher, student, private citizen, or competing publisher can copy the contents with impunity?

This argument seems reasonable enough, but publishers refute it with their own practice. The fact that the Warren report on the assassination of President Kennedy, and Surgeon General Luther Terry's report on smoking and cancer were in the public domain did not deter commercial publishers from reprinting them. For years, the Government Printing Office has issued 40,000 copies of the "Statistical Abstract of the United States" at $3.75 a copy. Recognizing that the abstract is in the public domain, a paperback book publisher recently announced plans to issue an edition at $1.95, and plans a first printing of 125,000 copies. Evidence shows that timely marketing and attractive presentation are worthy substitutes for exclusive ownership in profitable publishing.

Another objection is that public domain subjects the researcher's work to unauthorized borrowing that may harm his reputation. As one scholar observed, "Once material is in the public domain, anyone may modify or tamper with it as he chooses, and an author may see some strange versions of his work."

But surely no scholar would claim ultimate wisdom. The Office of Education not only recognizes that others may adapt to new uses work supported by public funds but in fact hopes they will. The resulting changes may be for the worse as well as for the better. Agreed. * * * But such risk is inherent in all innovation, and American education badly, badly needs innovation.

We do not believe that encouraging revision by others represents a serious threat to a scholar's reputation. If he is quoted accurately and in context, he has no legitimate complaint, for no reputable scholar would knowingly use the work of another without acknowledging the debt. If the author is quoted inaccurately or out of context, he falls prey to the same misuse to which the work of any eminent writer is subject; the names of Charles Darwin and Sigmund Freud, among dozens of others that might be cited, seem to have survived decades of misinterpretation.

In any case, we believe the public domain policy is practical in purpose as well as sound in principle. It has been supported by the press, public officials, and by people in the publishing and academic communities. The American Newspaper Publishers Association and the American Textbook Publishers Institute have praised the policy; so have Members of Congress. An editorial in the Washington Post stated well one of our prime objectives in announcing the policy:

"However interesting research findings may be to theorists, they will have practical effect only as they reach schools and children. They will be put to use more quickly, and more widely, because they will now lie in the public domain."

We need publishers and scholars. We believe that the research we support is a marketable commodity. And we believe that the production and dissemination of research materials under a public domain policy leaves plenty of room for all involved to seek their own varied interests.

The first example of research materials being released under the policy discussed here is project English, a complete series of materials for a senior high school English curriculum, developed by the Curriculum Studies Center of Carnegie Institute of Technology.

The fundamental effect of the new public domain policy is to eliminate a legal monopoly. At the same time, it is calculated to speed the advance of educational research and encourage the operation of free enterprise mechanisms in educational publishing. In announcing a public domain policy, the Office of Education is seeking ways in which to put those mechanisms to work for education and the public interest.

THE SMITHSON BICENTENNIAL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in September of last year the Smithsonian Institution celebrated the 200th anniversary of the birth of its founder with an international gathering of scholars, scientists, and representatives of museums from many nations. The celebration began with an academic procession onto the Mall from the historic Smithsonian Building and a significant address by President Johnson on international education. Leonard Carmichael, seventh Secretary of the Smithsonian, addressed the gathering on the subject of James Smithson, whose death in 1829 was followed by the generous bequest which launched the Institution. The Chief Justice of the United States presided as Chancellor of the Institution.

The bicentennial celebration coincided with the first visit to the United States of the International Council of Museums, a distinguished assembly of world museum leaders which promotes continued progress in all aspects of the museum field on a worldwide basis. Thus it seems especially appropriate that in 1965 the Senate passed S. 1310, the National Museum Act now awaiting action in the House, to accentuate Smithsonian programs of cooperation with other museums in this country and elsewhere. The program of the bicentennial celebration was a distinguished one, emphasizing the unity of man's knowledge in a series of stimulating addresses by great scholars: Jerome S. Bruner, "The Perfectibility of Man's Intellect"; Herbert Butterfield, "History as the Organization of Man's Memory"; Sir Kenneth Clark, "Changing Values in the Arts"; Ian McTaggart Cowan, "Environment and Man—the Concept of Conservation"; G. Evelyn Hutchinson, "The Problem of Being a Meter and a Half Long"; Arthur Koestler, "Biology and Mental Evolution—An Exercise in Analogy"; Claude Levi-Strauss, "Anthropology: Its Achievements and Future"; Lewis Mumford, "Technics and the Nature of Man"; J. Robert Oppenheimer, "Physics and Man's Understanding"; Stephen E. Toulmin, "Intellectual Values and the Future"; and Fred L. Whipple, "Knowledge and Understanding of the Physical Universe as Determinants of Man's Progress." I was delighted to learn that the Smithsonian will arrange for the publication of these brilliant papers under the title "Knowledge and Man," an apt allusion of the Institution's mandate "for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men."

Our esteemed colleague, Senator SALTONSTALL, presided at the culminating evening of events as a Regent of the Smithsonian Institution. The Smithson Medal for outstanding contributions in the fields of science, technology, history, and art was presented to the Royal Society of London by Mr. Robert V. Fleming, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Board of Regents. In a final address before the nearly 2,000 guests from 90 countries, Prof. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian, restated the basic purposes of museums and of the Institution in the advancement of knowledge. As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Smithsonian Institution I have found this a most challenging statement on its prospects and purposes. Consequently I ask that the portion of Mr. Ripley's remarks which will appear as his introductory essay to the Smithsonian Bicentennial Papers, "Knowledge and Man," appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to add how fortunate I consider both the United States and the Smithsonian Institution to have Dillon Ripley as its Secretary. Mr. Ripley's creative ability, imagination, and flair have all gone to the enlarging of the Smithsonian Institution and through it, of our Nation.

Moreover, the pageantry and success of the 200th anniversary of the birth of James Smithson sprang in great part from the broad thinking of Mr. Ripley.

EXHIBIT 1

MAN AND KNOWLEDGE

(Introductory essay by S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution)

Man's knowledge has doubled in a lifetime. The complexity of the universe, of human history, of man's self-awareness severely tests our comprehension. Since the American people accepted the bequest of James Smithson the Institution bearing his name has been devoted to the advancement of knowledge and its appreciation by the citizen. On the 200th anniversary of his birth a number of the world's leading scholars gathered to appraise man's knowledge. In the papers collected in this volume, they trace certain classic themes which are the foundations of knowledge.

They see man's knowledge as a vast fabric telling us as much about those who have created it as about the objects of their thought. If the extent of this knowledge is the hallmark of our civilization, the use to be made of it may be its crisis. Through understanding how knowledge has progressed and what it tells us of ourselves we may better know how it should be used to advance man's welfare.

The laws of the physical universe are somewhat parallel to those of the world of life and even to those of the realm of the mind. The evaluation not simply of organisms but of galaxies, of cultures, and of individual personalities reveals some similarities. James Smithson enjoined the Institution to make these unities manifest: "the particle and the planet are subject to the same laws, and what is learned of the one will be known of the other." The essays in this volume bespeak a unity of knowledge which provides an avenue to understanding for us all, scientist and layman alike.

We must also understand how knowledge has its origin in experience and the course of thought. The scientist does not simply amass new bits of information like beads of glass on a string. The progress of knowledge depends upon a profound interplay among the structure of theory, the accumulation of evidence, and intuition. It is tempting always to dress out the same old notions with slight alterations responding to fashion more than fact. But we must avoid becoming fixed in our ideas. The best remedy for sterility of that kind is to seek nature in the fact, to employ all the senses in a direct encounter with the problem. This is one of the principal values of museums.

OBJECTS—A KEY TO UNDERSTANDING

Many interesting problems are associated with the study of objects and the managing of collections. It is paradoxical that most people would rather read about objects than study them directly. In our system of education today we assume that one can be educated only by learning to read at least, if not to write. The use of the eyes, perhaps only on the television screen, becomes all important. The assumption that truth can be learned, second hand, by reading what someone else has written, is all-pervasive. It dominates our thinking. It forms the foundation stone of our system of education. There is obviously a confusion here which becomes glossed over and unrecognized in our educational training. Rules may be printed out and learned by rote, but truth cannot be printed out, and probably not absorbed just by reading, and certainly not learned by rote.

In this pattern, this set of assumptions, the objects are left off, and those institutions which harbor collections of objects, as libraries do books, get left out also. It is a common postulate that a man can be educated to take his place in much of our professional society without ever being in contact with objects in the sense of learning through them or by working with them. Is there something degrading about objects? Does the touching of them and working with them imply something less than what an educated man, above a scholar would do? Does it imply a kind of illiteracy? If there is such an assumption, if someone who touches objects, who works with his hands is considered to be a common laborer, then there is something wrong. In our American way of life we tend to assume that everyone must now go to college in order to be happy, to have equal opportunity, to fit our ideal of the finished, the complete citizen. But if by going to college one grows away from objects, becomes a reader and not a toucher, then there is something wrong, for there are many roads to insight and to the discovery of truths. What is clear is that in the pursuit of knowledge no road should be left unexplored.

Indeed there is a talent in being illiterate. For some people insight and learning derive from the sense of touch. Objects are documents to be read as much as the printed page. Many people and all children need to touch objects, assess their texture, not simply read about them, in order to learn. St. Peter's toe, a dinosaur bone in a museum, a live cow, a piece of sculpture, a stone ax; we have a need for objects. Through them the truth is seeking us out.

EDUCATION—CLUES TO INTEREST

I sometimes think that people shrink from the attempt to learn from objects because one must give a little of oneself to the objects in the process. To study objects is more demanding than to read about them. To use them one must give a little, and how few of us like to do that. It is safer, less obligating merely to read and learn by rote. One can always put the book away and forget about it after the exam. How many social anthropologists or social psychologists of today have ever felt the tools, the axes and the masks about which Malinowski and Boas wrote? Most of our social theory today is based on the written observations of anthropologists of a generation or two ago who worked with primitives, groups of isolated, illiterate yet enormously skilled people beautifully adapted to their way of life, people who had the talent to be illiterate, to work by touch, speech, and hearing to create complex and sophisticated cultures. I suspect that many of the best anthropologists of today have an almost unconscious yearning to touch objects, to hear chants, to savor cultures by not reading about them. They should come and look at the objects and the texts in the collections at least. These exist while many of the cultures that gave them life have vanished from the scene. These can be felt and touched and, if you give a little, they can be made to teach something. There are certainly new truths to be derived from them. They are the testament, the original revelation. Colleges and universities should understand this and should include museum objects as a vital part of higher education. Objects are not an end in themselves to be fondled and cherished, but purely verbal people may come to mistake the representation of reality for reality itself.

The educator of today should recognize museum objects as much more than the static byproducts of past ages. The object may be approached again and again from differing points of view and be made to yield clues to biological or even cultural environments and their formative influences. These evidences may be transposed dynamically into systems which may be models for discerning future trends in environmental change, human ecology, and cultural patterns. The object is a catalyst enabling the museum to perform intellectual synthesis, helping to meet a need, particularly urgent in our time, to translate history into prediction.

Curiously enough scholars do not always wish either to give of themselves, or to search out and grasp the nettle of truth. Many scholars both in science and in the arts and humanities wish to join only the previously initiated few, an already chosen circle. Let a segment of art or a segment of science become fashionable, a discovery be made, and a welter of scholars will run, a veritable gaggle of geese, in search of crumbs of an original truth which can be mulled over, fragmented, and attenuated until they become mere chaff, echoes of a past act of discovery. There are graduate students today who are going into various abstract phases of molecular biology because it is safe, because they can get a job, and possibly a retirement plan, by refining segments of past discoveries, while the vast, unformed, incomprehensible truths of environmental biology elude us for lack of enough people willing to get their hands dirty.

In the field of art, history, and criticism the same can be true. Scholarship for scholarship's sake, too attenuated and refined, provoked Francis Taylor once to say, "The locust has flown away while we have been debating the morphology and iconography of his discarded shell."

It has been said over and over that now that our Federal Government has taken the decision to assault the massive problems of education in this country, it is up to the private foundations, who have in some instances pioneered, charted the way for present-day acceptance of this principle of Federal support, to pioneer anew. How can foundations help in the next stage, the stage that goes beyond providing an opportunity for education for everyone? The horse can be led to water but not made to drink. The equal opportunity is not enough.

People will not become educated unless they are interested, unless they have goals and a purpose, and, above all, interests. If the future for everyone is to include leisure, then objects come again onto the stage, interests, crafts, hobbies. Through the study of objects we can revive dormant skills and unconscious drives and urges that lie submerged in people as in what I have called the talent to be illiterate.

Furthermore we can study how best to interest people in things through programs and research in museums. Objects properly displayed and explained bring the visitor back time after time. Beyond this the visitor may enroll in classes to work behind the scenes with the materials themselves. We can study that elusive subliminal threshold of interest, of how to be interested in anything at all. For this the Smithsonian hopes to join hands with imaginative and pioneering foundations.

THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

If the Smithsonian Institution has a motto, aside from the enigmatic and Sibylline "increase and diffusion of knowledge among men," it should be the pursuit of the unfashionable by the unconventional. This motto would not be unique. It should be shared by some of our greatest organizations devoted to basic research, the Rockefeller University and the Carnegie Institution to take two illustrious names also associated with original philanthropy. But in its history the Smithsonian has always tried to do only what for various reasons, other organizations or agencies were not doing, and to husband its resources of manpower toward the accomplishment of abstract and original study.

Let us hope that the venerableness of this institution does not require us to accept Brancusi's suggestive statement that "when we are no longer younger, we are already dead." To function we must not become set or rigid, but always receptive to new possibilities. To be creative in the arts or the sciences we must retain the direct apprehension of the environment, the external world. As Dubos has said, to retain this perception is the "surest approach to a true enlargement of human life." Let this indeed be our mission.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have just received from the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado their memorial asking the Congress of the United States to enact truth-in-lending.

This is a heartening development and I congratulate Representative Gerald Kopel, of Denver, and his associates and colleagues for their interest in this question of great importance to American consumers.

This is strong evidence of the growing support for congressional action on my truth-in-lending bill, S. 2275. President Johnson has called for the enactment of truth-in-lending legislation this year, and I think there is strong public support for his request. I ask unanimous consent that the covering letter from Representative Kopel and House Memorial No. 1003 of the Colorado House of Representatives be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and memorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Denver, Colo., January 13, 1966.

Hon. PAUL DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: The House of Representatives of the State of Colorado has this day passed unanimously a memorial to Congress requesting the enactment by Congress of truth-in-lending legislation. Its sponsorship constitutes 40 of the 65 elected members of our body.

It is our hope that, at long last, this will be the year when Congress will favorably pass this necessary bill restoring to consumers the right to make responsible decisions in borrowing money, based upon full disclosure of interest rates.

Very truly yours,

GERALD KOPEL.

HOUSE MEMORIAL 1003

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact truth-in-lending legislation

Whereas short-term consumer debt in the United States is more than $83 billion; and

Whereas the total consumer and business debt in the United States of $819 billion is 2½ times greater than the Federal debt; and

Whereas the total interest paid by consumers just on short-term consumer debt is as large as the total interest paid out by taxpayers on the entire Federal debt of the United States; and

Whereas the price of credit is little understood by the consumer; and

Whereas the consumer can make no real comparison in the cost of credit unless he is able to translate credit charges into a uniform statement of true annual interest rates; and

Whereas since 1960, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS has sought enactment of a truth-in-lending bill which would require that charges incident to the extension of credit be stated at a true annual interest rate on the outstanding balance of the obligations; and

Whereas the Department of Defense of the United States, in a directive on personal commercial affairs, has required all lending institutions dealing with servicemen to provide full disclosure through truth in lending; and

Whereas the truth-in-lending bill, S. 2275, will aid the ethical and efficient lender or credit extender who wishes to be honest and accurate in disclosing the cost of credit but who can do so only at the peril of losing customers to competitors who would continue to disclose deceptively low credit prices; and

Whereas such legislation is essential to the maintenance of a competitive free enterprise system and would in no way interfere with the buyer-seller relationship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 45th General Assembly of the State of Colorado: That this house of representatives hereby petitions the Members of the Congress of the United States to propose and enact legislation in the Congress for truth in lending; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, and Members of the Congress from the State of Colorado.

ALLEN DINES,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
EVELYN T. DAVIDSON,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

COMMUNIST STRATEGY IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the crisis in the Dominican Republic has highlighted once again the lack of understanding of Communist plans for expansion in the Western Hemisphere—a lack of which has already resulted in the transformation of Cuba into a base for hemispheric subversion.

Although the Communists are most explicit in stating their aims, and in launching programs to achieve them, many observers fail to believe that the Communists mean what they say, and many more are unaware of what these stated policies are.

In the winter issue of the Yale Review Dr. Josef Kalvoda has written a well-documented analytical article entitled "Communist Strategy in Latin America." Believing that Dr. Kalvoda has captured the essence of Communist tactics and approaches for the domination of the countries of Latin America, I wish to bring this article to the attention of my colleagues.

The Communist plans for the Western Hemisphere, Dr. Kalvoda points out, are part of the historical approach enunciated by Lenin in 1920 at the Second Congress of the Communist International. This involves attacking the West through its weakest link. Acting on the assumption that revolution in advanced industrial countries is hardly possible, the Communists have decided to concentrate upon the dependent and underdeveloped areas of the world, the weakest links in the free world.

Though Russian and Chinese Communists may disagree about the proper tactical way to bring about a Communist victory, the author believes that they do agree upon fundamentals. He notes that they both "point to the need to capture political power as the first task of any Communist Party operating outside the peace zone of the world socialist system."

In different countries they follow different policies. In Cuba the revolution was nationalistic, middle class, and anti-Batista in its appearance. But in Argentina "it is the proletariat, and not the petty bourgeoisie, that heads all important decisive actions." Dr. Kalvoda states that "Communist exploitation of the Dominican revolt has been obvious to all open-minded people" and he discusses the case of Luis Acosta, the Cuban Communist, who "led the mobs that seized Santo Domingo's radio and television stations."

The Communists, in short, identify themselves with the needs and hopes and dreams of the people. They do not tell the people that what they will get under communism is not land, or peace, or bread, but simply tyranny, exploitation and the total deprivation of human dignity.

The author concludes:

> The continuation of our present inaction cannot lead to anything but disaster * * *. The combined political and military threat from Cuba to us and to our Latin American neighbors must be dealt with soon.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNIST STRATEGY IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Josef Kalvoda)

The success of communism in Cuba has been a powerful stimulus to all Communists in this hemisphere, and even a casual reader of newspapers is aware of the increase in their activities throughout Latin America. Their ability to deceive the Catholic Church in Cuba, the Government of the United States, and the majority of this country's mass media during the process of their capture of power in Cuba testifies to the efficiency of their propaganda and the gullibility of their audience, and success has only strengthened their belief in the invincibility of their movement and the inevitability of its victory.

The announced aim of Latin American Communists is first the encirclement of the United States and then the takeover of the whole hemisphere. To accomplish this aim they have adopted the strategy and tactics of revolution originally devised by Lenin and refined by his successors. Lenin's plan of attacking imperialism through its "weakest link," as presented to the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920, has been the theoretical foundation of Communist-led revolutions in Latin America, as it has been in Asia and Africa. According to this plan, since the possibility of revolution in advanced industrial countries is very slight, the Communists will have to concentrate on gaining ground and spreading their power in the dependent and underdeveloped areas on this globe, the "weakest links" in the imperial system. And since Latin America, according to the Communists, is the weakest link in the United States' system, it is obviously the first target in this hemisphere.

The technique Lenin outlined for subverting the weakest links is known as "boring from within," that is, capturing control of already existing organizations. Wherever in colonial, former colonial, or semicolonial areas, there are native political movements aimed at political and/or economic emancipation from foreign domination and at internal social revolution, especially if those movements have the support of several classes and social groups, the Communists are to exploit them. They are to identify themselves with the genuine aspirations of the native peoples, advance the already stated aims of the nationalist movements, add to them their minimum program, assume their leadership, and finally capture them completely from the inside. Although communism is internationalist by definition, its supporters in the "weakest link" countries will often have to conceal their true identity, masquerade as nationalist, work with the masses, capture leadership in indigenous movements, and make their followers believe that they, and the program advanced by them, represent the true aspirations of the people.

Lenin's 1920 plan for capturing the weakest links by boring from within was supplemented the following year by a plan for temporary collaboration between the Communists and the local nationalist revolutionaries and leaders of some political parties. This broadened the basis for Communist action by introducing the tactics of the united front—cooperation between the Communist Party and some other leftwing parties. Now, in addition to infiltrating the native nationalistic movements, the local Communist Parties were advised to adopt the tactics of the united front from above (collaboration with the leaders of non-Communist organizations on a temporary basis) and/or the united front from below (appealing to rank-and-file members of such organizations over the heads of their leaders). Lenin realized that the Communists could not win power alone, that they would have to seek the collaboration of sympathizers, fellow travelers, and the so-called innocents if they were to succeed. He knew that Marxist doctrine had so little appeal for the masses that the Communists would have to stimulate nationalism and foment social discontent through broader political coalitions under such names as people's front, united front, or front of national liberation in order to capture political power. In Latin America the united front strategy was tried in the 1920's, 1930's, and 1940's with little success, but in the 1950's and 1960's it was revived, with the results we now observe.

While the appeal of nationalism was being used to capture the middle class, social discontent was to be cultivated among the peasants, by far the largest segment of the population in dependent and semidependent areas. Lenin had learned in Russia that without the support of the peasantry, or at least its neutralization, the forces of revolution had no chance to succeed.

The theoretical aspects of the Latin American revolution and its fundamental strategy have been worked out by the theoreticians and leaders of the international Communist movement. They may argue among themselves, they may disagree on tactics to be used in specific instances (on what shovel they should use to bury us), but they agree on fundamentals. They all point to the need to capture political power as the first task of any Communist Party operating outside the peace zone of the world socialist system, and to a remarkable extent they agree on how it is to be done. Those who argue that the Russian and Chinese positions are opposed should compare the following two quotations, the first from the "Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" of 1961 and the second from the Chinese "Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement" of 1963:

"(1) The success of the struggle which the working class wages for the victory of the revolution will depend on how well the working class and its party master the use of all forms of struggle—peaceful and nonpeaceful, parliamentary and extraparliamentary—and how well they are prepared for any swift and sudden replacement of one form of struggle by another form of struggle. * * * But whatever the form in which the transition from capitalism to socialism is effected, that transition can come about only through revolution.

"(2) In order to lead the proletariat and working people in revolution, Marxist-Leninist Parties must master all forms of struggle and be able to substitute one form for another quickly as the conditions of struggle change. The vanguard of the proletariat will remain unconquerable in all circumstances only if it masters all forms of struggle—peaceful and armed, open and secret, legal and illegal, parliamentary struggle and mass struggle, etc. It is wrong to refuse to use parliamentary and other legal forms of struggle when they can and should be used."

There is nothing new in these passages; the Marxist-Leninists have always put great emphasis on the need to master all forms of struggle and to change tactics to suit different situations. In Latin America these have ranged from the ostensibly parliamentary tactics of the Chilean Communist Party to the terrorism of the Venezuelan Party. These differences in methods and approaches have stimulated rather than hampered Communist subversion in the Western Hemisphere, as a recent Organization of American States report notes.

In Latin America the "fronts of national liberation" have been advised to exploit such local issues as poverty, the peasants' hunger for land, labor-management frictions, racial strife, and rifts among their opponents. Soviet Pravda of April 12, 1965 ("Latin America in the Struggle for Democracy and Social Progress" by S. Mikhail and A. Shegovsky), advised Latin American comrades in countries ruled by military juntas or caudillos to embrace "the defense of democratic liberties." There "the struggle for the restoration of civil liberties and working people's social rights is assuming enormous importance. It is precisely these forms of action that make it possible to draw into the liberation movement those strata of the population that are still infected with anti-Communist bias and that nurture illusions about U.S. imperialism." Consequently, in the Latin American dictatorships, Communist leaders pose as champions of those very individual rights and civil liberties that they would themselves suppress as bourgeois concepts and practices if they came to power.

The article recommends somewhat different forms of struggle in "such countries as Mexico, Chile, and Argentina, where the activities of Communists and other progressive parties and organizations are legal." There the Marxist-Leninists should attempt to organize broad popular movements by propagandizing for the "extension of democracy" and by advocating social change, economic independence, and an "independent foreign policy line." An "independent foreign policy" will lead to establishing diplomatic relations with Communist-dominated countries, and that will in turn open new avenues for the native Communist Parties. Then diplomatic representatives of Communist countries can supply native parties with funds and advice under the protection of diplomatic immunity. Furthermore, as the article states, establishing diplomatic relations has a powerful propaganda effect, and it points out that when relations were established between Chile and the Soviet Union there were "great repercussions throughout Latin America" which led "many politicians * * * to reexamine their opinions regarding the expansion of contacts with the Socialist countries."

Flexibility of approach is again emphasized by Ernesto Judisi in his article "The Revolutionary Process in Latin America: Some Lessons of the Liberation Movement in Argentina" in the World Marxist Review, February 1965. "Although some features coincide, the revolutionary process in the different countries is developing in diverse forms," Judisi observes. "The Marxist-Leninist parties in the different countries, familiar with the conditions and possibilities, are best qualified to define the ways and means of the revolutionary struggle in their countries." Though the Communist victory in Cuba "opened new revolutionary vistas to the countries of Latin America," it would be unwise to try to repeat exactly the same methods in some other country. In Cuba the revolution was nationalistic (middle class) and anti-Batista in its appearance, but in Argentina "it is the proletariat, and not the petty bourgeoisie, that heads all important and decisive actions." And yet he warns against "the error of idealizing the working class," though the national bourgeoisie "should act as an ally of the proletariat in the struggle, and not vice versa."

"Creative Marxism manifests itself in an increasing variety of ways and forms, without seeing any one of them as an absolute," Judisi argues; what is unchanging in the revolutionary goal—the defeat of "United States imperialism on the continent." The revolutionaries must rely "on the forces which are most progressive and which carry the most weight at the given moment and in the given circumstances"; they must work with the forces "actually available at the moment." In Argentina the party has expressed its program in the slogan: "For mass action to win power." A mass "unity movement" of the working class, spearheaded by the Communists, is to be organized against the "alliance of the reactionary military and civil forces." Slogans of "working class unity" are expected to take in some of the members and leaders (on the "middle-level") of the Socialist, Peronist, and Christian Democratic parties. Since the army is "rent by group rivalries" and is in "a process of political and ideological differentiation," the Communist leaders must try to divide their enemies and unite their friends among the military. The "different forms" of unity to be pursued, depending on the concrete situation, include "broad democratic unity," "a national liberation front," and "unity of the left." The leaders of the party decide, at any given time, what particular form of "unity" is to be pursued in order to achieve maximum possible gains.

In spite of their emphasis on flexibility, Communist writers on Latin America often tell their readers that the Marxist-Leninist professionals in this hemisphere must follow "the Cuban way to revolution." That way can be briefly summarized. In the 1950's an elite of professional revolutionaries was trained at various institutions in Mexico, in the Soviet Union, and, most important, at the Graduate School of Latin American Studies in Prague. There they were indoctrinated in Communist ideology and mastered the Marxist-Leninist techniques of guerrilla and psychological warfare. They learned how to manipulate the peasants and bourgeoisie through slogans and catchwords and libel of their enemies, how to disguise their Communist affiliations, and how to handle firearms, drugs, and poison. Although they maintained close connections with the international Communist movement (the revolution was largely financed from the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City), the revolutionaries for some time denied that they were Communists, and thereby deceived much of the public in Cuba and elsewhere. In the United States, for example, most newspapers reported favorably on Castro's guerrilla activities and on his new government when he first came to power early in 1959, and a well-known politician hailed Castro as a liberator in "the best Simon Bolivar tradition."

The revolutionaries denied that they had any plan to establish a Communist regime, to imitate the Soviet Union, or to collectivize agriculture; on the contrary they approved of private initiative and small businessmen. All that they wanted to accomplish was an end to their country's dependence on foreign capital and to its domination by "big business and large landowners." In all this they were simply following the steps of the approved strategy for a Communist revolution: first, the domination of a nationalist front by the Communist Party, operating either openly or in disguise; then, a period of "national liberation" marked by purely temporary cooperation with non-Communist groups; and finally, avowed communism. The tactics change, but the objective remains the same.

Hugo Barrios Klee, a prominent Guatemalan Communist, discussed the specific meaning of the "Cuban way to socialism" in the March 1964 issue of the World Marxist Review under the title "The Revolutionary Situation and the Liberation Struggle of the People of Guatemala." He hails the Cuban revolution as a turning point in the history of Latin America, not only because its success has demonstrated the existence of a revolutionary potential there that had often been doubted, but also because it has actually advanced the revolutionary situation in the Western Hemisphere. Cuba has become a political and military stronghold from which Communist subversion and guerrilla activities are directed and financed, and Latin America is now one of the main fronts of the struggle against the United States. All Latin American revolutionaries must learn from the Cuban experience, but "loyalty to the spirit of the Cuban revolution does not mean mechanically copying its experience. Taking the Cuban way does not necessarily mean following the exact pattern of events in that island." Latin America has changed since 1959, and the non-Communists have learned from the Communist victory in Cuba; "the imperialists * * * are hardly likely to repeat their fatal mistakes of 1956–59. They have intensified their resistance and they are doing everything to consolidate their forces."

To overcome the obstacle represented by the stiffening of the non-Communist resistance, Barrios Klee calls for more maturity, more unity, and greater efficiency in the revolutionary leadership. "Larger masses of people must be drawn into the movement," he argues; it must "enlist the support of those sections which did not play a big part in the revolutionary struggle in Cuba (for example, progressives in the armed forces)." To take "the Cuban way," he says, now means to "use flexible and diverse forms and methods of struggle."

That the Latin American Communists have learned the lesson of flexibility in tactics was demonstrated in the Dominican revolution of April 1965. The revolt started when Donald Reid Cabral, the Dominican leader, sent his army chief of staff to fire two officers for graft and corruption on April 24. The chief of staff was instead arrested by rebels whose proclaimed goal was to overthrow the triumvirate headed by Reid Cabral and to return Juan Bosch as President of the republic. In planning the revolution the Communists cooperated with other parties, including the Dominican Revolutionary party (on whose ticket former President Juan Bosch had been elected). Air Force Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, instead of crushing what was then a small mutiny of some Communist and non-Communist military men, tried to act as a mediator between the rebels and Reid Cabral, whom he advised to resign to avoid bloodshed. While the rebels were pushing for a full-scale civil war, General Wessin offered to set up a military junta with them, if they would agree to holding a free election within 90 days. They refused.

The Communists helped to trigger an "indigenous" revolution and tried to control it. They took advantage of the temporary power vacuum when the main forces of law and order, the army and the police, were divided and thereby nullified. They helped to create chaos by distributing between five and ten thousand guns to civilians, including toughs who organized street mobs, gangs of thieves and juvenile delinquents (the most prominent gangs being the Turbas and the Tigers), to local Communists, and to some from abroad. Now they were able to take over the rebellion completely. The street gangs looted, raped, and killed at their pleasure. A Cuban Communist, Luis Acosta, led the mobs that seized Santo Domingo's radio and television stations at the beginning of the revolt, and radio broadcasts encouraged the liquidation of Cuban refugees in the Dominican Republic. There were mass executions of prisoners, and some members of the Dominican Revolutionary Party, realizing where their cooperation with the Communists had left them, took asylum in the embassies of other Latin American countries. At this stage, when the Communist-led rebels claimed complete victory, the President of the United States responded to the urgent request of Ambassador Bennet, and sent U.S. troops into the Dominican Republic, in order to save the lives of American citizens and others, and to "prevent another Communist state in this hemisphere."

Communist exploitation of the Dominican revolt has been obvious to all open-minded people; however, a small but vocal minority has been sharply critical of the President's action. In order to make even the most skeptical aware of the need to keep the Inter-American peacekeeping force which has replaced the U.S. troops in the Dominican Republic, our Government is planning to issue a white paper which would fully document the danger posed by the uprising to the entire Western Hemisphere. It is hoped that the present (October 1965) interim government in the Dominican Republic will be succeeded by a new one issuing from a free election held under the auspices of the Organization of American States.

In his discussion of the liberation struggle in Guatemala, Barrios Klee emphasizes the need to draw the peasants and the Indians in the Guatemalan mountains into the struggle. He acknowledges that the Indians are backward, without political consciousness, and, like the peasants, under the influence of the church, but he hints at a Communist plan to change all this by the use of terror: when the guerrillas attack the government forces they will make the peasants and Indians support them; if the peasants and Indians refuse, punitive expeditions will be organized against them. In the ensuing struggle they will be caught in the middle; some will be neutralized, others will join the Communists. The plan recalls the activities of Tito's partisans in Yugoslavia during the last 2 years of the Second World War and the terrorism of the Vietcong in South Vietnam. And in fact waves of terrorism have moved already across Venezuela, Colombia, Bolivia, and Guatemala several times during the past few years.

The lack of mass support among the working classes, peasants, and Indians (to continue Barrios Klee's analysis) is to be compensated for by increased support elsewhere. Some segments of the armed forces can be enlisted in the Communist cause, as recent events in the Dominican Republic demonstrate, and the need for broad alliances with other political parties is reemphasized. (In Guatemala the United Resistance Front is such a coalition, and the Insurrectionary Armed Forces represent its military arm.) Some urban middle-class people who "are petty bourgeois in thinking and in status" can nevertheless, "as the Cuban experience has shown, play an important revolutionary role in Latin America."

That Barrios Klee is correct in assessing the role of the urban middle class is shown by the part they have played in the Communist attempts to seize power in Brazil, Honduras, and the Dominican Republic. The Armed Forces of National Liberation (FALN) in Venezuela consist largely of middle class students, and even of some extreme rightwing army officers. In Argentina the Communists are wooing the Peronists to join them in a united front against the present government, although, from what is being printed in the World Marxist Review, it would seem that their overtures to the Peronists have not been very successful so far. The strenuous attempt to woo the middle class demonstrates once more that in Latin America, as elsewhere, the Communists do not speak for the working class and peasants, that they do not have any considerable support among them, and that their claim that they are the vanguard of those classes, interested only in improving their economic and social condition, is a myth.

Realizing the weakness of the Communist movement in Latin America, Barrios Klee calls for the exploitation of any rift among its opponents, though he also points out that there may be chances for peaceful transfer of power and ownership of the basic means of production, so that in some countries the revolution may be nonviolent, and cites Chile as a case in point. In other countries the early stages of the revolutionary process can be accomplished peacefully, through the development and use of legal forms of mass struggle. He is probably thinking of British Guiana and the situation as it existed in Brazil before the changes of April 1964. But, in the end, "guerrilla warfare * * * will be the main form of struggle everywhere." However varied the preliminary forms of struggle, when the day arrives, when conditions are ripe, violence must be resorted to. "We believe that these conditions exist in Guatemala," Barrios Klee declares. "Our party therefore supports the guerrilla actions now taking place in the country."

The policy of peaceful coexistence wins Barrios Klee's support because it promotes rifts among the non-Communists; some will take it at its face value and denounce those who do not as warmongers, imperialists, and enemies of peace. So as a result the non-Communist governments will have trouble in devising and following consistent policies vis-a-vis the Communists, making it all the easier for them to switch from one form of struggle to another, to maintain initiative, to get the support of temporary allies, and generally to deceive their opponents.

Since the publication of Barrios Klee's article the Communists have suffered two serious setbacks in Latin America, the first in Brazil early in April 1964, and the second in Chile early in September 1964, when the front supported by the local Communists lost the presidential election, after high hopes of a peaceful takeover had been built up.

Early in 1964 the Secretary General of the Brazilian Communist Party, Luis Carlos Prestes, boasted that the Communist-dominated front in Brazil "has already won"; yet a few months later the front was defeated, and President Joao Goulart and his brother-in-law Leonel Brizola fled to neighboring Uruguay. This setback only convinced the Brazilian Communists that they must analyze their mistakes and learn from them, as the following account by Lucas Romao ("Democratic and National Struggle in Brazil and Its Perspectives") in the World Marxist Review (February 1965) shows:

"The United Front gravely underestimated the strength of its adversary; it was taken for granted that the military forces supporting Goulart far outnumbered those of the conspirators. The masses had not been prepared for the emergency which necessitated the use of all forms of struggle, including armed action. Like the other forces in the United Front, the Communist Party was taken by surprise. We realized that we had underestimated the enemy's strength in claiming that we could foil any plot. This was due, on the one hand, to the illusions we entertained concerning army support for the government. On the other hand, we did not perceive that a political realinement was taking place in the enemy's camp, that he was winning over people associated with the Front.

"The party as a whole, with the leadership in particular, living in illusions, placed too much reliance on the command of the army, in its ability to resist the coup. In point of fact, we failed to understand that victory over the enemy depended largely on mass action throughout the country.

"The program approved by the Fifth Congress of our party in September 1960, and defined more precisely in the documents circulated in preparation for the Sixth Congress (it was postponed in view of the new situation), noted the possibility of the peaceful and non-peaceful path of development of the Brazilian revolution, or armed action being one of the possible forms of the struggle. However, we tend to see the peaceful way as the sole way and consequently, failed to prepare for the eventuality of armed struggle."

The Brazilian Communists, in short, were overconfident; they overestimated their own strength, underestimated the strength of the democratic forces opposed to them, and relied too exclusively on Khrushchev's then-prevalent theory that the revolution could be peaceful. The failure of a gradual and non-violent strategy in Brazil has forced the Communists there and elsewhere to reevaluate that theory.

The new line of the Brazilian Communist Party was defined in the political notes adopted by the executive committee in October 1964. It holds that the present government of Brazil "has deeply wounded the feelings of the nation, whose anger is mounting." Communists therefore should exploit a wide variety of economic and social problems, ranging from the overproduction of coffee, the rising cost of living, and inflation, to payment of debts to the United States, as well as the differences of opinion and frictions, especially on the election issue, among the present political leaders of the country.

"At the moment," the communique says, the aim is "to set up a national and democratic government. In present conditions this means a struggle to overthrow the dictatorship, to oust those who seized power through a military coup. The main form of the struggle will be determined by the course of events, but irrespective of what this form will be, the overthrow of the dictatorship can be secured only through mass actions by the working people. Our efforts are concentrated on setting up a united front of struggle against the dictatorship, a front which will include all the forces opposed to reaction. The steps already taken in this direction are encouraging."

The plan of action provides for "combining legal with illegal activity," for "working in the various mass organizations," for "struggle in all its forms," and for "correctly combining the different forms, peaceful and nonpeaceful" in order to oust the present government and prepare for a Marxist-Leninist revolution.

In Ecuador the Communists make a similar appeal for "the overthrow of the military dictatorship by joint action of the forces destined to unite in a national-liberation front," and for establishing a "people's government" which would include "Communists, Socialists, and representatives of the mass following of the Liberal Party, the Federation of Popular Forces, etc." (See Ricardo Ortiz Gonzales' "Ecuador: Realities and Prospects," World Marxist Review, March 1965.) This "democratic revolutionary" government in which the "leading role would be played by the alliance of the workers and peasants," must adopt and carry out "the program adopted by the Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of Ecuador" of which the basic demands are as follows: "democratic agrarian reform; industrialization; strengthening the state sector in the economy; a tax reform removing the bulk of the tax burden from the shoulders of the working people; nationalization of enterprises owned by foreign monopolies as well as of foreign trade; democracy; consistent extension of trade union rights; raising the material and cultural level of the working people; an independent foreign policy; peaceful settlement of the Peru-Ecuador frontier problem; and the establishment of diplomatic relations with all countries, and primarily with the Socialist countries."

Ricardo Ortiz Gonzales pays lip service to a "nonviolent revolution," but he hastens to add that there are serious "limitations on peaceful and legal forms of struggle." Therefore, he asserts, "the decisive role will be played by armed struggle."

A year ago there appeared to be a split among the various Communist parties in Latin America. Some leaned toward the Chinese, others toward the Russians, and for a time dissensions plagued the whole movement. Now the crisis seems to be over for the present. The new theme of all the parties, the theme adopted by the representatives of the revolutionary parties in all the Latin American countries at a conference held at the end of 1964, is "militant unity of Latin American Communists."

The communiqué of the conference, issued on January 19, 1965, calls for "promoting the solidarity movement with Cuba" through restoration of diplomatic and trade relations, ending the economic blockade, and exposure of "the preparations for renewed aggression and the counterrevolutionary activities of CIA agents." The communiqué further calls for "active struggle against the ruling oligarchies and military juntas in many Latin American countries"; for the organization and support, on a continental scale, of solidarity movements with the liberation fronts in Venezuela, Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras, Paraguay, and Haiti; for the independence of Puerto Rico and British Guiana, the autonomy of Martinique, Guadalupe, and French Guiana, and the like.

To promote the unity of the world Communist movement, the communiqué advocates calling bilateral and multilateral meetings and conferences. It condemns factional activities and insists on immediate discontinuation of public polemics; and it calls for adoption of a "common point of view" expressing the "common ideology, Marxism-Leninism."

The inauguration of a new phase in the Latin American revolution was hailed by Fidel Castro, who predicted new victories and boasted that the guerrillas operating in Colombia, Venezuela, and Guatemala could not be crushed by the armies of those countries. There is a considerable body of evidence that many of the Communist activities in this hemisphere are directed and financed from Havana. In September 1964, Undersecretary of State Thomas C. Mann observed that "between April and August 1960, the Castro regime promoted armed invasions of Panama, the Dominican Republic, and Haiti. They all were failures. Then, under the guidance of his Soviet and Chinese Communist masters, Castro's campaign to destroy representative democracy in the hemisphere became more sophisticated and more dangerous. The new tactic was to overthrow free governments by subversion from within, using and expanding on the Communist apparatus which already existed in every country."

On June 11, 1965, Castro's sister, Juanita, described her brother before a subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee as a man obsessed with a desire to destroy the United States, and detailed what she called "Castro-Communist plans for intervention and aggression in the hemisphere." Earlier, in February 1963, a U.S. Senate Committee published a report entitled "Cuba as a Base for Subversion in America" which discussed at length some of the evidence concerning the role of Cuba in Communist plans for conquest of this hemisphere. The report called attention to the numerous training centers that have been established in Cuba to prepare workers for the "wars of national liberation" in Latin America. In the 1950's most of the professional revolutionaries in Latin America were trained in Prague and the Soviet Union, but in the 1960's Cuba has become a center for training activists of all kinds: leaders, orators, and propagandists; experts in sabotage, espionage, and terrorism in all its forms; specialists in the handling of arms and radio shipment, in guerrilla warfare, etc. Recruitment is carried on preferably among students, teachers.

A TRIBUTE TO SARGENT SHRIVER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as do many who warmly support the war on poverty, I welcome the news that its outstanding director, Sargent Shriver, will be devoting full time to the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In the year and a half that Mr. Shriver has been directing both the Peace Corps and the war on poverty, it has been abundantly clear that his record has been replete with tremendous accomplishments.

In a nation once apathetic to the plight of the invisible poor, today poverty is an issue in every city and hamlet of this Nation. The new hopes and new programs for the betterment of our society have infused the thinking of concerned citizens and leaders everywhere with a new and positive vigor. Most encouraging is that among the most constructive voices are the voices of the poor themselves, already taking their places in the society once closed to them.

It is hard to imagine that any man could have done more to provide leadership for this immense and inspiring effort.

Yet we know that Sargent Shriver will do more. He knows no other measure of effort than the fullest and expects as much from all who serve the Nation.

It is fitting, I believe, that I take this opportunity to thank Mr. Shriver for his brilliant leadership of the Peace Corps and to assure him that we who passed the law that declared war on poverty remain committed to its aims and confident in the leadership he is providing.

OF MOVERS AND IMMOBILISTS: ADDRESS OF WILLIAM L. MARBURY, PRESIDENT, MARYLAND BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate an address by a distinguished president of the Maryland bar, William L. Marbury, that merits consideration by lawyers everywhere.

William Marbury has long been a leader of his profession in Baltimore and throughout the State of Maryland. It is not surprising, therefore, that he should be the one to remind the organized bar that the law is a profession, and that by virtue of this fact lawyers owe special service to society and its needs.

Too often in recent years lawyers have failed to heed the "basic tenet of their profession that a lawyer is bound never to refuse to represent a litigant or a person charged with crime because his cause is an unpopular one." Too often and in too many communities the bar has failed to grapple effectively with the problem of caring for those who need legal services but who cannot afford to pay for them. Too often the legal profession at best has observed a society in the midst of inexorable change from the sidelines, or at worst has allied itself with the forces of resistance, when instead it should have been helping to direct the forces of ferment into constructive channels.

Mr. Marbury's incisive and persuasive address points out that lawyers can no longer afford to be "immobilists" in an age of dynamic change, but must measure up to their obligation to society by moving with and ahead of the social forces that are characteristic of the day in which we live.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the excellent address of William L. Marbury, delivered before the Maryland State Bar Association on Friday, January 14, 1966.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Daily Record (Baltimore), Jan. 15, 1966]

Address of William L. Marbury, President, Maryland State Bar Association, Delivered at the Winter Meeting of the Association on Friday, January 14, 1966, at the Sheraton-Belvedere Hotel

Forty years ago, the late Joseph C. France, thought by many to be the wisest Maryland lawyer of his generation, opened an address to this body by remarking that the speaker on such an occasion as this was expected to deliver a sermon. Now, as my children are ready to testify, my qualifications for such a task are very limited. Certainly they are not as good as those of Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, whose lawyer-son complained that his father was forever inculcating virtue in dull terms. Justice Holmes went on to wonder whether if he had a son, he, in his turn, would yield to the temptation to twaddle.

It seems that even among the Olympians the inculcation of virtue has its pitfalls. But Mr. France has pointed out the path of duty in plain terms and whatever the risks, I propose to follow it. Since, then, I must preach a sermon, I have looked around for a text. I have found it in the opening paragraphs of an essay called "A Note on Progress" written by a Jesuit priest, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. Here is the passage.

"The conflict dates from the day when one man, flying in the face of appearance, perceived that the forces of nature are no more unalterably fixed in their orbits than the stars themselves, but that their serene arrangement around us depicts the flow of a tremendous tide—the day on which a first voice rang out, crying to mankind peacefully slumbering on the raft of Earth, 'We are moving. We are going forward.' * * *

"It is a pleasant and dramatic spectacle, that of mankind divided to its very depths into two irrevocably opposed camps—one looking toward the horizon and proclaiming with all its new-found faith, 'We are moving', and the other, without shifting its position, obstinately maintaining, 'Nothing changes. We are not moving at all.'

"These latter, the 'immobilists,' though they lack passion (immobility has never inspired anyone with enthusiasm), have commonsense on their side, habit of thought, inertia, pessimism and also, to some extent, morality and religion. Nothing, they argue, appears to have changed since man began to hand down the memory of the past, not the undulations of the earth, or the forms of life, or the genius of man or even his goodness. Thus far practical experimentation has failed to modify the fundamental characteristics of even the most humble plant. Human suffering, vice and war, although they may momentarily abate, recur from age to age with an increasing virulence. Even the striving after progress contributes to the sum of evil; to effect change is to undermine the painfully established traditional order whereby the distress of living creatures was reduced to a minimum. What innovator has not retapped the springs of blood and tears? For the sake of human tranquility, in the name of fact, and in defense of the sacred established order, the immobilists forbid the earth to move. Nothing changes, they say, or can change. The raft must drift purposelessly on a shoreless sea.

"But the other half of mankind, startled by the lookout's cry, has left the huddle where the rest of the crew sit with their heads together telling time-honored tales. Gazing out over the dark sea they study for themselves the lapping of waters along the hull of the craft that bears them, breathe the scents borne to them on the breeze, gaze at the shadows cast from pole to pole by a changeless eternity. And for these all things, while remaining separately the same—the ripple of water, the scent of the air, the lights in the sky—become linked together and acquire a new sense; the fixed and random universe is seen to move.

"No one who has seen this vision can be restrained from guarding and proclaiming it. To testify to my faith in it, and to show reasons, is my purpose here."

Now that is a long text, and you may very well be wondering what possible relevance it can have to any concern of Maryland lawyers. Surely after the able addresses of my immediate predecessors in this office, we need no Galileo to tell us that the law moves. A glance at any weekly summary of important opinions will demonstrate that precedents are falling at a pace which has left the profession not exactly dumbfounded—for there has been no lack of vocal response—but certainly astonished. When Mr. France spoke, it was still possible for a lawyer to think of the law, and particularly of constitutional law, as a more or less fixed body of knowledge, the precise contours of which could be traced from a study of history and of the decided cases. To this generation such an idea is simply quaint.

But as members of the organized bar, our concern is not merely with the law. Granted that everyone recognizes that the law is moving in response to a changing society, the question remains whether the legal profession is moving with it; or are we, like Chardin's immobilists, still sleeping on our raft as it drifts into evermore troubled waters? That the waters are indeed getting pretty rough, stirred as they are by powerful currents and blasts of almost hurricane force, is known to everyone in this room. My purpose today is to consider whether we as a profession are meeting the responsibilities which new social forces have thrust upon us.

But first perhaps I should specify just what I mean by new social forces. That is not easy, since they take many forms, but all of them seem to me to spring from a single source, which may be identified as a drive toward equalization. All over the world inequalities between man and man, and I might add, between men and women, which used to be thought inevitable are now considered to be intolerable. In his recently published book, "The Garden and the Wilderness," Prof. Mark DeWolfe Howe, who holds the Charles Warren Chair in American Legal History at the Harvard Law School, has said that "when the constitutional history of the central decades of this century comes to be written, I feel quite sure that the key to an understanding of its turbulence will be the concept of equality." This seems to me to be a wise observation which has validity well beyond the confines of American constitutional law. Is it not the concept of equality which is responsible for the ferment in Asia and Africa, and which is producing new nations every few months? Is it not the concept of equality which has made elitism a naughty word among professional educators?

Winston Churchill once remarked that the days of his youth were splendid times—for the rich and well born. Some of us can still remember the golden years before World War I when the family of a successful lawyer could live a life which is today quite unattainable even by the very rich. Those days have gone, of course, and while we may suffer from occasional nostalgia, I think that most of us would agree with Sir Winston that the world is better for their passing. Few are those who would now undo the great reforms of the Roosevelt era, and if we may judge by the performance of the most recent Congress, the tremendous tide of equalization is still moving in. The goals of an awakened sense of social responsibility have not yet been met.

One of the most dramatic aspects of this worldwide drive for equality is the fundamental readjustment which is taking place all over this country in the relations between the white majority and the Negro minority. This is a subject which since the earliest days of our Nation has been the concern of lawyers. The basic contradiction between the institution of slavery and the principles announced in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights troubled lawyers from Thomas Jefferson to Abraham Lincoln. Maryland lawyers were among the first to seek a solution. Believing that separation of the races was impossible so long as they lived in the same country, the leaders of the Maryland bar took an important role in organizing the American Colonization Society, whose purpose was to free slaves, and transport them back to Africa. This effort was, on the whole, a failure, although it left a permanent mark in the establishment of the Republic of Liberia. Even more futile and far more drastic in its consequences was the attempt of a Maryland lawyer to lay this problem to rest in the Dred Scott case. The tale has been told with clarity and understanding by our fellow member, Mr. Walker Lewis, in his recently published biography of Chief Justice Taney, which every Maryland lawyer will want to read.

The Emancipation Proclamation, followed shortly thereafter by the end of the Civil War, ushered in a period of reconstruction which a new generation of historians is even now engaged in reappraising. There were those led by Charles Sumner of Massachusetts and Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania, who believed that the only proper course was to rebuild our society on the premise that—to paraphrase Mr. Justice Harlan's famous remark in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*—our society should be colorblind. Their views did not prevail, and the struggle ended with a compromise which substituted for slavery a system of subordination in which Negroes were obliged to accept the inferior role. There was no real physical separation of the races—indeed this was believed to be entirely impracticable—and Negroes and whites continued to live and work together in intimate daily contact. True, there came to be various forms of segregation for special purposes, mostly as a result of laws passed in the last years of the 19th century, but these discriminations were tokens which symbolized the inferior status of the Negro. Sitting in separate seats in railroad cars, like the universal use of first names in addressing Negroes, regardless of their age or occupation, and a myriad other similar distinctions which were so familiar to us that we tended to be unconscious of them, were all intended to and for years did serve to keep the Negro "in his place."

The researches of historians have now made it clear that under the influence of Booker T. Washington the Negro leadership accepted this compromise very reluctantly and only as a temporary expedient necessary to the transition from slavery to full equality. By the end of World War I the compromise had begun to wear thin, and Adolf Hitler, with his odious persecutions based on racial theories, completely undermined it. Promptly at the end of World War II, the issues which were thought to have been settled when the period of Reconstruction came to an end, were reopened.

Ironically enough, during the same period, largely as the result of the development of transportation by motor vehicle, our great urban centers began to be transformed into inner cities inhabited almost exclusively by Negroes, surrounded by white suburbs. For the first time in our history, physical separation of the races became a reality, and the word "ghetto" has become as familiar to us as it was to the people of Eastern Europe prior to World War II. Whereas before the Negro played a definite, if inferior, role in our society, he has now begun to feel excluded from it altogether except when the policeman or the tax collector or the draft official arrives at his door.

The consequences of this alienation have been analyzed in hundreds of publications ranging from studies by learned sociologists to novels, poems, and plays by writers of varying talents. To the student of the history of Israel, there is little that is novel in this outpouring of words. The feelings of those who find themselves among the alien corn, have not changed very much. What those feelings are, the occurrences in the Watts district of Los Angeles of last summer make all too clear.

That this great movement has had its effect on the law, no one can dispute. I will not bore you with a recital of the extensive changes in substantive and procedural law which are directly traceable to this source. What I am concerned with here is its significance to lawyers as a profession. Let me try to explain what I mean. You would agree, I am sure, that a basic tenet of our profession is that a lawyer is bound never to refuse to represent a litigant or person charged with crime because his cause is an unpopular one. Many of you have taken or at least heard the oath administered to lawyers when they are admitted to practice before the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland. I often think that if the medical profession has its Hippocratic oath, we, too, can exhibit an equally lofty statement of our professional commitment. You remember what it says:

"You will never reject from any consideration personal to yourself the cause of the defenseless or oppressed."

Do we as a profession live up to what we so nobly profess? In June of 1963, at the suggestion of President Kennedy, a committee of lawyers was organized to protect the civil rights of all citizens. This committee was made up of leaders of the bar from all parts of the Nation, many of whom had been presidents of the American Bar Association or of their State bar associations. Under the direction of that committee a careful study was made to determine whether those involved in cases where civil rights are affected are receiving adequate representation from the legal profession. The answer, unfortunately, was all too clear. The lawyer who is willing to handle a civil rights case is a rare bird indeed.

At the meeting of the American Bar Association held in Miami last August, the chairman of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law announced the opening of a law office in Jackson, Miss., to provide legal representation in civil rights cases. That office has a small permanent staff made up of lawyers from California, New York City, and Washington, D.C. In addition, it has the benefit of the volunteer services of young lawyers with trial experience who are associated with leading law firms throughout the country and who are willing to serve a 1 month hitch in Mississippi.

Now the significant thing about this is that at the Miami meeting the President of the Mississippi Bar Association gave his warm endorsement to this work of the Lawyer's Committee and requested all members of the bar of his State to give these visiting lawyers all possible assistance. The reason for this receptive attitude on the part of the Mississippi bar may be found in a report recently made by the Civil Rights Commission after extensive investigation made by its staff in Mississippi and after considering voluminous testimony given at a public hearing held in that State. Dean Griswold, who was a member of that Commission, summarized that report in the flat statement that "there are no white lawyers in Mississippi who will ordinarily handle a civil rights case." So you see that these young lawyers from New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit and Washington—and I am happy to be able to add, from Baltimore—are upholding the honor of the profession, which has been sadly tarnished by the failure of the local bar to live up to its responsibilities.

Now, of course, the condition described by Dean Griswold is not confined to the State of Mississippi. There is, for example, the case of the young Harvard Law School student, Fred Wallace, who decided to spend his vacation in Farmville, Va., clerking for the only Negro lawyer in that community. Farmville is in Prince Edward County, which, as you all know, closed its public schools rather than to comply with the mandate of the Supreme Court in *Brown* v. *The Board of Education*. The result was that the Negro children of the county went without schooling for many years, during which their rights were continuously in litigation. As the result, feelings in the community were aroused to a high pitch. One morning the student was sent by his employer to deliver a message to the local judge at the county courthouse. As he approached the judge's chambers a deputy sheriff who did not know him demanded to know what he was doing there. After what appears to have been a display of bad manners on both sides, a physical struggle took place, in the course of which the sheriff's finger was trodden upon and began to bleed. The student was promptly taken into custody and charged with assault with intent to kill.

The dean of the Harvard Law School, believing, not without reason, that the student needed to be represented by a white lawyer of standing in the community, appealed to the head of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights, who, in turn, asked the dean of the Law School of the University of Virginia for suggestions. Dean Ribble recommended that George Allen of Richmond be asked to take the case. Mr. Allen, who was then nearly 80 years of age, is a native of Prince Edward County and is well known at that bar, although his principal reputation has been made in Richmond, where he has gained recognition as the leading plaintiff's lawyer in the State and has been elected to the presidency of the Richmond Bar Association. He agreed to represent the student, but said that he would need the services of a member of the Prince Edward bar as local counsel. He then approached every lawyer at that bar and was turned down by every single one of them, although many of them had been associated with him in civil cases. He promptly filed a motion to transfer the case to the Federal court and gave as one of his principal grounds the fact that no Prince Edward County lawyer could be found who was willing to appear for the defendant. Incidentally, the American College of Trial Lawyers gave its first award for fearless advocacy to George Allen at a meeting held in Miami last August, which was attended by the then president of the American Bar Association, himself a Richmond lawyer.

Let me give you one more illustration. You all remember the libel suit in which the police commissioner of Montgomery, Ala., obtained a verdict of $500,000 against the New York Times, which was later set aside in the Supreme Court of the United States. Perhaps you may have wondered why the Times chose to be represented in the courts of Alabama by a New York lawyer. The answer is that New York counsel attempted unsuccessfully to obtain the services of an Alabama lawyer who was qualified to handle a case of that character. Not one of the leading law firms in that State would handle the case. This is not so surprising when you remember that a well-known Alabama lawyer was subsequently thrown out of one of the most prominent law firms in the State because he agreed to defend an FBI informer in a suit for counsel fees brought for services rendered in a case in which the agent had been indicted and had given evidence against his codefendants charged with the murder of a civil rights worker.

You may say that all these examples have arisen south of the Potomac, but I wonder whether, given a similar state of public feeling, the Maryland lawyer would be willing to pay the penalty which might be exacted from him were he to perform his plain professional duty. I do not remember that reputable members of this bar were anxious to represent persons charged with violations of the Smith Act or other allegedly communistic activities. The truth of the matter is that there are few John Adams' among us. You will recall that he gained an undying reputation for courage by defending the British soldiers who were indicted for murder as the result of the Boston Massacre. Nowadays a Massachusetts lawyer can gain a national reputation for courage simply by representing high-ranking Army officers before a congressional committee.

Here, it seems to me, is an area into which the profession should move. We simply cannot expect the individual lawyer to run the risk of social and professional ostracism which the representation of the unpopular cause sometimes brings, and we should be ashamed to try to cover the situation up by mouthing sanctimonious hypocrisies. I suggest, therefore, that it is the responsibility of each local bar association to take the necessary steps to make competent counsel available in such cases. We can, of course, help by contributing funds and services to volunteer organizations such as the Lawyers' Committee, but it seems to me that what is needed is recognition that this is a responsibility of the organized bar. When cases arise such as that which recently occurred in this State when young William Murray spent a substantial time in jail under a clearly illegal sentence, it should not have been necessary for the president of your association to act on his own initiative in order to make sure that this young man had adequate representation. We are all deeply indebted to Mr. Charles Evans, Mr. Joseph Kaplan, and Mr. Leonard Kerpelman for upholding the honor of the Maryland bar, but would it not have been better if a committee of the bar association had been in existence, charged with responsibility for making legal services available under such circumstances?

Let me turn to another aspect of the subject. One very unpleasant consequence of the increasing alienation of the Negro community is the hostility of a great many decent Negro citizens toward the police. This is a very serious situation which has been recently exacerbated by the destructive tactics of some who hold positions of leadership in the Negro community, aided and abetted, I regret to say, by naive journalists who have only a superficial knowledge of the problem. I do not for a moment suggest that there has not been fault on the side of the police, although it is certain that the charges of police brutality are exaggerated. This whole subject has received patient and sympathetic study by a representative biracial committee which recommended a plan designed to assure the community that charges against the police are not simply swept under the rug. The complaint evaluation board is not and was never intended to be a review board, holding hearings and usurping the disciplinary responsibilities of the police commissioner. Its single responsibility is to evaluate complaints, make sure that they are thoroughly investigated, and to see that charges are brought when they should be brought. That is as far as the board was intended to go and, in my opinion, as far as it can go without impairing the morale of a police force already buffeted by unprecedented problems of law enforcement arising out of the social forces which I have attempted to identify.

Another result of the drive for equalization is the proposal of the Office of Economic Opportunity to contribute to the support of approved plans developed by local organizations for the purpose of making legal services available to the poor. This is not the time or place to evaluate the Great Society or to compare it with its competitors. However, the upheaval in the Baltimore City Bar Association which followed upon the recent approval by the executive committee of that association of a plan for expanding the work of the Legal Aid Bureau with the aid of Federal funds, has focused attention once more on the age-old problem of legal assistance to the poor. Every lawyer recognizes an obligation to furnish legal services to those who cannot pay for it, but the time has long since gone by when the volunteer service of the individual lawyer can pretend to meet the needs of the poor for legal advice and assistance. We can, of course, contribute to the Community Chest and thus indirectly to the Legal Aid Bureau, but the plain fact is that if every dollar contributed by lawyers to the Community Chest were channeled into the work of the Legal Aid Bureau, it would still not have nearly enough money to fill the need. If we are honest with ourselves, we are bound to admit that lawyers have fallen far behind the medical profession in caring for those who cannot afford to pay for their services. Yet I venture to say that most lawyers welcomed the passage by Congress of the recent program of federally financed medical care. Certainly, very few lawyers would withhold governmental assistance to hospitals caring for the indigent sick. In the words of Chief Judge Markell, to do so would be to return to the "bow and arrow days."

Now I realize that there were at that meeting some who found fault with details of the plan which had been approved by the executive committee and others who felt that it should have been more thoroughly considered and explained before its approval. With them I have no quarrel, but unless I misunderstand the tenor of some of the speeches which were made on that occasion, objections were voiced to the plan which were far more deep seated. Not only was there hostility to the use of tax money for any such purpose, but there was a suggestion that any organization engaged in supplying legal aid to the poor by making available the services of a staff of paid lawyers was in some way violating the canons of professional ethics and destroying the profession. I could not help wondering whether the speakers had ever heard of the legal aid bureau or had any knowledge of what it has been doing for the past 54 years.

But I do not propose here to argue the merits of any particular plan. The president of the Bar Association of Baltimore City has appointed a committee to study that matter, and I am pleased to note that one of its ex officio members is also the chairman of the committee on legal services of this association. What I do suggest is that the time has come for Maryland lawyers to face facts. It is an undeniable fact that there are thousands of men and women in this State who need the services of lawyers in civil matters and who do not get them. Most of them know no lawyers and, indeed, fear them. Their contacts with the law have not been such as to make them think of the lawyer as the protector of the poor and oppressed.

Recently I got a call from a man who used to work as a servant in my mother's household. He had bought a household appliance on the installment plan under a contract which guaranteed service for a specified period. The appliance had proven to be defective, but repeated letters and telephone calls asking that the defects be corrected had been ignored. Finally he had declined to make payment of an installment and sent a letter explaining his reasons. In reply he had received a form letter advising him that unless the payment was made by a specified time, the appliance would be repossessed. I asked one of the young men in my office to look into the matter. He made one telephone call. The next day I got a call from my client telling me that the appliance had been fixed and expressing his profound gratitude. I replied that I had done very little—just had one of my associates put in a telephone call. "Mr. Marbury," he replied, "It all depends on who does the calling."

That man knew a lawyer to whom he could turn for help. There are thousands like him who do not and who, in like circumstances, would simply have suffered the loss of the payments which had been made on the appliance. I do not doubt that there are dozens of such occurrences every day throughout this State. Each one is a bit of social dynamite, ready to explode at the first spark. Do we not, as a profession, owe a duty to grapple effectively with this problem? Or shall we continue to sit with our heads together, telling time-honored tales about our glorious profession and its readiness to serve the poor?

You will have noted that I have said nothing about the representation of the indigent charged with crime. Frankly, I think that subject has not lacked for discussion. One trouble is that we do not yet fully understand the rules of the game. There is still a heated controversy as to when counsel must be supplied to persons who are taken into custody by the police. Law journals are filled with polemics on this subject, and the interchange of letters between the Attorney General of the United States and the Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has become notorious. No doubt in time the full scope of the Gideon and Escobedo cases will be determined and the profession will by necessity have to devise methods for discharging the responsibilities which will automatically fall upon the bar. In the meantime, let us take care that vested interests are not established which it will be difficult to eliminate. All history teaches us that the dispensation of patronage is a corrupting force which should as far as possible be removed from the hands of those who should be above politics. It is a cause of genuine concern that our judges now have the responsibility for dispensing such large sums in the way of compensation to compel appointed to represent indigent defendants in criminal cases. Here again it seems to me that the profession should be moving to devise adequate methods for coping with a new situation. We have made a beginning in that direction, but much remains to be done.

There is one aspect of equality which all admit should be the special concern of lawyers. The phrase "equal justice under law" expresses the highest aspiration of our profession. It is trite to say that to be equal, justice must be speedy. Everyone knows that the financially weak litigant is obviously the greater sufferer from the law's proverbial delays. It is now 60 years since a young Nebraska lawyer named Roscoe Pound startled the members of the American Bar Association by delivering an address entitled "The Principal Causes for the Public Dissatisfaction with the Administration of Justice." One of the striking points which he made was that in England and Wales 95 judges seemed able to handle with expedition and in a manner which set a standard for the rest of the world, all the civil litigation, both at the nisi prius and appellate level, generated by a nation of 32 million people. I cannot help wondering what Dean Pound would think if he could be told that in Maryland, in 1966, 69 judges are getting far behind in the attempt to handle the litigation of a community of roughly 3½ million people. Not more than one-third of the time of our judges is devoted to criminal cases, and to offset this it must be remembered that the English courts handled bankruptcy, admiralty, and probate matters, as well as much other civil litigation which under our system lands in the Federal courts. So the comparison is pretty devastating.

You all know what the trouble is. Our judicial system is based on geographical divisions which make no sense today; the best available men are too often not appointed to the bench; we continue to admit to our bar men and women who have not had the necessary preparation in order to enable them to assume the responsibilities of a member of our profession, many of them graduates of schools which are not even accredited; we do not afford practicing lawyers the opportunities for continuing legal education which they need to keep abreast of a constantly changing legal system; we have failed to make full use of tested methods of expediting the disposition of cases, such as the pretrial conference; our criminal law is a patchwork full of pitfalls for the unwary.

I could go on with this dreary rehearsal, but you have heard it all before. Indeed, it is only fair to say that lawyers as a profession and, in particular, Maryland lawyers, are struggling with these problems. The committee on judicial administration of this association has begun the task of modernizing our judicial system. Our committee on judicial selection is striving to improve the method by which our judges are chosen. Our committee on legal education is trying to raise the standards for admission to the bar and to eliminate the law schools which are not accredited. Our committee on continuing legal education is trying to make available to lawyers throughout the State the opportunity to keep abreast of developments in the law. I might add that we have an active section on criminal law which is taking an important part in a general revision of our criminal statutes which has been undertaken by the Governor's committee headed by former Chief Judge Brune. Furthermore, your board of governors has recently approved the appointment of a committee representing not only this association but also each of the county bar associations who will, it is hoped, render active assistance to the Governor's commission on a constitutional convention.

In these respects, at least, we are moving forward, although, we must admit, not as rapidly or as effectively as might be hoped. The truth of the matter is that until the Maryland Bar Association speaks with the voice of the entire profession, we shall not do what we could and should be doing even in this specialized field of our own expertise. But that is another story, about which you will be hearing a good deal during the coming months from a committee on unifying the bar, whose members have just been appointed by the board of governors.

You will think, perhaps, that I am asking too much of the organized bar to expect it to cope with all of these problems. I should point out to you, however, that the young lawyers who are now coming to the bar seem far more eager than their elders to undertake these tasks. Apparently our law schools are inculcating in their students a greater sense of social responsibility than was common a generation or more ago. These young men and women, taking them by and large, are anxious to come to grips with the vexing problems which I have attempted to present to you today. We, their elders, can, of course, surrender the task into their hands, but I suggest that our leadership is still needed, or else for what have we lived so long?

GENERAL REEVES DISCUSSES THE STATE OF ALASKA'S DEFENSES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Monday Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, commander in chief of the Alaskan command, gave an important address at the weekly meeting of the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce. In it he outlined the present status and posture of the Alaskan command and its relation to global events.

As one who has long been concerned that Alaska defenses be kept adequate, which for many years they were not, General Reeves' analysis of the present situation is of interest to all who realize the importance of Alaska to our national defense.

It is still true, despite changing fashion of weaponry, and the growing importance of missiles, that Alaska's strategic importance to the United States is undiminished. Fronting as it does on the Arctic, both an airways and submarine seaways of growing importance in our time; lying as Alaska does within naked eye's view of Soviet Siberia, it is no less true today than it was when 31 years ago Billy Mitchell uttered his great wisdom that:

> Alaska is the most important place in the world for aircraft, and he who holds Alaska, holds the world.

General Reeves' estimate is that Alaska defenses have not been substantially diminished despite the recent withdrawal of the 317th Fighter Squadron—against which Senator BARTLETT and I felt obligated to protest—but are being kept up to full adequacy.

I ask unanimous consent that General Reeves' speech be included at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. RAYMOND J. REEVES, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ALASKA, AT MEETING OF ANCHORAGE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, JANUARY 17, 1966

Since my assignment, 2½ years ago as commander in chief, Alaska, I have had one of the most challenging and, to me, one of the most rewarding assignments in the Armed Forces. It is a vital and interesting position, for not only is it a joint command, where all services are welded into a unified force which forms the first line of defense for North America from a potential attack over the Arctic, but also, because it is located in a new State, still challenging to all newcomers. My purpose today is to discuss the current world situation, some of the recent changes in our Armed Forces, including those in Alaska, and lastly, to give you some of my thoughts as to the future posture of the military in the 49th State.

Notwithstanding the many difficulties now being experienced within the Communist camp, as long as political and economic instability continue to exist in so many countries around the world, both the U.S.S.R. and the Chinese Communists will find many low-cost opportunities to carry on their assault on freedom and to spread the subversive Communist doctrine. This, despite a most significant development—the public airing of the dispute between the rulers of the Soviet Union and Communist China. It is now quite clear that we are witnessing more than a disagreement on methods and strategy in opposing a free world. The bitterness with which the dispute has been waged has already led to almost total cessation of economic cooperation and has split the worldwide Communist movement. This dispute between the Soviet Union and Communist China is not over the ultimate objective, but rather, how it is to be achieved and who is to control the worldwide Communist movement. Nevertheless, both the Soviet Union and Communist China have shown that they are as eager as ever to create difficulties for the free world, whenever and wherever they can do so safely. Expansionism is so deeply engrained in Communist doctrine that it would be naive for us to expect any Communist leadership to repudiate it. Thus, we can expect, in spite of their differences, continued pressure from the Communist camp.

Limitation of this expansionism during the past few years is due in large measure, I believe, to the systematic buildup since 1961 in our own military strength, both for general and for limited war. Some examples of this buildup are:

1. Emplacement of over 850 land based intercontinental ballistic missiles plus deployment of over 450 Polaris missiles on Polaris submarines.
2. A 300-percent increase in nuclear warheads, with a 200-percent increase in total available megatonnage.
3. A 100-percent increase in airlift capability with a 600-percent increase programed by 1970.
4. A 50-percent increase in tactical fighter squadrons.
5. An 800-percent increase in special forces.
6. A 45-percent increase in the number of combat-ready Army divisions.

Not only has our strategic retaliatory force maintained its predominance vis-a-vis the Communist bloc, namely the capability of destroying the target systems of both the Soviet Union and Communist China, even if we were to absorb an initial surprise attack, but also, our capability to respond to a wide variety of less serious situations has improved markedly.

With this picture in mind, let us look at some of the changes and developments in our Armed Forces. As you know, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara recently announced details on 149 actions to consolidate, reduce, or discontinue Department of Defense activities in the United States and overseas. When completed, these actions will produce annual savings of $410 million and reduce personnel by 53,000 without decreasing military effectiveness or limiting our current and future activities in southeast Asia.

These actions produce a great deal of publicity, especially in those areas where entire installations are closed. Unfortunately, many people get the impression that we are decreasing our national defense posture. Actually, these consolidations and base closures are taking place while the capability of our Armed Forces is being altered and improved so as to be increasingly responsive to the situation in Vietnam while at the same time maintaining our worldwide strategic posture. For example, the basic bomber force of the Strategic Air Command is being adjusted while maintaining the required strategic nuclear capability. This is being accomplished by phasing out of the inventory all B–47's, the older models of the B–52 bombers and all B–58 bombers—well after our strategic nuclear capability of intercontinental ballistic missiles and Polaris missiles has been increased to offset the phasedown of bombers. In this connection, there are no plans to eliminate bombers completely from the strategic forces. Secretary McNamara recently announced plans to build a new force of bombers to take the place of those being phased out of our strategic bomber force. The new bomber, to be known as the FB–111, will have twice the speed and a comparable range to the early model B–52. The FB–111 will be a modified version of the F–111, a tactical fighter bomber now being developed for both the Air Force and the Navy. Authorization for the $1.75 billion program will be sought from Congress as part of the Defense Department's request early in 1966 in order to attain an operational capability in 1968. At the same time, the strength of the Army is being increased by 1 division, making a total of 17, plus activating 3 brigades, a large number of helicopter companies and other supporting units. This will increase the Army's strength by about 235,000.

Some 30,000 additional military personnel are being provided for the Marine Corps to augument existing units such as helicopter squadrons, and communication, engineer, and military police battalions.

The increased tempo of attack carrier operations and the intensified coastal patrol off Vietnam require a small increase in the number of active ships in the Navy, as well as an increase in the manning of the ships deployed to that area. Therefore, some 36,500 additional personnel are being added to the Navy.

Additional bombing sorties, and more tactical fighter and troop carrier squadrons will be supported with an increase in Air Force strength of about 40,000.

These technological adjustments and force increases will provide a better balanced posture by expanding the variety of military options available to our policy makers. We have to be able to deal rapidly and effectively with threats to our security, not only at the level of all-out war, but also at levels of limited war and guerrilla action. We must be prepared for contingencies involving conventional or nuclear weapons or both.

I would like now to summarize for you the changes which have or will take place in the Alaskan Command. Some of these changes are the result of technological changes and are generally long-range in character. Others are more directly related to the situation in South Vietnam, and therefore, are more temporary in nature. In each case, I shall try to give you a feel for the impact on the Alaskan Command as well as any follow-on changes which may result.

As announced in the Department of Defense consolidation and reduction program, the 317th Fighter Squadron at Elmendorf Air Force Base is programed to be deactivated by July 1, 1967. The program also will return the land of the inactive Naval installations at Attu and Dutch Harbor to the State of Alaska. I am sure you are as proud of the record of the 317th as we are. It is the only unit which has twice won the coveted Hughes Trophy for outstanding performance. The 317th has F–102 aircraft assigned and has had F–106 aircraft assigned to it from the continental United States.

Prior to the deactivation of the 317th, we plan to receive a more sophisticated weapon system here in Alaska. This capability will be provided by a rotational squadron of F–4C Phantom jet fighters. These advanced multi-capable aircraft will be under my operational command while in Alaska. By rotating these aircraft, the Air Force will benefit greatly through the training of large numbers of aircrews in the Arctic and sub-Arctic environment.

Further, we will still have the two NIKE Hercules battalions of the U.S. Army, Alaska to defend the Anchorage and Fairbanks areas against air attacks.

In addition to the scheduled phaseout of the 317th Fighter Squadron, there are other program changes.

One of these changes involves the F–4C Fighter Squadron which was assigned to the Alaskan Command, on a rotational basis, last September.

Because of the increasing scope of U.S. Air Force worldwide commitments, the 389th Tactical Fighter Squadron of the F–4C Phantom II jets was not replaced immediately after its rotation from Alaska in December. As in the past, Alaskan air defenses will be maintained in the immediate future by the F–102 Delta Darts of the 317th Fighter Interceptor Squadron, augmented by supersonic F–106 Delta Daggers on rotation from the Air Defense Command, and the Army's Nike-Hercules battalions.

Another change involves the Strategic Air Command B–47 unit at Elmendorf. As has been previously announced, all B–47's of SAC will be phased out by July 1, 1966. The SAC unit at Elmendorf is included in that phaseout and it has already redeployed its aircraft. These are actions primarily affecting the Air Force. Current programs for the Army and Navy components in Alaska provide for a continuation of almost the same overall strength levels we have today.

Alcom is also assisting the effort in Vietnam by supporting the Military Airlift Command (formerly MATS) program of supplying Pacific bases by airlift. As I have previously announced, this program is now underway and will accelerate sharply this year. At present, there are over 30 C–141's, as well as 150 other cargo aircraft utilizing Elmendorf each month en route to and from southeast Asia. By June 1967 there will be more than 810 C–141 landings at Elmendorf each month. The total capability to support military operations in the Pacific area by Alcom, via airlift through Elmendorf Air Force Base, must be assured if we are to retain this very large and important mission. This requires, among other things, a continuous and reliable petroleum resupply system. In our opinion, this can best be accomplished through construction of a pipeline from Whittier to Anchorage.

I think it will be helpful to take a look at some of the economic aspects of the Department of Defense. For over a decade, the Department of Defense has absorbed half of every dollar paid in taxes, and Defense's inventory of real estate and equipment is worth over $150 billion. There are also millions of Americans working for industry in jobs directly related to the needs of national defense and even minor changes in the spending policies of the Department can have profound effects on the whole American economy.

What we will spend for our national security in the fiscal year ending next July exceeds, by several billion, the total sales of the country's 10 largest corporations. I think it is quite clear that this country can afford these tremendous sums, which are the price of national security and that, in fact, we could afford to spend more, if that were judged necessary. Whatever the cost of freedom, we can pay the price, but, this does not justify ineffective defense spending or waste. Some of the changes I have discussed are the result of this continuing emphasis on economy even during the current buildup.

To bring this picture a little closer to home, I would like to review for you some of the economic aspects of the Alaskan Command. We have a very large military investment in Alaska with a total of over $2 billion in just the real property and in-place equipment and supply items necessary to support our forces. One of the most significant features is our average annual expenditure in Alaska. Expenditures on civilian payrolls, supply purchases, and maintenance contracts average $137.5 million annually. Adding the money spent on military payrolls, troop subsistence and new construction, results in the military here spending $290 million a year for its operations—most of which is spent within Alaska and is certainly a significant factor in Alaskan economy. We do not foresee any big change in the overall military investment and annual expenditure in Alaska because from a military point of view, Alaska possesses several outstanding assets:

First, while Alaska is U.S. soil and a State of the Union, nevertheless, it is, strategically speaking, an overseas area. However, since it is a State, we are not subject to the many international restrictions which complicate our operations in other overseas areas. Further, the military force here does not contribute to the gold flow problem as in some overseas areas.

Second, Alaska has a favorable strategic geographical location. This is shown graphically by the increased use by civil airlines of the polar air routes and the increase in activity at Elmendorf resulting from the buildup in southeast Asia. The movement of more military personnel and cargo through Alaska is taking place because the air route distance from the continental United States to southeast Asia, via Elmendorf Air Force Base, is shorter than the air routes from the continental United States to southeast Asia over the mid-Pacific.

Third, the accommodations and training environment in Alaska for additional military forces are in being, and are outstanding. The developed military bases and facilities are ideal for handling and supporting tactical troops. The terrain, the climate, and the availability of the area make Alaska an extremely valuable training area, especially when compared with the problems of securing training areas in the more populated areas of the other States.

In short, I believe Alaska will continue to have substantial military forces stationed here.

Looking into the future, however, we see no great change in our contribution to the Alaskan economy, but we do foresee that our relative importance will decline because this State is just starting to grow. Your future delights us, and we will continue to play our part in your development, as well as in the national defense. In this connection, I would like to depart for a moment from purely military matters, and point out to you what has happened in other areas and how it relates to Alaska.

First, in predicting the future of Alaska, a globe of the earth is more useful than a crystal ball. By looking at a world globe we can see, at a glance, the population centers and we can locate those nations which are economically or politically important. Now, when surface ships were the main or sole source of transportation between these world centers, we know that points along the way grew and prospered.

Hawaii, for example, has prospered for many reasons, but primarily because it became an important crossroad in Pacific surface shipping. Hawaii had the good fortune to be ideally located on some of the main shipping routes. For the same reason, Hawaii has had the distinction of being the aerial crossroad of the South Pacific. The flow of passenger and cargo traffic by aircraft is steadily increasing, and it is already evident that Alaska's role as an intercontinental aerial crossroad is growing. More people are learning what Alaskans have known for a long time—that is—that Alaska lies on the great circle route from the continental United States to the Orient, as well as the transpolar route between Europe and the Orient. The flying weather in Alaska is good—far better than is generally known.

I have reported to you that at Elmendorf Air Force Base we will have, in the years just ahead, a substantial increase in military air traffic through to the Orient. This is a good sign for Alaska's growth. We have here a good location for intercontinental air travel and, I believe, that there is a clear opportunity to profit from Alaska's strategic location.

Speaking further of Alaska's growth potential, I believe tourism will increase at a rate which will astound the average Alaskan. A military transport which is capable of carrying almost 200,000 pounds is now being developed. It is conceivable that a commercial version could carry 500 to 550 passengers and be operating early in the 1970's.

A reduction in air fares could be expected. Commercial air travel is becoming less expensive with the development of more efficient aircraft. Tourism will get another boost from a change in the size of the market or the level of income throughout the world. In the United States, for example, the average family income which stood at $5,900 in 1962 is estimated at over $10,000 by 1975. There is a growing number of healthy, retired persons who make up a sizable portion of the tourist business. They are the most important tourist market. In the United States, for example, corporate retirement funds now total well over $44 billion and are rising sharply from year to year. This is only about one-third of the total of all pension or retirement reserves. There will be a corresponding growth in nontourist travel, that is, those who have a primary purpose other than pleasure of travel itself. Those will be the people who travel about the world on scientific, professional, educational, or governmental business. In 1964, Alaska had an influx of about 75,000 visitors and it has been estimated that by 1975, the annual visitor arrivals in Alaska should be about 450,000 and should be increasing by about 18 percent per year.

Going back to Hawaii, in 1954, there were about 75,000 visitors to Hawaii, or about the same as in Alaska in 1964. This year, 1966, arrivals in Hawaii will exceed 600,000 and in another 10 years, 1,500,000.

This tourism outlook alone should be most encouraging to Alaskans. I would like to point out that we send back to the other States more than 10,000 Alaskan ambassadors each year. These are the Alaskan servicemen who have completed a tour here, and who then go back to cities and homes throughout our country where stories of their experiences here create interest in Alaska. These men, who with their dependents, make up a force of perhaps 30,000 adult spokesmen, can do a great deal to dispel any misconceptions about Alaska. By your interests and actions, you, the people of Alaska, have evolved into an important segment of our Nation, and you are in the mainstream of the national effort, as well as the mainstream of worldwide jet travel. I have no doubt that this evolution will continue and that the future will bring increasing Alaskan support to our national objectives, as well as increasing prosperity to your forward-looking State.

In summary, we don't know what specific changes in weapons and strategy the future will bring, no one knows; I can only assure you that the Department of Defense and the Alaskan Command are committed to providing the best defense possible to meet the current world situation. Neither you nor I want to see unnecessary defense spending. We want the best defensive effort that our tax dollars will buy, and this can be accomplished only by continuing to change the defense posture to keep pace with the changing threat and the advancement of applied scientific and technical knowledge.

Some of these changes will involve reduction or elimination of some military units; others will require addition or strengthening of some military units. There will be more changes in the military programs in Alaska, and we have made classified presentations and recommendations to the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington, D.C., in line with our future requirements. Whatever changes are required, the Alaskan Command will continue to serve, not only as an important part in the defense of Alaska and North America, but also as friends and supporters of this great State.

WHY NOT WITHOUT FRANCE?

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Prof. Elliot R. Goodman, of Brown University in Providence, R.I., has established a remarkable record when it comes to knowledge and experience in NATO affairs. He has served as a NATO research fellow and has written a great deal on the subject.

In addition, his services in helping me at NATO parliamentarian meetings that occurred in May and October of this past year were great.

He has written an excellent piece that appeared in the Providence Journal of January 16, 1966, offering various thoughts on NATO. Since his article contains much wisdom and delineates many of the problems remarkably clear, I thought it might be of interest to my colleagues, and for this reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT WITHOUT FRANCE?

(By Elliot R. Goodman)

NATO is in transition.

The forthcoming spring meeting of NATO defense and foreign affairs ministers will presumably consider French proposals for reform of NATO. Reform, as viewed by President de Gaulle the disintegrator, is a euphemism for unscrambling the NATO omelet and reducing the present integrated and highly interdependent defense arrangements to the status of a classical 19th century military alliance.

If, as seems likely, the French will stand alone, what attitude should the other powers assume? Should they do all they can to appease General de Gaulle and therefore water down the effectiveness and credibility of their common commitments? Or should they note with regret French self-isolation, and reaffirm their common commitments?

Beyond that, should they actively plan for the French withdrawal from NATO when it becomes legally permissible in 1969, as General de Gaulle himself has threatened to do in his September 1965 press conference, should his allies not agree to remodel NATO according to his wishes? And could not this new NATO, though weakened by French absence, also mark the beginning of a rejuvenated and modernized structure which could prove to be a greatly strengthened, more effectively integrated entity, once it is freed of the drag of Gaullist obstructionism?

HARD CHOICES SOON

These are the types of alternative policies that are currently being pondered in the chanceries of the NATO nations, since sometime soon hard choices will have to be made. Contingency planning is already well underway in the State Department in the eventuality of a French withdrawal. This is as it should be, since realistically the fate of NATO, and with it the prospect for developing related cooperative arrangements among the advanced industrialized nations of the West, will depend on the character of American leadership. For the past year or more the Johnson administration has assumed an extremely passive attitude toward NATO affairs, but this policy of drift cannot, or at least should not, go on forever.

One element in making the proper decisions is the degree of public awareness of the crucial nature of the decisions involved, and the extent to which the articulate spokesmen who help formulate public opinion can be brought to bear upon these issues. It is in this connection that Dr. Timothy Stanley's searching examination of NATO can be extremely useful. ("NATO in Transition: The Future of the Atlantic Alliance," by Timothy W. Stanley. Praeger $7.50.)

While Stanley is speaking for himself, he nonetheless speaks with considerable authority, since he has long been associated with NATO policy planning in the Department of Defense and is currently working in the Paris NATO headquarters as an aid to U.S. NATO Ambassador Harlan Cleveland.

TRANSITION

The central theme of his book is that NATO should be viewed as living through a transitional stage, moving from the performance of its traditional task of preserving security in the Atlantic area to providing leadership in building a broader world order. In theory, the countries of the West have the capabilities for attacking the seemingly insoluble difficulties in fashioning a viable and stable world order. But this highly desirable objective calls for a political cohesiveness, if not a consensus, which presently does not exist. One might even question the possibility of NATO continuing its traditional security role in the Atlantic area, in the face of the Gaullist critique.

Dr. Stanley points out effectively that the consequences of a Gaullist policy would be a strategic divorce between the United States and Europe, and with it the end of NATO.

The "force de frappe" is not really designed to be used independently to attack Soviet cities, since this would be committing national suicide for France. Therefore, "the problem is one of France claiming to have an 'independent' trigger to the U.S. strategic forces," thereby making "the 'force de frappe' a potential 'detonator' for the overall strike forces of the alliance. Indeed, it is this blackmail potential against the United States which the French tacitly rely upon to compensate for the unilateral ineffectiveness of their national forces in relation to a major nuclear power like the Soviet Union."

A situation of mutual mistrust arises: General de Gaulle feels that vital decisions cannot be left in the hands of the President of the United States, while Washington feels that it might be in the intolerable position of being triggered into war by the "force de frappe."

"There is little doubt," Dr. Stanley continues, "that in a tense situation in which France threatened to employ its strategic nuclear forces independently, the United States would be compelled to disassociate itself—publicly and perhaps dramatically—even from such a close ally as France.

"Thus a vicious cycle could start in which the fact of national nuclear forces in Europe would lead the United States to reconsider the automaticity of its commitment to European defense. In practical terms, this could mean a phaseout of American power from the Continent and a withdrawal not only of nuclear forces, but of the six divisions which we now maintain there.

"That this would be disastrous for Europe as a whole is clear. The result would be a Europe inadequately defended by its own forces, unprotected by the United States, and subject to easy neutralization by the Soviet Union. The key objective of Soviet policy since the war—to drive a wedge between America and Europe—would thus have been achieved in spite of, not because of, its aggressive nature."

UNIFIED STRATEGY

The missile era, Dr. Stanley reasons, quite correctly, demands a unified strategic approach on an intercontinental scale. Even better, wherever possible, the defense of the West should be conceived as a global problem. The author provides a long and coherent account of the current U.S. defense doctrine of a flexible response and corresponding need for a set of centralized nuclear controls. As Dr. Stanley sums up the case: "In the last analysis, the least disadvantageous, and the only remotely rational use of strategic nuclear weapons is in a controlled and limited counterforce context."

The military logic for this doctrine is unimpeachable, but the problem is a political, not a military, one. Defense Secretary McNamara has been criticized frequently, and justly so, for treating the political realities of our European allies as impersonal digits to be fed into computers that decree cost effectiveness and provide the basis for an integrated strategic doctrine. If the United States and Europe were integrated politically, this approach would make sense, but lacking political integration this only incites a feeling of resentment and dependence in Europe, upon which General de Gaulle plays and ends up by creating a "unified" intercontinental strategic doctrine which is rejected in varying degrees in different European countries.

The author is aware of this problem when he says that "solutions must be found which can give France and Europe a reasonable sense of participation in decisions affecting the common destiny of the West." Without such an approach it will surely prove impossible to plan effectively in Atlantic, let alone global, terms. As Prof. David Calleo, of Yale has aptly observed in his recently published "Europe's Future," "The spread of Gaullist resentment in Europe can be contained, the Atlanticists believe, only by making the Alliance more federal, by creating those institutions and practices that will nourish mutual trust and common identity between Europe and its American leader. In short, if the Atlantic Alliance is to last, America's leadership must be less imperial and more federal."

MLF

Dr. Stanley's prescription for dealing Europe in on the joint management of the nuclear power of the Alliance is the famous, and now dead, multilateral force (MLF). The MLF died, in large measure, not because the plan was no good, but because it was not good enough. The effect of the MLF would have been to add in the present U.S. strategic nuclear superiority, while serving as a laboratory in allied nuclear collaboration. But it would not have solved the really crucial problem of allied sharing in political decisionmaking, so long as the United States retained its veto over the use of this force. In effect, the U.S. veto did not give "Europe a reasonable sense of participation in decisions affecting the common destiny of the West," however much it might have seemed to do so when judged from the Pentagon. In Professor Calleo's terms, the MLF was simply too imperial and not sufficiently federal.

It is true that the MLF concept contained a "European clause" which envisaged the abandonment of the U.S. veto under several circumstances, should Europe unite politically. This would have taken some years, under the best of circumstances, since the creation of a single European government able to control nuclear weapons was not likely to emerge overnight. And with Gaullist France injected into the picture, the subject became entirely academic. The "European clause" could not, therefore, be taken as a serious effort to solve the problem of nuclear sharing by abandoning the U.S. veto within the foreseeable future.

There was another possibility of attacking this problem at once, and it is curious and most regretful that neither the Pentagon nor the State Department gave this alternative serious consideration. The Dutch Parliamentarian, A. E. M. Duynstee carefully elaborated a plan in the Defense Committee of the Assembly of Western European Union which provided for the creation of a nuclear executive authority run by weighted majority voting, in which the United States would abandon its veto, but under conditions that would still protect vital American security interests. Here, at least was a formula for sharing nuclear power that could have aroused support among several states interested in joining, unlike the MLF which appealed only to the Germans who, because of their peculiar position, have a special incentive for expanding the scope of their nuclear connections.

MLF WAS A LESSON

The demise of the MLF should be instructive for U.S. policymakers. If our European allies are to be prevented from going their own ways, their sense of participation in decisions affecting the common destiny of the West must be real and not contrived. For the moment the problem of nuclear sharing has been pushed underground but it has not disappeared. When it reappears let us hope that we may have learned from sad experience and be ready to make genuine offers of nuclear sharing, without which the problem will continue to fester.

Elsewhere in his book Dr. Stanley strongly inclines toward the federal, rather than the imperial, approach. "The alliance," he points out, "is already an entangling one—perhaps a greater source of informal constraints upon U.S. policy than is commonly realized. The possible disadvantages of making NATO a more supranational body (in which the constraints could become more formalized) must be balanced against the potential gains in European sharing of the defense burden, and a greater sense of joint responsibility for the twin tasks of securing the Atlantic area and developing a stable world order."

While the author recognizes the present impracticality of creating a truly supranational Atlantic government with a NATO defense minister with wide powers, he does advocate an American willingness to take the lead in abandoning the sacred principle that NATO is an international rather than a supranational organization, and delegating to alliance officials greater authority in specific areas. These might be narrowly limited, especially at first; but the details are less relevant than the basic act of will involved.

As examples of such more highly integrated ventures, Dr. Stanley suggests commonly financed military forces, such as a highly mobile fire brigade put at the disposal of SACEUR. He also advocates an expansion of common funding of construction, procurement, and research and development programs in which the various NATO countries would subscribe a certain percentage of the defense expenditures to NATO, acting as a judicial personality, capable of awarding contracts based on the overall needs of the alliance.

SHIFT OF DECISION

All this would require a reorganized and strengthened NATO international staff which Stanley also recommends. If our intent to save NATO is to be taken seriously by our European partners, this will require a willingness on our part to make a substantial shift in decisionmaking from the Pentagon to Porte Dauphine (or to wherever the NATO headquarters may be moved, should France withdraw). Without an American will to invigorate the common institutions of the alliance, the rationale for Gaullist separatism will continue to flourish. It is within the capability of this country to use its power constructively, given enlightened leadership and the determination to exercise it. Otherwise Washington will have condemned itself to the frustration of railing at Gaullism in vain.

BEAUTY AND MARVELS SKILLFULLY PORTRAYED IN "THE APPALACHIANS" BY MAURICE BROOKS, WEST VIRGINIA AUTHOR

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, rarely have I had as pleasurable an experience as was afforded me last week by my good friend, Prof. Maurice Brooks, of the Division of Forestry of West Virginia University, when he sent me his newest book, "The Appalachians."

This splendid work is the first in a series to be published by Houghton Mifflin Co., a series with two purposes: to interest North Americans in the wildlife, plants, and geology of their continent, and to recapture the inquiring spirit of the old naturalists. In selecting Maurice Brooks to author the first work in this series, the editors—Roger Tory Peterson and John A. Livingston—and publisher wisely chose a splendid researcher, an articulate reporter, and a true naturalist whose creative imagination, combined with a meticulous respect for fact, has produced a guidebook for those magnificent, stately mountains which rise first in the north in the Gaspé Peninsula of Canada and stretch southwestward into northern Alabama.

While the panoramic sweep of the Appalachian Mountain Range is captured for all readers—those who are fortunate in living in States blessed by these great relics and those who hopefully someday will visit there—I read portions of this account dealing with our own State of West Virginia with delight and longing. The description of Gaudineer Knob—in summer months the home of splendid species of warblers, flying squirrels, butterflies, trees and flowers; in the winter months inhabited by varying hares, and perhaps a panther or two—is particularly pleasing to me, as is the description in chapter 15, "Orchids That Aren't in the Tropics," of a typical West Virginia mountain meadow replete with summer wildflowers.

And when I read the moving story of the community that sent one of its sons to college in Pennsylvania, to prepare him for the ministry, by digging and selling "sang"—known to outlanders as ginseng—it brought back to mind the many happy days of my boyhood when I dug "sang" with my grandfather, Jesse F. Randolph, in Salem, W. Va.

The marvels and richness of the flora and fauna in Cranberry Glades, Canaan Valley, and Kate's Mountain; the unique character of Ice Mountain; the secrets of the Appalachian caverns, like McClung's Cave, are all made vital and enticing as we explore with Maurice Brooks the treasures each one offers. We are told that it is not only Vermont which products some of the finest maple sirup in the East—a fact most West Virginians already know. We read of the merchant in Mount Storm, in our State, who attempted to market West Virginia maple sirup, only to find that the public was not interested, and who subsequently sold it to a firm in St. Johnsbury, Vt., where it was promptly graded and marketed as "Vermont No. 1."

From azaleas to wolves, from the huckleberries of Greenbrier to the salamanders of Cheat Mountain, the author invites our respect and enthusiasm and stimulates our curiosity about the wonders still hidden in the Appalachian system.

The people of the land are treated with respect and fondness in the chapter dealing with the arts and crafts, the hunting and farming carried on in the Appalachian Range. While many of Professor Brooks' episodes are relative to West Virginia, he captures the spirit of all mountaineers early in the book when he tells the story of the Appalachian Trail—one of the proudest, most striking achievements of concerned individual Americans—a product of hard, but loving labor to which we all can point with pride. This trail was hewed through the wilderness, foot by foot, mile by mile, by individual men and women who had as their inspiration a deep and abiding love of the mountains in which they toiled. Today, on many sections of this trail which are not under the care of forest and park employees, the trail is maintained and cared for by private members of the Appalachian Trail Clubs. It is a tribute to our mountaineer heritage of individual responsibility, that "the system works; people come, and the jobs get done."

Maurice Brooks, on the last page of his study, speaks for all of us who, from Vermont to Georgia, know and love our hills, when he writes:

> And thus it is with those nurtured in Appalachia—they leave, but they look back, remembering pleasant things. The land has claimed them, and its ties will not be severed.

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I was very pleased this week to receive a copy of a resolution sent to the Congress of the United States by the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America.

The resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas 1966 commemorates the 50th anniversary of the granting of the charter from Congress to the Boy Scouts of America—through the enactment of Public Law 84 duly passed by the House of Representatives on March 7 and the Senate on May 24, and enacted into law on June 15; and

Whereas a report to the Congress has been made each year by the Boy Scouts of America as required by the law; and

Whereas the Boy Scouts of America, the first youth group to receive such a charter, has received encouragement and support of inestimable value: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America, assembled for its 55th annual meeting in Bal Harbour/Miami Beach, Fla., expresses its thanks and appreciation to the Congress of the United States of America and respectfully requests the Congress suitably to recognize the 50th anniversary of the granting of the charter in such way or ways as it may deem appropriate.

We should all be proud of the fine work performed by the Boy Scouts of America. This wonderful organization has performed a great service during the past half-century and I think it is fitting that we recognize this group's great achievements in helping the youth of today to take their proud place among the citizens of tomorrow.

Mr. President, New Hampshire has 5,400 dedicated adults who serve as leaders of the State's 14,000 Boy Scouts. I extend to them my congratulations for a job well done and my best wishes for many more years of service to the State's youth.

WHERE TITOISM WAS TRIED

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, despite the growing abundance of evidence that the Tito government in Yugoslavia is in fact an integral part of the Communist world, discovering its natural allies in Moscow and Peiping rather than in Washington, there exists a stubborn unwillingness to recognize this reality.

As this session begins, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent analysis of the Yugoslav situation by Mr. George Bailey which appeared in the Reporter magazine last summer. This article is as pertinent today as it was when it was written.

Though by the end of fiscal 1963 the United States had supplied Yugoslavia with $2.5 billion in aid, Mr. Bailey points out that this has had no appreciable effect upon Yugoslav foreign policy.

U.S. officials did not take the Belgrade declaration of 1955 at face value, although at this time Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union expressed their agreement on major policy questions.

Belgrade recognized East Germany in 1957 and Tito supported the Soviet Union's resumption of atomic testing in 1961.

Only in 1961, after the bitterly anti-West speech by Tito at the Belgrade Conference of nonalined nations, did Congress finally move to terminate aid, but the program continued until 1963.

Mr. Bailey describes the case of Mihaylo Mihaylov, a lecturer on Russian literature at the Croatian University of Zagreb in Zadar. He visited the Soviet Union, and published an article describing his trip. The Yugoslav Government arrested Mihaylov on charges of slandering a friendly state and violating the press law by sending the manuscript of his banned article to an Italian publisher. He received a sentence of 9 months' imprisonment, indicating to the world that freedom of speech and of the press certainly have no place in Yugoslavia.

Mr. Bailey is of the firm opinion that in any major showdown with communism, Yugoslavia would surely be on the side of its Communist allies. It has never sided with the West on the major issues of conflict, and to imagine that it would do so in the future is wishful thinking.

The article concludes by pointing out that:

> The Titoist experiment has been scarcely a success in the only country where it has been tried out. A proliferation of Titos in other parts of the world is unimaginable today, unless the West expects to subsidize pro-Chinese nonalinement.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Where Titoism Was Tried

(By George Bailey)

Belgrade.—Yugoslavia has six republics, five peoples, four religions, three languages, two alphabets, and a partisan in every pear tree. It harbors a family of South Slav nations united by the fear that their hatred of each other may be exploited by outsiders. The accumulated experience of Ottoman, Habsburg-Hungarian, and finally German occupation begot the fiercest partisan movement of the Second World War. This in turn produced the Yugoslav League of Communists, 80 percent of whose members are former partisans. Today, these aging veterans provide the regime of Marshal Tito with a less vigorous base. The thrust of the external and internal pressures that have sustained Titoism have changed, and the result has been both to lay bare the centrifugal factions and to provoke a tightening of centripetal totalitarian controls in a country often cited for its rebellion against the more rigid forms of communism.

When Stalin, to consolidate the Soviet Empire, tried to take over Yugoslovia, the partisans defied him, thus causing the first split in the Communist bloc and opening Yugoslavia to Western influence on a scale to which no other Communist country has ever been exposed. Two results of the break with Stalin have determined the state of affairs in Yugoslavia ever since. They are the United States Yuglioslavia Emergency Relief Assistance Act of 1950, and the workers' council which was established by law in the same year. The law, which decreed the decentralization of the economy and the creation of semiautonomous self-management committees of workers, was Yugoslavia's way of remaining Communist while producing what was claimed to be an alternative to Stalinism. Its federal structure was determined by ethnic regionalism.

The aid program was all-embracing. It included military assistance and industrial equipment as well as a training program. It also granted most-favored-nation status and qualified Yugoslavia for United States surplus agricultural commodities. By the end of fiscal 1963, $2.5 billion in aid had been supplied to Yugoslavia by the United States Government. For years the Yugoslavs assured the donors that solvency was just around the corner. But Yugoslavia's leaders clearly had no intention of setting the country's finances in order. On the contrary, they projected U.S. aid into the national budget and their long-term planning in order to finance extensive industrialization projects, apparently assuming that year after year the gaping trade deficit would be covered by the allotment.

The attitudes of both countries in this relationship were largely determined by political considerations. The Yugoslavs were determined to demonstrate the effectiveness of their hybrid system; the Americans were willing to subsidize Titoism first as a military counterweight to the Soviets in the Balkans, and later as an ideological alternative to communism at large—a blend of economic self-government and political totalitarianism. The United States courted Yugoslav support in international forums, particularly in the United Nations. And, in fact, the Yugoslav U.N. delegation did approve that organization's involvement in the Korean war. Moreover, the Yugoslavs closed their frontier to the Greek Communist rebels, helping the Western allies to put an end to the Greek civil war. Yugoslavia's signing of the Balkan Pact against aggression with Greece and Turkey in 1954 was further in keeping with the desires of the West.

The United States cherished the hope that its largesse would gradually transform Yugoslav communism into something resembling Western social democracy. There had always been a strong liberal element in the Yugoslav League of Communists and the strengthening of this element as a result of the break with Stalin and the disastrous crop failure of 1950 increased the deceptive nature of the Yugoslav situation. It not only encouraged the liberals to make promises they could not keep but it rendered them the unwitting pawns of the conservative Communists, for it induced U.S. officials to lend credence to the idea of a more democratic Yugoslavia as well as money to Tito's totalitarian regime. The sincerity of liberal assurances to the West only enhanced the effectiveness of the ultimate deception. This was one of the main reasons for the clinging of American officials to their hopes even after Khrushchev and Bulganin went to Belgrade in 1955 to reestablish their relations with Tito.

WHEN THE AID STOPPED

United States officials refused to take at face value the Belgrade Declaration of 1955, in which Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union proclaimed their agreement in the question of disarmament and the banning of atomic weapons, in the cessation of all forms of polemics and other acts tending to sow mistrust among nations, and in "a solution * * * of the German question * * * in the interest of general security * * *." The Belgrade government diligently followed the Soviet line on foreign policy from this time on, including the recognition of East Germany in 1957 and Tito's support of the Soviet Union's resumption of testing in 1961.

In addition to his support of Soviet testing, Tito also singled out East Germany for praise and West Germany for censure as a fascist state 2 weeks after the construction of the Berlin wall. But his greatest service to the Soviet cause was to fit the Marxist formula to the anticolonialist resentments of the nonalined states, some of which proceeded to denounce the Common Market as the economic arm of Western imperalism. It was only when Tito himself—just after the West had advanced $275 million in credits to enable Yugoslavia to implement a foreign currency exchange reform—unequivocally linked Yugoslav policy to the Soviet line in an anti-Western speech at the Belgrade Conference of nonalined nations in 1961, that Congress finally moved to terminate U.S. aid.

When the last of the program was delivered in 1963, Yugoslavia was apparently on its own for the first time in 12 years (substantial Soviet aid, begun in 1956 with glowing promises, by 1962 totaled just $73 million). But it was only "apparently": Yugoslav eligibility for the benefits of Public Law 480, under which U.S. food surpluses were provided to Yugoslavia on long-term credit arrangements (payable in dinars and hence sparing the country's meager foreign currency reserves), was restored at the last moment by the intervention of President Kennedy, who reportedly was impressed by Yugoslavia's resistance to Khrushchev's troika proposal in the United Nations. However, the crucially important most-favored-nation status, enabling Yugoslavia to compete on equal terms for American markets, was suspended.

Assessing the situation after the blow had fallen, Yugoslav economists quickly realized that U.S. aid had not only become an integral part of the economy but also a key element of national economic progress. As such, it had proved a mixed blessing: by creating the illusion of success it had lent impetus to crude experiments, random investments, and dogged persistence in crackpot schemes. For instance, the cult of the decentralized workers' councils and the desire to develop the abjectly poor regions in the south and east of the country resulted in a 12-year splurge of investment in industrial plants in areas remote from sources of raw materials and lacking in transport facilities. This was the origin of the "political factories," as the Yugoslavs call enterprises chronically immune from sensible management, which make up roughly 25 percent of all factories in the country. To subsidize these factories in the south and east, the Government imposed drastic taxes on profitable enterprises, mainly in the industrial centers of Slovenia and Croatia.

This has been the source of bitter recriminations against Belgrade: "Penalties for success; premiums for failure," is the way the Slovenes describe the situation. With only 8.6 percent of the population, Slovenia contributed 37.2 percent of the national budget in 1958. This taxation both stirred up regional antagonism and acted as a deterrent to industrial production. The result is that Yugoslav industry today operates at only 54 percent of capacity.

HANDS IN THE TILL

It was clear that the loss of U.S. aid could be made good only by a sharp increase in production and exports. It was also clear that a main prerequisite to any substantial increase in production was an increase in consumer buying power as well as in investment capacity of individual enterprises. But Yugoslav leaders found themselves in a special dilemma. The decentralized banking system was an indiscriminate purveyor of subsidies to Government-sponsored enterprises throwing good money after bad into the political factories. Thus the nationwide program was dissipated by a flood of uncoordinated investment at the lowest production levels.

The Government, which had not relinquished the responsibility for financing basic industries and was willing to tolerate imports in excess of plan in order to increase exports, could not resist the sudden pressure for imports. It authorized the Foreign Trade Bank to supply foreign exchange to enterprises against their obligation to increase their exports commensurately. As a result, credits to the enterprises increased in 1964 by 45 percent; total commodity imports, however, rose by only 25 percent. The difference was used by the workers' councils not to finance imports but to increase wages and bonuses of the workers, and the result was that the disposable income of the nonagricultural population rose by 30 percent. This in turn created a consumer demand that far outstripped domestic supply and spurred the country's ambling inflation into a gallop.

HOLES IN THE STAR

The fact that the Government not only tolerated but even encouraged the pocketing of credits designated for imports points up the schizoid nature of the Yugoslav system. It was, nevertheless, a revolt, and one inspired by the fading of the utopian Socialist vision. "We want to enjoy the fruits of our labor right now," the director of one of Belgrade's largest factories told me. "Certainly our children should have a better lot, but we want ours now, too. The spread of apathy in the party itself—particularly among youth—was admitted by Vice President Aleksander Rankovic at the Eighth Party Congress last December: in the last 8 years the percentage of members under 25 years of age has dropped from 23.6 to 13.6. To counter this trend a system of rotation has been introduced to rid the party machinery of partisan deadwood and make way for new men.

The Government's agricultural program has been hardly more successful. Driving past one collective farm recently, I noticed eight bullet holes in the plastic red star fixed over the portal. "Who put those holes there?" I asked a passerby. "Farmers," he answered. "Do farmers have guns?" I asked. "All farmers have guns—somewhere," he said. "Why don't they put up a new star?" "That was a new star 3 months ago."

The rural bulwark of resistance to the regime remains unshaken. Rankovic has emphasized "the anomaly of a party with only 8 percent of its members drawn from the agricultural sector that makes up half the population."

The Yugoslav League of Communists fears the peasants. The bitterest pill the league ever swallowed was the decollectivization of agriculture in 1953. This was part of the alternating decentralization and recentralization that followed the prolonged drought of 1950. The crop failure of that year, however, was not only caused by the lack of rain: the forced collectivization of all farming land in Yugoslavia in the late 1940's had provoked the peasants to the point of armed insurrection. But more telling than the peasants' sporadic violence was their passive resistance which throttled agricultural production and prevented the accumulation of reserves.

The Communists tried to circumvent the resistance of the peasants, mainly by contriving to price them out of existence or to force them into the remaining large collectives.

This surreptitious drive to recollectivize the peasants was backed by an attempt to make the state farms appear to be flourishing. To this end the Government concentrated its agricultural investment programs almost exclusively on the collectives. But the system suffered a severe blow early last year when it was revealed that the largest state farm in the country, the Belye, had declared a loss of about 2 billion dinars, or $2.75 million, at the end of 1963. Shortly thereafter the Government finally abandoned the persuasion program and, in an effort to restructure the entire economy, raised prices paid to producers by 21 percent. The effort came 10 years late and contributed strongly to inflationary tendencies. The resultant increase in crop yields, particularly in corn, was nullified by the increase in rural consumption: in the face of rocketing consumer prices, the farmers cut costs, as always, by eating their own produce.

Yugoslav agricultural imports rose by 34 percent in 1963 to a record $328 million, $121 million of it coming from the United States under Public Law 480. Wheat imports in 1963 nearly doubled the 1962 level, with the United States supplying 85 percent. From 1959 to date Yugoslav agricultural production has stagnated, suffering an average yearly deficit of more than a million tons of wheat, or a quarter of the annual amount required to feed the population. The deficit in wheat alone costs the Yugoslav Government about $64 million a year. The harvest of 1964 was poor and the prospects for this year poorer still.

Beginning in early 1964 the dam of Government price controls slowly collapsed and was swept away. Within the last year the cost-of-living index in Yugoslavia has risen more than 25 percent. Ominously, the sharpest increase took place in food prices: milk went up 25 percent, bread 30 percent. A pound of prime meat now sells in Belgrade for approximately the same price as in a New York supermarket—and this when the average wage of a Serbian industrial worker is about $50 a month at the official rate of exchange. By the end of 1964 the average Yugoslav worker was spending 65 percent of his take-home pay for food.

The combined splurge in agricultural and industrial imports drove the balance-of-trade deficit for 1964 to an alltime high of $429 million, more than twice as high as the 1962 deficit and more than half again as high as that for 1963. About $200 million of this amount was made good by hard-currency profits from the tourist trade, remittances from some 140,000 Yugoslavs working in the West, and various forms of insurance, leaving an actual deficit of $229 million, or almost exactly the average annual deficit over the previous 10 years. Foreign currency reserves are at present just enough to finance 25 days of imports. Moreover, the third devaluation of the dinar in 15 years is now regarded as inevitable. In other words, despite a much larger gross national product, and despite $3.5 billion in western aid, the Yugoslav economy is still hopelessly unbalanced.

DIPLOMACY FOR PROFIT

Much of Yugoslav diplomatic activity in the last year has been taken up in desperate attempts to restructure, reschedule, and otherwise refund the country's long-term debts, many of which fall due this year. Some creditors, such as West Germany, have continued or expanded credits to protect their original investment. Bonn has offered a partial moratorium on the outstanding Yugoslav debt. Likewise, most-favored-nation status was restored by the U.S. Government last year, and the Export-Import Bank has recently agreed to finance two construction projects.

An experienced observer in Belgrade has remarked that Yugoslavia is an underdeveloped country in need of technical assistance in every field except foreign policy. This policy is largely dictated by the importance of appearing to be a going political concern. The attractiveness of the Yugoslav position on the international scene as a combination of fashionable outcast, faithful renegade, and safe ideological trailblazer continues to stand the country in excellent stead despite Tito's costly political forays.

THE MIHAYLOV CASE

In general, the Yugoslav system has been dictated by the necessity of appearing progressively liberal while remaining totalitarian at the core. This requirement forced a refinement of the party control mechanism, a diversion of command channels, and development of parallel organizations such as the Socialist Alliance, the trade unions (to keep the workers' councils in line), and electoral commissions (to police the recently reformed electoral system). The result was a system so elaborate that even the country's leaders became thoroughly confused. In the end, the stresses proved too great; the party split into two openly conflicting factions—"centralists" and "liberals." In this situation—unprecedented in a nominally Communist country—both sides have been obliged to disguise their moves, and the liberal side the more, in order to disguise its weakness. It is in this light that the significance of the Mihaylov case and much else becomes clear.

Early in 1963 a delegation of the Soviet Writers' Union spent 15 days touring the country as the guest of its Yugoslav counterpart. The results of the trip were summed up in the Soviet journal "Voprosi Literaturi" (Questions of Literature) by the critic Valyeri Ozerov, in an article entitled "To The Battle Stations." Ozerov singled out the Yugoslav monthly "Delo" for concerted attack. Much of this article is taken up with a debate between the Soviet guests and the "Delo" editorial staff on the function of literature in society, in which the Delo representatives rejected the Stalinist-Zhdanovist dictum that writers must act as "engineers of the soul." Ozerov branded the Delo group as decadent "modernists" under bourgeois Western influence and accused it of spreading pessimism throughout the Socialist ranks.

In the summer of 1964 Mihaylo Mihaylov, a 30-year-old lecturer on Russian literature in the philosophy department of the Croatian University of Zagreb in Zadar, visited the Soviet Union for a month as part of the cultural exchange program. In its January and February numbers this year, Delo published two long installments of an article by Mihaylov describing his trip. A few days after the appearance of the second installment, the Soviet Embassy in Belgrade lodged a violent protest. But it was not until February 11, when Marshal Tito himself warned of rampant "Djilasism" and chastised a delegation of public prosecutors for not immediately suppressing the magazine, that the Yugoslav Government confiscated the remaining copies. On March 11, Mihaylov was arrested on charges of slandering a friendly state and violating the press law by sending the manuscript of his banned article to an Italian publisher.

Mihaylov was released after a month in investigative custody and his trial was held in the public court of Zadar. He received the comparatively mild sentence of 9 months' imprisonment out of a possible 4 years. He has appealed to the supreme court of Croatia, and there the matter rests.

The entire incident is referred to in Belgrade as "Delo's revenge," and apparently with good reason. "Moscow Summer" was a broadside fired at point-blank range; the anguished response of the Soviets is an indication that it found its mark. Mihaylov mentions the squads of "sobering-up" ambulances, whose sole purpose is to clear the streets of drunks, the danger of being attacked by hooligans at night, the "desperate rudeness" of Muscovites in their dealings with one another ("I beg your pardon, sir, I didn't realize you were a foreigner"), the inevitable comparison of Lenin's mummy to a wax model, indifference toward or active contempt for the school of Socialist realism among Russian intellectuals and the contrasting enthusiasm for modernist art, the high rate of abortions among university students, the universal fear of stool pigeons, and the wild enthusiasm of the students for the works of Kafka.

Mihaylov devotes the bulk of his article to the anti-Stalinist revolt of Soviet writers, citing as the great tragedy of Soviet society the life-and-death struggle of individual talent in which an artist must risk his career and even his physical existence in order to realize an original idea. He emphasizes the high incidence of former concentration-camp inmates among the writers and dwells on the existence and great popularity of an entire genre of concentration-camp literature and song, most of which is bootlegged in handwritten copies and tape recordings.

Mihaylov discusses at length the works and views of some 20 Soviet writers, most of whom he visited. The overwhelming majority are revealed as more or less militant liberals fighting the good fight against state and party controls and specifically against Socialist realism. He exposes Ozerov and his like as nothing more than embattled government functionaries who are themselves increasingly isolated from reality.

A highly accomplished polemicist, Mihaylov possessed all the necessary attributes for the job that Delo assigned him. "Delo's revenge" was the first counterattack in force to be mounted against the Soviet Union by the now institutionalized political opposition in Yugoslavia. Moreover, it was an attempt by the Yugoslav opposition to make common cause with its Russian counterpart against the centralist enemy in both countries. In the third installment of his article, unpublished in Yugoslavia but now available in the West, Mihaylov suggests that Yugoslavia could play a role in leading the Soviet Union into the Western cultural community. It is a project that runs parallel to the prideful avant-garde function of the Yugoslav regime in bringing the Soviet Union to adopt a broad Socialist approach in its foreign policy as an instrument of Communist expansion.

The object of the exercise is to counter the recent series of moves by the Yugoslav regime to aline itself more closely with Soviet policy. Yugoslavia's accession as an associate member of the Council for Mutual Economic Aid—COMECON—last year and the various interparty cultural agreements have made the opposition afraid that the regime seeks to rejoin the Soviet bloc as the only means of reimposing traditional Communist rule and insulating the country against Western influence.

The split in the Yugoslav League of Communists is so great that the centralist machinery of repression could not be set in motion against Mihaylov until Tito himself intervened. The chronicle of recent cultural suppressions is impressive, but it also indicates the degree of opposition activity.

DECENTRALIZING POLITICS

Easily the most important organ of the opposition is the monthly magazine Praxis, published in Zagreb. The "Praxis Group," which is strongly influenced by Western and particularly American sociologists, force-feeds with well directed articles a nationwide discussion involving the roots of Communist theory. It has proclaimed the failure of Marxism to mitigate the alienation of the worker and to provide a system of values to replace the Christian ethic. But the ultimate objective of such liberal periodicals is to undermine the ideological authority of the party-state, and this process is further advanced than is generally appreciated.

The doctrinaire Communists in Yugoslavia now find themselves in somewhat the same position as the liberals. They, too, have been encouraged or driven by desperation to make promises they cannot keep. The triple coincidence of the battles over regional cultural autonomy, the political issue of centralization versus decentralization, and the great economic divide between the "have" and "have-not" Yugoslav republics rendered the split roughly along the traditional ethnic-geographic lines in the League of Communists inevitable and all the more ominous.

The liberals are especially at home in the Government and party offices in the republics of Croatia and Slovenia. Zagreb, the capital of Croatia, has become a kind of anti-Belgrade. The authoritarian stronghold is the Central Committee of the Serbian Communist Party. The doctrinaire Communists have been forced to take support wherever and however they can find it—in the "have-not" republics of Macedonia and Bosnia-Herzegovina and by pandering to Serbian chauvinism.

In keeping with Serbia's traditional claims of leadership, it is now a foregone conclusion that Tito's successor must be a Serb, Aleksander Rankovic, Vice President since 1963 and former chief of the state security police. Rankovic is obviously being groomed in preference to the party's chief ideolog, the comparatively more liberal Slovene Edvard Kardelj, President of the Parliament. This development prompted the liberals to engineer the adoption of a new statute at the latest party congress providing for the convocation of party conferences in the various republics, as well as at the federal level. In effect, there are already two parties in Yugoslavia. Their emergence as separate organizations has been prevented only by the prestige of Tito and the fact that circumstances have forced the opposition to institutionalize itself by decentralizing the original totalitarian party machine. Yugoslavia is now near the brink of the prewar multiparty morass based on ethnic regional allegiances.

The crescendo of the economic and political crisis has totally discredited Yugoslavia as the pilot model for underdeveloped countries seeking to acquire internal stability while preserving neutrality in the international power struggle. To top it all, the Yugoslav's expertise in foreign affairs has failed them. The sharpening of the Sino-Soviet struggle in the last 3 years has compromised Yugoslavia's position as a prime champion of would-be nonalinement among pro-Communist nations. A comparison of its stances in the Belgrade Conference of 1961 and the Cairo Conference of last fall is revealing. At Belgrade, Yugoslavia posed as the nonalined mediator between the Soviet bloc and Western imperialism; at Cairo it was forced to settle for the role of bridge between the Socialistic bloc (including, of course, the Soviet Union) and the nonalined and neutralist nations. Since then, Indonesia has veered off into the Chinese Communist camp, Cuba has said some highly uncomplimentary things about Yugoslavia, Morocco has alined itself more closely with the West, and Kenya has taken action against Chinese gun-running through its territory. In short, the neutralist nations are falling to one side or the other of the knife edge of China's crusade for wars of national liberation.

For Yugoslav leaders the danger of the Soviet Union's settling its differences with Communist China has been heightened by the ouster of Khrushchev and by the Vietnam crisis. Desperate to avoid a forcing of the issue in Vietnam, Tito has told every foreign statesman he has recently seen that the United States has fatefully misinterpreted the relationship between the Soviet Union and China. "If China goes to war with you over Vietnam," one Yugoslav editor warned us, "the Soviet Union will side with China and so will we." The latter part of this threat is empty. Yugoslavia would not be accepted, for the prerequisite of Soviet-Chinese reconciliation is Soviet renunciation of revisionism and the policy of peaceful coexistence, or pro-Soviet "nonalinement," patented by the Yugoslavs. The Titoist experiment has been scarcely a success in the only country where it has been tried out. A proliferation of Titos in other parts of the world is unimaginable today, unless the West accepts to subsidize pro-Chinese "nonalinement."

TRIBUTE TO SARGENT SHRIVER

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, less than 18 months ago, the President, the Congress, and the American people declared war on poverty. Almost overnight many new programs existed where none had existed before. Today, the burden of 35 million of our citizens trapped in poverty is being lightened.

It would be unfair to all those dedicated men and women in Washington—and to all those citizens across America who have labored long and hard in this war on poverty—to credit one man with the progress to date.

But much of the success thus far in the crusade to eliminate human misery must be attributed to Sargent Shriver.

Four years ago, President Kennedy asked Mr. Shriver to lead another kind of crusade—the Peace Corps. Like the war on poverty, the Peace Corps was hard hit by its critics when it began. Mr. Shriver is fond of pointing out that President Kennedy gave him the job as Peace Corps Director because, if he failed, "it would be easier to fire a relative than a political friend." But Shriver did not fail.

Before the Office of Economic Opportunity was a reality, its critics had doomed it to failure.

> A political boondoggle * * * more handouts * * * another make-work program.

These were the mild statements.

Another furor arose when President Johnson asked Mr. Shriver to take on leadership of the poverty program while still guiding the Peace Corps.

The critics said "impossible."

But they had been wrong about the Peace Corps and the war on poverty and they were wrong about the ability of Sargent Shriver.

In the Peace Corps, Shriver simply asked for men and women to volunteer for work all over the world, not for money or glory, not even for comfort or convenience, but only to help others who needed and wanted their help. In the war on poverty, he used the same kind of an appeal, challenging not only individuals, but an entire Nation to look inward at a neglected minority and do something about their condition.

"Eloquent" is almost too fragile a word to apply to this hard-driving man. But the challenges Sargent Shriver has made of us all—challenges to heed the cries of human beings asking for help—whether they came from the jungles of Peru or the hills of Appalachia—were eloquent challenges. And the Nation has responded.

Today, Sargent Shriver has only one task. With all of his skill and dedication applied to the war on poverty I think we can expect that worthy venture to soon reach the same lofty plateau of success and acceptance now enjoyed by the Peace Corps.

UKRAINIANS WILLING TO FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, January 22 marks the 48th anniversary of a day which is sacred to the more than one million Americans of Ukrainian descent. It should also serve as a reminder to all the rest of our people and to freedom-loving people everywhere of the existence today of a form of imperialism which threatens all mankind. On January 22, 1918, with the Bolshevik armies invading their homeland, a group of Ukrainian patriots courageously proclaimed that centuries of foreign oppression were ended and that the Ukraine was an independent member of the family of nations.

Few battles for independence are won without blood and the creation of a free democratic state in non-Russian eastern Europe cost many Ukrainians their lives. But the freedom gained by the Ukraine was short-lived. The Red army smashed the independence movement in characteristically ruthless fashion and with tactics that can be found in today's crises in southeast Asia.

The same basic Russian technique of civil war, liberation front and guerrilla warfare, combined with Red army force, toppled the Ukrainian nation. Independent Ukraine ceased to exist. The Soviet Russian masters may have thought that the bloodletting and defeat of the Ukrainian Army meant the end of the people's desire for their nation's independence. But they were wrong. And the Russians were equally wrong in assuming that they had crushed the people's willingness to fight and to die for their freedom.

The Communists could not have been more wrong. Under the surface of foreign repression, the passionate desire for liberty from alien and Communist oppression continued. The German invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941 was the spark which set off the explosion of the people to regain their national freedom. First against the German occupiers and then later against the returning Communist armies the Ukrainian people carried on a long, tenacious, heroic, and desperate guerrilla war.

They had their own army, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army. It had the formal and complex organization of any modern army. It numbered perhaps 200,000. It fought the enemy until at least 1950, against terrible disadvantages, because it had one great advantage over the invaders—the love and loyalty of the people. This army did not receive aid from the outside world. Rather, it had to rely on its own ingenuity in utilizing weapons and supplies captured from the Soviets and the Germans. Constantly moving among the people, fully aware of the invaders' movements from local patriots, fighting a clever guerrilla war which sometimes included spectacular successes against larger and better armed enemies, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army added a glorious chapter to the epic of its people's struggle for freedom.

Although the Army has been disbanded, we can be sure that many of its members still carry in their hearts an unrelenting opposition to the Communist regime. An alien dictatorship has never been accepted willingly by the Ukrainian people. They have the recent memories of a gallant effort by their fighting men to liberate their land. On this anniversary it would be well for all of us to remember that in this occupied land the spark of freedom still burns, fed by the pride in the thousands of sons who died not so long ago to repel the enemies from east and west.

THE TWO WARS IN VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the issue of January 24, 1966, of the U.S. News & World Report contains an excellent article entitled "The Untold Story of Vietnam War" which could just as easily be entitled the two wars in Vietnam—one that is known and one that is untold.

As summarized, the untold story is the one to be found in the countryside and in Saigon: Expanding terrorism, insecurity, a violent inflation, profiteering, food shortages, dealings with people who eventually will decide whether a viable nation can be put together.

I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNTOLD STORY OF VIETNAM WAR

There are two wars here in South Vietnam—one widely known, the other virtually ignored.

The widely known war involves bomber strikes, U.S. soldiers, jungle battles, Vietcong battalions.

The untold story is the one to be found in the countryside and in Saigon: Expanding terrorism, insecurity, a violent inflation, profiteering, food shortages, dealings with the people who eventually will decide whether a viable nation can be put together.

In this other war—really the main one—the United States is losing ground.

The situation inside South Vietnam is found to be worse now than before the United States started moving in large numbers of troops last spring.

During the first week of January, Red guerrilla activity reached an all-time high—more than 1,100 "incidents" of sabotage, village raids, kidnapings—twice the rate of a year ago. As the Vietnamese New Year—January 21—approached, the number of Red attacks slackened markedly, but few authorities were convinced that it was permanent.

South Vietnam's normal distribution system has been severely disrupted, with consequent scarcities and high prices.

Food prices up: In the Saigon area, for example, the cost of rice has doubled in 6 months. Prices of chicken, cooking oil and other foods are up even more. It's the same with rents and clothing.

Black marketing is bad and getting out of control in some areas. So are pilferage and profiteering. In big cities the atmosphere seems infected by honky-tonks, get-rich-quick merchants and builders, and a general air of decay.

The $600 million in U.S. economic aid that was poured into the country last year apparently has disappeared.

It boils down to this: While the United States is trying to build up the country's economy and to provide stability, the Communists keep tearing it down.

U.S. and South Vietnamese forces actually hold less territory now than they did a year ago. So-called pacified areas are not safe, and the highly touted American counterinsurgency campaign has not gotten off the ground.

Americans have promised to back the South Vietnamese Government with large-scale aid in the countryside, to convince people they can find a better life by supporting the government.

Much of the time, the United States can't make good on the promise. Sometimes it is because the roads are cut and the Communists won't let help come through.

Even in more secure areas, the program to win the peasantry is a long way from being successful. The logistics bottleneck in Saigon, caused by the U.S. troop buildup and a $400 million military construction program, is almost hopeless.

In many Provinces during the last 8 months, less than 10 percent of the promised American aid has actually been delivered.

Where material has been delivered—steel and cement—you frequently find that local contractors would rather work on lucrative U.S. military projects. Some 100,000 Vietnamese are now working on military projects at wages higher than they could get in village programs.

The Government's image in the countryside—where peasants for hundreds of years have been against all central governments—remains clouded at best.

Widespread corruption—at "almost a comic level," as one Vietnamese puts it—is not only giving the Government a bad name, it is pouring millions of dollars into Communist coffers. One principal supplier for Marine Corps construction projects has been closely associated with the Communists since the days of the French colonialists—and is paying off handsomely to the Reds.

The Communists allow road traffic to pass in many areas only so they can collect "taxes" on the goods. Gasoline to power U.S. helicopters and planes in attacks on Reds in the Mekong River Delta is carried through Communist-controlled areas by transport companies owned by overseas Chinese. The carriers pay the Communists for permission to go through, then charge the Americans, at least indirectly.

Take a look at the First Corps area—the northern part of the Republic of Vietnam—and you see what has been happening. There are five Provinces. The area has been given over to the U.S. Marines. They have put more than a division into the area, moving out from the strategically important airbases at the port of Da Nang and the newly created Chulai base.

However, the internal security is worse than before the Marine forces arrived, in the Province of Quang Nam, just outside Da Nang, and in Quang Tin and Quang Ngai, south of the Marine area. In two Provinces north of Da Nang, also, the situation is deteriorating.

Or take the Fourth Corps area, at the other end of the country. It covers the mouths of the Mekong River that flows out of Cambodia into Vietnam and on to the sea. In the last few months, the Communists have been forced by U.S. airpower, which is extremely effective in the flatland areas where there is little or no cover, to withdraw to their strongholds.

Yet the Reds have stepped up their terrorist assassination of village leaders and Government officials, and have put on a great new display of propaganda.

Reaction to air power: Use of American airpower to combat the growing size of the Communist forces has been—to villagers—the most important military fact of life for the past year. The Communists have taken a tremendous beating from the air. At the same time, these bombings have forced thousands of people to flee their homes and become refugees. At this point, no one is sure how many refugees there are, but certainly in the hundreds of thousands.

In many areas, a villager gets a bitter choice: be forced into labor battalions by the Communists, face assassination if he doesn't cooperate with the Reds, have his sons recruited for the guerrillas, and be bombed by United States and Government planes—or move into Government areas as a destitute person, dependent on the whim of largely inefficient and sometimes corrupt officials for refugee relief.

Massive use of American airpower in the countryside is equated, in the minds of many villagers, with Red terrorism.

A village story: If you want to see how things are going at the village level, travel to Tu Thanh, only 6 miles from the Provincial capital in Quang Ngai Province.

Last May, a battalion of Communist troops swept into the village. They had with them Pham Kinh, a 52-year-old Communist. In 1954, Pham Kinh had withdrawn with 183 other Reds to the north when the Communists turned this area over to the Saigon Government.

Now Pham Kinh was back in his old area as political commissar for the Communist battalion.

The first thing that Pham Kinh did in the village was to arrest seven of the village leaders. Six were shot, and the seventh was buried alive. That was to make certain the villagers knew who was running the show.

Most of the villagers fled into Government-held areas, where they were fed and protected. It took the Government three attempts to liberate the area from the Reds. In the process, 40 percent of the houses in the village were destroyed by United States and South Vietnamese planes attacking Communist positions.

When the Communists withdrew, they took 40 village youths who had remained behind when most villagers fled. The youths will be indoctrinated as guerrilla troops.

Now the village is being rebuilt. Yet, if one of the chief aims of the Government and the United States is to prove that they can do a better job than the Red, then they are failing.

Like the rest of South Vietnam, the area around Tu Thanh is agricultural and needs help with farming. But the U.S. aid mission in Saigon has only 25 staff members dealing with agriculture throughout the nation.

When pigs go hungry: A pig-and-corn program that began in 1962 with lots of U.S. fanfare does not even function in Quang Ngai Province. There is a good reason: You can't import corn to feed pigs when there is barely enough transport to feed the refugees. In this Province, 1 out of every 10 people is homeless.

Only recently did the Province get a public-health nurse from U.S. headquarters to help reorganize the local medical corps.

There are only 900 native physicians in the entire country, and most are in the military. In one neighboring Province, with 300,000 people, there are only 4 physicians, all in the service and meeting civilians' health needs on a part-time basis.

If it were not for millions of U.S.-administered inoculations against smallpox, cholera, plague, and typhoid, the country would be at the edge of a medical disaster.

Life in the cities, for those not on the "gravy train" of profiteering, is grim. Inflation is making it that way. Since the start of 1965, money in circulation in South Vietnam has gone from 27 million piasters to 47 billion.

Inflation is fed not only by the vast U.S. construction program, but by private spending of 190,000 American soldiers. That spending alone runs between $45 and $60 a month per man.

The whole society seems turned upside down. A Saigon bar girl can make 80,000 piasters a month—about $650—compared with Government salaries of $120 for middle-echelon civilian officials or $100 for a major in the South Vietnamese Army.

A Vietnamese college professor tells about meeting his former housemaid while he was on his motor scooter in downtown Saigon. The former housemaid, now the girl friend of an American soldier, drove by in a shiny automobile.

There is talk of bringing in thousands of skilled workers from the outside—the Philippines and South Korea, for example—to take some of the pressure off the labor market and supply the technical help to unclog the ports.

You get some idea of what has happened to the labor market from the fact that a stevedore in Da Nang used to get about 30 cents for a day's work. Now, ricksha boys demand 75 cents from U.S. marines for a 10-minute carriage ride.

All this economic chaos has spurred the large-scale corruption that already existed. Government workers find that their fixed salaries buy only a fraction of what they once did. Shortages of goods make it easy for the seller to ask higher sums than those fixed by law. It is now commonplace to bribe one's way aboard local civilian transport—air or ground.

It is only in the past few weeks and months that the American Embassy and the U.S. military have decided to try to come to grips with some of these nonmilitary problems, in the cities and in the countryside.

A new U.S. program: On January 12, in Washington, U.S. aid officials announced a long-range program for winning the war in the countryside.

The reaction in South Vietnam among many was cynical: "On paper, one more U.S. plan to save the country."

Most veterans who know the situation are convinced that it would take between 6 and 10 years to win the war in Vietnam—and "win the peace."

Yet the intensity of the U.S. peace offensive indicates to most South Vietnamese that the United States is not about to undertake a commitment of 6 to 10 years.

In a country that has seen hundreds of promises by French and Vietnamese officials broken over the past 25 years, there would be great reservations about such a U.S. commitment in any case.

The fact is: The U.S. peace offensive has further shaken Vietnamese confidence. First came U.S. troops, and spirits went up. Now comes talk that sounds to Vietnamese like "peace at any price"—and spirits are down. The U.S. attempt to negotiate is seen here as a sign of irresolution, not determination to stay and fight for a decade.

All this is having a profound effect on the "forgotten war" in the thousands of villages where the fate of the country is likely to be decided.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MINIMUM WAGE LAW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 8126.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8126) to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Joseph Goldberg, of the Department of Labor, be granted the privilege of the floor during the consideration by the Senate of H.R. 8126, the District of Columbia minimum wage bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the Senate proceeds to consider the bill and the report of the committee in regard to the District of Columbia minimum wage bill, I wish to make this opening statement in support of the bill and the report of the committee.

The minimum wage and hours bill, H.R. 8126, as amended, would improve the minimum wage and overtime protection coverage for women and minors, and extend coverage to domestic workers and men who have never been covered under District of Columbia minimum wage law. The members of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia believe that H.R. 8126, as amended, is very reasonable, exceedingly modest, and a practical bill. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I am somewhat embarrassed to be put in a position of advocating a minimum wage and hours bill with a provision for a $1.25-an-hour statutory minimum wage in 1966.

Mr. President, if an employee works 40 hours a week, 52 weeks per year, at $1.25 per hour, as specified in this bill, he would earn a gross annual minimum wage of $2,600. As I said earlier, it somewhat embarrasses me to be advocating a statutory minimum wage floor of $2,600 a year, if the employee should work 40 hours a week for 52 weeks, when the President of the United States several years ago declared that any family with an income under $3,000 a year is classified as a family in the poverty category.

The bill which we are considering today is similar to S. 860 of the 88th Congress which was reported to the Senate unanimously by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, and was unanimously approved by the Senate on August 21, 1964.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety, I received testimony that clearly demonstrates that H.R. 8126, as amended, is strongly supported by the U.S. Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, the American Federation of Labor–CIO, the Greater Washington Council of Churches, the District of Columbia Citizens Council, District of Columbia Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board, District of Columbia Health and Welfare Council, District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia Board of Education, District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council, District of Columbia League of Women Voters, Catholic Interracial Council of the National Capital Area, National Association of Social Workers, Democratic Central Committee, Forward-Looking Republicans, Washington Medical Committee for Human Rights, Washington Urban League, Teachers Union of Washington, D.C., and numerous neighborhood and church groups in the Nation's Capital.

There was contained on the ballot in the last Democratic primary in the District of Columbia the following questions:

> Should the Democratic Party continue to advocate the following: That the District minimum wage law be changed to cover all workers and to provide a $1.25 per hour minimum wage? Yes, 72,417; no, 1,537.

The Washington Board of Trade, the Restaurant Association of Metropolitan Washington, and the Hotel Association of Washington, D.C., opposed major provisions of the bill. The committee very carefully studied the statements presented by these three special-interest groups, and concluded that H.R. 8126, as amended, would best serve the public interest and welfare of the entire community, including that segment of the community supposedly represented by these three groups.

H.R. 8126, as amended, increases the minimum wage law's application to 300,000, rather than 87,000 workers, as are covered under the very limited existing law. The overtime pay provisions in the bill would reduce the excessively long hours worked in many business establishments in the District of Columbia. As I said in the Senate last year, a statutory minimum wage floor of $1.25 an hour is inadequate, but that it would help many employees buy a little more and better food, clothing, housing, medical care, and other necessities of life than they are now able to buy. It is the opinion of the committee that wage earners earning less than $1.25 often quit working and go on public assistance if they are eligible, or sometimes enter a life of crime in order to keep their families together. Very often the mother must also work in order to keep the rent paid and a little food on the table and some shoes on her children's feet. This must be done in order to keep the family together, and then at times the family must be farmed out to friends and relatives or the Welfare Department, because the wage earners cannot adequately provide for their children. The committee strongly believes that this is neither right nor in the public interest for employers to force employees to work at unconscionably low wages.

Every time I go to Junior Village and take note of the children that have been sent there, I become more and more dedicated to the cause of adopting a more reasonable minimum wage in the District of Columbia.

The committee received testimony last year that the last census for the District of Columbia revealed that in the midst of unprecedented prosperity in the Nation's Capital, 17.3 percent, or nearly one-fifth of all District of Columbia families, had incomes of less than $3,000 a year.

Mr. President, this is unconscionable. It is the view of the committee that the minimum wage and hours bill is one of the best places to begin a more intensive war on the pockets of abject poverty in the District of Columbia. This Nation and this city are wealthy enough, both spiritually and financially, to eradicate from this city the causes of poverty, crime, and unhealthful living conditions, provided there is the determination to do what the facts indicate needs to be done to make this city the symbol of what can be done in a free society.

President Johnson last week, in his state of the Union message, stated:

> There are men who cry out: We must sacrifice. Let us rather ask them: Whom will they sacrifice? Will them sacrifice the children who seek learning—the sick who need care—the families who dwell in squalor now brightened by the hope of home? Will they sacrifice opportunity for the distressed * * * the hope of our poor?

In answer to the President's question, I would say that there are those in the community—and I know they are a minority indeed—that would sacrifice the working poor—those locked in poverty—for profit. I am pleased to state that there is not a member of our committee who agrees with that point of view.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] will offer some amendments to the bill. I wish to make it perfectly clear that the Senator from Vermont supports a fair minimum wage in the District of Columbia.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I wish publicly to express to the Senator from Vermont and to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] my appreciation for the complete cooperation that they have extended to us at all times as we sought to take this bill through the committee and to the floor.

The differences that developed as to certain parts of the bill that the Senator from Vermont will address himself to later as he presents certain amendments relative thereto, in no way express any opposition to the bill on the part of the Senator from Vermont. The same applies to the amendment that will be offered on behalf of the Senator from Colorado.

These two men join with a unanimous committee in agreement that a minimum wage bill needs to be passed.

I hope that the Senator from Vermont and I can resolve some of the differences by agreement on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. In certain instances we will not find ourselves in agreement, and we will let the will of the Senate work upon our disagreement.

But I do wish to say that although I am not bringing to the Senate this afternoon a bill unanimously supported in all of its details, I am presenting a proposal for improvement in the minimum wage situation in the District of Columbia with respect to which there is unanimous agreement as to its major objective.

There are those who will plead that if certain businesses in this community are required to pay a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour and time and a half for work in excess of a 40-hour work week, those businesses will go broke and will have to move to Maryland or Virginia. It is those employers who are asking the rest of the community, through the Welfare Department, the Police Department, the poverty program, and our schools, to subsidize them through general taxation. I ask these spokesmen, "Where is your conscience?"

There are those in this community who think only in terms of money brought into the city by tourists. I believe that they are missing a great reservoir of potential income by not seeing to it that they pay their employees an adequate wage, so that that money, in turn, may be released many times over in the cash registers on every street in the city. It is the businessmen in the city who will benefit from an increased minimum wage, as much as those citizens now deprived of a decent wage.

I digress to say how well I remember the great opposition to the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, and that at the time that it was first proposed, those who advocated it had to bear the stigma, for a time, of the labels which were attached to us, such as being designated creeping socialists and what not. It is interesting that now we cannot go on the main streets of America and obtain support of any degree of substance from any group of employers advocating a repeal of the Fair Labor Standards Act. For American business has come to recognize that the Fair Labor Standards Act has been one of the great economic stabilizers of our country; and it is recognized that the Fair Labor Standards Act has been one of the great causes for keeping their cash registers ringing. It has been one of the soundest pieces of legislation enacted in our country in our time.

That is true of unemployment compensation insurance legislation as well. Also when we fought for unemployment compensation insurance legislation, there were those who became very emotionally concerned about it. Now business firms recognize that unemployment insurance legislation is another one of the economic stabilizers. One could not find a corporal's guard, among businessmen in most communities, to advocate a repeal of unemployment compensation insurance.

What businessmen should be thinking about is the purchasing power, the year around, of the inhabitants, the people who live in the District of Columbia, not just those who come and go as tourists, but those who are permanent residents as well. It is important to sound business in this city that we maintain a decent standard and level of purchasing power for every permanent resident.

There are many business firms doing business in the Nation's Capital that are presently covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act. It is estimated that in 1965 there were approximately 151,500 employees in the District of Columbia covered by Federal minimum wage legislation. It is argued by restaurant and hotel interests that the proposed District of Columbia minimum wage law would make it unprofitable for them to remain in the District of Columbia. I say good-naturedly and respectfully, but pointedly, that this is so much hogwash, and they know it. They are not fooling me by such absurd arguments, nor did they fool other members of the committee. The restaurants are going to be used by people who need to eat three times a day, with the imposition of a fair minimum wage, and restaurant operators know it. I say to the restaurant operators, "Where do you think they are going to eat? Do you think tens of thousands of people are going to go to Virginia and Maryland each day to eat, because you are required to pay a decent minimum wage, in my judgment an exceedingly low minimum wage, to your employees?"

No. All of us know that the present minimum hourly wage in the District of Columbia has been increased, through cumbersome Wage Board procedures, from time to time for certain women and minors. During the same period of time when these increases have been made, there never have been more hotels and restaurants operating in the Nation's Capital. It has not run them out of business. They are here because there is a need for the services they provide. I am told by the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Board that so far as it knows, the District has not lost any business to either Maryland or Virginia because from time to time it has increased the minimum wage for certain women and minors. I believe that the facts put that old scarecrow argument to rest.

I have held the position for many years that no employer has the moral right, and should not be permitted the legal right, to exploit fellow human beings by not paying them a wage which will permit an employee the basic essentials of life and decency. The pending bill involves a moral issue. I have been derided for that position, and it has been charged that I would put businesses out of business with my philosophy. The answer is, I have no doubt about that, they should go out of business, if they cannot pay a decent minimum wage to make it possible for a fellow human being to live in health and decency. They had better go out of business and go to work as employees themselves, and see how they like it.

Many years ago, before I came to the Senate, I brought wrath down upon my head because of a decision I wrote on the War Labor Board, seeking to protect laundry workers. During a 10-day hearing downtown in the Labor Department during the war, I listened to counsel representing the great laundry association of this country try to justify, in 1942, 19 cents an hour for laundry workers. What did he think would be the crowning, devastating argument that would prevent increasing the basic wage for laundry workers? That if we changed that rate, the housewives would take their laundry back into their basements, and put laundries out of business.

In that opinion, I pointed out that if the housewives of America believed that they had a moral right to have the laundry workers of America subsidize them, the sooner the housewives got down into their basements and did their own laundry, the better. I was criticized for that as not being a politic statement.

I have never been known to substitute politic statements for facts, and I considered that an undeniable fact. But the strange part of it is that after we were through awarding a wage for the laundry workers which was at least an attempt to be fair—although I thought it was still too low—we did not receive any subsequent complaints of any laundry on any street in America with a sign on it, "Gone out of business because of the War Labor Board's wage decision."

We will not get any notice as a result of the passage of the bill, which I hope will be passed today and subsequently will be approved by both houses and signed by the President, that any restaurant or hotel will close its doors because of the requirement to pay $1.25 an hour as a minimum wage.

Mr. President, the reason none of them will go out of business is that they are in the Nation's Capital, where services are needed, and are called upon to provide those services for certainly a reasonable profit.

It is also known that many employees are working long hours. The U.S. Department of Labor conducted a survey in 1962 of wage and hour conditions in the District of Columbia of 87,000 workers. The survey showed over 8,500 persons working more than 48 hours a week. The survey also showed that the largest number of these employees were employed in retail trade, restaurants, automobile services, and real estate operators' establishments.

The committee believes that the time and one-half for overtime would reduce the very long hours worked in many business establishments in the District of Columbia, in unskilled occupations in which many unemployed workers in the community could find work. Also, premium pay could be expected to make available more work to those who are involuntarily working part time, of whom there are a considerable number in the Nation's Capital.

In summary, Mr. President, the bill, as amended, provides a statutory minimum wage floor of $1.25 an hour and 1½ times the regular rate for hours worked in excess of a 40-hour workweek, effective 180 days after enactment. This is the same protection provided by the Fair Labor Standards Act. In regard to minimum wage and overtime standards, the bill also provides that an employer shall pay his employees wages at a rate of not less than the highest of the following: First, $1.25 an hour; second, such rate as may, from time to time, be established by section 6(a) (1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended and as it may be amended in the future; or, third, such rate of pay as is or may be established by any applicable wage order issued pursuant to this bill, or preserved by section 2 of this bill. It is the intention of your committee that the wage rate referred to in section 2 above is that provided in subsection (a) of section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act without regard to the effect, if any, of any other subsection of section 6 or any other provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The committee believes that this relationship between the Federal and the District of Columbia statutes should be maintained by law. It is therefore extremely important that the measure not merely adopt the existing $1.25 per hour established at the present time by the Federal legislation, but that it insure that the prescribed District of Columbia minimum wage rate will automatically follow the Federal rate if, and whenever, it may be increased again—as it already has been on several occasions—by the Congress.

In regard to coverage, the bill covers any individual—man, woman, or minor—employed by an employer, with two exceptions applicable to volunteers who render gratuitous services to educational, charitable, nonprofit, or religious organizations and to lay officers of religious organizations. It also excludes employees of the United States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, the committee believes that the bill is modest, practical, and reasonable, and urges the Senate to adopt it as it did a similar bill, S. 860, in the 88th Congress.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question or two?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont for that purpose.

Mr. PROUTY. In section 3(b) the term "regular rate" is used as the basis for computing time and one-half. Nowhere in this bill is that term defined, but the same term is used and defined in section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act as amended. Is it the Senator's understanding that undefined terms used in this bill which are also used in the Fair Labor Standards Act, such as the term "regular rate," shall have substantially the same meaning and be given substantially the same effect as they receive under the Fair Labor Standards Act?

Mr. MORSE. The answer is yes. That is exactly the intention of the drafters of the bill. For legislative history, as the Senator in charge of the bill, let me say that the Senator from Vermont has set forth exactly the meaning of the "regular rate" in the language of the bill, and he has also set forth the intention of the committee that any term in the bill not specifically defined shall be interpreted and applied as it is defined or used in connection with the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act.

Mr. PROUTY. Then I gather it would be the Senator's understanding that regular rate of compensation for purposes of computing overtime compensation rates under the District of Columbia minimum wage bill, H.R. 8126, would basically consist of cash wages paid the employee and in some circumstances might take into account an allowance for board and lodging, but consistent with the practice under the Fair Labor Standards Act, would not include fringe benefits or gratuities?

Mr. MORSE. The answer is "yes." The legislative history will show that the Senator from Vermont has set forth clearly the intent of the Senator in charge of the bill and the meaning of the bill except that gratuities would be included in the regular rate to the extent they are accounted for by the employee to the employer.

Mr. PROUTY. I thank the Senator very much for his clarification.

Mr. President, first, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Oregon for his charitable references to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and myself; the Senator from Oregon has always been extremely cooperative on almost any question. He has been fair in all respects and we are very grateful to him for it.

Mr. President, I can understand how some, who are not thoroughly conversant with the amendments to the bill presently before the Senate might become confused.

At the outset of my remarks on the proposed legislation, I should like to clear up any confusion with respect to my position on the question of the bill as a whole. I do this in response to certain articles published in Washington newspapers which misinterpreted my position.

Mr. President, I do not come to the floor today to do battle against the passage of the District of Columbia minimum wage bill. I come here in the hope that I can make this bill a better bill, a fair, equitable, and more meaningful bill.

As this bill came to us from the House, it was different from the version before us in a number of substantial and material provisions. The House version never wholly attains the broad coverage and powers written into the present language.

The House-passed bill provided for a minimum wage floor of $1.25 per hour by the 3d of September 1967. The Senate bill goes to a floor of $1.25 effective 6 months after enactment.

The House bill provided for a 3-year phase-in period with separate overtime provisions for hotel and restaurant employees. The Senate bill includes them as of the effective date.

The House bill permits the Commissioners to issue wage orders going below the statutory floor in cases where that floor works undue economic hardship on the employer. The Senate version empowers the Commissioners to issue wage orders in excess of the statutory floor, in order to provide employees with wages sufficient to provide adequate maintenance and to protect their health.

The House bill exempts domestic employees in a private home, employees of charitable and eleemosynary institutions, and commissioned salesmen from minimum wage and overtime provisions and car wash employees from overtime alone. The Senate bill contains no comparable exemptions except for auto salesmen under certain situations.

The House bill vested such additional powers as were necessary in the existing Wage Board. The Senate vests the powers in the Commissioners for delegation as they see fit.

Finally, Mr. President, the House bill's statutory floor would remain until further action by Congress on the District of Columbia minimum wage. Under the Senate bill the statutory floor for the District of Columbia minimum wage will always at least equal the national floor.

There are many meritorious provisions and objectives in the House-passed bill. There are many excellent features in the Senate version. When this bill is passed—and it clearly will pass—the differences between the two versions of the bill will have to be ironed out in conference. But, that is not to say that the Senate has no obligation to look closely at the hypotheses upon which the Senate version is founded. That is not to say that this bill is perfect in every respect. That is not to say that the destiny of this proposed legislation should be left entirely to the conferees.

So, Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor to engage in honest efforts to bring forth a meaningful and significant minimum wage bill. I come to the floor, as I have come a number of times before, as a supporter of minimum wage legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the questions which have been raised by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] deserve to be debated on the floor of the Senate and deserve to have the consideration which he proposes to have them given. He is a most valued member of the Subcommittee on Labor, and the legislation deserves careful scrutiny from the point of view of practicality.

One thing I would like to put in focus, which I think is very important, is that the minimum wage bill must be adjusted to conditions in the District of Columbia. The fact that the Senate is tying it to the Federal standard because the District of Columbia happens to be the Federal enclave, and at least that standard should obtain whatever else may happen, does not change the fact that the District of Columbia is one of the very high income areas of the country and is one of the very high living cost areas of the country.

What this proposal really amounts to is a State minimum wage law. I can understand why some State minimum wage laws may provide for less than the Federal standard, but I can also understand why they may provide for more.

So I rise to state that the principle which I have stated is just as applicable as is the principle stated by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], whose opinion I value so highly. I refer to scrutinizing the bill to be sure that injustices and unfairness are not perpetuated and that opportunities for employment are not reduced, which could happen if the minimum wage were fixed so high that people might lose work as a result. Let it be remembered that one does not have to have his car washed every week, or even every month. A car that is dirty can be driven just as easily as a car that is clean. So the bill should be scrutinized to see that it will not have that effect.

I rise to urge that principle as a template to a discussion of the bill.

First, there is a case of tying the District of Columbia to the Federal minimum wage formula, because this is the Federal enclave, and it should not be necessary to pass laws every time with regard to it.

Second, the District of Columbia is not only the Federal enclave, but it has a high income level and is a pretty expensive area in which to live. Therefore, the Senate should accommodate the bill to the localized situation in terms of what it costs people to live and what is a decent standard of living.

Third, we must be careful to pay attention to each amendment, to the questions raised, and to the answers made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], because we can also cut off employment by being impractical. In many businesses, especially in the service trades—and that includes motels, hotels, and restaurants—if the costs are hiked too much, the city may be deprived of services that the people need, because a person can operate a business only if he makes a profit.

If these principles are taken into consideration, and the amendments which have been suggested are carefully considered by the Senator from Oregon, and, indeed, by every Member, we can come forth with a good bill.

Mr. President, I am a liberal. I would like to support the statement of the Senator from Vermont. I hope what he has proposed will be put to the test. It should not be forgotten that the remarks of the Senator are fundamental to the support that should be had for the bill when it is passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with everything the Senator from New York has said. The committee has taken note of the three criteria he has laid own. I respectfully say that we have brought to the Senate a bill which, in my opinion, follows those criteria.

The Senator from New York is correct when he says that what we are doing in effect today is passing a minimum wage bill as a State legislature. Our problem is that we really should not be the ones doing this, but we have to do it because we have not had the wisdom in the past to provide for a home rule government in the District of Columbia so others would be passing this legislation.

We have tried to take into account the point the Senator from New York makes, that we have to adjust these wages in the light of the particular circumstances that relate to the various conditions in the District of Columbia. There is no better way to do it than the way it has been done. We provide for an ad hoc committee approach. We provide for a wage board. An ad hoc committee is provided for that would enter into an inquiry into a given type of business and decide whether or not there was justified a wage order that would require the payment of a minimum wage above the so-called standard minimum wage of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I was insistent that that be continued, because the experience we have had with respect to women and minors in this area has been successful. There has been little, if any, criticism of the actions of the ad hoc committees and the Wage Board.

The question is also raised whether a minimum wage should be authorized at a figure of more than $1.25 an hour. I want to make very clear to the Senator from New York that $1.25 is the floor. As the Senator from New York has pointed out, Washington, D.C., is a high living cost area. It is also a good business area. Businesses are not suffering in the District of Columbia when we take the economy as a whole into consideration. There is a carryover into all businesses when there is a general high level of prosperity.

With regard to the particular businesses the Senator has mentioned, restaurants, hotels, and motels, I have given a great deal of attention to that question, because we wanted to be absolutely certain that we would be completely fair to restaurants and hotels. I know of no evidence in the record presented to the committee that gives any support to claims that we are unfair to restaurants and motels if we adopt the minimum floor of $1.25 an hour. I have talked with hotel and restaurant operators in many other cities. Their attitude has been that they wished they could have the guaranteed income that such operators get in the District of Columbia, because of the tremendous tourist trade that flows into the city 12 months a year.

I appreciate the Senator's calling attention to the three criteria. All I can say, as floor manager of the bill, is that he has my assurance that the bill fully and carefully follows out the criteria.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. Of course, the amendments of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] will test that out. I hope the bill will stand up in the debate. But I wanted to call attention to the standards which should be applied, which I hope will be applied, to show not only good faith, but that the proposals of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] should be tested.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from New York that I will try to arrive at some understanding with the Senator from Vermont on the amendments. I do not believe we shall have any difficulty. He has some rather technical amendments with regard to domestics which I will be glad to discuss with him.

Quite frankly I would not favor the cumbersome procedure that the bill would provide in respect to the keeping of records for domestics. Minimum records have to be kept which are similar to those the housewife has to keep in regard to social security. The housewife has to keep those anyway. She would not be imposed upon to keep a similar record for a domestic.

The Senator might ask why in the world it escaped me. It escaped me, and I do not know why it escaped me.

The Senator from New York knows that no Member of this body would object more than I, now along with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], to a $10,000 fine and 6 months in prison for a housewife.

I did not sufficiently take note of that item in the bill, and I shall agree to strike it.

Mr. JAVITS. Domestic service is a difficult subject throughout the United States. Domestic service is necessary in many families where it is impossible for the housewife to carry on, and it is becoming much more difficult. I believe one of the principal reasons is the fact that people who engage in domestic service do not feel any dignity in the calling.

It may be that there is needed the application precisely of minimum wages, an 8-hour day, and regularization of employment, to bring a nobility to the employee. The employee should be given rights, and not merely money. He should have personal dignity, which would attract more people to domestic work and give much greater satisfaction therefor, although superficially it might seem more costly and troublesome.

I believe this is an important point which, by being tried out here, may very well be somewhat of a laboratory experiment for other States, and perhaps even in a broader context than we are considering here today.

Mr. MORSE. I quite agree with the Senator from New York.

I believe the Senator should know that various representatives from women's organizations appeared before the committee who made the same point, and also that domestics should be brought under the minimum wage program.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. While I have the attention of the Senator from New York, I might add that 1½ million women in this country work as domestics, so we deal with no small labor force.

Mr. JAVITS. I realize that, and I am sure that the Senator agrees with me as to the great problem in this field in recent years.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] would like me to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 478

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment (No. 478) to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 38, after line 5, add the following new subsection:

> (d) The recordkeeping requirements of section 11, the posting requirement of section 12 and the penalties provided by section 14, shall not apply with respect to the employer of a domestic servant in a private residence.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the pending bill, H.R. 8126 provides minimum wage and overtime compensation protection for domestic employees in a private residence.

This amendment cuts from the bill a grievance encroachment of the governmental eye, ear, nose, and throat into the private home.

Without this amendment, Mr. President, a person who employs a domestic worker in his house or apartment could have to post a minimum wage notice on his dining room door, or wherever space was available.

Without this amendment, Mr. President, a homeowner or apartment dweller with a maid could have to keep a warehouse of extensive, detailed employment records, including the name, address, and occupation of the employee and, if an employee were under the age of 19, his or her date of birth.

Without this amendment, Mr. President, the homeowner or apartment dweller might need a certified public accountant to record the rate of pay, the amount paid each pay period to each employee, the hours worked each day and each workweek by the employee, the amount of board and lodging provided as part of the employment or the fair value of the uniform provided by the employer or required to be furnished by the employee.

Without this amendment, Mr. President, the homeowner could be asked to submit to annual audits and the Commissioners could demand from the homeowner or apartment dweller a sworn statement of such records and information upon forms prescribed or approved by the Commissioners.

Without this amendment, Mr. President, a woman who employs a maid could be required to, and now I quote the language of the bill:

> Furnish to each employee at the time of payment of wages an itemized statement showing the date of the wage payment, gross wages paid, deductions from and additions to wages, net wages paid, hours worked during the pay period, and any other information as the Commissioners may prescribe by regulation.

Without this amendment, Mr. President, the employer of a domestic servant will have to make, keep, or preserve these records for a period of not less than 3 years.

As if all this were not enough, Mr. President, he would have to make and preserve, and again I quote from the bill:

> Such other records or information as the Commissioners shall prescribe by regulation as necessary or appropriate for the enforcement of the provisions of this Act or of the regulations or orders issued thereunder.

But, Mr. President, the "piece de resistance," the quintessence of bureaucratic involvement in the day-to-day lives of each resident of the District of Columbia, is the language which appears on page 38 of the bill and permits the Commissioners to knock on the residence door and demand to see or transcribe the required records. I quote the language of the bill:

> Such records shall be open and made available for inspection or transcription by the Commissioners or their authorized representatives at any reasonable time.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I forewarn District of Columbia housewives not to be surprised some morning to find Commissioner Tobriner at the door with his clipboard.

Mr. President, as if these impositions on the patience, good nature, and understanding of the modern housewife were not enough, I would direct your attention to sections 13 and 14 of the bill.

If the housewife does not post the law or the appropriate wage orders in a conspicuous and accessible place in or about the premises, or if that gentle soul who graces our kitchen and brings us our slippers and irons our shirts does not find time during her working day to keep all the records the Commissioners may ask her to keep, and if that sweet thing should say, albeit under her breath, "this is the apotheosis of asininity," she may have made such a willful violation of the act as to entitle her to a $10,000 fine or 6 months in prison.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Do I correctly understand that without this amendment's being adopted every housewife in the District of Cloumbia will have to display the type of poster which I have in my hand, either in her dining room or in her kitchen, and that if she does not do so she will be subject to a $10,000 fine or 6 months in the penitentiary?

Mr. PROUTY. That is my understanding.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have heard of greed for power on the part of some bureaucrats; but is it not a little ridiculous to require the display of such a poster as this in every home? Will there be different color schemes to match the color of the paint of her kitchen or the decor of her dining room? The color of the poster I have in my hand is green.

Do I correctly understand that this poster must be displayed either in the dining room, where her guests will be served, or in the kitchen if a maid is employed in the kitchen, so that it may be in full view for reading at all times?

Mr. PROUTY. It will have to be displayed in a conspicuous place on the premises. It certainly would create a problem for even the most experienced decorator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I suggest that that may create a problem for those who try to enforce such a law. When they call on the housewives, present this poster, and attempt to make them hang it in their kitchen.

We have plans for the beautification of America. We have appropriated millions to beautify America. I believe that many housewives might suggest that this would not look good even on the outside of the house. It looks like a billboard.

I wonder how it would look in the White House. It would not go with some of the color schemes. Would this notice have to be posted on a prominent wall in the White House when the President is serving guests?

Mr. PROUTY. If the White House employed covered employees, it would.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest that there be a rollcall to settle this question. This is an attempt by some bureaucrat to go into homes and tell every housewife that he will put her in the penitentiary for 6 months or fine her $10,000 if she does not post one of these notices on a wall, in addition to complying with a system of books and records which not even the Government of the United States keeps for its American taxpayers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe it would be a capital idea if we were to make available to every housewife a fine Rembrandt or a Picasso or some work of art that conforms to the color scheme of the home. Then she can paste this notice on the back of the picture.

Mr. PROUTY. That has not yet been suggested by the Commissioners, but they should certainly explore the suggestion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would relate to the cultural projects and the beautification measures.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Illinois has made a very good suggestion. It seems to me that there are many unemployed, self-styled artists who swing paintbrushes around on canvas. They might be put to work designing something of this kind that would be universally acceptable to all decorative schemes in the kitchen or in other parts of the home where something like this would have to be hung.

I think it would be worthy of consideration to pursue that idea.

Mr. PROUTY. I must confess that, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I should have urged corrective action at the earliest consideration of the bill. I am equally at fault for letting a provision of this nature pass by.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is rather modest. He is not responsible. He should take the credit for calling this matter to our attention. If it had not been for the efforts of the Senator, this provision might have been passed by Congress, and what a predicament we might be in when we go home and tell our wives what had been done. We would get a lesson on lobbying direct from headquarters if we went home and told our wives that they had to put up any such poster as this in their dining rooms or kitchens and keep it on display or be subject to a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment for 6 months in the penitentiary if they did not keep it prominently displayed.

I congratulate the Senator from Vermont for calling this to our attention. I only hope that the bureaucrat who dreamed of this grab for power over the homes of America will talk to his wife before he makes any other similar suggestion. For his sake let us hope he is not married, and he had better hope so.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as this bill is written, the wife who employs a maid is put to the same standard of posting, recordkeeping, and criminal penalties as the officers of the District of Columbia's largest corporations.

Let us take the housewife off the hook. My amendment, while still requiring her to pay her maid a minimum wage or time and a half for overtime, strikes from the bill all posting, all recordkeeping, and all criminal penalties as they would apply to the employer of domestic employees in a private home.

I urge its adoption.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I congratulate the Senator for calling this to our attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a verbatim copy of this order which I believe it will be agreed is a comprehensive compilation of the requirements which probably would come into play under the bill as it now stands, without this amendment.

There being no objection, the order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST AND KEEP POSTED WHERE EMPLOYEES MAY READ—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MINIMUM WAGE AND INDUSTRIAL SAFETY BOARD—MINIMUM WAGE ORDER NO. 9—CLERICAL AND SEMITECHNICAL OCCUPATIONS—EFFECTIVE JULY 24, 1961—(THIS ORDER SUPERSEDES THE ORDER EFFECTIVE JUNE 8, 1954)

To Whom It May Concern Take Notice:

Pursuant to the authority in it vested by the District of Columbia minimum wage law of September 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 960; District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition, sections 36-401 through 422), as amended, the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board of the District of Columbia, after investigation, being of the opinion that a substantial number of women workers in clerical occupations in the District of Columbia and a substantial number of women workers in semitechnical occupations in the District of Columbia are receiving "wages inadequate to supply them with the necessary cost of living to maintain them in health and protect their morals"; and having received recommendations of the conference of representatives of employers and employees in the clerical and in the semitechnical occupations in the District of Columbia, together with representatives of the general public; and a public hearing upon said recommendations having been duly held in the District of Columbia on May 22, 1961; and having inquired into the wages of minors employed in clerical and semitechnical occupations and having determined that the minimum wages and standards hereinafter ordered are suitable for minors, the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board of the District of Columbia does hereby order that—

1. Definitions: As used in this order:

(a) Clerical occupations: The term "clerical occupations" includes general office clerks, stenographers, typists, secretaries, file clerks, mail clerks, bookkeepers, cashiers, tellers, shipping clerks, receiving clerks, information clerks, receptionists, checkers, proofreaders, investigators, examiners, claim adjusters, messengers, office boys and girls, telephone operators, office machine operators, duplicating machine operators, telegraph messengers, telegraphic-typewriter operators, telegraph operators, collection clerks, tracer clerks, ticket agents, baggage agents, vehicle dispatchers, and similar occupations.

(b) Semitechnical occupations: The term "semitechnical occupations" includes:

(1) Practical nurses, nurses aids, house mothers, institutional attendants.

(2) Assistants to (a) physicians; (b) dentists; (c) laboratory technicians; (d) X-ray technicians; (e) personnel counselors; (f) labor relations counselors; (g) public relations counselors; (h) librarians; (i) educators; (j) social workers; (k) writers; (l) research workers; (m) statisticians; (n) editors and other assistants whose work requires similar training, skill, and supervision.

Excluded are clerical or semitechnical occupations covered by other District of Columbia wage orders, as for example, such occupations found in retail trade laundry, and dry cleaning, beauty culture, manufacturing and wholesaling, and hotel restaurant, and allied occupations.

(c) Employees: The term "employee" means any woman, and any person of either sex under 18 years of age, who works in a clerical or a semitechnical occupation, except that an employee whose work is part of the required course of study for credits toward a degree or whose work is required in order to obtain a license or certificate from the District of Columbia Government to engage in the practice of a profession is excluded from this order.

(d) Employer: The term "employer" means any person, firm, or corporation who directly or indirectly controls hours of work, wages, or working conditions of any employee.

(e) Split shift: The term "split shift" means a schedule of daily hours in which the hours worked are not consecutive, except that a schedule in which the time out for each meal does not exceed 1 hour shall not be deemed a "split shift."

(f) Uniform: The term "uniform" means any garment, dress, suit, apron, shirt, collar, cuffs, cap, or headband worn by the employee as a condition of employment. It shall be a presumption that uniforms are worn as a condition of employment if such garments are of a similar design, material, or color, including black and white, or form part of the decorative pattern of the establishment. Clothing customarily used for street wear or other wear away from the place of employment shall not be deemed a "uniform."

(g) Wage: The term "wage" means the unconditional payment in cash or by check, negotiable at par, by an employer to an employee as compensation for working time. Wages are not considered unconditionally paid if the employee pays directly or indirectly to the employer or another person for the employer's benefit the whole or part of the moneys delivered to the employee. In no case shall gratuities be included as part of the wage.

(h) Week: The term "week" means any period of 7 consecutive days.

(i) Working time: The term "working time" means all time the employee is (1) required to be on the employer's premises, on duty, or at a prescribed place; (2) permitted to work; or (3) required to travel in connection with the business of the employer.

2. Minimum wage standards:

No employer shall pay any employee a wage less than the following:

(a) Weekly wage: For each week in which working time is 32 but not more than 40 hours, $42.

(1) Exception for practical nurses, nurses aids, housemothers, and institutional attendants:

Effective July 24, 1961, $40.
Effective July 24, 1962, $41.
Effective July 24, 1963, $42.

(2) The applicable weekly wage may be prorated if the employee requests time off when work is available. The prorated hourly rate for the $40 wage is $1; for the $41 wage, $1.025; and for the $42 wage, $1.05.

(b) Part-time hourly wage: For working time of less than 32 hours per week, $1.20 per hour.

(1) Exception for practical nurses, nurses aids, housemothers, and institutional attendants:

Effective July 24, 1961, $1.10 per hour.
Effective July 24, 1962, $1.15 per hour.
Effective July 24, 1963, $1.20 per hour.

(2) Exception for students under 18 years of age: 90 cents per hour, provided the employer has on file a valid student certificate obtained from the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board.

(3) Exception for students employed by the educational institution they are attending: 90 cents per hour.

(c) Overtime hourly wage: For working time in excess of 40 hours per week, $1.20 per hour.

(d) Wage rate under special license: A special license may be issued by the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board to a woman whose earning capacity has been impaired by age or otherwise, authorizing her employment at a rate of pay to be fixed by the Board and stated in the license.

(c) Apprentice wage rate: For a period of not more than 1 year after an employee has been registered under the District of Columbia apprenticeship law, such employee may be paid at a rate not less than 80 percent of the minimum wage established in this order:

3. Regulations to safeguard minimum wage standards:

(a) Minimum daily wage: An employee shall be paid for at least 4 hours at the applicable rate for each day on which the employee reports for work under general or specific instructions but is given no work or is given less than 4 hours of work, provided that such payment does not apply to students employed by the educational institution they are attending and further provided that on days when school is in session, students under 18 years of age may be paid for the hours actually worked.

(b) Additional daily wage: An employee shall be paid $1.10 in addition to the minimum wage for each day during which (1) such employee works a split shift or (2) the total time between the beginning and ending of such employee's working time exceeds 11 hours, provided that such payment does not apply to students employed by the educational institution they are attending.

(c) Uniforms: The employer shall pay the cost of purchase, maintenance, and cleaning of uniforms, except that in lieu of purchasing, maintaining, and cleaning uniforms, the employer may pay 3 cents per hour in addition to the minimum wage.

(d) Travel expenses: In addition to the minimum wage, the employer shall pay the employee for travel expenses incurred by such employee in performance of the business of the employer.

(e) Deductions: No deductions, except those specifically authorized by law or court order or as specified below, shall be made which would bring the wage below the legal minimum without the written consent of the employee and the written approval of the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board.

(1) Meals: Not more than 36 cents for each meal furnished the employee by the employer with the following daily limitations: For 4 or less hours of work, a deduction for not more than one meal; for over 4 hours of work, a deduction for not more than two meals; for an employee who lives at the place of employment, a deduction for not more than three meals.

(2) Lodging: When the employer furnishes lodging to the employee, not more than $5 a week for one person in a single room or not more than $4 a week for each of two persons in a double room; not more than the reasonable value of an apartment as determined by a comparison with the value of similar accommodations in the vicinity of those furnished.

4. Basis of payment: Irrespective of the basis of payment, whether time rate, piece rate, bonus, or commission, no employer shall pay any employee less than the minimum wage.

5. Time of payment: Every employer shall establish a regular periodic payday for each employee and shall pay to each employee on such payday not less than the minimum wage for all working time in the pay period.

6. Records: Every employer shall keep at the place of employment of each employee or at the employer's principal place of business in the District of Columbia an accurate record for each employee containing the following information:

(a) Name in full, address, and occupation.

(b) Date of birth if employee is under 18 years of age.

(c) Total number of hours worked each day and each week.

(d) Daily record of the hours of beginning and stopping work and the hours of beginning and ending the meal recess if the employee works a split shift or is covered by the hours law.

(e) For each pay period, gross wages and net wages, including additions to and deductions from wages.

(f) Regular periodic payday.

(g) Name of day and time of day on which employee's week begins.

Such records shall be kept on file for at least 3 years after the entry of the record and shall be open to inspection by the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board and any of its duly authorized representatives.

7. Posting: Every employer shall keep a copy of this order posted in a conspicuous place where it can be read by all employees.

8. Separability: If any section, sentence, clause, or phrase of this order is for any reason held to be invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portion of the order.

9. Repeal: Minimum Wage Order No. 9 entitled "Clerical and Technical Occupations." effective June 8, 1954, is hereby repealed, except with respect to rights accrued and liabilities incurred under said order prior to

the effective date of this order and except with respect to violations of said order occurring prior to the effective date of this order.

This order becomes effective July 24, 1961.

District of Columbia Minimum Wage
and Industrial Safety Board.
Charles W. Putnam,
Chairman.
Clayton B. Aldrich.
Richard D. Bailey.

Attest:

Carrie L. Allgood,
Executive Secretary.

May 25, 1961.

(Penalties for violation: Any employer who violates any provision of this order is guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by fine or imprisonment as provided by law. (See District of Columbia Minimum Wage Law of September 19, 1918, 40 Stat. 964; District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition, sec. 36–417.))

(Address inquiries regarding this order to District of Columbia Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board, 499 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., NAtional 8–6000.)

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is something that would have to be posted on the wall of the dining room or kitchen, fine print and all.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I join the Senator, because my wife does not like green, and this would not jibe with the new paint in the kitchen.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the reason I asked and received unanimous consent to have this order printed in the Record is that I am quite sure that if I had asked to have it printed in the Appendix of the daily Record the question would have been raised that it exceeds the maximum limit which we can have printed in the Appendix of the daily Record. If one were to read the details, I think he would find that it is an extremely long and complicated thing. The only way I could have it printed in the Record would be in conjunction with my remarks, because it would exceed the length of material that we are permitted to have printed in the Appendix of the Record. The public ought to be aware of that.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say to my friends the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] that I have enjoyed very much their good humor in light of the tragedy that they are seeking to remedy.

I have often said, and I believe that some of them have heard me say it, that the only difference between a mistake that I make and a mistake the other fellow makes is that when I make one it is really a blooper. This is one of those bloopers.

The Senator from Vermont very kindly stated that he is willing to take some of the responsibility. I take it all because I am chairman of the subcommittee; and when a Senator is chairman of a subcommittee and something like this goes through the subcommittee, through hearings, through executive session, and finally comes to a vote, and no one detects it, that is the fault of the chairman, and nobody else.

I take the responsibility. Of course, we all know, inexcusable as a mistake is, how this provision got into the bill. In drafting the bill, the Fair Labor Standards Act was followed. Of course, this is the procedure that is followed in connection with the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act in businesses and industries. No one even thought of it being applied to housewives. Of course, it must come out.

I am going to offer, in a moment, a modification to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, to which I hope he will agree. However, I say to my friend the Senator from Delaware that I appreciate his concern about Mrs. Johnson in the White House. However, it would not apply to Mrs. Johnson, because the White House is exempt under the bill anyway. The White House and Federal institutions are exempt. I am sure she will appreciate the great concern the Senator has for her. I shall see to it that she is advised that the Senator from Delaware has that concern. This provision ought to be stricken from the bill and we will strike it.

Even if it would apply to housewives, and it certainly should not, it would require, as it did in industry, willful violation. It provides that no person shall be imprisoned under this section except for an offense committed after the conviction of such person for a prior offense.

That is not much comfort, but they would not be put in prison the first time, just as they do not put a businessman or industrialist in prison the first time. It is a sort of probationary period that is allowed him after his first conviction. Of course, we must take this provision out.

Now, may I have the attention of my friend from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] on the language that I have handed to him, for just a moment? If he will turn to page 38 of the bill, between lines 5 and 6, inserting the following language, there will be a new subsection (d):

> The recordkeeping requirements of section 11, the posting requirement of section 12 and the penalties provided by section 14, shall not apply to any employer with respect to any employee of such employer employed as a domestic servant in the private home of such employer; except that with respect to such employee, the employer shall maintain such minimum records as the Commissioners may prescribe by regulation as necessary or appropriate for the enforcement of the provisions of this Act or of the regulations or orders issued thereunder.

Now, every housewife keeps those minimum records necessary for social security. All I am seeking here is that the only records she has to keep would be records of that type and the procedure for describing the records, if the Senator will note the language—and I state it to him again—"shall maintain such minimum records as the Commissioners may prescribe by regulation as necessary or appropriate for the enforcement of the provisions of this Act or of the regulations or orders issued thereunder."

Mr. PROUTY. If I understand the Senator's suggestion correctly, it would not require a housewife to keep any more records than she does for that employee under the Social Sercurity Act?

Mr. MORSE. Let the manager of the bill make perfectly clear, for the instruction of the Commissioners, that the only intent of this language is that they should not prescribe any record requirement that imposes greater requirements upon the housewife than the housewife now has in connection with keeping social security records and making reports thereon.

Mr. PROUTY. That is a fair approach. I have no objection to it.

Mr. MORSE. I would appreciate very much if the Senator would help me crawl out of the "blooper" in which I find myself, by the acceptance of that amendment to the bill.

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to assist the Senator in that regard.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is very kind.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Over the years, we have all seen amendments taken to conference and promptly dropped in the waste bin in conference, and a conference report brought back without an amendment which has been pretty generally approved of by the body that sent it over.

While I know the feeling of the Senator from Oregon—he is generally in favor of what the Senator from Vermont is trying to do—I wonder if the Senator from Oregon is willing to state that if the amendment as it is arranged between them at the present time, by some legerdemain of parliamentary procedure, should be thrown out in conference, the Senator from Oregon would oppose the conference report on that basis.

Mr. MORSE. I would if we ever reached that situation, but there is no danger of it, because the House bill does not contain the amendment which we are objecting to; and, therefore, we are willing to go to the House in conference with this language that the Senator from Vermont is willing to accept.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand——

Mr. MORSE. The House is not going to make the mistake we made in committee, but if the House came in with any such proposal, of course I would never agree to accepting it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have seen some rare instances on conference committees in which one body did not have a particular amendment in its bill as it passed. If such an amendment were put in by the other body, the House or Senate might rush up and say, "We accept the amendment" before it has ever been contested in the committee or anything else, or "we accept the proposal," or "we insist on altering it in some way to reach the purpose this amendment accomplishes."

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from Iowa that I believe there is no danger of it at all; but if the House should seek to have the Senate conferees accept any amendment which has the remotest similarity to the language of the Senate language which we are now dropping; namely, the posting requirement or imprisonment requirement, or a fine or penalty upon the housewife, the floor manager of this bill—and I am sure I speak for all my fellow committee members—would oppose the bill and refuse to bring it to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator. That satisfies me so far as I am concerned.

May I ask one more question, while the Senator is so indulgent?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is there a provision in the legislation now before us that the District Commissioners or any other authority in the District may raise the minimum wage?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Arbitrarily, above the minimum that we established in this bill?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes. I have discussed that. That situation has existed for a good many years in the District of Columbia, in connection with the minimum wage law affecting women and children. It is a procedure that exists in some State minimum wage laws.

Let me explain to the Senator the way it works. The Commissioners appoint an ad hoc committee. It is a tripartite committee, consisting of public members, industry members, and labor members. They make a study of the wage situation in a given industry or occupation, and they make recommendations to the Commissioners.

The Commissioners are not bound by their recommendation. Let us take a hypothetical case. Let us assume that the minimum is $1.25. It is found that the minimum wage in that particular industry should be $1.30. The Commissioners are not bound to accept the report of the ad hoc committee.

The practice, I am advised, is that they hold a public hearing, and if they find that under the facts and circumstances of that particular business or industry, the minimum wage should be $1.30 instead of $1.25, they have the authority to raise it to that amount.

They have been doing that in the District for a good many years in regard to the minimum wages with respect to women and minors.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator let me send to the desk my proposed language for a modification?

Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposal for a modification of the Prouty amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The proposed modification will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 38, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

(d) The recordkeeping requirements of section 11, the posting requirements of section 12, and the penalties provided by section 14 shall not apply to an employer with respect to any employee of such employer employed as a domestic servant in the private home of such employer; except that with respect to such employee the employer shall maintain such minimum records as the Commissioners may prescribe by regulation as necessary or appropriate for the enforcement of the provisions of this Act or of the regulations or orders issued thereunder.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair inquires of the Senator from Vermont whether or not he accepts the modification suggested by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment is so modified.

Mr. MORSE. I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This may seem to be a joke, but on the other hand I was very serious about the fact that I thought there should be a record vote so there would be no question in the minds of conferees and the House as to where the Senate stood on this particular proposal.

Mr. MORSE. I am all for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But I understand now that this was not a part of the House bill.

Mr. MORSE. No; but I have no objection to a yea-and-nay vote, if the Senator wishes it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I——

Mr. MORSE. I told the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] that if some Senator indicated he wanted a record vote, I would cooperate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The reason I was suggesting a rollcall vote was so that we could go on record in clear terms to anyone concerned that the Senate did not approve of the proposal whereby a housewife could be forced to put up the same set of rules and regulations in her kitchen and dining room, as is required of a businessman, with a provision in the bill that she would be subject to a $10,000 fine or 6 months in the penitentiary for failing to post this ridiculous looking poster in her living quarters.

The amendment of the Senator from Vermont would delete that language. If we can have the assurance of the Senator from Oregon that in the event the bill comes back from the House if by any chance any part of the provision reinstating this language should be incorporated in the bill, he and his conferees will join us in opposing this bill in its entirety in order to defeat that. If so, I would be inclined to go along without taking the time of the Senate for a record vote.

But I do want it clear that if the measure comes back from the conference with any part of this provision which we are deleting here with the Prouty amendment, the Senator from Oregon and the conferees will join us in opposing the entire bill, if necessary, for the purpose of defeating that section.

Otherwise, I believe that we should go on record so that the House will know our position. I am confident that the vote in the Senate would be unanimous in favor of the housewife.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make clear to the Senator from Delaware that, unthinkable as the thought is, if the House should seek to have the Senate conferees adopt an amendment which would require any posting of a notice in homes throughout the country, to which the Senator from Delaware is referring, or to impose any fine or imprisonment upon housewives for violations, I, as Senator in charge of the bill and a member of the conferees, would certainly oppose any such amendment.

However, I do not wish to have the record brought back to me with the statement that I agreed to no word changes in the amendment. I do not know what word changes might be suggested, but I would oppose any word changes which resulted in placing any such penalty upon the housewife or requiring any such posting. I can give the Senator from Delaware assurance on that score.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is what I wished to know. I am not wedded to the exact language in the amendment but am discussing the principle of having the housewife subject to fines or imprisonment under the measure if she fails to post a notice in her living room or dining room—any such ridiculous poster as would have been mandatory without the amendment. Such a requirement is unthinkable. Certainly with that assurance on the part of the Senator from Oregon—and I know that he means it and that he will also stand back of the principle about which we are speaking—I would not insist that there be a yea-and-nay vote, because I believe we have made it crystal clear as to what the Senate desires and what it would accept if the bill were sent back to us.

Mr. MORSE. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Delaware one moment further, and also my friend the Senator from Vermont, it is clearly understood that the bill does provide the right on the part of the employee to have the Commissioners act to bring suit against an employer—housewife in this case—if the housewife is violating the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am speaking of the provisions being corrected by this particular amendment; and under the circumstances——

Mr. MORSE. Let me make clear that I am in agreement with the Senator from Vermont on the point he has raised and also with the Senator from Delaware on the point he has so ably presented.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the point I am discussing now, not the other features of the bill. I appreciate the assurance that the Senator from Oregon has given.

With that assurance I will not press for a record vote.

Mr. MORSE. It is all right to have a yea-and-nay vote, but it is not necessary.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 478), as modified, of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 477

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 477, and ask that it be stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. **PROUTY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment (No. 477), offered by Mr. PROUTY, is as follows:

On page 22, beginning with line 16, strike all through line 21 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) 'Wage' means compensation due to an employee by reason of his employment including allowances for the reasonable cost of board, lodging, or other facilities or services, customarily furnished by the employer to the employees, or allowances for the fair value of gratuities customarily received by employees in any occupation in which gratuities have customarily and usually constituted and have been recognized as part of the remuneration for hiring purposes."

On page 30, beginning with line 23, strike all through the period on line 5, page 31, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(e) The committee report shall include, but shall not be limited to, recommendations for allowances for the reasonable cost of board, lodging, or other facilities or services, customarily furnished by the employer to the employee, or allowances for the fair value of gratuities customarily received by employees in any occupation in which gratuities have customarily and usually constituted and have been recognized as a part of the remuneration for hiring purposes. The committee may make a separate inquiry into and report on any branch of any occupation and may recommend different minimum wages for such branch of employment in the same occupation."

Mr. **PROUTY**. Mr. President, this amendment redefines the term "wage" to include the fair value or reasonable cost of tips, gratuities, board, and lodging.

In H.R. 8126, as it passed the House of Representatives, the term "wage" was defined so as to include the fair value received by the employee in board, lodging, apparel, or other facilities or services customarily furnished by the employer to the employee, as well as the reasonable value of gratuities.

The bill as reported by the Senate District Committee takes an entirely different approach. "Wages" are defined as legal tender received by the employee "including such allowances as may be permitted by any order or regulation, and so forth." The definition is so ambiguous and uncertain as to leave open the question whether the allowances spoken of must be likewise in "legal tender" so as to qualify for inclusion.

Aside from this ambiguity, H.R. 8126, as reported by the Senate District Committee, contains a definition of "wage" which is wholly inconsistent with the approach taken under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Under FLSA "wage" includes the reasonable value of board and lodging. The amendments to FLSA sent up by the administration and now pending in both the House and Senate Labor Committees are designed, in part, to expand the definition of "wage" to include, besides board and lodging, the fair value of tips and gratuities.

H.R. 8126, as it is now before us, ignores the reasoned judgment of the Fair Labor Standards Act, disregards the reasoned judgment of the Department of Labor's recommendations on amending the Fair Labor Standards Act and suggests that somehow tips, gratuities, board, and lodging ought to be kept in mind, but that their inclusion in the computation of "wage" be left wholly to the discretion of the Commissioners.

In all candor and honesty, I cannot recall ever seeing draftsmanship of the type I have seen in this bill relating to tips, gratuities, board, lodging, and the like.

First, the bill's definition of "wage" makes no direct references to these forms of compensation. Buried deep in the bill is a procedure for setting up ad hoc advisory committees to review the minimum wage as it relates to any industry or trade. The committee is to come forward with a report on the need for a minimum wage above the statutory floor for that trade or industry.

The committee's report may include a recommendation for inclusion of tips, board, lodging, and so forth, in the computation of "wage" and, if the committee determines to include such considerations in the computation, it may also recommend a permissive allowance for the dollar amount of such extras to be included in the computation. At this point, even though a trade or industry has, as a major portion of its compensation to the employee, tips, board, lodging, and so forth, the committee is not required to take them into account, the dollar allowance may or may not have a relationship to the fair value received by the employee. Such important judgments are left to the unfettered discretion of the committee.

Now, as if the foregoing gives us little comfort the additional language of the bill is enough to bring on cold chills.

The Commissioners are empowered, under the Senate version of the bill, to issue wage orders going beyond the statutory minimum. In arriving at a new level of minimum wages for a particular business, the Commissioners may—and of course, may not—take into account the recommendations of the ad hoc advisory committee. And, if they do decide to take the committee's report into account, they may decide whether to take into account tips, board, and lodging. If they should decide to take them into account they may determine what permissive allowance to include in the compensation of the "wage."

Again, the inclusion of tips and board and lodging in the computation of wages an employee customarily and usually receives from his employer is left to the unfettered discretion of the Commissioners.

In other words, even though these items may constitute the major form of compensation for an employee, the committee or the Commissioners, or both, may elect to disregard this fact and impose upon the employer a minimum wage totally unrelated to these other means of compensation. The employer would have no recourse.

To this point, I have talked about the computation of the term "wage" as it relates to the issuance of wage orders in excess of the statutory floor. The almost unbelievable feature of this ambiguous compounding of "mays" and "permissive allowances" and unfettered discretionary authority vested in ad hoc committees and the Commissioners is that their pronouncements on the inclusion of tips, board and lodging in the computation of "wage" for subsequent wage orders (keeping in mind that no such pronouncements need be made) are incorporated by reference into the definition of "wage" applicable to the entire act, thereby rendering the definition wholly without meaning and substance.

Mr. President, my amendment would require the Commissioners and the ad hoc committees to take tips, board and lodging into consideration when computing wages for any purpose under the act, be it in determining the statutory floor or subsequent wage orders. Additionally, they would be required to do more than take an arbitrary stab at the value to be allowed. They would be required to give full allowances for the fair value or the reasonable cost of these items.

Mr. President, the restaurant and hotel trades are being brought under the minimum wage law for both male and female employees for the first time by this bill. The impact on this dynamic and significant part of Washington's economy by the enactment of this legislation may be substantial. It is important therefore that these trades, as well as the others in which the employees are compensated in media other than legal tender, be assured that this bill and its subsequent administration will be fairly and equitably applied.

We are asked so much these days not to tie the administrators hands with specific legislative language. We are asked to give them a free rein to do the job as they see fit. We rely so much these days on the divine guidance and benevolence of the administrators of our laws that we may some day find to our embarrassment we no longer run the country.

We ought not sit idly by and leave the fate of a major sector of the District's economy in the hands of the Commissioners or their committees. We ought not permit this gaping loophole in the District of Columbia minimum wage bill to pass unnoticed. We ought not support a provision which would allow the administrators to completely and totally ignore the existence of a major form of employee compensation and ignore it with impunity.

So, Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to follow the course which has already been set by the Fair Labor Standards Act. I ask them to follow the recommendations of the administration that tips, board, and lodging be included in the computation of minimum wages. I ask them to reject a concept which relies wholly on the good graces and good faith of the administrators for its proper application.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the proposals of the Senator from Vermont, if I understand them correctly—and I shall make some suggestions to meet what I think are his criticisms of the bill in its present wording—make three substantive changes.

First, the amendment makes it mandatory for an ad hoc committee to include, in any revised wage order, allowances for board, lodging, other facilities, and tips.

Second, it requires the committee to make an allowance for the "fair value" of tips, instead of "a reasonable allowance," as provided in section 5(e), page 31, lines 1 and 2.

Third, it deletes the requirement that wages must be paid in cash or negotiable check.

The proposal of the Senator from Vermont to make mandatory the inclusion of allowances for board, lodging, other facilities, and tips appears reasonable, and I support it, and I shall offer language that I hope he can accept.

We are advised by the District Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board that, for all practical purposes, they are following this procedure in setting minimum wage rates under the present law. But we must have a guarantee to make it mandatory.

So, to accomplish this, I shall offer an amendment to change the word "may" on page 30, line 23 of the bill, to the word "shall."

Then I shall offer an amendment that will make it clear that they include "reasonable allowances."

When we come to the matter of fair value, I hope the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] will accept the language "reasonable allowance," because of the administrative problems that the language "fair value" would require.

This is what would happen under the administrative procedure: Let us take a chain of restaurants. A hearing is held. The members of the Board go into the question of what the tips average. They decide that the average is 30 or 35 cents an hour, or 45 cents an hour. It is agreed by all concerned that that will be computed as a part of the wage of the employee.

If the requirements of "fair value" are followed, there will be serious administrative problems.

As the Senator knows, a waitress takes a tip and puts it into her apron pocket. Others take their tips and deposit them somewhere else on their persons. One has to rely on the report of the employees as to how much they received. It creates much friction and often leads to bad employee-employer relationships. So a procedure on the value of tips has been worked out. They have worked out a "reasonable allowance" on the basis of what their understanding of the amount of tips seems to be.

So far as paying in check or cash is concerned, that is very important to an employer from the standpoint of having an accurate accounting record for tax purposes as well as for meeting the requirements of paying the minimum wage.

I shall read the suggested amendments to the Senator from Vermont for resolving the problem, which I thank him for raising. I propose the following:

On page 30, line 23, strike out "may" and insert "shall".

On page 30, line 24, strike out "permissible" and insert "reasonable".

On page 32, line 1, strike out "may" and insert "shall".

On page 32, line 2, strike out "and classifications as are referred to in section 5(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "as are referred to in section 5(e) and recommended in the report".

On page 33, line 19, beginning with the semicolon, strike out all through "allowance" on line 20 and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and "and shall include reasonable allowances".

On page 33, line 21, immediately after the semicolon, insert "reasonable".

I offer those changes. I think they will comply with the major objections of the Senator from Vermont and leave the bill in a much more workable form.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I accept this language as a modification of my amendments. I think it is a reasonable approach.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

I request that the Senator's amendments be modified in accordance with the language I have just sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon would be handled better if the Senator from Vermont would withdraw the original amendments and offer the new amendments as suggested by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PROUTY. I withdraw my amendment numbered 477 and offer the amendment suggested by the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 29, beginning with line 1, strike out all through line 24 on page 32.

On page 22, line 21, strike out ", 5, 6, or 7" and insert in lieu thereof "or 5".

On page 25, line 20, beginning with "not", strike out all through "section" on line 21 and insert in lieu thereof "of $1.25 an hour or at such rate as may, from time to time, be established by section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)), whichever is the greater,".

On page 26, line 11, strike out "7" and insert "5".

On page 26, line 20, beginning with the comma, strike out all through the comma on line 21.

On page 26, line 23, beginning with "the", strike out all through "and" on line 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "provisions setting the minimum wage at a rate of $1.25 an hour or at such rate as may, from time to time, be established by section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, whichever is the greater, and the overtime provisions as prescribed in subsection".

On page 27, line 1, strike out "7" and insert "5".

On page 33, line 2, strike out "7" and insert "5".

On page 34, line 12, strike out "8" and insert "6".

On page 36, line 9, strike out "SEC. 9." and insert "SEC. 7.".

On page 37, line 2, strike out "10" and insert "8".

On page 38, line 7, strike out "11" and insert "9".

On page 39, line 8, strike out "12" and insert "10".

On page 39, line 18, strike out "13" and insert "11".

On page 39, line 24, strike out "11" and insert "9".

On page 39, line 25, strike out "12" and insert "10".

On page 40, line 1, strike out "7" and insert "5".

On page 40, line 22, strike out "12" and insert "10".

On page 40, line 24, strike out "14" and insert "12".

On page 40, line 25, strike out "13" and insert "11".

On page 41, line 10, strike out "15" and insert "13".

On page 43, line 5, strike out "16" and insert "14".

On page 43, line 14, strike out "17" and insert "15".

On page 43, line 21, strike out "18" and insert "16".

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] was unable to be present today because of a speaking engagement in Colorado which could not be canceled at the last minute.

I have a statement which has been prepared by him which I have not had an opportunity to read. I shall read it in his behalf. I am sympathetic with the principles of his amendment and I intend to support it. I am unable to say whether I will find myself in agreement with everything in the statement.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOMINICK

I wish to express the strongest possible objection to action taken by the Department of Labor this week concerning the legislation now under consideration on the District of Columbia. The Labor Department has apparently notified the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon who is managing the

District of Columbia minimum wage bill that they, the Department of Labor, refuse to consider my amendment to H.R. 8126.

My amendment would eliminate the power of the District of Columbia Commissioners to arbitrarily raise the minimum wage above the statutory limitations proposed by H.R. 8126. It would not affect that portion of the bill which would permit automatic escalation of the District of Columbia minimum wage to the level set by any increase in the Fair Labor Standards Act, nor would it affect any existing wage orders.

The issue at stake here is much larger than the substance of the amendment or of the pending legislation itself for the unamended bill already enables the District government to fulfill functions normally reserved for Congress. It is, therefore, not a question of whether or not Congress is willing to relinquish part of its authority to the District Commissioners of its own volition. The substance of the unamended bill clearly indicates that it is willing to do so. It is rather a question of whether Congress is even going to consider amending the bill or whether it is going to be dictated to by a department of the executive branch. Who in the world are the people in the Labor Department to tell us we cannot consider an amendment to a piece of pending legislation? By what authority do they pass down a take-it-or-leave-it dictum? I, for one, refuse to accept such an order which has no basis in law and which is contrary to normal legislative procedures.

We are faced here with an arrogance of power manifested within the executive branch which is not only contrary to accepted cooperative procedures between the executive and legislative branches of government, but is in direct conflict with the constitutionally assigned responsibilities of the Congress.

The District of Columbia is still, at this point in time, a Federal city chartered, structured, financed, and governed under the auspices of the U.S. Congress. It is not, and I repeat not, an agency or ward of the Department of Labor or of any other department of the executive branch.

The Constitution of the United States is quite explicit on the status of the Federal city. The Founding Fathers, recognizing that the District of Columbia was the focal point of our national governmental structure and also recognizing that it would be dependent upon taxes levied from citizens all across the land, wisely decreed that final governing authority should remain in the most representative branch of our Government, the House and Senate. Obviously, it would have been impossible for these molders of our Nation to envision the dynamic changes which have taken place within our society. They did, however, fully realize that the Congress would be a weather vane of national attitudes and should, therefore, have the power to adjust the Federal city's status accordingly.

In recent years Congress has been attempting to tread judiciously along the fine line between the wishes of the local inhabitants of the Federal city and those who must support it in large measure across the land. This has been no easy task and the pressure for revamping of the city's governing structure has grown greater each year. Thus, it appears quite likely that in the not-too-distant future there will be instituted some form of home rule for the Federal city to more effectively meet the complex problems of a modern metropolis. This is as it should be and is as the Founding Fathers would have wished, for the decision of whether to grant home rule rests in the hands of Congress. The determination of what characteristics a home-rule charter should have also rests in the hands of the legislative branch.

The fact of the matter is, however, that home rule in not yet a reality, nor have the Members of Congress relinquished their constitutional responsibility to determine how the District of Columbia will be governed. While many of us, including myself, voted in favor of home rule during the last session, we did not wish these votes to be misconstrued by the executive branch into a blank check endorsement of executive fiats. Nor do we intend that any such votes in the future should fall into that category. The Department of Labor's attitude in this matter is uncalled for, unjustified, and unconstitutional. The Department's arrogance in attempting to dictate to the Congress on what they will or will not accept is outrageous and should not be tolerated.

Had the Department of Labor or any other affected segment of the executive branch indicated a willingness to reach a rational solution within the scope of their legal authority, they would have met with little dissent from Congress. Had the Department of Labor been willing to accept the perfectly reasonable compromise offered by Congress whereby all existing orders could remain in effect until superseded by further legislation, there would have been no resistance from the Congress. Had the Department of Labor proven by its actions that its sole interest was the well-being of the citizens of the District of Columbia rather than the delegation of illegal powers to itself, who among us could object?

However, the Department of Labor has not shown a willingness to be rational or reasonable in this matter, nor have they adopted an attitude clearly designed to promote either good government in the Federal city or proper relations with Congress. They have instead adopted as arrogant and as arbitrary an attitude as any ever taken by a branch of our National Government.

The Department of Labor's attitude in this matter exceeds the disdain for public good it has shown in the ill-fated bracero program and the ill-advised program to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. They have flaunted their arrogance in the face of Congress and dared us to try and stop them. They have completely ignored congressional constitutional prerogatives in this situation and have usurped powers never granted to them.

I would remind Senators that this is not the first time such power-grasping actions have taken place within a department or agency of the executive branch of our Government. Nor will it be the last time such power grabs are attempted unless we act to stop them dead in their tracks now.

Each of us has a deep responsibility to the people of this Nation to uphold the Constitution. We have all sworn to this in our oath of office. We have an equally deep responsibility to remain constantly alert for acts, wherever they occur, which disturb the delicate balance of powers in our Federal Government. This balance of powers has, as much as any other single factor, been responsible for the stability of our Government and the growth of our Nation. To relinquish these responsibilities to the faceless bureaucracy of a Federal department which is almost beyond the reach and wrath of the American citizenry would be a betrayal of our solemn oaths and the trust vested in each of us by our constituents.

For these reasons, I urge the Senate to act now and without equivocation to prevent further growth of the executive authority at the expense of the Legislature. The power-hungry, irresponsible persons within the Department of Labor who have defied the Constitution and the Congress must not be allowed to continue on such a course. They may be unresponsive to the wishes of the people but they must not be untouchable by the representatives of the people, the U.S. Congress.

Mr. President, again I wish to make it clear that the statement I have just read was prepared by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. On his behalf, I have read the statement and have offered his amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the substantive facts that are involved in the amendment which my good friend from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] has offered.

I say most respectfully that the Department of Labor is not at all in issue in regard to the section of the bill which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] wishes to change. I can say as chairman of the subcommittee that the Department of Labor has never sought to dictate to the committee what legislation we should pass. The chairman of the committee and other members of the committee, as well, and also the staff of the committee, have sought information from the Department of Labor. We have, on our own, asked the Department of Labor to advise us what their practices are in other jurisdictions in relation to various aspects and sections of the bill.

Mr. Goldberg, from the Department of Labor, who sits beside me on the floor of the Senate as a technical adviser, and is here at the request of the committee, sat with the subcommittee during our consideration of the bill. As Senators know, I always refer to my handling of a bill as a seminar, and I call upon the executive departments of the Government that have jurisdiction over the general subject of such bills to send up a few "graduate students" to participate in the seminar with me. Mr. Goldberg has been one of our very best "graduate students," to use my academic analogy. He has been exceedingly helpful to us. He has received assignments from the chairman and other members of the committee. He has supplied us with certain factual information that we have used in fulfilling our legislative responsibilities in bringing before the Senate the final draft of a given piece of proposed legislation.

I wish to say for Mr. Goldberg's benefit that it is my testimony that he has never sought to tell the committee the kind of legislation it should or should not propose.

I have advised with officials in the Department of Labor from time to time in regard to minimum wage legislation as it concerns practices that exist in other States, and I shall refer to some of those practices momentarily. We shall have before us in due course of time, as the Presiding Officer [Mr. MCGOVERN] knows, some proposed changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act. I have spoken with officials in the Department of Labor from time to time with regard to them.

I was approached several days ago by the Senator from Colorado in regard to this amendment.

I told him I would look into it. He presented it to me. It seemed to have a good deal of merit. I did look into it. The amendment was not a justifiable amendment. I explained to him that I had obtained from the committee staff and from the Department of Labor certain factual material that caused me to oppose the amendment. I wanted him to know that.

I did say that I had told my friend, the Senator from Vermont, that the Senator from Colorado told me he could not be present today, and that I would assure him that his amendment would be presented, that I would present it if no one else did. Of course as was the most appropriate thing to do, he asked the Senator from Vermont, his colleague on the minority side of the committee, to present the amendment.

I told the Senator from Colorado that if it came to a rollcall vote, I would be willing to give him a live pair as a matter of courtesy, although I am opposed to his amendment. I hope that the Senate will not agree to his amendment.

There is no question about the sincerity of the Senator from Colorado, but certainly in fairness to the Department of Labor, to the District Commissioners, and to the Minimum Wage Board in the District of Columbia, from whom we have obtained certain factual information which I have presented, I want to say as the chairman of the subcommittee, and as manager of the bill, that we have received no dictation from anyone. We have received the advice that we have asked for. We have received advice in response to our inquiries for advice.

I want to go to the merits of the substantive issue raised by the Senator from Colorado. Mr. President, for a good many years in the District of Columbia in connection with our minimum wage bill relating to women and minors, we have had, as I said in the discussion of an earlier amendment today, the authority vested in the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Board to raise the minimum wage above the minimum wage of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

If we should adopt the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, what we might be doing is to lower the wages already authorized by the Wage Board, and ad hoc committees for 40,000 employees out of a total of 87,000 employees covered by the minimum wage law for women and for minors.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. It certainly is not the intention or effect of this amendment to accomplish that purpose. How does the Senator reach that conclusion?

Mr. MORSE. If we were to agree to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, which amendment provides that the wage cannot go above the minimum of the Fair Labor Standards Act—and there is already a provision in the existing minimum wage law in the District of Columbia as it affects women and children—we would in effect be adopting a principle that could say to these 40,000 people for whom wages higher than the minimum have already been provided that they should not receive those wages.

These proposed increases are not very high—$1.30, or $1.35. The building service industry in particular is involved. We also have, for part-time employees, a part-time rate of $1.40.

I do not believe that we should adopt here this afternoon a policy for the District of Columbia that is at variance with the practice that has prevailed in relation to the setting of wages for women and minors for a long time. Furthermore, I do not understand the argument of my good friend the Senator from Colorado, concerning what home rule has to do with the issue before us.

Certainly Congress under the Constitution has the responsibility to govern the District of Columbia. How do we do it? We do it by a considerable amount of delegation of authority. We have a Board of Commissioners. We have authorized the Commissioners to provide for the ad hoc committees. They are not acting in violation of any of their authority. That is the present governmental structure of the District.

I cannot reach any other conclusion. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado would mean that we are not going to permit that procedure in the future in respect to the employees who would come under the jurisdiction of the minimum wage bill that we hope to pass this afternoon.

Mr. President, we are not doing something in the District of Columbia that is not done elsewhere. For example, Alaska, Massachusetts, and California follow the procedure that we are proposing in this bill. The States of Arizona, California, Colorado, the District of Columbia, Kentucky, Minnesota, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Utah, Wisconsin, Illinois, Kansas, and Louisiana provide in their legislation for the establishment of wage boards, which is the practice, as I say, that is followed in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, we must protect the procedure that is provided. We have our tripartite ad hoc committees which have to recommend to the District Commissioners. The Commissioners do not have to accept the recommendations.

I explained earlier in the debate that the District Commissioners may hold a public hearing to look into the facts.

We would be taking a step backward if we were to agree to the proposed amendment of the Senator from Colorado this afternoon by categorically saying, "You cannot have a wage imposed under your Wage Board procedure in the District of Columbia above the minimum of the Federal act."

That, in my judgment, is an attempt to place a restriction upon the administrators that we have placed in authority in the District of Columbia to assist us in governing this District.

I do not see any relationship between the continuation of that practice and the observations of my friend in regard to home rule.

If we had home rule, there would be little doubt that the District government itself would continue the Wage Board approach.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] on behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of my friend the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, that page 12 of the committee report, referring to section 2 of the bill, reads:

> No amendments made by it shall affect any provision of law or any regulation or order which prior to the effective date of the bill prescribes additional or more favorable standards relating to minimum wages, maximum hours, overtime compensation, or other working conditions.

The amendment does not disturb any past orders or orders required to be made by this bill. It would bar orders which exceed the District of Columbia statutory floor or national floor, whichever is higher. Undoubtedly the national floor will go up very shortly. It seems to me that the Senator is in error when he suggests that some wages would actually be reduced by the amendment. That is not correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct; it could not reduce existing wages. But what it does do is prevent Wage Boards from continuing their present work of giving consideration to increasing some wages in order to bring them up to par, to wage increases that they have already ordered; and I believe that would be an unfair discrimination against those employees.

The question which should be met by the Senator from Colorado, through his spokesmen here this afternoon as well as the Senator from Vermont in his own right, is whether or not the procedures for the Wage Board policy in the District of Columbia are working any injustice, whether there is any need for changing them. What is wrong with them?

So long as we have the safeguards that our present procedure provides, we should not this afternoon say, in effect, "We are going to stop the further operation of the Wage Boards in the District of Columbia."

That would be the effect of the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, this amendment would remove from the pending bill those sections empowering the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to issue wage orders which exceed the statutory floor.

By the terms of H.R. 8126 the Commissioners may issue wage orders not limited in amount. It is technically possible under this bill to provide by administrative decree minimum wages of $2.00, $5.00 or $10.00 an hour.

The hearing record on this bill does not fully disclose what other States or jurisdictions authorize the establishment of minimum wage levels by administrative decree which exceed the statutory floor. Historically minimum wage determinations have fallen within the legislative domain, and for good reason. The legislative body is obligated by its nature to take into account all of the arguments, reasons and persuasions put forward by all interested citizens. An administrative determination of minimum wage levels is not inherently so broadly responsive to the community needs and interests.

If it is unorthodox to vest broad wage setting powers in the Board of Commissioners, it borders on the irresponsible to vest in them such powers without the benefit of legislative guidelines and limitations.

The Department of Labor and the Board of Commissioners maintain that complete and unfettered discretion should be vested in the administrator so as to leave him free to make just and sagacious determinations But, behind these lofty objectives is the plain and simple fact that these procedures are intended to bypass the Congress. The language of this bill is an outright invasion of the legislative domain. Adoption of this language in the bill will entirely eliminate the Congressional role in minimum wage determinations for the District of Columbia.

Is that what the Senate wants?

Senator DOMINICK's amendment is opposed by the Department of Labor. I understand the Department is lobbying against it. Is the District of Columbia, without representation in the House or Senate, subject only to the Department's whim and fancy? Is the Department of Labor asking the Senate to enact for the District of Columbia a provision it would not dare suggest for enactment in the 50 States?

Analogously, is Secretary Wirtz firmly convinced that his agency ought to have the power to set Federal minimum wage rates by fiat? If he is, I urge him to come forward during this session of Congress with such a proposal.

Is the administration asking enactment of a law for the District of Columbia which it would find inappropriate for any other jurisdiction?

The Department of Labor, in its fact sheet 4–A on State minimum wage laws, points out that since 1939 States enacting minimum wage legislation have followed the statutory floor pattern of the Federal act. This interesting booklet also points out that in no instance in a State having both a statutory floor and wage order powers has a wage order been issued which exceeds the statutory floor. Two States with wage order powers alone have elected to exceed the Federal wage floor. They are the industrialized and populous California and New Jersey.

Now the Department of Labor recommends an abrupt and total departure from the practices in the other States in the Union. It suggests that the District of Columbia should not only tie its minimum wage floor to the Fair Labor Standards Act, it also should be encouraged to issue wage orders in excess of that floor. The Department of Labor attempts to foist on the District what is practiced nowhere else in the United States.

I ask my colleagues to do no less for the District than they would do for their own constituents. I ask them to reject this concept so alien to the Federal theory and practice of minimum wage determination.

On the subject of the District's lack of self-government, I feel compelled to raise these additional considerations.

If home rule is adopted, in whom will these new powers be vested? Will the city council set the minimum wage rate? Or, under some theory of the administration's home rule bill, would this power be vested in the mayor?

If under the administration's home rule bill the power would vest in the city council two questions arise: What experience, background, or affinity would this brandnew city council have for the intricate and complicated affairs relating to wage determinations?

Not knowing the character or caliber of the men who will run the city government, I am reluctant to create at this time new and unheard of powers in the field of minimum wage determination and vest them in a governmental form which may soon give way to untried leadership.

Looking at this problem from another vantage point, Mr. President, does the Department of Labor want to impose a minimum wage law which would be binding on the new city government under home rule? If the Department's suggestions are as meritorious as they protest they are, then the people of the District of Columbia ought to have the opportunity to decide, after the establishment of home rule, whether or not they want the Department of Labor to cram their wage theories down the throats of the residents of the District. I feel certain that the city fathers under home rule would overwhelmingly reject dictation of local matters by a wholly Federal agency.

If this is a matter appropriate to the affairs of the District of Columbia, let us leave it to local determination.

While I am concerned over the quality of leadership in a new local government, I would prefer to let that government evolve its own legislative theories on minimum wage than vest in it broad, mandatory, and limitless powers.

In conclusion, Mr. President, my colleague's amendment merits your consideration and approval.

It will uphold the traditions and sound foundations of established minimum wage doctrines.

It will prevent the Department of Labor from using the District as a guinea pig for experiments it would not dare attempt on a national basis.

It will prevent disturbance of the delicate balance now maintained on the question of home rule.

It will prevent the vesting of autonomous minimum wage authority in a government not responsible to the people.

It will prevent prejudgment of matters which should be left to the determination of a local government under home rule.

And, most importantly, Mr. President, Senator DOMINICK's amendment prohibits the unwarranted and unthinkable disposal of important legislative function to the unresponsive hands of disinterested administrations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to reply briefly to my friend from Vermont.

First. The Department of Labor is not at issue in this amendment. The question of the Department of Labor dictating anything to the Congress of the United States is not in issue, any more than the Department of Labor is at issue in the 15 States which have wage board procedures, any more than the Department of Labor is at issue in Alaska or Massachusetts or California, in regard to the wage orders that they have issued which go above the minimum.

My second point is that there has been a minimum wage law in the District of Columbia since 1918. The procedure which the Senator from Colorado is now discussing so strenuously has prevailed in the District of Columbia since 1918, with regard to the minimum wage law which has regulated the wages for women and minors. Has that been an encroachment on the powers of the Congress since 1918?

The residue power already exists, and always remains with the Congress. If any abuses develop in connection with the administrative practices of those whom we place in charge of the District government to administer the affairs of this city, we can enact whatever legislation is necessary to repeal or modify our proposals.

Mr. President, as my third point, I wish to stress the fact that the discussion by the Senator from Vermont on behalf of the Senator from Colorado of the national minimum wage figure is, of course, based upon a decision reached concerning the composite economy of the various sections of the country which include rural areas and industrial areas. The reason why so many States have found it desirable to have available the use of a wage board—such as the one in the District of Columbia, which acts on the basis of an ad hoc tripartite committee—is that in some industrial areas such as San Francisco, for example, and some of the highly industrialized areas of Massachusetts, the cost of living is much higher than it is in the rural areas of those States. Thus, they provide in those States, under State laws—and the Senate today is acting, really, in one sense, as a State legislature, or a city council, for the District of Columbia—for wage boards which can take into consideration whatever facts can be presented to a tripartite board which would justify a wage somewhat higher than the so-called national scale.

That is not the act of the Department of Labor. That is the act of the States. They have found that this procedure should be available. As I had said earlier, which was reiterated by my good friend the Senator from Vermont, there are very few instances in which wage boards have raised the wage above the national figure. I pointed out that in the District of Columbia it has been raised to $1.30 in one case, $1.35 in another, and for part-time workers the rate has been figured on a base of $1.40.

In Alaska, there are some instances in which it went to $1.75. Those who know the great differences in the cost of living as between Alaska and the mainland can understand why that might have occurred.

In Massachusetts, the minimum wage is $1.30. In California, in one instance, it is $1.30. That is wage orders only. We are not dealing here with giving a wild, arbitrary discretion to officials in the District of Columbia, because we sit in this Chamber to check them. But I believe it would be very unfair for the Senate to adopt an amendment this afternoon which would say to the Wage Board and to the District Commissioners that in the future we are not going to allow them to consider the same problems they have already considered on behalf of 40,000 out of a total of 87,000 persons already covered by the minimum wage law in the District of Columbia.

I believe that the procedure is fair, and I believe that it is necessary. I believe that it should be continued, and I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be defeated.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. All that needs to be said on this question has been said. I should like to have a live quorum and ask for a yea-and-nay vote on behalf of the Senator from Colorado, and to speak for 2 or 3 minutes to reiterate what his amendment is all about; if the Senator from Oregon is agreeable, we can proceed along those lines.

Mr. MORSE. I am willing to have a live quorum call.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon withhold that request for a moment, so that I may inquire of him whether I correctly understood him to say that under the national minimum wage legislation, provision is now made in the law to provide that the States of the Union, after appropriate hearings before some State-established wage board, may raise the minimum wage?

Mr. MORSE. No; not in the national law. What I have said is that the States of California and Massachusetts have enacted State legislation which provides for the setting up of wage boards whereby, on the recommendation of wage boards which follow the procedures, the minimum wages may be raised in a given State above the national figure. At least 15 other States have wage boards with certain procedures available; but, as I have said, wage orders have not as yet been issued setting wages above the national minimum.

Mr. KUCHEL. In the District of Columbia, under the Federal law which applies to the District of Columbia, has the Board of District Commissioners adopted wage orders to increase the national minimum wage in certain instances?

Mr. MORSE. Let me explain that. We have to be careful in the use of the word "Federal." Of course, it is Federal legislation because it is enacted by Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. But it is not the fair labor standards legislation.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Because that covers the Nation as a whole. Since 1918, there has been a minimum wage law in the District of Columbia relating to women and minors. Under the procedures of that law, the wage board procedure has been adopted. The Commissioners will appoint an ad hoc tripartite committee, representing workers, employers, and the public, and they will study the situation and bring in a recommendation to the Commissioners. They may recommend that the wage for that particular industry should be X cents above the Federal minimum wage. Now they have issued such orders in the District of Columbia covering 40,000 of the 87,000 employees who would come under the District Minimum Wage Act for women and minors.

The Dominick amendment would merely provide that in the District of Columbia we cannot henceforth go above the Fair Labor Standards Act figure.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that it be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 6 Leg.]

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dirksen
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. BREWSTER. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. PROUTY obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to permit me to make an announcement?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Vermont will speak for 2 or 3 minutes in explanation of the amendment. I shall speak for a couple of minutes in opposition to the amendment. The vote on the amendment will then take place, unless other Senators wish to speak. Immediately after the vote on the amendment, so far as the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Oregon are concerned, we shall be ready to vote on the bill.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who were unable to be in the Chamber earlier, the amendment was proposed by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], who is unable to be present today. I have offered the amendment in his behalf.

The amendment would eliminate those sections of the bill empowering the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to arbitrarily raise the minimum wage above the statutory limitations proposed by H.R. 8126. The amendment would not affect that portion of the bill which ties the District of Columbia minimum wage to the level of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Nor would it affect any existing wage orders or wage orders required to be made by this bill.

The bill provides unlimited authority for the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish minimum wages. The Senator from Colorado—and I share his sentiments—feels that there should be a limitation. He proposes to retain only the statutory limits otherwise provided in the bill.

Business interests in the District of Columbia face severe competition in Maryland and Virginia, where wages are generally lower and there are no minimum wage laws.

Within the last 5 years, 2,000 business enterprises have left the District. This means that there are fewer jobs in the District, fewer business enterprises to pay taxes.

It is the responsibility of Congress, until home rule becomes a reality, to keep this city a viable, economic unit.

I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute will be agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment. I wish to make a very quick passing remark concerning the statistics which my friend the Senator from Vermont just gave us in respect to businesses leaving the District.

Not a single case was cited in our hearings of any business leaving the District because of wages paid in the District of Columbia.

What the amendment purports to do is to do away with the wage board procedure that exists in at least 15 States, and a wage board procedure that exists with the approval of Congress since 1918 in respect to the minimum wage law of the District regulating the wages of women and minors.

There happens to be 87,000 employees in the District of Columbia, and Wage Board orders have been issued since 1918 covering these employees. However, these minimum wage increases have been slight, but the procedure exists also in at least 15 States. I name them: Arizona, California, Colorado—the State of the Senator who offers the amendment, and the Colorado Minimum Wage Board has issued a number of wage orders—the District of Columbia, Kentucky, Minnesota, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Utah, Wisconsin, Illinois, Kansas, and Louisiana.

Alaska, Massachusetts, and California also have, by statute, authority to go above the Federal rate. Let me point out how the procedure operates in the District of Columbia.

The District Commissioners, who are our agents—we have not given home rule to the District, but we have provided for this form of government—can appoint ad hoc, tripartite committees composed of industry, labor, and the public. The committee can investigate a particular industry and find that because of the high cost of living in the District of Columbia—and it is a high cost area—the minimum wage for that particular industry should be a certain number of cents above the national limit. The highest figure in the District to date has been $1.35, except for part-time workers in the service trades. They are part-time workers and their rate is to be figured at $1.40 an hour.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, is there any limit whatever as to the amount to which the District Commissioners, acting on the recommendations of the Wage Board, can raise the minimum wage?

Mr. MORSE. The only limitation is the limitation of experience. There is no figure limitation. However, I shall come to the judicial review procedure in a moment. The judicial review procedure is an effective limitation. Those who argue that they might go "hog wild" and lay down some unreasonable proposal overlook the judicial review section of the bill which I shall cite.

There is no experience in any of the States in which wage boards have operated of any abuse of any discretionary authority on the part of a wage board.

Mr. ERVIN. But, apart from that, the sky would be the limit.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, the sky would be the limit until the Congress of the United States, which has the checking power, repealed the act, if Congress wanted to do it.

Mr. ERVIN. I have one other question.

Mr. MORSE. Let me take the judicial review section, because this is my answer. Section 8 reads:

> Any person aggrieved by an order of the Commissioners issued under this Act may obtain a review of such order in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals by filing in such court, within sixty days after the issuance of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Commissioners be modified or set aside in whole or in part.

The interesting thing is that there apparently have been no appeals. The orders have been found to be reasonable. However, there is an established procedure. The most effective appeal, however, is that Congress has complete authority to govern the District of Columbia.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the language of the bill provide a limit that the court can set in fixing the increase in the minimum wage in the event it finds it to be unreasonable?

Mr. MORSE. No. The review by the court shall be limited to questions of law, and findings of fact by the Commissioners when supported by substantial evidence.

Mr. ERVIN. If the Minimum Wage Board made a recommendation and the District Commissioners accepted it, they could raise the minimum wage to $5, $10, $50, $100, or $1,000 an hour.

Mr. MORSE. There has been no upward limit in the District of Columbia law since 1918. There has not been the slightest abuse of practice on the part of the District Minimum Wage Board.

I think we can take judicial notice that it will lean over backward to see to it that it does not follow a course of action which might cause it to be charged with using arbitrary discretion or abuse of power on its part.

Mr. ERVIN. If the Board has the power already, what is the necessity of passing that provision of the bill

Mr. MORSE. This broadens the coverage, not only with respect to women and minors, but also with respect to men. The bill increases the coverage so that approximately 300,000 workers would be covered in the District of Columbia.

The Senator from Vermont earlier read from a statement by the Senator from Colorado to the effect that there is a standard minimum wage at the Federal level. However, that takes into account the economic conditions across the country, which includes rural as well as industrial areas. However, in some areas there is a high industrial population and a high cost of living.

Alaska and Massachusetts are good examples of that. The record is without any evidence to show that at any time the power has been abused. It happens to be an authority that ought to exist in wage boards to protect against the injustices that can sometimes creep in as a result of a wage that is fixed too low to meet cost-of-living problems.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I ask to what extent the bill covers Federal employees?

Mr. MORSE. It does not cover Federal employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. It covers only residents of the District of Columbia?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I pointed that out in my earlier statement. It does not cover District of Columbia employees or Federal employees.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I personally have no qualms about voting against the amendment. I cannot understand that the District of Columbia Commissioners would be so arbitrary, especially when they are not subject to being elected, as to institute floors on minimum wages which would drive business out of the community. I cannot imagine how that could happen.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I urge the Senate to reject the pending amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] on behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BREWSTER. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin]. If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] are absent on official business.

The pair of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea" and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 42, as follows:

[No. 7 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Dirksen
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
McClellan
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak

NAYS—42

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Case
Church
Clark
Douglas
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Robertson
Saltonstall
Smith
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—30

Allott
Bass
Boggs
Burdick
Cannon
Cooper
Curtis
Dodd
Dominick
Fannin
Fulbright
Inouye
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
McNamara
Miller
Morton
Nelson
Neuberger
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman
Symington

So the amendment offered by Mr. Prouty to the committee amendment, on behalf of Mr. Dominick, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to the bill (H.R. 8126), the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make all necessary technical and clerical changes and corrections, including corrections of designations of sections, subsections, and cross-references.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the committee amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], I would like to read a statement, prepared by him, relating to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement of Mr. Kennedy of New York is as follows:

I rise in support of S. 19, which provides long-needed amendments to the District of Columbia's minimum wage law.

Present law gives minimum wage coverage to only 85,000 workers in the District. This bill would extend protection to some 300,000 more, as well as raise the level of the minimum to $1.25.

I think that it is a disgrace that we in Congress did not enact this legislation long ago. We are finally enacting a $1.25 minimum when that minimum has become obsolete—at that rate of pay a man would make only $2,600 a year, $400 below the poverty level.

It is obvious that at rates of pay below this minimum, a man could support a family only in the lowest miserable squalor.

There has been much comment, of late, about the disintegration of the Negro family—about a rise in families headed by women. But if wages are far below the poverty level, a man may have no alternative but to leave his family, for at present aid to dependent children rates, a man earning $1 an hour can double his family's monthly income by living apart from his wife and children.

This is not an argument for lowering ADC payments, for those payments are already at a bare subsistence level. It is an argument for increasing the minimum wage—to $1.25 in the District now, and to a minimum of $1.50 in the entire Nation this session.

It is time that we do this much, and I hope the Senate will enact this bill today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as Senator in charge of the bill, I urge the Senate to pass the bill for the reasons I have heretofore set forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BREWSTER. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Virginia Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] would each vote yea.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 10, as follows:

[No. 8 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dirksen
Douglas
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Saltonstall
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—10

Bennett
Eastland
Ellender
Hill
Hruska
McClellan
Robertson
Simpson
Stennis
Tower

NOT VOTING—30

Allott
Bass
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Cooper
Curtis
Dodd
Dominick
Fannin
Fulbright
Inouye
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
McGee
McNamara
Miller
Morton
Nelson
Neuberger
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman

So the bill (H.R. 8126) was passed.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. **PROUTY**. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Bible, Mr. Morse, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Dominick conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] for the exemplary manner in which he directed the District of Columbia minimum wage bill through the Senate today. His keen understanding of the measure's provisions, his brilliant explanations of its provisions and his usual clear and concise manner once again demonstrated the validity of his reputation as an astute parliamentarian and brilliant floor manager of legislation.

The people of the District of Columbia are fortunate to have an advocate of his ability and devotion. In like manner, great praise and credit should go to all members of the District of Columbia Committee, especially to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], who so ably assisted in the expeditious handling of the bill on the floor today. Both he and the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] are owed a debt of thanks of the Senate as a whole for their cooperation and assistance in expediting the passage of this measure.

I hope that this cooperative experience will serve as a template for future action on other measures to be considered during this session.

PROJECT HOPE

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, nearly four centuries ago, that great poetic heart, William Shakespeare, wrote, "The miserable have no other medicine, but only hope."

Never have the Bard's words been more true than today. This very day, a group of dedicated Americans are literally bringing hope to millions in Central America.

I say literally, because these Americans are a part of Project Hope. Over 100 doctors, nurses, and technologists from all over the United States begin a 10-month mission today, January 19, in Nicaragua.

They came aboard the hospital ship SS *Hope*. And they will teach their medical counterparts on a people-to-people basis how they can better take care of their ill and maimed.

For many of these magnificent men and women in white the journey will be a repetition of previous voyages, because the great white ship has brought hope to five other countries on three continents.

The docking of the SS *Hope* in the port city of Corinto today marks the initial visit of the floating medical center to the Central American Republics.

In previous voyages the good ship *Hope* has been to Peru and Ecuador in South America, as well as to Indonesia and South Vietnam in Asia, and to Guinea in Africa.

Now the talents of outstanding men and women in U.S. medicine will be put to work in Nicaragua, on a private, personal foundation.

It is this nongovernmental foundation from which Hope has built its unprecedented accomplishments and international good will. While treating and training thousands, it has touched millions.

Thus, Hope is legend on three continents.

The people of Kupang on the remote island of Timor in Indonesia, for instance, judge time by two dates. They say, "Before the Japanese invasion," and "Since the *Hope* came."

Guinea's President, Sekou Toure, sums up the effect of Hope in Africa with these words:

> The stay of the *Hope* has left a profound impression of friendliness and cooperation between the American and Guinean peoples.

But perhaps Hope's success is best described by our own Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate. He was moved to comment on the extraordinary impact the doctors and nurses of Project Hope had on the people of Trujillo, which before their arrival had been the nucleus of pro-Castro and anti-American feeling in Peru.

Chaplain Harris said of the change that came over these impoverished people, who traveled 45,000 strong for miles to bid farewell to their beloved "Hopies":

> Here is an inspiring example of the spirit of the rejected conqueror riding into a modern city in spite of the revilings of the crowd and fulfilling the test of the final judgment as forecast by the Christ of Palm Sunday and Easter—"I was sick and ye came unto me; I was hungry and ye gave me to eat."

Now *Hope* begins anew the fifth chapter in its historic log. After two yearlong journeys to South America and separate trips to Asia and Africa, the vessel is in Central America. And it is welcome there.

As Nicaragua's eminent Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa, dean of the diplomatic corps in Washington, D.C., said when the ship departed American shores for those of his country:

> I shall always be grateful to Dr. William B. Walsh for bringing about what we are celebrating here today. The ship *Hope* sails out to my country as one enormous heart. My praise is for America, which gives such an example as the *Hope* to my country.

All Americans should be grateful to Dr. Walsh, who created Hope, and to the superb medical staff of the SS *Hope*, who devote parts of their lives to helping the less fortunate in developing nations.

And like my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee, I "look with favor upon the provision of another hospital ship" for Hope, so that this fine organization can double its good work in the world.

Indeed, I look to the day when peace in southeast Asia may relinquish one of our demothballed hospital ships so that it can be loaned to Project Hope for its humanitarian endeavors.

In the countries SS *Hope* has visited, the miserable frequently have had no other medicine but hope—and in some cases not even that. But now, thanks to Project Hope, they have that and more. They have a medical corps trained in the latest medical skills, who in time will spread that knowledge throughout their countries, and that knowledge will enable them to give themselves healthier, more meaningful lives.

According to Alexander Pope; "Hope springs eternal in the human breast." As Hope today begins in Nicaragua, may Hope thrive, eternal in the world.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while the opportunity presents itself, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader, after we complete action on three other bills on the calendar, which I understand will be called up and which came from the Finance Committee, what the order of business will be for the remainder of the day and what the distinguished majority leader has in mind for the rest of the week, if he can tell us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted to answer the question raised by the distinguished minority leader. When the three bills from the Finance Committee are disposed of, that will end the business for the day, although there is a very important speech to be made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], and perhaps other Senators will speak. But it is the intention, with the approval of the minority leader, to go over until Monday, and then on Monday, at the termination of the morning business, to take up the bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF CERTAIN NONPROFIT CORPORATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS OPERATED TO PROVIDE RESERVE FUNDS FOR DOMESTIC BUILDING AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, at the request of the leadership, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 919, H.R. 327.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title.

The **Legislative Clerk.** A bill (H.R. 327) to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the bill now before us, H.R. 327, has two important provisions. The first amends present law with respect to the tax exemption provided for certain nonprofit associations which provide reserve funds for domestic savings and loan associations. The amendment broadens the exemption now contained in the law to include organizations which are similar in all essential respects to those now exempt but which do not meet one of the technical requirements of the present statute. The bill also amends present law to confine the exemption for all such organizations, both those now exempt and those that would be exempt under this bill, to income which is substantially related to the purpose or function that is the basis for their tax exemption.

HISTORY OF PRESENT LAW

Under present law, corporations or associations which provide services for domestic building and loan associations, cooperative banks, and mutual savings banks are exempt from tax if they meet certain requirements. They must be organized and operated for mutual purposes, have no capital stock, and have been organized before September 1, 1957. Such organizations exist in several States to provide services to a group of building and loan associations or similar institutions. The services they provide include extending loans to associations which are short of liquid assets and providing insurance of shares or deposits in such banks. Present law requires that, to be exempt, organizations of the type described must both provide funds for and insure shares or deposits in member institutions.

Prior to September 1, 1951, organizations of this type were exempt from tax under the provisions of the general exemption which then applied to mutual savings banks and building and loan associations. While the Revenue Act of 1951 removed the exemption for mutual savings banks and building and loan associations, it continued the exemption for nonprofit organizations of the type considered under this bill if they were organized before September 1, 1951. In 1959, the law was amended to change the required date of organization from September 1, 1951, to September 1, 1957. This amendment was designed to include a particular organization which would not otherwise have been eligible for the exemption.

THE NEW YORK STATE SAVINGS AND LOAN BANK

Another such organization, the New York State Savings and Loan Bank was initially exempt from tax by virtue of a ruling issued by the Internal Revenue Service in 1952. In December 1961, however, the Internal Revenue Service notified the bank that it intended to revoke the 1952 ruling. This action of the Service was based on the fact that the bank, while it does provide reserves for its members, does not also insure their shares and deposits. The bank meets all the other tests for exemption provided in the law.

Revocation of the exemption was delayed while the organization tried to obtain an amendment to the banking laws of New York State which would enable it to provide such insurance services. New York State law authorized the bank to administer an insurance fund only if 100 or more savings and loan associations—two-thirds of those now in existence—in the State were included. While State law was amended to eliminate this requirement, so many State savings and loan associations already have insurance that it is not feasible for the bank to establsh an insurance program. Furthermore, New York State law limits the role of the bank to that of trustee for an insurance fund and it is not clear that such a role would satisfy the technical requirements of present Federal law. The 1952 ruling was therefore finally revoked for 1962 and subsequent years.

ACTION OF THE COMMITTEE

It is the opinion of your committee that an organization which meets all the other requirements for tax exemption laid down by the law should not be precluded from tax-exempt status merely because it does not provide insurance of the shares and deposits of its members. As the situation of the New York State Savings and Loan Bank illustrates, failure to provide such services may be due to factors beyond the control of the organization. Your committee's bill, therefore, amends present law to add a new subparagraph to the existing provision, section 501(c)(14) of the Code. This new subparagraph exempts from tax nonprofit corporations and associations organized before September 1, 1957, which are operated for mutual purposes to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, cooperative banks, or mutual savings banks. The exemption is only available, however, if 85 percent or more of the organization's income is attributable to providing reserve funds for member associations or to investments. The latter requirement will not apply to those organizations which qualify for tax exemption under present law.

Your committee knows of only one organization which will be exempt under the new subparagraph—the New York State Savings and Loan Bank. It feels, however, that any other organizations which meet the requirements of the subparagraph should also be exempt from tax.

TAX ON UNRELATED BUSINESS INCOME

Your committee believes that as far as the organizations described are concerned, including both those previously tax exempt and those which will be exempt under the terms of this bill, only the income connected with either the provision of reserve funds or the insurance of shares and deposits should be tax exempt. Therefore, the bill contains a provision which defines as unrelated business income subject to tax any income derived by any such organization from activities which are not substantially related to the purpose which forms the basis for their tax exemption.

Thus, for example, if such an organization provides data processing services for its members, the income from this activity will be subject to tax.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The exemption provided in your committee's bill will apply to taxable years ending on or after the date of enactment. The unrelated business income provisions will apply to taxable years beginning after the date of enactment. The provisions of the bill are expected to have a negligible effect on revenue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 327) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IMMUNITIES ACT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 8210.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8210) to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act with respect to the European Space Research Organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 8210 authorizes the President to extend tax and tariff exemption (and other immunities) to the European Space Research Organization (and its foreign employees) just as such exemptions and immunities may be extended to a public international organization in which the United States participates.

Under present law, the President is authorized to extend tax and tariff exemption to a public international organization of which the United States is a member, and which is organized pursuant to a treaty or an act of Congress. Employees of such organizations who are foreign citizens or nationals similarly may be extended tax and tariff exemption and other immunities. These exemptions and immunities are provided for under the International Organizations Immunities Act. However, the benefits of this act are not available if the United States is not a member of the international organization.

The European Space Research Organization is a cooperative organization sponsored by 11 European nations: Belgium, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. It was established to provide for, and to promote, collaboration among European stations in space research and technology, exclusively for peaceful purposes. The United States is not a member of this organization, and, thus, under existing law, the President may not designate the European Space Research Organization as a public international organization.

The ESRO is seeking to build a tracking station in Fairbanks, Alaska, for use in its space research program. If the ESRO is recognized as an international organization for purposes of the International Organizations Immunities Act, it would be treated as though it were a foreign government entitled to bring into the United States such materials and equipment as are necessary for the construction of a tracking station without the payment of duties. Among other things, the baggage and effects of its personnel and their families would be exempt from duties and taxes imposed by reason of importation if the articles are imported in connection with their arrival in the United States.

The taxes for which exemption may be provided under the International Organizations Immunities Act include income taxes, social security, unemployment, and withholding taxes, and excise taxes.

It is understood that other nations generally afford analogous treatment to the United States in conjunction with tracking stations constructed abroad by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in connection with our Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo programs. H.R. 8210 represents a concession to the foreign countries for the treatment that our Government seeks and obtains from them when it wants to build a tracking station abroad.

Organizations which presently are designated as "international organizations" for purposes of exemptions and immunities include the Caribbean Organization, Coffee Study Group, Food and Agriculture Organization, Great Lakes Fishery Commission, Inter-American Defense Board, Inter-American Development Bank, Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Inter-American Statistical Institute, Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, Intergovernmental Maritime Consultive Organization, International Atomic Energy Agency, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Civil Aviation Organization, International Cotton Advisory Committee, International Finance Corporation, International Hydrographic Bureau, International Joint Commission—United States and Canada, International Labor Organization, International Monetary Fund, International Pacific Halibut Commission, International Telecommunication Union, International Wheat Advisory Committee (International Wheat Council), Organization of American States (including Pan American Union), Pan American Health Organization, South Pacific Commission, Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, United Nations, United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Universal Postal Union, World Health Organization, and World Meteorological Organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

COMPUTATION OF RETIRED PAY OF JUDGES OF THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 921, H.R. 8445.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8445) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Under present law the retired pay of a judge of the Tax Court is based on the salary payable to him as a judge "at the time he ceases to be a judge."

Under H.R. 8445, the retired pay of Tax Court judges is to be computed on the basis of the salary of the office, that is, in a manner similar to that presently provided for judges of other Federal tribunals.

Under present law a judge of the Tax Court may retire after 24 years of service and thereafter receive as retired pay the equivalent of "the salary payable to him as judge at the time he ceases to be a judge." He may retire voluntarily after 18 years of service, but if he retires before completing 24 years of service his retired pay will be that proportion of "the salary payable to him as judge at the time he ceases to be a judge" as is the proportion of years served to 24, e.g., if he has served for 18 years he will receive 18/24 of such salary. A judge of the Tax Court must retire at age 70 with 10 years of service (or at such time as the 10-year service requirement is fulfilled after attaining age of 70). No judge upon retirement can receive retired pay which is less than one-half of the rate (12/24's) of such judge's salary.

Unless precluded by illness or disability, all retired Tax Court judges are subject to recall to active duty by the Chief Judge for a minimum period of 90 days each year and may be recalled for longer periods with their consent. Any retired judge of the Tax Court who should fail to perform the judicial duties required of him on recall would forfeit entirely his retired pay for the year in which such failure occurs. In order to insure the availability of retired judges for recall, the retired judges of the Tax Court are prohibited from accepting any other Federal office or employment or from engaging in the practice of law or accounting in the field of Federal taxation. If they should do so they would forever lose their rights to retirement pay. No such limitation is provided with respect to judges of the Federal District Courts.

Judges of the U.S. District Courts, the Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals and the Customs Court, may retire from regular active service after 15 years of service upon attaining the age of 65 and after 10 years of service upon attaining the age of 70. Their retired pay is the full amount of "the salary of the office." They may be recalled for such judicial service as they are "willing to undertake." There is no loss of retired pay should a judge refuse further service.

A recent review of the average years of service of retired judges of the Tax Court prior to their retirement indicated such service to be over 25 years, while the average of the years of service prior to their retirement of 24 U.S. District Court judges who retired over a recent 3-year period showed an average of 19 years. At the present time, of the seven living retired judges of the Tax Court, six judges are serving on recall on a full-time basis and one judge is precluded by disability from further service.

The calculation of retired pay for judges by reference to "the salary payable to him as judge at the time he ceases to be a judge" is a characteristic of retired pay to Federal judges who are appointed to office for short terms, who are not subject to recall after retirement or resignation, and who are not precluded from engaging in any activity they choose after retirement or resignation. Examples are judges of the District Courts of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, whose terms of office are for only 8 years, who are not subject to recall for any judicial duties after their retirement, and who are not precluded from engaging in any activity they choose, such as the practice of law after their retirement or resignation. The difference between these judges and the judges of the Tax Court is evident.

The Committee felt that the longer terms of service required from judges of the Tax Court before they are eligible for retirement rights and the more stringent obligations imposed on them by law to perform judicial service on recall during the rest of their lives call for a calculation of their retirement payments in a manner similar to that of retired judges of the U.S. District Courts, the Court of Claims and the Customs Court, i.e., by referring to "the salary of the office" rather than to "the salary payable to at the time he ceases to be a judge."

The provisions of the bill would be effective with respect to retired pay accruing on or after the first day of the first calendar month which begins after the date of enactment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot support the pending bill. I realize that it applies to only a small number of individuals; nevertheless, if we pass the bill we shall be establishing a precedent which may some day come back to give us a great deal of trouble.

Under present law a judge may retire after 24 years of service and receive his full retired pay equal to the salary at the time he retires. If he is retired, for example, after 18 years of service he receives eighteen twenty-fourths of that salary; and so forth.

Mr. President, the pending bill is geared not to the salary the judge receives on the day he retires but to the salary of his office at any future date. For example, if a judge retired 10 years ago or 5 years ago and he received a salary of $22,500, he is now living on a pension based on that $22,500 salary. Since that time the salary of this office has been raised to $30,000. On the other hand there are some who retired years ago when a judge's salary was $10,000. Today they are all eligible for a $10,000 pension.

Under this bill their pensions would be increased 300 percent, or to the equivalent of the present salary.

Under this bill prior retirees would automatically have their pensions raised to the equivalent of this year's salary, which is $30,000 a year.

On the other hand, suppose a judge who after having qualified for 24 years retires this year at the $30,000 salary. If in the years to come the salary for the office is raised to $35,000, he would have his pension raised to $35,000, and it would be raised every time the salary was raised.

The bill would set up an entirely different formula from what it is now in the retirement system. The civil service retirement system is already in a very dangerous financial situation in that it is not actuarially sound—far from it, Mr. President—and Congress will some day have to meet this situation; otherwise we shall find that the fund is bankrupt.

Although the bill would apply to only a few individuals, it would set a precedent and there would be the possibility that we would have to extend the same principle to others. Such a step no doubt would completely bankrupt the retirement fund as well as the taxpayers.

I do not believe the bill should be passed, and I wish the Record to show that I am not supporting this proposal.

Mr. **CARLSON.** Mr. President, I did not oppose the bill in the Committee on Finance yesterday when it was reported, nor do I now oppose it. But I believe the Senator from Delaware made a very frank statement on a problem that this Congress has to meet, and I believe it will have to be met in the near future.

Last fall the President appointed what I would call a blue ribbon committee, composed of industrial leaders, Government leaders, and labor leaders, to study the entire retirement system and the evidence of increased liabilities that have been building up for payment in future years. That committee should report within the next week. I had thought the report would be available this week.

When the report is forthcoming, the Congress will be not only warned, but notified of a problem that we must meet. I did not oppose it. I am concerned about increasing retirement benefits without regard for the entire fund.

I commend the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] for having made the statement that I think should have been made.

Mr. **THURMOND.** Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks that have been made by the able and distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams].

It seems to me that we must be very careful with regard to the retirement system in the future, because I understand that today the civil service retirement system is $40 billion in debt.

Considering the large amounts by which we are going into debt each year, it strikes me that in order to protect the employees of the Government who render long and faithful service and to prevent their retirement from being jeopardized, steps should be taken to place the retirement system on a sound basis.

In the bill it appears that a departure is being made and that new precedents might be established. This might be a dangerous step to take.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 8445) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION WITH INDONESIA, SPAIN, AND SWITZERLAND

Mr. **GORE.** Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I wish to inform the Senate that pursuant to section 123 (c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to the Joint Committee proposed amendments to the agreements for cooperation with the Governments of Indonesia, Spain, and Switzerland concerning peaceful uses of atomic energy. The proposed amendment to the Spanish agreement was received by the Joint Committee on December 1, 1965, and the proposed amendments to the Indonesian and Swiss agreements were received on January 12, 1966.

The proposed amendment to the Indonesian agreement, which expired on September 20, 1965, would extend the life of the agreement for 5 years. This would be a research-type agreement concerning peaceful use of atomic energy, providing for such matters as exchange of information, lease of enriched uranium as fuel for research reactors, and the sale of relatively small quantities of fissionable materials for use in defined research projects. The agreement would provide for safeguards to assure that materials and facilities subject to the agreement are used only for peaceful purposes, and that arrangements be made for assumption of safeguards responsibilities by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The amendments to the Spanish and Swiss agreements would, among other things, provide for long-term supply of fuel for these nations' nuclear power programs, and also that arrangements be made for assumption of safeguards responsibilities by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Section 123 c. of the act requires that these proposed amendments lie before the Joint Committee for a period of 30 days while Congress is in session before becoming effective. It is the general practice of the Joint Committee to publish proposed civilian agreements for cooperation in the Record and to hold public hearings thereon.

In keeping with this practice, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the text of the proposed amendments to the agreements for cooperation with Indonesia, Spain,

and Switzerland, together with supporting correspondence.

There being no objection, the correspondence and amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1966.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR CHET: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

(a) An executed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Indonesia Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy";

(b) A copy of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and

(c) A copy of a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the amendment and authorizing its execution.

The proposed amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would extend the life of the agreement for a period of 5 years. In addition, the proposed amendment would provide that arrangements be made for the International Atomic Energy Agency to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement.

The amendment will enter into force when the two Governments have exchanged written notifications that their respective statutory and constitutional requirements have been fulfilled.

As you know, this agreement expired on September 20, 1965, and the Department of State received on that date a formal note from the Government of Indonesia recognizing the continuing effect of the safeguards provisions of the agreement for cooperation over any materials, equipment or devices transferred under the agreement pending the coming into force of the amendment extending the agreement.

The agreement with Indonesia is a standard research type agreement providing for such things as exchange of information, the lease of enriched uranium for use as fuel for research reactors, and the sale of research quantities of special nuclear materials for use in defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The standard safeguard provisions contained in similar research type bilateral agreements are included in the Indonesian bilateral agreement.

United States assistance to Indonesia under the agreement for cooperation has taken the form of the provision of generally available unclassified information in the peaceful uses of atomic energy for medicine, agriculture, biology, the training of a few Indonesian scientists in peaceful uses, the export of a 250-kilowatt Triga research reactor, the necessary fuel therefor, and a grant of $350,000 to cover a portion of the reactor cost.

We do not anticipate any need to increase the limits on the amounts of material which may be transferred to Indonesia during the life of the agreement as extended by this amendment.

Cordially,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

Enclosures:

1. Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation with the Republic of Indonesia.
2. Letter from the Commission to the President.
3. Letter from the President to the Commission.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Indonesia,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Indonesia Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, signed at Washington on June 8, 1960 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation");

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article X of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"1. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Indonesia, recognizing the desirability of making use of the facilities and services of the International Atomic Energy Agency, agree that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under this Agreement for Cooperation. It is agreed that the necessary arrangements will be effected without modification of this Agreement, through an agreement to be concluded between the Parties and the Agency which may include provisions for suspension of the safeguard rights accorded the Commission by Article VIII, paragraph 3, of this Agreement during the time and to the extent that the Agency's safeguards apply to such materials and facilities.

"2. In the event the Parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement on the terms of the trilateral arrangement envisaged in paragraph 1 of this Article, either Party may by notification terminate this Agreement. In the event of termination by either Party, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to this Agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of the Republic of Indonesia for such returned material at the Commission's schedule of prices then in effect domestically."

ARTICLE II

The first sentence of paragraph 1 of Article XI of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by deleting the phrase "five years" and substituting in lieu thereof the phrase "ten years".

ARTICLE III

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation, as hereby amended.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this twelfth day of January, 1966.

For the Government of the United States of America:

WILLIAM P. BUNDY,
Assistant Secretary, Far Eastern Affairs,
Department of State.
GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of the Republic of Indonesia:

LAMBERTUS N. PALAR,
Ambassador,
Embassy of Indonesia.

Certified to be a true copy:

RICHARD V. WILLIT,
Division of International Affairs,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., September 23, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Indonesia Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission recommendation.

The proposed amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would extend the life of the agreement for a period of 5 years. In addition, the proposed amendment would provide that arrangements be made for the International Atomic Energy Agency to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement. In every other respect, there is no proposed change in the basic agreement.

Following your determination, approval, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Indonesia. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the proposed amendment will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

GERALD F. TAPE,
Acting Chairman.

Enclosure: Proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Indonesia.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 1, 1966.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me by letter of September 23, 1965, a proposed amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Indonesia Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, and has recommended that I approve the proposed amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution.

Pursuant to provisions of section 123b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) Approve the proposed amendment and determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America.

(b) Authorize the execution of the proposed amendment on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., December 1, 1965.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR CHET: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

(a) An executed amendment to the agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain.

(b) A copy of the letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment.

(c) A copy of the letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that performance of the amendment will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the amendment and authorizing its execution.

The amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would extend and modify the agreement between the United States of America and the Government of Spain which was signed at Washington on August 16, 1957.

As we reported to the Joint Committee on June 4, 1964, the Government of Spain has for some time been desirous of receiving a general assurance from the United States concerning the availability of enriched uranium on a long-term basis for the Spanish nuclear power program. Accordingly, the amendment extends the term of the United States-Spanish agreement from 1968 to 1988. Consistent with the private ownership legislation, production or enrichment services could be provided after December 31, 1968, and would be subject to such terms and conditions as are established by the Commission. In addition, the amendment increases the quantities of enriched uranium that can be transferred to Spain to cover the estimated long-term enriched fuel requirements of three Spanish nuclear power projects as well as the miscellaneous requirements of the Spanish research and development program. The net amount of enriched uranium that could be transferred to Spain under the fuel article has been raised from 500 kilograms to 8,500 kilograms of U^{235}. The three principal projects that will be covered by this increased amount are the 153 MWe Zorita or UEM power station, the 30MWe DON prototype power reactor and the 300–400 MWe NUCLENOR power station.

Under the present agreement the Commission may, at its discretion, make available a portion of special nuclear material to be supplied as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor. The amendment broadens this provision in keeping with the approach the Commission generally follows in its new power agreements and permits the Commission, upon request and at its discretion, to transfer material containing more than 20 percent in the isotope U^{235} when there is a technical or economic justification for such transfer.

Article II of the amendment provides for removal of the limitation on the amounts of materials, including special nuclear material, that may be transferred to Spain for defined research applications (other than for fueling reactors and reactor experiments), and permits such materials to be made available on an "as may be agreed" basis when such material is not commercially available. A similar provision is incorporated in several of our other agreements.

Under article IIIA and article IV, enriched uranium and other materials could be transferred (including loaned, subject to required governmental authorization) for defined research applications, including research reactors, materials testing reactors, reactor experiments, and reactor prototypes. The inclusion of the provision of loan is designed to reflect the cooperative arrangement the Commission is currently negotiating with Spain, as a part of which the initial enriched uranium and heavy water requirements for the Spanish heavy water, organic cooled reactor prototype (DON) would be loaned to Spain over a period of 5 years.

Article VI of the amendment provides that the International Atomic Energy Agency will assume the responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement for cooperation at least 6 months prior to the startup of the Spanish Zorita power reactor or by December 31, 1966, whichever date is earlier. This transfer of responsibility would be accomplished without further modification to the agreement by means of a trilateral agreement to be negotiated among the United States, Spain, and the IAEA.

The amendment will enter into force on the day on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of this amendment.

Cordially,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

Enclosures:

1. Amendment to agreement for cooperation with the Government of Spain.
2. Letter from the Commission to the President.
3. Letter from the President to the Commission.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF SPAIN CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, signed at Washington on August 16, 1957 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation");

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article II, paragraph B, of the Agreement for Cooperation is hereby amended by deleting the words "ten years" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "thirty years".

ARTICLE II

Article VI, paragraph A, of the Agreement for Cooperation is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Materials of interest in connection with defined research applications, including special nuclear materials (other than special nuclear materials to be used in the fueling of reactors and reactor experiments), source materials, by-product materials, other radioisotopes and stable isotopes may be sold or otherwise transferred in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially."

ARTICLE III

Article VIII of the Agreement for Cooperation is hereby amended to read as follows:

"A. During the period of this Agreement, the United States Commission will transfer to the Government of Spain, under such terms and conditions as the Parties may agree, uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} for use in the fueling of defined research applications, including research reactors, materials testing reactors, reactor experiments and reactor prototypes as the Commission may agree to upon request of the Government of Spain, it being understood that the material will be delivered in accordance with contracts which set forth the agreed delivery schedules and other terms and conditions of supply.

"B. In addition, the Commission will sell to the Government of Spain all of Spain's requirements for enriched uranium for the power reactor program described in Appendix A, it being understood that the material will be delivered in accordance with contracts which set forth the agreed delivery schedules and other terms and conditions of supply.

"C. The Commission is also prepared, to such extent and under such conditions as may be established by the Commission, to enter into contracts to provide after December 31, 1968, for the production and enrichment in facilities owned by the Commission of special nuclear material for the account of the Government of Spain for the uses specified in paragraphs A and B above.

"D. The net amount of enriched uranium transferred from the United States to the Government of Spain under paragraphs A, B, and C of this Article during the period of this Agreement for Cooperation shall not exceed 8500 kilograms of U^{235}.

This net amount shall be the difference between:

(1) The quantity of U^{235} contained in enriched uranium transferred to the Government of Spain pursuant to said paragraphs A, B, and C, and

(2) The quantity of U^{235} contained in an equal quantity of uranium of normal isotopic assay, less the difference between:

(3) The aggregate of the quantities of U^{235} contained in recoverable uranium of U.S. origin either transferred to the United States of America or to any other nation or group of nations with the approval of the Government of the United States of America pursuant to this Agreement, and

(4) The quantity of U^{235} contained in an equal quantity of uranium of normal isotopic assay, except that if the difference between (3) and (4) is negative, it will not be considered.

"E. It is agreed that, should the total quantity of enriched uranium which the Commission has agreed to provide under this and other Agreements for Cooperation reach the maximum quantity of enriched uranium which the Commission has available for such purposes, and should the Government of Spain not have executed contracts for the net amount of enriched uranium specified in paragraph D of this Article, the Commission may request, upon appropriate notice, that the Government of Spain execute contracts for all or any part of such enriched uranium as is not then under contract. It is understood that, should the Government of Spain not execute contracts in accordance with a request by the Commission hereunder, the Commission shall be relieved of all obligations to the Government of Spain with respect to the enriched uranium for which contracts have been so requested.

"F. The enriched uranium supplied hereunder may contain up to twenty per cent (20%) in the isotope U^{235}. The United States Commission, however, may make available a portion of the enriched uranium supplied hereunder as material containing more than 20% in the isotope U^{235} when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer.

"G. It is understood, unless otherwise agreed, that in order to assure the availability of the entire quantity of enriched uranium allocated hereunder for a particular reactor project described in Appendix A, it will be necessary for the construction of the project to be initiated in accordance with the schedule set forth in Appendix A and for the Government of Spain to execute a contract for that quantity in time to allow for the Commission to provide the material for the first fuel loading. It is also understood that if the Government of Spain desired to contract for less than the entire quantity of enriched uranium allocated for a particular project or terminates the supply contract after execution, the remaining quantity allocated for that project shall cease to be available and the maximum quantity of enriched uranium provided for in paragraph D of this Article shall be reduced accordingly, unless otherwise agreed.

"H. Within the limitations contained in paragraph D of this Article, the quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred by the Commission under this Article and in the custody of the Government of Spain for the fueling of reactors or reactor experiments shall not at any time be in excess of the quantity thereof necessary for the loading of such reactors or reactor experiments, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Parties, is necessary for the efficient and continuous operation of such reactors or reactor experiments.

"I. It is agreed that when any special nuclear material received from the United States of America requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor prior to delivery to the Commission or the facilities acceptable to the Commission for reprocessing.

"J. With respect to any special nuclear material not owned by the Government of the United States of America produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States of America which is in excess of the need of the Government of Spain for such materials in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States of America shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase such material at prices then prevailing in the United States of America for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation with the Government of the United States of America, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or a group of nations in the event the option to purchase is not exercised.

"K. Special nuclear material produced, as a result of irradiation processes, in any part of fuel leased hereunder shall be for the account of the Government of Spain and after reprocessing as provided in paragraph I of this Article shall be returned to the Government of Spain at which time title to such material shall be transferred to that Government, unless the Government of the United States of America shall exercise the option, which is hereby granted, to retain, with appropriate credit to the Government of Spain, any such special nuclear material which is in excess of the needs of Spain for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

"L. Some atomic energy materials which the Government of Spain may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this Agreement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of Spain, the Government of Spain shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States of America is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may, pursuant to this Agreement, lease to the Government of Spain or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of Spain shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States of America against any and all liability (including third party liability) for any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to the Government of Spain or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction."

ARTICLE IV

Article IX of the Agreement for Cooperation is hereby amended by deleting the words "lease, or sale and purchase," and substituting in lieu thereof the words "sale, lease, or, subject to required governmental authorizations, loan,".

ARTICLE V

Article X, paragraph B.3., of the Agreement for Cooperation is hereby amended by deleting the phrase "paragraph F(b)" and substituting in lieu thereof the phrase "paragraph J(b)".

ARTICLE VI

Article XII of the Agreement for Cooperation is hereby amended to read as follows:

"A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain, recognizing the desirability of making use of the facilities and services of the International Atomic Energy Agency as soon as practicable, agree that the Agency will be requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under this Agreement for Cooperation so that this responsibility will be assumed by the Agency at least six months prior to the startup of the Zorita nuclear power station described in Appendix A or by December 31, 1966, whichever date is earlier. It is contemplated that the necessary arrangements will be effected without modification of this Agreement, through an Agreement to be negotiated between the Parties and the Agency which may include provisions for suspension of the safeguard rights accorded the Commission by Article X, paragraph B, of this Agreement during the time and to the extent that the Agency's safeguards apply to such materials and facilities.

"B. In the event the Parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement on the terms of the trilateral arrangement envisaged in Paragraph A of this Article, either Party may, by notification, terminate this Agreement. Before either Party takes steps to terminate, the Parties will carefully consider the economic effect of any such termination. Neither Party will invoke its termination rights until the other Party has been given sufficient advance notice to permit arrangements by the Government of Spain, if it is the other Party, for an alternative source of power and to permit adjustment by the Government of the United States of America, if it is the other Party, of production schedules. In the event of termination by either Party, the Government of Spain shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear materials received pursuant to this Agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of Spain for such returned material at the current Commission's schedule of prices then in effect domestically."

ARTICLE VII

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation, as hereby amended.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and Spanish languages, both texts being equally authentic, this 29th day of November, 1965.

For the Government of the United States of America:

JOHN M. LEDDY,
Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, Department of State.

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of Spain:

MERRY DEL VAL,
Spanish Ambassador to the United States.

Certified to be a true copy:

WILLIAM L. YEOMANS,
Chief, European Branch, Division of International Affairs, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

APPENDIX A

Spanish enriched uranium power reactor program

Reactors (1)	Start of construction (2)	Total kilograms U^{235} required[1] (3)
A. DON, 30 megawatts electric	1965	366
B. Zorita, 153 megawatts electric	1964	2,934
C. Nuclenor, 300 megawatts electric	1966	4,930
Total		8,230

[1] As calculated in art. VIII.D. of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would extend and modify the agreement between the United States of America and the Government of Spain which was signed at Washington on August 16, 1957. The principal objective of the amendment is to provide fuel for the planned Spanish nuclear power program of a long-term basis.

Article I of the amendment would extend the expiration date of the agreement from 1968 to 1988.

Article II would permit materials of interest in connection with defined research applications, including special nuclear materials (other than special nuclear materials for fueling reactors and reactor experiments) to be made available on an "as may be agreed" basis when such material is not commercially available. A similar provision has been incorporated in several of our other agreements.

Under article IIIA and article IV, enriched uranium and other materials could be transferred (including loaned, subject to required governmental authorization) for defined research applications, including research reactors, materials testing reactors, reactor experiments, and reactor prototypes. The inclusion of the flexibility permitting loan is designed to reflect a proposed cooperative arrangement the Commission is now negotiating with Spain under which the initial enriched uranium and heavy water requirements for a proposed Spanish reactor prototype (the DON reactor) would be loaned to Spain for a 5-year period. The new language to be inserted in the agreement covering the possibility of a loan of materials is permissive and not obligatory in nature and it is understood that the actual conclusion of a loan arrangement with Spain will be contingent upon a final decision on the part of Spain to proceed with the project, the development of a suitable detailed exchange arrangement covering U.S. participation, and the receipt of the requisite congressional authorization.

Article III of the amendment would also permit the sale of enriched uranium to meet all of Spain's requirements for enriched uranium for the power reactor program described in the agreement. In addition, consistent with a recent change in the Atomic Energy Act, production or enrichment services would be provided after December 31, 1968, and would be subject to such terms and conditions as may be established by the Commission.

Under article III of the amendment, the quantities of enriched uranium that could be transferred to the Government of Spain to cover the estimated long-term enriched uranium fuel requirements of Spain would be increased to a maximum amount of 8,500 kilograms of U^{235}.

Further, article III would allow the Atomic Energy Commission, at its discretion, to make available to Spain uranium enriched to more than 20 percent in the isotope U^{235} when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer. This provision has been incorporated in our agreements with several other countries.

In keeping with the U.S. policy on safeguards, article VI would provide that the International Atomic Energy Agency will assume the responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement for cooperation at least 6 months prior to the startup of the Spanish Zorita power reactor or by December 31, 1966, whichever date is earlier. This transfer of responsibility would be accomplished without further modification to the agreement by means of a trilateral agreement to be negotiated among the United States, Spain and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Following your determination, approval, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the proposed amendment, together with your approval and determination, will then be submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

Enclosure: Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 24, 1965.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with section 123(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me a proposed "Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain" and has recommended that I approve the proposed amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution.

Pursuant to the provisions of 123(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) Approve the proposed amendment, and determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America;

(b) Authorize the execution of the proposed amendment on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1966.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR CHET: Pursuant to section 123(c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

(a) An executed "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy";

(b) A copy of the letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the agreement; and

(c) A copy of a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the agreement and authorizing its execution.

The agreement, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would supersede the "Agreement for Cooperation of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland," signed at Washington on June 21, 1956, and amended on April 24, 1959, and June 11, 1960. As we reported to the Joint Committee on July 14, 1965, the 1955 research agreement with Switzerland was allowed to expire since cooperation could be continued under the 1956 power agreement.

The Government of Switzerland has been desirous for some time of receiving from the Commission a general assurance regarding the availability of enriched fuel for their long-term nuclear energy program. Accordingly, the agreement would have a duration of 30 years and would provide for the transfer of an increased quantity of U^{235} to meet the needs of both the long-term program and of miscellaneous research and development projects.

Article VI of the new agreement implements the provisions of the private ownership legislation by providing a framework within which private persons in the two countries may be parties to transfers of special nuclear material. While the precise means by which these private transactions would be carried out have not yet been developed, the Commission retains the right to insure that they are made in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, policies and license requirements of the United States. Proposed regulations for licensing the export of special nuclear material have been published for comment. Materials transferred under article VI would be part of the total quantity of material available under the agreement.

Article VII would, consistent with the private ownership legislation, permit the Commission to perform uranium enrichment services after December 31, 1968, for the account of the Government of Switzerland. In addition, the net amount of U^{235} which could be transferred to Switzerland is increased to 30,000 kilograms, and uranium enriched to more than 20 percent in the isotope U^{235} could be made available when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer. In keeping with stated Commission policy, article VII also includes language which assures the comparability of domestic and foreign prices for enriched uranium and services performed, as well as of the advance notice required for delivery.

Article IX contains the peaceful uses guarantees of the Government of Switzerland and the Government of the United States. The U.S. guarantee would extend to equipment and devices transferred to the Government of the United States, to special nuclear material produced in U.S.-fueled reactors which is in excess of Switzerland's needs and which the United States decides to purchase, and to special nuclear material produced in U.S.-leased fuel which the United States elects to retain after reprocessing, or alternatively, to equivalent amounts of such purchased or retained material.

Article XI provides that the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland will promptly request the International Atomic Energy Agency to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement. This transfer of responsibility to the agency would be accomplished without amendment to the agreement by means of a trilateral agreement to be negotiated by the United States, Switzerland, and the IAEA.

The agreement will enter into force on the day on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of the agreement.

Cordially,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

Enclosures:

1. Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of Switzerland (3).
2. Letter from the Commission to the President (3).
3. Letter from the President to the Commission (3).

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF SWITZERLAND CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of

Switzerland signed an "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland" on June 21, 1956, which was amended by the Agreement signed on April 24, 1959, and the Agreement signed on June 11, 1960; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland desire to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy, including the design, construction, and operation of power-producing reactors and research reactors, and the exchange of information relating to the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland are desirous of entering into this Agreement to cooperate with each other to attain the above objectives; and

Whereas the Parties desire this Agreement to supersede the "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland", signed on June 21, 1956, as amended;

The Parties agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

A. The "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland", signed on June 21, 1956, as amended, is superseded on the date this Agreement enters into force.

B. This Agreement shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Agreement and shall remain in force for a period of thirty (30) years.

ARTICLE II

A. Subject to the provisions of this Agreement, the availability of personnel and material, and the applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements in force in their respective countries, the Parties shall cooperate with each other in the achievement of the uses of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

B. Restricted Data shall not be communicated under this Agreement and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred, and no services shall be furnished, under this Agreement, if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such services involves the communication of Restricted Data.

C. This Agreement shall not require the exchange of any information which the Parties are not permitted to communicate because the information is privately owned or has been received from another Government.

ARTICLE III

A. Subject to the provisions of Article II, the Parties shall exchange unclassified information with respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses and the problems of health and safety connected therewith. The exchange of information provided for in this Article shall be accomplished through various means available, including reports, conferences, and visits to facilities, and shall include information in the following fields:

(1) Development, design, construction, operation, and use of research, materials testing, experimental, demonstration power, and power reactors;

(2) Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of the types of reactors listed in subparagraph (1) above; and

(3) The use of radioactive isotopes and radiation in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

B. Agreed classification, patent, and security policies and practices shall continue to be maintained with respect to all classified information (including any inventions or discoveries employing such information), materials, equipment, and devices which have been exchanged under the superseded Agreement. The Parties intend to consult with each other to review the extent to which the agreed classification, patent, and security policies and practices referred to above continue to be appropriate and applicable.

ARTICLE IV

A. Materials of interest in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information, as provided in Article III and subject to the provisions of Article II, including source materials, special nuclear materials, by-product materials, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, may be transferred for defined applications other than fueling reactors and reactor experiments in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not commercially available.

B. Subject to the provisions of Article II and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor materials testing facilities of the Parties shall be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities, and personnel conveniently available when such facilities are not commercially available.

C. With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article III and subject to the provisions of Article II, equipment and devices may be transferred from one Party to the other under such terms and conditions as may be agreed. It is recognized that such transfers will be subject to limitations which may arise from shortages of supplies or other circumstances existing at the time.

ARTICLE V

The application or use of any information (including design drawings and specifications) and any material, equipment, and devices, exchanged or transferred between the Parties under this Agreement, shall be the responsibility of the Party receiving it, and the other Party does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of such information and does not warrant the suitability of such information, material, equipment, and devices for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE VI

It is contemplated that, as provided in this Article, authorized private individuals and private organizations as well as governmental bodies in either the United States of America or Switzerland may deal directly with authorized private individuals and private organizations as well as governmental bodies in the other country. Accordingly, in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article III, it is understood that either Party and authorized persons under its jurisdiction may make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including special nuclear material, and equipment and devices to, and perform services for, the other Party and authorized persons under its jurisdiction. Such arrangements shall be subject to:

(1) the limitations in Article II; and

(2) applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of the Parties.

ARTICLE VII

A. During the period of this Agreement, the United States Commission will transfer to the Government of Switzerland, under such terms and conditions as the Parties may agree, uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} for use in the fueling of defined research applications, including research reactors, materials testing reactors, reactor experiments, and reactor prototypes, as the Commission may agree to upon request of the Government of Switzerland.

B. In addition, the United States Commission is prepared to sell to the Government of Switzerland all of Switzerland's requirements for uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} for use in the power reactor program described in the Appendix to this Agreement, which Appendix, subject to the quantity limitation established in paragraph E of this Article, may be amended from time to time by mutual consent without modification of this Agreement.

C. The United States Commission is also prepared, to such extent and under such conditions as it may establish, to enter into contracts to provide after December 31, 1968, for the production or enrichment, or both, in facilities owned by the Commission of special nuclear material for the account of the Government of Switzerland for the uses specified in paragraphs A and B above.

D. With respect to transfers of uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} provided for in paragraphs A, B, and C of this Article, it is understood that:

(1) contracts specifying quantities, enrichments, delivery schedules, and other terms and conditions of supply or service will be executed on a timely basis between the United States Commission and the Government of Switzerland; and

(2) prices for uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} sold or for services performed and the advance notice required for delivery will be those in effect for users in the United States. The United States Commission may agree to supply enriched uranium or perform enrichment services upon shorter notice, subject to assessment of such surcharge to the usual base price as the United States Commission may consider reasonable to cover abnormal production costs incurred by the United States Commission by reason of such shorter notice.

E. The adjusted net quantity of U^{235} in enriched uranium transferred from the United States of America to the Government of Switzerland under paragraphs A, B, and C of this Article during the period of this Agreement for Cooperation shall not exceed 30,000 kilograms. The following method of computation shall be used in calculating transfers, within the ceiling quantity of 30,000 kilograms of U^{235}, made pursuant to said paragraphs A, B, and C of this Article:

From:

(1) The quantity of U^{235} contained in enriched uranium transferred to the Government of Switzerland pursuant to said paragraphs A, B, and C, minus

(2) The quantity of U^{235} contained in an equal quantity of uranium of normal isotopic assay.

Subtract:

(3) The aggregate of the quantities of U^{235} contained in recoverable uranium of U.S. origin either transferred to the United States of America or to any other nation or group of nations with the approval of the Government of the United States of America pursuant to this Agreement, minus

(4) The quantity of U^{235} contained in an equal quantity of uranium of normal isotopic assay.

F. It is agreed that, should the total quantity of enriched uranium which the United States Commission has agreed to provide pursuant to this and other Agreements for Cooperation reach the maximum quantity of enriched uranium which the Commission has available for such purposes, and should the Government of Switzerland not have executed contracts covering the adjusted net quantity specified in paragraph E of this Article, the Commission may request, upon appropriate notice, that the Government of Switzerland execute contracts for all or any part of such enriched uranium as is not then under contract. It is understood that, should the Government of Switzerland not execute a contract in accordance with a request by the Commission hereunder, the Commission shall be relieved of all obligations to the Government of Switzerland with respect to the enriched uranium for which contracts have been so requested.

G. The enriched uranium supplied hereunder may contain up to twenty percent (20%) in the isotope U^{235}. The United States Commission, however, may make available a portion of the enriched uranium supplied hereunder as material containing more than 20% in the isotope U^{235} when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer.

H. It is understood, unless otherwise agreed, that in order to assure the availability of the entire quantity of enriched uranium allocated hereunder for a particular reactor project described in the Appendix, it will be necessary for the construction of the project to be initiated in accordance with the schedule set forth in the Appendix and for the Government of Switzerland to execute a contract for that quantity in time to allow for the United States Commission to provide the material for the first fuel loading. It is also understood that if the Government of Switzerland desires to contract for less than the entire quantity of enriched uranium allocated for a particular project or terminates the supply contract after execution, the remaining quantity allocated for that project shall cease to be available and the maximum adjusted net quantity of U^{235} provided for in paragraph E of this Article shall be reduced accordingly, unless otherwise agreed.

I. Within the limitations contained in paragraph E of this Article, the quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} transferred by the United States Commission under this Article and in the custody of the Government of Switzerland for the fueling of reactors or reactor experiments shall not at any time be in excess of the quantity thereof necessary for the loading of such reactors or reactor experiments, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Parties, is necessary for the efficient and continuous operation of such reactors or reactor experiments.

J. It is agreed that when any special nuclear material received from the United States of America requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor prior to delivery to the Commission or the facilities acceptable to the Commission for reprocessing.

K. With respect to any special nuclear material not owned by the Government of the United States of America produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States of America which is in excess of the need of the Government of Switzerland for such materials in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States of America shall have, and is hereby granted, (a) a first option to purchase such material at prices then prevailing in the United States of America for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation with the Government of the United States of America, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or a group of nations in the event the option to purchase is not exercised.

L. Special nuclear material produced, as a result of irradiation processes, in any part of the fuel leased hereunder shall be for the account of the Government of Switzerland, and, after reprocessing as provided in paragraph J of this Article, shall be returned to the Government of Switzerland, at which time title to such material shall be transferred to that Government, unless the Government of the United States of America shall exercise the option, which is hereby granted, to retain, with a credit to the Government of Switzerland based on the prices in the United States of America referred to in paragraph K of this Article, any such special nuclear material which is in excess of the needs of Switzerland for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

M. Some atomic energy materials which the Government of Switzerland may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this Agreement, or which have been provided to the Government of Switzerland under the superseded Agreement, are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of Switzerland, the Government of Switzerland shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States of America is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may lease pursuant to this Agreement, or may have leased pursuant to the superseded Agreement, to the Government of Switzerland or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction duly authorized to this effect, the Government of Switzerland shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States of America against any and all liability (including third party liability) for any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to the Government of Switzerland or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE VIII

As may be necessary and as may be mutually agreed in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article III, and subject to the limitations set forth in Article II, and under such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed, specific arrangements may be made from time to time between the Parties for the lease or sale of quantities of material, including heavy water and natural uranium, but not including special nuclear materials, greater than those required for research when such materials are not commercially available.

ARTICLE IX

A. The Government of Switzerland guarantees that:

(1) Safeguards provided in Article X shall be maintained.

(2) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Switzerland or authorized persons under its jurisdiction by purchase or otherwise pursuant to this Agreement or the superseded Agreement, and no special nuclear material produced through the use of such material, equipment and devices, including any such special nuclear material held under the superseded Agreement, will be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

(3) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Switzerland or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this Agreement or the superseded Agreement, and no special nuclear material produced through the use of such material, equipment, or devices, including any such special nuclear material held under the superseded Agreement, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Switzerland, except as the United States Commission may agree to such a transfer to another nation or group of nations, and then only if, in the opinion of the United States Commission, the transfer of the material is within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the other nation or group of nations.

B. The Government of the United States of America guarantees that no equipment or devices transferred from the Government of Switzerland to the Government of the United States of America or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this Agreement or the superseded Agreement, no material purchased by the Government of the United States of America pursuant to paragraph K of Article VII of this Agreement, and no material retained by the Government of the United States of America pursuant to paragraph L of Article VII of this Agreement, or an equivalent amount of material of the same type as such purchased or retained material substituted therefor, will be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

ARTICLE X

A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of Switzerland pursuant to this Agreement or the superseded Agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

B. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this Agreement are supplanted, by agreement of the Parties as provided in Article XI, by safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Agreement, shall have the following rights:

(1) With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any

(a) reactor and

(b) other equipment and devices, the design of which the United States Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards, which are to be made available to the Government of Switzerland or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate, or process any of the following materials so made available: source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission;

(2) With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of Switzerland or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment, or devices so made available:

(a) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission,

(b) reactors,

(c) any other equipment or device designated by the United States Commission as an item to be made available on the conditions that the provisions of this subparagraph B (2) will apply.

(i) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in ensuring accountability for such materials; and

(ii) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of Switzerland or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this Article and the guaranties set forth in Article IX;

(3) To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the United States Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph B (2) of this Article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in Switzerland and which is not purchased or retained by the Government of the United States of America pursuant to Article VII of this Agreement, transferred pursuant to Article VII, paragraph K (b), or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the Parties;

(4) To designate, after consultation with the Government of Switzerland, personnel who, accompanied, if either Party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of Switzerland, shall have access in Switzerland to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph B(2) of this Article, to determine whether there is compliance with this Agreement, and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary;

(5) In the event of non-compliance with the provisions of this Article or the guaranties set forth in Article IX and the failure of the Government of Switzerland to carry out the provisions of this Article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this Agreement and to require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph B(2) of this Article;

(6) To consult with the Government of Switzerland in the matter of health and safety.

C. The Government of Switzerland undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this Article.

ARTICLE XI

A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland, recognizing the desirability of making use of the facilities and services of the International Atomic Energy Agency, agree that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under this Agreement. It is contemplated that the necessary arrangements will be effected without modification of this Agreement through an agreement to be negotiated between the Parties and the Agency which may include provisions for suspension of the safeguard rights accorded to the United States Commission by Article X of this Agreement, during the time and to the extent that the Agency's safeguards apply to such materials and facilities.

B. In the event the Parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement on the terms of the trilateral arrangement envisaged in paragraph A of this Article, either Party may, by notification, terminate this Agreement. Before either Party takes steps to terminate this Agreement, the Parties will carefully consider the economic effects of any such termination. Neither Party will invoke its termination rights until the other Party has been given sufficient advance notice to permit arrangements by the Government of Switzerland, if it is the other Party, for an alternative source of power and to permit adjustment by the Government of the United States of America, if it is the other Party, of production schedules. In the event of termination by either Party, the Government of Switzerland shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to this Agreement and still in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of Switzerland for sold material so returned at the United States Commission's schedule of prices then in effect domestically.

ARTICLE XII

The rights and obligations of the Parties provided for under this Agreement shall extend to cooperative activities initiated under the superseded Agreement, including, but not limited to, material, equipment, devices, and information transferred thereunder, to the extent applicable.

ARTICLE XIII

For the purposes of this Agreement:

A. "United States Commission" or "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

B. "Parties" means the Government of the United States of America, including the United States Commission on behalf of the Government of the United States of America, and the Government of Switzerland, including the Office of the Federal Delegate for Atomic Energy Questions on behalf of the Government of Switzerland. "Party" means one of the above "Parties".

C. "Atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

D. "Byproduct material" means any radioactive material (except special nuclear material) yielded in or made radioactive by exposure to the radiation incident to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material.

E. "Equipment and devices" and "equipment or device" means any instrument, apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

F. "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency, or government corporation but does not include the Parties to this Agreement.

G. "Reactor" means an apparatus, other than an atomic weapon, in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium, or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium.

H. "Restricted Data" means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of Restricted Data by the appropriate authority.

I. "Source material" means (1) uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the United States Commission or the Government of Switzerland to be source material; or (2) ores containing one or more of the foregoing materials, in such concentration as the United States Commission or the Government of Switzerland may determine from time to time.

J. "Special nuclear material" means (1) plutonium, uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other material which the United States Commission or the Government of Switzerland determines to be special nuclear material; or (2) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing.

K. "Superseded Agreement" means the Agreement signed by the Parties on June 21, 1956, as amended by the Agreement signed on April 24, 1959, and the Agreement signed on June 11, 1960.

L. "Safeguards" means a system of controls designed to assure that any materials, equipment, or devices committed to the peaceful uses of atomic energy are not used to further any military purpose.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Agreement.

Done at Washington in duplicate, in the English and French languages, both equally authentic, this 30th day of December 1965.

For the Government of the United States of America:

WALTER J. STOESSEL,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, Department of State.
GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of Switzerland:

ALFRED ZEHNDER,
Ambassador of Switzerland, Embassy of Switzerland.

Certified to be a true copy:

WILLIAM L. YEOMANS,
Chief, European Branch, Division of International Affairs, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

APPENDIX

Swiss enriched uranium power reactor program

Reactors (1)	Start of construction (2)	Total kilograms U^{235} required[1] (3)
A. NOK, 350 megawatts electric, PWR (Beznau)	1965	7,560
B. Atom-Electra, 600 megawatts electric (Electrowatt)	1966	9,220
C. 100 megawatts electric	1967	970
D. Bernese, 300 megawatts electric (Muhleberg I)	1967	6,058
E. Bernese, 300 megawatts electric (Muhleberg II)	1970	5,160
Total		28,968

[1] As calculated in art. VII, par. E, of the Agreement or Cooperation.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., October 29, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance with section 123(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed agreement, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would supersede the "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland," signed at Washington on June 21, 1956, as amended. The Agreement for Cooperation signed in 1955 covering a limited program of research was allowed to expire on July 17, 1965, inasmuch as the cooperative activities initiated under that agreement had been brought under the provisions of the existing power agreement.

The primary reasons for entering into a new agreement are (a) to provide the framework for assuring the long-term supply of enriched fuel required for the projected Swiss nuclear power program and (b) to implement provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, which were added by recent amendments, permitting the performance of uranium enrichment services by the Commission and the private ownership of special nuclear material.

The proposed agreement, which would have a term of 30 years, would provide for the conduct of activities on an unclassified basis, in contrast to the existing agreement which permits the exchange of classified information.

Article VI of the new agreement would reflect the recent changes in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 permitting private ownership of special nuclear material by enabling private parties in the United States and Switzerland to be parties to arrangements for the transfer of special nuclear material. Previously, such transactions were confined to governments. Arrangements made directly between private parties under the proposed article VI would be undertaken pursuant to applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of the United States and Swiss Governments.

Article VII of the proposed agreement would permit the sale of enriched uranium required for the long-term Swiss power reactor program described in the appendix to the agreement and would increase the maximum quantity of U^{235} that could be transferred to Switzerland from the present limit of 500 kilograms to 30,000 kilograms.

Article VII would also permit the Commission to perform uranium enrichment services after December 31, 1968, for the account of the Government of Switzerland under terms and conditions which the Commission may establish. In addition, the Commission would be able, at its discretion, to make available to the Government of Switzerland uranium enriched to more than 20 percent in the isoptope U^{235} when there is an economic or technical justification for such a transfer.

In keeping with stated Commission policy, article VII also includes language which assures the comparability of domestic and foreign prices for enriched uranium and services performed, as well as of the advance notice required for delivery.

Article IX would continue in effect the U.S. guarantee that no equipment or device transferred to the Government of the United States will be used for military purposes. The U.S. guarantee would also extend to (a) special nuclear material produced in U.S.-fueled reactors which is in excess of Switzerland's needs and which the United States decides to purchase, and (b) special nuclear material produced in U.S.-leased fuel which the United States elects to retain after reprocessing, or, alternatively, to equivalent amounts of such purchased or retained material.

In keeping with U.S. policy to arrive at explicit understandings with countries with which we have cooperative agreements as to the transfer of safeguards to the International Atomic Energy Agency, article XI of the proposed agreement provides that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement.

Following your determination, approval, and authorization, the proposed agreement will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Governments of the United States and Switzerland. In compliance with section 123(c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the proposed agreement will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

(Enclosure: Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland.)

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., December 2, 1965.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SEABORG: In accordance with section 123(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me by a letter of October 29, 1965, a proposed "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," and has recommended that I approve the proposed agreement, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 123 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby (a) approve the proposed agreement and determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America; and (b) authorize the execution of the proposed agreement on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. GORE. I am also scheduling a public hearing by the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation concerning these amendments, beginning on January 27, 1966.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

A PLEA FOR PATIENCE AND COURAGE IN THE SEARCH FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, those of us in positions of public trust are now involved in what may be the most fateful decision-making period of our lives. The war in Vietnam will either begin to move this year toward a peaceful resolution—however slow and uncertain the road—or it will degenerate into a deepening morass that may claim the lives of our sons and the sons of Asia for years to come. A major war on the Asian mainland could exhaust America's blood and treasure for all our days and in the end create conditions of bitterness and despair that would curse us for a generation. I believe that preventing that war is the most urgent task of statesmanship of the next 10 or more years.

The sober report of Senator MANSFIELD, the distinguished majority leader, and our colleagues who traveled with him in Asia this fall, concludes:

> The situation, as it now appears, offers only the very slim prospect of a just settlement by negotiations or the alternative prospect of a continuance of the conflict in the direction of a general war on the Asian mainland.

Those observations state my own impressions better than I could after a visit to Vietnam in late November and early December. The Mansfield report is a document which every American policy planner, every Member of Congress, and every concerned American citizen should read and ponder carefully. The Senator from Montana, who has no peer in the Senate as an authority on southeast Asia, and his distinguished colleagues including the highly respected senior Republican of the Senate, Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, have performed a great service to the Nation and to the peace of the world. Their report may prove to be one of the most significant documents in recent years in that it has given our country a clearer view of the hard and dangerous realities that now face us in Vietnam.

I am deeply grateful to President Johnson, who carries the heaviest burden of us all, that he has stopped the bombing of North Vietnam in spite of the objections of some of his advisers. The more we can reduce the scope of this struggle and confine it to the local trouble in Saigon, where it began, the less danger there will be of losing our young men in an inconclusive and widening war.

I am deeply grateful, too, for the President's vigorous efforts in recent days to find a diplomatic breakthrough to an honorable settlement of the war. We need now to exercise great patience and courage during the President's current efforts for peace. We have been patient for five years with those who offered a military solution to the problem. Now let us be equally persistent and equally patient in the effort to find a peaceful solution. Each time our Vietnam policymakers have offered a new formula for winning the war they have been proved wrong. Yet, we have not only been patient with these strategists; we have permitted them to launch new and larger ventures. Many Members of the Congress, even those with deep apprehension about our growing involvement in the Vietnam struggle, have kept silent or have restrained their dissent rather than risk weakening the various strategies we have tried on the battlefield. Now the time has come to exercise the same patience and perseverance in the search for a peaceful settlement. Just as we have tried a wide range of military efforts, and experiments of various kinds, we now need to try a full range of diplomatic and political efforts to end the war. Patience is cheaper than blood, and an honorable peace is better than the length of the daily body count. Prime Minister Shastri's last recorded words, spoken to his defense minister, were: "We must fight for peace bravely as we fought in war." That is an appropriate admonition to all nations.

So let us not be too quick to launch the bombing attacks again. I think it is clear that we have nothing to gain and much to lose by resuming the bombing of North Vietnam. First of all, these attacks have been largely ineffective militarily. They were designed to stop the flow of North Vietnamese soldiers into South Vietnam, but as Secretary McNamara observed recently, after returning from a trip to Vietnam, there are now several times as many North Vietnamese in the south as when we started the bombing last February. Furthermore, we have suffered a heavy loss of skilled pilots and costly airplanes in the bombing effort. The advocates of resuming the bombing look at the losses on the other side, but they do not consider the losses on our side. Our losses have been excessive in terms of the limited damage to the enemy's military capability. In one instance reported to me, we lost three highly trained pilots and three expensive bombers trying unsuccessfully to knock out a little bridge of secondary military importance. As a former bomber pilot who has asked many questions of some of our thoughtful military tacticians, I see little or no military advantage in resuming the bombing of North Vietnam. Quite the contrary, the record indicates that North Vietnam responds to the bombings by sending more forces southward. In other words the bombing missions in the north may result in the death of more American soldiers in the south.

Nor is there any compelling diplomatic or political reason for resuming the bombings. They have not put Hanoi in a more favorable mood to negotiate. The lessons of recent history are that bombing attacks infuriate and unite a people behind their government in rigid resistance to the attackers. To produce a climate favorable for discussion, which is now the announced top priority of our Government, both sides need time for the clash of battle, the hatreds, and tensions to cool down. That process cannot be enhanced by resuming the bombing raids on the bridges and buildings that the people of North Vietnam have built at such sacrifice in recent years.

Furthermore, President Johnson with imagination and vision has sent his top diplomats around the world and around this city to the various embassies, urging many other governments to use their good offices in persuading the Government of North Vietnam to enter discussions with us looking toward a settlement of the war. Friendly governments in eastern Europe, such as Yugoslavia and many other countries have at our request agreed to assist in the search for a peaceful settlement. These concerned governments which have placed their confidence in us have urged for months that we halt the bombing. Now they need time—perhaps many months—to convince Hanoi that a satisfactory settlement can be achieved with the United States, and with other interested governments and groups which are involved in the struggle. If we were to resume bombings now or in the near future, I tremble to think of the staggering blow this would be to our presently favorable position with the many governments whose help we have asked in the search for peace.

I sometimes think that one of the great, unrecognized costs of this crisis is that we have neglected our relationships with other major countries that are important to the long-range security of our country and peace of the world.

A front-page story in today's New York Times reports:

> The Governments of Britain, France and Japan, all allies of the United States, and the Communist governments of Europe as well as the governments of a number of nonalined nations are said to be pleading for several more weeks or even months of restraint. More time is needed for diplomatic maneuver, they maintain, and for a better assessment of North Vietnam's interest in tempering if not settling the conflict.

Mr. President, these countries are being bitterly chided by Red China who is telling them that the bombing pause is just a lull before we hit even harder. Let us not play into the hands of the Chinese Communists and undercut our friends by resuming the bombing as China insists we are about to do.

It would seem to me that we should also exercise caution in the conduct of the war in the south. I frankly was puzzled by our recent offensive in the delta involving 8,000 American soldiers. Why is it necessary to engage in such large offensive operations during this intensive search for a peaceful settlement? I hope there will be no more such engagements undertaken by us unless the other side forces the issue. We are advised by the President and by others that it has been several weeks since any North Vietnamese forces have engaged our troops in battle and that Vietcong initiated incidents have been reduced during the bombing pause. Why, then should we needlessly risk the death of our own soldiers in major offensive campaigns when our diplomats are trying to reach an end to the war? Would it not be more realistic and sensible to defend our present position and hold the line while the peace efforts are underway rather than to launch new operations that can only lead to loss of life and perhaps complicate the search for a settlement? Now would seem the time to escalate the peace offensive and deescalate the killing. As Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, one of the wisest Members of the Senate and in our country, put it in a thoughtful statement recently:

> Negotiation, not escalation, should be the dominant theme of our activity now.

Let me make my own position clear. I have never agreed with the foreign policy assumptions that first took us into southeast Asia in an active combat role. Nor do I accept those assumptions now. Southeast Asia is outside the perimeter of our vital interests. Furthermore, it is an area convulsed by nationalistic revolutionary movements aimed at ineffective and sometimes corrupt local regimes. We identify with such regimes and against popular revolutionary movements at our peril. We have no commitment or interest in southeast Asia that justifies the sacrifice of American troops on the scale necessary to win a military decision.

In 1954 when the French were on the verge of military disaster in Vietnam, there were those who urged that American troops be sent in an effort to turn the tide. That move was blocked in considerable part because of the sound advice of our then Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Matthew Ridgway, whose warnings made sense to another experienced general, President Dwight Eisenhower. In his book, "Soldier: The Memoirs of Matthew B. Ridgway," published in 1956, General Ridgway wrote:

> When the day comes for me to face my Maker and account for my actions, the thing I would be most humbly proud of was the fact that I fought against, and perhaps contributed to preventing the carrying out of some harebrained tactical schemes which would have cost the lives of thousands of men. To that list of tragic accidents that fortunately never happened I would add the Indochina intervention.

In hearings before the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate in May 1951, the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur—a man of vast military experience in Asia, confirmed an earlier statement he had made on NBC when he asserted: "Anybody who commits the land power of the United States on the continent of Asia ought to have his head examined."

At the same hearing, one of our wisest and ablest generals of World War II, Gen. Omar Bradley, said:

> I would hate very much to see us involved in a land war in Asia. I think we would be fighting a wrong war at the wrong place and against a wrong enemy.

I agree with General Ridgway, General MacArthur, General Bradley—and, more recently, with General James Gavin—and others that the United States should never commit our manpower to a major war on the Asian mainland except in the event of a direct attack on the United States such as occurred at Pearl Harbor some 25 years ago.

Anyone who believes that it is easy for a Western power to win a war against Asia's limitless manpower, its dense jungles, and its vast terrain should read the testimony of our generals in full when they were being interrogated for the record. If those warnings do not suffice, let those who advocate a bigger war, and who are in a hurry to resume the bombing and step up the war, ponder the careful language of Senator MANSFIELD and his colleagues:

> If present trends continue, there is no assurance as to what ultimate increase in American military commitment will be required before the conflict is terminated. For the fact is that under present terms of reference and as the war has evolved, the question is not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation, but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open ended.

Mr. President, those are sober words. They are not overly emotional. I believe that the "open ended" situation to which the Mansfield report refers is the pathway to Armageddon and the loss of our national strength in a war without end.

So I oppose any further extension of this highly dangerous war.

Furthermore, I believe the President is right in making certain modifications in our previous diplomatic position so that we can better clear the path to a conference with the other side. I said recently in an NBC televised interview that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to negotiate an end to this war without recognizing the primary interest of the South Vietnamese rebel leaders in both the negotiations and the postwar provisional government. This, I think, has been a major barrier to negotiations. If one studies the two proposed negotiating positions of Hanoi and Washington, it becomes clear that one sticking point centers on the question of whether or not the National Liberation Front of the Vietcong shall play a role in the negotiations and in the postwar settlement. At a time when this group is in control of two-thirds of the terrain and from one-third to one-half of the people of Vietnam, it is unrealistic to think that they can be left out of the negotiating efforts or the post-war settlement. Such an approach would have been paralleled in our early history if King George III had expressed a willingness to negotiate with our French ally while ignoring George Washington and his rebel Americans.

As to what specific part the Vietcong rebels should play in the postwar provisional government of South Vietnam, that is a matter to be decided at the conference table and eventually to be decided by free elections on the part of the people of Vietnam. I am encouraged by recent reports that our Government has indicated a new willingness to recognize these political realities.

We need to pursue the search for peace in Vietnam in a variety of ways until the war is ended. If we can afford to experiment for long years with costly techniques of destruction, we ought to have the self-discipline to devote at least the balance of this year to the search for peace before we consider any extension of the war. Each time our strategists have mistakenly predicted that the war would be won if we just tried one more technique or expansion, we have simply redoubled the military prescription. And now Senator MANSFIELD and his colleagues report, after all the sacrifice, that the military lines are about the same at the end of 1965 as they were at the end of 1964.

We have gone, almost without realizing what was happening, from a seemingly harmless offer of economic assistance some 12 years ago, offers by President Eisenhower, to the point where we now have almost one-fourth of a million American men on land and immediately offshore on naval units engaged in combat roles.

We have been bombing South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Laos, and now, folly of follies, there are those who are urging that we ought to bomb Cambodia and the cities of North Vietnam and perhaps even China.

But each extension of the war has only resulted in more troops from the other side. So let those who talk of easy solutions through more soldiers and more bombs and more guns recognize that their past advice has only taken more of our soldiers to their deaths. In one breath these strategists deplore that American boys are coming home in wooden boxes. But in the next breath they offer a so-called victory formula that might send 100,000 young Americans home in boxes. They say to the President, let us not talk of ending this war until we have destroyed the enemy, until we have won a victory.

Do they know what that means? Have they counted the cost? Do they know that may involve sending a million American boys to the jungles of Asia to pursue an elusive rebel force that is everywhere and yet nowhere—a rebel force that defeated the cream of the French Army, a force of half a million men? Do they know that we are confronted by dedicated guerrilla fighters so intermingled with the civilian populace that to kill the guerrillas would involve slaughtering men, women, and children by the tens of thousands whose support we need?

A veteran reporter of the New York Times, Jack Languth, after spending more than a year traveling with our forces in South Vietnam and viewing the operations at first hand, came to the conculsion that we might be able to win a military victory of sorts. However, he said that to do it we would have to kill at least two or three innocent men, women, and children who are on our side for every Vietcong guerrilla we were able to destroy.

Mr. President, I suggest that that is a price that is not worthy of the interest involved.

A year ago when some of us took the Senate floor to warn against the deepening U.S. involvement in that self-defeating war and to urge that our country express its willingness to negotiate an honorable settlement, we were accused on this floor of running up a white flag and deserting our President. But as I said then, those gentlemen who talk of total victory will not be the ones who give their lives in that so-called victory. It will be our sons and the sons of other nations. Nor will those gentlemen who call for total victory necessarily stand with the President. Some of them will try to turn this dangerous venture that they urge on the President into a political gain for themselves and political destruction for the President and his administration.

That is what they did when the Korean involvement turned sour 15 years ago, and that is what they would try to do with Vietnam.

In June of 1950, President Truman ordered American troops to Korea to turn back the Communist invaders from North Korea. That mission had a limited purpose—to repel the aggressors and reestablish the legitimacy of the 38th parallel. In a few months' time, with a moderate loss of life, our troops drove the invader back to his side of the demarcation line. But then the momentum of the war took charge and the administration nervously approved sending our troops far into North Korea to try for a total victory over the enemy. Then came the great tragedy of the Korean war. As our troops approached the Chinese border, Peiping ordered its forces into the war a million strong—in spite of General MacArthur's intelligence reports that this would not happen. The Korean war then took on a bloody dimension that eventually cost us 50,000 American casualties and billions of dollars. In the end, after months of bloodshed, we finally settled on a cease-fire at the 38th parallel, which we could have had at a fraction of the cost in lives and treasure many long months earlier had we not seen fit to escalate the war.

So I hope and pray that the President will continue the bombing pause in North Vietnam indefinitely, that he will confine our military action in South Vietnam so that we lose the least possible number of those brave American men I visited in Vietnam last month—that he will go all out not for a so-called victory which only means that the jungles of Asia will be drenched with American blood—but rather that he will continue to expand and diversify and strengthen the quest for a peaceful settlement.

On July 27 of last year, I took the Senate floor to describe what I believed to be the realities then facing us in Vietnam. Because I believe that analysis is equally valid today, I quote a few of my earlier remarks as follows:

> We are talking here, however, of a major war involving thousands of American casualties, the expenditure of billions of dollars, vast bloodshed and destruction for the Vietnamese people, and an uncertain outcome. There are other possible side results of such a war that may be even more serious in the long run than the war itself, including:
>
> (1) the worsening of relations between the world's two major nuclear powers, the Soviet Union and the United States;
>
> (2) the strengthening of the most belligerent leadership elements in the Communist world and the weakening of the moderate forces;
>
> (3) the growing conviction in Asia, whether justified or not, that the United States is a militaristic power with a low regard for the lives of Asiatics and an excessive concern over other people's ideologies and political struggles; and
>
> (4) the derailment of efforts toward world peace and the improvement of life in the developing countries, to say nothing of its impact on our own hopes, for a better society.

The questions now before us, I said on July 27, are:

> (1) Do we continue to accelerate the struggle toward a major war? (2) Do we call it off and withdraw our forces? or (3) Do we consolidate our present position, keep our casualties at a minimum, and hold out indefinitely for a negotiated settlement?
>
> I strongly recommend the third course. I urge that we stop the bombing attacks in both North and South Vietnam. Bombing is largely ineffective in a guerrilla war and more often than not kills the wrong people. We should also stop the jungle land skirmishes which subject our soldiers to ambush. Instead, let us consolidate our troops in a holding action in the cities and well-defended enclaves along the coast. We can hold the cities and the coastal enclaves with few casualties and with little likelihood that the Vietcong will attack frontally. Such a plan would provide a haven for anti-Communist, pro-Government citizens including the religious groups, and would demonstrate that we are not going to be pushed out.
>
> Furthermore, it is based on the realities of the present political and military map of Vietnam. While we are in control of the cities and the coast, the guerrillas control most of the rural and village areas. To dislodge them would be to destroy in the process thousands of the innocent civilians we are trying to save.

And I might add, whose support will decide in the long run the outcome of this struggle.

> A policy of restricting our military efforts in Vietnam to a holding action in tne cities and the coastal enclaves will avoid this kind of self-defeating jungle warfare. We can supply, feed, and defend, the urban and coastal areas with a modest effort and minimum loss of life. This is a strategy that calls primarily for restraint and patience until such time as the Vietcong get it through their heads that we will not be pushed out. I have been critical of our unilateral Vietnam involvement, and I think the original commitment and its acceleration was a mistake. But we made the commitment, and I would be prepared to support the kind of holding action outlined above until we can reach an acceptable settlement of the struggle.

That ends the remarks that I made on the Senate floor last July.

Mr. President, that approach to our present involvement in Vietnam has recently been recommended in convincing terms by former Gen. James M. Gavin, in a communication for the current issue of Harper's magazine. I hope all of our policymakers will read that thoughtful communication by one of our most able former generals.

Since I made the foregoing remarks last July, our pilots have flown thousands of bombing sorties. Let me say here parenthetically that we have never sent any better men into combat than those pilots and our other men now fighting in Vietnam. We have sent another 125,000 troops into combat—a thousand of them giving their lives and another 5,000 being maimed or wounded since last summer. The Vietnamese people, caught in the crossfire between the two sides, have been ground to death by the thousands in recent months.

These developments have only served to strengthen my conviction of months ago that we must find a way to end this war. I believe that involves continuing the bombing pause. I believe it involves consolidating the line militarily, while pushing in every possible way for a peaceful settlement. I know that is going to be difficult, painful, and may not produce an entirely happy outcome. But the alternative, as the Mansfield report makes perfectly clear, is a larger and bloodier war, which I think is sheer madness.

During my tour of Vietnam I visited, among other installations, a large American airbase. At one point the driver made a mistaken turn, and we found our car blocked by a large flatbed truck. As I remember, there were several other trucks waiting to pull into the road behind it. As we sat there, I noticed that the truck carried a long row of silent coffins, each one bearing the address in the United States of a fallen soldier: a sergeant from Oklahoma, a captain from Minnesota, a marine corporal from Tennessee, a major from Connecticut, with all those different names that make up the United States—Scandanavian, Irish, German, Czech.

I sat there momentarily looking at those coffins glistening silently in the sun, and I thought what a tragic waste of young life and laughter and love. The day before I visited a hopelessly overcrowded civilian hospital in Da Nang with all its torn victims of the war—children with their legs and arms torn from their bodies by the bombing attacks; old men, mothers and infants, blasted and burned by napalm jelly, some mutilated almost beyond recognition—all of them watching us silently, without a murmur and without a sound, as we moved around from bed to bed in that overcrowded hospital.

I wondered then, as I did while we waited before that truck carrying the bodies of American soldiers, have I done my part as a Senator to prevent this from happening? Have I spoken out honestly and courageously enough? What more can I do as a citizen and as a Senator to help move mankind toward a better solution of our differences than this?

The last time I was so deeply moved by the tragedy of senseless violence was when I stood in Arlington Cemetery in November of 1963 and saw a gallant young President laid to rest. Recall his words:

> So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

In what I personally regard as his greatest speech, the American University speech of June 10, 1963, which opened the way for the nuclear test ban treaty, he cited that ancient Biblical promise, "When a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." I believe we share his resolution that "We shall do our part to build a world of peace where the weak are safe and the strong are just. We are not helpless before that task or hopeless of its success. Confident and unafraid," he said, "we labor on—not toward a strategy of annihilation but toward a strategy of peace."

That, I believe, is the deepest desire of our great President, Lyndon Johnson, of Vice President HUMPHREY whose every instinct reaches out for peace, and of Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara, with whom I happen to disagree on some of their recommendations, but who have for years sacrificed every ounce of their energy of mind and body to their country for what they believed was the national interest. That is the desire, too, of Ambassador Goldberg and Averell Harriman and our other leaders. The cause of peace is the most urgent heartthrob of every American mother and father. It is the wistful hope of our young men—of their wives and girl friends. I believe it is the most profound longing of a war-weary world.

Our President said in his superb state of the Union address a few days ago: "I will try to end this battle and return our sons to their desires."

I have the faith to believe that however difficult the task, President Johnson has the will and the capacity to achieve this purpose, and achieving it, to win that high place in history—that blessing of immortality reserved for those who make peace among men and nations.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I congratulate the Senator from South Dakota on a brilliant, carefully logical, and, to my way of thinking, irrefutable approach to the difficult problem which confronts us in Vietnam.

This is a speech which is not only beautifully organized from a logical and persuasive point of view, but it is also an eloquent speech, with a clear understanding of the human values involved in the useless and largely unnecessary slaughter which is presently going on in Vietnam.

I congratulate the Senator. I wish I had the ability to write a similar analysis of our problems today and to suggest an equally cogent and reasonable solution.

Let me say to the Senator that he need have no fear that he has not done his part as a Senator to keep these tragic events from continuing to happen. He certainly has spoken out, honestly and courageously. I would hope that every one of his 99 colleagues would read his speech and ask themselves the same question I asked myself as the Senator was speaking: Have I done my part as a Senator to keep this slaughter from continuing? Have I spoke out honestly and courageously enough? Do I believe in this war to total victory in the jungles of southeast Asia, and, if so, why?

I certainly feel, as does the Senator, that it would be a tragic mistake to start the bombing of North Vietnam again, until such time as it is clear beyond peradventure that there is no reasonable hope we can end this useless, tragic slaughter either by moving the war from the battlefield to the negotiating table, or, in the alternative, to a mutual but unilateral de-escalation as a result of which the shooting will slowly but surely stop, as it did in Malaya some years ago, the Senator will recall.

If the Senator will permit me, I should like to make a few comments and then ask him to observe whether he would agree with them or not.

I have seen in the newspapers that of some 2,600 villages in South Vietnam, the South Vietnamese Government, and ourselves control a mere 700. I have seen maps—as I am sure the Senator has, too—which show the minimal amount of real estate which is still, 24 hours a day, under the control of the South Vietnamese Army or of the American Army

I have seen three little enclaves which are held by our side in the middle of the country, in the northern part of South Vietnam, enclaves which to my untutored gaze—although I served in World War II for 4 years—are potential Dienbienphus.

I do not believe that we control all of the coastline. I believe the maps show that we control only the major portion. I was told by two members of the Mansfield committee the other day—and I am sure there is nothing secret about this—that when the senatorial airplane took off from the Saigon airport to leave the country, the Vietcong had to be chased off the runway with napalm bombs. I have been told that the Vietcong are within 3 miles of the perimeter of Saigon, that most of the food that the people of Saigon eat has already had a tax levied upon it by the Vietcong, that the highways could be cut and interdicted at any time, and that 80 percent of the members serving in the Vietcong army were born and brought up in South Vietnam, although they may have temporarily gone to the north and then come back.

I have been told that access to the city of Saigon from the sea by water is a channel only one ship wide, that there are 35 ships awaiting to be unloaded in that harbor, that only one ship can get in at a time, that in darkness the waterway could be cut, in all likelihood, by sinking one or two junks across it any time the Vietcong wish to do so, that the huge oil supplies necessary for the use of our Air Force and the South Vietnamese Air Force are in constant jeopardy from sabotage and attack, being located, as they are, in the area of Saigon, and that the only reason the Vietcong do not render Saigon untenable is that we have not bombed Hanoi, that actually one capital city stands as hostage for the other.

I wonder whether the Senator from South Dakota has similar information, and what comments he may care to make on what I have just said.

Mr. McGOVERN. Before I comment on the Senator's questions, which are certainly pertinent and go to the heart of some of the realities we face, I thank him for the kind words he just spoke about my remarks on the Senate floor this afternoon. As he knows, we have been in agreement on this issue, for the most part, for many months. I have felt that the Senator from Pennsylvania has spoken out as clearly, as forcefully, and as courageously on this issue, and, perhaps more important, as accurately, as any Member of the Senate. So to have his statement here in the RECORD reinforcing what I have tried to say makes me all the more confident of my position. I am very grateful to him.

With regard to the points he has made respecting the military situation that faces us in Vietnam, I do not feel in a position to comment with any great technical knowledge about that, but I do agree with the Senator that it is a very discouraging prospect. I do not think our own military people in South Vietnam are under any illusions about what they are up against. We have highly competent military officers in Vietnam. They have made clear, from General Westmoreland on down, a military victory would require an enormous increase in American forces.

The French military effort ended with a disastrous defeat at Dien Bien Phu some 12 years ago in spite of the fact that they had committed a land force of something over 400,000 men. That is twice the number we have now committed to this conflict.

So I do not blame our military people for asking for reinforcements. I think they realize, as the Senator from Pennsylvania does, that they are up against a dangerous situation.

I do question the policy assumptions that have led us into this situation in Vietnam and the military mission we have asked our forces to undertake.

Mr. CLARK. I share the Senator's concern. I would hope the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, the President of the United States, would redefine for us our diplomatic and military policies in Vietnam, and just what our military and diplomatic objectives are.

I am as concerned as is the Senator from South Dakota at the escalation of the war and having our American boys hunting through elephant grass to look for the elusive Vietcong. As Walter Lippmann said some time ago, what we are doing there is very much like trying to punch water. As soon as one pulls out his arm, the water comes back, and often spills over him.

The policy which the Senator from South Dakota has advocated is to fight a defensive war at our strongpoints—I would hope with our backs to the sea—while we proceed in an honorable way to try to persuade the Communists and others in South Vietnam who are not Communists—and there are many of those—that we are not going to leave until there is an honorable peace that will include free elections by the people of South Vietnam to select those they want to govern them.

What concerns me is what appears to be a tug of war between various highly located persons in the executive and administrative arms of our Government. For example, I read this in the newspapers. I did not acquire this information through access to any classified document. It was stated that General Westmoreland and Ambassador Lodge are really opposed to negotiating at this point because they believe the military situation is too unfortunate from our point of view to enable us to get a satisfactory settlement.

The map to which I referred gives graphic evidence that the question involved is how many Americans we are prepared to have killed in order to improve the military situation. I for one do not want a single American killed to reclaim useless jungle land in South Vietnam.

Although I expressed it more explosively than did the Senator from South Dakota, I wonder if he would comment on my statement.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think the Senator's point is well taken. If we had some assurance that after prodigious military effort on our part we would have created conditions that would permit democracy to flourish in South Vietnam, perhaps some argument could be made that the effort would be worthwhile. We have no such assurance. What we do have is some indication that the more we try to attack the Vietcong forces by military means, the more we terrorize and destroy the civilian population with which they are intermingled.

One of the reporters who has been over there for some time and who has been watching our efforts to destroy the Vietcong forces in the villages and jungles has suggested that the attacks we are making would make more sense if we were fighting an enemy rather than an ally. What he meant was that when we bomb a village or area controlled by the Vietcong guerrillas, or when we shell those areas or spray them with machinegun bullets, or destroy their crops we are destroying and alienating the civilian population, whose aid we will need if we are to attain our objective.

Mr. CLARK. And to continue these tactics makes the result almost inevitable that we will lose any election which we may prearrange.

Mr. McGOVERN. That is my own judgment. I have tried to read the history of what happened when the French were involved against the Vietcong from 1945 to about 1954. A number of people who have written about that struggle have said that one of the most frequently used tactics of the Vietcong—which were then called the Vietminh—was to put up a flag in a village friendly to the French Government, or to take a pot shot at a French airplane. The French would then bomb that village or area—thereby losing the support of the people, and another area would go to the Communist side. It seems to me there is a danger of our falling into the same trap.

Mr. CLARK. One factor which no amount of acceleration of the war or increase in American aid is going to change is that it is impossible to tell foe from friend. They all look exactly alike. A friend of mine, a Pennsylvanian, a great statesman, an eminent politician, said that it was like things were during the troubles over the Irish Republic. One Irishman looked exactly like another. During the day they would say, "Three cheers for Great Britain," and as soon as dark fell, they would go out and shoot the British troops. It is difficult to distinguish friend from foe. While the clothes and the climate and the location are different, there is an analogy to any guerrilla warfare where forces try to do things that the people do not want them to do.

I will ask the Senator to comment on two more points.

First. I was under the view until recently that this was not our war, but that it was a war which involved the people of South Vietnam; but that it had been our policy to send them technical assistance and support. My recollection is that at the end of 1963 we had 10,000 men there. The next year it increased to 34,000, and we now have some 200,000 there. The President has sent to us an appropriation request to enable him to increase the number of our military forces by more than 100,000, with the implication that some of these additional forces will also go to Vietnam.

I wonder whether the Senator from South Dakota agrees with my view that there should be a full debate in some depth on the floor of the Senate before we agree to the requested appropriation. Certainly we should not be parties to a unanimous consent which would enable the request to be rushed through in 5 hours, as the request for $700 million was rushed through last year.

I would hope that the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee would ask searching questions of

Secretary of Defense McNamara and the Joint Chiefs of Staff as to what they plan to do with the money. Are they committed to escalate the war or not?

I do not wish to put the Senator from South Dakota in an invidious position, nor do I desire to indicate that I shall vote against the request.

Does the Senator believe that the time has come for debate with respect to the Vietnamese policy?

Mr. McGOVERN. I welcome the opportunity to comment on that question. The Senator is not putting me on the spot.

I believe that one of the unfortunate aspects of our South Vietnam involvement is that there has been so little searching and thoughtful debate either in committee or on the floor of the Senate.

As I indicated in my remarks earlier, we did not make any commitment originally to fight a war on behalf of South Vietnam or anyone else. What President Eisenhower said in October 1954, when he made the first American offer of assistance to South Vietnam, was that we would make available a modest amount of economic aid, provided the government in Saigon would carry out some desperately needed political and social reforms. Those reforms were never carried out. We were absolved at that point, with respect to the offers of economic assistance.

We maintained for the next 10 years, that this was not our war; that this was basically a struggle to be resolved by the people of South Vietnam.

President Kennedy said in a press conference in September 1963, a few months before he was killed, that in the final analysis this was their war; that they were the ones who must win or lose it. He said that we can send men there as advisers and offer a certain amount of equipment, but we cannot win a war for freedom for other people. This is a struggle they have to win for themselves.

I believe that it is disastrous from the standpoint of our own interests and the interests of the people of South Vietnam for us to try to impose a military and political solution in that part of the world from the outside.

I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania in his hope that one day elections can be held, hopefully under international supervision. I do not believe that it necessarily follows that the elections would go against our interests.

I do not know what the outcome would be. But if arrangements could be made for honest elections under international supervision, we ought to abide by the result, even though we do not like the government that might emerge.

We found in Eastern and Central Europe, that when a country like Yugoslavia took on a Communist government, the world did not come to an end.

If we did not have problems with other countries any more serious than the problems we have with Yugoslavia, we could celebrate with joy. It is not fatal to American security when an election does not come out as I would like to see it come out. We can continue to exert influence in various ways as we have in Eastern Europe and even in our relations with the Soviet Union.

Mr. CLARK. I congratulate my friend from South Dakota for the fine address he made. I associate myself with his recommendations.

I hope that our beloved friend, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and the President, who I understand announced this afternoon that bombing would resume at the end of the new year holiday, will take a hard look at the recommendations of Omar Bradley, Ridgway, MacArthur, and Gavin and have second thoughts as to the desirability of accelerating this war.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my NBC interview with Sander Vanocur of January 5, 1966; a press release of that date; and a New York Times article, written by E. W. Kenworthy, published on January 6, 1966, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator George McGovern

Mr. Merrill Mueller. Congress reassembles next week, and it's expected that sometime in the next 2 months there will be a debate on our future course in Vietnam. Since Congress adjourned last fall, many legislators went to Vietnam for a firsthand look at the war, its causes and its effects. Their voices will be heard when the debate takes place.

One Senator who has been over there, George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, is in our Washington studio this morning with "Today Show" Correspondent Sander Vanocur. Sandy?

Mr. Sander Vanocur. Thank you, Merrill. Senator McGovern, what is the future for the United States in Vietnam, after you've been there and taken a look for yourself?

Senator George McGovern. Well, Sandy, I think the best we can hope for is a negotiated settlement. I don't see how either the other side or our side can score a decisive military victory. We have a truly superb group of military men fighting in Vietnam. I don't think this country has ever assembled a more capable, better trained, more dedicated or more ably led group of fighting forces than the men that we have in Vietnam, but they're up against enormous and, I think, overwhelming odds, because of the terrain of that country, because most of natural advantages are with the Vietcong; they're so elusive, they're so intermingled with the civilian population, which supposedly we're trying to win over to our side, that if we were to destroy the Vietcong, we'd have to destroy a large part of the civilian population in the process.

So it seems to me that the most practical goal that we can hope for is to hold the line, and then press very hard, which I think we're now doing, for some kind of a peaceful settlement.

Mr. Vanocur. Well, Senator, as a former distinguished bomber pilot in World War II, one of your objectives was to talk to the bomber pilots in Vietnam. Did you get any impression that the bombings had done what they were supposed to do when they were started last winter?

Senator McGovern. Well, I'm not sure that I know what all the objectives of the bombing policy have been. If those attacks were designed to stop the flow of manpower from North Vietnam into South Vietnam, they've failed, because we have many more men from the North fighting on behalf of the Vietcong in the South today than we did when the bombing attacks started last February. If the bombing was designed to encourage North Vietnam to come to the negotiating table, I'm not sure that that has been achieved; it may be that it had just the opposite effect, that it tended to produce a more rigid situation than what might otherwise have been the case.

But what disturbs me most of all is that no matter how careful our pilots are about the bombing attacks—and these are truly superb pilots—in a situation like this, you're bound to kill many innocent civilians. I'm talking now, not about the bombing in the north, but in the south, where supposedly the people or at least a large percentage of them are on our side. I was told that we exercise great caution in bombing villages and hamlets, but nevertheless, while I was there, in visiting the civilian hospitals in South Vietnam, I found them crowded with bombing victims, with little children with their legs, arms blown off; men, women and children with their faces and their bodies horribly burned and scarred with napalm bombs; those things, it seems to me, are inevitable in bombing attacks of this kind.

Mr. Vanocur. But Senator, how can you possibly come to negotiations now, given the present attitude of the north and the National Liberation Front?

Senator McGovern. Well, I think it's going to be difficult to get the other side to the conference table, but I don't think the differences that have been spelled out, either by them or by our leaders, are insurmountable. Now, as I understand it, both sides have given some rather strong indications that the terms of the original Geneva settlement, going back to 1954, are for the most part acceptable. We may have some difference of opinion as to how those Geneva terms should be interpreted. My understanding is that the other side is saying that there must not only be an eventual troop withdrawal, which we have accepted on principle; there also must be a coalition government formed in South Vietnam on a provisional basis until elections can be held, and that the Vietcong, or the National Liberation Front, would have to be a part of any such coalition government.

I think those are negotiable terms. We don't have to accept everything that has been proposed by the other side, but at least I think we could go into the conference room willing to discuss a settlement, pretty much along the lines of the original Geneva accord.

Mr. Vanocur. But sir, the four points of Pham Van Dong, of April 8, the North Vietnamese premier, said on the third point that they had to accept the program of the National Liberation Front. Now, are you suggesting that we have to accept the National Liberation Front's program, or a coalition government?

Senator McGovern. Well, as Secretary Rusk has said, their position is somewhat ambiguous. It's not entirely clear just what they mean by the program of the National Liberation Front, and of course, that's the purpose of negotiations, to clear up the ambiguities and the uncertainties in the positions offered by the two sides. For my own part, I don't see how we can hope, realistically, to exclude the National Liberation Front entirely from the postwar settlement. After all, whether we like it or not—and of course we don't like it—they control probably two-thirds of the terrain in South Vietnam, and they control somewhere between a third and perhaps as much as a half of the people, and so a force of that kind is going to have to be given consideration, both in the negotiations and in the eventual settlement.

Mr. Vanocur. Well, what are you going to do about people like Premier Ky in South Vietnam, who now seem to want to fight on to the end?

Senator McGovern. Well, I think that's one of the principal flaws, perhaps the basic flaw in our current negotiating effort and in previous efforts, is that those efforts have excluded the two primary antagonists in this struggle, and that's General Ky's government in Saigon and the National Liberation Front, the Vietcong guerrillas, the Vietcong rebels, whatever you want to call them.

Now, this war began in South Vietnam as a struggle between the government which we were backing in Saigon and another group of South Vietnamese that have formed under the National Liberation Front, which does not accept the government that we've been supporting. It was basically a civil and local conflict. So, I think we could greatly improve the chances for success in our current negotiating efforts, if those efforts included General Ky, or whoever happens to be in power in Saigon when negotiations get under way, and the National Liberation Front.

For us to insist that we can't have any dealings with the Vietcong, with the so-called National Liberation Front, would have its parallel, it seems to me, if 200 years ago, King George had said to the American Revolutionists or to George Washington, we'll talk to the French but we're not going to talk to Washington and the American rebels. Sooner or later, these two primary contestants to this struggle have to be brought into the negotiations.

Mr. Vanocur. Well, Senator, if the present peace offensive does not bear public results, would you be in favor of resuming the bombings and taking the offensive again once more in the field?

Senator McGovern. No; I would not. I don't think it's in our interest to renew the bombing attacks or to spread this war in any way. I think we may have reached a situation of stalemate, whereby neither side can score a decisive victory. I've been trying to think of some analogy to the military and political situation that confronts us there, and the other day I—it occurred to me that it's very much like putting a bumblebee in a cage with an elephant. We have the power of the elephant—we have the air power, we have naval power, we have great power on the ground, great firepower, and we're not going to be pushed out of Vietnam; I don't see any way by which the other side can push us out militarily. But by the same token, they're in the role of the bumblebee. They can continue to harass and to sting and to draw blood, but they can't push us out. If we could catch them—if we could find them, and bring that firepower to bear on the Vietcong guerrillas, we could quickly stamp them out, but it doesn't seem that that's about to happen.

Well, I hope we'll take advantage of what I think is approaching, a stalemate, not to spread the war, not to start bombing North Vietnam or bombing Cambodia or bombing other countries in the area, but try to localize this struggle and hold it down to the battleground in South Vietnam, and I think the President was very wise in the bombing pause; I hope it'll be more than just a very brief pause.

Mr. Vanocur. Senator, one last question. If this does not work out the way you would like it to, and more money is asked by the administration to support a wider war, what is going to be your position in the U.S. Senate?

Senator McGovern. Well, I'm not sure how I'll respond to that. I think as long as we have forces committed to Vietnam, we have to see that they're well equipped and that they have the resources that they need, but that's a decision I'll have to face up to when we're confronted with it.

Mr. Vanocur. Thank you very, very much Senator George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, who was out in Vietnam in November and early December, and who will be one of the voices heard in the forthcoming debate on Vietnam in the Congress.

Mr. Mueller. Thank you, Senator, and thank you, Sander Vanocur, Today's Washington correspondent.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 6, 1966]

A Vietcong Place at Parley Urged—McGovern Wants Saigon at Peace Talks Also

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

Washington, January 5.—Senator George McGovern said today the "basic weakness" in U.S. efforts to negotiate a Vietnam settlement was the exclusion of the primary antagonists—the South Vietnamese Government and the rebel National Liberation Front.

The South Dakota Democrat, who recently returned from a week in South Vietnam, said:

"This war began as a local conflict in South Vietnam and that is still the primary battleground, no matter how many major powers feel called upon to gamble their national honor on Premier Nguyen Cao Ky of South Vietnam or Ho Chi Minh, President of North Vietnam."

Since the fundamental issue in the war is the political question which group will exercise power in South Vietnam, Senator McGovern said in a statement, "the negotiations ought to be primarily between the two competing groups in South Vietnam."

SENATOR CHURCH AGREES

Mr. McGovern's views are shared by several Senators who have been critical of the escalation of the war.

One of these, Senator Frank Church, Democrat, of Idaho, said in an interview that Senator McGovern's proposal "makes sense."

"The United States can back Saigon at the negotiating table as Hanoi can back the Vietcong," Mr. Church said, "but neither the American Government nor the Government of North Vietnam can end a revolution in South Vietnam without the participation and consent of those who engaged in it."

President Johnson has said that "the Vietcong would not have difficulty being represented (in negotiations) and having their views represented."

Presumably he meant by this that representatives of the National Liberation Front, of which the Vietcong is the military arm, could be included in North Vietnam's delegation.

The United States has refused to deal directly with the National Liberation Front, to assure it a place in a future South Vietnamese Government or to recognize its military hold on roughly one-third of South Vietnam.

One of North Vietnam's conditions for peace is that the Liberation Front have a role in any new government before elections are held in South Vietnam. Washington finds this condition unacceptable.

As for Premier Ky, he has set his face against any negotiations.

MOVE TO END IMPASSE URGED

Senator McGovern sought today to cut through all these entrenched positions by asking all the parties to face up to the realities of the situation.

"It makes no sense at all," he said in a statement, "for us to try to bomb North Vietnam into negotiations or to talk them into negotiations unless our South Vietnamese allies and the rebel forces in South Vietnam are ready to negotiate a settlement."

"The most logical way for the South Vietnamese Government leaders to assist in ending the war would be to explore the possible basis for a settlement with their fellow Vietnamese in the National Liberation Front."

The Liberation Front leaders, he said, are "determined proud men," who could be expected not to let Moscow, Peiping, or Hanoi do their negotiating for them. On the other hand, he said, they could not be expected to accept a settlement that did not give them "a proportionate share in the postwar government."

Senator McGovern had previously urged a halt to U.S. bombing of North Vietnam and a negotiated settlement of the war. His statement today indicated that the pause in the bombing and efforts to start negotiations had not convinced him that the United States was doing enough to obtain peace.

Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat, of Maine, who accompanied Senator Mike Mansfield, the Democratic leader of the Senate, on a globe-circling trip that included Vietnam, did not agree with Mr. McGovern's recommendations. Reached by telephone, he said he doubted whether the National Liberation Front was independent of North Vietnamese control.

Senator Richard B. Russell, Democrat, of Georgia, and chairman of the Armed Services Committee, said in an interview that the pause in the air bombing of North Vietnam had gone on too long.

Statement by Senator George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota

(Note.—Senator George McGovern, a member of the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and former Director of the U.S. food for peace program (1961–62) visited Vietnam in early December.)

A basic weakness in the current efforts to negotiate a settlement of the Vietnamese war is that those efforts seem to have excluded the two primary antagonists in the struggle—the South Vietnamese Government in Saigon and the National Liberation Front of the Vietcong rebel forces.

I appreciate President Johnson's great desire to end the war. But the chances of negotiations taking place could be greatly improved if the two principal contestants were involved in the negotiating effort.

The fundamental issue at stake in this war is a local political question as to which group will come to power in South Vietnam. I doubt that an issue of that kind will be resolved by military forces from the outside.

But negotiations should include the two competing groups in South Vietnam—the Vietcong National Liberation Front and General Ky or whoever happens to be in power in Saigon when the negotiations begin.

It makes no sense at all for us to try to bomb North Vietnam into negotiations or to talk them into negotiations unless our South Vietnamese ally and the rebel forces in South Vietnam are ready to negotiate a settlement.

It is disturbing that while President Johnson has been trying to get negotiations started, General Ky, our South Vietnamese ally, has expressed his opposition to negotiations.

The most logical way for the South Vietnamese Government leaders to assist in ending the war would be to explore the possible basis for a settlement with their fellow Vietnamese in the National Liberation Front.

This war began as a local conflict in South Vietnam and that is still the primary battleground no matter how many major powers feel called upon to gamble their national honor on General Ky or Uncle Ho.

It will be difficult, if not impossible, to end the war without discussions with the Vietcong rebel leaders as well as Hanoi and Saigon.

The rebels control two-thirds of South Vietnam and their leadership front embraces a broad cross section including many non-Communists. They cannot be expected to permit Moscow, Peiping, Hanoi or anyone else to do their negotiating for them.

Nor can they be expected to accept any settlement that does not give them a reasonable opportunity to share in the postwar government—a government which ultimately should be determined by the Vietnamese people in an honorably supervised election.

Refusing to negotiate with the rebel front would have its parallel if King George III had expressed a willingness to negotiate with France while refusing to talk with George Washington and his rebel forces.

The most realistic way to achieve a settlement between Saigon and the local rebel forces, is for the outside powers to begin reducing their involvement on a reciprocal basis so that the struggle can be confined to a local rather than a global struggle. President Johnson took a long stride toward localizing the war when he stopped the bombing of North Vietnam. Let us hope that our commanders will not be so foolish as to extend the bombing to Cambodia or other countries. I believe that the Russians and the Chinese, while giving some assistance to Hanoi, have limited their interference in the struggle because, no matter how belligerently they talk, they know it is no more in their interest than in ours to blow this local issue into a global war. The major powers ought to search for every possible way of confining the struggle to South Vietnam. There is no issue there that can possibly be of enough importance to justify a major war between the great powers.

Indeed, for the United States and the other major powers to waste their resources and their young men in a global slaughter over who is to be in charge in Saigon would be to create the conditions of chaos out of which could come a hundred Vietnam tragedies to curse our children for all their days.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] to read Washington's Farewell Address on February 22 next. It is the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] will be the only man who has read this famous address in both the House and the Senate.

PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE WITH MEXICO

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces the appointment of the following Senators to attend the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary meetings to be held February 9 through 16, 1966, at Washington, Philadelphia, and San Francisco: Senators MANSFIELD, GRUENING, METCALF, NELSON, MONTOYA, KUCHEL, FANNIN, and MURPHY.

These Senators will serve along with Senator SPARKMAN, who is the chairman of the delegation, and Senators MORSE, GORE, and AIKEN. The last four mentioned Senators will serve for the full Congress.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon, on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Monday, January 24, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 20, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

William Gorham, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

Paul Kaplowitz, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1967.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: *Thy hands have made me and fashioned me; give me understanding that I may learn Thy commandments.*

Eternal God, who art the help and hope in the thought and work of our days, be Thou our joy and consolation as we bring to Thee the nameless needs of our minds and hearts.

Keep us strong and steadfast as we bow in weakness, in sorrow, in temptation, in depression of soul and open to us the word of truth and break to us the bread of life.

Grant that in following Thee we may find the highest wisdom, the deepest delight, the sum of the duty and discipline of life, the ideal of its dedication, however complete and compelling its demands may be.

May the witness and testimony which we give to life be one of lofty faith, heroic character, and fruitful service and all for Thy glory in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 767. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim National Ski Week.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 30. An act to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1446. An act to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes.

FOUR-YEAR TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a clear and pressing need for an amendment to the Constitution extending the terms of Members of the House of Representatives from 2 to 4 years.

It is true that the original purpose of limiting the term of Representatives to 2 years was to keep them close to the people and assure responsiveness to the people's will. It was felt that if a Representative failed to measure up to what was expected of him, 2 years in office were enough.

The 2-year limitation, however, cuts both ways, and on balance I think that today it does far more harm than good.

As we all know from our own experience, it takes time for the House to be reorganized at the beginning of a session. It takes time for even a highly qualified freshman Member to learn the ropes if he is to contribute to the work of Congress and the needs of his constituents. Yet, whether he is new or a veteran, every Congressman must immediately begin giving extended thought and time to his next campaign. And he must be prepared to spend a considerable amount of time at home, even during a legislative session.

Such conditions are scarcely conducive for a Member to do his best work on matters before the Congress.

When the Nation was founded, economic and social conditions were relatively uncomplicated. Today, legislation requires careful study and a high degree of skill in drafting legislation, writing reports, and conducting hearings. In an age marked by continuing crisis, 2 years is barely time enough to learn the job. The time has come to extend the term of Representatives to 4 years.

It is my opinion, also, that, if any elections are to be eliminated, it should be the off-year elections. The election of a President and the Members of the House for a concurrent term of 4 years, as President Johnson proposes, will help to insure that the mandate of the people is carried out by the new administration.

I urge the adoption of this amendment in the form suggested by the President.

AIRLIFT OF MAIL FOR U.S. PERSONNEL OVERSEAS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DULSKI**. Mr. Speaker, several members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee visited the European area during November and December last year, and one of the main purposes of our visit was to obtain onsite information concerning the operation of the U.S. Armed Forces postal service. The delegation was unanimous in its belief that legislative action should be scheduled immediately on legislation authorizing the airlift of priority mail to U.S. personnel stationed overseas.

I have today introduced legislation to carry out this recommendation. I will press for immediate consideration of this legislation before our committee.

The primary purpose of this legislation is to provide transportation by air of certain types of mail between the United States and Armed Forces post offices overseas.

The first section amends section 4169 (a) of title 39, United States Code, to remove the requirement that mail from a serviceman in a combat area, which is sent at no cost to the sender, be sent as "airmail." Airmail classification requires a higher rate of transportation than would be required under the proposed new authorization to transport all letter mail by air. This change would remove the requirement that the mail be transported by air inside the continental United States.

Section 2 rewrites paragraph (5) of 39 U.S.C. 4303(d), to provide new authority for transportation by air between the United States and the overseas military post offices when the mail is classified as: First, first-class letter mail; second, second-class publications having current news value; and third, fourth-class parcels not exceeding 5 pounds in weight and 60 inches in length and girth combined.

This legislation applies to any individual, military or civilian, receiving or sending mail at an Armed Forces post office overseas. The regular rate of postage for surface transportation will be required in all cases.

FOUR-YEAR TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. **WHITENER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WHITENER**. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, when our Founding Fathers wrote our Constitution, they provided that Members of the House of Representatives would be elected directly by the people. In article I, section 3, of the Constitution they provided that the Members of the U.S. Senate would be elected by the legislatures of the several States, the theory being that the Senators would be the representatives of the States and that the Representatives would be the direct representatives of the people. In 1912 the 17th amendment to the Constitution was adopted, which destroyed the theory and philosophy of our Founding Fathers by providing that the U.S. Senators would be elected by direct vote of the people.

So, with this change of philosophy, it seems to me that the recommendation of the President that the House and the Senate submit to the States a constitutional amendment providing for 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives is long overdue. I support a constitutional amendment, therefore, fixing the term of the Members of the House of Representatives at 4 years. This amendment is long overdue. The fact that it is overdue is well indicated by the results of the polls which have been taken throughout the Nation by responsible poll-taking organizations. So, as we receive this recommendation from the President, I think that we should all consider it seriously. In my considered judgment the increase of the term of Members of the House of Representatives to 4 years would have the effect of meeting the public will. It would have the effect of increasing the efficiency of Congress and, as the President well said, would no doubt attract many to seek this high position who do not find themselves willing to do so because of the inconvenience and the expense of the regular 2-year campaigns.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one who is inclined toward changing our Constitution as readily as some of my friends may be. But in this case I believe it would meet the best interests of our society and our Nation. It would make the House of Representatives a more effective body in its service to the people.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter on the Asian Bank bill introduced today.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the Asian Development Bank Act. On Tuesday of this week the President of the United States sent up a message on this most vital piece of legislation. It is vital that the United States participate in this endeavor, as we have participated in the creation and active support of such similar institutions as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Inter-American Development Bank. The creation of the Asian Development Bank can probably do more to create peace and promote rapid economic development in Asia than any other single action.

Recently, members of your House Banking and Currency Committee had the privilege and honor, at the request of the President of the United States, to participate in the signing of the charter of the Asian Development Bank at Manila. Prior to this time your House Banking and Currency Committee had been advised and consulted with by those in the administration charged with the responsibility of exploring the structure and functioning of this proposed bank and the determination as to whether or not the United States would participate.

The structure of this proposed institution resembles both the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank, with which we are all familiar. These two instiutions have done much to assist the developing nations achieve high levels of economic productivity. In addition, these institutions have done much to promote free democratic institutions in the developing nations. It is certainly anticipated that the same will be true of the Asian Development Bank.

I shall not at this time discuss all of the details of the proposal. Much of the background is contained in the U.S. Treasury Department's special report on the proposed Asian Bank, which I insert following my remarks.

Your House Banking and Currency Committee will begin hearings on this proposal immediately. I am sure that all Members of the House of Representatives, and the other body, will recognize the necessity and importance of this institution and speedily enact the legislation required for the United States to participate in this Bank.

U.S. Treasury Department Special Report on the Proposed Asian Development Bank, January 1966

I. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

This special report strongly recommends that the United States promptly accept membership in the proposed Asian Development Bank. Early congressional action in the 1966 session is required if the United States is to play its proper role in the formation of the Bank this year. The Bank springs from Asian needs and desires. It is enthusiastically supported by the Asian nations themselves, and has received pledges of financial support from a broad range of non-Asian countries as well.

The Bank is to have an authorized capital of $1 billion; its membership will number 30 or more countries including many capital-contributing developed countries as well as the developing countries of Asia. The Bank will make sound loans on conventional terms similar to World Bank loans. The U.S. subscription of $200 million will be equaled by that of Japan; the combined subscriptions of the other developed countries far exceed our own. The U.S. subscription should have a minimal effect on our balance of payments.

The Bank will be Asian in character and multilateral in form. Its operations will benefit both short- and long-range policy objectives of the United States. As a nucleus around which Asian cooperation can grow, the Bank can promote closer ties within the region which the United States has long sought; as a financial vehicle, the Bank can spread the burden of foreign assistance more broadly, serving as a channel for special funds which other donor countries may provide on special terms to meet special needs of the region; and, in its day-to-day operations the Bank can complement and thereby make more effective the extensive U.S. bilateral programs in the Asian region. U.S.

membership is, therefore, fully in our national interest. Establishment of the Asian Bank is a vital element in current efforts to offer the peoples of Asia a reason to hope for a better future and for an opportunity to enjoy the fruits of peaceful economic progress. It points toward those works of peace which are the true need of Asia and the center of the purpose and hope of the United States, there and everywhere.

II. BACKGROUND

A. History and origin of the proposal: In a broad sense, the concept underlying the Asian Development Bank goes back at least to the early postwar years, when the idea of a public international institution supported cooperatively by its member nations and designed to speed growth in developing areas found its embodiment in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank). In the ensuing dozen years, the idea of institutionalized multilateral cooperation in development financing was broadened with the establishment of two specialized affiliates of the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation and the International Development Association. In 1959, multilateral cooperation in the field of development finance was adapted and applied at the regional level through the establishment of the Inter-American Development Bank, the first such institution to have as its particular field of action a major geographic area. By 1964, a second regional bank, the African Development Bank, had come into being in order to help with the developmental problems of that major region. The Asian Bank would take its place along with the latter two institutions, as a regional development bank for a great continental land mass of the developing world.

In addition to the general evolution of the institutions of financial cooperation, several encouraging areas of regional cooperation were taking root at the same time among the Asian countries. Since 1947, the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) has provided a forum for discussions and analysis of the economic problems and outlook for the broad area stretching from Iran to the Pacific Islands. The technical scope of ECAFE's concerns has broadened progressively, and its initiatives are increasingly resulting in specific cooperative actions being undertaken by the nations involved. Similarly, the activities of the nations cooperating under the Colombo plan have, since 1950, contributed substantially to the spirit of regional cooperation. As one feature under the Colombo plan technical assistance for key growth projects is made available not only from sources outside the region but from one regional country to another as well.

The more specific and immediate antecedents of the Asian Development Bank date from late 1963, when an ECAFE Expert Group on Regional Economic Cooperation first formally proposed the establishment of a regional bank for Asia. This proposal was quickly endorsed by ministers representing Asian nations at the ECAFE Ministerial Conference on Asian Economic Cooperation in Manila in December 1963. During 1964, detailed technical investigations were made by a working group of experts and a comprehensive report was made available to governments at the end of that year. In March 1965, the 21st session of ECAFE, meeting in Wellington, unanimously agreed to further efforts toward realization of the Bank project. It was agreed that a Consultative Committee drawn from nine Asian nations would meet to review the principal issues involved. The Consultative Committee held its first meeting in June in Bangkok. Mr. Eugene Black—the President's Advisor on Southeast Asian Development and former President of the World Bank—was invited to consult with the Committee. In July and August, members of the Committee visited capitals, including Washington, in order to gain the benefit of views from each of the governments interested in the establishment of the Bank. The Consultative Committee then met again in August in Bangkok to draw up a preliminary charter for the institution.

The decisive event insuring that the proposal would have major support from outside the Asian region was President Johnson's announcement in April 1965, that the United States would be prepared to become a member of a properly conceived Asian Bank.

The main negotiations on the charter of the Bank took place at the meeting of the Preparatory Committee on the Asian Development Bank in Bangkok, Thailand, October 21–November 1, 1965. The U.S. delegation was headed by Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Merlyn N. Trued.

In its final form, the agreement establishing the Asian Development Bank was signed at Manila at a conference of plenipotentiaries held December 2–4, 1965. The agreement was signed on behalf of the United States by Eugene R. Black, Advisor to the President on Southeast Asia Economic and Social Development, and Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, head and alternate head, respectively, of a U.S. delegation which included Members of both Houses of Congress.

B. Need for an Asian institution: The proposal for an Asian Development Bank arose as an Asian initiative, and the Bank will be a predominantly Asian institution in location, in finance, and in management.

President Johnson summarized the advantages of establishing an Asian Development Bank in the following terms:

"I regard the organization of this great new institution as one of the most hopeful events of our times because the Asian Development Bank has been put together by Asians, and because they themselves are contributing the greater part of its capital and will direct its lending for development in Asia.

"But, most of all, it is an important and hopeful event, because the Asian Development Bank will bring so many of Asia's diverse peoples, who so long have gone their ways alone, together in a cooperative effort for peaceful development and human betterment in Asia."

The Asian Bank can, as could no institution either with extra-regional concerns or of subregional size, accomplish the following objectives:

Bring an explicitly Asian viewpoint to bear on the problems of complementary growth in the region.

Satisfy the widespread desire among countries of the region for an institution attuned specifically to meeting Asian economic needs.

Point toward that peaceful cooperation in Asia which is the region's most pressing need.

Offer an institution with its own tangible and constructive purpose to serve as a nucleus around which broader forms of economic and possibly political cooperation could grow. Asia as a whole enjoys no history of common political institutions comparable to the Organization of American States in Latin America. The political infrastructure must be built out of positive acts of economic cooperation such as the Bank would provide in its daily operations.

Elicit significant amounts of capital from the Asian countries themselves for use elsewhere in the Asian region, with a concomitant assumption of the responsibility for sound fiscal operations.

Stimulate a flow of public and private capital into Asia from outside the region.

Provide an administrative channel through which governments interested in national and regional development in Asia as a whole, or in specific subregions of Asia, could make potentially large sums available for special purposes or on special terms. A major contribution to southeast Asian development by the United States and other capital-providing countries, for instance, could be administered by the Bank, giving an appropriate Asian imprint to the funds thus provided.

C. Relationship to U.S. programs in Asia: The proposed Asian Development Bank can play a key role in the overall U.S. economic assistance strategy for Asia at the same time it is fulfilling the need of the Asians themselves for new cooperative institutions. In much the same manner, the Inter-American Development Bank is already serving successfully as a major vehicle through which U.S. funds are made available to support long-range development goals of the Alliance for Progress in Latin America.

Substantial U.S. bilateral development assistance in the form of loans and grants to Asian countries is now extended to many of the developing countries eligible for membership in the Asian Development Bank. A large proportion of this assistance is concentrated in a relatively few major program countries. The Asian Bank will not have the subscribed resources to replace any significant portion of current U.S. programs, nor is there reason to expect that its pattern of financing will necessarily reflect the same country emphasis as U.S. programs now have. Nevertheless, the Bank can be expected to complement U.S. programs in a number of important ways: through lending in conjunction with the United States and other donors for projects too large for any single donor to finance; through furnishing technical assistance which will improve the effectiveness with which U.S. and other external assistance is utilized; through financing of surveys and assistance in project formulation which will provide the Agency for International Development and other bilateral lenders with a better basis for assistance decisions; through eliciting contributions to its own capital; and through serving as a coordinating mechanism for numerous bilateral programs in particular countries. In addition to contributing to greater effectiveness of aid, these functions would help to spread the aid burden more widely.

The creation of a regional development bank by and for the Asian nations is particularly important in relation to the $1 billion program of expanded U.S. economic and social development assistance in southeast Asia announced by President Johnson in his speech at Johns Hopkins University on April 7, 1965. The President's design calls for a great international cooperative effort that would lift the hopes and spirits of the peoples of Asia by offering a promising alternative to the destruction of wars and the oppression of adverse economic circumstances.

The Asian Bank, with its authority to administer special funds made available over and above subscribed capital by member or nonmember donor nations, is well suited to serve as a channel for the President's southeast Asia program. Special funds handled in this manner through the Bank could, by agreement with the donor, be lent on concessional repayment terms appropriate to the country or project concerned. The extent to which the United States makes funds available to the Bank for administration would depend first, of course, on congressional approval of the necessary resources, but also on the indications from other donor countries of their intention to do likewise. Subject to these two conditions, U.S. representatives have already indicated U.S. willingness to consider a substantial contribution to a Southeast Asia Regional Development Fund. The earlier a sound, strong Asian Development Bank can be brought into being, the earlier plans can move forward for the Bank to receive and utilize such special fund contributions.

III. THE PROPOSED BANK

The form and functions of the proposed Asian Development Bank are laid down in its articles of agreement. These articles were negotiated at the meeting of the Preparatory Committee on the Asian Development Bank in Bangkok, Thailand, October 21–November 1, 1965. Along with two annexes subsequently completed and agreed at the Manila meeting, the articles form the body of the Agreement Establishing the Asian Development Bank. This agreement was signed by representatives of governments at a conference of plenipotentiaries in Manila, Philippines, December 2–4, 1965, subject to approval by legislatures. In broad outline and in many details, the articles themselves and the institution to be established under their authority follow the outstandingly successful pattern set by the World Bank.

A. Financial structure: The financial resources of the Bank consist of its paid-in capital, special funds, and funds it may raise in the future through borrowing in private capital markets. The Bank would also add to its resources through its earnings.

1. Authorized paid-in and callable capital: The authorized capital stock of the Bank is $1 billion, divided into 100,000 shares of $10,000 each. The Board of Governors of the Bank by a special majority vote may increase the authorized capital. Of the $1 billion authorized capital, $650 million is available for subscription by the Asian regional members, while the remaining $350 million is reserved for subscription by nonregional member countries.

Half of the authorized capital consists of paid-in shares and half consists of callable shares; the subscription of each member country to the capital stock of the Bank will consist of equal parts of paid-in and of callable shares.

Payment for subscriptions to the Bank's paid-in capital stock is to be in five equal installments of 20 percent each. If a country deposits its instrument of ratification before the agreement enters into force, then its first installment payment is due within 30 days after the entry into force. If a country deposits its instrument of ratification after the agreement has already entered into force, then its first installment payment is due on or before the date of deposit. The second and subsequent installments fall due at annual intervals after the date of entry into force of the agreement.

Not all of a member's subscription to paid-in capital is to be paid in cash at the outset. The articles require the Bank to accept noninterest-bearing demand notes or similar obligations in lieu of 50 percent of any installment on paid-in capital, provided the Bank does not need the cash for its operations.

Callable capital stock amounting to one-half a country's total subscription would be subscribed at the time of the first installment on paid-in capital. The function of the callable capital in the Asian Development Bank is the same as that of the callable capital in the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank, i.e., to provide a backing against which the Bank would be able in the future to sell bonds in the capital markets of the world. Payments would be made on callable capital only if at some future time it became necessary to call these shares in order to make good on borrowings by the Bank or on guarantees it had issued. Such calls must be ratable on all such shares.

2. Special funds: The Bank's articles (arts. 19–20) provide that the Bank may establish special funds by earmarking up to 10 percent of its paid-in capital for that purpose, and by accepting resources—outside the subscribed capital stock—from member governments or other sources for administration by the Bank. Special funds derived from such earmarking of a portion of the Bank's resources may be used to guarantee or make loans of high developmental priority, with longer maturities, longer deferred commencement of repayment and lower interest rates than ordinary bank loans.

Special funds received from members may be used as flexibly as the agreement between the Bank and the member permits, so long as the purpose is consistent with the purpose of the Bank.

3. Borrowed funds: The Bank's subscribed funds may be supplemented by borrowings in the name of the Bank in member countries or elsewhere (e.g., Switzerland) against the backing of its callable capital. No borrowing may take place in the territory of a member or in the currency of a member, however, without the prior approval of that member. The Bank may also add to its lendable resources by selling portions of loans from its portfolio, with or without its own guarantee, provided again that the prior approval of the member in whose territory the securities are sold is obtained.

B. Administrative aspects: The Articles of Agreement of the Asian Development Bank established it as a regional international organization with full juridical personality. The Bank's members would be national states and their territories, and its structure would consist of a Board of Governors, a Board of Directors, and a management consisting of international civil servants.

1. Membership: The Bank is open to membership by members and associate members of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) and by other regional countries and nonregional developed countries which are members of the United Nations or of any of its specialized agencies. Thus, Communist China, North Korea, and North Vietnam are not eligible for membership.

Countries eligible for membership as charter members are listed in annex A to the articles. Any of those countries that have failed to sign by January 31, 1966, and countries not mentioned in annex A desiring to become members can only be admitted after the Bank is organized. Admission to membership then will require an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the total number of Governors representing not less than three-fourths of the total voting power. The subscription of a new member would be fixed by the Governors at the time of admission.

2. Board of Governors: The senior policymaking body of the Bank is to be its Board of Governors, consisting of one Governor and one alternate for each member. Governors would nomally be ministers of finance or central bank heads; the Board of Governors would normally meet annually and conduct its other business by mail. The fundamental powers of the Bank—including the power to admit new members, to change the authorized capital stock, to elect Directors and choose a President, and to amend the articles are reserved exclusively to the Governors.

3. Board of Directors: The day-to-day supervision of the general operations of the Bank rests with the Board of Directors. The Board is to consist of 10 Directors, 7 to represent the Asian regional countries and 3 to represent nonregional members. Each Director may appoint an alternate to act in his absence. The size of its subscription entitles the United States to elect its own Director from the three allocated to the nonregional countries.

Directors are elected for 2-year terms in accordance with procedures shown in annex B of the articles, and may be reelected. With regard to the three Directors for nonregional members, annex B provides that the third Director shall be elected when nonregional subscriptions total $345 million. It is hoped that this provision will be fulfilled at an early date. Article 30(1)(ii) provides that, after 2 years, the size and composition of the Board of Directors shall be reviewed by the Board of Governors. The reason for this subsection is the desire of the smaller developing countries for representation on the Board by the creation of one or more regional directorships. Any such change, however, would require approval by a majority of the total number of Governors having at least two-thirds of the total voting power. Moreover, a change in the number of Directors would not affect the number of votes cast by the United States or other countries, since voting strength is related to size of subscription.

The Board of Directors would pass on all loan or guarantee applications, oversee financial operations and approve the Bank's budget. Unlike the Governors, the Directors would meet at frequent intervals as demanded by the pace of the Bank's operations.

4. Voting: Like the other multilateral development financing institutions of which the United States is a member, the Asian Development Bank embodies the broad principle that voting strength is related to size of subscription. In recognition of the strong opinion among the Asian nations that a large proportion of total votes should be distributed equally among members without reference to size of subscription, it was agreed during negotiations leading up to the charter that 20 percent of total votes—so-called basic votes—would be distributed equally among the members and the remainder would be proportional to subscriptions.

On the basis of full subscription of the $1 billion authorized capital, the U.S. share of total voting strength would be approximately 16 percent. Ordinary voting in both the Board of Governors and the Board of Directors would be by a majority of the votes cast. On specified major matters, however, the articles require qualified majorities of two-thirds or three-fourths of total votes.

5. Management: The principal executive officer of the Bank is to be its President, who will be responsible for the organization of the Bank's staff and who will, under the supervision of the Board of Directors, conduct the Bank's current business. The President will be an Asian national, who will be elected by the Board of Governors, probably at the inaugural meeting. The President serves as Chairman of the Board of Directors, but would not vote except in the case of an even division.

The President will serve for a renewable 5-year term and will be assisted by one or more Vice Presidents, whom the Directors would appoint on the basis of the President's recommendation. In keeping with the Asian character of the Bank, the bulk of its staff is expected to come from the Asian countries themselves. The articles (art. 36) on the one hand prohibit the President, Vice President, and staff of the Bank from either interfering in the political affairs of members or taking noneconomic considerations into account in their decisions, and on the other hand, prohibit member countries from attempting to influence them in the discharge of their duties.

6. Privileges and immunities: The articles of the charter relating to status, immunities, exemptions, and privileges (arts. 48–58) are similar to those embodied in the charters of the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank. With respect to salaries or emoluments paid by the Bank to Directors, alternates, officers, or employees, including experts performing missions for the Bank, the charter provides that such payments to the nationals of a member may be taxed by that member only upon deposit of a declaration by it at the time of ratification that it intends to do so. It is intended that the United States would deposit such a declaration with its instrument of acceptance.

7. Site of the Bank: The site of the Bank is to be at Manila, Philippines, where the Philippine Government has indicated it will provide an appropriate building. The choice of Manila as site of the Bank was made by the Asian nations themselves just prior to the conference of plenipotentiaries in early December 1965. The United States maintained an attitude of strict neutrality throughout the discussion of the site question.

C. Operations: All of the lending and financial operations of the Bank are aimed at fulfilling the purposes set forth in article 1 of its charter; i.e., to foster economic growth and cooperation in the Asian region and to contribute to the acceleration of the process of economic development of the developing member countries in the region, collectively and individually.

The principal functions of the Bank toward fulfilling its purposes are (1) the promotion of public and private development capital inflow to the region and (2) the use of resources available to it for development financing in the region. In the latter connection, the Bank is to give priority to regional and subregional as well as national projects that will promote harmonious regional growth, and is to keep especially in mind the needs of smaller or less-developed countries in the region.

In addition to these direct financing activities, the Bank is expected to assist in the coordination of development policies so as to enhance complementary trade and other relations in the region and in development planning and project formulation. The Bank would cooperate with other international and national institutions in order to stimulate a maximum flow of funds to the region.

The Bank's lending operations are divided into two major categories: ordinary operations and special operations. Resources used for each category are entirely separate and distinct, and must be separately accounted for. Ordinary capital resources may not be charged with any losses or liabilities arising from special operations.

1. Ordinary lending and guarantee operation: The Bank's hard loan operations will normally take the form of direct loans from capital funds or funds borrowed in private markets, on terms similar to those of World Bank loans to developing countries. World Bank loans are presently made on terms of 5½ percent with maturities normally up to 25 to 30 years. The Bank's articles also confer authority to guarantee loans made by others and, at a future time to be decided, to invest in equity capital of entities or enterprises.

Ordinary loans would normally cover the foreign exchange costs of specific projects. In special cases, the Bank may provide financing for a reasonable portion of the local costs involved. In addition to its direct loans for particular projects, the Bank could lend to national development banks which would sublend for smaller projects. No loan could be made in a country if the government of the country objects. The guarantee of the government is not required if the loan is not to the government itself. The Bank may, however, if it deems it desirable, require such a guarantee. The Bank must pay due regard to the ability of the borrower to find financing elsewhere on reasonable terms before it approves a loan.

The articles do not specify any particular types of development projects for emphasis in the Bank's ordinary lending operations. Loans may be expected for the usual infrastructure projects such as roads, ports, power and the like, for agricultural projects such as irrigation systems and agricultural credit institutions, and for private enterprise activities in manufacturing and service industries. While specific loan terms are not prescribed, the Bank is required in its first 5 years of operation to charge a commission on its ordinary loans of 1 percent, the proceeds of which must be held in a special liquid reserve to meet possible future liabilities of the Bank. Such a special reserve was a feature of the charters of both the World Bank and the Inter-American Bank.

2. Special lending operations: Loans made from special funds earmarked from the Bank's own capital must be of high developmental priority and must conform to the same general operating guidelines as ordinary loans. Such funds shall be provided on a revolving fund basis and may be extended with longer maturities, longer grace periods and lower interest rates than those established for ordinary operations. Loans made with special funds given to the Bank for administration by donor nations may be for any purpose and on any terms not inconsistent with the overall purpose of the Bank.

3. Borrowing by the Bank: It is not expected that the Bank will be in a position in its early years to obtain funds in significant amounts from private capital markets. Accordingly, the Bank will rely for its initial period of operations on its subscribed capital. When the Bank does commence borrowing, the articles require it to follow the principle of spreading its borrowing equitably among the various financial markets, thus avoiding undue concentration on any one financial center. As already noted, no borrowing may take place in any member country or in any member's currency without prior approval by that member.

4. Procurement: Article 14(ix) of the charter prescribes the basic rule that the Bank's subscribed resources—whether for ordinary lending or special lending—be used only for procurement in any member country of goods and services produced in member countries. Thus no industrial country can expect to enjoy the benefits of Bank-financed procurement from its suppliers without making a contribution to the Bank's resources in the form of capital subscriptions. In special circumstances, as in the case where a nonmember country, e.g., Switzerland (which is not a member of the World Bank but is eligible to provide goods and services for World Bank-financed projects) permits the Asian Development Bank to raise a significant amount of capital in its markets, the Directors may allow procurement for a particular loan to take place in that nonmember country, or the goods of that nonmember country to be purchased in a member country. Such permission by the Directors could only be given, however, by a special majority of two-thirds of total votes.

5. Currency provisions: All member countries, developed and developing alike, are required to make at least 50 percent of their subscriptions available in convertible currencies, and no member may make restrictions on the use by the Bank or its payees of this portion of its paid-in subscription. A developing country may restrict the other 50 percent of its subscription, which is payable in national currency, to payments for goods and services which it produces and which will be used in its territories. A developed country, on the other hand, is required to make the second 50 percent of its subscription, also payable in national currency which in most cases would already be convertible, available on the same restriction-free basis as the first 50 percent. In short, developed country subscriptions may be thought of as generally convertible. (Among the regional members, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand are considered developed; all of the nonregional members are likewise considered developed.)

Article 24(2) (ii) permits a developed country in the Asian region, if its exports of industrial products are not a substantial portion of total exports and it is therefore not in a position to compete effectively for Bank-financed business, to restrict the 50 percent portion paid in national currency—which therefore would normally have to be convertible—to purchase of national goods. Any country wishing to exercise this option must do so at the time it deposits its instrument of acceptance, and the continuation of the restriction is subject to periodic review by and consultation with the Bank. A country opting to restrict its subscription in this fashion would, however, be required to finance such national goods out of the portion of the subscription that would otherwise remain in cost-free non-interest-bearing notes. Only Australia and New Zealand will be in a position to take advantage of this provision of the articles.

The currency of each member is always freely available to the Bank to meet administrative expenditures in the country. Currency made available to the Bank for administration as a special fund, however, may be restricted in any manner specified in the relevant special fund agreement.

In the event of depreciation or appreciation of a member's currency, the member must pay to or may receive from the Bank a payment sufficient to maintain the original foreign exchange value of the Bank's holdings of the currency, other than holdings derived from borrowings or administered special funds.

D. Entry into force and interim arrangements: The entry into force of the agreement establishing the Asian Development Bank will take place after a two-stage procedure consisting of (a) signature and (b) ratification or acceptance. The United States and 21 other nations signed the agreement at Manila, and the remaining nations listed in annex A may do so until January 31, 1966. Signature, however, is an ad referendum act by an executive power, requiring in most governments—including the United States—approval by the legislative power. Ratification or acceptance by a signatory takes place by deposit of an instrument of ratification or acceptance with the depository (the Secretary General of the United Nations) after any necessary legislative approval has been obtained. Instruments of ratification must be deposited not later than September 30, 1966. The articles of agreement make no provision for extension of this deadline. A signatory which has deposited its instrument of ratification becomes a member on the date of deposit or the date the agreement enters into force, whichever occurs later.

The agreement enters into force when 15 signatories having subscriptions or at least $650 million have deposited their instruments of ratification or acceptance. In order to insure broad support for the Bank within the Asian region, the articles require that not less than 10 of the necessary 15 signatories be regional members. The inaugural meeting of the Board of Governors, the election of the Board of Directors, the formal organization of the Bank management and the fixing of the date for commencement of operations would promptly follow entry into force of the agreement.

Since the subscription of the United States is to be $200 million and total anticipated subscriptions are in excess of $950 million, it is clear that unless the United States moves forward rapidly with the deposit of its instrument of acceptance, the agreement may enter into force prior to deposit by the United States. Although the United States could still become a charter member by subsequently depositing its instrument prior to the September 30, 1966, deadline, failure to participate in the inaugural meeting of Governors and its important work of organizing the Bank would both damage the idea of the United States as a supporter of the Bank and impair the ability of the United States to play an appropriate role in the important early period when the Bank's operating policies and procedures will be developed. Accordingly, legislation permitting final acceptance of the agreement by the United States should be obtained as early as possible in the spring of 1966.

In order to facilitate the early establishment of the Bank on a fully operational basis, the conference of plenipotentiaries established a 14-nation Committee on Preparatory Arrangements, 12 members of which are Asian countries and the remaining 2 (United States and Germany) are nonregional. This steering committee will supervise the operations of a small staff whose principal tasks will be to prepare for the Bank's inaugural meeting, make preliminary plans for acquiring and training staff, initiate arrangements for facilities and services at the Bank's permanent headquarters and otherwise promote an efficient commencement of Bank activities.

IV. U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE PROPOSED BANK

As was the case with existing international financial institutions, U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank will be pursuant to specific authorizing legislation to be passed by both Houses of Congress. Appropriations will be sought in the years required. U.S. representation in the Bank will likewise follow the general pattern established for existing institutions.

A. U.S. subscription: The U.S. subscription to the capital stock of the Bank is $200 million. The United States and Japan, each with subscriptions of $200 million, are the largest subscribers of capital. The subscriptions of the nations whose pledges for joining the Bank were indicated at the Manila meeting are shown below in table 1. The U.S. subscription represents 21.3 percent of such total subscriptions including the developing countries and 33.1 percent of the subscriptions of the developed countries alone.

Table 2 compares the paid-in portion of the U.S. subscription in the Asian Development Bank with U.S. paid-in subscriptions to the other international development financial institutions both as a percentage of total capital and as a percentage of the subscriptions of the advanced countries. The U.S. share in the Asian Bank represents a lesser relative burden on the United States than does the U.S. share in the institutions established earlier.

TABLE 1.—*Subscriptions to Asian Development Bank capital stock (based on pledges as of Dec. 4, 1965, as shown in annex A of Articles of Agreement)*

Country	Millions of dollars	Percent of total subscriptions	Percent of developed country subscriptions	Percent of regional country subscriptions
Regional:				
Afghanistan	3.36	0.4	------------	0.5
Australia	85.00	9.1	14.1	13.2
Cambodia	3.00	.3	------------	.5
Ceylon	8.52	.9	------------	1.3
Republic of China	16.00	1.7	------------	2.5
India	93.00	9.9	------------	14.5
Iran	60.00	6.4	------------	9.3
Japan	200.00	21.3	33.1	31.1
Korea	30.00	3.2	------------	4.7
Laos	.42	------------	------------	------------
Malaysia	20.00	2.1	------------	3.1
Nepal	2.16	.2	------------	.3
New Zealand	22.56	2.4	3.7	3.5
Pakistan	32.00	3.4	------------	5.0
Philippines	35.00	3.7	------------	5.5
Vietnam	7.00	.7	------------	1.1
Singapore	4.00	.4	------------	.6
Thailand	20.00	2.1	------------	3.1
Western Samoa	.06	------------	------------	------------
Subtotal	642.08	68.8	50.9	100.0
Nonregional:				
Belgium	5.00	.5	.8	------------
Canada	25.00	2.7	4.1	------------
Denmark	5.00	.5	.8	------------
Germany, Federal Republic of	30.00	3.2	5.0	------------
Italy	10.00	1.1	1.7	------------
Netherlands	11.00	1.2	1.8	------------
United Kingdom	10.00	1.1	1.7	------------
United States	200.00	21.3	33.1	------------
Subtotal	296.00	31.6	49.0	------------
Grand total	938.08	100.0	100.0	100.0

NOTE.—Totals may not add due to rounding.

TABLE 2.—*U.S. subscription in Asian Development Bank compared with subscriptions in other international development finance institutions* [1]

[Dollars in millions]

	IBRD	IDA	IFC	IDB (ordinary capital)	ADB [1]
Total paid-in subscriptions of all members	$2,166.3	$995.7	$99.0	$850.0	$938.08
Total paid-in subscriptions of developed country members	$1,580.1	$751.3	$81.1	------------	$603.56
U.S. paid-in subscription	$635.0	$320.3	$35.2	$350.0	$220 0
U.S. paid-in subscription as percent of subscriptions of all members	29.3	32.1	35.6	41.2	21.3
U.S. paid-in subscription as percent of paid-in subscriptions of developed country members	40.2	42.6	43.4	------------	33.1

[1] Based on pledges as of Dec. 4, 1965, as shown in annex A of Articles of Agreement.

B. Form and timing of payments: As indicated in chapter III, section A of this report, half of a country's subscription is to be paid in five installments and the other half is to remain callable.

For the United States therefore, only $100 million is scheduled to be paid in, and $100 million will remain callable. Five payments, of $20 million each are due on the paid-in portion, the first at the outset and the remaining four at approximately annual intervals thereafter. Further, of the amounts to be paid in only one-half—amounting to $10 million per installment or $50 million in the aggregate—need be paid in cash. The remaining $10 million of each installment—aggregating $50 million in all—may be made in promissory notes or other obligations. For this portion, the United States will issue irrevocable letters of credit to the Bank which will not be drawn on until cash is actually required by the Bank. The letter of credit technique has already been adopted in connection with our participation in the International Monetary Fund, the International Development Association, and the Inter-American Bank.

The U.S. callable capital subscription of $100 million must be made at the time of the first paid-in installment. This $100 million subscription represents only a contingent liability on the part of the United States. Similar callable subscriptions by the United States in the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank have been on the books for 20 years with little prospect of being called. With prudent management in the Asian Development Bank, there is no reason to expect that its callable capital need be drawn on.

Table 3 summarizes, by fiscal year, the subscription obligations undertaken by the United States in joining the Bank. The first payments would be required during the spring of 1966, and accordingly a supplemental appropriation will be necessary in fiscal year 1966. Regular appropriations will then be sought in each of the fiscal years 1967–70 inclusive.

C. Legislative aspects: A draft Asian Development Bank Act is being submitted by the President for consideration by the Congress early in the 1966 session. The principal provisions of the draft legislation are those authorizing the acceptance of membership in the Bank by the President and the appropriation and payment of the U.S. subscription. In addition, the draft legislation provides for the appointment by the President, by ana with the advice and consent of the Senate, of the U.S. Governor, Alternate Governor, and Director. The draft legislation further provides, inter alia, for periodic reports to the Congress on the policies and operations of the Bank, for reference to the Congress of any change in the Bank's articles and for such amendments to other legislation as are necessary and appropriate to facilitate the sale of the Bank's obligations in the United States at such future time as that may become feasible and desirable.

TABLE 3.—*Appropriations required for U.S. subscription obligations in Asian Development Bank*

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Paid-in capital		Callable (no payment required)	Total
	In cash	In letters of credit		
1966	10	10	100	120
1967	10	10	------------	20
1968	10	10	------------	20
1969	10	10	------------	20
1970	10	10	------------	20
Total	50	50	100	200

V. PARTICULAR QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

A. U.S. participation in the Bank in relation to the U.S. balance of payments: The need to achieve and maintain equilibrium in the U.S. balance of payments remains an urgent one. The initial impact on the U.S. balance of payments of the U.S. subscription to the Asian Bank, however, will be minimal at most, and the longer range probability is for no net balance-of-payments cost.

As described earlier in this report, the structure of required subscription payments to the Bank is such that the cash portion of our $200 million subscription—the only portion which enters the balance-of-payments accounts at the time of payment—amounts to only 5 percent of the total, or $10 million, in the first year. In view of the substantial advantages accruing from the successful establishment of the Bank, this level of balance-of-payments cost, even if fully realized, would be entirely justified. There is reason to believe, however, that some or all of even the minimal short-term balance-of-payments effects will be offset. Moreover, dollars held by the Bank do not represent a potential claim on gold.

Over a somewhat longer term the prospects are favorable that there will be no net balance-of-payments cost to the United States. Procurement by the Bank will be limited to member countries and the Bank will mainly finance capital goods imports of which the United States is a major international supplier. Further, the group of countries in which the bulk of Bank financing will likely take place includes many in which the United States enjoys a strong competitive position. The U.S. share of the convertible currency resources of the proposed Bank is about one-fourth, whereas the factors just enumerated offer the possibility that U.S. procurement could come close to or even exceed this proportion of total Bank-financed procurement with its convertible resources. Any U.S. funds supplied to the Bank as special funds over and above our capital subscriptions could, in accordance with the articles of agreement, be explicitly tied to U.S. procurement.

B. U.S. voting rights: The United States will enjoy sufficient voting strength in the Asian Bank to insure itself of a permanent seat on the Board of Directors and hence a continuing important voice in the Bank's affairs. It is characteristic of the international financial institutions that formal voting issues are extremely infrequent, and agreement is usually reached on the basis of consensus, taking into account the essential interests of the institution and the member nations concerned.

Table 4 shows the approximate voting strength in the Board of Governors (on which the voting power of Directors is based) computed on the basis of memberships and subscriptions known as of December 4, 1965. Since the U.S. share of paid-in capital is substantially lower in the Asian Bank than in the other international financial institutions, U.S. voting power is correspondingly lower than in such institutions. As a minority shareholder, the United States cannot expect to exercise a veto by itself. Our percentage of total votes in the Asian Bank further reflects the fact that 20 percent of total votes are distributed among the members without regard to size or subscription, while the remaining 80 percent are weighted proportionately to subscriptions. The nonweighted votes represent a substantially higher proportion of total votes than in other institutions.

Notwithstanding the differences in the voting arrangements between the Asian Bank and other institutions, the basic form and purpose of the Asian Bank is so similar to the other institutions that no significant difference in its basic policy framework or in the soundness with which it is operated need be anticipated. The Asian nations have given ample evidence—particularly through their subscriptions totaling $642 million—of their intention to have a Bank that would command the highest respect in financial circles. There is every reason for confidence that a capable and prudent management will be selected, and that the Board of Directors will endorse policies that will give the Bank the stature its sponsors seek. It is safe to conclude, therefore, that U.S. interests and those of the developed countries as a group will be adequately protected in the operations of the Bank.

TABLE 4.—*Voting strength in Asian Development Bank*[1]

Country	Subscription amount	Proportionate votes	Basic votes	Total votes	Percent of total
	Millions				
Regional:					
Afghanistan	$3.36	336	869	1,205	1.03
Australia	85.00	8,500	869	9,369	7.99
Cambodia	3.00	300	869	1,169	.99
Ceylon	8.52	852	869	1,721	1.47
China	16.00	1,600	869	2,469	2.11
India	93.00	9,300	869	10,169	8.67
Iran	60.00	6,000	869	6,869	5.86
Japan	200.00	20,000	869	20,869	17.79
Korea	30.00	3,000	869	3,869	3.29
Laos	.42	42	869	911	.78
Malaysia	20.00	2,000	869	2,869	2.45
Nepal	2.16	216	869	1,085	.93
New Zealand	22.56	2,256	869	3,125	2.66
Pakistan	32.00	3,200	869	4,069	3.47
Philippines	35.00	3,500	869	4,369	3.73
Singapore	4.00	400	869	1,269	1.08
Thailand	20.00	2,000	869	2,869	2.45
Vietnam	7.00	700	869	1,569	1.34
Western Samoa	.06	6	869	875	.75
Total regional	642.08	64,208	16,511	80,719	68.84
Nonregional:					
Belgium	5.00	500	869	1,369	1.17
Canada	25.00	2,500	869	3,369	2.87
Denmark	5.00	500	869	1,369	1.17
Germany	30.00	3,000	869	3,869	3.29
Italy	10.00	1,000	869	1,869	1.59
Netherlands	11.00	1,100	869	1,969	1.68
United Kingdom	10.00	1,000	869	1,869	1.59
United States	200.00	20,000	869	20,869	17.79
Total nonregional	296.00	29,600	6,952	36,552	31.15
Grand total	938.08	93,808	23,463	117,271	100.00

[1] Based on pledges as of Dec. 4, 1965, as shown in annex A of Articles of Agreement.

NOTE.—Totals may not add due to rounding.

C. Consistency of Bank's operations with legislative guidelines on U.S. foreign aid program: The policies and operations of the existing international financial institutions of which the United States is a member have been fully consistent with the legislative guidelines laid down for the bilateral aid program of the United States. Inasmuch as the Asian Bank is to be a new institution, it is not possible to evaluate it in this regard on the basis of experience. It is possible to say, however, that the new Bank gives every promise of following the same satisfactory policies that have characterized the existing financial institutions. The Bank's articles call for it to promote private as well as public investment for developmental purposes, to give priority to projects that contribute most effectively to regional economic growth, to cooperate with international and national entities concerned with the investment of development funds in the region, to pay due regard to the prospects of repayment, to ensure that financing is used for the purposes intended, and to be guided by sound banking principles.

D. Membership of the Soviet Union: In his April 1965 speech at Johns Hopkins University, President Johnson specifically welcomed participation by the Soviet Union in an expanded program of southeast Asian development. As far as can presently be determined, however, the Soviet Union does not now intend to become a member of the Asian Development Bank, despite attendance by its representatives at the Bangkok Conference. The Soviet Union has indicated that it may be interested in exploring other ways of cooperating with the Bank.

VI. CONCLUSION

The establishment of an Asian Development Bank along the lines described in this report would be a hopeful and important event in the long and troubled history of the Asian region. Such a bank could contribute greatly to a new spirit of cooperation among the nations of that area. The proposed Bank would have a capital of $1 billion and enjoy broad membership among the countries of the region as well as widespread support among capital-exporting countries. The Bank could not only provide needed new capital of its own but also administer funds made available to it by developed countries on special terms and for special purposes, as for example a portion of the President's southeast Asian multilateral program for economic and social development.

The U.S. participation in the capital subscription in the Bank would be $200 million, of which only one-half would have to be paid in, and that half would be spread over five annual installments. The benefits to U.S. political and economic objectives in Asia would be substantial, especially in comparison with the costs involved. The advantages of U.S. participation in such international lending institutions as the World Bank, its affiliates, and the Inter-American Bank have been amply demonstrated over the last two decades. Prompt action by the United States to join the Asian Development Bank would be in United States short and long-term interest. Early enactment of legislation to make membership in the Bank possible is therefore strongly recommended.

LARRY O'BRIEN, "MAN OF ACTION"

Mr. **CHARLES H. WILSON.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CHARLES H. WILSON.** Mr. Speaker, when Larry O'Brien assumed office several months ago, he brought with him the reputation as a man of action. This well-earned reputation was justified recently when he announced a sweeping plan for the mechanization and modernization of the Post Office. As a member of the House Post Office Committee, I applaud Larry's leadership.

The initial phase of the program scheduled for immediate implementation involves the installation of the most modern mail-handling equipment in 109 post offices which handle approximately 60 percent of the Nation's mail. The total mechanization program being accelerated by Mr. O'Brien will cost about $65 million between now and June 30.

High speed letter sorters and machines geared to read ZIP code addresses at speeds of 36,000 per hour are among the equipment to be installed. Orders have been placed for 4,000 additional mailsters and 100 new self-service post offices.

Other hardware to be installed in this accelerated mechanization program are facing and cancelling machines, edger-stackers, huge automatic sack sorting machines, parcel post systems designed to sort packages at very high speeds, machines capable of removing odd-shaped items such as motel keys from the mail stream, and closed-circuit televisions to pinpoint problem areas in the mechanized mail-handling systems.

It has been brought to my attention that five of these new mechanized aids will be installed in the Los Angeles Post Office, including the closed-circuit television system.

It must be emphasized that this mechanization program is not intended to offer an alternative to manpower, but to assist employees in doing their job better.

It is very gratifying to me as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to witness the new Postmaster General enacting programs that will provide our post office employees with the necessary tools to handle the huge and ever-growing mail volume.

I salute Larry O'Brien for a job well begun.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS ON ASIA

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce that beginning next Tuesday, January 25, the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will conduct a series of hearings relating to Asia.

In the course of these hearings, the subcommittee will receive testimony from various experts on economic, political, military, and other conditions which prevail on that continent.

In addition, the subcommittee will seek information and expert opinions about developments which may be anticipated in these conditions—and about U.S. relations with that area of the world.

The holding of the hearings on Asia is consistent with our subcommittee's policy of keeping informed about developments in the area under its jurisdiction—and in making such information available to the Congress.

During the first week of our hearings, the subcommittee will receive testimony from 12 distinguished experts. Their names will be entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at an appropriate time. The public hearings will be held in room 2172, Rayburn Building, the main hearing room of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

FOUR-YEAR TERM

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today President Johnson sent to the Congress a proposed constitutional amendment to extend the term of office in the House of Representatives to 4 years. It also provides for House Members to be elected concurrently with the President.

I believe this is a sound and long-overdue reform. And I believe it merits prompt and favorable action.

Those of us now serving in the House of Representatives know only too well how seriously the existing 2-year term operates to interfere with the proper administration of Government business.

I need not elaborate on the cost and effort that go into election campaigns every second year: the time diverted from the important work to be done here in Washington; the strain and fatigue; the disruption of home and family life; the waste of experienced manpower in turning qualified men out of office before they have had a fair chance to be of useful service.

But we here in Washington are not the only ones aware of these self-defeating factors. As recent polls demonstrate, the voters are fully alert to them too—and have indicated a preference for a 4-year term.

It seems to me that we have in the President's proposal one of the major keys to effective government, and I am proud to announce my support of it.

LET HIM WARM HIS CHAIR

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, since Lyndon Johnson became President of the United States, the extremely important post of Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs has changed hands three times. Both Thomas Mann and his successor, Jack Hood Vaughn, performed extremely well in the short period of time they headed the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs. The newly appointed Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, Lincoln Gordon, has done a fine job as our Ambassador to Brazil and should be well qualified for the new post he expects to take over in February.

In an editorial appearing in the January 19, 1966, issue of the Washington Daily News, which follows, it was pointed out that three Assistant Secretaries for Latin America in the past 2 years is "needlessly risky." I concur with this conclusion, and I, too, trust that "if Ambassador Gordon proves himself as capable as we hope," he will be allowed to remain on the job considerably longer than his predecessors.

The editorial follows:

LET HIM WARM HIS CHAIR

Ambassador Lincoln Gordon seems a good selection for the all-important post of Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs since Jack Hood Vaughn had to give up that post which he was filling so superbly. (President Johnson has named Mr. Vaughn Director of the Peace Corps and promoted U.S. Ambassador to Brazil Gordon to succeed him.)

Mr. Gordon demonstrated in Brazil that he is an able exponent of the hard line Latin policies identified with President Johnson and Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann. And his elevation means there will be no change in these policies. Nor should there be. Among other things, the Johnson-Mann policy means that we don't sever relations or throw up our hands in horror because a new Latin government might not be as democratic as we would like.

As Ambassador, Mr. Gordon demonstrated thorough knowledge of Latin problems and how to deal with them. An economist and former Harvard business professor, he knew what help Brazil needed and what Brazil herself needed to do to pull out of her economic slump. His recommendations helped that giant South American country make impressive strides in the past year.

But what disturbs us in the picture of our dealings with our hemisphere neighbors is the speed with which our Government has been changing the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs—the top man in formulating and carrying out policy in this most important sphere of foreign relations.

We've had five Assistant Secretaries for Latin America in the past 4 years—and three in the last 2 alone.

This is preposterous. And needlessly risky.

If Ambassador Gordon proves himself as capable as we hope, let's leave him on the job long enough to follow through with what predecessors Mann and Vaughn got underway.

FOUR-YEAR TERM

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the applause which greeted the President's recommendation that the country adopt a 4-year term for Representatives in Congress was eloquent testimony to the popularity of such a measure among the Members.

I need hardly remind you that today every Member of Congress is virtually swamped by an avalanche of work which seems to increase with every session. Legislative life grows more formidable, complex and technical each day.

I believe that we should always be slow to tinker with the Constitution. But adherence to the 2-year term for Representatives, at this time of our history, is definitely a disservice to the people. It prevents Congress from acting with full efficiency and effectiveness. It tends to concentrate much of the thinking and energy of Representatives on their own reelection, and it constitutes a drain on the time that they would far prefer to devote to legislative affairs. The short term also deprives new Members in the House of a fair opportunity to demonstrate their legislative ability and achievement before going before the people for a verdict. Frequent election campaigns, furthermore, are too costly for persons of moderate circumstances to undertake.

A 4-year term, on the other hand, would not only promote efficiency, but also would help to remove many roadblocks to cooperation between the Members of the House of Representatives and the President in advancing programs required for this age of unprecedented danger. The President's proposal merits our full support.

FOUR-YEAR TERM

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, without doubt, public interest calls upon us to support a 4-year term for Representatives.

The average Member in the House today represents slightly over 400,000 persons; in the First Congress he represented about 45,000. In the 88th Congress, there were over 15,000 bills introduced; in the first session, fewer than 150. Comparable differences exist in every aspect of the legislative process.

With the tremendous growth and development of our country, the problems presented to a Member in Congress are not only infinitely greater in volume, but also are far more diverse and complex than they were more than 185 years ago.

A 2-year term is wholly inadequate for the Congressmen trying to cope with these problems.

In addition, the 2-year term causes great inconvenience to individuals who have families, and whose children are of school age. Representatives hesitate to move a family and interrupt attendance of their children at school when they face the uncertainty of elections every other year. This in turn creates pressures on him to return home for long weekends, legislative calendars are often adjusted for the benefit of such Members, and the progress of legislation frequently suffers delay.

Of the various 4-year proposals before us, I favor the one proposed by the President, providing that the election of Representatives shall coincide with the presidential term. Experience has shown that the off-year elections frequently interfere with action on the President's programs. When the people elect a President, they give him and his administration their mandate for the future conduct of the national government. That mandate is more likely to be carried out when a House of Representatives is elected at the same time as the President—and elected for 4 years.

ERNEST PETINAUD

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I thought I would call to the attention of the Members of the House today the birthday of a great American, our headwaiter, Ernest Petinaud. It was my good fortune to meet this wonderful person back 7 years ago when I first came to the Congress. I believe every Member of the House will agree with me that he is one of the most gracious persons in the Nation's Capital. His concern for the plight of his fellow man makes him a great man.

Ernest Petinaud is an untiring and faithful worker no matter how late the hour or how long the day. He is always ready at the House restaurant to greet the Members of Congress and their guests with a friendly smile and a cheery word.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Nation's Capital are very fortunate indeed to have the excellence of service, the quality of performance and the warmth of his personality.

This is Ernest Petinaud's 61st birthday, but I know that Ernest will always remain young at heart.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the gentleman from Massachusetts has taken this time to call to the attention of the House the birthday of one of our real favorite employees of the legislative branch.

Ernest Petinaud's sartorial splendor is exceeded only by his perfect patience and pleasing personality. I know of no one who is employed by the legislative branch who regards the Members of Congress with higher esteem or treats them with greater courtesy.

So it is nice that our colleague is taking this time to call to the attention of the Members of the House the 61st birthday of Ernest Petinaud, and I join with my colleagues in these felicitations to this splendid and devoted employee of the legislative branch.

Mr. BURKE. I thank my good friend and colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I should like to join with the gentleman in his tribute to Ernest Petinaud, and to say that 2 years ago I had the good fortune to have him in my delegation, and he made a better ambassador than about 90 percent of the delegation.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join Congressman JAMES BURKE in offering congratulations to Ernest Petinaud, headwaiter in the House restaurant, on his 61st birthday. He is a wonderful man, a credit to the House of Representatives. I have my breakfast there daily. It is great to start the day meeting a man so pleasant, so joyful, and so kind. He beams with personality and makes the day a brighter one for whomever meets him. The Members of the House can well be proud of Ernest Petinaud.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Ernest Petinaud on the occasion of his 61st birthday. "Ernie," as he is known to all of us, certainly typifies the ideal employee in the friendly manner with which he always greets us and the efficient manner in which he conducts the activities of which he is in charge. We are certainly fortunate in having as an employee of the House a man of his qualities.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues who have joined the many friends of Ernest Petinaud, of the House restaurant, in wishing Ernest a happy birthday.

Ernest is a remarkable man, possessed of wit, tact, perception, and generosity. He has given the House of Representatives great service, and I hope will continue to do so for many, many years.

Ernest's abilities and talent have contributed much to this House. A born diplomat, he presides daily with uninterrupted dignity over the Members' dining room.

Ernest Petinaud's attention and consideration of each Member of the House have earned him the respect of many friends. I extend to him best wishes for the coming year, and for many years of continued health and success.

HOW ARE MEN CALLED INTO THE SERVICE?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think the appropriate committees of the House need to look into the matter of calling young men into the service. I just received a letter from a father, and I wish to read it to the House of Representatives:

MARGATE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL,
Margate, Fla., January 17, 1966.

Representative PAUL G. ROGERS,
Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My son is 5 feet 7 inches tall and weighs 150 pounds. He suffered a cartilage and ligament injury to his knee while playing football. He also had a broken bone in his foot that causes a slight limp after a strain has been placed on it. In college he had a bone chipped in his arm that has caused pain at different times. This was discovered while he was in the service. His nose has been broken three times and he suffers chronic bronchial infections.

With the 1st Cavalry in Vietnam, he fought in the battle at An Khe and Pleiku. He was in hand-to-hand combat at Plei Me and the Ia Drang Valley. At the present time he is on another search-and-destroy mission near the Cambodian border.

In order to understand the fairness and impartiality of the Selective Service Board, I would like to know why there is no menial duty that can be given to physical weaklings such as Joe Namath, of the New York Jets' professional football team so the physical giants such as my son can be freed to fight our country's battles.

To me and I expect most people who can think, issuing a physical deferrment to a professional football player is the most asinine action of the year. I would like an explanation of this.

Sincerely,

E. H. CARNEY,
Principal.

I join with this father in asking that the appropriate committee of this Congress help to find such answers.

IN SUPPORT OF THEIR COUNTRY

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my intent to speak of patriotic Americans and their efforts in support of their country, I want, today, to tell the story of Mr. Paul Stewart, of Columbus, Ga., and of Vietnam Mail Call.

This dedicated American has just been chosen Man of the Year by the South Columbus Merchants Association, and in this regard, I received a letter from the association's president, Mr. James L. Thomas, which included a letter from Gen. Harry W. O. Kinnard of the 1st Cavalry Division—Airmobile. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that these letters tell far better than I could the story of this courageous man—in support of his country:

SOUTH COLUMBUS MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION,
Columbus, Ga.

Hon. "BO" CALLAWAY,
Representative from Georgia,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to ask you to please bring to the attention of the House of Representatives the outstanding efforts of a fine Georgian and American, E. Paul Stewart, 2517 Dawson Street, Columbus, Ga., in behalf of our men in Vietnam and our country's defense effort.

He has given his time and energy to the most worthwhile project, Vietnam Mail Call full time since he singlehandedly started the project in July of 1965. He has conducted the project at a substantial sacrifice to his family and to himself, often working 16 to 18 hours a day. He has said he will discontinue the program when our boys are home with their loved ones and the people of South Vietnam are free.

Paul has typewritten over 900 letters to newspapers, radio and television stations, magazines, personalities, colleges, schools, etc. throughout the United States and many friendly countries around the world pleading support for our protective forces in South Vietnam. He mailed over 500 printed news releases to the news media around the United States and to friends of the United States around the world.

Paul's letters and news releases inspired hundreds of organizations, colleges, schools, clubs, and thousands of individuals throughout the Nation to start similar support projects to back our men in Vietnam and our country's defense effort. Paul and Vietnam Mail Call have been praised by privates to generals in Vietnam. Many editorials have been written praising the project.

The idea of the project is to flood our men in Vietnam with morale-building friendly letters of support and encouragement to offset the protests and demonstrations by a few misguided souls in this country who have received notice from the press far in excess of their importance. The letters, Christmas greetings, and gift packages let our men know freedom-loving Americans all over America and our friends around the world do appreciate the sacrifices they and their families are making in defense of freedom, and that we do back them 100 percent.

HON. "BO" CALLAWAY: To say Vietnam Mail Call is a success is the understatement of the year. Paul and his daughter, Mary Ellen, have sorted, stamped forwarding addresses on over 50,000 support letters and remailed them to our boys in Vietnam. VNMC shipped several thousand gift packages to U.S. troops in Vietnam. Paul is now going after the 100,000 mark in support letters.

Paul has not received 1 cent nor does he expect any money for his long hours of work on this project month after month.

I do hope you will bring this to the attention of the House. So many times people who work the hardest for our community and country never receive the thanks they deserve.

Best wishes in all your plans for the future.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. THOMAS,
President.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
HEADQUARTERS 1ST CAVALRY
DIVISION (AIRMOBILE),
APO San Francisco, Calif., January 5, 1966.

Mr. JAMES THOMAS,
South Columbus Merchants Association,
2080 Cussota Road,
Columbus, Ga.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: I take this opportunity and means to recommend Mr. Paul Stewart to be South Carolina Man of the Year. Lt. Col. John Rilovick (retired) has written me indicating that he has already nominated Paul for this honor. Since I am a near neighbor to South Columbus, I wish to express my position on this matter.

You well know that Paul was the founder and chief proponent of Vietnam Mail Call. This program has been an unqualified success and as such brought a touch of Christmas to the soldiers here in Vietnam. Even greater than the Christmas aspect, it indicated to all of us that we are being supported by the folks at home; this is important to soldiers away from their country. Unfortunately the spectacular type incidents such as demonstrations receive lurid publicity which can only be offset by great efforts and multitudes of good deeds. From my vantage point it appears that Paul has been a great contributor in this regard, and as such should receive some sort of public recognition from the people of South Columbus.

I thank you in advance for whatever consideration you may give to this matter. Best personal regards to all the friends at home.

Sincerely,

H. W. O. KINNARD,
Major General, USA, Commanding.

MINIMUM WAGES AND PUERTO RICO

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, while the poor are being told that the war on poverty will provide them jobs, are these jobs to be snatched away from their hungry reach by another minimum-wage bill?

In the light of the threatening economic clouds which developed during the congressional races the Nation braces itself against the minimum-wage hurricane which the President promised in his state of the Union message.

The little island of Puerto Rico seems to be in the eye of this particular storm. With one-fourth the per capita income of New York has Puerto Rico pirated away too many industries from the mainland. On the other hand, will Puerto Rico be exempt from the rigors, the constrictions of a national uniform minimum wage in order that it continue to be the economic playground of special interests?

The hearing before the House committee on the subject of Puerto Rican minimum wages was strangely limited—almost hush-hush. A Senate subcommittee journeyed to the island 3 weeks ago to further explore Puerto Rico and minimum wages. I am told that only 1 Senator out of 15 appeared: the liberal press has observed its customary silence. Leon Keyserling, the liberal writer, made a 3-month study of Puerto Rican minimum wages which is unavailable for public examination.

Since Governor Rockefeller of the State of New York vetoed a $1.50 an hour minimum wage—for the wealthiest State in the Nation—stating that he did not wish to place New York at a disadvantage with other States—what is this administration planning for or against Puerto Rico in the way of minimum wages? Before Pandora's 1966 minimum-wage box is opened, I urge a closer study by the House committee on Puerto Rico and minimum wages.

LENGTH OF TERM OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, today we have received the message of the President of the United States concerning his proposal for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives.

I have been interested to hear the variety of brief speeches today supporting this proposal by Members of this body.

The various proposals apart from the 2-year term include a 4-year term with Members to be elected in presidential election years, a 4-year term with Members to be elected in nonpresidential election years, a 4-year term with half of the Members running for election in presidential election years and half of them running in nonpresidential election years.

All these proposals have been criticized: some as being too short, some as being too long, some as creating a House that would be too responsive to the executive, or that would be too unresponsive to the executive.

Last year I testified before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, recommending its consideration of a proposal which I believe is free of the various drawbacks inherent in the proposals which I have described.

Basically, the program I suggested would phase Members of the House into a 6-year election cycle, just as Members of the Senate are today, but Members of the House would run first for a 2-year term, and then for a 4-year term, then again for a 2-year term, on an alternating basis. In this way they would run twice every 6 years, rather than three times, as they do now. This would mean that Members of the House would run both during presidential election years and nonpresidential years over a period of time. Thus, this approach would avoid, I believe, the criticisms that the House would become too responsive or too unresponsive, depending upon when the 4-year term might be scheduled.

I personally see some serious drawbacks in the President's proposal for a 4-year term. I hope that the appropriate committees of the House will give careful thought to all the approaches, including the one I have outlined and on which I testified before the joint committee last year.

PROTECTION OF PUBLIC INTEREST IN LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the recent New York City transit strike has clearly demonstrated the need to reform existing laws to protect the public interest in serious labor disputes.

It is imperative that we give the President new and necessary powers to cover not only national emergency strikes, but also labor controversies which involve State or municipal employees engaged in transportation, transmission, or communication; or which imperil the health or safety of any substantial part of the population or territory of our Nation.

Today I am introducing legislation which would accomplish these aims. My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, is sponsoring a similar bill in the other body.

The legislation we propose, Mr. Speaker, would amend the Taft-Hartley Act and the Railway Labor Act to protect the public in a wide variety of controversies, from transit strikes to steel crises to rail work-rules disputes. The legislation would:

First. Authorize the President to appoint a board of inquiry to make public recommendations for a settlement based on fact-finding.

Second. Authorize the President to order a 30-day freeze, during which the parties would be under a duty to bargain upon the recommendations, although neither party would be required to accept the recommendations.

Third. Authorize the President to seek appointment by a Federal court of a special receiver to operate the struck facilities to the extent which, in the opinion of the court, is necessary to protect the public health and safety.

Fourth. Extend coverage of the emergency labor disputes provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, including these new provisions as well as the existing 80-day cooling-off provisions, to controversies which, though they may not affect an entire industry nor imperil the health or safety of the Nation as a whole, do affect interstate commerce and do imperil the health or safety of a substantial part of the population or territory of the Nation, and cover employees of a State or political subdivision if they are engaged in transportation, transmission, or communication.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, would require a factfinding board and subsequent bargaining within a period of 30 days. During this time public opinion would have a chance to assert itself. The proposal does not involve compulsory arbitration—the negotiations would be voluntary and carried out by the parties themselves.

The record over the past few years is clear: existing machinery is inadequate. We have witnessed a severe transit strike in the largest city of our country, a steel crisis last fall, and a rail crisis in 1963—all of which had to be resolved on an ad hoc basis and not within an established procedure.

I am happy the President recognized the need for reform in his state of the Union message, and it is my hope that the distinguished chairman of the House Special Subcommittee on Labor, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], will hold prompt hearings on this important legislation.

LOOPHOLE IN EXISTING ANTIBOYCOTT PROCEDURES

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the American President Lines has reinstated its previously scheduled visit to the Israeli port of Haifa for the cruise ship SS *President Roosevelt*, which reportedly had cancelled this scheduled stopover in acquiescence to the Arab boycott.

All governments involved evidently helped to make this possible. The announcement was carried in this morning's New York Times.

I do want to point out that this experience vividly illuminates a glaring loophole in existing antiboycott procedures, as administered by the Department of Commerce. I have written to the Secretary, urging that the Department study present rules and regulations with a view toward strengthening and broadening their effect, so that this lamentable table of events may be avoided in the future.

The Secretary has assured me that he is currently examining antiboycott provisions in line with my suggested improvements.

This recent acquiescence to foreign boycott pressure is deplorable, and it raises the question whether the United States has formulated realistic procedures aimed at preventing interference at the source.

The fresh reappraisal of the Commerce Department should shed some light on the matter. We must continue to keep a sharp eye on events of this nature and if need be, alter existing regulations to remove any ambiguity or subservience afflicting the American response.

THE COSTLY CONSONANT "T"

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MICHEL**. Mr. Speaker, just a single consonant—the letter "T"—is going to cost the American taxpayer at least a billion dollars over the next 2 years.

The trouble began when the administration planned to set up a separate Government Department of Transportation, Housing, and Urban Growth. Then somebody pointed out that the new Department would have to be known as THUG—Thug for short. Well, that would not do.

So then they put it up to the computer and the computer came back with a new title, the Department of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development. More trouble for the administration. In Washington gobbledygook, that would work out as THUD—Thud for short—and that would suggest another administration flop. Surgery was called for. Cut off that deadly first letter "T" and you would come up with HUD, so that is the way it is. And that is why we are going to be saddled with an entirely new Department of Transportation, to take care of that extra letter "T."

While we are changing names maybe it would be in order for the administration to retitle the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Under current directives, this agency ought clearly to be called the Department of Public Health, Education, and Welfare—PHEW—or Phew for what it has become under the Johnson administration.

FOUR-YEAR TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. **YOUNGER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **YOUNGER**. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that the President has sent a request that we change the term of our membership in the House to 4 years, with the election occurring at the same time as the presidential election. I think that would be a very disturbing action on our part. I would go along with the 4-year term, but, in my opinion, the election should be every 2 years, with half of the Members of the House elected every 2 years and a third of the Senate. I think one of the stabilizing influences that has supported this Government is the fact that the people can go to the election booth every 2 years and vote for a percentage of the House and Senate. If we change that, then I think we will lose one of the most stabilizing influences we have had for perpetuating this Government.

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a result of the President's message recommending an extension of the term of Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress to 4 years, perhaps so that most all of them would eventually become "coattail riders," as many did in the election of 1964. I for one resent very much the executive branch interceding with affairs of the House which governs its own rules and prerogatives, according to the Constitution. Further, I care not one whit about what political pollsters think, if they poll among uninformed people.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, primarily to say that I noticed no lack of opponents for congressional seats, nor any Members of Congress who did not know full well before they ran for a 2-year term, the emoluments as well as the responsibilities of this high and privileged office. I think we are in trouble with the Senate also, as to concurrence at this point.

I particularly resent the intrusion upon the prerogatives and jurisdiction of the Committee on the Organization—and Reorganization—of Congress which has been serving now for over a year and is the second in 60 years, and which we will ask be continued under Senate Concurrent Resolution 69 forthwith at considerable expense. It has not had a chance to express itself on this very vital matter after hearing testimony from political scientists, fellow Congressmen, and Members of the Senate and members of the executive branch of the Government, and so forth.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to warn this body in considering any change whatsoever of the constitutional dictates of our Founding Fathers that we are dealing with very basic essentials that have made this Nation great as far as the principle of separation of powers is concerned, the power by the executive if not indeed the judicial branch of the Government, and even the very basic consideration of majority rule. I think we should ponder, be pensive, perceive, and exercise slow but prudent judgment before we jump on any gravy train to change the time of election or period of service of Members of the House of Representatives. If indeed the Constitution is to remain in effect wherein trade, tariff, taxes, and levies must originate in this body, the body of the people's personal representatives—whom they have a right to turn out to pasture at any time in any 2-year period that they so desire—we must preserve this tenet and constitutional principle.

IS OUR NATO COMMITMENT REALLY AUTOMATIC?

Mr. **FINDLEY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FINDLEY**. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] as presented yesterday—RECORD, page 567—to this body, concerned statements I had made on Monday and Tuesday relative to a recently published exchange of correspondence between President Johnson and the Prime Minister of Turkey in 1964.

The gentleman from Ohio has on many occasions and over a period of years demonstrated his concern for Atlantic unity, and I admire him for the energy he devotes to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conferences each year. I am sure his comments of yesterday were made from a sincere desire to clear up facts, and that is my one and only purpose in replying to them.

The President's effort in June 1964 to discourage what appeared to be an unwise military intervention by an ally is certainly laudable.

My criticism of the President's hitherto secret letter to the Prime Minister of Turkey was limited entirely to the sentence in which he qualified the automatic character of the U.S. commitment to defend Turkey in the case of Soviet attack. The President's letter included this unfortunate statement:

> I hope you will understand that your NATO allies have not had a chance to consider whether they have an obligation to protect Turkey against the Soviet Union if Turkey takes a step which results in Soviet intervention without the full consent and understanding of its NATO allies.

In my opinion, this sentence should have been omitted from the President's letter. With it omitted, the letter would have retained—in my view—adequate strength to deal with the Cyprus crisis and it would not have qualified in any way the automatic character of our commitment to defend Turkey against Soviet attack.

With the sentence included, however, it obviously caused the Turkish Government concern and raised the question of credibility of our treaty commitments elsewhere.

In replying to President Johnson, the Turkish Prime Minister wrote:

> Our understanding is that the North Atlantic Treaty imposes upon all member states the obligation to come forthwith to the assistance of any member victim of aggression. The only point left to the discretion of the member states is the nature and the scale of this assistance.
>
> If NATO members should start discussing the right and wrong of the situation of their fellow-member victim of a Soviet aggression—the very foundations of the alliance would be shaken.

Until the President's letter became public, it was universally assumed that the North Atlantic Treaty obligated each signatory automatically to assist each and all others in the event of attack. Indeed, the treaty was explicit on this point. The President's letter, however, suggested that the act of assistance would not be necessarily automatic but might depend on other circumstances, that is, what Turkey did in regard to Cyprus.

If the President deemed it necessary to make some reference to the NATO commitment, he could have put it in terms which would have left intact its automatic character.

Treaty commitments are based completely on faith between governments. The one we have made with our NATO allies is supremely important to all parties, and especially to Turkey, a nation literally in the shadow of the Soviet Union.

Since the affair news reports indicate that U.S.-Turkish relations have been chilly and Turkey has been quietly trying to improve its relations with the Soviet Union.

MEANS SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR DELIVERY OF GIFTS TO SERVICE PERSONNEL IN VIETNAM

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during the last week I had at least six inquiries directed to my office from organizations who are desirous of sending gifts to our boys in Vietnam. For example, the Arthur D. Little Co., the office located in my area, its employees collected and bought over $750 worth of gifts. They now find it is going to cost $52 to send these gifts to the boys in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, in Charlestown, the VFW has also collected numerous gifts for our service personnel in Vietnam but they find it is going to cost an estimated $45 to send these gifts to our boys.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it would be well to encourage these organizations, both civic and charitable, who desire to help build the morale of our boys overseas by sending them gifts and to work out some way whereby we can make available the franking privilege so that these organizations will not have to pay the postage.

Mr. Speaker, I have today written to the Postmaster General, the Honorable Lawrence O'Brien, asking him to look into this matter.

SARGENT SHRIVER TO DEVOTE MORE TIME AND ENERGY TO DIRECTION OF THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, for the poor of this Nation no news could be more welcome than the President's recent announcement that Sargent Shriver will be able to devote even more of his time and energy to the direction of the war on poverty.

Mr. Shriver's stewardship of the Peace Corps and the war on poverty has been an inspiring example of devotion to public service—a devotion prompted neither by necessity nor ambition but springing from an intense consciousness of a citizen's responsibility in a free society.

Not only has Sargent Shriver found for himself the supreme satisfactions of action in the service of his country, but he has inspired others with his enthusiasm and energy and with his unique vision, which unites high purpose with high adventure. He has brought many talented people into Government service, and thousands of the young people of this generation have found a channel for their best hopes in the organizations he has headed. This Nation is already richer from what he has accomplished to date.

Mr. Speaker, no one in this body need be told of Mr. Shriver's quickness of mind, apparently inexhaustible energy, or attention to detail. Nor can it be said that any agency is more responsive to the will of the Congress than those directed by Sargent Shriver.

It was the intention of Congress that the injustice of poverty be banished and Sargent Shriver now addresses himself fully to that task.

Mr. Speaker, for those who wanly hope that this war can be carried on quietly and politely, with little disturbance of the status quo, with the least possible inconvenience to the conscience, Mr. Shriver's new schedule offers little solace. The war on poverty will now be carried on with greater intensity. For it is not the nature of this man to hold back.

Yet, no one need fear the outcome, for under Sargent Shriver we can rest assured that the war on poverty will be directed with the full understanding and respect of American freedoms and institutions. Few feel more deeply than he the vital importance of preserving those freedoms and institutions and none is more dedicated to assuring that they become the rights of all American citizens.

ERNEST PETINAUD, A VALUED HOUSE EMPLOYEE

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the friends of our very delightful headwaiter in the House dining room, Mr. Ernest Petinaud, in extending to him on this, his 61st birthday, our great desire that he live for a long, long time and to wish for him many, many happy returns on this, his birthday.

As the Members know, Ernest is one of the most charming and delightful people that we have on Capitol Hill, and I am glad to recognize him on this, his birthday.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] in paying felicitations to Ernest Petinaud on his 61st birthday and to wish him many, many more birthdays.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND FOR THE WEEK OF JANUARY 24

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the distinguished majority leader of the program for the balance of this week and any possible program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we have no further business for this week. So far as I know at the present time we will have no legislative business next week. There will be some messages sent up from the White House. However, we do not want to foreclose the possibility of business. We may have amendments to bills that come back from the other body. However, if the gentleman will bear with us, we would like to reserve the opportunity of announcing a further program, if necessary.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FOUR-YEAR TERM FOR HOUSE MEMBERS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 364)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1816 Thomas Jefferson wrote:

> Some men ascribe to the men of a preceding age a wisdom more than human, and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment. * * * I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions. . . . But I know also, that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind.

I believe that in the interest of progress and sound modern government—and to nourish and strengthen our creative federal system—we must amend our Constitution, to provide a 4-year term of office for Members of the House of Representatives.

I believe that for the same reasons we must also eliminate those defects in the electoral college system which make possible the frustration of the people's will in the election of their President and Vice President.

FOUR-YEAR TERM FOR HOUSE MEMBERS

I

Debate over the length of the House term is not new. It began in the Constitutional Convention, where those who thought annual elections were essential to freedom clashed with others, such as Madison, who held that 3 years were required "in a Government so extensive, for Members to form any knowledge of the various interests of the States to which they did not belong," and that without such knowledge "their trust could not be usefully discharged." Madison's thoughts are ruefully familiar to Members of the House today: he was certain that a 1-year term would be "almost consumed in preparing for and traveling to and from the seat of national business," and that even with a 2-year term none of the Representatives "who wished to be reelected would remain at the seat of Government."

Between the advocates of a 1-year term—those who, bearing in mind recent English experience, feared the despotism of a government unchecked by the popular will—and those who saw a tenure of 3 years as necessary for wise administration, a compromise of 2 years was reached.

Thus there was little magic in the number 2, even in the year of its adoption. I am convinced there is even less magic today, and that the question of tenure should be reexamined in the light of our needs in the 20th century.

II

The authors of the Federalist Papers said about the House of Representatives:

> As it is essential to liberty that the Government in general should have a common interest with the people; so it is particularly essential that the branch of it under consideration should have an immediate dependence on, and an intimate sympathy with the people. Frequent elections are unquestionably the only policy by which this dependency and sympathy can be effectually secured. But what particular degree of frequency may be absolutely necessary for the purpose, does not appear to be susceptible of any precise calculation; and must depend on a variety of circumstances with which it may be connected.

The circumstances with which the 2-year term is presently connected are—

The accelerating volume of legislation on which Members are required to pass. In the first Congress, 142 bills were introduced, resulting in 108 public laws. In the 88th Congress, 15,299 bills were introduced, of which 666 were enacted into public law.

The increasingly complex problems that generate this flood of legislation, requiring Members to be familiar with an immense range of fact and opinion. It is no longer sufficient to develop solutions for an agricultural nation with few foreign responsibilities; now a man or woman chosen to represent his people in the House of Representatives must understand the consequence of our spiraling population growth, of urbanization, of the new scientific revolution, of our welfare and education requirements, and of our responsibilities as the world's most powerful democracy.

Longer sessions of Congress, made necessary by the burden of legislation and outstanding public issues. In less turbulent times, Members of Congress might conduct the public business with dispatch during election years, and spend the summer and autumn campaigning in their districts. Congress adjourned in April of 1904, June of 1906, May of 1908, and June of 1910. But increasing workloads have substantially extended the sessions. Thus it was in August of 1958 that Congress concluded its work, in September of 1960, October of 1962, and again in October of 1964.

The competitive pressures imposed by the 2-year term, when the incumbent must remain in Washington into the fall to attend the public business, reduce his capacity to do either task—campaigning or legislating—with the complete attention his conscience and the public interest demand.

The increasing costs of campaigning that biennially impose heavy burdens on those who represent vigorously contested districts, and that magnify the influence of large contributors, pressure groups, and special interest lobbyists.

It may be said that every elected official confronts similar circumstances in the 1960's. Yet it can be said of none that his power for the public good or ill is both so great as the Congressman's, and so sharply pressed in time.

For this public servant—part judge and author of laws, part leader of his people, part mediator between the executive branch and those he represents—is scarcely permitted to take his seat in the historic Hall of the House, when he must begin once more to make his case to his constituency.

The Congressman's effectiveness as a legislator is reduced by this.

His district's right to be fully represented in Congress is diminished by this.

The Nation's need to be led by its best qualified men, giving their full attention to issues on which our security and progress depend, is ignored by this.

In the States, in private business, and indeed, in the Federal Government itself, the wisdom of longer terms for senior officials has come steadily to be recognized. State after State has adopted a 4-year gubernatorial term.

This administration has made every effort to extend ambassadorial tours of duty, to promote career civil servants to posts of higher responsibilities, and to retain Cabinet and sub-Cabinet officers on the job for longer periods than before. For we have learned that brief and uncertain periods in office contribute—not to the best interests of democracy—but to harassed inefficiency and the loss of invaluable experience.

III

Thus I recommend that the Congress adopt this amendment to the Constitution in the belief that it will—

Provide for each Member a sufficient period in which he can bring his best judgment to bear on the great questions of national survival, economic growth, and social welfare.

Free him from the inexorable pressures of biennial campaigning for reelection.

Reduce the cost—financial and political—of holding congressional office.

Attract the best men in private and public life into competition for this high public office.

I am mindful of the principal reason advanced for maintaining the 2-year term—that it is necessary if the voice of the people is to be heard, and changes in public opinion are to be registered on the conduct of public policy. My own experience in almost three decades in public office—and, I believe, the experience of Members of Congress today—is otherwise.

For we do not live in a day when news of congressional action requires weeks to reach our constituents, nor when public opinion is obscured by time and distance. Communications media rush the news to every home and shop within minutes of its occurrence. Public opinion polls, and mountains of mail, leave little doubt about what our people think of the issues most vital to them. I do not fear deafness on the part of those who will take their seats in Congress for a 4-year term.

It is also vital to recognize the effect of a longer term on the authority of the House in making known the will of the people. Established in office for 4 years, the weight of the House in the councils of Government is certain to increase. For the sake of democracy, that is a development devoutly to be welcomed.

IV

I recommend that the amendment become effective no earlier than 1972.

It is imperative that each Member of the House have the opportunity of campaigning during a presidential election year. To divide the House into two classes, as some have proposed—one elected during the "off-year," one with the President—would create an unnecessary and wholly unfair division in that body. It would also create severe problems in every State: as reapportionment is ordered and redistricting takes place.

"Off-year" elections are notorious for attracting far fewer voters—perhaps as much as 15 percent fewer—than presidential elections.

If our purpose is to serve the democratic ideal by making the people's House more effective in its performance of the people's business, then we must require that its Members be chosen by the largest electorate our democracy can produce. That, assuredly, is the electorate called into being during a presidential year.

I do not believe the Congress will wish to make the House the least representative of our three elective elements; by perpetually condemning half its membership to a shrunken electorate. Such a body could not long sustain its claim to be an equal partner in the work of representative government.

V

If this amendment is to serve the public interest—if Members are to be free of campaigning for a period sufficiently long to enable them to master the work of the House—it is right that they should remain at that work during the entire term to which they are elected.

It would defeat the purpose of the amendment, if a Member were free to campaign for the Senate without resigning his seat in the House. Because we seek to strengthen the House, and through it, representative government—not to provide a sanctuary and platform for further electoral contests—I recommend that no Member of either House be eligible for election as a Member of the other House until his own term has expired, unless, at least 30 days prior to that election, he submits his resignation from the office he holds.

VI

Our democracy cannot remain static, a prisoner to the past, if it is to enrich the lives of coming generations. Laws and institutions—to paraphrase Jefferson—must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind, and must respond to the changing conditions of life itself.

One law that should be changed limits the term of office for one of the great arms of our Government to a period too brief for the public good.

Let us no longer bind ourselves to it. Let us reform it. We shall better serve our people when we do.

Because I profoundly agree with former President Eisenhower, when he said, "Congressmen ought to be elected for 4 years, at the same time with the President," I urge the Congress promptly to consider a constitutional amendment extending the term of office for the House of Representatives to 4 years.

REFORM OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

In my special message to the Congress last January, I urged an amendment to the Constitution to reform the electoral college system. I renew this recommendation and strongly reaffirm the need to reform the electorial college system.

There are several major defects in the existing system. They should be eliminated in order to assure that the people's will shall not be frustrated in the choice of their President and Vice President.

First, there presently exists the possibility that the constitutional independence of unpledged electors will be exploited, and that their votes will be manipulated in a close presidential race to block the election of a major candidate in order to throw the election into the House of Representatives. This grave risk should be removed.

Second, if the election is thrown into the House of Representatives, the existing system suffers from other fundamental defects. In such an election, the House of Representatives would be empowered to elect a President from the three highest candidates. However, each State casts only one vote, with the result that the least populous States have the same vote in the election of the President as the most populous States.

As early as 1823, Madison reached the conclusion that—

> The present rule of voting for President by the House of Representatives is so great a departure from the republican principle of numerical equality, and even from the Federal rule, which qualifies the numerical by a State equality, and is so pregnant also, with a mischievous tendency in practice, that an amendment to the Constitution on this point is justly called for by all its considerate and best friends.

I firmly believe that we should put an end to this undemocratic procedure.

Third, if the electoral vote is indecisive under the existing system, the President is elected by the House of Representatives, but the Vice President is elected by the Senate. This creates the possibility of the election of a President and a Vice President from different parties. That possibility should not exist. To prevent its realization, the President and the Vice President should both be elected by the same body.

Fourth, the 23d amendment makes no provision for participation by the District of Columbia in an election of the President by the House of Representatives, or of the Vice President by the Senate.

I firmly believe that we should extend to the District of Columbia all the rights of participation in the election of a President and Vice President which the 50 States may exercise.

Fifth, existing law fails to provide for the death of the President-elect or Vice President-elect between election day and the counting of the electoral votes in December. There is also no provision in the Constitution to cover the contingency presented by the death of a candidate for President or Vice President shortly before the popular election in November. These gaps should now be filled.

Elimination of these defects in our Constitution are long overdue. Our concepts of self-government and sound government require it.

Congress can now, in the words of Daniel Webster, "perform something worthy to be remembered," by uprooting the more objectionable features in the system of electing a President and Vice President, and thereby helping to preserve representative government and the two-party system.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 20, 1966.*

A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF MR. AMLETO ABBATANGELO

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill for the relief of Mr. Amleto Abbatangelo, a present citizen of Italy who is in this country on a nonimmigrant visa. Mr. Abbatangelo has peculiar talents of immediate value to the growing Missouri tourist industry. Although this individual is making efforts to avail himself of an administrative remedy, the machinery for the adjustment of his status will take some time. This bill will allow the opportunity for Mr. Abbatangelo's needed skills to benefit the country and the economy while his status is being clarified.

ALCOHOLISM—ONE COMPANY'S SPLENDID REACTION

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., has adopted a farsighted compassionate policy for its employees suffering from the disease of alcoholism. So that other company and union officials may profit from the experience of this company, I ask unanimous consent to have an article entitled "Alcoholism," which was contained in the December 1965 issue of P.T.M., the company magazine, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

I urge other companies and labor unions, large and small, to consider this valuable report on a most commendable project of Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.:

ALCOHOLISM

More than 6 years ago, Pacific Telephone introduced a formal policy and program to help employees suffering from the disease of alcoholism.

This program has brought our company wide recognition and representatives of our medical and personnel departments have been asked to speak to groups throughout the country. Our general medical director, Dr. Clyde C. Greene, Jr., recently participated in the Industrial Workshop at the 1965 Utah School of Alcohol Studies. He traced the development of our program from its discussion stages to the present time. One of the early problems he mentioned was overcoming the reluctance of employees, including those in management, to accept the fact that alcoholism is an illness and not perverse or antisocial behavior. Recognition by Pacific Telephone people of the fact that alcoholism is, indeed, a serious disease, has now been generally accomplished through the efforts of our medical and personnel departments.

Last year, when the program had been in existence for 5 years, the company decided to review completely all aspects of the policy and program. This has now been done with the assistance and cooperation of all the areas and departments. The results are heartening. The overall program is considered to be of definite value to the company and its employees. Many employees have been helped because of the existence of the policy, a number of them persons who had not been diagnosed as alcoholics. Many recognized alcoholics have been rehabilitated. The review showed a need for some minor revisions in the program. The company is now working to bring about these changes.

Over the 6 years the program has been in operation there has been a significant change in the public attitude toward the severity and incidence of alcoholism. However, the stigma attached to the diagnosis has not disappeared and supervisors do not yet find the recognition and supervision of a person suffering from alcoholism an easy task.

An informal status report, cited by Dr. Greene in his recent talk before the Utah School on Alcohol Studies, indicates that our rehabilitation rate to date has been about 40 percent, with rehabilitation being defined as 2 years of work with no known use of alcohol. The remaining 60 percent of the cases were closed as failures. Among the failures, 11 percent resulted from death, 40 percent from retirement for any reason, including age; 15 percent from resignation, and 34 percent from dismissal. Many other cases are still open with the end result unpredictable.

The medical department has knowledge of other employees who have controlled their use of alcohol without having been officially recognized as alcoholics.

Employees being the company's single most valued asset, we cannot afford to lose them for any health problem, including alcoholism, without making a serious effort to maintain and/or restore good health. What does this mean to us as employees of this company? What it should mean, if we are aware of the policy and program, is that alcoholism is recognized as a serious illness, that the company stands ready to assist anyone suffering from it as quickly as the need can be recognized and diagnosed, and that the chances for successful treatment are much greater if it is detected early. The longer we wait, the harder the problem. Many of the failures detailed in this report resulted from late diagnosis.

In an accompanying interview, Dr. Greene offers additional insights into this widespread health menace and dispels some misconceptions about it.

AN INTERVIEW WITH DR. CLYDE C. GREENE, JR., GENERAL MEDICAL DIRECTOR, ON THE DISEASE OF ALCOHOLISM

Question. Dr. Greene, how serious is the alcoholism problem in the United States?

Answer. The latest estimates indicate there are some 5 million alcoholics in the country today, 2 million of them wage earners. There's no question but what it is one of the Nation's most severe public health problems, probably outranked only by emotional illness, heart disease, and cancer.

Question. What chance is there that I will become an alcoholic if I drink?

Answer. Statistics show that 1 out of 15 persons who drink at all will, sooner or later, develop alcoholism.

Question. How about age? Is a person with alcoholism likely to fall into any age bracket?

Answer. Yes. Most men and women contract the disease only after years of so-called normal drinking. This means that they tend to become ill in the middle years when their experience, maturity, and productive powers should be at their peaks. This is a terrible loss to their families and to the companies they work for. Needless to say, it's a tragedy for the individuals personally.

Question. What can be done to help a person who has alcoholism?

Answer. There are many things we can do. The treatment varies with each individual. Diet is important—and that includes vitamins and minerals. There is a wide variety of medication. Many tranquilizers are used, and for a very carefully selected few there are drugs which make it extremely dangerous if not fatal to drink. There is also the so-called aversion treatment where shots are given along with alcohol and the resulting violent illness is associated in the patient's mind with drinking. Some patients find most help through religion. Others respond to psychiatric counseling. One of the most successful groups, of course, is Alcoholics Anonymous, which employs a sympathetic but strong group approach through staying away from alcohol 1 day at a time.

Question. There have been a number of stories in the newspapers lately indicating that a person can be cured of alcoholism and taught to develop an acceptable pattern of moderate social drinking. Would you please comment on this?

Answer. There are a few physicians who say this is possible. I have never seen an example and do not believe that there is a cure in the usual sense for alcoholism. It can be controlled or arrested, that's all, and the way to control it is: No alcohol at all. End of quote.

Question. How can a person know whether he's just a normal "social drinker" or an alcoholic?

Answer. Anyone can tell whether or not he is in trouble because of drinking. However, no lay person can say whether or not he or someone else has alcoholism. That's a job for the physician. The one thing all persons suffering from alcoholism have in common is their loss of the ability to control their drinking. Once they take a drink, they've got to take more and they can't stop. Such a person may have been drinking socially for years. What makes it suddenly impossible for him to enjoy a couple and go home? We just don't know.

Question. Is it difficult to recognize the alcoholic in the business world?

Answer. Very difficult. Remember this, only 3 percent of the alcoholics in this country fit the average person's stereotype of the "skid row bum." The great majority of alcoholics are able to cover up their problem for a long time of period. In fact, this is one of the common characteristics of the sufferers from this illness—they are extremely skilled at hiding their problem. Among other common characteristics are highly variable moods, attitudes and productivity.

Question. You say they hide their problem. How can they do this?

Answer. Usually with the aid of sympathetic family, friends or supervisors who tend to want to protect them and keep their plight a secret.

Question. This wouldn't seem to be a really helpful approach, would it?

Answer. Indeed, not. In fact, such people are lengthening the odds against our being able to help the sick person.

Question. In your own diagnosis of alcoholism, do you have any particular guideline?

Answer. Yes. In accordance with our company's policy, an employee can be said to have alcoholism if his drinking interferes with any major part of his life—job—health—family—social life or reputation in the community.

Question. What about the physical effects of excessive drinking, doctor?

Answer. If we ignore the acute poisoning effect of overdosage, which, of course, can be fatal, the physical harm is to a large degree the product of nutritional imbalances. Alcohol is a food of sorts, rich in calories, but it contains no vitamins or minerals. One of two things will happen to a person with alcoholism: (1) He'll get all the calories he needs and won't eat, bringing on a vitamin and mineral deficiency, or (2) he'll continue to eat, gain weight and develop complications associated with obesity. The degeneration of the liver and kidneys which so often accompanies alcoholism is due to nutritional deficiency or to excess fat in those organs.

Question. Is alcohol a stimulant?

Answer. No; it is a sedative—a kind of depressant or anesthetic. In concentrated form it irritates the intestinal tract, causing vomiting, thus complicating the nutritional problem.

Question. What is the most important thing a relative, friend or coworker can do for a person with alcoholism?

Answer. Try to make the sick person recognize that he or she has lost control and needs help. This, of course, should not be done when a person is intoxicated.

Question. Is early recognition important?

Answer. Extremely important. It does little good to recognize alcoholism when a person is dying from its long-term effects. The hidden alcoholic in the early or middle stages of the disease is now recognized as the person who can be most easily rehabilitated if found in time.

Question. What is the company's attitude toward the alcoholic employee?

Answer. The alcoholic employee who accepts the fact of loss of control of drinking, is entitled to all his benefits while cooperating toward rehabilitation. The basic objective here is one that I believe any employer, any union or any employee group could endorse and support if the administration of the policy and objective is as stated. I can assure you that it is.

Question. It's difficult to understand why people who know they are sick don't ask for help. Why is this?

Answer. There are many reasons. No one likes to admit that he cannot control a problem, physical or mental. Also, there is an ancient stigma about alcoholism. People feel that there's something morally bad about it, or they believe that their job or chances for promotion may be endangered, which, of course, is what will happen eventually if they don't get help. Another reason is that some just don't want to give up alcohol.

Question. Would you comment on the effect of drinking on the family?

Answer. Yes, and in addition to the social and economic problems as well as the all too common physical damage to family members by the alcoholic, there is still another important aspect. Children tend to reflect the drinking habits of their parents. A child with two alcoholic parents is in serious danger.

Question. One final question, doctor. What can we do to lessen the chance that we will become alcoholic?

Answer. Dr. William Terhune, one authority on the problem, has suggested "Ten Commandments." I think they are worth heeding:

1. Never take a drink just because you think you need one.

2. Sip slowly and pace your drinks—the second after 30 minutes and a third an hour after the second. Never a fourth.

3. Dilute alcohol. Have a long, weak drink—never on the rocks, never straight, and never right out of the bottle.

4. Keep an accurate and truthful mental record of the amount and number of drinks you take. Never take a drink every day.

5. Be vigilant and do not permit your host to give you doubles or triples.

6. Do not drink on an empty stomach.

7. Do not drink on "signal." Such signals as "luncheon," "left office," "dinner," "meeting people," and "celebration" should be skipped. Instead, substitute something else—a big cup of coffee, hot tea or a bowl of bouillon. Even a drink of water will help.

8. When tired or tense, soak in a hot tub instead of drinking. Follow with a cold shower.

9. Never take a drink to escape discomfort, either physical or mental.

10. Never take a drink in the morning, thinking it will offset a hangover.

NOW, WHAT ABOUT KANSAS?

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Mize] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, every State can point with pride to the attributes which make it stand out from all the rest as something special. This is certainly true of Kansas, where we feel we have a great many things going for us which make us the envy of those commonwealths less endowed. A recent editorial in the Topeka, Kans., Daily Capital sets forth a sparkling list of what Kansas is. Under leave to extend my remarks, I respectfully include this editorial, under the title "Know Your State," in the body of the Record:

Know Your State

For the benefit of argumentative barbarians who might boorishly demand, "Now what about Kansas?" the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce has the answers. With the cooperation of its research department, it has prepared a nutshell report on what Kansas is and stands for.

As projected, it will take the form of a pocket card of which two each, or about 8,000, will go to members of the State chamber. News media will also receive copies, and there is a possibility circulation will expand through the Kansas Economic Development Commission. It will read:

"Kansas is—

"The wheatheart of the Nation, ranking first in the production of wheat and in flour milling.

"The salt of the earth, with sufficient salt reserves to last the United States 375,000 years at the present rate of consumption.

"A State with a real sunny disposition—and people to match. (A 67-percent average percentage of possible sunshine; also, 92 percent of daylight hour weather is conducive to outdoor recreation.)

"A world leader and ranking first in the United States in the production of executive aircraft.

"A growing industrial center, with one out of every eight of the Nation's largest corporations having headquarters or branch plants in Kansas. Also, Kansas ranks among the top 10 States in the Nation in auto assembly.

"An important mineral producing State.

"A healthful place, ranking among the top 10 States in life expectancy.

"Ranking fourth in helium production.

"Ranking fourth in the number of producing oil wells.

"Ranking fifth in the production of natural gas.

"Ranking seventh in crude petroleum production.

"Ranking ninth in overall mineral production.

"A leading transportation center.

"Ranking third in total road and street mileage (exceeded only by Texas and California); enough mileage to reach literally half-way to the moon.

"Ranking sixth in total railroad mileage without a State debt.

"The geodetic, or map-making center, for the North American Continent.

"Leader in establishing direct primary elections and the legislative council.

"An acknowledged leader among the States in the field of mental health.

"A literary State, keeping up to date with more daily newspapers than all but nine other States.

"A State with four invigorating seasons and an average temperature of 55 degrees.

"A growing center of higher education, with 45 institutions of higher learning with enrollments topping 50,000 students."

THE 103D ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 103 years ago the people of Poland revolted against the autocratic rule of czarist Russia and fought heroically against far superior manpower. The Polish insurrection of 1863 failed, but the people of Poland persevered and finally achieved their independence in 1918.

This historic event has special significance at the present time since the current Communist dictatorship of the Soviet Union, which is substantially more diabolical than the czarist regime, actually holds Poland in bondage through the Communist regime which Russian military forces installed at the close of World War II.

On this historic occasion, the 103d anniversary of the Polish struggle for freedom against the czars, we encourage the brave people of Poland to remember that the defeat of that year was ultimately rewarded in independence, thus demonstrating the perseverance of the Polish people and the righteousness of their cause. Certainly, this historic perseverance and quest for freedom will again produce a government based on the true wishes of the Polish people.

It is certainly not asking too much of the U.S. State Department, which is giving lipservice to the principle of self-determination, that it develop a foreign policy which would apply this principle to the oppressed people of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, a current note that relates to the Soviet puppet government in Warsaw is the recent action by the Polish Reds banning trips outside the country by Cardinal Wyszynski. One hundred and three years ago czarist officials persecuted the churches of Poland, just as their Communist successors persecute religion today. It is also pertinent to note that this year the people of Poland celebrate 1,000 years of Christianity. Throughout the world free Poles will commemorate this historic landmark and pray that the great faith of their people will help produce the freedom to which they are entitled.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON PAYS TRIBUTE TO HISTORIC VALOR OF THE POLISH PEOPLE

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, we are reminded that this Saturday, January 22, is the 103d anniversary of the Polish insurrection against Czarist Russia. This observance is important to us in a multitude of respects, and I believe properly of interest to a legislative body whose Members are dedicated to the cause of freedom from oppression.

I would like to share with my colleagues a brief historical account of this valiant uprising because I think it illuminates very clearly the noble qualities of the Polish people in their quest for self-determination and individual liberty. These are qualities which burn in the hearts of Poles today as they struggle to lift off the yoke of Soviet tyranny that harnesses their proud land.

Further, these national characteristics are prominently present among our fellow citizens whose ancestry is Polish. I have the honor to represent many people from Rochester, New York's Polish community, so that I feel confident in speaking from personal acquaintance of the love of freedom which is the heritage of every Pole.

In remembering the events of 1863, I ask that the United States reaffirm its support of the aspirations and yearnings of the people in Poland to join the family of free and independent nations.

Of the innumerable peoples under the autocratic regime of Czarist Russia the Poles were the most restless and proved most difficult for the Czar's officials to reconcile. They refused to submit passively to Russian rule and repeatedly during the 19th century they arose in rebellion. But each time they were put down with cruel severity. However, ruthlessness and cruelty could not subdue the Poles. They wanted to regain their political rights and national freedom. That was the goal of the Polish insurrection of 1863.

This abortive but heroic armed uprising had its beginning late in 1861. At that time the spirit of revolution flared up in Poland, and a conspiracy was formed with adherents in all parts of the country. In Warsaw there was a demonstration on October 15; the people took possession of the churches and refused to be dislodged. This led to the closing of the churches by the clergy. Then the Czar made overtures of peace, and the churches were reopened in February of 1862. Later on, through conciliation and concessions, a period of peace ensued, and it looked as though the revolutionary activity of the rebels was blunted. In the summer, however, an attempt to assassinate the Grand Duke—brother of the Czar—occurred in Warsaw, and the Russian Government hanged the persons charged with the attempted assassination. This provoked new uprisings. The Central National Committee was set up in Warsaw, and called itself the true government of Poland. Again the Czar made friendly overtures, and even promised autonomy to the Poles. But the Polish leaders sent an ultimatum to the Czar stating that they would accept nothing short of complete national freedom.

This daring move cut short the possibility of an easy settlement. In this hour of trial the Poles placed high hopes for the success of their rebellion on international diplomacy, expecting more than mere moral support at least from France. On January 16, 1863, Polish leaders called the nation to arms, even though they could organize no more than 10,000 men against the Czar's 100,000. The Poles then serving in the Russian Army responded to this call, resulting in simultaneous uprisings in many parts of the country. As there was no unified command, units of these soldiers operated for many weeks as guerrillas, until General Langiewicz emerged as leader early in March. Soon, however, he was defeated in a pitched battle, escaped to Austria, and there he submitted to arrest and internment. The peasants in the steppe country could not be united behind the rebels with any effectiveness, and the Russians had little difficulty in conciliating them. The rebel leaders soon realized the seriousness of their situation. While fighting through spring and summer against forbidding odds, they resorted to diplomacy.

They sent Wladislaw Czartoryski to London and Paris to plead the Polish cause. But this resulted in only token gestures on the part of England and France, and the Governments of these countries reminded the Government of Russia of its international guarantee in the Treaty of Vienna. But Russia did not heed and the diplomatic hopes of the Poles were dashed. Meanwhile they had found a new leader in the 37-year-old Romuald Traugutt, an ex-officer in the Russian Army. In mid-October he was in Poland with dictatorial powers. He hoped to draw upon the untapped fighting manpower of the peasantry. But his efforts were frustrated. Through devious and deceptive means the Czar's agents had succeeded in alienating the bulk of the peasantry from the revolutionary cause in Poland. This weakened greatly the chances of the revolutionists, and by the early spring of 1864 all seemed lost. With the capture and hanging of Traugutt on the public square in Warsaw on August 5, the glorious Polish Insurrection of 1863 came to an abortive end.

CLARKSBURG, W. VA.—BIRTHPLACE OF STONEWALL JACKSON

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, my State of West Virginia was born of the strife of the Civil War. It was the scene of numerous Civil War battles which pitted brother against brother and friend against friend. Several of the great Civil War generals were born in the hills and valleys of West Virginia, as it was known prior to secession from Virginia and becoming officially admitted to the Union on June 20, 1863. Among the Civil War leaders who called western Virginia their home was Stonewall Jackson, who was born in Clarksburg, W. Va., on January 21, 1824. It was ironic that Stonewall Jackson was killed in battle in 1863—the year West Virginia became a State. He was 39 years old at the time. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following extremely well-written article which appeared in the January 21, 1966, edition of the Clarksburg, W. Va., Exponent on Stonewall Jackson:

Stonewall Jackson Was Born in Clarksburg 142 Years Ago Today

Today marks the 142d anniversary of the birth of Gen. Thomas Jonathan (Stonewall) Jackson, born in Clarksburg, January 21, 1824.

S. J. Birshtein, chairman of the Stonewall Jackson Historical Committee of the Chamber of Commerce, informed the press that two local organizations are honoring the occasion with appropriate wreaths.

The United Daughters of the Confederacy have placed a wreath on both the Stonewall equestrian statue and on the bronze plaque erected on the site in the 300 block of West Main Street where the famous general was born.

The Stonewall Jackson Civic Club has remembered the 142d anniversary by placing a wreath on the striking equestrian statue located on the plaza of the Harrison County Courthouse.

The Clarksburg chapter of the UDC erected the bronze plaque in August 1911 to commemorate the famous general's birthplace. On May 10, 1953, the equestrian statue was dedicated.

The magnificent work of art was sculptured by the late Charles Keck of New York and the base of the statue was designed by William Grant, Clarksburg architect.

Birshtein furnished the press with the following information regarding Clarksburg's great general and renowned military tactician:

Clarksburg's brilliant officer during the War Between the States acquired the sobriquet or nickname of "Stonewall" with the stubborn defense of his 1st brigade in the first Battle of Manassas (Bull Run) on July 21, 1861.

Gen. Barnard E. Bee in rallying his men exclaimed "See, there stands Jackson like a stone wall." A near rout for the Confederate forces was turned into an overwhelming victory. Throughout the Confederacy and the world he became "Stonewall Jackson" from that moment on.

General Jackson was one of the ablest of the Confederate officers, and was probably the greatest corps commander on either side during the war. He had a deeply religious nature and has often been compared with the Cromwellian leaders in England, historians contend.

He deprecated secession but was a strong believer in States' rights, and when Virginia withdrew from the Union he maintained his allegiance to the State.

The military tactics of "Stonewall" Jackson are studied at West Point, Virginia Military Institute, Fort Knox, in St. Cyr, France, and at Sandhurst, England. It is said to be the consensus of military experts that his genius has seldom been equaled and never surpassed.

One of the finest tributes to "Stonewall" was sent in a telegram by the great general of World War II, Douglas MacArthur at the unveiling of the bronze bust of "Stonewall" in the Hall of Fame at New York University, May 19, 1957:

"Perhaps the most prized message I ever received came from the famous historian, Douglas Southall Freeman, who wrote me at the close of my campaigns in the Southwest Pacific area of World War II, 'The mantle of Robert E. Lee and "Stonewall" Jackson has now fallen on your shoulders.' "

Two of "Stonewall's" favorite maxims are "You may be whatever you resolve to be" and "Never take counsel of your fears."

Birshtein said that few persons in West Virginia realize that the Clarksburg Public Library has an original letter by Stonewall. This letter is on exhibit together with a miniature replica of the Polaris submarine, the *Stonewall Jackson,* and other diversified mementos dealing with General Jackson.

Miss Charlotte Bailey, librarian, has extended an invitation to the public to visit the Clarksburg Public Library and examine the Jackson items being displayed.

Also on display is an excellent sketch by Bruce Haymond of Jackson's birthplace (234–328 West Main Street) now occupied by a mercantile store. The sketch graphically reveals a neat 3-room brick cottage with semiattic and inset porch, of a type now fast disappearing.

A large oil painting by David Van Pelt is also on exhibit in the library. This painting of Stonewall is by Edwin F. Draughman and is a fine copy of the famous original by John A. Elder in the Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C.

A ladderback rocker which belonged to Stonewall's mother can also be seen in the library.

The original letter by Jackson was presented to the library by the late D. H. Hill Arnold of Elkins, grand nephew of Stonewall.

The letter, postmarked West Point, is addressed to Jackson's sister, Mrs. L. (Laura) A. Arnold of Beverly, Randolph County.

Stonewall wrote his sister of his preparations for the annual examination at West Point and reported that his health was "very good at the present." He requested that his sister inform him as to the subscription rates of "the Democratic paper published in Clarksburg."

Jackson's paternal grandparents, his father Jonathan, and Stonewall's sister Elizabeth, are buried in the historic cemetery located in Jackson Park located on East Pike Street in Clarksburg.

The general's mother is buried in Ansted, W. Va. His sister, Laura, is buried in Buckhannon, and his brother Warren is buried near that city.

Stonewall Jackson died May 10, 1863, at the age of 39, near Guinea Station, Va., and is buried in Lexington, Va. He had led the army corps around Hooker's flank at the battle of Chancellorsville, routing the right wing of the Federal army.

He was wounded and died of pneumonia.

His death was a severe blow to Gen. Robert E. Lee and the southern cause. Jackson was a religious man who always prayed before battle. He was a tactician of the first rank and although a strict disciplinarian, was popular with his men. He was Lee's ablest and most trusted lieutenant.

EXPANSION OF EDUCATIONAL FIELD CALLS FOR ADDITIONAL TEACHERS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Helstoski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of this 89th Congress, we have had under consideration and passed several bills to aid in the advancement of education. We provided for educational facilities, and reported several measures to aid teachers in their desire to advance themselves in their chosen profession.

All this, we have done with the full knowledge that our educational system would be of the highest caliber that we can offer to our youth to face these times when our Nation is rapidly expanding its technological knowledge.

This expansion in the field of education necessarily needs additional teachers to keep pace in imparting to our youth the knowledge they possess.

In view of the fact that there is a critical need for well-qualified teachers, it is inconsistent that many local selective service boards have taken steps to induct into the services many teachers whose services are required on the home front. A fair number of teachers in the State of New Jersey have received their induction notices—to be taken in the middle of a school year into our Armed Forces. This is unfair to the schoolteachers and to the institutions which they serve.

To correct this injustice, I am today introducing legislation—H.R. 12209—which would amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, by adding a new subsection which reads as follows:

> (p) Any person who is employed on a full-time basis as a teacher in a public or private elementary school, high school, college, university, or similar institution, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be exempted from induction for training and service under this Act.

It is my hope that this legislation will receive early and favorable consideration so that our well-trained and qualified teachers will not be inducted into the armed services at a time when we experience the greatest need for their capabilities to teach the youth of our Nation.

AMENDING TARIFF SCHEDULES TO PROVIDE FOR EDUCATIONAL EQUIPMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Helstoski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide for the free importation of certain specialized educational equipment.

This legislation would remove from the U.S. tariff list special educational equipment which is used in the so-called Montessori system of teaching preschool children, which is not manufactured in the United States because of a limited market.

This special apparatus is mandatory for the employment of the Montessori system. The child learns through his physical manipulation of the equipment and through its self-corrective qualities. The equipment is varied and diverse and I shall enumerate only a few of the most essential items.

Among others, one will find wooden graded touch boards, wooden geometrical solids, wooden color tablets, metal geometrical insets, sandpaper letters on wood, number frames, boxes with chromonickel temperature tubes, bead stairs, boxes of beads for subtraction with charts on wood, and many others.

The existing tariff schedules already permit duty-free imports of many kinds and types of educational materials. The need for this bill stems out of the fact that the equipment used in the Montessori system of teaching is unique in its nature and the restrictive definitions of the various duty-free materials currently listed in the tariff schedules.

Many of our most distinguished educators acclaim the Montessori system, which was evolved by Dr. Maria Montessori after she received her degree in medicine from the University of Rome late in the 1890's. Working in the university psychiatric clinic, Dr. Montessori was shocked by the lack of training facilities and lack of toys for retarded children. Her efforts to correct this situation led to the establishment of a state school for such children and there she developed simple teaching apparatus to help these children obtain even a simple education. Using her method, soon many of these children were reading, writing, and doing simple problems as well as children with a normal mentality of the same age.

Dr. Montessori continued her study, research, and experimentation and, in 1906 opened a school in Rome's worst slum district. It was quickly found that her techniques had even a greater effect upon normal children in the advancement of their education. The Montessori system of education soon spread to many parts of the world and it was clearly shown that it is effective with normal children, with retarded children, with children of any culture or social background. It knows no language barriers or religious beliefs.

This is a highly meritorious educational program, but we are hindering its use by maintaining a tariff on the apparatus used in the Montessori system of advancing education. The removal of the tariff will not in any way hinder any domestic industry, since none of these items are manufactured in the United States. It could, however, permit the expansion of this type of teaching among what we call the culturally deprived—the big city slum child who is a major target of President Johnson's antipoverty program.

Antipoverty programs, with a strong emphasis on preschool education, are seriously considering using the Montessori system as one of the time-tested and proven programs for this preschool age group. The removal of the tariff on the materials used in this method will greatly assist our educators in expanding this type of project in their communities.

EXTENSION OF EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS TO VETERANS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to extend GI educational benefits to veterans who have served in the Armed Forces during the period February 1, 1955, until the Universal Military Training and Service Act terminates.

The educational and training allowances in my bill are identical to those of S. 9, passed by the Senate last year. The effective date of eligibility for entitlement is also the same as provided in S. 9, but my bill makes servicemen eligible as long as we find it necessary to draft young men for military service. The tendering of educational benefits to some veterans and not to others on the basis of cutoff dates is bound to produce inequities.

An important additional advantage of this bill is that it creates an incentive for our highly trained military personnel to remain in the service without forfeiting their educational entitlements. The bill provides that educational and training programs must commence within 3 years after his last discharge or release from active duty.

Now is an opportune time to give attention to a GI educational program on a long-range basis. We need a plan which is coherent and equitable, and applicable to all servicemen without regard to where they may be directed to serve in response to the exigencies of the cold war or crisis situations.

HARRY MARLEY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hanley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, I was privileged to attend the annual meeting of the Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, here in Washington. The outgoing president of the institute is a resident of my congressional district and, I might add, one of central New York's most outstanding citizens—Mr. Harry Marley.

I am pleased to call Harry Marley my friend, and want, for a few minutes today to relate to the House some of his activities as president of the institute.

For purposes of clarification, it should be emphasized that the institute is an association of scrap processors. They are not junk dealers, nor are they auto wreckers. Scrap processors perform a yeoman's job in conserving our natural resources. They also play an integral role in preserving the natural beauty of our Nation.

During his tenure as president of the institute and before, Harry Marley played a leading role in the above-mentioned activities of America's scrap processors. He represented the scrap processing industry before Congress during the hearings on the highway beautification bill; at the White House Conference on Natural Beauty; on the National Advisory Committee on Highway Beautification; and at the annual international conference of scrap and salvage associations, held last year in England.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Marley is so esteemed in his profession that last year, the institute subscribed, in his name, $4,000 to the Scrap Research Foundation.

Harry Marley's personal dedication exemplifies the dedication of the institute to making America a better place in which to live. Both have contributed greatly to America's store of precious metals and both deserve recognition.

MODERNIZATIONS IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hanley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Postmaster General O'Brien announced at a press conference many long overdue modernizations in the postal service. As a member of the Modernization and Facilities Subcommittee of the House, I am most pleased with the Postmaster's actions.

The job Mr. O'Brien assumed is one of the most difficult in the Government. He must oversee the operations of a multibillion-dollar operation, and the performance of over 600,000 employees. That he has begun his task admirably is self-evident; that he will succeed in our efforts to bring the U.S. postal service into the mid-20th century is predictable.

Mr. Speaker, no activity of the Federal Government plays a more vital role in the continued expansion of our economy. Fast, efficient postal service is an absolute necessity for the business community, and a growing business community is an absolute necessity for a sound economy.

I salute the Postmaster General for his bold initiative and promise my own support in his efforts to improve the postal system.

We are fortunate in having this man, his energies, and his talents at the service of the American people.

NEW IDEAS—NEW SUCCESSES

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Hathaway] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the wings of a mighty airplane are built not rigidly but with great flexibility. Indeed, this flexibility makes them strong and enduring.

This is, in a sense, what is great about America and Americans. We have built new industries by trying new approaches. We have never closed doors just to prove that we could be rigid and thereby strong. We gain new solutions by new ideas. We are truly a nation of people who are willing to listen, to learn. We learn because we have not arrived at a point where we think we have all answers to all solutions down pat and easy.

In a recent editorial, the Christian Science Monitor pointed out:

> The situation in Vietnam is difficult and complicated. But we are convinced that an answer to that situation is available.

Because this article will be of much interest to my colleagues, I have asked permission to insert it in the Record, as follows:

RIGHT MOTIVE—RIGHT PATH

Seldom in its history has the United States had a greater need for the virtues of patience, wisdom, and care. Faced with the crucial question of where to go next in the Vietnamese war, America can afford no misstep, whether this misstep be a rash broadening of the conflict or a misguided failure to do what the moral and practical aspects of the situation require.

The United States has already made a major contribution to the effort to find a path to peace with its suspension of the bombing of North Vietnam.

Doubtless this suspension greatly helped bring about the direct contact between Washington and Hanoi, now confirmed by the White House. This, in itself, constitutes full justification for the American decision. In addition, the suspension responds both to the wishes of an anxious world and to the promptings of America's own conscience.

From most points of view, the road ahead is somber and obscure. To many observers it appears to offer a choice only between dishonorable retreat and a disastrous broadening of the war. It is at just such a moment that a nation, like an individual, needs to sit back, think calmly and carefully about the situation, and open its thoughts to those answers which come from a wisdom higher than man's own.

In Isaiah we read: "And thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it, when ye turn to the right hand, and when ye turn to the left." If we assume that America's aims in Vietnam are honorable and right (whatever doubts may be held about some of its methods) we have the right to expect that the correct method of achieving those goals will become apparent. History has often shown that rightness of motive brings rightness of action, and that a path through an apparently impenetrable wood will open up where at first all roads seemed blocked.

We believe that the United States is in the right frame of mind to look and listen for such an answer. Despite the frustrating aspects of the war in southeast Asia, it is still happily obvious that no war psychosis has yet gripped America. Nor, we believe, is America adamant on imposing any one preconceived solution on Vietnam. These facts bring a flexibility to the situation which is a necessary part of any openminded search for a just solution.

The situation in Vietnam is difficult and complicated. But we are convinced that an answer to that situation is available. It can be found through looking and listening.

COMMITMENT OF RELIGIOUS LEADERS TO THE ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gilligan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of my colleagues to a statement released in Washington this week by the Inter-Religious Committee Against Poverty.

The newly formed, 45-member committee includes leaders from the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the National Council of Churches, and the Synagogue Council of America.

This committee represents millions of Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant Americans and its purpose, as outlined in the lucid statement that follows, is both right and noble.

It represents a vigorous commitment by the Nation's religious leaders to expanding and strengthening the programs already laid out in antipoverty legislation passed by the Congress.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF INTER-RELIGIOUS COMMITTEE AGAINST POVERTY

The leaders of churches, synagogues, and organizations cooperating through the Inter-Religious Committee Against Poverty are committed to the proposition that the persistence of massive poverty in our society is a moral blight which can and must be eradicated.

Recent Federal legislation marks a great stride forward in America's efforts to achieve this national purpose. The passage of the Economic Opportunity Act, the legislation for Appalachia, the Manpower and Development Training Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the Civil Rights Act, social security amendments including medicare, expansion of the rehabilitative focus of public welfare, legislation for housing urban renewal, health, education, and other measures represent notable advances.

What is on the statute books must be implemented and augmented to translate the hopeful potentialities of these goals into effective realities.

Many programs are already demonstrating their value. They should be extended and intensified. And where experience has indicated opportunities for improvement, such constructive advances should be made.

In view of the magnitude of the task and the experimental nature of these programs, some mistakes may well occur in their conception and implementation.

While the duty of responsible criticism should be exercised, the entire effort should not be condemned because of occasional false starts, setbacks, or errors of judgment. Such problems are inherent in new programs and should be the stimulus to new and greater efforts and commitments.

THE PROGRAM MUST BE STRENGTHENED

Our military commitments in Vietnam have led some to suggest reduction or holding the line on domestic antipoverty, health and educational programs. We reject such proposals as a major retreat in the war on poverty and a major defeat for America. Hundreds of thousands of the poor are now participating in governmental antipoverty programs. Their opportunities must not be wasted or thwarted.

Those now being assisted and the millions not yet being assisted must be helped to escape from poverty and to make their contribution to the strengthening of our society.

We urge that increased appropriations be provided to strengthen and broaden the Nation's programs to eliminate poverty. Our country has both the material and human resources to expand and strengthen these programs. It would be a cruel injustice to require that the poor—the young, the old, the sick, the disadvantaged—should be the ones to make the major sacrifice for the other problems we must solve.

COMMUNITY ACTION

The Congress has wisely emphasized the importance of community action programs to encourage local initiative and responsibility for devising and administering programs best adapted to differing needs, problems and circumstances.

Greater awareness of poverty in each community, deeper understanding of its causes, a firm resolve to overcome it and the strengthening of communitywide bodies with the fullest participation of voluntary agencies are vital goals of antipoverty programs. We urge continuing and increased support for community action programs.

MAXIMUM FEASIBLE PARTICIPATION OF THE POOR

One of the most challenging aspects of the community action programs is the requirement that they be "developed, conducted and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the area and members of the group served." This basic concept is an integral part of the religious and democratic commitment to help people to help themselves. We deplore any attempt, national or local, to dilute the concept of maximum participation of the poor. We affirm our faith in the fact that their involvement is feasible and should be viewed as a creative utilization of the natural human resources found in the community of the deprived who are themselves dedicated to ridding the Nation of poverty. Constructive participation of the poor in the conduct of these programs is achieveable. The difficulties of accomplishing this purpose should not lessen our striving for its realization. We urge a redoubling of the efforts to encourage the full involvement of the poor in antipoverty programs.

The commitment to our antipoverty programs must not only be maintained but must be increased to achieve its noble purpose—the development of a just society.

SING-OUT '66

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Fifth District of Tennessee at Nashville will be experiencing over the next few days the celebrated Sing-Out '66 edition of the moral rearmament program of recent months.

In view of widespread distortions in our era regarding the attitudes and beliefs of our younger generation, I am in agreement with many Tennesseans and Americans in finding abundant stimulation from the conviction of these youngsters.

It is heartening indeed to note the message being delivered by this group who demonstrate the majority thinking of younger America. Of paramount importance, the moral rearmament movement has registered in a dignified manner what they are for, as opposed to what some minority groups and individuals are against.

The moral rearmament movement takes issue with the advocates of moral and military pacifism, noninvolvement, atheism, and the so-called new morality. These Americans are punctuating with exciting patriotism, colorful and meaningful alternatives to being communized, animalized, and modernized. It is such actions as these, manifested by the energy of our youth, which serve up the answer to some of the knottiest problems of our times and formulate concrete plans and action for attack.

I have requested permission for this notation to be entered into the RECORD; and with it, commendation to Mr. James Stahlman, publisher of the Nashville Banner, for his sponship of this program and support of the movement in general.

Also gratitude and congratulations to the Banner's Lee Bandy, in Washington, and Jacque Stubbel, in Nashville, whose reportorial endeavors applied measurable antidotes against beatnikism.

REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to follow the lead of our very able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN], in proposing a Redwood National Park on the northern coast of California. The gentleman's efforts on behalf of conservation have appropriately earned him the gratitude of many of us who share his anxiety about the depletion of this great and natural wonder.

The bill I have introduced today is identical to that proposed last year by the gentleman from California.

The redwoods are a vital and historic national asset, and I know that many of us from throughout the Nation will support the efforts to save them. These giant trees, some of them reaching skyward more than 300 feet, belong not only to the great State and people of California but to all America. They stood before our Nation was established. In the minds of visitors to our country, they are as much a symbol of the United States as some of our famous landmarks and public buildings.

Over the years, 85 percent of the redwood stands have been cut for commercial and industrial uses. Only 15 percent of our country's original redwood forest remains, and it would be a monumental and irreparable loss if more of these virgin redwoods—the world's tallest trees—were destroyed.

The proposed Redwood National Park would preserve 90,000 acres identified as most desirable by the National Geographic Society, the Sierra Club, and the National Park Service. It includes the largest remaining concentration of virgin redwoods. I urge all of my colleagues to join in supporting the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] in his effort to preserve the remaining redwoods.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b)

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, high on the agenda of unfinished business of this 89th Congress is repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Section 14(b) has permitted 19 States to hold down wage rates by banning the union shop. Using this lure of lower wage scales, these areas have conducted a series of raids on established industries in other States.

In my own home State of Ohio, union leaders claim that we have lost 15,000 jobs in the past 7 years to these areas.

This loss of industry has injured the economy of Ohio, and has also damaged the national economy by unfairly curtailing the income and buying power of 15,000 men and women. In the long run, the States which now welcome these runaway plants will find that they have also damaged their own economy.

It is ironic that a nation which is now engaged in a war on poverty should have a statute on its books which, in effect, condemns thousands of men, women, and children in 14(b) States to substandard wages, and consequently substandard living conditions. The causes of poverty are many, but there are few that would not yield to the remedy of full employment under minimum wage standards that provide a decent way of life for all wage earners. Business or industry that profits on substandard wages for its producers stand as a barrier to economic growth which is the key to full employment.

President Johnson has again called upon Congress to repeal section 14(b). It is an unfair law which damages the economy of every State in the Union. I urge Members of Congress to work to repeal this harmful law at the earliest opportunity.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, early this week President Johnson sent up a proposed Asian Development Bank for our earnest consideration. This proposal, Mr. Speaker, I believe to be the most constructive and unifying program that has been suggested as a means of aiding the war-torn and economically deprived area of southeast Asia.

The Asian Development Bank promises to be an effective use of limited resources for Asia's economic development. This proposed Development Bank resembles the World Bank in its administrative setup and economic programs. It is a program developed by Asians and run by Asians. An initial $1 billion of capital has been authorized, 65 percent of which has already been subscribed by Asian countries. The United States has subscribed $200 million over a 4-year period. This initial subscription is to be paid in one-half in a member country's own currency and the other half in dollars or other convertible currency.

The Asian Development Bank will guarantee or make loans for economic development projects, such as dams, irrigation projects, highway systems, and agricultural development. These long-term development loans will have long maturities, low interest rates, and a long period prior to the initial repayment. A second program of this Development Bank will lend out funds for a relatively short period of time, much like regular short-term foreign aid loans, for instance, to strengthen a country's monetary and currency system.

The Asian Development Bank will be run by a Board of Governors who will act as policymakers. Each member nation will have one representative on the Board of Governors. The day-to-day operations of the Bank will be run by a 10-man Board of Directors, 7 of whom will be Asians and 3 non-Asians, 1 a representative of the United States. The Bank's headquarters will be located in Manila, the Philippines.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, 21 nations have agreed to become members of this promising program. Membership and associate membership in the Asian Development Bank will be open only to those countries who are members of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, thus excluding Communist China, North Vietnam, and North Korea.

The leadership has been taken by the countries of Asia. This aspect in itself represents the most promising start that could be imagined. It is about time, after 15 years of constant warfare that has almost destroyed the spirit and morale of the people of Asia, that a constructive effort has been undertaken to attempt to better the lives and provide a stronger and more viable economy for the countries of Asia.

I am pleased to see, Mr. Speaker, that this farsighted administration proposal has the strong bipartisan support in Congress. I was happy to see a number of my Republican colleagues this very week stand up and strongly support the Asian Development Bank. I believe that the Asian Development Bank is the most potent weapon that the administration has proposed in its recent peace campaign that would bring to an end the constant crises in southeast Asia. It is a promise of the future, a promise which will provide a better life for all the people of Asia.

MURDERING NEW HAVEN PASSENGER SERVICE MEANS CHAOS FOR CONNECTICUT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the proposal of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad that it be authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission to terminate all interstate passenger train operations effective March 1, 1966. It is obvious what chaos and disruption of the lives of the people of Connecticut would result from this wholesale ending of a traditional service. I informed the ICC of my position in a statement on the railroad's proposal on January 11, 1966.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include my statement at this point because I believe that the problem is not solely that of Connecticut, but it is a concern of all the New England States and indirectly of every person in the Nation who must rely upon railroad transportation:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN S. MONAGAN SUBMITTED TO THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED DISCONTINUANCE OF PASSENGER SERVICE BY THE NEW HAVEN RAILROAD, HARTFORD GAS COMPANY AUDITORIUM, HARTFORD, CONN., JANUARY 11, 1966

I oppose the discontinuance of all Connecticut passenger railroad service by the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. It is unthinkable that the State of Connecticut, with its population of more than 2½ million, should be without passenger train service. It is true that the New Haven Railroad has been in a fiscal decline during the past several years and the standards of passenger service and facilities have likewise deteriorated but this does not justify a surrender of responsibility by responsible public bodies in a search for a solution to this problem.

Public service demands the continuance of railroad passenger service in Connecticut, and this factor must be given precedence over all other considerations. This service is essential to the livelihood and well-being of commuters, workers, business people, and ordinary travelers and to the economic welfare of the entire State.

My statement will be brief. The railroad's plan should not be authorized. Initially, the proposition was to discontinue a substantial part of its regular commuter service. The current hearings are on the proposal to discontinue all interstate passenger service. We can anticipate that the next request will be to abandon every vestige of passenger service in the areas served by the New Haven.

The notice of proposed discontinuances of passenger train service issued by the New Haven in pursuit of its proposal to terminate all interstate passenger train operations effective March 1, 1966, shows that the following runs would be terminated:

	Number of trains cut
Greenwich to New York	2
New York to Greenwich	1
Stamford to New York	83
New York to Stamford	81
New Canaan to New York	2
New York to New Canaan	2
New York to Norwalk and South Norwalk	2
Danbury to New York	6
New York to Danbury	7
Pittsfield to New York	2
New York to Pittsfield	2
Worcester to New London	6
New London to Worcester	6
Boston to New York	41
New York to Boston	39
New Haven to Boston	1
New London to Boston	1
Providence to Boston	18
New Haven to New York	24
Springfield to New York	32
Springfield to New Haven	3
Providence to New London	1
Boston to Providence	17
New York to New Haven	30
New York to Springfield	27
New Haven to Springfield	8

It is obvious what chaos and disruption of the lives of the people of our State would result from this wholesale suspension of a traditional service.

Testimony has been given by a representative of the Bureau of Accounts of the Interstate Commerce Commission that the New Haven Railroad is not now meeting its operating expenses in either the freight service or the passenger service. I shall not burden the Commission with a discussion of the technical phase of the railroad's bankruptcy. Some of the figures are definitely in dispute and I ask that the Commission carefully review the allocation of expense items to determine their validity and necessity.

I do want to emphasize, also, that this question is a matter of concern not only to Connecticut, but to Massachusetts, New York, and Rhode Island as well. My immediate concern is for the patrons in the State of Connecticut and, particularly in the Fifth Congressional District which I represent, but I am keenly sensitive to the broader implications of the requested change.

The proposal to abandon 273 passenger trains by July 1966, if approved, will have immediate impact on service in the towns of Bethel, Danbury, Meriden, Wallingford, and Redding, and, of course, upon the contiguous cities and towns whose residents are served by these trains. Immediately and inevitably, there will be curtailment of any local service remaining in the State, and this will hit many other towns including Waterbury and communities of the Naugatuck Valley whose volume of industrial freight has done so much to keep the railroad from worse financial disaster.

The trustees of the New Haven Railroad have reached an agreement with the Pennsylvania and New York Central Railroads that the New Haven Railroad's freight operations will be continued in the event the proposed merger of the Pennsylvania and New York Central is consummated. This represents an attempt to gain the prize operation while declining all responsibility for the necessary and irreplaceable operation because it is more difficult. This should not happen.

I have consistently supported reasonable State and Federal aid which has and will continue to make possible the operation of the New Haven Railroad.

It is a matter of record that Connecticut and New York have each advanced $750,000 and that the HHFA has provided $3 million for the demonstration project which assures railroad service until July 1, 1966. In addition, Connecticut and New York have appropriated $5 million each to improve passenger service providing a stable arrangement is developed, and HHFA will be asked to provide $10 million additional when demonstration project expires in July 1966.

Tax relief also has been provided by the States of Connecticut and New York to a total value of $2,700,000 contingent upon maintenance of satisfactory standards of service.

I am aware that the New Haven and other railroads have been confronted with severe competition through the development of State and Federal highway systems which have contributed not only to greater and more effective use of passenger cars, but, also, to the growth of bus and truck services. The airlines and the shipping industries, like the bus and truck operators, have been the beneficiaries of direct or indirect supports which have aided their operations at the expense of the railroads. Even the helicopter passenger lines which supplement the long-line routes of air traffic enjoyed the benefits of Federal assistance.

If public support of competing modes of transportation for the benefit of the public is to continue, then we must make certain that the public which relies upon the railroad is also served. We must not permit the complete demise of railroad passenger service in Connecticut and in the adjoining States. Ours is one of the heaviest populated areas in the country. It is because of this heavy population that through the efforts of the new Congress and the President, the Department of Commerce is currently engaged in experimentation with high-speed trains to run between Boston and Washington, D.C. This is a program which I support and which I hope will come to fruition in the immediate future for the sole purpose of improving passenger train service.

The State of Connecticut, under the leadership of Governor Dempsey, has made broadscale financial commitments including tax reductions in order to maintain the New Haven passenger lines. This action is in the public interest and in this same interest I urge the Commission to deny the petition of the trustees. Let us hope that such a decision will stimulate the tripartite efforts of State and Federal Governments and private enterprise to solve the problems of the New Haven Railroad without the abandonment of passenger lines.

If the vast rail network in Connecticut is used only for the movement of revenue-producing freight and passengers are to be denied what is a commonplace service in every other country in the world, this action will be contrary to any reasonable concept of public interest. This Nation can afford adequate passenger train service and it is a sad commentary on our country that we can put men in space and reach the moon, but we can't solve our transportation problems in one State of the Union.

Your decision will help bring such a day closer.

EQUAL POSTAL RATES FOR LOOSELEAF MATERIAL CONTAINING MEDICAL AND LEGAL INFORMATION

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 12182 that would apply the same postal rate to looseleaf material containing legal information as presently is applied to similar material containing medical information.

Under present postal law, looseleaf pages and their binders consisting of medical information for distribution to doctors, hospitals, medical schools, and medical students are carried at the lower book rate while similar material consisting of legal information for distribution to lawyers, courts, law schools, and law students takes the higher parcel post rate.

Section 4554(a)(8), title 39, United States Code, assigns the book rate to looseleaf pages and their binders containing medical information for distribution to doctors, hospitals, medical schools, and medical students. No similar provision is made for the looseleaf distribution of legal information to lawyers, courts, law schools, and law students. It, therefore, is carried at the parcel post rate. There seems to be no valid reason why medical looseleaf material should be carried at a lower rate while the legal looseleaf material should be carried at the higher parcel post rate.

This inequity should be rectified. The same compelling reasons which warrant a special rate consideration in the case of medical material operates with equal potency in the case of legal material. My bill would correct this injustice by amending paragraph (8) of subsection (a) of section 4554, title 39, United States Code, to include the distribution of looseleaf pages and their binders containing legal information to lawyers, courts, law schools, and law students.

LIMITING NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wolff] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make known my support of Senator Pastore's resolution limiting nuclear proliferation.

To our best knowledge, there are now five members of the "nuclear club," but the exclusivity of this club can no longer be guaranteed. It has been amply demonstrated that no individual country has a monopoly on creative thinking; thus, inclusion in the club is for the most part a decision dependent upon a nation's economic and political willingness and tenacity.

The need to achieve atomic capabilities has and will continue to be justified, by those not in its possession, for a plethora of reasons. To obviate each of these supposed compelling reasons is a task that will necessitate lifetimes and lifetimes. Must each country on the brink of nuclear capability be individually deterred, be individually bargained with to refrain. Would not this system lead to inequities depending on one's point of view or inclination?

What is truly needed is a system that would impede completely the continued spread of atomic weaponry. If we can achieve a moritorium on the dispersal of these weapons, the peaceful planet we all seek is an attainable goal, if we do not achieve a moritorium, peace may be purely emphemeral.

I am not suggesting that we infringe on our present systems of defense—for I am equally adamant that our security remain strong and secure. The achievement of atomic limitation and remaining cognizant of our security needs presents a difficult dilemma. Frankly, I do not know how to achieve the result, but we must try.

The way to try is to dedicate ourselves to the solution. The executive branch must be made aware of our goal, and when this is achieved, the executive must know that we support his initiative toward this end.

MICHIGAN CITY (IND.) NEWS-DISPATCH ENDORSES 4-YEAR TERMS FOR CONGRESSMEN

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the text of an editorial dated January 20, 1966, from the Michigan City, Ind., News-Dispatch, published in my own congressional district, which endorses President Johnson's recent proposal for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives.

The text of the editorial follows:

Four-Year Terms for Congressmen

President Johnson's proposal for a 4-year House term struck many Members as the most admirable idea they have heard from the White House since the last congressional pay raise.

The political rose that the Chief Executive offered the House in his state of the Union message looked good to many Members who hardly finish one campaign before starting another.

Under the Constitution, all 435 House seats are up for grabs every 2 years. In the

100-seat Senate, only 33 or 34 seats normally are at stake every 2 years and terms run for 6 years.

Thoughtful political scientists and campaign-weary politicians have been suggesting for years that the system be changed. But they never have had the kind of endorsement that Mr. Johnson gave.

As a result of Mr. Johnson's totally unexpected recommendation, a constitutional amendment providing for a 4-year House term probably will get early consideration.

Mr. Johnson said: "To strengthen the work of Congress I strongly urge an amendment to provide for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives—which should not begin before 1972.

"The present 2-year term requires most Members of Congress to divert enormous energies to an almost constant process of campaigning—depriving the Nation of the fullest measure of their skill and wisdom.

"Today, too, the work of Government is far more complex than in our early years, requiring more time to learn and master the technical tasks of legislation. And a longer term will serve to attract more men of the highest quality to political life. The Nation, the principle democracy, and each congressional district will be better served by a 4-year term. I urge your swift action."

During his speech Mr. Johnson was applauded 60 times. His reference to changing the 2-year terms to 4 years understandably drew the most vigorous applause.

It's a good suggestion and should be put into effect as soon as possible.

YOUTH OPPORTUNITY INVESTIGATION

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. FASCELL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. **QUIE**. Mr. Speaker, I have been reading Mr. Clark Mollenhoff's magnificent book, "Despoilers of Democracy." I commend it to the attention of all Members of Congress and every concerned citizen who believes that government should serve the people, rather than itself, or favored individuals.

In the introduction to his book, Mr. Mollenhoff quotes the late President Kennedy, who in a special message to the Congress said:

> There can be no dissent from the principle that all officials must act with unwavering integrity, absolute impartiality, and complete devotion to the public interest. This principle must be followed not only in reality but in appearance. For the basis of effective government is public confidence, and that confidence is endangered when ethical standards falter or appear to falter.

I gained personal insight last summer into some of the ways in which a Federal program, however outstanding its motives, can go astray and thus endanger public confidence because ethical standards "falter or appear to falter."

This faltering occurred in the President's so-called youth opportunity campaign. President Johnson announced that Federal departments and agencies would hire 1 young person for summer employment for each 100 regular employees. The President also appealed to State and local governments, private industry, and foundations, to make available another 100,000 jobs for young people.

When he announced the program on May 23, 1965, President Johnson said:

> These opportunities will be given, so far as this is practicable to boys and girls 16 through 21 who need them the most because of economic or educational advantages.

The program was to provide some 25,000 summer jobs in the Federal Government, which were to pay the young people $1.25 an hour. As it turned out, some 8,600 of the jobs were ultimately to be in the Post Office Department.

It was in the first week of June that I received the first inkling that the manner in which the Post Office Department was distributing its share of the jobs might give the appearance that ethical standards were faltering. I received a telephone call from a newspaper reporter, who asked if I had yet been asked to submit names for possible hiring in the Post Office Department under the so-called youth opportunity campaign.

I had not received such a call at that time. I was to later learn, however, that members of the majority had been contacted at least several days earlier and had been given definite quotas of these jobs for which to recommend names. I was to learn that only after Nick Kotz, of the Minneapolis Tribune and Des Moines Register Washington Bureau, began asking questions did the Post Office Department begin contacting minority members and then no quotas were offered—they were simply told to submit names. I was to learn that at least some majority members were contacted by high-ranking officials of the Post Office Department.

Though the Post Office Department was to repeatedly claim that all Members of Congress had been contacted, a poll of the minority membership showed that 50 of the 140 had not.

The same afternoon that I was called by the newspaper reporter, I received a call from the Minneapolis regional post office and told that I could submit names for possible hiring under the President's so-called youth opportunity campaign. However, no quota was offered—as it was not in other calls to minority Members.

But most important, there was absolutely no mention of the criteria the President had established—that these jobs were to go to young people who needed them the most, due to educational or economic disadvantage. In fact, I was to learn that this criteria was never mentioned in any call to a Member of Congress—majority or minority.

The case was obvious. Youth opportunity campaign jobs, intended for educationally or economically disadvantaged young people who needed them the most, were being distributed as patronage with disregard of the Presidential criteria.

On June 10, I sent a telegram to then Postmaster General Gronouski, asking for clarification. Among the questions I asked was:

> Why do high officials of your Department, in soliciting patronage appointments for certain Members of Congress, fail to point out that the President had designated these jobs as being created for economically and educationally disadvantaged young people?

Mr. Speaker, the same day I appeared before the House and disclosed the situation, including the full text of my telegram to Mr. Gronouski, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 10, pages 13287-13288.

A reply to my telegram was received on June 11, from Mr. Michael Monroney, executive assistant to the Postmaster General. In answer to the question which I have cited, Mr. Monroney wrote:

> The 7,500 summer post office jobs (which later increased to 8,600) in the field will be used to substitute for regular mail handlers, letter carriers and postal clerks who take their vacation time during this period. These jobs do not involve manual labor, gardening or other less technical work and, as a result, the postal service is primarily interested in obtaining the highest quality young people available.

Mr. Speaker, this was the Post Office Department's explanation of why its officials failed to mention the President's need criteria when soliciting patronage appointments for Members of Congress. I must admit I was puzzled by the reply. Did it mean that because a young person was financially disadvantaged that he was not the highest quality young person available? This reply was even more confusing in light of what Mr. Monroney wrote two paragraphs later, in answer to a question concerning the employment of girls as well as boys. He wrote:

> For the most part, these young people will be doing work which is normally done by male employees, such as handling heavy mail bags and working as letter carriers.

Mr. Speaker, I could not comprehend the difference between "manual labor, gardening, or other less technical work," and "handling heavy mail bags," or even serving as letter carriers.

Mr. Monroney included with his letter an official Post Office memorandum, dated June 9, which had been sent to all regional postmasters. It said:

> These appointments will be as seasonal assistants, PFS-3, $2.29 an hour, for individuals who are in need of money to remain in school, or who are economically underprivileged.

It was interesting to note that, unlike other Youth Opportunity Campaign employees, those in the Post Office Department were to make $2.29 an hour—the same as regular summer postal employees.

But it was even more interesting that this official Post Office Department memorandum directed specifically that the President's "need criteria" be observed in hiring. This memorandum was dated June 9—after majority Members of Congress had already been contacted, but 2 days before Mr. MONRONEY told me that the criteria had not been mentioned to Congress because "the postal service is primarily interested in obtaining the highest quality young people available."

I was to confront this type of apparent evasion many times in the investigation which I undertook last June, and which did not end until January.

But I learned that some 3,380 of the 8,600 postal jobs were filled by congressional patronage and that close relatives of some Members of Congress and even of the Vice President of the United States, as well as many with well-developed political or social ties, found jobs under the Post Office Department's portion of the President's Youth Opportunity Campaign.

I was to find that in post offices from Maine to Hawaii, young people were hired with disregard for the President's need criteria.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not explore all of the details of the situation at this time, but the bulk of them are outlined in remarks which I made on the House floor and which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 13, page 18145; volume 111, part 15, page 20792; and volume 111, part 17, beginning on page 22517.

Where did blame for this patronage distribution of jobs in disregard of the Presidential need criteria, lie? Patronage has long been a part of the Post Office Department operation and the high postal officials who first contacted majority Members of Congress did not mention any need criteria, nor did they mention it to minority Members at a later date. Thus—in light of the longstanding tradition of postal patronage—it is not surprising that few Members of Congress questioned the technique. I simply do not believe in such patronage as this, and thus was sensitive to the implications. I believe one of the greatest benefits of my investigation is that the Civil Service Commission has announced that future summer hiring of youth will be on a merit basis.

I hasten to add that I certainly do not blame the young people involved for accepting the jobs. Any student would find it useful to have a $2.29 an hour summer job. Those who had the opportunity to obtain them cannot be blamed and should be commended for their desire for employment.

If blame is to be attached, it is to those officials of the Post Office Department to whom political patronage has become so much a part of life that they disregarded the criteria of the President—which was reaffirmed in their own postal memorandum—in order to seek political gain by the distribution of jobs intended for the disadvantaged.

Patronage distribution of the jobs was also in violation of a U.S. Civil Service Commission directive, which instructed that the youth opportunity campaign employees were to be chosen from special rosters prepared by the U.S. Employment Service on the basis of the need criteria.

The Post Office Department was to excuse itself by saying that it did not have time to wait for these special rosters. However, the Director of the U.S. Employment Service says he was never told his organization was not meeting the need and State employment directors in Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and South Dakota said they supplied names by the date requested. In these States, as well as others, few employment service referrals were hired. But this is understandable. The patronage calls had already been made to Congressmen and their recommendations submitted to the Post Office Department.

Even granting the Post Office Department's assertion that it did not have time to wait for the special rosters, some questions should be raised concerning a program so hastily contrived that it is not announced until a week or two before the young people are flooding the job market.

But as it turned out, another major issue was raised by this case, in addition to serious diversion of the program from the President's intent. A major debate was to develop around the right of the Post Office Department to withhold the names of these young people from the public and even from Members of Congress.

On September 1, in a House speech, I said:

> There is an issue which has developed out of this case that I believe must be dealt with promptly and judiciously. That is the issue of departmental secrecy regarding nonsecurity governmental information.
>
> A clammy, gray cloud of secrecy has descended to envelop all who would inquire or anyone who might question the procedure of the Post Office Department.
>
> For instance, I have requested the names of the people hired by the Post Office Department under the so-called youth opportunity campaign. My requests have been denied. I have introduced a resolution, pending before a committee of the House, which would require the Post Office Department to provide the information to Members of Congress.
>
> I have written the President of the United States, pointing out to him that if Members of Congress cannot obtain the most innocent information from executive branch agencies and departments, that representative government is dead. I have respectfully requested him to require the new Postmaster General, the very able Mr. Lawrence O'Brien, to voluntarily provide this information to Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this innocent, nonsecurity information was repeatedly denied me, as it was other Congressmen and representatives of the press, throughout the summer of 1965. This denial was based on Postal Regulation No. 744.444. This regulation states, in part:

> Lists of employees, including their designations, salaries, or addresses shall not be furnished to any individual, commercial firm, or non-Federal organization.

I can see no justification for a regulation which prevents Members of Congress or the American people from knowing who works for their Government, particularly in a department which has no reason to justify secrecy on grounds of national security.

The Post Office Department took the position that Members of Congress are individuals and thus not entitled to the information of the Department.

By this time, however, the public and the press were aroused, and other voices in Congress were being raised, asking for the information. Mr. Gronouski made a concession. He said that anyone could have the names, if they were obtained from individual postmasters.

What Mr. Gronouski failed to mention is that there are some 34,000 individual postmasters in the United States.

His concession, while operationally impossible, was philosophically meaningful, however. For it was an implied repudiation of Postal Regulation 744.444. This appeared to mean that the Post Office Department's refusal to release the information was entirely arbitrary, grounded neither in law nor regulation.

It was in this atmosphere that my resolution of inquiry to require the Postmaster General to make the names of the youth opportunity campaign employees available to the whole House came to the floor on September 16.

The appropriate subcommittee and the full committee had met hastily that morning, clearing the privileged resolution with an adverse report. I did not even learn that it was coming up on the floor until I arrived in the Chamber. During debate on the resolution, I stated my case in these words:

> I believe the American people, who pay taxes, are entitled to know who is employed by the Federal Government in every area where it is not a security matter. I understand that with reference to security matters, this is not done. But on a nonsecurity matter, such as employment in the Post Office Department, where they are hired in local communities, anybody can go in and find out who is employed. I do not see that this has to do with any matter dangerous to the national security.

Mr. Speaker, when the resolution came to a vote, it passed on the first tally, but then enough votes were changed so that the final tally was 186 to 180 to kill a resolution designed to break through the serious matter of secrecy in government. I issued a statement, in which I said that this vote was "a bigger scandal than the scandal itself."

However, I continued to seek the information, as did other Members of Congress, the press, and the public. When the present Postmaster General, Mr. Lawrence O'Brien, was up for confirmation before a Senate committee, he was closely questioned regarding his position on the release of the names of postal employees. He said he saw no reason why they should not be released and has repeated this position on subsequent occasions.

I have recently written Mr. O'Brien and await his reply as to when he will live up to his Senate testimony and eliminate this ridiculous secrecy regulation. Mr. John Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, was quoted in the Minneapolis Tribune as saying the Commission will adopt a Government-wide regulation eliminating such secrecy. I have also written Mr. Macy asking when he plans to eliminate such secrecy.

I immediately wrote to all of the regional postmasters requesting the information. A few days ago, my efforts were finally finished, as I obtained the final list.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to include all of these names in the RECORD today. I do so for two important reasons.

First. I believe that nonsecurity information concerning any department or agency of the Federal Government should be in the public doman. There are some limitations on this, of course, such as time of compilation and expense.

Certainly, no nonsecurity information should be withheld from a Member of Congress as the representative of the people, especially where the intent of a Government program obviously has been violated.

Second. I believe that the American people have a right to examine this information themselves, to determine whether or not the Post Office Department administered this portion of the President's youth opportunity campaign—which he closely identified with his so-called war on poverty—according to the intent of the program and the will of the people. Did the action of postal officials in offering the jobs as patronage with no mention of the need criteria tend to benefit or further deprive those young people who needed the jobs the most?

Mr. Speaker, I must stress two important qualifications.

First. In offering this information to the Congress and the people of the United States, I believe that the Members of Congress who accepted this patronage did so without being fully appraised of the intended nature of the program and I find no fault in Members of Congress. I do believe that Congress should take a long, hard look, however, at the use of patronage, especially in the Post Office where it has tenaciously lived on after it had become a sorry memory in most departments and agencies.

Second. The offering of this information is in no way an attempt to embarrass any of the people on the lists. As I have previously pointed out, the persons who accepted the jobs were simply seeking employment. I believe that it is good for any young person to seek and obtain gainful employment. However, these jobs were created within the Federal Government with a specific intent and that intent was to help those who might not otherwise have the opportunity to continue their educations or who might, in other ways, have pressing need of a job.

The conclusions of this case are twofold:

First. When a program is devised and presented to the public as a means of helping the disadvantaged, the disadvantaged should be helped.

Second. Any attempt to withhold from the Congress and the people information regarding nonsecurity matters of the executive branch, should be opposed.

As I said on the floor of the House on September 1:

> If the people see their elected representatives turned into rubberstamps and their free press turned into propaganda by the secrecy of departments and agencies, the people's right to know is gone.
>
> And if that is gone, democratic government is gone.
>
> I ask my colleagues to picture in their minds the spectacle of a huge department of the executive branch, charged with grave responsibilities, using the distribution of 3,380 summer jobs for 16- to 21-year-olds as political patronage. And, picture in your minds the spectacle of this same supposedly responsible department, having distributed these jobs for partisan political purposes, adopting a fierce stance of defensiveness toward Members of Congress and representatives of the press, as they wrap this episode in a cloud of bureaucratic secrecy.
>
> If such unworthy actions are taken regarding a trivial matter, what of the important matters?

Mr. Speaker, following are the names of those employed by the Post Office Department during the summer of 1965 under the President's so-called youth opportunity campaign. One further clarification is needed. In a few cases, regional post offices did not differentiate in their records between regular summer hiring and the youth opportunity campaign. As a result, a small percentage of the people in the following list were regular temporary employees and not youth opportunity campaign employees. I regret that they are included, but evidently the few regions where this occurred did not choose to differentiate between the programs:

Florida

Anctil, Joe, 2904 St. Conrad, Tampa.
Adams, Albert R., Jr., NK.
Argenio, Joseph A., 220 Beta, University of Southern Florida, Tampa.
Bachrach, Franklin A., 301 6th Avenue, Melbourne Beach.
Bauer, David, 4018 West South Avenue, Tampa.
Baxley, Ronald, 2009 Chowkeebin Nene, Tallahassee.
Beaman, Marvin Lee, Jr., NK.
Bedwell, Stephen B., 163 Shannon Avenue.
Benefield, Curtis J., NK.
Benford, William N., NK.
Benjamin, Adam, NK.
Bentley, John G., 3907 Laguna Drive, Orlando.
Berry, Sammy, 2708 Avenue D., Fort Pierce.
Beusse, Carleton, Maitland.
Beveridge, Mike, 4265 West 6th Avenue, Hialeah.
Bloodworth, Robert W., 2070 Shannon Avenue, Indialantic.
Boldin, Wayne T., 1278 Kathwood, Eau Gallie.
Bradshaw, LeRoy, 18214 Homestead Avenue, Perrine.
Breslin, Robert W., 3118 South Maritana Drive., St. Petersburg.
Brown, Barbara A., 14400 Tyler SW., Miami.
Brown, Cathryn, 14741 Polk Street, Richmond Heights.
Bryan, David R., 2929 Alamo Drive, Orlando.
Budner, Sharon, 2040 Southwest 20th Street, Miami.
Callahan, Robert, 184 Northwest 11th Street, Homestead.
Carpenter, Charlotte, 3661 Catalina Road, Lake Park, West Palm Beach.
Clark, Donald E., 33 Charles Avenue, Miami.
Clark, James C., 467 Alice Drive, Eau Gallie.
Cobb, Julius C., 742 Short Street, Orlando.
Cobb, Robert L., Jr., 744 Short Street, Orlando.
Collins, Charles R., 92 Balcross Drive, Miami.
Crawford, Clifford T., 9760 SW. 77th Terrace, Miami.
Crim, Harold L., 619 Cocoanut Grove, Melbourne.
Crona, Jim, Jr., 2014 Hollywood Drive, Tallahassee.
Culmer, Donald N., 3616 Charles Avenue, Miami.
Cumbie, Fred H., Jr., 1121 Shorewood Drive, Orlando.
Dart, James L., 1020 Terrace Street, Tallahassee.
DeStefano, Alfred, 1682 NE. 181st Street, North Miami Beach.
Diez, Robert, 2724 Carmen Street, Tampa.
Diglio, Vincent, Jr., 570 NE. 178th Street, North Miami Beach.
Dittmar, Christian F., 2530 S.W. 76th Avenue, Miami.
Dollison, James H., 338½ Vitoria Avenue, Winter Park.
Donnell, LeRoy R., Jr., 502 Shannon Road, Orlando.
Edwards, David L. (address not known).
Engle, Ronald, 1959 NE. 180th Street, Miami.
Fields, Donald C., 104 Bradford Drive, Tallahassee.
Frantz, Robert Edward, 2312 St. Joe Street, Tampa.
Frink, Robert, 812 Riverview Drive, Melbourne.
Fryer, Jeffrey O. (address not known).
Garvin, Thomas L. (address not known).
Gary, Harold, 2963 NW. 70th Terrace, Miami.
Gary, Howard, 2963 NW. 70th Terrace, Miami.
Glass, Jerry, Route 1, Box 91, Marianna.
Gishler, Walter S., Miami.
Gonberg, Leslie, 670 South Shore Drive, Miami Beach.
Green, John S., 1941 Legion Drive, Winter Park.
Gremer, Robert L., 2110 Euclid Street, Jacksonville.
Harris, Nathaniel, 10320 South West 173 Terrace, Miami.
Herndon, A. B., 1514 Steven Ave., Orlando.
Higgs, Richard P., 701 Melbourne Avenue, Melbourne.
Jamieson, Joseph, 753 America Street, Orlando.
Jones, Donovan St. Clair, 1121 Greenwood Street, Lakeland.
Kirby, Leslie, c/o M. J. Kirby, Live Oak.
Lawyer, George W., II, 1500 78 Terrace, North, St. Petersburg.
Leatherby, Patrick, 118 Glenridge, Temple Terrace, Tampa.
Lee, Gordon R., 525 Fee Avenue, Melbourne.
Livingson, Thomas J., Madison.
Long, John F., 1504 North Hampton Street, Orlando.
Lundin, Philip J., not known.
Lynch, Jeremy, 496 NE. 88th Street, Miami.
Mason, Robert D., 15740 NW. 27th Court, Miami.
Mathis, Gerald W., 7310 Autumnvale Drive, Orlando.
McCollum, Stanley R., 418 West 6th Avenue, Tallahassee.
McLeod, William J., not known.
McLeroy, David, Route 1 Box 826, Dover.
Mertz, Lowell C., 856 SE., Port Malabar Boulevard, Palm Bay.
Mobley, Isaac, 14741 Fillmore Street, Miami.
Mock, Donald, 1855 Dawn Drive, Melbourne.
Mock, Joe M., not known.
Moorefield, Robert P., 4835 Highland Street South, St. Petersburg.
Pace, Phillip R., not known.
Papp, Alex C., 205 Gardenia Drive, Melbourne.
Parker, Viola, 14761 Polk Street, Richmond Heights, Miami.
Pilcher, Ronny, 302 South Orleans, Tampa.
Pollard, Charles T., NK.
Polo, Jerry, 2316 Douglas Street, Tampa.
Popplein, Ernest C., 163 NW, Hickory Street, Melbourne.
Quesada, Armando A., 1407 Louise Avenue, Tampa.
Roberts, Tommy, Angela Street, Key West.
Rothenberg, Arthur, 6237 SW., 14th Street, Miami.
Rizzio, George, Jr., 1580 NE., 139th Street, Miami.
Salgado, Michael, 2702 Abdella, Tampa.
Samras, Roy K., 24 Lake Hollingsworth Drive, Lakeland.

Sands, Gladys, 15015 Harrison Street, Richmond Heights, Miami.

Sands, John, 15015 Harrison Street, Richmond Heights, Miami.

Scavella, Elizabeth, 10201 SW., 171st Street, Perrine.

Scott, John L., NK.

Seeman, Richard E., 3405 Omar, Tampa.

Sherrill, William C., 225 Murray Road, West Palm Beach.

Sierra, Richard, 1502 South Street, Key West.

Smith, James, 445 SW., 6th Court, Homestead.

Smith, Willie, 17525 SW., 107th Avenue, Miami.

Starr, Victor, 3250 Charles Avenue, Miami.

Sterling, Michael D., 331 Piney Ridge Road, Casselberry.

Stoutamire, James W., 1471 Crestview Avenue, Tallahassee.

Sullivan, Richard Lee, 19311 NW., 39th Court, Miami.

Summers, Robert C., 1819 South Eola Drive, Orlando.

Swart, Michael M., 23 Seneca Road, Fort Lauderdale.

Taylor, William E., 9795 SW. 70th Street, Miami.

Tibbs, James F., 1825 Monterey Avenue, Orlando.

Vickers, Kenneth, 1015 West Warren Street, Plant City.

Waldron, Don, 5025 SW. 7th Street, Miami.

Weinstein, Stanley, Miami.

West, Charles, 17011 NW. 34th Avenue, Miami.

West, John R., Not known.

Williams, Del, Rte. 1, Box 91, Live Oak.

Walfarth, Mary M., 2100 SW. 23d Street, Miami.

Georgia

Adams, Francine, Not known.

Allen, Terrell W., 345 University Drive, Athens.

Arrington, Marvin S., 883 Neal Street, Atlanta.

Belford, Richard D., 4145 Warrior Trial, Stone Mountain.

Bird, Becky L., 635 Banks Street SW., Gainesville.

Brooks, Evelyn, Box 114, Chestnut Mountain.

Burnett, William C., 4885 Northway Drive NE., Atlanta.

Campbell, Terry M., Rte. 8 Meadowview Drive, Gainesville.

Campbell, William W., 1911 Jeff Davis Street, Macon.

Carroll, Jerry Lee, 605 Mulkey Road, Toccoa.

Clark, Ted M., Rte. 1, Murrayville.

Cooper, Clarence, 111 Chappell Road SW., Atlanta.

DeFoor, James N., 921 South Big A Road, Toccoa.

Duke, John C., Newnan.

Fisher, Clifford P., 3216 Kemble Avenue, Brunswick.

Fortson, Frank, Elberton.

Geissler, Bill, 412 Stanton Way, Athens.

Goodwin, Alfred L., 1600 11th Avenue, Columbus.

Greene, Tom E., III, 169 Country Club Drive, Macon.

Harrison, Richard A., 1778 Winston Drive, Macon.

Hasty, David L., 1350 Sheridan Road, Atlanta.

Hatfield, Archie E., 2439 Cindy Drive, Columbus.

Higingbotham, Tom B., 428 South East Main Street, Eastman.

Hix, Stanley J., Danielville.

Jordan, Douglas Lee, Unknown.

Kantor, Michael E., 1266 Owsley Avenue, Columbus.

Lee, John L., Eastman.

Maddox, Alton, Jr., 368 Newport Street, North West, Atlanta.

Neighbors, John M., Unknown.

Richards, Kenneth, Route No. 1, Canton.

Ross, Charles A., 2696 Houston Avenue, Macon.

Rowland, Charles A., 205 Pine Needle, Athens.

Rouse, Harry, 201 Roach Street, North West No. 332, Atlanta.

Seymour, Guy, Elberton.

Shoenberger, Beverly A., 420 Lynhurst Drive, South West, Atlanta.

Smaha, Jiggy E., 815 Boulevard Avenue, Macon.

Smith, Charles B., Newnan.

Smith, Ronald M., Route 6, Gainesville.

Stovall, Mary, Unknown.

Summerour, Carol, Unknown.

Tucker, Oliver E., 815 Atlanta Avenue, Decatur.

Wager, John, 700 Cascade Drive, Marietta.

Weyandt, Thomas L., 3659 Admiral Drive, Chamblee.

Whiteside, John G., 301 East 19th Street, Rome.

Whittenburg, James P., 7 Parkway Drive, Rome.

Wyatt, Miriam, NK, Atlanta.

Abraham, William C., NK, Atlanta.

Baker, Gerald K., NK, Atlanta.

Blackburn, Linda C., NK, Atlanta.

Bloodworth, Michael H., NK, Atlanta.

Cook, Ronald D., NK, Atlanta.

Dounis, George S., NK, Atlanta.

Efferson, Susan L., NK, Atlanta.

Gaines, Robert G., NK, Atlanta.

Goosby, Alvin, NK, Atlanta.

Grimes, Henry M., NK, Atlanta.

Hammack, Larry C., NK, Atlanta.

Harris, Jon E., NK, Atlanta.

Hilliard, Earl F., NK, Atlanta.

James, Jack L., NK, Atlanta.

Jordan, Brenda J., NK, Atlanta.

Kellett, Roy C., NK, Atlanta.

Lester, James M., NK, Atlanta.

McChesney, Donald E., NK, Atlanta.

McKinnon, Michael A., NK, Atlanta.

McWilliams, Joseph, NK, Atlanta.

Martin, Sharon L., NK, Atlanta.

Murphy, Gail Y., NK, Atlanta.

Murtagh, Jerry A., NK, Atlanta.

O'Callaghan, Robert, NK, Atlanta.

Perry, Cheryl A., NK, Atlanta.

Phelps, Eddie L., NK, Atlanta.

Pierce, Ernest P., NK, Atlanta.

Rucker, Judith M., NK, Atlanta.

Ryan, John F., NK, Atlanta.

Shaw, Richard D., NK, Atlanta.

Simmons, Johnnie M., NK, Atlanta.

Singleton, Peter T., NK, Atlanta.

Smith, Elizabeth H., NK, Atlanta.

Stephens, James R., NK, Atlanta.

Summers, Michael C., NK, Atlanta.

Thomas, Norman H., NK, Atlanta.

Tibbetts, Samuel W., NK, Atlanta.

Wall, Philip H., NK, Atlanta.

Watts, Daniel T., NK, Atlanta.

West, George, Jr., NK, Atlanta.

Wigley, Gary Shannon, NK, Atlanta.

Wright, Anthony E., NK, Atlanta.

Dounis, Soterios S., NK, Atlanta.

Walton, Dan L., NK, Atlanta.

Hasty, David L., NK., Atlanta.

Strickland, George M., NK, Atlanta.

North Carolina

Abernathy, David P., 1702 Charlotte Avenue, Kinston.

Ainsley, William F., Post Office Box 22, Hertford.

Bell, Daniel, 1106 Downing St., High Point.

Brabble, James C., Route 2, Edenton.

Brady, Gary M., 118 East 1st Street, Newton.

Brewer, Frank L., not known.

Brown, Alan Dean, not known.

Brown, Kenneth M., 1542 Lynway Dr., Charlotte.

Calloway, Donald R., 1721 Circle Drive, Greenville.

Cannon, Clarence R., 219 Hill Street, Kinston.

Clay, Eric Lee, 36–C Wabash Avenue, Durham.

Cobb, Thurston, not known.

Conway, Donald R., Route 2, Box 35, Beaufort.

Croom, Edward M., 3118 Auburn Avenue, Charlotte.

Dawkins, Willie L., 1901 Grier, Charlotte.

Drayton, Jerry, 205 K Court, Winston-Salem.

Earnest, James D., Montreat.

Everett, Robert H., 5022 Sordis Road, Charlotte.

Eggleston, James E., 210 Roanoke Avenue, Elizabeth City.

Faison, Ollie W., Route 1, Box 349, Knightdale.

Felton, Billy, not known.

Ferebee, C. Thomas, Route 2, Box 16–P, New Bern.

Fuller, John M., not known.

Grady, John P., Post Office Box 1297, New Bern.

Griffin, Joseph W., 109 South Watts Street, Williamston.

Harper, Richard A., Wallace.

Harris, Wiley Dowd, 5212 Six Forks Road, Raleigh.

Hemric, Clay H., 2519 Pineway Drive, Burlington.

Huggins, Walter, Jr., 726 South Alexander, Charlotte.

Ivory, Cecil, 1631 Van Bruen Avenue, Charlotte.

James, Tracey, Burgaw.

Kinard, Glenn, 72 Ingleside Drive, Concord.

Knowles, Rodney, 117 East Park Avenue, Mount Olive.

Bunn, Lee H., 1515 Ridgecrest Avenue, Burlington.

Mallory, James D., 106 Country Club Drive, Plymouth.

Mapp, Kenneth, 242 Lincoln Avenue, Asheville.

McBride, Gene, NK.

McGee, George, 3113½ Rowena Avenue, Durham.

Morgan, George F., 49 Highland Street, Asheville.

Morris, Leslie, 1809 Tryon Road, New Bern.

Neidig, Milton E., 4210 Tangle Drive, Charlotte.

Nicholson, G. F., Richlands.

Nolan, William J., 5010 Milford Road, Charlotte.

Page, Bob, 311 Brentwood Avenue, Jacksonville.

Paris, Fulton, Graham.

Parrott, James H., 303 Sherwood Avenue, Kinston.

Perez, Frank W., 4921 Plum Nearly Lane, Charlotte.

Potter, NK.

Powell, Robert N., Post Office Box 756, Clinton.

Price, Ralph, NK.

Raiford, William R., 1608 Old Snowhill Road, Kinston.

Roberson, Clarence E., Memorial Drive, Ahoskie.

Rufty, Joe Hearne, 220 Confederal Avenue, Salisbury.

Sauder, John Larry, 313 Scofield Road, Charlotte.

Shaw, Jane G., 1133 Ordemore Avenue, Charlotte.

Seila, Andrew F., 129 Circle Drive, Lenoir.

Settle, James, 109 North Griffing Boulevard, Asheville.

Shotwell, Lonnie T., 107 Blue Ridge Avenue, Asheville.

Shreve, Richard A., Post Office Box 517, Brown Summit.

Smith, Dan G., 1904 Bragg Street, Fayetteville.

Smithwick, Billy H., Route 1, Belhaven.

Spivey, Charles B., Windsor.

Teachey, Bruce, 407 Brentwood Avenue, Jacksonville.

Uppercue, Charles Q., 13 Old West, Chapel Hill.

Vernon, John H., Jr., 1124 Aycock Avenue, Burlington.

White, Glenn C. Route 1, Box 123, Elizabeth City.

Winters, Joseph, Jr., 101 Pettigrew Street, Raleigh.

South Carolina

Babb, David R., NK., Anderson.

Bates, Carter Dean, 216 Holly Drive, Spartanburg.

Blanks, Billy, 561 Arch Drive, Rock Hill.

Bolton, Melvin R., NK., Columbia.

Brewer, Frank L., 1007 Colonial Avenue, Greenville.

Brockman, Barry B., Route 1., Duncan.

Carpenter, Arvil W., NK., Greenville.

Coffee, William T., 1143 Alderman Street, Aiken.

Crowder, Elliott W., 1208 Jessamine Street, Cayce.

Culbertson, John D., Greenville.

Curaton, Kenneth, Greenville.

Davis, Michael, 15 Ethelridge Drive, Greenville.

Dawkins, Stanley T., 105 Summit, Harris Station, Greenwood.

Douglas, Jackie, Chesterfield.

Dozier, John, 900 Mohawk Drive, Florence.

Dudley, Bruce W., 209 S. Sumter Street, Columbia.

Dusenberry, Sammy, 507 Temple Street, Conway.

Ellis, Nathaniel T., NK.

Gwynn, Andrew K., NK.

Folsom, John E., 708 Maryland Street, Columbia.

Hagan, George, 1312 S. Boundary, Aiken.

Hammond, Cullen, 1530 Barberry Lane, Spartanburg.

Harlow, Christopher W., 9 Carroll Lane, Greenville.

Harmon, Jerry, Route 2, Box 32, Gaffney.

Jacks, Samuel W., Route 2, Donalds.

Law, McDonald, 716 Rollinwood Road, Aiken.

Lever, David, 410 Park Avenue, Florence.

Mack, Richard N., 105 Applewood Lane, Spartanburg.

McCrorey, Joseph R., 1515 Alexander Road, Rock Hill.

McCulloch, Jere W., c/o Cherokee Co. Courthouse, Gaffney.

McElveen, Milton F., Post Office Box 379, Conway.

Mohrmann, Alan F., 102 Claredon Drive, Clemson.

Moore, Johnny, c/o Mr. Marion Moore, Manning.

Moss, Frederick H., NK.

Moye, William, 1401 East 5th Street, Greenville.

Parks, Steve, 315 Pendleton Street, Rock Hill.

Pinckney, Thomas M., NK.

Pittman, John G., 1211 Pinewood Road, Rock Hill.

Price, Hinton A., NK.

Quackenbush, James H., 2915 Stratford Road, Columbia.

Rigby, Charlie S., 13 Carroll Lane, Greenville.

Rivers, Mendel L., 9 Palmetto Road, Wappoo Heights-Charleston.

Ropp, John C., 501 Elm Street, Conway.

Smith, James V., Route 1, Effingham.

Stewart, Mark, 30 McBeth Street, Monoghan Greenville.

Stogner, Jack B., Route 2, McBee.

Stokes, Cherry, c/o S. & E. Motor Co., Ayden.

Thompson, Donald W., 187 Brookland Circle, Columbia.

Thompson, Elliott, NK.

Vaughn, Alton H., 151 Sherwood Circle, Rock Hill.

Yonce, Branson, NK.

Whittington, Edward W., 221 Hendrix Street, West Columbia.

Williamson, James G., 523 Poplar Street, Spartanburg.

BOSTON REGION

Massachusetts

Tine, Mary A., 20 Coolidge Park, Wakefield.

Mahar, Catherine M., 46 Richardson Avenue, Wakefield.

Auger, Marc F., 45 Murphy Way, Hyannis.

Laffan, John M., 44 Kilton Street, Taunton.

Fee, Kristan M., 100 Tower Road, Hingham.

Scudder, John A., 24 Baxter Road, Hyannis.

Eaton, Meredith B., 100 Otis Street, Hingham.

Trice, Harley N., 15 Arlington Street, Hyannis.

Mason, John P., Winfield Lane, Osterville.

Newell, Robert C., Jr., 55 Phillips Road, Sagamore Beach.

Sykes, Timothy A., 25 Seaview Road, Sagamore Beach.

Cashman, Diane L., 6 Gilmore Terrace, West Roxbury.

Masse, Eli E., Jr., 24 Sullivan Street, Chicopee Falls.

Holle, Katherine M., 53 Statler Road, Belmont.

Begg, David Arthur, 4 Sunset Avenue, Methuen.

Martin, Craig Albert, 89 Greenfield Street, Lawrence.

Laughlin, Peter M., 7 Housatonic Avenue, Chelmsford.

McGee, Walter L., Jr., 142 Wilder Street, Lowell.

McKinley, David V., 119 Fremont Street, Lowell.

O'Dea, Dennis M., 60 Winthrop Avenue, Lowell.

Burke, Florence E., 33 Lennon Court, South Boston.

Carr, Deborah J., 37 Pond View Avenue, Jamaica Plain.

Grossman, Norma, 8 Bangor Road, West Roxbury.

Toye, Ellen M., 29 Durso Avenue, Lawrence.

Cronin, Fredericm R., 17 Maple Street, Lynn.

Daley, Dennis F., 321 Lafayette Street, Salem.

Kiricoples, Charles P., 25 Brimblecom Street, Lynn.

Lennon, Robert G., 100 Johnson Street, Lynn.

Martin, Michael J., 94 Greenwood Avenue, Swampscott.

McDonald, Henry F., 67 Eustis Street, Revere.

McPhetres, George H., 59 Lake Avenue, Lynn.

Weber, Paul A., 3 Bradford Road, Lynn.

Donovan, Grace D., 20 Pickman Road, Salem.

Falls, Gary L., 224 Chatham Street, Lynn.

Gordon, Bruce J., 37 Moffatt Road, Salem.

Maker, Melvin L., Jr., 40 Fair Oaks Avenue, Lynn.

O'Connor, Joseph T., 37 Phillips Avenue, Lynn.

O'Shea, Arthur J., 5 Starratt Road, Lynn.

Wentzell, Paul J., 132 Bellevue Road, Lynn.

Call, Mark A., 27 Shore Avenue, Salem.

Cavanagh, Catherine M., 60 Graves Avenue, Lynn.

Conners, Robert A., 6 Conner's Road, Salem.

Cuffe, T. Richard, Jr., 89 Bickford Street, Lynn.

Curley, Matthew J., 18 Chestnut Street, Boston.

Dorey, George R., 41 Tower Avenue, Lynn.

Kelliher, Laurence M., 41 Jenness Street, Lynn.

Kennedy, Francis M., 146 Western Avenue, Lynn.

Blanchard, Albert J., 264 Nonotuck Avenue, Chicopee.

Cheika, Alan L., 117 Fairview Avenue, Chicopee.

Cyboron, Daniel F., 5 Hooper Road, Chicopee.

DesRosiers, Denis A., 40 Abbey Street, Chicopee.

Kieltyka, Theodore S., 214 School Street, Chicopee.

Kozaka, Theodore F., 7 Hooper Road, Chicopee.

Lempart, Walter E., 78 Hafey Street, Chicopee.

Lunardini, Lawrence M., 89 Mount Vernon Street, Willimansett.

Olbrych, Walter C., 114 Washington Street, Chicopee.

Piotrowski, Frederick J., 31 Cyman Drive, Chicopee.

Ricardi, Paul F., 29 Goodhue Avenue, Chicopee.

Stoy, Carl S., Jr., 174 Center Street, Chicopee.

Ziolkowski, Henry J., 170 Springfield Street, Chicopee.

Balvin, Joseph C., 74 Summit Street, Clinton.

Ellam, Thomas J., 121 Berlin Street, Clinton.

Gibbons, William F., 8 Flagg Street, Clinton.

Kilcoyne, Robert M., 58 Park Street, Clinton.

Tierney, Thomas M., 773 Main Street, Clinton.

Thompson, William J., 101 Beech Street, Clinton.

Caulfield, Michael E., 58 Carson Avenue, Dalton.

Green, Robert, 75 Tower Road, Dalton.

Collins, John B., 7 River Drive, Danvers.

Kelley, Richard J., 35 Fremont Street, Lowell.

Furtado, Vincent A., 425 Globe Street, Fall River.

Allardice, Richard C., 190A Merriam Avenue, Leominster.

Barnicle, Michael J., 160 Pond Street, Leominster.

Schrader, Thomas R., 559 Pearl Hill Road, Fitchburg.

Turcotte, Robert J., 20 Thomas Street, Fitchburg.

Daniels, William E., 3 Auburn Street, Framingham.

Little, Thomas J., 27 America Street, Framingham.

Sullivan, John B., 14 Bare Hill Road, Framingham.

Aro, Stephen P., Rocky Pasture Road, Gloucester.

Procon, Edward, Jr., 29 Edwards Square, Northampton.

Sheehan, Patrick J., 159 Homestead Avenue, Holyoke.

Collins, Thomas C., 10 Flint Street, Salem.

Nickerson, Harold L., 177 Main Street, Chatham.

Litchman, Thomas E., 22 Rhodes Circle, Hingham.

Mallon, Joseph A., Jr., 41 Harborview Drive, Hingham.

Birmingham, Robert, Garrison Lane, Wianno.

Moore, Maryanne E., 6 Briarcliff Terrace, Mattapan.

Gaffney, Jane, 71 Gladeside Avenue, Mattapan.

Mutrie, Richard D., 14 Peirce Road, Wellesley Hills.

Holle, Marilyn M., 53 Statler Road, Belmont.

Dalton, John W., Jr., 32 Jacqueline Circle, Hyannis.

Goldstein, Stanley D., 35 Alden Road, Swampscott.

Putnam, Joseph E., 7 Anawon Avenue, Saugus.

Goff, Richard, 15 Mansfield Place, Lynn.

Fillos, Stevan M., 39 Belleview Avenue, Salem.

Jones, Martin L., 49 Smith Street, Marblehead.

McMahon, Francis J., 40 Hanson Street, Salem.

Wasserman, Mark, 14 Ralph Road, Marblehead.

Wheeler, Sherman V., 28 Commercial Street, Marblehead.

Burke, Alexander B., Jr., 6 Sagamore Road, Marblehead.

Cuttell, William F., 41 McKinley Street, Maynard.

Lucas, Gary F., 10 Canal Street, Millbury.

Couture, Richard F., 39 Riverlin Street, Millbury.

Coughlin, Pual J., 25 Osgood Street, Salem.

Coughlin, John E., 25 Osgood Street, Salem.

Holdgate, David J., Vesper Lane, Nantucket.

Alfonso, Norman A., 194 Nemasket Street, New Bedford.

DaCosta, James H., 83 Alden Street, New Bedford.

Duphily, Raymond G., 408 Highland Street, New Bedford.

Quin, James M., 15 Anthony Street, New Bedford.

Sylvia, Edmund J., 30 Viall Street, New Bedford.

Connors, John J., 15 Charles Street, Newburyport.

Johnson, William W., 27 Prospect Street, Newburyport.

Eaton, Lawrence K., 14 Beach Road, Salisbury.

Follett, Susan D., 7 Monument Street, Wenham.

Niemaszyk, Thomas A., 32 Nabnasset Street, Nabnasset.

Dineen, James F., 9 Winter Terrace, Westwood.

Keedy, John L., 31 Downing Road, Norwood.

Hallinan, Michael, 135 Linden Road, Peabody.

Hogan, John P., 7 Calumet Street, Peabody.

Joyce, Paul J., Jr., 21 Cottage Street, Peabody.

Manning, John H., 17 Forest Street, Peabody.

Sullivan, Paul R., 64 Butler Road, Quincy.

Dillion, Thomas A., 198 Windsor Avenue, Pittsfield.

Lyons, John F., Jr., 242 Appleton Avenue, Pittsfield.

Mole, Richard P., 38 Dartmouth Street, Pittsfield.

McGonigle, Barry, 10 Himoor Lane, Randolph.

Conlon, Paul, 27 Francis Drive, Quincy.

Cashman, William James, 7 Fidelis Way, Brighton.

Frisoli, Leonard M., 291 School Street, Watertown.

Cunningham, Robert, 10 Lee Road, Sharon.

Thomas, Maureen Cathrine, 903 Dwight Street, Holyoke.

Still, Charles E., Jr., 38 Indian Memorial Drive, South Yarmouth.

Brady, Michael B., 30 Craig Street, Springfield.

Britt, John B., 18 Whittaker Street, Springfield.

Brown, Frederick A., 35 Blunt Road, Springfield.

Darney, John E., Jr., 34 Kipling Street, Springfield.

Desmond, William T., 88 South Street, Agawam.

Dube, Philip A. Jr., 141 Garvey Drive, Springfield.

Fitzgerald, Michael, 14 Wilbur Street, Springfield.

Fitzgerald, Robert E., 333 Nottingham Street, Springfield.

Foley, William T., 110 Wayne Street, Springfield.

Gaines, Gary W., 1312 Bay Street, Springfield.

Hodge, Robert L., Jr., 33 Lafayette Street, Springfield.

Hurley, William J., 127 Mass Avenue, Springfield.

Morneau, Richard N., 21 Peekskill Avenue, Springfield.

Novicki, David J., 12 Campus Place, Springfield.

Orr, Michael A., 541 Union Street, Springfield.

Payne, Henry B., 38 Berkeley Street, Springfield.

Podworski, James M., 126 Croyden Terrace, Springfield.

Reavey, James P., 53 Fairfield Street, Springfield.

Tangredi, Colleen, 583 Suffield Street, Agawam.

Reavey, John L., 116 Revere Street, Springfield.

Waldron, Thomas A., 17 Stafford Street, Springfield.

Walsh, Donald J., 83 Pennsylvania Avenue, Springfield.

Ward, Gregory G., 46 Riverview Avenue, Longmeadow.

Williams, Thomas C., 8 Marlborough Street, Springfield.

Blanchette, David H., 67 Marlboro Road, Sudbury.

Lazzaro, George V., 54 Converse Street, Wakefield.

Midura, Theodore A., 76 South Street, West Warren.

Kulig, Douglas J., 60 Main Street, West Warren.

Mahoney, Joseph E., 49 Farm Lane, Westwood.

Donohue, James J., Jr., 25 Norcross Street, Lowell.

O'Hare, Thomas J., 86 Highland Road, Somerville.

Sinclair, John S., 18 Carter Street, Woburn.

Badasarian, Monte R., 29 Daniels Street, Arlington.

Bohigian, George P., 14 George Street, Worcester.

Coontz, Otto F., 26 Old English Road, Worcester.

Degon, Stephen G., 122 Winfield Street, Worcester.

Donohue, Donald J., 8 Bay Edge Lane, Worcester.

Donohue, Vincent P., 8 Bay Edge Lane, Worcester.

Dumas, Richard E., 27 Shamrock Street, Worcester.

Lindblom, Terry M., 5 Pine Street, Boylston.

Maloney, Timothy W., 299 Plantation Street, Worcester.

Rojcewicz, Richard J., 135 Endicott Street, Worcester.

Troupes, James P., 19 Ashwood Street, Worcester.

Sullivan, Garrett F., 2 Forest Street, Worcester.

New Hampshire

Karla A. Reinholz, Post Office Box 7, Lakeport.

Donald G. LeBrun, 9 Redwood Avenue, Concord.

Thomas Martel, 247 Pleasant Street, Concord.

David E. Morgan, 175 Pleasant Street, Concord.

Edgar S. Casey, Route 1, Dover.

Kathleen Mullen, Third and King Highway, Hampton.

Irene Dubois, 101 Little River Road, Hampton.

Douglas L. Richards, 2021 North River Road, Manchester.

Paul L. Durette, 92 Kearsage Street, Manchester.

Roland Metivier, 432 Kelley Street, Manchester.

Albert Desbiens, 46 Cartier Street, Manchester.

Henry Gravel, 661 Summer Street, Manchester.

Raymond Boisvert, 36 Alsace Street, Manchester.

David Lynch, 1081 Somerville Street, Manchester.

Rebecca Sidore, 32 Trenton Street, Manchester.

John H. Handfield, 109 Sunnyside Street, Manchester.

Arthur Learmonth, Jr., 182 Kennard Road, Manchester.

Albert Desrochers, 278 Holly Avenue, Manchester.

Margaret H. Gallant, 197 Laval Street, Manchester.

James R. Sliney, Kendall Hill, Mount Vernon.

William A. Tretter, Jr., 9 Bailey Street, Nashua.

John R. Curran, Jr., 27 Russell Avenue, Nashua.

Maurice P. Guertin, 5 Haines Street, Nashua.

Martin T. Kelly, 70 Harbor Avenue, Nashua.

Maurice J. Richard, 11 Fulton, Nashua.

Frank R. DiPietro, 61 Spauling Street, Nashua.

Andrew Buswell, 58 Ferry Street, Nashua.

Wayne T. Bowlen, 143 Profile Avenue, Portsmouth.

Denis G. Cartier, 52 South Street, Somersworth.

Michael E. Gould, 207 Rockland Street, Portsmouth.

Michael A. Lamb, 145 Lincoln Avenue, Portsmouth.

Gordon F. Mullavey, 31 Cottage Street, Portsmouth.

Peter J. Murphy, 15 Richardson Drive, Dover.

Barry D. Osborn, 187 Woodbury Avenue, Portsmouth.

Sherman C. Pridham, 472 Middle Road, Portsmouth.

Shaun T. Rafferty, 349 Wibird Street, Portsmouth.

Lawrence Strang, 4 Wilson Street, Rochester.

Michael G. Murray, 26 Windward Terrace, Salem.

Vermont

John F. Berry, 79 Linden Terrace, Burlington.

Max A. Kahn, 165 East Avenue, Burlington.

Kevin P. Maley, 21 Ledge Road, Burington.

Harland Saunders, 84 West Spring Street, Winooski.

Dana U. Wakefield, 35 Charles Street, Lyndonville.

Michael B. Morrissette, RFD, Montpelier.

Stephen S. Dumas, None, Danby.

John Guarino, 28 North Main Street, White River Junction.

John Brockway, South Main Street, White River Junction.

Craig Walker, 9 Mountain Avenue, White River Junction.

Rhode Island

William H. Boucher, 28 Rand Street, Central Falls.

Robert Gasse, 17 Reservoir Avenue, Pawtucket.

Marc L. Godbout, 97 Boutwell Street, Pawtucket.

Gregory E. Hart, 147 Benjamin Street, Pawtucket.

James F. Schnelle, Jr., Angell Road, Ashton.

Carl A. Bishop, Shore Road, R.R. No. 1, Westerly.

David E. Dredge, Post Road, R.R. No. 1, Westerly.

John D. Grispino, 23 Pierce Street, Westerly.

Roger E. Knapp, 63 State Street, Westerly.

Robert F. Savage, 45 Stillman Avenue, Pawcatuck.

Richard G. Stenhouse, 99 East Avenue, Westerly.

Dennis J. George, 51 Majestic Street, Westerly.

Richard A. Anderson, 6 Racing Avenue, Warwick.

Dennis M. Canulla, 67 Bourne Avenue, Tiverton.

Joseph E. Gray, Jr., 63 Roanoke Street, Providence.

Paul J. Huot, 103 Adelaide Avenue, North Providence.

John J. Hynes, 89 Sorrento Street, Providence.

Thomas F. Lavery, 3 Oak Grove Boulevard, North Providence.

Richard Lupino, 20 Jones Street, Providence.
Gerald M. Macomber, 1189 Anthony Road, Portsmouth.
Dwight F. Matthews, 22 Heath Street, Newport.
Ronald R. Montaquila, 46 Yorkshire Street, Providence.
Michael F. Neville, 37 Greenfield Avenue, North Providence.
Joseph C. O'Connell III, 31 Weeden Avenue, Rumford.
John A. Parrillo, Jr., 340 Woodward Road, Providence.
Edward J. Sharkey, 101 King Street, Warwick.
Thomas F. White, 103 Butler Avenue, Providence.

Maine

Richmon E. Auger, 128 Highland Street, Portland.
Donald I. Baird, 1248 Broadway, South Portland.
George F. Burns, 303 Pine Street, South Portland.
David T. Flanagan, 121 Pleasant Avenue, Portland.
Paul K. Foley, 175 Deering Avenue, Portland.
David St. Humphries, 90 Simmons Road, South Portland.
Robert D. Johnston, R.F.D. 3, Biddeford.
James J. Lancaster, Jr., 17 Bonnybank Terrace, South Portland.
Thomas W. Loughran, 55 Hamblet Avenue, Portland.
Richard P. McCallum III, 339 Ludlow Street, Portland.
John J. O'Leary, Jr., 20 Sunset Lane, Portland.
Charles F. McNamara, 11 Kineo Street, Bangor.
Richard D. Crowe III, 244 Fourteenth Street, Bangor.
John M. Samway, 102 Walter Street, Bangor.
John R. Caron, 25 Fifth Street, Old Town.
Stanley R. Tupper, Jr., 222 Main Street, Orono.
Philip L. Ingeneri, 37 Fifth Street, Bangor.
Donrick Dorsky, 44 Pier Street, Bangor.
Albert R. LePage, 85 Mary Carroll Street, Auburn.
David A. Murphy, 80 Orchard Street, Auburn.
Jotham A. Trafton, 323 Minot Avenue, Auburn.
Walter R. Desjardins, 51 Pierce Street, Westbrook.
Andrew A. Loomis, 63 Main Street, Yarmouth.
Wallace D. Campbell, MD–A, Augusta.
John R. Turcotte, 163 Eastern Avenue, Augusta.
George E. Roy, 236 East Avenue, Lewiston.
Ronald Moody, 191 Atlantic Avenue, Wells Beach.
Allan Mills, 5 Cross Street, Gorham.
Richard S. Lane, 52 Forest Street, Bar Harbor.
Lawrence A. Moores, None, Hancock.

Connecticut

Walter Esdaile, 71 Beers Street, New Haven.
Jerome J. Bielizna, 179 Kohanza Street, Danbury.
William J. Shea, 135 Deer Hill Avenue, Danbury.
Joseph F. Zelenski, 81 Kohanza Street, Danbury.
Richard Gregory, 117 Allen Street, Groton.
Frank A. Dinucci, 120 Selden Hill Drive, West Hartford.
William J. Hagan, 12 Birch Road, West Simsbury.
Robert M. Horozy, 101 Ridgefield Street, Hartford.
John C. Karl, 462 Washington Street, Bristol.
Thomas J. Albani, 308 Freeman Street, Hartford.
Thomas C. Banever, 35 Outlook Avenue, West Hartford.
Richard E. Barr, 146 Madison Avenue, Hartford.
Charles N. Bonadies, 198 Homestead Avenue, Hartford.
Joseph A. Borcynski, 53 State Street, Wethersfield.
Howard S. Brecher, 5 Lewis Lane, West Hartford.
Thomas C. Butler, Jr., 48 Sulgrave Road, West Hartford.
John D. Cameron, 147 Cherry Hill Drive, Newington.
Peter J. Canestrino, 190 Stoddard Avenue, Newington.
Richard D. Cohen, 36 Lyman Road, West Hartford.
Thomas C. Corso, 119 Shultas Place, Hartford.
Joseph B. Curran, 43 Westfield Road, West Hartford.
Harold J. Davanney, 137 Wheeler Road, Wethersfield.
Dean M. De Angelis, 70 Webster Street, Hartford.
William A. Di Bella, 74 Freeman Street, Hartford.
Francis G. Dowley, 395 Woodland Street, Hartford.
Michael Fanelli, 232 Pinceton Street, Hartford.
Francis J. Farrelly, 34 Kenneth Street, Hartford.
Harris A. Friedberg, 134 Cedarwood Lane, Newington.
Joseph W. Gagne, 25 Carmel Street, Hartford.
Robert P. Gionfriddo, 702 Prospect Street, Wethersfield.
Peter G. Gleave, 71 Thornbush Road, Wethersfield.
Jeffrey W. Grande, 780 Farmington, Avenue, West Hartford.
Norman H. Harris, 30 Kirkwood Road, West Hartford.
Thomas A. Hill, 172 Florence Street, Elmwood.
Cornelius J. Kelly, 25 Canaan Street, Hartford.
Paul V. Kennedy, Jr., 140 Fisk Drive, Newington.
Robert E. Lehrer, 11 West Ridge Street, West Hartford.
David R. Lynch, 12 Plymouth Street, Hartford.
James D. Lyons, 72 Crest Street, Wethersfield.
James J. Naughton, 24 Spring Lane, West Hartford.
Val E. Nichols, 90 Mohawk Drive, West Hartford.
Frank D. Parseliti, 9 Forest Hills Drive, West Hartford.
Nicholas J. Piergrossi, Jr., 752 Asylum Avenue, Hartford.
Richard F. Piranian, 559 New Britain Avenue, Hartford.
Philip D. Rose, 101 Ridgefield Street, Hartford.
Frank E. Russo, Jr., 37 Darwell Drive, Wethersfield.
Jeffrey G. Sheldon, 162 Brewster Road, West Hartford.
Anthony J. Spinella, 15 White Street, Hartford.
Richard T. Sponzo, 80 Hunter Drive, West Hartford.
Edward J. Sullivan, Jr., 12 Marvis Street, Newington.
Lester A. Tillman, 40–B Dutch Point, Hartford.
John T. Warnes, 28 Bentwood Road, West Hartford.
Ralph E. Wentworth, 230 Terry Road, Hartford.
Mark Y. West, 311 Holcomb Street, Hartford.
Thomas E. Whalen, 141 Robin Road, West Hartford.
Philip H. Williams, East Street, Hebron.
John R. Murphy, 17 Broadview Street, Bristol.
Joseph Koniusheski, 148 Miller Street, New Britain.
James A. KcKeown, Jr., 69 Wade Avenue, Bloomfield.
Joseph F. Miscia, Jr., 208 Granderd, East Hartford.
Richard A. Morelli, 720 Matianuck Avenue, Windsor.
William E. Walsh, 31 Dougherty Street, Manchester.
Vincent A. Avallone, 430 Lighthouse Road, New Haven.
William K. Belcher, 31 Bluff Avenue, Clinton.
Nicholas F. Candido, 267 Fort Hale Road, New Haven.
Joseph J. Castiglione, 525 Ridge Road, Hamden.
Eileen B. Condron, 151 Linden Street, New Haven.
Joseph E. Crapanzano, Jr., 350 Taulman Road, Orange.
Robert R. Forgione, 48 Rowe Street, New Haven.
Janet A. Gollinger, 1600 Chapel Street, New Haven.
Martin K. Kravitt, 105 Bryden Terrace, Hamden.
Michael B. Katz, 41 Coram Street, Hamden.
Helene G. Marchitto, 279 Woodin Street, Hamden.
Leonard I. Massman, 245 Winthrop Avenue, New Haven.
Joanne E. Perrelli, 720 Townsend Avenue, New Haven.
Anita T. Russo, 492 Lombard Street, New Haven.
Teresa E. Scarpellino, 197 Wooster Street, New Haven.
Robert C. Sutfin, 69 Apple Tree Lane, Hamden.
Thomas H. Welch, 101 Grove Street, Clinton.
John J. DeNoia, Jr., 33 Burgess Place, Groton.
George S. Malleck, 140 Colman Street, New London.
Thomas S. Dopona, 7 Commerce Street, Norwalk.
Gary P. Shank, 23 Adams Avenue, Norwalk.
Philip T. Morgan, 14 Mack Street, South Norwalk.
Robert M. Slapin, 201 Newtown Avenue, Norwalk.
Michael D. Fox, 55 Moravia Road, Avon.
Jeffrey F. Gardner, 511 Brook Street, Rocky Hill.
Douglas H. Burger, 50 Havemeyer Lane, Old Greenwich.
Peter J. Coughter, Jr., 67 Deacon Hill Road, Stamford.
James R. DeCamillo, 126 VanBuskirk Avenue, Stamford.
Edward M. Dunne, Very Merry Road, Stamford.
Glennon G. O'Connell, Jr., 95 Myano Lane, Stamford.
Robert A. Slavinsky, 51 Plymouth Road, Stamford.
Mark Mink, Rural Route 2, Harwinton.
James Bagnaschi, 139 Funston Avenue, Torrington.
Robert Sweeney, 202 McKinley Street, Torrington.
Edward S. Wotkyns, Crest Road, Middlebury.
Thomas J. Flanagan, 78 Revere Street, Waterbury.
Albert A. Guimares, 28 Pearl Street, Waterbury.
James R. McGrath, 117 Grandview Avenue, Waterbury.
John W. Lawley, Jr., 141 Beecher Avenue, Waterbury.
Gerald E. Mambruno, 116 Woodside Avenue, Waterbury.
Terence R. McDonald, 120 Randolph Avenue, Waterbury.

Joseph A. Marcello, 151 South Street, Waterbury.

Thomas G. Nelson, 135 Hillside Avenue, Waterbury.

Walter Nelson, 102 Griggs Street, Waterbury.

Joseph F. Burke, 155 Eastfield Road, Waterbury.

Cornelius Quick, Jr., 259 Hoyt Street, Darien.

Kevin Doyle, 149 Elmwood Place, Bridgeport.

Bryon Morris, 11 Daniels Drive, Bridgeport.

Roger W. Williams, 1 Ulbrick Lane, Westport.

Charles W. Hagen, Ridge Lane, Weston.

Keith R. Colin, 226 Highland Road, R.F.D. No. 3, Willimantic.

Robert W. Rosen, 30 Pigeon Road.

Donald Zahewa, Center Street, Stafford Springs.

CHICAGO REGION

Illinois

Chicago

Abraham, Irene, 1322 West Farwell.

Alexander, Pamela VaMay, 3035 South Springfield Avenue.

Anderson, Charles E., 651 West 62d Street.

April, Lindsey D., 801 South Karlov.

Arnold, Jeffrey A., 1236 Farwell.

Austin, Ramona M., 1433 East Marquette Road.

Baldwin, Sarah Frances, 700 South Vernon.

Barmash, Ronelle, 6327 North Oakley.

Bingley, Lawrence J., 2901 South Parkway.

Blachley, Robert, 8414 South Francisco.

Black, Bennett R., 7426 South Constance Avenue.

Blaylock, Cassandra Desiree, 425 East 89th Place.

Bond, Clyde R., 3527 West 65th Place.

Bonin, Michael Leroy, 4956 West Roscoe.

Boylan, Michael E., 1759 West 94th Street.

Braden, Alice A., 7010 South Paxton.

Bradley, Kathleen Mary, 8351 South Dorchester.

Brennan, Lyn Marie, 12515 South Elizabeth.

Brittain, George M., 2710 West 86th Street.

Brooks, Maureen, 11256 South Carpenter.

Brown, Barbara Lynn, 427 West 97th Place.

Brown, Irwin Jerald, 3901 West 69th Place.

Brown, Willie B., 5326 South Wabash.

Brumfield, Hattie M., 7933 South Champlain Avenue.

Burke, James F., 2813 West 85th Place.

Burke, Sterling M., 4637 Evans.

Buszkiewicz, Lawrence W., 2346 West Dickens.

Butler, Harrison, 7430 South Perry.

Callinan, Dennis Martin, 2927 Arch Street.

Catchings, Frank H., Jr., 107 East Marquette Road.

Chaet, Eric Richard, 6359 South Sacramento.

Chambers, Dorothy J., 5308 South Indiana.

Chatt, Charles L., 4715 South Seeley Avenue.

Ciurek, James J., 5038 South Carpenter Street.

Clay, Thomasina, 3517 South Federal.

Clegg, Allan James, 5916 West Bernice.

Cogan, Dominic James, 309 West 107th Street.

Cohen, Anthony R., 6436 North Troy.

Coleman, James, 418 South Central Park.

Conaway, John C., 820 North LaSalle Street.

Conone, Angela Maria, 5621 North Major Avenue.

Cook, Edward W., 1346 West 64th Street.

Cortinas, Guadalupe, 2447 West Taylor Street.

Cowley, James A., 1510 South St. Louis.

Cox, Michael Wade, 8327 Vernon Avenue.

Cyscor, Peter, 1751 West 48th Street.

Dale, Walter R., 8128 South Eberhart.

Daniels, Kathy, 3410 West Fulton.

Davis, Carl E., 6812 Indiana.

Dees, Jerry J., 1510 West 14th Place.

Denard, Eddie James, 733 S. Keeler.

Denoms, Stephen D., 9426 South Indiana.

Depa, Thomas J., 2219 North Seeley.

Dertz, Raymond J., 10545 South Lawndale.

DiCaro, Joseph, 543 North St. Louis.

Diggs, John, 7611 Ridgeland.

Dobias, John E., 146 North La Porte Avenue.

Dolan, Robert D., 1339 West Garfield Boulevard.

Downes, James E., 10506 South Central Park.

Duff, James P., 171 North Leamington.

Dunigan, Jimmie Ann, 1547 East Marquette Road.

Dunigan, Nadine, 1547 East Marquette Road.

Elumn, Albert T., 6618 Stony Island.

Epstein, Ronald S., 5752 North Spaulding.

Evans, Doris Marie, 2320 South State.

Falls, Deborah C., 6934 South Cornell.

Fitzpatrick, Michael J., 5309 South Harper Avenue.

Flagg, Cora Lee, 835 East 75th Street.

Flynn, William R., 10726 South Bell.

French, Cassandra, 7221 Perry Avenue.

Fulgium, Joyce Oweter, 6131 South Champlain Avenue.

Fumbanks, Caroline I., 721 East Bowen.

Futrell, Henrietta E., 8138 Saint Lawrence.

Ganzer, Frank Michael, 1412 North Lawler Avenue.

Garrett, Zeller, 3445 West Walnut.

Gdowski, Joseph E., 6400 West 57th Street.

Grant, Robert L., III, 3249 South Calumet.

Gray, Dennis M., 206 North Leamington Avenue.

Green, Charles W., 7618 Calumet Avenue.

Guberman, Arthur P., 8843 Clyde.

Gunderson, William J., 9522 South Sangamon.

Guy, Timothy George, 4735 North Maplewood.

Hall, De Idra C., 8743 South Michigan Avenue.

Harris, DeWayne A., 5032 Evans Avenue.

Hartney, Edward J., 8051 South Washtenaw.

Hayden, Robert L., 7821 Eberhardt.

Hill, Joseph E., 400 East 33d Street, Apt. 714.

Holdsworth, James C., 10172 South Malta.

Holloway, William Lee, 1735 West Washburne.

Houston, John J., 8627 South Elizabeth.

Howard, Jeffrey P., 7531 South Rhodes.

Hultman, William, 4208 West Palmer.

Hunter, Charles E., 5136 South Ellis.

James, Willie D., 4033 South Calumet.

Jankowski, David A., 2440 South Oakley Avenue.

Jewell, Gary Gordon, 2115 North Sedgewick.

Johansson, Orve Karl, 4238 West 81st Street.

Johnson, Craig M., 7246 South Calumet.

Johnson, Thomas Theo, 6934 South Bell.

Jones, Brenetta Alma, 5420 Indiana.

Jones, Donald D., 401 East 32d Street.

Jones, Everett L., 7533 South Perry.

Jones, Leon Michael, 8023 South Vernon Avenue.

Jones, Steven Loring, 8325 South Calumet Avenue.

Jordan, Sherrilyn Faye, 6036 South Calumet Avenue.

Keelen, Russell N., 6628 South Evans.

Kindt, Thomas Leroy, 4028 North Austin.

Kleban, Stewart Ira (Mr.), 831 West Wilson.

Knox, Pearla Mae, 1622 West Jackson, Room 428.

Kondos, Robert A., 1714 North Maplewood.

Koswenda, Matthew A., 8364 Brandon Avenue.

Kubin, Lynn Anne (Miss), 116 Forest, New Lenox.

Kucharik, John F., 5737 North Roger Avenue.

Kurland, Howard J., 5643 North Spaulding Avenue.

Kurpiewski, Alan Paul, 1227 North Bosworth Avenue.

Kustusch, Ray J., 2040 West 83d Street.

Lane, Daniel P. T., 5832 North Medina.

Lewis, Michael B., 9603 South Indiana Avenue.

Lewis, Oswald G., 7925 South Indiana.

Livorsi, Tom J., 7043 West Summerdale.

Lloyd, Betty J., 4217 South Berkley.

Lobough, Patrick J., 5045 North Mont Clare.

Loda, Terry Allen, 5357 North Canfield.

Loeser, Michael, 7427 South Oglesby Avenue.

Loney, Elizabeth, 3672 South Wabash.

Lorenc, Zbigniew Thaddeus, 3410 North Linder Avenue.

Lukowich, David Albert, 1309 North Oakley.

MacKenzie, Malcolm Scott, 558 West Belden Avenue.

McCrary, Linda G., 11408 South Carpenter.

McCray, Robert Lawrence, 4250 West Adams.

McGough, James, 4717 W. Van Buren.

McKay, Randall P., 5615 N. Sacramento Avenue.

McNamara, Thomas M., 8114 South Justine.

Mackey, John Joseph, 9131 South Wallace Street.

Malloy, Richard J., 516 North LeClaire.

Maxcy, Stephen Ernest, 7720 South Rhodes.

Metzler, Eric, 7618 Calumet Avenue.

Meyer, Fred M., 6492 North Newcastle.

Migut, Thomas Edward, 3135 North Monticello.

Miller, Karen, 6628 South Rhodes.

Misiulis, Vytantes Dominic, 11734 South Ridgeway.

Mitchell, George P., 400 East 33d Street.

Moore, Michael Pleasant, 1445 South Hamlin Avenue.

Moran, Teodore Jr., 1226 East Hyde Park Boulevard.

Morris, Robert G., 919 East Hyde Park Boulevard.

Mosley, Earnestine, 8131 South Yale Avenue.

Moszur, Edward J., 12410 South Lowe Avenue.

Mrumlinski, Arthur John, 8207 South Washtenaw.

Murrell, Andew, care of Mr. Frank Morries, 1920 West Washington Boulevard.

Murrell, Render, care of Mr. Frank Morries, 1920 West Washington Boulevard.

Nadel Phillip Charles, 4853 North Springfield.

Nakagawa, Robert Yoshio, 5062 North Winthrop.

Nawojski, Richard H., 5038 South Aberdeen Street.

Nicolei, Kevin P., 5415 South Laflin Street.

Nitzsche, Kathryn Joann, 2643 South Harding Avenue.

Noah, Kathleen Ann, 2756 West 43d Street.

Norris, Michael J., 7921 South Fairfield.

Novak, Cynthia Rose, 4545 South Spaulding.

O'Brien, Sally J., 4933 West Hirsch.

O'Connor, Michael J., 211 North Laramie.

O'Connor, Thomas P., 5837 South Francisco.

O'Neal, Leohsenth, 4222 South Parkway.

O'Sullivan, Daniel Patrick, 7948 Luella.

Orro, Keenan, 7425 South Michigan.

Osiol, Ronald S., 5329 North Milwaukee.

Pabalan, Steven S., 4841 North Ridgeway.

Pacholski, John J., 5232 South Winchester Avenue.

Pajkos, John E., 4725 South Seeley Avenue.

Panzica, Joseph P., Jr., 4221 West Hirsch.

Parker, Mike Thomas, 1255 North Sandburg.

Parrillo, James A., 6725 South Paulina.

Parrish, Darrell Nordice, 444 East 93d Street.

Pearce, Linda Marian, 2619 North Sawyer Avenue.
Pekarsky, Daniel Nachman, 5516 South Cornell.
Pelzer, Harold Joseph, Jr., 1539 North Mayfield Avenue.
Petty, Mary E., 1427 South Central Park.
Petullo, Thomas J., 5106 West Quincy Street.
Pierre, Norbert A., 6459 South Aberdeen.
Pietruszewski, Walter, 1057 North Sacramento.
Plens, Thomas, 2221 North Maplewood.
Dodgorski, Edward J., 5212 South Marshfield.
Prentiss, Hazel D., 358 East 54th Street.
Provisor, Hartley Thomas, 6609 North Campbell.
Pucher, Michael Alan, 11046 Avenue "D".
Quish, John Joseph, 1334 West 97th Place.
Ramos, Jessee Rincon, 1924 South Loomis Street.
Reed, Royal E., Jr., 5103 Ellis.
Reid, Charlotte Louise, 4107 South Ellis.
Reisman, Cary S., 2237 East 98th Street.
Robertson, Evelyn I., 7114 South Cornell.
Robinson, Ed. G., 2701 South Dearborn.
Romani, Frank M., 5350 North Mobile Avenue.
Rosenberg, Kenneth R., 4914 North Spaulding.
Rosenberg, Lawrence J., 10052 South Crandon Avenue.
Ryan, James E., 10536 South Millard.
Rytlewski, Craig Bernard, 4430 South Christiana Avenue.
Sekerka, John Francis, 2432 North Bernard.
Setka, Robert P., 6051 West Matson Avenue.
Shamberg, Lee Gary, 559 West Roscoe.
Shropsheer, John, 5129 Drexel.
Shymanik, Joseph E., 847 North Pulaski.
Siuta, Francis, 6564 West Devon Avenue.
Slothower, John Robert, 2055 West Jarvis.
Smith, Eulalia M., 7319 South Lowe.
Smith, Jeffrey W., 6507 North Hamilton Avenue.
Smith, Robert W., Jr., 7726 West Catalpa Avenue.
Spearman, Arnold David, 2941 West Lexington.
Stirling, Jack Martin, 10345 Cottage Grove.
Stokes, Paulette Royal, 200 East 72d Street.
Summers, Sandra L., 6936 Union.
Targonski, Conrad Andrew, 8637 Exchange Avenue.
Tate, Gail (Miss), 8223 Calumet.
Turner, Robert, 4265 West Cermak Road.
Vanderbilt, Mardelle A., 6809 Harper.
Van Etten, James L., 515 West 107th Street.
Versey, Henderson, 6531 Kenwood.
Walker, James R., 7342 South Prairie.
Wang, James Payton, 8200 South Indiana Avenue.
Washington, Alex Eugene, 5615 South Calumet.
Waterford, Herman L., 7230 South Michigan Avenue.
Webb, Melvin, 1827 South Karlove.
Weintraub, Joseph Nathan, 1645 West Greenleaf.
Wells, Neal, 7935 South Prairie.
Wheatley, George, 7721 South Indiana Avenue.
Wilkens, Myris Louise, 6242 South Bishop.
Williams, Eddie R., 3720 South Parkway.
Williams, Gloria Jean S., 4109 South Wabash Avenue.
Williams, William Michael, 2443 West Greenshaw.
Willingham, Camille Aljean, 4414 South Michigan.
Willis, Carolyn Theresa, 517 East 89th Place.
Wilson, John U., 6537 South Langley.
Winfrey, Carl M., 6034 South Indiana.
Wisinski, Carl L., 6092 North Naples.
Witt, Klyle Don, 9416 South Racine.
Wulff, John Newbury, 7304 West Greenleaf.
Ziubrzynski, Stanley J., 2328 West McLean Avenue.

Michigan

Allen Park

Brunelle, Garrett, no address.
Quinn, Paul, no address.
Ray, Robert, no address.
Shade, Jeffery, no address.

Alpena

Gamage, Robert, 111 Oliver Street.

Ann Arbor

Hayden, Charles L., 1604 Peach Street.

Battle Creek

Carr, Woodrow A., no address.
Garland, John Burton, 247 Cherry Street.
McNamee, L. C., III, no address.
Noverr, Dogulas A., 115 Cook Street.
Pool, Ronald Lee, no address.

Bay City

Charters, Thomas M., 311 North Sheridan Street.
Evans, Albert C., 103 Leng Street.

Calumet

Mikkola, James W., Rural Route No. 1, Box 106.

Charlevoix

Stephan, Paul, 207 Prospect.

Crystal Falls

Kudwa, Robert, Route 2, Box 106.

Dearborn

Bohas, John Jr., 225 North Vernon.
Borovsky, Jerry, 6489 Robindale.
Henry, Earle W., 7631 Maple.
Kopczyk, Christine, 6583 Kingsbury.
Palise, Sandra K., 6159 Argyle.
Paluch, Elizabeth J., 6133 Argyle.
Traye, Gordon Theodore, 731 Mohawk.
Whitcomb, Susan (Miss), 8136 Riverdale.
Wohlford, Pauline (Miss), 4465 Grindley Park.

Detroit

Ambrose, Donald H., 5035 Hillsboro.
Anderson, Shannon, no address.
Ardrey, Terry Walls, Mr., 2037 Oakman Boulevard.
Arnold, Earnestine, 612 East Philadelphia.
Ausgood, William, 1634 Glendale.
Barnes, Gary L., 16315 Coram.
Beard, Joyce M., 19925 Northlawn.
Bennett, Barbara A., 11328 Hawthorne.
Bibbins, Victor E., 2997 Belvedere.
Bland, Charles, no address.
Bolden, James, 13253 Trumbull, Highland Park.
Boone, Curtis D., 2325 Highland.
Bridges, Thomas C., 12057 Hawthorne.
Brown, Arthur R., 17690 Grandville.
Brown, Karen, no address.
Bullock, Robert E., no address.
Campbell, Harry L., 4587 Allendale.
Carter, Patricia, no address.
Cawthon, Gerald C., no address.
Chapman, Clement, no address.
Cherry, Lugreta, L., 5758 Woodrow.
Childers, Theda S., 2481 Seminole.
Clark, Elizabeth B., 6374 Ironwood.
Clarke, Brenda P., 3960 Garland.
Cochran, Edward, no address.
Coleman, Larry H., no address.
Coleman, Leroy, no address.
Collins, Harold S., 19929 Manor.
Colquitt Bernard B., 5202 Yemans, Hamtramck.
Colquitt, Thelma, 4405 Hireman.
Corbin, Gregory, no address.
Czerwinski, Lawrence M., 3965 Talbot.
Diggs, Charles C., III, 2522 West Boston Boulevard.
Dozier, Tyrone, no address.
Duthrie, Eleanor, no address.
Eddington, Nathaniel, III, 2069 Cody.
Edwards, Willie L., 675 Eliot.
Eldridge, Carolyn, 621 Navahoe.
Evans, Marilyn J., 19937 Ohio.
Ewing, Richard, 14738 Quincy.
Finkel, Howard, no address.
Ford, Beverly, no address.
Fox, Booker T., 4618 Beniteau.
Franklin, Roman, 20172 Tracey.
Frederick, Joanne M., no address.
Frey, James P., 2410 Inglis.
Gandy, Adak, no address.
Gardner, Reginald E., 1482 West Grand Boulevard.
Garvin, John M., 4444 St. Clair.
Gaspar, Kenneth L., 17700 Omira At.
Gee, Clara M., no address.
Grayson, Bessie M., 5012 McClellan.
Green, Sherril N., 142 Connecticut, Highland Park.
Greenwald, Leslie Neil, 19490 Steel.
Gulley, James C., 584 Erskine.
Gunn, Carolyn, 2721 Doris.
Hall, Frank Eugene, 2015 Highland.
Harper, Glenn, 5056 Underwood.
Hendon, Mary Jane, 3899 Garland.
Herring, Willie, no address.
Holston, Charles, no address.
Holtyn, Kenneth J., 6266 Joseph Campau.
Horn, Delores, no address.
Hudson, Frederick B., 18111 Greenlawn.
Hughes, Carl D., Jr., 258 Trowbridge.
Hunt, William J., 3161 Fourth.
Jackson, Henry, Jr., 3001 Cochrane.
Johnson, Gwendolyn J., 2918 Montclair.
Johnson, Patricia A., 11748 Cardoni, Highland Park.
Joseph, Edward F., 18088 Maine.
Kliber, William A., Jr., 8530 Concord, Grosse Ille.
Koseman, Susan, no address.
Kotlarczyk, Raymond, 7258 Rutherford.
Kuczynski, Bernadette M., 18940 Curtis.
Kulikauskas, Alfred A., 7441 Forrer.
Kusak, Christine E., 7427 Grandmont.
Langston, Von H., 21637 Highwood, Ferndale.
Law, Donovan, no address.
Leonard, Michael C., 15882 Fairfield.
Ligon, William J., no address.
Lonyo, Annette Louise, 751 Boston Boulevard.
Lorey, Lawrence, no address.
Lukshaitis, Eugene, 3869 Norwalk, Hamtramck.
McCarver, Clarence H., Jr., 3937 McGraw.
McCauley, Marcia L., 4370 Kensington.
McConnell, Rosemary, no address.
McFarland, Lynda Jane, no address.
McGivern, Kevin G., 11487 Findlay.
McGraw, Tom C., 15602 Lappin.
McKay, Edward B., III, 19359 Rutherford.
McLeod, Maureen A., 18625 Santa Rose.
McMurty, Dennis, 3237 Vicksburg.
Marable, Diane J., 16932 Parkside.
Marshall, Carl E., Jr., 3265 Burlingame.
Masley, Phillip A., 3890 Cicotte.
Mathis, Vickie Henry, 509 Westminister.
Maurant, Dorian, no address.
Mejca, Joseph A., no address.
Merski, Jack, 6509 Faust.
Merzulli, Mary J., no address.
Meyers, Gerald W., 16861 Mendota.
Millender, Patricia Louise, 5537 S. Clarendon.
Miller, Janice, no address.
Mitchell, Roger D., 3225 Concord.
Molnar, Robert L., 9175 Lane.
Moody, Maurice, no address.
Mozham, Marc M., no address.
Mucker, Lawrence, 7358 DeSoto.
Mulawa, Joseph L., no address.
Naugles, Barbara Mae, no address.
Neal, Michael E., 15327 Linwood.
Nosek, John W., 3288 Lehman, Hamtramck.
Onica, Paul A., 16156 Kentucky.
Orlowski, Richard J., 9006 Keller.
Palka, Mary Jane, 8082 Sussex.
Passmore, Charles, no address.
Pechur, John C., 825 Philip Avenue.
Pechur, Robert E., 825 Philip Avenue.
Peirsel, William L., 12257 Wilshire.
Peterson, Sandra J., no address.
Pickett, Kenneth, 1207 Burlingame.
Pierce, Gwendolyn J., 2293 Glynn.
Pishko, Gale Andrew, 8888 Auburn.
Pitts, Rozanne E., 2732 Charlevoix.
Pusker, Robert J., 8603 Cheyenne.
Ragland, Rosalynne Elaine, 2941 Cortland.

Ralyea, Evan P., 15900 Winthrop.
Ramos, Norma O., no address.
Reardon, Daniel James, 17136 Wildemere.
Reeder, William, 2992 Beniteau.
Reid, Eddie D., no address.
Reynolds, Paul G., 10371 North Oak Drive, Ferndale.
Richter, Francis, J., 19152 Grandville.
Riley, Michael, no address.
Ripton, George, 19942 Northlawn.
Rivers, Sidney, no address.
Robinson, Charles E., 4747 Cooper.
Rodriguez, Robert, no address.
Rogers, Nathaniel, Jr., 4439 St. Clair.
Romanowski, Dennis S., 3301 Kanter.
Romanski, Jr., Matthew Leo, 3935 Caely.
Ross, Jacqueline V., 7438 Dexter.
Rout, Emmanuel A., 3060 Bewick.
Sallee, Andrew J., 25541 Gardner, Oak Park.
Saunders, Ingrid Juanita, 2531 South LaSalle Gardens.
Scott, Ronald, 3520 Gibson, Apartment 11.
Shaw, Allan, no address.
Shepherd, James, no address.
Shomin, Jean L., 4646 Military Street.
Shore, Jerry N. (Gerald), 18619 Hartwell.
Sikus, Leonard, no address.
Slaughter, Richard L., 13816 Trumbull Avenue, Highland Park.
Slayman, Cheryl J., 22500 Alexander, St. Clair Shores.
Smith, Ernestine, 1756 West Boston Boulevard.
Smith, Harvey, no address.
Stanfield, Larry, 4429 Fairview.
Stanley, Celene M., no address.
Staples, Richard L., 19739 Santa Barbara.
Stewart, Clarence, no address.
Stocks, Jacqueline B., 2235 West Boston Boulevard.
Strong, Roger M., 13959 Greenview.
Sturkey, Gregory C., 2332 Buena Vista.
Szczhgielski, Joseph T., 3881 Hulrouk, Hamtramck.
Szirtes, Gerald J., 20234 Schaefer.
Thomas, Daryl C., no address.
Tomaszychi, Alex A., 3697 Medbury.
Townsend, Gordon, no address.
Tumidanski, Joanne Theresa (Miss), 2592 Military.
Uller, Frank D., 16261 Lappin.
Vincent, Joyce E., 17535 St. Aubin.
Waroway, Dennis M., 17836 Roe.
Washington, Gerald Daniel, 7535 Dexter.
Watson, Janet E., no address.
Wilder, Louis H., Jr., 5072 Holcomb.
Williams, Carol Ann, no address.
Williams, Clyde L., 2906 Harding.
Williams, Nathaniel, 3939 12th Street.
Williams, Robert E., 8476 Minock.
Wilson, Cattie, 1938 Hancock (East).
Wortham, Rozaa J., 2967 Glynn Court.
Worthy, Anthony P., no address.
Wynn, Larry L., no address.
Zakobielski, Marlene M., 8168 Archdale.
Zellars, Vivian A., 910 Gladstone.
Zrolka, Richard, 20316 Rosemont.

East Detroit

Bommarito, Margaret M., 21797 Pleasant.
Heuer, Lynda M., 16641 Stephens.
Kronberg, Gay (Miss), 21720 Donald.

Escanaba

Bruce, Jimmy R., 617 South 10th.
Vader, Charles L., 508 Second Avenue South.

Farmington

Jamieson, Perry D., 21640 Hamilton.
Key Smith, Catharine M., 34235 Cortland.

Flint

Bearup, Rodney T., 2127 Milbourne.
Bess, Dayne M., 618 Lyon Place.
Hickman, Dennis P., 121 Grace.
Jeffes, David L., 1426 Davison Road.
Lehnst, Michael S., G-2033 Delaney.
Martin, Webb F., 3734 Norwood Drive.
Mondell, Constance, 214 Edwin.
Schmidt, Wayne A., 2081 E. Bristol.
Snyder, David, 4410 Kilarney Park Drive.
Turnbull, Patricia L., 4265 North Gale, Davison.
Shaffer, Judith, 489 East Glass, Ortonville.
Wright, Charles O'Carnell, 2817 West Boulevard Drive.

Garden City

Anderson, Bruce M., 30742 Elmwood.
Koloski, Philip A., 32581 Sheridan.
LeMond, Carey Lee, 34563 Glover Street, Wayne.
Murphy, Sharon M. (Miss), 31560 Barton.
Patterson, Harold Vance, 31438 Rush.

Grand Rapids

Ashley, Ronald A., 4462 Hunsberger NE.
Buzen, Norbert J., 900 Flat Street NE.
Cwick, Patrick, 612 Davis Ave. NW.
Farrand, David L., 834 Canterbury Street SW., Wyoming.
Haas, David R., 332 Marion St. NW.
Koon, Frederick R., Jr., 1714 Kalamazoo Street SE.
Marlowe, Nancy L., 2704 Woodward SW., Grand Rapids.
Ponne, Brian T., 830 Canterbury SW., Wyoming.
Smiley, Harold Upjohn, Jr., 842 Cadillac Drive.
Terbeek, Kenneth J., 1104 Cricklewood Drive SW., Wyoming.
West, Rudolph, 402 Union SE.
Wissman, William, Jr., 838 Buckingham SW.
Zainea, Leo M., 1654 Woodward St. SE.

Hancock

Martin, John, no address.
Witting, James, no address.

Houghton

Niva, Mildred, Toivola.
Salo, Paul.

Ionia

North, Kenneth, 654 North Jackson Street.

Iron Mountain

Hanson, Dennis, 521 West Sagola Avenue, Kingsford.

Ironwood

Morin, Dennis J., 1225 Margaret.

Ishpeming

Turino, Steven P., 168 Saginaw.

Jackson

Darnell, Kenneth K., 1410 Pringle Street.
Baker, Robert Paul, 4197 Lancashire Drive.

Kalamazoo

Barnum, Thomas, 4238 Mayfair Street.
Brown, Robert A., 813 Ferris Court.
O'Connor, Michael J., 4011 Devonshire Avenue.
Williams, Shirley Marie (Miss), 1015 Hotop Avenue.

Lansing

Davenport, Lawrence F., 608 West Street.
Holmes, Winfield L., 813½ Jerome Street.
Keesler, Eric Lynn, no address.
Kruger, David D., 2925 Pleasant Grove.
Reid, Lynn Edward, 1948 Elm Street, Holt.

Lincoln Park

Haf, James J., 1365 Moran.
Tomaszewski, Joseph W., 3043 Green.

Marquette

Labreche, Tom M., 136 West Crescent.
Mendelin, Jack W., 1123 North 3d Street.

Monroe

Williams, David C., 11 Richards Court.

Mount Clemens

Borowski, Michael A., 22215 Thomson.
Finch, Mary P., 22626 15 Mile Road.

Mount Pleasant

Turner, Gerry D., 107 West Hall Street, Shepherd.

Muskegon

Derezinski, James J., 11 North Wolf Lake Road.
Hughey, Jack L., 305 North Muskegon Boulevard.
Sullivan, Michael P., 457 Grover Road.
Sullivan, Michael P., 457 Grover Road.
Zellar, Michael F., 4091 South Wolf Lake Road, Fruitport.

Negaunee

Pirkola, Carl R., 406 Cherry Street.

Petoskey

Sterzik, Terry J., RFD, Resort Township.

Plymouth

Good, B. R., no address.
Hinderliter, Charles, no address.
Kenner, James F., no address.
White, R. E., no address.

Pontiac

Bisogni, Gary, 731 Third.
Corke, Hortense, 94 Wall.
Dugan, William, 363 Nelson.
Elkins, Robert, 1886 Elsmere.
Hayes, Jeanette D., 421 Lynch.
Metz, Barbara K., 90 W. Berkshire, Bloomfield Hills.
Mathews, Claudine, 348 Howard McNeil.
Norman, Thomas A., 981 Kettering.
Payette, Judy, 5115 West Combe, Orchard Lake.
Ramirez, Mary, 54 Hillside.
Sulaica, Gloria, 248 Columbia.

Rochester

Lorraine, Susan, no address.

Rockwood

Koerber, Dave E., 30023 Young Drive, Gibraltar.

Royal Oak

Almany, Julian R., 2343 Sunny Knoll, Berkley.
Bolk, Alexander, 20110 Stotter, Detroit.
Czarnik, Thomas J., 19357 Carrie, Detroit.
Hahn, Edward, 3448 Royal, Berkley.
Murphy, Sheila M., 710 Catalpa.
Pietrzak, Patrick J., 18048 Mount Elliott, Detroit.
Valdez, Dennis N., 19651 Cliff, Detroit.

St. Clair Shores

Rzempala, Carol A., 27804 Ruehle Street.

St. Joseph

Smith, Thomas William, 1803 Niles Avenue.

Sault Ste. Marie

Cody, Calvin, Riverside Drive.
Dubow, Tom E., 3301 Lake Shore Drive.
Ziewacz, Larry E., 1503 Minneapolis.

Saginaw

Boese, Richard, 1845 Joy Road.
Bustamante, Robert, 1810 Sanford.
Chaney, James, 3172 Wadsworth.
Ehlert, Melvel H., no address.
Haney, Robert T., 413 South 25th Street.
Orange, Tommie, Jr., no address.
Schilling, Eugene P., no address.
Simmons, Warren W., no address.
Smith, William S., no address.
Toureau, Timothy, no address.
Turner, Joseph M., no address.
Volz, David Robert, 5016 Wadsworth Road.

Taylor

Day, Jim L., 7626 Mayfair.
Pray, David Peter, 3445 Filmore.

Traverse City

Hager, Robert T., Route 6.
Hulett, Bruce W., 3109 Townline Road.
Strong, Gary W., Route 4.

Trenton

Sawyer, James W., 2550 Edgemont.
Shamanski, Thomas L., 2977 Syckelmoore.

Wakefield

Petranek, John C., 405 Ascherman.

Walled Lake

Lewis, Forest G., 5681 Halsteed.

Wayne

Nicholas, Dennis, no address.
Ryerson, Nancy R. (Miss), 6973 Bison.

Wyandotte

Malinowski, Norman N., 2224 21st Street.
Piasecki, Joseph H., 544 Orange.

Illinois

Forpe, Scott W., 921 East Olive, Arlington Heights.
Gould, James P., 1531 Mascoutah, Belleville.
Orlet, James J., 27 South 10th Street, Belleville.
Cavalli, Nick, 404 West Reed, Benton.
Collier, Harold P., Jr., 6608 Cermak Road, Berwyn.
Ballard, Mark E., 174 Van Dyke Drive, Canton.
Turner, James, 1503 East Charles, West Frankfort.

Centralia

Wolf, Larry, 504 East 7th Street, West Frankfort.
Biagi, Arthur Jr., RR No. 2.
Duncan, Harry, 419 North Maple.
Duvian, Harry J., 419 North Maple.
Rissi, Michael F., Collinsville, no address.
Ruffus, Michael, 340 North Fairway Decatur.
Zindahl, Bernard W., 209 East 138th Street, Dolton.

Du Quoin

Adams, Michael, 107 East Smith, Benton.

East St. Louis

Belz, Edward Joseph, 8547 Church Lane.
Hudson, Richard E., III, 214 North 24th Street.
Knor, Joseph, 4010 Caseyville Avenue.
Lipe, Jeffrey A., 6788 Mary Avenue.
Mays, Cedric E., 4447 McCasland.
Mays, Robert Berry, 4447 McCasland Avenue.

Effingham

Bryant, David J., 604 South Fifth Street.
Foreman, Jerry J., Rural Route No. 1.

Evanston

Bane, Keith J., no address.
Burks, Deborah K., 1513 Asbury Avenue.
Cunningham, Thomas F., Jr., no address.
Galen, Arthur M., no address.
Gargas, James C., no address.
Gould, Francis B., no address.
Johnson, Linck C., no address.
Kaufman, Stuart D., no address.
Leibowitz, Burton H., 534 Sheridan Road.

Galva

Maupin, Gerald J., 504 Southwest Fifth Avenue.

Glencoe

Sheldon, Harvey M., 1228 Oak Street, Winnetka.

Glenview

McFadzean, John, 2111 Robin Crest.

Granite City

Bourbon, Jr., Archie Theodore, 2758 Washington.
Cozart, Frank E., 2905 Wayne Avenue.
Johnson, Larry Gene, 2231 East 25th Street.
Toth, David Neil, 2616 East 28th Street.

Harrisburg

Feazel, Kurt, 402 North Webster.

Herrin

Wright, Michael A., Route 1, Johnston City.

Hillsboro

Cox, Arthur L., Route 2.

Homewood

Dougan, Frances Eva (Miss), 3113 Emery Lane, Robbins.

Highland Park

Jacks, J. T., no address.
Lindstrom, Harry E., no address.
Poppe, Stephen C., no address.
Schecter, Steven Barry, no address.

Joliet

Bartl, Frank J., 701 Geneva Avenue, Lockport.
Farner, James Robert, 328 Bass Street, Wilmington.
Lang, Otha Olen, 210 Edward Street.
Macarek, John Stephen, 218 Youngs Avenue.
MaGee, Phillip James, 921 McKinley Avenue.
Rems, John W., Jr., 521 North Hickory.
Smolich, Richard Joseph, 1620 Clement.
Spires, Linda Sue, 1627 Marquette Road.

Lansing

Herschman, Michael Henry, 3318 Maple, Hazelcrest.

La Salle

Wasilewski, Philip M., 1328 Fifth Street.
Ryan, Michael, 552 Joliet Street.

Litchfield

Woodland, Sanders P., 703 North Harrison.

Lyons

Corollo, Anthony P., 4012 Joliet Avenue.
Hrejsa, Richard Kenneth, 8324 West 44th Place.

Madison

Bright, Richard J., 1119 Madison Avenue.

Marion

Vick, Jerry D., Trout Street, Johnston City.

Moline

Furlong, Stephen J., no address.

Monmouth

Barton, George Michael, 203 South 2d Street.
Gillette, James R., no address.

Murphysboro

Boyer, Dale, 1824 Kennedy.
Miluer, John, 1304 Manning Street.

Oaklawn

Bencic, Charles, 4041 West 90th Street, Chicago.
Kos, Kenneth J., 6733 West 87th Place.
O'Connor, Neal M., 10409 Kostner.

Oak Park

Clark, John Kearin, 519 South Euclid Avenue.
Daleiden, George Richard, 942 North Grove Avenue.
Farrell, John Jerome, 801 Washington.
Feeney, Daniel Patrick, 810 Gunderson.
Flank, Arnold, 840 North Marion.
Hinrichs, Bruce W., no address.
Lancaster, Samuel Pottinger, Jr., 311 South Scovile Avenue.
Lonergan, Michael, no address.
McNicholas, Dennis John, 819 South Humphrey.
Murphy, Eugene E., 132 South Austin Boulevard.
Nichols, Lawrence T., no address.
Pearlman, Martin, 901 Forest Avenue.
Reckamp, Ralph J., no address.
Walsh, David Patrick, 419 South Humphrey Avenue.

Olney

Walker, Kelly G., 602 West Cherry Street.

Park Forest

Rodin, Richard K., 15 Westwood Court.

Peoria

Dawson, Gary R., 825 North Bourland.
Fitch, Arthur D., RR No. 2 Charter Oak Road.
Hall, Eugene C., 202 Mound Street.
Henderson, John, 710 Commercial, Apt. 243.
Kuhlman, Gary A., 623 East Glen.

Posen

Litko, Joseph Ralph, no address.

River Grove

Gedwellas, James, no address.
Steinmiller, Michael, 2702 North 76th Avenue, Elmwood Park.

Rock Island

Rutherford, William Clyde, Jr., Route 2, Joy.
Soucinek, Joel E., 2049 3X Avenue, East Moline.

Skokie

Kohn, David Z., 7435 Tripp.
Robinson, Jerome Jay, 7534 North Kostner.
Wolf, Richard A., 7907 Kenneth.

Waukegan

Aikens, Kenneth L., no address.
Carlson, Dennis A., no address.
Long, Lester B., no address.
McClure, Richard P., no address.
Meyer, Dennis A., no address.
Pecaro, Vincent J., no address.
Spenko, Frank J., no address.

West Frankfort

Down, Glendell L., RFD 2.
Kaiser Jay, 705 East Fourth Street.

Wheeling

Ferris, R. E., no address.
Larsen, A. R., no address.
Paisly, James D., no address.

Winnetka

Balmes, C. J., no address.
Fox, Barry, no address.
Heinbrink, J. J., no address.
Knowles, Robert M., no address.
Weiss, Harvey S., no address.

Zion

Bunner, Martin, no address.
Olsen, Brian, no address.

North Suburban Facility

Aleksy, August Paul, 2005 North 74th Avenue, Elmwood Park.
Bachner, David A., no address.
Bailey, Stephen C., 350 South Belmont, Arlington Heights.
Byrne, Helen Mary, 2845 North Washtenaw, Chicago, Ill.
Calendo, Kathleen, no address.
Chiappetti, Mike R., 1848 North Sayre, Chicago.
Collins, Donald A., no address.
Curry, Lon Westley, 2N500 Pearl Avenue, Glen Ellyn.
Ellis, Bernard, 1546 North Mohawk, Chicago.
Fortin, Thomas A., no address.
Gonzales, Richard, 2831 West Belmont, Chicago.
Hogan, John P., no address.
Isaacson, George A., no address.
Jonak, Kenneth Allen, 8927 West Church Street, Des Plaines.
Kasper, Thomas Paul, 3026 North Oconto, Chicago.
Krings, William M., no address.
Ladd, Sandra Elizabeth, no address.
Lovig, Betty Day, no address.
Maggio, Joseph D., 1914 North 78th Avenue, Elmwood Park.
Mudra, James, no address.
Murawski, Vernon, no address.
Neubert, Rodger C., no address.
Plewa, James Wilfred, 4930 West Quincy.
Purchase, Orson, no address.
Purchase, Wendell, no address.
Robinson, Johnnie Lee, 4344 West Adams Street.
Shapiro, Arthur Howard, 7441 North Rockwell Street.
Smolynsky, Jerry Leo, 7557 West Gunnison, Harwood Heights.
Stasny, Jane, no address.
Stawicki, Ronald Michael, 5472 North Parkside.
Stein, Stuart J., 4820 North St. Louis.
Stott, Donald W., no address.
Sutton, Richard A., 5967 West Augusta Boulevard.
Taylor, Reece, no address.
Twarowski, Allen John, 2129 North 75th Avenue, Elmwood Park.
Washington, Jacqueline M., 6100 North Sheridan Road.
Weiss, Jerry, 4920 North Troy.

Whittington, Ronald G., 5744 South Parkway.

South Suburban Facility

Ballard, Johnnie, no address.

Bazmore, Winston Leonard, 4626 Champlain.

Berry, Steven Mark, 9143 South Emerald.

Biggs, Lester, no address.

Burrell, James A., no address.

Clapas, Leonard John, 4444 South Mozart.

Clay, Lillie Mae, 6633 South Langley.

Crenshaw, Theodore, no address.

Culley, Odell (Mrs.), 6500 South Loomis.

Dickerson, Dana Ronald, 9210 South Park Avenue.

Eiland, John W., no address.

Elliott, Charles Ellis, 2059 West Madison.

Ellison, Larry, no address.

Fanelli, Daniel, no address.

Filer, Elgie B., no address.

Frisco, Nick, no address.

Gainer, Harvey, no address.

Gant, Anthony James, 1161 North Larrabee.

Hawkins, Vaughn E., 7929 South Woodlawn.

Hester, Lynn, Jr., no address.

Hicks, Curlee, 7649 South Wabash.

Humphrey, Saundra M., no address.

Jones, Savannah Louis, 328 West 59th Place.

Jones, Walter, 8104 South Indiana.

Jordan, Frank, Jr., South Calumet.

Keys, James Walter, 7612 South Emerald.

Lawrence, Jerome, 3312 West Walnut.

Logan, Marrion, no address.

Lyles, Chester, 329 West 61st Street.

McGhee, Veodis, no address.

Minor, Albert K., no address.

Noonan, William F., no address.

Odum, Ernest, no address.

O'Neill, Thomas M., no address.

Packer, Charles, no address.

Pippins, Tilton Cleveland, 6140 South Dorchester, Chicago.

Post, Richard Matthew, 8936 South Ashland Avenue, Chicago.

Reps, Robert Eugene, 4945 South Rockwell Street, Chicago.

Reynolds, Shaun David, 10560 Longwood, Chicago.

Rhodes, Gregory Hayze, 6405 South Carpenter, Chicago.

Richardson, Reanet (Miss), 741 East Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Robertson, Marc A., 6724 South Morgan, Chicago.

Rucker, Alan Eugene, 7019 South Indiana Avenue, Chicago.

Salles, Michael E., no address.

Saxton, Arthur M., 8123 South Maryland, Chicago.

Shure, Michael I., 2432 East 91st, Chicago,

Sjoreen, Terrence Paul, 5746 South Fairfield, Chicago.

Smejkal, Earl S., no address.

Smith, Thomas Patrick, 1830 West 104th Street, Chicago.

Stephens, James Melvin, Jr., 4022 South State Street, Apartment 1303, Chicago.

Taylor, Jesse Charles, 4812 South Wabash, Chicago.

Taylor, Vulcan C., no address.

Thompson, Bishop Scott, Jr., 7844 South Morgan, Chicago.

Ward, Lawrence James, 9336 South Parnell Avenue, Chicago.

Williams, Colston, 612 East 41st Street, Chicago.

Williams, James H., no address.

Wilson, Rufus Tommy, 1209 South Racine, Apt. 1607, Chicago.

Yeatman, Albert James, 8012 South Langley, Chicago.

CINCINNATI REGION

Indiana

Ricki B. Apgar, 2222 Park Road, Anderson.

Geralding L. Fortson, 519 West 3d Street, Anderson.

Vernon R. Whitehouse, 820 East 21st Street, Anderson.

George P. Gabel, Jr., 1307 19th Street, Bedford.

William E. Lemen, 1016 24th Street, Bedford.

Joseph Delbert Cull, 3508 Longview Drive, Bloomington.

James Stephen Frye, 1828 Hunter Avenue, Bloomington.

Stephen Timothy Lemon, 2727 North Dunn Road, Bloomington.

Richard Allen Reineking, 821 Hawthorne Drive, Bloomington.

Douglas Allen Williams, 434 South Dunn Street, Bloomington.

Terry Lynn Henderson, Rural Route No. 1, Post Office Box 46, Brownsburg.

Gary S. Andrews, Rural Route No. 2, Edinburg.

Joseph F. Newson, Rural Route No. 1, Columbus.

Dennis R. Barrett, 237 North High Street, Austin.

Lawrence T. Zatorski, 40 Berens Street, Dyer.

Stancho N. Kileff, 4309 Elm Street, East Chicago.

David D. Drlich, 5630 Wegg Avenue, East Chicago.

Edward J. Greichunos, Jr., 5630 Northcote Avenue, East Chicago.

Max D. Eby, 1908 Frances, Elkhart.

Timothy R. Holtz, 155 Simpson, Elkhart.

Barry S. Newman, 821 Taylor, Evansville.

Stanley A. Newman, 821 Taylor, Evansville.

Ardell Smith, Jr., 209 South Bedford, Evansville.

William R. Kitchens, 2913 Madison Avenue, Evansville.

Thomas W. Tornatta, 1411 Reiter Drive, Evansville.

David W. Barton, 407 Pemberton Avenue, Evansville.

Kenton E. MacGregor, 641 Jefferson Avenue, Evansville.

Martin A. Peter, 935 Ninth Street, Tell City.

Thomas A. Cavacini, 4412 South Harrison Street, Fort Wayne.

O. Graham Grove, 3510 Gaywood Drive, Fort Wayne.

Richard J. Hathaway, 4632 Spatz Avenue, Fort Wayne.

Jan. T. Lepper, 10610 Huffman Road, Fort Wayne.

Septhen P. Merchant, 4841 Bowser, Fort Wayne.

Welton Moore, 1209 Summit, Fort Wayne.

S. E. Ottenweller, 4902 Southwood, Fort Wayne.

Stephen A. Russ, 4928 Old Mill Road, Fort Wayne.

Thomas M. Ryan, 6819 Hiltonia Drive, Fort Wayne.

Patrick McGregor, 2924 Santa Rosa Drive, Fort Wayne.

Michael Sheehan, Route No. 1, Monroeville.

Floyd M. Young, 1802 Purdue Drive, Fort Wayne.

Ronald J. Gartner, 4018 Indiana Avenue, Fort Wayne.

Gilmore Haynie, Jr., 4610 Beaver Avenue, Fort Wayne.

George D. McKay, 7675 Bluffton Road, Fort Wayne.

Robert W. Antos, 170 Howard Court, Gary.

Michael A. McCarney, 4614 Pierce, Gary.

David L. Vorwald, 5373 Adams Street, Gary.

George A. Sufana, 300 Garfield, Gary.

Timothy M. Swan, 1116 North Ripley Street, Gary.

Gerald L. Anderson, 2373 Madison Street, Gary.

Patsy C. Predaina, 7312 Taft, Crown Point.

Judy R. Taylor, 3035 West 57th Street, Gary.

Forest A. Ormes, 515 Buchanan, Gary.

James D. Key, RR No. 2, Box 101, Crown Point.

Charles W. O'Boyle, 403 Harrison Street, Gary.

Terry W. Guthrie, 4265 Madison Street, Gary.

James F. O'Boyle, 3612 Van Buren, Gary.

Paula R. Sivertson, 836 Tennessee Street, Gary.

Anna K. Watkins, 2340 West 20th Avenue, Gary.

Dean M. Kontos, 3922 Pierce Street, Gary.

David J. Menke, 553 Pennsylvania, Gary.

Theodore J. Mens, 1101½ Franklin, Michigan City.

Robert C. Murawski, 618 South Lake Street, Gary.

John A. Luers, 607 North West Street, Crown Point.

Thomas R. Diehl, 1246 Hoffman Street, Hammond.

Zygmunt J. Dross, Jr., 940 Merrill Street, Hammond.

Mike J. Pens, 6420 Jefferson, Hammond.

Andrew D. Hiduke, 3015 173d Street, Hammond.

Byron C. Bayne, 3821 English Avenue, Indianapolis.

Joseph A. Beck, 305 North 14th Avenue, Beech Grove.

Michael C. Bell, 1829 North Alton, Indianapolis.

Christopher J. Booz, 4400 Haughey, Indianapolis.

Michael J. Caplan, 2126 East Northgate, Indianapolis.

Darryl S. Churchill, 626 Memorial Drive, Beech Grove.

Terry L. Clayton, 2201 North Groff Avenue, Indianapolis.

William D. Davies, 1729 East 77th, Indianapolis.

Larry D. Dawson, 3920 North Guilford Avenue, Indianapolis.

Cloice C. Dotson, 5808 North Illinois, Indianapolis.

Ronald A. Fields, 413 Harvard Place, Indianapolis.

Luther E. Hall, 506 West 38th Street, Indianapolis.

David F. Hummons, 4045 Clarendon Road, Indianapolis.

William R. Jones, 1210 North Belmont Avenue, Indianapolis.

Kenneth N. Kast, 3713 North Linwood Avenue, Indianapolis.

Joseph W. Kenney, Jr., 3644 North Park Avenue, Indianapolis.

Philip M. Kenney, 3644 North Park Avenue, Indianapolis.

Samuel C. Kitchens, 1085 West McCarty Street, Indianapolis.

Dana S. Klinck, 674 East Drive, Woodruff Place, Indianapolis.

Stephen A. Lahey, 951 East Georgia Street, Indianapolis.

David C. Miller, 2807 Canterbury Lane, Indianapolis.

Donald C. Pence, 623 North Dearborn, Indianapolis.

Daniel T. Quigley, 4302 Kingsley Drive, Indianapolis.

Richard L. Reed, 3940 East 57th Street, Indianapolis.

Carl W. Reichwein, 1154 North Medford Avenue, Indianapolis.

David L. Shull, 6809 East 52d Place, Indianapolis.

Hugh K. Sinnock, 1515 East 101st Street, Indianapolis.

Albert C. Spurlock, Jr., 3955 Cornelius Avenue, Indianapolis.

Edward J. Thiesing, 3728 Rockville Road, Indianapolis.

Thomas S. Ulen, 4545 North Delaware, Indianapolis.

Charles D. Ward, 6255 North Meridan, Indianapolis.

Carl J. Wolf, 3138 Lawndale, Indianapolis.

Bernard P. Wolfla, 3345 Lincoln Road, Indianapolis.

David J. Yount, 1136 North Mitthoeffer Road, Indianapolis.

William M. Bogle, 6024 Coburn Road, Indianapolis.

James V. Cortese, 6302 Minlo, Indianapolis.

Joseph A. Fisher, 4311 Broadway, Indianapolis.

Gayle F. Gresick, 411-B Greene Avenue, Indianapolis.

Ronald G. Hansen, 1225 East 54th Street, Indianapolis.

Roger S. Palamara, 632 North Tuxedo Street, Indianapolis.

James A. Richards, 1089 Windermire, Indianapolis.

Dennis C. Schafer, 1340 Lee Street, Indianapolis.

Larry F. Sells, 7207 South East Street, Indianapolis.

Tom H. Wilks, 1410 North Bosart, Indianapolis.

Timothy M. Niehaus, 11 East Palmer, Indianapolis.

Joseph H. Tilford, 5425 Allisonville Road, Indianapolis.

Robert M. Harrmann, 3545 North Rural Street, Indianapolis.

Steven R. Bradley, 5740 Maplewood, Indianapolis.

John H. Draft, 15075 Allisonville Road, Noblesville.

Christopher J. Sweeney, 3123 West 22d Street, Indianapolis.

Larry Keith Judd, 302 East 10th Street, Jeffersonville.

Stephen Kent Smith, Highway 403, in care of Wayne Rogers, Sellersburg.

John Kenneth Butler, 214 East 8th, Peru.

Jerry William Grau, RR No. 4, Box 87, Kokomo.

Gary M. Van Winkle, 810 South Market, Kokomo.

James M. Whiteside, 236 Van Buren, Peru.

Terrance McGaffney, 1109 North Courtland, Kokomo.

Garnett G. Carter, 812 East Gerhart, Kokomo.

Tim J. Watts, 5501 Menomonee Drive, Kokomo.

Richard E. Bunnell, 1531 Meadowbrook, Kokomo.

Gary Minnich, 1301 Meadowbrook Lane, Kokomo.

Philip R. Smith, 2233 Sacramento, West Lafayette.

Eddie L. Russell, Box 58, Battle Ground.

Dennis L. Dewey, 2112 Arapahoe Drive, Lafayette.

Robert C. Graham, Jr., 2110 Underwood Street, Lafayette.

David L. Heath, 31 North 29th Street, Lafayette.

John A. Misner, 1813 Hanna Street, Lafayette.

John H. Rutherford, 1021 Beck Lane, Lafayette.

Michael F. Wood, 1320 Union Street, Lafayette.

Michael Lee Bell, 519 Mulberry Street, Madison.

Donald W. McAlister, Rural Route No. 1, Madison.

Edwin H. Woodrick, 3411 East Michigan Street, Michigan City.

David D. Murray, Michiana Shores, Michigan City.

John M. Bradway, Rural Route 4, Box 458, Muncie.

Daniel F. Brand, 1317 Riley Road, Muncie.

Michael G. Groves, Rural Route 5, New Castle.

William J. Price, 100 Forrest, Muncie.

Philip J. Taylor, 2914 Ethel, Muncie.

Dennis W. Stephens, 232 South Water Street, Albany.

Joseph Castelo, Jr., 207 North Stanley, Eaton.

Joyce D. Thomas, 115 North Truitt Road, Muncie.

Charles Allan Main, 1503 Portage Avenue, Portage.

Price I. Faulkner, 770 South 17th Street, Richmond.

James W. Hunt, 22½ South 14th Street, Richmond.

John B. Livengood, 1821 Gaar Road, Richmond.

Phillip C. Williams, 1021 North "I" Street, Richmond.

Philip W. Smith, 1110 Elm Street, Shelbyville.

Thomas A. Wolter, 54610 North 29th Street, South Bend.

Robert F. Christin, 902 East Dayton Street, South Bend.

John J. Horan, Jr., 304 West Navarre Street, South Bend.

Joseph L. Amaral, 1010 North Ironwood Drive, South Bend.

Nicholas G. Cenova, 56699 South Sundown Road, South Bend.

Joseph E. Hannan, Jr., 1805 Greenwood Drive, South Bend.

Frederick L. Rosenfeld, 2706 York Road, South Bend.

Paul J. Baldoni, 1720 South Main Street, South Bend.

Thomas H. Fautz, 1124 Woodward Avenue, South Bend.

Thomas G. Mihail, 301 North Sunnyside Avenue, South Bend.

Anthony J. Sabo, 1719 West Dubail Avenue, South Bend.

Charles A. Shock, Jr., 1001 South 27th Street, South Bend.

David J. Lesniewicz, 702 South Carlisle Street, South Bend.

Charles M. Love, 1306 Chalfant Street, South Bend.

Donald P. Smith, 1402 South Catalpa Street, South Bend.

Charles S. Bouvette, 1976 Briarway, South Bend.

John R. O'Connell, 310 North Michigan Street, Plymouth.

Daniel L. Dammann, 1618 Fourth Avenue, Terre Haute.

Timothy W. Brown, 1404 North 6th Street, Terre Haute.

Jay D. Orman, Post Office Box 225, Selyville.

David E. Foy, Rural Route No. 5, Terre Haute.

Frank A. Hamblen, 3127 North 10th Street, Terre Haute.

Thomas Mellon, 2200 North 14th Street, Terre Haute.

James R. Elliott, 815 North 6th Street, Vincennes.

James M. McGowan, 2000 Charles Street, Vincennes.

Terry Robert Lynch, 305 North Meridian Street, Washington.

Byron Lee Burkhardt, 1102 Downey Avenue, Washington.

Donald L. Rees, 802 East Van Trees Street, Washington.

Kentucky

Charles G. Bernard, 3108 Oakland Avenue, Catlettsburg.

Charles S. Duncan, 1532 Roselawn, Bowling Green.

Michael D. Keown, College Heights, Bowling Green.

Patrick M. Shannon, 236 Audubon Drive, Bowling Green.

David Hunter, 153 Jacob Price Homes, Covington.

Donald E. Meyers, 3126 Rosina Avenue, Covington.

Kenneth G. Rump, 5205 Woodland Drive, Covington.

Thomas A. Souther, 1199 Far Hills Drive, Covington.

Robert Larkin, Gardner, Post Office Box 206, 206 Terry Court, Elizabethtown.

Edward Thomas Donnelly, 315 Robin Road, Elizabethtown.

Michael Gary Allen, 411 North Mulberry Street, Elizabethtown.

Gerald B. Hope, 6409 Ferncrest Road, Fern Creek.

Donald C. Turner, 1028 Seminole Trail, Frankfort.

Philip A. Nichols, Route No. 3, Glasgow.

Kenneth Wayne Hazelwood, Post Office Box 184, Henderson.

Ronnie Carrol Moore, 135½ Second Street, Henderson.

Scotty G. McElfresh, 2911 Liberty Road, Lexington.

Dale B. Mitchell, 600 Gibson Avenue, Lexington.

Donald L. Smith, 1110 Stillwell Avenue, Lexington.

John J. Archdeacon, 719 Cramer Avenue, Lexington.

Edward L. Givens, 409 Ferguson Street, Lexington.

Daniel D. Briscoe, 3509 Forrest Brook Drive, Louisville.

Bruce K. Cassidy, 3605 Hanover Road, Louisville.

Daniel T. Erwin, 7100 Boxwood Drive, Louisville.

William P. Hill, 304 Stiltz Avenue, Louisville.

Thomas Johnson, 2721 Grand Avenue, Louisville.

James M. Kupper, 1715 Gagle Avenue, Louisville.

William H. Miller, Jr., 2011 San Jose Avenue, Louisville.

Joseph T. Mitchell, 608 Cloverlea Road, Louisville.

Terrence O. Mulhall, 2161 Tyler Lane, Louisville.

John D. Osting, 1285 Eastern Parkway, Louisville.

Garner M. Petrie, Jr., 2332 Alta Avenue, Louisville.

Daniel F. Ridge, 1613 Girard Drive, Louisville.

Ervin Sellars, Jr., 1124 South 32d Street, Louisville.

John F. Sheckler, 3408 Garland Avenue, Louisville.

Fred A. Shuck, 7208 Wesboro Road, Louisville.

Ronald E. Becht, 2409 Green Valley Road, New Albany, Indiana.

Edward S. Carle, 828 East Washington, Louisville.

William E. Dehn, 2323 Shelby Street, New Albany, Indiana.

William J. Finnegan, Jr., 719 Hazel Street, Louisville.

James T. Julius, 1219 Ashland Avenue, Louisville.

Walter C. Jurt, Jr., 3515 Hughes Road, Louisville.

David J. Mateja, 647 South 34th Street, Louisville.

Jesse F. McClure, Jr., 3309 Dumesnil, Louisville.

Norman L. Miller, 435 East Brandeis, Louisville.

Dennis H. Ofcacek, 4011 Valley View Drive, Louisville.

William D. Rowzee, 411 Locust Street, Danville.

Larry M. Wheeler, 2543 Woodbourne, Louisville.

Winfred J. Nunn, 421 Tennessee Street, Paducah.

James B. McDarment, 4318 Whitmore Avenue, Louisville.

David N. Miller, 5103 South Side Drive, Louisville.

Everett F. Ferrell, 1723 Lytle Street, Louisville.

John R. Moberly, 2820 Dixie Highway, Louisville.

Foch L. Karem, Jr., 4416 West Market Street, Louisville.

J. Clifton Thomas, 317 East Center Street, Madisonville.

Oran F. Lizenby, Post Office Box 202, Scottsburg.

Stephen B. Wilcox, 605 Florence, Maysville.

Joseph H. Bane, RR No. 3, Maysville.

Donald Ray Dunn, 215 Park Avenue, Owensboro.

Robert Allen Fowler, 2013 East 6th Street, Owensboro.

James Earl Hicks, 5304 Old Henderson Road, Owensboro.
James D. McElroy, 272 Mount Airy, Paris.
James E. Cook, Jr., Pikeville.
Randall Cawood Newsom, Elkhorn City.
David Lee Potter, Elkhorn City.
Richard H. Potter, Paintsville.
Leslie Elmo Varney, Meta Rural Station, Pikeville.
James I. Moberly II, 207 Leimaur Drive, Richmond.

Ohio

Glenna Marie Batz, 2759 Fairland Street, Cuyahoga Falls.
Thomas Francis Baughman, 311 Wheeler Street, Akron.
Joan Theresa Breitenbach, 1832 Carter Avenue, Akron.
Patrick Thomas Carr, 371 North Pershing, Akron.
Gary Lee Connell, 1574 10th Street, Cuyahoga Falls.
Barbara Lorraine Downs, 1788 Orchard Drive, Akron.
Thomas Paul Herceg, 243 Ira Avenue, Akron.
Adrienne Lee McClellan, 505 Edgewood Avenue, Akron.
Robert Louis Mihiylov, 1311 Leonora Avenue, Akron.
Gerald Lowell Miller, 3949 Cox Road, Barberton.
William Henry Petrarca, 581 Patterson Avenue, Akron.
Edward Stephen Preusse, 1249 Dearborn Drive, Akron.
John Godfrey Ragsdale, Jr., 466 Inverness Road, Akron.
Terence Edward Scanlon, 266 Dorchester Road, Akron.
Janet Ellen Smith, 1459 Delia Avenue, Akron.
William Paul Spoonster, 414 East Tuscarawas, Barberton.
Rodney Wayne Thompson, 2747 Tifft Street, Cuyahoga Falls.
Michael George Ziga, 180 Rhodes Avenue, Akron.
Margaret JoAnne Barnes, 2902 Long Road, Akron.
Nicholas John Creme, 2393 Banbury Road, Akron.
John William Freeman, 363 Afton Avenue, Akron.
Edward Earl LeRoy, 1204 Laird Street, Akron.
Henry Anthony Merlitti, 1078 Oakland Avenue, Akron.
Russell Norman, 1431 Woodbirch Avenue, Akron.
Carolyn Ann Castile, 1113 Dover Avenue, Akron.
Howard Eugene Locke, 968 Neptune Street, Akron.
Walter Charles Melton, 49 Sommers Court, Akron.
Timothy Andrew Morrison, 2152 Stone Street, Cuyahoga Falls.
Earnest Lee Mosley, 962 Rhodes Avenue, Akron.
Barry Bennett Myers, 2864 Fulmer Drive, Cuyahoga Falls.
John Talbot Clerk, 282 Mull Avenue, Akron.
Charles E. Blackwell, 1827 Virginia Avenue, Ashtabula.
Jerry Powell, 4303 West Avenue, Ashtabula.
Stephen Joseph Heim, 637 East Ford Avenue, Barberton.
James Carey Hunger, 41 Eighth Street, NE., Barberton.
Charles M. Przepasniak, 460 East Ford Avenue, Barberton.
Richard Charles Roth, 222 Sixth Street, NW., Barberton.
Stephen Graig Willig, 3024 Dutt Road, Barberton.
Jeffrey W. Largent, 440 East Liberty Street, Medina.
Frank J. Rome, RFD No. 4, Cambridge.
Frank W. Stroud, 506 Foster Avenue, Cambridge.

Canton

David G. Elsass, 4460 Eighth Street, NW.
John A. Grinaldi, 6141 Firestone Avenue, NE.
Robert J. Groenke, Jr., 1132 34th Street, NW.
Thomas Guirreri, 1162 Rockwood Avenue, SW.
John A. O'Hara, 344 25th Street, NW.
Paul S. Snopel, 1118 18th Street, NW.
Richard C. Stambaugh, 4403 Harrison Avenue, NW.
Donald G. Wingard, 1215 Sunford Avenue, NW.
David J. Visinger, 4511 Emma Place, NW.
Timothy S. Brady, 336 Belden Avenue, NE.
Edwin M. Perkins, 1743 Market Avenue, North.
Joseph L Souliere, 3021 Daleford Avenue, NE.
Robert H. Wilson, 351 18th Street, NW.
John R. Hoffman, Jr., 1333 Woodrow Avenue, NW.
Robert L. Holder, 105 Wertz Avenue, NW.
William J. Adams, 700 Madison Court, SE.
Harold I. Glenn, 2320 Seventh Street, NE.
Stephen Pressley, Jr., 1835 Second Street, NE.
Bissett, Ray J., 1267 Cottage Place, NW.
Fred Mathews, 801 Liberty Avenue, SE.
Charles M. Riley, 404 Fenton Avenue, NE.
Gary M. Zazula, 1243 Wertz Avenue, SW.
Timmy R. Brendle, 1511 Maryland Avenue, SW.
Scott H. McGirr, 1218 47th Street, NW.
John P. Wilgus, 119 Miles Avenue, NW.
James A. Robinson, 187 Solon Road, Chagrin Falls.
Ruth A. Marks, 51 Olive Street, Chagrin Falls.
Chester Daniel Dilday, 105 Alameda Court, Lancaster.
Joseph Richard Griesheimer, Route 1, Londonderry.

Cleveland

Glenn C. Anderson, 4923 Pershing.
Joseph J. Andre, 1394 Dorsch Road.
Carl E. Barnes, 1518 East 81st Street.
Richard A. Bene, 11908 Parkview.
Dennis M. Boswell, 1456 West 110 Street.
Nicholas J. Bush, 1222 West Clifton.
Timothy J. Campbell, 28802 Osborn Road.
Michael C. Clement, 2568 University.
Leo J. Congeni, 23718 Lake Road.
Robert J. Duffner, Jr., 3357 Sylvanhurst.
Charles E. Duffy, 24115 Bruce Road.
Eric W. Ehrmann, 17415 Winslow Road.
Paul A. Fisher, 3493 Benedemeer.
David L. Fuente, 3855 East 38th Street
Chauncey H. Gibson, 3333 East 118th Street.
Walter T. Gorbett, 4710 Krueger Avenue.
Christopher C. Hanley, 28203 Wolf Road.
Paul Hill, 15515 Eldamere.
Charles N. Jordan, 9106 Kempton Avenue.
Richard M. Kaliszewski, 4726 Blythin Road.
Robert J. Kallins, 2340 Miramar Boulevard.
Ronald J. Kornokovich, 7909 Guthrie Avenue.
Krepop, Kenneth L., 4718 Brookwood Drive.
Aloysius P. Martinich, 3753 Wallingford Road.
Dale Masino, 1019 Ansel Road.
Stephen H. McElroy II, 2180 Olive Avenue.
Donald B. McEwen, 4123 Germaine Avenue.
James J. Menart, 800 Alhambra Road.
Jason A. Morton, 9322 Amesbury.
Kenneth A. Murphy, 10615 Lee Avenue.
Louis J. Nimylowycz, 1260 Cranford Avenue.
Michael T. Norton, 11107 Ashbury Avenue.
Charles J. O'Malley, 1117 Allston Road.
Frank R. Osborne, 164 East 211th Street.
Alvin J. Payne, 10831 Massie Avenue.
Alan M. Rauss, 3747 Bainbridge.
Robert E. Reese, 3518 Granton Avenue.
Ronald E. Richter, 5607 Forest Avenue.
James G. Robbins, 4007 Bush Avenue.
Stephan W. Salay, 18731 Holland Road.
Howard A. Schulman, 23225 Bryden Road.
Frederick A. Sizler, 12802 Grannis Avenue.
Michael Slusarz, 2220 Ralph Avenue.
Russell P. Smith, 14736 Fernway.
Thomas W. Smith, 16926 Chatfield.
Larry J. Soeder, 966 Nelaview Road.
Thomas E. Stafford, 19201 Forest Wood.
Thomas M. Stroh, 3820 West 136th Street.
Anthony J. Thomas, Jr., 15836 Norway Avenue.
Timothy M. Toner, 1254 Bunts Road.
David J. Trenton, 16106 Arcade.
Terence M. Troyer, 104 East 213th Street.
Louis Vallos, 2615 Vestry Avenue.
Leo W. Young, 1486 East 118th Street.
James A. Slater, 2821 Southington Road.
David C. Swaddling, 16000 Terrace Road.
William P. Welsh, 17427 Clifton Boulevard.
Leroy S. Atkinson, 115 Chestnut Road.
Gerald E. Batchlar, 2264 East 89th Street.
Warren F. Chrisholm, 18905 Colahan Drive.
Dennis R. Coy, 21770 Wilmore Avenue.
Jonathan K. Duff, 2911 Weymouth Road.
Gerald E. Fallon, 30902 Nantucket Row.
James S. Gillespie, 1579 Holmden Road.
John J. Gladstone, 2915 Eaton Road.
Kevin J. Lyons, 27319 Donald Drive.
Robert M. Murray, 3350 West 125th Street.
Thomas E. Porubsky, 1721 Merl Avenue.
Conrad H. Pokorski, 20668 Donnybrook Road.
Grover C. Randle, Jr., 3460 East 142d Street.
Gary A. Smith, 2544 East 38th Street.
Joseph W. Urbas, Jr., 3922 St. Clair Avenue.
Patrick J. Carey, 1441 Robinwood.
Maurice Carlton, 12217 Craven.
William A. Meltzer, 12700 Lake Avenue.
Anthony C. Nickras, 12700 Sprecher Avenue.
Brian F. Stenger, 19951 Upper Valley Drive.
Rufus F. Wilkes, 3465 East 119th Street.
Margie D. Burden, 3341 East 125th Street.
Thomas A. Hanson, 3332 Rumson Road.
Daniel L. Grady III, 14108 Southington Road.
Joseph P. Ditchman, 14026 Terrace Road.
Daniel P. Henninger, 3687 Stoneleigh Road.
Barry A. Jacobs, 3667 Blanche Road.
Paul J. Siedlecki, 1282 West 115th Street.
Harry C. Barnes, 2034 East 125th Street.
Thomas M. Hardulak, 1005 Kenilworth Avenue.
Arthur Lewis, 3336 East 123d Street.
Gary E. Polster, 2288 Loyola Road.
Thomas P. Roberts, 3219 Bradford Road.
Stephen H. Spiegle, 2199 Cranston Road.
Eugene C. Hughey, 1934 East 90th Street.
Fred A. Ettari, 3594 East 112th Street.
John L. Chorich, 15851 Drake Road.
Victor E. Sordi, 8004 New York Avenue.
Byron R. Webster, 23966 Duffield Road.
David L. Bieber, 2244 Jackson Boulevard.
Gary W. Demko, 4000 Henritze.
Morris M. Levin, 3031 Torrington Road.
Rodney Sledge, 2344 East 55th Street.
Russell H. Zeskey, 1856 Forest Hills Boulevard.
Ralph J. Zwolinski, 3084 East 65th Street.
Gardner K. Christopher, Jr., 1196 East 99th Street.
Robert E. Holden, 10247 Greensheath Drive.

Columbus

William E. Karath, 81 East Oakland Avenue.
John B. Moriarty, 277 South Cassady Avenue.
Richard W. O'Shaughnessy, 2960 Wellesley Drive.
Terence J. O'Shaughnessy, 1904 Malvern Road.
William R. Sheehan, Jr., 350 East North Broadway.
Eric A. Solu, 229 West North Broadway.
Douglas L. Woodyard, 704 Euclaire Avenue.
Nicholas L. Butler, 2131 Margaret Street.

Sandra A. Crockett, 21 North 21st Street, Apartment K.
Gary N. Davis, 2096 Woodward Avenue.
Danny L. DeMatteis, 977 Kenley Avenue.
Thomas J. Donley, 478 Piedmont Road.
Harry J. Green, 200 Warren Street.
Steven B. Gugliemi, 2509 Vanderberg Avenue.
Jeffrey R. Hicks, 2125 London-Groverport Road, Grove City.
Charles M. Javorina, 1284 Country Club Road.
Leonard Lee, 2131 Margaret Street.
Stephen J. McGrew, 891 Sheridan Avenue.
Joseph E. Meehan, 741 City Park Avenue.
William S. Meyer, 825 Chestershire Road.
James F. Moore, Jr., 277 South 18th Street.
Stephen A. Mowrer, 2729 Ferris Road.
John R. Parker, 2322 Mecca Road.
Maxine M. Sarpa, 692 Pleasant Ridge.
Edward J. Smith, 280 S. Hague Avenue.
Harold W. Strickland, 929 Lilley Avenue.
Tom D. Swisher, 4686 Annhurst Road.
Donovan Thackery, 2376 Brentwood Road.
Raymond J. Troth, 814 South Ogden Avenue.
Joseph V. Vittorio, 4632 Scenic Drive.
Phillip E. Walker, 1430 Bryden Road.
Reynelda L. Ware, 1921 Denbridge Way.
Todd C. Barkan, 245 North Drexel Avenue.
Michael D. Campbell, 1486 Pennsylvania Avenue.
Thomas P. Smithberger, 1356 Rich Street.
Thomas D. Thompson, 66 West Beechwold Boulevard.
Stephen M. Ward, 2606 Camden Road.
James F. Battin, 318 Brevoort Road.
James B. Rader, 45 South Harding Road.
James S. Ridgeway, 125 South Columbia Avenue.
Douglas Shepherd, 2201 Charles Street.
Philip R. Williamson, 199 North Stanwood Road.
Stephen J. Nolan, 377 Glenburn Place.
Thomas A. Williamson, 199 North Stanwood Road.
William R. Fair, 5483 Driftwood Road.
James M. Johnston II, 703 Malvern Avenue.
Richard L. Walker, 186 West Weisheimer Road.
Robert J. Schmidt, 2760 Fair Avenue.
L. A. Cooper, 2933 Ivanhoe Road, Cuyahoga Falls.
R. L. Baldwin, 3058 Lake Road, Cuyahoga Falls.
T. G. Jones, 436 Marguerite Avenue, Cuyahoga Falls.
R. B. Lusk, 2026 Fourth Street, Cuyahoga Falls.
R. T. Richards, 625 Viewpoint, Cuyohoga Falls.
R. H. Judson, Jr., 2101 23d Street, Cuyahoga Falls.
J. D. Calvert, 2313 Hoch Drive, Cuyahoga Falls.
V. D. Geriak, 2343 23d Street, Cuyahoga Falls.
J. Craig Brubaker, RR No. 1, Walden Road, Farmersville.
Richard L. Cline, 301 West Center Street, Farmersville.

Dayton

Kelly T. Daniels, 820 South Euclid Avenue.
Alan R. Donaldson, 2436 Elsmere Avenue.
Charles E. Flax, 808 Wilberforce.
Robert A. Lischke, 1444 Ohmer Avenue.
Michael S. Portis, 609 Hall Avenue.
Robert E. Reedy, 1220 Edward Drive.
David M. Stockert, 206 Elm Street, Farmersville.
Charles H. Wagner, 4725 Silverwood Drive.
James B. Desch, 7791 Peters Road.
Edward D. Dunn, 1507 Riverside Drive.
Edward F. Fahrendorf, 11 Greenmount Boulevard.
Jeffrey Alan Jones, 320 Brooklyn Avenue.
Michael E. Bach, 640 Bowen Street.
Richard Malone, Jr., 1516 Bowman Avenue.
Lonnie L. McNew, 2708 Nacoma Place, Kettering.
James F. Spitzman, 28 Central Avenue.
Thomas L. Grieshop, 3502 Stanford Place.
Patrick C. Williams, 3729 Pittsburg Avenue.
Michael B. Keys, 409 Washington Avenue, Elyria.
James E. Neidhardt, 424 Sixth Street, Elyria.
Greg H. Davison, 434 12th Street, Elyria.
Dennis M. Moore, 1036 North Pasadena, Elyria.
John M. Sarnovsky, 423 Washington Avenue, Elyria.
Rupert E. Ruppert, 8699 Deardoff Road, Franklin.
John W. Holweger, 210 Locust Street, Franklin.
Patricia A. Ballman, 633 Western Avenue, Covington, Ky.
Connie J. Coffman, 841 Beechtree Drive, Cincinnati.
Jean M. Donovan, 6 Alcott Lane, Cincinnati.
Cheri A. Hardgrove, 115 Deborah Drive, Aurora, Ind.
Marilyn K. Macke, 3510 Darwin Avenue, Cincinnati.
Kelly C. Baugh, 441 Oak Street, Cincinnati.
Betty S. Dees, 3976 Dickson Avenue, Cincinnati.
Thomas R. Deitz, 3526 Glenn Avenue, Covington, Ky.
Hugh Doran, 1103 St. Gregory Street, Cincinnati.
Charles F. Faust, 15 Biehl Street, Newport, Ky.

Cincinnati

Richard W. Hanlon, 7110 Van Kirk Avenue.
John A. Haverkamp, 4656 Orchard Lane.
Douglas B. Kramer, 5800 Belleview Road.
Robert V. Nash, Jr., 1015 Hill Street.
Joseph A. Penwell, 117 West 69th Street.
Lawrence M. Stroup, 1111 Fuller Street.
Ronald C. Wilson, 879 Rockdale Avenue.
Michael E. Wolf, 702 Indiana Hill Road.
Lynn M. Woods, 1003 Cutter Street.
Frances E. Wright, 705 South Crescent Avenue.
Frank J. M. Capazza, 2540 Sarvis Court.
John R. Compton, Jr., 3522 Trimble Avenue.
Tom A. Dean, 2 Beckford Drive, Apt. D.
Charles J. Fitzsimmons, 4107 Homer Avenue.
Lawrence J. Gottlieb, 1746 Avonlea Avenue.
Gary L. Graf, 1484 Foxwood Drive.
Charles L Green, 939 Goss Road
Roger T. Hanlon, 5892 Kenwood Road.
Steven W. Hermes, 5425 Hunter Avenue.
Dennis M. Heywood, 2536 Sheridan Drive.
William J. Klus, 4234 Zetta Avenue.
Edward B. Krekeler, 2903 Temple Place.
William J. Leonard III, 621 McAlpin Avenue.
Dennis J. Maher, 2170 Quatman Avenue.
James W. Marx, 7360 Tike Avenue.
Frederick Michael, Jr., 3329 Royal Place.
Peter F. Moran, 227 West Seymour.
Ronald W. Ogletree, 395 Spring Street, Batavia.
John P. Russell, 1747 Northcutt Avenue.
Michael W. Sanders, 1915 Auburn Avenue.
Edward K. Schneider, 5415 Moundcrest Drive.
Dennis D. Schuermann, 1121 Fuller Street.
Joseph W. Shea III, 2216 Cathedral Avenue.
Ronald L. Spears, 46 Maple Street.
Raymond L. Voegele, 4224 Sullivan Avenue.
James H. Vonderhaar, 4402 Linden Avenue.
Paul Young, 1262 Herschel Avenue.
John D. Hickey, 533 East Southern Avenue, Covington, Ky.
Gary E. Hunninghake, 3850 North Broadlawn Circle.
Daniel R. Husekabel, 5544 Raceview Avenue.
Joseph E. Santangelo, 3751 Middlebrood Avenue.
Donna P. Sweeney, 2327 Grigg Avenue.
Michael J. McCullough, 8498 Darnell Avenue.
Emmette B. Craft, 126 Burley Circle.
Charles G. Gibson, 10111 Chester Road.
Michael D. Gillespie, 1607 Springlawn.
Edward W. Jackson, 4322 Floral Avenue.
Dudley A. Levick, 11 Dexter Place.
J. Michael Meretta, Jr., 1808 Dexter Avenue.
Phillip N. Sansotta, 2878 Ziegle Avenue.
Thomas T. Curran, 2363 Concord Street.
Audrey R. Gilyard, 1576 Dixmont Avenue.
Joseph C. Dooley, 874 Dernier Place.
Ronald L. Dreffer, 6636 Stoll Lane.
John J. Ryan, 5566 Picardy Lane.
Claborn L. Kendrick, Jr., 3965 West Park Drive.
Carleton L. West, RR #1, Kenton Farm, Alexandria, Ky.
Marlen S. Adamore, 22 Burton Woods Lane.
Eugene Dawkins, 705 Central Avenue.
Anthony F. Edelmann, 711 Hermose Avenue.
Elmer A. Hausterman, 8430 Chadwick Lane.
Jack R. Holzman, 2449 Eastern Avenue.
Robert G. Ritter, 3297 South Road.
Roosevelt Smith, 1926 Auburn Avenue.
Terence M. Tranter, 7835 Keller Road.
John Greg Holbrock, 45 Orchard Drive, Hamilton.
James Ralph Zettler, 2626 Pleasant Avenue, Hamilton.
Robert A. Stanforth, 338½ South High Street, Hillsboro.
Dale Edward Williams, Jr., 243 East Liberty Street, Hubbard.
Michael Thomas Bolchalk, 328 East Water Street, Hubbard.
Anthony Ingraham Hubin, 1055 Waugh Drive, Hubbard.
Paul Michael Goldcamp, 1548 South Sixth Street, Ironton.
Thomas R. Kuhn, 1919 Wendell Avenue, Lima.
Thomas R. Weadock, 706 Loretta Place, Lima.
Michal J. Scherach, 1118 West 12th Street, Lorain.
Michael J. Campbell, 4570 West Point Drive, Fairview Park.
Paul E. Butkowski, 700 West 17th Street, Lorain.
Richard R. Muzik, 1058 Highland Park Boulevard, Lorain.
John R. Springowski, 1244 West 23d Street, Lorain.
Dennis E. Snell, P.O. Box 351, Medina.
Thomas W. Grant, 7656 Acacia Avenue, Mentor.
Robert L. Owens, 7624 Munson Road, Mentor.
Joseph A. Rupert, 7484 Southwood Road, Mentor.
John R. Summers, Jr., 7097 Lake Shore Boulevard, Mentor.
Edgar J. Howard, 620 Louis Place, Middletown.
David A. Kinder, 816 Eighth Avenue, Middletown.
Scott A. Leonard, 609 Garfield Street, Middletown.
Edwin C. Pfeil, 137 North "F" Street, Hamilton.
Thomas G. Woerz, 942 Ronlee Drive, Milford.
Everett S. Curry, 458 Kemper Avenue, Lancaster.
Richard L. Debevoise, 215 Rose Hill Avenue, Newark.
John G. Marriott, 404 North 11th Street, Newark.
Clarence L. Ketchum, 1059 Stewart Street, Newark.
Michael A. Straud, 1121 Parkview Drive, Newark.
Frank Lee Cox, 1820 Wayne Street, Sandusky.
Michael Edward Dunn, 812 West Market Street, Sandusky.
Richard L. Chilton, 1900 Michigan Avenue, Springfield.
Anthony V. Hall, 363 Buxton Avenue, Springfield.

Eugene Chilton, Jr., 312 West Liberty Street, Springfield.
Michael L. Hix, 2744 Sunset Avenue, Springfield.
Daniel F. Hopper, 235 Rosewood Avenue, Springfield.
William E Klenke, 1445 Torrence Street, Springfield.
Harold B. Mowrey, 36 West Auburn Avenue, Springfield.
Elisha Reynolds, Jr., 312 West Liberty Street, Springfield.
Larry J. Stickland, 1325 West Perrin Avenue, Springfield.
James M. May, 1112 Rosedale Avenue, Springfield.
Michael S. Davis, 216 Opal Boulevard, Steubenville.
Stanley F. Lakota, 315½ Belleview Boulevard, Steubenville.
George A. Marini, 246 Hollywood Boulevard, Steubenville.
William Clemmer Ralston, Northwest Street, Flushing.
Anthony J. Stevens, Jr., 1304 Park Street, Steubenville.
William Paul Sunyoger, 267 Hollywood Boulevard, Steubenville.
Dominic E. Carcelli, 410 Fifth Street, Struthers.
John E. Trucksis, 168 Poland Avenue, Struthers.
Richard W. Mackin, 66 Renee Drive, Struthers.

Toledo

Vernon L. Albright, 5215 Secor Road.
Robert W. Bernius, 535 Myers Street.
Franklin D. Brown, 601 Lincoln Avenue.
Joseph T Buffy, 533 Brynhaven, Oregon.
James E. Hill, Jr., 921 Forest Avenue.
Floyd H. Johnson, 1505 Collingwood.
Melvin Jones, 1401 Prospect Avenue.
Beryl N. Schwartz, 4607 Burning Tree, Sylvania.
Robert L. Woods, 628 Fernwood Avenue.
Ralph W. Baker, 618 Palmwood Avenue.
Byron G. Buermele, 4203 Douglas Road.
Edward D. Neuhausel, 2922 Burnett Place.
Dennis E. Szollosi, 2005 Valentine Street.
Michael Bradshow, Jr., 133 44th Street.
Dennis M. Kiel, 3520 Glynn Drive.
Michael J. Kralovic, 2313 Caledonia Street.
Ben R. McCollam, Jr., 3050 Darlington Road.
James J. Molnar, 2025 Genesee Street.
Joseph J. Slivinski, 641 Reineck Drive.
Duane J. Szewczykowski, 1280 Tucumseh Street.
Emery W. Kolibar, 833 Athens Road, Oregon.
William R. Brockmeyer, 66 Rockingham Court.
Steven R. Connor, 2759 Daleford Drive.
Robert J. Lohner, 937½ Phillips Avenue.
Barry R. Radbone, 2839 123d Street.
Ronald D. Seymour, 3640 Berkeley Drive.
Thomas R. Szollosi, 2005 Valentine Street.
Thomas E. Warszawski, 2205 Castlewood Drive.
John D. Willey Jr., 3534 River Road.
James M. Collins, 2703 Barrington Drive.
Thomas J. Collins, 2447 Portsmouth Drive.
John M. Rogers, 3122 Warsaw Street.
Sherwood L. Applebaum, 2936 Hardale Boulevard.
John W. Holland III, 2636 Kirkwood Lane.
Jerry N. Hobbs, 1033 Lincoln Avenue.
Ronald L. Palmer, Anchorage Way, Vermilion.
Ronnie E. Coates, 1925 Southern Boulevard, NW., Warren.
John D. Hughes, 1186 Edgewood, NE., Warren.
Douglas R. Johnson, 724 Kenilworth, SE., Warren.
Joseph J. Kearney, Jr., 735 Oak Knoll, SE., Warren.
James W. Norris, 1530 Romas Street, SE., Warren.
Tyrone Shakespeare, 2728 Douglas Drive, SE., Warren.
William R. Thompson, 422 Howland-Wilson, SE., Warren.
Thomas W. Walker, 1385 Oak Street, SW., Warren.
Thomas K. Wareham, 3150 Draper Street, SE., Warren.
Richard B. Yerman, 172 Atlantic NE., Warren.
Patrick M. Lynch, 190 Traymore Boulevard, Eastlake.
Daniel F. Milo, 38864 Harmondale Drive, Willoughby.
Stephen A. Mika, 327 High Tee Drive, Willowick.
Grant R. Templin, 33145 Vine Street, Apt. 16, Eastlake.
Dale Eugene Campbell, RFD No. 2, Wooster.
Randolph Lee Snow, 940 Forest Drive, Wooster.

Youngstown

Neil H. Altman, 486 Norwood Avenue.
James P. Dwyer, Jr., 1329 Himrod Avenue.
John T. Farina, 611 Pasadena Avenue.
Edward J. Hartwig, 55 Brooklyn Avenue.
Francis Kos, 1902 Smithfield Avenue.
Ray I. Michel, 144 West Boston Avenue.
Robert L. Stevens, 469 Francisca Avenue.
Anthony J. Szmara, Jr., 1921 Highlawn Avenue.
John W. Tumbri, 7211 Tippecanoe Road, Canfield.
James R. Tyndall, Jr., 154 Upland Avenue.
John L. Zumrick, Jr., 1131 Inverness.
Richard D. Fisher, 168 North Middle Street.
John T. Long, 1421 Kensington Avenue.
Edward C. Milano, 4136 Euclid Boulevard.
Robert K. Bittle, 3318 Nelson Avenue.
James L. Borsh, 1034 Fifth Street, Struthers.
Charles L. Brooks, 753 Fairgreen Avenue.
William W. Cox, 2709 West, Schenley.
Daniel A. Czombos, 355 South Hazelwood.
Martin A. Garchar, 410 Coitsville Road, Campbell.
James B. Prosse, Jr., 1926 Elm Street.
Robert J. Ferreri, 4313 Helena Avenue.
Michael M. Matune, 1469 Cascade Drive.
Robert P. Rosko, 874 Edenridge Drive.
Duncan, Cleothus, Jr., 512 Belmont Avenue.
Ward, Ralph W., 23 Seventh Street, Columbiana.
Mook, Donald J., 8 Broadway.
Guzzy, Edward J., 68 West Evergreen Avenue,
Gaudio, Robert J., 405 Williamson Avenue.
Brooks, Richard S., 56 Woodbine Avenue.
Benard, Charles G., 3108 Oakland Avenue, Catlettsburg, Ky.

DALLAS REGION

Texas

Abilene

Charles F. Ferguson, 3511 Hunters Glen.
Mike Grant, 417 Popular.

Amarillo

Ralph Inman, Route 3, Box 210–F.
Bill Melin, 1019 Milam.
Ken Dawson Little, 2600 Harrison.
Timothy M. Sherwood.
Johnny L. Turner.
Jay H. Lowry, 1503 Lawrence.

Arlington

Lawrence P. Warren, 2615 East Mitchell.
Diana Gail Brewer, 1312 Westcrest.
Pat Ann Ailshire, 1601 University.
Mary Gobel, 1208 Navaho.
Michael Joe Wood, 518 South Center.
Teddy Dale Kendrick, 1128 West Park Row.
Harold Wayne Roberson, 2012 Fiedler Road.
John M. Carroll III, 828 North Fiedler.

Athens

Jerry Simmons, 114 West Clinton.
David Michael Stover, 801 Maryland.

Austin

Lawrence Olsen, Route 7, Box 187.
Ted Dodd, 1900 Schule.
Joe Newman, 6308 Wilbur.
Bob Martin, 4012 Vineland.
Charles Larry Boles, 806 Theresa.
Mike Holeman, 201 West 33d.
Mickey Bonesio, 2011 Sabine, Hillside Village.
Alva Edwards, 1916 Speedway.
Richard Trejo (Everett), 3011 South Fifth.
Terry Parker, 1616 Forest Trail.
John A. Hutchison, 2503 Pearl.
David V. Beavers, 3808 Bailey Lane.
Roy A. Green, 2904 Pearl Street.
Charles King, 1903 Tillotson.
Kenneth T. Nance, 1202 Bob Harrison.
Hige W. Russell, 1206 Coleto Street.
William Wise, 1710 Karen Avenue.
Alan Erwin, 3502 Woodcrest, Baytown.

Beaumont

Chester Slay, 2290 Tyler.
Martin Blum, 780 East Drive.
William Carter, 1060 Powell.
Phillip Lockhart, 5485 Hamilton.
Kenneth D. Rose, 3715 Lynwood.
James Paul Roen, 605 Howell.
Michael Browne, 3435 Crestwood.
Ronnie Boyette, 310 Charlotte.
Frank Adams, 1030 21st Street.
Patricia Ann Summus, 4416 Dorsey, Bellaire.
Robert Weaterbom, 107 Pandora, Brownsville.
Joe W. Villarreal, Jr., 244 Blanch, Brownsville.
Samuel Franklin Baxter, Box 638, Carthage.

Corpus Christi

Don T. Booker, 1138 Rickey Drive.
Larry Kelly, Route 2, Box 26.
Mike Deming, 915 Grant.
Gregory Haas, 5025 Cape Ann.
David Kanipe, 4801 Monette.
Rudy M. Flores, 1313 Craig.
Mandy Medina, 2210 Belton.
William Robert Terry, 1002 Easy, Crockett.

Dallas

Luke Grazzaffi, 3230 Springwood.
Bill H. Yarborough, 4625 N. Lindhurst.
Ronald Capehart, 804 Clearfield.
Lee G. Anderson, 5011 Echo.
Ronald Lynn Ellis, 2918 Don Street.
Robert David Guarnero, 901 Valencia.
John R. Black, 738 Huddleston, Grand Prairie.
Ken Zauber, 6823 Putting Green.
Roy Mortin, 520 Lacewood.
Miss Mary Ann Goodwyn, 3701 Turtle Creek.
James Lyle, 1446 Coner.
Mike Crutcher, 3911 Gillon.
Edward Acree Pietzsch, 517 Pittman, Richardson.
Willie Majors, 3837 Simpson Stuart Road.
Jerry Frank Mathis, c/o G. T. Visse, 869 Peavy.
John Franklin Egan, 4140 Fortune.
Victor Ralph Ellison, 3309 Alaska.
Jacqueline Lorraine Lewis, 2421 Caddo.
Ronald William Shepherd, 3741 Cortez.
Joseph S. Graves, 8427 Inwood.
Anthony R. Currey, 203 Hartsdale.
Jon Y. Beck, 4411 Buena Vista.
George B. Bristow, 821 Turner Boulevard.
Denford A. Brumbaugh II, 9715 Cloister.
John T. Collier, 4136 Sleepy Lane.
John M. Combs, 4428 Livingston.
David A. Hanson, 4901 W. Lovers Lane.
Gene M. Jackson, 2319 Berwick.
William J. Johnson, 922 Valencia.
Willie L. Lutts, Jr., 1507 Maywood Avenue.
Glen D. McClain, 2614 Ivandell.
Leo Northington, Jr., 7610 Caillet.
James T. Swift, 2814 Belknap.
George D. Allen, 6816 Coleshire Dr.
Kent A. Bowman, 6729 Country Club Circle.
Richard W. Chapman, 3320 Chadwell.
Louis S. Conroe, 11166 Lawnhaven Road.
Clifton L. Davis, 5510 W. Amherst.
Jerry H. Hoffman, 11140 Wyatt.
Gary M. Holt, 4603½ Junius.
Joel A. Horsley, 1410 Pine.
Richard E. Hull, Jr., 1111 Greenway.

Lloyd S. Kimble, 3112 Woodwind.
Gary W. Larrabee, 6735 Santa Marie Lane.
Joe D. Lynn, 6823 Norway.
Jon R. Parker, 2316 Tolosa.
Michael G. Marsalis, 4627 W. Amherst.
Tommy F. Spellman, 6326 Parkdale.
Henry A. Abernathy, 2912 Canberra.
Roy L. Bounds, 1749 Inwood.
Robert W. Bellamy, 1139 S. Bryan.
Howard R. Bones, 6255 Oram.
Ronald G. Brown, 9036 Donnybrook Lane.
Jack P. Chamberlain, 819 S. Mont Clair.
Lee B. Fargo, 4724 Alcott.
James F. Haller, 10509 Somerton.
Kenneth C. Killen, 5222 Denton Dr.
Albert V. Mitchell, Jr., Box 174.
Galal L. Walker, 1826 Pratt.
Jonathan Thomas Barker, 4715 Dove Creek Way.
Lloyd Edwin Briscoe, 2247 Harding.
Samuel Thompson, 2715 Bridal Wreath.
William Ronald Thompson, care of W. P. Kelly, 8903 Forrest Hills.
Richard A. Grimmer III, 3343 Gladiolus.
Gordon F. Walsh, 6230 Ravendale.
David Tomonek, 5000 W. Amherst.
Gary Trammell, Garland.
Lawrence I. Carpenter, 1617 Randolph, Garland.

Dallas

Robert Miller, 1515 Burlington.
Joe D. Weir.
Robert M. Azala.
Cheryl Clay.
John G. Edwards.
Shelton D. Miller, Jr., Del Rio.

Denison

John Hancock, 113 E. Coffin.
Lynn Barringer, 1420 W. Bullock.
Jack William Brady, 1009 W. Junction.

Denton

Dickie Sawyer, 1206 Dover.
Gary Taylor, 2309 Kayerwood.
Thos. W. Loney, Jr., 1516 Maple.
Lynn Melton, Box 6132.
Doug Muir, 3027 Sherwood, Dickinson.
Luis Alameci, Jr., 901 W. Cane, Edinburg.

El Paso

Mike J. Crews, Jr., 7613 Hermosillo.
Ed E. Graves, 5172 Mt. Abbott.
Richard Edens, 244 S. Maryland.
Ralph Craig Rowlin, 8224 Strickland.
Glen G. Johnson, 8941 Mt. Etna.
Donald Thomas, 7694 Alameda.
Winston L. Black, Jr., 2431 Altura.
Gary Bones, 2605 Nations Ave., Apt. 3.
Robert D. Hawley, 3302 Diamond Avenue.
Raul I. Baca, 909 South Park St.
Robert M. Long, 8124 Edgemere Blvd.

Fort Worth

Phillip Suebb-husen, 1929 Yosmite Drive.
Raymond Eugene Kaptejna, 2104 Fremont.
Ramina Garza, 3500 Childress.
Douglas Ford, 2805 Greene.
Oscar Menchaca, 2422 Prospect.
Gilbert Garcia, 6247 Malvey.
Herman Mason, Jr., 2451 Evans.
Norman Bonner, 820 E. Robert.
Armando Gonzalez, 1410 N. Calhoun.
Roger Jackson, 1308 E. Murphy.
Reuben Reges, 609 McCundy.
Stuart Marshall, 2216 Brairsdale.
Frank Alvarado, 3412 Lovell.
Robert Williams, 909 East Maddox.
Allen Willard Barr, 3014 Bright.
Miss Candice Schriver, 5032 Sherwood.
Ray Orren, 1316 Woodland.
Miss Karen Nunn, 4304 Harwen Terrace.
Parker Willson, Jr., 3832 Westcliff Road South.
Thos. Faber Chamberlain, 2300 Medford Court East.
Richard D. Baker, Route 7, Box 250–B.
Dudley Elliott, Route 7, Box 227.
Dorothy J. Sanders, 809 Colvin.
Beverly Jean Dunn, 4121 Wayside.
Willie C. Evans, 5117 Calumet.
Ronald H. Lofton, 2703 Lincoln.
Langston C. Coleman, 1313 Powell.
Claudie R. Hemphill, 1205 East Magnolia.
Grover G. Riddle, 4217 Eastland.

Galveston

Melvin Crockett, 4210 Avenue N½.
Albert Sidney Johnson, 4615 Avenue North.
Donnie Marvin Dunavant, 313 Fairview, Garland,

Greenville

Timothy Mason, 1903 Wesley.
Roy Pat Oler, 1409 Tulane.
Gary Mike Currin, 3702 Bourland.

Grand Prairie

Chas. E. Troup, 821 Walter Hill.
Gregory Chas. Horsley, 1410 Pine.

Harlingen

Gaudalupe Castillo, Jr., 107 Atlanta.
Allen Dwight Barker, 920 Beaumont.

Houston

Mike Driscoll, 1902 Driscoll.
Chas. W. Raulston, 817 Harold.
Wm. E. Wegner, 5217 Coonish.
Edward F. Zelenka, Jr., 2329 Hollis.
James N. Siedow, Jr., 4601 DeMilo.
Dalton Hughie Oliver, 5731 Takefield.
Miss Dianne Horn, 1106 Wynwood.
Caleb Morrow, 1205 Lockwood.
Floyd S. Denman, 5711 Clements.
Danny Gilbert, 1907 Chew.
Raymond White, 3619 Idaho.
Reginald White, 4717 Gunter.
Edward Ward, 9526 Beckley.
John James Duffy, Jr., 7102 Langdon.
Richard Lasser, 4726 Merwin.
John Swain, 8123 Sandbury.
Cherry Idell Bridges, 8113 Linda Vista.
Fred Douglas Calloway, 2614 Southmore.
Geo. Alvarez Cardinas, 3408 King.
Althalo Benjamin Horton, 8114 Hoffman.
Patricia Rochelle London, 1506 Dowling.
Grady James Landry, 3310 Maroneal.
Roger Alan Smith, 1415 Laskey.
Carl Moore, 2544 Sakowitz.
Reginald Allen Lang, 503 West Sixth.
Chas. Robert Miller, Killeen.

Laredo

Maxine Hernandez, Jr., 1318 Baltimore.
Victor Alcour, 805 Nobahan.

Lubbock

Dora Jean Crockett, 2106 Date.
Jan Vernon Graham, 2812 23d Street.
Tommy Joe Carry, 2010 68th Street.
Larry Oliver Greesen, 6117 Lynnhaven.

Lufkin

Jan Marshall, 541 Humason.
James Henderson, 1921 Keltys.
Lorenzo Wilson, 408 Ridge.
Paul Fenley, Route 5, Box 240.

Longview

Donnie Anderson, 314 E. Avalon.
Lorenzo Jackson, 304 Ledger.
Harold Lilly, 2213 Dunbar.
Lazarus Taylor, 1024 Irving Bridge Road.

McAllen

Joe Morales, 909 North 20th.
Robert Liles, 1519 Walnut.
Winston P. Logan, Jr.,
Santos (Fito) Guerra, 2200 Camellia.
John Hardin, 407 Brooklane, McKinney.
Ronald D. Kidd, 3136 Emily, Mesquite.
Manuel R. Rivera, care of Dondlinger, 1020 Conway.

Mineral Wells

Cynthia Jane Hendrick, 1605 Northwest 6th Avenue.
Joe Mendoza.

Pasadena

Miss Sharon Jeanne Buchanan, 3402 South Shaver.
George Lynn Lankford, 1503 Brickwood.
Jimmy Howard Stang, 319 South Center.
Frank Herman Mandorza, Jr., 1020 Mobile.
James Lionel Hendie, 7503 Glen Vista.
Douglas Elwood Miller, 12117 Palmfrie.
Herman Davis, 820 West Dye, Palestine.

Pampa

John C. Guidry, 349 Sunset.
Gary Doke, 121 North Starkweather.
Chas. W. Collier, Pecos.

Port Arthur

Shelby Perkins, 119 West 6th.
Chas. E. Freeman, 331 Tinkwood.
Lee Cliett, 2233 10th Street, Port Neches.
John W. Ferguson, 819 Wisteria, Richardson.
Tommy K. Rude, 1618 Avenue L, Rosenburg.

San Antonio

Edmund Guerro, Jr., 918 West Mariposa.
Angelo Sabelli, 305 East Cevallas.
Chas. Gonzales, 409 Kendall.
Edward J. Herrera, 1606 Ruiz.
Rudy Herrera, 3200 Buena Vista.
Tom Herrera, 2001 Quintana.
Bernard Stoller, 318 Notre Dame.
Paul T. Sangner, 4539 Cambray.
Jerry Dee Terroll, 525 East Park.
Dean Siever, 1727 San Angelo.
Jesse Solis, 2425 McKinley.
Wayne Newsome Brown, 11 Rosemont.
Joe B. Lopez, 114 South San Marcos.
Delia Guerrero, 440 North San Felipe.
Ernest Ball, Jr., 2210 Nebraska.
Adolph Herrera, 858 West Mayfield.
Joe Graham, 2110 Kenilworth.
Robert M. Cumbor, 3751 Electra.
Jimmy Alex Molinar, 115 Can't Stop.
Kenneth Ward Pfeiffer, 212 Vivian Lane.
Paul Ramiriz, 134 Piegon.
David Curtis Robinson, 421 North Olive.
Frank Alan Woolf, 1507 Gladstone.
Michael Carpenter, 1311 South Crockett, Sherman.
David Avery Hargrove, 550 Roosevelt Drive, Silsbee.
Sammy H. Attlesey, 211 Radio Road, Sulphur Springs.

Temple

Ronald E. Newman.
James Lee Carroll.
Lezely W. White.

Texas City

David Alan Wilson, 812 13th Avenue North.
David B. Schneider, 417 10th Avenue North.

Tyler

James Morrison, 222 West Houston.
Gary Gormer, 803 West Oakwood.
Jack Graves, 2215 Glenbrook.
Steve King, 2720 Brestwood.
Samuel Biscoe, 1115 West Front.
Dennie Hamilton, 309 South Herndon.

Uvalde

John R. Green, 241 Pecan.
Braxton P. Smallwood, 224 North Second.
Glenn Ray Goldsem, 1307 East Warren, Victoria.

Waco

Chas. Scott Budy, 1120 Faulkner Lane.
John Lewis Sharp, Jr., Route 6.
Robert H. Graston, 3704 Shelby.
Curtis Lee Sallenburger, 1623 South 26th.
Crawford Long, Waco.

Wichita Falls

Robert Grady West, 3409 Barrett Place.
Carrol David Dawn, 2522 Inglewood.
Tommy Chas. Nelson, Jr., 504 "D" Bailey Street.
Joe T. Bruton, 1427 Harris Lane.
Ray Martin, 2626 Bretton.

Louisiana

Richard Beazey, 509 South Lamar, Abbeville.
Randal Bordelon, 135 Timothy, Alexandria.

Baton Rouge

Bobby DeJean, 4436 Mimosa.
Johnny Bennett, Route 2, Box 65, Zachary.
Henry L. Belton, 1763 Rosenwald Road.

James E. Gerace, 950 Aberdeen.

Leroy Shanklin, Route 2, Box 65, Zachary.

Rebecca Moreau, 206 Guava Drive.

Dan E. West, 2304 Fairway.

Francis I. Patriquiri, 2646 Jessamine.

Alvin C. Moreau, Jr., 206 Guava.

Brian W. Dean, 2109 Lee Drive.

Jack M. Fraser, 4354 Delaware.

Joseph E. White, 1225 Alabama, Baker.

Barney D. Cazart, 2940 Bootsie Drive.

Larry C. Denham, Route 4, Hooper Road.

Marsha Dickerson, 3864 Elm Drive.

Reggy J. Hunt, 3486 Delaware.

Thomas Maggio, 1922 Edinburgh.

John B. McLavy, Jr., 2245 Stanford Avenue.

William H. Nestler, 1802 College Drive.

Darrell Welsh, 2266 Cedardale.

Donald G. Cave, 834 Azalea, Apartment D.

Michael Gordon Crowe, Bogalusa.

Bossier City

Joseph Bruce Lotshaw III, 2205 Wakefield.

Dick Riding, 2656 Old Minden Road.

C. W. "Chip" Talley, Box 581, Covington.

Anthony Stewart, Route 2, Box 244, Crowley.

Dale L. DeWitt, 1021 North Texas, DeRidder.

Gary Dwaynn Fuselin, 521 South Third, Eunice.

Hammond

Clarence Johnson.

Eldridge Clark, Jr.

Robert Farris, Jr.

Bud Antin, 117 East Thomas.

Thomas J. King, 215 Palm, Houma.

Dalton Dale Landry, 313 Rutland, Jennings.

Steven Louis Dumody, 214 Webster, Kenner.

Donald J. Brignac, 720 Louie, Lake Charles.

John C. Roth, Lake Charles.

Louis Neil Moss, 616 DeWald, Lake Charles.

Nathan R. Granger, 209 West Prien Lake Road, Lake Charles.

Lafayette

Charles Guilbeaux, 114 Memory.

Claude John Boudreaux, 262 Randolph Drive.

Carrol James Duplechin, 116 Rayland Street.

Joseph Kennedy Green, 816 Kaliste Saloom Road.

James Vernon Edney, P.O. Box 196.

Kenneth Joseph Duhon, P.O. Box 388.

Terence Patrick Gardner, 804 St. John.

Irving A. Taylor, 703 Ouachita Avenue, Monroe.

Michael J. Worley, 119 Glenwood Drive, Monroe.

Edwin Lastrapes, 204 Sena Drive, Metairie.

Walter Bougene, 187 Ridgewood, Metairie.

Eugene R. Bonner, Jr., 1020 Sycamore, Morgan City.

New Orleans

Sidney Alexander, 1143 Marais.

Edmund J. Anderson, 3121 Milan.

Larry D. Arnold, 1235 Seventh Street.

Lawrence J. Centala, 1600 Bodinger.

Barry A. Chickini, 6038 Memphis.

Melvin J. Creecy, 645 North Dorgenois.

Milton C. Doll III, 2721 North Prieur.

Kenneth J. Domilesi, 5240 Annunciation.

Albert J. Doyle, 2600 Chippewa.

Gerard J. Haddican, 908 First.

Samuel Henry, Jr., 2029 Benefit.

Allen C. Hope, Jr., 3117 General Pershing.

Joseph G. Albe, 1328 Perrin Drive, Arabi.

Margaret Mary Amato, 6036 Wickfield Drive.

Annie T. Bageon, 2308 Feliciana Street.

Lyman H. Barrow, 1926 St. Philip Street.

Bruce M. Blanchard, 2117 Brutus Street.

Philip J. Bordelon, 625 Larisa Street.

Merial Rita Brown, 2339 Mandeville Street.

Michael S. Cashen, 19 Forest Avenue, Metairie.

Louis A. Catalanotto, 2139 Filmore Avenue.

Donald A. Creighton, 216 West Jean Baptist, Chalmette.

Anthony Currera, Jr., 4635 Touro Street.

Arthur P. Dehon, Jr., 331, 22d Street.

Lawrence J. Despenza, 1921 Washington Avenue.

Kathleen A. Donelon, 3013 Baudin Street.

Richard A. Dundin, 245 Douglas Drive.

Ira M. Dusang, 7215 Pritchard Place.

Veronica M. Faust, 4481 Paintus Street.

Cecelia B. Feitel, 2–A Neron Place.

Joel David Ferguson, 4712 Papania Drive.

John W. Houston, 1717 Urquhart Street.

Eric L. Humphreys, 1740 Marengo Street.

Ella M. Jackson, 2016 Foucher Street.

Thomas Lee Fischer, 2927 Pine Street.

Lawrence Joseph Heller, 936 Beverly Gardens Drive.

Raymond Robert Egan, 1032 Turnbull Drive.

Calvin T. Scott, 3523 Abundance Street.

Bruce R. Lohfink, 1336 Congress.

Edward B. McGinnis, Jr., 2430 Constance.

Hubert H. Morton, 4617 Clara.

Ronald J. Schaefer, 4305 Annunciation.

Edwin O. Schelesinger, 1630 Arabella.

Earl A. Thompson, Jr., 4901 Hauck.

Paul R. Wagner, 6075 Dorothea.

Philip J. Gatluso, 1112 Dante.

Geo. R. Seaman, 6429 Avenue B.

Henry Newman, 2714 Orleans.

Gary Joseph Dragon, 1028 Center, Arabi.

Louis A. Moffett, 1334 Seville.

Larry J. Benson, 2419 New York.

George S. Wurz, 6361 Gen. Haig.

McMillian.

Woodall.

Herman Millet, Jr., 8327 Oleander.

George B. Long, 7500 Chef Menteur Highway.

Louis P. Bicocchio, 6563 Colbert.

John Arthur Coleman, 2425 Massachusetts.

Paul Jessie, 1021 Lyons Street.

Sydney Mae Jones, 2718 Law Street.

Virginia J. Joseph, 3704 Hamburg.

Joseph P. Jouet, Jr., 2512 Laharpe Street.

Ulysses P. Jupiter, 1508 Lizardi Street.

James L. Kreller, 2820 Constance Street.

Thomas C. Lillenitt, 4714 Stemway Drive.

George V. Platz, 719 Bartholomew Street.

Leonard A. Radlauer, 4300 South Prieur Street.

Jacob L. Schwander, 2817 St. Philip Street.

Sharon P. Scott, 655 North Miro Street.

Alonza T. Stanza III, 226 Jules Avenue.

Sandra T. Stimpson, 938 Hidago.

Janice M. Thomas, 2828 Upperline Street.

Kenneth P. Thomas, 6053 Vicksburg.

Leonard L. Vaughn, 1526 Lizardi Street.

Betty Mae Villere, 6117 Campus Boulevard.

Syndia V. Wall, 6520 Catina Street.

Donald P. Whalen, 1326 Pier Avenue., Metairie.

Ronald J. Wiltz, 1922 Center, Arabi.

Ruth M. Lambremont, New Orleans.

Philip A. Blappert, Jr., 6411 Memphis.

Torrence E. Bordelon, 4240 Homecourt.

Miss Patsy Kennedy, 1629 Toledano.

Layton Martens, 1205 Bourbon.

James H. Waggoner, 702 East 7th, Oakdale.

Vance R. Andrus, 453 South Court, Opelousas.

Wayne LeBleu, Opelousas.

Christine Ledig, Port Allen.

Shreveport

John M. Kirkland, 878 Capitan Shreve Drive.

Gene Hunt, 224 Carrollton.

Michael Hudson, Plain Dealing.

Ray Neal Andrews, 1468½ Ashton.

Thomas H. Bacus, 702 Lencourt.

Donna Rae Corley, 710 West 70th Street, New Orleans.

Thomas A. Giles, 4530 Crawford.

Dennis L. Grote, 3296 Murphy.

William D. Harrold, 5830 Fern.

Leon G. Nash, 3622 West College.

Phil C. Richards, 408 Stephenson.

Jay Tuminello, 2011 Vivian.

John M. Urankar, 2717 Knight.

Willie G. Washington, P. O. Box 382, Dixie.

Robert Reeston, 3109 Broussard, Sulphur.

Merle Joseph Boudreaux, 608 Menard, Thibodaux.

James Dewel, 621 Canal, Thibodaux.

DENVER REGION

Arizona

Flagstaff

Ralph Juarez, Jr., 403 South Leroux.

Connally Nears, 3225 North Patterson.

Glendale

Lynn E. Smith, 4611 West Palmaire.

Allen Fusler, 6625 North 60th.

Mesa

Lon Grushko, 4441 North 35th, Phoenix.

Billy Lugo, 5545 McDonald Street.

William L. Cooper, 125 East 4th Place.

Miami

Louis Mazei, 611 Woodrow.

Nogales

George Valasquez, 127 Kolvar Avenue.

Phoenix

Ron J. Flores, 4025 East Cambridge.

Ralph J. Kounkin, 120 West Missouri.

Salvatore Cintineo, 2710 East Windsor.

Ralph F. Herro, 517 E. Tuckey Lane.

Jay Mariella, 1028 East Orange Street, Tempe.

Michael R. Stanton, Box 623, Avondale.

Larry Marks, 3420 W. Rose Lane.

John Trenbino, 3040 W. Mariposa.

Verdie O. Hagensted, 1526 West Fairmont.

Geoff Gonsher, 1017 East Glenrose.

Patrick J. McAuliffe, 3538 West El Cominito Drive.

Vincent Immordino, 2011 W. Whitton Avenue.

Billy W. Terry, 3643 West Echo Lane.

Thomas J. Burnham, 391 North 21st Avenue.

Billy C. Cheriden, 55 North May Street, Mesa.

Sam C. Riddle, 1929 West Yavapai.

Princie M. Andrews, 1723 East Monroe, Apartment 429.

Prescott

Chris Domingues, 205 North Mount Vernon.

David Salazar, 650 Western Avenue.

Scottsdale

Charles Valenzuela, 2529 East Monterose, Phoenix.

Sierra Vista

Chuck Riske, 601 Callo del Norte.

Tempe

George F. Longstreth, 1708 East McLellan Street, Phoenix.

Tucson

Ken Fraser, 1804 South Santa Cruz.

Ed Osborn, Jr., 703 West Corona.

Francisco Baraza, 1951 West Waverly.

Brendon, Brett, 3902 North Riviera Drive.

John L. Cleary, 5261 East 17th.

Edmund R. Tellez, 1628 East 10th Street.

Calvin Grigsby, 2201 North Hampton Street.

Michael S. Nichols, 6359 Calle Luna.

Joe Harper, 1402 San Felipei Drive.

M. Stephen J. Langham, 1650 East Roger Road.

George M. MacGregor, 103 East Pastime Road.

Yuma

John R. Stewart, 1425 13th Avenue.

Tim W. Rooney, 1200 First Street.

Colorado

Alamosa

Kenneth Wilson, 701 12th Street.

Arvada

Joseph T. Boscia, 6877 West 53d Avenue.

Ed P. Dalecheck, 6146 Janice Way.

Robert H. Smith, 6549 Depew Court.

Aurora

Eugene M. Stone, Jr., 1950 Monoco Parkway, Denver.

Boulder

Gary Thomas, 1320 Ammons, Lakewood.

Colorado Springs

Scott Dyer, 2757 Chelton Road.
Cornelees Davis, 2412 Erich.
Michael Hassett, 1103 East Caramillo.
Michael Abel, 634 Glen Eyrie Court.
Marshall Griffith, 2622 Summitt Drive.

Commerce City

Richard J. Martinez, 7720 Larkwood Street.

Denver

Ed J. Grossman, 7030 East Sixth Avenue.
David E. Marshall, 2529 West 33d Avenue.
Richard A. Bell, 1575 South Hazel Court.
Tomson D. Schaetzel, 6161 East Eastman.
Richard Hill, 2646 Elm.
Tom E. O'Hayre, 4395 Tennyson.
Clayton Cline, 4020 West Dartmouth.
Bruce Roberts, 3363 West 26th Avenue.
Ronald L. Melichar, 3094 West Hillside Place.
Frank J. Farrell, 4555 East 17th Avenue.
James T. Gibbons, 4342 Pecos.
Nicholas A. Tolve, 2800 Locust.
Ron Germano, 3557 Newton.
Richard Sanzalone, 4160 Yarrow Court.
Donald R. Baugh, 2531 South Franklin.
Robert H. Knott, 35 Hillside Drive.
Richard H. Garcia, 7260 West 28th Street.
James A. Bland, 1725 Ulster.
James K. Atkinson, Jr., 5749 Quay.
Harvey C. Cannova, 5060 West 8th Avenue.
Stephen M. Smaldone, 4659 Eliot.
Marcellus Bryant, 2534 Williams Street.
Kenneth Wirtz, 9247 East Nassau Avenue.
Allen Roth, 2887 South Monroe.
John Riordan, 2576 Birch.
Thomas Carmedy, 2291 Clermont.
Arthur Dye, 4308 Raritan.
Dave Rathbun, 2633 South Cook.
Lawrence T. Cohen, 5530 East 2d Avenue.
Charles A. Maierhofer, 975 Clay.

Durango

Michael Murphy, 1807 Eastlawn.

Englewood

Christofer Grant, 3026 South Clermont.
John Morrison, Jr., 731 East Bates Avenue.
James R. Sauer, 395 West Parkview, Littleton.

Fort Collins

James W. Roselieve, 723 South Washington.

Fort Morgan

Gary Ringo, 800 Diana Street.

Golden

Thomas L. Jackson, 1005 20th Street.

Grand Junction

William Fanning, 2208 North 20th Street.
James W. Frank, 2143 Broadway.

Greeley

Gerald E. Karre, 2405 24th Street.
Gary E. Wallace, 1202 23rd Court.

Littleton

Steven L. Peterson, 1919 South Ogden, Denver.
Carl J. Bjork, 2937 South Cherry Way, Denver.

Loveland

Robert Whitehouse, 607 Franklin Avenue.

Pueblo

Albert R. Crus, 602 West Arroyo.
James A. Carlee, 155 Cornell Circle.
Mark B. Reynolds, 119 West Orman.
Dave Ferraro, 509 Tyler.

New Mexico

Albuquerque

Arthur Melendres, 733 Mansano, NE.
Joseph A. Nickard, 29 Garden Park Circle, NW.
Charles R. Springer, 1502 Los Tomases, NW.
James P. Baxter, 302 Silver, SW.
Abran Lujano, 1971 DeVagas Circle, SW.
Franklin Robinson, 417 13th Street, NW.
Joseph R. Espinosa, 713 Tijeras, NW.
Richard C. Mattenci, 1317 San Carlos, SW.
John T. Murillo, 1059 Lead Avenue, SE.
John R. Scanlon, 1203 Copper Avenue, NE.
Joseph A. Abeyta, 423 Santa Fe, SW.
Wilfred J. Brennan, 1414 Silver, SW.
Armand J. Giannini, 324 13th NW.
Robert Lee Martines, 3313 Northfield Court, NW.
Daland J. Vertz, 1226 Britiana NE.

Belen

Frank M. Montoya, 818 North Main.

Carlsbad

James E. Powell, 903 Solano Road.
George L. Watkins, 1101 South Country Club Circle.

Clovis

Joseph Harry Turner, 2705 Ross.

Gallup

Sam Lopes, 508 South Puerco.

Hobbs

Tommy J. Cope, 1300 Pecos Drive.

Las Cruces

Arturo J. Flores, 418 East Amadon.
Leon Gluck, 2355 Rosedale Drive.
Harris Klein, 2011 Turrentine Drive.

Las Vegas

Johnny Aragon, Conches Dam.

Roswell

Howard E. Babcock, Post Office Box 1684.
Robert Tellez, 206 East Albuquerque.

Santa Fe

Albert Carrillo, 220 Rodriguez.
Laurence Lopez, 214 West San Francisco Avenue.
William Zimmer, 710 San Pasqual.
Marshall Saiz, 303 Rosario Boulevard.
Gilbert H. Quintana, Route 1, Box 10, Santa Cruz.

Socorro

Delbert Fraissinet, 563 Terry Avenue.

Taos

Joseph F. Montoya, Taos.

Tucumcari

Terry Turner, 1307 South First Street.

Utah

Salt Lake City

Allen Lee Bleak, 2039 Stratford Drive.
Ronald Floyd Brown, 3037 South 900 West (Magna).
Darwin C. Christofferson, 1751 Siesta Drive, Sandy.
Georganna Cuff, 4765 West 5015 South.
Jeanne Faust, 5093 South 2100 East.
Dale H. Gresteron, 1313 West Crystal.
James Herbert Hammons, 1963 West 7300 South, West Jordan.
Ken M. Keddington, 4176 South 900 E½.
Dare D. Keller, 5385 Holladay Boulevard.
Barry Lee Modnick, 725 Farley Hall, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
Leroy Michael Montoya, 205 North 5th West.
Myron Ray Nalder, 228 South 2d East.
Karim Prawitt, 233 West 1st North.
Wm. E. Rasmussen, 127 East Winslow.
Charles L. Schack, 549 First Avenue.
Larry W. Sheffield, 170 "P" Street.
Randall L. Sobieski, 763 Oakmont Avenue.
David M. Taylor, 1620 Sherman Avenue.
Stephen A. Taylor, 1318 East 17th South.
Stephen W. Thayne, 1518 East 17th South.
Steven Dale Thompson, 4555 West 4805 South.
Ted Van Weeren, 330 North 1st West.

Ogden

Brent Julander, 565 West 4900 South.

Provo

David E. Smith, 839 North 100th East.

Wyoming

Casper

James Joseph Steward, 255 South Jackson.
Brookie Peter Turk, 118 South Washington.
Robert Ford, 2726 Hamway Avenue.
Richard Bruce Land, 920 Missouri Circle.

Cheyenne

Gary Horton, 3618 Dover Road.
Sharon Mothershead, 603 McGovern Avenue.
Tim White, 500 West 51st Street.
Bob True, Box 55, Meriden Route.
Mike Fitzpatrick, Box 79, Route 1.
Jeff McClintock, 1211 Richardson Court.

Cody

Larry George Mix, Box 1199.

Laramie

Edward Woods, 2207 Hillside Drive.
Jerome E. Benson, 1527 Custer.

Newcastle

Neil Sweet, Upton, Wyo.

Powell

Dennis Earhaft, Star Route.

Rawlins

Wallace Wolfe, 1120 Nieman Street.

Riverton

Lance Gunderson, 809 West Park Avenue.

Rock Springs

Everett Martin, 211 Thomas Street.
Joe Dee Gatti, 1301 9th Street.

Sheridan

Bert Roger Bendi, 320 Sherman Avenue.
Judy G. Elliot, 1151 Gladstone.

Wheatland

Dick Watson, 401 South 14th Street.

MEMPHIS REGION

Alabama

Mr. Thomas Randy McPherson, 301 Carlisle Avenue, Albertville.
Mr. Walter A. Coley, 523 Circle Drive, Alexander City.
Mr. Ray V. Hartwell III, Post Office Box 1228, Anniston.
Mr. L. Hiller, Sessions, 1017 Cynthia Crescent, Anniston.
Mr. James E. Grimes, 305 Warrior Court, Auburn.
Mr. Dan C. Stucky, 411 West Sixth Street, Bay Minette.
Mr. Edward E. Keith, Jr., Route 7, Box 486, Bessemer.
Mr. Thomas R. Chase, 118 North 16th Street, Bessemer.
Mr. George Jerald Knight, 1031 14th Avenue, Bessemer.
Mr. Thomas Lee Buttram, Route 1, Box 80B, Bessemer.
Mr. Lowell Wayne Tew, Route 2, Box 445, Bessemer (employed in Birmingham post office).
Mr. Michael O. Laney, 2216 Fifth Place NW., Birmingham.
Mr. Thomas Wilson Gibb, Jr., 815 Wingate Circle, Birmingham.
Mr. Jacob Wayne Staggs, 656 Main Street, Montevallo.
Mr. James Houston Allison, 1877 St. Charles Avenue, Birmingham.
Mr. Jesse Baskerville, 1329 Avenue S, Ensley, Birmingham.
Mr. Larry Chandler, 307 Greenwood Street, Talladega.
Mr. Kenneth Wayne Pate, 2300 32d Place SW., Birmingham.
Miss Gloria Jean Brown, 701 South 12th Street, Birmingham.
Mr. James William Davis, 522 Fourth Court, Birmingham.
Mr. Edward Thomas Johnson, 437 Iota Avenue, South Birmingham.
Mr. Barry Morton Hertz, 2310 Highland Avenue, Birmingham.

Mr. Michael John Brown, 3025 Warrington Road, Birmingham.

Mr. Schuyler Allen Baker, 3611 Locksley Drive, Birmingham.

Mr. Benjamin S. Franklin, 306 Underwood Street, Brewton.

Mr. Larry DeWayne Freeman, Route, Bremen.

Mr. Kelly Wayne Cartron, 705 Sixth Street, East Cullman.

Mr. Eugene Royer, Route 1, Trinity.

Mr. Stanley Cash, High School Street, Hartselle.

Mr. Mike Simpson, Hartselle.

Mr. Howard Woodward, Route 1. Eva.

Mr. Richard W. Dean, Cherokee Avenue, Dothan.

Mr. Barry Britt Bromberg, 200 Pinehurst Drive, Enterprise.

Mr. Robert W. Wilkins, 247 Newton Parkway, Evergreen.

Mr. Mike Gusmus, 700 North Commons Street, Tuscumbia.

Mr. Donald Rogers Wynat, 631 South 10th Street, Gadsden.

Mr. James H. Hamilton, 2738 Hilltop Circle, Gadsden.

Mr. Eirik Duerr, 1101 Dale Drive, Huntsville.

Mr. Ingolf Hermann, 3306 Panorama Drive, Huntsville.

Mr. Patton Nelson, Sixth Street, Jasper.

Mr. Vernon Crosby Britton, 38 Ashley Drive, Mobile.

Mr. John Blair Hamlin, Jr., 3808 Clardy Road, Mobile.

Mr. Harry Burton, 288 Siena Vista, Mobile.

Mr. Solomon Bennett, 212 Fifth Court, Orange Grove, Mobile.

Mr. Evander Isiah Dickinson, 2417 Redmond Street, Mobile.

Mr. Daniel Mose, Jr., 1570 Polk Street, Mobile.

Mr. Freddie Jones Jordan, 1009 Swan Drive, Mobile.

Mr. John T. Calhoun, 357 Ryland Street, Mobile.

Mr. Richard D. Miller, 4951 Princeton Drive, Mobile.

Mr. James Adams Hill, Route 1, Box 67, Mt. Vernon.

Mr. Clausen Ely, Jr., 528 East Fairview Avenue, Montgomery.

Mr. Thomas Arthel Keynton, 800 South Perry Street, Montgomery.

Mr. Harry Neel, 2035 East 5th Street, Montgomery.

Mr. James Earl Whittle, 656 Elmwood Street, Montgomery.

Mr. William Alfred Harris, Route 3, Box 357, Montgomery.

Mr. Charles T. Austin, 2341 Carlisle Street, Montgomery.

Mr. Ralph Russell Martin, 727 Tettus Street, Montgomery.

Mr. Arthur Harvey Day, Jr., 128 Vine Street, East Selma.

Mr. James E. Brooks, Jr., 3402 Crescent Circle, Montgomery.

Mr. Harold James Coachman, 3319 South Boone Street, Montgomery.

Mr. Robert C. McNeal, Jr., 1713 Gilmer Avenue, Tallassee.

Mr. Tommy H. Armstrong, Jr., 306 South Scott Street, Scottsboro.

Mr. Robert M. Rountree, III, Route 4, Selma.

Mr. J. D. Vanderpool, 1523 8th Street, Tuscaloosa.

Mr. Dennis Holcomb, 1431 19th Avenue, East Tuscaloosa.

Mississippi

Mr. Brodie Wayne McAlpin, 1805 East Barroum Circle, Corinth.

Mr. Carl Baxter Abraham, care of Mr. Miller Abraham, Drawer 599, Greenville.

Mr. Ronnie T. Russell, Bay St. Louis.

Mr. James Babington Galloway, 1519 Kelly Avenue, Gulfport.

Mr. Clyde W. Applewhite III, 2009 Hardy Street, Hattiesburg.

Mr. Henry Glen Lewis, Route 1, Box 304, Foxworth.

Mr. Leslie L. Pritchard, 221 Dixie Avenue, Hattiesburg.

Mr. Clifford James Wohlgenueth, 1830 Bellewood Road, Jackson.

Mr. J. L. Boyd III, 1711 Robinson Street, Jackson.

Mr. Ted Estess, Tylertown.

Mr. Edward Jenkins Adams, 4623 Hanging Moss Road, Jackson.

Mr. James G. Martin III, 2222 Southwood Road, Jackson.

Mr. Louis Henry Rhymes, Jr., 4410 Childress Drive, Jackson.

Miss Janice Kaye Dawson, Route 1, Box 83, Bolton.

Mr. Floyd Williams, 1332 Lynch Street, Jackson.

Mr. Thomas Elgin Dorsey, 4310 Watkins Drive, Jackson.

Mr. Mike Vincent, 952 Briar Field Road, Jackson.

Mr. Terry M. Sturzel, 3971 Meadow Lane Drive, Jackson.

Mr. C. A. Nelson, 3342 Oak Forest Drive, Jackson.

Mr. Tommy Miller, Jr., 516 South Fourth Avenue, Laurel.

Mr. Dwight Leon Hastings, 47 Oakcrest Drive, Laurel.

Mr. Mike Crosby, 2035 38th Avenue, Meridian.

Mr. Randolph Pool, 2424 Parkway Boulevard, Meridian.

Mr. Richard Glen Patterson, RR Box 131, Walnut Grove.

Mr. James William Shields, 1303 Dantzler Street, Moss Point.

Mr. Marvin Luther White, Jr., 300 Griffin Street, Moss Point.

Mr. Jerry A. Davis, Route 4, Box 139, Tupelo.

Tennessee

Mr. Fred Thomas Long, 817 Holston Street, Bristol.

Mr. Alan Wayne Garner, 1808 South Beech Street, Chattanooga.

Mr. Dick Kile, 1802 McBrien Road, Chattanooga.

Mr. Jerry Wayne Jordan, Soddy.

Mr. Michael James Dzvonik, 15 South Street Marks Avenue, Chattanooga.

Mr. Clevon E. Thompson, 3406 Tarleton Avenue, Chattanooga.

Mr. Byron M. Fogo III, 404 Druid Lane, Chattanooga.

Mr. Larry J. Ramsey, 305 Nelson Road, Chattanooga.

Mr. Gordon James III, 1100 Crown Point Road, West Signal Mountain.

Mr. William Michael Gross, Route 1, Trenton, Ga.

Mr. Raymond H. Brantley, 3601 Frederick Avenue, Chattanooga.

Miss Reatha M. Montgomery, 3416 Chandler Avenue, Chattanooga.

Mr. David Kaplan, 4008 Albermarle Avenue, Chattanooga.

Mr. Robert Eldsworth Craig, 123 Madison Terrace, Clarksville.

Mr. Bobbie Wendell Griffin, 1517 Walnut Hills, Clarksville.

Mr. Seldon Dale Sledd, Box 4750, A. P. S. C., Clarksville.

Mr. Robert Bryan Smith, 225 East Meadow Circle, Clarksville.

Mr. Will Daniel Foston, 1156 College Street, Clarksville.

Mr. William Kittrell Cooper, Columbia

Mr. Stephen L. Flatt, Cookeville.

Mr. Jere L. Hargrove, Cookeville.

Mr. Paul Edward Young, Covington.

Miss Nancy Garner, Franklin.

Mr. Floyd Carmack Hayes, Humboldt.

Mr. William R. Menzies III, 1460–A Hollywood Drive, Jackson.

Mr. Samuel Jackson Bowman, 710 West Maple Street, Johnson City.

Mr. Dana Craig Smick, 1325 Post Street, Kingsport.

Mr. Douglas Releford, 302 Louis Street, Kingsport.

Miss Betty Jo Asquith, 2921 Brabson Drive, Knoxville.

Mr. Arthur Levern Cheek, 5509 Cliffwood Road, Knoxville.

Mr. James R. Hathcote, Jr., 3117 Vera Drive, Knoxville.

Mr. Alfred Babington-Johnson, 2542 Brooks Road, Knoxville.

Mr. Carlton Bales, Route 11, Knoxville.

Mr. Helen Kelsey Colbert, Stonewall Extended McKenzie.

Mr. Hubert A. King III, McMinnville.

Mr. Larry Michael Handley, 1640 Huxley Street, Alcoa.

Miss Barbara J. Billings, 2926 South Radford, Memphis.

Mr. J. Trent Snipes, 1081 Railton Road, Memphis.

Mr. Wayne Cain, 3628 Steele, Memphis.

Mr. Larry Barker, 2965 Ranier St., Memphis.

Mr. William Andrew Nesbitt, 184 Horn Lake Cove, Memphis.

Mr. Jim Kadell, 5599 Fox Meadows Cove, Memphis.

Mr. Dan Powell, Jr., 5298 Revere Street, Memphis.

Mr. J. J. Sohm, 1600 Kirkwood, Memphis.

Mr. Edward Friends, 1733 Marble, Memphis.

Mr. Bill Mitchell, 3609 Carnes, Memphis.

Mr. Kenneth Cox, 2719 Supreme, Memphis.

Mr. Joshua G. Brown, 681 Rozelle, Memphis.

Mr. Lawrence Barr, 3901 Spottswood Avenue, Memphis.

Mr. Bevan Canale, 1766 Forrest Avenue, Memphis.

Mr. Albert Page, 4836 Avondale, Memphis.

Miss Mary Joyce Mallory, Route 1, Box 179, Oakland.

Mr. Joe Hailey, Selmer.

Miss Linda Turner, 2920 South Radford, Memphis.

Miss Estell Bluington, 919 McDowell, Memphis.

Miss Molly McCalla, 8217 Kerrville-Rosemark Road, Route 1, Millington.

Mr. Thomas J. Hanrahan, 1063 Faxon Avenue, Memphis.

Mr. Sam Williams, 910 Palmer Ally, Memphis.

Mr. Alfred Leonard Gray, 1171 Englewood, Memphis.

Mr. William Hays, 3068 Bomah, Memphis.

Mr. John Edward Wilson, 539 Mariana St. Memphis.

Mr. G. S. Dismukes, III, Route 2, Murfreesboro.

Mr. Leslie Darnell Arnette, 820 East State Street, Murfreesboro.

Mr. James C. Cooper, 2815 Acklen Avenue, Nashville.

Mr. Richard Fulton, Jr., Nashville.

Mr. R. C. Bailey, Jr., 2012, 28th Avenue, North, Nashville.

Mr. Wade Mitchell, 908 Mitchell Road, Nashville.

Mr. Joseph Lynch, 1108 Sunnymeade Drive, Nashville.

Mr. Jimmy Surface, 914 Elvira Avenue, Nashville.

Mr. Joseph C. Sanders, 2018 Straightway Avenue, Nashville.

Mr. Gary Liddington, 2805 Western Hills Drive, Donelson.

Mr. David L. Pigna, 1803 Joy Circle, Nashville.

Mr. Robert L. Wells, 509 Chelsea Drive, Madison.

Mr. Jim Faulkner, 1219 Grandview Drive, Nashville.

Mr. Edward Smith Blankenship, 211 Theodore Drive, Nashville.

Mr. Lawrence Gilbert Brown, 807 33d Avenue, North, Nashville.

Mr. Jerry Hackney, Gallatin.

Mr. Lewis Dale, 2307 Hampton Avenue, Nashville.

Mr. Richard Poehlein, Eva.

Mr. Richard Alan Kottler, 3423 Amanda Avenue, Nashville.

Mr. Charles Richard Waller, Jr., 646 39th Avenue, North, Nashville.

Mr. Ronald Parham, 1908 Neeman Street, Nashville.

Mr. Leroy Hatchett, 2016 Jordan Drive, Nashville.

Mr. Kenneth Ervin Yager, Box 244, Camden.

Mr. Benny Robert Arp, 149 Maryville Circle, Oak Ridge.

Mr. Larry Odell Cole, 18 West Ridgecrest, Kingston.

Mr. Freddie Wartman, Ridgely.

Mr. William B. Acree, Jr., Ridgely.

Mr. Daniel Richard Baird, Ripley.

Mr. Limmie Lee Harrell, Jr., Trenton.

Mr. Roger Fowler, Route 2, Union City.

Minnesota

Bemidji

F. W. Barthelemy, 1407 Beltrami Avenue.

T. F. Byrne, 1019 Beltrami Avenue.

Brainerd

A. F. Kokesh, Garrison.

L. J. Pikula, 1704 Thirteenth Avenue NE.

Chaska

D. A. Dungey, Chaska.

Duluth

M. F. Bruno, 119 South 61st Avenue West.

W. W. Engdahl, 1449–90th Avenue West.

G. A. London, 401 East Eighth Street.

E. H. Luick, 1925 West Third.

M. P. Maki, 1031 North Eleventh Avenue East.

J. P. Neve, 707 Boundary Avenue.

J. W. Yount, 800 Almac Drive, Proctor.

Ely

L. I. Esterberg, Route 1, Box 103.

Fairmont

M. F. Matthes, 409 South Prairie Street.

Hibbing

R. A. DeLeo, 306 East 42d Street.

Hopkins

T. C. Dunphy, 15205 Lynn Terrace.

J. Y. Hanzalik, 13727 Orchard Road.

T. E. Jacobson, 350 Althea Lane.

J. P. Smerdon, 14019 Excelsior Boulevard, Minnetonka.

Mankato

M. D. Bennett, 112 Mayfair Drive.

J. F. Dauffenbach, 408 Tyler Avenue.

R. L. Haseman, 124½ East Liberty.

M. P. Meyer, No. 1 Petticoat Lane.

Minneapolis

M. E. Ahlfeld, 3103 East 24th Street.

F. L. Anderson, Jr., 1188 Fourth Avenue North.

T. K. Basford, 2304 Drew Avenue South.

D. W. Billadeaux, 695 East 79th.

M. W. Blackwell, 1220 Fourth Avenue North.

J. A. Blanchard, 4432 Upton Avenue South.

C. R. Boeckmann, 3732 Elliott Avenue.

A. G. Boler, 3411 Bryant Avenue North.

L. L. Brekke, 619 University Avenue SE.

R. M. Brekke, 2537 Stevens.

G. H. Broom, 4905 38th Avenue South.

S. M. Bungert, 5261 Fillmore Street NE.

J. A. Connor, 1801 Fifteenth Avenue South.

C. O. Dahle, 5211 Vincent Avenue South.

D. T. Dunne, 3514 Pierce Street NE.

D. P. Earley, 1839 Morgan Avenue North.

A. P. Favorite, 619 East 36th Street.

M. A. Franey, 4213 Xerxes South.

C. P. Frawley, 5537 Fourteenth Avenue South.

D. A. Freiheit, 9217 Upton Avenue South.

K. R. Gohmert, 2754 Queen Avenue North.

D. L. Graham, 1212 Russell Avenue North.

M. G. Grimshaw, 2319 Roosevelt Street NE.

R. L. Gulla, 325 Harvard Street SE.

G. G. Hanes, 4416 Dunham Drive.

L. R. Hasledalen, 3144 Jersey Avenue South.

K. G. Johnson, 11526 Xavis Street NW.

C. R. Jones, Jr., 2305 Milwaukee.

G. D. Jones, 3425 Cedar Avenue.

A. F. Knutson, 821 Twelfth Avenue SE.

S. M. Lester, 4700 Ewing Avenue South.

F. J. Madden, 2504 St. Anthony Boulevard.

R. F. McFarlane, 1621 West 32nd Street.

M. R. Miller, 1418 Fourth Street South.

R. J. Morris, 2305 Milwaukee.

G. L. Moses, 2001 Eastman Drive.

K. H. Nau, 1310 Circle Terrace NE.

A.G. Nicklow, 4644 Aldrich Avenue South.

P. A. O'Dougherty, 5015 Gladstone Avenue South.

R. J. Olson, 403 East Fourth Street, Litchfield.

T. P. Olson, 6425 Dellwood Drive.

R. B. Padden, Waverly, Minnesota.

J. M. Porrazzo, 805 Newton Avenue North.

W. C. Raymond, Hamel, Minnesota.

K. R. Retzlaff, 1127 Fourth Street SE.

D. Royster, 4200 Portland.

P. J. Ryan, 867–23d Avenue SE.

R. R. Skillings, 5925 Main Street NE.

C. L. Slater, 1023 West Minnehaha Parkway.

D. A. Sletten, 2227 Riverside Avenue.

I. O. Smith, 1131 Irving Avenue North.

M. J. Spencer. 3835 Oak Street North.

R. J. Spencer, 3835 Oak Street North.

W. R. Stoynoff, 9812 Columbus Avenue.

M. E. Stroud, 1013 Plymouth Avenue North.

J. Thompson, 726 36½ Avenue NE.

L. P. Tobin, 2626 Como Avenue SE.

W. N. Truelson, 1924 Third Avenue North.

R. A. Wedlund, 304 Sixth Street SE.

G. H. Wiles, 5502 Toledo Avenue North.

Moorhead

L. K. Coalwell, 103 Bean Avenue, Dilworth.

L. M. Cuklanz, Route 2.

N. E. McLellan, 221 Nineteenth Avenue North, Fargo.

Owatonna

D. W. McAnnany, 218 East Rose Street.

M. K. Sprung, 504 East Vine Street.

Rochester

J. T. Beckley, 723 First Street NW.

J. W. Damaska, 34 Thirteenth Avenue NE.

R. R. Kopischke, 1101 Cascade Street NW.

K. R. Luebke, 2416 Eighteenth Street SE.

A. F. Pulford, 119 Thirteenth Avenue SE.

J. J. Sibley, 632 Eighth Street SW.

J. Thompson, 1105 Eighth Avenue SW.

St. Cloud

J. D. Gohman, 1045 15th Avenue South.

B. D. Hegg, 212 6th Street, Sauk Centre.

B. J. Opheim, 718 8th Avenue South.

D. R. Zech, Maple Lake.

St. Paul

K. L. Beseke, 2457 Spruce Place.

G. J. Blockey, 229 Edith Drive.

T. M. Boland, 68 North Cleveland.

L. W. Chester, 2890 West Owasso Boulevard.

D. Conroy, 126 Wood Street.

T. O. DeCorsey, 2244 McMenemy.

M. A. Dexheimer, 518 Charles.

D. J. Drew, 695 79th Street, Minneapolis.

E. J. Ellis, 63 Grove Street.

T. J. Enright, 191 Otis Avenue.

R. D. Greengard, 1026 Bowdoin Street.

S. G. Hansen, 3865 Bellaire Avenue.

D. P. Hollensworth, 322 4th Street.

J. H. Kalkes, 2437 Stewart Avenue.

G. R. Lee, 1487 Maywood.

R. E. Long, 1765 Galtier Street.

F. M. Lucio, 499 Greenwood Avenue.

D. J. Lundgren, 472 East Nevada.

C. J. Magnuson, 706 East Channing Avenue, Fergus Falls.

D. J. Martin, 171–A Bigelow Lane.

P. B. Martinez, 277 Winifred.

S. L. Maxwell III, 882 Carroll Avenue.

J. H. Merck, 1615 Ashland.

G. E. Miller, 365 West Sandhurst Drive.

R. E. Myers, 1010 North Fourth Street, South St. Paul.

C. E. Nightingale, 1485 North Hamline.

M. D. O'Hara, 1911 Ashland Avenue.

G. E. Olson, 704 Park Avenue.

L. F. Poss, 280 Stinson.

H. Redmond, 816 West Central.

J. L. Roberts, Jr., 586 South Fairview.

J. G. Scherman, 5225 Elk Street.

K. E. Schon, 2045 Fremont Avenue.

T. W. Scott, 693 Orleans.

R. G. Simmons, 1662 Elair.

J. P. Smith, 2144 North Ramsey County Line.

N. J. Sullivan, Jr., 615 Ashland Avenue.

D. R. Thuente, 2198 Goodrich Avenue.

D. K. Van Cleave, 754 Lightner.

J. R. Velin, 318 Cook Avenue.

J. D. Von De Linde, 1511 Reaney.

J. D. Younghans, 1729 Blair.

South St. Paul

A. L. Buford, 888 Aurora Avenue.

D. W. Cheyne, 225 Sixth Avenue North.

J. J. Doherty, 1183 West Como Boulevard, St. Paul.

Thief River Falls

J. L. Noel, 702 East Eighth Street.

Virginia

J. A. Fraboni, 412 First Street North.

J. W. Urick, 801 South Fourth Street.

Wayzata

D. L. Chemberlin, Route 3, Box 259, Mound.

Willmar

R. A. Berg, 519 North Seventh.

C. A. Hoglund, Box 125, Spicer.

G. E. Hulstrand, Jr., 325 North Seventh Street.

R. D. Nelson, 624 West Tenth Street.

Worthington

J. C. McNab, Box 285, Brewster.

North Dakota

Bismarck

B. T. Bartholomew, Wilton.

C. R. Cannon, 106 Seventh Avenue NW., Mandan.

S. M. Crawford, Route 1, Box 5B, Mandan.

E. G. Himler, Post Office Box 110.

G. R. Hyland, 810 Sixth Street.

M. R. Ives, Route 1.

B. S. Johnsen, 921 Sixth Street.

R. H. Moncrief, 1013 Lake Avenue.

J. R. Owens, 308 20th Street.

Devils Lake

T. J. Mahoney, 601 Eighth Street.

A. R. Nosbusch, Route 3.

J. H. Shaffer, Route 3.

Dickinson

J. A. Klein, 949 First Street East.

R. T. Lenhardt, 829 Park Avenue.

J. L. Sticka, 115 Fourth Avenue SE.

Fargo

L. R. Bolton, 708 First Avenue South.

R. A. Feder, 1700 South Eighth Street.

A. D. Reyelts, Galchutt.

G. D. Thompson, 1312 North 10th Street.

Grand Forks

B. S. Doutt, 1009 Belmont Road.

N. W. Fleming, 2700 University Avenue.

R. J. Fritz, 2532 Eighth Avenue North.

G. B. Hazen, Jr., 611 North 24th Street.

S. E. Johnson, 107 Walnut Street.

M. D. O'Halloran, 1529 Cherry Street.

R. L. Rolland, 305 North Sixth Street.

R. J. Skaar, 625 Ninth Avenue South.

Jamestown

E. R. Kabanuk, 610 Fourth Street SE.

W. A. MacKenzie, 908 Second Avenue SW.

K. W. Smith, 111 Sixth Avenue SE.

Minot

F. A. Engberg, 214 Fifth Street NW.

J. E. Nybakken, 415 Eleventh Street NW.

T. L. Severson, 417 Hillcrest Drive.

Valley City

D. H. Thompson, 846 Central Avenue North.

Williston

D. M. Scollard, 1616 Second Avenue East.

South Dakota

Aberdeen

D. S. Bittner, 809 North Lincoln.
L. D. Miller, 916 South Lincoln.
T. L. Perrizo, 823 North Lincoln.

Brookings

T. E. Klinkel, 1430 Sixth Street.

Huron

R. H. Gosch, 608 Third Street SW.
J. D. Noonan, Route 2, Frankfort.

Madison

B. D. Olson, 402 Northeast Third Street.

Mitchell

H. C. Alsgaard, 221 West Ninth.
R. J. Colvin, 2202 East First Street.
L. G. Feiler, Route 3.
D. H. Grant, 216 West Fifth Avenue.
U. P. Unzicker, 901 East Second.

Mobridge

M. D. Eichelberg, 321 First Avenue East.

Pierre

W. L. Eldridge, 301 South Fillmore.
W. W. Graves, 102 West Fifth Street.
R. A. Wise, 517 Harney.

Rapid City

G. L. Braunesreither, 130 Cleveland.
J. D. Croes, 731 St. James.
G. L. Jacobson, Jr., 112 St. Charles.
J. D. Schmeling, 820 South Street.

Sioux Falls

W. F. Arnold, 909 North Duluth.
T. P. Dunn, 320 North Summit Avenue.
R. A. Grewe, 711 South Grange Avenue.
R. R. Lien, 2324 Wayland Court.
G. L. Robertson, 1224 West Sioux Street.
D. J. Wallner, 2821 South Center.

Watertown

C. N. Evans, Route No. 4.
P. T. Maloney, 205 Seventh Avenue NW.

Yankton

L. D. Rasmussen, 714 East Canby, Vermillion.

Wisconsin

Appleton

M. L. Gietman, 221 North Mason Street.
H. K. Hilton, 836 Higgins Avenue, Neenah.
M. R. Mullen, 2443 East Wisconsin Avenue.

Beloit

D. P. Bolgenzahn, 852 Moore Street.
J. E. Hallberg, 1929 Forest Avenue.
H. R. Snyder, 1151½ Prairie.
R. H. Weaver, Jr., 944 St. Paul Avenue.

Brookfield

R. S. Miko, 14245 Flora Avenue.

Cudahy

F. W. Marko, 3618 East Martin Avenue.

Eagle River

T. L. Obrodovich, Eagle River.

Eau Claire

D. T. Dexter, 715 Sixth Avenue.
L. D. Kastel, 1787 McKinley Avenue.
M. L. Steil, 203 Bellinger Street.

Edgerton

J. P. Staff, 505 Washington Street.

Fond du Lac

R. A. Fardy, 368 Wilson Avenue.
P. D. Frank, 225 East Ninth Street.
P. J. James, 516 Silver Street.

Green Bay

T. J. Brosteau, 1176 McCormick.
R. L. Farr, 2514 Shawano Avenue.
J. C. Francis, 1156 Bond Street.
G. N. Gerend, Route 1, Greenleaf.
J. C. Gierczak, 1481 Eliza Street.
G. J. Gordon, 304 South Maple.
D. J. Konshak, 1347 Dousman Street.
T. J. Lawler, 810 North Ashland Avenue.
B. J. Leduc, 2857 Circle Shore Drive.
A. R. Pesavento, 750 Heyrman Street.
J. F. Stodola, 626 South Jackson Street.
M. A. West, 1496 Biemeret Street.
J. P. Wieske, 715 South Jefferson.

Greendale

J. M. Dolter, 6055 Oakwood Lane.

Hayward

L. A. White, 608 Minnie Avenue.

Janesville

J. R. Hall, Jr., 1604 Hawthorne Avenue.
T. L. Jacobs, 339 North Academy Street.
D. F. Millard, Jr., 308 North High Street.
R. L. Rowin, 209 Park Lane, Edgerton.

Kenosha

D. A. Gittens, 6709 22d Avenue.
M. J. Hanrahan, 7846 20th Avenue.
M. D. Lindas, 1614 63d Street.
M. J. Zaleski, 920 42d Street.

La Crosse

T. R. Canard, 727 George.
T. L. Christopher, 2123 South 15th Street.
J. M. Coady, 821 Windsor Street.
J. A. Gionali, 1918 Travis.
R. A. Senn, 1706 Badger Street.

Madison

R. G. Barry, 219 North Brooks Street.
G. W. Beytien, 6002 Gallery Court.
R. E. Delaney, 211 Langdon Street.
D. J. Geldernick, 2121 University Avenue.
J. C. Gilchrist, 2002 Madison Street.
J. T. Grand, 206 North Park Street, Apt. 1.
J. D. Klaprat, 117 Bradfort Lane.
W. A. Kutzke, 541 West Doty Street.
T. M. Lillesand, 3733 Ross Street.
R. W. Lincoln, 541 West Doty Street.
P. J. McWilliams, 1819 Helena Street.
J. H. Miles, 1101 Lincoln Street.
R. M. Nuckles, 4005 Hanover Street.
M. J. Philps, 1054 Jenifer Street.
C. J. Price, Route 1, Oregon, Wisconsin.
R. S. Rabinovitz, 426 North Segoe Road.
E. E. Schunk, Y.M.C.A.
K. A. Schwartz, Box 396, Deerfield.
L. F. Sparr, 3922 Plymouth Circle.
D. A. Zick, 1506 Steensland Drive.

Manitowoc

W. R. Becker, 1502 Madison Street.

Marshfield

R. A. Danner, 323 Concord Avenue.
S. P. Kliner, 703 South Apple Avenue.
J. A. Nesser, 300 North Ash Avenue.

Menasha

J. P. Dachelet, 400 First Street.

Menomonie

P. J. Kinney, 1509 Main Street.

Milwaukee

A. J. Alberti, 8908 West Courtland.
G. R. Albright, 7434 West River Bend Drive.
J. S. Bakowski, 4684 North Ironwood Lane.
G. A. Balistreri, Jr., 233 East Montana Street.
J. L. Bestul, 4020 North 66th Street.
T. A. Carr, 1115 Lonetree Road, Elm Grove.
P. H. Casey, 4004 North Farwell.
S. J. Chevalier, 2358 North 45th Street.
D. T. Cieszynski, 2184 South Fourth Street.
J. Clayton, 1439 North Eighteenth Street.
J. P. Clemens, 3232 North 34th Street.
M. L. Cohen, 2663 North 55th Street.
M. R. Corrigan, 9435 Brown Deer Road.
D. J. Daigle, 4852 North 76th Street.
R. H. Erdman, 2248 South Eighteenth Street.
P. D. Gigl, 3425 South 58th Street.
D. Ginter, 7928 West Oklahoma.
P. C. Gnadt, 6626 North 90th Street.
K. W. Gorecki, 1956 West Congress Street.
A. N. Gorski, 2613 North 51st Street.
R. A. Greiten, 1559 South 57th.
P. R. Grabowski, 2216 South Sixteenth Street.
M. M. Hall, 1702 South 53rd Street.
D. L. Kegley, 3436 North Weil Street.
R. F. Kojis, 3400 South Tenth Street.
H. G. Landoff, 2422 North Murray.
J. J. Leininger, 5934 North Bay Bridge Road.
R. C. Lovendahl, 2010 North Hi Mount Boulevard.
R. J. Lutzke, 2506 West Locust Street.
R. L. Michalski, 2101 West Royer.
O. Wells, 1877 North Twelfth Street.
M. G. Brecke, Box 804, Mellen, Wisconsin.
T. O. Bronk, 1234 North Astor Street, No. 9.
J. B. Brown, 2347 North Fourth Street.
M. J. Chojnacki, 3536 West Sunbury Court.
P. K. Cullen, 9035 Jackson Boulevard.
J. C. Czerwinski, 1230 South 34th Street.
D. J. Deda, 4408 West Midland Drive.
T. R. Gierhahn, 705 Elm Avenue.
S. C. Grote, 14722 West Woodland Drive, New Berlin.
R. A. Hanson, 2828 East Van Norman.
S. M. Hackett, 3606 North 92d Street.
E. L. Henderson, 630 West Vliet Street.
J. C. Houge, 610 North Seventeenth Street.
M. D. Lathan, 3232 North Fifteenth Street.
J. E. Leeser, 301 North 67th Street.
R. P. Lesak, 3249 South Eighteenth Street.
T. J. McCarrier, 320 Parkway Drive.
M. G. Malmstadt, 2130 South 81st Street.
P. M. Manders, 1406 South 36th Street.
B. H. Menominee, 1229 South 62d Street.
T. J. Murray, 725 North Thirteenth Street.
W. M. Pyawasay, 3249 South Eighteenth Street.
P. A. Reinelt, 2021 South Sixteenth Street.
E. R. Romaniszek, 2428 South Sixth Street.
G. J. Talsky, 1329 South 56th Street.
T. H. Tollkuehn, 9530 West Loomis Road.
S. J. Werner, 2327 North 38th Street.
K. O. Wieland, 3216 South Griffin Avenue.
F. A. Words, Jr., 3338 North 16th Street.
H. H. Zielinski, 1565 South 74th Street.

Neenah

J. F. Jensen, 620 Sherry Street.
R. R. Johnson, 541 South Commercial Street.
G. E. Wiesner, 407 Isabella Street.

Oconomowoc

G. T. Pritchard, 409 Lake Road.

Oshkosh

T. J. Brooks, 1035 East Black Wolf Point Avenue, Route 2.
S. M. Brownlea, 529 Algoma Boulevard.
T. J. Galica, 2694 Edgewood Lane, Route 4.
W. G. Gehling, 940 Monroe.
R. A. Mehne, 1012 Waugoo Avenue.
R. K. Moore, 734 Frederick Street.
C. R. Rayner, 412A Otter Street.

Portage

P. A. Ellenz, 209 North Street, Madison.
R. A. Ryerson, 1124 Elizabeth Street, Madison.

Racine

D. W. Cashion, 618 Echo Lane.
D. D. Costello, 2026 Michigan Boulevard.
L. M. Cutrell, 1900 Arthur Avenue.
C. H. Grau, 8208 Botting Road, Route 1.
U. Sutka, 1007 Hagerer.

Rhinelander

M. J. Hildebrand, 537 Lake Shore Drive.

Sheboygan

M. F. Christenson, 148 Guilford Street, Sheboygan Falls.
K. Hansen, 310 Center Avenue.
T. C. Jetzer, 1814 North 12th Street.

Spooner

G. N. Rydberg, 616 River Street.

Stevens Point

C. A. Smith, 1126 Clark Street.
R. B. Weronke, 312 Cornell Avenue.

Superior

D. L. Bolk, 89 Norwood Avenue.
W. R. Johnson, 2410 Banks Avenue.

Waukesha

B. W. Luedke, 1017 Belmont Drive.
H. M. Rehbein, Route 3, North Avenue.
D. A. Roteik, 156 Walton Avenue.
T. D. Williams, 406 South Grand Avenue.

Wausau

M. W. Aldrich, 705 Lemke Street.
J. V. Bartelt, Route 2.
T. G. Garske, Route 4, Box 56.
M. J. Halkoski, 3002 West Stewart Avenue.
W. M. Kankelfitz, 506 West Street.
F. M. Leonard, 1520 Franklin Hill.

West Bend

J. J. Wahouske, 1215 Evergreen Street.
D. A. Zimmel, 450 Western Avenue.

Wisconsin Rapids

T. A. Arnold, 141 13th Street North.
D. R. Ross, 510 15th Street South.

NEW YORK REGION

New York

Utica

R. A. Capalupo, Jr., 518 Milgate Street.
R. A. Clark, 1562 Taylor Avenue.
L. A. Degironemo, 928 Rutger Street.
P. F. Domser, 619 Trenton Road.
A. J. Gigliotti, 1643 Conkling Avenue.
P. J. Holehan, 1618 Mohawk Street.
W. I. Hutchinson, 829 Waverly Place.
S. R. Isaac, 465 Larchmont Avenue.
D. L. Kraus, 1512 Dudley Ave.
E. P. Lindell, 1638 Grandview Avenue.
D. D. Martinelli, 1605 Clementian Street.
J. J. Molesky, Box 696, Trauton Road.
A. C. Washington, 107 Seneca Street.
D. G. Whitfield, 1301 Eagle Street.
J. A. Ackerly, 16 Smallwood Place, North White Plains.
M. S. Barnow, 44 North Broadway, White Plains.
P. C. Barton, 59 Richbell Road, White Plains.
R. A. Bertoldi, 2500 Fenton Avenue, Bronx.
E. D. Burak, 45 Lawrence Drive, White Plains.
D. A. Cohen, 3433 Dekalb Avenue, Bronx.
J. J. Cook, Jr., 8 Ethelridge Road, White Plains.
J. H. Finneran, 271 Church Street, White Plains.
R. D. Geraghty, 1755 Jarvis Avenue, Bronx.
S. C. Glover, 40 North Road, White Plains.
J. E. Gold, 13 Herbert Avenue, White Plains.
D. W. Guido, 10 Taft Lane, Ardsley.
O. P. Henry, 100 Sickle Avenue, New Rochelle.
S. J. Henry, 394 South Lexington Avenue, White Plains.
B. C. Hernon, 52 North Broadway, White Plains.
R. L. Johnson, 12 Fairfield Street, White Plains.
R. T. Jones, 414 East 5th Street, Mount Vernon.
G. L. Kesselman, 8 Pilgrim Road, White Plains.
F. N. Kugel, 232 Chatterton Parkway, White Plains.
J. D. Lantier, 84 White Plains Avenue, White Plains.
P. R. Leon, 146 Havilands Lane, White Plains.
M. L. Levin, 25 Fairway, Mount Vernon.
R. L. Livingston, 10 Dennison Street, White Plains.
D. F. Luddy, 58 Gedney Park Drive, White Plains.
B. J. Maclean, 34 Robin Hill Road, Scarsdale.
T. F. Madden, 82 Davis Avenue, White Plains.
R. C. Maxwell, 204 Marting Avenue, White Plains.
D. L McClure, 53 James Street, North White Plains.
J. S. McGovern, 17 Weeks Place, New Rochelle.
T. F. McGrath, 6 Doyer Avenue, White Plains.
D. R. Padnes, 3 Howell Place, Eastchester.
G. W. Peters, 44 Witherbee Avenue, Pelham.
R. F. Peterson, 2053 Allan Avenue, Yorktown Heights.
J. C. Rohrbach, 36 Westview Avenue, White Plains.
C. P. Rosenzweig, 15 Charlotte Street, White Plains.
L. M. Ryan, 15 Doyer Avenue, White Plains.
P. J. Salvo, 239 East Lake Street, White Plains.
H. M. Samis, 131 Soundview Avenue, White Plains.
A. B. Schultz, 755 North Street, White Plains.
R. J. Sokol, 90 Bryant Avenue, White Plains.
N. M. Soriano, 25 Custis Avenue, North White Plains.
B. D. Thomas, 3 Partridge Road, White Plains.
B. M. Vucker, 35 Blackthorn Lane, White Plains.
F. P. Altieri, 27 Florence Street, Yonkers.
D. A. Amend, 84 Ash Street, Yonkers.
H. J. Arnstein, 37 Ridge Street, Crestwood, Yonkers.
J. M. Bayard, 66 Otsego Street, Yonkers.
T. E. Beck, 130 South Broadway, Yonkers.
J. P. Colello, Jr., 200 Valentine Lane, Yonkers.
M. A. Colucci, 2756 Barnes Avenue, New York.
E. C. Cooper, care of W. Kramer, 15 Iroquo, Harrison.
J. A. Dirksen, Eastbourne Alger Court, Bronxville.
W. J. Dougherty, 120 Hampshire Road, Bronxville.
H. A. Engle, 353 Hawthorne Avenue, Yonkers.
F. Fallik, 56 Arthur Place, Yonkers.
K. B. Fisher, 31 Alexander Avenue, Yonkers.
J. E. Foster, Jr., 73 Pleasant Avenue, Tuckahoe.
J. A. Geisner, 55 St. Andrews Place, Yonkers.
A. J. Gottesman, 1670 Metropolitan Avenue, Brox.
S. C. Greenbaum, 17 Ascot Road, Yonkers.
R. P. Hill, 3 Cottage Place, Yonkers.
V. R. Himber, 50 Mill Road, Eastchester.
V. I. Landau, 10 Bayley Avenue, Yonkers.
D. Metviner, 19 Abeel Street, Yonkers.
H. C. Millar, 27 Bayberry Street, Bronxville.
R. I. Miller, 14 Livingstone Avenue, Yonkers.
N. B. Naigus, 29 Abeel Street, Yonkers.
T. M. O'Shea, 8 Rutland Road, Bronxville.
R. Quinones, 324 East 143d Street, Bronx.
P. S. Riger, 75 Bruce Avenue, Yonkers.
S. J. Schwartz, 18 Coyle Place, Yonkers.
D. G. Silverstone, 7 Manor Honuse Drive, Dobbs Ferry.
S. H. Stern, 29 Abeel Street, Yonkers.
D. Toone, Jr., 428 Walnut Street, Yonkers.
B. M. Tunick, 47 Beechwood Terrace, Yonkers.
A. F. Wilson. 487 Park Avenue, Yonkers.
F. F. Bianchi, 62 Knollwood Avenue, Amsterdam.
B. E. Mitchell, 10 Phillips St., Amsterdam.
K. Sabo, 16 Boat Lane, Levittown.
L. J. Werkstell, 878 Bellmore Road, North Bellmore.
G. J. Evans, 606 Liberty Avenue, Endicott.
E. J. Stack, 510 Exchange Avenue, Endicott.
J. C. Vartuli, 922 Hooper Road, Johnson City.
A. E. Baden, 410 B 54 Street, Arverne.
J. M. Beran, 183 Beach 114th Street, Rockaway Park.
B. E. Kurens, 447 Cedarhurst Avenue, Cedarhurst.
J. M. Levy, 348 Beach 13th Street, Far Rockaway.
D. F. Magoolaghan, 44 West 14 Road, Broad Channel.
I. J. Morrow, 415 Beach 47 Street, Far Rockaway.
C. F. Pacetta, 1046 Bay 25th Street, Far Rockaway.
G. Rachlin, 2047 Seagirt Boulevard, Far Rockaway.
L. S. Smoliett, 1132 Brunswick Avenue, Far Rockaway.
N. A. Tafeen, 2422 Bayswater Avenue, Far Rockaway.
W. I. Weinstein, 524 Beach 129th Street, Rockaway Beach.
E. M. Weis, 12607 Rockaway Beach Boulevard, New York.
J. J. Fox, 331 Carnation Avenue, Floral Park.
D. A. Braver, 839 Catalpa Drive, Franklin Square.
K. L. Forbes, 1902 George Court, Merrick.
D. A. Gerber, 1401 Van Nostrand Place, Merrick.
V. S. Glass, 2956 Joyce Lane, Merrick.
R. J. Sweeney, 224 East Seaman Avenue, Freeport.
T. R. Greiner, 9 Burnham Place, Manhasset.
P. P. Gunther, 58 Beacon Hill Road, Port Washington.
J. G. Gurren, 2 Gristmill Lane, Manhasset.
S. M. Kaufman, 92 Carlyle Place, Roslyn Heights.
L. E. Kobrin, 105 Nassau Avenue, Manhasset.
J. T. Mascia, 1 Murray Avenue, Port Washington.
W. C. Allen, 8875 Commonwealth Boulevard, Bellerose.
R. M. Beirne, 260 Garfield Avenue, Mineola.
W. E. Brown, 605 Marcellus Road, Williston Park.
M. P. Calandra, 1341 Pea Pond Road, North Bellmore.
N. E. Colten, 2555 Joel Place, Oceanside.
P. M. Condon, 45 Jerome Avenue, Mineola.
S. B. Dana, 80 Percheron Lane, Roslyn Heights.
J. C. Dow, 49 Taylor Road, Huntington.
F. K. Essenwein, 259 Hill Street, Mineola.
S. M. Feldman, 12 Village Road, Roslyn Heights.
F. X. Fields, Jr., 48 Wyatt Road, Garden City
R. B. Funk, 159 Courthouse Road, Franklin Square.
M. J. Gill, 154 Grant Avenue, Mineola.
G. Graepel, 34 Daley Street, New Hyde Park.
G. D. Hamerman, 13029 235 Street, Rosedale.
R. J. Jeremiah, 197 Brixton Road, Garden City.
D. Malkin, 18 Barberry Lane, Sea Cliff.
J. McCann, 126 Jefferson Avenue, Mineola.
R. W. Nohejl, 135 Dewey Avenue, Albertson.
S. C. Persek, 160 Banbury Road, Mineola.
G. J. Philip, 537 South 13th Street, New Hyde Park.
V. E. Russek, 2 Locust Lane, Roslyn Heights.
S. H. Secofsky, 8419 259th Street, Floral Park.
J. M. Selva, 19 Straford Avenue, Williston Park.
W. E. Shasky, 208 Wellington Road, Mineola.
W. E. Slade, 73 Broadway, West Hempstead.
M. A. Stein, 32 Gordon Drive, Williston Park.
R. B. Webb, Jr., 195 Lafayette Street, Williston Park.
R. Wunderlich, 74 Patton Boulevard, New Hyde Park.
D. J. Ainbinder, 791 Oakleigh Road, Valley Stream.
A. M. Cohen, 1261 Central Avenue, Far Rockaway.
J. L. Fields, 916 Meehan Avenue, Far Rockaway.
B. E. Howard, 10 Lynwood Drive, Valley Stream.
G. J. Leonard, 2811 Whaleneck Drive, Merrick.

J. H. Miller, 189 Rolling Street, Malverne.
R. K. Polish, 432 Marlborough Road, Cedarhurst.
R. Schoenfeld, 245 Pepperidge Road, Hewlett.
P. M. Chierichella, 2170 Dogwood Lane, Westbury.
L. B. Cohen, 20 Pinetree Road, Westbury.
F. E. Dunne, 92 Longfellow Avenue, Westbury.
B. J. Kemler, 4 Woods Lane, Old Westbury.
J. J. Cawley.
J. F. Corrigan.
C. M. Curry, Jr.
T. J. Flanagan.
R. C. Moore, 177 Kings Avenue, Lindenhurst.
T. Taylor.
R. R. Timmers.
T. Bayer, 478 Marie Avenue, Baldwin.
D. J. Forbes, 2095 Milburn Avenue, Baldwin.
L. H. Hillman, 990 Clyde Road, Baldwin.
D. W. Jaeger, 2944 Lindale Street, Wantagh.
A. A. Rabin, 2035 Hendricks Avenue, Bellmore.
E. Sivin, 2569 Merrick Road, Bellmore.
W. F. Brander, 167 Sherman Street, Brentwood.
N. J. Ruisi, 92 Staff Circle, West Brentwood.
J. R. Dimarinis, 966 Windermere Road, Franklin Square.
N. K. Goldwein, 732 Byron Avenue, Franklin Square.
P. Cerasi, Jr., 29 Elm Avenue, Glen Cove.
R. D. Cleland, 53 Vine Road, Larchmont.
T. N. Spitzer, 10 Elm Avenue, Larchmont.
R. Lynch, 411 South Third Street, Lindenhurst.
M. H. Barnett, 25 Marshall Street, Oceanside.
G. F. Charlton, 147 Jefferson Avenue, Island Park.
R. I. Kramer, 222 Madison Avenue, Island Park.
J. K. Popper, 63 Trenton Avenue, East Atlantic Beach.
I. M. Schaeffer, 215 East Chester Street, Long Beach.
P. K. Feldman, 20 Stonewall Lane, Mamaroneck.
W. J. Rooney, 925 Stuart Avenue, Mamaroneck.
A. E. Schwartz, 207 Frank Avenue, Mamaroneck.
A. R. Spirer, 1237 Knickerbocker Avenue, Mamaroneck.
S. J. Warnow, 221 Lawn Terrace, Mamaroneck.
R. L. Wood, 105 Hix Avenue, Rye.
D. B. Allen, Jr., 485 Front Street, Hemstead.
R. G. Atkinson, 301 Fishel Avenue, Riverhead.
B. F. Butler, Jr., Box 217 Coxs Lane, Cutchogue.
J. R. Fioretti, Box 302 Rural Route 1, Wading River.
B. E. Hayes, Hampton Street, Sag Harbor.
T. J. Keenan, 18 Joyce Drive, Riverhead.
C. L. McCaffery, Jr., Box 192 Rural Route 1 Alvahs Lane, Cutchogue.
G. R. Moore, 203 Union Avenue, Riverhead.
R. W. Schulze, Rural Route 1 Wading River Road, Wading River.
Z. Wilinski, 44 Meadow Lane, Riverhead.
J. E. Yakaboski, Jr., 424 Marcy Avenue, Riverhead.
P. W. Ciaralli, 919 Roosevelt Avenue, Rome.
F. F. Dandino, 127 Fourth Street, Rome.
V. J. Oshel, Jr., 1606 Bedford Street, Rome.
A. M. Anderson, 54 Birchwood Lane, Hartsdale.
G. M. Fox, Jr., 26 Barry Road, Scarsdale.
A. Iannuccillo, Jr., 9 Bayard Street, Larchmont.
S. M. McAndrews, 95 Fairmont Avenue, Hastings on Hudson.
J. G. Rechetnick, 121 Highland Road, Scarsdale.
W. J. Sittib, Garth Woods Apartments, Scarsdale.
S. V. Wright, 99 Cushman Road, Scarsdale.
T. J. Curtis, 2095 Beech Street, Wantagh.
J. P. Kilkenny, 1605 Argyle Road, Wantagh.
W. P. Page, 27 South Ketcham Avenue, Amityville.
V. C. Williams, 59 Walnut Street, North Amityville.
D. B. Tarr, 525 Ashferd Avenue, Ardsley.
A. L. Wool, 6 Rose Street, Cedarhurst.
J. Wisniewski, 1113 Namdal Avenue, Bay Shore.
J. R. Selvaggio, Jr., 4 Orchard Place, Harrison.
T. A. Hanley, 24 Raymond Street, Latham.
T. J. Nelson, 59 Sherwood Drive, Nanuet.
H. L. Taplin, 76 Smith Street, Nanuet.
R. P. Rosen, 3 Reservoir Avenue, Northport.
B. K. Bernard, 3705 Locust Avenue, Seaford.
C. R. Edvardsen, 2368 Penatiquit Avenue, Seaford.
J. G. Kampf, 109 Meeting House Lane, Southampton.
R. A. Maresco, 6414 Robinson Avenue, Medford.
W. E. Mahoney, 28 Roe Park, Highland Falls.
M. J. Samuels, 104 Norben Road, Monsey.
T. J. Schoeck, 17 Frost Lane, Amityville.
M. J. Murphy, East Spring Street, Pawling.
J. J. Gabriele, 189 Mohawk Street, Ronkonkoma, Long Island.
P. Dibenedetto, 231 Cambon Avenue, St. James.
C. D. Hendricks, 57 North Kensico Avenue, Valhalla.
F. W. Berliner, 163 East Rockaway Road, Hewlett.
G. J. Rothman, 973 Dartmouth Lane, Woodmere.
A. Orza, 9 North Fifth Street, Holbrook.
R. F. Swed, New Road, Shrub Oak.
P. W. Hassinger, Bulsontown Road, Stony Point.
R. Strassman.
C. R. Hillriegel, Margaretville.
A. A. Weigel, Scarborough Road, Scarborough.

New York City

M. Agran, 2227 Coney Island Avenue, Brooklyn.
R. H. Baker, Jr., 236 East 23d Street, Brooklyn.
P. O. Chomak, 636 Brooklyn Avenue, Brooklyn.
J. E. Cone, 71 80th Street, Brooklyn.
H. A. Eisenberg, 1100 Ocean Avenue, Brooklyn.
H. Elterman, 1510 Ocean Parkway, Brooklyn.
I. S. Epstein, 5014 9th Avenue, Brooklyn.
P. W. Feeney, 770 Ocean Avenue, Brooklyn.
S. I. Flamm, 1622 East 7th Street, Brooklyn.
E. J. Gershon, 125 Brighton 11th Street, Brooklyn.
J. F. Glynn, 14638 230th Street, Rosedale.
H. A. Gutter, 318 Rochester Avenue, Brooklyn.
K. E. Halliburton, 338 Blake Avenue, Brooklyn.
V. G. Ilardi, 155 Blecker Street, Brooklyn.
A. Israel, 640 East 2d Street, Brooklyn.
R. N. Katen, 7204 Colonial Road, Brooklyn.
R. E. Lord, 308 Cumberland Street, Brooklyn.
S. Mandel, 914 Avenue K, Brooklyn.
E. Marchese, 180 Warren Street, Brooklyn.
J. McGivern, 3703 Foster Avenue, Brooklyn.
R. A. Miller, 2183 Brown Street, Brooklyn.
T. C. Newman, 1685 St. Johns Place, Brooklyn.
J. K. Odaly, 410 East 25th Street, Brooklyn.
B. Ratner, 2107 78th Street, Brooklyn.
S. M. Rizzo, 175 Amity Street, Brooklyn.
P. W. Smith, 582 5th Street, Brooklyn.
H. L. Stomel, 122 Ashland Place, New York.
E. E. Tortora, 61–61 Woodhaven Boulevard, Queens.
J. Ameen, 787 East 175th Street.
W. J. Arbuckle, 500 East 77th Street.
J. Arnstein, 80 Merritt Avenue, Cresskill.
J. Bauer, 3112 Bay View Avenue.
P. R. Bell, 1291 Chisholm Street, Bronx.
G. E. Benjamin, 253 West 111th Street.
D. L. Berry, 159 64 Harlem River Drive.
R. Bertin, 4058 Ely Avenue, Bronx.
R. W. Bethea, 121 West 77th Street.
B. Bluestone, 701 West 175th Street.
C. A. Brown, 2400 Webb Avenue.
K. G. Brown, 40 West 135th Street.
J. P. Browne, 2400 Davidson Avenue, Bronx.
M. P. Brunner, 1475 Wythe Place, Bronx.
K. Bulger, 509 West 155th Street.
D. L. Buskin, 158 East 179th Street.
R. Castro, 243 West 15th Street.
R. R. Chapman, 225 West 123d Street.
J. A. Coleman, 2401 Davidson Avenue, Bronx.
H. I. Cooper, 335 East 13th Street.
D. R. Cope, 640 Riverside Drive.
J. S. Coviello, 2417 Bathgate Avenue.
C. A. Cunneen, 101 Post Avenue.
T. R. Dargan, 181 East 2d Street.
A. D. Darvin, 14 Pascack Road, Hillsdale.
J. Deas, 308 West 133d Street.
A. S. Dilley, 58 Brunswick Road, Cedar Grove.
L. Diaz, 500 West 190th Street.
C. A. Dickerson, 2720 Bronx Park East.
L. V. Donovan, 270 Convent Avenue.
R. Douglas, 218 West 116th Street.
R. M. Downey, 2 Stuyvesant Oval.
D. Drossman, 164 32 73d Avenue, Flushing.
K. Duffy, 2725 Marion Avenue.
R. J. Duggan, 666 West 207th Street.
W. A. Duncan, 2 Ellwood Street Apartment 3K.
R. Dunn, 46 Gerard Avenue, New Hyde Park.
W. T. Duran, 400 Riverside Drive.
S. T. Egan, 65 Park Terrace East.
R. Filmore, 455 FDR Drive.
W. M. Finer, 130 Post Avenue.
N. H. Finkler, 530 F Grand Street.
A. Fishel, 1435 Lexington Avenue.
R. M. Florio, 1726 Fowler Avenue.
J. M. Fogle, 250 West 131st Street, Apartment 3C.
G. Forrest, 5 West 131st Street.
R. L. Frankfeldt, 200 Cabrini Boulevard.
J. R. Galler, 11 Stuyvesant Oval.
R. Gardner, 1005 St. Nicholas Avenue.
J. E. Gavin, 91 Park Terrace West.
W. M. Gavin, 5 South Road, Mount Marion.
B. Getzel, 2095 Creston Avenue, Bronx.
M. Ginsberg, 832 Midwood Street, Brooklyn.
S. S. Givens, 1350 Fifth Avenue.
M. R. Grant, Jr., 2195 Seventh Avenue.
J. J. Grennan, 506 Amsterdam Avenue.
H. W. Grotsky, 935 Waring Avenue, Bronx.
F. I. Grunberg, 3283 Benjamin Road, Oceanside.
G. R. Guardarramas, 640 Prospect Avenue.
R. J. Guastella, 69 Fairview Avenue.
K. B. Gubin, 340 East 80th Street.
W. H. Gunn, 45 East 135 Street.
P. E. Gunning, 155 Audubon Avenue.
S. R. Gurka, 118 Avenue D.
D. Guzman, 529 East Sixth Street.
B. E. Hammonds, 157 West 143d Street.
D. F. Hammonds, 25 Street Nicholas Terrace Apartments.
J. W. Hanna, 17 East 89th Street Apartment 13E.
R. J. Hudgins, 509 West 155th Street.
P. Hutchinson, 99 Hillside Avenue.
A. S. Hyman, 2324 Boston Road.
J. Jackson, 157 West 143d Street.
C. Jenkins, 8 Morningside Avenue.
R. C. Johns, 1357 Boston Road, Bronx.
E. Johnson, 250 West 131st Street.
T. J. Johnson, 474 West 150th Street.
H. Y. Jones, 530 West 157th Street.
P. Juresic, 592 Amsterdam Avenue.
A. Kardon, 340 West 28th Street.

M. B. Kelly, 1205 East 224th Street.
F. Kemp, 1370 St. Nicholas Avenue.
D. J. Kennely, 159 Litchfield Avenue, Elmont.
H. G. Kesner, 15715 29th Road, Whitestone.
G. Koenig, 200 East 15th Street.
E. D. Kornhaber, 117 West 197th Street.
H. Korzennik, 621 West 172d Street.
J. Kowal, 333 East 9th Street.
M. Lattimore, 840 Columbus Avenue.
A. J. Lavopa, 2435 Frisby Avenue.
G. Loveless, 304 West 152d Street.
J. R. Majett, 3d, 2784 10th Avenue.
J. A. Malloy, 500 West 159th Street.
S. J. Marrero, 225 East 99th Street.
W. McCants, Jr., 1849 Sedgewick Avenue, Bronx.
I. McCown, 11 Riverside Drive.
J. McDermott, 764 Ninth Avenue.
J. McHugh, 15 Jacobus Place, Bronx.
E. V. McNair, 626 East 179th Street, 3A, Bronx.
O. P. McShane, Jr., 130 West 227 Street.
K. C. Meissner, 636 Glenmore Avenue, Brooklyn.
T. Mercer, 220 West 149th Street.
M. R. Merlis, 80 Seaman Avenue.
R. M. Mintz, 900 West 190th Street.
S. A. Murphy, 238 Fort Washington Avenue.
E. H. Nieves, 147 West 105th Street.
J. H. Paradise, 505 East 79th Street.
K. F. Payne, 1199 East 222d Street, Bronx.
S. Penzell, 3801 Hudson Manor Terrace, Bronx.
A. Perry, 70 East 10 Street.
B. Perry, 1536 President Street, Brooklyn.
R. D. Pirrone, 12 Cedar Road, East Northport.
A. Pizarro, 176 East 103d Street, No. 2C.
H. G. Powell, 870 Columbus Avenue.
J. E. Probst, 220 Cabrini Boulevard.
J. A. Quinones, Jr., 769 Tinton Avenue, apartment 2C.
J. F. Rath, 1541 Metropolitan Avenue, Bronx.
E. J. Riley, 518 Fort Washington Avenue.
R. E. Rencher, 9912 25th Avenue, East Elmhurst.
N. Rios, 1508 Amsterdam Avenue.
P. Rios, 159 East 123d Street.
B. R. Rixson, 559 West 141 Street, apartment No. 3.
A. Roberts, 219 West 145 Street.
S. Rosensweet, 1275 Nelson Avenue, Bronx.
R. O. Ross, 1315 Amsterdam Avenue.
W. B. Rouse, 45 Fairview Avenue.
A. Rowley, Jr., 15 St. James.
A. J. Rupel, 420 East 105 Street, apartment No. 5D.
J. T. Ryan, 1598 Unionport Road, Bronx.
L. A. Sacchitello, 511 East 119 Street.
D. S. Salinsky, 2020 Grand Avenue, Bronx.
J. H. Schwartz, 420 East 51st Street.
O. Scott, Jr., 412 West 147th Street.
E. Serrano, 825 Columbus Avenue.
B. M. Silberstein, 2074 Wallace Avenue, Bronx.
R. H. Sinclair, 302 Convent Avenue.
S. Spector, 95 West 195 Street, Bronx.
I. B. Spindler, 3980 Hillman Avenue, Bronx.
M. Staab, 66 Post Avenue.
P. Stecyk, 194 East 3d Street, apartment No. 1.
L. Stewart, 3d, 591 East 165th Street, apartment No. 2, Bronx.
S. L. Streit, 530D Grand Street.
J. D. Tarpey, 2915 Heath Avenue, Bronx.
R. S. Tonti, 283 East 234th Street, Bronx.
J. Traub, 504B Grand Street.
M. Tuerack, 550J Grand Street.
J. J. Turco, 2737 Marion Avenue, Bronx.
C. E. Ward, 430 West 125 Street, apartment No. 5B.
J. H. Wertheimer, 210 West 101 Street.
R. West, 1664 Park Avenue.
J. Wiesenthal, 21 West 58th Street.
A. R. Willems, 228 Audubon Avenue.
J. Wilner, 264 East Broadway.
M. Wolfe, 255 Cabrini Boulevard.
J. E. Wrice, Jr., 215 East 102d Street.
H. H. Young, 3950 Blackstone Avenue, Bronx.
L. H. Zimmerman, 255 Cabrini Boulevard.
J. T. Zuewski, 111 15 122 Street, South Ozone Park.
W. J. Zwaryczuk, 206 East Sixth Street.

Albany

G. J. Adams, 42 Ten Eyck Avenue.
T. F. Curry, 7 Wendys Path, Loudonville.
M. R. Donovan, 72 Russell Road.
J. D. Fryer, 7 Pinehurst Avenue.
T. J. Horan, 167 Rosemont Street.
J. A. Kenny, 122 Edgecomb Street.
R. A. Moraski, 245 Sheridan Avenue.
T. W. Spinrad, 654 Western Avenue.
D. R. Vanamburgh, 15 Erie Street.

Buffalo

R. D. Blewett III, 385 Faraday Road.
T. A. Bobowicz, 78 Pine Ridge.
C. C. Brown, 66 East Utica Street.
W. C. Bryant, 101 Dodge Street.
L. N. Bystrak, 52 Bissell.
F. J. Chmielewski, 118 Oberlin Street.
J. F. Cleary, 387 Minnesota Avenue.
W. Clemons, 870 Humboldt Parkway.
A. N. Diina, 42 Tacoma Avenue.
M. V. Dropik, 129 Pine Ridge Road.
A. J. Dulski, 50 Peace Street.
G. Graham, Jr., 128 Madison Street.
M. J. Hooven, 281 Oakmont Avenue.
D. P. Hustead, 62 Chapman Parkway.
R. Johnson, 68 Kingsley Street.
J. W. Kissel, 87 Summer Place.
C. R. Maclin, 462 Northland Avenue.
C. J. Marinello, 809 Amherst.
A. R. Maurer, 304 Gold Street.
W. F. McLean III, 342 Middlesex Road.
T. G. Mendola, 775 Richmond Avenue.
J. Miklas, 262 Sumner Place.
D. W. Mullens, 236 East Delavan Avenue.
C. J. Nasca, 853 Prospect Avenue.
D. H. Orlowski, 111 Quincy Street.
D. A. Oved, 560 Grover Cleveland H.
P. A. Piechalak, 43 Weiss Street.
R. S. Roesler, 89 Clark Street.
L. G. Schue, 129 Military Road.
R. T. Semrau, 57 Empire Street.
J. H. Smith, 332 Clifton Parkway.
M. E. Solomons, 330 Huntington Avenue.
W. T. Stachowski, 2030 Clinton Street.
C. J. Szafranski, Jr., 855 Clinton Street.
D. J. Szefel, 687 Riley Street.
A. J. Vincent, 269 Woodside Avenue.
W. J. Walsh, 42 Tuscarora Road.
R. W. Wardenski, 826 Clinton Street.
H. B. Washburn, 35 East Parade Circle.
C. V. Willis, 202 Best Street.
R. P. Wnuk, 88 Rees Street.
D. P. Addis, 8022 210th Street, Hollis.
B. A. Arnow, 21805 73d Avenue, Bayside.
J. J. Assenza, 21204 53d Avenue, Bayside.
F. Auerbach, 6712 164th Street, Flushing.
A. A. Ayvazian, 6148 219th Street, Bayside.
M. J. Bailin, 6435 Yellowstone Boulevard, Forest Hills.
A. Baills, 3603 171st Street, Flushing.
K. A. Banks, 250 East 29th Street, Brooklyn.
J. F. Bartomioli, 6947 Loubet Street, Forest Hills.
R. Belle, 2511 Gilmore Street, East Elmhurst.
F. P. Bennett, 14747 78th Road, Flushing.
R. A. Bennett, 2935 Gillmore Street, East Elmhurst.
R. A. Bernikow, 7012 141st Street, Flushing.
B. S. Bernstein, 1704 201st Street, Bayside.
M. A. Bianco, 695 Degraw Street, Brooklyn.
B. T. Bickerstaff, 2324 100th Street, East Elmhurst.
A. A. Bitterman, 13320 Roosevelt Avenue, Flushing.
J. J. Blaustein, 3150 140th Street, Flushing.
C. L. Bohdan, 16331 26th Avenue, Flushing.
L. D. Bonanni, 3323 143d Street, Flushing.
B. M. Borneman, 3218 157th Street, Flushing.
A. R. Brejensky, 166–64 17th Road, Whitestone.
A. J. Brennan, 9122 50th Avenue, Elmhurst.
R. H. Bressler, 10256 63d Avenue, Forest Hills.
S. G. Bricker, 1509 Bruckner Boulevard, New York.
P. J. Brickfield, 1355 East 57th Street, Brooklyn.
R. L. Brockman, 10240 62d Avenue, Forest Hills.
V. C. Brugess, 6105 Catalpa Avenue, Ridgewood.
G. Buchferer, 1358 Bell Boulevard, Bayside.
R. J. Burns, 14633 61st Road, Flushing.
D. Calliste, 86 Carlton Avenue, Brooklyn.
R. Cantor, 9707 Horace Harding East, Rego Park.
R. J. Cella, 4834 187th Street, Flushing.
J. D. Cerola, 7904 31st Avenue, New York.
D. L. Cherkis, 7480 220th Street, Oakland Gardens.
V. E. Clarke, 281 Bonner Place, New York.
E. F. Coby, 13340 Roosevelt Avenue, New York.
H. S. Cohen, 3246 88th Street, East Elmhurst.
K. M. Connell, 7224 Juno Street, Forest Hills.
P. W. Comerford, 2821 49th Street, Long Island City.
P. E. Connelly, 16427 78th Avenue, Flushing.
R. S. Conovitz, 16906 45th Avenue, Flushing.
P. Conti, Jr., 15014 22d Avenue, Whitestone.
C. E. Cropper, 24–07 202d Street, Bayside.
T. J. Daley, 4732 198th Street, Flushing.
C. A. Damico, 4217 Corp Kennedy Street, Bayside.
J. J. Dimisa, 3525 29th Street, Long Island City.
M. Dorfman, 13720 45th Avenue, Flushing.
C. Downs, 2355 99th Street, East Elmhurst.
H. M. Dubinsky, 5703 253d Street, Douglaston.
A. L. Dudick, 201 West 80th Street, New York.
J. S. Eisenstein, 8542 53d Avenue, Elmhurst.
R. J. Elgart, 3360 21st Street, Long Island City.
P. B. Engel, 3316 153d Street, Flushing.
W. J. Fay, 1425 166th Street, Whitestone.
S. I. Fein, 16212 14th Avenue, Whitestone.
E. L. Ferguson, 10820 36th Avenue, Corona.
J. F. Ferrera, 5920 164th Street, Flushing.
F. S. Ferrara, 1454 76th Street, Brooklyn.
L. Fetta, 21218 43d Avenue, Bayside.
T. E. Finch, 3321 157th St., Flushing.
P. Finkelstein, 5719 Marathon Parkway, New York.
R. J. Fitzgerald, 3727 221st Street, Bayside.
T. J. Forgione, 2337 126th Street, New York.
A. J. Forte, 9222 Corona Avenue, Elmhurst.
C. Fox, 220 Throop Avenue, Brooklyn.
I. H. Fraser, 401 Legion Street, Brooklyn.
D. M. Fried, 3345 90th Street, Jackson Heights.
A. D. Friedheim, 9419 35th Avenue, Jackson Heights.
J. L. Fristachi, 21423 47th Avenue, Bayside.
J. E. Gaffney, 3959 58th Street, Woodside.
J. S. Garitta, 402 Onderdonk Avenue, Ridgewood.
R. S. Garry, 19816 29th Avenue, Flushing.
C. A. Gaynor, 3213, 172d Street, Flushing.
R. M. Gilchrist, 34–59 110th Street, Corona.
R. M. Gilchrist, 3458 110th Street, Corona.
J. P. Gillis, Jr., 1518 145th Place, Whitestone.
M. Goldberg, 10011 67th Road, Forest Hills.
P. Goldberg, 12340 83d Avenue, Kew Gardens.
R. H. Goldberg, 14116 25th Road, Flushing.
W. Goldman, 6601 Burns Street, Forest Hills.
B. S. Goodman, 20920 18th Avenue, Bayside.
L. Gordon, 21002 43d Avenue, Bayside.
G. W. Graham, 6644 74th Street, Middle Village.
R. F. Greco, 14208 Horace Harding, Flushing.
D. I. Greenberg, 4220 Kissena Boulevard, Flushing.

H. E. Greenberg, K4220 Kissena Boulevard, Flushing.

G. S. Gruber, 1526 212th Street, Bayside.

J. J. Gucciardo, 13410 60th Avenue, Flushing.

M. C. Harris, 16420 Highland Avenue, Jamaica.

M. E. Harris, 3520 98th Street, Corona.

J. H. Hart, 8427, 122d Street, Richmond Hill.

G. P. Hartford, 15161 Willet Point Boulevard, Whitestone.

J. G. Heath, 3240 108th Street, East Elmhurst.

W. P. Henderson, 621 Union Avenue, New York.

M. H. Herman, 5020 231st Street, Oakland Gardens.

S. Heurung, 2528 48th Street, Long Island City.

J. M. Hickey, 3525 155th Street, Flushing.

R. Hoffman, 25306 57th Avenue, Little Neck.

D. C. Howell, 3549 98th Street, Corona.

I. Hymson, 9910 60th Avenue, Corona.

A. I. Ingberman, 7515 137th Street, Flushing.

P. J. Inguagiato, 24923 51st Avenue, Little Neck.

A. J. Israel, 3441 78th Street, Jackson Heights.

D. H. Jacobs, 99–63 66th Avenue, Rego Park.

R. E. Jacobsen, 833 50th Street, Brooklyn.

J. M. Jokl, 83 38 Penelope Avenue, Middle Village.

G. T. Jung, 90 39 Corona Avenue, Elmhurst.

J. R. Kaiser, 32 15 169 Street, Flushing.

P. Kaiteris, 14912 Sanford Avenue, Flushing.

A. King, 77 Sullivan Place, Brooklyn.

W. J. Kingsbury, 14230 60th Avenue, Flushing.

M. S. Klein, 670 Adee Avenue, New York.

A. F. Klittnick, 3225 88th Street, East Elmhurst.

R. F. Krauser, 14426 Barclay Avenue, Flushing.

S. A. Krupp, 14308 Roosevelt Avenue, Flushing.

C. Lamorgese, 14238 58th Road, Flushing.

J. G. Landau, 200 Atlantic Avenue, Lynbrook.

J. F. Leahey, 40–45 Elbertson Street, Elmhurst.

J. J. Leahy Jr., 3018 36th Street, Long Island City.

H. I. Levine, 2984 Nostrand Avenue, Brooklyn.

R. M. Levine, 6544 Saunders Street, Rego Park.

S. C. Lewis, 2111 Beekman Place, Brooklyn.

G. M. Linker, 1199 Ocean Avenue, Brooklyn.

J. A. Lipman, 7734 Austin Street, Forest Hills.

W. F. Losquadro, 86 Louisa Street, Brooklyn.

B. Mack, 11420 131st Street, South Ozone Park.

J. S. Makul, 7922 67th Drive, Middle Village.

M. R. Malanga, 3436 88th Street, Jackson Heights.

E. W. Malin, 259 Hollywood Avenue, Douglaston.

A. D. Maillet, 6721 Kissena Boulevard, Flushing.

A. R. Mann, 5324 213th Street, Bayside.

D. J. Manning, 4315 160th Street, Flushing.

H. Margolis, 19643 69th Street, Flushing.

K. C. Massa, 12419 22d Avenue, College Point.

A. P. Matragrano, 7203 6th Avenue, Brooklyn.

L. Q. Matos, 3169 49th Street, Woodside.

R. G. Mehrer, 2616 Union Street, Flushing.

F. Mays, Jr., 3544 99th Street, Corona.

J. Mays, 3544 99th Street, Corona.

J. K. McCaffrey, 11122 43d Avenue, Corona.

J. M. McManus, 541 8th Street, Brooklyn.

J. P. McNeill, 15018 59th Avenue, Flushing.

S. A. Mersky, 6260 99th Street, Rego Park.

A. M. Meyerson, 1450 Jesup Avenue, New York.

C. K. Middlebrooks, 11015 172th Street, Jamaica.

P. Migden, 10023 67th Drive, New York.

F. J. Miller, 24021 Maryland Road, Douglaston.

L. M. Miller, 1560 200th Street, Bayside.

R. B. Miller, 2145 Starling Street, Bronx.

R. L. Miller, 7640 167th Street, Flushing.

S. A. Mills, 3432 110th Street, Corona.

M. Mirabile, 5824 196th Place, Flushing.

R. G. Mooney, 14936 Cherry Avenue, Flushing.

D. J. Mosblech, 11606 14th Avenue, College Point.

R. C. Moscato, 22311 Union Turnpike, Bayside.

H. G. Moskowitz, 2534 Union Street, Flushing.

W. J. Murphy, 376 Roslyn Road, East Williston.

R. J. Nanton, 9602 32d Avenue, E. Elmhurst.

S. D. Navarro, 2813 Avenue P, Brooklyn.

J. T. Neilson, 36 19 217th Street, Bayside.

K. M. Nelson, 160 20 78th Avenue, Flushing.

E. Nissan, 94 10 59th Avenue, Rego Park.

S. F. Norwalk, 144 30 76 Avenue, Flushing.

M. D. O'Connell, 38 Greenway Terrace, Forest Hills.

C. M. Odom, 154 Monroe Street, Brooklyn.

L. R. Ogus, 100 10 67th Road, Forest Hills.

N. A. Olch, 104 40 Queens Boulevard, Forest Hills.

R. Oliver, 114 22 166 Street, Jamaica.

S. L. O'Neill, 154 16 27 Avenue, Flushing.

J. A. Opatowsky, 88–09 Northern Boulevard, Jackson Heights.

R. P. Orne, 58 40 150th Street, Flushing.

M. Othello, 840 Freeman Street, New York.

P. A. Parisi, 143 08 Roosevelt Avenue, Flushing.

L. M. Parver, 9 20 166 Street, Whitestone.

F. E. Peguero, 111 75 41 Avenue, Corona.

A. R. Picarello, 7009 12 Avenue, Brooklyn.

L. J. Pinesick, 160 04 17 Avenue, Whitestone.

F. T. Pizzuro, 196 23 56 Avenue, Flushing.

H. A. Plotkin, 61 31 Little Neck Parkway, Little Neck.

U. Price, Jr., 896 Park Avenue, Apartment 3C, Brooklyn.

A. V. Prisco, 97 20 81st Street, Ozone Park.

C. Prisco, 220 28 67th Avenue, Bayside.

W. E. Raftery, 80–09 35th Avenue, Jackson Heights.

B. S. Rand, 34 11 93d Street, Jackson Heights.

R. E. Reilly, 17 Ruby Street, Elmont.

R. M. Reiter, 39 75 58 Street, Woodside.

R. Rimlinger, 153 28 78th Avenue, Flushing.

D. Rinaldi, 60 17 53d Street, Maspeth.

E. Robinovitz, 205 02 33 Avenue, Bayside.

P. Rock, 32 43 88 Street, Jackson Heights.

I. P. Romaner, 80 35 Springfield Boulevard, Queens Village.

P. Romanella, 209 35 Avenue E, Bayside.

M. Roper, 109 09 Ditmars Boulevard, East Elmhurst.

J. Rosenthal, 53 36 187 Street, Fresh Meadows.

H. J. Ross, 69 35 181 Street, Flushing.

W. L. Ross, 102 30 67th Avenue, Forest Hills.

P. C. Ruebenacker, 63 06 83 Street, Middle Village.

P. M. Samalin, 42 20 Kissena Boulevard, New York.

G. L. Sample, 34 22 105th Street, Corona.

E. J. Samuels, 151 61 20 Road, Whitestone.

R. S. Sarli, 141 North 11th Street, Brooklyn.

I. Scharff, 26 20 141 Street, Flushing.

R. E. Schembor, 77 22 171 Street, Flushing.

L. R. Schenker, 36 23 192 Street, New York.

T. J. Schenker, 36 23 192d Street, New York.

M. Schwed, 141 07 72d Avenue, Flushing.

F. A. Schultz, 46 09 194 Street, Flushing.

J. H. Schutzer, 147–25 76th Road, Flushing.

S. D. Schwartz, 67 71 Yellowstone Boulevard, Forest Hills.

P. M. Schwartz, 34 58 90 Street, Jackson Heights.

R. J. Schwartz, 55 30 99th Street, Rego Park.

R. A. Siegel, 21202 16th Avenue, New York.

T. J. Sharko, 35–33 204th Street, Bayside.

N. Sheinwold, 18230 Wexford Terrace, Jamaica.

E. J. Siegeltuch, 6770 Austin Street, Forest Hills.

J. M. Sigmund, 13815 Franklin Avenue, Flushing.

E. D. Singer, 16005 16th Avenue, Whitestone.

N. L. Smith, 2702 Humphrey Street, East Elmhurst.

W. A. Smith, 8706 55th Road, Elmhurst.

M. S. Solomon, 14910 61st Road, Flushing.

T. J. Somma, 177 Troutman Street, Brooklyn.

J. F. Spar, 6739 152d Street, Flushing.

G. M. Spring, 1567 201st Street, Bayside.

R. G. Springer, 3760 88th Street, Jackson Heights.

J. F. Stanton, 3432 Corporal Ken Street, Bayside.

M. E. Steiger, 2619 141st Street, New York.

V. M. Sternberg, 5444 Little Neck Park, Little Neck.

A. H. Sterenbuch, 137–75 Geranium Avenue, Flushing.

G. C. Stills, 3223 108th Street, East Elmhurst.

R. M. Strizver, 3619 Bowne Street, Flushing.

J. C. Sullivan, 4248 65th Street, Woodside.

R. L. Sullivan, 22428 Edmore Avenue, Queens Village.

J. K. Syze, 357 Hollywood Avenue, Douglaston.

J. G. Tarulli, 19108 39th Avenue, Flushing.

P. J. Terranova, 7153 Loubet Street, Forest Hills.

R. Thatcher, 4118 68th Street, Woodside.

G. E. Titus, 25648 Upland Road, Great Neck.

S. J. Turkel, 14425 Roosevelt Avenue, Flushing.

T. G. Venet, 6540 172d Street, Flushing.

M. Walker, 402 Nostrand Avenue, Brooklyn.

L. Wallach, 20003 48th Avenue, Bayside.

V. T. Wargelin, 15319 32d Avenue, Flushing.

F. R. Weber, 6514 Parsons Boulevard, Flushing.

I. S. Weinerman, 5833 150th Street, Flushing.

B. Williams, 15039 119th Avenue, Jamaica.

C. J. Williams, 10421 200th Street, Hollis.

W. A. Winterbottom, 2945 215th Place, Bayside.

D. M. Witlin, 59 Pineapple Street, Brooklyn.

S. H. Yager, 2220 Leighton Road, Elmont.

N. Yarbrough, 3801 104th Street, Corona.

T. Yip, 2049 23d Street, Long Island City.

G. M. Zatzkin, 16625 Powells Cove Boulevard, Beechhurst.

B. M. Zimmerman, 5016 31st Avenue, Woodside.

H. M. Zinser, 4213 177th Street, Elmhurst.

J. L. Connelly, 48 Magnolia Avenue, Garden City.

P. W. Michelsen, 19 Roosevelt Street, Garden City.

G. N. Palange, 115 Brook Street, Garden City.

W. R. White, 57 Harvard Street, Garden City.

J. L. Barber, 116 20 146 Street, Jamaica.

A. I. Barnett, 17 Van Siclen Avenue, New York.

R. F. Barney, 33 46 103 Corona, New York.

D. M. Berg, 69 26 Fleet St., Forest Hills.

R. Billups, 208 05 109th Avenue, Jamaica.

R. B. Bradshaw, 202 07 109 Avenue, Jamaica.

M. O. Brown, 107 16 Watson Place, Jamaica.

T. L. Brown, 1107 Aberdeen Road, Hampton.

A. N. Buonpastore, 158 25 83d Street, Howard Beach.

R. N. Buonpastore, 158 25 83d Street, Howard Beach.

P. A. Byrnes, 104 20 200th Street, St. Albans.

J. L. Carra, 232 14 Mentone Avenue, Laurelton.

B. A. Cassidy, 121 66 236th Street, Rosedale.

J. M. Chapuis, 65 28 174th Street, Flushing.

A. G. Cherry, 103 23 177th Street, Jamaica.

T. A. Chin, 109 13 213th St., New York.

E. P. Cinicola, Jr., 10403 103d Avenue, Ozone Park.

R. Clark, 115 40 146 Street, Jamaica.

R. B. Clay, 120 60 200th Street, St. Albans.

P. B. Cohen, 183 18 Dalny Road, Jamaica.

E. B. Coleman, 177 24 105th Avenue, Jamaica.

T. M. Coleman, 108 Stafford Street Southwest, Atlanta.

E. F. Collins, 183 52 Babylon Avenue, New York.

M. A. Colton, 20 Belver Drive, Bohemia.

J. T. Comer, 222 B 120th Street, Belle Harbor.

R. J. Conklin, 132 19 86th Street, Ozone Park.

R. N. Cookler, 220 55 46th Avenue, Bayside.

M. J. Corrigan, 35 24 72th Street, Jackson Heights.

A. L. Dambrosio, 84 20 133d Avenue, Ozone Park.

M. P. Denigris, 1637 Crosby Avenue, Bronx.

L. A. Desena, 92 04 107th Avenue, Ozone Park.

R. S. Diller, 139 39 224th, New York.

F. A. Douglas, 1390 Fifth Avenue, New York.

J. H. Edwards, 2101 Madison Avenue, New York.

R. J. Falkenstein, 38 15 149th Street, Flushing.

L. J. Feher, 99 10 208th Street, Bellaire.

G. A. Foley, 62 74 Austin Street, Rego Park.

T. Ford, 22 52 99th Street, East Elmhurst.

W. M. Freeman, 2101 Madison Avenue, AP, New York.

T. P. Furnari, 129 39 135th Street, South Ozone Park.

J. J. Gisondo, 85 18 88th Avenue, Woodhaven.

B. S. Gluckin, 220 08 Stronghurst Avenue, Queens Village.

M. R. Goldstein, 87 40 Francis Lewis Boulevard, Hollis.

H. Goodfriend, 90 20 175th Street, Jamaica.

J. F. Grandinetti, 8021 15th Avenue, Brooklyn.

B. M. Gubersky, 183 Wortman Avenue, Apartment 12, Brooklyn.

E. J. Harris, 110 06 Colfax Street, Queens Village.

C. S. Haye, 114 24 179th Street, St. Albans.

D. B. Heller, 200 East 27th Street, New York.

G. E. Hickman, 77 46 79th Street, Glendale.

J. Hinkley, 457 52 Street, Brooklyn.

W. J. Hubbard, 114 60 180th Street, St. Albans.

D. L. Huff, 60 East 135th Street, New York.

D. J. Hutchins, 10734 159th Street, Jamaica.

C. M. Jackson, 20415 109th Avenue, Hollis.

T. E. Jackson, 11040 168th Street, Jamaica.

W. L. Jackson, 1744 Watson Avenue, Apartment 1C, Bronx.

J. R. Jankowski, 8945 Springfield Boulevard, Queens Village.

R. J. Janssen, 8464 252 Street, Bellerose.

F. A. Jarmuth, 230 West 79th Street, New York.

S. R. Johnson, 17546 Murdock Avenue, St. Albans.

T. W. Jones, 19915 120th Avenue, St. Albans.

A. Karp, 14724 72d Drive, Flushing.

J. R. Karteron, 11618 169th Street, Jamaica.

J. A. Kaspar, 97 Saint Regis Drive, Massapequa Park.

R. B. Katz, 19325 Keno Avenue, New York.

L. Kearse, 15518 114th Road, Jamaica.

R. L. Konigsberg, 24925 147th Road, Rosedale.

S. I. Krich, 8726 95th Street, Woodhaven.

S. J. Krouse, 1616 43d Street, Brooklyn.

S. Krug, 13220 Merrick Boulevard, Jamaica.

J. C. Langone, 24111 Mayda Road, Rosedale.

D. M. Langsam, 190 East 17th Street, Brooklyn.

G. S. Lindell, 22610 88th Avenue, New York.

D. M. Maddox, 10715 Ludlum Avenue, Hollis.

H. B. Marley, 18702 104th Avenue, St Albans.

K. E. McMillan, 18721 Tioga Drive, St. Albans.

M. Meister, 453 FDR Drive, New York.

A. S. Miller, 10709 Ridgedale Street, Springfield Gardens.

D. E. Mills, 10739 159th Street, Jamaica.

H. R. Mills, 60 East 135th Street, New York.

J. Natoli, 1156 62d Street, Brooklyn.

A. W. Otterman, 16433 Grand Central Parkway, Jamaica.

C. J. Palmer, 19412 109th Avenue, New York.

O. Palmer 3d, 19412 109th Avenue, Hollis.

R. J. Petersen, 222 Sullivan Place, Brooklyn.

M. A. Polan, 1225 Ocean Parkway, Brooklyn.

M. Ray, 19078 Foch Boulevard, Jamaica.

C. Reed, Jr., 10910 160th Street, Jamaica.

R. M. Reid, 19819 118th Avenue, St. Albans.

J. M. Reitman, 24633 54th Avenue, Douglaston.

M. G. Ribarich, 7507 Pitkin Avenue, Jamaica.

M. J. Richman, 1415 St. Johns Place, Brooklyn.

R. N. Roberston 10205 183d Place, Hollis.

A. J. Rosenberg, 9905 63d Drive, Rego Park.

P. M. Rothstein, 23 Landau Avenue, Elmont.

G. V. Rubsam, 9745 75th Street, Ozone Park.

C. M. Ruggiero, 192 Franklin Avenue, Malverne.

J. W. Schein, 1820 Loring Place, New York.

M. R. Sheehy, 25431 84th Road, Floral Park.

G. P. Siracusa, 8732 114th Street, Richmond Hill.

E. A. Smith, 11539 201st Street, St. Albans.

K. L. Sobsey, 60 Turner Place, Brooklyn.

H. Solomon, 16844 127th Avenue, Jamaica.

P. B. Solomon.

J. F. Stana, 9141 91st Street, Woodhaven.

S. E. Steiner, 227 23 88th Avenue, New York.

L. C. Stewart, Jr., 187 31 Sullivan Road, St. Albans.

K. H. Suggs, 112 01 208 Street, Jamaica.

F. T. Swanston, Jr., 168 34 127th Avenue, New York.

G. L. Tate, 205 39 100th Avenue, Hollis.

G. L. Thompson, 111 29 179 Street, Jamaica.

C. T. Thompson, 191 03 William Avenue, Springfield Gardens.

J. A. Thompson, 111 29 179 Street, St. Albans.

L. A. Torres, 102 35 Remington Street, Jamaica.

F. Turnofsky, 5975 Shore Parkway, Brooklyn.

P. D. Ulrich, 151 02 84 Drive, Jamaica.

S. D. Vallen, 85 25 120th Street, Kew Gardens.

J. P. Varachi, 2105 Burr Avenue, New York.

E. A. Wachtel, 91 27 109 Street, New York.

T. Wachter, 72 35 66 Place, Glendale.

K. R. Washington, 123 32 146th Street, Jamaica.

A. R. Waymon, care of Fell 41 East 131 Street, New York.

F. J. Weinrauch, 145 76 225 Street, Rosedale.

T. C. Williams, 188 12 Ludlum Avenue, Hollis.

K. B. Wint, 71 Winthrop Street, Brooklyn.

S. B. Zeldin, 130 05 226 Street, Laurelton.

B. L. Chall, 33 34 Crescent Street, Long Island City.

T. A. Cotter 41 20 47 Street, New York.

M. R. Curcio, 20 31 31 Street, Long Island City.

M. L. Cusack, 20 70 46 Street, Long Island City.

R. Goon, 34 15 12 Street, Long Island City.

R. W. Gorski, 51–01 39 Avenue, Long Island City.

C. M. Gussin, 41 16 25 Avenue, Long Island City.

W. J. Krahe, 32 56 36 Street, Long Island City.

R. W. Kweit, 34 04 30 Street, Long Island City.

A. L. Mondello, 47 09 21 Avenue, Long Island City.

P. W. Neubert, 42 05 31 Avenue, Long Island City.

S. A. Reisman, 36 05 29 Street, Long Island City.

J. F. Scavetta, 34 22 28 Street, Long Island City.

P. J. Titolo, 32 40 32 Street, Long Island City.

J. N. McGroarty, 2262 Amsterdam Avenue, New York.

J. D. Salzman, 2 Fisher Drive, Mount Vernon.

H. M. Silver, 42 Sheridan Avenue, Mount Vernon.

Rochester

J. N. Abbott, 108 Crosman Terrace.

A. A. Baskin, 50 Sullivan Street.

T. P. Bowlan, 543 Pine Grove Avenue.

J. B. Carey, 102 Harper Street.

D. R. Giunta, 47 Karnes Street.

A. Godfrey, 49 Arnett Boulevard.

E. R. Heidt, 11 Borchard Street.

W. Johnson, 16 Jefferson.

R. M. Leary, 415 Flint Street.

G. F. Mack, 178 Grafton Street.

P. E. McGovern, 21 Highview Trail.

P. H. McJilton, 383 Wimbledon Road.

D. D. McNamara, 910 Highland Avenue.

C. D. Nielsen, 36 Sandymount Drive.

I. B. Phillips, 54 Brooklawn Drive.

S. T. Prawdzik, 39 St. Casimir Street.

B. J. Prestianni, 92 Highland Avenue.

T. J. Samway, 111 Leonard Road.

S. F. Sayre, 45 Rogers Parkway.

M. A. Schalk, 159 Ledgerock Lane.

S. L. Schrader, 238 W. Filbert Street.

J. W. Scott, 25 Glasgow Street.

F. F. Velte, 114 Dunn Street.

Syracuse

D. F. Atlas, 200 Hillsboro Parkway.

W. Bell, 105 Elk Street.

B. Benderson, 301 Hurlburt Road.

P. J. Brown, 707 Willis Avenue.

R. M. Carroll, 325 Bryant Avenue.

R. J. Cavallaro, 223 Mosley Drive.

J. E. Hayes, New Court Avenue.

J. H. Howard, Jr., 120 Kimber Avenue.

P. A. Indivero, 102 Valentine Drive.

P. Italiano, 147 East Onondaga.

T. E. Mancini, 701 East Molloy Road.

J. F. Miller, 212 Dixon Drive.

R. C. Schlegel, 307 Loma Avenue.

T. Storto, 107 East Raynor Avenue.

M. L. Taber, 420 Hixson Avenue.

M. J. Vaccaro, 225 Grumbach Avenue.

L. R. Griffin, 243 College Avenue, Elmira Heights.

K. A. Friedman, 5 Kings Place, Great Neck.

N. Koppelson, 15 Kings Place, Great Neck.

M. B. Marvin, 752 Palmetto Drive, Franklin Square.

A. Napoleon, Jr., 109 Carl Avenue, Franklin Square.

W. E. Heath, 56 Harts Avenue, Roosevelt.

G. W. Heinlein, 2 Vanata Court, Hempstead.

R. J. Koch, 827 Henry Street, Uniondale.

M. J. Kolbrenner, 89 Bud Lane, Levittown.

E. L. McKee, 550 Bedell Terrace, West Hempstead.

J. V. Miracola, 14 Talmadge Drive, Baldwin.

J. J. Mulvaney, 6 Nostrand Place, Hempstead.

M. J. Nissenbaum, 565 Harrison Avenue, East Meadow.

E. J. Odom, 144 Underhill Avenue, Roosevelt.

R. J. Ried, 2020 Central Drive North, East Meadow.

J. M. Achtziger, Jr., 65 Burton Avenue, Plainview.

M. V. Achtziger, 65 Burton Avenue, Plainview.

P. H. Anselmo, 14 Maglie Drive, Hicksville.

L. J. Azzara, 620 Milligan Lane, West Islip.

J. A. Baldwin, 67 East End, Hicksville.

R. Bauman, 824 Plumtree Road East, Westbury.

R. A. Becker, 313 North Virginia Avenue, North Massapequa.

A. A. Bell, 72 Main Parkway, Plainview.

R. M. Blachman, 1450 Eric Lane, East Meadow.

W. B. Bosch, 342 Nicholai Street, Hicksville.

R. L. Bothun, 87 Green Lane, Levittown.

R. A. Bourke, 57 Timber Lane, Levittown.

E. J. Brennan, 224 Jerusalem Avenue, Hicksville.

R. D. Briell, 2 Dairy Lane, Hicksville.

L. K. Burnell, 23 Forest Drive, Plainview.

L. F. Candito, 65 Bernard Street, Farmingdale.

F. Capone, 9 Acorn Lane, Plainview.

R. F. Case, 85 North Oak Street, North Massapequa.

P. D. Cohen, 54 Jacqueline Road, North Massapequa.

R. M. Colman, 8 Helen Avenue, Plainview.

D. G. Cook, 93 Arbour Street, West Islip.

M. A. Coppola, 264 North Boston Avenue, North Massapequa.

T. W. Cranmer, 15 Edward Avenue, Hicksville.

J. B. Cundelan, 313 Richmond Avenue, Massapequa.

R. J. Dackow, 59 Autumn Lane, Hicksville.

A. T. Damico, 20 Sunnyfield Road, Hicksville.

C. H. Davenport, 51 Meander Lane, Levittown.

J. M. Davis, 56 Crescent Lane, Levittown.

M. E. Dedomenico, 50 April Lane, Hicksville.

R. L. Deleonardis, 15 Maxine Avenue, Plainview.

W. H. Demarest, III, 7605 267th Street, New Hyde Park.

P. J. Docherty, 20 Thrush Lane, Levittown.

R. A. Doman, 278 Division Avenue, Hicksville.

V. J. Donela, 5 Maple Street, Greenvale.

J. M. Donoghue, 30 Hardy Lane, Westbury.

S. M. Dostis, 44 Rockland Drive, Jericho.

W. Ducker, 96 Greenbelt Lane, Levittown.

D. A. Dukoff, 41 Riviera Drive South, Massapequa.

B. S. Duncan, 73 East Street, Hicksville.

S. E. Dushnick, 31 Maple Place, Hicksville.

J. A. Eder, 81 Virginia Avenue, Plainview.

F. V. Eidmann, Jr., 107 Elm Drive, Levittown.

R. Enslein, 36 Hollywood Drive, Plainview.

W. R. Ewald, 6 Orlando Street, Massapequa.

L. S. Factor, 85 Elm Drive, Levittown.

G. J. Farber, 17 Maxine Avenue, Plainview.

W. E. Farrow, Jr., 22 Preston Lane, Hicksville.

R. C. Fein, 87 Lincoln Road South, Plainview.

R. G. Fero, 33 Oxford Road, Plainview.

J. L. Fink, 51 Pasadena Drive, Plainview.

G. F. Fox, 36 Cedar Street, Hicksville.

J. R. Fromer, 95 Nassau Avenue, Plainview.

M. L. Gagne, 4 Venetian Boulevard, Lindenhurst.

M. D. Geller, 1372 Oakfield Avenue, Wantagh.

K. R. Gentile, 5 Felms Court, Bethpage.

L. R. Gerber, 145 Grace Street, Plainview.

C. J. Geveda, Jr.

J. D. Giardina, 64 Cedar Street, Hicksville.

M. N. Gimbel, 61 Helen Avenue, Plainview.

J. M. Glickstein, 1489 Prospect Avenue, East Meadow.

F. B. Gold, 34 Comet Lane, Levittown.

L. G. Goldberg, 32 Lincrest Street, Syosset.

M. P. Grady, 287 Linden Street, Massapequa Park.

W. E. Haynes, Jr., 33 Jamaica Avenue, Plainview.

R. F. Healey, 36 Wishing Lane, Hicksville.

D. H. Heberer, 25 Twinlawn Avenue, Hicksville.

S. M. Hesekiel, 2959 Jerusalem Avenue, Wantagh.

J. J. Hood, 210 Plainview Road, Hicksville.

R. J. Hoops, 114 Cambridge Drive, Hicksville.

T. J. Hough, 40 Diamond Drive, Plainview.

F. M. Hudak, 29 Boblee Lane, Hicksville.

J. T. Judge, 2 Lawn Place, Hicksville.

M. A. Katz.

S. J. Katz, 10 Petal Lane, Hicksville.

P. W. Keelin, 3430 Bunker Avenue, Wantagh.

D. P. Kibbe, 368 South Kilburn Road, Garden City.

N. S. Kleinstein, 447 Briar Lane, Wantagh.

T. H. Koch, 533 Ocean Avenue, Massapequa.

E. T. Kondracke, 176 Ohio Street, Hicksville.

D. E. Korn, 8998 219th Street, Queens Village.

A. Krieger, 9 Martin Lane, Old Bethpage.

A. P. Laskin, 269 North Wisconsin Avenue, North Massapequa.

L. B. Lenetsky, 38 April Lane, Hicksville.

W. F. Love, 38 Bloomingdale Road, Hicksville.

S. R. Lowenthal, 50 Elliott Drive, Hicksville.

G. P. Maguire, 21 Terrace Place, Hicksville.

P. A. Mann, 12 Terry Lane, Plainview.

P. M. Masone, 74 Bruce Avenue, Hicksville.

J. C. Mauro, 3417 Demott, Wantagh.

R. J. McHenry, 54 Chaflin Boulevard, Franklin Square.

P. J. Meed, 7 Robin Court, Bethpage.

R. H. Nadrich, 20 Springtime Lane, Levittown.

S. A. Nash, 99 Greenbelt Lane, Levittown.

A. R. Nave, 35 Arch Lane, Hicksville.

I. J. Negrin, 803 North Delaware Avenue, Lindenhurst.

D. A. Ness, 16 Silversmith Lane, Levittown.

P. A. Oddo, 230 North Hawthorne Street, North Massapequa.

G. Oreilly, 87 Green Lane, Levittown.

R. M. Oxhandler, 29 Hardy Lane, Westbury.

J. V. Patwell, 154 East Avenue, Hicksville.

J. E. Pavlakis, 8 Booth Lane, Levittown.

W. D. Pescod, 1426 Britton Street, Wantagh.

R. M. Pine, 448 Mansfield Avenue, Levittown.

E. S. Pirreca, 14 Forte Avenue, Old Bethpage.

A. R. Polanski, 22 Thimble Lane, Hicksville.

J. P. Prible, 28 Abbey Lane, Plainview.

D. Pruce, 16 Arrow Lane, Hicksville.

H. S. Rabinowitz, 3729 Sandra Court, Wantagh.

P. Rasmussen, 7 Irving Place, Massapequa.

S. Reiss, 116 Sutton Drive, Plainview.

S. L. Rosenbaum, 9 Patricia Lane, Syosset.

A. H. Rothstein, 40 Netto Lane, Plainview.

D. T. Ryan, 87 Rim Lane, Hicksville.

R. M. Sales, 60 Barry Lane East, Old Bethpage.

C. J. Saltz, 43 Lincoln Road, Plainview.

J. S. Sarno, 108 Woodbury Road, Hicksville.

R. Schiavone, 41 Cambridge Drive, Hicksville.

K. J. Schwartz, 44 Marilyn Boulevard, Plainview.

J. N. Senyszyn, 9 Timberline Road, Huntington.

M. Shafran, 9 Kalman Court, Plainview.

L. M. Shapiro, 14 Greenvale Lane, Syosset.

D. R. Shor, 4 Helen Avenue, Plainview.

M. P. Siegel, 240 North Boston Avenue, North Massapequa.

R. S. Siegel, 1022 Cedar Drive East, New Hyde Park.

M. Slauenwhite, 61 Timerpoint Road, East Islip.

R. M. Smith, 10 Lawrence Street, Hicksville.

G. A. Smyth, 12 Primrose Avenue, Hicksville.

A. D. Soberman, 28 Saratoga Drive, Jericho.

R. W. Steine, 12 Grace Lane, Levittown.

R. J. Stutzbach, 169 Morton Boulevard, Plainview.

W. Stutzel, 14 Cynthia Lane, Plainview.

R. Tabachnick, 60 Dante Avenue, Hicksville.

W. Tabachnick, 60 Dante Avenue, Hicksville.

R. Terdeman, 3 Linda Lane, Plainview.

M. R. Terrone, 28 Chapel Lane, Levittown.

J. A. Tilelli.

S. E. Tisman, 37 Peachtree Lane, Hicksville.

T. M. Walsh, 68 School House Road, Plainview.

R. J. Young, 16 Old Farm Road, Levittown.

B. M. Zimmerman, 44 Church Road, Levittown.

E. C. Kline, 68 Seventh Street, New Hyde Park.

W. A. Breitbart, 55 Sunnyside Way, New Rochelle.

P. D. Letterese, 347 Summit Avenue, Mount Vernon.

G. C. Diloreto, 69 Croton Avenue, Ossining.

E. T. Dooley, 17 Lincoln Avenue, Pleasantville.

H. E. Lindsay, 135 Oak Ridge Road, Pleasantville.

R. J. Nofi, 2 Durbyan Street, Port Washington.

E. J. Oexner, 31 Linwood Road South, Port Washington.

D. J. Shapiro, Sycamore Drive, Port Washington.

E. S. Turbyfill, 30 Spruce Street, Great Neck.

D. G. Vail, 19 Beachway, Port Washington.

A. V. Caccomo, 7 Crestwood Boulevard, Poughkeepsie.

R. B. Dietz, 38 Parkwood Boulevard, Poughkeepsie.

R. W. Dixon, 105 Garden Street, Poughkeepsie.

J. R. Frye, 189 North Hamilton Street, Poughkeepsie.

F. A. Glenn III, Clover Hill Road, Poughkeepsie.

N. M. Gottesman, 51 Brand Avenue, Poughkeepsie.

V. Honczar, 7561 Oriskany Road, Rome.

W. F. Mincey, 143 Union Street, Poughkeepsie.

H. Murphy, Jr., 155 Main Street, Poughkeepsie.

J. L. Murphy, 155 Main Street, Poughkeepsie.

J. R. Otto, 6 Wasson Drive, Poughkeepsie.

C. A. Rathkopf, Jr., Poughquag.

D. L. Rumsey, Jr., 2816 Fillmore, El Paso.

W. B. Russell, 4112 Memphis Avenue, El Paso.

J. S. Schwartz, 28 Manitov Avenue, Poughkeepsie.

R. P. Watkins, 25 Main Street, Pawling.

N. G. Cachianes, 3443 Knight Street, Oceanside.

R. M. Slam, 671 North Village Avenue, Rockville Centre.

J. M. Bennett, 2049 Caldecott Road, Schenectady.

G. E. Male, R.D. 2, Rexford.

G. McGarrahan, 71 Linden Street, Schenectady.

K. L. Wozniak, 202 South Holmes Street, Scotia.

Staten Island

G. W. Allen, 250 Corson Avenue.

J. T. Baker, 74 Wayne Place.

R. Battista, Jr., 22 Sanders Street.

G. E. Braadt, 124 Ridgecrest Avenue.
R. J. Burke, 439 Hunter Avenue.
R. H. Crowe, Jr., 16 Wakefield Road.
W. M. Curley, 230 Elm Street.
T. D. Curry, 62 Grand Avenue.
A. J. Devito, 151 Overlook Avenue.
J. J. Digiovanni, 72 Forest Road.
L. F. Dipietro, 209 Foch Avenue.
K. M. Dugan, 45 Ravenhurst Avenue.
R. A. Fama, 256 Van Pelt Avenue.
W. H. Farley, 191 Raymond Place.
J. A. Frank, 42 DeKay Street.
G. D. Ganey, 226 Baden Place.
P. M. Giambardella, 173 Harrison Place.
J. Hicks, 283 St. Mary's Avenue.
G. E. Hurley, 205 St. Marks Place.
G. A. Iafe, 393 Seaview Avenue.
M. J. Keegan, 277 Great Kills Road.
A. J. Laurie, 30 Hawthorne Avenue.
M. A. Mazella, Jr., 408 Seaview Avenue.
D. J. Naiman, 171 Colifield Avenue.
T. M. O'Neill, 364 Van Duzer Street.
H. Rabinowitz, 215 Hart Boulevard.
G. A. Reinhold, 39 Willow Pond Road.
A. V. Rizzo, 23 Lansing Street.
J. W. Rowan, 46 Pelton Avenue.
M. J. Scamardella, 155 Seneca Avenue.
J. M. Scandaglia, 15 Penn Avenue.
J. E. Smith, 974 Post Avenue.
J. H. Stanley, 71 McClean Avenue.
V. C. Tropeano, 171 Cannon Boulevard.

PHILADELPHIA REGION

Delaware

J. T. Bailey, 609 Fairview Avenue, Dover.
J. C. Crossley, 111 Rodney Road, Dover.
B. R. Fry, Shaw Avenue, Harrington.
C. D. Hyatt, 1622 South State Street, Dover.
N. F. Dufendach, care of Postmaster, Houston.
J. A. Brown, Sea Air Mobile City, Rehoboth Beach.
D. S. Shockley, Bay Road, R.D. 1, Rehoboth Beach.
D. M. Harris, care of Postmaster, St. Georges.
J. J. Bird, 1709 Delaware Avenue.

Wilmington

J. W. Dorsey, 1031 West 7th Street.
S. A. Ficca, 4917 Lancaster Pike
G. R. Harrison, Jr., 109 South Road, Lindamere.
K. H. Potts, Jr., 4921 Lancaster Pike.
R. L. Russell, 312 Spalding Road.
C. L. Simmons, 45 North Stuyvesant Drive.
J. L. Thomas, 2722 North Pine Street.
R. C. Ward, 107 Dickinson Lane.

New Jersey

J. H. Cleary, 7 Vreeland Avenue, Allendale.
P. R. Copple, 206 North Brighton Avenue, Atlantic City.
P. R. Damato, 30 North Haverford Avenue. Margate City.
R. J. Fichera, 8084 Michener Avenue, Philadelphia.
J. D. Katz, 6200 Ventnor Avenue, Ventnor City.
D. M. Levin, 32 North Newton Avenue, Atlantic City.
E. G. P. Lund, 9406 Pacific Avenue, Margate City.
M. A. Marion, 40 East Decatur Avenue, Pleasantville.
J. E. McLoon, 170 Ocean Avenue, Atlantic City.
M. E. Ruddy, 14 Walton Place, Ocean City.
R. W. Swartz, 120 North Oxford Avenue, Ventnor.
G. E. Toll, 32 South Richards, Ventnor City.
F. B. Ward III, 304 North Clermont Avenue, Margate.
M. B. Wolf, 81 Chestnut Avenue, Irvington.
R. J. Arnold, 274 South Finley Avenue, Basking Ridge.
J. A. Kouffie, Jr., Main Street, Bedminster.
D. R. Bohan, 39 West Maryland Avenue, Beach Haven Terrace.
G. A. Burkland, 133 West Delaware Avenue, Beach Haven.
C. V. Davis, 313 West 13th Street, Surf City.
B. L. Grimmett, 259 19th Street, Surf City.
D. L. Grimmett, 259 19th Street, Surf City.
D. H. Huggler, 116 East Alabama Avenue, Beach Haven.
L. R. Knauth, 10100 Long Beach Boulevard, Beach Haven.
N. Levison, 205 South Beach Avenue, Beach Haven.
M. B. MacNaul, 13210 Beach Avenue, Beach Haven Terrace.
T. A. Melega, Jr., 8 East 18th Street, Beach Haven.
P. R. Moore, care of postmaster, Beach Haven.
J. P. Scully, 4306 Bay Boulevard, Beach Haven.
T. J. Scully, 4306 Long Beach Boulevard, Brant Beach.
A. C. Todd, 808 South Beach Avenue, Beach Haven.
D. F. Todd, 808 South Beach Avenue, Beach Haven.
C. L. Decker, 82 Church Street, Belford.
C. W. Heinrichs, 1644 Riverview Terrace, Belmar.
P. J. Matoska, 294 South Washington Avenue, Bergenfield.
D. J. Coletta, 18 Kuntz Avenue, Berkeley Heights.
K. P. Swarthout, 15 Holmes Oval South, New Providence.
J. A. Parker, care of postmaster, Cookstown Road, Wrightstown.
T. A. Bass, 35 Norfolk Avenue, Maplewood.
A. S. Berson, 96 Oakview Avenue, Maplewood.
W. S. Greenberg, 450 Elmwood Avenue, Maplewood.
T. D. Murphy, 31 Knolls Road, Bloomingdale.
S. P. Weiss, 401 LaReine Avenue, Bradley Beach.
H. A. Felder, Bricktown.
F. W. Musgrave, 132 Lillian Street, Bricktown.
S. G. Riello, Jr., 101 Ashwood Drive, Bricktown.
K. W. Thomas, 36 View Drive, Bricktown.
F. E. Valeri, 213 Lorraine Place, Bricktown.
P. F. Winchester, 1841 Lanes Mills Road, Bricktown.
N. C. Barbarette, Buena.
M. Cooney, 48 Elmwood Road, Cedar Grove.
D. L. Embs, Box 36, Rural Route No. 2, Cape May.
C. K. Hickman, 1108 Ohio Avenue, Cape May.
H. D. Burton, 56 Bergen Street, Carteret.
E. E. Mantie, 13 Grant Avenue, Carteret.
P. D. Vandermark, care of postmaster, Carteret.
M. M. Falar, 55 Pine Boulevard, Cedar Knolls.
R. A. Benvenuti, 48 East Madison Avenue, Florham Park.
A. F. Burger, Jr., 1201 Kresson Road, Cherry Hill.
G. Febish, 33 Wagon Lane, Cherry Hill.
M. A. Jones, Jr., 117 Wisteria Avenue, Cherry Hill.
E. A. Lucke, 243 Van Horn Avenue, Clementon.
J. J. Bizub, 120 Park Slope, Clifton.
T. J. Castorina, 72 Cliffside Trail, Denville.
H. E. Defazio, Jr., 91 Randolph Avenue, Dover.
J. P. Fitzpatrick, 250 South Main Street, Wharton.
G. M. Cohen, 35 Frost Avenue, East Brunswick.
P. H. Belott, 11 Beverly Road, West Orange.
R. J. Goode III, 131 North 14th Street, East Orange.
C. W. Hermann, 60 Colonial Terrace, East Orange.
W. A. Iannacone, 386 Tremont Avenue, Orange.
J. J. Lynch, 420 New England Terrace, Orange.
D. P. Marino, 329 Park Avenue, East Orange.
P. McCarthy, 647 Scotland Road, Orange.
A. J. Polychronopoulos, 28 North 18th Street, East Orange.
G. M. Joachim, 139 Boulevard, East Paterson.
D. S. Orlovsky, 133 Stefanic Avenue, East Paterson.
I. P. Slevin, 2–18A 14th Avenue, East Paterson.
W. F. Warren, 23 Valley Place, Edgewater.
J. D. Pfeiffer, care of postmaster, Edison.
C. P. Jackson, 202 Edgar Place, Elizabeth.
T. Martin, 1539 Ann Street, Selma, Ala.
F. R. Mellage, 412 First Avenue, Elizabeth.
C. F. Merritt, Jr., 1625 Voeglin Avenue, Selma, Ala.
D. N. Nicholas, 755 Rahway Avenue, Elizabeth.
L. M. Sniezek, 240 Franklin Street, Elizabeth.
B. C. Weinstock, 253 Greenwood Terrace, Hillside.
A. J. Grassi, 121 Jefferson Avenue, Emerson.
J. V. Scully, 108 George Road, Emerson.
J. B. Olmsted, 77 Rensselaer Road, Essex Fells.
M. N. Feinbloom, 2616 Berdan Avenue, Fair Lawn.
C. Hahn, 315 Grove Street, East Rutherford.
D. S. Hartstein, 1247 Burbank Street, Fair Lawn.
L. Kabat, 4–19 Cyril Avenue, Fairlawn.
R. S. Lustig, 1436 East 7th Street, Plainfield.
E. M. Anderson, care of postmaster, Flanders.
D. W. Cotto, 56 East Edsall Boulevard, Palisades Park.
R. J. Labarbera, 194 Harrison Avenue, Garfield.
C. P. Obremski, 22 Williams Street, Garfield.
L. G. Rubin, 1618 Orchard Terrace, Linden.
S. E. Bergen, 122 Lakeview Avenue, Leonia.
E. G. Bilof, 225 Ross Avenue, Hackensack.
C. E. Colello, 25 Webb Place, Hasbrouck Heights.
K. C. Dolecki, 297 First Place, Bogota.
B. C. Flynn, 160 Lawrence Avenue, Hasbrouck Heights.
E. H. Hynes, 351 Maywood Avenue, Maywood.
T. J. Karl, 476 Bergen Avenue, Maywood.
E. P. Lynch, 643 Midwood Road, Ridgewood.
J. V. O'Shea, 94 Euclid Avenue, Hackensack.
D. T. Shaeffer, 168 Williams Avenue, Hasbrouck Heights.
W. K. Trautwein, 51 Spring Valley Avenue, Hackensack.
P. H. Wenzel, 514 Rock Road, Glen Rock.
R. A. Winters, 186 Fairmount Avenue, Hackensack.
J. D. Ressler, 73 Centre Street, Haddonfield.
F. P. Thiel, 128 West End Avenue, Haddonfield.
C. R. Field, 505 Ridgedale Avenue, Hanover.
R. A. Rakoczy, 1 Cottage Place, Hanover.
G. E. Reseter, 21 Lammers Street, Hazlet.
M. B. O'Neill, 214 Raymond Street, Hillsdale.
P. T. Jordan, 56 Kensington Avenue, Jersey City.
B. A. Reynolds, Sr., 907 Clinton Street, Hoboken.
J. F. Schmidt, 1310 Bloomfield Street, Hoboken.
L. V. Sprang, 613 Willow Avenue, Hoboken.
H. E. Schroder, care of postmaster, Iselin.
G. M. Marlow, 276 Gatzmer Avenue, Jamesburg.
J. P. Ankin, 193 Cambridge Avenue, Jersey City.
J. A. Banach, 11 Armstrong Avenue, Jersey City.

J. D. Barba, 1031½ West Side Avenue, Jersey City.
R. D. Black, 372 Fulton Avenue, Jersey City.
C. D. Brandt, 217 Wegman Parkway, Jersey City.
J. J. Campbell, 118 West 10th Street, Bayonne.
R. D. Campbell, 4 Seaview Court, Bayonne.
J. Carlinsky, 161 Orient Avenue, Jersey City.
C. J. Catrillo, 214 Hopkins Avenue, Jersey City.
W. R. Colbert, 513 Avenue A, Bayonne.
T. F. Cosgrove, 95 Highland Avenue, Jersey City.
C. J. T. Curran, 3304 Hudson Avenue, Union City.
R. N. Danback, 136 West 16 Street, Bayonne.
T. Drew, 59 Boyd Avenue, Jersey City.
A. T. Fox, 255 Dwight Street, Jersey City.
R. A. Fristensky, 193 Academy Street, Jersey City.
D. Gallagher, 42 Lexington Avenue, Jersey City.
J. P. Gerba, 519 Avenue A, Bayonne.
W. J. Griffin, 324 Duncan Avenue, Jersey.
J. S. Hausser, 246 Jewett Avenue, Jersey City.
S. A. Herman, 533 Central Avenue, Jersey City.
K. J. Hoebel, 256 Congress Street, Jersey City.
E. J. Hudson, 70 Bergen Avenue, Jersey City.
J. K. P. Jones, 346 Liberty Avenue, c/o Mahan, Jersey City.
R. J. Kacprowicz, 413 Union Street, Jersey City.
E. C. Kaminski, 230 Jewett Avenue, Jersey.
R. C. Kopczynski, 806 West Side Avenue, Jersey.
J. A. Kopycinski, 169 Fourth Street, Jersey City.
C. A. Kuchar, 17 Terrace Avenue, Jersey City.
C. R. Kuzminski, 721 Garfield Avenue, Jersey City.
P. D. Manganiello, 347 Woodlawn Avenue, Jersey City.
G. J. Marasco, 136 West 16th Street, Bayonne.
J. P. Milsop, 3801 Kennedy Boulevard, Union City.
R. P. Nastawa, 37 College Drive, Jersey City.
J. T. O'Donnell, 292 Harrison Avenue, Jersey City.
A. P. O'Reilly, 70 Clendenny Avenue, Jersey City.
J. H. Page, Jr., 54 Claremont Avenue, Jersey City.
F. C. Parente, 12 George Street, Saddle Brook.
C. R. Parker, 15 Morton Place, Jersey City.
F. Pietrusiewicz, 158 Hopkins Avenue, Jersey City.
R. J. Raczynski, 170 St. Paul's Avenue, Jersey City.
J. A. Repka, 64 Wegman Parkway, Jersey City.
H. J. Roarty, 292 Avenue C., Bayonne.
J. E. Savage, Jr., 320 Marshall Drive, Apartment 6B, Hoboken.
M. S. Scharf, 404 Stegman Parkway, Jersey City.
J. R. Sek, 227 Townele Avenue, Jersey City.
E. J. Silver, 59 Garrison Avenue, Jersey City.
L. Simeone, 129 Booraem Avenue, Jersey City.
J. A. Smith, 82 Danforth Avenue, Jersey City.
V. F. Steckler, 1625 Palisade Avenue, Union City.
L. D. Sullivan, 231 Bayview Avenue, Jersey City.
G. Sussman, 40 Lexington Avenue, Jersey City.
W. E. Taylor, 130 Grant Avenue, Jersey City.
W. T. Torpey, 15 Glenwood Avenue, Jersey City.
M. A. Torres, 386 Fourth Street, Jersey City.
M. A Venutolo, 22 Concord Street, Jersey City.
T. J. Viggiano, 108 Pamrapo Avenue, Jersey City.
V. W. Waiters, 170 Randolph Avenue, Jersey City.
W. J. Warren, Jr., 6 Spruce Street, Jersey City.
J. M. White, 173 Boyd Avenue, Jersey City.
G. Witterschein, 126 Glenwood Avenue, Jersey City.
D. P. Zampella, 222 Summit Avenue, Jersey City.
J. A. Napolitano, 109 Lawrence Avenue, Keansburg.
M. R. Leve, 1407 Knoll Road, Lakewood.
R. J. Teck, 110 West Caranetta Terrace, Lakewood.
R. F. Horan, Jr., 3 West Ellice Street, Lincoln Park.
J. A. Coulson, 126 West Gibbons Street, Linden.
G. B. Julian, 1025 Hollywood Road, Linden.
S. A. Rafelson, 507 Washington Avenue, Linden.
N. F. Watter, 141 Fernwood Terrace, Linden.
J. A. Zboray, 822 North Stiles Street, Linden.
J. J. Duffy, 379 Main Street, Little Falls.
J. Krom, 21 Ryle Avenue, Little Falls.
J. D. Vonder Heyden, 13 Ethel Road, Little Falls.
A. P. Christense, Livingston.
F. R. Struckmeyer, 79 Hillside Terrace, Livingston.
S. N. Garmansky, 393 Church Street, Hasbrouck Heights.
P. V. Lynch, 18 Bernice Place, Lodi.
C. T. Brown, Jr., 147 North 5th Avenue, Long Branch.
B. G. Main, 258 Howard Avenue, Elberon.
P. M. Monahan, 5 Washington Drive, Madison.
J. C. Tassini, 294 Euclid Avenue, Manasquan.
G. E. Loeb, 335 Fucillo Street, Manville.
J. L. Mourovic, 204 E Street, Millville.
M. Kohlberg, 55 Ardsley Road, Montclair.
K. P. Delafrange, 1 Grand Avenue, Montvale.
F. J. Garzione, 9 Briarcliff Road, Morris Plains.
N. Pompilio, Netcong.
B. J. Armstrong, 21 Homestead Park, Newark.
R. Babaoglu, 12 Cutler Street, Newark.
E. R. Barbier, Jr., 204 Fifth Street, Newark.
S. F. Beachum, 16 East Alpine Street, Newark.
M. A. Blake, 258 Goldsmith Avenue, Newark.
W. R. Bonelli, Jr., 369 Roseville Avenue, Newark.
J. E. Boone, 130 West Runyon Street, Newark.
G. Cassese, 45 Tappan Avenue, Belleville.
A. Cataldo, 1079 Grove Street, Irvington.
P. M. Cathey, 77 17th Avenue, Newark.
E. L. Ciccone, 51 North 10th Street, Newark.
E. Cilento, 95 Parker Street, Newark.
A. R. Delvescovo, 132 North 15th Street, Bloomfield.
N. Disend, 15 Mulford Place, Newark.
J. T. Dunn, 35 Montrose St. Newark.
H. Ehrenkranz, 245 Wainwright Street, Newark.
F. J. Fede, 171 Park Avenue, Newark.
C. L. Feder, 324 Scotland Road, South Orange.
M. Forfa, 389 Walnut Street, Newark.
A. A. Gamba, 31 Finlay Place, Newark.
K. A. Giunta, 345 Second Street, East Newark.
S. H. Goldman, 99 Weequahic Avenue, Newark.
H. N. Gottlieb, 385 Leslie Street, Newark.
C. P. Grasso, 385 Highland Avenue, Newark.
C. L. Gregory, 15 Shephard Avenue, Newark.
M. M. Hammonds, 207 Chadwick Avenue, Newark.
E. F. Harrigan, 365 Main Street, Belleville.
S. L. Harris, 382 Badger Avenue, Newark.
T. P. Hauke, 213 Grumman Avenue, Newark.
W. J. Hodge, 86 Avon Avenue, Newark.
E. D. Hoffman, 201 Vassar Avenue, Newark.
T. T. Howard, Jr., 61 Rose Terrace, Newark.
E. A. Humm, 110 North Ninth Street, Newark.
K. B. Hurdle, 12 Mitchell Place, East Orange.
C. I. Jernow, 616 Lyons Avenue, Irvington.
P. Jones, 13 Marie Place, Newark.
R. Jordan, 33, 12th Avenue, Newark.
W. J. Kane, 37 Humboldt Street, Newark.
J. M. Katusak, 53 Goble Street, Newark.
S. King, 190 Wainwright Street, Newark.
D. H. Lawrence, 60 Main Street, Orange.
J. C. Lorenzo, 101 Malone Avenue, Belleville.
Salvatore Maiorana, 138 Jerome Place, Bloomfield.
H. A. Massler, 52 Duffield Drive, South Orange.
J. M. McCabe, 191 Cortlandt Street, Belleville.
G. E. McClendon, 61 Tillinghast Street, Newark.
J. J. Metsopulos, 226 Academy Street, Newark.
J. Morgan, 660 South 18th Street, Newark.
N. J. S. O'Louglin, 189 Johnson Avenue, Newark.
A. V. O'Neill, 96 Houston Street, Newark.
R. T. Palma, 53 Sandford Place, Newark.
T. Parrillo, 55 Frederick Street, Belleville.
D. Pepe, 647 Clifton Avenue, Newark.
N. M. Perna, 16 Watsessing Avenue, Belleville.
E. D. Porcelli, 385 Highland Avenue, Newark.
R. J. Reilly, 139 Hillside Avenue, Glen Ridge.
K. W. Ruth, 82 Chestnut Street, West Orange.
N. J. Salvato, 575 North 7th Street, Newark.
G. M. Santuoso, 150 Liberty Avenue, Belleville.
R. S. Saulino, 168 North 10th Street, Newark.
H. J. Schrader, 65 Oakley Terrace, Nutley.
N. Schulman, 1415 Highland Avenue, Hillside.
R. K. Silberberg, 51 Grumman Avenue, Newark.
E. Silver, Jr., 114 Barclay Street, Newark.
R. J. Spagnola, 49 Columbia Avenue, Newark.
T. A. Spagone, 755 Ridge Street, Newark.
C. E. Spellman, 46 South 7th Street, Newark.
J. B. Thor, 35 Freeman Place, Nutley.
A. Tomaselli, 10 Memphis Avenue, Belleville.
I Walton, Jr., 65 Newton Street, Newark.
J. A. Weinberg, 9 Troy Court, Maplewood.
I. R. Whitaker, 67 Fairmount Avenue, Newark.
M. A. Zigarelli, 87 Lincoln Avenue, Newark.
L. Adler, 76 Adelaide Avenue, Highland Park.
C. H. Carman, 36 Paulus Boulevard, New Brunswick.
C. M. Griffin, 58 Lee Avenue, New Brunswick.
J. J. Hoagland, Jr., 289 Redmond Street, New Brunswick.
L. A. Kertesz, 99 Senior Street, New Brunswick.
W. S. Kover, 42 Nelson Avenue, Highland Park.

L. D. M. Pino, 110 South 11th Avenue, Highland Park.
H. Rosen, 341 Mansfield Street, Highland Park.
M. S. Saiff, 1380 Seminole Road, North Brunswick.
P. L. Sano, 103 South 4th Avenue, Highland Park.
A. D. J. Stankowicz, 1367 Luke Street, North Brunswick.
K. A. Scepansky, in care of postmaster, New Lisbon.
R. J. Birx, 31 Barberry Lane, New Providence.
R. T. Goble, in care of Postmaster, Newton.
C. E. Anderson, in care of Postmaster, North Bergen.
J. M. Corless, in care of Postmaster, North Bergen.
L. A. Crescitelli, in care of Postmaster, North Bergen.
P. D. Fiehamer, in care of Postmaster, North Bergen.
E. G. Maske, in care of Postmaster, North Bergen.
R. V. Oliver, in care of Postmaster, North Bergen.
H. R. Scholp, in care of Postmaster, North Bergen.
W. A. Stanton, 8400 Boulevard East, North Bergen.
R. Zevenvadjian, 407 3d Street, Union City.
H. L. Blackmon, 35 Harbor Road, Ocean City.
J. A. Burkhardt, Jr., 113 Ocean Avenue, Ocean City.
J. L. Caldwell, 600 Atlantic Avenue, Ocean City.
F. J. Esposito, 1308 Simpson Avenue, Ocean City.
E. M. Farrell, 108 36th Street, Sea Isle City.
M. L. Flynn, 1513 Asbury Avenue, Ocean City.
H. W. Gates, 365 Seabright Road, Ocean City.
P. M. Gould, in care of Postmaster, Ocean City.
T. J. Herrington, 248 Wesley Avenue, Ocean City.
J. R. Hogan, 142 Ocean Road, Ocean City.
J. W. Kiphorn, 400 First Street, Ocean City.
F. W. Klein, 322 East Surf Road, Ocean City.
C. G. Krattenmaker, Jr., 3613 Pembroke Lane, Ocean City.
J. S. Lee, 916 Asbury Avenue, Ocean City.
R. R. Lee, 327 Wesley Avenue, Ocean City.
H. F. Ludlam, 307 Seabright Road, Ocean City.
R. E. Maurer, Jr., 400 18th Street, Ocean City.
R. B. Perkins, 811 Third Street, Ocean City.
W. G. Peterson, Jr., 410 Tuckahoe Road, Marmora.
D. M. Romano, 206 West Seabright Road, Ocean City.
J. R. Warren, 3547 Asbury Avenue, Ocean City.
S. J. Witmer, 1020 Asbury Avenue, Ocean City.
T. C. Brown, Jr., 29 Boston Road, Neptune City.
G. P. Nicholls, Jr., 64 Cookman Avenue, Ocean Grove.
J. R. Esposito, 346 Prell Lane, Oradell.
R. R. Riso, 990 Amaryllis Avenue, Oradell.
P. J. Christiano, 22 Meeker Street, West Orange.
W. J. Hanley, 296 Tremont Avenue, Orange.
W. R. Herman, 10 Fairway Avenue, West Orange.
A. R. Liberman, 66 Lenox Terrace, West Orange.
J. D. McCarthy, 577 Valley Road, West Orange.
R. P. McGovern, 159 Gregory Avenue, West Orange.
P. J. Passero, Jr., 62 Rock Spring Avenue, West Orange.
J. M. Renna, 39 Gaston Street, West Orange.
G. K. Ruff, 4 Thomas Avenue, Riverton.
G. G. Harrison, 169 Forest Avenue, Paramus.
P. E. Bagoon, 14 Village Drive, Livingston.
T. G. Rogers, 1 Carlton Street, Morristown.
K. L. Sterner, 376 South Street, Morristown.
H. Bonaparte, 47 Lucille Place, Passaic.
S. C. Fried, 53 Warren Street, Clifton.
J. L. Hirschfield, 24 State Street, Passaic.
C. Hookaylo, Jr., 16 Potter Road, Clifton.
D. C. Kwasnik, 239 Howe Avenue, Passaic.
D. W. Mann, 15 Wells Court, Clifton.
A. A. Mitchell, Jr., 351 Highland Avenue, Passaic.
R. Moss, Jr., 351 Highland Avenue, Passaic.
V. J. Senatore, 102 Ann Street, Passaic.
D. W. Azar, 384 North 11th Street, Paterson.
B. I. Barrish, 415 11th Avenue, Paterson.
S. L. Bressler, 801 11th Avenue, Paterson.
M. L. Canger, 114 Richmond Avenue, Paterson.
S. E. Capers, 389 11th Avenue, Paterson.
T. P. Coates, 941 East 25th Street, Paterson.
H. L. Cornish, 125 Governor Street, Paterson.
M. L. Elvin, 926 East 28th Street, Paterson.
A. A. Grano, 267 East 25th Street, Paterson.
E. Levy, 586 East 29th Street, Paterson.
A. L. Peck, 415 East 28 Street, Paterson.
P. F. Reilley, 205 Michigan Avenue, Paterson.
R. E. Reines, 28 Dale Avenue, Paterson.
J. L. Shaw, 19 2nd Avenue, Paterson.
G. A. Victor, 462 East 31st Street, Paterson.
A. L. Minniti, 54 Capitol Street, Pavisboro.
K. J. Knudson, 28 Sixth Street, Fords.
C. C. Kowxna, 77 Sixth Street, Fords.
R. J. Mantz, 47 Broad Street, Perth Amboy.
S. L. Bootman, 731 East Front Street, Plainfield.
H. J. Goldrich, 1217 Field Ave., Plainfield.
C. D. Payten, 941 Spring Street, Plainfield.
M. J. Regan, 524 Parkside Road, Plainfield.
R. A. Shupack, 69 Myrtle Avenue, North Plainfield.
B. J. Skladany, Jr., 121 Hillside Avenue, Plainfield.
A. T. Slater, Jr., 2145 Orchard Drive, South Plainfield.
R. A. Starks, 24 Martins Lane, Berkeley Heights.
R. T. Blazer, 503 Forman Avenue, Point Pleasant Beach.
A. Cadalzo, 816 Trenton Avenue, Point Pleasant.
B. A. Doyle, 616 Marshall Drive, Point Pleasant.
D. J. Grohowski, 3402 Fairview Road, Point Pleasant.
J. J. Horton, care of Postmaster, Point Pleasant Beach.
D. B. Meseroll, Jr., 400 Atlantic Avenue, Point Pleasant Beach.
M. I. Seldin, 390 Stiles Court, Pompton Lakes.
F. J. Gerard, 141 Glenwild Avenue, Bloomingdale.
R. M. Aagaard, 129 Russell Avenue, Rahway.
R. E. Morahan, 431 Maple Avenue, Rahway.
R. T. Schmaeling, 1071 Thirza Place, Rahway.
A. W. Frick, 25 Orchard Drive, Upper Saddle River.
D. C. Slack, 41 Chestnut Street, Allendale.
G. R. Johnson, 434 Oak Avenue, River Edge.
P. J. McKenna, 297 Concord Drive, River Edge.
A. J. Rovegno III, 186 Monroe Avenue, River Edge.
J. J. Barkocy, 915 Lichtenthal Street, Riverside.
R. J. Caracci, 32 Hancock Street, Riverside.
R. A. Fort, 2412 Branch Pike, Cinnaminson.
E. J. Cusack, 151 Alberta Drive, Saddle Brook.
E. J. Dersch, 533 Dewey Avenue, Saddle Brooks.
A. F. German, 504 MacArthur Avenue, Garfield.
H. Hascup, 16 Hoffman Avenue, Rochelle Park.
S. J. Heck, 81 Chestnut Street, Garfield.
E. Husselrath, 315 Saddle River Road, Saddle Brook.
K. E. Klinger, 223 Lanza Avenue, Garfield.
M. F. Lastowski, 491 Stuyvesant Avenue, Rutherford.
R. B. Mitchell, 707 Cornwall Avenue, West Englewood.
R. Mudrak, 17 Welcome Road, Saddle Brook.
R. T. Pastuch, 126 7th Street, Saddle Brook.
D. R. Versace, 338 Midland Avenue, Saddle Brook.
G. F. Vornehm, 64 Taggart Way, Saddle Brook.
J. K. Ward, 72 Christina Place, Paterson.
A. C. Winkler, 164 Bnorwood Aveune, Lodi.
N. F. Healy, 80 Valley Way, West Orange.
R. J. Rigney, 104 Manor Court, Runnemede.
R. P. Roberts, 2337 Hudson Terrace, Fort Lee.
R. S. Sableski, 524 Forest Avenue, Lyndhurst.
W. R. Skene, 185 14th Street, Wood-Ridge.
W. F. Walling, 344 2d Avenue, Lyndhurst.
C. H. Disbrow, 347 Cedar Grove Terrace, Scotch Plains.
R. L. Taintor, 16 Farragut Drive, Bricktown.
P. B. Tunney, 300 Carteret Avenue, Seaside Heights.
J. P. Fimiani, 5905 Madison Street, West New York.
H. A. Massler, 52 Duffield Drive, South Orange.
D. H. Steckroth, 44 Cypress Street, Millburn.
B. S. Tepper, 59 Pilgrim Road, Short Hills.
C. G. Wroble, Jr., 217 East High Street, Somerville.
E. Lutsky, care of postmaster, South Branch.
P. E. Geiger, 3 Lexington Avenue, South River.
E. H. Heyman, 102 Edgewood Avenue, Springfield.
W. R. Gregor, 802 Allaire Road, Spring Lake Heights.
V. D. Boyd, 132 Gloucester Avenue, Lawnside.
J. A. Langston, 203 White Horse Pike, Lawnside.
P. C. Mulford, 539 Sixth Avenue, Lindenwold.
J. L. Tallant, 12 College Circle, Stratford.
P. F. Cappadona, 448 Rutland Avenue, Teaneck.
A. J. Cohen, 938 Lincoln Place, Teaneck.
A. J. Edelman, 960 Warren Parkway, Teaneck.
E. A. Fox, 256 Edgemont Terrace, Teaneck.
R. Nelson, 1309 Somerset Road, Teaneck.
R. D. Stanzione, 193 Snepard Avenue, Teaneck.
J. S. Fitzpatrick, 7 Cathedral Drive, Lakewood.
N. M. Kramer, 1367 Lanes Mill Road, Lakewood.
M. D. Leifer, 1501 Lane Mills Road, Lakewood.
F. Adams, Jr., 28 Cadwalader Terrace, Trenton.
R. S. Blaustein, 247 South Walter Avenue, Trenton.
M. R. Christie, 31 Evans Avenue, Trenton.
M. S. Cohen, 201 Maple Avenue, Trenton.
J. E. Cubberley, Jr., 333 South Logan Avenue, Trenton.
T. S. Davis, 3019 Nottingham Way, Trenton.

P. T. Deangelo, 73 Wickom Avenue, Trenton.

D. R. Delozier, 22 Banbury Road, Trenton.

C. C. Dunn, Jr., 852 Norway Avenue, Trenton.

R. G. Freedman, 942 Greenwood Avenue, Trenton.

L. M. Hilton, 96 Prospect Village, Trenton.

D. G. McClaskey, 66 McCarthy Drive, Trenton.

D. A. Olivieri, Jr., 133 Washington Street, Trenton.

J. S. Pekala, 9 Unwin Drive, Trenton.

W. P. Schur, 4 White Oak Way, Trenton.

H. C. Scott, 3212 South Broad Street, Trenton.

R. W. Thomas, 111 Brookside Avenue, Trenton.

R. C. Baxter, 2100 Kay Avenue, Union.

A. J. Gelfand, 374 Minute Arms Road, Union.

J. A. Lamont, Jr., 308 Halsey Avenue, Union.

G. Raskulinecz, Jr., 910 Irving Avenue, Westfield.

P. D. Rosenberg, 864 Colonial Avenue, Union.

J. S. Simpson, 351 Princeton Road, Union.

J. S. Wolfe, 1817 Manor Drive, Union.

E. H. Brandli, 2716 Palisade Avenue, Union City.

M. C. Brunhoper, 6809 Madison Street, Guttenberg.

G. A. Camporini, 308 West Street, Union City.

R. M. Casey, 6900 Broadway, Guttenberg.

M. F. Latyn, 32 Pine Street, Spotswood.

T. J. Molon, 427 Gregory Avenue, Weehawken.

E. Sklarew, 7 65th Street, West New York.

N. D. Sklarew, 7 64th Street, West New York.

J. Urbanik, 307 Bergenline Avenue, Union City.

C. L. Woltmann, 7 Clifton Terrace, Weehawken.

K. D. Haynes, 367 Tower Street, Vaux Hall.

J. P. Kenny II, 109 Miami Avenue, Wildwood Crest.

R. K. Boomer, 811 Grandview Avenue, Westfield.

A. J. Kern, 436 Montauk Drive, Westfield.

J. A. McGeary, 606 Raymond Street, Westfield.

A. J. Smith, Jr., 343 Whittier Avenue, Dunellen.

R. W. Young, 1454 Deer Path, Mountainside.

E. D. Delaney, 45 Park Avenue, Rumson.

J. R. Schilling, Westville Post Office, Westville.

M. C. Gere, 80 Third Avenue, Westwood.

R. K. Phoenix, 25 Pleasant Valley Road, Whippany.

S. I. Bellman, 3409 Pacific Avenue, Wildwood.

J. R. Cuddhy, Jr., 113 West Juniper Avenue, Wildwood.

W. M. Fath, Jr., 102 East Glenwood Avenue, Wildwood.

E. K. Ferguson, 814 New York Avenue, North Wildwood.

A. J. Fulginiti, 3106 Pacific Avenue, Wildwood.

F. W. Garrison, Jr., 217 East 14th Avenue, North Wildwood.

N. B. Halpern, 123 East 20th Avenue, North Wildwood.

R. K. Johnson, 120 Stanton Road, Wildwood Crest.

C. J. Ketterer III, 208 East Nashville Avenue, Wildwood Crest.

J. C. McAllister, 889 Egret Drive, Toms River.

P. Olwell, 202 East 22d Street, Wildwood.

P. E. Nestor, 1900 New York Avenue, North Wildwood.

R. Simon, 402 Second Avenue, North Wildwood.

A. C. Staller, 107 East 21st Avenue, Wildwood.

E. M. A. Taylor, 3817 Arctic Avenue, Wildwood.

J. N. Thompson, 133 West Baker Avenue, Wildwood.

R. E. Young, Jr., 207 Louisville Road, Wildwood Crest.

R. M. Ryan, 120 Green Street, Woodbridge.

B. E. Sipos, 107 New Street, Woodbridge.

B. A. Minkoff, 534 Hunter Street, Woodbury.

J. F. Tumulty, 24 Lake Drive, Woodbury.

Pennsylvania

D. S. Reeder, 247 Spruce Street, Emmaus.

E. W. Schiffer, 115 College Drive, Allentown.

L. Schmaldinst, 2838 Reading Road, Allentown.

J. M. Bradley, 313 Parsons Avenue, Bala Cynwyd.

E. F. Deegan, 24 Llandillo Road, Havertown.

P. F. Grow, 319 Woodbine Avenue, Narberth.

J. E. Keezel, 24 Sabine Avenue, Narberth.

O. C. Garber, c/o Postmaster, Barnesville.

T. R. Coates, College Hill Apts., Beaver Falls.

J. F. Ranii Jr., 132 Burns Avenue, Beaver Falls.

D. R. McMullin, 422 East Bishop Street, Bellefonte.

R. F. Braxmeier, 322 Summit Street, Bethlehem.

J. Dozpat III, 633 Linden Street, Bethlehem.

T. J. Fischer, 1526 Lebanon Street, Bethlehem.

T. M. Fore, 236 West Coal Street, Shenandoah.

A. M. Gonzales, 734 Elm Street, Bethlehem.

W. J. Hart, 1454 Lane Avenue, Bethlehem.

J. L. Heidecker, 449 Grandview Boulevard, Bethlehem

J. C. Hoffner, 1308 Broadway, Bethlehem.

P. D. Howlett, 724 12th Avenue, Bethlehem.

J. J. Kachmar, Jr., 762 Washington Avenue, Bethlehem.

G. A. Kardos, 541 Elmhurst Avenue, Bethlehem.

W. L. Kovacs, 2010 Davis Street, Bethlehem.

J. F. Leary, 620 Buchanan Street, Bethlehem.

R. M. Long, 1905 Columbine Avenue, Bethlehem.

F. J. Martin, 2115 Princeton Avenue, Bethlehem.

H. M. Ortevein, Jr., 616 West Union Boulevard, Bethlehem.

R. J. Roseman, 619 Hellener Street, Bethlehem.

R. C. Scheetz, 1458 Stefko Boulevard, Bethlehem.

E. J. Shields, Jr., 1118 Russell Avenue, Bethlehem.

L. A. Steixner, 945 East Sixth Street, Bethlehem.

J. F. Sullivan, 632 Pawnee Street, Bethlehem.

P. D. Sullivan, 632 Pawnee Street, Bethlehem.

M. S. Turwaver, 1354 North Vister Street, Allentown.

J. M. Gambrell, 128 Third Street, Rankin.

T. D. Jones, 10 Fairbanks Avenue, Bradford.

A. L. Mussari, 203 Bramber Drive, Broomall.

P. R. Riley, 501 Lawrence Road, Broomall.

F. M. Stec, 726 Winchester Road, Broomall.

M. A. Casper, Tanglewood Park, Valencia.

C. R. Paradis, 469 East Jefferson Street, Butler.

A. M. Twyford, 811 Wood Street, Butler.

G. J. Watson, 101 Gilbert Avenue, Butler.

R. M. Bellotti, 326 First Avenue, Cadogan.

A. P. Christensen, 36 Carlton Terrace, Bloomfield, N.J.

D. C. Brown, Post Office Box 437, Clarksville.

A. A. Lamo, Box 411, Clarksville.

F. D. Herman, 423 Kismet Street, Carnegie.

L. M. Mamula, 309 Thompson Street, Bridgeville.

D. J. Kalamas, 517 Isabella Avenue, North Charleroi.

C. F. Ralston, 420 Elm Avenue, Clearfield.

M. M. Jacoby, Care of Postmaster, Commodores.

J. J. McCabe, 236 East Hector Street Conshohocken.

M. Slovak, 111 Center Street, Conshohocken.

D. J. Vohar, RD 1, Baden.

H. C. Collins, 921 Forrester Avenue, Darby.

D. I. Fulton, 223 Mac Dade Boulevard, Collingdale.

R. C. Keith, Jr., Post Office Box 267, Donora.

L. S. Graham, Jr., 363 North Main Street, Doylestown.

J. D. Welsh, 216 East Ashland Street, Doylestown.

J. L. Cutuli, 907 Burmont Road, Drexel Hill.

M. E. Martin, 827 Ridley Creek Drive, Media.

W. R. McDevitt, 1131 Cornell Avenue, Drexel Hill.

A. J. McGarry, Jr., 5012 Fairway Road, Drexel Hill.

———, Care of Postmaster, Eagles Mere.

J. A. F. Bullock, 246 West Wilkes-Barre Street, Easton.

J. C. Janos, 800 Sheridan Drive, Easton.

R. D. Lucey, Jr., 171 Charles Street, Easton.

T. Pukson, 729 Arndt Road, Easton.

W. L. Stubblebine, Care of Postmaster, Edison.

M. A. Bickerstaff, Box 175, Ellsworth.

C. B. Hennon, Rural Delivery No. 1, Wampum.

M. E. Simpson, Care of Postmaster, Elmhurst.

T. S. Buczek, 311 Southgate Drive, Erie.

P. M. Consiglio, Post Office, Erie.

J. M. Diplacido, 1602 Hickory, Erie.

D. E. Gallegos, 1132 East Eighth, Erie.

K. H. Graham, 68 Vine Street, North East.

C. J. Karlein, Jr., 932 East Ninth Street, Erie.

M. A. Mancini, 2715 Melrose Avenue, Erie.

J. T. Simmons, Jr., 350 West 10th Street, Erie.

D. M. Whitby, 445 East 10th, Erie.

A. J. Cerra, 2005 Mary Street, Farrell.

R. D. Demarco, 156 Shenango Boulevard, Farrell.

T. J. Acita, 9 Zeller Street, Greensburg.

F. J. Bassegio, 9 South Hamilton Avenue, Greensburg.

J. P. Foti, 243 West Otterman Street, Greensburg.

F. B. Imbrescia, 1428 Maple Street, Monessen.

J. J. Lichwa, Jr., Box 438, Hutchinson.

A. J. Moff, Care of Postmaster, Greensburg.

W. J. Murrin, 101 North Second Street, Greenville.

J. P. Walton, Rural Delivery No. 4, Greenville.

D. C. Gobel, 245 Baltimore Street, Hanover.

J. P. Graybill, 1130 Baltimore Street, Hanover.

T. M. Scheivert, 256 Fleming Avenue, Hanover.

D. R. Bellemare, 2250 Kensington Street, Harrisburg.

J. K. Bottonari, 37 South 24th Street, Camp Hill.

M. L. Boyer, 3222 Sunnyside Avenue, Harrisburg.

B. E. Bragg, 1716 Herr Street, Harrisburg.

J. W. Brown, 4927 Virginia Avenue, Harrisburg.

T. O. Dissinger, 406 Lansvale Street, Marysville.

J. E. Eaddy, 1106 North 17th Street, Harrisburg.

T. J. Elliott, 3703 Brisban Street, Harrisburg.

E. J. Gallagher, 230 Woodland Avenue, New Cumberland.

W. Gilcrist, 1926 Briggs Street, Harrisburg.

R. E. Green, 1509 Wallace Street, Harrisburg.

P. E. Kauffman, 334 Louther Street, Lemoyne.
D. L. Lobel, 3207 Derry Street, Harrisburg.
T. G. McNeil, 601 North Union Street, Middletown.
J. M. Munley, 3242 Green Street, Harrisburg.
R. M. Murray, 2815 Rumson Drive, Harrisburg.
W. M. Shields, 2123 Jefferson Street, Harrisburg.
J. E. Shomper, 243 Market Street, Millersburg.
J. A. Sims, 518 Kelker Street, Harrisburg.
R. E. Smeltzer, Jr., 708 South 24th Street, Harrisburg.
C. C. Snedeker, Jr., Moated Route 2, Enola.
L. Spencer, Jr., 596 Lincoln Street, Steelton.
J. P. Pandosh, 64 Horsham Road, Hatboro.
G. J. Baurnes, care of postmaster, Homestead.
F. J. Petras, Jr., 202 Ohio Avenue, Glassport.
R. F. Snyder, 532 Halsey Avenue, Pittsburgh.
J. A. Witt, care of postmaster, Homestead.
P. B. Hefferle, 616 Rose Street, Irwin.
W. Karako, Route 1, Irwin.
P. A. Merlino, 48 Lincoln Avenue, Jeannette.
S. M. Riehl, 1015 Ohio Street, Jeannette.
J. J. Moore, III, 4008 South Warner Road, Lafayette Hill.
W. M. Barrett, 952 Avenue D, Parkland.
D. P. Blatt, 39 Grapevine Road, Levittown.
D. R. Hendricks, 431 East Penncrest Drive, Langhorne.
A. P. Zacharka, 1237 West Maple Avenue, Langhorne.
J. C. Flounders, 29 North Maple Avenue, Lansdowne.
A. J. Watson, 2 North Fairview Avenue, Upper Darby.
S. J. Weinberg, 358 Hastings Boulevard, Broomall.
J. H. Wagoner, 69 Cumberland Road, Lemoyne.
D. P. Blatt, care of postmaster, Levittown.
P. M. Redmond, 14 Sunset Road, Lewistown.
E. R. Brush, 181 Oxford Orive, McKeesport.
P. R. Sanders, 1423 Kansas Avenue, McKeesport.
J. L. Vukovcan, 1004 Park Street, McKeesport.
M. A. Ressler, 739 Water Street, Mount Joy.
T. A. Henretta, 756 Chestnut Street, Meadville.
S. L. Shay, R.D. 3, Meadville.
M. F. Conaboy, Jr., 521 Fairmont Road, Haventown.
——— ——— care of postmaster, Milford Square.
J. G. Kalidonis, % Postmaster, Monaca.
M. A. Richardson, Box 763, Morgan.
T. A. Burrell, % Postmaster, Mt. Gretna.
L. T. Kolanowski, 122 West Main Street, Nanticoke.
T. E. Hupp, 2540 Brighton Road, Ellwood City.
J. N. Mangieri, Jr., 14 Maitland Street, New Castle.
A. A. Russo, 733 Castle Street, New Castle.
R. J. Despirito, 129 Wilson Road, King of Prussia.
S. R. Saunders, 633 East Basin Street, Norristown.
M. J. Tinzer, care of postmaster, Oakland Mills.
J. H. Lippke, 826 College Avenue, Oakmont.
J. M. Angelichio, 232 Candy Lane, Ambler.
E. A. Cogliano, 45 Keystone Avenue, Paoli.
G. R. Wuerstle, 1021 North Fifth Street, Perkasie.
R. M. L. Acito, 5746 Grays Avenue, Philadelphia.
L. Baker, 5115 Springfle, Philadelphia.
P. Baldino, 6439 Malvern Avenue, Philadelphia.
S. B. Barenbaum, 8311 Lynnewood Road, Philadelphia.
G. H. Beasley, 211 North Alden Street, Philadelphia.
J. R. Bigley, 601 65th Avenue, Philadelphia.
J. V. Bivins, 5524 Chancellor Street, Philadelphia.
P. N. Bladen, 762 North 43d Street, Philadelphia.
H. M. Blitman, 1329 Stirling Street, Philadelphia.
S. D. Brandschain, 2200 Parkway E–110, Philadelphia.
J. Breland, 2129 North 27th Street, Philadelphia.
T. Brennan, 6918 Dicks Avenue, Philadelphia.
C. T. Brooks, Jr., 1512 Nedro Avenue, Philadelphia.
H. D. Brcussard, 5142 Larchwood, Philadelphia.
F. A. Brown, 1332 N. Allison Street, Philadelphia.
J. J. Brown, 4919 Walton Avenue, Philadelphia.
S. Brown, 6523 Souder Street, Philadelphia.
E. A. Bryant, 443 North 61st Street, Philadelphia.
J. R. Buckley, 7914 Fayette Street, Philadelphia.
M. M. Burns, 5540 Chancellor Street, Philadelphia.
J. V. Byrne, 7421 Revere Street, Philadelphia.
A. P. Cabrera, 1818 North Van Peh Street, Philadelphia.
A. W. Canada, 1850 North 27th Street, Philadelphia.
M. Canty, 5407 West Master Street, Philadelphia.
J. A. Carey, Apartment 20–B Erringer Place Apartments, Philadelphia.
J. F. Caviston, Jr., 222 East Roosevelt Boulevard, Philadelphia.
A. A. Chappell, 320 West Dauphin Street, Philadelphia.
J. R. Chudnow, 1401 Greywall Lane, Philadelphia.
W. J. Closson, 1306 West Erie Avenue, Philadelphia.
B. D. Cohen, 6948 Horrocks Street, Philadelphia.
H. J. Cohen, 8022 Rodney Street, Philadelphia.
K. M. Cohen, 1812 Farrington Road, Philadelphia.
P. L. Cohen, 941 East Dorset Street, Philadelphia.
I. C. Coleman, 3834 North 15th Street, Philadelphia.
P. J. Colgan, 515 South 56th Street, Philadelphia.
C. L. Collis, 1814 North 54th Street, Philadelphia.
D. A. Cook, 3804 Powelton Avenue, Philadelphia.
G. E. Cooper, 1722 North 60th Street, Philadelphia.
J. A. Cooper, Jr., 701–B Sartain Place, Philadelphia.
D. Cruse, 5220 Master, Philadelphia.
M. J. Cull, 11615 Banes Street, Philadelphia.
L. A. Daniels, 330 North 59th Street, Philadelphia.
R. Dantonio, 2010 Morris Street, Philadelphia.
W. G. Davis, 501 North 40th Street, Philadelphia.
W. L. Davis, 2144 North 7th Street, Philadelphia.
J. F. Dewey, 4227 North 3rd Street, Philadelphia.
J. B. Dicair, 1474 Braddock Lane, Philadelphia.
F. J. Digilio, 2228 South 21st Street, Philadelphia.
F. Dingwell, 1436 South 23d Street, Philadelphia.
V. J. Distefano, Jr., 6462 Morris Park Road, Philadelphia.
S. Doktors, 1611 Justrn, Philadelphia.
T. A. Doyle, 6152 Argyle Street, Philadelphia.
J. W. Duckett, 620 North Frazier Street, Philadelphia.
R. M. Edwards, 1531 Widener Place, Philadelphia.
D. B. Elfman, 7214 Lynford Street, Philadelphia.
W. L. Fairfax, 1545 North 56th Street, Philadelphia.
S. V. Farmer, 6053 Webster Street, Philadelphia.
J. D. Felder, 2213 Disston Street, Philadelphia.
D. M. Flandra, 257 West Albanus Street, Philadelphia.
F. R. Fields, 228 Roscombe, North Hills.
D. P. Fomby, 3125 North 16th Street, Philadelphia.
A. Ford, Jr., 5449 Christian Street, Philadelphia.
J. F. Fort, Jr., 1336 South 31st Street, Philadelphia.
M. P. Freedman, 1017 Chandler Street, Philadelphia.
M. E. Freeman, 3645 North 15th Street, Philadelphia.
J. H. Freiberg, 1427 Robbins Street, Philadelphia.
H. P. Friedrich, 2035 Disston Street, Philadelphia.
J. J. George, 659 North 66th Street, Philadelphia.
S. M. George, 2224 South Juniper Street, Philadelphia.
I. H. Getzoff, 1033 Levick Street, Philadelphia.
W. Gilchrist, 1734 North Wilton Street, Philadelphia.
D. C. Ginsburg, 4604 Old York Road, Philadelphia.
M. L. Gold, 7509 Malvern Avenue, Philadelphia.
E. A. Goldberg, 625 A Garland Street, Philadelphia.
M. E. Gooden, 6230 Jefferson Street, Philadelphia.
D. A. Grant, 248 North 61st Street, Philadelphia.
D. V. Grillett, 39 East La Crosse Avenue, Lansdowne.
G. Grillone, 1706 South 28th Street, Philadelphia.
M. A. Gross, 1021 East Cliveden Street, Philadelphia.
C. J. Guillory, 130 North 53d Street, Philadelphia.
I. S. Hairston, 1104 A Reno Place, Philadelphia.
M. D. Halkin, 1039 Fanshawe Street, Philadelphia.
W. C. Hall, Jr., 5320 Vine Street, Philadelphia.
B. A. Handy, 448 North 50th Street, Philadelphia.
D. E. Harmon, 6154 Walnut Street, Philadelphia.
J. Harrell, 2809 West Huntington Street, Philadelphia.
J. B. Harrigan, Jr., 8641 Hickory Drive, Philadelphia.
K. M. Harris, Jr., 1433 North Wanamaker, Philadelphia.
F. S. Hass, 1616 Longshore Avenue, Philadelphia.
J. G. Hayden, Jr., 3960 The Oak Road, Philadelphia.
J. K. Hayden, 3860 The Oak Road, Philadelphia.
K. Heller, 1348 Passmore Street, Philadelphia.
P. Hershovitz, 412 Winton Street, Philadelphia.
W. Hill, 2928 West Page Street, Philadelphia.
B. Hillian, 5932 Addison Street, Philadelphia.
R. M. Hillian, 5932 Addison Street, Philadelphia.

F. W. Hoensch, Jr., 3921 Claridge Street, Philadelphia.

R. W. Holman, Jr., 5022 Race Street, Philadelphia.

R. P. Horn, 5102 Spruce Street, Philadelphia.

S. M. Horne, 929 North 43d Street, Philadelphia.

J. P. Hurvitz, 904 East Upsal Street, Philadelphia.

A. D. Isley, 3023 West Girard Avenue, Philadelphia.

C. Y. Jackson, 4617 Hawthorne Street, Philadelphia.

C. J. Jerolmack, 2502 Aspen Street, Philadelphia.

K. Jett-El, 2918 West Gordon Street, Philadelphia.

C. F. Johns, 5932 Carpenter Street, Philadelphia.

O. C. Johnson, 4522 Pine Street, Philadelphia.

R. C. Johnson, 2032 North 15th Street, Philadelphia.

C. G. Jones, 844A Alden Place, Philadelphia.

W. C. Jones, 2009 West Madison Street, Philadelphia.

Z. E. Jones, 5044 Summer Street, Philadelphia.

J. J. Kedra, 601 East Hilton Street, Philadelphia.

A. Kenney, 3723 North 5th Street, Philadelphia.

M. A. Klein, 9873 Bridle Road, Philadelphia.

T. J. Krause, 5232 Beaumont Avenue, Philadelphia.

H. L. Lackey, 2307 West Edgeley, Philadelphia.

W. L. Ladson, Jr., 6045 Carpenter Street, Philadelphia.

E. W. Leak, 1330 North Taney Street, Philadelphia.

J. A. Leo, 8761B Glenloch Street, Philadelphia.

E. L. Levin, 1822 Merribrook Road, Philadelphia.

N. W. Levin, 7415 Evston Road, Melrose Park.

J. W. Lewis, Qtrs. C–25, U.S.N. Base, Philadelphia.

J. W. Logan, Jr., 3904 North Smedley, Philadelphia.

T. A. C. Lopresti, 7633 Malvern Avenue, Philadelphia.

N. M. Lubin, 1821 Fox Chase Road, Philadelphia.

W. J. P. Lynch, 1545 South Lindenwood Street, Philadelphia.

D. H. Lyons, 4524 North Warnock Street, Philadelphia.

H. N. Lyons, 4037 Locust Street, Philadelphia.

D. A. Martin, 434 South 62d Street, Philadelphia.

F. T. Martella, 1430 South 23d Street, Philadelphia.

R. K. Matthews, 276 South 58th Street, Philadelphia.

K. C. McCullough, 6345 Woodbine Avenue, Philadelphia.

B. J. McFadden, 1003 West Godfrey Avenue, Philadelphia.

J. P. McFadden, 1134 North 64th Street, Philadelphia.

M. J. McGee, 711 East Thayer Street, Philadelphia.

F. L. McGinty, 2626 South 66th Street, Philadelphia.

R. McIntyre, 9237 Academy Road, Philadelphia.

J. E. McKeever, 2108 East Arizona Street, Philadelphia.

J. F. McNally, 2442 South Garnet Street, Philadelphia.

C. M. Miller, 4378 Reno Street, Philadelphia.

N. Miller, Care of Postmaster, Philadelphia.

V. H. Miller, 760 M 41 Street, Philadelphia.

R. A. Montague, 4034 Lucust Street, Philadelphia.

A. L. Moore, 1946 Spencer Street, Philadelphia.

C. E. Moran, 5002 Willows Avenue, Philadelphia.

J. W. Moraney, 5461 Spring Street, Philadelphia.

G. E. Munroe, Jr., 148 East Duval Street, Philadelphia.

M. L. Murphy, 2891 Gradyville Road, Broomall.

R. W. Murray, 234 North 60th Street, Philadelphia.

S. R. Nemeroff, 4919 North Ninth Street, Philadelphia.

M. A. Nibbio, 917 South 10th Street, Philadelphia.

G. M. Owens, 321 East Sharpnack Street, Philadelphia.

J. P. Ozga, 5990 Woodbine Avenue, Philadelphia.

R. J. Palangi, 1220 Elbridge Street, Philadelphia.

P. A. Patterson, 5931 Opal Street, Philadelphia.

J. R. Perrello, 6356 Farnsworth Street, Philadelphia.

R. J. Perry, 131 South 55th Street, Philadelphia.

T. B. Peterson, 1523 North Allison Street, Philadelphia.

L. S. Petkov, 4916 Wynnefield Avenue, Philadelphia.

D. Philpot, 3811 Aspen Street, Philadelphia.

S. M. Pickholtz, Bromley House, apartment A–201, Philadelphia.

J. Pitts, 337 West Glen Echo Road, Philadelphia.

M. S. Podgorski, 1802 Arthur Street, Philadelphia.

C. M. Povine, 4965 Thompson Street, Philadelphia.

W. M. Powell, 402 North 59th Street, Philadelphia.

L. Powers, 5137 Hazel Avenue, Philadelphia.

R. A. Procopio, 1123 Mifflin Street, Philadelphia.

J. A. Prout, 1832 North Bailey Street, Philadelphia.

N. L. Purnell, 3219 Summer Street, Philadelphia.

M. Radbill, 2314 B Benson Street, Philadelphia.

C. D. Raiskin, 820 Lawler Street, Philadelphia.

R. J. Reaney, 7336 Pittville Avenue, Philadelphia.

W. J. Reeves, 7016 Limekiln Pike, Philadelphia.

P. J. Robinson, 5146 Hoopes Street, Philadelphia.

N. F. Rodowicz, 925 Sanger Street, Philadelphia.

M. A. Rosenbaum, 3729 North 17th Street, Philadelphia.

D. R. Rosenfeld, 1849 North 77th Street, Philadelphia.

F. J. Schweighauser, 6820 North 10th Street, Philadelphia.

R. L. Shamwell, 1916 North 22nd Street, Philadelphia.

C. J. Sharkey, 1133 South Ruby Street, Philadelphia.

A. M. Siegel, 2417 North 56th Street, Philadelphia.

R. Singleton, 117 North 60th Street, Philadelphia.

J. Slabothin, 1101 Mount Pleasant, Philadelphia.

E. E. Smith, Jr., 9636 Torresdale Avenue, Philadelphia.

A. F. Sokoloff, 4802 N. Warnock Street, Philadelphia.

H. D. Spirt, 1117 Sydney Street, Philadelphia.

G. Stanback, 2015 Morris Street, Philadelphia.

G. M. Stankieuicz, 5241 Sydenham Street, Philadelphia.

M. D. Steel, 1029 South 55th Street, Philadelphia.

J. C. Stinson, 1243 Wolf Street, Philadelphia.

L. C. Strang, 3319 North Waterloo Street, Philadelphia.

P. Tabas, 7730 Green Valley Road, Wyncote.

D. Talley, 433 North 42d Street, Philadelphia.

R. L. Tana, 830 Pierce Street, Philadelphia.

J. S. Tecklin, 8426 Forrest Avenue, Philadelphia.

J. M. Thomas, 2222 Reed Street, Philadelphia.

M. J. Tracey, 1232 East Cheltenham Avenue, Philadelphia.

J. C. Ulfelder, 4404 Sansom Street, Philadelphia.

E. Vanlandingham, 241 East Sedgwick Street, Philadelphia.

D. D. F. Vedder, 5529 Angora Terrace, Philadelphia.

A. Wadler, 1304 Magee Avenue, Philadelphia.

R. Wallace, 2334 Reed Street, Philadelphia.

J. Weinberg, 1022 East Slocum Street, Philadelphia.

J. R. Whitters, 6203 Ludlow Street, Philadelphia.

A. Wilmer, 5019 Reno Street, Philadelphia.

W. F. Wozniak, 310 Fitzgerald Street, Philadelphia.

R. J. Yanchuk, Hamilton Motor Court, Philadelphia.

D. E. Daniels, care of Postmaster, Pineville.

D. Atkinson, 5231 Schenley Avenue, Pittsburgh.

K. M. Ault, 97 East Steuben Street, Pittsburgh.

N. R. Baker, Jr., 806 Sarah Street, Pittsburgh.

A. J. Basinksi, 217 Main Street, Pittsburgh.

G. K. Bennett, 429 North Aiken Avenue, Pittsburgh.

R. M. Benney, 1058 Cox Avenue, Pittsburgh.

W. M. Berkins, 223 Glen Caladh Street, Pittsburgh.

S. L. Biancaniello, 2073 Kearns Avenue, Pittsburgh.

B. A. Blandino, 3537 Fairwood Street, Pittsburgh.

T. J. Broderick, 344 Vanadium Road, Pittsburgh.

L. A. Burdman, 1215 Murrayhill Avenue, Pittsburgh.

R. L. Burley, 7370 Stranahan Street, Pittsburgh.

J. M. Burwell, 3209 Iowa Street, Pittsburgh.

D. P. Butkiewicz, 5167 Coral Street, Pittsburgh.

R. H. Calhoun, 217 Dalzell Avenue, Pittsburgh.

T. Carroll, 705 Morgan Street, Pittsburgh.

D. L. Chelli, 504 North Sheridan Avenue, Pittsburgh.

J. L. Clegg, 11612 Joan Drive, Pittsburgh.

L. G. Cocheres, 2800 Perrysville Avenue, Pittsburgh.

E. S. Cohen, 5537 Avondale Place, Pittsburgh.

R. T. Crystian, 32½ Roberts Street, Pittsburgh.

A. W. Daniel, Jr., 408 Veronica Drive, Pittsburgh.

J. M. Danko, 765 Montclair Street, Pittsburgh.

M. R. Dellavecchia, 1256 Hillsdale Avenue, Pittsburgh.

A. J. Demar, 534 Elaine Drive, Pittsburgh.

J. F. Dillon, 120 Marlboro Road, Pittsburgh.

M. Duddy, 141 Enger Avenue, Pittsburgh.

D. S. R. Duff, 1174 Murrayhill Avenue, Pittsburgh.

K. E. Dunn, 103 Owendale Avenue, Pittsburgh.

J. C. Dybiec, 202 Parkfield Street, Pittsburgh.

R. P. Edwards, 800 Parkview Boulevard, Pittsburgh.

R. J. Fest, 2500 Leticoe Street, Pittsburgh.

F. M. Foley, Jr., 145 Catskill Avenue, Pittsburgh.

R. Franconeri, 690 Elmbank Street, Pittsburgh.

C. J. Franklin III, 2229 Somers Drive, Pittsburgh.

W. J. Fry, 137 Wynoka Street, Pittsburgh.

R. J. Fundakoroski, care of Post Master, Pittsburgh.

W. J. Gallagher, 3081 Pinehurst Avenue, Pittsburgh.

R. J. George, 301 Suncrest Street, Pittsburgh.

G. W. Griffin, 311 Burrows Street, Pittsburgh.

J. W. Griffin, 1632 Lincoln Avenue, Pittsburgh.

J. M. Grossman, 1414 Denniston Avenue, Pittsburgh.

R. Harris, 346 South Aiken Avenue, Pittsburgh.

N. Hawrylak, Jr., 23 Holt Street, Pittsburgh.

R. S. Hoover, 227 Silver Oak Drive, Pittsburgh.

M. S. Hoskins, 401 Morewood Avenue, Pittsburgh.

J. F. Johnson, 4743 Norma Drive, Pittsburgh.

R. D. Kaleida, 114 Rahe Street, Pittsburgh.

M. L. Kanarek, 508 Fruithurst Drive, Pittsburgh.

T. J. King, 429 Ruxton Street, Pittsburgh.

J. J. Klein, 103 Haberman Avenue, Pittsburgh.

H. C. Klemp, 109 North Sprague Avenue, Pittsburgh.

S. I. Kornhauser, 5717 Hobart Street, Pittsburgh.

S. E. Kram, 2533 Mount Royal Road, Pittsburgh.

S. H. Kreimer, 6381 Douglas Street, Pittsburgh.

S. M. Kroll, Jr., 4111 Library Road, Pittsburgh.

R. E. Krysinski, 174 Home Street, Pittsburgh.

M. E. Lako, 2339 McCook Street, Pittsburgh.

P. F. Langbein, 1521 Dagmar Avenue, Pittsburgh.

R. L. Lewis, 316 Sylvania Avenue, Pittsburgh.

T. P. Lewkowicz, 164 42d Street, Pittsburgh.

J. R. Lindsay, 1864 Runnette Street, Pittsburgh.

R. V. List, 478 Dailey Road, Pittsburgh.

A. C. Lockman, 623 Midtown Square, Pittsburgh.

P. E. Losco, care of postmaster, Pittsburgh.

D. B. Mahoney, 1705 Laporte Street, Pittsburgh.

C. R. Marney, 8531 Westwood Road, Pittsburgh.

D. McAuley, 4923 Wallingford Avenue, Pittsburgh.

C. C. McClelland, 1018 Haslage Street, Pittsburgh.

R. D. McDonald, 3151 Ashlyn Street, Pittsburgh.

R. A. Mikuta, 424 Kenmont Avenue, Pittsburgh.

K. R. Mori, 4642 Friendship Avenue, Pittsburgh.

E. D. Moyle, Post Office Box 8635, Pittsburgh.

K. E. Mura, 739 Orchard Avenue, Pittsburgh.

R. E. Murphy, 267 South Winebiddle Street, Pittsburgh.

E. H. Myers, 1374 Navahoe Drive, Pittsburgh.

R. M. Newham, 420 Fairywood Street, Pittsburgh.

D. K. Obermeier, 80 Oakwood Avenue, Pittsburgh.

G. J. Ogilvie, 902 Haller Street, Pittsburgh.

R. Orlowski III, 4569 Carroll Street, Pittsburgh.

F. E. Parker, 4201 Willow Avenue, Pittsburgh.

J. B. Patterson, 75 Kendal Avenue, Pittsburgh.

A. F. Paukovits, 414 Ruxton Street, Pittsburgh.

M. C. Pavlik, 3200 Mary Street, Pittsburgh.

D. R. Pellegrini,, 6513 Stanton Avenue, Pittsburgh.

J. P. Pietursinski, 3505 Melwood Avenue, Pittsburgh.

M. Pollock, 1118 Woodbine Street, Pittsburgh.

J. Preston, Jr., 7209 Monticello Street, Pittsburgh.

P. E. Preusser, 6372 Caton Street, Pittsburgh.

L. E. Racke, Jr., 1211 Island Avenue, Pittsburgh.

R. D. Racke, 1211 Island Avenue, Pittsburgh.

N. Radick, Jr., 173–D–45th Street, Pittsburgh.

R. J. Ransaw, 709 Dornbush Street, Pittsburgh.

R. G. Rea, 117 Scotia Street, Pittsburgh.

R. L. Reaves, 2545 Chauncey Drive, Pittsburgh.

S. F. Reck, 4348 Coleridge Street, Pittsburgh.

F. N. Reed, Jr., 1200 Brushton Avenue, Pittsburgh.

B. J. Reese, 8018 Susquehanna Street, Pittsburgh.

F. E. Reilly, 1216 Barton Street, Pittsburgh.

W. G. Remensnyder, 311 Rennie Drive, Pittsburgh.

R. Ricci, 4611 Friendship Avenue, Pittsburgh.

L. J. Rock, 1434 Woodbine Street, Pittsburgh.

J. R. Ross, 4670 Sherwood Drive, Pittsburgh.

M. R. Ruffner, Route No. 2, Box 82, Tarentum.

T. C. Russell, 70 Haldane Street, Pittsburgh.

J. A. Schmitt, 509 Elizabeth Street, Pittsburgh.

G. L. Seidel, Jr., 333 South Home Avenue, Pittsburgh.

T. F. Sherer, Jr., 108 Blackhawk Street, Pittsburgh.

D. J. Smith, 708 Pennwood Drive, Pittsburgh.

B. B. Sokolow, 2342 Eldridge Street, Pittsburgh.

C. A. Sperandeo, 1934 Lowrie Street, Pittsburgh.

M. D. Spirnak, 1430 Nixon Street, Pittsburgh.

D. C. Spitzer, 6557 Bartlett Street, Pittsburgh.

J. J. Stiscak, 91 Cedar Avenue, Pittsburgh.

L. Stitt, 1212 Glenn Avenue, Pittsburgh.

J. W. Strouss, 123 Crawford Avenue, Pittsburgh.

A. M. Sullivan III, 3043 Harmening Avenue, Pittsburgh.

J. B. Sullivan, 99 East Manilla Avenue, Pittsburgh.

F. E. Taylor, 316 Columbia Avenue, Pittsburgh.

F. W. Thackeray, 1913 Perrysville Avenue, Pittsburgh.

B. E. Thompson, 1512 Wolpert Way, Pittsburgh.

T. S. Trasatti, 5097 Forbes Avenue, Apt. D–11, Pittsburgh.

J. W. Turnbaugh, 1648 Dellrose Street, Pittsburgh.

R. J. Velte, 524 Knoll Street, Pittsburgh.

R. A. Vierheller, 240 Augusta Street, Pittsburgh.

W. C. Volkman, 1437 Howard Street, Pittsburgh.

D. A. Von Kaenel, 98 Locust Street, Pittsburgh.

M. J. Walsh, 132 Kearns Place, Pittsburgh.

D. C. Watts, 226 Collins Drive, Pittsburgh.

F. T. Webb, 1836 Bedford Avenue, Pittsburgh.

J. R. Weber, 207 Clover Street, Pittsburgh.

J. E. Whitehouse 220 Parkside Avenue, Pittsburgh.

M. A. Wiezorek, 1248 Superior Avenue, Pittsburgh.

A. J. Williamson, 572 Orchard Avenue, Pittsburgh.

W. E. Wilson, 715 Hays Avenue, Pittsburgh.

U. R. Winn, 805 Whiteside Road, Pittsburgh.

M. J. Wittgartner, 988 Glencoe Avenue, Pittsburgh.

D. L. Worstell, 8287 Tanglewood Road, Pittsburgh.

P. M. Wrigley, Jr., 3450 McClure Avenue, Pittsburgh.

R. D. Yagulli, 766 Darlington Road, Carnegie.

R. A. Young, 502 Cabot Way, Pittsburgh.

M. L. Zucker, 5564 Beacon Street, Pittsburgh.

A. A. Knoll, 204 York Avenue, West Pittston.

R. L. Gregor, 210 East Franklin Street, St. Clair.

D. B. Mills, in care of Postmaster, Prospectville.

H. L. Brown, 1158 North 11th Street, Reading.

L. S. Newberry, 1138 Carsonia Avenue, Reading.

D. L. Pflum, 742 Franklin Street, Reading.

T. S. Reed, R.D. 1, Mohrsville.

K. C. Sherwood, 117 North 25th Street, Reading.

M. P. Brett, in care of Postmaster, Robinson.

E. J. Sanner, P. O. Box 386, Robinson.

J. P. Corcoran, in care of Postmaster, Scranton.

C. R. Harte, R.D. 1, Waymart.

J. S. Mattioli, U.S. Post Office, Scranton.

J. B. McNulty, 109 North Van Buren Avenue, Scranton.

P. J. Mellody, 311 Larch Street, Scranton.

F. J. Morgan, 1109 South Main Avenue, Scranton.

G. J. Popil, 237 North Cameron Avenue, Scranton.

J. L. Santini, U.S. Post Office, Scranton.

M. J. Latsko, 663 Service Avenue, Sharon.

E. A. Macknis, 113 South Gilbert, Shenandoah.

R. W. King, Jr., 102 North Kimberly Avenue, Somerset.

G. D. Miller, R. D. 2, Somerset.

R. H. Weigle, R.F.D. 5, Somerset.

W. M. Wiester, Jr., Route 3, Somerset.

N. D. Hartzel, 304 Washington Avenue, Souderton.

J. J. Ryan III, 148 Maple Avenue, Southampton.

T. O. Farrar, 411 Colfax Street, Springdale.

B. V. Intorre, Care of Postmaster, State College.

J. F. Kessinger, Jr., 1100 Centre Lane, State College.

M. L. Pierson.

L. J. Mudry, 247 Barclay Avenue, Pittsburgh.

J. Calloway, 12 Linn Avenue, Washington.

A.J. Caruso, 122 Woodland Avenue, Washington.

F. B. Ostovic, Jr., Box 74, Fredericktown.

G. F. Relich, 45 Fairhill Drive, Washington.

A. J. Sacco, 1375 Allison Avenue, Washington.

T. L. Trosch, 231 Lebanon Manor Drive, West Mifflin.

J. J. Yuhasz, 3519 Whitaker Street, West Mifflin.

J. H. Born, 271 East South Street, Wilkes-Barre.

S. J. Ebert, 239 George Avenue, Wilkes-Barre.

J. R. Kindler, 50 Pierce Street, Kingston.

W. A. Krute, 42 Auburn Street, Wilkes Barre.

J. W. Lynch, 65 Bethel Street, Wilkes-Barre.

M. A. Purcell, RD 5, Shavertown.

N. W. Wartella, 811 Scott Street, Wilkes-Barre.

L. S. Yudkovitz, 21 West Union Street, Wilkes-Barre.

B. W. Smith, 234 West 5th Avenue, Conshohocken.

T. A. Glatfelter, 935 Maple Avenue, Lancaster.

C. B. Horner, 222 Orchard Road, New Cumberland.

M. R. Sheffer, 1952 Leonard Street, York.

K. L. Shellenberger, 61 Wise Avenue, Lancaster.

ST. LOUIS REGION

Missouri

Richard T. Jones, 220 West Locust, Bowling Green.

Jerry L. Staley, 435 North Fredrick, Cape Girardeau.

Larry L. Loos, 780 West Rodney, Cape Girardeau.

Paul Huey, Chaffee.

Denis Edward Rigdon, 1521 Themis, Cape Girardeau.

Floyd Williams 516 Jefferson Avenue, Cape Girardeau.

Carl R. Fisher, Caruthersville.

Jack L. Reynolds, 1400 Fair Street, Chillicothe.

Robert L. Brenneman, Route 1, Chillicothe.

Norman K. Perry, 308 Hillcrest, Chillicothe.

Larry Prather, 111 North 15th Street, Chillicothe.

Terry D. Coult, 1612 Bryan, Chillicothe.

David N. Tise, 403 Westmount, Columbia.

William A. Atkinson, 1605 West Broadway, Columbia.

Dennis D. Murphy, 715 Spring Valley Road, Columbia.

Addie J. Smith, 811 Leawood Terrace, Columbia.

Allan Schuh, 516 West Pratt, De Soto.

Carol R. Libbee, 903 Stewart Road, Columbia.

Robert DePew, 417 Sanford Avenue, Columbia.

Charles H. Sauer, 1635 Highridge Circle, Columbia.

Richard A. Pettus, 9 College Avenue, Flat River.

Nick Lingo, Potosi.

Terry G. Hassell, 501 Field Street, Flat River.

Richard Bess, 309 Haney Street, Flat River.

Barbara A. Hocker, Drexel.

Harold E. Hicklin, Jr., Perry.

Michael K. Osborn, Hazelwood.

Daniel E. McLaughlin, 602 West Walnut, Independence.

Stephen R. White, 102 Reed Street, Fulton.

Dennis H. Gaffke, 710 Houchins, Jefferson City.

Jerry M. Wekenborg, Route 5, Jefferson City.

Kenneth L. Adams, 1304 East Ducklin Street, Jefferson City.

Frederick L. Bloomfield, 922 Fairmount Boulevard, Jefferson City.

Roger D. Crocker, 617 W. McCarty, Jefferson City.

William P. Klauber, 2013 Norris Drive Jefferson City.

Edwin B. Hamilton, 614 Linn Street, Jefferson City.

Danny M. Melton, 1518 Notre Dame, Jefferson City.

Terry M. Reed, 922 Moreau Drive, Jefferson City.

Dennis McCurren, 721 Clark, Jefferson City.

Danny Dowdy, 811 East Dunklin, Jefferson City.

Charlene Mayberry, 504 Lafayette, Jefferson City.

Stephen Stauffer, 1715 Michigan, Joplin.

Richard Cook, 2807 Picher, Joplin.

James D. Saale, 517 Norma Drive, St. Charles.

Thomas B. Becker, 540 Monroe Street, St. Charles.

Joel F. Achtenberg, 1028 West 70th Street, Kansas City.

Donald C. Baker, 4116 College, Kansas City.

Ronald L. Bodinson, 6414 Warnall Road, Kansas City.

William E. Boykin, 4006 Euclid, Kansas City.

Arthur D. Coleman, 3224 Bellefontaine, Kansas City.

Larry F. Colletti, 2406 West 79th Terrace, Prairie Village, Kans.

Robert J. Davis, 5116 Rosewood Drive, Shawnee Mission, Kans.

Gordon F. Dawson, 11138 Oak, Kansas City.

Douglas R. Dubin, 1820 East 85th Street, Kansas City.

Fred G. Graham, 6418 Wornall Road, Kansas City.

Cheryl E. Jones, 3201 East 52d, Kansas City.

Robert E. Kelley, 5600 Bales, Kansas City.

Terry R. McCall, 3530 North Myrtle, Kansas City.

Charles W. McTyer, 2432 Olive, Kansas City.

John E. Mockobey, 9300 East 103, Kansas City.

Stephen J. Moore, 450 West 50th, Kansas City.

John B. Moree, 11222 East 50 Highway, Raytown.

Wesley C. Parham, 3509 Brooklyn, Kansas City.

Robert B. Patterson, 4407 Bellefontain, Kansas City.

William H. Redmond, 2456 Spruce, Kansas City.

William E. Shade, 2715 East 35th Terrace, Kansas City.

Harry D. Shrago, 112 East 67th, Kansas City.

David B. Silverforb, 209 Brush Creek Boulevard, Kansas City.

Karen J. Taylor, 1720 Berry, Independence.

Rodney M. Thompson, 3208 East 31st, Kansas City.

Ben Turec, 8409 Central, Kansas City.

Charles W. Wheeler, 204 South Jackson, Kansas City.

Charles B. Williams, Jr., 2714 Brooklyn, Kansas City.

Walter R. Jacobs, 912 West McCoy, Independence.

John E. Redmond, 604 East 65th Terrace, Kansas City.

Carl Bengston, 515 East 61st Street, Kansas City.

Richard Lippman, 817 Jefferson, Kansas City.

Joe Fanning, 5313 Prospect, Kansas City.

Frank M. McMahon, 1474 East 76th Terrace, Kansas City.

Charles Murphy, 2000 Benton Boulevard, Kansas City.

Lee C. Simm, 3845 Montgall, Kansas City.

David Paul Lyman, 5525 Garfield, Kansas City.

Edward V. Johnson, 3220 East 30th, Kansas City.

Bailus Melvin Tate, 3225 East 30th, Kansas City.

Verlie Norton, 3218 East 32d Street, Kansas City.

Milton C. Smith, 3046 East 32d Street, Kansas City.

Sammie Lee Smith, 3737 Garfield, Kansas City.

James Walter Rider, 3809 Windsor, Kansas City.

Patrick James Lillard, 322 North Brighton, Kansas City.

Raymone W. Sonnenberg, 421 East 55th Street, Kansas City.

James Ora Wallace, 1242 South Hardy Avenue, Kansas City.

Judith Anne Johnston, 1509½ West Walnut, Independence.

Helen Marie Ellis, 3025 Olive Street, Kansas City.

Carol Sue Horn, 845 West 30th Street, Independence.

Jullous Carey, 1015 Vine Street, Kennett.

Patricia Novinger, RFD, Novinger.

Kenneth F. Robb, Jr., 602 Marion, Kirksville.

Donald Bradley, La Belle.

Joseph D. Roberts, II, 419 West Kansas, Liberty.

Gerald D. Jackson, 321 West 5th Street, Maryville.

Samuel C. Richardson, 4612 East Rollins, Moberly.

James G. Spencer, 402 North Olive, Nevada.

Larry G. Sheridan, Moundville.

William F. Johnson, 926 Tremont, Poplar Bluff.

John Throckmorton, 2535 North Main, Poplar Bluff.

James O. Essary, 928 Park Avenue, Poplar Bluff.

Lyndel Harold Porterfield, 511 Cedar Street, Poplar Bluff.

Sandra Schierloh, Belle.

Douglas L. Hermann, 808 West 12th, Rolla.

Chuck Downing, Houston.

Steven A. Honse, Route 3, Box 146, Rolla.

Stephen G. England, 806 Bray Avenue, Rolla.

Chris M. Killian, 902 Angus Valley Drive, Rolla.

Gary L. Frank, Route 4, Rolla.

Janice M. Duncan, Post Office Box 544, Rolla.

Rebecca Fuller, Augusta.

Albert Boos, 3504 Doniphan Saint Joseph.

Rita Hafner, 2814 Francis Street, St. Joseph.

Thomas J. Kneib, 2838 Messamine Street, St. Joseph.

Wilson G. Loar, Jr., 5419 South 22d, St. Joseph.

Alan G. Silverglat, 3029 Douglas, St. Joseph.

Charles E. Stewart, 53 East Hyde Park, St. Joseph.

Dee A. Turner Thomas, 904 Corby, St. Joseph.

John R. Yancey, Jr., 1805 6th Avenue, St. Joseph.

William F. Piercy, 220 North 18th Street, St. Joseph.

Patrick G. Peeple, 520 North 24th, St. Joseph.

Dennis Johnson, 1404 East Kathleen, Sikeston.

Robert Brothers, 230 Watson, Sikeston.

Richard Compas, 305 J Drive, Sikeston.

Mitchell Ray Shelby, 520 Wallace, Sikeston.

William T. Solon, 1415 West 3d, Sedalia.

William H. Bunn III, 1506 South Barrett, Sedalia.

Jack E. Gross, II, 1930 Ventura, Springfield.

Russell Campbell, Jr., Republic.

Larry J. Butrick, 2534 North National, Springfield.

Tim A. McColm, 502 North Burton, Springfield.

Joyce E. Franks, 2424 West Walnut, Springfield.

Michael D. Lumley, 521 West Minota, Springfield.

Terrence N. Hyde, 2139 Prairie Lane, Springfield.

Larry Gooch, 2817 Rocklyn, Springfield.

Craig E. Alexander, Route 4, Box 162, Marshfield.

Miss Neda L. Bockover, 806 West Seventh Street, Washington.

St. Louis

John A. Sappington, 4615 Tower Grove.

Michael Handley, 4354 Engright.

James Murphy, 5915 Waterman.

Frank Keaney, Jr., 6423 January.

Raymond Bruntrager, 71 Bellerive Acres.

Joseph Forti, 5407 North Kingshighway.

Joseph Herbst, 5019 Queens.

Thomas Archer, 5360 Queens.

Frank Bubb, 9 Wrenwood Court.

Lucy Christman, 659 Tuxedo Boulevard.

Michael Smolens, 601 North Price Road.

Jess Mitchel Usery, 5919 Garesche Avenue.

John J. Hennelly, 6230 Delor.

Robert Guilliams, 7820 Wilmore.

Eddie D. Evans, 4812 Cote Brilliant.

John O'Toole, 5644 Mimika.

Octavis Harrison, 3740 St. Louis.

Frank Cushing, 63 Bellerive Acres.

Arthur Groesch, 5420 Queens.

Richard L. Schuler, 4336a Arco.

Loren A. Jackson, 5026 Page.

Jack Davis, 719 Landscape.

Edward Levitt, 9626 La Jolla.

Kenneth Shear, 50 Creekwood Lane.

Steven Schwedt, 8425 Braddock.

Oliver R. Anderson, 6536 Itaska.

Thomas A. Grooms, 51 Westmoreland.

Grady Ward, 4021a Kennerly.

Terry L. Baker, 6216 Helm Drive.

Dayton M. Cramer, 4045 Germania.

Dennis Huelsing, 3230 Pennsylvania.

Byron Bass, 7535 Ahern.

James F. Booth, 6250 Walsh.

Larry Benoist, 2105 East Fair.

Harold Kalishman, 7301 Tulane.

George Otte, 5214 Finkman.

Ray Overman, 6037 Harney.

Roland Rose, 5317 Ruskin.

Michale J. Kelly, 150 Grenoble Lane, Florrisant, Mo.

Fred Miller, 1323 Midland Drive.

Betty J. Clayborne, 2432 Cleveland, East St. Louis, Ill.

Albert Zimmer, 932 Chelsea.

Charles Wartts, 3024 Thomas.

James J. Crane, 7701 Mallard Drive.

William F. Seeck, 4233 McRee.

Ronald J. McIntyre, 2622 Belle Glade.

Douglas Whittington, 3900 Flora Place.

Michael Streng, 2045 East Prairie.

Andrew Farris, 45 Bellerive Acres.

Robert G. Hess, 2839 Miami.

John Hinrichs, 3250 Lucas and Hunt Road.

John DiFatta, 9946 Norwick.

Delores Warren, 2027 Franklin.

James Jeter, 4910 Maffitt Place.

Robert Mills, Jr., 7460 Hiawatha.

John W. Hammon, 915 West Main, Festus.

David Tolie, 4640 Tennessee.

Luke A. Knese, Jr., 5211 Bonita.

Bessie R. Johnson, 3027a Whittier.

Charles Kleine, 1438 Klein.

Lewis Jenkins, 4650 Page.

Kenneth W. Macon, 4501 Newstead.

Allan J. McCarthy, 3909a Fillmore.

Freddie C. Pryor, 2733a Franklin.

Paul E. Schroeder, 5733 Higgins.

James F. Chik, 10430 Four Winds Court.

Robert L. Nelson, 5041 Maple Street.

Donald J. Torizzo, 215 Westgate.

Vallon Brown, 5082 Westminster.

Timothy Meyer, 2214 Indiana.

Thomas Weatherby, 4902 Michigan.

Gary Pratte, 5202 Potomac.

John Kennedy Nolan, 900 Surrey Lane.

Robert McAlevey, 4933 Heege Road.

Elson Williams, Jr., 3914 St. Louis.

Mary S. Maginn, 8221 Glen Echo Drive.

Franklin S. McKeown, Jr., 7022 Canton.

Vickie A. Riggins, 5564 St. Louis.

Robert F. Allison, 6715 Murray.

David L. Green, 8206 Airport Road.

Gordon N. Johnson, 902 Drummond Drive.

Gary R. Rahm, 4139 Banks Road, St. Ann.

John H. Hoelzer, 7449 Dale.

Lyn F. Bayer, 701 Capac Court.

Raymond D. Kayser, 5095a North Kingshighway.

Barbara J. Dorsey, 5739 Westminister.

John J. Hennelly, Jr., 6230 Delor.

John W. Tecu, 5734 Lisette.

Lawrence A. James, 12127 Valencia.

Tom Mendelson, 8006 Stanford.

Joseph Domian, 7115 Hosmer.

Diane Molz, 2315 Wismer.

Craig Phegley, 46 Tulip Drive.

Gary S. Grisbeck, 5223 Potomac.

Thomas R. Zeisler, 5239 Emerson Street.

Leon B. Smith, 1420 Laurel.

Paul L. Small, 4637 Pope.

Thurman L. Willett, Jr., 213 Solley Drive, Manchester.

Gabriel Wallace, 2311 Biddle.

Timothy Foley, 6148 Washington.

John Moll, 2745 Accomac.

Archie Harrison, 3732 St. Louis.

Bradford Buchek, 9036 Consul Drive.

Charles Haller, 1240 Tamm.

Arkansas

Linda Lee Schuburg, 939 St. Louis, Batesville.

Robert Edward Parks, Newark.

James F. Holman, 701 Walnut, Newport.

Danny Smith, Bentonville.

Joe Cook, Route 4, Box 125–A, Camden.

William B. Ellis, Jr., Stephens.

Jimmie A. Brady, Route 3, Vilonia.

Marvin Keith Marshall, Route 3, Box 123, Crossett.

James William Berry, Route 8, Fayetteville.

James Alfred Cole, 321 West Lafayette, Fayetteville.

Ernest E. Rothrock, Box 478, Lincoln.

Gary D. Alverson, 4423 South 30th, Fort Smith.

Daniel L. Borengasser, 300 North 39th, Fort Smith.

Regina R. Crain, 1811 South Greenwood, Fort Smith.

James R. England, 1922 North 44th Terrace, Fort Smith.

Phillip Bushman Farris, 518 May Avenue, Fort Smith.

Dan Hendrix, 2215 South 40th Street, Fort Smith.

Pete Nicely, 208 Federal Building, Fort Smith.

Robert E. Woods, 805 North Greenwood, Fort Smith.

Larry Joe Jefferson, Route 2, Harrison.

Don Wesley Walker, Jr., 620 North Walnut Street, Harrison.

M. C. Clark, 917 Jefferson Street, Texarkana.

Frank Boyd Coleman, Lewisville.

Michael G. Mitchell, Star Route, Mountain Pine.

Andrew C. Donaldson, 714 Hope Street, Jonesboro.

Ralph Donaldson, Jr., 804 East Washington, Jonesboro.

Lynda F. Smith, 1609 Ethel, Jonesboro.

Ann L. Carter, 1612 West College, Jonesboro.

Clyde M. Knight, 1108 Kitchen, Jonesboro.

Michael L. Ball, 3120 Peyton, Little Rock.

Carroll R. Bates, 211 South Plaza, Little Rock.

Phillip Charles Bressinck, 1301 Garland Avenue, North Little Rock.

Joseph E. Cassady, 1407 South Harrison, Little Rock.

Jeff N. Hardwick, 923 East H, North Little Rock.

Jerry Wayne Hollis, 10024 West Markam, Little Rock.

James R. Isum, 1808 Bishop Street, Little Rock.

Henry L. Jones, Jr., 1511 West 23d, Little Rock.

Jim A. Lorenz, 508 West Pine, Little Rock.

Truman Mitchell, 2 Gilliam Park Road, Little Rock.

Drajah H. Morrow, 2123 Rice Street, Little Rock.

Barbara J. Rawls, 2124 West Seventh Street, Little Rock.

Phillip S. Shavers, 3024 Fulton Street, Little Rock.

Nancy E. Woods, 7 Belle Meade Drive, Little Rock.

David Allen Fincher, Box 218, Waldo.

Billy Earl Clampit, 502 East Jackson, Monticello.

Gail Bigge, Mena.

Murphy Davis, RFD No. 3, Newport.

Edwin L. Goff, 901 West 20th Street, North Little Rock.

Donald R. Owen, Jr., 1215 Parkway Drive, North Little Rock.

Manuel Dison, 1518 East 4th Street, North Little Rock.

Bruce Cook, Jr., Dooley Road, North Little Rock.

Don Roberts, 520 North 5th Street, Paragould.

Joel Railsback, 1615 West 33d, Pine Bluff.

Miles Fish, Jr., Box 476, Star City.

Kenneth L. Johnson, Jr., 1311 Alabama Street, Pine Bluff.

Hugh E. Hays, 905 North 9th Street, Rogers.

Jim W. Pickens, Box 128, Rogers.

Hugh R. Showalter, 503 North Walnut, Searcy.

William E. Black, Jr., 109 SE. J Street, Bentonville.

James S. Keeton, 522 Highland Drive, West Memphis.

Harold D. Masterson, Route No. 2, Earle.

William K. Thomas, 513 Ingram, West Memphis.

Cheryl D. Williams, Box 584, Clarkedale.

Lee N. Ziegenhorn, Route 1, Earle.

Robert Lee Williams, 530 South 9th Street, West Memphis.

Arthur Jackson, 202 South 11th Street, West Memphis.

Iowa

Howard J. Foulkner, Story City.

Larry K. McCoy, 413 East 3d Street, Ames.

Bernard Malone, 401 Olive St., Atlantic.

John Morton, 104 Clinton, Boone.

David Myers, 1628 Marshall, Boone.

Richard L. Houser, Boone.

Judith McCarty, Argyle.

Rick Humphrey, 606 West Ramsey, Burlington.

Fred Meeker, Mediapolis.

Fred Delezal, Carroll.

Niles B. Smith, Harper.

Thomas Borchart, 305 W. Water, Fayette.

Charles H. Patrick, 4305 Cavalier NE., Cedar Rapids.

Timothy Maddigan, Celwein.

Richard Menning, 825 Straub Court, Cedar Rapids.

Larry T. Baker, 1105 14th Avenue SW., Cedar Rapids.

Joseph H. Schmickle, 4001 Midway Drive NW., Cedar Rapids.

Franklin L. Spinka, 3311 Southland SW., Cedar Rapids.

Earl J. Williams, 1411 10th Street SE., Cedar Rapids.

Thomas R. Preston, Cedar Rapids.

Raymond R. Anderson, 914 9th Street SW., Cedar Rapids.

Donald E. Joens, 2320 J Street SW., Cedar Rapids.

Barry Fish, 2939 Skyline Drive, Clinton.

John Rayes, 1013 West 7th Street, Davenport.

Richard Rodriquez, 1453 West 3rd Street, Davenport.

William R. Ray, 1115 East Columbia, Davenport.

Michael C. Gaul, 3012 Tremont, Davenport.

James Hegeman, 303 First Avenue NE., Waukon.

Gerald Bagg, 2330 S.W. 9th, Des Moines.

Steven Cox, 307 Davis, Des Moines.

Ron West, 2514 West 53d, Des Moines.

John Brick, 1728 East 9th, Des Moines.

Charles Costelline, 2020 Harding Road, Des Moines.

Lynn Hoffman, 549 28th, West Des Moines.

Sam Gillotti, 915 Kirkwood, Des Moines.

Michael L. Durnavich, 618 Clinton, Des Moines.

James Denato, 1610 Watrous, Des Moines.

Roger Parker, 922 West 16th, Des Moines.

Gene Grozino, 2337 S.W. 9th, Des Moines.

Alfred D. Parr, Box 113, Humeston.

Gerald Kelaso, 5933 Cottage Grove, Des Moines.

Roger Mason, R.R. No. 1, Osceola.

Gary Lundholm, 1105 Euclid, Des Moines.

Fred Joseph Lucia, 1816 60th, Des Moines.

Ralph A. Chiodo, 318 Edison, Des Moines.

Charles A. Talcott, 931 29th, Des Moines.
Terrance L. Arnold, 1506 East 9th, Des Moines.
Richard M. Bush, 1107 12th, Des Moines.
Ronald L. Fisher, 914 Guthrie, Des Moines.
Roger D. Freel, 1021 West 26th, Des Moines.
Joseph J. Gedden, Jr., 662 36th Street, Des Moines.
Lloyd Jones, Jr., 950 West 17th Street, Des Moines.
James M. Mincks, 2406 Adams, Des Moines.
William S. Thyberg, 5304 Grand Avenue, Des Moines.
Melvin Crippen, 512 SW. Virginia, Des Moines.
Stephen King, Winterset.
John P. Mullen, 3113 Clark Street, Des Moines.
Michael W. Shearer, 1351 22d Street, Des Moines.
Dennis Mullin, 2411 Maryland Pike, Des Moines.
Nicholas J. Lemmo, Jr., 3513 SE. 8th Street, Des Moines.
Michael D. Porter, 1131 18th Street, Des Moines.
Paul G. Storey, 714 East Sheridan, Des Moines.
Curtis M. Murphy, Julien Hotel, Dubuque.
Dennis A. Boda, 434 Loras Boulevard, Dubuque.
Michael J. Durkin, 1511 Bluff Street, Dubuque.
Gerry W. Hallenbeck, 1555 Ruan Drive, Dubuque.
Thomas J. Wild, 752 University, Dubuque.
Douglas N. McNaver, 1646 Finley, Dubuque.
Wilmer Atkinson, 2411 Rhomberg, Dubuque.
Michale Laughlin, 1722 Avenue C, Fort Madison.
Daryl Beall, Somers.
Roger Conway, Swea City.
Michael Christenson, Jewell.
Michael W. Anderson, 2023 3d, South Fort Dodge.
Tim V. Langerman, 1729 4th Avenue, South Fort Dodge.
J. Michael Swank, 1253 North 25th, Fort Dodge.
Pat Cavanaugh, Lohrville.
Martin Huffman, Manson.
James Lynch, 1010 Highlane, Iowa City.
James Moore, 1006 North Church, Leon.
Paul L. Becker, 40 Oak Drive, Mason City.
Steven H. Collins, 721 North Jackson, Mason City.
Brian L. Ekborg, RFD No. 2, Nora Springs.
Jeffrey E. Judy, 215 Fourth Street, NW., Hampton.
Dale B. Olson, RFD No. 1, Rudd.
Douglas B. Tiedeman, 1215 North Hampshire, Mason City.
Jon R. Yankey, 302 14th Street SE., Mason City.
David R. Walters, 317 West North Street, Manly.
James H. Anderegg, Rural Route No. 3, Mason City.
Stephen Loy, 321 Taft, Ottumwa.
Richard J. Odem, Box 13, Kirkville.
Gary Raymond Smith, Route 3, Albia.
David Baker, 902 Center, Ottumwa.
Keith Kunkel, Rural Route 2, Ottumwa.
Frank Bell, 615 East Court Street, Ottumwa.
J. C. Irvin, Shenandoah.
John Perdue, Emmetsburg.
Gary D. Luft, 3519 McComb, Sioux City.
Sharon L. Powell, 2808 South Paxton, Sioux City.
John Wittstruck, 3600 Peters Avenue, Sioux City.
Harry Kitts, 3600 Peters Avenue, Sioux City.
Michael Halaszyn, 3423 Jennings, Sioux City.
Ken Heaton, 1622 West 16th, Sioux City.
John J. Mitzsechte, 2102 Pierce, Sioux City.
Darryl E. Nelson, 1515 McDonald, Sioux City.
Michael E. Bilunas, 2651 South Lemon, Sioux City.
Vernon E. Allen, 515 Sumner, Waterloo.
Lawrence W. Ash, 2817 East Fourth, Waterloo.
Ross R. Burrill, 357 Butler, Waterloo.
Marvin E. Dillavou, 1929 Sixth Street, Evansdale.
Richard J. Junker, 901 Brookside, Waterloo.
Noel R. Shekleton, 324½ West Fourth, Waterloo.
John S. Steidler, 916 Wellington, Waterloo.
Anthony L. Tisdale, 526 Iowa, Waterloo.
Thomas Berling, 1445 Bertch, Waterloo.
Gary M. Riley, 126 Harrison, Waterloo.
Joe N. Austin, 317 Sumner, Waterloo.
Gary L. Letchford, 202 Mulberry, Waterloo.
Jane Little, West Branch.
Michael A. Crivaro, 940 Creston, Des Moines.

SAN FRANCISCO REGION

California

V. J. Calderon, 2150 Fulton, Monterey Park.
W. H. Hanna, 8821 East Naomi, San Gabriel.
M. L. Huff, 2355 Bunker Avenue, El Monte.
W. C. Lee, 1100 South Bradshaw, Monterey Park.
S. M. Roland, 9556 East Nadine, Temple City.
R. Salinas, 1835 Portogrande Drive, South San Gabriel.
J. R. Stifel, 1625 Laurel Street, South Pasadena.
L. M. Tsuchiya, 1177 Garfield Avenue, Monterey Park.
R. P. Ward, 470 East Concha Street, Altadena.
R. L. Adler, 916 South Roberts, Anaheim.
W. T. Bryan, 702 Westvale Drive, Anaheim.
R. E. Clerisse, Jr., 2918 West Ravenswood Drive, Anaheim.
R. C. Scharples, 1332 Rosewood Avenue, Anaheim.
A. J. Aoki, 710 L Street, Bakersfield.
C. J. Barton, 2117 Lantana Way, Bakersfield.
L. G. Brawn, 3912 Wilson Road, Bakersfield.
L. D. Durbin, 404 Electra Avenue, Bakersfield.
P. J. Easley, 1501 Camino Primavera, Bakersfield.
A. Edwards, 338 Highland, Bakersfield.
A. A. Gibbs, 1605 Woolsey Street, Berkeley.
A. H. Hays, 3812 Phaffle, Bakersfield.
W. J. McLean, Jr., 5104 Elysium Street, Bakersfield.
J. F. Vitz, 1811 Kent, Bakersfield.
M. L. Avakian, 900 Oxford Street, Berkeley.
T. G. Boyden, 1208 Shattuck Avenue, Berkeley.
W. B. Carroll, 2315 Parker Street, Berkeley.
A. A. Gibbs, 1605 Woolsey Street, Berkeley.
J. W. Hanson, 8 Jessen Court, Berkeley.
J. B. McCallan, Jr., 1611 Carleton Street, Berkeley.
B. L. Fox, 9118 David Avenue, Los Angeles.
J. A. House, 171 South El Cerrito, Brawley.
R. T. McIntosh, 1050 Monterey Street, La Habra.
D. N. Schneider, 1537 East Commonwealth, Fullerton.
C. E. Kroum, Jr., 2938 North Buena Vista, Burbank.
R. L. Sanders, 2921 North Frederic Street, Burbank.
D. J. Thorpe, 2740 North Lincoln, Burbank.
J. W. Thorpe, 1630 Highland, Glendale.
R. P. Bradley, 411 North Delaware, San Mateo.
L. B. Branson, 1401 Columbus Avenue, Burlingame.
D. M. Constantino, 1920 Carmelita Avenue, Burlingame.
J. M. Cullen, Jr., 1523 Columbus Avenue, Burlingame.
P. R. Durazzo, 1445 Benito Avenue, Burlingame.
E. S. Edwards, 609 Costa Rica, San Mateo.
W. H. Hartley, 1048 Black Mountain Road, Hillsborough.
R. S. McLeod, 1472 Benito Avenue, Burlingame.
D. M. Splain, 1510 Cypress Avenue, Burlingame.
G. L. Benson, 827 Heber Avenue, Calexico.
G. F. Elston, 3935 Linmar Lane, Carlsbad.
J. P. Murphy, 2570 Gregory Drive, Carlsbad.
J. M. Prout, 3440 Donna Drive, Carlsbad.
C. P. B. Burgess, 1002 Pomona Avenue, Chico.
T. L. Dawson, 1411 Almond Avenue, Chico.
F. J. Heffington, 420 Lake, Chowchilla.
S. J. Capuano, 1680 Fincroft Avenue, Claremont.
J. Navarro, 340 East Durian, Coalinga.
C. Austin, Jr., 802 North Northwood, Compton.
L. M. Bowen, 2323 West Raymond Street, Compton.
A. R. Henry, Jr., 1014 South Acacia Street, Compton.
G. D. Jackson, 1511 A. South Bentley, Compton.
A. Payton, Jr., 2209 West Reeves Street, Compton.
G. B. Thompson, 230 E. Raymond Street, Compton.
D. A. Aldrich, 3027 Esperanza Drive, Concord.
K. Ellingson, 1500 North Mitchell Canyon Road, Concord.
T. A. Keller, 3925 Royal Arch Drive, Concord.
J. E. McDonald, 3984 Dracena Court, Concord.
R. W. Serventi, 2514 Bonafiaco Street, Concord.
D. G. Tomlin, Post Office Box 21227, Concord.
R. T. Trumm, 2148 Frederick Street, Concord.
N. J. Aeberhard, 374 Esther Street, Costa Mesa.
E. M. Foster, 604 W. Bay Street, Costa Mesa.
J. D. Glenn, 858 Center Street, Costa Mesa.
C. J. Morgan, 720 Victoria Apartment A-3, Costa Mesa.
V. M. Mouzakis, 1045 North Dodsworth Avenue, Covina.
S. H. Simonton (address not available).
S. H. Simonton, 1045 N. Dodsworth, Covina.
R. L. Harness, 1625 16th Place, Delano.
B. C. Edwards, 10077 Fondo Road, Spring Valley.
C. H. Hall, 6225 Acorn Street, San Diego.
S. L. Campbell, 558 Euclid Avenue, El Centro.
M. L. Huff, 2355 Bunker, El Monte.
L. D. Pfeiffer, Route 4, Box 44, Escondido.
R. L. Francesconi, 826 J Street, Eureka.
S. J. Meininger, 1890 River Lane, Firebaugh.
R. S. Bellomy, 17490 Elaine Drive, Fontana.
J. D. Kern, 16248 Montgomery Street, Fontana.
L. A. Ornelas, 18024 Ivy Street, Fontana.
J. A. Avila, 42632 Charleston Way, Fremont.
N. P. Bruneau, 4496 Seneca Park Avenue, Fremont.
J. P. Herrera, 40374 Condon Street, Fremont.
S. L. Rockett, 41332 Chapel Way, Fremont.
B. A. Taylor, 444 Hillview Drive, Fremont.
A. M. Avila, Post Office Box 162, Laton.
T. E. Babcock, 340 Richardson Way, Hanford.
E. J. Benedict, 1926 West Griffith Way, Fresno.
D. M. Bowen, 28 East Strother, Fresno.
M. M. Calderon, Jr., 35 Lorena, Fresno.
R. Chinn, 103 Hawes, Fresno.
E. E. Hall, 4th 27 Whitesbridge, Fresno.
T. N. Hardy, 3035 Adoline, Fresno.
J. W. Herring, 914 East Street, Reedley.

L. J. Hill 3d 135 Oleander, Fresno.

M. P. Jensen, 1612 North Adoline, Fresno.

D. C. Morgan, 1089 Ventura, Kingsburg.

J. L. Murrin, 2026 Kensington Way, Hanford.

R. F. Thomas, 4664 East Lewis Avenue, Fresno.

J. E. Tomer, 1213 Pleasant Way, Hanford.

D. B. Chaffee, 184 Hillcrest Drive, Fullerton.

T. H. Maxwell, 840 Grandview, Fullerton.

C. B. Stack, 1000 Arroues Drive, Fullerton.

E. A. Baker, 14907 Yukon Avenue, Hawthorne.

J. P. G. Johnson, Jr., 8731 Elmer Lane, Garden Grove.

J. M. Probst, 11311 Stratford Way, Garden Grove.

P. J. Remmel, 9662 Blanche Avenue, Garden Grove.

C. W. Webber, 10811 Blake Street, Garden Grove.

J. A. Black, 1634 Highland Avenue, Glendale.

S. K. Lecheminant, 1320 Norton Avenue, Glendale.

A. R. Matoza, 575 Sycamore Avenue, Gustine.

J. R. Gingrich, 296 West Kelly Drive, Hamilton Air Force Base.

P. T. Bitz, 24822 Broadmore Avenue, Hayward.

D. C. Cavallaro, 533 Banbury Street, Hayward.

L. J. Ghilardi, 2736 Pineridge Road, Castro Valley.

R. W. Pratt, 21785 Dolores Street, Castro Valley.

G. E. Sundberg, 24037 Wilcox Lane, Hayward.

R. J. Vigil, 26617 Luvena Drive, Hayward.

G. S. Bennett, 2733 East 58th Street, Huntington Park.

S. S. Geldman, 6712 Seville Avenue, Huntington Park.

G. K. Avila, 83 475 Highway 111, Indio.

R. G. Avila, 83 124 Center Street, Indio.

R. A. Garcia, 45 975 Grace Street, Indio.

T. G. Hill, 73 290 Catalina Way, Palm Desert.

H. S. Mestas, 45877 Sage Street, Indio.

G. R. Montez, 50021 Coronado, Coachella.

M. G. Saldivar, 46121 Towne, Indio.

R. T. Salgado, 43690 Jackson Street, Indio.

L. C. Smith, 46200 Calhoun Street, Indio.

W. P. Sprinkel, 85306 Avenue 52, Coachella.

D. L. Wheeler, 82185 Sierra Street, Indio.

D. B. Adler, 8011 Maitland Avenue, Inglewood.

N. E. Adler, 8011 Maitland, Inglewood.

H. Bauchiero, 2505 West 80th Street, Inglewood.

M. E. Brown, 350 East 70th Street, Los Angeles.

R. C. Buchholz, 108½ South Cedar Avenue, Inglewood.

K. C. Carter, 931 West Stockwell, Compton.

R. Caudillo, 433 North Nestor, Compton.

J. C. Clark, 1951 East 130th Street, Compton.

D. B. Cohen, 9421 Second Avenue, Inglewood.

R. J. Desimone, 13236 St. Andrews Place, Gardena.

L. W. Holmes, 7218 South Denker Avenue, Los Angeles.

D. D. Johnson, 16301 Visalia Avenue, Compton.

D. L. Jones, 1202 East 150th, Compton.

L. C. Jorgenson, 5359 West 117th Street, Inglewood.

R. J. Kintz, 8356 Chase Avenue, Los Angeles.

J. D. Kuns, 2301 Thoreau Street, Inglewood.

J. L. Kuns, 558 Glenrock 12, Los Angeles.

R. A. Leavell, 140 West 71st, Los Angeles.

J. K. Lowell, 3516 West 80th Street, Inglewood.

B. A. Monegan, 6310 5th Avenue, Los Angeles.

N. Oliver, 641 West 92d Street, Apartment 10, Los Angeles.

B. S. Parker, 140 West 71st, Los Angeles.

D. W. Ross, 1508 West Compton Boulevard, Gardena.

N. Rumanzeff, 2937 West 95th Street, Inglewood.

J. A. Saltzgiver, 323 Penn Street, El Segundo.

N. E. Shearin, 2102 Vanwick Street, Los Angeles.

W. L. Slaughter, 1122 South Dwight, Compton.

C. L. Solder, 1428 West 47th Street, Los Angeles.

D. R. Stutzman, 9014 5th Avenue, Inglewood.

L. Tippins, Jr., 340 East 64th Street, Los Angeles.

M. G. Townsend, 333½ West Kelso Street, Inglewood.

E. D. Williams, 319 West 122d Street, Los Angeles.

V. A. Pollack, 4933 Indianola, LaCanada.

T. H. Lipman, 2359 Caracas, LaCrescenta.

A. O. Baltuth, 637 K. Glenneyre Street, Laguna Beach.

M. J. Blair, 2669 Nido Way, Laguna Beach.

N. B. Woodbury, 443 Bent Street, Laguna Beach.

R. G. Case, 435 North Western Avenue, Whittier.

T. M. Coffey, 1041 North Euclid, LaHabra.

C. A. Feeney, 2521 Cajon Drive, LaHabra.

D. R. Wilson, 9673 Russell Street, LaHabra.

M. J. Cox, 6032 Castana, Lakewood.

R. D. Nunnally, 5515 Hazelbrook Avenue, Lakewood.

D. J. Sudakow, 5523 Coldbrook Avenue, Lakewood.

R. T. McIntosh, 1050 Monterey Street, La Habra.

H. L. Sumner, 15039 Costa Mesa Drive, La Mirada.

L. Hooker, 351 North Orange Avenue, Apartment 7, La Puente.

A. L. Larson, 14976 East Las Tunas Drive, La Puente.

R. C. Luehmann, 312 Pamela Kay Lane, La Puente.

J. Seargeant, 18744 Aguiro Street, La Puente.

I. V. Weil, 14543 Flanner Avenue, La Puente.

R. R. Bartlett, 1501 Foothill, La Verne.

J. C. Soto, 2320 Second Street, La Verne.

B. A. Shelby, 41304 North 27th Street West, Lancaster.

P. L. Brown, 34 East 69th Street, Long Beach.

S. A. Dum, 11852 Davenport Road, Los Alamitos.

S. J. Greenfield, 20 Grand Avenue 6, Long Beach.

D. I. Leddel, 4226 Pacific Avenue, Long Beach.

G. T. Mullan, 5603 Whitewood, Lakewood.

P. D. Olaso, 336 Gulf Avenue, Wilmington.

R. C. Rumley, 1136 Orizaba Avenue, Apartment 6, Long Beach.

D. V. Scott, 1322 Lewis Avenue, Long Beach.

R. J. Stanley, 707 Molino Avenue, Long Beach.

A. L. Steuer, 1114 East Harding, Long Beach.

K. E. Walczak, 2337 Daisy Avenue, Long Beach.

G. V. Morgan, 12222 Hilltop Drive, Los Altos.

T. A. Addison, 1332 East 106th Street, Los Angeles.

G. C. Aguiniga, 401 Wolfskill Drive, Los Angeles.

C. G. Allen, 4566 Lomita Street, Los Angeles.

D. B. Armstrong, 329 East 49th Street 3, Los Angeles.

L. K. Baker, 209 West 123d Street, Los Angeles.

R. L. Berry, 2624 10th Avenue, Arcadia.

K. Bornstein, 8555 Holloway Drive, Los Angeles.

G. H. Boyd, 2123 West 74th Street, Los Angeles.

L. S. Brazell, 2003 Thoreau Street, Los Angeles.

R. G. Brito, 3218 East 1st Street, Los Angeles.

P. L. Bronson, 2217 East 118th Street, Los Angeles.

A. H. Bustamante, 2207 South Mednik Avenue, Los Angeles.

W. E. Campbell, 2763 Highview Avenue, Altadena.

P. F. Carlson, 2263 Overland Avenue, Los Angeles.

T. J. Consiglio, 9902 Tristan Drive, Downey.

M. A. Coupe, 5848 Bowcroft Street, Los Angeles.

A. M. Cuevas, 152 West 110th Street, Los Angeles.

J. Curel-Sylvestre, 6669 Delongpre Avenue, Los Angeles.

P. A. Delpit, 1838 West 65th Street, Los Angeles.

K. C. Dixson, 1630 East 84th Street, Los Angeles.

P. R. Doose, 285 Beloit Avenue, Los Angeles.

R. D. Dunseath, 143 East Laurel Avenue, Arcadia.

S. A. Egan, 1208 Stearns Drive, Los Angeles.

R. W. Erickson, 1542 West 113th Street, Los Angeles.

J. R. Esters, 7618 Brighton Avenue, Los Angeles.

D. J. Estrada, 3435 Opal Street, Los Angeles.

D. B. Geffner, 3133 Barbydell Drive, Los Angeles.

B. Griffin, 4353 Don Tomasco Drive 17, Los Angeles.

S. W. Harper, Jr., 624 West 53d Street, Los Angeles.

H. R. Herod, 803 East 76th Place, Los Angeles.

C. J. Higgins, 1751 Kilbourn Street, Los Angeles.

D. S. Huffman, 5333 Live Oak View Avenue, Los Angeles.

K. W. Hunt, Jr., 9450 Jenny Avenue, Los Angeles.

L. J. Ivery, 7506 Denker Avenue, Los Angeles.

R. I. Johnson, 4415 West 30th Street, Los Angeles.

T. E. Johnson, 1946 East 126th Street, Compton.

W. E. Johnson, 858 East 102d Street, Los Angeles.

H. A. King, 212 North Mountain View Avenue, Los Angeles.

H. M. Knee, 6540 Moore Drive, Los Angeles.

M. C. Lechuga, 734½ South Carondelet Street, Los Angeles.

J. M. Lehman, 1920 Wellington Road, Los Angeles.

J. K. Lewis, 903 East 76th Place, Los Angeles.

B. Matsuno, 2942 9th Avenue, Los Angeles.

H. McGary, Jr., 7806 South San Pedro Street, Los Angeles.

G. B. McKay, 1503 West 81st Street, Los Angeles.

E. M. McMonigle, 1129 South Stanley Avenue, Los Angeles.

G. W. McTaggart, 823 West 117th Street, Los Angeles.

D. T. Mitani, 3724 Dozier Avenue, Los Angeles.

R. E. Montalvo, 2775 Motor Avenue, Los Angeles.

F. N. Moore, Jr., 1881 Buckingham Road, Los Angeles.

J. M. Moskow, 3400 Grandview Boulevard, Los Angeles.

P. J. Nathan, 438 North Sierra Bonita Avenue, Los Angeles.

L. Noel, 10717 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles.

B. B. O'Loughlin, 309 South Westgate Avenue, Los Angeles.

W. E. Pajaud III, 850 East 104th Street, Los Angeles.

C. F. Palmer, 4202 Collis Avenue, Los Angeles.

B. Paul, Jr., 10411 South Wilmington Avenue, Los Angeles.

L. N. Pickett, 12213 Lawler Street, Los Angeles.

V. Ransom, 2256 West 30 Street, Los Angeles.

D. E. Reyes, 4334 Rogers Street, Los Angeles.

E. J. Ross, 1435 South Redondo Boulevard, Los Angeles.

K. L. Schreiber, 1239 North Gower Street, Los Angeles.

H. E. Schuck, 819 South Dunsmuir Avenue, Los Angeles.

G. A. Schulman, 421 North Ogden Drive, Los Angeles.

J. Y. Shiohama, 3736 Hammel Street, Los Angeles.

M. D. Shulkin, 340 North Harper Avenue, Los Angeles.

C. G. Simpson, 13524 Avalon Boulevard, Los Angeles.

B. T. Soifer, 3401 Colbert Avenue, Los Angeles.

J. L. Soifer, 3401 Colbert Avenue, Los Angeles.

W. P. Stires, 3310 London Street, Los Angeles.

J. H. Stratton, 7804 South Figueroa Street, Los Angeles.

P. L. Thomas, Jr., 2762 Highview Avenue, Altadena.

T. A. Torres, 524 North Fickett Street, Los Angeles.

L. L. Uballez, 5509 Hastings Street, Los Angeles.

R. L. Vazquez, 601 West 62d Street, Los Angeles.

S. J. Verebelyi, 5132 Roseland Street, Los Angeles.

B. N. Washington, 728½ East 75th Street, Los Angeles.

J. M. Weisberg, 5607 Wenlock Street, Los Angeles.

H. S. Weisberg, 3314 South Canfield Avenue, 1, Los Angeles

P. W. White, 407 East 105th Street, Los Angeles.

H. O. Whitlock, 4251 West 59th Street, Los Angeles.

J. L. Williams, 3412 Bellevue Avenue, Los Angeles.

L. Williams, 2624 Thurman Avenue, Los Angeles.

P. R. Woodward, 12922 Stanford Avenue, Los Angeles.

W. T. Yoshizaki, 3412 Percy Street, Los Angeles.

P. J. Smith, 530 Jefferson Avenue, Los Banos.

R. C. Rickard, 15401 Blackberry Hill Road, Los Gatos.

M. C. Stone, 3701 Lynwood Road, Lynwood.

M. E. Purl, 212 Hilton Avenue, Madera.

J. D. Badgett, 24119 Neptune, Wilmington.

E. L. Treisman, 2021 Tennessee Street, Vallejo.

D. E. Anderson II, 576 East 16th Street, Marysville.

T. R. Battaglia, 1280 Barry Road, Yuba City.

M. S. Clarke, 1165 Queens Avenue, Yuba City.

D. L. Davidson, 1124 Vine Avenue, Marysville.

T. P. Durso, 1934 Romero Street, Yuba City.

E. J. Hannan, 414 6th Street, Marysville.

W. G. Herbert, Jr., 2115 Freeman Street, Marysville.

S. J. Palmer II, 1935 Lincoln Road, Yuba City.

S. C. Peters, 403 East 14th Street, Marysville.

L. G. Sage, 5903 Fern Court, Marysville.

D. L. Schrader, 807 Taber Avenue, Yuba City.

K. R. Collins, 727 Harvard Avenue, Menlo Park.

N. J. Craig, 256 Hedge, Menlo Park.

R. T. Murai, 216 Chester Street, Menlo Park.

D. E. Blair, 1530 West 23d Street, Merced.

D. H. Payne, 1772 Ardell Drive North, Merced.

J. T. Sabo, 568 East 27th Street, Merced.

R. E. Beckstrom, Route 1, Box 168 B, Mill Valley.

A. R. Venegas, 361 Oliver Street, Milpitas.

S. Alcala, Jr., Post Office Box 404, Riverbank.

E. Chavaz, 213 South 4th Street, Patterson.

R. C. Garcia, 409 Ribier Avenue, Modesto.

K. W. Longcor, 1606 Oakwood Drive, Modesto.

C. W. Nelson, 1772 Arbor Avenue, Turlock.

J. W. Richardson, Jr., 704 Key Avenue, Ripon.

B. E. Spencer, Post Office Box 133, Ceres.

C. Mangapit, 201 Dorado Street, Ridgecrest.

N. R. Tacklind, 232 East Marklan Drive, Monterey Park.

W. H. D. Hammond, 2160 San Vito Circle, Monterey.

D. E. Londahl, 501 Casanova Avenue, Monterey.

R. Phinney, 30 Via Castanada-Monterey, Monterey.

R. R. Myers, 1660 Loma Verde, Monterey Park.

R. R. Winsor, 1015 South Cordova Street, Alhambra.

J. V. Sousa, 928 Munster Street, Moraga.

R. L. Fleming, Jr., 2545 San Ramon Avenue, Mountain View.

P. T. Kinnison, 13384 Pastel Lane, Mountain View.

J. O. Pritchard, 148 Sherland Avenue, Mountain View.

M. R. Bishop, 7 Almar Drive, Napa.

P. L. Hein, 2120 Lernhart Street, Napa.

D. P. Hoxmeier, 3154 Piedmont Avenue, Napa.

G. A. Pavia, 1698 Sierra Avenue, Napa.

K. A. Skinner, 1515 Tallac Street, Napa.

R. H. Diem, 10854 Rathburn Avenue, Northridge.

F. L. Silvagni, 17951 Devonshire Street, Apartment 3, Northridge.

E. U. Lange, 11119 Jersey Street, Norwalk.

J. B. Loeffler, 1277 Lynwood Drive, Novato.

C. D. Bonner, 2040 24th Avenue, Oakland.

J. M. Clayborn, 4295 Fair Avenue, Oakland.

R. E. Colyar, 4187 Fruitvale Avenue, Oakland.

R. G. Dunn, 835 Santa Barbara Road, Oakland.

E. R. McCray, 2124 25th Avenue, Oakland.

G. W. McPeake, 3741 Linwood Avenue, Oakland.

J. J. White, Jr., 1836 East 25th Street, Apartment 4, Oakland.

W. B. Borth, 1821 South Horne, Oceanside.

B. F. Harrison III, 4730 College Avenue, San Diego.

G. E. Hinds, Jr., 1637 Lopez Street, Oceanside.

W. P. Stanley, 1648 Hunsaker, Oceanside.

H. M. Russell, 130 North Driskill Street, Oxnard.

S. P. Farmer, 12813 Weidner Street, Pacoima.

F. D. Perry, 1212 High SE., Albuquerque.

R. L. Erwin III, 43148 Arabia, Indio.

M. F. Austin, 350 Grant Avenue, Palo Alto Avenue.

E. P. Day, 2373 Palo Verde, Palo Alto.

F. C. Jenssen, 1720 West Bayshore, Apartment 29, Palo Alto.

H. M. Saunders, 3372 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto.

W. Wadley, Jr., 2741 Southcourt, Palo Alto.

R. S. Wormus, 5220 Willow Wood Road, Rolling Hills.

A. E. Floyd, 3425 Yorkshire Road, Pasadena.

M. G. Helm, 416 South Madison, Pasadena.

J. W. Kaull, 352 San Juan Way, La Canada.

B. B. Little, 190 South Arroyo Boulevard, Pasadena.

J. R. Prchal, 4947 Alminar Avenue, La Canada.

D. Scott, 1051 Mentone, Pasadena.

B. D. Smith, 648 South Rosemead Boulevard, Pasadena.

K. G. Bolton, 1060 Arroyo Park Drive, Pomona.

R. W. Daseler, 1320 Hillcrest Drive, Pomona.

S. J. Davis, 2757 Edwin Avenue, Pomona.

R. Estrada, 1658 East Lincoln, Pomona.

D. J. Flaming, 4237 West State Street, Pomona.

H. B. McIntosh, 2141 Arroyo Drive, Pomona.

D. E. Newman, 1986 Singingwood, Pomona.

W. M. Pichotta, 1318 Weber, Pomona.

D. B. Trapp, 471 West McKinley Street, Pomona.

J. M. Loyd, 420 Carmelita Way, Porterville.

R. M. Schwab, 332 North Roche Street, Porterville.

R. L. Takington, 362 North Lindale, Porterville.

R. K. Hanks, 1924 Sheridan Avenue, Escondido.

R. D. Brown, 1032 State Street, Redding.

P. J. Buck, 1032 Echo Road, Redding.

M. L. Fitch, 1845 Wisconsin Street, Redding.

W. G. Forney, 3035 Irene Street, Redding.

D. V. Goodwin, 2106 Butte Street, Redding.

G. M. Gray, 5791 Rene Lane, Redding.

C. R. Love, 2115 Olive Street, Redding.

P. A. Miller, 2371 Eureka Way, Redding.

G. A. Pearl, 1004 A Street, Redding.

K. E. Welch, 5989 Emerald Lane, Redding.

R. F. Fox, 1534 West 260th Street, Harbor City.

D. G. Rombold, 1724 West 248th Street, Lomita.

P. D. Quinney, 1702 Rosemary Lane, Redwood City.

M. J. Reff, 320 Edgewood Road, Redwood City.

E. L. Duvall, 743 South 21st Street, Richmond.

C. R. Armengol, 2497½ Hall Avenue, Riverside.

M. D. Benitez, 8366 Via Norte Drive, Riverside.

L. D. Crawford, 2944 Taos Drive, Riverside.

J. C. Fitzgerald, 17580 Barton Road, Perris.

D. E. Godwin, 4045 Azalea Street, Riverside.

C. L. Gray, 13549 Ellsworth, Riverside.

J. Gulick, 716 West 9th, Corona.

J. J. Hagen, 6117 Duquesne, Riverside.

J. L. Lockwood, 4158 Hillside, Norco.

B. J. Loya, 4312 Bermuda, Riverside.

C. A. Lozano, 3945 Strong Street, Riverside.

J. W. Mahoney, Jr., 3511 Harrison, Riverside.

M. D. Stanton, 4145 Heidi Road, Riverside.

L. C. Ferguson, 1510 Cardinal Way, Roseville.

T. J. Pettit, 112 Earl Avenue, Roseville.

S. M. Bachtold, 3210 Fieldcrest Drive, Sacramento.

W. L. Douglas, 5609 Nolder Way, Sacramento.

E. G. Dutton, 4501 Francis Court, Sacramento.

J. M. Edelstein, 1175 Monte Vista Way, Sacramento.

S. Fujii, 2030 Vallejo Way, Sacramento.

J. M. Gay, 4457 Francis Court, Sacramento.

D. A. Hamblen, 700 Greenwood Avenue, Broderick.

R. Hurtado, Jr., 789 Arcade Boulevard, Sacramento.

J. P. Jackson, 936 Eastern Avenue, Sacramento.

L. D. Laurent, 9156 Cecile Way, Sacramento.

R. McEvilly, 2280 Parkington Court, Sacramento.

W. G. Miles, 1500 Madrone, West Sacramento.

M. D. Moss, 5020 Del Rio Road, Sacramento.

T. P. Munyer, 3561 58th Street, Sacramento.
J. P. Pesavento, 2812 P Street, Sacramento.
D. G. Skates, 730 Greenwood Avenue, Broderick.
C. J. Smith, 803 Bright Court, Sacramento.
R. G. Tavera, 2607 Patton Way, Sacramento.
C. E. Williams, 2750 Meadowvale Avenue, Sacramento.
L. L. Worlow, 4590 Francis Court, Sacramento.
J. C. Wymore, 4631 Francis Court, Sacramento.
M. L. Wymore, 4631 Francis Court, Sacramento.
D. V. Alford, 191 Chaucer Drive, Salinas.
P. J. Alsop, 201 Somavia Road, Salinas.
J. A. Powers, 185 Chaucer Drive, Salinas.
L. J. Romo, 1455 Nichols Avenue, Salinas.
W. M. Wallace, Jr., 1213 Adams Street, Salinas.
G. J. Van Cleave, 40 Martling Drive, San Anselmo.
J. Arias, 840 Harris, San Bernardino.
R. L. Bonfils, 2876 I Street, San Bernardino.
A. D. Davis, 2924 Wall, San Bernardino.
C. P. Johnson II, 337 Mill Street, Colton.
R. P. Kuennen, 2747 G Street, San Bernardino.
L. L. Levin, 4995 North F, San Bernardino.
H. A. McCoy, Jr., II, 1131 Muscott, San Bernardino.
K. T. Molina, 7006 Elm Avenue, San Bernardino.
J. F. Penman, 25739 Walker, San Bernardino.
J. G. Walden, 971 27th Street, San Bernardino.
F. D. Aiken II, 6223 Mesita Drive, San Diego.
D. M. Bellinger, 5863 Hardy Avenue, San Diego.
W. H. Couture, Jr., 5934 Hardy Way, San Diego.
J. K. Daniels, 8072 Lake Adlon Drive, San Diego.
M. D. Egan, 1325C Goshen Street, San Diego.
J. W. Falletta, 510 Fifth Street, Coronado.
J. C. Fay, 5115 Castle Hills Drive, San Diego.
R. A. Fleischman, 6769 El Cajon Boulevard, San Diego.
J. S. Graham, 8821 Nottingham Place, La Jolla.
D. M. Graves, 3702 Monroe Avenue, San Diego.
A. E. Green, Jr., 2847 Arnott Street, San Diego.
W. C. Green II, 2847 Arnott Street, San Diego.
J. J. Greene, 2901 Sego Place, San Diego.
L. E. Hilliard, 6156 Acorn Street, San Diego.
G. D. Hoffman, 1141 Juliette Place, Fallbrook.
R. M. Kaplan, 5831 Hardy Avenue, San Diego.
L. H. Kelly, 6115 Montezuma Road, San Diego.
C. W. Kinney, 8826 Prestwick Way, Santee.
C. F. O'Rourke, 5140 Arlene Place, San Diego.
T. B. O'Rourke, 4807 Lantana, San Diego.
R. W. Phillips, 6210 Mesita Drive, San Diego.
L. L. Rhodes, 6271 Madeline, San Diego.
J. A. Smith, 9050 Memory Lane, Spring Valley.
R. C. Steddom II, 4708 Lucille Drive, San Diego.
P. L. Turner, 5318 Manzanares Way, San Diego.
C. Wall, 3500 Kurtz Street, San Diego.
R. R. Wenzel, 3044 Hancock, San Diego.
H. R. Whitefield, 5826 Montezuma Road, San Diego.
J. M. Ahern, 2742 43d Avenue, San Francisco.
R. Ariano, 4924 California Street, San Francisco.
B. Alter, 4595 18th Street, San Francisco.
T. W. Barner, 133 Winding Way, San Francisco.
J. P. Bechtold, 65 Rodeo Avenue 2, Sausalito.
J. M. Becnel, 2146 40th Avenue, San Francisco.
W. R. Becnel, 2146 40th Avenue, San Francisco.
W. D. Berger, 2616 Buchanan Street, San Francisco.
J. M. Bishop, 140 Hilltop Road, San Francisco.
B. R. Brandi, 1857 Lombard Street, San Francisco.
R. Burrell, Jr., 1411A Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco.
E. M. Castellini, 2201 Pacific Avenue, San Francisco.
R. V. Chabaury, 2615 18th Avenue, San Francisco.
G. J. Chan, 1422 Sacramento Street, San Francisco.
C. C. Creeks, Jr., 1460 Golden Gate Avenue, Apartment 7, San Francisco.
M. J. Cummings, 3600 San Bruno Avenue, San Francisco.
B. E. Daniel, 174 Middlefield Drive, San Francisco.
T. G. Devereaux, 1565 Octavia Street, San Francisco.
R. E. Diggs, 164 Harbor Road, Building 2, Section J, San Francisco.
R. W. Dougherty, 39 Northridge Road, San Francisco.
L. V. English, 1010 14th Street, San Francisco.
P. S. Fujii, 794 Sutter Street, San Francisco.
P. J. Gallagher, 177 Wawona Street, San Francisco.
K. F. Hagedorn, 565 Marina Boulevard, San Francisco.
J. P. Haley, 433 39th Avenue, San Francisco.
D. T. Hara, 2865 Clay Street, San Francisco.
M. O. Hartney, 110 Riverton Drive, San Francisco.
A. M. Hing, 411 28th Avenue, San Francisco.
M. O. Holland, 1518 46th Avenue, San Francisco.
R. S. Horwitz, 449 Parker Avenue, San Francisco.
O. W. Howard, Jr., 2351 Griffith Street, 232, San Francisco.
M. J. Huvane, 420 42d Avenue, San Francisco.
G. M. Jobst, 1618 33d Avenue, San Francisco.
J. N. Katz, 241 Middlefield Drive, San Francisco.
G. R. Kendall, 143 Dublin Street, San Francisco.
W. J. Kovacich, 1 Baltimore Way, San Francisco.
W. L. Lee, 1150 Washington Street, San Francisco.
J. L. Lowery, 22 Reardon Road, San Francisco.
J. W. Luther, 1234 Jones Street, San Francisco.
C. P. Macaluso, 370 Madison Street, San Francisco.
D Matuska, 4305 24th Street, San Francisco.
S. L. Millich, 1158 Page Street 4, San Francisco.
N. Minai, 555 19th Avenue, San Francisco.
B. J. Murphy, 163 28th Street, San Francisco.
E. K. Naritomi, 1290 Grove Street 106, San Francisco.
R. R. Nuanes, 319 Arlington Street, San Francisco.
J. R. O'Connell, 50 Beverly Street, San Francisco.
D. C. Paizis, 796 37th Avenue, San Francisco.
L. P. Percell, 1871 Church Street, San Francisco.
D. C Peters, 1185 South Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco.
J. E. Ponet, 161 Edgehill Way, San Francisco.
W. R. Porter, 1011 Lake Street, San Francisco.
R. J. Riddell, 549 Anderson Street, San Francisco.
O. M. Ridenour, 2083 41st Avenue, San Francisco.
L. A. Rivera, 45 Naples Street, San Francisco.
D. M. Ruby, 3540 Broderick Street, San Francisco.
A. A. Sauer, 770 Huron Avenue, San Francisco.
D. M. Smallwood, 215 Navy Road, San Francisco.
M. E. Tigno, 100 Bosworth Street, San Francisco.
A. White, 1064 Griffith, San Francisco.
D. T. Williams, 2946 Taraval Street, San Francisco.
M. V. Williams, 27 Hernandez Street, San Francisco.
M. R. Wilson, 775 41st Avenue, San Francisco.
Y. Y. Wu, 783 31st Avenue, San Francisco.
H. D. Yank, 201 Maywood Drive, San Francisco.
M. A. Yuen, 1755 Stockton Street, San Francisco.
R. J. Castro, 15425 Herring Avenue, San Jose.
M. S. Collins, 335 South 11th Street, San Jose.
G. D. Craig, 174 Viewmont, San Jose.
D. R. Fleharty, 656 South Clover Avenue, San Jose.
D. Galindo, 3365 Mount Vista Drive, San Jose.
S. J. Galindo, 3365 Mount Vista Drive, San Jose.
D. R. Garcia, 1225 Sierra Avenue, San Jose.
T. O. Hall, 155 South Morrison Street, San Jose.
V. Hernandez, Jr., 33641 9th Street, Apartment 3, Union City.
J. Hirabayashi, 941 North 3d Street, San Jose.
R. Ojeda, 33433 4th Street, Union City.
J. B. Olvera, 549 Spencer Avenue, San Jose.
S. R. Pitcher, 1058 Westlynn Way, San Jose.
M. A. Rapport, 1190 Camino Ramon, San Jose.
R. Rodriguez, 369 Hobson Street, San Jose.
J. C. Russell, 4560 Bolero Drive, San Jose.
T. G. Teasley, 1907 Crinan Drive, San Jose.
H. Waldren, Jr., 335 South 11th Street, San Jose.
R. D. Evans, 2d 16066 Cambrian Drive, San Leandro.
C. L. Kirkpatrick, 14835 Tower Street, San Leandro.
W. F. Sullivan, 15832 Via Cordoba, San Lorenzo.
M. T. Fraser, 1115 Santa Rosa Street, San Luis Obispo.
E. A. Mukai, 1025 Foothill Boulevard, Apartment 3, San Luis Obispo.
D. W. Bajada, 658 West 29th Avenue, San Mateo.
M. S. Chaput, 469 Midway Avenue, San Mateo.
M. D. Grady, 30 Conifer Lane, Hillsborough.
C. B. Luce, 521 Dorchester Road, San Mateo.
D. P. Odabashian, 520 Darrell Road, Hillsborough.
G. M. Snell, 1208 Yew Street, San Mateo.
R. A. Werner, 4108 Alameda de Las Pulgas, San Mateo.
L. Chance, 824 E Street, San Rafael.
R. L. Cuneo, 541 Bret Harte Road, San Rafael.
B. L. Duthie, 260 Merrydale Road, San Rafael.
M. S. Gilmer, 334 Paloma Avenue, San Rafael.
D. C. Jensen, Jr., 225 Devon Drive, San Rafael.

P. R. Nance, 562 Idylberry Road, San Rafael.
L. J. Shields, 321 Cypress Drive, Fairfax.
M. R. Snyder, 794 Las Colindas, San Rafael.
A. Apodaca, 430 West Second Street, Santa Ana.
C. W. Cullings, 2134 Greenleaf Street, Santa Ana.
D. Fonfara, 9662 Blanche Avenue, Garden Grove.
D. K. Holiman, 1311 South Valwood Street, La Habra.
J. F. Peronteau, 112 North Ashford Place, Fullerton.
G. A. Raub, 1100 Kenwood Place, Fullerton.
D. R. Rhoads, 1525 East Commonwealth, Fullerton.
V. Alonzo, 632 Del Monte, Santa Barbara.
G. L. Dominguez, 1708 Gillespie Street, Santa Barbara.
S. J. Evans, 2028 Chapala Street, Santa Barbara.
M. J. Selker, 980 Mission Canyon Road, Santa Barbara.
R. H. Torry, 1955 South Bedford, Los Angeles.
R. H. Caulfield, 420 Steele Lane, Santa Rosa.
M. J. Clisham, 3352 Magowan Drive, Santa Rosa.
P. V. Crowley, 732 Brentwood Drive, Santa Rosa.
G. C. Hartley, 2524 Steele Lane, Santa Rosa.
K. P. Hartley, 2524 Steele Lane, Santa Rosa.
C. E. McGrew, 504 Mendocina Avenue, Santa Rosa.
J. A. Moore, 1314 Grand Avenue, Santa Rosa.
C. H. Snow, 3443 Fir Drive, Santa Rosa.
T. D. Taylor, 6177 Batesole, Santa Rosa.
D. J. Moreno, 2612 Pine Street, Selma.
D. E. Robertson, 1191 Capri, Simi.
C. S. Sturges, 8978 Dorothy Avenue, South Gate.
J. E. Coppin, 1502 Wayne Avenue, South Pasadena.
T. P. Burns, 131 Rockwood Drive, South San Francisco.
D. D. Eli, 110 Mulberry Avenue, South San Francisco.
D. L. Kimble, 830 Commercial Avenue, South San Francisco.
D. C. Krepelka, 564 Serra Drive, South San Francisco.
W. G. Chan, 321 East Church, Stockton.
M. J. Durand, 206 East Louise Avenue, Manteca.
R. M. Fernandez, 1690 East 11th Street, Stockton.
J. D. Fields 3d, 626 South Court Street, Stockton.
J. W. Hartnett, Route 2, Box 104, Acampo.
F. M. Hernandez 2d, 125 West Jackson Street, Stockton.
D. L. Huckabee, 203 East 20th Street, Tracy.
P. D. Maynard, 2247 East Alma Avenue, Stockton.
J. L. Segura, 1522 Spring Street, Stockton.
J. L. Winges, 1009 El Monte, Stockton.
P. R. Arechiga, 397 Roosevelt Avenue, Sunnyvale.
A. J. Garcia, 1317 Torrance Avenue, Sunnyvale.
B. D. Green, 309 Greenlane Drive, Sunnyvale.
L. Hooker, 351 North Orange, La Puente.
R. C. Luehman, 312 Pamela Kay Lane, La Puente.
G. C. Aguinig, 3427½ North Figueroa Street, Los Angeles.
C. A. Lozano, 3945 Strong Street, Riverside.
J. W. Mahoney, 3511 Harrison, Riverside.
D. H. Redman, 814 San Rafael, Sunnyvale.
T. D. Lambert, 807 Seventh Street, Taft.
M. F. Loeb, 407 Seventh Street, Taft.
R. M. Sturgeon, 108 Monroe, Taft.
N. J. Alesso, 1362 18th Street, San Pedro.
G. N. Demaria, 769 30th Street, San Pedro.
R. G. Elliott, 2628 Averill Avenue, San Pedro.
D. A. Gyerman, 3603 South Parker, San Pedro.
C. Lafarga, 1310 West Santa Cruiz, San Pedro.
A. Maricic, 760 West 10th Street, San Pedro.
C. A. Marino, 3636 South Meyler Street, San Pedro.
R. L. Soto, 621 West Third Street, San Pedro.
J. J. Williams, 2523 South Leland Street, San Pedro.
A. N. Zabica, 2115 Elanita Drive, San Pedro.
L. J. Dooley, 1221 Coolidge, Tracy.
R. A. Ihler, 143 Madden Lane, Tulare.
L. M. Rogers, 233 South East Street, Tulare.
C. W. Nelson (address not available).
C. L. Guardalibene, 10407 Vernon Avenue, Montclair.
D. E. Bitle, 918 Branciforte Street, Vallejo.
B. G. Dickson, 1707 Griffin Drive, Vallejo.
R. M. Droast, 515 North Camino Alta, Vallejo.
E. J. Fahy, Quarters A Mare Island, Vallejo.
D. G. Kaiser, 1232 Arkansas Street, Vallejo.
D. M. King, 165 Coleridge Drive, Vallejo.
E. A. Poche, 849 Fifth Street, Vallejo.
A. J. Rising, 401 Nevada Street, Vallejo.
S. R. Willis, 523 Napa Street, Vallejo.
E. Arambula, 13343 Pinney, Pacoima.
G. V. Cerrillo, Jr., 11162 Amboy Avenue, San Fernando.
R. L. Cole, 9611 Sepulveda Boulevard, Sepulveda.
D. Farmer, 12813 Weidner Street, Pacoima.
M. J. Griego, 13046 Garber, Pacoima.
R. R. Kacy, 14061 Daubert Street, San Fernando.
P. A. Kalnay, 14715 Saticoy Street, Van Nuys.
C. S. Karp, 7810 Ranchito Avenue, Panorama City.
L. Macias, 1013 Kewen Street, San Fernando.
J. M. Margarito, 1507 Pico Street, San Fernando.
M. J. Narvid, 10011 Encino Avenue, Northridge.
W. L. Persons, Jr., 11712 Bromont, Pacoima.
B. M. Stecher, 7236 Darby Avenue, Reseda.
J. Waltuch, 10445 Kailya Lane, Tujunga.
L. H. Watson, 12669 Louvre Street, Pacoima.
A. L. Jenkins, Jr., 802 Indiana Avenue, Venice.
B. S. Eckerson, 825 South Bridge Street, Visalia.
R. E. Schultz, 315 Lenox Avenue, Exeter.
C. B. Johnson, 20700 San Jose Hills Road, Walnut.
K. C. Cochrane, 1790 Magnolia Way, Walnut Creek.
R. K. Montz, 3232 Hudson Avenue, Walnut Creek.
C. D. Oneal, 3006 Woodlawn Drive, Walnut Creek.
R. D. Palmer, 2231 Buena Vista Avenue, Walnut Creek.
D. M. Siligo, 12 Calvin Court, Walnut Creek.
J. B. Taylor, 567 La Vista Road, Walnut Creek.
M. L. Barry, 1301 McWood Street, West Covina.
C. D. Brown, 333 North Walnuthaven Drive, West Covina.
C. S. Chase, 441 North Osborn, West Covina.
R. M. Perri, 1637 Greenville Drive, West Covina.
W. F. Crowley, Jr., 1100 North Hacienda Boulevard, La Habra.
B. T. Haraldson, 611 West Exeter Avenue, La Habra.
C. Lane, 179 Janine Drive, La Habra.
R. J. Stevenson, 1111 Sharpless Street, Whittier.
P. C. Thelin, 8149 California, Whittier.
P. L. Thomson, 1021 Williams Way, Whittier.
J. C. Stevenson, 23466 Hatteras Street, Woodland Hills.
E. M. Hayashi, 99 1284 Aica Heights Drive, Aiea.
A. A. Higaki, P.O. Box 65, Honomu.
P. S. Aoki, 2551 Gardenia, Honolulu.
R. Y. Endo, 91 Kawananakoa Place, Honolulu.
C. L. Yu Fong, 1701 Alewa Heights, Honolulu.
C. O. L. Fong, 895 Hao Street, Honolulu.
R. L. Fong, 1102 Alewa Drive, Honolulu.
R. Y. Fujii, 3454 Oahu Avenue, Honolulu.
A. T. Hironaga, 2874 Booth Road, Honolulu.
R. B. Ko, 3153 Charles Street, Honolulu.
K. K. L. Kong, 1839 Bertram, Honolulu.
P. T. Kubota, 1068 Makaiwa Street, Honolulu.
R. K. Lee, 3895 Poka Street, Honolulu.
R. T. Matsumura, 2349 B Palolo Avenue, Honolulu.
G. M. Murata, 1437 Rahanu, Honolulu.
J. H. Nakagami, 3514 Pinao, Honolulu.
W. T. Nishigaya, 1819 Mott Smith Drive, Honolulu.
M. J. Okamura, 94 1067 Awalei Street, Waipahu.
J. R. Rummell, 345 Puamamane Street, Honolulu.
D. H. Sasai, 3571 Akaka Place, Honolulu.
D. P. Shiraki, 99 1616 Aiea Heights Drive, Aiea.
R. R. Takatsuka, 1704 Punahou Street, Apt. 14, Honolulu.
J. Tangen, 1415 Victoria 111, Honolulu.
R. R. Tomi, 831 A Tenth Avenue, Honolulu.
W. H. Tsuji, 3535 Pinao, Honolulu.
L. Y. Uyehara, 1760 Gulick Avenue, Honolulu.
R. L. Villamil, 2236 Hiu Street, Apartment A1, Honolulu.
C. K. Yorita, 155 Polulani Place, Honolulu.
S. Yanagi, 331 Waiehu Beach Road, Wailuku.
E. S. Ogata, Post Office Box 401, Captain Cook.
T. M. Contrades, Kapaa.
C. M. Nakamura, Post Office Box 106, Lihue.

Nevada

J. P. Helmer, 2489 East Nye Lane, Carson City.
B. L. Steenis, Deluxe Terrace Park 61, Carson City.
L. E. Thurman, 2530 Airport Road, Carson City.
R. R. McCarty, 1070 Sewell Drive, Elko.
T. G. Goretzki, 66 Church Street, Henderson.
G. L. Cook, 225 Coran Lane, Las Vegas.
J. L. Foley 2d, 3141 Scarlet Oak Avenue, Las Vegas.
R. A. Foote, 328 Jones Boulevard, Las Vegas.
J. C. Fox 2d, 1222 North F Street, Las Vegas.
J. E. Garr, 1700 Atlantic, Las Vegas.
M. A. Mleczko, 4725 Lorna Place, Las Vegas.
S. A. Paternostro, 3816 Apache Lane, Las Vegas.
C. E. Payton, 1101 West Washington, Las Vegas.
R. L. Rowles, 2412 Clifford Avenue, Apartment 5, Las Vegas.
V. M. Thorne, 720 Kenny Way, Las Vegas.
R. J. Vernon, 1705 South Sixth Street, Las Vegas.
W. J. Wade, 1912 South Sixth Street, Las Vegas.
L. C. Zervas, 1632 Palmer Street, North Las Vegas.
R. W. Brown, 900 North Tonopah Drive, Las Vegas.
G. Bowling, 1185 Upton Way, Sparks.
J. A. Conton, 1280 Tacoma Way, Reno.
D. L. George, 205 University Terrace, Reno.
M. A. Gray 2d, 60 Keystone Avenue, Reno.
R. A. Mathisen, 350 Sunnyside Drive, Reno.
D. M. Seifert, 123 Mark Twain, Reno.

SEATTLE REGION

Alaska

G. M. Banks, 2700 Kobuk Circle, Anchorage.
W. F. Cummings, 939 East Fireweed Lane, Anchorage.
H. J. Hilscher, Box 846, Anchorage.
S. J. Lindemuth, 2426 Turnagain, Anchorage.

N. Novak, Box 1435, Anchorage.

T. S. Parker, Box 606, La Habra.

W. R. Stevens, 1507 Marten Street, Anchorage.

A. L. Lindsey, Bethel.

T. G. Burkhead, 507 5th Street, Fairbanks.

W. L. Johnson, 2d, 2044 Airport Way, Fairbanks.

D. L. McQueen, 100 Bridget, Fairbanks.

J. B. Lesh, Health and Welfare, Alaska Office, Juneau.

V. M. Metcalfe, Jr., 730 Gold Street, Juneau.

R. C. Olsen, Box 1344, Juneau.

L. A. Parker (address not available).

M. Schwantes (address not available).

Idaho

T. H. Blevins, 1110 Targee Street, Boise.

G. D. Bokich, 2773 Cristine Avenue, Boise.

J. M. Bridges, 1315 River Street, Boise.

J. C. Millensifer, 944 Argyll, Boise.

W. G. Neely, 214 E. Jefferson Street, Boise.

R. K. Powell, 215 Cutterell Drive, Boise.

E. A. Sturza, 623 South Kimball Avenue, Caldwell.

A. J. Cooper, 819 C Street, Coeur d'Alene.

J. R. Bates, 1066 Redwood Drive, Idaho Falls.

C. V. Fattu, 611 Hill Street, Kellogg.

H. B. Rossum, 312 East Pine, Meridian.

T. L. Weber, 390 East 3n, Mountain Home.

C. W. Cornell, Box 217, Kuna.

R. C. Barlow, 591 Ridge, Pocatello.

L. R. Davis, 2d, 527 Ridge, Pocatello.

T. W. Eriksen, 127 Charles Place, Pocatello.

T. Sarriugarte, 245 South Grant, Pocatello.

R. C. Babell, Post Office Box 650, Rexburg.

J. C. Feldtman, 166 Polk Street, Twin Falls.

B. E. Heck, 151 Heyburn Avenue West, Twin Falls.

Montana

J. F. Hatten, 520 West Fifth Street, Laurel.

R. N. Scarborough, 1214 Avenue D, Billings.

R. W. Brooks, 513 South Ninth, Bozeman.

R. W. Brunell, 725 West Daly Street, Butte.

R. L. Delich, 1972 Princeton, Butte.

T. J. McCarthy, 307 West Broadway, Butte.

F. B. McGarry, 7 South Excelsior, Butte.

M. M. Merkle, 943 South Wyoming Street, Butte.

G. W. Nolan, 317 South Crystal, Butte.

D. P. Shea, 938 Iowa, Butte.

M. J. Simonich, 2720 State Street, Butte.

T. J. Tracy, 2601 Princeton, Butte.

E. J. Stipich, 108 West Main Street, East Helena.

C. J. Boyle, 2809 Fifth Avenue South, Great Falls.

G. N. Cunniff, 1716 Third Avenue North, Great Falls.

J. M. McMahon, 317 41st Street South, Great Falls.

M. R. Milversted, 2719 Second Avenue South, Great Falls.

K. E. Banschbach, 528 South Rodney, Helena.

L. B. Erickson, Blackstone Apartments, Helena.

W. W. Leaphart, 411 North Ewing, Helena.

D. J. McCabe, 615 Stuart Street, Helena.

S. H. Meloy, 1317 Ninth Avenue, Helena.

C. W. Richards, 902 North Park, Helena.

P. L. Beatty, Route 1, Whitefish.

M. P. Garland, 1322 Tole Avenue, Missoula Mount.

E. M. Hunter, 105 Takima Drive, Missoula.

M. B. Nelson, Box 4, Milltown.

G. L. Sherwood, 406 North Davis Street, Missoula.

L. W. Stewart, 711 Brooks Street, Missoula.

Oregon

R. J. Snyder, 828 East Queen Avenue, Albany.

R. M. Thompson 2d, 1120 Shady Lane, Albany.

A. D. Abelsen, 145 Southwest 140th, Beaverton.

C. J. Cyders, 900 Southwest Murray Road, Beaverton.

C. L. Guyton, 3445 Southwest 124th, Beaverton.

P. S. Hennessey, 55 Southeast Hall Court, Beaverton.

C. F. Johnson 2d, 3380 Southwest 174th, Aloha.

J. M. Reiling, 4170 Southwest 160th, Beaverton.

T. C. Moisan, Route 2, Box 252, Bend.

D. D. Tucker, 730 South Egan, Burns.

T. M. Bradley, Jr., 4440 West Hills Road, Corvallis.

H. K. McKenzie, 1021 North 32d Street, Corvallis.

C. J. Shaw III, 1225 South 26th Street, Corvallis.

J. E. Vanderburg, Route 3, Box 545, Corvallis.

D. C. Aman, 2160 Lawrence Street, Eugene.

E. L. Davenport, 1950 I Street, Springfield.

F. M. Dotson, 2683 Elinor Street, Eugene.

C. L. Henderson, 540 East 34th Street, Eugene.

D. P. Judd, 2167 Potter Street, Eugene.

P. M. Roberson, 450 East 36th Avenue, Eugene.

K. L. Rockel, 1001 West Harbeck Road, Grants Pass.

D. L. Huck, 3905 Boardman, Klamath Falls.

G. L. Luft, 4008 Delaware, Klamath Falls.

D. V. Saks, 1410 Sargent, Klamath Falls.

R. J. Goucher, 815 Cedar Street, Medford.

A. D. Krohn, 31 Crater Lake Avenue, Medford.

S. V. Lusk, 333 South Riverside, Medford.

J. L. Sherrill, 1316 East Jackson Boulevard, Medford.

D. J. Terry, 2615 Tennessee Drive, Medford.

C. F. Payne, 1319 Bayview, North Bend.

R. W. Gould, 680 Northwest 8th Avenue, Ontario.

D. E. Boatwright, Jr., 212 Southwest 6th, Pendleton.

F. W. Anderson, 3618 Northeast 39th, Portland.

D. H. Bialostosky, 22620 Southeast Main Court, Gresham.

R. J. Boley, 3727 Northeast 116th, Portland.

C. C. Carey, 1025 North Church, Portland.

R. W. Collins, 12840 Southwest Faircrest, Portland.

E. T. Diaz, 904 Southeast 20th, Portland.

D. L. Gunesch, 18446 Southeast Tibbetts Court, Gresham.

N. L. Helzer, 5746 Southeast 22d, Portland.

G. K. Hillesland, 5524 Southeast Knight Street, Portland.

H. E. Hinojosa, 7221 Southeast Madison, Portland.

Z. J. Holzman, Jr., 9316 Southwest Westhaven Drive, Portland.

B. A. Kannenberg, 1137 Northeast 81st, Portland.

L. L. Lumby, Jr., 3545 Northeast Alameda, Portland.

D. E. Metcalf, 3141 Northeast 36th, Portland.

L. V. Pendergrass, Jr., 110 Northwest 13th, Gresham.

R. F. Scholze, Jr., 9565 Southwest Greenburg Road, Tigard.

S. J. Snyder, 2d, 1137 Northeast 81st Avenue, Portland.

R. S. Springer, 3620 Southeast Rural Street, Portland.

R. D. Stalick, 2911 Southeast Concord Road, Milwaukie.

S. R. Treacy, 7115 Southeast Lincoln Street, Portland.

P. C. Yaeger, 3545 Northeast Alameda, Portland.

D. E. Plouff, 173 Southeast Miller Street, Roseburg.

T. M. Amundson, 533 Richmond Avenue Southeast, Salem.

J. L. Harmon, 1675 Marshall Drive Southeast, Salem.

J. G. Ogdahl, 780 Hope Avenue Northwest, Salem.

M. I. Schmidt, 7110 Wheatland Road Northeast, Salem.

D. L. Jones, 425 North East Hill Street, Sheridan.

Washington

G. A. Gudaz, 206 D Street, Cosmopolis.

T. A. Kalkwarf, 1520 West 6th Street, Aberdeen.

R. C. Hibler, Route 3 Box 836, Anacortes.

G. C. Johnson, 1015 84 North East, Bellevue.

A. B. Sachs, Post Office Box 302, Carnation.

B. C. Hemminger, 2519 Dean Avenue, Bellingham.

V. E. Deming, 1 Lake Street, Kirkland.

D. E. Coates, Post Office Box 382, Harper.

R. J. Hieber, Jr., 423 North Buckner Street, Centralia.

K. B. Donaldson, 319 North Iron, Centralia.

J. C. Nelson, 824 Olympic Avenue, Edmunds.

J. L. Hennessey, Route 1, Box 566, Marysville.

E. R. Petersen, Address not available.

G. F. Ruben, 918 Lombard, Everett.

L. S. Voie, Address not available.

R. W. Challen, 715 South McCormick, Olympia.

J. M. Koiste, 16244 41st Street Northeast, Seattle.

G. L. Lozier, 815 North 7th, Olympia.

N. K. Spadafore, 1102 Margaret Street, Pasco.

R. J. Wren, 825 South Queen Street, Pasco.

W. R. Bell, 3022 7th Street Northeast, Puyallup.

L. A. Breiland, 324 3rd Street Southeast, Puyallup.

S. C. Cambell, 1106 Davis Street South, Renton.

B. P. Shaw, 86 Hodges Court, Richland.

Seattle

N. A. Brown, 2477 Southwest 112th Street.

M. L. Dong, 9636 60th Avenue South.

D. M. Roselli, 4732 52d Avenue South.

P. L. Keller, 5427 37th Southwest.

D. D. Erickson, 9024 12th NE.

A. L. Fine, 3023 29th Avenue West.

W. R. Friedhoff, 103 North 178th Street.

A. P. Gillespie, 5110 NE 201 Street.

C. E. Greene, 825 23d Avenue.

S. E. Grubbs, Jr., 15669 19th Avenue SW.

J. M. Henry, 2510 Nob Hill Place North.

B. L. Hicks, 822 24th Avenue South.

A. I. Ibuki, 666 South Lucile Street.

G. W. Lau, 2815 22d Avenue South.

D. M. Oleary, 1803 East John Street.

J. D. Picton, 1914 North 48th Street.

C. G. Sander, 7515 57th Place NE.

P. C. Siemion, 518 South 165th.

W. B. Stotler, 4306 Francis Avenue North.

C. S. Strickland, 16044 51st Avenue South.

G. M. Sweet, 9258 Greenwood Avenue North.

L. M. Sylvester, 2916 10th Place W.

M. P. Voolich, 3256 12th Avenue West.

A. L. Walker, 428 Dewey Place East.

D. E. Jubb, 1663 Delanty Road, Shelton.

Spokane

P. M. Canning, 3902 S. Browne.

J. E. Donner, 5724 North Lincoln.

K. E. Fredrickson, 422 East 14th Street.

W. A. Mourin, 5712 North Cannon.

S. D. Phillips, North 4811 Maple.

B. L. Preecs, West 2424 Everett.

M. W. Queen, 12818 East 4th.

D. N. Robertson, 4312 Northwest Boulevard.

P. A. Roskelley, West 2604 Herdy.

L. L. Veltrie, 2323 West Providence.

G. W. Vorlicky, 1922 East 18th.

T. H. Wolfendale, West 1628 13th.

Tacoma

S. J. Bufalini, 3123 South 19th Street.

W. D. Cornwell, 12117 Golden Given Road.

R. H. Mecklenburg, Route 5, Box 644.

L. E. Perryman, 11709 McKinley Avenue.

D. R. Roning, 3537 South Jay Street.

J. Shanahan, 809 South 52d Street.

M. L. Tretton, 1524 North Steele Street.

T. F. Woodward, Jr., 11805 Nanza Road SW.

C. D. Blair, 1208 NE. 63d Street, Vancouver.

D. R. Bryant, 1212 East 28th Street, Vancouver.

C. L. McCann, 910 NW. Sluman Road, Vancouver.

P. T. Meade, 114 Far View Drive, Vancouver.

S. R. Bybee, Whitman College, Walla Walla.

K. L. Keeler, Route 5, Box 5320, Wenatchee.

R. D. Wyles, Route 2, Box 2407, Wenatchee.

WASHINGTON, D.C. REGION

R. W. Abernethy, care of postmaster, Washington, D.C.

F. W. Abruzzino, 1900 South Gads Street, Arlington, Va.

W. H. Adams, Jr., 4869 Longview Road, Washington, D.C.

W. S. Adams, 5614 Third Street Northwest, Washington, D.C.

J. D. Addabbo, 1653 Crittenden Street Northeast, Washington, D.C.

J. C. Adkins, 301 G Street Southwest, Washington, D.C.

M. A. Agnew, 4505 Gault Place Northeast No. 1, Washington, D.C.

G. D. Albert, 49 East Taylor Run Parkway, Alexandria, Va.

C. A. Albright, 321 North Pennsylvania Avenue, Falls Church, Va.

K. D. Alexander, 10023 Greenock Road, Silver Spring, Md.

M. Alexander, 9209 Limestone Place, College Park, Md.

R. L. Alexander, care of postmaster, Washington, D.C.

G. W. Allen, 1181 46th Place Southeast, Washington, D.C.

L. D. Allen, 1712 D Street Southeast, Washington, D.C.

V. J. Alston, 2413 Perry Street Northeast, Washington, D.C.

V. Alston, 316 Farragut Street Northwest, Washington, D.C.

W. I. Althen, 2711 Q Street, Washington, ington, D.C.

R. E. Altomore, 508 Manor Circle, Columbiana, Ohio.

D. A. Aluisi, 4801 Byevs Street, Washington, D.C.

R. W. Amberg, Jr., 1318 Stateside Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

S. Amico, 3330 South 28th Street, Alexandria, Va.

C. J. Anderson, 2424 North Quintana Street, Arlington, Va.

E. L. D. Anderson, 636 Rock Creek Church Road NW., Washington, D.C.

L. D. Anderson, Jr., 5298th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

M. L. Anderson, 14 Glenn Street, Suitland, Md.

R. C. Anderson, 909 North Ivy, Arlington, Va.

W. D. Anderson, 1211 Seventh Avenue North, St. Cloud, Minn.

L. C. Andrews, Jr., 4662 Kendrick Road, Suitland, Md.

F. R. Angel, 8509 Ewing Drive, Bethesda, Md.

E. O. Anglin III, 1452 Dewberry Court, McLean, Va.

J. E. Glanin, 2210 North Madison Street, Arlington, Va.

A. D. Annadale, 3712 40th Avenue, Cottage City, Md.

J. D. Aquilino, Jr., 1515 38th Street SE., Washington, D.C.

R. L. Ardoin, 8109 Kipling Parkway, District Heights, Md.

J. B. Arnstine, 3339 Lansmere Road, Shaker Heights, Ohio.

R. E. Askins, 1814 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

M. B. Augsback, 5570 Spur Road, Oxon Hill, Md.

G. A. Austin, Jr., 711 Ingraham NW., Washington, D.C.

H. A. Austin, Athens Star Route, Princeton, W. Va.

J. R. Austin, 4710 Glenbrook Parkway, Bethesda, Md.

M. E. Auth, 1316 53d Avenue, Hillside, Md.

G. J. Baden, Sr., 7610 Dangerfield Road, Clinton, Md.

H. Baller, 3349 23d Street SE., Washington, D.C.

J. A. Baker, Jr., 106 West Braddock Road, Alexandria, Va.

J. J. Baker, 1631 McKean Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

P. C. Balderson, Jr., 4107 Southend Road, Rockville, Md.

M. L. Banks, 1101 Seventh Street SE., Washington, D.C.

R. G. Banks, Route 1, Box 109, Cambridge, Md.

L. R. Barber, Rural Route, Box 292, Salt Lick, Ky.

R. E. Barham, 803 Chetworth Place, Alexandria, Va.

B. R. Barnes, 244 Eighth Street NE., Washington, D.C.

L. N. Barnes, 301 37th Street SE., Apartment 104, Washington, D.C.

D. A. Barrett, 5702 67th Avenue, Riverdale, Md.

J. E. Barnett, 105 49th Place NE., Washington, D.C.

R. W. Barry, 2106 Chapman Road, Hyattsville, Md.

C. G. Barnett, Apartment 116, 1230 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

H. Baskerville, 5607 2d Street NE., 2, Washington, D.C.

J. R. Bates, 3863 Saint Barnabas Road, Marlow Heights, Md.

E. B. Bauckman, Lothian Post Office, Drury, Md.

K. C. Baver, 1430 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

R. P. Baver, 5815 Madawaska Road, Springfield, Md.

S. V. Baver, 10103 Chickadee Lane, Adelphi, Md.

G. B. Baumgardner, 245 South Virginia Avenue, Falls Church, Va.

E. M. Baxley, 1642 Fort Dupont Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. J. Beamon, 142 Eastern Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

W. B. Beaver, 5003 Danbury Court, Bethesda, Md.

D. W. Beckley, 1127 Fourth Street NE., Washington, D.C.

R. T. Beckman, Jr., 3305 Roslyn Avenue, District Heights, Md.

W. L. Beckman, 4021 Byrd Road, Kensington, Md.

J. R. Behling, 5309 Riverdale Road, Riverdale, Md.

M. S. Beightol, 6710 Wakefield Drive, Alexandria, Va.

N. P. Bell, 4921 A Street SE., Apartment 203, Washington, D.C.

G. T. Bellamy, 1058 Wahler Place SE., Apartment 204, Washington, D.C.

M. Bennett, 923 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D.C.

L. E. Berk, 12639 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

C. W. Bernard, 2101 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

J. P. Beverly, Jr., 918 Symphony Circle, Vienna, Va.

O. C. Bibb, Apartment 409, 2400 16th NW., Washington, D.C.

E. R. Biglin, 9519 Edgely Road, Bethesda, Md.

G. S. Bingham, 5412 32d Street NW., Washington, D.C.

M. A. Biscoe, 5932 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. P. Bishop, 3380 North Dickerson, Arlington, Va,

M. T. Bishop, 7739 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. A. Blackistone, 3102 Cummings Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.

J. M. Blanchard, 312 Eddy Court, Fargo, N. Dak.

S. F. Blythe, 1004 Varney Street SE., Washington, D.C.

E. S. Bobb, 5101 34th Street, Washington, D.C.

C. D. Boggs, 501 Virginia Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

L. A. Boggs, 98 Auburn Court, Alexandria, Va.

C. Bolding, 609 Sheridan Street NW., Washington, D.C.

S. R. Bolling, Jr., 3073 Cleveland Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. J. Booker, 417 Jefferson Street NW., Washington, D.C.

G. R. Boone, 9025 Darcy Road, Forestville, Md.

R. P. Boone, 111 A Joliet Street SW., Washington, D.C.

T. I. Boone, 9025 Darcy Road, Forestville, Md.

A. C. Booth, Jr., 8001 Bainbridge Road, Alexandria, Va.

K. F. Boothe, 7515 Marion Drive, Forestville, Md.

J. L. Borda, 3745 McKinley Street, Washington, D.C.

G. W. Bowers, 7620 Lynn Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.

E. G. Bowie, Upper Marlboro, Md.

M. A. Bowie, Church Road, Fairview, Mitchellville, Md.

N. M. Bowie, Rural Free Delivery, Post Office Box 2730, Upper Marlboro, Md.

R. C. Bowie, Upper Marlboro, Md.

R. J. Bowker, 7709 Braymer Avenue, Suitland, Md.

G. W. Bowles, 5000 Shadyside Avenue, Washington, D.C.

O. A. Bowling, 27 Bryant Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. B. Bowman, 4000 East Street SE., Apartment 103, Washington, D.C.

H. A. Bradford, 4208 Hillside Road SE., Washington, D.C.

O. W. Bradford, 2020 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

S. E. Bradley, Jr., 5505 McKinley Street, Bethesda, Md.

C. E. Brady, 5910 Second Place NW., Washington, D.C.

W. P. Brady, 727 Sixth Street SE., Washington, D.C.

E. W. Brakus, 9322 19th Avenue, Adelphi, Md.

V. D. Brandy, 2730 52d Avenue SE., Cedar Valley, Md.

V. Wooton, 8212 Beltz Drive, Washington, Md.

B. A. Wright, 4212 28th Street, Mount Rainier, Md.

W. Wylie, 337 Elm Street NW., Washington, D.C.

H. T. Yates, care of postmaster, Washington, D.C.

A. H. B. Young, 32 Mill Street, Frostburg, Md.

D. A. Young, 4218 Clay Street NE., Washington, D.C.

J. D. Yowell, 7602 Bedford Lane, Clinton, Md.

M. D. Zagami, 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

J. L. Zamberlan, Post Office Box 111, Keystone, W. Va.

R. P. Zimmerman, 1608 29 Court, Washington, D.C.

L. I. Zinnamon, 1213 Ballard Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. V. Zukoski, Jr., 7412 83d Avenue, Hyattsville, Md.

S. J. Barker, 3633 Yuma Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. A. Chapman, 2422 South Ives Street, Arlington, Va.

J. J. Clemens, 4508 Chase Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

P. A. Dabbs, 6910 Parkwood Street, Hyattsville, Md.

F. J. Damico, 2814 O Street SE., Washington, D.C.

J. M. Donnelly, 9717 Singleton Drive, Bethesda, Md.

J. E. Fincher, 1705 Green Street, Columbia, S.C.

D. M. Williams, 1230 Holbrook Terrace NE., Washington, D.C.

J. E. Williams, 1410 M Street NW., Apartment 705, Washington, D.C.

J. L. Williams, 5400 Seventh Street NW., No. 4, Washington, D.C.

W. S. Williams, Jr., 1807 H Street NE., No. A, Washington, D.C.

A. L. Wilson, Post Office Box 3080, Upper Marlboro, Md.

C. M. Wilson, 10307 Douglas Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

C. W. Wilson, Jr., 5215 12th Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. E. Wilson, 5607 Pioneer Lane, Washington, D.C.

D. M. Wilson, 3807 Rectory Lane, Upper Marlboro, Md.

R. W. Wilson, 6013 Chesworth Road, Baltimore, Md.

G. R. J. Winalski, 916 Clemson Drive, Alexandria, Va.

D. M. Winkler, 407 Pershing Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

T. E. Winslow, 7108 Meadow Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.

V. Wisdom, 1606 Allison Street NW., Washington, D.C.

J. P. Witten, 787 Barnaby Road SE., Washington, D.C.

W. E. Whitten, care of postmaster, Washington, D.C.

R. S. Wolfe, 2021 North Kensington Street Arlington, Va.

J. L. Wong, 1215 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

T. S. Woolner, 3552 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.

S. L. Watson, Jr., 2615 Fourth Street NE., Apartment 104, Washington, D.C.

W. Watson, 4610 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

W. T. Waugh, 10702 Lorain Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

R. G. Webb, 3004 South Abingdon Street, Arlington, Va.

R. J. Weeks, 4670 Kendrick Road, Suitland, Md.

J. B. Weiner, 2631 Colston Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.

K. A. Weinstein, 1806 Reedie Drive, Wheaton, Md.

J. H. Weisblatt, 713 Greyrock Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

L. C. Weiss, 3312 Brooklawn Terrace, Chevy Chase, Md.

L. C. Welch, 1314 Semmes Road, Memphis, Tenn.

L. B. Werner, 10108 Portland Road, Silver Spring, Md.

S. F. Westerfield III, 4801 Colorado Avenue, Washington, D.C.

V. E. Westergard, 5080 Livingston Terrace, SE., Washington, D.C.

R. N. Weyant, Jr., 2027 Pimmit Drive, Falls Church, Va.

W. L. Wheaton III, 1202 Mercer Avenue NW., Roanoke, Va.

E. A. White, 5307 Sangamore Road, Washington, D.C.

L. White, Jr., 4532 Eads Street NE., No. 1, Washington, D.C.

S. B. Whiting, 5026 Seventh Street NW., Washington, D.C.

R. N. Wildy, 733 Gallatin Street NE., Washington, D.C.

G. E. Turner, Rural Free Delivery Box 1469, Upper Marlboro, Md.

B. Tyree, Jr., 4383 Benning Road NE., Washington, D.C.

S. G. Urban, 5510 Newton Street, Cheverly, Md.

R. J. Uryga, Box 2942 30th Street SE., Washington, D.C.

E. F. Valentine, 39 Bates Street NW., Washington, D.C.

H. N. Vaughn, 1514 Corcoran Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. A. Vieird, 2018 37th Street SE., No. 302, Washington, D.C.

G. V. Wadden, 6014 Hawthorne Street, Cheverly, Md.

P. B. Walczak, 2001 Pelden Road, Hyattsville, Md.

J. M. Walker, 2612 Kirkwood Place, No. 102, Hyattsville, Md.

D. T. Wallace, 1909 Eighth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

W. L. Walsh, 4625 Rockwood Parkway, Washington, D.C.

E. I. Ward, 1208 South Columbus Street, Arlington, Va.

F. M. Ward, Route No. 1, Box 344, St. Paul, Va.

G. V. Ward, 5529 Potomac Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

W. K. Warmbrod, 1641 South Stafford Street, Arlington, Va.

L. J. Warren, 5505 Sonoma Road, Bethesda, Md.

J. M. Washington, RFD Box 1331, Upper Marlboro, Md.

J. C. Watkins, Jr., 411 Hillsboro Drive, Wheaton, Md.

M. J. Thornton, 7405 84th Place, Hyattsville, Md.

W. H. Thornton, 758 Newton Place NW., Washington.

G. L. Thrall, 6307 Gormley Place, Springfield, Va.

B. B. Tibbs, 1439 Kennedy Street NW., Washington, D.C.

P. A. Tidwell, 5302 Joan Lane, Temple Hills, Md.

F. A. Tinney, 1136 Dundalk Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

F. L. Tinsley, 728 Marietta Place NW., Washington, D.C.

S. K. Tipton, 9810 Brixton Lane, Bethesda, Md.

H. C. Tompkins, 1227 Carlotta Road West, Jacksonville, Fla.

M. L. Triplett, 5211 Ferndale Street, North Springfield, Va.

R. E. Trodden, 4833 South First Street, Arlington, Va.

R. E. Trogolo, 7511 Halleck SE., Washington, D.C.

J. E. Truesdale, 1445 Perry Place NW., Washington, D.C.

T. D. Truluck, Jr., 7435 Keystone Lane, Forestville, Md.

J. R. Tucker, 12619 East Bourne Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

W. W. Tullner III, 5909 Greenlawn Drive, Bethesda, Md.

A. V. Turner, 1469 Darcy Road, Upper Marlboro, Md.

C. H. Turner, 1330 L Street SE., Washington, D.C.

C. L. Turner, RFD Box 1469, Upper Marlboro, Md.

M. D. Swartz, 5824 Ipswich Road, Bethesda, Md.

M. B. Syphax, 1370 Hamilton Street, Washington, D.C.

W. D. Talbert, 5323 Henderson Road, Washington, D.C.

P. E. Tatham, Jr., 6408 Buchanan Street, Washington, D.C.

E. E. Taylor, 7226 G Street, Seat Pleasant, Md.

E. J. Taylor, 4717 Medora Drive, Suitland, Md.

M. E. Taylor, 7 Second Avenue, Brunswick, Md.

R. U. Taylor, 304 50th Street NE., Washington, D.C.

R. D. Tillman, 2100 South Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.

G. Terranova, 9129 Eton Road, Silver Spring, Md.

E. L. Terry, 1114 Merwood Drive, Takoma Park, Md.

P. D. Thacher, 18 Southwest Park Road, Jenson Beach, Fla.

J. H. Thibadeau, Jr., 3112 Alabama Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

D. J. Thomas, 2246 Sudbury Road NW., Washington, D.C.

P. A. Thomas, Candy Hill Road, Naylor, Md.

W. J. Thomas, 805 Rittenhouse Street NW., Washington, D.C.

P. W. Thompson, Jr., 109E Clifton Terrace, Washington, D.C.

R. D. Thompson, 1412 Columbia Street NW., Washington, D.C.

V. M. Thompson, 3215 D Street SE., No. 2, Washington D.C.

M. S. Stanford, 4630 Davis Avenue, Suitland, Md.

L. M. Stanley, 930 Emerson Street NW., Washington, D.C.

W. K. Starkloff, 5915 Crawford Drive, Rockville, Md.

C. S. Steinbach, 6450 Lily Ohu Lane, Falls Church, Va.

M. C. Stephens, 1535 Gales Street NE., Washington, D.C.

J. W. Sternberg, 3612 Maureen Lane, Bowie, Md.

J. B. Stevens, 100 Madison Street NW., Washington, D.C.

M. F. Stevens, 1217 Kennedy Street NW., Washington, D.C.

R. J. Stewart, 1303 Congress Street SE., Washington, D.C.

R. G. Stillwell, 5310 85th Avenue, Lanham, Md.

M. H. Stout, 4727 South 31st Street, Arlington, Va.

T. R. Strawderman, 4261 Duke Street, Apartment 3–C, Alexandria, Va.

J. J. Strong, 341 Irvington Street, Oxon Hill, Md.

S. O. Strunk, Chester Avenue, Oneida, Tenn.

J. M. Sullivan, 2339 North 11th Street, Apartment 201, Arlington, Va.

T. F. Sullivan, Jr., 12408 Kembridge Drive, Bowie, Md.

J. M. Sutter, 7625 Greenleaf Road, Hyattsville, Md.

P. W. Swain, 5001 13th Place NE., Washington, D.C.

E. H. Swann, Route 1, Box 202, Bryans Road, Md.

F. E. Smith III, 7424 Hampden Lane, Bethesda, Md.

J. L. Smith, 106 Snoddy Street, Marksville, La.

J. S. Smith, 1804 Benson Lane, Forestville, Md.

K. D. Smith, 3130 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

W. M. Smith, 1736 G Street NW., Central Y, Washington, D.C.

T. W. Smith, Jr., 712 Brandywine Street SE., Washington, D.C.

P. W. Smithson, 5315 Wriley Road, Washington, D.C.

A. M. Smoot, 625 Chesapeake Street SE., Washington, D.C.

W. Smythe, 541 Riggs Road, NE., Washington, D.C.

B. J. Snyder, 2812 South Columbus Street, Arlington, Va.

M. M. Soldano, 1934 U Place SE., Washington, D.C.

J. J. Soldano, 1934 U Place SE., Washington, D.C.

L. L. Somlyo, 6535 Seventh Street NW., Washington, D.C.

T. Spankman, Jr., 306 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

S. L. Spellman, 5820 Carlyle Street, Cheverly, Md.

C. J. Spooler, 116 Decatur Street, Cumberland, Md.

P. J. Spooler, 116 Decatur Street, Cumberland, Md.

K. M. Stallo, 4700 Ferry Landing Road, Alexandria, Va.

D. J. Stancliff, 6010 Princess Garden Parkway, Lanham, Md.

M. S. Shields, 821 North Jackson Street, Arlington, Va.

E. C. Shopland, 510 Sterling Road, Silver Spring, Md.

G. K. Shriver, Jr., 5415 Center Street, Chevy Chase, Md.

G. R. Shumaker, 546 West Piedmont Street, Keyser, W. Va.

J. E. Simenton, 2107 Shipley Terrace Street Southeast, 101, Washington, D.C.

J. J. Simmons, 1540 Geranium Street Northwest, Washington, D.C.

A. Sims, 4431 South 36th B 2, Arlington, Va.

R. A. Simms, 703 Randolph Street Northwest, Washington, D.C.

D. J. Simons, 8522 Garland Avenue, Takoma Park, Md.

A. M. Sinicropi, 1218 Buchanan Street Northeast Washington, D.C.

P. D. Skehan, 3810 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

S. Skiles, 5436 North 24th Street, Arlington, Va.

E. A. Skrivseth, 203 Rogers Drive, Falls Church, Va.

M. J. Skwierawski, 8514 Glenview Avenue, Takoma Park, Md.

I. D. Slavin, 4473 Sedgwick Street Northwest, Washington, D.C.

F. H. Small, 1111, 16700 Batchellors Forest Road, Olney, Md.

B. V. Smith, 7416 Merritt Street, District Heights, Md.

C. D. Smith, Box 4855, Upper Marlboro, Md.

R. C. Schmidt, 5901 Cromwell Drive, Bethesda, Md.

A. H. Schoem, 2626 Henderson Avenue, Wheaton, Md.

I. Schoenholtz, 1705 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, Md.

K. A. Schwartz, 4511 MacArthur, Washington, D.C.

M. C. Schwenneker, 3005 Duncan Drive, Adelphi, Md.

B. A. Scott, 9125 Seven Locks Road, Bethesda, Md.

M. R. Scott, 5719 Kansas Avenue Northwest, Washington, D.C.

W. Seabrook, 1206 N Street Northwest, Washington, D.C.

D. A. Seaman, 5987 Suit Road, Morningside, Md.

L. E. Seifert, 4 Oldham Road, Silver Spring, Md.

K. E. Seitz, 6103 Princess Garden Parkway, Lanham, Md.

D. R. Semonco, 5732 Chillum Heights Drive, Hyattsville, Md.

J. Settel, 3313 Ross Place Northwest, Washington, D.C.

J. M. Seymour, 6402 Ridge Drive, Washington, D.C.

S. P. Shufritz, 13 Fraternity Road, College Park, Md.

M. A. Sharpe, 7515 Forest Road, Kentland, Md.

P. E. Shelton, Jr., 7606 Barto Avenue, Camp Springs, Md.

R. W. Sheppard, 4931 Brandywine Street, Washington, D.C.

J. P. Sherman, 8515 Grubb Road, Silver Spring, Md.

P. E. Rosenthal, Box 546, Fredericktown, Pa.

B. C. Rourke, 2509 North Quincy Street, Arlington, Va.

J. A. Rourke, 6911 Leesville Boulevard, North Springfield, Va.

J. F. Rowe, 4402 Oxford Street, Garrett Park, Md.

P. R. Rowles, 104 64th Place, Maryland Park, Md.

R. H. Roy, 226 Normandy Hill Road, Alexandria, Va.

T. B. Royall, 49 Greenwood Street, Boston, Mass.

V. I. Roystuart, 6400 Lumar Drive, Washington, D.C.

F. G. Rubin, 3401 Bonnie Road, Baltimore, Md.

J. L. Russell, 105 Bankhead Highway West, Birmingham, Ala.

G. H. Rutherford, Jr., 1238 Southern Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

J. J. Ryan, Jr., 1405 Merrimac Drive, Hyattsville, Md.

H. W. Rybka, 7419 Joneau Street, Washington, Md.

R. K. Samad, 1101 7th Street SE., Washington, D.C.

G. A. Sample, 911 South Alfred Street, Alexandria, Va.

J. E. Sanchez, Jr., 3500 76th Avenue, District Heights, Md.

R. E. Sanders, 5059 Oakcrest Drive, Oxon Hill, Md.

F. C. Sapienza, 723 Somerset Place, Chillum, Md.

J. E. Scales, 808 Madison Street NW., Washington, D.C.

W. R. Riblett, Jr., 9714 Singleton Drive, Bethesda, Md.

K. M. Rich, 1336 Van Buren Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. T. Richardson, 3819 Rectory Lane, Upper Marlboro, Md.

R. W. Ridgely, 4905 Que Street SE., Bradbury Heights, Md.

C. L. Ridgley, 5530 Ritchie Road, Washington, D.C.

D. B. Roberts, 12829 Holdridge Road, Silver Springs, Md.

J. F. Robertson, 6121 Yellowstone Drive, Alexandria, Va.

J. M. Robinson, Jr., 1305 Point View Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.

R. S. Roby, 4261 Duke Street, Apartment C–3, Alexandria, Va.

J. M. Rocca, 142 Lynhaven Drive, Alexandria, Va.

M. J. Rodak, 6311 Joslyn Place, Cheverly, Md.

E. F. Rodriguez, Jr., 3511 Country Hill Drive, Fairfax, Va.

J. F. Rollins, 11608 Lockwood Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

R. R. Roney, 904 North Jacksonville Street, Arlington, Va.

J. M. Roof, 7717 Emerson Road, Hyattsville, Md.

E. Rosado, care of Postmaster, Washington, D.C.

J. M. Rosenbaum, 9101 Kensington Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.

R. M. Rosenberg, 2904 Rittenhouse Street, Washington, D.C.

N. H. Rosenthal, 7501 Westfield Drive, Bethesda, Md.

N. E. Putnam, Route No. 1, Box 550, Clinton, Md.

T. J. Quinlan, Jr., 5820 Ipswich Road, Bethesda, Md.

J. R. Rader, 2647 North Powhaton Street, Arlington, Va.

M. V. Raedy, Jr., 5002 Cushing Drive, Kensington, Md.

K. Rafferty, 9309 Hollyoak Court, Bethesda, Md.

S. A. Randall, 1923 S Street NW., Washington, D.C.

M. R. Ratti, 5918 24th Street SE., Hillcrest Heights, Md.

R. M. Rawden, Jr., No. 1 Fraternity Row, College Park, Md.

J. M. Rawlings, Box 1818 Brooke Road, Upper Marlboro, Md.

W. N. Raynor III, Apartment 105 2020 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

C. A. Reace, University of Maryland Golf Club, College Park, Md.

A. M. Redding, 10500 Falls Road, Rockville, Md.

T. T. Redmond, 5526 9th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. M. Reeks, 3401 Poster Street NW., Washington, D.C.

C. A. Reid, 1219 Owen Street, Washington, D.C.

J. M. Reilly, 1909 33d Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. M. Reisdorfer, 4938 12th Street NE., Washington, D.C.

S. L. Rhodes, R.F.D. No. 1, Box 223, Bel Air, Md.

W. C. Rhodes, 1731 Park Road NW., Washington, D.C.

G. F. Pinkston, Jr., 4122 Arkansas Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

R. F. Piper, 1816 12 St NW., Washington, D.C

B. P. Pittman, 3601 17th Street NE., Washington, D.C.

J. M. Pittman, 2543 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

R. L. Poindexter, 4330 Halley Terrace SE., Washington, D.C.

L. S. Poole, Washington, D.C.

A. T. Pope III, 701 59th Place, Washington, D.C.

R. G. Portner, Box 5, St. Leonard, Md.

O. L. Patts, 310 Division Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. R. Powell, 5413 4th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

C. W. Powell, Hunting Towers Apartment 328W, Alexandria, Va.

R. A. Price, 2321 Lincoln Road NE., Washington, D.C.

T. Price, 834 18th Street NE., Washington, D.C.

E. M. Proctor, 1202 Savannah Street NE., Washington, D.C.

E. M. Proctor, 1202 Savannah Street SE., Apt. 2, Washington, D.C.

M. A. Pryce, 332 17th Street NE., Washington, D.C.

H. S. Pulley, 2532 Southern Avenue SE., Washington, D.C

J. W. Pulliam, 4707 Falcon Street, Rockville, Md.

S. K. Puterbaugh, 4514 Westbrook Lane, Kensington, Md.

R. D. Payne III, 1160 Michigan Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

T. M. Payne, 1660 Michigan Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

R. C. Pearl, 12032 Claridge Road, Wheaton, Md.

O. I. Pearlman, 2812 Iverson Street, Hillcrest Heights, Md.

A. Pearson, 5039 Eighth Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. C. Pearson, 2112 Flagler Place NW., Washington, D.C.

R. E. Pearson, 441 Delafield Place NW., Washington, D.C.

J. D. Perkins, 2119 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

J. W. Perrie, 5413 Manchester Drive, Washington, Md.

J. R. Perrygo, RFD Box 3332, Upper Marlboro, Md.

F. E. Peters, 3401 A Street SE., No. 101, Washington, D.C.

G. Peterson, 805 North Quaker Lane, Alexandria, Va.

G. D. Pehus, 1001 Otis Street NE., Washington, D.C.

G. Philip, 2306 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

J. L. Phillips, 203 N Street SW., Apartment 516, Washington, D.C.

T. D. Phillips, 405 Cloverway, Alexandria, Va.

W. H. Phillips, Jr., 87 Harvard Avenue, West Medford, Mass.

J. F. Pierce, 3208 38th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

C. F. Pilczuk, 1224 11th Street NW., No. 4, Washington, D.C.

A. O'Bryant, Jr., 2528 Naylor Road, SE., Washington, D.C.

J. D. O'Connell, Jr., 3 Park Valley Road, Silver Spring, Md.

J. R. O'Connell, 10035 Frederick Avenue, Kensington, Md.

P. A. O'Neill, 7710 Maple Avenue, Apartment 805, Takoma Park, Md.

W. L. Owens, Mechanicsville, Md.

E. P. Padgett, Jr., 5400 Middleton Lane, Camp Springs, Md.

M. J. Padgette, 826 Crittenden Street, Washington, D.C.

E. A. Palank, Jr., 5203 Silver Hill Road, Suitland, Md.

P. R. Angelo, 211 14th Avenue, Newark, N.J.

M. A. Paris, 6813 Calverton Drive, Hyattsville, Md.

L. W. Parker, 1424 F Street NE., Washington, D.C.

G. E. Parker, 3217 Brothers Place SE., Washington, D.C.

H. E. Parmes, Jr., 60 S Street NW., Washington, D.C.

H. S. Partridge, 4101 Harrison Street NW., Washington, D.C.

S. F. Pasquini, 6513 Abbington Drive, Oxon Hill, Md.

V. Y. Patrick, 3830 Ninth Street SE., Washington, D.C.

H. O. Patterson, Jr., 3812 Great Neck Court, Alexandria, Va.

J. Patterson, Jr., 4907 A Street SE., Apartment 4, Washington, D.C.

W. S. Paul, 5630 Old Chester Road, Bethesda, Md.

E. J. Nalley, College Park, Md.

W. B. Nance, 1319 Fargo Street, Durham, N.C.

C. Nash, 105 Audrey Lane, Washington, Md.

J. L. Nash, Jr., Oxon Hill, Md.

J. T. Nelson, 500 West Potomac Street, Brunswick, Md.

J. F. Ness, 6135 85th Avenue, Hyattsville, Md.

H. Newbill, Jr., 517 Kentucky Avenue, SE., Washington, D.C.

E. M. Newman, 2207 Champlain Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

R. J. Nichols, 2927 Fairhill Road, Fairfax, Va.

V. Nicknadavich, 5000 Townsend Way, Bladensburg, Md.

J. E. Nix, 1214 Staples Street, NE., No. 3, Washington, D.C.

S. K. Noble, 3709 Perry Street, Brentwood, Md.

P. V. Noonan, Jr., 2905 Richie-Forestville Road, Forestville, Md.

W. M. Noonan, 3714 Harrison Street, Washington, D.C.

A. H. Norman, 5420 31st Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

G. L. Norton, Ridge, Md.

H. W. Norton, 7700 District Heights Parkway, District Heights, Md.

J. L. O'Brien, 3430 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.

H. L. Mitchell, Jr., 2804 Brierdale Lane, Bowie, Md.

T. E. Mitchell, 3920 Suitland Road, Suitland, Md.

N. E. Modderman, 251 Center Street, Coopersville, Md.

P. D. Moeser, 7009 Fresno Street, Seat Pleasant, Md.

G. E. Moore, 314 Orondaga Drive, Forest Heights, Md.

T. S. Moore, 5008 Sargent Road, NE., Washington, D.C.

E. J. Morris, 4003 Rosemary Street, Chevy Chase, Md.

D. G. Morse, 9402 Stateside Court, Silver Spring, Md.

R. D. Mosher, 2004 G Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

D. L. Moss, Apt. 314 2375–15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

W. G. Moy, 405 Seward Square, SE., Washington, D.C.

M. J. Moynihan, 1007 Varnum Street, NE., Washington, D.C.

G. M. Mulhall, 1505 Curtiss, Ames, Iowa.

R. P. Mullikin, 5512 Lewis Avenue, SE., Washington, D.C.

T. H. Mulrooney, 6112 Montrose Road, Cheverly, Md.

M. J. Mulvey, 2021 South Scott Street, Arlington, Va.

T. Murtaugh, 1528 Arlington, Arlington, Va.

E. E. Musser, 5716 Jason Street, Cheverly, Md.

S. E. Myles, 3509 21st Street, SE., Washington, D.C.

F. J. Meade, Jr., 4914 Neptune Avenue, Oxon Hill, Md.

P. L. Meehan, 1254 Crest Haven Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

J. M. Mencarini, 4902 56th Avenue, Hyattsville, Md.

D. L. Mercier, 3320 25th Street, Alexandria, Va.

A. B. Merkel, 516 Short Street, Jackson, Tenn.

N. L. Middleton, 2311 Altamont Place SE., Washington, D.C.

M. Midgley, 6212 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C.

C. R. Miller, Jr., 9814 53d Avenue, College Park, Md.

G. A. Miller, 12602 Gould Road, Wheaton, Md.

M. R. Miller, 3821 Rectory Lane, Upper Marlboro, Md.

R. H. Miller, 2606 Garfield Street NW., Washington, D.C.

M. L. Millikan, 1814 Crosby Road, Hyattsville, Md.

W. R. Millington, 236 W Street NW., No. 33, Washington, D.C.

D. A. Mills, Mitchellville, Md.

M. W. Milton, P.O. Box 37, Welaka, Fla.

D. J. Miner, 18 9th Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. E. Mitchell, 1420 Harvard Street, Apartment 34, Washington, D.C.

V. L. Mitchel, Route 1 Box 300, Clinton, Md.

W. N. Mitchell, Jr., 636 Farragut Place NE., Washington, D.C.

G. J. McCoy, 4209 Russell Avenue, Mount Rainier, Md.

M. W. McCrewsky, 6909 Wilson Lane, Bethesda, Md.

R. E. McCubbins, 3108 Ramblewood Drive, District Heights, Md.

M. T. McCully, 5406 Gunston Lane, Camp Springs, Md.

C. W. McDonald, 316 Larkspur Road, Morningside, Md.

J. P. McDonald, 6022 Bellview Drive, Falls Church, Va.

T. S. McDonald, 3401 Prospect Street NW., Washington, D.C.

R. J. McDowell, 4424 3d Street NW., Washington, D.C.

J. L. McDuffie, 849 21st Street NE., Apartment 3, Washington, D.C.

J. S. R. McFall Jr., 1706 Southeast 14th Street, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

L. B. McFarland, 3500 6th Street SE., No. 2, Washington, D.C.

S. E. McFarland, 1624 10th Street NW., Apartment 3, Washington, D.C.

M. J. McGee, 12 S Street NE., No. 3, Washington, D.C.

E. A. McGee, 608 60th Place NE., Washington, D.C.

R. McGovern, 5062 Silver Hill Court, Suitland, Md.

L. D. McGraw, 6210 Oakford Road, Capitol Heights, Md.

M. P. McGreenery, 3314 80th Avenue, Forestville, Md.

G. S. McMurtry, 5810 Blair Road NW., Washington, D.C.

A. McRae, Drew Hall, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

R. E. Martin, 1919 Colebrooke Drive, Washington, D.C.

L. H. Martinez, 1377 Downing Street NE., Washington, D.C.

C. Mason, 7614 F Street, Seat Pleasant, Md.

J. S. Massie, 8734 Ridge Road, Bethesda, Md.

J. T. Massie, Post Office Box 139, Newport News, Va.

M. A. Mattera, 6270 Marlboro Road, No. 203, Washington, D.C.

H. A. Matthews, care of postmaster, Washington, D.C.

M. K. Matthews, 1401 Fairmont Street NW., Washington, D.C.

W. F. Matthews, Jr., 1922 Gaither Street, Hillcrest Heights, Md.

G. E. Mattingly, 8600 11th Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

E. A. Mattox, 1630 Irving Street NW., Washington, D.C.

L. L. Maynard, Dingess, W. Va.

M. B. Mazow, 5835 Dumfries, Houston, Tex.

F. A. McCaskill, 73 Maywood Drive, Jackson, Tenn.

J. M. McCauley, 14049 Eton Drive, Upper Marlboro, Md.

J. E. McBride, 8910 Second Street, Lanham, Md.

L. T. McCannon, 4327 Polk Street NE., Washington, D.C.

E. M. McCarthy, 3 Gruenther Court, Rockville, Md.

M. A. McCloud, Post Office Box 616, West Point, Va.

D. W. Loving, 823 Turkey Run Road, McLean, Va.

D. R. Lowman, 28 R Street NE., Washington, D.C.

C. W. Lowry III, 3121 33th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

W. C. Luna, 129 Woodrow Street, Jackson, Tenn.

M. J. Lusby, 5815 Atmore Place, Washington, D.C.

J. Lusk, 2015 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

G. T. Lyle, 2006 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

S. Madigan, 4923 56th Avenue, Hyattsville, Md.

J. A. Major, 1310 Monroe Street NE., Washington, D.C.

C. Makle, route 3, box 248B, Brandywine, Md.

B. D. Makuson, 637 Fourth Street NE., Washington, D.C.

H. P. Mallard, Jr., 1234 Hamilton Street NW., Washington, D.C.

P. J. Maloney, Jr., 4520 Burlington Place NW., Washington, D.C.

D. Marble, 4724 Blaine Street NE., Washington, D.C.

W. F. Marciniak, 915 Sibley Avenue, Old Forge, Pa.

A. P. Marin, 4301 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

N. Marrow, 1717 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

W. C. Marshall, 316 Wistereia, Lake Jackson, Tex.

M. A. Martin, 509 Rienl Avenue, Cumberland, Md.

W. T. Legro, 3940 Marrizon Street NW., Washington, D.C.

H. Lemons, 2615 Fourth Street NE., Washington, D.C.

W. A. Lespenance, 7902 Radnor Road, Bethesda, Md.

M. S. Leukoff, 17 Nevereaux Street, Charleston, S.C.

F. Lewis, 4122 Illinois Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

J. C. May, 8102 Whittier Boulevard, Bethesda, Md.

F. X. Lilly, 3245 Beech Street NW., Washington, D.C.

H. J. Lilly, 3245 Beech Street NW., Washington, D.C.

H. T. Linehan, 2004 Jameson Street SE., Hillcrest Heights, Md.

K. E. Lion, Jr., Route 3, Box 24A, Manassas, Va.

R. A. Lish, 308 Marcy Avenue, Oxon Hill, Md.

C. A. Loar, 1631 Varnum Place NE., Washington, D.C.

J. R. Logan, 233 Vee Street NW., Washington, D.C.

J. Lohman III, 605 Galveston Street SE., Washington, D.C.

L. G. Lomax, 4775 West Avenue, Suitland, Md.

W. J. Lomax, 232 Warren Street NE., Washington, D.C.

T. Longstreet, 811 Barnaby Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. L. Lotts, Natural Bridge, Va.

T. N. Loveless, 7111 Salsbury Road, Washington, D.C.

N. C. Kraft, 5916 22d Place, Washington, D.C.

J. H. Krall, 7710 Maple Avenue, Takoma Park, Md.

D. J. Kurtz, 8471 Buffalo Drive, Union Lake, Mich.

J. Lacovaro, 3450 Toledo Terrace, Hyattsville, Md.

P. D. Lake, 10 West C Street, Brunswick, Md.

J. W. Lampo, 612 South Jefferson, Neosho, Mo.

C. A. Lancaster, Box 453, Rural Route 1, Bowie, Md.

E. T. Lane, 610 Tuckerman Street NW., Washington, D.C.

T. J. Lantz, 7510 Elmhurst Street, District Heights, Md.

R. J. Larocca, 6 Wessex Road, Silver Spring, Md.

T. G. Lauth, 2903 56th Place, Cheverly, Md.

J. R. Lawrence, 3305 Ames Street NE., Washington, D.C.

W. F. Laws, 6015 Birch Lane, Washington, D.C.

F. B. Lawson, 3800 Cathedral Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

W. H. Leach, Box 641A, Springvale Road, Great Falls, Va.

C. A. Ledbetter, 1737 Webster Street NW., Washington, D.C.

G. E. Lee, 4027 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

J. A. Lee, 5707 43d Avenue, Hyattsville, Md.

W. R. Lee, 616 44th Street NE., Washington, D.C.

S. T. Kessel, 8807 Honeybee Lane, Bethesda, Md.

D. L. Kester III, 5523 Belfast Drive, Oxon Hill, Md.

G. A. Kiattn, 1005 Chillum Road, Hyattsville, Md.

M. E. Kidd, 4801 Kenmore Avenue, Apt. 506, Alexandria, Va.

J. A. Kidney, 7210 Rollingwood Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.

J. M. Kidwell, Upper Marlboro, Md.

D. A. King, Post Office Box 65, Upper Marlboro, Md.

O. T. King, 2129 Eldridge, Memphis, Tenn.

B. W. Kinsey, 1700 Harvard Street, Apt. 309, Washington, D.C.

L. A. Kiraly, 5206 Valley Road, SE., Washington, Md.

R. N. Kirby, 1914 18th Street, SE., Washington, D.C.

P. F. Kirk, 7408 Lansdale Street, SE., District Heights, Md.

B. A. Kirkpatrick, 4884 Eastern Lane, Suitland, Md.

D. B. Klafter, 5065 Dunlap Street, Hillcrest Heights, Md.

J. F. Klossner, 2501 Cherokee Street, Adelphi, Md.

M. W. Kluckhohw, 3161 Adams Mill Road, Washington, D.C.

D. H. Knoch, 1104 North Kentucky Street, Arlington, Va.

G. J. Korab, 362 Raleigh Street SE., Washington, D.C.

R. Korink, 501 Juniper Lane, Falls Church, Va.

M. W. Judge, 5011 Kerbyhill Road, Oxon Hill, Md.

J. R. Justice, 18 Argonne Avenue, Great Falls, S.C.

L. A. Kalashian, 7320 73d Court, Kent Village, Hyattsville, Md.

J. D. Kamykoski, 2801 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

L. P. Karstetter, 1429 Bell Avenue, Altoona, Pa.

T. J. Kaufman, 9201 New Hampshire Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

W. K. Keane, 5006 Cathedral Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

P. R. Keefer, 5830 Carlyle Street, Cheverly, Md.

B. A. W. Keels, 4116 13th Place NE., Washington, D.C.

J. J. Keightley, 494 Latham Street, Alexandria, Va.

J. M. Keller, 2906 Cortland Place, Washington, D.C.

B. Kelly, 608 3d Street NW., Washington, D.C.

G. Kendrick, 4519 9th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

C. M. Kendzior, 4650 Kendrick Road, Bradbury Park, Md.

J. E. Kennedy, 2703 Valley Way, Cheverly, Md.

M. S. Kennedy, 9740 53d Avenue, College Park, Md.

W. P. Kennedy, Jr., 9804 Parkwood Drive, Bethesda, Md.

J. D. Keppel, 6336 Western Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

T. H. Kerr III, 717 Otis Place NW., Washington, D.C.

E. I. Johnson, 1100 Kingwood Drive, Takoma Park, Md.

E. P. Johnson, 6212 Foote Street, Seat Pleasant, Md.

J. O. Johnson, 5009 Bellbrook Court, Washington, D.C.

L. F. Johnson, 6304 9th Street Northwest, Washington, D.C.

M. M. Johnson, 2710 Birdseye Lane, Bowie, Md.

R. H. Johnson, 1501 Varnum Street Northwest, Washington, D.C.

R. J. Johnson, 813 51st Street Northeast Washington, D.C.

T. L. Johnson, 3932 Illinois Avenue Northwest, Washington, D.C.

T. L. Johnson, Naylor Post Office, Md.

W. L. Johnson, 3419 B Street Southeast, Apartment A, Washington, D.C.

B. A. Johnson, 5425 Nash Street Northeast, Washington, D.C.

F. R. Johnson, 1200 East Capitol Street Northeast, Apartment 21, Washington, D.C.

S. L. Johnson, Washington, D.C.

A. Jones, 615 5th Street Northeast, Washington, D.C.

B. Jordan, 115 Missouri Avenue Northwest, Washington, D.C.

M. G. Jones, 1909 North Dinwiddie Street, Arlington, Va.

R. N. Jones, 615 5th Street Northeast, Washington, D.C.

V. L. Jordan, 1309 Congress Street Southeast, Washington, D.C.

J. W. Joyner, 4900 Essex Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

S. D. Hubbard, 4217 Rhode Island Avenue, Mount Rainier, Md.

P. C. Hudson, 1425 N Street Northwest, Washington, D.C.

C. Hughes, Jr., 13 Underwood Street Northwest, Washington, D.C.

R. A. Hurley, 10521 Columet Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

D. L. Hutchison, 3810 School Lane, Upper Marlboro, Md.

N. C. Hylton, 1406 Quincy Street Northwest, Washington, D.C.

D. W. Ide, 11905 Rockbridge Road, Silver Spring, Md.

R. A. Innamorati, 4211 Kings Mill Lane, Annandale, Va.

C. R. Irving, 5109 V Street Southeast, Bradbury Heights, Md.

A. Jackson, 5103 Just Street Northeast, Washington, D.C.

D. E. Jackson, 318 Rhode Island Avenue Northeast, Washington, D.C.

M. T. Jackson, 1220 Orren Street Northeast, Washington, D.C.

J. Jackson III, 1720 Trenton Place Southeast, Washington, D.C.

J. H. Jacques, 3925 Legation Street, Washington, D.C.

W. C. Jahn, 7210 Lois Lane, Lanham, Md.

E. James, 4248 H Street Southeast, Washington, D.C.

J. S. Jefferson, 174 U Street Northeast, Washington, D.C.

H. Jenkins III, 1333 Tuckerman Street, Washington, D.C.

E. Johnson, Care of Postmaster, Washington, D.C.

B. T. High II, 3802 24th Street NE., Washington, D.C.

C. F. Hill, 3274 Chestnut Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. Hillery, Jr., 3424 25th Street SE., Washington, D.C.

J. M. Himmelberg, 2215 31st Place SE., Washington, D.C.

R. G. Himmer, 2558 Gallows Road, Falls Church, Va.

A. Hines, Jr., 4509 South Four Mile Run Drive, Arlington, Va.

E. Hinkes, 9716 Kenmore Drive, Kensington, Md.

C. V. Hitchens, 5507 Belle Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

D. P. Hobbs, 204 Ottawa Street, Forest Heights, Md.

J. P. Hochman, 4911 West Street NW., Washington, D.C.

W. A. Holden, 6106 Swansea, Bethesda, Md.

P. L. Holland, 9118 Lincoln Avenue, Forestville, Md.

J. A. Hollowell, 2529 Waterside Drive NW., Washington, D.C.

T. L. Holliday, 1902 Lincoln Road NE., Washington, D.C.

E. Hollis, 1334 Seventh Street, Washington, D.C.

R. P. Halt, 2631 Naylor Road SE., Washington, D.C.

T. B. Holt, 1600 South Joyce Street, A 1702, Arlington, Va.

B. A. Horowitz, 12930 Valleywood Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

J. R. Howell, 5113 25th Place, Washington, D.C.

D. W. Hart, 5206 Fenwood Avenue, Oxon Hill, Md.

M. C. Haught, 4112 Clagett Road, Hyattsville, Md.

J. T. Hawkins III, Forrestville, Md.

L. Hayden, 1114 5th Street NE., Washington, D.C.

J. W. Haywood III, 1625 Nicholson Street NW., Washington, D.C.

C. L. Head, 18 47th Street SE., Washington, D.C.

M. A. Healey, 4902 40th Place, Hyattsville, Md.

R. L. Healy, Jr., 8508 Oliver Street, Hyattsville, Md.

T. P. Healy, 7413 Beverly Road, Bethesda, Md.

C. E. Hearne III, 2306 Lee Highway, Apt. 109, Arlington, Va.

S. B. Heishman, 2036 North Woodrow Street, Arlington, Va.

J. W. Helms, 1200 North Royal, Jackson, Tenn.

C. C. Henderson, 328 17th Place NE., Washington, D.C.

R. L. Henderson, 2109 South Oakland Street, Arlington, Va.

R. F. Henderson, 1347 Michigan Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

J. C. Henningsen, 902 Anne Street, Takoma Park, Md.

M. L. Henry, 1737 A Street SE., Washington, D.C.

W. A. Herman, 1630 R Street NW., Washington, D.C.

R. J. Hicks, 723 Euclid Street NW., Washington, D.C.

L. C. Gray, 3719 Rectory Lane, Upper Marlboro, Md.

M. W. Gray, 596 South Liberty Street, Spartanburg, S.C.

C. E. Green, 1210 Linden Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. A. Green, 1028 South 16th Street, Arlington, Va.

R. D. Green, 1028 South 16th Street, Arlington, Va.

R. M. Green, 9601 Bruce Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

A. E. Greene, 3416 B Street SE., Apt. 201, Washington, D.C.

F. Greene, 1391 F Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. R. Gregory, 4748 Benning Road, Washington, D.C.

C. W. Grier, 1314 Balfour Court, Hyattsville, Md.

P. W. Griffin, 442 Luray Place NW., Washington, D.C.

K. M. Griffith, 3207 Old Dominion Boulevard, Alexandria, Va.

J. D. Guilfoyle, Jr., 1622 Montague Street, Washington, D.C.

G. D. Guthrie, 4509 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

J. T. L. Guyton, 1441 R Street NW., Washington, D.C.

J. W. Gwinn, 7908 Kennewick Avenue, Takoma Park, Md.

E. D. Hafeey, 1003 22d Street, Washington, D.C.

G. T. Haight, 7615 Lansdale Street, District Heights, Md.

G. F. Hall, 3668 Park Place NW., Washington, D.C.

R. D. Hall, 4109 55th Avenue, Bladensburg, Md.

J. H. Halmond, Jr., 654 Sixth Street NE., Washington, D.C.

W. Ham, 7011 Ritchie Marlboro Road, Washington, D.C.

C. M. Hamilton, 306 1828 Q Street SE., Washington, D.C.

E. L. Hamilton, 2111 I Street NE., No. 10, Washington, D.C.

J. R. Hamilton, 5316 P Street SE., Washington, D.C.

P. C. Handy, 4245 Meade Street NE., Washington, D.C.

M. R. Haney, 11908 Renick Lane, Silver Spring, Md.

J. F. Hardy, Jr., 2306 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

R. W. Hardy, care of postmaster, Washington, D.C.

R. J. Harlan, Jr., 1791 Verbenast NW., Washington, D.C.

D. R. Harper, Jr., J–1146 Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.

J. C. Harper, 3316 Parkside Terrace, Fairfax, Va.

W. Harper, Jr., 3500 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. L. Harrington, 2 T Street NE., Washington, D.C.

P. A. Harris, 418 Nicholson Street NW., Washington, D.C.

R. L. Harris, 2744 North Wyoming Street, Arlington, Va.

G. V. Harshaw, 121 Anacostia Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

E. M. Harshaw, 121 Anacostia Avenue, Washington, D.C.

L. George, 1357 Otis Place NW., Washington, D.C.

T. L. Gerber, 2713 Finch Street, Silver Spring, Md.

J. E. Gibson, Rupert, W. Va.

P. T. Gibson, Jr., 4240 Eads Street NE., Washington, D.C.

W. W. Gilbert, 5501 Darel Drive, Suitland, Md.

P. C. Gibert, Jr., 5507 Sedgwick Lane, Springfield, Va.

A. T. Gilmore, 7508 9th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

P. E. E. Gilmore, 1819 Gales Street, NE., Washington, D.C.

A. B. Givens, 6223 Clay Street, NE., Washington, D.C.

E. Glenn, Jr., 1119 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

E. N. Glenn, 4431 Gavit Place NE., Washington, D.C.

C. J. Glover, 1103 East Capitol Street SE., Washington, D.C.

J. C. Goode, 855 21st Street NE., Washington, D.C.

F. D. Gooding, Jr., 12704 Gould Road, Wheaton. Md.

R. J. Gould, 921 61st Place, Capitol Heights, Md

A. Graves, 940 Randolph Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Graves, 4028 E Street SE., Washington, D.C.

W. A. Graves 1915 N Ode Street, Arlington, Va.

I. Gray, Jr., 449 15th Street NE., Washington, D.C.

G. M. Frank, 12 Eastmoor Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

G. O. Franklin, Hartnett Hall, 1426 21st Street NW., Washington, D.C.

L. L. Fraser, 7455 Keystone Lane SE., Washington, D.C.

J. T. Frazier, 39 Ridge Road SE., Washington, D.C.

W. T. Friend II, 8128 15th Avenue, Hyattsville, Md.

G. A. Frisbie, Jr., 4505 Mount Vernon Highway, Alexandria, Va.

W. M. Fuge, 4109 Dana Court, Kensington, Md.

R. J. Furbush, Jr., 3960 Blaine Street NE., Washington, D.C.

R. J. Gabaldon, 5810 Craig Street, Springfield, Va.

C. J. Gaines, 6783 Blakemore Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

R. B. Gaither, 23 Logan Circle, Washington, D.C.

P. M. Gallagher, 252 Van Buren Street NW., Washington, D.C.

G. H. Gallun, 9301 19th Avenue, Hyattsville Md.

C. B. Gambrell, 1437 Spring Road NW., Washington, D.C.

J. R. Garner, Box 355, Leonardtown, Md.

H. G. Garvin, Jr., 3401 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.

P. M. Gary, 7720 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. M. Gatling, 232–7230, Washington, D.C.

D. E. R. Gay, 201 Suffolk South, College Station, Tex.

D. M. Fiedler, 7645 Walters Lane, Washington, D.C.

E. T. Finnegan, 604 A Street NE., Washington, D.C.

R. E. Fisher, 4020 Reno Road, Washington, D.C.

A. S. Fitzgerald, Continental Hotel, Washington, D.C.

O. P. Fitzgerald, 1529 North 17th Street, Apartment 201, Arlington, Va.

T. E. Flanagan, Jr., 3004 M Place SE., Washington, D.C.

T. E. Flanagan, Jr., care of postmaster, Washington, D.C.

V. E. Flint, 2800 Virginia, Washington, D.C.

E. J. Floyd III, 1676 Irving Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. J. Flynn, 305 C Street NE., Apartment B104, Washington, D.C.

P. E. Flynn, 3405 Shepherd Street, Chevy Chase, Md.

R. A. Flynt, 2201 Woodmont Road, Alexandria, Va.

J. J. Foley, Jr., 7211 13th Avenue, Takoma Park, Md.

R. E. Folts, 2960 M Street SE., Washington, D.C.

L. M. Foote, 168 Locust Street, Herndon, Va.

J. L. B. Forrester III, 1354 Euclid Street NW., Apartment 101, Washington, D.C.

P. L. Foster 4410 Forest Glen Court, Allandale, Va.

C. W. France, 1202 Kevin Road, Baltimore, Md.

W. E. Francis, 1309 Floral Street NW., Washington, D.C.

J. A. Edgren, 1602 North Quincy, Arlington, Va.

R. C. Edwards, 4877 Longview Road SE., Washington, D.C.

E. A. Arcenia, 905 Irving Street NE., Washington, D.C.

K. D. Ellis, 3107 Parfield Street NW., Washington, D.C.

K. P. Ellis, 5302 Kenwood Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

A. P. Endres, 4605 68th Place, Landover Hills, Md.

L. C. English, 5123 Illinois Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

C. J. Errico, Jr., 2732 52d Avenue, Washington, D.C.

J. P. Errico, 6272 Marlboro Road, Apartment 102, Washington, D.C.

P. J. Esseff, 1312 35th Street, Washington, D.C.

H. H. Evans, Jr., 1637 A Street NE., Washington, D.C.

C. A. Everett, Jr., 12004 Livingston Street, Wheaton, Md.

R. A. Fagins, 5001 Hanna Place SE., Washington, D.C.

M. F. Fanning, 409 University Boulevard East, Silver Spring, Md.

J. V. Ferrell, 5072 Dogwood Lane, Washington, D.C.

J. E. Fauver, 5950 23d Place SE., Washington, D.C.

R. E. Fenn, 7169 White House Road, Washington, D.C.

M. J. Fers, 2711 Ontario Road NW., Washington, D.C.

W. D. Ferris, 1400 Hampshire West, Apartment 10, Silver Spring, Md.

T. W. Dolan, Jr., 5814 Channing Road, Springfield, Va.

J. M. Donald, 5029 Ayers Place SE., Washington, D.C.

C. D. Donaldson, 510 North Jordan Street, Alexandria, Va.

D. F. Donaldson, 939 55th Street NE., Washington, D.C.

R. H. Doran, Jr., 149 Central Park Drive, Holyoke, Mass.

R. L. Doran, 101 G Street SW., A 317, Washington, D.C.

J. A. Dorsey, 1359 Kalmia Road NW., Washington, D.C.

D. E. Dorto, 1706 Merrimac Drive, Adelphi, Md.

J. E. Douglass, Jr., 430 Roland, Jackson, Tenn.

B. C. Drake, 501 Virginia Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

F. N. Dubofsky, 4481 MacArthur Boulevard, Washington, D.C.

C. R. Duley, 2508 Corning Avenue, Oxon Hill, Md.

D. S. Dunlap, 743 Fairmont Street NW., Washington, D.C.

C. E. Dunne, 7205 Rollingwood Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.

P. G. Dunnigan, 312 Williamsburg Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

W. J. Durkin, Jr., 10009 Belhaven Road, Bethesda, Md.

D. J. Duross, 6610 Elgin Lane, Bethesda, Md.

J. M. Dyer, 2312 Calvert Street, Hyattsville, Md.

H. M. Eagleton, 2901 Gainesville Apartment 103 SE., Washington, D.C.

J. V. H. Davis, 3225 23d Street SE., Number 1, Washington, D.C.

M. A. Davis, 1315 Emerson Street NW., Washington, D.C.

M. L. Davis, 1011 15th Street SE., Washington, D.C.

R. L. Davis, 1610 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

T. D. Davis. 1806 Benning Road NE., Apartment B, Washington, D.C.

J. A. Dawson, 5831 Colorado Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

R. Deans, 4559 Benning Road SE., Number 103, Washington, D.C.

G. C. Defreece, 3984 Blaine Street NE., Washington, D.C.

M. Degraffinreid, 1113 Sumner Road SE., Washington, D.C.

J. L. Delgado, Jr., 805 Rittenhouse Street NW., Washington, D.C.

R. E. Denny III, 1454 Wasp Lane, McLean, Va.

J. B. Desavro, Jr., 3021 Park Way Terrace, Suitland, Md.

J. J Devery, Jr., 4417 Ambler Drive, Kensington, Md.

H. T. Dickey, 1718 H Street NE., No. A, Washington, D.C.

D. Dilley, care of E. Gavza, House of Rep., Washington, D.C.

C. H. Dillon, 10407 Glenmore Drive, Adelphi, Md.

D. P. Dillon, 5208 Edgemoor Lane, Bethesda, Md.

S. W. Dockstader, 6804 Buttermere Lane, Bethesda, Md.

T. W. Dodson, 1001 K Street NE., Washington, D.C.

L. C. Curtis, Jr., 315 W Street, Apartment 304 NE., Washington, D.C.

M. A. Cushman, 2103 Keating Street, Hill Heights, Md.

J. A. Cuthrell III, 7408 Mansfield Drive, Washington, D.C.

R. R. Cyr, 3434 Sheridan, Butte, Mont.

W. F. Cyron, 2018 North Quinn Street, Arlington, Va.

J. P. Dailey, 2308 North Harrison Street, Arlington, Va.

M. F. Daly, 5308 41st Street NW., Washington, D.C.

R. B. Dandridge, 1516 North 29th Street, Richmond, Va.

D. C. Daniel, 6046 22d Road North, Arlington, Va.

E. W. Daniels, 2875 Southerland Street, Beaumont, Tex.

A. V. Darrow, Glenndale Road, Glenndale, Md.

L. A. Datcher, 435 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

J. H. Davenport, Jr., 9233 Forest Haven Drive, Alexandria, Va.

C. M. Davis, 7404 Harwood Road, District Heights, Md.

D. E. Davis, 3149 Queens Chapel Rd., Mt. Rainier, Md.

D. F. Davis, 2119 Carrhill Road, Vienna, Va.

G. C. Davis, 617 Morton Street NW., No. 22, Washington, D.C.

G. C. Davis, P.O. Box 33, Waldorf, Md.

J. R. Davis, Jr., 9011 Volta Street, Lanham, Md.

E. B. Collins, 4212 Grant Street NE., Washington, D.C.

G. R. Collin, 10118 Brock Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

F. D. Cook, 5442 30th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

J. S. Cook, 1034 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

I. Cooper, 624 50th Street NE., Washington, D.C.

J. P. Corcoran, 7302 Riggs Road, Hyattsville, Md.

M. E. Countee, 416 Luday Place NW., Washington, D.C.

K. M. Cox, 208 Massachusetts Avenue NE., No. 208, Washington, D.C.

J. E. Crawford, Route 2, Box 225, Blounts Creek, N.C.

M. L. Creasy, 2005 Columbia Pike, Arlington, Va.

W. E. Crockett, 931 K Street, Washington, D.C.

E. T. G. Cross, Box 2618 R.F.D. 2, Upper Marlboro, Md.

K. A. Crown, 6802 C Street, Seat Pleasant, Md.

K. A. Culhane, 915 Plum Street, Vienna, Va.

R. F. Cumberland, 3539 Texas Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

T. B. Cunniff, 2807 Curtis Drive, Washington, D.C.

J. A. Curcio, Jr., 5877 Skyline Drive, Washington, D.C.

A. B. Curtis, 1825 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

J. E. Curtis, 3710 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.

R. Christmas, Jr., 4606 Iowa Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

W. L. Christofili, 3701 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

R. M. Chupas, 4520 MacArthur Boulevard, Washington, D.C.

H. L. Churchill, 344 North West Street, Manassas, Va.

R. L. Cioffi, 7500 24th Avenue, Hyattsville, Md.

C. G. Clark, 555 Thayer Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

J. C. Clark, 7222 Delfield Street, Chevy Chase, Md.

J. F. Clark, 2727 N Street SE., Washington, D.C.

L. L. Clark, 360 Windover Avenue NW., Vienna, Va.

O. P. Clark, 2000 South Eads Street, Apartment 415, Arlington, Va.

L. Clay, 2219 Celia Avenue, Charlotte, N.C.

R. E. Clement, 1386 Bryant Street NE., Washington, D.C.

M. J. Clements, 2404 Griffen Street, Hyattsville, Md.

G. H. Cobb, 415 Wells Avenue NE., Roanoke, Va.

D. B. Cochrane, 1005 K Street NE., Washington, D.C.

J. W. Cohen, 6403 Marjory Lane, Bethesda, Md.

M. N. Cohen, 2415 Minnesota Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Cohn, 1711 Holly Street NW., Washington, D.C.

J. A. Colbert, 1500 Ridge Place SE., Washington, D.C.

P. G. Carr., 2114 Maryland Avenue NE., No. 6, Washington, D.C.

H. E. Carreker, 53 Hamilton Street NW., Washington, D.C.

C. T. Carroll, 3952 Clay Place NE., Washington, D.C.

T. A. Carrol, Jr., 2103 Gatewood Place, Silver Spring, Md.

C. W. Carter, 906 East F Street, Brunswick, Md.

E. M. Carter, 606 Quincy Street NW., Washington, D.C.

L. E. Cashman, 7500 Arrowwood Road, Bethesda, Md.

R. E. Cator, Jr., 3405 Forestville Road, Forestville, Md.

M. A. Causey, 5528 Helmont Drive, Oxon Hill, Md.

E. J. Cawley, Jr., 4418 Cortez Drive, Fairfax, Va.

D. J. Celia, 4425 Maple Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

W. H. Chalmers, Jr., 2210 Wyngate Road, Suitland, Md.

L. C. Chapman, 712 Iona Drive, San Diego, Calif.

C. C. Chase, 124 East 95 Street, New York, N.Y.

C. L. Cheaves, 105 33d Street NE., Washington, D.C.

E. B. Chewning, 7 South Hudson Street, Arlington, Va.

C. S. Chin, 414 17th Street SE., Washington, D.C.

W. G. Christian, Jr., 5087 Temple Hills Road, Temple Hills, Md.

V. H. Christie, 406 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

B. J. Bush, 133 33d Street NE., Washington, D.C.

G. R. Butcher, Verdunville, Logan, W. Va.

S. K. Butkus, 1908 Brisbane Street, Silver Spring, Md.

B. M. Butler, 1302 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.

J. T. Butler, 605 North Main Street, Oneida, Tenn.

W. M. Butler, 730 Quincy Street NW., Washington, D.C.

K. H. Byrd, 1319 Randolph Street NW., Washington, D.C.

U. M. Byrd, 5608 Blaine Street NE., Washington, D.C.

M. J. Cafferty, Jr., 221 5th Street SE., Washington, D.C.

T. R. Callahan, 5115 Crisfield Drive, Oxon Hill, Md.

T. K. Callhnan, 3808 Benton Street NW., Washington, D.C.

L. E. Calvert, 3820 Rectory Lane, Upper Marlboro, Md.

D. C. Calvin, 7900 Walker Mill Drive, Washington, D.C.

C. J. Cameron, Cederville Trailer Park, Brandywine, Md.

R. H. Campbell, 6500 7th Place NW., Washington, D.C.

W. B. Campbell, 6616 2d Street NW., Washington, D.C.

H. T. Canaday, 3385 South Stafford, Arlington, Va.

M. S. Canaday, 717 Euclid Street NW., No. 4, Washington, D.C.

R. G. Carnahan, Jr., 6 Foxhall Court, Silver Spring, Md.

M. L. Browne, 1604 Webster Street NW., Washington, D.C.

S. D. Browning, 8103 Mason Street SE., Washington, D.C.

R. S. Brubaker, 344 Maury Avenue, Oxon Hill, Md.

D. L. Bryant, 2418 Shannon Place SE., Alexandria, Va.

W. S. Bryant, 1507 D Street NW., Washington, D.C.

J. R. Buchanan, Jr., 712 21st Street NE., Washington, D.C.

T. A. Buchanan, 4726 East Avenue, Suitland, Md.

L. A. Buck, 710 Chestnut Avenue, Bowie, Md.

M. V. Buckley, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

T. Buckwalter, 4735 East Avenue, Suitland, Md.

P. M. Bucko, 7840 Brompton Street, Springfield, Va.

H. Budd, Jr., 415 32d Street SE., Washington, D.C.

R. D. Buettner, 1020 North Potomac Street, Arlington, Va.

J. R. Bunten, Route 1, Box 343, Arnold, Md.

D. C. Burch, 5817 Ogden Court, Washington, D.C.

J. O. Burdsall, 8700 Fenway Drive, Bethesda, Md.

M. I. Burgess, 7608 Lombard Street, Kentland, Md.

W. E. Burleigh, 10106 Portland Road, Silver Spring, Md.

G. M. Burman, 2921 Greenvale Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

J. T. Brannan, 4805 Springbrook Drive, Annandale, Va.

R. E. Breeding, 1245 Fourth Street SW., Apartment E801, Washington, D.C.

B. L. Brewer, 9459 Arlington Boulevard, Apartment 301, Fairfax. Va.

R. Brewster, 217 K Street SW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brock, 9702 Underwood Drive, Oxon Hill, Md.

W. P. Brockington, 4820 10th Street NE., Washington, D.C.

J. E. Brookman, 7410 Juneau Street, District Heights, Md.

D. V. Brooks, RFD 9135, Upper Marlboro, Md.

C. L. Brown, Jr., 255 Bellevue Avenue, Trenton, N.J.

D. V. Brown, 3412 Eads Street NE., Washington, D.C.

G. M. Brown, 4916 Just Street NE., Washington, D.C.
J. B. Brown, 1361 Fairmont Street NW., Washington, D.C.
J. L. Brown, 7003 Ritchie Marlboro Road, Washington, D.C.
M. A. Brown, 4425 13th Place NE., Washington, D.C.
S. W. Brown, 2729 Central Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
S. W. Brown III, 1754 Kilbourne Place NW., Washington, D.C.
V. B. Brown, 713 Farragut Place, Washington, D.C.
W. M. Brown, Route 1, Box 177, Trappe, Md.
L. Brown, Jr., 3716 Ely Place SE., Washington, D.C.
D. T. McHugh, Post Office Box 142, Annapolis, Md.
K. J. Morris, 11710 Emack Road, Beltsville, Md.
S. R. Raymond, 17431 Astoria Lane, Ednor, Md.

Baltimore, Md.

P. L. Allen, 3818 Barrington Road.
P. S. Arthur, Jr., 700 East 33d Street.
A. C. Baer, 4 Samwood Court.
C. L. Barnes, 2134 Firethorn Road.
A. M. Beane, 1657 West North Avenue.
B. T. J. Beckett, 638 Portland Street.
R. F. Bednarski, 405 East Clement Street.
H. M. Bennett, 122 North Central Avenue.
R. A. Blackwell, Jr., 108 North Smallwood Street.
J. B. Bondurant, 1447 Putty Hill Road, Towson, Md.
S. Bridgeforth, 2507 McCullen Street.
M. L. Brooks, 3402 Woodbrook Avenue.
V. L. Brown, 992 East Lombard Street.
M. L. Burton, 6330 Old Washington Boulevard, Elkridge, Md.
J. Butler, 645 Rosedale Street.
C. J. Byrd, 2331 Norfolk Street.
M. A. Caplan, 3403 Redman Road.
E. J. Cheney, 677 West Vine Street.
M. R. Chism, 877 Bethune Road.
J. A. Ciotola, Jr., 419 Wickham Road.
J. E. Cohen, 3309 Avondale Avenue.
J. S. Cohen, 3200 Strathmore Avenue.
M. F. Cooney, 3901 Parkside Drive.
M. K. Cronin, 8433 Garden Road, Pasadena, Md.
J. M. Curtis, 727 Dolphin Street.
M. L. Dates, Jr., 3421 Piedmont Avenue.
J. Z. Davids, 2417 Crest Road.
J. G. A. Davis, 2022 East Preston Street.
R. E. Dockins, 1426 North Bethel Street.
W. L. Dorsey, Jr., 1825 Clifton Avenue.
F. E. Duncan, 6222 McClean Boulevard.
B. A. Edwards, 1806 North Dukeland Street.
G. W. Elfrey, 3512 Ellerslie Avenue.
R. S. Elliott, 403 Robert Street.
A. G. Emerson, 215 Scott Street.
J. I. Epstein, 3430 Dolfield Avenue.
M. M. Fallon, 405 Giftings Avenue.
R. Feldstein, 2204 Chilem Road.
J. M. Fidler, 2754 Moorgate Road.
R. B. Fine, 12 Swan Hill Drive.
J. P. Finke, 400 Stevenson Lane.
M. Fisher, 4223 Rokeby Road.
M. P. Fitts, 3612 Cederdale Road.
E. A. Flanigan III, 3301 Norman Avenue.
R. L. Green, 525 Cumberland Street.
J. J. L. Hands, 411 Hazlett Avenue.
B. J. Hock, Jr., 4903 Fait Avenue.
E. J. Hruska, 704 Morris Avenue, Lutherville, Md.
S. M. Huff, 2303 Calverton Heights.
L. Israel, 4702 Bonnie Brae Road.
R. D. James, 2000 Euclid Avenue, Elkridge, Md.
A. Johnson, Jr., 5112 Craig Avenue.
E. W. Johnson, 411 Watty Court.
B. A. Jones, 763 West Saratoga Street.
C. B. Jones, 44 North Kossuth Street.
H. E. Jones, 2116 North Calvert Street.
M. E. Jones, 8 North Washington Street.
R. J. Jones, Jr., 3019 East Federal Street.
T. P. Kelly, 1418 Hadbert Street.
L. M. Klaus, 1109 South Curley Street.
E. F. Kmieciak, Jr., 621 South Streeper Street.
H. M. Kushner, 3602 Spaulding Avenue.
S. A. Kutchey, 5511 Pioneer Drive.
R. S. Landsman, 6917 Fieldcrest Road.
B. G. Levin, 3640 Fords Lane.
E. T. Levin, 7644 Carla Road.
P. Lewis, 809 Tessier Street.
R. Lieberman, 6318 Greenspring Avenue.
C. D. Long III, 1015 Boyce Avenue.
S. L. Luckman, 2849 West Cold Spring Lane.
M. B. Maddox, 6 South Abington Avenue.
G. A. Marsalek, 2211 Kentucky Avenue.
A. D. Martin, 123 West Greystone Road.
C. G. Martin, 2537 Round Road.
R. B. Mayeski, 126 Patapaco Avenue.
S. C. Mazelis, 3002 Glen Avenue.
B. McCormack, 3824 Beech Avenue.
G. A. McGill, 840 Edmondson Avenue.
J. T. McLawhorn, Jr., 2614 Boone Street.
H. S. McKilicsky, 4104 Belle Avenue.
K. J. Merritt, 3019 Brighton Street.
D. H. Meyers, Jr., 4206 56th Avenue.
P. B. Mickle, 3114 Presstman Street.
R. C. Milam, 3010 Westwood Avenue.
M. B. Mitchell, 1324 Druid Hill Avenue.
W. M. Monfried, 3312 Terrapin Road.
V. F. Monti, 212 Pontiac Avenue.
D. E. Mullins, 1420 West Lombard.
E. L. Murray, 2211 Chesterfield Avenue.
N. L. Murray, 1823 Wilson Point Road.
R. Nachlas, 4306 Maine Avenue.
C. L. Nelson, 801 Clintwood Court.
H. T. Oconnor, 3934 Frisby Street.
N. M. Osher, 3803 Clarks Inn.
F. C. Owens, Jr., 3111 Leighton Avenue.
I. S. Palmer, 765 Linnard Street.
L. R. Pearl, 5422 Gist Avenue.
P. A. Povegoy, 1907 Northbourne Road.
C. A. Phillips, 29 Tenbury Road, Lutherville.
A. Pope, 1231 North Linwood.
E. M. A. Rador, 1518 Byrd Street.
E. L. Ray, 1116 Ashland Court.
L. W. Ray II, 1607 Halbrook Avenue.
G. M. Reinsfelder, 7918 Montrose Avenue.
B. D. Richmond, 4110 Elderon Avenue.
J. F. Ryan, 6504 Roomount Avenue.
J. R. Sachs, 1210 North Gay Street.
J. A. Soaljon, 903 Beaumont Avenue.
W. E. Shade, 12 Sullivan Drive, Severna Park.
N. D. Sheeley, 14 Pelozar Avenue.
W. E. Smith, 2807 Glendale Avenue.
V. Smith, 1200 Waldo Court.
B. R. Southworth, 900 Old Oak Road.
I. Sternberg, 3310 Ludgate Road.
P. Stokes, 907 Funche Road.
L. F. Sullivan, 508 East 42d Street.
J. H. Sundstrom, Route 97, Glenwood.
A. J. Seczorbicki, 811 South Decker Avenue.
C. R. Thompson, 1525 Appleton Street.
J. W. Traffley III, 1310 Greenmount Avenue.
S. J. Venable III, 610 Wilton Road.
C. A. Weaver, 2752 Marbourne Avenue.
J. B. Weinstock, 5731 Jonquil Avenue.
J. L. Williams, 424 East 23d Street.
R. E. Wilson, 706 South Conkling Street.
S. F. Wilson, 2506 Calverton Heights.
C. L. Woodson, 923 North Carey Street.
H. A. Wunder, 3116 Cresson Avenue.
D. E. Wyatt, 6417 Hilltop Avenue.
M. Wylie, 1951 West Lexington.
H. C. Warfield, care of postmaster, Benedict.
A. R. Leifer, 3006 Traymore Lane, Bowie.

Cambridge, Md.

J. D. Balderson, Division Street, Oxford, Md.
E. L. Streagle, Jr., 421 Phillips Avenue, Cambridge, Md.
K. P. Harrison, care of postmaster, Crumpton, Md.
R. E. Shelton, Jr., 609 Frederick Street, Cumberland, Md.
V. E. Ricketts, care of postmaster, Dayton, Md.
E. M. Hill, care of postmaster, Dunkirk, Md.

Easton, Md.

J. O. Birmingham, Box 191, Tilghman, Md.
J. H. Kibler, 402 Cherry Street.
K. W. Pensel, East Oak Avenue.
J. E. Mosener, Jr., 157 North Street, Johns Lane, Ellicott City, Md.

Frederick, Md.

J. M. Atchison, 607 West Patrick Street.
J. J. Crum, 4 Frederick Avenue.
K. R. Miles, rural free delivery Route 1, Ijamsville, Md.
R. A. Sullivan, Post Office Box 47, New Market, Md.
F. C. Anderson, care of postmaster, Glencoe, Md.

Glen Echo, Md.

A. S. Thomas, 6203 Dunrobbin Drive, Washington, D.C.
E. L. Gilespie, 159 South Potomac Street, Hagerstown, Md.
L. M. Clark, care of postmaster, Highfield, Md.

Hyattsville, Md.

A. V. Christian, 7628 West Park Drive.
R. E. Bishop, 5717 43d Avenue.
P. A. Colovas, 4335 Southern Avenue, Bradbury Heights, Maryland.
J. D. Feldsman, 610 Valleybrook Drive, Silver Spring, Maryland.
J. R. Frothingham, 5203 59th Avenue.
T. N. Grant, 7012 Bradley Boulevard, Bethesda, Maryland.
T. A. Hay, 5505 Center Street, Lanham, Maryland.
E. B. Jones, National Trailer Park, 126 D Street, College Park, Maryland.
R. C. D. King, 427 49th Avenue, Capital Heights, Maryland.
R. J. Orleans, 9500 Colesville Road, Silver Spring, Maryland.
Q. R. Remein II, 903 Linwood Street.
J. L. Sheesley, 6205 41st Place.
S. A. Smith, care of Col. Merritt Booth, Fair Haven, Maryland.
F. D. Taylor, 6101 42d Avenue A–201.
J. R. Taylor, Jr., 11720 Ellington Drive, Beltsville, Md.
T. S. Templeton II, 8320 Nicholson Street,
R. W. Vaughan, 3923 Warner Avenue.
C. T. Banks, 1303 Strauss Avenue, Indian Head, Maryland.

Kensington, Md.

R. Podolak, 40126 Saul Road.
R. L. Rooney, 4221 Dresden Street.
L. R. Mundy, 9304 Ogden Place, Lanham Maryland.

La Plata, Md.

D. R. Head, Jr., Port Tobacco, Md.

Long Green, Md.

R. A. Stemler, Box 41 Kane Road, Glen Arm, Maryland.
T. G. Sauer, 107 Longdale Road, Lutherville-Timonium, Maryland.

Ocean City, Md.

W. S. Ayres, 809 Boardwalk.
W. M. Brown, Rural Route 1.
E. A. Disharoon, Care of Mr. R. S. Tull, Rural Route 3, Pocomoke City, Maryland.
R. F. Fagain, Post Office Box 65.
L. M. Higgins, 808 Baltimore Avenue.
J. H. Phillips, 111 Baltimore Avenue.

Rockville, Md.

N. J. Brandt, 2311 Ross Road, Silver Spring, Md.
C. W. Carpenter, 4103 Woodbine Street, Chevy Chase, Md.
V. G. Christiansen, 12109 Old Bridge Road.
R. H. Ficker, 9008 Flower Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.
F. R. Griggs, Jr., 26101 Mount Vernon Avenue, Damaseus, Md.
J. H. Groth, 6800 Belford Drive, Takoma Park, Md.
J. B. Harrod, 9408 Byeforde Road, Kensington, Md.

R. V. Holden, 11305 Galt Avenue, Wheaton, Md.

R. F. Kramer, 2810 Abilene Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.

R. G. Rayne, 1400 Riverside Drive, Salisbury, Md.

Silver Spring, Md.

E. W. Abramowitz, 12603 Connecticut Avenue.

J. D. Baker, 702 Southland, Electra, Tex.

J. M. Belt, 11503 Amherst Avenue.

D. B. Brandt, 2802 Radius Road, Wheaton, Md.

C. P. Brown, 10701 Kenlock Road.

S. Brown, Jr., 1315 69th Avenue, Landover, Md.

J. G. Degooyer, 1112 Mourilee Lane.

G. R. Dunlop, 13020 Valleywood Drive, Wheaton, Md.

R. W. Fout, 1008 Copley Lane.

E. M. Horowitz, 247 Southhampton Drive.

C. F. Kennedy, 119 Hedgewood Drive, Greenbelt, Md.

J. P. Knowlton, Howland, Md.

J. P. Kruse, 46 Shaw Avenue.

F. P. McCoy II, 3504 Edwin Street.

L. J. Pagliai 10606 Dunkirk Drive.

J. E. Reidinger, 8917 Whitney Street.

R. J. Rodriguez, 9122 Seventh Street, Lanham, Md.

R. W. Ruhling, 1 Manchester Place.

D. A. Smith, 11307 Galt Avenue, Wheaton, Md.

T. E. Sprague, 7514 Wellesley Drive, College Park, Md.

D. P. Strasnick, 5812 44th Avenue, Hyattsville, Md.

L. A. Wilson, 5713 Wainwright Avenue, Rockville, Md.

R. B. Woods, 1706 Norton Road, West Hyattsville, Md.

R. L. Young, 7929 Gateway Boulevard, District Heights, Md.

N. H. Cox, Sunderland, Md.

Westminster, Md.

F. B. White, 59 Penn Avenue.

E. R. Wilhide, R.F.D. 5.

J. F. Goodmen, R.F.D. 5, Abingdon, Va.

Alexandria, Va.

C. C. S. Beverly, Jr., 425 Timberbranch Parkway.

R. J. Comisky III, 3523 Wilson Avenue.

A. C. Fraiser, 622 North Columbus Street.

W. L. Fugate, 3404 Saylor Place.

W. O. Hall, 315 Buchanan Street.

C. B. Hanak, 6103 Augusta Drive, Springfield, Va.

J. E. Herbert, Jr., 305 Mount Vernon Avenue.

D. D. Hunt, 2501 Dewitt Avenue.

P. D. Kenny, 5335 Duke Street.

C. E. Kiblinger, 3454 Martha Custis Drive.

W. C. Leffingwell, Jr., 4513 Roundhill Road.

M. R. Lentz, 416 W Building Hunting Towers.

T. A. Lucas, 163 Chinquapin Drive.

A. J. Marche, 6407 Prospect Terrace.

C. L. Horavitz, 6611 East Wakefield Drive.

E. G. Newberger, 2909 Farm Road.

S. B. Savage III, 409 Jefferson Street.

C. J. Sobotka, Jr., 805 Enderby Drive.

Annandale, Va.

C. R. Michael, 7712 Killebrew Drive.

K. W. Hayder, care of postmaster.

K. W. Hayden, care of postmaster.

Arlington, Va.

G. L. Cron, 6039, North 27th Street.

R. M. Frederick, Jr., 227 North Park Drive.

R. L. Graham, 2017 North Emerson Street.

M. I. Edwards, care of postmaster, Birchleaf, Va.

D. L. Cushing, Box 473, Bowling Green, Va.

B. L. Roberts, 607 Arlington Avenue, Bristol, Va.

B. E. Lane, care of postmaster, Clinchport, Va.

Colonial Heights, Va.

G. T. McLaughlin, 263 Washington Avenue.

J. R. Williams, Jr., 516 Walnut Avenue.

D. P. Davis, care of postmaster, Crystal Hill, Va.

Culpeper, Va.

C. L. Button, Jr., 902 North East Street Extended.

T. J. Tysinger, care of postmaster.

K. P. Durgo, care of postmaster, Dolphin, Virginia.

Fairfax, Va.

E. Embree, Jr., 11333 Waples Mill Road, Oakton, Va.

D. D. Jennings, Jr., 3923 Tedrich Boulevard.

K. J. Marton

J. C. West, 10640 Maple St.

Falls Church, Va.

J. R. Akers, 3408 19th Avenue, Sheffield.

J. M. Bischoff, 7201 Marc Drive.

G. J. Cain, 1328 South Rulfe Street, Emporia, Va.

E. G. Crump, Rural Route 2, Box 2B, Climax, Va.

C. M. Finley, Jr., 22228 East Quebec Street, Arlington, Virginia.

J. R. Mellott, 3022 Westfall Place.

S. L. Toothman, 2617 Shelby Lane.

S. R. Wareholik, 6460 Spring Terrace.

W. E. Swan, Quarters 141, Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

R. S. Rodgers, Hampden, Sydney, Va.

Hampton, Va.

H. C. Brown, Jr., 16 Langley Avenue.

J. P. Cotton, 303 Ivy Home Road.

D. R. Jones, 1149 Garden Drive.

R. L. Moore, Jr., 1518 Morgan Drive.

Harrisonburg, Va.

J. M. Obannon III, Woodville, Va.

W. H. Holsper, Herndon, Va.

Lynchburg, Va.

W. R. Campbell, 3820 Cambria Street.

K. H. Coleman, Lucy Street, Appomattox, Va.

R. P. Cunningham, 1417 Gates Street.

W. R. Duff III, 806 Mansfield Avenue.

T. A. Hardin, 424 Cabot Street, Portsmouth, Va.

D. A. Rauh, Jr., 3908 Columbia Street, Portsmouth, Va.

S. O. Martin, Care of Postmaster, Marion Va.

I. E. Glascock, Post Office Box 73, Marshall, Va.

R. S. Hodnett, Jr., 1007 Cherokee Trail, Martinsville, Va.

I. O. Hockman, Maurertown, Va.

H. I. Bruce, Care of Postmaster, Meherrin, Va.

J. A. F. Dooley, Care of Postmaster, Montvale, Va.

Newport News, Va.

J. E. Cofield, Jr., 1016 22d Street.

W. N. Cunningham, 702 River Road.

R. R. Hatten, 6 Club Terrace.

L. W. Hauser, 1210 Roberts Road.

F. V. Jones, 12 Quillen Terrace.

W. A. Mitchell, Jr., 215 James River Drive.

B. S. Williams, 1608 Marshall Avenue.

S. C. Smith, Nora, Va.

Norfolk, Va.

B. M. Armstrong, Jr., 8618 Sturgis Street.

W. H. Baker III, 1403 Conoga Street.

J. W. Broadway, 1129 Hickman Street.

H. R. Bybee, 117 Arden Circle.

J. M. Foster, 1615 Bay View Boulevard.

L. A. Istrow, 3410 Willard Place.

C. B. Kello III, 4016 Gosnold Avenue.

J. T. Legault, Jr., 8830 Stratford Street.

J. M. Mason, 179 Blades Street.

D. B. Viccellio, 8915 Tidewater Drive.

A. E. Posten, Jr., 236 Craig Street, Norton, Va.

L. P. Wood, Patrick Springs, Va.

S. P. Johnson III, 1730 South Sycamore Street, Petersburg, Va.

E. M. Ward, care of postmaster, Pilgrim Knob, Va.

Portsmouth, Va.

P. I. Baker, 1914 Elm Avenue.

C. A. Forrester III, 3111 Duke Street.

L. P. Long, Jr., 110 Lisbon Road, Chesapeake, Va.

Richmond, Va.

D. I. Allen, 2116 Venable Street.

M. L. Aleton, 1707 Texas Avenue.

E. I. Bownan, 1215 Denny Street.

D. M. Claiborne, 110 Overbrook Road.

H. J. Cook, 603 North 35th Street.

V. M. Cottman, 1902 Chelsea Street.

W. R. Crookmur, 2011 Monument Avenue.

S. H. Crosby, 2809 Griffin Avenue.

R. E. Edwards, 2017 West Cary Street.

R. N. Evans, 810 Wilmer Avenue.

R. C. Featherston, 1320 West Laburnum Avenue.

C. A. Fraser, 2700 Fendall Avenue.

C. C. Galloway, Jr., 1613 Idlewood Avenue.

T. N. Georges, 7701 Brawsford Drive.

H. T. Hardy, Jr., Route 1 Box 1730, Sandston, Va.

R. B. Hill, 1319 North 27th Street.

C. L. Jasper, 1004 Edgehill Road.

W. A. Jewell, 6205 West Club Lane.

R. B. Kuper, 920 Sabot Street.

N. R. Lawson, 1710 Southhampton Avenue.

M. G. Morris, 330 Albermarle Avenue.

J. S. Hammond, Post Office Box 1, Ridgeway, Va.

J. J. Smith, care of postmaster, Ruthville, Va.

Suffolk, Va.

W. R. Fraser, 321 Cedar Street.

I. E. Williams, care of postmaster.

E. R. Rainey, care of postmaster, Sutherland, Va.

T. E. George, Jr., Tazewell, Va.

B. W. Piercey, 502 Niblick Drive, Vienna, Va.

Vinton, Va.

A. C. Anderson, L. G. Carter.

Virginia Beach, Va.

R. E. Baker, Jr., 1556 Ohio Avenue.

R. Y. Bonham, 3302 Holly Road.

C. V. Brown, Jr., 3302 Holly Road.

N. L. Gotwald, 2348 South Wolfsnare Drive.

J. W. Sills III, 219 86th Street.

W. M. Snider II, 404 22d Street.

H. M. Dennis, care of postmaster, Wattsville, Va.

E. S. Burke, Post Office Box 382, West Point, Va.

V. R. Wrixon, Post Office Box 143, Wilsons, Va.

Winchester, Va.

A. W. Jordan III, Strasburg, Va.

H.E. Craft, Box 412, Wise, Va.

J. L. Wilcox, care of postmaster, Allen Junction, W. Va.

C. Ellis, Post Office Box 78, Amigo, W Va.

B. H. Dempsey, Ansted, W. Va.

Beckley, W. Va.

J. P. McGee, Glen White, W. Va.

C. R. Wood, Jr., Route 2, Box 11, Bluefield, W. Va.

E. M. Silvers, Post Office Box 144, Bradley, W. Va.

Charleston, W. Va.

E. O. Allen, 1003 Copenhaver Drive.

L. G. Austin, Jr., 1418 3d Avenue.

D. M. Ballard, 2107 Kenawha Avenue.

G. T. Bane, 5212 Florida Street, South.

D. L. Cummings, 1640 Chandler Drive.

S. A. Davidson, 64 Garrison Avenue.

R. C. Gilligan, 1410 Watts Street.

T. D. Hamilton, 109 Pennsylvania Avenue.

R. R. Heath, 4907 Virginia Avenue.

A. J. Holley, 621 Simms Street.

E. W. Lampton, Sr., 1003 Edgewood Drive.

D. A. Liberty, 1157–C Bridge Road.

J. L. Miller, 1517 Huron Terrace.

K. A. Mollohan, 5222 Blaine Drive.

J. V. Reishman, 4200 Staunton Avenue.

F. G. Selbe, III, 786 Campabelle Creek Drive.

J. A. Sturgeon, 315 Roune Street.

T. L. Tucker, 110 Vine Street.

R. M. Vincent, 817 Somerset Drive.

D. M. P. Huffman, Chelyan, W. Va.

Chester, W. Va.

R. M. Temple, Laurel Heights, Box 22.

P. S. Chambers, care of postmaster, Clothier, W. Va.

Dehue, W. Va.

R. Hurek, Hutchinson, W. Va.

S. Lipinski, Glen Dale, W. Va.

E. G. Doss, Glenwood, W. Va.

E. Elusko, Post Office Box 144, Grant Town, W. Va.

Huntington, W. Va.

J. W. Blake, 1048 Harrison Street, Milton, W. Va.

T. H. Hensley, Jr., 346 Navaho Trail.

C. M. Sullivan, 1230 Glenwood Avenue, Milton, W. Va.

J. R. Welker, 2005 North Main Street, Pleasant, W. Va.

J. G. Dawson, 230 Armstrong Street, Keyser, W. Va.

C. S. Casey, care of postmaster, Kincaid, W. Va.

D. R. McClung, Post Office Box 38, Asbury, W. Va., Lewisburg, W. Va.

P. Lemon, Mallory, W. Va.

Martinsburg, W. Va.

D. S. Barney, Jr., Post Office Box 100Y, Route 4.

J. F. Davis, III, Route 3, Box 191–AA.

M. V. Milton, care of postmaster, Millville, W. Va.

D. W. Hilling, Jr., route 3, box 219, Morgantown, W. Va.

R. D. Peters, 117 Grant Street, Newell, W. Va.

R. R. Clark, route 1, Ona, W. Va.

Parkersburg, W. Va.

D. E. Johnson, 501 Columbia Avenue, Willamstown, W. Va.

M. L. Shockey, Sherrard, W. Va.

M. J. Whitt, care of postmaster, Switzer, W. Va.

W. R. Cogar, Webster Springs, W. Va.

Wheeling, W. Va.

J. W. Bayless, Tunnel Street, West Alexander, Pa.

B. R. Byrum, Jr., Highland Park.

G. E. Cappiccie, 31 South Wabash Street.

E. J. Dugas, 307 12th Street, Moundsville, W. Va.

A. E. Hatfield, 17 West Sixth Avenue, Williamson, W. Va.

WICHITA REGION

Kansas

Theis, Roger M., 1034 North C, Arkansas City.

Crawford, David A., 709 Avenue B, Dodge City.

Waldron, David L., 1005 Avenue B, Dodge City.

Remsberg, Steven R., 507 North Summit, Eldorado.

Bishop, Robert D., 623 Sunny Slope, Emporia.

Briscoe, Harry James, Jr., 1241 Thompson, Emporia.

Cukjati, John J., 304 East South, Arma.

Willard, Ralph R., Route 2, Fort Scott.

Goodwin, Kent L., 109 East 23d, Hays.

Kerbs, Kenneth W., Jr., 317 Skyline Court, Hays.

Wasinger, Stephen F., 1320 Marshall Road, Hays.

Weigel, Lawrence N., 1114 Centennial Boulevard, Hays.

Olson, Michael G., 616 East B, Hutchinson.

Kelly, James Patrick, 709 East Main, Independence.

Seals, Mitchell L., 1301 West 9th, Coffeyville.

Goreham, Kenneth C., 430 West Maple, Junction City.

Baker, Harry W., 6616 Wood Avenue, Kansas City.

Blee, John J., Lake of the Forest, care of J. Welch, Bonner Springs.

Burdette, Otis L., III, 2028 Darby, Kansas City.

Flury, Kirk E., 7341 Canterbury, Shawnee Mission.

Hanson, Alan L., 5122 Yecker, Kansas City.

Holton, Michael Wayne, 1131 Ella, Kansas City.

Jackson, Gerald L., 720 Stewart, Kansas City.

Kirksey, Jackie Arnold, 2317 North 5th, Kansas City.

Louden, Woodrow, 242 North Early, Kansas City.

Love, Cheryl Christi, 2853 Parkview, Kansas City.

Naaktgeboren, Martin J., 1832 North 28th Street, Kansas City.

Oesterreich, Robert A., 6444 Leavenworth Road, Kansas City.

Persley, Michael Dean, 4315 Nebraska, Kansas City.

Peters, Jay L., 721 North 14th Street, Kansas City.

Rush, Virgil P., II, Rural Route No. 1, Severance.

Skibniewski, Michael Gary, 5012 Georgia, Kansas City.

Thompson, Rudolph B., 2734 North 10th, Kansas City.

Gillispie, James D., 1421 Kentucky, Lawrence.

Mitchell, Jeffrey Clerk, 1626 West 20th, Lawrence.

Paul, Jack N., 1122 North Pershing, Liberal.

Jones, Willie L., 1317 Anderson Street, Manhattan.

Payne, Donald Edward, 306 Goodnow Hall, Manhattan.

Durso, Carl Kent, Rural Route No. 1, Olathe.

Fulton, Jack Richard, 503 West 5th, Pittsburg.

Smrcka, Roderick, 605 South Main, Plainville.

Green, Oliver Deck, 727 Morrison, Salina.

Litchman, John Frederick, 150 South Eighth Street, Salina.

Corcoran, Thomas J., Jr., 3920 West 95th Terrace, Shawnee Mission.

Johnson, Duane R., 8114 West 74th Street, Shawnee Mission.

Johnson, Larry D., 8114 West 74th Street, Shawnee Mission.

Kline, Jack Davis, 9000 Goodman, Shawnee Mission.

Powell, Stephen T., 5121 Rock Creek Lane, Shawnee Mission.

Sheridan, John L., Jr., 4211 West 90th Terrace, Shawnee Mission.

Winn, Douglas S., 9610 High Drive, Shawnee Mission.

Haney, John P., 2524 Duncan Drive, Topeka.

Harrop, Robert J., 2632 Michigan, Topeka.

Ralston, Harold Clee, Phi Delta Theta, Washburn University, Topeka.

Regan, Thomas Walter, 1407 West Eighth Topeka.

Symons, Stanley M., Onaga.

Bell, Charles Edward, 1329 Greenwood, Wichita.

Beatty, Brian A., 425 North Bluff, Wichita

Bonnett, Marily E., 4001 Bellaire, Wichita

Brechbill, Robert Kent, 8315 Peach Tree Lane, Wichita.

Broshears, Beverly L., 613 North Gordon, Wichita.

Buchan, Robert Eugene, 244 North Pershing, Wichita.

Burmeister, Larry Louis, 1925 South Elizabeth, Wichita.

Emery, Jane C., 1918 North Chautauqua, Wichita.

Griffey, Michelle, 2012 Pattie, Wichita.

Grubbs, Daniel Franklin, 3025 Oakland, Wichita.

Hawkins, Chester L., 932 North Piatt Wichita.

Hoagland, Janet Ruth, 806 North Green, Wichita.

Hogan, Paul D., 1331 South Main, Wichita.

Jones, Michael L., 36 Mission Road, Wichita.

Low, Harold R., 255 South Pershing, Wichita.

Mardock, Richard Stanly, 1713 Mentor, Wichita.

Massey, Michael G., 1020 North Parkwood, Wichita.

Mucklow, Gary L., 258 North Holyoke, Wichita.

Patterson, Loren B., 2166 Greenway Boulevard, Wichita.

Rich, Ivan H., Jr., 1601 Socony, Augusta.

Simmons, Donald L., 2616 Clover Lane, Wichita.

Taylor, Lyle E., 1950 South Madison, Wichita.

Tuxill, Bruce Farrant, 507 Stratford Road, Wichita.

Williams, Melvin, 2027 Corning, Parsons.

Nebraska

Ensz, James H., R.R. No. 3, Beatrice.

Fitzpatrick, William L., 1208 Potter, Bellevue.

Burt, Kelly, Box 263, Newport.

Ramaekers, Joseph C., Route No. 1, Monroe.

Schupbach, Norman Walter, R.R. No. 4, Box 86, Columbus.

Chisholm, Robert Charles, R.R. No. 1, Fremont.

Lamme, George T., 1040 North Pebble Street, Fremont.

McIntosh, Michael X., 739 North Union, Fremont.

Stoltenberg, Gerald A., 1663 North Sommers, Fremont.

Rinder, Thomas P., 1822 West Anna Street, Gr. Island.

Nein, Samual M., 622 East 7th, Hastings.

Ganow, Harold C., 738 East 4th, Hastings.

Flemming, James Richard, 223 East 4th, Hastings.

Armstrong, John Michael, 1040 "A" Street, Lincoln.

Bates, Eugene Paul, 4011 South 40th, Lincoln.

Bogard, Robert L., Jr., 3810 "L" Street, Lincoln.

Dolan, Ronald J., care of Lincoln Hotel, Lincoln.

Eikleberry, Lana K., 2053 Calvert Street, Lincoln.

Exon, Stephen J., 5101 Washington, Lincoln.

Goebel, Jon F., 2929 Georgian Court, Lincoln.

Horn, Frederick Emil, 351 South 45th Street, Lincoln.

Jordan, Betty A., care of Jordan Hotel, Valentine.

Kafka, David K., 6713 "Y" Street, Lincoln.

Kleppinger, Michael V., 4525 "A" Street, Lincoln.

McGoogan, Ralph Richard, 3225 South 30th, Lincoln.

Muehling, Conrad A., 423 North 20th, Beatrice.

Priefert, Frederick T., 2551 South 36th Avenue, Lincoln.

Rodgers, Richard R., 2510 Van Buren, Bellevue.

Snyder, Lee L., 545 North 27th Street, Lincoln.

Sparks, Robert B., 2036 South 26th, Lincoln.

Veed, Patricia R., 1127 "E" Street, Lincoln.

Vogt, Jerry J., 1728 South 26th, Lincoln.

White, Dennis E., 1965 Brower Road, Lincoln.

Zwink, William E., 540 "I" Street, Loup City.

Wood, Kelly R., 1140 Linden, Sidney.

Frazier, William J., 1220 East 12th Street, North Platte.

Webb, Marvin L., 318 South Reynolds Avenue, North Platte.

Ruff, Steven Mark, 112 Elder, North Platte.

Dittrick, William G., 1102 Koenigstein, Norfolk.

Froehlich, Lee D., 1311 Prospect, Norfolk.

Winter, Douglas J., 303 North 9th, Norfolk.

James Patrick Adams, 2622 North 24th, Omaha.

Peter Joseph Beauchamp, 2615 Camden Avenue, Omaha.

Jan M. Bogard, 99 Country Club Road, Ralston.

Gerald Brock, 3017 Myrtle Avenue, Omaha.

Harold S. Conner, 6338 Binney, Omaha.

John E. Duggan, 2216 Hanscom, Omaha.

Philip L. Dunham, 208 North 35th Avenue, Omaha.

Gwynn Eleby, 2409 Manderson, Omaha.

Mike E. Eyster, 1236 Bellaire Boulevard, Bellevue.

James P. Fitzgerald, 2735 Fontennelle, Omaha.

Priscilla L. Fuglei, 4118 North 54th Street, Omaha.

James A. Gallant, 2114 4th Street, Kearney.

Fred M. Guss, 4963 Cumings, Omaha.

Leslie L. Henderson, 8073 Cedar Street, Omaha.

Terry Lee Johnson, 6011 Curtis, Omaha.

Herbert P. Jurgens, 4161 Cass, Omaha.

Paul R. Kaster, 3259 Jefferson, Omaha.

Danny E. Kinsley, 1410 Main Street, Bellevue.

Dennis E. Koley, 2835 South 32d Street, Omaha.

Michael E. McAndrew, 3019 North 45th, Omaha.

Kenneth R. Middleton, 2611 Van Buren, Bellevue.

Judith Lynn Owens, 3030 California, Omaha.

Richard D. Peck, 1610 South 75th, Omaha.

Michael W. Ryan, 2047 North 54th, Omaha.

Duncan M. Shrout, 7515 Highland, Ralston.

Joseph R. Steward, Jr., 3513 "U" Street, Omaha.

Francis Leo Vail, 4212 Polk, Omaha.

Richard C. Waller, 6321 Odgen, Omaha.

Jerry D. Belford, 1701 Avenue "F", Scottsbluff.

Robert M. Eddy, 2439 Craig, Sidney.

Gerald L. Collingham, 521 Beaver, York.

Oklahoma

Snow, Jerry David, 730 East Fifth, Ada.

Truett, Thomas E., 519 East 14th, Ada.

Hughes, Carol Sue, 605 North Louis Tittle Avenue, Mangum.

Walker, James W., 1518 North Crain, Altus.

Settles, Robert S., Box 6, Antlers.

Alexander, Richard A., 706 Second Avenue NW., Ardmore.

Axsom, Ralph E., 1532 Maple, Bartlesville.

Sholl, David S., 105 W. Brahma, Dewey.

Pentecost, Michael E., 615 Mason Drive, Broken Arrow.

Wilson, Keith Dwayne, 417 East Freeport, Broken Arrow.

Brown, Richard Norman, 123 Phillips Lane, Clinton.

Mitchell, Anthony G., Box 237, Cordell.

Whisenhunt, Billy, Route No. 3, Caddo.

Laster, Roy E., 202 East Park, Enid.

Nearing, Richard C., 722 North Peachtree Street, Ponca City.

Robinson, Phillip W., 1621 West Oklahoma, Enid.

Weaver, William D., 609 W. Jackson, Hugo.

Grimes, Johnnie Dale, Route No. 1, Box 27, Idabel.

Fargo, Michael J., 1633 North 27th, Lawton.

Mims, Jerry D., 124 West Washington, Walters.

Serda, Edward Jerome, 4316 Santa Fe, Lawton.

Boggs, Max, Fort No. 3, McAlester.

Cobb, John D., 1020 East Deleware, McAlester.

Dillingham, Michael J., 1313 South 10th, McAlester.

Graham, Jimmy, Box 34, Marietta.

Herbert, Adam W., Jr., 710 Fondulac, Muskogee.

Fisher, Harold B., 921 West Okmulgee, Muskogee.

Stevenson, James W., 2026 Boston, Muskogee.

Carpenter, Donald J., 515 Dee Anne, Norman.

Keim, Howard Lynn, 469½ College Street, Norman.

Allen, Robert N., Jr., 1324 Northeast Seventh, Oklahoma City.

Biscoe, Charles E., 5925 Northeast 63d, Oklahoma City.

Boyd, James D., 435 Northwest 22d, Oklahoma City.

Chandler, Wayne C., Jr., 637 Northeast 11th, Oklahoma City.

Child, Gilbert C., 2805 Plymouth Lane, Oklahoma City.

Claro, Joseph A., 309 Northeast 61st, Oklahoma City.

Edwards, Ronald, 516 North Lindsay, Oklahoma City.

Elliott, William D., 1800 North Main, Altus.

Gage, John F., 3205 Southwest 21st, Oklahoma City.

Gwin, Robert M., 1624 Westminister Place, Oklahoma City.

Hall, John A., 2700 Normandy Drive, Oklahoma City.

Howard, Moses, Jr., 2221 Northeast Park Place, Oklahoma City.

Humble, Jerry W., 204 West Ercoupe, Oklahoma City.

Lawter, Joseph M., 2125 Southwest 64th, Oklahoma City.

Lewis, Jamerson Ambus, 924 Northeast 2d, Oklahoma City.

Luper, Calvin B., 1819 Northeast Park, Oklahoma City.

McClain, Richard J., Ft. No. 2, Box 122, Luther.

Magers, Michael Bruce, 721 Southwest 47th Street, Oklahoma City.

Mead, Michael R., 3320 North Robinson, Oklahoma City.

Meek, John H., 309 East 5th, Edmond.

Moen, Russell C., 2637 Southwest 42d, Oklahoma City.

Paramore, Gary L., 117 Northeast 14th, Oklahoma City.

Proctor, Barbara K., 1501½ Northwest 20th, Oklahoma City.

Ramsey, Stephen Douglas, 9909 Sunny Meade Place, Oklahoma, City.

Ray, Branda L., 3844 Northwest 36th, Oklaroma City.

Reed, Ronald L., 620 Southwest 51st Street, Oklahoma City.

Roberts, Gary T., 3400 Northwest 41st, Oklahoma City.

Rodgers, James R., 323 South Second, Blackwell.

Seba, Terry A., 3119 Northwest 19th, Oklahoma City.

Simms, Lewis C., 840 Northeast 5th, Oklahoma City.

Sledge, Connie Lee, 1711 Northeast Park, Oklahoma City.

Sperling, Kenneth, 5833 Northwest 47th, Oklahoma City.

Thomason, William P., 838 Northwest 34th, Oklahoma City.

Williams, John C., 20 Northeast 4th, Oklahoma City.

Wilson, Joseph Purman, 3212 Northwest 23d, Oklahoma City.

Dehart, Charles W., Route 1, Poteau.

Smith, Kenneth G., Route 2, Sallisaw.

McLaughlin, Jon Mike, 807 East Commerce, Altus.

Shaw, James Keith, 1010 10th Street, Snyder.

Giddens, John B., care of Giddins Jewelry, Cleveland.

Hinds, James I., 500 East Seneca, Tahlequah.

Adams, Charles L., Route 2, Box 80-A, Shawnee.

Arnold, James T., 1607 East 12th, Tulsa.

Carter, Carolyn, 501 South 7th, Okemah.

Davis, Elmer L., Jr., 1614 North Cheyenne, Tulsa.

Halka, Dennis W., 1001 West Dewey, Shawnee.

Higgins, William R., 402 North Lynn Riggs Boulevard, Claremore.

Jimerson, Herman H., 304 East Woodrow, Tulsa.

Liljedahl, John E., 3129 East 5th Place, Apartment 6, Tulsa.

Lynam, Robert B., 505 East Ada, Shawnee.

Mize, Rick L., 3513 East Archer, Tulsa.

Palm, Irvin David, 2421 North Main, Box 6038, Tulsa.

Parsons, Kenneth D., 3230 East 7th Street, Apartment 7, Tulsa.

Pendergraft, Thomas Elston, 920 "I", Northwest, Miami.

Powell, Peter Earl, 1901½ North Broadway, Shawnee.

Simmons, Larry L., 2603 North Broadway, Shawnee.

Taylor, Lawrence D., 413 West Walnut, Barnsdall.

Bishop, Stanley Anthony, P.O. Box 282, Vinita.

Freeman, Lynn B., P. O. Box 706, Vinita.

Hodge, David L., 515 North State, Wagoner.

Braly, Murlin E., 1721 Oklahoma Avenue, Woodward.

Waggoner, Terry Lloyd, 2133 2d Street, Woodward.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman taking the floor in behalf of this book by Clark Mollenhoff entitled "Despoilers of Democracy." Certainly none of us want democracy despoiled, no more than we want the representative Republic under the Constitution despoiled. This book hangs up some valiant red lights about how it can be done, not only in the areas which the gentleman has referred to, but this author, with his keen perceptiveness and his stick-to-it-iveness and his prudent judgment, the man who wrote "The Pinnacle of Power," I believe, just before this, wherein some of the goon administrations and gangster control of labor unions which were despoiled, or at least brought to light, so that normal processes of good government could despoil reprehensible practices in that movement, has clearly laid out deficiencies in the appointive system of the Cabinet office, errors documented and depicted in the administration of the Department of Defense, which has not only been policymaking in its lately assumed powers under the Curtis-McCormack amendment to an appropriation bill of a few years past, toward the end of empire building in more than 18 instances, that has again brought to public light and for considered consumption and decision of informed opinion by necessary repetitive process, such errors in administration as the Billie Sol Estes, the Bobby Baker cases and many others which have indeed despoiled the good name of democracy as spelled with a small "d" in the last few years.

Again I compliment the gentleman. Certainly this fine author will not be despoiled by expediency in what he has brought before the American public.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS IN BIRMINGHAM, JEFFERSON COUNTY, ALA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FASCELL). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, following a period of peace, harmony and orderly progress in the city of Birmingham which it is my honor to represent, we find ourselves in recent weeks once again in the glare of the spotlight of the news as a result of riotous demonstrations, led in the city of Birmingham and the neighboring city of Bessemer, by one Hosea Williams of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and others.

The purpose of these demonstrations is, as I am given to understand from the lips of Mr. Williams and those of others, twofold. In the first place, to press for night registration, neighborhood registration, and more lately, the bringing in of Federal registrars to facilitate the registration of all Negro citizens in the area in the immediate future.

There is a second purpose about which Mr. Williams has spoken: that Birmingham was so successfully used by certain elements before that they are using our city again. I gather this to mean that they will try to use our city as a stage for a drama in which the people are the props and our city is an object lesson to be held up before other cities.

As the pressure in all areas has grown for the facilitation of Negro registration and voting, and since this has been taking place in recent weeks in the city of Birmingham, I felt it would be useful to insert into the RECORD the truth and the facts to make clear the status of registration of voters in my county at this time.

First, may I say that it is my conviction and the conviction of many others of both major racial groups in my area, that there is no discrimination in the registration of voters in Jefferson County, Ala., at this time.

As of July 31, 1965, there were registered in my county some 153,974 white persons and some 24,088 Negro citizens, for a total registration of 178,062.

Since the white adult population constitutes about 70 percent of the adult population of the district, and the Negro population about 30 percent, there was a larger percentage of registered Caucasian persons than Negro persons, as of July 31, 1965.

However, in the month of August 1965 there were registered in Jefferson County 150 white and 2,220 Negro citizens.

In September there were registered 462 Caucasians and 2,155 Negroes.

In October 1965 there were registered 413 whites and 1,444 Negroes.

In November there were registered 399 whites and 1,443 Negroes.

In the month of December 1965 there were registered 858 Caucasian persons and 3,859 Negro citizens.

In the first half of January 1966 there were registered 714 white persons and 4,160 Negro citizens, bringing the total registration at this point to 196,339, of which 156,970 are Caucasian citizens and 39,369 are Negro citizens.

Now, these new figures indicate that as of the beginning of January, 1966, 21 percent of the registered voters in my county were Negro citizens, against a 30-percent population figure.

It is estimated that at the present rate, estimated by responsible local officials, the Negro registration by April 1, 1966, will be 30 percent of the total registered voters in our county, thereby bringing into balance the percentage of Negro citizens registered to vote and the percentage of Caucasian citizens registered to vote. on a population basis.

Mr. Speaker, not only has there been no discrimination practiced, I can testify to the fact that as early as the fall of 1964 the people who were having difficulty registering in my county were not Negro citizens. When the lines became heavy, near the election season, the lines were filled with Negro citizens who were being registered; the people who had difficulty registering were Caucasian rather than Negro.

Not only has there been no discrimination but steps have been taken to facilitate such registration. From the period August 6, 1965, the following changes have taken place:

On August 6, 1965, the Board of Registrars was staffed by six clerks. Since that time 15 additional clerks have been employed, such additions being made as per the following: on August 18, 4 employees; on December 15, 6 additional employees; on January 4, 1966, 5 additional clerks were employed, 3 of whom I believe were Negro clerks and 2 of these were serving on the last registration day which I checked.

Now the opening week of January 1966, is an indication of the present rate of registration. On Monday, January 3, 376 applied for registration. On Tuesday, 395 and on Wednesday, 366. On Saturday, January 15, more than 800 persons were registered in Jefferson County. On a normal day the Board of Registrars estimate they can easily register some 600 persons to vote. With the single exception of the Saturday on which 800 applied, and the 800 were handled by the Board with no undue delay, there has been no day to date when as many as 600 persons applied for registration.

In short, those who have wanted to register have been handled by the Jefferson County Board of Registrars at this time without delay.

In addition to employing extra employees, arrangements have been made to keep the board open for 5 days instead of 3 days which had previously been the case. Saturday was substituted as one of the registration days. Registration takes place on Saturday rather than Thursday to enable those who work and cannot obtain leave during the weekdays to register.

These things have been done to facilitate registration of voters in my county on a nondiscriminatory basis and to provide all citizens a reasonable opportunity to come to a centrally located place and to register themselves to vote.

The fact that there has not yet been a day on which there have undue delays in which the board has been unable to handle those who presented themselves is an indication that steps have been taken which appear to be sufficient to facilitate registration of all citizens in my county who have a reasonable and minimal interest in registering themselves in order to vote.

Now there has been a demand for night registration or neighborhood registration. Without commenting finally on whether this kind of registration is a good thing or not, may I say that night registration has been tried once and it was found not successful by the board of registrars.

Neighborhood registration presents a number of difficulties both in law and in the physical capability to handle such registrations.

But may I point out in this connection that there are available means for registration of all citizens for 5 days a week in a central location and these facilities are available regardless of race, color, or creed.

Now no one can guarantee that every citizen of either major racial group will in fact present himself to be registered and to vote. Because, as a matter of fact, not only in our city but in all America apathy is one of the problems in getting people to participate as they ought to participate in the political life of the Nation. This is a problem that I think a check of any district's voting record would indicate. In very few places if ever at all do 100 percent of the citizens present themselves to register to vote and participate actively in the processes of selecting their leaders in government.

Apathy has been one of the problems in our city. The militant group which came into our city to organize demonstrations to press for these changes in registration and in voting had great difficulty in arousing enough interest on the part of the adult Negro community to get an impressive demonstration underway and to get such demonstrations carried out.

On a normal day of demonstrations some 100 persons have participated and the law enforcement agencies report approximately 52 out of the 100 are paid workers of civil rights organizations.

Therefore, there has been apathy on the part of the adult Negro community to the attempts to organize these demonstrations, and there is apathy on the part of both Negro and Caucasian citizens in the matter of registering to vote. No one can guarantee that every citizen will in fact, whatever arrangements are made, present himself to be registered and will in fact vote. But may I say that it would appear—and it is the conviction of most of the leadership of our community that it is the case—arrangements have been made to cover all normal reasonable demands for registration and voting.

May I say that if neighborhood registration did come to pass, our registration is at present on a nondiscriminatory basis. While there are some 76,000 Negro citizens who are not yet registered to vote, there are over 100,000 Caucasian citizens who are not yet registered to vote, and in light of the fact that many of those unregistered voters are Caucasian housewives who do experience some difficulty in leaving their homes in order to register to vote, if the neighborhood registration takes place, it would seem to me mandatory, obvious, and elementary that it should be on a nonracial, nondiscriminatory, countywide basis in every precinct and in every neighborhood, and not in selected neighborhoods; particularly since by April 1, according to the present rate, the percentage of Negro to Caucasian registered voters against the adult population figures for those two racial groups will be in balance in my district.

Therefore, to sponsor and to carry out registration in certain selected neighborhoods only, on a racial basis, would be to create a new discrimination, to create a new imbalance rather than to correct any present imbalance, and would be working against the rights of and that which could be considered equity for the majority of the citizens of my county.

It would seem from these facts that the Board of Registrars of Jefferson County has made reasonable effort to comply with the requirements of the 1965 Civil Rights Act, that there is no discrimination, that efforts have been made to facilitate registration, and that soon there will be a complete balance in registration figures, and that there is present ample opportunity for any citizen who desires to present himself to register to vote to do so without undue delay or inconvenience.

The leadership of our city has spoken emphatically on behalf of equal rights, but also for responsible action, in a statement published in the Birmingham News on January 11, 1966. That statement is as follows:

> While this statement does not presume to speak for every elected or appointed official or every individual citizen, it does—in our sincere and considered opinion—represent the convictions of the great majority of the people of this area.
>
> There are two cardinal principles of government which appear, in effect, as the mottos of the governments of Jefferson County and the city of Birmingham. One is engraved above the 21st Street entrance of the county courthouse; the other on the walls of the city council chamber.
>
> Above the courthouse entrance, from the pen of Thomas Jefferson are the words: "Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion."
>
> In city hall the words mean: "Cities Are What Men Make Them."
>
> Those two phrases ought to be a part of the governmental fabric of every American city, county and State. But even when they are—as they now are part of the governmental fabric of Jefferson County and Birmingham—they cannot be effective until all qualified citizens, of all races and creeds, are ready and willing to undertake full participation and full responsibility as citizens.
>
> In order to make voting participation possible as rapidly and practically as possible, the Jefferson County Board of Registrars has completely fulfilled its obligations, both moral and legal.
>
> Its effort to accommodate those who wish to register as voters are now limited only by the physical requirements of State laws which may not be abridged except by due process of either legislative amendment or court orders.
>
> The fact that some applicants may have had to stand in lines for short periods is hardly a challenge to either the capacity or willingness of the Board of Registrars to fulfill its duties under the civil rights or any other act, State of Federal.
>
> Let it be noted that every year, regardless of months of notice and mail-in privileges, 10 times as many citizens stand in line from dawn till dark for automobile tags.
>
> Several times yearly hundreds stay in line for 72 uninterrupted hours solely for the privilege of buying a football ticket. At least five times a year some 70,000 people ride bumper to bumper for 2 hours or more for the same purpose and thousands miss the opening kickoff because they did not start in time.
>
> No week passes that people, regardless of color or creed, do not stand in tiresome checkout grocery lines, in front of theater box offices, at bus stops and in restaurants.
>
> The world's richest grocer could not provide an instant checkout clerk for every grocery shopper; the richest county in America has not and cannot produce an instant registrar for every applicant.
>
> Groceries and voting privileges are both fundamental to the full pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness. Both are worth, and usually require standing in line. But now, even that has been minimized.
>
> We believe that it is the right of any qualified citizen to participate, as a voter, in government. We believe that under existing laws the exercise of that right cannot be limited by race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.
>
> Certain groups have requested the Justice Department to send Federal registrars to Jefferson County.
>
> We believe the Board of Registrars has the capacity and will to register all those who, within reasonable bounds, seek to register.
>
> We believe the responsibility for encouraging registration and voting lies with local leadership at all levels.
>
> We believe that as people are encouraged to register and vote, they must also be instructed in the obligations as well as the privileges of full citizenship. Strong and responsive democracy can only come as a byproduct of the maintenance of law and order; the realization that self-determination also includes self-restraint; that no man or group of men may disrupt the peace, violate the law or otherwise unlawfully or violently expedite their own aims at the expense of the whole society in which they live.
>
> Every citizen owes a duty to act in the best interest of his entire community.
>
> Today there is rapidly developing a growing and responsible leadership in both the white and Negro communities. It is a leadership capable of communication and understanding.
>
> That leadership recognized that local problems can be solved satisfactorily, and without rancor, only at the local level. They believe affirmatively that local opportunities can be fully realized and fully shared only by local cooperation and accommodation.
>
> That leadership needs to grow and to be strengthened. It will be vastly strengthened when the qualified citizens register and vote in good conscience for the best interest of the city as a whole, Jefferson County as a whole, Alabama as a whole, and the Nation as a whole * * *. "One Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
>
> W. Cooper Green,
> *President, Jefferson County Commission.*
> E. H. Gilmore,
> *Member, Jefferson County Commission.*
> Thomas B. Pinson,
> *Member, Jefferson County Commission.*
> Albert Boutwell,
> *Mayor, City of Birmingham.*
> M. E. Wiggins,
> *President, Birmingham Council.*

These leaders, including the president of the county commission, the city mayor, and the president of the city council, point out that while they support absolute equality of opportunity, they do not believe it reasonable to expect them to guarantee instant registration to every citizen everywhere at this or any future time. They point out that every day more people stand in line to receive licenses of various kinds than stand in line to register to vote, that people are often subject to delays in supermarket lines and at football games. Certainly it would not be physically possible to guarantee instant registration for every citizen, but registration has proceeded without any undue delay or inconvenience that anyone can observe at this point for all citizens.

So much for the registration itself, which seems to be proceeding at an orderly and nondiscriminatory pace.

May I address myself now to the efforts that have been made to change the procedures of registration and to press for these various things—Federal registrars to come in, night and neighborhood registration in Negro neighborhoods only. As I indicated, our city has made peaceful, harmonious, and orderly progress in recent months and years. However, recently there came into our city a group of personalities, nonresidents of Jefferson County, who attempted first to inflame the passions of adult Negro citizens and, failing this, turned their attention to Negro high school students in my county.

These individuals sought to persuade these young people to leave school, to demonstrate, to defy authority, to press for their demands regarding registration.

On January 10, 1966, the following took place, according to an affidavit of Lt. David Wayne Orange of the Jefferson County Sheriff's Department:

> At the urgency of alleged nonresident civil rights leaders, students from the Brighton High School, a school under the jurisdiction of the Jefferson County Board of Education, left said school and went to Carver High School, a Jefferson County school, where they persuaded a number of students to leave said school and join in their march and continued on to Abram School, also a Jefferson County school, where they persuaded a number of students to join in their demonstration and continued on through the streets of Bessemer to the Jefferson County Courthouse, Bessemer Division.
>
> On Tuesday, January 11, 1966, some 250 to 300 Negro students from Brighton High School lay down in the four-lane Bessemer superhighway between Birmingham and Bessemer, blocking vehicular traffic; later marching back to Brighton after a warning. On Tuesday, according to local reports published in the Birmingham News, Negro students hurled rocks and bottles at police and

> bystanders in an outburst of violence at Birmingham's Parker High School.

School officials sought to restrain these young people.

May I say that these actions are not representative of the Negro community in the Birmingham area. These actions are not representative of the Negro leadership who live in our city and in our State. These actions were spurred and inspired and encouraged and incited by persons who are not residents of Birmingham, Ala., or of Jefferson County, and were carried out by young schoolchildren at the urging of these outside leaders.

In each instance in the school, the school officials pled with the young people to stay in school, sought to restrain them from demonstrating, and acted responsibly by trying to talk reason and good judgment into these young people who are in their charge legally as well as morally during the school hours.

> Faculty members of the school forcibly prevented young Negro students from breaking out of the school grounds. One policeman, D. L. Faulkner, was hit in the outbreak of the rock throwing. Students went on the roof and kept up a steady barrage of rocks and bottles at police and passersby near the school at 330 Eighth Avenue North, Birmingham, Ala. A group of about 100 Negro students went to the Birmingham city hall seeking to enter this building.

From this the students went on, led by Mr. Williams, and others, and demonstrated in blocking main thoroughfares, in demonstrations blocking traffic in various ways in Birmingham, and between Birmingham and Bessemer.

> On Tuesday, January 11, Hosea Williams spoke to a group of about 200 Negroes in front of the Jefferson County Court House. He said an attempt would be made to keep children out of all the schools in Jefferson County.

He said—and I quote—"We are going to turn this town upside down."

He said when he spoke on the courthouse steps to the students in his audience that they could give a year of their life toward the movement. When asked how he would keep them out of school he said: "We are professionals in keeping them out of the schools."

And this is the kind of incitement that was made by Mr. Williams and others in order to persuade young people in violation of law to come out of their school during school hours. The young people first threw rocks and bottles at the police and obstructed traffic. A police officer said that the mood was the ugliest he had seen. This was a mood inspired, as has been repeatedly said, by outside agitators and not by local Negro leadership.

Indeed, while there are many local leaders militantly supporting registration of all Negro voters at the earliest possible time, certain of these leaders have indicated they do not concur in Mr. Hosea Williams' approach in leading young people to violate law and to defy authority.

For example, a prominent Negro businessman in our area, Mr. Gaston, came forth with a statement in which he made clear his disapproval of the misuse of young people and, in fact, he deplored such action. Here is that statement:

> As a native of Alabama and a taxpaying, first-class citizen of Birmingham and Jefferson County; as an employer of a large number of people whose total earnings are more than $1 million a year and with several million dollars invested in this area, I feel that I am qualified, and have a right, to be concerned not only about myself, or my businesses, but about the hundreds of employees and their families who are associated with me—as what affects the good name and economy of this community, good or bad, affects all of us who benefit from this community.
>
> I would hope that the line of communication recently established with the leaders of the white community would not be adversely affected by the present unrest, but instead strengthened and enlarged to give more Negroes an opportunity to participate in our city and county governments on all levels of which they are capable, including counsel and advice to foster good will and growth in our community.
>
> I feel that there is a reservoir of intelligent, dedicated, responsible Negroes in this community. If given a chance to do so they can and will, together with their counterpart in the white community, make Birmingham a real magic city in fact.
>
> I am concerned about the more than 13,000 shareholders in the Citizens Federal Savings and Loan Association who have entrusted to us more than $8 million of their savings, of which more than $6 million has been invested, to enable our people to become homeowners. The security of the homes of these people and the protection of their savings are directly affected by the climate, the image, and the solid economy of this community.
>
> As a responsible citizen of Birmingham, I deplore the invasion of our schools to enlist students for demonstrations during school hours.
>
> "I would recommend that steps be taken to institute workshops to train our young people in discipline, nonviolence, and good law-abiding citizenship.
>
> "I support the right of peaceful protest and freedom of assembly when across-the-table conferences fail to achieve the goals. When all of these fail, demonstrations are inevitable. Demonstrations reflect the dissatisfactions of Negro and white citizens alike, but should at all times be within the law.
>
> "I think the Board of Registrars has demonstrated its willingness and ability to register all who apply. I think this is a challenge on the part of interested Negroes to present themselves to the Board of Registrars in large numbers and get their names on the voters list.
>
> "I think it is the responsibility of all interested Negro citizens of our community to urge all capable Negroes who are interested in employment with our city or county government to qualify with the county personnel board for any vacancies in our city, county government, including the police and sheriff departments.
>
> "The doors of opportunity are rapidly opening for qualified Negroes. In many fields firms are unable to locate capable personnel to fill many of the positions offered. The Booker T. Washington Business College, which we operate, is dedicated to training efficient personnel for commercial and automated technical positions. The demand for such persons is greater than we are presently able to supply.
>
> "One of the great needs of our people today is a good education. I would urge our young people to stay in school and prepare themselves for these opportunities which are opening up very rapidly, and to also prepare themselves for first-class citizenship by assuming their responsibilities as law-abiding citizens of the community, contributing to the good and prosperity and best image of the community, as well as receiving the benefits therefrom.
>
> "I do not condone violence or violation of the law on the part of anyone, and I am sure all responsible Negro citizens share this thought.
>
> "The responsibility and conduct of our youth is first the responsibility of the parents and our local leadership. And I would hope that we as local, concerned, and responsible citizens will not shirk our responsibility for the conduct of our children in or out of school, and give our cooperation and support to our teachers and school administrators in training our children to be law-abiding, respectable, and responsible citizens."

This, Mr. Speaker, is an indication that the Birmingham Negro leadership does not endorse wrong methods toward achieving ends which many of them might applaud. The Negro newspaper, the Birmingham World, also came forth with a statement reminding citizens that the place to register was at the voter registration tables and not in the streets.

Dr. John Nixon, the chairman of the NAACP for the State of Alabama, stated that he deplored the use of schoolchildren in these demonstrations. So we see that such methods are not representative of the Negro leaders. Nevertheless, the outside agitators were determined to inflame the passions of these young people and incite them to commit acts of defiance and attacks on the persons of police officers and disobey the law. As a result, the Jefferson County Board of Education sought and received a temporary restraining order on January 13 pointing out that the young people were being abused by these demonstrations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record at this point the petition and the restraining order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Fascell). Without objection, it is so ordered.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama Southern Division—the County Board of Education of Jefferson County, Alabama, a Public School Board Under the Laws of the State of Alabama; George Rogers, Mrs. Robert Gwin, C. R. Bottenfield, Robert L. Ellis, Jr., and O. G. Gresham as Members of Said Board and Kermit A. Johnson, Superintendent of Education of Jefferson County, State of Alabama, Plaintiffs *v.* Hosea Williams, Edward Bedford, Andrew Marsete, and Southern Christian Leadership Conference, a Corporation, Defendants—Civil Action No. CA 66–24

COMPLAINT

Now comes the plaintiffs in the above styled cause and shows unto your Honor as follows:

I

That the County Board of Education of Jefferson County, Alabama, is a public school board under the laws of the State of Alabama. That George Rogers, Mrs. Robert Gwin, C. R. Bottenfield, Robert L. Ellis, Jr., and O. G. Gresham are members of the Jefferson County Board of Education and are all residents of Jefferson County, Alabama, and over the age of 21 years. That Kermit A. Johnson is Superintendent of

Education in Jefferson County, State of Alabama, and is also a resident of Jefferson County, Ala., over the age of 21 years.

II

The defendant Hosea Williams is over the age of 21 years and is a resident of the State of Georgia, whose present address is unknown. Edward Bedford and Andrew Marsete are both over the age of 21 years and nonresidents of the State of Alabama, their place of residence being to the plaintiffs unknown. The defendant Southern Christian Leadership Conference is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Georgia with its principal office and place of business in Atlanta, Ga.

III

This court has jurisdiction pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C.A., section 1332, and Civil Rights Act, 1960, as amended. The amount in controversy, exclusive of interest and consideration, exceeds the sum of $10,000.

IV

The Jefferson County Board of Education receives over 60 percent of its entire income from the educational trust fund of the State of Alabama and this income is based upon daily attendance which averages $1 per day. The continued absentees from the Jefferson County school will cause irreparable loss to the Jefferson County School System.

V

The plaintiffs are by law charged with the general administration and supervision of the public schools and educational interests in the Jefferson County schools with the responsibility to seek in every way to promote the interests of said schools and the welfare of said children who attend said schools, and with the duty of securing the prompt and regular attendance of students enrolled at and obligated by law to attend said schools. That during school hours the principal of each school and others in authority are in effect the personal guardian of said students and responsible for their safety and attendance in school. That said board of education and its superintendent are charged with the duty and responsibility under the laws of the State of Alabama and the constitution of the State of Alabama to see that said students attending said schools keep the peace and do not engage in any activity destructive of said properties of said board of education.

VI

That commencing on or about January 10, 1966, and continuing each day since that date, the individual and corporate defendants individually and through their agents, employees, servants, members, followers, and other persons in active concert or participation with the defendants conspired to and did induce, coerce, encourage, or persuade large numbers of students enrolled at and attending public schools under the administration and control of plaintiffs to be absent from said schools on days and at times when said schools were being operated for the benefit of said pupils and when such pupils were required to attend said schools; that said individuals and corporate defendants individually and through their agents, employees, servants, members, followers, and other persons in active concert and participation with the defendants conspired to and did induce, coerce, encourage, or persuade said students to participate in unlawful activities sponsored or incited or caused to be sponsored or incited by defendants, including demonstrations, street parades or processions without permits, and congregating in mobs upon the public streets and other public places in Jefferson County, Ala., and in the city of Birmingham, Ala.; that agents, employees, servants, members, followers, and other persons in active concert and participation with the defendants have entered upon the school properties under the control and supervision of the plaintiffs and have encouraged, coerced, intimidated, induced, and persuaded said students to leave school during school hours and to engage in unlawful street demonstrations in Jefferson County and the city of Birmingham, during which demonstrations the students have been instructed to lie down in public streets thereby blocking traffic and did on, to wit, January 11, 1966, to cause students in the Jefferson County school system to leave their classes during school hours and to lie down in the Bessemer super highway, being a heavily traveled highway between Birmingham and Bessemer, designated as U.S. Highway No. 11 and block traffic for several minutes, resulting in over 300 cars being prevented from passing on said highway; that said individual and corporate defendants individually and through their agents, employees, servants, members, followers, and other persons in active concert and participation with the defendants have caused said students to organize demonstration groups and did induce, coerce, encourage, and attempt to persuade said students to attempt to be arrested by the commission of unlawful acts and have on many occasions requested the students to influence other students to boycott public schools operated under the supervision of plaintiffs; that such conspiracy of the defendants and others in active concert and participation with the defendants, as hereinabove described, has resulted in serious interference with the operation of said schools by plaintiffs and in irreparable harm to the education and welfare of said students and in substantial diminution of the amount of funds which can by law be apportioned and made available to plaintiff for operation of said schools and that the defendants, as hereinabove set out, have threatened and stated their intention to continue such conduct and conspiracy as aforesaid and thereby cause said students to continue to be absent from said schools and have threatened to close down the public school system of Jefferson County.

That the defendants by their conduct have caused mass demonstrations of county students to spread to Negroes attending the city schools of the city of Birmingham and several hundred students did abandon their classes and leave the Parker High School in the city of Birmingham on January 11, 1966, and did engage in mass demonstrations, in which bricks and rocks were thrown at law enforcement officers and traffic was obstructed on the public streets; that on each of the days of January 10, 11, and 12, 1966, said defendants have so caused approximately 500 students to be absent from the public schools operated by the plaintiffs and have caused said students to participate in unlawful activities as hereinabove stated.

VII

The defendants have urged, persuaded, encouraged, and intimidated and caused large numbers of Negro pupils to withdraw from the public schools in Jefferson County on the 11th day of January 1966, and to participate in mass demonstrations in Jefferson County thereby preventing Negro pupils from continuing their academic courses and encouraging said students to violate the laws of the State of Alabama in keeping peace and in blocking the highways of said county preventing a free flow of traffic. This conduct on the part of the defendants has denied these students who desire to remain in school their civil right of attending school unmolested, unafraid, and without interference.

The large number of Negro pupils having withdrawn from public school of Jefferson County as a result of threats, persuasion, and intimidation on the part of the defendants has caused a loss in appropriation from State funds of some $500 a day and will continue at the rate of $1 per day per student if continued.

The large number of Negro students having walked out of school without permission and participating in mass demonstrations, blocking public highways, defying lawful authority has created a situation wrought with danger and which could result in riot, insurrection, bloodshed, and injury to person and property in excess of $10,000.

VIII

That your plaintiffs are informed and do believe on such information and belief that the law enforcement officers of said county do not have adequate personnel and facilities to prevent a wholesale riot, insurrection, and breach of peace by said student demonstrators, and if the sheriff of Jefferson County would call upon the Governor of the State of Alabama to furnish adequate law enforcement officers to protect said school properties and public highways and to protect the lives and properties of other citizens of said county the expenses of providing such law enforcement personnel would unduly burden the taxpayers of the State of Alabama, and neglect of law enforcement to counties other than Jefferson.

Wherefore, plaintiff respectfully prays:

1. That the court will enter an ex parte temporary restraining order, preliminary and permanent injunction restraining and enjoying defendants, their officers, agents, employees, servants, members, followers, successors, and all other persons in active concert and participation with them from conducting, encouraging or participating in demonstrations, boycotting the public schools in Jefferson County; from encouraging, coercing, enticing, intimidating and persuading said students to absent themselves from school or leave school during school hours, from marching, parading, or in any wise protesting and interfering with the operation of public schools in Jefferson County; from encouraging students to join any demonstration during normal school hours, from leading any demonstrations involving students who have absented themselves from school; from encouraging, persuading, inciting any students to commit any breach of the peace within Jefferson County; from leading any demonstration, obstructing the public streets in any manner so as to prevent or delay the orderly flow of traffic both vehicular and pedestrian; from in any manner or method encouraging students in the Jefferson County schools to become truants; from encouraging and advocating any boycotting of Jefferson County schools, and from in any manner committing acts of violence, endangering the lives and property of citizens.

2. That the court will grant such other, further and general relief to which plaintiffs may be entitled, including the costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

EARL C. MORGAN,
MAURICE BISHOP,
Attorneys for Plaintiffs.
EARL C. MORGAN,
610 Court House, Birmingham, Ala.
MAURICE BISHOP,
Frank Nelson Building, Birmingham, Ala.

STATE OF ALABAMA, JEFFERSON COUNTY

Before me, the undersigned authority in and for said county and State, personally appeared Earl C. Morgan who on his oath does state that the matters and things stated in the foregoing complaint are true and correct, except as to those matters and things stated on information and belief, and as to such matters and things, that he is informed and believes that the same are true, and upon such information and belief, does swear that the same are true.

Earl C. Morgan.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this —— day of January 1966.

——— ———,
Notary Public.

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, Southern Division—the County Board of Education of Jefferson County, Alabama, a Public School Board Under the Laws of the State of Alabama; George Rogers, Mrs. Robert Gwin, C. R. Bottenfield, Robert L. Ellis, Jr., and O. G. Gresham as Members of Said Board; and Kermit A. Johnson, Superindendent of Education of Jefferson County, State of Alabama, Plaintiffs, *v.* Hosea Williams, Edward Bedford, Andrew Marsete, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, a Corporation, Defendants—CA 66-24

TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

Pursuant to the opinion of this court this day entered in this cause, the defendants, Hosea Williams, Edward Bedford, Andrew Marsete, and Southern Christian Leadership Conference, a corporation, and each of them, their officers, agents, employees, successors, and all persons in active concert and participation with them, be and they are hereby restrained and enjoined from conducting, encouraging, or participating in a demonstration on or near any public school in Jefferson County, Ala.; from encouraging and enticing pupils to leave the public schools in Jefferson County, Ala.; from encouraging, aiding and abetting in any respect truancy on the part of any pupils in the Jefferson County school system; and from conducting, encouraging, or participating in demonstrations, picketing and boycotting the public schools in Jefferson County, Ala.; from marching, parading, or protesting the operation of the public schools in Jefferson County on or near the school premises; from encouraging or engaging in riotous conduct which would invade the privacy of property or injure citizens, and from obstructing the public streets in any manner so as to prevent or delay the orderly flow of traffic, both vehicular and pedestrian, and from in any manner committing acts of violence, endangering the lives and property of citizens.

A delay in the granting of this order will result in irreparable injury to the plaintiffs due to the fact that the actual operations of the schools of the Jefferson County school system will be interfered with and impaired if the boycott is carried out as threatened.

It is not possible to give notice to the defendants of the hearing on the temporary restraining order and the issuance of this order in time to prevent the interference and impairment referred to due to the fact that the defendants' movements and whereabouts are presently unknown.

Issued this 13th day of January 1966, at ——.

Hobart Grooms,
Seybourn H. Lynne,
Clarence W. Allgood,
U.S. District Judges.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I think this raises before us a great moral question in our time and in our land. After the tragedy of Watts it would seem clear and elementary that every American citizen and certainly every public official at whatever level of government would understand the danger of the doctrine of civil disobedience, would understand the grave threat to all our institutions and to the liberty of all of us of these attacks upon the framework of law within which we have known our liberty. It would seem elementary and clear that the doctrine that we can disobey those laws with which we disagree, that we can defy any authority with which we disagree, and rightly do so, and believe that this is an acceptable way of moving toward the realization of our goals and ambitions in America—it would seem that everyone could understand by now the danger of this doctrine. Yet we see this doctrine applied once again in leading young people in acts of lawlessness.

I am grateful that certain voices both Negro and Caucasian in my district have been raised against this dangerous practice, this practice which led to great tragedy in Watts and could lead to national tragedy if left unchecked.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no practice or doctrine more dangerous in our time than the one of civil disobedience. The forces pressing for the changes in my district at this time have behind them the full force of Federal law and the sympathy of the Federal Government and the Federal courts. Why, then, is it necessary or why, then, is it acceptable to anyone that there should be those who press for unlawful means, for dangerous means, for riotous means to work toward their desired ends? It is not my desire that any person of any age of any race in my district or elsewhere in the State of Alabama, that any person who desires to register and vote, shall be denied such privilege of registering and voting. I am sure I express the will of the vast majority of the people of my district, but even those who are militantly supporting the cause of registration and of voting of the citizens—and I would do so strictly on a nonracial and nondiscriminatory basis—do not endorse nor subscribe to the methods which have been used by the officers of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in my district—in their use of young people and unlawful means, in teaching them to commit acts of defiance against authority, to break the law, and in teaching them that they are morally right in so doing. This is dangerous, and sooner or later this Government and its officials must face up to this danger and answer it emphatically and not compromise or give in to it. Liberty under law has been the political system in this country under which we have guaranteed our rights and liberties. America can only be sustained as a nation of liberty if we sustain it as a nation of law. So I would say that we have had both lawful and rational work toward the registration of people of all racial groups to vote in my county. We have had unlawful and unacceptable pressure by the leaders of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and some of their followers. One of these men was quoted as saying after the restraining order was issued that he understood he was violating it but nevertheless was trying to incite young people to go out in the streets and to leave schools. Another stated that Federal court injunctions are "made to be broken."

Mr. Speaker, we have made a national decision, and it is a very important part of our law and it is a part of what is taking place in our land, that there shall be no discrimination in registration and voting in our country.

I pray that this shall be the case and that we shall not create a new day of discrimination in areas like the one which it is my privilege to represent, in which we go into some neighborhoods but not into others, in which we create new imbalances and in which we create new discrimination.

But, Mr. Speaker, even more basic than this I would say, it is my profound hope, representing all of the citizens of my congressional district and on behalf of the 200 million American citizens, that we shall no longer heed and give any recognition to the voice of the prophets of civil disobedience, a dangerous diabolical doctrine which—left unchecked—could destroy our land.

AFFIRMATION VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Fascell). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Callaway] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I was recently visited by a group of young men from Emory University in Georgia who brought with them a very interesting story about a truly worthwhile project. Today I would like to present, in their own words, the story behind their project: Affirmation Vietnam:

The aim of Affirmation Vietnam is to show emphatic and positive affirmation of the U.S. commitment in Vietnam. We know that this country fully supports the commitment of American forces to the freedom of South Vietnam; but to our fighting men on the frontlines, and to the rest of the world, our dedication must be made crystal clear.

We students feel that fundamental to the success of America's commitment in Vietnam is the support of American public opinion. There is evidence to show that the Communist authorities in Hanoi are impressed by the draft-card burners and other protest movements in this country, and that the Communist resolve is hardened and strengthened by reports of these dissenters. To our great concern, one American newspaper said this: "In the world environment or our time, European and Asian observers, reaching conclusions out of their own environment, view our student demonstrations as somehow representative of a majority American opinion. Certainly those opposed to Vietnam have a right to be heard but for a long time I have been concerned that in the absence of some sort of effective reply to these negative demonstrations, our strength might be deteriorated. I have heard from Vietnam that the Vietcong casualties have been found with clippings about these student protests in their pockets. Our own troops have been receiving mimeographed propaganda from the more radical student protest movements in this country."

Such reports led us, as students in the State of Georgia, to try and show exactly how the people of Georgia and the Nation stand on the vitally important issue of Vietnam. Thus we have organized into a group called Affirmation Vietnam through which we hope to show the world that the people of the United States support our commitment to the Vietnamese people to freely develop as they see fit, without external interference and indirect aggression through so-called wars of national liberation.

Affirmation Vietnam intends to accomplish this purpose through the use of three complementary programs: a statewide opinion poll, an educational program, and a massive assembly in the Atlanta stadium.

The opinion poll will be conducted as thoroughly as possible among the citizens of Georgia through the services of the Georgia Youth Council. All persons interviewed will be asked to give a "yes" or "no" answer to the statement: "We, as Americans and Georgians, affirm and endorse our country's commitment in Vietnam."

College campuses will be especially well polled. We feel this is important because college students are the leaders of tomorrow, and because they are the ones who will have to fight this war, and they have much to lose through personal involvement. Clubs and other civic groups are being utilized to conduct the opinion poll, again under the control of the Georgia Youth Council. The nonpartisan Georgia Youth Council was organized over a year ago, and consists of outstanding high school and college students in all of Georgia's 10 congressional districts. Their numbers include some 325 students who, in the normal routine of their work, institute and maintain needed and worthwhile projects in each of the congressional districts.

During the months of January and February, over 50 qualified students from colleges across the State will speak to civic groups and student gatherings on the historical basis of the U.S. position in Vietnam. This series of lectures, in addition to the presentation of public discussions, groups, forums, panels, and the publication of papers and pamphlets, will form the backbone of their effort to educate the public regarding the background of the present situation in southeast Asia.

The assembly in Atlanta stadium will represent the culmination of the project and will involve the presentation of the results to a high-ranking Government official. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has agreed to be the keynote speaker at the assembly which will take place on February 12 at 2 p.m.

The Affirmation Vietnam movement has found enthusiastic support at all 50 of Georgia's accredited colleges, because the youth of Georgia and of our Nation want to take an active interest in national and international matters, and to do their part in helping the just and righteous cause of freedom and self-determination for the people of all countries.

Affirmation Vietnam has received endorsement and support from outstanding national leaders of business, government, and the press. Nevertheless, Affirmation Vietnam is entirely a student movement. It started with 2 college students at Emory University in Atlanta and grew to 6, then to 20, and 40, and now to its present size and state of organization. Affirmation Vietnam is maintained only by students of Georgia institutions of higher learning.

Together we students, in a concerted effort with the residents of Georgia, hope to impress the nations of the world with the fact that in one State, and presumably in all States, the majority of Americans are in support of our Government's commitment to South Vietnam.

This, Mr. Speaker, in their own words, is the story of Affirmation Vietnam. I am tremendously proud that this fine project originated in Georgia. But I daresay that I, or any of us, would be proud to have seen it originate in any State, for I feel that it is representative not just of Georgia's, but of the high caliber of our youth throughout America. Mr. Speaker, we have always been proud of our young men and women, but I feel that at no time in our history could we be more proud than we are today, for, despite the bad publicity of the few, the many continue to uphold the highest traditions of American citizenship.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I want to commend the gentleman on his statement, but most of all I want to congratulate the students of Georgia. Being a Representative of one of your sister States, I think it behooves all of us in the Congress and all of us in all the States of the Union to look into the fine project the gentleman has just discussed. I thank the gentleman for bringing it to our attention.

I also would like to use a moment of his time to congratulate my colleague from Jefferson County and Birmingham for the very fine discussion he made to this House, and I hope the Members of this House will give their consideration and attention, and honor this fine record that our colleague has just given to this Congress.

To both of my colleagues, I express my sincere thanks.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Alabama. I would like to say that many of us are involved in a great many worthwhile projects in Vietnam. In my own district which includes Fort Benning, the home of the 1st Air Cavalry Division, we have Vietnam Mail Call and other wonderful projects.

But in my experience I have never seen anyone quite so enthusiastic about anything as these students are. I met a few weeks ago with about 20 of them at the home of a friend and we talked until midnight about their projects. These students are calling on people throughout the State every day. A project like this does not just happen. The enthusiasm of the students makes the project possible.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to add my words of commendation to the students of Georgia and to the gentleman in the well of the House for what he has so vividly brought to our attention about this program for the benefit of the people in this Chamber.

I hope his remarks will be read and that this program will be emulated by many people throughout the country and that it will bring you relief and encouragement in the fact that it has been started spontaneously, and may I say simultaneously, in other colleges.

On October 30, I had the privilege with one of my colleagues of this House to visit the Evangel College in my hometown of Springfield, Mo., where a "Back the Boys in Vietnam" program was started. Evangel College is generally a liberal arts college in my hometown which was originally church oriented to the Assemblies of God and who have their international headquarters there. This seems to be similar to the program that you have related about the students in Georgia and the "Back Our Boys" movement. And the student body has adopted a resolution which has been forwarded to the President of the United States as well as to General Westmoreland, the commanding general of the theater in South Vietnam. They also distribute bumper strips that encourage "Back Our Boys." It is an enlightened effort.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, it has been of vital interest to me—as well as to many others—to try to make an assessment of what the rabblerousing, poorly informed, draft-card burners represent and portray of themselves to the troops in South Vietnam. It is an almost infinitesimal small percentage, less than one-hundredth of 1 percent. Of course, it is interesting though that the noisemaking, publicity-seeking, television-camera-crowding reaction of these extremists and ultrapoorly informed people suggests those who before World War I formed the "I Won't Work" organization, and the "Peace-at-any-pricers" before World War II. We seem always to have these few with us. They are our cross to bear. But they amount to very little as far as the body politic and the informed opinion of our public is concerned. Thank goodness for the USO shows and the Bob Hope entourage at Christmastime which more truly reflects the attitude of the citizens, U.S.A.

I thank the gentleman for what he has done today.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his contribution. I feel sure that the gentleman agrees with me that the best thing that might happen in respect to the events in Georgia is further emulation of what is being done in other States. The gentleman is, of course, aware that even though the people who will protest our policies in Vietnam may be a small portion of our people, the national attention they get is much more than that.

I have been told that Ho Chi Minh once said that he did not win the war against France at Dienbienphu; instead, he won when the people of Paris no longer supported that war. I have been told also that he now sees the same sentiment in the United States that he saw in Paris.

I believe it is totally different. I think the people of the United States do support our commitment to Vietnam, but it is important that those of us who do support that commitment be heard. It is tough to be heard when the press quite naturally wishes to hear dissenting opinions and not people who agree. That is why the enthusiasm of these young people is so important. They are enthusiastic. They must be heard. They will be heard. Ho Chi Minh will hear about Affirmation Vietnam. When he does, perhaps he will realize that his policy of continuing the war waiting for the collapse of U.S. support will not work.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I wish to join in congratulating my colleague from Georgia for his remarks today, for his continued leadership in this field, and for the fact that he, for one, has certainly been vocal. He has demonstrated his interest in going to Vietnam and his repeated work in the House. I wish to congratulate also, and join my colleagues in congratulating, these young people in Georgia who have certainly set a fine example for the whole Nation. I think there is very little question that the American citizens stand behind our men in Vietnam.

As the gentleman has indicated, the tiny minority who take this opposite stand have received entirely too much press. I would say that in my own city we, too, have sought to demonstrate our support and make it concrete and real through the adoption of the 1st Infantry Division.

Various groups and clubs within my city of Birmingham have adopted various units of the division. Last Christmas they were flooded with mail, with gifts, and with other remembrances from the people of my city as an indication of our full support of what they are doing there.

I wish to congratulate your young people for an outstanding example of leadership in making concrete the support we all feel for the cause in Vietnam.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Alabama. I commend the people of Birmingham for adopting the 1st Infantry Division, one of the fine units that is fighting in Vietnam today.

In closing I should like to say that these young people, in their enthusiasm, have not made the mistake of going off halfcocked. When I talked to them about it and explained to them how difficult it was to get publicity for those who supported our position as contrasted with those who do not support our position, they told me that they had an international press conference in New York with representatives of the international press, international editions of New York papers, and international magazines. At that time I asked them, "Why did you go to New York to do this?" realizing that Atlanta is the headquarters of this movement. They said, "Why, don't you know that New York is the headquarters for the international press?"

They had already been to people who were knowledgeable, who told them to get maximum international press coverage, they must go to the headquarters of the international press. They are working enthusiastically and hard and in a very meaningful way.

It is a real privilege for me at this time to present this information about enthusiastic Georgia students to the Members of this Congress.

WE CAN WIN IN VIETNAM

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the things which I say today are based on studies made in the war theater in December. Recommendations were made at that time to the Department of Defense as a result of these observations. They reflect the advice and opinion of senior U.S. military and civilian leaders there.

The past year has seen a rapid escalation of the effort of the United States in the war in Vietnam. This escalation has been marked by additional appropriations for defense, foreign aid, and State Department activities. It has resulted in increased military operations, bombing of a portion of North Vietnam, and increased airstrikes, including B-52 missions, in support of allied military operations in South Vietnam. Similarly, nonmilitary activities, including the programs of AID and USIA have been increased. These escalated programs have served to hold in check the efforts of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese Government for a takeover in South Vietnam. However, they have not succeeded in bringing about a negotiated peace settlement, nor have they strengthened the military posture of South Vietnam to the extent that Government forces, U.S. and allied troops supporting their position, have been able to seize and hold the initiative.

Increased allied effort in this area has been matched by the increased involvement of troops from North Vietnam over the Ho Chi Minh trail. This is not in reality a trail but is a well-developed, thousand-mile road system over which men and equipment flow steadily from North Vietnam, around the demilitarized zone into Laos, and southward in South Vietnam. Despite repeated bombings of military targets in North Vietnam and recently of the Ho Chi Minh trail, infiltration of weapons, supplies, and North Vietnamese regular army troops into South Vietnam is increasing. The monthly rate of these troops is estimated to be approximately 4,500.

These forces are well supplied with modern weapons and equipment of Communist manufacture which come through the port of Haiphong or over the two railroads from China. Other supplies move up the Mekong River and its tributaries or along the coast. The Communist forces are equally well supplied with food, most of which is obtained from the huge South Vietnam rice crop.

The present situation has been brought about by a variety of things, but in part by repeatedly underestimating the future actions of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. To some extent, our response to the requirements for the prosecution of the war have been based on estimates of what we thought the enemy would do rather than on their capabilities. Repeatedly these estimates have proven erroneous.

At the best, the prosecution of the war promises to be a lengthy affair. Under present ground rules, it can continue for many years. However, the war can be won and won speedily, if a determined effort is made which properly utilizes the power and capabilities of American fighting men and American resources, plus whatever help is available from our allies, and which reinforces the determination of the Vietnamese to win their own war.

Obviously, then, there is a necessity for the establishment of an atmosphere favorable to a stable government for freedom-loving people of a nation willing to stand up against Communist oppression. It can be created, but such a task will not be easy. We have given tremendous help in every category to South Vietnam. Nevertheless the efforts of this country to assist the Government of South Vietnam must be increased further.

This simply means that measures must be taken and taken at once to strengthen our position and that of the Government of South Vietnam for the prosecution of the war. This will require a number of actions. The cost will be high, but it is a cost which must be paid if we are to be successful. I will discuss primarily the military side of the picture.

Additional men and materiel must be supplied at once. We have about half enough of each in Vietnam to do the job. The South Vietnamese and their allies are already hard pressed for manpower sufficient to carry the war to the Communists. Many United States and South Vietnamese troops are required to pin down allied holdings and to perform other security duties. Last year's big buildup of forces seems at best to have resulted only in containing the Communists. Open invasion of South Vietnam by North Vietnamese regulars has changed the picture drastically. We cannot attain a healthy atmosphere until sufficient troops are available to search out, fight, and destroy Communist forces. We must be able to retake and hold South Vietnamese territory which is now largely in Communist hands. Bigger and bloodier battles are in store and it is essential that the forces and supplies necessary to win those battles be provided with a minimum of delay.

In other words, steps must be taken to increase our operational troop strength so that we cannot only contain the buildup of the North Vietnamese forces and those of the Vietcong, but be able to seize and hold the initiative. This is essential to victory. We cannot continue to operate at our present level and hope for more than a standoff. Failure to increase our forces and our effort will not only lead to a lack of success in the military field, but will place in jeopardy the lives of American military men now serving in Vietnam. Certainly no effort should be spared to give these troops, who are responding gallantly to their mission, the protection and support which they deserve.

If the present peace offensive fails, we can no longer afford to make a sanctuary out of the northeast industrial area of North Vietnam. This policy must be changed to permit essential military targets in the area to be neutralized by bombing or other effective measures. This means power, POL, airfield, and port facilities, including those at Haiphong which serves as a major source of supply for the war economy of North

Vietnam. Failure to do this can only assist the Government of North Vietnam in its escalation of the conflict and result in the deaths of more Americans. If the Government of Cambodia allows its ports and facilities to be used to supply the enemy, effective quarantine of these ports should be established. The pure and simple fact is that delivery of personnel, equipment, supplies, and the weapons of war being made available in support of the Vietcong operations can best be stopped in North Vietnam or at least before it reaches South Vietnam.

Within South Vietnam itself, a large portion of the huge rice crop produced in this nation has, in recent years, gone to the Vietcong. In a limited way, inroads were made into the quantities of rice which Communists secured in 1965; however, far too much still went into their hands. This must be stopped. To do so will require larger military operation to protect those gathering the rice crops and to seize the rice-bearing areas now in the hands of the Vietcong. For areas where this cannot be done, it is better to destroy the crop than to permit it to fatten Communists to kill Americans.

If food and supplies are denied to the enemy, I believe the war can be won in 1 to 2 years, despite ready Communist access to ample manpower. Failure to take strong steps can result only in the loss of lives of additional American, South Vietnamese, and allied servicemen without resulting in successful military operations or the attainment of the just peace which we seek.

In major part, this is a war of logistics. Logistics and construction play an essential part and a limiting part in our operations in southeast Asia. Augmented U.S. forces—roughly twice as many as are now on duty there—must be sent into southeast Asia before success can be anticipated. We must be prepared to support them with food, weapons, equipment, bases, airfields, and ports. At this moment, it is barely possible to support forces already on duty there. Unless the required ports, airfields, and military camps can be constructed rapidly, our forces, and their supplies must be crowded somehow into existing facilities and effective military operations will necessarily be hampered, confused, and delayed. In other words we need additional troops and additional aircraft immediately. Yet there are limits on the numbers which can be sent to Vietnam simply because we cannot supply their needs. This is a situation which cannot effectively be overcome within months or even years at the present rate and method of procedures. Work has barely started or not started at all on some essential projects. Logistics is the limiting factor in the conduct of the war.

Let me reiterate, the construction effort in Vietnam, particularly the provision for port facilities and operational bases is vital to military operations. However, to this date there has been a marked lack of central authority and coordination in the construction efforts. Steps have been taken, in some instances effectively, to bring about a coordination between the construction and operational programs. But at best, it has been piecemeal. The proposal to establish a general officer position on the staff of the military advisory command to effectuate this coordination should be promptly implemented. This officer should report directly to the commanding general, and be responsible for the coordination of the construction effort and making it responsive to operational requirements.

An essential portion of the construction problem is the lack of a sufficiently skilled labor force in South Vietnam to meet the military construction effort which is required. Present contractor effort is requiring all of the available local labor force plus generating a requirement for the use of foreign labor. The latter proposal is not meeting with enthusiastic response from the South Vietnamese Government and will probably never be a fruitful source of labor for our construction effort. Still less desirable would be the importation of high-priced workmen from the United States because of price problems which their presence would generate. The construction battalions of the Navy and the Army are doing heroic work in their activities there. If the escalated construction program is to be successfully implemented, there is a need for more troop construction battalions from both the Navy and the Army. The requirement for these troops will be accentuated as additional facilities become operational and it is necessary to maintain them with troop labor. In order to meet the overall requirement for the construction and maintenance of facilities, steps should be taken as promptly as possible to drastically increase the troop construction units in South Vietnam including the activation of Air Force battalions to bolster the troop effort in this area.

The Reserve Forces of the Army and of the Navy also contain a large number of troop construction units. These are manned by skilled personnel who in most cases have been training for years to meet emergency situations. Certainly such a situation exists in southeast Asia today. There is a backlog of construction work in Vietnam today which could well be performed by troop labor. This requirement will be magnified by construction which will be necessary in support of the items in the January supplemental appropriation request. There will be questions on whether or not the transfer of all Navy Seabee construction battalions and Army Engineers construction battalions now deployed in other theaters of operation should be undertaken. Considerations must be given to whether we would seriously impair our military efficiency in the areas in which these troops are now operating. Regardless of this, there are available selected Reserve units capable of contributing to the construction effort in southeast Asia, either by their own presence there or by replacing Regular units who could then be transferred to this area without impairing our military requirements. Failure to utilize the services of all available units—Regular or Reserve—is handicapping and holding back the war effort at a time of great urgency.

Fourteen are now on duty in the theater. Their number can be increased fivefold by utilizing Regular and Reserve forces. They can make a tremendous contribution. It is inexcusable not to utilize their service. Whether to use them is one of the most important unresolved questions. We are fighting only one war and that is the place they are really needed.

Aside from troop labor considerations, your subcommittee finds that construction programs are based on the expectations that the contractor's labor supply can be increased threefold to fourfold. Contractor personnel at the time of the subcommittee's visit was 22,000. It is anticipated this number will have to be increased to 60,000 or possibly even 80,000. Completion of essential projects—ports, airfields, troop cantonments, and so forth—within the prescribed time is predicated upon securing additional contractor personnel. Witnesses in the theater stated that the supply of skilled labor is now virtually exhausted. I am convinced that very material contributions can be made through a more realistic vocational training program, but this will take time. It is planned to obtain approximately 10,000 third country nationals to alleviate the labor shortage. This still is a far cry from the 60,000 to 80,000 required. When it is taken into consideration that this number is needed to complete projects, programed for the troop structure already authorized, and that the percentage of completion on these projects is now quite small, the enormity of the task ahead to provide facilities and accommodations for a troop level of 400,000 can be seen. We can provide the uniformed personnel much faster than we can provide facilities for their use.

The tremendous distances which must be overcome in providing more equipment and supplies for the Vietnamese war are seldom comprehended in the United States. South Vietnam is half way around the world from Washington. The great stretches of the Pacific mean that the bulk of logistic support must move by sea transportation. It is a long, long trip from the U.S. west coast to the docks of South Vietnam. Most of the ships which make the 20- to 25-day trip must wait for a period longer than their travel time across the ocean before space for unloading is available at dockside. In late November 120 ships were in Vietnamese waters and the waiting time before discharging cargoes was 28 to 30 days each. There the crews receive the higher pay authorized for those in danger areas and this further multiplies the cost.

The lack of port facilities in Vietnam is both geographical and historical. Saigon is the only major effective deepwater port. Additional deepwater facilities of a limited nature have been made available at Da Nang. These are being improved and expanded under existing construction programs. A completely new logistics base including deepwater facilities is now under construction at Cam Ranh Bay. Every effort must be made to expedite the construction of these facilities and additional facilities in the Saigon area or where needed.

Proper advance planning must be accomplished to see that port battalions and other personnel required for the operation of facilities of this type will be available as soon as any of them can be effectively utilized. In the meantime and probably for an indefinite period, greater reliance must be placed on over-the-beach landing and shallow port operations which would lessen the strain on existing port facilities and permit an expedited flow of supplies more quickly than will be available through the completion of ports now under construction. Even with the completion of planned port facilities, any escalation in the military effort will require more effective logistics operations.

It is fallacious reasoning to think that the completion of deepwater port facilities will meet all logistics requirements for port facilities. The escalation in numbers of troops and military operations which must take place if we are to be successful in attaining our objectives in South Vietnam will place increasing workloads on all port facilities.

Shallow water ports do exist in South Vietnam and are available for shallow draft vessels. This will mean moving additional landing craft type vessels into the area as well as others of the type capable of utilizing such port facilities. It is essential that greater use be made of LST type vessels, and that greater reliance be placed on seagoing tugs and barges and on lighterage equipment. Steps should be taken to activate all required additional vessels of this type in the reserve fleet, including those available to the Military Sea Transport Service. Consideration should be given to transferring those vessels now serving in other parts of the world to the southeast Asia area wherever practicable in keeping with other military requirements and the obtaining of this equipment from stocks of other nations.

Steps should be taken at once to implement realistic plans for utilization of the type of equipment described above.

Many of the ships servicing the forces in Vietnam are chartered from private shipping firms. This is a necessary but costly requirement. The cost is compounded by the problem of the long wait to discharge their cargo. Certainly, consideration should be given to placing high priority cargo in these ships and to unloading them quickly so that costly delays are not incurred.

One basic requirement in the logistics-construction field is for additional funds to be made available for the construction of adequate facilities and for the logistical support essential to our troops in Vietnam.

Consideration should be given to making a large portion of these funds available directly to the Military Advisory Command in Vietnam—MACV—rather than to the individual military services. This is particularly true with reference to the construction portion of the logistics effort. Construction should be accomplished wherever possible without fiscal and programing restrictions and with complete flexibility. This has not been the case in the past but must be done now if our troops in this area are to be properly supported.

It is very difficult for the logistics effort to respond to the changing operation's program under present limitations and regulations. The military command in Vietnam should be provided with greater flexibility in the use of funds. Wartime conditions which are existent in Vietnam today, simply do not permit a continuation of peacetime operating conditions within the Office of the Secretary of Defense. To allow existing conditions in this area to continue will increase the number of costly delays which have taken place to the detriment of the overall military operations.

In addition to providing increased funds for specific construction line items, a reserve of funds should be established and made available to the command in Vietnam for changes in scope of projects and increased cost of construction as requirements change.

Additional preprograming functions are necessary in the construction program in order to formulate the coordinated construction-logistics effort which is necessary to support the operational requirements.

The lack of total funding now precludes adequate advance procurement of materials and restricts contractor mobilization. Both are essential if the construction program is to be responsive to operational requirements. These actions require long lead times of a minimum of 4 months. Advance funds should be made available for the immediate requirement. They should continue to be made available in the future because this requirement is a continuing one and will increase as the construction program escalates.

However, money is not everything. Money already is available which cannot be expended. There is still too much paperwork on programing, on requisitions for construction material, and on other needed supplies. Requisitions sometimes take weeks or even months for approval. The lack of preprograming to assess actual requirements for construction and the ability to meet these requirements is stressed. This is partially attributable to peacetime procedures which necessitate too much paperwork.

In another area too much equipment, especially construction equipment has been deadlined throughout the area for lack of spare parts. The situation is improving and will continue to improve as additional port facilities are made available. There is now a shortage of spares, worldwide, and this must be faced up to. There is a need, however, for greater emphasis, not only on making additional spare parts available, but also in changing the length of the time for replacement of equipment to one which is more in keeping with the conditions in Vietnam. For example, the construction contractor plans for the amortization of his equipment on the basis of 18 months usage. If this is realistic, and apparently it is from experiences to date, equipment of the troop construction units should also be programed on this basis rather than the 2- to 3-year cycles now anticipated.

I am disturbed by the fact that equipment and material requirements for the war in Asia do not command top priority in the American marketplace. Military witnesses state that other governmental programs, such as NASA, Polaris, and the missile program, all have a priority higher than the war effort. The moon will wait. The other programs are well along toward completion. It appears unrealistic not to give the highest priority to a program which is taking the lives of American youths.

The supply situation is further aggravated by the fact that most of the roads and railroads in Vietnam can be utilized only to a limited extent if at all by United States and South Vietnam forces. The Communists control most of the countryside and can cut many important highways almost at will. Only limited stretches of the country's one railroad can be used. That places the burden largely on air transportation and creates inordinate demands on our ability to provide and maintain a sufficient number of aircraft to supply U.S. forces who are located away from port areas. Thus far, the job has been done with remarkable ability. I found no instances where key operations have been prevented for lack of essential supplies. Nevertheless, the problem is a critical one and the situation will be greatly improved if sufficient forces can be made available to open and maintain essential highways and railroads.

Since it is necessary to supply many of our bases in South Vietnam by airlift, we must accept the fact that escalation of our efforts in this area will increase the requirements for airlift support of our troops. Consideration will have to be given to the utilization of C–123 and C–130 aircraft in much greater numbers than those now available in southeast Asia until highway and road transportation can be opened. This is a part of the story of the need for sufficient U.S. and allied assistance to enable the A.R.V.N. to seize and hold the initiative in land warfare.

The B–52 bombing activities in southeast Asia are required in support of our ground operations. As our military planners become more aware of their potentialities and more experienced in their use in a war of this type, their effectiveness will be even greater than at present. The aircraft presently used are based at Anderson Air Force Base, Guam. The flight to southeast Asia is long and requires refueling for a round trip mission. Steps should be taken to secure an additional site for these aircraft closer to the target area so that the present costly refueling and long and wearing flights on personnel and aircraft can be avoided. There are several locations available if proper authority can be obtained from other nations. In the case of utilization of one of these sites—Okinawa—no such additional authority would be required. But it would be necessary to move some tanker-type aircraft to other locations.

Naval aviation is playing an effective role in the conduct of the war. Due to the limitation on the number of carriers presently available to the 7th Fleet, it is not possible to provide sufficient naval aviation support on station at all times to meet the operational needs. The escalation of our military operations and the presence of additional troops will cause an added burden on the units providing air support. The construction of land facilities for Air Force and Marine aircraft even at an accelerated rate will still probably lag behind the operational requirements. Consideration should, therefore, be given to the assignment of additional carriers to the 7th Fleet so that this required air support can be made available to our operational troops.

The A–6A is a Navy aircraft newly assigned to the 7th Fleet. It is the only aircraft in any of our forces with a night reconnaissance and bombing capability. Although it may have minor deficiencies, this single factor dictates that its use and number in Vietnam be expanded. Consideration should also be given to adapting the night reconnaissance equipment of this aircraft to existing aircraft available to the Navy, Marine, and Air Force. Research and development should be implemented at once which would lead to the provision of adequate night reconnaissance and bombing capability for aircraft employed or to be employed in this area.

Naval gunfire has played a role in supporting the operations in Vietnam. The nature of the terrain and long shoreline of this country makes naval gunfire often effective when used in support of military operations. Consideration should be given to strengthening the 7th Fleet, so that additional naval gunfire might be made available. This might require the activation of ships from the reserve fleet, including some which are equipped with heavier guns than those presently available.

I should comment on the intelligence picture. It is generally agreed that the intelligence system in Vietnam requires more personnel who have better training for the job to be done. There is a definite need for better coordination and more skillful interpretation of information to permit a quicker response at policy levels.

For instance, there frequently is a lack of followthrough on bombing missions to assess results and to permit fullest advantage to be taken of enemy losses. Informed witnesses feel that intelligence-gathering is neither broad enough nor detailed enough and that stronger efforts are needed, both in military and in civilian application. As an illustration, our forces have no accurate information on Vietcong supply forces. Civilians and coolies seen on the streets may, in fact, be Vietcong pipeline forces. Undoubtedly, some U.S.-employed Vietnamese are also working for the Vietcong. Often, detailed information at the village level regarding Communist sympathizers and local Communist organizations is nonexistent.

Apparently there is a strong Communist underground which on occasion is able to report important events to Hanoi, where they are broadcast before they are known generally to United States and allied government forces. These are parts of the intelligence problem to be coped with.

Now to turn to the field of psychological warfare, I am convinced there is a definite need for improved program direction which can best be provided through having a director who is responsible solely for this program. Good work is being done in this area, but its potential is far from being realized. It should be kept in mind that the Vietcong is highly vulnerable to psychological warfare operations. There is much capital to be made of the fact that refugees flee only to the South Vietnamese. The Vietcong tax and conscript, and seize the rice crop, and offer nothing in return. The Saigon government offers a much greater hope to the villagers for the future. These things should be emphasized over and over again. They are only token examples among many.

Recreation facilities for American personnel, particularly for enlisted men, remains one of the serious problems throughout southeast Asia. Granted that there is not much time for recreation, the fact remains there are leave periods when our personnel can get away from their exacting duties for short periods. For these periods, there is in most areas a dearth of wholesome recreational facilities. The alternative is the nearest local counterpart of honky tonks and other places of questionable value. Additional emphasis on adequate recreational activities and facilities remains very important.

There is a need to train additional skilled labor throughout South Vietnam. This is not only true from the standpoint of our present military construction and logistics requirement, but from the standpoint of the future economy of the country. This should involve vocational training on a much larger scale than is taking place now or is contemplated through present programs. A realistic vocational training program would remove much of the necessity to seek additional skilled labor from foreign nations to meet anticipated needs in the construction field.

In addition steps should be taken to establish vocational and agricultural type training for skills of the type needed in the villages in order that more people can become self-supporting.

The increasing activities of the South Vietnamese and allied military operations have led to thousands of refugees leaving their homes to escape Vietcong oppression or because of the displacements which are a problem of any war. It is a problem which is helped in South Vietnam by the nature of the people who have a longstanding tradition of caring for their own and assisting those who are homeless. Yet it is a problem which cannot be resolved through reliance upon these means alone. The numbers are far too great even now. Escalation of military operations will increase these numbers and with it the problem. These refugees are basically anti-Communist because they have felt the heel of Communist oppression. As such, they can be effectively utilized to tell their story to others who may be wavering in their support of the Government or who do not know what oppression of this type can mean. These people cannot be used to get their story across nor are they likely to remain anti-Communist if they are caused to suffer unnecessary hardships and privations in their new homes. As they are a source for good today, they can become, as history has proven in other areas, a source of instability if their basic needs are not met.

It is obvious that a coordinated long-range program to meet the refugee problem is not available today. There seems to be too much of an attitude that the problem can be overcome by passing out limited material aid and allowing the local populaces to attempt to assimilate the refugees. This is impractical. It cannot be accomplished. The South Vietnamese will assimilate every refugee humanly possible. It is their nature, but the numbers are far too great. There is immediate need for a large program for the resettlement of these refugees in areas where they can support themselves in new homes or at least until the time when they can return safely to their home villages. A little has been done but such areas must be established in a greater quantity than has been done to date. This resettlement should be coupled with increased vocational training, with primary emphasis on agriculture and in locally needed skills. Failure to accomplish this will add to the instability of the Government, but if accomplished it will allow these proud and industrious people to contribute, not only to their own support, but to that of the countryside about them.

Any report on the war in Vietnam should include an especial commendation for medical and hospital units whose responsibility it is to heal the wounded and sick and to contribute to the maintenance of health of U.S. personnel. Although faced with serious problems—some of them almost insurmountable due to large numbers of sick and wounded for whom no theater hospital facilities had not been made available—they improvised and met every requirement in admirable fashion. Unanticipated problems with new and virulent strain of malaria, which frequently exceeded battle casualties in number, added to the difficulties. However, your subcommittee found no instances of inability to meet the pressing demands placed upon medical personnel nor cases of shortage of essential medical supplies. In part the problems were met by air evacuating sick and wounded to the Philippines and thence to convalescent hospitals in other areas. There are cases where battle wounded were receiving treatment at Clark Field, Philippines, within 6 hours from the time the injury was received. This policy of air evacuating sick and wounded is not the most desirable procedure, but it served to insure prompt and adequate treatment. Additional hospital facilities are under construction which should soon permit in-theater treatment for all emergency and short-term cases.

We were briefed many times during the course of my work in southeast Asia. It is the belief of this committee that briefing procedures can be modified materially to the benefit of staff personnel without taking away from the value of the briefings. It was noted that in most instances, briefing teams comprised essentially all of the top staff members of the respective groups. Although 20, 25, or even more staffers might be present, the briefing was conducted essentially by 2 or 3 individuals. Most of the others took no part. Although appreciative of the efforts of the U.S. units to provide a detailed picture it is respectfully suggested that three or four well-informed staff members could do the job, freeing others for pressing work which always awaits them. It is suggested also that film clips showing areas and actions could well be substituted for much of the detailed information on organization and mission. In other words, a great deal of time for the briefing teams can be saved without taking away from the effectiveness of the briefings.

It would have been impossible for me and other Members of Congress to accomplish our mission in Vietnam without the outstanding cooperation and helpfulness extended by both the military and civilian personnel in the areas visited. Every effort was made to provide all possible assistance. The work of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations and of the legislative liaison officers involved in the planning and execution of the trip was outstanding. The wholehearted support of all those who participated in this endeavor is deeply appreciated.

No report would be complete without a high tribute to the morale and valor of America's fighting men in southeast Asia. Their contributions have been and are magnificent. Their will to win, their morale and their esprit de corps is of the highest. Their valor and ability in battle, their friendly relations with the local populace and their untiring efforts to assist these people in the problems which they face in their everyday lives are in the highest tradition of the American military service. They know why they are fighting in Vietnam. They are satisfied that their missions and objectives are proper ones and they are dedicated to the achievement of those objectives with every means at their disposal, including their lives. No lesser contribution is being made by the many civilians in our military and many of our nonmilitary programs who are living and working side by side with many of our military personnel. Even a brief association with these people and a short glimpse into their lives in Vietnam makes one proud to be an American. In every area, they have the will to win. They deserve and they need the full and unlimited support of the American people and of their Government.

SUMMARY

This will be no easy war. Many unresolved problems confront us. The ground rules under which U.S. forces fight will have to be changed. It is necessary that the North Vietnamese port, power and industrial complex which supply Communist forces be neutralized or the war will go on indefinitely. Continuation of the sanctuary now provided those facilities in North Vietnam will mean continued escalation of conflict and more American deaths. Cambodian ports should be quarantined if that country insists on supplying the enemy. The bulk of South Vietnam's huge rice crop now goes to the Communists. This, too, will have to be stopped. If food and supplies are denied to the enemy, I believe the war can be won in 2 years despite ready Communist access to ample manpower.

Additional U.S. forces, supplies, bases, and port facilities must be provided at once. We appear to have underestimated Vietcong and North Vietnamese capabilities in number and supplies. The buildup of opposing forces has not permitted us to seize and hold the initiative. This is essential to victory. The lives of American servicemen are at stake in this operation and no effort should be spared to give them the protection and support they deserve.

Logistics and construction play an essential part in successful U.S. operations in southeast Asia. Unless ports, airfields and military camps can be constructed more rapidly, our forces and supplies must be crowded onto existing facilities and effective operations are delayed. The available labor force of South Vietnam is being utilized effectively but the number of skilled manpower is limited. Greater dependence should be placed in Seabees and Army engineer construction battalions through the transfer of additional units and call-up of reserves. Air Force aviation maintenance battalions should be activated to bolster construction forces in the combat area. Much broader vocational training programs should be instituted for South Vietnam and Thailand personnel without delay. There is a need for additional skilled labor throughout the area which can be provided from local sources. This is true not only from the standpoint of the future economy of the nations involved but also because of the requirement for skilled workers in military construction and logistics problems.

We recommend that steps be taken to develop another B–52 site closer to southeast Asia. Guam, the present site, is far removed from the target area and the long flights represent unnecessary wear and tear on men and equipment and require costly refueling operations. A number of such alternate sites are available.

More effective use can be made of naval aviation if additional carriers are provided. This will permit naval aircraft to be on station for a greater length of time than is presently possible. Strengthening of the surface craft in the 7th Fleet will also permit heavier gunfire to be made available to our land forces in operation near the coast.

Greater reliance on over-the-beach landing operations would lessen the strain on existing port facilities and permit an expedited flow of supplies more quickly than will be available through the completion of ports now under construction. This will mean making greater use of LST's and similar landing craft wherever available and placing greater reliance on seagoing tugs and barges. Through the use of such equipment, many ships which now wait for days in the rivers and harbors of Vietnam to discharge cargo can be offloaded onto equipment which utilizes shallow ports or beach landing operations.

There is a need in the logistics construction field for additional money to be made available directly to the military command in Vietnam under regulations which provide greater flexibility. Wartime conditions simply do not permit peacetime operating practices to be followed without costly delays. Some funds already provided through supplemental appropriations are not yet available. In other construction cases appropriation processes need to be speeded up in the field. A reserve of funds should be made available for changes in scope and cost of construction as requirements change in the theater. Work has barely started or not started at all on too many essential projects in the theater.

Additional preprograming is needed and it is probable that this can be expedited if additional planning personnel are made available. However, it is apparent that high enough priorities are not being given construction requirements in the war theater. Top priority is not being given to some of the equipment and material needs in Vietnam.

Too much equipment has been deadlined throughout the area for lack of spare parts. The situation is improving but there is a need for greater emphasis on making spare parts available. Much equipment is in short supply and when equipment cannot be used for lack of spare parts, the loss is doubly costly.

In nonmilitary activities there is a requirement for more positive direction and emphasis, especially in our efforts in psychological warfare. In this connection, tribute is paid to American teams, including AID, Peace Corps, and Armed Forces medical teams, who through direct contact with villagers have presented a new and needed picture of the U.S. intentions and helpfulness to the Vietnamese.

The refugee program in South Vietnam also remains a problem. There is a need for a better coordinated refugee program with stress being placed on the resettlement of refugees in areas where they can contribute, primarily through agriculture, toward their own support and that of the countryside.

We wish to pay highest tribute to the morale and valor of America's fighting men in southeast Asia. Their contributions are magnificent. They have the will to win and they deserve the full and unlimited support of the American people.

THE TRICONTINENTAL CONFERENCE IN CUBA: A THREAT TO WORLD FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, between January 3 and 15, some eleven hundred miles from Washington, but only 90 miles from Key West, Fla., a most significant event took place in the capital of Cuba.

Last July 26 in my speech on Cuba, I warned that a tricontinental meeting of

Communist representatives would be held this January in Cuba. That meeting did in fact occur and its deliberations should be of monumental concern to all who value freedom.

Last Saturday, after 13 days of deliberation, this conference of the Asian, African, and Latin American Communists came to a close in Havana. Sponsored by the Communist powers, organized by known Communists, and attended by pro-Communist delegates and observers from 82 countries, including official delegations from the Soviet Union and Communist China, the tricontinental conference represents a direct and major threat to the stability of Latin America and, consequently, a danger to the whole of the Western Hemisphere.

As a cofounder of the Cuban Freedom Committee which operates Radio Free Cuba, I have followed the progress of this meeting with great concern.

Our staff, which maintains close contact with activities in Cuba, has compiled a comprehensive record of the conspiratorial meeting and I should like today to present briefly some of the highlights of this meeting which most directly affect us as free Americans.

I believe that the conclusions and objectives agreed upon at this meeting clearly show that this conference represents the beginning of the most important Communist effort to penetrate Latin America since the Castro takeover in Cuba in January 1959.

That the Castro regime is the willing tool and promoter of international communism's desire to intensify subversion and terrorism throughout the continent and the world becomes more evident daily.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a direct correlation between our struggle in Vietnam and the Communist meeting in Havana last week.

If the United States were ever to be driven out of Asia, such a defeat would give the green light for Communist subversion all over the world.

Last week's meeting of Communist leaders in Havana clearly spelled out the blueprint for waging subversion and terror as the new mode of coordinated Communist aggression.

In the last days of the tricontinental conference it was decided that the executive secretariat and liberation committee—with four representatives from Latin America, four from Africa, and four from Asia on each committee—should have their headquarters in Havana, Cuba.

The avowed purpose of the liberation committee is to channel aid and materials for insurrection throughout Latin America. This is the first time that Moscow and Havana have formally set up an office for international communism in Havana.

Because of the Havana conference's importance, the American people should know, and this Chamber should thoroughly investigate, the significance of the pronouncements made during its sessions, the role of Communist Cuba as host nation, and the final results and future consequences of the gathering.

Too often preoccupied with events in Vietnam, we unfortunately fail to attach proper importance to portentous events in our own backyard.

The aims of this conference greatly affect our security, the safeguard of which is our prime duty. President Monroe in 1823 outlined that responsibility when he declared that the United States would consider any attempt of an extra hemispheric power to extend its system to any portion of this hemisphere, dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States.

The celebration of the tricontinental conference in Havana was agreed upon in Cairo last May, when the so-called African-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, decided to expand its activities and include Latin America in its ranks.

Although Communist Cuba is going through a serious economic and financial crisis, lavish preparations were carried out in Havana for the conference, and the best facilities were offered to about 600 delegates and observers, all declared guests of the Castro regime. The Havana Hilton Hotel—now called the Havana Libre—was the site of the meetings and was declared off limits for the public.

According to the official Cuban announcement, the principal points on the conference's agenda were as follows:

> 1. The struggle against imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism.
> 2. Support for Vietnam against U.S. imperialist aggression and for the liberation of South Vietnam and the reunification of the whole country.
> 3. Struggle for complete national liberation of the three continents; against imperialist aggression and foreign intervention of independent states and against the imperialist policy of isolating peoples that are fighting for national liberation.
> 4. Intensification of every form of struggle, including armed struggle, by the peoples of the three continents.
> 5. Support for the Cuban people's struggle against U.S. imperialism; support for the patriotic struggle of the peoples of Latin America against U.S. imperialism and its tools, such as the OAS.
> 6. Liquidation of foreign military bases on the three continents and action against the policy of military pacts.
> 7. Ways and means of helping liberation movements in Africa, Asia, and Latin America in general and armed struggle for independence in particular.

In an article on the tricontinental congress, the official Cuban newspaper Granma, in its issue of January 6 said:

> The strategy of the revolutionary movements in their struggle against imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism and, especially against Yankee imperialism—principal enemy of peoples—calls for closer military ties and solidarity between the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the working class, the progressive forces of the capitalistic countries of Europe and the United States, and the Socialist camp.

The same article says it is obvious that military solidarity of the peoples of the three continents is an urgent necessity.

Fidel Castro said on January 2 that any revolutionary movement in any part of the world "would receive concrete and unconditional help from Cuba."

The belligerent tone of the tricontinental congress was set by Cuban President Dorticos in his inaugural speech on January 4, when he asked for the "overthrow of the United States."

He proclaimed that "the right as well as the duty of the people was to answer armed violence of imperialism with armed revolutionary violence."

The Asian delegates in particular called for support of South Vietnam as well as for the oppressed peoples of Japan.

The Russian delegate Rashidov declared Soviet support of the Dominican Republic "in its battle against the North American invaders."

Rashidov praised highly "the armed struggle" of the patriots from Venezuela, Peru, Colombia, Guatemala, against the lackeys of imperialism"—referring to their governments.

Continuing to speak on the subject of Latin America, the Soviet delegate also expressed "the solidarity of his government with the peoples of the British, French, and Dutch Guianas, as well as the peoples of the Antilles, in general, and—of special note—to the peoples of Puerto Rico. Mind you, the Soviets now publicly proclaim their grand design to ultimately take over our territory in the Caribbean—Puerto Rico.

Particular importance was placed on the statements of the Latin American delegates: Pedro Medina Silva, chief of the Venezuelan delegation to the conference and supreme chief of the armed forces of the National Liberation Force of Venezuela said, on January 6:

> The Tri-Continental Congress must make a base for the coordination of our movements in order to fight more effectively U.S. imperialism. We intend to see to it that no American ship will feel safe in any Latin American port, nor will the vast commercial enterprises of the North Americans, which cover our continent, feel safe.

Another militant Latin American delegate, Guido Gil, from Santo Domingo, said:

> Armed struggle is the only solution to the Dominican Republic's problems.

Peru's delegate paid warm tribute to Communist Cuba's influence on the armed struggle in that country.

Major Turcio Lima, head of the so-called Armed Liberation Forces of Guatemala also endorsed revolution as the only solution.

On January 7, Aluisio Palao, Brazilian extremist, said that the Brazilian Communists were "preparing the people to overthrow the present government in the armed struggle."

This was the tone and substance of the statements of all the delegates from Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The tricontinental conference ended on January 15 with a 2½-hour vitriolic speech by Fidel Castro, which I recommend to all of you for a clearcut understanding of the grave situation which faces the United States as long as there is a Communist Cuba in this hemisphere.

Castro described all Latin American representatives as "men from national movements which are presently fighting, or will begin to fight for liberation."

Castro clearly indicated in his speech that he considers all hemispheric nations, including Canada and Mexico, ripe for so-called national wars of liberation.

The Cuban dictator added:

> We Cubans are the only people truly liberated from Yankee domination.

His bellicose attitude was further evidenced in his pledge, not only to send civilian volunteers but also members of the regular Cuban armed forces to aid national liberation movements around the globe, especially in Latin America.

Referring to guerrilla activities in Venezuela, Peru, Colombia, and Guatemala, he added:

> There should be no single movement fighting alone.

Castro urged that a simultaneous struggle be initiated at once, and mentioned the possibility of insurrections in Bolivia, Paraguay, Ecuador, Argentina, and other nations.

Castro criticized the anti-Communist activities in Indonesia. He paid special attention to insurrection in Portuguese territories in Africa; to the guerrilla activities against the Leopoldville government and he strongly backed terrorist activities against the State of Israel.

The conference closed by voting, among other things, to demand the withdrawal of North American troops from the three continents and the dismantling of U.S. bases, especially in Guantanamo.

In essence, the conference was a declaration of increased aggression and subversion against the United States and a pledge of concerted help in this effort from all Communist and pro-Communist movements.

The secretariat of the conference is to maintain headquarters in Havana, as stated earlier. Also a liberation committee has been set up in Havana to facilitate the channeling of men and materials to Latin America.

The New York Times in an article on January 19 discloses, on page 5, that "Cuba is to become a center of anti-U.S. activities in the Western Hemisphere."

The Cuban radio announced today that 27 delegations, in Cuba, for the tricontinental conference that ended in Havana last Saturday, had created the Latin American solidarity organization, with headquarters in Havana, which will unite, coordinate and impel the struggle against North American imperialism. The meeting at which the organization was created was presided over by Pedro Medina Silva, chief of the pro-Communist Venezuelan guerrillas. In addition to 20 Latin American delegations, representatives of leftist groups from Guadaloupe, British Guiana, Jamaica, Martinque, Puerto Rico, Trinidad, and Tobago were present.

This decision was entirely to be expected because Cuba, for some time, has been the training center for Latin American saboteurs. Since the tricontinental congress repeatedly recommends increased efforts in preparing cadres for guerrillas and subversive activities, Communist dominated Cuba can now be expected to enlarge its training facilities. As you know Cuba has for some time maintained schools for the training of saboteurs and agents, the most important of which is the Sierra Maestra school, for propaganda and guerrilla specialists and, the "Caribe" guerrilla school, outside of Havana.

Evidence that Cuba is a base for Communist activities to infiltrate and, by violence and subversion, to overthrow national governments throughout the Western Hemisphere is not new. Since Premier Fidel Castro in 1959 established his Communist regime, Cuba has carried on, supported and directed in various ways a policy of intervention against independent countries of Latin America, according to an investigating committee report of the OAS made public on February 24, 1964. The report charged that Cuba had supplied military equipment to "support those movements that seek to subvert national institutions through force in order to install Communist regimes." It also revealed that Cuba's Communist Party and government has conducted extensive training programs in sabotage and guerrilla warfare.

OAS exposure of Cuba's aggressive intentions and methods is part of a long chain of evidence against the Castro regime. Soon after he had installed himself in power, Fidel Castro initiated the first phase of his plan to subvert Latin America by carrying out direct aggression, financing and organizing expeditions to overthrow the Governments of Panama, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Guatemala. In 1960, Castro embarked on a new, more subtle phase of penetration. Starting with the first Latin American Youth Congress in Havana in July 1960, Cuba began to attract students from other Latin countries, offering what she called scholarships, but which actually were courses of indoctrination and training in sabotage, guerrilla tactics and terrorism. Also, part of this plan was a vast propaganda campaign directed at Latin America, and the world through its powerful radio facilities.

These broadcasts include one in English to the United States. This is a virulent program called Radio Free Dixie, which is especially designed to arouse hatred and incite the Negro in the South.

Many of our Latin American neighbors are cognizant that this Havana conference represents a distinct and open threat to the entire continent. Principal newspapers of Latin America recognize that the conference has as its principal objective, the intensification of Communist subversion in the hemisphere. To cite only a few, La Prensa of Buenos Aires, said recently that the "dominant aim of the conference is the conquest of the Latin American peoples." In Bogotá, Colombia, El Tiempo said that the "plan for attacking imperialism," worked out in Havana, is in fact a "plan of Communist expansionism." The daily La Prensa Libra of Costa Rica said that Castro plans to "bleed the continent to deliver it to his bosses in the Kremlin." "What took place in Havana was not a conference but a conspiratory reunion, the danger of which is so clear, that only a blind person fails to see it," declared editorially the daily El Globo of Rio de Janeiro. The daily added that "once more the sinister shadow of subversion begins to cover the continent." In Caracas, Venezuela, the daily La Esfera called on Latin Americans to "be prepared as soon as possible for emergency and not to remain with our hands crossed."

This, Mr. Speaker, should be our attitude also. Because of the Havana Conference, the peoples and governments of the Americas now face the serious danger of a coordinated and intensified subversion campaign, handled by the international Communist apparatus.

This new thrust of terror, guerrilla activities, and violence creates conditions which make it increasingly difficult for public and private enterprises to achieve economic and social progress, essential to the success of our long-range economic and social goals envisioned by the Alliance for Progress.

Cuba is, of course, a small country, which cannot directly affect U.S. security. However, the Communist government there maintains the largest army in Latin America and is supported by the most cruel and tyrannical police state ever devised. The Castro regime is dedicated to the proposition of creating revolutions, effecting overthrows in Latin America, and, ultimately, in the United States. We must not forget that Castro's admitted motive is his pathological hatred of the United States and its powerful position in the world today. Nor must we forget that only 3 years ago he was a willing participant with the Soviet Union in the Cuban missile crisis.

I hope, gentlemen, that you will agree with me that this Conference is eminently destructive in its publicly announced purpose.

I urge that this body seek ways and means to help rid our hemisphere of the rapidly expanding Communist advance which seeks to debilitate and make impotent our efforts to maintain a free society based on democratic principles for all peoples.

I also urge that the delegates to the OAS take all steps within their power to meet the threat of the Tricontinental Congress held last week in Havana, Cuba.

At this moment I would like to quote a few paragraphs of a speech delivered on April 20, 1961, by President John F. Kennedy, which I believe to be even more meaningful today than they were 5 years ago:

> It is clear that this Nation, in concert with all the free nations of this hemisphere, must take an even closer and more realistic look at the menace of external Communist intervention and domination in Cuba. The American people are not complacent about Iron Curtain tanks and planes less than 90 miles from our shores. But a nation of Cuba's size is less a threat to our survival than it is a base for subverting the survival of other free nations throughout the hemisphere. It is not primarily our interest or our security but theirs which is now, today, in the greater peril. It is for their sake as well as our own that we must show our will.
>
> The evidence is clear—and the hour is late. We and our Latin friends will have to face the fact that we cannot postpone any longer the real issue of the survival of freedom in this hemisphere itself. On that issue, unlike perhaps some others, there can be no middle ground. Together we must build a hemisphere where freedom can flourish and where any free nation under outside

attack of any kind can be assured that all of our resources stand ready to respond to any request for assistance.

Mr. Kennedy's words are as important today as they were 5 years ago. I hope the appropriate committees of Congress will immediately undertake a full analysis of this latest menace in our hemisphere and—in consultation with the President—outline an effective program to deal with the Communist menace.

WORK AS A PROCESS OF THERAPY IN A SCHOOL FOR EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED ADOLESCENT GIRLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FASCELL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the extremely dedicated and experienced principal of Public School No. 621 in New York City, Dr. Esther P. Rothman, has sent at my request her cogent and authoritative appraisal of some elements involved in the process of educating emotionally disturbed children.

Dr. Rothman conducted a study on work as a therapeutic method at the Livingston School for Girls. Her report was made available to me and I commend its careful reading to all my colleagues in the House and Senate.

This is a field where we need increased research and facilities. It is a vocation requiring the very best of human instinct, energy, intelligence and compassion.

Dr. Rothman's thesis is forward-looking and promising. I hope it will serve to awaken further understanding:

WORK AS A PROCESS OF THERAPY IN A SCHOOL FOR EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED ADOLESCENT GIRLS

(By Esther P. Rothman, Ph. D.)

The Livingston School for Girls is New York City's only day school for emotionally disturbed adolescent girls. It is part of the educational system of the city, servicing those girls whose behavior has been so disruptive that they cannot attend the regular schools of the city. The school consists of 120 girls ranging in age from 13 through 19. A few girls are older, as any student in New York City has the legal right to attend school until the age of 21 if both the student and the school agree. Girls are referred to the school from several sources; hospitals and treatment centers, State training schools, or the regular schools from which they generally have been suspended. While the courts have no jurisdiction over the school, it is not uncommon for a judge or a probation officer to make referrals to the school. Girls travel from all parts of the city to attend the school which is located in the borough of Manhattan.

The guidance counselor is the liaison between the school and all referring agencies. She collects all pertinent data and meets individually with each girl and her parent. This initial interview is the girl's first therapeutic contact with the school. Most of the girls are frightened, expecting to find a prisonlike atmosphere. The guidance counselor often dissipates these fears as she encourages the girls to speak freely about these fears and explains the many resources of the school in terms of both personnel and programs.

At the end of the first interview it is not infrequent for girls to want to be admitted immediately. It has been found, however, that often the girls most eager for admission are not always the candidates with the best prognosis for a successfully therapeutic school experience. Very often these are the girls who have not attended any school for several years because of severe emotional instability. Equally often, these are the girls who had been released from treatment centers or training schools because they presented severe problems of management and did not seem to profit from the treatment offered. If the guidance counselor seriously questions the advisability of admitting any girl, the clinical team consisting of a psychologist, social worker, and psychiatrist, is consulted. Actually, however, very few girls are ever denied admission as professional ability to predict adjustment and behavior is simply not definitive enough in our present systems of psychology to enable valid predictions of adjustment at the school. Because there is a great margin of error in the prediction of future behavior both in school and in the community, almost every girl who is referred to the school is admitted and given her last chance for schooling within the public school system. She then attends the Livingston School for Girls.

The Livingston School girls are all in emotional trouble. A large percentage of them are in trouble with their communities as well. For instance, approximately 80 percent of the girls have been adjudged delinquent at some time in their lives; almost every one of them, however, or 100 percent of the school population has appeared in court as witness to crime or as victims of rape, parental disharmony, neglect or abuse. The girls appear to live in a milieu of violence. For instance, when some particular crime rocks the city, it is not unusual to find that some girl in the school is the sister, girl friend, cousin, or daughter of the person arrested for the crime. It is therefore almost axiomatic that the tenor of any particular school day is related to the tenor of the city at large. That is to say, when the city is gripped by a specific act of violence, the girls are extremely anxious, aggressive and unpredictable. These are the most difficult school days. For instance, when a popular singer was murdered several years ago, it took the school staff several days to calm, soothe, and quiet aroused feelings of anger and anxiety. When, on the other hand, men were catapulted into space or presidential elections were held, the girls showed little or no interest. War, peace, politics, space in short, the world around them has no real meaning to the girls for they shut themselves off from the rest of the world. They are essentially isolated girls who are concerned primarily with their own needs and lives in the immediate present. One girl in describing herself put it this way: "When June was born, she was born alone and when she dies, she dies alone." Between the two, there seems to be little room for interest in other people and in conditions of life other than what they themselves are experiencing at the moment.

For instance, while every one of them travels to school daily, some of them traveling as much as 2 hours one way to get to school, very few of them take the opportunity to explore other neighborhoods in the city. Thus, each girl takes a direct route from the block of her neighborhood to the block of the school, and does not often deviate from it. Considering the fact that the school is in the heart of one of New York City's most interesting and picturesque neighborhoods, Greenwich Village, very few girls, in the 7 years of the school's existence, have ever returned to the neighborhood after they had left school for the day. Similarly, although Broadway and Times Square is only a 15-minute subway ride from the school. few girls have ever detoured there. The girls appear to be insulated against curiosity by hatred—self-hatred, as well as hatred directed against others. This apparent lack of curiosity and interest in their environment, is but an inability to make an emotional investment in others which in turn stems from their own self-perceptions as something lesser than human beings. It is not only that they feel unloved primarily by their parents, and secondarily, by the world, but that they feel unworthy of love because they see themselves as unlovable. Referral to the Livingston School convinces them that their parents, their schools, and their communities were really right in rejecting them, that they are indeed unlovable. Their behavior and their feelings become then cyclical, "If I am really worthless so that no one can love me and no one, not even my parents, love me, so I must be worthless." The girls seem to accept the unalterability of this position and they face the future with depression and fatalism. They seem to feel that their destinies are already created, that they cannot dare to hope for control over their own lives.

One girl, talking of her life, put it this way, "All this static for nothing." This attitude of hopelessness does not mean that girls accept their lots with equanimity and passivity for just as they rebel against their lives, so do they equally resist any attempts at intervention or change. As one girl said, "I'm just growing inside me for everybody just plain hate."

How does the school dissipate this hatred so that personal emotional growth and learning can take place? The curriculum of the school cannot be considered from the usual educational framework. It cannot be discussed primarily in terms of subjects taught. Rather, the curriculum is the milieu of the school, a place where girls are taught to see themselves as adequate human beings.

Primarily they are taught that they are important to themselves. This is the first step. Once they perceive themselves to be important, they can then begin to feel important to other people. They can then afford to give of themselves to another person. The second step therefore is a process of making meaningful interpersonal relationships that are both emotionally satisfying and socially acceptable. The process sounds simple; yet, it is extremely difficult to achieve. The teacher is the important figure in the process. It is the teacher who must begin to provide opportunities for the girl to feel adequate, and who must have sufficient ego strengths so that each girl may borrow from some of these strengths—it is the teacher who in essence must be the girl's ego, who must set the limits for her. At the same time the teacher must always provide areas of success for each girl giving her tasks, especially at first, which he knows she can accomplish with ease.

Each girl must be praised for everything she does that deserves praise. Sometimes, searching for an ear of praise makes a gargantuan task, for everything a girl may do may defy conformity and praise. As little a thing as keeping margins straight, however, may be deserving of praise even if everything written on the page is wrong. When the girl feels secure in the teacher's strength and in the teacher's ability to accept her even though she knows that her behavior is unacceptable she begins to want to achieve. Her attempts to achieve may at first be only to please the teacher, but as his words of praise become rewarding to her, so do the knowledges gained. She begins to want to achieve for the sake of achievement. Perhaps for the first time in her life, she feels successful. This is not an easy educational process. It starts with a staff who are above all insightful into their own problems and who can differentiate their problems from the problems of the girls. Staff is asked to empathize with each girl, particularly with those girls with whom they are not immediately successful at establishing a good relationship. A teacher who learns to ask himself "How would I act if I lived in a slum, had an alcoholic for a mother and a crippled father dying of cancer? How would I act if my brother were in prison? With such self-imposed questions, teachers develop a new respect for the dignity of each girl and for the struggle each girl has undergone in trying to make her own way in life. With such soul searching, teachers develop a new respect for each individual's right to feel the way she does, even though they may not approve of her behavior. Thus, each teacher never preaches or moralizes, trying to convince a girl not to hate. Rather, the teacher accepts each girl's feelings of hatred and tries to lead her into patterns of behavior which will alleviate her feelings but not cause hurt or distress to her or to someone else.

Teachers do not indulge in fatuous sentimentality. Rather, they train themselves to utilize the resources within themselves to be emphatic and compassionate. Sentimentality becomes a trap of do-nothingness in that it is relatively easy for a teacher to weep figuratively with a girl but do nothing therapeutic for her. It requires much more strength and ability on the part of a teacher to refrain from weeping and to act constructively. Sometimes acting constructively requires strong action such as sending for the police. In the long run, strong community action may help a girl much more intensively than merely feeling sorry for her and permitting her to continue in her destructive course of action. Police action can be most therapeutic. Arresting a girl for an assault, for instance, holds up reality to a girl. Accepting the assault and doing nothing about it, does nothing for the girl but confuse her. The question the girl then logically asks herself, "What can I get away with?" becomes a very real threat to her because it is answered with, "I can get away with murder." It means no limits are set for her. It means that she begins to fear her own aggressive impulses and where they will lead.

The Livingston School program sets limits. It makes demands upon the girls, but demands that are reasonable and that can be met. This does not mean that each teacher always maintains a stable relationship with each girl and that each teacher is always in control of each girl. On the contrary, the teacher is not always in control of a girl, but with self-understanding, the teacher is always in control of himself and of the situation.

The program of the school is divided into two parts, known respectively as the Lower School and the Upper School. They are, of course, housed in the same building. In the Lower School, classes are organized on the basis of cores of interest rather than on grades. Classes are therefore called dance, music, dressmaking, cooking, business practice, and nursing. All these areas have a high interest level for adolescent girls. Some areas are of particular importance because they are evocative of creative expression. The expressive qualities of music and dance are obvious. Not only do girls learn how to perform but they also create. Not so obvious, however, is the creativity and expressions inherent in business practice, dressmaking, cooking and beauty culture. The business practice provides opportunity for typing original stories, poems, etc. The cooking program centers upon cooking in the glamorous tradition. Experimentation with foods and with different methods of preparation of foods often results in chocolate mousse rather than chocolate pudding or in a souffle instead of scrambled eggs.

Dressmaking, centering upon making oneself attractive, and beauty culture, equally centered are classes geared toward exploration of the self, making oneself attractive. Turning out a beautiful dress or a stunning coiffure is creative in that the individual reshapes an old pattern of appearance into a new pattern. It is therefore emotionally satisfying. These are personal skills, that are extremely important to every adolescent girl and adult woman in the world today. The focus of these areas is not on vocational training but if some vocational interest in a particular area is sparked, the girl is, of course, motivated to explore the full potentialities of the field in which she is interested.

The nursing program deserves particular mention because adolescent girls are particularly concerned with their own bodies. Moreover there are the girls who very often care for babies, either as babysitters or because they care for younger siblings at home. Some girls have children of their own. The nursing program therefore includes child care, as well as personal hygiene and care of the sick.

Classes are heterogeneously formed in terms of ages, grades, and achievement levels. Thus, 13-year-olds may be grouped with 15-year-olds, and second-grade readers may be in a class with high school readers. As the basis of the class is the activity involved, and as the activity does not depend primarily on academic skills, the level of achievement is of little importance in grouping.

It simply makes no difference in baking a turkey or performing a dance if a girl reads well or, is proficient in arithmetic. All classes however, are scheduled for academic work in mathematics, English and social studies. Because the top register of each class is no more than 10, individual instruction is completely feasible in the academic areas. There are some girls, however, who find it difficult to approach reading or arithmetic even within a very small group structure. They find it shameful to display their difficulties in front of other girls. They cannot work in a room with other girls present. These girls need their dignity preserved, and for them, completely individualized lessons in privacy are provided. To achieve this goal, there are three remedial reading teachers on staff and one remedial mathematics teacher. Ninety girls attend the lower school. They are placed in an official class, after an initial placement in the orientation class. In orientation, the girls learn the rules and the program of the school. In addition they also study the other girls in the school and quickly find their place in the scheme of things. They really learn, "Who acts big, but isn't big and chickens out," and who "is big" and within this framework they learn to find their own niche. The orientation class usually lasts for approximately 10 days. During this time girls remain with one official teacher for most of the day.

At least once a day, they go to a specific subject area. That is, during this time the class goes to nursing, dance, dressmaking, etc. Each teacher in the school therefore gets to know each new girl in the orientation class. In addition, each new entrant is evaluated completely in reading, and arithmetic skills, and is also examined by the school doctor. At the end of her stay in orientation, a faculty conference is held at which each girl is discussed and decisions made jointly for her future class placement. As each girl's case history is presented and as her present behavior is discussed, teachers learn about each girl's behavioral modes of adaptation and they make tentative judgments about the girl's future adjustment at school. Teachers can often predict the possible areas of difficulty each girl will encounter and with some anticipation, serious difficulties can often be averted by preventive measures.

The question is often asked how long must a girl be in the lower school before she goes to the upper school. There is no definitive answer. For some girls the answer may be 1 year, for another, 6 months, or 2 years. It depends entirely on the girl herself and upon how long it takes her to learn how to exercise some inner controls. In other words, she must have learned to inhibit her impulses, to tolerate frustration and delay, to cope with external and internal pressures without "letting off steam."

Behaviorally, the pattern changes from overt explosive, volatile aggression to aggression expressed only verbally, usually in the form of threats or obscenities, to verbal control with an ability to express a grievance and a point of view. When a girl reaches a state of control, when she can come to school every day and on time, when she can accept direction and suggestions from teachers, when she looks for ways "out" of troublesome situations rather than "in" to troublesome situations, she has shown that she is ready for a work situation.

Faculty conferences are held weekly. At this time, the staff suggests those girls who may be ready for the upper school. The guidance counselor takes the next step. She interviews such girls and in a counseling relationship, the girl decides for herself whether she feels she is ready for this program. Readiness implies a willingness and an ability to assume the obligations of an employee. It also assumes the ability to tolerate more freedom of movement within the school structure than she had formerly enjoyed. All girls are not ready for obligation, responsibility, and freedom and many girls ask for deferment into the upper school. Nevertheless, the fact that the faculty feels they are ready for the work program is a therapeutic experience in itself. The girl often begins to see that other people have faith in her even though she may lack faith in herself.

Many girls have to be weaned away from the sanctuary of the lower school. The weaning process is slow and often painful to the girl. During this period, each girl is placed in a class called preparation or prep, as it is commonly known. In this official class, girls prepare themselves for their approaching new status in school. While prep is part of the lower school, it is a bridge to the upper school. Girls know that more is expected of them than previously had been expected. Teachers demand more academic work. The girls begin to make more demands of themselves. They become more critical of their own achievements and social behavior. How long a girl remains in prep depends upon two things; her own needs and the availability of openings in the upper school. Some girls remain a matter of weeks, some a matter of months, some only a few days, even as few as two. It would also be accurate to say that some girls have not really "earned" their way from prep to the upper school. That is, they are still extremely aggressive. Yet, in many cases, the upper school is really the girl's last chance to succeed in both the school and her community. To deny her this opportunity would be most unfair to both her and the community at large for very often the upper school keeps the girl functioning in the community. Very often a girl catapulted into a situation of responsibility assumes that responsibility even though her previous behavior did not indicate that she would be able to tolerate the stress of work.

To say that she was psychologically ready for the responsibility is probably a truism, yet, readiness could not be attested to by her behavior, nor, perhaps even by psychological testing and psychiatric interview. Thus, it does happen, that girls are placed in the upper school even though they have not truly merited it. At first, there were some questions about this procedure. Many staff members felt that the other girls in the school would object, that putting a girl into the program who did not merit it, would deter other girls from trying to merit it. If a girl can be bad and get into the program, the faculty reasoned, a girl might feel, "Why should I be good?" Yet, this probability did not become a reality. Because the program of the school is so tailor made to each girl's needs and because the girls themselves are so ego-centered, they pay too little attention to another girl's school achievements. The philosophy of the school reinforces the positive aspects of this psychological isolationism. "Never mind what so-and-so does or what class she's put in, that's right for her. What's right for you? is a faculty statement and question that is generally accepted by the girl. Thus, "right" for one girl may be a 2-day stay in prep, for another a 3 month stay. When a girl moves from prep into the upper school, she again goes through counseling sessions, exploring her own feelings about the move, as well as learning about the realities of the work world.

During this time of intensive counseling, she gets her working papers and her social security card. These procedures are not easy for the girls. It entails traveling to other parts of the city to other government offices. It involves learning how to dress appropriately, fill out forms, travel, ask for information. It also involves a physical examination. Because of the tremendous anxiety of each girl during this process, it sometimes takes weeks for a girl to complete all these details. It is not unusual for girls to "get lost" on the subway, "lose their papers" or come to an office too "late," etc. They fear the responsibilities of their new status and they often anticipate "failure." Thus, they put many obstacles into their own paths. Eventually, however, each girl is finally placed in the school to employment program (STEP).

STEP is the first level of the upper school. Girls work 3 hours each morning and attend school 2 hours each afternoon. Their work assignments are in neighboring schools, but the schools are not in close proximity so that each girl must travel to her job. In schools they act as librarians, assistants to kindergarten, first grade teachers, secretaries and guidance counselors. They do many secretarial tasks as well as work directly with the children. They escort children to clinics and homes, help them with clothing, tell stories, play games. They form new perceptions of children, of people in authority, of work, of themselves.

Working with little children, for instance is extremely provocative of self-insight. At first, the girls are most often critical of the behavior of children. They do not seem to expect them to be children, but rather miniature models of adult conformity. They expect the children to respond automatically to their demands and commands. These girls, the ones who have been the least conforming to adult standards, expect the children to obey them without demur. With very little time, however, the girls begin to empathize with the children and to understand why a child cries in school or refuses food or hits another child. They become invaluable to the cooperating teacher in assisting her in handling these moments of crises. Of much more value, however, is the insights the girls develop into their own behavior and feelings. They look at the child from two frames of reference, the teacher's and the child's, and they begin to see themselves from the same two points of view, their own and society's. It is indeed cathartic for a girl to be able to undergo an emotional experience with a child and to interpret this experience from the school's point of view as well as from the child's. Moreover, in this kind of experience, the girls are filling in a gap in their own lives. For the first time many girls are learning the songs, games, and poems of childhood that they themselves had never learned. As most of the girls had never had a kindergarten experience or enjoyed an uninterrupted period of elementary education, many of the childhood games, stories, and learning experiences made available to the young school child were not made available to them. In the guise of teacher, a girl may teach a nursery rhyme to a child, when, she in fact, is learning and enjoying the same material for the first time.

STEP is an arduous program. Girls may become proficient at clerical tasks. Acquiring these skills, however, is relatively easy. Much more difficult to acquire are the work attitudes and habits necessary for maintaining a job. For instance, many girls can learn to type well within a few weeks. It takes a much longer time, however, for the girls to learn that they have to report to work when it rains even though they rebel against getting their hair wet. It takes self-discipline and control to do assigned tasks when they do not want to do these jobs, or when they do not approve of the way in which they are asked to do them. The girls are extremely sensitive. They demand that their employers be excessively polite, saying "please" and "thank you" at every turn. Yet, they reserve the right to be sullen, impolite, or unresponsive.

The second level of the upper school is the Neighborhood Youth Corps program (NYC). The Neighborhood Youth Corps consists of girls who worked at least a year in STEP and who demonstrated by faithful attendance, devotion to work, controlled behavior, and the good performance of their duties that they were ready for more responsibilities. Instead of working in a school, the girls in this program work in community agencies such as hospitals, settlement houses, nurseries, and welfare agencies. Their duties remain very much the same, but their school- and workday is longer. They work from 1 to 4 p.m. and attend school in the morning. For the longer day that they put in, for their responsibility to an agency rather than a school, they receive $1.25 hourly, an increase of 25 percent over the STEP girls. Here too, the therapeutic experience still holds. Something extremely important however has been added. These girls, most of whom have been on the "taking" end of agencies' services, are now on the "giving" end.

They began to identify with giving service, rather than receiving it; they became the authority themselves. For most of the girls, social workers and social agencies have played a very important role in their lives. Many of the families have received public assistance at one time or another, and social workers are received most often as the dispenser of funds. Generally they feel that one must "put the social worker on." Social workers are perceived as people about whom one must maneuver in order to gain one's ends. The ability to maneuver successfully around another person in order to gain one's end, most often implies that the person about whom one maneuvers is a fool. He is a fool simply because he can be manipulated. Social workers, whether they are dispensers of welfare funds or associated with other agencies, are therefore often viewed as ridiculous figures. When the girls become identified with the agencies in which they work, when they develop an investment in the welfare of the agency, they begin to appreciate its values rather than deprecate its services. Not only do they respect the agency, but they begin to wish to be part of it, not as a recipient of services, but as a contributor. This is the greatest therapeutic value of the program—an identification with authority and a recognition of the need for authority. It would be extremely beneficial to the girls, if in addition to community social agencies, they were permitted to work in courts and police stations. In these positions, they would be in a unique position to see the "other" side of the law and to perceive law-enforcing personnel not as ogres and sadistic brutes, but as people who are doing a job that needs to be done. To date, girls have not been placed in these positions as many problems, namely, the confidentiality of these agencies precludes the placement of girls in these positions.

Thirty girls are enrolled in the upper school, twenty in STEP and ten in the NYC program. Each class has its own teacher who coordinates the program, supervises the work, and teaches the academic skills related to their jobs. In addition, there is a business practice teacher and a remedial mathematics and remedial reading teacher. The funds for the program come from both the State and the Federal Governments. Most recently they come from the Office of Economic Opportunity under the antipoverty legislation. Periodically as new budgets emerge each year, there is trepidation lest funds be slashed. This anxiety is shared by both staff and girls. There were times when appropriations were cut and the staff and the girls utilizing their prerogatives as citizens, wrote letters of protest to their legislators. Girls are not interested in government in the abstract. They become intensely interested in the workings of government, however, when government affects them. Thus, by writing letters, by becoming a pressure group, they learn at first hand about democratic procedures. This is indeed a lesson worth learning.

Money is extremely important to the girls and their families as it is to everyone. Equally as important, however, is the status that goes with the money and the job. Girls are not placed in menial positions. They are placed in offices, libraries, classrooms, and hospitals. They are now the authority figures. Girls who had once been rejected from their schools now return to the schools, not as students, but as assistants to the staff. The pride of the girls at this accomplishment is unmeasurable. Unfortunately, in many schools, students who are put into a work program are on their way out of the school. Generally they are placed in a work study program because they have failed in the academic program. It's a downward process from school to a labor market. The work program at the Livingston School, however, is an upward program. Pupils must earn their right to be in it. They must exhibit by demonstrated self-control, achievement, and good attendance that they are the elite of the school. Quite remarkably, it is this elite of the school who often find that they want to continue their own education. Working in positions of prestige, they learn the importance of more educational skills. They begin to want to continue their education on a more intensive basis. From the upper school, comes our greatest number of girls returning to the regular schools. Eventually they graduate from high schools, a few graduate from college. Approximately 25 percent of the entire school population returns to the regular school.

Almost all of this number have gone through our school-work sequence. It is not all an upward climb, however; there are incidents that were impossible to predict and therefore control. For instance, one girl with her first paycheck, left home. Another girl spent her entire salary on records and was brutalized by her parent. A third girl's parents took the girl's entire salary for themselves. Individual problems each one of them—but each was handled clinically and therapeutically by teachers, guidance counselors and members of the clinical staff.

The key to the success of the upper school lies in the qualities of the teachers. Because girls in STEP have just come from the lower school, they need more external controls imposed upon them than do the girls in the NYC program. When the girls are ready for the NYC program, they have internalized these controls. The controls and values of the teacher are now their controls and values. As this process takes place, the girls need to borrow less of the teacher's own strengths. In essence, they have developed egos of their own. The final success therefore for the girls going from the lower school through prep to STEP and finally to NYC is the development of their own self-concepts. They emerge from the upper school as young ladies of substance and quality.

INTER-RELIGIOUS COMMITTEE AGAINST POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, this week an event of historical significance took place in this Capital City of Washington. Leaders of our three great religious faiths formed an Inter-Religious Committee Against Poverty. Forty-five distinguished Americans, clergymen and lay leaders, have united in a most significant undertaking—support of a national commitment to wage war against poverty and to seek its broadest and most effective prosecution.

It comes as no surprise, of course, that the religious leaders of our Nation should enlist in this thoroughly holy war. What is significant is that it has been possible to forge a unity the like of which has rarely been seen. I append a list of the organizers of this great movement. I salute particularly the six cochairmen of this committee. They are: Rabbi Seymour J. Cohen, president of the Synagogue Council of America; Mrs. Louis Stern, former president, Council of Jewish Federation and Welfare Funds; Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey, S.T.D., Archbishop of San Antonio; Most Rev. Raymond J. Gallagher, D.C., Bishop of Lafayette, Ind.; Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, stated clerk, United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: member, National Advisory Council to OEO; Dr. Norman J. Baugher, general secretary, General Brotherhood Board, Church of the Brethren, Church Division of Christian Life and Mission, National Council of Churches.

This committee, let me stress, is not an official Government-inspired committee. These religious leaders on their own organized themselves for this great cause. They are not and will never be apologists for any Government program. Theirs is an independent voice. It is particularly gratifying, therefore, that in the first statement issued by this committee, the committee hails recent actions of this Congress, including the Economic Opportunity Act. This statement recognizes that many of the programs "are already demonstrating their value." They ask that these programs be extended and intensified.

Mr. Speaker, these leaders of America know what they are talking about. They are not motivated by blind partisanship—as others have been recently—to attack and derogate vital programs. Who better than religious leaders know the needs of our people—know whether programs are in fact reaching the poor—know whether corruption has taken over these programs?

It is a great tribute to the work of this Congress and to the administrators of the war on poverty that such a distinguished group speaks out not only in support of the program but for its extension. This is the most eloquent answer imaginable to those who have made petty and uninformed attacks on the program.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to append the prospectus of the program, the statement adopted at an organizational meeting on January 18, and an article on the meeting from the New York Times. I should like to note, finally, that two of the leaders of this group are serving this Nation not only in this new capacity, but also as members of the National Advisory Council to the Office of Economic Opportunity. Appointed by President Johnson, Archbishop Lucey and Dr. Carson Blake have been kept fully informed about developments in the war on poverty and are in a unique position, therefore, to bring to the Inter-Religious Committee Against Poverty relevant and up-to-date information about the program.

The material referred to follows:

ROSTER OF PERSONS ACCEPTING THE INVITATION TO SERVE ON THE INTER-RELIGIOUS COMMITTEE AGAINST POVERTY, AND STAFF SERVING IN AN ADVISORY CAPACITY TO THE COMMITTEEE

Persons invited by the Synagogue Council of America and other cooperating Jewish bodies:

Rabbi Seymour J. Cohen, cochairman, Anshe Emet Synagogue, Chicago, Ill., president of the Synagogue Council of America.

Mr. Moses I. Feuerstein, Malden Mills Sales Co., Inc., New York, N.Y., president of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations.

Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, New York, N.Y., president, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Mr. Aaron Goldman, Macke Vending Corp., Washington, D.C., chairman, National Community Relations Advisory Council.

Mrs. Florence G. Heller,[1] New York, N.Y., president, National Jewish Welfare Board.

Hon. Philip Klutznick, Chicago, Ill., former Ambassador to the United Nations, former president, B'nai B'rith.

Rabbi Israel Miller, Kingsbridge Heights Jewish Center, Bronx, N.Y., president, Rabbinical Council of America.

Mr. George Maislen, New York, N.Y., former president. United Synagogue of America.

Rabbi Max J. Routtenberg, Temple B'nai Sholom, Rockville Centre, New York, president, Rabbinical Assembly.

Mr. Louis Stern, cochairman, New York, N.Y., former president, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.

Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein, K.A.M. Temple, Chicago, Ill., president, Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Mrs. Joseph Willen, New York, N.Y., president, National Council of Jewish Women.

Mr. Jacob Blaustein, Baltimore, Md., honorary president, American Jewish Committee.

Mr. Milton Waldor, Washington, D.C., national commander, Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.

Dr. Joachim Prinz, New York, N.Y., president, American Jewish Congress.

Staff:

Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, Washington, D.C., director, Religious Action Center Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Mr. Philip Bernstein, New York, N.Y., executive director, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.

Mr. Sanford Solender, New York, N.Y., executive vice president, National Jewish Welfare Board.

Mr. Arnold Aronson, New York, N.Y., director of program planning, National Community Relations Advisory Council.

Persons invited by the National Catholic Welfare Conference:

Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey, S.T.D., cochairman, San Antonio, Tex., Archbishop of San Antonio.

Most Rev. Raymond J. Gallagher, D.D., cochairman, Lafayette, Ind., Bishop of Lafayette, Ind.

Mr. Joseph A. Beirne, Washington, D.C., president, Communications Workers of America.

Mr. Stanley Herbert, Washington, D.C., chairman, NCCS executive committee.

Mr. John Donnelly, Holland, Mich., president, the National Council of Catholic Men.

Very Rev. Msgr. Lawrence J. Corcoran, Washington, D.C., secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities.

Mrs. Marcus Kilch, Youngstown, Ohio, president, National Council of Catholic Women.

Mr. Edward Marciniak, Chicago, Ill., director of human relations, city of Chicago.

Mr. James J. Norris, New York, N.Y., assistant to the executive director, Catholic Relief Services—NCWC.

Most Rev. Edward E. Swanstrom, D.D., New York, N.Y., executive director, Catholic Relief Services—NCWC.

Rev. John Wagner, San Antonio, Tex., executive secretary, Bishops Spanish Speaking Committee.

Staff:

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick J. Stevenson, Washington, D.C., director, Youth Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Very Rev. Msgr. Francis T. Hurley, Washington, D.C., assistant general secretary, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. George G. Higgins, Washington, D.C., director, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Thomas D. Hinton, Washington, D.C., executive director, National Catholic Community Service.

Rev. Alphonsus B. Slivinski, Washington, D.C., field consultant, National Catholic Community Service.

Persons invited by the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States:

Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, cochairman, Philadelphia, Pa., stated clerk, United Presbyterian Church in the United States; member, National Advisory Council to Office of Economic Opportunity.

Dr. Norman J. Baugher, cochairman, Elgin, Ill., general secretary, general brotherhood board, Church of the Brethren; chairman, division of Christian Life and mission, National Council of Churches.

Bishop Henry C. Bunton, Washington, D.C., presiding bishop, seventh Episcopal district, Christian Methodist Episcopal Church.

Dr. J. Edward Carothers, New York, N.Y., associate general secretary, national division, Board of Missions of the Methodist Church; chairman, National Council of Churches Antipoverty Task Force.

Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Eugene, Oreg., president, University of Oregon; member, general board, National Council of Churches.

Mr. Albert J. Hayes, Wilson Hills, Silver Spring, Md., past president, International Association of Machinists (AFL–CIO).

---

[1] Deceased.

Mrs. Douglas Horton, Randolph, N.H., vice president, United Church Board of World Ministries; former chairman, division of Christian life and work, National Council of Churches.

Rev. C. C. Hung, Washington, D.C., pastor, the Chinese Community Church.

Archbishop Iakavos, New York, N.Y., patriarchal vicar, Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America.

Mrs. Abbie Clement Jackson, Louisville, Ky., North American president, World Federation of Methodist Women; member, program board, division of Christian life and mission, National Council of Churches.

Judge William H. Maness, Jacksonville, Fla., senior partner, Kurz, Toole, Maness & Martin, attorneys and counselors-at-law; member, general board, National Council of Churches.

Dr. Paul Miller, Morgantown, W. Va., president, University of West Virginia.

Mr. Walter Reuther, Solidarity House, Detroit, Mich., president, International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America—UAW; chairman, Citizens Crusade Against Poverty.

Staff:

Dr. R. H. Edwin Espy, New York, N.Y., general secretary, National Council of Churches.

Dr. Jon L. Regier, New York, N.Y., associate general secretary, division of Christian life and mission.

Dr. Shirley E. Greene, New York, N.Y., associate director, Commission on the Church and Economic Life.

Rev. Richard O. Comfort, Washington, D.C., Washington staff, antipoverty representative.

Rev. Sheldon L. Rahn, New York, N.Y., director, Commission on Social Welfare.

A PROSPECTUS FOR AN INTER-RELIGIOUS COMMITTEE AGAINST POVERTY

PREAMBLE

The problem of poverty and its solution have been the concern of Judaism and Christianity through the ages. Deeply imbedded in the prophetic literature of our religious heritage are the moral imperatives calling for the elimination of poverty. Among these are the conception that God created the earth and all its resources and found them good; that man was created and ordained for dominion over the earth and its fruits; that man has the obligation of trusteeship over the natural resources of earth; and that the will of God for man includes abundance of life, justice in human dealings and sharing of his gifts in charity and equity.

For the first time modern science and technological development make the elimination of poverty in the United States of America a possibility. United in the conviction that toleration of persistent poverty amidst our national affluence is morally indefensible and that the combined efforts of both voluntary and governmental agencies are required for the successful waging of a total war upon this social and moral blight, the Synagogue Council of America in cooperation with other Jewish bodies, the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States, of America, and the National Catholic Welfare Conference are joining in the creation of an Inter-Religious Committee Against Poverty.

PURPOSES OF THE COMMITTEE

The purposes of the Inter-Religious Committee Against Poverty shall be:

1. To symbolize and communicate to their own constituencies and to the Nation the moral conviction that the persistence of involuntary poverty in a society possessing the resources and the technological capacity to eradicate it is both economically and politically indefensible and morally intolerable.

2. To identify major issues and areas of moral concern which emerge in connection with the total efforts to eliminate poverty in the United States, of America, and to study and evaluate current policies, programs and experiences in the war against poverty, both in the public sector and in the religious communities.

3. To apply the common ethical insights of the major religious traditions to formulation and application of goals and standards for the Nation's antipoverty efforts.

4. To stimulate and coordinate the antipoverty efforts of religious groups, agencies and institutions and to provide facilities for communication and liaison between such religious groups and the poverty-combating activities, both public and private, of the general community.

5. To encourage the creation where alternative means are nonexistent, unavailable or clearly inadequate, of instrumentalities for the utilization of resources—governmental, religious, private or foundation—for combating poverty.

6. To encourage the creation of such corporate or other instrumentalities as it may find necessary to mobilize and bring to bear the impact of the three religious communities, including their various local churches and synagogues, councils and judicatorial units, agencies and institutions, upon the elimination of poverty in the United States.

STRUCTURE OF THE COMMITTEE

The committee shall be composed of 50 to 60 persons of the highest standing chosen from the Jewish, Protestant and Orthodox, and Roman Catholic communities selected respectively by the Synagogue Council of America and cooperating Jewish bodies, the National Council of Churches, and the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

The committee shall be an agency of the above-mentioned sponsoring bodies. The sponsoring bodies shall determine the personnel of the committee and their terms of office; determine and underwrite its budget; receive regular reports from the committee; and retain the power to terminate the committee.

The committee shall be brought into being by a joint declaration of duly authorized spokesmen of the three sponsoring bodies as soon as its members have been designated. It may be terminated at any time by a 3-months' written notice from any one of the sponsoring bodies.

The committee shall establish its rules of procedure and shall elect its own officers and standing committees.

OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Frequency of meetings: The committee shall meet at least semiannually, and may meet more frequently at its own discretion.

Budget: The committee shall formulate its own budget with the approval of the sponsoring bodies. The budget shall be funded in equal shares by the sponsoring bodies.

Staff: The committee shall be staffed by professional persons assigned from the sponsoring bodies.

Headquarters: The headquarters and business address of the committee shall be established in Washington, D.C.

STATEMENT OF INTER-RELIGIOUS COMMITTEE AGAINST POVERTY, JANUARY 18, 1966

The leaders of churches, synagogues, and organizations cooperating through the Inter-Religious Committee Against Poverty are committed to the proposition that the persistence of massive poverty in our society is a moral blight which can and must be eradicated.

Recent Federal legislation marks a great stride forward in America's efforts to achieve this national purpose. The passage of the Economic Opportunity Act, the legislation for Appalachia, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the Civil Rights Acts, Social Security Amendments including medicare, expansion of the rehabilitative focus of public welfare, legislation for housing, urban renewal, health, education, and other measures represent notable advances. What is on the statute books must be implemented and augmented to translate the hopeful potentialities of these goals into effective realities.

Many programs are already demonstrating their value. They should be extended and intensified. And where experience has indicated opportunities for improvement, such constructive advances should be made.

In view of the magnitude of the task and the experimental nature of these programs, some mistakes may well occur in their conception and implementation. While the duty of responsible criticism should be exercised, the entire effort should not be condemned because of occasional false starts, setbacks, or errors of judgment. Such problems are inherent in new programs and should be the stimulus to new and greater efforts and commitment.

THE PROGRAM MUST BE STRENGTHENED

Our military commitments in Vietnam have led some to suggest reduction or holding the line on the domestic antipoverty and health, and educational programs. We reject such proposals as a major retreat in the war on poverty, and a major defeat for America.

Hundreds of thousands of the poor are now participating in governmental antipoverty programs. Their opportunities must not be wasted or thwarted. Those now being assisted and the millions not yet being assisted must be helped to escape from poverty and to make their contribution to the strengthening of our society.

We urge that increased appropriations be provided to strengthen and broaden the Nation's programs to eliminate poverty.

Our country has both the material and human resources to expand and strengthen these programs. It would be a cruel injustice to require that the poor—the young, the old, the sick, the disadvantaged—should be the ones to make the major sacrifice for the other problems we must solve.

COMMUNITY ACTION

The Congress has wisely emphasized the importance of community action programs to encourage local initiative and responsibility for devising and administering programs best adapted to differing needs, problems, and circumstances.

Greater awareness of poverty in each community, deeper understanding of its causes, a firm resolve to overcome it, and the strengthening of communitywide bodies, with the fullest participation of voluntary agencies, are vital goals of antipoverty programs.

We urge continuing and increased support for the community action programs.

MAXIMUM FEASIBLE PARTICIPATION OF THE POOR

One of the most challenging aspects of the community action programs is the requirement that they be developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the area and members of the groups served.

This basic concept is an integral part of the religious and democratic commitment to help people help themselves. We deplore any attempt, national or local, to dilute the concept of maximum participation of the poor. We affirm our faith in the fact that their involvement is feasible, and should be viewed as a creative utilization of the natural human resources found in the community of the deprived who are themselves dedicated to ridding the Nation of poverty. Constructive participation of the poor in the conduct of these programs is achievable. The difficulties of accomplishing this purpose should not lessen our striving for its realization. We urge a redoubling of the efforts to encourage the full involvement of the poor in antipoverty programs.

The commitment to our antipoverty programs must not only be maintained, but must be increased to achvieve its noble purpose—the development of a just society.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 19, 1966]

THREE FAITHS JOIN TO COMBAT POVERTY

(By Nan Robertson)

WASHINGTON, January 18.—Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leaders formed a coalition today against poverty, which they assailed as "morally intolerable" in this rich Nation.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference, the National Council of Churches and the Synagogue Council of America, working with other Jewish groups, created a 45-member Inter-Religious Committee Against Poverty.

Its mission is to rally the full weight of their constituencies behind the poverty campaign.

Those on the committee, both laymen and clergy, directly represent hundreds of religious bodies of the three great faiths and indirectly represent tens of millions of Americans.

Vice President HUMPHREY and Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, were present at the news conference announcing the group's formation. Both expressed enthusiasm.

The Reverend Dr. Eugene Carson Blake of Philadelphia, stated clerk and highest official of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, said the committee would support, coordinate, and criticize existing private and governmental programs for the poor, and perhaps would suggest additional ones.

RESOUNDING ACTION

Mr. HUMPHREY said the members were translating their faith into resounding action that will transform America.

The formation of the committee is an important extension of the all-faith cooperation that helped produce the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The Vice President said that "there wouldn't be any civil rights legislation without the margin of difference contributed by the clergy bringing their moral persuasion to bear. Every Member of Congress knows that fact."

The committee immediately issued a joint statement by the six cochairmen for more poverty funds (which Mr. HUMPHREY assured them would be asked in the President's budget message next Monday), and maximum participation for the poor in poverty programs.

"Hundreds of thousands of the poor are now participating in governmental antipoverty programs," Dr. Blake said. "Their opportunities must not be wasted or thwarted."

Calling participation of the poor "an integral party of the religious and democratic commitment to help people help themselves," the group deplored "any attempt, national or local" to dilute their involvement. Some big city mayors have resisted the demands of the poor for a voice in shaping community projects.

The group rejected suggestions that antipoverty programs be cut back or held at the present levels because of the increasing military commitment in Vietnam. They called such proposals "a major retreat in the war on poverty, and a major defeat for America."

The only other private antipoverty organization to compare in scope with the committee formed today is the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty. That coalition of more than 125 groups and leaders in civil rights, labor, agriculture, teaching, and business is headed by Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers. His union has given $12 million to the crusade.

There is some cross-fertilization between the crusade and the interreligious committee.

REUTHER ON COMMITTEE, TOO

Mr. Reuther is a member of the interreligious committee and attended today's meeting. Dr. Blake is chairman of the crusade's Commission on Community Activity and Organization. The crusade also includes some religious groups, among them representatives from the three bodies that joined forces today.

When asked if the committee would direct ministers, priests and rabbis throughout the Nation to "mount their pulpits" to preach involvement in the campaign against poverty, Dr. Blake replied:

"I expect them to preach the faith they profess to hold. It includes this commitment."

Another of the cochairman, Rabbi Seymour Cohen of Chicago, president of the synagogue council, rose in the conference room at the Capitol to give his answer.

IDEALISM AND REALITY

"There is a concrete need to close the gap between the idealism of our faith and the stark realities of society," he said. "We have a moral imperative to rise, to speak, to stir to action."

The four other cochairmen are Louis Stern of New York City, past president of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds; the Reverend Dr. Norman Baugher of Elgin, Ill., general secretary of the Church of the Brethren General Brotherhood Board; the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, Catholic bishop of San Antonio, Tex.; and the Most Reverend Raymond J. Gallagher, Catholic bishop of Lafayette, Ind., and formerly executive director of the National Conference of Catholic Charities.

The National Catholic Welfare Council is an association of about 300 American bishops. The National Council of Churches represents 30 Protestant, Anglican, and Greek Orthodox denominations. The Synagogue Council of America represents Orthodox, Conservative and Reform rabbis and presidents of congregations.

In another development tonight, Mr. Shriver said he believed that "one of the great contributions of the War on Poverty" was that the plight of 30 million poor Americans had been made visable and understandable to other, more fortunate Americans.

He said that to him one of the most interesting developments was the creation of Women in Community Service.

"It's composed of all four of the major religiously oriented women's organizations in the United States, and for the first time these four groups—Protestants, Catholics, Jewish people, and Negro women—have all gotten together" to fight poverty.

Mr. Shriver's remarks came during an interview on national educational television.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RANDALL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. DOW for January 21, 1966, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. McDADE), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FINO.

Mr. PERKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McDADE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. BOLTON.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. HOSMER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HANNA in two instances.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. GILLIGAN.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1446. An act to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 767. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim National Ski Week,

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 24, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JANUARY 17, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the "Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946," Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Heimburger	General counsel	$12, 470. 46
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	12, 470. 46
Christine S. Gallagher	Clerk	12, 470. 46
Hyde H. Murray	Assistant clerk	10, 480. 35
George F. Misslbeck	Printing editor	6, 194. 97
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	5, 792. 91
Betty M. Prezioso	do	5, 792. 91
Peggy Jean Lamm	do	5, 347. 86
Martha S. Hannah	do	5, 347. 86
Jane C. Wojcik	do	5, 151. 06
INVESTIGATING STAFF		
Thomas A. Banks	Staff assistant (July 1, 1965).	$405. 41
Carolyn Windsor Berkeley.	Staff assistant	3, 073. 72
Roger J. Brown	Staff assistant (through Oct. 31, 1965).	2, 959. 96
Larry Allison High, Jr.	Staff assistant (July 1 to Aug. 31, 1965).	810. 82
Marjorie B. Johnson	Staff assistant	3, 899. 16
Champion Mitchell	Staff assistant (July 1, 1965).	405. 41
Fowler C. West	Staff assistant	4, 154. 18
Catherine L. Bernhardt.	Staff assistant (Aug. 1 to Dec. 31, 1965).	2, 130. 30
Aaron Neal Clinard	Staff assistant (Aug. 1, 1965).	405. 41
Jimmy Lee McElreath	do	405. 41
Jacqueline White	Staff assistant (Oct. 15 to Dec. 31, 1965).	204. 64

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75, 000. 00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	18, 829. 71
Amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 31, 1965	20, 031. 08
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	38, 860. 79
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	36, 139. 21

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 15, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth Sprankle	Clerk and staff director.	$11, 679. 12
Paul M. Wilson	Assistant clerk and staff director.	11, 679. 12
Carson W. Culp	Staff assistant	11, 586. 09
Robert M. Moyer	do	11, 353. 50
Jay B. Howe	do	11, 353. 50
Ross P. Pope	do	11, 353. 50
Frank Sanders	do	11, 353. 50
G. Homer Skarin	do	11, 353. 50
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	11, 353. 50
Robert L. Michaels	do	11, 353. 50
Aubrey A. Gunnels	do	10, 480. 35
Robert P. Williams	Editor	9, 371. 79
George E. Evans	Staff assistant	9, 180. 24
Francis G. Merrill	do	9, 180. 24
Samuel R. Preston	do	9, 180. 24
Earl C. Silsby	do	8, 544. 54
Samuel W. Crosby	do	7, 792. 35
Keith F. Mainland	do	6, 972. 84
Lawrence C. Miller	Assistant editor	6, 338. 90
John M. Garrity	Staff assistant	1, 210. 62
Gerald J. Bova	do	966. 86
Dempsey B. Mizelle	do	2, 596. 05
Milton B. Meredith	do	1, 182. 65
Robert C. Nicholas III.	do	5, 101. 89
George A. Urian	Clerical assistant	5, 101. 89
James E. Moore	do	4, 690. 47
Austin G. Smith	do	4, 690. 47
Francis W. Sady	do	3, 169. 44
Randolph Thomas	Messenger	3, 109. 59
Alan R. Henry	Clerk-stenographer	4, 690. 47
Ruth E. Addison	do	2, 303. 76
Helen C. Hampson	do	4, 629. 54
Patrick M. Hayes	do	4, 690. 47
Mary L. Hollis	do	3, 001. 89
Rosalind E. McGovern.	do	4, 690. 47
William J. Neary	do	4, 690. 47
John A. Ringwald	do	4, 044. 12
Mary L. Schwarzmann.	do	3, 894. 90
Mary H. Smallwood	do	4, 690. 47
Mary F. Wilson	do	1, 986. 30
Iva E. Heath	do	2, 386. 71
Jack W. Watson	Clerk to the minority (to Dec. 15, 1965).	9, 591. 54
Robert C. Gresham	do	962. 85
Stephen T. Adams	Clerk-stenographer	3, 681. 78
Alex Coffin	do	4, 044. 12
Jessemine A. Falls	do	4, 690. 47
Charles H. Fritzel	do	4, 690. 47
Raymond L. Gooch	do	4, 690. 47
David Gramling	do	4, 690. 47
Larry H. Jose	do	3, 802. 56
Thomas M. McMurray.	do	4, 690. 47
Neta C. Messersmith	do	4, 202. 97
Ann L. Obrotka	do	4, 327. 01
Clara B. Posey	do	4, 690. 47
Frankie C. Ramage	do	4, 690. 47
Geraldine E. Rothwell.	do	717. 01

Amount expended from July 1, 1965, to Dec. 31, 1965	$333, 142. 95
Total amount expended from July 1, 1965, to Dec. 31, 1965	333, 142. 95

GEORGE MAHON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIONS STAFF)

JANUARY 15, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leo E. Conroy	Director, surveys and investigations staff.	$9, 315. 09
Charles Bolz	do	9, 315. 09
Edward J. Hayes	Assistant director, surveys and investigations staff.	9, 067. 77
Lillian M. Mackie	Stenographer	4, 739. 07
Mary A. Sauer	do	4, 446. 69
REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES		
Agriculture, Department of:		
Kelly, L. L	Investigator	$4, 673, 61
Mizelle, Dempsey	Editorial assistant	2, 360. 30
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Bader, T. J	Investigator	3, 259. 68
Bennett, C. L	do	6, 832. 16
Byrnes, R. C	do	6, 716. 96
Carson, W. D	do	6, 832. 16
Currall, W. G	do	6, 654. 80
Flatley, J. M	do	6, 294. 32
Franklin, R. M	do	6, 294. 32
Health benefits		706. 27
Ivy, C. M	Investigator	6, 294. 32
Kunkel, R. G	do	5, 333. 90
Lanphear, R. L	do	4, 888. 40
Law, S. W	do	2, 224. 64
Law, W. C	do	413. 84
Life insurance		421. 97
McCloskey, J. J	Investigator	6, 017. 76
McGahey, H. B	do	3, 216. 56
Magee, E. H	do	569. 76
Midkiff, G. L	do	4, 754. 24
Murphy, P. J	do	6, 243. 12
Retirement fund		8, 141. 85
Schafer, C. H	Investigator	2, 626. 64
Shanley, J. F	do	1, 972. 32
Shannon, A. J	do	6, 700. 16
Stewart, J. T	do	4, 469. 04
Sullivan, J. V	do	6, 716. 96
Tierney, J. R	do	4, 850. 72
Torrence, R. E	do	4, 008. 80
Van Wagoner, R. L	do	6, 716. 96
Welch, W. H	do	7, 009. 52
Wood, H. B	do	6, 832. 16
Interior, Department of the:		
Jervis, S	do	6, 237. 89
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:		
Healy, J. F	do	1, 703. 80
Lowry, J. G	do	5, 766. 08
Small Business Administration:		
Hartman, G. S	do	2, 526. 72
Tariff Commission:		
Taylor, J. A	do	4, 084. 64
Travel and miscellaneous expense		40, 592. 93

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$700, 000. 00
Amount expended from July 1, 1965, to Dec. 31, 1965	248, 843. 99
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	451, 156. 01

GEORGE MAHON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JANUARY 12, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive,

together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John R. Blandford	Chief counsel	$12,438.21
Philip W. Kelleher	Counsel	12,185.64
Frank M. Slatinshek	do	12,185.64
William H. Cook	do	10,879.44
Earl J. Morgan	Professional staff member.	10,879.44
Ralph Marshall	do	8,657.28
Oneta L. Stockstill	Executive secretary	7,214.22
Kalinowski, Berniece	Secretary	6,326.37
L. Louise Ellis	do	6,326.37
Edna E. Johnson	do	6,326.37
Dorothy R. Britton	do	6,326.37
Doris L. Scott	do	5,224.86
Innis E. McDonald	Secretary (from Sept. 1, 1965).	3,039.88
Shelley J. Pyle	Secretary (from Nov. 1, 1965).	1,218.24
James A. Deakins	Clerical staff assistant.	4,812.87
Benjamin Frasier, Jr.	Messenger	2,547.36
Bertha J. Zinszer	Secretary (to Oct. 16, 1965).	1,767.69
Barbara L. Bullard	Secretary (from July 15 to Aug. 30, 1965).	1,087.22

SUBCOMMITTEE FOR SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS (PURSUANT TO H. RES. 118, 119, AND 526, 89TH CONG.)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John T. M. Reddan	Counsel	$12,185.64
Walton Woods	Investigator	9,825.51
John J. X. Ford	Professional staff member.	8,644.37
Phyllis Seymour	Secretary	6,180.14
William B. Short, Jr.	Clerical staff assistant.	4,812.87
Leslie M. Berman	Assistant investigator (from Sept. 1, 1965).	3,236.95
Adeline Tolerton	Clerk	3,875.04

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 119 and 526)	$250,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	38,230.53
Amount expended from July 1, 1965, to Jan. 1, 1966	50,582.01
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1965, to Jan. 1, 1966	88,812.54
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1966	161,187.46

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JANUARY 10, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965 to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

STANDING COMMITTEE STAFF

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Paul Nelson	Clerk and staff director.	$12,081.78
Orman S. Fink	Minority professional staff member.	11,679.12
Norman Leonard Holmes.	Assistant counsel	7,451.53
Charles B. Holstein	Professional staff member.	11,679.12
Alvin Lee Morse	Counsel	8,972.11
Curtis A. Prins	Chief investigator	8,932.83
Benet David Gellman	Investigative counsel.	$7,400.90
Jane M. Deem	Administrative assistant.	6,433.95
Mary W. Layton	Secretary to minority.	6,433.95
Donald G. Vaughn	Assistant clerk	5,600.58
Total		86,665.87

INVESTIGATING STAFF (PURSUANT TO H. RES. 133, 134, AND 517, 89TH CONG.)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Karl Robert Bailey	Messenger	$961.40
Charles S. Beller	Counsel	1,737.75
James D. Clark	Research analyst	1,250.72
Timothy Allen Colcord.	Professional staff member.	8,818.51
John Cook	Messenger	229.73
Susan M. Day	Secretary	1,802.40
Dolores K. Dougherty	Assistant clerk	4,318.73
Martin G. Goldman	Research analyst	867.12
Helen C. Hitz	Assistant clerk	4,751.05
Norman Leonard Holmes.	Assistant counsel	1,458.80
Janice L. Johnson	Secretary	4,227.34
Robert Murray Kendrick.	Assistant clerk	1,314.40
Stephen D. Kennedy	Research analyst	1,026.16
Gerald Richard McMurray.	do	3,369.29
Bruce Edward Mason	Assistant clerk	1,463.84
Constance D. Mellinger.	Secretary	2,102.80
Mildred S. Mitchell	Assistant clerk	4,501.59
Jonas V. Morris	Professional staff member.	2,750.36
Margaret L. Rayhawk	Research secretary	3,174.31
Carolyn Virginia Thomas.	Secretary	1,032.67
William E. Turner, Jr.	Staff investigator	1,760.41
James Weighart	Professional staff member.	6,333.62
Total		59,253.00

H. Res. 134	$225,000.00
H. Res. 517	60,000.00
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	285,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	70,054.80
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	68,782.44
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1965	138,837.24
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	146,162.76

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

JANUARY 10, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John E. Barriere	Staff director	$3,824.20
Kenneth W. Burrows	Housing economist	11,539.59
Richard K. Cook	Minority staff investigator.	8,932.83
Mary M. Edwards	Consultant	$5,232.31
Casey Ireland	Minority staff member.	10,343.00
Margaret J. Leary	Secretary	4,769.81
John J. McEwan, Jr.	Deputy staff director.	11,679.12
Wilhelmina C. Proctor.	Secretary	2,173.48
Alicia F. Shoemaker	do	3,349.92
Patricia A. Taylor	Assistant clerk	2,196.93
Margaret E. Tucker	Secretary	3,713.00
Doris M. Young	Assistant clerk	4,690.47
Total		72,444.66

H. Res. 247	$150,000
H. Res. 516	97,000
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	247,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	[1] 76,263.63
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	74,801.63
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1965	151,065.26
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	95,934.74

[1] Revised figure.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JANUARY 15, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hayden S. Garber	Counsel (P), standing committee.	$10,480.35
Clayton D. Gasque	Staff director (P), standing committee.	8,321.55
Donald J. Tubridy	Minority clerk (P), standing committee.	7,586.79
Leonard O. Hilder	Investigator (P), standing committee.	7,476.24
James T. Clark	Clerk (C), standing committee.	11,679.12
Ellen M. Coxeter	Assistant clerk (C), standing committee.	5,108.04
Jean Quarles	do	4,519.86
Peggy L. Thornton	do	4,446.69
H. E. Yarborough III	do	3,055.77
Lois Marion Rivers	Clerk typist (C), standing committee.	3,055.77
Total		65,730.18

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	1,839.87
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1965	1,839.87
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	[1] 10,089.49

[1] Additional clerical stenographic and typing assistance amounting to $10,089.49 in connection with committee work under investigating committee funds.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

JANUARY 15, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louise Maxienne Dargans.	Chief clerk	$12,470.46
Russell C. Derrickson.	Staff director	12,470.46
Grace L. Hewell	Chief of education	12,470.46
Leon Abramson	Chief counsel for labor management.	11,740.53
C. Sumner Stone, Jr.	Special assistant to the chairman.	12,470.46
Donald Louis Anderson.	Counsel (Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1965).	3,454.09
Odell Clark	Chief investigator	8,814.75
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant (July 1 to Sept. 30, 1965).	2,750.79
Corrine Annette Huff.	Secretary	7,231.63
Minority:		
Michael J. Bernstein.	Counsel for education and labor.	12,470.46
Charles W. Radcliffe.	Special counsel for education.	9,825.51

Amount of expenditures previously reported	$94,811.76
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	106,169.60
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	200,981.36

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

INVESTIGATIVE STAFF

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Goldie A. Baldwin	Administrative assistant.	$3,627.42
Donald F. Berens	do	5,600.59
Richard J. Coffey	Assistant counsel for labor management (Aug. 31, 1965).	1,686.66
James B. Freeman	Assistant chief investigator (July 31, 1965).	503.23
Walter James Graham, Jr.	Secretary	4,373.58
Walter B. Huber, Jr.	Clerk-typist (July 1, to Oct. 31 and Dec. 3 to Dec. 31, 1965).	2,188.51
Janet R. Inscore	Secretary (from Sep. 20, 1965).	1,738.34
Ridgely Jones	Administrative assistant (from July 1, to Aug. 31, 1965.)	1,408.14
John R. Kramer	Assistant chief of education (from July 12, 1965).	5,985.92
Cleomine B. Lewis	Secretary	4,087.17
Betty D. Nixon	Secretary (from Sep. 1, 1965).	2,228.23
Francine Nord	Secretary	3,348.96
Olivia F. Reid	Administrative assistant (from July 6, to Sept. 24, 1965).	2,019.58
John D. Schuyler	Counsel	7,387.38
Mary L. Shuler	Secretary	4,330.93
Mary Ellen Terziu	Secretary (to Aug. 31, 1965).	1,205.56
Jeanne E. Thomson	Administrative assistant.	5,600.59
E. Pamela Williams	Assistant clerk (from Aug. 1 to 31, 1965).	325.18
John Everett Warren	Assistant clerk	2,138.79
Theresa M. Zapert	Secretary	3,826.71

INVESTIGATIVE STAFF—continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Minority:		
Louise W. Finke	Secretary (from Aug. 1 to Sept. 30, 1965).	$1,096.58
Crawford C. Heerlein.	Administrative assistant (to Nov. 30, 1965).	6,355.07
Will Henderson	Assistant clerk (to Aug. 31, 1965).	1,006.46
Alice R. Hipsley	Research assistant (from Sept. 1 to 30, 1965).	77.97
Ruth Giles Macknet.	Secretary (to Sept. 30, 1965).	1,964.81
Delores Y. Tillman	Secretary (to July 9, 1965).	187.95

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$180,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	71,560.52
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	87,696.53
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1965	159,257.05
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	20,742.95

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 1, REPRESENTATIVE CARL D. PERKINS, CHAIRMAN

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Elizabeth A. Cornett	Clerk	$4,044.12
Eileen Bailiff O'Haver.	Assistant clerk	760.80
Hartwell Duvall Reed, Jr.	Counsel	10,735,25

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	13,167.53
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	15,985.67
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1965	29,153.20
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	5,846.80

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 2, REPRESENTATIVE JAMES ROOSEVELT, CHAIRMAN, JAN. 3, TO OCT. 20, 1965; REPRESENTATIVE ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, CHAIRMAN, OCT. 21, TO DEC. 31, 1965

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Adrienne Fields	Clerk (to Nov. 30, 1965).	$3,889.41
Jay H. Foreman	Counsel	7,378.94
Carol A. Weiss	Assistant clerk (to Aug. 21, 1965).	299.06
Jon C. Bednerik	Research assistant (from July 1 to July 31, 1965).	251.06
Miriam K. Carliner	Staff assistant (from Oct. 20, 1965).	1,536.11
Mertis A. Southerland.	Assistant clerk (from Nov. 1, 1965).	664.24
Ardyce E. Harrison	Clerk (from Dec. 1 to Dec. 31, 1965).	434.08

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	11,621.45
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	15,034.47
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 1965	26,655.92
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	8,344.08

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 3, REPRESENTATIVE EDITH GREEN, CHAIRMAN

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Barbara A. Deiss	Secretary	$3,807.33
William F. Gaul	Counsel	8,435.31
Linda Sullivan	Clerk	2,633.76
Charles P. Tobin	Assistant clerk (to Aug. 31. 1965).	1,006.46

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	12,024.30
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1965	16,780.74
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, to Dec. 31, 1965	28,805.04
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	6,194.96

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 5, REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk	$10,471.02
Lelia W. Troup	Secretary	2,684.25
Dale Burnham	Assistant clerk (to Aug. 22, 1965).	376.39
Andrew Moore Williamson.	Assistant clerk (to Aug. 15, 1965).	575.89
Anne G. Thompson	Assistant clerk (to Aug. 31, 1965).	783.74
Daniel H. Pollitt	Special counsel (to July 31, 1965; from Sept. 1, 1965).	4,669.35

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	12,136.55
Amount expected from July 1 to Dec. 31 1965	20,202.82
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1965	32,339.37
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	2,660.63

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 5, REPRESENTATIVE JOHN H. DENT, CHAIRMAN

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
A. R. Kelley	Assistant clerk	$2,227.03
Eleanor Carson Keown.	Clerk	3,725.85
Robert E. Vagley	Director	7,310.55
Lynn C. Myers	Assistant clerk (to Aug. 31, 1965).	607.26
Carol A. Weiss	Assistant clerk (to Aug. 21, 1965).	299.06
Patti L. Noble	Assistant clerk (from Sept. 1 to Oct. 31, 1965).	652.68

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	13,180.66
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	15,763.09
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1965	28,943.75
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	6,056.25

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 6, REPRESENTATIVE ELMER J. HOLLAND, CHAIRMAN

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert E. L. Knight	Director (to Oct. 4, 1965).	$3,917.45
Susan M. Parry	Clerk	3,652.35
William A. Hoveland, Jr.	do	621.12

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 6, REPRESENTATIVE ELMER J. HOLLAND, CHAIRMAN—continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
James B. Harrison	Assistant director (from Aug. 21, 1965).	$5,552.78
Austin F. Rinella, Jr.	Assistant clerk (from Oct. 2, 1965).	385.40
Joseph Carl Gerson	Assistant clerk (from Sept. 16, 1965).	208.85

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	11,573.40
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	15,821.77
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1965	27,395.17
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	7,604.83

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON POVERTY NO. 7, REPRESENTATIVE ADAM C. POWELL, CHAIRMAN

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Donald Louis Anderson.	Counsel	$2,750.79
Loretta A. Barnett	Secretary	2,309.31
Wellington C. Beal	Investigator (from Sept. 21, 1965).	4,248.26
Garrett H. Byrne, Jr.	Chief investigator for accounts and financial records (from Sept. 21, 1965).	4,302.53
Richard P. Crane, Jr.	Legal analyst and investigator (from Nov. 15, 1965).	1,278.89
I. T. Creswell, Jr	Investigator (from Sept. 2, 1965).	2,783.42
Lloyd J. Elliott	Staff economist (from Dec. 1, 1965).	1,250.26
Dorothy W. Himes	Administrative assistant.	4,886.64
Virginia Randolph Hoffman.	Secretary (from Sept. 15, to Nov. 30, 1965).	927.35
Malcolm R. LaPlace	Assistant director for public information (from Nov. 1, 1965).	2,182.58
James E. McCarthy	Investigator (from Sept. 10, 1965).	4,760.96
Juliet G. McCoy	Secretary (from Sept. 1, 1965).	2,427.49
Phyllis A. Mann	Secretary (from Nov. 18, 1965).	1,038.11
Helen B. Prillaman	Secretary (from Sept. 8, 1965).	2,289.61
James B. Robinson	Staff assistant (from Sept. 1, 1965).	2,055.19
Michael Schwartz	Assistant counsel	5,600.59
Gregory M. Sullivan	Investigator	1,624.21
Emma T. Swann	Receptionist	3,348.96
Warren L. Wilson	Investigator (from Sept. 9, 1965).	2,884.69
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant (from Oct. 1, 1965).	2,849.80
Minority:		
Dixie Ann Barger	Secretary (from December 1, 1965).	667.50
John R. Buckley	Chief of Staff for minority (from September 22, 1965).	5,112.77
Louise W. Finke	Secretary (from October 1, 1965).	1,704.09
Patricia A. Goldman.	Consultant	3,854.11
Crawford C. Heerlein.	Administrative assistant (from December 1, 1965).	1,298.08
Will Henderson	Assistant clerk (from September 1, 1965).	2,067.26
Alice R. Hipsley	Research assistant (from October 1 to November 30, 1965).	161.56
Minority—Continued		
Edmund La Claire	Secretary (from September 21 to November 30, 1965).	$1,203.36
Ruth Giles Macknet.	Secretary (from October 1, 1965).	2,079.72
James J. Ryan	Investigator (from December 1, 1965).	1,149.92
William N. Stoltze	Investigator (from September 23 to November 30, 1965).	2,144.38

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$250,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	15,836.55
Amount expended from July 1 to December 31, 1965	91,961.46
Total amount expended from January 3, 1965 to December 31, 1965	107,798.01
Balance unexpended as of December 31, 1965	142,201.99

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JANUARY 12, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator	$12,470.46
Roy J. Bullock	Senior staff consultant.	12,470.46
Albert C. F. Westphal.	Staff consultant	12,470.46
Franklin J. Schupp	do	11,939.43
Robert F. Brandt	do	11,818.68
Harry C. Cromer	do	11,708.19
Philip B. Billings	do	9,180.24
Marian A. Czarnecki	do	11,679.12
Melvin O. Benson	do	10,039.95
June Nigh	Senior staff assistant.	8,960.94
Helen C. Mattas	Staff assistant	7,553.64
Helen L. Hashagen	do	7,393.32
Mary Louise O'Brien	do	7,214.22
Mary M. Lalos	do	4,923.54
Doris B. McCracken	do	6,016.26
Jean E. Smith	do	3,905.22
Robert J. Bowen	Clerical assistant	4,781.95

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$118,250.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	33,679.76
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	37,368.79
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	71,048.55
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	47,201.45

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JANUARY 10, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Expenses, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965:	
Full committee	$882.34
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee	39,671.37
Military Operations Subcommittee	48,211.94
Government Activities Subcommittee	26,519.12
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee	43,589.13
Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee	41,555.94
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee	53,064.82
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee	29,785.84
Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee	35,651.15
Special Subcommittee on Donable Property	11,998.00
Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy	25.25
Total	330,954.90

SALARIES, FULL COMMITTEE, JULY 1 TO DEC. 31, 1965

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Christine Ray Davis	Staff director	$12,470.46
James A. Lanigan	General counsel	12,470.46
Miles Q. Romney	Associate general counsel.	10,480.35
Earle J. Wade	Staff member	8,304.81
Dolores L. Fel'Dotto	do	5,445.48
Ann E. McLachlan	do	5,335.56
Patricia M. Maheux	do	5,335.56
Charlotte C. Bickett	do	4,855.92
J. Philip Carlson	Minority counsel	9,553.29
Raymond T. Collins	Minority staff member.	8,304.81

EXPENSES, FULL COMMITTEE, JULY 1 TO DEC. 31, 1965

Travel, publications, telephone, stationery, supplies, etc	$882.34

EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE (HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, CHAIRMAN)

Elmer W. Henderson	Counsel	$10,896.75
Louis I. Freed	Investigator	9,292.41
Peter S. Barash	Assistant counsel (legal assistant).	5,108.04
Francis J. Schwoerer	Staff member	6,182.40
Veronica B. Johnson	Clerk	4,855.92
John L. Dodson	Clerical staff	2,737.11
Expenses		598.74
Total		39,671.37

MILITARY OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (HON. CHET HOLIFIELD, CHAIRMAN)

Herbert Roback	Staff administrator	$12,470.46
John Paul Ridgely	Investigator	7,192.35
Douglas G. Dahlin	Staff attorney	6,852.30
Daniel W. Fulmer	do	6,016.26
Robert J. McElroy	Investigator	5,519.91
Catherine L. Koeberlein.	Research assistant	5,200.29
Mollie Jo Hughes	Clerk-stenographer	4,855.92
Expenses		104.45
Total		48,211.94

GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES SUBCOMMITTEE (HON. JACK BROOKS, CHAIRMAN)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ernest Cornish Baynard.	Staff administrator	$10,480.35
William M. Jones	Counsel	5,095.74
Irma Reel	Clerk	4,855.92
Lynne Higginbotham	Clerk-stenographer	4,422.33
William David Allred	Research assistant (July 1 to Aug. 15, 1965).	1,171.36
Roland J. Williams	Investigator (July 1-5, 1965)	122.83
Expenses		370.59
Total		26,519.12

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN, CHAIRMAN)

James R. Naughton	Counsel	$10,079.97
Delphis C. Goldberg	Professional staff member.	10,079.97
George O. Serini	Investigator	7,553.64
William Donald Gray	Research analyst	6,852.30
Bebe B. Terry	Clerk-stenographer	4,568.61
Lexine Rollins	do	3,899.16
Expenses		555.48
Total		43,589.13

NATURAL RESOURCES AND POWER SUBCOMMITTEE (HON. ROBERT E. JONES, CHAIRMAN)

Phineas Indritz	Counsel	$10,480.35
Harry V. Lerner	Assistant counsel	8,668.53
William Earl Rasco	Professional staff member.	6,016.26
Catherine L. Hartke	Stenographer	4,855.92
Josephine Scheiber	Research analyst	4,855.92
Francine Shacter	Clerk-stenographer	3,899.16
Richard P. Crane, Jr.	Legal analyst (July 1 to Nov. 14, 1965).	2,477.76
Expenses		302.04
Total		41,555.94

FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE (HON. JOHN E. MOSS, CHAIRMAN)

Vincent J. Augliere	Chief, foreign operations.	$10,480.35
Samuel J. Archibald	Chief, government information.	10,480.35
David Glick	Chief counsel	9,530.61
Jack Matteson	Chief investigator	8,955.30
Johan T. Benson	Investigator (Nov. 1 to Dec. 31, 1965).	1,657.68
Betty W. Baldwin	Secretary (July 15 to Dec. 31, 1965).	3,294.53
Elizabeth Jayne Bodecker.	Secretary	3,464.40
Benny L. Kass	Assistant counsel (July 1 to Oct. 31, 1965).	3,786.82
Glenna G. Donat	Secretary (July 1-31, 1965).	680.12
Expenses		734.66
Total		53,064.82

LEGAL AND MONETARY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE (HON DANTE B. FASCELL, CHAIRMAN)

M. Joseph Matan	Staff administrator	$10,079.97
Charles Rothenberg	Counsel	9,292.41
Clara Katherine Armstrong.	Clerical staff	4,688.00
Millicent Y. Myers	Stenographer	4,446.69
Herbert Lee Goldblatt.	Clerical staff (July 1 to Aug. 31, 1965).	684.10
Expenses		594.67
Total		29,785.84

RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL PROGRAMS SUBCOMMITTEE (HON. HENRY S. REUSS, CHAIRMAN)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Edna Gass	Staff administrator	$9,163.38
Jonas V. Morris	Chief consultant (Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1965).	4,274.07
Harry L. Selden	Consultant	4,867.68
John Handley Betz	Counsel	5,854.95
Royce W. Riehlman	Investigator	5,095.74
Catherine S. Cash	Secretary	3,313.05
Carol Flanagan	Secretary (Aug. 9 to Dec. 31, 1965).	2,422.07
Betty W. Baldwin	Clerk-stenographer (July 1-14, 1965).	272.53
Expenses		387.68
Total		35,651.15

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON DONABLE PROPERTY (HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN, CHAIRMAN)

Norman G. Cornish	Staff administrator	$7,636.53
Mabel C. Baker	Stenographer	4,330.92
Expenses		30.55
Total		11,998.00

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVASION OF PRIVACY (HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, CHAIRMAN)

Expenses (total)		$25.25

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 109, 89th Cong.)	$650,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	313,715.94
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1965	313,715.94
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	330,954.90
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	5,329.16

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JANUARY 14, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julian P. Langston	Chief clerk	$12,379.11
Marjorie Savage	Assistant clerk	9,825.51
David S. Wolman	do	9,825.51
Louis Silverman	do	6,672.93
Gurney S. Jaynes	do	3,444.39
Vivian M. Robinson	do	2,790.66
Mary F. Stolle	do	767.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$5,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	305.50
Amount expended from July 1, 1965, to Dec. 31, 1965	453.77
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1965 to Dec. 31, 1965	759.27
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	4,240.73

OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

JANUARY 13, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Sidney L. McFarland	Professional staff director and engineering consultant.	$11,715.48
T. Richard Witmer	Counsel and consultant on national parks and recreation.	11,243.67
John L. Taylor	Consultant on territorial and Indian affairs.	11,243.67
Milton A. Pearl	Consultant on mining, minerals, and public lands (resigned Aug. 1).	1,850.31
William L. Shafer	Consultant on mining, minerals, and public lands (from Aug. 15).	7,780.87
Nancy J. Arnold	Chief clerk	9,942.00
Dixie S. Barton	Clerk	5,194.11
Patricia Ann Murray	do	5,194.11
Virginia E. Bedsole	do	4,954.32
Patricia B. Freeman	do	4,580.76
Susan A. Whitener	do	4,300.44
Salaries paid pursuant to H. Res. 137, 89th Cong.		
Charles Leppert, Jr.	Assistant counsel	6,433.92
Lee McElvain	Assistant counsel (from Sept. 1).	3,464.40
Kathleen Vance	Clerk	3,681.78
Edward Gaddis	Messenger	2,816.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	9,951.10
Amount expended from July 1, 1965, to Dec. 31, 1965	45,156.87
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1965, to Dec. 31, 1965	55,107.97
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	19,892.03

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JANUARY 3, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
W. E. Williamson	Clerk	$12,470.46
Kenneth J. Painter	1st assistant clerk	9,451.20
Marcella Fencl	Assistant clerk	5,606.79

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff—Con.		
Glenn L. Johnson	Printing editor	$7,807.92
Joanne C. Neuland	Clerical assistant	4,629.54
Mildred H. Lang	do	4,629.54
Mary Ryan	do	4,629.54
Elsie M. Karpowich	do	4,629.54
Edwin Earl Thomas	Staff assistant	4,044.12
Marion M. Burson	Staff assistant (minority).	10,148.61
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson	Professional staff coordinator.	12,470.46
Kurt Borchardt	Legal counsel	1,388.72
William J. Dixon	Professional staff member.	11,962.83
James M. Menger	do	11,962.83
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 35 and H. Res. 235:		
Constance Jane Freeman.	Clerical assistant (to Aug. 31, 1965).	796.10
Edwin Benjamin Keith, Jr.	Messenger (from July 1–31, 1965).	380.40
James Edward Harris.	do	380.40
Randy Hardin	Messenger (from Aug. 1–31, 1965).	380.40
Chris McRae	do	380.40
Charles L. Honey, Jr.	Staff assistant	7,686.30
P. Wallace Whiteaker.	do	6,138.60
Lewis E. Berry, Jr	Minority counsel	11,869.93
Helen M. Dubino	Staff assistant (minority).	9,179.24
Peggy C. Cooke	Clerical assistant (minority) (to Nov. 30, 1965).	3,057.30
Barbara L. Bullard	Clerical assistant (minority) (from Nov. 22, 1965).	820.86
Lola LeMieux	Clerical assistant (minority).	3,405.45
Special Subcommittee on investigations:		
Herman C. Beasley	Research attorney (from Sept. 1, 1965, retired civil service annuitant).	3,054.47
Jonathan W. Sloat	Special counsel (from July 12, 1965).	10,975.86
Daniel J. Manelli	Staff attorney	6,416.04
Edmund M. Sciullo	do	6,416.04
James R. Connor	Staff assistant	6,416.04
Sanford L. Mervis	Attorney	7,686.30
Linda E. Spirt	Clerk-stenographer	3,669.69
Elizabeth G. Paola	Clerical assistant	4,629.54
Victoria Williams	do	4,263.87
Catherine C. McLees.	do	4,629.54
Sally Ann McCaffrey.	Clerical assistant (from Sept. 7, 1965).	1,667.80

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$262,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	85,047.00
Amount expended from July 1, 1965, to Dec. 31, 1965	106,819.75
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1965, to Dec. 31, 1965	191,866.75
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	70,133.25

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JANUARY 14, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick	Staff director	$12,470.46
William R. Foley	General counsel	12,470.46
Murray Drabkin	Counsel (through Dec. 13, 1965).	11,271.87
Stuart H. Johnson, Jr.	Counsel (through Oct. 31, 1965).	7,436.77
Garner J. Cline	Counsel	8,623.53
Martin R. Hoffmann	Associate counsel	5,693.64
Benjamin L. Zelenko	Counsel (as of Nov. 1, 1965).	3,171.48
Carrie Lou Allen	Clerical staff	5,347.86
Lorraine W. Beland	do	5,101.89
Anne J. Berger	Clerical staff (through Nov. 30, 1965).	6,410.13
Gertrude C. Burak	Clerical staff	5,644.02
Jane C. Caldwell	do	6,016.26
Frances F. Christy	do	6,852.30

SALARIES PAID PURSUANT TO H. RES. 19 AND H. RES. 88, 89TH CONG.

Appel, Leonard	Assistant counsel	$9,598.65
Beatson, Robert J	Legislative assistant (as of Aug. 23, 1965).	4,378.64
Benn, Donald G	Associate counsel	7,060.80
Breslow, Jerome W	Assistant counsel (as of Oct. 1, 1965).	3,120.39
Cors, Allan D	Deputy associate counsel.	5,298.63
Eisenberg, Roberta E.	Clerical	4,690.47
Haardt, Alma B	do	4,324.83
Harkins, Kenneth R.	Chief counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee.	11,679.12
Hunter, Jane Ward	Clerical (as of Oct. 11, 1965).	1,390.25
James, Raymond J	do	2,539.72
Jett, R. Frederick	Counsel	9,598.65
Kelemonick, Michael	Clerical	4,568.61
Lee, Charles R	Messenger	3,289.15
McGrady, Florence T.	Clerical	4,044.12
McGrath, James P	Clerical (as of Oct. 1, 1965).	2,057.82
Marcus, Philip	Associate counsel (through Oct. 31, 1965).	7,009.73
Martz, Uzal H., Jr	Legislative assistant (as of Sept. 14, 1965).	4,287.44
Meekins, Elizabeth G.	Clerical	4,690.47
Resweber, Harold J., Jr.	Clerical (as of Oct. 1, 1965).	1,453.61
Shattuck, Patricia H.	Clerical	4,044.12
Sourwine, Mary G	do	3,529.70
Sutherland, David A.	Counsel (as of Oct. 1, 1965).	5,178.57
Zeifman, Jerome M	do	4,146.39
Zelenko, Benjamin L.	Counsel (through Oct. 31, 1965).	6,094.74

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$250,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	95,537.96
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	122,908.76
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1965	218,446.72
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	31,553.28

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE TAXATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE, SALARIES PAID PURSUANT TO H. RES. 123, 89TH CONG.[1]

Baskir, Lawrence M.	Counsel (through July 3, 1965).	$71.70
Breslow, Jerome W	Assistant counsel	3,011.97
Cohen, Felice Davis	Counsel (through July 16, 1965).	382.42
Cooley, Alford W	Clerical (through July 25, 1965).	502.32
Faircloth, John W. F.	Counsel (through July 31, 1965).	1,252.06
James, Raymond K	Clerical	2,451.48
McGrath, James P	do	1,986.30
Resweber, Harold J., Jr.	do	1,288.48
Sutherland, David A.	Counsel	4,998.63
Zeifman, Jerome M	do	4,002.30

[1] As of Oct. 1, 1965, salaries transferred to H. Res. 19 and H. Res. 88, 89th Cong.

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditures	$90,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	65,160.19
Amount expended from July 1 through Dec. 31, 1965	24,839.27
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 through Dec. 31, 1965	89,999.46
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	.54

FUNDS FOR PREPARATION OF UNITED STATES CODE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS

A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1965	$115,477.62
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	57,507.32
Balance Dec. 31, 1965	57,970.30
B. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code:	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1965	64,137.13
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	23,175.99
Balance Dec. 31, 1965	40,961.14
C. Revision of the laws 1966:	
Legislative Appropriation Act, 1966	27,000.00
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	12,520.46
Balance Dec. 31, 1965	14,479.54

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

DECEMBER 31, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry	Chief counsel	$12,470.46
Bernard J. Zincke	Counsel	11,818.68
Ned P. Everett	Assistant counsel	10,182.93
Arthur Pankopf, Jr	Minority counsel	8,437.47
W. B. Winfield	Chief clerk	11,742.34
Frances P. Still	Assistant clerk	6,218.85
Ruth A. Brookshire	do	4,855.92
Edith W. Gordon	Secretary	4,855.92
Vera A. Barker	do	4,885.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	10,895.55
Amount expended from July 1, 1965, to Dec. 31, 1965	15,144.63
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1965, to Dec. 31, 1965	26,040.18
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	23,959.82

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

JANUARY 15, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive,

together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

STANDING COMMITTEE STAFF

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles E. Johnson	Staff director	$12,470.46
B. Benton Bray	Associate staff director.	12,197.37
John H. Martiny	Counsel	12,197.37
William A. Irvine	Assistant staff director.	12,197.37
Lillian H. Hanninen	Assistant clerk	6,672.93
John B. Price	do	5,519.91
Lucy K. Daley	do	5,519.91
Elsie E. Thornton	Secretary	5,347.86
Barbara M. Wells	do	5,101.89
Blanche M. Simons	do	4,917.42

INVESTIGATIVE STAFF, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 245 AND 246, 89TH CONG., 1ST SESS.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Barton, Richard	Staff assistant	$5,501.30
Bates, Kathryn E	Secretary	3,914.94
Berner, Joan H	Stenographer	4,324.83
Blewett, Arlene	Clerk-typist (from Sept. 29, 1965).	407.93
Bova, Joyce C	Clerk-stenographer	3,055.77
Carlson, Geraldine N.	Clerk-typist (from Dec. 16, 1965).	250.01
Carroll, Patricia G	Staff assistant	5,501.30
Devlin, Ralph J	Staff member	7,382.27
Green, Thelma R	Stenographer	4,324.83
Kazy, Theodore James.	Staff assistant	7,176.85
Keating, Michael M	do	3,567.06
Kennedy, Thomas R.	Staff assistant (from Aug. 1, 1965).	4,600.63
MacKay, John W	Staff assistant	5,501.30
Mann, Lawrence	Staff assistant (from Aug. 1, 1965).	4,600.63
Monahan, Jean	Clerk-stenographer	3,669.69
Olian, Victoria L	Stenographer (summer employee).	801.38
Olsen, Margaret Rae	do	1,300.68
Pendleton, Maria R	Stenographer	4,446.69
Peters, Dorothy L	do	3,778.02
Powell, John William	Staff assistant	4,197.76
Richards, James Walsh	do	3,055.77
Schwartz, Harold Alan	Legal intern (summer employee).	734.60
Simons, Jennifer	Clerk-typist (summer employee).	454.35
Snipes, Justine P	Stenographer	4,690.47
Tansill, Helen C	do	2,522.77
Ward, Ella R	Staff assistant	5,501.30
Young, Richard E	Staff assistant (from July 6, summer employee).	499.79

INVESTIGATIVE STAFF, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 595 AND 511, 89TH CONG., 1ST SESS.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Mode, Douglas G	Associate counsel	$788.18

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$175,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	45,244.65
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	102,173.59
Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to Dec. 31	147,418.24
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	27,581.76

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JANUARY 14, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

STANDING COMMITTEE

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Edward J. McNeal	Staff director (through Sept. 30).	$5,736.30
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	11,679.12
Joseph R. Brennan	Engineer-consultant.	11,679.12
Clifton W. Enfield	Minority counsel	11,504.67
Stephen V. Feeley	Subcommittee clerk.	7,918.47
Audrey G. Warren	do	6,016.26
Helen A. Thompson	Staff assistant	8,026.05
Dorothy A. Beam	do	6,786.00
Meriam R. Buckley	do	4,592.97
Sterlyn B. Carroll	do	4,507.65

INVESTIGATING STAFF—SALARIES PAID JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1965, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 142 AND H. RES. 514, 89TH CONG. 1ST SESS.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Maurice B. Tobin	Subcommittee clerk.	$7,653.15
John A. O'Connor, Jr.	do	6,016.26
Augusta B. Peters	do	6,016.26
Robert F. Spence	do	6,016.26
Marina M. Gentilini	Staff assistant	3,971.67
Anne C. Kennedy	do	3,693.87
Harvey C. Simms, Jr.	Staff assistant (through Aug. 31).	693.62
Erla S. Youmans	Minority staff assistant.	5,557.17
Randal C. Teague	do	4,587.00
Gerard F. Schiappa	do	3,567.06
Mary Ann Hodges	do	3,055.77

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:	
H. Res. 142	$150,000.00
H. Res. 514	115,000.00
Total	265,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	53,421.49
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	56,623.11
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	110,044.60
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	154,955.40

GEORGE A. FALLON,
Chairman.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Walter R. May	Chief counsel	$11,679.12
John P. Constandy	Assistant chief counsel.	10,827.54
Robert L. May	Minority counsel	10,752.57
George H. Martin	Administrative assistant.	9,734.76
Salvatore J. D'Amico	Associate counsel	8,210.05
John P. O'Hara	do	8,210.05
Carl J. Lorenz, Jr	do	7,503.87
Robert G. Lawrence	do	7,168.48
George M. Kopecky	Chief investigator	10,228.69
Sherman S. Willse	Professional staff member.	8,210.05
Richard A. Cordasco	do	7,647.59
James P. Boyd, Jr	Professional staff member (as of Aug. 15).	5,815.46
Paul R. S. Yates	Minority professional staff member.	8,065.07
Kathryn M. Keeney	Chief clerk	5,445.49
Stuart M. Harrison	Staff assistant	6,113.55
Mildred E. Rupert	do	4,452.80
Agnes M. GaNun	do	4,300.45
Shirley R. Knighten	do	3,669.69
Sylvia Reppert	Minority staff assistant member.	4,221.24

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:	
H. Res. 142	$300,000.00
H. Res. 514	15,000.00
Total	315,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	$154,839.88
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	151,442.76
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	306,282.64
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	8,717.36

GEORGE A. FALLON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JANUARY 12, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
T. M. Carruthers	Counsel, standing committee (P).	$8,544.54
Mary Spencer Forrest	Assistant counsel (P).	6,350.40
Robert D. Hynes, Jr.	Minority counsel (P).	6,350.40
James Collins Adkins	Staff assistant (Oct. 1, 1965, to Oct. 31, 1965).	557.88

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

JANUARY 12, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles F. Ducander	Executive director and chief counsel.	$12,470.46
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.	Chief clerk and counsel.	11,679.12
Philip B. Yeager	Counsel	11,679.12
W. H. Boone	Chief technical consultant.	11,542.04
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.	Counsel	11,107.37
Mary Ann Robert	Secretary	4,825.20
Emily F. Dodson	do	4,617.36
Carol F. Rodgers	do	4,501.59
June C. Stafford	do	4,501.59
Elizabeth M. Fleming	Secretary (to Sept. 15, 1965).	1,842.50
Virginia Robison	Secretary	4,221.24
Investigations Subcommittee:		
Richard P. Hines	Staff consultant	10,792.91
James E. Wilson, Jr.	Technical consultant.	10,645.61
Peter A. Gerardi	do	10,645.61
Harold A. Gould	Technical consultant (from Sept. 1, 1965).	6,956.28
Philip P. Dickinson	Technical consultant.	9,163.38
Katherine V. Flanigan	Assistant clerk	6,323.89
Joseph M. Felton	Assistant counsel	5,600.58

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frank J. Giroux	Printing clerk	$5,594.37
Elizabeth S. Kernan	Scientific research assistant.	5,445.48
Denis C. Quigley	Publications clerk	3,820.68
Helen A. Thomas	Secretary (Sept. 29 through Nov. 30).	1,069.59
Kieran U. Cashman	Secretary (from Dec. 1).	584.53
Francis Shea	Clerical assistant (July and August).	600.58

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$250,000.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	99,471.54
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	189,938.65
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	60,061.35

George Miller,
Chairman.

Committee on Un-American Activities

January 13, 1966.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

STANDING COMMITTEE

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hitz, William	General counsel	$12,470.46
McNamara, Francis J	Staff director	11,376.75
Appell, Donald T	Chief investigator	9,695.04
Wheeler, William A	Investigator	9,067.77
Turner, Anne D	Chief of reference and files.	7,137.51
Joray, Juliette P	Recording clerk	7,082.73
Purdy, Rosella A	Secretary to general counsel (retired Nov. 30, 1965).	4,769.15
Gittings, Helen M	Research analyst	5,954.25
Nagel, Isabel B	Secretary to counsel	4,690.47
Veley, Lorraine N	Secretary to investigators.	4,446.69

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE (H. RES. 188)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Baldwin, Beatrice P	Clerk-typist	$3,169.44
Berman, Ellen Sue	Clerk-typist (transferred from H. Res. 310, Nov. 1, 1965).	913.93
Buglio, Theresa J	Clerk-typist	2,784.51
Burke, Gerard F	Clerk-typist (resigned Sept. 7, 1965).	1,116.44
Butler, Daniel	Clerk-typist	3,085.69
Butler, Eve C	Clerk-stenographer (transferred from H. Res. 310 on Nov. 1, 1965).	1,054.61
Collins, William R	Editor	4,501.59
Cunningham, Anniel	Information analyst	4,862.08
Curll, Jean W	Secretary to staff director.	4,087.17
Doyle, Florence B	Clerk-typist	2,327.52
Edinger, Elizabeth L	Editor	5,108.05
Ellsweig, Rochelle J	Clerk-typist	2,227.03
Fournet, Adrienne B	Clerk-typist (terminated Aug. 31, 1965).	847.70
Francis, Emily R	Information analyst	3,235.29
Gaffney, Metje	Clerk-typist	2,327.52
Gallagher, James L	Research analyst	5,730.90
Holton, Katherine R	Research clerk	3,289.15
Huber, Walter B	Consultant	9,180.25

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE (H. RES. 188)—continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
James, Mildred	Clerk-typist (appointed Sept. 13, 1965).	$1,351.96
Joyner, June	Clerk-typist (terminated Dec. 31, 1965).	2,121.99
Kelly, M. Patricia	Research analyst	3,875.04
McConnon, B. R., Jr	Investigator	6,113.55
McCroskey, David H	Clerk-typist (resigned Dec. 31, 1965).	2,464.34
McLaughlin, Carol E	Clerk-typist	2,370.31
Manuel, Philip R	Investigator	6,113.55
Masumian, Alberta	Secretary	5,347.86
Montelaro, James	Clerk-typist (appointed Sept. 20, 1965).	1,602.17
Monts, Esther L	Clerk-stenographer (resigned Aug. 31, 1965).	1,221.38
Mouton, J. Camille	Clerk-typist (resigned Aug. 31, 1965).	847.70
Muffley, David E., Jr.	Clerk-typist	3,408.81
Nittle, Alfred M	Counsel	9,337.78
Pfaff, Alma T	Research analyst	3,567.06
Phillips, Katherine	Switchboard operator.	3,019.86
Poole, William	Clerk-typist (appointed Sept. 1, 1965).	1,741.18
Randolph, Josephine S.	Research clerk	3,778.41
Rappaport, Toby	Clerk-typist (transferred from H. Res. 310 on Jan. 11, 1965).	913.93
Rector, Lynne M	Clerk-stenographer	2,291.12
Romerstein, Herbert	Investigator	3,442.23
Rosas, Doris E	Secretary to chairman, investigating (transferred from H. Res. 310 on Jan. 11, 1965).	1,410.57
Russell, Louis J	Investigator	7,301.92
Salathe, Doris R	Information analyst	2,942.10
Stiles, Lela Mae	do	3,609.33
Sweany, Donald I., Jr	Research analyst	5,519.91
Sweeny, Barbara C	Clerk-stenographer	3,055.77
Valente, Mary Myers	Administrative secretary.	5,854.95
Vernor, Dorothy	Clerk-stenographer	3,319.04
Voultsides, Carol	Clerk-typist (transferred from H. Res. 310 on Jan. 11, 1965).	913.93
Walton, Stanley F	Clerk-typist (resigned Aug. 31, 1965).	806.92
Weber, Stephen J	Clerk-typist (terminated Aug. 31, 1965).	847.70
Wetterman, Neil E	Investigator	6,119.85
Wheeler, Billie	Clerk-stenographer	2,323.47

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$370,000.00
Amount or expenditures previously reported	158,889.15
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	191,869.34
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, to Dec. 31, 1965	350,758.49
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	19,241.51

E. E. Willis,
Chairman.

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE (H. RES. 310)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Beatson, Robert J	Investigator (resigned Aug. 22, 1965).	$1,734.91
DuRoss, William, III	Clerk-typist (terminated Sept. 17, 1965).	1,087.88
Rosas, Doris E	Secretary to chairman investigating (Sept. 2 to Nov. 1, 1965).	2,506.30
Berman, Ellen Sue	Clerk-typist (Aug. 1 to Nov. 1, 1965).	867.12
Butler, Eve C	Clerk-stenographer (Aug. 1 to Nov. 1, 1965).	1,500.87
Lee, Meyer	Investigator (Sept. 2 to Nov. 1, 1965).	3,274.97

I NVESTIGATING COMMITTEE (H. RES. 310)—continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Rappaport, Toby	Clerk-typist (Sept. 1 to Nov. 1, 1965).	$852.67
Voultsides, Carol	do	867.12

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	3,431.01
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	46,293.01
Total amount expended from Apr. 14 to Dec. 31, 1965	49,724.01
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	275.99

E. E. Willis,
Chairman.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

January 11, 1966.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Full committee:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director	$11,679.12
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel	11,679.12
John R. Holden	Professional staff member.	9,592.98
Billy E. Kirby	Professional aid	8,210.04
George W. Fisher	Chief clerk	11,679.12
Helen A. Biondi	Assistant clerk	6,380.16
Carol A. Davis	Clerk-stenographer	1,957.78
Alice V. Matthews	do	5,224.86
George J. Turner	Assistant clerk	5,224.86
Investigative staff:		
Mark L. Davis	Clerk-messenger	934.10
Adin M. Downer	Staff member	8,527.86
Barbara Price Daniel.	Clerk-stenographer	2,683.55
Barbara E. Ehrman	do	3,609.33
Wilma Jean Johnson.	do	4,855.92
John B. Kidd	Research assistant	1,403.88
Marjorie J. Kidd	Clerk-stenographer	3,609.33
Leila W. Osborne	do	2,076.30
David C. Thomas, Jr.	Clerk-typist	2,370.47

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$100,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	28,906.02
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	46,480.91
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	75,386.93
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	24,613.07

Olin E. Teague,
Chairman.

Committee on Ways and Means

January 10, 1966.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leo H. Irwin	Chief counsel (C)	$12,470.46
William H. Quealy	Minority counsel (P).	12,470.46
John M. Martin Jr	Assistant chief counsel (P).	12,197.37
John P. Baker	Professional assistant (P) (from Sept. 1, 1965).	6,053.24
Thomas P. Kerester	Professional assistant (P).	8,972.16
John P. Baker	Staff assistant (C) July and August.	155.94
Florence Burkett	Staff assistant (C)	4,367.49
Virginia Butler	do	5,761.92
William Byrd	do	2,840.34
Mary K. Daniel	Staff assistant (C) to Oct. 31, 1965.	2,079.42
Grace Kagan	Staff assistant (C)	5,761.92
June Kendall	do	6,248.73
Max Mehlburger	do	4,044.12
Elizabeth Price	do	3,905.22
Martha Sue Ritner	Staff assistant (C) to July 31, 1965.	657.16
Dolores Rogers	Staff assistant (C)	3,820.68
Gloria Shaver	do	5,274.06
Eileen Sonnett	do	4,831.32
Susan Taylor	do	6,553.44
Irene Wade	do	5,323.34
Richard Wilbur	do	6,107.31
Hughlon Greene	Document clerk (C).	4,001.85
Walter Little	do	4,001.85

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	2,792.93
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1965	14,693.71
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	17,486.64
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	17,513.36

W. D. MILLS,
Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

JANUARY 5, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Harold J. Warren	Clerk and counsel	$10,480.35
Joseph C. Lewis	Professional staff	9,021.20
George T. Ault	do	7,301.91
C. Oral Lambert	do	6,144.87
Edward Hart	do	804.32

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$80,000.00
Amount expended from July 1, 1965, to Dec. 31, 1965	33,798.91
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	46,201.09

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

JANUARY 15, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Edward M. O'Connor	Staff director	$11,679.12

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$24,100.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	12,108.84
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1966	11,921.16

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

DECEMBER 31, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
L. N. Woodworth	Chief of staff	$12,999.96
Lincoln Arnold	Assistant chief of staff.	11,749.72
Nicholas Tomasulo	Legislation counsel	10,752.58
Robert Smyers	Refund counsel	10,182.94
James H. Symons	Statistical analyst	10,148.62
Grace T. Gunn	do	9,689.37
Alan P. Murray	Economist	9,923.05
Earl V. Willetts	Attorney	8,388.42
James M. LaMarche	Administrative assistant.	7,653.15
Harrison B. McCawley.	Attorney	7,387.80
Anastasia F. Connaughton.	Statistical clerk	6,779.94
Joseph E. Fink	do	6,779.94
Carl A. Nordberg, Jr.	Attorney	6,925.50
Herbert L. Chabot	do	6,925.50
Cleo H. Fonelli	Secretary	4,057.65
James W. McBride	Attorney	4,574.46
Blanche F. Nagro	Secretary	4,032.07
Joanne B. McDermott	do	3,975.56
Jacqueline S. Pfeiffer	do	3,829.29
Nicki Rae Fairfax	do	602.78
Gloria J. McCabe	do	3,217.32
Ila Coe	do	3,091.64
June B. Matthews	do	3,091.64
Cecilia Juarez Grimm	do	2,748.96
Mildred Feldt	do	2,798.77
Janmarie Spangler	do	2,429.83
Marilyn Smout	do	654.89
Michael Fox	Attorney	2,696.16
Total salaries		168,537.51
Contract employee: P. W. Meekins	Tax consultant	4,500.00
Total salaries and contract payments.		173,037.51

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$390,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported (reported for period Jan. 1 to July 1, 1965)	167,776.74
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	$173,037.51
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, to Dec. 31, 1965	340,814.25
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	49,185.75

W. D. MILLS,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JANUARY 20, 1966.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1965, to December 31, 1965, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Richard L. Mitchell	General counsel	$12,470.46
Myrtle Ruth Foutch	Clerk	5,347.86
Sylvia U. Keel	Secretary	4,215.12
Bryan H. Jacques	Staff director	12,470.46
Harry Olsher	Consultant	11,035.14
Astrid E. Gram	Secretary	3,450.80
Gregg Potvin	Counsel	11,035.14
Leslie Ann Conway	Secretary	2,206.92
Audrey R. Smith	Research analyst	3,249.30
Charles E. O'Connor	Counsel	10,480.35
Dorothy M. Partin	Secretary	4,087.17
Henry A. Robinson	Counsel	9,292.41
Beth S. Russell	Secretary	3,375.91
Justinus Gould	Counsel	10,480.35
William M. Reddig	Research analyst	6,374.19
Gertrude Maxine Dean.	Secretary	3,375.91
William A. Keel, Jr	Research analyst	9,180.23
Alan MacDonald	do	928.08
John J. Williams	Minority counsel	8,148.69
Robert D. Zitko	Assistant minority counsel.	3,573.06
Eugene W. Loehl	do	1,650.75
Calvin J. Collier	Minority staff assistant.	1,202.07
Beverly B. Denbo	Secretary (minority).	1,398.78
Maxine M. Porter	do	422.01
Nancy L. Bigelow	do	830.23
Total		140,281.39

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$300,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	134,303.34
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1965	156,005.32
Total amount expended from Jan. up to Dec. 31, 1965	290,308.66
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1965	9,691.34

JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1914. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1965, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice (H. Doc. 365); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered printed.

1915. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of industrial diamond stones from the national stockpile and the supple-

mental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1916. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1917. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of platinum from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1918. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1919. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of crude silicon carbide from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1920. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of fused crude aluminum oxide from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1921. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1922. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1923. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of November 8, 1965 (79 Stat. 1295), establishing the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1924. A letter from the Secretary of Defense transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction in support of military activities in southeast Asia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1925. A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a reply to the report of the Acting Comptroller General of October 29, 1965, on the use of dollars rather than foreign currencies to pay U.S. expenses in the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1926. A letter from the Archivist of the United States transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 59 Stat. 434; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1217. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MADDEN: Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. Report on the organization of Congress (second interim); without amendment (Rept. No. 1218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 12202. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 12203. A bill to restore non-service-connected veterans' pensions which have been reduced or eliminated because of the receipt of increased social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 12204. A bill to facilitate the management, use, and public benefits from the Appalachian Trail, a scenic trail designed primarily for foot travel through natural or primitive areas, and extending generally from Maine to Georgia; to facilitate and promote Federal, State, local, and private cooperation and assistance for the promotion of the trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 12205. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 12206. A bill to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain lands on the Spokane Indian Reservation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 12207. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 12208. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 12209. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide for the exemption of teachers from induction into the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12210. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for the free importation of certain specialized educational equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 12211. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist States and communities in meeting the initial cost of establishment and operation of programs for the care of patients with kidney diseases and to train professional personnel needed to conduct such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 12212. A bill to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1965 to eliminate the provision which denies hospital insurance benefits to uninsured individuals who are members of certain organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 12213. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the loan provisions relating to directors, members of the supervisory committee, and members of the credit committee of Federal credit unions; to increase the unsecured loan limit that a member can borrow from a Federal credit union; to require each Federal credit union to establish an education committee; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12214. A bill to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal- or State-chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 12215. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 12216. A bill to provide that the fee increases prescribed by Public Law 89-83 shall not be effective in any case wherein the application was filed prior to the effective date of that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 12217. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 12218. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to permit the duty-free entry of gifts not exceeding $100 in retail value from members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 12219. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 12220. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 12221. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and the Railway Labor Act with respect to emergency labor disputes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12222. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code (relating to patents), to provide counsel for the defense and prosecution of rights of indigent patentees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 12223. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12224. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12225. A bill to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the discontinuance or change of certain operations or services of common carriers by rail, in order to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to give full consideration to all financial assistance available before permitting any such discontinuance or change; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12226. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code with respect to criminal procedures and sentencing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 12227. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of

1965 to authorize parts of counties and municipalities to be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 12228. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 12229. A bill to authorize the transfer of two inactive Liberty ships to the Santa Rosa County Board of Commissioners, Florida; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 12230. A bill to provide that the fee increases prescribed by Public Law 89-83 shall not be effective in any case wherein the application was filed prior to the effective date of that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12231. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for the free importation of certain specialized educational equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 12232. A bill to amend title 1 of the United States Code to provide for the admissibility in evidence of the slip laws and the Treaties and Other International Acts Series, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 12233. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to protect any veteran against a loss of pension as a result of enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 806. Joint resolution designating February of each year as American History Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H. Con. Res. 553. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Con. Res. 556. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 555. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Con. Res. 556. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H. Res. 679. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the operation of the Economic Opportunity Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KREBS:

H. Res. 680. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 681. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. Res. 682. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 12234. A bill for the relief of Amleto Abbatangelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 12235. A bill for the relief of Dong Myong Shin Yoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 12236. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stefania Scislowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 12237. A bill for the relief of Tri-States Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

317. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Clarence E. Whaley, San Diego, Calif., and others, relative to impeachment of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Msgr. John O'Grady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MSGR. JOHN O'GRADY

The death of Msgr. John O'Grady, while it has brought sorrow to all who knew him, has also brought rejoicing in the triumphant conclusion of a splendid life. The nature of the man, and the value placed upon him by those who best knew his character and achievements, are well expressed in the editorial with which the Washington Post saluted his passing. Evidently speaking from the heart, the editorial writer began with the memorable exclamation: "What a glorious, triumphant, robust, and joyous Christian life came to a close when the Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady died on Sunday." It is a strong temptation to make the eloquent words of this editorial tribute my own, as they compress so tellingly the many and varied contributions of this great man to America and to mankind, and carry over effectively to the reader the qualities of energy and compassion that made Monsignor O'Grady such a fighter for human needs and against injustice and intolerance.

Millions who have never heard of Monsignor O'Grady, and who presumably never will hear of him, are deeply in debt to his labors, and to those who have followed his lead. For more than 40 years he served with distinction as secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, holding the title of secretary emeritus at the time of his death on January 2, 1966. In this office, he was a major organizer of Catholic social welfare work both here and abroad, bringing both his scholarship and his boundless energy to bear on the many enterprises that came within the scope of this organization between 1919 and 1961, when he retired on account of ill health.

Even while carrying out the extensive duties of this position, Monsignor O'Grady became a founder of the National Catholic School of Social Work, in the Catholic University of America, and served as dean of that school from 1934 to 1938.

Monsignor O'Grady's was an effective voice in contributing to the study of legislation in social matters, since he combined the scholar's mastery of details with the executive's grasp of essentials. In housing, in social security, in employment of the physically handicapped, in nondiscrimination in employment, in immigration policies, in the resettlement of displaced persons, in the community approach to social welfare programs, Monsignor O'Grady has been a major contributor in the making of laws and in the establishment of government policy.

We who come of Irish stock take particular pride in the fact that Monsignor O'Grady was one of the great number of fine priests that have been contributed to America by Ireland. He was born in County Clare and ordained in Dublin; at his death he was survived by a brother living in County Clare, and a sister in Limerick.

Monsignor O'Grady's concerns and activities went beyond the borders of this country, not only in matters of the resettlement of refugees, and the liberalization of immigration laws, but in the far-flung benefactions of War Relief Services (later named Catholic Relief Services) of which he was vice president, and in his service as Consultant to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. In this capacity, he visited Africa to work on community development projects, and in 1959 he was cited by Pope John XXIII for his contributions to the welfare of Africa through this work. The Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, said, upon hearing of Monsignor O'Grady's death: "His influence on charitable works of the church in this country and throughout the world for widespread social reforms will be long remembered. He was truly a modern apostle of Christian charity."

Monsignor O'Grady's theoretical emphasis on community service was also carried out in his life. Despite his national and worldwide interests, in the National Conference of Catholic Charities, and in his services as a consultor to various branches of the U.S. Government and to the United Nations, he was active locally as organizer of the Catholic Charities of Washington, which he headed from 1920 to 1938, and as professor of sociology at Trinity College for many years, besides his continuing interest in the National Catholic School of Social Work.

A great priest, an outstanding American, a valued friend of mine for many years, Monsignor O'Grady was "One of God's noblemen," during his many years of active, progressive, and constructive life. When things looked dark, Monsignor O'Grady was not only a bulwark of strength, but an inspiration to progressive Members of the Congress to fight successfully for the passage of progressive legislation in the best interests of the people.

We may well mourn that such a man has left us, but the occasion of his death is truly, in the long view, the occasion for rejoicing, both in the splendor of his Christian soul, and in the lasting benefits which his career has brought to our Nation and to the world. May his soul rest in peace, and may his example inspire generations yet to come.

In my remarks, I include the text of the sermon delivered by Most Rev. Raymond J. Gallagher, D.D., Bishop of Lafayette, Ind., at the Requiem Mass offered at St. Matthews Cathedral for Msgr. John J. O'Grady and an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post of January 5, 1966.

TRIBUTE TO CHARITIES PIONEER

(By Bishop Raymond J. Gallagher)

With great wisdom Holy Mother Church encourages us to avoid the giving of a eulogy on the occasion of a person's death. This bit of advice is very wise since it enables those of us who are present for the ceremony to succeed in attaining the primary purpose of a funeral mass; namely, a learning of the lesson which death itself teaches us.

Although the church recognizes the value of a life well lived, she endorses as more important the lesson of life taught by death. All of us have witnessed many times the entrance of death into our immediate circle under both tragic and ordinary circumstances. Regardless of how it arrives, attacking youth or old age, it presents us with a teaching unparalleled.

The recommendation that we consider the mystery of life and the inevitability of death provides an additional safeguard to both preacher and listener. By suggesting a relatively impersonal sermon, Holy Mother Church protects us from the caprice or unfortunate choice which a preacher might make among those qualities and characteristics possessed by the deceased.

CHURCH GUIDANCE

On the one hand, some might be selected and emphasized for personal reasons. On the other hand qualities of great significance might be neglected or ignored, presenting a final picture of the individual which is neither true nor balanced.

We can be grateful for this guidance and for the motif of the ceremonies here being performed since they enable us to focus on the true and basic identity of man and help us set a priority on those threads of relationship which typify us. By reason of the very simplicity of these ceremonies, we are reminded of the fact of our creation by God. We are once more complimented by the realization that God created us to help achieve His purposes. We are sobered by the realization that we must give an accounting of our stewardship in terms of what we have accomplished with what God has given us.

No one of us will question the wisdom involved here, for it provides us edifying and compelling encouragement to redirect and reform our lives while we yet have the opportunity. It reminds us of our distinct and precious identity as a being created by God's hand, a matter of proof that we are not the product of some accidental process, in reminding us that even though science, with magnificent competence, succeeds in developing life from primary ingredients, that we, as individuals, represent the miraculous existence out of nothingness which required a God to achieve.

This intimacy in sharing the mission of God among His creatures clarifies not only its importance, but identifies the warmth and affection with which we must pursue this godly objective of prosecuting the needs of our neighbor through love. The talents which God has given to each of us were meant as a means toward this end and our right to share in the perfection of God's company depends upon our use of these talents.

It is significant in the gospel story that the person who received the five talents put all five of them to the advantage of himself and his neighbor. Because of the striking similarity of our deceased friend and colleague to this utility of one's talents, as portrayed in the gospel, I am encouraged to depart from the advice of Holy Mother Church and become a little personal in this eulogy.

I have had the privilege of knowing Monsignor O'Grady for fewer number of years than most of you and I, therefore, anticipate your indulgence if I have not seen everything in proper perspective. What I say is a reflection of the manner in which he affected me.

Here was a man of God who combined many characteristics. He often told me that he was not popular with some of our Irish brothers because he didn't seem to dislike the English sufficiently. Although he was no less our ideal as both Catholic and Irish, he still preserved a sense of proportion that enabled him to love his brother regardless of other characteristics.

We have often characterized him as an opponent of what welfare theorists identified as dramatic new thrust in behalf of the poor. Even with this great motivation, our friend could preserve a balanced mind that measured the costs of these thrusts in terms of personal rights and duties. A man, a student, an educator, and a social reformer are but a few of the facets of his long and arduous priestly life.

He was indeed intense and dedicated, fearless, and courageous. He was blunt and direct, but it seems to me, only in order to dull those thrusts made by individuals or programs which would invade areas of critical importance to individuals, areas of responsibility, self-direction, self-sufficiency and freedom. He knew no equal in identifying those philosophies which would have reduced ourselves and our brother citizens to the stereotype of sameness, dependence, and thoughtlessness.

In retrospect, all of us will conclude that he was ahead of his time in ability to perceive and describe the impact of social change on the character of our Government and upon the lives of its citizens. He was a giant, physically and intellectually, and his tall shadow has been cast over the format of the Catholic charities movement in this country and over progressive social policy abroad.

If it is prudent to single out one goal achieved by this missioner of charity, it would be his contribution in making men in this country and abroad conscious of the inestimable value of self-sufficiency and self-direction. I suppose most of us chuckled and chided him at one time or another as he made the expression "self-help" a byword. As with all great characters, he persisted in his fight until this principle became an accepted device by which people help people and nations aid nations.

KEY TO EQUALITY

The importance of preserving a man's identity as resourceful where his own welfare was involved is today and will remain for many days, a key to full and complete establishment of equality among all people. With the same wisdom as the evangelist in the gospel story, he has taught us that the talents granted us by God are our most cherished possession, our birthright and our basis of admission to the courts of heaven.

It is remarkable what we learn about people as they live their life under changing circumstances. Under pressure Monsignor O'Grady lived with great courage, without fear of criticism, committed to the achievement of commendable goals. Under suffering of handicap and illness he revealed a capacity for humility and patience. Under the hand of God in the fullness of his human and priestly life and under the limits of increasing years and declining health, he has etched on our memories a portrayal of heroic resignation and acceptance of the will of God.

Perhaps Holy Mother Church will endorse my departure from the recommended practice since in the final analysis we have concentrated on characteristics, principles, values, and goals. Perhaps we will be forgiven this venture into the personal because it has demonstrated the successful manner in which one individual's talents have been placed at the disposal and for the improvement of many thousands, if not millions, of his brothers in Christ.

It remains for us who have had the privilege of observing the manner in which his talents were thus exploited to continue them in our own pursuit so that they become solid rules of life for us in the particular apostolate which now involves us.

One further permission I seek of you and I am sure you will grant it to me since we who are gathered here participate in individual ways of the family of charity developed by Monsignor O'Grady. As his associate and disciple, I consider it a privilege to thank some of those who have served him so well. To the sisters of Holy Cross at Dunbarton, to the Carmelite sisters at Carroll Manor, to Monsignor Coady and Archbishop O'Boyle, who have been his special guardian angels, I say a word of gratitude. To Margaret Coffman and Miss Alice Padgett who served him and loved him with great devotion, a simple expression of gratitude. To Jane Gallagher, may all of us be blessed with the affection, service, and devotion of a character as beautiful as yours.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 5, 1966]

MSGR. JOHN O'GRADY

What a glorious, triumphant, robust, and joyous Christian life came to a close when the Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady died on Sunday. Ordained in his native Ireland more than half a century ago when he was a lad of no more than 23, he became one of those priests whose whole life was a ministry, a consecration and a testament to the ideals of Christianity. Not for him the cloister. He was in the thick of every major social struggle of his time—and always on the side of the oppressed and the unfortunate, responsive always to suffering and to need, moved always by compassion and generosity.

He was one of the great innovators and developers of professional social service in the United States. Founder and dean of Catholic University's National Catholic School of Social Work, he served for more than 40 years as secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities. He fought for social security, for liberalization of the immigration laws, for enlightened aid to delinquent juveniles and to the indigent aged, for minimum-wage legislation, for interfaith tolerance and understanding and for a host of other measures designed to help his fellow man. He was a great lover of life and of humanity; and he will be mourned and remembered with love and with gratitude.

One of Our Commissioners Is Missing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following communication has been sent by

me to the House Republican conference, but I believe it may prove of interest to all our colleagues:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION VACANCY—FAILURE TO FILL

For almost 7 months—since July 1, 1965—a vacancy has existed on the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. This vitally important body with an annual budget exceeding $2 billion is functioning at 80 percent of its statutory manpower level. The management of its vast complex of scientific and industrial activities rides heavy on the shoulders of four rather than a proper complement of five supervising Commissioners. The input of thought, judgment, experience and wisdom into Commission decisions affecting both U.S. nuclear defense and American progress in peaceful uses of the atom continues month after month to remain starved by a factor of 20 percent.

Yet the Johnson administration remains totally unconcerned. Washington hears not the slightest rumor whatever of any possibility of a new Commissioner to replace Dr. Mary I. Bunting, who returned to the campus of Radcliffe College last June 30.

This regrettable state of affairs follows on the heels of an equally regrettable body blow to the Commission's force level dealt by the same Johnson administration in 1964. This involved the appointment of Dr. Bunting herself in that year with the understanding and agreement of the White House that she would remain away from her teaching responsibilities only for a year. During her year in Washington, Dr. Bunting proved to be a brilliant, hard working, and able Commissioner. Expectedly, however, most of her year was devoted to learning the job. She left, therefore, at the very moment of emergence into a capability to assume her full share of the Commission's workload.

The administration knew, or should have known, at the time it appointed her that such would be the case. There were other candidates for the 1964 vacancy who were willing and able to serve the full term, which Dr. Bunting was not. Nevertheless, she was selected, because at that moment the administration was going through one of its periodic "appoint women to office" weeks.

All of this is a record of bad government administration. The people should know it. They are entitled to something better. The Commission vacancy should be filled promptly by a person of high competence who will agree to serve the term.

Constantino Brumidi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to authorize procurement of a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi to be placed in the Capitol's first floor Brumidi corridor.

Certainly the Capitol should somewhere have a bust or portrait of the artist who did so much to beautify it. The Capitol is a far more beautiful place because of Brumidi's murals, paintings, and frescoes.

Constantino Brumidi left mid-19th-century Italy as a political refugee, vowing to find liberty. He found it in America, and beginning in 1855, worked 25 years to make the Capitol the inspirationally beautiful seat of liberty that it is today.

I hope that the Committee on House Administration will give this legislation serious and favorable consideration.

The Memoirs of Senator Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, now that Congress is back in session, I take pleasure in noting the timely publication of the book, "The Memoirs of Senator Brown, a Capitol Cat," as told to Frances Spatz Leighton. Senator Brown, who resides at the Woodner Hotel, is Washington's only independent mouser, and is an advocate of such legislation as a Caticare-Veticare program. He is also passionately in favor of the establishment of a Cat Cultural Center, and believes that a mouse should be the first living creature sent to the moon to investigate certain persistent rumors that it is made of green cheese. Senator Brown originally comes from Montana, and is a descendant of a traveling bobcat and a worthy domestic. He presently lives with his loyal retainers, Reuben and Dorothy Fine, together with his legislative assistant, Blackie, and his AA, Alexander the Great. I have heard rumors that he has an unusually attractive secretary, Kitten Galore, whose parents have been nominated for the Nobel Prize for architecture.

Senator Brown, since arriving in Washington, has shown his political acumen by specializing in that most important Capitol concern: status. His publishers, Fleet Publishing Corp. of New York, describe his book as "the ultimate inside guide to Washington, D.C." The tasteful illustrations, described as "Senator Brown's Status Wall," show our President with his dogs, the Vice President's cat, and a number of Washington personalities with their illustrious retainers.

Washington life, as recorded in these memoirs, is not without its lighter side. Anecdotes, both true and aprocryphal, are recorded of the adventures of Congressmen, Senators, and Cabinet members. There are also certain indirect references, possibly satirical in tone, to lobbyists, social climbers, tax collectors, and members of the press. I particularly commend to Members, Senator Brown's "All Purpose Political Speech" and Senator Brown's "First Press Conference."

Frances Spatz Leighton, whom Senator Brown wisely chose as his ghost writer, originally comes from Geauga County in Ohio. She is a writer of many talents, and has worked with other notables and celebrities on memoirs of the Washington scene. Her coauthored books include "White House Chef," "My 30 Years Backstairs at the White House," "I Was Jacqueline Kennedy's Dressmaker," and "They Call Her Ladybird." She also recently edited a short book, "The Johnson Wit." Look, a New York pictorial magazine of popular nature, has described her as "Washington's classiest ghost" in its "Offbeat Guide to Washington." She is Washington editor of This Week, and other periodical publications.

Included in "The Memoirs of Senator Brown" are words and music of two of her songs, written especially for Senator Brown, "Fling Yourself on the Windowsill," and "Senator Pussycat." I am told that Senator Brown has asked Miss Leighton to write a musical play based on these memoirs.

Senator Brown, as is common with many here in the Capitol, has tried his hand at writing a regular series of reports to the folks back home. A chapter of his book, devoted to these "Mewsletters," embodies much homely wisdom. All in all, I wish to put on record that Senator Brown's view of life in Washington offers a suitable, lighthearted guide to the practical side of political life: how to get elected, how to establish residence and offices, how to deal with the press, and, particularly, how to get on with animals. After all, as the philosopher said, "Man is a political animal."

A Summary of Federal Assistance to All Forms of Education During Recent Fiscal Years in Hamilton County, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, education is the keystone of the democratic arch. It has become increasingly important to our free society as our social and economic structure becomes more complex, more difficult to understand, and less yielding to old and too-simple remedies for its ills.

This Congress has already passed legislation to improve the educational opportunities of our citizens which is truly historic. It is my hope that what we did last session will be supported and enlarged upon by our actions this session.

It is vitally important that the public be informed of how their national tax dollars are being spent. I am sure that many citizens of my district will be astounded to learn that over $32 million was spent during the last fiscal year in Hamilton County on education and public health programs.

In order that the citizens are fully informed, I have compiled the following information, which deals with the size and placement of national tax funds in the fields of education and public health in Hamilton County. I have used the word education generally, to include research, teaching, administration, along with supporting medical, dental, technical, and food support programs. Statistics have been furnished by departments and agencies of the National, State, and local governments.

I include this information at this point in the RECORD:

A summary of Federal assistance to all forms of education during recent fiscal years in Hamilton County, Ohio

DEPARTMENT OF ARICULTURE

	Fiscal 1964	Fiscal 1965 (preliminary)
Consumer and Marketing Service:		
National school lunch program, cash payments for food assistance	$291, 042	$345, 075
Special milk program for children	625, 118	608, 195
Donation of agricultural commodities to schools and welfare agencies	1, 741, 095	2, 644, 168
Agricultural Research Service: Contract with University of Cincinnati for research on leather (duration 2½ years)	85, 430	
Total, Department of Agriculture	2, 742, 685	3, 597, 438

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

(PROGRAMS RELATED TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964)

	Grant
Project Head Start:	
Hamilton Board of Education (246 children; 12 centers)	$30, 531
Board of Education of Cincinnati (1,720 children: 31 centers)	224, 199
Total (1,966 children: 43 centers)	254, 730
Neighborhood Youth Corps (through Department of Labor):	
12,000 enrollees	1, 460, 150
1,050 enrollees	198, 713
750 enrollees	148, 595
300 enrollees	140, 940
830 enrollees	234, 270
Total (14,930 enrollees)	2, 182, 668
College work study program:	
Spring:	
Ohio College of Applied Science	2, 268
University of Cincinnati	6, 170
Xavier University	4, 119
Total	12, 557
Summer:	
Ohio College of Applied Science	2, 925
Xavier University	5, 426
Total	8, 351
Fall:	
Ohio College of Applied Science	5, 257
University of Cincinnati	29, 575
Xavier University	9, 485
Total	44, 317
Total, college work study programs	65, 225
Additional Community Action Commission programs:	
School community center program	145, 293
Preschool program:	
Cincinnati Board of Education	121, 500
Lincoln Heights, Ohio	33, 812
Montessori method preschool program	36, 776
Dental care program for schoolchildren	192, 064
Recreational therapy programs, institutions for the aged	82, 750
Steele subdivision preschool and neighborhood services	55, 328
Total	667, 523
Total, Office of Economic Opportunity	3, 170, 146

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION GRANTS TO THE STATE OF OHIO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FOR CINCINNATI, OHIO, BOARD OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS

	1962-63	1963-64
Smith-Hughes	$24, 985. 50	$16, 152. 20
George-Barden:		
Title I	37, 256. 46	40, 545. 70
Title II	16, 860. 59	17, 080. 49
Total, vocational education	79, 102. 55	73, 778. 39

Note.—Totals available from Ohio Board of Education only for 1962-63 and 1963-64. Little variation expected to be shown in expenditures for later years. Information about non-Cincinnati boards of education in Hamilton County not received from Ohio Board of Education.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

	1965
University of Cincinnati	$417, 000

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

	1965
University of Cincinnati (research grant)	$59, 597
University of Cincinnati (teaching grant)	20, 000
Total, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration	79, 597

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' BENEFITS

	1965
Education and training allowance, veteran	$25, 100
Vocational rehabilitation, veteran	19, 800
Total	44, 900

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

	1963	1964	1965
Educational contracts and research:			
University of Cincinnati	$52, 000	$12, 000	$9, 000
May Institute for Medical Research		15, 000	15, 000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Cincinnati		49, 000	
Xavier University	1, 000	15, 000	
Total, Atomic Energy Commission	53, 000	91, 000	24, 000

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, COMMUNITY FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION—TOTAL LOANS APPROVED

	1963	1964	1965
Cincinnati area:			
Xavier University	$1, 250, 000		
University of Cincinnati	6, 160, 000		
Deaconess Hospital of Nursing			$700, 000
Total	7, 410, 000		700, 000

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF EDUCATION

	1963	1964	1965
Xavier University:			
Training grants, fellowships, and loans	$55, 697	$87, 300	$118, 044
Construction grants			572, 608
College of Mount St. Joseph on the Ohio: Training grants, fellowships, and loans	27, 731	42, 968	50, 000
Ohio College of Applied Science: Training grants, fellowships, and loans	6, 061	10, 550	20, 714
Our Lady of Cincinnati College: Training grants, fellowships, and loans	6, 756	10, 210	([1])
University of Cincinnati: Training grants, fellowships, and loans	301, 000	305, 163	323, 890
Greenhills Exempted Village School District: Project grants	13, 387	13, 641	20, 580
Loveland Exempted Village School District: Project grants	2, 476		
Southwest Local School District: Project grants	29, 154	29, 650	28, 349
Mount Healthy City School District: Project grants	5, 266		
Princeton City School District: Project grants	32, 761	15, 381	
Finneytown Local Board of Education: Project grants	23, 946	11, 854	
Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Northern Hill Branch: Construction grant			75, 000
Total			1, 209, 180
FUNDS TRANSFERRED FROM DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES			
Training grants, fellowships, and loans:			
Stowe Adult Center	84, 030		
Central Vocational High School		21, 503	
Cincinnati Board of Education			170, 166
Norwood Evening School			7, 464
Norwood Technical High School			10, 422
Central Adult High School			21, 316
Total			209, 368

[1] Figures not available.

A summary of Federal assistance to all forms of education during recent fiscal years in Hamilton County, Ohio—Continued

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued

	1963	1964	1965
WELFARE ADMINISTRATION ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES, CUBAN LOAN PROGRAM			
Training grants, fellowships, and loans:			
Ohio College of Applied Science			$1,939
Our Lady of Cincinnati College	$1,500	$1,023	2,716
University of Cincinnati			750
Xavier University	2,350	3,045	6,500
Total			11,905
Total, Office of Education			1,430,277

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Grants to colleges and universities in Hamilton County	$27,000

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Recipient	Research and demonstration grants	Construction grants	Training grants, fellowships, and loans	Project grants	All other	Total
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE DEPARTMENT						
Children's Hospital, Cincinnati	$53,567					$53,567
Children's Hospital Research Foundation	709,337	$1,724,000	$53,017			2,486,354
Cincinnati Bureau of Air Pollution Control	12,600					12,600
University of Cincinnati	2,122,402		1,702,651	$34,002		3,859,055
University of Cincinnati, College of Medicine	287,157				$8,559	295,716
Family Services, Cincinnati	63,788					63,788
Institutum Divithomae	13,800					13,800
Jewish Hospital of Cincinnati	278,964		27,968			306,932

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—Continued

Recipient	Research and demonstration grants	Construction grants	Training grants, fellowships, and loans	Project grants	All other	Total
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE DEPARTMENT						
College of Mount St. Joseph on the Ohio			$29,276			$29,276
Rollman Psychiatric Hospital			24,000			24,000
Xavier University	$6,900		2,995			9,895
Community Chest and Council of Cincinnati, Inc				$42,850		42,850
Bethesda Hospital School of Nursing			7,234			7,234
Deaconness Hospital		$350,000	3,407			353,407
Good Samaritan Hospital School of Nursing			14,219			14,219
Cincinnati General Hospital		2,333,198				2,333,198
Riverview Home		385,000				385,000
St. George Hospital		500,000				500,000
State health department					$1,500	1,500
Taft Sanitary Engineering Center					12,087,371	12,087,371
Total, funds appropriated to the Department	3,548,515	5,292,198	1,864,767	76,852	12,097,430	22,879,742

SUMMARY BY DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY—FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO EDUCATION

	1965
Department of Agriculture	$3,597,438
Office of Economic Opportunity	3,170,146
Vocational Education	73,778
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	417,000
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration	79,597
Veterans' Administration	44,900
Atomic Energy Commission	23,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency	700,000
Office of Education (HEW)	1,430,277
National Science Foundation	27,000
HEW (Public Health Service)	22,879,742
Grand total	32,643,886

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, amidst our preoccupation with a struggle being waged by South Vietnamese and United States forces in the jungles and rice paddies and cities of Vietnam, we pause to remember the fate of another people—who also struggled, who lost, but who have not given up hope. January 22 is the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, an occasion not for celebrations but for tributes to the valor of Ukrainian martyrs and to the noble efforts of a long-suffering people. Indeed, 5 years ago, when we observed the centennial of the Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko, we were reminded that by eloquent words as well as by valorous deeds, Ukrainians have contributed to the cause of freedom and independence everywhere.

For over 300 years, the people of the Ukraine dreamed of independence while suffering under the oppression of Russian czars. Then as the czarist regime crumbled during 1917, the long-awaited opportunity came. A group of Ukrainian patriots declared their intention to seek independence in December 1917, and declared it achieved on January 22, 48 years ago. The newly independent Ukraine was a war-torn country, however, surrounded by aggressive and feuding neighbors. The preservation of independence was to prove impossible. The Red army invaded the Ukraine in the spring of 1920. In 1923, the Ukraine was made a constituent republic of the Soviet Union; the Ukrainians were among the first victims of a new imperialism.

The Ukraine experienced no respite during World War II. As in World War I, the country became a battlefield for the contending forces of East and West. The Soviets withdrew only to be replaced by other cruel masters—the Nazis. Following World War II, Soviet authority was reasserted, and tightened. Cruelest of ironies, the Ukrainians, on Soviet insistence were given a delegation to the United Nations. But this delegation is a sham. The facade of independence cannot disguise the ugly fact of subservience.

The Ukraine has a population of more than 45 million, and a territory which exceeds in area that of several Western European nations combined. The Ukraine is rich in human and material resources; the history and culture of the Ukraine are more than a thousand years old. In an era which has seen the rise of many new nations, some of them throwing off colonial bonds after long periods of subjugation, is it not a singular injustice that the Ukrainians along with their neighbors in Eastern Europe continue to be subject to exploitation by the worst colonial system of modern times?

Today, as we fight in southeast Asia on behalf of a small, brave people striving to maintain its freedom and independence, let us not forget that there are many areas of the world where the cause of liberty has yet to prevail, and that we must not relax our vigilance or abandon our struggle until that cause has prevailed.

Restore Veterans' Pensions Cut by Social Security Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to restore nonservice-connected veterans' pensions which have been reduced or eliminated because of the receipt of increased social security benefits.

Last year when the badly needed increase in cash social security benefits was enacted many of our veterans were moved into a higher income bracket. Since non-service-connected pensions are based on income limitations, some of our ex-servicemen and their widows had their pensions reduced or terminated entirely.

The income test for pension purposes is made up of only a few broad income brackets with very sharp drops in pension amounts as one moves to a higher bracket. The result is that the additional money received from the higher social security payment does not offset the loss in pension payments suffered by those pushed into a higher income bracket, to say nothing of those whose pensions were terminated entirely.

Most of the group whose pensions have been cut are disabled, on limited incomes, and in their advanced years. A reduction in their pension is a real hardship and the situation should be corrected. I hope the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will take action in the very near future.

Education Is the Real Answer to Poverty and Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, this week the minority leader of the House came out wholeheartedly in favor of education. He said what the House majority—and the Senate majority and the President—have been saying all along: that education is the real answer to the problem of poverty and unemployment.

This may represent a change in Republican policy—or it may not. It cannot be forgotten that 3 out of 4 of the Republicans in the House and nearly half of the Republicans in the Senate voted against the Elementary-Secondary School Education Act of 1965. But, if the Republicans have had a change of heart on this issue, they propose a rather strange way for solving the problem.

The only firm proposal in last night's speech was for a Federal income tax credit for college students and their parents. What they will do, in other words, is to make it easier for the well-to-do to send their children to college by transferring part of the burden to all the taxpayers. To the family whose entire income may be little more than the cost of a year in college, the Republican proposal would give nothing whatever. Such a tax break would reduce Federal taxes by perhaps a billion dollars annually. Yet, it could not guarantee that so much as one boy or girl who does not now go to college would be added to the rolls. Most emphatically, it would do nothing to guarantee that every youth should pursue his education as far as his talents would take him. The talented boy from an impoverished family would be no better off than he is today.

Our real aim in education must be to improve educational resources and to provide opportunities for every student whose family cannot afford to send him to college. The best methods are scholarship, fellowships, loans—money placed at the disposal of those who need it, and not by providing tax windfalls to those families whose children already have access to college programs.

Orange County, Calif., Honors David Baker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the President in his state of the Union address made abundantly clear the importance of "a creative federalism to best use the wonderful diversity of our institutions and our people to solve the problems and to fulfill the dreams of the American people." The essential cooperation between officeholders on the city, county, State, and Federal levels has been the foundation of our system of government.

Since being elected to public office I have worked on numerous projects that could not have been brought to successful conclusion without the dedicated and talented help of various Orange County city and county officials. The working relationship between Orange County's local leadership and the county's State and Federal representatives has produced a working model that can easily set an example for the Nation.

Tonight the citizens of Orange County are honoring one of the men who really make the federal system work—David Baker.

Mr. Baker serves as one of the five members of Orange County's board of supervisors. In the fastest growing county in the Nation, Mr. Baker, working in concert with all levels of government, has been instrumental in meeting the myriad of complicated problems faced by the area. Orange County's success in effectively meeting the challenge of its phenomenal growth rate is to a great extent due to the creative and energetic talents of David Baker employing creative federalism.

Mr. Baker moved to Orange County in 1950 and soon was proving his skill in a position with the county's department of building safety. Ever interested in all aspects of community and civic life Mr. Baker has been active in the YMCA and the various Scouts' organizations, as well as being a charter member of the Orange County Chapter of the American Institute of Building Design.

Elected to the Orange County Board of Supervisors in 1962, David Baker quickly assumed a role of prominence. He has served as chairman of the board's committees on probation, building services, parks, fish and game, forestry-fire control, and the Coastal Projects Water Committee, among others. He also serves on the Inter-County Committee on Roads, and the Community Action Committee.

His farsighted vision in the area of regional development has been recognized by his southern California colleagues, for he serves as chairman of the Southern California Association of Supervisors' Committee on City-County Relations, and as the interim vice president, secretary-treasurer of the all-important Joint City-County Committee for Southern California Associated Governments Formation.

Mr. Baker has also been prominent in the County Supervisors Association of California, and the National Association of Counties, as well as recently serving as a panelist on Gov. Edmund G. Brown's conference on beauty.

Mr. Baker's tireless effort on behalf of the more than 1 million Orange County residents is evidenced by his recent trip to Washington to meet with me, Secretary Udall and numerous other Government officials in order to obtain additional recreational facilities for the expanding population of Orange County.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join with my fellow Orange Countians in paying tribute to David Baker. He is an outstanding example of talented, and vigorous young America. His service to Orange County has been guided by the principle that President Johnson so eloquently articulated when he said:

> It is the genius of our Constitution that under its shelter of enduring institutions and rooted principles there is ample room for the rich fertility of American political invention.

We Are Overcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the gremlins are loose again and this time they have joined the civil rights movement—at the expense of the overburdened and usually infallible corps of proofreaders in the Government Printing Office.

On the other hand, I may have uncovered a new style of subversive activity designed to unnerve both sides in the current struggle for equal rights. It may be that the Committee on Un-American Activities should consider placing this matter on its agenda for investigation when it has completed its current work on the Ku Klux Klan.

At any rate, you can understand my surprise and dismay when I looked in the 1966 Congressional Directory table of contents to find the page on which the Civil Rights Commission is listed. I was directed to turn to page 84. I was shocked, Mr. Speaker, to discover that page 84 contains the biographical listing of the Mississippi delegation.

Founding Convention of Hawaii State Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 1966, Congressman SPARK MATSUNAGA, of Hawaii, delivered a speech at the Founding Convention of Hawaii State Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO, in Honolulu.

I would like to share the thoughts expressed in this speech with my colleagues:

SPEECH OF HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA BEFORE FOUNDING CONVENTION OF HAWAII STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR, AFL–CIO, HONOLULU, HAWAII, SATURDAY, JANUARY 8, 1966

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is indeed a great honor for me to be here today, on the eve of the opening of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, and to share with you some of the thoughts which come to mind as you engage in the deliberations of this important convention.

The job for which you are assembled here is a monumental one, as you are well aware, but it also represents a significant milestone in the labor movement in Hawaii.

We know, of course, that the promotion or fostering of cooperative effort is a difficult task at best. If the various unions of the Islands can forget their differences, however real or imagined they may appear to be, and unite into a resolute federation as labor has done on the mainland, then real progress will be assured.

It has taken time, patience, and skill to bring this meeting together. The purpose and objectives in bringing a State federation into being must not fail.

Samuel Gompers, the man who brought the American Federation of Labor into being and who guided the federation through the sometimes brutal and tough years of formation until it was an established entity in labor's own behalf, was a great believer in cooperation. Gompers was more than aware of the value of the federation presenting a united front to the State legislatures in the States where the American Federation of Labor had the unions and the membership to be effective.

John L. Lewis, the founder of the CIO and leader of the United Mine Workers for three decades, and Philip Murray, president of the CIO and the United Steelworkers of America, both strongly stressed a united approach when dealing with State legislatures. Both of these men could relate some sad experiences they encountered in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, through the tragic failure of a disunited labor movement in the Commonwealth.

Dan Tobin of the Teamsters, Dan Tracy of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, John Lyons of the Ironworkers, Dick Gray of the Building Trades Department, Al Hayes of the Machinists, and President George Meaney, who came out of the New York State Federation of Labor, can all attest to the crying need for a united labor movement within the various States.

In the days before the Wagner Act the employer completely dominated labor relations. Employees were forced to sign "yellow dog" contracts which bound them not to join unions. They either signed or got fired. Those who were fired often were blacklisted. Individual working men and women were helpless.

Despite such intimidation unions managed to emerge, but many employers refused to bargain with them. Management resorted to all sorts of tactics to break up unions: threats, intimidations, physical violence, use of spies, scabs, and strikebreaking detective agencies. State and Federal courts were asked to issue injunctions.

The decisive big step toward legal recognition of the rights of organized labor was section 7(a) of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933. This section affirmed the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing without interference, restraint, or coercion on the part of employers.

The next big step was the Wagner Act of 1935. It provided an agency, the National Labor Relations Board, to administer and to enforce the legal rights of labor. The law protected the right of working men and women to organize unions of their own choosing and to bargain collectively through those unions. It also set up election machinery for democratically selecting the bargaining representative.

Industry bitterly opposed the Wagner Act. The National Association of Manufacturers and leading corporation attorneys advised employers not to comply with the law because they claimed it was unconstitutional. When the Supreme Court in 1937 established the constitutionality of the Wagner Act in five separate cases, most employers grudgingly began to comply.

The NAM and reactionary employers began an intensive campaign against the Wagner Act. The campaign consisted of appealing slogans, half-truths, misinterpretation, and misrepresentation.

This campaign succeeded in deceiving part of the American public into believing that unions and labor leaders had too much power.

Strikes in a number of industries during 1946 and 1947 played into their hands. The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 was the result of this campaign, with other factors playing a contributing role.

The major item of labor legislation in the 86th Congress was the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959.

The impact of this law, along with the so-called Taft-Hartley Act, has impaired the effectiveness of organized labor in many areas. It is generally conceded that the restrictions placed upon organized labor by this law have placed obstacles in the way of unions organizing the unorganized.

As we all know by now, our State legislature and the Congress can set terms for collective bargaining, can fix minimum wages and maximum hours, and can vitally influence working conditions. They can even determine whether there shall be unions.

It was Congress which outlawed the closed shop, and State legislatures which, in many States, outlawed the union shop. Nineteen States now have misnamed right-to-work laws.

Today, we are concerned with the direction our economy is taking. To the economists this is a matter of academic concern. To the building tradesman on the job site or the factory worker in the plant it is a matter of bread and butter, clothes, and shelter for himself and his family. It means the difference between meeting payments on his car or arguing with the repossessor, between meeting payments on the television set or watching it being toted out of the house.

What government policy is, and what it will be in the next few months, will hit each of us in the bread basket whether we like it or not. We may agree or disagree with the theory that government should or should not exercise control over economic policy, that it should be left to the businessmen. Whatever theory we hold, the inescapable fact of life today is that government does determine economic policy and thereby the amount of food in the family pot.

Nor is our Government some vague group of people called "they." It is composed of men and women elected to public office for specified periods of time by each citizen who avails himself of the right to register and vote. (I can vouch for the specified time—which is 2 years for Representatives to Congress, and which means that before too long you will be hearing from me.) You prosper or struggle depending upon their wisdom, foresight, prejudices, and capacity.

Sometimes I hear trade union people tell me that, through their trade unions, they can set rates and determine conditions that will affect the lives of their members and that is the limit of their responsibility as trade unionists.

I don't quarrel with that statement. There is nothing wrong with self-interest. It may be—although I doubt it—that there was a day when this was so, but it is emphatically not so today. The trade union movement is composed of 18 million members in a sea of upward of 186 million people in the United States, and more than 2 billion people in the world. We cannot live our lives apart from them, nor are we pursuing that course as a nation in the world today.

As President Theodore Roosevelt stated: "When a band of 150 or 200 honest, intelligent men, who mean business and know their business, is found in any district, whether in one of the local organizations or outside, you can guarantee that the local politicians of that district will begin to treat it with a combination of fear, hatred, and respect and that its influence will be felt."

Trade unions are instruments intended for the improvement of the welfare of its members. When so much of the welfare of your members is determined in the field of politics and government it is impossible for trade unions to ignore it. That is why we must have in Hawaii a united federation of all the unions on the islands which will stand ready and able to see to it that when labor speaks in Hawaii it does so for all labor, and not just one or two unions.

The record of Congress, though not the 89th in its 1st session, reveals many attempts to restrict the rights of our trade unions, and the same is true of many of the State legislatures, though, thank God, those conditions don't apply in our State of Hawaii. But we must remember that eternal vigilance is not only the price of liberty, but also the price of true progress.

A strong united federation of all the unions in Hawaii can and will make a real contribution not only to all union members, but also to our growing State and our Nation in this difficult and changing era upon which we are now entering.

I thank you for your invitation to be here today, and I wish you every success in your endeavors for a strong united trade union federation in our own State of Hawaii.

Thank you very much.

Cooperative Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we will hear increasingly in the days ahead from skeptics who will speak scoffingly of programs that attempt to alleviate the problems of other countries. It will be said, and in some respects demonstrated, that our demands at home and the urgencies of Vietnam, preclude a continuing effort in foreign assistance.

May I point out a source of strength and a potential for multiplying our performance which has so far not been widely acknowledged? The people we have helped are now in a position to themselves assume some of the burdens of improving world conditions. We have for some time been urging greater participation in this great calling from our European allies. Let us not disregard the emerging capabilities of our friends in the Pacific community.

The free Chinese of Taiwan are now extending technical assistance to 20 nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The effectiveness of these technicians freshly recruited from the ranks of a country just beginning to realize the benefits of adapting to newer methods and improvements, cannot be underestimated. The underdeveloped nations which must be encouraged to stretch into the mainstream of modern industrialization can relate far more readily to those who have just gone through the experience of the major shift than they can relate to the arrived giant, America.

We can magnify at least fivefold the effectiveness of our dollars in the foreign assistance field by cooperating with technical assistance programs from Taiwan, Korea, Japan, and the Philippines whenever, and to the degree, it is possible and feasible. In my view, Mr. Speaker, it is the next logical step in the evolution of our international aid programs. At the same time it can answer positively the carping critics who maintain we cannot solve all the world's ills alone. The answer is clear. We are not alone, and we need not be alone. Let us commence a dynamic program of cooperative effort. Not only, mind you, from the most advanced countries to the least advanced, but from the more developed areas to the less developed areas. Free China has given us a classic showcase that should be duplicated and expanded.

Truth In Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the Senate the other day, Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware made some interesting comments, following President Johnson's state of the Union message. He referred to the President in his message having advocated new legislation to provide truth in packaging and truth in lending. The Senator suggested a third recommendation; namely, truth in government. He said that if the President wanted to protect Americans from misrepresentation he might well include protection of American taxpayers from misrepresentation with respect to the true cost of his administration's proposals and the truth about the Federal budget. The people, Senator WILLIAMS said, should know that the expenditures of this administration are the most extravagant in history.

President Johnson's request this week for a supplemental appropriation of more than $12 billion for financing of the war in Vietnam is a case in point with regard to budget juggling and withholding of information from the American people.

In other words, the President's request for these essential funds was deliberately delayed last year until all the Great Society programs had been funded. Now, Congress gets this emergency request for defense which must be funded when it is too late to make cuts in existing nonessential, nonmilitary programs.

As to truth in budgeting, the proposal of the President for a speedup in tax collections in this election year is another example of juggling the figures. The acceleration of corporate and individual income tax payments and the payment of self-employed social security taxes on a quarterly instead of annual basis will make the fiscal picture look better prior to the election next November, but by the fiscal year's end, the true situation will be apparent, when it is too late for voters to do anything about it.

Mr. Speaker, as pointed out by the minority party congressional leadership, Republicans intend to fully support needed appropriations for defense. On the other hand, it is our responsibility to scrutinize the administration's spending and, especially on nonmilitary appropriation requests, Mr. Speaker, we Republicans intend to do just that. We are frank in saying that, in this time of stimulated prosperity and high employment, we think the public debt during the past 5 years should have been reduced instead of planned deficits exceeding $31,500 million. This present fiscal year, which ends June 30, will increase our huge national debt by another $6 billion and the legal debt ceiling will have to be increased again.

Of course, President Johnson did not admit this in his message, but instead predicted the deficit for fiscal 1967 would be reduced to only $1.8 billion.

As to this prediction, let me recall that a year ago, in his 1965 state of the Union message, President Johnson talked about continuing along the path toward a balanced budget. Actually, that 1965 path is now estimated to be a deficit of $7 billion for that year alone, not including $2,687 million resulting from accelerated corporate taxes approved last year.

But getting back to truth in government, the taxpayers of America have a right to know the facts. Indeed, the Treasury's own figures show the estimated deficit for 1967 will not be $1.8 billion, but rather it is given as $9.2 billion.

The difference in these two estimates is due largely to some nonrecurring items, which are shown as general revenue by the President. One of these is the $2.5 billion which the Government expects to receive over and above cost in the coining of new silver quarters and 50-cent pieces with a new low silver content. Also the President includes as revenue the proceeds from the sale of millions of dollars worth of materials from the defense stockpile. Good bookkeeping and truth in government, it seems to me, should require this income to be listed separately as special receipts. The President should have explained that his figure of a $1.8 billion deficit was based on Congress acceding to his request that tax collections in fiscal 1967 be accelerated so that $3.2 billion in taxes from corporations would reach the Treasury in fiscal 1967 instead of fiscal 1968.

The withholding tax acceleration for individuals suggested by the President would add another $400 million to this amount ahead of regular schedule.

This new juggling proposal is the same as obtaining an advance payment on a worker's next week's salary. In the end his finances are not improved. He is just as badly off.

Under these planned tax accelerations, plus the estimated profit on coinage, the Treasury would collect an extra $2,687 million in fiscal 1966 and $7,440 million in fiscal 1967; and, as I said, these are nonrecurring items. This situation should be shown and explained to the American people. Certainly, this information should not be withheld until after an election. Furthermore, right now when Congress is considering the advisability of a "guns and butter" policy, the true facts should be known. President Johnson, in asking Congress to continue his Great Society programs and at the same time to support the huge cost of the Nation's war in Vietnam, should spell out the truth as to our overall financial condition.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has had billions of dollars of losses that have not been reimbursed. Likewise, the civil service retirement fund is owed approximately $40 billion by our Government. Obligations such as these are covered up and not openly mentioned.

So, Mr. Speaker, I fully support our Republican minority leader in calling for truth in budgeting and likewise in questioning the President's wisdom in calling for increased Federal spending on domestic, nonmilitary programs. The American people have always supported austerity in wartime and the United States is at war, whether the administration cares to admit it or not. I do not mean cutting health research, or education, or funds for the care and needs of the elderly. I mean cutting down on duplication and waste and delaying new low-priority programs that can just as well wait until peace comes in southeast Asia.

The honest thing to do is to forgo political boondoggling, Mr. Speaker; the country cannot afford it in peacetime, but even more so in time of war.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with this Scripture: *My son, give me thine heart and let thine eyes observe my ways.*

Our Heavenly Father, we humbly turn to Thee for Thou art the source of the life that is eternal, of the light that never fails, and the love that never forgets.

As we bow together, the cares of life become less burdensome and its struggles less difficult.

Grant that we may always have a great trust in Thee, and take counsel with Thy will and purpose as we give ourselves to each task and responsibility.

Let us not live on the low level of our temptations and yield to those trials and tribulations, which we daily encounter, and seek to drag us down.

Lift us to the wider outlook of that quiet place of vision and service and may we serve Thy holy will faithfully and reverently.

In the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 20, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on January 21, 1966, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 767. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim National Ski Week.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 327. An act to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8210. An act to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act with respect to the European Space Research Organization; and

H.R. 8445. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8126. An act to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. DOMINICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 10779) entitled "An act to authorize the Pharr Municipal Bridge Corp., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Pharr, Tex.," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. AIKEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 86-420, appointed Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. METCALF, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. FANNIN, and Mr. MURPHY to be members of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group to attend the meetings to be held in Washington, Philadelphia, and San Francisco, on February 9 through 16, 1966.

BOARD OF VISITORS, AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 9355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. LAIRD, and Mr. DOLE.

BOARD OF VISITORS, COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 14 United States Code 194(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. ST. ONGE and Mr. WYATT.

BOARD OF VISITORS, MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 46 United States Code 1126c, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. CAREY and Mr. MAILLIARD.

BOARD OF VISITORS, MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 4355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. LIPSCOMB, and Mr. PIRNIE.

BOARD OF VISITORS, NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 6968(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. MINSHALL, and Mr. KING of New York.

ARTHUR PATRICK CANNON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to advise my colleagues and friends of the death of a former Member of this distinguished body, Arthur Patrick Cannon, who represented the Florida counties of Dade and Monroe, and his country extremely well. He died on Sunday, January 23.

He was born in Powder Springs, Cobb County, Ga., on May 22, 1904. The family moved to South Carolina where Pat attended public school and Wofford College at Spartanburg, S.C. Pat Cannon came to Florida where he attended John B. Stetson University at DeLand and then graduated from the University of Miami in 1931 with an LL.B.

Arthur Patrick Cannon served in this distinguished body from January 3, 1939 to January 3, 1947.

"Pat," as he was affectionately called by his many friends, was an able, knowledgeable, and humble man of great heart, who knew and understood—and was ever willing to assist—his fellow man.

In 1939, speaking before a committee of the Congress, he stated:

> My walking in marble halls has not caused me to forget thousands of shacks that house many of our unfortunate people, where they merely exist, hungry, ill-clothed, without medical care.

Pat never forgot his fellow man. He was always in the forefront of those striving to better each individual's way of life.

He was among the first to propose and encourage the adoption of Federal old-age assistance programs. He was among the first to propose Federal programs to assist the rehabilitation of veterans—particularly the wounded veteran. He urged that more liberal benefits be included in the Social Security Act.

Pat was a strong supporter of the Florida sugar industry and was an early advocate of the intracoastal waterway, which is now nearing completion.

Pat was a leader among those who proposed programs to eliminate poverty and crime and to increase education and employment opportunities.

In the late thirties, when crime and poverty were most prevalent and when employment was at a low ebb, he told his colleagues in these halls:

> It is true that there has been crime in the past and unfortunately in all probabil-

ity there always will be crime. But it is just as true that idle youth is a dangerous instrumentality. If we turn the crime pages that have blackened our history we will be reminded that "Baby Face" Nelson, "Pretty Boy" Floyd, and John Dillinger all embarked on their criminal careers during the tender years of their lives. I am firmly of the belief that criminals are not born, and that criminals are made, largely by the environment in which they find themselves. A child born of normal parents who are equipped to properly rear the child does not become a criminal. The activity and the anxiety and the ambition of unbridled youth cursed with poverty and denied the association of parentage because of economic conditions is the matter with which we must concern ourselves. Thousands of boys and girls are graduated from our high schools and colleges mentally fit and equipped in every way to fill that niche in society. As they walk out into the world, employment is not found. They are nonetheless ambitious and nonetheless able, and as a result of the deplorable condition of lacking of buying power and lack of available employment, they are called upon to use their good resources toward a criminal end. That is the plight largely of a greater portion of the inmates of our houses of correction, penitentiaries, and reformatories today and likewise our asylums. The youth of America must be employed and put to work and it must be done immediately, lest irreparable injury visit our society.

Pat was a great humanitarian, always concerned with the welfare of his fellow human being, possibly because of his humble beginnings, but whatever the reason, it is certain that Pat was motivated by a keen desire to help the youth, our elder citizens, veterans, and the deserving downtrodden.

After his fruitful and vigorous service in the Congress of the United States, Pat returned to Miami.

He went on to become a circuit judge elected in 1952, 1954, and in 1960 for a 6-year term. He was serving in that office at the time of his death.

Pat Cannon was an outspoken man. No one ever had any doubt about where Pat Cannon stood on anything, because he was quick to tell you.

Pat Cannon will be missed sorely by his friends and colleagues. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, and that I may have permission to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am grieved to hear of the death of the Honorable Pat Cannon, a former colleague in Congress from Florida, and a longtime distinguished jurist in our State.

It was my privilege to serve with Pat Cannon in the House of Representatives and to enjoy a warm friendship with him. He was elected from Miami in the late 1930's, and he served until 1946. As a matter of fact, I am the only member of the Florida house delegation who served with him in Washington. Subsequent to his service here, he became a judge of the circuit court in his home town of Miami and continued to serve in that capacity until his death.

Pat Cannon was one of the best known and best liked Members of the House. He was a big man with a personality to match. Liking him was instinctive. As a Congressman, he served well, and represented the city of Miami and the State of Florida with distinction. Although 20 years has elapsed since his service here, the memory of Pat Cannon is still strong in the Halls of Congress, among the Members, the staff, and the House employees who knew him and who still serve here.

I consider it a privilege to add my praise to his memory, and I extend my condolences as a longtime friend, to the members of his family.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until 12 o'clock midnight tonight to file a report on the bank merger bill, H.R. 12173.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SEVENTY-SEVEN MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE URGE THE PRESIDENT NOT TO GIVE UP CURRENT PEACE OFFENSIVE

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, a number of the Members of the House, sharing a growing concern about the war in Vietnam, last Thursday drafted a letter to the President and in the course of only 4 hours on Friday obtained its signature by 77 Members. Our letter to the President expressed our support of his extensive efforts to move the Vietnamese war to the conference table and we promised him our continued support in resisting aggression against South Vietnam. We urged the President not to give up on his current peace offensive at this time and we offered a suggestion that the United Nations be asked to seek an effective cease-fire in Vietnam.

On Saturday the President replied to our communication in the form of a letter addressed to me as the first name in the alphabetical list of signers. Mr. Speaker, the text of our letter, including a list of all Members who have signed or associated themselves with it, along with the text of the President's reply, is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We strongly support the vigorous efforts you have undertaken to bring the war in Vietnam to the conference table. Specifically, we applaud you for the moratorium on bombing North Vietnam and for the extensive personal contacts you have initiated with the leaders of other nations to make clear our unrelenting desire for a just peace. We would like to suggest that you further consider one additional dimension to this diplomatic offensive, that we formally request the United Nations to seek an effective cease-fire and that we pledge our support and our resources to such an effort.

While the response from the other side has not been encouraging, we do not believe we should yet assume that the door has been firmly closed. We cannot expect that a conflict which has raged so bitterly for so long will be quickly or easily resolved. Neither can we ignore the alternative to negotiations, a prolonged and probably expanded war with attendant costs in human suffering and material resources.

We stanchly support the determination of our Government to resist the terror and aggression which deny the people of South Vietnam the right freely to determine their own future. We continue to support you in that commitment. We recognize that there are those who urge a resumption of bombings of North Vietnam and a premature abandonment of our peace efforts. We are, however, concerned that unless we can halt or reverse the escalation of the last months it will become increasingly difficult to achieve a further pause, a ceasefire and meaningful negotiations. We urge you, therefore, to continue your present determined search for peace until such time as it becomes clear that no reasonable hope remains for a just settlement by peaceful means.

Sincerely yours,

BROCK ADAMS, JOSEPH ADDABBO, THOMAS ASHLEY, JONATHAN BINGHAM, JOHN BLATNIK, JOHN BRADEMAS, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., JAMES BYRNE, RONALD B. CAMERON, JEFFREY COHELAN.

JAMES CORMAN, WINFIELD DENTON, JOHN DOW, KEN DYAL, DON EDWARDS, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, DONALD FRASER, SAMUEL FRIEDEL, RICHARD FULTON, ROBERT GIAIMO.

JACOB GILBERT, JOHN GILLIGAN, HENRY GONZALEZ, BERNARD GRABOWSKI, GEORGE W. GRIDER, MARTHA GRIFFITHS, HARLAN HAGAN, WILLIAM HATHAWAY, AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, KEN HECHLER.

FLOYD HICKS, CHET HOLIFIELD, ELMER HOLLAND, HAROLD JOHNSON, JAMES KEE, PAUL KREBS, ROBERT LEGGETT, CLARENCE LONG, RODNEY LOVE.

RICHARD MCCARTHY, HARRIS MCDOWELL, JR., JAMES MACKAY, JOHN MACKIE, RAY MADDEN, LLOYD MEEDS, GEORGE P. MILLER, WILLIAM MOORHEAD, JOHN MOSS, LUCIEN NEDZI.

BARRATT O'HARA, JAMES O'HARA, ALEC OLSON, JOHN RACE, ROLLAND REDLIN, THOMAS REES, HENRY REUSS, GEORGE RHODES, EDWARD ROYBAL, WILLIAM ST. ONGE.

JAMES SCHEUER, B. F. SISK, HERBERT TENZER, PAUL TODD, JR., JOHN TUNNEY, MORRIS UDALL, WESTON VIVIAN, CHARLES WELTNER, LESTER WOLFF, FRANK THOMPSON, JR., ANDREW JACOBS, JR., BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, EDWARD P. BOLAND, JOSEPH E. KARTH.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 22, 1966.

HON. BROCK ADAMS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am responding to you as the first in alphabetical order of those Members of the House who have written to me under date of January 21 on the search for peace in Vietnam. I hope you will share this answer with your cosigners.

I am grateful for your strong support of our effort to move the war in Vietnam to the conference table. This support is a real encouragement, coupled as it is with the equally strong support of our determination to meet our commitments in Vietnam.

I share your interest in effective action through the United Nations, and I want you to know that there is no part of this whole problem to which we give closer attention. I have reviewed this matter many times with Ambassador Goldberg, and we have repeatedly considered the suggestion you offer. You can be assured that he and I are firmly determined to make every possible use of the United Nations in moving toward peace, and toward an effective cease-fire as part of that purpose.

Unfortunately, you are correct in your statement that the response from the other side has not been encouraging. The evidence available to this Government indicates only continuing hostility and aggressiveness in Hanoi and an insistence on the abandonment of South Vietnam to Communist takeover. We are making no hasty assumptions of any sort, but it is quite another matter to close our eyes to the heavy weight of evidence which has accumulated during the last month.

I can give you categorical assurance that there will be no abandonment of our peace efforts. Even though it is increasingly clear that we have had only a hostile response to the present pause in bombing North Vietnam, you can be sure that our unflagging pursuit of peace will continue. As I said this week in a letter to Speaker McCormack, "Whether the present effort is successful or not, our purpose of peace will be constant; we will continue to press on every door."

And at the same time, I am confident that as elected representatives of the American people, you will share my determination that our fighting forces in Vietnam shall be sustained and supported "by every dollar and every gun and every decision" that they must have "whatever the cost and whatever the challenge." For a month we have held our hand in an important area of military action. But the infiltration of the aggressor's forces has continued, and so have his attacks on our allies and on our own men. I am sure you will agree that we have a heavy obligation not to add lightly to the dangers our troops must face. We must give them the support they need in fulfillment of the commitment so accurately stated in your letter—"the determination of our Government to resist the terror and aggression which deny the people of South Vietnam the right freely to determine their own future."

Sincerely,

Lyndon B. Johnson.

AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN TAX CREDIT PROVISION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE U.S. ECONOMY

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to amend section 902(b) and section 902(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. These sections provide that if a U.S. corporation owns 10 percent or more of the voting stock of a foreign or first level corporation, and if such foreign corporation owns 50 percent or more of the voting stock of a second level or a foreign subsidiary, the domestic parent corporation may credit its proportionate share of the subsubsidiary's taxes. No credit is allowed to the U.S. corporation for foreign taxes paid by a foreign corporation beyond the second level.

As an example, a U.S. corporation has a wholly owned or majority owned foreign subsidiary in country X. This subsidiary wishes to develop a new activity in which local capital should participate, but it is in no position to provide 50 percent of the required capital without help from its American parent. However, it could provide 25 percent, with local capital providing the other 75 percent. Under present tax law, the latter cannot be done without complete loss of foreign tax credits on the new enterprise.

The foreign tax credit provision of the Internal Revenue Act, which was enacted in 1918 to remove international double taxation, has been amended several times. The present requirements of 10-percent and 50-percent ownership go back to the 1951 tax law. I understand that the 1951 requirement of at least a 50-percent stock ownership on the second level was predicated entirely on administrative convenience to the Internal Revenue Service. However, section 6046 of the Internal Revenue Code now requires an information return from each U.S. person who, directly or indirectly, owns 5 percent or more in the value of the stock of a foreign corporation. In addition, the 1962 tax law dealing with "subpart F income" provides the Treasury with detailed information on foreign operations of U.S. taxpayers. All this information in the hands of the Internal Revenue Service should eliminate the administrative inconvenience which might arise from reduction of the ownership test from 50 percent to 25 percent and from inclusion of the third level foreign corporation in the tax credit structure.

The proposed amendment would reduce the 50-percent requirement to 25 percent between the first and second levels and would include third level foreign corporations in the tax credit structure if the 25-percent test is met.

This change will have four major effects, all of which are in our national interest:

First. It will contribute to the U.S. balance of payments.

Second. It will enable American business to expand and grow abroad with reduced amounts of American equity capital.

Third. It will create a more favorable business climate abroad by furthering the increased participation of foreign local nationals in their own foreign economy.

Fourth. It should encourage a demand, wherever feasible, for raw materials, products and equipment to be supplied from sources within the United States rather than elsewhere, thereby benefiting our economy through increased employment and income.

Income from oversea investments by U.S. industry is the major factor in the U.S. balance of payments. Consequently, anything that can be done to expand the source of this income, without the use of U.S. dollars, would further the balance-of-payments' position. Such expansion also is affected by foreign competition which requires American industry operating abroad to protect its marketing position by additional investment from either the United States or abroad.

The United States has taken certain steps to reduce the amount of U.S. dollars used for foreign investments. One way to expand and grow without using U.S. dollars is to encourage foreign nationals to share in the ownership of the foreign enterprises in which American industry has interests. The reduction of the 50-percent test to 25 percent, and an extension of the credit to third level foreign corporations, would enable American industry, without the loss of foreign tax credits, to tap local sources of capital in the foreign country in which modernization and expansion are required to meet foreign competition abroad.

In addition, the increased participation of foreign nationals with American business in the industrial life of a particular foreign country should create a healthier attitude toward American activities in that country. Section 106(1a) of the Canadian Income Tax Act, effective in 1963, is an example of the concern of foreign governments for increased local participation in non-resident-owned businesses. This law provided for a reduction in the Canadian withholding tax paid by nonresident corporations having a prescribed degree of Canadian ownership.

In those countries which have local national stock exchanges, use of local equity capital could lead to a wider distribution of the stock of a second or third level foreign corporation. This penetration of the local capital markets could create additional sources for raising future venture capital.

Modernization and expansion of American financed industry abroad are necessary to meet foreign competition abroad. Under the foreign tax credit structure, as it now exists, capital required for such modernization and expansion must come largely from the United States. This is so because any reduction of the 50-percent stock interest between the first and second level foreign corporations, or the use of third level foreign corporations, would result in a loss of foreign tax credits to the U.S. parent corporation.

As this proposed legislation will prove beneficial to the economy of the United States as well as participating foreign countries, I urge my colleagues to actively support its enactment.

THE 4-YEAR TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, as you and my colleagues know, I am for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives.

My bill, House Joint Resolution 394, is not new—it has been in the hearts and on the minds of men since the days of that great American, James Madison, who favored a longer tenure of office for Members of the House.

Many others, over the years, have fought for this worthwhile project. In my own case—it has taken the constant prodding of my people for 20 years to arouse me to do something about it. Only when I had to fight and finance four, hard, costly campaigns, all in the last 2 years, would I launch myself into the frontline trench of the 4-year term battle. I refuse to sit idly by and wait until election costs grow so great and so frequent that only a wealthy person with unlimited means can afford to run for Congress.

The President has one version of this legislation and I have another. While our approaches differ somewhat, we both want a 4-year term. President Johnson may be on the New York Central and I on the Pennsylvania but we will arrive at the same destination. Only the route, the modus operandi, or legislative mechanics are at variance. I shall gratefully accept constructive amendments to my bill. I am happy to introduce today the President's prepared draft of the legislation.

I am convinced that the people of the United States are for this constitutional change by a ratio of 3 to 1. The Gallup poll—a 3-to-1 count—which was released last week, is in keeping with the many polls that have been taken by various Members of the House in their respective congressional districts.

For a year now, many of you have good naturedly needled me for "more action" on this legislation. At the lunch counter, at the dining room table, on the floor, behind the rail, in the cloakroom, on the train between buildings, you have "kidded" me to "get with it." Now that you have action and a powerful friend and ally, I would admonish you to quit talking and go to work on our 41 colleagues who are against the legislation and those 67 others who have expressed some doubt. Surely, the 254 who are strong for the measure here in the House do not need any persuasive conversation.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED 4-YEAR TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am, and have been, an advocate of the 4-year term for Members of the House. The increasing burdens of the office, the expense of campaigns, the ability through modern communication to keep close contact with his people, the need for undivided attention to the national problems are all persuasive.

However, Mr. Speaker, even as I applaud the support of the administration for this idea I am critical of the proposal as advocated by the administration.

First. I feel that there should be an expression by the electorate on national issues every 2 years; a staggering of the terms would accomplish this goal.

Second. I see no reason to insert in the necessary constitutional amendment a limitation which would prevent a Member of the House from running for the Senate unless his term had expired or unless he resigns. Surely such a provision is not necessary to induce these statesmen who serve in the other body to vote for such an amendment.

I am unalterably opposed to cluttering up a constitutional amendment with such a limitation. I hasten to add I am not and probably never will be a candidate for the Senate.

ERRONEOUS STORY ABOUT SUMMER POST OFFICE JOB

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I should like, this morning, to pay my respects to the Washington Post.

On September 14, 1965, the Washington Post said I had got a summer post office job for one of my relatives. Never doubt that the Washington Post prints the news. It was news to me, especially since it was not true.

Well, they were pretty nice about it. They ran a correction containing a regret.

But I must confess that when, on January 22, 1966, the Washington Post reran the same erroneous story about the same alleged job for the same alleged relative, it did get to be a bit of a bore.

Besides, some of my relatives are beginning to find out and complain about the job discrimination.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, poverty has always been the number one enemy of Puerto Rico. Twenty years ago, in order to destroy this foe, Puerto Rico embarked upon an industrial development program with the object of raising living standards for all its people and particularly for its working people in the cities and in the fields. Its interest was and is in the educational and economic opportunities for the poor.

But in industrializing, Puerto Rico's policy was and is to create new industrial activity and to build on that base. Through these years, Puerto Rico's spokesmen have made it clear—and I emphasize this again today—that Puerto Rico neither seeks nor will shelter runaway industries from any State.

We seek only a small share of the annual expansion of U.S. industrial capital. Mainland expansion of manufacturing capital in recent years has been about 4 percent per year, adding 1,200,000 jobs annually. Puerto Rico has been developing at the rate of about 29,000 jobs per year, or about 1 for every 40 in the mainland.

I make these observations because there was raised in the RECORD of this forum the question of minimum wages in Puerto Rico with the suggestion that Puerto Rico might be enticing industries from the mainland. The implication was that minimum wages in Puerto Rico are too low and that Puerto Rico is thus placed in a position of competitive advantage with the mainland firms.

Mr. Speaker, the implication is false, and I maintain that it is unnecessarily damaging to the 2.4 million fellow citizens living and working in the island.

Puerto Rico will not build on the foundation of misery for its people. We belong to the family of governments which advocates and strives for better things for its people—more jobs, higher wages, more education, better living, fuller employment. We have come far in this respect, and in 1964 had advanced to $900 per capita income as compared to $1,749 per capita income in Alabama. Yes, we have come far by the standards of many nations in this hemisphere and in others, but we are still very poor in this respect as compared with any of the sister States of the Union.

The real key to progress is fullest possible employment. Such a condition makes for simultaneous advance on all fronts. When employment rates fall, any community begins to disintegrate economically, politically, culturally, and morally.

Realizing this, Puerto Rico believes in and champions minimum wage legislation—so much so, that it has its own minimum wage laws to supplement statutory minimum wages set by the National Fair Labor Standards Act.

We have found through experience, however, that inflexible extension to Puerto Rico of the Federal wage law simply does not work, and we bear in mind that the purpose of this law, as stated in the law itself, is to work to the advantage of the workingman, not to his disadvantage.

The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as its finding and declaration of policy stated:

> SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the existence, in industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, of labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers (1) causes commerce and the channels and instrumentalities of commerce to be used to spread and perpetuate such labor conditions among the workers of the several States; (2) burdens commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; (3) constitutes an unfair method of competition in commerce; (4) leads to labor disputes burdening and obstructing commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; and (5) interferes with the orderly and fair marketing of goods in commerce.

> (b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act, through the exercise by Congress of its power to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, to correct and as rapidly as practicable to eliminate the conditions above referred to in such industries without substantially curtailing employment or earning power.

Section 208 of title 29 of the United States Code, with regard to wage orders in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, states:

> The policy of this chapter with respect to industries or enterprises in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce is to reach as rapidly as is economically feasible, without substantially curtailing employment, the objective of the minimum wage prescribed in paragraph (1) of section 206(a) of this title, in each such industry.

In 1938 the Fair Labor Standards Act imposed a statutory minimum wage of 25 cents per hour. This was applicable to Puerto Rico as to the mainland. It soon became apparent to the Congress, however, that the application of even this small, compulsory minimum to Puerto Rico imposed a disruptive and unbearable hardship on the local economy. In 1940, the Congress wisely provided that in lieu of the uniform statutory minimum, a special system of determining minimum wages prevail in Puerto Rico on an industry-by-industry basis.

The problem was how to lay more golden eggs for the worker without killing the goose.

Tripartite committees were provided for, representing industry, labor, and the public, and appointed by the U.S. Secretary of Labor, to hold hearings on minimum wages for individual industries according to the economic condition or ability to pay of each specific industry. Such minimum wages on an industry-by-industry basis must be reviewed at least once each 2 years. The guideline is that each industry must pay the highest minimum wage that it can without substantially curtailing employment.

This flexible procedure recognizes and adapts itself to the economic conditions of industry itself, and to the economic climate of the island, but it has not gone without challenge from time to time since its inception.

In 1949 its opponents pressed for the extension to Puerto Rico of the then new 75-cent minimum, but it was concluded that this would force a drastic curtailment of employment in Puerto Rico, and the committee system was kept as the only workable alternative. In 1955 there was an effort to extend the new $1 minimum to Puerto Rico. Critics of the Puerto Rico flexible system charged that it gave unfair competitive advantage to Puerto Rican manufacturers. But Congress gave close scrutiny to industrial conditions in the island, and again the flexible system prevailed.

In 1961 the mainland minimum was being raised again to $1.15; and to $1.25 in 1963. In this case Congress provided for proportionate increases of 15 percent in Puerto Rico minimums as the first step; and a further 10-percent increase as the second step.

This was the first time that an element of inflexibility was introduced for wage determinations in Puerto Rico. There was, however, provision for review by a so-called Hardship Committee, appointed by the U.S. Secretary of Labor, where the automatic increases threatened substantial curtailment of employment. The Review Committee met upon application by employers accounting for more than one-half of the employment in a given industry. Eleven industries in Puerto Rico employing more than one-third of the workers covered by the act in the island, filed applications for relief from the fixed 15-percent increase provided for in 1961. Ten of these industries were granted relief by the Review Committee.

In 1963 8 industries covering 24 classifications within the group, applied for relief from the second step increase, and 22 classifications were given relief from the 10-percent increase prescribed by the act.

Thus, it is seen, that an inflexible formula of minimum wage increases in Puerto Rico does not work, simply because economic conditions in the island and the economic conditions of some of the respective industries makes it impossible to attain such minimums and still survive.

I may point out that Puerto Rico is a small island of 3,500 square miles in which most of the land is not arable. This land must support 2.4 million people, and it has no known mineral resources. We must industrialize, and we started from scratch. The industrial capital which we attract must, in our system of private enterprise, be used to make a profit.

Industries in Puerto Rico have to develop skills from among our people. They must pay for the cost of transporting raw materials to Puerto Rico, and then for shipping finished products to the marketplaces of the Nation. The two-way transportation costs are expensive and, of course, we use American-flag ships with American seamen, and American wages, and without American subsidies.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize that Puerto Rico will not trade on the misery of its people. It will not deprive its workers of the just rewards of their labor to gain a position of competitive leverage. Neither will it permit mainland industries to close up shop and reestablish in Puerto Rico on the promise of cheap labor or any other advantages. We play the game fair as you people in the States play the game fair. We seek no privilege, but we do ask that the realities of our economic position be recognized. Above all, we believe in higher wages and full employment, and we will continue to strive for this goal.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include at this point in my remarks an editorial from the January 10 edition of El Mundo, and a recent editorial in the San Juan Star relating to this subject.

[From El Mundo, San Juan, P.R., Jan. 10, 1966]

It Is Urgent To Reach Congress

The Government of Puerto Rico has expressed clearly its opposition to the planned increase in minimum wages, in the form in which the U.S. Congress contemplates it at the present time, and it has stated that it would constitute a mortal blow to the efforts being made to give impulse and vitality to the island's economy.

Several Puerto Rican officials—among them Alfredo Nazario, Secretary of Labor—making a statement before the Senate Labor Subcommittee, pleaded for keeping the special industry committees, which up to the present time have had the right of regulating the minimum salary.

Such committees, which would disappear if the Federal legislation under consideration is approved, have been up to now a relief for certain industries which cannot bear the pressure of the present salaries.

The Secretary of Labor expressed opposition also to the suggested formula of automatic increases, stating that the same would result in harm to the Puerto Rican economy. Up to now, the existing precarious balance, between what many industries can pay its workers and what they are actually paying them, has been kept, thanks to the complex series of factors, which vary in each situation. The salary increases have taken place, but they must be justified, so that they do not endanger the existence of industry, nor its capacity to generate employment.

The automatic increases proposed by Congress would not have the virtue of making the individual corrections needed by many of those industries, and the disappearance of the special committees would eliminate the last refuge for them.

The closing of those factories and the decrease in the number of jobs in many others, undoubtedly would be enough to hold and even turn back the economic revolution which has been taking place in Puerto Rico.

Ever since the U.S. Congress started to promote the revision in minimum wages, El Mundo has been pointing out the need for the Government leaders to become aware of the irretrievable harm which might be done to the Puerto Rican economy.

In the recent public hearings, even the labor leaders, traditionally bound to defend every salary increase, were divided regarding the desirability of eliminating the special committees, which up to now have kept, in some cases, lower salaries from those stipulated by law.

Puerto Rico should bring up, with great urgency and by all the available means, its point of view before Congress regarding this case. The greatest number of authorized persons should raise their voices to warn clearly that one of the bases of our progress during the last 20 years cannot be eliminated in such a way, without endangering the stability of our whole economic structure.

[From the San Juan (P.R.) Star; January 1966]

Editorial

There may be trouble ahead for Puerto Rico, however, in the President's promise to fight for a higher Federal minimum wage and expansion of coverage to millions of workers not now included in the minimum wage law. Puerto Rico is included in the Fair Labor Standards Act, which includes minimum wages under a special provision which permits reviews by industry committees of hardship cases. It is ironic that all of the beneficial provisions of the Great Society program could be negated here by one mistake in the treatment of Puerto Rico under one wage law. If the Federal minimum wage were to apply here equally with the mainland, without special consideration for the peculiar conditions in the island and the difference between this and the U.S. economy, all the anti-poverty help wouldn't make a dent in the poverty that would be created let alone relieve what exists today.

Resident Commissioner Santiago Polanco-Abreu said in Washington last week that he would ask the House Subcommittee on Labor to reopen hearings on the minimum wage bill to hear Puerto Rico's story. A subcommittee of the Senate held hearings here recently and compiled a strong record of warnings against extension to Puerto Rico of the minimum wage bill already approved by the full House Labor Committee last year. This could be a make or break issue for the island this year, at a time when Puerto Rico needs more than ever before to increase the momentum of its economic growth rather than to apply artificial and unrealistic brakes to its progress.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL ORGANIZATION

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, as cochairman of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, I filed the committee's second interim report—House Report No. 1218, Senate Report No. 948.

We spent so much time during the first session of this Congress listening to the views and recommendations of everyone who wanted to speak on congressional reform that there was no opportunity before adjournment to meet in executive session and consider what the committee would recommend. We listened to everyone who wished to testify—we excluded no one.

Fifty-nine Members of the House of Representatives and 17 Senators appeared personally and testified. I know they diverted many man-hours from their other congressional tasks to prepare their statements and appear in person to give the committee the benefit of their views. That is also true with respect to many Representatives and Senators who prepared statements for our record—but due to other commitments could not present them in person. I am sure there were many other Members interested in making Congress more effective—who wanted to testify but just could not find the time to do so in a formal way. The joint committee will be glad to receive statements from Members and place the same on file.

The 13 volumes of our record of hearings from May 10, 1965, to September 23, 1965, total 2,063 printed pages. They are available in our staff office in the Capitol, room S–146. As cochairman of the committee, I want to thank my colleagues and the members of the other body for their interest in our work.

Our committee now will meet in executive sessions and debate the multitude of proposals presented by Congressmen, Senators, political scientists, trade associations, industrial management, labor unions, and other citizens' groups. I am sure after consulting with the leadership of both legislative chambers, we can bring forth sensible, practical, and productive recommendations which will help the Congress to more economically and efficiently perform its functions in this the greatest representative government in the world.

I believe we will assemble a good report and I hope you will adopt reforms which will preserve the vitality and vigor of the Congress of the United States as the primary instrument of self-government of the American people, not only for today but for decades to come.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record I include a press release, relating to our committee's second interim report.

Second Interim Report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress

Senator A. S. Mike Monroney, Democrat, of Oklahoma, and Representative Ray J. Madden, Democrat, of Indiana, cochairmen of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, on filing the committee's second interim report said:

"The committee at an executive session determined to request its continuation during the 2d session of the 89th Congress and commenced consideration of the congressional reforms suggested by the 181 witnesses the committee has heard, whose testimony is contained in 13 printed volumes totaling 2,063 pages."

The cochairmen noted that these reforms were summarized under appropriate topics in the appendix of the second interim report.

Senator Monroney and Congressman Madden also noted that 17 Senators and 59 Congressmen had appeared personally before the committee and many Representatives and Senators had submitted their recommendations in the form of statements. The two cochairmen praised the interest and cooperation of their colleagues in the Congress and observed that their suggestions would be most helpful as "practitioners of the legislative art."

The cochairmen indicated that no fixed timetable for the filing of a final report had been set by the committee, but that the members and the staff would immediately commence detailed study of proposals and attempt to arrive at tentative agreement on recommendations.

VOICED CONCERN

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, if any one of us saw that vials of poison were within the reach of a child be loved, he would sound the cry of danger.

Yet, today poison surrounds all of our loved ones—ourselves—all of us.

This is the poison in the air and in the water, which we have allowed to become so polluted that it endangers not only insects, fish, and fowl, but human beings as well.

The administration is to be commended for sounding the danger of "the continued poisoning of our rivers and air." Along these lines, I ask that my colleagues take particular note of a recent editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer, which I offer for the Record:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Jan. 16, 1966]

Battling Air and Water Pollution

Of all the concerns voiced recently by the President, possibly the most widely shared is that concerning the ruin of our air and water resources. Mr. Johnson called the "continued poisoning of our rivers and air" a "shameful" devastation, and no one can deny it.

He advocated "a cooperative effort to end pollution in several entire river basins—making additional Federal funds available to help draw the plans and construct the plants necessary to make the waters of entire river systems clean—and a source of pleasure and beauty for our people."

The Inquirer has long advocated a regional approach to both air and water problems, and we believe Pennsylvania (and the city) to be less culpable in recent years than many other areas. Yet there is a long and expensive way to go.

No such curative sum has been mentioned, for instance, but the cost to the Nation of unchecked air pollution alone has been estimated at $11 billion annually. What filthy waterways add to the bill is anybody's guess, but it can hardly be less.

All of which helps to justify the huge sums needed to end the disastrous legacy of past greed and carelessness. New York State has voted a billion-dollar bond issue to clean up its streams and rivers, and observers do not expect this to be half enough.

It is difficult in semi-wartime to divert to such "peaceful" uses as a widespread, badly needed cleanup, enough funds and/or attention to do the job right. Yet last year's antipollution bill in Congress provided only a bare start and a strong follow-through is required.

For this is another kind of war, no less important than armed combat. Where is the profit if we militarily handle all our exterior foes only to strangle with every breath we take, or fill a glass with poison out of the faucet?

Exaggerated? Today, yes. But not much—and not for long, unless every city, town and county, and the Congress, really puts some muscle into the cleanup now.

APPALACHIAN TRAIL

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced the bill H.R. 12204 to advance the management, use, and benefits of the Appalachian Trail. This is a counterpart of the bill S. 622 introduced in the other body by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson].

In these days when the man in the street has joined with the conservationists in supporting the need for preservation of our natural heritage, it is certainly appropriate to reinforce one of the very earliest official projects having such a purpose.

This bill is in effect an extension of the Appalachian Trailway agreement which since 1938 has been a guide for the 13 States through which the trail passes. About one-third of the trail is now on Federal lands. It runs from Mount Katahdin, Maine, to Springer Mountain, Ga.

One of the most beautiful sections of the trail lies in my own 27th Congressional District in New York State. It was here in 1922 that the first section of the trail was opened under the leadership of the late Raymond H. Torrey, a name highly honored in my district. The trail there is partly within the Palisades Interstate Park, itself a majestic treasure of natural American forest land. At that point the Appalachian Trail is at the point closest in its entire length to the

New York metropolitan area. Perhaps here the greatest numbers of Americans enjoy this fraction of America in its original condition.

In substance my bill H.R. 12204 provides coordination of the efforts of the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, and Defense and those of other Federal officials in providing uniform administration and protection of the Appalachian Trail. The trail is designated to be a trailway which shall be maintained so as to retain its natural and scenic character. The Secretary of Interior, with concurrence of other Federal agencies, is authorized to issue regulations carrying out the purpose of the act. The Secretary is authorized to redefine the route in order to improve its quality. The bill sets up the principle of locating the trailway to provide maximum retention of natural conditions and scenic and historic features, and its primitive nature. The bill provides for acquisition by the Federal agencies of properties through donations or willing sellers, all for the benefit of the trailway objectives.

PEACE QUEST PRAISED

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, the President has made quite clear his hopes for ending the war in Vietnam. No one doubts that the United States prefers peace—a just and honorable peace—to a mean and ugly war. Our motives will go far to convince others that we do not seek added territory and that we do not seek to rob another country of its resources.

A recent editorial in the Washington Star is typical of many which have praised the administration for its approach to ending the war in Vietnam. Because this editorial is of much interest, I insert it in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 17, 1966]

CONTINUING PEACE QUEST

Whatever signals have or have not been received from the Communist leaders in Hanoi, President Johnson is acting as if he means business in his search for peace in Vietnam.

The state of the Union message did not, as many people expected, mark the end of a peace offensive and a return to intensified war. It marked, on the contrary, the culmination of an appeal to shift the conflict from the battlefield to the conference room.

Since then the Russian mission to Hanoi headed by party leader, Alexander N. Shelepin, has wound up its work. Along with increased aid for North Vietnam, the Russians also have been urging negotiations, in the opinion of some analysts here. In South Vietnam, observers have marked a slackening pace of hostilities. In New Delhi where he attended the funeral of Premier Shastri, Vice President HUMPHREY conferred for almost 2 hours with Russian Premier Alexei Kosygin, presumably on ways to end the fighting.

The surprise visit of Secretary of State Rusk to Saigon adds fuel to the speculation that something is cooking. The opposition of the South Vietnamese Government to any formal negotiations at this stage is a major obstacle to peace talks that would have to be overcome if discussions were to be held. The presence of Mr. Rusk in the troubled capital, along with the President's chief emissary, Averell Harriman, suggests that the chances are brightening.

"I am hopeful," said Mr. Johnson Wednesday. "And I will try as best I can with everything I've got to end this battle and return our sons to their desires." The substance of these hopes today remains very much a mystery. But few can doubt that the President is doing his best.

DR. MANFRED GEORGE

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to a man who was not only a great American, but a great citizen of the world. The death of Manfred George in New York on December 30 has saddened not only those who knew him, but all those through the world who were familiar with Aufbau, the German language weekly which he edited so brilliantly and tirelessly for more than 25 years.

Manfred George came to this country in 1939. At that time he could already look back on a distinguished career in his native Germany as an author, novelist and, above all, a journalist. Forced to leave Germany because of his implacable enmity to Nazism, he settled briefly in Czechoslovakia, then in France and finally found his way, like so many other refugees from tyranny, to the United States.

Shortly after his arrival he was persuaded to take over a small monthly newsletter, called Aufbau, dedicated to maintaining contact among German speaking refugees. Under his inspired leadership this publication, which soon became a weekly, gained worldwide renown as one of the finest German language papers in the world. Today Aufbau is read in more than 80 countries and is universally respected as a thoughtful and outspoken voice for decency and liberalism.

Through the pages of Aufbau, Manfred George provided an entire generation of immigrants with their first link to their new homeland. While international in its interest, Aufbau was and remains primarily an American paper, and through it our many new citizens who arrived in the late thirties and early forties as refugees from the evils of Hitlerism received their first introduction to America.

Manfred George communicated a sense of excitement, dedication, and the sheer joy of being alive. And he never once lost sight of his aim and his supreme ideal: freedom and decency everywhere. Wherever the fight for human decency was being waged, he was at home: whether it was Germany or Isreal, New York or Mississippi. His pen was in the forefront of the struggle against oppression and tyranny. His life was dedicated to the cause of freedom and justice.

Mr. Speaker, all those who shared his ideals have lost an articulate spokesman. Manfred George was not only an illustrious constituent but a cherished friend whose sound counsel I valued. He was fortunate in leaving a monument of his own creation. Aufbau will endure because Manfred George succeeded in imbuing it with his own spirit. Through his paper he will continue to live.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD articles about Dr. Manfred George which were published in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune on January 1, 1966:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 1, 1966]

DR. MANFRED GEORGE 72, DIES; EDITOR OF GERMAN WEEKLY HERE—NOVELIST AND BIOGRAPHER MADE AUFBAU A VOICE OF HELP TO REFUGEES OF NAZISM

Dr. Manfred George, editor of Aufbau, a German weekly here, died Thursday night in the University Hospital. He was 72 years old and lived at 785 West End Avenue.

Dr. George, a biographer and novelist, who was known as a liberal editor in Germany before the rise of Hitler, became editor of Aufbau in 1939, after arriving here as a penniless refugee.

Aufbau was then a small monthly newsletter published by the German Jewish Club of New York, which is now the New World Club, Inc. Dr. George marshaled a distinguished advisory board, including Albert Einstein and Thomas Mann, and built the publication into an influential weekly with a circulation of 30,00C.

In World War II, the Aufbau helped thousands of refugees adjust to new homes and aided in the reunion of families and friends. It offered subscribers English lessons, information about naturalization, jobs, and housing.

Aufbau changed with the times. Its search column, which assisted refugees in tracing families after the war, gave way to a supplement to help Jews establish claims for restitution from the German Government. Today, it carries theater and opera reviews, columns on the stock market, and hobbies, as well as articles on world affairs.

EXCLUSIVE FROM HEUSS

"Aufbau," Dr. George once said "never stressed the concept of collective guilt for Germany." This resulted in friendly relations with the German Government. In 1951, Theodor Heuss, President of West Germany, gave Aufbau an exclusive story about the decision of his Government to pay Jews for loss of property under Hitler.

Dr. George toiled as many as 100 hours a week, aided by a staff of 30, to get Aufbau to its subscribers throughout the United States and many foreign countries. His reward was a loyal readership among uprooted people all over the world.

He was born in Berlin, the son of a businessman, and studied law at the Universities of Berlin, Greifswald, and Geneva. In World War I, he served in the German army and was discharged in 1915, after being severely wounded. In 1917, he received a doctor of jurisprudence degree from the University of Berlin.

While a student, he entered journalism. He served for 2 years as managing editor of the weekly Deutsche Montagszeitung. In 1917 he joined the Ullstein Verlag, newspaper publishers. He served as local editor of several of its Berlin papers and then became chief editor of the Berliner Abendpost.

ESCAPED FIRING SQUAD

Later he went to Silesia as a correspondent and to direct the Ullstein office in Breslau. While reporting on the Upper Silesian plebiscite during the Kapp Putsch of 1920, he was arrested by rightwing insurgents and escaped a firing squad only after producing a certificate of military service.

He left Ullstein in 1923 to join the Mosse Verlag, for whose newspapers he was drama critic and a correspondent. He returned to Ullstein in 1928 as chief editor of Tempo and was coeditor of the cultural magazine Marsyas.

In the 1920's and early thirties, he wrote political articles for liberal journals, radio dramas, and a musical revue, "Oh, U.S.A." which had 50 performances in Berlin in 1931.

He also wrote short stories, novels, including "Eine Nacht in Kattowitz," which was seized and destroyed by the Nazis before its scheduled publication, and brief biographies, including one of Marlene Dietrich.

"The Case of Ivar Kreuger," was the title of his study of the Swedish financier, which was translated into English and Italian.

A member of the German Zionist movement, Dr. George wrote an early popular biography of Theodore Herzl, the Zionist leader, with introductions by Mann and Einstein.

LED ANTIHITLER PARTY

With the growth of nazism, Dr. George became an active opponent, serving for several months as president of the Republican party of Germany.

After the Nazis took control in 1933, he went on foot over the mountains into Czechoslovakia and became editor of a Prague newspaper. In 1935, he helped found the Judische Revue.

He spent 6 months in Spain during the civil war, reporting from the loyalist side to Czechoslovak, Swiss, Austrian, Dutch, and Rumanian papers.

After the Munich pact of 1938, Dr. George made his way here through Hungary, Yugoslavia, Italy, Switzerland, and France. He started on the Aufbau at a salary of $15 a month.

At the celebration of the publication's 30th anniversary March 21 at the Hunter College Assembly Hall, the speakers included Mayor Wagner; Dr. Heinrich Knappstein who was the West German Ambassador, and diplomatic representatives of Israel and Austria. President Johnson sent greetings.

INTERVIEWED THE FAMOUS

Dr. George wrote thousands of articles for leading European and United States publications and had interviewed, among others the late Dr. Albert Schweitzer, David Ben-Gurion, and Mr. Johnson.

He became a citizen in 1945.

In 1963, West Berlin's Mayor Willy Brandt presented to Dr. George the Berliner Bar Award.

He was a member of the Overseas Press Club, the Foreign Press Association, the Jewish Academy of Sciences, B'nai B'rith, and the Zionist Organization of America.

Surviving are his widow, the former Jeanette Simon; a son, Frank D. George; a daughter, Mrs. Renee G. O'Sullivan; and three grandchildren.

There will be a private funeral service.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 1, 1966]

Manfred George, Edited German Aufbau Here

(By Jerome Zukosky)

Manfred George had been swept across the borders of Europe before Nazi oppression, at times crossing mountains on foot, when he arrived penniless in New York in 1938.

A lawyer, prolific author of plays and biographies, a journalist who ranged the world, and a leader of liberal German republican politics, he was one of the tens of thousands of German-Jewish professionals who contributed to the flowering of a liberal and humane German culture before Hitler. It was his mission, Dr. George wrote later, to preserve in America what remained of that tradition.

He succeeded by creating Aufbau, or Reconstruction, as a forum for his countrymen. He began at a salary of $15 a month with a decrepit typewriter, a 1-room Manhattan office and a 4-page monthly newsletter of a refugee's club and 2,000 subscribers. Working often 7 days a week and 14 or more hours a day, writing much of the paper himself, Dr. George turned Aufbau into one of the most influential foreign-language newspapers in the United States. Its circulation of about 38,000 a week includes readers in 38 nations.

Dr. George, editor of Aufbau for the last 27 years, died Thursday evening at University Hospital of a stroke at 72. He entered the hospital in October after a long illness but continued to edit the paper from his bed, telephoning constantly to his shabby cluttered office at 2121 Broadway, on whose walls were pictures of such old friends as Marlene Dietrich, whose first biography he wrote.

Dr. George rounded up an advisory board in 1941 for Aufbau that included Albert Einstein, Thomas Mann, Franz Werfel, Lion Feuchtwanger, Emil Ludwig, Freda Kirchwey, Roger N. Baldwin, and others of similar talent who set the tone of the paper. He was an intimate friend of Dr. Albert Schweitzer, who occasionally contributed and with whom Dr. George had a long and lengthy correspondence.

Dr. George mixed sophisticated theater reviews—he was one of the first to pay serious attention to the off-Broadway theater—and literary news with advice to the immigrants about finding jobs, apartments, and language instruction. Special sections were devoted to tracing missing persons and survivors of the Nazi holocaust and helping refugees here make claims for restitution from the postwar West German Government.

Yet Dr. George "never stressed the concept of collective guilt for Germany," he said, and his moderation paved the way for close ties with the West German Government. At a testimonial meeting at Hunter College last May on Aufbau's 30th anniversary, some 2,000 readers gave an ovation to West German Ambassador Heinrich Knappstein as well as the Israeli consul general here.

As Aufbau's readers changed into Americans, so did Dr. George and his paper. "When I go to Europe now, I am going abroad," he said in 1959. He felt increasingly cut off from the postwar German generation, for which he used the German word "truemmerkinder"—children of the ruins. "They are bent, they came out of the shadows, there is a wall between us," he said.

His paper runs an average of 32 pages a week. Walter Lippmann is translated into German, but Art Buchwald and Dick Schaap of the Herald Tribune appear in English.

Dr. George was born in Berlin, the son of a businessman whose ancestors included rabbis, merchants, and architects. His study of law was interrupted by World War I, during which he was seriously wounded in the German Army. Soon after obtaining his law degree in 1917 he began writing for German newspapers. He was editor of the Berlin Abendpost, drama critic for the Berliner Volkszeitung, and later Prague correspondent for the Nationalzeitung of Basel, Switzerland, which he served as American correspondent after emigrating here.

During the 1950's Dr. George contributed to the Herald Tribune editorial page and wrote many articles for other newspapers and magazines in the United States.

Surviving are his wife, the former Jeannette Simon of 785 West End Avenue, a former social worker he married in Germany in 1920; a son Frank, an architect, of Stamford, Conn.; a daughter, Mrs. George O'Sullivan, a book illustrator, and three grandchildren. A private funeral service will be held today. A memorial forest in Israel in honor of Dr. George is being planned.

FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIENT IN U.S. SHIP CONSTRUCTION

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Federal budget released today contains provision for construction of only 13 new merchant ships.

As of October 31, 1965, the U.S.S.R. had 464 merchant ships of 1,000 gross tons or over under construction or on order. The Soviets have reached the point where some 24 percent of the total number of ships being built throughout the world are being built for them.

Shipyards in some of our closest allied nations are hard at work trying to fill the Russians' orders. Britain, Japan, Italy, Holland—they are all building ships for the Reds.

By comparison, the United States had only 39 merchant ships under construction or on order as of last October. Our own shipyards are operating at less than half capacity.

During 1965, the Soviets accepted delivery of 100 new ships, while the United States took delivery of only 16. In terms of cargo capacity our total delivery of ships was approximately 24 percent that of the Russians.

The Soviet Union spent over $600 million last year on new ship construction. The U.S. figure comes to less than 20 percent of that.

The importance of shipping strength in time of war or national emergency is seen from the fact that our merchant marine has been called our "fourth arm of defense." Yet so pitiful is today's U.S. shipping strength that it has become necessary for the Defense Department to charter foreign ships, at least four of them, for the sealift to Vietnam.

Last week the Chief of Naval Operations raised serious questions about the adequacy of this Nation's shipping strength to handle emergency requirements.

Somewhere in the Defense Department someone has been derelict in assessing the need for shipping capacity in time of emergency.

As a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee I urge that a full and thorough review of this matter be initiated immediately. So little attention to planning has been given to shipping matters that vessels are now tied up for at least 30 days in a maritime logjam in South Vietnam. Military supplies are hopelessly detained, and overtime wages are adding to other waste and expense caused by a ludicrous situation.

I urge the Congress to explore this entire situation fully in this session.

REVISION NEEDED IN ARLINGTON CEMETERY BURIALS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly having to bring to the attention of the House the subject matter of what I am going to say. First I want to read the following Associated Press article from yesterday's Washington Post:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 23, 1966]

Red Leader To Be Buried at Arlington

New York, January 22.—The ashes of Robert G. Thompson, 1 of 11 top Communist leaders convicted of conspiring to overthrow the Government, will be buried January 31 in Arlington National Cemetery, his widow said today.

Thompson was New York State chairman of the Communist Party when the leaders were tried in 1949. He received a 3-year sentence in Atlanta Penitentiary and a $10,000 fine.

His widow, Sylvia, said she had asked that the traditional gun salute be omitted at the burial services because she disagrees with the Government's Vietnam policy.

Arlington Cemetery confirmed that a Robert G. Thompson would be buried there January 31, but said it had no other information.

Thompson won the Distinguished Service Cross for heroism while serving in the Pacific in World War II. He was 50 when he died here last October 15.

To have Arlington Cemetery, a place hallowed by the graves and memories of our Nation's greatest heroes, bespoiled by the interment of a man dedicated to the overthrow of our beloved country is as painful a concept as I can imagine. Tragically, it is entirely unnecessary and results from misplaced bureaucratic idealism. If this can be justified, we can justify burying there Benedict Arnold, Aaron Burr, and a host of others who had at one time in their lives contributed something to America, but then turned their backs on the country that had helped them to secure all the good things they had attained. When I called to the attention of the Department of the Army some years ago the impropriety of burying in Arlington an Army sergeant who had taken $40,000 from the Soviet imperialists in turn for giving American secrets to them, they promised to try to draft legislation which would prohibit this in the future. As a result I introduced legislation in 1963 with this idea in mind. Regrettably it was not strong enough to cover the things that should be covered; for I attempted to come into accord with the bureaucratic opposition. My efforts were at getting something they would agree to and which we could, therefore, pass. Even this mild piece of legislation failed to pass because of ultimate departmental opposition; so I tried again and finally a bill was given to me in an informal manner, for introduction. This I was told might obtain departmental approval. This is H.R. 10750, introduced August 30, 1965. Again it is a compromise and would not prohibit the burial of Thompson even if it were passed. It would eliminate some improper burials but would be but a mild gesture in the right direction. When I talked to Department officials this morning about this matter, I was told that the regulations in the Army controlling who shall be buried in Arlington do not really prevent the exclusion of Thompson and similar persons; neither do the statutes; but the bureaucratic answers given me were that these regulations and statutes also do not direct that people in these circumstances should be forbidden interment there. So I am told that the statutes and regulations would allow Thompson and other disloyal persons to be not admitted, but that all that the Army expects to do about this is to bring out a new regulation which would subsequently provide against the interment of disloyal persons. I will continue to press for the passage of H.R. 10750 and will seek an amendment to this to prevent by statute things like this happening in the future; and I will hope that the Department will give departmental approval. But I want to point out that the whole disgraceful affair could be prevented by the Department today by utilizing the regulations and statutes it already has. With our splendid and courageous young Americans giving their lives in Vietnam for our country, the failure of our Government to act vigorously in this just plain makes me sick.

THE INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

Mr. **WELTNER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WELTNER**. Mr. Speaker, I heard with interest the remarks of my distinguished colleague and friend from Florida concerning one aspect of the internal security laws of the country. I agree with him that this entire field needs thorough study and revision. I have obtained a special order, for tomorrow afternoon, to discuss a bill which is nearing completed form. I make this statement today because I feel that the House must give its attention to a thorough revision and updating of these most important protections of our country and of our people.

SECRETARY RUSK ON "MEET THE PRESS"

Mr. **CEDERBERG**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CEDERBERG**. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to commend Secretary of State Dean Rusk for his excellent performance last evening on the "Meet the Press" international program. While I do not always agree with Secretary Rusk and I have serious reservations regarding the advisability of expanding East-West trade at this time, nevertheless, the Secretary stated our country's desire for peace but our unwillingness to surrender to Communist pressure clearly and without equivocation.

Mr. Speaker, these are troubled times and require that we unite as a people to assure the safety of our own country from the desire of Communist expansion and world domination.

Mr. Speaker, the late Sir Winston Churchill stated in 1938, after the partition of Czechoslovakia at Munich these words which are true today and which should serve as a lesson from history, and I quote:

> The belief that security can be obtained by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion.

May we wisely use these lessons from history as we pursue our relentless desire for an honorable peace.

AMERICAN AID

Mr. **FINDLEY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FINDLEY**. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to read in today's St. Louis Globe-Democrat a report by Mr. Edward O'Brien, chief of the newspaper's Washington bureau, announcing a United Nations grant to support a technological institute in Cuba, with 40 percent of the money coming from the U.S. Treasury. Only Communist Party members and members of the militia, according to the report, are permitted to attend the institute.

This means that more than $1 million in U.S. tax dollars will go to support what may well be a principal Communist training school for revolution.

The news report indicates that the United States will not attempt to block approval of the project or withdraw the U.S. contribution.

Perhaps the United States has obligations through the U.N. treaty which it cannot duck, but the language of this news report suggests otherwise. Certainly the project deserves thorough congressional examination.

On the face of it, the United States seems to be in the ridiculous position of throwing bullets at the Communists on one front and throwing dollars at them on another.

Has the Monroe Doctrine sunk to such low ebb that the United States now feels obliged to help support the Communist military establishment 90 miles off our shores, an establishment which quite clearly continues to be the focal point for Communist activity throughout Latin America?

Here is the text of Mr. O'Brien's article:

American Aid To Total $1.2 Million—Roosevelts Puts Tentative OK on Project

(By Edward W. O'Brien)

Washington.—A United Nations agency which receives 40 percent of its money from the U.S. Treasury is planning to give $3,100,000 to Cuba, with more than half of the aid funds allocated to strengthen the University of Havana's technological faculty.

The United States, through Ambassador James Roosevelt, has informed the U.N. agency it will not demand rejection of the project, nor will the United States withhold its $1,240,000 share of the cost.

TRAINS ENGINEERS

The university's technological branch trains engineers and others and is headed by Russian and Cuban military personnel. Only Communist Party and militia members are permitted to attend.

"Cuban technology is specifically oriented toward training in computers, electronics, and other areas of endeavor which Fidel Castro has stated are related to the military potential of Cuba and particularly to radar and military communications," according to the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba Inc., an anti-Castro organization of prominent Americans.

In 1963, the U.N. special fund headed by Paul G. Hoffman, proposed an aid project for Castro's Cuba but dropped it after an angry outcry in Congress and State Department opposition.

Last Tuesday, Ambassador Roosevelt, who represents the United States on the U.N. development program governing council that passes on special fund projects, said this Government's opposition in 1963 was "a gimmick" and "didn't mean a thing in the whole concept of the fund."

PUBLIC RECORD

Mr. Roosevelt said he will "place on the public record the Government's objection in principle" to the new project but will do nothing else to block the project or cut off the customary 40 percent contribution by Washington.

U.S. payments to the U.N. special fund are voluntary. The fund will spend over $150 million this year.

Mr. Roosevelt said the U.S. nominal opposition to the Cuban project is not based on the Castro regime's communism but on the theory that Cuba's shortage of technical experts was caused by the Castro regime itself, which has caused thousands of Cubans to flee.

The new aid project was proposed by Mr. Hoffman, who maintained that U.S. support "must be kept free of ideological and political considerations."

FIGURE JUGGLING IN THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, although I do not serve on the Committee on Appropriations, I have asked for 5 minutes today following the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], partially because subject matters contained in the budget message involved matters over which our Committee on Public Works has jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members do not think there is figure juggling in this budget, I will cite some examples as to where it occurs.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, there is $200 million which is proposed to be taken from the general fund. One percent of the excise tax on automobiles is to be transferred to a special highway trust fund, to be used for beautification purposes. That is example No. 1.

Example No. 2 is as follows: Inland waterway user taxes are being proposed, and they have been included in the receipts of the budget proposal. This is an old acorn that has been kicked around in Congress for years and has never been approved and, in my opinion, it is never going to be approved and should not be approved. That is example No. 2.

Example No. 3, Mr. Speaker, are highway user tax increases which are being proposed and were proposed last year. These requested increases were not given a second thought by the Committee on Ways and Means. Even if those user tax increases, as this budget message seems to imply were enacted, the budget message proposes extending the life of the interstate highway program from January 1972 to February 28, 1973, proposing a 14-month extension, without adequate funds even with the road user tax increases, to finance the present authorized program.

These are some examples, Mr. Speaker, and I shall cite more when given the opportunity to do so.

TAX SHARING FOR EDUCATION

Mr. HALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous tables and material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced legislation which would share part of the Federal revenues with the various States for use as they see fit, in elementary and secondary education. This measure, which a number of Members on this side of the aisle have also introduced, would give substantial additional financial resources to the States to enable them to shoulder their responsibilities in education, without growing Federal controls and restrictions.

The bill would establish an educational assistance trust fund, into which 1 percent of the revenue received from the Internal Revenue Code and tariff schedule would be deposited the first year, 2 percent the second year, up to 5 percent the fifth year, and thereafter.

Tax sharing for education is based on a two-part formula: half of the money would be returned to the States on a per-student basis; the other half would be based on the amount of effort each State is currently putting into education. "Effort" is defined as the percent of gross personal income spent on public elementary and secondary education.

Tax sharing will yield the greatest return for dollar expenditures, and it would utilize the maximum capabilities of each level of government. It would keep the door open for maximum individuality, freedom of expression, and personal choice. It would also eliminate the need for thousands of Federal employees in Washington, who now act the role of "money changers," directing a multitude of tightly restricted grant-in-aid programs, each of which must conform to Federal guidelines. It would preserve the spirit of the 10th amendment to the Constitution.

My discussions with educators in the Seventh District during the congressional recess, convinced me that present aid programs are full of inequities and redtape, to the point of an inaccessible labyrinth or maze for applications routed through numerous agencies.

It also fails to take notice of different educational problems in different States. California, for example, may have an urgent need for school construction money, whereas, in Missouri, the most pressing need might be for teacher salaries. Under my proposal, the local need would determine the use of funds.

The present financial resources of State and local governments are inadequate to meet the rising demands placed upon them. State taxes have gone from $4.9 billion in 1946 to $24.2 billion in 1964—an average increase of over $1 billion a year. A sharp jump in 1963 produced a hike in property taxes of 7.3 percent over the previous year, sales taxes went up 8.7 percent, corporate and individual income taxes 7.5 and 6.3 percent, respectively—all in 1 year.

In the 5 fiscal years beginning in fiscal 1959, there were 52 increases in State cigarette and tobacco taxes, 42 increases in levies on alcoholic beverages, 18 on general sales taxes, 17 on individual income, and 18 on motor fuel. Today every State taxes motor fuels and alcoholic beverages. All except 16 States tax personal income, all except 13 States tax corporate income and general sales, and all except 2 tax tobacco products. Almost every imaginable tax resource has been subjected to increasing and even undesirable pressures.

The property tax, which supplies 45 percent of State and local revenue is reaching the limit to which it can be subjected, and the burden on the people further tolerated.

The Federal Government has at its disposal the broadest source of tax collection—the income tax, followed by corporation, excise, and other taxes.

The greatest knowledge of local problems, especially in education at the elementary and secondary level, rests in the local community with parents, PTA's, teachers, school boards, State and local community officials—not with the Federal Government in Washington. I would recommend that we combine the maximum strength of both these approaches into one effective solution to the problems of public elementary and secondary education.

I propose that 1 percent of the Federal revenue received from the Internal Revenue Code and tariff schedule be returned to the States the first year, 2 percent the second year, up to 5 percent the fifth year and thereafter. This money will be deposited in a trust fund administered by the Secretary of the Treasury, who would be responsible for returning the money to the States.

Half of the money would be returned on a straight per student basis.

The remaining half of the formula would be based on the amount of effort each State is putting into public elementary and secondary education.

The mathematics of the formula work as follows: The percent of gross personal income spent on public elementary and secondary education is multiplied by the number of enrolled students in public elementary and secondary schools. This figure I call a "State product." To determine the actual number of dollars each State receives under the "effort section" each State's percent of the sum total of "State products" is multiplied by the amount of money available in the effort section.

To guarantee that the money being shared with the States is spent for educational purposes, each Governor must submit an outline of how his State plans to spend the money to the Comptroller General of the United States.

The benefits from this approach to solving a pressing problem are manifold.

First, and foremost, of course, it would be an enormous boost toward meeting our responsibilities as legislators concerned with the welfare of our children. My own State of Missouri, while currently low in the effort she is making in education, would nevertheless, first, have her pupil expenditure increased by over 25 percent when the program is fully operational—in its fifth year—and second, be provided with a meaningful incentive to increase her effort. I am inserting in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point five tables which estimate how much money each State will receive under my bill—assuming for convenience that 1 percent of the revenue from the Internal Revenue Code and tariff schedule equals $1 billion. Also, I am inserting a table showing how much "effort" each State is putting into education in order of their ranking.

This expenditure represents the soundest investment Americans can make—far sounder than many of the programs the U.S. Government now undertakes. Simply stated, this is an investment in our children, their well-being and their opportunities for tomorrow.

Second, this approach would, in my opinion, yield the greatest return for dollar expenditures, and it would utilize the maximum capabilities of each level of government—Federal, State, and local.

Third, it would keep the door open for maximum individuality, freedom of expression and personal choice. Thereby, it would encourage individual responsibility instead of undermining it. The relative absence of Federal controls would serve to insure this.

Fourth, the statistics I have cited indicate the States are badly in need of financial relief. They are trying to meet their responsibilities, but a severe imbalance has developed in the revenue structure, at all levels of government. Tax sharing would first, provide additional financial assistance; and second, might save some States from going into bankruptcy.

State and local taxation now is increasing at about double the rate the income is increasing. Since World War II, the Federal debt has gone up 20 percent, while State and local debt has gone up 600 percent. Clearly, tax sharing will supply needed relief.

Finally, if successful, and I believe it will be, it would set a historic precedent for a whole new concept of Federal-State relationships which could well solve the continuing dilemma faced by liberals and conservatives alike—that of finding solutions to national problems, while maximizing personal freedom. If we are to earn our freedom, then we must solve this vexing dilemma.

The preservation of our uniquely excellent Federal system is incumbent upon all of us. Increasing emphasis on the role of State government in that system will tend to strengthen the entire structure of government in its effort to serve all our people. It will guard against growing centralism in Washington.

A multiplicity of viable State and local governmental units forces each government to face the often rugged tests of comparison and contrast. It permits a wide variety of values and protects minority and regional interests. Innovation, experimentation, and progress grow best in a small area. What works well in one setting can spread to others.

Our national problems cannot be solved by an easy "No" to every new proposal offered by the so-called other side, because there is no other side when we seek to preserve our freedom and create a greater opportunity for our children. Our problems will be solved by a nation ever receptive to creative ideas and ever responsive to the continuing need for initiative and incentive.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD at this time five tables which estimate the amount of money each State will receive under the tax sharing for education bill. The tables show the estimates of the amount of money each State will receive the first 5 years the program is in operation:

1st year (1 percent distribution)

State	Col. 1 [1]	Col. 2 [1]	Col. 3 [1]	Col. 4 [1]	Col. 5 [1]
Utah	$3,411,921	$4,920,000	$17.40	$8,331,921	$29.47
Montana	1,991,191	2,815,000	17.06	4,806,191	29.13
New Mexico	3,141,496	4,410,000	16.94	7,551,496	29.01
Alaska	678,422	945,000	16.81	1,623,422	28.86
Wyoming	1,062,649	1,375,000	15.61	2,437,649	27.69
Arizona	4,414,670	5,655,000	15.46	10,069,670	27.53
South Dakota	1,980,351	2,515,000	15.33	4,695,351	27.40
Nevada	1,204,833	1,500,000	15.08	2,704,833	27.10
Minnesota	9,513,001	11,745,000	14.90	21,258,001	26.97
Washington	8,674,625	10,665,000	14.84	19,339,625	26.91
North Dakota	1,782,153	2,165,000	14.66	3,947,153	26.73
Oregon	5,322,194	6,425,000	14.57	11,747,194	26.64
California	49,932,908	59,735,000	14.42	109,717,908	26.49
Louisiana	9,491,453	11,145,000	14.17	20,636,453	26.24
Colorado	5,745,402	6,470,000	13.59	12,215,402	25.66
Mississippi	6,987,925	7,820,000	13.50	14,807,925	25.58
Michigan	23,161,580	25,640,000	13.36	48,801,580	25.43
Kansas	6,113,997	6,665,000	13.15	12,778,997	25.23
Wisconsin	10,036,841	10,310,000	12.40	20,346,841	24.47
Florida	14,297,593	14,600,000	12.32	28,897,593	24.39
Arkansas	5,412,891	5,525,000	12.32	10,937,891	24.39
Idaho	2,082,480	2,120,000	12.28	4,202,480	24.36
Indiana	13,281,372	13,535,000	12.30	26,817,372	24.43
New York	37,779,324	38,250,000	12.22	76,029,324	24.29
Iowa	7,489,843	7,500,000	12.08	14,989,843	24.16
Vermont	989,445	990,000	12.07	1,979,445	24.15
Texas	$29,748,751	$29,695,000	$12.05	$59,443,751	$24.12
South Carolina	7,528.195	7,445,000	11.76	14,973,195	23.84
Oklahoma	7,243,200	7,015,000	11.69	14,258,200	23.76
Hawaii	1,830,945	1,825,000	11.57	3,655,945	23.64
Maryland	8,882,239	8,530,000	11.59	17,412,239	23.66
Nebraska	3,745,084	3,670,000	11.56	7,415,084	23.63
Ohio	26,922,056	25,525,000	11.44	52,447,056	23.51
Alabama	9,907,961	9,370,000	11.41	19,277,961	23.48
North Carolina	14,226,984	13,395,000	11.36	27,621,984	23.43
New Hampshire	1,513,466	1,395,000	11.12	2,908,466	23.19
Maine	2,633,458	2,415,000	11.05	5,046,458	23.12
Virginia	11,697,224	10,670,000	11.01	22,367,224	23.08
New Jersey	15,153,317	13,825,000	11.01	28,978,317	23.08
Georgia	12,578,794	11,345,000	10.88	23,933,794	22.95
West Virginia	5,262,764	4,736,000	10.86	99,987,642	22.93
Tennessee	10,435,411	9,280,000	10.73	19,715,411	22.80
Delaware	1,263,443	1,120,000	10.70	2,383,443	22.77
Kentucky	8,009,631	6,770,000	10.20	14,779,631	22.27
Illinois	24,667,236	20,495,000	10.03	45,163,436	22.10
Connecticut	6,761,273	5,475,000	9.77	12,236,273	21.84
Missouri	11,448,022	9,125,000	9.62	20,573,022	21.69
Rhode Island	1,819,262	1,415,000	9.38	3,234,262	21.46
Pennsylvania	26,706,764	20,400,000	9.22	47,106,764	21.29
Massachusetts	11,988,328	8,530,000	8.58	20,518,328	20.66
District of Columbia	1,706,932	960,000	6.78	2,666,932	18.86

---

[1] Explanation of columns:

Col. 1: $500,000,000 divided up on a straight per student basis; $12.07 multiplied by number of enrolled students in the State.

Col. 2: Total dollar sum each State receives on EFFORT formula ($500,000,000).

Col. 3: Amount per student each State receives on EFFORT formula.

Col. 4: Total amount each State receives: addition of cols. 1 and 2.

Col. 5: Overall amount each State receives on a per student basis.

NOTES

1. The figures in col. 1 are taken from "Fall 1964, Statistics of Public Schools," U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Number of enrolled students for fall 1964 divided into $500,000,000.

2. EFFORT is defined as the amount of gross personal income of each State spent on public elementary and secondary schools. This is taken from "Digest of Educational Statistics," 1965 edition. Mathematics involved: EFFORT times enrolled students equals a "State product." Total dollars received in col. 2 under EFFORT section is determined by multiplying each State's percent of sum total of all "State products" times $500,000,000 (or amount authorized under EFFORT section).

2d year (2 percent distribution)

State	Col. 1[1]	Col. 2[1]	Col. 3[1]	Col. 4[1]	Col. 5[1]
Utah	$6,823,842	$9,840,000	$34.81	$16,663,842	$58.95
Montana	3,982,383	5,630,000	34.13	8,961,238	58.27
New Mexico	6,282,992	8,820,000	33.89	15,102,992	58.03
Alaska	1,356,844	1,890,000	33.62	3,246,844	57.77
Wyoming	2,225,299	2,750,000	31.24	4,875,299	55.38
Arizona	8,829,340	11,310,000	30.92	20,139,340	55.06
South Dakota	3,960,702	5,030,000	30.66	9,390,702	54.80
Nevada	2,409,667	3,000,000	30.05	5,409,667	54.20
Minnesota	19,026,002	23,490,000	29.80	42,516,002	53.95
Washington	17,349,250	21,330,000	29.68	38,679,250	53.82
North Dakota	3,564,306	4,330,000	29.32	7,894,306	53.47
Oregon	10,644,389	12,850,000	29.14	23,494,389	53.28
California	99,965,817	119,470,000	28.85	219,435,817	52.99
Louisiana	18,982,906	22,290,000	28.34	41,272,906	52.49
Colorado	11,490,805	12,940,000	27.18	24,430,805	51.33
Mississippi	13,975,850	15,640,009	27.01	29,615,850	51.16
Michigan	46,323,161	51,280,000	26.72	97,603,161	50.86
Kansas	12,227,994	13,330,000	26.31	25,557,994	50.46
Wisconsin	20,073,683	20,620,000	24.80	40,693,683	48.94
Florida	28,595,187	29,200,000	24.65	57,795,187	48.79
Arkansas	10,825,783	11,050,000	24.64	21,875,783	48.78
Idaho	4,164,960	4,240,000	24.57	8,404,960	48.72
Indiana	26,562,274	27,070,000	24.60	53,634,745	48.74
New York	75,558,648	76,500,000	24.44	152,058,648	48.58
Iowa	14,979,686	15,000,000	24.17	29,979,686	48.32
Vermont	1,978,890	1,980,000	24.15	3,958,890	48.30
Texas	$59,497,503	$59,390,000	$24.10	$118,887,503	$48.24
South Carolina	15,056,391	14,890,000	23.53	29,946,391	47.68
Oklahoma	14,486,400	14,030,000	23.38	28,516,400	47.52
Hawaii	3,658,290	3,650,000	23.15	7,311,890	47.29
Maryland	17,764,478	17,060,000	23.18	34,824,478	47.32
Nebraska	7,490,168	7,340,000	23.12	14,830,168	47.27
Ohio	53,844,113	51,050,000	22.88	104,894,113	47.03
Alabama	19,815,922	18,740,000	22.83	38,555,922	46.97
North Carolina	28,453,969	26,790,000	22.73	55,243,969	46.87
New Hampshire	3,026,933	2,790,000	22.25	5,816,933	46.39
Maine	5,266,916	4,830,000	22.11	10,092,916	46.25
Virginia	23,394,449	21,340,000	22.02	44,734,449	46.16
New Jersey	30,306,635	27,650,000	22.02	57,956,635	46.16
Georgia	25,157,589	22,690,000	21.77	47,867,589	45.91
West Virginia	10,525,528	9,472,000	21.72	19,997,528	45.87
Tennessee	20,870,822	18,560,000	21.46	39,430,822	45.61
Delaware	2,526,886	2,240,000	21.40	4,766,886	45.54
Kentucky	16,019,263	13,540,000	20.40	29,559,263	44.54
Illinois	49,334,473	40,990,000	20.06	90,326,873	44.20
Connecticut	13,522,547	10,950,000	19.54	24,472,547	43.69
Missouri	22,896,044	18,250,000	19.24	41,146,044	43.38
Rhode Island	3,638,524	2,830,000	18.77	6,468,524	42.92
Pennsylvania	53,413,529	40,800,000	18.44	94,213,529	42.58
Massachusetts	23,976,657	17,060,000	17.17	41,036,657	41.20
District of Columbia	3,413,864	1,920,000	18.57	5,333,864	37.72

[1] Explanation of columns:
Col. 1: $1,000,000,000 divided up on a straight per student basis.
Col. 2: Total dollar sum each State receives on EFFORT formula ($1,000,000,000).
Col. 3: Amount per student each State receives on EFFORT formula.
Col. 4: Total amount each State receives; addition of cols. 1 and 2.
Col. 5: Overall amount each State receives on a per student basis.

NOTES

1. The figures in col. 1 are taken from "Fall 1964 Statistics of Public Schools," U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Number of enrolled students for fall 1964 divided into $1,000,000,000.

2. EFFORT is defined as the amount of gross personal income of each State spent on public elementary and secondary education. This is taken from "Digest of Educational Statistics," 1965 edition. Mathematics involved: EFFORT times enrolled students equals a "State product." Total dollars received under this section (col. 2) is determined by multiplying each State's percent of sum total of all "State products" times $1,000,000,000 (or amount authorized under EFFORT section).

3d year (3 percent distribution)

State	Col. 1[1]	Col. 2[1]	Col. 3[1]	Col. 4[1]	Col. 5[1]
Utah	$10,235,764	$14,760,000	$52.21	$24,995,764	$88.43
Montana	5,973,575	8,445,000	51.19	14,418,575	87.41
New Mexico	9,424,489	13,230,000	50.83	22,654,489	87.05
Alaska	2,035,266	2,835,000	50.44	4,870,266	86.65
Wyoming	3,187,949	4,125,000	46.86	7,312,949	83.07
Arizona	13,244,010	16,965,000	46.38	30,209,010	82.60
South Dakota	5,941,053	7,545,000	45.99	14,086,053	82.20
Nevada	3,614,501	4,500,000	45.08	8,114,501	81.30
Minnesota	28,539,004	35,235,000	44.71	63,774,004	80.90
Washington	26,023,875	31,995,000	44.52	58,018,875	80.73
North Dakota	5,346,459	6,495,000	43.99	11,841,459	80.20
Oregon	15,966,583	19,275,000	43.71	35,241,583	79.93
California	149,948,726	179,205,000	43.27	329,153,726	79.49
Louisiana	28,474,359	33,435,000	42.52	61,909,359	78.78
Colorado	17,236,208	19,410,000	40.78	36,646,208	76.99
Mississippi	20,963,776	23,460,000	40.52	44,423,776	76.74
Michigan	69,484,741	76,920,000	40.08	146,404,741	76.30
Kansas	18,341,991	19,995,000	39.47	38,336,991	75.69
Wisconsin	30,110,525	30,930,000	37.20	61,040,525	73.41
Florida	42,892,781	43,800,000	36.97	86,692,781	73.19
Arkansas	16,238,674	16,575,000	36.96	32,813,674	73.18
Idaho	6,247,440	6,360,000	36.86	12,607,440	73.08
Indiana	39,844,118	40,605,000	36.90	80,452,118	73.12
New York	113,337,972	114,750,000	36.66	228,087,972	72.88
Iowa	22,469,529	22,500,000	36.26	44,969,529	72.48
Vermont	2,968,335	2,970,000	36.23	5,938,335	72.45
Texas	$89,246,255	$89,085,000	$36.15	$178,331,255	$72.36
South Carolina	22,584,586	22,335,000	35.30	44,919,586	71.52
Oklahoma	21,729,600	21,045,000	35.07	42,774,600	71.28
Hawaii	5,492,836	5,475,000	34.72	10,967,836	70.94
Maryland	26,646,718	25,590,000	34.77	52,236,718	70.99
Nebraska	11,235,253	11,010,000	34,69	22,245,253	70.90
Ohio	80,766,170	76,575,000	34.33	157,341,170	70.54
Alabama	29,723,883	28,110,000	34.24	57,833,883	70.46
North Carolina	42,680,953	40,185,000	34.09	82,865,953	70.31
New Hampshire	4,540,399	4,185,000	33.37	8,725,399	69.59
Maine	7,900,375	7,245,000	33.16	15,139,375	69.38
Virginia	35,091,673	32,010,000	33.03	67,101,673	69.25
New Jersey	45,459,952	41,475,000	33.03	86,934,952	69.25
Georgia	37,736,383	34,035,000	32.65	71,801,383	68.87
West Virginia	15,788,292	14,208.000	32,58	29,996,292	68.80
Tennessee	31,306,233	27,840,000	32,20	59,146,623	68.41
Delaware	3,790,330	3,360,000	32.10	7,150,330	68.31
Kentucky	24,028,894	20,310,000	30.60	44,338,894	66.82
Illinois	74,001,709	61,485,000	30.09	135,490,309	66.30
Connecticut	20,283,820	16,425,000	29.32	36,708,820	65.53
Missouri	34,344,067	27,375,000	28.86	61,719,067	65.06
Rhode Island	5,457,787	4,245,000	28.16	9,702,787	64.38
Pennsylvania	80,120,294	61,200,000	27.66	141,320,294	63.87
Massachusetts	35,964,986	25,590,000	25.76	61,554,986	61.96
District of Columbia	5,120,797	2,880,000	20.36	8,000,797	56.58

[1] Explanation of columns:
Col. 1: $1,500,000,000 divided up on a straight per student basis—enrolled students in public elementary and secondary schools.
Col. 2: Total dollar sum each State receives on EFFORT formula ($1,500,000,000).
Col. 3: Amount per student each State receives on EFFORT formula.
Col. 4: Total amount each State receives, addition of cols. 1 and 2.
Col. 5: Overall amount each State receives on a per student basis.

NOTES

1. The figures in col. 1 are taken from "Fall 1964 Statistics of Public Schools," U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Number of enrolled students in public elementary and secondary schools for fall 1964 divided into $1,500,000,000.

2. EFFORT is defined as the amount of gross personal income of each State spent on public elementary and secondary education. This is taken from "Digest of Educational Statistics," 1965 education. Mathematics involved: EFFORT times enrolled students equals a "State product." Total dollars allocated to each State under this section of the bill is determined by multiplying each State's percent of sum total of all "State products" times $1,500,000,000 (or amount authorized under EFFORT section).

4th year (4 percent distribution)

State	Col. 1[1]	Col. 2[1]	Col. 3[1]	Col. 4[1]	Col. 5[1]
Utah	$13,647,685	$19,680,000	$69.62	$33,327,685	$117.91
Montana	7,964,767	11,260,000	68.26	19,224,767	116.55
New Mexico	12,565,985	17,640,000	67.78	30,205,985	116.07
Alaska	2,713,688	3,780,000	67.25	6,493,688	115.54
Wyoming	4,250,599	5,500,000	62.48	9,750,599	110.76
Arizona	17,658,680	22,620,000	61.84	40,278,680	110.13
South Dakota	7,921,404	10,060,000	61.32	18,781,404	109.60
Nevada	4,819,335	6,000,000	60.11	10,819,335	108.40
Minnesota	38,052,005	46,980,000	59.61	85,032,005	107.90
Washington	34,698,500	42,660,000	59.30	77,358,500	107.64
North Dakota	$7,128,612	$8,660,000	$58.65	$15,788,612	$106.94
Oregon	21,288,778	25,700,000	58.28	46,988,778	106.57
California	199,931,635	238,940,000	57.70	438,871,635	105.99
Louisiana	37,965,812	44,580,000	56.69	82,545,812	104.98
Colorado	22,981,611	25,880,000	54.37	48,861,611	102.66
Mississippi	27,951,701	31,280,000	54.03	59,231,701	102.32
Michigan	92,646,322	102,560,000	53.44	195,206,322	101.73
Kansas	24,455,988	26,660,000	52.63	51,115,988	100.92
Wisconsin	40,147,367	41,240,000	49.60	81,387,367	97.88
Florida	57,190,375	58,400,000	49.30	115,590,375	97.59

See footnote at end of table.

4th year (4 percent distribution)—Continued

State	Col. 1[1]	Col. 2[1]	Col. 3[1]	Col. 4[1]	Col. 5[1]
Arkansas	$21,651,566	$22,100,000	$49.28	$43,751,566	$97.57
Idaho	8,329,920	8,480,000	49.15	16,809,920	97.44
Indiana	53,125,491	54,140,000	49.20	107,269,491	97.49
New York	151,117,296	153,000,000	48.88	304,117,296	97.17
Iowa	29,959,372	30,000,000	48.35	59,959,372	96.64
Vermont	3,957,780	3,960,000	48.31	7,917,780	96.60
Texas	118,995,007	118,780,000	48.20	237,755,007	96.48
South Carolina	30,112,782	29,780,000	47.07	59,892,782	95.36
Oklahoma	28,972,800	28,060,000	46.76	57,032,800	95.04
Hawaii	7,323,781	7,300,000	46.30	14,623,781	94.56
Maryland	35,528,957	34,120,000	46.36	69,648,957	94.65
Nebraska	14,980,337	14,680,000	46.25	29,660,337	94.54
Ohio	107,688,227	102,100,000	45.77	209,788,227	94.06
Alabama	39,631,844	37,480,000	45.66	77,111,844	93.95
North Carolina	56,907,938	53,580,000	45.46	110,487,938	93.75
New Hampshire	6,053,866	5,850,000	44.50	11,633,866	92.79
Maine	$10,533,833	$9,660,000	$44.22	$20,185,833	$92.51
Virginia	46,788,898	42,680,000	44.04	89,468,898	92.33
New Jersey	60,613,270	55,300,000	44.04	115,913,270	92.33
Georgia	50,315,178	45,380,000	43.54	95,735,178	91.83
West Virginia	21,051,056	18,944,000	43.44	39,995,056	91.73
Tennessee	41,741,644	37,120,000	42.93	78,861,644	91.22
Delaware	5,053,773	4,480,000	42.80	95,337,736	91.08
Kentucky	32,038,526	27,080,000	40.80	59,118,526	89.09
Illinois	98,668,946	81,980,000	40.12	180,653,746	88.40
Connecticut	27,045,094	21,900,000	39.09	48,945,094	87.38
Missouri	45,792,089	36,500,000	38.48	82,292,089	86.77
Rhode Island	7,277,049	5,660,000	37.55	12,937,049	85.84
Pennsylvania	106,827,059	81,600,000	36.88	188,427,059	85.16
Massachusetts	47,953,315	34,120,000	34.35	82,073,315	82.64
District of Columbia	6,827,729	3,840,000	27.15	10,667,729	75.44

[1] Explanation of columns:
Col. 1: $2,000,000,000 divided up on a straight per student basis. Enrolled students in public elementary and secondary schools.
Col. 2: Total dollar sum each State receives on EFFORT formula ($2,000,000,000).
Col. 3: Amount per student each receives on EFFORT formula.
Col. 4: Total amount each State receives; addition of cols. 1 and 2.
Col. 5: Overall amount each State receives on a per student basis.

NOTES

1. The figures in col. 1 are taken from "Fall 1964 Statistics of Public Schools," U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Number of enrolled students for fall 1964 divided into $2,000,000,000.

2. EFFORT is defined as the amount of gross personal income of each State spent on public elementary and secondary education. This is taken from "Digest of Educational Statistics," 1965 edition. Mathematics involved: EFFORT times enrolled students equals a "State product." Total dollars received under this section (col. 2) is determined by multiplying each State's percent of sum total of all "State products" times $2,000,000,000 (or amount authorized under EFFORT section).

All succeeding years (5 percent distribution)

State	Col. 1[1]	Col. 2[1]	Col. 3[1]	Col. 4[1]	Col. 5[1]
Utah	$17,059,607	$24,600,000	$87.03	$41,659,607	$147.39
Montana	9,955,959	14,075,000	85.33	24,030,959	145.69
New Mexico	15,707,482	22,050,000	84.73	37,757,482	145.09
Alaska	3,392,111	4,725,000	84.07	8,117,111	144.43
Wyoming	5,313,249	6,875,000	78.10	12,188,249	138.46
Arizona	22,073,350	28,275,000	77.31	50,348,350	137.67
South Dakota	9,901,756	12,575,000	76.65	23,476,756	137.01
Nevada	6,024,169	7,500,000	75.14	13,524,169	135.50
Minnesota	47,565,007	58,725,000	74.52	106,290,007	134.88
Washington	43,373,126	53,325,000	74.20	96,698,126	134.56
North Dakota	8,910,765	10,825,000	73.32	19,735,765	133.68
Oregon	26,610,973	32,125,000	72.86	58,735,973	133.22
California	249,914,544	298,675,000	72.13	548,589,544	132.49
Louisiana	47,457,265	55,725,000	70.87	103,182,265	131.23
Colorado	28,727,014	32,350,000	67.97	61,077,014	128.33
Mississippi	34,939,627	39,100,000	67.54	74,039,627	127.90
Michigan	115,807,903	128,200,000	66.81	244,007,903	127.17
Kansas	30,569,985	33,325,000	65.79	63,894,985	126.15
Wisconsin	50,184,209	51,550,000	62.00	101,734,209	122.36
Florida	71,487,969	73,000,000	61.63	144,487,969	121.99
Arkansas	27,064,458	27,625,000	61.61	54,689.458	121.97
Idaho	10,412,401	10,600,000	61.44	21,012,401	121.80
Indiana	66,406,864	67,675,000	61.51	134,086,864	121.87
New York	188,896,620	191,250,000	61.11	380,146,620	121.47
Iowa	37,449,215	37,500,000	60.44	74,949,215	120.80
Vermont	4,947,226	4,950,000	60.39	9,897,226	120.75
Texas	$148,743,759	$148,475,000	$60.25	$297,218,759	$120.61
South Carolina	37,640,978	37,225,000	58.84	74,865,978	119.20
Oklahoma	36,216,000	35,075,000	58.45	71,291,000	118.81
Hawaii	9,154,727	9,125,000	57.88	18,279,727	118.24
Maryland	44,411,197	42,650,000	57.96	87,061,197	118.32
Nebraska	18,725,422	18,350,000	57.82	37,075,422	118.18
Ohio	134,610,284	127,625,000	57.22	262,235,284	117.58
Alabama	49,539,806	46,850,000	57.08	96,389,806	117.44
North Carolina	71,134,923	66,975,000	56.83	138,109,923	117.19
New Hampshire	7,567,333	6,975,000	55.63	14,542,333	115.99
Maine	13,167,292	12,075,000	55.28	25,232,292	115.64
Virginia	58,486,123	53,350,000	55.05	111,836,123	115.42
New Jersey	75,766,588	69,125,000	55.06	144,891,588	115.42
Georgia	62,893,973	56,725,000	54.43	119,668,973	114.79
West Virginia	26,313,821	23,680,000	54.31	49,993,821	114.67
Tennessee	52,177,055	46,400,000	53.67	98,577,055	114.03
Delaware	6,317,217	5,600,000	53.50	11,917,217	113.86
Kentucky	40,048,158	33,850,000	51.01	73,898,158	111.37
Illinois	123,336,183	102,475,000	50.15	225,817,183	110.51
Connecticut	33,806,368	27,375,000	48.87	61,181,368	109.23
Missouri	57,240,112	45,625,000	48.11	102,865,112	108.47
Rhode Island	9,096,312	7,075,000	46.94	16,171,312	107.30
Pennsylvania	133,533,824	102,000,000	46.10	235,533,824	106.46
Massachusetts	59,941,644	42,650,000	42.94	102,591,644	103.30
District of Columbia	8,534,662	4,800,000	33.94	13,334,662	94.30

[1] Explanation of columns:
Col. 1: $2,500,000,000 divided up on a straight per student basis, $60.36 multiplied by number of enrolled students in the State.
Col. 2: Total dollar sum each State received on EFFORT formula ($2,500,000,000).
Col. 3: Amount per student each State receives on EFFORT formula.
Col. 4: Total amount State receives; addition of cols. 1 and 2.
Col. 5: Amount overall that each State receives on a per student basis.

NOTES

1. The figures in col. 1 come from "Fall 1964 Statistics of Public Schools," U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Number of enrolled students for fall 1964 divided into $2,500,000,000.

2. EFFORT is defined as the amount of gross personal income of each State spent on public elementary and secondary education. This is taken from "Digest of Educational Statistics," 1965 edition. Mathematics involved: EFFORT times enrolled students equals a "State product." Each State's percent of sum total of all "State products" multiplied by $2,500,000,000 (or amount being authorized under this section) equals total dollars the State receives.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting here in the RECORD a table which ranks the States in terms of the estimates of total money each State will receive under the tax sharing for education bill when it is enacted and fully operational—that is, when 5 percent of the Federal revenue is being returned to the States:

Rankings of the States in terms of total money received under the Brock effort per student education plan, 1964 figures

	Amount
California	$548,589,544
New York	380,146,620
Texas	297,218,759
Ohio	262,235,284
Michigan	244,007,908
Pennsylvania	235,533,824
Illinois	225,817,183
New Jersey	144,891,588
Florida	144,487,969
North Carolina	138,109,923
Indiana	134,086,864
Georgia	119,668,973
Virginia	$111,836,123
Minnesota	106,290,007
Louisiana	103,182,265
Missouri	102,865,112
Massachusetts	102,591,644
Wisconsin	101,734,209
Tennessee	98,577,055
Washington	96,698,126
Alabama	96,389,806
Maryland	87,061,197
Iowa	74,949,215
South Carolina	74,865,989
Mississippi	74,039,627
Kentucky	73,898,158
Oklahoma	71,291,000
Kansas	63,894,985
Connecticut	61,181,368
Colorado	61,077,014
Oregon	58,735,973
Arkansas	54,689,458
Arizona	50,348,350
West Virginia	$49,488,821
Utah	41,659,607
New Mexico	37,757,482
Nebraska	37,075,422
Maine	25,232,292
Montana	24,030,959
South Dakota	23,476,756
Idaho	21,012,401
North Dakota	19,735,765
Hawaii	18,279,727
Rhode Island	16,171,312
New Hampshire	14,542,333
Nevada	13,524,169
District of Columbia	13,334,662
Wyoming	12,188,249
Delaware	11,917,217
Vermont	9,897,226
Alaska	8,117,111

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD two tables which indicate respectively, first, the rankings of the 50 States and the District of Columbia in terms of percent of gross personal income spent on public elementary and secondary education as available from the Office of Education for 1964–65, and second, the estimated expenditures for elementary and secondary education as available in the 1965 edition of the Digest of Educational Statistics in more detailed form. These tables, I feel, give a reasonably accurate index of the amount of effort each State is currently putting into education at the elementary and secondary level:

Rankings of the States in terms of percentage of gross personal income spent on elementary and secondary education, 1964–65

	Percent
Utah	6.89
Montana	6.79
New Mexico	6.71
Alaska	6.68
Wyoming	6.16
Arizona	6.12
South Dakota	6.07
Nevada	5.95

Rankings of the States in terms of percentage of gross personal income spent on elementary and secondary education, 1964–65—Continued

	Percent
Minnesota	5.90
Washington	5.88
North Dakota	5.81
Oregon	5.77
California	5.71
Louisiana	5.61
Colorado	5.38
Mississippi	5.34
Michigan	5.29
Kansas	5.21
Wisconsin	4.91
Florida	4.88
Arkansas	4.88
Idaho	4.87
Indiana	4.87
New York	4.84
Iowa	4.80
Vermont	4.80
Texas	4.77
National average	4.74
South Carolina	4.66
Oklahoma	4.63
Hawaii	4.59
Maryland	4.59

Rankings of the States in terms of percentage of gross personal income spent on elementary and secondary education, 1964–65—Continued

	Percent
Nebraska	4.58
Ohio	4.53
Alabama	4.52
North Carolina	4.50
New Hampshire	4.41
Maine	4.39
Virginia	4.36
New Jersey	4.36
Georgia	4.31
West Virginia	4.30
Tennessee	4.25
Delaware	4.24
Kentucky	4.04
Illinois	3.97
Connecticut	3.87
Missouri	3.81
Rhode Island	3.81
Pennsylvania	3.65
Massachusetts	3.40
District of Columbia	2.87

Source: Digest of Educational Statistics, 1965 edition, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

CHART 2

TABLE 43.—*Personal income, 1964, related to estimated expenditures for public elementary and secondary education, by region and State, 1964–65*

Region and State	Personal income		Estimated expenditures for public elementary and secondary education	
	Total (in millions)	Per capita	Total (in thousands)[1]	As a percent of personal income
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
United States	$487,881	$2,550	$23,106,854	4.74
North Atlantic	151,345		6,434,659	4.25
Connecticut	8,989	3,250	348,150	3.87
Delaware	1,682	3,426	71,343	4.24
Maine	2,107	2,130	92,525	4.39
Maryland	9,913	2,888	454,848	4.59
Massachusetts	15,598	2,922	530,000	3.40
New Hampshire	1,532	2,343	67,540	4.41
New Jersey	19,792	2,962	863,600	4.36
New York	56,240	3,139	2,722,000	4.84
Pennsylvania	29,509	2,575	1,067,824	3.65
Rhode Island	2,266	2,479	84,275	3.72
Vermont	877	2,144	42,096	4.80
District of Columbia	2,840	3,515	81,458	2.87
Great Lakes and Plains	140,043		6,538,511	4.67
Illinois	31,495	3,003	1,249,396	3.97
Indiana	12,201	2,529	594,470	4.87
Iowa	6,533	2,370	313,853	4.80
Kansas	5,141	2,311	263,000	5.21
Michigan	22,135	2,733	1,170,000	5.29
Minnesota	8,356	2,373	492,736	5.90
Missouri	11,441	2,595	435,500	3.81
Nebraska	3,407	2,302	156,100	4.58
North Dakota	1,298	2,012	75,450	5.81
Ohio	26,490	2,623	1,201,300	4.53
South Dakota	1,310	1,832	79,506	6.07
Wisconsin	10,236	2,492	502,200	4.91
Southeast	$79,630		$3,672,558	4.61
Alabama	5,918	$1,737	267,533	4.52
Arkansas	3,157	1,633	153,952	4.88
Florida	13,008	2,280	635,222	4.88
Georgia	8,299	1,933	357,519	4.31
Kentucky	5,720	1,811	230,933	4.04
Louisiana	6,463	1,864	362,500	5.61
Mississippi	3,341	1,444	178,500	5.34
North Carolina	9,217	1,900	414,877	4.50
South Carolina	4,209	1,647	196,072	4.66
Tennessee	7,035	1,852	299,360	4.25
Virginia	9,738	2,224	424,500	4.36
West Virginia	3,525	1,962	151,650	4.30
West and Southwest	116,863		6,461,126	5.53
Alaska	782	3,128	52,253	6.68
Arizona	3,506	2,218	214,467	6.12
California	55,912	3,092	3,190,000	5.71
Colorado	5,093	2,591	274,205	5.38
Hawaii	1,777	2,579	81,541	4.59
Idaho	1,392	2,612	67,754	4.87
Montana	1,539	2,183	104,000	6.76
Nevada	1,325	2,248	78,861	5.95
New Mexico	2,026	2,010	135,985	6.71
Oklahoma	5,165	2,095	239,160	4.63
Oregon	4,868	2,602	280,800	5.77
Texas	22,611	2,175	1,079,000	4.77
Utah	2,157	2,174	148,600	6.89
Washington	7,861	2,634	462,200	5.88
Wyoming	849	2,475	52,300	6.16

[1] Includes current expenditures, capital outlay, and interest.

NOTE.—Detail will not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

Sources: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, "Fall 1964 Statistics of Public Schools"; and U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics, "Survey of Current Business," April 1965.

(Source: A copy of page proof taken from U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education: "Digest of Educational Statistics," 1965 edition.)

THE BUDGET, 1967—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 335)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

With this message I transmit to you today the budget of the United States of America for the fiscal year 1967.

A budget is not simply a schedule of financial accounts.

It is a program for action.

The program of the Federal Government which this budget recommends is grounded on these fundamental premises:

In international affairs we are determined to seek peace with every means at our command—but we are fully prepared to meet the costs of opposing aggression.

In domestic affairs we are determined to press confidently forward toward the Great Society—but we shall do so in an orderly and responsible way, and at a pace which reflects the claims of our commitments in southeast Asia upon the Nation's resources.

The budget for 1967 bears the strong imprint of the troubled world we live in.

It provides the funds we now foresee as necessary to meet our commitments in southeast Asia. If our efforts to secure an honorable peace bear fruit, these funds need not be spent. Yet it would be folly to present a budget which inadequately provided for the military and economic costs of sustaining our forces in Vietnam. And those costs are substantial.

In this setting I have sought to frame a balanced program.

We are a rich Nation and can afford to make progress at home while meeting obligations abroad—in fact, we can afford no other course if we are to remain strong. For this reason, I have not halted progress in the new and vital Great Society programs in order to finance the costs of our efforts in southeast Asia.

But even a prosperous nation cannot meet all its goals all at once. For this reason, the rate of advance in the new programs has been held below what might have been proposed in less troubled times, many older and lower priority activities have been reduced or eliminated, and economies have been sought in every operation of the Government.

At the same time, I want to insure that the necessary increase in budget expenditures is so financed as to promote economic stability. For this reason, I am proposing several tax measures designed to increase Federal revenues.

With this balanced program we can:

Meet our international responsibilities with firmness.

Maintain continued prosperity and economic stability at home.

Raise the productivity, earnings, and living standards of our poorer citizens.

Improve the quality of life for all citizens.

Preserve and protect our national resources for the generations to come.

And we can achieve these ends without unduly straining our economic resources or impairing our steady economic expansion.

THE BUDGET AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

The unprecedented and uninterrupted economic growth of the past 5 years has clearly demonstrated the contribution that appropriate fiscal action can make to national prosperity. Aided by the judicious use of tax and expenditure policy, the Nation continues to benefit from the longest period of sustained economic growth since the end of World War II.

With proper policies, this growth will extend through the current calendar year and beyond. In calendar year 1966, the Nation's output of goods and services—the gross national product—is expected to grow by $46 billion over 1965, reaching $722 billion, plus or minus $5 billion. This increase will follow on the heels of last year's healthy growth, when the real gross national product advanced by 5½ percent. During that year:

Nearly 2½ million additional jobs were created.

Countless new and previously idle plants and machines were drawn into productive use.

Consumer and business incomes reached record levels.

The unemployment rate fell to 4.1 percent, the lowest in more than 8 years.

A growing economy provides rising Federal revenues and expanding economic resources both for meeting our military and international commitments and for moving closer to our Great Society goals. But this does not relieve us of the obligation to weigh expenditure decisions carefully and carry them out efficiently. Inflation need not be the price of social progress, nor should it be a cost of defending freedom.

Our fiscal and monetary policies must also be designed to help reduce further the balance-of-payments deficit. During the past calendar year, the deficit declined by more than half from the preceding year. Private banks and other businesses contributed significantly in a variety of ways through voluntary programs announced last February. In addition, the Federal Government has been eliminating or reducing payments abroad wherever possible and consistent with essential program requirements. We will continue these efforts.

FISCAL PROGRAM

This budget presents a responsible fiscal program. It accommodates our foreign and domestic responsibilities in an environment of strong but noninflationary economic growth.

The 1967 fiscal program consists of the following elements:

First, apart from the special costs of operations in southeast Asia, increases in Federal expenditures for high priority Great Society programs and for unavoidable workload have been largely offset by reductions in lower priority programs, management improvements, and other measures. As a consequence, total regular administrative budget expenditures—i.e., outside of special Vietnam costs—rise by only $0.6 billion between 1966 and 1967—and this increase is virtually the same amount as the congressional additions to my 1965 pay proposals for military and civilian employees.

Second, I propose to supplement the expansion of Federal revenues which is a consequence of economic growth by a series of tax measures which will yield $1.2 billion in fiscal year 1966 and $4.8 billion in 1967:

A plan for improving the pay-as-you-go effectiveness of the withholding system on personal income taxes.

A corresponding plan to accelerate the transition of corporate income tax payments to a full pay-as-you-go basis.

A temporary reinstatement of the excise taxes on passenger automobiles and telephone service which were reduced at the beginning of this calendar year and deferral of the further reductions scheduled in the future.

Third, the combined increase in revenues from economic growth and from my tax proposals will amount to $11.0 billion in 1967. This is substantially larger than the growth in administrative budget expenditures. In fact, it virtually covers the total special costs of operations in Vietnam as well as the small increase in regular budget expenditures from 1966 to 1967.

Fourth, as a consequence, the overall 1967 deficit in the administrative budget is $1.8 billion, sharply lower than in 1966 and the smallest deficit in 7 years, despite the added costs we are incurring in southeast Asia.

Fifth, on a consolidated cash basis—which is the most comprehensive measure of budget totals—the 1967 budget will show a surplus of $0.5 billion.

No one can firmly predict the course of events in southeast Asia. They depend not only upon our own actions but upon those of our adversaries. As a consequence, ultimate budgetary requirements could be either higher or lower than amounts I am now requesting. Prior experience shows that such estimates are extremely difficult to make. During the Korean war, for example, actual military expenditures fell substantially below the original budget estimate. The amounts which I am presenting here reflect the best judgment which can be made at this point in time.

Because of the uncertainties inherent in this situation, the 1967 budget is designed to provide flexibility of response to changing conditions. In the new programs authorized by Congress in the last several years, we have an effective array of weapons to attack the major domestic problems confronting the American people—in the fields of health, education, poverty, housing, community development, and beautification. The 1967 budget provides funds to press forward vigorously with these new programs. But because of the costs of maintaining our commitment in Vietnam, those funds are, in many cases less than the maximum authorized in the enabling legislation. Should our efforts to find peace in Vietnam prevail, we can rapidly adjust the budget to make even faster progress in the use of these new programs for the solution of our domestic problems.

If, on the other hand, events in southeast Asia so develop that additional funds are required, I will not hesitate to request the necessary sums. And should that contingency arise, or should unforeseen inflationary pressures develop, I will propose such fiscal actions as are appropriate to maintain economic stability.

BUDGET SUMMARY

Administrative budget: Administrative budget expenditures in the fiscal year 1967 are estimated at $112.8 billion, an increase of $6.4 billion over 1966. Apart from the special military and economic assistance costs in Vietnam, expenditures for the regular programs of the Federal Government in 1967 are estimated at $102.3 billion, a rise of $0.6 billion from 1966, only six-tenths of 1 percent.

Administrative budget receipts are also expected to increase in 1967, to $111.0 billion. Of the $11.0 billion increase over 1966, $3.6 billion results from the tax measures I am proposing. Most of the remainder results from the sound and orderly economic growth expected for calendar year 1966.

Excluding both special Vietnam costs and the recommended tax measures, the 1967 administrative budget could have

been in surplus. When I urged the Congress to enact the Revenue Act of 1964, I stated that the growth in economic activity yielded by the tax reduction, in combination with economy and efficiency in Government expenditures, would lead to a balanced budget in a prosperous economy. Barring the then unforeseen costs we are incurring in southeast Asia, that forecast remains a correct one.

Summary of Federal receipts and payments

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
FEDERAL RECEIPTS			
Administrative budget receipts	$93.1	$100.0	$111.0
Trust fund receipts	31.0	33.5	41.6
Deduct: Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments	4.4	5.4	7.1
Total cash receipts from the public	119.7	128.2	145.5
Deduct: Loans, differences in coverage, and other adjustments	1.0	.6	.7
Add: Cash to accrual basis and other adjustments	.9	1.2	−2.6
National income account receipts—Federal sector	119.6	128.8	142.2
FEDERAL PAYMENTS			
Administrative budget expenditures	96.5	106.4	112.8
Excluding special Vietnam costs	(96.4)	(101.7)	(102.3)
Trust fund expenditures (including Government-sponsored enterprises)	29.6	33.8	37.9
Deduct: Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments	3.7	5.2	5.7
Total cash payments to the public	122.4	135.0	145.0
Excluding special Vietnam costs	(122.3)	(130.3)	(134.5)
Deduct: Loans, differences in coverage, and other adjustments	5.8	4.0	1.6
Add: Cash to accrual basis and other adjustments	1.7		−.7
National income account expenditures—Federal sector	118.3	131.0	142.7
Excluding special Vietnam costs	(118.2)	(126.3)	(132.2)
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS (+) OR PAYMENTS (−)			
Including special Vietnam costs:			
Administrative budget	−3.4	−6.4	−1.8
Receipts from and payments to the public	−2.7	−6.9	+.5
National income accounts—Federal sector	+1.2	−2.2	−.5

Consolidated cash statement: The administrative budget does not include a number of important Federal activities which are financed through trust funds, such as social security, medical care for the aged, and aid for highway construction. A more complete measure of the Government's finances is the consolidated cash budget which covers all of the Government's programs and transactions with the public.

Total payments to the public on the consolidated cash basis are estimated at $145.0 billion in fiscal year 1967, and increase of $10.0 billion over 1966. Excluding special Vietnam costs, cash payments are estimated to rise by $4.2 billion in 1967, primarily because of the recently enacted hospital and medical insurance programs for the aged which begin in 1967 and are being financed in large part by special taxes.

Total receipts from the public are estimated to be $145.5 billion in 1967, an increase of $17.4 billion over 1966. Of the total in 1967, $6.5 billion represents the yield from special trust fund taxes that were recently enacted or are proposed in this budget.

Federal sector, national income accounts: A third measure of Federal finance is based on the national income accounts. This concept is designed to indicate the direct impact of Federal fiscal activity on the economy. In this set of accounts, Federal receipts and expenditures, including trust fund transactions, are generally estimated on an accrual rather than a cash basis. In addition, purely financial transactions are excluded because they do not directly result in current output and income.

Total Federal sector receipts and expenditures are estimated to show a deficit of $2.2 billion in 1966 and $0.5 billion in 1967.

FEDERAL REVENUES

Since 1962, private demands for investment and consumption have been stimulated by several major tax revisions. The stimulus resulting from these tax changes has been the single strongest contributor to 5 full years of sustained economic growth. In the current year, private wage earners and investors are benefiting from tax reductions totaling $20 billion as a result of:

The Revenue Act of 1962, highlighting an investment tax credit for business.

Liberalized depreciation allowances.

The Revenue Act of 1964, providing a record cut in personal and corporate income tax rates.

The Excise Tax Act of 1965, authorizing a broad program to abolish most Federal excise taxes and reduce others.

Despite this massive tax reduction, administrative budget receipts under existing legislation are estimated to be about $21 billion greater in 1966 than they were 5 years earlier in 1961. This increase is more than double the increase during the previous 5 years, when there were no significant tax cuts. Thus, we have a clear illustration of the direct relationship between tax policies, economic growth, and Federal revenues.

Tax policy, however, must be used flexibly. We must be equally prepared to employ it in restraint of an overly rapid economic expansion as we were to use it as a stimulus to a lagging economy.

Receipts from the public

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Source	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Administrative budget receipts:			
Individual income taxes	$48.8	$51.4	$56.2
Corporation income taxes	25.5	29.7	34.4
Excise taxes	10.9	9.2	8.9
Other	7.9	9.7	11.5
Total administrative budget receipts	93.1	100.0	111.0
Trust fund receipts:			
Employment taxes	16.9	18.8	24.3
Deposits by States, unemployment insurance	3.1	2.9	2.9
Excise taxes	3.7	3.9	4.4
Federal employees retirement system	2.2	2.2	2.2
Interest on trust fund investments	1.8	1.8	2.0
Veterans life insurance premiums	.5	.5	.5
Other	3.0	3.4	5.3
Total trust fund receipts	31.0	33.5	41.6
Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments (deduct)	4.4	5.4	7.1
Total receipts from the public	119.7	128.2	145.5

The current situation calls for a modest measure of fiscal restraint. As a consequence, I am recommending a tax program which consists primarily of desirable reforms in tax collection procedures, having the effect of increasing revenues in the current and coming year. In addition, I am proposing the deferral of certain scheduled excise tax reductions.

Larger corporations are beginning the third step of a seven-stage transition to a full pay-as-you-go system for corporate income taxes by 1970. I propose that this transition be accelerated this year and completed in 1967 to produce increased corporate tax collections of $1.0 billion and $3.2 billion, respectively.

Similarly, higher income individuals now find that withheld taxes under the existing flat-rate system fail to cover the full tax liability at the end of the year. Establishment of a graduated withholding system will increase tax collections by $0.1 billion in fiscal 1966 and $0.4 billion in 1967, without a change in total personal tax liabilities.

In the case of the self-employment social security tax, individuals may now elect to make payments annually instead of quarterly. By requiring these payments to be made quarterly, trust fund receipts will be increased by $0.1 billion in both fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967.

Together, these three changes in collection procedure will put higher income individuals and corporations closer to the full pay-as-you-go schedules which now apply to moderate and lower income wage earners.

However, it is desirable that the economic impact of these three collection speedup reforms should be supplemented by temporarily rescinding reductions in excise tax rates on automobiles and telephone service which took effect in January of this year and by postponing the reductions in rates on these items now scheduled to take place in the future. Together these temporary tax

measures will yield $0.1 billion in 1966 and $1.2 billion in 1967.

An increase in the payroll tax rate and wage base to finance higher social security benefits and the new hospital insurance programs took effect on January 1, 1966. A further increase in the rate will occur on January 1, 1967, under existing law. These increases are expected to provide additional trust fund receipts of $1.5 billion in fiscal year 1966 and $6.2 billion in 1967.

The nature of many Government services is such that they should be provided without any charge or with only a nominal charge. However, in certain cases when a Government program provides special benefits or privileges to specific identifiable individuals or businesses, appropriate user charges should be initiated. To this end, legislation will be proposed when necessary, and equitable user charges will be instituted administratively where authority exists to do so.

This budget proposes a number of new or increased charges, the largest of which are in the transportation field. I again urge the Congress to enact legislation so that the primary beneficiaries will defray a larger part of the costs incurred by the Federal Government in providing transportation facilities and services to these beneficiaries.

Increased highway user charges are essential for completing the Interstate Highway System on a pay-as-you-go basis and for financing certain additional activities of importance to highway travelers, such as safety programs.

The users of the airways bear substantially less than the full cost of the Government investments and services upon which they rely. Accordingly, I am recommending an increase in the passenger ticket tax, increased taxes on fuels used by general aviation, and a new tax on air freight. Receipts from the fuel tax on general aviation which now go into the highway trust fund should be retained in the general fund.

The facilities of the inland waterways system, which have been improved steadily by the Federal Government, presently are available to general and commercial users free of charge. I propose that they meet a portion of the cost of the system through a fuel tax.

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

The recommendations in this budget will require $121.9 billion in new obligational authority for fiscal year 1967 in the administrative budget. The special costs of Vietnam represent $9.1 billion of this amount.

Of total new obligational authority, $106.3 billion requires action by the Congress this year; $15.6 billion represents permanent authorizations not requiring further congressional action; the largest of these is for interest on the public debt.

In addition to the new obligational authority required for the administrative budget, $42.6 billion will be available for the trust funds in 1967, an increase of $7.5 billion from the estimate for 1966. Most of this is in the form of automatically appropriated revenues from special taxes.

New obligational authority

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Total authorizations requiring current action by Congress:			
Administrative budget funds	$93.6	$111.6	$106.3
Trust funds	1.6	.6	1.7
Total authorizations not requiring current action by Congress:			
Administrative budget funds	13.1	14.4	15.6
Trust funds	30.4	34.4	40.9
Total new obligational authority:			
Administrative budget funds	106.6	126.0	121.9
Trust funds	32.0	35.0	42.6

The total recommended for 1967 in the administrative budget is $4.1 billion below the estimate for 1966. Most of this decrease—$3.5 billion—is in the Department of Defense—including military assistance—reflecting the large supplemental appropriations requested for 1966 for financing special southeast Asia costs.

New obligational authority in 1967 for all other agencies has been held at or below the 1966 levels wherever possible. The total estimated decline of $0.6 billion includes a number of significant changes in the authority requested for individual agencies and programs.

Major decreases other than for the Department of Defense are: $1.8 billion for the Department of Agriculture; $163 million for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; $110 million for the Federal Aviation Agency; $103 million for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Major increases are: $1.4 billion for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; $750 million for interest on the public debt; $316 million for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The administrative budget estimate for fiscal year 1966 includes a recommended $15.8 billion in new obligational authority not enacted to date. The special Vietnam supplemental represents $12.8 billion of this total. Other supplemental funds will be required to finance legislation enacted last year for which no funds have yet been provided, such as higher military and civilian pay and a Teacher Corps to help in the education of underprivileged children. Additional funds will also be needed for the Asian Development Bank and for the new activities authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the new hospital and medical insurance programs for the aged. Finally, relatively uncontrollable veterans benefits, public assistance grants, and disaster relief will require more funds than provided by the Congress last year.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES

The programs proposed in this budget are designed to serve the national interest to the full extent possible within an expenditure level appropriate to the time.

Our military needs are heavy. But they have not led us to a shortsighted policy of abandoning the war on poverty, ignorance, blight, and disease. We will continue to advance toward our goals for a Great Society. This budget provides for a significant increase in programs which attack urgent domestic problems.

To achieve better returns for the taxpayer's dollar, every Government activity has been subjected to exacting standards of necessity and priority. Some have been redirected to increase the benefits they produce, some have been reduced, and others have been eliminated. Savings from these actions are permitting greater expansions in programs of more immediate urgency.

Over the 3 years—from fiscal 1964 to 1967—the structure of the Federal budget will change substantially. Excluding special Vietnam costs, total administrative budget expenditures for regular Federal programs will rise by $4.6 billion, an increase of only 1½ percent per year.

Within the total, however, expenditure trends among various programs are sharply different. Between 1964 and 1967, combined expenditures on major programs directed toward the aims of the Great Society in health, in education, in the war on poverty, in manpower training, in housing and community development, will rise by $6.2 billion. Unavoidable interest costs will rise by $2.1 billion. But expenditures on all other activities will decline by $3.7 billion.

The changing Federal budget

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	Administrative budget expenditures, excluding special Vietnam costs				
	1964 actual	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate	Change, 1964 to 1967
Interest	$10.8	$11.4	$12.1	$12.9	+$2.1
Health, labor, education, housing and community development, economic opportunity program, and aid to the needy	6.7	7.3	10.8	12.9	+6.2
All other	80.2	77.6	78.8	76.5	−3.7
Total	97.7	96.4	101.7	102.3	+4.6

As we have moved forward with new programs to improve the quality of life for all Americans, we have sought to reduce or eliminate activities of lower priority, and to pursue every technique of modern management which reduces governmental costs. The expenditure trends since 1964 demonstrate anew what I have stated on many occasions in the past:

A compassionate government need not be a profligate government.

Concern for the needs and aspirations of people can go hand in hand with responsibility and efficiency in the management of the public's business.

The 1967 budget continues this approach. Net expenditures for Great Society programs rise by $2.1 billion—reflecting a gross increase of over $3 billion, partly offset by the substitution of private for public credit in several of these programs; interest costs rise by $0.8 billion; while all other regular expenditures decrease by $2.3 billion.

During the course of the year, unforeseeable events may call for prompt action by the Government. We will also want to act on matters—such as developing a civil supersonic transport—for which the amounts required cannot now be precisely estimated.

In addition, there are other matters—such as the pay and retirement benefits of Federal civilian employees—which are under study and on which decisions have not yet been reached. To make it clear that the budget totals provide adequately for such situations, I have included $500 million in new obligational authority and $350 million of expenditures as an allowance for contingencies.

Payments to the public

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Function	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Administrative budget expenditures:			
National defense	$50.2	$56.6	$60.5
Excluding special Vietnam costs	(50.1)	(51.9)	(50.2)
International affairs and finance	4.3	3.9	4.2
Excluding special Vietnam costs	(4.3)	(3.8)	(4.0)
Space research and technology	5.1	5.6	5.3
Agriculture and agricultural resources	4.9	4.3	3.4
Natural resources	2.8	2.9	3.1
Commerce and transportation	3.5	3.2	2.7
Housing and community development	−.1	.1	.1
Health, labor, and welfare	5.9	8.4	10.0
Education	1.5	2.3	2.8
Veterans benefits and services	5.5	5.1	5.7
Interest	11.4	12.1	12.9
General government	2.4	2.5	2.6
Allowance for contingencies	--------	.1	.4
Interfund transactions (deduct)	.9	.6	.7
Total, administrative budget expenditures	96.5	106.4	112.8
Total, administrative budget, excluding special Vietnam costs	(96.4)	(101.7)	(102.3)
Trust fund expenditures:			
Health, labor, and welfare	23.2	26.6	31.1
Commerce and transportation	3.9	3.8	3.9
Housing and community development	1.1	2.0	1.2
National defense	.8	.9	.9
Veterans benefits and services	.6	.6	.7
All other	.7	.8	.9
Interfund transactions (deduct)	.6	.8	.8
Total trust fund expenditures	29.6	33.8	37.9
Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments (deduct)	3.7	5.2	5.7
Total payments to the public	122.4	135.0	145.0
Total payments to the public, excluding special Vietnam costs	(122.3)	(130.3)	(134.5)

The following are my major expenditure recommendations:

National defense: Aggressive forces are now testing our will and commitment to help a brave ally under attack. This Nation will continue to seek a just settlement in Vietnam. At the same time, we must provide the funds and forces required to sustain us until that goal is reached. The 1967 budget meets those requirements as we now see them.

The costs will not be light. Defense expenditures necessary to meet the special requirements in southeast Asia will amount to $4.6 billion in 1966 and $10.3 billion in 1967. If early settlement is secured, many of these expenditures need never be made. But prudence requires that we budget for them at this time.

We must also continue to maintain defense forces equal to possible challenges elsewhere. The funds recommended in this budget provide for maintaining and improving the broad range of forces we need to meet all our defense requirements.

In 1967, we will:

Improve our strategic missile forces with additional Minuteman II and Polaris A-3 missiles, with further development of the Poseidon submarine-launched missile, and with initial procurement of the Minuteman III missile to be delivered in future years.

Initiate procurement of the new, high performance FB-111 to replace older, less effective bombers.

Begin to purchase giant C-5A transport aircraft to increase greatly our airlift capability.

Begin to build a new nuclear-powered aircraft carrier—our second—to augment the Navy's general purpose forces.

Add to the readiness, mobility, and staying power of our conventional war forces.

Continue the vigorous research and development programs vital to our continued ability to field the most modern and potent forces in the world.

While meeting our requirements in Vietnam and bolstering our forces, we must maintain our unrelenting efforts to operate our defense establishment efficiently and economically. In 1967, we will continue to weed out those forces and installations which have served their purpose and which are no longer essential. The successful defense cost reduction program will seek further savings. Moreover, because of the rising costs in Vietnam, we will defer certain programs where this can be done without harm to our defense capabilities.

These twin goals—insuring that we have the forces we need and operating them at the lowest reasonable cost—will require an increase of $4.0 billion in national defense outlays in 1967. In the absence of the special costs of supporting our operations in South Vietnam, however, defense expenditures would decline in 1967.

International affairs and finance: As we meet the direct military threat to freedom and security, we must also continue our pursuit of a world at peace, in which—

Freedom can thrive;

Hunger and disease are no longer a common condition of life;

Education is available to everyone;

All people and nations prosper together.

The long-run security and the innate compassion of the American people both call for policies which bring such a world closer.

The Congress and the public rightly demand that our assistance programs be effective in achieving their objectives. In the past several months I have carefully reviewed these programs. As a result of that review I am proposing the following steps:

First, I shall send to the Congress a special message proposing major initiatives in international health and education. Healthy and educated people are the most important resource a nation can possess. Therefore, the 1967 budget provides for expanded activities in education and health as next steps toward a better world.

Second, I am proposing to expand and reorient our food and agricultural assistance to the hungry peoples of the developing countries. We will emphasize assistance to the recipient countries in raising their own agricultural production so that they may eventually lessen their dependence on food aid from the United States. In this effort, increased economic aid for agricultural development will be closely coordinated with a new food-for-peace program.

Increased expenditures of the Agency for International Development for activities in health, education, and agriculture are provided within an economic assistance budget which, apart from special Vietnam costs, is no higher than in 1966.

Third, we will step up our efforts to encourage recipient nations to take vigorous measures of self-help. Our economic assistance will be provided to countries which are taking determined steps to help themselves.

Fourth, we will further concentrate our economic assistance efforts. In 1967 almost two-thirds of expenditures by the Agency for International Development outside of South Vietnam will be in nine key developing countries.

Fifth, to increase the effectiveness of our assistance, I am proposing that the program be authorized for a 5-year period.

My recommendations will be set forth in greater detail in other messages.

We will carry forward our long-term commitment to the Alliance for Progress. To this end, funds are included in this budget for continued expansion of the resources of the Inter-American Development Bank's Fund for Special Operations. Our own alliance activities are also being increased.

As part of a cooperative effort to promote economic development in Asia, I will propose legislation to authorize the United States to become a charter member of the Asian Development Bank. The budget also includes funds to pay our share of the current replenishment of the resources of the International Development Association. As soon as future needs and an appropriate sharing formula are determined, I will seek legislation to authorize additional contributions to this highly successful affiliate of the World Bank.

This budget will also enable us to expand the Peace Corps, of which we can be justly proud; to continue our overseas information activities; and to maintain our firm support of the United Nations.

Space research and technology: Just over 60 years ago, man entered the age of controlled flight. Today, men orbit the earth at speeds measured in thousands of miles an hour. In 1967, less than 6 years after this Nation set the goal of a manned landing on the moon within the present decade, we will begin unmanned test flights of the giant Saturn V rocket and the Apollo spacecraft—the complete space vehicle required for achieving that goal. Later on in the 1960's, we will undertake the manned lunar mission itself.

Our many space achievements—both manned and unmanned—have dramatically advanced our scientific understanding and technological capabilities. They have also clearly demonstrated our remarkable progress in the peaceful exploration of space. In 1967, our large space projects will be progressing from the more expensive development phase into operational status, and new projects of equivalent cost will not be started. Accordingly, expenditures of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration are estimated to decline by $300 million in 1967. This level will sustain our progress in space exploration and continue the advancement of science and technology.

Agriculture and agricultural resources: Our increasingly efficient agricultural production is a bulwark of strength for the Nation. It provides us with an ample supply of high quality food at home and a large volume of commercial exports. It also allows us to assist the economic development of other countries.

Our increasing productive efficiency, however, has not been fully matched by new employment opportunities for rural people who are no longer needed in farming and farm-related occupations. Consequently, large numbers of farmers and other rural people do not share fully in the benefits of this increased efficiency.

To help eligible rural people and communities participate more fully in all available Federal programs, the Department of Agriculture is expanding its services to advise and inform them about these programs and to furnish information to other Federal agencies about rural problems. The Department will also participate with other agencies and local representatives in establishing pilot multicounty development districts to coordinate the planning of programs to improve rural life.

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 represents a milestone in modernizing our farm commodity programs. Under this act, greater emphasis will be given to direct payments to farmers. Moreover, the Secretary of Agriculture will have more discretion in adapting farm programs to new conditions. Nevertheless, we must explore new approaches to the problems of commercial farming and seek new ways to adapt our programs for low-income people to rural conditions.

In November 1965, I appointed a National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber and directed it to make a penetrating appraisal of all aspects of agricultural policy and to report in 18 months. The Commission's recommendations, along with valuable experience under the 1965 farm legislation and our general programs to help low-income people, should provide a firm basis for further improvements in programs for agriculture and rural people.

Natural resources: In developing and conserving our natural resources, we must always look ahead to the Nation's changing needs.

We must act now to meet the outdoor recreation needs of our growing population and to preserve our historic and scenic sites. I again urge the Congress to authorize the national park, seashore, and lakeshore areas recommended in my message last year on Natural Beauty. I also recommend legislation to establish a Redwoods National Park in northern California. With some of California's magnificent State park lands as a nucleus and Federal acquisition of key adjoining lands, a substantial area of the redwoods will be preserved for future generations.

Water is a worldwide concern. It is often not available in the proper amount and quality, or at the time it is needed. Lack of water or poor use of it can be a major deterrent to the growth of developing nations. At my request, the Secretaries of the Interior and State, together with other concerned agencies, are preparing a program to cooperate with other nations in finding solutions to the world's water problems.

Future water supplies both at home and abroad can be greatly expanded by the economical conversion of sea and brackish water. The Office of Saline Water, in conjunction with the Atomic Energy Commission and other agencies, is intensifying its research efforts on this problem. The 1967 budget includes funds for the Office of Saline Water to complete construction of an advanced distillation unit at the west coast test center. This project will accelerate development of large-scale economical processes for converting sea water to fresh water.

The 1967 budget provides for starting construction on a number of new water resources projects. These projects represent a national investment in land, water, and power resources which will yield dividends for years to come.

Improved use of nuclear energy will assure a major source of economical power for the future. In working toward this objective, the Atomic Energy Commission is intensifying its long-term program to develop "fast breeder" nuclear power reactors which, by producing more fuel than they consume, would greatly expand usable energy resources.

Commerce and transportation: In the year ahead, strong overall economic growth will contribute importantly to the improvement of conditions in the Nation's depressed areas. In addition, the 1967 budget provides for an orderly expansion in Federal assistance for those areas.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 has given us new means for helping develop depressed grants, and technical assistance will be provided. The Federal Government will also offer special incentives in 1967 for consolidating such areas into development districts better able to plan and achieve economic expansion.

The special development program for the Appalachian region will continue at a rapid pace. This unique Federal-State effort provides new opportunities for the 17½ million people of the region through highway construction, natural resource development, and construction of needed public facilities.

The new Office of State Technical Services in the Department of Commerce will be in its first full year of operation in 1967. This Office will make grants to State and regional centers to provide the latest scientific and technical findings to American business.

An efficient and safe transportation system is essential to a nation whose economy is growing, whose population is increasing, and whose urban areas are expanding at a very rapid rate. Nearly one-fifth of our annual gross national product is spent on transportation of people and goods.

The Federal Government is not now organized to deal effectively with this major segment of the American economy. Public programs for research, promotion, and investment in transportation are scattered among a host of Federal agencies. Where we need consolidation we find fragmentation. I shall propose, in a later message to the Congress, the creation of a new Department of Transportation to provide a realistic and consistent approach to the Nation's transportation problems.

There is no single statistic of American life more shocking than the toll of dead and injured on our highways. Each day we kill 135 of our fellow citizens—each year we injure 3 million more. I will shortly recommend to the Congress a major new highway safety program providing for the reorganization and centralization of the Federal Government's highway safety activities and a sharp expansion of their scope. The program will give particular attention to comprehensive research into the causes and prevention of highway accidents and to cooperative efforts with State and local governments in strengthening accident-prevention programs.

We will continue to give special attention to the transportation problems facing our growing cities and metropolitan areas. Research and demonstrations to improve intercity high speed ground transportation and urban mass transit will be actively pursued next year.

During the past year progress made by industry on the development of a civil supersonic transport aircraft has been promising. I will therefore propose to the Congress a joint Government-industry program to build the prototype of a safe and commercially profitable supersonic airplane.

Housing and community development: During its last session, the Congress passed two far-reaching acts that greatly improve our ability to solve the problems of:

Providing good housing for those who cannot now afford it.

Restoring the central cores of the cities.

Achieving a rational pattern of growth in metropolitan areas.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is the most important piece of substantive legislation for the American city since the Housing Act of 1949. The act creating the Department of Housing and Urban Development will enable the Government to launch a coordinated attack on the problems of housing and the city.

The new programs authorized by the 1965 legislation must be effectively carried out. Accordingly, this budget provides funds for:

Maximum use of existing housing in the low-rent public housing program.

Well-planned water and sewer systems.

Beautification of our cities.

Facilities to house social services and recreation in lower income neighborhoods.

The 1967 budget also provides for full use of the rent supplement program. I ask that the Congress immediately take the action needed to start this necessary program.

Federal aid will be approved in 1967 for over 160,000 additional housing units for low- and moderate-income families and elderly individuals. Progress will continue on restoring older areas of cities, and greater emphasis will be given to rehabilitation and provision of land for housing that most people can afford.

Public actions to improve poor housing conditions, to upgrade deteriorating neighborhoods, and to tackle the social blight associated with slums too often have not worked to support each other's objectives. The leadership resources of private business, civic, and labor organizations have not been fully utilized in formulating and carrying out the actions needed to preserve for all citizens the human dimensions of city life. I am requesting legislation authorizing assistance to qualifying cities across the Nation to show how complex and intertwined urban problems can be effectively attacked on a large scale through the coordinated use of local, State, and Federal programs.

I again urge the Congress to grant home rule to the District of Columbia so that its citizens may exercise the right of self-government enjoyed by other Americans.

Health, labor, and welfare: Outside of defense, the Federal Government's largest outlays are devoted to improving the Nation's health, protecting workers and their families against loss of income, and assisting the disadvantaged to overcome poverty and unemployment.

Last year, the Congress enacted more than a score of major bills which will advance us toward the goal of a better and more secure life for our citizens. This was an unsurpassed achievement. However, there are still a number of important gaps which we should begin now to fill.

Health: Last year, the enactment of medicare marked a milestone in the social history of the United States. To make that legislation effective and to assure that the American people have access to high quality medical care at reasonable costs, we need to concentrate our efforts on the provision of adequate medical facilities and manpower. The 1967 budget is designed to that end. Increased funds are made available under legislation enacted last year to help educate more doctors, dentists, nurses, and graduate public health personnel. Funds are also provided for newly enacted programs to increase the number of community mental health centers and help support their staff. I shall propose legislation to assist our communities in modernizing and replacing older hospitals. Similarly, legislation should be enacted to extend training assistance to medical assistants and other health personnel not now eligible.

Apart from medicare and other programs I have already mentioned, the impressive listing of health measures passed last year and financed in this budget includes:

Regional medical programs to provide up-to-date diagnosis and treatment for heart disease, cancer, stroke, and related diseases.

Comprehensive medical treatment and care for preschool and school age needy children in selected areas of low income.

Increased efforts to safeguard and purify the air we breathe.

Improvements in vocational rehabilitation so that over 200,000 disabled or handicapped people can return to productive work.

Pollution control: Clean and sparkling rivers ought to be a part of every American's environment. I intend to propose a new and expanded program to combat the problem of polluted water. This program will call for the improved enforcement authority needed to conquer pollution. It will also provide for large-scale cooperative efforts of Federal, State, and local governments to show how pollution can be eliminated throughout entire river basins.

Labor: I urge enactment of legislation to—

Provide long-needed improvements in our unemployment compensation system.

Repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Increase the minimum wage and extend protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act to over 5 million more workers.

Activities under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 will be reoriented in 1967 to place more emphasis on the training of persons who now have little or no skill. Special attention will also be given to training for skills in particularly short supply. Not only will this raise the earnings of the poor, but it will increase the availability of productive labor to meet the demands of our expanding economy.

Economic opportunity programs: The war on poverty launched in 1965 will continue to help low-income people develop the skills and abilities needed for them to break out of the cycle of poverty handed down from one generation to the next. The budget will increase this program to reach individuals whom even full prosperity does not touch.

In 1967, community action programs will be in effect in 900 communities, making a concerted attack on the poverty in their midst. The Head Start preschool program, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the Job Corps will again help at least 1 million children and youths. Work experience, adult literacy, small business loans, and special employment projects will help over 250,000 adults.

Other aids to the needy: I intend to propose legislation to—

Strengthen programs giving assistance to unemployed parents of needy children by providing work experience, services, and training to equip them for regular employment.

Improve the nutrition of needy children.

Older programs will be redirected, shifting more of their resources to helping the disadvantaged:

The school lunch and special milk programs will focus more on needy children, helping to provide them with adequate and well-balanced meals.

The public assistance program will provide more financial aid and better medical care to families with dependent children.

The Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program will enroll more handicapped persons who are receiving public assistance.

Education: There is no greater challenge than that of providing our children and youth with the opportunity to develop fully their talents and interests. Education is vital to the achievement of a Great Society and is our major weapon in the war on poverty.

The 89th Congress has made education history. It has truly opened the doors of opportunity to preschool, elementary, secondary, and college education for millions of our young people. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 will benefit this generation and clear the way to greater opportunity for future generations.

This budget reflects the added Federal responsibility for improving our Nation's educational system. The expenditures proposed for 1967 are more than 85 percent above the 1965 level. In 1967 this will make possible—

An increase of $905 million in expenditures for school aid under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, mostly for grants to improve the education of more than 7.5 million disadvantaged children;

A Teacher Corps of more than 3,700 members to serve in schools with large numbers of children from low-income families;

Scholarships, loans, and part-time work for well over 1 million college students, 3 times the number in 1965;

Commitments exceeding $1 billion for loans and grants to help more than 1,300 colleges build needed academic and college housing facilities.

We should continue to build upon the programs to enlarge educational opportunity and improve the quality of teaching. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 should be extended beyond June 30, 1966, and improved. To increase its effectiveness, the income criterion for allocating funds for fiscal year 1968 should be raised from $2,000 to $3,000 and the incentive grant provision should be dropped.

Veterans benefits and services: The Nation properly provides special help to those who suffer disabilities while in the service of our country; this help is extended through programs of income maintenance, vocational rehabilitation, and medical care. We also have a continuing obligation to the widows and children of those who have died in performing military service.

The 1st session of the 89th Congress recognized both of these basic trusts by—

Increasing disability compensation payments;

Liberalizing vocational rehabilitation benefits;

Affording more generous allowances for children receiving educational aid under the War Orphans Act;

Providing a new program of insurance coverage for men in our uniformed services.

We are currently engaged in armed conflict and have called upon the youth of our Nation to serve in that conflict. We should develop and expand programs to ease their readjustment to civilian life by providing education and training assistance.

The 1967 budget also provides for further improvements in the high quality of medical care administered in VA hospitals. New services will continue to be added to bring to veterans the latest advances of medical science.

Veterans programs should continue to emphasize the needs of the service-disabled. All veterans and their families are, of course, eligible to participate in the steadily improving general health, education, and welfare programs provided by the Government for all citizens.

General government: Action by the Congress is urgently needed in several different areas of governmental responsibility.

In recent years, we have made giant strides toward the goal of equal rights for all citizens. We still have far to go. To guarantee equal protection to individuals and to minorities under the law, there are clear and positive additional legislative actions which must be taken. I will shortly recommend such actions to the Congress.

A Great Society cannot be marked by rising crime rates. Americans, rich and poor, are as one on this. In 1965, I proposed and the Congress enacted the Law Enforcement Assistance Act. Under that program Federal, State, local, and private institutions can work together to—

Improve training of law-enforcement personnel;

Promote research and spread information on law enforcement and correctional techniques;

Strengthen the administration of justice.

The 1967 budget provides for an 89-percent increase in the funds allotted to this program.

I am determined to take whatever further steps are necessary to combat crime. I will propose to the Congress additional legislation to meet that objective.

The stockpile of strategic and critical materials will be reduced further in 1967 as we continue to dispose of materials excess to our long-term needs. To permit management improvements and reduce costs, legislation should be enacted to consolidate inventories and facilitate disposals from the stockpile.

PUBLIC DEBT

The size of the public debt varies from year to year primarily as a result of the Government's surplus or deficit. Based on the estimates of receipts and expenditures in this budget, the debt on June 30, 1966, will be $320.0 billion. On June 30, 1967, it will have risen to $321.7 billion.

Public debt at end of year

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1964 actual	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Owned by Federal agencies and trust funds	$60.7	$63.0	$64.9	$69.9
Owned privately and by Federal Reserve banks	251.8	254.8	255.1	251.8
Total	312.5	317.9	320.0	321.7

Present law provides a temporary debt limit of $328 billion until June 30, 1966. After that date—if no action is taken—the limit will revert to the permanent ceiling of $285 billion. It is necessary, therefore, that the ceiling for the period after June 30, 1966, be raised.

A workable debt limit should allow for two factors in addition to the estimated size of the debt at the end of fiscal year 1967:

Seasonal fluctuations in the size of the debt.

The need for flexibility in managing the debt.

The first is necessary to allow for periods when the debt will exceed the end-of-year total. This results from the seasonal pattern of receipts, which are lower in the first half of the fiscal year.

Adequate provision for flexibility will permit the Treasury to take full advantage of favorable market conditions and thus avoid unnecessary interest costs.

IMPROVING GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT

As a nation we have much to do. We have the will. We have the resources. But we must conserve these resources, investing them wisely. We dare not waste them.

This calls for improved Government organization, better programing, cost reduction, and effective employment policies. I intend shortly to present the Congress with a number of proposals designed to accomplish these objectives.

Government organization: In moving toward the goals of the Great Society, the enactment of substantive legislation is only the first step. The 89th Congress has, through its accomplishments to date, provided the basis for advancing in such critical areas as civil rights, economic opportunity, medical care for our older citizens, improvement of our cities, and regional development.

However, if these laws are to produce the desired results—effectively and at minimum cost to the taxpayer—we cannot afford to cling to organizational and administrative arrangements which have not kept pace with our changing needs.

Government organization must provide for fast and flexible response to new problems and conditions. We must be as bold and imaginative in reshaping and modernizing the executive branch as we have been in devising new programs. A structure designed in major part to carry out programs and policies of the 1950's and earlier years will not give us the organization we need as we move toward the 1970's. I will propose shortly to the Congress a series of reorganization measures which will enable the Government to manage its business more effectively.

Federal, State, and local coordination: Many of our critical new programs involve the Federal Government in joint ventures with State and local governments in thousands of communities throughout the Nation. The success or failure of those programs depends largely on timely and effective communications and on readiness for action on the part of both Federal agencies in the field and State and local governmental units. We must strengthen the coordination of Federal programs in the field. We must open channels of responsibility. We must give more freedom of action and judgment to the people on the firing line. We must help State and local governments to deal more effectively with Federal agencies. We must see that information gets to the field and to cooperating State and local governments, promptly and accurately.

I intend to see to it that this dimension of the new public management receives major attention and action in the coming year.

Planning-programing-budgeting system: I have directed the executive branch to develop and introduce a new planning-programing-budgeting system which will incorporate the most modern management techniques now used in Government and industry. This system will enable us to—

Be more concrete and precise about the objectives of our programs;

Examine longer term problems and consequences more systematically;

Consider more alternatives before reaching decisions;

Link our planning efforts more directly to budget decisions;

Get more effectiveness for the dollars we spend;

Provide more benefits to the American people in more economical ways.

During the next year, I expect to see much progress made in this system with results that will be reflected in the budget for fiscal year 1968.

Substitution of private for public credit: In recent budgets, I have pressed for the encouragement of private financing in the major Federal credit programs wherever I have felt it to be consistent with the public interest. I will need the cooperation of the Congress to carry this effort still further in the coming year.

This is an important and sensible way to manage our Federal credit programs. I, therefore, urge prompt action on legislation being proposed to authorize a considerable expansion in the sale of participations in Government loans. The budget assumes its enactment. With the authority provided by such legislation, my budget proposals for encouraging the substitution of private for public credit will reduce 1967 expenditures by $4.7 billion from what they would have been otherwise.

Automatic data processing: The Federal Government has obtained great benefits from the use of electronic computers. With the direct annual cost of acquiring and operating this equipment now in the range of $2 billion, I intend to make sure that this huge investment is managed efficiently—through such means as research, equipment sharing, careful purchasing, and coordinated Government-wide utilization policies.

Cost reduction: During the past 2 years, I have not ceased to demand an exacting standard of cost-consciousness in every department and bureau of the executive branch. I believe neither in padded budgets nor in tax habits of organization and management. Every dollar of expenditure must produce results. I expect each Government employee to spend the public dollar with the same care and concern he would exercise if it came out of his own paycheck.

In preparing this budget, all existing programs have been reexamined closely. Wherever a program could be cut back on grounds of less priority, I have cut it. Despite the appeal of many of these programs to affected groups, I urge the Congress not to restore them to their previous levels.

There are many ways to reduce costs and eliminate unnecessary spending:

By curtailing or eliminating activities of declining importance.

By closing marginal branch offices or installations.

By pooling common services.

By simplifying organization.

By increasing productivity.

By installing up-to-date systems and equipment.

By interagency coordination of plans and operations.

By stringent budgetary reviews.

Last March, I set in operation a Government-wide, formal program for systematic cost reduction in which each agency must identify savings goals for the year ahead and report to me on actual results. This program is working.

Agencies have identified specific savings in 1965 and 1966. Additional savings will be made in 1967. Altogether, the civilian cost reduction program will reduce the costs of operating the Government by some $1 billion in each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

The Department of Defense accomplished $4.8 billion of savings in fiscal year 1965, and the annual rate of savings in that Department is expected to exceed $6 billion in 1969.

No agency, regardless of size or importance, is exempted from the duty to save the taxpayer's money by better management and alert business methods.

One of the most gratifying developments to come to my attention is the remarkable progress of Government agencies in improving productivity. With workloads increasing in nearly every category of Government activity, the only way to restrain mounting Federal employment is by persistent management improvement and higher productivity. These are just a few of the changes in productivity which are reflected in this budget:

The Social Security Administration is achieving a productivity gain of 2½ percent by automating the recomputation of benefits, with a saving of 1,742 man-years and $12.4 million.

The Post Office Department's budget reflects an increase in mail processing productivity of 1.4 percent, resulting in a saving of 3,900 man-years and $23 million.

The Federal Aviation Agency is increasing productivity by 5 percent in airways facilities operation and maintenance, thus absorbing nearly all the workload increase resulting from the growth in aviation activity, with a budget saving of almost $4 million.

By using advanced medical techniques, the Veterans' Administration has been able to reduce the duration of patient stay in its hospitals. In 1967, about 1 percent more patients can be accommodated than in 1966. This means that the same number of beds operated in 1966 will take care of 7,000 more patients in 1967.

These actions are the result of tireless effort by many officials and employees of the Federal Government. It is often harder work to save money than to find productive ways to spend it. But it is equally important to the public interest.

I believe we are making good progress in reducing costs and improving efficiency, but I will never be satisfied that we have done all we should. I expect the top officials of every department and agency to press hard in the coming year to do still better—and not only in headquarters operations. Only 10 percent of all Federal employees are in Washington—most of our employees and operations are spread throughout the 50 States and overseas. I intend to stress particularly this year the urgency of management improvement and better public service in the field establishment of the Federal Government.

CONCLUSION

This Nation has committed itself to help defend South Vietnam against aggression. We are determined to fulfill that commitment.

This Nation has also committed itself to a major effort to provide better economic, social, and cultural opportunities for all Americans. We are also determined to fulfill this commitment.

Both of these commitments involve great costs. They are costs we can and will meet.

The objectives we are seeking are interdependent.

We cannot fight for peace and freedom in Vietnam, while sacrificing individual dignity and opportunity at home. For it would be a hollow victory if our pursuit of world peace were carried out at the expense of domestic progress.

Yet we must also recognize that a truly Great Society looks beyond its own borders. The freedom, health, and prosperity of all mankind are its proper concern.

The struggle in Vietnam must be supported. The advance toward a Great Society at home must continue unabated.

This budget provides the means for both these goals.

I urge the support of Congress and all Americans for its principles and its programs.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 24, 1966.

The message, together with the accompanying papers, was, without objection, referred by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, we have a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress which is looking into the possibility of improving the operations of the Congress.

In reading some of the testimony before that joint committee, I find that a considerable point has been made to the effect that Congress does not get an opportunity to view the overall picture of Federal expenditures, Federal revenues, and the fiscal plan of the Government.

Whether or not there is great hungering for this understanding, I am not sure. I would hope that there is. Surely, there ought to be. But the relatively small attendance of Members here on the House floor to hear the President's budget message, in which he recommends appropriations of about $121 billion for fiscal 1967, would indicate something less than a consuming interest. Be that as it may, we do need to look at the overall budget and fiscal situation as well as to the specifics. The money business is probably our most important single business.

The President of the United States has done his job. He has performed his responsibility, in that, in compliance with the law, he has submitted his budget. Whether we like it or not is a different matter, but he has discharged his duty in that he has submitted his recommendations. He has submitted his budget to the Congress for consideration.

Now it is up to the Congress to discharge its responsibility.

The President is not unaware of the mood of the country. I believe he understands generally the thinking of the American people. He knows that the American people want peace. They want a successful conclusion of the war in Vietnam. In the meantime, they want domestic programs to take the back seat, relatively speaking.

On the other hand, I believe the people want a continuation of orderly government. Surely, they do not want to abandon everything we are doing in this country and sidetrack all programs while devoting ourselves exclusively to the war in Vietnam.

What the country wants and what the country needs is restraint in the application of the present laws and in the passing of additional laws relating to the expenditure of money. In other words, what the country wants is a slowdown, or certainly not a buildup, of expenditures in areas where reductions can safely be made.

Mr. Speaker, I think it wholly unlikely that the Congress will receive from the President at this session any communication or proposition bearing more vitally on the future welfare of the United States, and in fact of all mankind, than the budget and the message we have just heard. Manifestly, we can do no more than react in a general way to the tone and direction of the message and the big features of the overall budget. I shall supplement these observations with additional remarks and supporting statistics, but anything so vast, so complex, and so encompassing as this huge compilation known as the budget of the United States will require weeks and months of individual and committee study and floor debate to fully ingest and process.

There are some distinguishing features to this message and this budget—some quite remarkable, some quite unremarkable. Perhaps the most unremarkable, yet in some ways significant thing about it is that, like the last budget, and even several budgets previously, the great bulk of it will unquestionably receive broad acceptance from both parties and throughout the country. Undoubtedly, some features will be greatly controverted.

I believe the President has put some things in the budget—I know he has—of which I will not approve, and of which some other Members will not approve. He has cut too low in some places, in my judgment, and he has gone too far in some places. This is inevitable. This is not something about which we should complain here, because it is the President's responsibility to propose, and it is our responsibility to dispose of the matter from the legislative standpoint.

For myself, and I would hazard to say probably for the great majority, I like the general tone and direction of the message. I believe it responds reasonably well to the imperative necessities of the times. It heads in the right direction. Bringing the deficit down to $1.8 billion from $6.4 billion now shown for the current year, in the face of what we are having to do in Vietnam, is quite remarkable. It looks to me like a fiscally responsible course.

The message is remarkable for its manifestations of restraint, yet equally noteworthy for its unrestrained commitment to the cause of peace and freedom. It is unrestrained in its message to the world Communist movement, and in its allocation of resources to give substance to that message, that we will do what we have to do to preserve our freedom and that we cannot be defeated by force of arms. Implicit is the message that the breath of freedom is like an eternal flame—unquenchable, imperishable. There can be no limits to the necessities—there will be no limits—because there is no second place in the struggle.

Mr. Speaker, when we wish to emphasize something we do so by repeating it, or if we are writing, we underscore it. The printer italicizes it—italics are supplied for emphasis. I want to underscore and italicize and emphasize by repeating a passage from today's message that I believe epitomizes the remarkable restraint through which and by which the President and his many associates have succeeded in containing budget expenditures and marked out big strides that can be taken and, in his opinion, ought to be taken by the Congress toward balancing the budget. I read from the first page:

> The rate of advance in the new programs has been held below what might have been proposed in less troubled times, many older and lower priority activities have been reduced or eliminated, and economies have been sought in every operation of the Government.

The dominant theme struck by this message and this budget—in all but the most imperative and unassailable national security and defense necessities—is restraint, moderation, discipline. The budget is the convening place for all the policies and programs of the Government. It is the occasion of the greatest contest between conflicting and competing interests. With public money never in overabundance; with these great contests between needs and wants for a place in the budget; and especially with the great unfertilized seedbeds of budget growth so generously sown by the Congress in new legislative enactments last year, who would deny that the President and his associates have exercised remarkable restraint and great ingenuity in putting together a war, peace, and prosperity budget only $1.8 billion out of balance?

When we consider the much larger $6.4 billion deficit now foreseen for the current year, the $1.8 billion looks all the more remarkable. It involved some painful and unpopular choices; some cutting out; some hacking at the roots as well as at the branches; some deferments to a more propitious time. And low-priority defense spending did not escape the knife. It was not done without great effort and much study and I believe the people will generally applaud those efforts.

Of course, there are some programs which are large in importance but not so large, relatively speaking, where the major controversies will come. There will be no controversy about the importance of defense appropriations. We will have to provide nearly $13 billion for interest on the debt, because that is automatic. We will have to provide for the Veterans' Administration and perhaps the probabilities are that we might go beyond the request of the Administration with respect to the care of the veterans of the country.

We will have to provide for an agricultural program. Some very sharp and painful reductions have been made in that program as well as in other programs by the President.

I suspect that there will be little controversy about the need to provide for a strong space program, even though it has been held down.

Every knowledgeable person concedes the long truth of history that growth of the population and growth of the country and its economy ordain some automatic growth in public services. Public services cost money—and thus the budget grows. I well recall President Eisenhower's often-quoted, lucid acknowledgment of this in his own budget message to Congress in 1960:

> Moreover, inescapable demands resulting from new technology and the growth of our Nation, and new requirements resulting from the changing nature of our society, will generate Federal expenditures in future years. * * * We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities.

For example, there are 2,308,000 more Americans this morning than when the previous budget came last January 25. And the bellwether gross national product, measuring the economy's total production of goods and services, grew $47 billion last year and today's budget projects a further growth of $46 billion this year—the basis, of course, for much of the anticipated rise in budget revenues.

Against this background, the overall fiscal 1967 administrative budget shows up rather well—it is about 15 percent of the projected gross national product, virtually the smallest in 15 years.

Another useful way of gaining some better perspective about the dimensions of Federal budget spending is to note that about three-fourths of the budget goes for objects considered proper functions since the earliest days of the Republic—national defense, internal revenue, the postal service, administration of justice, aid to veterans, conduct of foreign affairs, and interest on the debt.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND ACTIONS

But the budget is only the first step. It is only a plan. It is not self-executing. It is here for our consideration and our disposition; the next moves are up to us. What shall we do—what shall be our attitudes, our approach, our guidelines? We hear much about guidelines these days. What shall be our master guideline as we study and vote on these many budget recommendations?

In view of the situation confronting us, both at home and abroad, and the great uncertainties we face, I believe, and I would indulge the great hope that in respect to all nondefense, and even to low-priority defense budget items, our one principal guideline this session ought to be fiscal caution and restraint. We ought to thoroughly screen every proposition of new or enlarged authorization; every old and every enlarged appropriation; every suggestion for increased revenue; and every responsible suggestion for further reductions.

We ought to take a determined stand against marginal spending.

We might well use the same pencil the President used in making up the budget, but resharpen it and bear down a little harder when we write the legislative and appropriation bills.

I have even urged that the executive branch delay the expenditure of funds already appropriated where this can be done safely in view of the changed and changing circumstances. That is a proper course under the right circumstances. The law authorizes it. Common prudence justifies it. The necessities of war and the perils of inflation command it.

But Congress will not acquit itself well on this score unless the people generally demand and support such a course. We promised to follow a course of fiscal restraint when we adopted the big tax cut bill 2 years ago. More than ever, now is the time to redeem that pledge.

There are times, as Woodrow Wilson once wisely observed, when "the duty of economy is not debatable; when it is manifest and imperative." Now is such a time. Economic well-being is the wellspring of our strength. Inflation is its enemy.

Restraint in public spending is not easy to come by. The chainsmoker finds it hard to give up the habit. The compulsive eater has the same problem. One of the Pharaohs of Egypt wanted to learn something about geometry but didn't want to study all the 13 parts of "Euclid's Elements." He said a shortcut would be agreeable, whereupon Euclid told him there was no royal road to geometry. And there is no royal shortcut road to economy.

We are not a well-disciplined people in this regard. As someone once remarked, the tendency of everything is to be more so. But a policy of discipline and good sense on the part of the people generally is the only lasting answer. Bernard Baruch, the distinguished financier and advisor to Presidents, once put the idea rather well:

> Government is not a substitute for people, but simply the instrument through which they act * * *. The greatest blessing of our democracy is freedom. But in the last analysis, our only freedom is the freedom to discipline ourselves.

What we need, then, in my judgment, is to draw a sharper distinction between our needs and our wants. A need is a necessity; a want is a desire. And as a general proposition of principle, I think it best for the health of government and the public good that all of us ought to find ourselves in some perpetual state of dissatisfaction about public spending at all levels of government, no matter what the size of the budget, but with our perspectives in good focus.

BUDGETARY VARIATIONS

As we process segments of this budget during the session, we ought to also take account of the inherent nature of virtually every budget from every President in every time and administration.

Budgets set goals, chart courses of actions, outline expectations, and embody anticipations. It is not only traditional, it is understandable that a budget be somewhat optimistic in outlook and tone. In making the budget, the President has to declare something of the end from the beginning. He has to draw the first line between what he thinks we need and what he thinks we can afford as a nation. It is up to us, as independent legislators, to redraw that line as we see best. And in redrawing it, we ought to remember:

First. All original budgets are tentative at best—and the uncertainties of the Vietnam situation make this 1967 budget more tenuous than most.

Second. All original budgets turn out differently—the realizations often do not match the expectations.

Third. The hard, cold experience is that over the last many budgets, while there have been some years when realizations overmatched initial projections and the Treasury came out ahead, in the aggregate the shoe was on the other foot; there was a shortfall. Budget balances tend to be illusory.

There are many slips between the cup and the lip. Economic conditions change. Congress alters the budget. Emergencies arise. And so on. So, Mr. Speaker, as we work on these many budget recommendations, simple prudence compels the suggestion that we ought to assume some worsening of the budget position. It is wise to hedge against overoptimism and against uncertainty. Speaking about national appropriations way back in 1879, the distinguished Republican, James A. Garfield, then a Member of the House, hit the nail on the head.

"War overturns all ordinary calculations," he said. That is exactly what it has done to the current fiscal 1966 budget and to this fiscal 1967 budget. And it is the big cloud of uncertainty still hanging over the Treasury.

I included an enlightening summary on this point of budget variations:

Variations in the administrative budgets—original projections versus final results (using the last 11 budgets, 1955–65)

[NOTE.—Rounded amounts used]

Net budget receipts:	
Original January budget projections	$849, 263, 000, 000
Final results (when the years were over)	840, 824, 000, 000
Revenues fell short by	−8, 439, 000, 000
(NOTE.—In 6 of the 11 years, revenues were less than the original budget; in 5 they were more.)	
Net budget expenditures:	
Original January budget projections	862, 502, 000, 000
Final results	883, 964, 000, 000
Expenditures went higher by	+21, 462, 000, 000
(NOTE.—In 8 of the 11 years, actual spending exceeded the original budget. In 3 years, it was less.)	
So, in total, there was a deviation of	+29, 901, 000, 000
Budget surplus (+) or deficit (−):	
Original January budget projections	−$13, 239, 000, 000
Final results	−43, 140, 000, 000
So, in total, instead of a total deficit of $13.2 billion over the 11 years as originally projected, there was a deficit of $43.1 billion—a change for the worse of	−29, 901, 000, 000
New obligational authority (the forerunner of actual expenditures):	
Original January budget proposals from the President (which he not infrequently amends and supplements from time to time)	874, 200, 000, 000
Final amounts enacted	917, 400, 000, 000
Final amounts enacted exceeded the original budget proposals by	+43, 200, 000, 000
(NOTE.—In 10 of the 11 years the final amount enacted exceeded the original January budget proposal for the year.)	

Source: Budget Documents. January 1966.

BUDGETARY CONTINGENCIES

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, remarkable though this budget is, it is in the red, not in the black. It is still $1.8 billion short of balance. That is a lot of money and not only leaves no room for relaxation of our standards, no room for complacency; it calls for sacrifices.

While all budgets rest to some extent on contingencies, this $1.8 billion imbalance now projected for fiscal 1967, and to some lesser extent the $6.4 billion revised deficit now estimated for the current fiscal year 1966, depend partly on a fairly long list of nonappropriation legislative actions. Even holding to those amounts will involve the work of many hands and the minds of many Members and several committees. We have our work cut out for us.

A President's budget is not just a fiscal plan; it is a broad legislative plan. I can think of no exception, in previous budgets submitted by the Executive, to this statement. The President usually requests additional revenue. Maybe it is a postage rate increase or an increase otherwise in revenues. Today, the President has requested an increase in revenues for fiscal 1967, which would be equivalent to about $4.8 billion or so in that year. Similar requests, that is, requests requiring new legislation were made by former Presidents both Democratic and Republican. The President submitted a plan, and according to the plan which he has submitted we will be in the red by the sum of $1.8 billion. He could have eliminated this deficit and provided for a balanced budget had he been willing to submit a recommendation for revenues in excess of the amounts which are in fact proposed in the budget today.

For example, if Congress failed to pass the corporate income tax acceleration and the graduated individual withholding measures now pending in the Committee on Ways and Means, the $1.8 billion deficit for 1967 would rise to $5.4 billion and the 1966 deficit would rise to $7.5 billion. And if the President's request that the 7-percent excise tax on automobiles and 10-percent excise tax on telephone service be restored was also not adopted, the 1967 deficit would rise another $1.2 to $6.6 billion and the 1966 deficit to $7.6 billion.

Other minor tax and user charge proposals to be considered by the Ways and Means Committee, while relatively minor to the budget totals, involve not only some new concepts, but also several earlier recommendations that Congress did not see fit to adopt. Inaction would be further adverse to the budget.

Another legislative committee—presumably the Committee on Banking and Currency—will have for consideration legislation to enlarge the program of shifting credit to private sources by selling participations in pools of Government-owned loans held in several agencies. Some authority to do this already exists and the budget assumes its use, but it also assumes enactment of a bill to permit selling $3.2 billion additional participations. Translated into budgetary terms which count these sales as offsets to expenditures rather than as receipts, the $112.8 billion administrative spending budget for 1967, and thus the $1.8 billion deficit, would increase by about $2.3 billion if this is not done; $350 million would also be added to the fiscal 1966 expenditure and deficit amounts.

Still another recommendation of legislation in today's budget which the Committee on Agriculture probably will have before it would authorize fees for meat, poultry, and commodity inspection and classification. These involve about $68 million and the deficit would deepen if not enacted.

Legislation that would reduce 1967 expenditures by $42 million by shifting forest and public land highways from the general budget to the highway trust fund budget is also in today's budget—presumably the Committee on Public Works will have the bill before it. And the budget proposes legislation similarly treating the new highway beautification program; this is tied to a budget proposition to shift some automobile excise tax funds to the highway trust fund. It involves $67.7 million of spending. Failure of either or both would adversely affect the $1.8 billion deficit.

Proposed legislation involving operation of the Government mortgage liquidation fund, and about $252 million, and shown as an expenditure reduction in 1967, is urged in today's budget. Failure of enactment would deepen the deficit by the $252 million.

Another significant budget assist that reflects necessary and timely action, but which cannot be counted on to keep recurring at the immediately projected level, is the sale of stockpiled materials. As I understand it, the budget assumes that sales of $1.9 billion will be made this year and next, but this will require certain congressional actions.

The budget again proposes that operations of the REA and power administrations of the Interior Department be placed on a revolving fund basis. These are bookkeeping propositions in that both budget receipts and expenditures are equally reduced, with no resulting effect on the deficit.

These are some of the principal instances of contingent conditions on which the $1.8 billion hinges. They aggregate, for 1967, over $7 billion. Many other factors influence the final results, of course. A key point here, however, is that some of these propositions, running into $5 billion or more, are one shot, nonrecurring; a certain budgetary fortuitousness surrounds them. It is well to keep in mind as we process the budget that, once adopted, they will not recur to help balance the following year's budget. We must look ahead, to the longer view. Government is a continuing and ever increasing, costly business. A single fiscal year is but a brief, arbitrary accounting period in the world's biggest ad infinitum business.

On the new obligational authority, rather than the expenditure, side of the budget, four of the propositions in today's message that depend on actions by several legislative committees involve over $1 billion in new obligational authority cancellation. Two items involve cancellation of $750 million now available for college housing and Federal National Mortgage Association; $91 million relating to highway beautification; and $305 million attending the proposition to put REA operations on revolving fund accounting. Inaction on either of them would have the effect of exceeding the President's aggregate budget obligational requests by just that much.

In virtually every session, something is said about so-called budgetary gimmicks or gadgets that, if not by design then in effect, more or less tend to minimize budget totals. I do not recall any budget of the last 10 or 15 or more years—whether from a Republican or a Democratic President—that did not have a few proposals that someone either did or could somehow label as "phony," or "bookkeeping," or "gimmickry."

I remember one in particular in President Eisenhower's fiscal 1956 budget that at the time was considered one of the most unusual entries ever encountered in a national budget. The countless budget items were totaled up and at the bottom of the page, just before the grand total, an "unallocated reduction" of $1,750 million was entered against the expenditure total. The individual appropriation requests were not reduced; just the total estimate of spending. It brought the defense budget expenditure total—not the detailed estimates, just the grand total—down from $35,750 million to an even $34 billion and, of course, similarly lowered the overall budget total. The appropriation requests and the supporting details for defense were hitched to the $35,750 million basis, not the $34 billion.

This unusual item was advanced as representing defense economies that could not then be pinpointed but which it was hoped could be realized on a day-to-day operational basis throughout the fiscal year.

But as not infrequently happens, the expectation exceeded the realization. Not only was none of the $1,750 million realized; final defense expenditures that year consumed all of it and $41 million besides.

The fact is that Federal operations and activities are so vast, so varied, and so complex, and involve such a wide assortment of accounting and financing arrangements, that it should surprise no one who knows anything about the situation if, in the ordinary course of events, propositions are advanced for adjusting or changing some of the arrangements or otherwise dealing with the finances of the Government. Some may, at times, seem unrealistic. Some may, at times, be unduly optimistic in the opinion of a majority. Some may even be fortuitous to the situation of the moment. But all that I remember seeing were entitled to be in the budget if the President thought it appropriate to put them there. Nothing the President of the United States says is immaterial—or should be regarded as immaterial.

The budget law of 45 years standing directs the President to propose to the Congress whatever budgetary and legislative recommendations he deems appropriate, along with his reasons. He has carte blanche in this respect. It is then for the Congress, on its own responsibility, to accept or reject.

All such propositions are set out in the President's budget, for all to see. None can be put into effect if Congress wishes to countermand them. Some of them usually hinge upon action by Congress at the current session; some can usually be administratively done based on previous law. But that is the point—they must all be lawful.

Congress has its own independent responsibilities and has the final say on what the appropriations shall be and, ultimately, what the expenditures shall be. And it is our final prerogative to say what shall be done about the many recommendations in the budget. The President, acting within the law, has seen fit to make recommendations. It is up to us here in Congress to dispose of them as we see fit, by majority vote in the democratic tradition.

NEW LEGISLATIVE PROPOSITIONS WITH BUDGET AMOUNTS

Mr. Speaker, another noticeable feature of this budget is the much smaller number of propositions of legislation for new or extended activities calling for additional appropriations. There are only a few in today's message, in sharp contrast to the much longer list last year.

The first-year costs of these recommendations are included in the budget totals of both new obligational authority and expenditures. These are the class of items that must first go through the legislative authorization procedure before they are eligible under the rules to be considered in the appropriation bills. New legislation, of course, is the principal seedbed of higher future budgets; the first-year amounts are often comparatively small.

Propositions of new legislation in the budget for 1967 for both fiscal years 1966 and 1967

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal 1966		Fiscal 1967	
	New obligational authority requested	Administrative budget expenditures (estimated)	New obligational authority requested	Administrative budget expenditures (estimated)
INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS				
Investment in Asian Development Bank	$120,000	$10,000	$20,000	$10,000
Agriculture:				
FHA—Sale of assets				−549,000
(FNMA—Sale of assets)				(−51,000)
REA—Revolving fund		−189,000	−305,000	−196,000
CMS—User charges	20,360		−71,298	−66,172
ARS—User charges			−1,478	−1,478
Total proposed legislation, Agriculture	20,360	−189,000	−377,776	−812,650
Commerce:				
Bureau of Public Roads:				
Forest highways			−33,000	−33,000
Public lands highways			−7,000	−9,000
Highway beautification			−91,750	−67,690
Highway safety			−210	−310
Trust funds:				
Forest and public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)			(42,000)	
Highway beautification			(151,000)	
Total proposed legislation, Commerce			−131,960	−110,000
HEW:				
Public Health Service:				
Nurse and medical student loans			−20,900	−20,900
General health legislation to strengthen manpower and planning for health services and facilities			41,000	23,000
Water Pollution Control Administration: Clean rivers demonstration, strengthened enforcement, research development and training, and State support			74,100	23,500
Office of Education:				
NDEA student loans—Recission of 1967 NOA and expenditures			−34,187	−34,187
Expenditure effect of sale of participation certificates in pools of college academic facilities loans				−85,000
Total proposed legislation, HEW			60,013	−93,587
HUD:				
Pool participation sales:				
College housing loans			−300,000	−801,000
Public facility loans				−77,700
FNMA			−450,000	−383,265
Government mortgage liquidation fund:				
Aids to private housing				−16,735
Advancement of business				−161,433
Financing farm and rural housing				−51,000
Assistance to higher education				−21,525
Urban renewal and community facilities				−2,300
City demonstration grants			12,000	5,000
Total proposed legislation, HUD			−738,000	−1,509,958
Interior:				
Reclamation—3d powerhouse at Grand Coulee			3,000	2,400
Bonneville Power Administration	−38,951	−38,951	−40,432	−40,432
Southeastern Power Administration	−1,000	−25,200	−1,000	−26,200
Southwestern Power Administration	−1,731	−1,731	−3,325	−3,325
Total proposed legislation, Interior	−41,682	−65,882	−41,757	−67,557
Labor: Advance to the Employment Service			−23,000	−23,000
Veterans' Administration: Readjustment benefits—Cold war GI bill			100,000	90,000
Small Business Administration: Proposed participation sales authority legislation		−350,000		−383,292
District of Columbia:				
Revised Federal payment formula			11,900	11,900
Loan to District of Columbia for capital outlay, highway fund			11,300	11,300
Total proposed legislation, District of Columbia			23,200	23,200
Grand total, proposed legislation for 1966 and 1967 in the 1967 budget	98,678	−594,882	−1,109,280	−2,876,844

But another striking thing about this year's list of proposed new legislation is that it includes a relatively large number of item designed to diminish rather than increase budget totals, although several of them are either one-time or of short duration effect.

For general information, I have included above a tabulation from the Budget Bureau summarizing these propositions of new legislation.

WHICH BUDGET TOTAL IS BEFORE US FOR ACTION?

Mr. Speaker, the more generally familiar $112.8 billion administrative spending total is not the one on which we will be acting directly in the various authorization and appropriation bills this session. There is always considerable—and, I might add, understandable—confusion on the question of which budget we process. So it may help those who have occasion to examine these remarks if I try to bring some better understanding to the matter.

The $112.8 billion total represents the administrative spending budget—the disbursements, or checks-to-be-issued budget during the fiscal year 1967, which begins this coming July 1. It includes billions and billions to be spent from carryover balances of appropriations already voted in earlier sessions—some $30.7 billions in fact.

The new obligational requests in today's budget for fiscal 1967 is $121,904 million. The greater part of that will be expended in 1967 but considerable billions will carryover for actual disbursement—and some even for initial obligation—to fiscal year 1968 and beyond. On top of that, today's budget also contemplates supplemental new obligational requests of $15,757 million for the current fiscal year 1966—and in fact a nearly $13 billion request came from the President last week in the Vietnam defense supplemental.

Those are the initial expectations, the present indications, as shown in today's budget. There will be revisions and amendments as the session ensues—there always are—but, barring great emergencies, these are the general dimensions of what we are asked to authorize and appropriate. They total $137,661 million for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 combined—for the session, in other words.

There is one other pertinent note to what I have just said. Under laws of earlier Congresses, there are a group of so-called permanent appropriations that come about every year under terms of those earlier laws, and thus do not need to be acted upon in bills each session. This year, for fiscal 1967, they are presently estimated in the budget at $15,650 million; interest on the debt is by far the largest, but there are several others. They are set out in the budget. The amount is in both the $121.9 billion and the $137.7 billion totals I cited.

So using today's initial budget amounts, the House will be considering and acting on a budget considerably different from the $112.8 billion spending budget figure.

The following table may be helpful in summarizing the figures on this point.

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY—THE FORERUNNER OF SPENDING

Mr. Speaker, appropriations, or new obligational authority, are the forerunners of actual expenditures. Of course, the true genesis of spending under our system is the legislative authorization bills engaging the Government in new endeavors. It is somewhat akin to the ancient and immutable law of physics that what goes up must eventually come down. Whatever is put into the budget pipeline by appropriation or new obligational authority will, sooner or later, be expended. The job may be done without spending every dollar appropriated, and emergencies or changed conditions may sometimes call for withholding the use of it, but as a general proposition of principle, the level of new obligational authority voted by Congress is an accurate barometer to the future level of budget spending.

The grant of the power to obligate the Government to pay is the significant point of decision. The act of drawing the checks to pay the obligations—whether all in the same year the obligation was vested, whether some in future years, and so on—is essentially immaterial to the fundamental decision to empower the creation of the obligation. The authority to obligate and the actual obligation is what sets the wheels in motion. No obligation, no expenditure. A lower obligational authority means sooner or later, a lower expenditure. And, a higher obligational authority, sooner or later, means a higher expenditure. So, the appropriations, or "new obligational authority," is the more important to congressional consideration not only because it is the first step but also because it is the basis on which congressional actions are grounded.

We crossed the much publicized $100 billion barrier mark in new obligational authority not this year, but back in fiscal 1963; it was then only a question of time before the ensuing expenditures did likewise. The table I am inserting shows the situation in today's budget.

Spending and new obligational budgets—the portions subject to action this session

	Administrative budget estimate of expenditures (disbursements)	Administrative budget requests for new obligational authority
Relating to fiscal 1967:		
1. Totals proposed, President's budget, Jan. 24, 1966	$112,847,000,000	$121,904,000,000
2. Deduct estimate of expenditures in fiscal 1967 against obligational authority made available in prior sessions (and therefore not before the present session for action)	−30,739,000,000	
3. Deduct amounts applicable to permanent appropriations recurring automatically without necessity for action in this session (several items); interest is by far the largest. Expenditure figure here may negligibly duplicate some (small) part of item 2, but not enough to distort)	−15,650,000,000	−15,650,000,000
Amount relating to fiscal 1967 involved in proposals for direct consideration and action in this session	66,458,000,000	106,254,000,000
Relating to fiscal 1966:		
4. Supplementals for fiscal 1966 as shown in the President's 1967 budget, Jan. 24, 1966, for direct consideration and action in this session	5,797,000,000	15,757,000,000
Totals for this session:		
5. Totals proposed, President's budget, Jan. 24, 1966 (items 1 and 4)	118,644,000,000	137,661,000,000
6. Totals for direct consideration and action in this session (item 5, less items 2 and 3 which arise out of actions taken in prior sessions)	72,255,000,000	122,011,000,000

NOTES

Item 2, in the "expenditure" figure, would include some amounts applicable to activities subject to annual scrutiny under the Corporation Control Act which would largely result, however, from new obligational authority granted in previous sessions.

Item 3, the "expenditure" figure is a bit arbitrary, because a few relatively small items cannot be separately identified.

Source: The budget for 1967.

Mr. Speaker, as I tried to urge earlier, the heavy cloud of uncertainties hanging over us at this time calls for sacrifices and for fiscal restraint. I would underscore one point—good intentions in affairs of public money have a way of coming unglued, of going aglimmer. Final results have a way of being wide of the original marks—wide in the wrong direction, and for many reasons. Here is a striking fact that I think worth noting as we begin consideration of another budget: In 10 of the last 11 fiscal years, through all administrations and through good times and bad, final amounts of new obligating authority written onto the books of the Government exceeded the original January budget proposals by the huge sum of $43,200 million or an average of nearly $4 billion a year. There were many reasons but there was only one result—higher spending than originally estimated. So it seems to me we had best double our endeavors to deny access to the Treasury for any desirable but low-priority expenditures.

I include comparative statistics on defense and nondefense new obligating authority:

New obligational authority—Defense and nondefense

[Administrative budget basis, rounded amounts used]

Fiscal year	National defense functions	Other than national defense	Total new obligational authority
1953 enacted (Korean war year)	$57,298,000,000	$23,010,000,000	$80,308,000,000
1954 enacted (1st post-Korean year)	39,471,000,000	23,294,000,000	62,765,000,000
1955 enacted	33,656,000,000	23,420,000,000	57,076,000,000
1956 enacted	35,903,000,000	27,295,000,000	63,198,000,000
1957 enacted	41,344,000,000	28,835,000,000	70,179,000,000
1958 enacted	40,448,000,000	35,897,000,000	76,345,000,000
1959 enacted	45,517,000,000	35,848,000,000	81,365,000,000
1960 enacted	44,761,000,000	34,813,000,000	79,574,000,000
1961 enacted	45,994,000,000	40,681,000,000	86,675,000,000
Increase in level, 1961 over 1954	+6,523,000,000	+17,387,000,000	+23,910,000,000
1962 enacted	52,414,000,000	40,448,000,000	92,862,000,000
1963 enacted	54,323,000,000	47,960,000,000	102,283,000,000
1964 enacted	53,762,000,000	47,341,000,000	101,103,000,000
1965 enacted	53,198,000,000	53,410,000,000	106,608,000,000
1966: Enacted in the last session	52,536,000,000	57,689,000,000	110,225,000,000
Proposed supplementals in current session	13,222,000,000	2,535,000,000	15,757,000,000
Total proposed, 1966	65,758,000,000	60,224,000,000	125,982,000,000
1967 total now proposed (as shown in 1967 budget)	62,205,000,000	59,699,000,000	121,904,000,000
Comparisons:			
1967 total proposed compared to 1966 inclusive of proposed 1966 supplementals	−3,553,000,000	−525,000,000	−4,078,000,000
1967 total proposed compared to 1965 enacted	+9,007,000,000	+6,289,000,000	+15,296,000,000
1967 total proposed compared to 1961 enacted	+16,211,000,000	+19,018,000,000	+35,229,000,000

NOTE.—Data in this table corresponds to the classification used in the 1967 budget. "National defense functions" include Department of Defense military functions, including foreign military assistance; Atomic Energy Commission; stockpiling of strategic and critical materials; Selective Service System; expansion of defense production; and civil defense and emergency preparedness activities.

Source: Budget documents.

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE SPENDING

Mr. Speaker, it is useful to a better grasp of the dimensions and growth of Federal spending to examine, as we have done for some years, the allotment of budget resources between defense and nondefense.

For several years after the Korean war, the level of defense spending stood virtually still while nondefense spending rose rather steadily. From fiscal 1954 through fiscal 1961, defense spending rose only 1 percent while nondefense spending increased 65 percent.

The subsequent buildup following the 1961 Berlin crisis, the later emphasis on conventional and limited war capability, and buildup of our intercontinental ballistic missiles brought about some change in the proportional balance of increased spending as between defense and nondefense outlays. Then, the substantial completion of these buildups led to a renewed emphasis on domestic programs and brought about a degree of reversal to these ratios.

But again, the new and rising demands of the war in Vietnam, coupled with cutting back on some old programs and withholding fuller support for some of the new ones, have tilted the proportions of increase a bit in the other direction. War is an upsetting circumstance. As you just heard the President say in the message:

> Excluding both special Vietnam costs and the recommended tax measures, the 1967 ad-

ministrative budget could have been in surplus.

Comparing the spending figures estimated in today's budget, defense spending in fiscal 1967 rises 7 percent above the present expectation for the current year 1966. In contrast, nondefense spending is up less than 5 percent.

I include a tabulation in general support:

Defense and nondefense net budget expenditures for the fiscal years 1953–67

[Administrative budget expenditures—Dollars in millions]

Fiscal year	National defense functions		Other than national defense		Total budget expenditures
	Amount	Percent of budget totals	Amount	Percent of budget totals	
1953 actual (Korean war year)	$50,442	68.1	$23,678	31.9	$74,120
1954 actual (1st post-Korean war year)	46,986	69.6	20,551	30.4	67,537
1955 actual	40,695	63.2	23,694	36.8	64,389
1956 actual	40,723	61.5	25,501	38.5	66,224
1957 actual	43,368	62.9	25,598	37.1	68,966
1958 actual	44,234	62.0	27,135	38.0	71,369
1959 actual	46,483	57.9	33,859	42.1	80,342
1960 actual	45,691	59.7	30,848	40.3	76,539
1961 actual	47,494	58.3	34,021	41.7	81,515
Increase in level, 1961 over 1954	+508	+1.1	+13,470	+65.5	+13,978
1962 actual	51,103	58.2	36,684	41.8	87,787
1963 actual	52,755	56.9	39,887	43.1	92,642
1964 actual	54,181	55.5	43,503	44.5	97,684
1965 actual	50,163	52.0	46,344	48.0	96,507
1966 (current estimate in 1967 budget)	56,560	53.1	49,868	46.9	106,428
1967 (as shown in 1967 budget)	60,541	53.6	52,306	46.4	112,847
Increase in level, 1965 actual over 1961	+2,669	+5.6	+12,323	+36.2	+14,992
Increase in level, 1966 current estimate over 1961	+9,066	+19.1	+15,847	+46.6	+24,913
Increase in level, 1967 estimate over 1961	+13,047	+27.5	+18,285	+53.7	+31,332
Increase in level, 1967 estimate over 1966 current estimate	+3,981	+7.0	+2,438	+4.9	+6,419

NOTES.—The data on this table corresponds to the classification used in the 1967 budget. "National defense functions" include Department of Defense military functions, including foreign military assistance; Atomic Energy Commission; stockpiling of strategic and critical materials; Selective Service System; expansion of defense production; and civil defense and emergency preparedness activities.

Source: The Budget for 1967 (with percentages and comparisons supplied).

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. Speaker, an increased national debt necessarily results from unbalanced national budgets as we borrow to cover the difference. The bulk of our national debt was incurred in World War II; some during Korea; and of course the Vietnam war contributes, but we have also been borrowing from the future to help pay current domestic program costs. And we have been doing so in times of unmatched national prosperity yielding record Treasury revenues.

One of the most striking signs of changing national attitudes over the last 35 years is the decline in national self-discipline and restraint manifested by a rather persistent unwillingness to keep our outgo within our income in times of economic affluence. Not only is this drift of the majority view less than ideal in the minds of many; it is unsettling.

And as today's budget discloses, the complications of war expenditures will make it necessary, as in all but 1 of the last 12 years, to again raise the debt ceiling to accommodate the projected shortfall of revenues.

If every projection on every side of today's budget materialized exactly, the debt this June 30 would be $320 billion and would rise to $321,700 million at the end of the budget year of 1967. The economic weight or burden of the debt in the aggregate, as measured in relation to gross national production continues to lighten—from nearly 58 percent in 1960 to 45 percent, estimated, this June and 43 percent, estimated, in June of 1967.

Summary of direct and guaranteed debt on significant dates

[Based upon statement of the public debt published monthly; consequently all figures are stated as of the end of a month]

Date	Classification	Total debt (including interest bearing debt, matured debt on which interest has ceased and debt bearing no interest)				General fund balance [3]
		Direct debt (gross)	Guaranteed debt [1] [2]	Total direct and guaranteed debt	Per capita [3]	
	WORLD WAR I					
Mar. 31, 1917	Prewar debt	$1,282,044,346.28		$1,282,044,346.28	$12.36	$74,216,460.05
Aug. 31, 1919	Highest war debt	26,596,701,648.01		26,596,701,648.01	250.18	1,118,109,534.76
Dec. 31, 1930	Lowest postwar debt	16,026,087,087.07		16,026,087,087.07	129.66	306,803,319.55
	WORLD WAR II					
June 30, 1940	Debt preceding defense program	42,967,531,037.68	$5,529,070,655.28	48,496,601,692.96	367.08	1,890,743,141.34
Nov. 30, 1941	Pre-Pearl Harbor debt	55,039,819,926.98	6,324,048,005.28	61,363,867,932.26	458.47	2,319,496,021.87
Feb. 28, 1946	Highest war debt	279,213,558,897.10	550,810,451.19	279,764,369,348.29	1,989.75	25,960,900,919.30
June 30, 1946	Debt at end of year in which hostilities ceased	269,422,099,173.26	476,384,859.30	269,898,484,032.56	1,908.79	14,237,883,295.31
Apr. 30, 1949	Lowest postwar debt [4]	251,530,468,254.82	22,851,485.16	251,553,319,739.98	1,690.29	3,995,156,916.79
	SINCE KOREA					
June 30, 1950	Debt at time of opening of hostilities in Korea (hostilities began June 24, 1950)	257,357,352,351.04	19,503,033.97	257,376,855,385.01	1,696.74	5,517,087,691.65
Dec. 31, 1952		267,391,155,979.65	53,969,565.31	267,445,125,544.96	1,687.90	6,064,343,775.84
Nov. 30, 1965	Highest debt [5]	321,711,457,774.79	464,516,350.00	322,175,974,124.79	[6] 1,646.84	6,759,453,114.17
Dec. 31, 1964	Debt a year ago	317,940,472,718.38	809,241,900.00	318,749,714,618.38	[7] 1,647.32	7,295,120,212.97
Nov. 30, 1965	Debt last month	321,711,457,774.79	464,516,350.00	322,175,974,124.79	[6] 1,646.84	6,759,453,114.17
Dec. 31, 1965	Debt this month	320,904,110,042.04	455,241,200.00	321,359,351,242.04	[6] 1,641.10	6,582,097,195.90

---

[1] Does not include securities owned by the Treasury.

[2] Includes outstanding matured principal of guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies for which cash to make payment is held by the Treasury of the United States in the general fund balance.

[3] Based upon estimates of the Bureau of the Census.

[4] Represents the lowest point of the debt at the end of any month following World War II. The lowest point of the debt on any day following that war was on June 27, 1949, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$251,245,889,059.02
Guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies	23,876,001.12
Total direct and guaranteed debt	251,269,765,060.14

[5] Represents the highest point of the debt at the end of any month. The highest point of the debt on any day was Dec. 28, 1965 when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$322,145,019,952.27
Guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies	456,476,150.00
Total direct and guaranteed debt (includes $280,985,067.66 not subject to statutory limitation)	322,601,496,102.27

[6] Subject to revision.

[7] Revised.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, we again heartily commend the President and his many associates for their long and profitable labors in the direction of economy. This is the third successive budget in which the President has worked tirelessly to contain the totals and to strike for more economy and efficiency, more for the dollar in Government. This is good, for deep are the ingrainings of entrenched ways. Tenacious are the proclivities to self-perpetuation and ingenious are the ways to justify it.

Restraint is surely the need of the times and ought to be the order of this session. As a great legislative body with independent responsibilities and full and unfettered power over public money, I would hope we would do everything feasible to follow a course of fiscal caution and do nothing to shunt us from it.

We in the Committee on Appropriations begin hearings with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget next Monday. We will shortly develop, harmonious to the plans of the leadership, a schedule of hearings and floor debate for the appropriation bills. Our doors are open for any constructive suggestion at any time from any Member or anyone else. We do not know all the answers. We are less than perfect. And we are only one committee. We need help and support from all sides and from all Members. And in a time of considerable fiscal uncertainty with the budget still in deficit, we especially invite suggestions on how to improve on the business at hand.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include various tables and excerpts relating to the President's budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the budget set before us begs no issues. It is tough, taut, starkly honest—and sound to the core.

It is a reckoning of the price we must pay to preserve the freedom of the American people, and all peoples who look to us for leadership. It is a heavy price we pay today in Vietnam; the costs are added up in terms of broken lives and shattered hopes and wasted riches.

Every one of us wishes it were different. We wish the billions spent to protect a distant people from aggression could be spent, instead, to enrich man's life, to solve man's need for food and medicine and education—to raise all men up to new equality and community.

But we cannot turn back. We cannot turn our back on a brave and loyal ally. To do so would be to renege on our own history and principles—and undermine the foundations of our own freedom.

The President has faced these facts. He has had to bite the bullet. Thank God, I say, that we have a President today, a man whose courage is as steadfast as his compassion—whose judgment and sense of fiscal responsibility can stand as a beacon for us all.

The President set the strictest budget priorities from the start. And he has stuck to them to the end—to the last nickel and dime. He began with an estimate of $130 billion, and slashed it down.

He squeezed and pared until even the great additional costs of Vietnam will mean no more than a $600 million increase over last year's budget. In the cash budget, he has even planned for a surplus of one-half billion dollars in Government revenues over expenditures next year.

It is a masterfully balanced budget—because it balances our foreign commitments against our domestic needs and foretells the successful execution of each. One great mark of that success is that we can confidently expect a total budget deficit lower than those of many quieter years.

At the same time, the moment our adversaries permit a just settlement in Vietnam, the President has promised to move with renewed speed and muscle toward our domestic goals. I am ready and eager to take him at his word. This budget is a masterful balance of the reality and the ideal—a blueprint for surmounting peril and sustaining hope.

The President deserves our gratitude and our support for the fine job he has done.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has today submitted a realistic budget—one designed to meet our commitments abroad and maintain a growing and viable economy at home.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is by far the leader in growth in the whole world. Last year our growth alone was the equivalent of the entire gross national product of some of the largest nations on earth.

The budget which President Johnson has sent to us today will take us another major step toward a balanced budget in a balanced economy.

The deficit in the administrative budget for 1967 is estimated to be $1.8 billion, substantially below the estimated deficit of $6.4 for 1966. In fact, it is only about half the size of the actual deficit for 1965. Under the President's proposals, the 1967 deficit is the smallest in 7 years and the second smallest in a decade—this in spite of the added costs necessary because of our commitments in southeast Asia.

President Johnson worked long and hard to reduce or eliminate activities of lower priority in all the departments and agencies, and to reduce budgetary costs. Expenditures apart from special Vietnam costs are estimated to rise by only $0.6 billion.

But the President has not relied solely on holding down expenditures in maintaining a course of fiscal responsibility and economic stability. He has also proposed several tax measures to increase Federal administrative budget revenues. These measures will produce an additional $4.8 billion in 1967.

By choosing to take the route of collection-speedup actions and temporary excise tax changes, the President will have flexibility to determine whether and what additional steps are necessary, based on a continuing watchful eye on the situation in Vietnam as it develops in the coming months. I think we can all agree that this is a sensible approach. It is a better approach than letting the deficit grow. It is a better approach than prematurely raising personal and corporate tax rates. It is an approach of prudence, responsibility, and honesty. It deserves our support.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Mackay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposals in the 1967 budget, while taking full account of the situation in Vietnam, indicate a praiseworthy determination to continue our forward progress in improving the health of the American people.

The President's budget provides everything necessary for meeting the costs of many vital health programs passed last year. It provides for: hospital and medical care for our older people; assistance in educating more doctors, dentists, and nurses; more community health centers; regional programs to improve treatment of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and related diseases; medical treatment and care for young children in low-income areas; greater efforts to purify the air we breathe; expanded aids to handicapped people so that they can return to productive work.

The President is also proposing a new and expanded program to combat pollution of our rivers, to provide help to communities in modernizing and replacing older hospitals, and to extend training assistance to medical assistants and certain other health personnel.

Expenditures for health research have risen substantially in recent years. With the amounts provided in the 1967 budget, Federal support of health research will come to nearly two-thirds of the total national effort.

The budget before us today has had to provide adequately for greatly increased military needs without sacrificing high priority domestic needs. That the President has succeeded in doing this is illustrated by the funds provided for better health, both at home and among less fortunate peoples in other lands.

This budget deserves support both from the Congress and the American people.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. Albert]. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. I am in complete agreement with many of the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Texas. However, I believe there is no question but that the minority will do whatever is necessary to see that proper funds are provided for the defense of our Nation. I believe the cooperation which we have had in the past will continue and the relationship between the majority and the minority in the Committee on Appropriations will continue to be, as it has always been, a very cooperative one.

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the remarks I had prepared, I would like to mention one other matter.

We hear so much about gross national product and the increase in gross national product; that because of the increase in gross national product we can continue deficit spending.

But I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that the money which is spent by the Federal Government is a part of the gross national product. So every time we boost Government spending and build it up, that represents a little pump priming in which we are increasing gross national product.

If you wish to determine the real rate of growth in our economy, you should eliminate Federal, State, and local spending from the gross national product; you should measure the remainder in terms of constant dollars, eliminating the inflation that has occurred, and the result would be a picture not nearly as rosy as has been painted for us in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to proceed with a further discussion of the budget.

In all my years here, I have never seen a budget based on more tenuous revenue assumptions and with such little regard for the fiscal welfare of this great Nation of ours.

It seems to me that we in Congress are dutybound under our mandate from the Constitution to search into every item in the budget to the end that we can assure the public that the funds we provide in additional revenues and the funds we appropriate for spending are truly in their interest and in the interest of our fighting men in Vietnam and elsewhere throughout the world.

During the first session of this Congress, a good bit of questionable legislation was ill-conceived by the administration and hastily enacted by Congress. The time is long past due for the Congress to exercise its prerogatives as a coequal branch with the executive and the judiciary and I, for one, hope that 1966 will be the year when we reassert our responsibilities. The executive can recommend, the judiciary can interpret, but only Congress can provide, and I pray that this year we will overcome the rubberstamp character with which Congress was justifiably tagged last year.

In his administrative budget, the President has proposed spending $112.8 billion in fiscal 1967—up from $106.4 billion this year—against which he expects budget revenues to approximate $111 billion—up from $100 billion this year—which will result in a budget deficit of $1.8 billion—down from $6.4 billion this year.

For the cash budget, which reflects all of the cash transactions between the Government and the public, the President expects to spend $145 billion against which he foresees revenue collections of $145.5 billion and a cash surplus of $500 million.

But how does the administration propose to accomplish these great feats of legerdemain while materially increasing spending for Great Society programs and the Vietnam war?

BUDGET RECEIPTS

With respect to the cash budget revenue picture, the administration is relying on $4.7 billion of new revenue in 1967 that will come from increased old-age, survivors, and disability insurance taxes which the public began paying January 1 as a result of the Social Security Act Amendments of last year. Of course, that revenue will go into the social security trust fund but it will also increase cash receipts. Since January 1 the increased social security taxes have meant a cut of almost $2 a week in the take-home pay of an employed worker now earning $6,600 a year and a cut of nearly $3 a week for the self-employed person paying the maximum.

The administration is counting on an increase of $6.2 billion in revenues from growth in the economy. It has estimated that the gross national product will leap up from $676 billion in 1965 to $722 billion in calendar 1966. None of us can say with certainty, however, what level the GNP will reach this year. But if the economy should fail to grow as fast as projected, Federal revenues would fall short of their estimated goals and the budget deficit would increase. Moreover, if there should be any downturn in the economy, and who can say there will not, revenues could fall billions short of the estimates.

While the administration has not proposed any rate increases in either corporation or individual income taxes, it has hit upon three new gimmicks which are expected to bring in substantial additional revenues in fiscal 1967.

The Treasury has proposed and the Ways and Means Committee has begun consideration of legislation to accelerate corporation income tax payments to the end that all corporations earning more than $100,000 a year will be paying their income taxes on a current basis in fiscal 1967, rather than by 1970 as is provided under existing law. If Congress adopts this proposal, it will result in the Treasury collecting $3.2 billion in 1967 that would otherwise be collected at a later date. This, of course, means that revenues in the next few years after 1967 will be less than they would otherwise be.

The administration has also proposed a graduated withholding system for individuals. This proposal is expected to bring in an additional $400 million in 1967 that, otherwise, would come in later on. I am told that as a group, taxpayers who earn more than $10,000 a year will have more withheld under this proposal than they will owe in taxes. Naturally, they will be entitled to refunds but the Government will have had the use of the excess withholdings during the year. As we all know, a Member of Congress is paid $30,000 in annual salary. If he claims two exemptions under the proposal, his withholding will be increased from approximately $3,900 a year to $6,203.

The administration is proposing a tax increase by restoring certain automobile and telephone excises which expired last December 31. If these excises are restored by Congress, they are estimated to bring in additional revenues of $1.2 billion in 1967.

Also, to help improve the revenue situation, the administration has proposed that self-employed persons pay their old-age, survivors, and disability insurance taxes quarterly rather than once each year as is the case under existing law. If Congress approves that change, the additional revenues therefrom will amount to $100 million in fiscal 1967.

And finally, the administration expects to realize a seigniorage profit of about $1.5 billion in 1967 from the difference in the cost of the metals being used for minting and the face value of coins being produced under administration-sponsored legislation enacted last year.

The foregoing assumptions and revenue proposals make the revenue projections for fiscal 1967 as iffy as any I have seen presented to Congress.

PROPOSED SPENDING

With respect to planned spending in fiscal 1967, the President made the following statement in his state of the Union message:

> While special Vietnam expenditures for the next fiscal year are estimated to increase by $5.8 billion, I can tell you that all other expenditures put together in the entire Federal budget will rise this coming year by only six-tenths of a billion dollars.

Since the spending for Great Society programs alone is estimated to increase by $3.3 billion in fiscal 1967 over the current year, you may wonder how the administration came up with a net expenditure increase for all other programs of only $600 million. Well, I can tell you, that statement falls in the category of legerdemain which may prove to be nothing more than wishful thinking.

In addition to the $3.3 billion increase in Great Society spending, the administration expects last year's pay increases for military and civilian employees to cost $300 million more in 1967 than in 1966, interest costs to increase by $750 million, and workloads and certain contract functions to increase by $1 billion. Those increases add up to a total of $5.3 billion of additional spending. Against those increases the administration hopes to effect total savings of $4.7 billion, of which $1.7 billion will be in other than Vietnam defense spending, $1.5 billion in a variety of civilian programs, and $1.5 billion from the sale of Federal assets and from conversion of direct Federal loans to loan guarantees.

Now, some may have the impression that expenditures outside of defense are increased by only $600 million. The fact is, however, that these expenditures are budgeted at $2.3 billion above the 1966 level. This is explained by taking the total increases of $5.3 billion I just mentioned, and subtracting the nondefense reductions of $3 billion, which gives a net increase of $2.3 billion in such spending.

All of this assumes, of course, that the indicated reductions in spending will materialize. On that point I have some grave doubts. Although I have not had an opportunity to study all of the reduction proposals, let us look at some of what is involved.

Two of the proposals have been around up here for several years and Congress has never seen fit to approve them. One is the proposed Rural Electrification Administration revolving fund, the establishment of which would reduce budget expenditures by $196 million. The other is the proposal for charging fees for meat and poultry inspection which is estimated to reduce expenditures by $66 million.

Further reductions of $70 million in Interior Department power marketing programs are also contingent upon Congress establishing revolving funds to which power revenues would be credited, rather than to miscellaneous Treasury receipts as is done currently.

Additional reductions of $1.5 billion are contingent upon Congress approving more participation sales and upon the administration's ability to market such sales of loans made by the Farmers Home Administration, Office of Education, Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Small Business Administration. Naturally, the choicest of these Federal loans and guarantees have already been marketed. And I question whether the administration will even reach its goal of $3.3 billion of such sales in the current year, much less the $4.7 billion it visualizes for 1967.

The record of 1965 supports my reservation in this regard.

The budget for 1965 estimated such sales at $2.3 billion, whereas actual sales were only $1.6 billion or three-fourths of a billion dollars short of the planned goal.

A reduction of $85 million in Federal payments to impacted school districts is contingent upon the approval of new legislation. Changes in the program have been proposed by the administration in recent years but Congress has not seen fit to adopt them.

The cost of farm income stabilization for fiscals 1964 and 1965 and as currently estimated for 1966 has exceeded the budget estimates for those years by an average of over $1 billion a year. Certainly, that record of underestimation gives little assurance that the $3 billion estimated cost for 1967 will prove to be accurate.

If the record for fiscal 1966 is any indication of the administration's ability to forecast and control Federal spending, then we are in for a rude awakening in fiscal 1967. In January of last year, the administration estimated it would spend $99.7 billion in fiscal 1966. It has since raised that estimate to $106.4 billion, of which $4.7 billion is attributed to the war in Vietnam and $2 billion is for other spending. Certainly, none will argue with the premise that our fighting men in Vietnam deserve the Nation's unqualified support and I am certain they will get that support from Congress. Also, none will argue with the conclusion that it is difficult to forecast the cost of a hot war; but what happened between last January and the present to the administration's ability to project the nonwar spending which has increased by $2 billion?

I hope that none of us in Congress will be beguiled by the rosy picture that estimated revenues and projected expenditures portray in the 1967 budget. We may very well find those figures to be even less accurate than the ones in the original budget for fiscal 1966.

It would seem to me to be the better part of wisdom for the administration to follow in fiscal 1967 the course of budget action which it pursued in fiscal 1965 when the war on poverty and other Great Society programs were launched. To get the Great Society programs underway without admitted budget excesses, the administration cut its spending from a total of $97.7 billion in fiscal 1964 to $96.5 billion in 1965. Although there were spending increases in a number of programs in fiscal 1965, defense spending, alone, was cut by $2 billion.

Now that the shoe is on the other foot and the Vietnam war expenditures are estimated to escalate rapidly, the administration should make additional and more substantial cuts in nonwar spending than it has proposed in the 1967 budget.

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

Congress has already provided the administration with $110.2 billion of new spending authority for the current year. We have before us at the present time the special Vietnam supplemental which seeks additional appropriations of $12.8 billion. And even that will not be enough, because the budget anticipates further 1966 supplemental requests totaling $3 billion for a variety of programs, including Federal pay increases and funds for the Teacher Corps. If Congress approves these supplementals without material change, we will have provided $126 billion of new spending authority for the current year.

The administration estimates that $114.7 billion of previously enacted spending authority will be carried forward to fiscal 1967 and later years. But, to that carryover of $114.7 billion, Congress is asked in this new budget to provide $121.9 billion of additional spending authority.

Now, everyone knows that if Congress approves the $121.9 billion of new spending authority and the administration commits it for spending, it will constitute a Government obligation which must be honored whether in fiscal 1967 or at some later date.

I say to you, we need to find solid ways in which to economize. If we could make that first step in this session, we would be on the way to restoring fiscal responsibility to its proper role in this Government.

CONGRESS PLEDGE TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Congress ever plans to redeem its 1964 pledge to the American people? The Democratic majority wrote the pledge and voted for it when the tax reduction bill of 1964 was approved. The pledge, in case anyone has forgotten, promised the American people that increases in Federal revenues following the tax cut should first be used to eliminate deficits in the administrative budgets and then to reduce the public debt. It also said that "Congress, by this action, recognizes the importance of taking all reasonable means to restrain Government spending."

During the two sessions of the 88th Congress we adhered pretty well to the provisions of the pledge. In that Congress we cut about $10.5 billion from the budget requests. Last year we did not do nearly as well. I would hope that we could get back on the track of fiscal responsibility in this session and act on every spending measure with the pledge of the Revenue Act of 1964 in mind.

I certainly shall have other comments to make with respect to the budget and our fiscal situation as we progress through this session of Congress.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget should receive careful and critical scrutiny by the Appropriations Committees and by both Houses of the Congress.

When President Johnson's proposed spending in fiscal 1967 is compared with the last Eisenhower budget of 1960, we find that the increase in the administrative budget amounts to $36 billion and the increase in total Federal spending comes to $51 billion. Expenditures for national defense under the President's proposal would rise by 33⅓ percent or $15 billion above the 1960 level. Expenditure for nondefense proposals in the administrative budget would rise by 68 percent, or $21 billion.

In 2 fiscal years, 1966 and 1967, the President proposes to increase spending for programs in the administrative budget by $26 billion.

In its decisions on the budget, Congress must consider the impact of the sharp increase in Federal spending on an economy in which inflationary pressures are already strong. The administration admits its fiscal policies will increase the cost of living by 1.9 percent. If the White House will not tackle this problem with restraint on Federal spending, the Congress must. Republicans are deeply concerned and will maximize our efforts to reduce nonmilitary, nonessential spending.

I find it hard to understand how the national Government can ask business and labor to avoid price and wage increases which are measured in terms of millions of dollars when it is increasing nondefense spending by many billions.

I regret that the President did not see fit to indicate in his budget any system of priority to assist Congress in reducing the less essential and less urgent items of expenditure.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the 1967 budget of the President is a responsible budget designed to meet the realities of our times.

On the expenditure side it meets the needs of our forces in Vietnam. The budget provides for outlays of $10.5 billion in 1967 for that purpose.

Excluding Vietnam it calls for expenditures only $600 million higher than this year. It provides for $5.3 billion of increased outlays to cover unavoidable increases in interest, civilian and military pay, and to provide for an expansion in essential civilian programs. But it offsets those increases by savings and reductions amounting to $4.7 billion. It is interesting to note that the original requests from the departments and agencies totaled $130 billion. This was reduced to $112.8 billion.

On the revenue side the budget proposes measures to increase revenues by $4.8 billion—reforms to speed up tax collections and a deferral of excise tax reductions. The increases in revenues are temporary. They were chosen precisely for that reason. The President could have proposed no tax measures, and allowed the deficit to exceed $6½ billion. This was considered but rejected. He could have prematurely raised tax rates on individuals and corporations. This too was considered and rejected.

I believe the course chosen—economy in expenditures and temporary revenue increases—is an intelligent and responsible choice. In a period beset with uncertainties and hard decisions, I welcome its sanity and prudence.

FIGURE JUGGLING IN THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the very distinguished and learned ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee.

As I said earlier, my interest is to supplement the remarks that the gentleman from Ohio has made, and in particular as they relate to certain facts and figures which, after considerable research, have come to my attention. My interest has been sharpened from research into the figures relating to the Public Works Committee and its authorizations, and the administration's so-called policy on transportation which, incidentally, we have not seen published yet. We do not know exactly what it is, but we see it very definitely creeping into this budget proposal.

What are some of the transportation policies of this administration? What are they as they relate to completion of the Interstate Highway System, for instance? Congress authorized that system in 1956 to be completed, as a result of additional amendments, by January of 1972.

The President's proposal contained on page 58 of his budget document indicates that he is going to ask for an extension of that construction period for 14 more months, to February 28, 1973, instead of asking for adequate funds to complete this proven economy stimulating 41,000-mile system. L.B.J. refuses to put first things first.

At the same time it is interesting to note that the President is proposing to increase funds for the unproven antipoverty programs, many of which have been proved to be political boondoggles rather than sound antipoverty efforts.

The completion of the Interstate System, in my opinion, would have a greater and more favorable impact on employment and would cause a greater increase in business than any other single public works effort in America today, including economic development and other make-work-type antipoverty projects.

This shows that the President, while asking for increased unproven antipoverty programs, is at the same time asking for a 14-month extension for the completion of the 41,000-mile proven beneficial Interstate System.

Secondly, the President is proposing inadequate increased taxes for financing that system, to complete it even within the 14-month extended period of February 28, 1973. My conclusion, based on his submission, is, first, that the figures of increase he is proposing are not adequate to do the job. The figures as proposed would provide an increase in revenues of $464 million per year. This means $75 million from an increased diesel fuel tax, and a $389 million increase for contributions "by truckers closer to their share of highway costs, basing the cost on graduated weight scale." That is a total of $464 million. There is needed with constant increasing costs at least another $150 million annually to complete the program on the proposed extended date of February 28, 1973.

So under the President's proposal, if adopted, it would be the end of 1973 or early 1974 at the earliest before this vital system could be completed.

Because of failure of Presidential leadership last year, Congress was forced to reduce the 1967 authorizations to $3 billion from the needed $4 billion, from $2.9 billion in 1966, and thus push further into the future the completion date, because of the lack of funds. More than $1 billion is needed annually to complete the system on schedule.

Thirdly, it is interesting to note that in this budget message the President, knowing we already have trust fund problems relating to the highway program, is also proposing the deletion of certain taxes which now go into the trust fund. For instance, he is saying that the present 2-cents-per-gallon gasoline tax used in commercial aviation should be repealed, leaving the fuels used in commercial aviation untaxed. I am not arguing the merits or the demerits of that proposal, other than to say that it will mean $4 million less going into the highway trust fund, which is already inadequate.

What does he propose to take the place of this? He proposed nothing concerning commercial aviation. The gasoline and jet fuels are to be taxed on general noncommercial aviation to the tune of 4 cents per gallon, and all the receipts are to be retained—where? Not in the trust fund, to replace the taxes being repealed, which come from commercial aviation, but in the general fund instead. What the President is doing, in effect, is transferring $4 million from the trust fund, by repealing the commercial aviation taxes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CRAMER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. CRAMER. Therefore, the 4-cent new tax would go into the general fund rather than into the trust fund. This will mean in net effect less money for the highway trust fund.

Fourth. Members should listen to the administration transportation policy relating to user charges. There is going to be a greater effort to impose user charges on all types of Federal services, greater than at any time in the history of this country, in an effort to try to return to the Treasury—meaning eventually from the consumer, for he is the one who is going to pay the bill—greater revenues from specific user charges on Federal facilities and Federal functions.

For instance, a user charge of 2 cents per gallon or $7 million is proposed on fuel used by vessels navigating the inland waterways. An inland waterway user charge has been attempted for years. Congress has never approved it and yet it is in the "Receipts" column. In my opinion, Congress is never going to approve this one. Yet there is contained in the proposed budget $7 million to come into the general fund from that item. In my opinion, that is not going to come into being.

Let us look at the other user charges.

The President says user charges should be recommended in several other programs. The charges would become miscellaneous receipts of the general fund, and would not go into any trust funds for construction under these programs or for the administration of these programs.

As an example, this is what the administration is proposing:

For meat and poultry inspection, which Congress made mandatory by a law that has been enacted, the Federal Government is proposing a user charge. That will go back to the consumer in the form of higher prices.

For commodity inspection and classification, warehouse inspecting and licensing, a user charge.

For the administration of workmen's compensation safety programs, a user charge.

For overtime border inspection of private vessels and aircraft, a user charge.

Millions are included in anticipated receipts for these user-charge items.

Fifth. Additional transportation user charges or taxes proposed are: First, a 6-percent increase in air passenger tax to the tune of $36 million, and second, air freight tax of 2 percent to the tune of $6 million. Thus the user is hit again.

Sixth. Two hundred million dollars are included in the trust fund receipts for the highway trust fund based upon income from a 1-percent present tax on automobiles. This $200 million is now going into the general fund, based upon receipts of 1 percent from automobile excises. That same $200 million will be earmarked for the highway trust fund. For what purpose?

The administration's beautification bill is where the $200 million is going. For the first time in the history of the highway trust fund they are going to earmark within the trust fund this $200 million solely for beautification purposes. Now, that is wrong. We have never earmarked trust receipts into the highway trust fund for a specific highway construction program or purpose, be it for safety or otherwise. Certainly safety is as important as beautification. Even if it is for interstate highway construction which is saving some 4,000 lives a year, which is certainly as important as beautification. No earmarking of the trust fund has been proposed. It is wrong to earmark these funds in this way because if you proliferate the highway trust fund by program earmarking, you are asking for trouble by making administration of the fund inflexible.

These are some examples as they relate solely to the question of transportation policies in the highway trust fund.

Now I have a couple of other examples I would like to give you here. First of all I investigated how much seigniorage will be earned per coin in this coming year in the transition from our silver coins to the new metal. Senator WILLIAMS estimated that the income from this new minting will be $2.5 billion. The profits from coining quarters, for instance, with a mineral content of cupronickel will be great because this cupronickel in a quarter has a value of only 2 cents. That is the present value of the coin. The previous value of the silver in the quarter, containing 90-percent silver, was 23½ cents. The profit will be, therefore, 21½ cents per quarter minted, which comes in now as an income item supposedly helping to balance the budget, which is in effect hidden profit to the Government. The estimated value of the cupronickel in the dime is 1 cent. In the previous dime the silver content was 8.6 cents. Therefore, the profit per dime in the new minting will be 7.6 cents.

Now, as for the half dollar, it is 40-percent silver and there will be a profit there of about 21½ cents per half dollar minted.

As to Government stockpiles of strategic and critical materials, we will realize a profit of $260 million.

In surplus lands the Government has $1.2 billion worth of surplus property for immediate disposal and this figure, like the stockpile figure, is included in "inflow" receipts despite its nonrecurring nature.

Although the President said there would be no new taxes, he proposed the repeal of some of the excise tax revocation of last year. This means returning excise taxes on automobiles and telephone bills. So, no matter how you view it, it is a tax increase of $1.2 billion.

Readjusting withholding on individuals and corporations: The sum of $3.6 billion of the promised $10 billion-plus increase in Treasury receipts will come from speeding up tax receipts from corporations and individuals. This means that money which would otherwise be available next year is being forced out of the taxpayers' pockets this year and being spent this year. How this proposed income tax withholding change and social security increase which took effect the first of this year will affect taxpayers is revealed by the following tables citing figures published by the Treasury Department and the Department of Commerce:

Annual income tax and social security withholding

SINGLE INDIVIDUAL

Annual wage	Present tax withholding	Increased tax withholding	Proposed total tax withholding	Social security (with 1966 increase 0.6 percent)	Total amount withheld from wages
$3,016	$325.56	$5.20	$330.76	$126.88	$457.64
$4,996	605.28	65.52	670.80	180.96	851.76
$7,488	955.24	311.76	1,267.00	277.20	1,544.20
$9,984	1,305.20	386.40	1,691.60	277.20	1,968.80
$14,976	2,005.12	1,101.36	3,106.48	277.20	3,383.68
$30,004	4,105.40	3,500.64	7,606.04	277.20	7,883.24
MARRIED COUPLE—2 CHILDREN					
$3,016	$40.60	0	0	$126.88	$126.88
$4,996	321.36	−$33.80	$287.56	180.96	468.52
$7,488	671.32	−3.12	668.20	277.20	945.40
$9,984	1,021.28	+71.76	1,093.04	277.20	1,370.24
$14,976	1,721.20	+323.96	2,045.16	277.20	2,322.36
$30,004	3,821.48	+1,958.84	5,780.32	277.20	6,057.52

The budget also makes it appear that defense costs in the coming fiscal year will be only $4 billion more than in the present fiscal year while at the same time omitting to point out that a supplemental appropriation of $12.3 billion is being requested for defense. This additional money will be spent during this fiscal year so that it will not appear in next year's budget, another example of the out-and-out figure juggling that is the trademark of this year's budget.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], in his observations on the budget which the President just submitted to the Congress.

President Johnson has given us a budget that meets the needs of our Nation and which, at the same time, will advance noninflationary economic growth.

In a year when the special costs of Vietnam are expected to rise substantially, the President's budget reduces the projected deficit to less than $2 billion—the lowest in the past 7 years.

The President obviously has labored long and hard to reach this goal.

The choices obviously were hard and difficult. But he made his choices and he made them well.

For example, he could have ignored the need for measures to increase revenues entirely. While the deficit would still have been only half that of 1959, and well below that of 1964, the President rightly rejected this choice.

His administrative budget, exclusive of Vietnam, is only $600 million above this year's budget.

The President could have recommended higher income tax rates—but he rejected this as premature.

The temporary measures he proposes represent the middle ground and are wholly appropriate to the uncertainties of the period. They provide for flexibility.

If the situation warrants additional revenue, the President will call for the necessary action.

If, on the other hand, a settlement is reached in Vietnam, the budget can quickly be adjusted accordingly.

There always exist areas of disagreement. The number will not be great.

I was disappointed that the President did not recommend an appropriation for the revolving fund for the SBA to continue the small business loan program.

It is my feeling that the budget should be amended to include sufficient appropriations for this purpose.

The budget instead notes that SBA's loan financing will be provided through sale of participation in pools of loans.

I favor this method as an additional plan of financing.

I have introduced legislation to implement this plan. However, there must be some provision made for the SBA loan program during the transition period when a shift is being made from appropriations to self-financing. SBA must have sufficient funds with which to operate during this interim period.

Generally, the President's budget is excellent but I would propose this specific amendment at an early date.

In the main the President has presented a reasoned and responsible budget.

AMERICA'S MONETARY POLICY: EVERYBODY OUT OF STEP BUT THE FED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last December 6 the Federal Reserve System raised the rediscount rate from 4 to 4½ percent, and the ceiling on interest payable on time deposits from 4 to 5½ percent. As could be expected, this set off a wave of increased interest rates throughout the economy, from bank loans to home mortgages.

The December 6 action led to searching hearings the next week before the Joint Economic Committee.

Based upon those hearings, and on my reflections, I wish to report to my colleagues my tentative conclusions:

First. The Federal Reserve's rediscount rate increase was not coordinated with executive branch action.

Second. Members of the Fed other than its chairman do not have systematic access to needed information.

Third. The Federal Reserve's bludgeon method of fighting inflation—higher interest rates across the board—tends to be used prematurely, to the detriment of economic growth.

Fourth. The Fed's bludgeon method relies on two fallacies: The critical mass fallacy and the balance-of-payments fallacy.

Fifth. The Fed's bludgeon method has the additional fault of discriminating sharply against small business, low-income consumers, and homeowners.

Sixth. The Fed could combat inflation more effectively, and avoid harmful side effects, by seeing to it that selective methods are used, saving the bludgeon method for serious inflationary dangers. Among such selective methods are stock margin controls; consumer credit controls; partially closing the rediscount window; controls over the lending power of big banks which have shifted liabilities from demand deposits to negotiable time certificates of deposit, promissory notes, and repurchase agreements; Joint Economic Committee review of price-wage guidelines; and discretionary authority over the investment tax credit.

I shall discuss each of these.

1. THE FEDERAL RESERVE'S REDISCOUNT RATE INCREASE WAS NOT COORDINATED WITH EXECUTIVE BRANCH ACTION

The Employment Act of 1946 specifically requires the Federal Government "to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

The Federal Reserve System is a part of the Federal Government. To achieve coordination, fiscal and monetary policy must be made to work hand in glove. For if they do not, the economy can easily be pushed off the path of rapid, stable growth into inflation or recession. In any given situation a decision in favor of a tighter fiscal policy will call for an easier monetary policy than would otherwise be necessary, and vice versa. Neither fiscal policy nor monetary can be made without regard for the other.

The decision as to what the mix will be is crucial. It is not a quasi-judicial question like those which come before our regulatory agencies. It means deciding whether we will have more aid to education or more business investment, whether loans will be made harder for small businessmen to obtain or whether individual income taxes go up.

These decisions are the lifeblood of our Government. To the greatest extent possible, they should be made by the Congress, the President, and the Federal Reserve on a coordinated basis. That is what the Fed's independence within the Government, rather than independence from the Government means. That is what the Employment Act is all about.

But just the opposite happened last month. The President, much less the Congress, had not yet decided what kind of fiscal policy was required by the Nation; budget and tax plans were not complete. But the Fed refused to wait another month until these important plans could be taken into account. It went ahead and took a hard-to-reverse step which cut down on the options open to the President. By raising the discount rate, and thereby boosting interest rates generally, it moved toward a tighter monetary policy, thus restricting substantially the President's freedom to choose, if necessary, the alternatives of higher taxes or reductions in spending to achieve the same end. Instead of the President's formulating his fiscal plans and the Fed's taking action to accommodate them, the Federal Reserve Board took action. So now the President and the Congress must do the accommodating.

> The administration must now—

As Vice President HUMPHREY said—.

> develop an appropriate fiscal-monetary policy in light of the Federal Reserve action.

This is a gigantic case of the tail wagging the dog. As of December 6, everybody in the massed battalions of the Government was presumed by the Fed to be marching out of step—except the Fed.

There may be situations, of course, where economic pressures are so great that the monetary authorities cannot wait even a month before the public announcement of a tighter policy. But these are indeed rare, and neither the administration nor the three dissenting members of the Board of Governors thought that last month was such an occasion. Secretary of the Treasury Fowler, as Fed Chairman Martin himself testified in the hearings, strongly urged the Chairman not to raise the discount rate at this time, but to wait until the administration's plans become clear. Mr. Mitchell, a dissenting member of the Board, agreed:

> My position, basically, is that the discount rate action could have been delayed, to await coordination with other Government policies. My willingness to delay discount rate action in this way is based on the fact that monetary policy has already tightened, on the lack of evidence that inflationary pressures are strong or accumulating, and on the belief that we should continue to set high standards for the performance of the economy and, especially, for the reduction of unemployment.

Mr. Maisel, another dissenting Board member, said:

> Given * * * [the] important factor of the Federal budget, it seemed to me vital that we wait for the President to determine what the budget was to be. Clearly, since the budget hadn't been determined by the administration, the Federal Reserve could not know it and, in fact, the Federal Reserve had no inside information on what would happen for the last half of this [fiscal] year; therefore, it seemed to me most necessary to delay at least until the budget was formulated, because the delay could occur with but slight cost, while a failure to delay, taking an action on the discount rate, would be irreversible in terms of interest rates for a considerable period in the future.

And, referring to the boost in the discount rate, Governor Maisel said:

> A critical fact was that [the discount rate decision] reduced the choices of national policy available to the President. We were informing him that monetary policy would be tighter, leaving him to adjust fiscal and wage-price policy accordingly.

Even if some immediate tightening action was necessary, it would have been far preferable, as the third dissenting Board member, Mr. Robertson, pointed out, to use a subtle method—such as open market operations—rather than the slam-bang discount rate tactics. Such an approach would have been reversible if fiscal policy or other developments called for a reversal. It would certainly have been quieter, avoiding the unfavorable announcement effects of the discount rate tactic.

2. MEMBERS OF THE FED OTHER THAN ITS CHAIRMAN DO NOT HAVE SYSTEMATIC ACCESS TO NEEDED INFORMATION

Almost more disturbing than the results of the Board's failure to coordinate are some of the accompanying factors. One important factor, in my view, is the Board's almost total reliance on the Chairman of the Board for official information about the rest of the administration's views and intentions. No other member of the Board of Governors meets regularly with either the Director of the Budget Bureau, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors—the so-called quadriad. Nor, according to Governor Maisel, do the other Board members receive adequate written information about the administration's plans and analyses. On this point he said:

> I have never been told that there have been some staff studies of the Quadriad. I

> have never received any official information in any way of the feeling of the Treasury or the Budget Bureau or the Council of Economic Advisers with respect to what their feelings were at this time, whether they felt that there was a problem in the matter, whether there were any difficulties that could be met by monetary or fiscal policy.
>
> When I came [to the Board] I explored some of these matters [of information and coordination] * * * and I got a reaction that in the past, clearly, when attempts had been made to increase the amount of formal coordination, they had been rejected by the Federal Reserve.

And elsewhere in his testimony Mr. Maisel goes on to say:

> I found that I did not feel that I, as a member of the Board, had the necessary amount of information with respect to the combination, the interdependence of monetary and fiscal policy, to come to a proper decision.

In a modern society, knowledge is power. This is especially true in economic matters, where conditions change rapidly and policies must change constantly to keep pace. Unless the other members of the Board are fully informed of the administrations plans and the analyses behind them, they cannot make independent judgments about the requirements of a coordinated fiscal-monetary policy. They must, perforce, accept the Chairman's views on these matters, since he is the only one with "inside" information. We should remember that we have a collegial Federal Reserve Board of seven members, not a monarchy of one.

3. THE FEDERAL RESERVE'S BLUDGEON METHOD OF FIGHTING INFLATION—HIGHER INTEREST RATES ACROSS THE BOARD—TENDS TO BE USED PREMATURELY, TO THE DETRIMENT OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. Speaker, no one knowledgeable in economic matters would contend that the recent action of the Fed, although mistaken, threatens us immediately with a serious recession. But this action is symptomatic of a broad, long-range policy which has cost the country a great deal over the years. I am referring to what I believe is the Fed's continuing tendency to move prematurely and too vigorously toward tight money and higher interest rates.

There will undoubtedly be times when a restrictive monetary policy is required to prevent inflation. But the record of the Fed in the 1950's shows that they are often haunted by a specter visible only to themselves. Let me illustrate.

Beginning in January 1953, the Fed took action to tighten money and raise interest rates. The rate on long-term Government bonds rose from 2.68 percent in 1952 to 3.13 percent in June 1953, and the rate of growth of the money supply fell steadily beginning in January and by July 1953 was at less than 1 percent. The recession of 1953–54 began that July. It is difficult not to single out a mistaken monetary policy as one of its causes.

Our next recession began in July 1957. During the second half of 1956 and the first 9 months of 1957, the Fed pushed interest rates upward, adding more than a point to the rate on long-term Governments. This pushed toward higher rates, it is instructive to note, was continued even after the recession had begun. During 1957 the money supply was allowed to decrease, not just in its rate of growth, but in absolute amount. This recession, too, was given a push by overly restrictive monetary policy.

The last recession before our current economic expansion was in 1960–61. It, too, was preceded by Fed tightening of interest rates and an absolute drop in the money supply.

4. THE FED'S BLUDGEON METHOD RELIES ON TWO FALLACIES

The Fed's bludgeon method of forever injecting higher interest rates into the economy, as its contribution to the national synthesis, suffers from two major fallacies:

A. THE CRITICAL MASS FALLACY

The first misconception, one of long standing and fundamental importance, was identified by both Governor Robertson and Governor Maisel. It is the Fed's reliance on what Mr. Maisel called the critical mass theory of inflation. This holds that, at a certain point before inflation actually begins to appear in the economy, even a small additional infusion of money will set off, through changes in expectations, an explosive expansion of credit, and that an uncontrollable inflation will result. This theory explains the Fed's belief that credit should be tightened well before inflationary pressures appear. It has led the Fed to tighten money too quickly and ease it too late.

The critical mass theory of inflation has been thoroughly discredited by economists. Except in situations as extreme as that in Germany between the wars, the uncontrollable credit explosion predicted by the theory has never been observed. As Governor Maisel said before the committee:

> A large-scale credit expansion without added reserves would require peculiar types of discontinuities in our monetary system. There is no indication that they exist. They have not appeared in the past.

In actual fact, monetary policy is much more effective in stopping an inflation than it is in boosting us out of a depression. It is easier to pull on a string than to push on it. The Fed can keep banks from making new loans by raising reserve requirements or selling bonds in the open market, but once we are in a depression it cannot force businessmen to invest. Therefore, if any bias is justified in monetary policy, all the evidence suggests that it should be toward greater caution in tightening money than in easing it. But, as the facts I have cited earlier show, the Fed's bias has been just the opposite. They have rushed into tight-money policies much too fast and too hard to slay invisible dragons of inflation and they have waited until the country was well into its recessions before easing credit. The critical mass theory which leads the Fed in this direction should be brought out into the open and exorcised.

B. THE "BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS" FALLACY

The second piece of mistaken theory which has been used by the Fed to justify its bias toward tight money and higher interest rates is the balance-of-payments argument. Although it was used as a crutch more extensively in the past, and has gone somewhat out of style, Chairman Martin still cited it last month as one of the important reasons for the Fed's discount rate move. Governor Maisel scotched this argument definitively. I quote him here:

> The United States is doing extremely well in restraining interest-sensitive items through present programs. Further rate increases might simply be matched again overseas. Indeed, higher rates may have a perverse effect. United States interest payments abroad would rise immediately. Higher financing costs would make our exports less competitive. Slow growth in this country might make direct investments abroad—our chief problem area—look even more inviting.
>
> The traditional belief in higher interest rates for balance-of-payments reasons assumes either (1) rates high enough to raise unemployment sufficiently to curtail imports, or (2) interest high enough to change capital flows. No one admits to desiring the first path. The second path I regard as dangerous and almost impassable.
>
> When the discount rate was raised, the President was in the process of announcing a revised balance-of-payments program designed to bring about the necessary return to equilibrium. I believe the President's program was proper and sufficient. The constant use of balance of payments as a theme to raise interest rates can only have a most unfortunate long-run impact.

All of the economists who focused on the balance-of-payments question in their testimony before the committee agreed with the views expressed by Governor Maisel. Governor Robertson, another dissenting member of the Board, also pointed out that corporate direct investment abroad, the category of capital flow that has been least reduced to date, is notoriously insensitive to changing domestic credit conditions and so cannot best be attacked through changes in the interest rate. In sum, the Fed's argument that tighter money is an effective remedy to the balance-of-payments problem is simply not proved. In addition, of course, it runs the risk of halting domestic economic growth.

5. THE FED'S BLUDGEON METHOD HAS THE ADDITIONAL FAULT OF DISCRIMINATING SHARPLY AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS, LOW-INCOME CONSUMERS, AND HOMEOWNERS

Higher interest rates and tight money, the traditional weapons for fighting inflation, do not merely cause unemployment and prevent full use of resources. They discriminate heavily against particular sectors of the economy—particularly small and new businesses, low-income consumers and housing.

First, the impact of an increase in interest rates falls most heavily on small rather than large businessmen. The small manufacturer or retailer must go to the banks for his investment funds, whereas the big company or chain store is able to finance itself internally, without going to the money market. Mr. Martin Gainsbrugh, of the National Industrial Conference Board, made this quite clear at our hearings when he presented a survey indicating that 97.4 percent of the thousand largest corporations did not expect the rise in interest rates to affect their capital spending plans for the first quarter of 1966. If this is so, the effect can only be on the little man. In addition to the inequity involved, the loss of output of small firms is particularly serious for the economy, for they are often the innovators in expanding industries.

Second, interest increases affect the millions of low-income families that rely heavily on consumer financing—currently some $82.6 billion, one-fifth of our entire disposable income.

Third, housing construction, a sector in which we particularly want to encourage growth, is also especially hard hit by general interest rate increases. Housing starts are extremely dependent on mortgage rates; a chart of housing construction looks like the reversal of a chart on long term interest rates. So here, too, the bludgeon approach has unwanted side effects.

Vice Chairman Balderston, in his testimony, advanced the thesis that interest rate increases do not, in fact, have much of a discriminatory effect, since this country includes countless savers who receive interest payments as well as countless borrowers who make interest payments:

> Senator Javits. Do you challenge Chairman Patman's estimate that the consumer is going to pay $25 million more per year in interest by virtue of this rate rise?
>
> Mr. Martin. I am not in a position to challenge it because I don't know at this juncture. * * *
>
> Senator Javits. You would have some question?
>
> Mr. Martin. Would have some question. I would have to study this considerably further.
>
> Senator Javits. Would you be good enough to study it and submit for the record the analysis of the Board of what this is going to cost payers of interest for credit? Just exactly as Chairman Patman made an estimate, let us know. In other words, we have to juxtapose this. You say to us, juxtapose this to the cost of inflation. We say to you what are we going to juxtapose? What is your estimate of what it is going to cost?
>
> Mr. Balderston. Senator Javits, may I ask a question?
>
> Senator Javits. Certainly. That is the privilege of every witness before a congressional committee.
>
> Mr. Balderston. Is it not likely, sir, that there are more savers in this country than there are borrowers? The problem of double counting comes in because the same citizens are owners of Government bonds, and of policies with insurance companies, and also possess savings accounts and pension rights. If you take out the double counting it is my belief that there are more savers than there are borrowers.

I wish it were that simple. In fact, the evidence is overwhelming that an increase in interest redistributes income from the poor to the rich.

Lower income families pay out more than they receive in interest. About one quarter of the Nation's families and single individuals have no savings at all. Another 28 percent have savings of under $500; another 12 percent have savings of between $500 and $999. In other words, 64 percent of the Nation's families have savings of less than $1,000. Very little interest is received by these Americans.

How much do they pay out in interest? The total is far greater than the minimal interest gained on their small savings accounts. Millions of Americans have home mortgages ranging between $10,000 and $20,000. An even greater number owe $1,000 or $1,500 on an automobile. Millions of small businessmen and farmers are deeply in debt for capital. They borrow much more than they lend.

A rise in interest rates, therefore, is a redistributive device which favors the wealthy. A 1-percent increase in interest rates, for example, adds $4,734 in interest costs to a $20,000 loan over a 30-year schedule of maturity. Since this is roughly equivalent to the annual income of more than half the population, this means that millions of people will have to work a full year just to pay additional interest costs on their home mortgage as a result of the Federal Reserve Board's action. Facts like these should make us cautious about the use of higher interest rates to control inflation when other means are available.

The Fed majority apparently believes with Vice Chairman Balderston, that "there are more savers than borrowers." If you believe that, it is easy to believe that you are doing God's work by raising interest rates; you are helping the savers, and there are more of them.

Such an attitude may account for both the policy and the piosity of the Fed over the last 10 years.

6. THE FED COULD COMBAT INFLATION MORE EFFECTIVELY AND AVOID HARMFUL SIDE EFFECTS BY SEEING TO IT THAT SELECTIVE METHODS ARE USED, SAVING THE BLUDGEON METHOD FOR SERIOUS INFLATIONARY DANGERS

Unquestionably there are times when the blunt but powerful tool of higher interest rates must be used. When we face massive inflationary pressures similar to those of the post-World War II period, we must either tighten credit on a large scale or enact substantial tax increases, or both. But these situations have been rare in the past. They may arise even less often in the future. Our knowledge of economics has grown to the point where we will most frequently be called on to cope with the selective and relatively mild inflationary pressures associated with the regular management of a near full-employment economy. In this situation there are methods of preventing inflation which are at once more direct, more effective, and less costly to the economy than traditional monetary restraint. Some of these tools are now in the hands of the Fed. Others have been used in the past and have been put in mothballs. Still other proposals for action by other agencies are entirely new. For example:

A. STOCK MARGIN CONTROLS

The control of stock margin credit—the amount a buyer of equities must put up in cash—now rests in the hands of the Board of Governors. This power, embodied in regulations T and U of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, could be used more aggressively by the Board of Governors to dissipate inflation arising from a speculative boom in the stock market.

During the period October 1958–July 1960, with the Dow-Jones industrial average in the 600–700 range, the Fed kept the stock margin requirement at 90 percent. Today, with the Dow-Jones pushing 1,000, the margin requirement is less—only 70 percent. Why didn't the Fed selectively raise the margin back to 90 percent before using its bludgeon method of raising interest rates across the board?

B. CONSUMER CREDIT CONTROLS

Control over the terms of consumer credit used to be in the hands of the Board of Governors. But in 1957 the Board of Governors said that they did not want this authority, and the Congress allowed it to lapse. In recommending against it, the Board of Governors did not maintain that the volume of consumer credit was adequately responsive to traditional monetary controls. Nor did it maintain that the authority they wanted to give up was an ineffective method of control. The burden of their report was that they did not want the job of administering these controls.

Consumer credit is a volatile influence in the economy. It now stands at $82.6 billion or one-fifth of disposable income, up almost 7 percent from last April. This figure is sensitive to changes in the terms of credit, the period over which the loan can be paid back. This was exactly the authority embodied in regulation W, which the Board urged the Congress not to renew. We would do well, I believe, to take a hard and careful look at the possibility of reviving this authority, perhaps relocating it in the Treasury if the Board still finds the task of administration too difficult.

Chairman Martin took the position that it was Congress which was denying to the Fed consumer credit control powers. What he neglected to mention was that the Fed has not only failed to request such powers, but has proclaimed that it does not want them. I repeat to the Fed what I have said many times concerning Congress and control over consumer credit: Ask, and it shall be given unto you.

C. PARTIALLY CLOSING THE REDISCOUNT WINDOW

Chairman Martin gave as one of the reasons for raising the rediscount rate that banks could borrow at the rediscount window at, say, 4 percent and then turn around and invest it in securities yielding a higher rate of interest, thus gaining a windfall. In his testimony to the Joint Economic Committee, he said:

> Reflecting the intensity of credit demands, however, interest rates in money markets had risen above the discount rate. This relation could not be permitted to last indefinitely because it could stimulate an excessive resort by banks to borrowing from the Federal Reserve.

This seems to me an invalid reason for raising the rediscount rate. If banks are borrowing at the rediscount window to invest elsewhere at a higher rate, the remedy is partially to close the rediscount window and prevent it. Regulation A of the Federal Reserve adopted in 1955 expressly authorizes the Fed so to use the rediscount window by setting forth the general principle that the Fed must consider "whether the bank is borrowing principally for the purpose of profiting from rate differentials."

Yet when I questioned Chairman Martin on this point, here is the answer I got:

Representative Reuss. Why would it not have been possible to exercise some discretion at the rediscount window, rather than raise the interest rate, and refuse credit, for example, to a bank which simply wanted to borrow because it could invest the money at a slightly higher rate in some other form of security? Why didn't you do that?

Mr. Martin. This is always a possibility, an administrative possibility, and to some extent, this is carried out by all of the banks in their handling of the discount window.

Representative Reuss. As a matter of fact, doesn't so-called regulation A of 1955, which sets forth your rediscount policy, explicitly exclude granting rediscounting privileges to a bank which wants to borrow simply to make a percentage point or so on the interest rate by investing it elsewhere?

Mr. Martin. I think that the officer in charge of the discount window is always trying to determine what the use of this is going to be, and I think that we have improved the administration of the discount window a great deal in the last 4 or 5 years. We now have a committee that is studying this, but we have no hidebound way of doing it.

Representative Reuss. Your answer to my question of whether regulation A—adopted in 1955, and still, so far as I know, governing your rediscount policies—prohibits the use of the rediscount window to enable a bank to borrow from the Fed simply to lend it elsewhere at a higher interest rate, your answer to that question is that it does or does not?

Mr. Martin. No; my answer to that question is I would have to read the regulation.

Representative Reuss. I see. Would you, after reading it, and at this point in the record, indicate for the record whether it does in fact prohibit such rediscounts?

Mr. Martin. I will be very glad to prepare a paper on that.

Representative Reuss. You don't have to prepare a paper. Just tell me whether it does or doesn't.

I would hope that the next time the Federal Reserve feels impelled to raise the rediscount rate in order to prevent bank borrowing only to reinvest elsewhere at a higher rate, it pause and read its own regulation A to see whether bank borrowing for the purpose of making a quick profit in another investment cannot best be stopped by enforcing regulation A, rather than by raising the entire interest rate structure of the country.

D. CONTROL OVER THE LENDING POWER OF BIG BANKS WHICH HAVE SHIFTED LIABILITIES FROM DEMAND DEPOSITS TO NEGOTIABLE TIME CERTIFICATES OF DEPOSIT, PROMISSORY NOTES, AND REPURCHASE AGREEMENTS

Let us now look at the Fed's practice of allowing the banks to employ methods of attracting funds which permit them to avoid all, or nearly all, reserve requirements. In recent years three of these techniques have come into wide use: the negotiable time certificate of deposit, the promissory note, and the securities repurchase agreement, all in large denominations.

The first of these, an adaption of the traditional time certificate of deposit, are issued principally by the 30 or so big money-market banks, mostly in New York, in denominations ranging upward from $100,000. In spite of the fact that a secondary market for these instruments has developed, making the certificate almost as good as money, the Fed still classifies them as conventional time rather than demand deposits, and requires only a 4-percent reserve against them, rather than 15 percent average for demand deposits. The Fed had also raised the ceiling on interest paid on these deposits over the years, the last hike to 5½ percent coming last December. This has allowed the banks to attract funds out of demand deposits and Government securities into these low reserve and highly volatile negotiable certificates of deposit. In the last 5 years their total has grown explosively from $1 to $16 billion.

This shift from high reserve category deposits into CD's has in itself an inflationary effect. It allows an enormous expansion of credit, because banks holding CD deposits can loan out $96 for every $100 they receive, instead of the $85—in the average—they could loan if they received the money as a demand deposit. Second, the fact that the CD's funnels more money into the big banks is likewise inflationary, because these banks tend to loan out a greater proportion of their funds than do the smaller banks.

CD's also have a discriminatory effect against small banks, since their CD's cannot easily be resold on the market and are thus much less attractive to corporations.

The repurchase agreement, which now accounts for about $2 billion of bank funds, suffers from these same faults, only in greater degree. The repurchase agreement is a technique for obtaining funds whereby banks borrow from corporations, paying interest on the loan, and give securities for collateral. The Fed has ruled that no reserves at all need be held against funds obtained in this way, and that there is no limit on the interest that can be paid to attract them. These agreements, made in amounts near $1 million, discriminate, of course against small banks. Even more seriously, they weaken the Fed's power to prevent inflation. Since there are no reserve requirements against them, banks can loan out all the money they receive in this manner, and an uncontrolled credit expansion can take place.

The third instrument, the promissory note, has been of less significance to date. Here the bank simply issues a promise to pay, with interest, in return for a deposit of funds. The amount of money obtained by banks in this way is now about $500 million. They, like the funds obtained through repurchase agreements have not, until last week, been subject to reserve requirements or a ceiling on interest. The Fed has finally proposed, as it should have proposed a year ago, to classify promissory note funds as time deposits and thus subject them to the 4 percent reserve requirement and the ceiling on interest payable. It is unfortunate that this decision had to await the prompting of the Joint Economic Committee, since it was so obviously needed.

This step, Mr. Speaker, merely points the way for further action. Promissory notes account for only $500 million, whereas the negotiable CD's and repurchase agreements, although untouched by this change, account for $18 billion. Steps to restore full control over inflationary pressures to the monetary authorities, and to take away the unfair advantages of big banks, could readily be taken. For example, funds obtained through repurchase agreements could be classified as time deposits. Or a subcategory of time deposits, comprising funds obtained through the issue of negotiable CD's, promissory notes, or repurchase agreements, in denominations of more than $100,000, would be subjected to a reserve requirement somewhat similar to that on demand deposits. This would both restore full control over credit expansion to the Fed, and cut back on the unfair advantages enjoyed by big banks under present conditions.

In failing to react to those volatile new credit instruments, the Fed might well ask itself: Have we been asleep at the switch?

E. JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE REVIEW OF WAGE-PRICE GUIDELINES

The effectiveness of another tool of inflation control, the wage-price guideposts of the Council of Economic Advisers, could be substantially increased by bringing an informed public opinion to bear on violations of the guidelines which threaten economic stability. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 11916, which attempts to do this. It would amend the Employment Act of 1946 to assign to the Joint Economic Committee responsibility for first, passing on wage-price guideposts formulated by the Council of Economic Advisers; second, holding public hearings on price or wage increases which appear inconsistent with the price-wage guideposts and threaten national economic stability; and, third, making findings and recommendations on inflationary increases to the President, or the company or union concerned.

In the absence of too much demand driving up prices, there is a danger of so-called cost-push inflation. Inflationary pressure is caused by unjustified price advances and wage settlements in large industries in which price and wage levels are determined by decisions of industry and labor without effective restraint by competitive market forces. Prices so determined are called administered prices.

Restrictive monetary policies, such as the Federal Reserve's recent increase in interest rates, dampen the economy as a whole, but they are relatively ineffective against administered price rises or wage settlements. We learned this lesson in 1957–58, when even at a time of high unemployment and growing idle capacity, strong industries such as steel and automobiles were able to push through continuing price increases.

To restrain price and wage advances in pace-setting industries, the bill adopts the voluntary approach which has been utilized in urging industry and labor to refrain from price and wage advances which exceed the guideposts.

The bill in no way involves price or wage controls. It does strengthen the existing informal activities of the President, by establishing a regular procedure for focusing an informed public opinion upon price and wage increases. Under it the Congress, through the Joint Economic Committee, would participate both in establishing the guidelines and in determining whether guideposts have been violated.

The public has an interest in price and wage decisions which involve large amounts of output and large numbers of workers, or which set a pattern for large segments of the economy. An informed public, aware of the significance of major price decisions and wage bargains, and given a standard by which to judge whether they are in the national interest, can create an atmosphere in which the parties will make responsible decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I plan to discuss this bill in greater detail at a later time.

F. DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY OVER THE INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Another step which would provide a direct and highly effective tool for preventing inflation, and for stimulating the economy when recessions threaten, would be to give the President discretionary authority to vary the investment tax credit allowance, enacted by Congress 4 years ago. This allowance is the percentage of their investment that businesses are allowed to deduct from their net tax liability. At present, it allows businessmen to reduce the taxes they pay to the Federal Government by 7 percent of the amount they invest during the year. Since it is not uncommon for rapidly growing corporations to invest many times their net tax liability in any one year, varying this allowance would have a direct and powerful effect on total corporate investment. Furthermore, as discussed earlier, this important sector of our economy does not respond well to interest rate changes because the corporations which make the biggest investments finance themselves internally to a large extent. The use of the investment tax credit allowance as a regulatory device would make it possible to influence directly this key sector of the economy. It would also avoid the unwanted side effects that would accompany a sufficiently strong dose of the traditional interest rate remedy for reducing expenditure. May we hear from the Fed, the watchdog over inflation, on this proposal?

Mr. Speaker, some of my suggestions may be impractical, and some of my criticisms of the Fed rebuttable. But most of the ideas I have tried to present today are not new. They have been circulating among economists for a generation. They do deserve explicit and careful consideration by the Fed.

The President, through the Council of Economic Advisers, performs effectively his obligation to keep the Congress informed on the whole range of vital economic issues. I cannot say the same of the Federal Reserve.

The Board faithfully sends back replies to questions put to them by Members, but somehow the point of the question is often lost in the response. I read the Board's annual report on actions and policy, but I seldom find there a clear and quantitative account of the theory and reasoning behind its actions. The critical mass theory of inflation on which the Fed has been operating became explicit, for example, only in the statement of dissenting Governors before the Joint Economic Committee. Instead, I read vague accounts of the winds of the money market, ranging from gentle zephyrs to raging tornadoes, against which the Fed must constantly lean.

Money is a difficult subject, but it is not incomprehensible. There are quantitative and reasoned theories about its behavior and impact on the economy. Some of these theories accord much better with reality than others. The Fed owes it to the country to maintain a continuing dialog on monetary policy. This dialog should be out in the open, in the pages of the report of the Board of Governors. Mr. Speaker, it is the strength of this Nation that no subject can long remain closed to reasoned and open discussion. I am sure that, in the long run, monetary policy will prove no exception.

This year's annual report of the Fed, due in a few weeks, is a good place to start. I hope that it will focus on the issues I have discussed today.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for taking the time to put into the Record this very meaningful statement he has made on the floor today. I hope that all Members will take the opportunity to carefully review what the gentleman from Wisconsin has said today. I believe he has made it crystal clear that in this country at this time monetary policy does not stand alone. It has no sovereignty of its own in this land.

We are an indivisible country in many aspects, not the least of which bears upon the operation of monetary policy. That does not operate in any vacuum. It has its own interdependencies. It must operate and must be judged in terms of its impact upon our economy as a whole, which economy also is subject to the impact of our fiscal policy, which has just today been announced in the budget of the President. It is also subject to the impact of wage and price policies which are adopted in the country as a whole.

These policies should be set out under guidelines defined by this Congress. So I think the gentleman from Wisconsin has done a great service in bringing this interdependency to our attention.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we are not rivals for power in the operation of the various aspects of our economy. We should be rather partners in providing for the progress of that economy. If we do not see ourselves in that relationship, then we certainly do not see ourselves aright and the Chairman of the great Federal Reserve Board would not be seeing his position aright unless he sees it in just that light.

The gentleman from Wisconsin pointed out specifically how, when we operate without the considerations of these interdependencies, we can be doing harm and injustice to our people. We have had a hearing, and the gentleman knows of the hearings that we had on the mortgage policies in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Barrett] summoned before this committee Mr. Brownstein, the head of the FHA, and also the gentleman who is the head of the FNMA. He heard there that the policies that had been prescribed for those two agencies had already been preempted by the decision that was made by the Federal Reserve Board. Mr. Barrett in that hearing asked why can we not keep the policy of having low interest rates for home purchasers in this country so as to encourage new families and the unhoused to have homes. He learned there that they could not protect such policies when the interest rates were being increased in this bludgeon-like manner. If the interest rate did not go up on the loan, the discount would come in on the mortgage and the homeowner would be hurt in either instance because the piper must be paid.

Once the decision to increase the interest rates had been determined by the Federal Reserve Board, the cost of the housing had to march ahead in order to take care of this interest payment. This meant that if a person were buying a $20,000 home and the interest rate goes up one-half percent, which it immediately did, there was a $1,000 cost which had to be absorbed on a discount, or spread across the life of the mortgage. It meant monthly payments had to be increased by $6 a month. To qualify for the home the man had to have a pay increase of $24 a month. Now, for goodness sake, Mr. Speaker, if what we are trying to do here is to stop inflation, then I suggest to you the action of the Fed brought about the very condition that they were predicting because in the little movement recited above you can see the house cost increase and the payment per month has to increase. Therefore the wages, in order to take care of these demands, have to be increased. So, if we are upping the demand for wages and if we are upping the consumer prices, we are certainly moving forward on what I should judge is the common man's interpretation of inflation.

Therefore, it seems to me it was a very unhappy thing to do this. I must join the gentleman from Wisconsin in that determination, in that the Federal Reserve chose to make the determination they did at the time that they did it. It seems to me that the record is not yet clear as to how they can justify this move. I predict to you that the record will not show now or in the immediate future that the move they have made has stopped in any way the seeking of loans for investment. The bank loans have increased since the movement of the Fed. Everybody has rushed into the market because they said that inflation is coming. Immediately they charged the money market up, and there has been a greater demand as a result. I have seen no effect in the area in which one would hope to have gotten an effect. That leads me to believe that the gentleman from Wisconsin is right. Instead of firing a cannon they should have called up the riflemen and should have zeroed in on the problems on a selective basis. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I would hope that we can look in the future to action by the Federal Reserve Board that will really indicate they are a part of this Government and intend to be as responsible and as responsive as the rest of us in Government have to be.

I shall look forward to that great day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA], who is one of the most industrious and scholarly of our colleagues and who, particularly as a member of the great House Committee on Banking and Currency takes seriously the obligation which that membership entails for him, that he keep a continuing surveillance over monetary conditions in this country.

I am proud and delighted that the gentleman shares my hope that the annual report of the Federal Reserve, which will be delivered to our committee in a matter of weeks, will contain a reasoned account of what the Fed has done and an effort to come to grips with some of the problems and possibilities which I have discussed here this afternoon.

I thank the gentleman from California for his contribution.

VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, committees of the Congress are presently considering various aspects of our Nation's very substantial effort to stem Communist military and psychological aggressions in southeast Asia. Very shortly the Congress will act on the President's request for supplemental funds in the fiscal year 1966 budget to support our military operations in Vietnam. We will be asked to approve some additions to nonmilitary spending, specifically to permit expansion of the U.S. AID programs in South Vietnam.

I am confident the Congress will act speedily on the President's request, thus reaffirming its strong support for the President's policies and actions.

The situation confronting the United States in southeast Asia is difficult, complex, and fraught with danger. If it were anything less, it would not be the issue to which this Congress will devote the far greater share of its attention in the months that lie ahead. The actions of the Congress will, in large measure, determine the course the country shall follow; our decisions will influence the military and political actions of the United States.

I expect the Congress will engage in a broad and sweeping review of the situation. It is right that we should do so. I am confident the most searching studies will confirm that the President has followed a course of action best suited to achieve our objectives, which are to preserve the integrity of the established Government of the Republic of Vietnam, to turn back the armed aggressors from the North and to bring about a cessation of hostilities and a just and enduring peace.

The grave responsibility for the military and political actions necessary to achieve these objectives rests with the President. He, in his loneliness, wisdom, and conscience, must make the decisions. This is the shattering burden of the man in the White House.

Wide interest at the present moment is focused on the pause in the bombing. Great pressure is being brought to bear to resume the bombing. It may well be that a resumption will of necessity come about.

The decision on how long to continue the suspension of bombing against the north is one which only those with knowledge of all the developments, both military and diplomatic, can reach a meaningful judgment. Few are in possession of such knowledge. The President is. I will say, however, that once the bombing is resumed, the momentum established as the result of the present pause and the intent diplomatic activity which has accompanied it will die and the openings toward peace which might have developed will close.

We can resume the bombing of the north at any time, in a matter of minutes, and the advantages of that course—both physical and psychological—will immediately come into play. But the present efforts dedicated to seeking out a peaceful, political settlement—which the President has told us have thus far achieved neither success nor failure—would then be shut off—in a sense wasted. If we continue this peace effort a while longer, we do not sacrifice our ability to reinstitute the bombing whenever we might. But if we send the bombers against the North prematurely we have sacrificed—at this stage, in this time—the chances for moving in the direction of resolving the conflict in a peaceful manner. Therefore, unless there is an immediate and overriding necessity to resume the bombing of North Vietnam, I am inclined to believe that we should not press the President to do so now. If the bombs fall, so will fall the hopes for an early settlement. We will know then that the aggressors can only be deterred through continued military pressure.

The President is dedicated to peace but he is also dedicated to protecting the lives of the young Americans involved in the war. Both these goals are equated with the present bombing pause. I am sure that the President will make the right decision when all the ingredients have been evaluated. To press him now to resume bombing is but adding one more strain to what must be an agonizing review of the limited options at his disposal.

I address myself to a fundamental and therefore critical point—whether, as has been suggested in some circles the United States should make a formal declaration of war against North Vietnam.

This, in my opinion, would be a most unwise move. I know that many Members share my concern that we should even seriously consider such an action. The President now has the emergency powers and authority necessary to act. The Congress in joint resolution dated August 10, 1964, approved all steps taken including the use of armed force, in the defense of freedom in southeast Asia.

Let us be mindful that although we are involved in sizable military operations in support of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, we are at the same time, engaged in continuing worldwide effort to bring an end to conflict, to move from the jungle battlefields to the conference table. We seek to curtail the conflict, not broaden it. We seek to end it, not extend it.

The President of the United States must have flexibility to act quickly and decisively in a situation of this type.

A declaration of war would deny him this flexibility. It would place him in a rigid position, very severely reducing his capability of quick action to take advantage of either military or political targets of opportunity.

We must be conscious of the political sensitivity of our involvement in southeast Asia. Great change has taken place in the past two decades in the relationships between nations.

Although we are the most powerful nation on earth, we must be mindful that we live in a community of nations, many of whom are alined with us in the fight to halt the spread of communism. I am certain that a declaration of war would prove distressing to most of the allied nations who support our present policies and actions in Vietnam.

As war has become more devastating, diplomacy has become infinitely more delicate, more urgent. As the likelihood of expansion of a conflict increases, a responsible nation must intensify its efforts to end conflict.

The United States possesses military power so tremendous that it is almost beyond the comprehension of man. A declaration of war would assume the full application of that power with rather limited restraints in the hands of the President. At a time when our objective is to limit the conflict in southeast Asia and to end it as quickly as possible, a declaration of war would tend to broaden it, quite possibly extend it.

One who possesses great power must have the will and the means to control power. In the context of our involvement in Vietnam, there must be day-to-day, hour-to-hour management of our military operations at the highest level. The President, committed in an open campaign for peace, must have the control that can immediately escalate or deescalate our military effort as may be in his sound judgment dictated by developments.

If a declaration of war assumes the application of maximum military power, as most nations would take it to mean, it assumes destruction of North Vietnam. This, we are attempting to convince the world, is not an objective of the United States.

Our objective is to apply the military power necessary to rid the Republic of Vietnam of the armed aggressors—and to permit, in time free and open elections, a self-determination by the citizens of that country. What damage has been done and what further damage may be wrought by American airpower in North Vietnam is what is necessary to curtail and eventually to halt Hanoi's support of the Vietcong. This, we hope, is clearly understood by the leaders of the democratic Republic of Vietnam.

Although our objectives may be limited, our determination to achieve those objectives is not. It becomes more firm. The President, as he has so often stated, will apply the power necessary to halt the aggression. We will meet our commitments in southeast Asia.

I cannot give too great an emphasis to the point that a declaration of war would have serious international implications. This is so not only because as I have noted, a declaration would assume dedication to the total destruction of the enemy, but it would question the validity of the President's statements concerning his desire for a peaceful settlement. Our hope, of course, is that, in time, Hanoi will take a more reasoned and rational approach to a solution. A declaration of war would reduce such a possibility.

In this age, as post-World War II history shows, it is important that a powerful nation tailor its actions, both political and military, to existing situations. In Greece, threatened by Communist guerrillas in 1947, President Truman assumed a firm position in support of the Greek Government, providing necessary support to sustain that government. He designed his strategy and his policies to fit the existing situation.

The situation in Korea called for a totally different strategy, a tremendously expanded effort, approaching but not quite becoming a total effort. Here again, President Truman had the flexibility a Chief Executive needs.

The most recent example of controlled response was President Kennedy's handling of the Cuban missile crisis. He was prepared to use maximum power, but applied just enough pressure to force withdrawal by the Soviet Union, thus achieving his objective.

President Johnson's decision to halt bombing of North Vietnam properly complemented his very open and determined worldwide effort to bring those in conflict to the conference table. If he had been in an inflexible position, such as we might expect in a state of declared war, an adjustment to complement a stepped up move toward peace might not have been possible.

The decision as to how long the cessation of bombing shall continue must rest with the President. Only he has knowledge of all of the developments, military and political, that influence the actions that must be taken to achieve our objectives. Control is not a one-way street; it can be employed to achieve rapid escalation, as could well be the case once it becomes evident the cessation of bombing is serving no purpose. But at what precise moment this might become the better part of strategy, only the President can say.

Although there have been, since the founding of the United Nations in 1945, too many armed conflicts in the world, there has not been a formal declaration of war by any nation.

As the Congress seeks to assist the President in his efforts to gain the limited objectives that have so often been proclaimed, as we review and study the policies and actions aimed at winning those objectives, let us make sure that we place no undue restraints upon the President or insist on any actions that might hamper his efforts to win the war and win the peace.

DUPLICITY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration is certainly amenable to the charge of duplicity in government. This administration, which has shed so many crocodile tears about how it sympathizes with the plight of the aged, and professes to want to do so much for the poor, has been doing more to pauperize the aged and poor in this Nation than any administration in the history of America.

This administration, through its inflationary policies, has destroyed the life savings of the retired people by reducing the purchasing power of their pensions and savings. It has made the poor poorer, and the plight of those living on fixed incomes more severe, by driving up the cost of living so high that their meager income is insufficient to purchase the bare necessities of life. And now this administration continues its attack on the less fortunate by insisting that they be required to pay a tax on the use of telephones.

This is certainly duplicity in government. While giving lipservice on the one hand to the plight of the poor and the aged, the administration, on the other hand, is going to compound that plight by taking from these people part of their meager savings and income through a telephone tax. A telephone tax hits hardest those who can least afford it.

In this day and age telephone service is a necessity. Many people rely on this service to do their shopping, to be informed as to their work, as a means of communication with their children, jobs, schools, and homes; and, in many instances where both parents of a family work, this is the only means of communication between their children and emergency agencies. For many, particularly the aged and less fortunate, it is the only means of contact with law enforcement officials, the fire department, doctors, and hospitals.

If the administration needs this additional revenue to help finance the war in Vietnam, let it obtain it by striking a comparable amount from the foreign aid program. Let some of the other nations, who will benefit from the fight against communism as much as the United States, contribute to this onerous task, instead of placing the burden on the aged and those least able to afford it. I shall oppose the imposition of any telephone tax, and hope that those who are interested in the welfare of the aged, retired, and poor will join me.

INDEPENDENT SURVEYS ON THE POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, very few independent surveys have been made in regard to the poverty program. However, the attached article by Haynes Johnson, taken from the Sunday Star of January 23, 1966, gives a detailed report on the action of the program in Little Creek, Ky., which I am sure the Members will find most enlightening if they have not previously read it.

"HAPPY PAPPIES" AND THE POVERTY WAR

(By Haynes Johnson)

LITTLE CREEK, KY.—Back in the hollow the wind was coming up and the heavy clouds were threatening snow, but inside the wooden cabin it was warm, comfortable, and somewhat drowsy. The young father of three threw another piece of coal into the stove, watched it flare up, and went on talking about his own small battle in the national war on poverty.

"If I give you a quarter to buy a hamburger, you're still going to be hungry again tomorrow. But that's what they are doing. They're trying to solve it with money and money alone won't solve it. They jumped in too quick and threw in the money and said 'here is your check'."

He knows all about those checks as do more than 2,700 other men, women, and children in this county whose sole support is Federal poverty money from Washington. They are benefiting from what is called officially the work experience and training program, financed here in Breathitt County and in 12 other counties of the area by $1,123,713 in Federal money a month.

The hill men have another name for the program. They are members, they say, of the "Happy Pappy" program.

As unemployed fathers, they get up to $250 a month, which makes them very happy pappies indeed.

To hear the men talk, most of them have no intention of getting off the program. It means, particularly in these bleak winter months, less hunger, more warmth, a glimmer of hope for the young, some comfort for the old. But it brings no great upsurge of hope, no sense of change. The way things are in Breathitt County, from the firmly entrenched power structure to the litter of stripped automobiles in the creeks, is, one feels, the way things will continue to be.

In a sense, the Nation's war on poverty began down here with the disclosure of massive want during the last days of the Kennedy administration. When he took over the White House, Lyndon Johnson made it his personal war. In his first major trip as President, he came to eastern Kentucky 2 years ago and pledged in hamlet and village to drive poverty underground.

Under his prodding, legislation was quickly drafted and enacted; new agencies were created. Money began to flow from Washington into every part of the Nation.

What happened to some of that money when it reached Breathitt County, in the heart of Appalachia, provides an illuminating picture of the rural aspects of the poverty program. Some parts of that picture are hopeful—the educational program, for example—and some are less promising.

The county's war on poverty is carried on with a certain lackadaisical air. The poverty office, financed by a Federal grant, closes at 3:30 p.m. every day—and isn't open on Saturday, the one day when most people from the county come to town. The complaint is heard that even when the office is open one can't find anyone there except the secretary.

For the first 2 weeks of this year, the director of the office, with a federally-underwritten salary of $700 a month, was vacationing in Florida. When this reporter arrived here, no one, including the director's secretary, seemed to know when he would return. (He came back on January 18.)

The other full-time employee, the assistant director, comes to the office for about half of each day. He spends the rest of the time working in a local radio station. The director says this part-time arrangement was worked out by phone with Washington, although the grant specified the employee would work full time; there are no written records of the Washington dispensation.

A STRONG SMELL OF POLITICS

More important, there is a strong smell of politics in Breathitt's poverty war. The fact is, politics is the lifeblood of the county; it touches everything and everyone—including all those involved in the war on poverty.

That is not to say that politics was behind the designation of Breathitt County as a poverty war participant. By any standard it is an impoverished area. Within its 494 square miles of draggy peaks and narrow valleys are the hallmarks of poverty—isolation, illiteracy, poor health. The names of its creeks and way stations tell part of the story: Bloody Creek, Lost Creek, Troublesome Creek, Hardshell, Quicksand, Hell-for-Certain.

The county is almost entirely rural and, like so many Appalachia areas, it has a declining population. In 1940 there were 23,946 people in the county; today there are about 14,100. The per capita income is $529.

For these reasons, Breathitt was one of the two counties in Kentucky to receive war-on-poverty money. Today the 2,727 persons who live entirely on poverty funds draw a total of $108,000 a month. Many more share in other programs and grants from Washington.

For a picture of how the program works here, go to John Little's Hollow, alongside Little Creek, 26 miles from Jackson. To reach the hollow and its 100 inhabitants you must cross a narrow wooden footbridge—or swinging bridge as it is called down here—high over the north branch of the Kentucky River and then walk more than a mile along a dirt path to the cabins. The only other way in is a fire trail 3½ miles over the mountains from the main highway. But that is impassable most of the winter.

Twenty-five children living in the hollow go to a one-room school. Most of the older children drop out of school because, for one thing it's a 4-mile walk to the schoolbus.

The people of the hollow say their greatest need is a road. But they seem convinced that there will never be a road as long as they have to work through the county officials. The county machinery, they say, is not interested in them or their needs.

True or not, this is the common belief, commonly expressed. It seems to reinforce some of them in the belief that they should take what they can get—and the best thing going in that department is the "Happy Pappy" program.

BUSTING ROCKS, DIGGING DITCHES

Asked what he did on that program, the young father in the cabin in the hollow replied:

"Well, we're busting rocks and digging ditches and cutting trees and that's about it. Oh, and building a few swinging bridges. I've been in it a year and I haven't learned a thing. Now I'm not talking about the adult education. That is the only bright spot. If it wasn't for that, the whole program might as well be out of Breathitt."

To become a happy pappy, a man must have been unemployed for 90 days and have one or more children. He must be willing and able to work, must be registered with the State employment office and not be eligible for unemployment compensation. He also must have children at home, and if they are of school age they must go to classes. He can own a car and his farm or homestead, but his bank account can't be over $1,000.

The maximum payment to happy pappies is $250 a month. It is free of Federal and State taxes. The men do not even have to go to town to pick up their checks; they are mailed to them. There is no limitation. This spring many of the men in the hollows will have been happy pappies for 2 years.

In addition, they receive free medical care and can stretch their incomes by purchasing food under the U.S. food stamp program. One man said he buys $124 worth of stamps for $84 cash.

EDUCATION A SUCCESS

The program is divided into two parts, adult education for men who have had little schooling and the actual "work experience." The classes have been a major success. Some men are learning to read and write, and otherwise improve their skills. They go to school 1 day a week, and get paid the same rate as when they are working—$1.25 an hour.

There are 36 work projects in the county, and they are less successful than the education program. Some of the projects provide an introduction to job training, but most of the work is done on the roads and hills. Men work in teams of 10 supervised by a "happy pappy" like themselves who has been appointed foreman by the magistrate of the district. The foreman turns in the worktime sheets.

There is no effective way to check on his figures. Consequently, there are reports of men sitting home in the hollows when they choose, and continuing to draw full pay. Two county employees are assigned to check on the work projects, but they obviously cannot get around with any regularity.

The county also makes at least one home visit every 12 months to each "pappy" to see if he is still eligible, and some form of personal contact is supposed to be made every 3 months.

Many criticisms can be leveled at such a program. Inevitably, it lessens incentive and glorifies the welfare dole system. One measure of that effect can be seen in recent reports that a labor shortage now exists in some areas of eastern Kentucky, particularly in the coal mines.

But the sharpest criticism comes from men like the young father. They do not want to living only on the dole. They want to be trained for something better.

"Why don't they concentrate on education and let the weeds go to hell," the man said. "If they're going to spend all this money, why don't they spend it on something that will help us. What I'd like to see is some kind of training work—heavy equipment, welding, auto mechanics."

That may come in time to Breathitt County, but it is not here in any meaningful way now.

BIG BUSINESS AND BIG POLITICS

In a county the size and condition of Breathitt, the war on poverty is big business—and big politics. And the family that has dominated the political life of the county for nearly 30 years also dominates the poverty program.

The key to the political importance of the program is that it is entirely up to the county to handle the hiring and firing. It takes little figuring to realize that here is a potential political force. In Breathitt County this force adds further cement to the one political dynasty.

That dynasty centers around the Turner family. Judge Ervine Turner, 75, and his wife, Marie, 65, have controlled Breathitt for nearly 30 years. No matter where you travel in the county, you are told that if you want anything from a highway job to a poverty job, see the Turners.

Ervine Turner is the circuit judge for Breathitt, Powell, and Wolfe Counties at a salary of $14,000 a year. Marie Turner is vice chairman of the Kentucky State Democratic Central Committee. For 34 years she has been the county superintendent of schools, with more than 200 patronage employees in the systems. Her annual salary is $12,000.

Years ago, Judge Turner took a more active role. He is credited with getting roads built, establishing postal routes, and creating jobs. Today, he remains more in the background. His wife is a dominant figure. "See Marie," is a common expression in Breathitt.

Over the years, the Turners have done many good things for the county, and along the way they reinforced their political control. The school system, which Mrs. Turner heads, is said to be one of the best in eastern Kentucky.

"Believe it or not, Mrs. Turner is a really dedicated woman," said a poverty program VISTA volunteer working in the county. "A lot of people swear at her, and some swear by her. I swear by her. She gets things done."

FAMILY PLAYS MANY ROLES

The Turner control extends far beyond the judge and his wife. Their son, John R. Turner, is State senator for Breathitt and six other counties. A daughter, Mrs. Treva Turner Howell, is one of four members of the powerful State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee, which regulates all Federal farm programs in Kentucky. A first cousin, Sam P. Deaton, is the county judge. Another Deaton is county sheriff.

Mrs. Barbara Turner, who married Ervine Turner's nephew, is in charge of the work experience and training program (the Happy Pappies) for seven counties, including Breathitt. The monthly U.S. expenditure for those seven counties comes to $457,700 and involves 2,388 families.

Breathitt is also the headquarters for a second six-county area in eastern Kentucky under that program, which means that 32,982 persons are being served through the Breathitt regional offices.

The head of the Breathitt County Community Action Committee, Manuel Strong, married a niece of Judge Turner. The action committee was formed to spearhead the war on poverty program in the county through a Federal grant.

Mrs. Turner, affable and clearly accustomed to authority, dismisses the prevalence of kinfolk as unimportant. While she concedes she likes politics, she says politics has not detracted from the success of the poverty program here.

JACKSON BANK IS FOCAL POINT

Although the action committee's office is in the basement of the county courthouse in Jackson, the real center of operations is in the Citizens Bank of Jackson, directly across the street.

The chairman of the action committee is Jerry F. Howell, the cashier of the bank. Howell sits in the office of the president of the bank. Actually, the bank president is Judge Ervine Turner. Marie Turner is a director, and their son-in-law, Jeff D. Howell, is the assistant cashier. Jerry Howell is his brother.

Marie Turner became the vice chairman of the new antipoverty agency. Of the original 28 names on the application sent to Washington asking for a poverty grant, there were other Turner contacts. Dr. F. C. Lewis, one of the committee members, is a director in the bank. The county judge, Sam Deaton, a cousin, is a member.

The committee's bank account is in the Citizens Bank, and that was its first mailing address.

In an interview in his office in the bank, Jerry Howell explained how the committee was formed. It was, he said, an outgrowth of a former group called the Breathitt County Development Committee that has functioned for years.

When the U.S. poverty program was announced, Howell said, "I called Washington right away and said, 'we're ready to go.' They said we had to have a community action committee so we organized one and asked for a grant."

The community action committee actually is simply a warmed-over version of the development committee. (Its last three meetings were on July 30, August 30, and December 9.) It operates, as Howell said, "like a subcommittee of the development committee," which meets regularly once a month.

POOR AREN'T DEEPLY INVOLVED

Washington insists, before approving a local community grant, that representatives of the poor be included and that they have a voice in decisionmaking. Two representatives of unemployed fathers were on the original application. Since then, a number of other representatives have been added to the committee lists, but there is general agreement that the poor are not deeply involved in the program.

Privately, some say it is unrealistic to expect the poor to participate, particularly in eastern Kentucky. "What can you expect from a poor fellow," one committee member said. "We have tried to involve them, but * * *."

And Marie Turner, in an interview put it this way:

"Any time you have 15 people together you've involved a lot of poor people in this part of the world."

While the committee has been criticized for its composition, members are equally critical of Washington operations, particularly their dealings with the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), the war on poverty's official agency name.

"They change the rules and regulations too often, and their people too often," said one person. He said they often feel they don't know who is in charge of overseeing the poverty program in Washington.

Another member was more critical.

Asked if he were satisfied with the program, he snapped, "No, sir," and went on to say: "The concept of OEO seems to be based on what Jesus Christ tried to do—and he had 33 years where these programs are set up for 9 months, and it's impossible to get them off the ground in that time. In this county, what I would like is to have about 5 years and 30 good talkers just to get the people out of the habit of being dependent on the Federal Government."

WORK ON PROGRAM MOVES SLOWLY

Breathitt's original $19,447 planning grant was approved in Washington on December 12, 1964. Since then there have been some nine grants involving the county, four to the community action committee for such activities as remedial reading programs, counseling, and volunteer poverty workers. The bulk of the rest went to the county schools and to a junior college in Jackson.

But the original planning grant has not yet been extended. One proposal, called Operations United submitted to Washington last July, and asking for $131,762.50, was turned down with the suggestion that it needed reworking.

The terms of the first planning grant provided for salaries of three full-time employees—the program developer, at $700 a month (the committee had asked for $950 a month), a secretary at $300 a month, and a program assistant, Seldon Short, at $200 a month. All the salaries were for 9-month periods.

In addition, $1,500 for consultant fees and $1,602 for a part-time adviser were provided.

The grant approved the expenditure of $900 for office space. The rent money was paid to the county fiscal court, headed by Judge Deaton. The committee is now located in the basement.

It has at its disposal seven office rooms, plus the entrance room where the secretary sits. Five of the offices are vacant.

Committee financial records show it has spent almost nothing beyond salaries, expenses, rent, phones, and some supplies purchased from the Citizens Bank and the newspaper.

In its latest report filed with Washington, dated January 12, the committee stated it had a bank account of $7,187 in the Citizens Bank.

Now pending in Washington is an application to merge Breathitt and three other nearby counties into a Middle Kentucky River Area Development Council, a new overall antipoverty agency for the area. It would also be headed by Jerry Howell. Howell says the plan is to keep the center of operations in the Breathitt County Courthouse. He said Breathitt is entitled to remain the dominant voice because it is larger.

"We have to watch our political position * * * and we expect to be criticized for it," he said.

The new application asks the Government to provide $80,901 for a poverty program development grant. Of this, $60,564 would go for personnel for a 9-month period. The top price would be for a program developer at $1,000 a month, with an assistant at $800, an area fieldworker at $650, another one at $600, a secretary at $325, two at $300, and two more working part time dividing $300. In addition, eight subprofessionals would be hired at $300 a month each. They would be drawn from the ranks of the poor. Furniture and supplies for the office would cost $2,640.

A DILEMMA FOR WASHINGTON

For Washington, the new application might well pose a dilemma. Breathitt and the other three counties are in genuine need. They qualify for assistance on that ground alone. The educational programs have been, by all reliable accounts, a success. Last summer's Head Start and remedial reading programs for children, in particular, showed dramatic progress. Mrs. Lena Jett, in charge of the remedial reading program, said the children's average reading level improved by more than a year in just 2 months.

A VISTA program, under which volunteer workers move in to help the people of the county, has been a partial success. Several male VISTA workers got a poor reception in the hollows and returned to Jackson, but two young women were accepted and are reported to be successfully teaching, helping the sick, and doing other good works.

In addition, Federal money is helping those who were going hungry 2 years ago. But questions remain: Is the money being spent in the best way? Is it being administered effectively? Are the programs doing something about the real causes of poverty? Are they going to lead to real change?

There are no easy answers. Only more questions.

One thing does seem clear. While there are programs bearing new names in eastern Kentucky, at this time there is little hope for a basic change there. New elements have been grafted onto the old system.

It may be, as some have said, that the war on poverty is bringing with it a revolution in some parts of the United States. If so, that revolution has not yet extended to Appalachia.

NEW PEACE CORPS DIRECTOR

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the President's appointment last week of Jack Hood Vaughn as Director of the Peace Corps is particularly fitting in light of his broad background and experience in community development work around the world. However, while we congratulate Mr. Vaughn on his new post, we should extend our thanks for a job well done as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and U.S. coordinator of the Alliance of Progress.

Although he served in this post for only about a year, he rapidly distinguished himself and won the respect of our Latin American neighbors. His 1965 factfinding and goodwill trip to Latin America was marked with a warm reception and a genuine respect for his ability and his dedication to the best interests of the hemisphere.

Mr. Vaughn's perception of developmental problems has been sharpened through his service with the USIA in Bolivia and Costa Rica, with the foreign aid program in Panama City, Mali, and Senegal, and with the Peace Corps as director of Latin American programs. His diplomatic service included a year as our Ambassador to Panama before he assumed the post of Assistant Secretary of State.

I feel sure that his broad background in information, community development, and diplomacy will serve him in good stead as Director of the Peace Corps. We wish him well in this new position for he has earned our gratitude and respect as an outstanding public servant.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE A COST-OF-LIVING INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Mize] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to provide a cost-of-living increase in social security benefits.

All of us are aware of what inflation is doing to the purchasing power of the dollar. The cost of living rose by 2 percent in 1965. It is still rising.

Everyone gets hurt under inflation, which is the cruelest tax of all, but the people who get hurt the most are those living on fixed incomes—annuities, pensions and social security benefits.

During the last session of Congress, we increased social security benefits by 7 percent across the board. This was of some help to the people on social security, but this increase still does not put these payments where they should be to pay today's inflated costs. I have seen figures which show that even with the 7-percent increase, those on social security do not have as much purchasing power as they had in 1958.

Under the terms of the bill I have introduced, there would be a provision to meet the cost-of-living increases. Whenever the Consumer Price Index advances 3 percent for any year, social security benefits automatically increase 3 percent.

This would be of tremendous help to all of those struggling to make ends meets with their social security checks. They are caught in an inflationary squeeze right now. They see those bills for goods and services go up almost every month, yet they are falling behind in purchasing power to meet increased costs.

We have set the pattern for the kind of arrangement in the cost-of-living provision which was approved for civil service retirement pensions. Whenever we have a 3-percent increase in the cost of living, the civil service retirement pensions increase by 3 percent.

It appears to me that Congress has the same responsibility to write this provision into the social security law as it did in the civil service retirement law. Both civil service and social security are creatures of the Congress. If we have a responsibility to the one, we have it to the other.

I would sincerely hope that this legislation can be considered this session so that it would become effective as soon as possible. In the meantime, unless more drastic measures are taken to halt the inflationary spiral, the cost of living will keep going up and these people will be in greater need than ever of an increase of this type.

A 4-YEAR TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, after thoroughly considering all arguments, pro and con, I am convinced that the establishment of a 4-year term for Members of the House, with elections concurrent with that of the President, would be detrimental to our American political and governmental system.

We were all elected for 2-year terms, sought the office we hold knowing that we would again face the public in 2 years, and we should have accepted by now the political and personal burdens as a normal occupational hazard.

To elect Representatives for 4 years has some merit, but to tie the entire House to the coattails of the President would destroy the independence of Congress and eliminate the check-and-balance system in our Federal structure.

Therefore, I do not believe that it would be timely or practical to process the constitutional amendment that the President recommended establishing 4-year terms for Members of the House commencing in 1972.

I realize full well the need to control campaign expenditures, and I naturally realize the tremendous physical and emotional burden the Members bear campaigning every 2 years. However, I believe that, if a 4-year term for House Members should be seriously promoted, the election should be held in the nonpresidential election years to insure the independence of the legislative branch of Government.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday Ukrainians all over the free world, including over 10,000 in my native Minnesota, celebrated the Ukrainian Independence Day. These noble people, who are enjoying the fruits of liberty, are naturally concerned about the future of their Ukrainian brothers who now live under the rule of the Soviet Union. I would like to share a number of observations with my colleagues relative to these freedom-loving people.

Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation not only in the Soviet Union but also behind the European Iron Curtain. Its population of over 40 million ranks with that of England, France, or Italy. The territory exceeds in square miles that of France and embraces such historic Ukrainian cities as Kiev, Lvov, Kharkov, and Odessa. Economically, this rich territory has placed Ukraine second in the world in the mining of iron ore, third in pig iron smelting, fourth in coal mining and steel production, and at the top or near it in many agricultural lines.

Historically, the centuries-old struggle for freedom and independence on the part of the Ukrainian nation constitutes an impressive chapter in the annals of human history. Much of this was documented in 1955 by the Select House Committee on Communist Aggression.

One of the first victims of Russian Communist aggression, Ukraine has proved to be the Achilles' heel of the Soviet Union. The destruction of its national churches, the horrible manmade famine of 1932–33, the mass murder at Vinnitsia in 1937–39, and the vast purges and deportations decreed by Moscow have failed to exterminate the spiritual and moral resources for national freedom in Ukraine. The historic capital of Kiev, with centuries of rich tradition and culture conserved in its vaults, still symbolizes today the indestructible hope and passion of a nation destined to be sovereign, free, and independent. Plainly, Ukraine stands as one of our most important and natural allies in the eventual defeat of Russian Communist imperialism. Its historic claim to national freedom and independence can hardly be ignored.

I am privileged to join with my many Ukrainian friends in paying tribute to the will of the Ukrainian people and their desire for freedom. May it materialize at the earliest possible moment.

PHONY BUDGET CUTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the distinguished ranking Republican member of our Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], in extending the friendly wager with the chairman of our committee that there is no conceivable way under the sun for the President to realize a deficit of only $1.8 billion if we continue upon our present course.

This budget is in my opinion just as phony as the one we received last year and I would direct your attention specifically to just one small facet of it, having to do with the activities of the Department of Agriculture. Again we see budget anticipation of a billion dollars less spending in this Department than in the current year. This is the identical story the administration was trying to peddle last year. Take for example the agricultural conservation program, which has been at a level of a quarter of a billion dollars over the past 7 or 8 years but which is carried in this budget as $100 million figure. It's a popular program and the Members of Congress will be jumping all over themselves to offer amendments to increase this figure, if it is not done by our subcommittee before it reaches the floor of the House.

Take the school milk program, which is just a shade over $100 million this year. A very popular program again, which the President in his budget cuts back $50 million or more. And surely the Congress will not stand for this.

Take the school lunch program. Again a very popular program, and one which actually should be increased if for no other reason but simply to meet the demands of our expanding population and we find a $19 million reduction in the President's budget.

This is an old game the President is playing with the three aforementioned programs. He submits a completely phony figure which he knows the Congress in its wisdom will raise. By submission of a lower figure, he enhances his budget figure and throws the onus of raising the figure upon the Congress, for he knows these very popular, worthwhile, on-going programs are not going to be sacrificed under any circumstances.

As we make our close examination and detailed study of the budget, we will have much more to say on the subject, but this will do as a starter.

TOWARD BETTER UNITED STATES-CANADIAN RELATIONS: A REAL PACEMAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, for a great length of time the United States has worked together in peace and harmony with our neighbor to the north, Canada. In business, in government, and in other fields of endeavor, the two peoples have enjoyed a warm and friendly relationship.

In commerce and industry, the development of close ties has been a key element in our mutual economic progress.

In Canada, numerous American firms have established subsidiary companies. Trade relations between our two countries must continue to reflect the interests of both the United States and Canada. The unhindered growth of two-way business relations between Canada and the United States is a laudable achievement in a troubled world. My interest here led me to survey the records of some respected international private firms.

Typical of the good-neighbor business policy is the relationship of a dynamic young Canadian concern, whose success vividly illustrates my point. Clairtone Sound Corp., Ltd., which sells electronic entertainment equipment such as high-fidelity systems, has established a solid working relationship with American business and, in so doing, clearly shows the way in accomplishing mutually beneficial commercial ties.

Demonstrating the firm's export-oriented complexion, the Clairtone Sound Corp. has erected a nationwide sales organization in the United States, with permanent offices in such major cities as New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. One of Canada's most respected companies, it also maintains branches abroad in France, Great Britain, and Germany. The company is an enthusiastic exhibitor at trade shows throughout the world.

Because of my interest in nongovernmental relations, I have taken the liberty of reviewing the record and background of this company in view of its undoubted success. Much of its achievement is due to the vision and ability of the two founders, Mr. Peter Munk and Mr. David Gilmour. Both have wide experience in the export-import field.

It seems to me that the extraordinary success of this company should serve as an inspiration to free enterprise everywhere. Equally important, it inevitably affects United States-Canadian relations as a source of goodwill.

In examining the development of the company, it becomes clear that its two founders, recognizing certain ills in the electronic entertainment market, embarked upon an expansive program of research. Their first models of rapid audio equipment and cabinet design won instant awards from the Canadian National Industrial Design Council. The productions were termed "outstanding in good design, on the basis of appearance, usefulness, and consumer acceptability."

The enterprising spirit of the project was, from the first, the key to success. The company stressed advanced sound engineering and simplicity of cabinet design.

The products which the Clairtone Corp. introduced were singularly attractive in appearance and of superb technical quality. They won widespread praise and evoked instant demand. The company, however, did not stand still; in 1961, Clairtone presented its first television-stereo console to the North American market. Early in 1962 the firm acquired the Middlesex Furniture Co., Ltd., a long-established manufacturing operation in Strathroy, Ontario.

The historical growth of this company exemplifies the hemispheric widening of free enterprise markets. The success of the Clairtone Corp. underlines the steady development of economic ties between Canada and the United States. Undoubtedly, this development serves the interests of both countries. It should be encouraged by public policy.

The Clairtone story represents an awareness of both economic self-interest and the resultant goodwill bred within and outside of the business community. The forward leadership of this typically fine concern reminds us anew of the great gains to be won through private economic undertakings on a world scale.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the budget that was presented to the Congress today is a bag of fiscal tricks. There are many uncertainties surrounding any budget submission made by a President of the United States, but the clouds of uncertainty surrounding this budget submission today are indeed very black. The underestimation of defense needs is visible on the surface. In addition, there are many new kinds of gimmicks used to show expenditures and revenues in an unrealistic light. Let us take revenues—first, the coin trick is used. We roll out the penny, call it a quarter and we have an increase in revenues of $1 billion—$2.4 billion in the sale of assets are evident immediately in the receipts in this budget. A sale of $1 billion from stockpiles and $3.6 billion of revenues from fiscal year 1968 are moved into the revenue column of fiscal year 1967.

Those and many other gimmicks are used in this budget to give the impression, a false impression, that our budget deficit for fiscal year 1967 is a mere $1.8 billion. The sad fact is, however, that the American people will not have the full picture on this budget until after the November elections of 1966.

Every year since President Eisenhower left the White House his Democratic successors have talked about progress toward a balanced budget. And every year we have progressed deeper and deeper in the other direction. President Kennedy's first deficit was over $6 billion. In his second year he stated flatly:

> **I am submitting for fiscal 1963 a balanced Federal budget.**

He won an ovation—but at yearend there was another deficit of over $6 billion. The following year it was over $8 billion. What President Johnson presented two Januaries ago as "an important first step toward a balanced budget" came out with another deficit of over $3 billion. And his fiscal 1966 deficit will be more than doubled.

The President is underestimating his expenditures considerably as far as the Vietnamese situation is concerned. I would like to point out that he also underestimated his expenditures in the fiscal 1966 budget. Last June when I stated on the floor of this House that those expenditures were underestimated by at least $5 billion, the Secretary of Defense immediately implied that I did not know what I was talking about.

The President now hedges in his budget message by saying:

> **If on the other hand the events in southeast Asia so develop that additional funds are required I will not hesitate to request the necessary sums and should that contingency arise, and should unforeseen inflationary conditions develop, I will propose such fiscal actions as are appropriate to maintain economic stability.**

The point is that many of us, particularly those of us serving on the Defense Appropriations Committee know full well what those plans may call for. It looks very possible and, yes, probable, that we will not only maintain our Defense Establishment at the level that it is being maintained in southeast Asia at the present time, but there will be considerably more men and troops involved in southeast Asia.

The contingencies that are necessary in order to fund these defense needs are not included in this budget submission.

We have before the Defense Appropriations Committee now the Johnson administration's request for over $12 billion in supplemental budget sums for fiscal year 1966. This figure does not even include all of the 1966 defense supplementals. Republicans in the minority report which we filed on the appropriation bill last June 17th anticipated most of these 1966 supplemental requests.

We have to give priority to our national security needs. It seems to me that the defense efforts being made by the United States in southeast Asia may very well be escalated by the administration. This administration is not being candid with the American people when the President tells them that our total budget expenditures for fiscal 1967 will be $112 billion and then tells them that the deficit will be only $1.8 billion when we are in fact moving into the 1967 revenue column $9 billion of revenue by the use of "gimmicks." I think he should tell the American people the true facts on what it will cost if it is necessary to assign manpower in the neighborhood of some 400,000 troops to Vietnam.

It seems to me that we are in a position here where the President is trying to give us "rifles and ruffles" at the same time in this 1967 budget, and I think we clearly have to have better priorities assigned. I think the American people are willing to pay the costs of national security protection and that sufficient funds will be made available by this Congress. What has happened is that we have had submitted to us today a budget that includes all of the "ruffles," knowing full well that the Congress will come back later and vote supplemental after supplemental in order to pay for the "rifles."

I think the President ought to lay his fiscal cards face up on the table, and inform the American people on the full costs of our national security commitments.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House and the Senate a very fine address by Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler, delivered last Tuesday, January 18, 1966, to a meeting of the New York State Industrial Payroll Savings Committee in New York City.

Secretary Fowler has done a splendid job of outlining for all Americans the major sources of strength and confidence now existent in our Nation's economy: namely, to quote him, "a flexible fiscal program, a dynamic private economy growing at a stable and healthy rate, and a disciplined restraint on the growth of Federal expenditures." He also cited in a cogent and clear manner, the results of President Johnson's unrelenting effort to maintain frugality in Federal expenditures, which better enables our country, in Mr. Fowler's words, "to carry on the fight for freedom in South Vietnam without abandoning the effort for the Great Society at home."

Secretary Fowler also, most appropriately, commended the 25th anniversary in 1966 of the U.S. savings bond program, which has as its target for this year the enrollment of 1,200,000 new employee participants in the payroll plan of the program. He read a letter from President Johnson in which the President directed him to take the necessary steps to arrange another increase in the interest rates for U.S. savings bonds. Secretary Fowler said that he hoped to be able to make this announcement in the near future.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to commend this excellent speech by Secretary Fowler to all my colleagues in the Congress. The text of the address follows:

REMARKS BY HON. HENRY H. FOWLER

We meet on behalf of a program whose symbol—the Minuteman of Concord—could not be more appropriate or more pertinent than it is today.

For the Minutemen of Concord took up arms to win, not only for themselves but for all the unborn generations of Americans to come, the freedom to live their own lives and pursue their dream of a Great Society in whose abundant life every man could share to the fullest measure of his ability and his desire.

Today, in southeast Asia, we take up arms to help others in their struggle for survival as a free and independent nation—and at home we labor to build for all Americans a society worthy to be called great.

There are those, as you know, who have felt that we must forgo the effort in Vietnam—just as there are those who have felt that, because of Vietnam, we must forgo our efforts here at home.

Last Wednesday, in his message on the state of the Union, President Johnson made abundantly clear that we need not, and will not, forgo either effort. At the same time, he stressed, the war in Vietnam means that, at home, "we cannot do all we should, or all we would like to do"—although we must, and will, continue to do all that we can.

Because of Vietnam, therefore, we must proceed at a slower speed and on a smaller scale toward meeting our needs at home—but proceed we can and proceed we must.

We can do so because our economic policies and programs in recent years have met with such signal success.

We can do so because our economy has flourished under a fiscal program designed to encourage strong and stable growth in the private economy through a combination of massive reductions in Federal tax rates and suitable restraints upon the growth of Federal expenditures.

Let us reflect for a moment on these three sources of strength and confidence—a flexible fiscal program, a dynamic private economy growing at a stable and healthy rate, and a disciplined restraint on the growth of Federal expenditures.

Increases in private investment and consumption have flowed from the investment tax credit of 1962 and its improvement in 1964, the liberalization of depreciation in 1962 and 1965, the record cut in personal and corporate income tax rates in the Revenue Act of 1964, and the broad program to abolish most Federal excise taxes adopted and begun in 1965. This year wage earners and investors are receiving tax reductions of around $20 billion as a result of these measures.

This fiscal policy was a major contributing factor to the resurgent economic performance of the last 5 years. Our gross national product has increased from a rate of $504 billion in the first quarter of 1961 to a $695 billion rate in the fourth quarter of 1965. This increase in our national output in less than 5 years—this icing on the cake—surpasses the total annual output of any other nation of the free world and continues to widen the already enormous gap between productive capacity of the Soviet Union and our own. Our expansion represents a rate of growth of about 5½ percent in constant dollars—more than double the rate of the preceding years that followed the termination of the Korean war—comparing favorably with that of Western Europe, which last year averaged around 3½ percent.

This rising economic activity—rising incomes and profits, rising sales and jobs, and rising investment and productivity—has meant rising revenues for our Federal, State, and local governments.

According to our estimates, administrative budget receipts under present law would be about $21 billion greater in fiscal 1966 than 5 years ago—more than double the increases in the previous half decade when there were no significant tax reductions.

But what about Federal expenditures—the third element?

President Johnson's unrelenting insistence, in his words, that "every dollar is spent with the thrift and with the commonsense which recognizes how hard the taxpayer worked in order to earn it" has amounted to a new policy of expenditure control. Here are some of the results:

1. The original estimated expenditure level of $98.8 billion in the 1964 budget was reduced $1.1 billion to an actual $97.7 billion.
2. An estimated $97.9 billion expenditures for fiscal 1965, ending last July 30, were reduced $1.4 billion to an actual $96.5 billion.
3. These actual expenditures for fiscal 1965 were $1.2 billion less than those in fiscal 1964 and $2.3 billion less than those originally projected for fiscal 1964.
4. The expenditure target for fiscal 1966 was fixed last January at $99.7 billion. Some $4.7 billion of additional expenditures resulting from accelerated military activity in Vietnam were unavoidable. Some $2 billion of uncontrollable or legislated expenditures also could not be avoided. These included $740 million of military and civilian pay increases voted by Congress in excess of Presidential recommendations, and additional $500 million increase in veterans' pensions, a $500 million increase in interest charges on the debt and a half billion each of payments required by law under the space and agricultural commodity programs. They more than wiped out economies realized since the original estimate.

In summary, had it not been for these unavoidable cost increases in Vietnam and the uncontrollable increases cited, the President in nearly 3 years in office would have held expenditures in the administrative budget to an increase of less than $1 billion more than the amount estimated for the fiscal year in which he assumed office. This should be compared with the average increase of $3 billion per year over the previous 10 years.

And yet during the same recent period, his stringent emphasis on cost reduction and program evaluation paid huge dividends by enabling the Nation to afford urgent new programs through savings on those of lesser urgency and through greater productivity in existing programs.

The national strength, confidence, and flexibility which the results of this fiscal program now provide enable us to carry on the fight for freedom in South Vietnam without abandoning the effort for the Great Society at home. This was the striking feature of the President's announcement of Wednesday night that the enactment of all his recommendations will entail a deficit in the administrative budget for fiscal 1967 of only $1.8 billion—the smallest in 7 years—and will give us a surplus of $500 million in the cash budget.

This will be true despite an increase in special costs of Vietnam of $10.4 billion in fiscal 1967 over the 1965 fiscal year level—a $5.8 billion increase in fiscal 1967 on top of an increase of $4.6 billion in fiscal 1966.

But the new budget represents more than a reflection—however bright—of past success. Above all, it represents a full recognition of, and an effective response to, the present need for fiscal responsibility if—at a time of increasing defense expenditures and active military operations added on top of a burgeoning private economy—we are to maintain strong and stable growth in an economy where the gap between demand and efficient production and supply has markedly narrowed.

The new program is based as before, on fiscal flexibility, a health economy, and a disciplined application of sound expenditure control policies.

The fiscal dividends in the form of increased revenues derived from a projected expansion of the economy in calendar 1966 to a gross national product slightly in excess of $720 billion—from a level of $675.6 billion in calendar 1965—will be applied to the increased requirements of South Vietnam.

A disciplined restraint in expenditures in the budget apart from special Vietnam costs is equally necessary. The answer—all other expenditures put together in the entire Federal budget are projected by the President to rise this coming fiscal year only $600 million—even though some segments of the budget in the field of education, health, and the war on poverty will be substantially increased. How? Because of stringent economies in the other less urgent areas of the budget.

But even these fiscal features are not enough. Even the application of the fiscal dividends from growth and from holding down the increases in the budget in the areas other than Vietnam operations will still leave a sizable deficit at a time when the economic and financial situation calls for avoiding additional stimulus to demand.

Fiscal flexibility is called for. It takes the form of a tax program that will increase Federal revenues in the administrative budget for fiscal 1966 by $1.2 billion and in fiscal 1967 by an additional $3.6 billion, for a total in fiscal 1967 of $4.8 billion—enough to bring the administrative deficit down to a tolerable figure ($1.8 billion) and produce a cash surplus of $500 million.

This program—summarized in the President's state of the Union message last Wednesday and spelled out in detail in my letter the following day to the chairmen of the taxwriting committees—would (a) modify income tax collection procedures, without increasing income tax rates or changing anyone's final income tax liabilities and (b) temporarily postpone the scheduled excise tax reductions on two items.

More specifically the program includes:

1. A speedup in the acceleration of corporate tax payments, which would simply telescope the acceleration timetable established by the Revenue Act of 1964 and move the completion date up from 1970 to 1967;

2. A delay in the 1966 and later scheduled reductions of automobile and telephone excise taxes—postponing for 2 years the staged reduction of these taxes and restoring them in the interim to the levels in effect at the end of 1965;

3. Replacement of the present 14-percent flat rate for income tax withholding on wages and salaries by a graduated, six-rate scale, so that wages withheld for income tax purposes would more closely approximate actual tax liabilities at the end of the taxable year;

4. Quarterly payment of social security taxes by self-employed taxpayers, to relieve them of the present obligation of making such payment in one lump sum after the end of the taxable year (which goes into the trust fund and does not affect the administrative budget).

The economic and financial effect of these measures, over the near term, would be to diminish the inflationary potential in the economy and raise Federal revenues to a point where we can project a near balanced budget in a near full employment economy.

These measures, we believe, should furnish some restraining influence against any potential excessive economic exuberance without harming the continued healthy growth of our economy—and we must, in our zeal to avoid the onslaught of inflation, take care that in trying to prevent the disease we do not imperil the patient. At the same time, we all recognize that the most present danger before us—whose avoidance will require our most wary and watchful vigilance—is the danger of economic excess, not economic deficiency.

The President has, time and again, declared his determination to use every resource available to him to maintain our economic momentum free of inflation. He made plain last Wednesday, that—and I quote—"if the necessities of Vietnam require it, I will not hesitate to return to the Congress for additional appropriations, or additional revenues if they are needed."

Today, therefore, in clear contrast to the situation at any time over the past 5 years, the economic realities call for increased restraint on the part of us all—for continued cooperation between both the public and private sectors in adapting their plans and programs to current economic circumstances.

In particular, let me stress the fact that, while the Government can do a great deal to create a climate to encourage noninflationary growth, it is upon the shoulders of our businesses and our unions that the responsibility squarely rests for pursuing noninflationary price and wage policies. And today—when we fight a brutal war in Vietnam—it is imperative that wage and price increases remain within the guideposts set by the President's Council of Economic Advisers—or we run the grave risk of squandering the gains for which we have all worked so hard and so long and of undermining the economic strength which must support, not only the struggle in Vietnam, but our efforts elsewhere in the world and here at home.

In the days and months ahead, therefore, all of us—in Government and in the private sector—must bear an extra burden of responsibility in a national effort to keep a sure and steady economic footing while we continue to move ahead. And there is a special sense in which you here today can help in that effort—for now more than ever it is essential that we finance our debt without inflation, and now more than ever it is essential that we do all we can to encourage greater savings throughout our economy.

Through the payroll savings program—on whose behalf we meet today—we accomplish both these ends at once.

The first principle of debt management is, of course, to keep the debt from growing to an unmanageable size—and nowhere is our success in doing that better illustrated than in the budgets President Johnson has presented and carried out, and most particularly in the budget he will shortly present for fiscal 1967.

Let me simply cite the record: The 1964 budget submitted 3 years ago forecast a deficit of $11.9 billion premised in part on major tax reduction. This was reduced in the final outcome to $8.2 billion for the fiscal year 1964.

Last year's budget contained an estimated deficit for fiscal 1965 of $6.3 billion. This was trimmed down to $3.4 billion.

The budget submitted last January projected a $5.3 billion deficit for fiscal 1966. As of June 30, this estimate has been cut to $4.2 billion. Had it not been for the additional defense needs resulting from Vietnam, the higher revenues that are flowing from our vigorous expansion since June 30 would have produced a still smaller estimated deficit in the current fiscal year.

Had it not, in fact, been for the increases projected for Vietnam expenditures in fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967 since the 1966 budget was originally submitted last January, we could have used the fiscal dividends of this continued expansion to balance the budget in fiscal 1967 and still had room for some increases in civilian expenditures or additional tax reduction.

As a result of this record of expenditure control, Treasury demands on our capital markets have not been—and will not be—as great as many have expected. And, in the future as in the past, we will continue—consistent with minimum cost and other debt management objectives—to place our debt in the most noninflationary manner possible.

Our entire debt increase in calendar 1965 was financed outside the banking system—despite the sharp step-up in spending for Vietnam. Indeed, commercial bank holdings of Treasury issues steadily declined by several billions of dollars during the last year.

The savings bonds program, as you know, is vital to the success of our debt management policy—and in the months ahead it could prove one of our most valuable weapons in averting inflation.

The fact that E and H bonds outstanding now account for some 23 percent—or $49 billion—of the entire publicly held Federal debt is an abundant indication both of the importance of savings bonds to Federal debt management and of the tremendous job done by the corps of volunteers—whose dedication and abilities are not better exemplified than they are here today—who have advanced the savings bonds program.

Each of you, by your leadership in one of America's great industries, is making a substantial contribution to the stability and strength of our economy. By your presence here today—by your willingness to take a leading part in encouraging greater participation in the payroll savings plan in your own companies—you are adding immeasurably to that contribution.

The results of last year's campaign are impressive. There were some one-and-a-quarter million new participants in the payroll savings plan. Of that number, some 180,881 were employees of the companies represented on our U.S. Industrial Payroll Savings Committee. As a result, the overall sale of the payroll-saver bonds—that is, the $25 to $200 denominations— is today running at a rate of more than $3 billion annually, accounting for some 68 percent of the E and H Bond sales dollar.

In this new year of 1966—in this silver anniversary year of the savings bond program—our target and your mission is to enroll 1,200,000 new employee participants in the payroll plan.

The challenge is clear: next year more people will be at work than ever before—and at higher wages and salaries. And while no one can say how many new jobs we will have next year, let no one underestimate the job-creating capacity of our economy—which has generated some 2.7 million new nonfarm jobs over the past year, and some 8 million new nonfarm jobs over the past 5 years.

In little more than a month, our economy will enter its sixth year of unbroken expansion, and during the year unemployment should fall appreciably below what has been our interim target of 4 percent. As a result, many thousands of Americans will just be reaching a threshold of financial well-being that will enable them, for the first time, to take part in a program of systematic savings. At the same time, there are many thousands of current savers who will be financially able to save more than they do now—and who will do so with the proper encouragement.

As all of us know, the task of tapping this enormous potential for saving through the payroll savings plan—and thus lessening the inflationary potential within the economy as well as helping both the sound management of the public debt and the establishment of habits of thrift among our citizens—has been made particularly difficult by the sharp disparity that has recently developed between rates of return on savings bonds and on private savings accounts.

In this connection, I am privileged to read you a letter I have just received from the President:

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Over the years, one of the strongest links between this Government and its citizenry has been the U.S. savings bonds program. Born in the critical days before our entry into the Second World War, this program has been, for the Government, a vital source of noninflationary financing for needed Government programs. For the public, it has provided a matchless means for accumulating savings with absolute safety, and with an attractive rate of return.

"A successful savings bonds program is of particular urgency at this time—facing as we do a firm commitment to the defense of freedom in Vietnam and a strongly rising economy at home. We must not, and will not, at this juncture, permit our strength to be sapped by inflation.

"Today, above all, is a time for all Americans to rededicate themselves to the spirit that animated the minutemen of Concord—who serve as the symbol of the savings bonds program. For today, as at the founding of our Nation, it is freedom which is at stake. Not all of us are called upon to fight in the jungles of Vietnam—but while our men are there in the frontlines of a distant land, none of us can remain aloof on the sidelines. We must all do our share—in every way we can—to support our men in Vietnam. One sure way is open to all Americans through the savings bonds program.

"On several occasions during the postwar period it has been necessary to improve the rate of return on savings bonds in view of the higher rates available to many savers in various private savings accounts. The last change was made in 1959. To have failed to make those adjustments would have been a disservice both to the Government and to the public at large—risking inflationary dangers, complicating the task of managing our Government finances, and depriving millions of small savers of a reasonable rate of return on their funds entrusted to the Government.

"We are again at a point where rates available on a variety of alternative forms of savings have moved above the rate now paid on U.S. savings bonds. At the same time, we are at a point where maximum savings are vital to our national welfare—indeed, to our national future. Another increase in rate on those bonds is now timely.

"In order to sustain and enlarge the vital role of the savings bonds program, I therefore direct you to set in motion the necessary machinery for raising the interest rate on these bonds as of the earliest feasible date. Please submit to me as soon as possible your specific recommendations.

"As in past rate changes, I would like you to make appropriate rate adjustments on outstanding savings bonds as well, so that no current bondholder need cash in his current holdings in order to gain the advantage of the attractive new rate, and no prospective buyer need feel that he should delay his purchase to await the higher rate.

"Sincerely,

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON."

I hope we will be able to announce something soon to give added incentive to your efforts—which, as I cannot stress too often, are doubly crucial in this year 1966.

I know, however, that there are few more encouraging incentives—to those of us at Treasury and, I am sure, to all of you who will be working with him—than to know that the campaign in New York enjoys the able and dedicated direction of James F. Oates, Jr., who is responsible for this meeting today.

I have every confidence that you Mr. Oates, and George Champion—directing the New York Metropolitan area campaign—and John Lockton, as chairman of the State committee—will again exercise your considerable abilities and influence towards another total E and H bond sales figure for New York of more than a half billion dollars.

I know, too, Mr. Oates, how happy you must be to have as members of your team three "old pros" at payroll savings like Hal Geneen, Frank Milliken, and Elmer Engstrom—all former chairmen of our industrial payroll committee—each of whom enabled our program to take giant strides forward.

I know you all realize how much your efforts can help to bolster the Nation's financial position and steady its economic footing at a time when stability and strength are more imperative than ever.

I know that you will do all you can—and that is a great deal indeed.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR THE VETERAN

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress is the Congress which has demonstrated better than any of its predecessors its firm commitment to education, to equality of opportunity, and to the elimination of poverty. We are the Congress which has attempted most valiantly, through such efforts as Project Head Start, the Elementary and Secondary Education and the Higher Education Acts of 1965, to break the cycle of poverty which engulfs too many Americans and to insure them the right to as much education as they are capable of receiving. We are the Congress which, through the Manpower Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, has brought economic and educational opportunity to many other Americans. We are the Congress which has given concrete expression to the great national concern for the aged, the handicapped, the unemployed, and the educationally and culturally deprived. Yet, when we adjourned barely 2 months ago, we left a great social injustice unredressed.

Equality of opportunity is very close to the essence of democracy and it is a concept which we regard most highly. But we pay only lip service to the concept if, in our attempts to guarantee equal opportunity, we continue to exclude a whole segment of our population.

The men who defend our country perform an inestimable service to the Nation. They interrupt the normal pursuits of continuing their education or entering a career in order to secure her safety. For 2 to 4 years they put themselves at her disposal to be sent wherever they are needed and to do whatever is required of them. Many must risk and give their lives in South Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic, others dot the perimeter of the free world prepared to defend freedom if it is endangered and still others serve their country here at home. All of these men make extreme personal sacrifices in order to fulfill their military obligation.

The extent of their sacrifice becomes most apparent when they leave the service. When our young men lay aside their uniforms they face a civilian world much different from the one they left. The increasing demands of the labor market are for workers who have a solid education, advanced training or years of experience, and our cold war veterans find that they cannot compete with the more than half of the draft-age men who did not serve. It is apparent that without some kind of readjustment assistance our exservicemen have little chance of reentering the mainstream of American life. If they are to be self-supporting citizens then they must have a chance to regain the educational and training opportunities they lost.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which will give our servicemen that chance. The Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act is similar in content and purpose to the World War II and the Korean GI bills. It is designed to help the cold war veterans, those men discharged since January 31, 1955, make the difficult transition back to civilian life. In view of the fact that the cost of college tuition has doubled since 1952 and that the cost of living has greatly risen, the educational allowances under the bill, identical with those under the Korean GI bill, are not at all lavish. They will pay a much smaller percentage of the cold war veterans education or training than they did for the Korean veteran.

The cold war GI bill also contains a provision for home- and farm-loan assistance. A distinctive feature of the new loan program, however, is that the cold war veteran must pay a small fee before he may receive a direct loan or loan guarantee. Such fees would cover any losses which might occur under the program. The loan program of the cold war GI bill also differs from previous programs in that it does not include the business loans and the insured loans made available to the World War II and the Korean veterans. It is intended rather to help the veteran resettle his family as they too readjust to civilian life.

The success of the World War II and the Korean Readjustment Assistance Acts and the fine academic record which our veterans have left reinforce arguments for a cold war GI bill. The World

War II legislation, for example, enriched the American economy with 450,000 engineers, 180,000 doctors, dentists, and nurses, 360,000 schoolteachers, 107,000 lawyers, 711,000 mechanics, and 138,000 electricians. The list goes on and on because nearly 7,800,000 veterans received education and training under the GI bill. Not only that—the $14.5 billion cost of the program has been repaid in the form of taxes paid by higher earning veterans. These taxes add another billion dollars to the U.S. Treasury each year. The Korean GI bill repeats this success story with almost twice as large a percentage of veterans enrolled in college as under the World War II bill.

Equally impressive are the contributions which the veterans were able to make to the educational life of the country. One college president—Dr. Eric A. Walker, president of Pennsylvania State University—said this about the veteran students:

> (They) have shown themselves to be better students than nonveterans through their more serious application to their studies, through their earning of higher grades, through their smaller dropout rates, through their better discipline, through their better citizenship, and through their increased ability to assume responsibility.

The maturity, seriousness, and single-mindedness which the veterans brought to the classroom impelled another college head—Dr. Robert L. Sumwalt, president, University of South Carolina—to remark:

> The true objectives of higher education were never more evident than when the veterans were on our campus.

Many educators would agree that the presence of the veteran students in the schools and colleges precipitated a general upgrading of our educational system.

Mr. Speaker, we have every reason to believe that the cold war veterans would carry on this tradition of excellence. We owe them at least the opportunity to try. If we withhold from them the means whereby they can complete their education we discriminate against them. We tell them in effect that the service which they have given their country is a misfortune from which they will suffer perhaps for the rest of their lives. So long as there is a compulsory draft, so long as only some of our young men are forced to subordinate their right of self-determination to the common good, we must compensate these men for their loss. Justice compels us.

I do not conceive educational and training assistance as a reward for the fulfillment of an obligation or for the physical risk to which a man subjects his person. I do not believe that a serviceman must put his life and limb in jeopardy to qualify for readjustment assistance. The World War II and the Korean GI bills applied to all servicemen, not only to those who served in the frontlines but also to those who served safely here at home. The purpose of the bills was simply to assist the veterans in returning to civilian life and to help them catch up with their contemporaries. That is also the purpose of the cold war GI bill.

We are a stronger, greatly enriched Nation today because of the skilled and professional manpower, the educated citizens and the capable leaders we gained through the GI bills. Certainly legislation which extends the same opportunities to cold war veterans is in the national interest. The cold war GI bill is more than simply a good investment, however, it is the assurance which the American people wish to give their servicemen that the defenders of democracy will not be excluded from participation in it. It is the expression of our determination to attain genuine equality of opportunity.

I strongly urge my fellow Congressmen to support this important legislation. For now more than ever before the need for a cold war GI bill is clear, compelling, and urgent.

A PARTNERSHIP

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, everyone agrees that the tasks facing the new Secretary of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development are gigantic. I wish Dr. Weaver success. Along with others, I believe that he is the right man in the right place.

In one of his books, Dr. Weaver has said:

> We must avoid doctrinaire approaches. There are no simple answers. Indeed, there are few single answers or pat solutions which will be effective.

In dealing with the situations confronting us in the transition from a rural to an urban nation, "we shall attempt," in the words of Dr. Weaver, "to meet the problems involved through a partnership between private enterprise and government, but what we develop will be an indigenous American product, responsive to our people, institutions, and resources."

Typical of editorials across the land which have created the appointment of Dr. Weaver is one in the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 15, which I submit for publication in the RECORD:

THE PRESIDENT PICKS WEAVER

Because Robert C. Weaver will be the first Negro to serve in the Cabinet, this factor was given major mention in his announced appointment as Secretary of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

A great deal more stress is due his qualifications for the post. President Kennedy wanted him to head the new Department when it was first proposed in 1961. Now President Johnson agrees that he has the "talent, ability, and experience" that fit him for the job.

Actually, Weaver has been Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency since the beginning of the Kennedy administration, and that agency will form the core of the new Department. His experiences with Federal housing problems has shown him the impracticability and awkwardness of a semiautonomous status for the Federal Housing Administration and the Public Housing Administration.

As head of the Housing and Urban Development Department, Weaver will have direct control over these two key agencies, and greater efficiency should result.

Federal-urban relationships have continued to grow, and the new Department should be helpful in channeling Federal aid to the cities more effectively and less cumbrously than in the past. There is evidence that more attention will be paid by the Johnson administration to slum rehabilitation—and to the rehabilitation, too, of dispossessed slum residents.

THE BANK MERGER BILL—H.R. 12173

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week the House Banking and Currency Committee agreed to report a banker merger bill. The report is due to be filed tonight, and I have appended to the report my dissenting views on the proposed legislation.

I am opposed to the new, untried, and vague standards which the bill would create and by which bank mergers are to be evaluated. I am opposed to the so-called forgiveness provisions which constitute special legislation for a few banks found by the courts to be in violation of the antitrust laws. I am opposed to the provision of the bill permitting any Federal banking agency approving a merger which is subsequently challenged by the Department of Justice to intervene in the suit by its own counsel and thereby oppose and obstruct the Attorney General in the performance of his duties.

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD the text of my dissenting opinion to the report accompanying the bank merger bill, H.R. 12173:

DISSENTING VIEWS OF HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ, OF TEXAS, ON H.R. 12173

I dissent from the view expressed in the report on the proposed bank merger bill, H.R. 12173. My disagreement rests principally on three grounds:

1. I am in favor of uniformity in the law, but against vagueness. A vague uniform law is at least as undesirable as several different ones. The language of H.R. 12173 acknowledging that the general principle of the antitrust laws and creating an exception in cases where a merger is so beneficial to "the convenience and needs of the community to be served" that it would be in the public interest to permit it, is as vague and undefined a standard as any group of men could possibly dream up.

I agree with Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach that the differences in standards applied by the banking agencies and by the courts have been vastly overstated. A reading of the cases, in fact, will reveal that the standards applied by the courts are no different from those specified under the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

In my opinion, therefore, there is a serious question as to whether a public purpose is being served by enacting any legislation on this subject at this time. Frankly, the burden of establishing the need for such far reaching legislation resting on the proponents, I have not been convinced that there is any genuine need for the proposed law, despite the fury and histrionics that have accompanied the various bills in this 89th Congress.

But even assuming the need for a law, it is one thing to enact uniform standards. But it is another thing to enact new and untested standards, and vague ones at that. What exactly is meant by the phrase "the convenience and needs of the community to be served?" If it has a precise meaning it should have been spelled out in the bill. If it was intended to provide a ball of wax for any administrator to stick his finger into and pull out an exception, it could not have been done better.

2. No compelling reasons were demonstrated during the hearings to forgive past mergers already found by the courts to be in violation of the antitrust laws. What we are doing by this bill is enacting a special law for the banks involved in the three mergers which are receiving forgiveness.

3. The bill would permit any Federal banking agency approving a merger which has subsequently been challenged by the Department of Justice to appear in the suit by its own counsel and present the court the reasons for its action. In effect, this encourages Federal agencies to intervene in a law suit instituted by the Department of Justice for the purpose of opposing the Department of Justice. This is a bad precedent, one that fragmentizes the authority of the Attorney General to enforce the law, and one that could lead to much internecine squabbling amongst separate agencies of the Federal Government.

For all of these reasons, I am in disagreement with the majority report and am opposed to the bill, H.R. 12173, that has been reported out of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN ESTABLISHES SCHOLARSHIPS IN HONOR OF HIS PARENTS, LAWRENCE F. AND MYRA T. O'BRIEN, FOR GRADUATES OF CATHEDRAL HIGH AND WESTERN NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE, SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, more than 3,000 persons gathered in the Better Living Center at the Eastern States Exposition grounds in West Springfield, Mass., last November 10 for a gala homecoming reception for Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien. Among the honored guests for this magnificent and well-deserved banquet in honor of one of Springfield's famous sons, Larry O'Brien, were Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Gov. John A. Volpe, and Gov. John H. King, of New Hampshire.

Last week the new Postmaster General and former White House assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson announced the creation of the O'Brien Memorial Scholarship Fund in honor of his parents, the late Lawrence F. and Myra T. O'Brien, of Springfield. The fund is to be established from the proceeds of the Larry O'Brien homecoming dinner. Postmaster General O'Brien is to be commended for this noble gesture, for he not only perpetuates the memory of his late beloved parents who were very much admired in Springfield, but he does it through scholarships which will benefit those who need it most, the worthy but financially distressed graduates of Larry O'Brien's alma maters, Cathedral High School and Western New England College, both in Springfield.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I include with my remarks at this point in the RECORD an editorial of January 21 and a news story of January 20 on this scholarship fund from the Springfield Daily News:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Jan. 21, 1966]

SCHOLARSHIP HELP

Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien's magnanimous gesture in establishing two scholarship awards here should be applauded.

One scholarship will be awarded annually to a graduating senior at Cathedral High. The second will go annually to a student entering or attending Western New England College. Both will be for $500, and derived from the proceeds of a native-son banquet here last November honoring Mr. O'Brien on his elevation to the Cabinet.

Mr. O'Brien sets a good example. No one makes a better contribution to the future of the Nation than the public-spirited citizen who helps with education. Quite often, a financial assist is what is needed most to enable some qualified student to realize and perfect his talents. The O'Brien scholarships will most likely add substantially to the hopes of students now and still to come for advancement to education on the college level.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Jan. 20, 1966]

EDUCATIONAL FUND HERE ESTABLISHED BY O'BRIEN—POSTAL CHIEF USES PROCEEDS OF NOVEMBER DINNER TO AID CATHEDRAL, WNE STUDENTS

Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien today announced the creation of the O'Brien Memorial Scholarship Fund in honor of his parents, the late Lawrence F. and Myra T. O'Brien of this city.

The fund was created from the proceeds of a homecoming dinner held for the Postmaster General last November 10. The scholarship fund amounts to approximately $20,000.

Under the terms of the fund, two scholarships of $500 each will be awarded annually. One will go to a member of the Cathedral High School graduating class, and one to a student at or entering Western New England College.

The scholarship winners will be selected by their respective schools and no member of the O'Brien family will participate in the selection.

The Postmaster General is a graduate of Cathedral High School and Springfield division of Northeastern University, predecessor to Western New England College. He has been awarded honorary doctorate degrees from both Northeastern University and Western New England College.

"I am tremendously grateful to all my friends in Massachusetts who made this scholarship fund possible," Mr. O'Brien said. "My father and mother would be pleased to know that their memory will be honored in this manner."

Some 3,000 persons from all over Massachusetts attended the O'Brien homecoming dinner held at the Better Living Center, West Springfield, last November. It was the largest event of its kind ever held in western Massachusetts. Among the dignitaries at the dinner were Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, Speaker of the House JOHN MCCORMACK, and Gov. John Volpe.

AIRLIFT FOR APO MAIL OVERSEAS AND DUTY-FREE GIFTS

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, last fall when I was in Europe with several members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on a review of the postal services of the Armed Forces and of European countries, we found that the lack of fast APO mail services and duty-free gifts from the servicemen to their families were the two major problems which servicemen overseas were justified in complaining about most frequently.

I agree 100 percent with the position taken by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the report on our European trip, that both of these problems should be corrected by legislation immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored legislation to correct both of these problems and am hopeful that we will obtain immediate consideration.

AIRLIFT FOR APO MAIL

Letter mail airlifted between the United States and fleet post offices is delivered in 1 day to London, 2 days to bases in Europe, and 3 days to most other locations. Letter mail sent by surface transportation to Army and Air Force post offices in Europe requires a minimum of 30 days.

I am sponsoring legislation to provide new authority permitting transportation by air between the United States and overseas military post offices of mail classified as first-class letter mail, second-class publications having current news value, and fourth-class parcels not exceeding 5 pounds in weight and 60 inches in length and girth combined.

This legislation will apply to any individual, civilian or military, receiving or sending mail at an Armed Forces post office overseas when the regular rate of postage for surface transportation is used.

DUTY-FREE GIFTS

My bill, H.R. 12218, will permit members of our Armed Forces serving outside the United States to send to their families duty-free gifts not exceeding $100. The law now states that gifts, in order to be duty free, must not exceed $10 in value.

Christmas for military families at home while the fathers are overseas is not one of the better ways to spend Christmas. Those who had to pay duty at the local post office for their Christmas presents are justified in being a little bitter, and I do not blame them. Had the presents been under $10 each and shipped in separate boxes on separate days, there would have been no duty.

My colleagues will recall a similar law which was in effect during World War II, so I am hopeful that we can get early action on H.R. 12218.

SHRIVER MEETS PROBLEMS OF POVERTY

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago this House concerned itself with a bold new international idea—the Peace Corps. Less than 2 years ago we created an equally bold approach to domestic problems—the war on poverty.

Both have succeeded under administration as sure and imaginative as their concepts due to the dynamism and creative appeal of the same administrator.

Sargent Shriver has succeeded, I believe, because he sparks the best ideas, attracts the best people, attempts new approaches and establishes new precedents. Under two Presidents, he has created a feeling of excitement about government service that this city has seldom seen. Men and women of verve and imagination have found Government a profession of purpose and honor because of Mr. Shriver's leadership.

The Peace Corps will never lose his personal imprint and he is able to leave it now with the certain knowledge that it could not be in healthier condition.

As the war on poverty expands, and it must, it will require more and more of Mr. Shriver's time. Two years ago that program was nothing more than a legislative idea. A year ago it was a hard-driving, inspirational leader and a skeleton staff. Today, it has evolved overwhelming changes in the national condition.

Millions of America's poor are participating in health and education programs, in job training and work experience, in homemaking classes and consumer education projects, in legal service programs, in tutorial sessions and adult literacy classes, in community betterment and neighborhood organization—in an enormous variety of programs designed to meet the specific needs of a thousand communities throughout the country.

The war on poverty is no old-fashioned dole. It is a plan for change which requires the active participation of the poor as well as the service of their fellow citizens. It does not seek to make the poor content with their condition by offering temporary relief. Rather, it provides the means for permanent improvements which will benefit the national community as much as the individual poor.

This is no easy task; most men would readily step aside when the leadership of such an undertaking is proffered. Luckily, Sargent Shriver is not like most men and I commend him as highly as I might for accepting the increasing burdens of America's most ambitious domestic effort.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Jones of Alabama (at the request of Mr. Mills), for the balance of the week, on account of death in the family.

Mr. Hathaway (at the request of Mr. Albert), for the rest of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. Murphy of New York (at the request of Mr. Dow), for today through Wednesday, January 26, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Reuss, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Weltner, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, January 25, 1966.

Mr. Mills, for 1 hour, on Thursday next.

Mr. Mahon, for 20 minutes, today, after the reading of the President's budget message.

Mr. Bow, for 10 minutes, today at the conclusion of Mr. Mahon's remarks.

Mr. Cramer, for 5 minutes, today, following the budget message of the President and the remarks of Mr. Bow; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee, for 3 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Halpern, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Halpern, for 15 minutes, on Tuesday, January 25.

Mr. Laird, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hanna) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Gallagher, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Pucinski, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, January 25.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Weltner.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Hosmer.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hanna) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.

Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Celler.

Mr. Annunzio.

Mr. Bingham.

Mr. Rodino.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 327. An act to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8210. An act to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act with respect to the European Space Research Organization; and

H.R. 8445. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 767. An act authorizing the President to proclaim National Ski Week.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 25, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1927. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a report covering the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year 1965; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1928. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Elton P. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1929. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) transmitting a report of certain construction projects for the Air National Guard, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1), and pursuant to the authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1930. A letter from the Secretary of Defense transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1931. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of aluminum from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1932. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting the final report of the accomplishments of the Area Redevelopment Administration, during fiscal year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87–27; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1933. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting correspondence explaining the delay in submitting the overall economic development plan for Guam due to be transmitted on or about January 7, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88–170; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1934. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

1935. A letter from the secretary treasurer, Congressional Medal of Honor Society, United States of America, transmitting the annual financial report for the calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88–504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1936. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the settlement of claims against the District of Columbia by officers and employees of the District of Columbia for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1937. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, transmitting report of position in grades 16, 17, and 18, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84–854; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1938. A letter from the Secretary, U.S. Tariff Commission, transmitting the 49th annual report of the U.S. Tariff Commission, pursuant to the provisions of section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER: Committee on Science and Astronautics. A report on the National Science Foundation, a general review of its first 15 years; without amendment (Rept. No. 1219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER: Committee on Science and Astronautics. A report on master planning of NASA installations (1st interim); without amendment (Rept. No. 1220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 12173. A bill to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 12238. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for additional technological research; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 12239. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude disability pensions from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 12240. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 12241. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 12242. A bill to provide for the authorization of funds to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 12243. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase by $750 million the authorization of appropriation for the fiscal year of 1967, and to authorize payment to be made to States for retirement of certain bonds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 12244. A bill to amend section 1821 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem, mileage, and subsistence allowances of witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12245. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12246. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 12247. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 12248. A bill to appropriate funds to initiate and to complete preconstruction planning of the Cape Fear River, above Wilmington, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 12249. A bill to appropriate funds to complete preconstruction planning, to start site acquisition, and to initiate construction of the New Hope Reservoir project, North Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 12250. A bill to appropriate funds to complete preconstruction planning of the Carolina Beach and vicinity project, North Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 12251. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 12252. A bill to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 12253. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 12254. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12255. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for the free importation of certain specialized educational equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 12256. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 12257. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 12258. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 12259. A bill to strengthen State and local governments, to provide the States with additional financial resources to improve elementary and secondary education by returning a portion of the Federal revenue to the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 12260. A bill to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 12261. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 12262. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1969, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 12263. A bill to amend the act providing financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families in order to provide financial assistance for the education of orphans and other children lacking parental support; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12264. A bill to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12265. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 12266. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to make discrimination because of age in employment an unlawful employment practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12267. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 12268. A bill to provide educational assistance for veterans who have served in the Armed Forces since October 1, 1963; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 12269. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 12270. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the 12th World Jamboree and Conference of Boy Scouts to be held in the United States in 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 12271. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to prevent loss of veteran pension benefits as a result of increases in social security benefit payments under the Social Security Amendments of 1965; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 12272. A bill to amend section 902(b) and 902(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the 50-percent requirement to 25 percent between first and second levels and to include third level foreign corporations in the tax credit structure if the 25-percent test is met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.J. Res. 807. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.J. Res. 808. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.J. Res. 809. Joint resolution providing for the observance of Memorial Day and Independence Day on days other than those now fixed by law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 810. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 8th day of September of each year as International Literacy Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.J. Res. 811. Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 557. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H. Con. Res. 558. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LOVE:

H. Con. Res. 559. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 560. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 561. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 562. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BELL:

H. Res. 683. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the operation of the Economic Opportunity Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 684. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 685. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 12273. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Pipilas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 12274. A bill for the relief of Sandy Kyriacoula Georgopoulos and Anthony Georgopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 12275. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Doris C. Shannon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 12276. A bill for the relief of Etelka Molnar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 12277. A bill for the relief of Hae Soo Pyun and In Sook Pyun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12278. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Simoes Barboso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12279. A bill for the relief of Jose de Paiva Costa Rita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 12280. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Benes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12281. A bill for the relief of Jesus Aurelio Miranda-Arguelles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 12282. A bill for the relief of Rosario Furnari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12283. A bill for the relief of Audley F. Timol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12284. A bill for the relief of Clyde O. Timol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12285. A bill for the relief of Neville Barrington Timol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 12286. A bill for the relief of Teresita Gorostica Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

318. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to providing universities to be erected and operated by the U.S. Government, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

Monday, January 24, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Father of all Mercies: again we come before Thee, standing in the need of prayer. We have not always recognized this need. We have thought ourselves equipped and adequate for whatever the day might bring forth.

But this day brings forth such massive responsibilities, raises such tangled problems, presents such complex moral demands, that we are driven to seek a wisdom and power beyond our own.

Where else can we turn but to Thee, O God; for Thou alone hast the words of eternal life that give meaning to our mortal years, and answer to the questions that taunt us.

Enable us, then, to receive Thy good gift of understanding as we turn to the duties at hand, cast out the pride and prejudice that could preempt our minds and leave no capacity for thinking Thy thoughts after Thee.

May there be in the deeds and decisions of this day some quality that will yield evidence that we have wrought in the strength of prayer that has been heard on high.

In the name of Him who taught us to pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 20,1966, was dispensed with.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, a Senator from the State of Washington, attended the session of the Senate today.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 327. An act to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8210. An act to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act with respect to the European Space Research Organization; and

H.R. 8445. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the executive calendar.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James S. Duesenberry, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Authorization of Appropriations for Procurement of Aircraft, Missiles, Naval Vessels, and Tracked Combat Vehicles for the Armed Forces

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Officers Assigned or Detailed to Permanent Duty at the Seat of Government

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of December 31, 1965, there was an aggregate of 2,214 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Chapter 7, Title 37, U.S. Code To Authorize a Dislocation Allowance for Certain Travel

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize a dislocation allowance for travel performed under orders that are later canceled, revoked, or modified (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Property Acquisitions of Emergency Supplies and Equipment

A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Office of the Secretary of the Army, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ended December 31, 1965; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Department of Defense Procurement From Small and Other Business Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for July-November 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Amendment of Small Business Act

A letter from the Executive Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Small Business Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Proposed Amendment of Natural Gas Act To Give the Federal Power Commission Jurisdiction Over Direct Industrial Sales of Natural Gas

A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., expressing his dissension with a draft of proposed legislation submitted by Mr. Joseph C. Swidler, on April 12, 1965, to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act, which would provide the Federal Power Commission with jurisdiction over direct sales by interstate pipelines of natural gas to industrial customers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

District of Columbia Licensing Procedures Act

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise and modernize procedures relating to the licensing by the District of Columbia of persons engaged in certain occupations, professions, businesses, trades, and callings, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Expenditure of Appropriated Funds for Insurance Covering the Operation of Motor Vehicles in Foreign Countries

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the expenditure of appropriated funds for insurance covering the operation of motor vehicles in foreign countries (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Disposal of Excess Property in Foreign Countries

A letter from the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on the disposal of excess property in foreign countries, for the calendar year 1965; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports of Acting Comptroller General

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the use of contractor-furnished personnel in violation of statutes governing Federal employment, Post Office Department, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on hospital and surgical-medical insurance benefits available under Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans, Department of Public Health, District of Columbia government, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1965, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of controls over utilization and procurement of photographic equipment at the Sandia Laboratory, Albuquerque, N. Mex., Atomic Energy Commission, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of efforts to collect debts resulting from default of guaranteed housing loans, Veterans' Administration, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need for increased efforts to minimize rental delinquencies on acquired properties, Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on the examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1965, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on followup review of adjustments made in fees charged for summer homesites on national forest lands. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Matters Contained in the Helium Act

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on matters contained in the Helium Act (Public Law 86–777), for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Laws Enacted by Legislature of the Virgin Islands

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, in its 1965 regular and special sessions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Reports on Final Settlement of Claims of Certain Indians

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Shoshone Tribe of Indians of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., Docket No. 157 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Southern Paiute Nation et al., docket Nos. 88, 330, and 330–A (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Seminole Nation, Docket No. 205 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claims of the Iowa Tribe of the Iowa Reservation in Kansas and Nebraska, the Iowa Tribe of the Iowa Reservation in Oklahoma, et al., Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, et al., the Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, the Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri, Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa, et al., docket Nos. 138 and 339 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Act Establishing the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of November 8, 1965 (79 Stat. 1295) establishing the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Section 1821, Title 28, United States Code, To Increase the Per Diem, Mileage, and Subsistance Allowances of Witnesses

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1821 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem, mileage, and subsistence allowances of witnesses (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Settlement of Claims Against the District of Columbia by Certain Officers and Employees of the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the settlement of claims against the District of Columbia by officers and employees of the District of Columbia for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reports on Petitions To Accord First Preference Status of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on petitions to accord first preference status to certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reports on Positions in Grades GS–16, 17, and 18

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in the General Accounting Office in grades GS–16, 17, and 18, for the calendar year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS–16 and 17, in that Department, for the calendar year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, Chicago, Ill., tranamitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The President pro tempore appointed Mr. Monroney and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. **RANDOLPH**, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

H.R. 6845. An act to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act (Rept. No. 951).

AUTHORIZATION OF A STUDY OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. **MUSKIE**, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 205) authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 205

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by subsection 1(g)(2)(D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, including an evaluation of studies, reports, and recommendations made thereon and submitted to the Congress by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86–380, approved by the President on September 24, 1959.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $137,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL STAFF AND FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 952)

Mr. **MUSKIE** (for Mr. McNamara), from the Committee on Public Works, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 206) providing additional staff and funds for the Committee on Public Works, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 206

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to flood control, navigation, rivers and harbors, roads and highways, water pollution, air pollution, public buildings, and all features of water resource development and economic growth.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $110,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 2809. A bill for the relief of Lim Ai Ran and Lim Soo Ran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. Bayh):

S. 2810. A bill for the relief of Max Ratibor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. Smathers):

S. 2811. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Robert W. Stewart, Jr., U.S. Air Force;

S. 2812. A bill for the relief of Agnes C. Stowe; and

S. 2813. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ramon Baez Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 2814. A bill for the incorporation of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 2815. A bill to establish a joint congressional committee to make a continuing study and investigation of the activities and operations of the Central Intelligence Agency; to the Committe on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Young of Ohio when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2816. A bill to assist in alleviating the national railroad freight car shortage; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 2817. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to adjust sugar quotas for domestic areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Burdick when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 2818. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage behavior which threatens national economic stability; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD (for himself and Senators Allott, Bayh, Bible, Brewster, Burdick, Byrd of Virginia, Cooper, Dominick, Ervin, Fannin, Gruening, Harris, Hart, Hartke, Hruska, Inouye, Jordan of Idaho, Kennedy of New York, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Kuchel, Long of Missouri, Magnuson, McCarthy, Metcalf, Miller, Moss, Murphy, Nelson, Pell, Prouty, Robertson, Russell of South Carolina, Scott, Symington, Thurmond, Tower, Tydings, and Young of Ohio):

S.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution designating April 9 of each year as Sir Winston Churchill Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT "HOW TO OBTAIN BIRTH CERTIFICATES" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an original resolution (S. Res. 204) to print "How To Obtain Birth Certificates" as a Senate document, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Dirksen, which appears under a separate heading.)

AUTHORIZATION OF A STUDY OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 205) authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Muskie, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ADDITIONAL STAFF AND FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MUSKIE (for Mr. McNamara), from the Committee on Public Works, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 206) providing additional staff and funds for the Committee on Public Works, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Muskie, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

TO AUTHORIZE PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON S. 4, 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. MUSKIE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 207), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works, one thousand additional copies of the hearings held during the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, by its Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, on S. 4, the Water Quality Act of 1965.

TO AUTHORIZE PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON S. 3, 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. MUSKIE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 208); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works, one thousand additional copies of the hearings held during the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, by the Committee on Public Works, on S. 3, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

FUNDS FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CANNON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 209); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 209

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the election of the President, Vice President or Members of Congress;

(2) corrupt practices;

(3) contested elections;

(4) credentials and qualifications;

(5) Federal elections generally, and

(6) Presidential succession.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF EFFECTS OF OPERATIONS OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY UPON THE FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCARTHY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 210); which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 210

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study with respect to the effects of the operations and activities of the Central Intelligence Agency upon the foreign relations of the United States.

Sec. 2. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, through January 31, 1967, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, including actuarial experts, and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

A FEDERAL CHARTER FOR FEDERAL CAMPAIGN PRACTICES COMMITTEE

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Madam President, when the Fair Campaign Practices Committee was created in 1954, newspaper editors—who had been agonizing about smear tactics in election campaigns—smiled tolerantly and suggested that the committee was a nice idea that could not work. Many political figures—who had been smarting for years under the dishonest and unfair popular notion of politics as a dirty business—reacted similarly.

The Fair Campaign Committee stuck to its guns, and every citizen who is, as I am, proud to call himself a politician, is better off for that fact. Our political system in the better for the continued existence and growth of this courageous and impartial and dedicated group of citizens.

Newspapers and political leaders who greeted the committee with scoffing 12 years ago have turned to it many times since with requests for help or praise for a job well done.

The committee has studied the facts of unfair campaigning in an effort to get at the underlying causes of political smear and slander. It has identified the recurring dishonest tactics that are used to deceive voters and has developed literature and radio and television announcements to arm the voters against trickery. It has sought constantly to defend our political system against its detractors inside and outside its fabric. Last fall the committee brought together political leaders and broadcasters to explore with each other ways to improve the fairness and effectiveness of political argument on television.

Schools and universities, and churches and civic associations from coast to coast have used the committee's educational materials to help voters and future voters become better voters.

Over this dozen years the Fair Campaign Committee's operations have been national in scope and effect. In the summer of 1964 it was my pleasure to coauthor with my distinguished friend, now the Vice President of the United States, a reception in this Capital to honor the committee on its 10th anniversary. Those of my colleagues who attended that reception will recall that we took note then of the scope and effect, and stature, and truly national value, of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee.

I ask the Senate to initiate fitting recognition of the national character of this unique and splendid organization by granting to it a national charter. I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the incorporation of the Campaign Practices Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record, and lie on the desk until the close of business next Friday in order that Senators who so desire may associate themselves with me in this matter.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mrs. Neuberger in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The bill (S. 2814) for the incorporation of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, introduced by Mr. Kuchel, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2814

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following named persons: Hon. Charles P. Taft, Cincinnati, Ohio; Mr. Harry Louis Selden, New York, New York; Miss Anna Lord Strauss, New York, New York; Mr. Philip M. Stern, Washington, D.C.; Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania; Hon. Harry S. Truman, Independence, Missouri; Hon. H. Meade Alcorn, Jr., Hartford, Connecticut; Mr. Carl Ally, Norwalk, Connecticut; Hon. William Benton, Southport, Connecticut; Hon. James A. Farley, New York, New York; Mr. Bruce L. Felknor, Armonk, New York; Rabbi Louis Finkelstein, New York, New York; Mrs. Elizabeth Rudel Gatov, Kentfield, California; Hon. Guy M. Gillette, Cherokee, Iowa; Hon. Leonard W. Hall, Locust Valley, New York; Hon. Paul G. Hoffman, New York, New York; Mr. Palmer Hoyt, Denver, Colorado; Mr. George F. Jewett, Jr., San Francisco, California; Mr. Vann M. Kennedy, Corpus Christi, Texas; Mr. Herman S. Kohlmeyer, New Orleans, Louisiana; Bishop John Wesley Lord, Washington, D.C.; Mr. Joseph Martin, Jr., San Francisco, California; Hon. Stephen A. Mitchell, Taos, New Mexico; Mr. A. C. Nielsen, Jr., Chicago, Illinois; Mr. Louis Nizer, New York, New York; Mr. John Nuveen, Chicago, Illinois; Mr. Richard Ravitch, New York, New York; Mr. N. C. Templeton, Sacramento, California; Mr. Ernest G. Weiss, Armonk, New York; Most Rev. John J. Wright, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and their associates and successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate of the District of Columbia, where its legal domicile shall be, by the name of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation"), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations and restrictions herein contained.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

Sec. 2. A majority of the persons named in the first section of this Act, acting in person or by written proxy, are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of a constitution and by-laws not inconsistent with this Act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

Sec. 3. The purposes of the corporation shall be: To elevate the standards of ethics and morality which prevail in the conduct for campaigns for election to political offices on the national, State and local levels (including primary elections, as well as general elections), and covering party positions within the various political parties as well as public offices, including without limiting the foregoing, collecting information concerning capaign practices through studies of various media (such as press, radio, television, mail, and public platform) and through direct contact with the various candidates; to give wide publicity as to the requirements of the laws of the several States and the Federal Government concerning such practices; to stress the importance to the proper functioning of the American form of government of ameliorating any evils inherent in such practices; and to solicit contributions of money, securities or other property, real or personal, or rights or services of any nature to carry out the foregoing.

CORPORATE POWERS

Sec. 4. The corporation shall have the power—

(1) to have succession by its corporate name;

(2) to sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(3) to adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

(4) to choose such officers, managers, agents, and employees as the activities of the corporation may require;

(5) to adopt, amend, and alter a constitution and by-laws, not inconsistent with any Act of Congress or any law of any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

(6) to contract and be contracted with;

(7) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any public body or agency or any private corporation, association, partnership, firm, or individual and to hold absolutely or in trust for any of the purposes of the corporation any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of the law of the District of Columbia or of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in the District of Columbia or such State;

(8) to transfer, convey, lease, sublease, encumber and otherwise alienate real, personal, or mixed property;

(9) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, deed of trust, pledge or otherwise, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of any Act of Congress or of any State law; and

(10) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the objects and purposes of the corporation.

NONPROFIT, NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION; DISSOLUTION

SEC. 5. (a) The corporation is organized and shall be operated exclusively for educational purposes and not for pecuniary profit, and no part of its income or assets shall inure to the benefit of any of its members, directors or officers, or shall be distributable thereto otherwise than upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall not have or issue shares of stock, nor declare or pay dividends.

(c) No loans shall be made by the corporation of its officers or directors, or any of them; and any directors who vote for or assent to the making of a loan or advance to an officer or director of the corporation, and any officers participating in the making of any such loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

(d) Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets, if any, of the corporation shall be distributed in accordance with the determination of the board of directors and in compliance with the constitution and by-laws of the corporation and all Federal and State laws applicable thereto.

(e) The corporation and its officers and agents as such shall not contribute to any political party or candidate for public office.

MEMBERSHIP; VOTING RIGHTS

SEC. 6. (a) Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights, privileges and designation of classes of membership shall, except as otherwise provided in this Act, be determined as the constitution and by-laws of the corporation may provide.

(b) Each member of the corporation shall have the right to one vote in each matter submitted to a vote at all meetings of the members of the corporation.

GOVERNING BODY

SEC. 7. The supreme governing authority of the corporation shall be the board of directors thereof, composed of citizens of the United States who shall be elected from the membership of the corporate organization as shall be provided by the constitution and bylaws: *Provided*, That the form of the government of the corporation shall always be representative of the membership at large and shall not permit the concentration of control thereof in the hands of a limited number of members or in a self-perpetuating group not so representative. The meetings of the national convention may be held in any State or territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia.

OFFICERS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 8. (a) The officers of the corporation shall be selected in such manner and for such terms and with such duties and titles as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE; SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT; CITIZENSHIP

SEC. 9. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in New York, New York, or in such other place as may later be determined by the corporation, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place and may be conducted throughout the various States, territories, and possessions of the United States, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation; and notice to or service upon such agent; or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

(c) For purposes of court jurisdiction the corporation shall be deemed to be a citizen of the State of New York.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; AUDIT, REPORTS

SEC. 10. (a) The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of directors, and committees having any of the authority of the board of directors; and shall keep at its principal office a record giving the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purposes, at any reasonable time.

(b) The accounts of the corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(c) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than six months following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements, as are necessary to present fairly the corporation's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the corporation's income and expenses during the year, including (1) the results of any trading, manufacturing, publishing, or other commercial-type endeavor carried on by the corporation, and (2) a schedule of all contracts requiring payments in excess of $10,000 and any payments of compensation, salaries, or fees at a rate in excess of $10,000 per annum. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

(d) On or before June 1 of each year the corporation shall report to the Congress on its activities during the preceding fiscal year. Such report may consist of a report on the proceedings of the national convention covering such fiscal year. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

USE OF NAME

SEC. 11. The corporation shall have the sole and exclusive right to use the name Fair Campaign Practices Committee. The corporation shall have the exclusive and sole right to use, or allow or refuse the use of, such emblems and seals as have heretofore been used by the New York Corporation described in section 12 and the right to which may be lawfully transferred to the corporation.

ACQUISITION OF ASSETS OF NEW YORK CORPORATION

SEC. 12. The corporation may acquire the assets of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York, upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all the liability of such corporation and upon complying with all laws of the State of New York applicable thereto.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 13. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE SHOULD SCRUTINIZE THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a joint congressional committee to make a continuing study and investigation of the activities and operations of the Central Intelligence Agency.

This proposed committee would be composed of six Members of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives. The President of the Senate would appoint one majority and one minority member from each of the following committees: Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations. The Speaker of the House of Representatives would appoint one majority and one minority member from each of the following committees of the House: Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs. The chairmanship of this committee would alternate each Congress between the Senate and the House, and would be chosen by the Members of the House entitled to the chairmanship.

This powerful committee would be expected to hold regular executive sessions, to be kept full informed in respect to all activities and operations conducted by the CIA, and to conduct a continuing study and investigation of any and all matters relating to the Central Intelligence Agency. The committee would be provided with an expert staff.

The present informal committee has no staff. It is composed of the chairmen and ranking minority members of the six committees mentioned. Each of these Senators and Representatives already has a tremendous workload, and it is obvious from events during the past few years that present congressional supervision of the CIA is inadequate.

The vast CIA bureaucracy spends many hundreds of millions of dollars annually, more than double the amount appropriated for the entire State Department. There is no effective congressional scrutiny or check on this huge expenditure of taxpayers' money.

No other branch of the Federal Government enjoys this immunity. The Federal Bureau of Investigation must account for all funds appropriated to it by the Congress. The Atomic Energy Commission, which in all probability contains the most vital secrets of our Government, operates under the scrutiny of a legislative watchdog committee. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which was established at the same time as the AEC itself, is under congressional scrutiny.

The Department of Defense is also continually accountable to the scrutiny of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

While I realize that officials of the CIA cannot announce their triumphs, the record of their serious mistakes or misjudgments is impressive. The disclosure last autumn regarding CIA activities in Singapore was disgraceful. After denying the allegation that 5 years ago a CIA agent offered a $3 million bribe to Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore, officials of the State Department a few hours later were forced to make the admission that this had occurred, after Mr. Yew produced the letter in which Secretary of State Dean Rusk apologized for the incident.

In addition to its mistakes in southeast Asia, everyone is aware of the damage to our prestige caused by CIA bungling of the U-2 incident 5 years ago and of the stupid and disastrous role which CIA operates played in the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion. These are just a few of the more notable examples of CIA activities which have seriously damaged our Nation's goals and prestige.

In this space age of change and challenge, with its cold war and highly developed methods of espionage, counterespionage, and subversion, no one questions the need for secrecy in intelligence activities in which every great power must engage. Nevertheless the danger of future fiascoes by officials of the Central Intelligence Agency is enhanced so long as the Congress is prevented from exercising adequate supervision. It is not the presence of the CIA that is disturbing; it is the lack of direction and accountability of this secret organization.

Wrapped in its cloak of secrecy, the CIA has, in effect been making foreign policy. In so doing, it has assumed responsibilities which were heretofore solely those of the President and Congress. The CIA has gradually taken on the character of an invisible government, answerable only to itself.

The CIA was never intended to direct the foreign policy of our country, but was organized to be an intelligence agency, not an operating or policymaking branch of our Government.

When Congress created the Central Intelligence Agency in 1947, the Agency was given no power to formulate foreign policy. Its purpose was to centralize the collection and evaluation of intelligence information and material. Today, almost 20 years later, this agency, with thousands upon thousands of employees, spends much more than the State Department and, at times, has more real influence on important matters of foreign policy. The Director of the CIA is generally recognized as one of the most powerful men in Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, the Founding Fathers—the architects of our Constitution—gave Congress alone the power to give advice and consent to the President in making treaties with foreign nations. Congress is also the source of all foreign policy legislation, including all appropriations for foreign assistance and needed expenditures.

Officials of the CIA have no business infringing on the responsibilities of the State Department, the Defense Department, and the Congress. This must stop. The CIA must be made accountable not only to the President but also to Congress through a responsible committee of the Congress.

My belief is that the CIA is also overstaffed and is spending too much of taxpayers' money. Frankly, I could not prove that. No Member of Congress could. This is just another reason why there should be a joint committee of Congress to act as watchdog and to direct and supervise the operations and expenditures of this sprawling bureaucracy.

Some fear that the security of the CIA might be compromised by the establishment of a watchdog committee. Such fears are entirely unwarranted. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which handles highly sensitive and secret information—information that could destroy mankind—has a perfect security record. Its members have proved to be fully as reliable as the hundreds of civil servants, military employees, and Presidential appointees who have knowledge in this extremely sensitive field.

Madam President, the time has definitely come for Congress to assert a more formal and extensive supervision over the CIA. This is needed not only to eliminate waste, and to assure that its programs operate effectively and within proper constitutional limitations; more important, such congressional supervision is needed to assure that our basic standards of morality are not completely undermined in the conduct of our international intelligence activities. We cannot afford to delay asserting this supervision until these activities result in fiascoes of such proportions as actually to jeopardize our national security.

A small joint committee on the Central Intelligence Agency, such as I have proposed, would provide the safeguards necessary to prevent further abuses of power by the CIA. It would assure that Congress is included in the making of decisions vital to our national security, in accordance with the provisions and intent of the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2815) to establish a joint congressional committee to make a continuing study and investigation of the activities and operations of the Central Intelligence Agency, introduced by Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

A BILL TO ASSIST IN ALLEVIATING THE NATIONAL RAILROAD FREIGHT CAR SHORTAGE

Mr. BURDICK. Madam President, I introduce for appropriate consideration, an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act to assist in alleviating the national railroad freight car shortage. The amendment proposes to declare that a national emergency does exist in respect to freight cars and gives the Commission power to utilize the authority contained in section 1(15) of the act.

Such authority would allow the Commission to suspend existing regulations governing freight cars, set freight car rental rates and direct car service according to priorities it believed in the best interest of the country.

Last year, as you know, the Senate Commerce Committee held hearings on proposals to give the ICC authority to fix per diem charges on freight cars which would motivate the railroads to maintain an adequate supply of freight cars. That bill passed the Senate and is now pending in the House. I believe it will, if enacted, offer substantial relief. Unfortunately, the boxcar problem is with us today and will be until such time as the provisions of S. 1098 are implemented by the Commission. I propose in the interim to give the Commission power to deal with the problem by allowing maximum use of their existing authority.

During the per diem hearing, Acting Chairman of the ICC, John W. Bush, informed Senator MAGNUSON:

> The diminishing supply of railroad freight cars has been a matter of considerable concern to the Commission for many years. Despite the generally expanding economy of the country, the ownership of freight cars is now less than it was during World War II. As a result, critical shortages of increased duration and severity have become almost commonplace on the national transportation scene.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In addition to inadequate car ownership, one of the greatest contributing factors to recurring freight car shortages has been the failure of some carriers to utilize the existing fleet of equipment more efficiently. During the periods of critical shortages the Commission has resorted to every means at its command to cope with the problem.

I believe the Commission has used every normal means at its command. I suggest that the emergency designation by the Congress will give increased Commission authority to deal with the critical problem involving assignment of cars, adequate reporting of on-line ownership, movement of cars within 24 hours after loading, and the assignment of additional agents to police movements at interchanges.

Madam President, I call attention to a computation of boxcar ownership provided by the ICC, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE 1.—*Boxcar ownership*

	Jan. 1, 1956			Jan. 1, 1960			Jan. 1, 1965		
	Owned	Undergoing or awaiting repair	Percent to ownership	Owned	Undergoing or awaiting repair	Percent to ownership	Owned	Undergoing or awaiting repair	Percent to ownership
Eastern, Allegheny, Pocahontas, and southern districts:									
Plain	354, 304	13, 234	3. 7	347, 725	36, 498	10. 5	242, 193	21, 081	8.7
Equipped	31, 825	1, 481	4. 7	29, 685	1, 883	6. 3	58, 589	1, 976	3.4
Total	386, 129	14, 175	3. 8	377, 410	38, 881	10. 2	300, 782	23, 057	7.7
Western district:									
Plain	310, 044	9, 209	3. 0	307, 693	10, 645	3. 5	266, 520	13, 000	4.9
Equipped	20, 672	1, 495	7. 2	20, 635	1, 047	5. 1	29, 300	645	2.2
Total	330, 716	10, 704	3. 2	328, 328	11, 692	3. 6	295, 820	13, 645	4.6
Total United States:									
Plain	664, 348	22, 443	3. 4	655, 418	47, 143	7. 2	508, 713	34, 081	6.7
Equipped	52, 497	2, 976	5. 7	50, 320	2, 930	5. 8	87, 889	2, 621	3.0
Grand total	716, 845	25, 419	3. 5	705, 738	50, 073	7. 1	596, 602	36, 702	6.2

Mr. BURDICK. During the 9-year period, January 1, 1956, to January 1, 1965, plain boxcar ownership declined by 155,635. Furthermore, in the first 11 months of 1965 there was a further decline of 30.666 cars. This decline in ownership reflects only a part of the overall problem. The number of bad order cars has been increasing each year. It is difficult to ascertain the exact loss of cars because of bad orders, but in 1965, it was in excess of 6 percent of total ownership of plain cars. The following table gives bad order figures for the Northwest District and the Eastern District.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE 2

Railroad[1]	Ownership of plain boxcars	Number of system plain boxcars on line	Percent to ownership	Total plain boxcars on line, both system and foreign	Percent to ownership	Number plain boxcars undergoing or awaiting repairs	Percent to ownership	Ownership of equipped boxcars	Number of system equipped boxcars on line	Percent to ownership
Northwestern district:										
C. & N.W. system	22, 896	7, 297	31. 9	19, 294	84. 3	1, 423	6. 2	1, 088	66	6.1
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific	12, 203	2, 974	24. 4	10, 002	82. 0	890	7. 3	6, 977	3, 548	50.9
Great Northern	22, 626	6, 671	29. 5	14, 687	64. 9	840	3. 7	345	174	50.4
Northern Pacific	19, 338	4, 568	23. 6	11, 579	59. 9	604	3. 1	568	166	29.2
Soo Line	7, 315	2, 312	31. 7	6, 098	83. 4	648	8. 9	839	231	27.5
Eastern district:										
New York Central	32, 676	9, 875	30. 2	29, 975	91. 7	1, 662	5. 1	9, 051	4, 552	50.3
Baltimore & Ohio	14, 346	5, 386	37. 5	13, 777	96. 0	1, 174	8. 2	5, 327	2, 331	43.8
Pennsylvania system	26, 555	8, 012	30. 2	33, 746	127. 1	3, 644	13. 7	10, 519	4, 006	38.1
Southern system	16, 148	5, 263	32. 6	16, 122	99. 8	602	3. 7	7, 981	5, 176	64.9

Railroad[1]	Total number of equipped boxcars on line, system and foreign	Percent to ownership	Number of equipped boxcars undergoing or awaiting repairs	Percent to ownership	Percent total, all boxcars	Total boxcar ownership, both equipped and plain	Total, all boxcars on line	Percent to ownership
Northwestern district:								
C. & N.W. system	1, 371	126. 0	9	0. 8	6. 0	23, 984	20, 665	86.2
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific	4, 679	67. 1	72	1. 0	5. 0	19, 180	14, 681	76.5
Great Northern	627	181. 7	1	. 3	3. 7	22, 971	15, 314	66.7
Northern Pacific	166	29. 2	0	----------	3. 0	19, 906	11, 745	59.0
Soo Line	254	30. 3	0	----------	7. 9	8, 154	6, 352	77.9
Eastern district:								
New York Central	10, 862	120. 0	9, 051	6. 2	5. 3	41, 727	40, 837	97.9
Baltimore & Ohio	4, 494	84. 4	153	2. 9	6. 7	19, 673	18, 271	92.9
Pennsylvania system	9, 493	90. 2	664	6. 3	11. 6	37, 074	43, 239	116.6
Southern system	7, 496	93. 9	7, 981	. 6	2. 7	24, 129	23, 618	97.9

[1] Figures as of Dec. 1, 1965.

Mr. BURDICK. We are sometimes deceived by figures that indicate there has been an increase in boxcars—but this increase is represented in so-called specially equipped cars designed to handle particular industrial needs such as automobiles, chemicals, and so forth.

I am convinced we face a national freight car emergency. In testimony before the Commerce Committee dating back to the late 1940's, the ICC has lamented the shortage of cars and in most instances supported efforts to create incentives so that an adequate supply of cars would be available to the shipper. The problem has variously been described as "critical," a "national disgrace," "detrimental to our national defense." There is no reason to believe, until the per diem changes are implemented, it will do anything but worsen in succeeding years.

Madam President, you probably know as well as I do the future demands that are going to be placed on transportation. We have an expanding economy estimated to reach a gross national product of over $700 billion. During this session of the Congress we will consider renewal of the food-for-peace program. The program will undoubtedly be expanded. The demand for American agricultural products in Asia is mushrooming. We have greatly increased our sales to Japan. The severe drought in India will necessitate a greater commitment of our agricultural abundance to that nation. The war in southeast Asia continues to place greater burdens on transportation systems.

In order to honor these commitments we will need the freight cars to move the products and equipment to the ports. These, added to the unsatisfied normal demands, convince me that we have a national freight car emergency.

Madam President, I simply say that we can no longer tolerate this problem.

We must act to give the ICC the sufficient power to assure maximum utilization of available equipment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2816) to assist in alleviating the national railroad freight car shortage, introduced by Mr. BURDICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

TO COMBAT INFLATIONARY INCREASES IN PRICES AND WAGES

Mr. **CLARK.** Madam President, I introduce a bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946, to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon prices and wages which might threaten national economic stability by causing inflation, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2818) to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage behavior which threatens national economic stability, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. **CLARK.** Madam President, the purpose of the bill is set forth in the joint statement explaining that this is a companion measure to one introduced in the House by my good friend, Representative HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, and is not very different from the bill known some years ago as the Clark-Reuss bill dealing with the problem of combating inflationary increases in prices and wages.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill and statement may be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2818

A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage behavior which threatens national economic stability

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby declares that a new mechanism is needed to carry out the aims of the Employment Act of 1946 to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power (which includes the concept of reasonable price stability). Restrictive fiscal and monetary measures are appropriate and effective for controlling price and wage behavior caused by overall excessive demand. But in the absence of overall excessive demand, restrictive fiscal and monetary measures may be both harmful and ineffective. Such measures are harmful because they dampen the demand necessary for maximum employment and production. They may be ineffective with respect to individual price and wage behavior in industries with large firms or unions. This act provides a mechanism for bringing to bear an informed public opinion in order to restrain such price or wage behavior when it threatens national economic stability by causing inflation.

DETERMINATION OF PRICE-WAGE GUIDEPOSTS

SEC. 2 (a) Section 4(c) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting a semicolon, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) to transmit to the joint committee not later than 40 days from the enactment of this paragraph, and not later than January 20 of each year thereafter, price-wage guideposts which would, if observed, achieve noninflationary price and wage behavior;".

(b) Section 5(b) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a semicolon, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) to review the price-wage guideposts transmitted to it by the Council, and to make such reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives with respect to said guideposts as it deems advisable, and".

DETERMINATION OF PRICE-WAGE BEHAVIOR INCONSISTENT WITH GUIDEPOSTS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 4(c) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) to study actual or imminent price and wage behavior, in industries with large firms or unions, inconsistent with the price-wage guideposts; and to report promptly to the joint committee any such price or wage behavior which threatens national economic stability."

(b) Section 5(b) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) promptly upon receipt of a report from the Council pursuant to section 4(c) (7) if it deems it advisable, or upon its own initiative, to hold public hearings to determine whether price or wage behavior is inconsistent with the price-wage guideposts, and threatens national economic stability; and promptly file a report with the Senate and House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations of actions in the public interest to be taken by the President or the parties concerned."

The statement presented by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, today introduced legislation to enable Congress, through its Joint Economic Committee, to play a more effective role in the battle against inflation.

CLARK's bill, which parallels, with minor differences, a bill introduced by Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, in the House of Representatives on January 10, would authorize the Joint Economic Committee to review the wage-price guideposts of the Council of Economic Advisers and to hold public hearings on wage or price increases which might threaten national economic stability by causing inflation.

In his remarks prepared for delivery on the Senate floor, CLARK said:

"We have enjoyed the longest period of peacetime economic growth in our history. For the 59th consecutive month we are witnessing unprecedented prosperity fostered by the sound expenditure and tax policies of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

"Yet, unjustified price increases and wage settlements can threaten our economic stability and our steady progress toward full employment.

"A more effective mechanism is needed to assure that the individual actions of industry and labor are in the public interest and that an informed public is aware of the significance of major price and wage decisions. This legislation would enable the Congress to aid the executive branch by authorizing the Joint Economic Committee to review each year the wage-price guideposts recommended by the Council of Economic Advisers.

"The Committee would also be advised by the Council of Economic Advisers of possible breaches of the guideposts which threaten national economic stability. Public hearings would afford both industry and labor an opportunity to make their views known, and the Committee would make advisory recommendations to the President or the parties involved for action which would be in the public interest.

"Thus, Congress, through its Joint Economic Committee, would bring its opinion to bear on potentially inflationary wage and price actions; the public would be made aware of the significance and effect of major price and wage decisions; and the parties involved will be encouraged to make responsible decisions in the national interest."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana subsequently said: Madam President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I ask unanimous consent that the bill he introduced earlier today (S. 2818) to amend the Employment Act of 1946, be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

DESIGNATION OF SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL DAY

Mr. **DODD.** Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would authorize and request the President to declare April 9 of each year as Sir Winston Churchill Day.

I am introducing this joint resolution in behalf of myself and Senators ALLOTT, BAYH, BIBLE, BREWSTER, BURDICK, BYRD of Virginia, COOPER, DOMINICK, ERVIN, FANNIN, GRUENING, HARRIS, HART, HARTKE, HRUSKA, INOUYE, JORDAN of Idaho, KENNEDY of New York, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, KUCHEL, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, MCCARTHY, METCALF, MILLER, MOSS, MURPHY, NELSON, PELL, PROUTY, ROBERTSON, RUSSELL of South Carolina, SCOTT, SYMINGTON, THURMOND, TOWER, TYDINGS, YOUNG of Ohio.

To only one person has the U.S. Congress ever extended honorary American citizenship, and this was Sir Winston.

Sir Winston was one of the few authentic giants of history. Indeed, there are few other great men who have left so deep an impression on the course of events.

He was a warrior, a prophet, a leader of men and of nations.

His stubborn perseverance, his indomitable courage, and his oratorical genius twice rallied his own people and the peoples of the free world to resist totalitarian aggression.

His gifted historian's pen recorded this monumental era for present and future generations.

But Churchill's greatness is something that transcended his genius and his qualities of leadership.

As one perceptive editorialist wrote upon Churchill's death:

> What is unique with Churchill, Lincoln, and their kind is that in gaining a world's respect they have also won its love.

I think all Americans will agree that we as a nation have a particularly warm affection and admiration for Churchill as an individual and as a world leader.

His battles were our battles; his wars our wars; and his goals our goals.

The awarding of honorary American citizenship was an important and impressive tribute to this great man.

I hope that this April 9, the third anniversary of his honorary citizenship, will also be the first anniversary of Winston Churchill Day.

This would coincide with the unveiling of a magnificent bronze statue of Winston Churchill which will stand partially on U.S. soil and partially on the grounds of the British Embassy here in the Nation's Capital.

This statue will stand as a continuing tribute to Churchill, to the close ties between our two nations, and the enduring bond among English-speaking peoples everywhere.

The President has been invited to dedicate this statue. I believe it would make the occasion all the more memorable and significant if at the same time President Johnson were to proclaim the first Sir Winston Churchill Day.

I hope that this resolution will see early action by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 127) designating April 9 of each year as Sir Winston Churchill Day, introduced by Mr. Dodd (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, on January 14, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] introduced a bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia. It provides some controls on ratemaking.

This is an aggravated problem that merits the attention of the Congress. I discover that on January 27, 1942—which is 24 years ago—when I was the chairman of the House District Committee, I introduced a somewhat similar bill to regulate the operation and conduct of commercial parking of motor vehicles in District of Columbia. This matter cries for attention, and it will never get better. Some substantive and practical way must be found to deal with the problem.

This bill obviously will have rather extended hearings, and experts will doubtless come and testify before the committees of the House and the Senate.

I ask that my name be added as cosponsor to this measure, S. 2769.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Lincoln Gordon, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Jack Hood Vaughn.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATIONS OF PHILIP N. BROWNSTEIN, OF MARYLAND, AND CHARLES M. HAAR, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, I should like to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a hearing on the nominations of Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland, and Charles M. Haar, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretaries of Housing and Urban Development.

The hearing is scheduled to be held on Thursday, January 27, 1966, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, at 10 a.m.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with these nominations are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone 225-3921.

THE BUDGET, 1967—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 355)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to the budget. The message has already been read in the House. Without objection, the message will be appropriately referred without being read.

The message from the President, together with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(For text of the President's budget message, see House proceedings for today, pages 909 to 917.)

AMENDMENT OF THE TARIFF SCHEDULES TO SUSPEND THE DUTY ON CERTAIN TROPICAL HARDWOODS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 922, H.R. 7723.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 7723) to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments, on page 2, after the table after line 2, to strike out:

Sec. 2. For purposes of section 201(a)(2) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1821(a)(2)), in the case of a trade agreement entered into before July 1, 1967, the duty-free treatment provided by item 916.20, 916.21, 916.22, or 916.23 of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 for any article shall be considered as existing duty-free treatment.

And, on page 3, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "3" to "2".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an excerpt from the committee report.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the committee report (No. 949) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee amendments eliminate the provision in the House bill which would have authorized the President to proclaim continued duty-free treatment for the tropical hardwoods affected by the bill beyond December 31, 1967, if he determined it was required to carry out a trade agreement entered into under the Trade Expansion Act. Under the bill, as amended, the duty on tropical hardwoods would be suspended until January 1, 1968.

The Trade Expansion Act permits the duty on many of the hardwoods affected by this bill to be eliminated immediately rather than by progressive reductions over a period of years, and this amendment does not cut back on that authority. Thus, in the event of a successful trade agreement permanent and continued elimination of the duty on most of these hardwoods could be assured.

There are some tropical hardwoods, however, notably mahogany, with respect to which the duty can be eliminated only over a period of years. If a trade agreement is entered into during the period of suspension of duty provided by this bill, it would have to provide for progressive elimination of the duty unless Congress later acted to terminate it altogether.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The products covered by new TSUS items 916.20, 916.22, and 916.23 to be added by the bill are hardwood lumbers, rough, dressed, or worked, which the Tariff Commission has determined, pursuant to section 213(c) of the Trade Expansion Act, to be tropical forestry commodities (as defined in sec. 213(b) of that act) of kinds not produced in significant quantities in the United States. All of the products covered by the bill were found by the Tariff Commission, pursuant to section 256(7) of the Trade Expansion Act, to be dutiable at rates not exceeding 5 percent ad valorem (or ad valorem equivalent). While logs are already free of U.S. duty, the lumber remains subject to duties, albeit the duties are quite low, ranging from less than 1 to 2.5 percent ad valorem (or equivalent). The 10 leading supplying countries of tropical hardwood lumber to the United States in 1964 were Colombia, Ghana, British Honduras, Malaysia, Nicaragua, Thailand, Ecuador, Mexico, Nigeria, and Brazil.

Although the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 provides authority for the elimination of duties on tropical hardwood lumber under the trade agreements procedures, the elimination of the duties under that authority cannot be accomplished until after the conclusion of the Kennedy round negotiations.

Your committee believes that the U.S. foreign economic policy interests would be served by immediate temporary suspension of these duties pending arrangements for their permanent elimination by the trade agreements process.

The lumber covered by the bill was the subject of notice for public hearings by the Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee of the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations in connection with possible elimination of the duties under the authorities of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. No objection to the elimination of the duties was received by either of these bodies. The Department of Commerce, which favors the enactment of the bill, advised your committee that the Department knows of no objection that domestic industry would have to the bill. No objection to the bill has been made known to your committee. The Departments of State, Commerce, and Treasury also reported favorably on the bill, and the Tariff Commission submitted a detailed informative report thereon.

Provisions of the bill: Section 1 of the bill would add four new items to subpart B of part 1 of the appendix to the Tariff Schedules of the United States by which the column 1 rates of duty for the lumber described in the items would be suspended until January 1, 1968. (The col. 2 rates for these lumbers, which apply to the products of the Communist countries listed in general headnote 3(d) to the tariff schedules, will not be suspended.) The suspensions of the duties would apply to the lumbers included in the bill whether rough, dressed, or worked. The suspension would not apply to such processed lumber products as plywood, siding, molding, or flooring.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 923, H.R. 7813.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK**. A bill (H.R. 7813) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "lend," to strike out "to friendly foreign nations, on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate, ships from the reserve fleet as follows:

"(1) China, one destroyer and two destroyer escorts, (2) Turkey, two destroyers, and (3) the Philippines, one destroyer escort." and insert "one destroyer and one destroyer escort from the reserve fleet to the Republic of China on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the committee report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the committee report (No. 950) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENTS

The provisions of H.R. 7813 relating to the loan of naval vessels to Turkey and the Philippines were included in H.R. 7812, which became Public Law 89–324. H.R. 7813 relates only to the loan of vessels to China. Consequently the bill and the title have been amended accordingly.

PURPOSE

The bill would authorize the loan of one destroyer and one destroyer escort to the Republic of China.

The loan of these vessels is intended to give the Republic of China an increased capability to defend her contiguous waters against aggressive acts and to augment the free world naval forces in the western Pacific.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

In the 1st session of the 89th Congress three separate bills authorizing the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries were referred to the Committee on Armed Services. These 3 bills, H.R. 7811, H.R. 7812, and H.R. 7813, would have authorized the loan of 21 ships. The loans recommended by the committee in the first session, totaling 11 ships, were consolidated and included as an amendment to H.R. 7812.

The House disagreed to the Senate amendment. A parliamentary technicality prevented a full and free conference, as any loans not included in the Senate version of H.R. 7812 could not have been agreed to in conference without the conference report's being subject to a point of order, because these loans were not in the version of H.R. 7812, as passed by the House.

The conference agreement was that the House would recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment to H.R. 7812 and that the Senate committee would resume consideration of the ship loan program this year.

After resumption of such consideration the committee recommends approval of the loan of one destroyer and one destroyer escort to China.

BACKGROUND

Before 1951, U.S. naval vessels could be transferred to friendly foreign nations under the provisions of the Mutual Assistance Defense Act of 1949, as amended. Public Law 82–3, approved in 1951, the text of which appears in section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, provides that a battleship, carrier, cruiser, destroyer, or submarine that has not been struck from the Naval Register may not be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of without express congressional approval.

Since 1951 Congress has approved 18 measures relating to ship transfers. Twelve of these laws granted authority for new loans and extensions of existing loans and the others dealt with loan extensions only. The 18 laws relating to ship transfers that have been approved since 1951 authorized the loan of 105 ships, the transfer of 9 ships, and the sale of 4 ships.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The loan of ships under authority of this bill may be for periods not exceeding 5 years. The President may extend the period of the loan for an additional period of not more than 5 years. The loan agreement must contain a provision that the loan can be terminated if necessitated by defense requirements of the United States.

Authority for the loan is conditioned on a determination by the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the loan or sale is in the best interest of the United States.

Authority to lend the vessels would terminate on December 31, 1967. This period of time is needed to provide for negotiation and the orderly planning of activation and overhauling.

Financial information

The costs associated with the loan of the two ships may be paid by the United States as grant aid under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or may be loaned to the Republic of China under this same authority. Until there is a decision on whether the cost will be charged as grant military assistance or as a loan, it is not practical to determine the real cost to the United States. The cost of activating, overhauling, and rehabilitating a destroyer varies from $3.3 to $5.7 million. Similar costs for a destroyer escort are from $2 to $2.7 million.

If the United States should be required to pay all the costs, the bill could involve a total expenditure of about $8.4 million.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to China."

REVISION OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "HOW TO OBTAIN BIRTH CERTIFICATES"

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Madam President, I submit a Senate resolution, which I am sure is unobjectionable, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

It provides for a revision of the document entitled "How To Obtain Birth Certificates," Senate Document No. 101, 84th Congress, which was prepared by the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I ask that it be printed as a document.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 204

Resolved, That the revision of the document entitled "How To Obtain Birth Certificates" (S. Doc. No. 101, 84th Congress), prepared by the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed as a Senate document.

AMERICAN PARENTS COMMITTEE PROTESTS WITHHOLDING OF SCHOOL MILK FUNDS

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Madam President, again I intend to object to the Bureau of the Budget's action in withholding $3 million from the special milk program for schoolchildren—$3 million that was appropriated by Congress last year.

This not only deprives schoolchildren of milk, but it does so at no saving to the taxpayer. Milk not used under the program simply swells the surplus that must be purchased and stored at Government expense.

Today I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to a letter written to President Johnson by the executive director of the American Parents Committee, Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry. This letter reflects the great concern felt by Americans all across the United States over the milk cutback.

The letter points out that the school milk program offers indisputable benefits to all our Nation's children. Both in schools and centers for underprivileged children, its success has been attested by an average 5 percent annual increase in participation.

Mrs. McGarry then goes on to say:

> To eliminate $3 million from present operating funds would mean denying the last 2 years' proven growth in this program. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has advised us that, with this cut in effect, all requests by participating schools will have to be 10 percent disallowed, as of February 1, 1966.

Madam President, I want my colleagues to pay particular attention to the next paragraph in this letter because it pinpoints a contention I have been making every day on this floor since the beginning of the session in criticizing the Bureau's unwise cut; namely, that it is a phony economy. The letter says:

> As a logical and beneficial means of allocating surplus whole milk, this program also reflects much sounder economic practice than the Government's alternative of purchasing surplus milk at 75 percent of parity for price support, only to go to the additional expense of powdering and storage of the milk. In fiscal 1965 the Commodity Credit Corporation acquired $23 million of dried (powdered) milk, and suffered a subsequent loss of $13 million in sales.

The last two sentences of the letter rightly point to a contradiction between the Bureau of the Budget's cutback and the philosophy President Johnson spelled out in his state of the Union message that our children shall not be the victims of a false economy. As Mrs. McGarry says "surely, in humanitarian as well as economic terms, our Nation's children represent our greatest national investment."

Madam President, the letter I have excerpted today for the benefit of my colleagues outlines many of the reasons why I intend to speak out day after day after day on this floor until these funds are released. I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter from Mrs. McGarry to the President dated January 18, 1966, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN PARENTS COMMITTEE, INC.,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1966.

Re Withholding of national children's milk program appropriations.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.
Attention: Mr. Gardner Ackley

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The American Parents Committee is distressed to learn that the Bureau of the Budget has decided to withhold $3 million of the funds already appropriated by the Congress for fiscal 1966 operations of the national children's milk program.

The American Parents Committee has consistently supported this vital ongoing program, with the conviction that it offers indisputable benefits to all our Nation's children. Both in schools and centers for underprivileged children, its success has been attested by an average 5 percent annual increase in participation.

To eliminate $3 million from present operating funds would mean denying the last 2 years' proven growth in this program. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has advised us that, with this cut in effect, all requests by participating schools will have to be 10 percent disallowed, as of February 1, 1966.

As a logical and beneficial means of allocating surplus whole milk, this program also reflects much sounder economic practice, than the Government's alternative of purchasing surplus milk at 75 percent of parity for price support, only to go to the additional expense of powdering and storage of the milk. In fiscal 1965, the Commodity Credit Corporation acquired $23 million of dried (powdered) milk, and suffered a subsequent loss of $13 million in sales.

The Bureau of the Budget would seem to have disregarded the expressed philosophy of the state of the Union message, which pledges that our children shall not be the victims of a false economy. Surely, in humanitarian as well as economic terms, our Nation's children represent our greatest national investment.

Respectfully,

MRS. BARBARA D. MCGARRY,
Executive Director.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I assume that the Senator has read the budget message, and that he realizes that the budget cut of $3 million is for the first year, and that the future intent appears to be that the program will gradually be eliminated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I intend to speak on that later. It goes down to a pitifully small figure. It destroys the program, as the Senator has stated.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, with what I believe the Senator is going to say about the proposal, I shall undoubtedly agree wholeheartedly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

RETIREMENT OF WALTER L. REYNOLDS

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, on December 31 of last year, one of the Senate's most valuable professional staff members, Walter L. Reynolds, chief clerk and staff director of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, retired after 37 years on Capitol Hill. On that date, he concluded a long and distinguished career of outstanding and constructive service to Congress and the Nation.

Bob Reynolds, as he is known by his many friends, first served as a member of the staff of Representative Hamilton Fish, and, later, on the House Special Committee to Investigate Communist Propaganda. He spent 16 years as a staff member in the House before coming to the Senate in 1944, first as a member of the staff of Senator FULBRIGHT. Since 1949, he has been chief clerk and staff director of the Government Operations Committee.

During my years in the Senate, it has been my privilege to know and observe Bob Reynolds as he has carried out his important duties and responsibilities to the Senate. I know that he has rendered truly outstanding service to both House and Senate over the past 37 years. Certainly, all Members of Congress and the Nation are indebted to those loyal and dedicated staff members in the legislative branch who assist us in passing on the many matters of gravest consequence to the welfare of our Nation. This is especially true in the case of Bob Reynolds. He has consistently exemplified the very best in dedicated and devoted public service. He has served with credit to himself and to the Congress. This service has not only been outstanding, it has also been of the highest and most valuable quality.

In addition, Mrs. Stennis and I have been blessed with the personal friendship of both Mr. and Mrs. Reynolds during all of our years in Washington. We esteem them highly and appreciate them as dear and valuable friends. Mrs. Reynolds is a lady of charm and intelligence, with a friendly personality and a genuinely unselfish interest in people and human problems.

Both Bob and Clare Reynolds have many, many friends on Capitol Hill and in Washington, and will continue to have the fondest good wishes of all these friends. Mrs. Stennis joins me in wishing them continued success and happiness in the years to come; certainly they have earned and deserve the best.

WILLIAM CHALMERS "BILLY" JARVIS, CHAMPION CORNGROWER FROM KEMPER COUNTY

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, for the second consecutive year a young Mississippi Future Farmer has won the national corngrowing contest. It is a special privilege for me to congratulate last year's winner because he was born and reared and now goes to school in my home county. He is William Chalmers "Billy" Jarvis, from Kemper County, Miss.

Billy, who is a member of the Lynville High School chapter of the Future Farmers of America, won this fine honor in 1965 by producing 271.5 bushels of corn on 1 acre of land. In 1964, the national championship was won by Jackie Courson, from Benton County, Miss., with a yield of 263.6 bushels on 1 acre. The contest in which these young farmers compete, known as the "304 Bushel Challenge," is sponsored by Funk's G-hybrid corn in recognition of the all-time record yield produced by another young Mississippian, Lamar Ratliff, in 1955.

Young Jarvis achieved his amazing yield by applying the latest known methods and practices in the production of corn. He used a hybrid Funk G-732 corn with 25,000 stalks per acre, and his yield of 271.5 bushels is 6 times the average 1964 corn yield in the State of Mississippi.

This outstanding work has brought a distinct honor to Billy Jarvis, and I highly commend him for his diligent study and efforts. It reflects fine credit on his parents, Mr. and Mrs. H. T. Jarvis, his school, and particularly on his outstanding and dedicated vocational agriculture teacher, Mr. E. G. Palmer. I wish for Billy every success and know that he will profit greatly from the fine education and experience he is now receiving.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator, if I have enough time remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How do they do it?

Mr. STENNIS. They do it as a result of earnest effort and consistent application of the best known techniques in agriculture. I can give the Senator further information in the cloakroom.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, I ask for the attention of the majority leader. I noted, a few moments ago, on the call of the calendar, that Calendar No. 923, H.R. 7813, was passed. This is an act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries. The title suggests that the bill has importance and I believe it deserves an explanation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was informed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services this morning that this was a bill which had to be considered in relation to the loaning of one destroyer and one destroyer escort from the reserve fleet to the Republic of China.

The purpose, according to the report would be to authorize that loan, and, quoting from the report:

> The loan of these vessels is intended to give the Republic of China an increased capability to defend her contiguous waters against aggressive acts and to augment the free world naval forces in the western Pacific.

Is that enough information for the Senator?

Mr. COOPER. It is an explanation; and I believe it is good that it has been made. As I understand, this is a loan of a destroyer and a destroyer escort to the Republic of China?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. A full report will be incorporated in the RECORD.

CONSERVATION—AND DESERVED RECOGNITION TO SENATOR CHURCH, OF IDAHO

Mr. MOSS. Madam President, conservation is everyone's business. Unfortunately, too few Americans make it their business. As a result, the task of preserving our natural resources—of developing them but not exploiting them—has fallen on a few dedicated persons in both public and private life.

We in the West, enriched as we are with an abundance of magnificent natural wealth and beauty, are probably more aware of the need for balanced development of our natural resources than any other section of the country.

I am proud of the fact that our western congressional delegations have initiated and supported most of the great conservation measures that exist today. Last week, I was privileged to vote in support of another of the great pieces of legislation aimed at preserving for future generations, portions of America's rich heritage of splendor.

In voting for Senate passage of the national wild rivers system bill, I also acknowledged the outstanding leadership that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], has played in so many conservation efforts.

Conservation means far more than simple preservation. Wise use and management of our resources rank equally with wise preservation and management and in both fields. FRANK CHURCH has been the one who has shown the way and lighted our legislative steps. A half dozen great dams and reclamation projects bear the imprint of his effort, along with many other smaller projects. He has battled for continued and increased soil conservation measures and has pleaded for additional funds to open up our great western forests for larger timber outputs and for greater recreational uses.

As sponsor of the Wilderness Act, the Nez Perce National Historic Park bill, and the wild rivers bill, and as floor manager for the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, he has assured our grandchildren and our great grandchildren that segments of the American natural heritage will be theirs to enjoy, even as it has been ours.

It is fitting, Madam President, that we should recognize the effort and dedication of our distinguished colleague from the State of Idaho. It is even more satisfying to know that others appreciate his work and look to him as a champion of the cause of conservation. It is to the latter events that I direct the interest of the Senate.

On December 20, 1965, the Senator from Idaho was named the Idaho Conservationist of the Year by the Idaho Wildlife Federation. In appropriate ceremonies in Boise, Idaho, the Governor of Idaho, the Honorable Robert E. Smylie presented the Senator with the annual Governor's Award. Governor Smylie noted at that time a fact that we in the Senate have long known, that conservation is truly a bipartisan matter.

As the result of that award, the Senator from Idaho then became a finalist in the National Wildlife Federation annual competition for outstanding conservation honors.

On January 11, 1966, at the annual banquet of the National Wildlife Federation at the Hotel Statler Hilton, here in Washington, D.C., the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] received the National Conservation Legislative Award from the hands of the First Lady of our country. This came only moments after Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson had herself received the Federation's National Distinguished Service Award. The citation to the Senator from Idaho with the award read as follows:

> For significant congressional leadership in the creation of the national wilderness preservation system and for exceptional statesmanship and skill in focusing public attention on the need for preserving wild rivers, parks, and outdoor recreation areas.

Madam President, the senior Senator from Idaho has brought great honor to himself. But in so doing, he has reflected credit upon every Member of this body. We who have served with him during the years that the wilderness bill was debated, the Nez Perce National Historical Park was created, the wild rivers bill passed by the Senate and a host of other measures, have been termed "Conservation Congressmen" by our fellow Americans. If we are truly worthy of this honor, Madam President, it is because our able colleague, Mr. CHURCH, has guided our thoughts and actions.

THE VIETNAM CONFLICT: THE SUBSTANCE AND THE SHADOW

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, last fall it was my privilege to be a member of what has since been described in the press as the Mansfield mission.

Under the distinguished leadership of Senator MANSFIELD, it was our objective, in his words, "to look, to listen, to ask questions, and to report" to the President and the Senate.

In this factfinding process we engaged in some 50 formal discussions with the leaders of the countries we visited and with our representatives in those countries.

For us, as Senators, it was an invaluable opportunity to observe conditions in those countries, to hear firsthand the reaction of their leaders to our policies, to state and clarify U.S. positions, and to get in-depth briefings from American representatives in the field.

Our approach to our mission was simple: First, to discuss any subject, any problem, any issue, any point of friction raised by our hosts; second, to state and to clarify, to the best of our ability, any American policy involved; third, to consider, evaluate, and report to the President any suggestion, express or implied, to deal more effectively with any problem; and fourth, to note any possibility, however vague or remote, for moving toward a reduction of friction.

This approach led to discussions of a wide range of subjects in almost every country. The list included few, if any, surprises. The one subject which arose in every instance was Vietnam.

I take this opportunity to pay a personal tribute to the effective and able leadership of Senator MANSFIELD in developing the maximum utility of this kind of mission. His dignified and courteous, but "no nonsense" approach to our discussions was received with respect and frankness from our hosts, without exception. In my judgment, he made a major contribution to better understanding, in places where such understanding is important, of our country's purposes, intentions, and motivations.

The wise and distinguished Senator from Vermont, Senator Aiken, performed an invaluable service as "coleader" of the mission. He was a neverfailing source of good counsel and sound judgment.

The intelligent, hard working, and dedicated work of my good friends, Senator Caleb Boggs, of Delaware, and Senator Daniel Inouye, of Hawaii, completed the team of which I was proud to be a member.

The report of our mission has received wide attention and comment. Many descriptive labels have been attached to it. It was our purpose to produce a report which was, above all else, "realistic." It is the hope, I am sure, of each of us that the report may contribute to a sound understanding of the realities upon which to base the serious decisions we face.

Because there is such widespread interest in the report, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the report be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Vietnam Conflict: The Substance and the Shadow

A. VIETNAM: THE SUBSTANCE OF WAR

1. Introductory

The most important new factor in the war in Vietnam has been the introduction of large numbers of U.S. troops into South Vietnam and their direct entry into combat. This augmentation of the U.S. military role in Vietnam was a response to a near-desperate situation early in 1965. There is no question that the Government of Vietnam in Saigon was faced with a rapidly deteriorating position at that time.

After the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem, repeated coups had weakened the cohesiveness of the central authority and acted to stimulate public disaffection and indifference to the war. At the same time, there was a greatly accelerated military drive by strengthened Vietcong forces. Their control expanded over large areas of the country, particularly in provinces adjacent to the western borders. Communications and transportation between population centers became increasingly hazardous, except by Vietcong sufferance. In short, a total collapse of the Saigon Government's authority appeared imminent in the early months of 1965.

U.S. combat troops in strength arrived at that point in response to the appeal of the Saigon authorities. The Vietcong counter response was to increase their military activity with forces strengthened by intensified local recruitment and infiltration of regular North Vietnamese troops. With the change in the composition of opposing forces the character of the war also changed sharply.

2. Military forces of the Government of Vietnam

The Government of Vietnam now has approximately 635,000 men under arms. Of this number, however, only about 300,000 are regular troops of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, with about 88 percent being Army troops. A general reserve of six airborne battalions and five marine battalions is equipped to fight anywhere in the country.

The Vietnamese Government has six fighter-bomber squadrons. It also has a small navy, composed of sea, river, and coastal forces.

In the total of 635,000 men there are also regional forces of about 120,000 men which act as a constabulary in the 43 Provinces. Each Province chief, who has a military as well as a civil capacity, has a number of regional force companies under his command. Popular forces number about 140,000. Lightly armed, this group is recruited as a rule from local youth to act as defenders of villages and hamlets. A civilian irregular defense group is recruited by the Vietnamese Special Forces. It numbers about 25,000 and is posted in border areas for patrol purposes. Finally, there is a national police of about 50,000 men.

The total of 635,000 men in all categories is expected to be expanded in the current year, although a substantial increase is not anticipated. The sources of expanded recruitment are not great and, in any event, are shared with the Vietcong. Moreover, a high desertion rate continues, despite determined efforts to reduce it.

3. U.S. and international forces in Vietnam

In 1962, U.S. military advisers and service forces in South Vietnam totaled approximately 10,000 men. This number had increased by May of 1965 to about 34,000. At that time the American force was still basically an advisory organization. Americans, in regular combat units, were not yet engaged on the ground. U.S. helicopter companies were in use but only to supply tactical transportation to regular Vietnamese units and the U.S. jet fighter-bombers in the country with the exception of two or three squadrons of aircraft were not yet engaged in support of the Vietnamese Armed Forces.

By December 1965, however, there were approximately 170,000 U.S. troops in South Vietnam. Additionally, there were about 21,000 soldiers and marines from the Republic of Korea an infantry battalion and a battery of artillery, comprising some 1,200 men, from Australia, and a New Zealand artillery battery of about 150 men.

The augmented U.S. ground forces were composed of two Army divisions, the 1st Infantry Division and the 1st Air Cavalry Division, and two separate brigades, the 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division, and the 173d Airborne Brigade. The Australian and New Zealand troops were attached to the latter group. A full U.S. Marine division reinforced by a separate regiment was in Vietnam with the support of six Marine fighter-bomber squadrons.

The small Vietnamese coastal force was augmented by a number of U.S. naval ships and Coast Guard vessels. The U.S. 7th Fleet was off the Vietnamese coast. Planes from its carriers were active in the air campaign against North Vietnam. They were also reinforcing the U.S. Air Force and Vietnamese fighter-bomber squadrons in operations in South Vietnam.

Ten U.S. Air Force and Marine fighter-bomber squadrons were operating from five jet airfields in Vietnam; a sixth field was under construction. B-52 bombers from Guam were providing additional air strength, concentrating on more remote Vietcong bases which had previously been immune to harassment or attack.

The magnitude of the expanded U.S. military effort has required a vastly enlarged support complex. Starting almost from scratch in May of 1965, a logistic system has been built. There are four major logistic support areas. One is in the Saigon region, including Bien Hoa and Vung Tau. The other three are located along the coast, at Cam Ranh Bay, at Qui Nhon in Binh Dinh Province, and at Da Nang. The rapid infusion of American forces has strained the facilities of the new logistic system to the utmost, with long delays in unloading and moving equipment not unusual. There have also been and still are shortages of important items of supply despite efforts to eliminate these shortages.

4. Relationship of United States and Vietnamese forces

From the point of view of American policy and practice, the war itself remains a Vietnamese war. The American command emphasizes that U.S. forces in Vietnam are there to support the Vietnamese and their Armed Forces in the effort to resist aggression by infiltration from the north and terrorism and subversion from within. Vietnamese sovereignty and the paramount role of the Vietnamese are meticulously respected and the supporting nature of the U.S. role is stressed.

There is no combined or unified command of the international forces in Vietnam. United States and Vietnamese forces work together through coordination and cooperation. The commander of the U.S. forces maintains close liaison with the Vietnamese Minister of Defense and the Chief of the Joint General Staff. Strategy and plans are devised together. Parallel instructions are then issued to the respective commanders through corps and division to regimental level. In the execution of an operation a joint command post is set up or liaison officers are exchanged and terrain is apportioned for tactical areas of operation. According to American military commanders these arrangements have proved to be practical and workable.

5. Vietcong-North Vietnamese forces

In December 1965, the best available estimates placed Vietcong strength in South Vietnam at 230,000 men. This figure is double that of 3 years ago. Total Vietcong strength, apparently, is steadily increasing despite the serious casualties which these forces have suffered during the past few months.

Of the present total, approximately 73,000 are main force soldiers, including 14,000 regular PAVN (People's Army of North Vietnam) troops from North Vietnam. The Vietcong forces also include about 100,000 militia, some 17,000 support troops who operate along lines of communication, and approximately 40,000 political cadres. It is estimated that the Vietcong, through local recruitment in the south and infiltrated from the north, have the capability of a substantial increase in their numbers within a short period of time.

Infiltration of men from North Vietnam through Laos has been going on for many years. It was confined primarily to political cadres and military leadership until about the end of 1964 when North Vietnam Regular Army troops began to enter South Vietnam by this route. It is anticipated that with the multiplication of routes through Laos the rate of infiltration is likely to increase threefold from the present estimated 1,500 per month. The monsoon, which earlier was considered to be of great significance in its effect on the reinforcement capabilities of the Vietcong as well as on the ability of both sides to prosecute the war, has proved in experience to be of minor consequence if, indeed, of any consequence at all.

6. Current state of the war

By November 1965, American troops were directly involved in battle to a much greater degree than at any other time in the history of the Vietnamese conflict. At the same time, the intensity of the war itself reached a new high. The Vietcong initiated 1,038 incidents during the last week of November and the total number of incidents which had increased steadily throughout 1965, reached 3,588 in that month. These incidents involved armed attacks up to regimental strength as well as terrorism and sabotage of various kinds and antiaircraft fire against U.S. aircraft. In the later months of 1965 the trend was toward larger attacks, except in the Mekong Delta where there were numerous small-scale actions.

With the increase in the intensity of the conflict, there were increased numbers of casualties among all participants. In the month of November 1965, alone, 469 Americans were killed in action, a figure representing about 35 percent of all Americans killed in action in the war until that date. In addition, 1,470 Americans were listed as wounded and 33 as missing. During the same month the South Vietnamese Army reported 956 soldiers killed in action, 2,030 wounded, and 355 missing. The Vietcong, for their part, are estimated to have lost 5,300 men killed in the month and, in addition, 595 were taken prisoner. Many of these casualties were regulars of the North Vietnamese Army.

7. The security situation in South Vietnam

The presence of U.S. combat forces has acted to arrest the deterioration in general security in Government-controlled parts of South Vietnam. It has also improved the ability of the Vietnamese Government to hold Saigon, the strategic heart of the country, the coastal bases, and certain other key areas in the country. In the latter connection, it should be noted that a strategic route (19) from the coast to the western highlands has been reopened for convoyed ground traffic to Pleiku, a major military strongpoint in the western highlands. On certain other roads, an improvement in security is also reported.

8. Vietcong reactions

Faced by a blunting of their military efforts, the Vietcong have reacted strongly to the new situation. Beginning in June an estimated 1,500 North Vietnamese troops per month have entered South Vietnam through Laos and this number is rapidly increasing. The estimates are that at least seven regiments of regular troops from North Vietnam are now in the country with more on the way. At the same time the Vietcong have in recent months greatly stepped up the recruiting, induction, and training of South Vietnamese in the densely populated delta region. They have increased their small-scale attacks in that area, aiming apparently at isolated outposts and at demoralizing the regional and popular forces as well as harassing lines of supply and communication.

The stepped-up activity of the Vietcong in the countryside has been paralleled by an effort on the part of the Government forces to strengthen their control over the population in the base areas and their immediate environs. These base areas themselves are held in some force. At the U.S. Marine base at Da Nang, for example, the perimeter of security has been pushed out about 10 miles. The bulk of U.S. Marine forces, however, is now preoccupied in defense within that perimeter. Nevertheless, it is still possible for the Vietcong to bypass the defenders and penetrate the area in sporadic hit-and-run raids. Communications between the base areas along the coast are still subject to Vietcong ambush and attack.

In Saigon, heavily defended as it is, the rattle of automatic weapons fire or the explosion of mortar shells in the outskirts of the city are not uncommon sounds by day or by night. Vietcong ability to carry out terroristic attacks within the city itself is from time to time made evident. Indeed, it is considered by some that Saigon with its many vulnerabilities to sabotage and terrorism and Hanoi with its exposure to air attack are mutual hostages, one for the other.

9. Impact of increased American forces on the Vietnamese

The arrival in Vietnam of American combat troops in large numbers has had an immediate positive psychological effect on Government-held areas. Not only has there been an improvement of morale in the Government and the armed forces, there has also been a return of confidence among Vietnamese civilians. This is especially true in Saigon where the increased American presence is taken as insurance against an imminent collapse of the existing structure.[1] Politically and commercially minded Vietnamese, seeing that the United States had so far committed itself, have found renewed courage and confidence.

Of great significance is the fact that there has been a period of government stability in Vietnam following the arrival of additional U.S. troops. This stability is more essential than ever for the maintenance of public confidence after the debilitating consequences of the repeated coups which followed the assassination of President Diem. It is also vital for the effective prosecution of war and the formulation and carrying out of social, economic, and political reform programs.

10. The government of Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky

The new leadership in government which is drawn largely from military circles is young and hopeful, but with little knowledge of politics. Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, the Prime Minister, recognizes that a purely military solution to the problems of Vietnam is not possible. Security and social and economic reform, in his view, must proceed hand in hand in order to gain the support of the people.

The new leaders express the intention of moving toward some form of representative civilian government, taking into account the history and needs of the Vietnamese people. They speak of a consultative assembly to prepare the way for a constitution and hearings throughout the country on the constitution with a view to a referendum at the end of 1966. The referendum, according to their concepts, would be followed by elections to a legislative body by the end of 1967, if by that time elections can be held without intimidation in as much as two-thirds of the country. Some observers believe that, perhaps, not more than 25 percent of the villages under Government control in South Vietnam would be free from intimidation at an election at the present time.

In addition to prosecuting the war, the Government of Vietnam is seeking to initiate measures to protect and improve the welfare of the population. With the indispensable assistance of U.S. aid, food and other commodities are being imported into the country to meet current needs and to insure that the price of staples such as rice, fish, and canned milk remain within the reach of the people.

11. The pacification or civic action program

A new effort is also being made to bring the people of the villages into closer and firmer rapport with the Government. In the period following the fall of the government of Ngo Dinh Diem, the so-called pacification or civic action program which brought government, police, economic, and social organization into the hamlets, was allowed in large measure to lapse. Due to subsequent changes of government, there were eventually only a very few people left to carry on this work. Military necessity required the Government to concentrate on attempting to stop Vietcong military advances.

The present Government is once again seeking to create an organization to carry out a program of pacification or civic action. Screening the cadres left from the programs of previous governments, a basic group has been selected. Together with additional groups to be trained it is expected that a total number adequate to meet the needs for pacification teams in the priority areas chosen by the Government of Vietnam will be available by the end of 1966.

The present plan for pacification work is regarded by observerers as more thorough and more realistic than previous efforts. It contemplates teams remaining in each village for an initial period of several months with subsequent followups over a period of at least 1 year. The belief is that the inhabitants can generally be sufficiently won over to the side of the Government in that period and conditions established where elections for local officials can be held. It is realized, however, that even then the work cannot be considered as completed.

12. Other programs

In addition to giving strong support to the pacification program, the new Government has numerous other plans to better the lot of the people. There are, for example, projects to improve the pay of the troops, construct low-cost housing, and redistribute land. In this connection a program has been inaugurated to give 700,000 acres of land to 180,000 farmers. It is generally recognized that Government programs of this kind, many of which have been attempted in various forms before, will require years before any substantial political effect upon the population can be anticipated.

13. Economic aspects of the conflict

The Government of Vietnam has also instituted a resources control program in an effort to restrict the Vietcong's ability to get the things they need to carry on the war. In most parts of Vietnam, which is a naturally rich and productive country, it is not difficult to obtain enough food to support life. This is particularly true in the fertile and densely populated delta of the south with its great rice fields and network of interconnecting canals. The Vietcong obtain money by many means, including taxation and extortion, and they can and do use these funds to purchase food in the countryside and medicines in district and Provincial towns. The Vietcong can and do attack trucks and convoys on the roads and seize the weapons, ammunition, and the other goods which they may carry.

By a system of rationing, identity cards, and resource control, including checkpoints and mobile control teams, however, the Government hopes to stop the Vietcong from obtaining key commodities such as food and medicines in key areas such as the highlands, which is a deficit region. In other areas it is hoped that the system will make goods less available for the Vietcong and more difficult for them to obtain.

It must be said that there is also a reverse side to this picture. The Vietcong, operating in the countryside, have the ability to restrict the flow of food to cities and population centers such as Saigon. Vegetables, for example, come to Saigon from Dalat in the central highlands. Sugar also comes to Saigon along the same road which is controlled in part by the Vietcong. It is common knowledge that commodities reaching Saigon's markets by road from the Dalat area have paid a tax to the Vietcong before reaching the city and that unless the tax is paid they will not reach the city. The fact is plain: Much of Saigon's indigenous food and commodity supply depends on the sufferance of the Vietcong and on payments to them.

The ravages of war and terrorism, however, are taking a toll of the country's productive capacity. Rice fields and rubber plantations in areas that are being bombed and fought over no longer produce their contribution to feed the people and to nourish the economy. Fledgling enterprises in outlying areas, cut off from supplies and from markets by interrupted communications, wither and fail.

---

[1] The illustrative story is told of the Vietnamese professional man who sold his house in Saigon in January of 1965 in despair over the deteriorating situation, only to buy back the same house later in the year, following the arrival of American troops, for twice the price at which he had sold it.

Along with increased Vietcong activity in the delta in recent months, there has been growing Vietcong restriction on the flow of rice from that region to the Saigon market. The result is that Vietnam, a rice surplus region, in 1966, will have to import at least 300,000 tons of rice from abroad under U.S. aid programs to feed the population of the cities and towns under the Government's control.

Although, as has been said, the arrival of large numbers of American troops has gone far to restore business confidence in the cities of Vietnam, there have been adverse effects as well. One of these is the creation of a labor shortage, particularly among skilled workers, as men have been drained away from normal areas of employment to the base complexes and other regions where construction projects are being pushed to create the logistic structure and other facilities required by the American forces.

Inflationary pressures resulting from the war and the changed U.S. role have thus far been kept within bounds. Saigon itself, however, has an overstimulated atmosphere of almost hectic prosperity, in some respects, as the impact of spending by American servicemen and the effect of U.S. defense expenditure make themselves felt. There are also the beginnings of the rumblings of personal discontent and antagonism which generally characterize the reaction in any nation to the sudden infusion of a large body of foreign forces.

14. Summation

In sum, the overall control of the country remains about the same as it was at the beginning of 1965. It is estimated that about 22 percent of the population is under Vietcong control and about 18 percent inhabits contested areas. About 60 percent of the population in the country is, at present, under some form of government control, largely because of its hold on Saigon and other cities and large towns.

The population of the cities has been augmented by a great number of refugees. Hundreds of thousands in number, they are for the greater part composed of people who have fled to the cities in an effort to escape the spreading intensity of the war. In this sense, they are unlike the refugees who came from North Vietnam in 1954. These earlier refugees consciously chose to leave their ancestral homes and come south permanently, rather than accept a Communist regime. The new refugees, for the most part, are believed merely to be waiting for an end to the fighting in order to return to their homes and land.

The Vietcong have stepped up sabotage, terrorism, and hit-and-run attacks in the Government-held areas which are, principally, cities and major towns and indeterminate, but limited, extensions outward from them. Harassment by United States and Vietnamese air attack and airborne forces has increased in the firmly held Vietcong areas of South Vietnam which are almost entirely rural. And, of course, North Vietnam has been brought under air attack.

In general, however, what the Saigon Government held in the way of terrain in the early months of 1965 (and it was already considerably less than was held at the time of the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem), is still held. What was controlled then by the Vietcong is still controlled by the Vietcong. What lay between was contested at the outset of 1965 and is still contested.

B. VIETNAM AND THE NATIONS OF ASIA

Other nations of Asia generally view the conflict in Vietnam with great concern. Those countries nearest to Vietnam see in the spread and increasing intensity of the warfare a heightened danger of a spillover into their territory. They sense that the longer the conflict continues and the more it escalates the greater becomes this danger to themselves. Furthermore, they fear the effect upon their own future should all of Vietnam become a Communist state.

Laos already finds itself deeply although unwillingly involved on the fringes of the war in Vietnam. The fighting within Laos, which continues despite the 1962 Geneva Agreement, is now a closely interwoven part of the Vietnamese struggle. The connection is most pronounced in the eastern part of Laos which lies within the control of the Communist Pathet Lao forces. This region, the so-called Laotian panhandle, is a natural infiltration route for men and supplies from North Vietnam into South Vietnam. A long border abutting on South Vietnam makes it possible for troops and equipment from Hanoi to reach far south through Communist-controlled territory in Laos with a minimum of risk before being diverted across the border into South Vietnam by any number of lateral communications routes. New roads have been constructed through this mountainous terrain along which men and supplies can pass, for the most part undetected, protected as they are in some regions by double canopies of jungle foliage. These roads are not easily susceptible to aerial interdiction.

Cambodia, in a different manner and to a much lesser extent than Laos, is already directly touched by the fighting in Vietnam. There are repeated charges that Cambodian territory is being used as a base for Vietcong operations. That is possible in view of the remoteness and obscurity of the border but there is no firm evidence of any such organized usage and no evidence whatsoever that any alleged usage of Cambodian soil is with the sanction much less the assistance of the Cambodian Government. Prince Sihanouk responded immediately to a recent allegation that the Cambodian port of Sihanoukville is being used to transship supplies to the Vietcong by calling for an investigation by the International Control Commission which was set up under the Geneva Accords of 1954.

Cambodia's overwhelming concern is the preservation of its national integrity which, in times past, has been repeatedly violated by more powerful neighbors and is still subject to occasional forays from a minor dissident movement (the Khmer Serai) which has been allowed to base itself in the neighboring nations. Cambodia seeks recognition and respect of its borders by all parties to the conflict. It asks to be left to live in peace so that it may concentrate on its own problems and internal development. The Cambodians have made great internal progress, largely through their own efforts supplemented by a judicious use of aid from the United States in the past and from other nations both in the past and at the present time. They have a peaceful and productive nation with an intense sense of national unity and loyalty to Prince Sihanouk.

The fact that fighting in South Vietnam has raged close to the border and there have, as a result, been occasional border incursions and bombing of Cambodian territory has caused the deepest concern to the Cambodian Government. Cambodia can be expected to make the most vigorous efforts to resist becoming directly involved in the struggle surging through South Vietnam and to repel to the best of its capability direct and organized invasions of its territory which may stem from the mounting tempo of the war.

Thailand, the only country on the southeast Asia mainland directly allied with the United States, seeks to cooperate with the United States as an ally while avoiding a spillover of the war into Thai territory. That course is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain. Thailand has a large number of North Vietnamese living in its northeast region bordering on Laos. This element retains an affinity for Hanoi and is susceptible to its influence. Moreover, in the recent past Peiping has brought to the forefront a Thai leader in exile and has increased the intensity of its propaganda attacks against Thailand. Reports of terrorism and sabotage in the northeast of Thailand are increasing.

The Vietnamese war was brought very close to Thai territory in November 1965. A Pathet Lao military thrust toward the Laotian town of Thakkek on the Mekong, which was supported by North Vietnamese troops, was fortuitously driven back by Government forces. Had it not been repelled, the war, in effect, would have reached the point where it made direct contact with Thailand's frontier.

Nations in Asia more geographically remote from the war in South Vietnam are nonetheless conscious of the dangers to the entire area as the struggle in South Vietnam becomes more prolonged and ever more intense. These countries range from neutral and nonalined Burma through such allies of the United States as the Philippines and Japan.

Each of the countries of Asia has its own internal problems. Each has varying degrees of internal stability. Each has as a principal concern, the avoidance of direct involvement in the Vietnamese conflict. With the exception of Korea, there is little likelihood of substantial material help from these sources in providing military assistance in South Vietnam. Others are either unwilling or reluctant to become involved in a military sense or are unable to do so because of inner difficulties or the broader strategic requirements of the Asian situation. Even with respect to Korea, it is obvious that any withdrawal of forces for use in Vietnam creates new problems of military balance as between North and South Korea. It should not be overlooked that peace in the Korean peninsula is still held together only by a tenuous truce.

The Asian nations generally are aware of their own relative powerlessness to influence the main course of events, or, in the final analysis, to control their own destinies should the conflict in Vietnam ultimately develop into a confrontation between the United States and Communist China with all that such an eventuality might imply for the peace of Asia and the world. In Japan, for example, there is a deep anxiety over the possible consequences to that nation of such a confrontation if it should materialize. The memory of the escalation of the limited Manchurian incident of 30 years ago into a seemingly interminable war on the mainland of China is not yet dead in Japan.

To sum up, then, the nations of Asia recognize the immense importance to themselves of what is transpiring in Vietnam. But they also recognize their own limitations in the face of it. Their immediate preoccupation, in any event, is with their own internal problems and development. Throughout the area there is a continuing interest in activities involving peaceful cooperation for economic development. The Peace Corps is generally welcomed wherever it operates and, notably, in the Philippines. The new Asian Development Bank is being launched with considerable enthusiasm. The Mekong project has warm support throughout the region and considerable interest in Cambodia, which is central to the concept.

It is clear that none of the nations of the area desires the domination of either China or the United States. Given a choice, it is doubtful that any nation would like to see the influence of the United States withdrawn completely from southeast Asia. Generally speaking, the nations of the area welcome peaceful ties with the United States and our participation in the development of the region if that participation does not become overwhelming.

C. THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE

Without exception the Soviet Union, Poland, and Rumania give full and firm support to the position of Hanoi and the Vietcong. They are quick in their denunciation of the U.S. role in South Vietnam and vehement against U.S. bombing in North Vietnam.

Part of this solidarity is undoubtedly derived from ideological affinities. Whatever attitudes they may manifest toward Communist China, and they vary, it is clear that responsibility for the continuation of the conflict in Vietnam is assigned to the United States and this is regarded as an impediment to improvement in political relations with this country.

There is no reason to believe that the Soviet Union, in present circumstances, sees its way clear or, in fact, is anxious to play a significant role to assist in bringing an end to hostilities in Vietnam. The Soviet Union has steadfastly refused to join with the United Kingdom, the other cochairman of the 1954 Geneva Conference, in calling for a reconvening of that Conference. They have emphasized repeatedly in public statements as well as in other ways that they have no intention of taking an initiative for peace in Vietnam at this time.

The countries of Eastern Europe have reason for concern over the continuation of the conflict in Vietnam and its escalation. Some of these reasons have to do with their own national preoccupations and the situation in Europe. Both Poland and Rumania, for example, have a very substantial trade with the Western World and remain interested in increased trade with the United States should conditions permit. Both might well be disposed to make a contribution to a settlement of the Vietnam problem to the extent their capabilities permit but only should they see some possibility of success.

D. COMMUNIST CHINA

Behind the war in Vietnam, behind the fears and preoccupations of other Asian nations and through the attitudes of the Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union runs the shadow of Communist China.

Until now the Chinese Communists have not introduced their manpower directly into the conflict although they clearly recognize that the war may reach that point. They recognize, too, that the war may impinge upon China herself at some point and have begun to make preliminary preparations for that eventuality.

For the present, however, the Chinese appear to take the view that their direct intervention in Vietnam is not required since: (1) The war in South Vietnam is a people's war which the Vietcong are winning; (2) North Vietnam is successfully defending itself; (3) the more the United States escalates the war the higher our casualties will be and the more discouraged we will become; and (4) the United States cannot win, in any event, according to Chinese theories.

It is from Communist China that Hanoi and the Vietcong derive the bulk of their outside material support. It is from Communist China that there has also flowed encouragement of resistance to negotiation or compromise. As the war escalates and Hanoi becomes ever more dependent upon Chinese support, a dependence which Soviet aid at best only tempers, the likelihood also increases that North Vietnam will not be able to negotiate a settlement without at least the tacit consent of China. In fact, that point may already have been reached.

E. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

A rapid solution to the conflict in Vietnam is not in immediate prospect. This would appear to be the case whether military victory is pursued or negotiations do, in fact, materialize.

Insofar as the military situation is concerned, the large-scale introduction of U.S. forces and their entry into combat has blunted but not turned back the drive of the Vietcong. The latter have responded to the increased American role with a further strengthening of their forces by local recruitment in the south and reinforcements from the north and a general stepping up of military activity. As a result the lines remain drawn in South Vietnam in substantially the same pattern as they were at the outset of the increased U.S. commitment. What has changed basically is the scope and intensity of the struggle and the part which is being played by the forces of the United States and those of North Vietnam.

Despite the great increase in American military commitment, it is doubtful in view of the acceleration of Vietcong efforts that the constricted position now held in Vietnam by the Saigon government can continue to be held for the indefinite future, let alone extended, without a further augmentation of American forces on the ground. Indeed, if present trends continue, there is no assurance as to what ultimate increase in American military commitment will be required before the conflict is terminated. For the fact is that under present terms of reference and as the war has evolved, the question is not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open ended. How open is dependent on the extent to which North Vietnam and its supporters are willing and able to meet increased force by increased force. All of mainland southeast Asia, at least, cannot be ruled out as a potential battlefield. As noted, the war has already expanded significantly into Laos and is beginning to lap over the Cambodian border while pressures increase in the northeast of Thailand.

Even if the war remains substantially within its present limits, there is little foundation for the expectation that the Government of Vietnam in Saigon will be able, in the near future, to carry a much greater burden than it is now carrying. This is in no sense a reflection on the caliber of the current leaders of Vietnam. But the fact is that they are, as other Vietnamese Governments have been over the past decade, at the beginning of a beginning in dealing with the problems of popular mobilization in support of the Government. They are starting, moreover, from a point considerably behind that which prevailed at the time of President Diem's assassination. Under present concepts and plans, then, what lies ahead is, literally, a vast and continuing undertaking in social engineering in the wake of such military progress as may be registered. And for many years to come this task will be very heavily dependent on U.S. foreign aid.

The basic concept of present American policy with respect to Vietnam casts the United States in the role of support of the Vietnamese Government and people. This concept becomes more difficult to maintain as the military participation of the United States undergoes rapid increase. Yet a change in the basic concept could have a most unfortunate impact upon the Vietnamese people and the world at large. What is involved here is the necessity for the greatest restraint in word and action, lest the concept be eroded and the war drained of a purpose with meaning to the people of Vietnam.

This danger is great, not only because of the military realities of the situation but also because, with a few exceptions, assistance has not been and is not likely to be forthcoming for the war effort in South Vietnam from nations other than the United States. On the contrary, as it now appears, the longer the war continues in its present pattern and the more it expands in scope, the greater will become the strain placed upon the relations of the United States with allies both in the Far East and in Europe.

Many nations are deeply desirous of an end to this conflict as quickly as possible. Few are specific as to the manner in which this end can be brought about or the shape it is likely to take. In any event, even though other nations, in certain circumstances, may be willing to play a third-party role in bringing about negotiations, any prospects for effective negotiations at this time (and they are slim) are likely to be largely dependent on the initiatives and efforts of the combatants.

Negotiations at this time, moreover, if they do come about, and if they are accompanied by a cease-fire and standfast, would serve to stabilize a situation in which the majority of the population remains under nominal government control but in which dominance of the countryside rests largely in the hands of the Vietcong. What might eventually materialize through negotiations from this situation cannot be foreseen at this time with any degree of certainty.

That is not, to say the least, a very satisfactory prospect. What needs also to be borne in mind, however, is that the visible alternative at this time and under present terms of reference is the indefinite expansion and intensification of the war which will require the continuous introduction of additional U.S. forces. The end of that course cannot be foreseen, either, and there are no grounds for optimism that the end is likely to be reached within the confines of South Vietnam or within the very near future.

In short, such choices as may be open are not simple choices. They are difficult and painful choices and they are beset with many impounderables. The situation, as it now appears, offers only the very slim prospect of a just settlement by negotiations or the alternative prospect of a continuance of the conflict in the direction of a general war on the Asian mainland.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, since our return from our travels, each of us, of course, has been asked to add our personal impressions to the report.

The report speaks for itself and represents a consensus of the five Senators involved. Nevertheless, it cannot conceivably encompass the hundreds of reactions and impressions which we experienced and are still digesting.

It may be useful, therefore, Madam President, to include at this point in the Record—and I ask unanimous consent to do so—some excerpts from comments I have made since our return.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I have said that Vietnam was the single, consistently recurring subject in our discussions:

Only the Communist countries urged our unconditional withdrawal from South Vietnam—with varying degrees of emphasis and harshness in their criticism of American policy.

There appeared to be an underlying regret in Warsaw, Moscow, and Bucharest that the Vietnam problem exists and a wish that it might go away—but the words used consistently placed responsibility upon the United States for the existence of the problem and for eliminating it.

There was a general uneasiness about the dreadful uncertainties to which the Vietnamese conflict might lead.

There was a general pessimism about the prospects for a negotiated settlement, but indications of an interest in contributing to that objective if the opportunity arose.

Support for U.S. policy in Vietnam varied inversely with the distance from southeast Asia.

There was very great uneasiness in southeast Asia as to the consequences for southeast Asian countries of a complete U.S. withdrawal.

All the areas of the world which we visited were a constant source of interest to all of us, but southeast Asia had a particular fascination.

It is, of course, the site of our greatest overseas problem.

It is an area of great variety and beauty.

It is an area of great resources and potential richness.

On the surface, the five countries we visited—Burma, Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, and South Vietnam—have much in common and would appear to have much to gain from a closer association.

In reality there are differences and divisions, deep seated and historic, which are sources of constant friction—and instability even within a given country.

And the gap between the rich and the poor is as great as anywhere in the world, and productive of more instability.

There is no love or natural affinity between any of these countries and China—before or since mainland China has gone Communist; and each of these countries, in its own way is seeking to be independent of Chinese domination and control.

There is no question in my mind but that all of them would fall under Chinese domination and control if the United States withdraws or is driven from South Vietnam.

To the leaders of Red China, South Vietnam is just another incident in the long struggle which they have waged for 40 years and which they intend to continue to wage for the ultimate supremacy of their brand of communism in the world.

They will not be diverted from their ultimate objective by whatever happens in Vietnam.

Only the forces of evolution and change, when, as, and if their country emerges as a modern, industrial state, can blunt or eliminate their revolutionary fervor and persuade them to accept coexistence and diversity as the normal condition of the world.

This is the reality as we seek a way to resolve the Vietnam dilemma.

SUBSTITUTION OF PRIVATE FOR PUBLIC CREDIT

Mr. MOSS. Madam President, I am sure that Senators on both sides of the aisle will welcome the special emphasis that President Johnson's budget places on urging the private financial community to participate more fully in financing major Federal credit programs.

In the coming fiscal year, the Federal Government plans to relinquish to private buyers $4.7 billion of Federal loans—including both individual loans and opportunities to participate in pools of loans.

To make this possible, the President proposes to broaden the whole range of assets now sold through participation pools. He also proposes to expand the newly enacted program under which State and nonprofit agencies, with Federal assistance, insure private loans to college students, so as to reduce the budgetary requirements for direct Federal loans.

The President's program of substituting private for public credit—wherever consistent with program objectives—is in line with policies voiced by each of the last three Presidents. It fulfills the recommendations made in 1963 by the Committee on Federal Credit Programs that "Government credit programs should, in principle, supplement or stimulate private lending, rather than substitute for it"—a report endorsed by both President Kennedy and President Johnson.

It carries out the views so cogently expressed by the minority members of the House Ways and Means Committee in 1963 when they declared that "The administration can always reduce its borrowing requirements by additional sales of marketable Government assets."

Finally, this emphasis is most timely in the light of the special urgency of total budget requirements this year. By substituting private for public credit, we can free money for high-priority programs without increasing budget expenditures

This is realistic, sensible, financial management.

It penalizes no beneficiary of public credit assistance.

It encourages the private credit system to share with Government the responsibility and opportunity to build the Great Society.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR RUSSELL OF GEORGIA TO GEORGIA STATE LEGISLATURE, JANUARY 17, 1966

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], recently delivered an outstanding address to the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, meeting at the State Capitol in Atlanta.

Appearing before a joint session of the State senate and the Georgia House of Representatives, Senator RUSSELL outlined in some detail the lasting and meaningful results of more than 3 decades of service in the U.S. Senate to his native State and to his Nation. As his record clearly shows, his primary concern has always been and will always be the well-being of the people of his State, as well as the security and best interests of the United States. The warmth and respect with which Senator RUSSELL is regarded by an overwhelming majority of the people of Georgia was demonstrated by the enthusiastic reception he received from members of the Georgia Legislature, prior to, during, and following his address.

Just as the senior Senator from Georgia is held in high esteem by his fellow Georgians, so is he in the Chamber of the U.S. Senate. I know of no other Member of this body who is more respected for his unswerving allegiance to the principles which have made this Nation what it is today, for his steadfastness in holding to heartfelt convictions, or for his knowledge of the parliamentary inner workings and procedures of this body than my beloved senior colleague and warm friend, DICK RUSSELL.

Madam President, I commend Senator RUSSELL's remarks to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR RICHARD B. RUSSELL PREPARED FOR DELIVERY TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA AT THE CAPITOL, ATLANTA, MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 1966

It is a high honor to stand again in this historic hall where men and events have met to shape the destiny of our beloved Georgia.

For me, each return visit to this General Assembly is a sentimental and deeply moving experience. It brings back a flood of nostalgic memories of my own service in this body. I count the 10 years I spent as a member of the House from Barrow County—4 of them as speaker—as among the most pleasant and satisfying of my career.

This occasion today is especially meaningful. Last year, for the only time in my life, I was unable to respond to a call to address this Assembly. I can assure you that my esteem and respect for this body and its members are such that only illness prevented my presence on that occasion.

HEALTH GOOD, SPIRITS HIGH

So this morning I welcome the opportunity to redeem myself. I am happy to say that today my health is good, my spirits are high, and my face is turned full to the future. I look forward to serving Georgia in the Senate of the United States for many years to come—provided that meets with approval of the people of this State.

In both basis of organization and membership, this General Assembly is different from any that has met here in the memory of man. But I am confident that its dedication and devotion to the welfare of Georgia is as great as any that has gone before. I am sure that you will discharge every responsibility without fear, favor, or intimidation.

Georgia, in common with the rest of the country, is undergoing a period of whirlwind change and transition. When I was a member of this House, two thirds of the people of Georgia lived on farms and in rural areas. Today, however, slightly more than half of our people reside in urban communities—and the trend to the city is almost certain to continue in the coming years.

These changes have brought about a host of new and perplexing problems that are peculiar alike to the rural and the urban areas of our State.

In searching for solutions to our problems, I know there will be differences and conflicts among you. But these can be resolved if they are approached in a spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding—and in accordance with the words inscribed on our great seal—in "Wisdom, Justice, and Moderation."

GEORGIA'S HORIZON UNLIMITED

Nothing can do more to enhance the future of Georgia than to have all our people from all sections working in harmony together for the common good of all. We must not jeopardize that future through a needless struggle between urban and rural interests that can only bring harm to the people of both sections.

Georgia today is forging forward in all areas of life and in all spheres of activity. In the dark and discouraging years that followed Appomattox, the eloquent and incandescent Benjamin Harvey Hill uttered some words that Georgians of his day and ours have taken to heart. He said: "We can live neither in nor by the defeated past, and if we would live in the growing, conquering future, we must furnish our strength to shape its course, and our will to discharge its duties."

This we have done. Upon a proud and honorable heritage, we are constructing a new and modern Georgia that blends the best of the old with the promise of the new.

Today, the future beckons as never before with hope and opportunity for all our people. A recent survey by the U.S. Department of Commerce revealed that in 34 of 35 categories Georgia has outstripped the Nation in industrial growth since 1948. In the same period, the average income of Georgians has doubled—though in our self-congratulation on this achievement let us not forget that we are still behind many other States. This is an area in which we must do better.

WORKING FOR GEORGIA

During my years in the Senate, I have worked with unstinting zeal and energy to advance Georgia's progress in every legitimate and proper way at my command. I have undertaken to see that Georgia receives full opportunity to participate in all Federal programs and activities which our people, after all, help to pay for with their tax dollars. I have done so in the conviction that I have been elected to represent and work for Georgia's interest in Washington—and not Washington's interest in Georgia.

The record, I think, bears evidence that these efforts have borne fruit. Let me quickly summarize some major areas:

National defense

Some 60,000 Georgians today are employed on the 15 major military bases located in Georgia and in defense-related industrial activities. The total impact on the Georgia economy of military and defense payrolls and activities amounts to well over $1 billion annually and is increasing. Last year, for the first time, Georgia became one of the 10 leading States in dollar volume of defense contracts—and this was before selection of the Lockheed Co. at Marietta to build the mammoth C–5A aircraft—one of the largest defense contracts ever to be awarded.

River development

Four of Georgia's principal rivers—the Savannah, the Chattahoochee, the Coosa, and the Flint—are under major development by the Corps of Engineers and construction of four new multipurpose dams is underway or is authorized. In the postwar period, we have opened 500 miles of year-round navigable waterways on our rivers and our goal is to add another 250 miles in the foreseeable future. The cities of Augusta, Bainbridge, and Columbus have become inland ports and we intend to add Atlanta, Rome, and Albany to this list. To date, about $850 million has been invested in harnessing Georgia's river and water resources for navigation, flood prevention, municipal and industrial water supplies, pollution abatement, and recreation.

Agriculture

Georgia is the southeastern center for research activities of the Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Forest Service. Tifton, Macon, and the University system are hubs of this research effort which is discovering ways to better utilize and manage our bountiful land, forest, and water resources. The plant value of these various agriculture research facilities alone is in the neighborhood of $25 million, and total agriculture spending in Georgia for all purposes amounts to $325 million a year.

Airport and highway construction

Since I entered the Senate, eight different Federal programs have been enacted to assist communities in building and improving airports. Under these programs, Georgia has received $54 million, which has helped to build 104 airports. I am pleased to report that construction of 41 additional airports throughout the State is contemplated under the long-range plans of the Federal Aviation Agency. I believe we are in a strong position to obtain funds for most if not all of these.

Since 1957, Georgia has received $750 million in Federal matching money for highway construction—two-thirds of it for the Interstate System, which is financed 90 percent by U.S. funds. I am hopeful that the present lag in highway trust funds will be corrected so that the 42,000-mile Interstate System can be completed by the 1972 target date. But even before that time, I anticipate that Congress will authorize an expansion of the existing system. I also am devoting much effort to see that the very first extension of the system will include a new interstate route linking Fort Gordon, Warner Robins, Fort Benning, and Randolph Field, Ala.

Education

Georgia today ranks 11th in the order of the States in Federal assistance to education under 35 different programs, ranging from vocational education to school lunches. The amount of school aid to the State last year was $38 million, and this is expected to increase by some $50 million in the coming year as the new secondary and higher education programs get underway.

I believe one of the most far-reaching and significant achievements of the past session of Congress was the passage of the Higher Education Act, which increases the opportunities for our young people to receive a college education without family income being the determining factor. The new law expands the student loan program, which already has assisted 14,000 young Georgians to go to college, and establishes a new program of scholarships for talented and deserving students.

Georgia's institutions of higher learning also benefit extensively from the various research activities of the Federal Government. The National Science Foundation this year will assign $5 million in research grants and contracts to Georgia colleges. Another important source of research funding is the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Georgia Tech alone has received some $5 million in the past 5 years from NASA—including a million-dollar grant to help build Tech's new Space Science Technology Center.

TWO BILLION DOLLARS IN U.S. AID

The programs I have summarized constitute but a small fraction of the total scope of Federal activities in Georgia. The most recent figures I have seen put the grand total at more than $2 billion a year. When broken down on a population basis, we stand very near the top among all 50 States in our per capita share of Federal benefits and activities.

It is hardly necessary for me to say that I have not voted for all the Federal programs that have come along during my time in the Senate. I could not do so and remain true to the principles of constitutional government which I hold dear.

I have supported—and I shall continue to support—those worthwhile measures that are based on the tried and proven principle of Federal cooperation with the States and local government. But I have opposed—and shall continue to oppose—those programs which undertake to give the Federal Government power to control and dominate the States.

Let me make it perfectly clear that though I do not support every program that is proposed, I undertake to do everything within my power to see that Georgia gets its full share of whatever benefits may be provided. I may vote against a given program, but if it becomes law anyway, I take my tin cup and try to fight my way to the head of the line.

There are some who apparently feel the concept of Federal-State cooperation is old fashioned and outmoded. They favor the concentration of all powers of government in the hands of a bureaucratic colossus on the banks of the Potomac.

I realize that those in certain quarters maintain I am old fashioned and outmoded. Be that as it may, I shall never abandon my Jeffersonian belief in a government of divided and defined powers—and in a government that recognizes the role, rights, and responsibilities of the States of this Union. Let us never forget that the States created the Federal Government; the Federal Government did not create the States.

This year, by coincidence of the calendar, the General Assembly of Georgia and the Congress of the United States began their deliberations on the same day. I must confess to a tinge of envy of your knowledge that your labors will culminate in 40 days, because the outlook for the Congress is uncertain indeed.

CONGRESSIONAL MOOD SOMBER

The new session has convened in an atmosphere as somber as any I can recall since World War II. The dangerous and vexatious crisis in Vietnam is principally the cause of this. But the mood also is influenced by the storm flags that are flying in many other parts of the world today.

Against the backdrop of war and threat of war, President Johnson has served notice on Congress and the country that he intends not only to push ahead with the Great Society at home, but to extend it on an international scale.

I have been one of those who has questioned whether this Nation, for all its wealth and resources, can fight a war of the magnitude of Vietnam and carry on a broad range of domestic spending—without a tax increase or a dangerous deficit. The President apparently believes we can.

For the sake of the country and the soundness of the dollar, I hope and pray that he is right. But it must be pointed out that the new budget estimates he has given—including a projected deficit next year of under $2 billion—are at best educated guesses. In the present year, for example, expenditures of the Federal Government have so far exceeded initial predictions by some $8 billion.

Certainly, to the extent feasible, I favor pressing ahead with programs to combat disease, poverty, ignorance, and hunger and other social ills that persist even in the midst of our unprecedented affluence. But I simply fail to see how under present circumstances we can fight a war, continue domestic spending on a scale proposed by the President, and initiate vast new programs to help every impoverished nation on this earth.

MEET U.S. NEEDS FIRST

The hearts of all men of conscience and good will go out to the hungry, the sick, and the ignorant of other lands. We want to help them. But let us first minister to the needs of our own people—and particularly to the needs of the men who are fighting and dying at this very moment in the trackless jungles and sodden rice paddies of Vietnam.

I regret exceedingly that the President, in his state of the Union message, has proposed another round of so-called civil rights legislation. The people of this country generally have not yet understood—much less assimilated—the legislation that was enacted in the past 2 years. We do not know the details of the legislation that will be proposed, but it is indicated that the Federal Government will be given unlimited power over the basic civil right of private property. If this be done, we have come to the stage where newly created rights are proposed to devour and consume those that are as old as our history and have been the mudsill of our greatness and prosperity.

Altogether, the President has presented a formidable array of proposals and requests to the Congress. But it seems clear that Vietnam and related subjects will dominate the new session of the Congress.

This is as it should be. For few problems have so much potential for disaster to our Nation and to the world as Vietnam. Hardly any other is likely to affect our people directly and immediately in such tangible ways.

Last year, one of my Senate colleagues recalled the time in 1954 when he, then a State Department official, was assigned the duty of informing me of President Eisenhower's decision to send a military mission to South Vietnam, which was made against my advice. My response at the time was to state that there was no alternative to supporting the flag when the President committed it, but that the effort to save South Vietnam would be costly in blood and treasure.

I recall this incident not to indulge in self-praise as a prophet, but because I deeply believe that in times of international crisis like these there can be no loyal course except to support our country's policy.

SOLDIERS DESERVE SUPPORT

Regardless of what one thinks about the wisdom of our original commitment to help South Vietnam—irrespective of one's personal opinion on the extent of our involvement—the fact is that some 200,000 Americans are now on the soil of South Vietnam and other thousands are embarked in vessels off shore. Unhappily, the prospect is that many more American young men will be required before, with good conscience, we can discontinue our assistance. In these circumstances, it is unthinkable that the members of our Armed Forces who are fighting so heroically are not fully supported at home.

The persistent and diverse approaches President Johnson has prosecuted in recent weeks leave little room for any objective observer to doubt our desire to end the fighting. But the Communists in North Vietnam and elsewhere have as yet given no indication of their willingness to talk on terms other than our abandoning our commitment, letting them subjugate South Vietnam, and then discussing whatever is left to discuss at that point.

What, then, is the answer to our growing dilemma in Vietnam?

Unfortunately, the President in his message of last Wednesday failed to chart a clear course for our future action if the Communists continue to rebuff all attempts to arrive at an honorable settlement at the conference table.

The present indecisive situation must not drag on interminably, though this undoubtedly would please the Communists who recognize the strategic and tactical disadvantage in which the United States is ensnared.

A time for decision is drawing near. I believe we must decide whether or not we are willing to take the action necessary to win the war in Vietnam and bring a conclusion to our commitment. The only other alternative I can see is to pull out—and this the overwhelming majority of Americans are not prepared to do.

Today, as always, the struggle for freedom against the forces of tyranny demands courage and sacrifice. In the words of Thomas Paine: "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

And Georgians today, as always, are proving by word and deed that they are neither "sunshine soldiers" nor "summer patriots."

CHANGING OF THE GUARD AT THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the changing of the guard at the Peace Corps. Sargent Shriver is stepping down, and the nomination of Jack Hood Vaughn to succeed him has been received by us today.

I well remember 5 years ago, when the Peace Corps was but a dream. Its success we owe to the work of many men, but first and foremost among them stands Sargent Shriver. His tireless energy, his unflagging enthusiasm, and his drive and his integrity made it what it is today.

And today, the Peace Corps is a qualitative instrument of our way of life, not just of our Government, but of our Nation in its fullest dimension. From the prairies of my home State, from the farms and homes and colleges of Kansas, the finest of our youth have gone overseas to serve the cause of peace. And so, too, the youth from all the States of our great Nation. Today, more than 10,000 of them are in 46 foreign lands. There they live and work with and among the peoples of those nations. They have brought the enthusiasm, the zest, and the quality of our young people to those lands. They have brought themselves as the representatives of America, of the schools.

More than half of those young people are in education. Nearly a quarter of them are in community development. The rest are in health, in agriculture, in public works, and other varied callings.

To the world, we have given of our youth. And they have been received with kindness, with interest, with affection and with respect.

I can best illustrate my point by telling the Senate of an African country which shall remain nameless. In that country, in its capital city, in its Presidential palace several nights every week, four Peace Corps volunteers sit down for dinner with the President. They spend the evening together, the five of them, discussing in English the state of the world, the great issues of the United States, the same kind of economic and social questions we discuss here in these Chambers. How many, many ambassadors of any nation get to spend this kind of time with the head of the country to which they are accredited? Who can measure the good will these young Americans are creating? Who can match this kind of person-to-person diplomacy?

The Peace Corps works. And we have Sargent Shriver to thank for it. We in this Chamber have often been infected by his idealism, by his sense of purpose and his dedication. We have been made richer by it, and our American youth have been stimulated by it. Our country has been made stronger by it. And the world has been made a better place by it. All of us can take pride in the work Mr. Shriver has done.

It is in the great tradition of public service.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Madam President, I am very glad that the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has paid a sincere and proper tribute to the Peace Corps and its Director, Sargent Shriver.

My wife and I have been taking private vacations for the past 6 years in Central America, the Caribbean, and northern South America. We have witnessed the work of the Peace Corps in Guatemala, El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, Colombia, and Venezuela. The men and women of the Peace Corps have almost uniformly conducted themselves with efficiency, meritorious skill, and diligence. They have presented what we like to think of as the very best image of America, which has been due to the good faith as well as the efficiency with which they have worked.

We all remember the doubts and arguments which were expressed against the Peace Corps when the late President Kennedy proposed it, and some of the bitter words that were uttered about it then. It is, therefore, a great source of satisfaction to have the complimentary words from the distinguished and gentle Senator from Kansas in the tribute he has paid to the Peace Corps. I think he is quite correct in saying that the major share of the credit for this development is due to Sargent Shriver, from my own State of Illinois, brother-in-law of President Kennedy, and who has worked with great efficiency, acumen, and unselfishness to produce this result.

He now goes into the more difficult task of the struggle against poverty, in which he can make a great contribution. He has been tested in fire for 5 years. He has been found personally worthy. I hope the success of the Peace Corps and its almost universal acceptance will make people charitable and compassionate in their judgment of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

PROBLEMS OF THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, on February 17, 1965, on the Senate floor, I spoke on the subject "Financial Soundness of the Civil Service Retirement System." I made those remarks after studying the 43d Annual Report of the Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement System, House Document No. 48.

I stated at that time that a brief study of House Document No. 48 showed that the financial status of the fund was gradually getting worse. It was my hope that the Congress would take immediate action to remedy the situation through passage of S. 273, authored by the late Senator Olin Johnston, or by some similar legislation. This was not done.

Madam President, now according to the best information I have been able to obtain, the Federal civil service retirement system on June 30, 1964, had an unfunded liability of over $39 billion. On June 30, 1965, it was about $40,013,467,000 and it is estimated that by June 30, 1966, the unfunded liability will be approximately $43,637,602,000. This would mean that by the year 1990, unless remedial action is taken by the Congress, additional direct appropriations will be required to meet benefit payments.

Madam President, we are now told the unfunded liability of the civil service retirement fund is being studied by the Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems. The report from this Committee was to have been filed with the President in December of 1965. It has not been filed. We are now told it will probably be filed in January 1966, and that the subject of unfunded liability will be thoroughly discussed.

On January 20, 1966, the Senate passed H.R. 8445, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court.

Judges of the United States are under their own retirement systems for judges of the United States.

The retirement fund for judges is not administered by the Civil Service Commission, but by a special arrangement of the courts. These funds are provided by congressional appropriations.

Without arguing the merits or demerits of H.R. 8445, I wish to emphasize the fact that the Senate, while providing for a retirement system for judges who do not contribute to their retirement system, should give serious and sincere consideration to putting the Federal retirement system for Federal employees on an actuarially sound basis.

Today millions of Federal employees, past, present, and future, look to the Federal retirement system for financial security in their old age and for income protection if disability or death strikes down the breadwinner of the family.

These employees have made their equitable contribution to the fund. The fund is not bankrupt. The full faith and credit of the Federal Government is back of it, which assures protection to our retiring employees.

Why, then, is the fund not actuarially sound? Here I again state as I did in 1965 what I believe to be the answer: The Government has not paid its share of the costs. For this reason the fund has lost the interest on invested funds that would have accumulated and been available for the trust fund.

From the beginning of the Federal retirement system, employees have contributed whatever rate was set up by current law, 2½ percent of their salary at first, then 3½ percent, then 6 percent, and now 6½ percent; and Members of Congress pay into the fund 7½ percent of their salaries. But, during the first 8 years of the retirement program, no appropriations were recommended by the President and no legislation was enacted by the Congress for appropriations to the fund. All benefits were paid out of contributions which had been made by the employees.

Madam President, the negligence of the Government to make its share of contributions on time proved to be bad financial business. That is how the unfunded liability of the retirement system started.

From about 1929 to 1957, Government contributions to the fund were on a now-and-then basis and were insufficient.

In 1956, on the recommendation of President Eisenhower and approved by Congress, a law was passed requiring all agencies to contribute out of their appropriations amounts equal to the retirement deductions withheld from employees' pay.

This means that the fund now has an annual income which about takes care of all normal costs. It does not take care of the interest or reduce the principal of the unfunded liability created primarily during those years in which the agencies did not contribute to the fund, nor does it take care of similar costs accrued in recent years.

It is not good business procedure on the part of the Government to let this deficit continue to grow. Let us face up to an obligation which the Congress should have met long ago. I shall be glad to see the report from the Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems and will give it consideration. But the time has come to put the civil service retirement fund on an actuarially sound basis. It is now in an inexcusable situation—a situation brought about through no fault of the Federal employee.

On Monday, January 17, there appeared in the Washington Evening Star an excellent article entitled "Troubles of U.S. Retirement Fund Compounded by Each Pay Raise," which was written by our friend, Joseph Young. I read only the first three sentences:

> For every dollar of a Government pay raise, the cost to the civil service retirement fund is $2.25.
>
> Putting it another way, a Federal and postal employee pay raise costing $500 million means an additional cost of $1.25 billion to the retirement fund.
>
> The unfunded liability of the financially troubled retirement fund is now about $42 billion, and with Government pay raises becoming a yearly thing, the fund's liability continues to climb.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Troubles of U.S. Retirement Fund Compounded by Each Pay Raise

(By Joseph Young)

For every dollar of a Government pay raise, the cost to the civil service retirement fund is $2.25.

Putting it another way, a Federal and postal employee pay raise costing $500 million means an additional cost of $1.25 billion to the retirement fund.

The unfunded liability of the financially troubled retirement fund is now about $42 billion, and with Government pay raises becoming a yearly thing, the fund's liability continues to climb.

The situation is very troubling to Johnson administration officials as well as to the Civil Service Commission.

DAY OF RECKONING

No one has come up with a satisfactory answer. While it is true that no additional funds are being expended for the retirement fund at this time, the day of reckoning is not too many years off. The CSC has estimated that the fund will be exhausted by 1990 unless added financing is secured in the meantime.

Each year that action is deferred on increasing appropriations for the fund means that even greater amounts of money will have to be appropriated in the years ahead.

It is not just the cost of pay raises that is increasing the fund's financial deficit; it is the huge interest the fund has to pay on the current indebtedness.

The reason why Government pay raises more than double the cost for the retirement fund is that Federal and postal employees' annuities are determined on the basis of their high 5-years' average salary. But the 6½ percent salary deduction by which they contribute to the retirement fund is based on all their years of service, not just on the high 5 years.

AVERAGE PUSHED HIGHER

Thus, each time there is a pay raise—and these have been occurring every year—the employees' high 5-years' salary average increases, while the 6½ percent salary contribution for most of their years of service is still based on much lower salaries.

One suggestion considered by the CSC is to change the law to base the computation rate on the average salary through an employee's entire career. But this has been rejected as unfair to the employee, because of the low salary scales of years ago compared to today's living costs.

Another proposal is to follow the example of a number of large industrial firms where a specific dollar value on annuities and pensions is fixed, based on years of service, and where any increases are a matter of negotiation between unions and management.

But the argument against this approach is that Federal workers pay more for their annuities than do industry employees and it would be breaking faith with them to deprive them of annuity rights they have been led to expect.

Also, a drastic cut in annuities would prove a tremendous financial hardship for retiring employes who already have to take a large cut in income when they shift from salaries to annuities.

Another proposal is that whenever a pay raise is voted Congress also approve enough funds to cover its cost to the retirement fund.

But this would raise the immediate cost of pay raise legislation and consequently dampen Congress' ardor to enact such salary increases. Of course, the added cost to the retirement fund will have to be paid eventually anyway.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Madam President, if I may be permitted to comment on the second subject to which the Senator from Kansas referred, I quite agree with the Senator from Kansas that we have not made appropriate government contributions to the civil service retirement fund, and that from an actuarial standpoint, on the basis of having a full reserve fund, these moneys should have been contributed. There is some question as to whether this is as necessary in a public compulsory fund as in a private voluntary body where people can move in and out of a fund. But it is true that we have not made the contributions.

I believe for the sake of historical accuracy it should be pointed out that this evil began in the Eisenhower administration. I can remember twice standing on the floor of the Senate and protesting the omission for the first and second times of Government contributions to the fund. I pointed out that if full reservations are assumed that is the start of a very bad precedent.

I believe this continued through virtually all of the Eisenhower administration. President Kennedy and President Johnson continued in the course set by the so-called advocates of fiscal responsibility.

I believe this footnote to history is worth recording.

I say this without reflecting on the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson].

RETIREMENT OF DR. PAUL F. DICKENS

Mrs. SMITH. Madam President, one of America's most distinguished physicians is retiring after 60 years of eminently successful practice of medicine. He is Dr. Paul F. Dickens, who has distinguished himself not only in the practice of medicine but with an outstanding career in the U.S. Navy. He has been the confidant and close friend of Presidents, Senators, Representatives, diplomats, and other national and international leaders. In these relationships he has had great influence with respect to our national policies and with respect to individual careers.

After a notable career in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Navy, Dr. Dickens retired from the Navy and entered the private practice of medicine in Washington in 1938 to become one of the city's leading internists. He has been associated with Dr. Walter A. Bloedorn, both while Dr. Bloedorn was dean of the George Washington University and medical director of the George Washington University Hospital, and thereafter.

Previous to his retirement from the Medical Corps of the U.S. Navy. Dr. Dickens was the head of the Department of Medicine and Cardiology at the Navy Medical School, where he became nationally famous for his diagnostic skill and his teaching talents with its personnel and the training of his fellow officers.

During a previous 3-year term of Navy duty in Haiti, he was the recipient of a letter of commendation from the Surgeon General of the Navy for his work in bacillary dysentery, and later for an article on choriomeningitis, its cause, diagnosis, and treatment. Similar commendation followed his article disclosing that aseptic meningitis should be classified as caused by a virus.

In 1938, in conjunction with Dr. Charles Armstrong of the U.S. Public Service, the Journal of Modern Medicine nominated Dr. Dickens and Dr. Armstrong for consideration as the doctors of the year. Subsequently, Dr. Dickens was the recipient of a grant from the George Washington University Medical School for a study of high blood pressure.

In World War II, Dr. Dickens served as Chairman of the Manpower Commission for Physicians in addition to carrying on the demands of his private practice. For this service to his country, President Truman presented him with a certificate of thanks and a Medal of Merit.

A former professor of medicine at the George Washington University Medical School, Dr. Dickens is professor emeritus of medicine at the George Washington University. Previous to his association with the George Washington University Medical School, Dr. Dickens served as associate professor of medicine at the Georgetown University School of Medicine.

Dr. Dickens is a member of Sigma Xi, the Washington Academy of Science, the Academy of Medicine of Washington, the American College of Physicians, the American College of Medicine, the American Medical Association, and the District of Columbia Medical Association.

A native of Norcross, Ga., Dr. Dickens graduated from the Norcross High School, and did special study at Dr. Johnson's School in Norcross before going to Nashville, Tenn., to graduate from the University of Nashville Medical School, now the University of Tennessee. Subsequently Dr. Dickens did postgraduate work in New York City at New York postgraduate schools in 1925.

An ardent golfer, Dr. Dickens is a member of the Burning Tree Club, the Army-Navy Club, and the Army-Navy Country Club, and is a great favorite of his fellow members in all clubs. He takes great pride in his son, Capt. Paul Dickens, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, who has carried on the Dickens medical tradition in the Navy, and in his three grandchildren. He is a devoted husband.

Yes, Paul F. Dickens has been an eminent leader in many fields. He has been an unexcelled physician of amazing knowledge and talents, who has kept fully abreast of medical progress and scientific changes. But more than that, he has possessed a special kind of healing capacity that rarely anyone is endowed with. It is that special way of human kindness, which does as much as, if not more than, all medical knowledge in the treatment and recovery of patients.

He has an abundance of what tragically so few possess. It is an abundance of empathy. I know, for he was the personal physician of my late husband. I know, because he has been my personal physician. I know, because it was Dr. Paul F. Dickens who urged and convinced me that I should run for election to succeed my husband after his death. I know, because it was Dr. Paul F. Dickens who literally launched me on my public service career.

REVIEW OF THE CONGRESS AND AMERICA'S FUTURE

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, the "Congress and America's Future," edited by Columbia Dean David B. Truman for the American Assembly, is a timely and provocative collection by some of our Nation's ablest students of Congress and legislative-executive relations.

I prepared for the December 1965 edition of the Political Science Quarterly a review of that excellent work.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my comments appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONGRESS AND AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL)

"The Congress and America's Future," edited by Columbia Dean David B. Truman for the American Assembly is a timely and provocative collection by some of our Nation's ablest students of Congress and legislative-executive relations. It comes at a time when Congress, at long last after almost two decades of coasting on the work of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, has once again attempted to give some consideration to putting its own house in order.

Proposals for reform have alternately been voiced and then largely disappeared in the intervening two decades. Some of these reforms include changing rule 22 in the Senate under which unlimited debate is permitted unless two-thirds of the Senators present and voting invoke cloture, germaneness in Senate debate, and providing that the members of the Cabinet might appear before either House to be questioned on the policies for which they are, in part, responsible.

Now the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress is holding extensive hearings on these proposals and dozens of others. I wish the committee well. The fact is that if there is a desire for reform the task can be accomplished at any time of only a sufficient number of Senators or Representatives are interested. This was done in both Houses in both parties at the beginning of the current Congress with reference to committee assignments and internal party procedures. However, with reference to the Senate, to which I will limit my comments, not all Senators feel the same pressures as does a Senator from a large urban State.

I attempt to represent the people of California as well as the national interest in the Senate. My State now totals almost 19 million people. Between 1,000 and 2,000 letters each day reach my office. They include views, both pro and con, on almost every piece of legislation coming before Congress, as well as pleas from mothers wanting to keep their sons from the draft, a family attempting to be reunited with loved ones from the old country, and a small city seeking a Federal public works project to keep flood waters from destroying it. Hundreds of people visit or telephone my office each day. Some merely want passes to see the Senate in session. Others want, or need, to talk at length with either myself or my administrative and legislative assistants on particular problems. All of this takes time. It takes a professional staff with sufficient supporting clerical workers. It takes space. The Senate has not faced up to the problems of the Senate from an urban State. It should.

But the problems of the Senate are, of course, not simply limited to those from the larger States. How can a Senator, no matter what size is his State, be at three committee or subcommittee meetings scheduled for the same time where important testimony is being given or important decisions are being made? He cannot, yet somehow he tries to be.

What I suspect is most disturbing to me is that some who talk most about Congress being the coequal of the executive branch have been the ones in the forefront in preventing necessary and realistic reforms in office staffing, committee structure and floor procedure from taking place. Legislative assistants to Senators who have specialized in an area when the Senator has been busy on other projects are denied admittance to some executive sessions when legislation is "marked up" while officials of the administration are present and writing in the details of the proposal.

Samuel P. Huntington in the chapter entitled "Congressional Responses to the 20th Century" notes that while Congress is an "autonomous, legislative body," it "can defend its autonomy only by refusing to legislate, and it can legislate only by surrendering its autonomy" (p. 6). Thus he says: "If Congress legislates, it subordinates itself to the President; if it refuses to legislate, it alienates itself from public opinion. Congress can assert its power or it can pass laws; but it cannot do both" (p. 6). Huntington would argue that the roots of this legislative dilemma lie in the great changes brought by the 20th century in urbanization, nationalization of economic problems, bureaucratization of private and public organizations, and increasing involvement of the United States in world affairs. He believes Congress has an institutional "adaptation crisis" (p. 7), and "the leadership of Congress has lacked the incentive to take the legislative 'initiative in handling emerging national problems" (p. 8).

He would argue that, since 1900—with increasing tenure in office for Congressmen, the importance of seniority, and its basis as a prerequisite for assuming congressional leadership—the Congress has gotten out of step with the rest of American society. He notes that there is little cross-fertilization between the House and Senate leadership and the leadership of other elite institutional groups in American society (pp. 8-11). In summary, he notes that congressional leaders "come up through a 'local politics' line while executives move up through a 'national organization' line" (p. 14).

Huntington argues that since rotation in office is truer of the administration officials selected by the President who in turn is selected every 4 years by the voters that "The administration is thus a far more sensitive register of changing currents of opinion than is Congress" (p. 17).

I think Huntington is more euphoric regarding administration responsiveness to public opinion than the actual facts require. Some who have been on the Washington scene for many decades would testify—as I suspect would a few Cabinet and other Presidential appointees who are aware of what is happening to them—that there is a coalition between the more senior committee members in both Houses and the more senior career officials in the executive departments which nullifies many an administration effort with which they are not in accord. When I recall the joint efforts led by urban Republicans in both Houses joined by some urban Democrats to pry a civil rights bill out from under the Kennedy administration in 1962 and the first half of 1963, I am not sure about a blanket statement that "The administration is thus a far more sensitive register of changing currents of opinion than is Congress" (p. 17). The administration, because of its unity in a chief executive and its command of the mass media, can set or mold public opinion much easier than Congress which is multiheaded.

Huntington also states that "as has been recognized many times, the actual work of Congressmen, in practice if not in theory, is directed toward mediation between constituents and Government agencies" and adds "increasingly divorced from the principal organized social forces of society, Congress has come to play a more and more significant role as spokesman for the interests of unorganized individuals" (p. 25). Much of this is all too true but it overlooks the fact that if a Senator wants to be a legislator, he can be. Many of our finest legislators come from the smaller States where constituent pressures are not so great in sheer volume. On the other hand, the legislator from the large State who desires to perform a legislative rather than errand boy function has a unique opportunity to do so since the great size of his State can enable him to be relatively freer of particular interest group pressures. While Senators and Representatives do strive to serve as a court of last resort with the administration for the unorganized individual, I do think Members of Congress in both parties are well aware of "the principal organized social forces of society" and definitely so if they operate in one's own State.

Huntington disagrees, correctly I think, with the so-called democratizers who "attack the power of the Senate Establishment or inner club and urge an equalizing of power among Congressmen so that a majority of each House can work its will," (p. 27). This dispersion of power would only lead to further oligarchy and he believes "the only effective alternative to oligarchy is centralized authority." Thus Huntington argues that the Speaker in the House and the majority leader in the Senate should select committee chairman and thus "restore to Congress a more positive role in the legislative process and strengthen it vis-a-vis the executive branch" (p. 28). Such a suggestion would be more likely to intensify the "rubber stamp" aspects of a particular transitory majority, but I doubt if it would further the accommodation intrinsic and necessary, to the legislative process. Nor would it promote the interpersonal relations required to accomplish business in a chamber such as the Senate where much is accomplished by unanimous consent. The fact is that some committee chairmen in both Houses remain where they are because a majority likes it that way since these chairmen can withstand the heat. Other chairmen who block a majority are circumvented in various informal ways when the majority desires.

Huntington feels that "recruitment of Senators from the national scene rather than from local politics would significantly narrow the gap between Congress and the other elements of national leadership. The 'local politics' ladder to the Senate would be replaced or supplemented by a 'national politics' line in which mobile individuals might move from the establishment to the administration to the Senate" (p. 29). It is an interesting suggestion and probably there will be a few unique examples where this happens, but if it had been the prevailing practice in the last two decades, two Presidents of the United States, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson and two Vice Presidents Richard M. Nixon and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, would not have risen to national power. They were strictly products of the "local politics" ladder each of them beginning as either Congressman or mayor.

Huntington offers another possibility of a role for Congress and that is as a vehicle for approving or disapproving Presidential requests within a given time period of 3 or 6 months. He notes: "If thus compelled to choose openly, Congress, it may be supposed, would almost invariably approve Presidential requests. Its veto power would become a reserve power like that of the Supreme Court if not like that of the British Crown. On these urgent measures it would perform a legitimizing function rather than a legislative function" (p. 30).

He assumes that such a procedure would induce the executive leaders to consult with congressional leaders prior to the submission of such legislation and that Congress would continue to amend and vote freely on nonurgent executive requests. I completely disagree. Certainly the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were two acts which might well be put in the urgent category, yet to have Congress simply vote them up or down without the right to change them would have been wrong from the standpoint of eventual implementation of these measures, as well as from the acceptance of the country for them. The fact is that Members of Congress urged these measures—and more comprehensive ones—before the Chief Executive submitted any at all. The fact is that in the case of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 it was largely written in the Senate Republican leader's office where by letting diverse viewpoints be aired, a version was agreed upon which was assured of passage. But even then further substantial—and worthwhile, e.g. the poll tax ban—amendments occurred in committee and on the floor of both Chambers.

With then Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, I was one of the Senate floor leaders in enacting the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As leaders of a bipartisan coalition, we also attempted, over the years, at the beginning of three Congresses to change rule XXII which permits the filibuster. In order to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1964 we were required to shut off a filibuster by securing approval from two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, which in practical terms meant two-thirds of the whole Senate. We did that. I think many of us who believe in majority cloture whereby 51 of 100 Senators could invoke cloture, after a stipulated period of time, say a month, or so, realize that despite the time it took us and the obstacles we had to overcome, when we got there, we had a consensus in this land which no narrow sectionalism could afford to overlook.

H. Douglas Price has written a brilliant and perceptive chapter entitled "The Electoral Arena" showing the effect of one's electoral district, party organization, and the cost of campaigning on the type of person, "local" or "cosmopolitan," elected. He notes, correctly and, I think, regrettably that the "blur of activity" one often witnesses in the House or Senate Office Buildings "has little or nothing to do with pending legislation or public policy, but a great deal to do with the reelection possibilities of the Members of the House and Senate," (p. 48). Not all Senators or Representatives are errand boys but there is no question that before one can be a statesman one must get elected. And who, in a free society, would have it another way?

Ralph K. Huitt, in a well-written essay, has analyzed the Senate with care and sentiment ("The Internal Distribution of Influence: The Senate"). As a staff man (for Lyndon Johnson and WILLIAM PROXMIRE), he had a unique opportunity to view the Senate from different perspectives. His comments on the role of individual and committee staffs and why these professionals serve is particularly noteworthy (pp. 97-98). In his first category of reforms which would strengthen the hands of the elected leaders, he retains the political scientist's nerve to change the seniority system, although his views are more tempered than most since he notes that "if it cannot be destroyed, at least chairmen might be required to relinquish their authority at a certain age or the committee majority might be given some choice among the ranking members" (p. 98).

Professor Huitt advocates a second category of reforms which would bring some coordination to the spending and taxing programs of Congress. I completely agree with him. In testifying before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, I stated that I was disturbed that the appropriations process in Congress bears little relationship to the economic, tax, monetary, and fiscal policies with which it should be intimately involved. I recommended that the Joint Economic Committee be reconstituted to include the chairman, the ranking minority member, and a majority member from the following committees: The Appropriations and Banking and Currency Committees of both Houses, the House Committee on Ways and Means, and the Senate Committee on Finance. Because of the tremendous economic impact which the decisions of the Armed Services and Public Works Committees of both Houses also have on Government spending and our economy perhaps they, too, should be represented. In addition, there should be greater coordination between the subcommittees which are practically autonomous and the full Committee on Appropriations in both Houses. The President's economic report should also be submitted more frequently and at a time when it can be utilized by the individual Members of Congress.

Huitt notes that a third category of reforms relates to the effectiveness of individual members and that "allowances for office help and materials are wholly inadequate for Senators from populous States. These are nagging nuisances which reduce a Senator's efficiency" (p. 99). Again, he is completely correct. While he does not outline specific reforms, I would like to note a few which I also mentioned to the Joint Committee: authorizing each Member to have an additional legislative assistant for each of his standing committee assignments, provision for more adequate space, professional staff (especially for the minority), travel, telephone, and mail allowances, especially for Members from larger States, securing management consultants to scrutinize senatorial offices and develop up-to-date procedures, precommittee staff hearings, elimination of senatorial consideration of postmaster appointments, permission for the military academies to select students via nationwide competitive examinations on a geographical basis, and establishment of a separate board of former Senators and Congressmen to consider private immigration bills and small claims.

Professor Huitt's fourth category of reforms "is aimed at the conduct of individual Members which brings discredit on the whole body" (p. 99). He is not talking so much about unlawful conduct as that "behavior which falls in a kind of twilight zone where the ethics of the individual must be the regulator" (p. 99). I agree, only I would be more sepcific, as I attempted to be before the Joint Committee, when I urged that standards be applied not only to the Members of Congress but also to the professional staffs and other Senate officials as well as to all candidates for congressional office in a primary, special, or general election. Such standards should also be applied to the senior career and policymaking Members of the executive and judicial branches.

Richard E. Neustadt in "Politicians and Bureaucrats" has written with skill of the relationships between the executive and legislative branches and within the executive establishment. He notes correctly that "presidential appointees are men-in-the-middle, owing loyalty at once to the man who put them there, to the laws they administer, and to the body of careerists, backed by clientele, whose purposes they both direct and serve" (p. 109). Professor Neustadt's administrative experience is perhaps greater than his experience on Capitol Hill, since I am not inclined to agree with his soothing statement that "for most of its inhabitants the Senate is a pleasant place, possessed of quite enough prestige and power (or its semblance), and amenities of staff and space, and time to enjoy them (6 years at a crack), so that it alone remains what much of Government once was, a refuge for the spirit of political free enterprise, unfettered either by undue responsibility or the restraints of size" (p. 117). The statement smacks more of a somnolent old men's club rather than the U.S. Senate which has a large number of relatively young men and bustles with activity and overwork—even with the 6-year term.

I found the chapters by Richard P. Fenno, Jr. ("The Internal Distribution of Influence: The House"), Harvey C. Mansfield ("The Congress and Economic Policy") and Holbert N. Carroll ("The Congress and National Security Policy") worthwhile and provocative. I do question Professor Carroll's statement concerning foreign aid authorization and appropriations legislation as far as the U.S. Senate is concerned. He notes that while substantial bipartisan majorities have supported these programs "since the mid-1950's, however, more than half of the Democrats from the South and, since the late 1940's, some two-thirds of the Republicans from the Middle West have voted 'No'" (p. 166). The fact is that during the 8 Eisenhower years of the 12 rollcall votes on final passage of either the mutual security authorization or appropriations bills, a majority of midwestern Republican Senators supported foreign aid in each of the 8 years except 1956. They did so often by 2 to 1 and 3 to 2 margins. Under a Democratic administration the record has been no different. In the final vote on June 14, 1965, on the Foreign Aid Authorizations for fiscal year 1966, six midwestern Republican Senators voted for the bill, only three were opposed. This has included the consistent support of Senators DIRKSEN, HICKENLOOPER, and MUNDT, among others.

Dean Truman concludes in "The Prospects for Change" that "One thread that runs through all of these essays is the dispersion of power, in the past half century apparently an increasing dispersion, within and between the Houses of Congress" (p. 178). He believes that many reforms such as separate days for committee and floor work, additional personal staff, home rule for the District of Columbia, a requirement of joint hearings by House and Senate committees, and even disclosure of assets and income by Members would be insubstantial in actual effect on Congress. Reforms which would further dispersion, in his judgment would include some of the "democratizing ones such as requiring fewer signatures on" a discharge petition. Truman is equally unenthusiastic regarding the introduction of electronic voting equipment and other timesavers. He believes this "would strengthen minority control by facilitating snap votes" (p. 180).

Truman views as most promising those measures which would increase leadership control not only over the floor, but also over the committee timetable. He agrees with Huntington as to the need for the Speaker or the Senate majority leader to select committee chairmen or at least to have the majority caucus choose a chairman from among the top three on each committee provided the leadership "were able and willing to make their preferences prevail" (p. 181). Otherwise the result, Truman thinks, would be a further dispersion of power.

Truman notes the various outside developments which have contributed to congressional cohesion (an executive budget and legislative program, White House legislative liaison, and regular Presidential consultation with his own congressional leaders). But he longs for the suggestion made by Huntington and others that there be a congressional commitment to bring to a vote top priority legislation from the administration. One recalls Senator Taft, and the attempt to draft striking railroad workers under another Truman—President Harry S. Truman—and is perhaps as glad that we lack such an urgency procedure.

I do think Dean Truman is profoundly correct in concluding that "The Congress and its power structure cannot profitably be viewed as something separate and isolable from the remainder of the Government and society. They affect and are affected by needs and changes in the society and in the Government as a whole. They must, therefore, be looked at within this context" (p. 183).

That is why I am optimistic regarding reform. Reform has come in Congress and between Congress and the Executive over the years. Reform will continue to come. Perhaps it will not come as rapidly as some of us would like. Perhaps it will come more rapidly than some of our colleagues prefer. But it is coming and will come, and in the process it has been aided by the thoughtful presentations such as "The Congress and America's Future," which have stimulated thought not only in various regional meetings of the American assembly throughout America but also in Congress and among the interested public generally.

UNAUTHORIZED VISIT TO NORTH VIETNAM BY THREE AMERICANS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, according to an article carried in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on January 20, 1966, the President of Yale University, Kingman Brewster, Jr., made a statement pertaining to the visit of Prof. Staughton Lynd to Hanoi.

Prof. Staughton Lynd, together with Communist Historian Herbert Aptheker, and Thomas Hayden, founder of the Students for a Democratic Society, several weeks ago obtained permission to visit Brussels, Belgium. When they got to Brussels they took a Communist plane provided by the Communists that carried them to Prague, Moscow, Peiping, and finally to Hanoi.

In Hanoi they met with the Communist leader. Out of Hanoi Professor Lynd, of Yale University, sent a telegram to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations asking for the right to appear before that committee and give testimony.

I am quite certain that the Committee on Foreign Relations will not honor Aptheker, the practical leader of the Communists in the United States, nor Professor Lynd, nor Hayden, by allowing them to appear before that committee.

However, It is rather refreshing to note that President Kingman Brewster, Jr., of Yale University, had the courage and the recognition of civil responsibility to speak up in regard to Professor Lynd.

Professor Lynd teaches at Yale. I now wish to quote from an Associated Press dispatch from New Haven, Conn.:

> Yale University President Kingman Brewster, Jr., said yesterday that Staughton Lynd was "naive and misguided" in making an unauthorized trip to North Vietnam.
>
> He had stronger words about the assistant history professor's speech in Hanoi, saying that it was "a disservice to the causes of freedom of dissent, freedom of travel, and conscientious pacifism."

In addition, President Brewster said he felt that Lynd's "disparagement of his country's leadership and policies, while in Hanoi, damaged the causes he purports to serve."

President Brewster then went on to refer to the statements ascribed to Lynd, which Lynd reportedly affirmed, to the effect that "while in Hanoi" Professor Lynd "publicly asserted that the Johnson administration lies to the American people and that the U.S. policy is immoral, illegal and antidemocratic."

Madam President, those statements are a disservice to our country. We can tolerate dissent about judgments, but we cannot tolerate persons going around the world unlawfully and depreciating the cause of their country, not by speaking the truth to their own people, but by trying to help Communists.

I repeat what I said last week: The Attorney General should investigate this visit to Hanoi, and if he finds there has been a violation of law, he should institute the necessary proceedings to see to it that justice is done.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Jan. 20, 1966]

SAYS PROFESSOR IS NAIVE: YALE PREXY ATTACKS LYND FOR HANOI TALK

NEW HAVEN, CONN.—Yale University President Kingman Brewster, Jr., said yesterday that Staughton Lynd was "naive and misguided" in making an unauthorized trip to North Vietnam.

He had stronger words about the assistant history professor's speech in Hanoi, saying that it was "a disservice to the causes of freedom of dissent, freedom of travel, and conscientious pacifism."

In his first direct comment on Lynd's activities, Brewster said he felt that Lynd's "disparagement of his country's leadership and policies, while in Hanoi, damaged the causes he purports to serve."

Lynd and two other Americans, Thomas Hayden, a founder of the Students for a Democratic Society, and Herbert Aptheker, a Communist Party theoretician, spent 10 days in North Vietnam, defying a State Department ban on travel there.

Brewster cited Hanoi radio reports, which he said Lynd reportedly confirmed, "that while in Hanoi he publicly asserted that the Johnson administration lies to the American people and that the U.S. policy is immoral, illegal and antidemocratic."

Brewster said that Lynd is entitled to his opinions, "but the use of his presence in Hanoi to give this aid and comfort to a government engaged in hostilities with American forces seems to me inconsistent with the purposes of factfinding in the name of peace."

Last week, when Lynd was asked about the radio Hanoi broadcast, he denied that he said the administration "lied" to the American people. He said he delivered the same speech last year at a rally in Washington, D.C.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Jan. 20, 1966]

OPPOSES SENATE UNIT HEARING: IGNORE LYND, LAUSCHE URGES

WASHINGTON.—U.S. Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, said yesterday he would vigorously oppose allowing three Americans who went to Hanoi to testify before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

LAUSCHE, a committee member, was referring to Asst. Prof. Staughton Lynd, of Yale University; Thomas Hayden, founder of the Students for a Democratic Society, and Herbert Aptheker, U.S. Communist Party historian.

Charging that the three men violated the laws of the United States in their unauthorized travel to Communist Vietnam and ought to be prosecuted, LAUSCHE said in a Senate speech:

"I can suffer disagreements with the views of the President and other distinguished leaders about the course that we should follow in South Vietnam.

"However, neither I nor the general citizenry and, of course, not the Members of the U.S. Senate, should give tolerance or sufferance to persons who make statements hoping that the Communists of North Vietnam would be victorious.

"These individuals are not promoting the cause of the United States. They should not be listened to; they should be recognized not in their false but their true colors which cause them to have greater sympathy for the cause of the Communists than for the cause of our own citizenry and Nation."

COMMENT BY SENATOR RANDOLPH ON THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, I have had access to the information contained in the President's budget message. I wish to make certain comments at this time and, if necessary, be permitted to have 1 additional minute beyond the 3 minutes allocated in the morning hour.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, the President's 1967 budget program demonstrates responsible fiscal and economic policy appropriate to the times.

With this program we can move closer toward the goals of what is characterized as the Great Society at home while strengthening our resistance to aggression abroad.

With this program we can look forward to a continuation of the unprecedented and uninterrupted economic growth of the past 5 years.

With this program, we can meet our domestic needs without either recession or inflation.

Since early 1961, the total national output has risen by nearly $200 billion, employment has increased by more than 6½ million workers, and the unemployment rate has dropped from 7 percent to close to 4 percent, a decrease which is highly encouraging.

In the year ahead, even higher levels of output, income, and employment can be expected. To sustain a sound and prosperous economy, the President is calling for a modest measure of fiscal restraint. He has proposed a set of tax measures which economic experts say will soak up a small proportion of the rising demand in the economy and enable the Government to achieve a small surplus in its cash transactions with the public. I have no reason to doubt the validity of the appraisal by the experts.

In sum, the President's 1967 budget provides adequately for furthering our domestic and international objectives without imposing undue strain on our economic potential or productive capabilities. His budget proposals, I believe, by and large, are both prudent and restrained. Together with responsible efforts by business and labor, our national and international objectives can be advanced—and advanced in an environment of steady yet noninflationary economic growth.

WHOM DO WE KILL IN VIETNAM?

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, in a two-page advertisement in the New York Times yesterday, January 23, 1966, the International Committee of Conscience on Vietnam answered the question uppermost in the minds of all of us: "Whom Do We Kill in Vietnam?"

The committee's membership is impressive. I ask unanimous consent that their names and addresses be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the names and addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF CONSCIENCE ON VIETNAM (AFFILIATED WITH THE CLERGYMEN'S EMERGENCY COMMITTEE FOR VIETNAM OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION)

Howard B. Radest, executive director, American Ethical Union, New York.

Msgr. Thomas J. Reese, director, Catholic social services, Wilmington, Del.

Esko Rintala, general secretary, Finnish Bible Society, Turku, Finland.

Rt. Rev. T. D. Roberts, archbishop (retired) of Bombay, London.

Rev. W. Harold Row, executive secretary, general brotherhood board, Church of the Brethren, Elgin, Ill.

Rt. Rev. John W. Sadiq, bishop of Nagpur, India.

Dr. Howard Schomer, president, Chicago Theological Seminary.

Prof. Hiroshi Shinmi, associate secretary, World Council of Churches, Tokyo.

Dr. Pavel Simek, curator of the Synod, Czech Brethren, Prague.

Rev. Gerard S. Sloyan, head, religious education department, Catholic University, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Francois Smyth-Florentin, general secretary, Bible study service, Protestant Federation of France.

Rev. Lord Donald Soper, former president, Methodist Church, Great Britain.

Vaclav Tomes, president, Baptist Union of Czechoslovakia.

Prof. Dr. Hans Urner, Halle/Saale, GDR (East Germany).

Rev. Valdo Vinay, professor, Waldenisan Theology, Rome.

Prof. Wilhelm Vischer, Reformed Church of France.

Rabbi Jacob Weinstein, president, Central Conference American Rabbis, Chicago.

Dr. Charles C. West, professor, Christian ethics, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N.J.

Jan-Eric Wikstrom, president, Svenska Missionsforbundet, Stockholm.

Very Rev. Colin Winter, dean, St. George's Cathedral, Windhoek, southwest Africa.

Bishop Friedrich Wunderlich, Methodist Church, GFR (West Germany).

Rev. Ake Zeterberg, dean, Stockholm Cathedral, and member of Parliament, Stockholm.

A Vietnam Buddhist, a leading monk in South Vietnam, whose name is withheld for reasons of prudence.

Dr. Helmut Bandt (professor systematic theology), University of Greifswald, GDR (East Germany).

Rev. Dr. William Barclay (professor of theology), Glasgow University, Scotland.

Prof. Dr. Karl Barth, University of Basel, Switzerland.

Colin W. Bell, executive secretary, American Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rev. Daniel Berrigan, S.I., associate editor, Jesuit Missions, New York.

La Campagnie des Pasteurs (120 Reformed Church pastors), Geneva, Switzerland.

Archbishop Canon S. H. Best, West Australia.

Dr. Harold A. Bosley, minister, Christ Church (Methodist), New York.

Rev. Girardo A. Bote, district superintendent, Methodist Church, Philippines.

Dr. George A. Buttrick, Garrett Theological Seminary, Evanston, Ill.

Prof. Aldo Capitini, director, Center of Religious Orientation, Perugia, Italy.

Canon L. John Collins, St. Paul's Cathedral, London.

Bishop Geoffrey F. Cramswick, Tasmania.

Rev. Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, former president, National Council of Churches, Chester, Pa.

Danilo Dolci, Sicily.

Dr. Ansgar Eeg-Olofsson, president, mission board, Evenska Missionsforbundet, Sweden.

Dr. Ragnar Forbech, former dean, Oslo Cathedral, Norway.

Msgr. Paul Hanly Furfey, professor of sociology, Catholic University, Washington, D.C.

Rabbi Roland B. Gittelsohn, Temple Israel, Boston.

Dr. Helmut Gollwitzer, professor of systematic theology, University of Bonn, GFR (West Germany).

Prof. Mario Gozzini, Florence, Italy.

Bishop A. Raymond Grant, Methodist Church, Portland, Oreg.

Dr. Dana McLean Greeley, president, the Unitarian-Universalist Association of United States, Boston.

Rolf-Dieter Gunther, national director of youth work, Evangelical Church, Brandenburg, GDR (East Germany).

Bishop Odd Hagen, Methodist bishop for northern Europe, Stockholm.

Bishop M. Hald, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Dr. Georgia Harkness, professor of theology, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif.

Alfred Hassler, executive secretary, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Nyack, N.Y.

Rabbi Abraham J. Heschel, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York.

Dr. Ralph M. Holdeman, associate director, evangelism, National Council of Churches, New York.

Vaclav Hunaty, general superintendent, Methodist Church, Prague, Czechoslovakia.

Dean Alfred Jowett, Manchester Cathedral, England.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., president, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Atlanta, Ga.

Oberkirchenrat Heinz Kloppenburg, Dortmund, GFR (West Germany).

Prof. H. Kohlbrugge, Utrecht University, Netherlands.

Rt. Rev. W. Appleton Lawrence, bishop (retired), western Mass.

Rev. Dr. Lindhardt, director, department of theology, University of Copenhagen.

Rt. Rev. Glyn Llandaff, lord bishop of Llandaff, Wales.

Rt. Rev. Sir George MacLeod, former moderator, Church of Scotland, Glasgow.

Dr. Kenneth MacMillan, general secretary, Canadian Bible Society.

Rev. Domenico Maselli, president, Italian Evangelistic Mission, Assembly, Naples.

Rt. Rev. Robert H. Mize, bishop of Damaraland, southwest Africa.

Dr. Juan Nabong, president Philippines Christian College, Manila.

Dr. John Oliver Nelson, former professor, Yale Divinity School, Bangor, Pa.

Bishop Tiran Nersoyan, Armenian Orthodox Church, Evanston, Ill.

Kirchepräsident Martin Niemoeller, copresident, World Council of Churches, Wiesbaden, GFR (West Germany).

Rev. Amor V. Oribello, moderator, Central Luzon Conference, United Church of Christ, Philippines.

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, the advertisement gave only a partial list of those endorsing the statement and I ask unanimous consent that the statement, the partial list of names and addresses of ministers, rabbis, and priests endorsing the statement, as well as the statement itself and reasons for the statement given by the Fellowship of Reconciliation be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement, names, and addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, the statement signed by all these eminent men is impressive because it separately addresses itself to the United States, to the people and Government of North Vietnam, to the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, and to the people and Government of the People's Republic of China. It is my earnest hope that the pleas for peace contained in this statement will be heeded by all those so vitally concerned.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1966]

International Committee of Conscience on Vietnam (affiliated with the Clergymen's Emergency Committee for Vietnam of the Fellowship of Reconciliation).

STATEMENT BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF CONSCIENCE IN VIETNAM—THEY ARE OUR BROTHERS WHOM WE KILL

No generation has had shown to it more clearly than ours the interdependence of all men. No matter what the reasons we advance for the killing we do—in Vietnam or elsewhere—they are our brothers whom we kill. More indeed than our brothers—they are ourselves and our children, for as surely as we do not find other ways than war for solving our human problems, we destroy the future for ourselves and for them.

We who sign this statement are impelled to speak by the tragedy of Vietnam, and by the failure of governments to end that terrible conflict. Yet we think not only of Vietnam, but of all our apprehensive world, torn by contending ideologies and ambitions, of which Vietnam is the present symbol. We, who in various ways have assumed the terrible responsibility of articulating the human conscience, must speak or, literally, we should expect the very stones to cry out.

We know the claims of both sides in the Vietnamese conflict. Each professes its own moral rectitude. The United States and its allies assert their determination to stop what they describe as "ruthless Communist agression" in order to defend freedom, both for Vietnam and for the world. North Vietnam, the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, and the People's Republic of China vigorously proclaim their intention to throw back the "ruthlessly aggressive American imperialists" in defense of the right of the Vietnamese to govern themselves, and on behalf of all those nations that are seeking "national liberation." Each side rejects with scorn the claims of the other, and ridicules the possibility that its antagonist may be sincere.

We do not question the sincerity of either side. On the contrary, the passionate conviction that each has of its own absolute rightness profoundly alarms us. Their determination seems to have no terminal point; to prove its case, each seems willing to risk the ultimate nuclear conflict and jeopardize the future of the human race.

Helpless villagers in Vietnam, unable either to escape or defend themselves, recoil from the bombing of one side and from the terror of the other. War has become a way of life for them, dominating their rice paddies and marketplaces, conscripting their young men, making widows of their women and orphans of their children, holding a whole population hostage to horror. In such circumstances, the claims of both sides become a mockery of the noble words they use. Freedom and justice are for men; they are not achieved by the tormenting of men.

We address ourselves to the rulers of nations, and to those associated with them: Lyndon B. Johnson, Nguyen Cao Ky, Ho Chi Minh, and Mao Tse-tung.

Continuation of the war will not prove which side is right and which wrong. It will only increasingly force both sides to commit such atrocities as will mock all their claims. It will draw both sides farther and farther into a maelstrom of destruction in which mankind as a whole may finally be engulfed.

You, each of you, has the opportunity at least to try to reverse this dreadful course, and each of you has the responsibility. We plead with you to accept it, now, today, in the interest of all humanity.

We address ourselves to our fellow human beings everywhere.

Each of our nations has its hopes and aspirations, its own history and grievances and resentments. We live in widely differing social systems and ideologies, which seem to have in common only one thing: a willingness to resort to war in their own interests.

But war cannot serve the interests of men any longer, if it ever could. In this age, no matter for what ends war is fought, it can only destroy all our hopes and all our accomplishments. We must find new, nonmilitary ways of dealing with the conflicts and misunderstandings that inevitably arise among us, and to secure justice for all men.

We recognize and respect the necessary functions of government. We are not disloyal; we honor the accomplishments and particular values of our respective societies. But governments have as their proper responsibility the safety and well-being of their citizens, and in our world that well-being cannot be achieved through the military confrontation of competing states.

It is your responsibility and ours to make this known, unmistakably and in every way open to us. To this end, we who sign this statement have committed ourselves as a beginning. We represent many religious faiths in many countries, but we are of a common mind in our plea to all the contending parties.

To the people and Government of the United States of America:

The horrors that your planes and massive firepower are inflicting on the people of Vietnam are beyond any moral or political justification. The destruction of whole villages and the murder of masses of noncombatants which are the consequences of your policies cannot be excused on any grounds whatever. We believe that there is wrong on both sides, but that, as the only one of the world's major powers directly involved, you bear the heaviest responsibility for the initiation of peace moves. We call on you:

To stop the air attacks in both North and South Vietnam, at once, unilaterally, not simply as a political move in the direction of negotiations, but because those attacks are an affront to human decency and unworthy of a great people;

To express a clear intention to withdraw all U.S. military forces from Vietnam, consistent with the 1954 Geneva Agreements, to take effect immediately on conclusion of satisfactory arrangements to assure the Vietnamese people a free choice of government;

To state unequivocally your readiness to negotiate an end of the war on the basis of the 1954 agreements, with the National Liberation Front as one of the principals in the negotiations.

To the people and Government of North Vietnam, and to the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam:

The opposition to your cause is not motivated solely by what you call the "aggressive imperialism" of the United States. Honest, brave Vietnamese patriots who fought beside you in the Viet Minh against the French are among those who fight against you now. They distrust your intentions; they cherish certain rights and freedoms which they suspect you of wanting to destroy; they are shocked and repelled by some of the methods you use. We believe that a heavy responsibility for ending the war honorably rests with the United States, but that there is also a very heavy responsibility on you to create the conditions of peace. We call on you:

To abandon the methods of torture, assassination, the indiscriminate bombing of civilians and other forms of terror. They are an affront to the whole concept of human decency, and hopelessly degrade your cause. No consideration whatever of either justice or vengeance can excuse such tactics;

To issue a clear statement that any Vietnamese Government in which you may have a part will honor the right of its citizens to practice their religions in absolute freedom, and that there will be no reprisals against those who have fought against you;

To express your unqualified willingness to meet with representatives of the United States and the present South Vietnamese Government to negotiate peace and the future of your country, based on the 1954 agreements.

To the people and government of the People's Republic of China:

Your influence in southeast Asia is enormous, your words and actions are weighed throughout the world as portents of the future. We call on you:

To refrain from statements and actions that harden already bitter attitudes on both sides, and so perpetuate the war:

To make clear your willingness to see the countries of southeast Asia develop their institutions of government and society free from outside intervention by force, and free from the military presence of any foreign powers.

It is hard to imagine a world so torn by suspicion and hatred as is ours turning away from war and toward the resolution of conflict and the building of justice by nonviolent means, yet we humans have no other choice, and in our great religious heritage we have the guidelines we need to make this difficult decision. We call on all those, of whatever faith and nationality, who share our concern, to join us in our efforts to build a truly human society on earth.

U.S. MINISTERS, RABBIS AND PRIESTS
(PARTIAL LIST)

William Abbot, Los Angeles, Calif.
Herman C. Absher, Salisbury, N.C.
Melvin Abson, Geneva, N.Y.
Lyman Achenbach, Columbus, Ohio.
Merlin J. Ackerson, Rowan, Iowa.
Eugene H. Adams, Holden, Mass.
Oscar M. Adam, Seal Beach, Calif.
Thomas F. Adams, Versailles, Ohio.
Roy Charles Agie, Brockport, N.Y.
Alvin A. Ahern, Churchville, N.Y.
Paul H. Alexander, Parker, Ariz.
Charles T. Allen, Chelsea, Mass.
Wesley H. Allen, Yonkers, N.Y.
Carl Allinger, Evansville, Ind.
Albert Allinger, Somerville, N.J.
Lawrence F. Almond, Boston, Mass.
Ezekiel T. Alvarado, Mountain View, Calif.
Bruce F. Anderson, Collinsville, Conn.
Elmer S. Andersen, San Mateo, Calif.
Jay W. Anderson, Wichita, Kans.
John C. Anderson, Warwick, N.Y.
Wm. C. Anderson, Marion, Tex.
Leslie E. Andrews, Wakeeney, Kans.
Lloyd R. Applegate, Collingswood, N.J.
Lewis F. Archer, Madison, N.J.
Merle S. Arnold, Williamsport, Pa.
John K. Arnot, La Grange Park, Ill.
David W. Ash, Ottumwa, Iowa.
Richard H. Athey, Prairie Village, Kans.
Lester W. Auman, Spirit Lake, Iowa.
James L. Austin, Rockville, Conn.
Clarence F. Avey, Oxford, Mass.
Leif H. Awes, Minneapolis, Minn.
Joseph B. Axenroth, Durham, N.H.
Thomas E. Alston, Valparaiso, Ind.
Frederick H. Allen, Findlay, Ohio.
William H. Allison, Cashmere, Wash.
Rabbi M. M. Abramowitz, Springfield, Ill.
Layen R. Adelmann, Odessa, Minn.
Ole Arnold, Burlington, Colo.
James L. Airey, Portland, Oreg.
J. E. Arthur, Saginaw, Mich.
M. P. Andrews, Jr., Alderw'd Manor, Wash.
K. Brooke Anderson, Cambridge, Mass.
K. Roy Bailey, Omaha, Nebr.
Ralph C. Bailey, Danbury, Conn.
Robert B. Bailey, Minneapolis, Minn.
Glen M. Baird, Ellicott City, Md.
John D. Baker, Washington, Kans.
George H. Baldridge, Atwood, Ill.
Lee M. Baldwin, Owaneco, Ill.
Frederic E Balt, Chicago, Ill.
Lee H. Ball, Arisley, N.Y.
Rabbi Henry Bamberger, Sharon, Mass.
Russell B. Barbour, Perkiomenville, Pa.
C. Eugene Barnard, Roseville, Calif.
Jack L. Barnes, Macon, Mo.
Glenn H. Barney, Center, Colo.
Robert U. Barrowclough, Newark, N.J.
Douglas E. Bartlett, Commack, N.Y.
E. H. Bassler, New Bremen, Ohio
Loyd A. Bates, Shepherdstown, W. Va.
Richard Bauer, Staten Island, N.Y.
Alvin J. Beachy, Souderton, Pa.
Joseph C. Beavon, Jr., Barbourville, Ky.
Edwin R. Beck, West Hilton, Ohio
Lawrence E. Beebe, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Leonard I. Beerman, Los Angeles.
Edwin E. Beers, Madison, Wis.
Birt Beers, Quincy, Mich.
C. Edward Behre, Silver Spring, Md.
Edwin de F. Bennett, Houston, Tex.
Gordon C. Bennett, Merion Station, Pa.
Albert A. Bentley, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Lloyd A. Berg, Bronx, N.Y.
Philip Berrigan, SSJ, Baltimore, Md.
Louis Bertoni, Vermilion, O.
Lee James Beynon, Jr., Rochester, N.Y.
Charles M. Bieber, Hummelstown, Pa.
Vernon Bigler, Syracuse, N.Y.
Lester H. Bill, South Bend, Ind.
B. Stanley Bittinger, Kingsville, Tex.
Charles H. Bixby, West Henrietta, N.Y.
Elizabeth Bixby, Jamestown, N.Y.
Donald K. Blackie, Grand Rapids, Mich.
Myles D. Blanchard, Monson, Mass.
Robert I. Blakesley, Shaker Heights, Ohio
George Blau, Decatur, Ga.
Robert M. Bock, Hollywood, Calif.
Robert W. Bockstruck, Louisville, Ky.
Paul John Bode, St. Louis, Mo.
Leslie Eugene Bogan, Allentown, Pa.
Milton Bohmfalk, Del Rio, Tex.
Ernest J. Bohn, Goshen, Ind.
Paul F. Boller, Malverne, N.Y.
Theodore W. Boltz, West Hartford, Conn.
Arthur E Bomers, Bakersfield, Calif.
Charles M. Bond, Lewisburg, Pa.
Charles W. Bonner, Kearney, N.J.
O. E. Bonny, Topeka, Kans.
Sister M. C. Borromeo, CSC, Notre Dame, Ind.
Lloyd Boshart, Lowville, N.Y.
Bill Bosler, Grand Rapids, Mich.
Ronald L. Boswell, Craig, Neb.
Emory Lee Bithast, Keene, N.H.
Robert D. Botley, Burlingame, Calif.
Clement Boutgrager, Raleigh, N.C.
Frank A. Boutwell, Pasadena, Tex.
Glenn H. Bowlby, Laverne, Calif.
Fred F. Bowman, Dayton, Va.
Harold L. Bowser, Union Bridge, Md.
Lee O. Boye, Tazewell, Va.
Richard V. Boylan, Fresno, Calif.
Roger V. Boyvey, Oakland, Calif.
Howard Box, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Orla E. Bradford, South Bend, Ind.
John W. Bradley, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Donald O. Brady, Honor, Mich.
James A. Braker, Kingston, N.Y.
J. Kenneth Brand, Warren, Mich.
Wilbur R. Brandli, Paterson, N.J.
Frank M. Branno, Jr., Madison, N.J.
Robert M. Brashares, La Habra, Calif.
Donald E. Bratton, Rocky Mount, N.C.
H. Myron Braun, Austin, Tex.
Richard H. Bready, Georgetown, Conn.
Alan R. Bragg, Swanton, Vt.
Bradley B. Brehmer, Denver, Colo.
Ray B. Bressler, Ellinwood, Kans.
Charles T. Brewster, Honolulu.
William M. Briggs, Chicago, Ill.
Robert L. Bromley, Louisiana, Mo.
George Douglas Brown, Palo Alto, Calif.
James R. Brown, Corpus Christi, Tex.
W. Paul Brown, Hannibal, Ohio.
W. G. Browning, Sylvis, Ill.
H. C. Brubaker, Saginaw, Mich.
Robert C. Brubaker, Brighton, Mich.
Daniel M. Brambaugh, Saxton, Pa.
Leonard J. Brummett, Columbia, Mo.
Monk Bryan, Columbus, Mo.
J. Ernest Bryant, Boston, Mass.
Walter E. Bucher, Canton, Ill.
Ben F. Buckinham, Prairie City, Iowa.
Robert C. Buckley, Hempstead, N.Y.
Hartzell Buckner, Auburn, Calif.
Leonard H. Budd, Stow, Ohio.
Gerard Bugge, Suffield, Conn.
N. Ellsworth Bunce, Baltimore, Md.
Dodds B. Bunch, Sunnyvale, Calif.
Richard L. Burgess, Laurel, Nebr.
Maurice Glynn Burke, Columbia, Mo.
John W. Burkholder, Lancaster County, Pa.
Clement Burns, New Haven, Conn.
Russell Burriss, Santa Ana, Calif.
Ina E. Burton, Maywood, Ill.
John C. Bush, Americus, Kans.
Jackson L. Butler, Modesto, Calif.
Jay Butler, Jr., Sharon, Pa.
William T. Butterfield, Staples, Minn.
Very Rev. John V. Butler, New York, N.Y.
L. A. Bangerter, Fairborn, Ohio.
H. D. Bollinger, Nashville, Tenn.
Harold Z. Bomberger, McPherson, Kans.
George W. Brighton, Stratford, Iowa.
Walter P. Brockway, Exeter, N.H.
Dale W. Brown, Oak Brook, Ill.
Albert W. Buck, Chicago, Ill.
Joe Riley Burns, El Dorado, Kans.
Lee Vaughn Barker, Oakland, Calif.
William F. Baur, Stony Point, N.Y.
Roger S. Boraas, East Orange, N.J.
Rabbi Stanley R. Brav, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Harold J. Bass, Tacoma, Wash.
Howard D. Baumgart, Sumner, Wash.
Lavon B. Bayler, Hinckley, Ill.
Robert F. Beach, New York, N.Y.
Robert E. Beck, Russiaville, Ind.
Robert W. Beggs, Ithaca, N.Y.
Joseph W. Bell, Nashville, Tenn.
Harry L. Bennett, Washington, D.C.
Ronald A. Beverlin, Elkton, Md.
Neil F. Bintz, Grand Rapids, Mich.
Paul Boecler, Milford, Ohio.
James W. Bristah, Detroit, Mich.
George G. Brooks, Burlington, Iowa.
John R. Bross, Billings, Mont.
Edwin A. Brown, Berea, Ohio.
J. Thompson Brown, Lexington, Va.
J. H. Bruemmer, Grand Island, N.Y.
Paul H. Burditt, Westbrook, Maine.
Francis A. Beloto, Lincoln, Nebr.
Rabbi Herbert Bronstein, Rochester, N.Y.
Jackson Burns, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
The Ven. C. D. Braidwood, Lapeer, Mich.
Prof. Carl Bangs, Kansas City, Mo.
George C. Beebe, Lakeside, Ohio.
B. J. Black, Sandusky, Ohio.
Prof. D. W. Brown, Jamestown, N. Dak.
Prof. Kenneth Brown, Manchester, Ind.
Prof. Herbert C. Burke, Collegeville, Minn.
Prof. G. Murray Brauch, Atlanta, Ga.
Edward A. Cahill, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Terry Cain, Greenwood, Neb.
Maurice Caldwell, Anderson, Ind.
Raymond Calkins, Belmont, Mass.
Raoul C. Calkins, Dayton, Ohio
A. W. Campbell, Somerset, Ky.
Charles G. Campbell, Norwalk, Conn.
Colin Campbell, Jr., Ann Arbor, Mich.
J. Warren Campbell, Edwards, Mo.
Ralph J. Capolungo, Oakland, Calif.
Fred Cappuccino, Takoma Park, Md.
Erland E. Carson, Escanaba, Mich.
Milton S. Carothers, Covington, Va.
J. Russell Carpenter, Pine City, N.Y.
Clyde Carter, Midland, Va.
Robert L. Carter, Shelby, N.C.
William I. Carter, Benton Harbor, Mich.
Donald L. Carver, Moville, Iowa.
G. Arthuh Casaday, Palo Alto, Calif.
Elwood E. Case, Schaghticoke, N.Y.
J. R. Case, Vergennes, Vt.
Estell R. Casebier, Louisville, Ky.
Harry L. Casey, Ardmore, Pa.
David G. Cassie, Providence, R.I.
Marid A. Cestaro, Jaffrey, N.H.
James N. Chamblee, Jr., Woodward, Okla.
Prof. D. R. Chandler, Washington, D.C.
Eben T. Chapman, Woodbury, Conn.
J. Howard Cherry, Pittsburgh, Pa.
James O. Childs, Norton, Va.
Charles J. Chipman, Abilene, Kans.
Paul E. Chreiman, Newtown, Pa.
Jonn P. Christensen, Barre, Vt.
Tom H. Christensen, Royal Oak, Mich.
C. W. Christman, Jr., Hudson, N.Y.
John Christoff, Lima, Ohio.
Prof. K. E. Christopherson, Tacoma, Wash.
Luther K. Clare, Erie, Pa.
Clarence H. Clark, York, Maine.
Gordon M. Clark, Johnsonville, N.Y.
Jack Clark, Laconia, N.H.
Bishop M. K. Clarke, Washington, D.C.
William R. Clark, Moran, Kans.
George V. Clauss, Portland, Oreg.
Kenneth D. Claypool, Seattle, Wash.

Marvin E. Clingenpeel, Smithville, Ohio.
C. Donald Close, Pratt, Kans.
John I. Coffman, Pomona, Calif.
Rabbi Jehudah M. Cohen, Los Angeles, Calif.
Rabbi Hillel Cohn, San Bernardino, Calif.
John H. Cole, Seelyville, Ind.
Jordan Cole, Schuylerville, N.Y.
George L. Collins, San Jose, Calif.
J. J. Collins, Newton, Ala.
George D. Colman, Detroit, Mich.
William H. Compton, Port St. Lucie, Fla.
J. Elliott Corbett, Washington, D.C.
Pablo Cotto, New York, N.Y.
Ray H. Cowen, Chester, N.H.
Robert M. Cox, Rye, N.Y.
Martha A. Cox, Rye, N.Y.
Thomas B. Cox, McLean, Va.
Robert B. Craig, Muncie, Kans.
Harry S. Crede, Peoria, Ill.
Edna L. Crede, Peoria, Ill.
Henry D. Crede, Roseville, Ill.
George Crenshaw, Steubenville, Ohio.
Tom O. Crosby, Jr., Bossien City, La.
Charles F. Crist, Canonsburg, Pa.
Tom O. Crosby, Jr., Bossier City, La.
Prof. John P. Crossley, Jr., Hastings, Nebr.
Walter B. Crowell, Ione, Oreg.
Donald J. Cunningham, Redwood City, Calif.
John M. Currie, Easton, Pa.
Sister Helen Carey, Nauvoo, Ill.
Marion Casey, Belle Plaine, Minn.
Franklin K. Cassel, Lititz, Pa.
Wallace Cedarleaf, Sidney, N.Y.
Rabbi Arthur A. Chiel, New Haven, Conn.
Robert T. Clark, Denver, Colo.
Arden Clute, Mountainview, Calif.
Martin J. Corbin, Tivoli, N.Y.
Thomas C. Cornell, New York, N.Y.
Henry Hitt Crane, Detroit, Mich.
Vivian Crossman, Honolulu, Hawaii.
W. Lynn Crowding, Carlisle, Pa.
Kevin Culligan, Milwaukee, Wis.
Gale D. Crumrine, Troy, Ohio.
M. E. Cunningham, Nashville, Tenn.
Harold A. Clark, Clarissa, Minn.
William G. Coxhead, St. Petersburg, Fla.
Donald S. Campbell, Myrtle Creek, Oreg.
Thomas M. Carson, Denver, Colo.
George P. Carter, San Mateo, Calif.
Paul E. Chreiman, Newtown, Pa.
W. R. Callaway, Cumming, Ga.
Charles B. Curran, Washington, D.C.
Prof. William Case, Kansas City, Mo.
Prof. Russel J. Compton, Greencastle, Ind.
Prof. Carl W. Condit, Morton Grove, Ill.
Elmer L. Dadisman, Astoria, Ill.
Arthur R. Daes, Otisco, Ind.
Gordon E. Dalbeck, Flagstaff, Ariz.
James P. Dale, St. Petersburg, Fla.
Leroy M. Dancer, Bainbridge, N.Y.
Alex E. Dandar, Elyria, Ohio.
John Irving Daniel, Franklin, Mass.
Wilbur O. Daniel, Pearl River, N.Y.
Prof. John W. Darr, Seattle, Wash.
David G. Davis, Timmath, Colo.
E. Julius Davis, Parlier, Calif.
Harry B. Davis, Kansas City, Mo.
Jack A. Davis, Orlando, Fla.
S. Kenneth Davis, Daytona Beach, Fla.
Albert Edward Day, Falls Church, Va.
A. Garnett Day, Jr., Indianapolis, Ind.
Ben F. Day, Rockford, Ill.
LeRoy Day, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
George W. Deaton, Claypool, Ind.
Purd E. Deitz, New York, N.Y.
Charles A. DeLay, Gilman, Ill.
Douglas Denton, North Weymouth, Mass.
Kermit H. Derstine, Akron, Pa.
Clarence R. Desler, Clatskanie, Oreg.
Oviatt E. Desmond, Indianapolis, Ind.
Charles De Vries, Harwich, Mass.
Rhoda Jane Dickinson, Minneapolis, Minn.
Albert A. Dickson, Spencerport, N.Y.
Elmer A. Dickson, Ashton, Ill.
Theodore Dixon, Simsbury, Conn.
Paul H. Doering, Loyal, Wis.
Carroll A. Doggett, Jr., Rockville, Md.
Herbert L. D. Doggett, Silver Spring, Md.
Harlow Phelps Dohovan, Jr., St. Louis, Mo.
John E. Donovan, Des Moines, Iowa.
H. F. Doran, Apros, Calif.
M. E. Dorr, Fairfax, Va.
James B. Douglas, Richmond, Va.
Robert E. Doxey, Binghamton, N.Y.
Francis A. Drake, Schroon Lake, N.Y.
M. Richard Drake, Cleveland, Ohio.
Allen E. Dripps, Rochester, Minn.
William H. DuBay, Santa Monica, Calif.
Wilton J. Dubrick, Binghamton, N.Y.
Paul H. Duckwall, Statesville, N.C.
Bert Logan Duncan, Traverse City, Mich.
T. E. Dunlap, Sr., Green Bank, W. Va.
James S. Duren, Menomonee Falls, Wis.
G. Engene Durham, Ithaca, N.Y.
C. L. Duxbury, Kansas City, Mo.
John Dykstra, Locust Valley, N.Y.
Claude F. Dadisman, San Diego, Calif.
Richard J. Davey, Rochester, N.Y.
Lewis H. Davis, Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.
Paul F. Davis, Corvallis, Oreg.
Jesse De Witt, Royal Oak, Mich.
Walter Dolde, Tioga, Ill.
Glenn A. Dunn, Westfield, Wis.
Prof. William E. David, Athens, Ga.
Norman Dewire, Detroit, Mich.
Joel Duffield, Hamilton, Ill.
E. Dale Dunlap, Kansas City, Mo.
J. Stanley Earhart, Mechanicsburg, Pa.
Riggins R. Earl, Jr., Nashville, Tenn.
Robert Ebey, Argos, Ind.
Thomas H. Eck, Rockford, Ill.
Robert M. Eddy, Farmington, Mich.
Rabbi Jason Z. Edelstein, Pitcairn, Pa.
Robert A. Edgar, New York, N.Y.
Prof. George R. Edwards, Louisville, Ky.
J. Edgar Edwards, Ann Arbor, Mich.
William C. Eicher, Rocky Mount, Va.
Charles W. Eichman, Hope, Ind.
John Elder, Waverly, Ohio.
M. W. Eiftmann, Kenosha, Wis.
Al Burton Eliason, Fond du Lac, Wis.
Richard F. Elliott, Jr., Clemson, S.C.
Thomas E. Ellis, Camarillo, Calif.
Charles A. Ellwood, West Liberty, W. Va.
George F. Emery, Springfield, Ill.
J. Martin England, Greenville, S.C.
Frank W. Engstrom, Natoma, Kans.
Kenneth L. Engstrom, Buffalo, Wyo.
Herman Ensslin, Waynesburg, Ky.
Fred Erion, Audubon, Pa.
Gerald Eslinger, Shelton, Iowa.
Edgar J. Evans, Los Angeles, Calif.
Rowland H. Evans, Mazomarie, Wis.
William M. Everhart, Ashboro, N.C.
M. Jones Egan, New York, N.Y.
Richard Ehrenberg, Leonard, N. Dak.
Rabbi Harry Essrig, Los Angeles, Calif.
Rabbi Randall M. Falk, Nashville, Tenn.
Lyman G. Farrar, Westbury, Long Island, N.Y.
Dean L. Farringer, Columbus, Ohio.
Frank Favalora, McFarland, Calif.
R. A. Feenstra, Falls City, Oreg.
Rabbi Alexander Feinsilver, Easton, Pa.
Raymond A. Fenner, Birmingham, Mich.
J. Frank Ferguson, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Harlo H. Ferris, Waterloo, Iowa.
Emerson S. Fike, Blue Ridge, Va.
Galen E. Fike, Eglon, W. Va.
Lester E. Fike, Ashley, Ind.
Oscar R. Fike, Bellwood, Pa.
Paul H. Fike, Weyers Cove, Va.
Kenneth A. Fineran, Frakes, Ky.
W. W. Finlator, Raleigh, N.C.
Thomas M. Finn, C.S.P., Washington, D.C.
Carleton M. Fisher, Massapequa, N.Y.
E. R. Fisher, Lansing, Mich.
Geo. L. Fitzgerald, New Haven, Conn.
William J. Fitzpatrick, Detroit, Mich.
J. Emery Fleming, Jr., Tokyo, Japan.
Daniel C. Flory, Peru, Ind.
Edgar Flory, New Preston, Conn.
Raymond C. Flory, Paradise, Calif.
Wendell Flory, Waynesboro, Va.
Williston M. Ford, O.S.L., San Diego, Calif.
Robert E. Forester, Loyall, Ky.
Charles W. Forman, New Haven, Conn.
James E. Forrest, Mobile, Ala.
Robert Forsberg, New Haven, Conn.
Gerald E. Forshey, Chicago, Ill.
Rabbi Stephen Forstein, Richmond, Calif.
Fred E. Fox, Mount Vernon, Wash.
Donald L. Frank, Eau Claire, Wis.
Howard G. Franklin, Jamesburg, N.J.
Dean L. Frantz, North Manchester, Ind.
Ira H. Frantz, Delphi, Ind.
Delton Franz, Chicago, Ill.
Harold R. Fray, Jr., Newborn, Mass.
Porter French, Chester, Ill.
Edward S. Frey, New York, N.Y.
E. A. Fridell, Berkeley, Calif.
Gerhard Friesen, Newtorn, Kans.
James E. Friesner, Sr., Bankin, Ill.
Harold I. Frost, Auburn, Maine.
Leota T. Frye, Sandlake, Mich.
J. Alfred Fryer, Madison, Wis.
Clifford F. Fugate, Huntington Park, Calif.
Clarence G. Fuller, Jr., New Orleans, La.
Clyde Funkhouser, Lebanon, Ill.
Norman J. Faramelli, Philadelphia, Pa.
W. H. Ferry, Santa Barbara, Calif.
Herbert A. Fisher, Kettering, Ohio.
Byron M. Flory, Jr., Dayton, Ohio.
Walter J. Fox, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.
Richard E. French, Auburndale, Mass.
Marion C. Frenyear, Unadilla, N.Y.
Prof. Gilbert S. Fell, Navesink, N.J.
Rabbi Henry Fisch, West Orange, N.J.
Rabbi Frank A. Fischer, Athens, Ga.
Allan R. Fisher, Grand Marais, Minn.
Charles F. Frederich, Gray, Maine.
John Fragale, Jr., Warwick, N.Y.
Prof. W. Arthur Faus, Williamsport, Pa.
Harlan M. Frost, Buffalo, N.Y.
Richard M. A. Gadow, Fairport Harbor, Ohio.
James S. Gadsden, Camden, S.C.
Erwin A. Gaede, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Bradford E. Gale, Quincy, Mass.
Rabbi Hillel, Gamoran, Hoffman Estates, Ill.
Dwight Ganzel, Waverly, Nebr.
Bruce W. Garner, Hancock, Mich.
Curt Garrett, Roselle, N.J.
Karl C. Garrison, Jr., Durham, N.C.
Allen H. Gates, Hatfield, Mass.
John H. Gebhart, Marathon, Fla.
Frank Gehman, Klamath, Calif.
Harmon M. Gehr, Pasadena, Calif.
Vance Geier, Los Angeles, Calif.
H. Robert Gemmer, Whitesboro, N.Y.
J. H. Gerberdins, Denver, Colo.
Ira W. Gibbel, Newport News, Va.
Pius Gibble, Tipp City, Ohio.
O. E. Gibson, Westmont, Ill.
R. John Gibson, Rapid City, S. Dak.
Bruce E. Gideon, Wilmette, Ill.
Wm. A. Gilbert, Ventura, Calif.
David A. Giles, New York, N.Y.
Malcolm E. Gillespie, Carbondale, Ill.
Philip H. Gillis, Amsterdam, Ohio.
Robert Gilman, Milton-Freewater, Oreg.
Aaron S. Gilmartin, Walnut Creek, Calif.
Paul J. Gilmer, Institute, W. Va.
William E. Gilpin, Little Falls, N.Y.
C. Homer Ginns, Middleboro, Mass.
Dennis E. Glad, Chicago, Ill.
Glenn D. Glazier, West Brookfield, Mass.
Charles Glenn, Roxbury, Mass.
W. Herbert Glenn, Vernon, Mass.
Irving R. Glover, Canton, Ohio.
Theodore S. Gooley, Wells, Maine.
Prof. John D. Godsey, Madison, N.J.
Robert E. Goessling, Owen, Wis.
Rabbi Robert E. Goldburg, Hamden, Conn.
Rabbi Abram Vossen Goodman, Lawrence, N.Y.
Quentin A. Goodrich, Elk Grove Village, Ill.
John Goodwin, S. Nyack, N.Y.
William M. Goodwin, Muscle Shoals, Ala.
Clifford H. Goold, Portland, Oreg.
Robert W. Gordon, E. St. Louis, Ill.
John W. Gosnell, Elizabethtown, Pa.
Prof. Norman K. Gottwald, Newton Center, Mass.
Harvey Graber, Topeka, Ind.
O'Ray C. Graber, Oklahoma City.
Grover C. Graham, Spruce Pine, N.C.
Don Gaymon, Manhattan, Kans.

Rabbi Sidney Greenberg, Philadelphia, Pa.
Albert Greene, Sayre, Pa.
Donald Greenough, Harrisburg, S. Dak.
Paul Ray, Greenwood, Sherrodsville, Ohio.
A. Ray Grummon, Springfield, Ill.
Kenneth Griswold, Minneapolis, Minn.
Malcolm Grobe, W. Lebanon, N.H.
Wilbur D. Grose, Minneapolis, Minn.
Thomas E. Guerdat, Randolph, N.Y.
Chester L. Guinn, Emmetsburg, Iowa.
David Gustafson, Kankakee, Ill.
Robert Gardiner, Wellesley, Mass.
Laurence Garrett, Stuart, Iowa.
E. L. Gass, Mountain Grove, Mo.
Raymond H. Giffin, Minneapolis, Minn.
Richard S. Gilbert, Ithaca, N.Y.
Rabbi Jerrold Goldstein, St. Paul, Minn.
Floyd Gotien, Silver Creek, N.Y.
Ellis Graber, Minneapolis, Minn.
Robert E. Grant, Suffern, N.Y.
John Paul Griffith, Bernardsville, N.J.
Thomas A. Grimm, Albany, Calif.
Rabbi, Everett Gendler, Princeton, N.J.
Dr. Ira E. Gillet, Portland, Oreg.
Eugene H. Haaf, Hampton Bays, N.Y.
Dennis W. Haas, Lancaster, Pa.
Dwight Haberman, Ortonville, Minn.
Carl C. Hackman, Richmond, Mo.
Rosco F. Haning, Alexandria, Minn.
Gary L. Hakes, Syracuse, N.Y.
Tom G. Haley, Van Alstyne, Tex.
Cameron P. Hall, Garden City, N.Y.
David C. Hall, South Norwalk, Conn.
R. F. Hall, Elyria, Ohio.
Williard B. Hall, Harrington, Wash.
Arthur A. Tamann, Leon, Iowa.
L. M. Hamby, Grafton, Mass.
P. M. Hammond, Portland, Oreg.
Robert A. Hammond, Ballston Spa, N.Y.
Bernie H. Hampton, Chattanooga, Tenn.
Emerson G. Hangen, Long Beach, Calif.
George Hangen, Reseda, Calif.
Ray E. Hankins, Exeter, Nebr.
Walter W. Hannum, Juneau, Alaska.
Carl A. Hansen, Minneapolis, Minn.
James H. Hanson, Glendive, Mont.
Vernon R. Hanson, Medford, Oreg.
George Haram, Flora, Ill.
Arthur L. Hardy, Kansas City, Kans.
Ira R. Harkins, Tiffin, Ohio.
Chester I. Harley, West Milton, Ohio.
Frederick F. Harlins, Somerville, Mass.
Herman Harmelink III, North Bergen, N.J.
John J. Harmon, Roxbury, Mass.
Lyle E. Harper, Walkersville, Md.
J. F. Harriman, Bellingham, Wash.
Ernest S. Harris, Jr., Hartford, Conn.
Gerald F. Harris, Elmira, N.Y.
Robert A. Harris, Celina, Ohio.
W. Reid Harris, Hickory, N.C.
Thomas O. Harrison, Lexington, Ky.
Norman L. Harsh, Staunton, Va.
J. Richard Hart, Stockton, Calif.
Marvin J. Hartman, St. Joseph, Mich.
Vartan Hartunian, Belmont, Mass.
L. H. R. Hass, Washington, D.C.
Roy Allan Hassel, New Platz, N.Y.
Glenn O. Hassinger, Myerstown, Pa.
Clabourne Hatcher, Columbia Falls, Mont.
Albert M. Haught, Mount Union, Pa.
Francis C. Hawes, Manchester, Conn.
Percy R. Hayden, Concord, N.H.
Edward H. Hayes, North Stonington, Conn.
Paul G. Hayes, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. Douglas Hayward, Berkeley, Calif.
R. W. Haywood III, Kingsville, Tex.
Prof. Lowell B. Hazzard, Washington, D.C.
H. Lee Hebel, Karthaus, Pa.
Raymond W. Hedberg, St. Paul, Minn.
Sam Hedrick, Newton Center, Mass.
Norval Hegland, Philip, S. Dak.
Matthias R. Hellig, Mount Gretna, Pa.
Gerald G. Heilman, Baltimore, Md.
Edward K. Heininger, Des Moines, Iowa.
Walter J. Heisey, Tiffin, Ohio.
Arthur G. Heisler, Columbia City, Ind.
DeWitt F. Helm, Kenly, N.C.
Robert A. Helstrom, Claysville, Pa.
Kenneth R. Hemphill, Manhattan, Kans.
C. L. Hendrix, Elkhart, Ind.
Walter F. Hendricks, Jr., Richmond, Va.
M. Miles Henry, Marion, Kans.
H. Eugene Herr, Scottdale, Pa.
Rabbi Richard C. Hertz, Detroit, Mich.
Robert E. Heskett, Roslindale, Mass.
Robert G. Hess, Goldendale, Wash.
D. Russell Hetsler, Alhambra, Calif.
Lorton G. Heusel, Wilmington, Ohio.
Clare B. Hewitt, Poplar Grove, Ill.
Gerald C. Hibbard, Milwaukee, Wis.
Richard R. Hicks, Chestertown, Md.
Anne Higgins, North Haven, Conn.
Clarence M. Higgins, Jr., Stone Creek, Ohio.
G. Truett High, Duluth, Minn.
William A. Highfield, Mountaintop, Pa.
Dean E. Hill, Weedsport, N.Y.
Gordon W. Hill, Northampton, Mass.
Robert W. Hill, Philadelphia, Pa.
Melvin Himes, Indianapolis, Ind.
Frank T. Hiroms, Wahpeton, N. Dak.
Philip D. Hirtzel, Mason, Mich.
Sam Hochstatter.
P. Stein Hockman, Romney, W. Va.
Violet Hodges, Montara, Calif.
George A. Hodgkins, Stratford, Conn.
Elmer H. Hoerer, St. Louis, Mo.
Gilbert E. Hoffman, Sharon, Pa.
Wayne M. Hoffman, Luverne, Minn.
Rodney D. Hokenson, Hancock, Mich.
Ralph M. Holdeman, New York.
Benj. R. Hollis, Keosaugua, Iowa.
Donald G. Holsopple, Lansing, Mich.
Reynold N. Hoover, Flagler Beach, Fla.
Harold Hornberger, Red Bank, N.J.
Laurence M. Horst, Evanston, Ill.
Robert Horton, Trevose, Pa.
Wright M. Horton, Galesburg, Kans.
J. J. Hostetler, Peoria, Ill.
Robert E. Houff, Harrisonburg, Va.
W. Donald Housser, Cattaraugus, N.Y.
Robert W. Hovda, Washington, D.C.
Ernest L. Howard, Chattanooga, Tenn.
Lee A. Howe, Schenectady, N.Y.
Robert M. Howes, Kennebunkport, Maine.
Paul C. Hoyt, Shokan, N.Y.
William Huckabone, Corydon, Ind.
John L. Hudson, Northlake, Ill.
Kenneth de P. Hughes, Cambridge, Mass.
James David Hulett, Claremont, Calif.
George M. Hunt, Henry, Ill.
Allan A. Hunter, Claremont, Calif.
Donald F. Hursh, Meyersdale, Pa.
Paul L. Huscher, Strawberry Point, Iowa.
Horace Huse, Logansport, Ind.
Jack Hustad, Overland Park, Kans.
David Hykes, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Dale Hylton, Westminster, Md.
John Harrell, Berkeley, Calif.
Wayne L. Harting, Butler, N.J.
Guy C. Heyl, Rock Hill, S.C.
Eugene W. Hibbard, Manson, Wash.
Geo. A. Hickson, Bellevue, Ohio.
Alberta Hidritch, Benton, Ill.
Dean E. Hill, Weedsport, N.Y.
Donald Robert Hoff, Monroe, Conn.
Everett R. Hunt, Tacoma, Wash.
Donald C. Hanson, Syracuse, N.Y.
Albert E. Hartman, Trenton, N.J.
Prof. Hideo Hashimoto, Portland, Oreg.
Anna E. Koglin, Thief River Falls, Minn.
Rabbi Isadore B. Hoffman, N.Y.
Prof. Yates Hafner, Yellow Springs, Ohio.
James F. Hopewell, Pomona, N.Y.
Charles W. Iglehart, Dunedin, Fla.
Bothan T. Illwell, Fort Lewis, Ohio.
Wilder V. Immel, Santa Cruz, Calif.
Bruce O. Inglis, Mojave, Calif.
Robert W. Inglis, Denver, Colo.
Deane W. Irish, LaCrosse, Wis.
Jerold L. Irvin, Des Moines, Iowa.
Edwin F. Irwin, Sacramento, Calif.
Earl Jabay, Princeton, N.J.
Charles H. Jack, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Patrick A. Jackson, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Richard H. Jackson, Mora, Minn.
Richard L. Jackson, Durham, N.C.
Warren E. Jackson, Vermontville, Mich.
Herman M. Janssen, Marlette, Mich.
Harold A. Jayne, Portage, Mich.
Loe E. Jeambey, Muscatine, La.
Alan Jenkins, Royal Oaks, Mich.
David W. Jenks, Tuxedo, N.Y.
Joseph R. Jennings, Fresno, Calif.
Harold V. Jensen, Santa Monica, Calif.
Warren E. Jensen, Ware, Mass.
Richard A. Johnsen, Middleburgh, N.Y.
Brace E. Johnson, Sterling, Ill.
Charles E. Johnson, Minneapolis, Minn.
Herman C. Johnson, Cambridge, Mass.
J. H. Johnson, Ferndale, Mich.
Roy A. Johnson, Elizabethtown, Pa.
W. L. Johnson, Tacoma, Wash.
Berwyn E. Jones, Kouts, Ind.
Jack E. Jones, Shelbroille, Ind.
J. Ira Jones, Lima, Ohio.
Laurence R. Jones, Oak Brook, Ill.
Richard E. Jones, New Albany, Ind.
Charles Wesley Jordan, Chicago, Ill.
Donald R. Jordan, Elgin, Ill.
Correll M. Julian, Walnut Creek, Calif.
Hershey Julien, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Andrew Juvinall, San Francisco, Calif.
William M. Justice, Stony Point, N.Y.
Augusta T. Jackley, Ogden, Utah.
Francis Johnson, Jr., League City, Tex.
Major L. Johnson, Weathersfield, Conn.
Clarence Jordan, Americus, Ga.
Donald E. Jordan, Fresno, Calif.
W. O. Johnson, Elmhurst, Ill.
Rabbi Wolli Kaelter, Long Beach, Calif.
Frederick F. Kaetzel, Mitchell, Ind.
Dean Ragarise, New Windsor, Md.
Dean C. Kallander, Oxford, Ohio.
Rabbi D. L. Kaplan, Needham Heights, Mass.
Rabbi Samuel E. Karff.
Calvin R. Kaufman, South Bend, Ind.
Bishop Nelson E. Kauffman, Elkhart, Ind.
Robert W. Kauffman, Waupun, Wis.
Stewart B. Kauffman, Huntingdon, Pa.
L. Robert Keck, Des Moines, Iowa.
Harold R. Keen, Ottawa, Ill.
Christian H. Kehl, San Antonio, Tex.
Arthur C. Keim, Pomona, Calif.
Howard H. Keim, Peoria, Ill.
D. Howard Kelper, Lititz, Pa.
Richard A. Kellaway, New Bedford, Mass.
Walter E. Kellison, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Max V. Kemling, Paw Paw, Ill.
J. Paul Kendall, Kokomo, Ind.
Harold M. Kenepp, Clearville, Pa.
Alick, M. Kennedy, Clinton, N.J.
George T. Kennedy, Athens, Ohio.
Hazel M. Kennedy, Elgin, Ill.
Roger Kennedy, Green Springs, Ohio.
LeRoy Kennel, Lombard, Ill.
Richard Kern, Findlay, Ohio.
Earl Kernahen, Chula Vista, Calif.
Erwin K. Kerr, McKean, Pa.
Howard A. Kerstetter, Baltimore, Md.
Donald A. Kessler, Wichita, Kans.
Milton G. Kessler, Cape Cod, Mass.
Phillip G. Kessler, North Manchester, Ind.
Delbert W. Kettering, Sheffield Lake, Ohio.
Russell W. Kiester, St. John, Kans.
S. Collins Kilburn, Raleigh, N.C.
Paul E. Killinger, Orange, Calif.
Carl E. Kime, Battle Creek, Mich.
Dean Kindy, Creston, Ohio.
David S. King, Amherst, Mass.
Deaconess Dellema J. King, Pierre, S. Dak.
Horace M. King, San Antonio, Tex.
Jack K. King, Northport, N.Y.
James Wilbur King, Bagler, Iowa.
Thomas Moore King, Sioux City, Iowa.
David C. Kinnard, St. Louis, Mo.
Glenn E. Kinsel, Hanover, Pa.
Alvin L. Kintner, Marion, Ind.
Homer Kirdcofe, Plymouth, Ind.
David Kirk, Wheeling, W. Va.
Dean R. Kirkwood, Oakland, Calif.
Stanley P. Kirn, Sr., Cass City, Mich.
Scott D. Kittredge, Wiscasset, Maine.
Gerhard Klassen, Fairfield, Pa.
LeRoy H. Klaus, Stillwater, Minn.
Voigt Kleckley, Atlanta, Ga.
Ralph G. Kleen, San Bernardino, Calif.
M. B. Klepinger, Dayton, Ohio.
Robert E. Klingel, Carey, Ohio.
George H. Klohck, Northville, N.Y.
A. W. Klumb, Moonee, Ill.
Charles P. Knight, Ottawa, Kans.
Edwin L. Knopf, Marlette, Mich.

John G. Koehler, Wakefield, Mass.
Robert W. Koenig, Terre Haute, Ind.
James H. Konrad, Fremont, Ohio.
William Koshewa, New Albany, Ind.
Charles F. Kraft, Evanston, Ill.
Aba Krause, Henderson, Nebr.
C. W. Kreamer, Bridgeton, N.J.
Burl G. Kreps, Greeley, Colo.
Eugene William Kreyes, Naperville, Ill.
Timothy J. Kribs, Harrisburg, Oreg.
Allen E. Kroehler, Lancaster, Pa.
Rabbi Charles A. Kroloff, Westbury, N.Y.
James F. Kubik, Half Moon Bay, Calif.
Rabbi Harold L. Kudan, Glencoe, Ill.
Wm. F. Kuechmann, Walnut, Iowa.
Ralph L. Kuether, Manchester, Mich.
Howard R. Kunkle, Fort Scott, Kans.
Gordon F. Kurtz, Rochester, N.Y.
H. E. Kettering, Greenville, Ohio.
D. Franklin Kohl, Great Falls, Mont.
Rabbi Pesach Krauss, Woonsocket, R.I.
A. V. Krebs, Jr., San Francisco, Calif.
John A. Kruse, Eau Claire, Wis.
Arthur L. Lacey, Ilion, N.Y.
R. Gwinn Lacy, Versailles, Ohio.
Arnold R. Lambarth, St. Claire Shores, Mich.
A. C. Lambert, Fruitland, Idaho.
Edward H. Lander, Jr., Dayton, Ohio.
Harvey M. Landis, North Manchester, Ind.
Herman B. Landis, Sunnyside, Wash.
Alfred P. Landon, Fenton, Mich.
Richard L. Landrum, Topeka, Kans.
William P. Langham, Jr., Dayton, Ohio.
E. G. Larson, Ada, Minn.
Hilmer Larson, Hastings, Nebr.
E. Edwin Lasbury, Fruitland, Md.
Philip H. Lauver, South Bend, Ind.
Rabbi Bernard H. Lavine, Evansville, Ind.
R. D. LaWall, Kasseville, N.Y.
Earl A. Lawrence, Auburn, Calif.
Henry H. Lawson, Dallas, Tex.
Fernando A. Laxamana, Waterman, Ill.
Richard D. Leach, Gregory, S. Dak.
Edward L. Lee, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.
James O. Leffingwell, Emporia, Kans.
Douglas Leffler, Finly, Ind.
Wilmer M. Lehman, Wiley, Colo.
Donald E. Leiter, Berwyn, Pa.
Robert L. Lemon, Richmond, Calif.
R. Webb Leonard, Middletown, N.J.
Richard D. Leonard, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi J. Aaron Levy, Sumter, S.C.
Rabbi Richard N. Levy, New York, N.Y.
L. Wilburn Lewallen, Nappanee, Ind.
Duane A. Lewellen, Dayton, Va.
Donald R. Lewis, Hudson Falls, N.Y.
Edson T. Lewis, Jr., Hoboken, N.J.
Henry H. Lewis, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
Donald Lichtenfelt, Fraser, Mich.
David H. Lindberg, Waynesburg, Pa.
Melvin W. Lindberg, Youngstown, Ohio.
Carl H. Linden, Redwood Falls, Minn.
Frank A. Lindhorst, Seal Beach, Calif.
W. C. Link, Jr., Liberty, Mo.
Rabbi Eugene J. Lipman, Washington, D.C.
Lester E. Loder, Bayside, N.Y.
Richard E. Lofgren, Minneapolis, Minn.
Richard D. Logan, Waterbury, Vt.
Wesley T. Logan, Waterbury, Vt.
Robert D. Loggie, Harwinton, Conn.
John G. Lola, Cambridge, Mass.
James A. Lollis, Lexington, Ky.
Kenneth G. Long, Perrysburg, Ohio.
John D. Long, Lancaster, Pa.
Loy L. Long, Auburndale, Mass.
Norman D. Long, Minneapolis, Minn.
Alden L. Longwell, Elm Creek, Nebr.
Charles Edwin Lord, Oakland, Calif.
Donald G. Lothrop, Boston, Mass.
James E. Loudermilk, Goleta, Calif.
Howard Lone, Taunton, Mass.
Julian Price Love, Louisville, Ky.
Warren B. Lovejoy, Albion, N.Y.
Adams Lovekin, LaVerne, Calif.
Edward F. Lovill, Pulaski, Va.
Herbert R. Lucas, Middletown, Ohio.
Randy Lunsford, La Crosse, Wis.
Prof. Robert E. Luccock, Boston, Mass.
Paul L. Ludlow, Burley, Idaho.
Dale Luther, Lockport, Ill.
William B. Lutz, Mayville, Mich.
Patrick Lynch, Suffield, Conn.
Wm. B. Lytle, Clarksville, Ark.
Bishop Charles W. Long, Tiskilwa, Ill.
James H. Laird, Detroit, Mich.
J. Harry Lau, Woodstock, Va.
John M. Lederach, Hubbard, Oreg.
Henry V. Lofquist, Wilson, N.C.
William W. Longenecker, Mount Joy, Pa.
Richard Lungren, Sacramento, Calif.
Verne H. Leininger, LaFayette, Ohio.
Carl H. Lenz, Buffalo, N.Y.
James S. Leslie, Delaware, Ohio.
Howard T. Lutz, Eau Claire, Wis.
Prof. Paul A. Lacey, Richmond, Ind.
Prof. George Lang, Tuscaloosa, Ala.
Prof. William F. Luder, Boston, Mass.

SIGNERS FROM EUROPE, ASIA, AFRICA, SOUTH AMERICA, AND CANADA

Australia: W. D. Adams, D. J. Andrews, Philip Andrews, Most Reverend G. Appleton, Lewis A. Borm, John Bryant, Frank Byatt, E. G. Clancy, A. M. Clarke, F. M. Combridge, W. R. Cowper, Eric Derbyshire, Alfred M. Dickie, Clyde Dominish, Arthur Ellemor, Leonard G. Forward; H. B. Freeman, Neil Glover, Frank Hartley, S. Henshall, A. C. Holland, A. G. Howse, David L. Hurse, Austin James, T. Lane, John A. Lloyd, R. V. Longthorpe, Dr. Allan W. Loy, J. Lukies, Dr. R. J. Maddox, E. Gwyn Miller, Bishop John S. Moyes, R. Painter, Norman H. Park, R. B. Patterson, R. G. Peterson, R. H. Pethybridge, David J. Pope, Gordon G. Powell, G. R. Riley, W. T. Riley, H. Roberts, H. E. Roland, Neville R. Ross, P. M. Saphin, W. W. Saunders, Bruce Silverwood, Donald H. Smith, G. C. Smith, Ralph Sutton, A. E. Vogt, Alan Walker, F. W. Whyte, A. R. Wilbrey, E. L. Williams.

Belgium: Abbe Paul Carrette, Abbe Chapelle, Abbe Georgery, Abbe Joseph Goffinet, Emil Jequier, Andre H. H. Van der Mensbrugghe, P. Tourne.

Canada: Gerald Brown, Richard G. Cammidge, Dr. David H. Carr, Rt. Rev. J. C. Feeney, Glenn M. Harmon, Peter B. Moore, K. Barry Passmore, J. C. Thompson.

Chile: Joel Gajardo Valasquez.

Czechoslovakia: Milos Sourek.

Denmark: S. Birke, Enirco Bejerne, Sage Bjirno, Father Borris, B. Christiansen, Im L. Christensen, Robert Christensen, Father Martin Drovsy, C. A. Flannen, Fritz Florin, Ligurd Granild, Jorgen Hansen, Uffe Hansen, Kell Helmer, Otto Helms, N. R. Hemmingsen, Hardy Hojhead K. Keiding, T. C. Kemp, G. Klausen, Bent A. Koch, Olaf Kune, Y. Lund, Ivan Mathiesen, Bent Melchior, Jorgen Nissen, S. Oldenburg, Ole Oleson, Paul Pedersen, N. Y. Raid, Tim Rosenberg, H. Skjerk, K. E. Skydsgaard, Berg Sorensen, G. Sparring-Petersen, Jan Stolt, Immanuel Telter, Marie M. Thulstoup, Gunner Tjalve, Mogens V. Zeuthen.

England: Rabbi Saul Amias, Lucy M. Burtt, Edward Carpenter, L. G. Champion, Pennar Davies, H. H. Farmer, Susan Ford, A. Graham Heilier, Anita Hicks, Robin E. Hutt, John Kielty, Kenneth A. Lee, Lewis MacLachlan, Clifford H. Macquire, David Mason, Geoffrey F. Nuttall, Paul Oestreicher, Prof. E. Gordon, W. G. Sewell, John Stacey, John Stewart, Stephen Thorne, Dr. John T. Vincent.

Finland: Alexander Kasanko.

France: Edward Theis, Jean Lasserre, Henri Rosser.

Ghana: Emmanuel Sackey Decker.

East Germany: Dr. Dieter Frielinghaus, Martin Kramer.

West Germany: Frank Crusemann, Gunther Danger, Kurt Essen, John R. Friesen, Joachim Gneist, Dr. D. Goldschmidt, Adolf Grau, Friedrich Hutendiek, Dr. Robert Kohl, Siegfried Mebrer, Dr. E. Muller-Gangloff, Otto Oetker, Helmut Pohl, Renate Riemeck, Ulricke Schleifenbaum, Alexander Semmelrock, Horst Symanowski, Gerhard Weber, Fritz Weissinger, Gerhard Wessler, Dieter Zimmermann.

Ireland: D. Erwin Strunz.

Italy: Raymond J. Bouley, Michele Foligno, Don Lorenzo Milani, Giorgio Spini, Tullio Vinay, Valdo Vinay.

Japan: J. Emery Flemming, Jr., George H. Theuer.

Netherlands: A. H. E. van Hengel, Mrs. M. M. van Hengel, T. C. C. Scholten, Prof. Dr. H. Kohlbrugge and Miss H. Kohlbrugge, Albert J. Rasker, Jan E. Uitman, H. W. P. Weggen.

Philippines: Abel A. Amago, Justiniano Cajuiat, Prof. Janice B. Deats, Dr. Richard Deats, Francisco Fernandez, W. Cecil Findley, Betty M. Hessel, Dr. Eugene A. Hessel, Marion Kline, J. William Matthews, Jannette E. Newhall.

Scotland: Werner Becher.

Southwest Africa: R. McKenzie Fraser, Norman Gess, Miss Mabel Charlotte Hart, Canon Frank M. Haythornthwaite, Hansie Herrle Mrs. Cornelia G. Warrington.

Sweden: Andes Akelund, Carl-Gustaf Boethius, Elsa Cedergreen, Olov Hartman, John Hedlund, Stiv Jakobson, Bernt Johnsson, Gosta Nicklasson, Dr. Margit Sahlin, Ingmar Strom, Joel Sorenson, Dr. Lars Thunberg, Dr. Anne-Marie Thunberg.

Switzerland: Prof. Samuel Amsler, Prof. Pierre Annen, Lydia von Auw, Pierre Balmer, Hermann Bauler, Willy Benguin, Jean de Benoit, Rodolphe Bergier, Ernest Bernouilli, Francis Berthold, W. Bieder, Giovanni Bogo, Emile Boissonnas, Fritz Bonnard, Jules Bonnard, Gad Borel, Jean Bourquin, W. Bremi, Arnold Bricod, Frederic Bron, Hans Bruppacher, Charles Brutsch, Joseph Buhlmann, Marc Buck, Robert Cand, Jean-Louis Charpie, G. Chautems, Prof. Marcel Cristen, Laurent Clerc, Franz Delhove, Gaston Deluz, Th. Dieterle, Charles Dintheer, Claude Dolivo, Reynold Dubois, William A. Dudde, Jacques Du Pasquier, Michel Du Pasquier, Richard Ecklin, Andre Emery, Julien Erni, Paul Fatton, Fernand Favre, Pierre Favre, Marc Flubacher, Charles Freundler, Willy Fritschy, Renaud Gallaz, Max Geiger, David Gigon, Louis Girardet, Roger Glardon, Theodore Gorge, Prof. William Goy, Marcel Grand, Michel Grenier, Marcel Grobety, Gerard Guenod, Jean Guye, Alfred Gygax, R. Hemmeler, Jacques Henriod, Willi Hirsch, H. Hoegger, Francois Hoguer, Paul-Emile Ingold, Bernard Jeanneret, Pierre Jeanneret, Marcel Jeannet, Paul Jomini, Jean-Daniel Kaestli, Willi Kobe, M. B. Koelbing, H. Kuhner, William Lachat, R. Lanz, Maurice Lauter, Antoinette Lozeron, J. Mangold, K. Marti, M. Martin, Prof. Charles Masson, Henry Mercier, Philippe de Mestral, Prof. Jean Meyhoffer, Henri Nicod, Albert Nicole, Bernard Nicole, Philippe Nicole, Edouard Pache, Daniel Pache, Edouard Panchaud, Sully Perrenoud, Albert Perrenoud, Willy Perriard, M. Petremand, Albert Pfund, Henri Piguet, Henri Pingeon, Paul Primault, Georges Probst, Prof. Dr. A. Rich, Maurice Robert, Andre Rochat, G. Roggwiller, Jacques Roland, Edouard Rossier, Heinz Rothenbuhler, J. de Roulet, Philippe Roulet, Jean Sauter, Claude Schaerer, W. Schatz, Martin Schwarz, Prof. Christophe Senft, W. Senft, F. Sieveking, E. Sigrist, Paul Siron, Gerard Soguel, Dr. J. J. Stamm, Dr. Paul Strassmann, Bernard Terrisse, P. Trub, Paul Vaucher, Max Vernaud, Georges Vittoz, Jean Vivien, Rene Vuilleumier, Jean Wachsmuth, Edouard Waldvogel, P. Walter, Paul Weber, Bertrand Zweifel.

Uruguay: Earl M.. Smith.

A NOTE FROM THE SPONSOR

The Fellowship of Reconciliation is the sponsor of the International Committee of Conscience on Vietnam, as it was of its predecessor the wholly American Clergymen's Emergency Committee for Vietnam. This does not mean that all of the supporters of the various statements and other actions of these committees endorse the entire position of the fellowship; many—perhaps most—of them do not, and their signatures commit them only to the statements they have signed, the one to the left in particular.

Considering the number of individuals involved and the complications of communication, however, it is unavoidable that decisions as to the time and circumstances under which these statements will be made public must be made by the fellowship. There will be those who will question the decision to publish this statement at this time. Their questions will be of two sorts:

1. Is it fair to publish a statement urging the United States to initiate peace moves at a moment when President Johnson has suspended the bombing of North Vietnam and is insisting on his readiness to negotiate peace?

2. Would it not be wiser to delay publication by 2 weeks more in order to have a fuller representation of signers from other countries? (Committees have been formed in a number of other countries, but have not had time to receive and transmit names of hundreds—perhaps thousands—of signers to the statement. It is probable that 2 weeks from now the number of signers listed here would be doubled or trebled.)

We have considered both these matters carefully and make these comments.

The peace offensive

We are gratified at the suspension of the bombing of North Vietnam, though we regret the continuation of bombing in South Vietnam and deplore the initiation of bombing in Laos. We rejoice at the emphasis on peace that has dominated our Government's statements in the past few weeks, and earnestly hope that it may continue. Some aspects of that emphasis, as well as the report that there has been no positive response from Hanoi make us uneasy, however.

Both in the President's state of the Union address and in other Government statements, the war in Vietnam continues to be described without qualification as "Communist aggression." From the point of view of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front (Vietcong), however, the genesis of the war was the refusal of the South Vietnamese Government under President Diem, supported by the United States, to permit the 1956 elections that had been the keystone of the armistice signed in Geneva in 1954. That armistice, ending the war between the victorious Viet Minh and the defeated French, had provided for the withdrawal of the Viet Minh north of the 17th parallel and the French south of it, as a temporary measure until the French could withdraw completely and nationwide elections under international supervision in July 1956, would unite the country. Millions of non-Communists throughout the world, whatever their ultimate political sympathies, agree that the refusal to permit these elections was the violation of the armistice that laid the foundation for the conflict now going on.

In the second place, though the President on January 12 carried the matter of Vietcong representation in negotiations an inch further in saying that "we will consider the views of any group," he has not accepted what many qualified observers consider may be the sine qua non for negotiations; recognition of the Vietcong National Liberation Front as a full principal in such negotiations. Since NLF has been the principal opposition force throughout the last 10 years of war, and since it now actually governs substantial portions of South Vietnam, it is not hard to understand its insistence that it be a direct and full participant in the negotiations.

Why now?

January 23 is the final day of the lunar new year celebration known in Vietnam as Tet, and the final day of the truce agreed upon by both sides. The days that follow may well be decisive in determining whether this brutal, bloody war will be ended or escalated. Hence this is a critical moment for those whose compassion goes out to the helpless Vietnamese people caught in this storm of ideological destruction and murder, and who are concerned lest all humanity's future be engulfed in nuclear conflict.

This is the moment to bring maximum, insistent pressure on both sides to make peace, to moderate their rigidities. It is a moment to insist that the United States recognize and deal with motivations on the other side that are more than simple aggression. It is also a moment to insist that the Government of North Vietnam and the leaders of the National Liberation Front respond to the American peace proposals more positively than with vituperation and mockery, stating in unequivocal language what specifically they consider to be wrong and how it could be set right.

These are the considerations that led to the decision to publish the statement now, while the U.S. Government still seeks peace and, regrettably, even before the names of many signers from this country and abroad can be included.

We hope that those who read this statement will feel led also to bring maximum pressure to bear on both sides, with letters to all the parties involved. Letters to governments can be addressed to Washington, Hanoi, and Saigon, of course; letters to the Vietcong forces may be addressed to Front National de Liberation du Sud-Vietnam, 18 Longevin, El Mouradia, Algiers, Alegeria.

Alfred Hassler,
Executive Secretary,
Fellowship of Reconciliation.

THE MANSFIELD REPORT ON VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, during the recess between the 1st and the 2d sessions of the 89th Congress, our able and distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], accompanied by four of our eminent colleagues, Senators Muskie, Inouye, Aiken, and Boggs, at the request of the President, undertook a study mission to Europe and Asia.

As a result of this 30-day mission, the study group filed with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on January 3, 1966, a detailed, realistic report on the United States involvement in the undeclared war in Vietnam entitled: "The Vietnam Conflict: The Substance and the Shadow."

I ask unanimous consent that that report be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, together with the letter of transmittal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, at the present time, it is obvious that the administration has under serious consideration the determination as to whether or not there should be further escalation of our military commitment in Vietnam. It would be well if those charged with such decision read carefully and fully the report submitted by Senator Mansfield and his colleagues.

Senator Mansfield is well qualified to head such a mission. A student of Asia, its history and politics, he submitted, February 25, 1963, and at various earlier times, reports on Vietnam and southeast Asia containing predictions of things to come there unless our policies were altered. His sage advice then remained unheeded. I hope his warning contained in this report will be more carefully considered.

The senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] was also a valuable addition to the study team, serving as he does as minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations with many years of experience in foreign affairs.

In fact, all the members of the study team are to be highly commended for the contribution which they have made to a more realistic appraisal of our Vietnamese involvement.

Some of the more important, sobering conclusions of the report are:

A rapid solution to the conflict in Vietnam is not an immediate prospect. This would appear to be the case whether military victory is pursued or negotiations do, in fact, materialize.

"Insofar as the military situation is concerned, the large-scale introduction of U.S. forces and their entry into combat has blunted but not turned back the drive of the Vietcong. The latter have responded to the increased American role with a further strengthening of their forces by local recruitment in the south and reinforcements from the north and a general stepping up of military activity. As a result the lines remain drawn in South Vietnam in substantially the same pattern as they were at the outset of the increased U.S. commitment. What has changed basically is the scope and intensity of the struggle and the part which is being played by the forces of the United States and those of North Vietnam.

Despite the great increase in American military commitment, it is doubtful in view of the acceleration of Vietcong efforts that the constricted position now held in Vietnam by the Saigon government can continue to be held for the indefinite future, let alone extended, without a further augmentation of American forces on the ground. Indeed, if present trends continue, there is no assurance as to what ultimate increase in American military commitment will be required before the conflict is terminated. For the fact is that under present terms of reference and as the war has evolved, the question is not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open ended. How open is dependent on the extent to which North Vietnam and its supporters are willing and able to meet increased force by increased force. All of mainland southeast Asia, at least, cannot be ruled out as a potential battlefield. As noted, the war has already expanded significantly into Laos and is beginning to lap over the Cambodian border while pressures increase in the northeast of Thailand.

Even if the war remains substantially within its present limits, there is little foundation for the expectation that the Government of Vietnam in Saigon will be able, in the near future, to carry a much greater burden than it is now carrying. This is in no sense a reflection on the caliber of the current leaders of Vietnam. But the fact is that they are, as other Vietnamese Governments have been over the past decade, at the beginning of a beginning in dealing with the problems of popular mobilization in support of the Government. They are starting, moreover, from a point considerably behind that which prevailed at the time of President Diem's assassination. Under present concepts and plans, then, what lies ahead is, literally, a vast and continuing undertaking in social engineering in the wake of such military progress as may be registered. And for many years to come this task will be very heavily dependent on U.S. foreign aid.

The basic concept of present American policy with respect to Vietnam casts the United States in the role of support of the Vietnamese Government and people. This concept becomes more difficult to maintain as the military participation of the United States undergoes rapid increase. Yet a change in the basic concept could have a most unfortunate impact upon the Vietnamese people and the world at large. What is involved here is the necessity for the greatest restraint in word and action, lest the concept be eroded and the war drained of a purpose with meaning to the people of Vietnam.

This danger is great, not only because of the military realities of the situation, but also because, with few exceptions, assistance has not been and is not likely to be forthcoming for the war effort in South Vietnam from nations other than the United States. On the contrary, as it now appears, the longer the war continues in its present pattern and the more it expands in scope, the greater will become the strain placed upon the relations of the United States with allies both in the Far East and in Europe.

Many nations are deeply desirous of an end to this conflict as quickly as possible. Few are specific as to the manner in which this end can be brought about or the shape it is likely to take. In any event, even though other nations in certain circumstances, may be willing to play a third-party role in bringing about negotiations, any prospects for effective negotiations at this time (and they are slim) are likely to be largely dependent on the initiatives and efforts of the combatants.

Negotiations at this time, moreover, if they do come about, and if they are accompanied by a cease-fire and standfast, would serve to stabilize a situation in which the majority of the population remains under nominal government control but in which dominance of the countryside rests largely in the hands of the Vietcong. What might eventually materialize through negotiations from this situation cannot be foreseen at this time with any degree of certainty.

That is not, to say the least, a very satisfactory prospect. What needs also to be borne in mind, however, is that the visible alternative at this time and under present terms of reference is the indefinite expansion and intensification of the war which will require the continuous introduction of additional U.S. forces. The end of that course cannot be foreseen, either, and there are no grounds for optimism that the end is likely to be reached within the confines of South Vietnam or within the very near future * * *.

Exhibit 1

Letter of Transmittal

U.S. Senate,
Office of the Majority Leader,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1966.

Hon. J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In accord with a letter from the President dated November 7, 1965, Senators Aiken, Muskie, Boggs, and Inouye joined me in a study mission to Europe and to Asia. The group was drawn in part from the Senate at large, rather than exclusively from the committee, because it seemed to me that it would be useful to add to a joint effort of this kind, the views of Members who could bring other perspectives to the study. In this connection, the contributions of Senators Muskie, Boggs, and Inouye were exceptional. Insofar as Senator Aiken is concerned, he also provided not only a bipartisan strength to our purposes, but his great wisdom and judgment and his knowledge based on a long Senate and committee experience.

The mission took us to France, Poland, the Soviet Union, Rumania, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Hong Kong, the Philippines, and Japan. Consideration was given to the inclusion of both Pakistan and India in the itinerary. It was decided that it would be inadvisable to include these two great countries, because the immediate difficulties with which they are beset over Kashmir are currently under active consideration before the United Nations, and it is the policy of the United States to support fully the efforts of that international body to alleviate these difficulties. In the circumstances and in view of the nature of the group, we did not wish by our presence even to imply otherwise. To avoid any possible misunderstanding, therefore, we proceeded by a longer route from Bucharest to Aden and across the Indian Ocean to Ceylon, making courtesy calls en route in Riyadh and Taiz.

On this mission, which took us more than 30,000 miles in over 30 days, we met with many of our own officials abroad and with officials of other governments. We went not to propound but to ask, to listen, and to note. To the extent that we spoke, it was to stress the essential unity of the Nation, irrespective of party or personal view in matters which affect the Nation in its relations with other nations. We emphasized the deep concern of the President and the people for peace, and the profound preference which this Nation has for the works of construction over those of destruction. We reiterated the deep and firm commitment of the United States to a just resolution of the conflict in Vietnam.

We were at all times correctly and courteously received and, on occasion, with very great warmth. Conversations with the officials of other governments were invariably frank, often animated, but never personally discourteous even where our points of view differed most markedly. Almost without exception, officials put their cards on the table We did the same.

Reports covering the situation in Vietnam and on other aspects of the mission were submitted to the President on December 19, 1965, the day following my return to Washington. Subsequently, these were discussed when I met with Secretaries Rusk and McNamara. A report reflecting the joint observations and conclusions of the group as the situation appeared to us in November–December 1965 is now submitted herewith to you as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The situation in Vietnam and its worldwide ramifications constitute the gravest international problem which has confronted the United States in many years. In connection therewith, the forces of the United States in Vietnam (under Gen. William C. Westmoreland) are performing a profound service at great personal sacrifice on behalf of the Nation. It is essential that the full dimensions of the Vietnamese problem be explored and considered as thoroughly and as widely as practicable in present circumstances. It was in the hope that a constructive contribution will be made to this exploration and discussion, that this report was prepared for the use of the committee and the Senate. There has also been included, as an appendix to this report, a study made public by a similar Senate group on a previous Presidential mission 3 years ago. It may help to provide a useful perspective for the current situation in Vietnam.

I should like to note before closing a matter of special interest to the committee. The Ambassadors and the officers of the Department of State abroad were immensely helpful to the mission. Administrative arrangements for the group were exceptionally effective and efficient. The knowledge, understanding, and diplomatic skills of the embassy staffs which were placed at our disposal were generally outstanding in character. And the cooperation of the Defense Department, not only in providing efficient transportation but in many other ways, was of the greatest value to us.

The group had as escort from the Department of State, Minister Francis E. Meloy, Jr., Mr. W. O. Trone, Director of the Office of Operations, Department of State, and Mr. Paul Kelly. The Department of Defense provided the services of Maj. Gen. Charles R. Roderick, Col. Frank Goss, and Lt. Col. George L. J. Dalferes. The assistance of these men was highly effective in every respect and of the greatest value to the group.

Sincerely yours,

Mike Mansfield.

The Vietnam Conflict: The Substance and the Shadow

A. VIETNAM: THE SUBSTANCE OF WAR

1. Introductory

The most important new factor in the war in Vietnam has been the introduction of large numbers of U.S. troops into South Vietnam and their direct entry into combat. This augmentation of the U.S. military role in Vietnam was a response to a near-desperate situation early in 1965. There is no question that the Government of Vietnam in Saigon was faced with a rapidly deteriorating position at that time.

After the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem, repeated coups had weakened the cohesiveness of the central authority and acted to stimulate public disaffection and indifference to the war. At the same time, there was a greatly accelerated military drive by strengthened Vietcong forces. Their control expanded over large areas of the country, particularly in provinces adjacent to the western borders. Communications and transportation between population centers became increasingly hazardous, except by Vietcong sufferance. In short, a total collapse of the Saigon government's authority appeared imminent in the early months of 1965.

U.S. combat troops in strength arrived at that point in response to the appeal of the Saigon authorities. The Vietcong counter response was to increase their military activity with forces strengthened by intensified local recruitment and infiltration of regular North Vietnamese troops. With the change in the composition of opposing forces the character of the war also changed sharply.

2. Military forces of the Government of Vietnam

The Government of Vietnam now has approximately 635,000 men under arms. Of this number, however, only about 300,000 are regular troops of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, with about 88 percent being Army troops. A general reserve of six airborne battalions and five marine battalions is equipped to fight anywhere in the country.

The Vietnamese Government has six fighter-bomber squadrons. It also has a small navy, composed of sea, river, and coastal forces.

In the total of 635,000 men there are also regional forces of about 120,000 men which act as a constabulary in the 43 provinces. Each province chief, who has a military as well as a civil capacity, has a number of regional force companies under his command. Popular forces number about 140,000. Lightly armed, this group is recruited as a rule from local youth to act as defenders of villages and hamlets. A civilian irregular defense group is recruited by the Vietnamese Special Forces. It numbers about 25,000 and is posted in border areas for patrol purposes. Finally, there is a national police of about 50,000 men.

The total of 635,000 men in all categories is expected to be expanded in the current year, although a substantial increase is not anticipated. The sources of expanded recruitment are not great and, in any event, are shared with the Vietcong. Moreover, a high desertion rate continues, despite determined efforts to reduce it.

3. U.S. and international forces in Vietnam

In 1962, U.S. military advisers and service forces in South Vietnam totaled approximately 10,000 men. This number had increased by May of 1965 to about 34,000. At that time the American force was still basically an advisory organization. Americans, in regular combat units, were not yet engaged on the ground. U.S. helicopter companies were in use but only to supply tactical transportation to regular Vietnamese units and the U.S. jet fighter-bombers in the country with the exception of two or three squadrons of aircraft were not yet engaged in support of the Vietnamese Armed Forces.

By December 1965, however, there were approximately 170,000 U.S. troops in South Vietnam. Additionally, there were about 21,000 soldiers and marines from the Republic of Korea, an infantry battalion, and a battery of artillery, comprising some 1,200 men, from Australia, and a New Zealand artillery battery of about 150 men.

The augmented U.S. ground forces were composed of two Army divisions, the 1st Infantry Division, and the 1st Air Cavalry Division, and two separate brigades, the 1st Brigrade, 101st Airborne Division, and the 173d Airborne Brigrade. The Australian and New Zealand troops were attached to the latter group. A full U.S. Marine division reinforced by a separate regiment was in Vietnam with the support of six Marine fighter-bomber squadrons.

The small Vietnamese coastal force was augmented by a number of U.S. naval ships and Coast Guard vessels. The U.S. 7th Fleet was off the Vietnamese coast. Planes from its carriers were active in the air campaign against North Vietnam. They were also reinforcing the U.S. Air Force and Vietnamese fighter-bomber squadrons in operations in South Vietnam.

Ten U.S. Air Force and Marine fighter-bomber squadrons were operating from five jet airfields in Vietnam; a sixth field was under construction. B–52 bombers from Guam were providing additional air strength, concentrating on more remote Vietcong bases which had previously been immune to harassment or attack.

The magnitude of the expanded U.S. military effort has required a vastly enlarged support complex. Starting almost from scratch in May of 1965, a logistic system has been built. There are four major logistic support areas. One is in the Saigon region, including Bien Hao and Vung Tau. The other three are located along the coast, at Cam Ranh Bay, at Qui Nhon in Binh Dinh Province, and at Da Nang. The rapid infusion of American forces has strained the facilities of the new logistic system to the utmost, with long delays in unloading and moving equipment not unusual. There have also been and still are shortages of important items of supply despite efforts to eliminate these shortages.

4. Relationship of United States and Vietnamese forces

From the point of view of American policy and practice, the war itself remains a Vietnamese war. The American command emphasizes that U.S. forces in Vietnam are there to support the Vietnamese and their Armed Forces in the effort to resist aggression by infiltration from the north and terrorism and subversion from within. Vietnamese sovereignty and the paramount role of the Vietnamese are meticulously respected and the supporting nature of the U.S. role is stressed.

There is no combined or unified command of the international forces in Vietnam. United States and Vietnamese forces work together through coordination and cooperation. The commander of the U.S. forces maintains close liaison with the Vietnamese Minister of Defense and the Chief of the Joint General Staff. Strategy and plans are devised together. Parallel instructions are then issued to the respective commanders through corps and division to regimental level. In the execution of an operation a joint command post is set up or liaison officers are exchanged and terrain is apportioned for tactical areas of operation. According to American military commanders these arrangements have proved to be practical and workable.

5. Vietcong-North Vietnamese forces

In December 1965, the best available estimates placed Vietcong strength in South Vietnam at 230,000 men. This figure is double that of 3 years ago. Total Vietcong strength, apparently, is steadily increasing despite the serious casualties which these forces have suffered during the past few months.

Of the present total, approximately 73,000 are main force soldiers, including 14,000 regular PAVN (Peoples' Army of North Vietnam) troops from North Vietnam. The Vietcong forces also include about 100,000 militia, some 17,000 support troops who operate along lines of communication, and approximately 40,000 political cadres. It is estimated that the Vietcong, through local recruitment in the south and infiltration from the north, have the capability of a substantial increase in their numbers within a short period of time.

Infiltration of men from North Vietnam through Laos has been going on for many years. It was confined primarily to political cadres and military leadership until about the end of 1964 when North Vietnam Regular Army troops began to enter South Vietnam by this route. It is anticipated that with the multiplication of routes through Laos the rate of infiltration is likely to increase threefold from the present estimated 1,500 per month. The monsoon, which earlier was considered to be of great significance in its effect on the reinforcement capabilities of the Vietcong as well as on the ability of both sides to prosecute the war, has proved in experience to be of minor consequence if, indeed, of any consequence at all.

6. Current state of the war

By November 1965, American troops were directly involved in battle to a much greater degree than at any other time in the history of the Vietnamese conflict. At the same time, the intensity of the war itself reached a new high. The Vietcong initiated 1,038 incidents during the last week of November and the total number of incidents which had increased steadily throughout 1965, reached 3,588 in that month. These incidents involved armed attacks up to regimental strength as well as terrorism and sabotage of various kinds of antiaircraft fire against U.S. aircraft. In the later months of 1965 the trend was toward larger attacks, except in the Mekong Delta where there were numerous small-scale actions.

With the increase in the intensity of the conflict, there were increased numbers of casualties among all participants In the month of November 1965, alone. 469 Americans were killed in action, a figure representing about 35 percent of all Americans killed in action in the war until that date. In addition 1,470 Americans were listed as wounded and 33 as missing. During the same month the South Vietnamese Army reported 956 soldiers killed in action, 2,030 wounded, and 355 missing. The Vietcong, for their part, are estimated to have lost 5,300 men killed in the month and, in addition, 595 were taken prisoner. Many of these casualties were regulars of the North Vietnamese Army.

7. The security situation in South Vietnam

The presence of U.S. combat forces has acted to arrest the deterioration in general security in Government-controlled parts of South Vietnam. It has also improved the ability of the Vietnamese Government to hold Saigon, the strategic heart of the country, the coastal bases, and certain other key areas in the country. In the latter connection, it should be noted that a strategic route (19) from the coast to the western highlands has been reopened for convoyed ground traffic to Plieku, a major military strong point in the western highlands. On certain other roads, an improvement in security is also reported.

8. Vietcong reactions

Faced by a blunting of their military efforts, the Vietcong have reacted strongly to the new situation. Beginning in June an estimated 1,500 North Vietnamese troops per month have entered South Vietnam through Laos and this number is rapidly increasing. The estimates are that at least seven regiments of regular troops from North Vietnam are now in the country with more on the way. At the same time the Vietcong have in recent months greatly stepped up the recruiting, induction, and training of South Vietnamese in the densely populated delta region. They have increased their small-scale attacks in that area, aiming apparently at isolated outposts and at demoralizing the regional and popular forces as well as harassing lines of supply and communication.

The stepped-up activity of the Vietcong in the countryside has been paralleled by an effort on the part of the Government forces to strengthen their control over the population in the base areas and their immediate environs. These base areas themselves are held in some force. At the U.S. Marine base at Da Nang, for example, the perimeter of security has been pushed out about 10 miles. The bulk of the U.S. Marine forces, however, is now preoccupied in defense within that perimeter. Nevertheless, it is still possible for the Vietcong to bypass the defenders and penetrate the area in sporadic hit-and-run raids. Communications between the base areas along the coast are still subject to Vietcong ambush and attack.

In Saigon, heavily defended as it is, the rattle of automatic weapons fire or the explosion of mortar shells in the outskirts of the city are not uncommon sounds by day or by night. Vietcong ability to carry out terroristic attacks within the city itself is from time to time made evident. Indeed, it is considered by some that Saigon with its many vulnerabilities to sabotage and terrorism and Hanoi with its exposure to air attack are mutual hostages, one for the other.

9. Impact of increased American forces on the Vietnamese

The arrival in Vietnam of American combat troops in large numbers has had an immediate positive psychological effect on Government-held areas. Not only has there been an improvement of morale in the Government and the Armed Forces, there has also been a return of confidence among Vietnamese civilians. This is especially true in Saigon where the increased American presence is taken as insurance against an imminent collapse of the existing structure.[1] Politically and commercially minded Vietnamese, seeing that the United States had so far committed itself, have found renewed courage and confidence.

---

[1] The illustrative story is told of the Vietnamese professional man who sold his house in Saigon in January of 1965 in despair over the deteriorating situation, only to buy back the same house later in the year, following the arrival of American troops, for twice the price at which he had sold it.

Of great significance is the fact that there has been a period of Government stability in Vietnam following the arrival of additional U.S. troops. This stability is more essential than ever for the maintenance of public confidence after the debilitating consequences of the repeated coups which followed the assassination of President Diem. It is also vital for the effective prosecution of the war and the formulation and carrying out of social, economic, and political reform programs.

10. The government of Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky

The new leadership in Government, which is drawn largely from military circles, is young and hopeful, but with little knowledge of politics. Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, the Prime Minister, recognizes that a purely military solution to the problems of Vietnam is not possible. Security and social and economic reform, in his view, must proceed hand in hand in order to gain the support of the people.

The new leaders express the intention of moving toward some form of representative civilian government, taking into account the history and needs of the Vietnamese people. They speak of a consultative assembly to prepare the way for a constitution and hearings throughout the country on the constitution with a view to a referendum at the end of 1966. The referendum, according to their concepts, would be followed by elections to a legislative body by the end of 1967, if by that time elections can be held without intimidation in as much as two-thirds of the country. Some observers believe that, perhaps, not more than 25 percent of the villages under Government control in South Vietnam would be free from intimidation at an election at the present time.

In addition to prosecuting the war, the Government of Vietnam is seeking to initiate measures to protect and improve the welfare of the population. With the indispensable assistance of U.S. aid, food and other commodities are being imported into the country to meet current needs and to insure that the price of staples such as rice, fish, and canned milk remain within the reach of the people.

11. The pacification or civic action program

A new effort is also being made to bring the people of the villages into closer and firmer rapport with the Government. In the period following the fall of the government of Ngo Dinh Diem, the so-called pacification or civic action program which brought government, police, economic, and social organization into the hamlets, was allowed in large measure to lapse. Due to subsequent changes of government, there were eventually only a very few people left to carry on this work. Military necessity required the Government to concentrate on attempting to stop Vietcong military advances.

The present Government is once again seeking to create an organization to carry out a program of pacification or civic action. Screening the cadres left from the programs of previous governments, a basic group has been selected. Together with additional groups to be trained it is expected that a total number adequate to meet the needs for pacification teams in the priority areas chosen by the Government of Vietnam will be available by the end of 1966.

The present plan for pacification work is regarded by observers as more thorough and more realistic than previous efforts. It contemplates teams remaining in each village for an initial period of several months with subsequent followups over a period of at least 1 year. The belief is that the inhabitants can generally be sufficiently won over to the side of the Government in that period and conditions established where elections for local officials can be held. It is realized, however, that even then the work cannot be considered as completed.

12. Other programs

In addition to giving strong support to the pacification program, the new Government has numerous other plans to better the lot of the people. There are, for example, projects to improve the pay of the troops, construct low-cost housing, and redistribute land. In this connection a program has been inaugurated to give 700,000 acres of land to 180,000 farmers. It is generally recognized that Government programs of this kind, many of which have been attempted in various forms before, will require years before any substantial political effect upon the population can be anticipated.

13. Economic aspects of the conflict

The Government of Vietnam has also instituted a resources control program in an effort to restrict the Vietcong's ability to get the things they need to carry on the war. In most parts of Vietnam, which is a naturally rich and productive country, it is not difficult to obtain enough food to support life. This is particularly true in the fertile and densely populated delta of the south with its great rice fields and network of interconnecting canals. The Vietcong obtain money by many means, including taxation and extortion, and they can and do use these funds to purchase food in the countryside and medicines in district and provincial towns. The Vietcong can and do attack trucks and convoys on the roads and seize the weapons, ammunition, and the other goods which they may carry.

By a system of rationing, identity cards, and resource control, including checkpoints and mobile control teams, however, the Government hopes to stop the Vietcong from obtaining key commodities such as food and medicines in key areas such as the highlands, which is a deficit region. In other areas it is hoped that the system will make goods less available for the Vietcong and more difficult for them to obtain.

It must be said that there is also a reverse side to this picture. The Vietcong, operating in the countryside, have the ability to restrict the flow of food to cities and population centers such as Saigon. Vegetables, for example, come to Saigon from Dalat in the central highlands. Sugar also comes to Saigon along the same road which is controlled in part by the Vietcong. It is common knowledge that commodities reaching Saigon's markets by road from the Dalat area have paid a tax to the Vietcong before reaching the city and that unless the tax is paid they will not reach the city. The fact is plain: Much of Saigon's indigenous food and commodity supply depends on the sufferance of the Vietcong and on payments to them.

The ravages of war and terrorism, however, are taking a toll of the country's productive capacity. Rice fields and rubber plantations in areas that are being bombed and fought over no longer produce their contribution to feed the people and to nourish the economy. Fledgling enterprises in outlying areas, cut off from supplies and from markets by interrupted communications, wither and fail.

Along with increased Vietcong activity in the delta in recent months, there has been growing Vietcong restriction on the flow of rice from that region to the Saigon market. The result is that Vietnam, a rice surplus region, in 1966 will have to import at least 300,000 tons of rice from abroad under U.S. aid programs to feed the population of the cities and towns under the Government's control.

Although, as has been said, the arrival of large numbers of American troops has gone far to restore business confidence in the cities of Vietnam, there have been adverse effects as well. One of these is the creation of a labor shortage, particularly among skilled workers, as men have been drained away from normal areas of employment to the base complexes and other regions where construction projects are being pushed to create the logistic structure and other facilities required by the American forces.

Inflationary pressures resulting from the war and the changed U.S. role have thus far been kept within bounds. Saigon itself, however, has an overstimulated atmosphere of almost hectic prosperity, in some respects, as the impact of spending by American servicemen and the effect of U.S. defense expenditure make themselves felt. There are also the beginnings of the rumblings of personal discontent and antagonism which generally characterize the reaction in any nation to the sudden infusion of a large body of foreign forces.

14. Summation

In sum, the overall control of the country remains about the same as it was at the beginning of 1965. It is estimated that about 22 percent of the population is under Vietcong control and that about 18 percent inhabits contested areas. About 60 percent of the population in the country is, at present, under some form of government control, largely because of its hold on Saigon and other cities and large towns.

The population of the cities has been augmented by a great number of refugees. Hundreds of thousands in number, they are for the greater part composed of people who have fled to the cities in an effort to escape the spreading intensity of the war. In this sense, they are unlike the refugees who came from North Vietnam in 1954. These earlier refugees consciously chose to leave their ancestral homes and come south permanently, rather than accept a Communist regime. The new refugees, for the most part, are believed merely to be waiting for an end to the fighting in order to return to their homes and land.

The Vietcong have stepped up sabotage, terrorism, and hit and run attacks in the Government-held areas which are, principally, cities and major towns and indeterminate, but limited, extensions outward from them. Harassment by United States and Vietnamese air attack and airborne forces has increased in the firmly held Vietcong areas of South Vietnam which are almost entirely rural. And, of course, North Vietnam has been brought under air attack.

In general, however, what the Saigon government held in the way of terrain in the early months of 1965 (and it was already considerably less than was held at the time of the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem), is still held. What was controlled then by the Vietcong is still controlled by the Vietcong. What lay between was contested at the outset of 1965 and is still contested.

B. VIETNAM AND THE NATIONS OF ASIA

Other nations of Asia generally view the conflict in Vietnam with great concern. Those countries nearest to Vietnam see in the spread and increasing intensity of the warfare a heightened danger of a spillover into their territory. They sense that the longer the conflict continues and the more it escalates the greater becomes this danger to themselves. Furthermore, they fear the effect upon their own future should all of Vietnam become a Communist state.

Laos already finds itself deeply although unwillingly involved on the fringes of the war in Vietnam. The fighting within Laos, which continues despite the 1962 Geneva Agreement, is now a closely interwoven part of the Vietnamese struggle. The connection is most pronounced in the eastern part of Laos which lies within the control of the Communist Pathet Lao forces. This region, the so-called Laotian panhandle, is a natural infiltration route for men and supplies from North Vietnam into South Vietnam. A long border abutting on South Vietnam makes it possible for troops and equipment from Hanoi to reach far south through Communist-controlled territory in Laos with a minimum of risk before being diverted across the border into South Vietnam by any number of lateral communications routes. New roads have been constructed through this mountainous terrain along which men and supplies can pass, for the most part undetected, protected as they are in some regions by double canopies of jungle foliage. These roads are not easily susceptible to aerial interdiction.

Cambodia, in a different manner and to a much lesser extent than Laos, is already directly touched by the fighting in Vietnam. There are repeated charges that Cambodian territory is being used as a base for Vietcong operations. That is possible in view of the remoteness and obscurity of the border but there is no firm evidence of any such organized usage and no evidence whatsoever that any alleged usage of Cambodian soil is with the sanction much less the assistance of the Cambodian Government. Prince Sihanouk responded immediately to a recent allegation that the Cambodian port of Sihanoukville is being used to transship supplies to the Vietcong by calling for an investigation by the International Control Commission which was set up under the Geneva accords of 1954.

Cambodia's overwhelming concern is the preservation of its national integrity which, in times past, has been repeatedly violated by more powerful neighbors and is still subject to occasional forays from a minor dissident movement (the Khmer Serai) which has been allowed to base itself in the neighboring nations. Cambodia seeks recognition and respect of its borders by all parties to the conflict. It asks to be left to live in peace so that it may concentrate on its own problems and internal development. The Cambodians have made great internal progress, largely through their own efforts supplemented by a judicious use of aid from the United States in the past and from other nations both in the past and at the present time. They have a peaceful and productive nation with an intense sense of national unity and loyalty to Prince Sihanouk.

The fact that fighting in South Vietnam has raged close to the border and there have, as a result, been occasional border incursions and bombing of Cambodian territory has caused the deepest concern to the Cambodian Government. Cambodia can be expected to make the most vigorous efforts to resist becoming directly involved in the struggle surging through South Vietnam and to repel to the best of its capability direct and organized invasions of its territory which may stem from the mounting tempo of the war.

Thailand, the only country on the southeast Asian mainland directly allied with the United States, seeks to cooperate with the United States as an ally while avoiding a spillover of the war into Thai territory. That course is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain. Thailand has a large number of North Vietnamese living in its northeast region bordering on Laos. This element retains an affinity for Hanoi and is susceptible to its influence. Moreover, in the recent past Peiping has brought to the forefront a Thai leader in exile and has increased the intensity of its propaganda attacks against Thailand. Reports of terrorism and sabotage in the northeast of Thailand are increasing.

The Vietnamese war was brought very close to Thai territory in November 1965. A Pathet Lao military thrust toward the Laotian town of Thakkek on the Mekong, which was supported by North Vietnamese troops, was fortuitously driven back by Government forces. Had it not been repelled, the war, in effect, would have reached the point where it made direct contact with Thailand's frontier.

Nations in Asia more geographically remote from the war in South Vietnam are nonetheless conscious of the dangers to the entire area as the struggle in South Vietnam becomes more prolonged and ever more intense. These countries range from neutral and nonaligned Burma through such allies of the United States as the Philippines and Japan.

Each of the countries of Asia has its own internal problems. Each has varying degrees of internal stability. Each has a principal concern, the avoidance of direct involvement in the Vietnamese conflict. With the exception of Korea, there is little likelihood of substantial material help from these sources in providing military assistance in South Vietnam. Others are either unwilling or reluctant to become involved in a military sense or are unable to do so because of inner difficulties or the broader strategic requirements of the Asian situation. Even with respect to Korea, it is obvious that any withdrawal of forces for use in Vietnam creates new problems of military balance as between North and South Korea. It should not be overlooked that peace in the Korean peninsula is still held together only by a tenuous truce.

The Asian nations generally are aware of their own relative powerlessness to influence the main course of events, or, in the final analysis, to control their own destinies should the conflict in Vietnam ultimately develop into a confrontation between the United States and Communist China with all that such an eventuality might imply for the peace of Asia and the world. In Japan, for example, there is a deep anxiety over the possible consequences to that nation of such a confrontation if it should materialize. The memory of the escalation of the limited Manchurian incident of 30 years ago into a seemingly interminable war on the mainland of China is not yet dead in Japan.

To sum up, then, the nations of Asia recognize the immense importance to themselves of what is transpiring in Vietnam. But they also recognize their own limitations in the face of it. Their immediate preoccupation, in any event, is with their own internal problems and development. Throughout the area there is a continuing interest in activities involving peaceful cooperation for economic development. The Peace Corps is generally welcomed wherever it operates and, notably, in the Philippines. The new Asian Development Bank is being launched with considerable enthusiasm. The Mekong project has warm support throughout the region and considerable interest in Cambodia, which is central to the concept.

It is clear that none of the nations of the area desires the domination of either China or the United States. Given a choice, it is doubtful that any nation would like to see the influence of the United States withdrawn completely from southeast Asia. Generally speaking, the nations of the area welcome peaceful ties with the United States and our participation in the development of the region if that participation does not become overwhelming.

C. THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE

Without exception the Soviet Union, Poland, and Rumania give full and firm support to the position of Hanoi and the Vietcong. They are quick in their denunciation of the U.S. role in South Vietnam and vehement against U.S. bombing in North Vietnam.

Part of this solidarity is undoubtedly derived from ideological affinities. Whatever attitudes they may manifest toward Communist China, and they vary, it is clear that responsibility for the continuation of the conflict in Vietnam is assigned to the United States and this is regarded as an impediment to improvement in political relations with this country.

There is no reason to believe that the Soviet Union, in present circumstances, sees its way clear or, in fact, is anxious to play a significant role to assist in bringing an end to hostilities in Vietnam. The Soviet Union has steadfastly refused to join with the United Kingdom, the other Cochairman of the 1954 Geneva Conference, in calling for a reconvening of that Conference. They have emphasized repeatedly in public statements as well as in other ways that they have no intention of taking an initiative for peace in Vietnam at this time.

The countries of Eastern Europe have reason for concern over the continuation of the conflict in Vietnam and its escalation. Some of these reasons have to do with their own national preoccupations and the situation in Europe. Both Poland and Rumania, for example, have a very substantial trade with the Western World and remain interested in increased trade with the United States should conditions permit. Both might well be disposed to make a contribution to a settlement of the Vietnam problem to the extent their capabilities permit but only should they see some possibility of success.

D. COMMUNIST CHINA

Behind the war in Vietnam, behind the fears and preoccupations of other Asian nations and through the attitudes of the Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union runs the shadow of Communist China.

Until now the Chinese Communists have not introduced their manpower directly into the conflict although they clearly recognize that the war may reach that point. They recognize, too, that the war may impinge upon China herself at some point and have begun to make preliminary preparations for that eventuality.

For the present, however, the Chinese appear to take the view that their direct intervention in Vietnam is not required since: (1) the war in South Vietnam is a people's war which the Vietcong are winning; (2) North Vietnam is successfully defending itself; (3) the more the United States escalates the war the higher our casualties will be and the more discouraged we will become; and (4) the United States cannot win, in any event, according to Chinese theories.

It is from Communist China that Hanoi and the Vietcong derive the bulk of their outside material support. It is from Communist China that there has also flowed encouragement of resistance to negotiation or compromise. As the war escalates and Hanoi becomes ever more dependent upon Chinese support, a dependence which Soviet aid at best only tempers, the likelihood also increases that North Vietnam will not be able to negotiate a settlement without at least the tacit consent of China. In fact, that point may already have been reached.

E. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

A rapid solution to the conflict in Vietnam is not in immediate prospect. This would appear to be the case whether military victory is pursued or negotiations do, in fact, materialize.

Insofar as the military situation is concerned, the large-scale introduction of U.S. forces and their entry into combat has blunted but not turned back the drive of the Vietcong. The latter have responded to the increased American role with a further strengthening of their forces by local recruitment in the south and reinforcements from the north and a general stepping up of military activity. As a result the lines remain drawn in South Vietnam in substantially the same pattern as they were at the outset of the increased U.S. commitment. What has changed basically is the scope and intensity of the struggle and the part which is being played by the forces of the United States and those of North Vietnam.

Despite the great increase in American military commitment, it is doubtful in view of the acceleration of Vietcong efforts that the constricted position now held in Vietnam by the Saigon Government can continue to be held for the indefinite future, let alone extended, without a further augmentation of American forces on the ground. Indeed, if present trends continue, there is no assurance as to what ultimate increase in American military commitment will be required before the conflict is terminated. For the fact is that under present terms of reference and as the war has evolved, the question is not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open ended. How open is dependent on the extent to which North Vietnam and its supporters are willing and able to meet increased force by increased force. All of mainland southeast Asia, at least, cannot be ruled out as a potential battlefield. As noted, the war has already expanded significantly into Laos and is beginning to lap over the Cambodian border while pressures increase in the northeast of Thailand.

Even if the war remains substantially within its present limits, there is little foundation for the expectation that the Government of Vietnam in Saigon will be able, in the near future, to carry a much greater burden than it is now carrying. This is in no sense a reflection on the caliber of the current leaders of Vietnam. But the fact is that they are, as other Vietnamese Governments have been over the past decade, at the beginning of a beginning in dealing with the problems of popular mobilization in support of the Government. They are starting, moreover, from a point considerably behind that which prevailed at the time of President Diem's assassination. Under present concepts and plans, then, what lies ahead is, literally, a vast and continuing undertaking in social engineering in the wake of such military progress as may be registered. And for many years to come this task will be very heavily dependent on U.S. foreign aid.

The basic concept of present American policy with respect to Vietnam casts the United States in the role of support of the Vietnamese Government and people. This concept becomes more difficult to maintain as the military participation of the United States undergoes rapid increase. Yet a change in the basic concept could have a most unfortunate impact upon the Vietnamese people and the world at large. What is involved here is the necessity for the greatest restraint in word and action, lest the concept be eroded and the war drained of a purpose with meaning to the people of Vietnam.

This danger is great, not only because of the military realities of the situation but also because, with a few exceptions, assistance has not been and is not likely to be forthcoming for the war effort in South Vietnam from nations other than the United States. On the contrary, as it now appears, the longer the war continues in its present pattern and the more it expands in scope, the greater will become the strain placed upon the relations of the United States with allies both in the Far East and in Europe.

Many nations are deeply desirous of an end to this conflict as quickly as possible. Few are specific as to the manner in which this end can be brought about or the shape it is likely to take. In any event, even though other nations, in certain circumstances, may be willing to play a third-party role in bringing about negotiations, any prospects for effective negotiations at this time (and they are slim) are likely to be largely dependent on the initiatives and efforts of the combatants.

Negotiations at this time, moreover, if they do come about, and if they are accompanied by a cease-fire and standfast, would serve to stabilize a situation in which the majority of the population remains under nominal government control but in which dominance of the countryside rests largely in the hands of the Vietcong. What might eventually materialize through negotiations from this situation cannot be foreseen at this time with any degree of certainty.

That is not, to say the least, a very satisfactory prospect. What needs also to be borne in mind, however, is that the visible alternative at this time and under present terms of reference is the indefinite expansion and intensification of the war which will require the continuous introduction of additional U.S. forces. The end of that course cannot be foreseen, either, and there are no grounds for optimism that the end is likely to be reached within the confines of South Vietnam or within the very near future.

In short, such choices as may be open are not simple choices. They are difficult and painful choices and they are beset with many imponderables. The situation, as it now appears, offers only the very slim prospect of a just settlement by negotiations or the alternative prospect of a continuance of the conflict in the direction of a general war on the Asian mainland.

ADMIRAL RICKOVER WRITES ABOUT LEWIS AND CLARK

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, one of America's most imaginative and active minds belongs to the eminent naval officer, Adm. H. G. Rickover. He possesses many talents. He has a wide range of interests. No matter on what subject he writes or talks, he is always able to interpret the information in a colorful and interesting way.

During the congressional recess, I received a letter from Admiral Rickover, written in the North Atlantic, aboard the U.S.S. *Lewis and Clark*, our new nuclear submarine. This is our 33d nuclear submarine, Admiral Rickover reported, and, added to the fleet of 22 other attack-type submarines, brings our total attack fleet to 55.

However, the very interesting part of the admiral's letter was a review of the accomplishments of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, the famous explorers who traveled through the area which now comprises my home State, as well as all the States adjacent to the Missouri River. Admiral Rickover gives a condensed review of the travels of Lewis and Clark in a most vivid manner. Because I feel that not enough is known about these famous explorers, or what they hoped to do and what they actually did do, I asked Admiral Rickover for permission—which I have received—to place his letter in the Congressional Record where I am sure it will be read by many persons heretofore unfamiliar with a great part of our American history and heritage.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

At Sea, U.S.S. "Lewis and Clark"
(SSBN-644),
North Atlantic, November 16, 1965.

Hon. Karl E. Mundt,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Mundt: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of the U.S.S. *Lewis and Clark*, our 33d Polaris nuclear submarine. We also have in operation 22 attack type nuclear submarines, making a total of 55. The *Lewis and Clark* was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va.

This ship is named for Meriwether Lewis (1774–1809) and William Clark (1770–1838), the Virginia-born captains under whose joint command a small American Army unit (3 sergeants, 24 men, 1 Indian, and 2 French Canadian interpreters) crossed from St. Louis to the mouth of the Columbia River and back, thus completing one of the great transcontinental voyages of exploration, ranking in importance with those of Balboa (1513) and Mackenzie (1793).

Planned and personally supervised by President Jefferson, the expedition had as its objective exploration of "the Missouri River, and such principal streams of it, as, by its course and communication with the waters of the Pacific Ocean * * * may offer the most direct and practicable water communication across this continent." If such a water route could be found, much of the lucrative fur trade, then largely in Canadian hands, might be diverted to American seaports. The President had long been interested in exploring this possibility; had, in fact, given aid to three previous attempts that came to nothing. He obtained from the Congress authorization and an initial grant of $2,500 in January 1803, a few months before the uncharted territory to be traversed by Lewis and Clark passed into our possession through the Louisiana Purchase. The expedition got underway, May 1804, in a bateau and two pirogues and did not return until nearly 2½ years later.

It is difficult for us to realize the importance of water transportation in those days. Men were inclined to believe certain navigable routes must exist simply because they so ardently wished that they should exist. Thus, the hope of reaching the Orient by sailing westward was not relinquished even after it became known that the American land mass stood as a barrier between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; this hope was merely transferred northward to the inland waterways of North America, where for 300 years Spaniards, Frenchmen, and Englishmen diligently searched for the mythical Northwest Passage first postulated by Verrazano in 1524. To discover this passage was one of the avowed objects of the Hudson Bay Co.

Some envisaged it as a strait across Canada at the latitude of Hudson Bay, others as a commingling of the headwaters of major eastward and westward flowing rivers. Both versions of the myth were inscribed, as late as 1767, in Jonathan Carver's map of America. Explorers kept the myth alive by asserting as fact what was pure fantasy. Thus, in 1765, Robert Rogers stated categorically that between the sources of the Missouri and the great river of the west the portage was not above 30 miles. His river of the west was pure figment of the imagination but, oddly enough, speculation placed it near the actual location of the Columbia. No one then knew of the Rocky Mountains or imagined that such a barrier might divide America's eastern and western rivers.

It must be counted a major gain of the Lewis and Clark expedition that it laid to rest forever the myth of a navigable passage across the continent. It established, by actual observation, that the sources of the Missouri and Columbia lay too far apart for an easy portage and that neither river was truly navigable in its upper reaches. A feasible route from St. Louis to the Pacific was, indeed, mapped out, but 430 miles of it ran overland through rugged terrain, and the 3,555 miles by river were part way navigable by canoe only. Not until a century later did Amundsen find the only true Northwest Passage which does not, of course, bisect the continent but runs along Baffin Island through the Arctic Ocean. In 1960, the nuclear submarine *Seadragon* traversed the passage underwater.

If then the Lewis and Clark expedition could find no natural and easy cross-continental water route, it accomplished what in the end proved more important: It greatly strengthened our claim to the Oregon Territory, originally based on the discovery of the Columbia River in 1792 by Capt. Robert Gray of the American ship *Columbia Rediviva*. Over the route mapped by Lewis and Clark soon came American trappers, and in 1811 Fort Astoria was built at the mouth of the Columbia, the first permanent settlement in the Oregon country.

America won the race to the Pacific by a hair's breadth, for Canadian traders were fast approaching the coast. Mackenzie had traversed Canada from Lake Athabaska to the mouth of the Bella Coola as early as 1793, Simon Fraser came down the river named for him in 1808, and David Thompson followed part of the Lewis and Clark route in 1811. When he reached the mouth of the Columbia, he saw the American flag flying over Fort Astoria—it had been raised but a few months earlier. As the historian John Bakeless writes: "Because of the Corps of Discovery, Oregon is American today. And 10 white stars in the blue field of Old Glory stand for States of the Union that one by one grew up in the farms and mills, cities and homesteads, along the trail where weary men in tattered elk-skin cursed the rocks that tore their feet, sweated at the tow rope, poled against the savage current of the muddy Missouri, stumbled in the chilly streams of the Rockies, and staggered down the western end of the Lolo Trail." It had been a hard journey and a long one. When Clark wrote in his diary, November 7, 1805, "Ocean in view. Oh joy." the weary explorers doubtless felt much the same triumph and relief as the men on the three small Spanish caravels when they heard the lookout on the *Pinta* cry "Tierra! Tierra!"

Charting a course—4,000 miles each way—through unknown territory inhabited by numerous, often hostile Indians, surely was difficult enough, but many other tasks were imposed on Lewis and Clark by Jefferson. He instructed them to keep a daily record of the weather and an accurate description of the route traversed; to ascertain "by celestial observation, the geography of the country"; describe in detail its fauna, flora and mineral wealth; report on the character, customs and languages of the Indians they encountered and try to win their friendship for the United States. It has been truly said that these tasks would seem superhuman had not the diligent and intrepid commanders fulfilled them all very nearly to the letter. Except for one sergeant who died of what seems to have been appendicitis, no life was lost. Total cost of the enterprise was a modest $40,000. Wherever one dips into the early history of our country, one is amazed at the number and variety of men of outstanding ability and courage produced by a nation with fewer people than Denmark has today.

Luck played some part, but the success of the expedition was due to the care with which its personnel and equipment were selected, the skill with which it was led, and the disciplined manner in which it proceeded. The captains spent the winter of 1803 in St. Louis, then the westernmost outpost of civilization, collecting all available information from woodsmen and trappers; when they set out on their journey, they had learned everything any white man then knew about the country they were to penetrate.

Lewis and Clark were ideally suited to their task. Close friends of similar background, sons of planters, they had much experience of command and of wilderness life. They had fought as regular army officers, Lewis for a time under Clark. Both were highly intelligent; Lewis more analytical, Clark more practical. Lewis had received a better education; moreover, Jefferson had sent him to Philadelphia to study intensively such matters as astronomy, botany, mapmaking, manipulation of instruments for meteorological observations—all essential to the conduct of a scientific expedition. Clark, however, had geographical genius and a gift for winning the friendship of the Indians. They trusted him because they sensed that he respected them as fellow human beings. When critical situations developed, both captains handled the Indians with consummated skill. "In personal dealings with them," wrote Bernard de Voto, "they made no mistakes at all."

At Jefferson's request, Lewis and Clark kept daily journals (as did some of the men). The journals were first published in 1814 and have been reissued several times. Straightforward, factual, often written under trying circumstances after days of physical exertion and danger, these journals tell of a fabulous voyage of discovery that can still be read for their sheer fascination as an adventure story. But they are more than that.

They are a sort of American Domesday Book, an inventory of the vast and rich lands we bought from France at the bargain price of 4 cents an acre. Many of the beautiful sights the captains describe have long since disappeared, bulldozed out of existence in the name of progress—the cascades of the Columbia River, the vast and somber forests of giant pines of the Northwest. As Bernard de Voto comments sadly in the preface to his edition of the journals, no American will ever again see the beauty or feel the majesty that overwhelmed Lewis when he first came across the Great Falls of the Missouri. Did we not have these journals, we might forget how beautiful the country was when it was first seen by these intrepid explorers.

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

STATES EXPRESS INTEREST IN COMPENSATING CRIME VICTIMS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, on June 17, 1965, I introduced a bill to provide for the compensation of innocent victims of crimes in areas of Federal jurisdiction. The criminal injuries compensation bill would create a Violent Crimes Compensation Commission empowered to order compensation for expenses, loss of earning power, pecuniary loss, and pain and suffering of the innocent victim.

In addition to establishing this principle in areas of Federal jurisdiction, one hope which I had in introducing the proposed legislation was to stimulate similar action by State governments. In the short time since the introduction of S. 2155, California became the first State in the Union to establish a governmental program of this kind. Bills have been introduced in the Wisconsin and Oregon Legislatures. In many other areas, discussion is going on and studies are being undertaken. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the January 18, 1966, New York Times discussing efforts in New York to bring about enactment of such a law. I hope that other States will follow the example set by California, Wisconsin, Oregon, and New York.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1966]

COMPENSATING CRIME VICTIMS

Since the maintenance of law and order is a basic responsibility of the State, it follows logically that the innocent victims of violent crimes are entitled to compensation from the State. Arthur J. Goldberg, while a Justice of the Supreme Court, endorsed this proposition. "The victim of a robbery or an assault has been denied the 'protection' of the laws in a very real sense," he said, "and society should assume some responsibility for making him whole."

Several experiments along this line have been initiated within the last 2 years. Great Britain and New Zealand both established the principle of compensating victims in 1964, and California followed their example last year. Only last month, as the result of the murder of a man who had sought to subdue a knife-wielding assailant in the subway, New York City adopted legislation permitting payment of a pension to his widow.

A committee appointed by Governor Rockefeller to help draft recommendations on this subject contends that compensating the victims of crime is a corollary to providing rehabilitation and other social services to the perpetrators of crime. The committee suggests that both minimum and maximum awards be fixed and that in general they be compensatory.

The committee is also considering a companion proposal to aid the good samaritan who suffers injury or damage while trying to prevent a crime or assisting in the apprehension of a criminal, either at a policeman's command or on his own initiative. Such a measure is long overdue and should be enacted both for humanitarian reasons and as an aid to law enforcement.

INVASIONS OF PRIVACY

Mr. BURDICK. Madam President, as a member of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, I have been associated with Senator EDWARD LONG's investigation into invasions of privacy. Indeed, I have participated in a number of the hearings both here in Washington and in other parts of the country.

What we have turned up is both startling and depressing.

Because of his interest in this subject, Senator LONG agreed to do a law review article on the subject for the St. Louis University School of Law. This excellent article was recently published and I ask consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY: THE CASE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT

(By EDWARD V. LONG, U.S. Senator)

It is the purpose of this article to establish firmly the importance and necessity of the citizen's right of privacy as a bulwark against government harassment. Establishing the right dictates the exigency for concerted efforts by the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of our Federal, State and local governments to safeguard the right from further depletion.

A brief analysis will be made of the origin and growth of a right of privacy in American jurisprudence.[1] An examination will then be made of the dangers confronting the preservation of the right from technological developments, overzealous law officers, and the general lack of understanding of basic constitutional guarantees. It is believed that such a review will demonstrate the detrimental effect upon our way of life if the right of privacy is lost or further circumscribed, and the insidious nature of the problems inherent in any attempt to protect our privacy, let alone broaden its meaning and the recognition of its value.

Finally, remedies for existing encroachments upon privacy and proposals for its future preservation can be studied.

EARLY RECOGNITION OF THE RIGHT OF PRIVACY

Since its inception in the legal thought of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, the right of privacy has been the subject of wide-ranging debate and analysis. The House of Lords made the first major recorded contribution of the right as a safeguard against abusive tactics of government agents in *Entick* v. *Carrington*.[2] The action of the case was one for trespass against messengers of the King for entering the plaintiff's home and searching and examining his books and papers. Lord Camden asked the defendants to show authority for their action. No authority could be shown that would convince the court that the action of the King's messengers was legal. The general warrant by which the agents searched and seized the plaintiff's papers was declared void. The decision was hailed by all men of liberty, both in the colonies as well as in England. It was firmly rooted in the law of trespass and the sanctity of a man's property. Every intrusion upon a man's property was held to be a trespass unless some justification or excuse could be found in the statute books or the principles of the common law. In this case none could be found though high authority had issued the warrant. The messengers were made to pay for their trespass.

In *Boyd* v. *United States*,[3] Lord Camden's decision was heavily relied upon to reach the interpretation of a portion of our Bill of Rights that has become the touchstone of the constitutional guarantees against invasions of privacy. This was a suit for forfeiture of goods for fraudulent nonpayment of custom duties. The Government had to prove the value of the goods. To do this it sought the production of invoices of goods previously shipped into the United States. Upon order of the lower court the defendant after making strenuous objections produced his invoices.[4]

The Supreme Court, upon review, took the first important step toward establishing, within the framework of the Bill of Rights, the basic human right to be left alone, to be secure from officious meddling into personal affairs, and to be free of the scrutiny of petty officials. Mr. Justice Bradley delivered the opinion of the Court:

"The principles laid down in this opinion [Lord Camden's] affect the very essence of constitutional liberty and security. They reach farther than the concrete form of the case then before the court, with its advertitious circumstances; they apply to all invasions on the part of the government and its employees of the sanctity of a man's home and the privacies of life. It is not the breaking of his doors, and the rummaging of his drawers that constitutes the essence of the offense; but it is the invasion of his indefeasible right of personal security, personal liberty, and private property, where that right has never been forfeited by his conviction of some offense—it is the invasion of this sacred right which underlies and constitutes the essence of Lord Camden's judgment.[5]

Four years after the historic decision in Boyd, the right of privacy was explicitly inscribed into our system of jurisprudence by the now famous article written by Warren and Brandeis.[6] The "right to be let alone" was here fully examined, its scope and characteristics outlined, and its importance made obvious. It is more than interesting that three-quarters of a century ago the authors saw the impending threats to the sanctity of a man's private life. Even at that time they saw the advances of technology and the changing nature of society as adding impetus to the incursive elements prevalent in the curious and the officious.

In 1894 the Supreme Court reaffirmed the decision in Boyd.[7] The Court was considering the power of Congress to grant authority to an administrative agency to compel the production of evidence in a hearing before the agency. The Court strongly indicated that Congress had such power to delegate to an agency and that the agency, if within the bounds of the statutory mandate, could properly exercise it.[8] However, the Court was most explicit in pointing out the limitations upon such power. Speaking for the Court, Mr. Justice Harlan stated: "Neither branch of the legislative department, still less any merely administrative body, established by Congress, possesses, or can be invested with, a general power of making inquiry into the private affairs of the citizen. We said in *Boyd* v. *United States*, 116 U.S. 616, 630—and it cannot be too often repeated—that the principles that embody the essence of constitutional liberty and security forbid all invasions on the part of the Government and its employees of the sanctity of a man's home, and the privacies of his life.[9]

DEVELOPMENT AND LIMITATIONS ON THE RIGHT OF PRIVACY

Later cases have affirmatively established the right of the Government to inquire into the affairs of private citizens when necessary for the public interest.[10] Of course such a power is at times necessary to carry on the Government's business. Taxes have to be collected, records showing compliance with the mandates of Congress must be compiled and maintained, censuses must be taken, and all sorts of other details and facts must be disclosed to the Government for the public good. However to posit the proposition that the Government needs, and legally can obtain, information from the citizens does not create blanket authority for the Government to invade the privacy of the citizen in doing so.

A Federal agency may obtain the records of a corporation subject to its jurisdiction, but it may not conduct a "fishing expedition" in quest of evidence of a crime.[11] Records do not have to be disclosed if the order for their production is not relevant to any lawful inquiry.[12] A person may have to file a tax return, but he does not have to answer any incriminating questions in the return.[13] The State cannot compel the keeping of membership lists of various organizations without some compelling or subordinating interest of the State to the citizen's interest of keeping the list secret to avoid threatened reprisals against those disclosed in the membership lists.[14] Contraband property cannot be seized without a legal serach warrant.[15] The State cannot compel teachers, as a condition of employment in State supported schools, to file annually an affidavit listing every organization (religious, political, avocational, professional, or social) to which they belonged or regularly contributed within the last 5 years.[16] The constitutional right of privacy of an admittedly legitimate organization cannot be invaded merely because "some Communists may have joined it."[17] General warrants for search and seizure are as outlawed today as they were 200 years ago.[18] Finally, the State may not enter the privacy of a marriage for the sake of protecting public morals.[19]

---

[1] The right of privacy entered the Anglo-Saxon legal system as a right pertaining to civil interests, e.g., a person's interest in his name, picture, or reputation. Cf. Annot., 138 A.L.R. 61 (1942); 168 A.L.R. 455 (1947); 14 A.L.R. 2d 750 (1950).

[2] 19 Howell's State Trials 1029 (1765). The cause of action was one of tort. However, the ramifications of the decision reached beyond the civil area.

[3] 116 U.S. 616 (1886).

[4] The defendant produced his papers only after the lower court ruled that failure to produce would cause the allegations of the Government to be taken as confessed. The Supreme Court held this to be compulsion of testimony tending to incriminate and, as such, in contradiction of the fifth amendment. Id. at 634–635. But see, *Eaton* v. *Price*, 364 U.S. 263 (1960); *Shapiro* v. *United States*, 335 U.S. 1 (1948); *United States* v. *Darby*, 312 U.S. 100 (1941); *Rodgers* v. *United States*, 138 F. 2d 992 (6th Cir. 1943).

[5] 116 U.S. at 630–631.

[6] Warren and Brandeis, "The Right to Privacy," 4 Harvard Law Review 193 (1890). While the authors did not approach the right of privacy from a constitutional viewpoint, their work took the place of precedents and made judicial recognition of the concept much easier.

[7] *ICC* v. *Brimson*, 154 U.S. 447 (1894).

[8] The decision did not reach the merits of the case. The Court remanded the case for further hearings on the question of the necessity of inquiring into the affairs of Brimson. Id. at 489.

[9] Id at 478.

[10] E.g., *Flint* v. *Stone Tracy*, 220 U.S. 107 (1911) (income tax returns); *Baltimore & O.R.R.* v. *ICC*, 221 U.S. 612 (1911) (reports of hours worked in excess of legally permitted limits); *Wilson* v. *United States*, 221 U.S. 361 (1911) (copy books before a grand jury); *United States* v. *Sullivan*, 274 U.S. 259 (1927) (income tax returns); *United States* v. *Darby*, 312 U.S. 100 (1941) (records required to be kept by statute); *Shapiro* v. *United States*, 335 U.S. 1 (1948) (records required to be kept by statute). Compare *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson*, 103 U.S. (13 Otto) 168 (1880); *Sinclair* v. *United States*, 279 U.S. 263 (1929); *Hutcheson* v. *United States*, 369 U.S. 599 (1962).

[11] *FTC* v. *American Tobacco Co.*, 264 U.S. 298 (1924). The FTC sought mandamus to compel production of the defendant corporations, records, contracts, memorandums, and correspondence for the year 1921 for the purpose of inspection and copying. The Court held it to be "contrary to the first principles of justice to allow a search through all the respondent's records, relevant or irrelevant, in the hope that something will turn up." Id. at 306.

[12] *Oklahoma Press Pub. Co.* v. *Walling*, 327 U.S. 186 (1946). The Administrator of the Wage and Hours Division of the Department of Labor issued a subpena duces tecum for records of defendant pursuant to an investigation under section 11a of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The Court held that there was no question raised of actual search and seizure and no violation of the fourth amendment.

[13] *United States* v. *Kohriger*, 345 U.S. 22 (1953).

[14] *NAACP* v. *Alabama*, 357 U.S. 449 (1958); *Bates* v. *City of Little Rock*, 361 U.S. 516 (1960).

[15] *Trupiano* v. *United States*, 334 U.S. 699 (1948). In this 5–4 decision, the seizure of the defendant's still, mash, etc., by agents of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division of the IRS was held void because the agents failed to obtain a search warrant when the facts showed there was ample time to do so with no danger that any of the contraband would be hidden or destroyed.

[16] *Shelton* v. *Tucker*, 364 U.S. 479 (1960).

[17] *Gibson* v. *Florida Legis. Comm.*, 372 U.S. 539 (1963).

The decisions in these and other cases rely on the basic guarantees of the Bill of Rights to outlaw governmental intrusions. However, the author sees as implicit in these cases, where it is not an explicit reason for the decision, the recognition of a universal right of privacy derived from the Bill of Rights. Indeed, in the recent cases of *Griswold* v. *Connecticut*,[20] the Supreme Court has clearly enunciated its recognition of the right of privacy as contained in the Bill of Rights.

The executive director of the Planned Parenthood League of Connecticut and the medical director of the league were convicted for disseminating contraceptives and advice as to their use in violation of a State statute.

Mr. Justice Douglas was the most explicit in his decision holding the Connecticut statute unconstitutional: "[S]pecific guarantees in the Bill of Rights have penumbras, formed by emanations from those guarantees that help give them life and substance. * * * Various guarantees create zones of privacy. The right of association contained in the penumbra of the first amendment is one. * * * The third amendment in its prohibition against the quartering of soldiers in any house in time of peace without the consent of the owner is another facet of that privacy. The fourth amendment explicitly affirms the "right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures." The fifth amendment in its self-incrimination clause enables the citizen to create a zone of privacy which Government may not force him to surrender to his detriment. The ninth amendment provides: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."[21]

Mr. Justice Douglas has long been a stalwart defender of privacy and a champion of the liberal approach to interpreting and applying the guarantees of the Bill of Rights.[22] The zones of privacy that Justice Douglas sees existing within the framework of the Bill of Rights do indeed exist in the developed sense of a right to be let alone. One need only reflect on exactly what the Bill of Rights guarantees and the historical background that produced that charter of liberty, and at the very least, some aspect of the necessity to act in private in order to act at all becomes apparent.

Could one meaningfully exercise his right of free speech if he were not able to retreat to his sanctuary to reflect and discuss his ideas? Can one truly practice the religion of his choice without being guaranteed that he will be able to do so in his own way, at his own time, at a place of his own choosing? Can one freely associate with those of his choice if the Government can scrutinize and dictate standards for the functions and purposes of a group? Can a man adequately prepare his defense against criminal prosecution if the cloak of secrecy necessary to prompt, candid, and complete answers is threatened with surreptitious penetration? [23] What good is the guarantee of a trial by jury of peers if the jurors' private lives are subject to searching examination? [24]

The right to be secure from illegal searches and seizures obviously is directed toward protecting the privacy of a man's home or office. The right not to be forced to testify against oneself or confess under coercion is cut from the same mold.[25]

The ninth amendment by virtue of the Griswold decision has new life and meaning. Former Associate Justice Goldberg based his decision, in which Mr. Chief Justice Warren and Mr. Justice Brennan concurred, upon a "concept of liberty [that] protects those personal rights that are fundamental, and is not confined to the specific terms of the Bill of Rights. * * * [I]t embraces the right of marital privacy though that right is not mentioned explicitly in the Constitution [and] is supported both by the numerous decisions of this Court, * * * and by the language and history of the ninth amendment.[26]

It cannot be doubted that there are basic rights of human beings, not expressed within the Bill of Rights, which nevertheless are necessary to man's freedom. A citizen should be free from harassment by bureaucrats. Citizens should be free from the processes of a libel of information, which, in the author's view, is no different from a general warrant.[27] Employees of the Government should be free from the insulting and often degrading ordeal of taking personality tests as a condition of employment or promotion. They should be able to send out mail without some faceless bureaucrat scanning the addresses for information as to the names of persons with whom we correspond. Federal employees should not be subjected to observation when they are eating lunch, changing clothes, or answering the call of nature.[28] Recipients of mail from Communist countries should not be harassed by an archaic regulatory system that requires them to request that such mail be forwarded to them and thus have their name placed on a list of those desiring to receive Communist political propaganda.[29] Businessmen should not be subjected to inspection in which surreptitious recordings are made.[30] Lawyers who have qualified before their State bars, the Federal bar, or the Supreme Court bar should not be forced to comply with a useless and peevish requirement that they qualify to practice before a Federal agency.[31] Government wiretapping and other electronic methods of Government eavesdropping on the citizenry should be declared unconstitutional.[32] It is degradingly beneath our national character that snooping and prying have become so prevalent in our country.

Should we as American citizens be able to trust our Government to keep its word? To ask the question is to answer it. Indeed, that we have to ask it at all is a most distressing commentary on the situation in which we find ourselves today. However, later in this article facts will be documented which will prove that such a question, far from being unnecessary or impertinent, has long been overdue in the asking and in the answering.

Should the Government pursue an undesirable character with the full power and prestige it has behind it until it finally pins some "rap" on the person? Should the Government be in the business of trying their cases in the press or having their own mimeograph services grind out releases often damaging and derogatory to a citizen prior to holding a hearing or making any attempt to verify the allegations made against the citizen? [33] Should a Federal agency be able to tell a citizen who his lawyer should be? [34] Should an agency investigate, prosecute, and then decide the fate of a citizen? [35] Should an agency be able to unceasingly summon a person before it, at considerable personal expense, to defend against groundless claims and then threaten him with continuous harassment and suit if he does not comply with the agency's demands? Should an agency open the mail of a taxpayer? [36] Should an agency use its most punitive weapons, when lesser means would accompish the same result?[37] Indeed, should not the agencies be required to use the lesser weapon until there is proof that it is unavailing?

---

[18] *Stanford* v. *Texas*, 379 U.S. 476 (1965).

[19] *Griswold* v. *Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965).

[20] Ibid.

[21] Id. at 484.

[22] See e.g., *Lamont* v. *Postmaster General*, 381 U.S. 301 (1965); *Gibson* v. *Florida Legis. Comm.*, 372 U.S. 539 (1963) (concurring opinion); *Mapp* v. *Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643, 666 (1961) (concurring opinion); *Silverman* v. *United States*, 365 U.S. 505, 512 (1961) (concurring opinion); *Bates* v. *City of Little Rock*, 361 U.S. 516, 527 (1960) (concurring opinion); *Frank* v. *Maryland*, 359 U.S. 360, 374 (1959) (dissenting opinion); *Breithaupt* v. *Abram*, 352 U.S. 432, 440 (1957) (dissenting opinion); *United States* v. *Kahriger*, 345 U.S. 22, 40 (1953) (dissenting opinion); *On Lee* v. *United States*, 343 U.S. 747, 762 (1952) (dissenting opinion); *McDonald* v. *United States*, 335 U.S. 451 (1948).

[23] *Lanza* v. *New York*, 370 U.S. 139 (1962). In this case the defendant paid a visit to his brother who was incarcerated in a New York jail. While the defendant conversed with his brother, his statements were being electronically recorded.

[24] *Rubenstein* v. *United States*, 227 F. 2d 638 (10th Cir. 1955). Treasury agents investigated jurors, asking them and their acquaintances questions. The Court held this to be a denial of defendant's right to a fair and impartial trial by jury as guaranteed by the sixth amendment.

[25] *Boyd* v. *United States*, 116 U.S. 616, 630 (1886).

[26] 381 U.S. at 486–487.

[27] A case will be documented later in this article which will show the ease with which the fourth amendment guarantees can be skirted by the use of this process.

[28] "Hearings on Invasions of Privacy (Governmental Agencies) Before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary," 89th Cong., 1st sess., pt. 1, at 105–106, 114, 121 (1965).

[29] Id at 181–202.

[30] *American Dietaids Co.* v. *Celebrezze*, 317 F. 2d 658 (2d Cir. 1963), cert. denied, 375 U.S. 896 (1963).

[31] These are lawyers who have qualified before their State bars, Federal bars, even the Supreme Court bar. Cf. "Hearings on S. 1466 Before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary," 88th Cong., 1st sess. (1963).

[32] Cf. *Olmstead* v. *United States*, 277 U.S. 438 (1928); *Silverman* v. *United States*, 365 U.S. 505 (1961).

[33] Hearings on S. 1160, S. 1336, S. 1758, and S. 1889 before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965). Testimony concerning this matter can be found in the statements of Dan S. Busnell, attorney at law, Salt Lake City, Utah, and of the General Counsel of the SEC.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Various agencies have to wear three hats in carrying out their statutory duties—investigator, prosecutor or advocate, and trier of fact. When these three functions are completely independent of one another, abuses are few. However, the very nature and makeup of an administrative agency lends itself to cooperation that could easily be detrimental to a completely impartial decision. Cf. 60 Stat. 239 (1946), 5 U.S.C. sec. 1004(c) (1958) and Hearings on S. 1663 Before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 88th Cong., 2d sess. (1964); Hearings on S. 1160, S. 1336, S. 1758, and S. 1889 Before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965).

[36] Hearings on Invasions of Privacy (Government agencies) Before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965) [hereinafter cited as Hearings on Invasions of Privacy]. The testimony on mail levies may be found in the statements of various officials of the Post Office Department, Apr. 13, 1965.

Should the agencies be required to teach their employees that they are there to serve the public, the people?

Should an agency demand answers to interrogatories during an investigation in a civil area and then use those same answers to prove guilt in criminal proceedings, when the agency knows it will prosecute criminally? Should an agency hold criminal prosecution as a club to achieve regulatory compliance when no fair and impartial hearing has been held to determine if there has in fact been a violation of the regulatory scheme?

It should be pointed out that the instances set forth are not without foundation in fact. The Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has been holding hearings in which just such types of activities have been disclosed in sworn testimony or alleged to the subcommittee in complaints from citizens all over the country. Indeed actual instances of criminal conduct by Federal agents have been admitted. Such activity has included wiretapping in violation of Federal[38] and State[39] law as well as instances of breaking and entering in attempts to obtain evidence.[40]

It cannot be doubted that such activity by Government agents is reprehensible and a slap at our system of democracy. It also cannot be doubted that the growing recognition of the meaning of the right of privacy and the landmark interpretation of the ninth amendment in *Griswold* could be effectively used to protect the interests of our citizens not to be harassed by the tactics described above. Whether the Supreme Court speaks in terms of "zones of privacy" or "concepts of liberty" as embodied in the ninth amendment, our jurisprudence contains ample principles by which to protect all basic and necessary freedoms of man in order that he may decide and achieve his own destiny. This was the commitment of our forefathers and this is the commitment of the leaders of this country today.

WIRETAPPING AND ELECTRONIC EAVESDROPPING

In the past few years much has been written about the use of electronic equipment to gain evidence of criminal activity.[41] The constitutionality of the use of such equipment has been frequently adjudicated by the Supreme Court. The leading cases in the area are *Olmstead* v. *United States*,[42] *Silverman* v. *United States*,[43] and *Massiah* v. *United States*.[44]

The Olmstead decision is, of course, the Supreme Court holding that wiretapping is not a violation of the fourth amendment guarantees.[45]

The Silverman decision concerned the use of electronic gear to obtain evidence.[46] In 1958 the police of the District of Columbia had reason to believe that the defendants were using their residence in the District as headquarters for gambling operations. The police then obtained the permission of the owner of an adjoining vacant house to use it for observation. For 3 days the police used a spike-mike to eavesdrop on the defendants next door.

The spike-mike is a microphone with a foot long spike attached to it. It is driven into the wall and picks up the sounds emanating from the room. In this case the officers inserted the spike-mike under a baseboard in a second floor room of the vacant house and into a crevice extending several inches into the party wall of the defendants' property until the spike hit a heating duct. The mike turned the duck into a conductor of sound and all conversations of the defendants on two floors of the house were overheard by the police officers. The testimony of the police officers was a substantial factor in the defendants' conviction.

The Court held that the evidence was illegally obtained in violation of the fourth amendment. The violation occurred when the officers physically intruded upon the defendants' premises. Unlike the other cases in which the Court held that there was no violation of the fourth amendment by means of electronic eavesdropping equipment,[47] in this case there was an actual intrusion upon a constitutionally protected area. Mr. Justice Stewart speaking for the majority stated: "Eavesdropping accomplished by means of such a physical intrusion is beyond the pale of even those decisions in which a closely divided Court has held that eavesdropping accomplished by other electronic means did not amount to an invasion of fourth amendment rights."[48]

Mr. Justice Douglas concurred. However, he was at a loss to see what difference it made as to what type of electronic equipment was used. The main issue was whether or not there was an invasion of privacy. If so, then the evidence was tainted and must be rejected.

In *Massiah* v. *United States*[49] the Court had another opportunity to review the constitutionality of "bugging." The defendant was indicted for violation of the Federal narcotics laws. He retained a lawyer, pleaded not guilty, and was released on bail. While he was on bail, Federal agents arranged to have one of his cohorts talk to him. The Federal agents equipped the informant with a radio transmitter which was placed under the seat of his car. The informant then engaged the defendant in conversation in which he made incriminating statements. These were overheard by a Federal agent a block away. The Federal agent testified in court to these statements and the defendant was convicted.

The Court held that Massiah's sixth amendment right to counsel was violated. Having a right to counsel at trial, which is open and public and replete with safeguards against any infringements of the defendant's rights, the Court could not hold that the right to counsel did not apply in the situation in which these safeguards were not present; i.e., in extrajudicial circumstances.

Today, by the decisions just outlined, the law can be stated that electronic eavesdropping, including wiretapping, is not unconstitutional if no actual physical intrusion (by means of penetration or otherwise) occurs into a constitutionally projected area, and if the "bugging" infringes upon no other constitutional guarantee of the defendant depriving him of his rights.

With the advent of an increasing awareness and a developing appreciation of the right of privacy, the present state of law cannot remain immutable. Constitutional rights should not rest upon a fraction of an inch or the manner in which the sanctity of the home has been invaded, be it physically or otherwise. A man's right to counsel should not be broader than his right to be secure in his home. How can the right to counsel be considered any more sacred than the right to be secure in our homes? Yet use of electronic gear without any sort of physical intrusion has been held capable of violating the former right, and no nice distinction can be made in that case. Surely it cannot be argued that there is any less intrusion upon a constitutional right because there was a physical invasion of the constitutionally protected zone to advice of counsel. Would it have been any more unconstitutional if the Federal agents had secreted the "bug" in the lawyer's office and listened to the conversations that took place there? While such direct action is more shocking, there are no degrees of invasions of constitutional rights. If a right has been invaded, the appropriate sanction should attach.[50]

Between the Boyd and Griswold cases the right of privacy has been firmly established in our jurisprudence. This right is currently under heavy attack by the investigative techniques of our Government. Inconsistent and hairline distinctions by our courts have helped perpetuate this attack. Disregard for Federal and State laws and the directives of their own superiors has allowed Federal agents to violate the right with impunity. When Government snooping is coupled with private snooping one may validly wonder if this country is not rushing toward an Orwellian nightmare 19 years ahead of schedule.

CURRENT INVASIONS OF PRIVACY

There are two principal foes to the right of privacy. One is the Federal Government.

---

[37] The Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 52 Stat. 1045 (1938), 21 U.S.C. sec. 336 (1958), provides for notices to cease and desist allegedly illegal activities as an alternative compliance technique prior to imposition of sterner and more severe steps to gain compliance. In at least one case in which this alternative could have effectively solved a questionable practice it was completely ignored and the stern measure of seizure of property was meted out instead.

[38] Cf. 48 Stat. 1103 (1934), 47 U.S.C. sec. 605 (1958).

[39] Mass. Gen. Laws Ann., ch. 272 sec. 99, (1950); Pa. Stat. Ann. title 15, sec. 2443 (1957).

[40] Hearings on Invasions of Privacy, supra note 36. Refer to testimony of special agents of the IRS. Cf. *Irvine* v. *California*, 347 U.S. 128 (1954).

[41] See generally "The Wiretapping-Eavesdropping Problem: Reflections on the Eavesdropper," 44 Minn. L. Rev. 813 (1960); Waldmor & Silver, "Ethics, Morals, and Legality of Eavesdropping," 9 Brooklyn Bar. 147 (1958); McElroy, "The Federal Law of Wiretapping," 19 Ala. Law. 128 (1958); Dash, "Eavesdroppers: A Preview," 30 Pa. Bar Assn. 21 (1958); Brown & Peer, "Wiretapping Entanglement: How To Strengthen Law Enforcement and Preserve Privacy," 44 Cornell L.Q. 175 (1959); Savarese, "Eavesdropping and the Law," 46 A.B.A.J. 263 (1960); Silver, "Law Enforcement and Wiretapping," 27 Tenn. L. Rev. 352 (1960); Kasimar, "The Big Ear, The Private Eye, and Laymen," 36 Wis. B. Bull, June 1963, p. 33; Gasque, "Wiretapping, A History of Federal Legislation and Supreme Court Decisions," 15 SC.L.Q. 593 (1963). Cf. Hearings Pursuant to S. Res. 62, Before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 86th Cong., 1st sess., pts. 1–5 (1959).

[42] 277 U.S. 438 (1928).

[43] 365 U.S. 505 (1961).

[44] 377 U.S. 201 (1964).

[45] Six years after the Olmstead decision, Congress passed the Federal Communications Act, 48 Stat. 1103 (1934), 47 U.S.C., sec. 151 (1958); specifically, sec. 605 banned wiretapping. In 1941, the Justice Department emasculated the law. Cf. "A History of Federal Legislation and Supreme Court Decisions," 15 S.C.L.Q. 593 (1963).

[46] See also *Goldman* v. *United States*, 316 U.S. 129 (1942); *On Lee* v. *United States*, 343 U.S. 747 (1952); *Lopez* v. *United States*, 373 U.S. 427 (1963); *Gorin* v. *United States*, 313 F. 2d 641 (1st Cir. 1963), cert. denied, 374 U.S. 829 (1963); *Todisco* v. *United States*, 298 F. 2d 208 (9th Cir. 1961), cert. denied, 368 U.S. 989 (1962).

[47] Ibid.

[48] *Silverman* v. *United States*, 365 U.S. at 509–510.

[49] 377 U.S. 201 (1964).

[50] See Mr. Justice Douglas' concurring opinion in *Silverman* v. *United States*, 365 U.S. at 512.

The other is the general inquisitive nature of man and the growth of "nosiness" in various sectors of our society. The following examination of the attack on privacy will be limited to the Federal Government. It is most perturbing that one of the major violators of the right to be let alone is the very authority that is sworn to uphold and protect the rights of all citizens.

The Federal Government has grown steadily as it has assumed more and more of an active part in promoting the general welfare and security of the Nation.[51] Today the vast regulatory and administrative complex of the Government oversees the totality of American life. It is not surprising that in this immense bureaucracy some lessening of the individual rights has occurred. The very nature of any bureaucracy promotes collective action at the expense of the individual.

The Government requires all sorts of facts and figures in order to operate. Congress has granted it the power to gather this information.[52] There is, of course, the security and police duty of the Government which requires an extensive array of agents and investigative procedures in order to function. In addition, the Government has to keep records of its activities. All of these unquestionably legitimate functions of the Government lend themselves to incursive probes into the private affairs of our citizens.

If these probes are properly handled, there can be little tolerance for carping complaints. However, when the zeal and self-righteousness of the Federal agent or employee gains the upper hand, abuses are bound to occur. So much power and so little control over those who exercise it places a premium on the integrity and competence of the Federal agent. The American citizen can be grateful that more widespread abuse of such power has not been prevalent. It is proof that there are many fine public servants within the Government today and many who have made their dedication and service an example for all of us.

Regrettably, there are also those in the Federal employ who have let their zeal or self-righteousness run away with their better judgment. More regrettably, there are also those who would use their Federal badge simply to play almighty and thus intimidate, harass, and browbeat the citizen who is unacquainted with his constitutional guarantees.

In addition to the problems of too many possessing so much power, another problem contributing to the reduction of privacy is the insulation from checks on their activities. Probably no one is more hard to find than the bureaucrat who has taken the responsibility for an act. This quality of remaining nameless, faceless, and totally impersonal and impervious to any challenge as to the propriety of any given action is a major factor in fostering lack of responsibility and a nonawareness of obligation in the upholding of individual rights. If the employee feels that to advance in his position he must get results at any cost, the balancing of the Government's interest with the individual's becomes impossible of fair assessment.

The author claims no psychological proficiency. Nevertheless it is evident that some actions of our Federal agents are difficult to explain on other grounds. As the incidents of strange behavior by some investigators is documented hereinafter, the reader may make his own independent evaluations.

Description of modern electronic techniques

The hearings before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure began with an amazing and frightening display of the latest technical equipment in the field of electronic "bugging."[53] Expert witnesses were asked to describe and demonstrate these devices, all of which are available on the open market.

During the course of this demonstration, the subcommittee witnessed the use of a small microphone (no longer than a man's thumbnail) cleverly concealed in a vase of artificial roses. This mike transmitted to an attaché case that one of the witnesses possessed. Portions of the opening statement were recorded by the hidden equipment in the attaché case.

A fully openable cigarette lighter and an innocent looking cigarette box each contained their own transmitter. One expert witness wore a wrist watch microphone. A wire attached to the watch ran up his sleeve where it connected to either a portable miniaturized tape recorder or to a transmitter capable of broadcasting to an associate 2 or 3 blocks away.

A transmitter disguised as an olive punctured with a toothpick, which served as an antenna, was displayed but not demonstrated. This cleverly concealed device was also capable of broadcasting 2 or 3 blocks—whether or not immersed in alcohol.

The parade of "bugs" continued with microphones or transmitters disguised as desk pens, fountain pens, desk staplers, tieclasps, cigarette packs, briefcases, etc. Most of these "bugs" did not involve intercepting telephonic communications.

An independent manufacturer from New York testified about a device that he himself developed and was selling for $400.[54] This device was designed to be connected in a room with telephone lines. It is self-powered and requires no batteries. It is placed near the phone or on the line. It does not affect or alter normal telephone operation—i.e., it has no effect on incoming or outgoing calls.

After the device is in place, the eavesdropper dials the number of the phone to which this device is attached. By blowing a small harmonica, the device is activated and the phone is prevented from ringing. Once the device has been activated, it will pick up all sounds in the room in which the rigged phone is located.

Perhaps the most frightening aspect of this particular device, other than its existence, is that there is absolutely no distance limitation to hamper its operation. For example, such a device could be installed in a phone in Washington, D.C., be activated, and be used to eavesdrop from Honolulu, Hawaii. In short the privacy intruder can be 5,000 miles away and still accomplish his invasion.

Another device produced by the same manufacturer was a small transmitter that automatically shut itself off when there was no sound in its vicinity. If such a device were placed in a room, it would automatically deactivate when the occupants departed (thus conserving the battery that powers it) and automatically activate (upon their return) when the key would "click" in the lock. Such a device can operate continuously for 20 hours, but with its built-in power conservation it can be useful for weeks.

Finally the subcommittee was given a look into the future. Research in electronics has developed what is technically known as a laser.[55] The laser emits a highly powerful beam of light. Methods have already been developed whereby the beam can be modulated with telephone or television signals.

When such a device is further developed an eavesdropper or an agent for "Big Brother" could beam this undetectable beam of light onto a window in the distance, arrange to have it reflected back and thereby pick up the conversation and actions taking place in the room.

Various devices were also shown that have improved upon the old technique of wiretapping. Now, instead of having to locate a hidden interception point, devices can be placed that intercept the phone conversation and broadcast it to a radio receiver where it can be audited or recorded. The obvious advantage here is the absence of the physical limitations imposed by wires running from the intercepted line to the listening post. With the new device, the wiretapper can place his device on the line he wishes to tap and retire to the comfort of his own den to listen to the conversations, no matter if his den is located some distance away.[56]

The next item demonstrated was a stylish attaché case which disguised a small broadcasting and recording studio. This highly efficient and sophisticated piece of equipment sells for around $1,400 and has been purchased in quantity by several Federal agencies over the past 5 years.[57] The manufacturer of this attaché case readily admitted the need for legislation to control abusive use of his product.[58]

This terminated the first day of hearings. The effect was to establish beyond a reasonable doubt that electronic snooping and wiretapping gear was readily available to anyone who wished to purchase and use it. The ease with which devices could be concealed or disguised,[59] the ease of purchasing them, and the awesome efficiency and effectiveness of the gear proved that it is now time that Congress legislated in this area in order to either provide strict controls on the use of this gear or abolish its use entirely.[60]

---

[51] This phenomenon of Government growth with its dangers to a free society was recognized almost two decades ago by Mr. Justice Murphy, *Oklahoma Press Pub. Co.* v. *Walling*, 327 U.S. 186, 218 (1946) (dissenting opinion).

[52] E.g., Internal Revenue Code of 1954, sec. 7602. The summons power of the IRS is one of the most extensive and comprehensive tools that the Government has in its arsenal of information-gathering weapons. In regard to detrimental effects such a broad power of inquiry may occasion, note the following statements of Mr. Justice Murphy:

"Perhaps we are too far removed from the experiences of the past to appreciate fully the consequences that may result from an irresponsible though well-meaning use of the subpena power. To allow a nonjudicial officer, unarmed with judicial process, to demand the books and papers of an individual is an open invitation to abuse of that power. It is no answer that the individual may refuse to produce the material demanded. Many persons have yielded solely because of the air of authority with which the demand is made, a demand that cannot be enforced without subsequent judicial aid. Many invasions of private rights thus occur without the restraining hand of the judiciary ever intervening." *Oklahoma Press Pub. Co.* v. *Walling*, supra note 51, at 218–219.

[53] "Hearings on Invasions of Privacy," supra note 36, pt. 1.

[54] Id. at 22–25.

[55] "Laser" stands for light amplification by stimulated emission by radiation. More simply it's a light generator. Id. at 21.

[56] Hearings on Invasions of Privacy, supra note 36, pt. 1. The TLT–6 telephone line transmitter will operate on batteries about 50 hours. See also, testimony of the Chief of Intelligence, Pittsburgh, Pa., July 14, 1965.

[57] Id. at 62.

[58] Id. at 63.

[59] A private detective from San Francisco, versed both in the offensive and defensive use of electronic bugs, testified that he could "bug" an office or home if he had access to the room for a period of 2 to 5 minutes or less. Id. at 19.

[60] It should be noted that the electronic snooping industry has branched out into the field of counterintrusion equipment or "sweeping" devices. These devices detect and eliminate "bugs." Id. at 39–44, 51–53. The invention of countermeasures spurs inventions of more sophisticated, undetectable "bugs." The consequence is a vicious circle.

Investigative practices involving the mail

The investigation moved into a new area of inquiry. Since 1893 the Post Office Department has engaged in the practice of placing "covers" on American citizens' mail.[61] While it is asserted that no mail has been opened pursuant to a mail cover, it was determined that a complete inquiry into the uses, techniques, authority, and legality of this practice was necessary if the privacy of our citizens was to be fully protected.

In the case of *Ex Parte Jackson*[62] the Supreme Court brought first-class mail under protection of the fourth amendment. Mr. Justice Field speaking for the majority of the Court stated: "Letters and sealed packages of this kind in the mail are fully guarded from examination and inspection . . . as if they were retained by the parties forwarding them in their own domiciles. The Constitutional guarantee of the right of the people to be secure in their papers against unreasonable searches and seizures extends to their papers, thus closed against inspection, wherever they may be. Whilst in the mail, they can only be opened and examined under the like warrant, issued upon similar oath or affirmation, particularly describing the thing to be seized, as is required when papers are subjected to search in one's own household. No law of Congress can place in the hands of officials connected with the postal service any authority to invade the secrecy of letters and such sealed packages in the mail; and all regulations adopted as to mail matter of this kind must be in subordination to the great principle embodied in the fourth amendment of the Constitution.[63]

In two subsequent cases, the courts of appeals for the second and third circuits had opportunities to examine the legality of mail covers. While these cases have been repeatedly cited as judicial recognition of the legality and constitutionality of mail covers,[64] that exact issue was never really before either the courts of appeals or the Supreme Court.

In *United States* v. *Costello*,[65] the defendant tried to stop the admission of evidence on the grounds that it was illegally obtained in violation of the laws of the United States.[66] The Court did not allow this defense to stand and admitted the evidence. In ruling on the admissibility of the evidence, the Court did not reach the issue of the legality or constitutionality of mail covers. No opinion was expressed on that issue. Rather, the Court held that mail covers did not constitute an obstruction or delay of the mails within the meaning of statutory provisions making such action a crime.[67]

The other decision that concerned the use of mail covers got no closer to the exact issue of the legality of mail covers. The third circuit court of appeals held that postal regulations are not violated when information obtained from a mail cover is turned over to the Justice Department.[68]

The authority for the legality of mail covers relied on by postal officials is found in two propositions: (1) Mail covers are legal because they do not constitute an obstruction or delay of the mail, in violation of certain sections of title 18 of the United States Code; (2) mail covers are legal because they do not violate postal regulations.

The first proposition is useless as precedent for the legality of mail covers because there was in fact no delay or obstruction of the mails in the Costello case. Thus the cover could not violate laws against obstruction or delay of the mails. Such a decision does not settle the broader question of whether mail covers per se are unconstitutional as an invasion of privacy or an illegal search (issues not raised before the court); or, whether if there was any evidence of actual obstruction or delay of the mail because of the cover,[69] would that be sufficient to place the cover in violation of the applicable laws.

The second proposition is of less precedential value than the first. To say that mail covers specifically authorized by postal regulations do not violate other postal regulations hardly expresses judicial recognition, other than upon a most implied foundation, of the overall legality and constitutionality of the covers.

The Post Office Department has also relied on the decision in *Ex Parte Jackson*[70] in defending mail covers. The decision is cited to show the Supreme Court "strongly indicated" that it is proper to examine the outside of sealed letters and to take cognizance of what appears thereon. The trouble with this argument is that the Court's indication is mere dictum. Furthermore, while it may be proper to examine the outside of a letter and determine what is there, it does not follow that the information gained by such activity should or could be used against the addressor or addressee. The sender of a letter only consents to the reading of the address, etc., for purposes of delivering the mail.

Taking a position that there is at least no law specifically prohibiting the use of mail covers, what abuses or potential abuses of this technique dictate either its abolishment or rigid control by legislation?

Repeated assertions that mail covers are used only against fugitives and criminals were made by postal officials.[71] This limitation on the use of covers was also asserted to be rigidly enforced and controlled.[72] Yet, despite these assertions, the committee documented the following questionable uses of mail covers.

Correspondence between a lawyer and his client is subject to mail cover. The family of a suspect, wife, children, or other relatives engaged in no other criminal activity than being related to a possible suspect, also could have their mail covered. Correspondence between doctors and patients, priests and penitents, and husband and wife could be subject to mail covers. Regardless of the obvious inconsistency of protecting the oral or other communications made during a confidential relationship, the communications made by means of mailed correspondence were not immune from probing investigations.

Another difficulty with mail covers is its very secrecy and surreptitious character. Not only are mail covers placed in secret, their duration and scope are kept secret, the information obtained thereby is not disclosed in court after the criminal is indicted, and no records are kept after 2 years.[73] The list of names of those whose mail is subject to cover runs to about 12,000 a year, but this list is also kept secret.[74]

The subcommittee is also concerned over whether or not the mail subject to the cover is opened.[75] Assurances were given that mail is not opened. However, testimony before the subcommittee, as well as many letters of irate citizens, while not proving that mail has been opened pursuant to a cover, has left the subcommittee with an uneasy feeling that it is all too possible that some overzealous Federal agent would not be above such action[76] or perhaps candling a letter in some fashion.[77] The shroud of secrecy surrounding mail covers adds to the subcommittee's uneasiness.

Mail levies

On April 13, 1965, postal officials were called to testify on their knowledge of the use of "mail levies" by the Internal Revenue Service.[78] In this instance the mail is not used to further an investigation but to collect taxes. First-class mail is actually opened, and the contents seized by IRS agents.

Once again, as with the use of mail covers, the subcommittee asked what legal authority the Post Office Department and the IRS relied upon to authorize the use of these mail levies. Once again the legal authority for such a practice was based upon a very weak foundation.

The IRS based its authority to levy mail on the largest collections of legal nonsequiturs ever gathered by an official body. In a memorandum dated April 7, 1965,[79] the legal department at the IRS detailed their authority to open and seize first-class mail.

The argument which follows defies rules of logic. The Internal Revenue Code provides what property shall be subject to levy in order to collect delinquent taxes.[80] The same section contains specific exemptions for certain property that is immune from the levy power. First-class mail is not explicitly within these exemptions. Thus by not including first-class mail in the exemptions Congress intended it to be subject to levy. Being subjected to levy, the mail could be seized and sold. To be seized and sold the mail had to be opened.

---

[61] A mail cover is the secret process by which the information on the outside of a piece of mail, e.g., the address and return address and postmark, is noted and recorded. Letter from Louis J. Doyle, General Counsel of the Post Office Department, to Senator EDWARD V. LONG, July 17, 1962, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 4, pp. 4964–4965.

[62] 96 U.S. 727 (1877).

[63] Id. at 733.

[64] Hearings on Invasions of Privacy, supra, note 36, pt. 1 at 67–68; letter from Louis J. Doyle, General Counsel of the Post Office Department, to Senator EDWARD V. LONG, July 17, 1962, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 4, pp. 4964–4965.

[65] 255 F. 2d 876 (2d Cir. 1958), cert. denied, 357 U.S. 937 (1958).

[66] 18 U.S.C. secs. 1701–1703 (1958).

[67] 255 F. 2d at 882. It would indeed be difficult for a court to find that Federal agents had engaged in criminal activities. Such a ruling would have had to be made as incidental to the case before the court, since the substance of Costello's defense was in fact that agents had violated the criminal laws of obstructing or delaying the mail.

[68] *United States* v. *Schwartz*, 283 F. 2d 107 (3d Cir. 1960), cert. denied, 364 U.S. 942 (1961).

[69] The subcommittee has received countless complaints from irate citizens that their mail has been delayed and even misdirected. Pursuant to these complaints some investigations have been carried out.

[70] 96 U.S. 727 (1877).

[71] Hearings on the Invasions of Privacy, supra note 36, pt. 1, at 67–69, 77, 83, 227.

[72] Id. at 68, 228.

[73] For the problems this poses to a defendant in preparing his defense or challenging the authenticity or admissibility of evidence see the testimony concerning a case in Kansas City, Mo. Id. at 70–80.

[74] Letter of John Gronouski, Postmaster General, to Senator EDWARD V. LONG, Feb. 19, 1965. Id. at 97.

[75] Only authorized officers having a search warrant or an employee in the dead letter office may legally open 1st class mail. *Ex parte Jackson*, 96 U.S. 727 (1877); 39 U.S.C. 4057 (Supp. II, 1961).

[76] Hearings on Invasions of Privacy, supra note 36. Cf. Testimony of Julius November, April 13, 1965.

[77] Hearings on Invasion of Privacy, supra note 36, pt. 1, at 212. Federal agents have not hesitated to ignore Federal and State laws on certain other occasions involving wiretaps or trespass. Such a record does not bespeak safety of the mails if agents deem it necessary to an investigation to open and read a person's mail to gain leads or evidence.

[78] The levy power of the IRS is set forth in Internal Revenue Code of 1954, sec. 6421.

[79] Letter from Mitchell Rogovin to Bernard Fensterwald, Jr., chief counsel, Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Apr. 7, 1965.

[80] Internal Revenue Code of 1954, sec. 6343.

It would be less difficult to follow this legal labyrinth, if it did not fly in the face of constitutional guarantees expressed in *Ex Parte Jackson*,[81] that first-class mail could only be opened after a search warrant was obtained that complied with the requirements of the fourth amendment. The IRS, however, did seize first-class mail and sold its contents in the face of three criminal statutes containing severe penalties for opening or interfering with the mails,[82] in the face of the Post Office Department's much vaunted official policy of the mail's sacredness and inviolability,[83] and in the face of the absurdity arrived at by drawing the argument to its logical limits that the delinquent taxpayer's blood could be seized and sold since it is not specifically exempted either.

It is valid statutory construction to include matters within the purview of a statute which are not specifically exempted. Yet, to found an unconstitutional and otherwise criminal act upon one small guide in construing statutes takes more temerity than insight.[84]

Moreover, not only is there less than clear authority to levy on mails, but the IRS violated its own statute by forwarding some of the mail that was purely personal or of no monetary worth.[85]

The IRS has to collect taxes. It may be that they have to use severe methods at times in doing so. But this is no excuse for violating the sanctity of the mail or justifying such violation with an argument having no stronger niche in the law than a legal skyhook.[86]

Surely Congress did not authorize the prostitution of citizens' rights so that tax collecting can be made easier and more efficient.

Observation galleries, Communist political propaganda, and pornography

The Post Office Department was queried on other questionable practices dating back for some time.[87]

In the major post offices around the country observation galleries or peepholes are used to observe employees while working and while attending to personal matters. These galleries are equipped with one-way glass which allow postal inspectors to view employees without being seen. Their use is stated to be limited to the protection of the sanctity of the mails.

Despite the obvious "big brother" quality of these galleries, the post office continues to use them. However, the more intrusive characteristics have been eliminated.[88] Little comment is necessary other than to state that these galleries represent just one more instance of official snooping. Whether their use should be entirely banned by legislation will depend on the effectiveness of the new regulations and the reoccurrence of abuses in the future.

For several years, the Post Office Department in conjunction with the Bureau of Customs has administered a program designed to censure certain foreign political propaganda.[89] This program was administered pursuant to statutory directives.[90]

The Post Office Department, after the Bureau of Customs determined that certain mail was Communist political propaganda,[91] would hold the mail; notify the addressee; and ask him whether he wished the propaganda to be forwarded or returned to the sender. If the addressee wished to receive his mail and notified the Post Office Department to that effect, his name was placed on a list of those desiring to receive Communist political propaganda.

Two suits (one in New York and the other in California) sought an adjudication as to the legality of this program and the constitutional provisions permitting the program. The lower court in New York upheld the constitutionality of the program; the California court struck down both the program and the statute.[92] Both cases were reviewed by the Supreme Court in a single opinion.

In *Lamon* v. *Postmaster General*[93] the Court held the program and the statute unconstitutional. The Post Office Department has since dropped the whole affair.[94]

Another program administered by the Post Office Department is the control of smut mail or pornography.[95] Pursuant to statutory directive the Post Office Department has conducted various degrees of censorship over articles going through the mails.[96] Once again, in order to receive his mail, the citizen has to state something to the effect that he wants to receive pornographic literature.

The intrinsic evil in both of these situations, i.e., censorship of political propaganda and censorship of pornographic literature, is that there is a prior determination by some unreachable bureaucrat that this or that is proper or improper reading material for United States citizens. The danger of such predetermination exists in its threat to the first amendment guarantees of freedom of the press and freedom of speech.[97] The danger is greater because of the intrinsic limitations of censorship and the personal predilections of the censor.[98] To add to the problem recent Supreme Court cases have made it impossible for anyone other than the Court to determine what is or is not obscene,[99] and the statute itself is outdated and in need of revision.[100]

The author is not in favor of political propaganda that distorts truth or prints outright untruths. Nor is the author interested in promoting the sale of smut. What is important here is the freedom of all citizens to exercise their rights to read, speak, and promote the ideas or thoughts they deem necessary or worthwhile. No one person is sufficiently omniscient to judge what is or is not obscene or distorted. The American people are not so naive or incompetent that they need "big brother" to dictate what is worthwhile to read or to specify what is truth. As Mr. Justice Brandeis stated:

"Those who won our independence * * * believed that freedom to think as you will and to speak as you think are means indispensable to the discovery and spread of political truth; that without free speech and assembly discussion would be futile; that with them, discussion affords ordinarily adequate protection against the dissemination of noxious doctrine, that the greatest menace to freedom is an inert people; that public discussion is a political duty; and that this should be a fundamental principle of the American Government.[1]"

Surely this Nation is wise enough and courageous enough to allow the expression of ideas repulsive to its sense of decency or dedication without pursuing a reckless and dangerous course of arbitrary censorship. Surely this Nation does not wish to trade the challenge and work of remaining alert to half-truths, lies, and worthless literature for the dubious and emaciating security of official seals of approval. The vigilance that is the price of freedom should not be readily relinquished by any citizen. It may be easier for "big brother" to take the watch; it may also be quite imprudent and costly to our heritage of freedom.

Protecting the health of the Nation

The Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has purchased various units of electronic snooping gear.[2] In addition FDA agents have used various other means to invade the citizens' right of privacy and have committed acts unbecoming Federal agents.[3]

In August 1962, two FDA agents, pursuant to their duty to conduct investigation of firms dealing in the health area, visited the American Dietaids Co. in New York. During the course of the inspection a tape recorder concealed on one of the agents malfunctioned. This caused the recorder to emit a whirring noise. The firm's representative immediately objected to the use of the recorder, terminated the inspection, and demanded that the FDA agents hand over the tape. The FDA inspectors refused and left the firm's premises. Later American Dietaids filed suit against the FDA and the HEW.

Relief was requested in the form of an injunction against further use of concealed recorders during an inspection, the production of the tapes, and a declaratory order that the FDA had no right to use such recorders as their use violated section 704(a) of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

---

[81] 96 U.S. at 733.

[82] 18 U.S.C. 1701–1703 (1958).

[83] Hearings on Invasions of Privacy, supra note 36, pt. 1 at 67.

[84] These statutory construction principles are of course only guides and not binding upon the courts. 50 Am. Jur. Statutes secs. 223–224.

[85] Internal Revenue Code of 1954, sec. 6331.

[86] Public Law 89–44, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (June 21, 1965), passed as a rider to the excise tax cut amendments with the result of a present curtailment of mail levies.

[87] Hearings on Invasions of Privacy, supra note 36, at 69–75, 100–107.

[88] Id. at 105.

[89] Letter from Louis J. Doyle, General Counsel, Post Office Department, to Charles H. Helein, assistant counsel to Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Jan. 29, 1965; letter from Fred B. Smith, Acting General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, to Bernard Fensterwald, Jr., chief counsel to Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Feb. 19, 1965. Id. at 181, 184.

[90] 76 Stat. 840 (1962), 39 U.S.C. 4008 (1958).

[91] For the definition of what constitutes political propaganda, the Customs Bureau used the one found in sec. 1(j) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 611(j).

[92] *Lamont* v. *Postmaster General*, 229 F. Supp. (S.D N.Y. 1964); *Heilburg* v. *Fixa*, 236 F. Supp. 405 (S.D. Calif. 1964).

[93] 381 U.S 301 (1965).

[94] Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska, the original author of sec. 4008, is preparing to introduce a new bill in light of the Supreme Court decision.

[95] Since much of this material comes from abroad the Customs Bureau coordinates its program with Post Office Department's program. Letters, supra note 89.

[96] 46 Stat. 688 (1930) 19 U.S.C. 1305a (1958). This applies only to foreign obscene mail and does not authorize domestic ownership.

[97] U.S. Constitution amend. I; *Whitney* v. *California*, 274 U.S. 357 (1927); *Gitlow* v. *New York*, 268 U.S. 652 (1925).

[98] Hearings on Invasions of Privacy, supra note 36, pt. 1 at 306.

[99] *Jacobellis* v. *Ohio*, 378 U.S. 184 (1964); *A Quantity of Copies of Books* v. *Kansas*, 378 U.S. 205 (1964).

[100] 19 U.S.C., sec. 1305a, forbids importation of contraceptives. This makes the statute obsolete in that Federal and State agencies now dispense such devices, and the Supreme Court has granted constitutional protection to their use. Cf. Hearings on Invasions of Privacy, supra note 36, at 173.

[1] 274 U.S. at 375 (concurring opinion).

[2] Hearings on Invasions of Privacy, supra note 36, at 61–62.

[3] Hearings on Invasions of Privacy, supra note 36. Testimony of the activities of the Food and Drug Administration occurred on Apr. 27, 28, 29, and June 7, 1965.

The court denied all relief. The Court of Appeals affirmed and the Supreme Court denied certiorari.[4]

In September of 1962, the FDA issued a directive banning the use of concealed recorders in factory inspections.[5] Testimony before the subcommittee raised a question as to whether this directive was being followed. The FDA maintains that it has been.

In November of 1962[6] and again in September of 1963,[7] tape recorders were used against persons under investigation by the FDA. In the 1962 case an FDA official attempted to hide a tape recorder in the closet of a hotel lecture hall. In the 1963 case (the testimony is not exact) it seems a concealed recorder was used in the office or warehouse of a firm being inspected by FDA agents.

Whether or not the FDA uses concealed tape recorders in factory inspections is of little consequence. To ban their use in factory inspection yet continue their use in other instances is at best a nice distinction completely ignoring the fundamental principle at stake. The people under investigation by the FDA are generally businessmen, not criminal fugitives, potential tax cheats, or bribers. The inspection is conducted pursuant to a purely regulatory program. The need of surreptitious recording equipment thus only brands the people subjected to their use as devious plotters, conspirators, or criminals. Such is not the case, and even if it were, there has been no showing that the recordings have produced any evidence or even leads of possible criminal or civil violation of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Balancing the right of the businessmen to their privacy and dignity against the questionable utility of these devices leaves the latter in poor light.

Another case in which the FDA used electronic gear was the case involving the sale of a milk substitute. The FDA had taken the position that the product did not have sufficient protein content to comply with the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. In an endeavor to obtain evidence that agents of the firm producing the milk substitute were in fact promoting its sale and distribution, seven FDA agents and one female undercover operative descended upon a supermarket located in a midwestern suburb. Here with the aid of a highly sophisticated piece of eavesdropping equipment one FDA agent and the female operative entered the store and attempted to record the spiel of two part-time employees of the company. Both employees were schoolteachers. Neither was displaying or promoting the product at the time of the raid. The attempt to record failed miserably.

The FDA agent could have easily asked the employees if they were selling the product and received a proper response. Instead, the agents chose, in the best James Bond tradition, to use subterfuge and surreptitious eavesdropping equipment in their endeavor to obtain evidence.[8]

It can be validly asked why all of this "cops and robbers" was deemed necessary. Why was taxpayers' $1,400 spent on a piece of eavesdropping equipment that was used against two schoolteachers?[9] Why did agents and an undercover operative have to accompany the investigating officer?

The next instance in which constitutional rights were violated and the privacy of citizens ignored is probably the most bizarre episode to come to light in some time.

In January of 1963, the FDA staged a raid on the Founding Church of Scientology located in Washington, D.C.[10] With the assistance of 14 or so U.S. marshals, with the Metropolitan Police cordoning off the street, and with the press and photographers standing by, the FDA, acting pursuant to a libel of information,[11] seized over 100 devices used in the confessional practices of the church and much of the church's literature. That day an area paper carried the story that the FDA had broken up a "cult."[12]

Such severe tactics could only be justified if the Scientologists were not in fact a church, and if the law that they were alleged to have violated prohibited some base crime.

In fact the charge against the Scientologists was that they were using a health device that was mislabeled.[13] The case is presently in litigation but only after an unexplained 2-year delay. The Scientologists were in fact found to be a church.

Did the FDA smash a notorious and clandestine organization of fraud and deceit? Or did the FDA blithely raid a bona fide church, seize its property and literature, brand it a cult, and otherwise heap ridicule and shame upon its members? It may be profitable for the FDA agents to read the first amendment.

It is also interesting to note that 2 days after the raid the Scientologists resumed their religious practices. It may be valid speculation as to how the FDA justifies their forceful conduct one day and their total indifference the next.[14]

The hearing record is replete with similar instances of invasions of privacy perpetrated by FDA agents. The citizens involved here were not fugitives or criminals but ordinary businessmen, churchmen, and schoolteachers. When law enforcement officials make indiscriminate use of this gear as well as their awesome policing power, the imminent danger to the privacy of all our citizens is patent. The immediate threat of a police state is clearly presented.

Collecting taxes

Recently completed hearings with regard to the IRS further document the rush toward 1984. It would serve no useful purpose to detail the instances of invasions of privacy and the disregard for constitutional rights documented for the record. A list of activities by IRS special agents should suffice to demonstrate the present situation.

Wiretapping, breaking and entering, impersonating an officer, possession and use of burglar tools, and lock picking complete the list of activities engaged in by the IRS agents. Maintenance of a wiretapping and snooping school in the national office of the IRS, use of "bugged" conference rooms (also equipped with one-way glass) in which taxpayers or suspects are interviewed, "bugging" an attorney's office, illegal seizure of records, denying transcripts of interviews to taxpayers unless they sign them, denying taxpayers the privilege of having their own stenographer in interviews are other questionable tactics of IRS agents. In addition, tax returns and bank records of individuals are pulled and examined, allegedly when taxpayers do not cooperate.[15]

Many statements[16] were made both in and out of the hearings that these actions took place while the agents were pursuing the IRS's part in the Justice Department's Organized Crime Drive program (OCD). Statements were also made that the investigation of the subcommittee was in fact "killing"[17] the OCD program.

Such statements are irrelevant. This country is plagued with criminal syndicates and organized and disorganized criminal elements. These criminals must be apprehended and put away from responsible elements of society. But committing other crimes in the name of law enforcement should not be done by those officers sworn to uphold the law and defend the Constitution. If these agents can, in their overzealousness, commit a crime and then justify it by showing they were after hoods, there is no American today who can be sure that he will not have his phone tapped, his home or office secretly entered, or his activities and associations placed under surveillance. When this happens, little security and less liberty will be left to the U.S. citizen. Such a state of affairs makes a mockery of this Nation's stand against totalitarianism and dictatorships.[18]

---

[4] *American Dietaids Co.* v. *Celebrezze*, 317 F. 2d 658 (2d Cir. 1963), cert. denied, 375 U.S. 986 (1963).

[5] Memorandum from the Director of the Bureau of Regulatory Compliance of FDA to all field offices, Sept. 20, 1962.

[6] Hearings on Invasions of Privacy, supra note 36. Cf. Testimony of Milton A. Bass, attorney at law, New York, N.Y., June 7, 1965.

[7] Hearings on Invasions of Privacy, supra note 36. Cf. Testimony of Kirkpatrick W. Dilling, attorney at law, Chicago, Ill., Apr. 29, 1965.

[8] *United States* v. *R.G.B. Laboratories, Inc.*, No. 21802–2, W.D. Mo., Mar. 2, 1965 The defendant was acquitted. During the course of the trial, the district judge expressed his belief that the Department of Justice should look into possible perjury charges against the main FDA witness. It has been brought to the author's attention that the Department of Justice did look into the matter but no action has yet been taken.

[9] This equipment was the same equipment that was deemed so dangerous by its own manufacturer as to warrant legislation to control its use. Hearings on Invasions of Privacy, supra note 36, pt. 1 at 63.

[10] The Washington Evening Star, Jan. 4, 1963, p. 1, col. 2.

[11] This process is an anachronistic and archaic leftover of the law of admiralty. It was intended to be used to seize guards aboard vessels. The urgency of seizure was created by the transiency of the storage place of the goods.

[12] *Supra* note 110.

[13] The device was an E-Meter which was similar to a polygraph. It was not used as a health cure device but as an aid to cleaning the consciences of the church's members. Hearings on Invasions of Privacy, supra note 36. Cf. Testimony of Wayne Rohrer, April 29, 1965.

[14] Letter from Commissioner George P. Larrick to Senator Edward V. Long, June 15, 1965. Commissioner Larrick informed the author that he had no knowledge that the Scientologists had resumed their activities.

[15] Internal Revenue Code of 1954, sec. 7602. The Internal Revenue Service summons is utilized for four purposes as provided in sec. 7602: (1) ascertaining the correctness of any return, (2) making a return where none has been made, (3) determining liability of any person for any internal revenue tax or the liability at law or in equity of a transferee or fiduciary of any person in respect of any internal revenue tax, or (4) collecting any such liability. *United States* v. *Powell*, 379 U.S. 48 (1964), has interpreted this statute to give near inquisitorial powers to the IRS. Namely it resolved a conflict among the courts of appeals in determining that probable cause was not necessary for the issuance of a summons.

[16] Hearings on Invasions of Privacy, supra note 36. Cf. Testimony of the Attorney General and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue Service, July 13, 1965.

[17] N.Y. Times, July 18, 1965, p. 1, col. 2.

[18] The role of the IRS agents in the drive against organized crime is questionable from a policy viewpoint. The IRS's purpose is to collect taxes. The FBI supposedly investigates criminal activities. Use of the IRS in crime drives evinces a philosophy to get the man at any cost. Such a philosophy is an extremely dangerous one. In this regard, Mr. Justice Jackson in a concurring opinion in *McDonald* v. *United States*, 335 U.S. 451 (1948), pointed out that overzealous drives

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND PROPOSALS

Corrective steps

Already much has been done to further develop and protect the citizens' right of privacy. Much remains to be done, but the following list is indicative of the increasing awareness of Government officials, the press, and the public of the necessity for assiduous and vigilant protection of their privacy and other constitutional rights.

The Postmaster General has cooperated and is remedying some of the unfortunate situations in his Department. An order was issued to block out peepholes overlooking areas in which employees were engaged in purely personal activities.[19]

New and more rigid controls have been issued in regard to the use of mail covers. Basically these regulations limit their use to investigations of crimes normally constituting a felony. Only the Chief Postal Inspector and district postal inspectors can order mail covers to be placed and only in defined situations, and only upon compliance with specific procedures. Indiscriminate use of mail covers that invade normally confidential relationships has been curbed. Records will be kept for a period long enough to make them available when needed in court or administrative proceedings. Definite time limits have been set on the duration which a mail cover can be in effect.[20]

Additionally, a public understanding exists between the subcommittee and the Postmaster General that if these new regulations are ignored, violated, or abolished, the subcommittee will renew its push to outlaw mail covers completely.[21]

Mail levies, the practice of IRS opening first-class mail to levy on assets of delinquent taxpayers, has been stopped. Legislation is on the books which specifically exempts first-class mail from the levy powers of the IRS.[22]

While the officials of most departments have ultimately extended cooperation and pledges to remedy existing situations, no such action has been taken by the FDA officials. No new regulations or controls, or even investigations, have occurred. However, this situation may be improved by new legislation currently under study that would make the FDA a multimembered commission with definite time limitations on tenure and the imposition of other restrictions on the commission members. In this way new thinking and a broader perspective can be introduced to aid the fair, efficient, and effective administration of the drug laws.

The very compilation of the record of the hearings is valuable. It documents the dangers inherent when the bureaucrats become too impervious and too insulated from criticism or challenge. Violation of laws, intimidation, and harassment have been proven. Disregard and ignorance of constitutional rights have been brought before the public and Congress. All of this will set the basis for future comprehensive legislation.

The Commissioner of the IRS has pledged that he will conduct his own investigation and report fully to the public and Congress. Already, new orders have been issued that will aid in controlling the overzealousness of his agents.[23]

On July 15, 1965, the President publicly reaffirmed his ban on wiretapping and praised the efforts of the subcommittee as in the public interest.

With this record of achievement, the future should promise that more definite steps will be more easily taken to get to the heart of the problem of protecting privacy.

Legislation and review

The intention of the subcommittee is to continue the investigation until a complete picture is developed. This may take some time. However, the record is sufficient to give some general direction that future legislation should follow.

Initially, a comprehensive code regulating investigative techniques involving invasions of privacy presents a feasible means to remedy the existing violations and guard against future infringements. This code would attempt a broad definition of the right to privacy and the policy of Congress that such a right should be fully protected.

Wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping could either be banned outright or limited to specific urgent needs such as national defense, national security, or the investigation of major crimes.[24] Criminal and civil penalties would be imposed for violation of these rights. In addition the code would protect against intimidation or harassment by Federal agents.

Presently, there exist criminal statutes outlawing deliberate violations of certain constitutional rights of citizens.[25] However, these have been either ignored or only partially enforced. There is need for expansion and effective enforcement of these laws.

Further possible legislation which could be considered separately by Congress or incorporated into the code would set forth a code of conduct for Federal agents, with appropriate penalties for its violation. In addition specific requirements as to the education of agents in the constitutional rights of citizens could be provided.

It is believed that while most agents have had the legal principles pertaining to search and seizure[26] made available to them, this isolated, microscopic information is inadequate. Further and more comprehensive education is needed in the purpose and meaning, not only of the fourth amendment, but of the entire Bill of Rights.

Agents should be instructed that their primary responsibility is to prevent crimes and violations of law, not solely to convict people. This conviction psychology is imbued into the agent from his first association with an agency and ingrained while he remains there. All too often this conviction syndrome is generated by the publication of statistics aimed at proving the dedication and necessity of the agency. In short, compilation of self-serving statistics goads agents into all sorts of indiscretions. It remakes a protector of society into a menace to liberty, a law enforcement officer into a potential violator of the law himself.

More civilized standards than the number of convictions should not be impalatable to Congress or to the people. Rather than branding law enforcement as lax when the conviction rate falls, we should study the overall reduced rate of crime. Putting people behind bars by illegal or questionable methods is no deterrent to crime; indeed, it acts only as a spur to competition in criminal acts.

The increasing difficulties of law enforcement, while partially due to lack of manpower, lukewarm citizen support, low salaries, etc., are attributable to a more deep-seated dilemma. Basically, law enforcement officers are confused as to what is or is not within the permissible scope of their duties. The IRS agents on the one hand were issued a directive by the Treasury Department, which was in existence since 1938, that completely banned wiretaps. On the other hand, the national office of IRS conducted a wiretap and snooping school, and furnished the equipment and experts to place the taps. Little wonder agents winked at the ban against wiretaps. Little wonder they had no fear of prosecution or other disciplinary action being taken against them. Setting forth specific guidelines in this code of conduct, plus education and the imposition of appropriate sanctions for its violation should alleviate the confusion of Federal agents caused by such double standards.

Two major salutary effects could come from this legislation. One, the right of privacy will be given public recognition as the constitutional and basic human right that it is. Two, the professionalism, efficiency, effectiveness, and dignity of the Federal agent can be judged, assessed, and determined by his compliance or lack of compliance with the code.[27]

These hearings have also pinpointed the need for further investigation into subjects tangentially related to invasions of privacy. The legal process of libel of information should be reviewed. This process exists as an anachronism in the law and permits the skirting of protections in certain cases afforded by a fourth amendment search warrant.

The summons powers and jeopardy assessment powers of the IRS should be reviewed with a view toward limiting their use and providing safeguards against abuse.

On an overall scale, Congress should be more wary of granting too much power to agencies. Indiscriminate grants have led to abuse and a lessening of congressional powers of control. It is hoped that from this point on, when Congress delegates its powers it will provide safeguards against abuse and retain some supervisory control over its delegates.

Congress should take more of an interest in how its laws are administered. No law is

---

against criminals usually involve the small time criminals and petty violators of the law rather than the more vicious element. He states:

> While I should be human enough to apply the letter of the law with some indulgence to officers acting to deal with threats or crimes of violence which endanger life or security, it is notable that few of the searches found by this Court to be unlawful dealt with that category of crime. Almost without exception, the overzeal was in suppressing acts not malum in se but only malum prohibitum. Id. at 460.

[19] Hearings on Invasions of Privacy, supra note 36, pt. 1 at 247.

[20] 111 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 10, p. 13878.

[21] S. Rep. No. 973, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965); *Lamont* v. *Postmaster General*, 381 U.S. 301 (1965).

[22] Pub. L. No. 89–44, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (June 21, 1965).

[23] Letter from Commissioner of IRS to all criminal investigative personnel of IRS, June 29, 1965. Letter from Acting Secretary of Treasury to Senator EDWARD V. LONG, July 23, 1965. In substance both letters concerned use of investigative equipment and methods destructive of the individual's privacy and dignity and both stated the steps taken to prevent future infringements in this area.

[24] Legislation to a similar effect was proposed by the then Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. It was subjected to comprehensive analysis. Hearings on wiretapping, Eavesdropping and the Bill of Rights Before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 87th Cong., 1st sess., pts. 1–5 (1961).

[25] *Rhodes* v. *Graham*, 238 Ky., 225, 37 S.W. 2d 46 (1931). Plaintiff was granted damages for invasions of privacy by means of a wiretap.

[26] 18 U.S.C., sec. 2236 (1958).

[27] A cleaning house for complaints against tactics of Federal agents could possibly be established. The recently created administrative conference may be of aid here. Its major advantage is that it would be independent of the agency it was investigating and answerable to the President through its chairman. In 1952 the IRS set up its Inspection Division to check the integrity of its employees. The fact that no instances of wiretap were discovered or reported since its inspection is indicative of the ineffectiveness of a program to police police by police.

very effective or promotes social development unless it is properly administered. Laws today are being misconstrued, misread, or ignored by some of their administrators. It is Congress who represents the people; Congress must answer to the people. Delegating powers to bureaucrats who often answer to no one is not responsible representation of the people. If vigilance be the price of liberty, that price has to be paid by the Congress as well as by the people. Today we seem to be experiencing a vital lack of vigilance when law enforcement officials disobey the law and Congress allows liberty to be lessened by administrative fiat.

CONCLUSIONS

If the privacy so necessary to the development of a free and independent people is to be preserved, our national lethargy and lack of knowledge must be countered. These hearings and the legislation that can be created pursuant to them are steps in the right direction. But more is demanded; more is needed before we as a nation can reach a plateau of civilized existence above that on which we now abide. Citizen concern and assistance is vitally needed at this time to foster and nurture the neophyte strides made to protect our privacy and our heritage. Without them, this country is threatened with degradation into a comatose state of dependence and conformity. Encroachments on freedom begin on a small insidious scale. Mr. Justice Frankfurter saw this danger as exemplified by police excess in the name of law enforcement and his keen perception pinpointed the aspects of that danger: "[W]e are in danger of forgetting that the Bill of Rights reflects experience with police excesses. It is not only under Nazi rule that police excesses are inimical to freedom. It is easy to make light of insistence on scrupulous regard for the safeguards of civil liberties when invoked on behalf of the unworthy. It is too easy. History bears testimony that by such disregard are the rights of liberty extinguished, heedlessly at first, then stealthily, and brazenly in the end." [28]

Would not all Americans feel more secure and justly proud of their democracy if the following were to become reality and no simple aphorism: "The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the force of the Crown. It may be frail—its roof may shake—the wind may blow through it—the storm may enter, the rain may enter—but the King of England cannot enter—all his force dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement." [29]

THE NEW YORK TIMES AND JAMES RESTON ON THE VIETNAM WAR

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam President, some of the most perceptive writing on the Vietnam war has been done by the editorial staff of the New York Times and its distinguished columnist, Mr. James Reston.

I ask unanimous consent that two important editorials published in the Times of January 21 and 23, together with columns by Mr. Reston of the same dates, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1966]

TALKS WITH THE VIETCONG

Secretary General Thant's formula for an interim broadening of the Saigon government, to "take over the responsibility" of organizing self-determination in South Vietnam after the war, points to the heart of the problem of achieving a peaceful settlement. Despite Secretary Rusk's negative reaction to U Thant's suggestion and his almost exclusive emphasis on Hanoi, somehow a way must be found to get talks going between the South Vietnamese factions that are doing the bulk of the fighting on the ground.

President Johnson's plan for free elections, after a cease-fire, is itself a means of achieving a representative administration in Saigon prior to American withdrawal. In a recent statement by Ambassador Bohlen, the United States has indicated that it would accept the results of such an election even if it returned a dominant Communist faction. But the real issue is how the elections are to be organized.

Essentially, this is a question of the kind of interim government that will preside over the country, under international supervision, during the electoral campaign. The electoral campaign itself can only follow a cease-fire. But a cease-fire is likely to be achieved only after an agreement on the makeup of an interim government.

Proposals often have been made—including one by the United Nations Secretariat after the fall of Diem in 1963—that neutralist South Vietnamese leaders resident in Paris be brought home to form a new government and mediate between the warring factions. Talks between the generals ruling in Saigon and the Vietcong leadership—either directly or through intermediaries initially—would be another possible approach. There have been hints that the Vietcong would welcome the independence from Hanoi that such contacts might encourage.

The intransigent attitude of Air Vice Marshal Ky, the present Saigon Premier, does not necessarily rule out such talks. There have been repeated rumors in the past of contacts with the Vietcong on the part of South Vietnamese officers, Buddhist leaders, businessmen, and intellectuals. There would be little difficulty in finding intermediaries if the United States were prepared to encourage such exchanges. The aim of such talks could be to form either a neutral administration or a coalition in which the South Vietnamese Army, the Vietcong, the Buddhists, the Catholics, the Cao Dai, and other political elements would participate.

The attraction of such an approach has been increased by the numerous setbacks Communist China has suffered during the past year in projecting its influence beyond its borders from Indochina to Africa. Most of its programs of expansion or subversion have either failed or have been deflated.

The result, as Times Correspondent Seymour Topping reported the other day, has been to create an opportunity for the United States to deal with the war in Vietnam no longer on the basis of determining "the form or ideology of the Vietnamese nation, but the reestablishment in southeast Asia of peace, order and respect for borders." A Vietnam, independent from China, that respected the borders of its neighbors would be a Vietnam contained—and separated from the rest of southeast Asia by the neutral buffer states of Laos and Cambodia.

The most orderly way to deal with the whole problem would be another Geneva conference similar to that on Laos in 1962. That conference brought together the five great powers, the Indochina states and factions, the neighboring nations of southeast Asia and the countries which comprise the International Control Commission, India, Poland and Canada. The best method to clear the way for such a conference might well be a beginning of efforts to broaden the Saigon government—a move that might also stimulate Hanoi's interest in getting into the negotiating act.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1966]

THE VIETNAM DECISION

Failure of the Johnson peace offensive thus far to bring about formal negotiations with Hanoi inescapably raises the question: what course should the United States now follow?

Much depends on Washington's evaluation of Hanoi's ambiguous public and private replies and on the official estimate of how long it is safe to keep the bombers grounded. Is Hanoi holding out for concessions? Or is Hanoi seeking to avoid a conference out of the conviction that the United States will get tired and withdraw? President Johnson expressed the latter belief yesterday. But his conclusion from this remains unclear, since he also said: "The door of peace must be kept wide open."

Many factors counsel patience. The 2-month absence of North Vietnamese Army units from combat in South Vietnam—which may signal a Hanoi desire to continue the diplomatic exchanges—is one such factor. Far more important is the fact that the military balance in South Vietnam has been fundamentally transformed in the past year.

The decisive new element has been the ninefold buildup of American troops in South Vietnam to a strength of about 190,000. South Vietnamese armed forces, including militia and police, now exceed 635,000. With South Korean, New Zealand, and Australian units, there are upward of 850,000 men in the field. And the backing of American air and naval strength gives these forces devastating firepower and unparalleled mobility.

This buildup, in the words of President Johnson's state of the Union message, has put the enemy on notice that time is no longer on his side and that a Vietcong victory now is out of reach.

Meanwhile, it has become evident that the bombing of North Vietnam failed to achieve either of its original two objectives. It failed to slow down the infiltration of men and supplies, which increased as the bombing intensified. And it failed to bring Hanoi to the conference table. The bombing did force North Vietnam to turn from Peiping to Moscow for antiaircraft missiles and, even more important, for massive economic and technical aid. But this unexpected dividend argues for a continued suspension of the bombing, rather than for its resumption.

As White House security adviser McGeorge Bundy recently observed: "It has been made clear to us over a long period of time that the Soviet Government hopes there can be a peaceful settlement." And Moscow has also made it clear that peace efforts cannot be carried on while North Vietnam is being bombed.

The critical decision that confronts President Johnson, therefore, is not whether to resume the early bombing of the North—which even Republican leaders no longer press—but how to conduct the war in the South while continuing the probes for peace. The ground and air war in South Vietnam undoubtedly will resume fully after the Lunar New Year truce. What the President now must decide is whether to escalate that war in the south to a wholly new level by yielding to military requests for a doubling of American forces. Such a move would finally convert the struggle from a Vietnamese conflict into an American war against Asians.

A further large-scale buildup would not end the military stalemate in South Vietnam. As in the past, it would be matched by increased Vietcong recruiting, infiltration of additional North Vietnamese units and ultimately—if the ground war expanded into Laos, Cambodia and, perhaps, North Vietnam—by the entrance of Chinese troops into the conflict.

At present, American forces are secure in their coastal positions and cannot be involuntarily dislodged. General Gavin's recent advice, not to expand the war but to continue efforts to negotiate the peace, has the force of logic on its side.

---

[28] *Davis* v. *United States*, 328 U.S. 582, 597 (1946) (dissenting opinion).

[29] 15 Hansard, Parliament History of England 1307 (1753–1765).

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1966]

WASHINGTON: WHAT GREAT DEBATE?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—The process of debate in Washington, even on so solemn a business as risking war with a quarter of the human race, is an astonishing and depressing business.

No capital ever talked so much about "great debates" or had so few of them. The Senate has not been performing its constitutional function of "advise and consent" on the critical issues of foreign affairs during the pause in the war. It has been tugging and hauling on the President in a series of disjointed and unconnected statements, speeches, and television remarks, most of them made outside the Senate Chamber.

The opposition party did not launch a debate on the President's state of the Union message. It put on a television show featuring Senator DIRKSEN and Representative FORD in a recitation which differed wildly from most of the things they have said about the war in the past.

CHAOS IN THE CORRIDORS

Secretary of Defense McNamara went before the Senate Armed Services Committee today and when he and the Senators emerged from the privacy of the commitee chamber the scene was about as orderly as the end of a professional football game.

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL of Georgia told the crowding reporters that the general tone of McNamara's private remarks was that time was running out on the peace offensive. "Never even mentioned it," the Secretary said later.

No doubt the discussion inside the committee room was better, but ever since the start of the peace offensive the public statements have been a babble of disconnected shouts. One day a general comes back from Vietnam and calls for a resumption of the bombing in North Vietnam. The next a Senator offers his opinion that escalating the war now would be sheer madness.

Yet there was no reason why the two Houses of Congress could not have taken a week for a serious discussion of the President's state of the Union message. It was at least a clear picture of a perplexed man. It defined the dilemmas if not their solutions.

In any other democratic country the parliament would have regarded such a message at such a time by the head of the government as an invitation to a debate. The leader of the opposition in both houses would have replied at length, defined the areas of agreement and disagreement. Experts on both sides of the aisle would have talked on the aspects of the message they know best. And at the end of the debate, the leaders of the majority party would have tried to answer the questions raised.

THE MYSTIFYING CLARIFICATIONS

Such a procedure not only clarifies the feeling of a democratic Congress, but is often useful to the Government executives who finally have to make the decisions. But no such orderly clarifying procedure has been followed here.

It may be objected that a public debate in the midst of the peace offensive would dramatize the divisions in the country on Vietnam—they are being dramatized anyway—but there is no reason why the Government, if it fears this result, cannot debate the issue in private. This was done during the last war, and while there were the inevitable leaks, these did little damage.

The present situation is remarkable in a number of other ways. President Woodrow Wilson died believing that the power of the Senate was so great in the field of foreign affairs that it could virtually paralyze the President, but today the President alone can decide whether to renew the bombing or extend the pause, to raise or lower the level of violence on the allied side, to bomb Hanoi and mine the harbor of Haiphong or leave them alone, to attack the Soviet ships carrying supplies to the North Vietnamese or ignore them, without even listening to the Senate.

THE CHINA QUESTION

There has been no real debate on the China question, which lies behind the whole war. It is not even clear whether the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have increased the number of attacks on our positions since the start of the peace offensive, for the Pentagon has testified that the attacks have increased and the President has said they have decreased.

If the purpose of all this is to confuse the enemy, it must be a success—for the so-called debate is certainly confusing everybody else. The American people are entitled at such a time to a candid and searching discussion of the issues in the Congress assembled, but this is precisely the one thing they have not had.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1966.]

WASHINGTON: THE MIND OF ASIA

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 22.—The mind of Asia, in all its different manifestations, is a constant puzzle to our policymakers in Washington.

The Vietcong are not intimidated by our superior firepower and airpower: They just keep on coming. The people in the South Vietnamese villages seem to resent the bombing of their dead more than the bombing of the living. The brutality of the Vietnamese to their fellow countrymen they capture is almost beyond our comprehension.

THE INDONESIAN MASSACRE

Seldom a week passes now without some startling illustration of the point. Not so long ago, the Communists in Indonesia were demonstrating against the United States, apparently with the approval of the Sukarno government and the Indonesion people. Then came the brutal murder of five leading Indonesian generals and a vicious counterattack against the Communists.

Since then, over 100,000, not 1 but 100,000 people, have been murdered in Indonesia, not in bombings but in savage manhunts. Even Sukarno concedes that 87,000 people have disappeared in this barbaric slaughter, and the intelligence services here put the total at nearer 130,000.

Understanding the European mind in the past 30 years has been hard enough for officials in Washington, but Asia is something quite different. The North Vietnamese do not react to our peace offensive as we thought they might. The South Vietnamese have been very quiet about it, not because they approved, but because, knowing their countrymen, they didn't think it would succeed.

Yet the same officials who have constantly been surprised by developments in Asia since the war, who were wrong in their calculations on the North Vietnamese bombing, wrong in their estimates of the effect of the American military buildup, wrong on a whole succession of Saigon governments, and wrong on the effects of our successful monsoon campaign—these same officials are now being quite dogmatic again about China.

RUSK'S PARALLELS

Secretary of State Rusk is constantly drawing the parallel between the Nazi aggression in Europe and the Chinese aggression in Asia. His proposition is perfectly plain: China is the enemy. China must be stopped in this early phase of its aggressive expansion, just as the Nazis should have been stopped in the 1930's, and as the Soviets were stopped in Greece and Turkey, Persia and Berlin, after the last war.

He may be right, but then again he may not. The Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, who is Burmese and presumably knows as much about Asia as Lyndon Johnson, sees China today not as a rogue elephant but as a nervous wreck. Prime Minister Sato of Japan thinks China is primarily concerned about her problems of production at home, and is using the war as a threat of foreign invasion to get more work out of the poor Chinese people.

DIFFERING VIEWS

When a country has been treated as an outcast, an outlaw, and a culprit, said the Secretary General, referring to China, "it is apt to act in a certain way * * *. In such a delicate stage, countries will sometimes show certain emotions, certain strong reactions, certain rigidities, and even a certain arrogance * * *."

These two views of China are not necessarily contradictory. If countries, like individuals, can have "nervous breakdowns," as U Thant suggests, they can also be dangerous, as Secretary Rusk assumes, but surely there is room here for more modest analysis of China, lest we commit more and more power to more and more false assumptions.

TIME TO THINK

The Communists may or may not need more time to think anew about the future course of the war and bring up supplies for the purpose, but the Johnson administration could certainly use more time. It is not agreed about how to proceed. It has not yet solved its supply problems in Vietnam, and it is not yet clear about the extent of the China menace or who is going to help contain China if it does go mad.

What, then, is the hurry? There is no danger that the American command can be overcome. We are constantly patrolling the enemy supply lines and will know in advance if any concentration of force is being gathered. And there's nothing in the situation other than past tradition that forces us to act before we take time to think.

MY SCOUTING PAST, YOUR SCOUTING FUTURE: BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam President, of all the many fine organizations in our country which help to build youngsters' lives, few are more important, more constructive, or more inspiring than the Boy Scouts of America. America is truly indebted to over a million adult leaders who serve the Boy Scouts in individual troops, in headquarters, and in other capacities.

Many of our outstanding leaders in public and private life have had the happy privilege of serving as scoutmasters. One of the finest descriptions of the joys and opportunities of scoutmaster has been given by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

In the January 1966 issue of the magazine, Scouting, he gives recollections of his days as a scoutmaster in South Dakota in the 1930's. And he summarizes the significance of today's and tomorrow's Scout work. "My Scouting Past, Your Scouting Future" is his theme.

I believe that his article will be of interest not only to all those who have worked with the Boy Scouts, but to many other thinking citizens as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY SCOUTING PAST, YOUR SCOUTING FUTURE

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

Scouting is a joy—and a challenge. It is fun and fellowship, adventure and achievement, honor and patriotism.

That's how I felt when I was a Scout in Reverend Hartt's troop 24 back in the little town of Doland, S. Dak., and that's how I remember my later years as a scoutmaster of troop 6 in Huron, S. Dak. And that's how I feel about scouting today.

My visit last spring to the national headquarters of the Boy Scouts of America brought back many fond memories. There was a large picture of Scoutmaster HUMPHREY and seven of his Scouts, and there were momentoes of all the early B.S.A. heroes—men like Beard, Seton, West, and Baden-Powell.

Then there were all those wonderful Norman Rockwell paintings that so accurately depict the adventure and the integrity of the scouting program. And there was a photograph of our first national jamboree that made me recall that in 1935 I was all set to attend that remarkable gathering of youth in Washington, D.C., when a national polio epidemic forced its postponement until 1937.

Appropriately enough, Mrs. Humphrey shared my visit to your national headquarters, just as she had shared so many of my days as scoutmaster. Mrs. Humphrey—Muriel—always enjoyed the outdoors and the company of Scouts. She called them young Indians.

An honor guard of uniformed Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, and Explorers greeted us at national headquarters. How that colorful assortment of blue and gold, khaki, and green differed from my crop of boys in troop 6 back in Huron.

In those days our people were pretty down on their luck from dust storms and the depression. We had a rule that no one could have a new uniform, because we didn't want any boy to feel inadequate or inferior. So we passed around second-hand uniforms and tried to outfit each boy from the hand-me-downs of older brothers. We made our camping equipment, too—at least some of it.

Old troop 6 was versatile when it came to meetings. We didn't even start out as a church basement operation—the church budget, like everything else, was the victim of the depression and, therefore, too skimpy to allow for heating the basement.

We were sponsored by the Good Fellowship Class of the Methodist Church and my first meeting was held in the church's vestibule during a dust storm. Later on we met outside the church, in the basement of Humphrey's Drugstore, in my living room, and, on occasion, even in Muriel's living room.

Those were difficult and trying days. Money was scarce and church funds were even less available. But we finally did get heat for that church basement, even though it took a small conspiracy and a well-kept secret.

We announced a big troop bean feed and promoted it all over town. A real crowd turned out and shivered through the meal. We had, on purpose, neglected to warn the folks that the basement wasn't heated. After that bean feed, the church officials managed to have it heated for us.

That was in 1933. I served as scoutmaster for about 3 years. During that eventful time we took into our troop a few boys who today might be labeled juvenile troublemakers. In fact, some of them had been in a little trouble, but they were not bad boys. They simply needed guidance, activity, and work. And the Boy Scout troop offered these opportunities.

Working with the troop committee we found jobs for our boys. I hired two of them to work in the family drugstore and put them on their honor to do well and to keep out of trouble. Given a chance, they came through with flying colors.

Those were days when we took a firmer stand with our young people. I had an understanding with my Scouts that we weren't going to have any smoking. So, when I caught several of the boys red-handed, I told them, "You're through—beat it."

They were the most unhappy boys in the world and they started coming around my home every morning. Finally they got up enough courage to apologize and we took them all back into the troop—provided they abided by the rules.

Starting in 1935 I was a pretty busy person, what with my Scout meeting on Tuesday nights and courting Muriel on Thursday nights. Muriel was always a sort of assistant scoutmaster. Even in those early days before we were married she encouraged me to carry on my Scout work—apparently she was already learning to cooperate with the inevitable.

This was when Muriel earned the "fastest and best hamburger maker in South Dakota"—and those Scouts would eat them as fast as she could make them. They always preferred her cooking to mine, and no wonder.

Once on an overnight hike I decided to show the boys what a great cook I was. I prepared for them a simple desert—a sort of pudding of rice and raisins. I recall dropping a rather large portion of rice into a kettle of boiling water. The rice kept expanding. We wound up filling about every container in the camp with rice pudding. From that point on the Scouts of Troop 6 resolved to do their own cooking and leave their scoutmaster to other chores.

Sometimes I was worried about the quality of discipline in our troop. After all, eager, spirited young men are not easy to order about. But when the occasion required it, we would have good discipline. There was no need to be authoritarian or hard-fisted. Our discipline was based upon fellowship, friendship, and a sense of pride in the achievements of troop 6.

When I wanted the boys to do something they did it because they knew I wanted it done. It reflected upon the record of our troop. I always was able to be "one of the gang" without losing their respect. We worked together, played together, and camped together.

I did my Scouting work right with the boys, starting as a Second Class Scout. I went on to Life Scout. Unfortunately, I didn't have the opportunity to finish my work as an Eagle Scout. But we had six Eagles in Troop 6 and that was good for those days.

Our town was Scout-minded; and with our little population, we had no less than six active troops. We had our own Scoutmaster's roundtable in Huron—all the Scoutmasters in town met once a week at noon. We developed great fellowship that way and great competition between troops.

By 1936 my future was taking a new turn. Muriel and I had decided to marry and to return to the University of Minnesota to complete my education which had been interrupted by the depression.

The move to Minnesota meant the end of my Scoutmaster days. On Scout Sunday during Boy Scout Week, I "preached" the sermon at the Methodist Church, then made my resignation official by presenting my khaki shirt to my good friend and fellow Scouter, the late Dewey Van Dyke.

As a Scoutmaster I was a novice and an apprentice. The success of Troop 6 was due in large measure to the man who served for some time as my assistant, Dewey Van Dyke, and to another outstanding church man and youth leader, Lynn LaCraft. It was Dewey and Lynn above all who gave stability, continuity, and leadership to Scouting in our community.

Dewey Van Dyke was full of stories of his youth and his experiences in World War I. He was a natural camper, loving the out of doors. He was the kind of man that boys respected. While short in stature, he was athletic, competitive, rugged, and a down-to-earth fellow. The boys loved him.

Dewey's only son, Bobby, was a member of Troop 6. He was an excellent Scout and he and his dad were inseparable companions. But early in Scouting, Bobby was to lose his life in a drowning accident. This was a tragic blow to Dewey and his wife, Hazel. Dewey's wife, like Muriel Humphrey, was a Scouter, too; her life was fully involved in the work of Troop 6.

The loss of Bobby Van Dyke was a blow to all of us. He was such a wonderful boy. But this sorrow and sadness that came to the Van Dykes served as an inspiration to Dewey. He redoubled his efforts in Scouting. He and Hazel literally adopted every boy in the troop. Instead of having one son, the Van Dykes now found themselves with anywhere from 25 to 35 boys—treating them all like their very own. Scouting to them was a labor of love.

My dear friend, Lynn LaCraft, a member of the troop committee, also lost his boy—a former troop member, Kendall—as a Navy pilot in World War II. They were also inseparable companions and dear friends to me.

Kendall was an outstanding Scout—an Eagle Scout. He was always the leader in the troop, a brilliant young man, athletic, an engaging personality, courageous, and cooperative.

Lynn LaCraft went on as did my friend, Dewey Van Dyke, to become a Scout leader, giving unselfishly of his life to other young men.

Tragedy befell two families—the Van Dykes and the LaCrafts—but they eased their sorrow and pain by giving of themselves to others. This is what it takes to make a great Scout leader—giving, sharing, caring for others. What wonderful memories these names bring back, memories of friendship and devotion to the highest values.

We who have served as volunteers receive far more from the scouting program than we can possibly give it. Whatever I gave to scouting was richly rewarded by the joys, satisfaction, and opportunities of working with my boys of Troop 6.

Few experiences can compare with the rich pleasure of seeing boys with whom you have worked grow to sturdy manhood and positions of respect in community life.

An investment in time and energy with youngsters reaps the greatest "dividends"—personally, for the boys, the sponsoring institution, for town and Nation. No wonder scouting has grown and will continue to grow.

Best of all, it is voluntary. This voluntarism is a unique characteristic of American life—the willingness of people to give of themselves to help others, the sharing and the building together out of conviction rather than ordered direction. Scouting is one of the finest examples of America's genius to get things done through the citizen's own initiative and responsibility. And it offers continuing challenge to so many adults who feel a deep desire to keep America free and to preserve the spirit of personal initiative and self-discipline.

Scouting is more needed today than ever before. Life in America has changed greatly in the last quarter of a century. Family unity is tested more than ever. People are constantly on the move and often our roots are not as deep as they used to be. Scouting unites neighbors and former strangers, welds communities, builds tremendous good will and understanding internationally.

As a former mayor, as a U.S. Senator, and now, as Vice President, I have seen scouting's good works in so many ways and places. Today in America's war against poverty, Scouting is helping to bring many disadvantaged youngsters into a new, better life.

Sometimes this expansion of scouting may not be easy, but it is in the finest Scout tradition. You're interested in the boy—not his race, color, or religion. The boy's own growth, his work, his skill—these are the things that count. You want to see that every boy is taught respect for law and order and the great institutions of our country—the family, home, church, government, industry.

Quite appropriately this "missionary" challenge is part of your current breakthrough for youth program, a national effort to make scouting even more effective and meaningful as it is brought within the reach of more and more boys. You are absolutely right to be doing this, because the program is too good to keep to ourselves.

Also on the scouting horizon is a significant event for all Americans—next year's 12th World Jamboree in Idaho. This will be the first time our country has been privileged to be host for this international show of scouting brotherhood. God willing, I hope to be there.

What a joy it will be to have boys from all over the world in our country.

What an opportunity it will be for them to see this land of ours, and how fortunate we will be to know the future leaders of other nations. They will come here as youngsters, but in a few years they will be guiding universities, managing businesses, leading trade unions, or serving in positions in government. They will be helping to build a finer, more peaceful world.

In our own land, Boy Scouts and their leaders will play an ever-more important role in helping America realize its highest ideals. For scouting is a vital activity in a truly great society. In his inaugural address, President Lyndon B. Johnson so well described "* * * the excitement of becoming—always becoming, trying, probing, falling, resting, and trying again—but always trying and always gaining."

Young men who are well prepared and inspired can make all the difference in the world. That is what our President saw and learned from his earliest years in Texas as a student and then, as a teacher. It is what I remember, too, from those early years in South Dakota.

Much has happened since those times. But I still know of no better motto than to "Be prepared"—physically, mentally, and morally. I know of no higher values than loyalty to God and country.

I wish every boy in the world had the fun of scouting, its training, its opportunities, its inspiration.

Whatever I can do and you can do for scouting is a service to a still better tomorrow.

THE 1967 BUDGET

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, the programs in the budget laid before us today by President Johnson are, in general, well conceived and designed to meet the Nation's major needs, both at home and abroad.

What the budget proposes is undeniably important. How the Government accomplishes its goals is equally important to Congress and the taxpayers.

The President's budget calls for lean and flexible Government. It reflects the hard choices of the troubled and uncertain world in which we find ourselves—a world in which:

The defense of freedom in Vietnam places heavy obligations on our resources.

The unfulfilled needs of one-fifth of our fellow Americans plead for greater national effort.

Our rapid approach toward full employment suggests fiscal prudence.

To meet all of these requirements requires efficient and economical Government administration. The 1967 budget bears that stamp. There is not an agency head in Washington who cannot testify to the President's sincerity and diligence in cutting back programs and requiring greater efficiency and productivity in operations.

Were it not for vigorous cost-reduction efforts and increasing Government productivity, we would be paying $3 billion more in both 1966 and 1967 for the services we are now receiving. For example:

The Defense Department has given us more powerful and flexible forces, at the same time cutting costs in 1966 and 1967 by an estimated $2 billion since 1964. By 1969, the annual savings since the start of the Defense cost reduction program in 1961 will be over $6 billion.

We may be confident that the President will continue his quest for the most efficient Government services possible. As he stated in his budget message:

> It is often harder work to save money than to find productive ways to spend it. But it is equally important to the public interest.
>
> I believe we are making good progress in reducing costs and improving efficiency, but I will never be satisfied that we have done all we should.

However, even though we salute the President for the leadership he has exercised in presenting a 1967 budget that in general fulfills so many of our national requirements, there are issues raised by the budget that will have to be the subject of searching examination by Congress in the months ahead. We shall have to exercise our judgment on these recommendations; it does not detract from the excellent job the President has done on the whole budget for the Congress to fulfill its own responsibility by differing in some details.

First on my list is the continuing failure of this Government to undertake any meaningful program of readjustment assistance for the 5 million cold war veterans who will have had their lives interrupted on an average of over 2½ years each so that they could do their part to defend their country. I shall have more to say about this at an early date.

Second, is the proposal to shift many Government programs from Government grants and loans to private financing which the Government either would repay, in the case of grants, or guarantee and pay part of the interest payments, in the case of loans. The impact upon our economy from such a change should be given thorough study.

Any saving in Government expenditures would be purely illusory. On the contrary, the governmental costs of using private financing would in the long run be greater than under the present arrangement, since the Government would have to pay interest on the loans. And the extent to which the national debt would thus be reduced would not make up the difference, since the interest rate which the Government pays for Government debt financing is surely less than the rate it would have to pay for private guaranteed loans under the proposed new method.

At the heart of the free enterprise system is the notion of profit as a return for taking a risk. With Government loans there is no risk; the banks are guaranteed a full return on their investment. What is being proposed is a direct subsidy for banks.

Last year, during the consideration of the higher education bill, I notified officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that it looked to me as though they were trying to get rid of the National Defense Education Act student loan program with their proposed insured reduced interest loan program, and inquired whether this was true. They assured me that nothing could be further from the truth; that the insured loan program was not intended to replace the National Defense Education Act loan program. Now the budget contains the following words on page 131:

> Legislation will be proposed to shift the National Defense Education Act student loan program to the newly authorized subsidized loan guarantee program * * *. As a result, National Defense Education Act student loan expenditures will decline by $149 million to a level of $30 million in 1967 * * *.

Under the National Defense Education Act the Government provides funds for student loans which are repaid with an interest rate of 3 percent a year. Under the insured loan subsidy program, the Government insures the loan for a bank; the student and the Government each pay 3-percent interest to the bank, and the Government insures the loan to boot. This program is being turned from a student-aid program into a bank subsidy program.

This country has never made a wiser investment than the National Defense Education Act student loan program. In November 1964, the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, issued a report on the National Defense Education Act, which contained the following findings:

> More than 37 percent of National Defense Education Act expenditures—the largest single amount—have gone into student loans. Some 600,000 students in 1,574 colleges and universities borrowed approximately $453 million; the Federal Government contributed almost 90 percent of the total, and colleges and universities, the remainder * * *. About 70 percent of the loans have been made to students with superior academic background who intend to teach in elementary or secondary schools and to those with superior ability or preparation in science, mathematics, or a modern foreign language.

The National Defense Education Act was carefully planned with the poor student in mind, and the program has worked well. A loan to a poor student is not the same thing as regular commercial loans with which banks are accustomed to dealing. I cannot see as smooth and fruitful a working relationship under the proposed program as there has been with the National Defense Education Act. Under the National Defense Education Act, all the financial arrangements were handled by people whose first and foremost concern was the education of the student, not the making of a few dollars. This means a tremendous amount in how well the program works, and it will work to the detriment of any educational program that puts needy students at the mercy of a bank.

Up to September 1965, approximately 800,000 students had gone to college in America with student loans totaling $619 million. This great program must not be destroyed now.

I am alarmed to see the Department of Agriculture following a policy that apparently is intended to discourage large numbers of farmers from continuing to farm. The budget calls for a $900 million cut in agriculture programs.

The Agriculture bill which Congress passed last year gave the Secretary of Agriculture much discretionary authority. In many cases, I regret to say, he has been using it to the detriment of the American farmer. We are now engaged in a war on poverty at home. Around the world, millions of people are starving; to combat this, an expanded food-for-peace program is being proposed. I fail to understand why, when we should be making our agriculture programs an integral part of these efforts, the Secretary acts as if he never heard of them. We need more production, not less. There is obviously a great need for better communication between the Department of Agriculture and certain other agencies of Government.

The Department also proposes to cut funds for REA by $462 million. At the present time, there is a great backlog of loan applications at the REA; there is a great need for more facilities in our rural areas. This is no time to be cutting back. This is no time to weaken our rural domestic economy. If we are to be strong all over the world, we must be strong at home first. Education and our family economies are the bulwark of our strength.

Finally, proposed spending for many new Great Society programs is well below what Congress has already authorized. The Higher Education Act authorized over $500 million and only $381,400,000 is requested. A total of $660 million is authorized for the new public works and economic development program, yet only $327,385,000 is asked for. A decrease of $27.6 million is earmarked for the Manpower Administration.

I do not believe that the poor should pay for the war in Vietnam. I will fight for adequate appropriations for all these programs which help the disadvantaged in our society to help themselves.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS FINDS DIRKSEN LEGISLATIVE APPORTIONMENT AMENDMENT LACKS "FIRM STANDARD"

Mr. TYDINGS. Madam President, as a member of the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee I have studied and voted against at least four different versions of the Dirksen amendment. Each successive draft has been more confusing than its predecessor. But Senate Joint Resolution 103 takes the prize for ambiguity. Every sentence is vague, is susceptible to more than one interpretation or produces an unintended result. I analyzed the weaknesses of Senate Joint Resolution 103 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 15, page 20903, and volume 111, part 21, page 28749.

The independent and impartial Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has recently issued a detailed, technical analysis of the latest Dirksen amendment. The Library of Congress finds, first of all, that the entire theory of the amendment has changed. Senate Joint Resolution 2 was based on the premise that the law of the land required both houses to be population-based and that any deviation from this requirement required that a nonpopulation plan be approved in a popular referendum. In other words, a referendum was required only on those States desiring to deviate from constitutional standards. The Library of Congress points out that under Senate Joint Resolution 103, there must be a referendum every 10 years whether the State wants to deviate from constitutional standards or not. In other words, the people must decide every 10 years whether or not they wish to depart from the equal protection clause. This, says the Library of Congress, is "not a matter of style or emphasis. It is a major substantive change."

The Library of Congress had other technical criticisms. It found, for example, that the unique method of ratification which Senator DIRKSEN proposes is possibly unconstitutional, and certainly likely to produce controversy over whether the amendment was properly ratified. The Library of Congress also says that it is not certain whether the resolution provides for judicial review of apportionment plans.

The most critical phase of the Dirksen amendment provides a State may deviate from fair apportionment standards "in order to insure effective representation of the various groups and interests making up the electorate." The Library of Congress points out that "there is no definition or elucidation of this phrase," and that it does not "offer a very firm standard." The phrase comes from the joint dissenting opinion of Justices Clark and Stewart in the principal reapportionment decision, but as the Library of Congress points out even they were unable to agree between themselves on how the standard would guide the disposition of four of the nine reapportionment cases decided the following week.

The Library of Congress asks:

> What is "effective representation"? How many representatives of the total does one need to have effective representation? Does the number vary or remain constant? Is the number of representatives proportionate to the number of people with a particular interest, and, if not, what is the ratio of numbers of representatives to numbers of people? Are all groups with distinct interests to be insured effective representation or just some? If not all, which? How are groups discriminated among?
>
> Is "effective representation" the ability to pass a desired measure? To veto an objectionable one? Only to be heard? Or something else? Is everyone to be given equal voice in the legislature? If not, by what standards is inequality to be introduced?

I emphasize, these are not only my questions. They are the words of the Library of Congress.

There are a great many other ambiguities which the Library of Congress points out and which Senators DOUGLAS, PROXMIRE, and I have discussed previously. I will not take the time of the Senate to review any more of them.

Suffice to say that there are sufficient questions about Senate Joint Resolution 103 that it should not be further considered, much less passed, without some hearings. I want to stress that this resolution has never been considered in a public hearing. No constitutional law experts or practicing lawyers have given the committee the benefit of their views.

When Senate Joint Resolution 103 was introduced, I wrote to a number of witnesses who testified on Senate Joint Resolution 2, and almost without exception they found the new amendment vague and unintelligible. I inserted these hearings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 19, page 26002—but such do-it-yourself hearings are no substitute for real hearings and detailed study.

I will conclude by quoting the conclusion of the Library of Congress:

> The change from the form of Senate Joint Resolution 2 to that of Senate Joint Resolution 103 has opened a number of areas to questions and raised many new issues. If and when the Senate is called upon to consider the proposal in the 2d session of the 89th Congress, it would seem desirable that these matters be fully explored.

I would agree.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Library of Congress to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE LEGISLATIVE APPORTIONMENT: AN ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

(By Johnny H. Killian, legislative attorney, American Law Division, December 7, 1965)

INTRODUCTION

Since the decision in *Baker* v. *Carr,* 369 U.S. 186 (1962), holding that the apportionment of State legislatures presented an issue cognizable by the Federal courts, there has been much discussion in Congress of a legislative response. With the decision in *Reynolds* v. *Sims,* 377 U.S. 533 (1964), and five companion cases, that both houses of a bicameral legislature must be apportioned substantially on the basis of population (the so-called one-man, one-vote rule), the discussion assumed greater immediacy and force. The adjournment of the 88th Congress was delayed while Congress debated measures to strip the Federal courts of jurisdiction of the field or to delay implementation of the decisions. Nothing was enacted.

In the 1st session of the 89th Congress the debate resumed. Hearings were held in both Houses. While no action was taken in the House, the Senate debated at length a proposal by Senator DIRKSEN and others for a constitutional amendment which would have allowed States to apportion one house of their legislatures on a nonpopulation basis, if the voters of the States approved. The proposal (S.J. Res. 2) received a majority vote but fell short of the two-thirds required for proposing constitutional amendments. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 14, p. 19373.)

Late in the session the Senate Judiciary Committee reported without recommendation a revised version of Senator DIRKSEN's proposal, and it is expected that the 2d session of the 89th Congress will be faced with the issue again.

It is the purpose of this paper to analyze the various proposals, with greatest attention paid to the revised Dirksen measure, from a technical viewpoint, raising and considering all the objections to phraseology, meaning, and content which might fairly be made. A constitutional amendment, unlike a statute, cannot easily be amended or revised once it is in effect in order to iron out unforeseen problems, to clarify an ambiguous phrase, or to correct what is thought to be an erroneous interpretation.

Only peripherally will the merits of the proposed amendments be touched upon and then only where unavoidable. Consideration of the merits should be a separate matter from consideration of the technical features of draftsmanship. It is, of course, to be expected that the success or failure of the effort to modify the Supreme Court's decisions will be decided on the merits of the substantive issues, but if it is decided that modification is in order, the interests of both proponents and opponents are served by attempting to make certain that the language used to carry out the intent of the measure adopted actually does so and does not effect more sweeping changes or some not contemplated.

Therefore, the tone of this paper is deliberately and possibly unnecessarily critical in order to develop for consideration, as sharply as possible, the meanings (or possible constructions) of the various proposals.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 103

The measure reported by the Judiciary Committee, Senate Joint Resolution 103, is set out in full below. Other proposed amendments, including Senator DIRKSEN's earlier versions, are set out in appendix A and are referred to throughout this paper. Senate Joint Resolution 103 provides:

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years of its submission to the States by the Congress, provided that each such legislature shall include one house apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population in accordance with the most recent enumeration provided for in section 2 of article I:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The legislature of each State shall be apportioned by the people of that State at each general election for Representatives to the Congress held next following the year in which there is commenced each enumeration provided for in section 2 of article I. In the case of a bicameral legislature, the members of one house shall be apportioned among the people on the basis of their numbers and the members of the other house may be apportioned among the people on the basis of population, geography, and political subdivisions in order to insure effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate. In the case of a unicameral legislature, the house may be apportioned among the people on the basis of substantial equality of population with such weight given to geography and political subdivisions as will insure effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate.

" 'SEC. 2. A plan of apportionment shall become effective only after it has been submitted to a vote of the people of the State and approved by a majority of those voting on that issue at a statewide election held in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution. If submitted by a bicameral legislature the plan of apportionment shall have been approved prior to such election by both houses, one of which shall be apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population; if otherwise submitted it shall have been found by the courts prior to such election to be consistent with the provisions of this Constitution, including this article. In addition to any other plans of apportionment which may be submitted at such election, there shall be submitted to a vote of the people an alternative plan of apportionment based solely on substantial equality of population. The plan of apportionment approved by a majority of those voting on that issue shall be promptly placed in effect.' "

In introducing the proposal on August 11, 1965, Senator DIRKSEN stated that it was drafted to take into account "every valid contention" that was made against the original version of the amendment. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 15, p. 20119.) Thus, in the following discussion, reference will be made to Senate Joint Resolution 2 and to the revised version voted on August 4, 1965, both of which are set out in appendix A.

A BROAD VIEW

The proposed amendments adopt several approaches. Some provide simply that the U.S. Constitution does not prohibit States having bicameral legislatures from apportioning one house on nonpopulation factors. An example, set out in appendix A, is House Joint Resolution 2, which was the object of an effort to get at least one proposal to the floor of the House in the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Others, such as Senate Joint Resolution 2, accept the Reynolds holding and provide a means by which a State can take itself out from under the principle of Reynolds with regard to one house.

If we have read Senate Joint Resolution 103 correctly, it adopts a third approach. The various sentences and phrases will be analyzed in detail below, but briefly, what the proposal seems to do is to set out within itself the Federal constitutional standards for State legislative apportionment. It provides that one house of a bicameral legislature is to be apportioned on a population basis, but that the other house "may" be apportioned on the basis of population, geography, and political subdivisions, or that both houses are to be apportioned on a population basis. Either alternative is acceptable under this proposal provided it is properly submitted to and ratified by a vote of the people every 10 years.

The change from Senate Joint Resolution 2 to Senate Joint Resolution 103 is not, nor does it purport to be, only a matter of style or emphasis. It is a major substantive change. Under Senate Joint Resolution 2, it remained the law of the land that both houses must be population-based and that altering this requirement necessitated the formulation of a nonpopulation plan and submission to the people. Only those States desiring to alter the requirement had to conduct a referendum; until the people approved, the population standard remained and had to be complied with.

Under Senate Joint Resolution 103, there is no such constant standard as to the basis of apportionment, but there is a constant requirement as to the manner of apportionment; that is, the basis may be either of the alternatives set out in the proposal, but to adopt either there must be a vote of the people in every State every 10 years. Until by a vote of the people a plan of apportionment is adopted every 10th year, there is apparently no standard, after the lapse of the 10th year, but a de facto legislature sitting under a no longer valid apportionment.

The change from one form of proposal to the other leads to a number of conclusions which are detailed below.

THE RATIFICATION PROCESS

The earlier versions of the proposed amendment provided simply that it was to be ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. This provision led to the contention of some opponents that this procedure allowed malapportioned legislatures to ratify the amendment in order to preserve their power and that because of such malapportionment the majority of the people in many States would never have the opportunity to express themselves on ratification. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 14, p. 18954 (Senators TYDINGS and PROXMIRE).)

Senate Joint Resolution 103 partially meets this argument by its requirement that one house of a ratifying legislature must be apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population.[1] Responding to the contentions of opponents, Senator DIRKSEN first rejected the suggestion of Senator BAYH (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 13, p. 18222), that before a legislature could submit a nonpopulation plan to the people, the legislature must itself be apportioned on the basis of population in both houses. Said Senator DIRKSEN:

"It is sufficient unto the purpose to provide that the amendment cannot be ratified unless that ratification is approved by the house of the State legislature which is apportioned on the basis of population. And by that I mean on the basis of the most recent census, so that a State must provide a legislative body which properly reflects the majority will, and the amendment must have the approval of that body." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 15, p. 20121.)

The first problem about this procedure is whether Congress under article V of the Constitution may lay down such a condition on ratification, or for that matter such a condition as Senator BAYH envisages. Article V[2] simply provides for ratification either by legislatures or by conventions; a question may be raised as to whether Congress possesses the power to prescribe as a condition precedent to ratification a certain composition of legislatures. It could be contended that article V limits Congress to the function of selecting the mode of ratification, whether by legislatures or by conventions, and that it is not a grant of any broader power.

On the other hand, it could be argued that article V is a grant of plenary power to Congress to give effect to the will of the people to change the Constitution and that the ratifying agents are instrumentalities, not of their respective States, but of Congress. (See, for instance, *Hawke* v. *Smith*, 253 U.S. 221, 226

---

[1] Considered below in connection with its use in the text of the proposal is the matter of the definition of "population."

[2] "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution * * * which * * * shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress."

(1920); *"Opinions of the Justices,"* (204 N.C. 806, 172 S.E. 474 (1933).) The argument would follow that if Congress can regulate the composition of ratifying conventions, it can impose standards as to the composition of State legislatures as respects the ratifying process.

There is no conclusive answer to either view. The issue was quite extensively argued during the proposing of the 21st amendment in regard to the power of Congress over ratifying conventions, and nothing definitive emerged. Congress in the end did not attempt to regulate the conventions, but of the 43 ratifying States which adopted legislation providing for conventions, 25 provided that if Congress undertook to regulate the manner in which the conventions should be constituted and function, the State laws would become inoperative, and only one State actually provided that its own law was to supersede any regulation by Congress.[3]

It should also be pointed out that Congress, in the last several proposals of amendments, has inserted a time limit for ratification, an act which has occasioned no particular comment and which seems to have the approval of the Supreme Court. (*Coleman* v. *Miller*, 307 U.S. 433, 452–53 (1939).) The setting of a time limit is, perhaps, analogous, but it does not involve the same exercise of power over State legislatures that the Dirksen and Bayh proposals involve.

Two additional points should also be made about the problem of Congress power over ratifying legislatures. The first is whether it could ever become a justiciable issue and be litigated (*Coleman* v. *Miller*, supra), although it may have been weakened by *Baker* v. *Carr*, supra, seems to be authority that a congressional determination of this kind would not be reviewable.

The second point is that under *Reynolds* v. *Sims*, supra, it is the law of the land that both houses of a legislature must be apportioned substantially on a population basis; any legislature which is not apportioned substantially on population is invalidly constituted, and Congress, insofar as the ratifying provision is concerned, would only be enunciating what is already required. This point is perhaps the strongest argument in favor of such an exercise of power by Congress, but it lends itself logically more to the support of the Bayh proposal than of the requirement in Senate Joint Resolution 103. Why, it may be asked, require only half of what the Supreme Court has held the Constitution to require?

Aside from the question of the power of Congress to enact this restriction on the ratification process, there are a few other points. The first one concerns the language of the proviso; that is, when it says that the ratifying legislature "shall include one house apportioned" on a population basis, does it mean "at least one house" or does it mean "only one house?" No doubt the former meaning was intended since that would accord with the requirement of the Court decisions, but it is a phrase over which argument could possibly develop.

The second point involves a question of determination as to whether one of the houses of a legislature is apportioned on the "basis of substantial equality of population." Who is to make this determination? Congress? The courts? The Administrator of General Services?[4]

Insofar as *Coleman* v. *Miller*, supra, stands for the principle that the questions surrounding the ratification of a proposed constitutional amendment are political in nature with the ultimate authority in Congress to pass upon questions of the adoption of amendments, it would seem to mean that a decision by Congress, by 51 percent of the Members of both Houses, would determine whether each State's attempted ratification is valid, which would necessarily involve a decision by Congress as to whether one house of a ratifying legislature was "apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population."

Yet, according to *Baker* v. *Carr*, supra, legislative apportionment presents a justiciable issue, which the courts, when properly presented with the question, must rule on. Therefore, the possibility is presented of political conflict between two coequal branches of the Federal Government.

A solution to any dilemma would seem to lie in Congress accepting as conclusive determinations court rulings as to the population apportionments of one or both houses, as in Vermont (*Buckley* v. *Hoff*, 243 F. Supp. 873 (D.C.D. Vt. 1965) (approving legislature's action)); in Oklahoma (*Reynolds* v. *State Election Board*, 233 F. Supp. 323 (D.C.W.D. Okla. 1964) (apportionment of both houses by court)); or in Wyoming (*Schaefer* v. *Thomson*, 240 F. Supp. 247 (D.C.D. Wyo. 1964 (apportionment of house upheld); *Schaefer* v. *Thomson*, Civil No. 4717, D.C.D. Wyo., Oct. 8, 1965 (apportionment of senate by court)). But what would be the situation in the case of a State where reapportionment was approved by the court because no one contested it (*Butterworth* v. *Dempsey*, 237 F. Supp. 302, 313 (D.C.D. Conn 1965)), or where the contest went only to certain features of the plan (*Mann* v. *Davis*, 245 F. Supp. 241 (D.C.D. Va. 1965), aff'd. per curiam 34 Law Week 3141 (Sup. Ct., Oct. 25, 1965)), or where there has been no litigation, as in Massachusetts, Maine, or Oregon? In the absence of a court decision or a completely pertinent court holding, would Congress in each case investigate and determine whether a legislature had one house apportioned substantially on population? What standards would it use? Would it select from among varying standards used by the lower Federal courts or would it formulate its own? Clearly, the provision does raise some difficulties.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

An objection raised under the language of the earlier versions of the Dirksen amendment was that it could be read to deny to the Federal judiciary any power to review the apportionment of either house of a State legislature. (Association of the Bar of the City of New York, committee on Federal legislation, "Proposed Constitutional Amendments and Jurisdictional Limitations on Federal Courts With Respect to Apportionment of State Legislature," p. 6 (New York, 1965) (mimeo), hereafter cited as New York City bar report.) This reading arose from the first sentence of Senate Joint Resolution 2 which provided:

"The right and power to determine the composition of the legislature of a State and the apportionment of the membership thereof shall remain in the people of that State."

Senator DIRKSEN explicitly denied that the sentence was directed toward or would limit judicial review. (Reapportionment of State legislatures, hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, Senate Judiciary Committee, 89th Cong., 1st sess., hereafter cited as hearings.) Others confessed to some worry about the sentence. Prof. Robert D. Dixon of the George Washington University Law School said:

"I am troubled by the first sentence * * * If it does not relate to court jurisdiction, it is difficult to know what important function it serves that would be lost if it were deleted. In other words, it seems to me there is at best an ambiguity here" (hearings, 343).

The language was deleted from the proposal voted on in August. Senator TYDINGS has suggested that the first sentence of Senate Joint Resolution 103 is a "subtle reincarnation" of the first sentence in Senate Joint Resolution 2.

"Does not apportionment 'by the people' as provided in Senate Joint Resolution 103 prohibit judicial review of an apportionment plan? In the absence of categorical language to the contrary, I would have real doubts." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 15, p. 20903.)

When introducing Senate Joint Resolution 103, Senator DIRKSEN said:

"I might also say that this amendment provides for judicial review of the constitutionality of an apportionment plan before it is submitted to the people unless it has received the approval of the House of the legislature apportioned on population only." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 15, pp. 20121–20122.)

Senator DIRKSEN refers apparently to the second sentence of section 2. In that case, whatever the first sentence of section 1 may mean, the second sentence of section 2 would prevent judicial review of a non-population based plan at least prior to its submission to the voters provided that one house of the submitting legislature was apportioned on population. This denial of review would apparently apply to the plan for the population-apportioned house as well as to the other, thus precluding any determination that the proposed plan did provide for one house in conformity with the holding of the Reynolds case.

Whether review would be possible of the second plan required to be submitted—that is, the population-based plan for both houses—is apparently left open by the prior sentence and would presumably turn, as would the question of judicial review subsequent to approval by the people, upon how the first sentence of section 1 is interpreted.[5]

Although it is not free from ambiguity, it can be argued that a requirement, standing alone, that apportionment be accomplished by the people in a referendum would not deprive the courts of the power to review anything subsequently approved by them. In *Lucas* v. *Forty-fourth General Assembly of Colorado* (377 U.S. 713 (1964)), the Court struck down a plan which had been passed on and approved by the people in a referendum; in other areas the courts have passed upon the constitutionality of measures which have been approved by referendum or accomplished through initiative and referendum, so that it might require more specific language to withdraw apportionment plans from judicial review. Consideration should be given, however, to whether the language of the first sentence of section 2 supplies that additional, more specific language.

That sentence provides that a plan of apportionment "shall become effective" after approval by the people in a referendum. Whether the quoted phrase merely means that after popular approval an apportionment plan shall become law, on the same basis as any other law and subject to constitutional attacks, or whether it provides that after popular approval the plan has Federal constitutional sanction and may not be attacked in court, cannot be determined from the language. The former meaning would comport with the everyday usage of the phrase, but, set out in a constitutional provision, either meaning could be argued.

---

[3] The arguments, the history and citations to sources may be found in Small, "State Conventions as Instrumentalities for Considering Ratification of Constitutional Amendments," Legislative Reference Service, American Law Division, Dec. 16, 1964.

[4] Under 65 Stat. 710 (1951), 1 U.S.C. § 106b, the Administrator is required to certify receipt of official notice of ratification.

[5] Mention should be made of the likelihood that a court would refuse to adjudicate the question of a plan which was pending before the voters on the ground that no justiciable issue was raised until the plan was actually approved and placed into effect. See, e.g., *Moss* v. *Burkhart*, 220 F. Supp. 149, 152 (D.C.W.D. Okla. 1963), aff'd per curiam, 378 U.S. 558 (1964).

One phase of judicial review which this and subsequent language would certainly seem to change, however, is the ability of the Federal and State courts to grant relief in apportionment cases by themselves reapportioning recalcitrant legislatures. Courts in Alabama, Illinois (senate), Montana, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, and Wyoming (senate) have to date reapportioned legislatures, and others have indicated a willingness to do so. The language of the first sentence of section 1 and of the first sentence of section 2 clearly indicates that the only way to apportion a legislature is by submitting plans to a vote of the people. The contrary conclusion may be drawn only if the plan referred to in the first sentence of section 2 refers simply to the plans actually required in section 2 to be submitted to the people, but this reading is apparently precluded by the language of the first sentence of section 1. Any apportionment plan which goes into effect must be voted on by the people. A cloud thus would be cast over any power of the courts to reapportion a legislature which has refused to act. That power would seem to be a most effective one to force action from legislatures inasmuch as the courts have shown great reluctance to order directly a legislature to perform a legislative act.

Senator Dirksen noted the problem of nonaction as follows:

"Then the point was made that some State legislatures have not reapportioned as required by their own State constitutions. I condemn such a practice, and this present draft of a constitutional amendment requires as a Federal matter the reapportionment of State legislatures every 10 years at the least. Thus, the people of a State have a constitutional remedy if the State legislature refuses to act." (Congressional Record, vol. 111, pt. 15, p. 20120.)

The constitutional remedy would have to be a suit in a Federal or State court seeking a remedy based on the requirement of this constitutional amendment. Unless the court is to formulate its own apportionment plan, or to order at-large elections (a plan of apportionment as any other), and devise a procedure to submit the plan to the electorate, the court would of necessity have to direct the legislature to act and to devise means of enforcing its order, a citation for contempt being actually the court's only means to enforce its order.

It is possible to read the proposed amendment as not precluding court reapportionment. Such action would, however, require the court first to formulate a plan, choosing from the two alternatives which the proposal envisages—population apportionment in both houses or one house solely population and the other not. Then it could direct the proper executive officials to make preparations for the requisite referendum and to submit the court-formulated plans. But if the legislature had enacted no measures for the conduct of such a referendum and authorized and appropriated no money to defray the expenses of conducting it, the court would still be faced with the problem of directing the legislature to carry out certain legislative duties.[6]

APPORTIONMENT FACTORS

Senate Joint Resolution 2 provided that one house of a bicameral legislature could be apportioned "upon the basis of factors other than population" without defining or limiting the factors which might be utilized. This wording led many opponents to suggest that the way would be opened to racial or religious discrimination by legislatures in drawing up apportionment plans. (New York City bar report, pp. 3–7; hearings, 852–865; Congressional Record, vol. 111, pt. 13, p. 18359 (Senator Mondale), Congressional Record, vol. 111, pt. 14, p. 18947) (Senator Proxmire).)

The version finally voted on provided for the apportionment of one house "using population, geography, and political subdivisions as factors" with each factor to be given "appropriate" weight by the legislature.

The present version allows the apportionment of one house on the basis of population, geography, and political subdivisions in order to insure effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate.

Although it is conceivable that a legislature under the guise of apportioning on geography and political subdivisions might attempt to discriminate racially in drawing district boundaries, there would seem to be nothing in the proposed amendment which could be held to impair the authority of cases invalidating such manipulation of political boundary lines. (*Gomillion* v. *Lightfoot*, 364 U.S. 339 (1960)[illegible] *Wright* v. *Rockefeller*, 376 U.S. 52 (196[illegible] And it seems clear that courts would look behind groupings of counties or townships or the like if there were sufficient allegations of racial discrimination. (*Sims* v. *Baggett*, Civil Action No. 1744–N, D.C.M.D. Ala., Oct. 2, 1965.)

The above comment assumes, of course, that the proposed amendment does not affect judicial review, and that Federal and State courts would be open to complaints of racial discrimination. If one concludes to the contrary, then, although the Gomillion case would not be impaired so far as its holding went, there would be no means to obtain a remedy.

The present version retains the conjunctive form of the statement of factors ("population, geography, and political subdivisions") rather than the disjunctive which appeared in the revised Senate Joint Resolution 2.[7] Would using the one or the other word at all affect any different result in the allocation of seats.

The new and interesting language is the clause "in order to insure effective representation" to various groups. If the proposed amendment does away with judicial review, it is not likely that the clause will have any great effect, since the legislature would have within its sole discretion, subject to voter approval, which way to draw boundary lines. But, if judicial review, after adoption of a nonpopulation based plan, is still possible, a number of problems could arise.

First, there is no definition or elucidation of the phrase. According to Senator Dirksen, the phrase derives from the language of Justices Stewart and Clark dissenting from the principle of Reynolds and its companion cases. (Congressional Record, vol. 111, pt. 15, p. 20119.) The phrase occurs in their opinion as follows:

"Representative government is a process of accommodating group interests through democratic institutional arrangements. Its function is to channel the numerous opinions, interests, and abilities of the people of a State into the making of the State's public policy. Appropriate legislative apportionment, therefore, should ideally be designed to insure effective representation in the State's legislature, in cooperation with other organs of political power, of the various groups and interests making up the electorate. In practice, of course, this ideal is approximated in the particular apportionment system of any State by a realistic accommodation of the diverse and often conflicting political forces operating within the State." (*Lucas* v. *Forty-fourth General Assembly of Colorado, supra*, 749.)

It should be noted that while Justices Stewart and Clark, relying on their "effective representation" test, agreed between themselves on disposition of the six cases before them on June 15, 1964, they did not agree on four of the nine cases decided the following week.[8] The phrase, then, may be said not to offer a very firm standard.

As examples of the problems of definition, we might ask: What is "effective representation"? How many representatives of the total does one need to have "effective representation"? Does the number vary or remain constant? Is the number of representatives proportionate to the number of people with a particular interest, and, if not, what is the ratio of numbers of representatives to numbers of people? Are all groups with distinct interests to be insured "effective representation" or just some? If not all, which? How are groups discriminated among?

Is "effective representation" the ability to pass a desired measure? To veto an objectionable one? Only to be heard? Or something else? Is everyone to be given equal voice in the legislature? If not, by what standards is inequality to be introduced?

Faced with these and other questions, a court could decide to leave the matter to the discretion of the legislature, subject, of course, to such prohibitions as that on racial discrimination. Or, the court could attempt to adjudicate the question in the light of, as yet, undeveloped standards, standards which might proceed from what Justice Stewart thought were the two "basic attributes" of an apportionment plan.

"First, it demands that, in the light of the State's own characteristics and needs, the plan must be a rational one. Secondly, it demands that the plan must be such as not to permit the systematic frustration of the will of a majority of the electorate of the State." (*Lucas* v. *Forty-fourth General Assembly of Colorado*, supra 753–54.)

Where this process of adjudication might lead may be seen in *Holt* v. *Richardson* (240 F. Supp. 754 (D.C.D. Hawaii 1965), prob. juris. noted 34 Law Week 3117 (Sup. Ct., October 11, 1965)), in which the court considered not only population but compactness and contiguity of territory, community of interest, community of problems, socio-economic status, political and racial factors in rejecting the reapportionment of the Hawaii Senate. Where the process of adjudication could lead is speculative.

Also to be considered is the possibility of increased litigation arising because of this phrase in the proposed amendment. Presently, legislative apportionment presents a justiciable issue (*Baker* v. *Carr*, supra), but the questions to be litigated are pretty well limited to population inequality (*Reynolds* v. *Sims*, supra), and racial gerrymandering, (*Gomillion* v. *Lightfoot*, supra). Partisan gerrymandering and other such matters are presently not being considered. (*WMCA* v. *Lomenzo*, 238 F. Supp. 916, 926 (D.C.S.D.N.Y. 1965), aff'd per curiam 34 Law Week 3116 (Sup. Ct. Oct. 11, 1965); but cf. *Fortson* v. *Dorsey*, 379 U.S. 433, 439 (1965).) But, under the quoted phrase above, one wonders whether it would be open to anyone, after ratification, to claim a cause of action upon being afforded "ineffective representation" in the legislature.

Thus, not only partisan gerrymandering but legislative determinations of how much representation to afford to any group could become subject to litigation with the standards to be applied highly ambiguous and unclear. This assumes, of course, that the proposed amendment leaves untouched the power of judicial review.[9]

---

[6] It has been the exception in the apportionment cases when the courts have issued orders directly to legislatures, but for an instance, see *Holt* v. *Richardson* (238 F. Supp. 468 (D.C.D. Hawaii 1965)).

[7] The "or" was changed to "and" by the Hruska amendment. (Congressional Record, vol. 111, pt. 14, p. 19354.)

[8] *Swann* v. *Adams*, 378 U.S. 553 (1964); *Meyers* v. *Thigpen*, 378 U.S. 554 (1964); *Nolan* v. *Rhodes*, 378 U.S. 556 (1964); *Hearne* v. *Smylie*, 378 U.S. 563 (1964).

In regard to unicameral legislatures, many of the same comments could be made as with bicameral ones. The only variation, really, is that the proposal seems to require more of a population base while at the same time allowing a deviation from that base, although with no indication of the amount of permissible deviation.

REFERRAL TO THE PEOPLE[10]

The proposal would apparently require, as noted above, that the people ratify any apportionment plan before it goes into effect, whether the plan be a nonpopulation based plan for one house or a plan for population apportionment of both houses. Several points may be made about the form and manner of submission and the action the voters take.

First, the proposal refers to a plan of apportionment which is to be submitted. The problem is whether this plan is to be a formula which, upon approval by the voters, the legislature would utilize in drawing boundaries and allocating seats or whether the reference is to a specific plan with county A allocated one seat, county B two seats, and so on. The point was raised in connection with the earlier versions and never apparently answered; in regard to Senate Joint Resolution 103, however, the language of the first sentence of section 1 clearly seems to choose the latter meaning. "The legislature of each State shall be apportioned by the people," it reads, and the commonly accepted meaning of the words are that they refer to the actual, physical act of allocating seats in the legislature.

In the Lucas case, the plans which had been voted on by the people were of the formula type, being differing constitutional provisions directing the legislature to accord certain weight to certain factors and to do or not do certain things in apportioning.[11] The formula then governs each apportionment by the legislature after each appointed time for reapportionment until the formula is again changed. If, however, a specific plan must be submitted, all the problems associated with the actual allocation of seats would be carried from the legislative chambers to a statewide political campaign every 10 years.

Second, the proposed amendment fixes the time when this apportioning is to take place, requiring it to be at the general election for Congress following the year of each decennial census. For most States, this would not generally alter the frequency prescribed in their constitutions for reapportionment since most of them do provide for reapportionment following the Federal census.

If, however, it is a correct interpretation of the proposal that it requires the people to pass on a plan of apportionment at the general election for Congress following the census year, the conclusion follows that it would result in a disruption of the normal time schedule. That is, as most State constitutions now require, the legislature meeting after the Federal decennial election reapportions and the legislature selected in the next election reflects the reapportionment.

The usual thing is for the census to be taken, for example, in 1970, with the report then fully available to the legislatures meeting in 1971 or 1972; the legislature reapportions either in 1971 or 1972 and the 1972 elections are held under the new reapportionment act.[12]

Still using the same example, under a proposal requiring prior approval by the people, the plan of apportionment would have to go to the people in 1972, and if approved by them the legislative elections next occurring to be held under the new apportionment would be in 1974. The result, then, would be the continuance in office for 4 years instead of 2 of a legislature elected under an apportionment plan based on the census of 10 years before, or 1960 to continue our example.

On the other hand, if all that is required to be submitted is a formula, it is difficult to see what the result in the interim will be. If the first sentence of section 2 does not mean literally what it says, the legislatures meeting next following the census could be obligated to reapportion, either on a population basis for both houses, as Reynolds now requires, or in accordance with a formula approved under the provisions of this proposed amendment in the preceding 10 years, in which case if the people approve the plan submitted to them a second reapportionment would be required at the next session of the legislature. Or, it might be that the legislature would take the position that, having referred a plan to the people, no action need be taken until following a vote of the people.

For those States which prescribe apportionment more often than once every decade or at a different time than following the Federal census, the proposed amendment would, of course, invalidate their constitutional provisions. Massachusetts, for example, requires a reapportionment of its legislature every 10 years following the State census, which is conducted in mid-decade. Other State constitutions provide for reapportionment every 6 years (Indiana), every 5 years (Kansas), or after any presidential election (Rhode Island). It should be noted, of course, that not all such provisions are always carried out. A new constitutional provision adopted by the Vermont legislature requires the reapportionment of the House following each second presidential election.[13]

The first sentence of section 1 apparently assumes without requiring that the apportionment is to be based on population, rather than, for example, registered voters, because of its requiring the apportionment following each Federal census. The second sentence of section 1, however, in its requirement that in one house the members "shall be apportioned among the people on the basis of their numbers," would seem to require that total population be used. Several States presently or prospectively use other bases, such as registered voters—Hawaii, Vermont (house), and Massachusetts—and the votes cast at the preceding gubernatorial election—Arizona. Indiana and Tennessee use total population 21 years and older. It is expected that the Supreme Court in its present term will clarify the question of whether total population is the requisite basis or whether something else, such as registered voters, will suffice. (*Burns* v. *Richardson*, No. 318, prob. juris. noted, 34 Law Week 3117, October 11, 1965.)

It is possible, of course, that the proposed amendment would not disturb the various State bases and that "number" would be interpreted as if it read "as defined by the States." At best, the wording leaves the situation ambiguous.

The same ambiguity exists in regard to the use of the word "population" as it appears several times in S.J. Res. 103. It is unclear whether this is a requirement that total population be used or not. The opinion in *Reynolds* v. *Sims*, supra, referred in various paragraphs to all terms, with, at one point, Chief Justice Warren speaking of "numbers of people," "voters," "citizens," and "qualified voters" in a series of sentences (supra, 560, 561, 562, 563), while at another point, he wrote within the same sentence the phrase "residents or citizens, or voters," (supra, 577). As noted above, the court may determine this term whether total population or a lesser, nondiscriminatory measurement may be used by the States, but that would not necessarily clarify Senate Joint Resolution 103.

A third point to be considered in connection with referral of the plan to the people is the effect upon those States which either have a nonlegislative body do the apportioning or which provide for nonlegislative apportionment in the event the legislature fails to act. If what is required to be submitted to the voters is a formula of apportionment, no particular problem would arise since the legislature would be the proper agency to submit such a formula to the voters and the nonlegislative apportioning agency would simply carry out an allocation of seats according to whatever formula was in effect.[14] If, however, the plan to be submitted is an actual apportionment, a serious problem would arise.

The problem is that once a board or commission of apportionment—as is provided for in such States as Alaska, Arkansas, Michigan, Missouri, and Ohio—formulates an apportionment plan, how does it then refer this plan to the voters? Would the legislature be required to act? Could the board or commission by some procedure get the matter on the ballot? Each State would undoubtedly have to provide by statute or constitutional amendment for the problem and if it did not do so, deadlock would develop necessitating court action.

The same sort of problem, except that it would be more difficult to resolve, would confront those States—such as Arizona and Massachusetts—in which the legislature allocates seats to the counties and then the governing county boards or commissions district the seats within each county. Here, not only would the mechanics of getting the plans to the voters have to be worked out, but the question of the form of submission would be bothersome. Would, for example, the voters be called upon to pass on, as a package, the allocation of particular numbers of seats to each county and the subsequent division of each county? Or would the two matters be presented separately? Would the division of each county be voted on statewide or only by the voters of each county concerned?

Other States, such as Illinois and Oregon, provide that if the legislature does not act, a board or commission is called into play to reapportion. Such an agency would have the same problem as a corresponding agency initially charged with taking such action except that if the legislature has deadlocked in the first place or refused to act, it is doubtful that it would provide the regulatory provisions or money to refer any plan produced by an independent agency to the people.

---

[9] It also leaves undiscussed problems of standing, proof, and remedy which would confront complainants in such a situation.

[10] For consideration in the apportionment context of the working of the referendum system, see Tienken, Initiative and Referendum—with Particular Reference to Apportionment of State Legislatures, American Law Division, Legislative Reference Service, June 14, 1965.

[11] See appendix B for the texts of the two Colorado proposals.

[12] For those States, like New Jersey or Kentucky, with legislative elections in odd numbered years, of course, the corresponding dates could be inserted.

[13] Senate Joint Resolution 103 does not actually forbid reapportionment more often than every 10 years so that it would perhaps be possible to do so provided the vote of the people requirement were fulfilled, which would make reapportionment more frequently somewhat difficult. On the other hand, the first sentence of section 1 could be read as prescribing an exclusive frequency.

[14] The only problem, actually, would be what such agency would do in the interim between the census and the vote of the people; that is, whether it would act on the old formula or wait to see if a new one were adopted.

Another feature of this problem is apparently the second clause of the second sentence of section 2, which provides that if the plan of apportionment "is otherwise submitted" to the people; that is, it is not submitted by a legislature, one house of which is apportioned on a population basis, the plan "shall have been found by the courts prior to such election to be consistent with the provisions of this Constitution, including this article." The first function of the clause is apparently to provide for the case of a legislature, neither house of which is apportioned on a population basis, submitting an apportionment to a vote of the people, contrary to the provision of the first clause of the second sentence of section 2.

The second function of the clause apparently provides for submission by a unicameral legislature, without regard to whether it is apportioned substantially on population or on population with weight accorded to geography and political subdivisions as provided in section 1. Third, it could also take into account the submission as considered above of a board or commission.

There are, then, three possibilities comprehended by the phrase "if otherwise submitted," in the second clause, second sentence of section 2. The problem is enlarged when we consider the question of court review. The court is to determine whether the plan is consistent with all provisions of the Constitution, including those added by this proposal. Attempts to discriminate on the basis of race would fall before the 15th amendment and discrimination on the basis of sex before the 19th.

But what would the plan have to provide to be consistent with the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment and the provisions of this proposed amendment?

Reynolds interpreted the equal protection clause to require population-based apportionment in both houses. Section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 103 requires that one house be apportioned "among the people on the basis of their numbers" while the other house "may" be apportioned on the basis of population, geography, and political subdivisions. The "may" is predicated on the basis of approval by the voters as provided in section 2. But is not the apportionment of the other house on population, or of both houses on population, not also dependent upon approval of the voters as provided in section 2? That is, according to the first sentence of section 2, a plan of apportionment "shall become effective only after" it has been approved by the voters. Is the 14th amendment replaced as a source of judicial standards with the ratified Senate Joint Resolution 103?

There are three possible conclusions, then. First, no plan submitted by anything other than a bicameral legislature with one house apportioned on a population basis could be found by a court to be consistent with the Constitution. This conclusion would invalidate unicameral legislatures and apportionment boards and commissions and leading to such a drastic result would undoubtedly be avoided by the courts.

Second, it could be held that as a prospective plan subject to approval by the voters, it satisfied the requirements of this amendment in that it provided either for a population-based apportionment in both houses[18] or that the plan satisfied the requirement of the first or second sentence of section 1. As we have noted above, the Federal courts have generally taken the position that they do not abjudicate a matter which is of no consequence to anyone in such sufficient amount as to give him legal cause to complain of it. A direction to abjudicate such a matter contained in a constitutional amendment would doubtless be complied with.

Third, the courts could take the view that until and unless the vote of the people occurs, the holding in Reynolds is the law of the land and both houses must be apportioned substantially on equality of population. No plan which deviated from this could be upheld.

No prediction is possible, of course, as to the view the courts would take or indeed whether they might find an entirely different view. The problem arises essentially from the ambiguity of and the undoubtedly unintended logical line of, the language chosen.

Two other points may be raised in regard to the provision for a plan becoming effective upon approval by the voters. The last sentence of section 2 provides that the apportionment plan "approved by a majority of those voting on that issue shall be promptly placed in effect."

First, what is to happen if the voters defeat all the plans submitted to them? It might be that certain features of all the plans were objectionable to a number of voters and that sufficient numbers voted "No" to defeat everything. The legislature would have been elected under the old plan at the same time the new plans were voted down and would be sitting for the next 2 years. Would it be obligated to submit new plans 2 years hence or at a special election in a shorter time? Is the requirement of the first sentence of section 1 as to time exclusive, that is, only at that time may plans be submitted, or does it merely set the first time and each decade the issue is to be referred with the option open to refer new plans in the event of a defeat?

Second, what about the possibility of more than one plan being adopted? If the plans were listed on the ballot with the voter instructed to vote his preference for one, as on a list of candidates, this result would be unlikely, although if there were three or more plans there might be only a plurality instead of a majority as required by the Senate Joint Resolution 103. But if the plans were on the ballot, as such questions normally are, to be voted on separately on a yes-or-no basis, it is theoretically possible for two or more plans to obtain a majority, especially if the same number of people do not cast a vote on all the questions. The prospects of more than one plan winning are admittedly slight but some thought should be given to the possibility as well as to the somewhat more likely prospects of the defeat of all plans or only a plurality vote.

A last point on this subject is the provision in the first sentence of section 2 that the referendum should be held "in accordance with law and the provisions of this Constitution." The phrase "with law" apparently means State law since there are no Federal statutes on the matter, although it might be that with adoption of this amendment Congress would have the authority to legislate in request to such referenda. The phrase "and the provisions of this Constitution" would apparently mean nor more than that a State could not discriminate on the basis of race or sex or in any way which would violate the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment.

CONCLUSION

The change from the form of Senate Joint Resolution 2 to that of Senate Joint Resolution 103 has opened a number of areas to questions and raised many new issues. If and when the Senate is called upon to consider the proposal in the 2d session of the 89th Congress, it would seem desirable that these matters be fully explored.

DEATH OF ROBERT M. BENJAMIN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Madam President, recently, a great lawyer and a great American, Robert M. Benjamin, died in New York.

Mr. Benjamin became my friend because of his great help and assistance in the field of administrative law.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a short biography of this great man, as printed in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROBERT M. BENJAMIN DIES AT 69; LAWYER SERVED AS STATE OFFICIAL

Robert M. Benjamin, a lawyer, former Moreland Act Commissioner and former member of the State board of regents, died yesterday at his home, 45 East 82d Street. He was 69 years old.

Mr. Benjamin was a member of the firm of Parker, Duryee, Benjamin, Zunino & Malone until 1955, when he became its counsel. In 1955 he represented Alger Hiss in his unsuccessful appeal of his conviction for perjury.

In 1939 Mr. Benjamin was appointed by Gov. Herbert H. Lehman as a special commissioner under the Moreland Act, charged with investigating administrative law in the State. Two years later he presented his report before the legislature. It was later published as a book under the title "Administrative Adjudication in New York State."

He had a long-standing interest in public education. From 1949 to 1955 he was a member of the Board of Regents, serving as chairman of its committee on discipline. For many years up to 1962 he was a trustee and vice president of the Public Education Association of New York.

Born in New York City on April 26, 1896, Mr. Benjamin attended Harvard College, graduating in 1917. After completing Harvard Law School in 1922, he served as secretary to Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. It is said that the young clerk won the warm gratitude of the Yankee jurist when he once suggested that a draft of an opinion could be improved by being shortened.

After being admitted to the New York bar in 1923, he joined the firm of Root, Clark, Buckner, and Howland. He went to Parker and Garrison in 1929 and subsequently became a partner.

At his death, he was a member of the Board of Directors of the American Bar Foundation, a vice president of the New York County Lawyers Association and a trustee of the Practicing Law Institute in New York City.

In addition, he was chairman of the special committee on Code of Federal Administrative Procedure of the American Bar Association and a member of the American Judicature Society, of which he was director from 1956 to 1960.

Mr. Benjamin, who had been a captain with the 303d Infantry during World War I, was a member of the Alien Enemy Hearing Board during World War II. This body reviewed cases of enemy aliens turned over by military authorities for internment under civilian control.

He is survived by his widow, the former Helen Weil; a daughter, Mrs. Mary Arnstein, and two sons, Robert Morris and Stephen Benjamin.

A funeral service will be held tomorrow at 1 p.m. at Frank E. Campbell's, Madison Avenue and 81st Street.

---

[18] We take it to be required that any plan submitted by other than the properly apportioned bicameral legislature must be passed upon by the courts.

TIME IS RUNNING OUT

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, the thought of nations striving to obtain nuclear weapons is frightening and depressing.

The thought is frightening because chances for nuclear conflict, either by accident or by design, would be increased immeasurably.

It is depressing because governmental energy, scientific effort, technical skill, and economic resources would be diverted from such pressing human problems as hunger and poverty to weapons of mass destruction, from building better societies to building bigger bombs.

It is distressing that nations can be so misled so as to believe power rather than economic viability, art, and intellectual and political freedom is the key to greatness.

It is distressing that some nations seek nuclear weapons out of an overpowering fear that warps judgments.

It is for those reasons that I support this Nation's policy "to seek agreements that will limit the perilous spread of nuclear weapons and make it possible for all countries to refrain without fear from entering the nuclear arms race."

It is for those reasons that I cosponsored Senate Resolution 179 supporting efforts to carry out that policy.

Time is running out. The number of nations acquiring nuclear capability increases. Unfortunately, as the demand for peaceful uses of nuclear power mounts and is met, it will become increasingly easier for nations to build their own nuclear weapons.

As Henry D. Smyth, U.S. representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency, said in a recent speech:

> It is impossible to produce nuclear power without producing material usable in nuclear weapons.

In other words, with each new nuclear powerplant will come a new temptation to put the plant's so-called waste products to some use. The best way to encourage resistance to that temptation is to create a world in which no nation need fear not having nuclear weapons. There must be a moral climate opposed to construction of nuclear weapons and practical safeguards to support the moral climate.

The International Atomic Energy Agency has taken several small steps toward setting up safeguards. Agency officials are inspecting several small nuclear reactors in several countries.

However, it is up to the countries to create the necessary world opposition to the spread of nuclear weapons so that the safeguards, not the possession of bombs, will spread.

Mr. Smyth, referring to past and future Agency activities in the area of safeguards, observed correctly:

> What we have accomplished is pioneering and preliminary. It is solidly based. Every big powerplant that comes under IAEA safeguards in the next few years will strengthen the structure of international cooperation and control. Every one that stays out of the system will weaken it.

A similar statement can be made about resolutions such as Senate Resolution 179. Each such resolution which receives strong support from such bodies as this will give moral support to the Agency. Each resolution which fails or passes by a small margin will weaken support for the Agency in other countries.

For that reason, I hope that Senate Resolution 179 will pass by a unanimous vote.

Madam President, by seeking to limit the proliferation of nuclear weapons, we are dealing with more than bombs. We are dealing with enforcing and expanding the test ban treaty, which, in turn, is the world's best protection against polluting the atmosphere with radioactive fallout.

For several years I have been concerned about reports that the level of radioactivity is rising in the Arctic, despite the fact that there has been no atmospheric testing of nuclear devices since 1962, despite the predictions of experts to the contrary.

The more I investigate this subject, the more I become convinced that we do not yet possess the necessary information to arrive at a sound fallout policy.

When I seek information about the meaning of the higher fallout levels in Alaska, I receive vague answers referring to tables which are changed between each request for information.

A recent article published in Public Health Reports, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reported that Alaskans who eat caribou meat have absorbed 22 times the amount of cesium 137 found in persons in other States. The report stated that non-caribou-eating residents of Alaska native areas had absorbed four times the amount of persons living in other States.

A news report quoted a Public Health official as saying:

> These relatively high levels are well below the limit officially viewed as immediately dangerous to health.

Madam President, that answer is not reassuring.

Does the use of the word "official" mean there is another view, perhaps a view which holds the official limit is too high?

What does the phrase, "immediately dangerous to health" mean? Does it mean that the level of fallout in the Arctic may be a hazard to the health of future generations? The statement, like the prediction concerning levels of radioactivity in the Arctic, suggests a lack of information.

I have requested the Federal Radiation Council to review the problem of radiation in the Arctic. The people of Alaska, the people of the country have a right to know at what levels of contamination their Government is prepared to act and precisely what actions their Government is prepared to take.

As I said, time is running out.

The time to gather the necessary information is now, if possible, not after the levels of radioactivity have risen to hazardous levels.

Senate Resolution 179, then, is not only concerned with decreasing chances of nuclear conflict. Those persons who accept stockpiling of weapons as the way of the world, as a necessary evil in these troubled times, should realize that an increase in the level of radioactivity cannot be accepted on the same basis.

And, until we possess the information needed to make sound policy decisions in this area, it is imperative that man not increase the level of radiation in the atmosphere.

One way to ensure that man does not increase the amount of radioactive fallout in the atmosphere is to ensure that nuclear testing is not resumed.

The best ways to ensure the continuation of the test ban treaty are to remove the fears that lead some nations to seek nuclear armaments and to establish international safeguards against nuclear stockpiling.

Perhaps, though I prefer not to have to try, man can successfully refrain, despite the spread of nuclear weapons, from blowing himself up, but he cannot escape the damage resulting from indiscriminately increasing the level of radioactivity in the atmosphere.

Senate Resolution 179 should be approved unanimously.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the letter I wrote to the Radiation Council requesting a review of the problems of radiation in the Arctic.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
January 7, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. GARDNER,
Chairman, Federal Radiation Council,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GARDNER: As you know, over the last several years I have watched with increasing concern the buildup of radioactive contamination in the plants, animals and ultimately the people of Alaska. I have worked closely with the Radiological Health Division and other Government agencies in a determined effort to see that all measurements and all research necessary to the safety of the Arctic—its people and its ecology—are undertaken. So long as I am in the Senate, so long as fallout remains a problem, I shall continue in these efforts.

Results of these measurements and research are now becoming available. They make clear that Alaskans are receiving far more radioactivity than are other Americans in the other States. A recent article in Public Health Reports, published by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, states that Alaskans who do not eat caribou meat have absorbed levels of radioactive cesium–137 four times higher than the mean for the lower 48 States while Alaskans who make caribou meat a staple of their diet have levels of cesium–137 22 times higher. The Washington Post, in its story of this report of December 24, 1965, quoted Public Health officials as saying "These relatively high levels are well below the limit officially viewed as immediately dangerous to health.

Such statements are not reassuring.

Why the use of the word "officially?" Does this mean there is another, unofficial view which is less sanguine?

What does "immediately" mean? Is there reason to believe that over the long term there might, indeed, be health hazards involved?

The Federal Radiation Council was established by the President to provide him and the Nation with guidance on the evaluation of radiation hazards and the creation of such public policy on the subject as from time to time may be required.

It appears to me to be time for the Council to review the radiation problem in the Arctic, especially in Alaska. It is time to gather and to evaluate all that is known of the contamination by fallout of the indigenous Arctic food supply. And it is especially time for the Council to report to the people of Alaska, in clear, concise, and unequivocal language. Alaskans have a right to know, and their Government has an obligation to tell them, the extent of the hazard—if hazard it is.

They have a right to know what additional amounts can be expected to enter their food chain, at what levels of contamination their Government is prepared to act and precisely what actions their Government is prepared to take.

I would appreciate having from the Council such a report for the people of Alaska.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. BARTLETT.

DESERVED RECOGNITION TO DR. RALPH EDWARD GIBSON, DIRECTOR, JOHNS HOPKINS APPLIED PHYSICS LABORATORY

Mr. BREWSTER. Madam President, early this month, Dr. Ralph Edward Gibson, director of the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, was named by Queen Elizabeth as an Honorary Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire—C.B.E.

The high honor was made in recognition of Dr. Gibson's "outstanding contributions to Anglo-American friendship and understanding." It was but one of many honors tendered this eminent American scientist; most of them, however, have come from his own U.S. Government.

Dr. Gibson holds the Navy's Distinguished Public Service Award for the direction he gave to development of the Terrier guided missile at the applied physics laboratory. This supersonic guided missile, which armed the first ships of the Navy's guided missile fleet, now guards the nuclear carrier *Enterprise* and the nuclear frigate U.S.S. *Bainbridge* in the Gulf of Tonkin off Vietnam. From the Navy Dr. Gibson also received the Captain Robert Dexter Conrad Award for "outstanding research and development contributions." He was awarded the Hillebrand Prize of the Chemical Society of Washington and the Presidential Certificate of Merit for his direction in World War II of the development of solid propellant rockets. At that time he was director of research at the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory in Cumberland, Md.

Dr. Gibson has been in charge of the applied physics laboratory since 1947. This organization which now as 2,500 staff members in Howard and Montgomery counties in Maryland, has been responsible for development of the Navy's Talos and Tartar missiles in addition to Terrier. The laboratory has designed and built more than 30 artificial space satellites. Its space research and development for the Bureau of Naval Weapons has provided the Navy with a worldwide system of navigation, extremely precise in any weather day or night.

The applied physics laboratory is also a leader in the field of satellite geodesy, a new discipline based on the observations of our earth from the perspective of orbiting spacecraft. Satellite geodesy has led to the confirmation of the oblateness of the earth, the ellipticity of the equator, and the fact that the ocean surfaces are not level but have highs and lows that differ from each other by as much as 400 feet.

Space research is only one large role played by Dr. Gibson and his laboratory in scientific research. The laboratory also participates in the Navy's Polaris—fleet ballistic missile—program. On each newly commissioned Polaris submarine, an APL team evaluates the complete weapon system, first under controlled conditions at Cape Kennedy and then under the tactical conditions at sea.

The laboratory's work in missiles and space is supported by strong research teams in such fields as combustion and solid state and plasma physics, oceanography, geophysics, and ballistic missile defense. The successful tactics against Soviet antiaircraft missiles used by our fliers in Vietnam were developed by applied physics laboratory this past summer. The laboratory has made major advances in supersonic combustion ramjet engine technology, which holds the key to aircraft and missile engines of the future. Applied physics laboratory staff members recently headed a national study for the Department of Defense which led to improved technology and the understanding of combustion instability in solid fuel rockets, improving the safety and the efficiency of these giant space and defense boosters.

The role of applied physics laboratory in national defense dates back to 1942 when the laboratory was organized in a renovated garage at 8621 Georgia Avenue, in Silver Spring, Md., to develop the radio proximity—VT—fuse for rotating shells. Shells with the fuse's radio sets in their noses were credited with annihilating the buzz bomb over London and helping to stop the German Wehrmacht in the Battle of the Bulge.

When the Japanese high-speed planes and suicide tactics posed a new kind of threat to the fleet, applied physics laboratory undertook to develop an effective antiaircraft defense in the form of a long-range supersonic guided missile. In June 1945, 6 months after accepting this task, applied physics laboratory scientists, had flown the world's first supersonic ramjet-propelled vehicle from a sand spit on the New Jersey shore. In the wake of applied physics laboratory's intensive research and development program the Terrier, Tartar, and Talos guided missiles evolved as the Navy's primary anti-air-warfare weapons.

Since its inception, the laboratory has worked primarily for the Navy, for many years under the Bureau of Ordnance and more recently for its successor, the Bureau of Naval Weapons. In partnerships with many associated industrial and university contractors, this team developed a large part of the Nation's guided missile and space technology.

Dr. Gibson, the director of this outstanding national and Maryland resource, is a graduate of the University of Edinburgh where he received his Ph. D. in physical chemistry in 1924. He came to the United States that same year on a Carnegie research fellowship, and served on the staff of the Carnegie Institution of Washington until 1946, except for a 5-year period when he was on leave of absence to engage in wartime research and development. From 1929 to 1941 he also served as adjunct professor of chemistry at the George Washington University.

DAN BLOCKER ON VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam President, the star of the popular television program "Bonanza," Mr. Dan Blocker of DeKalb, Tex., was the subject of an article written by Lloyd Shearer in Parade magazine for January 23.

One paragraph of that article quotes Mr. Blocker in a manner that I think reflects the very deep apprehension many Americans feel about our deepening involvement in the Vietnam war.

I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paragraph was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At one time he was convinced "our posture in Vietnam was right but now I'm not so sure." Blocker fought in the Korean war. His squad was ambushed near hill 255 on Christmas Eve of 1951. "Our tanks were cut off. My squad was pinned down for 10 hours. Up until then I thought I was indestructible. I realized then that I wasn't, that I'd probably never get out alive. I tasted real fear. I thought about war and what it did to men and for what purpose, and I can tell you there is one helluva difference between intellectualizing about war and fighting it. Only those who've never been shot at, who've never crawled in the filthy, stinking mud or who've witnessed firsthand the political corruption in the Far East—only those are quick to send the flower of our manhood to their death. Like I say, I am a Lyndon Johnson supporter. To my way of thinking he is a great and humane President, but still I question in my own mind whether we can in the name of political justification submit young men involuntarily to a war which so many of them don't understand. I just don't know about this thing."

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE CHIEF JUSTICE OF HAWAII, WILFRED C. TSUKIYAMA

Mr. FONG. Madam President, it is with great sadness that I take this occasion to pay tribute to a most distinguished son of Hawaii, the late chief justice of the Supreme Court of Hawaii, Wilfred C. Tsukiyama. Justice Tsukiyama passed away in Honolulu in his 68th year on January 6, 1966, only 1 week after a serious illness caused him to resign his judicial post. He had been hospitalized earlier last year and had partially regained his health and returned to his official duties, when he was taken ill again last month. On the advice of his doctors that he would not be able to continue his service for any prolonged time, Justice Tsukiyama tendered his resignation to the Governor, although he had less than a year before completing his 7-year term as chief justice.

His death ended the long and colorful career of one of the most respected and honored men in Hawaii. Justice Tsukiyama loomed large in the history of modern Hawaii. His was a brilliant success story of a first generation, native-born American—the son of poor immigrant parents, who achieved his distinction through high ambition, hard work, perseverance, superior ability, and absolute integrity. He was as well known throughout the State of Hawaii as any other contemporary individual. He lived an exemplary life, in public and in private, that won the admiration of the people of his State, regardless of their station in life or their ethnic background.

As a close personal friend and professional colleague of Justice Tsukiyama over a period of many years, I feel keenly the loss of "Tsuki," as he was popularly known. We served together in the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, he as president of the senate when I was speaker of the house of representatives. "Tsuki" was the personification of courtesy and considerateness. I could not have wished for a more understanding and cooperative colleague to work with as a legislator.

Justice Tsukiyama was born in Honolulu March 22, 1897, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Koken Tsukiyama, who emigrated from Japan to work as laborers on a sugar plantation in Hawaii. The qualities imbued in "Tsuki" by his parents—honesty, sincerity, good citizenship, and service to country—were to guide him for a lifetime.

"Tsuki" was graduated from McKinley High School in Honolulu, where his interest in a legal career was first sparked, and from the Japanese high school, where his linguistic talents were nurtured.

As a boy he shined shoes, sold papers, and worked in the pineapple canneries. Although small in stature, he excelled in football and baseball in high school and college, making up in nimbleness what he lacked in size.

His schooling was interrupted by 18 months of military service in Hawaii during World War I. After his discharge from the Army, he attended Coe College in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, for his prelaw studies. He worked his way through Coe College and the University of Chicago Law School. At Chicago he worked as a houseboy until the very day of his graduation. In 1949, Coe College awarded him an honorary doctor of civil laws degree.

Returning to Honolulu after receiving his law degree from the University of Chicago, he joined a law firm to practice his profession—the second Japanese-American attorney to do so in Hawaii up to that time. In 1929 he was appointed a deputy attorney for the city and county of Honolulu; he was promoted to city-county attorney, serving in the top post from 1932 to 1940, after which he resumed his private practice.

In 1946 he was elected to the territorial senate. From 1949–54 he was president of the senate, then minority senate floor leader in 1955, accumulating a total of 13 years in the senate.

Throughout his legislative career and for many years before, he was a tireless worker in Hawaii's campaign for statehood. As one who was allied with him in the statehood drive, I can personally attest to the effectiveness of "Tsuki's" efforts. He made numerous appearances before congressional committees in behalf of Hawaiian statehood. His oratorical eloquence and his forceful arguments contributed significantly to the eventual victory of the cause.

His powerful voice was raised, time and time again, in defense of Hawaii's people against unfair accusations. When feelings against Hawaii's Japanese Americans ran high before Pearl Harbor because they were suspected of being disloyal to the United States, he vigorously spoke up for them:

> Thousands of citizens of Japanese ancestry gave up their families and business connections during the First World War to serve under the American flag.

He said:

> There is no question in my mind but that they will all fight for the United States in the event there is war with Japan.

Justice Tsukiyama's words were prophetic. When Pearl Harbor came, Japanese Americans in Hawaii remained completely loyal to the United States. There was not a single act of disloyalty committed by them. When military service was closed to them immediately after the outbreak of the war with Japan, tens of thousands of Japanese Americans petitioned their Government for the opportunity to serve their country. When military service was opened up again, they flocked to volunteer, both in Hawaii and on the Mainland United States. Their combat record in Europe and the Pacific has been widely acclaimed. The 442d Regimental Combat Team and the 100th Infantry Battalion were cited as being the most decorated units for their size in American military history. Others served in the Pacific as military intelligence specialists, using their language ability to defeat the enemy on dangerous missions and thus saving the lives of countless other American fighting men.

The outstanding war record of the Japanese Americans removed one of the chief obstacles in Hawaii's statehood drive.

When statehood was finally attained in 1959, Wilfred Tsukiyama became a candidate for a seat in the U.S. Senate. Although he failed to win election by a very small margin, his popularity with the electorate was clearly shown in the strong race he ran.

Shortly thereafter, he was given the special distinction of being appointed the first chief justice of the supreme court of the new State of Hawaii. He served with great distinction as the top jurist of his State. He ably and effectively presided over a tribunal which was called upon to decide the many legal problems arising out of Hawaii's new status, thereby contributing to the smooth transition of Hawaii from a territory to a State.

In 1960, he was elected to the seven-member executive council of the Conference of Chief Justices, an organization of the country's 50 State supreme court justices.

When illness finally compelled him to step down from the bench last month, Chief Justice Tsukiyama could say, "My memory will linger back to the days when I have served with absolute honesty, conscientiously and judiciously to administer the affairs of the Hawaii State judiciary."

Justice Tsukiyama's activities ranged far beyond the judicial, legislative, and legal realm. Over the years, he served actively with numerous community and civic groups to promote religious, hospital, business, benevolent, and international relations causes.

Last year he was named Community-wide Father of the Year by the retail board of the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce.

His lifetime of distinguished service was also recognized by the Government of Japan. In 1963, the Emperor and the Prime Minister of that country conferred on him the Order of the Sacred Treasure, second class, for his contributions toward promotion of United States-Japan relations. It was the highest award ever presented by Japan to an American of Japanese ancestry.

On that occasion, a Honolulu newspaper editorial commented as follows:

> Those who know him know, too, that a dozen similar awards—if they existed—could well be made to this unobtrusive, scholarly man for promoting good relations with almost any racial group you could name, either in Hawaii or anywhere he has traveled. His qualities are such that he achieves this simply by being himself and talking with anyone he meets, not as a chief justice, or a lawyer, or a former legislator, but as an alert, friendly fellow with sparkling eyes, faultless diction, real interest in the other fellow's ideas and problems, and a vast store of information about Hawaii and its American heritage.

In death, as in life, Wilfred Tsukiyama will be remembered for what he made of himself and for what he gave of himself to this fellow men. His loss will be long felt by the community of which he was such a superlative example for a dedicated public servant and civic leader.

But, even more, he will be remembered as a warm hearted, devoted friend to the countless citizens of Hawaii whose advancement and well-being were his chief concern during his lifetime.

I mourn the loss of this most worthy and faithful friend. Mrs. Fong and I join "Tuski's" friends everywhere in saying a fond farewell and aloha. We extend our heartfelt sympathy to his beloved wife Marian and his family during their bereavement. May their sorrow be assuaged by the knowledge that a grateful community bows in tribute to his lifetime of good deeds. We will always cherish his memory.

RETIREMENT OF GEN. OSMOND J. RITLAND

Mr. CANNON. Madam President, I wish to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of this body, the career retirement of one of this Nation's most outstanding military leaders. I know all of you will want to join me in expressing our heartfelt thanks.

I should like to mention but a few milestones in his remarkable career. He was deputy to the commander, Air Force Systems Command, for Manned Space Flight, and a command pilot with more than 9,400 flying hours. In his 27 years of military service, he has amassed the equivalent of more than one full year at aircraft controls.

For the past 7 years, he has devoted his abilities primarily to the development and system acquisition of Air Force ballistic missile weapon systems and related military space programs.

He was born in Berthoud, Colo., on October 30, 1909, and attended San Diego State College for 3 years before beginning his Air Force career as a flying cadet at Randolph Field, Tex., in 1932. After completing flying training in 1933, he served at March Field, Calif., as a fighter pilot, and also flew the Army airmail before going on inactive status in 1935 to become a pilot for United Airlines.

After 5 years as an airlines pilot, he accepted a regular commission, and, in 1939, was transferred to Wright Field, Ohio, for a 5-year tour as an Air Corps experimental test pilot. He was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for this phase of his work, being closely associated with and responsible for the development, engineering, flight performance, and functional testing of the majority of American aircraft used during and immediately after World War II.

As a test pilot, he flew more than 200 different aircraft, including experimental versions of the P–38, P–39, and P–40. He was also one of the first Air Corps pilots to fly prototype jet aircraft such as the XP–59 and XP–80.

General Ritland's closest brush with death came in March 1943, when he parachuted from a burning British Mosquito seconds before it exploded in midair. The force of catapulting from a plane at high speed snapped some of the suspension lines of his parachute resulting in an excessive rate of descent. Although he sustained a broken back, he was back at work in 2 months with his back in a cast.

In December 1944, he was transferred to the China-Burma-India theater and served as commander of the Assam Air Depot until 1946. For his services in establishing and maintaining a supply system for support of operations against the enemy, he was awarded the Bronze Star and the Air Medal.

Upon his return to the United States, he was again assigned to Wright Field where he worked in research and development for the continuous evaluation and improvement of all U.S. Air Force aircraft. While Chief of the Aircraft Laboratory, he was instrumental in the development of the pilot ejection seat.

February 1950 found him assigned to the Special Weapons Command at Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex. There, he organized and commanded the 4925th Test Group which was responsible for the development testing of all equipment needed in attaining an Air Force nuclear weapons capability.

His test group also assisted the Atomic Energy Commission and the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project nuclear weapons effects tests, and developed an operational technique for airborne sampling.

In support of the U.S. nuclear weapons program, he organized, directed, and exercised operational control of all aircraft participating in the AEC Nevada Proving Ground atomic testing and received the Legion of Merit for this work.

Following the Kirtland assignment, General Ritland attended the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. He then served 2 years at U.S. Air Force Headquarters as special assistant to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Development where his performance in this sensitive job earned him a second Legion of Merit.

He was assigned to the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division as vice commander in April 1956, and promoted to brigadier general in October of that year. On April 25, 1959, he was appointed AFBMD commander and promoted to major general in July 1959. He held that position for nearly 2 years until a major reorganization of the Air Research and Development Command and the Air Materiel Command was effected on April 1, 1961. At that time, he assumed command of the newly created Space Systems Division of the Air Force Systems Command, a position he held until May 15, 1962, when he was appointed deputy to the commander, Air Force Systems Command for Manned Space Flight. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal in August 1962, in recognition of his outstanding achievements in furthering the aerospace capabilities of the United States while commander of the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division and commander, Space Systems Division. Additionally, in May 1963, he received the Gen. H. H. Arnold Trophy awarded by the Arnold Air Society for outstanding contributions to military aviation and aerospace progress.

He also worked with the Director of Manned Space Flight for NASA, being responsible for maintaining with them the necessary management arrangements on all support provided to Air Force programs by that agency. In recognition of his outstanding performance in carrying out these responsibilities, he was awarded, in November 1965, one of the highest awards of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the NASA Exceptional Service Medal and the Air Force Distinguished Service Medal.

ELECTRONIC EAVESDROPPING—BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Madam President, during the congressional recess, a comprehensive set of articles on electronic eavesdropping, by Thomas R. Guthrie, were printed in the Sunday edition of the Cleveland Plain Dealer of December 19. I ask that these excellent articles be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Dec. 19, 1965]

No Place To Hide

(Note.—Wiretapping or "bugging" of private conversations is not only a fascinating topic, but also is fraught with a great deal of danger to our personal freedoms. In the articles on this page, Thomas R. Guthrie, chief of the Plain Dealer's Washington bureau, explores the entire problem.)

Washington.—Almost literally there is now no place to hide.

Americans today are being mercilessly and pitilessly stripped of their constitutional right to privacy.

In the office and the workshop, in the streets of the city, in the store and even at home they are being listened in on, peered at, inquired about, exposed until they stand naked in all their weakness, at the mercy of a predatory bureaucrat, a hard-driving employer, or just a plain old nosy neighbor.

The Orwellian days of Big Brother are almost upon us. The invention, the development and the refinement of space-age miniature electronic wiretapping and eavesdropping devices has made that possible.

And more devilishly clever gadgets, which already have outmoded Dick Tracy's two-way wrist radio, are on the way. They are all designed to find out what you are doing and saying and, some day perhaps, what you are thinking.

Already they have begun to exercise a form of thought control. People who have reason to believe they are being spied upon or secretly listened to are not now talking with their colleagues as freely as they once did. Why criticize the boss if perhaps he is listening to what you say?

It is the easiest thing in the world to tap a telephone; and it is practically impossible to tell if it is tapped unless you are prepared to take your phone apart each time you use it.

Is your phone bugged? Can you be sure it isn't? Perhaps someone is listening to you next door, in the next block, the next city, the next State, or even in Hawaii. It's quite possible, you know.

Early in January the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure will open an investigation into what its chairman, Senator Edward V. Long, Democrat, of Missouri, calls "industry espionage." The airlines, he says, are spying heavily on each other—routes, rates and such things. So are competitors in the chemical industry, the aircraft industry, the auto industry, the distillers, pipeline companies.

"Law enforcement and national security," Long says, "provide justification for a certain amount of Government surveillance practices * * *. But the right to privacy that Americans have always guarded and cherished must be preserved against the threat of increasingly clever techniques of electronic snooping."

So where do we draw the line?

Is it possible to draft laws to curb these insidious practices?

Does the very desirable end of national security completely justify the diabolically clever means which could, perhaps, one day seriously impair the freedoms Americans have long been wont to take for granted?

The accompanying articles tell how easy it is to poke an electronic nose into your neighbor's wired-for-sound business and how deep is the concern of people aware of this sinister development.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Dec. 19, 1965]

Snoopers' Arsenal Is Fantastic

Washington.—It used to be that parents told their bug-eyed children the story of the birds and the bees.

Now it would appear that today's precocious children, educated and growing up in this exciting age of electronic wizardry, may soon be able to explain to their passé parents the story of the birds and the bugs.

Today's "bugs" are the electronic super snooper gadgets which listen to, transmit and record the unguarded conversations of people whose words may later be used to confound and destroy them. The people being spied on are the "birds," and the operators of the "bugs" are known in the jargon on the rapidly growing Machiavellian trade as the "birdwatchers."

To help them maintain their stealthy watch on the unsuspecting "birds," the snoopers have a remarkable arsenal of weapons which grows larger and more fantastic by the day as the genius of the research laboratory flowers in a profusion of miniature gadgets beyond belief only a decade ago.

The most elementary form of electronic bugging is, of course, the wiretap which, believe it or not, has been with us since the late 1800's. It has claimed among its victims Senators, Supreme Court Justices, mayors, police chiefs, even priests.

But that wiretap was a simple, uncomplicated thing—a direct connection to a telephone wire leading to a headset. Today, no such connection is necessary. There is, for instance, a tiny $3 induction coil which fits into the mouthpiece of a desk telephone and goes to work to broadcast its message when the phone is in use.

Perhaps the most remarkable of all the phone taps is one that will permit an eavesdropper in, say, Hawaii or California or Texas, to listen to all the conversations in a room in, say, Cleveland, while the phone is still in its cradle.

The only prerequisite for this type of tap is that the phones concerned be on a direct dialing system.

At the Cleveland end a special tapping gadget will have been placed inside the phone.

At the Hawaii end the eavesdropper will dial the Cleveland phone number. Before the bell can ring he will play a note from a harmonica into the mouthpiece of his telephone in Hawaii. That prevents the bell ringing in Cleveland and at the same time activates the bug. The phone in Cleveland is now live and will pick up any conversations in the room and transmit them to Hawaii. There is no way for the Clevelanders to know they are being listened to.

Progressing beyond wiretapping the snoopers get with the more sophisticated gadgets.

Most readers have heard of the olive transmitter with its toothpick antenna in the martini glass. That's nothing very remarkable these days.

Birdwatchers have the choice of a two-tooth denture which operates, naturally, right in the mouth of the spy. In one tooth there is a microphone, in the other a transmitter. About 60 yards away—probably in a room across the street or in an auto in a nearby parking lot—is another operative with a tape recorder taking every word that comes out of his colleague's mouth.

Then there is the tie-clasp mike with a wire running inside the wearer's shirt to a transmitter or recorder in his pants pocket. Perhaps the transmitter is enclosed in a normal cigarette pack.

Other items the well-heeled birdwatcher uses:

A wristwatch microphone with the wire going up his sleeve and into an inside coat pocket.

A mike and transmitter concealed in a rose.

An innocent looking picture on the wall which is a complete radio station behind the canvas.

A desk calendar with a built-in transmitter, or an ordinary looking stapler to sit on a desk and transmit all it hears.

A parabolic microphone which can be bought for as little as $13 and pick up conversations over considerable distances on a busy street.

TV cameras smaller than an ordinary flashlight which can be coupled to a two-way mirror and be used to obtain divorce evidence much more candid than anything Candid Camera has ever dreamed up.

Microphones smaller than a thin dime which can be concealed in a variety of interesting places.

Mikes which can be attached to a nail and driven through the wall of one apartment to the plaster of the wall in the next apartment and record everything that's said.

And from the realm of the amazing, we now move to the miraculous.

First, let's look at the laser beam for very soon it will be looking at us.

This is the much-publicized concentrated beam of light that can travel for hundreds, perhaps thousands, of miles with extreme accuracy. It has already been used with success in certain branches of surgery and therefore may be regarded as one of science's gifts to mankind.

On the other hand, a modulation device is now being perfected by the Bell Telephone Laboratories which would enable the laser beam to pick up sound and pictures from inside the walls and from behind the closed doors of rooms great distances away. No microphones, no cameras, no wires, no electric power required other than that in the laser's own light, portable case. Just the beam aimed at the room where the "birds" are.

This weapon will not be a practical proposition for the private snooper for years to come. Its price will be prohibitive.

But don't cheer just yet. There is a poor man's substitute that any snooper will be able to afford. It is a diode device—cousin to the ordinary radio transistor—which is only one-hundredth of an inch across and gives out infrared light. This diode has already been used to transmit both voice and TV pictures over a distance of 30 miles on an infrared light beam. The power required was so little that it would take 1,500 of the diode beams to equal the power of a single flashlight bulb.

According to John G. Marinuzzi, of New York, an electronics experts who wrote to the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, which is investigating invasions of privacy by snoopers, these diodes and the associated equipment necessary for this system are both simple and cheap to manufacture.

And if you want any more evidence as to how frail and vulnerable a thing is your constitutional privacy, take a gander at this—if you can see it.

It is an integrated microcircuit which is made by placing layers of metals and materials less than one-thousandth of an inch thick on top of each other to form a kind of electrical sandwich.

It can do everything its big brother made of tubes and wires can do, says Marinuzzi. But it is so small you need a microscope to see it and special sensitive machines to work with it.

A radio transmitter made this way, says the New Yorker, could be concealed in a slit made in the side of a playing card or a piece of wallpaper.

Not only are they practically impossible to detect, but they are reaching the stage where they can be made so cheaply they will be used like paper towels.

"The use of snooping tools by the crook and the curious public," Marinuzzi forecasts, "is about to explode."

There's nothing in these microcircuits to burn out so that their life will be indefinite; and they take their energy from any local broadcasting station, which means the bugs will remain active around the clock.

Already the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has had developed a complete radio transmitter-receiver that can be placed comfortably in the human ear; Case Institute of Technology in Cleveland has placed FM tranmitters smaller than an aspirin in the bodies of experimental animals as a research tool; General Electric has placed transmitters in rats which draw their power from the rats' bodies. No batteries are needed.

Thus the ramifications of snooping are almost limitless, and the chances of anyone being caught with such super-sophisticated equipment is very small. Though why anyone should worry about being caught is difficult to explain, unless their conscience should bother them. There is no law so far saying these gadgets are illegal.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Dec. 19, 1965]

"BUGS" PREY ON RIGHTS OF CITIZENS

WASHINGTON.—There was this woman in Michigan. A good worker, she was with the telephone company, but her standards began slipping. So her employers put a tap on her telephone and for 14 months recorded her conversations with her friends. They found she had terminal cancer. And she was fired.

"I know telephone people. They are fundamentally decent and honest people. But decency dies when it is too long exposed to immorality, especially where the immorality has some legal basis. Eavesdropping is not just an injustice to the person who is spied upon. Eavesdropping is also a corrosive and corrupting force on the person who does the spying. It corrupted those supervisors in Michigan. It will corrupt others." Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, testifying before Senator EDWARD V. LONG's Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure.

Then there are the three Ohio Internal Revenue Service agents—one each in Toledo, Cincinnati, and Youngstown. They were sent to the Treasury "school" in Washington to learn how to pick locks and plant bugs in the premises they enter. The argument is that the IRS agents' "skills" will be employed against such people as bookmakers, rackets figures, narcotics pushers and so on.

"The snooping that each (Federal) agency does individually may seem innocent enough in appearance. But when the total picture of such Government activities is put together, it may well indicate a frightening encroachment on individual privacy in this country." EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, which is investigating invasions of privacy.

In Dade County (Miami) it is reported that one-third of all divorces there last year were granted primarily on the basis of information obtained by wiretapping and bugging.

"The reasons for eavesdropping are many, but one thing is obvious: You cannot eliminate the reasons without eliminating man himself, which brings us to our present dilemma." John G. Marinuzzi, New York electronics expert, in written testimony to LONG's subcommittee.

In California a hospital administrator was caught monitoring, among other things, confidential doctor-patient conversations. He was fired.

"Would it not be possible for the CIA, with its governmental authority, to convince a dentist to install a bug in a suspect's tooth in the name of justice and all our country holds sacred? Could a hospital become an intelligence-gathering center for our police? Or, let's go one step further and put a radio transmitter into a suspect's body which monitors his breathing, his blood pressure, his perspiration rate and his heart. These things are exactly what a lie detector monitors." Marinuzzi.

There is also the problem of the Post Office Department and its "mail covers." When the Post Office uses a "mail cover" on a person, inspectors record from the outside of each piece of mail addressed to the suspect or members of his family, the name and address of the sender, the place and date of postmarking and the class of mail. The information is used as leads in an investigation and not as evidence in court.

Among those convicted where "mail covers" were used were:

Racketeer Frank Costello for income tax evasion.

A man named Sam Schwartz for mail fraud in a turf tipster scheme.

A man who raped and murdered a 5-year-old girl, then fled to Mexico. "Mail covers" led to his being deported to the United States.

"What we are dealing with here is clearly a problem of the balancing of interests: privacy of the individual on the one hand and law enforcement on the other. Obviously neither of these interests can be satisfied entirely. What we must seek and attain is a middle road which can best resolve this dilemma." Senator Long.

In that statement Senator Long goes to the heart of the matter. Clearly a balance of interests must be found, and found before the new microcircuits flood the market and everyone becomes his own private eye.

"It is obvious," Long says, "that this proliferation of snooping paraphernalia is increasingly placing the constitutional right of privacy of the individual citizen in peril.

"Surveillance is becoming more and more pervasive in our lives, and privacy is becoming harder to protect.

"If we expect to have any privacy in 1984 or 1985—we must examine the probable advances in technology, and we must provide stringent laws against indiscriminate eavesdropping.

"As incredible as it may seem, there are virtually no statutes, Federal, or State, to protect against eavesdropping, indiscriminate or otherwise."

Beirne argues that eavesdropping and wiretapping equipment of all types should be registered and that all users of such equipment must be licensed by the Federal Government.

In the licensing provisions he urges that strict limits be placed on the eligibility of agencies and individuals entitled to use such equipment.

"In discussing the weapons of eavesdropping and wiretapping," Beirne says, "we are talking about weapons as dangerous to democracy, to personal dignity, and to individual freedom as thermonuclear weapons are to human survival.

"We do not equip the State militia with thermonuclear missiles. Nor can the cop on the beat or the bank guard or the private detective avail himself of tactical nuclear weapons.

"For the survival of privacy, dignity, and freedom, for the survival of those things that make human survival most meaningful, let us sharply limit the number and drastically limit the use of all forms of wiretap and eavesdropping equipment."

A WAR THAT ALL CAN WIN—ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR McGOVERN OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Madam President, on January 18, 1966, Senator George McGovern delivered a significant address at the annual convention of the National Limestone Institute here in Washington.

In discussing the International Food and Nutrition Act, authored by Senator McGovern and now pending in the Congress, he said:

All men can be winner of a war against want, just as we are real winners today from the war against domestic want which started in the Thirties to bring an end to the paradox of want and surpluses coexisting within the United States itself.

As a cosponsor of this bill, I call the attention of other Senators to his remarks, and ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A War That All Can Win

(Remarks of Senator George McGovern, of South Dakota, at the annual convention of the National Limestone Institute, Washington, D.C., January 18, 1966)

For all of the decade I have spent in Washington I have been talking and writing about a war against want.

It is a real pleasure to talk to some of the warriors—to the men of an industry who have helped husband our soil resources and keep them productive both by supplying an essential mineral, calcium-carrying limestone, and by defending the Federal program which has helped to increase limestone use from the 1- to 3-million-ton-level in the 1921–46 period to 27 million tons last year.

All Americans are indebted to you and your industry for your part in the job that has been done.

I know you have a direct interest in the agricultural conservation program. We all do. And we will all benefit if the application of limestone to our farmlands climbs to the 80 million tons annually which the agronomists tell us that we need. You would benefit. Farmers would benefit. The land would benefit. America would be strengthened for the great war against hunger which lies ahead.

Private enterprise—yours, the hybrid seed salesman's, the farm machinery and supply industry's, and the farmers'—has now admittedly made the difference between America's food abundance and the Communist bloc's conspicuous lag in agricultural development and ability to feed its own people. Russia is now trying to build some incentives into her system and stimulate some of the sort of enterprise found in America.

We also have an obligation to the Limestone Institute for the presence in Washington of your president, Bob Koch.

Bob is a genius, and I say that thoughtfully. I have long known him as a man of great organizational ability and as a great legislative strategist. Two or three months ago he produced an edition of your Limestone magazine so effectively you received a well-deserved Freedom From Hunger Foundation Award. I can attest its effectiveness for I got a good many letters asking if I had seen it, or asking how to get a copy. Copies were also sent to me by a dozen people who wanted to be sure that I didn't miss it because they were themselves so impressed.

So Bob has proved himself an editor and publisher of great talent.

Last month, Bob and his staff almost single-handedly arranged an impressive organizational meeting of the Committee on the World Food Crisis. No one else could have assembled such an outstanding group of national leadership people and run a meeting so smoothly and impressively in the short time he had. Thus far, I have found nothing that your president cannot handle in a distinguished way.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to express my appreciation to you of him, as I have already expressed it to him.

Through your national office, this organization has already made a mighty contribution to efforts to awaken our country to what I am sure is the greatest challenge of our times. It is a challenge which involves not only our moral responsibilities as Christians to our fellow men, but also our national security and the possibility of bringing into existence a world at peace. At the same time, it offers us an opportunity for economic growth.

The world is faced with hunger and starvation on a scale never before known, unless we begin at once to plan for tomorrow's food needs, as well as to size population to what this planet can support. The food crises that are occurring this year in Russia, Red China, and India, resulting in food grain transactions of unprecedented size, are a very mild, pallid warning of what lies ahead.

The reality is that the Russia, China, and India emergencies have only tended to divert attention from even larger, chronic hunger and starvation in the world, which we have been taking for granted. Under so-called normal food supply conditions, want is far more extensive than generally realized.

Half a billion of the world's 3 billion people lack enough food. Another billion suffer from malnutrition, or lack of adequate proteins, vitamins and minerals in the foods they eat. Three million children die each year from diseases induced by malnutrition. Countless human beings go through life permanently crippled physically, mentally, and emotionally because they did not have proper food in their formative years. The ever-present companions of malnutrition—lethargy, disease, and premature death—breed a vicious cycle of listless people, powerless to break out of their misery but capable of breeding children and multiplying misery.

The present prospect of this undernourished planet is that population will double in the next 35 years and stand at 6 billion human beings in the year 2000. World population growth is now about 2 percent a year.

The growth rate testifies to the miracles of modern medicine, but it is a miracle, upon us here and now, which mankind cannot manage unless we adopt policies and make adjustments with far greater speed and boldness than ever before in human history. Massive famines that will take the lives of hundreds of thousands of our fellow men will be upon us in another decade unless the planet's agricultural resources—both those of America and of the less-developed world—are brought to maximum production during that decade.

There is one thing certain: the paradox of America restricting production while tens of millions starve cannot continue any more than this Nation in the thirties could tolerate the paradox of extensive want, hunger, and death in the midst of surpluses.

Population control measures are on the way. But they will not be adopted overnight. There remain both social and scientific hurdles to be overcome. Control is unlikely to do a great deal about the anticipated 40-percent increase in world population in the 15 years just ahead, to 1980. That means another 1¼ billion mouths to feed and bodies to be supplied.

Heroic increases in world food supplies are needed now to alleviate want and prevent another generation of warped bodies, extending the problem of handicapped adults another generation. Our surpluses are all but gone. Our 1.4 billion bushel carryover of wheat in 1961 will have been halved next July 1, and is headed down toward 600 million or even 500 million bushels—less than an adequate security reserve. Feed grain carryover has been pulled down from 85 million tons to 57 million tons. Dairy products are already in short supply seasonally. We need to stimulate soybean production for commercial markets this year. We have a statistical surplus of cotton, but less than enough to decently and warmly clothe the people on earth today.

It will take large increases in food production in the years just ahead if the adjustment is to be made with food rather than by reduction of population through war, disease, starvation, and mass deaths.

This grim world outlook can be our greatest international opportunity if we are capable of a grand strategy in world affairs. We have two courses to choose between, now that Public Law 480, the food for peace law, is drawing to an end because of the disappearance of agricultural surpluses on which it is based.

We can treat the race between food and population as a continuing, inevitable human tragedy which is remote from us. We can announce our surpluses are gone and let children and adults die off in the less developed and less fortunate lands, concentrating on protecting our island of affluence in a sea of misery with halfway aid measures and the threat of massive nuclear retaliation. If we choose that course, we will be running the risk of a cataclysmic war which will leave even the survivors in a cauldron of radioactivity to meet an uncertain fate.

Or we can choose, as wise commanders do, to fight on a front where we can win, to fight the war against want. It is the most important war the race of man ever faced, a war we can win, and a war from which our Nation can come off stronger and richer—richer in moral, spiritual, and material ways.

We have a disproportionate share of the world's arable land resources. They are not enough to meet the whole world's food deficits, but we also have unrivaled agricultural production and handling know-how which can increase productivity around the world. And we have a system of democratic government with freedom and enterprise which, copied throughout the world, can help to increase affluence everywhere.

We can fight the war against want with corn instead of cannon, with farmers instead of marines, with tractors instead of tanks, with nitrogen used in fertilizer instead of explosives, with technology instead of battle plans, with food instead of fear, and with development instead of destruction.

All men can be winners in such a war—just as we are real winners today in the war against domestic want which was started in the thirties to end the paradox of want and surpluses here at home. As we ended the depression in the thirties, and as we have created jobs and eliminated poverty in post-World War II days, we have enjoyed growing prosperity, and growing affluence.

A world war against want would be an extension, beyond our national boundaries, of a policy adopted by our first President and Congress that has brought us to our present greatness, strength, and prosperity.

George Washington, Albert Gallatin, and our earliest national leaders worked for Federal programs to bring about development of new areas. We have continued programs to stimulate the expansion of productivity across our land down to the present time. As geographical frontiers have disappeared, we have gone back to redevelop and upgrade the economic activity of some our own less developed areas and to expand vertically.

The Tennessee Valley, the Columbia Basin development, the great western reclamation projects, and now Appalachia and the planned regional commissions in New England, the Ozarks, the upper Great Lakes, and my own upper Great Plains area are examples of that policy.

These area developments have paid dividends to the Nation as well as the immediate territory involved.

Tennessee Valley counties bear twice the share of the Federal tax burden today that they carried in 1935. They pay twice as much income tax. That means they import and export twice as much or more from the rest of the Nation. Their contribution to the total economic strength of the Nation has doubled. The Columbia Basin has become an economic bastion of the Nation as a whole.

The flowback of benefits from economic development abroad is just as clear economically as the flowback from our own regional developments, and it has returns in terms of world peace and human freedom not involved in our own regional development projects.

We gave Japan food assistance after World War II. Japan is today our largest foreign market for agricultural commodities. She buys from us each year more than we granted her over several years.

The Department of Agriculture has made a study of our exports to 54 developing nations which we have given food-for-peace aid. For every 10-percent rise in per capita income their purchases of agricultural commodities from the United States have increased 21 percent.

An in-depth study by the Department of Agriculture, "Foreign Economic Growth and Market Potentials for U.S. Agricultural Products" concludes:

"The results of this study clearly indicate a definite and positive relationship between growth in income and trade. They also indicate that expansion in the demand for U.S. agricultural and other products will continue to be closely tied to world economic conditions. Rapid economic development will help maintain a steady growth in U.S. agricultural and total trade; * * * market outlets for an increasing part of American agricultural products will become more and more dependent upon the rate of economic progress in other countries. And, since the greatest market potential for U.S. agricultural products is in the developing countries, it would be in our own economic interest to help promote economic growth in these less-developed countries."

The techniques for using food assistance to stimulate development in the emerging nations of the world are well known to the agencies that administer our food-for-peace programs.

The voluntary agencies like CARE, Catholic Family Welfare, and the others use grant food for wages on community and rural development projects—and it is rural development that is most needed to meet the challenge of the food and population crisis.

The soft currencies which recipient nations pay for food-for-peace supplies under title I of Public Law 480 are loaned back from many types of development projects; a considerable amount is earmarked for American private business firms to borrow to start business in the issuing countries.

A war against want will require a decade or more to win.

There are bottlenecks of dock facilities, storage facilities, transportation, and of knowledge on how to use our foods, which must be broken. India does not have conventional port facilities adequate to unload the food she needs right now from the ships that bring it to her shores.

We cannot pour food into a less developed country in quantities or on terms which will destroy the incentive for their own farmers to increase their production, as they must if the race with growing population is to be won. We must help those countries with our know-how and supplies to achieve maximum self-sufficiency. There are many other problems, including increasing the support of other developed lands.

But if our great Nation has the skill to put a man on the moon, it has the skills necessary to solve the distribution and development problems connected with a major world food effort.

President Lyndon Johnson, in his state of the Union message, has called for a maximum effort to meet food, education, and health problems in a worldwide attack. He did not call for a limited effort.

I had the pleasure of reporting in the U.S. Senate last Friday that support given my proposed international food and nutrition bill reflected unprecedented unanimity among American citizens.

All of the four major farm organizations favor moving our international food effort from surplus disposal to production to meet the needs of men. Labor organizations and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce are in support. Church groups, professional groups, the college and university community, and scores upon scores of newspapers and magazines—leaders of the fourth estate—have expressed support. The endorsements are bipartisan, and by far the most extensive spontaneous outpouring I have ever known behind any proposal.

We have yet one gamut to run.

Space technologists and the electronics industry think they are the inventors of a new technique of miniaturization.

We have had experts at that technique in Government for a good many years. They sometimes serve a useful purpose, but not always. The war against want, the race between food and population, cannot be won with any miniaturized, pilot projects. It cannot be fought on weekends and holidays. It cannot be won with left-overs.

This war, from which our Nation and mankind can benefit eternally, can only be fought and won if we recognize it as the most important war in the history of mankind and if, in President Johnson's words, we make a "maximum, worldwide effort."

The war against want cannot ultimately be avoided.

What we do about it this year—in 1966—may very well determine whether 15 or 20 or 25 years from now the less developed world has become a world of self-sustaining, cash customers of both our agricultural and industrial industries, of if it is a cauldron of unrest and danger to the peace of the world, which can be brought into a balanced relationship between food and population only by the expenditure of greatly increased amounts for assistance and grants as a result of population growth and lagging development.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF SOUTH VIETNAM AT THE ARMED FORCES CONGRESS IN SAIGON

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, on January 15, I was in Saigon. On that day, the Prime Minister of South Vietnam, Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, spoke at the closing ceremony of the Armed Forces Congress, made up of approximately 1,500 officers, who serve in every area of South Vietnam.

In perhaps its most important feature, Prime Minister Ky declared that the Republic of Vietnam should set forth on the road to constitutional democracy. In his speech, he outlined procedures for the drafting of a constitution providing for democratic institutions, and plans to have the constitution voted on by the people at the end of 1966, with elections for office to be held a year later.

A second feature of the address is the stress on the pacification and rebuilding of the civilization. It indicates the importance which Prime Minister Ky attaches to bringing about a peaceful improvement in the living standards of the people. It is a statement that the Central Government is concerned about people throughout the country, and that his Government is taking vigorous action to demonstrate its concern.

I met with Prime Minister Ky and secured a copy of his speech from the U.S. Embassy. I believe it important that it should be printed in the RECORD, so that the full text will be available to the Members of the Congress of the United States and to the people of our country. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF PRIME MINISTER NGUYEN CAO KY AT THE CLOSING CEREMONY OF THE ARMED FORCES CONGRESS, JANUARY 15, 1966

Dear fellow Vietnamese, dear comrades in arms, in the course of national events, each period should provide an opportunity for these entrusted with national responsibilities, to review the manner in which they have carried out these responsibilities, to assess the situation and to plan adequate actions for the next stage.

This is why, today after over 200 days in the office entrusted to me by the directory as head of the Government and on the occasion which coincides with the end of the At Ty lunar year, I consider it my duty to appear before you, fellow citizens and comrades in arms, to draw, together with you, a yearend balance sheet and to define the objectives for the year ahead.

PART I

Dear fellow citizens and comrades in arms, before dealing with future objectives, we should, of course, glance back at the past and make a sincere review of past activities to determine what we have achieved and frankly acknowledge what we were unable to achieve and what still remains to be completed.

I am going to review the negative part first because what the Government has not done according to its wishes has always obsessed me.

Let me deal straight off with a minor problem but one which, however, is closely related to the daily life of the population in the capital and which has become a cause for criticism of the Government: electricity.

It is, of course, a handicap to industrial and commercial enterprises, and an irritation for private citizens and the government alike, when so vital a commodity as electricity cannot be supplied. In many press conferences and communiques explanations have been given regarding the cause of the electricity shortage and the measures taken to solve it. Some deadlines for solution have been set. But notwithstanding this, the capital still remained short of electricity until the end of 1965.

It was only at the beginning of the year that the electricity cut was limited to nighttime only. Despite the efforts made by the Government to help solve the shortage—efforts that yielded some results—the shortage which prevailed during the last 6 months was a stain which marred the picture of the Government's achievements.

While this stain still remains to be removed, another has appeared: the bus transportation problem. You all know that problem. It has been a chronic disease. Many remedies have been tried to cure the disease but all of them failed. Finally, the Government was compelled to remove the cause of the disease by allowing the bus management authority to wind up business and leave the place to another and sounder organization to run the company.

Outside of Saigon, the existing state of the interprovincial communications network is also a problem, but one which must be blamed totally on the war, not on technical or organizational defects. And the present war is chiefly one of sabotage directed by the enemy mainly against our infrastructure facilities: highways, bridges and so forth. Therefore, to solve the problem of lines of communication is conditional on the solution of this war of sabotage. Now that the war situation has begun to turn to our advantage, the improvement of the communications network seems realizable.

In the area of major concern is the economic problem. No government whatsoever could boast full success in its economic policy after only 6 months in power, especially when it inherits a chaotic situation which lasted for 2 years and which bore the aftermath of a period of 20 war years.

But not to have attained success does not mean failure. The tremendous effort and the achievements recorded will demonstrate this. However, as long as there is a large gap between wages and prices, as long as our people must strive so hard to find such items of prime necessity as milk, sugar and cloth, and so long as our fellow countrymen have to wait long months before being able to buy a motorbike the present government has to admit shortcomings, as it has to make all-out effort to settle the whole problem or at least to reduce the numerous injustices which still abound in all classes of society.

In the list of shortcomings, we must acknowledge the absence of institutions planned in the provisional charter, which to date still fail to be realized: such as the High Economic and Social Council, and the High Council of Magistrates. We must also recognize that, due to the present circumstances, the Government still is unable to create a favorable political climate. This leads to a report of what remains to be done.

These things of which I spoke were only part of the Government's shortcomings.

There were naturally many others, as mentioned almost daily in the press and by the public and that I sincerely admit in order to draw therefrom valuable lessons.

Dear fellow citizens and comrades in arms, while considering these shortcomings from an impartial and objective viewpoint, we cannot, however, deny the achievements made by the Government during the short period of time since it came to power.

In contrast to the earlier 6-month period, and contrary to pessimistic predictions by those malcontent politicians and especially by those ill omen tellers, we have achieved political stability, a key prerequisite if we are to win the present ideological war. The success in this can be ascribed to the spirit of comprehension and cooperation prevailing among all strata of the population and among all political and religious groups.

All of these were aware that the trend to division, to partisanship, and to mutual destruction in the national ranks are serious defects which can only result in hurting the people's fighting potential at a time when the Communists are increasing their war effort. Because of this achievement in national solidarity and unity of mind and action, our rear has been more consolidated than ever before, compared with what prevailed under previous postrevolution governments. It is also evident that this support for the frontline and the consolidation of the rear have taken place in an enthusiastic and stimulating atmosphere which has brought together the major sections of the population.

That is also the reason leading to the obvious improvement of the military situation, and that is also why the free world has shown its confidence in us with a great number of democratic nations giving full assistance in all fields to us. The most eloquent proof has been the participation in the fight, without any conditions, by the allied forces, who fight alongside their Vietnamese comrades in arms on all the battlefields. This has resulted in important military victories, making the situation better every day. If we were not cautious, we would say more and more optimistic. Without having to elaborate the difference compared to what it was 6 months ago it is clear for all to see.

Our military victories began immediately in the rainy season, the very monsoon season in which the Vietcong had boasted many times that they won the initiative in every battlefield. If this Communist propaganda made some lose their confidence and become pessimistic, the Government can point to its victories in the present dry season as something more specific than propaganda.

Since last October, after the world-famed victories of Pleime, Ya Drang, and Chu Prong, where thousands of Communist bodies were left behind, Government forces, with the effective support of allied forces, successively won many other important battles: the Ba Ria ambush, the pursuit operation against the VC Dong Thap Regiment at My Tho, Bau Bang, Ben Cat, as well as the battles at Cau Ke, Cho Gao, Thach Tru, Lap Vo, Tam Ky, Long My, and so on. Everywhere, enemy bodies were lying all over the battlefield along with huge quantities of weapons.

All this testifies to the valiant spirit and the combat tactics of the Government and allied forces. Of course, this fighting spirit can only endure if one has confidence in the Government and in the future of our Nation.

The point most worth mentioning in this present phase of our struggle is that no enemy position and no enemy stronghold can be considered safe, because all these have been smashed in repeated bombings and shellings.

In brief, in constrast with the military situation this month last year, the Government and allied troops have completely in hand the initiative of operations at every battlefront, and the tide of the war has turned in our favor.

Following the military victories, the Government has also scored many valuable successes in the diplomatic field. The Government has striven to restore the national prestige, the confidence, as well as the strengthening of cooperation and support, of the friendly countries in this anti-Communist struggle.

That is one reason why many high-level delegations from our country have made good-will visits to neighboring countries, such as the delegation led by the Secretary General of the National Directory to the Philippines recently and the visits to the Republic of China, Malaysia, the Republic of Korea, and Thailand.

The Vietnamese missions abroad also instructed their personnel to hold conferences and seminars at the universities, associations, press organizations, with student and religious and other groups to explain the aggressive plot of Communist North Vietnam, and the Vietnamese people's and Armed Forces' struggle.

Our diplomatic offensive has greatly diminished any prestige the Vietcong had. The most concrete proof of this is that the British Government has put aside a resolution submitted by a leftist parliamentary group and formally announced that it recognized only the lawful Government of the Republic of Vietnam.

Countries friendly to us, especially those in the Afro-Asian bloc, which include a large majority of nonalined countries that formerly paid little attention to our struggle for self-defense, have changed their attitude and now show good will and sympathy toward us through support for Vietnam at the Algiers conference.

At the United Nations General Assembly, many member nations have affirmed their support of the stand of the Republic of Vietnam. At present, nearly 40 free world countries are actively contributing to our struggle in one form or another and will continue their assistance until our final victory over the Communists and until peace and happiness are restored to the entire people.

Next comes the economic aspect. Though communication difficulties greatly affect the national economy the Government's efforts in regularizing the internal market have been as follows:

Rice supply: During the past 3 months more than 82,000 tons of rice have been supplied to the eastern provinces, the central highland, and midlands. Some 1,735 tons of paddy and 90 tons of rice have been transported from the Mekong delta to Saigon. Rice imported from the United States totaled more than 27,000 tons shipped to Da Nang and more than 16,000 shipped to Nha Trang. With more than 93,000 tons of imported rice, the Economy Department will have enough rice to provide for local needs and to set up reserves for the provinces.

During the past 3 months, 21,334 tons of sugar and 331,600 cases of condensed milk have been put on sale.

There was an increase in price and a shortage of rice and some other food in September and October but now thanks to the Government's efforts, food is no longer short and prices are stable. For example, Saigon consumes daily from 800 to 1,000 pigs. The price of pork previously was high because the city received only 400 pigs a day. But now the supply has become regular and in the last month the city has received 2,000 pigs every day or twice the quantity it needs.

The price of pork has dropped accordingly.

Since July 1965 the Government has spent $47 million to import rice, condensed milk and wheat flour, the quantity of which largely exceeds local needs for the Lunar New Year.

To supply other needed material for the has set up storage depots to stock needed goods such as rice. These include: two rice depots in Ba Xuyen and Bac Lieu, three in Da Nang, Qui Nhon and Nha Trang, eight depots for the cooperatives in the western provinces, six depots for the tobacco cooperative and other depots for cotton yarn and paper.

To supply other needed material for the population, the Government has provided 25 more million of U.S. dollars to import motorbikes, scooters, radios, sewing machines, and other goods. Meanwhile assistance from countries other than the United States has been used to import industrial equipment.

To cope with artificial shortages and excessive price increases, the establishment of large retail centers is being studied.

Our efforts to improve the standard of living and activities in the field of social welfare are also noteworthy:

Land reform: Thanks to the new land reform program, 3,158 farmers have been made landowners since September 1965. Of this total, 2,268 low-income farmers in 10 provinces were allotted cultivated land in accordance with ordinance 57. A further 758 families in seven provinces were allowed to work public-owned land and 132 families in one province were allotted cultivated land which was purchased from French nationals.

Further, by virtue of the October 8, 1965, decree, 227,629 families that were working on cultivating fallow land in the clearing and resettlement centers have been given ownership of 134,700 hectares of cultivated land.

Electrification of the rural areas: Three rural electrification pilot cooperatives were established in Tuyen Duc, An Giang, and Duc Tu (Bien Hoa) with the view of supplying power to the cooperative members at low prices. The Rural Electrification Cooperative Union was established on October 15, 1965, in order to push ahead the rural electrification program.

Workers' appropriation program: A total of 400 taxicabs and 200 tri-Lambrettas were imported in the first phase of the Government's program to sell these vehicles on an installment basis to drivers who used to rent their cars from others. A first lot drawing of such vehicles took place on January 8, 1966, in the capital. All the vehicles will be distributed by January 17. Other contingents of such vehicles will be imported by the Economy Department for redistribution.

Low-cost housing units: The Public Works and Communications Department built 554 single-story housing units at Vinh Hoi and Tan Qui Dong. Other construction projects such as road paving and drainage operations are underway at Thanh My Tay. Thanh Da and Phu Tho Hoa. Another building project, covering the construction of 1,000 housing units, at VN$25,000 each for workers is under study. Payment for the homes will be made on a 10- to 20-year installment basis and no down payment will be required. At the same time, the Department also plans to buy up vacant lots and sell them on an installment basis to low-income families who wish to do their own building. Another noteworthy fact is that the Government has canceled the "villa" building project for certain civil servants which was initiated by previous governments.

Health: The Health Department made a tremendous effort to build in the capital as well as in various provinces, a dispensary, a psychiatric center, a leprosy center, a surgical section, four maternity clinics, and a farm for mentally ill persons. These efforts have been carried out, along with the training of rural health cadres. We have arranged the reception of foreign medical teams including a number of experts and quantities of materials and drugs.

Social welfare work: As of December 12, 1965, the Social Welfare Department granted a total of VN$285,714,210 to anti-Red refugees throughout the country. Of the total number of refugees, 460,434 have been resettled. The Social Welfare Department also has enlarged the Thu Duc National Orphanage and built two new orphanages in Vinh Long and Binh Thuan at a total cost of VN$12 million. Plans have also been drafted for the construction of 20 day nurseries and 12 other orphanages in 1966 at a total estimated cost of VN$82 million.

All the regional social welfare organizations throughout the country have received financial assistance from the Social Welfare Department for further development. A beggar reformation center has been set up at Phu Binh in an effort to put an end to begging which must be eliminated in any modern society.

In the field of information, with the aim of bringing news to large numbers of people in the rural areas, more than 30 provincial newspapers have been published. During the past 6 months, the Chieu Hoi (open arms) program recorded more than 7,000 returnees who brought in nearly 1,000 weapons.

Television is one of the newest activities in our society. After a series of studies, on January 3, 1966, we signed an agreement with the American Government on television. At the end of this month television programs will be available here. One thousand TV sets will be installed in the heavily populated areas of the capital and in nearby provinces. A following shipment will bring another 1,500 sets to Vietnam.

In the field of culture and education, one can note the following points:

An education reform movement has been launched in order to help students make progress from the moral, intellectual and physical points of view. The movement also aims at giving the students a stronger sense of responsibility as citizens. This is an attempt to form a new generation of youth for the reconstruction of the country. Four pilot centers are now actively operating toward this end.

A large number of schools have been built to cope with our educational needs, such as the Viet Duc (Vietnamese-German) technical education and the craft and industry school at Thu Duc, the school for the deaf and dumb at Lai Thieu, three new primary schools in Thua Thien, Ham Tan, and Binh Tuy and so on. In addition to all this, 546 primary school noon classes which are very detrimental to the health of the children, have been abolished, and 224 new classrooms have been built for the pupils in the Saigon-Gia Dinh area.

The annual examinations at the primary and secondary education levels have been revised for the benefit of the students. The primary education examinations and those for the junior high school certificates will no longer be held, starting with this school year. The baccalaureate I system of examinations will also be abolished starting with the 1968–69 school year.

As another evidence of the Government's efforts in the rural education field, outstanding students from low-income families will be granted official scholarships, thus enabling worthy students to complete their secondary education.

A cultural institute is to be established with a view to promoting all the national cultural activities. The institute will be open to writers, artists, journalists, and to the public as well. A program aimed at improving arts and letters will be announced shortly and put into practice in the near future.

Administrative reforms are also being tackled by the Government. An administrative reform committee has been established to study and to recommend all appropriate measures designed to increase the administrative efficiency of the Government machinery. As a result of such reforms, close cooperation between the Administrative and Financial Inspection Directorate General on the one hand and the inspection divisions of the other departments on the other hand has been initiated. All the administrative abuses such as misuse of authority, bribery, misappropriation, etc., will be eliminated.

In other fields, the Government has done its best to successfully serve the people in accordance with scheduled programs which are scheduled but which I will not mention here.

The Government has strictly run its programs in line with what was announced 7 months ago. The outcome of the prosecution of such programs are modest but unquestionable and are decisive to the success of the social revolution. In fact, the steps which our society are taking have not merely started in another direction, they are already traveling in another direction. All those who directly contribute to the struggle for the emergence and the reconstruction of the fatherland are well treated and supported. All the low-income people who once suffered injustice under the old regime now are getting land of their own to plow or taxicabs of their own to drive. In the economic field, no complete control of consumer goods prices has been made by the Government as yet. But the normalization of the supply of such goods by the Government has been effected. This means that the Government is cutting off opportunities for the profiteers' malpractices by totally controlling the supply of the consumers' goods. In the military area the continuous victories on the battlefields have forced the enemy into a defensive position and he has to take recourse in terrorist acts.

Although these results have not yet entirely satisfied us, they do constitute reasons to strengthen our confidence in the final victory.

PART II

Dear fellow Vietnamese, dear comrades in arms, from the date of assumption of office by the war cabinet, the Government's policies and programs of action have been clarified on several occasions. Therefore, the major targets of the war cabinet could in no way be misunderstood by the people. The assessment of the home situation and the announcement of the major duties of the war cabinet during the inauguration ceremony of the Government on June 19, 1965, and the declaration of its 26-point program of action still constitute the guiding principles for governmental projects. In addition, on October 1, after 100 days of office, I made an amendment to the war cabinet's role so as to fit its programs of action more closely to the national requirements. On that occasion I also confirmed my standpoint on the national revolution and restoration of peace—a standpoint which the Government is perseveringly and determinately carrying out to respond to the situation.

Within the framework of such general policy of the Government, and on the basis of the results which I have reported, I would like now, on behalf of the cabinet, to announce the main targets to be realized by the Government in 1966:

A. First target: To win the war—to pacify, and to reconstruct the rural areas

First of all, what do we really want?

Such a question posed to any Vietnamese concerned with the fate of his compatriots and the honor of the nation and the happiness of the people in this part of the world—which means the happiness of each individual and each family—gets this unique and unvarying answer: Decidedly, not to communism.

To such an answer, no additional comment is needed.

There is no answer more eloquent than the blood of thousands of combatants who have sacrificed themselves for the survival of the fatherland from the Red imperialists' invasion.

There is no reason stronger than the hardship endured by the Vietnamese combatants and civilians during the lifetime of one generation, the hardships of those who are determined to eradicate Communist ideology from this part of the world.

There is no evidence more concrete than the flow of anti-Red refugees who prefer leaving behind all that is so dear to them: homes, ricefields, villages, rather than live shamefully under Communists' tyranny.

We are determined not to be Communists.

Such is the unanimous determination, the slogan of the whole Vietnamese population, yesterday, today and tomorrow, and until the day the Communist threat is eliminated from this country.

But how do we get rid of this threat?

There is no other alternative to the solution than to defeat the Communists and to rout them from their strongholds. We must defeat the Communists and exterminate communism. Otherwise, the Communists will exterminate us and enslave our people from our generation to our offsprings' generation. No one can foresee when enslavement by Communists will end.

The present anti-Red struggle is a total one. Its battlefields are everywhere. But the main line of resistance is in the rural areas and that is where the struggle will be decided.

So the formula for such a struggle for the war cabinet is: to defeat the Communists, to pacify and to reconstruct the rural areas.

Of course, such a formula is not a new discovery. All the former governments called for rural reforms, back to the countryside, and so on. The policy remains the same, from the so-called strategic hamlet program to the new life hamlet action program, to win the hearts of the people and to remove the poisonous fish from the pure rural waters.

What about the results? There is no need to repeat the results.

The war cabinet will not follow the path of the one which has failed. It is determined to do something for the rural areas, the areas which constitute the main and basic part of our Nation.

To attain this goal, one must have an objective and realistic view of the situation. In fact, after a victorious military operation, one may think that an area is automatically pacified. But a state of insecurity can quickly return to the area by a small number of the Vietcong who mix themselves in with innocent people.

Our viewpoint is not only to root out the Vietcong from the rural areas but also to root ourselves in the rural areas and this not only for some time, but forever.

But, how to put this concept into action?

The task of liberating national territory remains a heavy, but glorious, task of the Armed Forces. But, naturally the Armed Forces cannot be stationed forever in every hamlet and village, and on every portion of the roads. For this reason, immediately after a successful military operation, an effective and well-organized group of cadres will arrive to exploit the advantages brought in by the military operation. They will carry out pacification work with their main task to be the rebuilding of a new life in rural areas. These cadres will immediately set up teams among the people to help them rebuild their homes and till their land. They will contact authorities responsible for reconstruction of social welfare facilities such as schools, dispensaries, maternity clinics and the like. To maintain and consolidate the security in the area, they will also rally and organize the local people.

This effective system of cadres will spread horizontally from hamlet to hamlet and vertically from hamlet to village and village to district and so on. This will constitute an intersupport position having the effect of an oil spot. This is the very key to the problem of pacification and rural reconstruction.

These conceptions and plan of the Government will constitute the main work of the Vietnamese Government for this year. The Government is determined to mobilize every opportunity and every resource and make every effort to recover maximum control of our cherished population and our rural areas by the end of 1966.

B. The second goal is to stabilize the economic situation

Our second important goal in the new year is to stabilize the economic situation.

To draw up a correct economic policy, one must begin by assessing accurately the present economic situation in the country.

Do we have inflation or do we not?

If we take the word in its literal meaning—indiscriminately putting in circulation banknotes without maintaining proper gold and currency reserves—we do not have any inflation because we have sufficient gold reserves to meet any currency demands.

If we understand the word in its popular meaning, i.e. a too large and too rapid circulation of the currency, then we do have this thing called inflation. Why? The following five reasons will explain this situation:

1. For a long time, and particularly for the past few years, because of the increasing tempo of the war, the budget demands increased to meet the war situation. To an already deficit budget we have added more deficits because of the instability and successive changes in the national situation.

2. Due to increasing subversive Vietcong activities, the supply system has encountered many difficulties, many branches of production have slowed down.

3. A number of short-sighted businessmen, thinking only of their immediate interests, have indulged in speculation and hoarding, cornering the market in many items and disturbing the economic life of the people.

4. To stop the expansion of Red imperialism, 200,000 allied troops have come to Vietnam to fight on our side, with expenditures reaching 1 billion piasters a month. In addition to this are the amounts spent on construction.

These reasons are the direct causes of the increase in the volume of currency while goods and other necessities could not supply the demand, thus creating price increases.

We should introduce here a parenthesis: civil servants and employees in the private sector and other people who live on a fixed salary suffer the most from price spirals. At the same time, unemployment has completely disappeared, since services everywhere are paid at the highest rates ever seen. In brief, if there are some classes of people suffering from this situation, other classes have benefited and now have a higher living standard. This is an important change in the overall living standard of the Vietnamese society. It is too soon at present to estimate the effects.

Such is the real situation and the difficulties in the solving of the problems are enormous. I would like to report here a typical event.

When speaking about the increase in the volume of currency and the decrease in available goods, everyone sees that the simple solution is merely to import a large quantity of foreign goods to make up for the shortage in local goods.

Thus, in the last 3 months, the Government has released nearly $200 million from the aid funds as well as the Government-owned foreign currency to import prime necessity goods. But the problem is not that simple.

If you want to import goods, you have not only to pay for then, but also you have to hire ships to transport them and provide docks for landing them.

The commercial port of Saigon can only receive a maximum of 200,000 tons a year. With the present American aid program, the volume of imported goods already exceeds more than double this figure, not counting military materiel.

Thus, with the Government's utmost effort and with the help of the most eminent experts, it still needs a minimum period of several months to enlarge the landing piers and to construct new ones. This is the work the Government is urgently carrying out at Thu Thiem, an islet on Thu Duc River, and at Vung Tau, Cam Ranh, Qui Nhon, and Da Nang, so as to complete in a few months an emergency plan.

This plan includes any urgent and reasonable measures concerning financial, currency, and economic fields which will converge together to the important goal of maintaining the purchasing power of the piaster, arrest price increases, and provide the population with all the prime necessities.

On the one hand, the Government will strictly implement a policy of thrift and economy in its agencies, and reduce the national budget's expenditures to their minimum, despite the increase in military expenses.

The decision to reduce the expenditures down to $55 billion and the decision to give priority in the national budget to rural reconstruction, and to construction of schools and hospitals was a basic element in discussion with the U.S. Government on the aid program. These decisions led to an increase of U.S. aid this year to at least twice the amount of U.S. aid last year.

On the other hand, the Government will strive to increase national resources, mostly its revenues by improving tax-collecting methods. In this respect, I am convinced that our compatriots of all social strata not only are eager to fulfill their duties toward the national budget, but also heartfully contribute to any urgently needed national requirements.

The tax system is under reexamination with new standards on social equity, so as to enable those circles who were enriched greatly due to the war situation to have the opportunity to contribute more than other laboring and needy people, Concerning those who live on their monthly salary, the Government will carry out every logical and complete supply system for their benefit.

In the meantime, all Government credit and tax agencies will give every assistance to the establishment or development of all useful branches of business. The Government is planning to expand public and semipublic enterprises to enable Vietnamese capital to participate to a greater degree.

Therefore, the savings can be used productively. Investments for increasing production will replace passive holding or illegal trade speculation, and foreign currency blackmarketing, which the Government is determined to eradicate.

I would like to warn once again all those blindfolded profiteers who hoard goods for speculation and provoke price hikes; they will go bankrupt, because in the days to come, with the increase in foreign aid, imported goods will flow into the local markets. Adequate measures and procedures will be adopted to enable an abundant and rapid import of goods.

Concerning the consumers, I would like to call your attention to this fact: Every delay in the supplies and the temporary shortage of goods should be considered normal in a protracted war. So I ask you to avoid rushing into crowded shops to buy some temporarily short product. This only benefits dishonest dealers, pushes forward the speed of the money circulation and thus increases the pressure of inflation.

C. Our third goal: To build democracy

The third goal, building democracy, is as urgent and important as the two previous ones. I would like to clarify once more—to be sure that no one misunderstands the present Government's goal and policy: because of the need in this historic phase, and conscious of their responsibilities toward the national destiny, the Armed Forces have assumed power, not with the intention of clinging to it, but to create the necessary conditions for setting up a genuine democracy that will answer the aspirations of the entire people and the goal of our nation's long war which has been with us since the French domination to present.

My viewpoint in this problem has not originated from my subjective conception but from an objective situation of the 2-year period following the November 1, 1963, events. Two years which saw the profound division of the people, the decomposition of our society, the internal subversion, along with a war that reached its highest intensity—all this caused a loss of confidence in this part of land, increased the people's suspicion, and sowed confusion among them. No one had confidence in anything and every theory, policy, or program submitted was regarded with distrust and cynicism.

In pure theory, democracy is the only factor which can defeat communism; if there is no democracy we lose the reason for our struggle, let alone the means of victory.

A genuine concept of democracy, however, should be based on the true situation of the country, the real circumstances of the society, the political maturity level of the population and, in this case, the subversive war being waged by the Communists.

In fact, in these 2 years, there was no basic document which could serve as a basis for building democracy. A provisional convention which was in effect no longer than 3 months was violated, amended, and some months later, completely buried, only to be replaced by what was called the Vung Tau Charter. This charter had been the cause of a troubled, dark period before a civilian government come into being with a provisional charter. But the fate of this document was no different from that of its predecessors. Now, with the National Leadership Committee, we have a convention, but this is no more than a temporary statute which comes from the Government, not from the people.

When one speaks of democracy, everything should come from the base that is the people—the entire people, or at least the majority of them—and not dictated from the Government and forced on the people.

A democratic regime should begin with a democratic constitution. But a constitution is not the work of a few days, and also it is not an experiment in a laboratory. Thus, the main point of the problem is to build democracy.

Without such a basic medium, a constitution, no matter how ideal, will wilt and fade away, if it is not torn up by the uprisings.

However, I do not mean that this Government will use the state of war, or play up anticommunism or use the present condition of the nation, to restrict democratization. This Government has made up its mind to proceed with democratization, slowly but determinedly by training the people for their responsibilities and their interests, by helping the social organizations and political parties find ways and means to step up their activities and strengthen their positions. Thus will such organizations and parties lend a successful hand to the common performance of the national duties in the future. This Government has also made up its mind to drop demagoguery and to deny any confused, shortsighted and blind democratization which will push the whole nation into chaos.

With such a philosophy, we move on our way toward progress with the following:

1. A democracy building council will be set up after the lunar new year. Upon formation, such a council will propose a draft constitution in the near future.

2. This draft constitution will serve as the main topic of discussion for seminars to be held throughout the country. Invited to participate in such seminars will be city and provincial councilmen, members of political parties, trade-union members, and students. So all the pros and cons of the matter concerned will be aired and recorded. Thus the preparation of the future constitution will be the preoccupation of the whole people, not of just a minority.

3. Once these seminars are launched, the Democracy Building Council will collect and consolidate the opinions and ideas of the participants and arrive at a consensus. The council will then amalgamate the various points into a document to be voted upon in a popular referendum. The referendum will be held next October.

4. After the people's opinions seminars have decided on a particular constitution, that constitution will serve as the basis of our democratic regime and will be officially proclaimed next November.

Those who wonder why we don't elect a constitutional assembly like many other countries have to look straight at the present war situation with its difficulties, complexities, and tricks, to find the answer.

The situation of our country is not like any other, so why take after other countries? We have to establish a constitution which fits our nation.

5. When we have the people's opinions on the constitution, we will prepare for real democratic elections in 1967. With these elections, we will have legislative services, according to the people's will, and come back to the regular government elected by the people.

While accomplishing these objectives we naturally also have to increase our efforts in the war and in the rural reconstruction program, in order to recover the Vietcong-controlled areas and help the anti-Communist refugees. The elections will only have meaning and value if security is assured and the citizens vote in large numbers. This is one reason why we are choosing a gradual and stable solution for the establishment of our democracy.

Besides, it is a reality which everyone has to accept, to be patient and confident, to prepare for the next step. As for the Government, it will carry out its responsibilities in these tasks and provide the organizations and parties with appropriate opportunities and conditions to reach a mature and superior level, to assure the future of the nation. The organizations and the parties themselves will—to be realistic—will review their ranks, reorganize themselves, form new cadres, and reinforce their real strength and prestige to assure themselves of the people's and authorities' confidence.

On this point, I would like to add that, though the present Government may still be awkward and inexperienced, there is no doubt of its good will in collaborating with organizations, parties, and individuals who wholeheartedly want to lay the foundation for our future true democracy.

This completes the report on the objectives of the Government's program.

On this occasion, I deem it my duty to point out the traditional ideal and determination of the Vietnamese people which is to always cherish and seek peace but only a peace which will guarantee its freedom, independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity. Any other form of peace which fails to provide these guarantees, would only be a lure into slavery and one which the Vietnamese people, with their clearsightedness and courage, would crush down in order to proceed toward a genuine and realistic peace.

For those who still nurture doubts about this issue, I would say to them: our concept of peace is very simple. We have not provoked war, we have not declared war. The present war is an invasion from outside our country and one which at the outset was disguised as an internal struggle. But the disguise has been removed for a long time and the invader has uncovered himself. Now, it is up to the invaders from outside and his subversive henchmen within our country to end the invasion and subversion. Then peace would at once return to this part of the country. Thus we would end the concern of so many nations large and small and of so many statesmen the world over. If the invaders, acting like a blind force, cannot restrain themselves, then it would be our duty and the duty of all those peace-loving people to combine efforts to contain their ambition. Otherwise, the last resort would be to "outlaw them as peace saboteurs" in this peace-loving and freedom-loving part of this country.

I deem it my duty also to express the sincere gratitude of all our people to all the countries and international organizations and statesmen, as well as to all religious leaders, especially Pope Paul VI, who have demonstrated great concern over the plight of the Vietnamese people. I further want to insist that peace is workable only if it can guarantee national independence as well as the people's freedom of thought and human dignity.

I also want to associate all our fellow citizens and comrades-in-arms to the acknowledgment that under whatever circumstances, we should ourselves be responsible for our own destiny. No other nation is qualified and able to decide on our destiny, independently of our own will. For reasons of international solidarity, we have accepted, and are grateful for the moral and material, military and economic, assistance from the friendly countries. But never can we tolerate any interference harmful to our national sovereignty or any decision at variance with our people's aspirations.

Fellow citizens, comrades in arms, now I have spoken out all my feelings, my remarks and my observations and I have reported on the objectives of both the National Directory and the war cabinet from the period just ended to the next one.

Despite the clamor of war roaring around us, despite the noisy provocations hurled by our enemy to discourage us, despite differences of view touched off by certain people, whether responsible or not, we are determined to hold unflinchingly to our spirit, to endure suffering with great patience, to pursue tenaciously the struggle for national salvation and reconstruction with the purpose of defeating the Communists and bringing back peace to the fatherland. We will prevail in our present national plight in order to bring back democracy, prosperity and happiness to our people.

With this strong belief and decision, I sincerely urge all our compatriots without distinction of class, religion, social stratum group, or party to clearly assist in the effort to sweep aside all friction, confrontation, or jealously of an individual or communal nature and devote all their efforts and will to the future reconstruction of the fatherland and nation.

When the nation is faltering, when the country is suffering destruction and partition, most of our families will suffer estrangement, separation, misery, and the loss of loved ones.

If there are some classes of our society which are privileged, this is just a minority in the different classes of the national community.

The war situation, along with disorder, oppression and the struggle for survival and for progress have created social injustices, hampered the love of the nation and of mankind, and even has caused that love to be forgotten.

In the face of this state of affairs, I can only make a sincere appeal to every strata of society and to all of our compatriots to share the misfortune and to help the families who have been unfortunate in this national catastrophe. I also urge them to look straight at the situation created by the subversion, the mourning, and the war, in order to come to the assistance of our poor compatriots by sacrificing to a certain extent our own interests.

Only with this can one hope to reduce social injustices, to restore the love for our fellow creatures, so that we may advance toward the reconstruction of this country.

The international situation is now going through tremendous changes which will see either the upsurge or the decline of our people. The period that lies ahead will be a decisive one as far as the salvation and reconstruction of this beloved land of ours is concerned.

We will have opportunities to quickly refill the gaps, the delays, and the waste of time which occurred during the past 2 years.

We should remain united in mind and spirit so that we may try to take advantage of these opportunities. We alone can save ourself. We cannot stay idle waiting for assistance from others.

I am of the opinion that those of us who are still alive have as had those who have died, the duty of contributing to the task of rebuilding, renovating, and developing this land to help it become stronger and to help it progress.

This is our heritage and the heritage of our successive generations.

I resolutely have confidence in the clear-minded recognition and of the reasonable choice of all fellow countrymen as well as of our fellow combatants.

I salute my fellow countrymen and fellow combatants.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MINIMUM WAGE LAW

Mr. TYDINGS. Madam President, since my duties as Presiding Officer of the Senate last Thursday kept me from speaking on H.R. 8126, the bill to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law before it was passed by the Senate, I would like to take a moment now to note for the record, my strong support for this long overdue reform and my pleasure at its passage.

Madam President, the concept of minimum wage legislation for the District of Columbia is not new. Congress first enacted a District of Columbia minimum wage law in 1918. That law was a pioneer in the minimum wage field.

But as the decades have passed, that law stood still. Its coverage was too restrictive and its provisions were too rigid to meet the needs of the National Capital.

Although many workers in the District were protected by the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, more than 200,000 employees who work in the District of Columbia were not protected by any minimum wage law.

Indeed, one of the most glaring defects of the 1918 law was that it covered only female and children employees. It gave no protection to men at all. Nor did it cover domestic workers.

Who needs minimum wage protection? Do the lawyers, doctors, architects and other professional people have to worry about earning the $1.25 an hour minimum wage the bill the Senate passed last Thursday authorizes? Do organized and skilled employees work for less than $1.25 an hour?

No, the people who directly benefit from minimum wage legislation and the people who need it most are the unskilled workers whose labor contributes so greatly to the effective functioning of society, but whose skills are so slight or whose employment is so unstable that they have little power to organize and no ability to bargain for a decent wage.

The dishwashers, the waiters, the janitors, the car parkers, the household maids, and the thousands of others who provide many of the services which make life easier and more pleasant for all of us, most often find that society is willing to accept their labor, but not willing to see that they are paid a living wage.

In preparing the minimum wage bill we passed Thursday, the Senate District Committee discovered too many cases like that of a restaurant kitchen worker here in the District who works 48 hours a week and gets only $12.50 a week and two meals a day for his pay. The committee discovered an apartment house maintenance man paid $35.40 for a 40-hour week and a parking lot attendant paid 45 cents an hour.

We cannot tolerate these incredible conditions anywhere in the country, and especially not in the Capital.

H.R. 8126, as amended and passed by the Senate, is a reasonable response to the pressing problem of providing a minimum living wage for thousands of workers in the District of Columbia.

By extending the minimum wage to men, as well as women and children, in the District, the bill will eliminate conditions such as those found to exist in one upholstery shop, where a man was paid 90 cents an hour for doing the same work women do in the same shop for $1.10 an hour.

By requiring payment of time and a half for overtime, the bill will reduce the excessive hours worked in many District of Columbia places of business and spread the number of jobs available.

By extending the minimum wage to domestic workers in the District of Columbia for the first time, the bill will guarantee a decent wage for the many women who labor in others' homes to provide or supplement a bare subsistence income for their families.

All this bill does is to make sure that District of Columbia workers receive at least the national minimum wage for their labors. All this bill basically provides is that for a 40-hour week, 52 weeks a year, a worker should receive at least $2,600.

A reasonable minimum wage for the workers of the District of Columbia will help hold families together, help contain welfare costs, and help provide a decent opportunity for family dignity. A decent minimum wage will generate increased purchasing power for District of Columbia businesses, thereby improving economic conditions generally, and providing greater employment opportunity.

But an equally compelling reason for enacting this District of Columbia minimum wage bill is that the human cost of a lower minimum wage is simply too high to bear. When the father of a family cannot make enough to feed and clothe his family, the community cost in increased crime and delinquency, worsened slums, and rising welfare expenses is intolerable through the cost to our conscience of standing by while fellow citizens are exploited by a cynical and heartless wage slavery.

This revision of the District of Columbia minimum wage law was long overdue. It was necessary. It was right.

PRAISE FOR JACK VAUGHN AND LINCOLN GORDON

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, "A Good Reshuffle"—that is what the New York Times called the change which brought Jack Vaughn in as Director of the Peace Corps and Lincoln Gordon to take his place as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs. Knowing them both, I can say "amen" to the praise they have both received.

Jack Vaughn was in on the ground floor of the Peace Corps. He was there from the first, and was one of those who kept its programs close to the earth. He has emphasized a community development approach by which corpsmen act as catalysts, cheerleaders, gadflies, and promoters for self-help projects which begin when the local people identify their needs. When he came to the Peace Corps, there were 123 volunteers in Latin America. When he left to become Ambassador to Panama, there were 3,000. I have seen them at work in the urban slums and destitute backlands of Brazil, and I can testify that they are doing a praiseworthy job.

It was in Brazil, where he has served as our Ambassador, that I first met Lincoln Gordon. I endorse the appraisal of him made by the New York Times. Their editorial of January 19 said:

> The appointment of Lincoln Gordon as the new Assistant Secretary of State for Latin

America brings to that difficult assignment a man with penetrating judgment and a wealth of useful experience as an economist, Government official, and diplomat.

He has been an enthusiastic Ambassador to Brazil, providing that country with sensible economic advice and trying tactfully to steer its present military regime toward a democratic solution of its difficulties. Mr. Gordon understands what the Alliance for Progress is all about and can be depended upon to give it resolute support.

The Washington Evening Star said of Jack Vaughn:

> (He) was doing a remarkable job as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs and U.S. coordinator of the Alliance * * *. His selection does assure the Peace Corps of an able, imaginative Director.

Mr. President, both men promise well. We have reason for reassurance in their selection.

I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials to which I have referred be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 19, 1966]

A Good Reshuffle

Whether his directorship of the poverty program enhances or detracts from his reputation in the future, Sargent Shriver's service with the Peace Corps has marked him as an effective idealist.

The idea for the Peace Corps was first broached by Vice President Hubert Humphrey in the Senate and Representative Reuss, of Wisconsin, in the House and was later taken up by President Kennedy; but it was Mr. Shriver who transformed an exciting idea into a convincing success. His zest and energy have helped thousands of volunteers, young and old, cut through the deadly smog of cynicism that tends to envelop foreign policy and to reach the poignant human realities that lie behind today's crises.

Jack Hood Vaughn, who now takes over the leadership of the Peace Corps, is doubtless happy to be leaving the State Department, where he has been Assistant Secretary for Latin America. As an outsider with an academic background, he has been sandwiched between the career Foreign Service officers below him and the dominating personality of Under Secretary Thomas C. Mann above him.

He had barely assumed office a year ago when the Dominican crisis erupted. Mr. Vaughn has loyally defended administration actions in that crisis, but the evidence suggests that he was a bystander, as President Johnson and Under Secretary Mann did most of the policymaking. Back in the Peace Corps, where he previously served as Latin American chief, Mr. Vaughn can deploy his talents in a line of work totally congenial to him.

The appointment of Lincoln Gordon as the new Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America brings to that difficult assignment a man with penetrating judgment and a wealth of useful experience as an economist, Government official, and diplomat. He has been an enthusiastic Ambassador to Brazil, providing that country with sensible economic advice and trying tactfully to steer its present military regime toward a democratic solution of its difficulties. Mr. Gordon understands what the Alliance for Progress is all about and can be depended upon to give it resolute support. If any man can reassert the full authority of the Assistant Secretary as chief policymaker for Latin America in the bureaucratic jungles of Washington, Mr. Gordon is the man.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 19, 1966]

Girding for Battle

The White House showed good judgment in giving the war on poverty its first full-time administrator. This is the most ambitious of all the domestic programs created by the Johnson administration—and, at the moment, the most vulnerable. The Republicans are talking of scandals in the antipoverty war that will be revealed in due course. And such extravagant failures as New York City's Haryou-Act program have left the public skeptical of the whole operation. Relieved of his Peace Corps job, Mr. Shriver still will have his hands full defending and guiding what has become a prime target of congressional criticism.

The White House had to raid the State Department to find a Peace Corps Director—and the Alliance for Progress seems to be the loser. We agree with Representative Selden, chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee, that Jack Hood Vaughn was doing a remarkable job as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs and United States coordinator of the alliance. It is even possible that Vaughn's present tasks are a good deal more important than anything he could do as Peace Corps Director. But his selection does assure the Peace Corps of an able, imaginative director—leaving Sargent Shriver free to wage the bigger war at home.

SAGA OF THE SEA

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, on November 26, 1965, the SS *Oduna*, battered by high seas and 50-mile-an-hour winds, ran aground between rocks and a high cliff on Unimak Island, off western Alaska.

The angle of the ship made it impossible to lower lifeboats. Thus the scene was set for another great saga of the sea. In the true tradition of those that go down to the sea in ships, courageous attempts to take the men off the SS *Oduna* were successful. The entire crew of 37 was rescued.

The ship, on a regular run from Adak to Seattle, was owned by the Alaska Steamship Co. The company's agent in Kodiak submitted a report on the crew. The report is fascinating reading. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, those reading the report will learn of the courageous actions of four members of the crew of the MV *Adeline Foss*, a Seattle-based tug which sped to the stricken ship on receiving its S O S.

Weather conditions made it impossible to approach the *Oduna* from the sea or the air. Military helicopters sent to the scene were forced to wait for a turn in the weather.

However, the *Adeline Foss* crewmen did not wait. A party consisting of 1st Mate W. D. Thompson and Seamen Russ Christensen, Larry Ostby, and Ted Snider, managed to land on Unimak Island. After making their way down the cliff they successfully set up a breeches bucy line and brought 19 members of the *Oduna* safely to shore. At that point, the weather improved and the rescue was completed by helicopter.

A report of the rescue operation has been submitted to the Merchant Marine Awards Committee for consideration of possible awards for the four men of the *Adeline Foss*.

Special mention must be made of the efforts of Air Force Capt. Gerald Belanger and his helicopter crew, which completed the rescue. Describing the work of these men, the captain of the *Oduna* said:

> What he did is beyond words. We owe a great deal to him.

And finally, words of praise and thanks should go to all the units, military and civilian, which were alerted and ready to take part in the rescue operations if needed.

Madam President, the story of the rescue of the crew of the *Oduna* indeed belongs among the great stories about those who go down to the sea in ships.

Exhibit 1

Report on the SS "Oduna"

The tragic ending of this voyage of SS *Oduna* under the sheer 700-foot cliffs of Ikatan Peninsula, Alaska, can only be tempered by the successful rescue of all 37 crewmen aboard in spite of battering seas and 50-knot wind conditions.

At 0655 November 26 we were notified of the *Oduna's* distress by Capt. R. E. Emerson, commanding officer, U.S. Coast Guard Air Station, Kodiak, with the terse information that she was aground, breaking up, and safety of the crew was deemed to be in extreme danger. Our office staff was alerted and reported for duty immediately. The facilities of Alaska Communication System were also notified and placed in full emergency status by their Kodiak commanding officer, M. Sgt. Gordon Wells, which subsequently contributed immeasurably to the successful communications network for the ensuing rescue operations.

On my arrival at the Kodiak Coast Guard Rescue Center at 0735, it was learned that the U.S. Coast Guard Cutter *Storis* and one of their Albatross aircraft, both based at Kodiak, were already en route to the scene, and intense operations were in progress for the dispatch of other vessels and aircraft. Kodiak Rescue Center was in full charge of all rescue operations, and the facilities of related commands in the Alaska Sea Frontier and on the mainland were made available as required. The nearest suitable helicopter was dispatched from the Air Force at King Salmon. The Air Force also supplied a C-130 transport aircraft from Elmendorf to move a detachment of Army mountain troops from Fort Richardson which were deemed necessary in the event it became appropriate to perform a rescue from the beach cliff area. Another U.S. Coast Guard Albatross was dispatched from Kodiak with additional equipment and personnel, including Lt. Comdr. John Hancock, U.S. Coast Guard, who was directed to assume mission command of all rescue forces on arrival at Cold Bay.

Commercial marine units also responded to the distress call. The nearby tug *Adeline Foss* quickly anchored her tow in a cove near the area and proceeded to *Oduna*. A Japanese vessel also responded, *Taiyo Saru No. 82*, and permission was obtained from the Navy to place a Japanese landing party on the beach should it be necessary before arrival of the Army mountain troops. The fisheries research vessel *Reed*, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife vessel U.S.S. *Pribiloff*, operating in the Dutch Harbor area, were also dispatched to the scene.

By 0900 rescue operations had assumed massive proportions. Weather conditions at the scene did not abate, and were reported to worsen. A Reeve Aleutian Airways Goose, based at Cold Bay, managed a hazardous flight to position of *Oduna*, and resulting reports were indeed grim. Seas were breaking over the stranded vessel, and 50- to 60-knot wind conditions prevailed.

We waited for arrival of rescue units. By 1100 both the *Adeline Foss* and the Japanese vessel reported any attempted approach to *Oduna* was impossible by sea. Rocks offshore and on both sides of the stranded vessel prevented any close approach, as well as any launching of the *Oduna's* lifeboats.

The first Albatross from Kodiak arrived at the scene at 1145 and the helicopter from King Salmon arrived at Cold Bay at 1245. Attempts to get near the Ikatan cliff were fruitless due to extreme air turbulence. It was reported *Oduna* was foundering.

At 1400, the *Albatross* reported *Adeline Foss* had managed to get a beach party of four men ashore on the leeward side of the peninsula, and somehow they had scaled down the cliff area to *Oduna*, planted a "dead-man," received a line from the vessel, and set up a breeches buoy operation. This feat of accomplishment was viewed with amazement and admiration by the USCG on scene as well as at Rescue Command. Although the beach party was battered by surf and spray, the first reports of this operation began to filter through—1 man ashore, 3 men ashore, 9 men ashore, 13, 19. At this point, winds had subsided somewhat. and the helicopter was able to approach *Oduna*. In rapid succession they removed the remaining 18 crewmen from the vessel, as well as those already on the beach—including the *Foss* rescue party—to safe area. It is to be noted that the master and two of his ship's officers had to be ordered by the USCG to evacuate the vessel, as they apparently desired to remain aboard, in spite of the danger involved, until arrival of company salvage officials. The helicopter then transported all the personnel to the leeward side of the peninsula where they could safely get aboard the vessel *Pribilof*, who had offered her services to transport the survivors to Cold Bay, and where food and lodging facilities were available pending transportation arrangements to Anchorage and Seattle.

Although the mountain troops and their paramedics were held in readiness at Cold Bay, it was comforting to know they were available for deployment to the Ikatan Peninsula 35 miles away should the circumstances have required. *Adeline Foss* was back alongside her tow by 1030, and all rescue processes were secured. The *Pribilof* arrived Cold Bay at 2200, and in phone conversation with Captain Karbbe, he reported that all 37 crewmen were present, and no injuries reported, although some of the crew were wet and badly chilled.

We referred all requests for press releases or statements to our Seattle office, where detailed information about the stricken vessel and her crew was available.

We also kept our Seattle officials advised by periodic direct telephone reports from our position at Kodiak Rescue Center of all developments as they occurred, and furnished the Coast Guard with information as required concerning rescue equipment aboard *Oduna*, crew list company salvage personnel en route, plans for transportation of *Oduna* survivors from Cold Bay to Anchorage, and answers to numerous other questions as the rescue operation progressed.

The Coast Guard mission commander has advised us that on his departure from Cold Bay November 27 for return to Kodiak, he flew over *Oduna*, and vessel is now practically parallel to the beach and cliff with propeller completely out of the water, but is still on even keel in upright position, and crack in after hull is clearly visible.

The overall rescue effort under the direction of Captain Emerson was indeed remarkable, and offer our highest commendation to all who responded and/or participated in the successful rescue and evacuation of the officers and crew of SS *Oduna Vey 24*. Orchids to the *Adeline Foss*, and to the helicopter pilot Capt. G. R. Belanger and his crew, and we understand that those two units are being recommended for citation by appropriate authority.

THE VINLAND MAP

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I have had the privilege of reading a very interesting article by Mr. Amintore Fanfani, professor of economic history at the University of Rome. This article is entitled "The 'Vinland Map' and the New Controversy over the Discovery of America."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The "Vinland Map" and the New Controversy Over the Discovery of America

(By Amintore Fanfani, professor of economic history, at the University of Rome)

1. REEVALUATION OF THE VIKINGS ON COLUMBUS DAY OF 1965

On the eve of Columbus Day, 1965, the American press turned into a battlefield laid out for the explosion of a bombshell. The first uproar threatened to produce something like a revolution of all our previous notions of history and geography. Then, when the smoke had blown away, it became evident that the crux of the matter was the very timely publicity given to a book published by the Yale University Press under the title "The Vinland Map and the Tartar Relation."

The front page of the New York Times of October 11 proclaimed: "1440 Map Depicts the New World," and the continuation of the article on page 48 accentuated the importance of the discovery with the headline "1440 Map Gives Details of New World." The New York Herald Tribune's treatment of the item was even more provocatory; on both the front page and on page 22 the announcement of the book was headlined "New Evidence; Vikings Did Beat Columbus."

As might have been foreseen, the day after the yearly Columbus Day parade dawned upon a raging controversy. Scandinavians exulted, Latins protested, professors clashed and reporters assumed the mantle of scholarship. On October 12 itself the New York Times headlined the reaction with the words "Columbus' crew won't switch," and on the following days the ink storm continued unabated. On October 13 the New York Times reported the reactions in Italy, Norway and Spain, under the title "Did Erickson do it? Battle rages on." And on October 15 another roundup of news came out under the heading "Columbus loses another round: Pope, in 1160, let Vikings in America marry." One of the many sections of the Sunday edition of the New York Times (sec. 4-E) let loose another salvo: "Who discovered America? New evidence." Meanwhile the New York Herald Tribune of October 13 had carried news of the Columbus Day celebrations under the title "Parades Eschew That Yale Thing," stressing the fact that the chief contenders in the forthcoming mayoralty election of November 2—Lindsay and Beame—had been obliged to enter the fray because of the agitation of certain ethnic groups among the voters. The next day the same paper recorded the Spanish echoes of the controversy: "The Plaint in Spain: It Was, Too, Columbus," and on Sunday, October 17 carried an article on "The Man Who Discovered America."

The weeklies were not slow to enter the lists. In the book review section of the issue of October 15 Time magazine reviewed the Yale publication under the title "Map of History," and a week later, on October 22, under the title "A windblown Leif," gave news of the controversy aroused. Newsweek of October 18 presented the controversial volume on page 103 with the words "Seeing America First."

Several book publishers took advantage of this publicity to advertise such wares as C. E. Oxenstierna's "The Norsemen" (New York Graphic Society) and F. Mowat's "Westviking" (Little, Brown).

Meanwhile, following the flow of the Gulf Stream, American press treatment of the supposedly revolutionary contents of the Yale University Press publication had beat upon the shores of the North Sea and the Mediterranean, with all the effects of a tidal wave.

2. THE COLUMBUS CREW STRIKES BACK

Already on October 12 Italian dailies, in their anniversary commemorations, tossed the ball back to their American counterparts, taking them to task for their futile attacks on Columbus' glory. The Corriere della Sera reported that "Scandinavians were enthusiastic" about the revelations of the Vinland map, and that, according to the Svenska Dagbladet, "we know with certainty that Leif Erickson rather than Columbus discovered America." The Milanese paper, of course, had its reservations about the new contribution supposedly made by the Yale book. On the same day La Stampa of Turin made the point that Erickson's explorations had no consequences, whereas the voyages of Columbus marked a turning point in history. Similar observations were made public by the mayor of Genoa and by Ligurian scholars versed in the lore of Columbus. On October 17 the Communist daily, L'Unita, joined the effort to belittle the importance of the supposed revelations. Il Giorno of November joined the chorus in an almost humoristic vein, by stating that George D. Painter, one of the authors of the Yale volume, had been chiefly known, heretofore, for his biography of Marcel Proust.

The weekly Espresso gave the news a modest title: "They beat Columbus by four centuries," while Epoca entrusted to the Honorable Paolo Emilio Taviani—not because he is Minister of the Interior but because he is a Genoese scholar—the task of upholding the merits of Christopher Columbus.

After a lapse of a whole month, in the Roman evening paper, Paese sera, Giulio Obici entered the fray with a new weapon, the 16th-century publication of the 15th-century voyages to America of the Zeno brothers. The writer, however, failed to take into account the fact that this chronicle was mentioned on pages 197–198 of the Yale volume.

This last reference demonstrates how the first participants in the controversy were content to give summary news of the happening, without taking the trouble to examine the facts and their documentation. Such neglect is not uncommon in arguments of this kind. We may recall the two 16th-century noblemen who waged a duel in order to settle the question of whether a live fish weighs more than a dead one and flailed away on the dueling ground, without its ever having occurred to them to weigh the fish on a scale.

The director of the Yale University Press, Mr. Chester Kerr, apparently had some second thoughts on the subject, for on October 27, from Mexico City, he declared that "the university had no intention of diminishing the merits of Columbus or of attributing the discovery of America to the Vikings." But this statement came too late. In Italy, Dr. Mario Gattoni Celli told the Institute of Etruscan Studies of Florence that, on the basis of a similarity between the vocabularies and religious symbols of the ancient Tuscans and the pre-Columbian people of

Guiana, he was impelled to advance the hypothesis that America had been first discovered neither by Columbus nor the Vikings but by the Etruscans.

This new theory had a triple effect. First, it rekindled the controversy in the American press; second, it put to shame the supporters of the Vikings and third, it reawakened the suspicion that if, as it seems, certain aspects of pre-Columbian Indian culture relate to that of the Far East, the first arrivals in America were actually Asiatics.

If the controversy had dipped further into the past it might have raised from his tomb the Bolognese Trombetti, who half a century ago concluded, on glottological grounds, that Asiatics had island-hopped across the Bering Sea from Siberia to Alaska and then filtered down, through Mexico, Peru, and Chile, all the way to Tierra del Fuego.

At this point, among the American voices there was raised that of a Columbus expert, the eminent historian, Samuel Eliot Morison of Harvard University. In the book review section of the New York Times of November 7 and also in the Chicago Tribune, Morison sagely said that although it is a good thing for scholars to break through to the general public, the publicity given to the Yale publication on the eve of Columbus Day had distorted the true significance of the newly discovered manuscript and the scholarly text which accompanied it.

This publicity, however, had practical results. According to Harry Gilroy, in the New York Times, of November 25, the first edition of 5,000 copies was sold out and the Book-of-the-Month Club proposed to distribute 10,000 more.

3. THE SOURCE OF THE CONTROVERSY—A BOOK PUBLISHED BY THE YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

So far I have reported the widespread controversy which took place in October and November of 1965. It is time, now, to talk of its object, the Yale University Press publication, "The Vinland Map and the Tartar Relation."

With a foreword by Alexander O. Vietor, curator of maps of the Yale University Library, the volume consists of 303 pages, containing the history and description of the Tartar Relation manuscript by T. E. Marston (pp. 2–16), an edited text, translation and commentary by G. D. Painter (pp. 19–106), a long essay on the Vinland Map by R. A. Skelton (pp. 107–240), an interpretation of both manuscript and map by G. D. Painter (pp. 241–262); a lengthy bibliography (pp. 263–269), three indexes (of subjects, of Latin proper names and of Mongol and other non-Latin words (pp. 273–291), facsimile reproductions of the map and the manuscript (pp. 17 and 19), 19 illustrations (after pp. 2, 139, and 146), and 10 figures (pp. 156, 158, 170, 172, 174, 184, 190, and 193).

This detailed account of the contents goes to show that in both content and form the book is intended to set forth the results of a scholarly research project which had two definite aims, first, to locate in their historical and cultural context a medieval map (here referred to, because of one particularly marked portion, as the "Vinland Map" and a manuscript, also medieval, containing a section which begins with the words "Incipit hystoria tartarorum" (called for this reason "The Tartar Relation") and, second, to explain the possible connections between the two.

Both map and manuscript were bought from a private collection in Europe by an antiquarian bookdealer of New Haven, L. Witten. When he showed them to Messrs. Marston and Vietor of the Yale University Library, these two scholars opined that they were by the same hand and from the area of the Rhine valley, dating around the middle of the 15th century. Some of the wording on the map led them to believe that it went with the Tartar story, which tells of a mission to Mongolia on the part of Fra Giovanni del Plan dei Carpini between 1245 and 1247.

From these stimulating suppositions arose the urge to study the two items further. This study, conducted in a spirit of exemplary cooperation between New Haven and London, led to the publication of the volume in which the answers to the two questions which the authors asked themselves may be summarized as follow.

The manuscript of the "Hystoria Tartarorum" can be dated by its structure in the first half of the 15th century; the type of paper on which it is written points to around the year 1440. The paper, the binding and paleographical considerations indicate that it comes from the upper Rhine Valley. The Council of Basle, which took place between 1431 and 1449, may have furnished the occasion for presenting both manuscript and map.[1]

The manuscript seems to be a copy of an older, undiscovered text in which the "Tartar Relation," the Vinland map and the "Speculum Historiale" of Vincent de Beauvais (C. 1190–1264) were at one time bound together.[2] Or rather, the map was drawn immediately after the copying of the complete manuscript, at the same desk, so to speak, and was intended to illustrate the text which it accompanied.[3]

The map, which is of the three parts of the medieval world (Europe, Africa, and Asia), shows islands to both the east and west of the continental mass. Among the latter group, to the northwest, are Isolanda Ibernica, Gronelanda and Vinland Insula.[4] Because of its geographical and other features the map fits in, chronologically, after the map of Andrea Bianco (Venice, 1436), which may, indeed, have served as its model. The details regarding Greenland cause Skelton to say that this copy of the Vinland may have been drawn some 40 years after the last historically proved voyage between Norway and Greenland.[5]

This map is not the first document to inform us of Vinland's existence. The first news of this land is in the "Descriptio insularum aquilonis" of Adam of Bremen (c. 1070), the "Islendigabok" of Ari Thorgilsson (c. 1124) and the itinerary of Nicholas Bergsson of Thvera (d. 1159). The saga of Eric the Red refers to Vinland as having been discovered early in the 11th century. The Vinland map gives this land a vague outline, placing it, so it seems, somewhere between the strait of Hudson Bay, the estuary of the Saint Lawrence and Newfoundland.[6] The fact that the Vikings sailed as far south as Hudson Bay seems to be confirmed by the archeological discoveries made between 1960 and 1963 by Helge Ingstad, which were published in 1964.[7]

R. A. Skelton makes a guarded comment on the suppositions reached by Helge Ingstad[8] and, after summarizing the Viking contribution to the discovery of America, concludes that "to our knowledge of such occasional communication with America the Vinland map adds nothing."[9] Although "the map * * * records in graphic form the only documented pre-Columbian discovery of America,"[10] based on orally transmitted writings and recollections which may have furnished some stimulation to further exploration, it is Morison's opinion that it did not actually stimulate them because "Columbus never heard of it."[11]

4. THE VIKING VOYAGES AND THE VINLAND MAP

If the conclusions reached by the team of editors of the Yale volume are correct and further research—such as is called for by Franklin D. Scott[12]—does not modify their importance, we may still ask what they add to our historical knowledge and to what extent they clarify the longstanding problem of to whom to give credit for the first discovery of America.

In the first place, the Vinland map is another proof that between the 13th and 14th centuries there was a record of the Viking voyages and explorations of around the year 1000. But the remarks of the editors of the map indicate that while its author had a fairly clear geographical notion of Iceland and Greenland, his notion of Vinland was much less definite.

The difference between these notions, indicated by the different quality of the reproduced details, allow us to point out that the Vinland map confirms the fact the Vikings' ideas of geography were limited and generic where Vinland is concerned, that is, in that part of the map which is supposed to show that the Vikings reached the mainland of the future America 500 years before Columbus. The map proves, in any case, that the Vikings did not go far enough south or west to make them guess at the existence of a continent or, indeed, of anything more than an island, larger and more southerly and westernly than Greenland.

The map, dating from a few years before, of the Venetian Andrea Bianco, does not show Vinland. But the Vinland map proves that its author, although he added Vinland to the mapmaking tradition, was not able to show other territory south of Vinland, belonging to the area which, a century later, was to be identified as continental America.

If this is true, then the map, while it confirms the Vikings' acquaintance with Vinland, shows also that, to the knowledge of the most advanced mapmaker of the mid-15th century, they or their successors had not gone any farther south or west of it. In other words, the Vinland map confirms the fact that, around the year 1000, the Vikings had identified Vinland, but had considered it the ultima Thule and failed to go beyond it or even to try to learn more about it because it seemed to them of no particular interest.

We know from our schooldays that Scandinavian relations with the lands discovered by the Vikings tapered off and practically ceased to exist after the 13th century, perhaps because of a general deterioration of the region's climate.[13] The vague character of the Vinland area, as depicted on the map, and the lack of any other landmarks to the south and west show that the Viking exploits had no consequences; they led to no further explorations or descriptions but remained within the original geographical limits, without arousing interest, curiosity, or repercussions of any kind on the basis of the first discoveries. All this was known before the publication of the Vinland map, and its explicit confirmation in the Yale volume[14] shows, on the one hand, that the document has none of the revolutionary value which certain debaters claimed and, on the other, that it adds no merits to the Vikings' American discoveries beyond those which we all grant them, whether or not we live in Scandinavia, whether we are Nordics or Latins.

---

[1] Marston, T. E.: "The Manuscript: History and Description," in "The Vinland Map and the Tartar Relation." Yale University Press, New Haven, 1965, p. 16.

[2] Painter, G. D.: "The Tartar Relation," in "The Vinland Map and the Tartar Relation," op. cit., p. 24–25.

[3] Skelton, R. A.: "The Vinland Map," in "The Vinland Map and the Tartar Relation," op. cit., p. 109.

[4] Skelton, R. A.: ibid., p. 110.

[5] Skelton, R. A.: ibid., p. 208.

[6] Skelton, R. A.: ibid., pp. 210–212, 216, 222.

[7] Ingstad, H.: "Vinland ruins prove Viking found the New World," in National Geographic, November 1964, p. 708 ff.

[8] Skelton, R. A.: op. cit., pp. 220–21.

[9] Skelton, R. A.: op. cit., p. 227.

[10] Skelton, R.A.: op. cit., p. 233.

[11] Morison, S. E.: "Admiral of the Ocean Sea," Boston, 1942, vol. I, p. 35.

[12] Scott, F. D.: "Red Beards in the Sunset," in Book Week of the New York Herald Tribune, Nov. 7, 1965, p. 4.

[13] Skelton, R. A.: op. cit., p. 186. This point is also treated in "What did the Norsemen discover?" in Saturday Review, Nov. 6, 1965, pp. 49–52.

5. THE VINLAND MAP AND THE VOYAGES OF COLUMBUS

In the controversy over the importance of the Vinland map there has been renewed talk of voyages of Columbus to North Sea ports and of the possibility that he acquired knowledge of the discoveries recorded by the Vinland map of the middle of the 15th century and was inspired by them to launch his own undertaking.

This story of Columbus' geological knowledge and of his contacts with northern ports and seamen is taken up by the editors of the Yale volume,[15] but in a far more cautious manner than that of the publicity-minded newsmen and with honest recognition of the fact that the historian Morison does not believe that the Genoese navigator knew about Vinland.

But let us suppose, on a quite reasonable basis, that in preparation of his great voyage Columbus took cognizance of, among other things, the existence of Vinland, as discovered by the Vikings. Let us further suppose that either the original or a copy of the Vinland map fell under his eyes. What would it go to prove?

It would prove, first, that Columbus came to the conclusion that the Viking route was inadvisable, in view of the fact that not even the Vikings' descendants had followed it. And, second, that if indeed he knew of the map and of the voyages, they persuaded him not to emulate them but rather to set off on a completely different tack, to abandon the unproductive northwestern route and to set sail from the south in a straight westerly direction. If Columbus deliberately chose his route on this basis, it is because he correctly evaluated the difficulties which caused the Vikings to stop at Vinland and prevented following generations from exploiting their discoveries. It is an historical fact that Columbus chose points of departure and routes different from those of the Vikings, and if he did so with full awareness of the partial success which they had obtained 4 centuries before, it goes to show that he understood the reasons for the inconclusive nature of their explorations and learned from them that he had best strike out in a different direction.

In this light the publication of the Vinland map does not detract from the originality of Columbus' achievement; indeed, it aggrandizes it, by demonstrating that—if he was acquainted with the map—he showed keen judgment in evaluating the accomplishments of his predecessors. Anyone who thinks to belittle Columbus on the basis of his knowledge of the Vinland map is, in very fact, adding to his stature, by this proof of the fact that he was no lucky adventurer but a painstaking student of the experience of his elders in the field of his own endeavors.

6. VOYAGES AND EXPLORATIONS

The renewal of the controversy over the first discovery of America has served to draw attention to the whole question of the importance of geographical discovery. The proponents of the Vikings' priority have seen their arguments demolished by a simple question: Does the value of a discovery reside in the identification of a point or an area hitherto unknown, or does it not lie, rather, in the addition of this point or area to the network of world communications? This question leads to a noteworthy distinction between the first identification of a place or fact or phenomenon and the discovery, in a broader sense, of the possibilities of its permanent and systematic utilization.

This distinction is necessary in every field. In physics, for instance, we may say that Newton had millions of forerunners who had an apple fall on their heads from an overhanging tree. But he had no forerunners, in the real sense of the word, inasmuch as we justly attribute to him not the fact that an apple fell on his head but rather the discovery of the cause and laws of such a fall.

If we transfer this reasoning to the field of geographical knowledge, we can and must recognize that, around the year 1000, on the sea routes between known Europe and the unknown west, the Vikings discovered new lands which turned out to be located between the two continents. But this discovery, because of its partial and incomplete nature and the failure to exploit it, did not reveal the New World as a ground for further exploration or fit it into a permanent relationship with the Old.

We conclude, then, that the discovery of America, in the sense of a conscious identification of a new world and the establishment of communications between it and the old one was not made by the Vikings and their immediate successors. The real discovery was that of Columbus, on October 12, 1492, which, because it was shortly followed by further exploration, made Europeans genuinely aware of the New World's existence and led them to make it one with their own.

On these grounds there is reasons for the institution and celebration of Columbus Day as the anniversary not of the promised union between known Europe and unknown America (as the Vikings foretold it) but of a moment when Europe was fatefully anticipating the great event and ready to put it to fruitful use.

The world honors the meeting of Newton's mind and the falling apple as the discovery of the law of universal gravity, and this is as it should be, in spite of the fact that other heads and other apples had collided, over the centuries, with no appreciable consequences for the human race. With equal reason the world decided and should continue to celebrate October 12 as the day of the discovery of America, because it is on this day, and not at the unknown time of the Vikings' landing on Greenland and Vinland, that Columbus had the premonition, to be realized during his lifetime, of the existence of vast lands west of the Ocean Sea, which gave an impulse to a relationship that has changed the political, economic, and spiritual course of world history.

The Vinland controversy serves to confirm the fact that brave and fortunate voyages such as those of the Vikings do not lead to full-fledged discoveries. Such voyages must be systematically repeated and exploited if they are to give way, as they did in the time of Columbus, to a true discovery with all the attributions which physical and geographical science lend to the word.

7. A LESSON IN COOPERATIVE RESEARCH

After these considerations of the contribution made by the Yale publication to our knowledge of the discovery of America, it seems opportune to add a few words about the lesson which it teaches us about scientific methods.

Three points emerge from the study of the volume and the circumstances of its presentation.

First, the critical edition of "The Vinland Map and the Tartar Relation" confirms the validity and efficacy of scholarly teamwork. The long and patient effort of Yale University was bolstered up by the meaningful collaboration of a group of specialists, American and non-American.[16]

Second, the difficulty and length of the research involved show what a close link there is between success and the financial means necessary to achieve it. The history of science abounds in eloquent example of sensational success obtained by a single innovator with small means at his disposal. The character and talent of the individual scholar or scientist are irreplacable, and no number of heads can make up for one real brain, no outpouring of money for brilliant intuition. But the joint efforts of trained, well directed and cooperating brains and addition of adequate financial support serve to eliminate the disadvantages of isolation and poverty which have in the past hampered and frustrated scientific research. Yale's publication of the Vinland map is another example of the systematic cooperation and the financial support which characterize the work of American scholars, to their own benefit and as a model for other nations.

But if these two factors are positive elements of the Yale volume, the timing and method of its presentation carry with them a grave warning. The initial excitement actually detracted from the book's fundamental worth. The apparently aggressive timing of its publication dragged it into a dispute in the realm of folklore (the Columbus Day parade) and of nationalism (the priority of one discovery over another). As the controversy spread, the general public got the idea not of a delicate research job of fitting a fragmentary manuscript into its original context, of establishing the time and place of a literary source, not the conclusion reached by comparing the newly discovered manuscript with previously known texts, but only a loud outcry. And when this outcry died down, the public was left in doubt as to whether previous knowledge of the discovery of America still held water or whether a new theory should replace it. If such was the reaction—and such it was—what did scholarship gain thereby?

For—why should we not say so?—this third point must be made in regard to the Yale volume. A scholar must defend himself against the excesses of publicity. He must, of course, make known the results of his study, but he must not let high-powered publicity methods distort them by calling them to the attention not of those who are anxious to learn but to that of those who worship a tribal idol. Otherwise he will be hard put to it to defend the intrinsic value of his thesis, the soundness of his conclusions and the serious quality of his method of research. If his work falls into the hands of the hawkers he pays a high price for their disservice, and much time may be wasted before he establishes the seriousness of his intentions.

8. A FEW CONCLUSIONS

From the publication of the Vinland map, the ensuing controversy, and the comments upon the controversy, we may draw several conclusions.

(1) The 1440 map (if this is the exact date of its conception and drawing) confirms the fact that a memory of the Viking voyages was handed down as far as the middle of the 15th century.

(2) The vagueness of the outlines of Vinland, as compared with those of Greenland and Iceland, confirms the fact that the westernmost Viking explorations did not develop in such a way as to bring Europeans' knowledge of Vinland up to the level of their knowledge of Greenland and Iceland.

(3) Vinland is not shown on the map as an island with other insular or continental bodies to the west and south of it, although

---

[14] Skelton, R. A.: op. cit., p. 209: "We have also to remember that the Norse voyages to America, unlike those to Greenland and along its coasts, were isolated episodes, covering only a brief span of time, and that (so far as we know) they were not followed up by any regular navigation."

[15] Skelton, R.A.: op. cit., p. 236.

[16] Quinn, D.: "A Map of the Norse World," in the New Statesman, Oct. 25, 1965, p. 568.

such bodies did exist. Thus Vinland was the farthest point reached by the Vikings, and it gave them not even the foggiest notion that they had come upon a new continent. In their notion, Vinland was an island only slightly larger than Greenland.

(4) Acknowledging the value of the Viking voyages and granting that Columbus may have known about them and even have seen the Vinland map, his remains, nevertheless, the merit of having understood that the Viking discoveries could be enlarged only by following a different route. So it was that he set sail not from a northern port and on a westward tract between the 50° and 60° parallels, but from the south and on a track below the 40° parallel. By following this route Columbus found land to the south and west of the Viking discoveries and paved the way for the opening of other routes, fanning out in both a nothwesterly and a southwesterly direction. Within a few decades came the certainty of having discovered an entire continent and the possibility of staking out its eastern boundaries. This was done in one-fifth the time which went by between the Viking voyages and the drawing of a map (such as the Vinland map) which illustrated their discoveries.

(5) If we accept the above conclusions we must further state that Columbus' voyages were those which opened the way to the systematic exploration of America and to the establishment of an organic relationship between the Old World and the New.

(6) The beginning of what may be called the American phase of world history—whether we date it from the arrival of gold and silver from Central and South America before the middle of the 16th century, or, in more spectacular fashion, with the revolt of the English colonies of the northern hemisphere in the 19th century, or with the participation of the full-grown American Nation in the two world wars between 1900 and 1950, or with the era of atom-splitting and space exploration of the present day [17]—was not a short- or long-term result of the Viking voyages but the almost immediate consequence of the voyages and explorations of Columbus. Let this not be forgotten by those who appreciate the impact of the discovery of a continent upon world history.

(7) The organic insertion of America into world history required three conditions: (a) The discovery of an easily navigable route between the major political, economic and cultural centers of Europe and the new continent; (b) the systematic exploration of the new continent such as to identify its most habitable portions and the location of its natural resources; (c) the installation of lasting communications, of continuous political relations, of economic and cultural exchanges. All these things were necessary for inserting the new lands into the life of the old, so that all of them could proceed together along the new paths of world history, whose course was in part determined by the 16th century's geographical discoveries.

These three conditions were fulfilled, not after the Viking voyages of around the year 1000, but after Columbus' arrival at the tropical islands of the Caribbean in 1492.

(8) Acceptance of the above conclusions does not imply the least belittlement of the Viking exploits; it entails only restoring them to the proportion in which they were viewed before the Vinland map controversy. Then and now they were regarded as bold pioneering feats, which had no consequences either for the European lands from which they originated or for the future of the new continent whose northernmost shores the Vikings were not even aware of having reached, as is proved by the fact that their descendants neither pursued the explorations nor exploited them.

The so-called good fortune of Columbus lies really in the fact that he, by design, not by mere accident, took a giant stride on behalf of humanity, one which the Vikings—whether because their starting point was ill chosen, their route mistakenly directed or their landing place barren and inhospitable—were unable to accomplish.

In short, a comparison between the Viking voyages and those of Columbus leads us to consider the fate of all discoveries. Those which endure take place in an epoch in which their value is understood and there is a possibility of exploiting them and carrying them further. Their artificers are the true discovers and those who went before, inconclusively, must be content with the title of forerunner. We shall give everyone his just deserts if we wind up our commentary on the controversy aroused by the publication of the Vinland map in the following manner. Christopher Columbus revealed America to the world, with his voyages and their universal and still enduring consequences. The Vikings, 500 years before, were pioneers, whose efforts were ill-starred and inconclusive. The determining factor lay in the difference between the points of departure, the navigability of the sea routes and the wealth of the lands discovered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour be considered concluded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14 (b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 680, H.R. 77.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK**. A bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Madam President, I object.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Objection is heard.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Madam President, it is my intention to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 680, H.R. 77, but, before I do so, I ask unanimous consent that I may retain the floor while a quorum is being called, for the purpose of being recognized at the conclusion of the quorum call.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 9 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I announce that the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is absent on official business.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. A quorum is present.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Madam President, for the information of the Senate, the calendar is clear. There is at the present time no pending business.

I was a little surprised to read in yesterday's press a statement by a distinguished Member of this body in which he criticized bringing up the repeal of section 14(b) at this time, considering the situation in Vietnam.

If there had been any legislation on the calendar concerning Vietnam, I can assure that Senator and all others that that legislation would have been given primary consideration.

Insofar as the majority leader, the Senator from Montana, is concerned, it is not his intention at any time or under any circumstances to hold up or in anyway impede legislation of that nature, no matter what is pending at the moment.

What other Senators do is, of course, their individual responsibility.

The bill, H.R. 77, was reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by a very large majority last year.

---

[17] Chaunu, P.: "L'Amerique et les Ameriques," Paris, 1964, and the presentation of this work by a Fantani in "Economia e Storia," No. II, 1965.

I would like to see that bill made the pending business. But I anticipate that, in view of the action taken by Senators opposing the measure last year, we very likely may have some difficulty—but hopefully, not an insurmountable amount. Only time will tell. The merits of the bill should be reached and discussed. And that is what I shall work for.

I only hope that Members of the Senate consider it their duty to consider this measure and in doing so, to give to all Senators the privilege which is theirs: to vote for or against its merits on the basis of their convictions and in accordance with the Senate rules and procedures, and to vote on a measure which has been studied and reported by one of the standing committees of this body.

For, it is my understanding that when a bill is reported by a regular committee, the Senate as a whole usually gives the committee the simple courtesy of having that bill laid down and discussed.

May I say to my distinguished colleague the minority leader that, as far as the majority leader is concerned, there will be no tricks or procedural gimmicks, and, as far as moves go, the minority leader will be made fully aware of any motions I intend to make.

I feel this is the only way to execute procedures. But I make this statement with this factor in mind: The rules will be examined thoroughly with a view to determining a proper and expeditious manner for making H.R. 77 the pending business and, if at all possible, it will be made the pending business and decided on its merits.

Also may I say that, while I do not intend to have round-the-clock sessions on this measure, it is my hope that beginning tomorrow we shall be able to come in a little early and stay a little late. In that way, we can at least reach a position where the proposal and its suggested amendments may be considered.

That concludes my remarks, Madam President.

At this time, I move that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 680, H.R. 77.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Illinois.

SECOND BATTLE OF SECTION 14(b)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, before time is counted, I would first submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In view of what happened last year, after some days of discussion, a cloture motion was filed, and this measure was withdrawn. Time was accurately kept by the Parliamentarian, and I would like to be officially advised that whatever time was consumed by any Member of the Senate does not now count as we resume discussion of H.R. 77.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Everything starts de novo, as of this hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, the majority leader has very well and correctly stated the situation. First, let me say for him that no more honorable person ever graced this body, and particularly the leadership chair, than the distinguished Senator from Montana.

On many occasions, both publicly and privately, I have expressed my deep and abiding affection for him. I cherish that affection and I cherish his esteem as never before. He has never resorted to any sub rosa, or undercover methods or procedures in order to gain a point. He has a responsibility as the majority leader of this body to steer legislation under the rules of the Senate by an orderly procedure, and that he has always done.

He recognizes also the depth of our feeling with respect to the issue that is here involved and that is before the Senate.

As a member of the loyal opposition I have had no choice except to adopt whatever weapons are available, consonant with Senate rules, in order to prevent what I believe to be offensive legislation from coming to a vote.

If that were not a recognized procedure there would be no excuse to continue rule XXII in the rules of the Senate.

But we have to fight as best we can. On the other hand, in the discharge of his responsibility and his sense of duty he must take whatever honorable means are available in order to get a vote on the bill.

So, we are right where we were last year, at least, up to this point.

We intend to carry on this discussion on the motion to take up. That is nothing new to the Senate. It has been done on many occasions and very notably on the civil rights bill.

Here we are dealing with a civil right. It is the right of a person to work without paying tribute to an organization or a despotic leader in order to sustain his family and to sustain himself. If there is any greater civil right that inures to mankind, frankly, Madam President, I do not know what it is.

So, I do this because I believe in it. I take the course I pursue because I feel that the interests of the country and the American people are involved. I come not in any sense of hostility or prejudice, because I came up the hard way.

My mother came from the old country when she was only 17 years of age. She came here on a sailing vessel, buffeted by the tumultuous North Atlantic, when even the crew caught scurvy. She knew nothing about this new land except from letters of those who had gone before and who said that this was the land of freedom and opportunity, where only one's diligence, one's perseverance, one's willingness to achieve, one's willingness to engage in the great virtues of thrift and frugality could put a limit on what a person could accomplish.

My father came here at a young age only a few years after the Civil War. He, too, brought here a craft. He died when I was a youngster of 5 years of age.

Let no man stand in his place in the Senate and say that the Dirksen family did not come up the hard way. Here was a widowed mother with a brood of orphan children, and we had to strike out and make it as best we could.

A thousand times I have said to people in all parts of the country: There is one debt greater than the public debt itself and that is the debt that EVERETT DIRKSEN owes to this country and to all that it represents, to the freedoms that are here, because it afforded an opportunity that is well within the grasp of every citizen, young and old, if he will undertake to apply himself to it.

I have tried to bring to this task that same degree of fidelity which my distinguished friend from Montana brings to his sense of responsibility. I recognize him for it, and I commend him for it. I know, too, that he understands fully my feelings in this matter.

So far as I know, I have had no cause whatever to relent in my determination to resist this procedure as best I can.

In reviewing what has happened, I went back and reexamined the action taken in the House of Representatives.

The bill came from the House Committee on Labor and Education, and it received a rule on the 26th of July, in the 1st session of this Congress. The House debated it from July 26 to the 28th. That was only 2 days.

Every amendment except one was held to be out of order. I know something about the provincial narrowness of the House rules. I served under those rules for a period of 16 years; so did my distinguished friend, the majority leader. He knows what a job it used to be, when a bill was called up, to offer an amendment and to have it ruled to be germane by the presiding officer, on the advice of the Parliamentarian.

Every amendment was stricken before its merit had a chance to be exhibited and explained to the House.

Then, of course, there was one amendment that was finally allowed, and it was rejected because it dealt only with the effective date of this proposal. Of course, it is difficult even for a Parliamentarian to argue with the calendar. That one amendment escaped the House guillotine.

There was, and there always has been, available to the minority in the House of Representatives the right to offer a motion to recommit; and if any Member of the House stands in his place and claims that right, he shall have it, no matter what the difference in the ratio of the parties may be.

So a motion to recommit was made. It lost by a vote of 223 to 200. On passage, the vote was 221 to 203. That meant, Madam President, that there was a difference of only 18 votes in the House of Representatives that made it possible to get this bill out of the House.

There are in the House of Representatives some young men, very honorable and very ambitious young men, who in their earlier days have not always been submitted to pressure. But pressure is expected in this atmosphere. I know that on the day we voted on conscription in the House of Representatives, every Cabinet Member was on the Hill, buttonholing Members. I was buttonholed. I know something about the pressures that take place in these legislative halls. So notwithstanding the pressures, it commanded a majority of only 18 votes.

I have seen some statements to the effect that it is the people's will that we proceed to vote on the merit of this proposal. I have seen no such expression; and I shall get around to that in a little while. But let us go on now and review the RECORD.

To the Official Reporters, I suggest that they entitle these remarks—because I shall be all over the field—"The Second Battle of Section 14(b)." I am familiar with the Second Battle of the Marne in World War I; I am familiar with the Second Battle of Ypres in World War I. I am not familiar—although my very distinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is familiar, as a scholar who has pursued Virginia history—with the Second Battle of Manassas—and I do not live very far from the Manassas battlefield. So it is my pleasure that when these remarks appear in the RECORD, they be given a good, bold title: "The Second Battle of Section 14(b) in the Senate of the United States."

A motion for the consideration of this bill was made on the 4th day of October. On October 8, the distinguished majority leader moved to table. We had joined issue, and we had had some discussion of the matter.

Again I compliment and salute the majority leader, for at the moment when he said he would move to table, he told the Senate that he intended to vote against his own motion. It is an awkward and difficult fix to be in. As he so well knows, I got my head into that noose in the civil rights struggles. I found myself, humble in spirit, suddenly saying that I had to offer a motion to table, and that I would vote against my own motion. But I had to do it because the circumstances of the occasion called for it. Those are not happy situations.

Madam President, as one lives his life and accumulates a little wisdom, he also accumulates a little humility and somehow dissipates all the fears that spring mainly out of personal pride. Long ago, I learned to confess my sins in public when the occasion called for it; I have learned to apologize for my deviations from the law or the rule or the duty whenever the occasion called for it.

So our distinguished majority leader very honorably said to the Senate, "I intend to vote against my own motion to table." I was delighted, obviously, because I shared that feeling. I did a little missionary work, particularly on this side of the aisle. I said, "I think we should accommodate our distinguished majority leader. We should give him a vote"; and we did support him. As a result, the vote against tabling was 94 to 0. Madam President, one really has to go some to achieve a unanimous vote like that. I do not know where the recreant six were, but perhaps if they had been here they would have made the vote 100 percent with the greatest of pleasure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, all I want to say is that I could do without that sort of accommodation in the future. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. But, Madam President, the majority leader accepted the results in the best of grace, as he always does. That is, indeed, the stature of statesmanship.

On October 11, the Senate voted on the cloture motion which had been filed one day but one before, and on that occasion the cloture vote was 45 yeas and 47 nays.

My distinguished friend the majority leader and I have often been through that. We have traveled many valleys of sorrow together, because together we offered a cloture motion on the literacy test. On that occasion the Senate rose in its dignity and struck us down, and we went to the dreamless dust. But somehow we brushed ourselves off, and back we are.

But that was a part of what happened in the first battle of section 14(b). At long last, the motion to consider the bill was withdrawn.

Congress adjourned on the 23d day of October, and we went to our respective homes or other duties, whether abroad or at home.

I had an excellent vacation. It lasted exactly 7 days—4 days at a desk and 3 days of sunshine and 8 hours of fishing. On the first day—and I might as well give the ugly details—I caught one fish. No man worthy of the accolade of Izaak Walton would ever boast about that. But on the other day that I had a chance to fish, I caught five fish. I cannot say that I boasted about that, either. But that was the end of the vacation.

Then I began to travel, not abroad, but in this, our own sainted land. I traveled west as far as Boise, Idaho. I traveled south to Alabama, to Texas, and elsewhere. I traveled north to New York and Pennsylvania. I traveled to the Middle Eastern States. There, in my rather feeble way, I undertook to bring light and truth to the people and tell them of this issue. Never have I seen such spirit at the grassroots level of this country. I am pleasantly astonished with what discrimination the people read the news dispatches and know quite well what is going on in their Capital. If anything were needed to entrench more deeply in mind and conscience the need for encompassing the defeat of the measure which the leadership is undertaking to place before us, that was it.

So I recur to the second battle of section 14(b). Sinister things have happened since last it was before us. There is in the Empire State a gentleman by the name of Michael Quill. I do not know him. I have never seen him. I only know that he is the president and the general director of the Transport Workers in New York City, 138,000 in number. It was not too long ago that he gave an exhibition of his power as a leader in inconveniencing 20 million people when the public interest was at stake. There is a public interest in loading and unloading vessels, some of which vessels, perchance, may have been destined for that unhappy and troubled spot in Asia. I do not argue the details. I merely say, Madam President, what vast power and what arrogance it breeds.

Before the television cameras, he tore up the court subpena to show his contempt for the judiciary that stands for the trial of the rights and the enforcement of the law.

It is giving the people an opportunity to know what is happening in this country and at what point we become a monolithic country and a monolithic Congress. To make sure that we have some notion of what we mean by monolithic, its definition is, "a single stone." It means exactly that—that at long last we have people going in only one direction, and that creates monolithic government, even as it is now being reestablished in Nigeria, in which country they found the dead body of the Prime Minister. That is force in ruling. Nigeria is the showcase that we brag about. It is the country to which went our millions of dollars in foreign aid. That is another story, Madam President, and that story shall be told during this session, too, when foreign aid comes up.

We had a little unpleasantness in my own State. I received a telephone call from the Olin Industries at Alton, Ill. They manufacture powder there for small arms ammunition, and some larger gage for larger calibers. A group, one union, put 4,600 men out of work and kept them out of work. The management could do nothing toward bringing them back to work.

Meanwhile, our Defense Establishment had to send to Europe for millions of rounds of small arms ammunition for the youngsters who spill their blood on the monsoon mud in Vietnam.

I followed this situation, every thread of it. I then called Defense officials, told them what was going to happen. They said, "We will make out with small arms ammunition by cannibalizing our stores elsewhere." Then they told me that they would reactivate a powder plant at Baraboo, Wis., and that, when reactivated, it would stay reactivated. There would then be some competition and perhaps a few jobs would begin to filter away.

It is then that the union came to its senses, and only after that was made manifest. I telephoned the Alton newspaper and said to the reporter, "Get this straight, one, two, three, four, five, six, so that it will leak into their consciousness as to what they are doing." That strike was against the war effort. Perhaps at a time or at times I may undertake something like that, and then I reserve to be roundly scored.

Those things have happened since the first battle on 14(b). Putting it all together, what does it all add up to?

George Gallup is one of those distinguished people who has formulas and devices to ascertain the public mind. I would not believe that George Gallup in the 1964 election. I suppose I should have believed him, because it came out that way. However, that is neither here nor there.

Mr. Gallup has been polling people; and he really gets no name up in big letters. "Public Favors DIRKSEN Side in Fight on Union Shop."

The junior Senator from Louisiana can see this from back in the rear row. What does it say? It says: "Should be required to join a union, 44 percent; should not, 47 percent; no opinion, 9 percent."

This is interesting. As between men and women: "Men should be required to join a union, 46 percent; should not, 50 percent; no opinion, 4 percent; women should be required, 42 percent; should not be required, 45 percent; no opinion, 13 percent."

Here is one that is really ducky. This is graded as to education. Among college men we have the following: "Should be required, 22 percent; should not be required, 71 percent." Those are the young custodians and trustees of this country in our tomorrow.

Among high school students: "Should be required to join a union, 45 percent; should not, 47 percent." Even at high school age, repeal is not favored. It was only at the grade school level that the repeal of 14(b) got a break.

In the grade schools they are not yet ready to get a job. How can we get a reasoned judgment from boys and girls in grade schools?

This is a pretty well diffused vote. It covered 180 areas. Here are the results geographically. In the East, "Should be required, 52 percent; should not, 39 percent." That is where the repeal of section 14(b) gets an edge. In the Midwest, "should be required, 46 percent; should not, 48 percent." In the South, "should be required, 34 percent; should not, 54 percent." In the West, "should be required, 42 percent; should not, 50 percent."

They try to make it emphatic that there is a great resurgence of opinion behind this, that the people want it. The people did not tell George Gallup that they wanted it. They had their opportunity. Do not let anybody persuade you differently on that point.

We have the country behind us on this issue, and that is the reason that we are determined, God willing—and I say it in all humility—to fight to the finish.

I wish to make it abundantly clear this does not involve the State right-to-work laws. That is not the issue before the Senate. The issue here is the sovereign authority of the 50 States to legislate in this field if they so desire.

If what is sought to be accomplished here were accomplished, it would be only another deeper intrusion of the kind that is going to founder this great Republic where, Mr. President, we have not only a sovereign Federal Government, but sovereign State governments as well. The Founding Fathers set it up that way. They knew what they were about. They did it beautifully. They not only gave us a structure of government, but they built it on the broad foundation of freedom. They delegated express powers to the Central Government, and, in the residual clause, they said the powers not expressly delegated are reserved to the States and the people, respectively.

That is still in the Constitution. So they have some rights. The constitution of my State, the third one we have adopted, begins with the words, "We the people." That has meaning for me, and I am not afraid of them. I am not afraid to confront them at any time. They are my bosses; and the day I am afraid of them, I should clean out my office and walk out of this body; because I do not believe that one who is afraid of the people can very properly discharge his legislative responsibilities.

(At this point Mr. TALMADGE took the chair.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that is an element which needs plenty of emphasis, to make clear what this is about: Whether or not the people in the 50 States of the Union, through their respective legislatures, are to be entitled to vote upon this matter and determine it for themselves, and whether or not they can head off a requirement that either a man join the union and pay dues, or that at the end of 30 days his employer is mandated to fire him. Then what about his livelihood? I have heard some nonsense at times that he can go here, he can go there, he can go anywhere.

Mr. President, that is "a lot of stuff." One of the real difficulties today with labor people is the operation of the seniority rule. The most skilled machinist in the Caterpillar Tractor Co., in Peoria, if he decides to move to Cleveland or Buffalo or New York, or any other place, and then finds a job, begins at the bottom. He is anchored by the seniority rule. Otherwise, he starts at the bottom. And the rule is last on, first off, when there comes a slackening in business. He may be the most precise machinist and one of the ablest craftsmen in the whole wide world, but it will make no difference, because he will go to the end of the line.

I believe that the States have a right, if they so desire, to legislate on this subject. If they do not wish to do so, that is not my business, but I want that right to be safeguarded, if that is the only issue before the Senate.

Mr. President, if we can say no to them on this issue, what will be the next issue, with respect to which we will say, "You cannot legislate in this field"? We did it to them where subversion was involved. Pennsylvania, the classic example, had a law of its own. It was finally struck down and made invalid, for the very good reason that it went to the Federal courts, and they said, "The Government of the United States, by having the Congress enact the Smith Act, has preempted the field, and therefore you cannot enter into that sanctuary." What will be next, and next, and next?

Mr. President, we shall be destroying the Republic by cutting off the dog's tail a little at a time. Stay at it, and we shall put that dog in a doggy grave. That is the issue; and it must be kept before us all the time.

Now I must allude to some interim incidents, as we address ourselves to the second battle of 14(b). One suggestion that was made, in order to get this matter to a vote, was to start putting pressure on rule XXII—that we modify rule XXII all over again. We have been through that battle before, Mr. President, not once, but many times.

As I recall, rule XXII has been a part of the Senate rules since 1917; and if I have something to say about it, it will remain in the rules. There is a disposition to relent, to soften, and to modify. What about the voice of the minority? Where are their defenses? Where are their protections?

We have not always been in the minority, and I, for one, do not believe we always shall be. I begin to see a ground swell of restive feeling in the land, at long last, and it peeks out and expresses itself when the people exercise their right of suffrage.

It has been said that perhaps there ought to be more threats in this connection, and that the Senate should be sweated around the clock. Thank God for our majority leader, who is a humble and generous person of good will and of the utmost felicity.

The other day I had a birthday—and I have never concealed my birthdays. If the world does not know it now, Mr. President, then I give up, because by cartoon, by article, and by every graphic art, the country has discovered that on the 4th day of January, I became 70 years of age. I have to pinch myself now and then, Brother MUSKIE, to see whether it is true that somehow the spirit is waning.

No, the spirit is always willing, but sometimes, as the Book says, the flesh grows a little weak; and then one must be on his guard. So I thought of the Senate. There are probably 18 or 20 Members of the Senate who are 70 years of age or older. There is one Member who is well above fourscore years.

If this is to be a deliberative body, we do not allow the rest of the country to go on an 8-hour day and a 40-hour week, yet put the Senate on a 16-hour day and a 6-day week. Someone might drop over and we would never stop apologizing for our excesses. Why 40 hours a week elsewhere and then whiplash this body because an organized group in this country wishes action on something which is offensive to a majority of the people, as George Gallup has stated after surveying 180 areas in this country.

No—our distinguished majority leader has stated that we are going to have regular hours, and it is with regular hours that any Member of this or any other legislative body can do his best work.

I do not know how it is with most Senators, but I am on the platform so much at night that I have to stop it. It has become a major chore. Four or five nights a week—travel—going out to the State—going to New York, going here, going there—that is the extracurricular work. We feel that we have a duty to talk to people according to our likes, but we do a day's work in the Senate from morning until night and then off we go to make a speech somewhere.

Obviously, we have to have some regard for the social amenities. The Women's Press Club recently had their annual dinner. They had some difficulty in fitting it into our fast-moving Capitol schedule. Our distinguished Vice President was to be the speaker. He could not come. They tried to find a speaker in other quarters and then frantically, at 5 o'clock the night before their dinner was to take place, they called me up and said, "Please Senator, do not say no. We are in difficulty."

I told them that they could have given me a little longer because my days are so taken up with visitors and problems, and I must have a little time to look at a blank wall and think up a few pleasantries, because such witicisms are compounded with a little wisdom of the durable kind. So, I went there to speak. I got home at midnight. I got home from another meeting last week at 1:30 in the morning because I actually got on the platform at 11:50, and the Vice President was still behind me to speak. Those are late hours.

I was about to take all the time, because the toastmaster said, "We have had so many of the opposite political faith that we should give equal time to the other."

I said, "Mr. Toastmaster, I am far ahead of you. I have calculated the time used up to now, and I am going to give them an hour. It is now 11:50, so get comfortable in your seats because you are going to get a speech for the next hour."

Then, somehow, a great, ennobling, charitable impulse come over me and I was content to let them go on a Sunday morning at the hour of 12:15; yet the Vice President was still to speak. He is a bear—he is a Minnesota bear—for punishment, because this is hard work and it does sap the energies.

Consequently, I thank the distinguished majority leader when he said that the Senate will sit regular hours—and I am confident he will fulfill that promise.

Mr. President, in that interim period, I have read stacks of stuff. I sometimes wonder where we get the printer's ink, the paper, and sufficient talent to get it all together. Letters galore. It is too bad that I shall have to inflict myself upon the Senate—which will have Senators in the Chamber now and then, and on occasion there will not be very many because they will have to go out and eat, and I will have to forget my lunch, but that is perfectly all right—because I am trying to make the whole case against repeal of Section 14(b).

I almost became lost in all this stuff that I have collected. Let me refer to a letter from an old gentleman in Appomattox, Va. He has been a member of the Communications Union for a great many years. He wrote his letter in longhand, double spaced, one page. He said, "Don't let them repeal 14(b). It is the only disciplinary weapon that we ordinary members of the union have to make sure that our officers and trustees stay in line."

Oh, how right he is. Whenever they get smart alecky, or words to that effect, we can say, "Here is your card. You get your dues from someone else." That will bring them back into line.

The other morning, I went to the railroad station in Washington at 7 o'clock in the morning and walked into the station master's office. Here was a man in railroad uniform—a conductor—I noticed by the hashmarks on his arm that he had 30 years of service. He said to me, "Senator, don't you let them repeal 14(b). It is the only weapon we have."

I went down that long staircase to the station platform to meet the train, and there was a man in oily clothes, pouring grease into the axleboxes. He looked around and when he saw me, he said, "You look like DIRKSEN to me."

"Yes," I said, "I am. I admit the impeachment."

He did not wish any more pleasantries and said, "Don't you let them repeal 14(b)."

I said to him, "Do you carry a card?"

He said, "I am a longtime card-carrying member of the Maintenance Union."

The man in uniform in the stationmaster's office was also a 30-year member of his union.

Thus, when I say on the floor of the Senate that I have stacks and stacks of mail from union members from all over the country who do not wish to see section 14(b) repealed, I will never let Mr. Meany sell me his kind of goods, if I can help it.

It is a little tragic that he should have gone to San Francisco, to that industrial union council, whatever it was, and made some unkind remarks.

Mr. President, I like George Meany. He is a nice fellow. I also like Mrs. Meany. She is a charming person. Mrs. Dirksen likes her also. We meet often at dinner. We met at the Touchdown Club recently. He was on the program, but for reasons unknown to me we were not introduced. We did not have to be, of course. But, I am always glad to acknowledge him, to acknowledge what he has done for labor and labor organizations in the country. But Mr. Meany, like many other people, can be fallible; he can be wrong.

I remember from my college days what Sir Richard Steele said about the Church of England and the Church of Rome in one of his essays, "The one is infallible and the other is never wrong."

One cannot quite claim that for an individual, and so he can be wrong.

I tried to make it plain that this was a matter of principle and that I thought we had the people on our side. But people are being called names. Mr. President, anybody can call one a name, but that does not make him what he is called. Mr. Meany called me a windbag. He called me other things, too. It does not make me a windbag.

I am reminded of a story that Mr. Lincoln used to tell about two men who were arguing and fussing. Finally one of the men said, "If you call a sheep's tail a leg, how many legs does that sheep have?" He said, "Five." The friend said, "Oh, no. Calling a sheep's tail a leg does not make it a leg."

And calling me a name does not make me that. But there is enough of a charitable spirit in me to overlook that, because it is the atmosphere in which we live, and so I accept it for whatever it is worth.

Mr. President, I am about to present to the Senate a discussion dealing with 16 different arguments that have been advanced in favor of repealing 14(b) and against the position that we take. It will take a little while. Before I start, perhaps I should tell Senators that the memorandum is 34 pages long. If any Senator wishes to go out and get lunch, he is free to do so. I would like to go to lunch myself, but I cannot. So with that fair warning, here we go.

Some 100 years ago a man of great wisdom and compassion for his fellow man, the 16th President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, made a statement on liberty which clearly defines the meaning of today's debate. He said:

> We all declare for liberty, but in using the same word we do not mean the same thing. With some the word "liberty" may mean for each man to do as he pleases for himself and the product of his labor; while with others the same word may mean for some men to do as they please with other men and the product of other men's labor.

That ends the quotation from Abraham Lincoln.

Unfortunately, we have ignored the words and wisdom of this man, and in the past few decades thousands of American workers have lost their liberty, their freedom of choice. Thousands of rank-and-file union members are victims of compulsory union membership.

Today we are here to discuss whether or not the Federal Government should enact legislation that would legalize compulsory union membership in all 50 States, legislation that, by all evidence, would benefit only a handful of the people in this country—the union leaders who demand compulsory unionism because they know it is the key to limitless political and economic and ideological power.

What makes this so appalling to many Members of the U.S. Senate, and most Americans, is that the men leading the fight to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act are the same ones who have expressed the most concern for the civil and human rights of all Americans.

For example, Mr. George Meany said, in a column written for Victor Riesel on July 12, 1965:

> Experience has taught that any movement which opposes freedom of association, conscience and worship, any government which denies its people these basic human rights, any regime which prohibits free trade unions is hopelessly reactionary—regardless of how radical it may pretend to be or how revolutionary its slogans may sound.

Mr. President, that is not the Senator from Illinois speaking. That is my friend Mr. George Meany, the president of the AFL–CIO.

Walter Reuther said on March 15 in Selma, Ala.:

> When you deny freedom to any person, you are destroying your own freedom.

I carried in my pocket for a long time a little verse, but I lost it. At the moment I can reconstruct only the first line, although it made a deep impression. That line was:

> When freedom fails, no man escapes.

Nothing truer was ever written. Our Secretary of Labor, Mr. W. Willard Wirtz, perhaps in a sense, and I say it in a kind sense, the most paradoxical of all advocates of compulsory unionism, said not long ago:

> The large edifice of civil rights is dependent on equality of employment opportunity. If men are to be truly free in accord with the tenets of democracy, then they must be free to seek a livelihood without prejudice.

That is not the Senator from Illinois speaking. That is the distinguished Secretary of Labor, and a member of the incumbent administration.

Finally, one of the most ardent supporters of the Texas right-to-work law and the Taft-Harley Act, and a former Senator from that great State, once said:

> I have never sought, nor do I seek now, the support of any labor bosses dictating to freemen anywhere, any time.

I am not going to tell the Senate who that was. Senators will have to guess. But I do not believe they will have difficulty in guessing.

This same gentleman, highly respected, highly honored, and highly revered, said in his state of the Union message last January:

> Ours is a history of freedom and of concern for all freemen. We are dedicated to freedom from arbitrary power, not merely for Americans, but for all.

Then there comes later a man, who by his words is greatly concerned with the need for self-determination by the people in Africa, Asia, and other countries, calling for changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, including section 14(b), that would mean a return to nationwide compulsory union membership.

Do these men truly believe in civil and human rights, including the right of an individual to freedom of choice or are they so beholden to a handful of power-hungry leaders that they will sell their souls to Lucifer?

If the latter is true, they can be described only in the words of that great Revolutionary liberal Thomas Paine, who said:

> It is impossible to calculate the moral mischief that a certain type of approach has produced in our society.

I had better leave the next sentence out, Mr. President, because it is a pretty stern sentence. I will delete it.

Even though voluntarism has universally regarded as a fundamental principle of our American way of life throughout the history of the Republic, we now have a Federal law that permits a supposedly free citizen to be forced into a labor union except in those States which have enacted right-to-work laws. In the remaining States an individual can be compelled to join a union as a condition of earning a livelihood.

Union-company agreements requiring all workers to be union members are inappropriately called "union security" or "union shop" contracts. They were legalized in 1935 by the passage of the National Labor Relations Act, otherwise known as the Wagner Act.

Mr. President, I was serving my second term in the House of Representatives when the Wagner Act was enacted by Congress. However, increasing public rebellion against the element of compulsion in the union movement led Congress to include section 14(b) in the Taft-Hartley Act.

This all-important section recognized and reaffirmed the historical right of the States to outlaw compulsory unionism.

There is a point, Mr. President, that I emphasized only a short time ago to make sure that the issue was abundantly clear; namely, the right of the States to legislate in that field if they so desired. If they do not want to do so, that cannot be my concern, but that is the nub of the issue.

Section 14(b), which must sound highly cryptic to lots of people, and which is just now creeping into crossword puzzles, strangely is very simple and the RECORD should show the exact language. I shall read it:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or Territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or Territorial law.

That is how simple it is. I fancy it has had much to do with that surge of feeling that is becoming so readily evident throughout the country.

Speaking in the Senate on June 6, 1947, the late Senator Robert Taft, coauthor of the act, explained the purpose of section 14(b). Incidentally, he was a great statesman whom I was honored to nominate at the National Convention in Chicago in 1952. This is what Senator Taft stated:

> Many States have enacted laws or adopted constitutional provisions to make all forms of compulsory unionism illegal. It is not the intent of Congress to deprive the States of that power.

That is the point. It is the right of the State to do it if it so desires; if its legislature feels that way and if the Governor signs the bill, or if they override the Governor's veto. That should be their prerogative in a country where the States and those who represented the States in the Constitutional Convention in 1787 were safeguarded by that residual clause in the Constitution.

The right of States to prohibit compulsory union membership has been challenged repeatedly by union officials. But that right has been upheld consistently by the judiciary, including the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I must suspend for a moment to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it in violation of the Senate rules if the Senator from Illinois asks one of the page boys to go to the restaurant and bring him a glass of milk? If it is in violation of the rules I will forget it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is nothing in the rules to prohibit the Senator from requesting a glass of milk.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Chair, because water becomes pretty thin after a period of time. My lunch today will be a tall glass of milk.

The constitutionality of the right-to-work measures adopted by Nebraska, North Carolina, and Arizona was the concern in 1949 by the U.S. Supreme Court. The decision was written by Justice Hugo Black, once a Member of this body, and a distinguished Member, with the variant concurrence of all other Justices. That was the case of *Lincoln Union* v. *Northwestern Co.*, 335 U.S. 525 and 531. The following are some of the highlights:

> It is also argued that the State laws do not provide protection for union members equal to that provided for nonunion members. But in identical language these State laws forbid employers to discriminate against union and nonunion members. Nebraska and North Carolina, thus command equal opportunity for both groups of workers.

But Justice Black goes on to say in this same case:

> Much of the appellant's argument here——

Meaning the union's argument——

> seeks to establish that due process of law is denied employees and union men by that part of these State laws that forbids them to make contracts with the employer obligating him to refuse to hire or retain nonunion workers.
>
> But that part of these laws does no more than provide a method of aid enforcement of the heart of the laws; namely, their command that employers must not discriminate against either union or nonunion members because they are such. If the States have constitutional power to ban such discrimination by law, they also have power to ban contracts which if performed bring about the prohibited discrimination.

The court continues in that same decision:

> There cannot be wrung from a constitutional right of workers to assemble to discuss improvement of their working standards, a further constitutional right to drive from remunerative employment all other persons who will not or cannot participate in union assemblies. The constitutional right of workers to assemble, to discuss and formulate plans for furthering their own self-interest in jobs cannot be construed as a constitutional guarantee that none shall get and hold jobs except those who will join in the assembly or will agree to abide by the assembly's plans.

But the court continues:

> Claiming that the Federal Constitution itself affords protection for union members against discrimination, they (the unions), nevertheless assert that the same Constitution forbids a State from providing the same protection for nonunion members. Just as we have held that the due process clause erects no obstacle to block legislative protection for union members, we now hold that legislative protection can be afforded nonunion workers.

The court continues:

> Precisely what these State laws do is to forbid employers acting alone or in concert with labor organizations deliberately to restrict employment to none but union members.

In legal briefs presented to the court, attorneys attacking the validity of right-to-work legislation asserted "that the right-to-work as a nonunionist is in no way equivalent to or the parallel of the right to work as a union member."

The court ruled as follows:

> We deem it unnecessary to elaborate the numerous reasons for our rejection of this contention of the appellants (the unions).
>
> Nor need we appraise or analyze with particularity, the rather startling ideas suggested to support some of the premises on which the appellants' conclusions rest.

The court refers to that argument against section 14(b) as "startling"—and no wonder.

Mr. President, freedom of individual choice is the bedrock upon which the right-to-work laws rest. The right to work is a basic personal liberty of freedom of association, guaranteed by the first amendment of the Bill of Rights, the same amendment that protects freedom of religion, speech, press, and assembly, and the very same amendment which constitutionally protects the right of unions to exist as private associations.

Justice Wenke, in Hanson against Union Pacific, summed up the essence of the individual's freedom to associate or not to associate in terse language.

> We think the freedom of association, of freedom to join or not to join in association with others for whatever purposes such association is lawfully organized, is a freedom guaranteed by the first amendment.

Mr. President, that could not be said better or in shorter form That opinion is found in 71 Northwestern Reporter, Second Edition, 545, 546.

The importance and fundamental character of these rights are not only recognized in American constitutional law, but they are attested by express recognition in the Declaration of Human Rights, approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1948.

Section 1 of article 23 of the U.N. Charter provides:

> Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work, and to protection against unemployment.

Then, if we refer to article 20 of the U.N. Charter itself, we find that that section states:

> 1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.
>
> 2. No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Mr. President, I do not know how to account for these interesting double standards. We summoned the leaders of the whole world to San Francisco in 1945. I shall never forget it. I was in the little country of Lebanon, on the Levantine coast. I had gone to see a member of the faculty—for all I know, the president—of the American University at Beirut. He spoke perfect English. He was a professor of electrical engineering and held a high station in his Government. He had never been on an airplane in his life. President Roosevelt sent a plane for him. The plane went to Egypt. To get to Egypt, my distinguished friend in Lebanon had to travel in a smaller plane to get to Cairo or any other good place for a takeoff. It alarmed him a little. I spent all afternoon giving him encouragement. I said, "I have flown all over the world." I told him I had flown the North Atlantic when it was not as easy or as fast as it is today. I finally got him to come to that plane, then to New York, and then to San Francisco, where the world leaders, moved by noble purposes, were undertaking to fashion an organization that ultimately would develop stability and lasting peace, noble purposes, and great undertakings for the expansion and the enjoyment of living of all mankind.

So we had a hand in shaping that charter. There are now 113 countries, I believe, which are members of the United Nations. One must watch the press every morning to make sure that he knows the accurate count, because another country might have gotten in the night before. There are many nations in the United Nations.

This is the charter under which they labor in the General Assembly. We said this is good for the world and for ourselves included. We subscribe to that charter.

The second item in article 20 provides:

> No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

That is good for Texas, because they have it there. It is good for Virginia; they have it. It is good for 17 other States. It is good for the nations because they said so when they subscribed to that charter. We are now asked to renege on this principle and to take it out of our laws by denying to the States the right to legislate in that field. That, to me, is clearly an astonishing thing.

In country after country in the free world, the right to work or the freedom of association—or both—is embedded in the law and is held to invalidate compulsory union membership.

In Belgium, the Netherlands, Austria, Denmark, Switzerland, and France these rights are protected by code or a statutory provision. In Western Germany they are secured by the postwar Bonn Constitution. In those countries the dignity and liberty of the individual are accorded a higher degree of respect than in many of our own States, despite our vaunted fidelity to liberty and our Bill of Rights which, in this field at least, are all too often honored in the breach. Because of the existence of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, all 50 States are now empowered to adopt right-to-work laws. All forms of mandatory union membership are presently forbidden by the laws of 19 States.

These laws protect the individual's right to work at his job, whether he is a union member or not. They forbid discrimination against either union members or nonunion members.

This traditional right of the States is threatened by bills calling for the repeal of section 14(b). Union officials have failed in their repeated attempts to nullify these laws at the State level, with one exception, and are now demanding that Congress do their bidding.

Twenty States had right-to-work laws. However, that law was repealed in Indiana. It will be rather interesting to follow the political destiny of that State over the next 2 years and to see precisely what will happen to those good Hoosiers out in the Middle West. They are my neighbors, and they are good people.

Repeal of section 14(b) would shatter industrial harmony by automatically imposing union membership, and would also strike down all of the existing 19 State right-to-work laws.

Organizations, fortified with talent of all kinds, legal, propaganda, and so forth, rather quickly discover that it is easier to deal with one legislature than with 50. It is easier to deal with a national legislature than it is to have to go to the capitals of the 50 States, including Alaska and Hawaii, although I doubt whether those who are interested would shrug particularly at the thought of a trip to Hawaii. But here is the National Legislature, the Congress, only one body. That makes an easier dish, and so they have come here. They have had their opportunity to speak for the repeal of section 14(b) during House and Senate hearings.

Every reliable survey of public opinion reflects overwhelming opposition to the practice of forcing working men and women into labor organizations. Virtually every Representative who polled his constituents on this issue found that the people of his district were against compulsory unionism. All but a handful of Members of Congress conceded that their mail ran overwhelmingly against the radical proposal.

Most organizations and associations actively interested in public affairs are on record against repeal. Union shops candidly admitted that they cannot get their membership to support repeal with letters to Congressmen. They have gotten some, to be sure, but what was astonishing to me was the vast amount of union mail supporting the position that we take, against the repeal of 14(b).

Unnumbered thousands of representative citizens have written letters to their newspaper editors on this subject, and almost all major newspapers in the country have arrayed themselves against repeal.

Now for the argument. The demand for the legalization of compulsory union membership is difficult to understand in view of the generation-long battle fought by the labor unions against "yellow dog contracts." Devised by management, these onerous agreements made joining a "company" union or agreeing not to join a union a mandatory condition of employment. To free labor from such coercion, "yellow dog contracts" were made unlawful by National and State law.

Today, union labor leaders are demanding that their own version of a "yellow dog contract" be legalized. This is called a union shop agreement.

Under such an agreement a new employee must join a particular union within a specified time, usually 30 or 60 days, or lose his job. The union may be a good or bad union. It may be loyal to the workers and to the Government, or it may be a Communist-controlled union, disloyal to both. However, no matter. The employee must join or look for another job.

How can labor unions, which developed as voluntary organizations to free labor from any oppressions of employer power, justify their present program to force men into unions to which they do not wish to belong?

The major arguments in behalf of compulsory unionism—all fundamentally unsound—are as follows:

First. Right-to-work laws do not give anyone the right to work.

Second. Right-to-work laws are antiunion.

Third. Right-to-work laws promote labor strife.

Fourth. Right-to-work laws deny trade unions their right to gain union security through collective bargaining.

Fifth. Right-to-work laws violate the majority rule principle.

Sixth. Right-to-work laws permit "free riders."

Seventh. Other organizations, such as the bar association, have compulsory membership.

Eighth. Right-to-work laws stifle a State's economic growth.

Ninth. Right-to-work laws violate the employers' and unions' "freedom of contract."

The facts refute the fallacies inherent in all of the arguments. Let us take a careful look at each one and see how.

First, that right to work is a fraud.

One, the advocates of compulsory unionism argue that a right-to-work law is a fraud because it does not give anyone the right to work.

This argument erroneously implies that proponents of right to work are misrepresenting the facts regarding this legislation. Popular support for right-to-work laws are based upon a correct understanding of the basic principle involved That principle is the freedom of the individual to choose either membership or nonmembership in a labor union without losing his job or being prevented from getting a job.

Right-to-work laws do not give anyone the right to work. But they do protect any employee from being forced to join or pay money to a labor union—or any other private organization—in order to get a job, or hold a job. Conversely, right-to-work laws protect the right of an employee to join a union if he so chooses.

Right-to-work laws do not interfere in any way with legitimate union activity. They do not restrict the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively with their employers. Right-to-work laws relate to only one issue: compulsory unionism, and the only issue before us is the right of any State to legislate in that field, and deal with it, and accept it or reject it if the State so desires.

Right-to-work advocates are often accused falsely of dishonest sloganizing. Union spokesmen and their apologists use the words "union security" in an attempt to disguise compulsory unionism. They thereby hope to make their use of compulsion palatable to the general public. This is an attempt at deception in pretty nearly, Mr. President, its rankest form. "Right to work" is a legal term with a long history. It was first defined in this country by the U.S. Supreme Court during the 19th century. The Civil War was followed by passage of Federal legislation which denied supporters of the Confederate cause the right to engage in their professions. Defining the "right to work," the Supreme Court nullified this spite legislation. Right-to-work laws are aptly and honestly named in that they protect the individual's inherent right to work whether he is or is not a union member.

But the issue before us is not a right-to-work law; it is a section in the Taft-Hartley Act which has been repeatedly upheld as constitutional by the courts of this country, including the U.S. Supreme Court, and it has been there for the past 18 years.

Now, they would like to refer to this—and perhaps we had better call this by the Roman numeral II—"the right to wreck."

The second major argument describes right-to-work laws as really right to wreck laws. The union bosses—Mr. President, I think I would like to strike that word "bosses" and say "the union leaders"—describe them as laws designed to destroy the labor movement by discouraging workers from becoming union members.

When anyone takes the position that a strong labor movement is dependent upon compulsory unionism, he is saying in effect that no one would belong to the union unless forced to join.

America's working men and women have clearly demonstrated that they will voluntarily join and support those unions which effectively represent the best interests of their members.

The history of the union known as the Communications Workers of America illustrates how a union can grow and prosper without compulsory membership. Virtually all of its members work under collective bargaining contracts which stipulate that employees represented by the CWA are free to join or not join the union. Between 1934 and 1951 the railroad unions were prevented by Federal law from compelling membership. Despite this prohibition, the railroad unions trebled their membership during that 17-year period.

I might refer back a moment, Mr. President, to the so-called Communications Workers of America, of which Joe Byrne is the president. That humble man down in Appomattox, Va., who wrote me a longhand note, was a member and is a member of the Communications Workers. In the letter he said, "We have a good union." They do; and Joe Byrne has given it good direction. It did not have to depend upon compulsion to get members or to keep the union intact and make it an effective force.

What the language of the right-to-work laws obviously indicates is borne out by the practical experience of unions in right-to-work States. Numerous statistical studies demonstrate that unions have had no less success in organizing employees in States which have right-to-work laws than they have had in other States. In fact, from all indications, they have had more organizing success in the right-to-work States. This should not be surprising when one takes into consideration the fact that right-to-work laws protect union membership as fully as they protect nonunion membership.

For example, the Texas right-to-work law, one of the earliest, is representative. It provides:

> SECTION 1. The inherent right of a person to work and bargain freely with his employer, individually or collectively, for terms and conditions of his employment shall not be denied or infringed by law, or by any organization of whatever nature.
>
> SEC. 2. No person shall be denied employment on account of membership or nonmembership in a labor union.

Mr. President, that is the law in the largest, unfrozen State in the Union—the great State of Texas, the home of our President. They have had this law for some time, and I have heard the Governor of that State come to Chicago and, before a large luncheon group, defend it with all the vigor at his command. I am referring, of course, to Gov. John Connally.

It will be observed immediately that the Texas law, like its counterparts in the other right-to-work States, extends precisely the same protection to union membership as it does to nonunion membership. As a matter of fact, union members have frequently resorted to right-to-work laws for protection against employer discrimination. See, for example, *Lunsford* v. *City of Bryan*, 156 Tex. 520 (1957).

This fact is what made Mr. Justice Black regard the union challenge to the constitutionality of the right-to-work laws as so "startling." In the leading Lincoln Federal Labor Union case of 1949 (335 U.S. 525, 532), he said:

> It is also argued that the State laws do not provide protection for union members equal to that provided for nonunion members. But in identical language these State laws forbid employers to discriminate against union and nonunion members.

Justice Black learned in this case that when referring to the right-to-work laws as "right to wreck" laws, union leaders use language in a peculiar way. What they really mean, he discovered, is that the right-to-work laws have the unfortunate quality—from the point of view of the union leaders—of giving equal employment right indiscriminately to union and nonunion employees.

In view of the evidence, it is genuinely surprising that unions continue to refer to them as "union busting" measures. The evidence proves otherwise.

III. PROMOTE STRIFE

The third major argument presented by the union bosses is the right-to-work laws promote strife and disrupt industrial peace.

This argument falls completely apart by merely referring to the testimony of George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, presented to the House Labor Subcommittee on May 25. Mr. Meany admitted that union demands for compulsory unionism are a major cause of industrial strife.

Union officials, in an effort to enforce their demands for making union membership a condition of employment, often foment strikes which lead to acts of violence.

For example, in June 1965, there was a bloody and bitter strike of electrical workers in Garrett, Ind.—a strike called as a result of the union's demand for a union shop agreement. During the strike, pickets held more than 70 workers, mostly women, hostage overnight; set off fire and broke out windows in the building where they were held captive; and burned and wrecked automobiles with gasoline and other fire bombs.

And only 6 months before this strike, the Indiana labor bosses were demanding the repeal of Indiana's right-to-work law on the ground that only by eliminating the worker's freedom to join or not to join a labor organization could labor-management peace and tranquillity be attained.

Instead of "peace and tranquillity" the repeal of Indiana's right-to-work law has erupted into an epidemic of coercion of both management and the individual worker. Repeal, in effect, constituted a directive to a certain element in the union hierarchy to resort to all illegal and violent procedures at their command to force both management and workers into the bondage of compulsory membership contracts.

It is simple fact that every known study of the subject, including those of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, show that in States which permit compulsory unionism almost twice as much time is lost because of work stoppages as is lost in right-to-work States.

Rather than encourage strife, right-to-work laws actually contribute toward harmonious union-management relations. They remove the explosive issue of compulsory union membership from the collective bargaining table.

Irresponsible and lawless behavior by union officials can only be curbed by the rank-and-file members—provided the members are free to withdraw from the union without forfeiting their jobs.

UNION SECURITY

The union hierarchy next claims that right-to-work laws deny the American trade unions their right to gain union security through the collective bargaining system and, they claim, union security, the very strength of the union, depends upon universal acceptance of membership.

This argument is absurd, since it is a simple historical fact that the unions have vastly increased their economic and political power in the last 30 years. Today, as we all know, any one of the number of unions can tie our economy into knots in a matter of hours.

Donald R. Richberg, a lifetime fighter for the legitimate rights of labor, coauthor of the famed Railway Labor Act of 1926 and the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, said in his book, "Labor Union Monopoly—A Clear and Present Danger," that:

> Americans are more-out-of-date and ill-informed concerning the realities of the labor movement in the United States than they are in any other area of public interest. Fifty years ago, the picture of a labor union as a weak, idealistic organization of downtrodden workers struggling against an oppressive concentration of property power was often accurate. Any such picture of an established union today is not merely ridiculous; it is willfully or ignorantly untruthful.
>
> Today the greatest concentrations of political and economic power in the United States of America are found, not in the over-regulated, over-criticized, over-investigated, and over-taxed business corporation, and certainly not in their hag-ridden, brow-beaten, publicity-fearful managers. The greatest concentrations of political and economic power are found in the under-regulated, under-criticized, under-investigated, tax-exempt, and specially privileged labor organizations, and in their belligerent, aggressive, and far-too-often lawless and corrupt managers.
>
> During the last quarter century, while the American people kept vigilant guard against the formation of business monopolies, numerous labor union monopolies have been established behind their backs. These new and hidden monopolies—of which the public, bemused by carefully fostered misconceptions, remains blissfully unaware—carry with them all the dangers of any monopoly: the tendency that unlimited power concentrated in a few hands will be used irresponsibly for personal or collective aggrandizement rather than for the common interests; the ease with which that power can, by direct or indirect pressures, bypass the established rules of law and order; the extreme difficulty of correcting concentrated power when it has grown corrupt.

It is also hardly debatable that a voluntary organization of workers united for self-help is inherently a much stronger organization than a union composed to a considerable extent of unwilling members. To argue that compulsion is necessary for union "security" is to argue that the union bosses could not organize a union without the power of compulsion.

Many of the strongest friends of organized labor have pointed out on various occasions that the strength of unionism would be greatly weakened by converting them into compulsory, monopolistic organizations which, if legally permitted, would inevitably require detailed regulation by Government which would otherwise be unnecessary.

Voluntary union membership for Federal employees was formally established by Executive Order No. 10988 which set up labor-management relations for the Federal Government with its employees.

Then Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg commented on this Executive order and voluntary union membership in a speech on January 20, 1962, in Washington, D.C., at a dinner meeting of the American Federation of Government Employees.

I am referring to Hon. Arthur Goldberg, who has been a close and intimate friend of mine for 25 years or more. He has had a great career as a brilliant labor lawyer and as counsel for the AFL-CIO. He was a member of the Council on Labor Relations Law of the American Bar Association. He was appointed as a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court and confirmed by this body. He was selected as Secretary of Labor and confirmed without a dissenting vote of the Senate. Now he is a distinguished U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and has gone many places to carry out work in the interest of peace. I regard him as a profound and able person. I quote what Mr. Goldberg said:

> Now there is another thing. We all want to preserve the merit system for entry and retention in the Federal service. I had my share of winning the union shops for example for unions in private industries, but I know you will agree with me that the union shop and the closed shop are inappropriate to the Federal Government. And because of this, there is a larger responsibility for enlightenment on the part of the Government union. In your own organization you have to win acceptance not by an automatic device which brings a new employee into your organization, but you have to win acceptance by your own conduct, your own action, your own wisdom, your own responsibility and your own achievements. And let me say to you from my experience representing the trade union movement that this is not a handicap necessarily. This is a great advantage because very often the union shop has been very much justified in private industry as a result of modern development. Very often even the union that has won the union shop will frankly admit that people who come in through that route do not always participate in the same knowing way as people who come in through the method of education and voluntarism. So you have an opportunity to bring into your organization people who come in because they want to come in and who will participate, therefore, in the full activity of your organization.

That great liberal Supreme Court Judge, Louis Brandeis, had this to say on the subject:

> The union, in order to attain or preserve for its members industrial liberty, must be strong and stable. It need not include every member of the trade. Indeed, it is desirable for both the employer and the union that it should not. Absolute power leads to excesses and to weakness: Neither our character nor our intelligence can long bear the strain of unrestricted power. The union attains success when it reaches the ideal condition, and the ideal condition for a union is to be strong and stable, and yet to have in the trade outside its own ranks an appreciable number of men who are nonunionists. In any free community the diversity of character, of beliefs, of taste—indeed mere selfishness—will insure such a supply, if the enjoyment of this privilege of individualism is protected by law. Such a nucleus of unorganized labor will check oppression by the union as the union checks oppression by the employer.

That is the end of the quotation from Justice Brandeis.

All the experience we have had since the beginning of the century bears out the views expressed by Justice Brandeis. To the degree that corruption exists among unions today—and the McClellan committee hearings demonstrated that there is much, too much—the remarkable fact is that it is concentrated exclusively among unions which practice one or another form of compulsory unionism.

That no well managed union needs compulsory membership to gain "security" has been demonstrated by actual experience in the railroad industry.

From 1934 to 1951, all unions covered by the Railway Labor Act were under what has now come to be known as a right-to-work law. Section 2, 11th of the act provided that membership in covered unions must be voluntary, not compulsory. It was during this period that the railroad union movement became strong and effective. The membership in railroad unions under that right-to-work law trebled in 17 years. The influence of the railway unions under that law expanded to the point that in 1951 they represented 94 percent of the rail trackage in the United States.

Having reached that position of great strength under voluntarism, union officials went to Congress and asked it to legalize compulsory unionism.

During hearings on the subject held by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the unions actually conceded that they did not need a union shop for union security. George Harrison, president of the Railway Clerks and chief spokesman for the railroad unions made this point clear in his testimony. When asked by Congressman HARRIS whether the union shop would strengthen the unions' bargaining position, he replied:

> No, I do not think it would affect the power of bargaining one way or the other, Congressman HARRIS * * * if I get a majority of the employees to vote for my union as the bargaining agent, I have got as much economic power at that stage of development as I will ever have.

Sylvester Petro, professor of law at New York University, summed up the case against this argument in a recent essay on 14(b). He said:

> As Justice Brandeis so wisely observed, the human character is fallible; it is never at its best in a situation of unrestrained power. Just as businessmen need the market check of free competition to remind them persistently that their job is to serve consumers to the best of their ability, so too union leaders need market checks to remind them that their job is to serve workers, not to master or abuse them. The basic check for businessmen is the right and the freedom of consumers to quit buying their products. In the same way, the basic and most effective check for union leaders is the right and the freedom of workers to refuse to become members—or to resign their membership when they feel abused—without losing their jobs. All the policemen, bureaucrats, and judges in the world could not duplicate the restraining effect upon union corruption that an inability to secure members, or to keep them, has.
>
> In the light of these considerations, the contention of union leaders that they must practice compulsory unionism if they are to be strong and responsible carries a singularly light weight of conviction. Union leaders are men like other men. If unions are to acquire enduring strength they must do so by persuading workers, not coercing them, to the belief that their interests will be served most effectively and responsibly by joining unions.

That is the end of the quotation from Professor Petro of New York University.

I proceed now to the argument on majority rule.

MAJORITY RULE

The next argument states that right-to-work laws violate the majority rule principle, that if a majority of employees vote to organize a union, it is undemocratic to prevent a union from entering into a collective bargaining agreement which provides for union security.

This is a wholly fictitious argument because our labor laws, enacted through the demands of unions themselves, already require the minority of employees who are not members of a labor union to accept the terms and work under the contracts of the majority.

A collective bargaining agreement which provides for union security compels all employees to belong to the union as a condition of employment. There is nothing democratic about the tyranny of an unrestrained majority. Compulsory unionism is clearly a form of totalitarianism, in that it tramples the rights of the minority.

The individual citizen has rights which the governing majority may not transgress. He must abide by the will of the majority as expressed in a free public election. But he cannot be compelled to join the political party of the majority.

Under the U.S. Constitution, only the Government has the sovereign power to compel submission to rule, and its power is limited by the protection enjoyed by minorities under the Bill of Rights. The very purpose of the Bill of Rights is to lay restraints upon the majority for the protection of the fundamental rights of minorities. Under constitutional government majority rule cannot be employed as an instrument for the obliteration of minority rights.

In talking about "majority rule," union spokesmen erroneously assumed there is no difference between public government and private labor organizations, so far as power over the individual is concerned. Sovereign rights cannot be claimed by a labor union or any other private organization. If a minority of employees does not want to be unionized, no democratic principle will support action which compels that minority to join the union of a majority.

Some union leaders have recognized the value of voluntarism in the matter of union membership and the dangers inherent in compulsion. Warren S. Stone, for many years grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, is on record as follows:

> I do not believe in forcing a man to join a union. If he wants to join all right; but it is contrary to the principles of free government and the Constitution of the United States to try to make him join. We of the engineers work willingly side by side with other engineers every day who do not belong to our union though they enjoy without any objection on our part the advantages we have obtained. Some of them we would not have in the union; others we cannot get.

In 1953, Guy L. Brown, grand chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotives Engineers, told a reporter for a national magazine that his union did not ask Congress for the union shop and had actually opposed it as a matter of policy.

He went on to say:

> We support it only on individual roads where other unions have put it into effect. Engineers just simply resent being told they must join anything. We still think that labor in the long run has a good-enough product that you won't have to force men to join. We must go along on a union shop in some instances where it is necessary because of the possible encroachment upon our membership by some other organization.

As Donald Richberg said:

> The claim of democratic majority rule by compulsory unionism is a pure fraud. Our democratic theory of majority rule is based on the preservation of minority rights and minority opposition and the possibility of shifting the majority power. But when the workers are required to join and support a union regardless of their desire to oppose it, the whole democratic basis of majority rule disappears. It is supplanted by a monopoly rule which has no place in a democratic society.

The next topic in this argument would be topic VI, the so-called free rider argument. I think I have continued sufficiently long. I have quite a number of people to see yet this afternoon. So I now suggest the absence of a quorum. Mr friend, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] will follow me in this discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Illinois in changing the normal pattern of this exercise, so that I might have enough time to place in the RECORD a substantial amount of what I intended to say while the Senate was still in session.

Before I enter into a serious discussion of the problem, I have two interesting obligations to fulfill. The first is based on a telegram I received on October 12, last year from Jerrold J. Myrup, president of local No. 750 of the Typographical Union of Provo, Utah.

Mr. Myrup's telegram reads as follows:

> PROVO, UTAH,
> *October 12, 1965.*
>
> Senator BENNETT,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> We are sending you this telegram to let you know how disappointed we are in you. Your vote on cloture we mean. Last year the people of the State of Utah elected Senator MOSS, Representative KING, Governor Rampton, and President Johnson by large majorities. They were elected on the platform which included repeal of right to work. The telegram that was sent to you by BYU students was a shame. How many of the 2,000 students are of voting age and are even registered? How many of them are even citizens of the State of Utah? Think it over and vote for repeal of section 14(b). Have you the courage to read this on the Senate floor?
>
> JERROLD J. MYRUP,
> *President, Local No. 750,*
> *Typographical Union.*

I believe the RECORD will now reflect that, if it required any courage to read that telegram on the Senate floor, it has been read. That brings me to the other telegram which this gentleman said was a shame. This is a telegram signed by 2,000 students of Brigham Young University. It is 56 feet long.

I believe that I have the same obligation to these students to read this telegram that I had to read Mr. Myrup's message. In the beginning of the telegram it states:

> We, the undersigned, as citizens of the United States of America—

That answers Mr. Myrup's first question.

The telegram reads as follows:

> PROVO, UTAH,
> *October 14, 1965.*
>
> Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT,
> *U.S. Senate Office,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> We, the undersigned, as citizens of the United States of America, being keenly aware of our heritage, desire to express our continued support and allegiance to the traditional constitutional principles that our Founding Fathers sacrificed so much to establish for the benefit of their posterity. The greatness of our country lies in its respect and desire to maintain the freedoms guaranteed to the individual in the Bill of Rights. It is with these thoughts in mind that we find it necessary to express our concern regarding legislation presently before the Congress of the United States of America; in particular the proposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.
>
> We cannot support any movement which may, in effect, deprive the individual citizen of the freedom of acquiring gainful employment free from the direct influence of collective bargaining through labor unions should he choose to do so. We cannot support any movement which would tend to weaken, or dilute the free agency of man. An agency established by the Creator for the benefit of mankind, and which we feel a responsibility to do all in our power to preserve and strengthen. How can it be fair and just for all those concerned when, as a condition of sustained employment, membership in a union organization is required? Should not the individual have the right to express his free agency as a contributor to the economic sphere of America?
>
> We believe this right can and must be preserved, and that the personal liberties of each citizen must be safeguarded at all costs. Therefore we do heartily sustain retention of 14(b).

I shall unroll this 56-foot telegram to let the Senate realize just how extensive it is, and read the names as I go down the list. The names are:

Mary Kaye Thurston, Richard Flint, Denice Barainca, Susan Tout, Gerald Stott, Irma Ruiz, Marilyn Smout, Helen Robison, Mary Ann Braia, David Adams, Carol Ann Schafer, Mr. and Mrs. Glade Barr, Lynn Rowe, Terril Memmort, Dennis Burgi, Ken Nelson, Robert Bair, Gerald Bowns, Patricia Marie Sakisbury, Dan Baker, Ray Cleverly.

Janet Fornalski, John Barainca, Dennis Smith, Gerald Stott, Alvin Mitehill, Charles Eberhard, Robert Hall, Ramon Yorgason, G. Bruce Braithwaite, Reed Bartlet, Gary Hendrix, David Baker, Patricia Hatch, Judy Mitchell, John Winters, David King, John Corless, Sandra Kay Terry, Carolyn Hill, C. Brian Hardy, Ivan Tyler.

Robert Berry, Karin Eriksson, Ruth Jacob, Ray Ann Bowers, David Faulkner, Willard Burge, Mr. and Mrs. Fenton Tyler, Linda Hallett, James Waters, Charla Neilson, Dorothy Anderson, Carolyn Larsen, Joan Ellen Smith, Linda Beebe, Jim Sipe, D'Wayne Baird, Sara Chadwick, Claudia Smith, Jean Drinkwater, Billy Crystal.

Walter Chudleigh, David Kest, Scott Nickerson, Darwin Rygg, Lee Cooper, Noel Reynolds, Sandy Barnes, Marie Butler, Ken Larsen, Connie Brooks, Marianne Bye, Dabbie Rowe, Lynell Bennett, Darlene Tousley, William Simper, Cheryl Deann Nelson, Paula Rust, Sydney Nethercott, Mary Bohn, Edith Larsen.

Dennis Biggs, Lynn Despain, Kenneth Higa, Michael Creasy, Marilyn Johnson, Tina Wilkinson, Karen Andersen, Euleen Clay, Sharon Voutaz, Larae Gardner, Margaret Dyreng, Carole Ann Kennedy, Joanne Harlan, Pamela Dewitt, Jean Johnson, Joan Johnson, Jeanene Sprague, Margaret Brown, Karen Arthur, Shauna Knight, Lowell Coy Barber, Barry Romney, Elizabeth Kirk, Jeff Jacobsen.

Taunita Stock, Susan E. Cram, Linda Miller, Nancy Sidwell, Roberta Dwigley, Virginia McAllister, Kathryn Dusenberry, Berine Babble, Alice Daly, Karen Colette Nixon, Nadine Maxfield, Janet Thomas, Mary Gartrell, Kathlene Anne Baker, Helen Madsen, G. B. Done, John McTea, Bob Hughes, Rodger Wandy, Gail Miles, Larry Weight.

David Draper, Stephen Nelsen, Kim Despain, Marilyn Lamoreaux, Judy Chadwick, Jan Hanks, Chris Trauntrein, Colleen Shields, Gilbert Guecr, Roger Brient, James Ratos, Rick Winward, Janine Collier, Bobbie Putter, Linda Crabb, Jimmie Chandler, Mary Kay Lawrence, Maxine Ryser, Myrna Scheigel.

Kathy Candland, Jay Las, Milton C. Baker, Wiebeum Pine, Nancy Taylor, Bill Homer, Don Mangum, Dave Groves, Steve Spears, Kathy Slocum, David Hamilton, Frank West, Kathleen Hatcher, Chuck Christensen, Ron Scheson, Gordon Thayne, Renae Huck, Lynne Hammond.

Edwin Beus, Gene Merrill, Dave Tovey, Joseph Johnson, Ole Dunn, Kathleen Dunn, Levier and Linda Gardner, Larry Allen, Brent Alder, John Vanorman, George Ullin, Keith Bates, Keith James, James Berry, Jeffrey Delia, Nancy Stowe, Barbara Jacobsen, Ida Dawn Gubles, Barbara Betner, Lula Gray, Keith Light.

Charlene Billings, Mary White, Terry Delaney, Darrylin Fry, Dean Zimmerman, Mildred Ulbricht, Bruce Galbraith, Rex Friaut, Noel Stewart, Linda Fleming, Tony Martin, Diana Lynn Sorenson, Mary Jane Ludwig, Kathy Olson, Tammy Malmbert, Diane Spagenski, Gail Leavitt, Claudia Wright, Janet Page, Ines Stolworthy.

Marius Christensen, Ronald Lewis, Sharon Corbin, Mary Peterson, Anabel Lee Leslie, Bernell Benett, Preston Kies, Clark Christensen, Clyde Taylor, Kaye Bickmore, William Timmins, David Day, Douglas Wakefield, Val Jolley, Raphel Huntzinger, Joe Parker, Ronald Snouge, Reed Turnbow.

Richard Smith, Val Jones, D. Wade Richards, Carolyn Swenson, Leona Jo Spencer, A. Gaila Helmes, Susan Spencer, Keith C. Porter, David Carle Bohn, Lamont Devong, Wayne Turley, Don Jay Brown, Diana C. Rowson, Charles Nodling, Fern Smith, Leta Boyer, Wayne Hansen, Lawrence Hills, Roderick Cameron, R. Q. Shupe, Shari Mecham.

Rosemarie Neal, Varla Burkhart, Erica Feuz, Carol Barrus, John Bingham, Dennis Martin, Samuel Harper, Georgenia Stewart, Kathleen Johnson, H. Scott Margan, Elizabeth, Groberg, Paul Platero, Michael Robinson, M. H. Lightburne, Cass Bettinger, Sherry Beardall, Lyn Clayton, Nancy Birch, Durlin Bailey, Ruth Ann Harrison, Sandra Hemshay.

John Peter Graves, Richard Budge, Duane Huff, Harold Smith, Raymond Cantrell, Cary Howard, Charlotte Chamberlain, Vincent Congreves, Merwin Ladd Biggs, Wilford E. Biggs, Donna Lou Solosabal, Paula Remsburg, Eugene Lane, Floy Crandall, Eldon Hurst, William Ellis Strunk, Phyllis Anderson, George Cobabe, Dorr Hanson, John Dohl, Judith Johnon, Rulon Ballow, Gordan Bissegger.

Donald Schrieder, Carl Hunter, Maxine Bays, N. Carl Tenney, Betty Delph Wilson, Suzie Heaviside, Bill Brady, Stephen Millor, Henry Micholes, Don Hoburg, Burton Reald, Winston Sam Fong, Mark Taylor, John Riglle, Gary Draler, Anthoney Verey Razozzine, Stan Ferguson, Jane Blackielder.

Duane Carling, Susan Neisereau, Elaine Renell, Pafail Johnson, Patricia Steinman, Claudia Smith, Jill Greenwood, Robert Folkman, Rita McMinn, J. Allen Green, Kirk Nielson, Elaine Eastmond, Phyllis Wendel, Thais Carlson, Eloise Davis, Ilene Todd, John Peterson, Cory Allred, J. Ross Taner, Leonard Brimley.

Joel Ketch, Heber Done, Ned Karren, Richard Villa, Gary Poole, Jeff Leblaes, Frank Tuft, Fred Helsmaner, Dick Rees, Keith Higginbotham, Wesley Hoover, Kathryn Luke, Lyle Burnett, Steven Wilson, Rawlin Evans, Bill McCurdy, Charles Rush, Diane Erickson, Rebecca Anderson.

Max Loerlscher, Gary Stevens, Devon Hokanson, Judi Jones, Sarah Jane Keeler, Larry Keeler, John Meacham, Jimmy Hill, Joyce Clawson, Colleen Nilson, Richard Hunt, Mike Ahlstromp, Lynne Ahlstromp, Richard Young, Doug Jacobsen, Steve Jex, John Smith, Gary Clunar, Hubert Larne Crockett, James Frank Anderson.

Marianne West, Dick Clark, Eugene Reynolds, David Hoggerty, Val Judd, Val Bunker, Gayla Bunker, Elizabeth Shellman, Bonnie Baier, Phyllis Nuttall, Neil Smith, Alan Smith, Arnold Hult, Craig Witt, Weiley Hurren, Clayne Yeates, Ivan Emery, L. Loran Lee.

Preston Larson, Beth Clegg, D. M. Youth, Don Gull, John Marshall, Mr. and Mrs. P. H. Cunningham, Rocky Kuoner, Ann Behnmin, Kirk Webster, Alton Percival, Robert Johnson, Keith Norman, Shiekl Montgomery, Lou Jean Willis, Douglas Thompson, Paul Loscano, Larry Clark, Sherry Walder, Mr. and Mrs. M. Kim Sharp.

Margaret Malin, Jerry Fullmer, Reed C. Rasmussen, Dennis Flint, Leroy Dean Bird, Sue Grant, Gerald Tingey Aaron, Dean L. Castle, Garth Moore, Vickey Mickelson, Eleanor Knowles, W. Don Rogers, Janet Rogers, Ronald Lewston, Vernon R. Morgan, Gilbert J. Sandley, Wayne Bevan, Michael Moody, Louise Kerr, Emily H. Josephson.

Jill Roundy, Murlyn Brown, Floyd Smith, Alan Keele, Edmond Wayne Vanlawren, Anthony Albrethsen, Bill H. Taylor, Lennard Gabrielson, J. Norman Smith, Cardell Jacobson, Allen Sambert, Howard Kempton, Franklin Dimich, Juliana Woolley, Ronald Rosade, Dick Smith, Calvin Summer, Blaine Liljenquist, Larry Rands, Jack Hoagland.

Howard Palmer, Preston Nielson, Lynn Bradford, William J. Berry, Lynn Stewart, Bryan Hartley, Robert Bruce Wilson, Orin Dilworth, James Smith, Levere Merritt, Paul Johnston, Malcolm H. Johnson, Wayne Braithwaite, Gary Allen, Fugo Boren, Kjartan Magnusson, Brent Jones, John Dilz.

H. Gerald Pedersen, Robert Fears, Judith Magnusson, Steve Gilbland, Bonnie Anderson, Rosalie Erekson, R. Gayle Hohnan, Pamela Bromley, Keith Latan, Kirt Matthis, Craig Lello, Carolyn Cathey, John Marshall, Alice Clayton, Thomas Taylor, Janine Taylor, Barbara Chaffin, Sanrolane Larsen, Doug Keeler, Robert Gray, Grant Madsen.

M. V. Bond, Myron Hopkins, Judith Gardner, Keith Durfey, Bill Nuttall, Jacquelyn Osborne, Wayne Bingham, Robert Delplain, Evelyn Stiborek, George Cook, Kay Merrill, Judy Walk, Richard Diaper, Jordan Ridel, Bob Winlet, Kenneth Cox, Stephen Taylor.

William Gufforts, Gary Brown, Amel Levy, Ralph Redford, E. Brent Tragun, H. William Thomas, Vernalynn Andres, John S. Andrews, Kathleen Glade, Philip W. Winkler, Mille C. Brien, Royce Henningson, Harold Wilkinson, Mike Twitty, J. Deanne Ferrin, Dennis Deranx, James Lloyd Lee, Glen Boyle, Nancy Berry, Michael Dickerson.

Craig Smith, Lynda Hunter, Larry Vaughn, Alan Folkman, David Hoskisson, William Halless, Daniel Harrison, Dianne Carter, Neal Thomas, Michael Vanwert, Henry Laisen, Jerry Prigmor, Joan Roylance, Kathy Ostler, Cjus Knaip, Kenneth Gledhill, Stephen Sevuft, Jeff Holl.

Deanne Peterson, Beverly Peterson, Hazel Hughes, Roger Mitroy, Nancy Tate, Carolee Tonk, Davis Tonks, Vicki Enders, Richard Smuin, Kathy Laferty, Michael Barthlomer, Dixie Pearce, David Butler, Macy Lynne Goodwin, Douglas Smith, Nedra Nelson, Loma Lund, Carl Golden, Ronald Swapp, Ronald Nelson.

Ronald Bischoff, Diane Smith, Lynn Dahle, Michael Sessions, George Hall, Leslie Stuart, John Nieman, Vernon Benson, Linda Wirner, John Miller, Charlotte Smith, Jerry Hawksworth, Shirley Sialey, Harold Clark, Steve Wheatley, Richard Stone, Ernest Baird, Bradford McMullin, Kenneth Holmstead.

Cheryl Kirk, Art Barker, Evelyn Hull, Tony Jeffers, David Hoover, Bennett Bracken, Jim Snarr, Tamara Towler, Dennis Griffith, Hordon Davies, Roger Lewis, Robert Morley, Rodney Hickman, Lames Pritchard, Johnnie Tobler, Ronald Backe, Carwin Peterson, Roger Hogan.

Jay Thomas, Paul Meredith, Dodd Clark, Robert C. George, Harry Brown, Edson Barton, Aldon Gene Tyler, Milton M. Beck, Dwight Clark, Bruce Bennett, Richard Lamb, Keith Brown, Rulon Hohnson, Charles Grace, Joel Tate, Lynn Dittman, Leroy Jones, Georgia Law, Loraine Sims, Richard Wright.

Ronald Hawkins, Denzel Fillmore, James Adams, Casheu Donahoe, Jr., Michael Terry, Leon Young, Richard Whiting, Del Nebeker, John Wagner, David Sawyer, Frederick Huchel, Even Wright, Fred Bush, William Bush, E. William Sigapus, Dennis Hoagland, Janc Hoagland, Franklin Walker, Paul Pack, Laurie Platt, Guy Chamberlain.

Glen Jernon, Kevan Smith, Dennis Berrett, Gerry Weiner, Richard Gribbs, Marcia Gibs, Wilson Cononer, Glen Hopkinson, Richard Rowland, Kenneth Larson, Richard Alderst, Bill Lee, Lee Haney, Patricia White, David Aldred, Wayne Boss, Francis Alder.

James Lamb, Don Williams, Maurice Beaujeu, K. Allan Zahel, James Leo Keller, Gerald Kammerman, Alan Bohl, Gary Eberhard, Carl Palmer, David R. Shorten, David Brown, Kenneth Fugal, Joyce Boyle, Denmark Jensen, Harlan Ashby, David Dahl, Dorothy Anne Fielton, Jeanne Sorenson, Betty Lee Hooker.

Lynette Cardall, Stephen Bardsley, Edward Erdsisak, Stephen Clark, Kent Bradford, Paul Crapo, James Kirkwood, Irene Andreason, Gene Barlow, Bruce Brown, Thomas Mochay, David Palmer, Ron Riggs, Malcolm Young, Tim Puhr, Douglas Nettles, D. Scott Megregor, Ralphel Smith, Ralph Roberts.

Steve Richman, John Lamont, Stanley Morrell, Reid Beers, Michael Kovacs, Sidney Howk, Deloy Pierce, Sidney Howk, Deloy Lawrence, Gary Lawrence, Kenneth Gay, Louis Pope, Donald Ellison, Darl Christensen, Robert Travis, Arthur Draper, Lamont Reaps, Gary Allred, Wila Smith, Robert Christensen.

R. Dennis Ickes, Kent Hughes, Grant Sharp, Lee Barney, Marie Rinquest, Hanle Rinquest, Robert Campbell, James Meldrum, Jr., Ruth Acher, Janet Mealy, Stephen Rich, Marilyn Erickson, Cynthia Hathaway, Barbara Saver, Robert Wilson, William Boardman, Jay Johnston, Don Redd, Joseph Douglas Harris, Steven Jorgensen.

James Riggs, Bruce Allgood, Kenneth Woolf, Kenneth Bevan, Blaine Nichols, Catherine Nichols, Kim Johnson, Ernest Kiltermann, Judy Baugh, Kenneth Fairchild, Marian Roudle, Joanna Haris, Jay Garner, Gary Barron, Richard Paul, Merilynne Rich, Reese Edwin Rugg, Wally Rugg, Sheryl Strong, Kent Eksbrom, Marcia Eksbrom, Gail Marble.

Denna Marble, Ruth Benson, Myrna, Rasmussen, Ramona Marchant, Maria Clark, Glenn Rowland, Janet Irons, Clarence Dent, Oscar Rowland, Margaret Rowland, Mary Deut, Texaicria Rowland, Julia Greenwood, Susan M. Johnson, Betty Child, Alene Montgomery, Jayne Litster, Duane G. Francis.

Daryl Parker, Carl Glassford, Steve Albrect, Allan Brinkerhoff, David Dewer, Dan Passomore, Patti O'Brian, Gordon Harknes, Donne Dee Padden, Kristina Johnson, Lennie Sue Singleton, Kay Bobbel, Anita Edwards, Carma Brescott, Leslie Pugmine, Joan Ruplinger, Jacher Jones, John Judd, Krichard Holdaway, Don Thompson.

Willard Zurcher, Neal Van Alfer, Phil Writ, John Kibler, Larry Snupson, L. Thomas Fife, Garth Nelson, Merrill H. Perman, Rose Ann Finberson, Carole Davis, Jay Sudweeks, Pes Flake, Chall McRoberts, Gordon Kimball, Bob Taylor, Howard Rything, Keith Clayton.

Ed Ginn, Wayno Fortie, James McMelby, Malce Forsythe, Kenneth R. Walker, Selby Herrin, Dianne Astle, Blanche Tomlinson, Laura Davinport, Gordon McDane, Val Wessey, Kathi Sadleir, Donald Allred, Jenkin Vaughn Williams, Laura Mae Reynolds, Diann Morris, Mark Nielson, Patricia Man, Duane Roberts.

Russell Thompson, Kaye Bergquist, Gordon Hinderson, Cheri Clunas, Robert Bushman, Lani Hubbard, Gayle Hanssen, Victoria Cammack, E. Melvin Commack, Brent Julander, John Elbreith, S. Paul Steed, George Rogers, Eilleen Sheffield, Jay Chamberlin, Richard S. Morrison, Carol Ann Goodson.

Pamela Stott, Allen J. Chubbs, Kathleen Childs, Lynn R. Cook, Dianne Pierce, Linda Tate, George Young, Josephine Hanson, Marlene Hanson, Stan Albrect, Linda Kesel, Robert Westover, Pat Snelgrove, Charles Dowist, Bradley Green, Lamar Nybe, Roena Pollart, Dennis Parker.

Dennis Heaston, Mark Bell, Larry Parks, Bayne McMillan, Charles W. Whitaker, David E. Greenwood, Miriam Pamela Jones, Gary Bobber, Gary Johnson, Mar Allan, Hanie Schuson, Robert Valentine, David Geddes, Stephen Wiedner, Corwin S. Lewis, Curt Crandall, Patrese Stosich, Clyde Merritt, Leroy Christensen.

Martin Palmer, David Lorsen, Diane Dennis, Dianne Clyde, Wallace Carr, Karen Day, Edgel Liechton, Thomas B. Payne, Carlan Madshaw, Charles W. Hansen, Charles Richey, Steven Wolsey, Norma Vandaar, Joyce Skiba, Betty Nyholm, Rynn Kerrison, William Stirband, C. Randall Peterson, C. Bruce Barton, Ronald Bennie.

James L. McKumey, Ellis C. Worthen, Sidney Paulson, W. Blake Sonne, Gary Walberger, Barry Nielsen, Richard Douglas, Dennis Riggsly, Douglas Chadwich, Maryln Jensen, Sue Hallstrom, Kay Johnson, Larry Lyman, Trinh Dam, Martin L. Kelly, D. Paul Sampson, Douglas F. Baird, Michel L. Coll.

Harvey R. Self, John Hartvigsen, David Felton, Jerry Brown, Verla Beck, Fay Analla, Carol Anne Schuster, Douglas R. Medlyn, Steve Groat, Lonnie Olsen, Brent Jones, Arthur Reid Nelson, Keith Borrowman, Bruce Bird, Joyce Carnes, David Wilkins, Gary Wood, Stanley Hodge, Max Allenp, Stephen Fitt.

Dan Bachman, Loyd Campbell, Jr., Timothy Wayne Bramm, Monroe Tyler, Gary Brown, Craig Carter, Joseph James Ahlstrom, Russell Killpack, Paul Christensen, Dennis Rushforth, Richard Kennedy, Alan Wardell, Bob Christiansen, Pauline Van Dyke, Lawrence Hood, Stewart Fausett.

Richard Hilk, Paul Harmstan, Berthold Werner, John Cannon, Jon Hazelgren, Wayne Harvey, Bart Mortensen, David Gillingwater, Dale Clark, David Call, Hoover Clark, J. Rodney Day, Ladelle Cook, Arlete Galloway, Judy Goodrich, Lunnette Haycock, Robert Wyatt, Robert Kremer, Mark Haymann, Marvin Jones, Patricia Ann Taylor.

James Steven Good, Kent Harrettp, Paul Mintongrel, Bonnie Brown Marshall, James McDavid, Michael Anderson, Jim Sheffield, R. Kent Horsly, Adrian Stienbaugh, Anita Hebert, Becky Dilworth, Renee Thomas, William Ostler, Neil A. Riddle, Alice R. Bates, Carol Anderson.

Karyne Donald, Ron Snow, Richard Koch, Susan Applegate, Kathy Stephen, Pat Worthineton, David Roel Candland, Diane Stark, Stephen N. W. Newman, Marlin Criddle, Sharon Miller, Karl Miller, John Alen, Laraine Webecke, B. J. Gent, Scott L. Reave, Phil Spears, Milvin Kay Brown, Kay Ryan, Vernon Moon.

David Smith, Charles Hawley, Lucin Wadsworth, David Smith, James Fisher, Ken Carter, Jerry Anderson, Roger Rice, Roy Rose, Daniel Jackson, Val Brown, Gordon Bielzing, Roger Dixon, Rodney Crocket, Richard Anthony, Ken Batson, Patricia McCoy, Stephen Hauley.

Stephen Hays Russell, Douglas Bennion Butler, Raou Searle, Richard Jones, Susie Larson, Nancy Saunders, J. A. Hanson, Von L. Thompson, James Church, James Davis, Lanning Porter, Ried Wilcox, Rulon Smithson, William Waddellern, Alfred Gunn, Sydney Reynolds, Thomas Crockett, Elwis Pettingill, Marvin Stater, Neil Haris.

Dennis McCuder, Thomas Watts, William Rondall, Carol Ann Frischknect, Regina Read, Robert Stone, Lloyd Pendleton, Russell Barber, Linda Shumway, Michael W. Draper, Bruce Taylor, Ted Wittmayer, Vernon Davenport, Graham Wensen, Alice Hill, Pat Macey, Alan Snelgrove Layton, H. Sharon Dutkus.

David L. Ron, Howard B. Birstol, Nelson A. Merkley, Mason Harrell, Mary McConkie, Lina Thompson, Lois M. Thompson, Paul M. Tinker, Nyle R. Soper, Gerald Brown, Boyd Garriott, I. Wilson Anthompson, Garl Drake, Michael Gardner, Marsha Gardner, Gwendolyn Gwynel, Nancy Jean Rawlinson, Janet Pace, Pamela Sindel, Glen Lowry.

Ross T. Christensen, Lynn Caylor, Art Stoddard, Ted Davis, John Harker, Gareth Donaldson, Robert Kent Gardner, Erwin Farsworth, Marcia Nelson, Clyde Gibson, Robert Crawford, Gene Puckett, Kethlenn Robbins, Margaret Harspool, Don Eardley, David Hobson, Mary Woodberry, Ladd Bennett.

Peter Mortensen, Jr., Dennis Johns, Terrance Olsonstephen Peterson, John Latter, Max Jargensen, C. J. Scharles, Clair Miller, Candace Gutzman, Bob Shedd, Cheryl Temples, Sandia Browns, Danielle Bedstead, Charles Harrison, Tedd Reimer, Reed Morrill, Stanford Garrett, Patrick Scholfield, Amy Divey.

Patrick Sherrill, David Jay Bessey, Phillip Seager, Judith Rickards, V. Steven Fales, Janet A. Richards, Pamela Sharp, David Barton, Miviam Wright, Alan Culter, Marjorie Jensen, Ann Chipman, Brad Anderson, Jerold Knighton, Terrance Gallagher, John Tate, Jr., Roy Renchen, Charle Larsen, Louise Goates, Daniel B. Evans.

Kay Beebe, Lyce Larson, Richard Hopkinson, Larry Haucks, Farrell Pond, Farelyn Pond, Nanci Redford, Laurel Cale, Sonoma Goodwill, Mitch McCann, Steven Osteen, Thomas Jensen, Renae Morris, Kathleen Riches, Deloy Pack, Dianne Larsen, Cystal Fossum, Joanne Morrill.

Susan Brown, Dr. C. R. Harms, Kathleen Boyack, Terril Barney, Ronald Jolley, Bruce Harvey, Lynda Garrett, Stephen Lamad Garrett, George Berry, Joseph Bossi, Ric Paul Jim Thompson, Stan Warnich, Sarah Soderborg, Larry O. Lebaron, Donald Worden, Gary Pocock, Anal Pettit, Joanne R. Packard, Brian Richardson, N. Roger Anderson.

Gary Rogers, R. Bruce Sundrud, Rock Brady Clam, John Anderson, Isabel Barlon, Richard Deimott, Robin Titenson, Ralph Rowley, Orlo McEwen, Douglas A. Zincke, Walter Kilton, Jr., Stanley John Cutler, Charles H. Duke, Vaughn Benson, Lynn Southam, Peter Witt, Susan Hatford, John Samplers.

Mary Taylor, Janet Richards, Lawrence Mellor, David Henry, Loyd Drimman, Max Garber, Larry Jensen, Allen Isaac, Kathleen Isaac, Elsie May Paulson, Terry Hjorth, Kathleen Ritner, Judith Henderson, Keith Paulson, Gery Stephens, John Robison, Pat Airy, Fritze Fitzpatrick, Donald Bass, Ronald Kent.

Bob Reynolds, Carol Sue Buffington, Jerry Parkin, Joseph Hilton, Jr., Kermit Wright, Marilyn Black, Carol Lynn Page, Marilyn

Boren, Douglan McCombie, F. H. Gillespie, Alan W. Jensen, Richard Lasson, Nancy Hyatt, Sonja Holland, J. George Hill, Corlie Ann King, Susan Schmutz, Carolyn Weaver, Cheryl Chatterley.

Marie C. Lafond, G. Duane Nichols, Marjorie Nichols, Ivan Lucas, Patricia Hill, Ruth Ann, Terrill Price, David Christensen, Katherine Bannion, Mary Jane Johnston, Jeanne Huff, Richard David Bush, Vern Wolfley, John Warnich, Stephen Jay Hammer, Allen White, Grant Starley, Kenneth Oswald.

Richard Wilson, Roger Mechan, Margaret Black, Douglas Hamilton, Charles Hassard, Dave H. Johnson, J. Roy Brown, J. Rihard Sharp, Alyn Rockwood, Kent Boley, Janet Mielson, John Yales, Krista Hayes, Anita S. Call, Paul W. Roberts, Shirley Ann Smurthwaite, R. F. Michael Eujulcl, Teddy Smith, Julie Ann Alder, Linda Shaw.

Kenneth, Marilynne Jorgensen, Marie Atwood, Rite Edmonds, Darleen Sabin, Eve Haslan, Melvin Park, Paul Adams, Kelly McBride, Dennis Schade, Calvin Cutler, Timothy Fewkes, Marshall Romney, Jerry W. Sonkens, Chris Clautier, Robert Cheney, Francis Lewis Pratt, Edward L. Ford, Marilyn Capell, James Christensen.

Arbin Jolly, Tom Whitaker, David Zundel, Karl Wood, Donald R. Poole, Gary Guthrie, Elva Davis, Dee Peterson, Phil Painter, Ron Crompton, Bruce Richardson, John Alstrom, Pat Eldridge, John Madarsie, Dale Linton, Barry Jordan, Lawrence Klenk, Colin Vesterfelt.

Gail Gullekson, Thomas Ellsworth, Shirley Robertson, D. Frank Norton, Walter Lohnar, Patricia Halgren, Alma Wendillwebb, Duane Carlson, Susan Ogden, Carolyn Mortensen, R. L. Hammond, Phillip Bruelk, Jim Hinton, John Emmett, Morman Bodily, David Ward, Bruce Bammes, Carl Pletsch, Bryan Jones, Howard Turpin, Grant Holland.

Shula Spruell, Judi Kodel, Reulan Floyd Asher, Leslie Toggard, Mary Reynolds, Donald McDalton, Bruce Louthan, W. Richard Sandus, Bill Atwood, Douglas P. Sibley, Carylye Perkes, Bruce Matis, Victor L. Ludlow, Virginia Ann Ludlow, George S. Price, Bryce G. Christensen, Robert T. Raines, Marvin C. Hall, Richard W. Kimball.

Loren T. Honeycutt, Jr., Julie Barnes, Lare Eastand, Bill Morgan, Joseph W. Clark, G. Bruce Rogers, Larry D. Jensen, Mark Walkenhorst, William L. Fillmore, Keith B. Stoddard, Quentin E. Crockett, Jr., Martin B. Empey, Dale Andersen, David Sandberg, Marie Sandberg, Marilyn McVey, Evan L. Anderson, Jr., John Cameron.

Kenton Willis, Marvin A. Wiggins, Randall R. Scott, David B. Paraman, Jim Avery, Gar E. Jensen, David B. Stephens, Robert Estill Wood, Stephen W. Morgan, Gary Bett Richins, David Sheen, Eric Fossum, Briant Coombs, Judy Haynes, John J. Hess, Karen Mills, Alan Westover, Phoebe Wilkins, Don Lee.

Rod Harris, Marion K. Mortensen, Nancy Severns, Arlan Rasmussen, Linda Kingsford, Marsh Tanner, Larry G. Sass, Joseph P. Leonard, Gilbert Laron Hancock, Vonda Grace Merrill, Rodney M. Jex, Jane Massey, Gary Montgomery, Jade J. Leblanc, Gerald Meir, Charles Kinsey, Louise Gail Kovt, Russ Parker, Gerald W. Names, Terry J. Nielsen.

Joseph L. Reimann, Ed Richardson, Carvell Thatcher, Sally Ann Nebeker, Rosemary M. Irwin, Gordon T. Weir, Jr., Lester L. Slade, Randolph V. Bates, Richard B. Hopper, Paul K. Sharp, Wayne H. Brown, Paul A. Scherbel, David L. Henion, Dale B. Pearce, Arthur Pheysey, Larry Litster, Keith Sumsion, Layne Hinckley.

Helen Clair Stout, Stephen B. Gillespie, Barry R. Sanders, Forrest C. Smith, Walter B. Sudweeks, Lawrence A. Schreiner, M. K. Ruplinger, Tamara Call, Duane B. Call, Robert George, Garry Lee Cook, Diana Edens, Merlin J. Allred, Garry Kay McGregor, David G. Williams, Susie Hammond, Marguerite M. Fatiwitz, Dale G. Bailey.

Wayne Ront, Kent Garrett, Dennis Chandler, Ronald Kay, Elan C. Ray, Jr., Clive Jones, James L. Eggett, Gordon Stewart, G. Mark Davey, John H. Wittorf, Stanley H. Roberts, Jr., Ray J. Greer, Steven Carter, R. Alan Aiken, Earl W. Bascom, Ernest T. Bramwell, Dale Peterson, Richard M. Smith.

William J. Despain, Richard V. Watts, Robert Jones, David Wright, M. Garvin Wells, Dan Ray Taylor, Chati Malepeau, Karl Ahlstrom, Vern Young, Carnes Burson, H. James Locke, Carol Twelves, Veda Petersen, Barbara Walker, Alan Cassell, Elizabeth Huntington, Terry Tullis, Lyle R. West, Nora M. West.

David Hullinger, Russell R. Elen, Alan Murphy, Charles E. Powell, Sondra R. Grow, Roy H. Marloy, Lewis Wilson, James R. Edwards, Mike Larochelle, Donald L. Wright, Con Nohtheniss, Vaughn E. Nordes, Wayne Black, Karen Dawn Ford, Darlene Viola Thather Olsen, Merrill Gee, Marvin Rytting, James Green, Stephen Thomas.

Lorin A. Harris, James C. Eckhart, CPA, Robert Fuhriman, Stephen Terry, Sheila Hutchison, Diane Day, Chris Wright, Clair Price, Bud J. Winber, Steven C. Arthor, James Mangum, Jr., Elizabeth Allen, Elaine Gurr, Marley H. Davis, L. Carlyle Bowers, Pamela J. Shuey, Stephen B. Oldroyd, Legrande Avery, Jennifer K. Mendenhall, David L. Corbett.

Jack Baxter, B. Blake Bird, Greg Kelsey, Evan H. Curtis, Joseph D. Millward, Thomas B. Brighton III, James R. Wyler, Iva Galway, Robert H. Lewis, Richard Boyce, Larry E. Wood, Boyd L. Cardon, Owen Carter, William R. Prece III.

James R. Fox, Monte L. Roe, D. Clark Richardson, Shannon Jacobsen, Sharon Noble, Dennis W. Hoover, Walt C. Muller, Steven Ranzinbinger, Melva Lee Allred, Daniel A. Johnson, Kenneth A. Nielson, Karen Stevens, Duane J. Williams, Vicki L. Stein, Frosty Hansen, Angelo Demarco, Van W. McCarlie, David Rimington, Dale H. Larkin, R. Lynn Pugmire, Dan Aldridge, Jr., Reed Gibby, Barbara Gibby.

Robert Hill, Elaine Hill, Michael Georgeson, J. Richard Vance, Tim Hill, Fred Benson, Lee Beardall, Ann Marie Hales, Edith C. Knoblock, Paul D. Redd, Sonia Byrton, Gary Steed, Allen Yolno, Don Mayton Fackrell, John McKenzie, Jack A. Spigarelli, F. C. Ferguson, Todd Weaver.

Dave G. Smith, Cloy Jenkins, Howard Sorensen, Sharon S. Brown, Jill Bowen, Nita Jean Thurlin, Lynda Cox, Sharon Rowsell, Lynda Lawson, Bruce Ricks, Robert H. Benden, Duane Pratt, Bert Schilling, Lajuana Worthen, Wes White, Duane Stoydill, Lucille Fullmer, James K. Petersen, Sandee Mathewson, Diane McMullin.

Karen Molen, Elaine Goodman, Lester R. Burrell, Janet Packe, Donna Pack, Roeann E. Wilkins, Robert L. Hallewell, Linda Diane Lawonen, Steven A. Reich, Karl Lehndorfer, Elizabeth Enke, Brooks Sarand, Gordon Shipley, Dan Sallander, Jeanie Coy, Jeanie Zutter.

Harold Monson, Diane Ostler, Ray Luce, Clair Mitchell, Harvey West, Steven Gregory, Tom M. Gardner, William Hartley, Mary Austin, Clinton G. Harrison, Jerry Lund Hintze, Val W. Kendell, Evan D. Harrison, James H. Parker, Max Webb, Jr., Charlene Beam, Robert Kent Blazer, Max L. Mangelson, Valerie Barbato, Chery Morrison, Wendy Woolley, Carl Waymon, Lavar Rockwood.

William E. Southworth, John and Joan Kammerman, Richard A. McKinney, Judy MacDonald, Pauline Corbridge, David Thompson, Shirley Johnson, Peggy Lisonbee, Sue Roach, Carma Horne, Holly Neville, Renee Dirkmatt, Jania Lewen, Joyce M. Moore, Elaine Jones, Christend Hunt, Paul Hoskisson, Janis Stout.

Jenel Anhder, Barbara Gene Litster, Kay Whitney, Lee Ann Reeve, Valerie Harten, Suzanne Valentine, Robert S. McDuarrie, Susanne Boyce, Trudy Teichert, Vicki Brown, Lynn Garie Teeter, Ranae Stokes, Kent A. Dee, Gary Laweher, Charles H. Stanton, Robert Erich Paul, Darriel R. Shurtleff, Rex T. Davis, Doug Wheeler, David J. Schwendiamn.

Harold C. Brown, Judith Grimes, Donovan Dow Davisson, Doyle P. Buchanan, Gerald G. Blackburn, Dwayne C. Watson, Gene Walser, Jack Waller, Mila Paskett, David K. Woolf, Merlin F. Goode, Robert B. Gledhill, Max Spatig, Sharon A. Miller, Andrea Watkins, John Bennett, D. Allan Firmage.

Kenneth L. Kenitzler, S. Harold Smith, V. Dianne Smith, John D. Chase, Toni Rae Merrill, Dave Kelsey, Dean Hansen, Lynn Blamires, Ralph L. Daniels, Elbert E. Dittman, Stanley J. Andrews, David L. Wheeler, Richard Bockholt, M. Don Sabin, Gaylan V. Stewart, Amike Merzell, Craig N. Wright, John H. Adams, Bart E. Harrison, Joe Murdock.

Brent Koyle, Russell M. Wheeler, Jr., Wilbur Glen Jubeck, Kenneth Jensen, Owen A. Dixon, W. R. Heaton, Jr., Gary R. Thurber, Bruce Boswell, Jack Weyland, Merrill P. Finlayson, Ronald B. Funk, Robert R. Bert, Donald R. Darnell, Paulene McBride, Thomas W. Griffiths, Blaine B. Campbell, Jr., David F. Shoell, Alan Pace.

Mary Kay Marley, Judith L. Call, Carol Lee Brockers, Marsha Jacobs, Janice Briggs, Rosemary L. Belcan, Marsha Vandenburg, Linda Marie Ingram, Teddy Mann, Marsha Thorne, Mr. Michael P. Louhas III, Ileen Ferkovich, Nancy Stanger, Bertrand Logan Ball, Jr., Steve Boyd, George J. Crane, Kay Winegar, Tom Whitley.

Lilly Nohara, Dennis F. Sharp, John R. Calvin, Gayle Evans, John Wahlstrom, Andrea Bowers, Mitchell Stevens, John L. Blake, Elmer H. Davis, Jr., Fred L. Beck, Leon Stewart, Terry W. Jessop, Lela Jean Mourtsen, Margaret Lafontaine, Stephen G. Stews, Laraine Lee.

Susan Polley, Jim Little, Jessie Jones, Richard H. Jackson, Susan M. Albrechtsen, Douglas A. Wixom, Paul E. Barker (young Democrat), H. Trace Hall, Richard J. Doty, Charles H. Cumminsen, Barbara M. Pack, Stanley Roobins, Mary Jane Robbins, Royden L. Wittwer, William C. Harvey, Floyd I. Lewis, Ralph Muhlestein, Elwood L. Loveridge, Edward A. Parent, David A. Taylor.

Charles C. Langley, Jr., Lynn J. McKell, Lisle Updike II, Bruce Lloyd, E. Howard Hardy, Lee Shurlock, John R. Larsen, Duane A. Alleman, Judy Butler, Craig M. Allen, Donald G. Bearnson, Kent Ferguson, Kenneth L. Babcock, David Higginson, Gary M. Price, Jayanna Carlton, Lyle Waters, Mark A. Skousen.

E. M. Harvey Neubert, Arlene R. Taylor, Brian Dees, Des Yarrington, Jim Hunter, Susan Lewis, Gerald Greenwood, Ernest S. Romney, Bonnie Keith, Ralph W. Keith, Linda Shousen, Richard Maheny, Rebecca Moss, John F. Hall, Pam Robison, Rebecca Smith, John D. Stemmons, William W. Matthews, Grant Nielsen, Susan Nelson, Janice Work.

Lyn Bright, Charles L. Fairfield, Jeanne Thomas, Kenneth B. Backer, David L. Olsen, Lane A. Myers, Joseph C. Paul, Lamont W. Law, Wally Hennifson, Roger H. Goodwill, Don Alsop, Mary K. Davis, Gaylen Lane, Shoron Skousen, Linda May, Lyle F. Hinney, Clay Michael Conway, Dah George Wilder, Elisabeth H. Vassel.

Darian B. Andersen, Jess L. Green, Jay R. Michaelson, Linda Elaine Grover, Ray Thompson, Michael Bendio, Stephen Skarda, Herald O. Mackay, Robert B. Michel, Karen Chesley, Wilford Day, Harry J. Lyons, Keill S. Gundersen, Voy Menjory, Anthonh J. Legerski, Duane Olsen, Barbara Kay Rytting, Rosetta Smith, James A. Vance, Hal J. Allen.

Alana White, Brent Cordon, Lauren L. Locey, William T. Coysen, Dawn Ricci, David B. Ashworth, K. Douglas Chamberlain, Albert H. Brown, Calvin Carrelland, Dr. Richard W. Hanks, assistant professor, David R. Holdaway, Lin D. Miller, Dennis T. Beham, Marlene Berry, Alen H. Hansen, Gayle M. Lain.

Mariane Ralliff, Susan McGuire, H. Gary Niederhausen, Karl Weight, Richard Beard, Tommy W. Case, Don M. Wathall, Douglas Turley, Leroy E. Sievers, Ed Taylor, Paul Loveday, Linda Watson, Bernard S. Salken, Jr., Robert M. Baxter, Marvin L. Cozier, Mark F. Lau, Janet M. Johnson, Mary Jackson, James Murdock Reynolds, Jean Carol Boberg, Frank Davis, Jr.

Leann C. Rushton, Ken J. Christensen, Kent H. Price, Leland B. Nelson, Dan Blakesee, Susie Greathouse, Richard J. Farnsworth, R. Buckley Jensen, Mark F. Breinholt, Bill Paul, Lynn P. Ballard, Carla Baier, Richard J. Wilson, Patsy Crockett, Lanny R. Gneiting, Kathy Campbell, Robert M. Hogge, Royce Francis.

Brent W. Palmer, Karla Jensen, Steven Keith Ricks, Roger Lehr, Valerie Spray, Sue Adkins, Kathy Schlendorf, Sterlin Tanner, Martha Ward, David K. Harmon, Dawne L. Powell, Colen H. Wheatly, Kenneth F. McAllister, E. Rex Talbot, Jill R. Freidman, William R. McCracken, Douglas Alan Richardson, Ellen Furness.

David Christensen, Brent R. Hutchings, Michael Skousen, Harry Nez, F. Douglas Mather, Merrill Webb, Marcus White, David J. Blake, Owen D. Wright, Craig Sampson, Robert Mouritsen, Scott Lunceford, D. L. Court, Gary Leemaster, Clark B. Hinckley, Linda Clark, Angela Hecker.

Charles T. Mitchell, Dave Hansen, Becky Hatch, Lynda Mackey, McGregor Williamson, Dennis Smith, Winona Witt, George Tenney, Jerry Grossnickle, Roslyn Lillywhite, Theron Kay Haws, Snady Long, Judi Wolff, Anne W. Bews, Dick Dahl, Jerry Preator, Dixie Whicker, Scott Lynn Malan, Mrs. Don Fowler, Lary Reed Larson.

William T. Cluld, Jynn J. Cook, Sylvia Schaelling, Ruth Walker, Sam Marriotti, Farrell A. Lee, Jr., Lynn Fowler, Michal L. Aley, Francis Nielson, Jeanne H. Nielson, Myrle Fowler, Dorothy Nielson, Kay P. Johnson, Fernando R. Gomez, Janis Gay Kerkes, Francine Sherwood.

Guginia Merritt, Sue Hunt, Lynn Stott, Theron H. Luke, Zelda Luke, Stacy Luke, Melvin D. Cheney, Mjane S. Martin, Alta A. Johnsen, Carol A. Senke, Rulon O. Gibson, Barbara Tanner.

Interestingly enough, the list contains the name of David King, which is the name of our Democratic Representative in the other body. I am not sure this is not he, but the similarity of names is striking.

The list also contains the name of Winston Sam Fong, a name borne by one of our colleagues in the Senate.

This, to me, was a significant manifestation of the concern that these young people have for their future. I believe that it bears out what the distinguished minority leader, the junior Senator from Illinois, said earlier, that 77 percent of the students in the United States at the college level are opposed to the repeal of section 14(b).

GOOD UNIONS DON'T NEED REPEAL OF 14(b)—BAD UNIONS DON'T DESERVE IT

Mr. President, I have abounding faith in the wisdom and good judgment of the American people. They have always demonstrated the highest level of political comprehension, an awareness of important public issues, and a keen understanding of the political processes inherent in our democratic system.

This faith of mine has been reinforced once again during the interim period between the close of the last session of Congress and the beginning of the current session. Like the other Members of this body, during that period I returned to my home State and had the opportunity to discuss with the people who sent me here to the U.S. Senate, the important public issue of the day. I talked to many people throughout the various sections of the State of Utah and I was struck by the exceptionally keen interest which they displayed in the subject of repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. Everywhere I went, people in various walks of life and at various economic levels brought up the subject and expressed their views on this issue.

I cannot forget, Mr. President, that I am here to represent the people of the State of Utah, and within the limits of my powers, I am but an extension of the voice of the people of my State. I am their delegate, sent here to represent their views and feelings and their convictions. On the issue of repeal of section 14(b), I have found that the overwhelming majority of the people of Utah are opposed to repeal. They are opposed to repeal primarily because they believe that compulsory unionism is fundamentally wrong and that it is contrary to American concepts of individual liberty. They believe that labor union officials should not be given the power to control the very means of livelihood of any individual, or that any man should be compelled to join any private organization as a necessary condition to being able to work and to earn a living for himself and his family.

FREEDOM IS THE REAL ISSUE

The people of Utah are steeped in the idea of individual freedom. It has been their tradition and their way of life and they have grown to political maturity by exercising their individual freedom wisely. They are not, of course, unique in this respect, because the same can undoubtedly be said of Americans in every State of the Union. As the immortal Abraham Lincoln so aptly stated, this Nation is a nation "conceived in liberty"—liberty is the birthright and heritage of our people, and we in this generation have the duty to preserve this liberty and to resist every encroachment upon it by the Government, by labor unions, or by any other group or organization.

We are so committed to the concept of freedom that we are willing to bear the heavy burden of free world leadership and to expend our resources and our young men in an effort to preserve human freedom in other parts of the world. For this reason it is particularly ironic that while the young men of this Nation are fighting to preserve freedom 12,000 miles away in Vietnam, the Congress of the United States is being asked here at home to strike down with one blow the laws of 19 States which have as their only purpose the preservation of individual freedom—the freedom to work for a living without being compelled to join a labor union or pay tribute to a labor union for the right to hold a job or, conversely, the right to join a union and pay dues if one wishes.

In 1955 the people of the State of Utah adopted a law which prohibits compulsory unionism. They want to preserve this law because they believe in the principle of freedom that it represents.

Earlier I read a telegram from the president of a typographical union in my State, who ticked off the men who were elected in Utah in 1964. It is significant that we have gone through a legislative session since then, and no member of the Democratic Party raises his voice or proposed to the legislature that Utah's right-to-work law be repealed. It is ironic that they would come to the Congress and ask us to repeal it. The people of Utah are not willing to trade this freedom for the specious "free rider" argument, or the glib and superficial reason that it is necessary to have "uniformity" in the application of labor laws throughout every State. If there is any reason why we must have uniformity on this question, the people say, why should not the uniformity be in the direction of protecting individual freedom rather than destroying it? If we must have uniformity let us have a uniform rule which would prohibit compulsion and protect the free choice of our people.

PUBLIC IS AWARE OF REAL ISSUE

When the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of Labor talk about repealing section 14(b) in the interest of "uniformity" they are not giving the true reason, and the public is not being deceived.

As Lincoln said:

> The people are always much nearer the truth than the politicians suppose.

The political comprehension of the American public is not so obscure that they cannot see the real reason why this administration insists upon repealing section 14(b). That reason, they know, is simply the payment of a political debt to satisfy the selfish demands of the labor leaders, and to enhance the political effectiveness of these labor leaders. The people of Utah, as well as other American citizens, can rightly ask whether those who support this effort to repeal 14(b) have betrayed their trust of those labor leaders. And I interpose here to observe that all of the telegrams I have received calling for the repeal of 14(b) have come from the officials of labor unions—none from the people themselves.

The people know that repeal of section 14(b) is not in their best interest, they know it is not in the best interest of the rank-and-file workingman whose freedom of choice will be denied, and they know that repeal will not be of benefit to any segment of the public other than that very small minority of union officials who would reap harvest of compulsory dues payments from additional millions of American working men and women.

The wide cross section of people with whom I have discussed this issue are deeply offended by this whole idea. They believe that no private group, no matter if their intentions are of the purest, should have the authority or power to deny freedom of choice to the individual workingman or compel him to pay money for his fundamental right to work.

Let there be no mistake about it, the right to work is a fundamental right, and compulsory unionism is an infringement upon that right. Contrary to the union propagandists, the right-to-work laws are not misnamed. Nor does the title "right to work" misrepresent the true purpose of these laws. Their true and only purpose is to protect the individual worker's freedom of choice in deciding whether to join a union or refrain from joining a union, and thereby protect his right to work from either an employer or a union that would seek to deprive him of that right or impose some condition upon it. Union propagandists, however, fail to admit that right-to-work laws also guarantee a man the right to join a union.

CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE

The right to work concept was very well expressed a few years ago in an opinion written by Mr. Justice Terrell of the Florida Supreme Court in the case of Carpenters District Council against Miami Chapter, Associated General Contractors. In this 1952 decision Justice Terrell stated:

> The right to work is equivalent to the right to eat and the right to eat and provide raiment for his dependents is man's most dominant urge. In a free country like ours such a right should not depend on one's race, color, the lodge, craft, church, or other organizations to which he belongs. Such a requirement is contrary to the spirit of our institutions, the basis on which our democracy was founded and every impulse of the forefathers who gave it existence. I can think of nothing more out of harmony with true Americanism. Membership in one's lodge, craft or church may be a means of enlarging spiritual, cultural, and physical assets, but to make his breed depend on craft, or church membership, would be the worst species of anti-Americanism.

In this brief statement Justice Terrell expresses, I believe, the feeling of the vast majority of Americans. Most Americans feel that compulsory unionism is an infringement and violation of the constitutional rights guaranteed to the citizens of this Nation by the Bill of Rights.

They feel that compulsory unionism in operation cuts across virtually all of the basic rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

They feel that by taking money from a man without his consent, compulsory unionism contravenes the principle expressed in the due process clause in the 5th and 14th amendments of the Constitution.

Compulsory unionism by taking money from an individual to be used for the furtherance of political and ideological causes violates the freedom of speech guaranteed by the first amendment of the Constitution.

Compulsory unionism by denying a man the right to make his own choice in joining or declining to join a particular group violates his freedom of association as guaranteed by the first amendment.

Compulsory unionism by forcing membership in or support of a particular group violates the privacy of the individual as guaranteed in the ninth amendment of the Constitution.

Compulsory unionism by denying individual freedom of choice attacks the very foundation of the structure of individual liberty upon which this country was built.

HISTORY BACKS VOLUNTARY UNIONISM

It is well to remind this body that every elected official in this Government has taken an oath to uphold and sustain the Constitution of the United States. It is my firm belief that if I were to vote to repeal section 14(b) I would not only be acting contrary to the will of the people, but I would have failed in my obligation to uphold and support the Constitution and the principles upon which it is based. There is no doubt in my mind that the framers of the Constitution would unequivocably hold compulsory unionism contrary to the ideas expressed in the document they so carefully drafted. Evidence of this can be found in many of the statements and writings of the Founding Fathers. They would have rejected the free-rider argument for compulsory unionism as they rejected the free-rider argument for other types of restrictions on individual liberty.

A good example of this was provided in the year 1784 by a bill introduced in the Virginia Assembly calling for a tax, the proceeds of which would be used for the maintenance of religion—in other words, for the establishment of one particular church. The proposal would have required all Virginians—both church members and nonmembers—to pay the tax, and supporters of the bill argued that because everyone benefited from the influence of religion, everyone should contribute to its support.

A principal opponent of that bill was James Madison, who was later to become the fourth President of the United States. He argued:

> The same authority which can force a citizen to contribute for the support of any one establishment may force him to conform to any other establishment.

James Madison and Thomas Jefferson then introduced a bill for religious freedom which in its preamble declared that "to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical." This bill was appropriately adopted by the Virginia Legislature as the forerunner of the first amendment of the Bill of Rights.

The belief that compulsory unionism violates constitutional rights has been forcefully expressed by present-day authorities. For example, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas in his concurring opinion in Machinists Union against Street, a 1961 decision, said:

> Once an association with others is compelled by the facts of life, special safeguards are necessary lest the spirit of the first, fourth, and fifth amendments be lost and we all succumb to regimentation. I expressed this concern in *Public Utilities Co.* v. *Pollak,* 343 U.S. 451, 467, 96 L. Ed. 1068, 1080 72 S. Ct. 813 (dissenting opinion), where a "captive audience" was forced to listen to special radio broadcasts. If an association is compelled, the individual should not be forced to surrender any matters of conscience, belief, or expression. He should be allowed to enter the group with his own flag flying, whether it be religious, political, or philosophical; nothing that the group does should deprive him of the privilege of preserving and expressing his agreement, disagreement, or dissent, whether it coincides with the view of the group, or conflicts with it in minor or major ways; and he should not be required to finance the promotion of causes with which he disagrees.
>
> In a debate on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, later adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 10, 1948, Mr. Malik of Lebanon stated what I think is the controlling principle in cases of the character now before us:
>
> "The social group to which the individual belongs, may, like the human person himself, be wrong or right: the person alone is the judge."
>
> This means that membership in a group cannot be conditioned on the individual's acceptance of the group's philosophy. Otherwise, first amendment rights are required to be exchanged for the group's attitude, philosophy, or politics. I do not see how that is permissible under the Constitution. Since neither Congress nor the State legislatures can abridge those rights, they cannot grant the power to private groups to abridge them. As I read the first amendment, it forbids any abridgment by Government whether directly or indirectly.
>
> The collection of dues for paying the costs of collective bargaining of which each member is a beneficiary is one thing. If, however, dues are used or assessments are made, to promote or oppose birth control, to repeal or increase the taxes on cosmetics, to promote or oppose the admission of Red China into the United Nations, and the like, then the group compels an individual to support with his money causes beyond what gave rise to the need for group action.

Writing in the same case, Justice Hugo Black stated in his dissenting opinion:

> There is, of course, no constitutional reason why a union or other private group may not spend its funds for political or ideological causes if its members voluntarily join it and can voluntarily get out of it. Labor unions made up of voluntary members free to get in or out of the unions when they please have played important and useful roles in politics and economic affairs. How to spend its money is a question for each voluntary group to decide for itself in the absence of some valid law forbidding activities for which the money is spent. But a different situation arises when a Federal law steps in and authorizes such a group to carry on activities at the expense of persons who do not choose to be members of the group as well as those who do. Such a law, even though validly passed by Congress, cannot be used in a way that abridges the specifically defined freedoms on the first amendment. And whether there is such abridgment depends not only on how the law is written but also on how it works.
>
> There can be no doubt that the federally sanctioned union shop contract here, as it actually works, takes a part of the earnings of some men and turns it over to others, who spend a substantial part of the funds so received in efforts to thwart the political, economic and ideological hopes of those whose money has been forced from them under authority of law. This injects Federal compulsion into the political and ideological processes, a result which I have supposed everyone would agree the first amendment was particularly intended to prevent. And it makes no difference if, as is urged, political and legislative activities are helpful adjuncts of collective bargaining. Doubtless employers could make the same arguments in favor of compulsory contributions to an association of employers for use in political and economic programs calculated to help collective bargaining on their side. But the argument is equally unappealing whoever makes it. The stark fact is that this act of Congress is being used as a means to exact money from these employees to help get

> votes to win elections for parties and candidates and to support doctrines they are against. If this is constitutional the first amendment is not the charter of political and religious liberty its sponsors believed it to be.

The court ducked the constitutional questions on the *Machinists Union* v. *Street* case on a much narrower base. Justice Douglas thought they should have faced their question, and I hope some day that they will.

JUSTIFICATION FOR EXTENDED DEBATE

We have heard much lately, Mr. President, about "government by consensus," and we are constantly told that the program of the present administration is a program which represents the consensus of the various groups within our society. I think we can be sure of one thing, however, and that is that the proposal to repeal section 14(b) is not part of any consensus, other than the consensus of the labor union professionals. Every public opinion poll shows that the vast majority of the American people are opposed to repeal, and I feel that we have a duty here in the Senate of the United States to carry out the will of the people on this most important issue which is before us for the second time in as many years.

And, as last year, the debate will be on the motion to bring up H.R. 77.

This debate has been organized by the distinguished minority leader and a number of Senators from both parties because the American people have demanded it. The press by an overwhelming majority has cheered it. Our people and our press both know that this is a cause in defense of human freedom. Yet, it is ironical that the debate on this issue once again will take many hours of time, which the Senate undoubtedly could spend in examining other issues of major importance. This debate will require stamina and much hard work to get the message across. My colleagues and I will not shirk from that responsibility.

The Nation is entitled to know why this debate is being continued during the second session of the 89th Congress. Apparently, it is because the Johnson administration and its allies have once again promised those favoring compulsory unionism that they will attempt to repeal the right-to-work law. All this despite the fact that having failed dramatically last year—they should know that they are bound to fail again this year.

They have ignored the fact that last year when the backers of repeal attempted to shut off debate, they not only failed to gain the required two-thirds majority, they also failed even to gain a simple majority.

They have ignored the polls, the editorials, the letters, the ground swell of public opinion.

They have also ignored the fact that most Senators would like to leave this issue of compulsory unionism on the table as unwise legislation and move on to greater and more pressing matters now facing our people; matters such as inflation, taxes, and especially that brutal war in Vietnam.

They have ignored the fact that repeal would represent another serious invasion of the Federal Government into the rights of the States under the Constitution. My friend, colleague, and leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], discussed this issue at great length earlier today.

And so, here we are again going through the motions of explaining to the American people an issue on which the majority have clearly already made up their minds—but on which someone else is failing to get the message. None are so blind as they who will not see. Evidence that the American people understand has come from many quarters; rich and poor, members of unions and nonmembers, doctors and philosophers, lawyers and laymen, businessmen, and workers.

One of the most thoughtful presentations of what the American people clearly understand has come to me from Mr. O. C. Tanner, a prominent Salt Laker, who has an unusually broad basis of experience and variety of vantage-point. He is at once a professor of philosophy at the University of Utah, a member of the Utah Bar and founder and president of the O. C. Tanner Jewelry Co., which is the largest company in the United States manufacturing industrial service emblems.

In a personalized opening of his statement—which I will not quote in its entirety—Mr. Tanner wrote:

> I do not feel any real business interest in 14(b). My company employs many people, all of whom freely and independently decide for themselves the basis of our labor-management relations.

Continuing, Mr. Tanner wrote:

> Like all great issues, 14(b) has two sides, strongly defended, deeply felt, and far-reaching in consequences.
>
> Hopefully and modestly, the following may pinpoint, and also explain (1) why 14(b) is so controversial; (2) why the main issue of 14(b) is important to (a) the success of the American labor movement, (b) the success of American democracy.
>
> 14(b) raises many issues. Some of them are: (1) The right to work, (2) the free-rider problem, (3) majority rule of union democracy, (4) Federal versus States' rights, (5) economics of right-to-work laws, and (6) political obligations, either way.
>
> 14(b) is the age-old problem of individualism versus collectivism.
>
> Some favor, in the repeal of 14(b), what they believe is the larger social gain of a stronger labor movement. Some favor, in retaining 14(b), what they believe is the greater importance of individual freedom.
>
> Questions the Congress, and all of us ask of 14(b), are these:
>
> Which side is right—or more right than wrong?
>
> Which side is best for American labor?
>
> Which side is best for our democracy?
>
> Whatever the answer, 14(b) should be carefully examined for one great purpose—its meaning in the daily lives of the people involved.
>
> Such an approach, if carefully done, may aid in clarity, and possibly also, in understanding.
>
> To begin with, the first part of the meaning of 14(b), for the worker involved, may be explained by the concept of "institution joining."
>
> This concept of institution joining, if clarified may get at the controversy, and also explain the main problem of 14(b).
>
> All institutions, and all institution-joining, for simplicity, may be roughly divided into two kinds:
>
> First, there are those institutions which do not deeply affect the individual lives of their members—institutions necessary for some service, that are dues-collecting and which impose certain obligations, but institutions which do not penetrate deeply into an individual's life—his ideas, emotions, and personal convictions.

To interpolate, I would think that servicemen's clubs or luncheon clubs, to which so many businessmen belong, would fall into the category of institutions of this type.

> Then there are other institutions, whose requirements are intended to deeply involve the inner life of individual members. Such depth-institutions, to be successful, must profoundly affect a member's way of life—approving certain ideas while condemning other ideas, praising some attitudes and condemning others, calling at times for great personal sacrifices.

If I may interpolate again—and calling for a high degree of conformance.

> A labor union, if considered carefully, is the second of these two kinds of institutions. It is necessarily a depth institution, deeply and rightly affecting each conscientious member's ideas, emotions, convictions, freedoms, and responsibilities.
>
> Perhaps next to religion, good unionism involves the individual with more total commitment than any other institution.
>
> Joining a union, however lightly done by many, is eventually no surface affair of paying dues in return for benefits received.
>
> Unionism, both in the joining and belonging, becomes an attempt to solve many of life's great personal and social problems: The struggle for bread, the fight for justice, the rivalries for leadership, the arguments of policy, the uses of power, the payments of dues, and the sacrifices of strikes.
>
> Responsible union joining is no light decision, with easy obligations, and indifferent consequences. Perhaps no institution joining will more profoundly affect a person's ideas, emotions, and way of life.
>
> This fact involves 14(b) in the ultimate issue of real freedom—the freedom of the inner life—of the mind and spirit of man. This fact involves the Congress with the problem of a great freedom in American life.
>
> Some freedoms are not so important, such as choices of economic opportunities and surface decisions of everyday living.
>
> Other freedoms are about a person's ideas, private judgments, individual preferences, personal convictions—

And, I may interpolate, personal loyalties—

> here is the greatest freedom, or the greatest coercion.
>
> A labor union, and therefore 14(b), is involved with both these freedoms—economic freedoms, but also the inner freedoms that are intellectual or moral or spiritual.
>
> The free-rider argument is the simple justice that he who receives a benefit from the efforts and expense of his fellow workers, should help to pay for it. When this fact is established, he should pay his share—in money or effort—but not in lost personal freedoms of the mind, that or a lost job. Money justice is an easy problem for legislation. The vastly greater problem in 14(b), is the preservation of personal dignity.
>
> So when the Congress decides 14(b), it will be involved with the meaning of depth institution-joining for an individual worker—the meaning this has for the inner life of personal freedom.
>
> The above analysis, the meaning of 14(b) in the daily lives of working people, this is

only partly explained by the concept of institution-joining.

The other part of the meaning of the issue of 14(b) in the daily lives of millions of Americans, is the kind of coercion involved. All agree that 14(b) is mainly a concern about coercion. But what kind of coercion? How much coercion? What is the nature of this coercion? How powerful?

To be sure, all agree that the cause of unionism is one that requires a strong collective unity. To achieve this, great individual pressures are necessary.

The question of 14(b) is this: How far, how much, how deep, may a majority of union members go, in order to achieve the solidarity required for success?

What pressure applied against a minority is legitimate?

What pressure applied against a minority is excessive?

14(b) becomes the grave issue of whether the power of jobholding, and the power of job losing—such a power used by a majority in coercing a minority—whether this is excessive.

The argument used so widely by those who would repeal 14(b), is that a "majority rule" is sound democracy. Is it? What is the majority trying to do? How much rule, how much coercion—in what realms, and by what degree of coercion?

Whether a majority should rule, depends upon what the "ruling" is about, and how the "ruling" is used.

Perhaps next to force, the threat of losing, or the promise of keeping a job, is the ultimate coercion.

Life's great struggle is for bread. Life's great fear is poverty. Few powers can match the threat of failure, or the promise of success, in breadwinning.

14(b) already permits many unions to bargain for the great power of a job, or no job.

The issue of repeal of 14(b) is whether the Congress, our Federal Government, over the expressed wishes of 19 States—whether the Congress should now make such a powerful coercion universal in American life.

It is one thing for a partisan group to pressure their minority, it is a more serious matter for the Government of a free people to legalize this partisan coercion against a minority, involving perhaps millions of otherwise unwilling Americans.

The conclusion is that 14(b) joins two important elements in the lives of working people: (a) Their inner personal convictions, (b) their success or failure in breadwinning.

These two elements involve two of the most important freedoms in their daily living: (1) Their freedom of mind, of decision; (2) their freedom of economic opportunity, of keeping their jobs.

Repeal of 14(b) would make a national policy; namely, that economic opportunity for millions of Americans will be dependent upon that kind of institution-joining that profoundly affects the inner lives of these same millions of Americans.

Finally, the last important question of 14(b) is whether the American labor movement will be helped or hurt by its repeal.

Wherein lies the success of the American labor movement?

With the health and well-being of the American labor movement in mind, how may the issues raised by 14(b) be most wisely decided?

With apology, I attempt my reply from the background of my dual professional life—a professor of philosophy and president of a large manufacturing company. This background necessarily colors my views, so it is important that it be mentioned.

What follows would be my reasoning, if I were a Congressman attempting to solve 14(b), both for the best interests of our democracy, and also the best interests of the labor movement.

As a student of democrary, I have reached one rather firmly held conclusion, if a free people would remain free from within—they must avoid internal corruptions and internal tyrannies.

Here is my conclusion:

To remain free and healthy, the government of a democracy must firmly insist that all institutions, all special interest groups, including business and labor—all must live and prosper, if they can, by the hard and difficult tests of free, open, and fair competition.

The pinpoint of the wrong, if 14(b) is repealed, is this:

Our Government would, in this case, abandon the healthy competition of persuasion, for an unhealthy coercion, within the labor movement.

In earlier years our labor movement needed special Government protection and encouragement. Today, under the present NLRB, unions are able to grow very successfully, not as fast and as much as they desire, yet very successfully.

A healthy labor movement will therefore be more successful if it faces the following hard and difficult, yet healthy competition of the following three forms:

(1) Winning individual memberships and personal loyalties, by persuasion, rather than by the coercion involved in the repeal of 14(b).

(2) Winning union elections, in competition with companies, whose management tries to outdo the unions in benefits to workers. Our democracy gains by this wholesome competition.

(3) By proving with persuasion, the value of unionism, in right-to-work States.

(The above three forms of competition are understandably not favored by union leaders. Very naturally they will avoid the harder labors of unionism by persuasion in favor of easier success, if 14(b) is repealed. But their choice is not the last word for a Congressman or Senator. The last word is the ultimate freedom and health of our democracy.)

While unionism will be strengthened in numbers, finances, and political influences, if 14(b) is repealed, the big question for Congress is this:

Will unionism, in the long run, be healthier if it grows (a) by persuasion? (b) or by coercion?

Which of these two kinds of unionism is healthier for a democracy—the persuasive or the coercive?

The moral, spiritual, political issue of repealing 14(b) is this:

Since the health of a democracy is the highest possible degree of individual freedom, and since the sickness of a democracy is the unnecessary increase of individual coercion, is there now great urgency for the Congress to greatly increase the total amount of coercion in American life?

Finally, how far, how deep, how powerfully, will the Congress decide to invade the personal life of an individual?

All the freedom there is, is known only by an individual.

It is appropriate to conclude by a reminder, that the Bill of Rights was added to the Constitution, after it was fully realized that a majority could tyrannize over a minority, quite as much as an aristocracy or a single dictator.

This ends the very truthful discussion and consideration of the problem before us by Dr. O. C. Tanner writing from his mixed point of view as philosopher, employer, and lawyer.

I represent the State of Utah, which has had a right-to-work law on its books since 1955.

I shall now go into the editorial attitude of Utah newspapers. There are five daily newspapers in Utah. There has never been a prorepeal editorial in any of those five daily newspapers.

Shortly after last October's attempt to gag the Senate and prevent us from explaining this issue to the American people I came across three very interesting editorials, one in each of three Utah daily newspapers: The Salt Lake Tribune, the Salt Lake Deseret News, and the Ogden Standard Examiner.

Because of the message these editorials convey, I shall read them into the RECORD for the edification and information of the Senate. I have selected first an editorial which appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune of Tuesday, October 12, 1965.

THE 14(b) TEST VOTE JUSTIFIES TABLING ISSUE

The vote against cloture to shut off debate on repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act fell far short of the necessary two-thirds majority.

Supporters of repeal failed even to muster a simply majority. Of 92 Senators, recorded, only 45 voted for cloture, 47 against. This was 17 votes short of a required two-thirds majority of 62 of those Senators voting. It is not known how the absent eight Senators would have voted, but even had they all voted favorably, prorepeal forces would still have fallen 14 votes short of the needed 67 votes.

The antirepeal vote was considerably greater than Senator DIRKSEN, minority leader who is master-minding the fight, had predicted. He indicated he was only certain of perhaps three dozen votes.

Of course some of those 48 anticloture votes undoubtedly were not so much against repeal as against shutting off the time-honored senatorial privilege of unlimited debate.

VOTES FOR ADJOURMENT

And some, accepting the reality of a successful filibuster, were really voting in favor of putting the issue over to next January, winding up congressional business, and going home.

And that last still makes good sense.

After the cloture vote, Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD said: "The debate will continue." But it seems obvious neither he nor the administration has much heart in it.

The President, partially incapacitated after his gall bladder operation, is certainly in no position to twist senatorial arms. Nor indeed in the rebellious mood of many Members of Congress is there much reason to think he could accomplish much by armtwisting were he physically fit.

Senator MANSFIELD has already said the President would not apply pressure on Senators, and that he himself would not call all-night sessions to try to break the filibuster.

These statements, and the strong anti-cloture vote, doom 14(b) repeal at this session. Why, then, waste more time carrying on a useless debate?

HOUSE CLEARING CALENDAR

The House is rapidly clearing up its calendar and may be ready to adjourn by the end of the week. The Senate has considerably more work to do before it can quit—and it ought to get to it without any further procrastination in a useless effort to bring 14(b) to a vote.

We would hope that, despite Mr. MANSFIELD's announcement that debate will continue, he and other prorepeal Senators will now decide to put the matter over to the opening of the 2d session of the 89th Congress in January. Senator MANSFIELD previously had said: "It all depends on the size of the vote." He also admitted: "We have no rabbits to pull out of the hat."

Well, the vote shows clearly there were no rabbits, and the majority against cloture is surely strong enough to justify temporary retreat. Prorepeal forces would lose nothing by such a maneuver. While we still hope 14(b) can be retained in the law, advocates of repeal can renew the fight without prejudice next year, and with no basis for a charge of bad faith from their organized labor supporters.

Mr. President, I turn now to an editorial entitled "14(b) Stays on the Books," published in the Deseret News of Salt Lake City on October 12, 1965. It reads as follows:

14(b) Stays on the Books

The Senate's smashing defeat of the move to cut off debate on repeal of section 14(b) reflects a new mood in Congress.

It reflects a determination, after months of meekly rubberstamping the administration's proposals, to be pushed around no longer.

It reflects a determination that the Senate, once described as the "greatest deliberative body in the world," will stand on the dignity of its calling and make its own decisions.

It reflects an awareness of the undeniable fact that the great majority of Americans feel that there should be no further tampering with the Taft-Hartley law and no more coercion on workers to join labor unions as a condition of employment.

And it reflects the fact that Senators have long memories. They recall how another President was indebted to the union political machine, how he threw his entire weight into an effort to kill the original Taft-Hartley Act, how his veto was overridden by Congress, and how even the labor-strong State of Ohio repudiated him by overwhelmingly reelecting his major opponent in that fight, Senator Robert A. Taft.

Apparently, many Senators remembered that 1950 election, and got the message.

Incidentally, it was in that election that I came to the Senate over the opposition of organized labor groups in my State. I continue to read:

There is such a thing as a special interest group throwing its weight around too heavily, to the point where independent-minded men, both lawmakers and constituents, stand up and rebel. That point apparently had been reached in respect to the 14(b) repeal drive. The cloture vote would seem to have stopped it cold.

It now remains for the repeal supporters to admit the defeat and clear the way to table this measure, get on to the remaining few essential measures, and adjourn. Among the remaining bills are several essential to the West. They include a reenactment of sugar legislation which is now expiring, the public works appropriation, which includes the central Utah project, and others. Certainly western Senators should now use their influence to get 14(b) promptly out of the way and get to these vital measures.

Then, let Senators and Representatives get back to their constituents and find out firsthand how they feel about right to work. It is a fairly safe bet that after this experience, and with an election coming up next fall, there will be a considerably different attitude toward this issue in the 1966 Congress.

This issue has been an education in the democratic process. Despite the way the House caved in to administration persuasion, and despite the unremitting pressure of organized labor, the bill failed to get over its last remaining hurdle. A man's faith in the way we do business in Congress is strengthened.

Two days later, the Ogden Standard-Examiner published an editorial entitled "First Round Battle Victory on 14(b)." It reads as follows:

First Round Battle Victory on 14(b)

The first round of the fight to preserve States' rights to retain "right-to-work" clauses in their labor regulations is over.

It's a victory for those forces who believe that affiliation with a labor union is a voluntary privilege, not an obligation.

But the overall battle is not finished.

It will be resumed in January when the 2d session of the 89th Congress convenes in Washington. So the temporarily victorious supporters of "right to work" have only momentary cause for rejoicing—they should not let down their guards.

The first round success in the campaign to retain section 14(b)—the "right-to-work" clause—in the Taft-Hartley Labor Act came late Tuesday when Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield conceded he could not achieve repeal at this session.

Senator Mansfield's decision was a case of bowing to the inevitable. In a test vote Monday, only 45 Senators were in favor of ending the filibuster that had been mounted against the repeal. Forty-seven Senators voted for the "talkathon" to continue, if necessary.

With the filibuster—and repeal of 14(b)—now sidetracked, both the Senate and House can get on with other vital legislation. Adjournment by the end of next week is now possible.

Defeat of President Lyndon B. Johnson's effort to steamroller the 14(b) repeal through Congress this year is a blow to the prestige of both the President and the bosses of organized labor.

A spokesman for a major independent union blamed both Mr. Johnson and the AFL–CIO for failure of the repeal campaign.

He asserted that the President could have "broken the filibuster" on 14(b) by the same arm-twisting tactics he used to cut off debate earlier on the civil rights bill.

The Chief Executive didn't make an all-out push, this observer added, because the AFL–CIO failed to stir enough grass roots pressure on Congress or the White House.

On the other hand, there was a tremendous swell of opposition to repeal of 14(b). Senator Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen, leader of the filibuster, and his colleagues had literally reams of editorials and letters to read against the repealer.

Utah's two Democratic Congressmen, Representative David S. King and Senator Frank E. Moss, were subjected to considerable pressure from home. Representative King voted for repeal. Senator Moss consistently favored discarding section 14(b) and, to the end, said he would vote for repeal when and if he had the opportunity.

This pressure to retain the "right-to-work" law will not relent as Senator Moss and Representative King come back to Utah between sessions.

It shouldn't.

Utah is one of the 19 States that have "right-to-work" provisions in their labor laws, giving employees a choice of whether they wish to join a union or desire to remain independent of union affiliation.

Utahans would lose this choice if section 14(b) is tossed into the legislative garbage dump.

Not long after we defeated the administration effort to repeal section 14(b) just 4 short months ago, there came to my Washington office a very interesting telegram from a number of citizens in Provo, Utah. I have already shown that telegram to Senators and stretched it out across the well of the Senate. It had 2,000 signatures affixed thereto, and I assume that every person who signed it paid for that privilege. The telegram has been printed in the Record.

Mr. President, as the right-to-work question goes through the legislative mill in Congress, the Nation's editorial writers, opinionmakers, and columnists, took pen in hand and set their thoughts down on paper.

I have just read three editorials, one from each of the three largest Utah dailies.

I have here today a few more articles from Utah newspapers. Included among them are articles from all five Utah daily newspapers, a number from some of the Utah weeklies, and from a Salt Lake City radio station.

I have also been informed that an unofficial survey was taken in Utah during the past month or so and every weekly and daily newspaper in the State is for retention of our right-to-work laws.

I think the Senate will find some of these articles and editorials very interesting. They began to appear in October 1964, before the presidential election of that year, and continued down to the present.

Mr. President, it was my intention at this point to begin reading from these editorials. That would require another hour or so.

When the majority leader left the Chamber, earlier, he gave to me the responsibility of closing the session tonight. He suggested that I should not exercise that privilege until 5 o'clock. It is now within 7 minutes of that time, and I do not want to divide my material in two obviously awkward situations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 6968(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. Flood, Mr. Friedel, Mr. Minshall, and Mr. King of New York, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy, on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 4355(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. Teague, of Texas, Mr. Natcher, Mr. Lipscomb, and Mr. Pirnie, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy, on the part of the House.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 46 United States Code 1126c, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Carey and Mr. Mailliard as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 14 United States Code 194(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. St. Onge and Mr. Wyatt as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, on the part of the House.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 9355(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. Rogers of

Colorado, Mr. Flynt, Mr. Laird, and Mr. Dole, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy, on the part of the House.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON HEALTH

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, during the congressional recess I attended the White House Conference on Health. This gathering of distinguished leaders in health and welfare and health professions education responded overwhelmingly to two fine addresses by Secretary Gardner and the Surgeon General, Dr. William Stewart.

Secretary Gardner spoke of the innovations in the new legislation which forms a creative partnership between health professions, universities, hospitals, and other institutions in the health field. Among these innovations he cited:

> The inclusion of health insurance in the social security program is surely as significant in terms of social innovation, as the adoption of the original program 30 years ago.

Mr. President, I might add that there are innovations taking place within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as to organization and administration which I think will be beneficial to the wide scope of programs handled through this important department of our Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Secretary Gardner be included in the Record following my remarks.

Dr. William H. Stewart established the theme of the conference when he said:

> Today we aspire and fully intend to make the best health services readily accessible to all who need them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Stewart's statement be included in the Record following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Great Move Forward[1]

(By John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

If the sheer gathering together of eminent and talented people can insure the success of a conference, this one is going to be great. I estimate that there is enough intelligence and experience and dedication packed into this room today to transform our future—if it could be effectively released. But since no one knows what the results of such an explosion might be, perhaps it's fortunate that conferences are less than perfectly efficient instruments for the release of ideas and energy.

In any case, I look forward to an exciting Conference.

In his book, "Year of Decision," Bernard de Voto wrote: "Sometimes there are exceedingly brief periods which determine a long future. The affairs of nations are shaped by the actions of men, and sometimes, looking back, we can understand which actions were decisive."

De Voto's year of decision was 1846, a year of westward march and external crisis for the United States. Events move more swiftly today. In the turbulent world of the mid-20th century, every year is a year of decision.

Yet there are areas of demarcation and resolution which can be fixed firmly in a period of time. We now stand at such a period in the field of health. Surely future historians will look back and say that 1965 was a year of decisive action for the health of the American people.

The decision began with the President of the United States. His ardent belief that we could do a better job in health set the tone. "It is imperative," he said in the first of his special messages to the Congress, "that we give first attention to our opportunities—and our obligations—for advancing the Nation's health. For the health of our people is, inescapably, the foundation for the fulfillment of our aspirations."

And so a remarkably productive Congress enacted a series of laws which paved the way for advances in every area of health.

The sheer volume is impressive. Since the start of the 89th Congress, at least 12 major pieces of health legislation have been enacted. Several of these measures have multiple provisions, so that almost 2 dozen separate programs are affected. In addition, health was an important component of other major legislation—the poverty and area redevelopment programs, for example.

All of these measures are worthy of note. Several that have received little notice would have earned star billing in any lesser year.

To grasp the dimensions of what has been accomplished we need to stand back a bit. We need to see the trends reflected in the legislation, the pattern that emerges from the details.

If the Great Society is to mean anything it must mean something for the quality of our lives. And health, as all of us except the very young have had occasion to know, has a great deal to do with the quality of our lives. It is both an end and a means in the quest for quality. It is desirable for its own sake, but it is also fundamental if people are to live creatively and constructively. Health frees the individual to live up to his potential.

We have said that the good life is possible, not only for the favored few but for all the people. And we have said that each person should have the opportunity to fulfill the possibilities that are in him. That is why we seek to arrange things so that every American will enjoy the liberation and fulfillment that is possible through education. And that is why we should strive to make the blessings of health just as widely available.

But we have been slow to see health in that light. Over the past 50 years, during which we have taken truly extraordinary steps to make education available to all, we have moved relatively slowly in making the best health care universally available. And that is the first significance of the 1965 health legislation. At last we have made a great move forward.

With that as background, we can discern several other common threads in the recent health legislation.

First, comprehensiveness, in strategy as well as vision. In the past, our attack often has been piecemeal, fragmentary. We thought in negatives as we reacted to problems that threatened to overwhelm us. The familiar word was "control." We built a fence around disease and contained it.

Mutual protection is still essential, of course, but we have moved beyond it. Today we view our responsibility in terms of advancing the human condition as well as controlling disease. Our focus is on the larger problem, the individual and his place in society.

Our approach to the practical probelms of advancing the health fields matches the comprehensiveness of our vision. We go at it through research, through education, through the construction of facilities, through demonstration programs, through the delivery of services, and so on.

Another consideration worthy of comment in the recent legislation is the way in which the Federal Government has formed a creative partnership with the health professions, the universities, the hospitals, and a wide range of other institutions in the health fields. The great debate about Federal responsibility in health is well on the way toward being resolved. The responsibility is inescapable, but it must never lead to Federal domination. Rather it must express itself in the creation of fruitful patterns of collaboration between Federal, State, local, and nongovernmental interests.

Finally, I'd like to call attention to the innovative aspects of the new legislation. It is not simply more of the same. We are doing new and different things. And we are doing things differently.

We have known for a long time, for example, that older people, who are so vulnerable to long and costly illnesses, needed help in meeting their medical expenses. We struggled for years to find a formula that would protect their economic security without impairing the integrity of the medical profession or the dignity of the individual.

The medicare law does this by using the time-tested insurance mechanisms of social security.

The inclusion of health insurance in the social security program is surely as significant in terms of social innovation, as the adoption of the original program 30 years ago.

But the significance of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is not limited to medicare. The act represents a commitment to the young as well as to the aged. It expands the Kerr-Mills medical assistance program and extends it to other needy groups. It launches new programs of health services for children of impoverished families. And, most important of all, it calls for standards of health care. Standards established for treating patients under the health insurance program will ultimately mean better care for all patients. In short, the new law is a powerful affirmative force for improved health practice in the United States.

The heart disease, cancer, and stroke legislation represents a genuinely innovative step in public policy. For years, we have been seeking a mechanism to make the best in medical care available to all the people. We have searched for a practical method to distribute new knowledge widely and quickly. We have sought ways to fuse the largely isolated worlds of research, education, and medical care.

The new legislation is designed to help do all these things. It will create, across our Nation, regional programs to bring together the best in medical research with the best in medical care for heart disease, cancer, and stroke. Through these programs doctors will be able to draw upon highly specialized knowledge and equipment for the benefit of their patients. When the program reaches full fruition, every patient will have access to the latest in early detection, in surgery, in treatment, in rehabilitation. Every doctor will have the opportunity to receive advanced training in the skills that will help him treat his patients better.

It looks as though we may also be turning a corner in our efforts to combat the pollution of our physical environment. Heretofore, we have been picking up the pieces, frantically seeking to stem a tide of pollution which has often reached crisis proportions. We are no longer content with a finger-in-the-dike operation. Our aim now is to halt pollution before it starts. Under the new legislation the Government is for the first time involved in setting standards of water quality and controlling automobile exhausts.

---

[1] As delivered at the White House Conference on Health, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., Wednesday, Nov. 3, 1965, 9:30 a.m., e.s.t.

It is against the backdrop of developments such as these that the President has called this Conference.

Walter Lippmann recently said that the achievements of the 89th Congress are "a series of promissory notes." That is most certainly true in the field of health. You and I must honor those promissory notes. The tough job is still ahead of us.

Within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we are tooling up for our new responsibilities, and it is a huge task. As part of this task we are reexamining the way we are organized. I have asked the Surgeon General to review thoroughly the organization of health activities under his jurisdiction and their relationship to other health programs in the Department and elsewhere. To help him in this job, I have appointed a small committee of distinguished and informed citizens.

We shall move expeditiously to resolve our internal problems. But with respect to our broader relationships, we want your help in defining our most appropriate role. We need to know how we can work more closely with practitioners and with hospitals, medical schools, and local agencies. We need to learn how we can develop the Federal partnership with these groups and agencies in such a way as to help them grow but without subordinating them or endangering their autonomy. And they need to learn how to play their role as creative partners determined to preserve their integrity and independence but also determined to value the public good above their own vested interests. This will take statesmanship as well as dedication to a common goal.

Statesmanship will also be needed in education for the health professions. I am happy to see that you are devoting your first morning's discussion to this crucial question. Our medical future can be no brighter than the men and women who will provide the skills and services that we need.

Progress in health depends also on the strengthening of our society. There are limits to what we can accomplish in health as long as poverty, ignorance, and discrimination exist. These conditions not only aggravate but often create health problems.

People need to seek out health services and use them wisely, and for this they need education. They must know when to see a doctor. They need a certain level of knowledge to follow the doctor's instructions accurately. Yet the poor and the segregated, bypassed as surely by educational and social advances as by modern medical progress, may be unaware of health resources and uncertain of their worth.

How can we break this vicious circle?

Or to put the question in positive terms, and terms that open up considerably broader vistas, how can we design a society that will advance the physical and mental health of the individual?

You may say: "Why, we're just on the brink of such a society." But of course it's not at all clear what we're on the brink of.

Our technology has showered us with material riches. Few of us would turn back the clock and do without the cities and factories and automobiles and computers which our modern technology makes possible. Yet the price is high. We live in a world of machines, of noise, of pollution, of tensions, of bruised and fragmented lives. We must learn to capture the benefits of technology without losing our identity or individual integrity. And this, too, is essential in a society that aspires to greatness.

Those of you assembled here today represent the highest levels of leadership in American health. I know that the key questions have concerned you. And I know you are aware of the stakes. I want to thank you all for coming, and I wish you a successful conference.

Education for the Health Professions[1]

(By William H. Stewart, M.D., Surgeon General, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

We are convened as the heirs to remarkable progress in health and medicine. Our inheritance is bountiful, measured in terms not only of growth in scientific capability but also of growth in social philosophy related to health.

The scientific advance has been widely heralded. By comparison, the dramatic change that has taken place in our thinking has come quietly, without benefit of trumpets. But it is the more significant of the two. Yesterday we tacitly accepted a limited challenge—to make health services available to most of the people, most of the time. Today we aspire and fully intend to make the best health services readily accessible to all who need them.

Forging a way to match our national will is the unwritten charge before this White House Conference convened by President Johnson as an expression of his own deep concern with the challenge of better health for the American people.

To my mind it is most appropriate that the opening discussions of this Conference should be directed toward health professions education. For health manpower will shape and limit the health care we provide and the health protection we afford to the American people in the years ahead. Thus, your Conference planners have properly put first things first.

Moreover, in terms of health manpower, this Conference is particularly timely. The time has come for us to turn a sharp corner in our thinking about education for the health disciplines.

Thus far, faced with manpower shortages and recognizing a growing need, we have concerned ourselves primarily with "Education for how many?" We have been largely preoccupied with quantity.

Now, I strongly believe, it is time for us to focus sharply on the nature of the training we provide. I urge you, in your discussions this morning, to give higher priority to the question, "Education for what?"

I am aware, of course, that the quantitative battle is far from won. The decisive legislative actions of recent years are merely a beginning. Years must pass before the first products of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act and the Nurse Training Act become working members of our health resource. For those of you who represent academic medicine, the end-point of the legislative process is your starting point.

Nevertheless, the battle for adequate numbers is well joined. A few critical gaps remain—most notably, perhaps, among the top-level disciplines allied to medicine. New mechanisms and incentives are needed to increase our supply of physical therapists, occupational therapists, medical record librarians, and others whose skills are more in demand with every passing year.

But even if we reach the millenial day when every category of health manpower is adequately manned, we shall have done only part of the job. The other part, the harder part, is to tune our training and use of medical manpower to the changing needs of the people we serve.

All of us who have a hand in shaping education for the health professions take pride in the axiom that the training we provide today shapes the medical care pattern of tomorrow. But if we are to make good on this claim, we must also accept the corollary—that the medical care needs of tomorrow must shape the training of today.

I hope that in your brief discussions this morning, and in your long hours of work at home after the conference is over, you will ask searching questions and project your answers against the swiftly moving backdrop of evolving health needs.

You who are here today represent a part of the "general staff" of an enormous and rapidly growing army. The health services industry employed about 1 million people in 1940. Today its ranks are approaching 3 million. One out of every 25 gainfully employed persons in the United States today serves the cause of health.

How shall these forces be marshalled toward the accomplishment of our objective—the best health service, universally accessible?

To approach an answer to this enormous question, we must first look with unclouded vision at how these forces are being used today. And immediately we find that relatively little is known about what today's health workers actually do, how they spend their time, to what extent they make full use of the training they receive. Such data are urgently needed.

We must look objectively at the summit of the pyramid—the medical profession itself. What meaningful response can we devise—in terms of meeting human needs—to the challenge of specialization? Does the answer lie in further refinement of the principles of group practice? Does it lie in the conscious development of a new kind of family physician? Can we train a generalist who, like most generals, is at the top rather than the bottom of the totem pole, calling on specialists to assist him as the patient's condition demands? What combination will maximize scientific benefit and minimize the loss of the human touch on which medicine is built?

We need to examine critically our current patterns of distribution of health manpower—both broadly, in terms of regions, and narrowly, in terms of urban neighborhoods and suburban complexes. Will today's trends simplify or complicate tomorrow's tasks of meeting health needs? If the distribution trends appear undesirable, how can we influence them?

The developments of the recent past have produced a medical culture which has been characterized as "islands of excellence in a sea of mediocrity." Is this a fair description? Are we, in our professional schools, so preoccupied with the purity of clinical excellence—as exemplified in our super-equipped and super-staffed teaching hospitals—that there is nothing left over for raising the base of medical care in the broader community? Do we have educational programs that will prepare people to meet the needs of Appalachia, of Harlem, or even of Westchester County, N.Y.?

Moreover, our influence and our clientele are worldwide. What do our schools offer for meeting the health needs of southeast Asia? How long can the United States continue to support a position as an importer of physicians, an importer of nurses?

Year by year, our top professional personnel are being trained to perform still more complex tasks. How long can each profession afford to hang onto its simpler functions—the routine filling of a tooth, for example, or the several easily automated steps in a medical examination? How can we train the physician or dentist to make full use of the skills available in other people, freeing himself to perform only those duties for which he is uniquely qualified?

Moreover, artificial barriers separate one stratum of the health manpower pyramid from another, buttressed by such considerations as academic credits. Can we devise career ladders to permit the highly capable practical nurse to move into professional nursing, the professional nurse into medicine, the hygienist into dentistry? Wouldn't all the disciplines ultimately gain from such vertical mobility?

---

[1] For delivery at the White House Conference on Health, Washington, D.C., November 3, 1965.

These questions, and many more. Questions in search of not one but many answers, which will give shape and substance to the education of health manpower.

Most important of all, these answers must come from many sources. The great strength of our American system of health service lies in its diversity. No single element—neither private medicine nor academic medicine nor Government—can write the prescription and impose it on the rest of the partnership. Nor can all the elements of the health partnership, acting collectively, impose our answers upon the whole of society. For health is so interwoven into the fabric of the American culture that its ultimate design can only be determined by the people themselves.

But the people are looking to us for guidance, for leadership. They have accepted our new aspiration—the best health services for all—as their right. Indeed, in a sense, they have thrust the challenge upon us. They are only dimly aware of the questions I have posed this morning. But they expect us to find the answers.

Each of us brings to a meeting like this one, and to his daily work, a set of acquired assumptions and institutional biases. Emerson wrote, a long time ago, "If I know your sect, I anticipate your argument." He went on to say that each man is pledged to himself to look only at one side—what he called "the permitted side." This Conference will fall short of fulfilling its high promise if each of us looks only at the permitted side today.

As most of you know, we in the Public Health Service are now embarking upon a process of self-examination and self-appraisal. To protect ourselves against our own preconceptions, we are being assisted by clear and uncommitted minds from outside our own institutional culture. It is too early to foresee the nature and dimensions of the changes that will evolve. But our purpose is plain, and can be plainly stated: to fashion an agency that will deliver its full measure of the Federal commitment to the health of the American people.

As you consider the education of health manpower this morning, I invite each of you to adopt a similar posture toward your own individual and institutional patterns of practice. For we are much more than heirs to progress. We are also executors who can, if we will, raise the condition of man to heights that match his aspirations.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 25, 1966, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Lincoln Gordon, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Jack Hood Vaughn.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Robert C. Seamans, Jr., of Massachusetts to be Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the staff corps indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Frank T. Norris.

SUPPLY CORPS

George E. Moore II.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Robert R. Wooding.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Norvell G. Ward
Constantine A. Karaberis
William S. Guest
Edward C. Outlaw
Russell Kefauver
Allan F. Fleming
John M. Alford
James W. O'Grady
William F. Bringle
Edward E. Grimm
John D. Bulkeley
Ben W. Sarver
Don W. Wulzen
Frederick J. Harfinger II
Dennis C. Lyndon
Fred G. Bennett
David C. Richardson
Richard R. Pratt
Norman C. Gillette, Jr.
William P. Mack
Paul E. Hartmann
Donald Gay, Jr.
Charles S. Minter, Jr.
John P. Sager
Emery A. Grantham
Nathan Sonenshein

MEDICAL CORPS

Edward P. Irons
John W. Albrittain
George M. Davis, Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Harry J. P. Foley, Jr.
Jack J. Appleby
Winston H. Schleef

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

William M. Heaman
Walter M. Enger

Rear Adm. Edward J. Fahy, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 24, 1966:

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

James S. Duesenberry, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Polish Insurrection of 1863

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, Americans of Polish descent in my State celebrated the 103d anniversary of the Polish insurrection of 1863. That heroic event has been a symbol to generations of Poles who have loved liberty but have been deprived of it. It continues to be so today.

The uprising against Russian rule broke out in the middle of religious ceremonies. There were collisions with Russian troops and victims fell in the streets of Warsaw. In response, the pro-Russian ruler, Count Aleksander Wielpolski, ordered that the revolutionary youth be recruited into the Russian Army. The young people fled to the forests, and on January 22, set up a revolutionary committee. The struggle of the ill-equipped but gallant insurgents lasted for almost 2 years in many parts of the country. A secret national government was set up in Warsaw. However, the promised assistance of Napoleon III never materialized and wholesale executions and deportations followed the suppression of the revolt. Poland became a Russian province.

But the Polish people have never forgotten the young patriots of 1863. On this occasion I wish to reaffirm my personal dedication to the cause of freedom in Poland. The history of the Polish people gives us reason for hope.

The City of East Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government's war on poverty has long been needed. However, the efforts of the Government are not intended to and cannot replace the charitable efforts of individuals and private organizations. The two attacks—by Government and by private endeavor—must complement one another.

The city of East Point, in my congressional district, deserves special recognition of the manner in which it serves its people. This is accomplished through fine community pride and the concern of civic organizations of the city.

One example of the successful work of the civic organizations is the Tri Cities and Forest Park Clothing Bank, begun on Christmas Eve 1959 by the East Point Moose Lodge. From small quarters in a building on Main Street, the project has grown to occupy new quarters at 1949 Grove Avenue, East Point. This new building and land, valued at $27,000, was built through the donation of money, material, and labor by individuals, business firms, and civic organizations. The mortgage on this property will be burnt on February 3, thanks to the dedicated efforts of Ed Crumley and his associates.

Over 500 children in South Fulton and Clayton County receive their clothing free of charge from the bank. Volunteer women sort clothes and serve families on Saturdays. As a result of the success of this activity, 27 clothing banks have been established and are thriving throughout the State.

The Lay Committee of the East Point Health Council is a civic advisory board which supervises all welfare work in the city of East Point. It raises funds and provides assistance in necessary charity cases. It works with health nurses in administering all sorts of services to the poor, sick, and needy citizens, financed by allocations from the city and from individual contributions.

J. Lester Holt, chaplain of the city of East Point, is a dedicated servant of his community. The freezer locker and storehouse of food in his office is a source of needed assistance in family emergencies, and in 1965 he was responsible for 106 families receiving food, he counseled with 78 individuals, and visited 227 newcomers to East Point. In recognition of his tireless work in charitable causes, Chaplain Holt was chosen as "Mr. East Point" by the East Point Moose Lodge several years ago.

The city of East Point can take great pride and satisfaction in its accomplishments, which have earned for it a wide reputation as an energetic and civic-minded community.

Missing Atomic Reactor Parts and Pieces Mystery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, today I am making a report to the House GOP conference which may be of interest to others as well. Although the report discusses only certain nuclear reactor power station components, it is understood that considerable additional AID supplies for India are similarly missing. The report follows:

MYSTERY OF THE MISSING TARAPUR REACTOR PARTS AND PIECES

At Tarapur, India, a fine nuclear power station is being built costing over $100 million. Of this sum $80 million is being supplied by U.S. taxpayers via the Agency for International Development.

Early last September when the war between India and Pakistan broke out several hundred thousand dollars worth of parts and pieces for the Tarapur reactor where in the hold of a ship bound for India. The ship happened to be in a Pakistani port when hostilities commenced.

The Government of Pakistan immediately seized this cargo which consisted of a 20-ton airlock and precisely formed pieces of sheet steel. These were prefabricated components of the reactor containment vessel without which it could not be completed. The cargo was removed from the ship by the Pakistan Government to a place unknown.

AID and the State Department both were notified promptly of the situation. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy requested that every effort be made to obtain release of this property. It was given assurance by the Secretary of State that such efforts were being made. For week after week no results were obtained. The U.S. contractor involved (General Electric) eventually became discouraged and in order to avoid interminable delay in completing the reactor—and consequent heavy financial losses—ordered replacements fabricated and shipped from the United States all the way to India.

The original parts and pieces are still somewhere in Pakistan still being held by that Government. Apparently neither the State Department, AID, the contractor, or anybody else outside of Pakistan has the remotest notion where they are even today.

Nevertheless, since the seizure, not only has President Johnson entertained the Prime Minister of Pakistan at the White House, but on January 19 AID saw fit to make a loan to Pakistan, making $8.2 million American money available to that Government to assist in construction of the Mangla Dam and 100,000-kilowatt power station in West Pakistan. (The Tarapur reactor's initial power is scheduled at 380,000 kilowatts.)

It is difficult to formulate a moderate comment regarding this course of events, therefore, I am not attempting to do so.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 22, over 1 million Ukrainian-Americans observed the anniversary of an event that holds great significance for them as well as for their fellow Americans. Forty-eight years ago, on January 22, 1918, the people of the Ukraine declared their independence. This act culminated a struggle that had been waged throughout the years of the 19th century and the early years of the 20th century. During those years of struggle, the people of the Ukraine consistently looked for encouragement and inspiration to a country that had earlier fought to free itself from colonial rule and had declared itself devoted to the cause of freedom and self-determination for others who remained oppressed. That country was the United States of America.

Today, Ukrainians everywhere lament that their homeland knew the blessings of liberty for only 2 brief years, that their country has fallen under the sway of an imperial power which has consistently exploited the riches of the Ukraine and has sought to stamp out Ukrainian nationalism. In America, Ukrainians who have been fortunate enough to escape Soviet tyranny and to participate in the life of a democratic society are especially moved by the plight of the people of their former homeland. Surely, their fellow Americans should be similarly moved. For today, as yesterday, all Americans remain committed to freedom and self-determination for peoples living under the yoke of foreign tyrannies. And today, as yesterday, Americans are dying on faraway battlefields as they give proof of that commitment. As we observe an anniversary that Ukrainians everywhere hold dear, we cannot forget that we thereby also affirm our dedication to principles cherished by all Americans.

Proportional Representation: For Better or for Worse?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a major underlying principle of our American form of government is that of representative government. It is true that in the American system of government, the consent of the people is projected through their chosen representatives in the halls of Government—local, State, and National. These are elected representatives and are the means whereby society establishes its order. Thus, it is politics that constitutes the search for governmental power and influence. In this quest for political position, the interest of various groups must always be considered. The final determination, however, under our American system is the will of the majority. Of course, one must be mindful of the rights of the minority as guaranteed by our Constitution and laws. It is in that light that we have established the separation of powers and the checks and balances within the structure of our Government. The result is that the stability of law is established.

In our Government methods have been established such as voting, the right of petitions, referendums, and constitutional conventions, in order to reflect the expressions of the various interests of the people, both majority and minority, in order that the consent of the people may be garnered to favor one policy or the other.

I do not believe that proportional representation is consistent with the general traits of our American democratic representative system. In theory, proportional representation purports to foster individualism and freedom of action in representative government. In practice it falls far short of those goals. Historically, a major consequence of proportional representation has been the increase and cohesivensss of political groupings. European experiences under proportional representation demonstrate the instability of the governments it spawned. Efforts are made to organize and control a quota of voters because only a part of the electorate, a mere quota, is needed to elect a single representative. There is no need for a plurality; thus, what is commonly known as "bullet voting" is encouraged. The experience of the city of New York is a concrete example of such results. I recall our experience of the late thirties in the city council where representatives of minority groups, including the Communist Party, were able to foist upon the city of New York membership in that body. That was accomplished solely by the "bullet vote." Moreover, many votes are also wasted under that system.

I am a firm believer in the two-party system in American politics. Proportional representation militates against a strong two-party system. It seeks to carve party slates for office into quotas and encourages a system of preferred candidates over party candidates. Such a system is not in the best interest of all the people. A preferred candidate of a particular local group may achieve a seat in the representative chamber of government but that preferred individual will then become the voice of one crying in a governmental wilderness. He will not represent majority opinion, nor the consent of the governed. His interests are not those of all the people but only some of the people—a select group. Such politics is not American politics. It is not good government, it is not true representative democracy. Our political system must represent the will of the majority and respect and preserve the rights of the minority at all times and in all places.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. On that day Americans of Ukrainian descent celebrated the cause of Ukrainian freedom. It is a cause to which I am personally deeply committed. On January 22, 1918, Ukrainian patriots took advantage of the Russian revolution and proclaimed their national independence. But within less than 3 years the national hopes and aspirations of the Ukrainian people had been brutally crushed by the numerically superior Red army.

Today I should like to discuss the period of history in which the Ukraine's independence was declared, for it constitutes a stirring chapter in the story of the Ukrainian people. In November of 1917 the Bolsheviks overthrew the provisional Russian Government under Alexander Kerensky in Moscow. But in the Ukraine, the beginnings of a democratic republic were evident. On November 20 the Ukrainian Rada or Parliament issued its third universal, which showed how far Ukrainian thought had gone. Although the Rada did not yet advocate a complete break with Russia, it provided for the establishment of a democratic republic and guaranteed to all citizens those democratic rights that form the basis of a free country.

Although Lenin nominally accepted Ukrainian independence in December he also presented the Rada with an unacceptable ultimatum. The Ukrainians bravely defied the ultimatum, although they knew that their defiance might result in an invasion from Moscow. Even as Soviet troops were approaching Kiev the brave Ukrainians declared their independence on January 22, in the form of a Fourth Universal issued by the Rada. The Soviets entered Kiev only a few weeks later and instituted an unprecedented and brutal reign of terror.

But the Ukrainians fought on, for almost 3 more years. The withdrawal of the Ukrainian National Republic forces in November of 1920 marked the close of a chapter in the heroic struggle for national independence. But it was not the end of a book. For the Ukrainian people remember the heroes of their past and are determined that someday they shall be vindicated.

I should like once again to affirm my complete dedication to the cause of liberty and national self-determination for the Ukrainian people.

What the Repeal of Section 14(b) Would Mean for New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a number of letters recently which indicate that there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the real significance of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which the House of Representatives voted by a large margin to repeal last year.

For purposes of clarification, I should like to make the following brief statement on the subject "What the Repeal of Section 14(b) Would Mean for New York State."

The so-called right-to-work laws are misnamed: they do not give anyone a right to work, nor do they protect jobs. What these laws do is to interfere with free collective bargaining, by prohibiting voluntary contracts between unions and employers which require that all who enjoy the fruits of bargaining share equally in the cost of such representation. Section 14(b) permits States to enact such laws.

New York State has no such law and the repeal or retention of 14(b) would therefore not affect any rights now enjoyed by the workers in our State. The 19 States—primarily southern—which do have such laws use them to try to lure industry from New York to their States. The repeal of section 14(b) would therefore stop this unfair competition and would help maintain job opportunities in our State.

It is important also to understand what repeal of 14(b) would not do. It would not affect the prohibition in the Taft-Hartley Act against requiring a man to join a union to get a job—that is, the closed shop.

It would not take away the existing right of employees covered by a union shop contract, by secret ballot, to suspend enforcement of the union shop if a majority desire to do so.

It would not take away any employee's right to refuse to join a union—even under a union shop the employee can, if he prefers, pay to the union an amount equal to membership dues.

In short, repeal of 14(b) would protect New York workers' jobs against unfair competition while retention of this provision gives them no rights they do not presently enjoy.

American Policy in the Americas Restated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in the 1st session of the 89th Congress rather broad Latin American policy statements were enacted into law which have caused America considerable embarrassment in Latin American diplomatic circles and in the press.

The policy stated by Secretary Rusk is a good one which adherents to the Alliance for Progress policy can certainly support.

In reply to a letter I sent to the State Department soliciting their position on congressional foreign policy statements subject to misinterpretation, I received the following reply:

SEPTEMBER 30, 1965.

Mr. JACK H. VAUGHN,
Assistant Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VAUGHN: Pursuant to the telephone conversation today between your special assistant, Mr. Diego Ascencio and Mr. Wilber of my office, I respectfully request that you provide me with the State Department's official position respecting House Resolution 560.

I wish to further request the Department's position on Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 introduced by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

As this matter will be further debated in the House Chamber early next week, I would appreciate your immediate attention to this request.

Very truly yours,
ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 11, 1966.

Hon. ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEGGETT: Thank you for your letter of September 30, 1965, asking for the Department's views on House Resolution 560 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, as introduced by Senator JAVITS.

I have deferred my reply to your letter until the Second Special Inter-American Conference completed its work so that I might send you the address of the Secretary of State made on November 22 at that Conference. The address makes a full presentation of U.S. policy, including the views of this Government on specific improvements necessary in the inter-American system to enable it to act more promptly and effectively in time of crisis.

It is the Department's view that the Secretary's statement sets forth the position of the U.S. Government on the various points contained in the resolutions in question. The Department would prefer that the Secretary's address of November 22 at Rio de Janeiro stand as the single, authoritative expression of U.S. policy.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

JACK H. VAUGHN,
Assistant Secretary.

Address by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State of the United States of America, Delivered at the Fifth Plenary Session of the Conference Held on November 22, 1965

I

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates and friends in the Americas; we gather once more as representatives of the American community of nations to join in making more effective the great purposes which move our peoples.

We are privileged to be in the beautiful city of Rio de Janeiro as it celebrated its 400th anniversary. In his founding proclamation in 1565, Estácio de Sá said: "Let our land be free, let us build a city, let these words remain as a memorial to our resolution and labor." May our resolution and labor at this Conference add to that memorial.

Seventy-five years ago our governments launched the inter-American system—the oldest and most successful experiment of its kind in international cooperation.

Today the influence of its principles and mechanisms may be seen in regional arrangements throughout the world.

The secret of our relationship is our common ideals. If we have not always been able to live up to these ideals, we have known better than to forsake them. The conscience of the New World—rooted in freedom and justice—remains solid and unchanged. At every critical moment of choice it asserts itself and determines the path we follow. Embedded deeply in the minds and hearts of our peoples, that conscience is the engine that drives us forward against all obstacles: whether we strive throughout the Hemisphere to implement the Charter of Punta del Este or—in my own country—to carry forward President Johnson's Great Society program.

II

Our purpose at this special Conference is to examine our regional system in the light of new circumstances and requirements within our hemisphere, as well as in the world around us. This is what our predecessors did in 1945 at Chapultepec as World War II drew to a close. This has been the pattern of development of the inter-American system since the beginning. The success of our system lies in the flexibility of its institutions—in its capacity to face unfolding reality. We have known how to experiment and to adapt—how to preserve that which serves our foreseeable needs and when to alter that which has become obsolete.

Probably no two decades in the history of mankind have witnessed such sweeping political, social, and technological transformation.

Since 1945 we have moved into the nuclear and space age. This has given a new dimension to the threat of war and to the necessity for peace.

Rapid advances in communications and transportation have removed the barriers of geographic isolation. Our interdependence within the hemisphere and in relation to other continents is greater today than ever before. No longer can we afford to view what takes place in Asia, Africa, or the Middle East as removed and unrelated to our security and welfare. And developments within each of our countries have become matters of vital concern to all.

Old colonial empires have all but disappeared. From them have emerged more than 50 new nations—some strong, some weak—enriching and complicating our international relations.

This family of sovereign states, old and new, is becoming day by day, a world political community; and no one knows this better than those of us who serve as foreign ministers.

Within that community underprivileged citizens in every society throughout the world have been swept up in the revolution of rising expectations, which we must now convert into a revolution of rising opportunities. They no longer regard their condition of poverty, isolation, ignorance, and disease as immutable. They insist that the lives of the children shall be better than their own. They clamor for change—rapid, far-reaching change.

III

Our hemisphere has experienced profoundly this universal phenomenon; and our governments, peoples, and international institutions have responded creatively.

The greatest and most complicated task which the inter-American system has faced in the past decade is the mobilization of collective efforts in support of a peaceful and democratic, economic and social revolution.

To accomplish this it has been necessary to adapt and devise regional institutions capable of assisting governments in their development and reform programs. The Act of Bogotá in 1960 for the first time placed social progress on a par with economic development. In 1960, the Inter-American Development Bank opened its doors. In March 1961, President Kennedy called on all the people of the hemisphere to join in a new Alliance for Progress, a vast cooperative effort unparalleled in magnitude and nobility of purpose to satisfy the basic needs of the American people. In August 1961, the Inter-American Economic and Social Council approved the Charter of Punta del Este and launched the Alliance for Progress as the blueprint for a decade of development. The creation of the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress (CIAP) in 1963 strengthened the original concept of the Alliance as a cooperative effort. At its energizing core the Alliance has thus become truly multilateral.

The Alliance for Progress has seen some disappointments. Clearly there is still an enormous job to be done. But we in Washington have watched its unfolding with increasing hope and confidence. President Johnson last August described the 4 years of the Alliance as "the greatest period of forward movement, progress and peaceful change that we have ever made in the history of this hemisphere."

The statistics tell, in overall terms, a story of increased momentum throughout the hemisphere. Our general impression is confirmed by the expansion of schools and universities; houses and hospitals; measures for land and tax reform; the increase in the number and quality of development plans and programs; and by the expansion of job opportunities in the modern sectors of the Latin American economies.

Wherever one travels in Latin America, the earth is being turned and new foundations laid.

But our confidence in the success of the Alliance goes beyond what can be read in statistics and the fact of physical construction. What we see is that in one country after another governments and private citizens are focusing with increased seriousness, competence, and determination on practical measures of economic and social development. There is emerging—in both the public and private sectors—what one might call an Alliance for Progress generation.

We see the vision of our hemisphere fully modernized, absorbing and making regularly available to all the people the best that a rapidly unfolding modern science and technology can afford; a hemisphere loyal to its own rich history, tradition, and culture; loyal to the values of social justice, individual liberty, and representative democracy embedded in the Western civilization of which it is a vital part; offering to its citizens a widening range of opportunities to express their unique gifts, engaged in passionate struggle—not in class struggle but in common struggle against the ancient enemies of man: hunger, disease, and ignorance.

And, I would add as a North American, a vision of this modernized Latin America, increasingly integrated, bringing its special gifts responsibly to bear as a partner in all the great affairs both of the Atlantic and of the world.

This is a vision worthy of the highest values of a proud past—a vision in whose fulfillment a generation of Latin Americans will find a proud destiny.

In the next few months we will reach the halfway mark in the decade of the Alliance for Progress. Looking ahead for the next 5 years—and beyond—President Johnson has asked me to bring to you the following personal message:

"As I stated on August 17, on the fourth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, our vital Alliance is perhaps the greatest adventure that this hemisphere has embarked upon since Columbus reached our shore five centuries ago. I also pledged my administration to helping all of our countries meet the goals of the Alliance.

"Recognizing that fulfillment of our goals will require the continuation of the joint effort beyond 1971, I wish to inform the conference—and through you, your respective governments—that the United States will be prepared to extend mutual commitments beyond the time period foreseen in the Charter of Punta del Este. In determining the scope of the U.S. effort, we will want to examine carefully with you at that time the requirements of the hemisphere, in the light of progress made through self-help measures and the contributions which by then some of your countries will be able to make to one another to further the common effort."

We are conscious that as the national plans and programs of our countries take shape and take hold, two great issues are coming to the fore: the question of accelerating Latin American economic integration and measures to increase Latin America's capacity to earn needed foreign exchange as its economies mature.

The future of Latin American economic integration is, of course, a question for you to decide. But we in the United States also have a deep and positive interest in it. We hope decisions to hasten integration will be taken sooner rather than later. Let no one in this hemisphere suppose that we in the United States are fearful of your unity—we welcome it. We have, therefore, noted with pleasure that in recent meetings of foreign ministers in both the Latin American Free Trade Area and the Central American Common Market decisions have been taken which give promise of accelerating the integration process.

We cannot now foresee the final structure of a Latin American economic community. We cannot foresee the role which your governments might wish the United States to play in relation to it. Our earnest hope is that it will maintain an intimate, cooperative, and constructive relationship with the United States. If together we can achieve that result, it would carry into the future the hemisphere tradition consecrated in the Charter of Bogotá and renewed and rededicated in the Charter of Punta del Este and the Alliance for Progress.

For there is an intimate relationship between national development and regional integration. A vital, integrated regional market must be based on vital, integrated national markets and, I would add, on an expanding, diversified international trade.

We accept wholly the proposition that trade and development are closely linked. What we need now are practical, concrete steps taken by both the developing countries and the industrialized countries that will in fact expand trade. The United States will continue to help Latin America to earn more foreign exchange from its own resources and efforts.

Working with countries inside and outside the hemisphere, we will do what we can to promote and participate in arrangements to stabilize and sustain the prices of the traditional products on which your foreign exchange earnings capacity still substantially depends. We are doing this in the case of the coffee agreement. We are also joining in a search for ways to develop a stabilizing arrangement in cocoa. We participated in the conference which developed the Third International Tin Agreement and we now have under active consideration the question of signature by the United States to that agreement.

We shall do what is possible to keep the U.S. market open to the traditional products of Latin America. The recent decision to remove quota restrictions on U.S. imports of lead and zinc, the elimination of the special import fee on sugar, and the allocation of sugar import quotas are earnests of our intentions. We shall also continue to press for the elimination of those discriminatory practices which work against Latin America on a world basis. And, as you know, in the Kennedy round negotiations on GATT, we are seeking the broadest possible degree of tariff reduction in both manufactures and agricultural products.

We support the programs of the IMF and IBRD looking to devices which would cushion short-term fluctuations in income resulting from export price fluctuations.

But we are all conscious that the future of Latin American trade must lie in the diversification, quality control, and competitiveness of its exports. In our work in the Alliance for Progress we are prepared to grant priority status in the supply of capital and technical assistance for such efforts. Each of your countries must design its own measures to encourage the diversification of exports. Our contribution will be geared to these national programs. But in the end only Latin Americans can overcome the habits and heritage of an industry and commerce built up in past generations behind excessive tariff barriers—tariff barriers which gave an initial impulse to industrialization but which now inhibit further expansion. Quite objectively I would suggest that this heritage may be the greatest single obstacle to both regional integration and the expansion of Latin American export earnings.

At the same time, we believe there would be great value in establishing an inter-American entity to support and coordinate export promotion activities to promote investment and research in Latin America, looking toward production for export and to provide support and encouragement for national export promotion activity in each of the Latin American countries. We believe it would be desirable for the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress (CIAP) to carry out studies looking toward the establishment of such an entity. Perhaps it could also develop plans for a model national export promotion agency, appropriate, with suitable adaptation to local conditions, for establishment in each of the countries. We realize that several of the Latin American countries have active and increasingly successful export promotion programs. But, clearly, there is a long road ahead. We believe that an inter-American agency, charged with the specific purpose of promoting Latin American exports, might make a useful and significant contribution.

The letter of CIAP to the presidents last August placed special emphasis on meeting the needs of rural Latin America. It is here where half the men, women, and children of Latin America live—and they are the poorest half. It is here where the struggle to build modern economies in Latin America will be won or lost. A radical and sustained increase in agricultural productivity in Latin America is a sheer necessity. But we must also devise ways to meet the social needs of the rural population—for housing and food, education and health. At the same time, we must help the campesino to increase his production, diversify his crops, and sell them at a fair and reliable price. This is an imperative area for improvement if Latin America is to grow the food, produce the raw materials, develop sound industrial plants, provide the national markets for industry, and earn the foreign exchange that will guarantee prosperity and dignity for the individual and the nation.

In this connection, I would repeat the recent pledge made by President Johnson. The United States is ready to assist in a continentwide effort to develop production within Latin America of fertilizer, pesticides, and other products that are needed to increase agricultural output.

One of the frontier areas of applied science which we have begun to explore is the use of atomic energy for large-scale water desalination. The international symposium recently held in Washington has opened new vistas. A practical application is the feasibility study agreement signed between Mexico, the United States, and the International Atomic Energy Agency for a plant along the United States-Mexican border. As we look into the future, we see these beginnings—as well as the possibilities of communications satellites and other advanced technologies—offering great opportunities for the development of our hemisphere.

When I speak of the problems which Latin America confronts in the economic and social fields and of the work we must do together under the Alliance to solve them, the problems we face in North America are equally in my mind. There are too many citizens in my country who are not participating fully in the social, material and political mainstream of our society. The dynamics of advanced industrial life and of exploding cities pose problems as searching and challenging as those confronted at earlier stages of development. This is why President Johnson launched his Great Society program, coupled with a major effort in the civil rights field.

We intend that every one of our citizens shall be able to exercise his right to vote; that the elderly citizens of our country shall have available the best of medical care; that our educational system will reach out, find, and develop every talented child and youth in our society and train the next generation so that they can cope with the problems of the future, not of the past; that pockets of poverty be eliminated; that the great problems of urban society be overcome. None of this will prove easy. None of it will be done overnight. But these are our active purposes.

In a real sense, the Great Society program is to be understood as our national effort to achieve the goals we have all set for ourselves in the Charter of Punta del Este. For, as President Johnson said last September, in announcing a new international effort in the field of education: "This Nation's dream of a Great Society does not stop at the water's edge * * *."

The United States believes it would be desirable for the members of the Inter-American system to undertake charter commitments, one to another regarding the pursuit of those goals. These would be commitments among the members to take steps, severally, and together, in aid of the economic and social progress and the well-being of the nations of this hemisphere. In our view, the members of the OAS should undertake to act individually—through measures of self-help—and, in conjunction with the efforts of individual states to mobilize their own resources, to act cooperatively. Each member of the organization should be pledged to lend its assistance reciprocally to others in accordance with its constitutional processes.

IV

It is built deeply into our common values that economic development and social justice must be accompanied by respect for human rights and strengthened representative democracy. We have come to recognize that these two vital objectives are indivisible. For democratic institutions to prosper and personal freedom to flourish, the social and material needs of a people must be met. But, the reverse is also true. In order for a modern society to achieve sustained economic development, it is essential that its members have the freedom of expression and choice, of initiative and experimentation, to stimulate the creativity and drive which fuel the fires of modern economies. As we observe the performance of Communist regimes, we are increasingly convinced that human freedom is not only morally right, it is also the most efficient route to progress.

There are the underlying premises of our Charter of Punta del Este.

The other side of freedom is responsibility. The other side of the assertion of man's rights is his duty to respect and uphold the rights of his neighbor and the interest of the community. The earliest and most basic democratic texts, coming to us all from our common Mediterranean heritage, distinguished liberty from license, freedom from anarchy.

This dimension of democratic life has been driven in on us in my country as we have struggled to reconcile full employment with the avoidance of inflation; as we have worked to assure the political and social as well as the economic rights of all our citizens regardless of race or color; as we have set about to eliminate in our society the pockets of poverty. These enterprises require cooperation among every important segment of our national community, regardless of politics or social status. Such enterprises require, in a democracy, widespread consensus and acceptance of responsibility.

As I have observed the work of the American Republics—each seeking to carry out its government's commitments under the Charter of Punta del Este—I have been struck by the increasing recognition of this dimension of the democratic equation. I see coalitions beginning to emerge which, essentially, place national development plans above day-to-day politics. I see the beginning of efforts to check inflation by cooperation among government, industry, and labor. The building of this sense of common purpose will, I suspect, prove as important in the southern as in the northern portion of our hemisphere in the years and decades ahead. In free societies the struggle to preserve human freedom, to assure each of our citizens a full measure of participation in the democratic process, and to build what North Americans would call consensus—and what some of our Latin American friends might call the social contract—is never ending.

A sound point of departure in considering these issues is recognition of the fact that respect for human rights and the responsible exercise of representative democracy must grow from within, nurtured by economic progress, social maturity, and cultural advancement. The integral approach to development and reform under the Alliance for Progress is designed to help create these conditions.

In the field of human rights much remains to be done in our countries. Mine is no exception. Other nations of the hemisphere confront problems peculiar to their own societies. Looking back over the last few decades, I think notable progress has been made in the hemisphere in extending basic democratic rights to all our citizens. Progress may, perhaps, not be uniform. We may grow impatient with the pace. But the trend is definitely forward.

The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights is playing a significant role in this process. The responsible and efficient manner in which its members have performed their duties also deserves our warm praise. The confidence placed by the Dominican people in the Commission during recent months is a tribute to its effectiveness. Its efforts—added to the moral suasion of governments through encouragement, reaffirmation of principles and example, and the Alliance—constitute, I am convinced, the most effective tools now at our disposal to advance the cause of individual freedom.

We confront comparable difficulties in trying to promote representative democracy and constitutional government. In this area perhaps the problems are even more complex than in the field of human rights. The overthrow by force of constitutionally elected governments is to be deplored. But we all know that political development is a complex historical process and that simple, abstract formulas are not necessarily the guide to wise assessments.

Therefore, we need to examine coups not in general but in particular—on a case-by-case basis. A proposal advanced several months ago that the American governments agree to consult together when unconstitutional changes occur in the hemisphere, is a good one. In this way the facts can be examined, and each government can decide on the course which it will follow in the light of those facts and of the views of the other governments.

The regular ministerial consultations which many of us now envisage might permit us to discuss intimately and with candor problems of this type before they become acute. By deepening our common understanding of the political forces at work in the various parts of the hemisphere, we might be able to contribute to the strengthening of democratic process.

V

I turn now to the problems posed for us by the hard, continuing fact of aggressive Communist activities on the world scene and in our hemisphere.

Freemen fight communism because Communists—as a matter of doctrine, policy, and action—have sought to divert, subvert, and destroy what freemen aim to build.

Since World War II international communism has moved aggressively on the world scene with doctrines and tactics for world conquest. Behind the false banner of "wars of national liberation," communism seeks to accomplish by subversion what it knows it cannot achieve by democratic process or by open warfare. This is the issue in Vietnam. This explains the betrayal of the Cuba revolution. This was the design when Latin American Communist parties met in Havana a year ago. This is the objective of the guerrillas fighting in several of your countries. This is why all of us in this hemisphere must be constantly on the alert against subversive action whether inspired from Moscow, Havana, or Peiping.

Communists are apparently now dusting off one of their older doctrines for renewed emphasis in this hemisphere: the doctrine of "popular fronts." A Soviet writer recently described developments in the Dominican Republic "the beginning of a new period in which the conditions are being created for broad national, anti-imperialist fronts." In Marshal Lin Piao's famous article of September 2, he also counsels, as a first step toward Communist takeover, "using the weapon of the united front." And he adds ominously: "Within the united front, the Communist Party must maintain its ideological, political, and organizational independence * * * and insist on its leading role."

In all conscience, after a generation's experience of Communist tactics, there is little reason for any of us to be deceived by their familiar, old-fashioned tricks.

I would like to touch for a few moments on the situation in Vietnam. This is but the latest of a series of efforts by Communist powers to extend their imperialism by force of arms. Since 1945 we have seen these efforts in Greece, in Berlin, in Korea, in North Vietnam, in India, and now in South Vietnam. These engagements were not isolated, local incidents. They were part of a pattern to probe the defenses of the free world—to test our will, to sap our strength, to open doors for greater conquests. We have been required to meet the challenge. The cost in blood and treasure has been high. But this is the price for protecting freedom—not only of the countries directly concerned, but of freedom throughout the world. For what is taking place today in Vietnam is not only the struggle of the Vietnamese people and those fighting by their side; it is also your struggle and that of every other free nation.

The impact of Communist aggression has been sharply felt in our hemisphere. In 1959 communism gained a foothold in our hemisphere. Turning his back on the inter-American system, Castro joined forces with the Soviet Union and converted Cuba into a base for Communist subversion. At Punta del Este in January 1962, we moved to protect ourselves by declaring communism to be incompatible with the principles of the inter-American system and suspending the Castro regime from further participation in the system. At the same time, we urged member states to take those steps they may consider appropriate for their individual or collective self-defense in the face of Communist indirect aggression.

National and collective action has reduced, although it has by no means yet eliminated, the flow of arms and funds and subversive propaganda; the training of men in guerrilla warfare; and other actions designed to undermine the security of our peoples.

In October 1962, we faced the grave threat of Soviet offensive missiles in Cuba. By acting swiftly and decisively under the Rio Treaty, we brought about their prompt withdrawal.

Two years ago, Venezuela was the victim of a flagrant subversive effort directed from Cuba. Again the Rio Treaty operated to help the Venezuelan people meet this challenge. In the process, the system served notice on the Castro regime that indirect aggression, like direct armed attack, would not be tolerated by the Americas. We made clear that the principle of individual or collective self-defense may be applied in either circumstance.

Our common hemispheric purposes in the Dominican Republic are simple. In 1960, the governments of the hemisphere decided that the actions of the Trujillo regime required the imposition of political and economic sanctions. In 1962 we declared Marxist-Leninism incompatible with the inter-American system. What we are doing now is providing the citizens of the Dominican Republic the opportunity to choose a government which is neither of the Trujillo nor the Castro variety; for we know that when the people register their consent in the Dominican Republic—as elsewhere throughout the hemisphere—they will reject both extremes.

Given the tragic history of the Dominican Republic in the past two generations, we know the task will not be easy. But we all can play our part confident that our mission conforms to the most basic shared values and purposes of the inter-American system.

VI

There is, I think, a general and increasing awareness of the need for vigilance by the American Republics to safeguard its own institutions and democratic processes against threats of totalitarian takeover and rule, whether coming from the extreme right or from the extreme left. This is a national responsibility—one for each nation to solve for itself in its own way. Apart from the requirements of national action, this Conference can usefully consider what developments and changes in our organization would strengthen its ability to act in support of hemispheric peace and security.

The ability of the inter-American system to act promptly in times of crises has been reassuring for the future. But it is well for us at this stage in our development to take another look at our institutions and our methods in order to see whether we can improve upon them.

This Conference should decide how we might best proceed with the consideration of specific improvements in the inter-American system which our deliberations disclose as necessary. It seems to me that the task might be entrusted after this Conference to one or more bodies which would carry forward our work in preparation for a special conference, under article III of the charter, to meet possibly within the next 6 months.

At this stage I should like to advance for consideration some of the ideas that the United States believes could contribute to making our organization a more effective instrument.

First, the United States favors annual OAS meetings at ministerial level. The interaction and speed of developments in our hemisphere and elsewhere make it highly desirable that we meet with more regularity and frequency than we have before. The consultations should not be confined to our hemispheric problems alone. Developments in other areas might be reviewed both for their implications for us, as well as for what we might do to further the cause of peace and freedom elsewhere.

Second, we should strengthen the organizational relationship among the key organs of the system: the Ministers, the Council, the Economic and Social Council, CIAP, and the Secretariat. Our objective should be to integrate the various facets of our collective effort; to insure they are responsive to the agreed policies of governments; to insure that cooperation in the political, economic, social and cultural fields are mutually reinforcing and to insure that new operational tasks are carried forward with administrative efficiency and dispatch.

Third, in our forward planning we should think not only of measures to deal with a conflagration once it has broken out, but also of preventive steps the Organization might helpfully take in a dispute or situation in this hemisphere before it has reached the crisis stage. There is wisdom in the old diplomatic tradition—incorporated in United Nations doctrine—that bilateral disputes are best settled bilaterally. Nevertheless, the Council might be empowered to consider a dispute or situation at the request of one or more American Republics; to recommend procedures for peaceful settlement; and perhaps to recommend provisional measures designed to prevent an aggravation of the situation. The Council, in carrying out such functions, could avail itself of assistance from the Inter-American Peace Committee, from special commissions, and from the Secretary General.

Fourth, the United States would also support strengthening the institution and role of the Secretary General, authorizing him to bring to the attention of the Council any matter which, in his opinion, may endanger peace and security in the hemisphere.

Fifth, there is the question of joint action. Both in the Cuban missile crisis and in the Dominican situation, the discharge by the OAS of its responsibilities involved not merely the assumption of political responsibility but also the employment of units of the armed forces of various member states. These were contributed voluntarily and operated collectively under a combined command. In the crises of 1962, this action was decisive. In the case of the Dominican Republic, the Inter-American Peace Force made a vital contribution to the avoidance of needless bloodshed and the creation of conditions for the Dominican people to determine their own future by votes and not by arms. Its importance is attested by the fact that the Provisional government has called upon it for continued assistance in the maintenance of peace and stability.

The United Nations has, of course, had much more experience than has the OAS in this type of multilateral peacekeeping force. Many of your countries have made personnel available for both United Nations observation and military operations in several crisis situations.

It may, therefore, be useful for us to examine, in the light of experience and the nature of our collective responsibilities for peace and security in the hemisphere, and elsewhere, the desirability of establishing these voluntary contributions to international peacekeeping operations on a more orderly basis in advance of their possible future use by the OAS or by the U.N.

If we face the fact that we live in troubled times, if we face the fact that there are those who seek with purpose and persistence to destroy democracy, I believe, if we are patient, we shall find a creative way to recognize two important principles: first, we ought to be prepared to move fast and effectively and, if possible, together when a dangerous situation arises in the hemisphere; second, none of our governments is prepared to engage its military forces except by a national decision, at the highest level, in the light of particular circumstances.

Sixth, I would note the need to avoid within our hemisphere competitive arms races. Our resources are desperately needed for economic and social development. With all its imperfections we are blessed by the most mature and reliable system for regional security and peacekeeping on the face of the planet. As military budgets are formulated we should keep these facts before us—and the examples, past and present, of the burdens and consequences of all arms races.

The experience of the Cuban missile crisis gave to the Western Hemisphere a heightened awareness of the need to control modern weapons and to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. One of the initiatives that received added impetus in 1962 was the proposal to create a nuclear-free zone in Latin America. The United States has followed with keen and sympathetic interest the efforts of Latin American countries to work out agreed arrangements for excluding the proliferation, the stationing, or storage of nuclear weapons within the territory of Latin American States. We have noted the encouraging progress toward this end which was made during the current year at discussions in Mexico City. The United States believes the project of a nuclear-free zone in Latin America is constructive statesmanship in the best tradition of the hemisphere. We welcome the effort and would be glad to see it reach a successful conclusion.

I should also note that our membership may expand.

The emergence of two new, independent states—Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago—caused our organization to devise a formula for the admission of members. We found the formula without need to alter the charter. The door is now open to additional countries to join the OAS. We will welcome them wholeheartedly at such time as they wish to avail themselves of this opportunity.

VII

This, as we see it, is the panorama of our common tasks.

The intent of my country to work with you in the common quest for freedom and prosperity has never been as strong as it is today—to build together and together to protect what we are building. President Johnson has summed it up this way:

"Our charter charges each American country to seek to strengthen representative democracy. Without that democracy and without the freedom it nourishes, material progress is an aimless enterprise, destroying the dignity of the spirit that it is really meant to liberate. So we will continue to join with you and encourage democracy until we build a hemisphere of free nations from Tierra del Fuego to the Arctic Circle."

Thus we would reaffirm the faith of my Government in the effectiveness and vitality of our regional system. It has served to bring new levels of understanding and good will between our peoples. It has served to promote freedom and democracy. It has served, and is increasingly serving, as a means for achieving material well-being and social justice for our nations. It has served to keep the peace in this hemisphere and to protect us from our enemies.

The Organization has demonstrated its flexibility and adaptability to change in the past. I am confident that it will continue to do so in the future.

The challenge in this old hemispheric system is like the challenge of domestic political life: to transform and modernize policies and institutions in harmony with abiding principles and values, so that the problems of today and tomorrow can be met.

Together I am confident we shall meet that challenge.

Man Will Be Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world are focused on the Far East today.

For it is there that the question most sharply asked is: "Will men be free or will men be slaves?"

And the answer from courageous men is that man will live as a free individual.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN—my distinguished colleague from South Carolina and a great American—underscored those points in a stirring speech January 23 at Taipei, Republic of China.

His remarks are an inspiration to those who cherish freedom, a ray of hope to the nameless faces enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. His message was clear and should give pause for thought to those misguided despots laboring under the delusion that America is soft, or will fail her commitments in the Far East.

His speech is of such import that I commend it for reading by the Members of the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I hereby insert his message for the information of this body:

Men Will Be Free

(Address by Congressman WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN of South Carolina at the 12th annual Freedom Day Rally Taipei, the Republic of China, January 23)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I bring you the greetings and the admiration of the Congress of the United States and the American people. As a member of the advisory board of the National Captive Nations' Committee and on behalf of that committee I bring to you the best wishes of captive peoples all over the world. You, of the Republic of China, have won the enduring admiration of free peoples everywhere by your valiant and successful struggle to maintain the freedom of this island. You are the hope of freedom throughout the mainland. Your past is an inspiring saga of man's indomitable will to be free. Your present is a source of pride and hope to all who hate tyranny. Your future is nothing less than a promise to history.

We gather here today to commemorate the courage of the 22,000 freedom fighters who defied tyranny and chose freedom instead. We gather here today to commemorate those throughout the world who have similarly struggled to escape terrorism and torture, those who continue the struggle for freedom. We commemorate and pay homage to the millions who have died to preserve freedom.

It is fitting and proper that we observe Freedom Day. May we be encouraged and inspired to go forth from this spot as the spark of a great crusade to free the world of enslavement and oppression. The valor of these 22,000 Chinese and Korean prisoners will remain forever an inspiration to those who cherish freedom.

The eyes of the world are today focused on the Far East. For, as Abraham Lincoln said with reference to my own country, the world cannot continue half slave and half free. And it is here, in the Far East that the question is today being most sharply asked—will men be free or be slaves? It is here that the answer is being most plainly given. Men will be free.

It will not be easy—and there is no reason to think that it will be quick—for freedom faces a massive challenge in Asia, a challenge led by those as determined as they are evil. There will be disappointments, frustrations, and setbacks in the future as there have been in the past. But men will be free.

They will be free because the determination on the side of freedom is inexhaustible—and you are the proof of that. They will be free because the resources of the side of freedom are more than sufficient and the will to use those resources is as firm as rock.

Let no one be in any doubt about the commitment of the United States to the cause of freedom in Asia. The propaganda from Hanoi and Peiping expresses the constant hope that the determination of the United States will weaken, that the effort of the United States will falter. They are engaging in a dangerous delusion if they believe their own propaganda. They are making the fatal mistake of tyrants when they misinterpret a freeman's love of peace. Love of peace does not mean that we will meekly submit to tyranny. Love of peace does not mean that we will purchase it at the cost of freedom—ours or anyone else's. As President Johnson said earlier this month in his state of the Union message, "We do not intend to abandon Asia to conquest."

The Far East is the key area of the world geographically, economically, and politically. If totalitarianism should conquer the Far East, then all of Asia would fall. With Asia in Communist hands, Africa would be conquered. Western Europe would be outflanked and the forces of freedom would be in grave peril.

In Asia there are vast untapped resources of manpower, rubber, tin, oil, and uranium. These resources, under the control of Communist aggressors, would be used for conquest and war. These resources, under Communist control, would not be used for peace or enlightment, for improved health and education. Under Communist control these vast resources would not be used for the advancement of freedom. They would be used for war and enslavement.

May I remind you that the Communist aggressors consider the individual as mere grains of sand on the seashore to be used by the masters of tyranny for their own selfish aggrandizement. We believe man is created in the image of an all-powerful being. We believe that man has individual rights and aspirations, that he is entitled to dignity and individual liberty. This we believe. This we will defend.

Lenin is reported as having said the road to Paris is the road through Peiping. The Communists are ruthlessly liquidating the opposition and are proceeding on that road to Paris by way of southeast Asia, the Near East and northern Africa. To halt this blueprint for tyrannical power, conquest, and enslavement, the United States is spending its blood and wealth in South Vietnam. The United States manifested its devotion to the cause of freedom by expending the flower of its young manhood to defend that cause in Korea.

Our Commander in Chief, President Lyndon B. Johnson, is very wisely supporting with strength the freedom fighters in South Vietnam. President Johnson will not preside over the liquidation of freedom in Asia. He will instead preside over the restoration of freedom in Asia. He is a determined leader in the tradition of the Founding Fathers of my country. By his courageous action, President Johnson has encouraged people throughout the world who are devoted and dedicated to the cause of freedom.

We support you, here in the Republic of China, with our wealth and with our armed might. Your struggle for freedom is ours. We will not withdraw and leave you to fight this battle alone. We are here to stay until freedom is secure in Asia and the aggressor collapses in his own evil structure.

In the history of the struggle for freedom you have produced one of the giant figures of our time. General Chiang Kai-shek was among the first to understand the diabolical tactics and sinister designs of the Communist world conspiracy. He began his heroic struggle to oppose communism on the mainland in the 1920's, and he has been a world-renowned champion in that struggle from that time to this. He and Madame Chiang long ago won the hearts of the American people and of freedom lovers everywhere. Madame Chiang is now in my country, and we welcome her both as a valiant ally and as a warm and honored friend.

The Republic of China stands ready on the flank of Communist aggression. The Republic of China is blocking the road of Communist expansion to the islands of the Pacific. The Republic of China and the magnificent forces of the Republic of South Korea are a deterring force to the announced Communist plans to conquer India, southeast Asia, and move into the Middle and Near East. I salute you for this magnificent contribution to world freedom.

I salute you also for the assistance you are giving to the free world effort in Vietnam. You are one of the almost 40 nations which are helping the gallant people of that beleaguered land build a better life at the same time that they defend themselves against a cruel aggression. Your country is giving assistance in the field of agriculture. You have built power stations. You have sent medical teams. You have trained more than 400 Vietnamese technicians. You have given warehouses, agricultural equipment, seeds and fertilizers, veterinary equipment and cattle, boats, airplanes, and over half a million textbooks. And you have been generous in extending to our forces fighting in Vietnam both material facilities and hospitality. You are playing your full role as part of the fraternity of freemen opposing aggression in Vietnam.

The United States is fighting in South Vietnam as a member of that fraternity of freemen. We are fighting there against stark Communist aggression by terrorism, infiltration, sabotage, deception, and murder—the most diabolical and dangerous form of aggression. We are fighting in South Vietnam to preserve the right of self-determination of nationalities. We are fighting for peace, as opposed to the spread of war. We are fighting to help all of you in a righteous cause. We are fighting to prevent a world war. We are fighting to prevent a world holocaust of unparalleled carnage and destruction.

We are daily growing stronger on land, on sea, in the air, and in space. This strength is for freedom. This military might is dedicated to your independence, to your liberty. It will never be used for aggression, slavery, and conquest. The United States has no territorial designs anywhere in the world. We are for liberty and individual dignity and freedom for peoples everywhere. We believe in lending a helping hand to the diseased and the underprivileged throughout the world.

We are standing beside all of you in this struggle for freedom to preserve your ancient heritage, your art, your culture—which precedes ours—to preserve your civilization, which began thousands of years before ours. We share your hopes and your aspirations for the future. In this age of science and astronautics, there is no room for Communist suspicion, hatred, bigotry, and deceit. I look to the future with hope and with confidence. I believe we are on the dawn of a new era.

The magnificent progress made on this island shows what free societies can accomplish. The growth in your production of both agricultural and industrial goods can only be described as startling. Your exports are rising, your economy is strong, your currency is sound. Most important of all, the benefits of this prosperity are going to the people. I am proud that my country has assisted you in your efforts. And I know that you are proud that through your own efforts you have done so well that in your country we have been able to end our foreign aid program.

The iron curtain in Europe and Asia is a manifestation of an inferiority complex. The iron curtain is necessary to hide tyranny and promote totalitarianism. The Iron Curtain is designed to keep people from knowing the truth—to prevent them from knowing the joys of freedom and self-determination of peoples, individual liberty, dignity, and economic opportunity.

I can assure you that the United States will stand firm throughout the world. We fought in Korea. We are fighting in Vietnam. We are with you here. We were with you in Korea, in Quemoy, and in Matsu. We are supporting SEATO in southeast Asia and NATO in Europe. We will oppose Communist aggression wherever it rears its ugly head.

The time has come to launch an offensive—an offensive of truth about freedom, the truth about stark Communist aggression and its sinister designs. We must offer hope for the captive peoples of the world to throw off the yoke of tyranny and again live in the sunlight of freedom. We must spread the truth, throughout the world, about Communist imperialism and colonialism. We must tell the truth about class hatred and race prejudice of Communist imperialists—the truth about their liquidations, murder, and deceit.

We must not reward Red Chinese aggression by giving Red China a seat in the United Nations. We must not dignify Red China by giving her a forum and a vote on the cause of freedom. We must not bolster her economic system with the trade of free nations and peoples dedicated to the cause of human dignity. It would be a grave mistake to bolster her sagging economy with the products of free enterprise nations. We must not make this same mistake again. The free nations of the world promoted trade with the dictators of World War II. It was their acquisition of products from free enterprise nations that largely enabled them to launch a war against private enterprise, property rights, dignity, and freedom of the individual. We cannot make this mistake again. Red China has the atomic bomb. She is perfecting the hydrogen bomb. Trade with the free world will enable her to have the hydrogen bomb, with which to launch an onslaught against civilization, in mass production at an early date. We must push our freedom offensive now.

Captive nations and peoples hold the key to the future security, independence, and freedom of the world. Remain steadfast in your struggle for freedom. Captive nations are the "Achilles heel" of Red imperialist aggression. Communism fears your yearning, your desire for freedom. Communism fears your courage and your ability to someday rise and turn back the tide of tyranny.

You have our hearts. You have our sympathy, our support, and our understanding. We share your hopes. We share your aspirations. Most of all, we share your sure and certain vision of the future: Men will be free.

Resolution Providing for Brumidi Bust Gains Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted at the overwhelming response of my colleagues who have joined me in introducing identical concurrent resolutions urging the House of Representatives to authorize the expenditure of $2,500 in order that a bust of Constantino Brumidi may be placed in the Capitol.

I have received many letters from my colleagues advising me of their wholehearted support in this effort to bestow recognition on Constantino Brumidi. It is my pleasure to insert these letters in the RECORD.

My heart is filled with joy and gratitude at this encouraging response and I take this opportunity to express my appreciation to all of you who have pledged support for this long overdue recognition of Brumidi.

I have talked with the distinguished chairman of the House Administration

Committee, Hon. **Omar Burleson**, of Texas, and he has assured me that the subcommittee of the House Administration Committee, which is chaired by the Honorable **Paul C. Jones** of Missouri, will hold hearings on this legislation as soon as possible. I am certain that the members of the House Administration Subcommittee, as well as the House Administration Committee, after reviewing all the facts, will unanimously approve this worthwhile endeavor.

Once again, I thank all of my colleagues for their enthusiastic support of this resolution. Your active efforts will insure its early enactment.

The letters from my colleagues follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of January 12, and its enclosures—a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 531 which you have introduced to authorize procurement of a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi for placement in the Nation's Capitol and your press release on this matter.

I share your concern that this talented artist, who contributed so much to the beauty of the U.S. Capitol, be honored in a fitting manner, and I will be pleased to give House Concurrent Resolution 531 every consideration when it comes to the floor of the House of Representatives for action.

Sincerely yours,
EDNA F. KELLY.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: Just a short note to tell you that I am more than happy to be able to introduce an identical resolution such as House Concurrent Resolution 531.

I have this day put it into the hopper and shall look forward to receiving my confirmation copies.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: Following your note about Brumidi, I will introduce a like resolution. This is mainly because I admire Congressman ANNUNZIO just about as much as I do Artist Brumidi.

Yours,
JOHN G. DOW.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1966.

The Honorable FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: Pursuant to the excellent suggestion made in your recent letter, I have on January 18 introduced a concurrent resolution which is identical with your House Concurrent Resolution 531.

My bill is known as House Concurrent Resolution 544.

Please be assured of my continued support to obtain passage of this legislation which will bring due recognition, however belated it may be, to Artist Constantino Brumidi, "Citizen of the United States."

Aloha and best wishes.
Sincerely,
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Thank you for contacting me with reference to your proposal that a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi be placed in the Capitol.

I'm for your bill wholeheartedly.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,
E. C. GATHINGS.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: Thank you for your letter and copy of your resolution to honor Brumidi.

I appreciate your sending me this resolution, and I will introduce it shortly.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
PAUL A. FINO,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Suite 1429, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: Thank you for your letter of January 12 and enclosed copy of your resolution, which would authorize the procurement of a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi for placement in the Nation's Capitol.

I am happy to inform you that I have today introduced a similar resolution, and I hope this legislation will be enacted during this session of the 89th Congress.

With warm personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM T. MURPHY,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Longworth House Office Building.

DEAR FRANK: I thought you might be interested in knowing that today I introduced in the House a concurrent resolution identical to House Concurrent Resolution 531 which you introduced on January 12.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
JOHN N. ERLENBORN,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Longworth House Office Building.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Thank you for calling my attention to House Concurrent Resolution 531. You have done well in securing recognition for an outstanding artist and a great American.

I am proud to support you in giving this well deserved recognition.

Cordially and sincerely,
BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: I appreciate your writing me with reference to your House Concurrent Resolution 531 which would recognize the outstanding artist and great American, Constantino Brumidi.

As you know, this legislation is pending before the House Administration Committee, of which I am a member. It certainly shall have my support and vote.

Sincerely,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
U.S. Congressman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: I am happy to join with you in this long overdue tribute to Constantino Brumidi and will put my bill in next week.

Kind personal regards.
Sincerely yours,
JOHN M. MURPHY,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Thank you for sending me your resolution and information on Constantino Brumidi.

I support your resolution, and will vote for it when it comes before the House.

With best wishes.
Sincerely,
DONALD M. FRASER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: It is my pleasure to introduce a bill identical to your House Concurrent Resolution 531 giving recognition to Constantino Brumidi.

Be assured of my support in securing passage of this resolution.

Very truly yours,
ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: This is in reference to your letter of January 12. I will be glad to support House Concurrent Resolution 531, to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi to be placed on the first floor of the Senate wing of the Capitol.

With best regards,
Sincerely,
RICHARD BOLLING.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1966.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: I appreciated receiving your letter of January 12, 1966, and I will support you in your efforts.

I am asking my staff to prepare an identical resolution, and I will plan to introduce it in the near future.

With best regards.

Yours very truly,

Brock Adams,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1966.

Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: I'm all for you. Count on my support for House Concurrent Resolution 531.

Donald Rumsfeld,
Representative in Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 13, 1966.

Hon. Frank Annunzio,
Member of Congress.
1429 Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Colleague: I want to thank you for your letter of January 12, 1966, with reference to House Concurrent Resolution 531 to provide a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi for the Capitol.

I agree with you that Brumidi should have a place of honor in the Capitol. I am happy to join with you in introducing legislation to provide a suitable bust for the Capitol of this great Italo-American artist.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

Basil L. Whitener,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1966.

Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Colleague: Thank you for your letter of January 12 and enclosure, House Concurrent Resolution 531.

I shall be very happy to introduce an identical concurrent resolution in the very near future.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

T. J. Dulski.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1966.

Hon. Frank Annunzio,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: It will be an honor and a pleasure for me to introduce your bill relating to the distinguished artist, Constantino Brumidi.

I plan to do so next week.

Sincerely,

Wm. Jennings Bryan Dorn,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1966.

Hon. Frank Annunzio,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Colleague: I acknowledge with thanks your letter of January 12 and enclosures concerning House Concurrent Resolution 531.

I shall be glad to support your proposal to provide proper recognition to Constantino Brumidi.

Sincerely yours,

John S. Monagan,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1966.

Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: Thank you for your letter of January 12 and the enclosed copy of House Concurrent Resolution 531.

I am pleased to advise you that I have today introduced a similar House concurrent resolution.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

Bill.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1966.

Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: I congratulate you upon your introduction of the resolution to provide a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi to be placed in the Capitol.

This should have prompt approval by the Congress and I am glad to join in introducing a similar resolution.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

Bob Sikes.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1966.

Hon. Frank Annunzio,
U.S. House of Representatives, Room 1429,
Longworth Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Colleague: Thank you kindly for your recent letter enclosing a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 531 and your press release on it.

I am pleased to advise I have today introduced a bill identical to yours and want you to know I will support this legislation and lend any assistance I can to get prompt action.

I appreciate your contacting me on this matter and will be happy to cooperate in every way I can.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth J. Gray,
U.S. Congressman.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1966.

Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: Enclosed please find a copy of the House concurrent resolution which I introduced.

I think this is a fine thought and a very appropriate gesture at this time.

Yours very truly,

Brock Adams,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1966.

Hon. Frank Annunzio,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: Appreciated receiving your letter of January 12, enclosing a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 531 and your release. I believe your idea is certainly a good one, with considerable merit, and you may be sure I'll do what I can to help.

Meanwhile, with kindest best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

Jack Brooks,
Member of Congress.

SENATE

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, maker of heaven and earth, who, when darkness was upon the face of the deep, didst say: *Let there be light*—and there was light. Draw near to Thy children now in this troubled hour when darkness covers the path ahead.

For in this night of unreason our feet stumble into pitfalls and senseless strife; our minds grapple in confusion, so often blind with ancient prejudice; and the peoples of this little planet, frantic with fear, strike at each other in the dark.

Save us in this fearsome hour we pray, O God, for we are like children crying in the night. Children crying for the light, and with no language but a cry. Let, then, our cry come unto Thee, O Father, for the light of Thy salvation.

Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King.

Nor for this land alone.
But be God's mercies shown
From shore to shore;
And may the nations see
That men should brothers be,
And form one family
The wide world o'er.

In the name of the Savior of the world. Amen.

Mr. MANSFIELD rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am not seeking recognition, Mr. President.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will please state his inquiry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Before the Journal is read, it is my understanding that it is subject to a point of order if there is no quorum present, and the request for a quorum is made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct in his observation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator withhold that suggestion, so that I may make a request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I withhold it.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal be considered as read.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I renew my request. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 10 Leg.]

Aiken
Bass
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Douglas
Eastland
Fong
Gruening
Harris
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
Mondale
Montoya
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Robertson
Stennis
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms is directed to execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. Allott, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Gore, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Morse, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Russell of South Carolina, Mr. Russell of Georgia, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Symington, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Young of North Dakota entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. What is the present business before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is just about to read rule III, which directs the course of procedure for the Senate. Rule III reads:

> The Presiding Officer having taken the chair, and a quorum being present, the Journal of the preceding day shall be read, and any mistake made in the entries corrected. The reading of the Journal shall not be suspended unless by unanimous consent; and when any motion shall be made to amend or correct the same, it shall be deemed a privileged question, and proceeded with until disposed of.

THE JOURNAL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed with the reading of the Journal.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Assuming that amendments are offered to the Journal, my understanding is that they are all debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

The Journal will be read.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the Journal of Monday, January 24, 1966.

During the reading, the following occurred:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate wanted to hear the Journal read. The Chair suggests that Senators seat themselves and listen to the reading of the Journal.

(At this point Mr. Bass assumed the chair.)

The legislative clerk resumed the reading of the Journal.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia in the chair). The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Has the morning hour officially closed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the Journal is of the highest privilege, and that must be completed first.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My question was, Has the morning hour closed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two hours have passed, and under the rules of the Senate, the morning hour runs for 2 hours; but under the rules of the Senate also, the reading of the Journal must be completed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand. If the Chair will indulge me one more question, Do I understand that when the reading of the Journal shall have been concluded, automatically, 2 hours having passed, the morning hour will be closed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair answers that question in the affirmative, and refers the Senator to rule VIII, at the beginning of page 11 of the Senate rules manual.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Chair does not have to prove his statement. I take his word for it.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that today, January 25, 1966, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 327. An act to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8210. An act to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act with respect to the European Space Research Organization; and

H.R. 8445. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia in the chair). The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Journal now considered as having been read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk has concluded the reading.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. JAVITS and Mr. COOPER addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The motion is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, if it will not interfere, but the motion is not debatable.

Mr. COOPER. I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana withhold his motion?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, but not for insertions, because I told my own Senators they could not do so.

Mr. JAVITS. How about a bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Whatever is done otherwise, I do not want to get into an argument on this question. If there is to be too much argumentation over it, I will go back to my orginal position, because I pointed out to Democrats what I was about to do.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Some of us had announced that we would make short statements today and I desire to speak briefly on Vietnam. On the first day of the Congress, I had planned to speak on

Vietnam. But on the first day of the Congress the Senate recessed until Wednesday evening when the President was to speak.

I know that the recess on opening day was appropriate. But today I had said I would make a short statement on Vietnam. Now I find I am not going to be able to do so.

With all deference to the majority leader, this side, too, has some right to have a chance to be heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator allow me to answer the question he raised?

Mr. COOPER. We could agree on a certain time period for this session today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say to the Senator from Kentucky that I called the distinguished minority leader this morning and said that it was my intention to move that the Journal be considered as read, and to have a regular morning hour so that speeches could be given; in other words, to have the regular procedure followed.

I was informed by the distinguished minority leader that it was the intention of those who are opposed to the repeal of section 14(b) that they had already decided that the Journal would be read in full. I accepted that position because there was nothing else I could do.

When Democratic Members came in, some of them with speeches and statements of various kinds, I told them it was my intention to adjourn the session after the conclusion of the morning business.

I might say in all frankness that I am doing this to get into a little more favorable position than I was placed in this morning.

As far as any discrimination being shown against Members on the Republican side of the aisle is concerned, I assure the Senator from Kentucky—and I know he feels that was not my intention, and will never be—that I am faced with a position in which I have come up against a proposition which has been forced upon me.

As I stated yesterday, I intend to do all I can, within the rules of the Senate and on the basis of stating the facts ahead of time to the interested parties, to move, as I shall shortly do, that the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow.

I hope the Senator from Kentucky understands the predicament in which I find myself. I assure him, so far as I am concerned, that there is no Senator whom I would rather hear speak on Vietnam than the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the majority leader's statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. Will the Senator from Illinois permit me to respond?

I appreciate as much as anyone in the Chamber the position of the majority leader. We know his honesty, fairness, and justice to all of us.

I cannot deny his right to make these decisions. I know they will be supported by his party, and today by the majority of the Members on this side of the aisle.

However, not that what I might say will be conclusive, but Vietnam is an issue which concerns all of us. Naturally I had looked forward to saying something about it, chiefly as a result of some conclusions I have drawn after two visits there in the last 6 weeks.

I shall have an opportunity to speak on this question tomorrow. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say to the distinguished Senator that the adjournment tonight, if it is agreed to, will permit a morning hour tomorrow. That is one of the reasons why I shall make this motion shortly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The majority leader is absolutely correct. He has been eminently fair at all times. He called me this morning. He has to use the weapons he can in order to carry out his responsibility. We have a deep and abiding conviction about what we are doing and we have to use what weapons we can. I am delighted this has always been done in the very best of grace and never with any feeling about it. We approach this as a couple of craftsmen trying to do their work.

The majority leader has been very fair in calling and making this request this morning. I told him it was our belief that we had to use this one weapon and we have used it.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to make this explanation.

I understand the position of the majority leader, as does the minority leader. I happen to be on the side of the majority leader on the 14(b) proposal.

I had intended to introduce this morning the Alcoholism Control Act of 1966, for myself, Senators FANNIN, MURPHY, PROUTY, and SCOTT.

I understand that I shall have to do it on the first available occasion, which I gather will be tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is to be hoped. I thank the Senator. Before I yield to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], may I express my deep personal regret to the Senator from Kentucky. I feel quite deeply about this.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR REPORTING S. 976 AND S. 1912

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, during the first session of this Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary favorably reported to the Senate two bills, S. 976 and S. 1912, to amend the bankruptcy law. The corresponding House bill numbers are H.R. 3438 and H.R. 136, respectively.

After the bills were reported to the Senate, the Committee on Finance evidenced an interest in the tax aspects of the two measures. Therefore, according to a unanimous-consent agreement entered into on August 12, 1965, the bills were referred to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report back by February 1, 1966. On December 12, 1965, the Supreme Court handed down a decision which has considerable relevance to this proposed legislation. The Treasury Department has now proposed several amendments to these bills which require additional consideration by the Finance Committee. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the cosponsors of the bills, Senator HRUSKA and I, agree that an extension of time is in order.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the RECORD show that the return day for these bills be February 15, 1966, in lieu of February 1, 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, at (1 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 26, 1966, at 11 o'clock a.m.

* * *

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Constantine Berdar, St. Josaphat's Ukrainian Catholic Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

May all honor and glory ever be Thine, our God, and may it ever be worshipfully offered to Thee by all the citizens of this, our beloved country.

We have indeed, as a nation and individuals, been the recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven; we have been preserved these many years in liberty and prosperity; we have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no nation has ever grown. To Thee do we, therefore, send up our heartfelt gratitude.

We beseech Thee to preserve us, our Nation, and our leaders in love of Thee and of freedom and of justice and of honor. Endow us all with these virtues, that in keeping them we may ever be a light of hope to the downtrodden and enslaved, a haven of rest for the oppressed and poverty-stricken.

On this day, when we observe the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, short-lived though it was, we offer to Thee, our God, our special thanks for the understanding You have given to the Members of Congress who have espoused and championed the cause of freedom for Ukraine and all the captive nations. They have on numerous occasions shown, in word and action, their wholehearted support for any action, proposal, or effort which would further the cause of freedom and self-determination among the subjugated nations and peoples of the world. Grant them the courage to continue in these efforts until every last vestige of slavery and injustice will have been wiped off the face of the earth.

Do Thou, our great God, look with favor upon the Ukrainian nation and people, and upon all those peoples and nations who have borne the burden of slavery and oppression all these many years.

Grant, we beg Thee, that truth and justice prevailing, they may take their place among the family of free nations to bring to their people and to the world, a just and lasting peace. Through the Prince of Peace, Thy Son, and Thy Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth and Love, do we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7723. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods; and

H.R. 7813. An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the Part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the Report of the Archivist of the United States No. 66–9.

FORT KNOX FEDERAL CREDIT UNION DOING ITS PART IN WAR AGAINST LOAN SHARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in two instances and include certain extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems facing the lower grade enlisted serviceman is obtaining adequate, reliable, and low-cost credit sources, particularly in times of emergency.

Most of the reliable credit channels are closed to young servicemen, forcing them to deal with high rates, and far too often unethical finance companies. Loans from this type of institution sometimes carry interest rates as high as 65 percent and the serviceman normally finds himself paying hundreds of dollars for padded service and insurance charges.

However, I am happy to report that through the work of credit unions on military bases throughout the United States, the plight of the young serviceman in the area of consumer finance is not as severe as it has been in the past. In August, the Department of Defense issued DOD Directive 1000.9, which for the first time spells out in detail the Department's policy and attitudes toward credit unions. Of particular significance is a section of the directive which calls on credit unions to pay specific attention to the credit needs of the lower enlisted grades, E–1, E–2, E–3, and E–4.

One of the outstanding examples of what a credit union can do to help the lower grade enlisted man is being carried out by the Fort Knox Federal Credit Union and its dynamic manager, Robert Schaffner.

During the period from November 10 through December 20, 1965, the Fort Knox Credit Union granted roughly 400 loans to military and civilian members. However, it is particularly significant that 150 of the loans were granted to servicemen in the pay grades of E–2, E–3, and E–4. The amount of these loans ranged from $25 to $417, with a majority of the loans used to enable the serviceman to visit his family during Christmas leave. Some loans were used to purchase Christmas presents, others for automobile repairs, educational expenses, and in three cases, the loans were used for marriage expenses.

Mr. Speaker, the work of the Fort Knox Credit Union not only brought happiness to the Christmas holidays for many of these soldiers, and in three cases contributed toward a successful marriage, but also has performed in another area. As Mr. Schaffner points out:

> Many of these young soldiers have established credit for the first time in their lives. By properly handling the repayment of their accounts as they have agreed, each one of these individuals has an opportunity to develop a good credit reference for future use.

If all military credit unions would follow the lead of the Fort Knox Credit Union, it would go a long way toward putting an end to the camp-follower finance companies that in the past have bilked servicemen out of unknown thousands, if not millions, of dollars.

CONGRESS SHOULD STOP INTEREST RATE WAR NOW

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the Congress to put a stop to the senseless escalation of the interest rate war.

Every day we are witnessing banks and savings and loan institutions leapfrogging over one another in this destructive competition for savings accounts.

The Federal Reserve Board touched off this war with its December 3, 1965, decision effective December 6, 1965, to allow banks to pay as much as 5½ percent on certificates of deposit. Board Chairman William McChesney Martin and his public relations staff did everything possible to hide the fact about this part of the interest rate increase. This side of the story was barely mentioned in the Federal Reserve Board's early statements about the increase in the discount rate.

This is something that Mr. Martin would have liked to have kept just between himself and the big banks that stood to profit so greatly from the December 3 order.

But Mr. Martin can no longer hide the ugly consequences of his decision. The interest battle has spiraled out of control, and the Federal Reserve Board is apparently unable or unwilling to bring it under control. Therefore, I feel strongly that it is the duty of this Congress to take whatever action is necessary to bring this dangerous interest rate war to an end. We cannot allow this to go on if we are to take our jobs as responsible legislators seriously.

No longer can the Congress afford to take a "head-in-the-sand" attitude. Even conservative journals like Time magazine are recognizing the serious implications of this Martin-inspired war. The January 7 issue of Time magazine carries a significant article entitled "Money—Battle of Interest," which I insert at this point in my remarks:

MONEY—BATTLE OF INTEREST

Rarely in recent years had there been such a rush of banks and savings and loan associations to lure deposits from the public. From New York to Los Angeles, financial institutions splurged with big-sized ads offering the average saver a return of 4½ percent, 4.85 percent, even 5½ percent. This growing struggle for savings is the most vivid result to date of the Federal Reserve Board's month-old boost in the discount rate and its simultaneous increase (from 4½ to 5½ percent) in the maximum interest that banks may pay on time deposits of 30 days or more. Some of the combatants seem distinctly unhappy—but the battle is on.

Like the reward for saving, the cost of borrowing has shot aloft in response to the Reserve Board's action. The impact has fallen chiefly on businessmen; by last week almost every commercial bank in the United States had lifted its minimum rate on commercial loans one-half of 1 percent—to 5 percent or more. Interest rates on home mortgages jumped by at least 0.1 percent in many areas; in Chicago the typical rate climbed from 5½ to 5¾ percent. Auto buyers will begin to feel the rub next month—not from higher interest rates but from slightly higher prices in some cities. Reason: major finance companies, California's giant Bank of America and several Philadelphia banks, boosted from 5 to 5½ percent the rate that they charge to bankroll stocks of cars in dealers' hands.

The tug of war for consumers' savings spread out spottily across the Nation from New York, increasing in complexity as it grew. Most big Manhattan commercial banks lifted their rates from 4¼ to 4½ percent on certificates of deposit—the most popular form of time deposit. They also began offering a wider variety of minimum denominations (generally $1,000 to $2,500) and time limits (6 to 12 months) to broaden the appeal of certificates of deposit from corporations to individuals.

Long Island's $1.5 billion Franklin National Bank, a traditional maverick, offered 4.8 percent for 5-month savings certificates (a form of deposit certificate) as small as $19.69. At least 15 New York savings banks hit back by lifting their savings-account rate to 4½ percent—a full one-half of 1 percent above the legal limit for rival commercial banks. Last week the 4½ percent savings rate spread to savings and loans in Minneapolis, Dallas, Kansas City, and parts of Missouri. By week's end, savings and loan men estimated that 250 savings and loans and at least 100 banks had raised their rates on regular or certificate-of-deposit savings.

Predictably, these pressures produced demands for restraint by lenders and for more

Federal controls. The New York State Savings Banks Association urged the Federal Reserve to reduce the competition by establishing guidelines calling for a $25,000 minimum on commercial-bank certificates of deposit. Reserve Board Member Sherman Maisel cautioned bankers that raising interest rates on savings could prove inefficient and dangerous. Nonetheless, the temptation seems likely to increase. It will take another 3 to 6 months before the full effect of the discount-rate increase filters through the complex U.S. economy.

Mr. Speaker, there is strong evidence that even Mr. Martin is becoming alarmed at the skyrocketing nature of the war. He has issued warnings to the banks against pushing the time deposit rate to the maximum of 5½ percent—the maximum which Mr. Martin himself established on December 3. The Federal Reserve Board Chairman now attempts to close the barn door long after the cows have escaped.

As anyone could have predicted, Mr. Martin's weak-kneed pleas for restraint are going unheeded by the banks. They do not take his requests for voluntary restraint seriously. After all, he is the man that turned them loose in the first place.

The banks' executives know that Mr. Martin could stop this increased war today if he could summon the courage to rescind the December 3 order. But it is an open secret in financial circles that Mr. Martin does not want to stop this rate escalation bad enough to embarass his banker allies who provide his support on the Federal Reserve Board.

It is becoming obvious that Mr. Martin, as a captive of the banking community, is unable to perform his functions in the public interest. Undoubtedly, Mr. Martin, like most economists and monetary experts, sees the increasing danger of this escalating interest rate battle. However, his hands are tied by his allegiance to the banks. He cannot take action now in the public interest without severing ties with the powerful financial interests which maneuvered him into this position. For all of his vaunted statements about independence, William McChesney Martin is today a sad little pawn of a handful of big banks.

Can the Congress sit back and idly watch this destructive turn of events? Can we sit back and watch the bankers dangle the Federal Reserve Board as if it were little more than a cheap puppet show?

If we do sit idly by, then this Congress, as well as Mr. Martin, must share in the blame and the embarassment which is certain to follow. The newspapers and magazines are filled with stories calling attention to the leapfrogging of interest rates. The newspapers are filled with advertisements of higher and higher interest rates being offered by various financial institutions. The newspaper comment is summed up well in a story by Hobart Rowen which appeared in the financial section of the Washington Post on January 20. I include this excellent article in my remarks at this point:

RATES LEAPFROG IN INTEREST WAR—SOME BANKS PAYING MORE THAN 5 PERCENT

(By Hobart Rowen)

All across the country, interest rates are climbing—in many cases to record highs. In response to the classic law of supply and demand, lenders including banks and others who are strapped for funds, are offering more and more inducements to those with money to save.

Thus, in a stiff competitive fight for deposits, major banks have begun to pay 4¾ percent on special savings certificates, and Treasury officials yesterday had word of a few paying as much as 5⅛ percent for certain large deposits.

Typically, savings and loan associations in the East have boosted their dividend rates from 4¼ to 4½ percent. And just this week, in an attempt to keep within hailing distance of the competition, the Government decided to hike the interest it pays on savings bonds from 3¾ to a probable 4 percent.

HEAVY LOAN DEMAND

Some observers, noting the tremendous—and largely unexpected—demand for loans have openly wondered whether or not the Federal Reserve will again step in to raise the discount rate, the level at which member banks can borrow from the Fed.

They note that the 4½-percent discount rate set only December 3 is once again less than the prevailing Treasury bill rate—which theoretically means that member banks can borrow from the Fed, and turn a profit simply by buying Treasury securities.

But there is no automatic relationship between the discount rate and the bill rate. The Federal Reserve, by its operations at the discount window, can turn away prospective borrowers among the banks. Instead of boosting the discount rate, the Fed might later tighten up on bank reserves.

If the Fed decides to cool off the blazing money markets, an appropriate time for it to act would be after a major Treasury financing in February.

OPPOSITE HAPPENED

Whatever happens in the next few weeks, the tremendous credit expansion recently has caught many professionals by surprise. They had missed last year, predicting that bond prices would go up (with yields therefore declining). The opposite happened: bond prices dipped and interest rates shot up.

The bond market experts haven't been prepared for a repeat this year, but now confess that the same thing may be happening.

"The market is scared," said one well-informed expert, "and as a result, we've had this leapfrogging effect on rates."

Banks have had to assume that loan demand will continue at recent record levels, although the President's new budget, calling for a deficit sharply less than fiscal 1966 (and hence, less competitive borrowing pressure from the Treasury) should ease total demands.

Some experts, including some Treasury officials, see scattered signs that the money markets may have hit about their worst point, and that a relaxation may set in soon.

"We may be near a peak of demand," says one source, "but until we know we're there, the banks have to assume that loan demand will be heavy—which means they will be in there competing for CD (certificate of deposit) money."

Although the rate is a bonanza for savers and investors, it is a headache to those who must borrow money.

For example, the Dallas Power & Light Co. this week had to pay a 4.865 percent annual net interest cost on $20 million worth of first mortgage bonds. That rate was the highest on triple-A-rated electric utility bonds since April 1960.

REFLECTS BUSINESS BOOM

Another major borrower, of course, is Uncle Sam. Not only is the Government about to pay higher interest on savings bonds—it already is doing so on other types of securities. The Treasury 13-week bill rate—reflecting the price paid for short-term money—rose this week to the highest level on record—4.673 percent. The previous high was 4.670 percent in December 1960.

Three- to five-year Government securities were yielding 4.85 percent in December, compared to 4.06 percent in January 1965.

The high-interest rate, tight-money pattern has its origins in the booming economy, which just after midyear last year had the evolving demands of Vietnam thrust upon it.

Businessmen demanded more money to finance plant expansion. And then the Federal Reserve Board added fuel to the fire by raising the discount rate in December from 4 to 4½ percent. At the same time, it allowed banks to go as high as 5½ percent in the rates they could pay for time deposits.

FEAR FROZEN LEVEL

"I wonder," says a money market expert, "how we ever get back down to a lower interest rate pattern compatible with sustained economic growth. It's going to be tough."

Rates have moved only one way since the Fed's 4–3 decision on December 3 (announced December 5). In the Washington area, most commercial banks have raised the rates they pay on certificates of deposit to 4½ percent, with a wide variation of time periods and minimum amounts. One small Fairfax County bank, National Bank of Commerce, said it would pay 5.5 percent—but a check shows it has accepted just a trickle of funds at that rate.

Locally, savings and loans have gone up to 4.5 percent on standard savings accounts, with a few paying 4.75 percent on savings left untouched for a year or more.

This week, the First National City Bank in New York said it would pay up to 4¾ percent on savings certificates of $2,500 or more. That was the second ¼-percent boost in 6 weeks.

UP TO 5 PERCENT IN NEW YORK

Some small New York banks, actively competing with the larger institutions, are doing even better. Franklin National Bank, for example, is paying as much as 4.80 percent for certificates denominated as low as $25. The Meadow Brook National Bank offered to pay 5 percent on 1-year certificates of $2,500 or more.

On negotiable certificates of deposit—usually sold in minimum amounts of $100,000—the rate for 90 days and longer ranges from 4.90 to 5.00 percent in New York.

Commercial finance companies—who make loans on autos and for other consumer purposes—themselves have boosted the rates they will pay savers to a range of 4¾ to 4⅞ percent.

Mr. Speaker, the newspapers, the magazines, the television and radio networks are calling attention to this leapfrogging war. Yet, so far, the Congress has been noticeably deaf on the issue.

As this congressional hearing defect continues, the banks move upward toward the maximum interest rates. In fact, many have already reached the 5½-percent mark. The next step, providing the Congress continues its silence, undoubtedly will be a new request for yet higher interest rates.

Even if we were to ignore the consequences of these actions in the private money market, then surely we have a definite and mandatory duty to safeguard the Federal Government's own financing. Are we in the Congress to ignore the fact that 91-day Treasury bills are being forced to all-time highs as a result of the Martin interest-rate war? All of us in this body know that on Monday, January 17, these 91-day Treasury securities were bringing 4.673—the highest yield in their history. Can we as elected representatives of the people honestly say that we have no responsibility in this area?

The interest war is putting a heavy pressure on all Government credit programs. One interest rate leaps over another interest rate and then on and on we go. The consumer, who must ultimately pay all of these increased costs, sits on the sidelines powerless to act in his own behalf.

It is we as Members of Congress who have a solemn duty to provide protection for the public in this vital area. If we fail, we are certain to see new pressures for even higher interest rates. And who doubts that the Federal Reserve Board will give in quickly to these new requests just as they did in December.

The Federal Reserve Board's action in December was simply the byproduct of direct pressure from the big banks. A majority of the Federal Reserve Board felt an obligation to cave in to this pressure and to bail out a handful of big banks.

The facts are there in black and white. Not even members of the Board deny them. A small number of big banks were holding about $16½ billion in certificates of deposit on December 3 when the Federal Reserve Board acted. Most of these deposits represented funds of the Nation's big corporations. The great majority of these certificates were coming due in December, January, February, and March. The banks desperately wanted to hold on to these deposits.

To do this, the banks had to have higher interest rates. Otherwise, the corporations would have pulled out the funds and invested in other securities which were paying higher interest rates created by the Federal Reserve Board's tight money policies which had been created and continued throughout 1965. For example, 91-day Treasury bills had been pushed above 4½ percent and, as a result, were becoming more attractive than certificates of deposit.

So, these big banks were desperate to leapfrog the interest rates and thus hang on to the certificates of deposit. Remember, about 75 percent of the $16½ billion of certificates of deposit were being held by just 30 big banks.

These are banks which wield great influence in the financial community and which are in a position to place tremendous pressure on the Federal Reserve Board. On December 2, the pressure reached the boiling point. That afternoon, the Federal Reserve Banks of New York—at 4:01 p.m.—and Chicago—4:20 p.m.—suddenly sent identical telegrams to the Federal Reserve Board in Washington demanding an increase in interest rates. Without question, these two banks were speaking for the huge financial institutions residing in those two cities and who had the great majority of the certificates of deposit.

With almost automatic reaction to the desires of these two financial centers, the Federal Reserve Board, within 24 hours, acted in accordance with the identical telegrams.

As the New York and Chicago banks had demanded, the Board increased from 4 to 5½ percent the rate permissible on time deposits of less than 90 days. On time deposits of more than 90 days the Board, again in accordance with the wishes of the New York and Chicago banks, raised the rate from 4½ to 5½ percent. This represented increases of 37½ and 22.2 percent.

At the same time, of course, the Board hiked the discount rate from 4 to 4½ percent—the rate at which the Federal Reserve loans to member banks. This represented an increase of 12½ percent in the wholesale cost of money and a probable retail increase—that is in the cost to the consumer—of at least 25 percent in the aggregate interest paid the next year.

All of these increases are huge by anyone's mathematics or economics. Imagine the hue and cry if any union or any industry—other than banking—had attempted to raise its prices by a similar percentage. What would this have done to the wage-price guidelines?

Yet, we seem to be placing the bankers in a special category, immune from the normal rules of society and the guidelines of the Congress and the administration.

Again, I say that this Congress cannot afford to continue to tolerate such special-interest actions so detrimental to the public. The Congress should take action this session to protect the public interest in this vital area.

PEOPLE TO PEOPLE—VERMONT PARTNERS OF ALLIANCE MEET HONDURANS

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, Sir Winston Churchill brilliantly stated in this same Chamber in 1941, a time when the United States found itself enveloped in a second world war, that he believed democracy to mean "trust the people."

This great statesman went on to remind us how confidently we reiterate the Gettysburg ideal of "government of the people, by the people, for the people" and urged the American people to utilize not only our total-war efficiency, but our "whole manpower, brainpower, virility, valor, and civic virtue." And, he continued with that fateful phrase, "we are the masters of our fate."

The job Sir Winston set before us was not easy but filled with burdens, toil, and hardships. But we did have the strength and endurance together in our cause—peace, and I dare say today we must show this same strength together—all the peoples of the world striving for a mutual cause of peace.

It is with this thought in mind that I bring to your attention today a program which is striving to enlist such a great joint effort, a living thing that goes beyond trade conferences, government decrees, and peace talks. The program to which I refer is part of the Alliance for Progress—a program fundamentally based on the principle that the people of a country receiving assistance from the people of the United States must respond with self-help efforts before the alliance is considered complete. The goal is to seek a balance of interest and improvement of the relationship between the peoples of this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, 16 days ago, the 1st day of the 2d session of this 89th Congress, a group of Vermonters—a five member-team from my home State, arrived in Honduras in Central America for an intensive 2-week study to discover and develop plans as to how the people in Vermont may cooperate as partners of the Alliance for Progress with the people of Honduras directly in a mutual people-to-people assistance program.

Dr. Donald B. Watt, who many of you know founded the experiment in international living program in 1932, is the capable leader of the group. Completing the team are: Dr. Dorothy Morrow, associate assistant professor of clinical studies in the pediatrics department at the University of Vermont since 1950, and who for many months has been a rotating physician on the hospital ship *Hope* to Ecuador, Peru, southeast Asia, Africa, and Guinea; Mr. Denning Miller, a member of the Vermont Water Resources Board, Lamoille County Development Committee, and past president of the famed Stowe Ski Area Association, the ski capital of the East; Dr. William W. Stone, director of rural development of the extension service at the University of Vermont and a rural development specialist; and Mr. William B. Wright, vice president and trustee of the Marble Savings Bank in Rutland, Vt. Mr. Samuel Guarnacia, a professor of Spanish at Middlebury College and former Peace Corps Director in Peru, is the sixth member of the factfinding mission who will make the trip to Honduras in February.

The members of the group, four of whom speak Spanish, attended an orientation session under the direction of Dr. Jay Gould, head of the department of area studies at the University of Vermont. Another orientation took place on Sunday, January 9, here in the Nation's Capital during the team's stopover en route to visit their partners.

The final briefing session was held under the direction of Mr. James H. Boren, Director of the Partners of the Alliance program, AID. Joining in the briefing was the Ambassador of Honduras, the Honorable Ricardo Midence Soto, who so graciously gave his time to assist the group with general information pertaining to his country and specific data, names, and so forth of persons who might be of particular assistance in various specified areas; Mr. Elvin Durst, AID, Honduras desk; Mr. Theodore Tenorio, Associate Director for Partners of Alliance; and Mr. Wade Fleetwood, also an Associate Director of the Alliance programs.

The emphasis or theme of the meetings centered about local self-help, people to people. Examples of such efforts discussed ranged from the development of tourism in specific areas in Honduras where coral fishing, for example, is at its finest, as the skiing capacity is in Vermont; investigation of wood industries, shipping of wood; rural health programs; preservation of unspoiled areas; the exchange of musicians, works of art, professors, doctors, woodcraft, and so forth; to the numerous unique projects carried on by small groups such as obtaining several essential tools, books, maps, globes, pencils, student projects, paintings, and tapestries.

I might add at this time that my fellow Vermonters will be the guests of various Honduran families throughout the country during their stay.

Each team member will investigate needs in his or her specific area of interest and experience. For example, Dr. Stone, among other studies, will investigate a farmers' cooperative which is now in the developing stage and which has already appealed to Los Companeros for assistance. Much time and effort has been expended both by members of the team and other interested individuals in learning about Honduras, the people, and their needs.

Upon returning to the United States, recommendations for projects will be presented at regional meetings throughout the State of Vermont. It is hoped that a close knit organization of Los Companeros will evolve as individuals, service clubs, chambers of commerce, churches, school districts, and educational organizations join to work together as friends with their counterpart Honduran partners.

It is anticipated that a Honduran delegation will also be visiting in Vermont during the summer to ascertain our needs, how they can help us.

These are not junkets but unparalleled program development teams that are often eating dust and wading through mud or swamps as they put together projects with their partners in various areas of Latin America. It is a partnership through which the peoples of two areas can work together in mutually beneficial activities. It requires unlimited time and energy for all participating.

We must revitalize our foreign policy, which is in desperate need of rebuilding and reorganization, and enlist the most powerful force on earth through this spontaneous cooperation between the free peoples. It is axiomatic that the area of greatest opportunity in our foreign relations lies in us, we the people. We must realize that Latin Americans, for example, are not merely a group identification but rather citizens, families, children, and leaders. We must identify ourselves with all segments and not merely on the governmental diplomatic echelon.

If honest with ourselves we must admit that we have many times failed to capture the imagination of the peoples of the world. Our victories in war or peace have nearly always been victories of the Nation rather than of a people.

Although I find little satisfaction in debating the pros and cons as to how we arrived at our present situation in terms of Vietnam and our present image to foreign countries, except to use it as a "live and learn" experience for future involvements, we must face the resulting steady erosion of our relationships with the peoples of the world with considerable concern.

We have a significant contribution to make to the nations of the world toward greater harmony and peace—toward the establishment of friendly relationships. While we have been quick to respond to dramatic space challenges, we have been lax in meeting the challenge in the maintenance and development of good, honest personal relationships. To serve the principles of democracy, this Nation cannot operate alone. We must realize the importance of all nations working together, of the people, for the people, by the people. We must seek active support for close and meaningful liaison with other people.

I am proud today of the role that Vermont is and will be playing in the partners program as the 28th State to join the alliance. I am most pleased that our Vermont citizens, as many other Americans have previously done, responded to the call to join in partnership activities with our Latin neighbors.

Let us at this time look ahead to the future. To a world peace where conflicting issues may be peacefully settled under honorable conditions, to a time when not only are the lives of Americans protected from unthinkable destruction, but the lives of all the peoples of the world.

In the months and years ahead it is our duty and responsibility to move toward the people rather than attempt to bring the people to us. I trust and hope that in days and years to come this great mission will, for the safety and goodwill of all man, enable the peoples of the world to walk together side by side in majesty, in justice, and in peace.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach has exceeded his authority in seizing the local functions of government in Jefferson County, Ala. If his action is allowed to go unchallenged, honest election procedures in this country will be finished and the people will be the victims of a system which invites vote stealing, fraud, and control by illiterates, felons, and the insane.

The Attorney General now has Federal examiners in Jefferson County because he claims, and the agitators of street demonstrations claim, that the Commissioners in Jefferson County are not doing enough to register Negroes. I would like to present some figures.

Since July 1, 1965, the Board has registered 21,536 new voters in Jefferson County, bringing the total registration to 199,074. On a month to month basis the registration figures are as follows:

	Negroes	*Whites*
August	2,270	150
September	2,155	462
October	1,444	413
November	1,443	399
December	3,859	858
To January 22	6,091	1,518

Last Saturday the Board registered 836 Negroes and 132 white citizens. Where is the discrimination?

Now, here are some additional figures. Originally the board of commissioners in Jefferson County hired seven clerks and registration was carried on 3 days a week. In the period since July they have hired an additional 27 clerks and have requested 20 more. Registration is now open 5 days a week. In all fairness, is any greater effort being made in the districts of any of the members of this House to register qualified voters? Then why does the Attorney General turn his wrath only upon Alabama and the South? What demons smolder in his breast which cause him to persecute, through the authority of his office, the people of my State and a great section of this Nation?

Today I have sent a letter to many of my colleagues in Congress, asking them to join me in a full and impartial investigation of the procedures being followed by the Attorney General's handpicked examiners who are now conducting registration in Birmingham without regard to the laws of Alabama or the election procedures followed by practically every State in the Union. I include my letter to my colleagues as a part of these remarks.

I would like to include also, a statement by Mr. W. Cooper Green, president of the Jefferson County Commission, which is legally charged with registration of voters and whose members have been doing an excellent job. Finally, I am including an editorial from the Birmingham Post-Herald of January 22, which also calls for an investigation:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1966.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I would like to call to your attention a wholly unwarranted abuse of Federal power now being sponsored by the Department of Justice in Birmingham, Ala. Last week, under the authority of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach ordered Federal registrars into Jefferson County in order to speed up the registration of Negroes there.

On Thursday, January 20, our able colleague, JOHN BUCHANAN, who represents Jefferson County, presented to the House a bill of particulars concerning registration in Jefferson County. I hope you will read Mr. BUCHANAN's remarks beginning on page 859 of the RECORD. You will note that he has cited facts which prove that every effort has been made and is being made to aid qualified Negro citizens in registering in Birmingham. The county officials have done an excellent job in increasing the hours and adding personnel to make registration easier. They have operated under the most difficult conditions in the face of street demonstrations and mob violence.

Notwithstanding the sincere efforts of local officials to obey the law and in spite of the progress which has been made in registering Negro citizens, the Attorney General sent his agents into Jefferson County. From past experience we may assume that he will accede to the demands of the demonstrators and force registration offices to remain open at night and will send registrars into the neighborhoods. To my knowledge this is not done in other States or other counties.

Now, how are the registrars doing the job? From information we have been able to gather, it is apparent they are registering Negroes to complete violation of existing State laws and without regard to the Federal acts passed in 1964 and 1965. Alabama law requires, and with reason, that a prospective voter give his full name, age, residence, and establish the fact that he is neither insane or has been convicted of a felony. Examiners in Jefferson County are registering voters without regard to this law. During the past week it has been found:

1. Federal examiners are not requiring the prospective voter to give the full name, sex, residence, or date of birth.

2. They are accepting "General Delivery" as a bona fide residence address. This makes it impossible to check for fraud or positive identification.

3. They are registering persons already registered by State registrars.

4. They are registering persons more than once. The Federal examiners are registering persons they, themselves, have already registered.

5. They are registering persons who live in nearby counties and who are not legal voters in Jefferson County. This will make it possible for vote frauds by permitting a person to vote in a number of counties and precincts.

6. They are registering persons convicted of felonies, contrary to the law.

7. No steps are being taken to remove the names of dead persons from the registration rolls, nor those who have moved from the county or have been convicted of felonies.

If the conditions which exist in Jefferson County are allowed to continue and the Attorney General is allowed to ride roughshod over State and Federal law, we are setting up conditions which will result in complete chaos in our election procedures. While Jefferson County is under attack today, it could be any county in the United States if an arrogant Federal official is permitted to get away with it.

I call upon all fairminded Members of Congress in both House and Senate and on both sides of the aisle, to join me in demanding that the Attorney General be halted in creating a second Reconstruction period in Alabama as he is now doing in Jefferson County. I ask that you join me in demanding a full and impartial investigation of the charges against the Attorney General's examiners now operating in Jefferson County. If these charges are proven to be correct, I see no choice but for Congress to demand the immediate resignation of Nicholas Katzenbach and, if he fails to resign, he should be removed from office by the President. Failure upon our part or upon the part of the President to force Federal officials to act within the law of the land is a betrayal of the people we represent.

In the name of justice I ask you to join me in this endeavor to save our Nation from the inevitable results of the lawlessness now being encouraged in Alabama by the head of the Department of Justice of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

JIM MARTIN,
Seventh District, Alabama.

JANUARY 20, 1966.

W. COOPER GREEN,
President, Jefferson County Commission,
Court House Building, Birmingham, Ala.

SIR: We have just learned that the Federal Department of Justice is sending Federal registrars into Jefferson County with instructions to register more voters, regardless of whether they are illiterates or not.

This is the first time in this country since the dark days of Reconstruction following the Civil War that Federal registrars have been dispatched to usurp, seize, and take over local functions of government. These Federal registrars are not needed to provide the orderly registration of any qualified person of whatever race. The board of registrars is a State agency. Historically, they have met for registration 3 days a week. Prior to any unlawful demonstrations, the personnel of this office was increased to 16 employees and the days available for registration were increased from 3 to 5. In addition, they were furnished new and enlarged facilities. They have the space and personnel capable to register 800 persons per day, but have averaged less than 400. Many hours of each day a majority of the employees of this agency are idle because no one is available for registration. No long waiting lines have been formed at Birmingham for registration for several weeks.

This is an important function of local government which has arbitrarily been seized by despotic and uncontrolled power and without any semblance of reason except obeisance to outside agitators.

Some weeks ago, nonresidents of Alabama moved into this county with the announced purpose of creating discord and violence. They were repudiated by the fine adult colored citizens of this county. They were here for two purposes—(1) to create strife and turmoil, and (2) to raise money for their rapidly dwindling "agitation and personal funds." After repudiation by our fine local colored citizens, these foreign rabble rousers invaded the public schools of our county and enticed schoolchildren to engage in riotous conduct, invading the privacy of property, obstructing public traffic, and endangering lives and property.

The three fine Federal judges of this district issued an injunction against them and their activity. On January 19, 1966, this same group filed a petition in the U.S. district court requesting that the injunction be modified to permit them to "conduct acts of violence, endangering the lives and property of citizens."

I am sure the people of this county share the feeling that citizens of whatever color should be permitted to qualify and vote if they possess the required qualifications. By the same token, I know that all of the people of this area—white and colored alike—resent this Federal intrusion and exhibition of brazen power. We are called upon again to endure actions that should never be directed by any government against its law-abiding citizens at the political demand of those admittedly engaged in discord and violence.

Shameful history is being made here by those in charge of the Federal Government, without regard to our local citizens program of trying to work out our own problems at the local level without outside agitators and dictatorial Federal officials trampling on our own local rights.

[From the Birmingham Post-Herald, Jan. 22, 1966]

THE RABBLE ROUSERS WIN

There can be but one conclusion to the Federal Government's action in sending registrars or examiners to Jefferson County—that President Johnson and the Justice Department, headed by Attorney General Katzenbach, are bowing to the demands of Martin Luther King and his cohorts.

They know, undoubtedly, that registrars at the courthouse were sitting around with nothing to do while demonstrators were marching and demanding changes in registration procedures—the chief ones being changes that could not be made under existing laws.

By this action, Katzenbach has damaged severely the gains made in racial relations in this county. He has acted upon the demands of people who do not live here and whose chief interest obviously is not good race relations or the welfare of even the Negroes of Jefferson County but the welfare of King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

This is the tragedy of the situation.

Birmingham was chosen as a place for a demonstration because it is a magic word across the country in helping to raise money for a racial cause.

Jefferson County's board of registrars has done much to speed up and extend its processes. It has hired extra clerks and has started Saturday sessions. Its registrations of Negroes, we understand, is exceeded in the Southeast only by Fulton County (Atlanta) which has a larger population and which also registers those who are over 18, instead of 21 or over as is done here.

Incidentally, we wonder whether the registrars sent here by Katzenbach will be used to register only Negroes or whether they will go out in the white sections of the city and county as well.

The number of unregistered whites greatly exceeds the number of unregistered Negroes here.

The Katzenbach action came despite the statements of leading Negroes of Birmingham opposing the demonstrations and saying that Federal registrars were not necessary—another indication of the political nature of the Washington action.

Birmingham and Jefferson County will live through this latest indignity, as they have lived through other critical situations. But new tensions have been created which will be long in subsiding.

Unfortunately this city has become a whipping boy and the reaction of Washington to King's demands will lead him to believe that whenever he needs to attract national attention all he needs to do is send a group of marching, shouting people here to "demonstrate."

This city, this State, this Nation cannot continue to progress if Negro promoters are allowed to whip up "crises" through such tactics.

We would favor a congressional investigation of this situation and we think that our two Senators, members of the ruling Democratic Party, should be the ones to demand it.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET WOULD CUT THE SCHOOL MILK AND SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Johnson's budget is considered rich in both guns and butter. The domestic budget takes money from some programs and transfers it to others. That is why the domestic budget does not appear larger.

In examining the budget, I find that the school milk and school lunch programs are cut to the bone. There would be an $82 million cut in the school milk program and $19 million cut in the school lunch program. That is a $101 million cut in funds that have provided better nutrition and better health for our children for a long time. This cut occurs in the same budget that proposes a $465 million increase in funds for the President's controversial and, in so many cases wasteful, war on poverty.

If it is necessary to reduce the expenditures in our domestic budget because we cannot have all the guns and butter that we want, then let us not take the butter away from the schoolchildren if we can afford it in so many other programs.

THE NEW MATH AND THE LAWS OF PROBABILITY

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, last week I sought to introduce the views of a resident in my district on the new math, international affairs, and the guerrilla war. Today I would like to present the third lesson.

There are many interesting comparisons to be made between the laws of Pandemania and the United States of America. In most of the United States it is illegal to gamble for money, whereas in Pandemania it is legal to gamble for money. On the other hand, gambling with the Nation's security is a serious offense in Pandemania.

Today, in The New Math, we shall consider a second principle. It is called "Reductio ad absurdum." Seven Pandemanians are gambling. They are shooting craps, which is legal in their country. There is no limit on bets. A and B are losing rather regularly, but A, who hates B, notices that B is losing money twice as fast as A. This pleases A greatly and the game is regarded by him as performing a perverse form of social justice.

When the game began, A had $200,000 and B had $700,000. By the time A has lost $100,000, B has lost $200,000. If both parties continue at the game and lose at the same rate, how much will A have left by the time B has lost $400,000? How much will B have left of his $700,000 after he loses $400,000? If you said that A will have nothing left, while B, at the same point, has $300,000 and can continue to play, still in hopes of winning, then you are beginning to understand the problem. It is called "Reductio ad absurdum."

Question by student: "Would the same rule apply to war casualties?"

Answer by doctor: "You do not understand foreign policy. You will do well if you simply master The New Math.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 336)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I present the budget for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966.

The great domestic challenge of our time lies in our cities. Significant efforts are being undertaken to meet this challenge, and to make it possible for every citizen to lead a productive and satisfying life.

The Federal Government has a special responsibility for the Nation's Capital. We have long resolved that the District can and should be an example of the best among our urban communities, but in many ways the District continues to fall short of that goal.

Programs for the future must recognize that there is much room for improvement. Yet, even to avoid regression is both difficult and expensive. The District, as the central portion of a major metropolitan area, must cope with unusual demands.

The past decade, for example, has seen a substantial increase in the need for services to meet the requirements of a changing population. During that short span, while total population of the District remained virtually unchanged—

School-age population—5 to 19—increased by 23,700—15 percent.

Actual school enrollments increased more than 37,000—35 percent, due primarily to expanded kindergarten programs and a modestly successful program to reduce school dropouts.

Working-age population—20 to 64—decreased 21,100—4 percent.

The over-65 age group increased 14,000—24 percent.

The student group certainly, and the older age group in many cases, require greater public services and public facilities. These needs cannot be ignored.

The District must also replace and modernize a physical plant that is aged and rapidly becoming obsolete. Of the public schools, for example—

Over 38 percent were built totally or in part before 1920.

Over 60 percent have some substandard classrooms.

Yet, the demands of the rapidly increasing school population, combined with limited appropriations for school construction, have made it impossible even to house new students, much less to modernize the existing school plant. Indeed, there is no fact of which we should be less proud than that in the Capital City of this great Nation there are some 2,100 children compelled by lack of classroom space to accept part-time education.

These and other program demands mean, therefore, that an increased level of appropriations will be required. To some extent that increase has been held in check by the cost reduction and management improvement program developed by the Commissioners. This program, similar to that required in each Federal department and agency, will continue to help in holding down the need for additional personnel and other resources despite the rapidly increasing program requirements. Moreover, to increase even further the productivity of District agencies, I have directed the Bureau of the Budget to work closely with the Commissioners in the development of—

A planning, programing, and budgeting system.

New management techniques.

Improved methods and procedures.

Intensified use of data processing equipment.

In addition, I have insisted that the increases in expenditures reflected in this budget be held to the minimum needed to—

Assure continuation of essential services.

Provide an adequate level of staffing to carry out essential services.

Permit only such improvement in services as is required to assure an acceptable rate of progress toward our ultimate goals.

Revenues: Increases in District resources must, as always, come largely from local taxes. Commensurate increases in support by the Federal Government are necessary. The Federal payment, which is now authorized at $50 million, should be authorized at a substantially higher level by approval of the formula contained in H.R. 6889, and appropriations should be increased accordingly. That formula provides a fair, equitable, and flexible measure of the amount of Federal support that should be provided the District government. The need for this type of flexible authorization and the inadequacy of the present laws are apparent. In 1965, the formula would have authorized only $4.8 million more than the present authorization of $50 million. In 1967, the formula indicates $61.9 million as the appropriate level of support—$11.9 million more than is now authorized. The propriety of thus measuring the appropriate level of Federal support to the District has twice had the approval of the Senate. I urgently commend it.

Increases in District taxes to accompany the larger Federal payment should be substantially greater than the $4 million provided for the general fund in H.R. 11487, the revenue bill which has been passed by the House of Representatives. While it is true that the contribution made by District taxpayers has substantially increased in the past year, both through larger receipts from existing taxes and from the increase of 20 cents per $100 of assessed valuation in the real estate tax, these increases fall far short of meeting the District's needs. I support, therefore, the recommendation of the Commissioners to the Congress of a tax package which will increase tax revenues in the general fund by $8.4 million annually beyond those provided in H.R. 11487.

Requirements and financing of the general fund, 1966–72

[In millions of dollars]

	Estimates		Projections				
	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
Funds required:							
Under existing legislation:							
Operating expenses	280.1	307.3	322.6	338.7	355.6	373.4	392.1
Capital outlay:							
Public works, including Federal obligations (cash required)	37.1	48.3	54.6	53.7	53.9	52.6	50.0
Rail rapid transit system	2.0	8.5	39.5	------	------	------	------
Repayment of loans and interest:							
Loans for public works	1.9	2.0	3.3	4.8	6.2	7.7	9.2
Loans for rail rapid transit	------	------	.1	.2	1.4	3.0	3.0
Repayable advances	20.0	------	------	------	------	------	------
Total under existing legislation	341.1	366.1	420.1	397.4	417.1	436.7	454.3
Under proposed legislation:							
Operating expenses—Pay increases for teachers, policemen, and firemen	2.9	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Reserves for indefinite appropriation and contingencies	3.6	.6	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
Total estimated funds required	347.6	371.0	431.4	408.7	428.4	448.0	465.6
Revenues and balances:							
From existing legislative sources:							
Taxes, fees, etc.[1]	256.0	266.9	281.2	299.3	318.2	334.5	351.3
Balances	−1.4	4.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Federal payment	48.7	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Repayable advances	20.0	------	------	------	------	------	------
Loan authorization:							
Public works	22.4	17.2	20.3	9.0	------	------	------
Rail rapid transit	2.0	8.5	39.5	------	------	------	------
Total estimated availability from existing legislative sources	347.7	346.7	393.0	360.3	370.2	386.5	403.3
From proposed legislative sources:							
Taxes	1.0	12.4	12.7	13.0	13.4	13.7	14.2
Federal payment	------	11.9	14.4	16.9	20.9	25.1	28.0
Loan authorization—public works	------	------	------	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
Total from proposed legislative sources	1.0	24.3	27.1	49.9	54.3	58.8	62.2
Total estimated revenues and balances	348.7	371.0	420.1	410.2	424.5	445.3	465.5
Additional financing required to meet total estimated requirements	------	------	11.3	------	3.9	2.7	.1

[1] Includes recent increase in real estate tax rate from $2.50 to $2.70 per $100 assessed valuation in fiscal year 1966. Also, rate increase from $2.70 to $2.80 in fiscal year 1969 and from $2.80 to $2.90 in fiscal year 1970.

Borrowing: The authority of the District to borrow for general fund purposes is now fixed at $225 million, of which $50 million is specifically allocated for the purposes of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965. When this amount has been borrowed the authority will be exhausted, irrespective of repayments. This form of lump-sum authorization should be replaced by the provisions of H.R. 6889, which relate the maximum amount which the District may borrow from the Treasury to a percentage of the assessed value of real and personal property in the District. This would—

Conform to debt limits generally used throughout the United States for local governments.

Relate the debt limit more closely to ability to repay.

Enable the District to incur new debt as repayments are made. Since at current levels of annual borrowing the District will soon exhaust its present borrowing authorization for general public works purposes, this matter deserves prompt consideration by the Congress.

New obligational authority, all funds

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 recommended
Current authorizations:			
Education:			
Operating expenses	72,038	75,727	82,609
Capital outlay	14,405	17,569	32,935
Welfare and health:			
Operating expenses	76,154	80,957	90,549
Capital outlay	487	6,014	4,888
Highways and traffic:			
Operating expenses	13,714	14,197	14,982
Capital outlay	13,769	9,852	15,455
Public safety:			
Operating expenses	73,724	80,024	85,752
Capital outlay	336	1,687	2,715
Parks and recreation:			
Operating expenses	10,150	10,972	12,256
Capital outlay	680	1,035	1,896
General operating expenses:			
Operating expenses	19,444	20,550	22,708
Capital outlay	5,030	2,111	1,298
Sanitary engineering:			
Operating expenses	22,385	23,097	24,248
Capital outlay	23,066	12,546	14,107
Repayment of loans and interest	5,363	5,690	6,078
Payment of District of Columbia share of Federal capital outlays	1,860	987	1,350
Contribution to rapid transit system	------	2,000	8,525
Current authorizations—Continued			
Additional municipal services—inaugural ceremonies	283	------	------
Additional municipal services—Shrine and American Legion conventions	------	221	233
Judgments, claims, and refunds	885	33	------
Personal services, wage board employees	------	660	1,320
Total current authorizations	353,773	365,929	423,904
Permanent authorizations	1,626	1,593	1,637
Operations of District of Columbia trust funds	58,178	58,961	63,480
Repayment (−) of advances from Federal funds	9,000	−26,000	------
Proposed for separate transmittal (under proposed legislation)	------	3,000	4,510
Total authorizations	422,577	403,483	493,531
Recapitulation of current authorizations:			
General fund	298,100	322,863	371,297
Highway fund	28,876	25,314	31,719
Water fund	11,049	10,397	11,884
Sanitary sewage works fund	15,668	7,270	8,930
Metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund	80	85	74
Total, all funds	353,773	365,929	423,904

With the additional revenues now being proposed, the District will measurably advance toward the goals outlined in my message to the Congress of February 15, 1965. Some of the more significant recommendations are—

EDUCATION

Operation of the school system in 1967 will require $82.6 million, an increase of $6.9 million over 1966. These increased funds will provide—

Additional classroom teachers needed to maintain the pupil-teacher ratios now in effect.

Additional positions in special subject areas such as science, mathematics, and reading needed to enrich and strengthen the District's educational program.

Addition of 24 librarians to provide 1 in every school in which physical facilities exist to house a library.

Additional counselors to achieve the Board of Education pupil-counselor ratios of 750 to 1 in elementary schools and 400 to 1 in secondary schools.

Four pupil personnel service teams. Each team will be composed of psychiatrists, clinical and school psychologists, social workers and attendance officers. They will be able to meet acute needs of literally thousands of pupils whose opportunities to achieve the maximum of their potentialities are now impaired because the schools do not have adequate information on their abilities, achievements, and emotional stability.

In addition, an increase in the salaries of teachers will be proposed to the Congress.

There has already been a substantial increase in funds available to the District school system through the several national programs for aid to education. In 1967, these funds will approximate $14.5 million. This Federal assistance has properly been concentrated in low-income areas of the city where the needs are the most severe, and potential for accomplishment is the greatest. While these funds make possible many improvements, they cannot and should not be used as a substitute for the basic educational program financed directly by the community. Together, however, the two sources of funds make the opportunities for major educational progress in the District brighter than ever.

The budget also includes $32.9 million for various stages of construction of 35 school construction projects, including 7 new schools, 18 additions to existing schools, and 10 school replacements, including the critically needed Shaw Junior High School. When they are all completed, they will provide 19,550 additional pupil spaces. This will, at long last, eliminate foreseeable part-time classes; and permit in 1968 the beginning of a concerted program to replace obsolete school buildings.

PUBLIC SAFETY

The budget provides $85.8 million for operating expenses for the District agencies concerned with public safety—an increase of $5.7 million over fiscal 1966.

Budget proposals for District agencies concerned with crime are necessarily made without benefit of the recommendations by the Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia which I appointed last July. That Commission, I hope and expect, will point the way toward further improvement of the District's efforts to achieve effective and fair law enforcement. Budget amendments appropriate in the light of its recommendations will be transmitted to the Congress promptly. I am determined that both citizens and visitors in our National Capital shall be secure in their persons and their property.

Pending receipt of the Commission's recommendations, however, we can proceed with confidence on several items. The pistol registration bill, S. 1632 and H.R. 6745, should be promptly enacted. The Police Department has been encountering great difficulties in recruiting qualified candidates. An increase in the salaries of policemen is necessary to bring the police force to its currently authorized strength. Legislation to accomplish this will be proposed to the Congress. A decision on increasing the authorized strength can await the Commission's report.

Funds are also appropriate, and are included in the budget, for several improvements that will enable the force to operate more effectively—

Civilian employees will be used to fill 31 administrative positions now filled by uniformed personnel who will be freed to utilize their training to greater advantage.

Closed-circuit, departmentwide television will be installed to increase the effectiveness of lineups and the efficiency of training programs.

A planning and development unit will be established to improve the utilization of computers and other technological advances in the field of crime prevention and control.

I am also recommending that the roving tactical force be continued in 1967. That force, the one-man scout cars, and the additional two-way radios for foot patrolmen, all provided last year, have contributed in a major way to the hopeful change in the trend of serious offenses reported in recent months.

Finally, there are funds for the more active recruitment that is needed to bring the police force to its authorized strength and for an increase from 25 to 60 trainees in the highly successful police cadet program.

Also, salary increases for firemen are proposed for later transmittal.

PARKS AND RECREATION

The budget provides those agencies concerned with parks and recreation with an increase of $1.3 million over the 1966 level of $11 million. Recreation facilities in the District remain well below needs and accepted standards. This is particularly unfortunate in areas where low incomes make it difficult for the residents to take advantage of facilities not in their immediate neighborhoods. Until these deficiencies can be remedied, maximum utilization must be made of existing facilities. This can be done only through the extension of hours during which facilities are open, and expansion of programs to enlarge the opportunity for participation by various age groups. The budget provides funds for these purposes, as well as $1.9 million for new facilities and expansion and improvement of those already in existence.

Funds are provided for an expansion of the roving leader program which has had a record of success with hard-to-reach delinquent and potentially delinquent youth. The budget also provides funds to enable the Recreation Department and the National Park Service to continue, in cooperation with the many nongovernmental efforts, to beautify the city, particularly through improved landscaping and planting. The needs of the Park Police for a larger force, and the National Zoological Park for increases in operating and maintenance staff, are likewise met.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

For health, welfare, and vocational rehabilitation programs for 1967, the budget proposes funds of $90.5 million, an increase of $9.6 million over 1966. These funds, together with the expanding levels of grants to the District for participation in Federal programs in these fields, will maintain the momentum already achieved in the District's public health and vocational rehabilitation efforts, substantially reduce the present deficiencies in the welfare program, and permit the District's full participation in the programs made possible by recent amendments in the Social Security Act.

In the field of public health the District is moving forward rapidly in the prevention and treatment of mental illness. Funds are provided to complete the staffing of the first of four community mental health centers, begun 2 years ago at District of Columbia General Hospital and operated during the past year with the aid of a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. The second center, to be located in the Northwest section of the District, will be a part of the Northwest Community Health Center for which site funds are requested. Funds are also requested for a demonstration project for the treatment of alcoholics on a volunteer basis. It is hoped that this program will reduce the burden now imposed on the police, the courts, and the correctional system by the chronic alcoholic.

Two demonstration projects heretofore operated with funds granted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the nursing home improvement program and the rheumatic fever prophylaxis program—have fully proven their usefulness, and are now proposed for partial financing by the District itself.

The welfare program must continue to meet the basic needs of the poor, the aged, and the disabled. This program has increasingly emphasized rehabilitation services which encourage and assist families in achievement of independence and self-sufficiency. This budget continues that emphasis.

Funds contained in this budget will permit the District to participate more fully in Federal programs. Maximum attention is paid to the needs of children. This is as it should be. Under this budget—

Additional staff will be provided to bring the number of social workers closer to the national standard of 60 cases per worker, particularly for families with dependent children, and to expedite the current welfare eligibility review.

Special programs will be continued and expanded to provide immediate help for families not eligible for regular welfare services but who face crises which might result in family breakup.

Needy children of the unemployed will be assisted through an improved program, which will provide training and job placement assistance for their parents. This program will be closely related to title V of the Economic Opportunity Act and will be designed to reduce relief rolls by equipping parents for productive employment.

An enlarged child welfare staff will be provided.

Higher rates of payment will be made to foster parents and group foster homes.

Homemaker and day care services will be expanded.

The favorable results of special efforts which have contributed to a marked reduction in the population of Junior Village during 1965—from over 900 in February to 630 at the end of the year—make it the more imperative that these efforts be further intensified.

TRANSPORTATION

The Congress, at its last session, took a major step toward resolving one of the significant transportation problems of the National Capital region by authorizing construction within the District of the rail rapid transit system. The budget provides for the appropriation of a loan in the amount of $8.5 million to the District to enable it to meet its share of the cost of this project during 1967.

Problems remain, however, in connection with the highway portion of the District's transportation system. One is the urgent need for additional resources for the highway fund if any highway program at all is to continue. The Commissioners' requests for a 1-cent increase in the gasoline tax and for an increase in the highway fund's borrowing authority are included in H.R. 11487, which has been approved by the House of Representatives. I commend these proposals to the Senate as well.

Another problem which should be promptly resolved concerns the dimensions and locations of the interstate freeway system within the District. The report of the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives on H.R. 11487 requests a further review and appraisal of some of the present plans. The Highway Department has already taken some steps in this direction, and a possible relocation of a portion of the inner loop is now under active consideration by the Policy Advisory Committee.

The magnitude of these projects, however, makes it important that both the Federal Government and the Washington community have full assurance that there will be no needless expenditures of moneys or dislocations of persons and businesses. Accordingly, I am requesting the Policy Advisory Committee to consider whether it should secure, in conjunction with the National Capital Planning Commission's work on the 1985 comprehensive plan, a review of present highway plans. This review would examine not only methodology but also the basic assumptions regarding dislocation of families and businesses, real costs, Federal needs, and other community values on the basis of the most recent data available.

In order that the highway program not be delayed, and in order also that the Congress may have as much information as possible before completing its consideration of the District's 1967 highway budget, I am requesting the Committee to complete both its current studies and any further reviews it may consider appropriate by April 1, 1966. The Commissioners have advised me that the status of the most controversial items—the north leg of the inner loop and the north-central freeway—is such that in the next few months there would be no major expenditures on these projects in any event except for planning.

I am encouraged by the close cooperation which has been evident among the Federal and District agencies with responsibilities for developing the District's transportation system. Continued cooperation will insure a coordinated and efficient transportation network—one which will best serve the needs of the Nation's Capital.

MUNICIPAL CENTER

During the past few years the District government has not been provided with additional government-owned office space for new or expanding programs. Rental space, at high cost in both dollars and efficiency, has been required. I am recommending an increase of $1 million for additional rental space as a temporary relief of overcrowding.

In this budget, a small but critical item of $75,000 is sought to finance the first step toward a permanent solution. These funds will enable the District to prepare floor plan layouts and budget estimates for two buildings in the Municipal Center area to house education, recreation, and technical services. These buildings, which help to fulfill the long-range plans for Pennsylvania Avenue, not only will permit consolidation of scattered fragments of several departments and relief from outmoded, inadequate, and overcrowded space, but will also be of definite economic advantage to the District.

CONCLUSION

In addition to this expenditure program, and the revenue measures which I am recommending, there are a number of other measures of importance to the District of Columbia that are already before the Congress.

Of preeminent importance is the passage of a home rule bill. I urge the House of Representatives to complete action on the bill already approved by the Senate. My views on the need for this legislation are well known to the Congress. There is no reason to repeat them here.

Among the other important District measures pending in both Houses are—

A bill to authorize in the District of Columbia a community college and a college of arts and sciences under a Board of Higher Education.

A bill to create a Pennsylvania Avenue Commission.

A bill to establish an international center.

The House has already passed H.R. 8126, which would extend the coverage of the District of Columbia minimum wage law to men.

Enactment of these measures would make the 89th Congress as memorable for the District as it is already for the Nation.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 25, 1966.

UKRAINE'S INDEPENDENCE AND A SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a copy of House Resolution 14 of the 89th Congress, introduced by me, calling for the creation of a Captive Nations Committee; as well as a copy of the pastoral appeal of His Excellency, the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn, O.S.B.M., Archbishop and Metropolitan of Catholic Ukrainians in the United States, which appeared in the October 28, 1965, issue of America, the Ukrainian Catholic Daily; and, in addition, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks the pamphlet entitled "The Educational Policy of UCCA"; written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, the distinguished professor of Georgetown University, which deals with America's attitude toward Ukraine and all the captive nations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on this 48th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine it is most important for all Americans to recognize the interrelationships between the captive nations of Eastern Europe and the war against Red imperialism in Vietnam. Russian material aid to the Red totalitarian regime in Hanoi comes in the last analysis from the sweat and toil of the captive nations in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe generally. The plight of 17 million captive North Vietnamese is substantially no different from that of 43 million captive Ukrainians or the millions of other captive nations in Eastern Europe, Asia, and Latin America. As freedom is indivisible, so is Red totalitarian tyranny indivisible, despite all the superficial changes in the Red Empire.

UKRAINE'S PUPPET IN THE U.N.

Before elaborating on the enormous significance of this anniversary, I should like to point out one of the most comical aspects of our period. Last October the new chairman of the Ukrainian S.S.R. delegation to the U.N. lamented in his maiden speech that we in Congress observe the real Ukrainian independence that was destroyed by Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism 45 years ago. This puppet had the gall to say:

> The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is a sovereign and free nation in the great brotherly family of Soviet Republics.

Using an old imperialist Russian theme song, he further insulted the intelligence of his audience by blurting:

> Our Government and our people consider the acts of some American circles as interference in the domestic affairs of the Ukrainian nation.

It is obvious that this poor puppet and his Moscow masters do not want us to bring the truths of the Ukraine's miserable captivity to the attention of our own people and the world. These truths hurt them in their efforts to enlarge the Red totalitarian empire. It is our moral and political obligation to drive these truths home in every corner of the earth, for without a captive Ukraine the artificial edifice of the U.S.S.R. would topple like a stack of cards. Moscow knows this, but many free governments have yet to learn to appreciate this fundamental truth.

OCCASION FOR HOUSE RESOLUTION 14

On this significant occasion of the 48th anniversary of the Ukraine's independence, I deem it necessary to go beyond the realm of sincere expressions of thought and feelings by advancing a concrete proposal that would aid immensely in the eventual liberation of the Ukraine—indeed, all other captive nations—from the imperio-colonialist heel of Moscow.

I know that by offering the adoption of House Resolution 14, a measure to establish a desperately needed special House

Committee on the Captive Nations, my proposal for specific and concrete action bespeaks also the desires of numerous Members of this body, who in the 87th Congress, in the 88th Congress, and in the present 89th Congress have joined in submitting similar resolutions.

This congressional observance of Ukrainian independence affords us the excellent opportunity in this Congress to urge the necessary creation of this special committee.

Mr. Speaker, in a move which I believe touches the heart of every Ukrainian patriot—in fact, the hearts of all our captive allies in the Red totalitarian empire—I take this important occasion to urge the immediate adoption of House Resolution 14, a copy of which will be found at the end of my remarks.

THIS 48TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. Speaker, the national histories of East European peoples are full of miseries and misfortunes, and the history of the Ukrainian people is no exception. Since the signing of a compact between the Russian czar and the Ukrainian leaders in 1654, stouthearted and liberty-loving Ukrainians have not been allowed, except for periods in the 18th century and the brief 2-year period of 1918–20, to enjoy the benefits of free and independent life in their historic homeland.

Through the turns and twists of fateful international events, some 45 million Ukrainians have not been permitted to be masters of their fate. For too long a period they have been held down under the oppressing yoke of alien despots. They have endured hardships, privations, and indescribable miseries. They have been ruthlessly persecuted for clinging to their national ideals, for dreaming and cherishing their independence and freedom.

Yet, no oppressive measure, no amount of severe persecution could compel them to abandon their yearning for freedom. Instead, oppressions and persecutions have united the Ukrainians against their foes, held them together. Then toward the end of the First World War, when the decrepit czarist regime was overthrown, and Austria's hold over the western Ukraine was broken, the Ukrainians proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic.

This historic event took place on the memorable 22d of January 1918—48 years ago. That day has become a landmark in the history of Ukraine, and remains the brightest spot in their struggle for freedom and independence. Unfortunately, the newborn Republic was suffering under severe handicaps. It was surrounded by powerful foes, ready to pounce upon it and put an end to its existence. And that is what happened even before the joy and jubilation had ceased.

Before the Ukrainian people had any time to recoup their losses, they were attacked by their inveterate foes, Moscow and its Red army. Early in 1920 enemy forces entered and occupied the eastern part of the country; soon the whole country was overrun and all Ukrainian opposition was ruthlessly crushed. Then in the fall of that year Ukraine became a satellite of Soviet Russia, and by 1923 it was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Since those fateful days, for nearly five decades, Ukraine has been submerged in the Soviet Russian Empire, and the Ukrainian people have suffered grievously under Moscow's totalitarianism. For all practical purposes the country is sealed off from the free world. Neither the people of Ukraine are allowed in large numbers to travel abroad, nor are the people of the free world, except under carefully guided Communist supervision, allowed to go to Ukraine.

Thus, the country has become a large prison-house for its people. Their most cherished possession is their spirit of freedom. Inhuman Kremlin agents have resorted to every device to deprive the Ukrainian people of this possession, but fortunately they have not succeeded in their task. Today, even under the most relentless of Soviet Russian totalitarian tyrannies, the sturdy and stouthearted Ukrainian clings steadfastly to his national ideals and still preserves his fervent love for freedom and independence.

The Ukrainian people, in and out of their homeland, have been a boon to the communities in which they lived. In this country they have been noted for their industry, ingenuity, and tenacity for hard work in whatever vocation. They have never shunned heavy labor in preference to something less arduous. In this respect their tough and resilient physiques, and their tenacious nature have served them well.

Hundreds of thousands of loyal, patriotic, and hardworking Americans of Ukrainian origin have always given excellent accounts of themselves in this country. I can say this because I have known many of them in my congressional district, and have seen them at work. These people of stolid character have contributed their full measure to the free and democratic way of life in this great Republic. They have been a positive force in the building of our democratic institutions, and they have always been ready to fight and die for the preservation of these institutions.

Today, on this solemn occasion, I am happy to join them in the celebration of the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit at this point a copy of the aforementioned House Resolution 14, 89th Congress, as well as a copy of the pastoral appeal of His Excellency, the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn, O.S.B.M., archbishop and metropolitan of Catholic Ukrainians in the United States, which appeared in the October 28, 1965, issue of America, the Ukrainian Catholic Daily. In addition, I would like to include as part of my remarks the pamphlet titled, "The Educational Policy of UCCA," written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, which deals with America's attitude toward Ukraine and all the captive nations. I am including this material because the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America conducts the annual U.S. observance of Ukraine's independence, and this pamphlet, as well as the archbishop's letter, make for instructive reading.

The material referred to follows:

H. Res. 14

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian Empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encourgement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the four Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

Lifting Hearts

(Pastoral appeal of His Excellency the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn, O.S.B.M., Archbishop and Metropolitan of Catholic Ukrainians in the U.S.A., on the November holiday, 1965)

The month of November in the life of the Ukrainian people is a month of joy and sorrow, for it was on November 1, 1918, that freedom's light shone forth on Galician Ukraine. Early that morning atop the city hall in Lviw the flag of blue and gold waved as the Ukrainian Army marched by. All grasped the truth that "in one's own house there is power, truth, and freedom." The bells of St. George's Cathedral announced to all that the long-awaited freedom was now born again for western Ukraine.

But alas, it was short lived. In a short time, "the joy was enveloped with sorrow." After days of joy there came years of sorrow, sufferings and servitude. There are still witnesses of the march of the Ukrainian Galician Army on Zbruch; those participants of death's quadrangle still live. It is not in our power to forget the cannons' tearing asunder of Ukrainian lands. Wounds from the torture racks of the prisons and the difficult pacification remain unhealed.

A still more bitter fortune fell upon our people in the eastern parts of Ukraine; it was so acrid that "there was no strength to withstand." There the entire populace became victims of serfdom bereft of all divine and human rights. The Ukrainian Church and her spiritual leaders were liquidated; the guiding lights of the nation were extinguished; and artificial famine was created; patriots arrested; and the young were rehabilitated beyond Ukraine's boundaries to do the work of slaves.

Such a state of affairs in the Ukrainian lands has lasted to this very day. But the enemies did not content themselves with present attainments of devastation in the occupied Ukrainian lands. In most recent times they have begun to disperse their servants into the free world so that even here they may continue their ruinous work by dividing the Ukrainian immigration, by undermining confidence in church and national leadership, utilizing to the fullest the evangelical words: "I shall smite the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered."

They have maintained this principle even in the occupied Ukrainian lands, so that even where once a pillar stood, they liquidated the Ukrainian Church. But the healthy roots of Ukrainian substance, that is, a deeply religious people, were not stifled there, and they will not fall prey to enticements here, for this people carries its religious flag highly.

Whether it be the marking of independence day on January 22, the sponsoring of Captive Nation's Week, or the recitation of a prayer in our American Congress, we remind the freedom-loving American people of our land and our governing authorities that there are still nations—among them the Ukrainian—who live in the slavery of an imperialistic Communist regime and, at the same time, we keep alive the hope of liberation for these people.

The first day of November, moreover brings to mind the great figure of church and nation, the servant of God, metropolitan Andrew Sheptytsky, who ended his God-pleasing life on November 1, 1944. He constantly warned our people of the enemies who would come in sheep's clothing and steal in our midst and cause desolation.

He calls from the grave to us and warns us of Communist encroachments which, just like in the old country—in the guise of that devil in the desert—leads the influential to tempt by showing the opulence of Ukrainian culture, the new achievements in Ukraine, and the melodious sounds of Ukrainian songs which embody all the charms of Ukraine, all in the name of cultural exchange. But let us not fool ourselves. Communism has not changed even though its tactics have.

Commemorating the illustrious anniversary of the November holiday and remembering in our prayers the heroes of Ukraine who laid down their lives for a better tomorrow for their people, let us ever be mindful that the liberating battle from the godless Communist yoke still continues. Ignoring political affiliations, we ought to stand in a united front against our religious and national enemies. The strength of our people lies in unity. Our unity will give moral strength to the Ukrainian people so that they may bear the burdensome yoke of slavery and spur them on to the continual battle with the enemy which ultimately will finish in the victory of the Church in Ukraine and her faithful.

Our unity here must not rest on our lips alone. It must be made manifest in good deeds. Let us not forget that many of our brothers and sisters, evicted from beneath their own roofs, still wander about the countries of Western Europe seeking out refuge for themselves and protection for the aged. They must yield to the graces of their new masters who do not always look on them with a favorable eye. Behold the victims of the last war and of our national catastrophe.

This November holiday gives us an opportunity not only to recall the great historic happenings that cast off the ancient shackles of Galicia but also to beg God for a better fortune, for the liberation from slavery so that once again freedom's light would radiate warmly over Ukraine. The November holiday exhorts us also to pray for the souls of those heroes who fell in the unequal battle and upon their heroism our freedom is tempered for further battle.

By this pastoral we direct that, on the occasion of the November holidays in 1965, the Our Father and Hail Mary be recited three times for the intention of the Ukrainian people at the end of all liturgies and a Panakhyda be celebrated for the servant of God, Metropolitan Andrew, martyred bishops, priests, and faithful who gave their lives on the altar of the fatherland. We conclude this archpastoral appeal with the words of a prayerful song: "O great and only God, protect our Ukraine." And I pray God that the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.

[From the Ukrainian Quarterly, Autumn 1965]

The Educational Policy of UCCA

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

In the past 15 years many changes have taken place in every part of this world. The changes have been of every conceivable character—economic, technological, political, social, religious, cultural and so forth. Any organization that has attracted international as well as domestic interest would necessarily have to take account of such changes if this rich interest is to be intensified and broadly interpreted in terms of the changed conditions, its programs must be prudently adapted to the new circumstances, and its publications and literary contributions must reflect a steady awareness of the need. The policy position of the organization must be periodically restated at home and in the world.

Significantly, as shifting conditions have warranted it, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America has at intervals defined and elaborated in the simplest and most precise terms possible the nature and objectives of its general policy. It has forthrightly stated and restated its position to innumerable inquirers who have raised the usual questions: "What are you for and against?" "Are you supported by foreign sources?" "Are you an emigré organization?" and "What are your purposes and aims?" Some, like the Washington Post in 1963, have mischaracterized the organization as one of the most powerful lobbies on Capitol Hill; others, like our recent Presidents, have properly viewed it as a citizens' group contributing to the welfare of this Nation; while still others, like the organs of colonialist Moscow and puppet Kiev, have furnished a series of hallucinations about the organization. The answers and replies have always been, so to speak, an open record and in the books, even for those with short memories or those suffering pains of uncertainty or changed allegiance.

As far back as 1951, for example, the committee offered its concrete responses to the problems that were then pressing and outstanding.[1] Taking full cognizance of numerous developments at home and in the world, it again stated its policy clearly and distinctly 6 years later.[2] In March 1965, UCCA expressed itself once more as to the nature and structure of its policy in the light of changes over the past 8 years. As in the preceding years, this action was necessary because of the never-ending inquiries, the forgetfulness of some, the healthiness of a periodic reexamination, and the doubts of a few who have been misguided by superficial developments in the Red Empire and elsewhere.

---

[1] "The Political Policy of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America," the Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. VII, No. 1, pp. 52–64.

The remarkable aspect of all these policy statements is the basic continuity of what are essentially principles and guidelines to a completely educational policy of UCCA. The 1957 statement, for instance, did not waver in this fundamental respect from the previous one, despite notable changes in the world such as the death of Stalin, the Pereyaslav Treaty concessions, the abortive Hungarian Revolution, the sputnik, and a host of other developments. Some individuals read too much into several of these changes and went hopelessly astray. As is often the case, changes in degree are mistaken for changes in kind, transformed appearances are misinterpreted for substantive modifications. In addition, mistakes of this sort usually reveal frail convictions, not to say tenuous knowledge.

Since 1957 to the very present who can deny the sweeping changes that have marked contemporary history? The tremendous economic strides of the United States, Western Europe, and other parts of the free world, the space explorations of this period, captive Cuba, the weakening of NATO, the Sino-Soviet Russian rift, the economic troubles of the Red empire, Sino-Russian infiltration of Latin America, Africa, and southeast Asia, Vietnam and numerous other significant developments can be cited. Each of these has to be rationally considered when one speaks of a policy that is fixed in principle but not static in content, flexible for operation but not naive in pragmatism, founded on certitude but not sterile in action. Each of these changes and more were carefully taken account of as the 1965 educational policy of UCCA was developed and accepted by its executive bodies. As in every instance, the policy can be democratically revised at the UCCA conventions, but in view of the firm and tested continuity of this policy, the likelihood of any substantial revision is virtually nil.

TEN POLICY POINTS

The educational policy of UCCA rests on 10 fundamental points. These really constitute the principles and guidelines of UCCA action. Dealing with norms, purposes, objectives, and principles, the 10 points naturally cannot provide ready answers to all problem situations. To expect this is to demand omniscience. The vain and actually absurd pretension of omniscience can best be left with the Red totalitarians. However, in the necessary interplay of theory and practice, idea and act, these points do provide a base for a rational treatment of pertinent problems, regardless of how complex they may be. The recurring plan of complexity is no excuse for inaction or muddled performance.

I. PRIMARY CONTRIBUTION TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Preceding all others, the first cardinal point of UCCA's educational policy is work and effort aimed at preserving and strengthening the national security of the United States. This has been and is the most fundamental objective of UCCA, and its accomplishment is being progressively realized through the many unique channels open to it. In one of his messages to a UCCA convention President Harry S. Truman underscored this point and stated that "The natural desire of all peoples for a free way of life will be strengthened as the true story of democracy is made known in lands where distortion has become an art of government."[3] This includes the United States as well as Ukraine and all the captive nations. It includes Russia. The statement alludes to only one of the functions of UCCA.

We cannot repeat too often the famous declaration of our late President John F. Kennedy, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." For us, this epitomized the spirit and action of UCCA long before it was uttered and appeared in print. If any group has hammered away at the truth that without a strong and courageous America, to which every citizen must contribute, the cause of freedom would be lost throughout the world, it is certainly this national organization. Freedom for Ukraine and for all the captive nations would be truly a grand illusion. Dedicated to our American tradition of democracy and independence, as expressed by the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the Constitution, UCCA is a completely American institution, a national organization, that draws upon a wealth of Ukrainian resourcefulness and experience to do what it can for our country and thus, in the world context, for the eventual liberation and freedom of all the captive nations, including the largest of them in Eastern Europe, Ukraine itself.

Contrary to illusions held by some, UCCA is not, nor has ever been, an ersatz Ukrainian Parliament, a government in exile, or an agent for any government in exile. Where these fanciful notions have arisen, it is difficult to say. However, various reasons inspiring and promoting such notions are not difficult to surmise. Any attempt to compromise the character of this essentially educational institution—which is one of Americans of Ukrainian background infused with a free Kozak spirit—and to hamper its effectiveness would tactically utilize such distortions. The plain fact is that not an iota of evidence exists to prove that UCCA is other than what it has been from its very inception.

It would literally take dozens of volumes to record the public testimonies, releases, articles, statements, and other documents, and to include a series of books and brochures, that have been produced and issued by UCCA in the specific interrelated interests of our Nation, the entire free world, and the captive nations in Europe, Asia, and Latin America. The educational purpose and value of UCCA's functions, indeed its very being, have been amply confirmed by the countless messages of support and complimentary affirmation received over the years from virtually every sphere of our American society.

From this strictly educational viewpoint, two notable and historic contributions by UCCA deserve mention. The first is the Captive Nations Week resolution (Public Law 86-90) passed by Congress in 1959. UCCA was in the educational vanguard for the passage of this resolution, which was authored by its president and explained by its branches throughout the States. Year in and year out, with every passing Captive Nations Week, Moscow and its junior partners and their colonial puppets pour verbal venom on the resolution. There is a morbid fear on their part that the resolution will in time be fully implemented; there is nothing but boundless psychopolitical power in this widespread fear for us.

The second, solid contribution to American understanding of the Soviet Russian menace is the Shevchenko Statue of Liberty in Washington. The Shevchenko memorial resolution (Public Law 86-749) was also the result of the educational efforts of UCCA, its president formulating its contents and its membership, propagating its meaning and significance among fellow Americans. As the roster of the honorary committee for the Shevchenko unveiling showed, the response across the country was tremendous.

Less spectacular but equally solid contributions by UCCA have been registered in the areas of immigration, the investigation of Communist aggression, the Voice of America's broadcasts to the Soviet Union, the development of Radio Liberty, the institutionalization of Captive Nations Week, and official recognition of Ukrainian Independence Day. The organization's continuous work in combating myths and falsehoods about the Soviet Union and rendering positive information and knowledge about the Red empire are even less dramatic, but for the long run are perhaps of more fundamental worth. In addition, as an intensely active citizens' group, representing with certainty the thoughts and sentiments of over 2 million Americans of Ukrainian background, UCCA is invariably consulted on matters of new legislation, new research projects, and public events. The Freedom Academy bill, the measure for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, the East-West trade issue, the consular treaty with the U.S.S.R. are only a few examples.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, who as Senator had participated in many Ukrainian independence observances, accurately portrayed our cause in a memorable message at the conclusion of the Shevchenko festivities. He said, "This is a cause which has not yet been fully won as long as there are still bonds of servitude which keep men from enjoying their rights and their liberties anywhere in the world."[4] "Anywhere in the world" means Ukraine and the other captive nations in the U.S.S.R.

II. THE DECISIVE DEFEAT OF SOVIET RUSSIAN IMPERIO-COLONIALISM

Concerning the most recent developments, UCCA was spontaneous in its support of President Johnson's courageous action in Vietnam. This unstinted support could almost be deduced from the points described here and the principles by which we abide and live. Our knowledge and convictions caused us to go even further, urging the President "to accommodate South Vietnamese psychopolitical warfare further north, to North Vietnam, warning the captive people of that Communist satellite that their aggressive Communist masters will eventually meet their doom."[5] It was no different in the case of the Dominican Republic, which was on the skids of a classical Communist takeover. Our endorsement of the President's action was unanimous, praising the President for his "preventive diplomacy toward the Dominican nation, truly saving it from an insidious Communist takeover sponsored jointly by the Soviet Russian imperio-colonialists, the Red Chinese totalitarians, and the Castro quislings."[6]

However, conflicts on the fringes of the Red empire should not blind us to the fact that both historically and analytically the ultimate source of the global friction is Soviet Russia in the U.S.S.R. This and other dominant reasons justify the second paramount point in UCCA's educational policy, namely, the goal of decisively defeating Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism without precipitating a world holocaust. We readily recognize the emergence of Red Chinese imperialism and the rivalries involved in the Sino-Soviet Russian rift. Yet, a wishful exaggeration of either or both cannot overshadow the blunt facts of predominant Soviet Russian power in the Red empire. Sober analysis of comparative economic, military, and technological data can only lead to the logical conclusion that the whole Red empire, including Mao's China, Tito's Yugoslavia, and Castro's Cuba, in the final countdown depends on the strength and power of the U.S.S.R. On the basis of hard facts rather than fleeting political rhetoric about polycentrism and the demise of bipolarity, the U.S.S.R. stands in the same power relation to the rest of the Red empire that the United States of America does in relation to the rest of the free world. If for some reason either should collapse, the rest would go, too.

---

[2] "UCCA Policy Today," the Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. XIII, No. 4, pp. 297–304.

[3] Message of the President of the United States, the Ukrainian Bulletin, July 15–Aug. 1, 1952, p. 1.

[4] The President's Shevchenko message, the Ukrainian Bulletin, July 1–15, 1965, p. 63.

[5] "UCCA Endorses President Johnson's Policies in Vietnam," the Ukrainian Bulletin, Apr. 1–15, 1965, p. 29.

[6] "UCCA Fully Supports President Johnson's Preventive Action in Santo Domingo," the Ukrainian Bulletin, June 1–15, 1965, p. 49.

In line with these perspectives, many current notions bearing on developments in the Red empire are critically challenged by UCCA. As one example, the notion of "a growing independence of East European nations" is a product of wishful thinking rather than a reflection of basic reality. At the beginning of this decade Moscow itself indicated the need for more flexible relations between Red states in order to enhance the strength of all. It was accommodated in this by the inert policy of the West toward the captive nations. In the area of Russian-non-Russian relations within the Soviet Union the evidence on flexible maneuvers to suit Moscow's purposes is overwhelming in its provision of precedents to what is occurring now in central Europe.

UCCA has developed and advanced the valuable concept of the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. In the past 15 years the concept has gained wide currency in official and private circles. It is anathema to Moscow because it emphasizes the primary enemy of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and sterilizes persistent Russian propaganda charges of "American imperialism," particularly among the underdeveloped states. The concept is an integral part of the broader captive nations conception which, too, is powerfully challenging to so-called Communist ideology.

In advancing these truths, UCCA does not minimize the deceptive power of Communist theory and ideology. On the contrary, it has always urged the necessity for a full exposure of the Russian and Chinese perversion of Marxism and the need to distinguish between the red cloths of Marxism-Leninism and the matadors of Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism that are behind them. We have marched a long way in impressing these distinctions and truths on the minds of other freemen. And since much remains to be done, all like-minded friends of freedom should always remember the words of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, "my hope is that your magnificent march from the shadow of the Washington Monument to the foot of the statute of Taras Shevchenko will here enkindle a new, world movement in the hearts, minds, words, and actions of men." [7]

III. DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF FREE WORLDWIDE CONTACTS

Constructive contributions to the free world's struggle for expanded freedom and against Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism can never be realized by sole possession of ideas, knowledge, talents, experience, and views. The steady and ever-widening circulation of such resources is imperative. This is almost stating the obvious. Yet to bring all this armament into operational play requires the formation of relations and contacts, time, and extensive travel.

UCCA has always emphasized the importance of developing and maintaining farflung free worldwide contacts. For maximum implementation of its educational programs and objectives this organization has developed lines of communication with groups and individuals on every continent. With its American orientation and Ukrainian background resources, it has contacts with scholarly, cultural, political, religious, and other groups, both Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian, throughout the world. These necessary relations imply no integral connections, no subsidies given or received, no preferential treatment or subordination of institutional will. They are simply indispensable channels for rich exchanges of ideas, informational flows, and the development of mutual projects.

On the plane of religious relations the question of a Ukrainian Catholic Patriarchate has been widely discussed. This really has posed no problem for UCCA. If you have read carefully the essential elaboration of point one, it should be evident that in its dedication to the historic principles of the American tradition, UCCA by definition is given to complete religious freedom, here, in Ukraine or elsewhere. This patriarchate would be both an expression of religious freedom and a vital national symbol of Ukraine. Its concrete establishment rests entirely with the decision of the papacy, which is in the best position to determine when, how, where, and who. Entanglements of any intrareligious sort are clearly beyond the purview of UCCA.

IV. ACTION COORDINATION WITH OTHER NATIONAL U.S. ORGANIZATIONS

In one of his messages to UCCA our late President Kennedy made a very significant point. He declared, "It would be surprising and also contrary to American traditions if our citizens of Ukrainian descent failed to retain interest in their former homeland or to show concern for the fate and future of Ukrianians there." [8] What the 35th President of the United States was stressing is the ever-present need of American understanding of other peoples and nations. With regard to Ukraine, who could better transmit such understanding than those who were born and lived there, as well as those who were born here but raised in such understanding?

To convey an accurate knowledge and appreciative understanding of Ukraine, as well as of other neighboring nations in Eastern Europe, a close action coordination with other national American organizations is a sine qua non. UCCA has long recognized this fact, so that today it itself is a member of several organizations, such as the All-American Conference to Combat Communism or the National Captive Nations Committee, and has coordinated its educational policy with the work of any groups dealing with a variety of subjects. Soviet Russian and Red Chinese genocide, cold war education, U.S. foreign policy, the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. and many other subjects have brought UCCA into a common bond with numerous groups and organizations.

Captive Nations Week, held annually in July, has provided an excellent medium for coordinated effort among our citizen groups. Veteran, youth, women's and other organizations now participate in the week's observance and the base of coordination steadily expands. UCCA performs its educational task for the benefit of others, who in this productive exchange does the same for us.

V. AVOIDANCE OF MYOPIC INVOLVEMENTS IN TERRITORIAL PROBLEMS

Another important principle in UCCA's policy is the scrupulous avoidance of myopic involvements in territorial problems, whether in Europe or Asia. This is not to say that an occasional discussion of such problems should not be undertaken. It would be unrealistic not to do so. But to become so involved as to delineate boundary lines for the future, as between Ukraine and Russia, Poland and Lithuania, etc., is a fruitless expenditure of time and energy. It is also a potential source of needless friction.

The first foremost objective is to lay the educational groundwork for the freedom of all the captive nations. This goal of freedom is primary; the matter of boundaries is secondary and even of no consequence at this time. Paradoxically, a general recognition of this basic fact makes it possible to discuss territorial and boundary issues in a calmer and more friendly atmosphere. And, as in the case of the Oder-Neisse line, it can in time contribute to an acceptable solution without hindering the freedom efforts of both the Poles and Germans.

VI. THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLD WAR EDUCATION

Almost 20 years ago an outstanding American writer and political analyst observed that "No people in Europe have a better fighting anti-Communist record than the Ukrainians." [9] The observation pointed to a wealth of experience in various types of warfare against the Soviet Russians—political, propaganda, and guerrilla. Anyone in the least familiar with the history of Ukraine from the Soviet Russian conquest in 1920 to the present can cite at will episodes and events substantiating this overall judgment. This fund of experience, learned directly and vicariously, lies at the base of UCCA's advocacy and advancement of cold war education in America.

The Red totalitarians have trained their professional revolutionaries for decades. Their schools have developed the operational science of political warfare, encompassing a whole range of subjects and techniques for conquest and takeover. There is nothing comparable to this in the free world. As a consequence, UCCA has long supported the establishment of a U.S. Freedom Academy and the idea of a supplementing private academy to train leaders in the theory and operations of psychopolitical warfare. Cuba, Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic are recent examples of Red political warfare; there will be more to come. This special type of warfare is the Red Empire's chief hope for further expansion, barring any startling breakthrough in military-space ventures.

It has been for these reasons and more that UCCA has persistently opposed the policy of simple containment, which today is really a quilt of patched-up containment. Only an intelligently understood policy of liberation, based on the operational science and art of psychopolitical warfare, can fend off further Red aggression in the free world, offer the best insurance against a hot global war, and pave the way for cold war victory.

As any Christian-motivated organization must do, UCCA has always upheld the principle of genuine, peaceful coexistence between and among nations. The Russian perversion of this principle, which it uses as a shield for its cold war activities, should be clearly understood. Moreover, the notion of evolution as applied to the U.S.S.R. and other Red states, whereby they will be transformed into peaceable and respectable entities, is belied by facts on their economic priorities, Communist Party controls, and global cold war operations. If evolution is to play a role, it would have to be selective under a liberation policy and not random as under present conditions.

---

[7] Shevchenko Address by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Ukrainian Bulletin, June–August, 1964, p. 43.

[8] Presidential message, the "Ukrainian Bulletin," November–December 1962, p. 82.

[9] William Henry Chamberlin, "Ukraine: Ally Behind the Iron Curtain," the Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. IV, No. 1, 1948, pp. 10–18.

Finally, the educational policy of UCCA has consistently supported the principle of unrestricted cultural exchange. This is a natural corollary of peaceful coexistence which would be reinforced by a healthy interpenetration of ideas and customs. The present brand of highly restricted cultural exchange is an instrument of cold war calculation for Moscow, resulting in numerous net advantages for our adversary.

Subtle Red attempts to neutralize and weaken anti-Communist organizations here should be firmly resisted. Red gestures to participate in the Shevchenko statue unveiling, to display the Ukrainian front in Moscow, the United Nations, and in the U.S.S.R. Embassy in Washington, and to promote "cultural meetings" with Americans of Ukrainian ancestry are only a few examples that have been properly thwarted by UCCA. One would have to be naive, indeed, to believe that dispatched Ukrainian agents of the Red Empire are motivated by purely cultural reasons. UCCA policy discourages the provision of any forums for these agents and any contacts with them by its leadership and membership. Nothing can be gained from them, much can be lost as the inevitable distortions of such meetings are circulated in Ukraine. UCCA policy is oriented toward the captive people of Ukraine, and they are not permitted to travel.

VII. REJECTION OF COMMON GUILT OF UNVESTED RUSSIAN PEOPLE

Another cardinal principle of UCCA's educational policy is the outright rejection of any common guilt on the part of the unvested and oppressed Russian people for the crimes and aggressions of the Government in Moscow. To be strongly and rightly opposed to Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism does not mean to be against the Russian people. Any attempt to confuse the two is sufficient cause for suspicion. The vast majority of the Russian people cannot be confused with the exploiting new class and the 12 million Communist Party members, their families and relatives who have a stake in Soviet Russian totalitarian rule and imperial dominion.

The unvested Russian people are a captive people, though not in the full sense of captivity as the non-Russian peoples. Russia was not overrun and conquered by any foreign aggressor. By and large the Russian nation has been captive for over five centuries in the closed society of barbaric Russian political institutions. The real independence of Russia means the final liberation of its people from this institutional bondage and its nexus, Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. One of the greatest contributions to the independence of Russia and the liberation of its people would be the defeat of this imperio-colonialism. This is why it is so important to concentrate on this central force.

VIII. THE NECESSARY DISMEMBERMENT OF THE SOVIET RUSSIAN EMPIRE

Logically consistent with the preceding point is this one establishing the goal of the necessary dismemberment of the Soviet Russian empire. Another way of putting it is the goal of freedom and independence for all the captive nations, particularly those in the Soviet Union. The twin forces of Russian imperio-colonialism and totalitarianism are the main props of the empire. A weakening of the former would undermine the latter, and pave the way for the independence of both the non-Russian nations and Russia. This is the meaning of a necessary dismemberment of the empire.

No reputable source has ever advocated the dismemberment of Russia, the nation, itself. To bring about the dismemberment of the entire empire or its primary structure, the Soviet Union, does not mean the cutting up of Russia. For the last is not identical with either of the preceding two. Here, too, any attempt to identify the dismemberment of the U.S.S.R. with that of Russia is the result of either an empire bias or an incapacity to distinguish realities. When we note a so-called expert on Russia writing about the Russian Empire as a traditional Russian state and claiming that the breakup of this empire would mean the dismemberment of Russia, we have good cause to wonder about the sources of his authority.[10]

There are many others on the American scene who are similarly confused. This unfortunate condition emphasizes again the importance of UCCA's educational policy in these times. No one profits from this protracted confusion but the totalitarian Red adversaries of America. From a window in the Kremlin this confused state of mind is political capital for Russian cold war gaming.

IX. INTENSIFYING THE PERENNIAL FORCE OF NATIONAL SELF-DETERMINATION

Since its inception UCCA has produced a variety of works dealing with the principle of national self-determination. This historic principle is a precious one in the revolutionary American tradition. Untiringly, UCCA has shown how the Russian Bolsheviks under Lenin had perverted and exploited it in creating the new Soviet Russian Empire and how the present imperio-colonialists in Moscow are manipulating it in the underdeveloped and formerly colonial areas. The importance of fully exposing Soviet Russian and Red Chinese imperio-colonialism in the United Nations and throughout the world cannot be too strongly emphasized.

These and other reasons account for UCCA's educational goal of intensifying the perennial force of national self-determination in its genuine and true sense. This force is truly a nuclear spiritual device that has not been properly employed by us in the United Nations, over the Voice of America, and through numerous other media. Moreover, the delicate use of the principle still eludes the understanding of many. For example, historically the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. and other parts of Moscow's empire have already determined themselves. Thus, in present circumstances, the application of this basic principle can only mean a revived opportunity to exercise fully and freely, without foreign domination or restraint, the already determined wills of these various captive nations.

X. GRADUAL FEDERATION OF EUROPE AND OF ASIA

Lastly, the final point of UCCA's educational policy is the gradual federation of Europe and of Asia. With a working vision of the future, it has consistently held that this historic process cannot logicaly begin in Eastern Europe without the moral and political base of genuine national independence and freedom. Both in Western and Eastern Europe the necessities of economic and technologic integration have been at work for some time, but the real fruition of the federalizing process depends on politico-moral criteria, and very likely would pass through stages of confederation.

Independence—confederation—federation would be the necessary process in Eastern Europe, Asia, and even now noncaptive Africa. The formula satisfies the driving necessities of history and could create a framework preserving the national identities, treasures, and diversities of each people. It certifies to a future of freedom, growth, and prosperity as against the mythical Red wave of the future featured by tyranny, imperio-colonialist exploitation, and cultural darkness.

CONCLUSION

Fifteen years ago this national organization dedicated its resources to a lifetime project—Our Crusade of Truth for Freedom.[11] It has been and is a crusade in an educational sense. Time is short, and it takes time to learn the truth. As one scans the range of UCCA's fundamental educational activities over these years, he cannot but conclude that this dedicated effort of all involved has succeeded well and also has an even brighter future than ever before: publications, work with congressional committees, international representations, endless consultations, public observances, testimonies, promotion of citizens' participation in election campaigns, use of communications media, and humanitarian and cultural projects.

The 10 points of UCCA's educational policy are the foundation of this crusade of truth for freedom. The crusade is not one of fanatical emotion but of calm convictions; it is not one of imposed views but the opportunity for reasoned deliberation; it is, in essence, an organized effort in education for freedom.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, in 1917, when the Russian revolution broke out, the freedom-loving Ukrainian people seized the opportunity to end centuries of subjugation and shed the yoke of Russian domination. Tragically, their independence, proclaimed on January 22, 1918 in Kiev, was short-lived.

Communist Russia immediately attacked the new Ukrainian National Republic and the valiant young nation succumbed to the military might of the numerically superior Soviet forces after 3 years of fighting.

On January 22, 1966, Americans of Ukrainian extraction observed the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of independence and the 47th anniversary of the Proclamation of the Act of Union which took place on January 22, 1919, in Kiev, uniting all Ukrainian lands into one sovereign and independent republic.

I have been notified by Walter Tustaniwsky, chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Detroit-East and Hamtramck branch, that Americans of Ukrainian descent in the Detroit metropolitan area held an observance of the anniversaries on Sunday, January 23, 1966, in the Masonic Temple in Detroit.

Such observances all across this land of the free serve as a forceful reminder to all Americans of all national backgrounds that the flame of liberty still burns brightly in the hearts of the more than 40 million Ukrainians who still are captives of the Soviets. I am honored to pay tribute to this freedom-loving people.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

---

[10] George F. Kennan, "On Dealing With the Communist World," New York, 1964, pp. 13–14.

[11] The Ukrainian Bulletin, vol. III, No. 20, Oct. 15, 1950, pp. 1, 4.

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of a free Ukraine. It was on January 22, 1918, that one of the great nations of Europe and one of the stalwart peoples of the world, achieved freedom and independence.

That nation—that great people—are no longer free. Attacked by a ruthless and greedy foe, the free peoples of the Ukraine were overrun by Russian Communist forces.

These are a brave people, whose courage is known throughout the world. They have been oppressed by the heavy hand of the Kremlin longer than any minority group in Soviet Russia.

It is fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we pause to honor these valiant men. I am proud to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to their indomitable spirit. We wish them continued strength and power in their fight for freedom.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, January 22 represents a memorable date to millions of American citizens who are committed to the concept of Ukrainian independence. It was on January 22, 1918, that the first independent Ukrainian state was proclaimed. Tragically, it was overwhelmed by superior Soviet Communist military force in November 1920.

The Soviet Union delivers high-sounding pronouncements against colonialism in Asia and Africa, but in truth it has an abysmal record in its colonial relationship, particularly with the area known as the Ukraine. The Ukraine surpasses a majority of the newly independent states and many United Nations members of long standing in possessing the attributes which comprise a nation.

My primary objective today is to encourage those in the Congress and in the information media who are in a position to do so to raise their voices, along with many movements and groups, in calling for Ukrainian independence and freedom.

Self-determination and individual liberty are among the most cherished ideals of mankind. Very well then, why should they not be applied in the Ukraine? Surely people who have fought and died and worked as hard for their freedom and national survival against the Soviet colossus deserve the right to self-determination as much as any other group or territory.

The Ukraine has many times shown its hatred of Soviet oppression. This is one factor that has caused the Soviet Government to disperse millions of Ukrainians throughout the Soviet Union. Though they are unable at the present time to voice their protests against Soviet colonial rule, millions of their descendants and supporters in America are raising the banner of freedom in their stead. How many Americans will take up the challenge which confronts all freedom-loving men?

On the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, I am deeply honored to count myself as a member of the forces arrayed to secure Ukrainian independence and freedom. The road is long and difficult, Mr. Speaker, but I feel confident that the spirit of the Ukrainian patriots will sustain us and guide us to ultimate victory.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], in commemorating today the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

The Ukrainian people, who are the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain, fought courageously to retain their democratic government and their recently acquired freedom against Communist forces, but they were vanquished in 1920.

The Ukraine had suffered as a divided nation under foreign rule for many years, so the loss of their brief period of independence and unity, free from war and conquest, which had been proclaimed on January 22, 1918, was especially unfortunate.

However, I know that the Ukrainian people continue to strongly aspire to freedom, and we must help them keep this goal alive until the day when they can rid their nation of Communist domination. The free world must continually assure these brave people that they are not fogotten.

A practical step that we could take on behalf of the oppressed people of the Ukraine is an increase in the hours of Ukrainian language broadcasts over the Voice of America facilities. Presently, the Voice of America beams only 1 hour of Ukrainian a day, which is a most impractical policy in view of the fact that the Ukrainians are the largest non-Russian nation held captive within the U.S.S.R.

For the last 5 years, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. FLOOD], and I have worked together to obtain approval for the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. Unfortunately, the State Department, White House, and majority party leadership in the House continue to oppose the establishment of such a committee.

It is an unfortunate fact that the present foreign policy of the United States is based on the erroneous view that the Soviet Union can be trusted and will cooperate with us in the quest for peace. Nothing in the history of the Soviet Union in the last 48 years substantiates the credibility of coexistence with communism. Certainly, the people of the Ukraine, one of the first victims of Communist oppression, bear witness to the basic deceit and the fundamental evil of communism.

Mr. Speaker, the world will not achieve true freedom and real peace until the Ukrainian people and the other captive nations behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains are allowed to adopt a government of their own choosing.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this week we commemorate the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Ukraine. It is well for us in the Congress of the United States to pause for a few moments in our deliberations to pay tribute to the people of Ukraine who have suffered so much for freedom and have enjoyed so little of it. For 200 years this gallant little nation of some 45 million has enjoyed a little more than 2 years of national independence.

On January 22, 1918, the independence of the Ukrainian Republic was declared and received recognition from the Bolshevik Government of the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, like so many promises made by the Communist masters in the Kremlin, the promise to recognize the national existence of Ukraine was ignored and the Soviets launched a military aggression against the Ukrainian people. By the end of 1920 independence had been snuffed out in Ukraine and this nation became a part of the Communist slave empire.

It is well for us on this anniversary to ponder the words of Taras Shevchenko, the national poet of Ukraine:

> One thing only I cannot bear:
> To know my land, that was beguiled
> Into a death trap with a lie
> Trampled and ruined and defiled—
> Ah, but I care, dear God; I care.

Mr. Speaker, let it never be said that we in the United States will forget the promise of Woodrow Wilson of self-determination for all people. On this 48th anniversary, let us renew our pledge to the Ukrainian people that one day they shall again know a new birth of freedom.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana at this point.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr, Speaker, I wish to commend our colleague from Pennsylvania the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD for setting aside this time today to pay tribute to the liberty-loving nation of Ukraine. This is the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence and the world admires its constant fight to regain its self-government and liberty which it has fought for so valiantly over the centuries.

The year 1917 brought great tidings and joy to millions of Ukrainians with the hope that victory had finally been won and that freedom would permanently be had for these long generations battling for independence. Unfortunately, one of its oldtime neighbors and enemies terminated this dream of self-government and today we find Ukraine under the tyrannical domination of the Soviet Socialist Republics.

Ukraine lies on the shores of the Black Sea and extends from the Carpathian Mountains to the Donets Basin and Kryvy Rih and Don River. This area comprises the richest and most productive soil in the world. Unlimited coal and iron deposits are in this section. By reason of the unlimited wealth in nature's soil and mineral deposits the Turks, Russians, and all of the powerful tyrants in history have sought to control Ukraine. It is the earnest hope of the people throughout the world that a nation which has fought for centuries for liberty will someday be rewarded with self-government and permanent peace.

When the Soviet Communists first invaded Ukrainia after World War I, they were as much interested in plundering the peasants to secure grain and food as they were in capturing the country. The peasants resisted and the leaders of the nation fought to the bitter end to maintain their independence. After heroic resistance by the Ukrainian people in 1930 came the Soviet order for compulsory collectivism organization of all the land and products of the nation. Naturally this aroused tremendous opposition. In many places the Ukrainian people killed their cattle rather than turn them over and the general revolt against the Soviet tyrants was rampant among the farmers of the nation.

In 1931 and 1932, Stalin and his henchmen inflicted their manmade tyranny which caused starvation to millions and sent others into Soviet prisons and labor camps. The story of Ukrainia since that time has been sad and sorrowful but to the everlasting credit of Ukrainians throughout the world, their spirit and desires for freedom and independence still survives with the same intensity that it has back through the centuries. With the aid of free nations and the fact that millions throughout the world are rapidly learning the true facts about atheistic communism and its leaders, it is our hope that the day is not too far distant when internal rebellion behind the Iron Curtain, with the aid of freedom-loving people on the outside, will bring independence to the Ukrainian people and other satellite countries now under the Soviet tyranny.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman from Indiana saw fit to make these remarks at this point, because he is known as the chairman of the now world famous Katyn Massacre Committee. I had the pleasure of serving with him on that committee, oh, it must be 10 years ago, when at the suggestion of this House we conducted the investigation of the massacre by Red Russia of 5,000 Polish officers in the early days of World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on this same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], who down through the last 20 years has stood with me in this well on this and allied subjects dealing with the captive nations.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend most highly our very distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], who has been in the forefront in the battle for human freedom and human liberty throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we should set aside this time in the House of Representatives to recall and honor the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian national independence.

We do so because this day has special meaning to over 1½ million of our citizens who trace their origin to the ancient nation of Ukraine. Well over a century ago Ukrainian immigrants began arriving on our shores, seeking a new life in freedom. They have prospered in our land and they have in turn made their full contribution to the building of our Nation. Today we find them and their descendants in every walk of American life; the professions, the sciences, the arts, in education, in government, in industry and business, and in great farming enterprises. They are proud to be Americans and they are proud of their heritage. It is only natural that they should aspire to see the blessings of freedom and national independence which they enjoy returned to the nation of their origin.

Only a few days ago President Johnson in his state of the Union address underscored the importance of our support of national independence for all countries as a foundation stone of our foreign policy. Outlining the five continuing lines of policy followed by the last four Presidents, President Johnson emphasized the importance of the national independence movement to world peace. These excerpts from his address bear upon the anniversary we observe today:

> The fifth and most important principle of our foreign policy is support of national independence, the right of each people to govern themselves and to shape their own institutions.
>
> For a peaceful world order will be possible only when each country walks the way that it has chosen to walk for itself.
>
> We follow this principle by encouraging the end of colonial rule.
>
> We follow this principle abroad as well as at home by continued hostility to the rule of the many by the few or the opposition of one race by another.

We have seen the world of our times torn by conflicting ideologies and selfish interests. At times the fainthearted have feared that the new totalitarianism of communism was gathering strength—and in the words of the Moscow propagandists "was the wave of the future." Those committed to human freedom have never shared this view. President Johnson has expressed the belief of our people on this issue, in these words:

> The insistent urge toward national independence is the strongest force of today's world in which we live.
>
> It is eroding the unity of what was once a Stalinist empire.
>
> History is on the side of freedom and is on the side of societies as shaped from the genius of each people. History does not favor a single system or belief unless force is used to make it so.

It is to the everlasting credit of all Americans of Ukrainian origin that they have labored over the years to bring deserved recognition and understanding to the plight of modern day Ukraine. They have done a great service for our country because they have been supporting the most important principle guiding our foreign policy. They have been working in the cause of world peace because the road to a just and lasting peace is that which leads to fulfilling the right of all nations, large and small, to national independence and a place in the community of free nations. And they have made a splendid contribution to strengthening the hopes and aspirations of the people in Ukraine—a nation which has struggled against great odds to regain its national independence.

Mr. Speaker, a nation which has sacrificed so much and struggled so long for the ideals of liberty, human dignity, and self-government cannot forever be denied fulfillment of its aspirations. Time and the tide of human events is on the side of the heroic people of ancient Ukraine. They will win their goal as surely as day follows night. The sooner they win victory in the cause we share with them the sooner will peace worthy of the name prevail in the world.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio who year after year for many years lends his voice and his feelings to this very important anniversary.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the unhappy condition of the captive nations continues. Non-Communist majorities continue to be subjected to rule by Communist minorities which took power by ugly and conspiratorial means. This is true of the Ukraine, as well as the nominally sovereign nations of Eastern Europe.

At least once a year, Congress puts the problems and plight of the Ukraine in proper focus by observing the anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic, which took place on January 22, 1918. But we are conscious of it the entire year.

There is pressure from within in all of Eastern Europe. This pressure should be encouraged from without, accompanied by an appreciation of all the subleties.

We are building bridges between ourselves and the people of the captive nations. Our continued interest may not be decisive in either the short or long term, but it is of the utmost importance.

Patriotism and nationalism still permeate every nation of Eastern Europe, making uncertain any prediction of tranquility and stability. For example, career diplomats on our side, as well as the Communist leadership, were unprepared for the October 1956 events in Poland and Hungary. We should not underestimate the endurance of patriots and nationalists, for conditions are not static. We have seen even Communists revolt against Communists, and now a formerly "safe" satellite, Rumania, has embarked on an ambitious expansion of trade.

It behooves us to rise above mere perfunctory acknowledgments of the independence days of the captive states and inform ourselves of every aspect of their condition.

The Ukraine, as much as any captive nation, has maintained its language, culture, and nationalist spirit despite centuries of Russian domination. It has given the Soviet Union constant cause for concern.

Americans of Ukrainian descent have not forgotten their brothers, and they remind us that we should not forget them either. We must do what is morally right—affirm the principle of self-determination—fully confident that such an affirmation is also politically right.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in observing the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the fair and fertile Ukraine is a natural and strategic borderland between East and West, between Europe proper and the Eurasian Continent, and its sturdy inhabitants have borne the brunt of all invaders in either direction throughout the centuries. For more than 300 years in modern times the country has been submerged in the huge Russian landmass, and during all that time autocratic czars and Communist tyrants have done their utmost to suppress and crush all distinctive Ukrainian national traits: their desire for freedom, their boundless love for their homeland, their undying yearning for political independence, and their readiness to sacrifice all their worldly possessions as well as their lives for the attainment of their national goals. Only once in the course of their centuries-long subjugation to alien rulers have they had the chance of attaining their freedom. That was in 1918. When the czar's autocracy was overthrown, and Austria could no longer rule over western Ukraine, they seized upon the occasion and proclaimed their national independence. That was done on January 22, 48 years ago.

That historic landmark in the recent history of the Ukrainian people has become their national holiday. They celebrate the day in due solemnity, even though the freedom which was ushered in on that day has long ceased to exist. More than 45 years ago the Ukrainian people were robbed of their freedom by the Red Army, and since then these stouthearted peasants have been subjected to the callous and cruel regime of the Kremlin.

To this day the Ukraine remains a province of the Soviet empire, and for more than four decades some 40 million Ukrainians have been living in their homeland as prisoners in a large prison camp, working there mostly for the benefit of their heartless taskmasters. They are separated from the free world by the unshakable Iron Curtain, and they are almost completely sealed off from the outside world. Of course they cannot enjoy any of the freedoms which we in the West regard as our own inalienable birthright.

Under such unenviable cirumstances they do not and cannot celebrate their national holiday, their independence day. Fortunately, however, hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians who live in freedom in the free world celebrate that holiday and Ukrainian-Americans solemnly observe the anniversary of this memorable day in the fond hope of keeping alive the undying spirit of an independent Ukraine. I am indeed glad to join them on the 48th anniversary celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the millions of our fellow American citizens who are celebrating the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence and express my congratulations to those who help to keep January 22, 1918, a living symbol of freedom. Not only do persons of Ukrainian descent commemorate this day, but many other citizens who want to show their dedication to the concept of individual freedom and liberty.

With the Ukraine being represented in the United Nations, some might mistakenly think that the Soviet Union has granted autonomy to such a degree that the Ukraine can genuinely take its place among other independent states. In reality, of course, nothing could be further from the truth. The Ukraine's membership in the United Nations is solely a token gesture and a means by which the Soviet Union is assured of another vote in the General Assembly.

The duplicity of the Russian Government is amazing when one considers how Soviet leaders have solemnly posed as champions of self-determination and anticolonialism, but in practice refuse to even consider granting real independence to the Ukraine. There is no doubt whatsoever as to the Ukraine's ability to prosper as a self-reliant, independent state. Its vast economic potential is one which would make any Ukrainian government proud. Russia's refusal to withdraw its colonial presence has prevented Ukraine from assuming its rightful place among the family of nations.

Many Americans have been active in groups which have attempted to publicize and expose the Soviet attitude for what it truly is: colonialism and exploitation at its worst.

Each of us should remind himself that as long as individual freedom is denied to one group, then our very own freedom is threatened. In the past, the people of the Ukraine had shed their blood in struggles against the Soviet Union. They received little direct support from the rest of the free world. It is up to each of us to determine in his own heart whether the neglect of the Ukraine is to continue in the future.

To the people of the Ukraine and their millions of supporters and sympathizers throughout this land, I offer my complete support in the fight to enable the Ukraine to once more enjoy the dignity and respect which were hers when she first proclaimed her independence in January 1918.

Mr. Speaker, let us all work toward the day when we can welcome the Ukraine back into the family of free and independent nations.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in joining with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] in this commemoration of Ukrainian Independence Day. Congressman FLOOD is known and respected internationally for his tireless work in behalf of those peoples in the world who cannot breathe the air of freedom because of its totalitarian pollution.

In commenting on the significance of this event, I want to call attention to the outstanding Ukrainian community in the Rochester, N.Y., area which it is my honor to represent. On countless occasions, I have worked with these constituents on matters of common concern. These experiences have enriched me because I have learned so intimately the spirit and the stamina of the Ukrainian heritage.

So it is in behalf of my Ukrainian constituents and in behalf of all who share their love of liberty and pride in national background that I again urge this House and our Nation to increase the tempo of our activity to restore self-determination among the captive nations and relieve the awful oppression which has been imposed on the millions of proud people who are held in Communist check.

Among the scores of ethnic groups held down by the rulers of the polyglot Soviet Union, the Ukrainians constitute the largest non-Russian elements. These gallant and gifted people, numbering some 37 million in all, form one of the largest ethnic groups in all Eastern Europe, and their fair land, extending from the Black Sea to the very heart of today's Poland, is the most fertile country in the area. These rugged and hardworking people lived in historic Ukraine for many centuries and throughout their long history theirs has been an endless struggle in defense of their freedom and independence. They carried on their fight valiantly, and for a long time held their own against powerful adversaries, but in the end, in the mid-17th century, they were tricked and then overwhelmed by czarist Russia. Since then, except for the brief but glorious period of 1918–20, national freedom has been denied to these unhappy Ukrainians.

The democratic forces let loose by the First World War offered the Ukrainian people their long-dreamed chance to free themselves. In the midst of that war, on January 22, 1918, while their oppressors were engulfed in the Russian revolution, they proclaimed their independence. Almost a year later, when western Ukraine was also freed from foreign rule, both eastern and western Ukraine were united and the Ukrainian National Republic came into being. Thus very early in 1919 the national dream of the Ukrainians was realized; their independence was attained, and the union of both parts of the country was consummated. Unfortunately, however, they were not to enjoy their richly deserved and well-earned freedom for long.

The freedom and national self-determination promised and proclaimed by the Russian revolutionary leaders proved to be a mere sham, and no sooner had they established themselves firmly in power, then they began to pursue the expansionist and oppressive policy of the czars. In the fall of 1920 the Red army attacked and overran the Ukraine, thus putting an end to the Ukrainian National Republic in October of that year. Then the country was declared a Soviet Socialist Republic, a part of the Soviet Union, placing the fate and fortune of the Ukrainian people into the hands of Communist leaders in the Kremlin.

Today for some 45 years Ukraine has been an integral part of the sprawling Soviet Empire, and its stouthearted, liberty loving people reluctant citizens of the Soviet Union. Many still live and work in their historic land, and most fervently they continue to cherish their national goal, their freedom and national independence. I personally had in mind their unenviable lot when, introducing House Resolution 36 in Congress a year ago, I pleaded for the setting up of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, with authority to conduct inquiries and studies on the status of non-Russian peoples held captive by the Soviet Union. On the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence we all hope and pray for the realization of their national goal, their freedom from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to share with my colleagues the fact that New York State Governor Rockefeller has similarly recognized the day we commemorate here today. By proclamation from his office, Governor Rockefeller set January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day in my home State of New York.

For its eloquence and evidence of commitment, I am honored to include the text of that proclamation with my remarks:

PROCLAMATION

Ukrainian Independence Day is naturally and justifiably an occasion dear to the heart of every American whose origins lie in that rich and fertile land. The men and women who have come here from the Ukraine are today popular and stanch fellow citizens. Their vitality, their industry and, above all, their passionate love of freedom have made it easy for them to achieve an ideal adjustment to the American way of life.

We sympathize keenly with their fidelity in commemorating the happy, though brief, independence of the land of their forefathers. For many long years Ukrainians have kept the flame of freedom alight. As free Americans, treasuring our own freedom, our hearts go out to those who never falter in the struggle to regain their lost liberty.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim January 22, 1966, as Ukrainian Independence Day in the State of New York; and I urge the people of the Empire State to join their fellow citizens of Ukrainian origin in proper observance of this day.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the Capitol in the city of Albany this 3d day of January in the year of our Lord 1966.

By the Governor,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.
WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, it is customary for the various peoples of the world to celebrate some day which symbolizes for them the highest aspirations of a people—national identity and independence. This celebration rightly evokes a strong glow of patriotism and brings back memories of a common heritage for the people. Since the end of the Second World War we have witnessed the increase of peoples who are able to observe this time-honored practice. The increasing number of sovereign countries in the world may easily blind us to the cruel reality that many historically recognizable peoples are still denied the pride and right of independence.

The Ukrainians are one such nationality. The Ukrainians have a recorded history and culture as a distinct people. Yet today they still live, as they have for almost three centuries, under an alien domination. Their resources are diverted for the benefit of their foreign masters. They are denied the form of government they might seek if allowed the free exercise of choice. Any sign of desiring to change this barbarous state of affairs is smashed quickly and brutally by firing squad and deportation. The new totalitarian masters are trying to prove that they are more efficient in destroying the feeling and signs of separate nationality in the Ukrainians than were their predecessors, the minions of the Russian Czar. It is undoubtedly the hope of the Soviet leaders that they will eradicate all vestiges of observance and pride in the celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day. January 22 is the anniversary of the moment in history in 1918 when a group of Ukrainian leaders proclaims that the Ukraine was free and independent of foreign rule.

This move was abortive. The Red armies of Lenin occupied the land. The full horrors of Communist rule and the humiliation of foreign domination were imposed upon the people. But the desire for liberty did not die. When the Germans invaded the Soviet Union in 1941 the Ukrainian people rose to form an army of their own to fight all invaders. Their Ukrainian Insurgent Army fought the Germans so successfully that the Germans were only able to occupy effectively a few cities and base areas. When the Germans retreated, the Ukrainian Army continued a brave stand, unaided by outside powers, against the reimposition of Communist tyranny. For several years the Ukrainians succeeded in holding the Russians from complete control of the land.

The Ukrainian people can be proud of their history of opposing foreign domination from all quarters. On this 48th anniversary of their great national day let us stop to recall what it means for this brave people and how their sons and daughters have so valiantly died to keep the fire of national independence alive.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, January 22 marked the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukraine. This historic event occurred in 1918 in Kiev, capital of the Ukraine, and was the culmination of years of long aspiration and hopes of the Ukrainian people after centuries of foreign domination. However, despite previous pledges that Ukrainian independence would be respected, the Russian Government, led by Lenin and Trotsky at that time, launched military aggression against this free state. After over 3 years of heartbreaking and unequal struggle, the brave Ukrainians succumbed to the brutal and superior forces of Soviet Russia.

Since 1920, the Ukraine has remained under the harsh and totalitarian yoke of Moscow, but even this has not stifled the love of freedom and independence inherent in these sturdy people.

There are Americans of Ukrainian origin in the United States who have this same love of freedom and independence, and who have given honorable accounts of themselves. They always have been ready to fight and die for the preservation of the institutions some of us perhaps take too much for granted, which is proof their proud heritage has remained with them.

Those of Ukrainian descent in my own congressional district of Delaware County, as well as those in our Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and throughout the United States, will, I am sure, join me in hope that this land of some 40 million people will never give up its efforts for the freedom it so proudly proclaimed 48 years ago.

I am proud to join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in this tribute to brave people—may they someday have the freedom and independence they deserve.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, once again we commemorate Ukrainian Independence Day—on the 48th anniversary of their proclamation of independence in January 1918.

For more than 300 years, the Ukrainian people have fought for the right to be a free and independent nation. This independence endured for only a brief 2 years. We all hope the time is not far off when they may once again be an independent nation—free of Communist domination and oppression. Their spirit of freedom has been kept alive through the years, and centuries of oppression has not quenched the hopes and aspirations of Ukrainians everywhere.

The threat to freedom of all peoples and independence of nations seems to be a constant threat, but the Ukrainians were among the first to suffer a fate that has befallen millions of others. May we who are free dedicate ourselves to make the most of our opportunities. Our nation has never tried to subjugate other nations, and we continue to espouse the belief that every nation has the right to decide for itself the type of government it desires and to choose this government by free elections. May the Ukrainians once again have this opportunity in the not too far distant future.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, 48 years ago on January 22 during injustice of mass executions, the Ukrainians declared their independence from Russian rule. For a short period Ukrainians lived in new freedom, organizing military forces to maintain it; formulating a constitution to sustain their centuries-old desire.

Tragically this country, faced with insuperable economic and political handicaps, was a target for attack from the Russian armies. After 2 years, the Ukraine was forced to become a part of the Soviet Union.

Today the people of Ukrainian descent in Syracuse and Onondaga County, N.Y., are joined by Americans and the free world in this commemoration. This is a time when we who are so fortunate to live in a democratic and free society must remember that our freedom is a cherished possession to be protected. It is a priceless medium in which we are able to create and promulgate the estate of mankind. It was achieved by perilous battles in which many young and brave Americans were killed. There are those of us who prosper because of peace who do not know the bitterness of slavery. There are those who content themselves in the belief that we in America can live in isolation from our universal neighbors, ignoring the absence of their freedom.

As we commemorate their freedom today, poignantly aware of the disaster that befell these people, we must not fail to recognize the parallel between the Ukraine and Vietnam.

When the Ukraine declared its independence the people began to establish the machinery necessary to maintain that independence. However, because there was no one to shield them from the more powerful Red army, the conditions of time and tranquility which are necessary for the development of independence, never materialized. This must never occur again. We Americans are dedicated to the principle of self-determination. Today we are at war because a more powerful aggressor is attempting to rob a small country of the necessary time and tranquility under which self-determination and democratic institutions can grow and prosper. The principle of self-determination applies equally to small emerging nations as well as to large established nations. We are willing and ready to protect this principle.

Realizing that peace and freedom breed organization and economic prosperity for a nation, let us reassure those balking at the harness of communism in the Ukraine and other nations, that we in America recognize their plight. Today we commemorate the efforts made by the people of the Ukraine to be independent, to implement the universal right of self-determination. We recall in addition to an historical effort, a continuing commitment on the part of the Ukraine to the idea of independence. Our commemoration serves to reinforce the desire for self-determination around the world. I urge today, as I did a year ago, that the U.S. Government recognize the right of the people of the Ukraine to be free and self-governing.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian National Council met in Kiev and proclaimed the independence of the Ukrainian Peoples Republic.

However, the joy of the Ukrainian people turned to sorrow, for the Republic was soon absorbed by the ruthless imperialism of the Soviet Union.

Technically, the Ukrainian Republic is considered a separate country. It is recognized by the United Nations—but it is really part of the Soviet Union—one of its many tragic satellites.

January 22 is widely observed by Ukrainians outside their beloved homeland. On this day, in the United States and in other free nations, Ukrainians remember with sadness their brief independence. The burden of Communist tyranny and subjugation is heavy and is hard to bear.

But despite the suffering and privation they have endured, their courage has remained indomitable and their hope for eventual independence and freedom continues strong.

I share their faith in achieving liberty, for freedom cannot be permanently thwarted. Their ultimate victory is inevitable, because their cause is right.

In the 15th District of New Jersey and in other areas of the State and Nation, I have always admired the hard work, vigorous patriotism, and fine character of Ukrainian-Americans. They are outstanding citizens.

On the 48th anniversary of Ukraine Independence Day, I salute these heroic people.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] as we once again honor the valiant Ukrainian people who have so long yearned for freedom. These 44 million people, after a struggle against oppression dating back to the 17th century, achieved their long-sought freedom on January 22, 1918—only to have it cruelly taken away again by Russian military power.

Although these people have been ruthlessly dominated by the Soviet, their desire for freedom, so long sought, continues. The remembrance of these oppressed people through our observance of this, the 48th anniversary of their brief independence is most appropriate at a time when we are fighting to prevent a repetition of the Ukrainians' fate for the people of South Vietnam.

We, who have been blessed with freedom, should take this opportunity to reaffirm our desire to lift the yoke of tyranny from man throughout the world. By our determination to help attain and protect freedom of people everywhere, we kindle the fire of hope in all who are oppressed.

In recognition of the plight of the Ukrainians and other Communist-dominated nations, I call attention to my resolution, H.R. 417, for the establishment of a special Committee on the Captive Nations. This resolution, which I introduced last year, is similar to many others pending before the Congress.

I take this occasion, therefore, again to urge my colleagues to establish this important committee to further support the Ukrainian people and those of the two dozen other subjugated nations in their brave efforts to obtain their freedom.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the 22d of January is a day which has special meaning for more than a million of our fellow citizens. For those in America who are of Ukrainian descent, this day recalls the moment in 1918 when a group of patriots in Kiev proclaimed the independence of their native land from Russia.

On that day the Ukrainian Republic was declared to be a sovereign member of the family of free nations. Two and one-half centuries of subjugation to the Russian Empire and its successor states were declared to be over, and the Ukrainian Republic was finally realized. Unhappily, however, the Republic was destined to be short lived. In 1920, only 2 brief years later, it was ruthlessly destroyed by the Red army, and the Ukrainians were once again denied freedom in their historic homeland.

Over 44 million Ukrainians are today under the harsh yoke of Communist rule. But the oppressions and the persecutions that these valiant people have endured has only strengthened their passionate desire for national independence.

My distinguished colleagues, it is indeed appropriate for us here in the Congress to remember on the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian Republic the millions of people still in the Ukraine, and their national compatriots in my own 7th District of Illinois, throughout our Nation, and all over the world who continue to cherish the hope of eventual independence and a free Ukraine. These dauntless people desire only that which is the right of all peoples—a nation of their own.

Let us, therefore, reaffirm our belief in freedom for all peoples and our hope that the valiant Ukrainians shall one day again enjoy the blessings of liberty in their own homeland for which they have so long courageously struggled.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the modern history of the Ukrainian people is the story of a gifted, gallant, and industrious people struggling for their freedom and independence. Since the middle of the 17th century, that is, since the signature of a compact between the Russian czar and the Ukrainian leaders in 1654, these liberty-loving and tireless tillers of the soil have not been allowed to enjoy the fruits of free and independent life in their historic homeland, except for the brief 2-year period of 1918–20.

Through the turns and twists of fateful international events, over which they had no control, the more than 40 million unhappy Ukrainians have not been allowed the mastery of their own fate. They have been held down for centuries under the unrelenting yoke of alien despots. They have endured hardships, privations, and indescribable misery. They have been oppressed ruthlessly and mercilessly persecuted for clinging to their national ideals, for cherishing the undying dream of their national independence and freedom. Yet no oppressive measures, no amount of endless persecution could force them to abandon and forgo their yearning for freedom. Oppressions and persecutions have united the Ukrainian people against their implacable foes, and toward the end of the First World War, when the decrepit czarist regime in Russia was overthrown by the Russian revolution, and when Austria's hold over the western Ukraine was relaxed, Ukrainians proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic.

The historic event took place 48 years ago, on January 22, 1918. Unhappily the Ukrainian National Republic thus proclaimed amid joy and jubilation was surrounded, from the moment of its birth, by powerful and greedy neighbors, all of them eager and anxious to pounce upon the newborn state and destroy it. In particular the ferocious Communist Russians in the east were its deadly foes, which cruelly put an end to the existence of the Ukrainian National Republic. Early in 1920 the Republic was treacherously attacked by the surging Communist forces. By the fall of that year the country was overrun by the Red army, all Ukrainian organized resistance was ruthlessly crushed, and then Ukraine's independence was brought to an end.

Since then the Ukraine has been a part of the Soviet Union, submerged in the sprawling Soviet empire, and the Ukrainians have been suffering under Communist totalitarianism. They have died in concentration camps by the millions, driven to starvation and death by the Soviet Government. But in the midst of all this inhumanity practiced upon them by the heartless Soviet rulers, they have not forsaken their national dream, their goal for national freedom and independence. Inhuman minions of the Kremlin have resorted to every devious and diabolical means, and have used every means of torture to deprive the Ukrainians of their ideals, but fortunately they have not succeeded in their evil task. Today even under the most relentless of totalitarian tyrannies, the stouthearted Ukrainian clings to his national ideals and preserves his fervent love of freedom.

On the 48th anniversary observance of Ukrainian Independence Day, Mr. Speaker, we can do no less than to hope and pray for the liberation of these daring and dauntless Ukrainians from their Communist oppressors.

For the past four and a half decades Ukraine has remained under the Communist yoke of Moscow, but it has never surrendered the spirit of freedom, nor has it given up the hope for the regaining of its full national independence.

Both the Congress and the President of the United States have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution, which listed Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved by Communist Russia and entitled to full freedom and independence.

In the common spirit of liberty, faith, and justice the American people join the Ukrainians all over the world in celebrating the anniversary of independence and reunification of Ukraine.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to join with my colleagues in commemoration of a significant event in Ukrainian history—January 22, 1918, the day which saw the culmination of Ukrainian dreams for national independence from Russia. On that glorious day the Ukrainian National Republic was born in the city of Kiev, and as we pause to observe this anniversary, we turn to thoughts of the future as well as of the past. Our fervent hope is that soon this gallant land will be free of oppression once more.

Perhaps the single most outstanding trait of the Ukrainian national character is the great courage and perseverance of its people. After gaining independence from Russia in 1918, the Ukraine experienced the tragedy of engulfment by the Russian bear less than 3 short years later. During World War II the Ukraine bore the indignity of the scorched earth policy, which resulted in acute economic problems. Throughout their hardships, however, the Ukrainians have never once lost faith in a regenerate Ukraine.

The son of the Ukraine who embodies the undying spirit of freedom most perfectly is the national hero, Taras Shevchenko. In Ukrainian literature he ranks foremost as a spokesman for freedom and as the intransigent foe of man's inhumanity to man. He stands with Pushkin and Mickiewicz as a literary genius. In Ukrainian culture he is credited as the poet who placed Ukrainian literature into the realm of great Slavic literatures.

Taras Shevchenko suffered from tyranny throughout his life. Of his 47 years, he enjoyed only 9 as a freeman, a striking parallel with the tragic fate of his homeland. The hearts of all his people beat in his, and thus the bitter anguish of an enslaved nation poured from his pen to produce powerful poetry. He wrote sorrowfully of mother Ukraine, who "like an orphan weeps on the Dneiper," and he demanded liberation for his people. His works had a tremendous effect upon the Ukrainians, strengthening their dedication to the cause of national independence and inspiring valiance in the darkest hours of their nation.

Today, over a hundred years after his death, his poetry still thrills the hearts of all men. His words are universal, and this country of ours has paid homage to his greatness. In June 1964, Americans of Ukrainian descent performed an outstanding tribute to the poet by erecting a statue of him here in Washington in honor of the 150th anniversary of his birth.

In a somber hour in our own country's history, a time when freedom once again is threatened, we gain inspiration from the Ukrainian Taras Shevchenko and from his compatriots who continue to struggle against Russian tyranny. To them on this glorious day in their history we send our warmest wishes.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I compliment our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for bringing the attention of the House to the oppression and Communist domination of the freedom-loving Ukrainian people.

This ethnic group declared its independence 48 years ago this month, but the Red army some 2 years later forced these people into the U.S.S.R.

As we continue to fight in southeast Asia to prevent a Communist army from enslaving the Vietnamese with a resulting loss of other parts of that area, it is well to note there are others who seek liberty but lack specific effort on their behalf. This is why I am pleased to join in supporting Mr. FLOOD's comments and his resolution.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, hardly a day passes without some Soviet leader denouncing the United States and its Western allies for holding the so-called last vestiges of colonialism. The fact is, of course, that the colonial empires of Western Europe have all but disappeared. In fact, only one major colonial empire remains in the world today; that is the giant Soviet Empire of Central Asia and Eastern Europe. It is a modern colonial empire which has been matched only by the Nazi empire of World War II for the brutal tyranny over free peoples.

To some Americans this news may come as something of a surprise, but it is no surprise to those Ukranian-Americans whose relatives still remain under the harsh colonial rule of the Soviet Union. Actually, the tiny Ukraine has been fighting for its independence against the overwhelming power of the Soviet Union ever since Catherine II established imperial control over the area in the 18th century.

For a brief period after the Bolshevik revolution, the Ukraine was allowed a certain amount of national autonomy under a proclamation by Lenin granting freedom to the Russian nationalities. After centuries of Russian domination and unsuccessful Russian attempts at forced assimilation, the Ukrainians jumped at the opportunity to reexercise their national independence. When the Bolsheviks signed an armistice with Germany to end Russia's part in the First World War, the newly proclaimed independent government of the Ukraine proceeded to conduct their own negotiations with the Germans and Austrians in the hope of firmly establishing their formal independence from Russia. Unfortunately their independence was short lived. A peace treaty with Germany meant occupation by German troops. When the Germans were finally defeated, the Bolsheviks returned to reestablish Russian control of the Ukraine. Since that day, Soviet rule has been clamped firmly over the luckless Ukrainians.

Like so many captive peoples of the Soviet Empire, the Ukrainians are the innocent victims of their geographical position on the borders of the great powers of central Europe. In many ways their vulnerability also comes from their strengths. The fertile farmlands and mineral wealth of the Ukraine and its population of high-spirited and industrious peoples have always been considered a rich plum by the less endowed but far more powerful Russian Empire.

It is a tribute to the courage and dignity of man, Mr. Speaker, that the Ukrainians have not allowed centuries of brutal Russian rule to subdue their independent spirit. Let us take this moment to salute their efforts and renew our pledge to support their quest for freedom and independence.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, may I join with my colleagues in commemorating the independence day of Ukraine.

It was 48 years ago, in Kiev, that the courageous Ukrainian people proclaimed their right to national self-determination and set forth to build a democratic state.

History records the tragic fate of the Ukrainian National Republic. The blood of freemen flowed as a nation fought for life itself. Murder, purges, famine, deportations, and mass destruction tolled the ravages of a naked war against military might. Freedom in a land bound by tradition and national feeling had begun only to flourish, when the Red army in 1920 accomplished its mission of enslavement and provided the base for the forcible incorporation of the Ukraine into the Soviet Union.

The world will not forget the Ukraine. Indeed, the unrelenting struggle of the Ukrainian people against tyranny has inflamed and strengthened the hearts of all men dedicated to the cause of freedom. On this day, let us pay tribute to this captive nation and let us give voice to the aspirations of its silenced people.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, this is an occasion for renewed faith, shared in by many of my friends who are today observing Ukrainian Independence Day. As one who has long attended these observances, and has advocated the formation of a Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, I find myself again pondering the deep significance of these occasions.

The enthusiasm for them that has been renewed for many years is to me a manifestation of enduring faith and hope among people whose spirit cannot be broken. It is a revelation and an inspiration.

These people who have an undying belief in the eventual release of their homeland from the yoke of oppression are spread around the earth. Baffling though the slowness of events may be, they do not lose faith. A gradual diminishing of the repressive forces behind the Iron Curtain seems to justify that faith.

Fluctuating as fortune may seem to those who view their homeland from afar, they nevertheless hope and believe that ultimately right will prevail.

The celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day is a reminder of the bond between the people of the United States and the Ukrainian people the world over. That bond is the bond of independence of spirit. The love of freedom, the willingness to sacrifice for it, the belief in the right of the individual to independence—these are tenets which the American people and the Ukrainian people whether at home or abroad hold to be fundamental.

History is a witness to the undying love of freedom in the Ukrainian soul. It is also a witness to the right of these people to an independence subordinated to none. For nearly four centuries, beginning a thousand years ago, the Ukrainian people flourished in their own powerful state, with their capital already at Kiev, even then enjoying a culture and economy advanced far beyond that of most of their neighbors.

The Ukraine was a rich country, appreciated and cultivated by its people. The high degree of their development was unequaled in the vast area that was one day to become Russia. It was, in fact—and still is—a source of envy among the neighboring peoples, and the cause of much suffering for that very reason. Coveted for its wealth in resources and, later, in industrial development, as well as for its high degree of civilization, it was overrun by the Tartars, the Turks, and the Poles; and, not once, but many times, in the course of centuries. With the emergence of Russia as a powerful state under Peter the First, the Ukraine was brought under Russian domination. From 1709 until 1918 it was deprived of its political independence. But the desire for and the conscious effort to achieve independence had never been stifled in the Ukrainian people. They were in name only subjects of the czars.

Despite more than two centuries of subjugation they were not subdued. Though a brave struggle to lift their yoke proved abortive in 1917, 1 year later, on January 22, 1918, their independence was declared. The Ukraine became that day a democratic republic.

That is the date we honor today. The sad fact that within a very short time Soviet domination was to replace czarist domination, and to prove far more ruthless and oppressive, does not detract from the glory of that day. For the spirit of independence still lives—intensified by oppression. In the hearts of the exiles are reflected the latent desires of their relatives behind the Iron Curtain. The love of freedom wherever it flourishes is indomitable. We in the United States share it and we honor it.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, 48 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian Central Rada—Parliament—issued a manifesto declaring the Ukraine to be an independent, free, and sovereign state of Ukrainian people.

A new life was opened for the people of the Ukraine, but in 2 years, tragedy in the form of the ruthless Red revolution struck again and took away their freedom once again.

For a people who has known so few years of independence, one might be prone to think that their love for freedom is slowly dying. On the contrary, the Ukrainian desire to be free permeates every daily act, for they are constantly faced with the crushing reality of living under a totalitarian system of government.

We are fortunate to have Americans of Ukrainian descent defending the freedom of our democratic way of life in this country. They are stouthearted people who continue to be a positive force in the building of our democratic institutions.

In North Dakota, we are proud to count a great number of Ukrainians among our citizens. They are known for their industry, ingenuity, and tenacity for hard work in any vocation. These characteristics, of course, serve as clues to their long history of nationalism.

If free world nations continue their support, Ukrainia will someday have the liberty, freedom, and self-government that country's citizens so richly deserve.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, Americans of Ukrainian descent celebrated the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, proclaimed at Kiev in 1918. Within 3 short years the gallant young republic was conquered by Soviet imperialism. But the desire for independence continues among the Ukrainian people. Their love of freedom is deeply rooted in their past, for they have suffered from a history of almost continual foreign domination.

Ukrainian history is a great inspiration to all Ukrainians struggling for freedom today. Between the 9th and the 13th centuries a powerful independent Ukrainian state existed. Ukraine had close contacts with the Byzantine Empire and her cultural development was extremely advanced. Volodymir the Great converted his nation to Christianity in 988 and his son Yaraslav the Wise, compiled a code of laws and founded many schools.

But the rich Ukrainian land attracted many invaders. For several centuries the Ukrainians bravely defended their country but were not always able to drive off their enemies. During this period of almost continual fighting there arose a brave military class known as the Cossacks. From this class came leaders of the struggling nation. The most famous was Bohdan Khmelnytsky—1595–1657.

In 1709 the Russian Czar, Peter the Great, conquered the Ukraine and ruthlessly crushed the leading Ukrainian class, which had believed in independence. From then on the history of the Ukraine is the story of the struggle of the Ukrainians to cast off the Russian yoke.

The Ukrainian people took advantage of the Russian revolution of 1917 to free themselves of Russian rule. After 3 years of fighting the Ukrainians succumbed to the numerically superior forces of Moscow.

But the struggle for independence did not end in 1920 or 1921. During World War II the Ukrainians organized the underground Ukrainian Insurgent Army—UPA—which fought first the Nazis and then the returning Red army. Even today news of opposition to the Soviet puppet regime leaks out to the West.

On this occasion I should like to reassert my personal commitment to the cause of Ukrainian freedom. No people so dedicated to national independence throughout their history can forever remain as captives of armed might.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, whenever the occasion has presented itself, I have been pleased to join my colleagues in tribute to those millions of freedom-loving, freedom-seeking people whom we refer to as the captive nations. It is quite appropriate that we observe this 48th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Eastern Europe's largest non-Russian nation, 45 million Ukrainians, and to remind ourselves again that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. What happened to the Ukraine and other nations can and may happen to many other nations whose subjugation the Communists seek.

Today, in Vietnam, our American military forces and the South Vietnamese are learning the grim facts of Communist aggression just as the Ukraine and other nations of Europe and Asia were taught—and were forcefully caught in the network of the Communist system and the Russian rule.

Seeing what happened in the Ukrainian homeland, where millions of lives were lost, millions of dollars in property, cultural and art treasures confiscated and millions of hopes of emancipation from Soviet tyranny were shattered, is to warn us that the Red juggernaut must be stopped—for all time—if the free world is to remain free. And, except we remain free, can we hold out hope to those whose 48th anniversary we observe today—hope that this anniversary will underscore reality and not be "a flower placed on the grave of yearnings to which we gave no hope when hope was all they asked."

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, once again we in this body are privileged to observe a brilliant milestone in the annals of man's struggle for freedom and human dignity. We are today commemorating the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day; the 48th anniversary of the brave day when the freedom-loving citizens of the Ukraine proclaimed their liberation from the yoke of czarist Russia, only to have that independence crushed and effectively snuffed out by overwhelming military might in a manner that has become all too familiar in our time.

We commemorate once again the indomitable spirit of the Ukrainians, the inextinguishable spark that has carried these courageous God-fearing peoples through centuries of subjugation and virtual enslavement without losing sight of their goals of freedom and self-determination.

I am proud and pleased to be able to add my own voice to the many others that are and will be raised in eloquent tribute to the idea of Ukrainian independence. But I would again, as I have on occasion in the past, insert a word of caution that we do not satisfy ourselves with mere words.

I would again urge, as I have in the past, that we renew our pledge to uphold and, to the extent that all peaceful means permit, to aid and abet the search for freedom and independence of not only the peoples of the Ukraine but of all the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain. We must give kinetic impetus to that pledge by supporting projects such as creation of a permanent Captive Nations Committee of the Congress, which I have been pleased to cosponsor, for a more encouraging immigration policy with respect to aliens from these countries, along the lines which I have proposed in two bills in the current session, and by encouraging a more meaningful and realistic consular relationship with the Soviets.

These are the means by which we can open more doors between ourselves and the captive peoples of eastern and central Europe, without offering any costly trade inducements, any carrot-on-a-stick propositions, nor any kind of aid and comfort to our adversary governments.

These are the means we must explore and exploit in order to demonstrate the true nature of and depth of our concern and our sympathy. We must offer positive action to supplement our words. We must hold out a hand as well as a promise. We must work as well as pray for the day when free Ukrainians can celebrate their own independence day just as we celebrate the Fourth of July; when Ukrainian independence will become a fact instead of a fleeting memory.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and I commend him for again taking time this year so that we all might have the opportunity to pause and pay tribute to the Americans of Ukrainian descent and to remind ourselves again of the tragic conditions which continue to exist in this part of the world.

It is important that we make it clear here in the Congress that the United States continues to be very much aware and deeply concerned with the plight of 43 million of our fellow human beings in the Ukraine who still suffer under the yoke of Communist tyranny. We know of the special concern of their relatives here in the United States and we realize that until the people of the Ukraine can celebrate the anniversary of their own independence our work on behalf of the freedom and dignity of man will remain unfinished.

It is bitterly ironic that some would condemn the United States for standing beside the people of Vietnam in their struggle to maintain their independence by calling it imperialistic and yet these same people say little if anything about the domination by the Soviet Union of the people of the Ukraine. This sorry fact is perhaps the most important reason for the establishment of a Committee on Captive Nations here in Congress, which I have long urged.

While we make it clear in Vietnam that we will honor our commitments to those whose independence we have pledged to defend, we also have a commitment, even if not by formal treaty, to all those whose freedom has been brutally taken from them and who now live in those captive nations, numbering over two dozen. The first step is to make this problem and plight known to all freemen and our commitment an active goal. To call attention and to give direction to our efforts to someday see our friends in the Ukraine once again among the free would be a most important contribution of Congress.

I firmly believe that we must give a positive direction to this country's policy of self-determination; that we must work to bring freedom back to lands which fell under Communist tyranny in days past as well as working to prevent communism from taking land of those who are among the free today.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has on several occasions eloquently expressed the need for a Committee on the Captive Nations and I am proud to be among those sponsoring legislation to establish it. Congress should not delay in taking action on this matter.

Each year that we take time to commemorate the anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine the one more year of Communist domination over that country that has elapsed makes the story of their plight all the more tragic, and each year it becomes even more imperative that their hope, courage, and determination to be free should not diminish.

It is my pleasure to join in again on this occasion, and I know we speak for all Americans, when we renew our pledge to the people of the Ukraine that we in the United States have not forgotten them and that we realize, as all free men must, that until each citizen of the world is free that struggle for freedom has not been really won.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the year 1966 commemorates the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, but inasmuch as the Ukrainian peoples are not independent, the commemoration is not one of celebration and joy. Let us rather remember and reflect on the true state of affairs surrounding the lives of these brave people.

In point of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Ukraine is not independent because quite simply it is a colony of the Soviet Union. The word "colony" which derives from the Latin colonia, originally meant "a transplanted part of human society" or a "home away from home," but today the term is more meaningful and precise; namely, a state of inferiority or even servitude suffered by a community—which, of course, includes nations and states—at the hands of another community.

Colonization has been a fact of international politics for a great many centuries, starting perhaps with the Phoenicians and running throughout history to the more modern Western colonization, especially in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, with which we are so familiar. As we have watched the demise of Western colonialism since 1945, another lesson of history comes through striking and clear: the colonizer eventually loses the colony.

Manifestation of colonization of the Ukraine by the Soviets is only too apparent; namely, in the exploitation of manpower and cheap labor, in the exploitation of natural resources, especially food, in the use of Ukrainian markets for Russian-made products, and finally in the Russification of the colony's art, culture, language, and education, all for the enrichment and glorification of the mother country.

The final mockery of the relationship between the Ukrainian peoples and the Soviet Union, however, is found in the rather ludicrous position of the Ukraine in the international community of independent nations. The Ukraine is a member of the United Nations yet in no sense are the Ukrainians free to conduct their own foreign policy or deal equally and independently with other nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, on this 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence we can do little more than to remind the Ukrainian people that we recognize their position for what it really is, and also to remind the Soviets that behind the facade of the

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics lies the biggest colonial empire in the world.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the great English Poet John Donne once wrote that "no man is an island unto himself." In our world of today when the countries of the earth are being pushed closer and closer to each other and when the menace of Communist totalitarianism seeks to destroy free governments throughout the entire world, it is not an exaggeration to rephrase the lines to "no nation is an island unto itself." When a people is threatened with, or even enslaved by, an alien movement, it is a danger and a loss to all freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

This Nation was born by its own declaration of national independence. We hold dear our tradition of championing the rights of all nations to freely choose their fates. Today American fighting men are again giving their lives to assist a foreign nation to preserve its independence. But, we cannot afford to forget that there are other nations which have lost their freedom. Behind the Iron Curtain there are many historically great and proud peoples subjected to the imposition of an alien ideology and even the physical domination of a foreign power.

The Ukraine is one such nation. On January 22, millions of Ukrainians in their native land and throughout the world will commemorate the day in 1918 when the Ukraine was declared an independent country. That declaration was not long fulfilled because the Soviet successors to the czarist government imposed a Russian Communist dictatorship by the bayonets of the Red army. The celebration of the anniversary of that proud day 48 years ago shows eloquently to both the people of the non-Communist world and to the foreign masters themselves that the desire for national freedom has not died in the hearts of the Ukrainian people.

Here in this land blessed with liberty we should rejoice that men will continue to hold to beliefs which we think are natural to, and the birthright of, all mankind. But, further, we need to recognize in the commemoration of a people's struggle for independence that the fight has not yet been won to end Communist tyranny in the world. We should never be allowed to forget that millions of people, such as the 45 million persons in the Ukraine, are the victims of a foreign conquest. I have long wished to call this fact to the attention of Americans. During the last session I had the honor to sponsor House Resolution 332, which calls for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. By means of such a committee we could better keep the problem of enslaved peoples like the Ukrainians before our own citizens.

The anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Ukraine should mean for all Americans a reminder that human freedom is still not a condition common to all men. On this anniversary of their national independence I wish to extend to all the people of Ukrainian descent here and abroad my deep wish that their native land may again enjoy the right of sovereign independence.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join the citizens of Ukrainian descent everywhere in commemorating the 48th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine.

Founded at the end of the First World War, after centuries of persecution, when the czarist regime had finally been overthrown and the power of Austria broken, the Ukrainian National Republic was permitted to enjoy a very short peace when the greed of Soviet imperialism swallowed them into the totalitarian state where they have remained virtual prisoners.

The Ukrainians are strong, industrious people who have always contributed much to American effort and purpose. They have borne the heavy burden of oppression for so long, but they have not surrendered their dream of freedom, and their stalwart stand has been a shining example for the rest of the world. This ideal has been nurtured by such men as Archbishop Josef Slipy, Primate of the Ukraine, recently made a cardinal by Pope Paul in recognition of his courage and fortitude.

Perhaps Taras Schevchenko, whose statue we have with us in Washington, best expresses the spirit and character of the Ukrainians. He said:

> Only in the house of one's own is there justice-truth; strength, and freedom. There is not another Ukraine in the world; there is no second Dnieper.

It is fitting that Americans, who are at this time actively engaged in other parts of the world in a struggle for freedom, take this occasion to pay tribute to a very brave people, to let them know that they and the other captive nations are not forgotten, and to renew our pledge of support and hope that one day soon they will again achieve their liberty.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in this observance of the anniversary of Ukrainian independence, which occurs each year on January 22. This is the 48th observance of the day when the people of the Ukraine proclaimed their independence as a free and democratic state, which lasted only 3 years and was crushed in 1921 by the Soviet Communist regime.

The 45 million people of the Ukraine were thus among the earliest victims of Communist tyranny and subjugation. Their aspirations for national independence and freedom, however, have not been subdued. The people of the Ukraine and those of their kinsmen who live in other countries have not given up their hope for the reestablishment of the Ukraine's independence.

As Ukrainians everywhere commemorate this anniversary, the people of America and of all freedom-loving countries join with them in the conviction of their righteous cause and the eventual attainment of their national independence. On this day, I salute the Ukrainian people and join with them in prayer for their early liberation from the yoke of Communist imperialism.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this commemoration of the Ukrainian Day of Independence, hoping that word of our interest in the freedom of the people of the Ukraine will somehow be communicated to those good people in that faroff land who still yearn for national independence and self-government.

History records the brave struggle for independence in the Ukraine, and the brief but promising period of self-government before the Communist terror overtook this ancient land. Certainly the love of liberty is one of the most powerful motivations of mankind, and just as certainly it is still alive in the hearts and minds of millions of citizens in the Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, once again I call attention to my longstanding resolution which would call upon the President and the Nation to join in observation of the independence days or national holidays of all the nations now unwillingly subservient to the Communist dictatorship in Moscow. Official action of this kind would hearten and encourage all those behind the Iron Curtain who long for freedom and national identity.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the 22d of January, which marked the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence was observed with both oratory and celebration. But more importantly it was filled with the remembrance of the heroic and valiant efforts of a proud and determined people to gain their freedom.

Forty-eight years have passed since the fledgling Ukrainian Rada, or governing body, issued its declaration proclaiming the Ukraine's independence from Russia. Not only did the Ukraine issue written directives concerning its independence, but showed its willingness to fight to preserve that freedom. In this regard, the battle near Kiev on January 22, 1918, is remembered as one in which a handful of ill-equipped and largely untrained Ukrainian volunteers, many of them youths, fought a gallant, though losing fight; against overwhelming Russian forces. Yes, they were defeated, but their military loss assured them a permanent place of honor in the hearts of millions of freedom-loving men.

The Ukraine's independence lasted for approximately 2 years, but during that period the Communists were unceasing in their attempts to weaken and destroy the young state. By November 1920 the Ukraine had been crushed by Russian military forces, but to this day the people remain determined to achieve freedom and independence.

The Ukraine lies under the heel of Russian oppression, and the relationship between Russia and the Ukraine is one of exploitation and imperialism. But the sacrifices and selfless courage of Ukrainian patriots have not been forgotten. We who have been blessed with freedom and liberty must not let the Ukraine's sacrifices be in vain.

It is to the credit of America that she has produced and encourages millions of her citizens who are dedicated to the concept of universal human freedom and dignity. This is a genuine testimony that the Ukraine has not and will not be forgotten. I salute these individuals and the many groups dedicated to the achievement of Ukrainian independence.

My sincere hope is that someday soon we will be able to witness a truly independent Ukraine taking its rightful place in the family of nations. Let us rededicate ourselves to the principle of freedom and justice for which so many Ukrainian patriots so nobly gave their lives.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the anniversary of an event of great significance to an old and proud people. Forty-eight years ago, on January 22, 1918, the people of the Ukraine achieved their independence. Unfortunately, their taste of liberty was brief. Two short years later, the Ukraine was invaded by the Red army. In 1923, the country was made a constituent republic of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Today, the Ukraine remains a part of the Soviet empire, unjustly subjected to arbitrary rule and economic exploitation by a foreign regime.

The history of the Ukraine is long and troubled, marked by constant invasions and domination by neighboring peoples. The northern and western parts of the Ukraine are the ancient territories of the medieval Russian state of the 9th through the 13th centuries, which had Kiev as its capital and the valley of the Dnieper River as its main economic artery. These territories were completely devastated by the Mongol invasions of the 13th century. The Mongols were no sooner driven back than the Poles and Lithuanians moved in. The whole of the Ukraine formed part of the Polish-Lithuanian Empire until 1667, when the territory east of the Dnieper River was ceded to Russia. By the end of the 18th century, the Ukrainians were divided under the rule of the Russians, the Poles, and the Turks. As a result of the second partition of Poland in 1793, the major portion of the Ukrainian people was subjected to Russian rule, but many still remained in the Austro-Hungarian Empire and in Rumania.

Russian rule came to a temporary end with the collapse of the czarist empire in 1917. But the Ukraine was invaded by the Germans in World War I, invaded by the Poles before the Red army moved in to bring an end to independence in 1920, and again invaded and occupied by the Nazis during World War II.

Given this history of foreign domination and invasion, it is remarkable that the Ukrainians early developed a distinct way of life and a rich culture. Throughout centuries of adversity, this culture has sustained the people of the Ukraine, reminded them of their separate identity, and spurred their search for independence. Moreover, by cherishing and preserving their cultural heritage, Ukrainians have maintained their ties with the West. Western influence was early strong in the Ukraine. In the 19th century, the fires of nationalism, lit by the French Revolution spread to the east. Inspired by the Ruthenian scholar Kostomarov and the Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko, who had been deeply impressed by events in the West, a Ukrainian separatist movement took root.

This movement reached its goal in 1918, only to be bitterly disappointed 2 years later. Today, however, the Ukrainians have not relinquished their hopes. Mr. Speaker, on an occasion which mingles cherished memories and steady aspirations, it is our duty to reaffirm our solidarity with the Ukrainian people, and to rededicate ourselves to the goal of freedom for all those who seek it.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, some Americans may find it strange that I take this time to celebrate the independence day of a nation that is presently anything but independent. Yet, for me the present political control of a country does not bespeak the character of the nation; the regime in the seat of power does not necessarily reflect the nation it governs. Such is the case in the Ukraine.

Ever since the 16th century, the Ukrainians have been fighting against immeasurable odds to preserve their national character, their proud culture, and their dignity against the tyranny of larger, more powerful enemies. The great Ukrainian hetman, Mazepa, fought courageously in a last-ditch attempt to preserve his nation's independence against Russia in a bloody battle at Poltava in 1709. And in 1775, Catherine II crushed the last vestiges of Ukrainian autonomy and brought the proud but small nation directly under the control of imperial Russia.

In the 19th century, Russian control was tightened even further and stern restrictions were placed on Ukrainian political activity and even on the use of the Ukrainian language. The Russians began a pattern of forced acculturation of the Ukrainian minority which was to become a legacy left to their Communist successors.

Although the freedom and autonomy of the Ukraine was promoted during the Bolshevik revolution in 1917, it was only a temporary plot to weaken the unity of the imperial regime. Once the revolution was over, the heavy fist of Communist tyranny smashed what many believed was the last hope of the Ukrainian people for self-determination.

But the doubters had seriously underestimated the strength and courage that represented the fire of national unity among the Ukrainian people. During World War II the Ukrainians once again took advantage of a momentary weakness on the part of their oppressors to proclaim their essential national autonomy and independence. Centuries of tyrannical rule and enforced assimilation had not succeeded in stilling the national unity and character of a proud and freedom-loving people.

Such is still the case today. The Ukraine may remain under the control of its Communist dictators, but the most oppressive of methods have not succeeded in destroying Ukrainian national unity and dignity. It is for this reason that it is most appropriate for us to pause and pay tribute to this proud people on their independence day. And at this time I would also like to personally renew my pledge to do whatever I can to further their cause of national independence.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join my colleagues in commemorating the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

This recollection of the short-lived freedom of these noble people from the tyranny of foreign subjugation is particularly meaningful to us today as we join with other free peoples to arrest the tide of aggression in Vietnam. The noble Ukrainian patriots gave their lives in defense of their hard-won independence, only to lose it to the ruthless Communist aggressor. Yet, in spite of this conquest, the spark of freedom still burns in the hearts of these gallant people.

It is fitting, therefore, that we who live in freedom pause on this anniversary to reaffirm our continued support for the Ukrainian and other captive peoples, and pray that they may soon be freed from their bondage to walk again in freedom, as befits the dignity of all men.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today we of the U.S. Congress take time out to pay tribute to a valiant people who for most of their history have known nothing but oppression and autocratic rule. Today we commemorate the brief 2 years from 1918 to 1920 when the Ukrainians broke from their alien rulers to establish a democratic republic.

It is ironic and sad that the rule of the czars from which they broke in 1918 was destined to be replaced by force with a much more sinister and all destroying ruler, communism, in 1920.

During the Ukrainian independence the people and newly formed government struggled heroically to mend the war torn country. Unfortunately, time and the Bolsheviks were against them. In 1920 the Communists overran the Ukraine and for the last 46 years the people have labored under the yoke of communism.

Having once tasted liberty and personal freedom, the burden of tyranny fell all the more heavily upon the Ukrainian people. This taste has been passed on from the old to the young and burns as vividly today in the hearts of all as it did in 1920.

Today these heroic struggles deserve our salutes because in all these years they have not ceased their struggle for independence even though the entire might of Soviet Russia is opposing them.

On this 48th anniversary of independence I join millions of Americans in wishing the Ukrainian victims of Soviet treachery fortitude and power in their struggle against the forces of totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak on a subject which is of deep personal concern to me. The subject is the lost independence of the Ukraine. On January 22, 1918, just 48 years ago, the patriots of the Ukraine proclaimed their country's independence. Although Ukrainian liberty was crushed by the superior numerical power of the Bolshevik imperialists by 1920, the declaration signed at Kiev, is a symbol to all freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

Today, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is a Charter Member of the United Nations, but it cannot enter into diplomatic relations with any of the free nations of the world. It is a state which is used by the leaders of the Kremlin, without regard to the wishes of the people or the principles of democracy.

According to careful calculations there are approximately 54 million Ukrainians in the world. The Ukrainians rank third in size among European populations, after the Germans and the Russians. A majority of the Ukrainians live in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. There are also a few areas on the Ukrainian borders which are inhabited by compact masses of Ukrainians, especially in the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. There are also areas of Ukrainian settlement in the Soviet Far East, along the Amur River and elsewhere. Over a million Americans are of Ukrainian descent.

The Ukrainian people have never lost their determination to regain their freedom. The struggle for independence did not end in the 1920's. During World War II the Ukrainians organized the underground Ukrainian Insurgent Army—UPA—which fought both the Nazis and the returning Red Army. Even today news of opposition to the Soviet regime sometimes reaches the West.

On this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I want to reaffirm my dedication to the cause of Ukrainian liberty. I am sure that I also speak for the Congress and for the American people. May the day come when the gallant Ukrainians will regain their national independence and freedom.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, today, January 25, 1966, I extend my best wishes to Ukraine on the 48th anniversary of its independence from czarist Russian rule.

I am certain that on that glorious day in January 1918, thoughts of all Ukrainians turned to the beloved poet of Ukrainian freedom—Taras Shevchenko, 1814–61, whose words continue to thrill freedom-loving peoples everywhere. In Ukrainian history he stands as a major literary figure and as a powerful voice of Ukrainian nationalism. Today it is fitting that we remember this great man and his contributions to his native land.

With the appearance of his first collection of poetry "The Kobzar," in 1840, came a new era in Ukrainian culture. Unlike most Ukrainian poets before him, Shevchenko turned not to Russian but to the Ukrainian language for his medium of expression. His countrymen thrilled to the music of his verse, which fairly resounds with the sonorous voices of Ukrainian peasants and is bright with rich folk images and rhythms. With his advent the future of Ukrainian literature was never in doubt, for his work proved its right to exist as one of the Slavic literatures.

From his earliest writings, Shevchenko was the patriot and poet laureate of Ukrainian independence. His people were always in his thoughts, and in his first works he idealized the life which they had lived, the stern and bitter struggles they had fought for independence, and he glorified the kobzars, folk bards, who alone had preserved for posterity the memory of the heroic deeds of the Ukrainian past.

During only 9 years of his life was he allowed to enjoy personal freedom. Yet ever before him burned the goal of Ukrainian independence from the cruel Russians, a dream that he never forsook, even during hard years of serfdom, forced military service, and police supervision. He defied the order of the czar, which forbade him to write or draw, and wrote poetry that cried for Mother Ukraine, who "like an orphan weeps on the Dnieper." Courageously, he hailed George Washington and the American Revolution, demanding to know:

When will we receive our Washington,
With a new and righteous law?
And receive him we will someday.

No wonder then that his inspiring words are especially cherished by all of his compatriots who have experienced the bitter anguish of oppression and who love and have not lost faith in a regenerate Ukraine.

On this momentous day in Ukrainian history, we honor the memory of Taras Shevchenko and echo his impassioned hope that soon Ukraine may be freed from oppression and take its rightful place among the independent, free nations of the world.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the 22d of January marked the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of a free Ukraine. On that day, in 1918, the Ukraine achieved its independence and freedom after centuries of slavery.

Today we observe the anniversary with mixed emotions for, today, the Ukraine is once more a captive nation in bondage. More than 43 million Ukrainians in the U.S.S.R. not only desire freedom but share our desire for freedom throughout the world. As we remember their struggle for freedom in 1918, we also face the struggle for freedom in South Vietnam and in other parts of the world. The lesson which we learn from events past is that, so long as any nation is a captive nation, our freedom is threatened and we are in danger.

The desire for self-determination is universal and it is the responsibility of the stronger nations to direct world attention to the history of the Ukrainians' struggle for freedom.

The Ukrainians have been persecuted and oppressed because they remember their heritage and history—and their dreams for self-determination as an independent nation. We are fighting in South Vietnam today for this same principle. While their Communist masters prohibit the Ukrainians in the Soviet Union from celebrating this anniversary, we in America join with our fellow Americans of Ukrainian descent in this celebration so that their history will not be forgotten. We will pay tribute to them in the Halls of Congress. We who are committed to defend freedom throughout the world will remember that 22d of January 1918.

The history of the Ukraine, studded with stories of courage and valor on the one hand, and of religion and culture on the other, should be told and retold. We join all Ukrainians and their descendants here and abroad in marking this anniversary during which we reaffirm our prayers and hopes for the return of freedom to the Ukraine and to captive nations throughout the world.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, in the past 21 years, or since the end of World War II, approximately 55 former colonies of Western countries have become independent nations of the world community. This group of newly independent countries constitutes about one-third of mankind now living, and this same group occupies about 23 percent of the world's inhabitable land mass.

For the past 21 years or so, as the number of these colonies began to dwindle and the number of free and independent states increased, the Soviet Union screamed its virulence at the West, and the issue of colonialism and imperialism became an issue in the East-West war of words, national prestige, and international propaganda. During these years the West worked toward the eventual independence of these countries, so that today, Western states have few overseas territories. During this time as the Russians tried to hang the albatross around our necks, we in the West suffered in quietude, righted a number of wrongs, and generally did a decent job of helping these countries prepare themselves for membership as responsible states in the family of nations.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to remind our own people and the Soviet Union that we have not been fooled by the verbal trickery of the Marxist dialectic, and that we realize that the largest colonial master in the world today is the Soviet Union, followed closely by her alienated sister east of the Urals, Communist China. It is of the Soviet Union's relationship to the Ukrainian people, however, that I wish to speak today.

The age-old manifestations of colonialism are apparent in what the Soviets glibly refer to as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. That is to say, the Russians have resorted to all possible means to deny the Ukrainian peoples their own distinct identity and culture. I should like to mention a few of these indicators.

The nourishment of any national identity is found in language, but today in the Ukraine, there is the Russification of language that would make the old Western colonialists dignified in comparison. Russian is the official language, and is mandatory in the educational system. The arts speak of the glories of Russia, and opera and theater are overwhelmingly presented in Russian. The life spirit of the Ukrainian peoples and their glorious past are placed second to Russia in the educational system. The Ukrainian peoples see what is happening to their country and to their cultural and national identity. Russians in the Ukraine have the best jobs, hold most of the administrative posts, and maintain a better standard of living. The Ukrainian peoples see Russian exploitation of their natural resources, especially of the food that leaves the country, and exploitation of their human resources, as the Ukrainians, not the Russians, hold the menial jobs and in general have to struggle for a higher living standard in this workers' paradise. The classless society, indeed.

What we should do, Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, is remind ourselves and the Ukrainian people that we have not been fooled. The lessons of the past are clear: Russian colonialism shall not succeed.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, by setting aside a period today to commemorate the 48th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, the House honors itself and its high principles just as it does the bravery and continued devotion to freedom and national independence of Ukrainians everywhere. It is a privilege, therefore, to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a people whose love of freedom has withstood generations of persecution.

The people of Ukraine have a special claim to our understanding and support. Not only do they seek for themselves what we have found and firmly established in the United States—the right to self-government, a right we hold to be inalienable for all peoples—but America has been the beneficiary of the approximately 2 million people of Ukrainian ancestry who have brought to this country the spiritual qualities and human values of an old, distinctive and rich culture.

As the representative of a congressional district whose residents include thousands of persons of Ukrainian descent, I have appreciated at close range the important contributions they have made to our way of life. Because of their friendship, I have obtained a closer, more personal understanding of the dedication of Ukrainians everywhere to the goals of individual liberty and national self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, Ukraine is the largest and one of the oldest of the captive nations of Eastern Europe. Yet, the period of her independence as a nation in the 20th century is the shortest, the 2 years from 1918 to 1920, during which Ukrainians fought for and won their freedom from the corrupt tsarist government of Russia only to have it wrenched away by the brutal forces of the new Soviet government. Thus it is that Ukrainians know, perhaps better than most, the evils of tyranny and imperialism in whatever form they are manifested. To have kept alight the ideal of freedom and liberty, to have refused to succumb to overwhelming oppression and virtually permanent persecution, is worthy of our deepest gratitude and admiration.

On this occasion, however, we should do more than salute a people's courage, more than indicate our understanding of their problems, more than pledge our support in general terms. We owe them action, effective action, even though we recognize the limits of our own national power. Among the concrete and positive steps this House can take, Mr. Speaker, is the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations which would bring into being an expert group of legislators devoting continuing attention to developments in those countries still dominated from Moscow.

This and related actions would help to give new emphasis to policies affecting Eastern Europe, new understanding of the opportunities we have to sustain hope and encourage freedom in this important area of the world, and renewed effectiveness to the exposure of the ugly record of Soviet colonialism in countries which were born to be free.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join in the observance marking the 48th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, which was proclaimed on January 22, 1918. Although that freedom was short lived, that important event, the proclamation of Ukrainian independence and the establishment of the Republic, symbolized the realization of a centuries-old dream.

The Ukrainians are one of the oldest and largest of the Slavic ethnic groups. They are known as one of the most peace-loving, industrious, and democratic peoples in Eastern Europe. For centuries they have been denied the benefit of these wonderful traits by the oppressive measures inflicted upon them by the Russians.

During all these centuries, the Russians were not able to eradicate Ukrainian nationalist feelings. The idea of complete freedom has always been nurtured in the people's hearts.

Today, Communist totalitarian tyranny has turned the Ukraine into a large prison camp in which more than 42 million freedom-seeking and hard-working Ukrainians are crushed under the yoke of the Soviets. There is no freedom of movement, and no freedom of expression. However, the Ukrainians in the free world, and particularly those in the United States, observe each year on January 22, Ukrainian Independence Day, with due solemnity.

Mr. Speaker, I join my fellow Americans in bringing congratulations to the Ukrainian people, and in the hope that the freedom we enjoy in the United States can become a way of life for all the lands now controlled by communism.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, 48 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the Ukraine broke the chains of Russian rule. This day marked a glorious culmination of the dreams of freedom which Ukrainians had harbored for hundreds of years.

Yet upon gaining independence, the Ukraine was beset from all sides by nations greedy for its abundant natural resources and strategic geographic location. Germany and Austria-Hungary seized the Ukraine and installed a puppet ruler. After its defeat in World War I, Germany withdrew, but the French then landed at Odessa in an attempt to bring the Ukraine into France's sphere of influence. White Russians fought through the Ukraine in their efforts to overthrow the Russian Bolsheviks. Poland invaded, trying to annex the Ukrainian lands west of the Dnieper River. Meanwhile the Bolsheviks constantly attacked in order to reannex the Ukraine to Russia. In 1922 the gallant Ukraine was forced to succumb to the strength of the U.S.S.R. and thus lost its last vestige of independence.

Today the beautiful and rich land of the Ukraine stands crushed in the paws of the Russian bear. Even so, Ukrainian patriots have never relinquished the most dominant theme of their national history—the will to be free. The world has witnessed this will many times. After World War II, when the Ukraine lost so much of its wealth, its people never once flinched from the hard task of rebuilding. In the early 1950's Ukrainian nationalist guerrillas still fought against the forces of communism in west Ukraine and Polish-Slovak-Carpathian borderlands. Such is the spirit of Ukrainians that the Russian press has made many attacks on Ukrainian literature for its nationalism.

The man who embodies the spirit of nationalism most perfectly in Ukrainian culture is Taras Shevchenko, poet and national hero. His power was such that his poems in defense of freedom, written in the 19th century, caused the Russian empire to quake and Czar Nicholas I to command him to desist from writing. For the first time a Ukrainian had risen to express the feelings of his people in their own tongue. Earlier writers had made some use of Ukrainian, but Shevchenko worked almost exclusively in his native language, thus placing the literature of his homeland in the ranks of the great Slavic writings.

In his earlier works Shevchenko idealized the lives of his people, their troubles, and their bitter struggles to gain independence. His words are still cherished by Ukrainians, who, just as Shevchenko chafed under the rule of czarist Russia 100 years ago, dream today of attaining freedom from the Russian Communists.

On this day it is fitting that we pay tribute to the genius of the Ukrainian people—their undying will to be independent and to take their rightful place among the free nations of the world. As Americans we must ever remember that as long as courageous Ukrainians remain under tyrannical Russian rule, as long as any nation remains subjugated to another, as long as men are denied the ideals of democracy and individual liberty, our task is not done. It is my privilege today, Mr. Speaker, to salute the Ukraine and all its valiant sons throughout the world.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, we who love freedom pause to honor the sacrifices and the valor of the people of the Ukraine, in commemoration of the 48th anniversary of their independence. This long-suffering people, whose centuries-old dream of nationhood flowered with such tragic brevity from 1918 to 1920, still aspire to independence and freedom. Numbering some 45 million people, and occupying one of the most productive agricultural areas in Europe, these brave people have continued to rebel against the crushing domination imposed upon them by the Soviets. They have suffered indignities, tyranny, and deportation of their political leaders to Siberia. Notwithstanding these outrages, they have repeatedly asserted their desire for freedom and independence, and staged active acts of rebellion to these ends during the 1950's.

At this time, we proffer our respect and our deep compassion for the long and continuing struggle of the Ukrainian people. We hope earnestly for their eventual emergence from foreign domination. We hope that their aspirations and those of their millions of friends and descendants throughout the world may be realized, and that this captive nation may once again be numbered among the free nations of the world.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked a solemn occasion for Ukrainians everywhere, and I am proud to join in commemorating this significant date in the history of the Ukraine.

Forty-eight years have passed since that memorable day when patriotic Ukrainians proclaimed their freedom and independence after centuries of subjugation by the Russians. Tragically, their period of independence was short-lived. After 3½ years of fighting valiantly against the onslaught of the Communist techniques of propaganda, "civil war," and "liberation front," which are the weapons for the subjugation of free people, the Ukraine was brought under the regime of the Soviet Socialistic Republic by the forces of its Communist neighbor.

Oppression, banishment, and persecution followed—but despite the sufferings visited upon them, the Ukrainian people have not lost sight of their dream of freedom. Their aspirations for self-determination and human dignity are as natural as the air we breathe. Since the dawn of history, man has longed and hoped for individual freedom and national independence. In commemorating this day of Ukrainian Independence, let us rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom and to the preservation of the rights of all mankind throughout the world—and let us not forget that "freedom is the sure possession of those alone who have the courage to defend it."

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this year when we pause to pay tribute to the courage of a brave and proud people on the 48th anniversary of independence on the Ukraine, we do so once again in the face of tragedy and cynicism. For the Ukrainians remain enchained by the bonds of an alien power, the Communist empire of the Soviet Union.

The Ukrainians have remained more or less under the heel of Russian tyranny ever since the 17th century, and the independence day which we are now celebrating marks the beginning of a mere 2 years of freedom, a brief flicker of the light of liberty amid centuries of darkness. The Ukrainians fought bravely to preserve the liberty they had achieved on the first day of November 48 years ago. It was a glorious day, but already the young Republic was surrounded by powerful enemies—the imperial dynasties of Austria and Germany and the arrogant young Communist state in Russia.

With Germany finally out of the war, the newly formed Red army moved quickly into the eastern sector of the country in early 1920. Before long the entire country had been overrun and the freedom of the Ukrainians had been brutally smashed once again.

Behind the Red army came the Communist commissars who stood ready to crush the spirit of liberty along with the political freedom of the Ukrainian people. But where the brutal might of the Red army was able to succeed, the assimilating process of the Communist commissars has failed, and failed miserably. Despite their desperate plight, the Ukrainians have not allowed the Communists to bend their unbreakable spirit. Amidst the ashes of defeat, the spirit of liberty in the Ukrainian people burns brightly.

That, I submit, is why this anniversary of Ukrainian independence is so terribly important to freedom-loving people everywhere. For the spirit of the Ukrainians, their refusal to submit to the harshest possible attempts at acculturation into a totalitarian Communist society, stands as a shining example to us all. Western visitors have reported that a brief trip to the Ukraine brings this point home even to the most casual observer. After the dreary, dark, and sullen atmosphere of the typical Communist country that pervades much of the Soviet Union itself, it is a refreshing pleasure to simply observe the cheerful and independent spirit of the Ukrainians, not to mention the rugged beauty of their homeland.

The present fate of our Ukrainian friends represents one of the great tragedies of modern man, the totalitarian enslavement that seems peculiarly a part of the darker side of the 20th century. On the other hand, their undying courage and independent spirit stand as a monument to the strength of man in the face of the cruelest odds.

This 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence must necessarily be a solemn occasion. Nevertheless, in the faith and courage of the Ukrainian people there is always a good deal of cause for rejoicing.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to participate in this commemoration of Ukrainian Independence Day by the House.

This date, January 22, is as significant to the people of the Ukraine as our own Independence Day, July 4, is to us. In addition, it holds great significance for this and every other free nation because it serves to remind us that there are hundreds of millions of people who live under the heavy hand of Communist imperialism.

The United States must never forget the plight of the enslaved citizens of the Ukraine, of the captive nations of Eastern Europe and of every other nation in the world which suffers today under the yoke of communism. This is why we are fighting today in Vietnam—to prevent the people of that embattled country from slipping into the waiting hands of tyranny.

This day is also an excellent occasion upon which to declare our support, once again, for the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives—at a time when there are more than two dozen Communist-dominated nations in the world, when the peoples of these countries have no real voice in their government, nor freedom nor self-determination, and when every fighter for freedom looks for a sign from this cradle of liberty that he is not alone in his fight and can depend upon the United States for continued support and encouragement.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, the Ukrainian Americans in my State celebrated the 48th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. On that day, in 1918, the Ukrainian Rada, or Parliament, proclaimed Ukraine's independence. The Ukrainian declaration of independence was called the Fourth Universal. Although the Ukrainians had taken advantage of the Russian revolution to proclaim their independence, they soon found that the new masters of the Kremlin were no more willing than the czars to allow them their right of self-determination. For 2 gallant years the Ukrainian patriots held out against the superior numerical strength of the Bolsheviks. But although the Soviets finally conquered the Ukrainian land they could not win the allegiance of the freedom-loving Ukrainians.

Peasant uprisings continued long after the Red army had occupied the Ukraine. During the Second World War Ukrainian patriots organized against both the Nazis and the Soviets. Even today stories of opposition to Soviet rule reach Ukrainian Americans.

I am sure I speak for the Congress and the American people when I reaffirm my dedication to the cause of independence for the Ukraine. For the American people, Mr. Speaker, have always believed deeply in the self-determination of all nations. As the Ukrainian experience clearly demonstrates, the fires of freedom are not only unquenchable, in our shrinking world they are also indivisible.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who live secure in a Nation where the Government is of our own creation, governed by institutions which are bound by the motto: "Of the people, by the people and for the people," it is difficult to understand the national frustration of peoples obliged to live under the rule of a foreign power.

Since the rule of Catherine the second in the 18th century, the Ukrainian people have lived under foreign rule. Occasionally their hopes have been rekindled by a relaxation of the grip or a military defeat suffered by their rulers, but in every instance, the Ukrainians have been cast back under foreign control.

The great hope of the Ukrainians came in 1917, when after two sudden revolutions, a new Russian Government assumed the reins of power and proclaimed the rights of all the nationalities of Russia to self-determination. The Ukrainians were one of the first to take advantage of the new policy and joyously proclaimed their independence. They were able to enjoy it just long enough to sign a separate peace treaty with Germany as Russia left World War I.

Unfortunately, the Bolsheviks had not been serious about the autonomy of the nationalities. They saw it as a means of weakening the unity of the imperial regime. Once safely in control, the Communist government of Russia clamped down on the nationalities, including the Ukraine.

To this day the Communist control over the Ukraine continues. This rule is imposed by the same group of men who claim themselves the champions of national independence movements. It is a tragic irony indeed. Yet, in all of this, one light of hope continues to glow; it is the unswerving national identity and dignity of the Ukrainian people. Despite the harsh attempts at Communist assimilation, the national character of the Ukrainian people stands triumphant.

Let us pause, Mr. Speaker, to take this moment to salute the proud people of the Ukraine.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence was observed on January 22, 1966. Just 48 years ago in Kiev in 1918, the Ukrainian people—a freedom-loving people—seized the opportunity created by the Russian revolution of the year before to declare their independence, proclaim their freedom, and shake the yoke of centuries of Russian domination.

As we all know, the freedom of the Ukraine was a short-lived freedom. Russian domination after 3 short years of bitter fighting was replaced by the Communist domination of the Soviet Socialist Republic.

Mr. Speaker, the Ukraine has a population of some 40 million people. In our country, more than one and a half million American citizens trace their origin to the Ukraine. So we in the United States—a free land—share at least a twofold common interest with our brothers behind the Iron Curtain: Like them we love freedom and we look with them to the day when freedom will once again be restored to their beleaguered country; and with their brothers who, like us are American citizens in a free land, we join in commemorating a glorious though short-lived episode in Ukrainian history.

The observances that were held all across this country on January 22 will serve as a forceful reminder to all Americans that the flame of liberty still burns in the hearts and minds of the millions of Ukrainians who live under the domination of communism.

It is a privilege to pay tribute to this freedom-loving people.

PROPOSAL TO ADJUST THE RATE OF BASIC COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to adjust the rates of basic compensation of our Federal employees in all branches of the service who depend on congressional action for appropriate attention. The bill I have introduced provides an across-the-board 7-percent increase. Close students of the matter agree that such an increase at this time is fully justified.

In addition to adjusting the pay of our Federal employees, the legislation I have introduced corrects a number of existing inequities in connection with compensation for overtime, holiday, and Sunday work, and in so doing provides administrators in the Federal service, particularly the Post Office Department, with ample flexibility so that our governmental functions can be performed in an efficient manner.

It is recognized that the mail moves in all directions every day of the year, even including Sundays and holidays. The bill I have introduced recognizes this fact, but provides justifiable compensation for those who are required to work on such days.

In simple terms the bill provides time and one-half for overtime and Sunday work and double time for work on holidays.

I hope that hearings can be held on this bill and others with a similar purpose at an early date. I am sure the testimony will support me in the action I have taken.

CRIMINAL CONSPIRACIES CONTROL ACT OF 1966

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, today I propose a major revision of the internal security laws of the Nation.

No one conversant with present security statutes can deny that they are outmoded, both as to the factual bases upon which they were drawn and as to subsequent application of constitutional principles. A brief examination of the Internal Security Act of 1950 should suffice to establish these contentions.

First. In its legislative findings, Congress set forth what was then the case—that "the direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country." That was the case, Mr. Speaker, before the assumption by Communist China of ideological independence, and before the schism that exists today between China and Russia. It is no longer the case, and that change is clearly reflected by the existence within the United States of two contending Communist apparati—the Communist Party and the Progressive Labor Party. The latter follows, not Moscow, but Peiping. It is in no way governed or controlled by the "foreign country" described in the 1950 act. To the contrary, the pronouncements of the Progressive Labor Party are couched in terms of scorn and derision for the revisionists and counterrevolutionaries of the Kremlin.

This struggle for leadership of the world Communist movement would be of no great moment insofar as our laws are concerned, except for one factor: the Internal Security Act of 1950 specifically defines both "Communist-action" and "Communist-front" organizations as groups which are "directed, dominated, or controlled by the foreign power controlling the world Communist movement," meaning Soviet Russia. Therefore, strict interpretation of the act must, of necessity, exclude from its scope, except to limited degree, any action or front group that is not Russian dominated. The most militant and revolutionary American Communist organization, the Progressive Labor Party, is not covered by the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Second. The act is outdated legally, as well as factually. Since its passage, not a single Communist has complied with its requirements, notwithstanding 15 years of administration by the Subversive Activities Control Board and 15 years of litigation. One by one, its provisions have been invalidated by the Supreme Court, which must apply the protections of the Constitution to Communists as well as patriots. The passport restriction has been wiped out, as have limitations on holding of office in labor unions. Only last December the Court struck down the registration requirements applicable to Communist organizations, thereby vitiating the central scheme of the entire act.

As a result of these rulings, the Subversive Activities Control Board is reduced to near meaningless ritual. Whatever functions are left to it are clearly incapable of controlling subversive activities.

The present state of the law is indicative of our general failure to revise and renew concepts and procedures affecting national security. For example, every person entering his country's service, civil or military, must subscribe to a lengthy affidavit denying or explaining any affiliation, past or present, with any of several score organizations. Many of these are relevant only to the distant past. No names have been added to the Attorney General's list since 1955, and none has been stricken since its inception in 1947. The Ku Klux Klan groups included in the list have long since faded away, being replaced by new and more dangerous Klan organizations whose names are not included.

The list was compiled when Japan, Germany, and Italy—now among our closest allies—were our recent enemies. It contains the names of many military and patriotic societies of these present friends—including a Russo-Japanese war veterans group, along with Shinto Temples. It is strange that past association with the national religion of our strongest ally in the Far East is still proscribed as subversive. The time has indeed come for thoughtful, practical, and constitutional revision of the internal security laws.

There are other serious shortcomings in our laws. They apply to groups attempting to subvert lawful procedures only when those groups are pawn to one specified foreign power. Yet, Communists are not the only subversives within the plain meaning of the term.

There exists in America today a number of organizations which show no more regard for the Constitution and the rights of American citizens than the Communist Party. Like that party, they operate in secrecy and through deceptive fronts. Like the Communist Party, they employ pious preachments to cover their true intent. Like the Communist Party, their members are under discipline higher than the law, and under compulsion to practice deceit and intrigue. I am speaking of the Ku Klux Klan.

The Communist Party, Mr. Speaker, is a criminal conspiracy whose purpose is to deprive the people through forcible overthrow of their collective right to a republican form of government. Similarly, the Klan is a criminal conspiracy, whose purpose is to deprive the people of their individual rights through force, violence, and intimidation. Differing in membership and pronouncement, they are nonetheless the same, each a criminal conspiracy, each acting in violation of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Then, there is a third element akin to these two—a third force existing under rigid discipline and complete secrecy. It, too, is based upon force, violence, and intimidation. Like the Communist Party and the Klan, it recognizes no fealty to the Constitution, or to lawful authority. It is a law unto itself, binding its members by oath, on pain of death.

Here I speak of the vast criminal network known varyingly as Cosa Nostra, Mafia, or the Syndicate.

I need not review the magnitude or scope of its activities. That, along with the identity of its leaders, is common knowledge. Its impetus is not political, as the Communist Party, nor social, as the Klan, but economic. The Cosa Nostra exists solely for the criminal gain of its members. And because the Constitution protects the guilty as well as the innocent, these criminals continue their careers of death and corruption, virtually beyond reach of the law.

These three, Mr. Speaker—Communists, Klan, and Cosa Nostra—are essentially the same. All are secret bodies acting beyond the law. All force upon their members a rigid discipline. All are engaged in planned and continued violations of the criminal statutes of the United States.

All jeopardize the internal security. All are criminal conspiracies.

I am today introducing a bill to revise the internal security laws, and to extend them to include other criminal conspiracies in addition to Communist organizations.

My bill recognizes the constitutional limitations enunciated by recent Supreme Court decisions on the subject, and works fully within those principles.

Styled "The Criminal Conspiracies Control Act of 1966," the bill defines criminal conspiracies in three categories, as follows:

> SEC. 3. (3) (a) Any organization in the United States having for one of its purposes or objectives the establishment, control, conduct, seizure, or overthrow of the Government of the United States, or the government of any State or political subdivision thereof, by the use of force or violence; or
>
> (3) (b) Any organization in the United States which advocates or employs acts of violence or intimidation for the purpose of depriving citizens of the United States of the free exercise of rights guaranteed them by the Constitution and laws of the United States; or
>
> (3) (c) Any organization having as its purpose the planned, continued, and consistent execution of acts which violate the criminal statutes of the United States.

It will be seen that this definition is directly related to acts which are violations of existing criminal laws of the United States. The first category includes conspiracies to violate the Smith Act; the second, violations of the several civil rights acts; the third covers violations of the general criminal statutes of the United States. I suggest no new political or social or economic crime, but only define certain combinations as "criminal conspiracies."

A Criminal Conspiracies Control Board succeeds the present Subversive Activities Control Board, with all procedural safeguards continued. The new Board convicts of no crime, imposes no sanction, and administers no control. Its sole function is a judicial determination, upon petition of the Attorney General, that a named organization is, or is not, a criminal conspiracy as defined in the bill. Because Communist organizations come within the first category of conspiracies, the duties of the Board in that area will be little changed. But those duties will be broadened to include conspiracies of the other two types, as the Klan and the Cosa Nostra. Thus, the sole duty of the Board is determination.

Upon Board determination that a named group is a criminal conspiracy, the Attorney General is empowered to seek an injunction to restrain and prohibit that group from further conspiring to violate the laws of the United States. The Board takes no part in the injunctive process, but its determination is the basis for an entirely new proceeding in a U.S. district court. Any injunction must, of course, be based upon competent evidence that the group so determined is, at time of filing of the application for injunction, continuing to conspire to violate the laws of the United States. The burden of proof will rest upon the Attorney General, and any respondent will be accorded all the safeguards inherent in the judicial process.

Even then, the sanction against the group and its members is not criminal conviction, but civil injunction ordering that it cease and desist from conspiring to violate the law.

Thus enjoined, conspirators will be subject to further proceedings for any breach of the injunction, with sanctions of fine and detention applicable as in other cases of contempt. Punishment for contempt, however, must rest upon still another court proceeding to establish, again by competent evidence, that the terms of the injunction have been violated.

Included in my bill is a provision for extending, upon request of the Attorney General and through court order, immunity to witnesses before the Board or the court. The fifth amendment prohibits compulsory incrimination. It is a wise and valuable protection, but its invocation often frustrates the discovery of truth. By the grant of full immunity from criminal prosecution in carefully considered cases, the truth might be derived without incrimination. A witness granted immunity, whether willingly or not, would be subject to the penalties of perjury, or citation for contempt upon refusal to testify.

These are the salient provisions of my bill. Its basic structure is tripartite—determination, injunction, and contempt. Being in essence a new civil proceeding, the bill repeals no substantive criminal statute. The twisted and hidden ways of conspiracy require a central tribunal with both experience and expertise for judging and determining organizational character. This is provided by the Criminal Conspiracies Control Board, whose final determination concludes that issue, thus relieving courts from establishing it anew with each new application for injunction.

The application of injunctive relief requires detailed consideration of the circumstances as they exist from day to day, full judicial protection, and power to mold decrees to fit the equities of the parties. This is provided through the established judicial process, but with new procedures and new standards set by the Congress.

The control of criminal conspiracies requires constant surveillance, full information, and prompt action by law enforcement authorities. This is provided by the new duties placed upon the Attorney General, and the new provision for immunity of witnesses.

Here, Mr. Speaker, are the essential elements of my bill, the Criminal Conspiracies Control Act of 1966. Being the product of my own draftsmanship, I am sure that some refinements will be in order. Other Members can doubtless make valuable contributions to its final form. But the basic structure is both practical and constitutional, and its goals are attainable. It will provide a new, competent, and flexible weapon against subversion, intimidation, and exploitation. It will provide the means to control, diminish, and ultimately destroy criminal conspiracies. It will enable the Congress more fully to discharge its highest duty—the protection of our country and the preservation of our liberties.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXTENDING TERMS OF MEMBERS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. **TALCOTT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **TALCOTT.** Mr. Speaker, the President has revived the old idea of extending the term of Representatives in Congress from 2 to 4 years, with a special dangerous suggestion that their terms be coterminous with the term of the President.

Proponents of this idea claim a desire to reduce the escalating campaign costs in time, money, and energy of the incumbent, the opposing candidate and their supporters. They also argue, "less campaigning will permit more time for legislating."

Our Founding Fathers, the greatest aggregation of political scientists ever assembled, acting from vivid experiences under European tyranny, established a bicameral Federal legislature—6-year terms for Senators to provide continuity and 2-year terms for Representatives to provide responsiveness to the people.

Today continuity is doubly insured. More than 150 Congressmen are reelected each election year without a real contest; 169 Congressmen are serving their sixth 2-year term—12 years or more; 259 have served four terms—8 years or more; only 5 Senators, but 25 Representatives, have served since before our entry into World War II.

Sufficient continuity is assured. Responsiveness to the constituency is the ingredient which needs attention and preservation.

Unquestionably too much time, energy, talent, and money of incumbents, candidates and supporters are wasted during campaigns—and too much time and energy is diverted from proper legislative functions. This problem can be solved in a better way than that suggested by the President.

I propose that the time between the primary and general elections be drastically shortened. If, for instance, primary elections were held on the first Tuesday after the second Monday in September, the enormous costs of campaigns and elections—and the exacerbation of fellow citizens—could be greatly reduced and yet the vital responsiveness of Representatives, insured only by short terms, could be preserved.

If a candidate cannot sell himself or his ideas in 45 days, he should quit and try again later. Such telescoping of campaign time would permit proportionately more legislative time.

This proposal may not be in the best self-interest of the incumbent Representative, but it would be in the best general interests of responsive legislation, our peerless federal system, and our Republic.

Long, protracted campaigns—from before March to early November—more than 9 months—are enormously wasteful of the time, talent, energy, and funds of a large and growing segment of our society—as well as of the candidates. The shortening of all campaigns by 6 months or two-thirds would be more effective than reducing the number of campaigns of Congressmen by one-half. Reduction of campaign time would benefit all campaigners—local, State, and Federal—and thereby permit enormous multiple savings.

Campaigns per se are not wasteful or detrimental to the legislative process. Only extended campaigns are unnecessary and bad. Short campaigns are beneficial to a legislator and to the constituency—affording an opportunity to exchange views and size up each other. It should help more than hinder the legislative process—and improve the caliber of representation—for every incumbent legislator to face an able opponent and a bona fide campaign every 2 years.

Let us understand the real problem. Let us sort out and pinpoint the actual defects. Let us make certain that our diagnosis is correct. Let us not confuse the issues or wrongly diagnose the ailment of the patient.

Before we anesthetize the American public into believing the President's political scheme for severing one of the important constitutional checks and balances will benefit the Republic as well as strengthen the Presidency, we should fully explore other proposals and evaluate the consequences of each.

Restoring an essential constitutional provision after it is removed by amendment is as difficult as restoring an amputated leg. Let us not hastily or negligently amputate the wrong leg before sundown just because the patient appears to limp a little in the morning.

Why cut off one leg of an expert athlete simply because you, or a competitor, detects a malignancy in his heart?

The ailment seems to be in the political campaigns—their length, their methods, their techniques, their standards, and so forth—not in the terms of office of the Federal legislators.

For almost 9 months of every other year—three-eighths of our time—the U.S. citizenry is buffeted and bombarded into near insensibility by political campaigns. This prolonged exacerbation of the electorate is immeasurably detrimental. A good game for four quarters or nine innings, a good debate for a few hours, or a good race for 2 furlongs, could be entertaining, educational, or exhilarating—but the prolongation of these delightful activities for days, weeks, and months would be boring, deathly, and repugnant. So with political debate and campaigning.

With the marvelous facilities of mass communication, long campaigns are not necessary to present a candidate, his views, or his platform satisfactorily. But the very miracle of vast, wide, comprehensive, in depth exposure by the communications media, dulls, bores, and satiates the electorate after weeks and months of repetition.

Protracted, elongated campaigns degrade rather than upgrade politics and the electoral process.

The exacerbation of the populace by protracted political campaigns contributes considerably to campaign abuses and election law violations. Illegal and excessive spending occurs more often in long campaigns. Smearing, libel, slander, misrepresentations, and deceit escalate in almost direct proportion to the extension of campaigns past 45 days. Bitterness and recriminations increase in intensity, degree, and persistence with long campaigns.

We need full debate and deliberation of the issues and thorough presentation of the candidates and their views—but we also need to return to normalcy, cooperation, and teamwork as soon as the election returns are counted. The longer the campaign, the more difficult it is to return to normal and to a respectful and cooperative effort with campaign opponents.

The longer the campaign, the further the candidates and their supporting organizations stray from the facts and issues and the more likely immaterial personalities are to become involved.

There must be dozens of valid reasons why almost all political campaigns should be shortened.

The principal deterrents to the changing of primary election dates to mid-September, are the election and voter registration officials who claim insurmountable mechanical and personnel problems in tabulating primary returns and preparing for the general election within such a short period of time. But new techniques and procedures, automated election equipment, and more efficient use of personnel can easily solve the problems imagined by election and voter registration officials. The mechanical difficulties which now may loom large to election officials must be solved because the much larger and higher interests of the electorate must be served. As other agencies and governmental offices have modernized to cope with changing conditions and needs, I am confident that election officials can develop the necessary procedures to permit the election process to serve the electorate best.

This issue demonstrates the need for local, State, Federal cooperation in solving governmental and political problems. Elections are primarily State responsibilities. State and local officials should and must contribute to the dialog and to the solution of this Federal issue concerning the terms of office for Representatives in Congress.

I urge each Member of Congress to take a broader look, to study this issue comprehensively and thoroughly, to consider the many advantages of reducing the campaign time rather than reducing the number of campaigns, and to place the best interest of responsive legislation, our peerless Federal system of government, the electorate, the general citizenry, and our Republic above the self-interest of incumbents and their campaign organizations and supporters.

I urge each Member of Congress to use his influence with the State and local officials in his State and district to shorten the time between primary and general elections. This proposal will do more than the proposal of the President to improve our political and legislative processes.

The President's suggestion to make the terms of Congressmen coterminous with the term of the President is especially devious and dangerous. His argument—that it would be unfair for half of the Representatives to be able to run with the President and the other half to be required to run between presidential elections—is specious.

The only purpose for the coterminous terms is to further subordinate the legislative branch of the Federal Government to the domination of the Presidency. Already we have drifted or have been guided too far toward executive control and presidential dictatorship. The legislative and executive branches, with the judicial, were constitutionally ordained to be, and should be kept, strong but coequal. If Presidential proposals for legislation are valid and meritorious, approval can be obtained by debate, deliberation, and majority vote without political manipulation or boss politics.

Such coterminous terms would encourage coattail and me-too campaigns. Such campaigns would result in rubberstamp or Xerox Congresses, slowly but certainly destroying the independence and responsiveness of the Legislature. A logical extension of this proposal would lead inexorably to an impotent Congress. Eventually a separate election for President and Congress would not be necessary. Perhaps the next step would be a constitutional amendment requiring all State gubernatorial and State legislative elections to be held concurrently with the presidential election. Think this proposal has not been considered by the collectivists and the centralists?

The President's argument is contrary to all fact and experience. In all States where the chief executive's 4-year term is equal in length with State senators or other State legislators, the latter elections are staggered, without complaint that some run with the Governor and some must run without the Governor.

The Governor and President should run for their respective chief executive offices and the individual legislator should run for his own office. The offices are different—the campaigns should be different and disassociated.

We should discourage coattailing rather than invite a practice which degrades legislators and diminishes the legislative function.

If a 4-year term must be adopted, let us preserve as much power and recourse as possible to the electorate, let us maintain as much distinction and independence as possible between the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government. Let us at least stagger the congressional elections every 2 years.

LEGISLATION TO CREATE A U.S. COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights in order to prepare for American participation in the forthcoming International Year for Human Rights in 1968.

I must explain at the outset why it is important to act during this session. We need an official body which will have sufficient time to plan for U.S. participation. Without initiating a program well before the start of 1968, the U.S. role may become inconsequential and meaningless.

This legislation is in furtherance of a recommendation made by the Committee on Human Rights, which issued its report to the White House Conference on International Cooperation in late November of last year. This was an ad hoc body of distinguished private citizens which, together with other committees, was charged with finding means to develop better international cooperation and understanding. This particular group concentrated on the field of human rights, and agreed upon many steps which the United States could and should take to further universal respect for the rule of law.

On July 28, 1965, the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations adopted a resolution setting forth a program for the celebration of the year 1968 as the International Year for Human Rights. This will mark the 20th anniversary of that great world covenant, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In response to this initiative, the International Commission of Jurists, headquartered at Geneva, Switzerland, is launching a world campaign for human rights, urging that national sections undertake organized action to explore the status of human rights and recommend ways to strengthen worldwide adherence.

Let me refer briefly to the proposal of the White House Conference on Human Rights Committee:

> The United Nations General Assembly has already designated 1968, the 20th anniversary of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, as International Human Rights Year. Advance planning for observance of this year should be undertaken now. A representative committee needs to be appointed as soon as possible to carry through a program of activity at the State, local, and national level. As an element of that program, it would be desirable for the United States to act as host to one or more United Nations human rights seminars.

We should pursue this opportunity to act with dispatch in insuring that the United States shall be found wanting in a fresh effort to strengthen and broaden the application of recognized standards of human rights around the globe.

My bill will establish a committee of 11 members, 4 from the legislative branch and 7 appointed by the President from private life. I would envisage these members as reflective of all sectors of American life, and additionally endowed with knowledge and experience in the field of international law.

The duties of the committee shall be to conduct studies and formulate plans for U.S. participation in Human Rights Year, 1968. To accomplish this objective, the committee is authorized to conduct meetings and seminars, and seek the cooperation of all affected departments of Government for the submission of a final report to the President not later than July 1967. This report shall represent the outcome of the committee's examination of the present policies of the United States with respect to human rights and what we can do to perfect our role. The report shall recommend practical steps whereby the United States can most effectively participate in the observance of International Human Rights Year.

This Nation, despite its reluctance to act on many concrete pending issues, has always stood forthrightly behind the concept of universal human rights. The principle is embodied in our earliest constitutional awakening. It pervades all our codes of law. In brief, without the recognition of individual or human rights, one could hardly visualize the United States as she has progressed through the years.

Internationally, we stand for peaceful progress and orderly growth in a turbulent world. We have rightly underlined belief in law and order as the outstanding element of a more peaceful planet.

The hard fact is that most underdeveloped and disadvantaged societies, in the advance toward economic betterment, will experience constant disorder and even violent upheaval without the evolutionary growth of institutions protective of fundamental human freedoms. Development is a double theme, which must be directed at both material and spiritual fulfillment. Without efforts to broaden the implementation of commonly accepted norms of individual rights, we are likely to confront more ferment and wasted energies than would otherwise be the case.

These are generalities, and I am sure we can point to several exceptions. The West has, regardless of colonial repression, wars, and brutality, constructed a tangible but often subtle system of international norms of conduct. Since World War II, we have been observing the promising effort to broaden the application of the rule of law to individuals. Skeptics say this will only break down traditional State jurisdictions, and in so doing, promote confusion and chaos.

I must admit that I disagree. We may be convulsed by temporary, perhaps violent reactions. But I do not think that this has been the case. Overwhelmingly, Western European governments have accepted the installment of rights attributable directly to their nationals, and have created a multilateral court to guarantee and effectuate these inherent rights.

It is my belief that this positive example should and can be transplanted to other parts of the world.

As for the United States, I can only visualize her role as a leader in the development of global adherence to human rights. Singly we have failed on several fronts thus far. Pending before the Congress are numerous international conventions which aim at insuring minimum universal rights clearly prescribed under our own statutes. Americans can no longer blind themselves to the real advantages of these multilateral contracts, conceived as instruments, however imperfect, to instill a respect and observance of fundamental rights.

The work of this new committee will hopefully clarify our perspective and remove old, tired myths and unfounded fears about alleged foreign interference in U.S. domestic affairs. The United States must play a prominent role in a worldwide endeavor to enhance the worth and importance of the individual person before the law and his government; we must seize the occasion to launch fresh initiatives in the vital area of universal, human rights. Nothing less will suffice from a nation whose institutional framework stems directly from the proposition that all men are endowed with recognized personal safeguards which the law, written or unwritten upholds.

I fervently urge that the Congress act resolutely on this legislation. It is required to make our observance of International Human Rights Year an effective and constructive effort. To shirk this responsibility, to respond without faith and innovation, would be a disservice to mankind and crush the hopes of the overwhelming majority of Americans for whom the concept of human rights is not simply an idle dream, but a relentless and purposeful search for a better world.

A REPLY TO CRITICS OF CHICAGO'S ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Chicago's antipoverty program is under attack for a strange reason—having courage in its own convictions.

Those who would have Chicago's program, yes, even the Nation's program, die in its infancy are throwing charges around like a farmer scattering grain to his chickens.

They can have only one reason. They do not wish the war on poverty to work. They do not wish to see a great program, fostered in a great time of American history, reach its goal—a real opportunity to every citizen.

My colleagues who attack Chicago's program remind me of an illustrious ballplayer, George Case, who stole bases for the Washington Senators several years ago. Case liked to kick up a lot of dust while the pitcher was beginning his motion. This was partly to create a diversion so the pitcher would mess up his delivery and partially a way to put a cloud of dust in front of his feet which already were beginning to move toward second base.

These current pronouncements are not much different. The attacks are meant to obscure, to hide the real intent of sabotaging the program and also to hide the accomplishments of the Chicago Committee on Urban Opportunity which oversees Chicago's program.

For, while these sneak attacks have been taking place, Chicago has put into operation the most forward-looking antipoverty program in the United States—a program that must survive the crossfire of those who are out to ruin it and those who are out to use it as a steppingstone to controlling the less fortunate among us.

Let me run through just a few of Chicago's accomplishments.

The first grants announced by President Johnson included a program development grant to Chicago. But Chicago had not waited for the Federal Government to pay the way. Chicago had moved ahead. As a matter of fact, Chicago began organizing its own war on poverty before there was even any mention of such action at the Federal level.

In a fashion that is only too typical of how a dynamic city, led by its dynamic mayor, Richard J. Daley, can mobilize its resources, a group of leading Chicagoans from all interests and points of view were ready for action when they met in April of 1964 to help prepare recommendations for the Economic Opportunity Act then under discussion in Washington.

That committee later became the basis for the Chicago Committee on Urban Opportunity.

As its executive director, Mayor Daley chose the able director of research and statistics of the Cook County Department of Public Welfare, Dr. Deton J. Brooks, Jr., a man who had authored a nationally known study of literacy levels among able-bodied relief recipients in the Woodlawn area.

Dr. Brooks, together with a loaned staff contributed without cost by various private and public agencies represented on the committee, put together the Chicago plan. These people did not wait for Federal grants to hire a staff; the agencies loaned the staff members to the committee because we in Chicago sensed the spirit of urgency which President Johnson ascribed to his antipoverty program.

Twenty-three persons comprised this staff and they often worked 80 or 90 hours a week so that when Federal funds ultimately did become available, Chicago would be ready with the best program in the Nation. And it was.

That is the background. Let us look at the months since.

While other cities have been stymied by obstructionists and those politically motivated, Chicago has—

Activated the biggest, most comprehensive Head Start program per capita in the Nation. Even Chicago's most partisan critics cannot deny that our Head Start program was one of the most successful in America;

Started the biggest, most comprehensive, Neighborhood Youth Corps program in the Nation;

Opened seven fully operating neighborhood centers in poverty communities;

Provided new and dignified opportunities to more than 650 residents of those communities who have been hired to form the nucleus of the Chicago committee's staff. Mind you, each of these 650 people who make up the bulk of personnel in the seven neighborhood centers must actually live in the immediate neighborhood of the center they serve. How much more "maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of groups to be served" can you get?

Had funded and begun a wider range and larger number of community action programs—31 in all—than any other community action agency in the country;

Contracted with more than 80 private and public agencies and institutions in Chicago to actually run community action programs;

Established, through neighborhood organizations, more than 50 community-based and community-operated service programs.

All of these programs are actually in operation and producing imposing results by getting people off the relief rolls and putting them to work with dignity and confidence. These are not plans or blueprints—they are now in full operation.

These impressive achievements are proof in themselves that Chicago has followed its traditional "go" spirit while others have either been mired in bickering or victimized by the backbiting of the critics. And we in Chicago do not intend to turn away from these successes just because a handful of politically motivated critics want to play politics with the unfortunate of our society.

There is a key to Chicago's program which far outweighs those statistics. In a word, it is "people."

Chicago's program, despite the uninformed allegations of those who would make an election-year issue of people's misfortune, is based on the premise that people, all people, are the foundation of any program designed to increase opportunities and eliminate poverty.

In Chicago, it is people, neighborhood residents, for whom this program was meant. It is people, neighborhood people, who have helped in its design. It is people, neighborhood people, who man the frontlines. It is people, neighborhood people, who are its only beneficiaries.

People, yes, Mr. Speaker, are the keystone of our antipoverty program in Chicago.

I wish these press-conference heroes who attack Chicago's program would come with me to a meeting in the Woodlawn Urban Progress Center on Chicago's South Side and watch Mrs. Abner Williams, a housewife and longtime Woodlawn resident, working with her fellow residents. Mrs. Williams, the mother of 11 children and grandmother of 12, is the wife of a man who labors in a steel mill for his livelihood. Mrs. Williams is not a polished parliamentarian. Mrs. Williams is a fine lady who has put her conviction that the poor can help themselves into indisputable practice. She has committed herself to making Woodlawn and Chicago a better place in which to live. She is not out on the press conference trail making impassioned, albeit, demagogic speeches.

Mrs. Williams shares her time between her family and her civic work because she knows firsthand the problems involved in fighting poverty. Her husband is fortunate to have a job. But with 11 children, she knows how far a dollar can stretch. More important, she knows the hardships of her less fortunate neighbors who have no jobs.

The people of Woodlawn are acting together to make Chicago's program best for them, just as the people who form the advisory councils in Lawndale and Uptown, on Chicago's Near West Side; in Englewood and in Grand Boulevard-Oakwood; all working together for a better tomorrow.

In these centers there are neighborhood people who not only know firsthand the problem, but who care; and the confidence felt by their fellow neighborhood residents shows in the numbers who have gone to these centers since the first one opened on Lincoln's birthday last year.

More than 164,050 people have come to these neighborhood centers. Another

121,809 families have been visited in their homes by community representatives of the centers. The Neighborhood Youth Corps reached nearly 10,000 poverty youths this last summer. The Head Start and preschool programs served more than 27,000 youngsters. This past summer, the committee ran a day-care program for more 10,000 young boys and girls between the ages of 6 and 15 who were introduced for the first time in their lives to the fact that opportunity does indeed lie ahead for them with proper education.

The younger children were introduced to the exciting mystery of school and the older children were given extended tutoring in vocational education and job opportunities.

People—Let me tell you about Chicago people—like the 17 Lawndale residents who are the special advisory board to a job development program on the West Side that already has meant new hope and a chance for dignity for 150 formerly unemployed men.

The program is called Lawndale for Better Jobs—its sponsors and board call it L.B.J. It was originally proposed as a local program to be sponsored by a citywide organization of considerable prominence in the city.

It came up for discussion through the advisory council for the Lawndale center where local people voted their feelings. When the citywide steering committee was proposed, it was stopped. "A good program, but why do we need a citywide agency to run a local program? Can't we have a local agency? Doesn't community action mean local initiative?"

The job development proposal went back to the advisory council. The local church pastor who had originated the idea called together a group of West Side leaders. They formed a resident board composed entirely of community people. The people applied for a grant from the Chicago committee. The committee approved it immediately and paid for it out of center funds set aside for the exclusive use of neighborhood advisory councils. This already very successful operation is meeting with even greater success because of the keen interest shown by all the people in the immediate community in wanting to help their less fortunate neighbors.

Local residents were hired to help reach the unemployed. They did not sit around in an office. One lady regularly goes around to the pool halls and directs the men into the office for interviews. Other local residents spend their time in working with local employers, some of whom have never hired Negroes before, in getting jobs lined up; opening new vistas of opportunity for the chronically unemployed. Yes, Mr. Speaker, bringing a new sense of direction and dignity to people whose only lot heretofore was relying on a public handout for their meager existence.

As of last Monday, January 17, only 5 months after the local board went into operation, it had placed 150—that is right, 150—formerly unemployed Lawndale men into jobs, and not $1.25 per hour jobs, but $2.50 and $3.25 per hour jobs that will let these men support their families, contribute to their city, and leave the public dole behind them. This is one example of community action is saving the taxpayers of Cook County more than $500,000 a year in welfare costs alone, not to mention the incalculable human value involved in giving these individuals a new sense of dignity and self-respect.

That is people. No press conferences. No handouts. Just people.

I recently talked to a man who had been unemployed several years and who has now been trained as a chef under this program. He and his wife have three children. I asked him how it feels to be working again and he replied, "Mister, you don't know what it feels like to come home from work and be greeted by your kids as a proud worker instead of a broke reliefer."

I ask the critics of this program, here and now, how do you measure the human value of this one American's experience?

Let me tell you about the remarkable experience in the Neighborhood Youths Corps this summer. The Chicago Board of Education had 4,100 youths in its Neighborhood Youths Corps program. At the close of the program, the board sent questionnaires to these boys and girls. A check of these trainees after the opening of school in September showed that all but 37 of the 3,600 that responded had returned to continue their education. The normal dropout rate for youngsters from these areas would have produced 400 dropouts, not 37. This amazing reduction in the dropout rate has been attributed to the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, 363 more Chicago youngsters took another step toward a decent future.

Then there is Gene Gallagher, the supervisor of landscaping for the Chicago Park District's West Side operations. He has been reading the want ads and placing tree trimmers and landscape aids whom his department has trained under Neighborhood Youth Corps in jobs with private landscape firms and suburban towns. The first group of five were hired by the city of Evanston at $407 a month with guaranteed raises to $495 the first year.

Can our self-styled critics deny that this is a most significant advancement for a group of dropouts who only months before were stuck in a neighborhood which produced gangs with names like the Egyptian Cobras and the Vice Lords?

That is people, Mr. Speaker, and they are the heart of the Chicago program which some have tried to tear down.

If you add up all the people who have been touched this first 14 months by some phase of the Chicago program, you get more than 300,000 separate individuals.

And while the people for whom the program was designed use it to help themselves, another change—far more subtle than a job placement order—is coming over Chicago. Those who are calling out for the tools to help themselves are discovering that government—that institution of freedom which freemen hold so dear—does have an interest in them and really means what it says about providing opportunity to all.

A further subtle change is coming over Chicago, too. It is a change on the part of men and women whose support is necessary to the success of the program—the homeowner, the man who has had the opportunity and has used it to lift himself up. These fine men and women, who form so vital a part of Chicago's imposing history, have discovered that the urban opportunity program is making all of Chicago a better place for all Chicagoans.

For the war against poverty in Chicago is a massive effort touching many facets of our society.

Chicago was among the first to form a Small Business Development Corp. to help struggling businessmen become a part of the economy. More than 83 loans have been granted through the Small Business Administration under title IV of the act. They range from $20,000 for one business to $750 loaned to a lady who was starting a cleaning service in a large apartment complex and who wanted to create employment for several more women by expanding dry cleaning facilities.

Admittedly, the program has not been without its headaches. It has had a few lumps here and there. And it will continue to have them. When we were debating this legislation, we all agreed a massive effort of this type would have its shortcomings. We in Chicago readily admit the program needs constant surveillance and improvement, but I submit here today Chicago need apologize to no one for its outstanding effort because people continue to be our most serious concern.

People like the mother who came into the South Parkway Urban Progress Center crying because her mentally retarded child had moved away from the window through which he had stared impassively day by day for more than 3 years and had begun talking with his brothers and sisters after only short weeks in a diagnostic center for the mentally retarded operated in the center by the Chicago Association for Retarded Children.

Do our critics want to close their eyes to this project? This concern with the problems of mental retardation gives me an opportunity to discuss another facet of Chicago's antipoverty program. The program for retarded children was expanded after community representatives began telling our neighborhood center directors about large numbers of mentally retarded children hidden away in their homes, in their communities, untouched by anyone or any institution. These children were hidden away in the darkness of complete ignorance during their entire young lifetimes. It was through the magnificent efforts of the community workers, neighborhood people, hired from among the unemployed and the underemployed, in the immediate vicinity of our neighborhood centers that hundreds of young victims of retardation were located and given a helping hand. Today, the antiretardation program stands as a beacon of new hope for parents who too often kept their retarded children from society because they did not know where to turn for help.

It was these same community representatives who, along with teachers from the schools, rang doorbells and climbed stairs to recruit 19,000 youngsters for Head Start in only 10 days. It is these same community representatives who will stay up long into the night with a mother whose son has been lost while others help police to find the boy. It is neighbor helping neighbor, showing him that Chicago cares about every single one of its residents.

While others were debating and fighting about who shall control the program in other parts of our Nation, Chicago acted—decisively and with a single purpose—to get families out of poverty and into the stream of America's economy as proud citizens.

It formed its neighborhood councils which have complete autonomy except for the guidelines laid down by the Office of Economic Opportunity. What has been an honest misunderstanding among people trying to guide their own destiny in their own neighborhoods in this war on poverty has too often been interpreted by our critics as a weakness of the program.

The very fact that there has been some turmoil in discussion of which programs are best to meet the particular purposes of each community constitutes the best proof how totally unfounded are our critics' charges that somehow this entire program is ruled and dominated by the political structure of Chicago.

It is in the diversity of opinion expressed day in and day out in the neighborhood councils that we find the greatest vigor in Chicago's antipoverty program.

It is easy enough to make loose charges of political domination. But let those who would make these charges document them with an iota of proof. So far, all we have heard have been hollow charges.

The fact that this program is moving forward and that more than 300,000 Chicago residents have, in one way or another, been affected by this program, proves the complete fallacy of those who would want to impede its progress with specious charges of political domination.

Make no mistake, the responsible elected officials of Chicago, starting with our mayor, play a full role in the development and administration of this program and that is the way it should be.

No man has shown a deeper personal concern for the plight of Chicago's poor than Richard Daley. His personal involvement toward successful administration of the entire antipoverty program is but another reason why he is today acclaimed America's most accomplished municipal administrator.

The critics of Chicago in this Chamber would have us allocate antipoverty funds in a manner which provides virtually no control over accounting. What a cynical contradiction this constitutes, for these are the very same people who, day in and day out, make great speeches here in the Congress about how every single dollar of the American taxpayers' money must be accounted for.

The city of Chicago has taken every step to assure "maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of groups to be served" in the development and administration of the antipoverty program.

But it would be a distortion of our responsibility and a breach of trust with the taxpayers if the responsible elected officials were to abandon their responsibility in the overall administration of these programs.

I submit here that those who have tried to create the impression that the antipoverty program in Chicago is either politically dominated or does not contain a voice for the poor are torturing the truth and are indeed strangers to the facts.

During 1965, Cook County Welfare Director Raymond Hilliard was able to place more than 12,500 persons in jobs through his impressive rehabilitation service. Another 600 so-called hard-core unemployed—people once considered unemployable and destined to remain on the public dole for the rest of their lives—are today gainfully employed through special training programs also financed by Chicago's antipoverty program.

Only yesterday, Hilliard announced in Chicago that aid to dependent children recipients decreased by 12.3 percent in December over the peak period in May of 1962. For the fourth month in a row, Chicago's aid to dependent children rolls decreased—with a reduction of 1,254 persons in December alone.

Let our critics be reminded that this reduction in our relief rolls in Chicago is a sharp reversal of the usual upward trend during winter months.

I am aware that we are in our sixth consecutive year of prosperity and labor demands certainly affect relief rolls. But let me remind you that we had prosperity before and still faced the paradox of large numbers of unemployed simply because they lacked training for employment.

Perhaps the best appraisal of Chicago's antipoverty program was voiced the other day by a Brandeis University professor who was in Chicago to study our program. He wrote:

> The more we see of programs around the country, the better are we impressed with Chicago's performance.

We will let our critics gallop all over the truth, but we in Chicago are staking our reputation on our record of achievement and that record will clearly show—and mind you, I say this with no fear or reservation—that Chicago will be the first major city of America to wipe out poverty.

In a fashion that is only too typical of how a dynamic city, led by is dynamic mayor, Richard J. Daley, can mobilize its resources, a group of leading Chicagoans from all interests and points of view were ready for action when they met in April of 1964 to help prepare recommendations for the Economic Opportunity Act then under discussion in Washington.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Chicago.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Illinois for yielding and I wish to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] for the outstanding job which he is doing in the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] has always been an outstanding citizen of our community and I take this opportunity to congratulate him again, because the mayor of Chicago, the people of Chicago, and those who are interested in doing something for the poor of Chicago have organized an effective program and are doing a good job.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Chicago [Mr. ANNUNZIO], who represents a district including the center core of the city and which has many of the antipoverty programs operating. I congratulate him for the great contribution that the gentleman has made toward the success of the Chicago antipoverty program.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. It is a privilege to yield to the distinguished Speaker of this House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is about time that we focused into proper light the position of the Republican leadership on "guns or butter."

Mr. Speaker, whenever they are opposed to progressive legislation, they always try to sloganize and create a slogan. Way back in the days when we were trying to put through social security, they tried to defeat it with slogans; minimum wage slogans, also.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are not deceived by that. The American people have a lot of good commonsense. They want something more than a slogan hurled at them, such as "guns and butter."

Mr. Speaker, the American people know that President Johnson has harmonized the situation, where we now protect effectively freedom's interests in the world and yet go ahead with a progressive America, on her onward and upward journey toward a better life for the people of our country.

So, Mr. Speaker, without going further into detail, I suggest that my Republican friends appoint a commission of Republicans to try and develop a better slogan.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Speaker of this House for his excellent observation and I certainly wish to associate myself with his observations.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor which developed and helped develop this antipoverty program, I share with the Speaker of the House of Representatives the feeling that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who have been so critical of this program, are really, as I said earlier today, like the farmer scattering grain to his chickens.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin in just one moment. However, I would like to complete my statement.

Mr. LAIRD. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to comment on the statement made by our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. First, I would like to say, as the Representative of the district that produces more milk than any other district in the House of Representatives, I agree with the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like the term "guns or butter." I would rather refer to it as "rifles or ruffles."

Mr. Speaker, our per capita sales of butter have been dropping during the past 20 years. I like to keep the sales of butter up as much as possible because such sales affect the income of a great many of my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, as one Member of the House of Representatives, I am sure the distinguished Speaker will not hear me referring to this as a choice between "guns and butter."

On the serious side, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that the matter which concerns those of us on the minority side most—and particularly those who serve on the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations—is the fact that the administration has been less than candid with us in respect to the total defense commitment and the total funding that is necessary for our southeast Asia commitment.

Let me make this statement. Back in June when I said on the floor of the House that our defense budget for 1966 was underestimated so far as Vietnam was concerned, a letter from Secretary of Defense McNamara was used which implied that I did not know what I was talking about and that there was sufficient funding in the 1966 budget for the defense commitments of this country for the next 12 months.

That letter was written to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. I would like to quote from that letter. The Secretary said:

> To summarize, the fiscal year 1966 defense budget request now before the Congress would provide all the funds we need at this time to continue the strengthening of our overall military posture and to carry out whatever combat operations our forces are called upon to perform during the next 12 months.

Mr. Speaker, subsequent events have proven I was correct. During the hearings on the 1966 defense bill, it was proven that there was not sufficient funding provided in the orginal 1966 budget. You have seen what has happened. First, we had a supplemental for $700 million for 1965. Then we had a supplemental in the form of a budget amendment for $1,700 million. Just a week ago we had another 1966 supplemental for $12.7 billion. I want the gentleman from Illinois to know contrary to what Secretary McNamara said last night that there will be another supplemental submitted for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1966 within the next few weeks. This fourth supplemental request will be in excess of $1 billion even to get through 1966. All funds needed for military pay and allowances for the rest of this fiscal year were not included in the $12.7 billion defense supplemental request last week.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, that is true. We may have more supplemental budgets because this Nation is committed to the defense of freedom.

President Johnson in his candid message right here in the Chamber 2 weeks ago said that he would not hesitate to come before the American people again and again if that is what it will take to save freedom for this country and the world.

Mr. LAIRD. That is the very point I want to make and the gentleman from Illinois is helping me immeasurably in making this point.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment. The gentleman is obscuring one fact, that when Secretary McNamara came before his committee last year, we had, I believe, 80,000 men in Vietnam and we had every hope of containing the Vietcong. But this is a crude, bitter, dirty war and the Secretary has been honest with the American people, and as the needs for the defense of freedom increase, the Secretary has had to, of course, increase the budget. But the gentleman obscures completely the fact that the Secretary of Commerce yesterday said that if we did not have a war in Vietnam, this administration would, for the first time in a decade, produce a $4½ billion surplus in the budget.

So you have to make your decision. Do you want savings and slavery? Or do you want to stand up with the rest of America and pay for freedom?

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman is not implying in any way that as a member of the defense committee I have not gone along with adequate funding of the commitment that has been made by our President and our country as far as Vietnam is concerned, I would hope.

The point I am making is that as our commitment escalates in this area, it is most important that the American people understand fully the costs involved. I believe they are willing to make sacrifices but must understand fully the situation and our short-term aims and long-term objectives.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Of course, they are.

Mr. LAIRD. As I say, I believe the people of America are willing to make sacrifices in order to cover the costs of national security and defense that this country must incur. But I think we are not putting all our fiscal cards on the table face up so that they can understand that there are difficult decisions which must be made, with the language which is used in the budget message, which says that as these defense needs come before us, additional requests will be made. The point I wish to make is that we should allow for these contingencies because I am sure the gentleman in the well of the House knows full well that it may be necessary for the President as our Commander in Chief to still further escalate the operations of the U.S. forces in this area of the world, and there was not sufficient funding for that escalation and I would only point to the history of the 1966 budget. Here we had a budget estimate and the original budget came up here with expenditures in the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1966 for $47.9 billion. What are our expenditures going to be for the fiscal year 1966? They will be closer to $53 or $54 billion. When the American people were told that the supplemental request last week in the amount of $12.7 billion was the supplemental needed to finance the Department of Defense for the remaining portion of the fiscal year 1966, they were misled because another supplemental will have to come up here even to cover the pay and allowances of the military personnel through the remaining portion of the fiscal year 1966.

Mr. PUCINSKI. And the President has stated repeatedly, our peace offensive will continue until we succeed, and God knows, the whole country hopes that we are successful. If we can resolve the Vietnam war quickly, we will then be able to avoid many of these supplementals.

Mr. LAIRD. You cannot avoid this additional supplemental for the fiscal year 1966 unless you borrow from other accounts. I guarantee to the gentleman from Illinois that a further supplemental appropriation bill will be here to cover pay and allowances of military personnel for the remaining portion of the fiscal year 1966, and that the $12.7 billion supplemental which was submitted last week is going to other defense needs and to the area of military assistance in Vietnam and does not cover the pay and allowances for military personnel for the remaining portion of fiscal year 1966.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is the gentleman suggesting that we scuttle the effort to eliminate poverty in America? Is that what the gentleman is suggesting? I would like a clear and concise answer to that question.

Let us have a clear and concise answer to the question on the issue. You made a bold statement here. What are you suggesting? Do you want to start shortchanging the poor?

Mr. LAIRD. If the gentleman will yield to me.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I think the gentleman knows that the budget request for poverty for fiscal year 1967 represents a very small increase over last year's funding for the poverty program, an increase of only about $200 million. The defense bill is a massive bill, so, quite obviously, we are not talking about scuttling the poverty program when we in the minority suggest that a system of realistic priorities be established.

In the area of domestic spending, I think it is most important to the American people, to our Government, and to the long-term interests of the United States that we place at the top of our priority list the adequate funding of the national security and defense commitments which this country has made and which more than 200,000 American servicemen are honoring. Then, Mr. Speaker, we should fund, as nearly as possible, those desirable programs on the domestic level which have sufficient priority in the mind of the Executive to see that they are fully and adequately funded. There have been no priorities established on domestic spending.

Those of us on the Appropriations Committee, both Republicans and Democrats alike, have the responsibility in the hearings on this 1967 budget to try to develop, as best we can, from the executive agency of our Government, the facts, and to try to insist that these priorities be clearly established in the very prolonged hearings which we will be conducting before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PUCINSKI. President Johnson has placed national defense at the top of his list of priorities and the gentlemen from Wisconsin knows this.

Mr. LAIRD. The Democrat and Republican Members alike in the congressional branch of our Government, which is coequal with the executive branch, will do what they can to develop these very important priorities, which have not been developed in this budget. Let me give you a few examples.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Let me ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question and then I will yield further. As a member of the Republican policy committee—I believe the chairman of the Republican policy committee——

Mr. LAIRD. No, I am not the chairman of the Republican policy committee. The distinguished gentleman from Arizona, [Mr. RHODES] is the chairman of that committee. I am the chairman of the conference committee on the Republican side, but I am speaking today as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is the gentleman now proposing that we cut the Federal effort to eliminate poverty in America? I would like a simple yes-or-no answer to that question.

Mr. LAIRD. No, I am for eliminating poverty. I serve on that particular committee.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I asked you again whether you are for cutting the President's budget for the antipoverty program; the budget which President Johnson has proposed, and in which he has already held the reins back on everything except national defense?

Mr. LAIRD. There are certain areas of many domestic programs, including the poverty program, that can be reduced. I think there is no question that there are certain areas which can be reduced. Let me talk about specifics. If you want to get into specifics, I would be glad to do so.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to state those specifics.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I am very much interested in the colloquy that has been taking place. It brings me back to memories of World War II. In World War II, during the campaigns of 1944 and 1946, the Republican leadership used every kind of tactic in order to build up a big war hysteria and lay the responsibility for World War II on President Truman and the Democratic Party. This was a propaganda smokescreen to stifle any progressive legislation that would benefit the little people of the country. Now, in the last session of the Congress, we passed a great program of progressive legislation, and we had almost unanimous Republican opposition to that program. Now they are trying to nullify the execution of these outstanding, progressive programs by building a bugaboo about war expense. We are hearing a pattern of what the Republican leadership is going to try to sell the people next November. I do not think they are going to fool the people in any way whatsoever. They will not drown out the great accomplishments of the Democratic administration during the last session of Congress by curtailing appropriations to provide for relief from poverty—also educational expansion, medicare, and other enactments.

So we shall listen to the same phony political charges this fall that we listened to in World War I, in World War II, and the Korean war. The Republican Party is going to try to drown out all of these progressive pieces of legislation by hollering, "Expenses for the war. We must devote all of our expenses to the war." We have today a $700 billion annual prosperity—gross national product. The richest nation in world history—profits reaped by big business—are fabulous and increasing year by year. We can protect our freedom—curtail the spread of communism and keep prosperity and employment high in this Nation.

We can handle war finances and also the programs which the Democratic Party passed in the last session of Congress.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am grateful to the gentleman from Indiana for his contribution, because it puts in the proper perspective how little faith our Republican colleagues have in the strength of America, in the capitalistic system, in the free enterprise system, in the profit system, and in the people of this wonderful Nation.

Is anyone going to sit here and tell me that a nation which has a $720 billion gross national product cannot appropriate sufficient funds to educate and train our poor so they too can enjoy this prosperity?

Within our lifetime, within this decade, every single economist, liberal and conservative, Democrat and Republican, is confidently predicting that the United States will reach a gross national product of $1 trillion by 1975.

Are you going to tell us that we are supposed to trim all sails, to stop all progress, to curtail all domestic programs, because Mr. McNamara is going to come here with a request for a supplemental appropriation? If the gentleman will be good enough to listen to my remarks, I can show him that this poverty program is presently saving the people of Chicago millions of dollars by taking people off the public dole and making them proud, dignified citizens working for a living and paying taxes like the rest of us.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman does not argue that the poverty program is the reason for covering up defense costs, does he?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Let me tell the gentleman something else.

Mr. LAIRD. Does the gentleman argue that we should cover up the supplemental defense costs, and that perhaps another $12.8 billion supplemental appropriation is going to be submitted? All I want to do is to give some credibility to the budget and the estimates of our defense costs. A credibility gap exists in the United States today. Let us tell the American people the facts.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Just a minute.

Mr. LAIRD. We have asked for truth in packaging. Let us have truth in budgeting.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am glad the gentleman is using the Republican's newest slogan: "credibility gap." That is another Madison Avenue slogan cooked up for the Republicans.

One thing that I would like to do some day, or I wish some scholar would do, is to compile for the American people an anthology of these Republican Madison Avenue slogans which we have heard during the past 20 years. That is the newest one now—and it doesn't ring any more true than all of its Republican predecessors.

Mr. LAIRD. Nothing will work out as well as "the missile gap" did in 1960.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The "credibility gap" is the newest thing that is going to be the popular word in the Republican rhetoric for the next few months, until they think of something else.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I am glad to see that the Republican side has now admitted the vacuousness of slogans like "guns or butter," but they have now fallen upon an even more outrageous slogan, "rifles or ruffles," I believe.

I should like to know if the antipoverty program is a "ruffle," because it would seem to me that the Republican Party is now saying to the American people, "We have got a war in South Vietnam. We must sacrifice." Whom do they want to sacrifice? It is the poor people of America.

Yes, they are willing for every poor person in the slums of Chicago, New York, and New Jersey to sacrifice. This is the "ruffle" that they are willing to sacrifice.

I would say, as a member of the Appropriations Committee and coming from a district which has an antipoverty program which is creating new hope and new direction among the people, I am not going to fall into that kind of trap. I am not going to insist that we fight this war with the poorest of our citizens making the greatest sacrifice.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman makes an important and significant contribution. Of course he demonstrates again that the basic philosophy of the opposition party has been that "ruffles" are only for the privileged rich. I believe that some of the poor people in this country would like to have a little "ruffle" too. They would like to be able to get jobs and to enjoy the basic comforts of all Americans. That is what this poverty program is all about.

We are making headway. I have shown in my remarks that in Chicago alone we have one of the finest antipoverty programs. I am willing to stand before my colleague from New York [Mr. Goodell] who has been one of the chief critics of the Chicago program, and say to him confidently, with no fear or reservation, that Chicago will be the first major city in America to eliminate poverty.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, because I am amazed by the comments made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden].

No Republican, to my knowledge, in either this body or in the other body, has sought to make the conflict in South Vietnam a political issue. No Republican has called this the President's war. No Republican has called this Mr. McNamara's war.

The truth is that several on the other side of the Capitol in the gentleman's party have labeled this Secretary McNamara's war. No Republican has stooped to those tactics.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I should like to finish my response.

The President has gotten all Republican support on any defense appropriation that he has asked for, in this body or in the other body. No Republican has voted "no" on any appropriation for the Department of Defense or for support of the conflict in South Vietnam.

The truth is, as I recall, that last year there were nine on the other side of the aisle who voted against one of the supplemental appropriations to support the President in this very difficult and very critical situation we face.

As I recall it, the only opposition to the appropriations to support our troops in Vietnam came from the gentleman's party, the Democratic Party. So I hope and trust that he realizes the error he made in accusing our party of not standing up to the critical situation which we face as a nation today.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. In answer to the gentleman's contention, I can only judge the present and the future by the past. I distinctly remember—and we are not going back very far—where the same identical blueprint was being used along in 1949 and 1950 during the Korean war, when all of a sudden, within 3 weeks of the election in 1950, the Republican leadership came out and called it a Truman war and said, what business have we got over in Korea, and so on and so forth. I can go back further than that. I very distinctly remember that back in the 1918 and 1920 elections it was called the Wilson war by Republican politicians. Now the blueprint is being laid again and the Republican leadership is laying the foundation to prevent ample money being spent for these great progressive pieces of legislation for the benefit of millions of people in America who need it. They are trying to submarine the program which is on the books today in order to prevent the great accomplishments of the last session of Congress.

I think the American people understand what is taking place. Since this Congress convened we have heard subterranean remarks about the war. We have heard that we cannot spend money for these great programs on poverty and other things if we are going to combat Vietnam agression. It is nothing more than a smokescreen.

Let me ask the minority leader this question: Are you in favor of spending any money for these programs that were passed in the last session of Congress? Yes or no.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes, I am in favor of spending money for some of the good projects in the programs that were enacted last year by this Congress, but we can sacrifice poor programs and sacrifice poor administrators and sacrifice the programs that cannot be depended on in any circumstances. May I say this further to the gentleman from Indiana?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has the floor. The Members will proceed in regular order.

Mr. PUCINSKI. As I have already demonstrated, I shall be very happy to yield to my colleagues. I think this kind of discussion is very important and serves a very useful purpose. I would like to make just one brief observation here with respect to the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Madden, and then I will be very happy to yield to the others. I agree with my colleague from Indiana that one of the things our colleagues on the minority side are unable to understand is that the greatest waste of human resources in this country is an unemployed American. Now, in this great Nation and in these great 6 years of prosperity, we still have people unemployed; not because there are no jobs, but because they are functionally unemployable. They need training. We in Chicago have devised what I believe to be a model program to meet that problem. We in the State of Illinois spend $680 million every 24 months on relief alone. You are talking about economy? You want to save the American people money? I tell you, help train these unemployed and put them back to work. That is the way you will save the American people money, and that is what I have tried to say here today. Only yesterday, Raymond Hilliard, the director of welfare in Cook County, announced that for the fourth consecutive month, in December, we reduced the aid to dependent children rolls in Chicago by more than 1,200 people. We have reduced the aid to dependent children rolls by more than 12 percent since the peak month of May 1962. This is living proof of the soundness of President Johnson's proposals. Just as we wage war across the seas for freedom, let us wage the same war effectively here at home against poverty to make this great democracy the living symbol for the whole world to see. This is the way we prove to the world that the capitalistic system, the free enterprise system, the profit incentive system and, yes, above all, the dignity of man is our answer to those who would challenge us abroad. This is the way we show all of these countries that their future lies in alining themselves with us, because we stand for human dignity. So this colloquy here today about trimming the budget here and there is important. It has demonstrated that this war on poverty is just as essential to America as the war in Vietnam.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I now yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman in the well and two or three on the other side raised a very false issue. It is not a question of whether you are for a war on poverty or not. We are all for war on poverty. Many of us feel that the present war on poverty is a disservice to the poor.

Now I want to tell the gentleman, if he wants to pose it in terms of "guns and butter" or "rifles and ruffles," it does not make any difference to me. I represent a dairy area also. But I am against the rancid butter that is contained in this particular administration program.

Mr. Speaker, I will give to the gentleman from Illinois specifics of the things that I am against, things that I do not believe would sacrifice the poor, if eliminated.

I am against the programs in Boston, for instance, that divert funds from the poor to politicos; where they have to fire their community action director because of bad checks, because of people who were not poor put in neighborhood Youth Corps for dropouts and potential dropouts.

I am against the things that are going on in Rhode Island, which have been clearly documented, where college students, children of politicians and children in families averaging an income over $5,000 have been put in the Neighborhood Youth Corps through the diversion of funds from the poor. I am against the things which are going on in Harlem, where they are having to reconstruct the books in order to find out where over $200,000 went.

I am against the things which are going on in Kansas City where they are hiring the politicos at the expense of the poor.

Mr. Speaker, I am against the mixing of politics and diversion of money from the poor that is going on in Kentucky, and almost any place you want to go around the country with reference to this program. You will find these kinds of things are going on.

I am against feeding the political machine of Mayor Daley in Chicago with poverty money.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] has made this statement not only on the floor of the House here but at various press conferences.

Mr. GOODELL. Absolutely, and it is documented.

Mr. PUCINSKI. And I am here to tell the gentleman that there is not an iota of proof in what the gentleman is saying.

Mr. GOODELL. Every single member of the poverty board of directors and the executive committee in Chicago all the way down the line, every one of the people that have been hired have been chosen by the Daley machine. The poor are not involved. They have not selected their own representatives on policymaking boards. The poor do not control these programs. They have nothing to do with the policy of the poverty war in Chicago.

All the gentleman has to do is go back to the city of Chicago and listen to these poor people talk about the program.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I want to show the gentleman how cynically hypocritical that statement is. We have a responsibility for the administration of these programs which by law the mayor of any city cannot delegate to anyone, and no one knows this better than the gentleman from New York, who helped write that provision into law.

The record will show conclusively and undeniably that the entire program in Chicago is developed and executed by representatives of the immediate neighborhoods. The programs serve with the city administration certifying their credibility to the Federal Government.

Mr. GOODELL. Is there a single representative of the poor, chosen by the poor themselves, on the board of directors of the poverty program in Chicago?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, the entire board of directors cannot move on a project unless the local board approves it and the entire local board must live in the immediate vicinity it serves.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman cannot say there is. They have been selected by Mayor Daley. They are kept people. The gentleman can talk to any of the poor people in Chicago and they will tell the gentleman this is true.

Mr. PUCINSKI. First of all, the gentleman from New York has created the biggest myth of this whole program in the gentleman's various press conferences. Yes, I heard the statement of the loyal opposition in emphasizing this lack of participation on the part of the poor. The gentleman knows that the act itself never even used the word "poor." It uses "maximum feasible participation of residents and members of the groups served." Nor does the act provide any requirements for electing representatives on these boards. We in Chicago refuse to stigmatize the poor by tatooing on their forehead that they are poor but the entire Chicago program is developed by residents of areas it serves.

Mr. GOODELL. The act says, "maximum feasible particiaption of the residents of the areas" to be served. That means the poor.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We in Chicago are not going to go around putting a tattoo on a man's forehead to advertise that he is poor.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman said there was not reference to the "poor." The act itself means "maximum feasible participation of the poor."

Mr. PUCINSKI. Where does the act say that?

Mr. GOODELL. If the gentleman will show me the act——

Mr. PUCINSKI. You show me the language in the act where it says "maximum participation of the poor."

Mr. GOODELL. I do not have the act before me but I shall be glad to get it later and point it out to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman from New York knows that the act does not say "participation of the poor." It says "maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served." I am quoting from section 202(a)(3) of the act and the gentleman knows that his appeals to the so-called poor are not even included in the act.

Mr. GOODELL. Does the gentleman say that it was not the intent of the act to have the poor participate at the policymaking level in community action programs?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would suggest to the gentleman from New York that he not twist my words. It refers to "community action programs." And I assure you there are substantial numbers of poor people represented on these community action boards in Chicago. That is why the program is so successful in Chicago because the poor have the greatest voice in its development and administration.

Mr. GOODELL. What "community action boards"?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is a favorite trick of the gentleman's party in twisting those expressions around. We can show the gentleman that in the program which is carried on in Chicago the bulk, the majority of the people executing this program and developing this program and managing this program, are people who live right there in the neighborhood of the community center. They cannot serve on a community action board unless they do actually live in the immediate neighborhood they serve.

You appropriated $200,000 last year for an investigation of the poverty program. I am the first one to stand here and say that there are many weaknesses in the program.

Mr. GOODELL. I am glad that the gentleman from Illinois finally has come to an admission of some of the rancid butter which is contained in the program.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would gladly support the gentleman in his efforts to improve this program. As a matter of fact, when we passed this program in 1964, every one of us here on the floor of the House said that this program was a large program and that it was going to need checking and reviewing. I would support meaningful amendments to improve the program but I have no intention to join the gentleman in wrecking it.

Mr. GOODELL. I am glad the gentleman has admitted that there are many deficiencies contained in the poverty program.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But I am not willing to let the gentleman from New York, without any basis of proof, come in and say that we in Chicago are somehow distorting the purposes of the program. I am telling my colleague and all who are listening that during the period of 12 months, because of the excellent program in Chicago, 300,000 people have been helped in one way or another by its services.

Many people have been taken off the relief rolls; and they have been trained; work has been found for them; 600 people who were considered hard-core unemployables, who otherwise were destined to be on the public dole for the remainder of their lives were taken off the rolls and put to work because of the special educational programs developed in Chicago. You can say what you like about other parts of the country—that is your business—but when you want to criticize the program in Chicago, you better have your facts.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, who is a member of our Education and Labor Committee. I want to commend him because I believe, as is quite apparent to those of us who are present on the floor of the House here today, that he struck a nerve. You can hear the loud sounds because you have struck a nerve. Our colleague has pointed out quite correctly that the poverty program is showing a substantial saving in cutbacks on the old-line welfare programs. I think this is quite true. In fact, as he developed this point, immediately we heard the cry of politics in the program. I happen to believe it is the obligation of the mayor of a large city to try to cut back on these old-line welfare programs. For example, I want to commend the poverty organization set up in Oakland by Republican Mayor Houlihan. He set up the entire organization. He appointed all the members of the board and one of the city commissioners, Dr. Norvel Smith, runs the whole program. I have not heard a single word of complaint here about that.

Let me point out that we have also found that these cutbacks in the old-line welfare and relief programs are showing up to the extent of $3 million in Cleveland, $8 million in Los Angeles and, I hope that when the mayor of New York finds out what is going on in our city, we can find some similar cutbacks in our welfare program. One of the cutbacks already effected in terms of bringing about reforms in this legislation, occurred recently in New York City. We had to call on the Office of Economic Opportunity to prevent the mayor of New York City from hiring a photographer on the poverty program so that the great profile could go down in the history of the poverty files. We fortunately were able to prevent this. Believe me, we are going to do our best in our committee to draw up tight guidelines so that photographers cannot be hired and to make sure that the deserving poor get the benefit of these programs.

I hope my colleague will join me in doing something of interest—I am going to find out from the Office of Economic Opportunity how many telephone calls have been received from Members of this body on both sides in programs or projects for their area. I happen to know these calls are running about several thousand a week. I hope the people who are making these calls will be here to vote for the programs and continue them. As a matter of fact the Office of Economic Opportunity gets more calls in support of projects in the poverty program than the Members of this body make to the Department of Defense on the war in Vietnam. I think the public should know and the House should know you have hit a nerve today because this program works. No amount of pettifogging, no amount of obfuscation and obscuring of the facts is going to defeat the purpose of this program because everybody knows what is going on. Finally, my colleague from New York is going to disparage the operations by the mayors to cut back the old-line welfare programs. He will not disparage the new mayor of New York City, a Republican who I hope will try to effect such reforms.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York, for his contribution. I agree with my colleagues on this side of the aisle. The opposition has traditionally fought us and they have traditionally fought us on every single phase of progressive legislation presented by our party. They fought us on unemployment compensation, they fought us on social security. They fought us on medicare and on aid to education. Then they fought us on every single bill that has come up in this great country today, a nation with a gross national product of $720 billion and a nation that is heading for a trillion-dollar gross national product. This poverty program is paying off. No one denies there are shortcomings in it. I would gladly discuss the shortcomings in a dispassionate way. I want to help to improve this program, but basically this program is paying off and it is putting unemployed Americans who have been on the public dole for years back to work.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the dean of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay a compliment to my able colleague from Illinois. I have listened to the arguments of both sides and I think with profit. I think it was a good debate. I thought that the speakers on the Republican side presented their party in the best light that they possibly could and have done so eloquently. I am sure that the presentation by those Members on the Democratic side has been brilliantly made and with convincing clarity. But, Mr. Speaker, sometimes things happen on this floor that we all regret. I do not know why my dear friend from New York had to sail to Chicago—knowing nothing about Chicago. I do not know whether he has ever been in Chicago in his life. But certainly he knows nothing about Chicago and was raising his voice until my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, said "Let us not make this a shouting match." But that was said a little too late.

The shouts were going up to the ceiling. It trembled with the severity of the voice aimed at the great mayor of the city of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that I live in Chicago. Dick Daley has always been my pattern of what a servant should be. He is a man of integrity, a man of heart, and a man of humility. He has made a record in the city of Chicago and in this world of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like to be in this Chamber, when we have had a fine debate, and when my good friend from my native State of Michigan, Jerry Ford—a good debater, a great statesman—has made a good talk, in which there was nothing petty—and others have spoken—when the gentleman from New York raised his voice so that we could even see the galleries trembling. His loud voice, fearful, with the pealing of thunder and lightning—all from the little State of New York—came to us. I did not like it.

Mr. Speaker, I had intended only to listen and to profit. Now I have been moved to make a kind of verbal protest. When someone speaks with humility and in a rather low voice, raising it only when it seems necessary to do so by the sincerity of one's convictions, it reaches into my mind that the man has something he is talking about. I may not agree with him, but he is approaching what seems to me to be commonsense. But when he starts yelling, raising his voice, and throwing his arms around and throwing feathers at a great man, the mayor of my city, who is my friend, and a man who, with the President of the United States, the gentleman in the well, the great man from Indiana, and the others who have spoken here, men who are sincerely enlisted in this fight against poverty, a war that will not end as long as one little child any place in America goes to bed hungry—and that is our goal, to eliminate that sort of thing—I must speak.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken too long, but I have spoken from a deep indignation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] for his great contribution.

Gentlemen, I have only about 12 minutes remaining. I would be happy to yield, but please remember that I would like to conclude my remarks.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald Ford].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I share the feeling which the gentleman from Illinois has expressed that this has been a fruitful and beneficial discussion. I am very grateful for his kind personal comment.

One point in particular bothers me. It is a point that was made by the gentleman from Indiana a few moments ago. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden] said that the war in Vietnam was a bugaboo. I am sure he did not mean it the way it sounded. It certainly is not a bugaboo to 200,000 U.S. GI's who are stationed there. It is not a bugaboo to the taxpayers of this country who have to support the cost of $62 billion.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] has the floor.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am only saying that I hope the gentleman did not mean it the way it sounded.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a comment?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I did not say that the war in Vietnam was a bugaboo. I said that the Republican leaders were using it as a bugaboo in order to curtail appropriations of money to stifle antipoverty, education, medicare, and all these constructive programs.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, before I yield any further, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 20 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Apparently some nerves on the other side were hit by some of the things that were said in this debate. I shall try to speak softly. I will say this for the edification of my colleagues on the other side.

I do get disturbed, I do get upset, I do get angry when money that should be going to help the poor is diverted into other areas. I think this is a very serious matter that should have been investigated a year ago. It should have been investigated effectively in the last 3 months, and it has not been.

I will say to the eloquent gentleman that he apparently got carried away in the well when he was talking about Republicans in opposition. The gentleman is well aware that in 1961 I was suggesting a Head Start program, a preschool program, an early school program at a national level, to be funded by the Federal Government through the States. And the administration opposed it, so not until 1964, in the poverty program, did we get a Head Start program, given the name by our gracious First Lady.

I proposed in 1961 a Job Corps program that would be an experimental program in the District of Columbia, subsequently to be expanded, so that we could do it in several other areas of the country. Instead, it was turned down and opposed by my colleagues on the other side and by the administration.

We launched in 1964 into a mass production, without any experimentation.

and we have seen the waste of dollars that should be going to help the poor. This is what concerns me. It concerns every American.

I hope this year we will have a full and open debate not about whether there should be any war on poverty, because that is a false and demagogic debate. The debate should be how we can secure the most effective war on poverty and how we can save the taxpayers dollars being wasted now in waging this war. We must really help the poor instead of diverting so much of the money into high administrative salaries, into political machines, and into the pockets of those who are not poor by any stretch of the imagination.

Mr. PUCINSKI. My colleague makes an impassioned plea for Head Start and the Job Corps, yet he comes to Chicago and criticizes our program, when Chicago last year, without any fear of contradiction, had the most successful Head Start program in the whole country.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I will yield further in a moment.

We mobilized. In 10 days we recruited 19,000 children who benefited from the Head Start program. We recruited more than 10,000 children in a neighborhood youth corps program, in the Job Corps—youngsters who would have been dropouts, who, because they had an opportunity during the summer months, made progress.

The gentleman talks about politics. If my colleague from New York would just take the trouble to go to Chicago, to sit down with reasonable and responsible people, he would find that not one single person was put to work in the antipoverty program in Chicago until his qualifications were reviewed and found acceptable by a nonpartisan private agency which has nothing to do with politics. There was only one criterion: Does this individual meet the requirements for this particular job?

And I want to tell my friends something else. I might recommend people for employment in the antipoverty program in Chicago, or my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, BARRATT O'HARA, or my very good colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], who is on the floor today, might recommend other people, and this would include Mayor Daley. We might recommend that we know someone who is particularly qualified for a job, but I will tell the gentleman that our recommendation and the fulfillment of the recommendation would be decided by a completely nonpartisan, nonpolitical private agency which screens the candidate to see whether or not he meets the test and the requirements for the job.

That is why I say today, though the gentleman may criticize all he wants about programs throughout the country—that is his business—if he wants to criticize the Chicago program, he had better have some documentation ready, because today, in my judgment it is the most effective campaign against poverty in this country.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I will yield further thereafter to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAIRD. I should like to get back to the takeoff point in our discussion and interchange this afternoon. That had to do with the credibility of the budget estimates which are before us.

First, I should like to say to the gentleman that the amount of money involved, so far as the poverty program is concerned, does not amount to very much in terms of the total budget figures.

As a matter of fact, I happen to serve on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and also on the Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee which handles the poverty program.

I state to the gentleman that I am sure all of us would like to eliminate the waste and inefficiency of the poverty program.

If the gentleman will look at the expenditure rate for the fiscal year 1967 he will see that the program level for 1967 is not as high as for 1966 in the budget which is before us. The expenditure level is only $200 million above the expenditure level for 1966, which means that those programs which are fully funded for 12 months will not be fully funded for the full 12 months in 1967.

As the gentleman will understand, this only amounts to $1.7 billion of the total overall budget.

We have had supplemental after supplemental come up here to cover the defense costs, and I believe we have to give some credibility to this whole area of defense costs and defense funding.

We have had four supplementals come up here already. We had one for $700 million. There was another for $1.7 billion. We also had one for $12.7 billion.

I heard Secretary McNamara last night say, we have submitted all the programs to the Congress for funding that are necessary. Yet I have not heard the gentleman answer this a bit. He has not even alluded to it.

There will be another supplemental here for the Department of Defense to cover the cost in fiscal year 1966. All I am asking is that we have our fiscal cards on the table so that the American people do know the full costs. I am sure that the gentleman from Illinois realizes full well when the Congress is called upon to appropriate funds for defense needs of this country they will give top priority to those appropriations, but it would help us, it would help us, if we do not have the kind of defense budget that we had this year and if we did not have the feeling that there is somehow an attitude that, well, the Congress will always appropriate these defense dollars so we can always submit them in the form of supplemental requests. Then when I hear the Secretary of Defense——

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman yield to me for a second?

Mr. LAIRD. When I hear the Secretary of Defense—and I imagine it was yesterday afternoon when he implied that his department had submitted to the Congress in the form of the supplemental last week and the defense budget request for 1967 all the estimated needs, when I know full well as a member of the Defense Appropriations Committee that that is not the case and does not cover the pay of military personnel through the remaining portion of even fiscal 1966, then I am concerned.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will you permit an interruption, and then I will come back to you?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes. You do not dispute my figures on the poverty program, do you?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish every Member of this House will read the statement just made by our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin in the RECORD. As a matter of fact, I think your statement is so significant that I wish they were all here to hear it. I hope we are going to be able to remind you over and over as we go along in this discussion of the budget of what you just now said. I hope you are not going to change it.

Mr. LAIRD. I will not change it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Because what you said now——

Mr. LAIRD. Because I want you to know——

Mr. PUCINSKI. Just a second now. What you have said here now is what we have been trying to say: that there is no correlation between the expenditures in this budget for the poverty war and our efforts to preserve freedom in Vietnam. By your own statement and by your own admission, the President, while he would like to progress much more rapidly in the war on poverty, has recognized that we have people in Vietnam that need the sinews of war for their defense. So, even though every department in the war on poverty said that they need greater funds to make this a more effective program, the President has said that we have a dual responsibility. We have to try to fight this war on poverty, but we can never forget our responsibility in Vietnam. The President and the Bureau of the Budget have held the line. By your own admission, they have held the line. You know, HEW and OEO and all the other agencies said last year that in order to move this program along they would need vastly more money. We had hoped that the Vietnam war would be over.

Mr. LAIRD. I understand the poverty budget. I serve on that committee, and I know there is a cutback in the proposed Job Corps program.

Mr. PUCINSKI. May I finish my point? I did not interrupt you until you finished. I want to say that this great President of ours submitted this budget but first he sent emissaries into every capital of the world looking for some way of resolving the war in Vietnam; looking for some way to see if we cannot get this to the negotiating table so that we would not have to trim our sails on these important domestic programs. When that failed and there was no response from Hanoi and it became clearly apparent to the President and the Secretary and to all other responsible members of this administration that we would not succeed in our peace efforts, the President did what he thought was right and necessary. He trimmed the poverty program down to the bare bones.

I say it is not fair for you to stand here today and say that we are shortchanging the boys in Vietnam by trying to keep these programs in the war on poverty going. The President has already cut these expenditures to the bare bones.

Mr. LAIRD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin providing I do not offend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], who has been asking for the floor for some time. I think he wants to get back to the war on poverty and the gentleman from Wisconsin wants to talk about our military budget. I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from Illinois attempted to put words in my mouth. I am sure that supplemental requests will continue to come up to fund the defense budget and the defense needs. My point is I think we ought to at least inform the American people of the supplementals that are needed. The gentleman does admit that another supplemental is going to come up here for fiscal 1966, does he not?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Are you asking me a question?

Mr. LAIRD. In addition to the $12.7 billion last week?

Mr. PUCINSKI. You are asking me a question?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Why, the President of the United States stood right there at that podium and told the American people that, if necessary, if the requirements of Vietnam are going to expand to assure victory, then this country is in Vietnam to stay, whether it takes a day, a week, a month, or a year.

The President has put this firmly on record so that there is no miscalculation of our intention that we are intending to see victory for freedom in Vietnam. If that takes more money, the President has said he will come back before the Congress and ask for more money.

So, Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman talks about supplemental appropriations, he is really muddying the water.

Mr. LAIRD. If the gentleman will yield further, I am not muddying the water. I just want to be sure that the American people are not fooled with reference to the $12.8 billion supplemental for 1966. When I predicted there would be a supplemental in January, Secretary of Defense McNamara said that he did not know what I was talking about. Last night when I said that there would be another supplemental for 1966, he said he did not know what I was talking about.

I guarantee the gentleman in the well of the House that not only will there be the $12.8 billion supplemental which was submitted last week, but within a very few weeks there will be another supplemental of at least $1 billion pending before this House of Representatives for 1966.

Mr. PUCINSKI. This is entirely possible.

Mr. LAIRD. I believe the American people should know these simple facts which have been projected now as well as after this Congress adjourns at some later time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I do not know where my colleague was when the President made his speech in this Chamber. I was sitting over there.

Mr. LAIRD. All I know is that I have been reading how firm this budget is. The gentleman from Illinois has perhaps read some other stories about how firm the budget was. I want the gentleman to know that the contingency reserve in the 1967 budget, as accepted by the President, and sent us last week, for 1967, was only $250 million. A contingency reserve of that amount is just not being candid with the American people. With reference to the 1966 contingency reserve we have already gone over it by the amount of over $14 billion in supplemental requests in the Department of Defense alone.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Well, of course, the gentleman from Wisconsin is entitled to his views.

Mr. LAIRD. The $14 billion makes the entire poverty program look rather small if you are merely referring to the poverty program funded through the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Of course, I gladly yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thought I might, having made a few observations of a nonpartisan nature earlier in the debate, make a few observations now of a nonpartisan nature.

I referred to the slogans of my Republican friends, going back many years, and coming up to the present time, of "guns and butter." I am very glad to note that one of the great leaders of the Republican Party—and he is a very able Member; he occupies a position of leadership and I have profound respect for that—the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] disavows that slogan. I believe I understood the gentleman correctly when he stated shortly after I made my remarks that he disavowed the slogan of "guns and butter."

Mr. LAIRD. I certainly would like to assure the distinguished Speaker that in my district we want to sell as much butter as we can.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand; but the gentleman disavowed that slogan?

Mr. LAIRD. I never like to use that slogan. I would rather use some other method of dramatizing the very critical issue this country faces, but I cannot keep up with the people on your side in developing slogans.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the gentleman disavowed it?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes. I do not like to use the term "guns or butter."

Mr. McCORMACK. I expect that with the gentleman's influence my Republican friends will forget it in the future.

I am interested to see what the next slogan will be.

But, one other observation: The gentleman from Wisconsin has been talking about appropriations and the budget message. Without passing upon what the gentleman said, and whether it is correct or not, I feel the gentleman lost sight of the purpose of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] in taking the floor today and making the very able speech that he has made.

The gentleman from Illinois has been talking about human values; the meaning and significance of Americans, the human beings who constitute our citizenship, and who represent the real strength and bulwark of our Nation.

I believe even my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], will admit that the strength of any nation—and applying it to the United States—is the human beings who live there; in particular our strength is centered around the family life of our country.

Of course, the antipoverty program is of vital importance in the strengthening of countless hundreds of thousands of families in America. The whole program of the Democratic Party throughout the years has been to strengthen the family life of our country—through social security; minimum wage; low cost housing; programs for better education—all these programs of the Democratic Party have had that purpose. In that respect my Republican friends have contributed. But when you get into these great programs that I have referred to, the great majority of our Republican friends have opposed them and then they have sullenly accepted them and, as years have gone by, they support them.

I recommend to my Republican friends that they jump over this gap of opposing and sullenly accepting and then ultimately accepting and supporting these programs as they come up in the months that lie ahead. It will mean that you are not talking one way and acting in another way. It will mean that you are acting in accordance with the way that you talk. The gentleman from Illinois was talking about human values—the real values of a nation—while the gentleman from Wisconsin has been talking about dollar values.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur with our distinguished Speaker in his suggestion that Republicans develop a commission to review slogans.

The first slogan that should be revised is the "Great Society." This slogan, purely and solely an administration slogan, is degrading and misleading.

We in the United States of America lived in the greatest society, not just a great society, but the greatest society ever devised or enjoyed by man on this earth—greatest industrially, socially, agriculturally, educationally, morally, spiritually, governmentally, and greatest in almost any other way one might suggest—and greatest by any measure.

We lived in, and enjoyed, the greatest society many years before this administration ever dreamed up the relative degrading slogan.

If the Speaker wishes a quick suggestion for a better slogan or a better goal for our Nation, I respectfully suggest that we seek a "Better Society." This would give each of us—public official and private citizen—a worthwhile goal. This slogan or goal would be accurate and not degrading.

I would also suggest that one of the most deceitful slogans ever perpetrated upon the American electorate, was the "Missile Gap." I respectfully request that the Speaker join with me in attempting to repudiate this deceitful slogan.

In fact, it occurs to me that the administration could obviate the necessity of the Speaker's proposal for a "Commission on Slogans" if only the administration would refrain from sloganeering.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. To get back to the poverty program for just a moment, I was interested when the gentleman referred to the Head Start program in Chicago.

As I indicated in my previous remarks, this was proposed by the Republicans in 1961, 1962, and 1963. The results and experiences under the Head Start program indicate that even a badly administered program, if it has basic merit and has virtue, will bring good results. I think the Head Start program, in spite of all the administrative bungling that ensued since the summer program, was a good program. Obviously, I believe in this approach of helping the preschool children and the early school youngsters. That is why I proposed it long before the administration did.

The gentleman also happened to mention the program, a Head Start program, which did not have to go through a community board action as such. In most parts of the country they have been given a direct grant to the school system and the school system could handle these things without any difficulty, free of local political interference. In a metropolitan area where there was a community action board program, the grant often technically went through the board to implement a Head Start program. The Head Start program in the schools was largely in accordance with what all of us had in mind and that some of us wanted to write into the law. We wanted those funds to go through the States and be implemented in that fashion in our school systems. But basically the gentleman named the one program, Head Start, which has been relatively free of the controversy and scandal and waste that has enveloped the rest of the poverty program.

If I may make one other point, then I will give the gentleman a free rein to finish his speech. He has been very generous in yielding.

The gentleman made a point about the poverty program diminishing welfare payments. Of course, all of us believe a logical and reasonable and sensible program to help people to help themselves will eventually take a good many of them off of the welfare rolls. Of course, the gentleman knows there has been a general decrease in unemployment in the past year which would affect this particular statistic. But it is also interesting to me that the request for welfare and for public assistance in the President's budget last year was $3.2 billion and it has increased to $3.7 billion for fiscal 1967. So certainly any savings in welfare are not reflected overall at the national level in the public assistance budget. I hope budget cuts will not be taken away from the poor people. What I want to see are savings from waste and the elimination of the waste that there has been in this program. Then the money that the taxpayers are spending will be truly helping the poor and not be diverted to high salaries and for a variety of other purposes that have no part in a true poverty program. Our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I and others in the original poverty debates said exactly this and warned of things that were going to happen if we passed a poverty law in this form at that time. They have happened.

They have been documented all around the country by our newspaper reporters who have done a magnificent job and who have been the only ones who have really investigated the poverty program.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If my colleague wants to see an effective example of how savings are being made and how an effective program is being operated and how people actually are being taken off the relief rolls, which is the main purpose of this program, I invite him to Chicago. I invite you to come down and look at our program. Of course, you can find some shortcomings in there. But I tell you if you visit Chicago, I would like to call your attention to our retarded children program, for example. I would like you to go down to the community center when one mother came in crying, overcome with emotion because for the first time in 3 years her little son had turned away from staring blankly through a window and had begun talking to his brothers and sisters. He was a retarded child. There would have been no hope for him. There are thousands of children like him who are being helped by the antipoverty program. We have instances on our job corps program where our park district has been training tree trimmers and men to take care of shrubbery who are now being hired in our suburbs for $400 a month.

These are men who were on the public dole, men who had no future; dropouts are for the first time finding some hope and dignity. Let me remind you of one thing. Never forget this, because this is what distinguishes us as Americans, as a free social order, from all other social orders in the world: the high regard that we have for the dignity of the individual. When a nation invests in a man, it frees the man.

So in respect to this poverty program, I invite you to Chicago. I want you to come and see our program. I want you to see the very things I have been talking about in my remarks. No man has shown a greater concern for the plight of the poor than has Richard J. Daley, the mayor of our city. No man has given this program more personal attention than has Richard J. Daley.

Mr. GOODELL. I will agree he has given it his personal attention.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Why? Because he realizes this is a program that can work. He is recognized as the outstanding municipal administrator in America. Why? Because he has worked honestly and diligently. You are doing him a great injustice. We can play politics. After all, this is the year for partisan politics. But after the coming campaign, beyond November, there is a great, beautiful, rich, wealthy and free America. Let us not, in the wake of pure, brutal, almost barbaric partisanship, tear down individuals whose lives are dedicated to serve the public needs.

I would like you to come to Chicago. I would like you to spend a day with Mayor Daley. Let him show you the programs we have undertaken. You can smirk. You can laugh, because you have no confidence in mankind. That is the difference between you and myself.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. We have been striving for 3 months on the Education and Labor Committee, in the poverty investigation, to have hearings in Chicago. We have requested them many times. Our requests have been turned down at every turn. I am happy to hear the gentleman invite us to Chicago. I do not want to go to Chicago and have Mr. Daley give me a guided tour. I want to go to Chicago with our poverty investigative staff, talk to the poor people, have hearings, and hear what they have to say about this program—not what Mayor Daley wishes to say about the program.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If you want to have a sideshow over there, that is your business. Your investigators have been in Chicago.

Mr. GOODELL. Are you referring to hearing the poor people as a sideshow? Is that what the gentleman has said?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is what you would like to make it. You are not kidding anybody.

Mr. GOODELL. Our staff investigating the poverty program should not be a sideshow in the hands of our chairman and our poverty investigators. We want to hear from the poor people, and I do not think that hearing from the poor people is a sideshow.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Let me tell you something. You are a free American. You are welcome to come to Chicago any time you want to. You are a Member of Congress. You have a minority counsel, and you have investigators. You sat and you appropriated $200,000 for investigations. You voted for that. Your investigators have been in Chicago.

If you want to know the truth about what a great program this is and how it is really working, you can see it clearly. Do you want to nit-pick? Do you want to find an error here or an error there? You will find it everywhere in America.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman is quite right. There are errors in the present poverty program everywhere in America.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The fact is—let me finish this—you had 3 months to come into Chicago and do what investigating you wanted to do. You have a minority counsel. I presume they have been there. I know they have been there.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Let me say this, and then I will yield.

You talk about the Chicago program. Recently we received a letter from a professor at Brandeis University who was in Chicago making a study of our program because he wanted to see if he could have a similar program in his community. He is a Ph. D. I do not know whether he is a Democrat or a Republican. I have no idea. All I know is that he is a distinguished, learned American. He was not there for any political purpose. He was not looking for an issue. He was not looking for a point. He was looking for guidance because he wanted to start programs in other parts of the country.

When he got through his impartial, nonpartisan, apolitical study of the Chicago system, he wrote and said, "The more we see of programs around the country, the better are we impressed with Chicago's performance."

I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to remind my colleague that insofar as the minority investigating staff is concerned, they cannot go any place in the country and receive reimbursement for their trip unless the majority puts the stamp of approval on it. The minority cannot send them out. We have 30 percent of the money for salaries, and that is all.

We have asked over and over and over again to go to Chicago. The first step in the big cities investigation by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] was to begin in Los Angeles. The investigators in Los Angeles were called back. The investigation has been called off. There is no opportunity to go to Chicago, under the last direction.

We have gone all these months with one short period when a few people went to Chicago. We have not had an opportunity for the poor people to express themselves in Chicago. They have been denied a voice so far in the program.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am sure the record will show that the minority have had ample opportunity to study the Chicago program. I again renew my invitation. My colleagues are welcome to come. I will be happy to take them to Chicago and show them the program.

AGRICULTURE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 367)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

Last year in my message on agriculture I described poverty's grip on rural America:

Nearly half of the poor in the United States live in rural areas.

Almost one in every two rural families has a cash income under $3,000.

One-fourth of rural nonfarm homes are without running water.

Rural people lag almost 2 years behind urban residents in educational attainment.

Health facilities in rural areas are so inadequate that rural children receive one-third less medical attention than urban children.

These deficiencies persist in 1966. Their effect is grievous on urban America—the recipient of millions of unskilled migrants from rural areas in the past two decades. It is tragic on the rundown farms and impoverished communities that still house 4.4 million poor rural families.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

Last year I directed—

Each Department and Agency administering a program that could benefit rural people to assure that its benefits were distributed equitably between urban and rural areas.

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Budget to review the administrative obstacles that might stand in the way of such a distribution.

The Secretary of Agriculture to put his field offices to the task of assisting other Federal agencies in making their programs effective in rural areas.

As a result, the Rural Community Development Service was created and charged with assuring that the Department made that assistance available.

This mission of the Department is now firmly established in practice. Its field personnel are active in informing rural people of their eligibility for medicare, and of its requirements. They work with the Economic Development Administration in planning and encouraging new rural industrial developments. In several pilot counties, concerted projects are underway. The Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Agriculture are joined in a common effort to bring social services to poor rural communities. The water and sewer facilities program has been simplified. They have been made more responsive to the needs of small towns and communities.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has increased its efforts in rural areas. Community action programs are underway in a number of rural counties supporting community action planning; providing remedial reading courses, vocational instruction, and adult education; and assisting small cooperatives to acquire farm machinery. These programs have inspired a new sense of hope among the rural Americans who have experienced them.

More—much more—needs to be done if their effects are to reach the dispersed but very real pockets of rural poverty throughout America.

THE NEED FOR PLANNING

Legislation enacted by the first session of this Congress, and in prior years, provides the means for a massive attack on poverty in America.

But—even with the help of these great new programs—too few rural communities are able to marshal sufficient physical, human, and financial resources to achieve a satisfactory level of social and economic development.

The central advantage of the city has been a large and concentrated population to provide the leadership and technical capability. This leadership can achieve economies of scale in operations, to provide adequate public services and facilities for its people.

On the other hand, it is difficult, if not impossible, for every small hamlet to offer its own complete set of public services. Nor is it economic for the small city to try to achieve metropolitan standards of service, opportunity, and culture, without relation to its rural environs.

The related interests of each need to be taken into account in planning for the public services and economic development of the wider community. In this way the benefits of creative federalism can be brought to our rural citizens—in small cities as well as its rural neighbors.

WHAT MIGHT BE DONE

The base exists for such coordinated planning.

New communities are coming into being—stimulated by advanced means of travel and communications. Because of these it is possible to extend to people in the outlying rural areas a richer variety of public services, and of economic and cultural opportunities.

Resources must be combined—in larger areas, as well as rural and small urban communities. In a population base large enough to support a full range of efficient and high-quality public services and facilities, we can achieve the conditions necessary for economic and social advance.

THE DIMENSIONS OF THE COMMUNITIES

The dimensions of an area within which residents should join to carry out integrated planning are likely to be already marked by the trading or commuting patterns.

In most such communities, the total population will be large enough, with enough potential users of each essential service, to justify employing competent full-time resident specialists in medical services, schools, and the like. In some such communities, where towns of even 10,000 are scarce, it may be more practical to provide major services to people at the outer limits through mobile facilities.

BENEFITS OF PLANNING

Coordinated planning can stimulate economic growth.

It can provide the economies of efficient public services—which attract business and industry.

It can make possible adequate vocational training. Rural workers who lack present job opportunities can become qualified for work in new and expanding industries within reach of their homes or farms.

It can provide the schools to spare young children the fate of their fathers. Seventy-two percent of all poor rural families today are headed by persons who have finished only 8 years of schooling or less.

It can greatly enlarge the effectiveness of public and private resources.

It can insure that programs will comprise a logical and comprehensive effort to solve the community's interrelated problems at minimum cost.

It can bring us closer to achieve a more beautiful, more livable rural America. An increasing combination of local, State, and Federal resources is already beginning to transform the countryside. This cooperation is making multiple uses possible—for production, for outdoor recreation, and for the restoration of natural beauty. Planning can help make this beneficence a part of the lives of millions of urban Americans.

Above all, planning is an affirmative act. It signifies the willingness of rural men and women to make their part of America a place of hope. Rural America need not be a wasteland from which the young, however ill-prepared, flee to the cities. It does not have to be a place where live only those too old, too poor, too defeated to seek other horizons.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS

I propose that we show how broad-based planning can inspire the people of rural America to unite the resources of their rural governments and small cities.

I propose this union to improve the quality of life for the citizens of both.

I propose that we assist in the establishment of a number of community development districts to carry out, under local initiative, such comprehensive planning.

The boundaries of community development districts will correspond to the normal commuting or trading patterns of the rural and city residents.

Planning activities for the district will be performed under the direction of representatives selected by each of the participating county or municipal governments. They will be responsible for planning the coordination of all governmental development and service functions within the district.

Federal grants would be provided:

First. For districtwide planning of public services and governmental functions where other Federal planning assistance is not available; and

Second. For districtwide coordination of local planning activities with Federal programs and private initiatives, in a comprehensive attack on rural community problems.

The Secretary of Agriculture will certify that the area has met the requirements for designation as a community development district. Selection of the pilot districts will be made to afford experience in a representative variety of geographic, economic, and social conditions. Funds will be requested to augment those presently available for planning grants.

Federal assistance would help to support—

Coordinated and comprehensive planning for all public services, development programs, and governmental functions within the district.

A continuing liaison with Federal and State agencies.

A comprehensive survey of resources and needs within the district, such as labor skills, industrial sites, land and water resources, health care, education, cultural opportunities, and public services.

Thus the scope of planning to be supported would extend beyond physical development. It would encompass as well the social and economic needs of the area, and its potential for growth.

Each agency of the Government charged with administering a program relevant to these needs will be requested to cooperate with the community development districts. For example, a comprehensive survey of medical conditions in the area would be undertaken by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Teacher Corps—which I again urge the Congress to support at a level commensurate with its promise—would be asked to make teams available for the districts. The Department of Agriculture will offer a concerted emphasis in its resource development programs within the pilot districts.

The purpose of the planning effort I recommend is to assist these districts to achieve significant economies of scale and rational use of resources. This achievement can lift them, and their peoples, above their present level of development.

Our purpose is to demonstrate how a common effort can provide the needed district vocational school in one county, the hospital in another, the police training in a third, industry or an adequate library in a fourth. This effort can avoid the waste of duplication—or worse still, the total lack of such facilities or services because of a failure to pool common resources.

Our purpose is not to supplant present efforts of local, State, or Federal Governments. Our purpose is to supplement them. Then we do not forsake the small community, but help to avoid underrepresentation in decisions that affect its life.

MEDICAL NEEDS

Rural families share with the urban poor a greater need for modern medical services. Infant mortality and infectious disease rates are higher, life expectancy is lower, and the need for chronic illness care is just as prevalent. Yet rural families have had less access to physicians, with rural States averaging only a third the number of physicians per person as the heavily populated urban States. The continuing decline in the per capita number of physicians, therefore, strikes harder at rural families.

The beneficial effects of recent legislation, providing for more extensive professional relationships between rural hospitals and urban medical centers; the improved schooling that will soon be available in rural areas; improved roads and transportation—all will reduce the difficulty in recruiting physicians for rural areas by increasing the professional and educational opportunities available to them.

Nevertheless, we are not recruiting sufficient numbers of medical students from the families of the urban poor and rural areas. We need a financial incentive that will make it possible for children of these families to undertake a medical career. At the same time we need to draw upon medical students from other areas to settle in rural medical practice.

I shall soon propose, therefore, that a loan forgiveness program modeled upon the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1965 be applied to medical students who choose to practice in poor rural areas.

RURAL POVERTY

The efforts of five administrations have provided some relief for hundreds of thousands of poor families who remain on small farms and in rural communities. Yet the old task remains undone: to end the travail of unemployed and underemployed men; to teach their children the skills they must have to prosper in a competitive society; to provide enough food, adequate shelter, and decent medical care for their families, and to help them achieve freedom from want and fear in their later years.

I do not believe we should stand idly by and permit our rural citizens to be ground into poverty—exposing them, unassisted and unencouraged, to the neglect of a changing society. Few other elements of our population are so treated by our humane and progressive people.

Yet I believe we need the counsel of those best qualified by experience and understanding of rural America's problems, to help us chart our course of assistance to her poor.

Consequently I shall soon appoint a Commission on Rural Poverty, whose task it will be to make recommendations to me, within 1 year of its appointment, on the most efficient and promising means of sharing America's abundance with those who have too often been her forgotten people.

Rural poverty has proved an almost intractable problem in past decades. Its abolition may require a journey of a thousand miles.

But the first step in that journey is the pooling of the common resources of rural Americans—joining them in a common planning effort that will magnify the resources of each.

In the program I propose, I ask the Congress to take that step with me today.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1966.*

The message, together with the accompanying papers, was, without objection, referred by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the community development districts program submitted by the President in his community development message is one of the most forward-looking approaches to rural problems ever sent to the Congress.

Many of us live in one of these rural communities that have been losing population for the last 10 or 15 years. Those who have not lived in such a district can scarcely imagine the heartaches, the dreariness, the inconvenience, and even the hazards to human safety that develop in such an area. When people move out of rural communities in large numbers, the commercial establishments and the public facilities and services which supplied their needs soon find they do not have enough customers to continue. This means that the hardware store which has served several generations must close. It means closed churches, closed community houses, and a decline in the number of children in school. Soon the people who remain in the community find that they are without even a doctor or nurse.

The rural communities have never been able to have medical service equal to that of the city, but with declining population in a rural area the disadvantage becomes even more pronounced.

Under the community development district concept, an area of reasonable size can set forth clearly its needs and its plans. Incentives needed for young medically trained people to enter the area can be provided. Working within the framework of the community plan, these medical people can be fully effective in working with the community health problems.

The community development districts program is a wise proposal and deserves our full support.

IN SUPPORT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS ACT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the President has today proposed a measure that can bring a new era of effectiveness and vitality to rural and small-town governments.

These local governments are today, beset with many seemingly insurmountable problems brought on by the complexities of modern life. The President's program will attack these problems in the best conceivable manner: by strengthening the local ability to cope with development and adjustment; by helping the people to keep local problems and local decisions in their own hands.

The proposed Community Development Districts Act will also provide practical and workable means for local governments to cooperate with each other in dealing with problems that affect the residents of several localities. This will further the cause of economy and efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal holds to the tradition in our American political system of keeping control and political power close to the people. It is a highly reassuring step, and it certainly deserves our support.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS ACT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have just read President Johnson's message on community development districts. I am particularly gratified by the attention that will be given to developing more adequate medical care facilities and services for rural people.

There is no problem in rural America that is more urgent than this. There is a shortage of doctors. There is a shortage of emergency services. There is a shortage of basic public health services. In many communities, there is too little money to pay for even the services that are available. And for the poor in rural areas, there are rarely the charity services and public health services that frequently are provided in the larger cities.

The districtwide approach to better medical care services makes sense. When facilities, trained professional personnel, and incomes of patients are all in scarce supply, it is essential that the greatest efficiency be achieved, in order to stretch the scarce resources as far as they can be made to reach.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration may have permission to sit this afternoon while the House is in general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

RURAL ELECTRIC CO-OP LEADERS SPEAK OUT ON ISSUES OF IMPORTANCE TO REA PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very familiar with the many social and economic benefits which rural electrification has brought to our farmers and rural residents, for there are 10 rural electric cooperatives in the Wisconsin congressional district which I am pleased and privileged to represent in the House. Some of them generate their wholesale power through their own generation and transmission co-op, Dairyland Power Cooperative of La Crosse, Wis.

This fall, over 750 rural electric leaders from Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois met in Des Moines, Iowa, for the region 5 convention of their national service organization, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. During that meeting, they passed a series of resolutions on issues of importance to the rural electrification program. These resolutions reflect the considered judgment of the representatives of some 375,639 consumer-members of 118 rural electric cooperatives in this 3-State area.

Because an adequate supply of low-cost electricity makes a significant contribution to the socioeconomic health of our rural areas as well as to the economy of the Nation as a whole, I urge that my distinguished colleagues in the House and Senate give thoughtful consideration to the proposals contained in these resolutions. Included is a tribute to the great leadership and untiring efforts which Clyde T. Ellis has given to the rural electrification program during his nearly 25 years as general manager of NRECA. I join the members of NRECA and his many other friends in wishing Clyde a rapid and complete recovery from the recent illness that has hospitalized him.

The resolutions follow:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION JURISDICTION

Whereas the exercise of FPC jurisdiction over nonprofit rural electric systems does not serve the public interest, duplicates and conflicts with the statutory powers and duties of the REA Administrator and exceeds the statutory authority of the FPC under the Federal Power Act of 1935 as amended; and

Whereas the Senate has passed S. 1459 which exempts REA-financed rural electric cooperatives from FPC jurisdiction and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is considering S. 1459 with subcommittee amendments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the House of Representatives to approve S. 1459 as passed by the Senate so that the issue of FPC jurisdiction may be promptly and satisfactorily terminated.

TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY

Whereas rural electric systems are committed to the principle of area coverage service and have assumed the responsibility to serve, fully and adequately, all customers within their service areas; and

Whereas in many instances other power suppliers seek out and attempt to serve existing consumers or new power loads located in the service areas of rural electric systems; and

Whereas the results of such piracy and territorial invasion make even more difficult the burdensome task of providing dependable low-cost service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm the unrestricted right and responsibility of rural electric systems to serve those areas in which they initiated service, and that we support and will defend this right against pirating of territory and consumers by any other electric utility system; and be it further

Resolved, That all rural electric systems are urged to cooperate and support statewide efforts to secure adequate State legislation to safeguard their service areas; and be it further

Resolved, That all rural electric systems inform their members fully so they will have an understanding of the benefits of consumer-owned electric service and will reject and combat piracy efforts by other electric utility systems; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress and appropriate officials in the State and Federal Governments be urged to investigate and take all actions available to them in order to develop and promote measures to protect the territorial integrity of rural electric systems; and be it further

Resolved, That NRECA and statewide associations cooperate in the exchange of information on matters relating to the territorial integrity of rural electric systems to the end that maximum effectiveness can be secured in protecting the service areas of such rural electric systems.

FINANCING PROPOSAL

Whereas the rural electrification program administered by REA in accord with the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 as amended has brought to rural areas over the past 30 years the indispensable benefits of area coverage electrical service; and

Whereas this outstanding example of cooperation between rural Americans and their Federal Government could not have been accomplished without adequate capital financing at interest rates and terms which permitted low-cost electric service in rural areas; and

Whereas rural electric systems must have increasingly large amounts of new capital merely to keep pace with the growing demands of rural electric consumers so that it is estimated the capital requirements in the next 15 years will reach between $8 and $9 billion—nearly twice as much as these systems required in the first 30 years of their being; and

Whereas NRECA and REA have made studies requested by rural electric systems of the future capital requirements and means of meeting these requirements, and NRECA has reported its findings and conclusions which encompass a supplemental financing plan to provide the building blocks for our rural electric systems' continued growth and service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend NRECA and REA for the work they have done and for their forthright recognition—as we also recognize from the facts presented in the NRECA report—of the urgent need for supplemental capital to augment the 2-percent, 35-year loan funds; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the administration and the Congress to recognize these supplemental capital needs, and that we endorse the principles and concepts set forth in the NRECA financing proposal as follows:

1. Retention of the REA program, in its present form and including 2-percent financing at a level sufficient to meet fully the growing capital requirements of all systems for which these loans are vital to their continued progress toward the objectives of the rural electrification program which have guided us for the past 30 years;

2. An REA intermediate financing plan, funded by a revolving fund, free of crippling restrictions now contained in the REA Act or imposed by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress; the revolving fund to be supported by principal and interest payments on REA 2-percent and intermediate loans, and reloaned at an interest rate equal to the average cost of money borrowed by the U.S. Treasury, to those more mature systems which can utilize this type of financing;

3. An arrangement which will make it possible to bring private financing into the program at acceptable and practical terms. We believe that if the most advantageous arrangement proves to be a central bank, that this bank mechanism should operate initially within REA, and that provision should be made for its ultimate ownership, control and operation by rural electric systems. We further recommend that NRECA explore further the possibilities for member-consumer investments in their rural electric systems, which we believe to be of particular merit and feasibility for some cooperatives in this region; and be it further

Resolved, That we request NRECA and REA to develop criteria for determining at what points the supplemental financing shall be applied so that rural electric systems' efficient operation and prudent, effective management will not be penalized; and be it still further

Resolved, That we urge NRECA and REA to develop promptly the details of these financing concepts so that a specific financing proposal may be made known to the membership sufficiently in advance of the 1966 NRECA annual meeting and the voting delegates can take a well-reasoned and decisive action which will expedite the task of obtaining the necessary enabling legislation.

GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOANS

Whereas the ability of rural electric systems to fulfill their responsibilities is directly dependent on their ability to obtain dependable low-cost wholesale energy; and

Whereas in the face of dual rates, escalator clauses and opposition from commercial power companies, the availability of G–T loans from REA is the only means many systems have to obtain a dependable and adequate supply of low-cost energy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to remove restrictions on the REA Administrator's authority to make loans for generation and transmission facilities, to defeat any attempts at further restrictions, and to insure an effective G–T loan program by appropriating adequate REA loan funds to meet the needs of rural America for electric power.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Whereas legislation was introduced in both houses of the 89th Congress to amend the Administrative Procedure Act; and

Whereas some of the proposed changes in this law would impose the burden of public hearings on the REA Administrator in any rulemaking of general applicability and would open to judicial review all final decisions of the Administrator, thereby impairing the operation of the Rural Electrification Administration and the economic security of the rural electric program; and

Whereas rural electric loans do not directly and substantially affect the general public, but only the cooperatives themselves: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we oppose any change in the law which would open REA rulemaking procedures to public hearings; which would fail to continue the existing exemption for confidential information filed at REA; or which would open to judicial review decisions of the REA Administrator; and be it also

Resolved, That we oppose any attempt to burden the REA Administrator with unnecessary and expensive formal administrative proceedings such as those proposed.

CAPITAL BUDGET

Whereas there is a need to clarify to the public the amount of money we as a nation are investing in resource development, rural electrification, and other similar projects, and to distinguish these national investments from Government expenditures which are not repaid to the Treasury: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the President and the Congress to adopt a capital budget to clearly distinguish between capital investments and operating expenditures.

HARD MONEY POLICY

Whereas we commend Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, for his efforts to reverse the hard money policies of the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department; and

Whereas we deplore these high interest rate policies as a major cause of unemployment and as an unwarranted burden upon the homeowners, businessmen, and consumers of America; and

Whereas the rate of interest on taxable, long-term U.S. Treasury bonds has increased from a range of 2.1 to 2.5 percent in 1940 through 1950, to a high of 4.3 percent and a recent level above 4 percent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the President and the Congress to eliminate the factors which have resulted in artificially high interest rates; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to give serious attention to the recommendations made by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN in favor of monetary policies which will be in the best public interest.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Whereas we commend the President and the Congress on the passage of legislation to assist the development of rural areas—such as the Public Works and Economic Development Act, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, and the Economic Opportunity Act; and

Whereas we commend the work of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other departments and agencies for their administrative programs designed to implement this legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge NRECA and all rural electric cooperatives to continue to support this legislation so that the programs may be extended to the maximum in rural America.

AEC RESEARCH ACCELERATOR

Whereas the Atomic Energy Commission is proposing to build an accelerator which will have an operating budget of $50 million per year, and will employ 2,000 scientists, engineers, technicians, and workers; and

Whereas the Midwest has many institutions of higher learning which are staffed with top scientists and engineers; and

Whereas it is expected that the proposed accelerator will develop large quantities of low-cost electric power, some of which could be used by electric cooperatives in the Midwest to serve better their rural consumers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge our Congressmen and the Atomic Energy Commission to consider carefully the establishment of the proposed accelerator in the Midwest and to designate rural electric cooperatives as preference customers for electric power developed from this project.

POWER POOLING

Whereas the cost of electric power constitutes an ever-increasing component of total agricultural and industrial production and consumer living costs; and

Whereas the National Power Survey published by the Federal Power Commission forecasts that by 1980, the cost of producing and delivering electricity can be reduced by 27 percent, thereby constituting a consumer saving of $11 billion per year; and

Whereas the realization of such savings and the opportunity of all electric systems to achieve maximum economies in the generation and transmission of electric power depend upon their participation in the national power pool: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our advocacy for a nationally integrated electric power system through which all major sources of generation and all major load centers can be interconnected; and be it further

Resolved, That we recognize as desirable the yardstick effect of Federal and consumer-owned power systems, and the consequent requirement that any nationally integrated power supply must be preserved through maintaining the integrity of private, public, cooperative, and Federal segments of the industry.

INTERCONNECTION OF FEDERAL POWER PROJECTS

Whereas interconnection of Federal power systems would result in economies to the Government, its wholesale customers, and private power companies; and

Whereas certain Federal interregional tielines and studies of such tielines have been authorized by Congress and are being undertaken by the Department of the Interior; and

Whereas early completion of all such planned Federal tielines and tieline studies will lead to substantial economies of Federal power system operation, improve system feasibility, and provide additional firm salable Federal power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we favor the construction of extra high voltage Federal interties, and power-pooling agreements between all Federal power marketing systems, and we oppose the imposition of power company discriminating charges between these systems.

PREFERENCE

Whereas renewed attempts are being made to destroy the principle that the benefits from the investment of the people's money in Federal multiple-purpose resource development should belong to the people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our belief that the benefits derived from multiple-purpose resource developments belong to the people, we strongly support the antimonopoly or preference clause and we urge Congress and administrative agencies to adhere to this purpose of the laws.

YANKEE-DIXIE

Whereas the Yankee-Dixie generation and transmission plan is to develop privately financed large-scale generating plants at mine sites in Appalachia and to transmit low-cost energy via EHV transmission lines to load centers throughout the Eastern United States, which includes some of the highest power cost areas of the Nation; and

Whereas this development would benefit the depressed areas of Appalachia and the declining economies of New England, and would benefit rural electric municipal and private power company consumers throughout the eastern third of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we recommend the Yankee-Dixie proposal, and urge our State associations and NRECA to give appropriate and timely support to the project.

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Whereas full development of water resources is of paramount importance to the development of the commercial, industrial, agricultural, and recreational potentials of this region: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we support the comprehensive and prompt development of all economically feasible projects and sites, including hydroelectricity and pumped storage, which are in the national interest; and be it further

Resolved, That we support Federal construction of power marketing facilities to achieve maximum public benefits from such projects and to promulgate the effectiveness of the preference clause in the marketing of power from such projects.

WATCH RESOURCES PLANNING

Whereas the natural resources of this Nation are a vital segment of our total wealth and strength; and

Whereas the natural resources of the Nation belong to all the people and the benefits of orderly development should be available to all the people; and

Whereas long-range plans and comprehensive surveys should be made by a coordinating group to determine the needs of our growing population and future generations, rather than by piecemeal, short-term plans and projects; and

Whereas it is in the national public interest that our resource requirements and the adequacy of our resource programs be constantly before the entire Nation; and

Whereas the elimination of pollution in our rivers and our ground water supplies is a particularly crucial problem requiring immediate attention from local and State government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we endorse the recently enacted Water Resources Planning Act, and commend the Congress and the administration for it, and encourage the Governors of the States and responsible State agencies to implement the provisions of this act in developing a long-range, comprehensive, water and related land plan for the States.

RECAPTURE OF HYDROPROJECTS

Whereas 50-year licenses granted by the Federal Power Commission for non-Federal hydroelectric developments, under the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, as amended, will expire beginning in 1970; and

Whereas the said Federal Water Power Act provides for recapture by the United States of such projects upon the expiration of such licenses, for licensing to a new licensee or for relicensing to the same licensee; and

Whereas the FPC has initiated proceedings under docket No. R-250 to establish a procedure for the recapture for such projects; and

Whereas the FPC, in its notice of proposed rulemaking in said docket No. R-250, has proposed that the recapture by the United States of any non-Federal licensed project can be effected only after enactment by Congress of special legislation authorizing such recapture; and

Whereas the necessity for such individual separate legislation was not contemplated by Congress in enacting the Federal Water Power Act of 1920; and

Whereas there is no evidence that Federal courts have, in considering the recapture provisions of the act, ever anticipated the need for such additional recapture legislation which would, for all practical purposes, emasculate the recapture device and thrust upon Congress an impossible administrative burden, the delegation of which constituted the basic purpose of the Federal Water Power Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Federal Power Commission to adopt procedures for the recapture of licensed projects which will fully recognize that complete authority for such recapture already exists in the United States without further congressional enactment.

OHIO RIVER BASIN HYDRO DEVELOPMENT

Whereas official reports of the Federal Power Commission show the availability of some 5 million kilowatts of undeveloped hydroelectric power in the tributaries and main stem of the Ohio River, capable of generating about 22 billion kilowatt-hours; and

Whereas in a report to the President's Water Resources Commission the U.S. Corps of Engineers outlined the possibility of developing over 3 million kilowatts in connection with their multi-purpose development program for the Ohio River with an average annual output of about 8 billion kilowatt-hours; and

Whereas development of the hydroelectric power of the Ohio River Basin increasingly will prove important in terms of modern pooled steam and hydropower supply for the entire Ohio River Valley region; and

Whereas history of hydroelectric availability proves that this power development will provide the stimulus for industrial expansion in the very heart of Appalachia, with vast numbers of people unemployed and underemployed; and

Whereas the Congress has appropriated over $70 million, requested by the Corps of Engineers to construct the Markland Dam in the Ohio River in Switzerland County, Ind., and of this $70 million, $100,000 was expended to construct foundations for turbines to use to generate electricity; and

Whereas the Federal Power Commission, under the Federal Power Act approved the application of a license by a profit power company to construct a $25 million hydroelectric plant at this site: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we request the Federal Power Commission to refuse approval of applications for non-Federal development of hydroelectric energy in the Ohio River Basin, prior to taking all appropriate steps to determine the feasibility of Federal development; and be it further

Resolved, That under authority vested in the Federal Power Commission by the Federal Power Act, we urge the FPC, at the earliest possible date to submit to the Congress plans and estimates for construction, on all dams constructed and proposed for construction in the Ohio River Basin for development of the hydroenergy potential.

NORTHEAST RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Whereas comprehensive development of the resources of this region and of the entire Northeastern section of the Nation has lagged, despite the heavy density of population and the urgent and growing need for such development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we support the prompt authorization and construction of all feasible multiple-purpose projects in the Northeastern United States, including the Dickey-Lincoln School project in Maine.

AID PROGRAM

Whereas we commend those who have participated in the NRECA-AID program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the continued strong support of this program by all systems in this region to help the developing countries have rural electric cooperatives which will improve rural life and thereby contribute to peace in the world.

CLYDE T. ELLIS

Whereas we have learned with distress of the serious illness of Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of NRECA since our national association was formed in 1942; and

Whereas we deeply appreciate the great leadership and untiring attention to the work of our rural electric cooperatives provided by Clyde T. Ellis for nearly 25 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we express to him our fondest hopes for his full recovery and that we extend to members of his family our warmest wishes and sympathy on the occasion of his illness.

APPRECIATION—NRECA

Whereas all members of the staff of NRECA have worked tirelessly to carry forward the national program of rural electrification during the past year; and

Whereas members of the NRECA staff prepared for and performed many tasks necessary to help make this region 5 meeting a successful, cooperative enterprise: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we express our thanks and commend the NRECA staff for its efforts in behalf of the rural electric program and our regional meeting.

MEMORIAM

Whereas we feel deeply the loss of several of region 5's finest rural electric cooperative leaders during the past year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we pause a moment in silence to pay our respect to these leaders who served their cooperatives so long and so well.

FOURTH NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF PLANS FOR PROGRESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the plans for progress program is holding its fourth national conference at the Washington Hilton Hotel this week. Plans for progress is a voluntary effort by American business and industrial leaders to participate in the promotion and implementation of equal employment opportunity.

Plans for progress companies go beyond the letter of the equal opportunity laws and Executive orders by initiating policies and projects to end discrimination and increase employment opportunities for minority groups. Both individually and in concert, member companies carry out a variety of programs involving community as well as in-plant action to achieve these aims.

An illustration of this approach is seen in the business industry coordinating groups in a number of States, including my own State of Massachusetts, which offer training programs and work-study programs for the disadvantaged.

Since the program began there has been an increase of more than 100,000 in the number of nonwhites employed by plans for progress firms. The concern of the companies is not merely with the promotion of equal opportunity programs within their own corporate structures, but also with the conditions and circumstances in their communities which contribute to inequality of opportunity.

Member company executives serve on an advisory council which gives direction to the program. A Washington staff of executives on loan from the member companies carry out the programs.

As an interesting sidelight, the wives of the advisory council are here in Washington to learn more about their husbands' role in the plans and to take a look at the governing process. They have met with Mrs. Hubert Humphrey at her home, a tour of the White House, a visit to the Supreme Court and a luncheon this noon in the Speaker's dining room, which I was privileged to address.

I salute the interest and enthusiasm which is being shown here this week, and particularly by these ladies who recognize that they, too, have a vital stake in equal employment opportunity for all.

PROPOSAL TO PERMIT OLDER AMERICANS RECEIVING SOCIAL SECURITY TO EARN UP TO $1,800 A YEAR WITHOUT LOSS OF BENEFIT

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gurney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation into the House of Representatives to allow those older Americans receiving social security benefits to earn up to $1,800 a year without loss of benefit.

Much has been said in the past months about the sharp rises in the cost of living. Just last week I introduced legislation to allow those on veterans pensions to receive more outside income—the reasons for the bill I propose today are substantially the same.

Despite the crocodile tears which this administration has shed over the plight of the older Americans, it has continued its policies of pauperizing these people.

Never has any administration shown such disregard for the life savings of its aged—savings which they have struggled all their lives to accumulate for their retirement years. Now, because of the ruthless "planned inflation" of this administration, these old people have watched these savings, their pensions, their life insurance policies, and their other earnings shrink in purchasing power. What seemed like modest security yesterday is hardly enough to pay today's grocery bills.

Yet the policies written into the social security legislation prevent these people from supplementing their other income with more than very modest earnings of part-time jobs. Presently, a man drawing a social security allotment may earn only $1,500 elsewhere without losing part of the social security benefits. He may earn an additional $1,200 a year, but will lose $1 in benefits for every $2 earned.

The bill I introduce today would allow him to supplement his meager income by earning $300 a year more without loss of benefits, and up to $3,000 before losing his social security altogether.

This is the first of several bills to aid the elderly who are on social security benefits that I plan to introduce. Others will include cost-of-living increases and benefits to disabled widows.

It is high time for the administration to stop the source of this almost unbearable hardship they have foisted upon the older Americans. But in the meantime they cannot deny them the opportunity afforded in this bill to aid themselves. I am hopeful that the administration will welcome this opportunity to help these people it has so consistently harmed and ignored by its reckless policies.

NEEDED LEGISLATION FOR BEAUTIFICATION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to require that at least 1 percent of the money available to construct Federal buildings shall be used to provide for decoration and beautification in such buildings.

During my entire career as a legislator, I have been concerned with the cultivation of art and the encouragement of American artists. In 1938, I introduced a bill, S. 3296, into the 75th Congress to provide for a permanent Bureau of Fine Arts. As a Senator, I also authored S. 2967 in the 76th Congress. Neither of these bills was enacted, but my interest in this legislation never flagged. I was privileged, 27 years later, to introduce H.R. 6196 in the 89th Congress to establish a National Foundation on Arts and Humanities. It was, of course, a great source of satisfaction to me that the Congress established a National Foundation and that it now promises to aid in promoting excellence in artistic endeavor, befitting a mature, civilized nation.

My bill requiring art work in public buildings grows out of this long interest in the arts. Certainly the quality of our architecture is a clear sign of our appreciation of beauty. It was Winston Churchill who said, "We shape our buildings, thereafter they shape us." Public buildings which are drab testify to a dearth of spiritual sensitivity. But a building enhanced by fine paintings, murals, or sculpture truly helps "shape" the esthetic appreciation of those who enter.

I think it is important to note that this bill is another effort in a general reawakening of our Nation's awareness of beautification.

The President's task force on the preservation of natural beauty recently reported that:

> The Federal Government * * * is the greatest single builder and landowner in the country. As a consequence—though often without specific intent—it greatly influences the quality of our environment merely as a matter of good housekeeping. The Federal Government should insure that its physical installations not only serve their immediate purposes efficiently but also enhance the appearance of their general setting.

I think this bill I am introducing will serve the purposes espoused by the President's task force, as well as the President himself who said in his message on natural beauty that beautification "requires attention to the architecture of building."

Some Federal agencies involved in construction activities have shown admirable attention to the importance of art. The Federal Housing Administration, for instance, in a policy statement of February 27, 1964, emphasizes the use of art by American artists in multifamily housing projects developed with FHA mortgage insurance. FHA authorized up to 1 percent of the estimated cost to be spent for art.

My bill would extend this kind of due concern for beauty in building to the structures built or contracted by the Federal Government for its own use.

In summary, the legislation I am introducing today will: First, benefit artists, by providing them opportunities for creating decorative art; second, beautify our public buildings, by requiring at least 1 percent of the cost to be used on decoration and beautification in these buildings; and third, further art itself, by encouraging the creation of murals, mosaics, paintings, sculpture, ironwork, pottery, weaving, wood carving, stonework, and artistic work in other media.

The bill establishes an advisory board which will advise and consult with the Administrator of General Services in carrying out the intent of this bill. The board will be composed of the chairman of the National Endowment for Arts, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institute, and seven other members appointed by the Administrator from among private citizens interested and experienced in artistic fields.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is second to none in economic and political power. But the noblest aspirations of a people come to expression in the artifacts of their creative genius. I should hope that our public buildings would be not only monuments to our power but symbols of our appreciation of artistic achievement.

I am privileged to continue my own efforts to further art in America with this bill. And I am heartened that with our present national awareness of beauty in our environment, this measure will be promptly and carefully considered by the Congress.

INTERAMA GETS THE GO AHEAD AT LAST

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Senate, by a vote of 56 to 18, overwhelmingly approved my bill, H.R. 30, providing for the Federal participation in the Inter-American Culture and Trade Center in Miami. The passage of this legislation marks the culmination of a quarter of a century of work by me on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I was in the other body when I introduced the first bill on the subject in 1941, and you can imagine how glad I was to see this bill finally pass in 1966.

To point out the feelings and respect that the people of Miami, and for that matter all of South Florida, have for the potential of Interama; one of Miami's leading and highly honored radio stations, WGBS, radio Miami, editorialized on the passage of this bill last week. Therefore, so that my colleagues may have the benefit of these views, I ask unanimous consent to place at this point in the RECORD, the editorial aired by WGBS on January 21, 1966.

INTERAMA GETS THE GO-AHEAD AT LAST

Over the course of the years, Interama has been subjected to so many changes in concept, so many false alarms and so many optimistic reports that burst like bubbles on the impact of reality that the final approval by the U.S. Senate has lost much of its real meaning.

The real meaning of the Senate action is that Interama, the dream in various stages for decades, is on the way to reality at last.

By an overwhelming vote of 56 to 18, the Senate approved a bill committing the United States to participate in the trade and cultural center and authorizing $9.5 million for a Federal exhibit and its maintenance. The House passed a similar bill last year and leaders indicated that they will accept the Senate version. This means that the bill can be sent to the President immediately, and since he has indicated approval of the project, there should be no hitch in passage of the necessary bill to appropriate funds.

It is expected that construction of the long-awaited north Dade trade and cultural center can begin within 5 or 6 months.

The significance of Interama's impact on the local economy, or for that matter its importance in stressing Dade's place as the gateway to the Latin American nations can hardly be over-emphasized. It is estimated that the enterprise will create some 54,000 jobs spread out over a 3-year period and that eventually it will generate 100,000 new permanent jobs.

On the international level, Interama can demonstrate to the Americas what has been achieved without sacrifice of individual freedom and liberty within the framework of democratic institutions.

WGBS is certain that Interama will live up to its expectations. And the highest commendation is due to Interama Director Irving Muskat, Senators HOLLAND and SMATHERS, Representatives PEPPER and FASCELL and all the others who had a part in winning a long and arduous battle.

AN OPTIMISTIC REPORT ON HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the people of Miami are truly fortunate to have an outstanding radio station which has taken a strong position on the subject of higher education in the South.

WGBS, radio Miami, has pointed out to its listening audience that Floridians have a reason to be proud of State educational facilities and that the South now offers better opportunities to all persons in the field of higher education than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this editorial should be read by my colleagues and any interested party who would like to better his or her educational facilities.

The people of Miami are fortunate to be better informed by a radio station such as WGBS. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to place at this point in the RECORD the editorial aired by WGBS on January 18, 1966.

AN OPTIMISTIC REPORT ON HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH

Recently radio Miami, WGBS, raised its editorial voice to laud the efforts of the Florida Council of One Hundred for its program called SCOPE, the statewide conference on private education. The plan to acquaint business and industrial leaders with the role of private, independent higher education in Florida is a commendable one.

Too often reports on the progress of higher education not only in Florida, but elsewhere are discouraging. Thus, as was the case with SCOPE, it is always pleasant to note some optimistic findings.

Such is the case with a survey by the Southern Regional Education Board just released. The report says the South today offers broader and better opportunities for higher education than ever before and is a national leader in some fields.

Board Director Winfred Godwin says at least 32 new community colleges were authorized in the South in 1965, making our area a national leader in the drive to establish local higher education. Florida was a major contributor to this accomplishment.

The survey showed a 54-percent increase in enrollment in southern colleges during the first half of the 1960's and a steady increase of students taking professional training.

There was also a 40-percent jump in the number of doctoral programs offered in the last 5 years.

As a leading contributor to these optimistic findings, Florida can take pride in the fact that this type of educational concern is establishing a solid foundation from which the State's future will grow and flourish.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON APPOINTS A COOL HEAD FOR ALIANZA—LINCOLN GORDON

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson appointed Lincoln Gordon as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs this week, he selected a diplomat par excellence who without question will further the growing success of the Alliance for Progress. Lincoln Gordon, Ambassador to Brazil since September 1961, has a long and outstanding career of service to his country. A former Rhodes scholar, he was a consultant for the National Resources Planning Board in the early forties; vice chairman of the War Production Board during World War II; a delegate to the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission; a leading figure in the early days of the Marshall plan and Minister of Economic Affairs in our Embassy in the United Kingdom, to name but a few of his many achievements.

In the early days of the Goulart regime as American Ambassador, he was one of the few men in the State Department who had the guts to say how he felt and stand up for what was right. The success of the Brazilian Government in cutting inflation and improving the growth in that country is in part a tribute to his continued efforts in support of our great neighbor to the south.

I am personally very happy that the President has selected this able man at a crucial point in our relationship with Latin America. Mr. Gordon's appointment by President Johnson has been well received. I am inserting the following editorial which appeared in the Miami Herald, January 19, 1966:

AND A COOL HEAD FOR ALIANZA

Selection of Lincoln Gordon, U.S. Ambassador to Brazil, to succeed Jack Vaughn as our No. 1 man in Latin American affairs is a clear indication of future Latin American policy.

It emphasizes our use of the Alliance for Progress as the chief weapon to counter stepped-up subversion by Communists directed from Cuba.

The new Assistant Secretary of State is not an old diplomatic hand but took his Brazilian post after years of service as a professor of economics at Harvard. His specialty is international economic relations and his chief interest is Brazil.

As an adviser to the late President Kennedy, Mr. Gordon was one of the architects of the Alliance for Progress. He has attended several inter-American conferences on its operation and can be counted on to give it all the push possible.

Latin American problems, however, are not all economic. The shadow of subversion lengthened at the recent Havana conference of revolutionaries which set up a permanent office to promote guerrilla warfare against all the nations of the hemisphere.

Priority targets include Venezuela and Peru, which are among the strongest economically, as well as Uruguay, which teeters on the rim of economic collapse.

Mr. Gordon, in his new job, must deal with this threat as well as press on toward Alliance goals. This complicates a sensitive assignment that has frustrated some who held the job previously.

There is need for strong central direction of Latin American policy and an acceptance by the various governments of their share in meeting complex problems.

In Rio, our Ambassador dealt with situations which are repeated to a degree in nearly every country of the hemisphere. His record has been good and our relations with the Brazilian Government has remained cordial through a period of stress.

This is an omen of success as Mr. Gordon takes on new and larger responsibilities.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the House of Representatives to grant early approval to President Johnson's request that the United States participate in the founding of the Asian Development Bank. The President's message of January 18 eloquently set forth the reasons for implementation of such a move, and the Secretary of the Treasury has made a logical and persuasive case for American participation.

Speaking uniquely as a citizen of that State where oriental and Western cultures blend most successfully within the borders of the United States, I see our participation in the Asian Development Bank as a powerful gesture that will prove our recognition of the needs and long-range goals of the Asiatic countries. For too long have poverty and famine dominated life in that part of the world; for too many centuries now has the attempt to reach subsistence level been the only pathetic aspiration of so many millions of people. In our typically American desire to help the underdeveloped countries and undernourished peoples of this globe, we have already undertaken to alleviate suffering and backwardness in other parts of the world through long-range economic and technical aid. Usually, this aid is unilateral, given as a bequest, and involves no effort on the part of the recipient country. We are proud and gratified to be able to offer this aid, but all too often we have found the recipients to benefit less than we expected and to be consequently less grateful than desired.

The Asian Development Bank, however, without deserting present American policy, would operate on the sounder principle that mutual participation between interested parties leads to more constructive action toward goals desired by those involved. The United States is not being asked to underwrite the major part of this project; rather we are being asked to commit ourselves to only 20 percent of the funding of this Bank. One of the Asiatic countries standing to benefit from this project—Japan—itself will match our investment, and in fact 65 percent of the Bank's capital is to be subscribed by Asians. Surely this is self-help at its best.

Countries as diverse as Afghanistan and Samoa, Australia and Korea, are pledged to participate in the Asian Development Bank. There are no thorny questions of political agreement raised here—only the strong cooperative drive to improve conditions in one interrelated part of our shrinking world. A few decades ago, it might have been debatable whether Asian interests were remote from our own, but who can deny today how intimately American interests are tied to developments in that area? Already we have made a moral commitment to help raise living standards in that part of the world—why not now solidify that commitment by joining in a visionary project that has the added luster of including active participation by nations already receiving U.S. aid?

The exemplary success of the World Bank in spurring rapid economic improvement throughout the world should be our touchstone in this case. What we are asked to invest is small in comparison to the potential benefits in the welfare of peoples whose kinship and cooperation we now acknowledge as necessary and right. The river projects, harbors, bridges, powerplants, and many other developments vital for economic growth would be possible with the pooling of national funds which is the central purpose of the Asian Development Bank. I heartily concur also in the President's opinion that the $200 million we are being asked to invest will not affect our balance of payments adversely, since American export goods will be one of the chief targets of projects to be financed by the Bank.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal is before us, the benefits to us and to the countries of Asia are obvious. We are not being asked to contribute, but rather we are being asked to make a sound investment in the future for ourselves and our brother nations. I urge that this House most vocally support America's commitment to a better world by speedy passage of an Asian Development Bank bill.

THE LEADERSHIP TRAINING COURSE AT THE INTER-AMERICAN CENTER OF LOYOLA UNIVERSITY

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the leadership training course now being provided for the future leaders of Central America and Panama at the Inter-American Center of Loyola University in my home city of New Orleans is a splendid vehicle for improving relations between our country and the peoples of our neighbors to the south.

This fine training program also is providing the youth of Central America and Panama with a greater understanding of the United States republican form of government and the inherent strength in our democratic principles. These future leaders, in turn, are returning to their native countries where they are transmitting what they have learned from the staff of the Inter-American Center to other young citizens in those lands who will join in shaping their future.

I am proud that the Agency for International Development has recognized the value of this type of seminar training program, and has contracted with the Inter-American Center of Loyola University to provide these leaders of tomorrow from Central America and Panama with the tools of knowledge and understanding, so that they are better equipped to improve their own governments at home, and to foster democracy in those nations.

Supplementing the work of the fine staff at the Inter-American Center are professors from the New Orleans-based universities and colleges: Loyola University, Tulane University, Louisiana State University in New Orleans, Xavier University, Dillard University, and St. Mary's Dominican College.

The leadership training course at Loyola was the dream and the inspiration of Father Louis Twomey, S. J., director of the Institute of Human Relations, the parent organization of the Inter-American Center at Loyola. Father Twomey has done a magnificent job of encouraging and initiating pioneering efforts in the field of human relations; and the people of the New Orleans area and all of Louisiana are indebted to him for his good works. It was Father Twomey who conceived, and then fostered the idea, of providing a leadership training course at the Inter-American Center, which he and others established at Loyola.

The present contract with AID, Mr. Speaker, will continue the leadership training program of a series of 6-week seminars until October 31, 1966, when more than 375 young citizens of Central America and Panama will have received this valuable instruction.

Officials of the Agency for International Development have been impressed by the progress and the success of this program; and it is the intention of the officials of the Inter-American Center to seek a renewal of their contract so that they can continue to provide this needed leadership training to the youth of Central America and Panama. With a renewal of the contract, the Dominican Republic also will be added to the list of countries to participate in the Loyola program.

Mr. George E. Flanagan, the executive director of the Inter-American Center who has done a fine job of directing the day-to-day operations of the center and its programs, also will seek financial assistance from the private sector of our country in order to enrich and improve the curriculum of the leadership course and its entire scope.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to salute Mr. Flanagan and the members of his dedicated staff for the good works they are doing for their fellow man, and for our country and all the peoples of the Americas. Under Mr. Flanagan's direction are Dr. Frank B. Keller, curriculum director, and chairman of the Department of Economics, Tulane University; Mr. Constantine Ghini, assistant director of the center; Jon French and Alfred Willis, coordinators of the center; William de Salazar and Mrs. Gloria Requena, interpreters; and Jimmie Haritos, Mrs. Dulce Romagosa, and Miss Cenovia Mendez, secretaries. They all are performing a vital job for our country and for all the people of the Western Hemisphere, and I am happy and proud to salute them.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the Record at this point a "Summation of the Purposes and the Activities of the Leadership Training Course for the Youth of Central America and Panama," prepared by the director of the Inter-American Center, Mr. Flanagan. He has cogently and concisely set forth the aspirations and goals of this training program, and the activities of the center in providing this course, to date. His summation follows:

Summation of Activities of Leadership Training Course for the Youth of Central America and Panama, Inter-American Center of the Institute of Human Relations, Loyola University, New Orleans, La.

On June 30, 1964, the Agency for International Development entered into a contract with Loyola University of New Orleans to provide leadership training for the youth of Central America and Panama.

Five goals were set for this program:

1. To increase capacity for analysis of political ideologies and development problems.
2. To provide a knowledge in depth of the requirements for development in a variety of local, national and regional settings.
3. To develop greater facility in identifying the roles and responsibilities of a local, national, or regional leader.
4. To increase skills in planning and implementing projects for effective intra- and inter-group action.
5. To develop clearer concepts and realistic understanding of the social, cultural, economic, and political life of the United States.

The objectives set forth herein are predicated on the possibility of developing within each participant an understanding and an acceptance of the fact that change, rather than stagnation, is a fundamental characteristic of society; that change is accelerating throughout the world at varying rates; that the speed of that change can be influenced within certain limitations; and that change from a traditional to a modern society is the critical problem that leaders from the developing nations are called upon to solve.

(a) Substantive material is presented in conferences and seminars conducted by professors drawn from a consortium of the five New Orleans-based universities, and outstanding authorities from Government agencies and private institutions.

(b) Critical observation and familiarization are offered in a variety of field study trips, as well as through interpersonal relations with North Americans in family visits, campus activities, and the promotion of philosophical interchange in unstructured settings.

(c) Laboratory work for the study of human relations and the dynamics of group interaction, under the guidance of qualified personnel of national training laboratories, develop skills and techniques for the identification, analysis, and solution of back home problems.

Participants are selected by AID training officers in their home countries, and are drawn in homogeneous groups from the following institutional sectors of their society:

1. Leaders of credit unions and cooperatives.
2. Secondary school educators.
3. Leaders of university student groups.
4. Leaders of rural communities.
5. Civic affairs leaders.
6. Leaders of planning groups.
7. Health and welfare personnel.

By February 12, 1966, 235 participants will have completed the 6-week seminar and returned to their homes to put to use the new knowledge and techniques acquired at Loyola's Inter-American Center. All these graduates return to their countries with a clearer understanding of the United States and enduring friendship for the many families of New Orleans into whose homes they were invited to engage in the people-to-people type of dialog which is of such profound value in the development of sound human relations.

But the true test of the validity of this training program at Loyola University's Inter-American Center is the ongoing communication between the graduates and the staff of the center. Within the first year, hundreds of letters were received from the Central American and Panamanian graduates. These letters are vivid testimony to the value placed upon the experience gained at Loyola by the graduates. They are further evidence of the fact that once back home these neighbors from the Central American isthmus implement what they learned during the seminar they attended. At this time 68 community projects have been initiated in the fields of housing, public health, rural electrification, credit unions, education, communications, and agriculture. From Guatemala to Panama determined men and women are providing the inspiration and the know-how to bring a better life to the people of their community. Many have been awakened from their lethargy through discovery of the ways and means of activating their community toward change, and this is being accomplished in the framework of democratic processes.

The motivating philosophy at Loyola's Inter-American Center is predicated on the belief that once people learn to identify, analyze, and solve problems on the community level in a democratic manner, then they are prepared to exercise their role as citizens in the larger area of sectional, national, and regional problems. Indeed, the mustard seed has been planted and the tree it begets is developing.

Finally, in each country of the isthmus an Inter-American Center alumni is now being formed—by the graduates themselves. This vehicle will provide mutual support within the indigenous setting, and more and more the resources for the solution of problems will be discovered by drawing from the joint strengths of one's fellow nationals who have undergone the training at Loyola. Thus is this Inter-American Center developing the strength as well as the dignity so ardently sought by our Nation's friends in Central America.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to insert into the Record a very fine article by Mr. Allan Katz, of the New Orleans States-Item newspaper, in which Mr. Katz cites the cooperative work being done by the National Council of Jewish Women in the New Orleans area to augment and foster the improvement of this leadership course for the benefit of the Latin American students and for their own enlightenment. The ladies from the NCJW also noted their own achievements in initiating civic programs in the New Orleans area, and presented ideas on how the visiting Latin Americans could begin similar programs in their own countries. Mr. Katz' article from the January 22, 1966, issue of the States-Item follows:

Jewish Women Explain Procedure: Process of Getting Civic Programs Started Related to Latin Teachers

(By Allan Katz)

The concepts of civic action for community betterment are deeply rooted in U.S. society, as any elected official here can testify.

But this is not always the case everywhere.

That is one of the reasons members of the New Orleans chapter of the National Council of Jewish Women met this week with 34 school principals and teachers from 7 Latin and Central American nations.

The meeting took place at the Inter-American Center of Loyola University where the Latin Americans are spending 6 weeks under a U.S. Government grant program.

Seven NCJW members explained to the visitors from Honduras, Guatemala, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Panama, and the Dominican Republic how a group of women go about getting civic programs going in a bustling, metropolitan community like New Orleans.

Among the NCJW achievements:

A pilot program called teen town that eventually evolved into the New Orleans Recreation Department. A pilot program called Project Learn designed to combat adult literacy. City and State programs aimed at overcoming the same problem have since incorporated the same concepts.

A pilot program for preschool education called magic land set in public schools. It was the forerunner here of Operation Head Start which is a massive preschooling effort financed by the antipoverty program.

The newest effort is Project Volunteer where mothers are working in classrooms in Audubon School here assisting the teacher. The idea is to let the teacher have more time for teaching while more routine tasks are taken over by the volunteer.

Mrs. Sam Katz, president of the local chapter, explained that the NCJW volunteers wanted to tell the principals and teachers not only what they had done but how and why they coordinated their efforts.

"I suppose that one of the things we want to tell them is how important it is for civic groups to serve as a social conscience for the community," she said before the program began.

"I guess that everywhere you go there is a tendency for people to say 'who cares?' when they're faced by a problem," continued the NCJW president. "We've found the answer is that almost everyone cares. It's just a matter of doing something."

One of the fine points that came up in informal discussions during the meetings between volunteers and the visitors was that with each NCJW project there were always officials and observers who said "it can't be done."

However, as the principals and teachers were told, a little dogged determination and persistence go far in a democratic society and the NCJW has yet to have a failure.

The conversations also turned to the financing of projects and the NCJW volunteers told of their thrift shop here which raises $25,000 to $30,000 a year.

The exchanges of views were facilitated by translators provided by the Inter-American Center. Later, the visitors were taken to see Magic Land and Project Volunteer in action at New Orleans schools.

George Flanagan, executive director of the Inter-American Center observed:

"This is the second time the ladies from the NCJW have helped us. Last year they talked to a group of Latin American politicians visiting here about the nonpartisan political role of groups like the NCJW. This is a concept new to most of Latin and Central America."

He added:

"We are especially glad to enlist their efforts today to talk to the principals and teachers about how the educational needs of a community can be served by civic organizations.

"Further, this whole thing is a rather unique effort. Loyola, a Catholic university, working closely with a Jewish women's group is a striking demonstration of how a multiethnic society operates for the common good."

Taking part in the program for the NCJW were Mrs. Arnold Levy, Mrs. William Stein, Jr., Mrs. Raymond Fishman, Mrs. Milton Pick, Mrs. Harvey Schwartzberg, Mrs. Thomas Godchaux, and Mrs. L. J. Israel.

Representing the Orleans Parish School Board was Dr. Juliana Boudreaux, head of kindergarten and primary education, who told of the role of the public school system in working with civic groups and how new programs could be followed up and developed into overall curriculums.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I note with a great deal of interest that in his state of the Union message the President stressed very clearly the need for specific legislation to bring about a full-scale program to provide safe driving for all our citizens.

As chairman of the Committee on Public Works and one who has been a strong supporter of the highway program for many years I applaud the President's stand on highway safety.

As President Johnson noted in his state of the Union message, there is an urgent need for a new approach to the highway safety problem in the United States. The statistics tell us loud and clear that a new national effort is called for.

Up until 3 years ago, we were able to console ourselves with the fact that the death rate per 100 million vehicle-miles was steadily declining. Since then, however, that figure has been inching up.

We simply cannot tolerate this reversal. This is a national problem demanding a national effort. The 50 States and countless numbers of safety-oriented organizations have done yeoman service in this field, but their programs have lacked cohesion.

We need a national effort in the same tradition that has marked the State-Federal partnership in roadbuilding. Nothing less will enable us to get at the root of this problem.

We simply do not know enough about the causes of highway accidents. Despite the fact that we experience some 12 million highway accidents a year, we really are not able to categorize these mishaps. There are so many interacting forces responsible—people, vehicles, roadways, weather, and so forth. We need and approach similar to that employed in the aviation industry. This calls for research and testing on an unprecedented scale.

The States already are showing a new interest in the field of highway safety. The Federal Government has a responsibility for leadership and coordination here, too.

The President's call for action in this field demonstrates once again his ability to sense the mood of the Nation on major problems. I am sure the Congress and the motoring public will heed his message.

A VISIT TO BALTIMORE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, it is with much pride and satisfaction that I draw the attention of my colleagues of the Congress to an article in the current issue of the Highway User, a national magazine of high repute, dealing with all aspects of our national highways.

An article in the current magazine is titled "A Visit to Baltimore," which can bolster the pride of any Marylander and afford the satisfaction of discovering that an outside, objective source agrees that we have ample reasons to be proud of our leading city. In prose and picture the article recalls the role Baltimore has played in our national history, making the story of more than local interest and value. For this reason, I ask its inclusion in the RECORD so its interest and educational values may be shared by a larger readership.

A VISIT TO BALTIMORE

Baltimore is a metropolis that blends Old World charm with modern progress. History and science education and recreation, the things of commerce and the sea—Baltimore has it all.

It was more than 300 years ago that a few hardy individuals, who were wiser than they knew, decided that the shores of Maryland's Patapsco River offered a good place to live and do business. The site they selected is now the Nation's sixth largest city with a population of 939,024, and its third largest seaport in foreign trade tonnage.

Centrally located along the eastern seaboard and closer to the interior than any other Atlantic port, Baltimore was destined from its beginning to become a gateway for commerce and a favored site for industrial development. In consequence, the 60-acre townsite of long ago has grown with small regard for political boundaries. The incorporated city of Baltimore is now the core of a metropolitan area that sprawls across city lines into Baltimore, Anne Arundel, Carroll, Howard, and Harford Counties, with a population of nearly 2 million.

COSMOPOLITAN

Metropolitan Baltimore is a community of people who are cosmopolitan in composition and culture. For many years Baltimore was a port of entry for immigrants. Many merely passed through, but others remained to establish their new homes. They came from England, Germany, Italy, and many other European countries.

The area's cosmopolitanism is seen in its architecture, which ranges from classical Greek to Italian Renaissance, to French Gothic, to English Tudor, with variations and deviations evolving into early American and ultramodern.

Baltimore is an art center of distinction. In its Walters Art Gallery the creative genius of many lands makes it possible to trace the history of art through some 6,000 years. In the Baltimore Museum of Art, the emphasis is on recent and contemporary developments and includes a notable Matisse collection.

Best known of Baltimore's educational institutions is the Johns Hopkins University. Its graduate schools of medicine and hygiene and public health are known the world over. Closely associated with the medical school and as widely known is the Johns Hopkins Hospital.

Other institutions of higher learning in the Baltimore area include Goucher College Loyola College, University of Maryland Professional Schools, University of Baltimore, Morgan State College, the College of Notre Dame, Mount St. Agnes College, Towson State College, and Copin State College.

FORT M'HENRY

High in popular appeal to visitors is Fort McHenry, birthplace of "The Star-Spangled Banner." Standing on the deck of a cartel ship during the bombardment by the British, Francis Scott Key wrote the words of our national anthem on the back of an old letter.

Thousands visit the "star fort" each week to see its massive earthworks, its thick-walled dungeons and ancient guns. Returning to downtown Baltimore they visit the old Flag House at Pratt and Albermarle Streets where Mary Pickersgill made the very flag whose 15 broad stripes and 15 bright stars were seen by Key in the "dawn's eary light" of September 14, 1814.

Visitors can trace the story of Edgar Allan Poe in Baltimore—his grave in Westminster Churchyard, his little home on Amity Street, the rare copies of his books in the Poe Room of the Enoch Pratt Library, and the Poe Monument in Wyman Park.

Mount Vernon Place forms the setting for Baltimore's most famous memorial, the Washington Monument. Here, towering to a height of approximately 200 feet, is the first monument erected to the memory of George Washington. Built of marble from nearby quarries, it is often credited with causing the style for the white marble steps of the row houses built in that period.

In the heart of downtown are the city hall, post office, war memorial and other public buildings grouped around the War Memorial Plaza, and nearby is another famous landmark—the Shot Tower. It was built in 1829 for the production of shot by pouring molden lead through a sieve at the top into a tank at the base—a drop of 234 feet.

REDEVELOPMENT

Charles Center, which Baltimoreans describe with pride as a "fabulous concept of modern city planning," is spearheading an impressive redevelopment of Baltimore's downtown area, with ultramodern buildings going up in the empty blocks where old, drab structures were razed.

There are approximately 600 churches, of all denominations, in Baltimore. Of particular interest are the Cathedral of the Assumption, the first Roman Catholic Cathedral in America and the primary Catholic See; the new Cathedral of Mary Our Queen on North Charles Street; Old St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church at Charles and Saratoga Streets, the fourth church on this site and home of the oldest Episcopal congregation in Baltimore; and Otterbein Church, built in 1785 by a German Evangelical Reformed congregation and regarded as one of the finest examples of Georgian style in Maryland.

For those interested in railroading, there is the Transportation Museum housed in the Baltimore & Ohio's Mount Clare Station, the first railroad station in America—built in 1830. It was here that the first telegraph message—"What hath God wrought?"— was received on May 24, 1844, from the Supreme Courtroom in the Capitol in Washington.

Many visitors like to spend a few hours in the northern section of the city, driving along the winding roads of Roland Park, Guilford, Homeland and other attractive residential developments. Here are the famous Sherwood Gardens and just beyond the northern city limits are three beautiful valleys—the Dulany, Green Spring and Worthington—where fox hunting and steeplechase racing are popular sports.

SPORTS CONSCIOUS

Baltimoreans are traditionally sports conscious. Memorial Stadium is the home of the Orioles in the American Baseball League and the Colts in the National Football League. The new Civic Center is the scene of professional basketball and ice hockey, boxing, wrestling, etc.

Horse racing is a popular pastime in Maryland; and one of its three beautiful mile tracks, Pimlico, is located in Baltimore.

Long known as a good restaurant town, Baltimore can boast of some of the finest seafood to be found anywhere. It is less proud of its reputation as a wide open nightlife town, with its downtown "strip" of honky tonks and cheap night clubs.

Nevertheless, this is part of the color and bustle of Baltimore. Unlike its more staid and park-like neighbor 40 miles to the south, Washington, D.C., Baltimore is a city of heavy industry and aggressive commerce. In many ways it plays as it works—with gusto and purpose.

THE USES OF POWER

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Congressman CHARLES WELTNER, recently spent 10 days in the Far East, 10 of what he called "perhaps the most enlightening days of my life." Visits to Bangkok and to the village of Phong Siwat in Laos, and to Tokyo and Manila, gave him two immediate, strong impressions: Humanity—billions of people—and immeasurable poverty. Mr. WELTNER made a full report of his visit and of the lessons he drew from it in a speech to the Atlanta Press Club early this month, and I would like to include it here in the RECORD for the interest and information of all Members of Congress.

THE USES OF POWER

(Speech by Congressman CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER, at the Atlanta Press Club, January 7, 1965)

We are now 1 week into the new year. At such a time, it is profitable, I believe, to see how far we have come, and try to discern where we are going. We should begin with where we are.

No one can look at the economic record compiled during 1965 without a sense of surprise, perhaps even mild disbelief. Here are the figures:

Personal income: Year ago $507.1 billion, now $545.7 billion; increase $38.6 billion or 7.6 percent.

Total spending in United States: Year ago $641.1 billion, now $688.3 billion; increase $47.2 billion or 7.4 percent.

Retail sales: Year ago $263.3 billion, now $289 billion; increase $25.7 billion or 9.8 percent.

Jobs: Civilians working—year ago 70,713,000, now 72,850,000; increase 2,137,000 or 3 percent.

People out of work: Year ago 3,364,000, now 2,813,000; decrease 551,000 or 16.4 percent.

Output of industry: Year ago 135, now 145.5; increase 7.8 percent.

Profits of corporations: Year ago $37.8 billion, now $45 billion; increase $7.3 billion or 19.3 percent.

Private building: Year ago $45.4 billion, now $47.8 billion; increase $2.4 billion or 5.2 percent.

Cost of living: Year ago 108.7, now 110.6; increase 1.7 percent.

Dow-Jones industrials average (established 1913 at 79.5) now 960.3.

Productive output of the United States for the present year indicates a $700 billion gross national product.

However, I must observe that even such cold, hard, dollar-and-cents statistics as these—constituting well-nigh irrefutable proof of this administration's success and, of the corporate wisdom of the Congress—does not seem to stay the doomsayers. As a matter of fact, they seem to be infuriated by the extraordinary successes of President Johnson. "The country is going to the dogs," is their old, unchanged refrain. If that is the case—which I vigorously dispute—we Americans, all 193 million of us, are certainly going first class.

These same remarkable economic accomplishments fail to make a dent on that peculiar element that makes a fetish out of hating the Federal Government. Having just completed the most profitable year in their respective histories, they have left their new $50,000 homes (financed by the Federal Housing Administration), driven up the Interstate Highway (financed by the Bureau of Public Roads) to Lake Lanier (financed by the U.S. Corps of Engineers), and there, in their comfortable retreats, appalled by the whole panorama of Government give-aways and subsidies, they decry their lost freedoms.

I know one outspoken critic of Federal affairs who was reduced to complaining about the new cupranickel quarter. "It used to be, back in the good old days," he proclaimed, "that when you melted down a quarter you had 24½ cents worth of silver." Think of the millions of Georgians—the scores of millions of Americans—who used to spend long winter nights happily melting down quarters. Another lost freedom.

But I did not mean to use the figures as a cat-o'-nine against the wailing wall element of American political thought.

I cite them because they are the facts—and facts, in political discussions, are always important. We have American economic successes. I think it is also important to compare American productive output to that of other nations. By 1967, we will produce $700 billion in goods and services. That $700 billion compares to $72 billion for the United Kingdom, $80 billion for France, $60 billion for Japan, $95 billion for the Federal German Republic, $260 billion for the U.S.S.R. All of South America produces $75 billion. All of Africa (excluding Egypt) produces $35 billion.

The gross national product of the United States accounts for one-third of the annual gross product of the whole world, although Americans make up only 6 percent of the world's population.

Now, these figures have a substantial impact.

They, of course, dramatize the magnitude of power of our Nation, derived from its massive and increasing wealth. With that wealth, we have built a military establishment of 2¾ million men under arms, manning military installations in 31 different countries around the globe. We have developed delivery systems that can pinpoint a target on the other side of the world. We have more ships and more planes than any other country. We have stockpiled enough nuclear weapons to destroy the earth several times over.

Military power flows from great wealth. That wealth gives to us also vast, worldwide economic powers. As importer, we can hike the tariff a point or two, or shave the quota a percent or two, and the economies of other countries, dependent upon us for markets, tremble and fall.

As exporter, we can ship our surplus and stockpiles into other countries at a penny or two lower unit price, and disrupt other suppliers, domestic or foreign, to the point of chaos.

That is the power of the United States in the world today.

The central question facing all of us is not the fact of power—for it exists in unparalleled degree—but the use of that power. And that consideration—the use of American power—is what I should like to discuss with you today.

What is the place of America in the world of 1966?

Like it or not, willing or unwilling, the worldwide power of this Nation—the worldwide wealth of this Nation—have their corollaries in worldwide responsibilities and obligations.

There is a watershed among the nations of today's world—dividing rich countries from poor countries. The rich, in turn, are divided into east and west. The poor countries are in a state of flux, changing from day to day in alliances, ententes, politics, leadership, geographical area—and even name.

In 1965, Singapore was part of Malaysia. Now it is independent.

In 1965, Zanzibar was independent. Now it is part of Tanzania.

In Africa, alone, military coups have toppled five governments—the latest only this week in Upper Volta. Rhodesia has seceded, the Congo remains chaotic.

It is in the nature of things that all developing countries look to developed countries for help, for all of them have massive problems, requiring massive help. Their hopes have not gone unnoticed. Our cold war antagonists have been only too anxious to extend their influence into the underdeveloped areas of Asia, Africa, and South America. By fair means or foul, Russia and Communist China have insinuated themselves—or attempted to—in almost every quarter of emerging humanity.

What are we, the world's most powerful nation, to do about it? Should we use our power and our wealth to channel, as we can, the course of history? Should we be concerned with the prospect of a solidly Communist Africa, or Communist Asia, or Communist South America? Should we wash our hands of the vexing problems of the Congo, or of Malaysia, or of Pakistan, and figuratively and collectively, all go to Lake Lanier and forget the whole, complex mess?

Should we try, or should we quit?

Fortress America, if it ever existed in the 20th century, is now gone forever. Some elements of Communist leadership may have abandoned their precepts of armed uprising and armed subjugation of the entire world. But in their place is still the old concept of world dominance, through economic and political, as well as military, means. Quite obviously, we must use our power, and our wealth, to confront communism. Nations seeking to remain without its toils look to us for help, and we must respond. Nations who are our allies rely upon our promises, and we must keep them.

It is hard, exacting, complex, and frustrating to bear the mantle of world leadership. But the mantle is there, placed about us by the forces of history, and our own bountiful resources and unparalleled successes. It grows sometimes heavy: seemingly smothering. It irritates, constricts, binds. And we would often rip it off and cast it from us. But there is no alternative. Either we bear it, or it falls to our enemies.

And here, again, I have difficulty in understanding that loud and persistent claque that is forever damning American involvement abroad. I know, of course, that there is no lobby for foreign aid. Very few Congressmen have constituents in Gambia, or the Maldives, or in Guatemala. No telegrams, letters, or telephone calls come cascading in from voters whose life or death, freedom or enslavement, hangs upon the vote. That, I understand.

But what I do not understand is how isolationist elements can deplore the tide of communism, demand that the Iron Curtain be "rolled back," and call upon everybody to do something, and then refuse to devote the first weapon to the cause they purportedly espouse.

Order a man to chop a tree, but forbid him an ax. Demand that an acre be plowed, but deny him entry upon the field. Call for a knockout in the first round, but keep the fighter out of the ring.

Now, if that seems to make no sense at all, it's because there's no sense to it.

Yet, that is the strange and paradoxical position of the many who complain the loudest, at the same time opposing foreign aid the most vociferously.

I suppose their solution is in speeches delivered to the folks in Belle Plaines, Iowa; or Gadsen, Ala.; or Lebanon, N.H. Or, possibly, we could get up a pamphlet on the glories of the two-party system, and send it to Yemen, or Cameroon, or Nepal.

Money? Of course it costs money. Why wouldn't it cost money to combat a deliberate, consistent course of global dominance? Last year we voted $3.25 billion for foreign aid. That's about 3 percent—the same percentage of our national revenue as the sales tax you will pay on this meal—to maintain freedom for fellow humans around the world, and security here at home.

Logical and honest men will, I believe, agree that investment of American efforts and American money abroad is essential. The existence and extent of American power requires its employment beyond our borders.

That requirement rests in part upon national security considerations. But security is not, in my view, the whole matter. There is the matter of common humanity.

It was my privilege a few weeks ago to spend 10 days in the Far East. Those were, perhaps, the most enlightening days of my life. That region has always held for me a certain fascination. Yet, as with most faraway places, it never quite existed until suddenly a giant plane swooped down from the clouds to land on the other side of the world, with me aboard. The immediate impression I gained of Asia was that of humanity—billions of people. Tokyo alone has 10 million people. Bankok has 2 million. Manila has 2 million people. And Indonesia, which is only a vague, sometimes troublesome somewhere to most of us, is the fifth largest nation in the world, with a population of 100 million.

Poverty was the second impression I gained of Asia.

One of those 10 days I spent in Laos. It is a strange land, of poor soil, poor crops, and poor people. It has nothing to export, consequently no means of acquiring international exchange. Many of its 2 million inhabitants know the name of their village but not of their country. The great mass of Laotians spend their every waking moment in gaining enough food to survive. Twenty-five percent of the labor force of the country is under arms, and three separate armed forces roam the hills and valleys of Laos, keeping and breaking tenuous alliances one with the other. A king, whom nobody knows, lives at Luang Prabang, the royal city. The affairs of state, such as they are, are handled by a ruling prince, with our support. Otherwise there would be total and utter chaos.

Laos is as improbable a country as the mind of man might conceive. In the balance of history, it probably should not even exist as a nation. Yet that small, landlocked, desperately impoverished, and wholly inadequate nation stands as a great challenge to America and to humanity. We are the richest nation. Laos is probably the poorest. And from that relationship of opposites, in my view, there exists an obligation on the part of Americans to Laotians.

I am not speaking now of arms, or hydroelectric plants, or vast public works. I am speaking of food, and medicines, and basic instruction in the most rudimentary disciplines of agriculture and sanitation. The United States is waging war in Vietnam; in Laos, we are waging peace. If in Vietnam we are required to employ death sciences, in the villages and provinces of Laos, we practice life sciences.

Thus the power of the United States is extended to the small, miserable village of Phong Siwat in developing a more productive strain of rice, in teaching farmers something about sanitation, in instructing young women in the physiology of childbearing, in dispensing quinine from the small medical stations over the countryside, in providing the children of that country a textbook written in Laotian when all they had before were in French.

These are not dramatic exercises of power. We are erecting no steel and concrete towers of science. We have no massive works to level mountains and raise valleys. Our power is extended in a small, quiet, personal way—to a farmer in a rice paddy, a child in a thatched schoolhouse, a mother in a village hut.

Success or failure in Laos—which it be—will hold strong portent of the success or failure of Western power to extend freedom and independence to the millions of Asia. If we can do nothing to better the lot of Laotians—to help them make for themselves a better life, then why should they hesitate to adopt whatever new form of tyranny might be tendered in wrappings of progress and reform? If all the might of America is employed only to keep a succession of ruling cliques in power, why should the peasant care? If American presence cannot change his lot, how does it differ from the presence of those other white strangers, the French, who exploited the poor of Asia for the wealthy of France? Guns, planes, tanks, political systems, economic theories and far-off struggles—all these mean little to the Laotian villager. Rice, medicine, basic agriculture, and education mean everything. Somehow, this proposition, which should be plain to see, came clear to me only when I stood in the midst of that far-off land, its red dust caked upon my clothes, and saw with my own eyes how different is that part of the world.

There is a duty that we bear to Laos, and to Nigeria, and to Honduras, and to the other poor of the world. It rests, not upon politics, or power, or economics, but upon humanity. It is found in the old command, "Love thy neighbor." It is formulated in the power we have, as the wealthy of the world, to raise the hopes and the lives of the poor of the world.

We cannot, in good conscience and with decent respect for mankind, "pass by on the other side of the road."

I have spoken of power, and its accompanying responsibility. I believe that here we might establish another axiom: as great power carries with it great responsibility, so its exercise is accompanied by great frustrations.

Nothing seems to rankle Americans more than the insults of some fifth-rate power. Recall the high dudgeon resulting from Nasser's advice that we jump in the Nile. Recall the indignation that bristled when Sihanouk told us where we could go with our aid. There were many Americans, with short fuses, who demanded that we do something—embargo, blacklist, boycott. Yet, it should be the character of a mature and confident power that it can ignore taunts and jibes of lesser powers; that it plot its course in world affairs according to the prevailing winds of history, not the passing squalls of petty tyrants. American foreign policy must be based upon the highest, not the lowest, denominator.

Nowhere is this frustration more evident than in our unhappy involvement in Vietnam.

Today 180,000 fighting men are in that land. To date, over 1,300 Americans have lost their lives. The war proceeds, without decisive or discernible change in our favor. "How," it is asked, "can illiterate peasants, ill fed, ill clothed, and ill armed, stand up to the greatest military power in the world?" "Why don't we get it over with?" "Why not victory?" You have heard all the questions. None is easy to answer.

Certainly, it would be a simple matter to bring about—within 24 hours—the utter devastation of all of North Vietnam. We could kill every able-bodied fighting man there—along with every little child, every woman, every old man—all within the twinkling of an eye. We can win, if winning means wiping out 16 million human beings, and if winning includes the very real chance of direct military engagement with Communist China, and if winning includes the probable necessity for using nuclear weapons against Peiping, and if winning includes the possible destruction of Russia, after, of course, Russia has simultaneously destroyed 100 million American lives.

We have the power to win—if we want to win under those circumstances. That power has gone unexercised, to the mounting frustration of us all, and to the increasing demand that we do something.

Of course, I can offer no sure road to an honorable peace. We sincerely seek it, and, I am convinced, are willing to go the extra mile. We will not, however, negotiate a peace that would mean the inevitable loss of southeast Asia to the thralldom of China.

There are many frustrations that beset our power. There was a time, after World War II, when this Nation, its productive machine undamaged, and its possession of atomic weapons a world monopoly, was, alone and of itself, insuperable. Times have now changed. Three Western nations have the bomb. Russia has the bomb. Communist China has a bomb—and there is mounting danger of nuclear proliferation. No one nation, East or West, capitalist or Communist, possesses absolute power over the remainder of the world. Hence, in facing reality, we, the greatest single power, must realize that we cannot expect instant agreement with our policies, or instant accord with our wishes. Then, too Americans are an impatient lot. We expect our problems somehow to be disposed of by saying the magic words. We grow weary with prolonged disputes, and restless with lack of immediate, decisive success.

Somehow, there is a substantial element which maintains that foreign difficulties are products of the last few decades, only that we never had this trouble in the "good old days."

History affords little basis for this view. For instance, one of our present vexations is Santo Domingo. We want it settled, now. We want to rid ourselves of the bother, and bring the troops home, now.

The President of the United States has commented as follows: "The relations between those parts of the island of the St. Domingo * * * are still in an unsettled condition. The proximity of that island to the United States, and the delicate questions involved in the existing controversy there, render it desirable that it should be permanently and speedily adjusted * * *. The Government of the United States will not fail, by the exercise of all proper friendly offices, to do all in its power to put an end to the destructive war which has raged between the different parts of the island, and to secure to them both the benefits of peace * * *."

President Lyndon B. Johnson? No, that was President Millard B. Fillmore, in his annual message to the Congress, December 2, 1850.

Nor is America the only great power to have run afoul of trying circumstances in Santo Domingo. In 1802, Jefferson wrote to his minister in France: " * * * The conquest of St. Domingo will not be a short work. It will take considerable time to wear down a great number of soldiers." The soldiers mentioned in that letter were not American, but French, then the world's first power.

Thus, we must exercise restraint, and cultivate patience, else we will be pressed by strident voices into precipitous and harmful actions.

The rest of the world moves in strange ways. It is not always immediately responsive to great power. Take, for instance, Nigeria. Do you remember how the United States, in its bounty and beneficence, sent to that newly independent country a team of Peace Corps volunteers? Backing them was the most educated, scientific, modern, sophisticated, richest Nation in all history. And do you remember how relations between the two nations were thrown into wrenching panic when Margery Michelmore of Foxboro, Mass., mailed her famous postcard to "Dear Bobbo," expressing dismay at the lack of sanitary facilities in Ibadan?

It mattered not then how great or powerful or rich we were. What mattered was that we had—through little Margery—delivered a national insult. Guns, planes, tanks, political systems, and economic theories all aside, the issue was a small postcard to "Bobbo."

If America is to be a good leader, then it must, as all good leaders must, have an intimate sense of identification and understanding of those it seeks to lead. This cannot be done by shallow attempts to superimpose our 200-year-old democracy—tripartite government and all—upon peoples who have no concept of self-determination. It cannot be done by requiring industry, thrift, and initiative alone to rear viable economies among people who, for the most part, have none of those qualities. It cannot be done by menacing gestures in response to slurs, however, rankling. It cannot be done by precipitous action or empty shows of force.

Our power requires us to lead. And lead we must, that the blessings of liberty, and the fruits of a bountiful world, be extended to the millions dwelling beyond our shores.

America can lead the world into a better age only by a national character exemplified by those old, simple qualities—kindness, compassion, patience, restraint, and liberality.

THE NEW JERSEY MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, considerable publicity has attached to various groups who have wanted to display their support of our young men now in the jungles of Vietnam. Presents of all descriptions have been sent to our troops from all over the country. But none, perhaps, has the impact of the gift that a group of New Jersey young men will donate next Sunday, the 30th.

On that day the members of the New Jersey National Guard who are enrolled in the officer candidate program at the New Jersey Military Academy in Sea Girt, N.J. are going to line up to donate their blood, which will be sent to assist the treatment of our forces in Vietnam. Although completely voluntary, it is expected that the academy turnout will equal the enrollment.

I learned of this plan of the officer candidates through the chairman of the project, Louis C. Mancuso, who lives at 5 Russell Avenue, Nutley, N.J., in my congressional district.

To Louis and his fellow guardsmen at the New Jersey Military Academy, my sincere congratulations and warmest thanks for your actions on behalf of our forces in Vietnam.

CONGRESSMAN WRIGHT SPEAKS IN OKLAHOMA CITY

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on January 14 one of this body's most eloquent and thoughtful Members, the Honorable Jim Wright, of Texas, addressed the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce on the subject "Today's Realities and Tomorrow's Hopes."

Reports from Oklahoma's State Capitol, where one of the Nation's most active and effective chambers of commerce is located, indicate that our distinguished colleague from Fort Worth delivered one of the most inspiring and memorable addresses in the history of the organization.

Because of its inspirational impact, and because of the vision and understanding inherent in Congressman Wright's message, I have secured permission to insert the complete text of the speech at this point in the Record. The text follows:

Today's Realities and Tomorrow's Hopes

(Address of Congressman Jim Wright, Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce membership luncheon, January 14, 1966)

I am glad to be here in the Nation's largest city. The 649 square miles within your city boundaries undoubtedly entitles you to this distinction.

And, from a Texan, that amounts to quite an admission.

There are those who erroneously thought that Texans grieved when Alaska displaced us as the largest State. Not so. We rejoiced with them in their new honor. We only hope they can bear it with the same becoming modesty that we have always exhibited.

Perhaps in one sense it is proper that a Texan should be invited to speak to the chamber of commerce luncheon in the Nation's largest city. Not because Texans and chambers of commerce bear in common a reputation for boasting. But because we share with this organization a common dream and a common goal to match our geographic quantity with economic, educational, social, and political quality.

A city without an ambitious, energetic, and well-balanced chamber of commerce would be like a ship without a rudder. It would be like a navigator without a compass. It would be like a builder without a set of plans.

Solomon said: "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

More and more chambers of commerce are coming to realize that—if they are to have a message, and a mission, and a future—they must learn to speak not only for the business community, but for the community.

Chambers of commerce are lengthening the stride of their vision to think not only of the immediate needs of today but of the untapped promise of tomorrow. I know no better example than the frontiers of science program launched right here in Oklahoma City.

And organizations like yours are extending the breadth of their vision to recognize that, if the individual communities they serve are to be healthy, then the Nation of which they are a part must be healthy.

No longer is it logical or even popular to cuss the Federal Government in one breath and demand more millions in benefits in the next. I am not pleading for subservience. I am pleading for adulthood. I am asking for a friendly, cooperative working partnership between the cities of our Nation and the Government of our Nation. Without it, the years ahead—with ever more of our people crowding into the burgeoning metropolitan centers—would be chaotic.

I am suggesting that we all grow up and recognize how silly it is to contend that the only way we may acceptably prove that we love our country is by demonstrating that we hate our Government.

Our Government belongs to us. It is not our enemy. It is our instrument. It is our creation. It is our servant.

No city in the country should be better equipped to recognize the impact of the world around us and the value of an intelligent working relationship with our Federal Government than Oklahoma City.

In 1964, the total amount of personal income in the State of Oklahoma was $5.1 billion. Approximately 17 cents out of every dollar came in direct payments of one type or another from the Federal Government. Certainly I am not contending that the Government owes every man a living. But I am contending that the Government owes every section of this land and the responsibility of helping to create an economic climate—an atmosphere of progress—which is conductive to widespread individual success in the private sector.

During the past fiscal year, the Corps of Engineers spent $14 million to tame the floods and harness the rivers in your State. No part of our Nation should better recognize the benefits of booming industry and thriving commerce which follow in the wake of developed water resources than the State of Oklahoma.

During this fiscal year, the Defense Department awarded $120 million in prime contracts to Oklahoma firms and businesses.

Tinker Air Force Base alone represents an annual Federal expenditure of some $680 million. Its 24,000 civilian employees release an annual payroll of $150 million into the economy right here in the trade territory of Oklahoma City.

There are in this city 41,000 people receiving social security benefits which are helping to turn the twilight years of their lives from gray years of need and neglect into golden years of fulfillment. This is not only a cushion against individual adversity, but a $32 million a year cushion for the economy of Oklahoma City.

During the current fiscal year, the Small Business Administration has made 135 business loans, for a total value of $4.6 million, to small independently owned businesses in this town, helping to stimulate the wellsprings from which new enterprise can flow.

Under the Water Pollution Control Act which the late Senator Bob Kerr and Representatives ED EDMONDSON and TOM STEED helped to write, your city has received grants totaling $2.2 million to help assure for the next generation of your residents a legacy of pure water.

And, just last week, the Secretary of Commerce released a little over $12 million to be invested in the highway program for the State of Oklahoma during the new fiscal year, to help provide the arteries of commerce through which the economic bloodstream can flow unimpeded.

Through a working partnership with our Federal Government, and with a vision of the future, Americans like Bob Kerr and CARL ALBERT and MIKE MONRONEY and William Morgan Cain and Stanley Draper have defeated the doldrums which only a few years ago held your State in the grip of introspective paralysis, and have blazed a trail of progress into a brighter future.

But Oklahoma, although an important part, is only a part of the world around us. It will prosper as the Nation prospers. It could never endure as one healthy cell in an unhealthy body. Nor could it exist as an insulated island of peace surrounded by an ocean of war.

Oklahoma City is part of the world.

If we would understand the world on which New Year's Day dawned just 2 weeks ago, we need to recognize four stern realities of our time. These are the great, overpowering facts of 20th-century life to which those of us in your Government are trying to react intelligently in our efforts to shape the future as you'd want it, rather than just waiting for it to happen to us however it will.

1. The first of these realities is the fantastic compression of time which has shrunk the planet earth.

It took Columbus 70 days to cross the Atlantic. Lindbergh did it in 33 hours. A B-58 can do it in a little over 3 hours. And, in the month just passed, our Gemini spacecraft were covering the same distance in just about 10 minutes.

But let's put it in a more personal way: For purposes of either transportation or communication, Oklahoma City is much closer today to London or Paris or Moscow or Saigon than it would have been 100 years ago to your neighboring State capital at Austin.

Think about it. Today you can communicate with someone in any major city of the world more quickly—or you can get there more quickly—than your great-grandfathers at your age could have traveled or sent a message from Beaver City to Idabel or from Altus to Miami, Okla.

Or—disquieting though the fact may be—your home, wherever you may live in Oklahoma—is no more than 40 minutes from Vladivostok by ballistic missile.

What does this mean? Well, it means that—whether we like it or not—this world has become a neighborhood. What happens anywhere in the world does have a bearing on our lives.

It means that cohesive international organization and swift, decisive action when freedom is threatened are not only desirable; they are absolutely necessary.

This is why the tide of Communist aggression must be turned back in Vietnam lest it spread like an unchecked prairie fire to engulf all of Asia. And this is why the United Nations must be made to work, for there's no alternative.

The choice is world law or world anarchy—the rule of reason or the rule of brute force.

Those who mouth the old platitudes and talk in scornful derision of what they call one worlders are speaking in a dead tongue. With the awesome weaponry at our command, the choice is one world or none. And I'm for having one. A free world where men may have a say in their destiny and settle their disputes by reason and not by riot, by ballots and not by bullets—where men and women can live without fear, and be neither red nor dead.

Can we attain such a world? Well, we'd better do so, because—

2. The second of these great realities of our age is that science and technology are speeding ahead at a blinding, ever accelerating pace.

So rapid has been this advance of science in the last 25 years that it threatens—unless we constantly update our social knowledge—to leave our human arts of government far behind.

It has forced upon us an entirely new dimension of problems not even dreamed of 20 years ago—problems that range from the threat of polluting the atmosphere by atomic explosion or by the exhaust fumes of 75 million automobiles in this affluent society—to the question of job displacement through automation.

So rapidly are old processes being obsoleted, that in our society today the average American industrial worker changes jobs 15 times and has to be retrained 3 times in the course of his career.

In such an age, education is no longer a luxury. It's a necessity. If America is to claim the promise of the future, it must be an America in which all of its children—north and south, east and west, rich and poor, black and white and red and brown—will be given the opportunity to develop their individual potentials to the maximum.

Still half of our high school graduates are not entering college—and a full 40 percent of those who do are forced to drop out. College tuitions are being forced ever higher, and if the hard-pressed parents of America are to keep up with the growing costs of educating and equipping their children for the age in which we live, they are going to have to have a realistic tax credit in the years in which they are actually seeing youngsters through college.

It will pay for itself many times over.

Here is one example of how that affects us right here in Oklahoma and Texas:

Across the country today, several sites are being considered for the location of a massive atomic accelerator project. For the area that gets it, it will be the biggest boon since the Manned Space Center went to Houston. Among those areas being considered are several in your State and several in mine. We in the Southwest measure up to the very best and better—in every criterion but one: our educational ratio is only 1 doctor's degree for every 25 masters' degrees; in some places it's 1 for every 7.

If the Southwest should fail to get this project, that will be the reason.

But broader than our two States and of greater lasting significance to each of us, is this fact:

Unless the human race is to be left behind by its own creations, it must develop the tools—and the understanding in governmental circles—to cope with these creations and direct them in constructive channels.

3. The third overpowering reality of the time is the world population explosion which increases by geometric progression.

At the beginning of the Christian era—at the time of the first Christmas—there were only about 250 million people in the whole world.

In another 10 years, there'll be that many right here in the United States—on only 7 percent of the world's land surface.

It took the human race 3,000 years to develop a population of 3 billion people. We are doubling that figure in less than 30 years.

The same amount of land and air and water and mineral resources must be made to serve more and ever more people. And so the conservation and management of the earth's natural resources is an impelling necessity.

Right here in America, we are growing so rapidly that every day we have the numerical equivalent of a new Woodward; every week, of a new Lawton; every month, of a new Tulsa; and every year, of an entire new State of Oklahoma.

In recent years we in America have come to think of food surpluses as a problem. But most of the nations on earth are confronted with increasingly drastic shortages—and hunger is the thing that most often leads to war or revolution or violent upheaval.

Here in this bountiful land—where we worry at lunch time about too many calories—as rapidly as we are growing and our cities are expanding, we could reach the point within this century where our available farm acres would no longer produce enough for our own people.

So every inch of topsoil that can be saved—and every drop of water that can be conserved—and every stream that can be cleansed of pollution—and every river that can be developed—will pay rich returns to the next generation of Americans.

Your own Congressman, JOHN JARMAN, has done a magnificent job in promoting the maximum recovery and conservation of the petroleum reserves which will have to power the machinery of future generations. He understands well—as everyone in the Southwest should understand—that discovery of new reserves so necessary to our future well-being as a people, ultimately must rest upon the health of a domestic industry with thousands of independent operators—the guys with a rig and a rabbit's foot and a sense of adventure—ever searching the earth for new discoveries.

During the past decade, your State has led the Nation in the development and conservation of your water supply. My hat is off to the citizens of Oklahoma City and of the western part of this State who have inspired the Nation with their display of statesmanship and vision in so actively supporting the Arkansas River project, even though thus far its tangible benefits have extended only to the eastern section of your State.

And, despite, the initial disappointment which all of us have felt over the somewhat negative report of the board of engineers for rivers and harbors, with men like MIKE MONRONEY, FRED HARRIS, and ED EDMONDSON plying the skill and resourcefulness and persuasion for which they are known, I firmly predict that no amount of obstruction will be able to hold back indefinitely the coming reality of the central Oklahoma project.

As one Congressman from a neighboring State, I pledge to you that—as long as I have the privilege to serve on the Public Works Committee—this practical and necessary development will have my hand and my heart, my voice and my vote, and whatever help that I can give.

The time is rapidly coming in the United States when that area blessed with a maximum development of its water resources will be better off by far than if it had oil or gold or uranium or any other resource of the earth, but lacked water. I have never heard a more ridiculous or more specious argument than that forced upon the Corps of Engineers by the Bureau of the Budget that a better set of freight rates through other modes of transportation, brought about by a navigation project, should be considered as a cost rather than a benefit factor.

It is obvious that the better rates will not come unless the canal is built. And if they should come as its competitive result, then I can't count that as anything but an additional benefit to the people.

Development of our waterways was one of the first functions of government recognized by the Congress in the first decade of the 19th century. But the history of their development has been a history of thinking too small and acting too slowly.

Not Oklahoma alone, but the Nation, will benefit by the central Oklahoma project. The best homiletic I have ever read on the subject was delivered on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives in 1848 by a young Congressman named Abraham Lincoln. He was speaking out against a Presidential veto of an omnibus public works measure.

Lincoln demonstrated through the flawless logic that came to be his hallmark that, because of an inland waterway in remote Illinois, the sugar merchant in New Orleans sold his wares a "little dearer" and the housewife in Buffalo, N.Y. sugared her husband's coffee a "little cheaper."

The history of that splendid professional group known as the Corps of Army Engineers has been a history of cautious calculations and conservative estimates to tonnages.

The Engineers projection on the Mississippi waterway was 9 million tons a year. In 1963, it carried almost 40 million tons—or 344 percent of the estimated volume.

The Engineers projected 9 million tons a year for the Ohio waterway. In 1963, it was carrying 88 million tons, or almost 9 times the estimated amount, and the locks were having to be rebuilt to accommodate the burgeoning volume of usage.

The orginal estimate, just a very few years ago, for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between New Orleans and Corpus Christi was only 7 million tons a year. That canal last year exceeded the official estimates by more than 10 times.

But the value of water resource development cannot be written in tonnages alone. The great complex of industrial development in the United States has grown up primarily along our inland waterways system, and from this the Nation has benefited beyond measure.

Last year, some 300 new industries sprang up along the banks of our Nation's navigable streams. This development not only creates a tax base for the local communities, it provides the payroll which generates other economic activities ad infinitum. In context with all we have been discussing, this may be far more important for the future than we realize.

Our population growth rate means something even more immediate than the things we have mentioned. It means that the private American economy must grow enough to produce 3 million new jobs every year—in the private economy.

It requires this many to take up the slack created annually by automation and to provide creative work for the young Americans coming into the job market for the first time each year.

We are in our 59th month of continuous economic expansion—the longest period of unbroken economic growth in the history of the Nation. We have over 73 million Americans gainfully employed. But next year we'll need to have 76 million at work if growing unemployment is to be avoided.

4. Finally, we face the reality of what has been called the revolution of rising expectations. Throughout the world, long submerged nations are churning in one of history's greatest upheavals, frantically trying to bring the benefits of 20th-century progress to their own people. They are desperately determined to compress into one generation what it took other societies a century or more to develop.

In the far corners of the earth, men are choosing sides between two diametrically opposed ways of life, and how they choose may well determine the fate of our children.

Let's take a quick look at tomorrow's world. Let's think for a minute of those between the ages of 5 and 20—the next generation. Some of these are your children. Four of them are mine.

If we were to take a representative cross section of 100 of these, 56 would be from Asia, 15 would be from Western Europe, 9 would be from Latin America, 8 would be from Africa, 6 would be from Russia, and only 4 would be from the United States.

Obviously, we cannot hold these people down in their quest for a better life. I don't think we would want to. We cannot simply hold back the tide of rising expectation. But we can win them to the side of freedom if we have enough imagination and sufficient understanding. Let's think for a minute about what makes these people tick.

Most of these people have never had a pair of shoes. Most of them have never seen a doctor. Most of them have never had enough to eat. But, thanks to modern communications, they are learning today what their ancestors never knew—that there are people who do enjoy the blessings of a better life.

These people are convinced that anything would be better than what they have—and they're desperately determined to get it.

This is one of our big problems in Vietnam. For generations, the local government had shown practically no interest in the problems of the average people. To those who do not stop to count the cost, communism promises a quick way out. They do not identify with our values—and they want something better for their children than what they have.

In this situation, it is not enough simply to stress the obvious negative, the evils of communism. It isn't enough just to be against something. It is our supreme task not only to say—but to demonstrate—that their legitimate aspirations can be realized—and better realized—through the framework of political democracy, without the sacrifice of their individual liberties.

This is why we have a Peace Corps. And this is why we have an Alliance for Progress. And this is why the best minds of our Government are engaged in imaginative pursuit of the best ways to win this contest for the minds of men.

These are the big realities. These are the real challenges. Beside them, the little, old, threadbare slogans and the petty, little arguments over which we quarrel and divide become as trifling and meaningless as deserted ant-hills dwarfed in the shadows of four great mountains.

These are the overriding problems which confront the Congress this year and in the years immediately ahead.

On the whole, we have made real progress in building a Great Society. Although the shrill intensity of uninformed criticism is sometimes a bit maddening, I think it is good that we are not satisfied.

We do well to recall that other civilizations, also blessed with a spark of greatness, strutted across the stage of world ascendency only to fade and wane, their bright promise unfulfilled.

The Egypt of the Pharaohs developed learning but not understanding, and was buried in the sands beside the Nile.

Jerusalem the golden, after flourishing under David and Solomon, disintegrated, quarrelled internally, split into two kingdoms, and was never again the same.

The Greeks wrestled mightily with philosophic problems and bequeathed us an intellectual inheritance rarely matched in history. Yet even the splendid aristocracy of Athens grew corrupt, abandoned its idealism, sought forcefully to impose its will upon others, and never recovered from the Peloponnesian wars.

Rome, gifted with lawmakers and warmakers but cursed with a degenerate patrician class, surfeited in the excesses of its own prosperity and became cruel and lustful until it rotted from within.

We still have problems to solve. As old problems disappear, new ones arise to take their place. One proof that a civilization has not reached its zenith and begun to fade is the very fact that its people are still restless and creative and anxious to come to grips with the new phenomena.

Much great work remains to be done. It will take vision to grasp the emerging challenge of education and thus claim the vast promise of the future. It will take self-sacrifice to insure that the basic resources of the earth are preserved intact for future generations.

It will take a willingness to think anew if we are to abolish the last vestiges of racial denial which scatter the seeds for bitter future harvests of anger and turmoil and which rob the nation of many hundreds of millions of dollars each year in unrealized productivity.

It will take insight to find and remove the causes of juvenile unrest and foresight to protect the fundamental rights of privacy against electronic eavesdropping and thus prevent our utopia from becoming an Orwellian nightmare.

The society has many problems—and these should be to us more challenging than discouraging. Nobody ever has suggested that the Great Society would be a sort of nirvana where all problems vanish like vapors. It is not a Garden of Eden, nor will it become so by the work of men. But we do strive to build a better life.

On a street corner in Athens, some 24 centuries ago, Socrates and Glaucon discussed the good society—the City of God. After listening in skeptical disbelief, Glaucon finally uttered this protest: "Socrates, I do not believe that there is such a city of God anywhere on earth."

Socrates made his immortal reply: "Whether such a city exists in heaven or ever will exist on earth, the wise man will live after the manner of that city, having nothing to do with any other, and in so looking upon it, will set his own house in order."

And this, with God's help, is what we seek to do.

WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS NEEDS NEW HAVEN RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE LINK WITH HARTFORD, NEW HAVEN, AND NEW YORK

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the New Haven Railroad last autumn petitioned the Interstate Commerce Commission for permission to abandon all passenger service in the States the railroad serves, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York. I immediately protested to the ICC on this possible loss of passenger service in southern New England, particularly between Springfield, Mass., Hartford, and New Haven, Conn., and New York, and asked for an investigation. In his reply to me on October 15, 1965, ICC Chairman Charles A. Webb said he felt sure the ICC would investigate. Subsequently an ICC investigation was ordered, and hearings were held in various communities served by the New Haven Railroad.

Mr. Speaker, ICC Commissioner William Tucker conducted the hearing in my home city of Springfield, Mass., on January 10. I include with my remarks at this point in the RECORD my letter of protest to Chairman Webb on October 12, 1965, Chairman Webb's reply to me, and my statement to the ICC hearing in Springfield on January 10, 1966:

OCTOBER 12, 1965.

CHARLES A. WEBB,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I respectfully request that the Interstate Commerce Commission investigate the petition of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, FD23832, to discontinue passenger train service under section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act. Under this provision, the Commission must decide, within 4 months, whether to permit the proposed discontinuance of service.

I feel that your Commission should institute such an investigation, during the course of which hearings should be held in the New England communities that will be affected by the New Haven Railroad's petition to discontinue passenger train service, including my home city of Springfield, Mass.

The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad is the fourth largest passenger hauling railroad in the country and services approximately 20 million long-haul passengers annually. Many of these passengers use the New Haven Railroad trains between Springfield, Mass., and New Haven, Conn., and Springfield, Mass., and New York City. Some 70 trains operate to and from these points every week. To allow the New Haven Railroad to discontinue these trains would have and adverse effect on the economy of the Greater Springfield area, a drastic loss in public transport accommodations for those people who must travel to New Haven and New York and return, and would result in a severe blow to the employees of the railroad who face the loss of their jobs and livelihood.

Again I urge the Interstate Commerce Commission to immediately order an investigation on this petition by the New Haven Railroad.

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Member of Congress.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., October 15, 1965.

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLAND: Thank you for your letter of October 12, 1965, in which you discuss the impact of the proceeding in Finance Docket No. 23831, wherein the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., by notice filed October 11, 1965, has proposed the discontinuance of all interstate passenger train operations, effective March 1, 1966. You request the Commission to order an investigation of the matter immediately and conduct public hearings in New England communities.

I agree with your observation that loss of New Haven passenger services could have adverse effects on the greater Springfield area and inflict hardships on thousands of commuters and carrier employees. In view of the impact of the substantial public interest in the proposed discontinuance, I feel certain that the Commission will issue an order in the near future, instituting an investigation of the railroad's proposal and assigning the proceeding for oral hearings at various locations in the New England area.

In deciding whether the New Haven should be permitted to discontinue all or part of its passenger service, I can assure you that we will analyze all aspects of the public interest, including, of course, the needs of commuters and the interests of the communities in which they live. Of course, under the law, those needs will have to be evaluated in the light of the New Haven's deteriorating physical and financial condition and the necessity of preserving its essential freight services.

In order that you may be kept informed of all developments in this proceeding, I have arranged for you to receive copies of all notices, reports and orders that are issued.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES A. WEBB, *Chairman.*

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE EDWARD P. BOLAND AT THE ICC HEARING, SPRINGFIELD, MASS., JANUARY 10, 1966

As I understand the nature of this proceeding, it is to determine whether the public interest allows and requires the removal by New Haven Railroad of all interstate passenger train service. I take no exception to this, of course. It is the job of the Interstate Commerce Commission, as spelled out by law, to make that determination.

But I wonder at the same time whether we should not be asking ourselves also whether the public demands and depends upon—and, I must stress, is now patronizing—rail service connecting western Massachusetts, the major cities of Connecticut, and the great eastern seaboard metropolitan center of New York City.

To me and to the growing towns and industries of western Massachusetts, that is a question of such significance that it overshadows the problems of any particular rail transportation company. And its answer, I submit, is ringingly in the affirmative. We need this rail service: we are using it now, such as it is: we will continue to use it, to support it, and to encourage its growth and improvement.

Let me assure this hearing that I mean in no way to obscure the said facts of life as lived today by the New Haven Railroad. While there may be room for disagreement as to the extent and underlying causes for New Haven's financial plight, there can be no doubt that this company is in painfully poor condition. This is reflected, of course, in its accounts, its debts, and its current status as a trusteed property. More important to many people, it also is reflected in the shamefully low quality, frequency, and dependability of its service.

And those who must see and endure that reflection of New Haven's ills, let us remember, are those who depend upon, patronize, and must continue to have its rail passenger services, shameful though they may be.

If there is little room for debate over New Haven Railroad's general financial health, so also is there no real room to challenge the fact that western Massachusetts' citizens and business are providing an extremely high level of utilization to those of New Haven's passenger trains which serve our area. Were the railroad in acceptable financial condition, I am convinced this very promising level of patronage would inspire its ownership and management to make the kind of capital investment and technological commitment necessary to revamp and totally modernize rail passenger service between western Massachusetts, Hartford, and New York City.

From a service standpoint, therefore, this is hardly the time to talk of fewer trains and lowered capacities. The demands of commerce for rail service between my area and the more southerly eastern cities I have mentioned will increase, not drop, from their already impressive level. To fully exploit those demands and, in doing so, to stimulate added regular passenger business for the rail lines on which we depend, heavy injections of new technology and new service concepts are the order of the day.

Is this utopian? I don't believe so. On the contrary, I think that steps to improve the quality, frequency, and dependability of rail passenger operations serving western Massachusetts are an extremely realistic subject for our consideration and action right now.

I am not, I should stress, talking about drawing board technology. I am talking about on-the-shelf, available programs, and products which can do the job of updating rail service between western Massachusetts and other areas of the Northeastern United States. In tandem with the management systems sciences, the booming field of computerization has given birth over the past decade to new tools for the expeditious, economical, and efficient allocation and distribution of rail cars, both for passenger and freight services. Moreover, it has generated vastly improved methods of cost identification and control which relate directly to the admittedly monumental problems of railroad accounting.

Even more impressive, I think, have been technological gains focusing particularly upon over-the-road rail passenger equipment. United Aircraft Corp., based here in New England, has developed a high-quality unit-type passenger train able to reduce existing transit time between such areas as western Massachusetts and New York City by as much as 50 percent—and, I should add, without any substantial or costly modification of roadbed over which existing rail passenger trains operate. Other companies, I understand, also are working on rail passenger equipment and operating techniques designed to cut traveltime, raise service, and comfort levels, and reduce operating costs to the railroads.

I don't want to imply that these developments are available to the New Haven or any other railroad for free, or at cut prices. They aren't—although I must stress they are not nearly so expensive as to represent unwise investments for a sound railroad management intent upon retaining existing passenger markets and generating new ones. The Federal Government, particularly through the administration's much-publicized northeast corridor rail development program, is making such investments on behalf of the public, and I can't believe that it would do so without the expectation of a return on those investments.

Here in western Massachusetts, the return on a railroad commitment to faster, better, more frequent service will be manifested, first, in retention of existing heavy patronage and, second, in markedly increased utilization over a relatively short period of time. Our people—as I have said before and cannot repeat too often—need, want, and will support such service.

But how do we get from here—from this hearing room, this discontinuance plan, this plight of the New Haven—to the happier state of affairs which I have just projected?

First of all, I think, immediate steps must be taken to reorganize and revitalize the New Haven property, through a program which will guarantee its future ability to make the capital and technological commitments necessary for healthy continuation and expansion of rail passenger service between western Massachusetts and other major areas in the northeastern region of the Nation. While this proceeding may not represent the most desirable forum for achievement of that immediate goal. I believe that it, taken together with the pending merger plan of the Pennsylvania and New York Central Railroads, can provide an appropriate vehicle for reorganization of the New Haven. But regardless whether the New Haven is included in a merged Pennsylvania Railroad-Central rail system or revitalized through some other means. I am firmly convinced that the first order of the day is to put the New Haven back on its feet.

Secondly, I am convinced that rail passenger service connecting western Massachusetts, Hartford, and New York City must be encompassed within the Federal Government's Northeast Corridor project—and I intend to immediately look into the project's intended scope with this in mind. I cannot think of a more critically needed, nor a potentially better patronized service, than the rail passenger operation between these points. It is inconceivable that it should not be included in a redevelopment project aimed at upgrading service on major north-south rail arteries in this region.

This hearing, I understand, is scheduled to conclude late this month in New York City, after which the ICC has less than 5 months to render its decision. The issues are technical and complex, and I know that they will demand deep and comprehensive consideration from your Commission before a final disposition of the matter can be reached. Recognizing the burden thus placed upon your agency, which has my complete confidence in its ability to pass on matters such as these, I will conclude by expressing the hope that none of us—neither railroads, passengers, elected officials or regulators—forgets the basic issue of present and future public transportation need which is overriding in this extremely important case.

Thank you.

ATOMIC AIRCRAFT CARRIER "ENTERPRISE"

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on occasions almost too numerous to count, I and other members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have spoken out in an attempt to bring to the attention of the Congress and the public, and in particular the Secretary of Defense, the unique military advantages which nuclear power can give to U.S. warships.

Only last week, in connection with the keel-laying ceremony for the nuclear submarine U.S.S. *Narwhal*, the first of a new class of submarines, I made some remarks along these lines—remarks which my colleague on the Joint Committee, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Morris], was kind enough to insert in the Record of January 18, 1966, at page 537.

I do not think our words have been lost on the public, and I know they have not been wasted upon the Congress: the strong endorsements for building nuclear-powered surface warships given by the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees attest to that fact.

I will not repeat these words again today. Rather, I will let the record speak for itself. Under unanimous consent I am submitting for publication in the Record an article from the January 24, 1966, edition of the Washington Post concerning the combat effectiveness of the nuclear-propelled aircraft carrier *Enterprise* during its recent activities in the waters of the Tonkin Gulf.

"Enterprise" Captain Praises Craft's Combat Behavior

(By George McArthur)

Subic Bay, Philippines, January 23.—The soft-spoken captain of the world's first battle-tested nuclear warship said with professional pride: "The only way to really test a combat unit is in combat. And we've done it."

The warship is the atomic-powered 85,350-ton aircraft carrier *Enterprise*. The captain is Carolina-born James Lemuel Holloway, 43.

Holloway relaxed Saturday in his carpeted cabin after a 45-day cruise off Vietnam—the first combat patrol ever undertaken by a nuclear-run surface vessel.

"The tons of bombs that have been flown off this ship would stagger you," he said in an interview.

"We went on the line December 2 for the first time. The (conventionally powered) *Kitty Hawk* had posted a record of 131 combat sorties in 1 day. The second day on the line we did 137. A week later we flew 165 combat sorties in 1 day."

PACE FROM THEN ON

That was the pace which the *Enterprise* set from then on.

The executive officer, onetime X-15 test pilot, Capt. Forrest Petersen, made it official in a plan-of-the-day order.

"If you are not working 14 hours a day you are not carrying your load."

Until air attacks against North Vietnam were called off December 24 the *Enterprise* operated in Tonkin Gulf waters off the north coast. Later she had a little more leeway in the open sea off the south coast.

Holloway admitted that operating a nuclear carrier in restricted water for tactical support against Communist guerrillas is not the ideal use of a ship with the punch and mobility of the *Enterprise*.

JOB FOR THE NAVY

However, he said "tactical aid support is required to do the job in Vietnam. The Navy's contribution is required. It is not an ideal situation, but nobody else could make those strikes if the carrier were pulled out."

"Off Vietnam we never canceled a sortie because of weather," he said. "Once we were operating in a weather trough. As the trough would get on top of us we would make a high-speed dash to get on the other side * * *"

How badly the *Enterprise* damaged the Communist side is a classified topic with the captain:

"I can say this, though. It has been substantial. The poststrike photos confirm the fact that we have been highly successful."

THE PROPOSED 200-BEV ACCELERATOR

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have attempted in the last session of this Congress to keep the Members of the House fully up to date with regard to the proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator. I shall attempt to do the same during this session of Congress. On July 9 last year I inserted in the Record a list of the proposals submitted to the AEC for sites for this accelerator. I updated that list with supplemental information placed in the Record of July 26.

Today I can report that while Congress was in recess the Atomic Energy Commission set up site-visiting teams to visit the more than 100 sites which were represented by the 85 proposals that the Commission had sent to the National Academy of Sciences for evaluation. The AEC team visits were completed in December of last year. Reports on these visits have been submitted to the Commission and to the National Academy's site selection committee.

The Commission anticipates that the site-selection committee will make its recommendations to the AEC during the next few weeks. Upon receipt of the National Academy's recommendations, the Commission expects to study the sites recommended and make its selection.

In the special analyses section of the President's fiscal year 1967 budget, there is the following statement:

> Design funds for the 200-BEV machine will be requested once a site has been selected and the design has been authorized.

This section also includes a new estimate for the capital cost of the accelerator with supporting equipment and facilities. That estimate is now $375 million.

Last January the Joint Committee received from the executive branch a report on policy for national action in the field of high-energy physics. In that report the estimated construction cost was $280 million. In June of 1965, the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Berkeley, Calif., the designers of this proposed accelerator, completed their report on the accelerator design and estimated a total capital cost of $348 million, including $40 million for research equipment. As I stated above, the President's fiscal year 1967 budget now shows an estimate of $375 million for this accelerator facility.

I wish to remind my colleagues, as I did last year, that neither the construction of the 200-BEV accelerator nor its architect-engineering design has as yet been authorized by the Congress, or recommended by the Joint Committee. Today I want to further point out that the President's fiscal year 1967 budget makes no request for such authorization. Included in the fiscal year 1967 budget, however, is a request for $2.2 million to continue with advanced design studies of the accelerator and studies necessary to evaluate possible sites.

Within the past several months there have been several suggestions made by physicists about designing this proposed accelerator in such a way as to reduce the overall costs. I have asked the Atomic Energy Commission to study these proposals carefully and to give the Joint Committee a report of its evaluation of these studies prior to the time we consider the AEC's authorization request for the high-energy physics program for fiscal year 1967.

Because of the wide interest in this project, I shall continue to keep the Members of this House informed of all major decisions or activities relating to this proposed accelerator.

DEATH OF DR. HOMI BHABHA IN AIRLINE CRASH

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to express the regret of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy concerning the loss of an outstanding scientist—Dr. Homi Bhabha—in an airline crash yesterday. Dr. Bhabha was a nuclear physicist and the chairman of India's Atomic Energy Commission.

Last October several members of the Joint Committee, including myself, visited Tarapur, India, where two large civilian nuclear power reactors are being built with substantial assistance from the United States. These reactors are expected to make a significant contribution to the Indian economy, and will be subject to safeguards inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

During our visit we had an opportunity to discuss the Indian atomic energy program with Dr. Bhabha, and with his principal assistants. We found them to be dedicated and capable men.

I am sure I speak for the other members of the committee in conveying our sympathy to the Indian Government and to the friends and family of Dr. Bhabha. We also wish the Indian people success in their efforts to develop the atom for peaceful purposes.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. STALBAUM, for 30 minutes, Thursday, January 27.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania), for 30 minutes, January 26, 1966; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 1 hour, February 15, 1966, on the 68th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. IRWIN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. BOLTON.
Mr. QUIE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KREBS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CORMAN.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. OTTINGER.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
Mr. COOLEY.
Mr. STALBAUM.
Mr. GILLIGAN.
Mr. ROGERS of Florida.
Mr. PICKLE.
Mr. WELTNER.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 327. An act to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8210. An act to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act with respect to the European Space Research Organization; and

H.R. 8445. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 26, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1939. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480, agreements concluded during December 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1940. A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting the report of Federal Contributions Program—Equipment and Facilities (reporting symbol OCD–CONG(Q)2) for the quarter ending December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1941. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1942. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the 15th Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 81–874 and Public Law 81–815, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1943. A letter from the General Counsel, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the 24th semiannual report covering the period January 1 to June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 80–402; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1944. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of activities carried on by the Geological Survey, during the reporting period July 1 to December 31, 1965, pursuant to section 2 of the act of September 5, 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1945. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a report of claims settled during the calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 3(e) of the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 10185. A bill amending certain estate tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; without amendment (Rept. No. 1222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1223. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report No. 4 on behavioral sciences and the national security; without amendment (Rept. No. 1224). Referred to the

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report on a special study mission to inspect Foreign Service buildings program in various countries combined with a report on Vietnam and a report on the 11th Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference; without amendment (Rept. No. 1225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 12287. A bill to provide for a decennial census of the physically handicapped; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 12288. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 12289. A bill to require certain vessels operating on the navigable waters of the United States to conform to standards of waste disposal; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 12290. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 12291. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, so as to authorize the establishment and operation of sea grant colleges and programs by initiating and supporting programs of education, training, and research in the marine sciences and a program of advisory services relating to activities in the marine sciences, to facilitate the use of the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf by participants carrying out these programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (by request):

H.R. 12292. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 12293. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that World War II and Korean veterans may elect whether their military service should be credited toward social security benefits or toward civil service retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 12294. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 12295. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 12296. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 12297. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in post offices of the first and second class of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Have you registered to vote?"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 12298. A bill to require that at least 1 percent of the money available to construct Federal buildings shall be used to provide for decoration and beautification in such buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 12299. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 12300. A bill to amend 38 U.S.C. 111 (a) to increase the rate of reimbursement of travel authorized Veterans' Administration beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 12301. A bill to encourage equity investment in new and small business, to relieve unemployment and provide additional revenue to the Federal Government to be applied to debt reduction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 12302. A bill to protect the United States and its citizens against certain criminal conspiracies, to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 12303. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12304. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 12305. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12306. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purpose; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 12307. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System and to increase the mileage in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 12308. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend for an additional year the eligibility of certain areas of substantial unemployment; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.J. Res. 812. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.J. Res. 813. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1972 winter Olympic games in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. Con. Res. 563. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H. Con. Res. 564. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Con. Res. 565. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Con. Res. 566. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Res. 686. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 151; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Res. 687. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 688. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H. Res. 689. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 12309. A bill for the relief of Houston Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 12310. A bill for the relief of Frank Kleinerman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 12311. A bill for the relief of Vincinzo Giambanco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 12312. A bill for the relief of Shigeo Imamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12313. A bill for the relief of Seok Choong Song; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 12314. A bill for the relief of Matilde Marino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 12315. A bill for the relief of Anthony A. Calloway; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 12316. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aiko Azuma Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 12317. A bill for the relief of Dr. Augusto J. Fernandez-Conde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

319. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the president, American Public Health Association, Inc., relative to commendations made by the governing council of the APHA for the advances made through the enactment of health legislation during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Soviet Colonialism in the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in admiration of the more than 10,000 Minnesotans of Ukrainian descent and all U.S. Ukrainians, I wish to note the observance on January 22 of another Ukrainian Independence Day. I believe that American foreign policy should have as its ultimate goal the right of freedom of national determination for people everywhere and this is a policy we are today vigorously defending in southeast Asia. Unfortunately, there are few people on the globe more deserving of this right, or who have been more consistently deprived of it, than the Ukrainians.

The rich Ukrainian lands have been a prize for conquerors for many centuries, but the Ukrainian people have always dreamed of independence and the right to mold their own destiny.

This desire has never seemed more remote than under the present Ukrainian condition, which sees the Ukraine as a state entirely subservient to the Soviet Union. Article 67 of the Soviet Constitution reads:

> The decisions and decrees of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. are binding for the whole territory of the U.S.S.R.

This does not prevent Soviet propagandists from speaking of the Ukraine as "the sovereign and independent Ukrainian SSR," nor does it impede the Soviets from gaining an extra seat in the United Nations by exploiting the myth of Ukrainian independence.

After the Russian revolution of 1917, the Ukrainian people formed a revolutionary parliament in Kiev, declaring independence. In 1918, the Ukrainians fought the Red Army for independence. Having defeated the Red Army, it had to, in turn, fight the White Army which was attempting to reinstate the czarist regime. The Ukrainians were defeated, but the White Russians fell, in turn, to the Red Army. In 1920, the Ukrainian People's Republic attempted to liberate the Ukraine from Bolshevism with the aid of Poland, only to again be divided between Russia, Poland, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia. At the end of World War II, the entire Ukrainian region ended up in the Soviet Union.

The Ukraine is, of course, of great economic importance to the Soviet Union. The Ukraine provides Moscow with some 55 percent of its iron ore, 52 percent of its pig iron, 40 percent of its steel, 41 percent of its rolled ferrous metal, 34 percent of its coal, and 61 percent of its sugar. It is the second largest producer in the Soviet Union of meat, milk, and grain.

To lose this economic wealth would be a serious blow to Moscow's world ambitions. But those who may be tempted to believe Soviet charges of colonialism against the West, which has given up the vast bulk of its colonial holdings, should also remember the sad fate of the Ukrainians under the yoke of Russian colonialism.

Aiding Leukemia-Stricken American Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to report that our youth in Vietnam have no corner on dedication and service. A recent example of this took place in my district, where a 16-year-old schoolgirl from Pacoima spearheaded an effort to organize the Nation's first junior chapter of a nationwide group called Aiding Leukemia-Stricken American Children (ALSAC). This charitable organization—with chapters in all major U.S. cities—collects funds annually through a teenagers march and turns them over to the famed St. Jude Hospital in Memphis, Tenn., where important research work into such diseases as leukemia is going on constantly.

The young lady in question is Donna Eubank, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence B. Eubank, and a student at Polytechnic High School. For 2 years Donna worked as a member, then cochairman and finally as chairman of the Teen-Agers March for ALSAC in the community of Pacoima. Her efforts in the 1965 campaign were so effective that Pacoima, not the richest nor the largest community in my district, led all the others in the amount of contributions, roughly one-sixth of the total. Television star Danny Thomas, whose work for St. Jude Hospital is well-known, paid Donna and her fellow workers a resounding and deserved tribute after this year's drive.

Now Donna is well on her way to having the Nation's first junior ALSAC chapter organized and operating.

Through this new youth-oriented organization, Donna believes she and her fellow ALSAC volunteers can involve still more teenagers, and keep them active and motivated throughout the year, rather than just during the teenagers' march every October. In her work, of course, she has had the help of others, and she took time out recently to salute some of these people at a public awards ceremony in Pacoima. There, certificates of merit and honorary membership in ALSAC were presented to community leaders of such groups as the chamber of commerce and the local Moose Lodge, among others.

In the year ahead, the Pacoima junior ALSAC chapter will be holding various teenage activities—dances, talent shows, and cookouts—and Donna's fertile brain is at work on setting up a teen club somewhere in the Pacoima area to attract still more ALSAC volunteers. In some respects, this long-range challenge is even more difficult than the organizational chores, but from what we have seen of Donna Eubank, no challenge is too great.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to address myself to a topic which is of deep concern to me. On January 22, Americans of Ukrainian descent in my State celebrated the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainians proclaimed their independence at the ancient city of Kiev. Within 3 years Ukrainian independence had been crushed by the heavy hand of Soviet tyranny, but the spirit which inspired the patriots of 1918 lives on in the hearts of the Ukrainian people. They have not forgotten their brief taste of freedom.

Today I should like to discuss a very early period of Ukrainian history. From the 9th to the 13th century the Ukraine was an outpost of Byzantine civilization. The Ukrainian people's pride in this period has contributed to their sense of national identity and was one of the factors which has enabled them to maintain their independent spirit through centuries of foreign domination. Herodotus described in detail the early history of what is now the Ukraine, and Byzantine historians traced the history of the various invading tribes. In the ninth century a strong figure organized the separate clans into a strong state, with its capital at Kiev. By this time the people in this area were already speaking a Slavic language which has been described as ancient Ukrainian.

By the end of the 10th century the country had been converted to Christianity and had accepted the main outlines of Byzantine culture. At a time when most of Europe was engulfed in the Dark Ages, Kiev was a city of learning and enlightenment. Under Yaroslav the Wise, who ruled from 1036 to 1054 schools and libraries were established and scholars and artists were encouraged. Yaroslav also established a code of laws. In form, it was patterned after the Byzantine law, but in content it summarized what Yaroslav considered to be the best rights and procedures which had been established by custom. With Byzantine help the great Cathedral of St. Sophia was constructed. Kiev became a meeting place for merchants from all over the civilized world. Despite Kiev's close ties to Byzantium, the Kievan rulers began to establish links with the rest of the world also. Dynastic ties, so important in those days, were made with England, France, and Norway.

The Kievan period is only a small part of the stirring history of the Ukrainians. The Ukrainian people have reason to be proud on their national independence day. We all fervently hope that the Ukrainians may someday regain their freedom.

World War on Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 19 I introduced in the House H.R. 12152, a bill to open the way for a world war on hunger, through extension and expansion of America's food-for-peace program.

There has been a broad and positive public response to this proposal. This interest affirms the humanitarian instincts and the great heart of the American people. I see in this response a feeling that this is a war in which we all may join, in the interest of suffering humanity and of world peace.

The legislation I have introduced embraces thoughts advanced on December 9 in Washington at the organization meeting of the Committee on the World Food Crisis. It was my privilege to speak at this meeting. I am gratified and encouraged by the interest in my remarks at that time. In response to this interest, Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I am inserting these remarks in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE THE ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS, IN WASHINGTON, DECEMBER 9, 1965

Mr. Chairman, there are two magic words in all the languages of this world, food and raiment.

The absolute necessity, the ultimate prerequisite, to peace in the world is food for the hungry and clothing for the naked.

I am dogmatic in this conviction. I am certain that each of you gathered here shares this persuasion. Our position is axiomatic. Then let us proceed from where we are. Let us here explore the opportunity, the challenge, before these United States—through its ingenious farmers, its fertile fields, and its God-loving millions of people—to bring peace to this troubled world.

You people, as I understand you, are gathered here today in a dedication to a greater deployment of our food and fiber abundance to do battle against the agonies of mankind.

You have come here, and I am here, drawn by a conviction that bread and not bullets will be the last in the train of human progression and consequences, as peoples finally make up their minds to live together in peace.

You are here and I am here to reexamine the philosophy and the policies that now guide us. We are here together to offer and to employ whatever talents we may possess to explore and to find the way to unleash the abundance of our agriculture, as a means to a peaceful world.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is the destiny of this country to attack starvation around the world. I feel that this mission is so urgent, its rewards to all mankind so promising, that nobody can head it off.

Anyone who looks closely at the food and population situation today must recognize that the trend of world hunger rises on the horizon like a vast, engulfing storm. Already the winds are howling. Already the misery is felt by over 1 billion people. On this very day 10,000 men, women and children around the world will die of starvation.

In the last 12 years, under Public Law 480—the Food for Peace Act—we have fed millions of people in many nations. This has been a demonstration of the great heart of America. Thousands, perhaps millions, of people are alive today because we have had food to share.

We have done this while restricting the production of our farms. It was necessary to do this, to maintain restraints upon the output of our agriculture, because we have not yet developed another means to prevent our farmers from producing themselves into abject bankruptcy and chaos.

Mr. Chairman, we are here today asking if there isn't a different and a better way. I will say that this Nation faces a decision on one of two courses:

1. Shall we further restrict the production of our farms in programs of controlled abundance in America, sharing only what we cannot use?

2. Shall we loosen the cords that now bind our agriculture, and then set upon a vastly expanded attack on starvation around the world—in programs aimed ultimately at developing the potentials for food sufficiency in those areas where hunger now is rampant?

Of course the great heart of America votes for a worldwide war on hunger.

But we who are gathered here know that the answer is not simple. We know that there must be limits upon the costs of such an undertaking. We know the great difficulty in delivering food to starving people in remote areas of the world where there are virtually no docking facilities, no storage accommodations, no refrigeration, virtually no transportation, and no system of distribution.

While I am here in a posture of advocacy, where hungry people are concerned, I must very carefully stress that it would not be possible to alleviate hunger in the world at one fell swoop. Moreover, as vast as is our potential to produce food and fiber, we could not with all our resources reach all who hunger.

Therefore, we can only promise to attack starvation, to the limits of our ingenuity—in a community of generosity among free peoples.

It would be folly here even to suggest that we immediately or summarily remove the restraints upon our outpourings of food and fiber abundance. Whatever course we follow must be orderly, else we might wreck our own farm economy, and fail in any new mission we may commend and command.

And, of course, the ultimate decisions must come from the Executive and the Congress of the United States.

There are momentous aspects to be considered.

The Communist world can offer the people of the world only starvation and slavery.

We here are talking in terms of food and freedom. How then will the masses of the world respond?

I think I can venture this observation: If Russia and China had been able to match the ingenuity of our agriculture, and they, and not us, had controlled the sources of abundance of food and fiber, the larger part of the world long since may have swung into the Communist fold, for starving people may often exchange their liberty for food in their stomachs.

In any enlargement of our assault upon starvation, there is the consideration of the effect upon our own farmers and, moreover, upon the total economy of the Nation.

I will say that I fear further restraints upon our agriculture.

It is well known that I did not lend any enthusiasm—to put it mildly—to the new cropland adjustment program in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. The Government is authorized in this new program to retire 40 million acres of cropland over the next 10 years, further constricting our agricultural plant at great expense.

On November 5, I wrote the President:

"In my view, Mr. President, this whole concept of buying millions of acres of farmland out of production is wrong. This same program was tried by the Eisenhower administration, through the old Soil Bank of the 1950's, and it caused such turmoil in rural America it was abandoned by the administration then in power and by the Congress.

"It is wrong because it will drive thousands upon thousands of people off the farms, and out of our rural communities, into our overcrowded cities.

"It is wrong because it concedes and admits defeat in the purpose of using our great food and fiber productive potential to aid free world people in their immediate needs and in the development of their own self-sufficient economy.

"The great opportunity now confronting us is to reverse the direction of all prior farm programs, which have repressed production to avoid surpluses, and to set upon a new course of vast exportation of food and fiber as the best instrument of our own security, the well-being of rural America, and for banishing hunger from the free world.

"The world cries out for food and fiber.

"Our farmers want to produce. They want to plant more acres, not fewer and fewer acres. Their business is to produce food to feed people and fiber to clothe people.

"There are now underway studies by private groups and persons which may show and prove that the billions now used to reduce the production of our fields may be better spent in an imaginative program freeing up our agricultural productive resources, buying off the abundance and using, as an instrument of foreign policy, the food and fiber we produce beyond our needs at home and for dollar sales in our normal export markets.

"But such studies and the work of the new Commission on Food and Fiber may be worthless if the cropland adjustment program is employed now to take millions of acres of land out of production on long-contract arrangements, and our rural areas thus are further depopulated."

I then respectfully urged the President to cause a suspension of the operation of the new cropland adjustment program until the Congress, with the Department of Agriculture cooperating, can explore new ways that our abundance can be delivered to ill-fed and ill-clothed free world nations, so that we may loosen the reins upon our agriculture instead of drawing them tighter.

I was disappointed that the President, in his response to me, did not see fit to accept my suggestion regarding the suspension of the cropland adjustment program.

However, I have informed the President that it is my intention, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to call public hearings early in 1966 to explore the possibilities of developing a new program dedicated to expanding the use of our agricultural abundance in needy nations of the free world.

While we must caution again and again that this meeting, nor no one of us gathered here, can commit this country to any course or to any policy, in advance of determinations by the Congress, still it is exciting and thrilling to me, as I am sure it is to each of you, to imagine what would happen in this world around us if, indeed, we can find the practical means to bring to bear the full force of our agriculture, and our agricultural know-how, in mankind's struggle against hunger and for freedom.

It would bring a new revolution to our agriculture and in world agriculture.

I can see in our own country a dead halt to the flight of our people from the land. I can see a new era of security for our farm families. I can see prosperity in rural America. I can see Main Street America flourishing again.

Mr. Chairman, there will be happy and peaceful days, years and centuries ahead, if we now can find the way. I commend each of those gathered here for his interest in and devotion to the aspirations, perhaps the dreams, that have brought us togther.

And I leave you with this final word, as a summary of my own feeling:

Food and fiber are weapons of peace. These weapons in our hands must be unsheathed.

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey at the First Annual Public Affairs Conference, Atlanta, Ga., November 19, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, on November 19, 1965, Vice President Hubert Humphrey spoke to 5,000 high school honor students in Atlanta, Ga. The occasion was the first annual public affairs conference, and his speech was a stirring declaration of the future responsibilities and challenges awaiting our young people. It is with great pleasure that I attach his speech to my remarks at this point in the Record:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, FIRST ANNUAL PUBLIC AFFAIRS CONFERENCE, ATLANTA, GA., NOVEMBER 19, 1965

I always welcome the opportunity to speak to young people.

President Truman has often said that young people are the best audiences. They listen intently—weighing each word with a scholarly mixture of skepticism and objectivity—and then ask questions that make you wish you had stayed in Washington.

And he is right.

My pleasure is enhanced by meeting with you in Atlanta—this bustling, growing, active city * * * this city filled with a spirit of faith in itself and in the future.

This pause today with young people is truly the pause that refreshes.

A young friend of mine, who only a few years ago was also a high school student in a southern city, told me recently of the visit he made this summer to his college reunion.

He found his college to be, on the surface at least, unchanged.

The one change that caught his eye was the bulletin boards.

The bulletin boards were filled with evidence of concern and activity which had not existed only a few years before.

There were placards describing the life of a Peace Corps volunteer.

There were brochures explaining how students could devote several hours each week to working in the city's slums.

There were organizational brochures for students' political groups ranging across the whole spectrum of the American political scene.

And there were copies of letters from classmates or recent graduates who had spent their summer working for causes in which they believed—on an Indian reservation in Oklahoma, or a village in Peru, or a town in Mississippi.

My young friend believed, and I believe, that the symbol of your generation of Americans is the bulletin board—filled with evidence of concern and commitment which young people today feel, and understand, and act upon.

What is it that has motivated young people to be interested in and concerned about their country, their world, and their future?

Today let us examine some of the challenges ahead.

We are challenged first and foremost by the need to insure that history's mightiest instruments of destruction will never be used. We are challenged to pursue the cause of a just and enduring peace.

We are challenged by our need to comprehend and to master the wonders of science and technology.

Of all the scientists who ever lived in all the history of mankind, 95 percent are now living and working. We must channel scientific revolution toward the creation of a better life for ourselves and for our children.

We are challenged by the vision expressed by our President: "An America in which no young person, whatever the circumstances, shall reach the age of 21 without the health, education, and skills that will give him an opportunity to be an effective citizen and a self-supporting individual."

We are challenged to lift the yoke of poverty from one-fifth of our fellow citizens * * * to reverse that tragic equation which has too often decreed that poor shall beget poor and ignorance shall beget misery.

Nowhere is that equation more accurate, or its consequences more devastating, than in our own American Southland where almost one-half the families live below the poverty line.

What a burden this is on the South—in terms of welfare costs, of lost productivity, of stress on your society.

We are challenged to make our cities decent places in which to live and learn, to work and play.

And this is a challenge which means as much to you here in Atlanta as to any people in all the world—for Atlanta is a city which is still young enough to avoid the mistakes which have fouled the atmosphere and shattered the hopes of millions of urban dwellers across our land.

And, finally, we are challenged to make good the promise of our Constitution—to insure that all Americans shall, as citizens, have equal opportunity to enjoy the blessings of our Republic.

These, then, are the challenges. We as Americans can share a sense of pride in what we are doing to meet them. You know of the record of this remarkable 89th Congress.

This Congress has passed laws which build a base for our American future: laws for better education, better housing, better medical care, laws to extend opportunity to people and places bypassed by opportunity.

Most of those laws directly benefit the American younger generation, as well they should.

But, as the late President Kennedy so often said, "You must ask not what your country can do for you—you must ask what you can do for your country."

Atlanta's great editor, Ralph McGill, recently wrote: "Today's generation of young people is our best. It is better educated, more poised, possesses superior information, and is in general more determined to commit itself to beliefs and principle."

He was right. Here and in the world, young men and women are showing what this generation of Americans can do:

More than 10,000 young volunteers—including 62 from the State of Georgia—are now serving in the Peace Corps. Another 3,000 have already returned after tours of duty. But most significant, more than 100,000 have asked to take part in the bold and imaginative experiment.

When VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America—the domestic Peace Corps) was launched, more than 3,000 inquiries were received from young people on the first day of business.

No fewer than one-quarter of the members of our armed services are under 20 years old.

Specifically, what can you do for your community and your country?

You can, first of all, stay in school and finish school.

The young person who does not educate himself to the limit of his ability dissipates his most precious possession.

Unemployment among younger workers is already three times as high as among older workers.

A diploma is the key to a job. Without it you may find the door of opportunity locked.

You will hear that success is simply a matter of being in the right place at the right time—or of knowing the right people. Do not believe it.

As Louis Pasteur said, "Chance favors the prepared mind."

You make your opportunities.

Today—as you never will again—you have a priceless chance to prepare your mind, to seize opportunity.

You can be aware of what is happening in the world—and this public affairs conference is a tribute not only to the foresight of your teachers and principals but also to your own interest in what is happening around you. And as you enhance your awareness of the great issues of our time, exercise your precious right to vote.

More than half the electorate today is under 35. By next year half of the population will be under 25 years of age. Work and vote for the candidates and the party you believe in. Improve the quality of politics.

You should give serious consideration to the opportunities for service which can be afforded best by public office. I do not mean to imply that only through elective or appointive office can you make your contribution to our progress as a civilization. As Oliver Wendell Holmes said: "Every calling is great when greatly pursued."

For American business, labor and agriculture need the vitality, the idealism and the dedication of young men and women. They welcome the spirit of adventure, and enterprise so characteristic of youth.

Holmes also said, "As life is action and passion, it is required of a man that he should share the passion and action of his time, at peril of being judged not to have lived."

No State offers a better example of the opportunities for young people in public service than your own Georgia. For this is the State that produced Richard Russell—elected Governor of Georgia at 34, the youngest Member of the U.S. Senate at 35, as was Herman Talmadge later. This is the State that produced your young Governor Sanders. This is the State which produced such farseeing men as Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Walter George, Carl Vinson, and Gen. Lucius Clay, who entered public life as young men.

There is a proud tradition of service in Georgia—and you would do well to turn your thoughts toward a role in carrying forward that tradition.

Finally, you should not put off until middle age those tasks which call for the zest and vigor of youth.

The story is told that Pericles of ancient Greece in his later years came across a young lawyer of Athens who was deeply involved in public affairs.

Pericles chastised the young man for being too bold and too brash—for concerning himself with things better left to older men.

Pericles said: "Of course, I understand, for I, too, was overeager in my youth. But now that I am older I have learned better. Take my advice and do not become so involved."

To which the young man replied: "I regret I did not have the privilege of knowing you when you were at your best."

In the years immediately ahead you will be at your best. So do become involved—for only by becoming involved in the needs and aspirations of others, can you truly satisfy your own inner needs and aspirations. And I hope you will become involved right here in your own community.

It was after the Civil War that Atlanta became the symbol of the new South. Rising like a phoenix from the ashes of that tragic war, Atlanta—under the Constitution's editor Henry Grady and others—came to epitomize the spirit of that new South.

Atlantans took bold action, recognizing the urgent need to reestablish relationships with the rest of the Nation, to restore business, to build a more stable future for young people.

Today, as then, Atlanta symbolizes the new South. This is a city on the move—and America knows it.

In your hands lies Atlanta's future, and the future of America.

Here in the South there lies before you the immediate task of extending opportunity and defeating poverty—of building a society equal and not separate.

And in this task you are joined by your President and the citizens of this Nation—a Nation unified in its belief that all people and places in America shall be full partners in our American tomorrow.

All of us bear responsibility for those left behind. It is the fault of no one section of the country, or political party.

And all of us bear responsibility for righting past wrongs, for practicing what we preach in this country.

In America today we seek to create a great society: a society of opportunity, and justice, and human dignity where each child can step forth into life with his eyes up and on the stars.

You young people, coming of age in this community, have the chance to make this dream come true.

I know of no place on earth where men more love their country than in the South.

More than once have I heard one of my colleagues in the U.S. Senate say: "I love the South."

And he has meant: I love the soil, I love my family, I love the people, I love the spirit of the place that bore me. I love a sense of duty and responsibility. I love men and women who hold their heads high in adversity and face tomorrow with determination. I love my country.

It is in this spirit that I charge you with responsibility for tomorrow.

May you work toward the goal expressed a generation ago by the author Thomas Wolfe:

"To every man his chance, to every man regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him—this is the promise of America."

Speech by Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, Before Economic Club of Detroit, Mich., January 24, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by the Honorable John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce, at the Economic Club of Detroit, Mich., on January 24, 1966.

The speech follows:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, JOHN T. CONNOR, AT THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF DETROIT, DETROIT, MICH., JANUARY 24, 1966

The United States has many capitals. Washington is our political capital; New York City our financial capital; and Detroit is the capital of the automobile industry—an industry that epitomizes the bountiful efficiency and continuing progress of our free enterprise economy.

Right at the outset I want to say that Washingtonians are the first to admit that better automobiles can be made in Detroit than in Washington. So today in Detroit I plan to talk mostly about the automobile industry, and the far-reaching ramifications it has for all of us, whatever our pursuits.

The motor vehicle has done more than lift the ceiling on our economic statistics. It has revolutionized the style and quality of American life.

The very success of the industry has given rise to challenges which would not exist if Americans had not taken the automobile to heart so naturally and so completely. Its success, however, has also given you the strength and resources to meet these challenges. I would like to look at both sides of the coin with you, against the backdrop of a broader, national challenge which faces all of American business today.

In the first year of automobile production in this country, 65 years ago, the industry turned out a little more than 4,000 units, valued at about $5 million. Last year more than 11 million units were produced, with a value of $21 billion—an all time record. Those two sentences tell the greatest industrial success story of the century.

The auto industry has had an important and far-reaching effect on the pattern of employment throughout the entire Nation. More than three-quarters of a million businesses are based on the automobile. One out of every seven wage earners is dependent upon the industry in one way or another.

Of tremendous significance to all of us is the fact that the automobile industry is the largest single employer in the United States—with around 700,000 persons. Only government and wholesale and retail trade employ more people. Autos use up half of our petroleum output, three-fifths of the rubber, more than half the lead, more than one-fifth of the steel, one-third of the zinc, and about 15 percent of the aluminum, copper, and nickel.

But these facts and figures suggest only one aspect of the industry's contribution to our economic life.

The principles of factory efficiency developed in the auto industry have been widely copied in other areas. The assembly line was first placed in effective operation in the auto industry. The industry pioneered in developing intercompany technical standards, as well as cost control and management techniques. Decentralized operations and responsibilities—with coordinated control, now an accepted concept in business management, were pioneered within the motorcar industry.

Detroit has played an important role in upgrading the skills of our labor force. Today, the industry is making a contribution toward the solution of one of our major problems—the wider employment of Negroes at all levels—blue collar and white collar, as well as management.

The auto industry's place in our economy is dramatically illustrated by a major analytical tool recently put into use by the Commerce Department. This is input-output analysis, which enables us to measure the effects of a given level of output in one industry on all related industries.

The production of $1 billion worth of automobiles, for example, requires nearly $203 million from the iron and steel industry, $51 million from nonferrous metals, $48 million from the rubber industry, $16½ million from the glass and glass products industry, and more than $20 million from finance and insurance. And there are many other industries which similarly benefit from auto sales.

In the immediate future—1968 or 1969—America will be traveling 1 trillion vehicle miles a year, and we will be producing 12 million trucks and cars. The prospects are that this enormous output of motor vehicles will require 22 million tons of steel, 1,200,000 pounds of aluminum, 1 million bales of cotton, 1,600,000 tons of rubber. And we will be consuming more than 80 billion gallons of gasoline.

Motor transportation has a massive stimulating effect on all segments of economic activity. Our economy literally moves on wheels, the wheels of Detroit.

And this economic activity involves thousands of small entrepreneurs who supply parts, products, and services to be the manufacturers and the motoring public. Included within the automobile-based segment of the economy are more than 2,000 manufacturers of vehicles or equipment who employ less than 250 workers. There are almost 50,000 individual repair shops with less than 8 employees, more than 100,000 service stations with less than 4 workers. So the economic benefits of motor transportation are widely dispersed throughout the country.

But what does the far future hold for the auto industry? The number of licensed drivers is expected to double by the year 2000. Automobile production will almost have to double between now and then even if we only maintain the present ratio of automobiles to licensed drivers. But we will probably better this record. Increases in per capita income and in population, brighten the future of the industry. We estimate that annual production will have to reach 20 million passenger cars to meet the demands of the year 2000.

The motor vehicle industry also has a great potential for growth in the developing countries. Transportation facilities are a necessary prerequisite for the achievement of even the first steps of economic development. Without transportation, little can be done to bring land into production, build industries, provide necessary channels between factory, farm, and markets, and translate the wealth of forests and mines from potential into reality.

We estimate that in Latin America per capita GNP will more than double by the year 2000. Population there is expected nearly to triple. These gains may mean registrations of about 26 million cars by the end of this century, compared with the current level of 3 million cars.

The prominent international position of the auto industry gives it a key role in President Johnson's voluntary program to improve the balance of payments. The postwar years have witnessed an extraordinary expansion in the foreign operations of your industry. The basic pattern has been the creation of major manufacturing facilities abroad rather than any substantial expansion of exports from the United States. Taking the American transportation equipment industry as a whole, the book value of foreign affiliates increased from about half a billion dollars in 1950 to almost $3½ billion in 1964. There were correspondingly large increases in the earnings of these affiliates and in their remitted profits.

I am very pleased to be able to report that the auto manufacturers rank with the top performers among participants in the 1965 balance-of-payments program. From recently submitted estimates, it appears that the auto firms registered an improvement in 1965 of more than 20 percent over their 1964 contributions to the U.S. balance of payments. This is more than twice the percentage improvement expected for all of the participating companies collectively.

In fact, preliminary data indicate that the auto companies contributed about one-fourth of the total improvement of $1.3 billion expected under the 1965 voluntary program. This was a response to our country's need of which the automobile industry can be deservedly proud. The overall increase in contributions by the motor vehicle companies was accomplished mainly through increased exports and through reductions in capital outflows. The major firms made sizable increases in their foreign borrowings so as to carry out foreign investment schedules while restricting the outflow of U.S. funds.

Our efforts to improve the balance of payments naturally led us to examine closely our export position and to strive for ways in which exports can be expanded. The motor vehicle industry has managed to expand exports in the face of more than a normal amount of difficulties. Its products must contend not only with all of the common hinderances to foreign trade and operations but they must cope, in addition, with others specifically aimed at that industry. Sales of American automobiles abroad have long been inhibited by internal taxes of various forms that effectively discriminate against the U.S.-built car. Customs duties many times larger than the U.S. duty are a major deterrent to our exports. The Common Market countries and the United Kingdom have a duty rate of 22 percent compared to the U.S. import duty of only 6½ percent.

These factors create a sharp difference between the retail price of a U.S. car in this country and the price tag it carries in foreign markets. For example, one particular car with standard equipment has a suggested retail price in the United States of just under $3,000. This same car has a list price of over $7,000 in France, over $6,000 in Austria, over $5,000 in Belgium, over $6,000 in Italy. Obviously, the inflation of medium-priced American cars to such high values in other countries is a severe deterrent to exports of these cars.

Despite these difficulties, however, exports by the industry increased $300 million between 1957 and 1964. However, the inhibiting effect of the barriers, and the incentives these barriers provide for production overseas, can be seen by the remarkable performance of sales from foreign production facilities. During the same period, sales from foreign plants increased more than 10 times as much as exports.

We in Government are constantly pressing for removal of unjustified import restrictions and for equitable tax treatment where discrimination against U.S. products is involved. In the Kennedy round negotiations, we are seeking tariff concessions on automobiles. We are also seeking more equitable tax treatment in the application of road taxes of certain European countries.

We are pressing the Japanese to modify the commodity tax on automobiles, which amounts to 40 percent of most U.S. vehicles and either 20 or 30 percent on most other nations' vehicles.

A major recent accomplishment in the ground rules governing international trade was the recently enacted Canadian-American agreement which provides for free trade in original motor vehicle equipment between the two countries. This agreement promises to benefit both countries significantly and is a milestone on the road toward freer trade between Canada and the United States.

What we see then, as we survey the automobile industry in modern America, is a dynamic center of strength in our economy, based on a technological invention that has had widespread social, cultural, educational, political, and many other consequences in the lives of every citizen. America literally drove into a position of world leadership during the 20th century on the wheels of the motor vehicle.

America has become a motorized Nation. We have taken automobile products into every corner of the country, into every facet of our lives. We have become dependent upon automobiles for the essentials of life, as well as for the pleasures and diversions of life. Our economic growth is inextricably linked with the healthy growth of the automobile industry. The integration of cars into our daily lives, however, because it has been so widespread, has been accompanied by some problems and challenges which are now attracting national attention.

Highway safety, the beauty of our countryside, a clean environment, the role of private cars in urban transportation, these subjects are on the current agenda of social observers, economists, government and professional leaders, and a host of other groups who are concerned about the nature and direction of national life. All too often, the automobile is seen as the one and only cause of many of our problems. This is a gross oversimplification.

But the automobile does play a part in these problems, and the automobile industry has a responsibility to help meet the challenges posed by these problems. Fortunately, the intellectual and material resources which have brought the industry to a position of great prominence in national life will serve it well as it prepares to meet these challenges.

We have come a long way, in highway safety, from the situation that existed decades ago. Mile for mile, the fatality rate for highway travel in this country is half the rate of Western Europe and one-fourth the rate of Japan. We take no comfort from these statistics, however, and we are determined to do better in the future.

There are a number of actions at the Federal level of Government which reflect mounting national concern with the problem of highway safety. Beginning in 1968, for example, each state will be required to have a highway safety program which meets uniform Federal standards.

Two years ago, President Johnson spurred a special effort to eliminate danger traps along older Federal-aid highways. The State of Virginia, to cite just one example, reduced accidents 66 percent under this spot improvement program. So we know that many lives and much loss can be saved by engineering.

The Interstate Highway System itself represents a significant advance in the area of highway safety. The fatality rate on the Interstate System is 2.8 per 100 million vehicles miles, compared with a rate of 9.7 on other roads, truly a remarkable example of what can be achieved.

As you know, there has been a great stir of interest and action on highway safety by both Houses of Congress in the past year and this activity will no doubt accelerate during the coming session, highlighted by President Johnson's proposed Highway Safety Act of 1966.

One of the most encouraging developments, in my view, is the recent announcement by the University of Michigan that a highway safety research institute will be established, supported by the automobile industry. The significance of this announcement arises, not so much from the substantial amount of funds involved, nor from the research program which will be carried out, but rather as one more dramatic example of a responsible industry helping to meet the challenge of highway safety. And the special public information program initiated recently on all phases of automobile driving safety by a leading automobile manufacturer certainly deserves a special word of commendation.

In the field of landscape beauty, Government has responded with the Highway Beautification Act, controlling billboards and junkyards along highways that benefit from Federal aid. I note, with satisfaction, that one of the leaders in the automobile industry has decided to buy the equivalent of a quarter of a million junked cars each year, in the form of fragmatized steel. Here is a combination of public service and technological ingenuity at its very best.

Maintaining a clean environment is becoming an increasingly difficult problem in our urban and highly industrialized society. There are may causes of air pollution. There are many essential requirements in modern life, however, where we have had to balance a certain level of pollution against other social objectives and needs.

It has been gratifying to me to note that industry's voluntary efforts to solve the air pollution problem, with respect to motor vehicles, have predated the issuance of Federal regulations in this area.

Finally, the role of the individual automobile in our total transportation picture has come under close and sometimes critical scrutiny in recent months. The automobile is attacked, defended, and interpreted in terms of land use, economics, city planning, cost-benefits, mass transit, and even Freudian psychology.

I don't pretend to be an expert in any of those areas, but one thing is clear—transportation in this country will increasingly be approached from a total systems point of view. This trend is clearly reflected in President Johnson's announced intention to create a Cabinet level Department of Transportation. Thus, more than ever, the automobile industry has a responsibility to help define the role of private motor vehicles in the national transportation picture.

All of the challenges I have mentioned call for resolute programs of action by our most important industry. But there is an additional element which must not be ignored. To the extent that the automobile industry exercises responsible leadership in matters of public concern, there will be correspondingly less pressure for governmental action. The judgment, in matters such as these, is ultimately based on public confidence—confidence among the general public that the industry is acting in a responsible manner.

So I would encourage those of you interested in this industry, as you shoulder your public service responsibilities, to make your story known. In this less than perfect world, it is not enough merely to do the right thing. People must know that you are doing the right thing. A solid bond of confidence between the public and the automobile industry would help provide the foundation to solve every problem I have mentioned today.

It is important to recognize that in our complex, interdependent society, business shares mutual interests not only with the public, but also with Government. Every Government activity, every Government program depends for its support on the strength and vitality of the economy. This situation requires a spirit of close cooperation between the two parties.

Recognizing this fact, business and Government in recent years have demonstrated genuine effort and good faith in making this partnership work. And the record of the past 5 years proves beyond doubt that the partnership has worked for the benefit of everyone: business, labor, Government, and the general public.

Five years ago the Nation was in the depths of a recession. Gross national product was about $500 billion. Corporate profits were $45 billion. Personal income was about $400 billion. Five and one-half million Americans were out of work.

Today, we are in the 59th month of uninterrupted economic growth. Gross national product last year was more than $675 billion. Corporate profits were more than $73 billion. Personal income was over $530 billion. Unemployment was down to less than 2.9 million. Eight million new jobs have been added to the economy in the 5-year period. And 1966 looks just as good.

I might point out that during this same period, the auto industry put together 4 consecutive good years, a feat never before accomplished.

What happened to cause this dramatic upturn in the economic life of the Nation? There is no single simple explanation. An increasingly skilled labor force was a factor. So were the vitality and initiative of business management. Government did its part, through sound fiscal and monetary policies. Put these things all together and they spell cooperation. In fact the cooperation has worked so well that our problem today is not how to get the economy out of a recession, but how to handle unparalleled growth and record prosperity with wisdom and finesse.

The natural pressures generated in any expanding economy have been complicated, in our case, by the greatly increased military requirements arising from the situation in Vietnam. The gap between our potential output and our actual output has been narrowing in recent months. As the gap narrows, the challenge facing us is: Can we maintain a balanced prosperity? There is no question about our ability to produce all the goods and services the Nation requires. The problem is to do this without disruptions caused by labor and material shortages, and to do the job without inflationary pressures on wages and prices.

In my view, we can meet these challenges. We can; that is, if business, labor, and Government continue to work together. The competing and sometimes conflicting demands of all groups in our society, at a time such as this, ultimately come into focus at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D.C. What does the situation look like from the White House? Put yourselves, for a moment, in the place of the man who occupies that seat, President Lyndon B. Johnson.

What are the alternative courses of action he sees when prices and wages threaten to escalate to inflationary levels?

Should we fall back on laissez-faire economic theory? Should we let an expanding economy and growing military requirements simply collide? Should we accept the inevitable inflation which would follow? This course is out of the question, for it would wipe out many of the social and economic gains of the past 5 years and impose intolerable burdens on our older citizens and others of fixed income who can least afford the consequences of inflation.

Or should we consider some form of legislative controls over wages and prices? Controls which would be centrally administered, by people far removed from the complicated workings of supply and demand in the marketplace? The President doesn't want this. The public doesn't want this. Labor doesn't want this. And business doesn't want this.

Finally, should we seek some middle course, a course based not on legislation and compulsion, but on good faith and cooperation? Given the alternatives, I see this as the only reasonable course of action. If we want to preserve the economic gains of the past 5 years, if we want to maintain our free world leadership, if we want to make good on our social and humanitarian obligations, then what we need is not less cooperation, but more cooperation and understanding between business and Government.

We need a course of action in which there is give and take on both sides, a course of action which recognizes that there are bound to be differences, but which also recognizes that good sense must, in the end, prevail.

On any mature basis of appraisal the forces that bind business and Government in common purpose are far stronger than the strains that tend to divide us.

We need statesmen in business no less than we need statesmen in Government. We need to recognize that these are exceptional times, and exceptional times call for exceptional acts of sacrifice and understanding, based on confidence and good will and concern for the public interest.

The continued maintenance of wage-price stability is a challenging task. But as the business and banking communities demonstrated by their magnificent response to the balance-of-payments problem, a challenge of this type can be successfully met if there is understanding and cooperation on all sides.

In saying this, I recognize that countering inflationary pressures is, in some ways, more difficult than most other tasks. In the balance-of-payments situation, for example, nearly all the variables are subject to management actions by corporation executives. Cost-price levels, on the other hand, frequently involve factors which are beyond the direct control of the average businessman.

We hope, and we expect, that in 1966 the American economy will rise to record heights of achievement. We also hope, and we expect, that in 1966 American business will rise to new heights of public service, to new levels of cooperation with Government in the public interest, so that we may meet all of our goals and commitments, both at home and abroad.

H.R. 12040: A Means of Protecting Laboratory Animals From Avoidable Pain, Fear, and Stress, Without Impeding Necessary Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced H.R. 12040, a bill to provide for the humane treatment of research animals.

For some time now evidence has been provided the Congress by doctors, researchers, and their technicians establishing the fact that animals in some research laboratories are being subjected to unnecessary suffering, pain, fear, and stress, and are being housed and cared for in appalling and atrocious conditions. Researchers themselves have told me, "Some deplorable conditions have existed up to now, but we are trying to improve."

That statement is one reason why I have introduced H.R. 12040. I not only want to protect animals in our research laboratories from such deplorable conditions, but I want to see the benefits to research which will stem from legislation designed to correct these deplorable conditions. As a civilized nation we cannot sit by any longer and allow unnecessary suffering to be inflicted on any living being when we have the power to prevent it. Let me make it very clear from the beginning, Mr. Speaker, my bill is in no way an antivivisectionist bill. It will not impede necessary research. It is not an antiscience bill; it is an anticruelty bill.

H.R. 12040 incorporates seven basic principles:

First. An independent Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare will be established not only to formulate and administer the regulatory provisions of this act but also to work constructively to improve conditions in laboratories by conducting studies, disseminating information, providing training programs, which will contribute to the most productive and reliable scientific results from the use of research animals under optimum humane conditions.

Second. The best care will be provided for all laboratory animals in comfortable uncramped quarters with adequate space and facilities for normal exercise and food, water, sanitation, ventilation, temperature, lighting, and handling as is appropriate and normal to each species.

Third. Pain and discomfort will be reduced to the utmost minimum by issuance of directives requiring the use of humane techniques. Painful procedures will be allowed only when absolutely necessary as a means of directly achieving the alleviation of suffering, the prolongation of life, the prevention and cure of disease, or the promotion of national safety, and only when there is no less painful way to accomplish the purpose. Interested scientists and animal welfare organizations will be consulted for their recommendations in these determinations of what is necessary and what is the least painful way of proceeding, thus bringing the best minds in the country to bear in this problem of infliction of pain.

Fourth. The number of animals used for research will be reduced by promoting improvements in experimental design, the substitution of nonsentient materials or less sensitive forms of life for higher forms, the elimination of needless duplication of experiments, and the elimination of worthless experiments.

Fifth. This broad coverage will be extended to virtually every laboratory in which animals are used, not only to Government laboratories and institutions receiving Federal funds but also to laboratories making and testing products for interstate commerce and for sale to the Federal Government.

Sixth. Effective enforcement measures will be maintained including eligibility requirements for individual experimenters, special rules for students, certification of laboratory heads, required pertinent records, unannounced inspections, and penalties for noncompliance including loss of Government grants and funds, revocation or suspension of certificates or loss of the privilege to use animals in any laboratory covered by this act.

Seventh. Recommendations will be sought from interested scientists and animal welfare organizations, thus enabling humanitarians and scientists to participate in establishing the highest standards of humane care and use of research animals.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12040 will provide protection on all levels to insure that laboratory animals are housed and cared for humanely and spared avoidable pain, fear, and stress, but it will accomplish this without impeding necessary research. Just as safeguards are woven into the bill to protect the animals, so are safeguards woven into the bill to protect valid research.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12040 is the companion bill to that introduced by Representatives PAUL ROGERS of Florida; LEO O'BRIEN, of New York; WILLIAM SPRINGER, of Illinois; OLIVA HUOT, of New Hampshire; WILLIAM RANDALL, of Missouri; CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida; and Senators THOMAS MCINTYRE, of New Hampshire; and BIRCH BAYH, of Indiana. The bill that we have introduced is supported by the two largest national humane societies of the humane movement, The Humane Society of the United States and the American Humane Association. Thus, this legislation has strong congressional support and the strongest support of humanitarians throughout the United States. I sincerely hope that it will receive early passage.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt Birthday Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. J. PICKLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 84th birthday anniversary of the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt—one of the greatest Presidents of all time. I ask my colleagues to join with me in paying special tribute to this truly outstanding humanitarian and distinguished world leader.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call to your attention a portion of page 809 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 30, 1948. The letter published therein and reproduced below was written by the late Fleetwood Richards, Sr., of Lockhart, Tex., whose son, Fleetwood Richards, Jr., now serves as my administrative assistant in Austin. Senator Richards was one of the greatest honest-to-goodness humanitarian leaders who ever lived. He knew human nature better than any man I have known.

Few men have been more loyal to the ideals of a President than Mr. Richards, Sr., was to President Roosevelt. His letter to his lovely wife is a warm and touching reflection of the love our country held for President Roosevelt. Similarly, the letter written to the then Congressman Lyndon B. Johnson was a tribute to the love and affection he held for Mr. Johnson whose cause he supported from the first day. He recognized then, as we all do now, that Mr. Johnson, a close friend and supporter of President Roosevelt, was an unusual leader—a warmhearted man whose star was ascending and who possessed qualities similar to those of President Roosevelt.

The letter was placed in the RECORD 18 years ago yesterday by the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, my predecessor, who now serves as our great President.

Both the letter and Mr. Johnson's remarks, then as now, are fitting memorials to the late F.D.R. They are as follows:

THE LATE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on this day in 1882 was born a man destined to guide his country through its greatest perils. As Franklin Delano Roosevelt loved his countrymen, so they loved him. That affection of one man for the many—and of the many for one man—bound our Nation together in a unity we have missed since he left us.

The altogether personal affection so many millions of us felt for Mr. Roosevelt was brought into poignant focus when he died. In our teeming cities, in small towns, at crossroad stores, and along lonely country trails, almost unbearable grief came to the people of America.

To those shocking words, "Roosevelt is dead," men, women, and children reacted as though the news concerned one near and dear to them. Some wept. Some were swept by black despair. Some were appalled at the unfillable gap left in the world's leadership.

In the small town of Lockhart, Tex., in my congressional district, one who loved Roosevelt found some comfort in the way so many of us find it: He told his wife what was in his heart. She was away from home, and he wrote her. I lately obtained a copy of that letter, written by Fleetwood Richards, of Lockhart.

Mr. Richards has a distinguished record of public service in our Texas Legislature. Because his letter so beautifully expressed the sorrow so many of us felt on that fateful day in 1945, and expressed it in language beyond our capacity, I have presumed upon my friendship with Mr. Richards to offer the letter today as a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt:

LOCKHART, TEX.,
April 13, 1945.

MY DEAREST GUSSIE: Roosevelt is dead. Sorrow and gloom shrouds the town of Lockhart and its people. Business and people are almost at a standstill. Golf has not been mentioned in almost a full day. The report of his death reached me in the Domino Hall. That is where Americanism lingers in the rough. There is where it is most typical. There is where Roosevelt is most loved and appreciated. There is where labor relaxes and recreates. The news stopped every game. No sounds were audible, except sighs. The leader of their hopes, the prince of their cause, their refuge, had gone. Silently, they went away. They walked slower, they talked less, and they thought more. It was the saddest moment in all American life. Their ship was without a rudder.

In his going, anxiety reached its greatest peak. Determination did not seem to falter or hesitate. It seemed to absorb vengeance. Hope was uncertain. It must wait. The future must build and sustain it. World peace took a body blow. It did not fall. It did not take the count. It is disappointed, and that disappointment should be, and must be, its inspiration and determination to work, to sacrifice, and to succeed. It is humanity's only hope.

In a weak and humble way, on every occasion, and at every call, I have tried to shoulder my responsibility to him and the cause that he represents. Maybe I have been a small part of a great undertaking. I feel so. I served him and his cause, and the people's cause, as I see it, with an apostle's devotion, free of selfish motive.

I say, and maybe I never could have said it before, a man is dead that I never doubted or questioned. Somehow, I followed him and his leadership with a faith and confidence, free of every doubt. He gave a part of his life's span to the cause of humanity and liberty. In it all, I think that he was conscientious. To the downtrodden, he was as faithful as Paul was to Christ. He served and saved others. "Himself he could not save."

I never committed an act or spoke a word that made his road longer or his burden heavier. I never added weight to his weakened body or his troubled mind. I tried to give him strength. I might have been, and I think that I was, a little more diligent and devoted to him, and the purposes and ideals that he championed, than I have been to myself and my own soul. In it all, I am satisfied.

Love,

FLEETWOOD.

A Questionnaire From Your Congressman, Richard L. Ottinger, 25th District, New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last September I sent my congressional newsletter to approximately 160,000 postal patrons in the 25th Congressional District of New York. I included in that newsletter a questionnaire on what I considered to be the major international issues at that time.

The response to this questionnaire was most gratifying. Nearly 15,000 recipients took the time to complete the questionnaire and return it to my office in Yonkers, N.Y. Many took the additional time to include additional comments and a high proportion sent me thoughtful letters dealing with the subjects covered in the questionnaire.

I feel the results of this questionnaire will be interesting and informative to my colleagues in the House of Representatives and I offer herewith a tabulation for inclusion in the RECORD:

A QUESTIONNAIRE FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, 25TH DISTRICT, NEW YORK

1. VIETNAM

Do you favor a policy to:

(a) Expand war, bomb North Vietnam cities and Red China sanctuaries and go all-out to "win", despite dangers of Russian and

Red Chinese involvement and threat of nuclear war: 24 percent.

(b) Continue administration policy of using limited military force necessary to stop Communist advance in South Vietnam while making initiatives to achieve satisfactory settlement through negotiations and offers to economic assistance: 51 percent.

(c) Stop bombing of North Vietnam, restrict efforts to South Vietnam and settle now on any available basis: 8 percent.

(d) Withdraw U.S. forces from Vietnam unilaterally: 6 percent.

(e) Other (specify): 11 percent.

2. DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
(a) Do you approve the President's action sending U.S. Marines unilaterally without prior consultation with OAS or Latin Ambassadors in internal revolution threatened by local Communists?	56	38	6
(b) In future similar situations should we—			
(i) Rely solely on international organizations even if they fail to act?	15	81	4
(ii) Appeal to international organizations and intervene unilaterally if they fail to act?	77	19	4
(iii) Intervene unilaterally only if there is external Communist invasion and then only after consultation with international organizations and allies?	50	45	5

3. COMMUNIST CHINA

Do you favor increasing contacts with Communist China by:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
(a) Having reporters from each side visit the other?	72	25	3
(b) Trade in nonstrategic goods?	44	49	7
(c) Cultural exchange?	63	33	4
(d) Having Peiping participate in disarmament talks?	60	34	
(e) Diplomatic recognition and admission to U.N. even if this means breaking with Nationalist China?	25	67	8
(f) Diplomatic recognition and admission to U.N. if question of Security Council veto and separate seat for Nationalist China can be resolved?	51	41	8
or—			
(g) No increased relationship with Communist China?	45	48	7

4. FOREIGN AID

I. Do you favor economic and technical aid to:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
(a) Latin American countries (through Alliance for Progress)?	83	12	5
(b) "Neutral" countries, such as India?	56	34	10
(c) Countries with pro-U.S. policies only?	49	42	9

II. Do you favor revision of aid policies:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
(a) Adopting Senator Fulbright's suggestion to end all bilateral aid and give only through international organizations?	26	54	20
(b) Restricting economic assistance to international banks and food for peace, and technical aid to expanded Peace Corps-type programs?	39	42	19
(c) Giving greater emphasis to encouraging U.S. investment abroad?	52	32	16
(d) Giving tariff and other trade preferences to underdeveloped countries?	57	27	16
(e) Trading in nonstrategic goods with Communist countries?	48	43	9
(f) Refusing access to U.S. ports to countries whose ships call at Red China or Cuba?	42	47	11

III. Is the size of our foreign aid commitment:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
(a) Too large?	71	14	15
(b) Too small?	15	57	28
(c) About right?	40	33	27

5. UNITED NATIONS

Do you favor:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
(a) Administration's decision to reactivate General Assembly by not insisting on loss of vote for failure by a member to pay peacekeeping assessments?	40	50	10
(b) Expanding U.S. reliance on U.N. even if we risk occasional adverse votes?	56	35	9
(c) Repealing the Connally reservation which permits nations to unilaterally withdraw cases from the World Court?	37	33	30
(d) U.S. subscription to Declaration of Human Rights, the Genocide Treaty, and Human Rights Conventions?	71	8	21
(e) U.N. Charter revision to provide weighted voting which would reduce influence of small and weak nations?	49	34	17
(f) Withdrawing from the U.N. if Communist China is seated?	22	71	7

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the life of every nation celebration of its day of independence is a joyous occasion. How proud and happy we in the United States are to commemorate each year the signing of our Declaration of Independence. But how sad it must be for Ukrainians the world over to know each January 22, their day of independence, that in their country there is no independence. Yet, January 22 is for them a proud day. In 1918 after 2½ centuries of foreign rule, an independent Ukraine was proclaimed. It was a daring act, an act for which the Ukrainians paid dearly in the ensuing 3 years. It has been 48 years since that day of Ukrainian independence in 1918. During those years nation after nation has become independent. The huge colonial empires are gone—except for that of the Soviet Union. Within that empire lies the Ukraine. Some day this great land north of the Black Sea may again be free, may again celebrate its independence day in freedom. We can do no less than work toward that end.

Excerpts From Remarks of Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall at Kenosha, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, our country's determined and forceful fighter against pollution and the desecration of our country's great natural resources, harnessed a startling collection of facts to an engaging style of presentation on November 8, 1965, in a speech before nearly 1,000 people in Wisconsin's First District. He spoke at a testimonial dinner give in my honor in Kenosha, Wis., at the Eagles Club.

Secretary Udall is catching the ear of America in telling the Nation what it needs to preserve its resources, its beauty, and the inspiring qualities of the country. It is gratifying to have a man of such great drive and high intelligence guiding this Nation's program of conservation in these immediate critical times.

I know my colleagues will enjoy sharing a portion of his excellent presentation:

> This year of 1965 has been, in my judgment, a year of incredible climax in terms of the accomplishments. It involved the teamwork of a President of the United States and a Congress of the United States.
>
> If you will look at it for a moment, this great high tide that washed ashore this year as a result of Democratic leadership in the Congress and in the White House has resolved most of the great issues that have been before the American people in this whole postwar period since the end of World War II. It was Harry Truman himself, two decades ago, who first talked about or sketched in what we now call medicare. Who said there was a need to change our immigration laws and make them more equitable and more Democratic? Who talked about aid to education, and the need for civil rights in this country? The American Congress. And yet, as we talked and argued in

the Congress, in the country these issues were the battleground politically.

Today, the 89th Congress has done something about these things. And, I think that you can look back with great satisfaction in the fact that your Congressman was one of those who made these great programs possible—that you had people in the Congress and in the Senate of the United States representing you. They participated vigorously and actively in providing the leadership to make these programs move forward.

And so, the question that we're confronted with, since it is this type of leadership that made the difference this year, is whether we can, as a party, move on from here, or are we going to rest on these laurels? I say it is contrary to our tradition to ever feel that the American people have achieved enough, or have done enough in terms of achieving that measure of excellence which should be expected of the greatest democracy of the world.

Six years ago there were two deeply imbedded traditions of American politics that, in my judgment, did more to diminish and limit the meaning of democracy in this country than almost anything else that affected our national political life. The first was a tradition that no Catholic could be President of this country. The second, a tradition of nearly a hundred years' duration, was that no one from the southern tier of States could be President. This was far from the American political folkways. It has been proven that these truisms of American political life were wrong, that American democracy was a larger and more expansive thing than this. Therefore, we nominated two men in the year of 1960—one a Catholic, and the other a person from the southern tier of our country. These two men, by a tragic accident of history, by a combination of teamwork between them, have exploded these two myths of American politics. I would simply say to you that I think as a result of this and the Democratic ideas in our country, that the American people are stronger and that our political system is stronger. I think this is something in which we should take a very special pride at this time.

But, let me speak for a few minutes about what I said are to be new issues in which our party will provide leadership. Having resolved many of these basic questions about our economy, about our social life and our political life, where do we go from here? There may be those in this country today who think that we are doing so well that we have moved up on a new plateau and we should complacently be satisfied with what we have. And, in truth, there is much to be satisfied about. I suppose this is the danger, because in terms of whether you measure it by a standard of living or gross national production, or the wages of workers, or the comforts and luxuries available, or the mobility of American people, or our military power, or the performance of our economic system, we are the richest and most powerful country in the history of the world, no question about it. But the question is, is this enough?

This is a rich society, but is it a Great Society? What will people say if we were to settle this as an American performance at this point? Would the historians say that we were a great civilization, that we left an example for other generations to come that was imitated, or must we go ahead and rebuild our cities and make them cities of which we can be proud? I am afraid this is not true in the main of America today.

Lest we do great new things, the type of things Senator GAYLORD NELSON talks about, preaches about and acts for, and Representative LYNN STALBAUM, too, in conservation, in terms of achieving an America that contains the very best in terms of resources and out of doors, are we going to go ahead and build our educational system into something that is not just good, but truly great?

Are we going to do as your Congressman suggests—see to it that the American granary is a granary for the hungry people of the world and to let our affluence and wealth ripple out into other parts of the world and help these people lift themselves up, as they must, if we are to have a stable world. These are only some of the issues that we're confronted with today. And I could discuss this at length because its the thing that I preach about week in and week out. I am talking about some of the conservation objectives that we think are so vital if our country is to preserve some of these essential things that add an indispensable element to American life. Basically, we have been a people that loved and treasured the things of the land—you people in this part of the world, particularly.

I attended a water pollution conference in Detroit only last Saturday, called by the United Auto Workers, with an indication that they are going to crusade on this subject, and Senator NELSON and I were discussing this on the plane, coming in today, because every American who is concerned about leaving a legacy to his children that is at least as good or better than he inherited, knows that one of the great tasks that we are confronted with in this country is the task of pollution, of contamination of air and water, and of our whole environment. This is an area of great failure. We must face this as a fact. You only have to look at your own Great Lakes as a threat, particularly Lake Erie. I know that Lake Michigan is not Lake Erie, but it is subject to the same laws of nature, and that should be a sufficient warning to you.

As recently as 8 years ago, just with one variety of commercial fish in Lake Erie, there was harvested by commercial fishermen, fishery products worth over $1½ million. Last year the value was $120. That is a lake that is seriously threatened. Its very vitality and life is in danger today. Of course, this is repeated all across the land. There came to my desk only last week a brochure of a newly formed organization in one of the most superb settings of the United States. It calls itself the League to Save Lake Tahoe, and if any of you have ever seen Lake Tahoe, you know of the great beauty that is there. Yet, it is threatened, too. This is a story that I can tell over and over again.

So, whether we talk about saving some of our remaining superb seashore areas or lakeshore areas, such as your Apostle Islands, as Senator NELSON and Congressman STALBAUM have proposed; whether we talk about adding to our National Park Systems or saving forests, wildlife areas nearby for people to enjoy; whether we talk about our fisheries or preserving our wildlife or saving the best of our wild rivers as trout streams and outdoor areas for people to enjoy, we're talking about your tomorrow. There's a big job to do.

I read a story to my young boys a few months ago. It was a best seller a couple years ago, and if some of you haven't read it, get it and read it to your children. The story is about a man now late in life, and his boyhood in southern Wisconsin and northern Illinois, 50 years ago. It's a story about a young boy and his pet raccoon. You only have to read it to realize what we have eliminated, and what we are lacking in our life today, in terms of the relationship of people and thier environment. I also read something the other day that one of your people from this part of the United States wrote. He is Eric Sevareid, one of the most eloquent spokesmen today. Let me read you this, because he wrote it after he went out on a duck hunt in the Chesapeake Bay area a few months ago:

"We spend our frenzied lives, most of us, feeling east or west of Eden, but never in it. Its identity depends upon our particular obsession and concern, and mine increasingly with the years, is for the lands and waters of America. They are wasted in soil by crowding and greed and heedless habits until one despairs of one's children's inheritance. It is the spreading of concrete over the land * * * greedy commercialization of mountain valleys, the poisoning of rivers by cities, sewage, and industrial wastes, their sickening scourging of the American land. If all this is not checked and regulated as severely as hunting and fishing are limited now, our grandchildren will read about an America where the geese once filled the sky over Chesapeake Bay and where the great buffalo herds roamed, but they will never see it." This is his indictment of the present time.

So, there is a great work to be done; there are areas of failure where we must move in with new successes in the conservation field. I can talk to you about so many of these areas, about the need to do something about preserving the history of this country.

We're talking about preserving trails all over the land, perhaps some of them that would follow the early pioneering trails—the Lewis and Clark Trail, the Oregon Trail—the trails that richly lead into this country, so that young men and women on foot, on horseback, on bicycle, could move through the land. This is the concept embodied in me, and I say it's a proposal that we're going to view tomorrow.

I think that I sense in the American people, in this part of the land particularly, an unwillingness to settle for mere material accomplishments, however important they are to us. I think there is a yearning in the American people for true greatness. * * *

Recognition of Brumidi Long Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi, for placement in the U.S. Capitol. Many of our colleagues have introduced similar legislation.

Evidence of Brumidi's genius is found everywhere in the Capitol. Thousands of visitors from every State of the Union and many overseas countries have viewed with admiration his artistic achievements.

Brumidi began his work in the Capitol in 1855 and for 25 years worked devotedly with all his strength and talent. His stirring murals, his colorful and expertly executed paintings, bronze stair rails, and bold and moving frescoes can be found in the corridors, in the committee rooms, and in the rotunda. While trying to finish the frieze in the rotunda, Brumidi died tragically as a result of a fall at the age of 75. He lay buried in an unmarked grave in Glenwood Cemetery for more than 50 years. Then, in the 1930's, Mrs. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, wife of our former colleague, Congressman Murdock, of Arizona, took a great interest in Brumidi and began gathering information about him. It was largely through her efforts that a bronze marker was finally provided in 1950 by the Congress for the Brumidi grave. No other tangible recognition of this great artist's contributions can be found in Washington today.

It is entirely fitting and appropriate for the Congress to demonstrate our Nation's gratitude to this great man who took such pride in his adopted country that he signed all his works simply, "C. Brumidi, Artist, Citizen of the United States."

Sea Research Receives More Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the field of ocean exploration, or the probe of the earth's "wet space," is receiving more and more recognition. The oceanographic pursuits of the United States are becoming a matter of concern to not only scientists, but those in Government circles as well.

Recently one of our distinguished colleagues, Congressman JOSEPH KARTH, of Minnesota, addressed the National Space Club on the benefits of sea research, and how they compare to the economic aspects of outer space.

Congressman KARTH, a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee as well as the House Science and Astronautics Committee, is in a position to bring to the Congress a unique blend of experience. He has knowledge of uses of outer space, as well as the seas, or inner space.

I ask that Congressman KARTH's address of January 18 before the National Space Club be included in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

POTENTIAL OF OCEANOGRAPHY

Perhaps I should begin with a personal note on why I am talking about oceanography at a Space Club luncheon.

Last summer I became a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Later, in the fall, I went on the Oceanography Subcommittee because I think it deals with an extremely important area, and because oceanography is becoming increasingly related to space.

I should be quick to point out that I am no expert on oceanography. But I have been digging into it and want to outline some of my preliminary thinking, particularly because we're at a critical stage on deciding how to proceed with oceanography development.

One of the earliest congressional oceanography experts is here in the audience today. From March to June 1959 Chairman MILLER (Congressman GEORGE MILLER, California) headed a special subcommittee which reviewed "Oceanography in the United States." He has consistently advocated a stronger national program and a more sensible organizational approach. Mr. Chairman, in addition to other things I think it only fair that I recognize you as the real congressional father of oceanography.

A moment ago I mentioned the relationship between oceanography and space activities. For a few minutes I intend to outline, what seems to me, some of the important points about this relationship.

One important contribution of aerospace technology has been general acceptance of the "total systems approach." A closely connected idea is the growing awareness that we need to view our world environment as a whole. And I have a hunch that in retrospect, historians will consider this concept as one of the truly significant ideas of our century.

As part of our environment, the sea is not "independent"—it is greatly affected by outside forces: the rotation of the earth and the movements of the sun and moon result in events we all can observe every time we go to the beach. Less apparent are the effects of the direct income and outgo of radiant solar energy and the vital interchange between sea and atmosphere and land.

This suggests that, as in the broad field of space, hardly any aspect of the sea is capable of adequate analysis without coordination of all the fundamental natural sciences and engineering. In this sense, as with the study of space, oceanography is not a science in itself. Rather, it is a combination of various sciences and fields of engineering to study the sea in all its aspects—including the complex interrelationships with our total environment.

An approach of this kind leads directly to what a number of people are suggesting as specific correlation between space "knowhow" and the problems being faced in oceanography. I'll just mention a few major areas: (1) Reliability and efficiency requirements, (2) systems management experience, (3) structures and materials, (4) operating in a hostile environment outside the atmosphere, (5) instrumentation and sensors—especially in standardizing, (6) computer, guidance and power systems, and finally (7) vehicle design and construction.

But I'm just summarizing when I talk about specific areas such as these. Most certainly, I'm not telling you anything that is startling. Many aerospace firms have already grasped the point. For example:

(1) North American Aviation has a new ocean systems facility which will draw heavily on the firm's space effort. It's no accident that it is located in their space and information systems division.

(2) Lockheed has established a marine laboratory.

(3) Nortronics is working on the Navy's deep submergence systems project.

(4) The underseas division of Westinghouse is now building a new research and test facility.

And (5) General Dynamics' Electric Boat Division has been in the field for a long time.

Incidentally, I understand that some people have become somewhat disenchanted because certain corporate investments of the early 1960's haven't started to pay off yet. My advice is this: Stick around for a while. Small opportunities are often the beginning of great enterprises.

Just this month, there have been two solid indications that space and oceanography are more than "kissing cousins":

(1) The Naval Oceanographic Office has undertaken the coordination of all investigations about possible applications of manned earth orbital operations in the field of oceanography. I intend to suggest that their interest be expanded formally to include unmanned operations as well.

(2) A symposium was held here in Washington last week on "Man's Extension Into the Sea." It was interesting to note that its cosponsors included not only such expected organizations as the Marine Technology Society—but the AIAA as well.

Having, I believe, established why I'm not out in left field by talking oceanography to a space group, I'd now like to turn to why the subject is so important.

For most of human history we have considered the oceans as little more than hunting grounds for fishermen and highways for ships. Of course, the shores have always provided recreation—and recently there has been the added pleasure of "bikini watching."

But for the future I strongly believe that we can expect a greatly expanded "ocean consciousness" as man turns to the sea with new eyes and new ideas. I see this as part of a broad scientific advance which may lead to profound changes in life as we now know it on this planet. In effect, we are taking the first, awkward steps to eventually controlling our environment—rather than letting it dominate us.

More specifically, as far as the sea is concerned, there is a growing consensus that:

(1) We will be able to obtain economically much of the world's fresh water needs from sea water within the next 10 years or so.

(2) We will be able to harness tides as a source of power.

(3) Ways can be found to help control the world's climate by controlling or using ocean currents.

(4) The oceans and, of course, the seabed and subsoil of the ocean basins are a vast potential source of many metals which are rapidly becoming in short supply.

(5) We can look to the oceans to solve some of the world's food problems as we learn to "farm" instead of just hunt. While more than 70 percent of the earth's surface is covered by water, not more than 1 percent of its total food supplies are derived from it.

I would like to dwell on this point for a moment. Recently, Dr. Lawrence Gould, Director of the U.S. Antarctic program during the latest IGY reported, "These Antarctic waters are so protein rich that it is generally agreed among scientists that acre for acre they are potentially richer food sources than any other equivalent areas of our planet * * * clearly here is an enormous, potentially rich food supply for an increasingly hungry planet."

I don't think Dr. Gould's comment can be lightly dismissed. Our planet's food problem is acute, and despite the superb performance of the American farmer, he can't solve it all by himself. Even if all of our surplus food were somehow provided to the rest of the world, it wouldn't be nearly enough. In fact, some experts tell us that in 10 years, U.S. citizens will consume every ounce the ingenious American farmer can produce.

Comments are being made widely "that there have always been hungry people and famine is part of the history of man." But what these people miss is a growing determination to attack and defeat one of mankind's most ancient enemies. The potential benefits of oceanography will clearly be powerful weapons in this attack.

While there seems to be relatively little controversy about the potential benefits of work in oceanography, how to go about realizing these benefits has been a cause of continuing debate for several years. The reasons for this debate are as complex as Government itself, but I'll take a crack at them.

One reason seems to be that the focus of our attention in oceanography has undergone radical changes during the past decade. Yesterday, we were interested in it as a science. Today, we are thinking more about man working and living on and in the ocean. We are thinking about the engineering and technological problems connected with harvesting the resources of the sea. This kind of transition from science to use is never made easily—but it must be made.

Another reason for the extensive debate is rooted in the fact that several administrations and the Congress have had differing points of view on how the Nation's effort in oceanography should be organized.

No small factor in this debate has been congressional concern that 22 agencies (by one count) are involved with oceanography. I can't find any record of it, but I'd be willing to bet that even the Army and the Air Force have an oceanography office tucked away somewhere—just in case.

The activities of these 22 agencies are brought together by the Interagency Committee on Oceanography which is under the Federal Council for Science and Technology. Basically, administration witnesses before the Congress have said this arrangement is satisfactory. The Congress has not agreed with them. Over the past several years it has considered these alternatives:

(1) Beefing up the present coordination setup.

(2) Establishing a new independent agency—I might add it has been referred to as a "wet-NASA."

(3) Establishing a National Oceanographic Council headed by the Vice President—it would be much like the present Space Council.

And (4) Establishing a national commission to study and recommend an overall plan for an adequate national program.

Of these various approaches, only the first, in the past, has been acceptable to administration witnesses. However, during the first session of this Congress, both the House and Senate passed a bill based on other approaches.

(1) The Senate bill, S. 944, proposed a Council at a higher level than the present Interagency Committee on Oceanography. The Council would be headed by the Vice President. A study commission also is provided for to recommend plans to the Council for implementation.

(2) The House version omits the National Oceanographic Council, and anticipates that the President would use existing mechanisms in the Office of Science and Technology, and the Federal Council to implement these proposals. It also establishes a self-liquidating Commission which would recommend plans for a program to the President.

Actually, I believe both bills agree on far more points than they differ.

Both broadly define "oceanography" and "marine science." This is a major contribution to our understanding of the scope of the national effort.

Both set forth a declaration of national policy and purpose so badly needed to give direction and stability.

Both provide for a representative, self-liquidating study commission.

Both call for annual Executive reports and the development of long-range annual plans and budgets.

Both provide funds for independent, governmentwide central planning.

Importantly, both bills emphasize the need for political action now. They differ only in the degree of required action and the level at which this action and leadership should be exercised. In proposing the Cabinet-level Council, with its own staff, the Senate bill tends to go much further than the House. The House prefers its version because we believe the legislation has a better chance of being approved by the administration.

In any event, it is my opinion that recent discussion and action in the Congress has gone a long way toward focusing attention on two very important points:

(1) Oceanography is not getting satisfactory attention within the administration under existing organizational arrangements. What seems to be needed as much as anything is to get oceanography out into the open in a more conspicuous position.

There is a distinct feeling within the Congress that the ICO—Interagency Committee on Oceanography—is buried too far down in the Government hierarchy. On this point, you don't need to be connected with space to know that Jim Webb heads NASA—but I would guess that a relatively few would know who is the Chairman of the ICO.

The existing organization gives rise for concern on the part of the Congress as to whether there is a national program. I mean this in the sense of whether it is screened and adopted to fit a set of national priorities in contrast to it being a simple addition of priorities arising from 22 different agencies.

(2) A second major concern on the part of the Congress is that oceanography is not receiving an adequate allocation of resources. Aside from the Navy antisubmarine warfare effort in fiscal year 1966, our oceanographic budget totaled about $140 million. Perhaps it's not a valid comparison to make, but this past week, Sears Roebuck announced that it would spend $200 million on store expansion during 1966.

In a nutshell, an investment of $140 million for oceanography does not seem to be consistent with our present capability and the potential benefits. The present rate of growth of the composite budget is about 8 to 15 percent per year. I won't presume to say what it ought to be—because I think this is the kind of question that we in the Congress would like to have considered by either a council or a commission. I will say, however, that I do think such a rate of growth is not fast enough.

In making this judgment, I am not unaware that there is danger in building up too rapidly. Professional oceanographers have, in fact, expressed their fears of swift proliferation—beyond the capacity of the existing qualified and experienced scientists and engineers to train increasing numbers of recruits.

There is something to be said for this point of view; when it is considered that there are only about 3,000 professionals working the field; and when it is considered that there are only 12 schools teaching 300 graduate students and turning out 20 Ph. D.'s a year. But this view overlooks one vital point.

An expanded oceanographic program will require the talents of many disciplines—not just those of professional oceanographers. In a sense, then, oceanographers will no longer have the isolation they have been accustomed to—but will be exposed to the rough and tumble world of teamwork on a large scale. Therefore, it seems to me that a shortage of oceanographers is not as critical as it might appear at first glance.

This is not to say our educational program is in good shape; it isn't. Twenty Ph. D.'s a year—of whom about half are replacements—won't be sufficient for the long pull. Energetic efforts should be taken to step up the pace—as has been done in the area of space. For example, we could well use the NASA-type facility grant for universities on an expanded scale in the field of oceanography, with emphasis on an interdisciplinary approach.

In concluding, I want to return to another facet of the space-oceanography relationship. As we move to considering more ambitious space programs—such as manned expeditions to Mars or the moons of Jupiter and Saturn—you all know what happens to the price tags. By comparison, Apollo may look cheap.

Frankly, I don't foresee general acceptance of the enormous outlays for such programs until we have solved the continually worsening home planet problems of hunger and poverty. This leads me to believe that in years to come there will be much greater emphasis on fields such as oceanography which have the potential for helping to solve them. By greater emphasis I mean far more than any of us might realize today; because true progress, it has been said, consists not so much in increasing our needs as in diminishing our wants.

I choose not to talk about this in terms of an "oceanography gap," even though I'm convinced we are not preeminent in the field. But I hope we don't wait for a sharp stimulus which forces us into a competition. Perhaps we should move more rapidly because we have the capability and it ought to be done for the benefits it can provide for us and the rest of mankind. How fast we move to meet the challenge of the ocean depends in large measure on the political action we take today.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., recited this verse of Scripture, Job 28: *Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding.*

Most merciful and gracious God, in this day may we be sensitive and responsive to Thy commands and demands in behalf of noble living and heroic service.

Grant that our faith may not be denuded of life and loveliness and may we not look upon life with disgust and bitterness but with deeper reverence and concern and love for all mankind.

Give us a clear vision of our high duty and destiny and may we be guided by its appeal and feel it filling us with confidence and power and inspiring us to be faithful at all times.

Help us to realize that Thy words are less a command than an invitation and that we must heed them if we are ever to find the meaning of life and reach its goal.

To the glory of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

CUT OUT LEGISLATION BY REGULATIONS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter from Dr. L. M. Garner, acting director of the Division of Health of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, once again my attention has been directed to a practice by a Federal bureaucracy which would subordinate or actually nullify the laws of many sovereign

States of this Union, merely by the writing of a regulation, which in my opinion is contrary to and not in the spirit of the laws passed by this Congress. I appreciate and am aware of the fact that some Members feel that the States have no rights, but I am predicting that some of these same Members will be in a most uncomfortable position when they try to defend a Federal agency which has indicated that it will not recognize nor accept a delayed birth certificate issued by the State, as proof of age, when the elderly citizens of their State are denied benefits which are due them under laws passed by this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there is already enough redtape involved in any program of the Federal Government, without the pandemonium which will exist when our elderly citizens make application for benefits under the medicare program, only to be informed that the delayed legal certificate of birth, issued by the State of their birth is not recognized by the Social Security Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the State of Missouri is in the unique position of being the only State, whose delayed certificates of birth are not recognized by the Federal Government, or at least are questioned by the Social Security Administration, and for that reason, I have asked permission to have printed herewith as a part of my remarks, a letter from Dr. L. M. Garner, acting director of the Division of Health of the State of Missouri, setting forth some of the difficulties which have already arisen in Missouri, and which in all likelihood already prevail in other States. It should not require legislation to correct this situation, but if legislation is necessary, I hope that the Members of this House will cooperate in correcting this inequity to save our elderly people further frustration and additional expense:

THE DIVISION OF HEALTH,
CITY OF JEFFERSON, MO.,
January 21, 1966.

Hon. PAUL C. JONES,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JONES: As you no doubt are aware, the Missouri Division of Health, through the Bureau of Vital Statistics, is assigned the responsibility for the registration of births. Chapter 193 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri, 1959, sets forth the methods by which delayed birth certificates may be issued to Missouri residents whose births had not previously been registered.

Many elderly citizens of this State who were born prior to 1910 when Missouri law provided for the registration of births can only obtain such a certificate by submitting proof from various documents so that the possibility of fraud may be eliminated insofar as is humanly possible.

On November 22, 1965, the Social Security Administration issued a rule of internal policy which will work a very real hardship on a great number of elderly Missouri citizens and their families. The rule in question directs the social security field representative to require additional evidence of age when the claimant presents a delayed birth certificate as proof of age. There are many other requirements to the directive, but we have been unable to obtain a copy of the directive since it is an internal management rule. With the advent of medicare, approximately 500,000 elderly people in the State of Missouri will be eligible for increased social security benefits. Applications for such delayed birth certificates are being received in this office at the rate of 50 to 75 per day, and approximately 90 percent of these are for applicants who are over the age of 60. We believe that most, if not all, of these applications are being made so that they may be used as a proof of age for social security benefits.

Now, as a result of the new internal rule of the Social Security Administration, the applicant will have expended much time and money to secure a certificate which is no longer acceptable for the purpose for which it was obtained. Unless certificates issued in accordance with Missouri law, or for that matter in accordance with the laws of other States, are acceptable as evidence for social security purposes, then the purpose and spirit of State statutes are completely frustrated and the elderly citizens are greatly handicapped in securing the benefits provided under the expanded social security law.

As a personal favor to me and for the benefit of all of our elderly citizens, I would like to request your assistance in this problem.

Respectfully,
L. M. GARNER, M.D.,
Acting Director.

SUPPORT OF U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, along with other Members of the House, I received a letter yesterday from Mr. Virgil Musser, president of the National Young Democrats. The purpose of Mr. Musser's letter which, incidentally, was dated 18 days prior to its receipt, was to disclaim Young Democrats participation in a January 8 Constitution Hall rally in support of President Johnson's Vietnam policy.

The January 8 rally, sponsored by the Young Americans for Freedom, was a bipartisan expression of support for the efforts of our fighting men who are bearing the brunt of the Nation's commitment to protect South Vietnam from Communist aggression.

I was privileged to be asked to speak at the rally, and did so, along with our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman BROCK. The text of my speech follows:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE ARMISTEAD SELDEN, "LIGHT UP FOR FREEDOM" RALLY, IN SUPPORT OF U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM, CONSTITUTION HALL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 8, 1966

"America," wrote Emerson, "is a country of young men."

I am honored to be here tonight at this "Light up for Freedom" rally of young Americans.

You have chosen as your symbol for this rally the torch—the torch of freedom. In preparing my remarks for this occasion, I could not help but recall that it was 5 years ago—almost to the day—when America's youngest President chose the symbolism of the torch of freedom in his inaugural address.

"Let the word go forth from this time and place," he said, "that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world."

Let me repeat the last part of that inaugural quotation: "disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world."

Disciplined—proud of our heritage—unwilling to stand by while aggression threatens the freedom of our fellow men throughout the world—I think these are the qualities reflected by this gathering of young Americans here tonight.

These are the same qualities—brought to the ultimate test—which sustain and ennoble the efforts of young Americans honoring our Nation's commitment in Vietnam this very night.

Discipline, pride, and commitment to freedom, have always been the qualities which distinguished this country of young men—and the young men of this country.

That is why the undisciplined, self-abasing, and uncommitted Vietnik protest marchers of recent months reflect not a national movement or mood, but only their own sickness.

They are a mockery of all those symbols which freemen hold dear.

They call for "peace"—but they mean surrender of our Nation's commitment to the people of Vietnam.

They distort the symbol of the torch itself, so that in their hands it becomes not an affirmation of man's hope, but a negation of that hope.

Are these the "young men" of whom Emerson wrote? Do they speak for—or reflect—America in 1966?

No. They do not speak for America—or for the conscience of America—or for young Americans.

They certainly do not speak for or reflect anything remotely resembling the new generation of Americans represented here tonight at this rally.

Young Americans are in Vietnam to honor a commitment. It is not simply a policy commitment to Vietnam, but rather a larger commitment which relates to our national heritage. A commitment, as was said in that address 5 years ago, to the freedom of men.

The history of this century teaches that nations which seek to take the easy course in the face of aggression pay a severe penalty.

In the 1930's, the Western democracies sacrificed smaller nations to aggression and paid the price—in terms of moral stain and aggression ultimately aimed at their own national interests.

So it would be in the 1960's were we to sacrifice South Vietnam. Aggression which succeeds begets larger, bolder aggression. The aggressors' target is not simply the sphere of southeast Asia. It is the Western Hemisphere.

Were we to take the easy course in Vietnam, we would soon be faced with Vietnam-type subversion and aggression by Communist and Communist-inspired enemies of freedom throughout Latin America.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I know the volatile nature of that threat. The Communists and their friends in Central and South America—encouraged and aided by Peiping—would need only the indication that the American will to resist in Vietnam was weakening.

We would then witness a quantum jump in the Communist technique of so-called wars of national liberation. Our own hemisphere would be the battleground.

Considering these and other fearful possibilities, were we to abandon our commitment in Vietnam, I am reminded of what the late Winston Churchill said during the early years of World War II.

Then, too, there was a vocal peace claque at work, urging that somehow, in some way, the war should be ended and a peace signed with Hitler. Churchill spoke of these critics of his government's war policy as "thoughtless dilettanti or purblind worldlings."

"They sometimes ask us," said Churchill, "'What is it Britain and France are fighting for?' To this I answer," said Churchill, "if we left off fighting, you would soon find out."

Today there are those in our own country and elsewhere who ask: "What is it that America is fighting for in Vietnam?" And like Churchill, our answer is: "If we left off fighting, you would soon find out."

Americans now fight, as did England in that day, on the front lines in the defense of freedom. Disciplined, proud, committed to our national purpose—we will continue to fight so long as there are those in the world who would extinguish the torch of freedom in free, independent countries.

Hitler was deceived by the thoughtless dilettanti and purblind worldlings of that former day into believing that Churchill's England did not possess the discipline, pride, or spirit of commitment to carry on and win the war.

The Communist aggressors of South Vietnam—and throughout the world—will be similarly deceived if they look to the thoughtless dilettanti and purblind worldlings whose protests against America's commitments in Vietnam represent only their own sick spirits.

I opened my remarks with a quotation from the inaugural of one American President 5 years ago. I will close with a quotation from another inaugural, delivered 9 years ago, January 21, 1957. This is fitting, for the commitment which we have made in South Vietnam transcends political party or administrations. It is a national commitment—to take up and carry the torch of freedom.

"May the light of freedom," said President Eisenhower, "coming to all darkened lands, flame brightly—until at last the darkness is no more.

"May the turbulence of our age yield to a true time of peace," he concluded, "when men and nations shall share a life that honors the dignity of each, the brotherhood of all."

Based on information supplied by the organizers of the rally, the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman Brock, and I sent a letter to other members explaining the purpose of the meeting and stating, incidentally, that the Young Democrats were among the organizations cooperating in the rally. This information, according to Mr. Musser, was erroneous, although the following letter from Mr. David R. Jones, executive director of the Young Americans for Freedom, indicates otherwise:

Young Americans for Freedom, Inc.
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1966.
Hon. Armistead Selden,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Selden: Your administrative assistant telephoned me today about the form letter which is being sent, apparently, to all members of Congress by a Virgil Musser, national president of the Young Democrats. As I understand it, it alleges that Young Americans for Freedom falsely claimed that the Young Democrats were a cosponsor of the "Light up for Freedom" rally held on January 8, 1966, in Constitution Hall. The letter goes on to state, I believe, that the Young Democrats did not play any such role in the rally and have taken this means to set the record straight.

We, too, would like to set the record straight.

1. The letter which you and Congressman Bill Brock, of Tennessee, graciously consented to sign did not refer to any group as a cosponsor of the rally. The letter does refer to cooperation tendered YAF by various groups, including the Young Democrats.

2. Young Americans for Freedom contacted both the College Young Democrats and the Democratic National Committee here in Washington, D.C., about the January 8 rally. We were told by representatives at each office that they would distribute materials about the rally. We mailed such materials to the College Young Democrats and delivered in person those materials to the Democratic National Committee. At no time were we told not to deliver such materials by either office.

3. At other rallies the weekend of January 7 and 8, in Boston, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Cleveland, Houston, and California we received wonderful cooperation from many different groups including the Young Democrats. For example, in Boston the Young Democrats along with the Young Republicans cosponsored the January 7 rally with Young Americans for Freedom. Speaker John McCormack sent a letter endorsing the rally and stating that he wished that he could be present. The mayor of Boston, a Democrat, also sent a message to that rally. The Governor of Missouri, a Democrat, endorsed the rally in St. Louis. The mayor of Houston, a Democrat, endorsed the rally there. And so it went across the country.

It was on the basis of such cooperation and such information that we contacted both you and Congressman Brock about distributing a letter to other Members of Congress as well as to their staffs. We regret this minor tempest in a teapot, which continues to be aggravated by certain Young Democrats, although we firmly believe that the overwhelming majority of the Young Democrats and, indeed, all Americans are behind the U.S. policy of firmness in Vietnam. After all, Congressman, it never occurred to us that the Young Democrats would not be willing to cooperate in publicizing a rally which supported our Government and our fighting men at a critical time.

With deep appreciation for your cooperation and understanding, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
David R. Jones,
Executive Director.

In any event, the president of the Young Democrats declares, and rather vehemently, that his organization did not participate in this rally in support of the President's policy in Vietnam. As a Democrat, I regret that they did not do so—and I am disappointed, to say the least, that the Young Democrat leadership desires to go to such great lengths to disassociate their organization from a cause which supports the policy of a Democratic President.

Nor only as a Democrat, but as a Member of Congress who felt a definite need for responsible American youth to take action to offset the irresponsible activities of the Vietnik draft card burners and pseudo-pacifist demonstrators, I was most grateful that the Young Americans for Freedom sponsored such a rally and that I was invited to participate.

I have sent the following reply to Mr. Musser, a copy of which already should have reached your desks:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1966.
Mr. Virgil L. Musser,
President, Young Democratic Clubs of America, Democratic National Committee,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Musser: I am in receipt of your letter of recent date regarding the Young Democrats' failure to participate in the January 8 Constitution Hall rally in support of the President's stand in Vietnam.

I stand corrected regarding your organization's role in this Young Americans for Freedom rally. As a Democrat who backs the President's policy of firmness against Communist aggression, I regret the national Young Democrats' failure to participate in what was an inspiring and much-needed bipartisan expression of the American people's support of their fighting men in Vietnam.

Since your organization did not participate in the January 8 Vietnam freedom rally, I presume you are making plans for a program of your own along these lines. If this is the case, please let me know, as I would be pleased to participate.

Sincerely yours,
Armistead I. Selden, Jr.

DR. HUGH L. ELSBREE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I have learned that Dr. Hugh L. Elsbree, Director of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress, is retiring from that position.

We all know the good work done for our offices by the Legislative Reference Service but many times I think we fail to appreciate the burdens placed on the Service because of the increasing workload of the Congress. As chairman of the Committee on House Administration and as chairman and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, it has been my pleasure to know Dr. Elsbree. He is an outstanding public servant whose qualities of leadership are self-evident and he has done a fine job during his 7½ years as Director of the Service.

I was therefore pleased to hear that Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, the Librarian of Congress, has presented Dr. Elsbree with the Library's highest citation—the Distinguished Service Award. I include with my remarks the letter from Dr. Mumford to Dr. Elsbree which accompanied the award:

January 20, 1966.

Dr. Hugh L. Elsbree,
Director, Legislative Reference Service,
Library of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Hugh: It is with the deepest personal as well as official regret that I must accept your decision to retire as Director of the Legislative Reference Service.

As I look back over your career, you seem to me to be the very model of the distinguished public servant. Your academic training—not one but three degrees in political science from Harvard—was impeccable. Before you came to the Government more than two decades ago your attainments as a college teacher, a productive scholar, and an administrator in academe's well-known groves were already of a high order. I like to think, however, that it was the Legislative Reference Service, which you joined in November 1945, that gave full scope to your learning and your talents. It afforded challenges, ever new and ever greater, which, however impossible they seemed, you never failed to meet.

You not only had the learning necessary for a top staff specialist, specifically as senior specialist in American Government and public administration, but you had the instincts for such service—the necessary self-effacement but also the self-confidence born of knowing your subject and how to apply it to problems of public policy, the ability to define issues and to present alternatives, and the scholary objectivity but also the realistic grasp of the politically possible.

Your unusual capacities were widely recognized, so much so that it was difficult for the Legislative Reference Service to hold onto you. For nearly 4 years (1952–56) you served part-time as managing editor of the American Political Science Review. When I came to the Library in 1954 you were on loan to the newly created Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, where, as Deputy Research Director, you earned high praise for the successful completion of the Commission's task. After your return to the Library in 1955, I was happy to appoint you as Deputy Director of the Legislative Reference Service. Although in 1957 you yielded briefly to the lures of the academic life, it was my proud accomplishment to bring you back to public service in 1958 as Director of LRS upon Dr. Griffith's retirement.

It was the Library's good fortune, as well as the Congress and the Nation's, to have you in charge these past 7½ years. It has been a period of phenomenal growth in congressional responsibilities, both in scope and complexity, and consequently in demands on the Service. The pressures on you and on your able staff, coupled with the dislocations caused by building renovations and by space and staff shortages, have often been, I fully appreciate, almost unbearable. It is a tribute to your leadership, I am sure your staff would all agree, that the Service has met the challenges of the times, while I am equally sure that you would insist that it was due to your staff's dedication. The truth is that it is due to both. However, your ability to discover, attract, and develop talent, your personal integrity, your standards of excellence, your sound judgment, your profound understanding of the requirements of the Congress, your skill in public administration, and your fine qualities as a human being have not only maintained an admirable esprit de corps but have enabled the Legislative Reference Service to fulfill its highest duty—to be responsive to the needs of the Congress.

At the same time, your deep interest in the Library of Congress as an institution, your appreciation of the principles for which it has stood for over a century and a half, and your understanding of its many faceted role in the research community, both public and private, have made you a most valued adviser to me.

For all these contributions, for a Federal career that reflects nothing but honor on you, on the Legislative Reference Service, on the Library, on the Congress, and on the Government, I present to you with gratitude the Library's highest citation—the Distinguished Service Award.

I am sure that the entire Library staff joins me in wishing you and Eugenia a healthy, happy retirement.

Sincerely yours,

L. QUINCY MUMFORD,
Librarian of Congress.

JUSTICE STUDIES ARLINGTON CASE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the umbilical cord of bureaucratic redtape has been cut, and justice for the memories of millions of war dead will apparently be served with the announcement by the Department of Defense that they have asked the Department of Justice to render an opinion on the proposed burial of convicted Communist conspirator Robert G. Thompson in Arlington National Cemetery.

I hope the Department of Justice can make a speedy decision to permit the rejection of the burial of disloyal persons in Arlington and that the Department of Defense will formulate clear regulations which would promptly remove all doubt on this policy of Government in all future cases.

To bury such persons in our graveyard of heroes is like burying Judas Iscariot in St. Peter's Basilica in Rome.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BILL

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the recently passed Federal aid to education bill is already having a beneficial effect on western New York schoolchildren.

As a result of the Primary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, $589,451 has already been channeled into schools in the congressional district I represent.

The amounts and the school districts follow:

Alden	$32, 194
Frontier	65, 070
Lancaster	58, 125
Depew	27, 514
Amherst Central	31, 240
Amherst District 13	19, 090
Amherst District 18	19, 378
Sweet Home	46, 341
West Seneca Central	60, 071
Akron	35, 540
Cheektowaga Central	32, 465
Sloan	50, 173
Maryvale	64, 476
Cleveland Hill	47, 774

In the past decade, local debt for public education has increased by nearly 400 percent, and many school districts have reached the limit of indebtedness.

Federal aid is indeed a blessing to heavily taxed property owners and debt-burdened school districts. But local control and initiative are most important. The law is written to encourage the interest and initiative of interested citizens in the local schools. The educational decisions are made at the State and local levels—not here in Washington.

POSTAL BUDGET

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, a week ago the Post Office Department announced a massive program to accelerate mechanization and modernization of the Nation's postal system. The initial phase of that program involved installation of mail-handling equipment in 109 post offices throughout the Nation, and the total mechanization program was to cost about $65 million by June 30, 1966.

Following that announcement, members of our Post Office and Civil Service Committee, myself included, enthusiastically endorsed the new plans and programs for the Postal Establishment. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Facilities and Modernization I was looking forward to working closely with the Department in carrying out its plans for improved mail service.

On Monday the 1967 budget came to this Congress. The total asked for postal research, development, and engineering—the real basis for any approach to modernization and mechanization—is $16 million. With defense spending zooming to $61.4 billion—and $5.5 billion of that for research and development—the Post Office Department has again presented a research budget totaling only 0.002 of its budget. There is no business of any size in the country today that could seriously expect to grow and improve with such a shortsighted investment in research. I cannot overemphasize the seriousness of this refusal to face the realities of the 20th century at a time like the present when the efficiency and speed of delivery of the mail are of paramount importance to the strength and safety of the Nation.

Our three postal subcommittees, which recently made a firsthand study of European postal systems, have recommended that the Post Office Department budget for research and development be substantially increased and that programs of research be employed to develop new systems, to evaluate old concepts, and to provide the tools for keeping pace with a mail explosion of 2 billion pieces annually.

It is now clear that the $65-million program announced by the Post Office last week is a retooling operation, not a modernization program. Without a basic research program to link this operation to a systematic effort to modernize the entire postal complex, the Department may soon find itself with $65 million in outmoded machinery.

The budget figures submitted Monday also make it clear that if the Post Office Department is to have a realistic research program, we in the Congress are going to have to take the initiative.

SENATE CONFIRMATION OF ANY NEW DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention and that of the House the fact that a bill requiring Senate confirmation of any new Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the FBI, is pending before the House after passing the Senate last May 24.

An article by the well-known columnist, Ralph de Toledano, in a recent issue of Human Events gives alleged reasons for delay in this measure being reported out of the Judiciary Committee. I do not have confirmation of these reasons, but I do know that the need to act fast is clear from other assertions in this article.

By unanimous consent, I introduce in the Record the article in Human Events:

[From Human Events, Jan. 15, 1966]

Coming: A Battle Over the FBI—Will the Bureau Be Political or Efficient?

(By Ralph de Toledano)

When Congress convenes there will be a determined push by security-minded Members of the House for legislation to require Senate confirmation of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This is at once a tribute to the incumbent, John Edgar Hoover, and an indication of suspicion for the wheeling-and-dealing aspects of the Johnson administration.

A bill to this effect has already been passed by the Senate. In the House of Representatives, however, Chairman Emanuel Celler, of the Judiciary Committee, has done his utmost to prevent the measure from reaching the floor. There is an ironic angle to this, given Mr. Celler's bitter criticism of other chairmen who have bottled up legislation.

Mr. Celler and the Democratic liberals in the House have argued that preventing a committee from taking up a bill—and therefore preventing a vote by the Congress—is violative of the democratic process. By a not-so-very-odd coincidence, they have waived this argument whenever legislation that they favor has been held up.

What is at stake in the case of the FBI succession bill is the control of FBI files and the future use of the Bureau for purposes which have little to do with the investigation of crime—and nothing at all with the war on subversion. In the years of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, the FBI has been under tremendous pressure from Attorneys General Robert F. Kennedy and Nicholas deB. Katzenbach. There has been criticism of Mr. Hoover in some quarters for presumably bowing to this pressure. But if there is any truth in this, it is far more noteworthy that he has been able to hold the line so well.

When Mr. Hoover retires, the administration will be in a position to appoint a man who is far more malleable. This is the fear of those who press for legislation which will give the Congress a check on the new Director. At present the man who will influence the choice, when Mr. Hoover terminates his long and honorable service, is Attorney General Katzenbach. And it is Mr. Katzenbach who has been lobbying most persistently against the proposed change.

In a way, it is understandable why Mr. Katzenbach wants to retain his power over FBI Directors. The new appointee will not be buttressed by the tremendous prestige which has made the FBI relatively impregnable under Mr. Hoover. The need for congressional approval will force the administration to find a man of stature—not a hack, crony, or ideologue.

There are reports on Capitol Hill that the administration has already begun the buildup on its choice. He is Adam Yarmolinsky, who was singled out by Congress for political extinction when he was being touted for an important post in the antipoverty war. Like a phoenix, however, Mr. Yarmolinsky returned to prominence as Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs.

If it is not simply the kind of self-propelled scuttlebutt which floats down House and Senate corridors, then there would be some semblance of sense in this new honor for Mr. Yarmolinsky. The word "security" is now part of his title, much to the shock and chagrin of legislators here, and could be used to enhance his credentials.

Congress, of course, would never have it—and this, to bring this account full circle, is why there will be a considerable push to make the appointment of an FBI Director subject to senatorial consent.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL CLERICAL HELP

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 690) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 690

Resolved, That effective February 1, 1966, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, until otherwise provided by law, such sums as may be necessary for:

1. Additional clerical help in the Office of the Majority Leader, not to exceed $3,000 (basic) per annum.

2. (a) An additional position in the Office of the Minority Leader, the basic compensation of which shall be at a rate not to exceed $2,500 per annum.

(b) An additional position in the Office of the Majority Whip, the basic compensation of which shall be at a rate not to exceed $2,500 per annum.

(c) An additional position in the Office of the Minority Whip, the basic compensation of which shall be at a rate not to exceed $2,500 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER IN DADE COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 30) to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 20, strike out "February 15, 1966," and insert "May 15, 1966,".

Page 4, line 19, strike out "$11,000,000" and insert "$7,500,000".

Page 5, lines 3 and 4, strike out "1967, 1968, 1959, and 1970" and insert "1968 and 1969".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

DEMONSTRATION CITIES ACT OF 1966—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 368)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The year 1966 can be the year of rebirth for American cities.

This Congress, and this people, can set in motion forces of change in great urban areas that will make them the masterpieces of our civilization.

Fifty years from now our population will reach that of today's India. Our grandchildren will inhabit a world as different from ours, as ours is from the world of Jefferson.

None can predict the shape of their life with any certainty. Yet one thing is sure. It will be lived in cities. By the year 2000, four out of five Americans will live and work in a metropolitan area.

We are not strangers to an urban world. We began our national life gathered in towns along the Atlantic seaboard. We built new commercial centers around the Great Lakes and in the Midwest, to serve our westward expansion.

Forty millions came from Europe to fuel our economy and enrich our community life. This century has seen the steady and rapid migration of farm families—seeking jobs and the promise of the city.

From this rich experience we have learned much.

We know that cities can stimulate the best in man, and aggravate the worst.

We know the convenience of city life, and its paralysis.

We know its promise, and its dark foreboding.

What we may only dimly perceive is the gravity of the choice before us.

Shall we make our cities livable for ourselves and our posterity? Or shall we by timidity and neglect damn them to fester and decay?

If we permit our cities to grow without rational design; if we stand passively by, while the center of each city becomes a hive of deprivation, crime, and hopelessness; if we devour the countryside as though it were limitless, while our ruins—millions of tenement apartments and dilapidated houses—go unredeemed; if we become two people—the suburban affluent and the urban poor, each filled with mistrust and fear one for the other; if this is our desire and policy as a people, then we shall effectively cripple each generation to come.

We shall as well condemn our own generation to a bitter paradox; an educated, wealthy, progressive people, who would not give their thoughts, their resources. or their wills to provide for their common well-being.

I do not believe such a fate is either necessary or inevitable. But I believe this will come to pass—unless we commit ourselves now to the planning, the building, the teaching and the caring that alone can forestall it.

That is why I am recommending today a massive demonstration cities program. I recommend that both the public and private sectors of our economy join to build in our cities and towns an environment for man equal to the dignity of his aspirations.

I recommend an effort larger in scope, more comprehensive, more concentrated—than any that has gone before.

THE WORK OF THE PAST

I know the work of the past three decades. I have shared in the forging of our Federal housing and renewal programs. I know what they have done for millions of urban Americans:

Eight million single family dwellings assisted by the Federal Housing Administration.

An additional 6.7 million assisted by the Veterans' Administration.

One million, one hundred thousand multiple units created; 605,000 families moved out of decayed and unsanitary dwellings into decent public housing; 300,000 dwelling units supported under urban renewal.

Without these programs, the goal I recommend today would be impossible to achieve. Because Federal sponsorship is so effective a part of our system of homebuilding, we can conceive a far larger purpose than it has yet fulfilled. We must make use of every established housing program—and of social, educational, and economic instruments as well—if the demonstration cities program is to succeed.

THE PROBLEM TODAY

Our housing programs have built a platform, from which we may see how far away is the reborn city we desire. For there still remain: some 4 million urban families living in homes of such disrepair as to violate decent housing standards; the need to provide over 30 percent more housing annually than we are currently building; our chronic inability to provide sufficient low- and moderate-income housing, of adequate quality, at a reasonable price; the special problem of the poor and the Negro, unable to move freely from their ghettos, exploited in the quest for the necessities of life; increasing pressures on municipal budgets, with large city per capita expenditures rising 36 percent in the 3 years after 1960.

The high human costs: crime, delinquency, welfare loads, disease and health hazards. This is man's fate in those broken neighborhoods where he can "feel the enclosure of the flaking walls and see through the window the blackened reflection of the tenement across the street that blocks out the world beyond"; the tragic waste and, indeed, the chaos that threatens where children are born into the stifling air of overcrowded rooms, destined for a poor diet, inadequate schools, streets of fear and sordid temptation, joblessness, and the gray anxiety of the ill-prepared; and the flight to the suburbs of more fortunate men and women, who might have provided the leadership and the means for reversing this human decline.

THE INADEQUATE RESPONSE

Since 1949, the urban renewal program has been our chief instrument in the struggle for a decent urban environment.

Over 800 cities are participating in urban renewal programs. Undertaken and designed by the cities themselves, these efforts have had an increasing influence on the use of urban land. Last year the Congress wisely extended the authorization for urban renewal, at a higher level than before.

Years of experience with urban renewal have taught us much about its strengths and weaknesses.

Since 1961 we have made major alterations in its administration. We have made it more responsive to human needs. We have more vigorously enforced the requirement of a workable program for the entire community. Within the limits of current law, we have achieved considerable progress toward these goals.

Nevertheless the social and psychological effects of relocating the poor have not always been treated as what they are. They are the unavoidable consequences of slum clearance, demanding as much concern as physical redevelopment.

The size and scale of urban assistance has been too small, and too widely dispersed.

Present programs are often prisoners of archaic and wasteful building practices. They have inhibited the use of modern technology. They have inflated the cost of rebuilding.

The benefits and efficiencies that can come from metropolitan planning are still unrealized in most urban regions.

Insufficient resources cause extensive delays in many projects. The result is growing blight and overcrowding that thwart our best efforts to resist them.

The goals of major Federal programs have often lacked cohesiveness. Some work for the revitalization of the central city. Some accelerate suburban growth. Some unite urban communities. Some disrupt them.

URBAN DILEMMAS

Virtually every forward step we have taken has had its severe limitations. Each of those steps has involved a public choice, and created a public dilemma: major clearance and reconstruction, with its attendant hardships of relocation; relieving traffic congestion, thereby widening the gulf between the affluence of suburbia and the poverty of the city; involving urban residents in redeveloping their own areas, hence lengthening the time and increasing the cost of the job; preserving the autonomy of local agencies, thus crippling our efforts to attack regional problems on a regional basis.

These dilemmas cannot be completely resolved by any single program, no matter how well designed. The prize—cities of spacious beauty and lively promise, where men are truly free to determine how they will live—is too rich to be lost because the problems are complex.

Let there be debate over means and priorities.

Let there be experiment with a dozen approaches, or a hundred.

But let there be commitment to that goal.

WHAT IS REQUIRED

From the experience of three decades, it is clear to me that American cities require a program that will: concentrate our available resources—in planning tools, in housing construction, in job training, in health facilities, in recreation, in welfare programs, in education—to improve the conditions of life in urban areas; join together all available talent and skills in a coordinated effort; mobilize local leadership and private initiative, so that local citizens will determine the shape of their new city—freed from the constraints that have handicapped their past efforts and inflated their costs.

A DEMONSTRATION CITIES PROGRAM

I propose a demonstration cities program that will offer qualifying cities of all sizes the promise of a new life for their people.

I propose that we make massive additions to the supply of low- and moderate-cost housing.

I propose that we combine physical reconstruction and rehabilitation with effective social programs throughout the rebuilding process.

I propose that we achieve new flexibility in administrative procedures.

I propose that we focus all the techniques and talents within our society on the crisis of the American city.

It will not be simple to qualify for such a program. We have neither the means nor the desire to invest public funds in an expensive program whose net effects will be marginal, wasteful, or visible only after protracted delay.

We intend to help only those cities who help themselves.

I propose these guidelines for determining a city's qualifications for the benefits—and achievements—of this program.

First. The demonstration should be of sufficient magnitude both in its physical and social dimensions to arrest blight and decay in entire neighborhoods. It must make a substantial impact within the coming few years on the development of the entire city.

Second. The demonstration should bring about a change in the total environment of the area affected. It must provide schools, parks, playgrounds, community centers, and access to all necessary community facilities.

Third. The demonstration—from its beginning—should make use of every available social program. The human cost of reconstruction and relocation must be reduced. New opportunities for work and training must be offered.

Fourth. The demonstration should contribute to narrowing the housing gap between the deprived and the rest of the community. Major additions must be made to the supply of sound dwellings. Equal opportunity in the choice of housing must be assured to every race.

Fifth. The demonstration should offer maximum occasions for employing residents of the demonstration area in all phases of the program.

Sixth. The demonstration should foster the development of local and private initiative and widespread citizen participation—especially from the demonstration area—in the planning and execution of the program.

Seventh. The demonstration should take advantage of modern cost-reducing technologies without reducing the quality of the work. Neither the structure of real estate taxation, cumbersome building codes, nor inefficient building practices should deter rehabilitation or inflate project costs.

Eighth. The demonstration should make major improvements in the quality of the environment. There must be a high quality of design in new buildings, and attention to man's need for open spaces and attractive landscaping.

Ninth. The demonstration should make relocation housing available at costs commensurate with the incomes of those displaced by the project. Counseling services, moving expenses, and small business loans should be provided, together with assistance in job placement and retraining.

Tenth. The demonstration should be managed in each demonstration city by a single authority with adequate powers to carry out and coordinate all phases of the program. There must be a serious commitment to the project on the part of local, and where appropriate, State authorities. Where required to carry out the plan, agreements should be reached with neighboring communities.

Eleventh. The demonstration proposal should offer proof that adequate municipal appropriations and services are available and will be sustained throughout the demonstration period.

Twelfth. The demonstration should maintain or establish a residential character in the area.

Thirteenth. The demonstration should be consistent with existing development plans for the metropolitan areas involved. Transportation plans should coordinate every appropriate mode of city and regional transportation.

Fourteenth. The demonstration should extend for an initial 6-year period. It should maintain a schedule for the expeditious completion of the project.

These guidelines will demand the full cooperation of government at every level and of private citizens in each area. I believe our Federal system is creative enough to inspire that cooperative effort. I know it must be so creative if it is to prosper and flourish.

SIZE OF THE PROGRAM

The program I recommend is intended to eliminate blight in the entire demonstration area. Through efficient rebuilding it must replace that blight with attractive and economic housing, social services, and community facilities.

There are many ways by which this can be done, once the commitment has been made to do it. Total clearance and reconstruction; partial clearance and rehabilitation; rehabilitation alone—any of these methods may be chosen by local citizens.

Whatever approach is selected, however, must be comprehensive enough to be effective and economic.

There are few cities or towns in America which could not participate in the demonstration cities program. We shall take special care to see that urban communities of all sizes are included. For each such community, the impact of the program will be significant, involving as much as 15 to 20 percent of the existing substandard structures.

For the largest qualifying cities a relatively modest program could provide decent housing for approximately 5,000 families now living in substandard dwelling units. It could rehabilitate other marginal housing sufficient to affect 50,000 people. A typical program could well involve a total of 35,000 units or 100,000 people.

For cities of approximately 100,000 people, 1,000 families could be rehoused, and 3,000 units rehabilitated, affecting a total of 10,000 people.

BENEFITS OF THE PROGRAM

I recommend that participating cities receive two types of Federal assistance:

First. The complete array of all available grants and urban aids in the fields of housing, renewal, transportation, education, welfare, economic opportunity, and related programs.

Second. Special grants amounting to 80 percent of the non-Federal cost of our grant-in-aid programs included in the demonstration. These grants are to supplement the efforts of local communities. They are not to be substituted for those efforts.

In every qualifying city, a Federal coordinator would be assigned to assist local officials in bringing together all the relevant Federal resources.

Once authorized, the supplemental funds would be made available in a common account. They would be drawn at the discretion of the community to support the program. They would be certified by the Federal coordinator.

It is vital that incentives be granted for cost reductions achieved during the performance of the program.

At least as vital as the dollar commitment for rebuilding and rehabilitation is the social program commitment. We must link our concern for the total welfare of the person, with our desire to improve the physical city in which he lives. For the first time, social and construction agencies would be joined in a massive common effort, responsive to a common local authority.

There is another benefit—not measurable in dollars, or even in the extended range of social services—that qualifying cities would secure by participating in this program.

It is a sense of hope: that the city is not beyond reach of redemption by men of good will; that through wise planning, cooperation, hard work, and the sacrifice of those outmoded codes and practices that make widespread renewal impossibly expensive today, it is possible to reverse the city's decline.

That knowledge, that confidence, that hope can make all the difference in the decade ahead.

FEDERAL COST

Funds are required in the first year to assist our cities in the preparation of demonstration plans. We should not underestimate the problems involved in achieving such a plan. The very scale of the demonstration, its widespread and profound effects on the social and physical structure of the city, calls for marshaling the city's planning and administrative resources on an unprecedented scale.

I estimate the appropriate Federal contribution to this planning effort at $12 million.

For the supplemental demonstration grants I will recommend appropriations, over a 6-year period, totaling over $2.3 billion, or an average of some $400 million per year.

It is impossible to estimate exactly—but it is necessary to consider—the rising cost of welfare services, crime prevention, unemployment and declining property values that will plague all governments, local, State, and Federal, if we do not move quickly to heal and revitalize our cities.

METROPOLITAN PLANNING

The success of each demonstration will depend on the quality of its planning, and the degree of cooperation it elicits from the various governmental bodies concerned, as well as from private interests.

Most metropolitan areas conduct some degree of metropolitan planning now. The Federal Government has made funds available throughout the country so that State and local planning agencies might devise—many for the first time—comprehensive plans for metropolitan areas.

I recommend improvements and extensions of this program. The Congress enacted them recognizing that the problems of growth, transportation, housing, and public services cannot be considered by one entity of Government alone.

The absence of cooperation between contiguous areas is wasteful. It is also blind to the reality of urban life. What happens in the central city, or the suburb, is certain to affect the quality of life in the other.

The widespread demand for these funds has resulted in their being spread thinly across the 50 States. Thus, the benefits of a truly coordinated attack on metropolitan problems have not generally been realized.

INCENTIVES TO ORDERLY METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

Over the past 5 years, the Congress has authorized Federal grants for urban mass transportation, open space, and sewer and water facilities. The Congress has required that such projects be consistent with comprehensive planning for an entire urban or metropolitan area.

The Federal Government has thus not only helped our localities to provide the facilities they need. It has also stimulated cooperation and joint planning among neighboring jurisdictions.

But more remains to be done. The powerful forces of urban growth threaten to overwhelm efforts to achieve orderly development. A metropolitan plan should be an instrument for shaping sound urban growth—not a neglected document.

I now propose a new incentive to help assure that metropolitan plans achieve their potential.

The Federal Government should bear a larger share of the total cost of related Federal aid programs. This share would be borne where local jurisdictions show that they are ready to be guided by their own plans in working out the patterns of their own development and where they establish the joint institutional arrangements necessary to carry out those plans.

DEMONSTRATIONS OF EFFECTIVE PLANNING

I propose that a series of demonstrations in effective metropolitan planning be undertaken promptly.

Metropolitan areas would be selected to return the broadest possible data and experience to Federal, State, and local governments. They should therefore be of varying size and environment, in widely separated locations. They would be selected to assure that their benefits reach small communities surrounding the large cities.

Advanced techniques and approaches should be employed. There must be balanced consideration of physical and human development programs; coordinated treatment of the regional transportation network; technical innovations, such as metropolitan data banks and systems analysis; new educational and training programs; new arrangements for coordinating decisions of the various local governments involved.

I estimate the cost of the demonstrations at $6,500,000.

I shall impose on the new Department of Housing and Urban Development the continuing responsibility to stimulate effective planning. If local governments do not plan cooperatively and sufficiently in advance of inevitable urban growth, even adequate funds and an aggressive determination to improve our cities cannot succeed.

HOUSING FOR ALL

The programs I have proposed—in rebuilding large areas of our cities, and in metropolitan planning—are essential for the rebirth of urban America.

Yet at the center of the cities' housing problem lies racial discrimination. Crowded miles of inadequate dwellings—poorly maintained and frequently overpriced—is the lot of most Negro Americans in many of our cities. Their avenue of escape to a more attractive neighborhood is often closed, because of their color.

The Negro suffers from this, as do his children. So does the community at large. Where housing is poor, schools are generally poor. Unemployment is widespread. Family life is threatened. The community's welfare burden is steadily magnified. These are the links in the chain of racial discrimination.

This administration is working to break that chain—through aid to education, medical care, community action programs, job retraining, and the maintenance of a vigorous economy.

The time has come when we should break one of its strongest links—the often subtle, but always effective force of housing discrimination. The impacted racial ghetto will become a thing of the past only when the Negro American can move his family wherever he can afford to do so.

I shall, therefore, present to the Congress at an early date legislation to bar racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing.

NEW COMMUNITIES

Our existing urban centers, however revitalized, cannot accommodate all the urban Americans of the next generation.

Three million new residents are added each year to our present urban population. The growth of new communities is inevitable. Unless they are to be casual parts of a general urban sprawl, a new approach to their design is required.

We must: enlarge the entire scale of the building process; make possible new efficiencies in construction, land development, and municipal services; relieve population densities; offer a variety of homes to a wide range of incomes.

These communities must also provide an environment harmonious to man's needs.

They must offer adequate transportation systems, attractive community buildings, and open spaces free from pollution. They must retain much of the natural beauty of the landscape.

The private sector must continue its prominent role in new community development. As I recommended to the Congress last year, mortgage insurance should be made available for sites and community facilities for entire new communities.

It is apparent that new communities will spring into being near an increasing number of major metropolitan areas. Some, already in existence, promise dramatic efficiencies through size and new construction techniques, without sacrificing beauty. Obviously such a development should be encouraged. I recommend that the Congress provide the means of doing so.

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

Rarely has a new housing program evoked such a dramatic and positive response as the rent supplement program.

The Department of Housing and Urban Affairs has already received preliminary proposals from sponsors to construct nearly 70,000 low-income units under this program as soon as funds become available.

The proposals involve 424 projects in 265 localities in 43 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The sponsors have already selected sites for some 40,000 of these units. The interested groups are about equally divided between nonprofit organizations and private limited dividend developers.

The need for this program is obvious. It is the need of the poor and the disadvantaged. The demand for the means to meet this need by private enterprise is demonstrated by the figures I have just cited.

I strongly urge the Congress to pass a supplementary appropriation to fund the rent supplement program at the $30 million level it has authorized in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

MASS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

We must continue to help our communities meet their increasing needs for mass transportation facilities. For this purpose, I propose an additional 1-year authorization for the urban mass transportation program.

THE NEW DEPARTMENT

No Federal program can be effective unless the agency that administers it is efficient. This is even more crucial for programs that call for comprehensive approaches at both the Federal and local level.

Progress was made after 1961 toward unifying the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But the very nature of that agency limited the extent to which its several parts could be welded into a truly unified whole. Its Administrator lacked the statutory basis for gaining full control over partially independent agencies.

With this in mind, I requested—and you enacted—legislation to create a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

As a result, the Secretary of the new Department now has the authority and the machinery for implementing the new programs I have asked for.

I see five ways by which he can do this:

First. He can organize the Department so that its emphasis will be upon meeting modern urban needs—rather than fitting new programs into old and outworn patterns.

Second. He can strengthen the regional structure so that more decisions can be made in the field.

Third. He can assert effective leadership throughout the Department.

Fourth. He can mesh together all our social and physical efforts to improve urban living.

Fifth. He can assume leadership among intergovernmental agencies dealing with urban problems.

Such a Department, and such leadership, will be worthy of the program I recommend you adopt.

A YEAR OF REBIRTH

The evidence is all about us that to be complacent about the American city is to invite, at best, inconvenience; at worst, a divided Nation.

The programs I have proposed in this message will require a determined commitment of our energy and a substantial commitment of our funds.

Yet these programs are well within our resources. Nor do they compare in cost with the ugliness, hostility, and hopelessness of unlivable cities.

What would it mean to begin now, and to bring about the rebirth of our cities?

It would mean: a more tolerable and a more hopeful life for millions of Americans; the possibility of retaining middle-income families in the city, and even attracting some to return; improving the cities' tax base, at a time of heavy strain on city budgets; ultimately reducing welfare costs; avoiding the unnecessary waste of human resources; giving to both urban and suburban families the freedom to choose where they will live; a clean room and a patch of sky for every person, a chance to live near an open space, and to reach it on a safe street.

As Thomas Wolfe wrote:

> To every man his chance—to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining, golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him—this * * * is the promise of America.

I believe these are among the most profound aspirations of our people. I want to make them part of our destiny.

I urge the Congress promptly to adopt the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966. If we begin now the planning from which action will flow, the hopes of the 20th century will become the realities of the 21st.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 26, 1966.*

DEMONSTRATION CITIES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to voice my full support for the President's proposal of a concerted, massive thrust against blight, poverty, and decay in great areas of our urban centers.

I refer to President Johnson's bold plan to move, in large areas of our central cities, with all the means at hand and uproot the causes and consequences of physical decay and human degradation once and for all. In this way, we can demonstrate that revitalization of our cities, and the simultaneous redemption and rehabilitation of the people who live in rundown areas, need not wait on piecemeal efforts which take decades or generations. It can be done now—if we will only make full concerted use of the resources we have today.

The President's new plan is simple in concept. It calls for no new programs to deal with separate problems. It calls, rather, for the full use of all the measures we already have, but applied jointly and in concert to the basic problems of a blighted area.

It means human and physical rehabilitation at one and the same time. It means a full-scale plan of action for the needs of the area and the needs of the people. It brings together our resources of renewal, education, employment, housing, and social help in one combined assault.

The plan is for Federal help to make it possible for urban communities, large and small, to mount a major attack of this kind. Federal funds will be used to do a thorough-going job of planning on an all-out program to deal with all aspects of human and physical blight in large urban areas.

The President's plan proposes fighting blight on a new and larger scale—in areas that may involve as many as 100,000 people in a large city—or as few as 10,000 in a smaller sized town.

It would place Federal resources under a joint command to accomplish this objective. It calls on our local communities, likewise, to think in larger terms, and to place their resources under a common direction for the same end.

It is time, I think, that we start on such a scale and with full force to move against the basic problem of blight and its many causes. The President's proposal offers the means. If we really mean to get it done, this is the way to do the job.

MESSAGE ON CITIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message on the cities outlines several needs of the urban areas of America that are yet to be met. He proposes new plans and programs to make urban development fit into the achievement of our overall objective of the Great Society.

The plans and programs proposed by the President are not idle dreams. They are highly practical, and based on long study and experience.

The President's proposal for rebuilding central cities suggests harnessing existing programs and activities of various Federal agencies and directing them in a more coordinated manner. He would add to these programs additional assistance for planning. The cities would contribute to their own rebuilding, but only an amount that is within their ability to pay. By these actions we can restore to the central city the tax resources and the industry and commerce that are essential to its prosperity.

The President would also provide the assistance to mass transportation that is needed if workers are to travel to and from our cities in a minimum of time, and with the least cost and inconvenience.

The President's message reports the great interest of private organizations in providing housing for low-income families with the assistance of rent supplements. I believe a fair trial will prove that this program, authorized by the 1965 Housing Act, is practical and that it will be successful in housing low-income families at least possible cost to the taxpayers.

These are only a few of the significant proposals made by the President in his various messages to the Congress on the cities and urban development.

I am sure the Congress will lose no time in giving them consideration so they can be put to work immediately.

DEMONSTRATION CITIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's proposals for a concentrated effort to eliminate blight and decay from the centers of our towns and cities is, to my mind, one of the most important and promising recommendations in recent years.

Billions of dollars of public and private funds are now going into the redevelopment of our cities. Concentration of all these efforts, under coordinated plans and direction, instead of separately as unrelated forays on physical and human blight, will produce a total effort far more valuable than the sum of its separate parts.

As the President points out, many things can be accomplished by such a concerted effort which would be impossible without it.

The way to reverse blight and decay, far more quickly and on a lasting basis, is to alter the total environment at one time, instead of trying to do it bit by bit, without plan or coordination.

We can work effectively with, not just for, people whose lives are affected, enabling them to become a creative part of their own urban community.

We can stimulate and implement local initiative and citizen participation in a community's future.

We can develop, in these areas, laboratories for exploring stubborn problems of technology, real estate taxation, building codes, and inefficiency in construction and rehabilitation.

We can develop new and higher levels of design and quality in housing, in area planning, in preservation of open spaces.

We can serve the individual needs and problems of people directly, with counseling and with social and economic help. We can reduce the human cost of urban development.

We can, especially, bring about a consolidation within a community of its own resources, and those of the surrounding area.

The President has offered us a comprehensive plan for doing a difficult job. It is one of the most important proposals now before us and I trust that the committee will begin work immediately. I urge support of these proposals.

RENT SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in his message on the cities, President Johnson has forcefully brought to our attention a basic fact of urban life that must be reckoned with: we do not have enough decent housing for the people who live in our cities. Nor are we preparing enough decent housing for the millions more who will be living there tomorrow.

Decent housing is the fundamental factor in building livable urban communities. Yet millions are now forced to live in slums, ghettos, or rundown housing because there is nothing else they can afford.

As the President also points out, however, we can have a lot more good housing for these low-income people if we want it and act to get it. Local sponsors and private developers are waiting for our word to build it.

Last year we enacted the rent supplement program to help provide this kind of housing. But we did not give it any money. Now the President asks for quick action to provide funds to put that program to work.

The President informs us that sponsors have already presented preliminary proposals to the FHA for the building of nearly 70,000 low-income units under this program. More than half of these—involving 40,000 units, already have sites available or optioned. This demand is nationwide—coming from 265 localities in 43 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The sponsors are both nonprofit organizations and private investors building for limited dividend returns.

This remarkable response to such a new program is highly encouraging.

I urge this body to move promptly to provide the full amount of funding for the rent supplement program. Our people need this housing now. They are looking to us to provide it. We should delay no longer.

CITIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SULLIVAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson signed the bill creating a new Department of Housing and Urban Development, he noted that we were "taking the first step toward organizing our system for a more rational response to the pressing challenge of urban life."

The Department is now in existence.

It has the leadership of Robert C. Weaver, who comes to us with impressive credentials and fine support. It has many good programs which it inherited from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, particularly the excellent legislation of the Housing Act of 1965.

Now we are ready to move ahead with even bolder steps. They are embodied in the legislation which the President has asked us to consider in this second session.

This legislation moves away from the piecemeal, and toward the comprehensive.

Foremost is the demonstration city program which will combine Federal aid with local programs and local initiative to rebuild entirely the central city and slum areas of several American cities.

Under another Department-scale program, demonstration grants will be given to selected areas for metropolitan planning. This is an incentive program which will help metropolitan areas prepare themselves for a better urban environment and help them reduce costs of public facilities and services.

The experience gained, and the data gathered from such demonstrations will prove of great value for further planning.

These are two of the major new programs in this legislation. There are others. They are large in scope and promise, and they are properly the concern of all of us.

GHETTOS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my great satisfaction to learn that the President, in a later message, will propose legislation aimed at that most poignant aspect of our American society—the existence of Negro ghettos in our cities.

Three years ago, President Kennedy signed his Executive order on equal opportunity in housing. That order, barring discrimination in rental or sale of FHA and VA housing, has not proved as effective as many of us hoped. Most housing today is rented or sold without FHA and VA assistance, and thus is not covered by the order.

It is my understanding there is some legal uncertainty that the Executive order can be widened, under existing law, to cover housing financed by conventional methods. Therefore, the only way open to the Nation to obtain an across-the-board end to housing discrimination is through new legislation.

We must do what we can to prevent the perpetuation of these ghettos.

This is the least that can be expected of the Congress if our fellow Americans who now live in congested ghettos are to have an equal chance to escape to better homes and better neighborhoods. Other legislation, some already enacted and some to be acted on this year, will accomplish still more—by providing better educational facilities, better jobs and other gains for minorities. But a further advance in legislation against housing discrimination must be made if all our other measures are to have their full effect.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON ASSISTANCE TO METROPOLITAN AREAS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the President's program for massive assistance to our metropolitan areas is aimed at one of the pressing problems of our day.

Today, each city has a multitude of agencies and jurisdictions, each struggling with separate parts of the total metropolitan problem. Often they succeed only in compounding each other's woes. We must develop the means for them to act in concert on common problems. We must help them serve rather than abdicate their common interests.

The President's recommendation would make this possible on a scale never before attempted. It would offer the means and the incentive, through increased Federal assistance, for the separate interests to join in common action on problems affecting them all.

It calls not merely for plans, but for effective action.

It would embrace physical and community planning. But it also would plan for the human environment, and for transportation, education, financial, and other essential parts of sound urban growth.

The cost is small. The need is urgent. Action on this front is needed quickly and in a large scale.

SECRETARY McNAMARA MAKES AN IMPRESSIVE CASE FOR REPLACING THE B-52 AND B-58 BOMBERS WITH A BOMBER VERSION OF THE TFX—FB-111

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, during the period of congressional adjournment last fall Defense Secretary McNamara announced a decision to phase out, in the next few years, a substantial portion of our present long-range strategic bomber force, both B-52 and B-58 bombers, and replace them with a smaller number of new aircraft; namely, a new bomber version of the famous TFX, the F-111 fighter, to be known as the FB-111.

Many Members of Congress were understandably concerned, when Mr. McNamara made this announcement, that the phasing out of these older aircraft and their replacement by a smaller number of a new aircraft, originally developed as a fighter rather than a bomber, might impair the Nation's security.

In an effort to determine the real facts in this matter the Hébert subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee was directed to undertake a full investigation of the Secretary's decision. Yesterday, as its first witness, the subcommittee heard Secretary McNamara in executive session. Subsequently a declassified or "sanitized" version of the Secretary's statement was released to the press.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Secretary McNamara's statement makes a very strong and impressive case for the soundness of his decision. While the impressiveness of the Secretary's case was, rather understandably, greater in the classified version, nevertheless the sanitized version is also very impressive and does, I believe, reveal the detailed and painstaking thought that went into the Secretary's decision.

For this reason, and because the whole subject of changes in our strategic bombing force is understandably of great concern not only to all members of Congress but to all Americans, I am taking this opportunity of inserting in the Record, following my remarks, the unclassified version of Secretary McNamara's statement.

Mr. Speaker, this month Secretary McNamara marks the fifth anniversary of his service as Secretary of Defense. He has now served in that position longer than any other person. Many people have suggested, and I would concur with them, that Mr. McNamara has in fact been our greatest Secretary of Defense. And the reason for that, Mr. Speaker, I would say, is that he has succeeded far more extensively than any of his predecessors in applying to the complex, detailed, and extensive conglomeration of matters that properly fall within the province of the Department of Defense, the disciplines of reason, logic, and science. Not all of the matters which relate to defense matters are in fact completely subject to these disciplines of reason, logic, or scientific method. In defense matters, as in the conduct of war, we always confront what Clausewitz called "the fog of war." Not everything yields itself fully to rational treatment. Human beings cannot fully discern the future. Nor can they fully discern the minds or the actions of the enemy. That is why we all make mistakes in war and in defense matters. Even Mr. McNamara is human.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, there is no other, no better way, to make decisions or to appraise facts, in defense matters as well as in other matters, than by the best possible application of reasoning, logic, and the normal disciplines of science. I for one am glad that our present Secretary of Defense is so highly capable in this particular aspect of management.

I believe the statement that follows will prove to be not only helpful and informative on the specific issue of the soundness of our defenses against the Soviet Union, but will demonstrate very clearly the impressive character of rational, logical analysis which has so marked the 5 brilliant years of Secretary McNamara's service, which have made him the greatest Defense Secretary in our history, and which have so fully justified the confidence placed in him, first by President Kennedy and now by President Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Secretary McNamara's statement in the Record:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. MCNAMARA BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2 OF THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ON THE FISCAL YEARS 1967–71 STRATEGIC BOMBER PROGRAM, JANUARY 25, 1966

I welcome this opportunity to discuss with you our longer range plans for the strategic bomber forces. You understand, of course, that the strategic bombers represent only a portion of our overall strategic offensive forces, and that the strategic offensive forces, themselves, are but one of two components of our general nuclear war posture; the other being the strategic defensive forces. I have found from my own work in this area that both of these components must be considered within a single analytical framework if the relative merits of available alternatives are to be properly evaluated; and last year that was the way I presented the strategic offensive-defensive programs, both to the President and the congressional committees.

Accordingly, I believe it would be most useful for the purposes of your inquiry, today, if I were to review with you at least the nature of the general nuclear war problem as we see it now, the capabilities of the programed offensive and defensive forces against the expected threat, and our specific proposals for the strategic offensive forces in the fiscal years 1967–71 period.

A. THE GENERAL NUCLEAR WAR PROBLEM

Last year I pointed out that the general nuclear war forces should have two basic capabilities:

1. To deter deliberate nuclear attack upon the United States and its allies by maintaining, continuously, a highly reliable ability to inflict an unacceptable degree of damage upon any single aggressor, or combination of aggressors, at any time during the course of a strategic nuclear exchange, even after absorbing a surprise first strike.

2. In the event such a war nevertheless occurred, to limit damage to the population and industrial capacity.

The first of these capabilities we call assured destruction and the second damage limitation.

Viewed in this light, the assured destruction capability would require only a portion of the ICBM's, the submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBM's) and the manned bombers. The damage limiting capability would be provided by the remainder of the strategic offensive forces (ICBM's, SLBM's, and manned bombers), as well as area defense forces (manned interceptors, longer range anti-ballistic-missile missiles, and antisubmarine warfare forces), terminal defense forces (antibomber surface-to-air missiles and shorter range anti-ballistic-missile missiles), and passive defenses (fallout shelters, warning, etc.). The strategic offensive forces can contribute to the damage limiting objective by attacking enemy delivery vehicles on their bases or launch sites, provided that our forces can reach them before the vehicles are launched at our cities. Area defense forces can destroy enemy vehicles en route to their targets before they reach the target areas. Terminal defenses can destroy enemy weapons or delivery vehicles within the target areas before they detonate. Passive defense measures can reduce the vulnerability of our population to the weapons that do detonate.

The vital first objective, which must be met in full by our strategic nuclear forces, is the capability for assured destruction. Such a capability will, with a high degree of confidence, insure that we can deter under all foreseeable conditions a calculated, deliberate nuclear attack upon the United States or its allies. This capability must be provided regardless of the costs and the difficulties involved.

Once enough forces have been procured to provide high confidence of an assured destruction capability, we can then consider the kinds and amounts of forces which might be added for reducing damage to our population and industry in the event deterrence fails. Such damage limiting programs could range across the entire spectrum, from one designed against a threat of a minor nuclear power—for example, the Chinese Communists in the 1970's—to one designed against the threat of a carefully synchronized surprise first strike by the Soviet Union on our urban industrial areas.

With respect to the damage limiting problem posed by the Soviet nuclear threat, I believe it would be useful to restate briefly certain basic considerations which have guided our programs over the last several years.

First, against the forces we expect the Soviets to have during the next decade, it will be virtually impossible for us to be able to insure anything approaching complete protection for our population, no matter how large the general nuclear war forces we were to provide, including even the hypothetical possibility of striking first. Of course, the number of fatalities would depend on the size and character of the attack as well as on our own forces. The Soviets have the technical and economic capacity to prevent us from achieving a posture which could keep our fatalities below some tens of millions; they can increase their first strike capabilities at an extra cost to them substantially less than the extra cost to us of any additional damage limiting measures we might take.

Second, since each of the three types of Soviet strategic offensive systems (land-based missiles, submarine-launched missiles and manned bombers) can, by itself, inflict severe damage on the United States, even a very good defense against only one type of system has only limited value.

Third, for any given level of Soviet offensive capability, successive additions to each of our various damage limiting systems have diminishing marginal value. The same principle holds for the damage limiting force as a whole; as additional forces are added, the incremental gain in effectiveness diminishes.

At the other end of the spectrum, it now appears to be technically feasible to design a defense system which would have a reasonably high probability of precluding major damage to the United States from an Nth country nuclear threat; e.g., Communist China in the 1970's. Such a defense system would also be effective against an accidental missile launching.

It was with these considerations in mind that we have carefully evaluated the major alternatives available to us in meeting the two strategic objectives of our general nuclear war forces—assured destruction and damage limitation—in the light of the latest projections of the threats. In addition, we have given special attention this year to an analysis of Soviet threats considerably greater than those projected, so as to guard against the possibility that their technological progress may be more rapid than we currently believe to be likely.

Accordingly, my discussion today will deal with:

The capabilities of our general nuclear war forces against the expected threat.

The adequacy of our assured destruction forces against a much higher-than-expected Soviet threat.

Specific recommendations on the strategic offensive forces for the fiscal year 1967–71 period.

B. CAPABILITIES OF THE PROGRAMED FORCES AGAINST THE EXPECTED THREAT

In order to assess the capabilities of our general nuclear war forces over the next several years, we must take into account the size and character of the forces the Soviets are likely to have during the same period. While we have reasonably high confidence in our estimates for the near future, our estimates for the latter part of this decade and the early part of the next are subject to great uncertainties. As I pointed out in past appearances before this committee, such projections are, at best, only informed estimates, particularly since they deal with a period beyond the production and deployment leadtimes of the weapon systems involved.

1. The potential aggressors' strategic offensive-defensive forces

By and large, the current estimates of potential aggressors' strategic offensive-defensive forces projected through mid-1970 are of the same general order of magnitude as those which I discussed here last year.

* * * * *

With these long-range projections of the potential aggressors' forces as background, I would now like to discuss the adequacy of the strategic offensive forces we propose to build and maintain through fiscal year 1971.

2. Adequacy of the strategic offensive forces for assured destruction

Although no one can state with any degree of certainty how a general nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union might evolve, for purposes of evaluating the assured destruction capabilities of our forces, we must assume the worst possible case—that the Soviets strike first in a well-coordinated surprise attack. (Since a significant Chinese Communist nuclear threat to the continental United States is not expected to develop any earlier than the 1975–1980 period, that threat can be omitted from this particular analysis.) Even if the Soviets in the 1970 period were to assign their entire available missile force to attacks on our strategic forces (reserving only refire missiles and bomber-delivered weapons for urban targets), our analysis shows that a very large proportion of our alert forces would still survive. And, of these surviving forces, a very large proportion could reliably deliver their payloads to their targets.

The effective delivery of even one-fifth of the surviving weapons on Soviet cities would destroy about one-third of the total population and half of the industrial capacity of the Soviet Union. By doubling the number of delivered weapons, Soviet fatalities and industrial capacity destroyed would be increased by considerably less than one-third. Beyond this point, further increments of weapons delivered would not appreciably change the results, because we would have to bring under attack smaller and smaller cities, each requiring one delivered weapon.

It is clear, therefore, that our strategic offensive forces are far more than adequate to inflict unacceptable damage on the Soviet Union, even after absorbing a well-coordinated Soviet first strike against those forces. Indeed, it appears that even a relatively small portion of these forces would furnish us with a completely adequate deterrent to a deliberate Soviet nuclear attack on the United States or its allies.

A considerably smaller number of weapons detonated over 50 Chinese urban centers would destroy half of the urban population (more than 50 million people) and destroy more than one-half of their industry. Such an attack would also destroy most of the key governmental, technical and managerial personnel and a large proportion of the skilled workers.

Thus, without any use of the bomber forces, the strategic missile forces recommended for the fiscal year 1967–71 period would provide substantially more force than is required for an assured destruction capability against both the Soviet Union and Communist China simultaneously.

3. The role of the manned bomber force

Given current expectations of vulnerability to enemy attack (before and after launch), and simplicity and controllability of operation, missiles are preferred as the primary weapon for the assured destruction mission. Their ability to ride out even a heavy nuclear surprise attack and still remain available for retaliation at times of our own choosing weighs heavily in this preference. (We are quite confident that the Soviets do not now have, and are most unlikely to have during the next 5 years, the ability to inflict high levels of prelaunch attrition on our land-based missiles, or any attrition on our submarine-based missiles at sea.)

However, in order to determine how best to hedge against the possibility that our missile forces may turn out to be less reliable and may suffer greater prelaunch attrition than currently estimated, we have analyzed alternative ways in which additional forces might be provided. To simplify the presentation, we show a hypothetical case in which our missile forces would be barely adequate for the assured destruction task, given the expected missile effectiveness and allowing no missiles for other tasks. (In fact, our approved missile forces are far larger than required for the assured destruction task and, therefore, already have built into them a large measure of insurance.) The following table shows the cost of insuring against various levels of unexpected missile degradation, by buying either additional missiles or bombers to attack the targets left uncovered as a result of the assumed lowered missile effectiveness. Against the current Soviet anti-bomber defenses, we have measured the cost to hedge with bombers in terms of B–52s armed with gravity bombs since the FB–111/SRAM would be a more expensive alternative. Conversely, against an improved Soviet anti-bomber defense, we have used the FB–111/SRAM since it would provide a less expensive hedge than the B–52 armed with either gravity bombs or SRAM.

Cost to hedge against lower than expected missile effectiveness

[10-year systems costs in billions of dollars [1]]

Assumed degradation to missile effectiveness (realized/planned)	Cost to hedge with—		
	Additional missiles	B–52/gravity bombs (against current Soviet antibomber defenses)	FB–111/SRAM (against improved Soviet antibomber defenses) [2]
1.0			
.8	0.8	1.3	5.4
.6	2.0	2.6	7.7
.5	3.0	3.3	8.7
.4	4.5	4.0	9.6
.3	7.0	4.7	10.6
.2	12.0	5.3	11.5

[1] 10-year systems costs include for missiles—operating costs plus procurement of missiles for replacement and testing; for bombers—operating costs of bombers/tankers, modification costs plus procurement of the FB–111.

[2] Assuming the Soviets were to deploy a force of new, improved manned interceptors in the western part of the Soviet Union.

Only when missile effectiveness falls to less than 50 percent of what we actually expect are bombers less costly than missiles for insurance purposes. Against current Soviet defenses, the presently available B–52G–H force (255 aircraft) is adequate to hedge against complete failure of the missile force, insofar as our assured destruction objective is concerned. Against possible improved Soviet defenses, we must be willing to believe that our missile effectiveness could turn out to be lower than 30 percent of what we expect before we would wish to insure with FB–111/SRAM aircraft rather with missiles.

Similar arguments could be developed with respect to greater-than-expected Soviet ballistic missile defense effectiveness. I will discuss this and other greater-than-expected threats later in this statement.

In summary, for the assured destruction mission, manned bombers must be considered in a supplementary role. In that role they can force the enemy to provide defense against aircraft in addition to defense against missiles. This is particularly costly in the case of terminal defenses. The defender must make his allocation of forces in ignorance of the attacker's strategy, and must provide in advance for defenses against both types of attack at each of the targets. The attacker, however, can postpone his decision until the time of the attack, then strike some targets with missiles alone and others with bombers alone, thereby forcing the defender, in effect, to waste a large part of his resources. In this role, however, large bomber forces are not needed. A few hundred aircraft can fulfill this function. Accordingly, as will be discussed later, we propose to maintain indefinitely an effective manned bomber capability in our Strategic Offensive Forces.

4. Adequacy of the strategic offensive-defensive forces for damage limitation

The ultimate deterrent to a deliberate nuclear attack on the United States or its allies is our clear and unmistakable ability to destroy the attacker as a viable society. But if deterrence fails, either by accident or miscalculation, it is essential that forces be available to limit the damage of such an attack to ourselves or our allies. Such forces include not only antiaircraft defenses, antiballistic missile defenses, antisubmarine defenses, and civil defenses, but also offensive forces, i.e., strategic missiles and manned bombers used in a damage limiting role.

a. Damage Limitation Against the Soviet Nuclear Threat

With respect to the Soviet Union, the potential utility of all damage limiting efforts, including the use of our strategic offensive forces in that role, is critically dependent on a number of uncertainties:

(1) Future developments in the Soviets' general nuclear war forces in the absence of further major damage limiting efforts on our part.

(2) Their response to our efforts at damage limiting.

(3) If deterrence fails, the precise timing of a nuclear exchange as well as the Soviet objective in such an exchange.

In order to illustrate some of the major issues involved in this problem, we have tested four damage limiting programs against two possible future Soviet threats. In practice, of course, uncertainty about the direction in which the Soviet threat was developing would lead us to maintain a flexible approach, matching the scope of our force deployments to our own technical progress and to our evolving knowledge of the Soviet threat. Nevertheless, these cases help to develop an appreciation of the possible future costs and benefits of such damage limiting programs.

Threat I is basically an extrapolation of current Soviet forces reflecting some future growth in both offensive and defensive forces. Threat II is a major Soviet response to our deployment of a ballistic missile defense. It includes a large number of big, land-based missiles equipped with penetration aids designed to overwhelm our ABM defenses and a qualitatively improved and somewhat larger manned bomber force, and also assumes the deployment of a very sizeable, sophisticated ABM system. This threat, if it were actually to develop, would require major additions to U.S. offensive forces in order to maintain our assured destruction capability.

The major components of the four U.S. 1975 damage limiting postures considered in this analysis include the Nike-X antiballistic missile system (Sprint and the new extended-range interceptor missiles), the Sam-D bomber defense system, the F-12 interceptor, offensive missiles used for damage limitation, and civil defense.

The Sprint missile, which I described to you last year, is now under development and would be used for terminal defense of population targets. The new extended-range interceptor missile, the development of which was initiated last year, would be used for area defense.

The Nike X system would also include a number of different types of radars: multifunctional array radars (MAR), missile site radars (MSR) and perhaps VHF radars.

The Sam D is a new ground-to-air antiaircraft missile system which is now in a very early stage of development.

The F-12 is the interceptor version of the mach 3 YF-12A aircraft, three of which are now in a flight test phase.

Two of the four U.S. damage limiting programs, postures A and B, are tailored against threat I; and the other two, C and D, against threat II. Postures B and D include more antiballistic missile defense forces and Sam-D batteries than postures A and C. Postures C and D include more F-12 interceptors than postures A and B.

These postures are highly tentative, but they illustrate the overall costs and effectiveness of a range of possible deployments. As our knowledge in this area of rapidly changing technology increases, we will refine the composition of these deployments and our calculations of cost and effectiveness.

The interaction of the various Soviet threats and the four alternative damage limiting programs are shown in the following table:

Costs of United States damage limiting postures and Soviet damage potential

[Dollar amounts in billions]

	Program costs fiscal year 1966-75			Soviet damage potential in terms of millions of U.S. fatalities[1]	
	Cost attributed to assured destruction[2]	Damage limiting increment	Total U.S. posture	Soviet 1st strike	U.S. 1st strike
1970					
U.S.S.R. expected threat—U.S. approved program				130-135	90-95
1975					
U.S.S.R. threat I:					
U.S. AD[3] posture plus limited civil defense program	$22.4	$1.5	$23.9	130-135	90-105
U.S. AD[3] posture plus full fallout shelter	22.4	3.4	25.8	110-115	80-85
U.S. DL[3] posture A	22.4	22.5	44.9	80-95	25-40
U.S. DL[3] posture B	22.4	30.1	52.5	50-80	20-30
U.S.S.R. threat II:					
U.S. DL[3] posture C	28.5	24.8	53.3	105-110	35-45
U.S. DL[3] posture D	28.5	32.3	60.8	75-100	25-40

[1] Rounded to the nearest $5,000,000.

[2] The assured destruction posture designed against threat I is more than just a minimal capability; it is designed to provide insurance against unexpected changes in the threat. In postures C and D a larger strategic missile force is provided for assured destruction to counter the increased Soviet offensive threat and the much more extensive ABM defense. (Threat II requires about 3 times as much surviving, deliverable payload than threat I, just to maintain our assured destruction capability.)

[3] AD is assured destruction; DL is damage limiting.

The program costs shown on the table represent the value of the resources required for each of the alternative postures. The costs attributed to assured destruction represent the resources required to insure that we can, in each case, deliver and detonate at least the minimum essential number of warheads over Soviet cities, even after a surprise Soviet attack. The costs for damage limitation represent the value of the additional resources required to achieve the various postures shown on the table. The last two columns of the table show the U.S. fatalities which would result under two alternative forms of nuclear war outbreak. In the Soviet first strike case, we assumed that the Soviets initiate nuclear war with a simultaneous attack against our cities and military targets, and with the weight of their attack directed at our cities. In the other case, we assume that the events leading up to the nuclear exchange develop in such a way that the United States is able to strike at the Soviet offensive forces before they can be launched at our urban targets.

The ranges of fatalities estimated in the table reflect some of the possible variations in Soviet targeting doctrine, in technological sophistication, in errors in attack planning, and in the degree of disruption to Soviet attack coordination. The higher end of the ranges of fatalities shown for each case represents the full damage potential (a well-planned, well-coordinated attack to maximize fatalities) under the assumed conditions. The lower end of the ranges of estimates represents possible degradations in execution and targeting.

The first line on the table shows the Soviet damage potential against the currently approved U.S. program in 1970. It illustrates the projected performance of the currently approved bomber defenses, the civil defense program and the strategic offensive forces. Without these programs, the damage potential could be 160 million or more U.S. fatalities in a mixed Soviet attack on military and civilian targets. This total would not increase very much even if the Soviets directed all of their forces at our cities.

As shown on the second line of the table, the situation is not substantially changed by the assumed Soviet buildup (threat I) between 1970 and 1975. A full fallout shelter program, at a cost to the Government of about $3.4 billion, would reduce fatalities by about 15-20 million in both cases. Damage limiting posture A (cost—$22.5 billion) might reduce fatalities to somewhere between 80 and 95 million and posture B (cost—$30.1 billion) to between 50 and 80 million in an early urban attack. But the benefits of these damage limiting programs could be substantially offset, especially in the case of a Soviet first strike, if the Soviets were to increase their offensive forces to the levels assumed in threat II.

Even larger Soviet responses than that of threat II cannot be ruled out completely by what we know of Soviet technology and resource constraints. Whether or how the Soviets actually would respond depends on how strong they desired a reliable threat against the United States, and on the alternative military and nonmilitary uses they have for the resources involved. In other words, if we were to try to assure survival of a very high percent of our population, and if the Soviets were to choose to frustrate this attempt because they viewed it as a threat to their assured destruction capability, the extra cost to them would appear to be substantially less than the extra cost to us. This argument is not conclusive against our undertaking a major new damage limiting program. The resources available to the Soviets are more limited than our own and they may not actually react to our initiatives as we have assumed. But it does underscore the fact that beyond a certain level of defense, the cost advantage lies increasingly with the offense.

The costs of the various damage limiting programs would, of course, be spread over a period of years. Even so, they would reach $5 to $6 billion per year in the early 1970's. To maintain or improve the postures shown (against an evolving Soviet threat) might involve continuing annual expenditures of $4 to $5 billion.

On the basis of this and other analyses of the damage limiting program in relation to the Soviet nuclear threat, we have concluded that:

(1) Against likely Soviet postures for the 1970's, appropriate mixes of damage limiting measures could effect substantial reductions in the maximum damage the Soviet could inflict, but only at substantial additional cost to the United States over and above that required for assured destruction. Even so, against a massive and sophisticated Soviet surprise attack on civil targets, there would be little hope of reducing fatalities below 50 or more millions.

(2) An efficient damage limiting effort against the kinds of postures which the Soviets could achieve in the 1970's would require a mix of measures, including a full civil defense fallout shelter program, ballistic missile defense, antisubmarine (SLBM) defenses, and improved bomber defenses. Against a very rapid buildup of Soviet missile forces based in hard silos, additional U.S. missile payload might have to be added.

(3) Feasible improvements in missile accuracy and re-entry vehicles could greatly increase the efficiency of our offensive forces against Soviet hard targets. However, the effectiveness of offensive forces in the damage limiting role is sensitive to the timing of a nuclear exchange.

(4) Assuming that the Soviet bomber threat remained at least as great as we currently estimate, a decision to build a significant U.S. damage limiting capability would require the deployment of a force of improved interceptor aircraft. The choice of a specific aircraft and the desired force size would depend on the composition of the threat, the level of damage limiting effectiveness aimed at, and the timing of the decision.

(5) An ABM system employing long range exoatmospheric interceptors in addition to lower altitude interceptors could complicate even a sophisticated attacker's ballistic missile penetration problem. It could also improve overall system performance compared to an equal cost system employing lower altitude interceptors only. However, this conclusion is based on a preliminary analysis and there are still many unresolved questions about the design and performance of a system employing both exoatmospheric and lower altitude interceptors.

(6) The entire problem of the extent and kind of efforts we should make to limit damage is dominated by the great uncertainties about Soviet responses to those efforts. How far we should go in hedging against these uncertainties is one of the most difficult judgments which have to be made. Analytical techniques can focus the issue but no mechanical rule can substitute for such judgments. Accordingly, we should not now commit ourselves to a particular level of damage limitation against the Soviet threat—first, because our deterrent makes general nuclear war unlikely, and second, because attempting to assure with high confidence against all reasonably likely levels and types of attack is very costly, and even then the results are uncertain. Our choices should be responsive to projections based upon the observed development of the Soviet threat and our evolving knowledge of the technical capabilities of our own forces.

Although a deliberate nuclear attack upon the United States may seem a highly unlikely contingency in view of our unmistakable assured destruction capability, it must receive our urgent attention because of the enormous consequences it would have. In this regard, I should make two points clear. First, in order to preclude any possibility of miscalculation by others, I want to reiterate that although the United States would itself suffer severely in the event of a general nuclear war, we are fully committed to the defense of our allies. Second, we do not view damage limitation as a question of concern only to the United States. Our offensive forces cover strategic enemy capabilities to inflict damage on our allies in Europe just as they cover enemy threats to the continental United States.

b. Damage Limitation Against an Nth Country Nuclear Threat

During the past year, the potential of an Nth country nuclear threat to the United States has become more real and the feasibility of a moderately priced defense against it more promising. The Chinese Communists have detonated two nuclear devices and could possibly develop and deploy a small force of ICBM's by the middle to latter part of the 1970's. Other nations are economically and technologically capable of producing nuclear weapons within the next 10 years.

Obviously the threat of greatest concern to the United States is that posed by Communist China. The development and deployment of even a small force of ICBM's might seem attractive to them as a token, but still highly visible, threat to the United States, designed to undermine our military prestige and the credibility of any guarantee which we might offer to friendly countries. The prospect of an effective U.S. defense against such a force might not only be able to negate that threat but might possibly weaken the incentives to produce and deploy such weapons altogether.

In order to illustrate the possibilities of defense against an Nth country nuclear threat, we have analyzed two possible U.S. damage-limiting postures, E and F, in relation to such a threat in the mid-1970's. Posture E provides Sprint terminal ABM defense for a number of cities, but no area defense. Posture F also includes long-range interceptor missiles, providing an area defense of the entire country. Both postures might also require some antibomber, ASW, and civil defense.

The effectiveness (and cost) of these postures could be increased further by strengthening them in any of a number of ways. Against attacks employing no penetration aids, increasing the number of long range interceptor missiles might be preferred. Against more sophisticated or larger attacks, the number of radars at each city might be increased, the capabilities of the radars might be improved, or more cities might be provided terminal defenses.

A minimum antibomber defense could be provided by deploying our current interceptor aircraft around the periphery of the country. Such a force, which would be required for the peacetime air surveillance mission in any event, would provide a relatively effective defense against small bomber attacks. To achieve higher effectiveness, this minimum area air defense could be supplemented: first by an improved surveillance capability to insure against enemy aircraft approaching U.S. airspace undetected; and second, by more advanced interceptors capable of attacking enemy aircraft with a higher kill probability and farther from our borders.

Our analysis suggests that something less than a full fallout shelter program may be appropriate in a light damage limiting posture designed against small unsophisticated attacks. Fallout shelters are designed primarily to protect against collateral fallout from countermilitary attacks, weapons aimed at other urban-industrial areas, and weapons deliberately exploded upwind of population targets in order to avoid terminal defenses. The area defense described above might be very effective in denying the last of these tactics, especially against small attacks. The other two sources of fallout are also relatively much less important in light attacks.

Much more analysis of light defense postures is required before we are in a position to choose appropriate combinations of the various components. To illustrate the potentials of a light defense, however, we have examined the cost and performance of postures E and F against small ICBM attacks of the sort that the Chinese Communists might be able to mount in the latter part of the 1970's. The results of this analysis, which are still highly tentative, are summarized below:

U.S. posture	5-year systems costs (billions)	Millions of U.S. fatalities
Approved program (extended)		6–12
Posture E	$8.0	3– 6
Posture F	10.6	0– 2

The costs shown are for the ABM components of the program only; they include investment, operating and future research and development. The lower bound of zero fatalities for posture F represents the defense effectiveness against a very unsophisticated attack, or even an attack on major U.S. cities with a somewhat more sophisticated payload. The upper bound for posture F represents an attack (with more sophisticated payloads) designed to maximize the number of fatalities, even if it means avoiding major U.S. cities with terminal defenses. The table above does not deal explicitly with the contribution of our offensive forces to damage limitation against *n*th countries. This contribution, however, would be substantial, both in terms of the retaliatory threat they would pose and in terms of their effectiveness in preemptive countermilitary strikes.

The table brings out two important points: (1) posture F, which includes exoatmospheric missiles, would be far superior on a cost-effectiveness basis to posture E which does not; and (2) the successful development of the exoatmospheric system would, for the first time, give hope of achieving a high confidence defense against a light ICBM attack, not just for a few selected cities but for the entire Nation.

Although the problem of designing light damage limiting postures is still under study, I believe that the following tentative conclusions can be drawn at this time:

(1) A light anti-ballistic-missile system using exoatmospheric interceptors and terminal defenses at a small number of cities offers promise of a highly effective defense against small ballistic missile attacks of the sort the Chinese Communists might be capable of launching within the next decade. The initial investment and 5-year operating cost (including research and development) would be about $8 to $10½ billion, depending on the number of cities defended and the density of the area coverage.

(2) It appears likely that such a defense would remain highly effective against the Chinese Communist threat for some time.

(3) Once fully deployed, this defense system could be augmented to increase its effectiveness against larger or more sophisticated threats—by adding more long range interceptor missiles, by improving the radars, or by increasing the number of cities with terminal defenses.

(4) On the basis of our present knowledge of Chinese Communist nuclear progress, no deployment decision need be made now. However, the development of the essential components should be pressed forward vigorously.

C. ADEQUACY OF OUR ASSURED DESTRUCTION FORCES AGAINST A HIGHER THAN EXPECTED SOVIET THREAT IN THE 1970'S

Earlier in this section of the statement, I noted that we had given special attention this year to an analysis of Soviet threats over and above those projected in the latest intelligence estimates. We have done so because an assured destruction capability is the vital first objective which must be met in full by our strategic nuclear forces under all foreseeable circumstances and regardless of the costs or difficulties involved. To hedge against the possibility of such a greater than expected threat, we now propose to accelerate the development of the Poseidon missile (which was initiated last year) and move forward on the development of new penetration aids. The timing of a decision to produce and deploy the Poseidon and the new penetration aids would depend upon how this threat actually evolved.

* * * * *

In the light of the foregoing analysis, it seems to me that there are seven major issues involved in our fiscal year 1967–71 programs for the general nuclear war forces. The first five are related primarily to the threat projected in the latest intelligence estimates. The last two are associated with the more remote possibility of a much more severe threat. These issues are:

(1) Should a manned bomber force be maintained in the 1970's; if so, what aircraft should be selected for the force?

(2) To what extent should qualitative improvements (in range, payload, etc.) be made in the Minuteman force?

(3) Should an antiballistic missile system be deployed; if so, when and what type?

(4) Should we produce and deploy a new manned interceptor?

(5) What should be the future size and scope of the civil defense program?

(6) Should development of new penetration aid packages for the Polaris and Minuteman missile forces be accelerated?

(7) Should development of the Poseidon missile be accelerated?

Since this committee is concerned specifically with the strategic bomber program, I will discuss only those issues and proposals pertaining to the strategic offensive forces.

D. STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE FORCES

The force structure proposed for the fiscal year 1967–71 period is shown on the classified table provided to the committee.

1. The maintenance of an effective manned bomber force in the 1970's

By the end of the current fiscal year the strategic bomber force will consist of 600 operational B–52's and 80 B–58's. (As I informed the committee last year, two squadrons of B–52B's will be phased out this spring.) Some 345 of the operational B–52's will be the older C through F models. Last year we stated that these aircraft could be kept operational through 1972 by a program of life extension modifications and capability improvements, at a cost of about $1.3 billion. To keep them operational through fiscal year 1975 would cost another $600 million for modifications. The 255 operational B–52G–H's can be maintained in a satisfactory operational status at least through fiscal year 1975, and the modifications necessary to insure this have already been included in the proposed fiscal year 1967–71 program.

As indicated in the foregoing analysis, a force of 255 operational B–52G–H's would be sufficient to compel the Soviets to maintain their present antibomber defenses. However, if they were to significantly improve those defenses, a mixed force including some more advanced bombers might be desirable. Shown on the classified table provided to the committee are the characteristics of the FB–111A compared with the B–52C–E, the B–52F, the B–52H and the B–58. As indicated in that table, the range of the FB–111A, on a typical nuclear strike mission, exceeds that of the B–52C–F's and the B–58's. I believe it is clear from this comparison, alone, that the FB–111 is not an interim aircraft but is, indeed, a truly effective strategic bomber.

Considering the role of the manned bomber in the strategic offensive mission, as we see the threat today and over the next 5 years, large expenditures on the development and production of a new advanced strategic aircraft (AMSA) do not appear to be warranted at this time. A much more sensible course would be to procure a force of 210 (UE) FB–111A's, configured as closely as possible to the fighter version so that it would, indeed, be a dual-purpose aircraft—strategic and tactical—and this is what we propose to do at a total investment cost of about $1.9 billion. Some $26 million of fiscal year 1966 funds are being utilized to initiate the necessary development work this year and $202 million has been included in the fiscal year 1967 budget to continue development and procure the first few aircraft, including initial spares and advance procurement of long leadtime items.

Accordingly, we propose to phase out the B–52C–F's over the next 5 years and the B–58's in fiscal year 1971, giving us a modernized force of 465 manned bombers (210 FB–111A's and 255 B–52G–H's) by the end of that fiscal year and at less than the cost which would result from maintenance of the older B–52's and the B–58's in the force.

This decision was reached only after a most careful and lengthy evaluation of all the factors involved. You may recall that when I appeared before this committee a year ago, I said:

"There are at least two other alternatives available to us, in addition to the immediate development of the AMSA, which would preserve the manned bomber option for the period following the retirement of the B–52 force. These are: (a) the procurement of a strategic version of the F–111 (i.e., a B–111), and (b) the initiation of advanced development work on long leadtime components which would be needed for the AMSA as well as for other new combat aircraft.

"A strategic version of the F–111 could carry the SRAM or bombs, or a combination of both. Its speed over enemy territory would be supersonic at high altitudes and high subsonic at low altitudes. While a B–111 force would have to place greater reliance on tankers than an AMSA force, its range (considerably better than the B–58), its target coverage and its payload carrying capability would be sufficient to bring under attack a very large share of an aggressor's urban/industrial complex. Since the F–111 is already nearing production, and we plan to initiate development of the SRAM in the current fiscal year, a B–111 could be made available in the early 1970's at a much lower cost than the AMSA, even if the decision to commence production is postponed for another 2 or 3 years."

Since that time, the Air Force has conducted detailed studies on the composition of our future bomber forces, including an evaluation of various strategic configurations of the F–111 and an extensive review of service life modifications for the B–52 fleet. In April of last year, General McConnell made an informal proposal to me to replace the B–52C–F series aircraft with a bomber version of the F–111. In June, the Air Force made a formal proposal to procure 210 (U.E.) FB–111's as a replacement for the 345 B–52C–F's. In August, the Joint Chiefs of Staff concurred in the Air Force proposal to deploy the FB–111 and to phase out the B–52C–F aircraft. After a thorough review of all the facets of the proposal in context with the overall strategic offensive-defensive forces program, I recommended and the President approved, going ahead with development and procurement of this aircraft, beginning in fiscal year 1966, and the phaseout of the B–52C–F on the schedule suggested by the Joint Chiefs.

Although we still cannot see a clear need for a new strategic bomber to replace the B–52G–Hs and FB–111s, we plan, as a hedge against some unforeseen improvement in Soviet antibomber defenses, to continue development work on the components and subsystems which would be required if it should ultimately become desirable to deploy such an aircraft. Last year we proposed a four-part program for an advanced manned strategic aircraft (AMSA) which included work on alternative design approaches, the avionics, the propulsion system and the short range attack missile, SRAM. For the first three elements of this program we envisoned a 1966 effort costing $39 million—$24 million from prior year funds and $15 million from fiscal year 1966 appropriations. In acting on our request, the Congress added $7 million specifying that the total of $22 million provided in fiscal year 1966 was to be available only for AMSA. All of this additional $7 million has been applied to the program. Advanced development work on the airframe design and propulsion elements can be continued in fiscal year 1967 with funds already on hand. The avionics development will require an additional $11 million in fiscal year 1967.

2. Air launched missiles

Last year we initiated development of SRAM as an element of the four part AMSA program. Now, given the decision to proceed with the procurement and deployment of the FB–111/SRAM system, this development program must be reoriented to the FB–111 schedule. The cost to complete the SRAM development program is now estimated at $170 million, including the related B–52 and FB–111 avionics. Some $8 million was provided in prior years; about $40 million will be needed in fiscal year 1967.

Although we do not now plan to deploy SRAM on the B–52G–Hs, we propose to undertake the necessary avionics development work to permit such a deployment if it should become desirable later. We would expect to keep the Hound Dog missiles in the operational inventory through fiscal year 1970 on the same schedule as envisioned a year ago. However, in 1971, with the completion of the phaseout of the B–52C–Fs, the Hound Dog force would be phased down accordingly. We also propose to undertake engineering development and test of a new terminal guidance system for Hound Dog which gives promise of achieving a better overall system reliability. Total development cost is estimated at $20.5 million of which $6.6 million would be obtained by reprogramming presently available funds and $8.1 million is included in the fiscal year 1967 budget.

In summary, the objective of forcing the Soviets to split their defense resources between two types of threats could be performed adequately by B–52 bomber forces considerably smaller than those we now have, i.e., the B–52G–Hs alone. However, a mixed force of B–52G–Hs and FB–111/SRAM would force the Soviets to build expensive terminal bomber defenses or be vulnerable to low altitude attack. Even against very advanced terminal defenses, the small size and low weight of SRAM would allow the United States to saturate their defenses with large numbers.

The cost of the manned bomber force we now propose, compared with the cost of continuing the current forces, is shown in the following table:

[Dollar amounts in billions]

	Fiscal year		
	1967	1971	1975
Current force extended:			
Forces (aircraft):			
B–52	600	600	600
B–58	80	70	64
Costs (cumulative 1967)	--------	$8.6	$17
Proposed bomber force:			
Forces (aircraft):			
B–52	600	255	255
B–58	80	0	0
FB–111	0	210	210
Costs (cumulative 1967)	--------	$8.4	$14

3. Strategic reconnaissance

The strategic reconnaissance force as shown on the classified table is essentially the same as that projected a year ago. All of these aircraft were procured in prior years.

4. Strategic missile forces

a. Qualitative Improvements to the Minuteman Force

There is now general agreement that a force of about 1,000 Minuteman missiles is appropriate in context with the total strategic offensive forces programed and in light of the expected threat. Accordingly, the principal concern at this time is the qualitative improvement of the Minuteman force, including the launch and launch control facilities. Three years ago we initiated a program ultimately to replace the Minuteman I with the Minuteman II, which has much greater accuracy, payload and operational versatility. In addition, its greater retargeting capability reduces the number of missiles that need to be earmarked against a given target system to achieve one reliably delivered warhead against each target. The first 10 Minuteman II's became operational last October and additional missiles will be in place by the end of this fiscal year.

We are now making certain further major improvements in the Minuteman which will so increase its performances as to warrant a new designation—Minuteman III. The initial procurement of this missile will be made in fiscal year 1967.

We still plan to continue the 54 Titan II missiles in the force throughout the program period.

By the end of the current fiscal year, we expect that 32 Polaris submarines (512 missiles) will be operational and, by the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 1968, the entire planned force of 41 submarines (656 missiles) will be operational. The force will then consist of 13 SSBN's with A–2 missiles and 28 SSBN's with A–3 missiles. All five of the earlier A–1 boats will have been retrofitted to carry the A–3 missile. We also tentatively plan to modify four of the A–2 submarines during their first overhaul in the fiscal year 1968–69 period to carry the A–3 missiles, in order to avoid the high unit costs which would be involved in restarting the A–2 missile production line (which closed down in

June 1964) when present inventories are depleted by testing and training programs.

b. Accelerated Development of Poseidon

For reasons I have already discussed, it appears prudent at this time to place ourselves in a position to deploy a force of Poseidon missiles if this should be required. Last year we initiated project definition for this missile, using available 1965 funds, but the pace of the development was not precisely established. Now we propose an accelerated engineering development program for the Poseidon missile. The total cost of this development is estimated at about $1.3 billion, of which about $300 million will be needed in fiscal year 1967. No decisions need be made now on the number of Polaris submarines to be ultimately retrofitted with Poseidon.

With respect to other future strategic missile systems, both the Air Force and the Navy have active study programs underway. The Air Force will continue work on several projects which would contribute to the development of an advanced ICBM, if one should be required at some time in the future. In total, some $10 million is required for fiscal year 1967 for these projects. The Navy will conduct an advanced development study of improved propulsion systems for future sea-based missiles at a fiscal year 1967 cost of $3 million.

c. Accelerated Development of Penetration Aids

Five years ago, when I appeared before this Committee in support of the first Kennedy amendments to the original fiscal year 1962 defense budget, I said:

"While we are recommending a sizable quantitative increase in the strategic missile force we are also concerned with the introduction of qualitative improvements to enhance the combat effectiveness of the missiles. One of the most important such steps is the development of techniques and devices to help our missile warheads penetrate to their targets. The January budget provides for research and development on these penetration aids, but in view of their importance in staying well ahead of possible Soviet defensive developments we are now recommending that the level of effort on such work be more than doubled from $15 to $35 million."

Four years ago, in presenting the fiscal year 1963–67 defense program and the fiscal year 1963 defense budget to this committee, I said:

"A careful analysis of the problem which a Soviet anti-missile defense system would pose to our offensive forces leads to the conclusion that an effective solution would require the development of various penetrations aids for our strategic missiles."

Since that time, we have intensively studied a wide variety of penetration aid techniques and have invested a total of about $1.2 billion on research and development in this area. We now propose to carry this work forward on an accelerated basis, particularly with regard to the development of new penetration aids, which would be needed to defeat an area ABM defense employing exoatmospheric missiles.

5. Other strategic offensive forces

The other strategic offensive forces are essentially the same as those programed a year ago. With respect to the KC–135's, as the total size of the bomber force declines we intend to retain one tanker for each of the bombers. Most, if not all, of the remainder will be used to improve the air-to-air refueling capabilities of the tactical air forces. However, the specific reallocation of these KC–135's will be made as they become available for reassignment.

With respect to the Post Attack Command and Control System (PACCS), a number of EC–135's have been added to the force planned last year. These aircraft have previously been used principally as refueling tankers with a secondary mission as communications relay aircraft. In 1963, anticipating the time when we might no longer be sure of the survivability of our ground-based missile launch control facilities, we undertook the development of an airborne launch control capability for all of the Minuteman force. The development costs of the necessary equipment through fiscal year 1967 is estimated at $18.6 million. We now propose to begin procurement of the airborne portion of this equipment in fiscal year 1966 at a cost of approximately $22 million. The ground portion of the airborne launch control capability is included as an integral element of the Minuteman program.

* * * * *

Mr. Chairman, I have not discussed the details of our proposals for the strategic defensive forces programs, but I will be prepared to do so when I appear before the full committee in support of the fiscal year 1967–71 program and fiscal year 1967 authorization requests. However, I believe it is clear from what has already been said, that the strategic forces proposed—both offensive and defensive—will provide in full the essential assured destruction capability required to achieve our primary objective, the deterrence of deliberate nuclear attack upon the United States or our allies.

DEMONSTRATION CITIES PROGRAM

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just read President Johnson's message on the demonstration cities program. It is one of the most forward-looking approaches to the challenges and promises of our urban America. As the President said:

> Cities can stimulate the best in man, and aggravate the worst.

The programs outlined by the President's message are a broad attack on the problems currently facing an increasingly urban America. I hope that these programs will speedily be enacted by Congress and that they are efficiently and effectively administered to the benefit of all America. The joint programs of private and public action should result in a useful program of physical reconstruction and rehabilitation for our cities.

One advanced and far-sighted proposal in the President's message is the appeal for a supplementary appropriation to fund the rent supplement program authorized in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. While rejected in the first session of this Congress, rent supplements promise a broad range of our population more adequate housing. They promise a beginning of the end for low income family ghettos and will enable many men to reach out for whatever measure he can make of himself.

The message also touches on a problem which has concerned me. I have long been concerned with the time lag between urban project conception and the actual funding of the project. In my own district urban projects are characterized by inordinate and unacceptably long leadtimes. All too often these delays have hampered local initiative and in severe cases have even meant an end to a project.

Any program finally approved by Congress should include provisions to correct the time lag problem. The President's program, recognizing the need for flexibility of action and calling for a Federal coordinator, provides a framework for congressional action to alleviate the problem.

Mr. Speaker, the challenge of an America of 300 million citizens in the year 2,000 is a great one. It promises to be a world of vast cities expanding to meet each other. The promises and realizations of 2,000 will in many ways depend on our actions. I, for one, believe we must lay the groundwork for man to move toward his aspirations in what promises to be a more vastly urban society. The demonstration cities program is the first important step in this direction.

WINNING ESSAYS ON "EMPLOY THE HANDICAPPED"

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Del Clawson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, it is my pleasure again this year to include the winning essays by high school students in the 23d District of California in the "Employ the Handicapped" writing contest, this time for the 1965–66 school year. The essays are sponsored by the Southeast District of the California Employ the Handicapped Committee. The committee under the devoted chairmanship of Mrs. Lillian M. Karnes, is active in assisting handicapped individuals who are striving to help themselves. They also perform the function of educating the community to the contribution these people are capable of making in industry, and through the example they set of self-reliance and individual courage which should be an inspiration to all. The essays follow:

What Handicapped Workers Are Contributing to My Community

(By Nancy Gilbert, age 17, first place, home address, 718 South Poinsettia, Compton, Calif.; school address, Dominguez High School, 15301 San Jose Avenue, Compton, Calif.; D. Taylor, teacher)

Only 25 years ago, World War II created a shortage of labor compelling the leaders of industry to consider the feasibility of hiring the many thousands of capable idle handicapped persons. The handicapped people took this opportunity to show themselves just as capable, if not more so, than the other workers. The deaf could perform well in foundries because they were not distracted from the work by the thunderous sound about them. The blind seemed to have an innate ability for assembling complex pieces of electronic equipment and similar pieces of work. The handicapped people, with jobs suited to their capabilities, put forth sincere effort to become useful members of the community. They live as actively as possible and participate in community activities to the fullest extent.

In the years following the war, when it was realized that a great deal could be done for the people permanently disabled in the war and for people disabled from birth, a movement began. Training centers were established to teach the people how to use what they had. Rehabilitation programs were begun to find positions for the people, raising the hopes of every disabled or handicapped person. From these centers came many thousands of people prepared to accept the responsibility of being effective citizens in the community. A few of these people developed their talents in the fields of art. Annually, there are expositions of the work done by these adept artists.

Some handicapped persons have become fine musicians, creating many hours of entertainment for audiences everywhere. Many handicapped persons have become writers who in their writing have shown ordinary things in a different light. They write about the mountains and beautiful things in nature. They see so much more because their attitudes are so different. They appreciate the people and things around them. All of these contribute to the cultural environment of the community. Some handicapped people become teachers, gaining the respect of their students almost immediately. They understand how slow it is for some people to understand and how much work must be done to accomplish even the slightest task. They are to be admired.

There is a lady working in an aircraft plant in Long Beach. She takes in calls and broadcasts through the plant. Many of the men have spoken of her as being the best speaker because they can understand her in the noisy plant. No one would guess that she is blind. And yet, she is performing a very important service in that company. A gate guard at another plant has worked there for many years. Although he has only one arm, he carries out his duties exactly and performs these duties safely to the satisfaction of his employer.

Many handicapped people use their talents to help other unfortunate people just as many people in the community. Ladies in the community make quilts and repair tattered clothing. They bake assorted cookies, cakes, and pies to make meager meals nicer for others at Christmas and Thanksgiving. Many handicapped people choose to work for the cause of the handicapped people so that the services may reach more afflicted people. An exceptional example of this is Helen Keller who, before her second birthday, was left blind and deaf after a serious illness. Miss Keller, after years of intense study and help, learned to communicate with braille and eventually learned to speak and type with a special typewriter. After completing her education, having graduated with honors from Radcliffe College, she labored to help the blind by lecturing and writing books and articles about her own ideas and experiences. She went even further by contributing the profit from these activities to the institutions working in the interests of the blind.

It is true that not every handicapped person becomes as famous as Helen Keller, but each handicapped person is recognized in his own neighborhood as a considerate friend. Each one is respected and admired for the great effort he has made to be that successful part of the community which he is. Handicapped people are an asset to every community for they desire to contribute to the community and not be just another apathetic individual.

ABILITY COUNTS

(By Herlinda Vallejo, age 17, second place, home address, 1210 West Magnolia Street, Compton, Calif.; school, Regina Caeli High School, address, 823 East Compton Boulevard, Compton, Calif., English teacher, Sister Maria Goretti, S.S.F.)

How fortunate to be whole and to possess the gift of health. We are indeed fortunate, but often take for granted that gift which enables us to do the simplest everyday things without giving them a second thought. How would we react if we suddenly had to function without the use of a limb, or our precious sight, or perhaps if we were doomed to a silent or speechless existence? Most assuredly we would react poorly, both physically and emotionally, if faced with such a circumstance. Yet, there are people who lead normal, independent, and productive lives, in spite of such handicaps.

Who are the handicapped? The handicapped are those who suffer some serious physical or mental disability. They are classified in four main divisions: The blind; the deaf and deaf mutes; the mentally handicapped; and the crippled.

Medical science cannot cure many of these handicaps, but it can help people to partially overcome them through training. From elementary schools up to vocational and trade schools the disabled are taught to develop the skills and talents they have and to give the people incentive.

By no means does an individual's talents, ambitions, and abilities end where his disability begins. History displays great credits to the handicapped such as Homer, the Greek poet, Helen Keller, Alexander Graham Bell, Beethoven, and more who despite their impediments made great contributions. But the display, be it great or unknown, does not end in history—it is always present in every community.

Hub Limited Workshop, in Compton, provides work for the mentally handicapped. The workers are those who are 16 years of age and over. No matter how simple the trade, it is a great contribution to the support and happiness of the mentally handicapped and in turn to the community to which they belong.

The managing editor of a local newspaper in our community suffered a heart attack which handicapped him to a certain extent, but he was given back his position because of his ability and the contribution he could make to our community.

A similar and personal experience of disability in my own family is my uncle, Mr. Filomeno Salas, whose occupation is that of a sheet metal worker. At his trade he developed tumors in the wrist of his right hand and has had several unsuccessful operations in which some tendons were cut. He was no longer able to install sheet metal as a result of his disability and constant pain. But because of his skill and previous training as a draftsman he not only remained with the company he worked for but was promoted. He is now working happily as the draftsman and foreman of his company in Culver City.

A very touching example of contribution to her community is the chairman of the employment of the handicapped committee in Compton.

The department of employment does a lot to help the handicapped, but this woman, who herself was handicapped by a stroke and other illnesses, earnestly dedicated her time to finding jobs for handicapped persons.

Mr. Daniel J. Quigg, veterans employment representative at the office of employment in Compton spoke of two veterans, with whom he had personal contact. One of them was unable to lift his feet as a result of a stroke. He had a very nice speaking voice and Mr. Quigg found him a telephone soliciting job in which he is doing quite nicely. The other veteran is confined to a wheelchair and is very eager to work. As yet, no job has been found for him, but his eagerness is something to be admired.

The handicapped are not only contributing the fruits of their labor, but also an example of courage and self-respect to my community.

IF ONLY WE LET THEM

(By Kay Partlow, 16 years old, third place, 11061–B Bullis Road, Lynwood, Calif., Lynwood High School, 12124 Bullis Road, Lynwood, Calif.

In 1961, the church was small and appeared dying. Then it called a new pastor. In the 4 years since this man accepted, the membership has jumped from 50 to 740, the property value has soared to $300,000, and a small, somewhat obscure building has been replaced with a beautifully designed auditorium and functional educational building. This is all a matter of record. The city even presented the church with an award for contributing to the beauty of the community through its building—a building designed and largely built by the pastor. But this is not all. Pains have been soothed, tears dried, despair transformed to hope, cynicism has bowed to faith, and hearts have been lifted to joy, all without number. No earthly awards have been issued, but this, too, is a matter of record—in the hearts of the people. The man mainly responsible for these accomplishments (although he would never admit it) is the pastor. This is the same man who found himself among those who came back from World War II physically handicapped. He is only a single example of one man who has refused to accept the label "handicapped."

In spite of recent progress made in understanding and rehabilitating the mentally and physically handicapped, the public as a whole still clings to the old image of a grotesquely twisted body or mind huddled in a dark corner to quietly decay. The physically and mentally whole do not seem to realize that to automatically assign a handicapped person to that vague cubbyhole in the mind set a bit apart from all others is vicious injustice. To set apart, to classify a handicapped person as "one of them" is debasing to human dignity. And "human" includes the handicapped.

They are capable, as the business world has discovered. Handicapped employees gladly contribute their efforts and are often more adroit in an area than the average employee. A local jeweler hires the handicapped almost exclusively to perform with painstaking care the tedious tasks of repairing watches. Another case in point is a 29-year-old man who has a responsible, well-paying job at Sears and Roebuck. (Sears and Roebuck was among the first to realize the value of hiring the handicapped.) This young man is a conscientious worker who attends church faithfully and has taken up music as an avocation. He lost his speech when he was 14 years old. He could have withdrawn and lived on sympathy, but he, too, refused to conform to the world's idea of handicapped.

A third handicapped person who could easily have yielded to discouragement has proved to be not only a capable, active citizen, but a great inspiration to those that have the privilege of knowing her. She was 17 years old when both legs and one arm were amputated in an automobile accident. After being fitted with artificial limbs, she returned to her job in the city water department, later married, and now has a son.

One woman, whose father had lost his right leg as a result of a bone disease, demonstrates admirably the attitude that is typical of those who have been near the handicapped and who know their potential.

When asked if she knew of any handicapped person, she thought for a moment and then replied, "No, I don't think I do." She did not cripple her father with her attitude.

These are just a few examples from my own community that can be multiplied a hundred times over in communities throughout the land. The physically handicapped, the mentally retarded, the emotionally disturbed are capable of living useful lives and contributing to humanity. The greatest handicap placed upon them is the attitude of those who are fortunate enough to be mentally and physically whole. Through ignorance, or perhaps through fear, people have set aside the handicapped as not quite a part of humanity, not quite capable of the deep emotions of all humanity. But they are capable and are willing to contribute to mankind. And they will—if only we let them.

What Handicapped Workers Are Contributing to My Community

(By Saundra Thompson, age 16, home, 1425 West 131st Street, Compton, Calif., school, 2606 North Central Avenue, Compton, Calif.)

"Just give them a chance, that's all they need." Those who are handicapped are a great asset to the community; if given a chance they can prove to be just as capable as a person who is not handicapped.

Once I heard an interesting story of a man who had been in an automobile accident and had lost one of his hands. The names that are used are fictitious ones, but the incident is very true. Joe, our main character, was out one day taking a leisurely drive when some person, not watching what he was doing, came up from a side street and hit Joe from the side. Joe was injured quite seriously and when everything was finally over, the doctors informed Joe that they would have to amputate one of his hands. When he heard this, he was quite upset, because the job he had held required much work with the hands, and what good was he with only one hand?

When Joe was released from the hospital, he had to find some sort of a job because he had a family to support. One day Joe saw a friend who told him that many factories and small shops hired handicapped people. He went from day to day, from place to place, looking for someone who would hire a man with only one hand. Joe began to get discouraged, but he was a very determined person and he would not let his discouragement stop him from getting a job.

One day Joe went to a small factory where toys were made and repaired. After a short interview, Joe was told that he would be hired. He was very happy, although he was not completely satisfied. When he started to work, he made a good enough salary to support his family and to have enjoyment. Joe worked on this job for a long time and soon worked his way up to an executive position. This made him and his family very happy. As the years went by, this small factory adopted a motto which read, "Just give them a chance, that's all they need."

FREE WORLD SHIPS SERVICING THE VIETCONG

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Dickinson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DICKINSON**. Mr. Speaker, in his news conference of January 21, Secretary Rusk was asked by an Australian correspondent this question:

> Don't you think there is something incongruous in the fact that the British are supplying by ship munitions and other materials to the Vietcong while Australians, who are part of the British Commonwealth, are fighting the Vietcong?

To this Secretary Rusk replied in part:

> Many of these free world ships go in empty in order to bring out fresh fruits and vegetables.

Mr. Speaker, this is shocking. On January 12, 1966, Mr. Rusk's own spokesman, Robert J. McCloskey, announced—according to the Associated Press—that North Vietnam imported $12.2 million "in ships operating under flags of non-Communist nations."

The Department of Defense publicly admits to 119 free world ships entering ports servicing the Vietcong during 1965. January 25 the Washington Post reported that Soviet Mig jet fighters are turning up in crates in North Vietnam, apparently having been shipped by sea, no one knows how.

For the information of the Secretary of State, the only vegetable North Vietnam grows is sweet potatoes, and fruit is not one of its products.

On January 3, in response to a telegram from me to the President, I was informed by his administrative assistant, Henry J. Wilson, Jr., that the matter of ending these free world shipments to North Vietnam was under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the President publicly to instruct the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense to halt immediately all free world and other shipping into North Vietnam. Americans are dying fighting communism in Vietnam. Our enemies there must not be supplied.

I call for the U.S. fleet to be ordered, if necessary, to halt these shipments. We have the example of Cuba when this was done even though American fathers, sons, and husbands were not involved as they are in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith an article in this connection from the Mobile, Ala., Press:

Shoe Is on Other Foot in Rhodesian Relationship

While this Nation has yielded to pressure from the British in applying economic sanctions against Rhodesia, it is interesting to note that the shoe is on the other foot insofar as Britons dealings with Castro Cuba are concerned.

Many of the major British shipping concerns have voluntarily refused to trade with Cuba, but records compiled by the U.S. Maritime Commission reveal that during 1965 a total of 119 vessels of British registry visited Cuba.

In addition, the latest figures on free world trade with Cuba compiled by the U.S. Department of Commerce reveal that Britain and Canada with a total of $55 million in exports to Cuba in the first 6 months of 1965, matched the combined total of 13 other free world countries trading with Cuba.

It then becomes evident that the British Empire, while putting the thumb screws on Rhodesia through the United States, has not cooperated to any degree in our efforts against Cuba, or for that matter, in Vietnam.

Canadian exports in the 6-month period were $30 million while British exports to Cuba were $25 million.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that the goods being traded to Cuba are American goods flowing through Canada or England.

Now is the time for the United States to take a firm stand on this issue.

If economic sanctions are to be applied by the United States against Rhodesia, let us insist that like economic sanctions be applied by the British and the Canadians against Cuba and certainly against North Vietnam.

Uncle Sam has long been a soft touch in his dealings of this nature. That image should be changed immediately. If there is one facet of the Asian situation in which irreparable damage could be done to the free world cause it would be the loss of face. To lose face or to appear to be weak could easily wreck the confidence of other Asian nations in the strength and determination of the United States.

This we cannot afford short of writing off southeast Asia, abondoning it to the Communists, and returning home like a licked dog with his tail between his legs.

DUTY ON CHRISTMAS GIFTS TO MEN IN VIETNAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gurney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **GURNEY**. Mr. Speaker, I was recently shocked to learn from families in my District that they had to pay duty on Christmas gifts sent to them by fathers and sons in Vietnam.

I am introducing legislation today to allow servicemen in combat zones to send gifts of up to $50 without being charged duty.

The present regulation allows a gift package valued at less than $10 to be sent from foreign countries without payment of duty as long as only one package is sent to a person on any day. For a serviceman stationed in a noncombat zone, this is a minor inconvenience that he can get around by mailing separate packages on different days.

But in Vietnam the picture is different. Boys have little opportunity to shop, wrap and mail packages and must often do so on one hurried trip to the PX. So they mail several gifts together and the family pays the duty.

Mr. Speaker, these boys and their families have enough to worry about without this. Christmas for military families with Dad in Vietnam is not such a happy occasion at best. The least we can do is make their gift giving a little easier by relaxing this unrealistic ruling.

The bill I am introducing allows a package valued at $50 or less to go duty free. I think this is a fairer figure that will cover most gift purchases made by servicemen.

The Congress enacted a similar law during World War II and I am hopeful that we can do the same for our men in Vietnam.

DIFFICULTIES FOR LOCAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS IN SUPPORTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret to any of us that local and State governments are finding it extremely difficult to pay for adequate support of public schools.

Over the past 15 years the costs of education have gone up about 700 percent. State and local expenditures for education have increased almost the same amount over the same period of time.

In the next few years the costs of education are expected to increase at almost the same rate. But State and local governments simply cannot continue to raise their expenditures at the same rate.

The reason for this is not hard to find. They have reached the saturation point in their ability to tax. Their sources of revenue have run out. The State income tax and sales taxes, the local property taxes and other revenue devices have been utilized to capacity.

Few responsible persons have any quarrel with the idea that public education requires our most diligent attention. To say that education provides the keystone of our country's future economic and social structure is to repeat a truth that hardly needs repetition.

This truth was, however, repeated in many different forms and at considerable length in this Chamber over a 3-day period last March when the House passed legislation designed to aid elementary and secondary education.

Many generalities regarding the importance of education were put forth as justification for specific legislation which should have been improved at that time. Instead, it was passed into law, and many persons, some here in Washington, some in State education departments, and many others in local school administrative positions around the country, are now wondering if our action of last year could not have been improved.

The schools now face a mass of differing regulations affecting a multitude of programs. The problem is such that it not only raises a question of just how effective our action of last year can be in meeting the basic financing needs of the schools, but in addition it costs the schools considerable leeway in running their own affairs.

In October of 1965 the New York City superintendent of schools, speaking to members of the Public Education Association, said that decisions involving school policy should be made locally and not by legislation. He said that strings attached to Federal aid programs were causing many educators to wonder whether "the schools will be run locally or from Washington."

Our top educators have expressed similar concern. School superintendents from the Nation's 52 largest cities, at a meeting in Memphis last fall, discussed this matter at considerable length.

It would be a mistake for us to believe, at least at this time, that education legislation approved by Congress over the past 2 years will provide satisfactory solutions to the school financing crisis.

Perhaps our legislation and its approach reflects limitations of attitudes here in Washington. It may be well to broaden our outlook and embark on an entirely new approach as a means of providing a bold new solution to a vexing problem which promises not to go away.

I believe that approach can be found in the concept of sharing Federal tax revenues with the States for the purpose of aiding our schools.

I had hoped that this year we could have definite evidence of a move toward reducing nonessential Government spending so that Federal taxes could be reduced accordingly. This would permit, first, a balanced national budget, and secondly, more opportunities for State and local government to broaden their own tax potential so as to be better able to meet the rising costs of public education.

But our hopes in this regard are now shown to be disappointed. According to the best available analysis of the Presidential budget announced this week spending for programs which are generally labeled as "Great Society" programs is scheduled to increase by $3.2 billion in the coming year.

And instead of anticipating tax reductions we are being asked to actually increase taxes with the restoration of the automobile and telephone service excises and the speeding up of tax withholdings, plus other kinds of increases which are being predicted for the coming months.

This all leaves our schools with a problem which deserves early attention. For that reason I am introducing a bill today to provide for a program of tax sharing with the States.

The Federal income tax is the broadest source of tax collection. There is good reason to believe that revenue from this source should be shared with the States on a "no strings" basis as a means of greatest help for our public school systems.

Further, there should be no partisan issue raised over this question. Leading public officials of both major political parties have advocated this kind of plan. And several bills have been introduced, advancing variations of the idea.

My bill provides that when it is fully operational 5 percent of the revenue received from the Internal Revenue Code and the Tariff Schedule would be deposited in an educational assistance trust fund.

The program would be 5 years in building. In the first year of operation, 1 percent of the total revenue would be deposited in the fund, in the second year 2 percent would be contributed, and so forth until 5 percent is deposited in the fifth year and thereafter.

Disbursements would be handled two different ways. Half of the funds would be distributed to the States on a per student basis. The other half would be allocated according to a formula based on the percent of its gross personal income a State is already spending on its State schools.

Each State would qualify only by guaranteeing that it would use the money for education purposes and by showing that it operates in fact in accord with that understanding. This would allow each State to determine its own education priorities.

This plan would not raise taxes. But it ought to provide badly needed help to public schools throughout the country by combining the strength of the Federal revenue system with local control of schools which is a basic essential of our system.

It is my hope that we may bring this proposal, along with others which have been introduced, to the point of active consideration in this Congress so that we may move forward with genuine help for our schools.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING ASSISTANCE FOR VETERANS

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, our involvement in the Vietnam war has served to highlight the sacrifices being made by our men in the Armed Forces. Let us properly recognize the contributions to national and international security being made by the 190,000 American men serving their country in Vietnam and the many other GI's supporting them on tours of duty elsewhere.

As draft calls for our young men increase, and the resulting interruption of educational and career plans becomes more prevalent, it becomes the serious responsibility of the Congress to extend GI educational benefits to veterans of current and recent service. In furtherance of this most worthy objective, I am today introducing a bill providing for a program of education and training assistance for veterans of military service since January 31, 1955.

It has long been the purpose of this Nation to encourage the pursuit of academic and vocational achievement. But the 6 million men serving in the Armed Forces since 1955 have not been accorded the opportunities and assistance made available by congressional action to veterans of World War II or the Korean war.

Mr. Speaker, I know that our country will continue to recognize and meet its obligations to its fighting men, and thus respectfully urge immediate consideration and favorable disposition of this legislation by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The provisions of my bill are summarized as follows:

This bill, entitled the "Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 1966," will provide a program of education and training for veterans of current service.

Service requirements: At least 6 months' military service between February 1, 1955, and the date of termination of compulsory military service.

Duration of training: Education or training time shall be earned at the rate of 1½ days of education for each day of military service during the specified period. The period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled shall not exceed 36 months.

Time limitations: Education or training must be initiated within 3 years after the veteran's discharge or release from active duty or 3 years from date of enactment, whichever is later. Veterans who have been unable to initiate programs of study within 3 years of separation because of the nature of their discharge shall be permitted to initiate a program of education or training within 3 years after the nature of the discharge was corrected or changed to make him eligible.

Expiration of education and training: No education or training shall be afforded an eligible veteran beyond 8 years from discharge from active duty or 8 years from enactment of this law, whichever is later. The entire program of education and training shall terminate 8 years after the date of termination of compulsory military service.

Payments to veterans: Each eligible veteran pursuing a program of education or training shall receive an education and training allowance to meet in part the expenses of his subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT PROMISES TO HELP RURAL AMERICA

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that the Post Office Department has assured me that rural America will receive attention in the announced study of the postal system that is getting underway. A representative of the Department was in my office recently and I was promised that after the situation has been studied, the Department intends to improve mail services across the entire Nation, including rural areas.

This meeting was one of a series of such discussions I have had with postal officials over the past couple of years, and we discussed the most recent complaints of deteriorated mail service that have reached my office.

At last they seem to be getting the message that mail service is going from bad to worse. While it is encouraging to receive a promise of action, we will be watching carefully for signs of actual improvement.

WHAT IS HAPPENING TO THE SPIRIT OF AMERICA?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ed W. Hiles, executive vice president of the Georgia Savings & Loan League, recently delivered an address in Atlanta, Ga., on the subject "What's Happening to the Spirit of America?" He makes a very challenging address as to what is transpiring in this country today in the way of destroying the spirit which has made this country great.

The address follows:

WHAT'S HAPPENING TO THE SPIRIT OF AMERICA?

(By Ed W. Hiles)

Whenever I am fortunate enough to get this many people in a captive audience, I am tempted to take advantage of the situation and talk about the savings and loan business which I am privileged to represent. As a matter of fact, the subject which I have chosen is not altogether unrelated to our business of encouraging thrift and homeownership, and it is definitely something in which you and I and the savings and loan business have a common interest.

The slogan of our business is, "The American Home—Safeguard of American Liberties." I want to devote my time with you today to the matter of our safeguarding of these liberties.

I have chosen as my topic the question "What's Happening to the Spirit of America?" I have done so purposely and not with any intent of trying to answer the question for you, but primarily for the purpose of impressing upon you the truth of the fact that something has been happening to the spirit of America over the years, and I hope to leave you with your minds made up to do some real soul searching in an effort to determine for yourself just what it is.

In referring to the spirit of America I am talking about that spirit which is built upon and which evolves from the interrelationship of Christian morality and individual responsibility. To me, these are the basic components of the true spirit of America, and it is my personal feeling that during the past 3 or 4 decades we have witnessed a gradual breaking down in the interrelationship of these two components to the extent that it poses a genuine threat to our freedom as individuals; the sanctity of our homes; the solvency of our businesses; the stability of our economy; the integrity of our Nation; and, the peace of the world.

I recognize that this is an election year, and I am sure some of you are going to attempt to read into my comments implications of a political nature which certainly are not intended; however, let me say this—if it is true (and I believe it is true) that our individual freedoms are being sacrificed away bit by bit at the altar of political expediency, then I firmly believe it is high time that we resorted to whatever political influences are available to us in order to recapture them.

But, I am not here today as a politician, not as a Republican or as a Democrat, or as a member of any of the much discussed extremist groups. One thing which bothers me a great deal is the fact that today whenever a man gets on his feet to publicly endorse the philosophy of government that has made the United States of America the greatest nation on the face of the earth, he immediately is branded as an extremist. If being extremely concerned about what is happening to the spirit of America makes me an extremist, then I will admit to being an extremist.

But I feel somewhat like the old man who had always loved to listen to a clock strike—he bought an old clock and hung it on the wall of his living room, and he would go to bed at night and listen to the clock strike. As the clock would strike, he would count. One night something went wrong with the mechanism in the clock. It began to strike, and he began to count. He got up to 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15—suddenly he realized something was wrong, he reached over, shook his wife and said, "Wake up Ma—it's later'n I've ever knowed it to be."

I feel as though it's later than a lot of us realize it to be—and so I want to talk with you, not as a politician nor as the executive vice president of the Georgia Savings & Loan League, but as Ed Hiles—a husband, father, professed Christian, and a fellow citizen of the United States of America.

This matter of individual freedom and Christian morality, as the basis for the true spirit of America, has been of interest and concern to me for many years. But my decision to take a public stand on some of the issues involved was actually triggered by a very simple—yet significant—incident a few months ago.

While attempting to assist with the coaching and organizing of a group of Little League beginners in baseball, I could not help but notice how much greater effort one of those little fellows put forth when trying to win the right to play the position he wanted most to play on the team than when playing in a position assigned to him by his coach. Here was a very simple—yet very positive—example of how the exercise of freedom of choice was serving as the incentive for these boys to reach the very pinnacle of their individual abilities.

I found myself comparing this simple example with some of the results of the ever-changing concepts of the so-called American way of life in our time. I asked myself: Just how much honest-to-goodness freedom of choice is going to be available to these boys as an incentive to make the most of their individual lives when they get a few years older?

God has blessed my home with three wonderful children. But I shudder at the thought of the very real possibility that their futures are going to be determined for them—not through their individual choice, but as a result of our steady and positive drifting into a state of controlled lives; not under communism, but under a converted form of Americanism as envisioned by those who espouse the idea of exchanging freedom for security.

If this should actually happen—and we are most surely headed rapidly in that direction—it will be due largely to default on the part of our generation in allowing something to happen to the spirit of America as based on Christian morality and individual freedom and responsibility.

I am taking my stand with those who believe that this is too big a price to pay for the type of security promised. History records that throughout all time, whenever people have decided they wanted security more than they wanted freedom, they have ended up by losing both.

Two boys in England were watching some birds flying about the tree tops above them. One of the boys asked the other why he was looking so sad. "I was thinking of those poor little birds up there," he said; "they haven't any cages."

He was sad because the birds were not safe in bondage like boys and men in a socialistic planned economy. He was born into—and was growing up under—that kind of philosophy. How about my Little League ballplayers?

Remember, we actually started on our paternalistic binge some 30 years ago, when the hardships brought on by the great depression shortened that famous cry of Patrick Henry from "Give me liberty or give me death" to just plain "Give me."

We began to take liberties with the Ten Commandments similar to those which are being taken today with the Constitution of the United States of America. We began to twist our interpretation of the Ten Commandments in order to satisfy our immediate needs and desires, or to justify our actions. We apparently changed our interpretation of the Tenth Commandment from "Thou shalt not covet." to "Thou shalt not covet except what thou would have from thy neighbor who owns it."

We began asking our Government not only to protect us in what we had, but to give us a part of what someone else had. We failed to recognize that if we granted to the Government the power to give us everything we wanted, we had to also give it the power to take from us everything we have.

We have followed this line pretty closely regardless of which political party happened to be in power in Washington. We have seen the tentacles of the octopus of Federal aid and Federal subsidy extending into virtually every phase of our economic, social, and cultural life. And, we have been swallowing the sugar-coated propaganda that we can have all this and freedom too.

But, is this the same kind of freedom that our forefathers deemed worthy of such tremendous sacrifices as were made in the founding of this great Nation of ours? I don't think so. I believe there is a difference—a great difference—between "freedom from something," which might be called protective freedom, and "freedom for something," or dynamic freedom, which serves to inspire man to strive to reach greater heights.

I am of the personal opinion that the finest statement yet made in referring to the Court decision on prayer in the public schools was that made by Evangelist Billy Graham. He said: "The trouble appears to be that a lot of people are of the opinion that the Constitution grants them freedom from religion instead of freedom of religion."

We, as a people have consistently over the past three decades sought freedom from individual responsibilities by either asking or simply allowing the Federal Government to assume more and more of such responsibilities without any objection on our part.

It is this trend toward "protective freedom" or "freedom from something" which, in my opinion, is eating away at the spirit of America.

So my hope today is that you will think along with me while we attempt to establish the four cornerstones of the foundation of true freedom as envisioned by our forefathers.

First of all, we are well aware of the great conflict which exists today between two basic ideologies of government—one based on freedom, the other on enslavement. We have heard and read many lengthy discussions attempting to set forth the differences between these two systems. But, if I were asked to write a book on the subject, it would probably be the shortest book ever written. I would have an artist prepare an attractive cover setting out the title in bold letters: "The Real Difference Between Americanism and Communism." Inside there would be just one page, and on that page one word. The word would be God in capital letters.

Our Nation became a great nation because it was a good nation. Whenever it ceases to be a good nation, it will cease to be a great nation.

We in America take great pride, and rightly so, in the fact that we enjoy the highest standard of living of any people on the face of the earth. We take great pride, and rightly so, in the tremendous material wealth of this country. We take great pride, and rightly so, in the tremendous productive capacity of this country. We take great pride in, and place great reliance upon, the tremendous military might of this country. These things are important, but in placing a measure of value on the importance of these things, we must not lose sight of the truth of the fact that our ultimate salvation as free individuals is going to depend, not on these things we have in our hands, but what we have in our hearts.

So the first cornerstone of freedom, so far as I am concerned, must of necessity be a basic fundamental belief in—and reliance upon—an Almighty God. This cornerstone was set by the signers of the Declaration of Independence when they wrote into that great document, these words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are * * * endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

They firmly believed that these rights came from God—not from government. Our own belief today should be just as genuine and not the lipservice type of belief which exists in so many quarters. We stamp our coins with the words, "In God we trust"—and then we cast our lot and our loyalties, sometimes blindly, with some political party or group espousing an ideology which time and again throughout history has led other nations to disaster.

Sometimes I wonder if we aren't unwittingly breaking the First Commandment by getting ourselves in the position of making a god of government and forgetting about the government of God.

It has been suggested that we are rewriting the 23d Psalm so that it would read:

> "The Government is my shepherd, I shall not work
> It maketh me to lie down in a fool's paradise,
> It leadeth me into deep water,
> But it refills my dinner pail."

Is this what's happening to the spirit of America?

The second cornerstone of freedom is a government limited by constitution.

We know that government is necessary and that it costs money. But whatever degree of government we have, it must be the servant and not the master of the people. That was clearly the intent of the framers of our Constitution.

They had learned from experience that the gravest and most constant danger to a man's life, liberty and happiness is the government under which he lives.

They were not only students of history—they were victims of it.

They had no Federal subsidy—nor did they seek any. All they had was character. All they did was work. All they wanted was self-respect.

They earned through sacrifice what we have been privileged to enjoy through heritage—and what is now being dissipated by our complacency. To make certain we would never have to suffer the tyranny from which they had fled, they wrote into the Constitution three unique characteristics:

1. The authority of the government was limited to specific delegated powers.

2. All authority or power not so delegated remained with the States or the people.

3. The power of government was divided into three separate branches with specific duties and realms of influence.

This was a written contract between the government and the people. It wasn't intended to be made flexible or amended by court interpretations in order to comply with some expressed policy of whatever political party happened to be in power.

This was no doubt the greatest governmental document ever struck by the pen of man. And, as it has been handed down from generation to generation, it has carried with it some very definite responsibilities for its preservation and protection on the part of those for whom its benefits were intended—the people of the United States of America.

On leaving the Convention Hall when the final draft had been agreed upon, Ben Franklin was approached by a citizen with this question: "Dr. Franklin, what have you given us?" He replied: "We have given you a Republic—if you can keep it." He didn't say, "If the President can keep it." He didn't say, "If the Congress can keep it." He said to that citizen, "If you can keep it."

But, somehow, when we changed Patrick Henry's cry to "give me," we either lost sight of—or deliberately turned our backs on—Ben Franklin's challenge.

With the help of a few Government planners, we developed a new game of "ring around a rosie." In it, we all stand in a circle, each with his hand in the pocket of the person next to him—expecting to get richer therefrom. We still seem to be blind to the truth of the fact that whenever a man gets something without earning it, someone else must earn something without getting it. That is morally wrong, and any society building upon such a foundation is bound to crumble.

We hear a lot of talk about Federal aid. To me this is a misnomer. There is no such thing as Federal aid. In fact, the thing which we refer to as Federal aid can only be obtained in two ways.

The first way is for the Government to take something from us in order to have it to give back to us. That is ridiculous, and to me it is like a person giving himself a blood transfusion by taking the blood from the right arm and inserting it in the left arm—meanwhile, running it through a tube that leaks. Under this system, we would soon find ourselves in the position cited in the legend about the wolves in the Arctic region, who are tricked into capture by the Eskimos.

The Eskimos imbed a sharp knife in the ice, with only a small portion of the razor-sharp point of the blade protruding. Around this blade they pour a small quantity of seal blood. The wolves, attracted by the blood, begin to lap at it and soon find that the faster they lap up the blood, the more blood appears. They become so overwhelmed with this apparently inexhaustible supply of blood that they continue to lap at it until they grow so weak from loss of their own blood that they fall over on the ice and freeze to death.

Is that what is happening to the spirit of America?

The other way in which we can receive this so-called Federal aid is for the Government to take it from someone else in order to give it to us. If we remove the Government from this operation, it would become a direct violation of the Eighth Commandment—"Thou shalt not steal"—unless, of course, we want to amend this one to read "thou shalt not steal—except for a worthy cause."

I think it is unfortunate today that even our churches, which are supposedly the custodians of the Ten Commandments, not only are condoning, but are actually demanding by their active and aggressive support of do-good welfare-type legislation that the fruits of the labor of some citizens be taken by force of law for the benefit of other citizens. To me this is an admission of failure on the part of the churches in their rightful area of persuasion and influence, and effort to substitute compulsion.

Is this a result of, or a contributing factor to, "What's happening to the Spirit of America?"

The third cornerstone of freedom is Christian ethics.

If something is morally wrong, I do not believe it can be made morally right simply by passing a law making it legal. By the same token, if something is not morally wrong, it can't be made so merely by passing a law making it illegal. This is basic to some of the problems confronting us as a Christian nation today.

The criteria for right or wrong come from sources outside the government and existed long before any current government was formalized.

I am going to attempt to draw for you an extreme analogy and I will admit to its extremeness, but I am hopeful that it will help to make a point. All of you have read during recent months about a young fellow by the name of Billie Sol Estes. Let's remember that when we started on our paternalistic binge in this country some three and a half decades ago, Billie Sol Estes had not yet begun his first grade education. He was born into, and grew up, in an era and an area where one group of citizens was collecting money from another group of citizens for not planting cotton, for not planting corn, and for not producing pigs; and what is Billie Sol Estes being sent to prison for? He is being sent to prison for collecting money from farmers for not producing fertilizer tanks. Here are two operations similar in nature, both of which are morally wrong, because each consists of one person getting something without earning it, thereby making another person earn something without getting it. One is sending a man to prison, the other is perfectly right and legal in the eyes of the law.

Let's take a close look at the Christian ethics of this philosophy of Federal aid, of the subsidizing of one segment of our economy at the expense of another. Do we honestly believe it is morally right for the Government to say to us: "We will protect you from being robbed on one hand; but if you can demonstrate the need, we will arrange for others to be robbed in your behalf?"

What sort of progress are we making in America when we urge our elected officials, by resolution and otherwise, to pass laws which will destroy human dignity by making half of the people victims of piracy and the other half victims of charity?

Please understand that I am not against charity. But it has always been my personal belief that charity, in order to be effective, must be voluntary. I refer briefly to the 13th and 14th verses of the 12th chapter of the book of Luke from the New Testament. Jesus was talking to a large crowd when a man approached him saying: "Master, speak to my brother that he share his inheritance with me." To this Jesus replied: "Man, who is it that would make me a divider among men?"

The fourth cornerstone of freedom is found in the individual strength of character among our people themselves.

It is my feeling that we have been witnessing a tremendous amount of erosion at this cornerstone of the foundation of freedom. This erosion has reached a point where we now find ourselves entrapped in a tremendous web of inconsistencies. Somehow we must generate the strength of character to throw off these inconsistencies one by one, if we are going to recapture or reestablish the true spirit of America.

For example, we are trapped in an inconsistency between what we truly believe and what we do. This is personal and individual—and consists primarily of giving our consciences a little bigger voice in making of our decisions.

We are trapped in an inconsistency between our true political philosophies and our traditions of blind loyalty to political parties. As far as I am personally concerned, I have no special preference as to whether my children grow up under a Democratic Republic of a Republican democracy, but I do not want to see them grow up under a politically amalgamated autocracy.

We are trapped in an inconsistency between our desire to have Government take from others and give to us, and our objections to having the Government take from us and give to others.

Between our demands for freedom from Government control of our respective businesses and our failure or refusal at self-regulation.

Between our desire for less government and our rejection of more individual responsibilities.

Between the enactment of laws purported to guarantee opportunity to succeed and the application and enforcement of those laws in such a way as to destroy the incentive to succeed.

Between court decisions purported to protect human rights and the application and enforcement of those decisions in such a way as to destroy property rights.

Between court opinions purported to grant freedom of choice to a buyer and the application of those decisions in such a way as to deny the freedom of choice to a seller.

Between court decisions purported to guarantee freedom to associate and the application and enforcement of those decisions in such a way as to deny the freedom not to associate.

Between the enactment of a law under the so-called title of "civil rights" purported to guarantee freedom "from" discrimination and the application of that law in such a way as to compel discrimination by destroying freedom of choice.

Last, but not least, the inconsistency between a pledge of allegiance which contains the words "One Nation Under God" and court written laws which deny to that God admittance to the classrooms of our children.

These are just a few of the hundreds of inconsistencies in which we find ourselves entrapped. I am inclined to attribute our predicament:

Not to our action, but to our inaction;

Not to our choice, but to our surrender of choice to somebody else;

Not to our desire to follow, but to our failure to lead;

Not to our inability to prevent it, but to our indifference toward it;

Not to our failure to recognize the threat, but to our refusal to admit its imminence.

And so this cornerstone of strength of character is extremely important because freedom and character will rise and fall together—and freedom cannot long endure where there is no character to sustain it. Freedom is a precious thing. It is a God-given thing, it is a voluntary thing. But freedom is not free, and it must not be taken for granted. It was won through sacrifice, and it must be maintained through sacrifice wherever necessary. It can be lost just as surely, just as completely—and just as permanently—tax by tax, subsidy by subsidy, and regulation by regulation, as it can bullet by bullet, bomb by bomb, or missile by missile.

And, so there you have one man's view of the basic foundation of freedom. It is my feeling that we are witnessing a steady decline of freedom in America. But it is not too late to stem the tide. You can be sure it will take strength of character of individual citizens. It will take a firm application of Christian ethics in the conduct of our relations with each other. It will take the restoration of constitutional limitations upon government. And it will also take one thing more.

At a critical period in Biblical history when Joshua was chosen to lead the children of Israel into the land of Canaan, he said to his people—"Choose you this day whom you will serve—but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord."

Some years ago there was discovered an epitaph on a tombstone along the coast of Greece. It read: "A shipwrecked sailor on this coast bids you set sail—full many a ship, ere we were lost, weathered the gale."

Still more recently in the news was a 45-year-old marine colonel responding to a question about his upcoming space attempt. He said to the people of America: "Some men will die—but keep on striving for your goal."

These three men lived centuries apart, but they had one thing in common: They had faith. They had faith in themselves. They had faith in their fellowmen. They had faith in their purpose. And above all, they had faith in God.

Real faith such as this is a living, vital force—and a constant source of strength and comfort.

The very faith that freedom will survive will, in itself, help freedom to survive. But we must never stop working at it if we are to recapture the true spirit of America.

To make our work most effective then, we must stand on the first cornerstone we mentioned—a fundamental belief in and reliance upon God. We must ask Him to grant us the willingness to accept those things in our lives which cannot be changed. We must seek from Him the courage to change those things which can and must be changed. And we must look to Him for the wisdom to know the difference.

U.S. CANAL ZONE: "THIS IS AMERICAN SOIL"

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, since announcement by the President on September 24, 1965, of the proposal for three new interoceanic canal treaties with Panama to replace the existing treaty structure for the Panama Canal there has been a slow but steadily growing interest among the people of our country in the overall canal situation, especially as regards retention of our sovereignty over the U.S. Canal Zone.

As an example of this increasing interest, I quote a recent editorial from the Manchester, N.H., Union-Leader:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Oct. 23, 1965]

"THIS IS AMERICAN SOIL"

It is alarming that there are so few voices of protest being raised throughout the Nation in opposition to President Johnson's proposal to relinquish U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal.

One of the voices of protest, and one of the most articulate, is that of Harold Lord Varney, last Wednesday night's speaker in Nashua at a meeting of the Southern New Hampshire Forum for American Opinion, an agency of the John Birch Society.

Varney called on all Americans to write their Congressmen and the White House to protest the proposed new treaty which would abolish the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903. The treaty, which gave the U.S. sovereignty "in perpetuity" over the Canal Zone, has long been a favorite target of Communist and leftist agitators.

Representative DANIEL FLOOD of Pennsylvania, who long has led the fight in Congress against those who would abandon this strategic facility to the vagaries of Panamanian politics, warns that the President's statement of September 24 will be "taken as a signal for accelerated activity among Communist revolutionary elements throughout Latin America."

The Pennsylvania Democrat told his House colleagues: "the grant of complete jurisdiction over the Canal Zone means that all laws made by the Congress for the government of the zone and the operation and maintenance of the canal may be scrapped at any time by Panama, and superseded by Panamanian law. Also, all civil activities in the zone—courts, police and fire, schools, roads and utilities—will be taken over by Panama."

"Unrealistic and astounding"—these were the terms used by Congressman FLOOD to denounce the new treaty being drawn up for presentation to the U.S. Senate. Representative FLOOD said the Panamanian Government can't even manage to collect its own garbage from the streets of Colon and Panama City.

The Communist-inspired riots in the Canal Zone are paying off in big dividends for Fidel Castro, Thelma King, and other Reds who helped to engineer the disturbances.

This newspaper has warned consistently that the State Department would succeed in relinquishing U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone if the American people failed to speak out.

As Mr. Varney pointed out, the House of Representatives did indeed go on record in 1960 in support of a resolution forbidding the State Department to fly the Panamanian flag anywhere in the Canal Zone, but this 381-to-12 vote was no sooner publicized in the press than the State Department rushed forward with major concessions.

In 1963, the State Department even went so far as to invite Abdul Hamid Abubakr, secretary general of Nasser's Suez Canal Authority, to come to Panama—at the expense of American taxpayers—to lecture audiences on how he and Nasser engineered the nationalization of the Suez Canal.

President Theodore Roosevelt, under whose leadership the Panama Canal was built, must have envisioned that future Washington administrations might not share his resolve to keep the 1903 treaty inviolate. He warned almost 50 years ago:

"The Panama Canal must never be internationalized. It is our canal; we built it; we fortified it; and we will protect it, and we will not permit our enemies to use it for war. In times of peace, all nations shall use it alike but in time of war our interest at once becomes dominant."

We have completely carried out the terms of the treaty.

We would be on solid legal ground in retaining "perpetual sovereignty" over the Canal Zone.

We dug the ditch.

We paid for the project.

And we have been pumping more than $80 million annually into the Panamanian economy.

As Harold Lord Varney pointed out last Wednesday night in Nashua, "this is American soil."

If we do not intend to stand firm here, when confronted by a motley assortment of leftwing agitators who are directed and financed by Cuban and Panamanian Communists, can it be long before the commendable resolve the Johnson administration has shown in Vietnam begins to sag under the barrage of leftist demonstrations in the United States?

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask the distinguished majority leader what the legislative program is for the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the only prospective business I know anything about now for the balance of the week, other than routine business, is the money resolutions from the Committee on House Administration. Subject to these resolutions being reported, they will be brought up tomorrow.

There are eight of these resolutions.

The first is House Resolution 633 for the Committee on Government Operations; House Resolution 634 for the Committee on Education and Labor; House Resolution 636 for the Select Committee on Small Business; House Resolution 638 for the Committee on the Judiciary; House Resolution 663 for the Committee on the District of Columbia; House Resolution 665 for the Committee on Un-American Activities; House Resolution 667 for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and House Resolution 686 for the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert the full titles of these resolutions in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

H. Res. 633. To provide $800,000 additional funds for studies and investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

H. Res. 634. To provide $400,000 additional funds for studies and investigations of the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. Res. 636. To provide $335,000 additional funds for studies and investigations of the Select Committee on Small Business.

H. Res. 638. To provide $300,000 additional funds for studies and investigations of the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 663. To provide $25,000 additional funds for studies and investigations of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. Res. 665. To provide $425,000 additional funds for studies and investigations of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H. Res 667. To provide $75,000 additional funds for studies and investigations of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. Res. 686. To provide $85,000 additional funds for studies and investigations of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, does the majority leader know whether any of these requests for committee funds are controversial?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, all I can say to the distinguished Republican leader is that I have been informed by some Members that they intend to speak in opposition to one of the resolutions.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. So the Members could contemplate quorum calls and rollcalls tomorrow if the Committee on House Administration reports out these resolutions?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS IN JEFFERSON COUNTY, ALA.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last I presented from the floor of this House the facts concerning registration and voting in Jefferson County, Ala. Our county board of registrars, on a nondiscriminatory basis, had conducted heavy registration of Negroes and other citizens, and had the capability of handling many more, which registration according to present methods and rate would result in a complete racial balance in registration and voting in Jefferson County. The energy and efficiency with which these local officials have fulfilled their responsibilities is highly commendable.

Mr. Speaker, last weekend, apparently in response to the demands of perpetrators of civil disobedience and lawlessness, who in recent weeks invaded my congressional district and led young people in riotous demonstrations punctuated by violence—deplored by local white and Negro leaders alike—the Attorney General sent Federal registrars into that district. Other such registrars elsewhere in Alabama have apparently pursued policies so lax that there have been repeated reports of false and double registration.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore demand—and I am conveying this to the Attorney General by mail—first, that these unwanted and unneeded Federal registrars be withdrawn from Jefferson County; second, that until they are so removed there shall be immediate and rigorous supervision of their policies and procedures, to the end that they shall not create discrimination in my county and make more problems than they solve through aiding and abetting false and fraudulent registration practices there; and finally, that there shall be an immediate investigation of the lax and careless policies apparently pursued by such new Federal registrars throughout the South.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—LARGE SEED AND BLANKET NUCLEAR POWER REACTOR PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from West

Virginia [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of the Congress I made a particular effort to have deleted from the Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill the sum of $91.5 million which would have gone for the construction of a large seed and blanket nuclear reactor for the State of California.

During the discussion of this matter on the floor I was pleased that a number of the membership that were present during the debate supported my motion to delete this $91.5 million authorization for the large seed and blanket nuclear power reactor.

I gave as my reason at that time that one of the noted authorities in this field, Admiral Rickover, had suggested that this particular program could not work and would not work and that this was a waste of funds and that there had not been any refinement of this particular reactor. However, the desires of my two colleagues on the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] and their interest in obtaining for their State a program of this size which would eventually have cost the Federal Government over $100 million—their interest, I assume, genuine, it was perfectly obvious what their interest really was.

The fuss that was made, Mr. Speaker, on the observations I advanced in opposition to the program was that I was a Representative in this body who represented a coal State and that this was the old historic argument between atomic energy and coal.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise the House today and those who stood up with me on that day when we attempted to delete this particular program over the opposition of the Representatives from the State of California that the Atomic Energy Commission themselves have now agreed that the program is not feasible and it could not be carried out. Further, that a great portion of the funds that were earmarked under that authorization bill, $91.5 million, a great portion has been spent—it is fair to say has been wasted, because the facts are already available which confirmed that the project could not go.

Yet I would say to those of my colleagues who supported me on that day that we were right; that what we said on that day has now been borne out and that the representations we made to our colleagues in the House on that day have been substantiated that the project should not then have been authorized has now been confirmed by the Atomic Energy Commission and it has been laid on the shelf. Seldom does one have a victory of such proportions.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Atomic Energy Commission for the forthright manner in which it recently dealt with a proposed project looking toward the construction of a large seed-and-blanket nuclear power reactor in California.

As Members of the House will recall, when the 1966 authorization bill was before us last year, a number of Members raised serious questions as to the wisdom of proceeding with the project, at a cost of almost $100 million to the Federal Government, under the unusual circumstances which surround it.

The Atomic Energy Commission had proposed to Congress that it be given the authority to enter into a contract to participate in the project with the California Department of Water Resources in the construction of a large nuclear powerplant, using the large seed-and-blanket reactor, to provide power for pumping water from northern to southern California.

Before the proposed authorization reached the floor for consideration, it became known that serious unexpected technical problems had developed with the reactor. As I understand the situation, these problems involved the life of the fuel core. It had been anticipated that the fuel core would have a life of 9 years and power costs had been predicated upon this long fuel life. Shortly after the Joint Committee authorization hearings, Adm. Hyman Rickover, the developer of the seed-and-blanket concept, reported to the committee that further research and development were required before confidence could be placed in the anticipated long core life. On the basis of this information, the California water resources agency deferred any definite commitment, agreeing to approximately a year's delay to see what might be done to resolve the admittedly serious technical problem and to give it time to evaluate other cost studies including a proposal submitted by a pool of private and public electric utilities to provide an alternate source of power from conventional fuel plants.

It was my conviction then, Mr. Speaker, in view of the uncertainties about the technical feasibility of the reactor and the admitted desire of the California agency for more time, that the House should not in any way take action which would appear to be a commitment to a questionable project involving the spending of almost $100 million in Federal funds. I offered an amendment to the AEC authorization bill to delete this project. When this was defeated, I offered a motion to recommit the bill to the Joint Committee with instructions to strike the project from the bill and then report it back to the House for action. On this motion, 43 Members of the House joined me in voting to recommit the measure, which indicated a growing concern over extending congressional approval to a project of such doubtful validity.

Many of the reservations which I expressed about the project on the floor of the House last year have now been confirmed by the Atomic Energy Commission.

In now announcing that it was withdrawing the proposed project altogether, the AEC said the technical problems of the seed-and-blanket reactor could not be resolved in time to meet the schedule and proposed Government warranties to the State of California. I take this to mean that the AEC will not come back to Congress this year and request any additional funds for the project. In passing the authorization bill last year, the Congress stipulated that $25 million could be used for further research and development work regardless of what happened to the project for the actual construction of such a reactor. This money is in addition to the estimated $20 million already spent on the reactor.

In the light of the developments in connection with the seed-and-blanket project, the California Department of Water Resources, through its director, Mr. William E. Warne, has recently said that it would now seriously consider building two large nuclear plants, using reactor concepts which are no longer experimental, as is the seed-and-blanket, to provide the pumping power which will be needed for the Feather River water project. I trust that Mr. Warne and the California agency fully understand that no Federal funds will be available for building reactors of this type.

The AEC and the Joint Committee have both stated, in unequivocal terms, that because these light water reactors have been proven and are now being built or planned for many areas of the country as commercial producers of electricity, they no longer can qualify for direct Federal subsidy. Therefore, the California Department of Water Resources should be on notice that if it does decide to build one or more proven light water reactors as a source of power for the Feather River water project, it will do so at its own cost and without 1 penny of Federal Government subsidy.

The AEC made it abundantly clear that no further subsidy for proven reactors is established policy in a recent action turning down a petition submitted by coal organizations and other allied industries, for the issuance of a ruling of practical value covering such reactors. The AEC said that one important practical effect of such a ruling would be to prohibit direct subsidies to builders and operators of such reactors and, inasmuch as this is already policy, adopted by it and confirmed by the Joint Committee, a practical value ruling would be to a great extent meaningless.

I think the AEC was wrong in this conclusion. I believe also that AEC was in error in another part of its decision on the practical value petition when it said that there really was no experience as to whether large nuclear power reactors are economically competitive with powerplants using coal and other conventional fuels. In effect, what the AEC said was that it could not make a judgment on this important question until the large 400,000 to 600,000 kilowatt nuclear plants now being built had operated for a long period of time. Only then, it said, would it be able to say whether they were actually competitive—whether the highly optimistic estimates could be realized.

This reluctance to acknowledge the economic feasibility of light water reactors—the type being announced for construction with increasing frequency—is in sharp contrast to the public posture of the AEC and its staff and of the manufacturers of the reactors. When they are speaking before electric utilities and other industry groups, AEC officials have no hesitancy in stating that nuclear power has "arrived," that it is technically proven and economically competitive and, therefore, utilities can safely make plans to build them not for experimental purposes but as baseload powerplants. The AEC encourages utilities to build nuclear powerplants.

To my mind there is no question but that nuclear plants of the type currently being pushed by the AEC and being built are of practical value. Otherwise, would electric utilities presume to commit millions of dollars of their shareholders' money to build them?

Therefore, we should not have to wait until the actual operating experience can be examined before deciding they are of practical value. This could mean another 30 years. Meanwhile, the Government would remain in the picture, legally free to grant subsidies whenever disposed to do so on one pretext or another.

This Nation has a technically competent and active civilian nuclear power industry. Nuclear plants using light water reactors are no longer experimental. They are commercial in nature.

The refusal of the AEC to formally acknowledge this fact is beyond comprehension.

I have said many times before, and I repeat it today, Mr. Speaker. The time has come for the Government to get out of the nuclear power field. It has spent almost $2 billion to develop the state of the nuclear art to its present high degree of efficiency and success. The manufacturers of nuclear reactors are now beginning to cash in on this vast Government expenditure by selling multi-million-dollar plants to privately owned utilities. They are advertising plants with guaranteed performance.

No doubt many improvements and refinements can be made in the present technology of light water reactors. The question is: Who shall finance these improvements and refinements? The Federal Government or private industry, which will profit from them?

I say that our economic system demands that private industry take over this task and the Federal Government step aside.

SOVIET JEWRY TODAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry issued a remarkably cogent report on conditions of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

This distinguished group of Americans has joined together to take whatever action is possible in seeking a demonstrable reversal of the oppressive anti-Semitism prevailing in Soviet Russia.

As I have stated before in the House, conditions have not really improved, except for temporary, elusive concessions aimed at placating foreign opinion and beclouding the harsh, persistent realities.

I visited the Soviet Union in November. The circumstances enumerated in the report complement my own firsthand observations. In the near future I will discuss my own experience at greater length.

I urge all my colleagues in the House and Senate to read the conference's report with care. It addresses itself to one of the great human tragedies of our day:

SOVIET JEWRY TODAY

(An interim report issued by the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, New York, N.Y.)

During the past year, a spate of events, large and small, has given rise to guarded hopes that the Soviet Union is changing its policy toward the Jews and that the situation of Soviet Jewry is undergoing fundamental improvement. Are these hopes grounded in fact? If so, to what extent and in what way? If not, what is the meaning of the events cited as concrete evidence of progress?

INTRODUCTION

The American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, a cooperative association of 24 national American Jewish organizations, seeks to bring about removal of the restrictions and deprivations imposed upon Jews in the Soviet Union through an intensive and sustained program of information and interpretation designed to expose those restrictions and deprivations to the world and thereby to bring an outraged world public opinion to bear upon the Soviet Government to redress them.

In the year and a half since the creation of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry at a solemn national assembly of delegates of major American Jewish organizations in April 1964, a vigorous and unceasing program of exposure to public notice of the oppressive anti-Jewish policies and practices of the Soviet Government has indeed pricked the conscience of the world. The world has responded with condemnations that the leaders of Russia have not been able wholly to ignore.

There have been some changes in Russia's treatment of her Jewish citizens during the past year and a half and in the official Soviet "line" on anti-Semitism. An assessment of those changes, and of the present situation of Soviet Jewry as compared with its situation before the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry was established, is the purpose of an analysis just issued by the conference. There is special appropriateness to its issuance on the anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations and within a few days of the advent of Chanukah, the festival by which Jews commemorate the revolt of the Macabees, the first recorded armed struggle for religious liberty in history.

Soviet society appears to be evolving gradually along more rational lines. Civilized world opinion—and the best elements of the U.S.S.R., itself—will expect of that society more than meager lifting of restrictions and denials. It will expect the eradication of the irrational factors that have hitherto determined Soviet policy toward the Jews. It will expect the establishment of the communal institutions necessary to assure the continuity and secure the future of Soviet Jewry, so as to permit them self-realization as Jews, as citizens, and as human beings: schools; textbooks; rabbinical seminaries; teachers institutes; centers of advanced learning; research institutes; courses and classes in Yiddish, Hebrew, and Russian, for the study of Jewish history, literature and values; a publishing house; a professional theater; newspapers and journals; a nationwide religious center; social-cultural centers in all the urban areas of Jewish population.

These are no more than is accorded other national-ethnic-religious groups in the Soviet Union. We of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry will not rest from our efforts until they have been equally accorded the Jews of the Soviet Union.

American Israel Public Affairs Committee.
American Jewish Committee.
American Jewish Congress.
American Zionist Council.
American Trade Union Council for Histadrut B'nai B'rith.
Central Conference of American Rabbis.
Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations.
Hadassah, Women's Zionist Organization of America.
Jewish Agency for Israel, American Section.
Jewish Labor Committee.
Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.
Labor Zionist Movement—Poale Zion, Farband, Pioneer Women.
Religious Zionists of America—Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi, Mizrachi Women's Organization of America.
National Community Relations Advisory Council.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council of Young Israel.
Rabbinical Assembly.
Rabbinical Council of America.
Synagogue Council of America.
Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.
United Synagogue of America.
Zionist Organization of America.

AN INTERIM REPORT

During the past year, a spate of events, large and small, has given rise to guarded hopes that the Soviet Union is changing its policy toward the Jews and that the situation of Soviet Jewry is undergoing fundamental improvement. Are these hopes grounded in fact? If so, to what extent and in what way? If not, what is the meaning of the events cited as concrete evidence of progress? Inadequate information or misunderstanding can only confuse the issue. A survey of developments therefore is required in order to gain the proper perspective. To lay the groundwork for this task, it is useful to restate succinctly the situation of the Soviet Jews and the nature of Soviet policy.

Although the Jews in the U.S.S.R. are officially defined as a nationality, many remain loyal to the faith of their fathers. Precisely because of the religioethnic duality of Jewish history and because of the ready availability of anti-Semitic myths, their very loyalty to Judaism has laid the Jews open to pressures that exceed in scope, depth, and nature those to which the regime's official atheism subjects all other religions.

Soviet antireligious propaganda has thus characteristically resorted to traditional anti-Semitic social stereotypes, and, by accusing Judaism of fostering Jewish "bourgeois nationalism," all too frequently has called into question the political loyalty of the Jews. Suspicion is inescapably reinforced in the prejudiced mind by the evident if intangible bonds that link Soviet Jews to Jewish communities and families outside the U.S.S.R.—especially in the United States and Israel, where a majority of the world Jewish community lives. Thus, the very persistence, dispersal, and mutuality of the Jews tend to confirm and exacerbate hoary anti-Semitic fears of the wandering, international Jew.

Rooted in irrational hostility, Soviet policy aims at the assimilation of Soviet Jewry. This policy has deprived the Jews of the rights, institutions, and facilities—cultural, religious, educational, and communal—whereby they might perpetuate and enhance their life as a self-aware historic group.

The policy is implemented in an atmosphere in which "popular" anti-Semitism has been tacitly encouraged from on high by the dissemination in the public prints of negative stereotypes of Judaism, the Jewish people, Jewish history and values, and the State of Israel. Moreover, it is decades since overt anti-Jewish acts were last punished by law, and anti-Semitic prejudice actively discouraged by the vast educational apparatus consistently used in the U.S.S.R. to inculcate officially approved public values. At the same time, severe discrimination is practiced against the Jews in key sectors of higher education and employment.

Deprived of the institutions by which a group maintains its distinctive life, prevented from acquiring a knowledge of and a natural pride in its heritage, intimidated from varied and unhampered association with other Jews at home and abroad, assailed by the intangible but very real atmosphere of prejudice and discrimination, humiliated by the accumulated experience of this treatment over the decades—Soviet Jewry is being doomed to a lingering death. In long-range historical perspective, this great and ancient community stands on the verge of disappearance.

All the essential elements of this policy were introduced by Stalin, but they have been retained virtually intact by his successors. As the outside world became gradually aware of the facts, criticism and protest began to be voiced—and as the protests waxed stronger, the Soviets began to react. There can be no doubt of the growing seriousness of the response, nor of the reasons for it. Since the death of Stalin and the unmasking of the excesses of his regime by former Chairman Khrushchev and his colleagues, an increasing measure of rationality has been very gradually introduced into Soviet life. Soviet leadership has become more responsive to the material and spiritual needs of the Soviet people, to the moral demands of the Soviet intelligentsia, to the restiveness of Communist parties in both Eastern Europe and the West, and to the moral susceptibilities of Western public opinion. (Moscow's archrivalry with Peiping has doubtless helped to shape and accelerate that responsiveness.)

Although the Jews have thus far remained the sole exception to this process of gradual liberalization and rationalization of Soviet life, the events of the past year, and their tempo, testify cogently to Soviet sensitivity and responsivenes to world public opinion, and to Soviet susceptibility to policy modification—even with regard to the Jews.

There have been roughly three stages in the evolution of the Soviet response. In the first, Soviet spokesmen tended simply to ignore or bluntly deny the charges. That stage ended about 2 years ago, when it became clear that this simple approach failed to stop the protest. In the ensuing stage, the Soviets went over to an intense, vigorous propaganda counteroffensive. This consisted of coupling the denials and evasions with evidence that purported to show the voluntary nature of Jewish assimilation and the major role played by Jews in Soviet life.

It is reasonable to suppose that, perhaps in the middle of 1964 (when it must have become quite clear to the Soviet policymakers that their counteroffensive was not working), Moscow took some decisions which have led to the third stage, the current one. It is one in which some token concessions, some promises and some real changes have been combined with a rather more sophisticated propaganda line that seeks to exploit the hopes that have been aroused.

The key to the current stage, the great watershed of world protest and of Soviet response to it, was the Kichko affair, a remarkable symbolic, psychological and political breakthrough. Trofim K. Kichko, a specialist in anti-Judaism propaganda, was the author of "Judaism Without Embellishment," a virulently anti-Semitic book, replete with Nazi-like cartoons, published in late 1963 by the Ukrainian Academy of Science in Kiev. It became known to the outside world in February 1964, to be met with a flood of protest and denunciation.

The highlight of the protests was the profound dismay and remonstrance expressed first by the Jewish Communists and, subsequently, by the general Communist movements and their peripheries in Western Europe, Latin America, Australia, and the United States. So determined and so intense were these expressions that the Soviets actually found it necessary to backtrack. The book was criticized by the Ideological Commission of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party and the criticism was published in the Soviet press in addition to which the book was apparently withdrawn—a unique Soviet reaction to foreign protest.

Phenomenal though it was, this denouement merely restored the situation to the status quo ante. As the basic policy of deprivation and discrimination remained in force, widespread condemnation of it persisted. In response, the Soviet leadership, already deeply affected by the Kichko affair, has apparently undertaken a new approach, the major consequences of which must now be reviewed.

For 3 years, beginning in May 1961, the Soviets conducted a wide-ranging, multifaceted campaign against such deeply entrenched and widely practiced crimes as currency speculation, black marketing, bribery, and embezzlement of state and public property. All major institutions of state and party, including the security police, the courts, and the press, were enlisted in the campaign. Thousands of Soviet citizens were pilloried in the press, tried and condemned to prison or worse. Among them were many innocents, as some Soviet papers have since admitted.

The most appalling feature of the campaign was the use of capital punishment. Insofar as can be ascertained from a study of the Soviet press in that period, at least 250 persons were so executed for economic crimes. More than 50 percent of these were Jews, and in some parts of the country—for example, the Ukraine, the most anti-Semitic area of all—the percentage rose to 80. These trials and death sentences were carried out to the accompaniment of an extraordinary press campaign that purveyed the most vicious anti-Semitic stereotypes.

By mid-1964, the campaign ground to a halt, and with it the anti-Jewish press campaign and the singling out of Jews for capital punishment. This was in no small measure effectuated by the systematic worldwide protests mounted by the Jewish community, with the active support of many prominent personalities, such as Bertrand Russell, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Norman Thomas. Throughout, growing Soviet sensitivity was revealed by a mountain of defensive press releases, letters to foreign newspapers, and even a lengthy letter from Khrushchev to Russell. However, the elimination of the campaign, and of its anti-Semitic implications and consequences, still does not represent any change in the basic Soviet policy of attrition against Jewish group identity, though it does signify an easier atmosphere for Soviet Jews.

In the autumn of 1961, a Yiddish literary bimonthly, Sovietish Heimland, was established, the first Jewish periodical permitted on Soviet soil since Stalin liquidated all Jewish cultural institutions in 1948–49. It is presided over by Aron Vergelis, a mediocre poet who is regarded by most Soviet Jewish intellectuals as a party hack and who is a sophisticated apologist for the cultural assimilation of Soviet Jewry.

Nevertheless, the magazine has evolved into something rather different from what was intended for it. To begin with, in January 1965 it was transformed into a monthly, and the number of its pages increased from 128 to 160. (Its edition of 25,000 has, however, remained fixed; nor has there been any reaction from Vergelis or his superiors to the demands of Jewish readers in various Soviet cities for the establishment of more journals.) In addition, the magazine has published some poetry, criticism, and fiction of some intrinsic Jewish interest and of genuine literary caliber, even though it remains inevitably an organ whose main task it is to disseminate officially approved ideas.

Most important, however, and despite its official function, Sovietish Heimland has published ideological articles on Jewish literature and literary history that mark a significant departure from past Soviet and Soviet Jewish attitude. In substance they recognize the historical continuity and positive cultural value of Jewish literary creation from the Bible to the present day. This acceptance of Biblical, rabbinic, and even medieval Jewish literature as a legitimate product of Jewish culture is all the more remarkable in that it explicitly honors the Hebrew language and Hebrew literature, which have been proscribed since the early 1920's. (Heretofore, Yiddish has been the only language officially allowed the Soviet Jews.) Another aspect of this chance has been the fairly consistent publication in the past year of literary news and literary works by Jewish Communists in other East European countries, and even in Western Europe, the United States, and Israel.

All this, in turn, necessarily implies recognition of historical facts that Soviet theory and practice have, for the most part, either disregarded or rejected the fact of the existence of an entity known as the Jewish people, of its ancient and continuous history, of its uninterrupted, millenial, cultural, and spiritual creation, of its contemporary unity and the mutual interest of its various geographical segments.

Although it is far too early to know whether these comparatively intangible shifts hold much promise, they do constitute fundamental, if tacit, theoretical changes. In a country where theory and ideology play a decisive role in molding policy, such changes can form the basis for the creation of genuine Jewish cultural, communal, and educational institutions. That they do not yet even hint of such institutions is revealed by the repeated fervent demands that continue to be made for them in the West, even by the Jewish Communists. Clearly, however, this significant ideological shift represents a response to both growing Soviet Jewish courage within a somewhat more relaxed general atmosphere and the incessant pressure from outside.

Beginning in 1957—ironically, during the early stage of the very period when some fresh air was filtering into other areas of Soviet life—Soviet Jewry experienced a new encroachment: the ban on public baking and sale of matzoth, the unleavened bread indispensable to the observance of Passover. In the next 5 years, the ban spread from outlying districts, until, by 1962, it had virtually blanketed the entire country.

This was not merely a stroke against a key religious rite, but a blow against Jewish group identity as such. For Passover, virtually uniquely among Jewish festivals, has a national-historical as well as a religious motif: the establishment of a self-aware people which has perpetuated its historical memory of that event through the subsequent millennia. Even secular, athiest Soviet Jews are known to have a special feeling for that holiday and for its national and family symbolisms. To prohibit the production and distribution of the key element in the observance of the festival obviously carried the process of attrition against Jewish group identity very far indeed.

Jewish communities around the world clearly understood these implications, and a great furor arose in 1963 and 1964. The Soviets met this wave of protest defensively, with evasions and prevarications, each more transparent than its predecessor. By the spring of 1965, it must have become clear to them that these tactics would no longer serve. So they permitted synagogues in Moscow, Leningrad, and a few other cities to organize the baking and sale of matzoth for those who registered for them.

Clearly, this was a response to protest abroad; it marked the first slight reversal of the policy of the preceding 8 years. Still, the partial lifting of the matzoah ban applied to certain show cities only; it remained in force in most of the country. A complete reversal would make matzoth readily available for all, with no registration of names; it would also make it possible for nonreligious Jews to purchase them, as was once the case, in state stores rather than in synagogues. Such a reversal would, of course, only return the situation to where it was before 1957. It would not in itself even begin to undo the wide range of institutional and substantive discriminations to which the Jewish community, religious and secular, is subjected.

In 1948, Stalin destroyed all Jewish communal-cultural institutions, including publishing houses and printing presses. After that, it was not until 1959 that a Jewish book was published. In that year, Yiddish volumes, by classic writers long dead, were issued in editions of 30,000. For unknown reasons, 1960 was skipped, but the following year three more classics were published. All five were slim volumes of selections from the vast creation of the Yiddish masters. The years 1961, 1962, and 1963 passed without appearance of a single Yiddish book.

The famine was broken toward the end of 1964, however, with the publication of "Azoy Leben Mir" (This Is How We Live), a collection of 20-odd pieces most of which had earlier been published in Sovietish Heimland, in glorification of the acculturation of Soviet Jews. There was hardly a word in it of Jewish life as such. Clearly this was a propaganda effort intended mainly for export. In February 1965, a more genuine literary effort appeared—an anthology of Yiddish poetry, the first publication of authentic Yiddish belles lettres by living Jewish writers since 1948. And in late September 1965, again for the first time since 1948, an entire Yiddish novel by a living Soviet Jewish writer appeared: "Erev" (On the Eve) by Ilya Shechtman.

Three books in the course of a year obviously are better than none, though many questions have been raised about the paucity and slowness of the publication program. It is even possible to assume the fulfillment of recent Soviet promises that several more Yiddish books will be published in the coming months, for it does not seem likely that the Soviets will wish to brave the storm of protests that would otherwise surely ensue. Still, the appearance of a handful of books cannot be mistaken for a real publication program, notwithstanding the efforts of Soviet apologists at home and abroad so to interpret it; nor can it obscure the fact that a genuine cultural institution—i.e., a Jewish publishing house, of the kind that used to abound in the U.S.S.R.—has been neither promised nor planned.

In the summer of 1965, a group of American rabbis visited several Soviet cities and met at length with Rabbi Yehudah Leib Levine, the rabbi of Moscow's main synagogue. Three of the rabbis were permitted to preach for 5 minutes each from the pulpit. In his private conversations, Rabbi Levine told the visiting rabbis of 3 promises recently made him by the authorities: that permission would be granted for the publication of 10,000 prayer books in Hebrew; that, by late 1965, 15 to 20 students would be admitted to the Moscow Yeshivah, the rabbinical seminary first opened in 1957 with a handful of students, but virtually shut down since 1962; that matzoth would be freely available in Moscow for Passover 1966. At the same time, Rabbi Levine rather pathetically begged his guests not to mention these promises from the pulpit in Moscow, for fear that his congregation's hopes, once raised, might subsequently be dashed by a governmental reversal.

A curiously sad note has accompanied these promises, for, though silence has prevailed about them inside the U.S.S.R., the American rabbis were able to report them when they returned home. Moreover, Rabbi Levine had conveyed the same promises to other foreign visitors during the same period, and he himself issued a statement containing the identical promises—for broadcast by Radio Moscow on its overseas transmission.

Even if these promises are fulfilled, however, the grave institutional discrimination suffered by Soviet religious Jewry will remain. For, unlike other recognized religious denominations, Jews are forbidden their own religious publication facilities and institutions. This prohibition, in turn, is part of an even wider ranging discrimination. Unlike all other religious bodies in the U.S.S.R. the Jews are forbidden a central religious organizational structure that would provide not only for publications, but for the production of religious facilities and articles, and for communication and formal contact among widely scattered congregations.

Indeed, in the absence of such a center, Soviet Jewry has no means of legally accepted affiliation or association with Jewish religious bodies abroad. Thus, for example, one cannot properly characterize the group of visiting American rabbis in Moscow as a delegation—something that can be said of such visits by foreign Christian and Moslem groups. Their appearance in the pulpit was surely a comfort to Moscow's religious Jews, for it dramatically signified that American Jewry had not forgotten them. But it was nevertheless a strictly informal, isolated event, a private visit by individual rabbis. Despite the efforts to inflate the significance of these events and promises, they remain disparate, isolated phenomena, which cannot replace or be mistaken for religious-communal institutions.

"There are no memorials at Babi Yar." With this line, the daring young Soviet poet, Yevgeni Yevtushenko, opened his world-famous poem of 1961, "Babi Yar"—which was a searing indictment of anti-Semitism, even in his own country and in his own day. That line symbolizes the fact that the catastrophic Jewish martyrdom at the hands of the Germans in World War II has been passed over in virtual silence in the U.S.S.R.

Two developments in the second half of 1965 are being cited as indicative of a change. For one thing, the City Council of Kiev has announced that it will erect a monument to the "victims of fascism" at or near Babi Yar (a suburb of Kiev which is the site of a mass slaughter of Jews in 1941). Twenty-five years later, there is nothing there to remind the world or the Ukrainians (among whom there were many Nazi collaborators) of the graves of scores of thousands of Jews. Secondly, there was a gala performance in Moscow's main concert auditorium, Tchaikovsky Hall, of the Shostakovitch "13th symphony"—in the presence of the composer himself, of Yevtushenko, David Oistrakh and other Soviet artistic luminaries. This musical work contains a choral section setting "Babi Yar" to music. What made that performance a telling one was of course the prehistory of both the poem and the symphony.

The poem was subject to a virulent, even anti-Semitic, attack by a number of Stalinist literary critics—and, indeed, by Khrushchev himself. In the end, Yevtushenko was pressured into revising a few of the lines, so as to de-emphasize the Jewish martyrdom at Babi Yar. (It is this revised, "official" version that Shostakovitch set to music.) The "13th symphony" itself was the object of a similar assault upon its first performance 2 years ago. After two performances, in fact, it was withdrawn from the Soviet repertoire. Thus, its reappearance, and in an obviously approved setting, suggests the possibility of reversal of the policy of silence about the Jewish holocaust.

A genuine reversal naturally would be reflected not only in one or two instances, but in a vast array of books, memoirs, monuments and observances all over the country, and in all relevant languages, be it Yiddish, Hebrew, Russian, Ukrainian, or Lithuanian. (At Ponar, the Nazi slaughterhouse of Lithuanian Jewry just outside Vilna, there stands a memorial to the victims. The Yiddish inscription on it was torn down by hooligans more than a decade ago and never has been restored. The Lithuanian and Russian inscriptions significantly fail to reveal that Ponar, like Babi Yar, was the site of Jewish martyrdom.) Quite aside from the question of historical justice, a crucial problem is that popular anti-Semitism in such places as the Ukraine, Lithuania, and Moldavia, where it has been most virulent, has only been encouraged by the systematic silence of the authorities about the tragedy of the Jews in those areas. A reversal of the policy of silence would do far more than redress the injustice rendered by Soviet history books: It would also instruct the local anti-Semites that hostility to the Jews is no longer tolerable. Soviet Jews are waiting for this.

Ever since the first flush of Soviet support for the partition of Palestine and the establishment of a Jewish state there, the U.S.S.R. has demonstrated consistent and bitter hostility to Israel, and has regularly portrayed it and its diplomatic representatives in the Soviet Union as agents and tools of Western imperialism and subversion. This has reflected not only Soviet support for the Arabs in the Middle East, but a serious attempt to intimidate Soviet Jewry itself and to frighten it away from its traditional feelings of kinship and warmth for Israel.

Recent developments indicate a rather more ambiguous situation. For example, in the past year there has been an expansion of cultural exchange between the U.S.S.R. and Israel, chiefly in the musical field. Artists and other cultural representatives of each country have been ecstatically received in the host country. Of course, this is arranged through Soviet Government channels, which means that the authorities knowingly permit the Soviet public, and especially the Soviet Jewish audience, to warm itself in the glow of these expanded contacts.

Another development being cited as indicative of a new atmosphere is the interview with the newly arrived Israeli Ambassador, Katriel Katz, published with his photograph (an unprecedented occurrence) in Sovietskaya Rossia, the organ of the Government and party of the Russian Republic. A friendly biography and a photograph also appeared in the Moscow journal, Novoye Vremya (New Times). Finally, a possible step toward improved relations between the two countries is the opening of negotiations for the purchase of Israeli textiles, in exchange for Russian property in Jerusalem that has been sold recently to the Israel Government. This marks the first thaw in the freeze on commercial relations between them since 1956.

These developments are balanced by two others. One was the joint communique issued at the end of a visit to the U.S.S.R. by United Arab Republic President Nasser, in which the Soviet Government reiterated its support of the cause of the Palestinian Arabs and explicity condemned Israeli aggression in the Middle East—hardly a friendly nod.

Far more significant, though not exclusively related to Israel, was a development at the United Nations General Assembly in late October. The Assembly's Third Committee, considering a draft "Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination," was presented with a new draft article proposed by the United States and Brazil, to "condemn anti-Semitism and take appropriate action for its eradication." To counter this proposal, the Soviet delegation suggested an amendment which read as follows:

"States parties condemn anti-Semitism, Zionism, Nazism, neo-Nazism and all other forms of the policy and ideology of colonialism, national and race hatred and exclusiveness, and shall take action as appropriate for the speedy eradication of those misanthropic (subsequently changed to 'inhuman') ideas and practices in the territories subject to their jurisdiction."

Knowing that there was strong sentiment in the Third Committee against concrete specifications of racial hatred, the Soviet mission deliberately injected this reductio ad absurdum of specific condemnations as a diversion aimed at defeating the American proposal on anti-Semitism. The idea was to exasperate the majority so as to move it to react precisely as it did: By an overwhelming vote, the Committee passed a resolution eliminating all specifications of racial hatred, thus, in effect, killing the U.S. proposal. The unmistakable reason for this Soviet maneuver was the powerful apprehension that the incorporation of such an article into the Convention would provide a permanent world platform for the airing of Soviet policy toward the Jews. Rather than allow that, the Soviets created a new amalgam, Zionis-Nazism, and equated them with other forms of "hatred, misanthropy and inhumanity."

This development evoked a torrent of condemnation all over the world, not least in the Communist movement in the West. Even if the ferment inside many Western Communist parties does not surface, it is nevertheless churning down below. A symptom is the blast issued by Combat, an influential left-wing French journal. Not less significant is the reaction of the Jewish Communists (who have close ties with the general Communist movement) in Tel Aviv, Paris, Toronto, and New York. The pro-Soviet Yiddish-language daily Morgen Freiheit in New York called the Soviet amalgam "monstrous."

Already, Moscow must recognize the commission of an egregious blunder. For it is just such criticism as this that had such an overwhelming effect in the Kichko affair, and which opened the doors wider still to even more pressure.

The professional Jewish theater once was one of the glories of Soviet Jewish life and of Soviet artistic life in general. The last of these professional institutions was liquidated by Stalin in 1949. In the past decade, all that has been allowed to the Jews is an amateur group in Vilna and about a dozen isolated professional performers who travel about the country giving variety performances. The Vilna group is a popular and proficient troupe of amateur dramatic, dance and choral performers who produce serious shows in their offhours. It has now been given the official designation of "Peoples' Theater" by the Lithuanian authorities. This honor reflects its recognition as the highest form of amateur group, but does not signify its transformation into a professional theater. In Moscow, on the occasion of a professional variety show last summer, posters were put up around town announcing the performance and containing the words, "Yiddishe Lieder" ("Jewish Songs"), in Yiddish.

Soviet apologists have attempted to make much of these developments; unhappily the effort serves only to underscore the pathetic contrast between an amateur group, or isolated individual professionals, and the cultural-communal institution of a state-sponsored professional theater.

The most significant development of recent months is what can only be described as the public and authoritative condemnation of anti-Semitism. Soviet ideology of course is opposed to anti-Semitism and there is a law on the books punishing incitement based on religious, national or racial grounds. In the 1920's this law was used to punish overt anti-Semitic acts, and anti-Semitism was actively condemned by Soviet leaders, from Lenin on down. But since then there has been silence and inaction on this score—at home, where it counts.

On July 19, Premier Kosygin injected a significant remark into an address at Riga commemorating the 25th anniversary of Latvia's accession to the U.S.S.R. He said that "nationalism, great power chauvinism, racism and anti-Semitism * * * are completely alien to our society * * * and contradict our weltanschauung." That was all; nothing of a similar nature preceded or followed it in that speech. It was indeed the first time in decades that a high Soviet leader had said such a thing to a home audience. But in the absence of any advance preparation or any immediate follow-up, the silence of ensuing weeks could well have given observers the impression that this was possibly a curiosum.

But on September 5, 1965, Pravda published an otherwise routine front page editorial on the "friendship of peoples" in the U.S.S.R.—which, however, contained a very important statement on anti-Semitism, thus retrospectively lending greater significance to Kosygin's July remark. The Pravda statement is worth quoting at length. After a good many paragraphs of cut-and-dried sort, the editorial states:

"It must likewise not be forgotten that the peoples of the whole world, and particularly the peoples who have freed themselves from imperialist oppression, look upon the Soviet Union, the world's first country of socialism, and on the relations that have taken shape among the peoples of our country as a model. This means that strengthening the fraternal friendship among the peoples of the U.S.S.R. is a most important international obligation of each Soviet Republic.

"Realizing the revolutionizing significance that the friendship of the peoples of the first country of socialism has, the imperialists outdo themselves to slander it. They do not cease their attempts to revive national discord among our peoples. Vain efforts.

"Nevertheless, we must keep them in mind and in conducting our ideological work we must remember who could benefit by any manifestations whatsoever of nationalist survivals and friction.

"V. I. Lenin, the great creator of the Communist Party and founder of the Soviet State, bade our people hold sacred the friendship of peoples of the U.S.S.R. He wrathfully assailed any manifestations of nationalism whatsoever, and in particular he demanded an unceasing 'struggle against anti-Semitism, that foul fanning of racial specialness and national enmity' brought about by the exploiting classes."

This unquestionably is a remarkable and significant statement. Stripped of its jargon, what does it say and what does it signify?

1. It admits, in effect, that anti-Semitism still exists on Soviet soil. For the only concrete instance it cites of survivals of national discord and friction is anti-Semitism. Pravda's admission takes on even greater importance in that its mention of this form of "manifestation * * * of national enmity" is lent the weighty authority of Lenin himself.

2. Its condemnation of anti-Semitism—unquestionably clear in and of itself—is nevertheless not principled or based on morality, but primarily argued on tactical and strategic grounds. Two such grounds are proved—but they both add up to the same general point: The world is watching:

(a) The first argument is that the strengthening of the friendship of peoples inside U.S.S.R. is an international obligation—for the peoples of tne world regard the U.S.S.R. as a model.

(b) The second argument is that manifestations of anti-Semitism at home will only help the imperialists in their energetic efforts to blacken the Soviet image abroad.

3. Its condemnation of anti-Semitism at home must be taken seriously, for it bears the quoted authority of Lenin—something that has not been done inside the U.S.S.R. for decades.

4. The importance of this editorial is enhanced by the fact that it was reprinted in the central newspapers of a number of Soviet republics (as was the Kosygin speech in July).

Thus, in a country where things of this sort do not happen accidentally and where the public has long since learned to recognize a sign in every nuanced shift of emphases or novel quotation of Lenin—this editorial, bolstering as it does the brief Kosygin remark at Riga, will be taken to mean what it says. It is a signal that anti-Semitism is not in favor, a directive to modify the atmosphere. Soviet Jews doubtless will feel some relief at this, but they will even more certainly be waiting to see whether this is indeed a first step, to be followed by others in a concerted nationwide educational campaign to eradicate anti-Semitism, or but a single step, faltering, isolated, and inconclusive. In any event, Pravda itself makes it quite clear that this singular move is an extraordinary reflection of and reaction to the pressure of world opinion—and its expectations of Soviet society.

Indeed, all of the small shifts, concessions, and promises of the past year reveal a Soviet leadership that is sensitive and troubled. Moscow is vulnerable on this issue; it is susceptible to the pressure of world opinion; it does move in response to it. There is even some reason to suspect that there are elements in the party and government, and certainly in influential sectors of the intelligentsia, that are unhappy about Soviet policy toward the Jews and are prepared to reevaluate it.

All those elements will be expecting far more, however, than even a full-scale educational campaign against anti-Semitism, invaluable as that in itself would be. They will expect, not token concessions or small shifts and vague promises, but a systematic reversal of the policy of forcible assimilation. They will expect the state-supported establishment, as is the case with all other such groups, of a network of communal institutions—schools, textbooks, rabbinical seminary, teachers institutes, centers of advanced learning, research institutes, courses and classes in Yiddish, Hebrew, and Russian for the study of Jewish history, literature and values, a publishing house, a professional theater, newspapers and journals, a nationwide religious center, social-cultural centers in all the urban areas of Jewish population (in the absence of a geographical-territorial-political base for the Soviet Jews).

In short, civilized world opinion, and the best elements of the U.S.S.R., will expect of a Soviet society that is gradually evolving along more rational lines the eradication of the irrational factors that have hitherto determined policy toward the Jews, and the establishment of the communal institutions necessary to assure the continuity and secure the future of Soviet Jewry, so as to permit them self-realization as Jews, as citizens, and as human beings.

GEN. COURTNEY H. HODGES

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, a mighty warrior has fought his last fight. Gen. Courtney H. Hodges died at the age of 79 at Brooke General Hospital, San Antonio, Tex., on January 16, 1966. His widow, Mrs. Mildred Lee Hodges, survives him along with two brothers and five sisters who live in Georgia.

Few military men in the Nation's history have attained the success in battle or in dealing with people as Gen. Courtney H. Hodges. His record of accomplishments covered 43 years of service in the U.S. Army. General Hodges was born on January 5, 1887, in Perry, Ga., the son of John Hicks Hodges and Katherine Norwood Hodges. He was the son of a newspaper publisher.

He was highly pleased to obtain an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy in 1904 when he was 17 years of age. He ran into difficulty with mathematics. As a result he left the Academy after 1 year. He attended North Georgia Agricultural College and was inducted into membership in Psi Chapter of Pi Kappa Alpha Fraternity. He had his heart set on being a soldier. After leaving North Georgia Agricultural College he enlisted in the Army as a private at Fort McPherson, Ga. Three years later he won a competitive examination for a commission as 2d lieutenant of infantry. This was in 1909 when he was 22 years of age.

He saw service with General Pershing in Mexico and was promoted to the rank of captain in 1917.

He sailed for France in 1918 with the 6th U.S. Infantry Regiment, 5th Division, and was promoted to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel, fighting as battalion and later as regimental commander in the Meuse-Argonne, Lorraine, and St. Mihiel battles. He was awarded the Silver Star and the Distinguished Service Cross for gallantry in action.

His was a life of being first in many, many instances. He was the first man who had not been graduated from West Point to be assigned to the faculty at the U.S. Military Academy. He was an instructor in the department of tactics. After a 4-year tour of duty at the Academy he was made a member of the General Staff and sent to the Philippines. Subsequently he was assistant commandant and commandant of the Infantry School at Fort Benning, Ga.

In March 1941, he was assigned to the Office of the Chief of Infantry in Washington where he became Acting Chief and later Chief of Infantry and was promoted to the rank of major general in May 1941. At that time, being a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs, I came to know General Hodges and visited him in his office during the time he served as Chief of Infantry. He possessed a pleasing personality but was unassuming, quiet, and humble. The New York Times in its obituary on January 18, 1966, referred to him as a southern gentleman. It was a real tribute which was justly deserved.

General Hodges was given the assignment of activating the X Corps which was a part of the 3d Army at that time, under Gen. Walter Krueger. General Hodges succeeded General Krueger in February 1943 and was promoted to the rank of lieutenant general.

In 1944 he was ordered overseas and was given the post of deputy commander to Gen. Omar N. Bradley who was commanding general of the 1st U.S. Army. He directed the training and coordination of the various divisions in the corps, preparing for the D-day assault which came on June 6, 1944, when he landed in Normandy. The first troops of the Allied Powers to put foot upon French soil.

When General Bradley took command of the 12th Army Group, General Hodges was made commander of the 1st Army on August 1, 1944. The 1st Army marched tirelessly through German defenses, joining the British 2d Army. It surrounded and captured some 100,000 German prisoners and knocked out the German 7th Army as a combat force.

Another first by General Hodges was when Paris fell to the 1st Army on August 25. The 1st Army continued its offensive, capturing Aachen and fought in the Battle of Huertgen Forest which set the stage for the fall of Roer River dams.

The 1st Army halted the attack of the German Army at the Battle of the Bulge and started another offensive on January 3, 1945. By the middle of February the enemy had been cleared from the west bank of the Roer River area. On March 7 another first was obtained—the 1st Army reached the Rhine through the city of Cologne. Elements of the 9th Armored Division crossed the Ludendorff Bridge at Remagen, preventing the Germans from destroying it, establishing a bridgehead across the Rhine. The latter part of March 1945, the 1st Army moved forward from the Remagen bridgehead on its final drive to destroy German resistance taking 300,000 prisoners in the Ruhr pocket.

Another first in the military annals of General Hodges and the 1st Army resulted when some of the divisions under General Hodges' command made a junction with Russians on the Elbe-Mulde River line at Torgau. A few days later General Hodges was promoted to the rank of full general.

Here are the firsts that General Hodges earned through his military exploits and genius as commanding officer of the 1st Army:

First to set foot on Normandy beaches.

The first to overrun St. Lo.

A great first was that of liberating Paris.

His units were the first to enter Germany.

The first troops to cross the Rhine.

The first to make contact with the Russians.

Truly the 1st Army had the right name.

I would like to express appreciation to the Department of the Army for furnishing the information which is used in these remarks. The Army lists the following decorations and service ribbons awarded General Hodges:

Distinguished Service Cross, for valor in the Meuse Argonne sector, 1918.

Distinguished Service Medal, for his contributions to the preparations for war, 1944.

Oak Leaf Cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal, for his leadership of 1st Army, 1944.

Silver Star, for gallantry in action, St. Mihiel and Meuse Argonne offensive, 1918.

Bronze Star Medal, 1944.

Mexican Campaign Ribbon.

World War I Victory Ribbon with three Battle Stars.

The German Occupation Ribbon—World War I.

The American Defense Ribbon.

The American Theater Ribbon.

The European Theater Ribbon with Arrowhead and five Battle Stars.

The Pacific Theater Ribbon.

World War II Victory Medal.

Companion of the Order of the Bath—British.

Knight Commander of the Order of the British Empire.

Grand Officer of the French Legion of Honor; The Croix de Guerre with Palm.

Grand Officer of the Order of Leopold, with Palm—Belgium; the Belgian Croix de Guerre with Palm.

Grand Croix of the Order de la Couronne de Chene—Luxembourg.

Order of Suvorov—Russian.

General Hodges was not the publicity seeker type of commander. He got results. He was a unique leader of men. When history is written, the name of Gen. Courtney Hodges will be listed along beside General Eisenhower, General Patton, General Montgomery, and other great heroes of World War II, including naval and Air Force officers who are entitled to such recognition. His ambition for an Army career—his determination through hard work to excel was rewarded by the services he rendered to his country on the field of battle.

I include an editorial from the Washington Post of January 18, 1966:

Courtney Hicks Hodges

Gen. Courtney H. Hodges, who died on Sunday at 79, will always occupy a place of high honor in the ranks of this country's military heroes. He assumed command of the great 1st Army in August 1944, shortly after the Normandy invasion, and led it to a series of dazzling victories. It was the first American force to enter Paris, the first to march on German soil, the first to cross the Rhine, and the first to make a juncture with the Russians at the Elbe.

At the age of 18, General Hodges was dropped from West Point because of difficulty with mathematics and told that he was not meant to be a soldier. Had he not ignored that judgment and enlisted in the Army as a private, the Nation would have lost one of its greatest infantry generals.

Perhaps the most fitting tribute to Courtney Hodges was paid by his wartime commander, Gen. Omar N. Bradley.

In "A Soldier's Story," Bradley writes of General Hodges as a "spare, soft-voiced Georgian without temper, drama, or visible emotion" who tended to be "left behind in the European headline sweepstakes." Yet, he emerges as "a general's general." "For Hodges," Bradley concludes, "successfully blended dexterity and commonsense in such equal portions as to produce a magnificently balanced command. I had implicit faith in his judgment, in his skill, and restraint."

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I was present in the San Francisco Auditorium when the National AFL–CIO Convention heard our distinguished Vice President, HUBERT HUMPHREY, an articulate and eloquent spokesman for the Great Society, outline the accomplishments of this administration and note the contribution which organized labor has made to social programs in this country.

I am taking this opportunity to reprint the Vice President's remarks, because I feel that it is well for us to recall, as he did, the constructive role which organized labor has played in making this Nation great. Full text of the remarks of Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY to the AFL–CIO Convention, San Francisco, Calif., December 10, 1965, follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, AFL–CIO CONVENTION, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., DECEMBER 10, 1965

The President is sorry that he could not be with you today. But, frankly, I'm not. It's just as well he doesn't hear all this talk about replacing vice presidents.

Seriously, I think you know how much President Johnson would have enjoyed being with you today. Both publicly and privately, he has spoken often and with deep feeling about his high regard for this great organization and its leaders.

Two years ago—8 days before his tragic death—our late beloved President John F. Kennedy addressed you.

He took the opportunity to express to you his deep appreciation of all that you had done, in his own words, "not only for the labor movement, but for the United States as a whole."

President Johnson feels exactly the same way. Recently, when he signed the Older Americans Act, he said that the AFL–CIO "has done more good for more people than any other group in America."

I'm not tonguetied about this either. I recall with pride that I rose on the Senate floor June 24, 1959—during the consideration of the Landrum-Griffith Act—and said: "For 2 years now we have been hearing much about what's wrong with the American labor movement—I rise today to discuss what's right with the American labor movement. The public should know the full story of what decent, honorable, devoted trade unionists are doing day by day for their fellow men, for their country, and for the cause of freedom in a troubled world."

And then I reminded the Senate of what was right with labor. And I have often done so before and since.

I have told of labor's leading role in the New Deal of the 1930's, which lifted this Nation out of the darkest depths of despair. I have told how labor turned with equal zeal and dedication to making the United States the arsenal of democracy in World War II.

I have told of its vigorous and effective support of the historic initiatives President Truman launched to rebuild democracy and contain Communist expansion—aid to Greece and Turkey, the Marshall plan, point 4 and NATO. I have told how it backed up the U.N. action to resist aggression in Korea.

I have told how it continued its fight for a better America into the fifties, during years when the going was uphill most of the way.

In the past few years—and particularly this year—the American people have reaped a rich harvest from the seeds you planted on what often seemed barren and stony ground.

It is good to dream great dreams. But it is even sweeter, after long years of toil and struggle, to see them come true.

More than 20 years ago, at Warm Springs, Ga., Franklin Roosevelt sat at his desk to write his address for Jefferson Day, 1945—an address that was never to be delivered. The last words Franklin Roosevelt wrote were these: "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

The words of Franklin Roosevelt were a challenge to us all. And, in these 20 years, we have met that challenge. That challenge was met by Presidents Truman and Kennedy. It is being met today by President Lyndon Johnson. It has been and will be courageously met by the American labor movement.

It was a great day in July, in Independence, Mo., when President Johnson signed the Medicare Act, in the presence of President Truman.

I say to you and to all the American people: There would be no Medicare today had it not been for the support of the AFL–CIO.

The Congress this year enacted historic legislation to aid education, to invest in the future of our children. We would not have these education laws today without the AFL–CIO.

The Congress enacted legislation to keep promises unkept a hundred years, so that all our citizens might have the right to vote. There would be no voting rights act—no Civil Rights Act, in fact—without the AFL–CIO.

The Congress enacted legislation to strengthen our war on poverty. There would be no war on poverty without the AFL–CIO.

The Congress enacted legislation to provide better housing. There would be no such laws, no national commitment to better housing without AFL–CIO.

The Congress purged our immigration laws of the racial and national discrimination which, for so many years, deeply stained them.

The Congress acted to make America more beautiful, by launching an attack on the pollution of our air and water, by moving to rid our highways of billboards and junkyards, and by further expanding our wonderful system of national parks.

None of these things could have been done without the AFL–CIO.

The AFL–CIO has been in the front line of the battle wherever the fighting was fiercest. You have truly earned the right to be called "the people's lobby."

I thank you, too, for putting the welfare of our Nation above self-interest, by respecting the wage-price guideposts in collective bargaining.

Labor and all Americans have benefited greatly from our sustained economic expansion, which has continued for almost 6 years.

The guideposts have, in my view, been an essential part of the policy mix which has kept this expansion going, without inflation.

To labor, our balanced expansion has brought the highest real wages in history—and has pushed unemployment down from 7.1 percent in May 1961, to 4.2 percent last month.

This is good, and we are proud of it. But it is not good enough.

We cannot forget those still unemployed, or ignore soft spots that may develop in the construction industry or elsewhere.

I promise you that this administration will fight on until every American willing and able to work has the opportunity to do so.

For our goal is nothing less than this: The creation in our country of a state of opportunity.

We work toward the time when every American child can step forth into life with a full and equal chance to be a participant in his society.

We want every American to have the education, the tools and training to sustain himself and his family.

We want every American to be able to hold his head high, to respect himself and his job and his place in life, to be able to communicate with his fellow citizens.

Yes, we want every American to exercise citizenship in its highest and fullest sense.

We want it known in the world that to be an American citizen is to stand upright and proud, to be committed to the future, to have compassion for one's fellow human beings, to be unconcerned with such irrelevant marks of the surface as a man's last name, or the color of his skin, or the place he comes from, or his faith.

And so we invest in America to fully develop our human resources.

Our great programs in the war against poverty, for better education, for better housing, for better health, for human rights—these are our investments in our people.

These are the things we do to meet Franklin Roosevelt's brave challenge of 20 years ago.

The stronger the labor movement is, the stronger America is, at home and abroad. That is why we consider action to fulfill labor's reasonable and responsible objectives to be in the best interests of business and, indeed, of the American community as a whole.

That is why this administration is determined to fight—to fight hard and win—on the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

They call the open shop laws that section 14(b) has spawned in 19 States right-to-work laws.

They do not offer anyone the right to a job. All they do is to maintain the so-called open shop. And the open shop is all too often where the door is open for the union man to be turned out.

Some people claim that the repeal of 14(b) is a narrow, selfish concern for labor. I say it is everyone's concern.

Right-to-work laws attract low-wage employers. And once they move in, they take charge. They oppose industry which will pay more than the prevailing low wages in the areas where they operate.

They work against progressive social legislation.

Only 2 of the 19 right-to-work States have a minimum wage of even $1 an hour—and then only for women. Eleven have no minimum wage laws at all. Only three require equal pay for women.

Only five of them meet even three of the eight international standards governing child labor.

These conditions are linked with poverty and perpetuate it. They are tragic for the people concerned. But they are also a heavy burden to our entire Nation.

Modern, progressive business understands that well-paid, well-organized workers are good producers and good customers.

The people of the right-to-work States are not given the opportunity either to produce or to consume at real American standards. And that is a net loss to all of us.

The repeal of 14(b) will lift the standard of living for millions of workers.

It is a major battle to be won in the war on poverty.

It will improve labor-management relations.

It will strengthen collective bargaining.

It will help eliminate unfair and cutthroat competition.

It will help America.

But there are other goals we share.

You seek to increase in the minimum wage and the broadening of its coverage; you seek to improve and modernize unemployment compensation benefits. And so does this administration. It will be done.

You seek ever-improving education and health programs; you want better homes, roads, and ports, and the opportunity to build them. And so does this administration. It is being done.

You seek a stronger merchant marine. And so does this administration. Together we will get it done.

You seek legislation to protect the American consumer—that is, all of us—from unfair interest rates and hidden interest costs, and from the baffling and often costly confusion that some present-day packaging and labeling can induce. And so does this administration. This too will be done.

All these things can help to build a better and stronger America, capable of fulfilling its responsibilities at home and abroad.

The AFL–CIO has recognized that a Great Society cannot and should not stop at the water's edge. The America that we build must be an inspiration and a source of strength to all mankind.

The American labor movement has long understood the fact of interdependence in our world.

Far in advance of many Americans, you saw the dangers of fascism. And again, far in advance of many Americans, you recognized the expansionists designs of communism and took effective steps to counter them.

But you know it is not enough to be against something. America must also stand for something in the eyes of the world.

Therefore, you have helped to organize free trade unions throughout the world—in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

You have helped to establish workers' schools, build cooperative housing, and strengthen the fabric of free institutions in many other ways.

You know, sometimes even a Communist says something with which I can agree.

Nikita Khrushchev once said to me, as he may have said to some of your own leaders in this very city: "Let the superiority of any particular system be proved, not on the field of battle, but in peaceful competition for progress, for improved living standards of the people."

I told him we'd be glad to take him on in that kind of competition, and that we'd compete him right out of Gorki Park.

And we have done just that.

Yes, before other Americans, organized labor recognized the threat of totalitarianism and determined to meet it.

And that is why organized labor understands and supports our position today in Vietnam.

We have heeded the lessons of the past.

We cannot turn our backs to raw aggression in other places.

We will not sacrifice small nations in the hope we may buy our own security.

Today young Americans are dying in Vietnam not for the safety of strangers, but for the safety of all freemen.

We are not in Vietnam to establish any American colony or base. We are not there to enrich ourselves or to subjugate others to our will.

We are there because, once again in history, it must be proved to aggressors that the price of their aggression comes far too high.

The aggression we face in Vietnam is not one in which massed armies attack across national frontiers. It is one in which the battlefield is often the homes of men. It is one in which the innocent suffer to the pain of all of us.

The aggression in Vietnam is one which deals in organized assassination and terrorism yet masks itself as a war of liberation. It is waged by hard and callous men who seek to prove that force and Communist militancy can win the future—by men convinced that democratic societies are soft and weak and unable to meet their form of warfare.

Some Americans dissent from our policy in Vietnam. The right to dissent—and no one knows better than labor how precious it is—is a vital part of the kind of democracy we defend.

But there is a right to affirm as well as a right to dissent. And I am glad to see that the AFL–CIO is making full use of it.

We will remain in Vietnam until a just and lasting peace can be established there.

At the same time we shall now—and after establishment of that peace—dedicate ourselves to creating conditions which will enable all the people of Vietnam, North and South, and all of southeast Asia to look forward to a tomorrow without danger of attack, without hunger, and with social justice and security.

There are times when American power must be used—when there is no alternative in face of determined aggression.

But military power alone will not provide stability and security unless it is accompanied by political, social, and economic effort—and the promise to the people of a better life. And thus we work with the Vietnamese people toward that goal.

No, peace will not come through military victory alone. Nor will peace come by good intention. Peace comes to those who earn it—work for it—sacrifice for it—as you have worked and sacrificed over these many years.

And so, my good friends, I congratulate you on your 10th anniversary. Congratulations to all of you and our thanks for all you have done throughout the years to lay the foundation for a Great Society—yes, that better and greater America so beautifully defined in our Pledge of Allegiance: "One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

This is our promise to ourselves and our children.

Let there be no doubt about tomorrow. We shall fulfill that promise.

NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION RESOLUTION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bingham] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have, today, cosponsored the resolution originally introduced in the other body by Senator Pastore and which already has cosponsorship of more than 50 of his colleagues in that body.

Senator Pastore's remarks at the time he introduced the resolution are very important and merit the attention of all of us who cherish peace. I agree completely with his judgment that Red China should not be ruled out of discussions on world disarmament—that disarmament cannot have real effect unless it is universal. Further, as Senator Pastore noted, nonproliferation would be only a steppingstone to a general disarmament agreement. Last year I publicly urged that the United States make it clear that if Red China were invited to a world disarmament conference, we would not object. If Red China refuses to participate, let its shame be made clear before the world.

Mr. Speaker, this nonproliferation resolution endorses President Johnson's initiative for an international agreement limiting the spread of nuclear weapons. I believe that all of us share his desire for such an agreement and I hope that this resolution will be adopted by this House to reflect our support.

EULOGY TO JUDGE PAT CANNON

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, those who served in this House with him, I know, have shared the deep grief I have experienced in the passing of Judge Pat Cannon in Miami at his home Sunday last.

On January 9, I was at dinner in Opa Locka with Judge Cannon who seemed then to be in his usual robust health.

Judge Cannon served with distinction and dedication to his district and to the public in this House from January 1939 until January 1947. He was always diligent in the serving of people of his district. He was liked and esteemed by his fellow Members and his lovely, gracious wife was admired and loved by all who knew her here in Washington.

In 1952, Judge Cannon was appointed judge of the Circuit Court of Dade County. He was continuously reelected and, at his death, was beginning his 14th year on the circuit court bench. He was fourth in length of service among the 22 judges of the Dade County Circuit Court.

As a judge, Judge Cannon prided himself on being what might be called a peoples' judge. He was truly and deeply dedicated to doing justice in his court. Whenever, in his opinion, the technical rules of law stood in the way of a decision by him which was equitable and just, he tried to find a way to avoid or to circumvent such technicalities. He, at times, was reversed on appeals because of such decisions but he continued his course of trying to do what he thought was right, fair and just in his court. In short, his decisions reflected his warmhearted feeling for people and his earnest desire to help them to right their wrongs and to redress their grievances when he could. Judge Cannon was loved and recognized as a judge of strong feelings, of deep human sympathy, and of great courage in the performance of his duties.

It was only natural that Judge Cannon's sympathies should be humanitarian because he came up in life in what we call the hard way.

He was born May 22, 1904, at Powder Springs, Ga. All his grandparents came from Ireland. His father, J. B. Cannon, was a railroad construction foreman. Judge Cannon grew up on his grandfather's farm near Mountville, S.C. After his graduation from Mountville High School he attended Wofford College, where he starred in football from 1921 to 1923. He came to Florida to get a job to earn money to attend Tulane Medical School. Instead of going to medical school, however, he got an athletic scholarship at Stetson University where he played football. He called himself "something of a tramp athlete." He worked as an iceman in Melbourne, then came to Miami in 1925 and became a policeman. For 3 years he patrolled a beat on foot and motorcycle. He worked part-time to get his law degree, graduating at the University of Miami Law School in 1932.

He ran for the Miami City Commission "to let the people know who I am" as he put it. He was unsuccessful in two attempts to win a city commission seat but the showing he made induced his friends to urge him to run for a seat in this House in 1938 where he served four terms.

Judge Cannon was not only large in body, but big in heart, able in mind, and great in spirit. The people liked his candid, often blunt speech, his keen sense of humor and his friendliness. To most of them he was their friend "Pat," whether policeman, Representative in Congress, or judge. They loved him.

Pat and his lovely wife were devoted friends of Mrs. Pepper and myself.

We are among the host who will mourn the passing of Pat Cannon. He made the world better and kinder and warmer while he was here. All of us who knew him will remember him with fond remembrance all the days and years of our lives. Fare thee well, Pat.

To his gracious and sorrowing widow, Mrs. Pepper and I , for ourselves and for his friends in the House and in Washington and for all who knew him, extend our heartfelt sympathy.

THE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Ukrainian Independence Day, like the month in which it is celebrated—January, and like the god Janus for whom that month is named, looks both backwards and forward. It looks back over a long past in which independence has more than once been a political reality, the fruition of that independence of spirit which marked the brave Ukrainian people. It looks forward to a future in which that ineradicable spirit of independence may again find a realization of its hope and faith.

This 48th anniversary, which we celebrate this month, honors the bursting of their bonds by the Ukrainian people from the hold of Russia; a hold which had lasted for over two centuries. But 1918 was by no means their first experience of political freedom. For some 400 years during the Middle Ages the Ukraine had flourished as a nation, an outpost of civilization among the surrounding undeveloped territories of Eastern Europe. From Poland to the Byzantine Empire there was no other area with the high degree of culture that the Ukraine enjoyed. The superior development there was based on the richness of the resources, developed by an intelligent and industrious people. The Ukraine over the centuries has been known as "the granary of Europe." Its capital, Kiev, was the center of culture and industry.

Because of the wealth and superior civilization of the Ukraine it was the envy of its neighbors. From east, southeast, west, and northwest it was overrun by covetous hordes. Tartars, Turks, Poles, and, later, Germans were among the rivals who encroached upon the territory of the Ukrainian people, which at one time stretched from the Black Sea to the Baltic.

It was under Peter I, of Russia, in 1709, that the long centuries of attempted russification began. But the Ukrainian people were never dominated in spirit. Their independence manifested itself in many ways; and they maintained an identity sufficient to become again in 1918, a free and separate nation.

That their long-sought freedom was to be of relatively short duration was through no fault of the Ukrainians. The Bolsheviks, too, saw a prize in the Ukraine, which they were not slow to incorporate in the Soviet Union. Domination by the Soviets was to be more intense than that of czarist Russia. The farcical independence which the Soviet Union itself claimed for the Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic as a member of the United Nations was no more than a claim to an extra vote for the Soviet Union in that organization. There the so-called independence claimed by the Soviets for the Ukrainians stopped.

So far was it stopped that the Soviet leaders have been known to threaten annihilation of the Ukrainians. Through mass murder and deportation over the years they have already gotten rid of many brave Ukrainians who defied and did not escape the ax of subjugation.

Mr. Speaker, the spirit of independence lives on in the indomitable Ukrainian soul. We hail it, as we find the hope and faith of these people an inspiration.

PANAMANIAN FLAGS IN CANAL ZONE PAID FOR BY U.S. TAXPAYERS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, January 9–12, 1964, the Canal Zone was the target of a bloody assault by Red-led Panamanian mobs. On the second anniversary of that sanguinary event, Panamanians commemorated the incident with marches passing through the Canal Zone and ending in Panama City where the U.S. flag was grossly insulted. I have reported the facts about this indignity to the Secretary of State with request to be advised as to what protest, if any, was made by our Government.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, it is advisable for Members of Congress to recall that on February 2, 1960, after considerable debate, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 381 to 12 on House concurrent resolution 459, 86th Congress, opposed the formal display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone. Later, the Congress, when passing the 1961 appropriations bill for the Department of Commerce and related agencies, unanimously adopted an amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] prohibiting the use of any part of that appropriation for the construction of "a flagpole, platform, or any other device for the purpose of displaying the flag of Panama in the Canal Zone, the sovereign control of which is vested in the U.S. Government by virtue of longstanding treaty."

Despite this clear intent of the people of the United States and the Congress, the executive branch of our Government on September 17, 1960, after adjournment of the Congress, authorized the formal display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone. This action has opened a Pandora Box of difficulty that has not yet ended. See my address in the RECORD of May 5, 1965, entitled, "Under Two Flags: Blunders, Confusion, and Chaos at Panama," for an extensive discussion of this matter. After Panamanian flags were displayed in the Canal Zone territory, many wondered who paid for the alien flags displayed on U.S. Canal Zone territory. I determined to find out and requested full information.

The first Panamanian flag flown in Shaler Triangle in the Canal Zone on September 21, 1960, was purchased from a flagmaker in Panama and charged to Department of State appropriations. Flags later displayed were manufactured by flagmakers in the United States with funds provided by our agencies of Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing but true that this purchase by our Government, at its own expense, of Panamanian flags to be flown in the U.S. Canal Zone territory as evidence of Panamanian sovereignty has been done. Thus, our Government has bought, at the cost of the U.S. taxpayers, and displayed emblems and insignia of our own weakness and depravity—a situation quite unprecedented in all our country's history.

If the Panamanian Government wished to have such display of its own flags, why did it not itself purchase them?

In order that the Congress and the Nation at large can have authoritative information in the premises, I quote the entire exchange of correspondence by which the facts were developed:

DECEMBER 17, 1965.

Mr. MERRILL WHITMAN,
Secretary, Panama Canal Company,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WHITMAN: Information has been received to the effect that Panamanian flags for display in the Canal Zone were obtained from flag manufacturers in the United States on Panama Canal Company orders, some of them rush, at the expense of the United States.

Please supply me with details of these transactions, including the following:

Dates of all orders.
Numbers of sizes of flags.
Costs.
Names of manufacturers.
Appropriation or fund used, and authority for the expenditures.
Any other information deemed pertinent.

Thanking you for the above information, I am,

Sincerely yours,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *December 20, 1965.*

DEAR MR. FLOOD: This is in response to your letter of December 17, 1965, regarding the purchase of Panamanian flags by the Panama Canal Company.

I have asked the appropriate official in the Canal Zone to investigate the matter and a report will be forwarded to you as soon as possible.

Sincerely,
W. M. WHITMAN,
Secretary.

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1966.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Mr. Whitman's letter of December 20, 1965, advised that your inquiry of December 17 concerning purchases of Panamanian flags by the Panama Canal Company had been referred to our office in the Canal Zone, and that a report would be submitted as soon as possible.

In Mr. Whitman's absence I am forwarding the attached list of purchases which was prepared by the Executive Secretary of the Canal Zone. The purchases are further discussed in his memorandum of January 7 to Mr. Whitman, a copy of which is also attached for your information.

Sincerely yours,
HAZEL M. MURDOCK,
Administrative Assistant.

Purchases of Panamanian flags from manufacturers in the United States for display in the Canal Zone

Order date	Manufactured by—	Quantity	Total award price
Size: 5 by 9½ feet:			
Feb. 16, 1962	Sherritt Flag Co., Richmond, Va	4	$150.64
Apr. 6, 1962	do	6	225.96
July 11, 1962	do	18	677.88
Oct. 29, 1962	do	2	75.32
Jan. 15, 1964	do	24	903.84
Jan. 17, 1964	do	24	903.84
Jan. 27, 1964	do	24	903.84
Aug. 25, 1965	Foster Co., 430 Notre Dame St., New Orleans, La.	24	423.60
Oct. 19, 1965	Sherritt Flag Co., Richmond, Va	24	469.68
Total		150	4,734.60
Size: 10 by 19 feet:			
Mar. 1, 1962	Sherritt Flag Co., Richmond, Va	2	169.84
Apr. 6, 1962	do	2	169.84
July 11, 1962	do	18	1,528.56
Jan. 15, 1964	do	24	2,038.08
Jan. 17, 1964	do	24	2,038.08
Total		70	5,944.40
Size: 20 by 38 feet:			
July 11, 1962	Sherritt Flag Co., Richmond, Va	2	746.00
Jan. 20, 1964	do	1	373.00
Total		3	1,119.00

JANUARY 7, 1966.

U.S. GOVERNMENT MEMORANDUM

To: Secretary, Panama Canal Company.
From: Executive Secretary.
Subject: Congressman FLOOD's letter on flag purchases, December 17, 1965.

1. This is in response to your request for a report on Congressman FLOOD's inquiry regarding purchases of Panamanian flags from manufacturers in the United States. The details requested by Mr. FLOOD are shown on the attached paper.

2. All the purchases were made initially by the Panama Canal Company. The cost in each case ultimately has been charged to the account of either the Company or the Canal Zone Government depending upon the activity that is in control of the physical location where the flag is flown. Depending upon the fiscal year in which the purchases were made the funds used were those appropriated or authorized to be expended by the General Government Matters, Department of Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1962 (Public Law 87-125), or the Public Works Appropriation Acts for 1963, 1964, and 1966, respectively (Public Law 87-880), (Public Law 88-257), and (Public Law 89-299).

3. These flags were purchased for display in the Canal Zone in implementation of the directive by President Eisenhower on September 17, 1960, and the agreement announced by Presidents Kennedy and Chiari in a joint communique on June 13, 1962, and the subsidiary agreement announced in a joint communique issued on January 10, 1963 by the joint commission appointed by the two Presidents.

4. A Panama flag was first flown in Shaler Triangle on September 21, 1960. The cost of that flag was charged to a State Department appropriation. That flag was purchased from a flagmaker in Panama as were additional flags flown at Shaler Triangle prior to the commencement of orders from American manufacturers on February 2, 1962. The funds used for the purchase of additional flags during the interim period for display at Shaler were those authorized to be expended by the appropriations acts pertaining to Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government activities for that period.

PAUL M. RUNNESTRAND.

THE CIVILIAN MARKSMANSHIP PROGRAM ASKS ITSELF SOME $100,000 QUESTIONS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I began asking questions about the civilian marksmanship program and the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice 2 years ago after I learned that under this program more than 60 million rounds of ammunition are given away and thousands of small arms placed on "loan" to private gun clubs each year. The cost of this program, about $2 million each year, is borne by the taxpayer.

But the startling facts I learned about the program go beyond the question of its cost. I refer to the facts relating to the control exercised over the program. My research and investigation revealed to me that there was an absence of the kind of controls which would prevent the free guns and ammunition given away through the program from falling into the hands of rightwing extremist groups, like the Minutemen.

When I first charged that effective controls were absent from the civilian marksmanship program and directed inquiries to the responsible Government officials asking what assurances there were that Federal guns and ammunition were not falling into the wrong hands, I was met with a barrage of criticism. Criticism came from the National Rifle Association which participates in the program, from other groups and individuals, and even from certain Members of Congress.

It seemed to some of my critics that I had touched a sacred cow. Of course, there are no sacred cows in the Federal Government, although there may be some bullheaded individuals who think there are. In any event, the fact is that my actions have been misconstrued. I have never criticized the NRA, nor have I criticized any of the individual gun clubs involved in the program. My criticism has been restricted to the negligent and slipshod manner in which the civilian marksmanship program has been handled. I have criticized the lack of controls and the fact that there is no assurance that rightwing extremists, or other nuts, cannot come together to form a gun club, gain easy admission into this program, and begin receiving their quota of free guns and ammunition.

In the light of the absence of adequate controls I raised questions about the operation of the program and questioned its value. I questioned whether it should continue under its present organization and procedures.

The responses to my inquiries were sometimes evasive, often slightly less than candid, and invariably slow in coming. As my questions continued, so did the criticism against me.

Now I have learned that even the Defense Department agrees that maybe there is some substance to the point I have been trying to make. In fact, the Defense Department is spending $100,000 to a private research firm, Arthur D. Little, Inc., for a study and report evaluating the civilian marksmanship program.

Obtaining the provisions of the contract between the Government and Arthur D. Little, Inc., has been like pulling the tusk of a walrus. I first inquired about the contract last July. Then on August 27, I wrote to the Defense Department and asked how much Arthur D. Little, Inc., was being paid to investigate the civilian marksmanship program. I received a reply 3 weeks later. The response to my question on the contract was that it was contracted "on the basis of cost plus a fixed fee of $7,900."

But it seemed to me that my question still had not been answered because the cost factor had not been fully explained. After several additional exchanges of letters, I therefore wrote again on November 4, requesting a copy of the entire contract. On November 25, 3 weeks later, I received my reply along with an enclosed copy of the contract.

It came as a shock to me to learn that the Government is not spending $7,900 for a private firm to investigate the Government's program. The Government is spending $100,000 for this study. It seems to me to be quite a large amount of money for the Government to be paying to learn about its own program. It is further evidence, in my judgment, that this program has been so loosely administered that the Government does not itself know what is going on in the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice or in the Office of the Director of Civilian Marksmanship.

In this regard, it is interesting to note that the contract provides for the study to include a determination of the adequacy of controls over the program, a determination that ammunition issued free under the program is in fact used for the purpose intended, a review of the relationship between the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and the National Rifle Association, and many other matters about which I have been probing and making speeches for the past 2½ years. In my judgment, the Government should already have the information that is being sought, it should have analyzed the program itself, and it should be taking steps now to correct the deficiencies instead of waiting for a private firm to tell it what needs to be done.

It is interesting to note that the Arthur D. Little $100,000 report was due to be completed in December. I have made inquiries with the Defense Department about this report but it is still not available. I have been informed that the report is on its way to the Secretary of the Army's desk and is due to be received by him in mid-February. That is pretty slow delivery service.

VIEWS OF WALTER P. REUTHER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WILLIAM D. FORD.** Mr. Speaker, the president of the United Auto Workers, Mr. Walter P. Reuther, recently delivered a thought-provoking speech before the Economic Club of Detroit, Mich.

Among his remarks were several dealing with the recently settled New York transit strike. Unfortunately, only part of his statements regarding the strike were picked up by the wire service, and as a result, news articles did not present the full impact of what Mr. Reuther said. Considerable misunderstanding and controvery has resulted.

I am sure that my colleagues in the House would appreciate an opportunity to learn precisely what Mr. Reuther said, and to read his exact proposals for a fair and practical way to achieve economic justice for workers in public service industries while insuring continued service for the public. I also believe that Mr. Reuther's entire speech is well worthy of wider distribution.

Therefore, I am asking unanimous consent to publish the entire text of Mr. Reuther's talk in the RECORD, and recommend it to the attention of my colleagues. I would call special attention to those sections of the talk dealing with the New York transit strike.

I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article from the Daily Labor Report of the Bureau of National Affairs, dated January 21. This article contains those portions of Mr. Reuther's speech on the subway strike and on his views for a public review board to review major wage and price increases. It also contains remarks made by Mr. Reuther at a press conference which followed his talk.

SPEECH OF UAW PRESIDENT WALTER P. REUTHER TO THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF DETROIT, JANUARY 17, 1966

All of us realize that 1966 confronts us with complex and compelling challenges. I share the view that labor and management must work together to meet those challenges by accepting new responsibilities so that together we can bring to fulfillment the new and bright opportunities.

There is some debate in America about whether we can carry the heavy burdens of defending freedom in Vietnam and at the same time build a great society at home. In my mind there is no problem because I believe that the American economy is equal to meeting both of those challenges.

There is a great dispute in America about Vietnam. There is a consensus about the need to find the peace but there are many confusing and conflicting voices on how best we might go about that.

I don't want to talk about that today but I would like to put the Vietnamese effort in its proper perspective in the broad context of the world in which we live.

For unless we can make the peace secure in the whole world, unless we can begin to deal with deemphasizing the nuclear arms race, then we may never have the opportunity of building a great society because now we have the capability of destroying the human family.

If you look at where we have been since the end of the last World War you will find that we have gone from crisis to crisis, whether it be in Korea or Cuba and now Vietnam. The real danger is that one of these crises in which the power structures are contesting each other on the outer fringe may trigger the use of nuclear weapons and that might be the end of human history.

All the nations of the world are the prisoners of the nuclear arms race. Look at the frightening fact that this year, we are told, the nations of the world will spend $200 billion to forge the weapons of defense in search of security. Yet the more money the world spends for the weapons of overkill, the more insecure we are because peace has become a condition of human survival in our troubled world.

Some years ago, I used the figure that the United States and the Soviet Union had a destructive nuclear capability of 20 tons of TNT for every man, woman, and child.

Today, I am advised by competent authorities that it is 40 tons of TNT for every man, woman, and child.

In the face of these kinds of frightening facts, it seems to me as one human being that the choice before the human family is both clear and compelling. Either the human family act rationally to end the nuclear arms race, or the nuclear arms race will end the human race.

Therefore, the Vietnamese conflict has to be evaluated in that broader context. What can we do to bring about a basic shift in the power contest in the world, because if that power contest is waged to its ultimate end, ultimately the weapons of nuclear destruction are used and then everything is academic because there will be no historians around to record who won because nobody can win that contest.

It would seem to me that the free world, because it does possess an overwhelming margin of economic superiority, ought to find a way to use that economic superiority with boldness and imagination to bring to bear upon the world's situation those leverages so we can shift the dynamics of the world power struggle from a negative nuclear arms race that no one can win to a positive contest between our competing social system.

I believe that the answer to that question is for the free world to take the offensive on the economic front by waging the peace in a total war against poverty and ignorance and disease in the emerging nations of the world and in improving the quality of our own society at home.

As we sit here, the balance of power in the world resides in the hundreds of millions of emerging peoples. That's what the Vietnamese war is about, that's what the Congo dispute was about, that's what Korea was about.

It's about who is going to influence these hundreds of millions of people and what direction will they take as they move forward in this great tidal wave of the revolution of rising expectations.

This is an explosive part of the situation because you cannot hope to achieve political stability upon which you can build a responsible society unless you begin to underpin that society with certain minimum economic and social standards and those standards are nonexistent in large sections of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The gap between the have and have-not peoples of the world is not getting smaller; it is getting greater; look at the fact that last year 800 million people had $100 or less income.

Now, the strategy of the Communist is to ride the naked backs of these people and to exploit their desperation and to forge their poverty into political power.

It seems to me that we need to understand that we cannot achieve stability politically nor can we inoculate these masses of the people in Asia and Africa and Latin America from the Communist virus of propaganda and subversion unless we make a massive effort to begin to raise their living standards and to narrow the gap between what they have and what those of us in the more fortunate part of the world enjoy.

I believe that our free system is capable of taking on these tasks of remaining strong enough to defend freedom wherever it may be challenged and at the same time launching a massive economic offensive against poverty in the world and building the Great Society at home. We should not undersell the power of freemen in a free society. Communists always underestimate us because they have never really understood the dynamics of a free society. They are still wedded to that concept that a free society is composed of competing and conflicting and irreconcilable economic pressure groups and that we are incapable as a free society of rising above that pressure group relationship in the absence of total war.

And therefore they believe that we are not capable of realizing our maximum potential to meet the challenge of peace. They know how they get unity in their totalitarian society by conformity through coercion but they have not understood the genius of our free society which achieves unity and diversity through consent. They believe also that there is an inescapable struggle between capital and labor.

But I believe that we are proving that communism is historically obsolete and morally bankrupt because the struggle today is not to divide up scarcity and that's the basic economic premise upon which communism is built. The struggle today is for free men, free labor, free management working together in the framework of a free society to harness the economic potentials of the new tools of science and technology, each year creating a larger and larger economic pie, and then recognizing that the interest of the whole transcends the interest of any part of the whole whether it be the labor part or the management part, and finding a rational and responsible way by which we can share that greater and greater abundance so that workers and stockholders and consumers can have more of that larger economic pie.

This is why I believe that the labor movement in its development with industry faces exciting new responsibilities and new opportunities.

We need to develop a cooperative relationship not only at the bargaining table but we need to create new forms of economic and social cooperation and extend that beyond the narrow limits of the bargaining table into the community.

In short, I believe that labor and management, if we are to build a Great Society, must establish a creative community partnership and working with other segments of society take on the task of together finding answers to all the problems for all the people.

President Johnson in calling upon the people of this country to join in building the Great Society in that historic speech at the University of Michigan in June 1964, characterized the Great Society by saying that it must be more concerned about the quality of its goals than the quantity of its goods.

One of the problems in America is that too often our value system gets corrupted by the material values of the marketplace.

We can't win a struggle based upon materialism because the Communists will win that since they will be acting true to their value system and we will be acting contrary to our value system.

The worth and the quality of a society is not in what you have; it is measured in what you do with what you have; how you take material wealth and give it human purpose; how you develop a sense of national purpose, and how you extend the frontiers of human fulfillment.

I believe that we can build a Great Society; I think we have the know-how; I think we have the technical capability; I think we have the economic resources. All we need to demonstrate is the will.

There are a number of areas where I think labor and management must join together and bring to bear upon the total problem the combination of their joint leverage which is greater than their separate leverages and I would list these areas where we need common action.

I believe that we need bold, adequate action in the field of education to overcome both the quantitative and qualitative deficits which deny millions of our young people the opportunity to facilitate their maximum growth and development.

For too long we have been more concerned about the condition of our national plumbing than about the adequacy of our school system.

By 1970, we have to build more than 1 million new classrooms in the elementary and secondary schools alone.

Secondly, in the civil rights field, we need to do more. We have made great progress. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Act of 1965 are landmarks in America's effort to meet its moral obligation.

But there is much more work to be done and I am disturbed about the growing complacency in America. People say, Let's relax, we have won the battle. Haven't we got the laws passed?

But the laws will do little or nothing; they are tools with which we must work in every community at every level and we must use those tools with courage, with compassion and with deep commitment.

The Negroes need not only jobs and housing, education, special training; they need a sense of hope. They need to believe that tomorrow can be better than yesterday, because out of hope comes deep motivation and without motivation we cannot solve this problem.

We also need new legislation to make sure that justice shall be equal in the southern courts and labor and management should testify on these things together because America needs to be united behind these basic objectives.

We have done some good work in Detroit on the civil rights front through the Detroit Citizens Equal Opportunity Committee in which labor and management and the church groups and other people have worked together. But what happened in Watts in Los Angeles ought to be a warning that there is great pressure underneath and we need to deal with these problems.

I believe that this is the hour when men of good will of all groups, of all races, of all creeds, of all political persuasions must join in searching for the answers in the light of reason by rational and responsible and constructive action.

For if we fail, then the vacuum created by our failure will be filled by the apostles of hatred and they will act in the dark of night and reason will yield to riots, the spirit of brotherhood will yield to bitterness and bloodshed, and we can tear asunder the very fabric of our free society.

Then we have the problem of rebuilding our cities. The American cities all over this country are in deep crisis. Their very survival is at stake.

The President has suggested the rebuilding of the cores of our cities. I would like to suggest that we take that small beginning in Detroit that we made some years ago, when we set up first the Citizens Development Committee and then the Citizens Redevelopment Corporation, and create by initiative of labor and industry a broad redevelopment authority to raise the resources and provide the initiative and imagination to take on the task in cooperation with the local government, the State and Federal Government of the total rebuilding of the city of Detroit—not to replace old slums with new slums, because slums are more than just buildings, but to replace slum neighborhoods with new neighborhoods that are wholesome and attractive, that provide the kind of total living environment worthy of citizens in a free society.

We need also to join together in a massive assault against human poverty in America.

This year with the gross national product expected to achieve somewhere in the neighborhood of $720 to $730 billion, the fact remained that 30 million Americans live in poverty, and the American labor movement and management must join together in dealing with that basic problem.

But the key to poverty is full employment, full employment at decent wages.

There are 2 million wage earners who worked full time last year, but they didn't earn a living wage, and they had to be supplemented by the public welfare rolls, and, therefore, we have to deal with minimum wages that are adequate to provide a living income, and we have to make that principle universal.

We have made progress on the unemployment front, but we have only made partial progress. Since the Employment Act of 1946 was passed 20 years ago, we have averaged almost 5 percent unemployment for those 20 years.

In the last 11 years we have wasted 34 million man-years of potential economic production, and because we had idle workers and idle capacity at an inadequate rate of economic growth we poured down the drain more than $900 billion, which I believe is the margin that will enable us to build the Great Society.

Now unemployment is at 4.1 percent and already people are saying we've got full employment. There was an article in Business Week on November 15 saying: "We have reached the level of full employment." I believe that we must say to ourselves, as Americans, that we cannot be satisfied and we cannot accept any level of unemployment so long as one American who is able and willing to work is denied a useful, meaningful, rewarding job. And yet 4 percent unemployment means a lot of people get left behind, and they are largely Negroes and young people.

We now have this new problem: Can we have full employment within the framework of a stable price structure? Here again we must reject this idea as being callous and irresponsible, that would have us believe that we must tolerate 4 or 4½ percent unemployment in order to achieve price stability. I believe we can have both full employment and price stability. We have had the best record of any industrialized nation in the democratic world. Our price structure has been relatively stable for many years and that has come about primarily because wages have not increased faster than productivity.

If you look at the facts—and after all if we are going to deal with economic facts which are very stubborn, they will not yield to propaganda or press releases; they only yield to rational economic action—if you look at the distribution, at what has happened in terms of the movement of wages and profits and other forms of income and you take the period from the second quarter of 1960 to the third quarter of 1965 which is the latest figure available, you will find that wages, including fringe benefits, went up 34 percent, profits went up 44 percent, personal interest income went up 62 percent, and cash for corporations went up 64 percent.

The automobile industry is doing extremely well as everyone knows, because when you increase volume and you increase productivity, you are bound to reduce the unit cost and that will be reflected in higher profits. Now, there is growing concern, as there ought to be, about the intervention of the presidency into negotiations and the price fixing procedures, and I believe that we need seriously to give thought to some new concepts. The UAW many years ago raised an idea that I think ought to be dusted off and re-examined.

We believe that when the presidency intervenes in unchartered waters, that it can do great damage to our democratic structure and great harm to the presidency. But the problem is there is no mechanism that can bring to bear upon the private decision-making processes, whether it be a labor decision on wages or a management decision on prices, the disciplinary impact of enlightened public opinion.

I'd like to suggest that we give serious consideration to the establishment of a price-wage review board and only those industries that are involved in the price-setting patterns and only those corporations responsible for at least 20 percent of the production of that total industry ought to be covered and the unions with which they bargain should also be covered.

If a union raises demands that would require price increases, they ought to be obligated to defend the economics of their wage demand before the American people.

And if industry threatens a price increase, they ought to be obligated to defend the economics behind that price increase.

If we are going to preserve the broadest area in which the private decision-making process continues to function, then we've got to improve the procedures by which we make private decisions publicly responsible.

I also believe that the transit strike in New York ought to lead all of us, whether we represent labor or management, to the conclusion that a better way must be found to deal with problems in public service industries.

I would like to propose that there be set up a tripartite committee of top people from labor and industry and Government to discuss and explore the possibility of creating a new mechanism and a new procedure by which workers in public service industries such as transportation and power and hospitals can secure their equity without the need of resorting to strike action.

I believe also that the collective bargaining process can be made rational and responsible in terms of the public interest only as collective bargaining is made into more and more a process of joint exploration of the economic facts, so the collective bargaining decisions can be made upon economic facts and not on the basis of economic power.

I believe that the joint study committees which we have instituted in the automotive industry, which were not too productive the first time because we were all overly cautious, can be made a valuable instrument in searching for new answers to new problems.

Now I suppose that I'm expected to say a few words about 1967 when I will have the privilege of looking at some of you people across the bargaining table.

I do not have a crystal ball and our demands as yet have not been formalized; we will have a special collective bargaining for that purpose in advance of those bargaining sessions.

But I do want to say that there are several items you ought to be thinking about. As I said on other occasions, I think that when you are forewarned, you have adequate time to make the emotional adjustment which is a part of this problem.

The automobile industry and the UAW supported the United States-Canadian automobile agreement. We think it makes sense. We think it's a historic step down a road where we need to achieve higher and higher levels of economic integration in the free world.

But it seems to me that since a member of the UAW will be doing the same job, making the same automobile, for the same company, for the same market, that you cannot pretend that the wage differential between the United States and Canada can be perpetuated and we intend to do something about that in 1967.

Then I also believe you need to be thinking about something that we've talked about many times and on which we've made great progress: that paying the worker by the hour or by the piece or by the 10th of the hour is historically obsolete, economically unsound and morally indefensible.

Just because this is the way it started 250 years ago in the industrial revolution in the textile mills of England does not mean it ought to continue forever.

We have made great progress on the supplemental unemployment benefits front and the short workweek benefit, and the difference from where we are to where we need to be is a manageable distance.

In 1967 we intend to talk to you about the abolition of this obsolete system of paying workers by the hour and we intend to convert to salaries so that we in effect can have some of the benefits that you enjoy on the management end of this problem.

I'd also like to suggest that you think about the overtime problem. This is a very troublesome problem and you can't brush it off by talking about overtime as an evil that everybody likes to share.

We know about this problem. What you need to keep in mind is that when overtime is excessive, it raises the basic problem that while a worker is willing to accept the discipline of the work place for his normal work hours, when you arbitrarily extend that and begin to take away his right to decide what he does with what normally would be his free time, you create a very serious problem.

If you ignore it, you will do so at great jeopardy and you may lose some of your operating flexibility; therefore you had better be thinking about that problem.

We are, as you know, organizing worldwide automotive councils and for the first time in the history of the free world labor movement, we are bringing together workers who work for the General Motors Corp. all over the world and Ford and Chrysler. In the first week in June we will meet in Detroit where we will begin to deal on a worldwide basis with these problems.

One other idea and then I'm going to conclude. Every year, work becomes more productive because we have access to the tools of science and technology and the labor movement wants those tools.

We want the best tools that science and technology can give us because we know there are no economic Santa Clauses. You can only share more wealth in the world as you create that wealth, and, therefore, we want the best tools.

But we are deeply disturbed about a problem that I think we should work at together, that work is becoming more productive but it is not becoming more meaningful.

In a more simple kind of society the worker not only earned his daily bread but he achieved in the process a sense of fulfillment, a sense of creation, a sense of belonging. Automation is denying that, because the worker has little relationship with the end product. And we need not only to work to make work more productive but to make it more meaningful, because the purpose of work is not the end purpose of our society; it is the fulfillment and enrichment of human life.

I would also like to suggest that we also work in terms of finding ways to create not only the interest but the facilities so that as technology gives us greater and greater amounts of access to human leisure, we can use that leisure creatively, constructively and meaningfully.

I've talked about many things but I have an unlimited faith in the capability of our free society. I worked in the German underground under Hitler, fighting Hitlerism. I worked in an automobile factory under Joe Stalin, I know something about tyranny. I know something about dictatorship.

We are the great hope because we must demonstrate that a free society can develop the common denominators of joint action and joint responsibility and what we in the labor movement and management do together in our relationship not only at the bargaining table but in the broad community will be decisive.

I have unlimited faith that we can be equal to this challenge and that together we can harness the rising star of science and technology and gear that abundance to the needs of the human community and together contribute increasingly to expanding the frontiers of human betterment and fulfillment.

[From the Daily Labor Report of the Bureau of National Affairs, Jan. 21, 1966]

REUTHER PROPOSALS ON PUBLIC SERVICE STRIKES, WAGE-PRICE HEARINGS UNRELATED

There is no connection between UAW President Walter P. Reuther's proposal for a top-level tripartite committee to explore the possibility of a "new mechanism" to prevent strikes in public services, such as the New York transit system, and his proposal for price-wage review board, according to a spokesman for the United Auto Workers.

Transcripts of Reuther's speech to the Economic Club of Detroit on January 17 and a press conference just prior to it show that he was talking about two different things.

In his speech, he recalled that many years ago UAW advanced the idea of a board to review proposed price and wage increases involving corporations controlling 20 percent or more of an industry's output and unions bargaining with them. The proposal was made to the Kefauver committee hearings on administered prices in 1958.

Reuther went on to say that he believed the New York transit strike ought to lead both labor and management to conclude that a better way must be found to deal with problems in public service industries.

The part of his speech dealing with both these matters follows:

"Now, there is growing concern, as there ought to be, about the intervention of the Presidency into negotiations and the price-fixing procedure, and I believe that we need seriously to give thought to some new concepts. The UAW many years ago raised an idea that I think ought to be dusted off and reexamined.

"We believe that when the Presidency intervenes in uncharted waters, that it can do great damage to our democratic structure and great harm to the Presidency. But the problem is there is no mechanism that can bring to bear upon the private decision-making processes, whether it be a labor decision on wages or a management decision on prices (except) the disciplinary impact of enlightened public opinion.

"I'd like to suggest that we give serious consideration to the establishment of a price-wage review board and only those industries that are involved in the pricesetting patterns and only those corporations responsible for at least 20 percent of the production of that total industry ought to be covered and the unions with which they bargain should also be covered.

"If a union raises demands that would require price increase, they ought to be obligated to defend the economics of their wage demand before the American people.

"And if industry threatens a price increase, they ought to be obligated to defend the economics behind that price increase.

"If we are going to preserve the broadest area in which the private decisionmaking process continues to function, then we've got to improve the procedures by which we make private decisions publicly responsible.

"I also believe that the transit strike in New York ought to lead all of us, whether we represent labor or management, to the conclusion that a better way must be found to deal with problems in public service industries.

"I would like to propose that there be set up a tripartite committee of top people from labor and industry and Government to discuss and explore the possibility of creating a new mechanism and a new procedure by which workers in public service industries such as transportation and power and hospitals can secure their equity without the need of resorting to strike action."

At his press conference, Reuther said he thought the outlook for labor peace in 1966 "is rather good because there are no major collective-bargaining negotiations in 1966," although there are a few of some significance. The real problem, he said, is going to be "dealing with this very touchy problem: how do we achieve full employment and at the same time maintain price stability?"

He mentioned the 1958 UAW proposal, saying that a corporation producing more than 20 percent of an industry's basic product and "in industries that have a historic role as price leaders" would have to give 60 days' notice of intent to raise prices and a public hearing then would be held. A union making wage demands that management felt would require a price increase would have to appear before the same board and defend its claim. He explained further:

"Now this public review board would have no authority in any way to set prices or wages, but it would have the opportunity of holding a public hearing and making all the facts available to the public. It would be doing this in the hope that in a free society there is a disciplinary impact that enlightened public opinion could bring upon the private decisionmaking process and make private decisions more publicly responsible.

"Otherwise we can get in the jungle. The President will be forced to get into more wage negotiations and price setting, or we can just go off to the races and get unlimited inflation. It would seem to me this mechanism is a more rational approach to dealing with this problem in a free society."

A transcript of the press conference shows these other questions and answers bearing on the two subjects:

Question. "Mr. Reuther, President Johnson says that candor compels him to call the settlement of the transit strike in New York inflationary. Do you agree with him?"

Mr. REUTHER. "I don't know enough about the economics of that situation to be able to make an independent judgment. I do believe that the transit strike in New York City illustrates a very serious problem that we'd better deal with. I would be hopeful that we could get a high-level labor-management-Government committee of experts set up to study this whole problem of how we could achieve equity for workers in public service industries such as transportation, hospital, power and so forth without the crippling effects of strikes. It seems to me that we just can't go on having these kind of crises that penalize the whole community and have that the only way the worker can get justice."

Question. "Would you denounce any settlement that violates the White House wage-price guideline?"

Mr. REUTHER. "It depends entirely upon whether the workers involved are workers who are getting substandard wages and benefits. In those cases I believe that a price increase is justified.

"In industries where the productivity is greater than the average such as the automotive industry, there ought to be price reductions and they would offset price increases in other segments of the economy. That would enable us to maintain price stability. In general, I support the position that wage increases should not exceed the increases in productivity."

* * * * *

Question. "Mr. Reuther, getting back to that New York situation, are you advocating a law prohibiting strikes by public employees?"

Mr. REUTHER. "I'm advocating that in our free society there ought to be a procedure worked out by which workers in the public service sector which is essential to the welfare and well-being of a society should be able to get a comparable equity for making a comparable contribution as other workers, without the necessity of using the strike weapon. I believe that there can be such a procedure and I would suggest a high-level study committee composed of industry and labor and Government to explore just how we might create such a mechanism."

Question. "Would you prohibit such strikes?"

Mr. REUTHER. "Well, I would prefer to create a mechanism so the strikes would not be necessary."

Question. "You wouldn't go as far as Calvin Coolidge."

Mr. REUTHER. "Well, I'm afraid Calvin Coolidge knew very little about this kind of situation."

* * * * *

Question. "I will combine two or three questions. Can a strike like that of the transport workers of New York City be justified; will the recent transit settlement in New York set the pattern for labor's request in 1966; what was the reaction to President Johnson's reaction to the settlement?"

Mr. REUTHER. "I'll take them in reverse order. I do not know enough about the economics of the settlement or the situation in the transit industry to comment on that. On the question of whether or not we can tolerate strikes in these areas, I think I have covered that. I think that the real problem is not just to criticize that strikes are wrong and should not take place. The real question is how do you develop acceptable, workable alternatives by which workers in these kinds of public service industries can get their measure of equity without the necessity of resorting to strikes, and this is why I believe that a top-level committee ought to probe this out and come up with some new ideas of how we might go about it. Obviously, society could not go on tolerating stoppages which bring into jeopardy the very survival of society because obviously society must defend itself against that kind of action. But saying that is not enough. We've got to find a practical, workable answer to the problem, and I believe that a top-level committee is the best way to go about it."

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, millions of Ukrainians, including exiles in many lands, observed the 48th anniversary of the Ukrainian National Republic, a nation established in the last days of World War I.

Tragically, the Ukrainians did not enjoy their liberty for very long. It was soon trampled by a ruthless Russian Communist army and brought under the tyranny of Moscow. But despite their continued oppression, and despite the efforts of the Soviet masters to eradicate their language and individual culture, these people continue to resist and fight to preserve their national identity.

On this anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, we once again pay tribute to these heroic people whose will for liberty and human dignity is indeed a source of inspiration to all freemen.

The history of the Ukrainian people reflects the centuries-long struggle of man to attain individual freedom. Three hundred years ago, the Ukraine was an independent state, rich in its culture and thriving in its commerce. Today, despite its enslavement, it is the second largest of the Soviet Republics and is still the richest in agriculture. Only once in three centuries has it had the opportunity to attain its goal as a free republic. That was a memorable and historic day in Ukrainian history, and remains as the brightest spot in the struggle of its people for their national independence and freedom.

It is only fitting that on this day of commemoration, we mention the contributions made by Americans of Ukrainian descent to the political heritage and culture of our own country. We have gained much from their love of freedom and their devotion to democratic ideals.

I have faith that the Ukraine, and indeed, all of the captive nations of Europe and Asia will once again be free. If history has proven anything it is that no despot, however cruel, can extinguish the yearning for liberty that dwells in the hearts of men.

We look forward with confidence to the day when not only the Ukrainians presently enslaved shall be free but when all men may live together under governments of their own choosing and in freedom, human dignity, and peace. This yearning for freedom must be kept alive in all our hearts. We must remember that the infringement of personal liberty in any part of the world constitutes a threat to freedom everywhere.

Today, on the observance of Ukrainian Independence Day, the peoples of the free world and, of course, we in this country, rededicate ourselves to the responsibilities that are ours as free peoples, and we should reconsecrate ourselves to the spirit to which that republic—and our own—was born.

I include the remarks made upon the occasion of this 46th anniversary of Ukrainian independence by Dr. Nestor

Procyk, executive director of the Ukrainian Division, national committee, American Friends of Anti Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, in Buffalo, N.Y.:

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

As in past years, we pause to reflect as January 22 passes by, upon the significance and implications of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence in 1917 and reunification of Ukraine in 1918.

Forty-eight years have passed since the blistery January day when the Ukrainian National Rada declared to the world the intentions and will of the people to lead an independent and sovereign life. The modern rebirth of Ukraine ushered in a new era of national self-determination. Nations, who were once free and proud members of the family of nations, made a valiant attempt to reassure their national identity. Ukraine, with its long history of determined love for freedom reasserted her will to join again the roster of free nations. The 300-odd years of Russian oppression were unable to obliterate the deep-rooted and firm will of the Ukrainian people to lead a sovereign existence, free from Russian interference. The harsh subjugation and slave labor camps of czarist Russia showed no match to the burning flame of liberty. Neither tears nor brutal Siberian exiles could stamp out this eternal flame. Reprisals seemed only to strengthen the people's will. So, when the conflagration of the First World War offered an opportunity to shed the oppressive Russian chains, the Ukrainian people chose their course.

History attests that not all righteous attempts toward freedom are crowned with success. Such was the case of Ukraine. The adversary now was of a different cloth—Czarist Russia was replaced by Red Communist Russia. However, their goals did not differ, only the approaches were somewhat varied. Communist dialectics, with its innate cunningness, found ways to undermine and topple the young Ukrainian Government. So-called national liberation movements were instigated and various means employed to bring down the hard-won freedom.

We witness today the dire results of our and the West's inertness to the outright rape Communist Russia perpetuated upon her neighbors. Today we pay dearly for our failure to respond to Eastern Europe's cry for help. Vietnam is but a continuation of the slaughter started by the Communist Russian imperialists in 1918. Had we reacted then, Vietnam would have been but a geographical location to us Americans.

The analogy between Ukraine and Vietnam is not far fetched at all. Ukraine was the first of the captive nations later joined by the long and somber number of others who fell prey to the Red menace. Our stand in Vietnam is not only righteous but long overdue. What we do now for Vietnam ought to have been done some 40-odd years ago in order to stop the Red drive to conquer—as they profess—the world.

Our stand in Vietnam is imperative and we bear witness from past sad experiences that the Russian bear—whether in czarist or Communist garb—is insatiable and that you cannot satisfy his lust. His lust for other nations and territories has to be stopped—if needed, in the jungles of Vietnam. But stopped it must be if we are to survive as a Christian civilization. Unimpeachable sources indicate that the unrelented fight for freedom behind the Iron Curtain in Ukraine is being carried out on all possible fronts.

Let us bow our heads in deference to the valiant Ukrainian armies, UPA and others, who defended freedom to secure a better and happier existence to all nations. Let us not forget the millions of victims who bear silent witness to the everlasting quest of people for dignity and human rights. Let us bow our heads in silent prayer for the utmost sacrifice of our own boys who gave their lives so that others might walk our American streets safely and proudly.

Hopefully that all these sacrifices will not be in vain, believing—to quote Victor Hugo, "that stronger than all the armies is an idea whose time has come," may I close my remarks today with the "idea of freedom to every nation and individual will carry to victory our side and secure independence to all that desire it—Ukraine among them."

WELFARE OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter to the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the absence of interest and concern by the present administration for the welfare of the Nation's small businesses is best evidenced by the failure or refusal of President Johnson to nominate an Administrator for the Small Business Administration, a position which has been vacant since the official departure of Mr. Eugene Foley in August of last year.

Once again, to call to the attention of the President the steadily deteriorating condition of the agency and the consternation and despair of the Nation's small businessmen, the minority members of the Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am the ranking member, have directed a letter to the President, respectfully urging his immediate appointment of an Administrator.

Concerned as we are for the betterment of the small business climate, we trust that this urgent and serious matter will be given immediate consideration.

The letter, which was forwarded to the White House on January 22, follows:

JANUARY 21, 1966.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Congress, through the Small Business Administration, has provided an instrument for effective and meaningful assistance to the Nation's small businesses. In order for the agency to accomplish the goals set forth by the Congress, however, it must have capable and dynamic leadership.

For a considerable period of time, the Small Business Administration has been woefully lacking in this regard, due, in part, to the absence of an Administrator. This leadership void has resulted in a steadily deteriorating program, a frustrating situation approaching chaos within the agency, and has brought consternation and despair to the small business community. The small businessman seeking vitally needed assistance finds the business loan program at a virtual standstill and other major agency programs reduced to ineffectiveness.

Mr. President, the Small Business Administration lacks direction, guidance and inspiration and has for a considerable period of time.

As the ranking member of and on behalf of the minority members of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, Congressmen H. ALLEN SMITH, RALPH HARVEY, SILVIO O. CONTE, FRANK HORTON, and JAMES T. BROYHILL who have joined me in this letter, I respectfully urge your immediate appointment of an Administrator for the Small Business Administration, who through capable and dedicated effort, will enable the agency to meet the pressing and critical needs of small businesses throughout the Nation.

Sincerely yours,

ARCH A. MOORE, Jr.
H. ALLEN SMITH.
RALPH HARVEY.
SILVIO O. CONTE.
FRANK HORTON.
JAMES T. BROYHILL.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL, for 5 minutes, on Thursday, January 27; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, January 27, 1966.

Mr. GATHINGS, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BERRY in two instances.
Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. POWELL.
Mr. CELLER.
Mr. GIBBONS.
Mr. REES.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 27, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1946. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notice of intention to issue an Executive order terminating the designation of certain countries as less developed countries for purposes of the interest equalization tax, pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 4916 of the Internal Revenue Code (H. Doc. No. 369); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1947. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report of refugee operations during the period from July 14, 1960, through November 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 203(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1948. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize suits in the courts of the District of Columbia for collection of taxes owed to States, territories, or possessions, or political subdivisions thereof, when the reciprocal right is accorded to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on postal systems of U.S. Armed Forces and certain countries in Europe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By **Mr. BURKE**:

H.R. 12318. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide for the free importation of certain specialized educational equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By **Mr. CELLER**:

H.R. 12319. A bill to amend section 4 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 15), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By **Mr. CLEVELAND**:

H.R. 12320. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind" in order to extend its provisions to persons who are unable to read normal printed material; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 12321. A bill to provide for a decennial census of the physically handicapped; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By **Mr. COOLEY**:

H.R. 12322. A bill to enable cottongrowers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research and promotion to improve the competitive position of, and to expand markets for, cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By **Mr. EDWARDS** of Alabama:

H.R. 12323. A bill to strengthen State and local governments, to provide the States with additional financial resources to improve elementary and secondary education by returning a portion of the Federal revenue to the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By **Mr. FASCELL**:

H.R. 12324. A bill to amend the act of August 22, 1957, relating to the conservation and protection of key deer and other wildlife; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By **Mr. GURNEY**:

H.R. 12325. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase the exemption from duty in the case of gifts sent by members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By **Mr. HELSTOSKI**:

H.R. 12326. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By **Mr. HOWARD**:

H.R. 12327. A bill to establish a National Highway Traffic Safety Center to promote research and development activities for highway traffic safety, to provide financial assistance to the States to accelerate highway traffic safety programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By **Mr. KEOGH**:

H.R. 12328. A bill to extend for 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By **Mr. KREBS**:

H.R. 12329. A bill to provide certain benefits for Federal civilian employees with respect to overtime, Saturday, Sunday, and holiday work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By **Mr. LAIRD**:

H.R. 12330. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit representing interest on amounts withheld for purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By **Mr. LANGEN**:

H.R. 12331. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By **Mr. MARTIN** of Nebraska:

H.R. 12332. A bill to make certain revisions in Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance for the construction and operation and maintenance of public schools in federally impacted areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By **Mr. O'KONSKI**:

H.R. 12333. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By **Mr. RIVERS** of South Carolina:

H.R. 12334. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12335. A bill to authorize certain construction in support of military activities in southeast Asia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By **Mr. ST GERMAIN**:

H.R. 12336. A bill to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12337. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, so as to authorize the establishment and operation of sea grant colleges and programs by initiating and supporting programs of education, training, and research in the marine sciences and a program of advisory services relating to activities in the marine sciences, to facilitate the use of the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf by participants carrying out these programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 12338. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By **Mr. TUPPER**:

H.R. 12339. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By **Mr. HELSTOSKI**:

H.J. Res. 814. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the month of February of every year as American History Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By **Mr. BINGHAM**:

H. Res. 691. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By **Mr. FARBSTEIN**:

H. Res. 692. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to U.S. ratification of the Genocide Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By **Mr. ROYBAL**:

H. Res. 693. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. ROSENTHAL introduced a bill (H.R. 12340) for the relief of Salvatore Priolo, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

320. By **Mr. PHILBIN**: Petition of Mrs. Esther B. Macdonald and other members of the Lancaster, Mass., Historical Workshop in support of the Shasta daisy as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

321. By the **SPEAKER**: Petition of adjutant, Worcester Veterans' Council, Worcester, Mass., relative to the continuation of the House Un-American Activities Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

* * *

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1966

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Very Reverend John Hundiak, pastor, St. Demetrius Orthodox Church, Carteret, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Eternal Father, we thank Thee for the blessings Thou hast bestowed upon the United States of America.

Bless, O Lord, we beseech Thee, our President, the Vice President, the Members of both Houses of our Congress and all those in authority.

Guide our Government in the crusade for a just peace in the world.

Send Thy blessings upon our Armed Forces and lead them to victory over the forces of oppression and tyranny.

Save us from the blight of arrogancy of divisiveness and internal strife.

Endow us with the spirit of unity, of brotherly love and dedication to the ideals of democracy upon which this Nation was founded.

Grant, O Lord, that America remain the fortress of righteousness, the haven of refuge, and the beacon of hope for all the peoples who are in bondage.

On this day of the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Ukraine—a nation which was suppressed by the overwhelming hordes of Bolshevist aggression—we offer to Thee, our Merciful Father, humble and fervent prayers for all her children and for all captive peoples enslaved by the godless and cruel Red regime. Comfort our Ukrainian brethren who are living in thralldom, suffering persecutions, imprisonment and exile, and sustain them in their aspirations for liberty and independent statehood.

Grant us the privilege of welcoming the dawn of true liberty, equality and brotherhood of all nations and races under Thy divine fatherhood.

This we humbly ask in Thy most holy name. Amen.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal be considered as read.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. TOWER. Objection, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. With the Senator's indulgence the Chair would like to make certain appointments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the following Senators to represent the Senate at the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference to be held in Geneva commencing on January 27, 1966: Senators Pastore, Gore, Symington, Hickenlooper, Carlson, and Cooper.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Am I correct in assuming, since the Senate convened at the hour of 11 o'clock, that the morning hour will end at 1 o'clock?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Secondly, Mr. President, does the Journal require formal approval by the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Journal, under the rule, must either be read or be accepted by unanimous consent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But if the Journal is read, no other action on the part of the Senate is required?

The VICE PRESIDENT. After the Journal is read, if not amended, no further action is required.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And, Mr. President, at what point is the Journal subject to amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Journal is subject to amendment, as the Chair indicated yesterday, after it has been read.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, with the greatest of respect, am I in order and is it proper for me to put the Chair on notice that I have 19 amendments to the Journal, and that there may be other Senators who have amendments also? We wish to be assured that we shall have full opportunity to offer those amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will indicate once again that the first order of business is the reading of the Journal or the acceptance by the Senate of the Journal; and because of the objection, the clerk will read the Journal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Also, Mr. President, there may be other Senators, who have amendments; and I should like some indication from them as to whether they have amendments.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just one moment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not in order, despite these questions raised, to commence the reading of the Journal?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was about to order that the Journal be read.

Mr. TOWER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOWER. Is it in order to suggest the absence of a quorum prior to the reading of the Journal?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is nearly always in order to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, unless the request for a quorum call is withdrawn, the Senator from North Carolina will be out of order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I intend to renew the request directly, but I will withhold it for the moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois withdraw his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry, based upon the first sentence of rule III, which reads:

> The Presiding Officer having taken the chair, and a quorum being present, the Journal of the preceding day shall be read, and any mistake in the entries corrected.

My parliamentary inquiry is this: Does not any Senator have the right, at the completion of the reading of the Journal, to offer amendments to correct mistakes in the Journal?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The rule is quite explicit. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Chair. I serve notice that I shall have some amendments of that nature.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appreciates the notice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it correct to assume that what the distinguished Senator from North Carolina is referring to is the Journal, which will be read shortly?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the understanding of the Chair that the reference of the Senator from North Carolina relates to the Journal which will be read after the quorum call.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator renew his request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum call has been requested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 11 Leg.]

Aiken
Bass
Bible
Burdick
Case
Church
Dirksen
Douglas
Ellender
Harris
Holland
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McGee
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Symington
Talmadge
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs] and the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. Allott, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Gore, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hill, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Morton, Mr. Nelson, Mr.

Pearson, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Russell of South Carolina, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Williams of Delaware, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of North Dakota entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The clerk will now proceed with the reading of the Journal.

THE JOURNAL

The legislative clerk read the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 25, 1966.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I propose an amendment to the Journal and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from North Carolina will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> I move to amend the Journal of the Senate for Tuesday, January 25, 1966, so as to include therein in full the prayer delivered by Bishop W. Earl Ledden, of Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., at the convening of the Senate on said day and that the Journal clerk be instructed to incorporate said prayer in the Journal of the proceedings at the proper place.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I make a point of order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. BASS. I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order because the prayer is not a part of the Senate proceedings. The prayer is a petition to the Divine and Almighty God. It is not a petition before the Senate; it is not a petition or a plea to Senators; it is a petition and a plea to the Almighty God for His benevolence to individual Senators.

I also make the point of order that the amendment would not be in order because the petitioner, the Chaplain or his designee, as the case may be, does not have the privilege of addressing himself to an amendment dealing with a subject that is not a proceeding of the Senate, since he is not allowed the privilege of the Senate floor other than to offer the prayer.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in commenting upon the point of order, I invite the attention of the Chair to rule IV, which prescribes what shall be in the Journal:

> The proceedings of the Senate shall be briefly and accurately stated on the Journal.

One of the proceedings of the Senate, and the first proceeding in the Senate yesterday, was the prayer by Bishop Ledden. It happened in the Senate. It was a proceeding had, after the Senate had been convened pursuant to adjournment from the previous day.

The prayer which Bishop Ledden delivered, and which I seek to have incorporated in the Journal in full, did not occur outside the Senate. It was not a proceeding had anywhere on the face of the earth except in the Senate of the United States of America, which was duly assembled for the transaction of business.

Mr. President, the records show that in the year 1922, when the Senate was governed by the same rule to which I have invited the attention of the Chair, it happened on one or more occasions that the prayer, which had been offered at the opening of the session of the Senate, was recorded in full in the Journal of its proceedings.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Utah for a question, but for no other purpose. I am sorry I have to impose a restriction.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah wishes to ask a question. Is it not true that at the beginning of the Congressional Record of yesterday's Senate session, the prayer is entered in the Record as the first item in the day's transactions?

Mr. ERVIN. That is true. That is the reason why I wish to make the Journal conform to the Record. One purpose in so doing is to reveal the difference between the character of the Journal, which is supposed to record all the proceedings of the Senate, and the character of the Record. There is a feeling of confidence throughout the United States in the integrity of the Journal, because the people of the United States have learned to know that the Journal is a factual statement of what happened in the Senate, and they rely upon the Journal as fact. On the contrary, many of the people of the United States believe that the Congressional Record is in large part fiction as distinguished from fact. I want the American people to have confidence that the Journal is a true record of the proceedings in the Senate. That is the reason for my amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair in this instance permits debate at his own indulgence, because the Chair is about ready to rule, unless he is talked out of it.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes. There is just one other thing——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that the point of order is not well taken; that the prayer is a part of the proceedings of the Senate, required by rule III. The Chair quotes from rule III:

> On February 6, 1939, the Senate agreed to the following:
>
> "*Resolved*, That the Chaplain shall open each calendar day's session of the Senate with prayer" (Senate Journal 93, 76–1, Feb. 6, 1939).

That resolution was included in the Journal of that day. So the Chair finds no merit in the point of order. The Chair appreciates the elucidation of the history of this matter, but the precedent is well established.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to speak in behalf of my amendment, but I should like to yield to the Senator from Illinois. Does he wish me to yield for a question or——

Mr. DIRKSEN. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished minority leader for the purpose of propounding a parliamentary inquiry, without losing my right to the floor or impairing in any way my right to speak in behalf of my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the proposal of the Senator from North Carolina is debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Second, is there any length or limit to the debate in which we can engage in relation to this very important matter?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The only point that the Chair would make is that the debate must be germane, under rule VIII, paragraph 3, of the Senate rules. The Chair will, of course, be alive and alert to the matter of germaneness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I propound a further inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish the Chair would read that rule to the Senate, because I believe it was rather loosely drawn and is subject to some confusion, as I have examined it. We ought to be very clear about the question of germaneness with respect to amendments and corrections of the Journal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will, at the request of the Senator from Illinois, read that part of rule VIII that relates to germaneness, which is paragraph 3:

> At the conclusion of the morning hour or after the unfinished business or pending business has first been laid before the Senate on any calendar day, and until after the duration of 3 hours, except as determined to the contrary by unanimous consent or on motion without debate, all debate shall be germane and confined to the specific question then pending before the Senate.

This debate can go beyond 3 hours. It can continue for a long period of time. The reading of the Journal is the business of the Senate, and an amendment that is offered to the Journal, as has been offered, becomes the pending business before the Senate. The debate pertaining to the pending business must be germane.

I think, under Senate practice and procedure, this should be an established procedure in our deliberations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the distinguished chairman will permit me to expound——

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in order to protect my rights to the floor, I will rely upon the Chair to confine the distinguished minority leader to the scope of the permission extended to him, with the unanimous consent of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished author of the germaneness rule is on the floor, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

We debated the matter before the Senate at the time. I was of the opinion that it had strict application only to substantive legislative matters. The Journal is certainly not a substantive legislative matter, as such.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has read the rule. There is no doubt that the reading of the Journal is the business before the Senate. An amendment has been offered, and therefore it becomes the pending business before the Senate.

The Senate has acted in an orderly, businesslike manner, and, the Journal having been read, that is the business before the Senate, and the amendment to the Journal is the pending business.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I do not yield for a point of order.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, the Senator has not started his debate. I have a point of order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I do not yield for a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator be kind enough to yield to me for a short parliamentary inquiry and still retain his right to the floor?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have the greatest affection in my heart for the junior Senator from Tennessee. I am a North Carolinian, and North Carolinians have had much experience with Tennessee. Tennessee used to be a part of North Carolina, and Tennessee was in a constant state of rebellion against North Carolina——

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that this discussion is not germane.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has raised a point of order as to germaneness.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from Tennessee does not have the right to speak at the present time without the consent of the Chair and of myself, and I do not yield. I was just explaining why I did not want the Senator from Tennessee to interrupt the speech that I am making—except for the purpose of asking me questions. I do not wish to lose my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator must proceed in order or the Chair will be compelled to make a ruling that will be displeasing to him.

Mr. ERVIN. I would not want that to happen. I shall follow the old adage, "Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation." I shall discuss the matter germanely.

I wanted to explain that North Carolinians were troubled much by rebellious Tennesseans in early days, and for that reason I am reluctant to yield to a Tennessean except for questions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator feel that he can do that within the purview of the prayer?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes. Mr. President, on one occasion I attended church and the minister——

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order, so that we can hear this very illuminating discussion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There will be order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the preacher preached a very beautiful sermon prior to his prayer. His sermon was on the text, "A merry heart doeth good like a medicine," which is found in the Book of Proverbs.

The Senate has long had association with prayer. One of the most eloquent men in the ministry was Dr. Edward Everett Hale, nephew of Edward Everett, who delivered the main speech at the dedication of the battlefield of Gettysburg when Lincoln gave his most famous oration.

Edward Everett Hale was later elected Chaplain of the Senate. During his service as Chaplain of the Senate, he prayed some of the most eloquent and beautiful and inspiring prayers ever uttered by the lips of man.

On one occasion the following question was put to Dr. Hale: "Doctor, when you pray as Chaplain of the Senate, do you look at the tragic condition of the country and the many problems existing in the country and then pray that the Almighty will give the Senators the wisdom to deal with those problems and to find their solutions?"

In reply to that interrogation, Dr. Hale said: "No. I do not look at the country and pray for the Senators. I look at the Senators, and then I pray for the country."

I have been concerned about prayer for some time. We have had several recent decisions from the Supreme Court of the United States on the subject of prayer. I refer particularly to *Engel* v. *Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, and *Abington School District* v. *Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203. I have studied them minutely. They give me much concern as a lawyer.

I am of the opinion as a lawyer that the Court ought not to have entertained jurisdiction of those cases because the parties bringing the actions did not have a standing entitling them to sue.

I am of the further opinion as a lawyer that since the Court saw fit to entertain jurisdiction in those cases, it should have upheld the right to conduct nonsectarian prayers under a rule of interpretation which the Supreme Court ignored in those cases, but which the Supreme Court previously followed throughout our history. This rule is that where public officers and people have placed a practical interpretation upon a constitutional provision for many years, the Court will adopt such interpretation as proper unless the language of the provision or other rules of construction require otherwise. Ever since the ratification of the first amendment in 1791, the officers and people of the States by their actions and their words had interpreted the first amendment to permit nonsectarian prayers and Bible reading in public schools, provided all children whose parents did not want them to participate were excused and provided no effort was made to proselyte any children to adopt any particular faith. I thought that if it saw fit to take jurisdiction of the school prayer cases, the Supreme Court should have adopted the practical interpretation placed upon the first amendment by officers and people at all times subsequent to 1791.

According to that practical interpretation, the first amendment did not prohibit the saying of simple prayers of a nonsectarian character or the reading of simple passages from the Bible or other sacred books, without comment. Such practice was considered to be proper, and was followed in virtually all sections of the country.

However, the Supreme Court held otherwise in the cases cited. I must confess that I disagree with the rulings. I believe that the rulings ought to have been to the contrary because of the practical interpretation placed on the first amendment by public officers and people throughout the United States from 1791 down to the date of such cases.

As Chief Justice Stone said:

> Where the courts deal, as ours do, with great public questions, the only protection against unwise decisions, and even judicial usurpation, is careful scrutiny of their action and fearless comment upon it.

I take a great deal of satisfaction from the fact that it has been judicially adjudged, as I understand it, that the disagreement of a lawyer with a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States or the supreme court of any State is not evidence of the lack of testamentary capacity on the part of that lawyer.

I have been informed that in one of the Midwestern States, there was an old lawyer who never agreed with the court when the court decided a case against him.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, a point of order. The rule of germaneness is now in force.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I do not yield for a point of order. I am talking about the school prayer cases, and I am trying to show——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator must proceed in order.

Mr. ERVIN. I am, Mr. President. I submit I am in order. I am merely undertaking to justify the fact that, as a member of the bar, I have a right to take a position in defense of prayer, even though the Supreme Court of the United States may have handed down decisions to the effect that prayer is not permissible in the public schools of this Nation. If that is not germane, I do not know what is germane.

Mr. BASS. The right of prayer is not being challenged.

Mr. ERVIN. The right to have a prayer recorded in the Journal is challenged. We have had the right to seek to correct the Journal for this purpose challenged upon a point of order asserting that the prayer uttered here yesterday should not be entered upon the Journal of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that I may tell the story of the decision of the court about the lawyer who disagreed with the court's decisions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a unanimous-consent request. Is there objection?

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, in the interests of orderly procedure, I must insist that we proceed under the rule of germaneness, since the Senate seems to be involved with this sort of debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, as properly stated by the Senator from Tennessee and earlier put by the Chair, Should the Senate proceed to include the prayer as a part of the proceedings in the Journal?

Does the Senator from Tennessee object to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BASS. Yes, Mr. President, I object, because I insist that Senators conform to the rule of germaneness during this period of debate, so that we can come to an early decision as to whether the prayer should be a part of the Journal.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, would it be germane for me to discuss the school prayer cases?

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I am not opposing the Senator's amendment. I wish it clearly understood that I am not opposing his amendment. I will vote for it.

Mr. ERVIN. I pray that the Senator from Tennessee will receive guidance from the Almighty to lend his aid to the adoption of my amendment in a more efficacious manner than he is employing at present.

Mr. BASS. The Senator reverently expresses his appreciation.

Mr. ERVIN. And I say that the Senator from Tennessee, like myself, is "standing in the need of prayer." I hope that is no undue reflection upon either the Senator from Tennessee or myself—especially within the purview of Senate rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, since objection has been interposed to my telling the story of the old lawyer who disagreed with the decisions of the courts in his cases, I shall proceed to discuss the school prayer decision in a way which might indicate that perhaps I am blessed with what the Book of Proverbs calls a merry heart; and I hope it may "do good like a medicine" before we have any acrimonious debate.

A few months ago, I had the most unexpected pleasure of being invited to preside over a luncheon given in honor of Nicholas Katzenbach, when he was appointed Attorney General, and Ramsey Clark, when he was appointed Deputy Attorney General.

The luncheon was held in the Lawyers Club in the city of Washington. When the guests had assembled and seated themselves at the luncheon tables, I discovered that the Chief Justice and four Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States were present. The Chief Justice was my right-hand luncheon companion.

Having attended many churches in my early days, and having heard many prayers and many hymns, there came to my remembrance the words of an old hymn which are substantially as follows:

This is the day I long have sought
And wept because I found it not.

So, when it came time for me to make some remarks as the master of ceremonies at the luncheon, I stated that I was delighted to have an opportunity to be with lawyers again; that I had been a lawyer most of my active life, and still claimed to have a law license which had not been revoked; and that I always loved to be with lawyers, not only because of the great companionship and fellowship they gave me, but also because of a habit they had, which I did not know whether I was permitted to talk about in the presence of the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court; namely, prayer. I said I loved lawyers because lawyers believe in prayer.

My good friend from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] says he is a layman, not a lawyer; so perhaps that explains some of his points of order.

"But the lawyers," I said, "believe in prayer," and, I said, "I desire to cite as an illustration of that the story of a young lawyer who had just embarked upon the practice of the profession, and who was having an experience which is common to young lawyers; namely, difficulty in acquiring a sufficient clientele to keep body and soul together."

This young lawyer, as I recounted on that occasion, went to a revival service one night, and the evangelist who was preaching—and praying, I might add—suddenly and unexpectedly called on the young lawyer to lead in prayer.

I said, "This young lawyer showed that lawyers believe in prayer, because he prayed a prayer which came directly from his heart. He said this to the Lord: 'Stir up much strife among Thy people, Lord, lest Thy servant perish'."

So, as a lawyer, I believe in prayer. I went further and said, in the presence of the august assemblage, that there was an old hymn which read:

The Lord moves in a mysterious way,
His wonders to perform.

I said, "Now, that is certainly true. The Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States might be surprised to learn that the Lord uses them as instruments to answer the prayer which came from the heart of the young lawyer: 'Stir up much strife among Thy people, Lord, lest Thy servant perish'."

I illustrated my point by saying that when the Supreme Court of the United States, or any other supreme court, for that matter, hands down a decision accompanied by an opinion which is susceptible to two or three different interpretations, or when a majority of the Court hands down one opinion, and the other members of the Court hand down dissenting opinions which say that the majority opinion is not sound, the inevitable result is that they stir up much strife among the Lord's people, and cause much litigation, thus bringing an answer to the young lawyer's prayer.

I said, "Furthermore, when the Supreme Court of the United States undertakes to explain in a new opinion what it meant when it wrote an old opinion, it answers the young lawyer's prayer more effectively, because it stirs up far more litigation."

I said, "It is a very fortunate thing for the bar of America that the Supreme Court of the United States cannot hand down an interpretation of its own opinions which is as clear and as lucid as the interpretation placed upon the school prayer cases by a North Carolina schoolteacher some time ago."

I said that this North Carolina school teacher entered her classroom one morning, 15 minutes earlier than the time to convene, and she saw a group of boys on their hands and knees huddling in a corner of the room. She demanded of them, in a stern tone of voice, "What are you doing?"

One of the boys yelled back, "We are shooting craps." The teacher said, "That is all right, I was afraid you were praying."

Mr. President, that brings me back to the serious aspects of the subject of prayer. I wish to read to the Senate the prayer which was uttered in the Chamber yesterday by Bishop W. Earl Ledden, of the Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C. This is the prayer as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but as unrecorded in the Journal:

> Almighty God, maker of heaven and earth, who, when darkness was upon the face of the deep, didst say: "Let there be light—and there was light. Draw near to Thy Children now in this troubled hour when darkness covers the path ahead.
>
> For in this night of unreason our feet stumble into pitfalls and senseless strife; our minds grapple in confusion, so often blind with ancient prejudice; and the peoples of this little planet, frantic with fear, strike at each other in the dark.
>
> Save us in this fearsome hour we pray, O God, for we are like children crying in the night. Children crying for the light, and with no language but a cry. Let, then, our cry come unto Thee, O Father, for the light of Thy salvation.

Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
  Great God, our King.

Nor for this land alone.
But be God's mercies shown
  From shore to shore;
And may the nations see
That men should brothers be,
And form one family
  The wide world o'er.

> In the name of the Savior of the world. Amen.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that that is a beautiful prayer. It is a timely prayer. It points out the condition in which the world finds itself today, wandering, as it is, in darkness, confusion, and strife. It asks for the only thing by which that darkness can be dissipated, by which that confusion can be obviated, and by which that strife can be ended; namely, the light which Almighty God has at his disposal for the guidance of human beings.

Therefore, Mr. President, I desire that the prayer, which is a prayer of great beauty, a prayer of great earnestness, a prayer of great sincerity, and a prayer of great power be printed in full in the body of the Journal, to the end that it may be given as wide a dissemination as is humanly possible.

Mr. BASS and Mr. TOWER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I will yield to any Senator, but only for a question.

Mr. BASS. The Chair has already recognized the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ERVIN. The Chair cannot recognize the Senator from Tennessee because the Senator from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. BASS. Was not the Senator from North Carolina off his feet?

Mr. ERVIN. I am still on my feet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for a question, but I will not yield to him for any other purpose, much as I regret it, because I know Tennesseans so well, and also, because I do not wish to lose my right to the floor.

Mr. BASS. The Senator from North Carolina is most generous in his remarks——

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I object to the Senator's telling me that I am generous because I cannot yield to him for any purpose except that of putting a question to me without my losing the floor.

Mr. BASS. This is the question: In lieu of the amendment which the Senator has offered, and which I am supporting with all my force, and all my power and influence——

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Senator is——

Mr. BASS. Because I believe in prayer——

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I suggest that my friend from Tennessee is making a speech and not propounding an interrogatory to me.

Mr. BASS. Very well. Let me ask the Senator this question: Would not he agree with this Senator that the prayer should be made a part of the Journal every day?

Mr. ERVIN. Absolutely. That is what I am trying to establish. I am trying to establish a precedent by this amendment, in the hope that the precedent will be followed in the future. I might——

Mr. BASS. All right, then, let me——

Mr. ERVIN. For the consolation of the Senator from Tennessee, I should like to inform him, as well as all other Senators, that the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], has an amendment which will be offered to provide for that very thing: that, hereafter, prayers are to be recorded in the Journal of the Senate from now until the last lingering echo of Gabriel's horn trembles into ultimate silence.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator from Tennessee for a question. I do not know whether there was a question mark at the end of his interrogatory. Unless a question is propounded to me, I do not wish to yield.

Mr. BASS. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me to propound a parliamentary inquiry relating to a prayer in the Journal?

Mr. ERVIN. I am afraid that this might be nongermane under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. BASS. Let me submit this question to the Senator from North Carolina: In view of the ruling of the Chair earlier, that the prayer is a part of the proceedings of the Senate and should be made a part of the Journal, would it not be fair to assume that the Presiding Officer has been derelict in his duty in not requiring the prayer to be made a part of the Journal on a daily basis?

Mr. ERVIN. I will not pass upon the alleged dereliction, if any, of the Presiding Officer of the Senate. I merely refer to the Scriptures which declare that men are as prone to err as the sparks are to fly upward. I am trying to correct an error now. The Senate has been following a bad precedent for a long time by failing to have the opening prayers recorded in the Journal.

I am trying to establish a precedent which will induce the Senate to do right hereafter.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, we stand here today, as Moses did before the burning bush when he laid down the rules for the Ten Commandments——

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I object. The Senator from Tennessee is making a speech—not asking a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The Senator from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I was about to say——

Mr. ERVIN. If the distinguished Senator from Tennessee wishes to propound to me an interrogatory which is germane to the business now pending before the Senate, I shall be glad to yield to him, notwithstanding the knowledge that North Carolinians possess, as of old, as to the rebellious nature of people from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. The Senator from Tennessee will now propound an interrogatory, and it will take this form: Is it not a fact that we stand here today under the rules, making new rules in the Senate, to which the Senator has referred previously, as Moses did before the burning bush at the time he was receiving instructions from God concerning the Ten Commandments? So today we stand in the face of a change in the rules, and I am agreeing with the Senator that the prayer should be made a part of the Journal on a permanent basis.

Mr. ERVIN. Do I understand correctly that there is a question mark there?

Mr. BASS. I ask this question: Would not he amend his amendment to state that not only the prayer should be included in the proceedings of this day but also that it be a part of the permanent proceeds of the Journal?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in reply to that question, I will say that as I construe the rules of the Senate, the Senator from Tennessee will have the right to offer an amendment to my amendment after I have finished speaking in behalf of my amendment.

I do not agree to his proposal at this time. Nor do I yield to him to offer such an amendment to my amendment. There is something in the Bible concerning patience and what patience can accomplish. Therefore, I believe that if he would constrain his soul in patience and listen to my speech, he would agree with me that my amendment should be agreed to in its present form.

Mr. BASS. I believe that the Senator has his amendment won, if he would only permit it to come to a vote.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. ERVIN. I am glad to yield for a question and for a question only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Texas for purposes of making an interrogatory?

Mr. ERVIN. For that purpose, I am glad to yield.

Mr. TOWER. Does not the Senator from North Carolina believe that if we are, indeed, reestablishing an old precedent, which was unfortunately abandoned a few years ago, it is of sufficient import, particularly in the light of recent controversy as to whether a prayer should be introduced into any governmental activity or not; and does not the Senator believe further that it is extremely important that there be considerable debate on this subject, so that Members of the Senate can be well informed and can arrive at some conclusions, on whether we should reestablish this very fine precedent?

Mr. ERVIN. The junior Senator from Texas could not possibly be more correct than he is in the implication in his question. People need more spiritual elucidation; and I believe men need the help of the Almighty in solving our problems. I think they would be solved better by the help of the Almighty than by some of the political platforms we read.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield to the junior Senator from Texas in order that he may propound an interrogatory, provided it is germane.

Mr. TOWER. Does the Senator from North Carolina believe we would be somewhat irresponsible if we failed to discuss this important matter before the Senate? Does the Senator think it would be irresponsible to bring the matter merely to a vote, rather than give other Members of the Senate an opportunity to discuss it so that we may better arrive at a correct solution?

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Texas is eminently correct. The book I hold in my hand—that is, the Bible—contains line by line, and precept by precept, what we must do in order that we may be guided aright. It is a beautiful book with many passages on the subject of prayer, which I would read to the Senate now, if time permitted. These passages might inspire some Member of the Senate to write a prayer approximating the beauty of Kipling's "Recessional." I shall now read this great prayer for the inspiration and edification of the Senate:

God of our fathers, known of old—
 Lord of our far-flung battle line—
Beneath whose awful hand we hold
 Dominion over palm and pine—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget.

The tumult and the shouting dies—
 The captains and the kings depart—
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
 An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget.

Far-called, our navies melt away—
 On dune and headland sinks the fire—
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
 Is one with Nineveh and Tyre.
Judge of the Nations, spare us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget.

If, drunk with sight of power, we loose
 Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe—
Such boastings as the gentiles use,
 Or lesser breeds without the Law—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget.

I invite the attention of the Senate particularly to the closing verse in view of the precarious hour that we universally face:

For heathen heart that puts her trust
 In reeking tube and iron shard—
All valiant dust that builds on dust,
 And guarding, calls not Thee to guard—
For frantic boast and foolish word—
Thy mercy on Thy people, Lord.

I submit that the beautiful prayer embodied in Kipling's "Recessional" is in complete harmony with the prayer which I seek to have placed in the Journal. This is so because Kipling points out that we cannot rely upon our weapons, but that we must rely on the Lord.

That was the theme of Bishop Ledden's prayer, and I think it should be included in the Journal of the Senate.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield for an interrogation.

Mr. TOWER. Is the Senator from North Carolina aware of the circumstances under which that prayer was written? Is he aware that Kipling was writing a poem to commemorate the anniversary of the 60th year of the reign of Queen Victoria, and that at that time Great Britain had suzerainty over a great part of the world, and it was a time when Britain was at its most powerful stage? It was on that occasion that Rudyard Kipling chose to write this poem, at a time when Britain had absolute power, to point out the transitory value of things of the earth.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator from Texas for inviting my attention and that of the Senate to the circumstances under which the "Recessional" was written. It was written at a time as the Senator from Texas has said, when Britain was at the height of its power; when it was the most powerful nation on earth, and its ships sailed and dominated the seven seas. It was a time when Englishmen were prone to forget the dependence of man on the Almighty and to view themselves as being responsible for the great achievements of their nation. That is why I think it is well to speak on my amendment in relation to the subject which I am now discussing, the necessity for the reliance of the world, the nation, and the individual on the Almighty.

It has been declared in a decision by Justice Douglas that we are a religious nation.

We have been taught to pray by passages in the Bible which I shall read later in case debate on my amendment becomes protracted. I hold in my hands books of prayer used by the adherents of two great denominations in this country. One of them is "The Book of Common Prayer" of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, which has many beautiful prayers in it. I shall later call to the attention of the Senate one of these prayers. The other book of prayer I hold in my hands is "The Catholic Companion," which has many beautiful prayers Roman Catholics use.

The prayers in these books show that the people of the United States are accustomed to praying in all the vicissitudes of life. They show that the people of the United States are accustomed to praying in their youth and in their age for guidance. They show that the people of the United States are accustomed to praying when their children are baptized or christened. They show that the people of the United States are accustomed to praying when they are married. They show that the people of the United States are accustomed to praying when God blesses them with children, as well as when their children are baptized or christened. They show that the people of our United States are accustomed to praying when they are in a state of bodily dissolution. And that they are accustomed to praying for the repose of the souls of their beloved dead.

I should like to read one of the prayers in the "Book of Common Prayer" because I do not believe that a more beautiful prayer was ever spoken by human lips. This is it:

> O Lord, support us all the day long, until the shadows lengthen and the evening comes, and the busy world is hushed, and the fever of life is over, and our work is done. Then in Thy mercy grant us a safe lodging, and a holy rest, and peace at the last.

As I have said, Justice Douglas declared in one of his opinions that Americans are a religious people. I invite attention to the fact that our dependence upon the God to whom we pray is recognized in the constitutions of virtually all the States.

The constitution of Alabama contains a preamble in which the people of Alabama invoke the favor and guidance of Almighty God in order that they might establish justice by their constitution. Their constitution also states that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.

I respectfully submit that one of those inalienable rights is the right to pray, for which I strive here today on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry for my guidance.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. ERVIN. Would it be in order for me to ask unanimous consent to yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], for the purpose of permitting him to make an insertion in the RECORD, without my losing the privilege of the floor and without my remarks, which I shall make immediately hereafter, being counted as a second speech?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator is correct in that understanding.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I make that unanimous consent request.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(Mr. MORSE then addressed the Senator on the report of Internal Investigations Unit of the Metropolitan Police Department. His remarks will be found elsewhere, under an appropriate heading.)

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I was pointing out a moment ago the provisions of the constitution and statutes of the State of Alabama with respect to matters of religion. I have already spoken of its constitution.

Section 52–542 of the Code of Alabama of 1961 requires daily readings from the Bible in all public schools. Section 52–543 of the Code of Alabama provides that teachers must show by their reports that there have been daily Bible readings in the public schools in which they teach; otherwise public school funds will be withheld from such schools.

Those provisions from the organic and statutory law of Alabama make it crystal clear that the people of Alabama are a religious people.

The constitution of the great State of Alaska recites that the people of Alaska establish their constitution with gratitude to God.

The preamble to the constitution of the State of Arizona contains this statement:

> We the people of the State of Arizona, grateful to Almighty God for our liberties, do ordain this constitution.

This constitutional provision illustrates that the people of Arizona are a religious people.

The same observation can be made with respect to the people of Arkansas. The preamble to the constitution of the State of Arkansas recites substantially that the people of the State of Arkansas establish their constitution with gratitude to Almighty God.

To further manifest the religious nature of the people of Arkansas I invite attention to the provisions of section 80–1606 of their annotated statutes. This section requires a portion of the Bible to be read daily in public schools without comment up to and including high school level. Then, it provides any prayer may be offered or the Lord's Prayer repeated. It contains the proviso, however, that no pupil shall be required to take part in such religious exercises, thereby recognizing that the relationship between any individual and his God is a matter for that individual rather than for government.

The preamble to the constitution of the State of California recites that in establishing their constitution the people of the State of California are grateful to Almighty God.

The constitution of the State of Colorado has a somewhat similar preamble to its constitution in which is expressed the profound reverence which the people of Colorado entertain for the Supreme Ruler of the universe.

The constitution of Connecticut recites in its preamble that in establishing their constitution the people of Connecticut acknowledge with gratitude the Good Providence of God in having permitted them to enjoy free government. Then, it contains in section 1 of Article VII this additional reference to the Supreme Being:

> It being the duty of all men to worship the Supreme Being, the Great Creator and Preserver of the Universe, and their right to render that worship in the mode most consistent with the dictates of their conscience——

They have certain religious and civil rights.

The preamble to the constitution of the State of Delaware contains a provision which states:

> Through divine goodness, men have by nature the rights of worshiping and serving their Creator according to the dictates of their consciences.

Section 1, article 1, of the constitution of Delaware elaborates upon this statement by reciting:

> It is the duty of all men frequently to assemble together for the public worship of Almighty God.

The constitution of the State of Florida contains a somewhat similar preamble, which recites, in express language, that in establishing their constitution for their government in civil affairs, the people of the State of Florida express their gratitude to Almighty God.

Although they have now been cast upon the scraphead of our religious history by the Supreme Court school prayer cases, certain statutes of Florida required the teachers in public schools to have Bible readings once every day without sectarian comments, and admonished teachers also to inculcate in their pupils Christian virtues.

Those provisions of the constitution and statutes makes it obvious that the people of Florida, like the people of the rest of the United States, were correctly described by Justice Douglas when he said that Americans are a religious people.

The State of Georgia has a constitution which recites that the people of Georgia, in ordaining and establishing their constitution, rely upon the protection and guidance of Almighty God.

The courts of Georgia, prior to the recent school prayer cases, held that requiring Bible reading in the public schools was not unconstitutional. By express statute, the legislature of Georgia decreed, prior to those decisions, that the Bible be read in all State schools, and at least one chapter thereof each school day at some appropriate time.

However, the statute contains a proviso that pupils who do not wish to hear the Bible read may withdraw upon written request of their parents.

When the State most recently admitted to the Union, the State of Hawaii, adopted its constitution, it inserted in its organic law a preamble which recites that the people of the State of Hawaii are grateful for Divine guidance, and that with that gratitude they establish their constitution.

The State of Idaho has a constitution which recites in its preamble that the people of the State of Idaho are grateful to Almighty God for their freedom.

This constitutional provision certainly makes it manifest that the people of Idaho merit the description of the people of America, given by Justice Douglas, as a religious people.

Section 33–1604 of the statutes of Idaho provides:

> Selections from the Bible, to be chosen from a list prepared by the State board of education, shall be read daily in each public school classroom, without comment or interpretation.

It is significant that that statute expressed the construction which the people of Idaho placed upon the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States and upon the provisions of the Idaho constitution as well relating to freedom of religion.

The State of Illinois is another State which has manifested that its people, too, merit the description of "a religious people." When the people of Illinois adopted their constitution, they recited, first, that they were grateful to Almighty God for the civil, political, and religious liberty which He permitted them to enjoy; and second, that they looked to God for a blessing upon their endeavors to secure and transmit them unimpaired to succeeding generations.

The constitution of the State of Indiana recites in its preamble that in ordaining their constitution, the people of the State of Indiana are grateful to Almighty God for the free exercise of the right to choose their form of government.

Section 28–5101 of the Statutes of Indiana provides, in substance that:

> The Bible shall not be excluded from the public schools of the State.

This constitutional preamble and this statute certainly make it manifest that the people of Indiana, likewise, are entitled to be described, as the people of America have been described as a religious people.

The State of Iowa has a constitution whose preamble recites:

> The people of the State of Iowa are grateful to the Supreme Being for the blessings heretofore enjoyed by them, and feel that they are dependent upon Him for a continuance of those blessings.

The statutes of Iowa, which have been invalidated by the school prayer cases, constitute rather interesting reading on this point. Section 280.9 provides that the Bible shall not be excluded from any public school, nor shall any child be required to read it contrary to the wishes of his parent.

In construing this section of the Constitution, the Supreme Court of Iowa, in Knowlton against Baumhover, 166 Northwestern 201, held that reading the Bible and the Lord's Prayer in public schools was not unconstitutional if objecting pupils were excused.

The constitution of the great State of Kansas contains a preamble to the effect that the people of Kansas are grateful to Almighty God for their civil and religious privileges.

It is interesting to note, in the light of the school prayer cases, that the people of Iowa, through their legislature, had put a practical interpretation upon the constitutional provisions, both Federal and State, relating to worship by enacting a statute, section 72–1624, which provided that while no sectarian doctrine should be taught in public schools of first-class cities, the reading of the Bible without note or comment should not be prohibited. The validity of this provision was upheld by the Supreme Court of Kansas in the case of Sinclair against Board of Education, 76 P. 422, where it was held that the statute permitted the reading of the Lord's Prayer and the Psalms.

The constitution of the State of Kentucky contains a preamble which recites that the people of the Commonwealth of Kentucky are grateful to Almighty God for the civil, political, and religious liberties they enjoy.

The constitution of the State of Louisiana contains a preamble to the effect that the people of the State of Louisiana are grateful to Almighty God for the civil, political, and religious liberties they enjoy; and it expresses the desire of the people to secure the continuance of these blessings.

The constitution of the great State of Maine contains a preamble reciting that the people of Maine acknowledged with grateful hearts the goodness of the Sovereign Ruler of the Universe in affording them an opportunity to establish a constitution for their government.

Maine had a statute, in 1964, which authorized daily reading from the Scriptures in the public schools of the State. This statute provided that special emphasis should be placed upon the Ten Commandments, the Psalms of David, the Proverbs of Solomon, the Sermon on the Mount, and the Lord's Prayer.

Maryland manifested, by the preamble to the declaration of rights in its constitution, that its people, too, merit the designation of being a religious people. I say this because their constitution recites in its preamble that the people of the State of Maryland are grateful to Almighty God for their civil and religious liberty.

Prior to the Schempp case, the State of Maryland authorized praying and Bible reading in its public schools in further illustration of the religious character of its people.

The great Commonwealth of Massachusetts has a constitution which is very interesting on this point. It manifests why the U.S. Senate should countenance prayer for its guidance and why the prayers which are prayed for the guidance of the Senate should be incorporated in the Journal as well as in the Congressional Record.

The constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts recites in its preamble that the people of Massachusetts acknowledge with grateful hearts the goodness of the Great Legislator of the Universe in affording them in the course of His providence an opportunity to form a compact, and that they devoutly implore His direction in adopting their constitution.

The constitution of the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts also has a provision in its declaration of rights relating to this matter, in addition to the provision contained in the preamble. I refer to article II. This article states that it is a right as well as the duty of all men in society publicly and at stated seasons, to worship the Supreme Being, the Great Creator, and Preserver of the Universe.

It is highly significant that the Massachusetts constitution elsewhere refers to the Supreme Being not only as the Great Creator and Great Preserver of the Universe, but also as the Great Legislator of the Universe.

I believe that legislators such as Members of the U.S. Senate, who are beset with scores of perplexing problems which seem insoluble, should pray for guidance and should have some eloquent men, such as Bishop Ledden, or our regular Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Harris, pray for us as well as with us for our guidance in order that we might be legislators worthy of the love of the Great Legislator of the Universe.

It is also significant to note that, according to a study made in 1964, Massachusetts had a statute, section 71-31, which required that a portion of the Bible should be read daily without comment in the public schools. It provided that the children whose parents objected would not have to take part.

I might add that this statute was held valid by the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts in *Spiller* v. *Woburn*, 94 Massachusetts 127.

The State of Michigan has established a constitution which contains a preamble to the effect that the people of the State of Michigan are grateful to Almighty God for the blessings of freedom.

This statement shows that the people of Michigan, like those of other States to whose constitutions I have alluded, merit the description of being religious people.

The same observation may be made with respect to the people of Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, and New York.

The constitutions of each of the States which I have just mentioned contain preambles which recognize the existence of a Supreme Being, which many of them call Almighty God.

All these constitutions express gratitude to God as well as dependence upon God. My own State of North Carolina has a constitution which expresses in its preamble the gratitude of the people of North Carolina to Almighty God, and also contains, in section 26 of article I, which is a part of the State's bill of rights, a declaration that—

> All persons have a natural and inalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences.

The passage which I have just quoted from the North Carolina constitution is a passage which appears in the organic law of many of the other States of the Union.

The constitutions of the States of North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming also contain provisions reciting that their people recognize the existence of Almighty God by expressing their gratitude to Him, and, in many instances, their dependence upon Him, not only for the origin, but also for the preservation of their civil, political, and religious liberties.

Hence, it is true that at least 49 of our States have constitutions recognizing in one way or another the existence of God, and our dependence upon Him.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ERVIN. In just a moment. A study made by the Legislative Reference Service of our Library of Congress in 1964 states that the West Virginia constitution contains no reference to God or to a Supreme Being. However, in order that West Virginia may not be dealt with unjustly, I call attention to a contradictory statement which appears in a book by Charles E. Rice entitled "The Supreme Court and Public Prayer."

That book states, with respect to West Virginia, that the preamble to the constitution of the State of West Virginia contains a recitation that the people of West Virginia had enjoyed the blessings of civil, political, and religious liberty through Divine Providence, and that in their constitution they reaffirmed their faith in and constant reliance upon God.

I now yield to the Senator from Texas for a question.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator, for the advice and counsel of the Members present, if he wishes a live quorum and the yeas and nays on his proposed amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. In reply to the inquiry of the Senator from Texas, I say that would be highly satisfactory to me, for a reason which is suggested by one of the great proclamations which Abraham Lincoln issued when the War Between the States presented to the Union its darkest hours.

In that proclamation, which was promulgated on April 30, 1863, President Lincoln called for a day of national humiliation and prayer. The proclamation opens with this recitation:

> The Senate of the United States, devoutly recognizing the supreme authority and just government of Almighty God in all the affairs of men and nations, has by a resolution requested the President to designate and set apart a day for national prayer and humiliation.

I believe it would be a fine thing for the Senate of the United States once again to recognize the authority and just government of Almighty God. The Senate can do this by adopting the amendment submitted by me to incorporate in the Journal a very beautiful, fervent, and I trust effectual prayer.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 12 Leg.]

Anderson
Bass
Burdick
Church
Cotton
Dirksen
Douglas
Ervin
Fong
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Monroney
Montoya
Mundt
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Scott
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. TOWER and Mr. MANSFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fanning, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Russell of Georgia, Mr. Simpson, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Symington, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of North Dakota entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin].

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Under the rule a motion to table, on demand on the part of a Senator, must be submitted in writing. I demand that the rule be followed. I ask for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Illinois that a motion to table is not debatable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not debating the motion. This is under the rule. The rule is clear that, on demand of a Senator, the motion must be in writing.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like further to respond to the statement of the Senator from Illinois that any motion or amendment upon demand has to be reduced to writing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It does on demand of a Senator. I suggest that the Chair read the rule to the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk my motion and ask that it be read to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> I move that the amendment of Senator Ervin now pending be tabled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], and the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper and Mr. Morton] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 37, as follows:

[No. 13 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Anderson
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Dodd
Douglas
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Montoya
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—37

Aiken
Allott
Bass
Bennett
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
Monroney
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—21

Bartlett
Bayh
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Clark
Cooper
Ellender
Fulbright
Gore
Hartke
Hayden
Kuchel
Long, La.
Mansfield
McNamara
Miller
Mondale
Morse
Morton
Murphy
Smathers

So Mr. Mansfield's motion to table Mr. Ervin's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I am about to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 680, H.R. 77, but before I do so, I wish to state further that after consultation with the distinguished minority leader it is our intention to ask that there be in effect a morning business outside the morning hour to the extent of 1 hour, up to 1 hour, so that Members who were deprived of the opportunity on yesterday and who have not had the opportunity today, may, under a 3-minute limitation, be allowed to make insertions, short speeches, and attend to other matters that come within that particular rule.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator wish me to yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I wish to reserve the right to object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator wishes to do so, he may, but we thought this was an accommodation for Members who were deprived of the right to participate in morning business yesterday and others who may have something today in the way of speeches, or others who wish to introduce bills and other matters.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Seantor from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the majority leader and I have discussed this proposal. The 1 hour of morning business that would follow this yea-and-nay vote would be limited to the introduction of bills and insertions in the Record, with speeches to be limited to 3 minutes. During the 1 hour, we would not call up the business that we have in mind. At the expiration of the 1 hour, we would return to the motion to proceed to the consideration of the repeal of section 14(b); we would be back on the beam, back on the track, where we were before.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct; we would be fully protected.

Mr. ERVIN. I merely wished to make it clear that the rule under which a measure could be called up on motion without debate during the morning hour would not be covered by the unanimous-consent request. With that understanding, I do not object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course. What is proposed is purely an accommodation to Senators on both sides of the aisle, to compensate for deprivations which occurred yesterday.

REPORT ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF LICENSES AND INSPECTIONS BY INTERNAL INVESTIGATIONS UNIT OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

During the delivery of Mr. Ervin's speech,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Carolina. I asked him to grant me this courtesy because I have just received from General Duke, Engineer Commissioner for the District of Columbia, a letter transmitting the report of the Board of Commissioners in connection with charges that were made last year by some in the community that there is evidence of a considerable amount of graft and corruption on the part of some of the personnel within the Department of Licenses and Inspection in the Washington, D.C., government.

The Board of Commissioners and the Metropolitan Police Department have been conducting the investigation for many months. The investigation has been completed. The very voluminous report has been filed with me this morning. Commissioner Duke sent a letter of transmittal accompanying the report.

I shall ask permission to have the letter printed in the Record so that it can be available to the press, because they keep insisting that I make available some statement on the matter.

The report will be carefully analyzed by me and my subcommittee and it may eventually lead to a hearing by my Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety.

I have scanned enough of it to satisfy myself this morning that there is evidence of sufficient malfeasance so that the services of some people probably should be dispensed with because of violation of public trust that goes along with their office.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Commissioner Duke, being a letter of transmittal of the report, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Government of the
District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: The report conducted by the Internal Investigations Unit of the Metropolitan Police Department is enclosed in response to a telephone request made yesterday by Mr. Richard Judd. I regret the length of time the investigation and consideration of the report has taken. In this letter I will briefly outline the main points of the report and the action taken by the Board of Commissioners.

The Acting Corporation Counsel studied the police report and discussed it with the Chief Assistant U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions. The Chief Assistant U.S. Attorney concluded that no basis exists for criminal prosecution and so notified the Acting Corporation Counsel, who agreed with this decision.

The charges made of widespread graft and corruption in the Department were not substantiated by the investigation. The report does indicate, however, that violations of the Commissioners' order regarding nonacceptance of gifts and gratuities did exist prior to Christmas 1965. The Board of Commissioners has strengthened its previous policy regarding gifts and gratuities by an order dated December 3, 1965 (copy enclosed). In this connection, the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a notice to all employees dated December 7, 1965, calling attention to the revised Commissioners' order (copy enclosed). In addition, the Department director sent notices to 30 firms and organizations calling attention to the same order. The Board of Commissioners is not aware of any violation of this order in 1965.

The Board denied certificates of merit to former members of the Engineering Branch, Department of Licenses and Inspections, as a result of their involvement in acceptance of gifts. These certificates are given to all long-time District employees upon retirement. In this connection, the Director of the Department of Licenses and Inspections was asked whether he had accepted gifts and gratuities over the past 2 years. He replied in the affirmative and a copy of his report is enclosed.

While the Board of Commissioners believes that the allegations of widespread graft and corruption were not substantiated by the police investigation, they do believe that the present administrative procedures are very inadequate. Steps are being taken to study and strengthen these procedures and every effort will be made to preclude a repetition of those matters brought out by the investigation.

You will be subsequently notified of any final actions taken by the Board as a result of the police investigation.

I believe that I should point out that the Chief of Police has written to the Board of Commissioners pertaining to the police investigation and stated that "consideration be given to the request of employees and others in the building industry that their statements be retained in as confidential a status as possible least they be subjected to reprisal measures because of the disclosures contained therein."

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

C. M. Duke,
Brigadier General, U.S. Army, Engineer Commissioner.

Enclosures.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank Commissioners Duke, Tobriner, and Duncan, the Chief of Police, and Deputy Chief Lorraine Johnson for the very able service they have rendered my subcommittee in carrying out the request that I made of them nearly a year ago.

I thank the Senator from North Carolina very much for yielding to me.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 680, H.R. 77.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this is only the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The motion is debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion, of course, is debatable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This puts us back where we started.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Exactly.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period from now until 2:45 p.m. be set aside for the transaction of routine morning business, and that statements made therein be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this evening, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEATH OF DR. HOMI BHABHA, CHAIRMAN OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION OF INDIA

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the death of Dr. Homi Bhabha, chairman of India's Atomic Energy Commission, is a severe loss to international science. He was not only a tremendous asset to India in her efforts for scientific development but he was also universally recognized and respected for his talent and his zeal in employing scientific developments for the benefit of all mankind.

PRESENTATION OF NATIONAL VETERANS AWARD TO DAVID SARNOFF, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, RADIO CORPORATION OF AMERICA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, for 19 years the city of Birmingham has recognized Veterans Day with a series of outstanding programs. Birmingham's ceremonies began even before November 11 was designated Veterans Day by the Congress.

I had the pleasure of introducing Gen. David Sarnoff last November 10 when he received the National Veterans Award at the Birmingham celebration. In accepting the award, General Sarnoff made an outstanding address.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Record so that it may be read by many Americans who did not have the privilege of hearing it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Second American Revolution

(Address by David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corporation of America, at the National Veterans Award Dinner, Birmingham, Ala., November 10, 1965, when he was presented with the 1965 National Veterans Award)

Senator Sparkman, fellow veterans, distinguished guests, no honor could be more meaningful to me than one which comes from my former colleagues in uniform. I am deeply grateful for this recognition, and I am proud to have my name associated with the distinguished Americans who have previously received the National Veterans Award.

For the past 19 years, this patriotic observance in Birmingham has led the Nation in paying homage to the men and women who have helped to secure our country as the citadel of liberty. The servicemen's and civic organizations, as well as the leaders of this community, deserve the commendation of every American for focusing national attention on November 11 as a day of tribute to all our veterans, past and present, who have contributed so profoundly to the well-being of this great Republic.

Tomorrow is perhaps the most solemn of our national holidays, for it bears witness to Americans that peace cannot be maintained nor freedom assured without sacrifice. With our young men fighting and dying in remote lands, this Veterans Day serves notice to all of us that liberty is not bestowed as the permanent possession of anyone and that each generation must be prepared to earn it anew.

COMMUNISM'S CHALLENGE TO THE FREE WORLD

Today, the freedom that we cherish is under assault around the world—from the rice paddies of southeast Asia beyond the China Sea to the remote Himalayas; from the oil-rich nations of the Middle East to the encircled outpost of West Berlin; from the heart of tropical Africa to the neighboring shores of the Caribbean.

Our adversary is as formidable and treacherous as freemen have ever faced. It is world communism. Its aim, today as always, is the destruction of the social, political, and economic structure that has been evolved over the centuries by the nations of the Western world.

The threat which this adversary poses is far more than that of military power alone. It is equally a psychological thrust, cloaked in every conceivable form of deception and brought to bear with great skill and cunning wherever freedom flourishes.

Only 2 months ago, in early September, a new dimension was added to the great conflict of our time by the most aggressive branch of the Communist family. Red China unveiled a doctrinal program equivalent to a declaration of war—military, economic, and psychological war to the finish—against the whole non-Communist world. More than that, it presented in detail a strategy by which the West—with the United States specified as the main enemy—is to be systematically harassed, isolated, cornered, and crushed.

Mao Tse-tung, with relatively small and weak forces, succeeded in seizing control of all China. The methods he used are now prescribed for Communists everywhere, to be applied on a global scale. The objective is to defeat and conquer the free world despite its immense military and nuclear superiority. The basic strategy rests on guerrilla operations in the countryside and villages, gradually encircling and then strangling the cities.

In the Chinese scheme, Asia, Africa, and Latin America are designated as the "rural areas of the world," with the industrialized West as the "cities" to be isolated and finally reduced to subjection. The first stage of this deadly effort—an attempt to establish a power base in the underdeveloped continents—is already well underway.

The tactical patterns differ, but the strategic doctrine of rural encirclement is apparent in southeast Asia, in Indonesia, in central Africa, and in the Communist-led banditry that is creating turmoil in Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, and other Latin American countries.

The crucial immediate test of the great communist offensive against freedom is, of course, in Vietnam. This is why it is imperative that we frustrate the Red aggression in that country and thus prevent its spread to other lands.

President Johnson recognizes this clearly and, despite the highly publicized demonstrations of a noisy minority, has the firm support of the American people.

There is no quick or cheap response to the Chinese communist challenge. Other Vietnams and other Congos may erupt wherever our adversary sees a prospective advantage to be gained by guerrilla action or direct invasion. We must be prepared to accept these possibilities resolutely and unflinchingly.

But even victory in such conflicts—vital as it is—is not conclusive, for these are essentially wars of containment. Success here is measured primarily by the degree to which we prevent further Communist encroachment upon the free areas of the world.

OUR RESPONSE TO THE COMMUNIST CHALLENGE

If we are to strike at the heart of the Communist grand design of rural conquest, we must also combat and conquer the principal forces which serve that design.

Throughout vast regions of the world, an immense burden of poverty, hunger, illiteracy, and disease weighs upon the majority of mankind. These are the apocalyptic allies of communism. There are the principal causes of unrest and the spawning grounds of violence. Where they continue to prevail, communism will endeavor to exploit them with mounting effect.

Yet, as they summon the underprivileged to revolution, the communists are in effect defrauding mankind. They have distorted the purpose of revolution to serve their own ends. We, and free men everywhere, know that true revolution expresses the hope of all men for a better life in a world of peace and freedom.

When we speak of a rural revolution, let us remember that this was first an American term, applied to the farmers of Lexington and Concord who fired the shot heard round the world. It was not the Communist Manifesto but the Declaration of Independence that expressed the right of all men to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Today, I believe we have it within our power to demonstrate the strength of our historic American principles with such clarity that the pretensions of communism can be totally exposed and its designs finally thwarted.

The instrument that we possess is technology—the application of science to human need. It is generating a second American revolution that will have as great an impact as the first upon this Nation and the world.

In the 19th century, America relied primarily upon manpower to protect itself against all enemies.

In the first half of the 20th century, it added industrial power—the capacity to mass produce vast numbers of weapons for the use of our Armed Forces and our allies.

In the second half of this century, technological power has emerged as a new and potent force. Our national defenses now reach into laboratories and engineering centers to enlist the men and women who develop the new scientific concepts, the new techniques, and the new tools of the future. Already, technology has given us advanced weapons systems capable of devastating response to any direct military assault upon us or our allies. The maintenance and the continued refinement of that retaliatory capability are a primary national objective.

Modern technology also is the basis of the prosperity of this Nation and its industrialized partners in the free world. But beyond that, technology has given us the ability to create a better life for millions, while the fulfillment of the Communist grand design depends upon their continued poverty and misery.

HOW TECHNOLOGY CAN SERVE FREEDOM

Applied wisely to the underdeveloped continents, the technological revolution can remove the vast distinctions between the rural areas and the cities. It can extend everywhere the same opportunities for greater well-being, the same technologies and resources, and the same means of using them. In short, this second American revolution can accomplish all that communism has promised and never delivered, and it can do so by using the implements of technology for constructive purposes.

To achieve victory in this worldwide contest, we must focus upon four principal human needs: power, food, health, and knowledge. These are the ingredients of a better life, and in each of them we possess a truly enormous potential.

Energy is the prime physical factor that determines whether a nation remains in the Middle Ages or emerges into the 20th century. Today, the underdeveloped nations of Asia and Latin America, with nearly 70 percent of the world's population, produce less than 20 percent of the world's power.

But technology now promises, within a few decades, means to produce energy in all but limitless quantity anywhere in the world. By the end of this century, for example, atomic generating plants will be commonplace, and their location will not be limited by the need for nearby sources of conventional fuel or waterpower. Small atomic power units that run for years without refueling will be available to furnish electricity for isolated villages.

Eventually, present-day experiments will lead to practical powerplants based on controlled thermonuclear fusion—the process that occurs uncontrolled in the hydrogen bomb. The fuel for the fusion process abounds in water, and we will thus become able to draw in endless supply from all the oceans of the world.

To the millions who are without electricity, and even without machines or the fuel to run them, the development and application of technology in this field will open a new world of productivity.

Food is the second critical factor in the global conflict. In this vital area, we enjoy a clear and growing advantage since the fallacies of communism in practice are most obvious in agriculture.

In China, always beset by food shortages and famine, these evils have been tragically deepened under communism. Only 2 weeks ago, China's Red masters were forced to purchase $400 million of Canadian wheat to avert further famine. This is in dramatic contrast to the comparative self-sufficiency in food of neighboring countries like Japan, Thailand, and especially Taiwan or Formosa.

East European nations like Poland, Hungary, and Rumania, which in the past were able to feed themselves and export large surpluses, are now, under communism, dependent on imports of grain and other staples.

The eastern segment of Germany used to feed itself and the rest of that country. Today, under its Communist system, it has to impose food rationing. The same is true in Communist Cuba.

Russia itself, despite backwardness in other respects and primitive agricultural methods, was a great food-exporting nation until the advent of communism. Now, after nearly half a century of Red rule, chronic shortages of food are the Soviet Union's greatest problem. Year after year, the Kremlin has been obliged to import substantial quantities of grain from the West.

Whatever else may be claimed by apologists for communism, its failures in farming are too conspicuous to be concealed or denied. In the free world, technology has given us mounting surpluses of all the staples of life. In the United States, the average farmer now grows enough to feed 23 people besides himself.

By contrast, in many underdeveloped areas—and in nearly the whole Communist bloc—it requires from 2 to 10 people to feed only 1 additional person. And perhaps a third of all the food grown in these areas rots in the field because there is no way to move it to market.

Great progress can be achieved in filling the world's food needs through methods now in advance development. The use of cheap energy will speed the introduction of desalinizing plants to adapt ocean water to irrigation for millions of barren acres. New types of fertilizers will multiply the productivity of land everywhere, and there is the early prospect of new synthetic foods and of harvesting crops from the ocean. Vastly improved methods of distribution and food preservation will enable us to get food where it is needed, when it is needed.

The third key to our counterstrategy is health. The average child born in any of the advanced countries of the West can expect to live to the age of 70. In the underdeveloped lands, the expected span of life ranges from 29 to 39 years. Of those fewer years, many will be marked by malnutrition, debiliating illness, and related factors that hinder useful activity and breed despair.

Our technology has achieved many spectacular triumphs in the conquest of disease and in the techniques of surgery. Much more will be achieved in the near future, and we shall benefit most directly by the increasing health and vigor of our children and those who follow them. As science gains greater understanding of the factors that determine heredity, healthier strains of plants and animals will be developed. We may even learn how to enhance the desirable qualities in human beings.

Just as our own Nation will benefit from these advances, the spread of new medical knowledge and techniques can do much to increase the lifespan and improve the health of millions who inhabit the vulnerable flank that our Communist adversary now seeks to conquer. This is above all a humanitarian goal, but the reward of effective planning and action would be strategic as well.

In the fourth critical area, the spread of knowledge, our strongest weapon is the technology of communications. Mass illiteracy and primitive communications serve to perpetuate human backwardness. In 100 countries of the world, fewer than half of the people can read and write, and in at least a score of other countries only 1 person in 20 knows how to sign his name. Under these conditions, economic development is difficult or impossible, and the half-truth or the distortion of the propagandist goes unchallenged by the fact.

The communications technology we are now developing can be a massive channel for the exchange of ideas, the growth of knowledge, and the spread of understanding in every part of the world.

Within 5 to 10 years, the most remote village can have simultaneous access to the same information that is available in the largest cities of the world. Broadcasting satellites, orbiting in fixed positions far above the equatorial regions of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, will be able to beam radio and television programs directly to home receivers over vast areas.

Similar satellites will provide two-way communications between these areas and all other parts of the world. We can overcome centuries of isolation and ignorance in the fraction of a second that it takes an electronic signal to leap from ground to satellite and back again to earth.

This Nation now leads the world in the technology of satellite communications and in the related fields of television broadcasting and high-capacity radio transmission. We are applying this technical leadership to the development of improved global communications systems that will speed the flow of world trade and strengthen both our national security and international understanding.

We shall be remiss if we do not also seek to develop the potential of this technology for raising levels of literacy and learning everywhere. With greater knowledge will come more rapid material progress in the underdeveloped areas, and with material progress will come a lessening of the pressures to employ violent means for radical ends.

These are not fanciful visions or remote prospects that I have outlined here. In each of these four aspects of emerging technology, we already possess the essential tools for countering the spurious revolution of communism with a genuine technological revolution whose result can be the satisfaction of human needs in a peaceful world.

We can—if we will—develop the means to abolish most starvation and malnutrition by the end of this century.

We can achieve the ability to tap virtually limitless energy for use throughout the world.

We can add new years and health to human life.

We can make knowledge the common property of all who have eyes to see and ears to hear, from the most isolated settlement to the most populated cities.

Just as Communist growth is rooted in frustration, it withers as the causes of the frustration are removed. Therefore, to the extent that we apply our technology to the needs of others, we strengthen ourselves. In this way, we can blunt the Communist thrust and defeat its objective of encircling and conquering the free world.

VICTORY REQUIRES PATRIOTIC DEDICATION

At the same time, let us remember that while technology can be the principal instrument for the peaceful victory of freedom, it is only an instrument. Its effective use requires our will, our wisdom, our dedication, and our faith.

To keep America free and brighten the world for all people, we must apply the products of science and technology in the spirit of service that has traditionally animated America. It has shown forth in the patriotism, courage, and endurance that have provided the most glorious pages in our history from Valley Forge to Belleau Wood, Iwo Jima to Bastogne, Inchon, and now Vietnam.

In the years ahead, we shall face an unremitting demand for these qualities, so eloquently expressed in this inspiring National Veterans Day observance and so ably upheld by the nine great patriotic organizations that sponsor it. Our readiness to sacrifice for freedom will be tested repeatedly in many corners of the world. Wherever we appear to falter, or display disillusion or indifference or fatigue, we shall find the adversary ready to exploit our weakness.

But the record of the recent past and the conditions of the present demonstrate that we can, when we are so determined, take great strides in the cause of freedom.

When Europe was prostrate in 1949, we directed our resources through the Marshall plan to help restore the economic strength of the free nations.

When the Soviet blockade threatened the life of West Berlin, we made clear, at the risk of war, our determination to sustain the city's freedom.

When Communist invaders thrust across the 38th parallel in Korea, we led the forces of the free world in resisting and ultimately repelling the assault.

When Soviet missiles threatened us from Cuba, we stood firm in our insistence upon their removal, whatever the sacrifice that might have been required.

Today, it is Vietnam; tomorrow it may be other points along the frontiers of freedom But, if we preserve our essential military financial, and economic strengths, if we maintain our faith in ourselves and the principles for which this Nation stands, then time and history will be our allies.

Time is our ally because science and technology continue to lend gathering force to the second American revolution. Here, and in the nations that share with us a common purpose, scientific progress far outpaces the very limited achievements of the Communist world in the areas of basic human needs.

History is our ally because of the principles that we seek to uphold. History has shown that no people, given decent living standards and hope for improvement in a climate of freedom, will choose to enslave their minds and spirits in the type of system advocated by the rulers of China or Russia.

We defend the right to think, to speak, and to live as we wish. We are the custodians of a heritage gained for us at great sacrifice by millions of brave men and women through generations of American history and by the intrepid American soldiers, sailors, and airmen who have given their lives in defense of these principles.

Today, in the face of an unprecedented assault upon the principles that we cherish, let us respond boldly and effectively in their defense. Let us proclaim the second American revolution as a new and vital force that combines our heritage of freedom with the immensely powerful instrument of technology. Let us use it to lift the hopes of people everywhere—for this is the surest course to final victory.

SCHOOL MILK BUDGET FOR FISCAL 1967 A TRAVESTY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, day after day I have been rising on this floor to criticize the Bureau of the Budget's directive that $3 million appropriated by Congress for the special milk program for schoolchildren not be spent. The Bureau's action will cripple a highly popular and badly needed program at a time when program participation is increasing by 5 percent a year.

My colleagues can imagine my surprise when I learned late Friday that the school milk program for fiscal 1967 was pegged at $21 million in the President's budget. This cut of $82 million is difficult, if not impossible, to understand. The Department of Agriculture has given no help. Both on Friday and Monday my office contacted the Department for information. My staff was told that representatives of the Department were willing to meet with me to discuss the matter, but could not give details over the telephone. I was also invited to submit questions.

Mr. President, I am going to raise these questions on the floor of the Senate today. I have waited long enough to comment on this travesty of a school milk budget for 1967. This program is too vital for me to withhold comment so that the Department of Agriculture can laboriously grind out their legislative recommendations.

A full explanation of the proposed cut in the school milk program should have been available at the time the budget was submitted to Congress. Instead, Congress was given only one sentence to ponder. In part 4 of the budget—"The Federal Program by Function"—we are told:

> The special milk program, which permits schools to sell milk at reduced prices, will be directed primarily to helping needy children in 1967, thereby permitting a reduction of $52 million in expenditures.

My basic question, Mr. President, is whether or not this program reorientation will require an onerous means test for children receiving milk under the program. Nothing is more abhorrent in my mind than requiring first and second graders to give evidence that Dad is too poor to pay for a half-pint of milk, but this is exactly what a means test would require. If no means test is required, then how are we to make sure that this milk goes only to the needy?

One apparent method would be to confine the school milk program to those schools in which a high percentage of the students come from needy families. This would be directly discriminatory against tens of thousands of children whose families are very needy, but who happen to go to schools where most of the students have families of adequate income.

Next, I would like to know how much of a saving this really represents. Will the Federal Government not have to step up its payments under the milk price support laws as less milk is used in the schools due to a reduction in Federal support for the school milk program? Certainly milk not used in the program is going to add to the existing surplus which must be purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation at 75 percent of parity.

Has the Department made any estimate of the decrease in milk consumption by schoolchildren this program cutback will create? Certainly it will cause a substantial drop in consumption. If a means test is used, many parents will be too proud to let their children go through the indignity of receiving a Government handout, yet too poor to give their children money to purchase school milk.

Does the Department expect local school districts to have increased costs because of the school milk program slash? Will this 80-percent cutback mean a further strain on already overtaxed school budgets at the very time when the Federal Government is working to relieve existing strain through programs such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965?

Does this new program reorientation require substantive legislation? I have reason to believe that it does, Mr. President. Consequently, the next question assumes increased importance. If new legislative authority is not forthcoming will the administration recommend that the program remain at this year's level, or at a higher level?

President Johnson said in his state of the Union address:

> There are men who cry out that we must sacrifice. Well, let us rather ask them, who will they sacrifice? Are they going to sacrifice the children who seek the learning?

I profoundly hope that this new approach to the school milk program does not ask such a sacrifice. I profoundly hope that the program will not result in children getting less milk. But until I get answers to the questions I have raised on this floor today I must continue to speak against the recent steps which, in the absence of further evidence, seem aimed at making a travesty out of the school milk program.

Mr. YARBOROUGH subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] concerning the stunning reduction by 80 percent in the budget for milk for schoolchildren. I do not see how we can save money by starving schoolchildren.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

DEMONSTRATION CITIES ACT OF 1966—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 368)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Nineteen hundred and sixty-six can be the year of rebirth for American cities.

This Congress, and this people, can set in motion forces of change in great urban areas that will make them the masterpieces of our civilization.

Fifty years from now our population will reach that of today's India. Our grandchildren will inhabit a world as different from ours, as ours is from the world of Jefferson.

None can predict the shape of their life with any certainty. Yet one thing is sure. It will be lived in cities. By the year 2000, four out of five Americans will live and work in a metropolitan area.

We are not strangers to an urban world.

We began our national life gathered in towns along the Atlantic seaboard. We built new commercial centers around the Great Lakes and in the Midwest to serve our westward expansion.

Forty million came from Europe to fuel our economy and enrich our community life. This century has seen the steady and rapid migration of farm families—seeking jobs and the promise of the city.

From this rich experience we have learned much.

We know that cities can stimulate the best in man, and aggravate the worst.

We know the convenience of city life, and its paralysis.

We know its promise, and its dark foreboding.

What we may only dimly perceive is the gravity of the choice before us.

Shall we make our cities livable for ourselves and our posterity? Or shall we by timidity and neglect damn them to fester and decay?

If we permit our cities to grow without rational design, if we stand passively by, while the center of each city becomes a hive of deprivation, crime, and hopelessness; if we devour the countryside as though it were limitless, while our ruins—millions of tenement apartments and dilapidated houses—go unredeemed; if we become two people—the suburban affluent and the urban poor, each filled with mistrust and fear one for the other; if this is our desire and policy as a people, then we shall effectively cripple each generation to come.

We shall as well condemn our own generation to a bitter paradox: an educated, wealthy, progressive people, who would not give their thoughts, their resources, or their wills to provide for their common well-being.

I do not believe such a fate is either necessary or inevitable. But I believe this will come to pass—unless we commit ourselves now to the planning, the building, the teaching, and the caring that alone can forestall it.

That is why I am recommending today a massive demonstration cities program. I recommend that both the public and private sectors of our economy join to build in our cities and towns an environment for man equal to the dignity of his aspirations.

I recommend an effort larger in scope, more comprehensive, more concentrated—than any that has gone before.

THE WORK OF THE PAST

I know the work of the past three decades. I have shared in the forging of our Federal housing and renewal programs. I know what they have done for millions of urban Americans:

Eight million single-family dwellings assisted by the Federal Housing Administration.

An additional 6.7 million assisted by the Veterans' Administration.

One million, one hundred thousand multiple units created; 605,000 families moved out of decayed and unsanitary dwellings into decent public housing; 300,000 dwelling units supported under urban renewal.

Without these programs, the goal I recommend today would be impossible to achieve. Because Federal sponsorship is so effective a part of our system of homebuilding, we can conceive a far larger purpose than it has yet fulfilled. We must make use of every established housing program—and of social, educational, and economic instruments as well—if the demonstration cities program is to succeed.

THE PROBLEM TODAY

Our housing programs have built a platform, from which we may see how far away is the reborn city we desire. For there still remain: some 4 million urban families living in homes of such disrepair as to violate decent housing standards; the need to provide over 30 percent more housing annually than we are currently building; our chronic inability to provide sufficient low and moderate income housing, of adequate quality, at a reasonable price; the special problem of the poor and the Negro, unable to move freely from their ghettoes, exploited in the quest for the necessities of life; increasing pressures on municipal budgets, with large city per capita expenditures rising 36 percent in the 3 years after 1960; the high human costs: crime, delinquency, welfare loads, disease, and health hazards. This is man's fate in those broken neighborhoods where he can "feel the enclosure of the flaking walls and see through the window the blackened reflection of the tenement across the street that blocks out the world beyond"; the tragic waste and, indeed, the chaos that threatens where children are born into the stifling air of overcrowded rooms, destined for a poor diet, inadequate schools, streets of fear and sordid temptation, joblessness, and the gray anxiety of the ill prepared; and the flight to the suburbs of more fortunate men and women, who might have provided the leadership and the means for reversing this human decline.

THE INADEQUATE RESPONSE

Since 1949, the urban renewal program has been our chief instrument in the struggle for a decent urban environment.

Over 800 cities are participating in urban renewal programs. Undertaken and designed by the cities themselves, these efforts have had an increasing influence on the use of urban land. Last year the Congress wisely extended the authorization for urban renewal, at a higher level than before.

Years of experience with urban renewal have taught us much about its strengths and weaknesses.

Since 1961 we have made major alterations in its administration. We have made it more responsive to human needs. We have more vigorously enforced the requirement of a workable program for the entire community. Within the limits of current law, we have achieved considerable progress toward these goals.

Nevertheless the social and psychological effects of relocating the poor have not always been treated as what they are. They are the unavoidable consequences of slum clearance, demanding as much concern as physical redevelopment.

The size and scale of urban assistance has been too small, and too widely dispersed.

Present programs are often prisoners of archaic and wasteful building practices. They have inhibited the use of modern technology. They have inflated the cost of rebuilding.

The benefits and efficiencies that can come from metropolitan planning are still unrealized in most urban regions.

Insufficient resources cause extensive delays in many projects. The result is growing blight and overcrowding that thwart our best efforts to resist them.

The goals of major Federal programs have often lacked cohesiveness. Some work for the revitalization of the central city. Some accelerate suburban growth. Some unite urban communities. Some disrupt them.

URBAN DILEMMAS

Virtually every forward step we have taken has had its severe limitations. Each of those steps has involved a public choice, and created a public dilemma: major clearance and reconstruction, with its attendant hardships of relocation; relieving traffic congestion, thereby widening the gulf between the affluence of suburbia and the poverty of the city; involving urban residents in redeveloping their own areas, hence lengthening the time and increasing the cost of the job; preserving the autonomy of local agencies, thus crippling our efforts to attack regional problems on a regional basis.

These dilemmas cannot be completely resolved by any single program, no matter how well designed. The prize—cities of spacious beauty and lively promise, where men are truly free to determine how they will live—is too rich to be lost because the problems are complex.

Let there be debate over means and priorities.

Let there be experiment with a dozen approaches, or a hundred.

But let there be commitment to that goal.

WHAT IS REQUIRED

From the experience of three decades, it is clear to me that American cities require a program that will: concentrate our available resources—in planning tools, in housing construction, in job training, in health facilities, in recreation, in welfare programs, in education—to improve the conditions of life in urban areas; join together all available talent and skills in a coordinated effort; mobilize local leadership and private initiative, so that local citizens will determine the shape of their new city—freed from the constraints that have handicapped their past efforts and inflated their costs.

A DEMONSTRATION CITIES PROGRAM

I propose a demonstration cities program that will offer qualifying cities of all sizes the promise of a new life for their people.

I propose that we make massive additions to the supply of low- and moderate-cost housing.

I propose that we combine physical reconstruction and rehabilitation with effective social programs throughout the rebuilding process.

I propose that we achieve new flexibility in administrative procedures.

I propose that we focus all the techniques and talents within our society on the crisis of the American city.

It will not be simple to qualify for such a program. We have neither the means nor the desire to invest public funds in an expensive program whose net effects will be marginal, wasteful, or visible only after protracted delay.

We intend to help only those cities who help themselves.

I propose these guidelines for determining a city's qualifications for the benefits—and achievements—of this program:

First. The demonstration should be of sufficient magnitude both in its physical and social dimensions to arrest blight and decay in entire neighborhoods. It must make a substantial impact within the coming few years on the development of the entire city.

Second. The demonstration should bring about a change in the total environment of the area affected. It must provide schools, parks, playgrounds, community centers, and access to all necessary community facilities.

Third. The demonstration—from its beginning—should make use of every available social program. The human cost of reconstruction and relocation must be reduced. New opportunities for work and training must be offered.

Fourth. The demonstration should contribute to narrowing the housing gap between the deprived and the rest of the community. Major additions must be made to the supply of sound dwellings. Equal opportunity in the choice of housing must be assured to every race.

Fifth. The demonstration should offer maximum occasions for employing residents of the demonstration area in all phases of the program.

Sixth. The demonstration should foster the development of local and private initiative and widespread citizen participation—especially from the demonstration area—in the planning and execution of the program.

Seventh. The demonstration should take advantage of modern cost-reducing technologies without reducing the quality of the work. Neither the structure of real estate taxation, cumbersome building codes, nor inefficient building practices should deter rehabilitation or inflate project costs.

Eighth. The demonstration should make major improvements in the quality of the environment. There must be a high quality of design in new buildings, and attention to man's need for open spaces and attractive landscaping.

Ninth. The demonstration should make relocation housing available at costs commensurate with the incomes of those displaced by the project. Counseling services, moving expenses, and small business loans should be provided, together with assistance in job placement and retraining.

Tenth. The demonstration should be managed in each demonstration city by a single authority with adequate powers to carry out and coordinate all phases of the program. There must be a serious commitment to the project on the part of local, and where appropriate, State authorities. Where required to carry out the plan, agreements should be reached with neighboring communities.

Eleventh. The demonstration proposal should offer proof that adequate municipal appropriations and services are available and will be sustained throughout the demonstration period.

Twelfth. The demonstration should maintain or establish a residential character in the area.

Thirteenth. The demonstration should be consistent with existing development plans for the metropolitan areas involved. Transportation plans should coordinate every appropriate mode of city and regional transportation.

Fourteenth. The demonstration should extend for an initial 6-year period. It should maintain a schedule for the expeditious completion of the project.

These guidelines will demand the full cooperation of government at every level and of private citizens in each area. I believe our Federal system is creative enough to inspire that cooperative effort. I know it must be so creative if it is to prosper and flourish.

SIZE OF THE PROGRAM

The program I recommend is intended to eliminate blight in the entire demonstration area. Through efficient rebuilding it must replace that blight with attractive and economic housing, social services, and community facilities.

There are many ways by which this can be done, once the commitment has been made to do it. Total clearance and reconstruction; partial clearance and rehabilitation; rehabilitation alone—any of these methods may be chosen by local citizens.

Whatever approach is selected, however, must be comprehensive enough to be effective and economic.

There are few cities or towns in America which could not participate in the demonstration cities program. We shall take special care to see that urban communities of all sizes are included. For each such community, the impact of the program will be significant, involving as much as 15 to 20 percent of the existing substandard structures.

For the largest qualifying cities a relatively modest program could provide decent housing for approximately 5,000 families now living in substandard dwelling units. It could rehabilitate other marginal housing sufficient to affect 50,000 people. A typical program could well involve a total of 35,000 units or 100,000 people.

For cities of approximately 100,000 people, 1,000 families could be rehoused, and 3,000 units rehabilitated, affecting a total of 10,000 people.

BENEFITS OF THE PROGRAM

I recommend that participating cities receive two types of Federal assistance:

First. The complete array of all available grants and urban aids in the fields of housing, renewal, transportation, education, welfare, economic opportunity, and related programs.

Second. Special grants amounting to 80 percent of the non-Federal cost of our grant-in-aid programs included in the demonstration. These grants are to supplement the efforts of local communities. They are not to be substituted for those efforts.

In every qualifying city, a Federal coordinator would be assigned to assist local officials in bringing together all the relevant Federal resources.

Once authorized, the supplemental funds would be made available in a common account. They would be drawn at the discretion of the community to support the program. They would be certified by the Federal coordinator.

It is vital that incentives be granted for cost reductions achieved during the performance of the program.

At least as vital as the dollar commitment for rebuilding and rehabilitation is the social program commitment. We must link our concern for the total welfare of the person, with our desire to improve the physical city in which he lives. For the first time, social and construction agencies would be joined in a massive common effort, responsive to a common local authority.

There is another benefit—not measurable in dollars, or even in the extended range of social services—that qualifying cities would secure by participating in this program.

It is a sense of hope: that the city is not beyond reach of redemption by men of good will; that through wise planning, cooperation, hard work, and the sacrifice of those outmoded codes and practices that make widespread renewal impossibly expensive today, it is possible to reverse the city's decline.

That knowledge, that confidence, that hope can make all the difference in the decade ahead.

FEDERAL COST

Funds are required in the first year to assist our cities in the preparation of demonstration plans. We should not underestimate the problems involved in achieving such a plan. The very scale of the demonstration, its widespread and profound effects on the social and physical structure of the city, calls for marshaling the city's planning and administrative resources on an unprecedented scale.

I estimate the appropriate Federal contribution to this planning effort at $12 million.

For the supplemental demonstration grants I will recommend appropriations, over a 6-year period, totaling over $2.3 billion, or an average of some $400 million per year.

It is impossible to estimate exactly—but it is necessary to consider—the rising cost of welfare services, crime prevention, unemployment, and declining property values that will plague all governments, local, State, and Federal, if we do not move quickly to heal and revitalize our cities.

METROPOLITAN PLANNING

The success of each demonstration will depend on the quality of its planning, and the degree of cooperation it elicits from the various governmental bodies concerned, as well as from private interests.

Most metropolitan areas conduct some degree of metropolitan planning now. The Federal Government has made funds available throughout the country so that State and local planning agencies might devise—many for the first time—comprehensive plans for metropolitan areas.

I recommend improvements and extensions of this program. The Congress enacted them recognizing that the problems of growth, transportation, housing, and public services cannot be considered by one entity of government alone.

The absence of cooperation between contiguous areas is wasteful. It is also blind to the reality of urban life. What happens in the central city, or the suburb, is certain to affect the quality of life in the other.

The widespread demand for these funds has resulted in their being spread thinly across the 50 States. Thus, the benefits of a truly coordinated attack on metropolitan problems have not generally been realized.

INCENTIVES TO ORDERLY METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

Over the past 5 years, the Congress has authorized Federal grants for urban mass transportation, open space, and sewer and water facilities. The Congress has required that such projects be consistent with comprehensive planning for an entire urban or metropolitan area. The Federal Government has thus not only helped our localities to provide the facilities they need. It has also stimulated cooperation and joint planning among neighboring jurisdictions.

But more remains to be done. The powerful forces of urban growth threaten to overwhelm efforts to achieve orderly development. A metropolitan plan should be an instrument for shaping sound urban growth—not a neglected document.

I now propose a new incentive to help assure that metropolitan plans achieve their potential.

The Federal Government should bear a larger share of the total cost of related Federal aid programs. This share would be borne where local jurisdictions show that they are ready to be guided by their own plans in working out the patterns of their own development and where they establish the joint institutional arrangements necessary to carry out those plans.

DEMONSTRATIONS OF EFFECTIVE PLANNING

I propose that a series of demonstrations in effective metropolitan planning be undertaken promptly.

Metropolitan areas would be selected to return the broadest possible data and experience to Federal, State, and local governments. They should therefore be of varying size and environment, in widely separated locations. They would be selected to assure that their benefits reach small communities surrounding the large cities.

Advanced techniques and approaches should be employed. There must be balanced consideration of physical and human development programs; coordinated treatment of the regional transportation network; technical innovations, such as metropolitan data banks and systems analysis; new educational and training programs; new arrangements for coordinating decisions of the various local governments involved.

I estimate the cost of the demonstrations at $6,500,000.

I shall impose on the new Department of Housing and Urban Development the continuing responsibility to stimulate effective planning. If local governments do not plan cooperatively and sufficiently in advance of inevitable urban growth, even adequate funds and an aggressive determination to improve our cities cannot succeed.

HOUSING FOR ALL

The programs I have proposed—in rebuilding large areas of our cities, and in metropolitan planning—are essential for the rebirth of urban America.

Yet at the center of the cities' housing problem lies racial discrimination. Crowded miles of inadequate dwellings—poorly maintained and frequently overpriced—is the lot of most Negro Americans in many of our cities. Their avenue of escape to a more attractive neighborhood is often closed, because of their color.

The Negro suffers from this, as do his children. So does the community at large. Where housing is poor, schools are generally poor. Unemployment is widespread. Family life is threatened. The community's welfare burden is steadily magnified. These are the links in the chain of racial discrimination.

This administration is working to break that chain—through aid to education, medical care, community action programs, job retraining, and the maintenance of a vigorous economy.

The time has come when we should break one of its strongest links—the often subtle, but always effective force of housing discrimination. The impacted racial ghetto will become a thing of the past only when the Negro American can move his family wherever he can afford to do so.

I shall, therefore, present to the Congress at an early date legislation to bar racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing.

NEW COMMUNITIES

Our existing urban centers, however revitalized, cannot accommodate all the urban Americans of the next generation.

Three million new residents are added each year to our present urban population. The growth of new communities is inevitable. Unless they are to be casual parts of a general urban sprawl, a new approach to their design is required.

We must: enlarge the entire scale of the building process; make possible new efficiencies in construction, land development, and municipal services; relieve population densities; offer a variety of homes to a wide range of incomes.

These communities must also provide an environment harmonious to man's needs.

They must offer adequate transportation systems, attractive community buildings, and open spaces free from pollution. They must retain much of the natural beauty of the landscape.

The private sector must continue its prominent role in new community development. As I recommended to the Congress last year, mortgage insurance should be made available for sites and community facilities for entire new communities.

It is apparent that new communities will spring into being near an increasing number of major metropolitan areas. Some, already in existence, promise dramatic efficiencies through size and new construction techniques, without sacrificing beauty. Obviously such a development should be encouraged. I recommend that the Congress provide the means of doing so.

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

Rarely has a new housing program evoked such a dramatic and positive response as the rent supplement program.

The Department of Housing and Urban Affairs has already received preliminary proposals from sponsors to construct nearly 70,000 low-income units under this program as soon as funds become available.

The proposals involve 424 projects in 265 localities in 43 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The sponsors have already selected sites for some 40,000 of these units. The interested groups are about equally divided between nonprofit organizations and private limited dividend developers.

The need for this program is obvious. It is the need of the poor and the disadvantaged. The demand for the means to meet this need by private enterprise is demonstrated by the figures I have just cited.

I strongly urge the Congress to pass a supplementary appropriation to fund the rent supplement program at the $30 million level it has authorized in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

MASS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

We must continue to help our communities meet their increasing needs for mass transportation facilities. For this purpose, I propose an additional 1-year authorization for the urban mass transportation program.

THE NEW DEPARTMENT

No Federal program can be effective unless the agency that administers it is efficient. This is even more crucial for programs that call for comprehensive approaches at both the Federal and local level.

Progress was made after 1961 toward unifying the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But the very nature of that Agency limited the extent to which its several parts could be welded into a truly unified whole. Its Administrator lacked the statutory basis for gaining full control over partially independent agencies.

With this in mind, I requested—and you enacted—legislation to create a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

As a result, the Secretary of the new Department now has the authority and the machinery for implementing the new programs I have asked for.

I see five ways by which he can do this:

First. He can organize the Department so that its emphasis will be upon meeting modern urban needs—rather than fitting new programs into old and outworn patterns.

Second. He can strengthen the regional structure so that more decisions can be made in the field.

Third. He can assert effective leadership throughout the Department.

Fourth. He can mesh together all our social and physical efforts to improve urban living.

Fifth. He can assume leadership among intergovernmental agencies dealing with urban problems.

Such a Department, and such leadership, will be worthy of the program I recommend you adopt.

A YEAR OF REBIRTH

The evidence is all about us that to be complacent about the American city is to invite, at best, inconvenience; at worst, a divided Nation.

The programs I have proposed in this message will require a determined commitment of our energy and a substantial commitment of our funds.

Yet, these programs are well within our resources. Nor do they compare in cost with the ugliness, hostility, and hopelessness of unlivable cities.

What would it mean to begin now, and to bring about the rebirth of our cities?

It would mean: a more tolerable and a more hopeful life for millions of Americans; the possibility of retaining middle-income families in the city, and even attracting some to return; improving the cities' tax base, at a time of heavy strain on city budgets; ultimately reducing welfare costs; avoiding the unnecessary waste of human resources; giving to both urban and suburban families the freedom to choose where they will live; a clean room and a patch of sky for every person, a chance to live near an open space, and to reach it on a safe street.

As Thomas Wolfe wrote:

> To every man his chance—to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining, golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him—this * * * is the promise of America.

I believe these are among the most profound aspirations of our people. I want to make them part of our destiny.

I urge the Congress promptly to adopt the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966. If we begin now the planning from which action will flow, the hopes of the 20th century will become the realities of the 21st.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 26, 1966.*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET, 1967—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 336)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I present the budget for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966.

The great domestic challenge of our time lies in our cities. Significant efforts are being undertaken to meet this challenge, and to make it possible for every citizen to lead a productive and satisfying life.

The Federal Government has a special responsibility for the Nation's Capital. We have long resolved that the District can and should be an example of the best among our urban communities, but in many ways the District continues to fall short of that goal.

Programs for the future must recognize that there is much room for improvement. Yet, even to avoid regression is both difficult and expensive. The District, as the central portion of a major metropolitan area, must cope with unusual demands.

The past decade, for example, has seen a substantial increase in the need for services to meet the requirements of a changing population. During that short span, while total population of the District remained virtually unchanged—

School-age population—5 to 19—increased by 23,700—15 percent.

Actual school enrollments increased more than 37,000—35 percent—due primarily to expanded kindergarten programs and a modestly successful program to reduce school dropouts.

Working-age population—20 to 64—decreased 21,100—4 percent.

The over-65 age group increased 14,000—24 percent.

The student group certainly, and the older age group in many cases, require greater public services and public facilities. These needs cannot be ignored.

The District must also replace and modernize a physical plant that is aged and rapidly becoming obsolete. Of the public schools, for example—

Over 38 percent were built totally or in part before 1920.

Over 60 percent have some substandard classrooms.

Yet, the demands of the rapidly increasing school population, combined with limited appropriations for school construction, have made it impossible even to house new students, much less to modernize the existing school plant. Indeed, there is no fact of which we should be less proud than that in the Capital City of this great Nation there are some 2,100 children compelled by lack of classroom space to accept part-time education.

These and other program demands mean, therefore, that an increased level of appropriations will be required. To some extent that increase has been held in check by the cost reduction and management improvement program developed by the Commissioners. This program, similar to that required in each Federal department and agency, will continue to help in holding down the need for additional personnel and other resources despite the rapidly increasing program requirements. Moreover, to increase even further the productivity of District agencies, I have directed the Bureau of the Budget to work closely with the Commissioners in the development of—

A planning, programing, and budgeting system.

New management techniques.

Improved methods and procedures.

Intensified use of data processing equipment.

In addition, I have insisted that the increases in expenditures reflected in this budget be held to the minimum needed to—

Assure continuation of essential services.

Provide an adequate level of staffing to carry out essential services.

Permit only such improvement in services as is required to assure an acceptable rate of progress toward our ultimate goals.

Revenues: Increases in District resources must, as always, come largely from local taxes. Commensurate increases in support by the Federal Government are necessary. The Federal payment, which is now authorized at $50 million, should be authorized at a substantially higher level by approval of the formula contained in H.R. 6889, and appropriations should be increased accordingly. That formula provides a fair, equitable, and flexible measure of the amount of Federal support that should be provided the District government. The need for this type of flexible authorization and the inadequacy of the present laws are apparent. In 1965, the formula would have authorized only $4.8 million more than the present authorization of $50 million. In 1967, the formula indicates $61.9 million as the appropriate level of support—$11.9 million more than is now authorized. The propriety of thus measuring the appropriate level of Federal support to the District has twice had the approval of the Senate. I urgently commend it.

Increases in District taxes to accompany the larger Federal payment should be substantially greater than the $4 million provided for the general fund in H.R. 11487, the revenue bill which has been passed by the House of Representatives. While it is true that the contribution made by District taxpayers has substantially increased in the past year, both through larger receipts from existing taxes and from the increase of 20 cents per $100 of assessed valuation in the real estate tax, these increases fall far short of meeting the District's needs. I support, therefore, the recommendation of the Commissioners to the Congress of a tax package which will increase tax revenues in the general fund by $8.4 million annually beyond those provided in H.R. 11487.

Requirements and financing of the general fund, 1966–72

[In millions of dollars]

	Estimates		Projections				
	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
Funds required:							
Under existing legislation:							
Operating expenses	280.1	307.3	322.6	338.7	355.6	373.4	392.1
Capital outlay:							
Public works, including Federal obligations (cash required)	37.1	48.3	54.6	53.7	53.9	52.6	50.0
Rail rapid transit system	2.0	8.5	39.5	------	------	------	------
Repayment of loans and interest:							
Loans for public works	1.9	2.0	3.3	4.8	6.2	7.7	9.2
Loans for rail rapid transit	------	------	.1	.2	1.4	3.0	3.0
Repayable advances	20.0	------	------	------	------	------	------
Total under existing legislation	341.1	366.1	420.1	397.4	417.1	436.7	454.3
Under proposed legislation:							
Operating expenses—Pay increases for teachers, policemen, and firemen	2.9	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Reserves for indefinite appropriation and contingencies	3.6	.6	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
Total estimated funds required	347.6	371.0	431.4	408.7	428.4	448.0	465.6

	Estimates		Projections				
	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
Revenues and balances:							
From existing legislative sources:							
Taxes, fees, etc.[1]	256.0	266.9	281.2	299.3	318.2	334.5	351.3
Balances	−1.4	4.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Federal payment	48.7	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Repayable advances	20.0	------	------	------	------	------	------
Loan authorization:							
Public works	22.4	17.2	20.3	9.0	------	------	------
Rail rapid transit	2.0	8.5	39.5	------	------	------	------
Total estimated availability from existing legislative sources	347.7	346.7	393.0	360.3	370.2	386.5	403.3
From proposed legislative sources:							
Taxes	1.0	12.4	12.7	13.0	13.4	13.7	14.2
Federal payment	------	11.9	14.4	16.9	20.9	25.1	28.0
Loan authorization—public works	------	------	------	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
Total from proposed legislative sources	1.0	24.3	27.1	49.9	54.3	58.8	62.2
Total estimated revenues and balances	348.7	371.0	420.1	410.2	424.5	445.3	465.5
Additional financing required to meet total estimated requirements	------	------	11.3	------	3.9	2.7	.1

---

[1] Includes recent increase in real estate tax rate from $2.50 to $2.70 per $100 assessed valuation in fiscal year 1966. Also, rate increase from $2.70 to $2.80 in fiscal year 1969 and from $2.80 to $2.90 in fiscal year 1970.

Borrowing: The authority of the District to borrow for general fund purposes is now fixed at $225 million, of which $50 million is specifically allocated for the purposes of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965. When this amount has been borrowed the authority will be exhausted, irrespective of repayments. This form of lump-sum authorization should be replaced by the provisions of H.R. 6889, which relate the maximum amount which the District may borrow from the Treasury to a percentage of the assessed value of real and personal property in the District. This would—

Conform to debt limits generally used throughout the United States for local governments.

Relate the debt limit more closely to ability to repay.

Enable the District to incur new debt as repayments are made. Since at current levels of annual borrowing the District will soon exhaust its present borrowing authorization for general public works purposes, this matter deserves prompt consideration by the Congress.

New obligational authority, all funds

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 actual	1966 estimate	1967 recommended
Current authorizations:			
Education:			
Operating expenses	72, 038	75, 727	82, 609
Capital outlay	14, 405	17, 569	32, 935
Welfare and health:			
Operating expenses	76, 154	80, 957	90, 549
Capital outlay	487	6, 014	4, 888
Highways and traffic:			
Operating expenses	13, 714	14, 197	14, 982
Capital outlay	13, 769	9, 852	15, 455
Public safety:			
Operating expenses	73, 724	80, 024	85, 752
Capital outlay	336	1, 687	2, 715
Parks and recreation:			
Operating expenses	10, 150	10, 972	12, 256
Capital outlay	680	1, 035	1, 896
General operating expenses:			
Operating expenses	19, 444	20. 550	22, 708
Capital outlay	5, 030	2, 111	1, 298
Sanitary engineering:			
Operating expenses	22, 385	23, 097	24, 248
Capital outlay	23, 066	12, 546	14, 107
Repayment of loans and interest	5, 363	5, 690	6, 078
Payment of District of Columbia share of Federal capital outlays	1, 860	987	1, 350
Contribution to rapid transit system	---------	2, 000	8, 525
Current authorizations—Continued			
Additional municipal services—inaugural ceremonies	283	---------	---------
Additional municipal services—Shrine and American Legion conventions	---------	221	233
Judgments, claims, and refunds	885	33	---------
Personal services, wage board employees	---------	660	1, 320
Total current authorizations	353, 773	365, 929	423, 904
Permanent authorizations	1, 626	1, 593	1, 637
Operations of District of Columbia trust funds	58, 178	58, 961	63, 480
Repayment (−) of advances from Federal funds	9, 000	−26, 000	---------
Proposed for separate transmittal (under proposed legislation)	---------	3, 000	4, 510
Total authorizations	422, 577	403, 483	493, 531
Recapitulation of current authorizations:			
General fund	298, 100	322, 863	371, 297
Highway fund	28, 876	25, 314	31, 719
Water fund	11, 049	10, 397	11, 884
Sanitary sewage works fund	15, 668	7, 270	8, 930
Metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund	80	85	74
Total, all funds	353, 773	365, 929	423, 904

With the additional revenues now being proposed, the District will measurably advance toward the goals outlined in my message to the Congress of February 15, 1965. Some of the more significant recommendations are—

EDUCATION

Operation of the school system in 1967 will require $82.6 million, an increase of $6.9 million over 1966. These increased funds will provide—

Additional classroom teachers needed to maintain the pupil-teacher ratios now in effect.

Additional positions in special subject areas such as science, mathematics, and reading needed to enrich and strengthen the District's educational program.

Addition of 24 librarians to provide 1 in every school in which physical facilities exist to house a library.

Additional counselors to achieve the Board of Education pupil-counselor ratios of 750 to 1 in elementary schools and 400 to 1 in secondary schools.

Four pupil personnel service teams. Each team will be composed of psychiatrists, clinical and school psychologists, social workers and attendance officers. They will be able to meet acute needs of literally thousands of pupils whose opportunities to achieve the maximum of their potentialities are now impaired because the schools do not have adequate information on their abilities, achievements, and emotional stability.

In addition, an increase in the salaries of teachers will be proposed to the Congress.

There has already been a substantial increase in funds available to the District school system through the several national programs for aid to education. In 1967, these funds will approximate $14.5 million. This Federal assistance has properly been concentrated in low-income areas of the city where the needs are the most severe, and potential for accomplishment is the greatest. While these funds make possible many improvements, they cannot and should not be used as a substitute for the basic educational program financed directly by the community. Together, however, the two sources of funds make the opportunities for major educational progress in the District brighter than ever.

The budget also includes $32.9 million for various stages of construction of 35 school construction projects, including 7 new schools, 18 additions to existing schools, and 10 school replacements, including the critically needed Shaw Junior High School. When they are all completed, they will provide 19,550 additional pupil spaces. This will, at long last, eliminate foreseeable part-time classes; and permit in 1968 the beginning of a concerted program to replace obsolete school buildings.

PUBLIC SAFETY

The budget provides $85.8 million for operating expenses for the District agencies concerned with public safety—an increase of $5.7 million over fiscal 1966.

Budget proposals for District agencies concerned with crime are necessarily made without benefit of the recommendations by the Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia which I appointed last July. That Commission, I hope and expect, will point the way toward further improvement of the District's efforts to achieve effective and fair law enforcement. Budget amendments appropriate in the light of its recommendations will be transmitted to the Congress promptly. I am determined that both citizens and visitors in our National Capital shall be secure in their persons and their property.

Pending receipt of the Commission's recommendations, however, we can proceed with confidence on several items. The pistol registration bill, S. 1632 and H.R. 6745, should be promptly enacted. The Police Department has been encountering great difficulties in recruiting qualified candidates. An increase in the salaries of policemen is necessary to bring the police force to its currently authorized strength. Legislation to accomplish this will be proposed to the Congress. A decision on increasing the authorized strength can await the Commission's report.

Funds are also appropriate, and are included in the budget, for several improvements that will enable the force to operate more effectively—

Civilian employees will be used to fill 31 administrative positions now filled by uniformed personnel who will be freed to utilize their training to greater advantage.

Closed-circuit, departmentwide television will be installed to increase the effectiveness of lineups and the efficiency of training programs.

A planning and development unit will be established to improve the utilization of computers and other technological advances in the field of crime prevention and control.

I am also recommending that the roving tactical force be continued in 1967. That force, the one-man scout cars, and the additional two-way radios for foot patrolmen, all provided last year, have contributed in a major way to the hopeful change in the trend of serious offenses reported in recent months.

Finally, there are funds for the more active recruitment that is needed to bring the police force to its authorized strength and for an increase from 25 to 60 trainees in the highly successful police cadet program.

Also, salary increases for firemen are proposed for later transmittal.

PARKS AND RECREATION

The budget provides those agencies concerned with parks and recreation with an increase of $1.3 million over the 1966 level of $11 million. Recreation facilities in the District remain well below needs and accepted standards. This is particularly unfortunate in areas where low incomes make it difficult for the residents to take advantage of facilities not in their immediate neighborhoods. Until these deficiencies can be remedied, maximum utilization must be made of existing facilities. This can be done only through the extension of hours during which facilities are open, and expansion of programs to enlarge the opportunity for participation by various age groups. The budget provides funds for these purposes, as well as $1.9 million for new facilities and expansion and improvement of those already in existence.

Funds are provided for an expansion of the roving leader program which has had a record of success with hard-to-reach delinquent and potentially delinquent youth. The budget also provides funds to enable the Recreation Department and the National Park Service to continue, in cooperation with the many nongovernmental efforts, to beautify the city, particularly through improved landscaping and planting. The needs of the Park Police for a larger force, and the National Zoological Park for increases in operating and maintenance staff, are likewise met.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

For health, welfare, and vocational rehabilitation programs for 1967, the budget proposes funds of $90.5 million, an increase of $9.6 million over 1966. These funds, together with the expanding levels of grants to the District for participation in Federal programs in these fields, will maintain the momentum already achieved in the District's public health and vocational rehabilitation efforts, substantially reduce the present deficiencies in the welfare program, and permit the District's full participation in the programs made possible by recent amendments in the Social Security Act.

In the field of public health the District is moving forward rapidly in the prevention and treatment of mental illness. Funds are provided to complete the staffing of the first of four community mental health centers, begun 2 years ago at District of Columbia General Hospital and operated during the past year with the aid of a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. The second center, to be located in the Northwest section of the District, will be a part of the Northwest Community Health Center for which site funds are requested. Funds are also requested for a demonstration project for the treatment of alcoholics on a volunteer basis. It is hoped that this program will reduce the burden now imposed on the police, the courts, and the correctional system by the chronic alcoholic.

Two demonstration projects heretofore operated with funds granted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the nursing home improvement program and the rheumatic fever prophylaxis program—have fully proven their usefulness, and are now proposed for partial financing by the District itself.

The welfare program must continue to meet the basic needs of the poor, the aged, and the disabled. This program has increasingly emphasized rehabilitation services which encourage and assist families in achievement of independence and self-sufficiency. This budget continues that emphasis.

Funds contained in this budget will permit the District to participate more fully in Federal programs. Maximum attention is paid to the needs of children. This is as it should be. Under this budget—

Additional staff will be provided to bring the number of social workers closer to the national standard of 60 cases per worker, particularly for families with dependent children, and to expedite the current welfare eligibility review.

Special programs will be continued and expanded to provide immediate help for families, not eligible for regular welfare services but who face crises which might result in family breakup.

Needy children of the unemployed will be assisted through an improved program, which will provide training and job placement assistance for their parents. This program will be closely related to title V of the Economic Opportunity Act and will be designed to reduce relief rolls by equipping parents for productive employment.

An enlarged child welfare staff will be provided.

Higher rates of payment will be made to foster parents and group foster homes.

Homemaker and day care services will be expanded.

The favorable results of special efforts which have contributed to a marked reduction in the population of Junior Village during 1965—from over 900 in February to 630 at the end of the year—make it the more imperative that these efforts be further intensified.

TRANSPORTATION

The Congress, at its last session, took a major step toward resolving one of the significant transportation problems of the National Capital region by authorizing construction within the District of the rail rapid transit system. The budget provides for the appropriation of a loan in the amount of $8.5 million to the District to enable it to meet its share of the cost of this project during 1967.

Problems remain, however, in connection with the highway portion of the District's transportation system. One is the urgent need for additional resources for the highway fund if any highway program at all is to continue. The Commissioners' requests for a 1-cent increase in the gasoline tax and for an increase in the highway fund's borrowing authority are included in H.R. 11487, which has been approved by the House of Representatives. I commend these proposals to the Senate as well.

Another problem which should be promptly resolved concerns the dimensions and locations of the interstate freeway system within the District. The report of the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives on H.R. 11487 requests a further review and appraisal of some of the present plans. The Highway Department has already taken some steps in this direction, and a possible relocation of a portion of the inner loop is now under active consideration by the Policy Advisory Committee.

The magnitude of these projects, however, makes it important that both the Federal Government and the Washington community have full assurance that there will be no needless expenditures of moneys or dislocations of persons and businesses. Accordingly, I am requesting the Policy Advisory Committee to consider whether it should secure, in conjunction with the National Capital Planning Commission's work on the 1985 comprehensive plan, a review of present highway plans. This review would examine not only methodology but also the basic assumptions regarding dislocation of families and businesses, real costs, Federal needs, and other community values on the basis of the most recent data available.

In order that the highway program not be delayed, and in order also that the Congress may have as much information as possible before completing its consideration of the District's 1967 highway budget, I am requesting the Committee to complete both its current studies and any further reviews it may consider appropriate by April 1, 1966. The Commissioners have advised me that the status of the most controversial items—the north leg of the inner loop and the north-central freeway—is such that in the next few months there would be no major expenditures on these projects in any event except for planning.

I am encouraged by the close cooperation which has been evident among the Federal and District agencies with responsibilities for developing the District's transportation system. Continued cooperation will insure a coordinated and efficient transportation network—one which will best serve the needs of the Nation's Capital.

MUNICIPAL CENTER

During the past few years the District government has not been provided with additional government-owned office space for new or expanding programs. Rental space, at high cost in both dollars and efficiency, has been required. I am recommending an increase of $1 million for additional rental space as a temporary relief of overcrowding.

In this budget, a small but critical item of $75,000 is sought to finance the first step toward a permanent solution. These funds will enable the District to prepare floor plan layouts and budget estimates for two buildings in the Municipal Center area to house education, recreation, and technical services. These buildings, which help to fulfill the long-range plans for Pennsylvania Avenue, not only will permit consolidation of scattered fragments of several departments and relief from outmoded, inadequate, and overcrowded space, but will also be of definite economic advantage to the District.

CONCLUSION

In addition to this expenditure program, and the revenue measures which I am recommending, there are a number of other measures of importance to the District of Columbia that are already before the Congress.

Of preeminent importance is the passage of a home rule bill. I urge the House of Representatives to complete action on the bill already approved by the Senate. My views on the need for this legislation are well known to the Congress. There is no reason to repeat them here.

Among the other important District measures pending in both Houses are—

A bill to authorize in the District of Columbia a community college and a college of arts and sciences under a Board of Higher Education.

A bill to create a Pennsylvania Avenue Commission.

A bill to establish an international center.

The House has already passed H.R. 8126, which would extend the coverage of the District of Columbia minimum wage law to men.

Enactment of these measures would make the 89th Congress as memorable for the District as it is already for the Nation.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 25, 1966.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT ACT OF 1966—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 367)

The **VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

Last year in my message on agriculture I described poverty's grip on rural America:

Nearly half of the poor in the United States live in rural areas.

Almost one in every two rural families has a cash income under $3,000.

One-fourth of rural nonfarm homes are without running water.

Rural people lag almost 2 years behind urban residents in educational attainment.

Health facilities in rural areas are so inadequate that rural children receive one-third less medical attention than urban children.

These deficiencies persist in 1966. Their effect is grievous on urban America—the recipient of millions of unskilled migrants from rural areas in the past two decades. It is tragic on the rundown farms and impoverished communities that still house 4.4 million poor rural families.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

Last year I directed—

Each Department and Agency administering a program that could benefit rural people, to assure that its benefits were distributed equitably between urban and rural areas.

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Budget to review the administrative obstacles that might stand in the way of such a distribution.

The Secretary of Agriculture to put his field offices to the task of assisting other Federal agencies in making their programs effective in rural areas.

As a result, the Rural Community Development Service was created and charged with assuring that the Department made that assistance available.

This mission of the Department is now firmly established in practice. Its field personnel are active in informing rural people of their eligibility for medicare, and of its requirements. They work with the Economic Development Administration in planning and encouraging new rural industrial developments. In several pilot counties, concerted projects are underway. The Departments of Labor, HEW, and Agriculture are joined in a common effort to bring social services to poor rural communities. The water and sewer facilities program has been simplified. They have been made more responsive to the needs of small towns and communities.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has increased its efforts in rural areas. Community action programs are underway in a number of rural counties supporting community action planning; providing remedial reading courses, vocational instruction, and adult education; and assisting small cooperatives to acquire farm machinery. These programs have inspired a new sense of hope among the rural Americans who have experienced them.

More—much more—needs to be done if their effects are to reach the dispersed but very real pockets of rural poverty throughout America.

THE NEED FOR PLANNING

Legislation enacted by the first session of this Congress, and in prior years, provides the means for a massive attack on poverty in America.

But—even with the help of these great new programs—too few rural communities are able to marshal sufficient physical, human, and financial resources to achieve a satisfactory level of social and economic development.

The central advantage of the city has been a large and concentrated population to provide the leadership and technical capability. This leadership can achieve economies of scale in operations, to provide adequate public services and facilities for its people.

On the other hand, it is difficult, if not impossible for every small hamlet to offer its own complete set of public services. Nor is it economic for the small city to try to achieve metropolitan standards of service, opportunity, and culture, without relation to its rural environs.

The related interests of each need to be taken into account in planning for the public services and economic development of the wider community. In this way the benefits of creative federalism can be brought to our rural citizens—in small cities as well as its rural neighbors.

WHAT MIGHT BE DONE

The base exists for such coordinated planning.

New communities are coming into being—stimulated by advanced means of travel and communications. Because of these it is possible to extend to people in the outlying rural areas a richer variety of public services, and of economic and cultural opportunities.

Resources must be combined—in larger areas, as well as rural and small urban communities. In a population base large enough to support a full range of efficient and high-quality public services and facilities, we can achieve the conditions necessary for economic and social advance.

THE DIMENSIONS OF THE COMMUNITIES

The dimensions of an area within which residents should join to carry out integrated planning are likely to be already marked by the trading or commuting patterns.

In most such communities, the total population will be large enough, with enough potential users of each essential service, to justify employing competent full-time resident specialists in medical services, schools, and the like. In some such communities, where towns of even 10,000 are scarce, it may be more practical to provide major services to people at the outer limits through mobile facilities.

BENEFITS OF PLANNING

Coordinated planning can stimulate economic growth.

It can provide the economies of efficient public services—which attract business and industry.

It can make possible adequate vocational training. Rural workers who lack present job opportunities can become qualified for work in new and expanding industries within reach of their homes or farms.

It can provide the schools to spare young children the fate of their fathers. Seventy-two percent of all poor rural families today are headed by persons who have finished only 8 years of schooling or less.

It can greatly enlarge the effectiveness of public and private resources.

It can insure that programs will comprise a logical and comprehensive effort to solve the community's interrelated problems at minimum cost.

It can bring us closer to achieve a more beautiful, more livable rural America. An increasing combination of local, State, and Federal resources is already beginning to transform the countryside. This cooperation is making multiple uses possible—for production, for outdoor recreation, and for the restoration of natural beauty. Planning can help make this beneficence a part of the lives of millions of urban Americans.

Above all, planning is an affirmative act. It signifies the willingness of rural men and women to make their part of America a place of hope. Rural America need not be a wasteland from which the young, however ill prepared, flee to the cities. It does not have to be a place where live only those too old, too poor, too defeated to seek other horizons.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS

I propose that we show how broad-based planning can inspire the people of rural America to unite the resources of their rural governments and small cities.

I propose this union to improve the quality of life for the citizens of both.

I propose that we assist in the establishment of a number of community development districts to carry out, under local initiative, such comprehensive planning.

The boundaries of community development districts will correspond to the normal commuting or trading patterns of the rural and city residents.

Planning activities for the district will be performed under the direction of representatives selected by each of the participating county or municipal governments. They will be responsible for planning the coordination of all governmental development and service functions within the district.

Federal grants would be provided:

First. For districtwide planning of public services and governmental functions where other Federal planning assistance is not available; and

Second. For the districtwide coordination of local planning activities with Federal programs and private initiatives, in a comprehensive attack on rural community problems.

The Secretary of Agriculture will certify that the area has met the requirements for designation as a community development district. Selection of the pilot districts will be made to afford experience in a representative variety of geographic, economic, and social conditions. Funds will be requested to augment those presently available for planning grants.

Federal assistance would help to support: coordinated and comprehensive planning for all public services, development programs, and governmental functions within the district; a continuing liaison with Federal and State agencies; a comprehensive survey of resources and needs within the district, such as labor skills, industrial sites, land and water resources, health care, education, cultural opportunities, and public services.

Thus the scope of planning to be supported would extend beyond physical development. It would encompass as well the social and economic needs of the area, and its potential for growth.

Each agency of the Government charged with administering a program relevant to these needs will be requested to cooperate with the community development districts. For example, a comprehensive survey of medical conditions in the area would be undertaken by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Teacher Corps—which I again urge the Congress to support at a level commensurate with its promise—would be asked to make teams available for the districts. The Department of Agriculture will offer a concerted emphasis in its resource development programs within the pilot districts.

The purpose of the planning effort I recommend is to assist these districts to achieve significant economies of scale and rational use of resources. This achievement can lift them, and their peoples, above their present level of development.

Our purpose is to demonstrate how a common effort can provide the needed district vocational school in one county, the hospital in another, the police training in a third, industry or an adequate library in a fourth. This effort can avoid the waste of duplication—or worse still, the total lack of such facilities or services because of a failure to pool common resources.

Our purpose is not to supplant present efforts of local, State, or Federal Governments. Our purpose is to supplement them. Then we do not forsake the small community, but help to avoid underrepresentation in decisions that affect its life.

MEDICAL NEEDS

Rural families share with the urban poor a greater need for modern medical services. Infant mortality and infectious disease rates are higher, life expectancy is lower, and the need for chronic illness care is just as prevalent. Yet rural families have had less access to physicians, with rural States averaging only a third the number of physicians per person as the heavily populated urban States. The continuing decline in the per capita number of physicians, therefore, strikes harder at rural families.

The beneficial effects of recent legislation, providing for more extensive professional relationships between rural hospitals and urban medical centers; the improved schooling that will soon be available in rural areas; improved roads and transportation—all will reduce the difficulty in recruiting physicians for rural areas by increasing the professional and educational opportunities available to them.

Nevertheless, we are not recruiting sufficient numbers of medical students from the families of the urban poor and rural areas. We need a financial incentive that will make it possible for children of these families to undertake a medical career. At the same time we need to draw upon medical students from other areas to settle in rural medical practice.

I shall soon propose, therefore, that a loan forgiveness program modeled upon the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1965 applied to medical students who choose to practice in poor rural areas.

RURAL POVERTY

The efforts of five administrations have provided some relief for hundreds of thousands of poor families who remain on small farms and in rural communities. Yet the old task remains undone: to end the travail of unemployed and underemployed men; to teach their children the skills they must have to prosper in a competitive society; to provide enough food, adequate shelter, and decent medical care for their families, and to help them achieve freedom from want and fear in their later years.

I do not believe we should stand idly by and permit our rural citizens to be ground into poverty—exposing them, unassisted and unencouraged, to the neglect of a changing society. Few other elements of our population are so treated by our humane and progressive people.

Yet, I believe we need the counsel of those best qualified by experience and understanding of rural America's problems, to help us chart our course of assistance to her poor.

Consequently, I shall soon appoint a Commission on Rural Poverty, whose task it will be to make recommendations to me, within 1 year of its appointment, on the most efficient and promising means of sharing America's abundance with those who have too often been her forgotten people.

Rural poverty has proved an almost intractable problem in past decades. Its abolition may require a journey of a thousand miles.

But the first step in that journey is the pooling of the common resources of rural Americans—joining them in a common planning effort that will magnify the resources of each.

In the program I propose, I ask the Congress to take that step with me today.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1966.*

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the following Senators to represent the Senate at the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference to be held in Geneva commencing on January 27, 1966: Senators PASTORE, GORE, SYMINGTON, HICKENLOOPER, CARLSON, and COOPER.

The Chair, pursuant to Public Law 754 of the 81st Congress, appoints Mr. Emery L. Frazier to the Federal Records Council to fill the vacancy caused by the retirement of Mr. Felton M. Johnston.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

NOTICE OF INTENTION OF TERMINATING THE DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN COUNTRIES AS LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FOR PURPOSES OF THE INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX

A communication from the President of the United States, reporting, pursuant to law, that he intends on or shortly after February 26, 1966, to issue an Executive order which will have the effect of terminating the designation of Abu Dhabi, Bahrain, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait—Saudi Arabia Neutral Zone, Libya, Qatar, and Saudi Arabia as less developed countries for purposes of the interest equalization tax; to the Committee on Finance.

Report of Rural Electrification Administration

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Rural Electrification Administration, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Title I Agreements Under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the month of December 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Authorization of Certain Construction in Southeast Asia

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction in support of military activities in southeast Asia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Authorization of Appropriations for Procurement of Aircraft, Missiles, Naval Vessels, and Tracked Combat Vehicles for the Armed Forces

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Construction Project for Air National Guard

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, on the revision of an estimate for a project under the Air National Guard at the Des Moines Municipal Airport; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Federal Contributions Program—Equipment and Facilities

A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, Office of the Secretary of the Army, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal contributions program—equipment and facilities, for the quarter ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Proposed Legislation From General Services Administration

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of platinum from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of fused crude aluminum oxide from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of crude silicon carbide from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of aluminum from the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of industrial diamond stones from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Proposed Legislation Relating to District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize suits in the courts of the District of Columbia for collection of taxes owed to States, territories, or possessions, or political subdivisions thereof, when the reciprocal right is accorded to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Reports of U.S. Tariff Commission

A letter from the Secretary, U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report of U.S. Information Agency

A letter from the General Counsel, U.S. U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report of Acting Comptroller General

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1965, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reply to Report of Acting Comptroller General Relating To Use of Dollars Rather Than Foreign Currencies To Pay U.S. Expenses in the Republic of Korea

A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Agency's reply to a report of the Acting Comptroller General, relating to the use of dollars rather than foreign currencies to pay U.S. expenses in the Republic of Korea (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Activities of Geological Survey

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on activities carried on by the Geological Survey outside the national domain, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Delay of Overall Economic Development Plan Required by Secretary of the Interior and Governor of Guam

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that the report on the overall economic development plan by the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Guam has been delayed; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Elton P. Johnson

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Elton P. Johnson (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report On Claims Settled Under Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, Washington, D.C., transmitting pursuant to law, a report on claims settled by that Department under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, during the calendar year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Refugee-Escapees

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, reporting, pursuant to law, on the refugee-escapees operation under that Department as of November 30, 1965; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Suspension of Deportation of Aliens—Withdrawal of Name

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Lai Sang Hom, also known as Hom Lai Sang Louie from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on September 1, 1965 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Audit Report of Future Farmers of America

A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that organization, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Administration of Public Laws 874 and 815

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report of Post Office Department

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Post Office Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 1003

"Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact truth-in-lending legislation

"Whereas short-term consumer debt in the United States is more than $83 billion; and

"Whereas the total consumer and business debt in the United States of $819 billion is 2½ times greater than the Federal debt; and

"Whereas the total interest paid by consumers just on short-term consumer debt is as large as the total interest paid out by taxpayers on the entire Federal debt of the United States; and

"Whereas the price of credit is little understood by the consumer; and

"Whereas the consumer can make no real comparison in the cost of credit unless he is able to translate credit charges into a uniform statement of true annual interest rates; and

"Whereas since 1960, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS has sought enactment of a truth-in-lending bill which would require that charges incident to the extension of credit be stated at a true annual interest rate on the outstanding balance of the obligation; and

"Whereas the Department of Defense of the United States, in a directive on personal commercial affairs, has required all lending institutions dealing with servicemen to provide full disclosure through truth-in-lending; and

"Whereas the truth-in-lending bill, S. 2275, will aid the ethical and efficient lender or credit extender who wishes to be honest and accurate in disclosing the cost of credit but who can do so only at the peril of losing customers to competitors who would continue to disclose deceptively low credit prices; and

"Whereas such legislation is essential to the maintenance of a competitive free enterprise system and would in no way interfere with the buyer-seller relationship: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Forty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Colorado,* That this house of representatives hereby petitions the Members of the Congress of the United States to propose and enact legislation in the Congress for truth-in-lending; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, and Members of the Congress from the State of Colorado.

"ALLEN DINES,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"EVELYN T. DAVIDSON,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Commerce:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 1002

"Whereas the purchase of packaged goods requires the spending of a substantial portion of the consumer's income; and

"Whereas every Colorado housewife has the right to compare products, the right to compare prices, and the right to get what she pays for; and

"Whereas under modern packaging conditions, the consumer cannot see what is inside the package and she must rely upon the package to tell her the truth as to quantity and price; and

"Whereas under present law, a statement of quantity of package contents can be placed on the side, back, or top, rather than the front; and

"Whereas the proliferation of packages in recent years has played havoc with our traditional system of weights and measures, through the use of odd fractional weights, and through the use of terms such as 'jumbo' quart, 'full' quart, and 'big' 12 ounces; and

"Whereas Colorado and nearly every other State in the Union has by statute or regulation established definite standards for weights and packaging of the sale of products from the producer to the wholesaler; and

"Whereas Senator PHILIP HART has introduced a truth-in-packaging bill designed to fortify the consumer in her right to be informed; and

"Whereas such bill is designed to halt hidden weight statements, to authorize regulations establishing reasonable weights and quantities for retail sale, and to halt the use of confusing or misleading adjectives; and

"Whereas the bill is designed to stimulate honest competition on the basis of quality and price and to increase the consumer's real purchasing power by enabling her to make rational choices more easily: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Forty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Colorado,* That this House of Representatives hereby petitions the Members of the Congress of the United States to propose and enact legislation in the Congress for truth-in-packaging; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Senator PHILIP HART, and Members of the Congress from the State of Colorado.

"ALLEN DINES,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"EVELYN T. DAVIDSON,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Public Works:

"CALENDAR NO. S. 455

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of a dam across the Savannah River and Duke Power Co. to construct an electric generating plant on the Savannah River

"Whereas, Duke Power Co. announced plans more than 4 years ago to construct a giant 2-million-kilowatt steam electric generating plant on the Savannah River in Anderson County, S.C.; and

"Whereas the subject plant will cost in excess of $210 million and would be the largest steamplant for the generation of electricity in the entire world; and

"Whereas to date 55 percent of all industry locating in the two Carolinas has located in the area served by the Duke Power Co.; and

"Whereas such a plant as envisioned by Duke is one of the most desirable single industries that could come, not only to Anderson County, but to South Carolina; and

"Whereas it is estimated that by the year 1985 the demand for electricity will exceed four times the present requirement; and

"Whereas this development would require virtually no investment by the local community for service facilities nor would it require a great expenditure for waterlines, sewerage, access roads or public facilities; and

"Whereas the Duke Power Co. is merely seeking permission to build a steamplant which would furnish an abundance of inexpensive electricity and pay to Anderson County more than a million dollars each year in tax revenue and to the State of South Carolina over $5 million annually; and

"Whereas this plant would provide permanent employment for a goodly number of people and during construction would provide jobs for over a thousand persons for a number of years; and

"Whereas the experience of investment in those areas served by the Duke Power Co. has reflected $3 in either new or expansion of old industry for each dollar invested in the generation of electricity; and

"Whereas the members of the General Assembly recognize the tremendous asset such a plant would be for the future development and prosperity of the State and of its people: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring),* That for the above reasons the members of the General Assembly wish to record themselves as favoring the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary in order that the Duke Power Co. may construct a dam across the Savannah River and proceed with the construction of the plant; be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the president of the Duke Power Co. and to the following officers and Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress; the Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives, each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"CALENDAR NO. S. 7

"Senate resolution memorializing the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to notify the U.S. Supreme Court that the House of Representatives will not tolerate any interference by the Court upon its right and prerogative to judge the election, election returns and qualifications of its own Members, free and untrammeled and without interference of the judicial or any other power

"Whereas a threat to the liberty of any citizen of the United States is a threat to the freedom of every South Carolinian and endangers the same; and

"Whereas the architects of the U.S. Government, both Federal and State, were fully cognizant of the dire and compelling necessity of defending and protecting and maintaining and preserving, separately, at all cost and expense and hazard, the written prerogatives and autonomy of each of the three great departments of constitutional government so that the legislative department shall never exercise the executive or judicial powers, or either of them; the executive shall never exercise the legislative or judicial powers, or either of them; the judicial shall never exercise the legislative or executive powers, or either of them; to the end that ours may be a government of laws and not of men; and

"Whereas the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina views with grave concern and critical alarm, generally and particularly and specifically, the recent seizures with usurping hands of the legislative power exclusively delegated to and vested in the several States and the Congress of the United States by right and by virtue and authority of the Constitution of the United States touching and affecting the judging of the elections and election returns and qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, by the judicial department through certain ultra vires decisions made and handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States which are tyrannical and destructive of self-government and in direct violation of the oath of each member of the Court to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution; and

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States is traditionally and actually the Democratic branch of the legislative department closest and most responsive to the elective will of a majority of the qualified electors of the United States, hence of the people of the United States; and

"Whereas the judicial department of the Government of the United States is the furthest removed from any control or direction by the directive will of the people of the United States, the judges being appointed for terms of life, nominated by the Executive and confirmed by the upper branch of the legislative department, subject only to impeachment and judgment to removal from office for treason and high crimes and misdemeanors through cumbersome and seldom used impeachment process by both Houses of the legislative department only too often stymied behind political party loyalties: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Carolina*, That the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States be, and the same is hereby respectfully and urgently memorialized to forthwith resolve by due and appropriate action to admonish and notify the Supreme Court of the United States that the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States stands firm and steadfast in its resolve to defend and protect and maintain and preserve the legislative autonomy and prerogative to judge the election, election returns and the qualifications of its own Members, free and untrammeled, without interference of the judicial or any other power, and the manner, time and places of electing Representatives to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States shall remain in the respective electorates of the several States of the United States, subject to supervision by only the Congress of the United States as provided in the Constitution of the United States; and defend, protect, maintain and preserve the coordination between the three great departments of government, to wit; the executive, the judicial and the legislative, and the liberties of the citizens of the United States, and the freedom of the inhabitants of the State of South Carolina and of the several States of the United States, with all the powers and resources at the disposal of the House of Representatives by virtue and authority of the Constitution of the United States; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; ordered to lie on the table:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 154

"Concurrent resolution of tribute to the Honorable Hobart Taylor, Jr.

"Whereas the Honorable Hobart Taylor, Jr., was named a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank and assumed that office on September 21, 1965; and

"Whereas Mr. Taylor, since April 1964 Associate General Counsel at the White House, where he was the highest-ranking Negro in Federal Government, has had a brilliant career; and

"Whereas born in Texarkana, Tex., Mr. Taylor was reared on a farm near Houston, and was a neighbor of President Johnson since boyhood days. Graduating from Prairie View State College in 1939, he received his master's degree at Howard University in 1941 and an LL.D. from the University of Michigan in 1943; and

"Whereas his professional career opened in 1944–45 with the chief justice of the Michigan Supreme Court as research assistant. Mr. Taylor was junior partner in the legal firm of Bledsoe and Taylor in Detroit in 1945–48. He became assistant prosecuting attorney in Wayne County in 1949–50; was chief of civil defense, office of the prosecuting attorney, Wayne County in 1951–61; in 1954–61, first vice president of Metropolitan Mortgage Co., the first Negro mortgage company in the United States; in 1958–61 he was senior member of the law firm of Taylor, Patrick, Bailer, and Lee in Detroit; and

"Whereas in 1961–62 Mr. Taylor was appointed Special Counsel to the President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity in Washington, D.C.; in 1962 he was appointed Executive Vice Chairman to that Commission, until 1964 when he was named Associate Counsel on President Johnson's staff: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Michigan Legislature extend official tribute to the Honorable Hobart J. Taylor, Jr., upon his recent appointment as a Director of the Export-Import Bank, and upon the brilliance of his achievements in the relatively short period of 21 years; and express the desire that his distinguished career may continue to his gratification and to the benefit of his country and fellow men; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this tribute be presented to the President of the United States and to the Honorable Hobart Taylor, Jr., as an enduring testimony of the esteem of the Michigan Legislature.

"Adopted by the house October 7, 1965.

"Adopted by the senate October 14, 1965.

"BERYL I. KENYON,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"NORMAN E. PHILLEO.
"*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A resolution adopted by the AFL–CIO convention held in San Francisco, Calif., in December 1965, relating to the American merchant marine and maritime policy; to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by Mrs. Robert Pinckney Tucker, of Charleston, S.C., relating to the method of appointment of members of the U.S. Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Ohio Association of Real Estate Boards, Columbus, Ohio, relating to reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Great Council of the United States of the Improved Order of Red Men, relating to the Government's position in Vietnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Eastern Conference of Teamsters, Washington, D.C., signed by Thomas E. Flynn, international director, favoring the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (Rept. No. 953).

S. Res. 170. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

S. Res. 174. Resolution providing additional funds for an investigation of intergovernmental relations.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for Mr. FULBRIGHT), from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 63. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., May 12 through 21, 1966 (Rept. No. 954).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the chartering by act of Congress of the Boy Scouts of America.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. Res. 188. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for further study of migratory labor; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR MAKING CERTAIN STUDIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 212) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Armed Services for making certain studies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES 212

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Common defense generally;

(2) The Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force generally;

(3) Soldiers' and sailors' homes;

(4) Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

(5) Selective service;

(6) Size and composition of the Army, Navy, and Air Force;

(7) Forts, arsenals, military reservations, and naval yards;

(8) Ammunition depots;

(9) Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

(10) Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;

(11) Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense;

(12) Aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $175,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 213) to authorize the Committee on Commerce to make certain studies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 213

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) interstate commerce generally;

(2) foreign commerce generally;

(3) maritime matters;

(4) interoceanic canals;

(5) transportation policy;

(6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines and highway safety;

(7) communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;

(8) Federal power matters;

(9) civil aeronautics;

(10) fisheries and wildlife;

(11) marine sciences; and

(12) weather services and modification, including the use of weather satellites.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $450,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR MAKING CERTAIN STUDIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SPARKMAN (for Mr. FULBRIGHT), from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 214) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Foreign Relations for making certain studies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 214

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; (3) to hold such hearings, to take such testimony, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses and adjourned periods of the Senate, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; and (4) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, as the committee deems advisable.

SEC. 3. In the conduct of its studies the committee may use the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals in its discretion, and it is authorized to divide the work of the studies among such individuals, groups, and institutions as it may deem appropriate and may enter into contracts for this purpose.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $200,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 215) to authorize additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 215

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1966, to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, seven additional professional staff members, and nine additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated January 12, 1966, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce: Roger W. Wilkins, of the District of Columbia, to be Director, Community Relations Service.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Marshall P. Jones, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Malawi; and

Cecil B. Lyon, of New Hampshire, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ceylon, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Maldive Islands.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

Leon E. Woods, of Maryland, and sundry other persons, for appointments and promotions in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 2819. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended;

S. 2820. A bill to provide for the collection and deposit of fees and charges for inspection and services under laws relating to Federal inspection of poultry and poultry products, meat and meat-food products, humane slaughter of animals, and for other purposes; and

S. 2821. A bill to amend certain acts relating to the inspection, classification, certification, testing, and identification of cotton, tobacco and grain; and the examination of warehouses licensed under the U.S. Warehouse Act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. TALMADGE):

S. 2822. A bill to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. PASTORE (by request):

S. 2823. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2824. A bill for the relief of the Southwest Gas Equipment Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 2825. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to obscene or harassing telephone calls in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. PASTORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2826. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, in order to encourage and stimulate increases in the food and agricultural production of developing nations receiving assistance under such act, to facilitate increased United States efforts to meet the threat of growing human hunger and malnutrition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONDALE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BASS:

S. 2827. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, to remove the limitation on the authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue bonds to finance its power program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BASS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 2828. A bill to establish a Temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Fiscal Needs and Resources; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2829. A bill to amend section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and

S. 2830. A bill for the relief of Otilia Arsiniega-Trujillo de Del Valle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2831. A bill to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the first and last above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. McGOVERN, and Mr. DODD) (by request):

S. 2832. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue marketing orders to cover chicken table eggs; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2833. A bill to increase the amount authorized by the joint resolution of October 4, 1961, to be appropriated for the preservation and protection of certain lands in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 2834. A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the control of alcoholism; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 2835. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. PROUTY):

S. 2836. A bill to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for community mental retardation facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution as to the length of terms of Representatives in the U.S. House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S.J. Res. 129. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 211), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 211

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the Standing Rules of the United States Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the Committee, from February 1, 1966 to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $67,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR MAKING CERTAIN STUDIES

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 212) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Armed Services for making certain studies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. STENNIS, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 213) to authorize the Committee on Commerce to make certain studies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MAGNUSON, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR MAKING CERTAIN STUDIES

Mr. SPARKMAN (for Mr. FULBRIGHT), from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 214) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Foreign Relations for making certain studies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. SPARKMAN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 215) to authorize additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HILL, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 RELATING TO OBSCENE OR HARASSING TELEPHONE CALLS

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, 2 months ago the Subcommittee on Communications, of which I am chairman, was conducting hearings with regard to the legislation which would require sponsor identification of anonymous telephone recordings which were attacking both prominent Americans and certain institutions. The concern which lead to the introduction of the legislation centered on the rapid growth of recorded messages pouring out offensive and anonymous attacks on persons and institutions. During the hearings, it was revealed that the telephone was also being used for annoying, abusive, harassing, threatening, and obscene calls.

The most cruel and vicious of all involved the calls made to a widow or parent of a Vietnam victim. The caller informs the widow or parent that he is glad that her husband or son had been killed in Vietnam. It does not take much imagination to guess what such a message does to a young widow or parent already in despair over the loss of a loved one.

I do not know how widespread this practice was but only last month I received a clipping from the Brooklyn Spectator dated December 3, 1965, in which the story of such calls involving the parents of a young soldier who gave his life in Vietnam was set out. According to the story, calls of which there had been four, added a cruel burden to the father and mother who were awaiting the boy's body to be brought home for burial.

Previously, I had asked the FCC for a report on the extent of this practice of abusive calls. According to a report submitted to me by the FCC, the telephone company indicated that such calls have increased steadily in recent years and it is estimated 375,000 complaints are received each year. Mind you these are 375,000 abusive, harassing, or obscene calls. Only recently a report by a congressional committee related the following:

> Washington residents, unprotected by any kind of law against telephone harassment, face this pattern of cases:
>
> A pervert posing as a doctor was believed to have made more than 50,000 calls throughout the area over a period of several years before his recent capture, in nearby Maryland. His spiel: Telling women that their husbands had visited him for delicate medical help and asking them numerous intimate questions.
>
> A university's telephone switchboard was tied up so completely that all school business came to a halt because of one family's domestic crisis. The man got 20 of his friends to keep calling the university where his wife worked. They said nothing, simply breathed into the telephone, but no other calls could come through.
>
> Two District firms—a moving company and a barbershop—nearly went out of business through telephone harassment directed not at the firms but at some employee. In both cases, calls swamped telephone facilities.
>
> A current trap for the unwary is the telephone survey. It's used by both burglars and perverts in the District.
>
> The perverts use the survey to entice the housewife into carrying on an innocent conversation before the caller moves into obscenity.

The most startling revelation of all was the fact that there are statutes in only 30 States which prohibit the use of obscene language over the telephone; only 12 States have laws prohibiting harassing or annoying telephone calls irrespective of whether or not there is use of obscene language; about 13 States have laws prohibiting the use of the telephone to make threatening calls such as threats of bodily harm or of harm to members of the family or of destruction of property or of an explosion of a public or private place. Most of these statutes and crimes referred to above are classed as misdemeanors with maximum fines ranging from $100 to $500 with maximum prison terms for 90 days to 2 years. Moreover, there is no Federal statute to cover the threatening, the harassing, the abusive telephone calls.

It is my personal judgment that this loophole must be closed. There is no penalty too strong to impose on a warped individual who taunts a widow or a parent about the death of their loved one in Vietnam. This is cruel and vicious.

I intend today to take a step to close the loopholes insofar as the Federal level is concerned by introducing a bill which will make it a crime for a person to use the telephone to make anonymous calls in a manner which would annoy, embarrass, harass, or abuse individuals. I know there are those who think we should not be burdening the Federal structure with new responsibilities but I cannot condone hate messages of the type that were revealed in our hearings.

Madam President, I introduce the following bill which would amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to obscene or harassing telephone calls in interstate or foreign commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2825) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to obscene or harassing telephone calls in interstate or foreign commerce, introduced by Mr. PASTORE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2825

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That title II of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:
>
> "SEC. 223. OBSCENE OR HARASSING TELEPHONE CALLS IN INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE.—Whoever by means of telephone communication in interstate or foreign commerce—
>
> "(i) makes any comment, request, suggestion, or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent; or
>
> "(ii) anonymously makes a call or calls in a manner reasonably to be expected to annoy, abuse, torment, threaten, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; or
>
> "(iii) makes repeated calls with intent to annoy, abuse, torment, threaten, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; or
>
> "(iv) knowingly permits any telephone under his control to be used for any purpose prohibited by this section—
>
> shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. Each such telephone call or use shall constitute a separate offense."

WORLD HUNGER ACT

Mr. MONDALE. Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make possible a reshaping and expansion of our food-for-peace program.

In his state of the Union message 2 weeks ago, President Johnson proposed that we "place the matchless skill and the resources of our own great America in farming and in fertilizers at the service of those countries committed to develop a modern agriculture."

The bill which I am introducing today is directed toward this objective.

I sponsor it not because I am wedded to a particular approach, not because I think it offers the final answer on how best to meet the growing threat of world hunger. I offer it rather because I believe it can make a useful contribution to the debate on this issue.

I feel we can take particular pride in the fact that this debate has been sparked, above all, by the leadership and vision of a Senator, our distinguished colleague GEORGE MCGOVERN. Through his dedication and commitment he has become America's preeminent leader in this field, and his International Food and Nutrition Act has stimulated concern throughout the Nation about the magnitude of the world food crisis.

My bill, entitled the "World Hunger Act of 1966," is not intended as a substitute for this proposal or any proposal, but as a supplement to what has already been put forward. It would place primary emphasis on encouraging and stimulating countries which receive our assistance to increase their own food production.

I have just returned from India, where I went to study the effectiveness of our food assistance effort. Wherever I traveled, in New Delhi and in rural farm areas, I learned that it was impossible to exaggerate the magnitude of India's food problem, or the importance of our wheat shipments. And in the year which has just begun, because of the disastrous drought and famine, India will need from us and other food-surplus countries up to 14 million tons of grain or more—more than twice the regular annual amount under Public Law 480—if millions of her people are not to starve.

But feeding hungry peoples is not enough. If we just keep people alive, without giving them the tools to provide for themselves, their dependence on us can grow from a temporary misfortune to a permanent habit. And this dependence on charity is humiliating, so that the long-time recipient becomes resentful of the gifts on which he relies.

So we must make food for peace not a crutch, but a catalyst. We cannot just feed people and nations while they limp along, hobbling deeper and deeper into dependence. Instead we must use this program as a catalyst, to activate the forces within these countries which seek to move toward a more modern agriculture.

And there is no alternative to this course of action. For even if we wanted to, even if we put every available farm acre in the United States into production, we simply could not keep up with the world's increasing food needs in the years to come. World population is spiraling and will double in less than 35 years, and we and the other food-surplus nations would only be able to meet the food requirements of these expanding populations for about 15 years or less.

The latest statistics on world food output are another grim omen of the disaster that is drawing nearer. In 1965 world agricultural production grew only 1.5 percent, with output of grains up only 1 percent. And this in a world where population is growing by more than 2 percent each year.

It is all too easy to see what will happen if these trends continue—we will have mass starvation as never before. And already we live in a world where approximately 10,000 die each day from hunger and malnutrition, and hundreds of millions live with minds and bodies stunted from malnutrition.

The World Hunger Act would meet this world food crisis by building into our food-for-peace program direct assistance and positive incentives for farm improvement.

It would establish a new category of loans and grants, drawing upon the vast reservoir of foreign currencies we are accumulating to support programs to improve food and agricultural production and distribution. These loans and grants would help finance a wide variety of activities—from fertilizer production to agricultural extension, from expanding agricultural schools to developing new seed varieties, from increased processing of high-nutrition foods to development of expanded port, storage, and distribution facilities.

Loans would be made at very low interest—one-half of 1 percent—to provide the maximum incentive for participation in this farm improvement program. Grants would be made only to governments where we have a supply of foreign currency for U.S. uses clearly in excess of our needs.

And to make sure such an agriculture assistance program would accomplish its purpose, no loans or grants would be made to any country unless the President determined that it was giving very high priority to programs to increase its food production.

This bill would also help overseas agriculture in another way, by authorizing the establishment of binational foundations for improving food and agricultural production. Such foundations would be endowed with grants out of excess foreign currencies held by the United States; they would use the interest from investing this endowment to finance programs to improve food output; they would be governed by boards of directors representing the foreign government, the U.S. Government, and private citizens from both countries.

This would take the idea proposed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in his bill S. 1057, and apply it to improving food production in developing countries.

Finally, the bill would further encourage countries to make a maximum effort in agriculture by permitting those who do to ease their foreign exchange difficulties by borrowing from our Commodity Credit Corporation, repayable in U.S. dollars, the shipping cost which they must pay for commodities under title I of Public Law 480.

Through all of these mechanisms, supported by strong administration policies such as those President Johnson is following, we can transform Public Law 480 into a catalyst, a major activating force for change in agriculture all over the world.

In addition to promoting agricultural improvement, this bill would make two other important amendments to Public Law 480.

It would eliminate the general requirement that foods used in this program must be in surplus, by authorizing the CCC to purchase such additional commodities as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary to supplement surplus commodities used in food for peace. This provision would help insure not only that we have enough food to meet the challenge of world hunger, but the right kinds of food as well—especially high protein foods which are necessary to combat malnutrition.

And the World Hunger Act would reform the administrative structure of the food-for-peace program by establishing a new body, the Food for Peace Policy Council, to recommend the broad levels of food and agricultural assistance which would best further the foreign policy objectives of the United States. Sitting on this Council would be the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Administrator of AID, the Director of food for peace, and such other high officials as the President may designate.

Such a Council would help to insure that the fundamental decisions in a reformed food-for-peace program are taken at a high level and oriented toward world needs, rather than made at a low level and shaped mainly by the requirements of our internal farm policy.

Madam President, America can never hope to feed the world, and recognition of this fact is the beginning of wisdom in our food-for-peace program. But neither can we refuse to do what we can. We must squarely meet the threat of human hunger and malnutrition, and use our unmatched farm potential to help hungry peoples feed themselves and, ultimately more important, help them to help themselves.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this bill be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks, together with a summary of its provisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2826) to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, in order to encourage and stimulate increases in the food and agricultural production of developing nations receiving assistance under such act, to facilitate increased U.S. efforts to meet the threat of growing human hunger and malnutrition, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2826

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "World Hunger Act of 1966".

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "surplus" wherever it occurs in that section, and by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"It is further declared to be the policy of Congress to use the agricultural abundance and technical knowledge of the United States to meet and help surmount the widespread threat of human hunger and malnutrition in the developing countries of the world through the provision of commodity and technical assistance, and by carrying out such assistance in a manner which will encourage and stimulate such countries to increase their own food output."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 104 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (t) and inserting a semicolon in lieu thereof, and (2) by adding after such subsection (t) two new subsections as follows:

"(u) For loans and grants to promote programs devoted specifically to improvement of food production and distribution in the friendly nation from which the foreign currency was obtained, including programs which provide for the production and distribution of fertilizer and pesticides, the expansion and improvement of agricultural extension services, the expansion and improvement of credit services to individual farmers, the support of farm prices if such is likely to stimulate increased production, the expansion of processing and marketing of high-nutrition foods and food supplements, the development of improved seed varieties, the support of agricultural schools and colleges, irrigation, and capital improvements, agricultural research, farmer cooperative services, land reform programs, the development of commercial fishing fleets, the development of port, storage, and distribution facilities to handle increased quantities of agricultural commodities, and other programs designed to increase food and agricultural production. Loans made under this subsection shall bear interest at a rate not less than one-half of 1 per centum per annum and shall be repayable in foreign currency over a term of not to exceed forty years. Such loans may be made both to foreign governments and to United States and foreign private business firms. Grants made under this subsection may be made only to the government of the friendly nation from which the foreign currency was obtained and only if the foreign currencies or credits owned by the United States and available for use by it in such nation are determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be in excess of the normal requirements of the departments and agencies of the United States for expenditure in such nation for the two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which such determination is made. No nation shall be eligible for a loan or grant under this subsection unless the President has determined that such nation is giving very high priority to programs for increasing its food and agricultural production.

"(v) For grants to provide the endowment for bi-national foundations for the promotion of increased food and agricultural production, in countries in which the foreign currencies or credits owned by the United States and available for use by it in such countries are determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be in excess of the normal requirements of the departments and agencies of the United States for expenditure in such countries for the two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which such determination is made. Such foundations shall be governed by boards of directors representing the foreign government concerned, the United State Government, and private citizens of each country, as established in the agreement, and shall use the interest earned from investment of the endowment to finance programs directed toward improvement of agricultural and food production, especially among farmers at the village level, including such programs as may be supported under subsection (u) of this section. No such foundation shall be established in any nation unless the President has determined that such nation is giving very high priority to programs for increasing its food and agricultural production: *Provided, however*, That sufficient currencies of any such nation shall remain available at all times for appropriation by the Congress to meet the normal requirements of the departments and agencies of the United States in such nation."

(b) Section 104 of such Act is further amended (1) by inserting in the first proviso following subsection (t) ", except in the case of foreign currencies used for the purposes of subsections (u) and (v) of this section," immediately after "December 31, 1964 and"; and (2) by striking out the period after the third proviso following subsection (t) and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That the Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall report annually to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives concerning the uses of foreign currencies accrued under subsections (u) and (v) of this section."

(c) The next to the last paragraph of Section 104 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows:

"The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not apply with respect to grants, or the use of principal and interest from loan repayments, under subsections (u) and (v) of this section."

(d) The last paragraph of Section 104 of such Act is amended by striking out "Any" and inserting in lieu thereof: "Except as provided in subsection (u) of this section, any".

SEC. 4. Section 104 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized, in the case of any friendly nation with which an agreement is entered into under this title, to loan such nation an amount not greater than the amount of the transportation charges required to be paid by such nation under section 102(a), if the President determines that such nation faces a severe shortage of foreign exchange, that such nation is assigning very high priority to programs designed to improve its food and agricultural production, and that alleviation of such nation's foreign exchange burden will substantially strengthen its ability to carry out programs of agricultural improvement. Loans made under this paragraph shall be repaid in dollars and shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe, except that the term of any such loan shall not exceed 20 years and shall bear interest at a rate not less than the minimum rate prescribed for loans made under section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961."

SEC. 5. Title III of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof two new sections as follows:

"SEC. 309. (a) The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to purchase such additional agricultural commodities, including but not limited to high protein animal and vegetable foods, as the Secretary deems desirable and appropriate to supplement surplus agricultural commodities sold, exchanged, or donated under this Act. Commodities purchased under this section shall be available for use under all programs authorized under this Act.

"(b) The Corporation is further authorized to make payment for the nutritional enrichment of foods available for use under all the programs authorized by this Act.

"SEC. 310. (a) There is hereby established to assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act a Council to be known as the Food for Peace Policy Council, to be composed of the Secretary of State or his designate, the Secretary of Agriculture or his designate, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, the Director of Food for Peace, and such other high officials as the President shall designate. The President shall select one of the members of the Council to serve as Chairman.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Council established under subsection (a) of this section to—

"(1) assess the food and agricultural assistance needs of friendly nations receiving assistance under this Act, and of developing friendly nations not receiving assistance under this Act;

"(2) recommend the amount of technical, commodity, capital, and local currency assistance that the United States should undertake in the case of each such nation to promote most effectively our foreign policy, taking into consideration (A) the broad objectives of this Act, particularly the policy of meeting the widespread threat of human hunger in developing countries and encouraging and stimulating increases in their agricultural production, (B) evidence that such countries are giving high priority to increasing their own agricultural production, (C) the desirability of encouraging the maximum participation by other wealthy nations in national and international efforts to combat human hunger and malnutrition; and

"(3) transmit such recommendations in an annual report to the President, the Congress, and the heads of the departments and agencies of the United States which participate in programs carried out under this Act.

"(c) The Secretary shall take into account the recommendations of the Council made under subsection (b) in carrying out his responsibilities under this Act, as well as his responsibilities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and such other Acts as have significant effect on the ability of the United States to carry out programs under this Act.

"(d) The Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall take into account the recommendations of the Council in carrying out capital and technical assistance to agriculture under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended."

The summary presented by Mr. MONDALE is as follows:

A SHORT SUMMARY OF THE WORLD HUNGER ACT OF 1966

Section 1: Title, "The World Hunger Act of 1966."

Section 2: The purpose of Public Law 480 (food for peace) is amended to eliminate the word "surplus" and add a new paragraph declaring it to be the policy of the Congress to use our agricultural abundance and technical knowledge to meet the threat of human hunger and malnutrition, and to do this in a way which will encourage poor countries to increase their own food output.

Section 3a: Section 104 of Public Law 480 (uses of foreign currencies obtained from selling food-for-peace commodities) is amended to establish two new programs of using these currencies to stimulate food production in poor countries:

1. Grants and low interest loans for production and distribution of fertilizer and pesticides, expansion and improvement of agricultural extension services and farm credit, support of farm prices, expanded processing of high nutrition foods or food supplements, development of improved seeds, support of agricultural schools and colleges, irrigation and capital improvements, agricultural research, farmer cooperative services, land reform programs, development of commercial fishing fleets, development of port, storage, and distribution facilities to handle increased volume, and other programs designed to increase food and agricultural production. Loans are at not less than one-half of 1 percent interest, repayable over not more than 40 years. Loans may be made either to foreign governments or to United States or foreign business enterprises. Grants may be made only to governments, and only in countries where U.S. holdings of foreign currency are in excess of our needs, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

No country would be eligible for a loan or grant unless the President determined it was giving very high priority to programs for increasing food and agricultural production.

2. Grants to endow binational foundations for the promotion of increased food and agricultural production—in countries where our

holdings of foreign currency are in excess of our needs. Such foundations would be governed by boards of directors representing the foreign government, the U.S. Government, and private citizens of both countries, and would use the interest from investment of the endowment to finance programs for improving food and agricultural production, such as those included under the direct grant or loan program (see above). The United States would have to retain enough foreign currency to meet the normal operating requirements of our departments and agencies. No country would be eligible for such a foundation unless it was giving very high priority to programs for increasing food and agricultural production.

Section 3b: Would waive for these programs the general Public Law 480 requirement that money for grants be appropriated sepcifically by Congress; would require the AID Administrator to report annually to the Appropriations and Agriculture Committees of the Senate and House concerning the uses of foreign currencies under these programs.

Section 3c: Would waive the requirement that grants, or the use of currency obtained from principle and interest repayments, under these programs be subject to veto by the Senate and House Agriculture Committees.

Section 3d: Would exempt the low-interest loan program from the general requirement that loans of food for peace foreign currency must be at a rate not less than the cost of funds to the U.S. Treasury.

Section 4: Would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to loan to recipient countries up to the full amount of the transportation costs in dollars which they are required to pay under title I of Public Law 480. Such loans would be repayable in dollars, over not more than 20 years, at an interest rate of not less than 1 percent for the first 10 years and 2½ percent thereafter, which is the minimum rate for AID development loans. A country would be eligible for such a loan only if the President determined it was facing a severe shortage of foreign exchange, that it was assigning very high priority to programs designed to improve its food production, and that alleviation of its foreign exchange burden would substantially strengthen its ability to carry out programs of agricultural improvement.

Section 5: Would add two new sections to title II of Public Law 480 as follows:

1. Would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase additional agricultural commodities, including but not limited to high protein vegetable foods, to supplement surplus agricultural commodities for use in the food-for-peace program. This would in effect end the general requirement that commodities used in the program must be in surplus.

The CCC would also be authorized to make payment for nutritional enrichment of foods available for use under all the programs authorized by Public Law 480.

2. Would create a Cabinet-level policy Council to assess the food and assistance needs of developing countries, and recommend levels of assistance in food, technical and capital assistance, and local currency assistance which would promote the maximum effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy. The Council would take into consideration the policy declared in section 2 of this bill of meeting the widespread threat of human hunger in poor countries and stimulating their agricultural production. It would also consider, in making its recommendations, the extent to which such countries are giving high priority to increasing their own food production, and the desirability of encouraging maximum participation by other wealthy countries in combating world hunger and malnutrition

The Council would be composed of the Director of Food for Peace, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of State, and such other officials as the President may designate.

It would report annually to the President, the Congress, and the heads of agencies involved in administering the food-for-peace program.

The Secretary of Agriculture and the administration of AID would be required to take the Council's recommendatons into account in carrying out programs which they administer, including food for peace, economic aid, and domestic farm programs.

TO AMEND THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT OF 1933, AS AMENDED, TO REMOVE THE LIMITATION ON THE AUTHORITY OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY TO ISSUE BONDS TO FINANCE ITS POWER PROGRAM

Mr. BASS. Madam President, in 1959, while a Member of the other body, I had the privilege of working with the leadership there to enact the Tennessee Valley Authority Self-Financing Act. Under the terms of this act, TVA is authorized to finance the construction of power facilities through the sale of bonds and notes. Also, under this act, TVA must pay to the U.S. Treasury an annual dividend or return on appropriations invested in power facilities. Under the terms of this law, TVA was required to pay a minimum of $10 million to the National Treasury last fiscal year. Revenues were such, however, that a total of $52.6 million was actually paid.

The one major drawback in the legislation written into law was a limitation on the authority to issue these bonds. A maximum of $750 million could be outstanding at any one time.

President Johnson, in his budget message, called for the removal of this limitation to insure the availability of funds to build new power facilities.

Madam President, I am sending to the desk a bill which would accomplish this purpose.

The new borrowing authority will be needed sometime in 1967 so that TVA may plan and initiate construction of generating facilities to be placed in operation in the early 1970's.

At present TVA has $340 million in outstanding bonds and notes, while an additional $160 million will be needed to complete generating units and transmission facilities now under construction. This includes the 1,150,000-kilowatt generating unit now under construction at the Paradise steamplant which is scheduled for operation to help meet the loads expected in the winter of 1969–70.

The steady growth in power demand in the area served by TVA requires the installation of more than a million kilowatts of new capacity each year. Because of the time normally required for the manufacture and construction of large conventional powerplant equipment, TVA must commit funds therefor at least 4 years in advance of the required operating date of the plant.

TVA's experience in the past and its projections for the future indicate that the steady growth in power demand on its system will continue for the foreseeable future. Accordingly, there will be a continuing need for issuing bonds to provide necessary capital to increase generating capacity. The act and the realities of the financial market together with TVA's covenants with its outstanding bondholders assure continued fiscal responsibility. The Congress and the executive branch are in a position to review TVA's operations, including the exercise of its bonding authority at any time and without regard to the amount of debt outstanding.

Madam President, I ask that this bill lay on the desk for 10 days to permit Senators who wish to join me in sponsoring this measure to add their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk for 10 days, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The bill (S. 2827) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, to remove the limitation on the authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue bonds to finance its power program, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BASS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

TEMPORARY NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL FISCAL NEEDS AND RESOURCES

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Madam President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Needs and Resources.

We are all aware of proposals that have been suggested by various experts, groups, and Members of Congress to provide some form of Federal financial relief to State and local governments. These proposals emanate from the knowledge that within our Federal system we are experiencing—and will continue to experience in greater severity—what may be termed a fiscal mismatch.

State and local governments historically have carried the major burden of providing the civilian needs of the population, and they do so today. But population growth, increased urbanization and the greater demand for more and better public services have combined to double State and local expenditures over the past decade. In their attempt to meet these responsibilities, the States and localities have wrestled with their own tax systems, already heavily burdened, trying in every way to find new revenue sources.

On the other hand the Federal Government, with a revenue system far more responsive to economic growth, is expected to realize revenue increases each year on the order of $6 to $7 billion.

The continuation of this situation of responsibilities unmatched by necessary revenues has serious implications for the future of our system of federalism. And the proposals that have been put forth to right this imbalance also carry implications of a change in intergovernmental relations as we have known them.

In the face of this there has not as yet appeared the kind of public debate that one would expect. For this reason

I am proposing the establishment of a temporary national commission of eminent citizens and governmental officials to undertake a full study of the fiscal relations among all levels of government.

I suggested this approach in a speech before the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders last November. I noted then that the many questions which have been raised, even with only a limited public discussion of Federal, State, and local fiscal relations, demand that the Congress, and the public have a full airing of the problems and suggested solutions before action, or inaction, is decided upon. I was later pleased to note that the President, in his state of the Union message, addressed himself to the need of discussing ways in which to develop a more creative federalism.

Madam President, this proposed Commission would examine the present allocation of governmental responsibilities and fiscal systems at all levels. It would look forward to the future in terms of economic growth and what that growth will mean for intergovernmental revenues and expenditures. The Commission would then recommend to Congress plans and programs to keep financial resources in balance with needs throughout our federal system.

The work of the Commission should not be prejudged. It is not being proposed to promote one approach or another, or in the belief that current Federal efforts through the categorical grant programs are unworkable for the future. It is proposed only to bring the best minds to bear on the whole range of issues confronting us in an attempt to better the quality of American life.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2828) to establish a Temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Fiscal Needs and Resources, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

TO AMEND SECTION 301(a)(7) OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I introduce a bill which would seek to correct an inequity in the law which has been of long standing. My bill would amend section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 235, U.S.C. 401). The purpose of this amendment is to remedy an inequity in our laws which operates against certain classes of citizens of the United States who serve abroad in a civilian capacity as officials or employees of the U.S. Government or of a public international organization, including the children of such officials and employees.

Under existing law a child born abroad to a U.S. citizen father and an alien mother, or vice versa, does not acquire U.S. citizenship at birth unless the citizen parent, prior to the birth of the child, was physically present in the United States or its outlying possessions for a period or periods totaling not less than 10 years, at least 5 of which were after attaining the age of 14 years. At present, only members of the Armed Forces may count the periods of honorable service abroad in order to meet the physical-presence requirement of section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. There should not be any second-class citizens amongst the U.S. nationals who serve abroad. This bill would make uniform the provisions of the law for all classes of U.S. nationals serving abroad and would not, as is presently the case, discriminate against nonmilitary personnel.

The problem which the proposed amendment is designed to overcome is a continually recurring one and is likely to intensify in view of the large number of American parents who, in recent years, have had protracted assignments abroad in connection with their official duties. It is particularly the sons and daughters of these parents who, if they marry a foreign national, are in many cases precluded by law from transmitting U.S. citizenship to their foreign-born children because they lack the requisite 10 years of physical presence in the United States. It is not uncommon for the children of a Foreign Service officer to spend most of their youthful years abroad accompanying their parents from one assignment to another. The proposed amendment, in effect, would treat the time spent abroad in such cases as constructive physical presence in the United States for the purpose of transmitting U.S. citizenship. I cannot see why dependent children who of necessity must live abroad, if they are to reside with their parents, should be penalized because of this involuntary action on their part.

The amendment which I am proposing would save the Congress the necessity of considering private bills designed to waive the provisions of section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. I see no reason why Members of the Congress and committee staffs, as well as employees of the executive branch, should be compelled to spend valuable time in preparing and passing legislation to overcome an inequitable provision of the law when this inequity can easily be corrected by the passage of the bill which I have introduced.

I hope that my colleagues, and especially those on the Judiciary Committee, will join in supporting this bill. The bill has the support of the State Department, USIA, AID, and other nonmilitary departments of the executive branch who have personnel serving overseas. The bill has been cleared and approved by the Bureau of the Budget. I hope it will receive the prompt consideration of the subcommittee to which it may be referred, of the committee, and of the Senate itself.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2329) to amend section 301 (a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT OF 1937

Mr. CASE. Madam President, in introducing today a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 as amended, I am re-presenting the substance of a measure which I had introduced in August 1965. My action last August was to offer an amendment to H.R. 9811, the 1965 farm bill which the Senate was at that time considering. I withdrew that proposed amendment at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who felt that, regardless of the merits of my proposal, an amendment to last year's farm bill was not the proper vehicle for achieving the necessary action.

Today, I am reintroducing my measure with the foreknowledge of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] who is the chairman of the committee by which it will be considered.

My bill will permit the egg industry—if its members so wish, through their affirmative expression in a referendum—to take advantage of privileges which are presently available to producers of milk, of many fruits, of tobacco, of fresh vegetables, of hops, of honeybees, and naval stores. My bill would afford egg producers the opportunity to express themselves, yea or nay, on an economic program to help to provide economic stability to their industry.

Because every one of the 50 States produces eggs in significant quantities, this measure is important to constituents of every one of the Senators present on this floor. Eggs are the product of highest farm value in the poultry complex. Poultry and egg production in 1965 was worth $3.6 billion in the 50 States, with one-half of that sum attributable directly to eggs, and the remainder divided among broilers, turkeys, and other poultry.

Although the egg is a basic item in the American diet, over the past 10 years its price has gradually declined to the extent that average returns to producers in my State—and I dare say in other States as well—have failed to reach a level consistent with what we like to describe as the American standard of living.

Despite an efficiency that has steadily pushed up average egg production per hen, and the average number of layers tended per family, New Jersey egg farmers—and family-type egg producers in other States as well—have not been able to match the incomes of farmers who have had the protection of economic programs to help their commodities achieve a reasonable price in the market. Thus, we have had the situation of an efficient producer, producing a desirable food which is accepted as a staple item of diet, being confronted by a generally declining—and unsatisfactory—income situation.

This situation—for which I will supply details in a moment—has one feature which makes my bill exceedingly timely. By a fortunate circumstance for which there is no adequate explanation, egg prices in December were almost 7 cents per dozen above the average of the six preceding Decembers—1959–64.

This means that today—and perhaps for the next 6 months—egg producers can review their situation without, at the same time, being subject to the strains and upsets and temptations toward snap judgment that occur when the returns from egg production barely cover feed costs, let alone other production costs as has periodically been the case at intervals during the past 10 years.

As evidence of the need to establish improved terms of trade for the family-type egg producer, I submit the following data, all taken from official statistical sources in the Department of Agriculture:

Year	Annual average price received for eggs, per dozen		Income of representative New Jersey egg producer		Efficiency factors, New Jersey egg producer		
	U.S. farmers (1)	Representative New Jersey farm (2)	Net cash farm income (3)	Net farm income including perquisites (4)	Capital investment Jan. 1 (5)	Eggs produced per layer (6)	Average number of layers in flock (7)
	Cents	*Cents*			*Thousands*		
1955	39.5	44	$1,701	$3,860	$39	189	3,744
1956	39.3	41	1,249	3,371	41	192	3,965
1957	35.9	39	542	2,462	41	195	3,908
1958	38.5	40	1,406	3,285	42	194	4,118
1959	31.4	33	−2,179	−523	43	196	4,214
1960	36.0	39	3,413	5,158	43	193	4,193
1961	35.5	37	3,339	4,959	45	194	4,514
1962	33.6	35	1,466	2,433	45	192	4,646
1963	34.4	34	1,038	2,093	44	196	4,696
1964	33.8	33	1,296	2,470	45	199	4,718
1965 (preliminary)	33.5	(1)	(1)	2,723	46	(1)	(1)

[1] Not available.

In summary, despite an egg price generally higher than the U.S. average, a rising rate of lay per layer, and increasing flock size, the typical egg producer's income has been slipping, and in 1965—including return on capital—he earned less than the accepted $3,000 figure which is supposed to indicate the edge of the poverty level.

There is further significance in the fact that—in a group of eight representative farms for which the Department of Agriculture publishes 1965 financial synthesis—the egg farm had the lowest returns, as measured by this series, "Farm Cost Situation," 1966 Outlook issue, pages 41, 42:

Type and location of farm	Preliminary 1965 data	
	Net farm income	Total farm capital
Dairy (grade A), eastern Wisconsin	$7,535	$75,530
Hog-beef fattening, Corn Belt	13,984	132,980
Tobacco, coastal plain North Carolina	6,204	43,570
Cotton, large-scale, Mississippi delta	30,148	316,540
Egg, New Jersey	2,723	46,150
Cattle, intermountain region	9,542	90,530
Wheat—small grain—livestock, Northern Plains	11,716	63,630
Winter wheat, Southern Plains	10,748	118,770

Of this cross section of farm, it is noteworthy that not only is the egg farm the lowest in income, but also it is one of the few that is innocent of any Federal income support through commodity-type agricultural stabilization programs.

My proposed legislation does not specify what type of stabilization program—if any—the egg industry should adopt. I do not want to prescribe that. Rather, under my legislation, the Secretary of Agriculture would be directed to hold hearings and consider testimony recommending means by which a reasonable opportunity toward earning adequate income could be opened to egg producers.

Simply to establish this opportunity is the purpose of my bill. No economic program is specified in the bill. No appropriation, or authorization of an appropriation, is specified. But the opportunity for hearing and for balloting is specified. And within the industry there is both the ingenuity to suggest programs, and the wisdom to separate the wheat from the chaff among those suggestions, so that the economic prospect of the industry can be brought more nearly in line with its accomplishments in productivity.

Because the industry is still groping for a satisfactory economic program or policy, it behooves all interested parties to join in attempts to develop a satisfactory mode of operation. If the hearings fail to develop practical stabilization methods for egg producers, then opposition will be justified at that time—but in a referendum on the issues, not in a gag on an inquiry or on a search for a way to keep the family egg producer a viable economic entity. The legislation I am proposing is simply enabling legislation to permit egg producers to express themselves regarding their economic future.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2832) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue marketing orders to cover chicken table eggs, introduced by Mr. CASE (for himself and Senators McGOVERN and DODD), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF CERTAIN LANDS IN PRINCE GEORGES AND CHARLES COUNTY, MD.

Mr. **TYDINGS**. Madam President, I want to direct the attention of the Senate to the urgent need for decisive action in this session of Congress to prevent destruction of the inspiring view toward the Maryland shore from Mount Vernon.

The danger is very real. The Congress has recognized it.

In 1961, when construction of a sewage treatment plant was proposed for the Piscataway Bay area on the Maryland shore directly across the Potomac from Mount Vernon, Congress acted swiftly to authorize a 1,152-acre park in place of the sewage plant.

That authorization, Public Law 87–362, included funds for the Department of the Interior to acquire one-half the acreage of the park, on the understanding that the other half would be donated by private interests.

The public response to the threat of destruction of the Mount Vernon view was swift and uncommonly generous. Private owners and foundations committed themselves to contribute 345 acres as soon as the Government completed its authorized 586-acre acquisition and a foundation made an initial contribution of 151 acres. In addition, private owners of property in the Piscataway area have pledged more than 130 scenic easements covering 900 acres surrounding the proposed park.

The only condition that these private persons and foundations attached to their notable civic spirit and generosity was that the Federal Government should fulfill its part of the bargain by acting under the 1961 authorization Congress gave to the Department of the Interior.

I must sadly report, however, that with the exception of the 97 acres originally earmarked for the sewage facility, the Department of the Interior has failed utterly to exercise the authorization given it in 1961. While real estate values in the area of the proposed park have soared, and in the face of reversionary provisions in most of the private pledges of lands and easements, requiring the Government to act before September 1967, the Federal Government has not acted at all to complete the park since the first 971-acre acquisition.

The Piscataway Park project faces two direct and immediate threats in the very near future. First, if the Federal Government does not act to complete its acquisition of the park within 20 months, the principal private contributions of property for the park and most of the scenic easements will revert to the present landholders. The second danger, equally real, is that the rising value of real estate in the Piscataway area will almost certainly compel the same kind of high-density development in the area which has been attempted on both sides of the Potomac Palisades and all along the Potomac shores from Georgetown through Alexandria.

Is the magnificent vista from Mount Vernon to be stamped out by high-density housing and commercial building simply because the Federal Government has defaulted for 4 years on the Piscataway Park project Congress authorized in 1961?

Are the millions who visit Mount Vernon to be deprived forever of the inspiring Potomac panorama at Mount Vernon?

This is the year Congress must act to secure the Maryland shore across from Mount Vernon for the pleasure and inspiration of all Americans.

We must this year authorize and appropriate the approximately $3.5 million necessary to complete the acquisition of the Piscataway Park site, and we must insist that the funds be spent.

We are talking about spending less than 1½ cents for each American citizen to preserve the view from Mount Vernon for all time and for all our citizens.

The conscience of the Congress on this question has been Representative HERVEY G. MACHEN, in whose Maryland congressional district the proposed park lies. Last summer he introduced H.R. 10017 to authorize the funds which will be necessary to complete the park. Directly attributable to his urging, I think, is the welcome news from Secretary of the Interior Udall that his Department will endorse the Machen bill and, after its passage, will complete the Piscataway Park project.

Because time is so much of the essence, I am introducing today in the Senate a bill identical to that Representative MACHEN has introduced in the House, so that consideration of the bill in the Senate can begin even as the proposal moves through the House.

The time to save the Mount Vernon view is very short.

The time to act is now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2833) to increase the amount authorized by the joint resolution of October 4, 1961, to be appropriated for the preservation and protection of certain lands in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md., introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ALCOHOLISM CONTROL ACT OF 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I introduce for myself and for Senators COOPER, FANNIN, MURPHY, PROUTY, and SCOTT the Alcoholism Control Act of 1966. This measure establishes under the Surgeon General an Office of Alcoholism Control which will administer a program of matching grants to the States for treatment, rehabilitation, education, prevention, and research in alcoholism. The Office will also administer a program of research, training, and demonstration projects through universities and other institutions and coordinate alcoholism programs conducted by different agencies. In addition, a nine-man Alcoholism Advisory Council is created to review project grants and the Office's programs and to make recommendations on dealing with alcoholism.

Another feature of this bill is the provision that an individual cannot be made the subject of research unless he specifically agrees to do so.

This bill is designed to launch an attack upon what has been described as the fourth most serious health problem in the United States—alcoholism. Alcoholism is defined as "any condition of abnormal behavior or illness resulting directly or indirectly from the chronic and habitual use of or dependence upon alcoholic beverages to the extent of loss of power of self-control over their use."

There are an estimated 5 to 6 million alcoholics in the Nation, 1 out of every 15 Americans who drink. Roughly 250,000 persons each year join the ranks of alcoholics. Some 15 percent of all new admissions to public non-Federal mental hospitals in 1960 were alcoholics.

The U.S. Public Health Service has described alcoholism as among the worst of our public health menaces, ranking behind only heart disease, mental illness, and cancer. But alcoholism does more than shorten life, taking an enormous toll of those it afflicts—alcoholics have a death rate 2½ times that of the normal population. It also takes a heavy toll of the family of the afflicted individual, a toll incapable of measurement by cold statistics. In addition, alcoholism takes its toll of other innocents through high crime and accident rates.

The economic costs of alcoholism run high. It has been estimated that the cost to business and industry from absenteeism, inefficiency, and accidents, due to alcoholism runs to some $2 billion annually. Indicative of industry's concern with the problem is the fact that one-fourth of the top 100 companies listed in Fortune are now conducting or are developing alcoholism programs for their employees.

Yet, despite the heavy incidence of alcoholism and its human and economic costs, the Federal Establishment today has relatively few programs dealing with this problem. And efforts in the States, while helpful, fall far short of the need. The North American Association of Alcoholism Programs, which helped in the development of this bill, indicates that 39 States and the District of Columbia have laws recognizing alcoholism as a medical problem and providing for State government financial services covering treatment, educational work and/or research. This bill seeks to enhance these State programs on a matching basis. For States not yet having alcoholism programs, provision is made for a one-time no-matching grant to establish such a program; this provision follows a precedent set in the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965.

The sponsors of the Alcoholism Control Act of 1966 take particular pride as Republicans in this measure. Our party has long manifested a constructive interest in the problems of alcoholism. The first major hearings on this subject since prohibition were held in the Republican 80th Congress—the present District of Columbia statute was the result.

President Eisenhower was the first President to proclaim Alcoholism Information Week. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur Fleming was the first postwar Cabinet officer to demonstrate significant interest in the problems of alcoholism. It was he who cautioned the Nation that "alcoholism is the fourth most serious health problem" facing us.

And, in 1964, the Republican platform specifically asked for increased financial support for combating alcoholism.

Alcoholism is a major menace. Yet while we expend some $380 annually to treat each tuberculosis patient, only 16 cents is spent on the average each year for treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics. The Alcoholism Control Act of 1966 seeks to correct this disparity. It is truly a measure designed at long last to seek to conquer America's fourth most serious health problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2834) to provide for a comprehensive program for the control of alcoholism, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COMMEMORATION OF 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF AMERICAN NUMISMATIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Madam President, on October 7, 1891, the American Numismatic Association was founded. It was federally charted for 50 years by an act of Congress on May 9, 1912, and in 1962 it was chartered in perpetuity by Public Law 87–433. The year 1966 marks the 75th anniversary of this association. At the present time, both the president, Mr. Matt H. Rothert, and the Washington education chairman, Mr. S. W. Freeman, are from my State of Arkansas. It is in recognition of these men and of the American Numismatic Association itself that I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2835) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

STAFFING OF MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I introduce for myself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1966 to provide Federal aid for the staffing of community mental retardation facilities.

The measure would provide:

First. Federal aid on a declining scale over a 51-month period for the staffing of community mental retardation facilities. Last year, Congress amended the 1963 act to provide this sort of aid for community mental health centers, and the bill introduced today seeks to provide the same portion of Federal aid for mental retardation facilities. The bill authorizes $30 million for this purpose and provides Federal aid for 75 percent of new staffing costs for the first 15 months, 60 percent during the next year, 45 percent the following year, and 30 percent for the final year.

Second. Further amend the 1963 act to include the cost of acquiring sites as part of construction costs for community mental health centers and mental retardation facilities.

Mentally retarded children can be educated to be useful citizens, in many cases self-supporting, and in most instances to be free of the need for expensive institutional care. If adequately rehabilitated, between 75 percent to 85 percent of the mentally retarded can become self-supporting and between 10 percent and 20 percent can become partially self-supporting; the remainder will remain completely dependent.

More important—and incapable of measurement—is the affect this rehabilitation will have on parents and family to whom the necessity for institutionalization is a shattering experience. And the meaning to the retarded themselves also cannot be measured in money—it is the difference between being a whole human person and being an impersonal statistic in an institution.

Three out of every 100 children born are destined to be mentally retarded. Mental retardation is the major cause of disability among the young adults, aged 21–35, who receive assistance under the Federal program for aid to the permanent and totally disabled.

While communities are spending more than $650 million annually for treatment, education, and training of the mentally retarded, these services fall short of the need for special training and care that is required. They require the staffing assistance provided by this bill.

The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Centers Construction Act of 1963 would be further amended by the bill I introduce today to include the cost of acquiring sites as part of construction costs for mental health centers and mental retardation facilities. Experience has shown that the original act was not broad enough to cover critical situations, especially in urban areas where land is expensive and often difficult to obtain. In urban areas, this shortcoming represents a serious deterrent to the public and private agencies desiring to provide buildings for services. The provision to correct this situation follows the pattern of the amendment to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act adopted last year.

While recognizing that the matching formula in the present law is inadequate, I have refrained from including corrective language in my bill at this time. However, it is my intention to press in committee for reform of many inequitable allocation formulas. Under present law, the Federal share of construction projects varies from 33⅓ percent to 66⅔ percent among the States. Under this formula, an organization or community with modest resources would receive the minimum Federal share if located in a high-income State and, conversely, a well-to-do community or organization would receive maximum Federal contribution if located in a low-income State. This obviously is unfair and demands correction.

I urge all who are concerned with the well-being and rehabilitation of the mentally retarded to join in this effort to bring to these unfortunates the care and training they require and which, all too often, overburdened State, local, and private agencies are unable to provide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2836) to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for community mental retardation facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself and Mr. Prouty), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROVIDING 4-YEAR TERMS FOR HOUSE MEMBERS

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would amend the Constitution to change the present 2-year term of U.S. Representatives to 4 years. My proposal differs from that recommended by President Johnson and embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 126 by providing that all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives will be chosen in the midterm national election instead of concurrently with the election of the President of the United States.

I have always favored a 4-year term for Congressmen because the present 2-year term forces most of them to spend too much time campaigning for reelection. Having served as a Member of the House for 16 years from a marginal district which was not safe in any election, I know whereof I speak. A Congressman simply cannot perform his duties diligently and conscientiously in this era of increasingly complex issues if he is forced to spend the bulk of his time mending his political fences back home.

For this reason, I agree with President Johnson on the need to lengthen the terms of Congressmen. But I disagree as to when they should be elected.

Electing the President and the House of Representatives at the same time, as President Johnson proposes, deprives the public of any opportunity to correct the excesses of a strong President or the mistakes of a weak one. For 4 long years there would be no way to counsel, check, or advise the President of alterations in public sentiment. A midterm election of the House, on the other hand, would give notice to a President of the sense of the public will.

The idea of electing Congressmen and, indeed, Senators for terms to run currently with that of the President has been advanced by those seeking to legitimize in the United States the doctrine of part responsibility. Under this doctrine, Members of the Legislature are supposed, for all practical purposes, to be subservient to the President. They are supposed to run on his coattails every 4 years and then be at his beck and call. An independent-minded Representative would be a rarity.

This doctrine may be fine for political systems like the British where a premium is placed on party discipline in Parliament. But this concept is alien to American politics. Our parties are not meant to be monolithic. They are coalitions of diverse groups and interests which reflect the variety and diversity that is America. A subservient Legislature is contrary to the purposes of the authors of our Constitution who created a Congress that is coequal to and independent of the executive branch of Government.

These considerations underlie my opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 126. This is why I am offering my proposal as an alternative to that recommended by President Johnson.

I want to point out that neither my resolution nor Senate Joint Resolution 126 should be regarded as the only measures required to strengthen Congress, so as to enable it better to discharge its responsibilities effectively. The Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, the so-called Monroney-Madden committee, is presently studying many proposals designed to revitalize and strengthen Congress so that it can effectively meet the challenges confronting it in the years ahead. I joined in sponsoring the resolution which created that committee, have offered recommendations to it, and am following its deliberations with keen interest and anticipation. I hope that its work will result in improving the organization and procedures of our National Legislature so that it can be restored to its coequal status in the triumvirate comprising our National Government and that it can merit the confidence of the electorate which chooses its Members.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my proposed resolution together with an editorial from the current issue of Life magazine which opposes the idea of electing the President and Congressmen concurrently be printed in the Record immediately following my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that my resolution lie on the table for 7 days in order to give my colleagues an opportunity to add their names as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk as requested, and the joint resolution and editorial will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 128) to amend the Constitution as to the length of terms of Representatives in the U.S. House of Representatives, introduced by Mr. Scott, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 128

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the

Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The terms of Representatives shall be four years and shall commence at noon on the 3d day of January of the second year after the year of the regular term of the President is to begin.

"SEC. 2. No member of a House of Congress shall be eligible for election as a Member of the other House for a term which is to begin before the expiration of the term of the office held by him unless, at least 30 days prior to such election, he shall have submitted a resignation from such office which shall become effective no later than the beginning of such term.

"SEC. 3. This article shall take effect on January 3, 1975, if it is ratified prior to January 1, 1974."

The editorial presented by Mr. SCOTT is as follows:

[From Life magazine, Jan. 28, 1966]

CONGRESSMEN NEED 4-YEAR TERMS

Of all the proposals put forth by President Johnson in his state of the Union message, the most popular with the assembled Congressmen, to judge from their applause, was the suggestion that Members of the House of Representatives ought to have 4-year terms, running concurrently with the President's. "The present 2-year term," Johnson said, "requires most Members of Congress to divert enormous energies to an almost constant process of campaigning—depriving this Nation of the fullest measure of both their skill and their wisdom."

"A Congressman," runs an old Capitol Hill gag, "is the shortest distance between 2 years." Plenty of men in and out of Government are prepared to testify to the wastefulness of the present system. Yet though during the last 40 years well over 50 proposed constitutional amendments to extend the term to 4 years have been introduced, none got anywhere. But no President ever pushed for the change the way Lyndon Johnson has.

The Founding Fathers compromised upon the 2-year term after considerable haggling. Elbridge Gerry would have preferred a 1-year term, in the belief that annual elections were "the only defense of the people against tyranny." James Madison felt that at least 3 years were required for a Representative to surmount local interests and get a sense of the country at large. Alexander Hamilton, with his mistrust of excessively popular rule ("Your people, sir, is nothing but a great beast"), also favored the longer term.

Defenders of the 2-year term still contend, much as Gerry did, that frequent elections are necessary if the people are to keep a checkrein on their representatives, and make them answer for what they do. This is not a bad argument, but it was better in 1787 than it is today, when so much more is demanded of a Congressman both in work done in Washington and campaigning done at home.

Nor is it pertinent to argue that only about 100 out of 435 legislators need to worry much about being reelected, since the rest come from "safe" districts. The men most threatened are often exactly those whose caliber and promise are greatest; tough races generally bring out the best candidates. Furthermore, the job security of a 4-year term would help attract higher quality men.

Doubling the House term is a sound idea. But should it be concurrent with the President's term as Johnson suggests? In the past, off-year elections have been a nuisance to the White House. Only once in this century (in 1934) has the President's party failed to lose House seats in the off year, and frequently it has lost control of Congress altogether. While the length of the presidential coattails is a matter of dispute (Johnson, for example, carried many Democrats into office with him in 1964, though in 1956 Eisenhower didn't get a Republican majority in either the House or the Senate), the newly elected Chief Executive usually has a sympathetic House during the first half of his term.

A friendly Congress means that the President has an easier time getting his programs passed into law, and so far as this amenability contributes to joint responsibility of the legislative and the executive it is a good thing. But a too agreeable Congress can be an inadequate counterweight to a strong executive, and with no off-year House elections the problem is likely to be compounded.

Johnson avoids the charge of power-collecting on his own behalf by proposing that no changes take place until 1972, when he possibly will have completed his second term. But as Prof. James MacGregor Burns points out in his brilliant new book, "Presidential Government," the Johnson administration represents a high point in the historic drift toward White House domination of the entire Government. The wish for concurrent House and presidential terms must be considered in this light.

Burns goes on to show that powerful forces like reapportionment and a general appetite for liberal programs are already driving Congress into the President's pocket. The danger for the future is no longer inefficiency and stalemate, but what he calls "the corruption of consensus," the stagnation which lies at the heart of too much presidential success.

It seems gratuitous to speed this process by making House terms jibe in toto with that of the President. The Senate has always got along well by dividing its membership into three 6-year "classes" so as to stagger elections 2 years apart. The House must represent a balance between providing a responsible area of support for an elected President with a mandate from the voters, and giving the Nation a chance to approve or disapprove, in mid-term, of the way the President has been operating. The logical solution is a 4-year House term with half the Members standing for election every 2 years. Our Government would be far healthier for it.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS MEMORIAL BOARD

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, I introduce for proper referral a Senate joint resolution to provide for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal that accompanied the request for introduction be made a part of the record at this point. The letter signed by Stanley A. Cain, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, sets out the Department's explanation of the proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 129) providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., December 9, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed joint resolution "Providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board."

We recommend that the enclosed resolution be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted. We believe that enactment at the present time is urgent.

The joint resolution creates a National Capital Parks Memorial Board which will prepare and recommend to the Secretary of the Interior broad criteria, guidelines, and policies for memorializing persons and events on Federal land in the National Capital Parks System. The Board will examine proposals made for memorials and make recommendations thereon to the Secretary of the Interior.

The Board will be composed of nine members, as follows: Five appointed by the President of the United States; the Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission; the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission; the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; and the Director of the National Park Service. The members of the Board will receive no salary but may be paid expenses incidental to travel while engaged in discharging their duties as members of the Board.

Memorializations place a constant demand on park land of the Nation's Capital. There are 100 memorials of the monument or statue type already existing on land in the National Capital Parks System. A number of others have been authorized but not yet constructed. In the 88th Congress alone numerous bills were considered with respect to 13 separate proposals, 2 of which were enacted into law. A similar pattern has been repeated in the prior Congresses. It is evident that, if the concept of open space and dignity which contribute so much to the beauty of the Nation's Capital is to be preserved in the face of constant pressures to use the land for memorials, sound guidelines for the control of this use must be formulated, a comprehensive plan must be developed, each proposal must be carefully evaluated, and sound criteria must be steadfastly followed. In fact, such a plan offers the only assurance that sites will be available for future memorials that in all respects merit a location in the parks.

We recommend the establishment of the Memorial Board as a means of meeting the critical situation which confronts the National Capital Parks System. The Board will provide an effective method for focusing attention on the problem, and will help all concerned to view the numerous proposals in proper perspective.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY A. CAIN,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

DRAFTEES SHOULD NOT BE SENT TO SOUTHEAST ASIA INVOLUNTARILY WITHOUT CONGRESSIONAL APROVAL—AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BILLS 2791, 2792, AND 2793

AMENDMENTS NOS. 481, 482, AND 483

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I send to the desk three proposed amendments to bills—S. 2791, S. 2792, and S. 2793—now under consideration by the Senate Committees on the Armed Services and Foreign Relations. Those bills authorize additional military and AID programs for Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask that these amendments lie on the table for 3 days, to give others an opportunity to cosponsor them, and that they then be printed and be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, I am offering these amendments to all three bills because there is no way of ascertaining at this time which of these bills will first come before the Senate for action and also because I believe that they should be considered by both committees.

These three amendments are identical and provide simply that persons drafted into the armed services should not be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without congressional approval.

On August 20, 1965, I had intended to offer a similar amendment to the defense appropriation bill then pending in the Senate. That morning the President asked to see me at the White House. The purpose of our meeting was to enable me to explain to the President in detail my opposition to our military involvement in Vietnam, which I had been voicing on the floor of the Senate for a year and a half. I told the President that I disagreed completely with his administration's position, that three Presidents had pledged support to this policy—that there was in fact no national pledge or an unavoidable commitment—that we had in fact asked ourselves into Vietnam. I also elaborated on my other reasons for believing that our involvement was folly—that it was a war we could not win—that continuation there would lead to greater and greater disaster.

While there, after I expressed my views, I told him I intended to introduce an amendment that very afternoon forbidding draftees to be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without the consent of the Congress. The President earnestly urged me not to introduce the amendment. He said that in any event no draftees would be sent to Vietnam before January. After repeating his request that I take no such action, he said that if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased.

In view of the President's request and his statement to me: "If we are not out of there by January you can do anything you please," I agreed to and did withhold my amendment.

Immediately upon returning to my office, I sent the President by special messenger a copy of my proposed amendment and the remarks I had prepared to make in support of my amendment on that afternoon. These I transmitted to the President with an accompanying letter. I ask unanimous consent that that proposed amendment, my proposed remarks, and my letter to the President of August 20, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, more than 5 months have now elapsed. We are still bogged down in an undeclared war in Vietnam which threatens to escalate into a third world war and the price of which in any event in lives and other costs would be staggering.

While I disapprove entirely of our involvement in Vietnam, it becomes clear that those who have enlisted in any of the Armed Forces have an obligation to go where their Commander in Chief sends them. "Theirs is not to reason why."

But an entirely different situation prevails when we reach into millions of American families and conscript these youths to fight involuntarily in this hopeless mess.

Since there apparently is no intention to ask for a declaration of war, this amendment will serve as a vehicle for Members of Congress to express themselves on an issue which strikes home in a literal sense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, the President has sought no declaration of war from that branch of the Government which alone is authorized under the Constitution to declare war—the Congress.

Of course, I can understand the difficulty the President would face in seeking a declaration of war. Against whom would he ask Congress to declare war?

Declare war against the Vietcong—or the National Liberation Front—which is one of the two parties involved in the civil war in Vietnam?

Declare war against North Vietnam only, which is now supplying the Vietcong—but where would that leave the Vietcong?

Declare war against Red China—which to date has not committed a man for combat, and is giving little material aid to Vietcong—although shouting much encouragement?

Declare war against Russia—which also is sending materiel to fan the flames of the discord in Vietnam?

It is important, therefore, before further draftees are sent to southeast Asia to fight a ground war in the steaming jungles of Vietnam that each Member of the Senate have an opportunity to express whether—absent such a declaration of war—draftees should involuntarily be sent to southeast Asia.

My amendments will afford an opportunity for each Senator to stand up and be counted.

When I call up my amendment—and I shall do so at the appropriate time—each Senator will have to ask himself these questions:

Is it fair, without an express authorization to that effect by the Congress, for draftees to be sent involuntarily to Vietnam to fight and perhaps die there while well-trained men of the Regular Armed Forces are not fully utilized in the fighting in Vietnam?

Is it fair, without an express authorization to the effect by the Congress, for draftees to be sent involuntarily to Vietnam to fight and perhaps die there while well-trained men in the Armed Forces Reserves—on whose training we have been spending annually well over one and three-quarter billion dollars—are not fully utilized in Vietnam?

Is it fair, without an express authorization to that effect by the Congress, for draftees to be sent involuntarily to Vietnam to fight and perhaps die there while over 300,000 well-trained, experienced troops are stationed in Europe?

I appreciate the fact that, when I call up my amendment, there is a risk that a motion will be made to table it or to amend it in such a way as to nullify its clear purpose. I hope if such a motion is made, it will not be made until there has been open and prolonged debate on the floor of the Senate on every single aspect of the crisis in Vietnam, including how we became involved there and whether we have exhausted very single legal avenue in our search for peace.

But if there is a motion to table my amendment, or to nullify it by amendment, let no one here remain unaware of how a vote to table will be interpreted by millions of mothers, fathers, wives, and children throughout the United States. A vote to table will be interpreted as a vote to send draftees to fight in Vietnam while hundreds of thousands of our regular Armed Forces are undergoing the "rigors" of being stationed in the United States or in Europe—while hundreds of thousands of Reserves are going about their daily civilian jobs, sacrificing only one evening a week or one day a month for which they receive pay.

It is high time this issue was debated. It is high time every Member of the Senate stood up and was counted on our involvement in the undeclared war in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that a table prepared for me by the Department of Defense showing the costs of Reserve and Guard Forces for the past 3 years be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

To the Committee on Armed Services:

"S. 2791

"Amendment No. 421, intended to be proposed by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. MORSE) to S. 2791, a bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes:

"On page 3 after line 8 add the following new section:

" 'Sec. 302. During any period that any Armed Force of the United States is engaged in armed conflict or hostilities in southeast Asia, no person who is a member of that Armed Force serving on active duty by virtue of involuntary inducton under the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to perform duty in such area, unless (1) such person volunteers for service in such area, or (2) the Congress hereafter authorizes by law the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted into such Armed Forces'."

To the Committee on Armed Services:

"S. 2792

"Amendment No. 482, intended to be proposed by Mr. Gruening (for himself and Mr. Morse) to S. 2792, a bill to authorize certain construction in support of military activities in southeast Asia, and for other purposes:

"On page 3 after section 6 add the following new section:

" 'Sec. 7. During any period that any Armed Force of the United States is engaged in armed conflict or hostilities in southeast Asia, no person who is a member of that Armed Force serving on active duty by virtue of involuntary induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to perform duty in such area, unless (1) such person volunteers for service in such area, or (2) the Congress hereafter authorizes by law the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted into such Armed Force.' "

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"S. 2793

"Amendment No. 483, intended to be proposed by Mr. Gruening (for himself and Mr. Morse) to S. 2793, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes:

"On page 2 after section 3 add the following new section:

" 'Sec. 4. During any period that any Armed Force of the United States is engaged in armed conflict or hostilities in southeast Asia, no person who is a member of that Armed Force serving on active duty by virtue of involuntary induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to perform duty in such area, unless (1) such person volunteers for service in such area, or (2) the Congress hereafter authorizes by law the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted into such Armed Force.' "

Exhibit 2

H.R. 9221

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. Gruening to H.R. 9221, an Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes:

On page 26 change the period to a comma and add the following: "*Provided,* That, none of the funds provided in this Act shall, except with the prior assent of Congress, be used to pay any of the costs of stationing or assigning, without his consent, any person serving in the Armed Forces of the United States by virtue of involuntary induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act to duty in southeast Asia."

Draftees Should Not Be Sent to Southeast Asia Involuntarily Without Congressional Approval

Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed amendment to H.R. 9221, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1966. I ask that the amendment be printed, lie at the desk, and be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

My amendment is simple.

It provides that no draftee can be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without the consent of the Congress.

The President has now stated publicly—what I have been saying openly time and again for a year and a half now—that the conflict in Vietnam is a war.

He has said:

"It is this lesson that has brought us to Vietnam. This is a different kind of war. There are no marching armies or solemn declarations. Some citizens of South Vietnam, at times with understandable grievances, have joined in the attack on their own government. But we must not let this mask the central fact that this is really war. It is guided by North Vietnam and spurred by Communist China. Its goal is to conquer the south, to defeat American power, and to extend the Asiatic dominion of communism." However, he has sought no declaration of war from the only part of the Federal Government authorized by the Constitution to declare war—the Congress.

It is important, therefore, before further draftees are sent to southeast Asia to fight in the steaming jungles of Vietnam that each Member of the Senate have an opportunity to express whether—absent such a declaration of war—draftees should involuntarily be sent to southeast Asia.

My amendment offers an opportunity for each Senator to stand up and be counted.

H.R. 9221 is the appropriate vehicle for such an expression of opinion by the Senate since it contains a separate section appropriating in title V, at the request of the President, the sum of $1.7 billion for the southeast Asia emergency fund for use by the Department of Defense.

Theoretically the United States is at peace.

Theoretically those called up for the draft for our armed services are being called up to serve in peacetime. If the ground rules are to be changed, it is up to the Congress—which authorized the peacetime draft of men for the Armed Forces—to change these rules.

Let no one doubt the interpretation of the vote which I shall seek on this amendment. A vote against the amendment or a vote to table this amendment will be a vote to use the peacetime conscription laws to send draftees to fight and perchance to die in what President Johnson has called the war in Vietnam.

This will be an extremely important vote to the thousands upon thousands of mothers and fathers of draftees throughout the country.

If this war in Vietnam is to be fought without the expressed sanction of the Congress then let it be fought by volunteers. With a clear expression of the will of the Congress that it be otherwise, let no draftee involuntarily be sent to Vietnam.

August 20, 1965.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: It was very good of you to see me yesterday and to give me the opportunity to present to you my views on the present situation in Vietnam.

Enclosed is a copy of the speech I had on my desk when I spoke to you yesterday. This was prepared for delivery yesterday and in it I offered an amendment to the defense appropriation bill prohibiting the sending of draftees, without their consent, to southeast Asia. You will recall I spoke to you twice about this, and that at your earnest request I agreed not to introduce this amendment.

In compliance with your wish, I shall not introduce this amendment at this time, although I feel deeply that at the very least the Congress should pass on the sending of our draftees into the war in southeast Asia.

However, as I suggested to you at our meeting, I strongly urge you to announce publicly that—at least until there has been a review of the entire situation after the Congress returns in January or unless a grave national emergency develops—draftees will not be sent to southeast Asia unless they volunteer for such duty. Such a public announcement from you would do much to reassure the people of the United States.

I was pleased to hear from both you and Ambassador Goldberg of the strenuous efforts to secure peace in southeast Asia. As I told you, I was particularly gratified to notice your clarification of your position since your Johns Hopkins speech. Your announcement at your press conference on July 28, 1965, that there would be no particular problem in bringing the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front to the conference table, as I had been urging for some time, was most reassuring.

I was also pleased to hear your changed stand on the reunification of Vietnam through internationally supervised elections as provided for in the Geneva Conventions of 1954. Of course, as I said, it is difficult to convince those with whom we are seeking to arrange a cessation of hostilities of our bona fides while we continue the bombing of North Vietnam.

With best wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senator.

Exhibit 3

Department of Defense—Cost of Reserve and Guard Forces

[In millions]

	Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1964	Fiscal year 1965[1]
Army Reserve	$372.9	$379.1	$358.9
Army National Guard	550.0	624.4	649.4
Naval Reserve	250.1	273.1	293.2
Marine Corps Reserve	82.2	83.1	84.2
Air Force Reserve	164.1	172.0	177.7
Air National Guard	303.5	351.9	369.2
Total	1,722.8	1,883.6	1,932.6

[1] Current estimate; subject to adjustment based on final reports.

Note.—The above costs represent obligations in each fiscal year for military personnel and operation and maintenance appropriations, and new obligational authority in the case of continuing appropriations, such as procurement and military construction.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Madam President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 69, which was reported today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. Senate Concurrent Resolution 69, authorizing additional expenditures for the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 69

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint

Committee on the Organization of the Congress, established by Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to March 11, 1965, is hereby authorized, from February 1, 1966, through December 31, 1966, to expend not to exceed $140,000 from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

INVESTIGATION OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 174, which was reported favorably by the Committee on Rules and Administration this morning, to authorize an investigation of intergovernmental relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 174), as follows:

S. Res. 174

Resolved, That S. Res. 59, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1965 (authorizing an investigation of intergovernmental relations), is hereby amended on page 2, line 23, by striking out "$129,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$137,000".

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Madam President, as the Presiding Officer well knows, the authorization of last year expires February 1. The money has already been spent. This additional authorization is necessary to pay for this month's payroll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. HART subsequently said: Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which Senate Resolution 174 was adopted be reconsidered and that the motion be laid on the table.

Mr. TOWER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, am I to understand that the Senator has cleared that matter with the leadership on this side of the aisle?

Mr. HART. I understand that the secretary of the majority has cleared the matter with the minority.

Mr. TOWER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion to reconsider will be laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Madam President, I send to the desk a resolution which was acted upon favorably this morning and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 170) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which was read a second time by title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 170

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-ninth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF SENATE BILL 2599

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add my name as a cosponsor of S. 2599, a bill to amend the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1964 to provide for additional technological research.

Today, when over 70 percent of our population lives in urban areas—and the projected figure for 1980 is 80 percent—the Federal Government must increase its participation in developing a dynamic urban transportation system. There is no reason why a government which has developed spacecraft which in the near future will send a man to the moon cannot develop new modes of ground transportation to enable the commuter to reach his place of business and return home quickly, economically, safely, and comfortably.

The Mass Transit Act of 1964 presently authorizes an expenditure up to $10 million a year for research, development, and demonstration projects in all phases of urban mass transportation. However, it is necessary to look through this veil of language to see what is actually being done. Although research into developing a "futuristic" transportation system would come within the purview of the present language, the money allocated has for the most part been spent in finding ways to improve existing urban transportation systems. Thus, for example, the Housing and Home Finance Agency information pamphlet for applicants for the mass transportation demonstration program states the "Demonstration projects are primarily oriented to operational problems of mass transportation rather than to planning on basic research."

Of the approximately $35 million spent only $12 million has been expended on new concepts in transportation. The other $23 million has gone toward the betterment of the present system.

This present allocation has led to a retardation of long range planning. This is true in that due to the lack of funds directed toward future planning, very few projects can be simultaneously undertaken and, in addition, insufficient moneys have caused high caliber scientists to shy away from this field. I am informed there has been neither foundation nor industrial money available to universities for research into transportation. I am today sending letters to the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation urging private studies of advanced forms of intracity transportation.

Last year the Congress enacted legislation to provide for a 3-year $90 million program to study high speed intercity transportation. It seems obvious that different technological problems would be involved in the construction of a well designed mass transit system than in the development of intercity transportation facilities. For example, it appears that trains developed for urban commuter transportation may run at slower speeds than those designed for the intercity system. On the other hand, intracity transit facilities will be required to accommodate greater masses of people.

I believe that long-range planning for urban transit has been held up long enough. Those who will live in the cities of the future will not forgive the present generation if we do not go forward now to develop an urban transit system to meet the needs of 1980—or even the year 2000. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join in support of S. 2599.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and resolution:

Authority of January 17, 1966:

S. 2776. A bill to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1965 so as to eliminate therefrom certain provisions which deny hospital insurance benefits to certain individuals otherwise eligible therefor because of their membership in certain subversive organizations or their prior conviction of crimes involving subversive activities: Mr. Clark, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Tydings, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

S. 2778. A bill to amend the act providing financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families in order to provide financial assistance for the education of orphans and other children lacking parental support: Mr. Brewster, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Javits, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Mondale, and Mr. Tower.

Authority of January 18, 1966:

S. 2783. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to permit for a temporary period the duty-free entry of bona fide gifts not exceeding $50 in retail value from members of the Armed Forces stationed outside the United States: Mr. Bible, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Russell of South Carolina, and Mr. Thurmond.

S. Res. 179. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons: Mr. Cannon, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Fong, and Mr. Prouty.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Theodore Jaffe, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement

Commission of the United States, for a term of 3 years from October 22, 1965 (recess appointment);

Archie Craft, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal, eastern district of Kentucky, for a term of 4 years (reappointment);

James J. Moos, of Illinois, to be U.S. marshal, southern district of Illinois, for a term of 4 years (reappointment).

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Wednesday, February 2, 1966, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATIONS OF PHILIP N. BROWNSTEIN, OF MARYLAND, AND CHARLES M. HARR, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—CHANGE OF TIME OF HEARING

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to give notice that the hearing on the nominations of Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland, and Charles M. Haar, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretaries of Housing and Urban Development, originally scheduled for 10 a.m. tomorrow, has been changed to 9:30 a.m.

The original notice of hearing appears at page 956 of the Congressional Record of January 24, 1966.

THE YELLOWTAIL DAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, nearly completed on the Big Horn River in south-central Montana is Yellowtail Dam—a 525-foot-high giant intended to harness the Big Horn for purposes of power generation, irrigation, recreation, sedimentation control, flood control, and fish and wildlife development. It is giving rise to the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, encompassing lands of spectacular scenery in both Montana and my own State of Wyoming. But in this age of increasing leisure time and increasing tension for our populace, these recreational benefits can be enjoyed by all Americans with the inclination to travel. And the other developments made possible by Yellowtail, Mr. President, will serve America by serving a wide expanse of area, bringing new potential for growth.

The story of Yellowtail has been told by Harold Aldrich, regional director of region 6, Bureau of Reclamation, in the current issue of the Wyoming Rural Electric News. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Aldrich's article, "Yellowtail—Giant of the Bighorn," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

YELLOWTAIL: GIANT OF THE BIGHORN

(By Harold Aldrich)

Another chapter in the story of man's development of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin is being added with the completion of the Bureau of Reclamation's Yellowtail Dam on the Bighorn River in south-central Montana.

The concrete giant—525 feet high—rising between the rugged Bighorn Canyon walls required more than 1.4 million cubic yards of concrete and nearly 5 years to construct. The dam, the highest in the Missouri River Basin and the seventh highest in the United States, curves both vertically and horizontally, and presents a picture of engineering beauty as it presses against the spectacularly eroded canyon walls. It is this double curvature that will transfer the tremendous pressure exerted by the water in the reservoir to the walls.

The massive structure is 145 feet thick at its base, tapering down to 22 feet wide along its 1,450-foot crest length spanning wall to wall across the spectacular canyon.

Constructed as a part of an overall plan to harness and use the waters of the Missouri River Basin, it is a modern, multipurpose water-resource development providing among its principal benefits power generation, recreational opportunities, irrigation, sediment retention, flood control, and improvement of fish and wildlife resources.

The dam is the key structure of a $90 million unit that includes a reservoir, powerplant, switchyard, and afterbay dam. In April 1961, a $42-million prime contract for constructing the dam and powerplant was awarded to a joint venture consisting of Morrison-Knudson, Inc., the Kaiser Co., Perini Corp., Walsh Constructing Co., and the F & S Contracting Co., organized as Yellowtail Constructors, Inc. Today this contract is 98 percent complete.

During the peak of construction, more than 1,300 workers were taking part in around-the-clock operations to complete this mighty river-taming job.

A work force of about 25 will operate and maintain the dam and powerplant on a permanent basis.

Water storage in the reservoir started with the river diversion tunnel closure in November 1965. Ten 6½-ton stoplogs—actually steel beams—were lowered across the 28-foot tunnel mouth, sealing if off from the rushing waters of the Bighorn River. About 4 years ago the tunnel was blasted for more than 2,200 feet through the rugged limestone canyon interior in order to route the roaring river around the damsite during construction. A permanent 69-foot-long concrete plug has been placed in the tunnel to forever seal off the riverflow.

At its maximum flood control capacity of 1,375,000 acre-feet, the reservoir will be 71 river miles long and have a shoreline of about 190 miles. About 42½ miles of the reservoir are in Montana and 28½ in Wyoming. Close to the dam the reservoir will be 500 feet deep. As the reservoir stretches into Wyoming, it flattens out into a tear-shaped body of water about 2 miles wide.

POWER

At the toe of the dam, a powerplant which occupies nearly the entire width of the riverbed is nearing completion. The plant houses four 62,500-kilowatt generating units that are to be driven by four 87,500-horsepower turbines. Waterpower is supplied to each unit by a 12-foot-diameter penstock through the dam. Installation of the first generating unit is scheduled for completion in March 1966, with the remaining units scheduled for completion at about 3-month intervals.

Under construction on the east rim of the canyon, high above the dam, is the switchyard through which electrical power and energy will be delivered to the Bureau's eastern and western divisions of the Missouri River Basin power system. Power to be produced at Yellowtail Powerplant will be fully integrated with the power produced at other Missouri River Basin developments and will be marketed over the Missouri River Basin transmission system.

In multipurpose development of water resources, power is a paying partner. Commercial power investments are fully repaid to the U.S. Treasury—including interest.

The powerplant will initially generate over 1 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity annually. This is an amount sufficient to meet the approximate annual requirements of 10 cities the size of Casper, Wyo. Power from Yellowtail has already been allocated to meet the growing needs of preference customers such as the rural electric cooperatives and municipalities.

The generation of electrical power—an important benefit derived from a multipurpose water-resource development—will be of particular significance at Yellowtail. The powerplant and switchyard will be interconnected to the 230-kilovolt transmission line running north to Dawson County and also to the two 115-kilovolt lines running south to the Bighorn Basin. These, when combined with other facilities, will constitute one of the major power interties between the Eastern and Western United States.

Water discharged from the powerplant will be regulated in an afterbay to prevent severe fluctuations in the flow of the river. The afterbay dam, located two miles downstream from Yellowtail Dam, is an earthfill structure with a concrete spillway section. This dam, about 53 feet high and 1,350 feet long, is about 95 percent complete.

RECREATION

Public use and enjoyment are big benefits to be realized in the use of Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir and the surrounding area. A new outdoor playground appears to be in the making. More than 63,000 acres of land surrounding the Bighorn Canyon—renowned for its scenic marvels—has been proposed to the Congress of the United States to be the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area.

During the last session of Congress, the Senate passed a bill authorizing the area, but as yet the House has not taken action. The area proposed for creation through legislation is now being operated by the National Park Service through a Memorandum of Agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau and the National Park Service are cooperating in the development of water-oriented recreation.

Major boat ramps have been constructed at two reservoir locations, Kane Bridge and Horseshoe Bend in Wyoming; and a ramp at Barry's Landing in Montana is nearing completion.

The spectacular and colorful canyon which requires centuries of carving by Mother Nature will provide visitors with scenic values that are unforgettable. Intercanyon boat camps will be constructed as rapidly as possible and true opportunities to "get away from it all" will be provided through the location of primitive boat camps in the heart of the canyon, its tributary canyons and recreation areas.

State fish and game departments have started to stock the reservoir with smallfry and fingerlings in order to assure opportunities for fishing as soon as possible.

Water-oriented recreation opportunities will be limited in 1966—midsummer of 1967 is when the real outdoor fun in this new playground can be expected. By late summer 1967 catchable-size fish will satisfy the anglers. Excellent fishing is expected by the summer of 1968.

WAGE-PRICE GUIDELINES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have been following with great concern the significant changes that have taken place in the application of wage-price guidelines first proposed by President Kennedy in his 1962 economic report.

While I hold the view that these guidelines are very useful, they are by no means a perfect instrument, and their current practical application has gone far beyond their original intent. I have found the use of the administration's methods in defending these guidelines particularly disturbing in the absence of specific legislative authorization. I am also concerned about the wide discretion now available to the President in choosing the time and place to uphold the guidelines.

A story in this morning's New York Times indicates that the administration proposes to keep the wage-price guidelines below last year's levels and that labor leaders expressed strong opposition. While business leaders did not protest these new guidelines, they reportedly did challenge the Government's position that wage-price guidelines are applied evenhand.

I believe that in view of this growing controversy the Joint Economic Committee should conduct a full and careful study of the concept, seek a more precise definition of the guidelines, and make recommendations to the Congress concerning the extent to which the Federal Government should use its powers to defend these guidelines. I have already made a request to Chairman Patman of the Joint Economic Committee to conduct hearings on the guidelines and I intend to question the administration spokesmen on this subject during our forthcoming hearings on the President's economic report.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article which pertains to this matter be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wage-Price Guide Will Stay at 3.2 Percent: Administration Shift Keeps Level for Raises Down—Labor Chiefs Protest

(By David R. Jones)

Washington.—The Johnson administration has decided to hold its controversial guideposts for wage-price increases—which it uses as a major weapon to fight inflationary pressures—at 3.2 percent during 1966.

Authoritative labor sources said today that President Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers had informed top business and labor leaders that it would hold to the 3.2-percent figure used last year because it provided the most valid measure of the trend of increasing productivity, upon which the concept is based.

The Council, in order to arrive at the 3.2-percent figure, changed its method of computing the guideposts. The guideposts had previously been based on the average national increase in output per man-hour over the prior 5 years, and the figure would have gone to 3.6 percent if that formula had been retained for 1966.

The Council's decision brought strong protests from labor leaders, who said it had no economic justification. They charged that it was merely a political maneuver to hold down labor's contract gains because of the Government's fears about inflation.

Business leaders were pleased that the figure did not rise.

The guideposts are designed to dampen inflationary pressure by persuading business and labor to tie their wage and price actions to rising output per man-hour, or productivity. The guideposts last year stated that productivity had risen an average of 3.2 percent over the previous 5 years.

Under the guidepost concept, labor settlements that grant increases beyond 3.2 percent are viewed as inflationary. Industries enjoying greater productivity than 3.2 percent are expected to cut prices.

When first issued in 1962, the guideposts were pegged at about 3 percent. This was based on the rise in productivity between 1947 and 1960. The figure was set at 3.2 percent in 1964 and held at that level in 1965.

The guideposts have been used by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations to hold down wages and prices. They have become a matter of particular concern lately as inflationary pressures have risen.

There had been a debate within the administration over the advisability of changing the formula for their computation, or, instead, of sticking with the old formula and running a risk of feeding the pressures.

The new view on the guideposts is contained in the President's Annual Economic Report to Congress—prepared by the Council of Economic Advisers—which will not be released until Thursday, when it is to be given to Congress. The contents of the report were not available for use today. But labor sources disclosed the Council's position on the guideposts after a meeting of labor leaders with Council members.

The labor sources said the Council's basic rationale for changing the guidepost formula, as expressed in the meeting today, was that the 5-year trend was inadequate and potentially misleading.

The Council said that using such a short span upon which to base productivity would result in sharp rises and declines in the average, such as the climb to 3.6 percent for 1966 and a drop in 1967, the sources said. The Council argued that a longer view must be taken, they said, and that the 3.2 percent figure was more in line with the real trend.

The Council's decision to stick to the 3.2 percent figure is certain to strain the administration's relations with organized labor. These ties already are under stress because of the President's inability so far to deliver on his promise to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This permits States to ban the union shop requiring employes to join a union to keep their jobs.

About 20 labor leaders were informed of the decision by the Council at a 2-hour briefing this morning in the Executive Office Building. Informed sources said they vigorously objected to the continued use of the 3.2 percent figure.

Organized labor has argued that the old formula for computing the guideposts should be maintained. That would have pushed the guideposts to 3.4 percent because of rising gross national product—output of all goods and services—and to 3.6 percent because the 5 years used in the base for the computation would shift with the start of 1966.

"They just grabbed the 3.2 percent out of the hat," snapped one union leader today. He contended such maneuvers would "destroy any confidence" the public has in the guidelines.

About 20 business leaders met with the Council here yesterday and were briefed on the guideposts. Informed sources said that the meeting was amicable and that the businessmen did not protest the guidepost decision.

Sources said the business leaders did challenge the Government's statement that it was applying the guideposts evenhandedly, contending that prices were being pressured more than wages.

The administration is concerned about inflation because the mounting costs of the Vietnam war are coming at a time when unemployment is at the lowest level since 1957 and labor shortages are cropping up. These conditions make for upward pressure on prices and wages.

Wage settlements negotiated in the first 9 months of last year ran an average 4.1 percent, well above the guideposts.

U.S. Chamber of Commerce officials emerged last week from a meeting with President Johnson and suggested that business and labor impose voluntary restraints on wage and price actions to discourage inflation.

George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, issued a statement today in which he said that "any immediate threat of inflation" was not serious enough to warrant "extraordinary measures." He said there were no restraints on prices and profits, and denied that higher wages were causing inflationary pressures.

CITIES

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, Americans are known and recognized for our inventive genius.

Americans not only excel in the field of gadgetry, but also in areas of solid, scientific achievement.

Our consumer products make the householder's life easier. We bounce pictures off devices floating in space.

But why can we not, or why do we not, apply our inventive genius to bringing down the costs of housing—particularly for our low- and moderate-income families?

I am not overlooking the efforts of private enterprise and the Federal Government in this field. True, the Federal Government finances a low-income housing demonstration program of grants through the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

But we must do more. We must expand our research activities so that the benefits of all this experimentation will be made available to all segments of the homebuilding industry.

The Federal Government has a clear-cut responsibility to show the way to a greater volume of homes for lower income families.

Research translated into homes, at prices within the reach of millions of wage earners, is a goal we must reach—not in the coming decades, but in the next few years. We have seen what research has done for industry and agriculture. Why can it not do as much, or more, for home building?

President Johnson's excellent message on the cities clearly states that we can do these things. And it insists that the time to begin is now.

I wholeheartedly concur.

ACHESON ON VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as is his way, former Secretary of State Dean Acheson has cut through the chaff to the heart of the Vietnamese issue. He has detailed the historical precedent for U.S. actions in Vietnam, which go back to the year 1947 and the Truman doctrine:

> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure.

Mr. Acheson, in an article which appeared in the Sunday Star for January 16, made it clear why the United

States must continue to resist the subjugation of free peoples until the aggressors conclude that cheap victories are not possible and that the cost of aggression is too great. His article speaks eloquently, Mr. President, and scarcely needs amplification. I direct attention to it in the hope that it will help clarify our position as a nation. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Acheson's article, as it appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, January 16, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACHESON ON OUR VIETNAM POLICY: AN ASIAN GREECE

(By Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State)

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempting subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."

The country referred to was poor, its poverty aggravated by foreign occupation and years of warfare. Guerrillas were creating political chaos and making economic recovery impossible. The existence of the state itself was threatened by large forces supplied, organized, and led by neighboring Communist movements. Many of these forces had taken part in the struggle against foreign occupation.

The Communist leaders had previously signed an agreement for peace but had hidden their weapons and resumed the conflict at the first signs of recovery. The national military forces were unequal to the renewed, foreign aided and directed attack.

The country's government was far from any democratic ideal. Previous aid had proved inadequate. The American government had to decide whether to go further with funds, armaments, and the necessary military advisers. The President's conclusion was summed up in the sentence quoted above.

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

The year was 1947, the country Greece, the president Truman, and the policy enunciated the Truman doctrine. It instantly received bipartisan support in Congress and for nearly 20 years, during four administrations, has been the policy of the United States. Under it necessary help was given in Greece, Turkey, Korea, Lebanon, and now in Vietnam to prevent Communist takeover "by armed minorities or by outside pressure," or by both.

Nineteen years ago, when the policy was first adopted, the United States was in the early stages of its education in methods of Communist conquest. In the immediate postwar years it learned how, in countries occupied by Soviet armies, Communist regimes were set up under their protection and opposition liquidated. This happened throughout Eastern Europe.

The next step was attempted in countries left in confusion by the war but not occupied by Soviet troops. Here internal subversion, instigated and supplied and controlled by outside Communist states, made an armed bid to take over the government. This was the form used in Greece and eastern Turkey. The Truman doctrine labeled this as aggressive Communist expansion and announced the necessity of stopping it. The aggression failed due to massive help given by the United States.

The next stage of the Communist assault did away with pretense. South Korea was openly invaded by organized army units from the Communist base outside. American and allied armed forces successfully came to the aid of South Korea.

WAR OF LIBERATION

The current method of Communist expansion, employed in Vietnam, is the so-called war of national liberation. In these wars there is an attempt, as there was in Greece, to cloak as an internal insurrection Communist subversion directed and supplied from outside, and there is added a Korea-like invasion by regular army formations from the neighboring Communist state.

Our decision to help South Vietnam resist this attempted subjugation involves principles and policies, all of which were already public and established by 1950. They in turn resulted from an appreciation of the lessons of the 1930's—Manchuria, Ethiopia, the Rhineland, Czechoslovakia—that aggression must either be met early before it has gathered momentum or it will have to be checked later under more adverse conditions.

SAME OLD COMPLAINTS

The complaints now raised at protest meetings on Vietnam are the same which have been directed against all our efforts to aid peoples resisting Communist subjugation. Our opponents are usually praised and those we are aiding criticized.

We were told that the terrorists, guerrillas, and belligerents in Greece were patriots who had fought the Nazis and whose aim was to replace a corrupt, demoralized government. That the evidence that they were serving foreign Communist purposes was flimsy; and that the United States was intervening in a purely Greek civil war. On the other hand, the Greek Government was denounced as weak, unrepresentative of the people, particularly of the resistance, and as the creature of the Western allies.

Similar unflattering comments were made about the late Syngman Rhee, President of Korea. But the fact now seems too plain for argument that in both Greece and Korea the intervention and help of the United States preserved the opportunity to develop toward democratic government by consent. No such similar development can be noted in neighboring Balkan states or North Korea.

So, today, it is argued that government in Vietnam is not and has not been democratic and, therefore, is unworthy of American support. But the existence of a democratic system is not the criterion of worthiness of American support. That criterion is determined and demonstrated effort in resisting attempted subjugation. Can there be more impressive evidence of such determination and effort among the people of South Vietnam than they are now giving. For they are fighting on after suffering military and civilian casualties which on the basis of comparative populations are equal to nearly 1 million American casualties. Their purely military casualties on the same basis are fully 10 times greater than those we suffered in Korea.

When, as in China and Cuba, a government facing Communist-led forces failed to retain the support of its people, its numerically superior forces simply melted away. But in South Vietnam the Government forces continue to grow in numbers and aggressiveness.

Not a single political figure or politically significant group in South Vietnam at the time Diem was overthrown, or since, has shifted allegiance to the Vietcong or been unwilling to continue the struggle.

MILLION REFUGEES

Finally, there is the record of those who voted with their feet, the million refugees who left the north for South Vietnam after the Geneva Accords of 1954, and the hundreds of thousands of refugees who in 1965 alone have left Vietcong areas for Government-controlled ones. The South Vietnamese people and army are fully justifying American assistance by willingly continuing to bear the brunt of what remains their struggle for independence.

Fortunately, there is also in Saigon and in Washington not only determination to suppress the belligerency, but an understanding of the importance of political consent in furthering the struggle for independence.

In South Vietnam, even in the midst of devastating warfare, the maneuvering and instability which have characterized the Government since the fall of Diem show both a shift in power and attempts to reach the new balance by taking into account the aspirations of the Buddhists, the Catholics, the civilian politicians, the military establishment, students, the sects, and the geographic regions.

The search for such a balance is not a substitute for political method, but there has also been progress in that direction. Though it seems to have largely escaped public notice, elections for the municipal and provincial councils were held in South Vietnam last May. Observers agree that they were conducted in a fair and orderly manner, and that the candidates substantially reflected local sentiments. Over half the eligible voters were registered and over 70 percent of those registered actually voted. In North Vietnam there can be found, of course, no glimmering of democratic political method.

VITAL TO UNITED STATES

The fate of the people of Vietnam is of the same vital concern to the United States as that of those who, in the past, we have helped to resist subjugation. Indeed, the situation in Asia today is reminiscent of the problems the United States confronted in Europe in 1947. The United States faces in Communist China an aggressive nation imbued with the same primitive Communist theology which the Soviet Union had 20 years ago, and possessing (as the Soviet Union did) military resources far greater than those of her neighbors. The area to the south, afflicted by foreign occupation and years of war, offers an invitation to aggression by means of the war of national liberation. Only the United States has the resources to make resistance possible.

The Chinese Communists have made it clear that Vietnam is another test of that strategy in Asia for the aggrandizement of the Communist world. The Communist Chinese Minister of Defense, Marshal Lin Piao, in a speech on September 3, referring to North America and Western Europe as the cities of the world and to Asia, Africa, and Latin America as the rural areas, declared that "contemporary world revolution also presents a picture of the encirclement of cities by the rural areas." In its policy of "encirclement of the cities," southeast Asia has the strategic significance of flanking the Indian subcontinent, facing the Philippines, and straddling the passage from the Pacific to the Indian Ocean.

With appropriate discount for verbal bluster, Communist China has shown an appreciation of the realities of power. There is surely no territory which Communist China desires more ardently than Formosa. Nevertheless, China's recognition of the vast force which the United States can bring to bear in Asia has caused the Communist leadership to refrain from attacking Formosa. The same appreciation of superior might is shown by Chinese unwillingness directly to challenge the United States in southeast Asia.

The American aim in South Vietnam is neither to destroy China nor North Vietnam. It is rather to continue the policy established by President Truman of assisting free nations to resist subjugation until the Communist states become convinced that cheap victories are not possible and that the cost of aggression is too great.

The success of this policy may be seen in the growing moderation which has marked Russian policy in the past 15 years. In time China, too, may grasp the fact that aggression is unrewarding and choose to focus her energies on her vast internal problems while playing a more mature role in the international system.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND—TIME'S MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the signal honor of being named Time magazine's "Man of the Year" for 1965 has been conferred on a great American—Gen. William Childs Westmoreland, commander of U.S. forces in Vietnam.

It was a most fitting choice. For General Westmoreland personifies the central crisis of our country in this time of conflict and challenge. He represents the courage and the determination of this Nation to face up to the dangers inherent in the Vietnam war. He is "up front" to help make good the American commitment in the struggle against aggression.

It was most appropriate that Time magazine, in selecting General Westmoreland, focused attention on an outstanding military leader in whom this Nation has entrusted the lives of its fighting men in Vietnam and upon whose shoulders will continue to fall the awesome burden of turning the tide of war in our favor. He has already demonstrated the sterling quality of his military leadership in the often frustrating, agonizing conflict in Vietnam.

The skill and drive with which General Westmoreland built up and directed the American forces have been described in impressive detail in Time's cover story. I commend the article to all patriotic Americans.

The people of Hawaii have a particularly warm association with General Westmoreland because his family is now in Honolulu. Along with 1,800 other dependents, some of whom are living in Hawaii at present, the Westmoreland family was ordered to leave Vietnam last year when the war spread dangerously.

When her husband was chosen Time's Man of the Year, Mrs. Westmoreland responded with the warmth characteristic of the general himself.

> He's not just the man of the year but a representative of the men of the year—the troops in Vietnam—

Mrs. Westmoreland remarked in Honolulu.

> When he was here last (Dec. 10–18) he told me he couldn't accept the award except as a symbol of the men in Vietnam. Of course, he's been the man of the year in our family for a long time.

In order that more Americans might become acquainted with the personal background of this stalwart military commander, I ask that General Westmoreland's biography be printed in the RECORD at this point, along with a description of the Man of the Year citation in the January 12, 1966 issue of Army Times.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTMORELAND TIME'S "MAN OF YEAR"

NEW YORK.—Gen. William Childs Westmoreland, MACV commander who "directed the historic buildup, drew up the battle plans, and infused the 190,000 men under him with his own idealistic view of America's aims and responsibilities," has been named Man of the Year for 1965 by the editors of Time magazine.

In selecting for the 39th year the man or woman who "dominated the news of the year and left an indelible mark—for good or ill—on history," Time's editors said:

"General Westmoreland was the sinewy personification of the American Fighting Man in 1965 who, through the monsoon mud of nameless hamlets, amidst the swirling sand of seagirt enclaves, atop the jungled mountains of the Annamese Cordillera, served as the instruments of U.S. policy, quietly enduring the terror and discomfort of a conflict that was not yet a war, on a battlefield that was all no-man's land."

"To the quickening drumfire of the fighting in South Vietnam," Time says, "Americans sensed early in 1965 that they might have to choose between withdrawal or vastly greater involvement in the war. By year's end, it was clear that the United States had irrevocably committed itself to the Nation's third major war in a quarter century, a conflict involving more than 1 million men and the destiny of southeast Asia."

The risk and responsibility for the war, Time says, were President Lyndon Johnson's, who "moved resolutely" to make good his pledge to stand in Vietnam, "weathering open criticism from within his own party, strident protest from the Vietnik fringe and the disapprobation of friendly nations from the Atlantic to the China Sea. * * *

"It fell to the American fighting man to redeem Johnson's pledge. Plunged abruptly into a punishing environment, pitted against a foe whose murderously effective tactics had been perfected over two decades, the GI faced the strangest, toughest war of all * * * with courage and a cool professionalism that surprised friend and foe, U.S. troops stood fast and firm in South Vietnam. In the waning months of 1965, they helped finally to stem the tide that had run so long with the Reds."

"In the process," Time notes, "American troops gave an incalculable lift to South Vietnam's disheartened people and divided government. And, important as that was, they helped preserve a far greater stake than South Vietnam itself. As the Japanese demonstrated when they seized Indochina at the start of World War II, whoever held the peninsula holds southeast Asia. * * *

"Lyndon Johnson had waited dangerously long to recognize the problem. Thereafter, for all his repeated declarations that the United States would negotiate an honorable settlement 'anywhere, anytime, without any conditions,' despite even last week's multiplicity of peace missions, the President moved swiftly and unstintingly toward its solution. With all the resources available to the world's most powerful nation, Johnson established beyond question the credibility of the U.S. commitment to Asia."

The troops under William Westmoreland did more. "If the other guy can live and fight under these conditions," he said, "so can we." In the baking heat and moldering humidity of the Asian mainland, they rewrote the rules of guerrilla warfare that Communists from Havana to Hanoi had long regarded as holy writ. With stupendous firepower and mobility undreamed of even a decade ago, U.S. strike forces swooped into guerrilla redoubts long considered impenetrable.

"Like clouds of giant dragonflies, helicopters hauled riflemen and heavy artillery from base to battlefield in minutes, giving them the advantages of surprise and flexibility. Tactical air strikes scraped guerrillas off jungle ridges or buried them in mazelike tunnels, or kept them forever on the run. Unseen and unheard from the ground, giant B–52's of the Strategic Air Command pattern-bombed the enemy's forest hideaways, leaving no sanctuary inviolable."

Whatever the outcome of the war, Time says, "the most significant consequence of the U.S. buildup is that for the first time in history, the United States in 1965 established bastions across the nerve centers of southeast Asia. From formidable new enclaves in Vietnam to a farflung network of airfields, supply depots, and naval facilities abuilding in Thailand, the United States will soon be able to rush aid to any threatened ally in Asia. * * *

"The U.S. presence will also have a more beneficial impact on the countries involved. The huge ports that are being scooped out at Cam Ranh Bay in Vietnam and at Sattship in Thailand should permanently boost the economies of both nations. Vast U.S.-banked civilian aid programs are aimed at eradicating the ancient ills of disease, illiteracy, and hunger."

Pacification, in the long run, is Westmoreland's greatest challenge. "Vietnam is involved in two simultaneous and very difficult tasks, he says, "nation building and fighting a vicious and well-organized enemy. If it could do either alone the task would be vastly simplified, but it's got to do both at once. A political system is growing. It won't, it can't reach maturity overnight. Helping Vietnam toward the objective may well be the most complex problem ever faced by men in uniform anywhere on earth."

Westmoreland constantly advises his men to remember their proper role in South Vietnam. "Saigon's sovereignty must be honored, protected, and strengthened," he insists. "In 1954 this was a French war. Now it is a Vietnamese war, with us in support. It remains, and will remain, just that."

Time magazine chose its Man of the Year for 1965 from a set of possibilities that ranged all the way from the Beatles to the astronauts, the editors said. The choice will appear on the cover of the January 1 issue of Time.

GEN. WILLIAM CHILDS WESTMORELAND, U.S. ARMY

William Childs Westmoreland was born in Spartanburg County, S.C., March 26, 1914, and graduated from Spartanburg High School in 1931. He attended the Citadel Military College of South Carolina for 1 year, and was then appointed to the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y. At the U.S. Military Academy he was first captain and regimental commander and was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the field artillery upon graduation on June 12, 1936.

His initial assignment was with a regiment of horse-drawn 75 mm. guns, the 18th Field Artillery, at Fort Sill, Okla. In March 1939, he joined the 8th Field Artillery of the Hawaiian Division at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii. Here he served as a battery officer, battalion staff officer, and battery commander. In May 1941, as a captain, he was assigned to the just organized 9th Infantry Division at Fort Bragg, N.C., as operations officer of the 34th Field Artillery Battalion (155 mm. Howitzer).

In April 1942 he assumed command of the 34th Field Artillery Battalion and moved with it later that year to Morocco, North Africa. He commanded the battalion in combat in Tunisia and Sicily. During combat in Tunisia, his battalion was awarded the Presidential Unit Citation.

During the campaign in Sicily, General Westmoreland's battalion was successively attached to the 82d Airborne Division, and the 1st Infantry Division before returning to its parent division. In March 1944 he was named executive officer of the 9th Infantry Division Artillery while the division was staging in southern England preparatory to the invasion of the Continent. Following D-Day, he fought with the 9th Infantry Division through France, Belgium, and into Germany. In October 1944 he was named chief of staff of the division, serving in that capacity in continuous combat from the German border to the Elbe River.

In June 1945 General Westmoreland assumed command of the 60th Infantry Regiment in Germany and in January 1946 was transferred to the 71st Infantry Division and as commander of that division returned it to the United States for inactivation.

Following training at Fort Benning, Ga., he earned the Parachute and Glider Badges and assumed command of the 504th Parachute Infantry of the 82d Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, N.C., in July 1946. In August 1947 he was named chief of staff of the 82d Airborne Division, serving in that capacity for the next 3 years.

He was appointed an instructor at the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., in August 1950. Later that year he was designated an instructor at the newly organized Army War College, also at Fort Leavenworth, and in June 1951 moved to Carlisle Barracks, Pa., with the Army War College, serving as a member of the faculty until July 1952.

On August 1, 1952, he assumed command of the 187th Airborne Regimental Combat Team in Korea. While under his command, the unit was twice committed to combat and during the interim was deployed to Japan as theater reserve. The Republic of Korea awarded his unit the Distinguished Unit Citation. During this period he was promoted to brigadier general at the age of 38. In August 1953 he was awarded the Master Parachute Badge.

In November 1953 he reported for duty as Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, G1, for Manpower Control. In 1954 he attended the advance management program of the Harvard Business School in Boston, Mass. He was named to the Secretary of the Army General Staff in July 1955.

On December 1, 1957, the Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, pinned a second star on General Westmoreland, making him at that time, the youngest major general in the Army.

General Westmoreland assumed command of the 101st Airborne Division "Screaming Eagles" at Fort Campbell, on April 2, 1958.

In July 1960, General Westmoreland was appointed Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He was transferred to Fort Bragg, N.C., in July 1963, at which time he became commanding general, STRAC and XVIII Airborne Corps.

In January 1964, he reported to duty at the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam. He was assigned first as deputy commander, then acting commander and finally, in August 1964 was made commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam.

FLOOD CONTROL SURVEY AT AUSTIN, MINN.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, 1965 will long be remembered in my State of Minnesota as a year unparalleled for devastation wrought by natural disasters. Tornadoes and unprecedented spring flooding combined to build a loss measured by scores of lives and millions of dollars.

For many natural disasters little adequate preventive action can be taken. But that is not the case with flooding.

One Minnesota city particularly plagued by recurrent flooding is Austin, a community of nearly 28,000 people built on the banks of the Cedar River. On March 1, 1965, following an unexpectedly rapid thaw of heavy snow covering, serious flooding of the Red Cedar River occurred. That flooding, in turn, resulted in serious and extensive damage to both residential and commercial property.

Recognizing the strong likelihood of recurrent flooding owing to the inadequate nature of flood control facilities in Austin and its environs, the city council of that city requested that surveys be undertaken at once to assess the need for flood control improvements.

I am happy to report that the Army Corps of Engineers has announced the initiation of such survey studies for the entire Iowa-Cedar River Basin. It is clear that this is necessary and desirable.

Our cities and towns must be made secure from the ravages of wind and water to the fullest extent possible. It is an all too sad fact that much of the multimillion-dollar damage wrought in Minnesota during 1965 could have been avoided or substantially alleviated had preventive flood control measures been undertaken years ago.

I welcome this announcement by the corps, and I commend the citizens and leaders of Austin whose perseverance is responsible for the initiation of this survey.

LIFE AND COMMUNITY SERVICE IN RURAL AMERICA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Staff Writer Bernard Kelly of the Denver Post Sunday magazine, Empire, has presented a telling picture of life and community service in rural America. His article, which appeared this past Sunday, details how the Little Bear Grange set about improving community life for families in its area of northern Laramie County and southern Platte County, Wyo. For its efforts, Little Bear Grange No. 73 was awarded the $3,000 prize offered by the National Grange and the Sears, Roebuck Foundation. Their efforts, encouraged by the grange, are an example to all, Mr. President, not just to ranchers or farmers in rural America. For it is this type of self-help which can do much to beautify America and make it a better place to live.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kelly's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG DOINGS AT LITTLE BEAR—RANCH FOLK OF SOUTHEASTERN WYOMING COMBINED SOCIAL WORK WITH FUN AND WON A PRIZE OF $3,000 FOR THEIR GRANGE

(By Bernard Kelly)

Last March 2, Ray Darby and Ross Welty, Wyoming ranchers, drove to a mill at a place called Foxpark, where lumber could be bought inexpensively. The temperature was 45 degrees below zero. They bought the lumber they needed, loaded it in two pickup trucks, and took it back to a snowswept plot of ground just off U.S. 87 between Cheyenne and Chugwater, Wyo. It had been a 287-mile round trip.

This volunteer mission in searing cold was undertaken on behalf of Little Bear Grange No. 73, a fraternal organization close to the hearts of its members who live in this lonely land.

As a result of the sacrifice of these two men, and hundreds of other selfless actions by its members, Little Bear Grange in 1965 won $3,000 in prize money for community-betterment programs. It now meets in its own newly remodeled home—partly finished with Foxpark lumber.

Welty, master of Little Bear Grange, says every cent of the $3,000 will go into further community betterment.

Most city folks, caught up in a tight and tense round of work and social activity, never have heard of the grange. And, if they have, they probably haven't much idea of what it is.

But, for the people of Little Bear community and 6,000 other communities in 38 States, the grange is a center of service and social life—a place to meet friends, to eat community suppers, to laugh and sing, to plan and to work. Whole families belong to the grange, and every night of the week, Monday through Friday, 500 grange meetings are held in grange halls from Maine to Florida to Kansas to Washington. There are two grange halls inside the city of Denver. They were there first and the city grew around them. And there are granges like Little Bear where in some places the sky and the earth are the only neighbors in sight.

The National Grange—officially the Order of the Patrons of Husbandry—is a farmers' organization. It is a fraternal order, with a secret ritual, degrees, and a program of recreation and education for members.

Its ranks are open to men, women, and children, and thus the close ties of farm and ranch families are carried over into grange work.

Many local or subordinate granges, like Little Bear, own their own halls, which serve as meeting places for themselves, other organizations, and the communities at large.

The 2-year program in which Little Bear Grange won the $3,000 was sponsored by the National Grange and the Sears-Roebuck Foundation. The competition began October 1, 1963, and closed August 1, 1965.

The idea was for the individual granges to study local needs, start programs to fill these needs, and carry them through. The work was then reported to judges, who later made inspections in person. First prize was $10,000, second $5,000, and third $3,000.

More than 4,500 local granges with a membership of more than 400,000 persons participated, and there were projects in all 38 granger States. Reports indicated more than 10 million man hours were devoted to projects.

Little Bear Grange draws members from a sparsely settled area of 736 square miles. Ten of its members live in Cheyenne, and two in Chugwater, 47 miles north of Cheyenne on U.S. 87. Most, however, live east and west of U.S. 87 at distances of 1 to 13 miles from the highway and from 1 to 22 miles from the grange hall.

This hall is 31 miles north of Cheyenne and 16 miles south of Chugwater. There's a sign pointing the way to it, but you can't see the hall from the highway. And you have to take down (and put back up) a gate in the barbwire fence to drive to the grange hall.

Members of Little Bear Grange took a look around their community and settled on a number of projects. Some, which were largely instrumental in winning the prize, were—

Developing a new grange hall and community center.

Installing rural road direction signs.

Conducting a community beautification program, including planting programs at a local cemetery and park.

A roadside cleanup program.

"We got the entire community interested," says Welty, "and a lot of folks helped. Other organizations pitched in and helped, too."

Until about a year and a half ago Little Bear Grange had met in a building on U.S. 87 named Richard Hall. When the building was sold and turned into a nightclub with bar, it left the community without a place to hold meetings.

A committee drove around the countryside looking at buildings. They found one, 16 by 42 feet in size, which had been two schoolhouses joined together. It had been standing for years on a field owned by Richard DuVall, a resident of the community, and was in poor condition.

The grange bought the building for $250. Members and friends donated time and work, trucks and gas, and lumber, doors and furniture. For $1 DuVall gave the grange a long-term lease on the ground where the building stood.

Francis Gard, chairman of the building committee, discovered he could buy lumber at good prices at Foxpark—good enough to make the 287-mile round trip worthwhile.

The building was remodeled and an addition built on the north side. While the men sawed and hammered, the women swept, picked up, scrubbed, cleaned and helped with the painting.

The hall, though not yet finished, was dedicated July 18, 1965, with the State Master, Morris Kershner, as dedicating officer. Five other Wyoming granges—Iowa Center, Antelope Gap, Cottonwood, Burns, and Platte County Pomona—were represented. Many nongrangers attended.

"We feel we're off to a good start," says Welty. "The main hall takes care of the grange meetings, and we have a kitchen, and a dining room which is used by the junior grange for their work. We have a stage and piano for entertainment, and a small room for miscellaneous use in back.

"We feel this hall will serve Little Bear Grange for any occasion, and it's available for other civic and local organizations, too."

Some finishing work remains to be done, and a lot of improvements are planned. But Little Bear Grange has a new home.

In their report the grangers estimated 40 persons helped in the work. They traveled 6,222 miles and spent 1,756 hours on the project.

Anyone who has traveled much on back country roads knows how much a good road sign system is needed. Several years ago Little Bear Grange put up direction signs from the main highway to each farm and ranch in the community. During the following years the signs were destroyed, defaced, or became out of date.

The grange decided to fix the signs. Old ones were taken down and repaired or replaced. New ones were added. In all, 70 signs were installed. The cost to the people—nothing.

Yard beautification has been a continuing project.

"There is scarcely a yard in the community now that is not fenced and improved," reports the grange. "This project has even made people outside our community conscious of their yards. A grange member gave away 300 tulip bulbs to residents of the community and others helped in the same way with small plants and shrubs. We follow this way of increasing our plantings by giving to each other. We know people are happier and more contented with beautiful surroundings.

The community cemetery is on a hilltop far from main roads. It commands a view of the rolling prairie country that is starkly impressive. The grange planted more than 200 tulip bulbs as markers. Members cut and pulled weeds, raked and hauled away rubbish.

Some of the grangers' work was less important, but just the same it was full of selfless spirit—and has a folksy sound that has largely been lost in urban affairs.

The following passages are made from the prize-winning report of Little Bear Grange, quoted by permission of its master, Ross Welty. Although not intended for publication they have a flavor of community life:

"Francis Gard mowed several miles of weeds and grass on the old highway and county road. This made it safer by eliminating the danger of hidden animals, such as a deer, bounding out in front of a car.

"Dick DuVall, a member, sheared 11 head of sheep for a little 4-H girl. Her father brought the sheep about 30 miles to Dick's house for him to shear. He didn't charge her anything.

"Dick and Emma DuVall were on their way to cut oats and saw that a neighbor's windmill had fallen down and the cows were almost out of water. They drove down to tell them about it."

Aid to the distressed is never forgotten:

"A small child was hit by a car and had serious head injuries. The father was out of work and they needed food. An alert granger * * * began calling everyone she knew in her vicinity. Before the day was over she had food lined up for a week's meals. She collected the food shortly before each meal time and took it to the home.

"CHORES, CARE, FOOD, AND FUN

"When the Ross Weltys had a death in their family this spring, Ray Derby did their chores for 2 days and looked after things so they could go back to Nebraska for the funeral.

"One of our members had the misfortune to lose an arm. The first few days he was in the hospital with terrible pain some of the neighbors and his relatives took turns sitting in his hospital room with him to help save nurse care. This was done by five people day and night for 5 days.

"Rose and Ida Welty gave 6 hens and 30 cans of food to the Salvation Army * * *. Francis and Hilda Gard gave 18 chickens to the Salvation Army * * *. Emma and Dick DuVall gave 97 articles of clothing to the Goodwill Industries."

There was fun along with the work.

"A year ago a grange family, the Jay Blisses, decided to sell out and move to North Carolina, so the grange gave them a party and supper at the hall. During the supper we took up a collection of over $30 and since the husband always wanted a set of 'Texas longhorns' this is what they bought with the money.

"A continued project is the Christmas party we give for the children of the community each year with the help of the ladies' club. We always ask each child that comes to take part in the program. The ladies have a grand time making popcorn balls, sacking candy, and having fun. Each child is given a gift and treats are given to young and old alike."

Perhaps the most unusual project was this. A piano was donated to the grange, "a good upright, but a little old fashioned and quite out of tune.

"One of our new grange members, Ben Shain, is a piano technician. He took the piano to his shop and completely restyled and rebuilt it. He also put on a new finish and tuned it.

"He drove 66 miles to pick up and deliver the piano. A job like this usually runs about $150. Shain's fee to the grange was 1 year's dues paid for himself and his wife (about $14)."

The National Grange was founded in 1867 in Washington, D.C., by Oliver Hudson Kelley, a Government clerk. Kelley had been on a tour of the South and had found the farmers poor and discouraged. He decided they ought to be bound together for mutual benefit in a fraternal organization. This organization, Kelley decided, should give the members a chance to learn modern methods of farming.

In 1868 he organized the first local bodies, and called them granges. By 1875 the grange had 850,000 members and 21,000 granges. It lost membership in the 1880's but began to grow again in the 1890's. By 1947 it was said to own halls and equipment valued at $35 million. Colorado has 122 granges.

As it now exists the organization has a junior grange for children 4 to 14. At 15 they are eligible for the subordinate grange, which has four degrees, the ritual of which is based on the four seasons. A district grange, called a Pomona, is the fifth degree, the State grange is the sixth, and the national the seventh degree. Little Bear Grange has 61 members in 25 families. Anyone acceptable to other members of the Grange can join—except a saloonkeeper.

What's coming up in 1966 for Little Bear Grange?

Now that they have $3,000 in prize money to work with, they plan to buy the land on which the grange hall stands. They'll put down a well for water and pipe the water into the hall, then install restrooms. There's talk of expanding the main hall another 6 to 8 feet.

And there's another 2-year competition coming up. There's nothing in the rules to keep Little Bear Grange from winning again.

PROPOSED DISCONTINUANCE OF PASSENGER SERVICE ON THE NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN & HARTFORD RAILROAD—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE VILLAGE OF PELHAM MANOR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the Village of Pelham Manor protesting the proposed discontinuance of passenger service on the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution Regarding Application of New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., Trustees, to Interstate Commerce Commission To Discontinue All Interstate Passenger Trains—Interstate Commerce Commission Finance Docket No. 23831

"Whereas there is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission an application by the Trustees of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. to discontinue all interstate passenger trains, being finance docket No. 23831, and

"Whereas the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad is the only direct means of public transportation beween the Village of Pelham Manor and Grand Central Terminal in New York City and between the Village of Pelham Manor and other Westchester County communities and communities located on the said railroad right-of-way in the State of Connecticut, and

"Whereas the Village of Pelham Manor is a first class village of over 5,000 residents and a great number of its residents use said railroad daily for the purpose of transportation from Pelham Manor to their respective places of business in New York City, and

"Whereas many residents of the Village of Pelham Manor purchased homes in Pelham Manor relying on the public transportation furnished by the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., and

"Whereas the discontinuance of the passenger service would have an adverse effect on real property values in the Village of Pelham Manor, due to the fact that many of the residents who use the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad would be forced to vacate their residences, and

"Whereas the discontinuance of passenger service would increase the vehicular traffic in the already overcongested traffic in the city of New York, and

"Whereas the merchants and small business people who conduct their business in the Village of Pelham Manor rely upon the families of commuting residents, not only of Pelham Manor but of the neighboring villages of Pelham and North Pelham for their livelihood, and

"Whereas the public convenience and necessity requires the continuance of the passenger service: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That this board opposes the application of the trustees of said railroad to discontinue passenger service and requests permission to intervene and send its representatives to hearings on this matter before the Interstate Commerce Commission, and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the mayor of this village is hereby authorized to appear and testify in said hearings being conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission on behalf of this board and the residents of this village and to take all steps necessary and do all things which he believes to be necessary or expedient on our and their behalf to avoid the discontinuance of passenger service over the right-of-way of said railroad, and to cooperate with other municipalities that are or will be affected by a discontinuance of passenger service and with the interested governmental departments or agencies of the State of New York, the county of Westchester, the State of Connecticut, and its affected municipalities, and it is further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Interstate Commerce Commission at its office in Washington, D.C., to Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, to our representatives in the New York State Legislature to Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, and to Congressman OGDEN R. REID, Office of Transportation of the State of New York, Westchester County Executive Edwin G. Michaelian, County Attorney Gordon Miller, and the mayors of the cities of New Rochelle, Mount Vernon and Rye, and the villages of Pelham, North Pelham, Larchmont, Mamaroneck, Harrison and Portchester, and the supervisors of the town of Pelham and the town of Mamaroneck."

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of Westchester, ss.:

I, the undersigned, village clerk of the Village of Pelham Manor, do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing resolution with the original thereof, on file in my office, and that the same is a true, full, and complete copy of a resolution duly adopted at a regular meeting of the board of trustees of the Village of Pelham Manor, duly called and held on the 10th day of January 1966, at which meeting all of the members of said board were present and voted in the affirmative and of the whole thereof.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the corporate seal of the Village of Pelham Manor, this 12th day of January 1966.

[SEAL] JULIUS J. ZHWORSCHAK,
Village Clerk.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the community development program presented by the President today is designed to correct the serious and persistent lag in opportunity for people in rural areas.

Rural people as a whole are not sharing fully in our expanding economy.

Rural median income in 1960 was $4,381. Urban median income was $6,166.

There were only 50 doctors per 100,000 population in rural areas in 1965 compared with 133 per 100,000 population in metropolitan areas.

The average rural adult has about 2 years less time in school than the average urban adult.

Despite these statistics, only about 18 percent of the trainees in the manpower development and training programs have originated from rural areas, and only 3.4 percent of the training classes have been conducted in cities of 10,000 population or less. In addition, only 15.8 percent of the funds advanced under the economic opportunity program for community action programs have gone to rural areas.

A new and concerted effort will be needed to overcome these disadvantages of rural people and I certainly support it. The President's proposals will lay a useful foundation for efficient development of the great potentials that exist in rural communities—both in terms of human and natural resources.

FORMULA FOR LIQUIDATING A MISTAKE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Walter Lippmann has, through the decades, acquired the reputation as the wisest of our public commentators. In recent months he has been conspicuous for the sanity and soundness of his views on the U.S. military involvement in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

His column which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Well, What Can He Do?" is illustrative of the enlightened character of his comments.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 25, 1966]

TODAY AND TOMORROW: WELL, WHAT CAN HE DO?

(By Walter Lippmann)

The reason why the peace offensive failed is most cogently revealed in the Mansfield report on the state of the war. Mr. Johnson has been trying to obtain by propaganda the victory which he has not been able to obtain on the battlefield—that is to say, the acceptance in the whole of South Vietnam of a government which has lost control of a very large part of South Vietnam. The peace offensive was bound to fail, and the grave decisions which the President hoped to circumvent and avoid are now before him.

If he is to make these decisions wisely, he must recognize that in international politics peace settlements are possible only as and when they reflect the real balance of power. In the World War, for example, Churchill and Roosevelt had to settle with Stalin for a Soviet political frontier in the midst of Germany and of Europe. That is where the Red army had arrived when the peace negotiations began. The same principle will hold in Vietnam. There will be no settlement until the terms of peace reflect the military reality.

The President will be disappointed again and again as long as he and Secretary Rusk ask for a settlement which in effect demands that the defeat of the Saigon forces be transmuted at the conference table into a victory for the Saigon forces. Nor should he indulge in any illusion that the informed opinion of mankind really thinks as Secretary Rusk talks merely because American envoys have been politely and sympathetically received in so many capitals.

What then should the President do? It is often said by the President's supporters that his critics propose no alternative to what he is doing. If that was ever true, it is no longer true today. It is not true since the Mansfield report and since the Gavin statement. The President should reduce his war aims, which today are impossibly high in the light of the conditions described in the Mansfield report. He should alter his strategy along the lines proposed by General Gavin, making it a holding operation pending the eventual negotiation of a political settlement.

The Mansfield report shows that Mr. Rusk's objective—the rule of General Ky or his successor over the whole of South Vietnam—is unattainable no matter how much the war is escalated. The burden of disproving the conclusions of the Mansfield report is on those who have been proved wrong about the escalation of last summer, on those who are now asking for another escalation in order to redeem their failure, on those who want to redouble the stakes in order to recoup their losses.

If the Mansfield report contains the truth of the matter, it follows inevitably that our war aims should be reduced and our strategy revised. We should put aside the hopeless task of searching out and destroying the Vietcong, and we should take our stand, as General Gavin advises, on a holding operation in the coastal cities.

This is not a policy for a glorious victory or for some kind of dazzling political triumph. It is no trick for pulling rabbits out of a hat. It is a formula for liquidating a mistake, for ending a war that cannot be won at any tolerable price, for cutting our losses before they escalate into bankruptcy, and for listening to commonsense rather than to war whoops and tomtoms.

Because we are neither omniscient nor omnipotent, we, even we Americans, cannot always win. But I cannot help feeling in my bones that a display of commonsense by a proud and imperious nation would be a good moral investment for the future.

SENATOR McCARTHY'S RESOLUTION ON THE CIA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on Monday Senator McCARTHY offered a Senate resolution (S. Res. 210) providing for "a full and complete study with respect to the effects of the operations and activities of the Central Intelligence Agency upon the foreign relations of the United States." Under the resolution, this task would be undertaken by the Foreign Relations Committee or an authorized subcommittee, and report would be made by January 31, 1966.

On Sunday the Washington Post presented an editorial commenting on the McCarthy proposal and his intention to offer the resolution. The editorial lifts up and comments on the point that the CIA has attained very great importance "as a factor in the formulation and execution of foreign policy."

As the editorial notes, the question whose study is called for does not deal with the more controversial question of whether or not the CIA should be involved in formulating or carrying out foreign policy, but with "the effects of its operations" on our foreign relations.

This is a proper sphere for concern of the Foreign Relations Committee. The area marked out by the resolution is not in conflict with that which is presently under jurisdiction of Armed Services and Appropriations Subcommittees. This, too, the Washington Post editorial points out.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the item to which I have referred may appear in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 23, 1966]

Congress and CIA

Senator Eugene McCarthy has announced that he intends to seek Senate authorization for an investigation of the impact of the CIA on U.S. foreign policy. The mechanism for this would be a new subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the CIA or—should the Senate prefer—a broader select committee. This is not the first attempt to bring the CIA under congressional surveillance. At the time of his death, the late Brien McMahon had indicated his intention to work for a Joint Congressional Committee on Central Intelligence as a followup to his successful fight to establish the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Majority Leader Mansfield and his 34 cosponsors envisaged just such a joint committee in their ill-fated 1956 resolution; and Senator McCarthy himself has kept the issue alive since. But the present move is unprecedented in its sharp focus on the importance of the CIA as a factor in the formulation and execution of foreign policy.

There can be little doubt that the institutionalized growth of the intelligence arm of our Government during the cold war years has impinged to a very great extent on what has traditionally been the exclusive sphere of the State Department. The CIA's experts in Saigon or Santo Domingo assess many of the same matters that preoccupy embassy political officers, and its operatives necessarily stir up dark waters that a diplomat might prefer to leave undisturbed. While on paper the CIA answers to the Ambassador in a foreign capital, in case after case the tail has wagged the dog. President Kennedy's Executive order of May 1961, reaffirming the authority of the Ambassador, has had relatively little practical meaning.

Senator McCarthy does not enter directly into the controversy over whether or not the new power of the CIA is a desirable and indeed unavoidable response to a new kind of global political contest. His concern appears to be primarily that this power be made subject to congressional restraints—and that the committees of Congress dealing with foreign policy have a central place in overseeing the CIA.

The establishment of the proposed subcommittee would be a desirable first step indicating a recognition by Congress that the Foreign Relations Committee has a proper interest in the affairs of the CIA. Both the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees have long had subcommittees on the CIA, and these bodies now hold informal joint meetings with CIA officials at irregular intervals in which the Foreign Relations Committee should be given a voice. Beyond this, the work of the new subcommittee in examining the record of the CIA could be a valuable guide for future congressional action, though it should be self-evident that this examination would have to be conducted under ground rules not normally acceptable to Congress.

REPORT ON SOUTH AMERICA—TRIBUTE TO JACK HOOD VAUGHN

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, last November, during the interim, the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] and I made an extensive tour of South America. We visited four countries—Peru, Argentina, Brazil, and Chile—and in each one we sought information on the economy, the people, and the government. Also, we sought to check on the effectiveness of our programs involving Latin America, seeking guidance on matters which will be coming before the Senate.

Among the highlights of our 3-week trip, as far as I am concerned, were our visits with the Peace Corps volunteers and the opportunity to watch them working among the people of Latin America in the fields and villages and in the crowded slum sections of some of the cities. I was deeply impressed by the dedication, the intelligence, and the ability of these Americans who are serving the cause of humanity in faraway places. The Peace Corps volunteers, I discovered, are in close contact with the people, are trusted and respected, and have a real feeling of the conditions in the countries where they serve.

Before making the South American trip, I was briefed by Jack Hood Vaughn, who then served as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress. Mr. Vaughn is a talented and dedicated administrator, and the insight I gained from our visit was most helpful to me. Also, Mr. Vaughn deserves much credit for the effectiveness of the Peace Corps in South America since it was he who organized the Peace Corps program in Latin America in 1960. Under Mr. Vaughn's direction the South American Peace Corps became a vibrant force for helping our fellow men help themselves to a better life.

I was, therefore, pleased by President Johnson's announcement last week that he was appointing Jack Hood Vaughn as director of the Peace Corps. At the time of the announcement and 2 days later, following a 2-hour visit with Mr. Vaughn, I expressed strong support of this action in statements to the Oklahoma press. Today I am going one step further, by calling the attention of Senators to what I believe is a commendable move and expressing confidence that the Peace Corps, under Jack Hood Vaughn, will continue its excellent operations and become an even more vital force in Latin America and throughout the free world.

Although Sargent Shriver, as I have many times said, is an uncommon and tremendously able administrator, I have long felt that one man should not be given the responsibility of supervising two programs as vital as the war on poverty and the Peace Corps.

Because of the action taken last week by President Johnson, the future looks bright for both of these important programs. I commend the President for taking this action.

WHY WE ARE WRONG IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the lead article in this month's issue of Foreign Affairs is an excellent and perceptive analysis of problems in Latin America written by Mr. George Cabot Lodge.

Mr. Lodge was my opponent in my first campaign for the Senate. But we did not differ on the basic foreign policy problems facing this country, and I have always respected his knowledge in this field and the services he has rendered.

In his article, Mr. Lodge describes with great insight some of the basic needs of the Latin countries; the gaps in education; the need for voluntary associations, such as credit unions, rural cooperatives, and marketing groups; the central role that must be played by democratic worker and political organizations. The need for developing a managerial class; the importance of ideology to the people of Latin America and the need for our own country's commitment to the revolutionary changes that must take place there if progress is to be made in freedom.

The proposals he makes for U.S. action, by both our Government and our business firms are most enlightening. I commend the article to my colleagues in the Senate and to all who are concerned with the welfare and progress of the nations in this vital part of this hemisphere.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that a reprint of major portions of the article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Foreign Affairs]

Why We Are Wrong in Latin America—Must Understand Revolution

(By George C. Lodge)

If the United States is to secure its vital interests in Latin America, it must better understand the nature of revolution there; it must determine more precisely its relationship and commitment to that revolution; and it must revise accordingly its Latin American policies and programs, both private and public.

Today there can be no doubt that the interests of the United States are in jeopardy. Chaos and violence are prevalent in some countries and imminent in others. Our efforts to promote economic development and political stability have been less than satisfactory, especially in rural areas.

Conversely, one of the most hopeful political developments in the hemisphere, the Christian-Democratic movement led by Eduardo Frei, of Chile, came about and is proceeding in several countries quite apart from our efforts.

In fact, it appears to derive part of its virility from its political and ideological alienation from the United States, as well as its increasing affinity with Europe.

The initial vision of the Alliance for Progress has been blurred and its spiritual message garbled. Once more the image of the United States is tarnished by the suspicion that it is committed to the status quo and therefore to passive resistance to change. The unique dedication of the Alliance to what in Latin America is seen as radical reform, which enlightened its inception and gave it fire, has been all but smothered. With it has gone the ideological initiative which the United States had seized in 1963.

We have a tendency to suppose that actions speak louder than words; yet perhaps the words of President Kennedy were most important in those first years of the Alliance—his assertion that the United States was a revolutionary country, that we profoundly supported the demands of the people of Latin America for radical social, political, and economic change, that we were concerned only that the revolution be constructive, serving its own highest and noblest ends, and that its independence be protected against those who would subvert it for imperialistic purposes.

These were the words which throughout the hemisphere helped put Mr. Kennedy's picture in the huts of the interior, in workers' housing projects of the cities, in tiendas (shops), gas stations, and schoolhouses.

These were the words which could have made our intervention in the Dominican Republic more understandable and acceptable in Latin America.

We missed the mark in that instance. Basing our action as we did on the need to save lives and on an ill-defined anti-communism, we were made to appear antirevolutionary.

In fact, we entered more a chaotic than a revolutionary situation in which the real and legitimate revolution of the people of the Dominican Republic was being endangered by those who wished to use it for imperialistic purposes. We were seeking to protect the independence of the revolution, but we did not say so.

Let us define what we mean here by the word "revolution."

It must be clearly distinguished from the anarchy, coups, or other unorthodox means of changing governmental leadership common in Latin America, and seen most recently in the Dominican Republic, Brazil, Honduras, and Guatemala.

By revolution we mean the deep and radical changes in the social, political, and economic fabric of a nation or a people which proceed constantly underneath the chaos and the coups and reach into every phase of work and life.

It is emotional and spiritual, it is concerned above all with dignity and justice, and in Latin America as well as elsewhere it appears to be inevitable and in its high purposes eminently desirable.

This revolution does not seem to require bloodshed or violence. It did in Mexico many years ago, but in Chile we appear to be watching it progress in peace and order; hopefully the same may be true in Venezuela and eventually in Brazil.

The importance of this revolution is made clear in the words of Roger E. Vekemans, S.J., sociologist, director of the Center of Research and Social Action in Chile, close adviser of President Frei, and an intellectual leader of the Catholic social-action movement in Latin America: "Without thorough and quick social change on a truly revolutionary scale, it will not be possible to achieve authentic and rapid economic development in Latin America; and without really startling economic expansion there is no possibility of responding adequately to the revolutionary crisis that obtains in the region.

"Blind and immediate pressure applied from abroad that fails to take cognizance of Latin America's need for social change might temporarily postpone an explosion. But even if delayed, this explosion would necessarily occur, and the longer it is delayed, the more violent it will be."

[From Foreign Affairs]

PATERNALISM MUST DIE

NOTE.—Historically, the church, in sharp contrast to North America, has been identified with wealth, power, land, and the aristocracy. As the vigilant watchdog of the status quo, the church enjoyed a central position in the traditional structure of paternalism.

"Imagine the church in the paternal framework," writes Bishop McGrath, "in which everything was in its place; God in Heaven, the King in Spain, the governor in the province, the patron on the farm, each farmhand in his house with his woman and children, and the priest who came and attended spiritually to the needs of the people."

Except for the King in Spain this is still a true picture of life in many areas of Latin America. Yet there is today perhaps no more militant or effective force for change in the hemisphere than the church.

Read the words of Most Rev. Helder Pessoa Camara of Brazil: "Liberty is only a name, a sound, for two-thirds of mankind, without houses, without clothes, without food, without a minimum of education, and above all without human conditions for working.

"Unfortunately, our Latin American rich men talk very much about basic reforms, but then brand as Communists those who decide to make them real."

In Panama, Peru, Chile, Brazil, Venezuela, and other countries, the church is making vigorous efforts to organize cooperatives in rural areas, to persuade the elites of their responsibility, to help the destitute in the big-city slums—leading, in short, a great social, educational, and religious reform giving effect to the encyclicals of Pope John XXIII and the new thought in the Vatican.

In some places, to be sure, it has not made this new departure. In Colombia, for example, when Fr. Camilo Torres, a young rebel priest, found himself confronted by a church hierarchy which is perhaps the most traditionalist in Latin America, and by a political and social situation which cries out for change, he asked to be relieved of his priestly obligations so that he could take up "the revolutionary struggle."

It is important to note that the principal support for the church's new social action in Latin America comes from Europe rather than the United States.

The German bishops, for example, provided some $15 million a year for what are the most radical and politically controversial operations of the church in the region.

The church in the United States tends in general to assist in more traditional ways, helping, for example, with the distribution of food and in various welfare activities.

Closely allied with the church's direct participation in the revolution, but clearly separate from it, has been the rise of the Christian Democratic political movement, strongest in Chile but gaining a following in Venezuela, Panama, Guatemala, El Salvador, Peru and elsewhere.

Beginning in the universities, it now attracts followers in all sectors and at all levels of society, but its most important leadership comes from the middle class.

In the words of its principal spokesman, Eduardo Frei, President of Chile and probably the outstanding statesman in Latin America today: "The central tenet of Christian Democracy looks to the crisis of a world exhausted, to the death of paternalism, and to the birth of a civilization of work and solidarity with man as its center, rather than the pursuit of monetary gain that pervaded the bourgeois society. And its inspiration is that this new era in history and the new social condition will be based on Christian values and concepts of Christianity."

Christian Democracy implies a breaking with the "established order," with prevailing structures.

"The achievement of power no longer means for us," says Frei, "as it does for the people of the United States, simply slight variations in political structures, but rather a change in the entire social structure, requiring new orientations for family, education, state and man."

It is a non-confessional party. "It is not constituted by Catholics for Catholics."

The Christian Democrat rarely speaks against communism and occasionally criticizes the United States for seemingly supporting the status quo with what appears to him to be a policy which is both pragmatic and materialistic. He is, therefore, branded frequently as "anti-American."

It is important, therefore, to understand President Frei's thoughts on this matter, remembering that he is surely no Communist, that his most vituperative political foes in Chile are Communists, and that on many occasions he has shown profound regard for the United States.

In his mind, communism in the Western Hemisphere represents more than just another political movement. Many see in it a system that explains to them in coherent and understandable terms their own existence.

It is for this reason, Frei thinks, that its success is "sometimes greater among the intellectuals and the better off proletarian sectors, and even among the middle class, than among the rural, uneducated mass."

But, thinks President Frei, the answer usually given to this challenge of communism is weak and mediocre. He writes:

"The anti-communisms of fear, of preservation of 'order,' and of forces, manifested in military coups, are doomed to failure and are constantly in rout. They have nothing to say to youth or the people. This explains the frustration resulting from regimes created to impose 'order.'

"Again, to ground all policy on the concept of 'free enterprise' is almost absurd. This does not satisfy anyone's soul or intelligence. Furthermore, to continue speaking of freedom and democracy to people deprived of land, housing, schools or opportunities is practically useless. They are words wasted. What is important is to point the way to a true democracy and a true freedom."

These words were written in 1963 before Mr. Frei was elected to the Presidency of his country. Since then he has sought to achieve reform and progress in Chile and has encountered predictable difficulty. But they are important words to ponder carefully.

[From Foreign Affairs]

LABOR RESISTS THE REDS

NOTE.—Another principal force for change in Latin America is organizations of workers: cooperatives seeking to organize workers to meet the challenges of nature, the market and the credit system; and trade unions seeking to organize employees to bargain more effectively with employers and to effect political objectives.

The historical purposes and responsibilities of workers organizations in Latin America far transcend the economic welfare of their individual members.

While this is and must be important, they are in a very real sense creators of new political, social and economic systems.

They are integrators where there is little integration, communicators where there is little communication, motivators where there is little motivation, and organizers where there is confusion and chaos.

They are the institutions in many ways best suited to ease the painful transition from traditional rural agricultural life to new urban industrial life. It is their natural function to identify ever-increasing areas of mutuality of interest among the various groups and classes in society.

Perhaps most important, it is through organization that industrial workers and campesinos gain a realization of their power in the community.

With this comes a sense of their own worth and dignity, and a sense of hope for the future for themselves and their children.

Like the cooperative, the Latin American trade union is quite different in origin and purpose from its U.S. counterpart.

Both historically and at present its political and social functions are substantially more important than its economic.

In spite of the fact that their numbers are small, their leadership inadequate and their finances scanty, these organizations constitute one of the very few means through which revolution can be made constructive.

Furthermore, it must be assumed that in time trade unions will increase in power, and once gained it will not be lost but will be vented in one direction or another.

Frequently the economic requirements of development and the facts of life make any dramatic increase in wages or improvement in living standards difficult if not impossible.

The responsible labor leader thus has a hard time maintaining the loyalty of his membership, especially in the face of the demagog who with his quick solution to complex problems, his promise of utopia, is a particularly effective tempter to those who have tasted power but find themselves unable to use it within the existing structure.

It is important to recognize, however, that while labor unions have been prime targets of international communism ever since the October revolution, they are also first lines of defenses against it and other totalitarian forces.

What is significant is the extent to which trade unions in Latin America have been able to resist penetration by these forces. Control of these organizations by democratic leaders is a key factor in hemispheric development.

While no self-respecting Latin American labor leader would deny the necessity of radical change, there are important differences in methods and techniques of leadership.

At present the Communists are definitely a minority group in the labor movements of most Latin American countries. Furthermore, where they exist they are badly split among themselves between those adhering to the old-line, peaceful coexistence policy of the U.S.S.R. and those following the Peiping-oriented policies of Cuba as enunciated by Guevara and Castro, calling for "wars of national liberation" and violence without regard to the international priorities set in Moscow.

[From Foreign Affairs]

WATCH YOUNG MANAGERS

NOTE.—One of the most potentially powerful and important new forces which can stimulate organization and motivation in Latin America is the new managerial elite, composed largely of the young men, some of them self-made and unencumbered by feudal attitudes, who are engaged in industrial and commercial enterprises.

They are found in virtually every country and are bound to have a significant effect in the years ahead.

They have felt the strong pressure for social action emanating from the Catholic Church, understand the realities of the situation more clearly than their fathers and in many cases recognize that revolution is not only inevitable but desirable.

They are perplexed, however, as to the means by which the revolutionary development can be made constructive and harmonious with their interests and obligations as managers and entrepreneurs.

Through their relationships with the employees of their companies and factories, these men are developing skills and capacities for practical and effective development planning and governmental reform.

They thus can be catalysts for political interest and activity on the part of a new and larger segment of the population; indeed, many political leaders of the future may well come from their ranks.

They also can be important agents of regional economic and political integration, carrying their enterprises across national boundaries and developing larger markets. This can result in more efficient production, better utilization of natural resources and, perhaps most important, the organization of agricultural enterprise for increasing the production of food and making it more efficient in packaging, preserving, distributing and marketing.

The new managers have the difficult task of proving that if employers who rely on their own initiative are able to operate in a hospitable governmental and public atmosphere they can create new social, political and economic structures which will meet the pressing needs of Latin America.

There is a real question as to whether, given the will, they will have the time and the power to do so within the hemisphere's presently crumbling framework.

Only unusual strength, capacity and vision will enable them not to abdicate leadership to the extremists on one side or the other.

Rufo Lopez Fresquet, the distinguished Cuban economist and historian who assisted Castro in the Sierra Maestra, became his first Minister of Finance, and barely escaped with his life when the revolution was betrayed, believes that the root cause of Castro's ability to seize and hold Cuba was the abdication of leadership by Cuban businessmen in the early 1940's thereby providing the basis for Batista's destructive dictatorship and thus for Castro's.

The new managerial elite must analyze the anatomy of the revolution in progress around them. They must assess the problems confronting their countries, the characteristics of the power-organization-motivation vacuum and the combination and balance of the forces striving to fill it.

They must then design engines of motivation and organization which are capable of successfully building and stabilizing new economic, social, and political systems.

In so doing they will be mistaken if they fail to shuck off the old myths, jargon and comfortable phrases of the past. The ideology they must build might well center around the notions of individual dignity; the value of individual initiative; the legitimacy of private property responsibly used for public benefit; and the great utility of managerial skill and technology.

Along with principles like these they must devise fresh ways of proceeding in order to tie business managers to other elements in society, so that the expansion of enterprise will help in the construction of a strong social and economic framework within which justice and democracy may flourish.

[From Foreign Affairs]

SOCIALISM NO BOGEY

NOTE.—Part of the difficulty in relations between the United States and Latin America lies in the realm of ideology and semantics, in the misunderstanding that each side has of the ideas and words of the other.

We find many countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa are taking to the word "socialism," even though it has become almost as useless a term as capitalism since it is applied to systems ranging from the totalitarian U.S.S.R. to democratic India.

Actually what most Latin Americans mean when they say socialism is merely a government with a social conscience, a system in which social justice is protected and promoted.

They refer, in fact, to very nearly the system which we have, but they cannot bring themselves to call it capitalism. Except for a small minority of doctrinaire intellectuals, few insist on ownership by the state of all the means of production.

Communism, too, means quite different things to different people. In its purest form, of course, it means nonproprietary communal living. We have no real objection to that, although we do not want to practice it ourselves.

Perhaps the Israeli kibbutz is the nearest thing to pure communism in the world. In this sense, it has a strong basis in religious teaching.

To the vast majority of Latin Americans, however, communism is understood to be simply the opposite of capitalism, not of democracy or liberty or freedom.

Therefore, when we say we are anti-Communist many understand us to be saying in effect that we are pro-capitalist; and without a precise definition this raises the problems mentioned above.

To Americans—and now to an increasing number of Latin Americans who have seen and learned from the example of Cuba—communism means an international imperialistic conspiracy which destroys the independence of nations and the liberty and dignity of the individual. But because of the difficulty implicit in the word, Christian Democracy and similar movements in Latin America forgo using it.

We might do well to follow suit, saying instead precisely what we mean. For after all, we are not prepared to make great sacrifices for the preservation of what is called capitalism today in Latin America; whereas we are quite prepared to do so to help protect the independence, liberty, and dignity of Latin Americans.

A prominent non-Communist leader of the revolutionary left explains how our real message and our vital interests are distorted today in Latin America:

"In the United States, communism is seen as a physical menace to the established way of life and the institutions that have brought a considerable degree of well-being to the vast majority of citizens. * * * In Latin America, however, communism is seen as a means of change, as a possible solution to an unsatisfactory way of life. * * * Negative anticommunism, often associated simply by blind opposition to change, is habitually fostered by American foreign policy * * * (which has) often worked to the advantage of communism.

"Democracy has many times been confused with capitalism, as if the capitalist system were essential to democracy. The fact is that the majority of the governments on our continent, wrongly called democratic, have always been in the hands of financial oligarchs that have practiced exploitation through capitalism. This democracy has nothing to do with capitalism as it now exists in Latin America."

The importance of sharpening our ideological concepts and making them more precisely understood is accentuated by the real split that Communist parties in Latin America are facing today.

On one side are those old-line party leaders who support and are supported by the Soviet Union; they favor a policy of infiltration, cooperation with non-Communist groups and peaceful coexistence.

On the other side are the supporters of Castro, who want an early revolution by force and have a natural sympathy therefore with Peiping. Castro is urging Latin America to follow the violent road because he wants to spread his revolution quickly; but his revolution has been branded counterrevolution by many because it has been deprived of its autonomy.

In some ways the struggle in Latin America is one between materialism and ideology. As a result of a strange series of misunderstandings, imprecisions, commitments to meaningless jargon and ideological naivete we find ourselves strangely identified with materialism, while Cuba, China, the Soviet Union, and their supporters are identified with spiritual ideology.

At the same time, we seem to be unwittingly forcing the ideologists to unite, although of course they have very little on which to be united.

RETIREMENT OF WALTER L. REYNOLDS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Congress of the United States is poorer today because we are losing a faithful, dedicated, and experienced professional staff man from the Senate Government Operations Committee. Walter Reynolds has decided "to call it a day" and has retired as chief clerk of our committee.

I do not want Walter to leave the Capitol without knowing full well that his long efforts in behalf of better government have been noticed, recorded, and appreciated.

Walter is one of those rare individuals who always wanted to go the extra mile—to do the job fully, paying attention to all details, giving the members of the committee every bit of information and help which was available to him. His performance set a high standard to which all staff people can well aspire. He was always careful and methodical. We could always count on him to brief us completely and accurately.

I first met Walter when he worked for the Honorable Ham Fish, a Member of Congress from New York. I was a freshman Congressman, seeking advice and guidance on many problems which were plaguing the world at that time. I often found Walter a source of information and help to me in those early days. We were good friends then, and, I am happy to say, we have remained good friends ever since.

I want to take this occasion to wish Walter and his lovely wife, Clare, the very best of luck and good fortune during their retirement days. They will be missed on Capitol Hill because of their friendliness and their charm. But most of all, they will be missed by those of us who have depended on them for help, and counsel. They richly deserve the best that life can offer and my hope for them is that they enjoy themselves fully in the years ahead.

MENTAL RETARDATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when the history of this decade is written, one of its most shining chapters will be the story of our counterattack against one of the oldest problems known to man—mental deficiency. Over five and a quarter million Americans unfortunately suffer from various degrees of mental retardation.

Under the administration of President John F. Kennedy, this Nation launched its most ambitious assault against this widespread disability which has caused so much loss to our people—in anguish, in loss of earning potential, and in so many other ways. Programs of Federal assistance to serve the mentally retarded have been continued and expanded under the administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

An excellent summary of the problem and of progress in meeting it was given in an article which appeared in the August 29, 1965, issue of the newspaper supplement, Family Weekly. The article was written by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. Throughout his 16 years as a Member of the Senate and in his current capacity, he has been a strong supporter of efforts against mental retardation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Family Weekly, Aug. 29, 1965]

WE CAN LICK MENTAL RETARDATION

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States)

(NOTE.—When this affliction struck his own grandchild, the Vice President learned what anguish it can cause a family, and what Americans can do to fight it.)

A mother recently wrote me: "Our family has suffered more from our child's mental retardation than from any other problem in our entire lives."

Her distress is echoed throughout the land. More lives are blighted for longer periods by mental retardation than by any other health problem except mental illness.

Some 5.4 million Americans suffer from retarded—that is to say, arrested—development of the brain. Of the 4 million children born in the United States each year, 3 percent will at some time in their lives be classified as mentally handicapped.

"Is our baby normal?" is the question every new mother and father ask the doctor or nurse in the maternity ward. Usually the answer is a delightful "Yes." All too often, however, the sad reply is: "You'll have to brace yourselves. I'm sorry to tell you * * *."

But diagnosis of subnormality cannot usually be made right after birth. Often it is not until a youngster enters school that anxious parents hear the answer they may have feared for years—the answer to why Johnny or Susie cannot seem to learn and to understand.

With all possible gentleness, the parents must be told that Johnny or Susie will grow physically but maybe not mentally. The shadow that this condition will cast over their lives is almost beyond belief, except to those who have lived with it.

Mental retardation can strike in any home. It struck a sister of the great and good leader, President John F. Kennedy. It also struck the first grandchild that Mrs. Humphrey and I welcomed into the world.

A child could hardly be sweeter than our little granddaughter Vicky. We love her deeply, as do our daughter and son-in-law. I recall how, when I visited Vicky in school not long ago, she introduced granddad to her friends with a joy that overflowed her heart—and mine.

But to parents and grandparents and other relatives and friends, realism is essential. Families are aware that, until now, there have been two strikes against every retarded child: (1) the disability itself, and (2) society's frequent misunderstanding. That's one strike too many.

Even so, the world has come a long way toward fair play for the retarded. For centuries, as far as mental retardation was concerned, even the most highly advanced nations, such as our own, lived in the dark ages. Superstition surrounded the mentally deficient; a stigma was attached to them. They were shunned, rejected, scorned—as if their sad affliction were contagious. Families felt guilty and ashamed, as if they were somehow to blame. Unfortunately, these mistaken ideas about mental retardation still persist.

Time was when laymen in general tended to confuse mental retardation with mental or emotional illness. They did not realize—and some people still do not—that mental illness is not a lack of intelligence (and so may be cured), whereas mental retardation is, by definition, inadequately developed intelligence (and is therefore lifelong).

Gradually, however, these old myths have been banished. Today, enlightened public opinion has changed the world of the retarded for the better.

Science has brought knowledge, sunlight, and warmth to that world. As a result, what once would have been considered wonders have been performed. In countless instances, the intelligence quotient (IQ), which used to be mistakenly thought of as rigid and unchangeable, has been raised by skilled education, improved diet, as well as other professional measures.

But the greatest miracles of all have been achieved through the most uplifting force in the world: human love—the devotion of mothers, fathers, and other relatives.

Given encouragement, special education and training, and proper medical attention, many a retarded boy or girl has astonished doubters and scoffers with growth and achievement. In effect, these youngsters are being helped to attain every American's birthright: the opportunity to rise to his highest potential.

For this happy change, credit is owed to many sources. Parents themselves—banded together in a dynamic, voluntary health agency, the National Association for Retarded Children—have been prime movers in spirited community action.

History also will record the preeminent contribution of one man: President John F. Kennedy. A panel of experts that he set up offered the Nation the boldest program for remedial action ever envisioned. Two great laws resulted—both signed just 1 month before the President's tragic death.

These laws, in effect, declared war against this terrible enemy which had brought such anguish to so many for so long. For the first time, massive national resources were thrown into a counterattack. Every State in the Union was given the means to plan a comprehensive program against every aspect of mental retardation. Funds were provided to improve maternal and child health, to train physicians and other specialized personnel, and to construct research and diagnostic centers.

The momentum has been maintained, indeed, accelerated. President Lyndon B. Johnson has stated: "Today we can say objectively that more has been done in the Government in the past 2 years than in the previous 200 years to meet the challenge of mental retardation."

But there is no ground for complacency. We have a long way to go. Look about you in your own community. Ask any expert physician or social agency whether the needs of the mentally retarded are receiving sufficient local attention. Invariably, the answer will be "No."

The reason: a continued shortage faces us in specialized manpower and facilities. Every age bracket—from an infant needing a preschool day-care center to an adult needing a sheltered workshop—has unfulfilled requirements. Long waiting lists continue to exist for almost every type of attention.

Expanded action is therefore necessary on five broad fronts. We need a stepped-up partnership of public and private, Federal, State, and local activity for research, diagnosis, education, employment, and care.

1. RESEARCH

Our greatest opportunity is in the area of prevention. If we are to defeat the causes of mental retardation, we must first know what they are. Already we have identified as many as 200 different factors which may be responsible. But only rarely can we be sure that a particular factor caused the damage to a particular youngster.

What we do know is that the 9 months from conception to birth, together with the first month after birth, are the 10 most important months of life. What happens within the mother's womb and the first 30 crucial days thereafter affects intelligence and overall health in ways which we are only now beginning to comprehend.

That is why prenatal care is so important. We have learned the hard way that there is an unusually high incidence of retardation among infants of the poor, few of whose mothers receive such care. For this reason, special attention is being devoted to care of pregnant mothers in the war against poverty.

We know also that, rich or poor, a long series of "ifs" may shape the destiny of the unborn. For example, if German measles strikes in the early weeks of pregnancy; if the life within the womb is subject to this or other viral infections or to poisonings or high-level radiation or certain medications; if later on, at the time of birth, the child is injured—there may be severe consequences for his intelligence.

Why should this be so? More and more clues are coming to light as scientific studies broaden and intensify. Throughout the Nation, hospitals are collaborating with the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness to accumulate detailed information about 50,000 pregnancies. By analyzing the factors associated with healthy or retarded or otherwise impaired babies, we should soon have decisive new knowledge to act on.

Already many a mystery has been cleared up. Science has given us the means to prevent the effects of a hereditary error of metabolism known as PKU. By a simple laboratory test costing only a few cents, an infant lacking a crucial enzyme can be quickly identified and given a remedial diet to prevent a lifetime of mental retardation.

A French scientist, Jejeune, tracked down some of the mystery of chromosomes (the threadlike structures in our cells which convey hereditary traits) and showed that Mongolism is associated with an extra 21st chromosome, singly or attached to another chromosome.

Later, other scientists added to Jejeune's finding by observing that this chromosomal abnormality is usually not transmitted in any hereditary mechanism (although sometimes it is). Thanks to this and other knowledge, a parent with a Mongoloid child can go to a physician and, by means of a cell analysis, find out whether the child is a carrier of the transmissible type of Mongolism, or whether the affliction in that family is of the more common nontransmissile type.

Genetic counseling thus serves invaluably to answer otherwise tormenting questions.

2. DIAGNOSIS

Science has been increasingly successful in identifying who is and who is not mentally retarded, in what way, and to what degree. But diagnostic tests must be further improved. The American Medical Association points out:

"Mental retardation is not the only depressant of learning capacity. A child who seems retarded may be suffering from defective hearing or vision, cerebral palsy, communication or language disorder, emotional disorder, another chronic illness, or from chronic undernutrition."

Careful diagnosis will distinguish among these conditions. It will throw light upon each of the multiple handicaps with which so many of the retarded children are burdened.

3. EDUCATION

We need to strengthen specialized schooling. Each youngster has a different potential for learning. Retarded children are generally grouped as educable, trainable, or totally dependent.

An educable child can achieve a fourth- or fifth-grade level of learning and a moderate amount of social adjustment.

A trainable child can attain an acceptable level of self-care, social adjustment, and dependability at home. A dependent child is helpless without institutional care and makes little response to his world.

Fortunately, the dependent ones are the least numerous. Seventy-five percent of all the retarded are only moderately impaired. Many are almost indistinguishable in normal living among the general population.

4. EMPLOYMENT

One of our most spectacular breakthroughs has been in the successful hiring of mildly retarded adults. Enlightened employers, including Federal agencies, have proved that, when properly selected and trained for the right jobs, mentally retarded persons make good workers. Jobs assure them dignity and self-respect. Becoming employees enables them to pay their share of the tax load instead of being public dependents. For a healthy economy, a taxpayer is always preferable to a "tax eater."

But many employment offices are closed to applicants with less than normal intelligence. These doors can be opened—should be opened—and will be, if the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped is heeded.

5. CARE

About 4 percent of the mentally retarded are in institutions, public and private. Every effort must be made to help these institutions achieve sound standards of care. For too long, many public institutions were little more than "snake pits." Even today, in some private institutions (where costs bear heavily on middle-class parents), standards are not what they should be.

This five-point program, carried forward aggressively, will make all the difference in the world to millions of human lives. All society will benefit. From the standpoint of finances, the assault on mental retardation will save untold sums. For each year, because of underachievement by citizens with an IQ lower than normal, the economy loses billions of dollars.

State and local governments do spend substantial sums on mental retardation—but largely for custodial purposes. By strengthening research as the Federal Government has been doing, the amounts that will have to be spent in later institutional care will be reduced.

By how much? A single infant, saved from the effects of PKU by the test which costs only pennies, might otherwise have cost the Government $100,000 for custodial care throughout his lifetime.

Dr. Stafford Warren, who has served as the President's Special Assistant on Mental Retardation, says: "The toll of mental retardation could be reduced by fully one-half if all we know today could be applied successfully everywhere."

When I met recently with Dr. Warren and his colleagues, I knew I was in the company of some of the most dedicated men in our country—men dedicated to human happiness. For the real "dividend" of our constructive action is not financial, it is human—it is smiles and joy on a child's face. It is peace of mind and pride that we have not turned our backs on the afflicted.

The American people have a strong sense of conscience. We will not rest, we dare not rest until we have helped those who cannot help themselves. This is our creed. This is our deed. This is why we are a great people.

FIVE YEARS OF ACHIEVEMENT IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, one of the truly heartening developments under our flag is what has been happening in the Virgin Islands during the last 5 years.

Five years ago, President Kennedy nominated for the governorship of that Caribbean possession of the United States, Ralph M. Paiewonsky. He was a native of the islands, had spent his entire life there, and had become a successful businessman. He was not the first native-born Governor appointed since the islands were acquired by purchase from Denmark in 1917. Since their transfer from the earlier naval rule, the islands had passed under civilian control in 1931 to the jurisdiction of the Interior Department. Most of the Governors since then were political appointees. Two before Governor Paiewonsky were Virgin Islanders, and it may be said, in general, that the practice of appointing a resident proved preferable to sending in someone who, whatever his qualifications, had to spend most of his gubernatorial term learning the facts and realities about this American colony and its disadvantaged people.

Governor Paiewonsky's 5 years have been years of achievement. They have exceeded, in terms of accomplishment, not only any previous 5-year period but it may well be that they have exceeded in results the entire previous history of that U.S. possession. The progress made has been economic, political, social, material, and spiritual. It evidences two basic premises: First, that for democracy to funtion effectively, leadership is required. Ralph Paiewonsky furnished that leadership, and second, the New Frontier of President Kennedy, and the Great Society of President Johnson furnished the atmosphere and climate in which such achievement was facilitated.

Since the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood and the very special status of Puerto Rico as a Commonwealth, which has given it essentially the kind of government and the kind of freedom that the people of that island desire, the United States has greatly diminished its role as a colonial power—a role which it should never have had and which it should liquidate as far as possible as soon as possible. Still retained, in varying degrees of that status, are the Virgin Islands, Guam, Samoa, the Trust Territories, and other scattered bits of real estate in the Pacific, such as Wake, Midway, the Line Islands, and so forth. The proper policy for all of these, where statehood is not practicable for obvious reasons, such as insufficient economic base and insufficient population, a maximum of home rule, and all other attainable concomitants of full citizenship, should be our objective.

Five years ago, after visiting the Trust Territories as a member of the Subcommittees on Territories and Island Possessions of the Senator Interior Committee, I came to several conclusions about them. First, that these islands were necessary to the United States, and that although they were now in trusteeship under the United Nations, their ultimate destiny should be as part of our Nation. This, of course, would be on the assumption that at the appropriate time referenda in the various island groups would establish their desire for permanent union with the United States of America. In view of the fact that we are now administering the Trust Territories, provided we do a conscientious job of administration, education, and economic development, it seems likely that that will be the decision of the people of those islands when the time comes for them to make a choice.

It also occurred to me that since they will never have the population or economy to justify statehood, they might consider, if the people of the Hawaiian Islands likewise approve, joining these islands and creating a vast Pacific State. It might, in time, be desirable, if this prospect seemed pleasing to all concerned, to include the other Pacific islands in such an arrangement. Then all their inhabitants would have secured full citizenship and their colonial status ended.

But, to return to the Virgin Islands, Ralph Paiewonsky's leadership and achievement have prepared and pointed the way for the Virgin Islands to attain that maximum of participation in all the rights, immunities and privileges of American citizenship, and it is to be hoped that in the not too distant future the United States will consider seriously and favorably giving the Virgin Islands an elective Governor and representation of the traditional nature for an area not a State in the U.S. House of Representatives.

In any event, the history of the United States in regard to these outlying possessions in the last decade and a half is highly commendable. It has eliminated the stigma of colonialism in the two new States admitted in the last decade, Alaska and Hawaii, and has given Puerto Rico, subject to some minor improvements which are now under consideration, the kind of government its people want.

Meanwhile, heartiest congratulations to Governor Paiewonsky, to the members of the Virgin Islands Legislature, and to the people of those islands, for 5 years of most gratifying progress and the prospect of more in the years ahead.

I ask unanimous consent that the state of the territory message, of Governor Ralph M. Paiewonsky, delivered to the seventh legislature of the Virgin Islands at its regular session on January 17, 1966, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State of the Territory Message, of Gov. Ralph M. Paiewonsky, to the Seventh Legislature of the Virgin Islands, Regular Session, January 17, 1966

Mr. President, honorable members of the seventh legislature, my fellow Virgin Islanders, it is almost 5 years since I took the oath of office as Governor of the Virgin Islands, and many of the promises we made and the programs we pledged for our people then have been fulfilled or are in process of fulfillment. When I recall that inaugural day and remember the obstacles that confronted us, I marvel at the progress we have made, and I humbly thank God for giving us the strength and the purpose to have accomplished so much. We needed so many things—housing, help for the aged and infirm, upgrading of education and expanded educational facilities, promotion of tourism, and diversification of the economy. We needed zoning, planning, water, power, airport development, slum clearance, and harbor improvement, to name but a few.

We pledged to build a better place here in the Virgin Islands for ourselves and for today's children, as well as tomorrow's. We knew we had to move forcefully and quickly, recognizing that when the youngest child of the islands has grown to manhood, we will be judged by what we provided now for his health, his education, his chance for a better home, a better opportunity, and a better life.

Now, almost 5 years later, we can see that these have been unprecedented and fruitful years—years of growth, of giant economic strides and social gains—and we gratefully acknowledge and pay tribute to the many people who have played a part in this eventful journey.

We have had help from a host of dedicated, hard-working, responsible members of our executive branch, our public servants.

We have had cooperation from a multitude of private citizens and interested officials of the Federal Government.

We have good fortune to be blessed with the natural beauty and benefits of a sunny clime, at a time when people have become travel-wise and vacation-conscious.

And we have had the advantage of President Johnson's Great Society program now being implemented here in the Virgin Islands in every possible way.

Most of all, we have the advantage of a responsible, forward-looking legislature and legislative program. You have recognized your duty to the people of the Virgin Islands and you have, through conscientious thought, exhaustive study, and long hours of work, amassed a legislative record unsurpassed in Virgin Islands history. The far-reaching programs of this administration could never have been carried out without your support.

Gentlemen, as I see it, we are—you and I—partners for progress in the Virgin Islands. It is my job to report to you on the state of the territory, but it is the task of all of us to strive for the constant improvement of our islands. Because we all have done our part and continue to do so with unremitting energy and dedication, I can report to you today that the state of the territory continues to be excellent.

The state of the territory is excellent because we have been partners for economic progress. Local government revenues, including internal revenue matching funds, totaled almost $29 million in fiscal 1965 as compared with $24,800,000 in 1964, and the trend of increased revenues continued during the first half of fiscal 1966. Per capita income has exceeded $2,000, a new high for the islands and the highest in the Caribbean. Bank assets continue to soar, up 35 percent to over $90 million. Tourism and employment are at alltime highs and wage scales continue upward. Over half a million visitors came to our islands last year spending $54 million, $6 million more than the previous year. We are building a sound, broad-based economy that continues to expand at unprecedented rates.

The state of the territory is excellent because we have been partners for progress in education. Ninety-two classrooms and twenty-six special facilities have been constructed in the past 4 years. Curriculum study and development, teacher training and the teacher-pupil ratio are vastly improved. We are embarked on a program of preschool training and adult education. We have provided a teacher pay incentive plan and with Federal help are working on the dropout problem and apprenticeship training. We have graduated the first class of our College of the Virgin Islands which continues to expand in number of students and courses offered.

Most important of all, we have embarked on a school construction program that is expected to provide an additional 113 classrooms by this fall, to be financed through funds from the highly successful recent bond issue program.

We also have been partners for progress in health and social welfare. There have been no epidemics in recent years and immunization programs continue to prevent the outbreak of communicable diseases. Our public health programs are being continually expanded and our hospital facilities improved. We have provided the community with a new youth-care center and a day-care center for preschool children. And we have, with Federal funds, begun work experience and training programs for persons unable to support themselves or their families.

And we have been partners for progress in housing. Thousands of Virgin Islanders have been relocated into safe and sanitary new apartments and homes through Federal and local programs. Five hundred additional low-rental units are in the planning and execution stage. The need for middle-income housing is also being met, with the first project of 128 units to be dedicated next month. Private construction continues to be encouraged and urban renewal programs planned. In all areas, public and private, we hope to continue to provide more than 1,000 housing units per year until all blight and substandard housing has been eliminated. More and more, we will avail ourselves of federally sponsored programs to provide the moneys necessary to complete this gigantic task.

The year just ended has been a year of many accomplishments, a memorable year in many ways.

In June, we were honored by the visit of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, whose warmth and eloquence captured the hearts of us all. Her address at the first commencement exercise of the College of the Virgin Islands focused national attention on our educational endeavors.

In November, we welcomed the Vice President of the United States, Hubert H. Humphrey, to the dedication of our new water and power plant.

Once again, the eyes of the Nation turned to the Virgin Islands and highlighted our progress in providing for our basic needs.

Throughout the year, distinguished visitors from the United States and other countries of the world have come here to see and enjoy our "Showplace of Democracy."

The year 1965 also saw the culmination of 4 years of effort to persuade the Congress to grant us the two-to-one customs advantage we needed for our tourism industry. The enactment of the special provision in our favor was recognition of the fact that most of every dollar spent here remains within our Nation's economy. It was a notable achievement for the islands.

This was the year in which jet service to St. Thomas, via St. Croix, was approved, and beginning on January 21, we will see an ever-increasing flow of direct flights to further enhance our tourism efforts. Allocations were approved by the Federal Aviation Agency for improvement of airport facilities on both St. Thomas and St. Croix, and plans are under consideration for a first class jet airport on the east end of St. Thomas to provide for our future needs.

The year 1965 saw important steps taken in the transfer of the major responsibilities of the Virgin Islands Corporation to the territorial government. Power generating facilities on St. Croix and St. Thomas were turned over to the Virgin Islands Water and Power Authority. We assumed management responsibility for the Harry S. Truman Airport and the submarine base, and about 1,000 acres of Vicorp land on St. Croix was designated for transfer to the local government to be used for education, housing, and health facilities.

The year 1965 will be remembered as the year the islands celebrated their first bond issue. More than $5 million in bonds were successfully sold to help finance school construction and the acquisition of land and planning for two medical centers and water facilities.

We will remember it also as the time when we acted to conserve and develop our natural resources. A bill was passed to control the use of underground water and to establish a water resources commission. A pilot program already has been established on St. Croix to utilize the underground water there. Together with our plans for desalinization, we will be permanently assured of an adequate supply of potable water. We are proud to point out, also, that our new soil conservation bill has been described by officials of the Soil Conservation Service as a "model law."

Farmers will recall 1965 as the year when relief from the prolonged drought came to them in the form of 134 tons of feed grain from the Federal Government and 400 tons from the local government.

This was the year in which delegates to the Virgin Islands Convention presented their recommendations for greater self-government to the Federal Government. Before the year ended, one of their recommendations, and a much needed one, to let legislators set their own salaries, was enacted by the Congress.

The year marked the beginning of an intensive beautification campaign with the goal of making the Virgin Islands the most beautiful in the Caribbean. With the help of a legislative appropriation and the cooperation of many private citizens, planting, painting, and cleanup already have begun.

This was the year when the islands industrial development program brought many new businesses and industries, among them a huge new oil refinery in St. Croix to add to the growing industrial complex there and provide the diversification and job opportunities that are needed for a continued broad-based, sound economy.

And it was the year that brought Federal approval and implementation of nine antipoverty programs for the Virgin Islands. They included a Neighborhood Youth Corps program, Head Start, a preschool training experience and an unskilled worker training program. Grants totaled $567,000 and applications are being reviewed for four additional programs totaling $566,000.

But though the year just past had many favorable highlights, it also focused attention on some major problems that still exist.

One of these is the problem of alien labor and the fact that our situation here is unique and different from similar problems that exist on the continent. Our objective is to provide employers with all the workers they need in this expanding economy but at the same time to see that qualified resident-citizens are given first preference. We must, also, remember that the worker, whether he be alien or citizen, needs a living wage and that by raising his standard of living, we raise the overall standard of living for the islands. To cope with the problem we have created a separate department of labor and have held meetings between the U.S. Department of Labor, and Department of Interior officials and employers here. I am confident that with thorough study, quiet reasoning and effective compromise we will arrive at a solution that will be satisfactory to all.

We are also facing a problem in those industries attracted here by the provisions of section 301 of the Tariff Act which gave the islands the opportunity to develop its own industry through the offering of certain tariff concessions. However, similar type industries in the United States enjoying the protection of a high tariff, have come to consider the 301 provision as unfair and have sought legislation in the Congress to abolish the privileges our firms enjoy. Though we are against the restraint of free trade, we realized a compromise was necessary if we were to save our woolen textile and watch assembly firms and the jobs of their employees. We needed to satisfy industries in the United States and the Congress and at the same time allow our firms the chance to fairly prosper. This has now been done in the form of statutory quota restrictions on goods produced here for export to the mainland. Though there are still problems to be resolved under the 301 section, we are hopeful that through discussion and understanding, we will arrive at a proper solution.

I have touched on only a few of the highlights of this past year and the years of this administration. The full and complete report of the departments and agencies of the executive branch, compiled as an "Annual Report to the Secretary of the Interior for Fiscal Year 1965," is appended to this message so that you may have a more detailed picture of our progress for that period.

Now, let us put aside the past, successful as it has been, and let us look to the future, a future that holds even greater promise for us all. We have been partners for progress thus far. Now, together, we must redouble our efforts to complete the job that was begun 5 years ago.

In all of our planning, in all of our efforts we have stressed time and time again the need for excellence in every program, the importance of equality in every achievement. Our resolve in this pursuit of excellence continues strong.

Our President has pointed out that we are only at the beginning of the road to the Great Society. "Ahead now," he said, "is a summit where freedom from the wants of the body can fulfill the needs of the spirit."

Together, we must climb to that great height, together we must reach that summit.

In the coming year, I will propose many specific new programs and the continuance of many already underway. But I would also propose to you now, paraphrasing the words of President Johnson, these major goals of our own Great Society.

I propose that we continue our program of educational excellence to insure every Virgin Islands child the fullest development of his mind and skills.

I propose that we continue our attack on sickness and infirmity and strive to provide the most advanced medical care for our people.

I propose that we seek every means, explore every area to provide as quickly as possible the rest of the adequate housing these islands need.

I propose that we do all in our power to add to the beauty and cleanliness of our islands and the comfort and well-being of its inhabitants.

I propose that we make new efforts to control and prevent crime and to halt delinquency whenever it appears.

I propose that we honor and support the achievements of thought and the creation of art.

I propose that we make an all-out campaign against waste and inefficiency.

And I propose that we continue to be partners for progress in realizing these lofty aims.

More specifically, I believe we will be partners for progress in urging the Congress of the United States to grant us greater self-government. Our Virgin Islands convention delegates have asked no more than we deserve, principally the election of our own Governor and Lieutenant Governor, the proper reapportionment of the legislative districts, representation in the Congress through a Delegate or Resident Commissioner, the right to vote for President and Vice President in national elections, and the abolishment of the Presidential veto over local laws. United, we must press for the adoption of these proposals.

I believe we will be partners for progress as we embark on a massive roadbuilding and street-improvement program. In the past, large sums of our annual revenues were, of necessity, devoted to programs of home and school construction, health facility expansion, and water and power needs. While we recognized the need for better roads, the funds were just not available. But now damage from the unusually heavy rains has added to the need and the program can no longer be put aside. Fortunately, increased Federal aid and our recent bond sale will help provide moneys for our housing, health, water and power expansion, thereby freeing some local moneys for other uses. I am going to ask that we spend $1 million in St. Thomas, $720,000 in St. Croix, and $225,000 in St. John for roadbuilding this year. Our gasoline-tax revenues will provide another half million dollars for this purpose. We are going to use all means at our disposal, including private contractors where their competitive bids will save us money, to accomplish this task.

We know, too, that there have been complaints and problems in the collection of garbage and trash. This has been due primarily to a shortage of proper equipment and personnel, further handicapped by the fact that we are disposing of an amount of garbage equivalent to that of a city four times the size of our towns' populations. Steps are being taken and considerable funds are being recommended in the new budget for necessary equipment so that we can look forward to marked improvement this year.

I believe we will be partners for progress in a continued attack on substandard housing and the furtherance of public housing, new middle-income housing and urban renewal programs. With the help of the Federal Government we are going to continue to expand our public housing programs, acting to acquire additional land for this purpose on both St. Croix and St. Thomas. We are going to take a new look at our urban renewal programs with a view toward better utilization of acquired land for housing purposes, and we are going to plan and build two 221 D–3 middle-income housing projects, one in Christiansted and another in Frederiksted, similar to the project now nearing completion on St. Thomas. We are going to ask you to improve mortgage financing to make it easier for our people to own their own homes. We will not rest in this endeavor until all Virgin Islanders have an opportunity to live in decent dwellings.

In addition to acquiring land for housing we must move to acquire the necessary private land for our proposed St. Thomas jet airport and to increase our holdings of public beach land for recreational purposes. And we must further strengthen and expand our recreational program and facilities.

This year, we must complete the detailed building plans and arrange for the financing of our two multimillion-dollar medical centers, designed to provide our islands with modern and adequate medical facilities. Each center will include a 250-bed general hospital, a 60- to 75-bed wing for long-term chronically ill patients and a new public health clinic. Plans also call for a school of nursing and a student nurses residence. The construction of these centers will be made possible from various sources including annual capital appropriations, through the sale of general obligation bonds, and Federal aid.

This year will also see the initiation of the college building program when the college library, the first building of our future campus, will be constructed. It will have an eventual capacity of 100,000 volumes. A women's residence hall for 80 students will also be built to be followed by a cultural center, men's residence hall and a classroom building.

The need for highly qualified Virgin Islands teachers impels us to be partners for progress in teacher training, in working out a program that will properly prepare a sufficient number of our high school graduates for a teaching career here in the Virgin Islands. We must act to achieve this end quickly but without sacrificing the high standards of educational excellence that have been a part of all of our programs in the field of education in the past 5 years.

In this regard, I'm sure we will also continue to support the fine work of the department of education in the fields of vocational training and rehabilitation, adult education, library improvement and curriculum development. One program in this latter category deserves our particular attention. We need to expand our Caribbean marine biology program in which our high school students are introduced to the wonders of the marine life surrounding their islands. The experiment already has been proven a success in its initial program and could lead eventually to professional training in the science of marine biology and career opportunities for many of our youth.

We can look forward to two new facilities for our senior citizens. Moneys have been allocated for the construction of a new Queen Louise Home for the Aged that will double the size of the present facility. The other, a federally financed project to be constructed near the Paul M. Pearson Gardens apartments at Long Bay, will provide 84 units for the elderly. A delay in the start of this home, the first of its type to be built under public housing, has now been overcome and ground breaking should take place in a few months.

Our newly created department of labor has undertaken an intensive recruiting program to induce skilled and trained Virgin Islanders and other American citizens now living on the mainland to come and make the Virgin Islands their home. The vast changes that have taken place here and the new opportunities available are expected to bring back many of our most talented Virgin Islanders.

We need to deal effectively with the flooding problem now being caused by the unusually heavy rains. To this end, we have requested implementation of a congressional resolution, permitting the Army's Corps of Engineers to design a flood control plan.

We take great pride in the Peace Corps' establishment of a permanent training center on St. Croix, the only one of its type, now training groups of up to 200 teachers a year. We believe so strongly in the aims and purposes of the Corps we will ask that a similar center be set up on St. Thomas and suggest that the facilities and services of the College of the Virgin Islands continue to be utilized in the training program.

We will also continue to press for authorization to form our own National Guard unit in keeping with the islands' growth and our belief that we are eligible for additional self-government.

We are going to ask for adoption of Planning Board recommendations for major improvements in the Christiansted area. These are to include a major harbor development together with a shoreline drive, ample parking and beach and recreational areas. A bypass road for trucks and heavy vehicles to relieve the possibility of traffic congestion will also be necessary. These plans are well advanced and will soon be released for a public hearing and public discussion before adoption and implementation. Projects at Crown Bay and Long Bay on St. Thomas will also proceed once clear title to these submerged lands is obtained.

I believe we will be partners for progress in assisting farmers who want to take part in a new agricultural program. If we are to retain and improve this important sector of the economy we must help provide the machinery, tools, chemicals, marketing aid and advice necessary to carry out the new and diversified programs we envision. The responsibility for the expansion and readjustment of agriculture is ours and we plan to meet it.

We will press for the further transfer of lands and facilities that can be better utilized by the local government; land still held in St. Croix by the Virgin Islands Corporation, and the transfer of Bourne Field, the submarine base and Crown Bay lands on St. Thomas. And we shall continue to plan for two new, complete Government centers through our urban renewal program, one in the Barracks Yard area of St. Thomas and the other in the Water Gut area of Christiansted on St. Croix. They will be designed to centralize the executive branch departments, providing greater efficiency and economy.

My budget proposals, which will be submitted to you shortly, will call for total operating expenditures of $35,600,000 or about $6,200,000 more than total operating appropriations of the current fiscal year. Major increases amounting to close to $5,200,000 are in the department of education, the department of public works, the department of health, and the department of public safety. My capital budget proposal will be $6,750,000, major appropriations being recommended for power, for roads and streets, for utilities, and for airport improvements. We will anticipate local revenues of $29,500,000; revenues from new medicare program of $500,000; a carryover of $700,000 from this fiscal year, and Federal matching funds of $11,750,000 of which we shall earmark $5 million for educational improvement. The operating and capital budgets being submitted will total $42,350,000.

I am proud to point out once again that the Virgin Islands continues to be a leader in the field of human relations. The peace and harmony in which men of all races, creeds, and national origins live and work here together is a lesson for all the world to view. When minor civil rights incidents do occur, they are quickly resolved in a spirit or harmony and good will.

Finally, I believe we will be partners for progress in implementing President Johnson's new and continuing Great Society programs. We are aware that there will be additions, changes, and new opportunities for our islands under housing, economic opportunity, antipoverty, education, medicare, and cultural programs. I shall ask for your support in seeing that the Virgin Islands receives its share of Federal funds to be made available in these areas.

I have touched on only a few of the major areas of effort for the year ahead. Other important programs and improvements will be introduced for your approval throughout the session. Many of these are included in a list of proposed legislation appended to this message.

I would be less than frank with you if I did not admit that the road ahead will not be easy.

I would be less than honest with myself if I did not admit there will be many problems along the way.

But though we are concerned over the difficulties that lie ahead, we are fully confident of their final solution.

Though we are ever mindful of the lessons of the past, we will continue to look ahead to what the future will bring.

Though we are humble before God as his servant and the servant of the people of the Virgin Islands, we are proud of what we have done, of the record of this administration.

The cornerstone on which we began to build our islands' Great Society was excellence. It will remain such in all our future endeavors.

Now we begin again our joint efforts on behalf of this growing territory. As we venture into the year 1966 with high optimism and hope, I offer this prayer to guide you in your deliberations, written by Stephen Vincent Benet and a favorite of the late United Nations Ambassador, Adlai Stevenson:

"Lord, grant us a common faith that man shall know bread and peace—that he shall know justice and righteousness, freedom and security, an equal opportunity and an equal chance to do his best, not only in our own land but throughout the world. And in that faith, let us march toward the clean world our hands can make."

May God watch over you in your endeavors.

APPENDIX "A" GOVERNOR'S STATE OF THE TERRITORY MESSAGE

List of important legislation to be recommended by the Governor

1. Amendment to Altona community development law.
2. Amendment to watch production tax law.
3. Amendment to law for purchase of portion of Sara Hill for airport purposes.
4. Additional road fund appropriations.
5. Rules and regulations to implement building code.
6. Adoption of official zoning maps.
7. Amendments to zoning and subdivision laws and zoning and subdivision regulations.
8. Resolution urging the participation of the Virgin Islands in Federal-State unemployment insurance program.
9. Amendments to unemployment insurance law for participation in Federal-State program.
10. Amendments to unemployment insurance law to facilitate collections of delinquent contributions.
11. Purchase of land from the United States for home for the elderly.
12. Child abuse law.
13. Council of arts law.
14. Amendments to child labor law.
15. New medical fee bill.
16. Provision of additional funds for improvements to existing hospitals.
17. Teachers education and training law.
18. FAA grant offer, Alexander Hamilton Airport.
19. FAA grant offer, Harry S. Truman Airport.
20. Bribery of public officers.
21. Amendments to pay plan.
22. Mortgage financing and redemption of mortgages laws.
23. New housing programs.
24. Creation of new agency to manage airports.
25. Regulation of billboards.
26. Disposition of public records.
27. Amendment to the industrial incentive act.
28. Settling of claims.
29. Citizens advisory commission on aging.
30. New pharmacy code.
31. Participation in Caribbean Economic Development Agency.
32. Liberalization of workmen's compensation law to include firemen.
33. Control of temporary water containers.
34. Transfer of marshals to municipal court.
35. Survey and planning applications, urban renewal: (a) Hill Street, Frederiksted, (b) Gallows Bay, Christiansted, (c) Ross Yard, St. Thomas.
36. Transfer of bureau of recreation to department of agriculture.
37. Transfer of veterinary services to the department of agriculture.
38. Amendments to banking law.

THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, one of the real success stories in this decade is the emergence of the Peace Corps as a worldwide force for the improvement of mankind and the potential the Peace Corps possesses to break down the barriers of suspicion that separate one culture from another. In this light, Mr.

President, I was very pleased and gratified to note the selection of my good friend, Jack Hood Vaughn, as the new Director of the Peace Corps. Mr. Vaughn has had wide experience within and outside of Government and has previously served as a Peace Corps administrator.

As organizer of Latin American programs for the Corps, he expanded the number of volunteers from 123 to almost 3,000 and pioneered in the concept of community development as a means of eradicating the rural and urban slums of Latin America. In his most recent position as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, he has again demonstrated his great ability as an administrator and his keen insights into the problems inherent in any attempt to bring overnight the marvels of the 20th century to those nations and peoples who have been denied them.

Jack Hood Vaughn's long experience in academic life, in the Marine Corps, and in many responsible positions in our Government, coupled with his imagination and industry, make him completely qualified for his new position, and I am delighted to note President Johnson's trust in him.

And in the same context, Mr. President, I should note that we have had from Mr. Vaughn's predecessor service clearly above and beyond the call of duty. The President's decision to ask Sargent Shriver now to devote himself and his considerable energies solely to the Office of Economic Opportunity was a wise one. It is clearly in the public interest and in the interest of the conservation of the energies of Sargent Shriver to permit him to focus his attention on one primary target, and I have no doubt that we shall all benefit from this change.

RESPONSIBILITY OF AMERICANS IN WORLD AFFAIRS—TODAY'S REALITIES AND TOMORROW'S HOPES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a former Oklahoman strayed to Texas and became one of that State's great Congressmen. He is the Honorable JIM WRIGHT.

On January 14 he appeared before the Friday forum of the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce and delivered a masterful speech. Although parts of it were of special and specific interest to Oklahomans, the bulk of it was of such a nature as to make all of us sit up and take notice of the responsibility we as Americans must take in world affairs.

Mr. President, I do not want anyone to be deprived of the wisdom displayed by my friend, the Congressman from Fort Worth, Tex., and, therefore, I ask that his address, "Today's Realities and Tomorrow's Hopes," be printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY'S REALITIES AND TOMORROW'S HOPES

(Address of Congressman JIM WRIGHT, Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce Membership Luncheon, Jan. 14, 1966)

I am glad to be here in "the Nation's largest city." The 649 square miles within your city boundaries undoubtedly entitles you to this distinction.

And, from a Texan, that amounts to quite an admission.

There are those who erroneously thought that Texans grieved when Alaska displaced us as the largest State. Not so. We rejoiced with them in their new honor. We only hope they can bear it with the same becoming modesty that we have always exhibited.

Perhaps in one sense it is proper that a Texan should be invited to speak to the chamber of commerce luncheon in the Nation's "largest city." Not because Texans and chambers of commerce bear in common a reputation for boasting. But because we share with this organization a common dream and a common goal.

To match our geographic quantity with economic, educational, social, and political quality.

A city without an ambitious, energetic, and well-balanced chamber of commerce would be like a ship without a rudder. It would be like a navigator without a compass. It would be like a builder without a set of plans.

Solomon said: "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

More and more chambers of commerce are coming to realize that—if they are to have a message, and a mission, and a future—they must learn to speak not only for the business community, but for the community.

Chambers of commerce are lengthening the stride of their vision to think not only of the immediate needs of today but of the untapped promise of tomorrow. I know no better example than the "frontiers of science" program launched right here in Oklahoma City.

And organizations like yours are extending the breadth of their vision to recognize that, if the individual communities they serve are to be healthy, then the nation of which they are a part must be healthy.

No longer is it logical or even popular to cuss the Federal Government in one breath and demand more millions in benefits in the next. I am not pleading for subservience. I am pleading for adulthood. I am asking for a friendly, cooperative working partnership between the cities of our Nation and the Government of our Nation. Without it, the years ahead—with ever more of our people crowding into the burgeoning metropolitan centers—would be chaotic.

I am suggesting that we all grow up and recognize how silly it is to contend that the only way we may acceptably prove that we love our country is by demonstrating that we hate our Government.

Our Government belongs to us. It is not our enemy. It is our instrument. It is our creation. It is our servant.

No city in the country should be better equipped to recognize the impact of the world around us and the value of an intelligent working relationship with our Federal Government than Oklahoma City.

In 1964, the total amount of personal income in the State of Oklahoma was $5.1 billion. Approximately 17 cents out of every dollar came in direct payments of one type or another from the Federal Government. Certainly I am not contending that the Government owes every man a living. But I am contending that the Government owes every section of this land the responsibility of helping to create an economic climate—an atmosphere of progress—which is conducive to widespread individual success in the private sector.

During the past fiscal year, the Corps of Engineers spent $14 million to tame the floods and harness the rivers in your State. No part of our Nation should better recognize the benefits of booming industry and thriving commerce which follow in the wake of developed water resources than the State of Oklahoma.

During this fiscal year, the Defense Department awarded $120 million in prime contracts to Oklahoma firms and businesses.

Tinker Air Force Base alone represents an annual Federal expenditure of some $680 million. Its 24,000 civilian employees release an annual payroll of $150 million into the economy right here in the trade territory of Oklahoma City.

There are in this city 41,000 people receiving social security benefits which are helping to turn the twilight years of their lives from gray years of need and neglect into golden years of fulfillment. This is not only a cushion against individual adversity, but a $32 million a year cushion for the economy of Oklahoma City.

During the current fiscal year, the Small Business Administration has made 135 business loans, for a total value of $4.6 million, to small independently owned businesses in this town, helping to stimulate the wellsprings from which new enterprise can flow.

Under the Water Pollution Control Act which the late Senator Bob Kerr and Representatives ED EDMONDSON and TOM STEED helped to write, your city has received grants totaling $2.2 million to help assure for the next generation of your residents a legacy of pure water.

And, just last week, the Secretary of Commerce released a little over $12 million to be invested in the highway program for the State of Oklahoma during the new fiscal year, to help provide the arteries of commerce through which the economic bloodstream can flow unimpeded.

Through a working partnership with our Federal Government, and with a vision of the future, Americans like Bob Kerr and CARL ALBERT and MIKE MONRONEY and William Morgan Cain and Stanley Draper have defeated the doldrums which only a few years ago held your State in the grip of introspective paralysis, and have blazed a trail of progress into a brighter future.

But Oklahoma, although an important part, is only a part of the world around us. It will prosper as the Nation prospers. It could never endure as one healthy cell in an unhealthy body. Nor could it exist as an insulated island of peace surrounded by an ocean of war.

Oklahoma City is part of the world.

If we would understand the world on which New Year's Day dawned just 2 weeks ago, we need to recognize four stern realities of our time. These are the great, overpowering facts of 20th century life to which those of us in your Government are trying to react intelligently in our efforts to shape the future as you'd want it, rather than just waiting for it to happen to us however it will.

1. The first of these realities is the fantastic compression of time which has shrunk the planet Earth.

It took Columbus 70 days to cross the Atlantic. Lindbergh did it in 33 hours. A B-58 can do it in a little over 3 hours. And, in the month just passed, our Gemini spacecraft were covering that same distance in just about 10 minutes.

But let's put it in a more personal way: For purposes of either transportation or communication, Oklahoma City is much closer today to London or Paris or Moscow or Saigon than it would have been 100 years ago to your neighboring State capital at Austin.

Think about it. Today you can communicate with someone in any major city of the world more quickly—or you can get there more quickly—than your great-grandfathers at your age could have traveled or sent a message from Beaver City to Idabel or from Altus to Miami, Okla.

Or—disquieting though the fact may be—your home, wherever you may live in Oklahoma—is no more than 40 minutes from Vladivostok by ballistic missile.

What does this mean? Well, it means that—whether we like it or not—this world has become a neighborhood. What happens anywhere in the world does have a bearing on our lives.

It means that cohesive international organization and swift, decisive action when freedom is threatened are not only desirable; they are absolutely necessary.

This is why the tide of Communist aggression must be turned back in Vietnam lest it spread like an unchecked prairie fire to engulf all of Asia. And this is why the United Nations must be made to work, for there's no alternative.

The choice is world law or world anarchy—the rule of reason or the rule of brute force.

Those who mouth the old platitudes and talk in scornful derision of what they call "One Worlders" are speaking in a dead tongue. With the awesome weaponry at our command, the choice is one world or none. And I'm for having one. A free world where men may have a say in their destiny and settle their disputes by reason and not by riot, by ballots and not by bullets—where men and women can live without fear, and be neither Red nor dead.

Can we attain such a world? Well, we'd better do so, because—

2. The second of these great realities of our age is that science and technology are speeding ahead at a blinding, ever accelerating pace.

So rapid has been this advance of science in the last 25 years that it threatens—unless we constantly update our social knowledge—to leave our human arts of government far behind.

It has forced upon us an entirely new dimension of problems not even dreamed of 20 years ago * * * problems that range from the threat of polluting the atmosphere by atomic explosion or by the exhaust fumes of 75 million automobiles in this affluent society—to the question of job displacement through automation.

So rapidly are old processes being obsoleted, that in our society today the average American industrial worker changes jobs 15 times and has to be retrained 3 times in the course of his career.

In such an age, education is no longer a luxury. It's a necessity. If America is to claim the promise of the future, it must be an America in which all of its children—north and south, east and west, rich and poor, black and white and red and brown—will be given the opportunity to develop their individual potentials to the maximum.

Still half of our high school graduates are not entering college—and a full 40 percent of those who do are forced to drop out. College tuitions are being forced ever higher, and if the hard-pressed parents of America are to keep up with the growing costs of educating and equipping their children for the age in which we live, they are going to have to have a realistic tax credit in the years in which they are actually seeing youngsters through college.

It will pay for itself many times over.

Here is one example of how that affects us right here in Oklahoma and Texas:

Across the country today, several sites are being considered for the location of a massive atomic accelerator project. For the area that gets it, it will be the biggest boon since the Manned Space Center went to Houston. Among those areas being considered are several in your State and several in mine. We in the Southwest measure up to the very best and better—in every criterion but one: our educational ratio is only 1 doctor's degree for every 25 masters degrees; in some places it's 1 for every 7.

If the Southwest should fail to get this project, that will be the reason.

But broader than our two States and of greater lasting significance to each of us, is this fact:

Unless the human race is to be left behind by its own creations, it must develop the tools—and the understanding in governmental circles—to cope with these creations and direct them in constructive channels.

3. The third overpowering reality of the time is the world population explosion which increases by geometric progression.

At the beginning of the Christian era—at the time of the first Christmas—there were only about 250 million people in the whole world.

In another 10 years, there'll be that many right here in the United States—on only 7 percent of the world's land surface.

It took the human race 3,000 years to develop a population of 3 billion people. We are doubling that figure in less than 30 years.

The same amount of land and air and water and mineral resources must be made to serve more and ever more people. And so the conservation and management of the earth's natural resources is an impelling necessity.

Right here in America, we are growing so rapidly that every day we have the numerical equivalent of a new Woodward; every week, of a new Lawton; every month, of a new Tulsa; and every year, of an entire new State of Oklahoma.

In recent years we in America have come to think of food surpluses as a problem. But most of the nations on earth are confronted with increasingly drastic shortages—and hunger is the thing that most often leads to war or revolution or violent upheaval.

Here in this bountiful land—where we worry at lunch time about too many calories—as rapidly as we are growing and our cities are expanding, we could reach the point within this century where our available farm acres would no longer produce enough for our own people.

So every inch of topsoil that can be saved—and every drop of water that can be conserved—and every stream that can be cleansed of pollution—and every river that can be developed, will pay rich returns to the next generation of Americans.

Your own Congressman, JOHN JARMAN, has done a magnificent job in promoting the maximum recovery and conservation of the petroleum reserves which will have to power the machinery of future generations. He understands well—as everyone in the Southwest should understand—that discovery of new reserves so necessary to our future well-being as a people, ultimately must rest upon the health of a domestic industry with thousands of independent operators—the guys with a rig and a rabbit's foot and a sense of adventure—ever searching the earth for new discoveries.

During the past decade, your State has lead the Nation in the development and conservation of your water supply. My hat is off to the citizens of Oklahoma City and of the western part of this State who have inspired the Nation with their display of statesmanship and vision in so actively supporting the Arkansas River project, even though thus far its tangible benefits have extended only to the eastern section of your State.

And, despite the initial disappointment which all of us have felt over the somewhat negative report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, with men like MIKE MONRONEY, FRED HARRIS and ED EDMONDSON plying the skill and resourcefulness and persuasion for which they are known, I firmly predict that no amount of obstruction will be able to hold back indefinitely the coming reality of the central Oklahoma project.

As one Congressman from a neighboring State, I pledge to you that—as long as I have the privilege to serve on the Public Works Committee—this practical and necessary development will have my hand and my heart, my voice and my vote, and whatever help that I can give.

The time is rapidly coming in the United States when that area blessed with a maximum development of its water resources will be better off by far than if it had oil or gold or uranium or any other resource of the earth, but lacked water. I have never heard a more ridiculous or more specious argument than that forced upon the Corps of Engineers by the Bureau of the Budget that a better set of freight rates through other modes of transportation, brought about by a navigation project, should be considered as a cost rather than a benefit factor.

It is obvious that the better rates will not come unless the canal is built. And if they should come as its competitive result, then I can't count that as anything but an additional benefit to the people.

Development of our waterways was one of the first functions of government recognized by the Congress in the first decade of the 19th century. But the history of their development has been a history of thinking too small and acting too slowly.

Not Oklahoma alone, but the Nation, will benefit by the Central Oklahoma project. The best homiletic I have ever read on the subject was delivered on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives in 1848 by a young Congressman named Abraham Lincoln. He was speaking out against a Presidential veto of an omnibus public works measure.

Lincoln demonstrated through the flawless logic that came to be his hallmark that, because of an inland waterway in remote Illinois, the sugar merchant in New Orleans sold his wares a "little dearer" and the housewife in Buffalo, N.Y., sugared her husband's coffee a "little cheaper."

The history of that splendid professional group known as the Corps of Army Engineers has been a history of cautious calculations and conservative estimates to tonnages.

The Engineer's projection on the Mississippi waterway was 9 million tons a year. In 1963, it carried almost 40 million tons—or 344 percent of the estimated volume.

The Engineers projected 9 million tons a year for the Ohio waterway. In 1963, it was carrying 88 million tons, or almost 9 times the estimated amount, and the locks were having to be rebuilt to accommodate the burgeoning volume of usage.

The original estimate, just a very few years ago, for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between New Orleans and Corpus Christi was only 7 million tons a year. That canal last year exceeded the official estimates by more than 10 times.

But the value of water resource development cannot be written in tonnages alone. The great complex of industrial development in the United States has grown up primarily along our inland waterways system, and from this the Nation has benefited beyond measure.

Last year, some 300 new industries sprang up along the banks of our Nation's navigable streams. This development not only creates a tax base for the local communities, it provides the payroll which generates other economic activities ad infinitum. In context with all we have been discussing, this may be far more important for the future than we realize.

Our population growth rate means something even more immediate than the things we have mentioned. It means that the private American economy must grow enough to produce 3 million new jobs every year—in the private economy.

It requires this many to take up the slack created annually by automation and to provide creative work for the young Americans coming into the job market for the first time each year.

We are in our 59th month of continuous economic expansion—the longest period of unbroken economic growth in the history of the Nation. We have over 73 million Americans gainfully employed. But next year we'll need to have 76 million at work if growing unemployment is to be avoided.

4. Finally, we face the reality of what has been called the revolution of rising expectations. Throughout the world, long submerged nations are churning in one of history's greatest upheavals, frantically trying to bring the benefits of 20th century progress to their own people. They are desperately determined to compress into one generation what it took other societies a century or more to develop.

In the far corners of the earth, men are choosing sides between two diametrically opposed ways of life * * * and how they choose may well determine the fate of our children.

Let's take a quick look at tomorrow's world. Let's think for a minute of those between the ages of 5 and 20—the next generation. Some of these are your children. Four of them are mine.

If we were to take a representative cross section of 100 of these 56 would be from Asia, 15 would be from Western Europe, 9 would be from Latin America, 8 would be from Africa, 6 would be from Russia, and only 4 would be from the United States.

Obviously, we cannot hold these people down in their quest for a better life. I don't think we would want to. We cannot simply hold back the tide of rising expectations. But we can win them to the side of freedom if we have enough imagination and sufficient understanding. Let's think for a minute about what makes these people tick.

Most of these people have never had a pair of shoes. Most of them have never seen a doctor. Most of them have never had enough to eat. But, thanks to modern communications, they are learning today what their ancestors never knew—that there are people who do enjoy the blessings of a better life.

These people are convinced that anything would be better than what they have—and they're desperately determined to get it.

This is one of our big problems in Vietnam. For generations, the local government had shown practically no interest in the problems of the average people. To those who do not stop to count the cost, communism promises a quick way out. They do not identify with our values—and they want something better for their children than what they have.

In this situation, it is not enough simply to stress the obvious negative, the evils of communism. It isn't enough just to be against something. It is our supreme task not only to say—but to demonstrate—that their legitimate aspirations can be realized—and better realized—through the framework of political democracy, without the sacrifice of their individual liberties.

This is why we have a Peace Corps. And this is why we have an Alliance for Progress. And this is why the best minds of our Government are engaged in imaginative pursuit of the best ways to win this contest for the minds of men.

These are the big realities. These are the real challenges. Beside them, the little, old, threadbare slogans and the petty, little arguments over which we quarrel and divide become as trifling and meaningless as deserted anthills dwarfed in the shadows of four great mountains.

These are the overriding problems which confront the Congress this year and in the years immediately ahead.

On the whole, we have made real progress in building a Great Society. Although the shrill intensity of uninformed criticism is sometimes a bit maddening, I think it is good that we are not satisfied.

We do well to recall that other civilizations, also blessed with a spark of greatness, strutted across the stage of world ascendancy only to fade and wane, their bright promise unfulfilled.

The Egypt of the Pharaohs developed learning but not understanding, and was buried in the sands beside the Nile.

Jerusalem the golden, after flourishing under David and Solomon, disintegrated, quarreled internally, split into two kingdoms, and was never again the same.

The Greeks wrestled mightily with philosophic problems and bequeathed us an intellectual inheritance rarely matched in history. Yet even the splendid aristocracy of Athens grew corrupt, abandoned its idealism, sought forcefully to impose its will upon others, and never recovered from the Peloponnesian wars.

Rome, gifted with lawmakers and warmakers but cursed with a degenerate patrician class, surfeited in the excesses of its own prosperity and became cruel and lustful until it rotted from within.

We still have problems to solve. As old problems disappear, new ones arise to take their place. One proof that a civilization has not reached its zenith and begun to fade is the very fact that its people are still restless and creative and anxious to come to grips with the new phenomena.

Much great work remains to be done. It will take vision to grasp the emerging challenge of education and thus claim the vast promise of the future. It will take self-sacrifice to insure that the basic resources of the earth are preserved intact for future generations.

It will take a willingness to think anew if we are to abolish the last vestiges of racial denial which scatter the seeds for bitter future harvests of anger and turmoil and which rob the Nation of many hundreds of millions of dollars each year in unrealized productivity.

It will take insight to find and remove the causes of juvenile unrest and foresight to protect the fundamental rights of privacy against electronic eavesdropping and thus prevent our utopia from becoming an Orwellian nightmare.

The society has many problems—and these should be to us more challenging than discouraging. Nobody ever has suggested that the Great Society would be a sort of nirvana where all problems vanish like vapors. It is not a Garden of Eden, nor will it become so by the work of men. But we do strive to build a better life.

On a street corner in Athens, some 24 centuries ago, Socrates and Glaucon discussed the good society—the city of God. After listening in skeptical disbelief, Glaucon finally uttered this protest: "Socrates, I do not believe that there is such a city of God anywhere on earth."

Socrates made his immortal reply: "Whether such a city exists in heaven or ever will exist on earth, the wise man will live after the manner of that city, having nothing to do with any other, and in so looking upon it, will set his own house in order."

And this, with God's help, is what we seek to do.

CLEARWATER, NEBRASKA'S SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL MEMORIAL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of the joint resolution introduced by the senior Senator from Conneticut [Mr. DODD], designating April 9 of each year as Sir Winston Churchill Day.

On January 24, 1965, at his Hyde Park Gate home, Sir Winston Churchill died. During his lifetime, this great and grand man had been often honored. Our country has honored him in a way it has honored no other, declaring him an honorary citizen.

And he was made the honorary citizen of many cities: Paris, Athens, Brussels, and Luxembourg, among others. And he has been claimed by the small as well as the large. Clearwater, Nebr., a small Antelope County community on the edge of the Sand Hills gave honorary citizenship to Sir Winston in February 1963. Later, this honor was bestowed by the State of Nebraska and then by the United States.

After his death, the Nebraska Churchill Freedom Foundation, Inc., was formed in Clearwater. The foundation is now raising funds to erect a memorial on the rolling prairies above Clearwater Creek just south of the village. Some day, it is planned, a statue of Sir Winston Churchill will overlook this land where freedom can be felt in the air.

Still in the planning stages, this prairie complex would contain three circular structures, including an outdoor amphitheater, an enclosed memorial room and study center and an outdoor memorial with the statue of this fondly remembered man symbolically facing toward the West and freedom.

Together, with the grant of citizenship, Clearwater gave Sir Winston a home "well stocked with champagne and cigars." At ceremonies in February 1963, he was represented by a stand-in, a young clerk in the city hall of Salford who was selected by means of an essay contest throughout the United Kingdom.

Now, a program is planned under which outstanding youth of the free countries of the world could meet at the memorial to exchange ideas and keep alive those principles so eloquently personified by Sir Winston Churchill. Each summer, representative youth would gather at the memorial's "parley" grounds for orientation and preliminary study. They would then journey throughout Nebraska to experience the way of life in the Midwest. Agricultural students would visit farms and ranches. Economics students would visit industrial centers. At the end of the summer, they would return for discussions.

The term "parley" was advisedly chosen, for Sir Winston preferred the informality of an open discussion parley rather than the formality and protocol of a conference or summit meeting.

The characteristic enterprise shown by my fellow Nebraskans has received warm thanks and every wish for success from Clementine Spencer Churchill, the widow of the British statesman.

The memory of Sir Winston Churchill remains fresh in our minds. His words remain relevant. At this time of great crisis, it is well to recall his counsel. He once wrote:

> There can hardly ever have been a war more easy to prevent than this second Armageddon * * *. Britain, France, and the United States have only to repeat the same well-meaning, shortsighted behavior toward the new problems which in singular resemblance confront us today to bring about a third convulsion from which none may live to tell the tale.

This man's words deserve not only our continued study and attention, but also his memory deserves our continued homage. Thus, it seems to me eminently right that we now again acknowledge our debt by declaring that the third anniversary of the proclamation declaring Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America and each anniversary thereafter be designated Sir Winston Churchill Day.

WATER RIGHTS OF VARIOUS LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT—STATES RIGHTS VERSUS NATIONAL POWERS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Dean Frank J. Trelease, of the University of Wyoming College of Law, is an acknowledged expert in the field of water law. So it is that his remarks in the field of water rights at various levels of government merit attention in this body and out of it. From the fall 1965 issue of the Wyoming Law Journal, we have Professor Trelease's paper, originally delivered at the western interstate water conference, on "Water Rights of Various Levels of Government—States Rights Versus National Powers."

I commend this article to my colleagues' attention, Mr. President, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Water Rights of Various Levels of Government—States Rights Versus National Powers

(By Frank J. Trelease*)

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.—U.S. Constitution, article VI.

"If you can't lick 'em, join 'em."—Unknown politician.

Inevitably, a discussion of the power of one level of government over water resources involves a comparison with the powers of other levels. A catalog of national powers, followed by a list of State powers, would be a meaningless exercise. The only reason for a paper such as this at a conference such as this is that in recent years, much talk and political activity has been focused upon the problem of States rights to water as contrasted with Federal power over water.

At the same time, the doctrine of States rights has been much mooted in a very different context—that of racial segregation. Yet there are some parallels between the two controversies. One aspect, common to both, is the unrelenting nature of the arguments of proponents of States rights, the unwillingness of those proponents to concede that the National Government has any case other than a bald usurpation of power. Reviewing the segregation controversy, a northern law professor analyzed the writing of southern lawyers in 10 years of a leading southern publication.[1] He found nothing but unmitigated blasts at the U.S. Supreme Court's "communistic, atheistic, nihilistic destruction of the Constitution." No writer in that journal so much as attempted to spell out the other side of the argument, or to analyze the strength of the Federal position. This is a wide departure from traditional legal method, for "the lawyer who cannot see his opponent's side or the difficulties in his own case gropes in a blindness that is often fatal."

Much the same one-sided quality has pervaded the writings and statements of the proponents of States rights to water, going back to the brief for "Preservation of Integrity of State Water Laws," promulgated by the National Reclamation Association in 1942, through the long series of hearings of Senate and House committees on the Barrett bill and its successors, including today's Kuchel bill.[2] Only a few non-Federal voices raised in the hearings have conceded any validity to the national position or any legitimate national purposes to be served by national supremacy in the water field.[3] Practically all State representatives see the question of State versus Federal supremacy over western water as a conflict, a struggle, a fight. Such an approach is futile, and there is danger in inviting a battle to the finish. The Western States cannot win such a battle. Despite the plausible arguments made in one-sided briefs, and the seemingly impeccable logic derived from State premises of "ownership" of water, they cannot win a lawsuit.[4] Subliminally, they realize this, for the battle has been shifted to the legislative arena. But they cannot win in Congress. Nine years and 50 bills after the original Barrett bill, the States stand in no better position than they did in 1956, when the first attempts to overthrow the Pelton doctrine were made.[5] The time has come to take a realistic approach to the subject and a realistic attitude toward the relations of the States and the Nation in the water resources field.

A realist does not seek an abstraction, but an objective. The doctrine of States rights is no more than a tool that may accomplish a desired result. Too often, the doctrine of States rights in water, like that of States rights in the segregation field, has been something considerably less than a noble political principle. It has been called upon to protect or advance some special advantage, as when large landowners seek exemption from the policy of the 160-acre limitation,[6] or when one State seeks an advantage over another, as in the early days when equitable apportionment was being fought out[7] or when Arizona sought to block the Boulder Canyon project.[8] All such attempts to use the doctrine of States rights to stymie the National Government or to put a single State's interest above those of the Nation or of a sister State, as a matter of right, as a rule of law, have failed.

On the other hand, the Western States have tried to assert the doctrine of States rights in water in order to further or to preserve some very legitimate State interests. If the decision is cast in terms of power, the result may be winner-take-all. But if the question is not the existence of power but the desirability of its exercise, compromise and accommodation are more likely to be achieved.

FEDERAL POWERS

If the United States is regarded as an opponent by the Western States, it is a formidable one indeed. It has a number of powerful weapons at its command. Though some of them look disarmingly simple, many are flexible and sophisticated, suitable for use in a wide variety of situations.

The Federal Government derives its authority from the Constitution of the United States. It has only such powers as are delegated to it by that instrument. But the Founding Fathers provided for a strong nation. Powers that permit the National Government to take action on water resources or to regulate their use are found in the authority given by the Constitution to control commerce, to provide for the common defense, to enter into treaties, to control interstate relations, to manage Federal property, and to provide for the general welfare of the country. Freedom to perform these functions without let or hindrance from the States is given by the supremacy clause.

The most highly developed body of Federal water law is in relation to navigable waters. The Constitution gives Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce,[9] which includes navigation as a part of transportation. The Federal power over navigable waters has been exercised in three ways—affirmatively, negatively, and permissively. Affirmatively, the United States may improve navigation channels, or build dams to provide a flow for navigable streams or protect the navigability of waters from floods or prevent the waters from doing flood damage to land.[10] Negatively, the United States may prohibit anyone else from interfering with the navigable capacity of the water.[11] Permissively, it may license others to do that which it might do or might prevent.[12] Since the national powers are supreme, the U.S. action in reference to a navigable river is not subject to State laws which on their face seem to apply to all waters.[13] If a State-authorized project affects navigable waters in a way inconsistent with Federal law, the non-Federal project must give way.[14] If a State-created right, or a State-authorized project, exists on a navigable river, and Congress decides to build a Federal project that destroys the State right or project, the National Government is under no obligation to pay compensation for the loss of the right or even for the destruction of a going business.[15] As far as the Federal Government is concerned, whatever rights a State may attempt to create in these waters are subject to the navigational servitude, an easement that is a defect in the title to such rights. Though at one time there was hope that this servitude did not weaken the title to western appropriative rights [16] there seems to be nothing to distinguish western consumptive uses from the riparian rights that have been destroyed or taken without compensation.[17] In the area of planning, the Federal Government may overrule a State plan for water resources by building a Federal project that is inconsistent with the plan.[18] Finally, in *Arizona* v. *California*,[19] the Supreme Court has now said that the power to dam and store the water of a navigable stream gives the power to distribute the water to States in such shares as Congress or its delegate may determine. Equitable apportionment—the legal claim of a State to a share in the benefits of a river—played no part in the decision.

---

* A paper delivered at 1965 Western Interstate Water Conference held at Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oreg., Aug. 5–6, 1965. Dean and Professor of Law, University of Wyoming.

[1] Frankel, "Alabama Lawyer, 1954–1964: Has the Official Organ Atrophied?" 64 Colum. L. Rev. 1243 (1964).

[2] "Hearings on S. 863 Before the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation," 84th Cong., 2d sess. (1956); "Hearings Before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs," 84th Cong., 2d sess., ser. 31 (1956); "Hearings Before the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation," 86th Cong., 1st sess., ser. 9 (1959). "Hearings on Problems Arising from Relationships Between the States and the Federal Government Before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs," 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961); "Hearings on S. 1275 Before a Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs," 88th Cong., 2d sess. (1964).

[3] See remarks of Goldberg, Clark, and Ely, 1964 Senate Hearings, supra note 2, at 120, 148, 243.

[4] Goldberg, "Interposition — Wild West Water Style," 17 Stan. L. Rev. 1 (1964).

[5] Note, "Federal Water Rights Legislation and the Reserved Lands Controversy," 53 Geo. L. J. 750 (1965).

[6] *Ivanhoe Irr. Dist.* v. *McCraken*, 357 U.S. 275 (1958).

[7] *Kansas* v. *Colorado*, 206 U.S. 46 (1907); *Wyoming* v. *Colorado*, 259 U.S. 419 (1922).

[8] *Arizona* v. *California*, 283 U.S. 423 (1931).

[9] U.S. Const. art. I sec. 8.

[10] *United States* v. *Commodore Park, Inc.*, 324 U.S. 386 (1945); *Oklahoma* v. *Atkinson*, 313 U.S. 508 (1941).

[11] *United States* v. *Rio Grande Irr. Co.*, 174 U.S. 690 (1899).

[12] *United States* v. *Appalachian Power Co.*, 311 U.S. 377 (1940).

[13] *Arizona* v. *California*, supra note 8.

[14] See Rio Grande and Appalachian, supra notes 11 and 12.

The war and treaty powers [20] give additional authority to the United States to build projects that will strengthen the national defense or comply with a treaty. The exercise of the war power has not been undertaken in such a way as to bring its resource development projects into direct conflict with State water laws or water rights. Normally, property taken for national defense purposes is condemned under the power of eminent domain. However, when it was coupled with the power to control the property of the United States, in the famous Hawthorne case,[21] the Court said that if the United States needs water for a national defense installation on the public domain, it need not "bend its knee" and comply with a State water law that might interfere with the management of property in the best interests of national defense. But the treaty power is like that over navigable waters, and States have conceded their duty to meet a national obligation such as the agreement to deliver annually a specific quantity of the water of the Colorado River to Mexico,[22] even though this might require State uses of water to be curtailed.

While interstate lawsuits and compacts may operate as a restriction on State law or State-created rights, the most important power of the Federal Government over interstate relations is the power to refuse congressional consent. Congress has refused to approve a compact, and one was killed when the President vetoed the act consenting to it on the ground that it would interfere with the jurisdiction and authority of the United States over the water.[23]

The proprietary power is less well developed than the power over navigable waters, but in recent years has given rise to the most controversy, in the political arena if not in the courts. The property clause of the Constitution [24] reads as follows: "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States."

In the Western States, the most important national property is land, the public domain, the vast areas of public land, national forests, national parks, and Indian, military, and other reservations. Whether or not the United States "owns" the waters on these lands, it is now clear that it has the power to use the water on the reserved lands to further the purposes for which the reservation was made.

The reservation of the water may be exercised and the water put to use without regard to State law, and in a manner inconsistent with it. The reservation may be exercised by taking the water for the reserved purpose even though this means taking it without compensation from persons who hold State rights to the water and who have put it to beneficial use. The *Pelton Dam* case,[25] *Federal Power Comm'n* v. *Oregon*, established the first proposition and *Arizona* v. *California* [26] realized the Western irrigators' worst fears as to the second. Implementation of the decree in that case will take water away from California irrigators and cities and put it to use on Indian reservations, national forests, recreational areas and wildlife refuges.[27]

Yet this should not have come as a surprise. The rule as to Indian reservations was established in 1908,[28] and in 1899 the Supreme Court warned that a State could not without congressional consent, "destroy the right of the United States, as the owner of lands bordering on a stream, to the continued flow of its waters; so far at least as may be necessary for the beneficial uses of the governmental property." [29]

There are other national proprietary interests, not connected with land, that affect water and its use. When in the exercise of one of its powers the United States controls the flow of a river by storing water, it owns the power potential in the stored water, it may produce electric energy with that potential, and the electric energy thus produced is property of the United States which the Government may sell or lease upon its own terms.[30] Nebraska once had a policy, based on its claims to ownership of the water in its streams, that hydroelectric power generated in Nebraska could not be transmitted or used beyond the confines of the State.[31] Obviously, this policy could not restrict the out-of-State disposition of power produced at a Federal dam.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the power to levy taxes and to appropriate funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States.[32] In the famous case of *United States* v. *Gerlach Livestock Co.*, the Court said that one of the largest Federal basinwide development projects—the Central Valley project in California—could be sustained under this power. "Congress has a substantive power to tax and appropriate money for the general welfare, limited only by the requirement that it shall be exercised for the common benefit as distinguished from some mere local purpose. * * * Thus the power of Congress to promote the general welfare through large-scale projects for reclamation, irrigation, and other internal improvement is now * * * clear * * *." [33]

This is the power of the purse. It broadens considerably the power of the United States to take action, to spend money for the construction of projects—and to withhold funds and limit its bounty if a State should be recalcitrant.[34] In addition, the spending power can provide a new ground for control of local activities. In the *Ivanhoe Irr. Dist.* v. *McCracken* case, on the 160-acre limitation,[35] the Court said, "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." By tying enough strings to its money, by imposing conditions upon those who receive the benefits, the Government may impose upon them rules and regulations over and above those required by State law.

STATE POWERS

The powers of the States in the field of water resources stem not from express delegations in State constitutions, but from the general residuum of sovereignty and imperium left to the States after the grant of specific powers to the United States. These include the power to create property rights and the police power to regulate property rights and the conduct of citizens in the public interest. State water laws have been traditionally directed to allocating water rights to individuals as property, in order to further the economic gain of the individuals. In the West, this has primarily taken the form of the law of prior appropriation.

The invention of prior appropriation was a master stroke in which the Western States justifiably take pride. The aridity of the climate and the scarcity of water were limiting factors on development from the start. There was not water enough to satisfy all demands that could be made upon it. Yet no planners prepared blueprints for its best use. Instead, the water was given to any and all who would put it to beneficial use. The miner used it to obtain the mineral wealth of the mountains and streams; the farmers turned the desert into rich croplands free from drought; the rancher took the water for his stock and to irrigate hay for winter feed; cities brought in supplies that enabled them to grow; railroads, power companies, manufacturers and other industries received the water they needed to operate. The western pioneers recognized that development by an individual in his private interest could also be development in the public interest. Water was used to produce wealth. The increase in the wealth of the citizens, from these property interests carved out of the public domain, increased the wealth of, and developed the resources of, the Western States and the Nation.

Giving the best water rights to senior appropriators encouraged junior appropriators to build dams to store spring floods, to build larger dams that would store the supply of good years against future droughts, or to bring water from long distances across or through mountain ranges from other basins where the supply exceeded the local demands. When it became obvious that completely unregulated appropriation might not always be in the public interest, the States invented administrative controls to prevent would-be appropriators from injuring the vested rights of others or doing acts that would be detrimental to the public interest. Agencies and officers administered the water laws and distributed the water to those entitled to it.

---

[15] *United States* v. *Chandler-Dunbar Co.*, 229 U.S. 53 (1913).

[16] "[W]e need not ponder whether by virtue of a highly fictional navigation purpose, the government could destroy the flow of a navigable stream and carry away its waters for sale to private interests without compensation to those deprived of them. We have never held that or anything like it. * * *" *United States* v. *Gerlach Livestock Co.*, 339 U.S. 725, 737 (1950). Mr. Justice Douglas, concurring, thought the constitutional power to do so was clear. Id. at 756–62.

[17] Morreale, "Federal Power in Western Waters; The Navigation Power and the Rule of No Compensation," 3 Natural Resources J. 1 (1963).

[18] *Oklahoma* v. *Atkinson*, supra note 10.

[19] 373 U.S. 546 (1963).

[20] U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8; art. II, sec. 2.

[21] *Nevada* v. *United States*, 165 F. Supp. 600 (D. Nev. 1958).

[22] 59 Stat. 1219 (1944); Colo. Riv. Compact art. III(c) (1922).

[23] Consent to the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers Compact (1937) failed of passage; the President's veto message in H. R. Doc. 690, 77th Cong. 2d sess. (1942).

[24] U.S. Const. art. IV, sec. 3.

[25] *F.P.C.* v. *Oregon*, 349 U.S. 435 (1955).

[26] *Arizona* v. *California*, supra note 19.

[27] Ibid.

[28] *Winters* v. *United States*, 207 U.S. 564 (1908).

[29] *United States* v. *Rio Grande*, supra note 11, at 703.

[30] *Ashwander* v. *T.V.A.*, 297 U.S. 288 (1936).

[31] *Kirk* v. *State Board of Irr.*, 90 Neb. 627, 134 N.W. 167 (1912).

[32] U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8.

[33] *United States* v. *Gerlach Livestock Co.*, supra note 16, at 738.

[34] Cf. title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. secs. 200d–d–3 (1964).

[35] *Ivanhoe Irr. Dist.* v. *McCracken*, supra note 6.

These property rights do not freeze development. If needs change, the water right can be changed to the new need. As the economy matures, as cities and industries need water from already fully appropriated sources, western water law provides for the reallocation of water rights by economic forces. No administrator reallocates the water to the higher use. The city or the industrialist simply offers to buy the water, tendering enough money to make it attractive to the farmer to cease irrigating. The process is the same as if the farmer's land were needed for an airport or a factory site. The city has the additional power to condemn the water right to insure its transfer at a fair price. This is the system of firm property rights in water upon which westerners have built their irrigated agriculture and their modern cities and industries.

States also have powers to take action. Absent a self-imposed restriction against a State engaging in works of internal improvement or borrowing money or lending its credit, States have power to use their own tax money and bonding capacity for water resources development. California's State Water Plan is the outstanding example in this area. And all States may create agencies to construct water control works up to river basin size, such as the Texas river authorities. Most commonly, these are some variant of the irrigation district or conservancy district and bring into the picture a third level, of local government. Today's great cities, and districts created as quasi-municipal corporations, armed with some delegated powers of government, may borrow money, construct projects, and tax, assess, or charge tolls to pay off the bonds. If one State may not act alone on an interstate stream, it may join with others in a fourth level of government, and by interstate compact jointly construct works without Federal aid, as Texas and Louisiana are doing in the Toledo Bend project on the Sabine River.

All of these State powers, laws, private property rights and future plans based upon them, must, as we have seen, give way when the United States chooses to enforce a national policy that does not coincide with the State policy. This does not mean that the United States has taken over the State water law, that water law is now Federal law, or that State agencies have been put out of business. On the contrary, the day-to-day administration of existing rights and current appropriations goes on much as usual, litigants in State courts continue to call on State statutes or decisions in arguing their cases, and State officials and agencies busily plan future developments. The fact is that while the National Government may be omnipotent, it is not omnipresent. Since the Federal jurisdiction is a conditional one, it may be ignored when the Federal interest is not present or is not being exercised. The Supreme Court of the United States has recognized the vital interest of the States in the control of water resources, and has specifically conceded the powers of the States to exercise control over navigable waters for the interests of their citizens. The States were said to have "traditional jurisdiction," not subject to challenge until Congress in some way asserts its superior power.[36]

The State is part of the Nation, and its representatives in Congress help to shape national policy. Many local and national interests coincide. The States often seek the aid of the Federal Government in the form of projects promising local as well as national benefits.

In many national laws Congress has chosen to waive Federal powers and has written into the legislation provisions for the recognition and even use by the Federal Government of State water laws. In several instances Congress has chosen to use less than all of its powers, and has elected to recognize State-created rights even though it was under no constitutional obligation to do so. The Central Valley project could have been undertaken as an exercise of the commerce power, and water rights for the project could have been taken under the navigation servitude, without compensation. Instead, Congress made reclamation law applicable, which requires condemnation of and payment for any water rights taken in aid of a reclamation project.[37] In the Federal Power Act, Congress did not delegate to its licensees the Government's powers to destroy the riparian rights of others, and provided that if the Government grants a license under the Power Act and then recaptures the plant, it will pay an amount that includes the investment of the licensee in State water rights.[38] Indeed, Congress has gone further and reversed the servitude in relation to certain western streams. The O'Mahoney-Milliken amendment to the Flood Control Act of 1944 [39] provides that in the operation of the Pick-Sloan projects the use of water for navigation will be subordinate to present and future beneficial consumptive uses—in other words, irrigation ditches will never be closed to supply water to float barges.

In practically every piece of legislation establishing Federal water agencies and authorizing them to prosecute projects, there are procedures for consultation with State and local authorities and for reconciling conflicts with State and local interests. In every major water development field, Congress has established mechanisms for obtaining a local voice in planning.[40]

CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS

If the law of national supremacy is so clear, if these lines of communication exist, what is all the shooting about? Why have the States so loudly proclaimed their ownership of water while at the same time so long petitioned Congress for an act to subordinate national water activity to State law? Some writers have ascribed cynical and less pure motives to the present proponents of States rights. It is suggested that some of the States are back doing business at the old stand, that some seek to gain an advantage over others by shackling the Federal Government's present and future plans for regional development.[41] It is hinted that some interests hope to overthrow the *Ivanhoe* ruling on the 160-acre limitation.[42] No purer motives are ascribed to their Federal opponents, who are accused of being power-hungry bureaucrats,[43] seeking to freeze out State and private enterprise and create a Federal monopoly in water resources development.[44] Yet both levels of government have honorable and valid motives.

The national interests are those inherent in the word "nation." The United States is a single nation, not a congeries of States. As a unified nation, it has an interest in all parts of its territory. It must take a broad view, and consider each part in relation to the whole. It must manage its resources for the benefit of all of its people, not only for the benefit of those who live in the locality of the resources. The funds it spends in one area are gathered from all of its citizens, and it therefore has some responsibility for seeing that benefits go to all the people. In providing for the general welfare, it may make local improvements, but it does so only when the collective good is thereby increased. It must develop itself as a nation, and in so doing it may often perform acts in one State in order to receive benefits in another. It must manage its property not for local benefit but for the national benefit. It sometimes must use its overriding powers to settle rivalries and conflicts between States. It must apply national policies nation-wide, though it may do so with variants suitable to different locales.

Although the States take a more parochial view, they have many legitimate interests in water development within their borders, regardless of who does the developing. They represent their citizens who live in the area, whose lives and whose children's lives are affected, who own much of the property involved, who may be called upon to pay for much of the development. One of the most important State interests is the preservation of the property rights of its citizens. The difference between irrigated crop land and desert pasture represents most of the value of Western farms. Firm water rights are required to encourage investment in industrial development, and to permit the growth of cities. The States have undertaken the orderly administration of water rights, and they need to know what those rights are.

Over and above the preservation of the status quo, the States have an interest in the future development of their territory. They believe that the choice between growth and stagnation should not be made elsewhere, that they should have a voice in whether their resources are developed or set on the shelf. Federal water resources programs in the Western States affect those States' people, their prosperity, their institutions. The States have a knowledge of local needs and problems, they have plans to solve them. They desire their plans for water to be integrated and coordinated with other State resources and interests. They therefore wish a voice in the plans of the United States.

The States interests in the future development of the waters stem in part from the promise of the National Government that they will share in the benefits of the waters within their borders. The enforceability of this promise is a matter of doubt, but the U.S. Supreme Court has said that few public interests are more obvious and indisputable than the interest of a State to maintain its rivers, which were described as great foundations of public welfare.[45] Each is said to have an interest above that of its individual citizens and above its individual property rights, and each State was said to be entitled to an equitable apportionment of the benefits resulting from the flow of the rivers.[46] Some States have had specific portions of the waters of interstate rivers allotted to them by the Supreme Court, or by Congress, or by compact approved by Congress. Even though a river is not yet apportioned, the States have very real though unidentified claims in it. This is a national policy, giving to each State the power and the hope of some degree of self-determination and self-development, by allocating to each a share in its rivers, to be held as a local asset, held in reserve perhaps, but offering the promise of future wealth.

When all of these interests are sifted, two core issues emerge. First, should the United

---

[36] *First Iowa Hydro-Electric Corp.* v. *F.P.C.*, 328 U.S. 152 (1946).

[37] *United States* v. *Gerlach*, supra note 16.

[38] *Niagara-Mohawk Power Co.* v. *F.P.C.*, 347 U.S. 239 (1954).

[39] 33 U.S.C. 701–1 (1964).

[40] These are detailed in Trelease, "Federal Limitations on State Water Law," 10 Buffalo L. Rev. 399 (1961).

[41] Goldberg, supra note 4, at 4.

[42] Clark, statement, 1964 Senate hearings, supra note 2.

[43] Martz, "Water for Mushrooming Populations," 62 W. Va. L. Rev. 1 (1959).

[44] Note "Federal Water Rights Legislation and the Reserved Lands Controversy," supra note 5.

[45] *Hudson County Water Co.* v. *McCarter*, 209 U.S. 349 (1908).

[46] *Kansas* v. *Colorado*, supra note 7.

States, for its own purposes, take water from present users without compensation? Second, should the United States initiate projects for unappropriated water without reference to the wishes of the States in which the project is located?

On the first issue, the navigation servitude, the reservation of water for use on reserved lands and the other Federal possibilities of uncompensated destruction of State water rights, all strike at the very heart of State water law. They make the State-created property right insecure. This not only creates fear in the hearts of present appropriators, but it has a tendency to discourage investment in water-based activities and to hinder the growth of the States by restricting the activity of the private sector. Another effect is to throw a monkey wrench into State planning activities and to disturb the State machinery for the orderly administration of water rights and for water distribution. On the second issue, the ability of the United States to proceed with projects without reference to State law leads to fears that, in the Federal planning, local benefits will be sacrificed and local costs will be discounted.

The position of the United States on the first issue is that negation of the reserved waters doctrine would defeat the purposes for which the reservation of land were made, and that when the water was needed for the national purpose, the Government would be forced to buy back the very water it gave away, possibly at a prohibitive cost.[47] On the second issue the United States has very valid reasons for not wishing "to bend its knee" to State officials, to have national projects subjected to a State veto, or limited to purposes recognized by a State. National policies might not be uniformly applied throughout the Nation. For example, the storage of water for future release to ease the pollution burden of streams in periods of low flow is now a national policy,[48] and while this is clearly a beneficial use in Oregon,[49] it is argued that it is not beneficial in Colorado.[50] Is wildlife management for recreation a beneficial use in Utah as it seems to be in Texas?[51] A fragmented national policy does not appeal to national officials.

SOLUTIONS

If the only solution to this clash of interests is a legal decision on States rights, the Western States are lost. The law is on the Nation's side. Whatever is meant by the proud phrase: "The waters of all natural streams * * * are hereby declared to be the property on the State,"[52] in giving power to the States to regulate its citizens, it does not mean that it gives power to regulate the National Government. The U.S. Constitution and laws are the supreme law of the land.

The time has come for the Western States to learn to live with the National Government. If national powers are capable of overriding State powers, if national interests are superior to State interests, the States must seek protection of their interests by some means other than asserting a rule of law that does not exist, or attempting to create that rule of law by Congress. The Western States must recognize the Federal authority, but they must use it, they must mold Federal policy. They must convince the National Government of the intrinsic worth of State interests as national interests, and as worthy of consideration and fair treatment by the National Government. Actually a great deal of this has been done in the past. National policies for Western development gave us reclamation and multipurpose projects that were in the public interest of both the Nation and the States.

On the issue of the States interests in water projects, the answer lies not in subordinating the National Government to State water law. It simply will not happen. It is not the law today, for Congress did not pass the Barrett bill, and it would not pass the original Kuchel bill[53] with such a clause in it. The U.S. Government could not live with it. But a State could live with a Federal water right for dilution of pollution, or for recreation, or one that gave a farmer less water than the State would, or water for less land, or even one that could not be used for growing certain crops.

What is really needed is not State control over Federal water rights but a stronger State voice in the planning and operation of Federal projects. Last year a thoughtful State official said:

"The real answer to Federal encroachment is the assumption of greater responsibilities by the States, not the head-on collision of forces. In such a collision the States are bound to come out second best. It is possible for a State and the United States to develop a reasonable modus vivendi. * * * Problems of regional development cannot be solved by the simple application of * * * concepts of water rights."[54]

He echoed a thought expressed in 1957 by one of this conference's planners, who suggested that if the States wish a stronger voice in the national water development area, they will get it in proportion to the amount they increase their financial contributions, and as fast as they devise responsible State agencies capable of policy formulation and project management, free from undue pressures from local special interests.[55] Perhaps the voices of the States may be strengthened if they are raised in chorus in the newly proposed Western States Water Council.

In addition to a strong voice, the States and the United States need better lines of communication. Perhaps a fourth level of government is needed, a Federal-State compact commission like that of the Delaware River Compact,[56] or the once-proposed Missouri Basin Compact.[57] Perhaps the new river basin commissions created by the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 will fill the need. Perhaps improved communications could clear up the remaining issue—that of compensation for impairment of security of State-granted water rights.

On this issue of a State desire for secure water rights versus Federal reluctance to buy back what it has given away, the solution seems a simple one, yet one that is somehow just beyond our grasp. All that is needed is for Federal officials on the policymaking level to understand an economic principle that is intuitively known by the Western water user and that has been officially adopted—on paper—as the policy of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and approved by the President. That is, that in developing water resources the goal is "to provide the maximum net benefits," and that in counting costs against those benefits the Government should include "losses * * * and induced adverse effects * * * whether or not compensation is involved." This quotation is worth more than a footnote citation; it is from "Policies, Standards, and Procedures in the Formulation, Evaluation, and Review of Plans for the Use and Development of Water and Land Resources," prepared under the direction of the President's Water Resources Council in 1962.[58] What does it mean? It means that if the Government initiates a water use for a military purpose on reserved land, and thereby deprives a farmer of water used for irrigation, the loss of the irrigation is a cost of the new military use. It is a cost whether or not the Government pays the farmer.

If, in addition to reserved land, the Defense Department needs the farmer's land, it will pay him for it. But the land, too, was "given away"—it was homesteaded by the farmer's grandfather. For years the land and the water have increased the gross national product and the national welfare. This productive quality has given each a value. Now, if either land or water must be used for military purposes, that gross product and that welfare will be decreased, and that value will be destroyed. The only issue is who should bear the loss and pay the cost. Should it be paid from the National Treasury and borne by all those in the Nation who get the benefit of the military post, or should the farmer be required to lay his costly sacrifice on the altar of the public good?

If the reservation of water, or the navigation servitude, acts as a "sword of Damocles" that may fall at any moment,[59] or as a "floating mortgage in the sky" that may be foreclosed at any time for any amount,[60] and this discourages development, this too is a cost of the ultimate national use of the water. Costs of "induced adverse effects" and "foregone benefits" include "opportunity costs," the loss of values that could be produced and added to national wealth, but that are foregone because the insecurity of the water right has frightened away the potential water user.

But suppose, as has been argued, that the compensation paid to the water user, the "buy-back" price, were "prohibitive," so great that the Government project for the water was economically infeasible. Then, the Government's water policy statement tells us, the Government does not want this project. It would be a step in the wrong direction, a step away from maximum use. The costs of the Government use (including the loss to the farmer) would exceed the benefits gained. An illustration from the private sector might demonstrate this more clearly. Suppose we have a water source divided between an irrigator and a manufacturer, each of whom could increase his use. Because the manufactured goods are worth more than the crops, the manufacturer can buy water from the farmer, paying him more than the crops are worth. But if we had a policy of preferring agriculture, so that the farmer could take the water without paying for it, the added crops would be worth less than the lost goods. Welfare would be decreased, the country would be less rich.

So at the very least the States must continue to fight for the compensability of water rights on the floor of Congress as the basic principle of the most recent Kuchel bill,[61] in presenting the views of the States on each future Federal project, and in the planning sessions of interagency and river basin commissions. The compensation principle is needed not because it sets States' rights above the national powers, or private interests above national interests, but because it is in the national interest and is in accord with the very policy officially adopted by the agencies of the United States and approved by the President of the United States.

---

[47] Statement of Ramsey Clark, 1961 Senate Hearings, supra note 2, at 35; Statement of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, 1964 Senate Hearings, supra note 2, at 39.

[48] 33 U.S.C. 466a (b)(1) (1964).

[49] Oreg. Rev. Stat. § 537.170 (1963).

[50] See Note, "Water Pollution Control in Colorado," 36 U. Colo. L. Rev. 413 (1964).

[51] Compare *Lake Shore Duck Club* v. *Lake View Duck Club*, 50 Utah 76, 166 Pac. 309 (1917), with *Diversion Lake Club* v. *Heath*, 126 Tex. 129, 86 S.W.2d 441 (1935).

[52] Wyo. Const. art. 8, § 1 (1889). Similar provisions in other State constitutions and laws are detailed in Trelease, "Government Ownership and Trusteeship of Water," 45 Calif. L. Rev. 638, 641 (1957).

[53] S. 1275, 88th Cong., 1st sess. (1963).

[54] Goldberg, supra note 4, at 37.

[55] Englebert, "Federalism and Water Resources Development," 22 Law & Contemp. Prob. 325 (1957).

[56] 75 Stat. 688 (1961).

[57] Trelease, "A Federal-State Compact for Missouri Basin Development," 7 Wyo. L. J. 161 (1953).

[58] S. Doc. No. 97, 87th Cong., 2d sess. (1962).

[59] Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, 1956 Senate hearings, supra note 2.

[60] Northcutt Ely, 1964 Senate hearings, supra note 2.

[61] S. 1636, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965).

PURCHASE OF SURPLUS OR USED EQUIPMENT—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Montgomery County, N.Y., in connection with the purchase of surplus or used equipment.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION IN CONNECTION WITH PURCHASE OF SURPLUS OR USED EQUIPMENT

RESOLUTION BY SUPERVISOR LUFT

Whereas counties and towns frequently have need for certain types of machinery and equipment the use of which will be for a limited time and surplus machinery and equipment of used machinery and equipment would be adequate and the ability of a county or town to purchase at reduced prices would result in considerable savings to taxpayers; and

Whereas the State finance law permits the office of general services to sell surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment and it has been the experience that much of such machinery and equipment is sold to dealers who then offer the same items for sale to counties and towns at a large increase in price; and

Whereas the Federal Government from time to time disposes of surplus machinery and equipment and about the only way a municipality is permitted to make purchase of particular items is through the local office of civil defense; and

Whereas it is the concensus of opinion of this board that such surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment should be made available to counties, town, cities and villages at a fair price before being sold to dealers: Now, therefore, be it, and it hereby is

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Montgomery hereby urges the legislature to amend the State finance law, and the general municipal law and other applicable statutes to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment for sale to prepare an inventory of the major items, such as trucks, power shovels, bulldozers, cranes, and other highway equipment and the price established for each item, and that copies of such inventories be furnished to each county, town, city, and village and that such municipalities be given a limited time in which to purchase such items at the price indicated on the inventory and that any items not sold to municipalities then be sold at public sale, and it is further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to enact legislation which will permit municipalities to purchase surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment at appraised value before the same are sold to the public, and it is further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board of supervisors be and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this resolution to Senator Dalwin J. Niles, Assemblyman Donald A. Campbell, Congressman SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, and Senator JACOB JAVITS.

Seconded by supervisor Bunick and duly adopted upon roll call, all members present (18) voting aye.

Dated: Fonda, N.Y., January 11, 1966.

JOSEPH DYLONG,
Clerk, Board of Supervisors.
GENE L. CATENA,
County Attorney.

State of New York, County of Montgomery, ss.

This is to certify that I, the undersigned, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Montgomery, have compared the foregoing copy of resolution with the original resolution now on file in the office, and which was passed by the board of supervisors of said county on the 11th day of January, 1966, a majority of all the members elected to the board voting in favor thereof, and that the same is a correct and true transcript of such original resolution and of the whole thereof.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and the official seal of the board of supervisors this 11th day of January, 1966.

JOSEPH DYLONG,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of Dutchess County, N.Y., dealing with the purchase of surplus or used equipment.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 24, 1966

Re: Purchase of surplus or used equipment.

Mr. Ringwood offers the following and moves its adoption:

Whereas counties and towns frequently have need for certain types of machinery and equipment the use of which will be for a limited time and surplus machinery and equipment or used machinery and equipment would be adequate and the ability of a county or town to purchase at reduced prices would result in considerable savings to taxpayers; and

Whereas the State finance law permits the office of general services to sell surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment and it has been the experience that much of such machinery and equipment is sold to dealers who then offer the same items for sale to counties and towns at a large increase in price; and

Whereas the Federal Government from time to time disposes of surplus machinery and equipment and about the only way a municipality is permitted to make purchase of particular items is through the local office of civil defense; and

Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of this board that such surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment should be made available to counties, towns, cities, and villages at a fair price before being sold to dealers: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors of the county of Dutchess hereby urges the legislature to amend the State finance law, the general municipal law and other applicable statutes to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment for sale to prepare an inventory of the major items, such as trucks, power shovels, bulldozers, cranes, and other highway equipment and the price established for each item, and that copies of such inventories be furnished to each county, town, city and village and that such municipalities be given a limited time in which to purchase such items at the price indicated on the inventory and that any items not sold to municipalities then be sold at public sale; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to enact legislation which will permit municipalities to purchase surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment at appraised value before the same are sold to the public; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board of supervisors be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Supervisors' Association, Association of Towns, the County Officers Association, County Superintendent of Highways Association, Town Highway Superintendents Association, Senator Pomery, Assemblymen Stevens and Waryas, Congressman RESNICK, Senator JAVITS, Senator KENNEDY and all other county boards of supervisors of the State of New York.

Resolution adopted.

I, Elting G. Burger, chief of the board of supervisors of the county of Dutchess, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy and the whole thereof of a resolution duly adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Dutchess on the 17th of January 1966.

ELTING G. BURGER,
Clerk, Board of Supervisors.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that similiar resolutions adopted by the board of supervisors of Hamilton County of New York and by the Board of Supervisors of Tompkins County of New York, be likewise printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. —

(By Mr. Burgess)

Whereas counties and towns frequently have need for certain types of machinery and equipment the use of which will be for a limited time and surplus machinery and equipment or used machinery and equipment would be adequate and the ability of a county or town to purchase at reduced prices would result in considerable savings to taxpayers; and

Whereas the State finance law permits the office of general services to sell surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment, and it has been the experience that much of such machinery and equipment is sold to dealers who then offer the same items for sale to counties and towns at a large increase in price; and

Whereas the Federal Government from time to time disposes of surplus machinery and equipment, and about the only way a municipality is permitted to make purchase of particular items is through the local office of civil defense; and

Whereas it is the concensus of opinion of this board that such surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment should be made available to counties, towns, cities, and villages at a fair price before being sold to dealers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Hamilton hereby urges the legislature to amend the State finance law, the general municipal law, and other applicable statutes to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment for sale to prepare an inventory of the major items, such as trucks, power shovels, bulldozers, cranes, and other highway equipment, and the price established for each item, and that copies of such inventories be furnished to each county, town, city, and village and that such municipalities be given a limited time in which to purchase such items at the price indicated on the inventory and that any items not sold to municipalities then be sold at public sale; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to enact legislation which will permit municipalities to purchase surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment at appraised value before the same are sold to the public; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board of supervisors be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Supervisors' Association, Association of Towns, the County Officers Association, County Superintendent of Highways Association, Town Highway Superintendents Association, Senator Stafford, Assemblyman Mitchell, Congressman KING, Senator JAVITS, Senator KENNEDY, and Warren County Board of Supervisors.

Seconded by Mr. Di Mezza and adopted by the following vote:

Ayes: Baker, DiMezza, Wadsworth, Burgess, Bird, Wickes, Partello, and Orr. Nays: None.

STATE OF NEW YORK, *County of Hamilton, Supervisors' Chambers, ss:*

I, Walter J. Snide, clerk of the board of supervisors of Hamilton County, do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing copy of resolutions with the original duly adopted by the above mentioned board at a session held on the 27th day of December, 1965, and that the same is a true copy of said original and of the whole thereof.

In witness whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the official seal of said board, this 29th day of December, 1965.

WALTER J. SNIDE,
Clerk.

RESOLUTION NO. 31—REQUEST FOR LEGISLATION—FEDERAL AND STATE

(By the Board of Supervisors, Tompkins County, Ithaca, N.Y.)

Whereas counties, towns, villages and cities of the State frequently have a need for certain types of machinery and equipment, the use of which is for a limited time only; and

Whereas surplus machinery or equipment or used machinery or equipment would be adequate for the job and the ability of a county, city, or town to purchase said machinery or equipment at reduced prices would result in considerable savings to taxpayers; and

Whereas the State finance law permits the office of general services to sell surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment; and

Whereas it has been the experience that much of such machinery and equipment is sold to dealers who then offer the same items for sale to municipalities at a large increase in price; and

Whereas the Federal Government from time to time disposes of surplus machinery and equipment to dealers who in turn offer it to municipalities at an increase in price; and

Whereas it is the consensus of this board that such surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment should be made available to counties, towns, cities and villages at a fair price before being sold to dealers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board of supervisors urges the legislature to amend the State finance law, the general municipal law and other applicable statutes to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete or used equipment for sale to prepare a list of said items and the price of each item and that a copy of said inventory be available in a central office in Albany so that a local municipality could be given a limited time in which to inspect said list in order to ascertain if there was any such machinery desired by it at the price indicated on the inventory and that after a specified time, items not sold then be sold at public sale or to a dealer, and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to enact similar legislation, i.e., making available at a central office a list of surplus, obsolete, or used equipment which can be purchased for a limited time by a municipality before same are sold to the public; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board is hereby authorized to transmit copies of this resolution to the Supervisors' Association, Association of Towns, the County Officers' Association, State Department of Public Works, County Superintendent of Highways Association, Town Highway Superintendents Association, Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor; Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS, Senator; ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Senator; Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON, Congressman; Hon. Theodore Day, senator; and Constance Cook, assemblywoman.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of Tompkins, ss:

I, Elsie D. Boyd, clerk of the board of supervisors of the county of Tompkins in the State of New York, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution is a true and exact copy of a resolution duly adopted by the board of supervisors of said county of Tompkins at a (regular) meeting of said board held in accordance with the rules of said board on the 10th day of January 1966, and the same is a complete copy of the whole of such resolution.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the board of supervisors of Tompkins County, N.Y., to be hereunto affixed this 14th day of January 1966.

ELSIE D. BOYD,
Çlerk, Board of Supervisors, Tompkins County, N.Y.

THE JOB CORPS IN THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the hue and cry that we occasionally hear with respect to a few isolated incidents of antisocial behavior on the part of Job Corps men often obscures and ignores the vast amount of good being accomplished through the Job Corps in the war against poverty.

Thousands of previously hopeless young lives are being transformed. New talent is being developed, and vitally important learning is being imparted. Hope is taking the place of despair, and responsible, productive young citizens are graduating into our complex society. The Job Corps program is performing an immensely difficult, but clearly necessary task and is making a real contribution to the future of our Nation.

In this light, Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article appearing in the January 2 edition of the Chicago Sun-Times, which describes the impact of the Job Corps upon the lives of five young men from Chicago. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AREA YOUTHS FIND A FUTURE IN JOB CORPS

(NOTE—Five Chicago youths who joined the Job Corps, an often criticized Federal program, returned home for a holiday visit. They told of their experiences and observations in a talk with a reporter and John Croy, chief counselor of the Youth Opportunity Center at 3140 West Roosevelt.)

(By D. J. R. Bruckner)

The Job Corps is possibility and promise.

It is a strange place with new friends from all over the country—friends who don't talk about brushes with the police and gang rumbles in the past, but only about today and tomorrow.

It is a ride on an airplane and a blue bus.

It is a quiet place to study, at your own speed, the things that really interest you.

It is a sense of making your own decisions about your own life.

It is a camp without girls and dances.

It is the wildwood where at night the coyote cries and bears walk in the mountains.

BEST OPPORTUNITY THEY EVER HAD

To four out of five young men home on Christmas vacation from Job Corps camps, it is the best educational opportunity they have had; to the fifth, at least, it was "not bad."

The five are William Hawkins, 17 ("I'll be 18 on New Year's"); Charles Brown, 16; Oliver Senior, 17; Ronald Jones, 17, and Lawrence Holmes, 18.

All are high school dropouts and all think they have a better future. All had lived in the Lawndale community before they entered the Job Corps.

Hawkins, who dropped out of high school in his freshman year, worked for a time as a busboy in a north side restaurant. But he wanted to travel and "saw the chance for a new experience," so he joined the Job Corps early last summer.

For 6 months he has been in a conservation camp at Wolf Creek, Oreg., near the town of Roseburg, where 200 youths "from everywhere, like Virginia and Hawaii," are learning basic mental skills and conservation training.

RAISES READING LEVEL

When he dropped out of school, Bill Hawkins had a fifth grade reading ability; 6 months at Wolf Creek has brought him up to the eighth grade level.

When he reaches a ninth grade reading level, he can "start being an auto mechanic which is what I want."

How could he almost double his reading capacity in 6 months when he could not do it in 9 years in the schools?

"Well, around here in town I had my mind on too many things. You know, I'd try to study and there would be a man standing on the corner, and so * * *. And I knew a lot of guys who didn't work. We had trouble getting books sometimes in school.

"Out at Wolf Creek we go to school 1 day and the next day we work outside. I already learned how to use a rod and scope for surveying, and we lay pipes for drainage and use heavy machinery for digging and clearing.

"In the academic work, we've got enough books and there is a quiet study room that's open all the time. Mostly we study English and reading and math. It just seems easier now."

LITTLE LONESOME AT FIRST

Ronnie Jones, another freshman dropout, was a little lonesome when he first went to the conservation camp at Mountain Home, Idaho, 2½ months ago.

"How could I help missing home?" he asked. "Out there they have coyotes that howl at night and you listen to them. There are bears up in the mountains, but they don't come down to where we are. But they've got everything up there."

Everything?

"No. There aren't any girls out there." That, in fact, was his biggest objection to the place, a national park reservation 40 miles from Boise. "I haven't any particular likes for it," he said, "but it's all right."

Mountain Home is basically a trailer camp and Ronnie and 100 other boys put siding on the trailers, bulldoze trees, clear spots, level land, lay drainage ditches and prepare the area for larger and more permanent Job Corps facilities.

They also study English and mathematics and use the recreational facilities of a nearby Army base for swimming and sports.

But Mountain Home is new and Ronnie wants to transfer to an urban camp where he can learn what he calls a "straight trade. I want to be a carpenter."

His very mild enthusiasm waned a little more as the three boys from urban camps told of being given blue blazers with red and white escutcheons on the left breast pockets and of receiving travel fare home for Christmas, things Ronnie had missed. (The fare is given after 6 months; Ronnie's problem here was time, not agriculture.)

Of the three in urban camps—larger institutions which concentrate on trades and skills associated with cities—Brown and Senior are together at Camp Gary near San Marcos, Tex., and Holmes is at Camp Custer, Mich., near Kalamazoo.

Camp Gary, with 2,000 boys in training, is one of the Nation's largest and enjoys amenities unknown to the conservation camps—niceties like Olympic regulation swimming pools, theaters, gymnasiums, and a jail.

CAN GET THROWN IN JAIL

"You can get thrown in jail if you get caught stealing," Brown explained. "Oh, it's not a little hole like solitary in a real jail, but it's a place you're locked into alone and you can't go to class or anything. You can get 3 days. One guy did. He said he was glad to get out."

Classes at Camp Gary run longer and the work is more integrated toward a single trade than in the rural camps. Senior, who is studying plant maintenance, also takes English, mathematics, and science courses, in the mornings. The afternoons are given over to vocational classes, including the assembly and maintenance of machinery.

The course includes plumbing, design, carpentry, repairs, and related subjects, and the boys who have learned skills work in San Marcos building, a youth center.

Brown said the Camp Gary training had the advantage of meaning, which he did not find in high school in Chicago. "In our science course the teacher doesn't just tell you things, he tells you how it all works in the machines or in what you're doing."

RELAXATION THE ADVANTAGE

To Senior the advantage of Camp Gary is relaxation. He dropped out of high school in Chicago in his sophomore year, and "before that I had been thrown out once for messing up." At Camp Gary he feels he is doing well.

"In school up here I was always being pushed. They made you compete with everybody else. So I messed up and missed class and didn't like it. Down there, now I feel relaxed. I don't have to worry about people to hound me. We've got a place to study and we go at our own speed. When we think we have learned something, we tell the teacher and he tests us. The whole camp is that way. They treat you nice and help you stay out of trouble."

Senior wants to be a pipefitter or a plumber and he intends to stay at Gary until he is ready to become one.

Both Brown and Senior have gained 10 pounds in their 6 months at the camp; they said the food was good but a little underspiced. At Camp Custer, Holmes kept his 170 pounds, "but I used to be fat and now * * *." Now he looks like a lithe athlete. Hawkins got taller in Oregon, and Ronnie Jones did not take to the food in Idaho any more than to the coyotes.

LOST INTEREST IN SCHOOL

Brown said he was in his third year of high school when he signed up for the Job Corps because he just lost interest in school.

"I was running around with a bunch of guys that cut class a lot," he explained, "and there was all this bit about keeping up with the class, so I lost interest. At home I would do some homework, but then I would start to help my little brothers with theirs and would forget my own, and there was television.

"At Camp Gary we study a lot and go at our own pace. When I first got there, I took basic auto, but I knew everything the man was teaching and I told him, so he got me into a higher course and I got interested."

And, at camp, are there not friends like those of the past who would rather skip class and goof off?

"Not many. The group I met at camp have learned their lesson. They know better now and they work."

Are there many who have been in trouble with police before they went to Gary?

WE DON'T TALK ABOUT TROUBLE

"I don't know. We don't talk about trouble. We talk about tomorrow. We talk about what we want to do."

Holmes, who dropped out of high school in his second year "because I was cutting too many classes messing around with girls," says Camp Custer is "all right. I think I've got a better future now."

He is studying the operation of heavy construction equipment and has learned, in 6 months, basics of bulldozers, front-end loaders, trucks, and a variety of repair and maintenance courses. After 3 more months of this, he intends to take the welding course to round out his training.

Camp, he says, gets better as it gets longer.

"At first we were on this plane going up there and I thought it would be all right, you know, with a plane and all.

"Then we landed and there was this little blue bus and I thought 'Man, this is it.' The bus made me think they were just going to take us off to this place and it would be all work.

IT'S ALL RIGHT

"But then we got there and we had nice barracks and good food and lots of recreation. It's all right."

Did any of the boys feel something was needed they weren't getting?

A chorus of "girls."

"Down at Gary," said Senior, "they won't even let you whistle at the nurses."

"But we got one guy that gets sick every day so he can go to the infirmary," said Brown. "He's been doing it about 6 weeks now, and they have some nice nurses."

They all suggested dances on the bases.

Otherwise, they seemed slightly enchanted with the Corps. Discipline, they said, is a minor problem most of the time. A few fist fights, maybe, but no big rumbles, and security is pretty tight. Thus, when Holmes tried to walk out of Custer to go into town without a pass, he was seized and brought back "pretty quick, you know—by the camp fire department."

In most camps the boys can go into town twice a week. Most are invited out frequently by families in neighboring towns who take them to church and to dinner and introduce them to friends in town.

"You meet some awfully nice people," said Hawkins.

Being home for the holiday was interesting, all said, for it seemed the city had changed a little and so had they.

And going back to camp would be all right, for the future had changed quite a lot.

ONE OF THE MOST WANTED MEN IN HARTFORD

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Newsweek magazine, in the January 31, 1966, issue, carried an advertisement by the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, about Mr. Sam Leveston, of Hartford. Sam is an outstanding man of character and ability who works for one of our Nation's leading insurance companies, the Connecticut General. Everything said about Sam Leveston in this advertisement is true. All of his friends are proud that his company saw fit to so recognize and honor him. I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement be inserted in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE OF THE MOST WANTED MEN IN HARTFORD

Sam Leveston's reputation and prestige among business and professional men did not come about by accident. It is the result of hard work and an impatience with mediocrity. Sam has long felt that he should excel in everything he does and do the best possible job. It's a trait which has paid off handsomely for his clients.

This emphasis on excellence has long been evident in Sam's actions. It dates back more than 27 years to the point where Sam decided that he wanted to devote his life to helping executives plan for their financial future. He chose a career with Connecticut General's office at 900 Cottage Grove Road, Hartford—a career which has been marked by countless significant achievements. One measure of his success is Sam's consistent record as one of CG's leading agents. Sam's willingness to help others can also be demonstrated by his status as a past chairman and a past president of Connecticut General's Field Executive Committee composed of the company's six most outstanding agents. And even more importantly, Sam is recognized as one of the leading businessmen in the area. It's not surprising that his clientele reads like a "Who's Who in Business."

Sam Leveston does things a little differently—it's his idea to serve first. It's impossible to appreciate the excellence of his work until you have experienced the benefits firsthand. It is a service you have never had performed by any other financial adviser. No wonder Sam Leveston is one of the most wanted men in Hartford.

CONNECTICUT GENERAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.
HARTFORD.

PRAISE FOR HUGH V. "PAT" RICHTER

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it is gratifying to note the growing consensus that a pleasing environment is an important ingredient in a life of quality for Americans.

In this light, I was interested to read in the Washington Evening Star that the Washington Redskins' Hugh V. "Pat" Richter, the pass-catching end and one of the best punters in the National Football League, is enthusiastic about the White House campaign for natural beauty and has chosen a second career in landscape architecture.

I think this University of Wisconsin graduate is to be commended for recognizing the limited duration of a football career and for preparing himself for a profession in which he can pursue goals he considers important to the future of this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Richter of Redskins Bares Gentler Side—100-Yard Manicure

Lady Bird Johnson may not know it but her beautification efforts have endeared her to Washington Redskins' end, Hugh V. "Pat" Richter.

With the 1965 football season now history as far as the Redskins are concerned, Richter has shed his football togs and is resuming his other career, in landscape architecture.

As the 6-foot 5-inch Richter explains his work, "landscape architecture is the art of arranging objects on the ground to form pleasing spaces."

This is the task that Richter will resume in the next few weeks with the Silver Spring firm of Thurman D. Donovan & Associates.

It is the career that the pass-catching end and fourth best punter in the National Football League has chosen as the one he wants to follow when he has to hang up his cleats. A former All-American, the University of Wisconsin graduate is well aware of the limited duration of a football career.

He chose to study landscape architecture when he entered the University of Wisconsin because he wanted to get into something creative, and enjoy the outdoors, Richter explained.

And he has found football valuable to his other vocation.

"Landscape architecture just isn't well known, and football has brought attention to me and from this people have been able to learn more about landscape architecture," he continued.

Richter is eager to boost the importance of the beautification campaign being put on by the White House.

"With Lady Bird and the President promoting beautification of our highways and Washington a lot of people are becoming more interested in this field and consequently the landscape architect is becoming more known and gaining the recognition he deserves," Richter explains.

The landscape architect, while primarily used by developers who are trying to create complexes more beautiful than those of their competitors, also can be used by the homeowner, Richter contends.

The layout of patios and backyards and the planting of flowers and shrubs are a few of the specialties of the landscape architect.

The victim of a fractured shoulder 2 weeks before the football season closed, Richter and his wife, Renee, and son, Scott, are now on a short vacation in Wisconsin, but will be back in their Silver Spring home and at work early in the new year.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS IN DESALINATION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate will recall that last year we enacted Public Law 89–118, expanding and accelerating the saline water conversion program, a program which the Interior Committee first initiated back in the 82d Congress when, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Senator Anderson, we enacted Public Law 448, 82d Congress.

The importance, and success, of this program, both in our own country and elsewhere, is attested by a news story published in the New York Times for Sunday, January 23, on a report submitted by the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, to the Economic and Social Council. The United Nations chieftain hails the gains made in desalting on an international basis as "progress toward eliminating many of the world's water shortage problems."

In view of the Interior Committee's leadership and continuing interest in development of desalination from its beginning as a large-scale Federal Government enterprise, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the New York Times story appear in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Desalting Gains Noted By Thant—World's Water Problems Are Reported Eased

(By Sam Pope Brewer)

United Nations, N.Y., January 22.—Secretary General Thant has reported growing progress toward eliminating many of the world's water shortage problems.

Studies are under way for nuclear-powered plants producing both desalinated water and electric power on a scale that could bring prosperity to many arid areas.

Mr. Thant reported to the Economic and Social Council this month that "the year 1965 witnessed a strong advance in applied desalination."

The report indicated that plants completed or begun in 1965 would almost double the total world capacity as of December 1964. Those already put into operation produce 5.25 million gallons a day. Others being built will add 34 million gallons. The total world capacity at the end of 1964 was about 45 million gallons a day according to U.S. sources.

Future hopes are centered on the huge nuclear plants that will produce electric power from steam, which will then condense into desalinated water.

FAR EAST IN PICTURE

The most striking advances in 1965, Mr. Thant's report said, were the establishment of the first desalination plant in the Far East (the Philippines), the rapid growth of desalination in southern Europe and the construction of the first large plant in the Soviet Union.

During the year the United States commissioned a dual-purpose plant in St. Thomas, the Virgin Islands, with a daily capacity of 1 million gallons of water and a power output of 7,500 kilowatts.

Several types of plant have been found practical. Greece had in operation four solar stills—operated by the sun's heat—on Mediterranean islands.

Israel was constructing a plant to work by electrodialysis, breaking up the salt in the water by an electrical reaction.

The system found most generally satisfactory, however, is flash distillation, with heat supplied by fuel oil, natural gas or nuclear reaction.

In this process, heated salt water is passed into a low-pressure chamber. Under the lowered pressure, it flashes into steam with almost the force of an explosion. The steam is used to produce power, then cools and condenses into desalted water.

Mr. Thant's report lists 12 plants put into operation last year in Africa, the Philippines, the Caribbean, Gibraltar, Spain and Italy.

Twelve more are listed as under construction and nine more as planned or under study.

The most impressive project is for a plant in southern California to operate on nuclear power with a capacity of 150 million gallons of water a day and 1,800 megawatts of electric power.

Mr. Thant's report said preliminary estimates indicated that water could be produced for less than 30 cents for each 1,000 gallons and low-cost electric power. The total capital cost was estimated at $300 million.

The Secretary General also cited the findings of a seminar of United Nations experts held here last fall. The findings included the statement that desalination techniques were already practical for areas where the need was sufficient to justify the relatively high cost.

The seminar recommended fuller exploration and development of all natural fresh water sources as well as continued efforts to lower the production cost of desalinated water.

No nuclear desalination plants are known to be actually under construction. Plans are being studied for one in Israel to produce 100 million gallons a day and one in the United Arab Republic to desalt 5.3 million gallons a day.

Both of them, like the California plant, are to be dual-purpose installations, producing power as well as water.

EDUCATION LOAN PLANS AVAILABLE TO STUDENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, CUNA International, Inc., the public spirited credit unions association, recently published in its magazine, Everybody's Money, an informative article on the availability of low-cost college loans.

I congratulate CUNA on its interest in this important question and I believe their article deserves widespread circulation.

It should help parents and students to avoid being victimized by unnecessarily high interest costs for college loans.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, and the table which accompanies it, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

There Are Low-Cost College Loans

Until free tuition college education is available in the United States and Canada, as it is in some European countries, parents and students must face up to paying college costs through savings, use of summer or school year job earnings, scholarships, and, as a last resort, borrowing.

It takes about $1,560 on the average to cover a year at a State university; about $2,500 at a good private college. Even at a tuition-free city college, a student needs food and shelter, books and equipment, clothing and spending money for such things as magazines, concerts, plays, sports events. Saving in advance for at least the first year of college is the most economical way to pay. If you have not built family savings to meet college costs, consider an education loan. A few years ago financial institutions included some that offered extremely high price plans. They are still in business but today there are numbers of low-cost loan plans offered by Government, credit unions, banks, savings and loan associations, and specialized nonprofit organizations.

You will have to shop around and become familiar with what's on the market—and give yourself time to find a loan you can afford before your freshman turns up at the college gates. Above all, plan to borrow as a last choice, not a first. When you borrow, keep the loan as small as possible. The repayment period should be as short as possible. Look for plans that let you prepay at any time without penalty. But if you can afford to repay a loan at from $60 to $100 a month on an education loan, probably you could save the same amounts in advance.

LADDER OF LOAN COSTS

Where do you go for a low- or moderate-cost college education loan? The major sources in the United States, in order of ascending costs, according to Consumer Adviser Sidney Margolius, are National Defense Act loans (NDEA), (in Canada, the Student Loans Act program), your college's own loan fund, State-guaranteed loan programs such as the New York State Higher Education Assistance Corp. (NYHEAC), United Student Aid Funds, Inc. (a private nonprofit program in which 6,000 banks and their branches participate), nonprofit organizations with special student loan funds, credit unions and banks (and savings and loan associations since 1964), Production Credit Associations (for farmers), mortgage or insurance loans if your equity is large enough (over $1,500); finally, the most expensive, finance-company education loans.

Some of the lowest cost plans available to students are shown in the table.

Future doctors, dentists, and optometrists should look into the health professions loan program of the U.S. Government; and future nurses should inquire about the nursing student loan program. Information about both comes from Student Loan Section, Division of Community Health Services, U.S. Public Health Service, Washington, D.C., 20201.

Fraternal and professional groups also make or guarantee education loans. For example, the American Medical Association assists medical students, interns, and residents in good standing by guaranteeing loans from cooperating banks. Religious organizations like the Board of Education of the Methodist Church make low-cost education loans to members of the church. Jewish students at colleges in the Cleveland area may obtain assistance from the educational league of that city.

CREDIT UNIONS' COLLEGE LOANS

More and more credit unions are making education loans, requiring only interest payments while the student is in school. Repayment periods range from 36 to 72 months, with some as long as 84. All permit prepayment without penalty, and most set up loans so that the borrower member also adds savings, dividends, and interest refunds to his share account. That's a welcome cash reserve when schooling ends. Credit unions with loan protection insurance also cover eligible educational loan borrowers at no extra charge. On the other hand, the cost of insurance required by banks or other lenders often adds from $120 to about $300 to the cost of borrowing, for a period of 60 to 72 months.

Credit union education loans compare favorably with banks and other commercial credit sources, but not all credit unions have such programs. University and government plans usually are cheaper than credit union or bank plans. However, not all students are eligible. Some New York credit unions participate in the most liberal State program for students, the NYHEAC.

ASK QUESTIONS WHEN BORROWING

When applying for an education loan ask: What is the total cost of borrowing? How much is each monthly payment? How long is the repayment period? What is the true annual interest rate? Can you prepay without penalty? Are there any other fees or charges that add to the cost of these loans? Is a loan available to a first-year student?

A few years ago Changing Times recommended that borrowers compare what they would actually pay for the same loan at a number of different banks. It's good advice to follow. But if you also compare interest rates, keep in mind that a bank's quoted 2¼ to 6 percent add-on or discount rate is an effective rate of 10 to 15 percent when it includes interest charges, insurance fees and all other charges added together. Credit union rates usually are stated as 1 percent per month on the loan balance, a true annual rate of about 12 percent; some credit unions grant education loans at a true 6 percent per annum, others at true 9 percent. With loan protection insurance at no extra charge, the effective rate is lower.

In all cases, compare carefully for the best terms.

NEW LAWS; NEW OPPORTUNITIES

New low-cost college loan opportunities in some States will be opened early in 1966 under the Higher Education Act of 1965. Families with adjusted annual incomes of less than $15,000 will benefit. But those with higher incomes may also be eligible for loans.

States are encouraged to set up their own loan-guarantee plans, much like the NYHEAC.

An undergraduate student borrower will be able to obtain loans up to $1,000 in any academic year, up to $5,000 during his entire course of study; graduate and professional school students, up to $1,500 in a school year and $7,500 during an entire course of study.

Simple annual interest will be 6 percent (in special circumstances defined in the law, 7 percent). Student borrowers in families with adjusted annual income below $15,000 will pay no interest while in school, but 3 percent thereafter. Interest subsidies by the Federal Government will be used to pay interest to lenders.

The U.S. Commissioner of Education will define "adjusted" income and is expected to take into account the size of the family. Thus a large family, even with a larger income, could also benefit.

Repayment of loans begins 60 days after leaving school. Student Peace Corps volunteers and those who serve in the Armed Forces may have up to 3 years to begin repaying.

Federal credit unions and some State chartered credit unions will be eligible to make such loans, as will other institutions.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

"Borrowing for College, A Guide for Students and Parents," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, (16 pp.) 20 cents.

"Canada Student Loans Plan" (a leaflet), Queen's Printer, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. Free. National Student Aid Information Service, 15 Welland Avenue, St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada.

"Planning for College," Sidney Margolius, Avon Books, 959 Eighth Avenue, New York, N.Y., 10019. (304 pp). 75 cents.

College aid kit, AFL–CIO Department of Education, 815 16th Street NW., Washington 6, D.C. Free.

"Complete Planning for College," Sidney Sulkin, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 330 West 42d Street, New York, N.Y. (268 pp.), $3.95.

"Education Loans"—a six-page reprint from the Credit Union magazine (May 1963). CUNA International, Inc., Publications Department, Box 431, Madison, Wis., 53701, 10 cents.

High school guidance offices, public library reference shelves, and credit unions.

Typical education loan plans available to students

	Amounts which can be borrowed	Repayment begins	Length of repayment	Annual interest rate	Life insurance	Other charges	Who may borrow	Additional information
National defense student loan program.	Up to $1,000 a year for 5 years.	1 year after leaving school.	Up to 10 years.	3 percent once repayment begins; none until then.	Included	None	Students attending U.S. schools participating in the program.	Apply at college or university. Public school teachers receive a 10-percent reduction of the loan for each year they teach, up to a maximum of 50 percent of the total loan.
North Dakota State Department of Public Instruction.	Up to $500 a year for 4 years.	do	1 year for each school year financed.	3 percent from date of loan; payable annually.	None	None	North Dakota residents attending school in the State and who have completed their first semester.	Similar plans are available in other States. Check with the school or the State department of public instruction.
Wisconsin State loan fund.	Up to $750 a year.	do	do	1 percent while in school; then 5 percent.	None	None	Wisconsin residents attending school in the State.	
New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. (NYHEAC).	$500 to $1,500 a year, depending on grade.	Arrangements to be made 60 days after leaving school.	Up to 6 years.	None in school (paid by NYHEAC); then 3 percent.	NYHEAC guarantees the loan.	None	New York residents in need of financial assistance. May attend school out of State.	NYHEAC established by New York State legislature. Similar plans are operating in Illinois, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Virginia, and Wyoming. Corporation guarantees student's loan from financial institutions participating in the plan.
Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corp. (MHEAC).	$500 a year in final 3 years.	6 months after leaving school.	Up to 3 years.	3½ to 5½ percent (depending on prime rate in Boston) while in school; then MHEAC sets rate.	MHEAC guarantees 80 percent of loan.	None	Massachusetts residents who have completed their freshman year and are in need of financial assistance.	MHEAC financed by contributions from businesses, individuals, and charitable foundations. Maine has a similar plan. Corporation guarantees student's loan from financial institutions participating in the plan.

Typical education loan plans available to students—Continued

	Amounts which can be borrowed	Repayment begins	Length of repayment	Annual interest rate	Life insurance	Other charges	Who may borrow	Additional information
United Student Aid Funds, Inc. (USAF).	Up to $1,000 a year in final 3 years.	4 months after graduation.	Up to 3 years.	No more than 6 percent from date of loan.	USAF guarantees loan.	None....	Students who have completed their freshman year, are in need of financial assistance, and are residents of State in which they apply.	USAF guarantees loans made by banks in areas where plan has been endorsed by State bankers' associations. 30 States have already endorsed the plan, others are considering it.
Province of Ontario..	Up to $500 a year for 4 years.	1 year after leaving school.	....	4 percent once repayment begins; none until then.	None........	None....	Students in Ontario schools.	Other Provinces have similar plans.
Canada student loans plan.	Up to $1,000 1 year; up to $5,000 aggregate.	6 months after leaving school.	Up to 10 years.	5¾ percent when repayment begins; no interest while in school.	None........	None....	Canadian citizens enrolled or who intend to enroll as full-time students in Canadian schools approved by Provinces.	Provincial Government authority receives applications and considers on basis of financial need, academic qualifications, and student's potential. Loans are made by chartered banks and credit unions.

NATIONAL SKI WEEK

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the State of Wyoming welcomed the action of this body last week in passing the joint resolution fixing this week as National Ski Week. Wyoming has a dozen major ski areas which provide almost incomparable skiing—a form of recreation we recommend to all.

At the present time, Mr. President, Wyoming is busting its buttons over its newest and largest ski development, Teton Village, in the Jackson Hole country. Offering the Nation the longest verticle drop—4,135 feet—the Jackson Hole ski area also offers excellent facilities for the skier, whether he be expert or novice. It has a 2½ mile aerial tramway, in addition to other lifts. It has beautiful powder snow overlaying the best scenery this country has to offer. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce and radio station KSGT in the town of Jackson have asked, Mr. President, that I extend an invitation to all to come to the finest and best ski area of the world for fun combined with the friendliness of the Old West. And I wish to join them in extending the invitation.

FORTY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on January 22, our hearts are saddened and our minds are impressed again by one of the great tragedies of our lifetime. This date marks the 48th anniversary of what was to be the beginning of national independence for Ukraine.

In 1918, the people of Ukraine declared complete independence for their state. But the imperialistic acts of the Russian Government quashed this move for freedom. The Ukrainians' cry for freedom is still heard. Their desire for freedom is still felt. This natural need burns in the deepest part of their hearts, immune from the intimidations of transitory dictators and despots. The desire is felt by all of the peoples of the captive nations.

A few short months after the declaration of independence, Ukraine, the largest non-Russian independent nation in Eastern Europe, became the victim of the same techniques practiced by the Communist tyranny that are today observed in Vietnam.

Vietnam is our primary concern today. The freedom and independence of the Vietnamese is our immediate goal today. But let us not believe that freedom for any of the captive nations is beyond our reach. And let our actions be such that the way to freedom is not made more difficult because the Communist position through our actions or policies is strengthened.

So it is well that we commemorate the 48th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. It tells the peoples of the captive nations that they have not been forsaken. It tells them that America is, and forever will be, with them.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET—PLAYGROUNDS AND RECREATION AREAS

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, in beginning my study of the budget for the District of Columbia which we just received from the President, I have already noted one point which I think is sufficiently important to call to the attention of the Senate. I refer to the proposals to give financial support to improving the availability and quality of some of our existing parks and recreation areas.

We all know that there are parts of the District where more playgrounds are badly needed. But the fact is that the problem is aggravated because existing facilities in these areas are not being properly utilized. Padlocks go on the gates of school playgrounds and even Recreation Department facilities sometimes as early as the end of the school day—at 3 or 4 in the afternoon. It is a fact that in many cases playgrounds are least available when they are needed the most.

I shall, of course, support all efforts by the Recreation Department to expand its facilities, but in the meantime, I hope that we will provide the Department with the funds to keep its present facilities open for as many hours a day, and for as many days a week, as they are needed.

I am delighted, therefore, to see this item in the budget for the District.

U THANT ON VIETNAM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the Washington Star, in its January 24 issue, took a critical look at the utterances of U.N. General Secretary U Thant who, in his recent press conference, could find little to praise in the American position in Vietnam, nor little to criticize in the position of our adversaries.

The Evening Star was overly kind in terming Mr. Thant's remarks "compulsive self-delusion." Indeed, the Burmese schoolteacher's views on the Vietnam conflict would seem to prove that a stupid statement by a statesman of stature often assumes the stature of the statesman when, in fact, the statesman should assume the stature of the statement.

The Evening Star observed, in pointing out that the coalition government of Laos has fallen into disrepute, that—

> In Vietnam there is no possibility whatever of forming a successful coalition between factions which have been engaged in bitter warfare for the better part of 20 years.

Mr. President, I ask that the editorial of the Evening Star be printed in the body of the RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 24, 1966]

U THANT ON VIETNAM

As Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant has an unquestioned obligation to aline himself with those who seek a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam. He has no obligation, however, to indulge in such exercises of compulsive self-delusion as his most recent press conference.

His suggestions for new concessions designed to overcome Communist aversion to truce talks reveal an interesting fact about the peace lobby of which he is a prominent member. When it comes to Vietnam, the doves are very much like the most ardent hawks: Concession to their arguments only brings on an immediate demand for more and bigger concessions. The pressures for total war on the one hand and total surrender on the other represent equally serious problems for American policymakers.

Since the pause in the bombing of North Vietnam has produced no response from the Communist side, U Thant apparently now wants the pause to be extended indefinitely. While Hanoi and Peiping remain as bellicose as ever, he suggests that the "psychological climate" should be improved "by all measures possible"—which means simply by new conciliatory gestures from the United States.

Among these is the idea that peace talks should be held directly with members of the Vietcong's National Liberation Front and that it should be agreed ahead of time that members of this organization be accepted as members of a new Saigon Government. Such an offer, in U Thant's opinion, would make it "difficult to justify" a Communist refusal to negotiate.

The fact that such an offer also would make it enormously difficult to negotiate anything other than a complete sellout of South Vietnam to the Communists apparently does not enter into the Secretary General's calculations. For their part, the Vietcong always have made it perfectly clear that they are interested in nothing less than the complete domination of the country. In Laos, where a three-way Communist, neutralist, and rightwing coalition was attempted in 1962, the Communists pulled out and returned to guerrilla tactics as soon as they failed to win outright control. In Vietnam, there is no possibility whatever of forming a successful coalition between factions which have been engaged in bitter warfare for the better part of 20 years.

In the case of Vietnam, U Thant is firmly wedded to the notion that bigger and better concessions are called for. In the case of China, which he argues will "naturally" have to be associated with any peace settlement in Vietnam, there is the implication that if only everyone would stop treating the country as "an outcast, outlaw and culprit," China might stop acting like one.

It all makes an agreeable pipedream. U Thant is not the first person to believe that ambitious and belligerent nations can be appeased into becoming more congenial members of the world community. And nations which have followed this course have learned many times to their sorrow what the price of illusion can be.

BOMBING PAUSE SHOULD CONTINUE FOR PRESENT IN VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I will support the principle of fund requests for support of the war against aggression in Vietnam, but with some reservations pending further developments.

Fundamentally I am for an honorable peace—but it must be a secure peace—and we must continually strive to achieve it. Until the peace is assured, however, and as long as we must persist in Vietnam with our South Vietnamese and other allies to thwart Communist aggression and infiltration, I will support the policy that the Vietnam effort and our manpower commitment to that effort must have the top priority attention of the Government and its citizens.

In answer to questions as to whether or not bombing of North Vietnam should be resumed and as to whether or not there should be assaults from the air on military and industrial targets in the Hanoi urban complex and of the North Vietnam port of Haiphong, I assert:

It is my judgment that we must first acknowledge that the conflict in Vietnam is one which, in one form or another, has been going on almost continuously for approximately 20 years, even though United States direct involvement has been relatively recent. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that a peace offensive on our part, no matter how sincere or intensive, would fail to yield definitive results in a short period of time. I hope that our efforts to achieve a basis for negotiations will continue. And, as a part of these efforts, I trust that we will continue to refrain from bombing North Vietnam unless there is a clear indication that such a policy unnecessarily jeopardizes American and allied forces in South Vietnam.

With reference to whether or not there should be bombing of military and industrial targets in the Hanoi urban complex and of the port of Haiphong, I note that the President's top advisers seem to be divided in degree in their views of the value of such bombing. And I point out that the Mansfield mission of Senators declared in the report filed January 3, 1966, with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and made public to the Nation, that Hanoi and Saigon are "mutual hostages, one for the other." This is a sobering evaluation and bears equally on the relationship of the port of Haiphong and the main port facilities we use in South Vietnam. Therefore, I oppose the bombing of Hanoi's urban complex and the port of Haiphong at this time.

INDIA'S NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today, 17 years after achieving independence, India celebrates her national holiday. It is only proper that we take note of this great nation.

During December of last year, it was a pleasure and an education for me, along with several of my colleagues of the Senate, to be a guest of the Indian Parliament on the great subcontinent. There, we had fruitful exchanges with a variety of public officials, and we observed many facets of Indian life from marketplaces to modern farms.

A nation twice the size of the American population, located on a land area one-third that of the United States, India has faced enormous economic problems which our nation was fortunate to escape during its formative years. With determined effort India has nevertheless raised the gross national product by 43 percent in the decade after 1954. Under her present 5-year plan, she is pressing forward for balanced development of power facilities, industry, agriculture, mining, transportation, and communications.

Through a federal structure similar to our own, through a national parliamentary system, and through revitalization of traditional village councils where "grass roots democracy" is fostered, India seeks to bind together a people diverse in language, ethnic origin, and religious belief.

Recently, the American people have been particularly aware of the agricultural needs of the rapidly expanding Indian population. Our nation has enjoyed a surplus in this vital area, and we only hope that an adequate distributive system will be developed to assure linkage between American supply and Indian demand for foodstuffs. It is the wish of many, I know, that our governments continue to build such arrangements.

Taxed by a host of domestic exigencies, Indian leadership has demonstrated remarkable energy and determination in strengthening democratic institutions, building an integrated economy, and stimulating social reforms.

With independence, India immediately rose to a position of prestige and leadership within the international community. Her vigorous activities in the United Nations, her willingness to both lead and serve, her earnest desire for international cooperation, have often been an example to us all. In less than two decades, she has made a distinct contribution—often a voice of reason amid the thunder of cold war propaganda.

Today much promise is seen in the new Prime Minister who will doubtless carry forward the Indian tradition of excellence in leadership. Having made with her nation the long trek to independence, having served it faithfully at the side of her father and in several official capacities, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi possesses the requisite wisdom and courage. She fills us with great expectation.

Mr. President, it is my wish that our two nations will continue to grow in friendship and mutual respect, and I know that many join with me in saluting the Indian people on this occasion.

THE AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY AWARDS—TRIBUTE TO TALBOT T. SPEER

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, recently the 1965 American Success Story Awards, made annually by the Free Enterprise Awards Association, were awarded to 10 outstanding American citizens.

The awards chairman is himself one of the foremost examples of the American success story and a leading Maryland citizen. He is Mr. Talbot T. Speer, who has risen from salesman to owner of one of the oldest and most respected newspapers in America, the 238-year-old Maryland Gazette, in addition to numerous other enterprises.

Since Mr. Speer's rise to success serves as an inspiring model for young Americans, I would like to have inserted in the Record a recent tribute to Mr. Speer by Mr. Charles P. Crane, another outstanding Maryland citizen.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this tribute be reprinted in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Maryland Gazette]

Awards Chairman Speer Symbolizes Traits of Awardees

Of the many words of praise written about FEAA Awards Chairman Talbot T. Speer, none more succinctly summarized his character, fighting spirit and service to his community than those of Charles P. Crane, former president and chairman of the Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., who now is the firm's executive committee chairman.

Said Crane, in introducing Speer as he was to be honored by the Newcomen Society in North America:

"He has carried energy and determination with him through his business career. His drive and will to succeed have never diminished. A man of action, he often has stepped into difficult and patriotic chores because of his belief in the cause they represented. And I'm happy to say, he has been instrumental in leading them to successful goals."

Speer has, indeed, been a fighter all of his life.

Following great athletic achievements at the University of Maryland and the University of Virginia in football and track, he became an officer of the famous U.S. Army's 1st Division which so highly distinguished itself in France.

His leadership and courage with field artillery won for him one of the few Silver Stars that were awarded for heroism.

Captain Speer also returned to the United States at the close of the war wearing, in addition to the U.S. Silver Star Medal, the French Fourragere, Croix de Guerre Medal, and the right to wear the Purple Heart Ribbon.

At stages throughout his more recent life, the Government has continued to cite Speer for his service on commissions. A number of certificates have been presented to him for Federal service rendered in connection with our country's war and economic efforts.

Since 1922, Speer has been president, general manager and chairman of the board of the Baltimore Salesbook Co., and more recently also of Baltimore Business Forms Co. These huge printing firms have offices in all sections of the United States. Like the newspapers, these companies have expanded many times under Speer's leadership.

He also is president-publisher of the Capital-Gazette Press, Inc. of Annapolis, Md., which publishes the Maryland Gazette—America's oldest newspaper—the daily Evening Capital, the weekly Brooklyn (Md.) News, and the County News.

And in 1951, he created the philanthropic Talbot T. Speer Foundation.

Speer was born in Pittsburgh, Pa., and was educated at the Brennens and Bradshaw Schools, Pittsburgh, the Episcopal High School, Alexandria, Va., the University of Virginia and the University of Maryland.

TOOK OVER REINS IN 1921

He was a salesman for the Daniel Miller Co., of Baltimore, from 1919 to 1921, became the assistant to the president of the Baltimore Salesbook Co. in 1921 and that same year became president and chairman of the board of the company.

He is the founder and president of National Education Fund, Inc., of Baltimore.

Speer lives at Friendship Hill, in Baltimore County, and also owns a large estate directly on the ocean at Delray Beach, Fla. He and Mrs. Speer has three sons, Talbot T. Speer, Jr., J. L. Dawson Speer III, and Ramsey Speer, and a daughter, Jane Alexander Speer.

Speer has been a director of the Union Trust Co. of Maryland since 1947 and was a director of the Baltimore Association of Commerce 1935–40, Baltimore Convention Bureau, 1946–48, the County Taxpayers League of Baltimore County since 1945, and a director of the U.S. Naval Academy Foundation, 1950–54.

He has been a member of the Higher Education Commission of Maryland since 1945, and was on the prison board, 1948–50, the War Production Board, 1940–1945, the Industrial Mobilization Commission since 1950 and the U.S. Army Advisory Commission since 1947.

LONG ACTIVE IN N.A.M.

A member of the National Association of Manufacturers, he was a senior director representing Maryland from 1947–1950. He is a member of the Accounting Supply Manufacturers Association, a director of the Associated Industries of Maryland, being president in 1951; president of the Salesbook Manufacturers Association, and was president of the Alumni Association, the University of Maryland for 2 years starting in 1950.

Speer also is a member of the Newcomen Society, the Navy League, the Society of the First Division, AEF; American Legion, Purple Heart, and Delta Psi. He is an Episcopalian, being member of the lay council, procathedral of Maryland, 1925–1954.

He was director, Baltimore Association of Commerce, 1935–1939; director, Keystone Automobile Club, 1943–1951, director, the Campaign for the 48 States, 1953–1959. Director, the Defenders of the Constitution of the United States, 1953–1959. Director, the Alumni Fund, University of Virginia, for the Class of 1915, from 1930–1959. Director, the Alumni Fund for the University of Maryland, 1957, 1958, and 1959.

Also, director, the Eastern Business Forms Co., 1957. First president, director, and organizer, the Associated Industries of Maryland, 1949, 1950, and 1951. President and founder, National Educational Foundation, Inc., Baltimore, Md., 1951 to 1959.

He was general chairman, the General Douglas MacArthur Celebration in the State of Maryland 1952. Member of the Society of the 1st Division, AEF, the American Legion, the Purple Heart, the Delta Psi Fraternity.

Also, member the lay council of the Episcopal Pro-Cathedral of Maryland from 1925–1954. Member of the Vestry of the Episcopal Cathedral Church of the Incarnation, Baltimore, Md., 1924–1956. Chairman of the Consolidation of the Church of the Incarnation and Emanuel Protestant Episcopal Churches, 1953. Member, Vestry of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Delray Beach, Fla., 1952–1953.

ACTIVE IN MANY ORGANIZATIONS

He belongs to the following clubs: Rotary, Bachelors Cotillion, Elkridge Kennels, Greenspring Valley Hunt, president, Carrollton Hounds; president, Wythmore Hounds; Baltimore Country Club, Annapolis Yacht Club, Annapolitan Club.

Also, St. Anthony Club, Lake Placid Club, Everglades Club, National Press Club, the Gulf Stream Golf Club, Newcomen Society. President, Alumni Association, University of Virginia, of Maryland, 1925, 1926, and 1927.

Also member, Higher Education Committee of the State of Maryland, 1945–53, chairman of the Community Fund, Publishers Committee, 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939. Member of the Prison Board of the State of Maryland, 1948 and 1949.

Also, chairman, the Business and Industry Sections of the American Red Cross, 1936–1939. Member, NRA representing the Business Forms Industry, 1933–1935. Member, the War Production Board, representing the Business Forms Industry, 1940–45.

He was cited by U.S. Government, and awarded a certificate of merit for services to the national war effort. Member, the Industrial Mobilization Committee, 1949–1958.

He was chairman, the committee to run the National Amateur Golf Championship, 1932.

He was nominated Man of the Year for 1950 in the South by the southern newspapers as announced in Publishers Auxiliary and the editors of Dixie Business magazine. Served on War Manpower Commission as Judge of Labor Management Problems, 1944–1945.

Chairman, the committee celebrating (in protest of the enormous taxes of 1957) the "Burning of the Peggy Stewart" (burned in protest of the taxes of 1775).

Trustee the Episcopal High School, Alexandria, Va., 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933. Chairman of the building campaign committee for the Episcopal Cathedral of the Incarnation in Baltimore, 1930, 1931, 1932, general chairman, Cathedral Church of the Incarnation Building Campaign Committee, 1954.

Donated a room in the Parish House at St. Anne's Episcopal Church, Annapolis, Md., 1956. Second largest contributor to rebuilding program of the Episcopal High School, 1945–1946.

Second largest contributor in the 1953 rebuilding drive for the Episcopal High School, and served on campaign committee. Donated new chapel to Sunday school, St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Delray Beach, Fla., 1953.

Donated two adjoining building lots to St. Paul's Episcopal Church in 1955, an air conditioner and heating unit for the rectory in 1958. Donated wing to the young peoples building, Episcopal Church of the Incarnation, Baltimore, Md., 1954.

Donated room to the women's building of St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., 1953. Donates yearly to the pay of the underpaid clergy of the Episcopal Church Diocese of Maryland. Chairman of board of advisors for Maryland, Western Tax Council, Inc., 1954–1955. Selected frequently, including 1960 and 1961, to present the American Success Story Awards for the Free Enterprise Awards Association Advisory Board, U.S. Air Patrol, 1958–1959, director of Business Forms Institute, 1954 to 1955.

THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, a great many comments have been authored on the President's state of the Union message of January 12. Not a few of these observations have dealt with the delphic nature of the pronouncements concerning the possibility of unlimited spending in the realms of both guns and butter.

I should like to call the Senate's attention to an editorial by James Flinchum, editor of the Wyoming State Tribune, who observed that:

> Lyndon Johnson has now blown the whistle on the Great Society, but not in the sense that had been anticipated. It is the whistle for full speed at home and abroad; and as we go careening down the track of history, we cannot even concern ourselves with where we are going since we have not yet learned where we have been.

The budget, submitted Monday, bears this out.

It is Mr. Flinchum's hope, and certainly a hope of mine, that as this 2d session of the 89th Congress turns its attention to the tasks ahead it will at times pause long enough to reflect on the balance of what it has done.

I ask, Mr. President, that the editorial by Mr. Flinchum from the January 13 Cheyenne Wyoming State Tribune be printed in the RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOOT-TOOT! CLACKETY-CLACK! HERE WE GO, DOWN THE TRACK!

The man who thought he had heard everything when President Johnson delivered his 1965 state of the Union message just a year ago learned last night that he hadn't.

The earlier message pledged all things to all people; now that they presumably have gotten it, the Johnson administration promises to do even better in the next year.

Internationally, Mr. Johnson by and large should find a people united on his foreign program, especially with regard to Vietnam.

It was Lyndon, leader of the Nation, at his very best in the Vietnam portion, especially when he said "we shall stay until aggression has stopped."

Few Americans should quibble with his assertion: "Let me be absolutely clear: The days may become months, and the months may become years, but we will stay as long as aggression commands us to battle."

And again: "To yield to force in Vietnam would weaken the confidence, undermine the independence of many lands, and whet the appetite of the aggressor. We would have to fight in one land, and then another—or abandon much of Asia to the domination of the Communists. And we do not intend to abandon Asia to conquest."

These are courageous, forthright, unequivocal statements of American policy in the truest American tradition. We shall fight for the freedom of ourselves and others when, in the latter case, our own interests dictate it. We shall not get out of Vietnam until an equitable determination of that nation's future has been achieved.

But not quite so bold, not quite so forthright was his statement: "We shall strive to limit conflict, for we wish neither increased destruction nor increased danger." Does this mean we shall continue withholding some of our punch in Vietnam? An extension of the bombing lull? The President did not say precisely. But it was not reassuring to those who think we should achieve a relatively quick military victory at the expense of a "safe" prolonged war.

Even domestically, there were a lot of Johnsonian proposals that the American people will support without regard to political sentiment. The 4-year term for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, for example; and the program for strengthening our local police departments.

Both of these are reforms long overdue. They should be speedily approved by the Congress, especially the 4-year term for House Members, judging from the thunderous applause that greeted Mr. Johnson's remarks last night.

But there are others that are not merely less appealing; they are absolutely appalling. We shall proceed with the Great Society full speed without the slightest regard to the Vietnam war for there is plenty of money to finance both, said Mr. Johnson in essence.

For those of both political parties who had conceived a lessening of the frenetic pace in the highly questionable war on poverty, the President's remarks were obviously a disappointment. It may cost the taxpayers more money to fund both of these undertakings, but never mind that, said the President. And those who doubt the morality of his course are mean. "Time may require further sacrifices," said he. "If so we will make them. But we will not heed those who wring it from the hopes of the unfortunate in a land of plenty."

There already is a hint of things to come; Mr. Johnson very quickly announced—so quickly it was difficult for television viewers to immediately grasp the import of his words—that some of the levies that were so bravely removed last year and which expired, as he said, only 12 days ago, will be re-imposed. These are the excise taxes on automobiles and telephones.

Thus the statement that "time may require further sacrifices" carries an ominous connotation.

In the war on poverty, the President proceeds under the questionable assumption that it has been a resounding success that has somehow magically eradicated poverty in this Nation. Let those who would remove the abundance of this program from those who need it, stand up and be counted, cried Mr. Johnson.

But the evidence is otherwise; there are suggestions that the people and even some of the poor themselves who are supposed to have benefited from the war on poverty, have not done so; that the great crusade to bring material abundance to all, with need as the only criterion, now is mired in a loblolly of local political in-fighting, inefficiency and waste.

It also seems probable that the Johnson administration is so hooked on the narcotic of total Government, feeding on Keynesian economic theories that conceivably are taking us to the brink of inflationary disaster, that it cannot do other than what Mr. Johnson has outlined.

Lyndon Johnson now has blown the whistle on the Great Society, but not in the sense that has been anticipated. It is the whistle for full speed at home and abroad; and as we go careening down the track of history, we cannot even concern ourselves with where we are going since we have not yet learned where we have been.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the budget for the District of Columbia which President Johnson has transmitted to us today reflects his continuing concern for children—a concern which I am sure is shared by every Member of this body.

We have not always, I am afraid, translated that concern into action. The schools in the District have long been given too little, too late. This is especially true of funds for buildings and supplies. The President has pointed out in his budget message that over 2,000 children in the Capital of our Nation go to school only part time because there is no room for them to enjoy a full school day. He proposes to double the amount appropriated in recent years for school construction. We should make certain that that is enough.

The President is also concerned with help to children under the welfare program. His message notes a half dozen ways in which child help will be strengthened. He is gratified, and rightly so, that the population of Junior Village has decreased from over 900 to 630 at the end of 1965. I have checked more recently and I am glad to say that the village population continues to decline, and has now gone below 600. While this is about 550 too many, it suggests to me that we are on the right track.

I hope the Congress will continue to support the President's proposals in this field.

CITATION TO R. J. O'NEILL, POSTMASTER AT BASIN, WYO.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as one who views the Post Office Department as the average citizen's first and most frequent link with his Government, I am sorry that business in Wyoming prevented me from taking part last week in a special ceremony at the office of the Postmaster General. On that occasion, Mr. R. J. O'Neill, postmaster at Basin, Wyo., was presented a citation of merit for beautification of the building and grounds of his facility.

As one familiar with the Basin post office, I can attest that the program of beautification undertaken there with the cooperation of a number of private citizens has been most worthwhile. I want to congratulate Mr. O'Neill, the people of Basin, and also the Post Office Department itself for encouraging such endeavors.

BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, in order to show that big brotherism is not purely a domestic matter, I ask consent to have printed at this point in the Record a few articles indicating the scope of the problem in such places as Britain and Greece.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, December 20, 1965]

Eavesdropping

No people have prized their privacy more than the British, who tuck their houses back of hedges and hide themselves in clubs behind the London Times. Any threat to this tradition of privacy is a matter of public alarm. The widespread sale of electronic eavesdropping devices has recently stirred up a hornet's nest and questions are being asked in Parliament.

A London manufacturer has confessed to selling hundreds of listening gadgets made in the form of matchboxes, pens, jewelry, cosmetic compacts, flashlights, and other disguises. A somewhat larger device is also available for motor cars. Even the staid Financial Times has been advertising microbug spy equipment available in a London television shop.

Although the sale of these devices is legal in Britain, their operation requires a license from the post office; operation without a license makes the user liable to a fine of £100 and 3 months in jail. Yet despite this hazard, hundreds of eavesdroppers are quietly listening in on their neighbors. No wonder the British are worried. There's no telling where it will all end. For example, the London Hilton Hotel looks down upon Buckingham Palace Garden. It may be possible for a roomer there to listen to intimate conversations in the palace itself. Nobody, not even the Queen, can be sure of privacy, although Her Majesty's government probably treats her with more respect than Army Intelligence showed Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt when they bugged her room in Chicago.

It is understandable that members of the House of Commons are threshing about in a lather of rage without knowing quite what to do about this troublesome invention. Every man may now be suspect. That harmless old duffer with the oversize Rotary button in his lapel may be recording heaven knows what secret conversations. Not big brother but little brother and all his sisters are now listening. More than ever silence is golden, and we can understand the British tendency to restrain their conversation to such harmless and equivocal responses as "Quite" and "I say."

[From the New York Post, Nov. 29, 1965]

Flea-Size Superbug Bugs British

London, November 29.—A Government department said today that it would investigate a matchbox spy radio which any amateur James Bond can buy in Britain.

A spokesman for the general post office, the department controlling radio and television, said his unit was considering a ban on the devices.

The microbug—a tiny radio transmitter capable of relaying conversations up to 100 yards—can fit into a matchbox or a packet of cigarets and could be easily hidden in a car, office or house.

It can be operated without knowledge of radio techniques and could prove of use to industrial spies, private detectives engaged in divorce cases, neighbors snooping on one another, or criminals planning payroll snatches.

The Daily Mail's main front-page story today said the matchbox spy, "the most sinister device yet produced for snooping," could be bought for $518 or rented for $56 a week.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 2, 1965]

BRITAIN SAYS WARSAW BUGGED HER EMBASSY

London, September 1.—The Foreign Office said today that diplomats in Warsaw had discovered a system of hidden microphones in the British Embassy building. The Foreign Office was understood to be planning a protest.

Although no details were given, it was believed that the microphones had been hidden in the walls of the new combined Embassy and residence completed a year ago at a cost of nearly $500,000. Britain's Foreign Secretary, Michael Stewart, is scheduled to stay there during an official visit to Warsaw September 17 to 21.

Diplomats here showed no surprise at the discovery. They took for granted that all Communist governments and some others attempted to "bug" Embassies in their capitals.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Morning Sun, Aug. 20, 1965]

BRITISH CHECKING REPORTS QUEEN HAS EAVESDROPPERS

London, August 20.—The British Government announced early today it is investigating reports that Queen Elizabeth's private phone line at the Badminton Horse Trials was tapped by telephone girls.

The story dominated the front pages of London's morning newspapers.

An official statement said the Post Office Department (G.P.O.), which runs Britain's telephone system, is checking reports that operators at Chippenham, in rural Wiltshire, 90 miles west of London, were listening in on royal calls.

The Daily Mirror, with a circulation of 5 million, banner-lined "The Queen: Phone-Tap Probe by G.P.O." It quoted a former operator who said she had listened in and so did others.

The Daily Sketch front-paged: "Tapping of Royal Calls Probed."

The Sun: "Queen's Calls Were Tapped."

The Daily Express: "G.P.O. Looks Into Royal Phone Tap."

The country telephone operators claimed to have heard the Queen and her children talking. Also they claim to have heard the Queen's sister, Princess Margaret, chatting.

The headline splurge was launched by a story in a village weekly. This paper, the Wiltshire Echo, is owned by Woodrow Wyatt, a Labor Party Member of Parliament.

The Daily Express said in its front-page story, quoting a Wiltshire telephone operator:

"The Official Secrets Act which we signed prevent us revealing what we had heard but it is true that we operators listen in. The phones of some people in the area are very popular for tapping. We consider them to be 'juicy conversation.'"

In the absence of the Queen and her family, on summer vacation in Scotland, a Buckingham Palace spokesman said:

"This is entirely a G.P.O. matter, although naturally we should be concerned if this sort of thing were going on."

[From the New York Times, Aug. 29, 1965]

ATHENS CASHIERS FOUR OFFICERS ON PHONE-TAPPING CHARGES

Athens, Aug. 27.—Four Greek Army intelligence officers are to be cashiered following investigations into the tapping of prominent politicians' telephones, Premier Elias Tsirimokos said Friday.

The previous government of George Athanasiades-Novas charged that calls made by Greek military and civil officials were tapped to provide reports for the government of George Papandreou, the 77-year-old politician who resigned as Premier July 15 after a dispute with King Constantine.

The officers include Cols. Nicolas Papaterpos and Panayotis Anagnostopoulos, both former deputy chiefs of the intelligence service under the Papandreou government.

[From the New York Times, Nov 20, 1965]

GREECE PUNISHES WIRETAPPING

Athens, November 18.—Four Greek Army intelligence officers have been dismissed for unauthorized telephone tapping. The decision of the Disciplinary Council was published Thursday.

NEW HAMPSHIRE JAYCEE RECEIVES NATIONAL HONORS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, Richard Chaput, a 29-year-old author and freelance writer from Nashua, N.H., has been named by the United States Jaycees as one of its 10 outstanding young men of the year.

Dick Chaput's accomplishment is particularly significant because he has been paralyzed since he was 9 years old.

Mr. President, as a tribute to this fine young man who has brought great honor to his State and Nation, I ask unanimous consent that a wonderful article about him in the Nashua, N.H., Telegraph be inserted at this point in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Nashua (N.H.) Telegraph, Jan. 10, 1966]

CHAPUT IS RECOGNIZED NATIONALLY

A Nashua man has been selected by the United States Jaycees as one of the 10 outstanding young men in the Nation.

This distinction goes to Richard Chaput, 29-year-old paralytic author, who through courage and perseverance, has conquered a major handicap—to succeed in various fields.

The Nashuan will receive the national award at ceremonies in St. Paul, Minn., this Saturday, according to Bernard A. Streeter, Jr., president of the Nashua Jaycees.

Chaput, who has spent years under an iron lung, now follows in the footsteps of the Kennedy brothers, former Vice President Nixon, leading scientists, educators and businessmen.

Although he has been paralyzed from the neck down since he was 9 years old, he has managed to overcome this handicap by completing the equivalent of a college education, by writing a book and serving as a freelance writer.

In addition, Chaput is much sought as a speaker. He has appeared before various organizations throughout New England.

Last year, both the Nashua Jaycees and the New Hampshire Jaycees named him their young man of the year in separate awards.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, Richard Chaput is a member of an organization which is performing a great service for the young men of New Hampshire. The New Hampshire Jaycees, through their interest in government and civic affairs, are making our State a better place to live in. I extend to them my congratulations for all they have done for their State and Nation and my best wishes for many more years of devoted service to the young leaders of our country.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the 22d of January is a date on which millions of Americans pause to show their continued support for Ukrainian independence. It was on January 22, 1918, 48 years ago, that the independence of the Ukrainian nation was first proclaimed. Unhappily, Soviet Communist force was used to conquer the fledgling state after it had experienced approximately 2 years of freedom. It should be noted that during those brief years of freedom, the Ukrainian people were constantly faced with military and economic pressures from the Soviets.

Not only did the Soviet leaders resort to military force, but they have continued to implement a policy of Russification of the Ukrainian people. Both the Ukrainian language and culture have been subjected to numerous pressures to conform to the example provided by Moscow. It is to the credit of the patriotic citizens of Ukraine that resistance has been strong.

The determined fighting and sacrifice surrounding the Ukraine's brief existence as a free and independent nation should serve as a source of continued inspiration and pride not only to those of Ukrainian descent, but to all freedom-loving men. It is true that Communist force prevailed over the freedom fighters in the Ukraine, but the people's will for freedom still prevails. What is required is for those of us in the free world to join in upholding the torch which in the end will one day ignite the flame of freedom and lead ultimately to the dismantling of the Communist brand of colonialism. It should be our firm responsibility to let the Ukrainian people know that they have our support in their hopes and dreams for an independent country.

We as freemen must be willing to demonstrate our desire to share that freedom especially with those who have demonstrated their willingness to fight and die to obtain and preserve the dignity and respect which independence and freedom bring in their wake.

Various national and local groups in this country have been active in promoting programs in support of their Ukrainian friends and relatives under Soviet control, and their achievements deserve our congratulations.

I hope that Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 which I joined in sponsoring, may help to achieve the goals for which so many have worked so hard. This resolution would urge the President to bring before the United Nations the question of the forceful incorporation of certain countries now under Soviet domination.

I consider it an honor and privilege to be counted as one who is completely dedicated to the principle of self-determination and independence for the Ukrainian people. Mr. Speaker, it is my fondest hope that the current programs now being carried out in America and abroad for Ukrainian independence will one day be triumphant.

BUDGET REQUESTS ON WATER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I was frankly dismayed by the low level of the requests in the President's budget for water resource development in the fiscal year 1967. Water development is something we cannot postpone. There can be no "guns or butter" argument about it. We simply must move ahead decisively on all types of projects if we are to provide enough water for our growing populations in water-short areas of the country.

It is almost inconceivable to me that in the fiscal year following the acute water crisis of 1965—and at the beginning of another year in which water outlook is already grim—the President or any of his advisers in the Budget Bureau or in the White House or anywhere else could feel that any water project which is ready to go could be postponed or put in cold storage or slowed down. Yet a combination of all these things is now happening to all water projects and most emphatically to two of our most important water projects in my State of Utah.

The first project which has been undercut is the Dixie reclamation project in Washington County, Utah, near the Arizona-Nevada border. This project was authorized in the 88th Congress, and $1,500,000 in construction funds was appropriated for it for the fiscal year 1966. This year no funds have been requested in the President's budget.

Now, I realize we have some problems on Dixie. The original damsite was found to be unsafe after extensive core drilling turned up base-rock conditions which showed excessive fracturing. A second site upstream presented excessive costs and other problems. A third site now appears to be generally acceptable. I am most hopeful that this will prove to be the case, and that we can build a safe and economical dam there. We should know shortly. But, in any event, we must be ready to step out with an accelerated construction schedule as soon as the new site is finally approved.

The Dixie project has been almost 50 years in the making. It was held up for the last dozen or so years because of the Arizona-California water controversy. The people of Utah's Dixie have waited and worked, and worked and waited. Now that the Dixie project has finally been authorized, we have a new delay. This last postponement of construction work, because of a faulty site, has been almost unbearable in the critically short water area to which the dam will bring such welcome relief.

As soon as construction is started it will not take long to exhaust the money already appropriated. There should be additional construction funds ready and available so that there will not be a single day's halt in construction work on the project. Dixie should not be slowed down, or left to mark time, waiting for appropriation committees to complete their work. Once construction is started, it should be moved full steam ahead until it is completed. Yet not one penny has been requested for Dixie in the fiscal year 1967—not one penny. This is hard for me, and hard for the people of Utah to understand.

In his budget message to Congress, the President stressed the importance of ending pollution in several large river basins, and requested that Congress work on this problem. There could be no stronger supporter than I in the Congress of this request. I was both delighted and reassured when I heard it. But I cannot see why it is more important to provide enough water for the people in one river basin by cleaning up available supplies for them than it is to provide enough water for the people in another basin through construction of the necessary works which will bring available water to them.

I can see no basis, Mr. President, for completely denying any funds to Dixie, the small, critically essential project which will provide water to a fine group of Utah people who have done everything they possibly could to bring their project to fruition for over 50 years.

I am equally concerned about the unfair treatment accorded to another of Utah's major reclamation projects—the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project.

This project was authorized 10 long years ago as a part of the Upper Colorado River storage project. It is the principal instrument through which Utah will make use of its share of the waters of the Colorado River—a share accorded to our State, incidentally, under the Colorado River Compact some 40 long years ago.

It has taken a long time to plan central Utah because it is a complex project. The Bonneville unit is its heart. It is the phase of the project which will bring more water to Utah's heartland—to Provo and Salt Lake City, and to the rich farming areas of the central part of our State.

Last session when the budget request came to Congress for the fiscal year 1966, the Bureau of Reclamation was nearing the end of its long planning on the Bonneville unit. There was every reason to believe that the Bureau could be ready to let contracts well before fiscal 1966 had run out. But there was no request for construction funds in that budget message. Utah was nonplussed. Utah's Governor, Calvin Rampton, came to Washington and the entire Utah congressional delegation joined with him in pleading for a construction start on Bonneville. We went in a body before both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to make our case. Members of both committees recognized the equity of our plea, and added $3.1 million for construction of the Bonneville unit to the budget request. Both the House and the Senate agreed.

Mr. President, the members of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and subcommittees judge constantly the worth and importance of the projects which come before them and for which funds are asked. They studied the Bonneville unit, and determined that it should be constructed. In a way, this could be considered a congressional mandate for construction. Congress, through its appropriation process—through a line item written into an appropriation bill—told the Bureau of Reclamation to go ahead with the Bonneville unit. It would seem that this should have ended any delay on Bonneville.

Yet when the budget requests for the fiscal year 1967 came to the Congress Monday there was a request for only $2.7 million for continued construction on the Bonneville unit—less than the amount the House and Senate wrote into the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1966. This would only allow work to continue on the Starvation Dam and on temporary construction camps, and would move us along at about a snail's pace toward our goal.

Mr. President, the Bonneville unit is a $312 million project. If kept on schedule it will take us at least 10 years to build. We are not going to get through in 100 years if we do not put more than $2 million into it each year.

I understand that the Bureau of Reclamation estimated it could use $13.7 million to good advantage in fiscal 1967 on Bonneville. When budget cuts were imposed because of the demands of the Vietnam war, the Bureau cut its request for Bonneville back to less than $3 million. We all know that cuts had to be made—we all recognize the problems the President and his staff had in keeping the budget within reasonable bounds—but I submit that an 80-percent cut on an essential water resource development project is pretty steep. In fact, I don't see how it can be justified.

The blow given the people in central Utah on Bonneville budget requests was equally as severe as that dealt to the people in southwestern Utah on Dixie.

Less than a month before the budget requests for the fiscal year 1967 came to Congress, the people of the Bonneville Unit area completed their organization and met all of the local requirements prerequisite to the letting of construction contracts. The repayment contract of the Utah Water Conservancy District was approved by a 13-to-1 margin on December 14 in the seven counties which will receive Bonneville Unit benefits and was signed by Secretary Udall on December 28. The contract provides for $130 million repayment by the water users over a period of 50 years, and is, incidentally, one of the largest ever negotiated. Thus the people of the district entered into partnership with their Government to assure repayment of the funds Congress appropriates for construction.

But Congress has been asked to appropriate only enough funds barely to get the project started. The people in the conservancy district are bitterly disappointed, and justifiably so.

I must make my position on this unmistakably clear. I shall use every means at my command to increase appropriations for the Bonneville Unit of the central Utah project. I shall do also what I can to see that additional construction funds are made available for the Dixie project as soon as its problems are settled. No other course is open to me.

CITIES

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I am pleased to see that Federal legislation is again being proposed by President Johnson to help finance the development of planned communities. Such legislation can strike at the heart of one our most serious urban problems: the chaotic use of urban land.

The past 40 years have produced the phenomenon variously known as "urban sprawl" and slurbs. The result has been ugliness and waste.

Community facilities, such as sewer systems and water supply, have been built on a too little, too late basis. Roads and highways have been developed with little thought to future land patterns. Commercial and industrial buildings have gone up, willy-nilly, wherever a local zoning ordinance could be bent.

This haphazard development has hurt us badly in the physical development of suburban communities. It will hurt us even more in terms of future growth.

And we know that the rate of population spillover into the suburbs—and beyond—is not slowing down. We know that by the year 2000 we will need as much urban land to accommodate our people as we have used in all our urbanized areas in our entire previous history.

As the President noted in his message on the cities, we shall effectively cripple each generation to come if we continue to devour the countryside as though it were limitless.

What is being proposed here is not legislation to establish a series of glorified subdivisions. This envisions a system for public and private organizations to purchase land at decent prices for the establishment of communities in which proper land use can be planned in advance.

The advantages are obvious:

First. Provision for public facilities, both for the present and for future expansion.

Second. The retention of land for open spaces and recreation areas.

Third. A comprehensive transportation system to and from the community and within the community.

Fourth. And, finally, an opportunity for a completely planned environment.

This does not mean that communities should be held to a rigid pattern of development, nor would this legislation lead to rigidity. But if we are to plan and build coherently for future generations, we must give our own generation the opportunity to make a start. This is what this legislation will do. That is what we must do.

ILLINOIS LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OVERWHELMINGLY OPPOSES DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the recent declaration of the League of Women Voters against the Dirksen rotten borough amendment is the most hopeful indication in many years that we are going to at last restore representative, vigorous governments in the States.

The Illinois League of Women Voters, with 77 leagues throughout the State, similarly has arrived at a consensus strongly in opposition to the proposed constitutional amendment. I have just received from Mrs. Ezra Levin, president of the Illinois League of Women Voters, a letter of official notification of the league's position.

It is a remarkable statement, and I wish to highly commend the Illinois league for its leadership in promoting statewide study and discussion of this issue, for the question of restoring representative State governments in accord with the Supreme Court's enforcement of the equality of citizenship under the equal protection clause is one of the most important constitutional questions of the century.

Mrs. Levin reports that the league's decision to firmly support the principle of one man, one vote in both houses of the State legislature was made statewide, "with no split between regions of the State, and included downstate leagues as well as urban and suburban." She writes:

> League members in certain areas of the State are perfectly aware that their areas have been overrepresented, and those in other areas that theirs have been underrepresented, and both—

I emphasize this, Mr. President—

> both are equally indignant about it.

Mrs. Levin also states that:

> The Illinois league is opposed to provisions for State referendums because we agree with the Supreme Court that the Constitution does not permit people to vote away their rights as citizens.

Mr. President, I want to say to the members of the League of Women Voters in my State that their study and conclusion on this issue is in the finest tradition of responsible citizenship for which the league stands and works. I will continue to work for the restoration of representative State government and equality of citizenship.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Levin's letter of January 20, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF ILLINOIS,
Chicago, Ill., January 20, 1966.
Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Because you have been leading the fight against the amendments proposed to allow States to apportion their legislatures on the basis of factors other than population, I know you will be interested in the outcome of discussions that have been held on this issue in the 77 Leagues of Women Voters in Illinois, along with leagues throughout the United States.

The leagues in Illinois overwhelmingly oppose such an amendment. There was an extraordinary amount of interest and participation in this study throughout the State, and a very thorough study was done in the local leagues. They read the material from the Senate hearings and thoroughly examined both sides of the question. The agreement that they came to was the result of a series of membership discussions in each league. It was statewide, with no split between regions of the State, and included downstate leagues as well as urban and suburban. The same widespread agreement across regions and kinds of interests emerged from the nationwide league study.

We believe that apportionment on any other basis than population would give a minority undue weight in the State legislature and we see no reason why a geographic minority should receive a weighted vote, as opposed to any other minority group. We believe that a State legislature which is truly representative will strengthen State government, make it more responsive, and increase respect for State legislatures. We are opposed to provisions for State referenda because we agree with the Supreme Court that the Constitution does not permit people to vote away their rights as citizens.

We believe that sufficient leeway is permitted under the Supreme Court decisions to allow for drawing district lines which take into account regional interests and political boundaries needed for easier administration of elections. We do not believe that the Federal analogy holds; the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives does not provide a model for the States because no political entity within a State has an independent existence or authority not given it by the State.

League members in certain areas of the State are perfectly aware that their areas have been overrepresented, and those in other areas that theirs have been underrepresented, and both are equally indignant about it. They believe that it is grossly unfair for one person's vote to carry several times as much weight as another's, simply by virtue of his place of residence.

Personal regards,

HELEN LEVIN,
Mrs. Ezra Levin,
President.

LAY TAXES, PAY DEBTS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several days ago there was carried in the Cleveland Press an editorial "Lay Taxes, Pay Debts." The main point of the editorial is that the Congress of the United States has not been living up to its constitutional responsibilities. The editorial asks:

> Has Congress lived up to its responsibilities?

It gives the answer:

> Obviously not, when our Government owes more than $321 billion and each day is spending $30 million in excess of revenues.
>
> Obviously not, when we are engaged in undeclared wars and a multiplicity of other activities under blanket authorizations and blanket appropriations, and the money which Congress coined continues to decline in value.

I concur with the views of the writer of this particular editorial which expressly and impliedly argues that it is the responsibility of the Congress by taxation to provide the moneys to defer the spending programs instituted by it.

No proof is needed to establish the fact that if the Congress assumed its responsibility of levying the taxes needed to produce the moneys for the financing of the many programs adopted by it, its enthusiasm for the spending and giving away of moneys would be materially lessened.

We in the Congress are willing to enjoy the political profit that allegedly comes from spending programs but are unwilling to suffer the political harm that comes from the placement of burdensome taxes on the shoulders of the taxpayers.

We escape the harm by the clever manipulation of borrowing the needed money, increasing the national debt and comforting ourselves by passing the burden of paying the debt upon future generations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Cleveland Press be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Jan. 10, 1966]

"LAY TAXES, PAY DEBTS"

Congress returns to Washington today, and it is a good time to read again from the U.S. Constitution, concerning congressional responsibilities.

There are majestic phrases in our national charter showing the faith and trust our Republic's founders reposed in our elected representatives. Quoting only a part of article 1, section 8, delineating the powers of Congress—

"To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States * * *.

"To borrow money on the credit of the United States.

"To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States * * *.

"To coin Money, Regulate the value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.

"To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal * * *."

Has Congress lived up to its responsibilities?

Obviously not, when our Government owes more than $321 billion and each day is spending $30 million in excess of revenues.

Obviously not, when we are engaged in undeclared wars and a multiplicity of other activities under blanket authorizations and blanket appropriations, and the money which Congress coined continues to decline in value.

But each year Congress meets afresh and can assert its powers and discharge its responsibilities, if it has the fortitude to do so.

The administration has indicated it will ask Congress for an extra $10 or $12 billion appropriations to fuel the war, but so far it has not indicated that it will ask Congress to lay taxes to pay for it. Congress doesn't need to be asked; it has primary duty.

It makes neither moral nor economic sense to put off the paying for this war until the men who are fighting it can come home to be taxed, or worse still that it be paid out of the diminishing value of the pensions of their widows and orphans.

PROPOSED DISCONTINUANCE OF PASSENGER SERVICE ON THE NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN & HARTFORD RAILROAD—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY TOWN OF MAMARONECK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an extract from the minutes of a regular meeting of the town board of the town of Mamaroneck, N.Y., protesting the proposed discontinuance of passenger service on the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.

There being no objection, the extract from the minutes was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF MAMARONECK, HELD JANUARY 19, 1966

Resolved, That this board herewith joins with the village of Pelham Manor in protesting the discontinuance of passenger service on the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, and to that end unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"RESOLUTION REGARDING APPLICATION OF NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN & HARTFORD RAILROAD CO., TRUSTEES, TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION TO DISCONTINUE ALL INTERSTATE PASSENGER TRAINS—INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION FINANCE DOCKET NO. 23831

"Whereas there is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission an application by the trustees of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. to discontinue all interstate passenger trains, being Finance Docket No. 23831; and

"Whereas the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad is the only direct means of public transportation between the town of Mamaroneck, which includes the villages of Larchmont and Mamaroneck, and Grand Central Terminal in New York City and between said town and villages and other Westchester County communities and communities located on the said railroad right-of-way in the State of Connecticut; and

"Whereas said town is a first-class town of over 30,000 residents and a great number of its residents use said railroad daily for the purpose of transportation from the town and villages of Larchmont and Mamaroneck to their respective places of business in New York City; and

"Whereas many residents of the town and villages purchased homes in said town and villages relying on the public transportation furnished by the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.; and

"Whereas the discontinuance of the passenger service would have an adverse effect on real property values in the said town and villages due to the fact that many of the residents who use the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad would be forced to vacate their residences; and

"Whereas the discontinuance of passenger service would increase the vehicular traffic in the already overcongested traffic in the city of New York; and

"Whereas the merchants and small business people who conduct their business in the neighboring towns and villages rely upon the families of commuting residents, not only of the town of Mamaroneck but of the neighboring communities for their livelihood; and

"Whereas the public convenience and necessity requires the continuance of the passenger service: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That this board opposes the application of the trustees of said railroad to discontinue passenger service and requests permission to intervene and send its representatives to hearings on this matter before the Interstate Commerce Commission: and be it further

"*Resolved,* That George D. Burchell, former supervisor of the said town of Mamaroneck is hereby authorized to appear and testify in said hearings being conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission on behalf of this board and the residents of this town and to take all steps necessary and do all things which he believes to be necessary or expedient on our and their behalf to avoid the discontinuance of passenger service over the right-of-way of said railroad, and to cooperate with other municipalities that are or will be affected by a discontinuance of passenger service and with the interested governmental departments or agencies of the State of New York, the county of Westchester, the State of Connecticut and its affected municipalities; and it is further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Interstate Commerce Commission at its office in Washington, D.C., to Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, to our representatives in the New York State Legislature, to Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, and to Congressman OGDEN R. REID, Office of Transportation of the State of New York, Westchester County Executive Edwin G. Michaelian, County Attorney Gordon Miller, and the mayors of the cities of New Rochelle, Mount Vernon, and Rye, and the villages of Pelham, North Pelham, Larchmont, Mamaroneck, and Portchester, and the supervisors of the towns of Pelham and Harrison."

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of Westchester,
Town of Mamaroneck, ss:

I do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed resolution with the original on file in my office, and that the same is a true and correct transcript therefrom and of the whole of the said original resolution, which was duly passed by the town board of the town of Mamaroneck, a quorum being present, on January 19, 1966.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the corporate seal of said town of Mamaroneck, this 20th day of January 1966.

CHARLES J. GRONBERG,
Town Clerk.

ARTICLE BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY IN TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, one of the finest tributes paid to our American free enterprise system appeared in the December 1965 issue of the Reader's Digest. It was written by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

In this article, our former colleague summarized many of the great achievements of American business. He pointed out that the profits which it makes are indispensable—not only for rewarding talent and investment, but for full employment, for fulfilling needs of our people and for financing the widest variety of philanthropic and other public service activities.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article, "America's Great Success Story," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S GREAT SUCCESS STORY

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States)

(NOTE.—The Vice President analyzes and emphasizes the manifold sources of this country's record of progress.)

"My dad's in business," a young man said to me recently, "but I want to go into public service." He obviously felt that he spoke of two completely different careers. It was not the first time I had heard this sentiment.

I am, in fact, surprised at the number of young people who believe that business and public service have nothing to do with each other. I will be most frank: there are still in America today some young people with a negative picture of business. This is despite the fact that our profit system has conferred more benefits upon more people than any other economic system in history. A young man eager for public service might well go into business. He can become a part of private enterprise, not with a sense that his interest is in personal gain, but with a feeling of pride that he is serving his country's future.

Too many people—particularly those who grew up in the depression—used to think that government had all the answers. They felt the way to get at unemployment was for the Federal Government to increase spending. But we have found that economic well-being depends on many things. There is no single answer to full employment, to growth or to price stability.

One thing is certain: the real dynamic force in American economic life is private initiative itself.

We believe in the profit system. We agree with Samuel Gompers, that old warrior of labor, who once said, in effect, that the greatest crime against the workingman is a business that fails to make a profit. When the plant gate closes, the jobs inside disappear.

A businessman makes a profit—hopefully—when he makes a good product, manages his operation efficiently and performs a needed service. Government encourages such profitmaking. For profits reduce revenues.

This year our gross national product will leap to a record $670 billion, marking the fifth consecutive year of substantial economic expansion.

Corporate profits after taxes have risen for 4½ straight years—from $24.4 billion in the beginning of 1961 to $44.2 billion by mid-1965.

Meanwhile, the average weekly wage in manufacturing has risen to a record level of more than $106. Nearly 70 million Americans are employed—the rate of unemployment dropped from 5.7 percent in 1963 to 4.5 percent by mid-1965. Prices have remained relatively stable, with consumer prices virtually the same as in 1960.

So much for the numbers. What do they mean?

They mean that our economic machine, fueled by initiative, propelled by our unique system of competitive enterprise, is on the move.

The tax cut of 1964 was consciously used to bolster our private economy—to bring more profits, higher wages, and more jobs to our citizens. The decision to cut taxes represented, above all else, a profound expression of faith in the strength and viability of our free enterprise system. Our year-end balance sheet indicated clearly that this faith had not been misplaced.

The performance of the American economy is one of the great success stories of modern times. Corporate after-tax profits for the first half of this year are 20 percent above the rate for the first half of last year.

This profit is available for investment, expansion, dividends. It is being used, not hidden under fence posts.

The acid test is whether business has the confidence to invest in new plants. This year's planned expenditures, according to the latest Commerce-Securities and Exchange Commission survey, show a 13.5-percent increase over last year. The total is $50.92 billion for this year alone. This is almost double the level of 10 years ago. No other country on the face of the earth can even dream of these figures, much less realize them.

This is the story of America. This is the good news of the world. While the totalitarian economies are in serious trouble, this economy has been going up for 57 consecutive months, every month better than the one before. Out of this prosperity comes the highest standard of living for a workingman anyplace in the world.

American business is doing a splendid job. But somebody ought to say once in a while how well it is done—by avoiding excesses of inventories, by keeping down unnecessary costs, by offering more and better goods and services to customers. And may I say this so it can be heard outside America: No single business group in the world is as humane, as progressive, as liberal as the American businessman and the American business community.

American business provides fringe benefits to its employees unknown elsewhere. The American worker, with his union and management, has hospital care, recreation, good living, and just working conditions. This is what interests the people in Latin America and many other parts of the world. This is what the peasant and the poverty stricken should know.

The Communist comes to them and says, "Follow us. Listen to us." We can reply, "See your American brother's standard of living, see his healthy family, his home, community, church, car, bank account."

Most people in the world want freedom. Most people in the world hunger for better things. Most people in the world want consumer goods. Most people want a chance to do things on their own initiative.

Too few American businessmen realize they are among the world's foremost progressives. See what they have done: They have turned out better products, more of them, and created the highest standard of living on earth.

Profits are not merely for business people. They help all our people. Profits make the most wonderfully progressive country in the world. They make possible not only our Government but our defense, our teachers, our doctors, research and exploration. Profits go into support for community chests, colleges and countless other humanitarian causes. From profits we help finance constructive activities throughout the world. People everywhere should know that capitalism as we practice it here—not as they practice it in some other places—has more humanitarianism in it than all the social philosophies of all the other countries put together.

The ideals of the Great Society can be realized only through the profits of our economy. In no other way can we pay the cost of the investment in more and better education, manpower, training, aid abroad, and war on poverty at home. We cannot do these things by merely dividing up the same size of pie. We must bake a bigger pie.

The hard facts of life are simply these: we cannot afford to be anything but a prosperous, booming America. We must have increased productivity, rising sales, increased employment, higher wages, and bigger profits. Only under these conditions does the Great Society have meaning. These goals are clearly within reach. Our free enterprise economy still possesses an enormous capacity to grow—and thereby to contribute to greater economic and social justice for every citizen.

And direct participation in that economy—in American business—is public service indeed.

SARGENT SHRIVER, MIRACLE WORKER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, when it was announced that Sargent Shriver was leaving the Peace Corps to devote his full energies to the poverty program, I remarked on the floor of the Senate on the superb job he had done and the great legacy he left.

In a recent column in the Washington Post Drew Pearson pays eloquent and moving tribute to Shriver and the great job he has done for this country and mankind in the Peace Corps. I ask unanimous consent that the excerpt from the Pearson article referring to Shriver be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Exit a Miracle Worker

> If Sargent Shriver had been getting out of Government altogether instead of shifting from the Peace Corps to the Office of Economic Opportunity, his exit would have brought many favorable editorials. Because he was merely shifting jobs, however, his exit from the Peace Corps was hardly noticed at all.
>
> No man in the many years I have been covering Washington, however, has done such an inspiring and efficient job in organizing a new Government agency from scratch and making it a vibrant, dynamic instrument around the world.
>
> I have seen other executives wrestle with new Government bureaus and get fouled up in redtape. But Shriver cut the tape, built with amazing speed, used excellent judgment in picking personnel, created a governmental miracle.
>
> More important, he won the confidence and admiration of young people. Thousands of youngsters joined the Peace Corps because they wanted to do something for their country and for world peace. Many stayed on because Shriver asked them to. They knew that he was knocking himself out every night working for them, and they wanted to help achieve his goals.
>
> Mr. Johnson has appointed a good man to replace Shriver, Jack Vaughn, but he will have a hard time equaling the Herculean job Shriver has done.

THE ATLANTA JOURNAL AND CONSTITUTION CALLS FOR A FULL-SCALE GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mrs. Neuberger in the chair). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, the prestigious and influential Atlanta Journal and Constitution, in an editorial in keeping with the high quality of its writing, has called for the passage now of a meaningful GI bill, and not a little, watered-down bill.

I should like to read about three sentences from the editorial, as follows:

> The Senate passed a bill patterned after the one enacted for those who saw military service during the Korean war. It never came to a vote in the House.
>
> The administration is now said to favor a minimum package of education benefits for those who serve during the Vietnam fighting. It would be markedly less liberal than the Senate's legislation.

The Atlanta Journal and Constitution goes on to say:

> If the economy is in such good shape, then the current crop of veterans should not be asked to settle for less than those of a decade ago.

This editorial is in keeping with the fine policies of that newspaper, as stated on so many issues before the American people in recent years. Madam President, this little, watered-down bill is called by some a "hotspot" bill; it is called by others a "pockmark" bill, a "smallpox" bill, a "little pocket" bill. It is called everything because, as stated in the Congressional Record a few days ago, as shown by a release of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, it would cover only

126,000 veterans out of our 5 million veterans of the cold war, leaving 4,874,000 uncovered.

So I am hopeful that the House Veterans' Affairs Committee will adopt the Senate bill, which offers a measure of education to 5 million veterans of the cold war. I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial from the Atlanta Journal and Constitution of January 23, 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW GI BILL

A logical piece of business left unfinished by the last session of Congress was a new GI bill for veterans of the Vietnam fighting.

The Senate passed a bill patterned after the one enacted for those who saw military service during the Korean war. It never came to a vote in the House.

The attitude of the administration didn't help its chances. The Defense Department said it feared the bill would attract men to leave the Armed Forces. The Veterans' Administration argued that military service today "does not present on a widespread basis the same rigors and hazards as found during wartime."

That contention appears ready to fall by the wayside—if it isn't already there. The fighting has been hot and heavy for some time. The news from Vietnam paints it as hazardous a place as Korea during that conflict. And the buildup of U.S. forces points to an American commitment as great as that made in Korea.

Also, as the Defense Department well knows, the fighting was still well underway in Korea when the last GI bill was enacted.

The administration is now said to favor a minimum package of education benefits for those who serve during the Vietnam fighting. It would be markedly less liberal than the Senate's legislation.

This is not exactly in keeping with the way the President has underscored the national prosperity and its ability to afford "butter and guns." If the economy is in such good shape then the current crop of veterans should not be asked to settle for less than those of a decade ago.

ADDRESS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE OHIO FARM BUREAU

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, President Johnson's farm policy creates new promises and new hope for farmers and all rural Americans. It gives new assurance of economic stability and security and new opportunity for our rural youth. The President's program recognizes the day-to-day problems that confront the men and women who live and work on our Nation's farms. It attempts to cure the many problems that have resulted from our rapidly changing rural economy in the past 30 years. It offers the opportunity to rural America to broaden its economic base and to increase the opportunities which it can offer to the children of its farmers.

This Democratic administration will continue to seek solutions to enable our family farmers to enjoy a decent standard of living from their labors.

Americans will continue to benefit from the fruits of an agricultural abundance unparalleled in any other country in the world. Our Nation is being, and will continue to be, served by the most efficient farmers in the world—farm families that own and operate their own land. At the same time we will use part of our agricultural abundance and our technical skills in agriculture to assist the underdeveloped nations in the world and to help feed the millions of men, women, and children the world over who go to sleep hungry every night.

Madam President, one out of five citizens in my State of Ohio earns his living from working the land. They and all other American farmers deserve to share in the economic prosperity of our Nation. President Johnson's farm program will not cure all the problems facing our farmers; however, it is a big step toward accomplishing that.

On November 18, 1965, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY addressed the annual meeting of the Ohio Farm Bureau at Columbus, Ohio. In his outstanding speech he set forth clearly the goals of this administration to restore parity of opportunity and an adequate income to farmers and all rural Americans and to bring our agricultural abundance to the 2 billion people in our world who are faced with imminent hunger or famine or are subsisting on barely marginal diets. I commend this speech to my fellow Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, ANNUAL MEETING OF THE OHIO FARM BUREAU, COLUMBUS, OHIO, NOVEMBER 18, 1965

It is good to be back among my friends of the Ohio Farm Bureau.

You have worked for many years so that economic and social well-being might be achieved for all rural America.

One of the ironies of our time is that, despite the incredible efficiency of our farmers, rural America has fallen behind economically while the rest of the Nation has moved ahead to new prosperity and opportunity.

From the beginning of this administration—since January of 1961—it has been the firm conviction of the late President Kennedy and of President Johnson that parity of opportunity and income should be restored to farmers and the people of rural America.

I share that conviction.

And so does a majority of the Members of Congress.

When the Congress passed the Food and Agricultural Act of 1965, it was a major fulfillment of President Johnson's firm request of last February when he said: "Our programs should provide efficient family farmers an opportunity to earn parity of income."

Few people yet realize the significance of this legislation.

No one contends that it will solve all of our farm problems.

But it does represent a major breakthrough toward better farm income, more judicious use of our land resources, and maximum use of our marketing systems both at home and abroad. And it assures a continued adequate supply of food and fiber for all our people.

It will accelerate the progress we have made since 1960 in raising net farm income—income that is $2.3 billion more today than it was 5 years ago. For the average farmer, this means that his realized net income is nearly one-third higher today than it was in 1960.

Experience with the feed grain and wheat programs since 1961 has taught us that direct payments to the farmer who voluntarily reduces his production can strengthen farm income, help eliminate surpluses, and maintain a working balance between production and use.

Furthermore, direct payments enable the marketplace at home and abroad to function more efficiently and more effectively.

The new farm bill will establish a 4-year program for most basic commodities. This will eliminate the uncertainty and confusion which former farm programs imposed on farmers.

It will permit further orderly reductions in surplus feed grain stocks and will reduce the Commodity Credit Corporation investment by $1.4 billion.

The feed grain program is the best stabilizer ever devised for the livestock and poultry industry. Livestock men need no longer gamble from year to year as to the price of feed. Now they can make long-term plans.

One of the most important sections of the bill is the cropland adjustment program. We have learned the wisdom in recent years of diverting land not presently needed to new uses or to conservation purposes.

The cropland adjustment program provides land adjustment contracts for as long as 10 years. But, most importantly, it contains proper safeguards so that no single county or area will be decimated of its farms.

These contracts will enable the farmer to make his plans on a long-range basis. In addition, the program will make land more readily available for new uses, particularly for outdoor recreation and beautification.

Already, conservation, wildlife and recreation groups are discussing with State and Federal officials how best to administer the program to serve this multiple purpose.

The new legislation also recognizes that the marketplace is the best mechanism to determine the flow and pace of commercial agriculture.

Farm products no longer will move in domestic and world markets at artificially high prices.

Instead they will be guided by the conditions of supply and demand.

At the same time, the farmer will be protected from depressed income by the payments he receives in return for his cooperation in diverting acres to uses other than crop production.

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 provides the flexibility necessary to keep pace with a dynamic and changing agriculture.

For the majority of commercial family farmers, it brings closer than ever the goal of income which will enable them to remain on the land.

It will enable this Nation to produce food and fiber in the quantities we need when we need it—with increased efficiency—and at modest cost in terms of benefits to producers, consumers, and taxpayers.

The American people will continue to be better fed and better clothed, at lower cost, than ever before. And this will be a remarkable achievement when you consider that today we spend less than 19 cents of our take-home dollar for food—far less than any other country in the world.

More of our people will share in our abundance. And nutritional standards will be vastly improved by the food stamp program and the school lunch and special milk programs.

The day of needless and expensive surpluses will end. Surpluses which once existed in wheat and feed grains already are nearly gone. The heavy surpluses we now have in cotton and tobacco will steadily disappear. We shall always, however, provide for adequate reserves of food and fiber necessary for national security and emergencies.

More and more, American farmers will be called upon to supply world markets. They will be better able to do so because they will be competitive. Farm exports have been more than $6 billion for the last 2 years, which means that more than 1 out of every 5 acres of farm production goes into world markets. In 10 years, our exports should exceed $8 billion.

American abundance will become even more critically important as the struggle for freedom around the world continues and as nation after nation outruns its capacity to feed a growing population.

Today, 2 billion out the world's 3 billion people either face imminent hunger and famine or are subsisting on barely marginal diets.

In the year 2000—just 35 years from now—world population will probably be 6 billion. American abundance and agricultural know-how are the only hopes for many of these people for maintaining their subsistence and for building productive economies of their own.

We will continue to move on many fronts to raise the standard of living of rural America and create new opportunities for its people.

New education programs will close the lag that places the rural schoolchild 2 years behind the urban child in educational achievement.

A new rural housing program will close the housing gap in rural America where one out of four homes should be replaced or given major repairs.

A new community facilities bill of loans and grants will revitalize some 15,000 rural towns and villages that are without water or sewer facilities, without fire protection, without recreation facilities.

President Johnson has declared war on poverty. That includes poverty in rural America, where half the Nation's lowest income families live. We are going to win the war.

Today we have a President, and a Congress, who care about people and their problems.

Today we have an American Nation with faith in itself and in the future.

This is the most exciting, most dynamic—and potentially most rewarding—era of all our history.

We have the means, and the determination, to strive for greatness, for brotherhood, for lasting peace.

We will succeed.

ABOUT TIME—DEFENSE OF WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, now, more than 20 years after World War II, the nations of Western Europe continue to evade the responsibility for their own defense. We are still there in force as a conquering power.

It is astonishing, but the fact is that the total number of men of our Armed Forces in Western Europe—West Germany, France, Spain, and England—is 345,000. We have nearly 650,000 men in our Armed Forces and their dependent wives and children living in Western Europe, helping fatten the economy of West Germany, France, Spain, and England. These countries are considered our allies and friends, but not one of them has sent even one combat soldier to aid us in South Vietnam.

Is it not time for us to withdraw most of our GI's from Europe? The West German and French Governments should relieve us of some of this excess pressure. Why should not these highly prosperous nations defend themselves with their own soldiers from any threatened Russian aggression, which at the moment seems nonexistent? We bear their burden which has caused a tremendous strain on our economy and our military manpower requirements. They, our allies, have given us no aid whatever in Vietnam, while little Korea has sent 20,000 of its finest troops to fight alongside our soldiers.

Madam President, the outflow of gold from our country is not due primarily to American tourists traveling abroad. One of the biggest factors in our chronic deficit-of-payments problem is the fact that we are maintaining 643,000 men of our Armed Forces and their dependents in Western Europe. The cost of doing so plus the amounts of money spent by service families compelled to rent houses and apartments of German and French landlords at exorbitant prices has helped reduce our gold reserves.

It is further a matter for astonishment that 20 years after the close of World War II we have such a huge number of combat troops in West Germany at a time when the West German Government is spending this year only 2½ percent of its total national budget on its Armed Forces. Contrast this with the fact that our Nation will spend for national defense 60 percent of its budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. Our President and his advisers in the State Department should not concern themselves over whether or not the feelings of the civilian leaders of that country or of other West European governments would be hurt because we finally, after all these years, return to the United States a substantial number of our men and their dependents. In view of the fact that these allies have refused to send any soldiers to aid us in Vietnam, thousands of these trained soldiers of the United States should be reassigned to Vietnam and other areas of the world where they are really needed. Then let the German Chancellor and De Gaulle scream in anguish. Let us quit catering to the West German and French Governments. With friends like De Gaulle one can well say the United States does not need any enemies.

If there is any truth whatever to the claim that the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union presently menace Western Europe, no dependents should be permitted to accompany our servicemen. Why should we Americans complain about the outflow of gold and restrict expenditures of American tourists in connection with their trips abroad when the real spenders are the hundreds of thousands of dependents stationed in Western Europe? Defense Secretary McNamara would do well to order the immediate return of at least 100,000 men of our Armed Forces and 150,000 of their dependents from France, Spain, and West Germany. Hereafter, officers and men should be sent for a tour of duty in Europe of not more than 13 months instead of 3 years; and their dependents should not be allowed to accompany them.

In the years following World War II, there was a real threat of Soviet aggression in Western Europe and the nations of that area, ravished by World War II, required the presence of our Armed Forces to deter the Russians. Stalin was then dictator of the Soviet Union. A bitter cold war was waged against us, not only in Berlin but elsewhere. That situation no longer exists. The threat of a military aggression by the Communists in Europe has all but vanished. The present rulers of the Soviet Union are no longer rattling their missiles. The Russians are veering toward capitalism. The nations of Western Europe are strong enough today, both militarily and economically, to cope with whatever danger remains and provide for a much greater share of their defense needs. Furthermore, by our Operation Airlift we have proven we can airlift a combat-ready division to West Germany from the Continental United States in a matter of hours.

Madam President, I recently received a very thoughtful letter on this subject from a constituent, an officer in our Armed Forces in Germany. His comments and viewpoints are so clearly, concisely, and logically set forth that I commend his letter to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 28, 1965.

Hon. STEPHEN M. YOUNG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: After 2 months in Germany I am forced to agree with your recent proposal to withdraw a substantial portion of our forces. I have visited, talked to, and observed many American military personnel of high and low rank and believe they are living exceedingly well. Those who are not (particularly senior noncommissioned officers) choose to live in substandard economy quarters to save money. In driving through the former U.S. sector of Germany it appears that literally dozens of towns have U.S. military garrisons, complete with all the trappings of peacetime service—PX, clubs, etc. In Wiesbaden the Air Force has a recently expanded shopping center that can best be described as a department store in the heart of Germany. The line soldiers in the field do really soldier. But, as I am sure you know, for each of them there are six or seven behind them—supply, clerical, medical, dependents, civilian employees (civil service, industry technical representatives, teachers, nonappropriated funds, etc., United States as well as German). Drastic consolidations or elimination of nonessential activities and reductions in personnel are definitely in order. Elimination of superfluous tactical units, as you have proposed, should trigger a corresponding decrease in administrative activities.

It is obvious to me that the Germans, especially those in low-level positions of authority, do not like us and do not want us here. They tolerate us because it is to their material advantage to do so. They insult Americans and kick them around at every opportunity, but we continue to take it and subsidize their economy. The Teutonic traits of superiority have not changed and "Deutschland uber Alles" is still the national creed.

Germany is prosperous and well able to finance its own defense. We Americans should wake up and take a realistic and practical approach to our commitments. I cannot conceive of any other nation so freely distributing largess as we do. Certainly Germany, if it were in America's position, would insist on, and get, its pound of flesh, with interest. And there are too many U.S. generals and colonels happy with things as fat as they are. What is needed is a sharp knife. The Germans would survive and secretly admire us for it while publicly screaming as if their collective throat had been cut.

As a former manpower specialist in the Army, it occurred to me that, in line with your idea of curtailing activities over here, you and your distinguished colleagues might find some form of a facts and figures study useful. Before my retirement in 1963 I was the manpower chief for the 4th U.S. Army at San Antonio, Tex., for 4½ years. In this capacity I was successful in achieving a measure of economy in the use of personnel, although I was sometimes overruled by my superiors who often had no stomach for deflating the empire-building tendencies of their subordinate commands.

I propose the conduct of a congressional manpower management analysis or survey of the military structure in Europe with a view to reducing those activities still programed for retention which prove to be unnecessary. I would be glad to discuss the matter further, should you so desire, in any manner you might consider appropriate.

Very truly yours,

——— ———,

Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army.

WALL STREET JOURNAL NOTES HOFFA INDICTMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal's "Bookshelf" there appears an article entitled "Teamsters Hoffa Gets a Vigorous Indictment."

This article is an excellent synopsis of the recent book "Tentacles of Power" written by Clark Mollenhoff. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Teamsters Hoffa Gets a Vigorous Indictment

An ugly and unique feature of some American trade unions, large and small, is their close identification with hoodlums, convicted criminals and racketeers who bring with them an unsavory aroma of violence, extortion, and corruption. When Victor Riesel, courageous journalist and specialist in trade union affairs, went to Germany after being blinded by acid thrown by some revengeful thug, a West Berlin journalist assured him that such a thing would be unthinkable in Germany, although a few West Berlin journalists had been kidnaped and spirited away by agents of the East German Communist police.

Evidence of misdeeds that had nothing to do with legitimate labor aims and aspirations (racketeers prey equally on employers and rank-and-file union members) piled up in enormous detail during the investigation conducted by Senator McClellan, of Arkansas. Much of this evidence pointed directly at Jimmy Hoffa, boss of the big Teamsters Union. A teamster in the old-fashioned meaning of the word is hard to come by in this age; Hoffa's million and a half tributaries are truckdrivers and various categories of miscellaneous workers who have been more or less voluntarily recruited in the big union.

During its sessions the McClellan committees frequently made headlines. But newspaper publicity is a transitory thing and Clark R. Mollenhoff, midwestern reporter who won a Pultizer Prize for getting on the Teamsters story and staying with it, has performed a genuine public service by putting together in "Tentacles of Power" what Hoffa and his merry men and others of the same type have done. Following the story brought Mr. Mollenhoff on the trail of some rare underworld characters. So we are introduced to Hoffa henchmen in New York, Johnny Dioguardi and Tony (Ducks) Corallo, the former a labor racketeer, the latter a convicted narcotics law violator.

THE 40 FELONS

According to Mr. Mollenhoff these 2 characters had brought into the labor movement 40 men who had convictions for crimes that included extortion, burglary, accessory to murder, robbery, bookmaking, possession of stolen mail, bootlegging, larcency, dope peddling and bribery. Shades of "Ali Baba and the 40 Thieves."

A man of driving energy and ability, austere in his personal habits, Hoffa built up a formidable virtual monopoly of road transportation. At his disposal were almost unlimited financial resources. Like the robber barons of the Middle Ages, whose ruined castles still dot the shores of the Rhine and the Danube, Hoffa felt himself above all law. Mr. Mollenhoff in vivid reporter's prose shows how he operated:

"For Hoffa's hoodlum empire there was almost complete protection. When grand juries got out of hand, Hoffa provided his subordinates with the best criminal lawyers. Often they went to trial before judges who had been softened by Teamster's political contributions.

"When these safeguards misfired, as they occasionally did, Hoffa paid the fines out of the union treasury and continued the salaries of the Teamster's officers and business agents who went to prison."

Who were these "business agents"? Well, there was Frank Kierdorf, who had served two penitentiary terms for armed robbery before Hoffa took him up and teamed him with Jack Thompson, another convicted armed robber turned "business agent."

Hoffa's apologists credit him with a humanitarian interest in "rehabilitating" men who had served jail sentences. This explanation would be more convincing if so many of these ex-convicts had not continued their criminal ways in the service of Hoffa. It was a long, difficult chase from Senate committee room to courts of law and back again. But retribution finally caught up with the tough little union boss, who once barked at Mollenhoff.

"Now looka here, Clark. They don't pay newspaper reporters enough for you to be giving me the bad time you've been giving me. Every man has his price. What's yours?"

TWO JAIL SENTENCES

Hoffa is now under two jail sentences on separate charges, one for 8 years for tampering with a jury, the other for 5 years for gross misuse of union funds. Whether he can dodge one or both of these raps remains to be seen. His grip on the Teamsters Union is still unbroken.

Mr. Mollenhoff's book could stand pruning. It is not as well organized as it might be and is repetitious. But it is a superb, boiled down record of the doings and misdeeds of some very ugly Americans, largely based on the voluminous records of the McClellan committee, spiced and freshened by the author's own experiences as a reporter.

A less unfavorable view of Hoffa is conveyed in "Hoffa and the Teamsters: A Study of Union Power," by a husband-and-wife team of industrial relations experts, Ralph James and Estelle Dinerstein James. They were given access to the files of the Teamsters Union and allowed to follow all Hoffa's movements for 3 months in order, at Hoffa's request, to present a true picture of the Teamsters' activities. Naturally such a book lays more stress on Hoffa's ability as an organizer, less on the hoodlum antecedents of many of his henchmen and associates. The authors point out that Hoffa has called few strikes, that on some issues he has taken the side of management in disputes and that some employers find one big union easier to deal with than several rival fragmented groups.

But such passages as the following confirm the essential truth of the picture painted in Mr. Mollenhoff's far more vigorous and colorful indictment:

"Hoffa looks upon moderate doses of violence as merely another acceptable means for obtaining his ends. As recently as 1962, I heard him order the beating of a man 3,000 miles away, and on another occasion I heard him instruct his cadre on precisely how to ambush nonunion truckdrivers with gun fire—to frighten them, not to kill."—William Henry Chamberlin.

THE GOOD CONSCIENCE OF SENATOR LAUSCHE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal there appeared an editorial complimenting Senator Lausche for his efforts to save the taxpayers $9½ million on Interama.

I ask unanimous consent that this well-deserved tribute be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Good Conscience of Senator Lausche

The way Congress behaves sometimes you'd never know that the United States is waging a major war on the other side of the globe or that the Nation's financial problems are, to say the least, immense. For the Senate of the United States has voted to spend $9.5 million of the people's money as the Government's contribution to a commercial Florida trade fair.

If you believe the proponents of the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, to be located on 1,700 swampy acres north of Miami Beach, it will help solve half the problems in this hemisphere. Florida's Senator Holland, for one, says that the Miami area's huge growth lately and the influx of Cuban refugees have created "a tremendous unemployment problem" which the center, known as Interama for short, will alleviate. Moreover, the project will, it is contended, cement cultural and commercial links between the United States and Latin America and otherwise be a great boon to the Alliance for Progress.

So far, however, the chief beneficiaries have been lobbyists for the project's private promoters who in the past 4 years have been paid more than $50,000 to try to persuade Members of Congress that governmental support is as essential for Interama as it is, say, for the national defense.

"Lobbyists," observes Ohio's Senator Lausche, "have infested the halls of Congress. Bankers, lawyers, friends—they've all asked me to lay off. But I am compelled by my judgment and my good conscience to oppose this project." It is, he said, a "new, indefensible, infamous pork barrel."

The good conscience of Senator Lausche as it turned out, got mighty little support. The vote to ladle public funds into this venture for private profit wasn't even close: 56 to 18.

No one need bother to look to the House to resist the Florida allure. Last fall the House voted to pour about $15 million into Interama. If that body agrees to the Senate's $9.5 million figure, it would not be surprising to find some Congressmen hailing such a compromise as a saving of almost $6 million.

There may nonetheless be some small satisfaction for Senator Lausche and the 17 Senators who voted with him. They, at least, will have an honest deed to boast of when they face their constituents.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] for short remarks, before my time begins under the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator's request is granted, and the Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania.

UPCOMING TRIAL OF BOBBY BAKER

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I notice that the trial of Bobby Baker is slated for October 17 of this year.

The date is significant to anyone who has practiced law as long as I have.

The purpose of this listing unquestionably is in order to permit able counsel for Bobby Baker to come in and say that any defendant is entitled to at least one continuance or postponement and then, of course, it will be postponed until after the 1966 elections, in order to avoid embarrassment all around.

Obviously, if there were any intention to expose the case of Bobby Baker to public view prior to November, the case would have been listed earlier, or at least during the month of September. Then Baker's counsel could have asked for a continuance, which would have gone over for a month, and then the case could have been tried.

Madam President, this is a palpable scheme to avoid having the further problems of Bobby Baker and his misdoings—if they shall be so termed by a jury—exposed to public view before election time.

Politics has again reared its ugly head in the trial of a person formerly connected with the Senate who greatly abused his public trust.

I thank the Senator from Delaware for yielding to me.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THREE MEMBERS OF THE CHILEAN CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madame President, it is my privilege and honor to introduce to the Senate three members of the Chilean Parliament who are visiting Washington today as guests of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

I should like to ask each member to rise when I introduce him.

Hon. Pedro Stark Troncoso.

Hon. Dr. Julio Montt Momberg.

Hon. Ricardo Valenzuela Saez.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

POLITICAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, our existing laws dealing with campaign contributions both by corporations and individuals either are wholly inadequate or through inadequate enforcement have become ineffective.

In recent years interpretations have been placed upon existing laws whereby political parties can solicit and accept large contributions from corporations under the guise of classifying these contributions as advertising in campaign folders, and under rulings by the Treasury Department they are being permitted to write these contributions off as normal business expenses.

These recent interpretations both by the Treasury Department and the Justice Department in effect nullify the effectiveness of our existing laws.

As an example of how under the Great Society these campaign contributions, which heretofore were considered illegal, are now being openly solicited and accepted I invite attention to the recent 178-page publication eulogizing the 1st session of the 89th Congress, which was released in November under the title "Toward an Age of Greatness."

This document was prepared for distribution at a Democratic fund-raising affair, and advertising space was sold to major corporations, in particular to defense contractors, at $15,000 per page.

Let there be no misunderstanding—this is not normal advertising, but rather it represents a "shakedown" of those industries who are doing or who hope to do business with the U.S. Government.

The only advantage of a corporation having its $15,000 full-page ad appear in such a campaign document is to let those officials who are in positions to award contracts or render important decisions which affect their companies, know that it is a friend of the administration.

Leaders of the Republican Party very understandably are now saying that if this unique—and heretofore considered unethical—avenue of raising campaign money is open for the Democrats, then they too will use the same procedure.

But this is not the solution. It only compounds the wrong. The proper remedy is for us all to join in putting a stop to this practice, which if allowed to continue can undermine the confidence and respect which the citizens have for the Government.

To put it in plain, blunt words—unless this practice is stopped we are opening the doors to political blackmail.

When accounts of this most recent multimillion-dollar spectacular appeared in the press last December I sent copies to the Department of Justice and asked for a ruling on the legality of such a fundraising procedure by soliciting contributions from corporations.

I have received a reply dated January 10, 1966, from the Department of Justice signed by Mr. Fred M. Vinson, Jr., Assistant Attorney General, in which he states that after an examination of this particular brochure the Department of Justice has reached the conclusion that "the facts within our knowledge do not demonstrate a violation."

In simple language, based on this ruling the lid is off and the sky is the limit as to how far a political party wishes to go in collecting campaign money from corporations—unless, of course, the Treasury and Justice Departments would have the gall to rule that such contributions, or should we say "advertisements," must be made to the Democratic Party.

But why stop at $15,000 a page—why not $100,000 per page from some company which is negotiating a multibillion-dollar defense contract or from an industry vitally concerned with some certain legislative proposal?

Personally, I am of the opinion that our existing laws do prohibit such practices. Our existing laws are very clear. Heretofore our laws had always been interpreted as placing a ceiling on the amount of any one contribution, and our laws specifically spell out a prohibition against any corporation or union making political contributions.

But as long as the Treasury and Justice Departments condone and encourage this fuzzy method of raising campaign funds by issuing these free-wheeling rulings let us face it—we have no protection against corrupt practices.

Our only solution is to enact a new law stating in plain language clear and rigid rules and then to demand enforcement from our officials. If they persist in closing their eyes to their duty then let the voters call them to task.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks, three articles be printed in the RECORD. The first appeared in the Washington Evening Star in early December 1965, written by Mr. Walter Pincus, entitled "Money and Politics, Fund-raising Book Ready." The second is an article appearing in the Washington Post the following day by Mr. Robert S. Boyd entitled "Full-page Ads at $15,000 Each To Help Party, 68 Firms Finance Johnson Booster Book," and the third is an editorial appearing in the Wall Street Journal of December 14, 1965, entitled "Raising Money the Democratic Way."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I next ask unanimous consent that my correspondence with the Department of Justice under date of December 21, 1965, and their reply thereto dated January 10, 1966, be printed in the RECORD following these articles. In this letter the Department of Justice in effect says it sees no violation of the law in this procedure or raising campaign funds from corporations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, following this I ask unanimous consent that following these articles there be printed in the RECORD two letters from the Treasury Department, the first dated October 26, 1964, and signed by Mr. Bertrand M. Harding, Acting Commissioner, and the second letter dated April 5, 1965, and signed by Mr. Sheldon S. Cohen, Commissioner.

These letters in effect say that the corporations making these campaign contributions when described as "advertising" can be deducted as necessary expenses for income tax purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, both of these letters were incorporated in the Congressional Record of October 12, 1965, at which time I called on the Treasury Department to submit its recommendations to correct this abuse.

President Johnson, in his state of the Union message, indicated that even he is getting embarrassed at the manner in which his party is raising campaign contributions and indicated his willingness to support corrective legislation.

To make sure that this important project is not forgotten in the rush of other Great Society business I am today directing a letter to the Attorney General asking that he submit a copy of the administration's legislative proposals to correct this abuse.

This ingenious scheme for raising campaign funds from corporations was first initiated at the 1964 Democratic National Convention in Atlantic City, and since then it has spread rapidly.

I have talked with representatives of several corporations—many of whom paid the requested $15,000 advertising, and almost unanimously they resent this new approach now being taken and consider it a shakedown of their companies; however, with the power which the administration can wield over their industries they do not feel that individually they can do any other than pay what in effect most of them describe as pure political blackmail.

There are other corrections which are needed in our laws dealing with campaign contributions, some of which I shall be discussing at a later date, but this one loophole should be corrected promptly. Otherwise we shall open up the greatest era of influence peddling ever to hit this Nation's Capital.

If any public official thinks these corporations are going to shell out these $15,000 ads every time a political party starts a fundraising drive without expecting some special consideration in return, then that official is too naive to hold public office.

Madam President, I hold in my hand this interesting brochure entitled, "Toward an Age of Greatness." Throughout we find full-page advertisements from the giants of industry—and I am sure that we will find the same group in the Republican brochure if they proceed along this line. I understand that they are soliciting from the same group of defense contractors. If this practice is allowed to continue, they will feel obligated to contribute to both sides. As I said before, it is a form of political blackmail. We find the giants of the motor industry, General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler, leading the parade along with others who are dealing with multi-million-dollar defense contracts. I find the aviation industry listed in this brochure—the airlines—many of whom are beneficiaries of Government subsidies and have been beneficiaries over the years.

Harvey Aluminum, Continental Can, Aluminum Co. of America, Spiegel, Endicott Johnson, Matson Lines, Sea-Land, United States Lines, General Tire, Fairchild Hiller Corp., Ling-Temco Vought, Inc., Loral Corp., General Precision, Inc., International Telephone & Telegraph, Sperry Rand—are all included as advertisers in this million-dollar brochure entitled "Toward an Age of Greatness."

In reality their $15,000 ads are just plain political contributions to the Democratic Party.

I am not criticizing these companies as much as I am this procedure. They resent the shakedown as much as I do.

They have only followed a procedure that has been ruled by the administration as legal.

The advertisers also include Braniff International, Hughes Aircraft, Lockheed Aircraft, Continental Airlines, Douglas Aircraft, Grumman, Pan American, Eastern, Trans World Airlines, American, Aerodex, and Avco. A couple of large insurance companies are also involved, Prudential and Pierce National Life Insurance.

There are also railroads which advertised, Southern Railway, the Milwaukee, and the Union Pacific.

We find Pepsi-Cola and Coca-Cola with their $15,000 contributions along with the brewing companies, Pabst, Budweiser, and Schlitz. Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., and Gulf Oil Corp. also contributed $15,000 each.

Those are examples of companies that are being shaken down—and it is a shakedown—for $15,000 advertisements which in reality are campaign contributions. Those are only a few out of the list which on this one event contributed over $1 million to the Democratic Party.

I emphasize again that I am not criticizing the companies as much as I am those who conceived this previously considered illegal method or scheme to shake down these corporations.

Do not forget that the most of these contributors or advertisers are defense contractors. Therefore, it is only reasonable to assume that at least a part of these costs—or contributions—will be included in the cost of a defense contract—thereby being paid by the taxpayers.

If it is a cost-plus contract, the company may actually make a profit when this $15,000 advertisement is included as a part of the contract cost.

This practice has been approved by the Treasury Department. Some argue that the money is really being solicited for educational purposes, to educate the voters. Educate them for what—how to vote a Democratic ticket? Ridiculous. I raised this question: Suppose some of the money from the educational fund is later transferred to a political candidate or political party—as we know it is intended to be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I raised the question as to what would happen if this money were transferred over to what is obviously a political purpose. Would it still be considered deductible as a normal business expense even though disguised as advertising? I have not received an answer, but since that question has been raised there have appeared in the press numerous questions showing that officials of the administration are now puzzled as to the legality of the way in which this money was obtained under the label of educational purposes. They now appear to realize that laws do prevent this form of raising campaign money.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of an article by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak entitled "A Fund-Raising Bust," which was published in the Washington Sunday Star of January 23, 1966, be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Jan. 23, 1966]

A FUNDRAISING BUST? DEMOCRATS' BIG PUSH FOR MONEY MAY COME A CROPPER BECAUSE OF TAX PROBLEMS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

That notorious Democratic Party fundraising magazine, modestly entitled "Toward an Age of Greatness," is turning out to be not so great.

Tangled legal complications are confronting advertisers, who paid $1,125,000 to buy space in the slick-paper magazine. It is now questioned whether they can claim a tax deduction for a "business" expense.

Although the whole matter is shrouded in secrecy, some advertisers are threatening to hold up payment for their full-page ads out of fear that the Internal Revenue Service may have been premature in its ruling last fall that the cost of the ads would be deductible.

So concerned is the White House that W. Marvin Watson, Jr., currently President Johnson's most confidential assistant, secretly ordered Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach to study all the legal problems. Hush hush White House meetings have been held.

Even if companies that bought the ads are fully satisfied that there won't be future legal problems over taking a deduction, the problem isn't solved.

The Democratic National Committee can't decide how to pass out the money legally so that Democratic Congressmen can use it next fall without running afoul of election laws prohibiting corporate contributions to a political candidate.

The idea was to allocate the money to "voter education committees," supposedly nonpartisan. But some Congressmen are leery about this gimmick. Thus, what was hailed as a great moneyraising breakthrough may become a great fiasco.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. These writers call attention to some of the problems facing the national committee in trying to dispose of the money in a way which will not be in direct and obvious conflict with the law as it has always been interpreted. Perhaps the ruling of the Department should be that the funds which have been collected by any political party under this illegal procedure must either be used for charitable purposes, or returned to the corporations. This would stop the whole procedure.

I trust that when the President sends his legislative proposals to Congress he will recommend legislation to close any further loopholes that exist in our election laws. More important still is the need for a greater respect for the laws we already have and a more rigid enforcement of them.

Exhibit 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star]

Fund-Raising Book Ready

(By Walter Pincus)

The Democrats newest program book is out, sandwiching verbal praise for President Johnson between advertisements that will mean almost $1 million to help elect his supporters.

Entitled "Toward an Age of Greatness," the 178-page slick picture and text publication eulogizes the last session of Congress. It was prepared to be distributed at Democratic fund-raising movie premieres now underway around the country.

Like its predecessor last year—the Democratic Convention program book—advertisements cost $15,000 a page, a rate roughly equal to that charged by Time magazine.

Fifteen Defense Department contractors and airlines regulated by the Civil Aeronautics Board appear to be major buyers of the 66 advertising pages.

Among the defense contractors are Ford, General Motors, Chrysler, Lockheed Aircraft, Douglas Aircraft and Grumman. Six of the nations domestic airlines also bought ads, including Pan American, Eastern, Trans World Airlines and American.

In order to avoid filing reports on money raised by the program, Democrats set up "independent" State committees on voter education as recipient groups for funds.

The Democratic National Committee, meanwhile, is spending $7,000 to send to 25,000 party wheelhorses around the country another brochure telling what a fine job the President thinks the 89th Congress is doing.

The slick paper, 16-page brochure with color pictures of Johnson on front and back covers was mailed this week to Democratic functionaries, Democratic State legislators and other party members.

The brochure, which cost the committee 28 cents each, consists mainly of pictures of Johnson and Congressmen interspersed with the text of "A Salute to Congress" prepared by the President last October.

Johnson never got to actually deliver the statement but it was released by the White House the night Johnson went to the hospital for his operation. In it, Johnson praised the recent session of Congress as "the greatest in American history."

A committee spokesman said the purpose of the brochure is to let Democratic leaders know what the President said about the achievements of Congress in the hope they will pass it on during the coming congressional elections.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]

Full-Page Ads at $15,000 Each to Help Party—68 Firms Finance Johnson Booster Book

(By Robert S. Boyd)

President Johnson is getting a million-dollar Christmas present from 68 major American corporations.

This blue-ribbon gift comes in the form of full-page ads purchased by defense contractors and other business in a glossy full-color book of tributes to the President's Great Society.

Revenue from the ads—at $15,000 a page will go to help elect Democratic Congressmen next November so they can pass more Johnson legislation.

The 176-page slick-paper book, about the size of Esquire magazine, is entitled, "Toward an Age of Greatness." It contains 11 long articles, signed by Cabinet members and other high Federal officials, detailing the exploits of the administration.

Pictures of the President and snippets of his speeches are scattered through the handsomely illustrated text.

Kicking in $15,000 apiece for the project—a brain child of Democratic National Treasurer Richard Maguire—are such giants of the business establishment as General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, General Tire and Xerox Corp.

Big defense contractors, like Lockheed, Sperry-Rand, Hughes Aircraft, Martin-Marietta, and Ling-Temco Vought, also paid their share.

Harvey Aluminum, which got slapped down by the Administration last month when it tried to raise its prices, bought a page to "join in honoring an illustrious President, a distinguished Congress, and an outstanding administration, impressive in accomplishments and dedicated to the principles of democracy."

Another victim of the aluminum price war, Alcoa, also bought an ad but skipped the schmaltz.

International Telephone & Telegraph used its page to brag of its accomplishments at the Camp Kilmer Job Corps. Elsewhere in the book appears an article by poverty war Chief Sargent Shriver, who holds the strings on ITT's contract.

A number of businesses subject to Federal regulation bought ads—like railroads, airlines, pipelines, and shipping lines eager for Government subsidies.

Southern Railway filled two pages with an impassioned appeal to Congress to cut freight rates.

Pepsi-Cola, whose lawyer is Richard Nixon, bought the inside front cover; Coca-Cola holds down the back cover. Pabst and Schlitz, the beermakers, got inside ads.

Las Vegas' gaudy Sahara Hotel, and New York's upper-crusty Carlyle, favorite of the Kennedy clan, coughed up for the administration.

Six ad pages weren't sold and were donated to worthy causes like saving bonds, antilitterbugs, and the Peace Corps.

Expenses of publishing the book are estimated at less than $100,000.

The remaining $900,000 or so will be turned over to a series of State committees on voter education. Such committees have been organized in about 20 States by Democrats as a thinly disguised fundraising device.

The money is supposed to be used for registration, get out the vote, and other voter education drives—not specifically to elect Democratic Congressman Zilch or defeat Republican Congressman Jones.

However, a spokeman for the Democratic National Committee acknowledged that "obviously, they are going to try to register and vote people who support the President's program."

Even so, the spokesman insisted, the ads do not represent "political contributions" by the corporations, forbidden under the Corrupt Practices Act.

About 250,000 of the books were printed. They will be distributed free to people who attend a series of fundraising movie premieres expected to net another $2 to $3 million for voter education.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 14, 1966]

Raising Money the Democratic Way

Unless you are a member of the faithful and are going to attend one of the fundraising theater galas being put on around the Nation by the Democratic Party, you may not get to see the magazine, "Toward An Age of Greatness," which has been printed in the party's behalf. Which is too bad, because it is some magazine.

Impressive in format—176 pages, about the size of Fortune magazine, embellished with photographs—it contains articles by such public figures as Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz and Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman, all of whom say their Departments are doing a wonderful job for the American people. There is a preface by Vice President Hubert Humphrey who proclaims, among other things, that the 1st session of the 89th Congress "was the greatest of any session of Congress since the Republic began."

There also are some impressive advertisements in the magazine, at $15,000 per page.

Among the advertisers are International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., which mentions its subsidiary, Federal Electric Corp., operator of the Federal Job Corps center at Camp Kilmer, N.J.; General Motors, which does some governmental defense business; Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., which gets its pipeline franchises from the Government; the hotels Sahara in Las Vegas and Carlyle (a favorite Democratic hostelry) in New York City; major aircraft manufacturers including Lockheed, Hughes Aircraft and Grumman, and two aluminum companies. One, Harvey Aluminum, says: "We join in honoring an illustrious President, a distinguished Congress, and an outstanding administration, impressive in accomplishments and dedicated to the principles of Democracy," with a capital D.

The revenue from these advertisers, almost 70 in all, does not, of course, go to the Democratic National Committee for party campaign expenses. The magazine is published by the party's State committee on voter education, so it is an educational venture; if it were a political gimmick all the advertisers could be hauled into court for violating the Corrupt Practices Act. The $900,000 in revenue which the State committees will share is to be used for preelection registration, get-out-the-vote and similar nonpartisan drives.

How many American corporations were approached as potential advertisers but declined to participate we do not know. By and large, though, we'd say they showed considerable courage and pretty good judgment.

Exhibit 2

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., December 21, 1925.

Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Attorney General: Enclosed are copies of two newspaper articles which appeared in recent issues of the Washington papers. One article, which appeared in the Washington Post, was written by Mr. Robert S. Boyd and is entitled "Sixty-eight Firms Finance Johnson Booster-Book." The second article, entitled "Fundraising Book Ready," was written by Mr. Walter Pincus and appeared in the Washington Star. Both of these articles refer to the sale of advertising rates at $15,000 per page in a recent campaign brochure.

Also enclosed is a copy of sections 610, 611 of title 18, United States Code, relating to prohibiting corporations from making contributions to political organizations.

I would appreciate answers to the following:

1. Are these contributions (which are being made under the guise of advertising) in violation of the above-mentioned law or in violation of any other section of Federal law?

(a) If not can we assume that all political parties can use this advertising gimmick as a method of bypassing the law and thereby soliciting contributions from corporations; and if this is possible are we to assume that there will now be no limit as to the amount which a corporation can contribute?

(b) If it should be your determination that this gimmick is in violation of existing law, what steps is the Department taking in the cases outlined?

Yours sincerely,

John J. Williams.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, January 10, 1966.
Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Attorney General has asked me to reply to your letter of December 21, 1965, concerning two newspaper articles, one of which appeared in the Washington Post and the other in the Evening Star. These articles report that various corporations have taken advertising in a publication entitled "Toward an Age of Greatness" and you ask if we can determine, on the basis of these newspaper articles, whether violations of sections 610 and 611 of title 18, United States Code, are indicated.

Section 610, in pertinent part, proscribes corporate contributions or expenditures "in connection with any election at which presidential and vice presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices." The legislative history of section 611 reveals that it is not applicable to corporations.

The Evening Star article, which you forwarded, notes without further comment that the money raised by the publication will go to various "independent" committees on voter education. The Washington Post story states that the money "will be turned over to a series of State Committees on Voter Education," which the author of the story concludes are "a thinly disguised fund-raising device."

Laying aside all conjecture, it is clear that neither newspaper article has demonstrated, or seriously attempted to demonstrate, that the advertising revenue is being used "in connection with any election at which presidential and vice presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices." It may be possible to speculate that at some time in the future the advertising revenue might be employed in other than the publicly announced manner, but you will appreciate that a legal conclusion cannot be predicated on such speculation.

You ask if any other Federal law might be relevant to this matter. We note section 608(b) of title 18 with the comment that, as with section 610, the facts within our knowledge do not demonstrate a violation.

Sincerely,

FRED M. VINSON, Jr.,
Assistant Attorney General.

EXHIBIT 3

OCTOBER 26, 1964.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your letter of September 21, 1964, concerning the deductibility of the costs of advertising space in the programs of the recent Democratic Convention. You inquire whether these expenditures are deductible for income tax purposes and request copies of all rulings issued in this area during the past 3 years.

The question as to whether expenses incurred for advertising in political publications is deductible was clarified in Revenue Ruling 56-343, published in Cumulative Bulletin 1956-2, page 115, which states that expenditures for the purchase of advertising space in the official program of a national political convention constitute ordinary and necessary business expenses, deductible from gross income under section 162(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, provided such expenditures are reasonable in amount and bear a direct relation to the advertiser's business. However, to the extent that amounts paid for such advertising (1) are not reasonable in amount, (2) do not bear a direct relation to the advertiser's business, or (3) exceed the advertising value of the space required, they will be considered as contributions to a political organization and are not allowable as deductions for income tax purposes.

Also, in the case of *Denise Coal Company, et al.* v. *Commissioner,* 29 T.C. 528 (1957) acquiescence C.B. 1958-2, 5, the Tax Court held that an expenditure for the cost for an advertisement in the 1948 Democratic National Convention program represented an ordinary and necessary business expense and was deductible for income tax purposes.

The Commissioner proposed to disallow the $7,500 paid by Denise for the space in the program on the grounds that it represented a political contribution. The expenditure was considered to be a political contribution mainly because the president of the company, Charles J. Margiotti, was a prominent political figure in Pennsylvania and because the subject matter extrolled the Democratic Party rather than Denise's products.

The Tax Court was satisfied from the record that the purpose in making the expenditure was to publicize and create good will for Denise. In sustaining the taxpayer, the court noted that Denise's name clearly appeared on the page, the page itself was printed in very attractive color form, and the readers of the program undoubtedly knew who sponsored the page in question. In addition, the court stated that the fact Denise's advertising expenses in other years were much less than in 1948 did not render the expense nondeductible, and the fact that advertising in a different medium or in a different manner might have achieved more desirable results did not require it to substitute its judgment for that of the taxpayer.

The Commissioner acquiesced in the decision merely because it was a factual determination, supported by some evidence and could not be said to be clearly erroneous.

No rulings have been issued with respect to this matter during the past 3 years since final determinations must be made by the appropriate field offices upon examination of the income tax returns in which the deductions are claimed based on the facts in each particular case.

We are enclosing a copy of Revenue Ruling 56-343 and a copy of each of the published rulings cited therein and trust that this letter will supply the information you requested.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

BERTRAND M. HARDING,
Acting Commissioner.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1965.
Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your letter of January 26, 1965, commenting on our letter of October 26, 1964, concerning expenditures for the purchase of advertising space in the programs of the 1964 Democratic Convention. You request advice whether the cost of tickets to political fundraising dinners is deductible as a business expense and wish to be furnished with copies of all rulings issued on this question during the past 5 years. You also request advice whether payments for tickets or boxes at the inaugural balls would be considered as necessary business expenses and thereby deductible for tax purposes.

Our letter of October 26 should not be interpreted to mean that all expenditures for the purchase of advertising space in the official programs of national political conventions constitute ordinary and necessary business expenses deductible from gross income. These expenditures are deductible only if they meet the various tests outlined in our letter.

It is the position of the Internal Revenue Service that, to the extent the cost of tickets to a dinner held for the purpose of raising political campaign funds represents a contribution to a political organization, such cost is nondeductible. Cf. I.T. 3276, C.B. 1939-1 (part 1), 108, a copy of which was furnished you with our previous letter. Normally, the part of the cost of the ticket in excess of the value of the meal is considered to be a political contribution. It makes no difference whether the purchaser, his family, his business associates, or others actually use the tickets.

While the above cited ruling was published in 1939 under the Revenue Act of 1938, it has remained in effect under the succeeding internal revenue laws and codes. A search of our records fails to disclose the issuance of any rulings within the past 5 years to the effect that any expenditures of this type are deductible for income tax purposes.

Regarding your question of whether expenditures for tickets to presidential inaugural balls will give rise to deductions for income tax purposes, it is important to note that the Presidential Inaugural Committee is quite distinguishable from a political party and thus the treatment described above with respect to payments for political fundraising dinners will not prevail. Such committee is originally organized on a bipartisan basis by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. In 1961, the excess of receipts over expenses (except for certain profits contributed to a reserve fund to be used for operations by the succeeding Inaugural Committee), over $200,000, was donated to the United Givers Fund. Accordingly, the rule with respect to contributions to political parties is not believed to be applicable and hence the cost of tickets to presidential inaugural balls are treated in the same manner as the expense for any other tickets to entertainment events (e.g., tickets to concerts, sporting events, or theaters). Consequently, expenses for presidential inaugural ball tickets are deductible whether used by the purchaser or given away if the taxpayer can satisfy the provisions of sections 162 and 274. In other words, the taxpayer must, in general, establish that such expenses are ordinary and necessary to the carrying on of his trade or business and either (1) directly related to the active conduct of his trade or business, or (2) in the event that the inaugural ball directly precedes or follows a substantial and bona fide business discussion, associated with the active conduct of his trade or business. In no event may a taxpayer deduct the cost of tickets which he uses solely for personal reasons.

Determinations under sections 162 and 174 of the Code, referred to above, are primarily factual and are customarily made by the field organization of the Service when a taxpayer's return is examined.

We trust that the foregoing is all the information you desire. If not, please do not hesitate to call on us again.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

SHELDON S. COHEN,
Commissioner.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I could use the remaining time in the morning hour, but I would not like to trespass on the time of other Senators. So if any other Member of the Senate

wishes to use time, I shall be glad to defer my speech.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I do not believe there are any speakers on this side of the aisle, so we shall be glad to defer to the gracious and lovely Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the remaining time in the morning hour.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered——

Mr. HART. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what was the request?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. That I have the remaining time in the morning hour.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, may I suggest that this time be given to the Senator from Oregon. If any further time is required in addition, we can ask for an extension of the morning hour business.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. That is agreeable to me.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? Without objecton, it is so ordered.

THE VIETNAM WAR

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, this is a difficult speech for me to make. I am not a specialist in foreign affairs. I am not privy to classified information on developments in southeast Asia. I cannot present today any bold new proposals to end the Vietnam hostilities. I am what must appear to be one of the few Senators who has not made a pilgrimage to that war-wracked land which has not known peace in 25 years.

My remarks today are the result of personal observations and conversations during home visits between congressional sessions. These impressions can be summarized in the following:

First. The President deserves great credit for launching his peace offensive and for temporarily halting the bombing of North Vietnam.

Second. The Senate can take pride in the realistic assessment of Vietnam which Senator MANSFIELD and our other four able colleagues have made in their report to the President.

Third. The American people do not have a clear understanding of why we are in Vietnam nor of the consequences of our stated policies there.

Fourth. A significant contribution which we in the Senate can make to improve this understanding is to have the Senate Foreign Relations Committee conduct public hearings on Vietnam, inviting not only administration spokesmen to appear but nongovernmental figures as well.

THE JOHNSON PEACE OFFENSIVE

We have been in Vietnam for 12 years and in that time the cost in lives, material, and dollars has moved inexorably up. As the size of our commitment has increased, so have the pressures on the President. The greater the involvement, the more justification necessary for these human and material sacrifices.

The result is less room for maneuver in seeking a settlement on anything but a purely military victory.

The Vietnam war is manifestly at a state where momentous decisions are going to be made. As the Mansfield report makes clear, the military situation has accelerated severalfold during the past year, yet the result is very much like what it was before the bombing and troop increases began.

The grisly change is that the casualty figures have gone up.

Some feel that the next move is to try to intensify the military pressure on the enemy by doubling the number of our troops in the field and by increasing and expanding the bombing in both North and South Vietnam. Others would have us defend our present positions and continue the search for a settlement. Some speak of military victory, some of formal negotiations, and still others of a gradual reduction of forces without official agreement. Whatever happens, the President is the one who must make the final decisions.

President Johnson has demonstrated not only good sense, but great courage in launching his peace offensive and calling a temporary halt to U.S. bombing of North Vietnam. No one wants a war to continue which could all too easily escalate into world war and nuclear disaster.

It required courage because the President, though the Commander in Chief, must pit his civilian policies against those of his own field commanders who advise that a halt to the bombing in North Vietnam might result in a stronger enemy and more American men killed.

But the consequences of not making this twin effort are even more grave. We can only hope that neither side misinterprets the actions or intent of the other, as some reasonable solution is sought this side of a holocaust.

THE MANSFIELD REPORT

There is a good deal of wry comment in the press about congressional factfinding and investigating tours at taxpayers' expense between sessions of Congress. But there can be no question about the value of the tour taken between the sessions of this Congress by Senators MANSFIELD, AIKEN, MUSKIE, INOUYE, and BOGGS, culminating in the comprehensive Mansfield report.

A more detailed analysis of their findings was made to the President, but the public version should be required reading for all who would try to understand the unenviable choices facing us in Vietnam.

The great value of the Mansfield report is that it successfully steps back from the daily press reports and gives perspective to what has and has not happened in Vietnam in the last year and what might lie ahead. I find this the best statement now available of where we stand in Vietnam.

POLICY AND THE PUBLIC

Mr. President, the governed can give their consent to their governors only if they understand what is being asked of them. Many people have not been won over to support the Vietnam war because they do not understand why we are there. I wish to discuss some of the reasons for this public hesitation to support U.S. policies in southeast Asia.

First is the war itself. No sane person wants to go to war. Americans already know that war is hell, for on three previous occasions in this century we have sent our forces to fight overseas and hundreds of thousands never returned.

Vietnam, however, is the first television war and it has brought hell into the living room. We see U.S.-destroyed villages, women and children horribly burned from our napalm bombs, and rice fields destroyed by chemicals sprayed from our planes. The memory of this human suffering in the name of freedom does not fade with the click of a television switch. And somehow, being told that the enemy is far worse does not ease the pain, for we are not responsible for their actions, only our own.

Another factor explaining the lack of public understanding of our Vietnam policies is found in the locale of the conflict. A European war is bound to have support within the United States because our people have strong historical, ethnic, religious, and family ties there. Millions of Americans are only one generation removed from Europe, and the great ocean liners and jet airplanes have turned the Atlantic into a pond.

Vietnam, on the other hand, seems foreign in every sense of the word. The Pacific is still the vast barrier of old to most of us. How many schools teach Asian languages in addition to or in place of the standard romance languages? The very word democracy as understood in the United States has little parallel in Vietnam. It is small wonder then that a U.S. war in Vietnam seems strange to the man in the street.

A third element influencing public attitudes to the Vietnam war is the failure of the administration to distinguish with enough care between rhetoric and reason in explaining our southeast Asia policies.

The protracted nature of the Vietnam war has provided ample opportunity to lay before the public the various policy alternatives available and their expected consequences. Instead, we have had incomplete rationales justifying military and political policies already put into effect. Once applied, the conditions which led to the first policy are changed and public discussion fulfills the function of a post mortem.

It can be claimed with some merit that this Nation has moved slowly in Vietnam compared to the alternatives available and that the major military and political decisions have been done with at least a degree of congressional consultation. The President received his open ended authority—as he chose to interpret it—on Vietnam from Congress following the Bay of Tonkin incident in 1964, and Congress appropriated $700 million for Vietnam only 2 days after he requested it. Both the President and Members of Congress have been before the people to seek election within the last 18 months. The electorate did not seek candidates who deviated appreciably from administration policy.

I believe this to be an inadequate rationale. In the first place, our military commitment in November of 1964, the last election, was very different from what it is today and what is being predicted. After all, the advocates of bombing North and South Vietnam and of defoliation were condemned in that election, yet they have become official U.S. policy.

Secondly, under our system of government, the President is charged with initiating and administering our foreign policy. As the Commander in Chief and de facto head of the State Department, any President is assumed to have the authority and information at hand to lead our policies abroad and to carry with him an automatic majority of the people in almost any short-term emergency or crisis situation.

But no President wants to have merely acquiescent and automatic support from the people. A President is of the people himself. He will want them to share his views so that by implication they can share the responsibility. Every President wants to be able to say, "I led, but you followed willingly and with understanding."

If I am any judge of the American mood today, the President would have a majority of the public behind him in just about any course of action in Vietnam he could realistically choose, but he could not say that they would do so willingly and in full understanding of the consequences.

The American people are literate and well informed. The public is not always right. But when the issue is war and all that that implies, they surely have a right to have all the factors involved in policymaking, commensurate with national security, presented to them and to participate in the discussions.

This lack of confidence in the ability of a free people to choose policies in their own interest has ironic overtones. The failure to share with the public the private debates on policy has resulted in the Vietnam case of the administration appearing to be weaker than it necessarily is, as though the policy would not stand up to public scrutiny.

Mr. President, I want to move now from the general to the specific, and illustrate the kinds of questions that are being asked about U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Some of them may appear to be naive, but they are among those I most often hear from constituents.

CIVIL WAR VERSUS NORTH VIETNAMESE AGGRESSION

President Johnson and his advisers have made it quite clear that in their judgment the Vietnam war is a clear and documented case of aggression by North Vietnam against South Vietnam. This policy recognizes the de facto existence of two independent sovereign nations, the capitals of which are Hanoi and Saigon.

The President also said in his state of the Union message that we stand by the Geneva Agreements of 1954. The public is aware of very little of the detail of that historic agreement, but one feature they are likely to remember: The 17th parallel was provisional and was not in any way to be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary.

On the face of it, the United States is saying both that it stands on the principle that there is no political or territorial boundary separating North and South Vietnam, and that we must stand and fight in South Vietnam because that nation has been attacked by its aggressor nation to the north.

When Americans scratch their heads over this logic, they are not excusing Communist aggression nor saying that the United States ought not to be in Vietnam. It is simple puzzlement over why our stated reason for being there and our stated terms for withdrawing seem to cancel out each other.

THE CHINA QUESTION

Who is the primary enemy in southeast Asia There have been two candidates nominated: Communist China and North Vietnam. The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] pressed the claims of the former last August in a debate with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern]:

> I think that our first priority in southeast Asia, the President has repeated it, Secretary McNamara has repeated it, Secretary Rusk has repeated it, that the first priority in southeast Asia is to contain the forces of militant expansionism from mainland China and its stooges. That is the issue, the internal politics of Vietnam comes second, not first.

Our distinguished majority leader, after a tour in that part of the world, said:

> United States-Communist Chinese relations are the basic factor in our present deep involvement in southeast Asia. It was the hostility of China in Korea which first projected the United States in depth—via aid programs—into Indochina. It is Chinese hostility which evokes the continued flow of the bulk of U.S. aid and other activity into southeast Asia.

The recent visit by Secretaries Rusk and McNamara to the NATO Council is also illustrative. The reports from that meeting suggested that the U.S. spokesmen attempted to solicit military and other support for the Vietnam war from our European allies on the grounds that Peiping was using the Vietnam war as just the first step in her plan to expand Chinese Communist power throughout the world and that our European allies in their own self-interest ought to help nip this in the bud in far-off Asia rather than fight years later on their own doorsteps.

The Chinese are the primary military suppliers and propaganda supporters of the Vietcong, although unlike the United States they have not yet committed any of their troops into the battle. The Mansfield report suggests that the forces opposing us in Vietnam may have or will in the future become so dependent on China for support that they may not be able to negotiate without her cooperation, rather like the relationship between Saigon and Washington.

If the expansionist desires of Communist China are the real elements in Asia which require massive U.S. forces there, it is noted that the President made no mention of it in his review of the Vietnam situation in the state of the Union message. And on a CBS news special last August, Gen. Maxwell Taylor said:

> I recognize that behind Hanoi is Peiping, and to some degree Moscow, but their direct influence on the decisions in Hanoi are far from clear.

The American people, with great justification, dread the prospect of getting bogged down in a land war against the staggering human resources of China. Yet the chief U.S. adviser on Vietnam to two Presidents and the current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have told us that the judgment has been made that China will not enter the fray directly, before the North Vietnamese will be forced to stop and withdraw. Both Generals Taylor and Wheeler said in August that "self-interest—a fear of the consequences" would keep China out of the war.

The Mansfield report does not mention this as a factor in Chinese thinking in its listing of the reasons why China has not introduced her manpower into the conflict. If we assume that the Chinese are afraid of the United States, the world could pay an awful price for this mutual ignorance of character and intentions.

THE LACK OF ALLIED SUPPORT IN VIETNAM

The lack of favorable response by our NATO allies to our yellow peril argument is but one facet of the larger issue of general support for U.S. policies in Vietnam.

The State Department lists over 35 nations contributing to our efforts there. Military contributions have come from Australia, with 1,200 troops, a 150-man artillery unit from New Zealand, and 20,000 South Koreans. Almost all the other contributions are in the nature of aid to the South Vietnamese victims of the war, providing food, clothing, building materials, medicine, technicians, money and credit, doctors, and teachers. All of this and more is desperately needed, but it is quite true that these expressions of compassion for the South Vietnamese victims of war need not be interpreted as support for U.S. Vietnam policies.

The Mansfield report put the situation bluntly and pointed to its consequence:

> With a few exceptions, assistance has not been and is not likely to be forthcoming for the war effort in South Vietnam from nations other than the United States. On the contrary, as it now appears, the longer the war continues in its present pattern and the more it expands in scope, the greater will become the strain placed upon the relations of the United States with allies both in the Far East and in Europe.

Could it be that our allies agree completely with the U.S. position, but believe their own commitments preclude military aid?

Could it be that some of our allies prefer the United States to bear all the responsibility and all the losses, while enjoying the security which our effort gives them? I am reminded of the subtlety of phrase used by Senator Mansfield in his 1963 Vietnam report:

> For in the last analysis if the United States is willing to bear the preponderant burdens of freedom in southeast Asia, out of

concern with Chinese hostility, communism, or whatever, the likelihod is that other free nations will not be overly inclined to deny us the privilege.

Or do our allies simply disagree with U.S. premises about the past, present, and future of southeast Asia? I cannot help wondering when after the United States has named North Vietnam as the aggressor nation and has bombed her for 10 months prior to the present moratorium, several of our allies have continued to trade with North Vietnam or have allowed ships flying their flags to do so.

Even the nations of Asia who would be most affected by a Communist takeover in Vietnam have not rallied around the U.S. banner with the support one might have expected if the domino theory was widely shared abroad. It is difficult to believe that the mainland nations of Asia would prefer a Communist Vietnam, but it is not self-evident whether that prospect appears as grim to the Asians as it does to the administration. According to the Mansfield report, each Asian country "has, as a principal concern, the avoidance of direct involvement in the Vietnamese conflict."

Presumably, Cambodia has the most to fear of a Communist Vietnam, because of the long common border. Yet this month, the Cambodian Government informed the United Nations that it would retaliate against United States and/or South Vietnamese forces if they continued to violate the Cambodian borders in pursuit of the Vietcong. The letter strongly implied that the Cambodians would seek assistance from China in doing so.

Laos, another border nation of the Vietnams, is being bombed by U.S. planes because the Vietcong freely use Laotian territory to infiltrate supplies and personnel from North Vietnam.

Even the generous military commitment by the South Koreans is clouded in dispute. The economic health of that nation is directly tied to the continued good will of the United States, and her army is 100 percent U.S. trained and equipped. To guarantee the continued independence of Korea, the United States believes it necessary to keep a force of not less than 50,000 troops there. In these circumstances, many have questioned whether the 20,000 South Korean troops are in Vietnam in response to the call of freedom or due to pressure to make the Vietnam conflict something other than a U.S. solo effort.

Burma has washed her hands of the whole affair. The archipelago nation of Indonesia has just dealt the Communists within her borders a stunning defeat, without U.S. assistance, and neither she nor the Philippines has felt it necessary to join the Vietnam fray. Japan has no military force to offer even if it was so inclined. However, an article by Stanley Karnow in the January 13 Washington Post stated that "Japan is expected to become Communist China's principal commercial partner this year," increasing to at least $540 million, or over 15 percent of the total foreign trade of Communist China.

If the rest of the world is going to put up signs reading "Business as Usual" whether the United States fights in Vietnam or not, the American people can be forgiven for wondering if the rewards are worth the fight.

U.S. BASES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The administration has emphasized repeatedly that the United States has no permanent designs on Asia. As soon as the North Vietnamese and Vietcong stop their aggression and the security of South Vietnam is no longer in question, we will withdraw. As President Johnson said in his state of the Union message, "we seek neither territory nor bases, economic domination or military alliance in Vietnam."

There are observers who suggest that this language oversimplifies to the point of easy misinterpretation by friend and foe alike. For example, last August 27, James Reston wrote in the New York Times:

> The U.S. base at Canranh, which has one of the best natural ports in Asia, is being developed into another Okinawa, not merely for the purpose of this war, but as a major power complex from which American officials hope a wider alliance of Asian nations, with the help of the United States, will eventually be able to contain the expansion of China.

Mr. Reston and others are suggesting that, if we mean that we have no permanent designs on Asia and we will withdraw from all bases as soon as the threat to Vietnam no longer exists, how does the United States define threat? If the threat is open warfare in South Vietnam, we mean one thing. If the threat is the presence of a belligerent China, we mean quite another. Failure to distinguish these points more clearly could lead unnecessarily to a questioning at home and abroad of U.S. judgment.

THE QUESTION OF WHO IS IN CHARGE IN VIETNAM

The United States is in Vietnam in response to continuing requests for help from a series of South Vietnamese Governments. Secretary McNamara said last year:

> The defense of South Vietnam is not being directed by the United States. The defense of South Vietnam is being directed by the Government of South Vietnam. * * * Our soldiers will operate under the command of U.S. officers, but it will be in a supplementary role, and we are not assuming direction of the military program there.

Two weeks ago, it was reported that the largest U.S. military engagement of the war, involving 8,000 of our troops, was launched in the Iron Triangle region not far from Saigon. The distinguishing feature of the maneuver was that the whole operation was put into effect without informing the South Vietnamese military, for fear of a security leak.

An even more obvious area of misunderstanding exists in the current peace offensive as seen from Washington and from Saigon. The world is not looking to South Vietnamese Premier Ky for proposals to end the war. The South Vietnamese Foreign Minister was reported January 14 as saying that the Vietnam war can only be resolved on the battlefield and that it is not negotiable.

No one is suggesting that U.S. troops ought to be under the command of Saigon or that all efforts to end the hostilities short of world war ought to be left to the colorful Ky. But to be told, as we were in the past 2 weeks, that the largest U.S. military operation and the most significant peace probe of the war were both launched without prior reference to the South Vietnam Government appears on the surface to be a major shift in United States-Vietnamese policy without public explanation.

BULLETS AND BALLOTS

The American position supporting free elections in Vietnam after the hostilities have ceased is consistent with our democratic heritage and the announced desires of the Saigon military government. The President reaffirmed this principle in his state of the Union message:

> We fight for the principle of self-determination that the people of South Vietnam should be able to choose their own course, choose it in free elections without violence, without terror, and without fear.

A general commitment to free elections in Vietnam begs several questions. A glance by a layman at a map of South Vietnam today reveals a crazy-quilt pattern of areas controlled or contested by the two sides. Most of the land is in Vietcong territory and most of the population is under United States and Government protection. Assuming a ceasefire under these circumstances, could a national election take place which had meaning? There is no individual or party in South Vietnam which has grassroots national identification, with the presumed exception of the National Liberation Front—NLF. Would elections take place in those areas of the country controlled by the Vietcong? How would candidates be selected?

It is obvious that any election which took place for a national government under the existing pattern of land and population control would be a coalition government including NLF or its sympathizers.

What is the meaning of "free elections" to South Vietnamese who live in areas controlled by Vietcong. The Vietcong has systematically murdered all unsympathetic leadership in hundreds of villages, and has extorted money, food, and personnel from the general population. Some of these areas have been dominated by the Vietcong for 10 years, although much of the population may be dead or have fled to refugee camps. A "free election" in this context is ridiculous.

The very able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has conducted Senate hearings and focused public attention on the plight of the dispossessed South Vietnamese now existing in wretched refugee camps throughout the country. There are approximately 1 million people jammed into these camps. In an election, would these refugees return to their native areas, or stay where they are? Would their vote count as being cast for political figures standing in the locales of the camps or for their home regions and villages? These tragic people are dependent for their food, clothing, and housing on the Saigon government. The opportunity for pressuring refugee votes in these circumstances is self-evident.

In any election which was really free, whether on the issue of political leadership or that of reunification, the Montagnards and related ethnic groups in South Vietnam would cry, "Pox on all your houses," and would choose independence for themselves.

South Vietnam is overwhelmingly Buddhist. Pacifism is a strong element within that faith. Looking at the situation realistically, rather than as we would like it to be, can it be predicted with some confidence that a Buddhist people can successfully protect their interests against an aggressive and unscrupulous Communist movement, even when the Communists eschew violence? I have heard no administration spokesman tested on this issue, yet it seems basic to the nature of any settlement which we might propose.

General Taylor once suggested that he could envisage another partition of population such as took place in 1954, those wanting to go north to the region of Hanoi doing so, and those who remained south could come forward under a general amnesty and be accepted back into South Vietnamese citizenship. Such a course would obviate several of the questions just raised and is consistent with the negotiating points put forward by Saigon.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to believe that this proposal would be acceptable to the Vietcong and North Vietnam. From their point of view, it was partition with the promise of elections within 2 years which prevented Vietnam from being united under Ho Chi Minh 12 years ago. In essence, we would be expecting them to give up everything they have fought for, with nothing in return except the same promises that were given last time.

If these two policy suggestions are representative of the only available alternatives to the polarized positions of pulling out or "bombing them into the Stone Age," then an early solution to Vietnam is indeed a long way down a deadly road.

SENATE HEARINGS ON VIETNAM

The administration is not alone in its reluctance to accept the responsibilities of stimulating public understanding of our Vietnam policies. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is in a unique position to focus public attention on this issue, but has not done so. I fully appreciate that the committee may have wished to move with some caution in this field, for there will be those who would leap to the conclusion that any information or contention brought out at such hearings which differed in any respect from that presented by the administration would undermine the efforts of the President to resolve the conflict.

I firmly believe that further hesitation is not in the best interests of our Vietnam policy, and respectfully urge the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the able colleagues who serve with him to schedule public hearings on the subject of our southeast Asia policy. I would include administration spokesmen, representatives from the universities, foundations, and other groups and organizations which have expressed a particular interest in Vietnam.

Some of the support for the rather bizarre forms of protest and demonstration indulged in this past year by normally responsible people might have been lessened if Vietnam public hearings had been scheduled. Obviously, many who flock to protest rallies are exhibitionists of the "rent-a-picket-for-a-day" variety, but to categorize all or most of the participants as such is unjustified.

A more plausible explanation for the distinctive character of the demonstrations is that frustration built up in the minds of many sincere and patriotic citizens who could see no place within the framework of government where a viewpoint other than that expressed by the administration could receive a fair hearing and could be expected to have some effect on future national policy. Whether it is an accurate charge or not, the administration has been widely viewed as more interested in justifying its actions on its own terms than in being sympathetic and receptive to alternative policy proposals in Vietnam.

Several members of the Foreign Relations Committee and others, have with great eloquence and vigor brought their individual views on the Vietnam conflict to public attention, but this is not an adequate substitute for the orderly record and penetrating probe which could be prepared and conducted by the full committee. No one wants security to be breached in these hearings, but surely it is possible to define more closely the reasons behind the policy judgments now guiding our actions in Vietnam.

I am struck by the concern expressed in the Washington Post recently by George Kennan that our commitment of personnel and diplomatic attention to Vietnam is so complete that it is creating a detrimental imbalance within our foreign policy:

> The most disturbing aspect of our involvement in Vietnam is its relationship to our interests and responsibilities in other areas of world affairs. Whatever justification this involvement might have had if Vietnam had been the only important problem, or even the outstanding problem, we faced in the world today, this not being the case, its present dimensions can only be said to represent a grievous disbalance of American policy.
>
> For nearly a year now, we have sacrificed to this effort all serious possibility for improvement of our relations with the Soviet Union, with all this implies from the standpoint of the ultimate danger of nuclear war, and this we have done at a time when prospects for such improvement were otherwise not unfavorable. We have placed a great and deeply regrettable strain on the friendship and confidence of the Japanese people.
>
> A pall of discouragement has been cast over those responsible for the conduct of the work of the United Nations. Constructive treatment of the great problems of Germany, of nuclear disarmament, of the future of the United Nations and of China in the wider sense has everywhere been placed largely in abeyance in deference to this one remote involvement.
>
> All of these problems are more important, for the long term, than what happens in Vietnam, and there is none of them that will be usefully met even by such further military successes as we may have in the Vietnam area—rather the contrary.

This is a serious charge by one so experienced in the past conduct of our diplomacy. It merits serious consideration by Congress and a thoughtful reply from the administration. A useful step in this direction would be an invitation to Ambassador Kennan to appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to elaborate on his concern just quoted.

Mr. President, whatever our views on the justification and tactics of the Vietnam war, no on can envy the responsibilities of our President. His dilemma is how to develop and execute courses of action which will neither violate the historic U.S. commitment to independence and freedom in the world, nor plunge us into nuclear chaos.

It has been my contention today that the Senate can do more than it has in the past to help the President clarify the choices available to us in Vietnam. I also believe that this administration could help itself by rationing its rhetoric.

RESOLUTION BY RICHFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, WACO, TEX., IN SUPPORT OF FREE PEOPLE OF SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the student council of a very fine high school in my State, Richfield High School in Waco, Tex., recently passed a resolution in support of the free people of South Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHFIELD HIGH SCHOOL,
Waco, Tex., December 6, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: The following resolution was passed by the Student Council of Richfield High School in Waco, Tex., on December 6, 1965:

"Whereas it is our firm belief that the blessings of individual freedom should be preserved and defended by and for our fellow men through a strict doctrine of open and unrestricted self-determination; and

"Whereas this doctrine is violated by the invasion of the lands and rights of the peoples of the Republic of (South) Vietnam by the agents of the (Communist) Democratic Republic of (North) Vietnam acting as a puppet of the People's Republic of China; and

"Whereas the people of South Vietnam have specifically requested and continuously supported the aid and intervention of the people of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the people of the United States have responded with men and arms to the plea of the people of South Vietnam and have sent their sons and brothers to fight and die for the freedom of the Vietnamese and, more indirectly, for themselves; and

"Whereas certain groups and individuals have expressed through word and deed their dissatisfaction and disagreement with the policies of the Government and people of the United States to a degree that would falsely suggest their representation of a majority of Americans and in a manner irresponsibly disregarding the laws of the United States: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the student council*, That—

"1. The student council solemnly affirm its open and unrestricted support of the present policies of the Government of the United States regarding the Republic of (South) Vietnam and her enemies;

"2. The student council further condemn those who would irresponsibly abandon a free people to dictatorship and would shirk their duty to the Nation by defying her laws;

"3. The student council shall sponsor a petition to be circulated among the student body of Richfield expressing approval of the above resolutions; and

"4. The student council shall forward this petition to the President of the United States of America, with copies of the above resolution to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, the U.S. commandant in Vietnam, Senator John Tower, Senator Ralph Yarborough, and Congressman Bob Poage."

Respectfully yours,
Richfield High School Student Council,
Michael C. Leskin, *President*.
H. Marvin Jennings, *Principal*.
Jeanette Maxwell, *Sponsor*.

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Gragg-Sherrill Post No. 248, of the American Legion, Corpus Christi, Tex., has adopted an excellent resolution relative to the war in Vietnam and Communist tyranny. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Gragg-Sherrill Post No. 248,
The American Legion,
Corpus Christi, Tex., December 14, 1965.

ADVOCACY OF THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES IN VIETNAM AND CONDEMNATION OF TREASON

Whereas the tyrannical ruling castes of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.), Red China, and their servile satellite nations, including North Vietnam and Cuba, are determined by subversion, terrorism, murder, and oppression, as well as by massive military invasion and conquest, to compel the free nation of South Vietnam to surrender its freedom and submit to enslavement under the diabolic domination of international communism; and

Whereas if South Vietnam falls to the Machiavellian forces of communism and is imprisoned behind Iron and Bamboo Curtains, then all southeast Asia must yield to the evil might of communistic oppression; and

Whereas in Santa Domingo, South and Central America, the satanic imperialists of the U.S.S.R., Red China, and Red Cuba seek the overthrow of the free, democratic governments by Communist inspired, directed, and controlled armed violence; and

Whereas treasonable individuals and organized groups within the United States are giving direct aid and comfort to our enemies in violation of section 3, article III, Constitution of the United States of America by anti-United States and procommunism demonstrations, exhibitions, marches, speeches, printed material, and draft card burning, etc.; and

Whereas the U.S. Government has irrevocably announced that it will defend and maintain the freedom of all non-Communist nations of the world; if necessary, with its Armed Forces, as it now is doing in Vietnam, Santa Domingo, Thailand, Japan, South Korea, Formosa, and Europe—to name a few nations of the free world; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Gragg-Sherrill Post No. 248, the American Legion, assembled in regular meeting in Corpus Christi, Tex., this 14th day of December 1965, declares and affirms that it totally supports the policy of the U.S. Government to defend and maintain the independence and freedom of all democratic governments of the Western World; to permit no further encroachment by the diabolic evils of communism on free nations anywhere at anytime; and to defeat the enemies of South Vietnam, using the full might and potential of its Armed Forces and armaments; and, further be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Government take immediate and effective action to punish the traitorous and treasonable citizens and their Communist abettors who by word or deed are opposing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in defending the free, democratic nations of the world, particularly those who speak and act against our defense of South Vietnam.

Attest:
Vern Bell,
Commander.
Lester W. Wolford,
Adjutant.
Nels L. Soderholm,
Judge Advocate.

RESOLUTION URGING PREVENTION OF SHIPMENT OF ARMS AND MUNITIONS OF WAR TO COMMUNIST NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Allen Brothers Post No. 148, the American Legion, of Lubbock, Tex., has adopted a very fine resolution in support of the U.S. posture in Vietnam and articulating their opposition to any further shipments of armaments and munitions to North Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The American Legion,
Allen Brothers Post No. 148,
Lubbock, Tex., December 15, 1965.

Whereas it has been reported in the news media on numerous occasions that the Communist enemy in North Vietnam continues to receive all types of armaments and munitions, including missiles, by sea without interference from our naval forces, and

Whereas it has been reported on numerous occasions that our highest ranking military officers have been pleading with the President to grant authority to our naval forces to prevent these said shipments of armaments and munitions into Communist North Vietnam: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Allen Brothers American Legion Post No. 148 of Lubbock, Tex., does hereby join with our competent high-ranking military leaders in urging the President to grant authority to our naval forces to prevent any further shipment of armaments and munitions of war into Communist North Vietnam; and, furthermore, be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the ranking officers of each of the military services, to the U.S. Senators from Texas, to the U.S. Representatives from Texas, to the 19th District of Texas American Legion, to the Department of Texas American Legion, to the national commander of the American Legion, and to the news media of radio, television, and press.

This resolution approved by the Allen Brothers Post No. 148 in its regular meeting of December 14, 1965.

Bill R. Neel, *Adjutant*.

EDITORIAL OPPOSITION TO REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, editorialization in Texas newspapers has been almost unanimously against the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial entitled "Section 14(b) Fight Can Be Two-Edged Sword," published in the Abilene Reporter-News of December 28, 1965, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Section 14(b) Fight Can Be Two-Edged Sword

The Nation's union leaders are put on notice by Senator Everett Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois, that the fight against repeal of the union shop ban will not be entirely defensive by nature.

Opponents of repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act have amendments in readiness that would require more democratic procedures within unions, in effect lessening the hold of labor leaders over the union rank and file. The labor issue is a readymade vehicle on which to attack discrimination in the tightly knit organizations and sponsors of the fight against repeal of section 14(b) are hinting broadly that racial characteristics of organized labor will be probed.

In their determination to repeal section 14(b), the labor leaders may have overlooked the possibility of losing as much as they gain by repeal. They should remember that Senator Dirksen and his associates in both parties are capable of driving hard bargains in the interests of States rights.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that renewal of the labor issue could result in nondiscriminatory legislation and retention of section 14(b).

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an excellent editorial entitled "Battle Against 14(b)," published in my hometown newspaper, the Wichita Falls Record-News of December 30, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Battle Against 14(b)

Opponents of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, relaxed last year when the Senate failed to pass the proposed action. The House of Representatives already had approved repeal, and approval was dangerously close in the Senate.

Most Washington reporters and editors believe a much more aggressive campaign for repeal will be waged during the 2d session of the 89th Congress opening next week. For this reason those who are opposed to such action cannot afford to stay relaxed. They do face what probably will be one of the most bitterly waged campaigns in recent history.

The section, popularly called the right-to-work law, makes it possible for States to enact legislation permitting the worker to decide for himself whether or not he wishes to join a union.

Those who approve 14(b) consider it an inherent right possessed by every individual to decide whether or not he wishes to be a union member. Repeal of this section would deprive the worker of that freedom.

We now have on the books a series of laws which prevent discrimination for reasons of race, color, creed, or sex. If a worker does not wish to join a union, should he be subject to discrimination?

It is not antiunion to support freedom of choice for all workers.

PROSPERING EAST TEXAS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, every January 1 the publisher of the Longview, Tex., Morning Journal, Mr. Carl Estes, and his staff associates publish a special New Year's Day edition, which contains many pages and requires many weeks of preparation. This special edition gives a review of that great land of opportunity, East Texas, and its business, agricultural, social, and historical developments. This annual edition has become a collector's item because it is a valuable source of reference concerning East Texas.

On January 5, 1966, the Dallas Morning News published an excellent editorial commenting on this fine annual edition published by Mr. Estes, and noting the changes that have occurred in East Texas.

I can remember that when I was a boy cotton and peanuts were raised on the sandy land. We were poor farmers. But now East Texas is verdant with pasture grass, and we see thousands upon thousands of head of the finest blooded cattle roaming the East Texas hills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the editorial entitled "East Texas' Estes."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Jan. 5, 1966]

East Texas' Estes

In East Texas, New Year's Day came in with a monumental edition of the Longview Morning Journal—566 pages chock full of information about the past, present, and potential of that prospering, growing region and city.

"Opportunity Land," title of the front-page editorial, aptly describes the area. Industrial developments, new lakes and other tourist attractions, over 33,000 jobs in Gregg County, alone, plans for navigation of the Sabine River are but a few of the hundreds of evidences of opportunity developed or developing from the Louisiana boundary to the doorsteps of Dallas.

Key figure in many of these advancements today, as he has been for many years, is Carl Estes, publisher of the Longview newspapers. Aided by an able staff, he produces a January 1 edition each year that is the envy of fellow publishers and a keepsake for historians, business analysts, and others.

His 1966 achievement not only is the finest yet, but a newspaper to challenge the best efforts of everyone in the future. And everyone includes not only the staff of the Longview Morning Journal, but newspapermen from California to the Carolinas.

Massive changes have taken place in East Texas. Hills that once ran red with water eroding between rows of corn and cotton now are brightened by the crimson of clover grazed by beef and dairy herds. Where mules not long ago turned sirup mills now stand plants turning out huge machines, beer and containers to put it in, to mention only a few.

"The foundations are laid and new walls of progress are going up in the mighty Sabine-Cypress inland empire," comments our neighbor to the east of Dallas. This city and newspaper heartily concur and proudly team up with East Texans to help build those foundations and walls.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further routine business?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, there appears to be no more routine business to be transacted within the time agreed upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further routine business to be transacted, the time under the unanimous-consent agreement has expired.

Mr. TOWER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 14 Leg.]

Burdick
Cooper
Dirksen
Douglas
Gruning
Harris
Hart
Holland
Inouye
Javits
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McIntyre
Mundt
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Talmadge
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Allott, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bass, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Eastland, Mr Ellender, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fannin, Mr Fong, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Gore, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hill, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Morton, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Russell of South Carolina, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Symington, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of North Dakota entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, news reports indicate that immediate consideration is being given to the resumption of bombing in North Vietnam; and if bombing in North Vietnam is resumed, a second question will follow quickly, whether to extend it to targets in Hanoi and Haiphong. This could, of course, mean the possible extension of the war in area, in time, and in casualties.

I appreciate and recognize the gravity of the decision the President will be called upon to make, and the heavy responsibilities he bears.

Mr. President, I was prepared to speak on these issues on January 10, when the Senate first met, but when the Senate recessed, I issued a statement outlining my position, based on a visit to Vietnam. Since January 10 I have been in the Far East again and in Vietnam. I have talked with Americans, allies, and neutrals.

The points I made in my statement on January 10, 16 days ago, have been strengthened, and I repeat them today.

The first that efforts toward negotiation should be continued. As I said before, negotiation, not escalation, should be the dominant theme of our activity.

The President's initiative for negotiations, pursued through able representatives, was one which we all commend, and they have had a deep effect on opinion in many countries. Perhaps they could be continued quietly in capitals in countries where the North Vietnamese have representatives, where soundings were made through our Ambassadors, and also perhaps through other representatives of this Nation, and through representatives of many nations which are concerned about extending the war.

My second point is that bombing should not be resumed now. If bombings are resumed we will lose, at least for the present, the chance to negotiate, however slim it is.

Although it would be an unfair judgment, it may discredit among other nations the President's efforts to bring about a negotiation.

Also, we should not judge the possibility of negotiation solely by Hanoi's recent public pronouncements. We must remember that the Communists did negotiate in 1954 over Vietnam and the Communist Pathet Lao did negotiate in 1962 about Laos. Agreements were not wholly satisfactory to the United States, but it is a fact that neither of these two nations are yet under Communist domination.

Surely if so many striving nations have expressed their support of a negotiated settlement in Vietnam their support can continue to exert some influence toward bringing Hanoi to reason.

My third point is that the President set out more clearly than before that the Vietcong could be included in proposed negotiations.

The Vietcong is supported in Vietnam with forces and supplies supplied by North Vietnam and by supplies from Communist China. But in the main they are the fighters we face.

This reality must be faced and distasteful as it is—it is obvious that negotiations or settlement are impossible or unlikely without their inclusion. We should consider this reality and not be limited by the objections of some countries, including the South Vietnamese, concerned as they are. A just, fair, and honestly negotiated settlement is our objective and it is, of course, the way of reason for South Vietnam and ourselves.

Another point that I made on January 10 is that after a cease-fire of specified duration, the people of Vietnam, both North and South should vote under the Geneva accords for a government it chooses. It is to be hoped, and I hope, that they vote for Saigon, but if they choose Hanoi it would be their choice and it would be because democratic values cannot be understood by their people.

If a cease-fire can be obtained for a period of time—3 to 5 years, or even less—it could be used by the United States and other concerned governments to engage fully and effectively in programs to develop the country's economy. These could include the proposed Mekong River project, health, education, and rural and administration programs.

The South Vietnamese and our Government are embarking now, and purposely, on such a program and with the help of other Democratic governments there would be the opportunity to show the people of Vietnam that a free system of government is best.

I recognize that there has been no favorable response to the efforts of the President. I know also that there is some risk to the security of our forces in the course that I recommend, although I do not believe it is as great a risk in the long run as the risk of now resuming or extending the bombing of North Vietnam.

The bombing of North Vietnam has not been very successful in preventing the movement of supplies into South Vietnam. With our military activity now directed to South Vietnam, I believe our strengthening forces are sufficient to insure their security, at least for a reasonable time, if the present level of military engagement does not escalate.

Finally the capacity of the United States to meet with any military eventuality is far greater than any enemy we face. This should not be doubted by them and should not be doubted at home. I know we may be forced to pursue military courses to insure a just settlement of the Vietnam problem. But I make these remarks in the hope that a continued effort will be made, at least for a reasonable time, toward the chance of negotiation, slim as that may seem.

If we are forced to pursue military courses, I know that we will stand together in the support of our country and I stand in support of our country as I always have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the Record following my speech, the statement which I made on January 10.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator J. Cooper

The war in Vietnam is the overriding issue before our country. It will be and should be debated, and every fact sought out. And, in this process, the administration must provide every fact.

The refusal thus far of the Communist authorities to respond to the administration's initiative for negotiations is producing great pressures to extend the war militarily, first by renewed bombing of North Vietnam, and more specifically, the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong. The present unwillingness of the Communists to negotiate, and the sad fact of increasing casualties makes these pressures inevitable.

Nevertheless, I believe it would be a mistake to cease efforts for negotiation, and particularly after the administration has made a worldwide appeal. Negotiation, not escalation, should be the dominant theme of our activity now.

We have a chance, admittedly not an encouraging one but perhaps the only one we will have for a time, to develop a set of steps toward negotiations and the just settlement of the war in Vietnam by peaceful means, rather than by a larger and bloodier war whose bounds we cannot foresee. We have an opportunity to continue efforts to influence the formation of a group of nations, either under the Geneva accords, or the United Nations, or outside these organizations, which would be willing to urge negotiations, to assist in their conduct, and to supervise and enforce any agreement that might be reached.

There is another reason for not broadening and intensifying the war now. Simply, it is that the logistic situation now defies any significant extension of the war and the maintenance at the same time of the security of our forces. The report of the group led by Senators Mansfield and Aiken confirms this. It says: "The rapid infusion of American forces (into South Vietnam) has strained the facilities of the new logistic system to the utmost, with long delays in unloading and moving equipment not unusual. There have also been and still are shortages of important items of supply despite efforts to eliminate these shortages."

Although I spent only 1 day in Vietnam in December, simple observation and a comprehensive military briefing there—which from my experience in Europe in World War II, I recognized as a reliable "war briefing"—were proof to me that we have not yet developed the port facilities and air bases to adequately supply and protect our forces which have been so rapidly built up.

The pressures for escalation rest upon concerns that touch all of us—the assistance and protection of our forces, and the ending of the war. But to step up bombing now without adequate supply facilities, without taking into consideration the additional strains that would be placed on our facilities and supplies, if North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam should be largely increased, could result in increased American and South Vietnamese casualties and a lengthened, rather than a shortened war.

Those who press for the immediate escalation of the war and a quick military solution should realize this most.

We may be forced to pursue the military course to insure a just settlement of the Vietnam problem and, if so, we will stand together in its support. But we should not plunge into it without consideration of all its consequences, and we should not slip or meander into it.

On March 25, 1965, I spoke in the Senate and urged that the President state that the United States was prepared to enter unconditionally into negotiations. I suggest today that the President make clear, without reservation, that negotiations could include the Vietcong, because it is obvious that neither negotiations nor a settlement are possible without their inclusion.

Perhaps the United States could propose a cease-fire of 3 to 5 years duration, supervised and enforced under the United Nations, at the end of which time the implementation of the Geneva accords of 1954, with respect to elections, would be carried out.

During this cease-fire, interested governments could embark on programs of economic and agricultural development, including the proposed Mekong River project, as well as programs in the fields of health and education. A country, not a battlefield, could be built.

And, at the end of those years, the people could vote to unite under a government of their own choosing—Saigon, we hope; Hanoi if the appeal of democratic value cannot be understood by their people.

It may be that no settlement is possible without extended war. But we must remember that in 1954, after Dienbienphu, when nothing stood in the way of the Viet Minh conquest of all Vietnam, there were negotiations at Geneva. Again, in 1961 and 1962, when the situation in Laos seemed hopeless, the representatives of the Communist Pathet Lao went to the conference table. The settlements reached were not wholly agreeable to the United States—but the United States agreed to them—and Laos, Cambodia, and even South Vietnam are not under the control of the Communists.

Let us continue to make the effort toward negotiations while there is yet a little time and while there is yet a chance—slim as it may be. For a cease-fire, and a just settlement, ought to be for the Vietnamese and for us the solution that reason recommends.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the basic issue in this debate is freedom. It involves several basic American freedoms, but primarily and fundamentally it involves that great concept of American freedom of association, our American freedom of an individual to earn his living in a vocation of his own choice, in an economic activity which is suited to his talents and his desires, and in a community where he desires to live and raise his family; and the concept that every American citizen has an equal right to enjoy those freedoms without having imposed upon him a license to work, or a requirement to pay a special tax or fee of any kind in order to support himself and his family.

There are times in the course of the country's history when the Members of this body are called upon to make decisions on legislation which can alter the very complexion of our Government and the entire way of life which prevails in the United States. Such decisions call for the most careful study, honest appraisal, and sincere soul searching. For if we err in our collective judgment, then we as Members of the U.S. Senate can do irreparable harm to this land which we love so much.

I am convinced that in this debate and in this decision we are facing that type of situation as we give consideration whether or not to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. The basic, fundamental, farflung ramifications of this legislation are far wider and deeper and more significant in import than the specific legal provisions involving right-to-work legislation in our respective States. Sometimes the issues that we are called upon to decide are complex.

It is not always easy to see which road is the right one. In the case of section 14(b), the issue that occurs to me is basically very simple, although the ramifications are very great. Some proponents of repeal of section 14(b) have gone to great lengths in their attempts to confuse the basic issue and shroud it in misunderstainding and misinformation. The Senate has been subjected to a veritable blizzard of propaganda aimed at convincing us that we should eliminate section 14(b)—that section of the Taft-Hartley Act which affirms the right to the States to enact right-to-work legislation.

To make the right decision, we must cut through all of the propaganda and get to the basic principles of this issue.

What are these principles that are the heart of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act? It seems to me there are two closely intertwined principles involved. One is the preservation of individual freedom—the issue to which I alluded as I began my remarks upon obtaining the floor—and the other issue is the preservation of the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of our several States—and, for me, also the constitution of my home State of South Dakota.

The Constitution of the United States contains guarantees of freedom of association, freedom of assembly, and freedom of speech. What happens to these guarantees if men and women can be coerced into joining labor unions, or any other kind of organization, in order to work at their jobs to support their families? If section 14(b) should be repealed, each of these guarantees would be imperiled and part of the basic framework of our Constitution would be impaired. That could lead to further erosions and saturations in the years to come.

The right to work was declared to be a plain and self-evident principle of American constitutional law by Justice Charles Evans Hughes when he declared nearly 50 years ago:

> It requires no argument to show that the right to work for a living in the common occupations of the community is the very essence of the personal freedom and opportunity that it was the purpose of the amendment to secure.

The amendment of which he spoke was the 14th, forbidding the Government to deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

It seems to me that section 14(b) should have powerful appeal to all believers in democracy, for two reasons. First, because it accents the principle of voluntary action instead of coercion. True democracies permit their people maximum freedom of action in their daily lives, while controlled societies compel and direct them by law. Second, the right of a man to earn his living free of all duress is the most basic of all civil rights. If a worker can be deprived of this basic right, then all others—including free speech and free assembly—are in peril as well.

Certainly, if a man cannot support his family, if he cannot find and accept a job, if he cannot find a position in which he can utilize his talents in order to earn the wherewithal to live, the other freedoms are of small moment to an unemployed or unemployable man starving because of the fact that he has been denied, by some act of legislation, the right to earn a living unless he does something which could be highly offensive and objectionable to him; namely, to pay a license or tribute in the form of an initiation and regular dues to an organization with which he has no sympathy, to an organization which he prefers to remain out of instead of to become a member of, or to an organization led by someone of whom he disapproves.

I happen to believe that he should have every right in the world to join that organization if he wishes to do so but, unless we may be entering some new era of economic slavery, I challenge the right of this Government, this body, or of any government, to compel a man, against his will, to pay tribute to a group of which he disapproves.

I believe that no one has that much power.

Good labor leaders do not need that kind of legislation. They attract—and properly so—the membership required to operate and organize the unions. Good labor leaders produce benefits for their workers, and men and women properly join and support such an organization which will be of benefit to them. Good labor leaders and good organizations do not need coercion and a government whip to drive workers into their membership.

Mr. President, why should we make this power available so that bad labor leaders and bad labor unions can coerce men and women into membership who otherwise would refuse to join?

Why put the power of the Government behind the activities of a dishonest labor leader who tends to discourage workers from joining his group because of his behavior?

Why put the strong arm of the Government in the hands of a disloyal labor leader who acts against the state and whose support of subversive causes repels men and women from membership, causing them to keep out?

Why put the strength of the Government behind lazy labor leaders who do nothing very much to promote the interests of their membership, who fatten themselves with the protective devices in their own jobs, who enjoy the luxury of the salaries they receive, who are indifferent to the needs of the workers, and who, on occasion, enter into sweetheart contracts with the employer?

Why give that kind of lazy, indifferent, inconsiderate labor leader the power of the Government to compel the people around him, who do not wish to join his union, to pay dues and an initiation fee so that he can lead an easier, plushier, and even lazier life?

As I have stated, good labor leaders and good organizations, do not need this kind of thing.

Understandably, men and women join unions which are producing benefits for them, which will create better working conditions, and which will give them better security in their jobs.

Intelligent men and women, understandably, refuse to join labor organizations which do not produce.

Why should Congress—why should this Government—compel workers to join unions of which they disapprove, which they consider worthless, or which, in some instances, they might consider to be even objectionable?

I should like to mention also, Mr. President, some of the elements involved in the fundamental right of association which is guaranteed by the Constitution and protected by right-to-work laws. This freedom has both an affirmative and a negative side. It guarantees not only the right to join, also the right to refrain from joining any private organization or association.

At a later point in my speech, I intend to show that this has an important duality of application as it is applied in my own home State of South Dakota, where we have found it to be beneficial at times to the working man, as well as to the employer and the general public, because it gives the worker his American right of free choice.

Freedom of association springs from the right of each person to order his life according to his own wishes, to choose where he will work and what, if any, church, political party, lodge, club, or labor union he will join and support. Many working men and women want to join unions. I can understand that. I think I would want to join a union if I worked at a craft or if I were surrounded by union members or worked in a shop of vast size where I had little contact with my employer. I know I would want to join a union if it were well led, if it were an honest union, if I had a right to participate in directing its destiny, if I had the right of secret ballot. I suspect that many men and women want to join that kind of union, and in fact do join unions which are led in that way and under such rules and regulations. Nevertheless, we find a man or a woman who does not want to join even a good union, just as there are men and women who do not want to join a good church, or a good lodge, or a good club. Either way, those choices should be respected. We do not want politicians to push people around. The totalitarians, the Communists, the Fascists, give their politicians the right to tell the fellow in private life what he must do. But in America we respect the individual citizen and give him the right to join or not to join a union, the right to join or not to join a club, the right to join or not to join a lodge, and the right to be protected by the right-to-work provision which is contained in a constitution such as that of the State of South Dakota.

Let us remember that a union is something more than a collective bargaining representative. It is partly a political organization, partly a fraternal organization, partly a social club with a meeting or assembly hall, partly an insurance or pension organization or association or company.

Frequently a union aspires to be a state within a state and exercise a high degree of discipline and control over its members. None of these things are objectionable if membership is on a voluntary basis and if the union is democratically run, for if the membership is, in fact, on a voluntary basis it must be democratically operated, because there will be an escape hatch through which its disenchanted members can walk out of a dictatorial union. Once the escape hatch is closed, the dictatorial leaders will grow and obtain strength and stature.

These kinds of labor unions, under coercion, violate the fundamental principles set forth in our constitution to force a man to join any private organization which performs these functions, should he join a service club, a service organization, a church, or an insurance firm. All these have been incorporated in greater or less degree in unions of one type or other. But by one fell swoop we would compel to join those unions only people who work with their hands as artisans or craftsmen and let them lose freedoms which all the rest of our Americans enjoy, that our farmers enjoy, that our businessmen enjoy, that many other types of activity in the private sector enjoy.

What is so wrong about a craftsman or artisan earning a living that there should be an asterisk in the Constitution of the United States pointing out in a footnote at the bottom of a page that because one is working with his hands he can be compelled to go into a union by government duress?

That concept of freedom for an important segment of our population is 100 percent wrong, and I believe before this debate is over many Americans will agree, and, before this discussion ends, that the attempt will be defeated.

There is another, equally important way in which the repeal of section 14(b) would weaken the Constitution of the United States. It would be another step in the direction of taking away from the States the right to order their affairs, and placing all control in the hands of a centralized Government.

It would accentuate and expand a trend which I believe has already attained dangerous proportions in this country. This was not what our Constitution provided.

The Constitution provided for a balancing of State and Federal powers with certain powers given to the Federal Establishment and all others reserved to the States.

I have said many times that I think the unique American contribution in constitutional government around the world and the one most significant innovation we produced on the Western Hemisphere in constitutional government was the incorporation of the 10th amendment into our Constitution.

I have served for a long time, and continue to serve, on congressional committees of investigation where I hear many more allusions in the course of an ordinary year to the 5th amendment than I do to the 10th amendment.

But, Mr. President, it is the 10th amendment that sets us apart from the rest of the world. It is the 10th amendment on which we can put the imprint "Made in America" with complete assurance that it has never been copied in its entirety and made operative in any other country in the world.

It is the 10th amendment which, in my opinion, has been the great genius of retention of freedom in this country and expansion of its benefits for so long. It is different from what is found in other constitutions. It was, in fact, made in America by our early colonial forefathers. It provided clearly that those of us who hold temporary power in Washington in the executive, in the legislative, or even in the judicial branch shall exercise authorities and powers from the central state only to the extent that they have been specifically delegated to us by the respective States or by the people living in them, or specifically defined for us in the basic text of the Constitution itself.

One may search in vain around the world to find a duplicate of that great freedom formula. If there were enacted repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act it would strike at the heart of the protective mechanism of the 10th amendment.

Mr. President, if we do that we do it at our own peril. It would substitute for a successful formula for freedom a new mechanism which would come back to plague State after State, different element after different element of our society and move the one great flight of a magic carpet, the great political power and control of a tremendous country, from the people, from their respective States in Washington, to be controlled by people holding public office temporarily.

In my opinion, the Constitution did well to provide for this checking and balancing system, this balancing of powers.

Prior to the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act and section 14(b), the States enacted a number of laws in the labor area, including laws in some States banning compulsory union membership as a condition of employment. Section 14(b) merely affirmed the authority of States to enact right-to-work laws.

As I have said, South Dakota has a right-to-work law. It was, in fact, enacted as an amendment to the constitution of South Dakota through a referendum of her people in 1946. The total number of votes cast in that referendum was 132,292, an unusually large vote for a constitutional amendment in our State at that time, indicating the interest of our people in right-to-work legislation. The vote cast in favor of the right-to-work amendment was 93,035, a "yes" vote of 70.32 percent for right to work. To be certain that the significance of the "yes" vote is understood, I point out that of 115 different constitutional amendments that have been voted upon in South Dakota elections since the year 1904, only one received a higher percentage of affirmative votes, and that was an almost completely noncontroversial amendment providing for the continuity of State government in the event of enemy attack.

The people of South Dakota clearly demonstrated that they wanted a right-to-work law in 1946, when they voted to make it a part of the State's constitution. The law has worked well. During the time it has been on the books, it has brought good labor-management relations and economic benefits to our State. The people of South Dakota continue to want their right-to-work law today. They have made that clear to me in many ways—through personal contacts and communications, as individuals, and as organizations representing people in all walks of life.

The people of South Dakota have made it abundantly clear through a variety of means that they are overwhelmingly in favor of maintaining the status quo. In addition to the popular vote in 1946, to which I have alluded, they have expressed their will through their elected representatives in the State legislature in Pierre, as recently as 1963. In February of that year, a concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to refrain from enacting any legislation abrogating the rights of the respective States to enact right-to-work laws passed both houses by impressive margins. The combined vote in the State legislature showed that 83 members, or 70 percent of those voting, favored such a continuation of the South Dakota right-to-work law.

This startling percentage of unanimity, produced from the bipartisan ranks of both Houses of the South Dakota Legislature, in which both of the two great major parties were liberally represented, has been reinforced by a recent South Dakota newspaper poll and by my own mail and personal contacts. In the poll, which I shall cover in greater detail later, the people of South Dakota were queried as to the advisability of Congress repealing section 14(b). By eliminating the undecided factor and giving a corresponding percentage of that vote to those who either favored or opposed such a proposal, which is a formula used by George Gallup and all other major pollsters in this country, the result was the 74 percent of South Dakotans expressed a preference for the retention of the right-to-work law. All of us, I am sure, have experienced an extremely heavy run of mail on this issue. I myself have received in my office well over a thousand communications from South Dakotans alone. We have read those communications, analyzed them, and tabulated them. More than 83 percent of those who have written me have asked, and many times they have pleaded, that I do everything I can to defeat this attempt to repeal section 14(b).

Following the fairly decisive defeat of this measure in the last session of Congress, I returned to my home State to consult with my constituents, as others of my colleagues, I am sure, returned to their States to consult with their constituents. In county after county, in the cities and on the farms, from men and women, young and old, from laboring man and professional man, two requests were invariably made as I visited the communities. One of them was that the United States work toward a just, honorable, equitable, and enforceable peace in Vietnam—the sooner the better.

The other was to prevent the repeal of section 14(b). Those were the two basic issues. Another almost universal complaint related to the deterioration of Uncle Sam's mail service in rural South Dakota. These represented the big bulk of the conversations I had with the people back home during October and November.

In discussing this issue with my constituents, I was impressed with the knowledge they exhibited on the subject. They know what section 14(b) is. They know what their right-to-work law does. They know what would happen if it were repealed. They know what the principle of States rights is. And, Mr. President, they know the significance of the 10th amendment to the Constitution.

Those people, who are my friends, are high spirited, independent, freedom-loving Americans who do not cherish being pushed around by anybody, whether he be government gauleiter or labor chieftain. So I know how they want me to vote, I know how they want me to work, and I know what efforts they expect me to make in the attempt to prevent an abortive attempt to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I do not believe that a legislator should necessarily cast his vote on the basis of polls or of mail from back home, or as a result of personal contacts with constituents whom he visits in his home State. Sometimes classified information on military or foreign policy comes into the possession of public officials and properly sways their judgment. There are times when inherent principles of political philosophy must be considered in determining a stand on an issue. So in determining such a stand, one must evaluate such evidence, consider it, and sometimes, even, allow it to prevail against the counsels of one's home constituents.

In this particular case, however, such principles are in complete accord with the feelings of my constituency. I therefore had no difficulty in determining a course of action. I must admit, however, that I was impressed by the depth of feeling by South Dakotans on this issue. They have spoken in a voice which is loud and clear; and I stand ready to echo their wishes in the halls of this Chamber and to fight with every ounce of my strength as long as may be necessary.

Mr. President, in this case there is no secret intelligence which presents Senators with information on the right to work, which information is not available to every private citizen in the land.

No Senator can respond to a constituent with whom he disagrees and say, "Look, old fellow, I appreciate your consulting with me, and your counsel is invaluable. I should like to go along with you. However, the CIA has given me some secret information to which you don't have access. This secret information concerns the significance of the repeal of section 14(b)."

We cannot hide behind such a statement and say that we appreciate the evidence and the counsel of a workingman in a union back home who does not want to be frozen into some kind of economic slavery and to pay tribute to a union which he does not like.

We cannot conciliate a man by saying, "I should like to preserve your freedom and to give you the same status as any other free man in America. However, I was at a secret session and received some off-the-record information from the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, or from Mr. McNamara or Mr. Rusk, who specialize in that kind of information, and I must do violence to your judgment because I have access to facts which you cannot have."

That is a lot of rubbish in this particular argument, and the constituents of every Senator in this Chamber know that it is a lot of rubbish and know that the judgment of the folks back home on matters of this kind is just as sound and valid and is based on facts that are just as firm and hard as the data available to the smartest Senator in the United States.

Repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act would mean tearing a page from the constitution of South Dakota. I doubt that the Federal Government has much right to tear pages out of the constitution of any State. I certainly resent it when they reach out with their well-heeled hand and tear a page out of the constitution of my State.

It would be a direct slap at the majority of the people of my State, who work, and at the constitution which was amended by referendum.

In effect, it would be saying to them that they were not competent to decide a matter for themselves and, therefore, the Federal Government must take it out of their hands, that, somehow, living on the banks of the beautiful Missouri, they had not developed intelligence and education enough to form their judgment properly, so that we, on the wrong side of the Potomac River, should have the right to do their thinking for them.

They really understand and fear that, if we are going to muss up their constitution with our far-off judgments in the field of labor, there is no logical end in sight. When we start interfering with the rights of people in their respective States to write their own constitution, we shall have grown so wise and powerful that the temptation to tell everybody what to do in every State and in every clause of every constitution will become so great that people cannot help yielding to the temptation to try to play God for everybody, because we have gotten away with it and wiped out the constitutional provisions involving section 14(b).

Mr. President, I can be counted on to be here to fight as hard as I can against the repeal of section 14(b), and the repudiation of the will of the people of South Dakota, as expressed in a constitutional referendum. To me, it violates the basic fundamental American rights of many mighty fine Americans whose only reason for being singled out for this kind of dictatorial treatment is that he happened to be a carpenter or a bricklayer or a man working in the Ford automobile production plant instead of a doctor or a businessman or a farmer or someone engaged in some economic enterprise.

I shall fight not only for the people of South Dakota, but also for the people of at least 18 other States who have expressed themselves affirmatively, and most of them repeatedly, on the right-to-work principle.

I fight for the rights of the people in the remaining 31 States to decide this issue for themselves, in full realization of the fact that so long as there is even one right-to-work State in the United States, it will tend to serve as a warning to labor leaders who are inclined to engage in excesses in any of the other 49 States that if they go too far and become too tough or steal too much or sell us out because of impulses or disloyalty, it is possible in this great country for any of the other States to write right-to-work legislation to prevent that kind of influence from freezing under their control people who need to work for a living and who, in that particular State, are compelled to join a union in order to exercise that right.

The proponents of the repeal of section 14(b) would have us believe that the right-to-work law is intended to injure unions and that such is the effect of the law. They would have us believe that a right-to-work law injures the individual who wants to belong to a union.

Those are interesting phrases, but I have yet to see a single shred of evidence of any injury to a union from the right-to-work law of South Dakota or of any other State.

For years union leaders have been calling right-to-work laws union-busting devices without producing any proof of unions which have been "busted" as a result of such law.

I challenge them now to come forth with evidence to substantiate this allegation. If they cannot produce it, they should cease making a charge the only purpose of which seems to be to create an unnecessary fear in the minds of unions.

If right-to-work laws "bust" labor unions, let some Senator read into the RECORD the list of "busted" unions. If the right-to-work laws do not "bust" unions, why use the argument? If right-to-work legislation does "bust" unions, let us find out which unions they are and examine whether, in fact, they cease to function and break down because of right-to-work laws or because of something else which has crept into the operation and the leadership of the particular labor union.

A right-to-work law gives full protection to the individual union member, affirming his right to join a union, and guaranteeing that he shall not be made the object of any discrimination because of his membership, or because of his nonmembership, in a union. It affords the same kind of protection to the individual who, for whatever reason, does not want to affiliate himself with a union. The right-to-work law of South Dakota is simple and clear. Here is what it says, quoting from article VI of the State constitution:

> SECTION 1. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor organization.
>
> SEC. 2. Any agreement relating to employment, whether in writing or oral, which by its stated terms, or by implication, interpretations, or effect thereof, directly or indirectly denies, abridges, interferes with, or in any manner curtails the free exercise of the right to work by any citizen of South Dakota, shall be deemed a violation of this act.
>
> SEC. 3. Any request, demand or threat made by any person to any employer or employee to persuade or coerce such employer or employee to enter into an agreement violative of the provisions contained in sections 1 and 2 of this act, shall be deemed a violation of this act, and such person shall be punished for a misdemeanor as hereinafter provided.
>
> SEC. 4. Any solicitation or request to join a labor organization made by any person to any employee, accompanied by threats of injury to such employee or members of his family, or damage to property, or loss or impairment of present or future employment of such employee, shall be deemed a violation of this act, and such person shall be punishable for a misdemeanor as hereinafter provided.

The remainder of the article deals with enforcement and penalties.

I call attention to the fact that every word in this article has to do with the protection of the individual employee, union or nonunion, against any compulsion, coercion, intimidation, threats, or physical injury. The individual is protected against both unscrupulous employers and unscrupulous unions. If the law is violated and anyone is punished, it is they, not he, the individual workingman.

A right-to-work law benefits the individual workingman in several ways. I have discussed a few of them this afternoon. There are others which I should like to mention now. The most effective voice any man can have in an organization, unless he is part of the ruling hierarchy, is the voice of opposition, the voice of dissent, the voice of criticism. It can be made effective only if it is coupled with the right to withdraw from the organization—to refuse to give it moral or financial support. The major value of unions to working men and women lies in the power of the workers to control their elected representatives. Union members may easily become helpless subjects of a union autocracy if the individual member is denied the right and freedom to refuse to support an officer, or an organization, which does not truly represent him.

Unions are meant to be the servants of the working men and women who comprise their membership. How much can a man rely on a servant he employs if the servant then assumes to be the master and says: "You must obey me or I shall inflict severe penalties upon you."

The power of the individual worker to join or not to join a union—to remain in a union or to withdraw, if it does not serve his needs—is the only effective means of maintaining democratic unions. It is the only real protection for the union member under leadership which would like to eliminate the democratic processes of a union.

Every Member of this body knows of instances in which unions have done precisely that thing, have tried to strip them of the democratic processes; and it is because of unions like that, that it is important that individuals retain the power which they have in their right to withdraw and to refuse to pay dues. It is the only real protection a worker has against corruption when it occurs, against dictatorial officials when they become drunk with power, against Communist domination as it has occurred in certain unions of this land, domination which at times has already been destroyed by the right of men and women to withdraw from a union set up for the purpose of serving the godless, imperialistic, aggressive purposes of Russia instead of the great democratic republic of this country, the United States of America.

As Samuel Gompers pointed out many years ago, the union movement will find that no lasting gains can come from compulsion. Voluntarism is an aid to good unions—only poorly operated or corrupt unions need fear making membership entirely a matter of the individual's free choice.

The proof that South Dakota's right-to-work law works to the benefit rather than the detriment of organized labor came in a ruling by the Supreme Court of South Dakota, handed down in January of 1962. The situation was as follows: Municipal employees of Sioux Falls, our largest city, brought action against the city, the mayor, and the city commissioners to prevent them from carrying out a resolution barring policemen, firemen, and health department workers from belonging to the International Fire Fighters, or the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. The suit was based on a charge that South Dakota's right-to-work law had been violated, because the city fathers were trying to prevent city employees from joining a union.

The right-to-work law and the provision in our constitution provided specifically, as will be recalled when I was reading it, that employers shall not have a right to prevent their employees from joining a union. So the issue was clear. The unions—the employees—were carrying into the supreme court a test case, to see whether or not in fact right-to-work legislation protected the employee against an employer who was antiunion.

Let us explore what happened.

In the circuit court of Minnehaha County, the suit was dismissed, and the city employees appealed to a higher court. The State supreme court held that the resolution of the city requiring the officers and employees of the police, fire, and health departments of the city to terminate membership in any union affiliated with a national or other labor federation violates that provision of the constitution which says that the right of person to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or organization.

So the judgment of the circuit court was reversed, and the city employees of Sioux Falls were protected in their membership in labor unions by South Dakota's constitutional amendment incorporating right-to-work statutes in our law, and by the State supreme court ruling upon the validity of that provision in the constitutional amendment. This was in a very real sense a landmark decision, and I feel certain that the Senate will benefit from a more complete knowledge of the case. I will, therefore, quote to you the decision in this case—Levasseur against Wheeldon—Levasseur representing the employees, Mr. Wheeldon being Mayor Fay Wheeldon of the city of Sioux Falls, I believe this case in part accounts for the surprisingly large volume of mail received by South Dakota Members of Congress from union members in our State, saying, "Don't take our right-to-work provisions and safeguards away from us." We recall when, without it, the employees of the largest city of our State would have been denied the right to join the union. They are union men and women today because South Dakota has a right-to-work law incorporated in its constitution.

Let us see what was said by the court.

> This is an action against the city of Sioux Falls, its mayor, and city commissioners to enjoin them from carrying into effect a resolution requiring officers and employees of the police, fire, and health departments of the city to terminate their membership in any union affiliated with a national or other labor federation and from discharging them for failure to comply. Plaintiffs brought this action individually and as a class suit for the benefit of other members of local unions affiliated either with the International Fire Fighters or American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees. Judgment of dismissal was entered and plaintiffs appeal.
>
> On January 18, 1960, defendant commissioners adopted a resolution declaring that the three municipal departments mentioned are so affected with public safety, health and welfare that the officers and employees thereof should not belong to any organization which might in any manner prevent or interfere with the fair and impartial performance of their duties, and it was therein resolved as follows:
>
> "SECTION 1. That no officer or employee of the police department, the fire department, or the health department of the city of Sioux Falls shall hereafter be or become a member of any organization in any manner identified or affiliated with any trade association, federation, or labor union whose membership is not exclusively made up of officers or employees of the city of Sioux Falls.
>
> "SEC. 2. That this resolution shall not be construed to prohibit membership in the Fraternal Order of Police, the South Dakota

> Sheriffs and Peace Officers Association, the Tri-State Peace Officers Association, or any other similar organization which does not have as one of its primary purposes the representation of its members in collective bargaining processes or the representation of its members in matters relating to wages, hours, or other conditions of employment.
>
> "SEC. 3. That any officer or employee of said department shall have thirty (30) days after the effective date of resolution within which to disassociate himself from such prohibited organizations.

Article VI of the constitution of this State is known as the bill of rights. An amendment of section 2 thereof was adopted at the general election in 1946 reading as follows:

> Sec. 2. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union, or labor organization.

The complaint is based primarily on the contention that the resolution denying employment because of membership in a nationally affiliated labor union is repugnant to the above constitutional amendment. In addition thereto, the complaint alleges that the resolution sought to be annulled is unconstitutional in that it would deprive city employees of certain freedoms, rights and privileges granted by both the Federal and State Constitutions.

Under the commission form of government adopted by the city of Sioux Falls, the board of commissioners consisting of the mayor and two commissioners elected at large has control of all municipal departments. The mayor is president of the board and has a vote upon all questions. Authority is conferred upon the commissioners to make rules and regulations, subject, of course, to constitutional and statutory restrictions, for the organization and management of the several departments of the city and such agencies as may be created for the administration of its affairs. SDC 45.0805. Defendant city pursuant to the provisions of SDC 1960 Supp. 45.0201 (103) enacted an ordinance establishing a civil service system. The ordinance provides for the appointment of a civil service board and prescribes its powers and duties. Defendant city thus has a legislative method for selection, tenure, fixing of compensation and regulating of other matters concerning its employees which apply to the plaintiffs and the classes they represent.

> There is no denial that the governing body of a municipality possesses only such authority as is conferred upon it by law together with such powers as are necessary to carry into effect those granted. (*Ericksen* v. *City of Sioux Falls*, 70 S.D. 40, 14 N.W. 2d 89; see also in 31 A.L. R2d 1142 citation of cases and discussion of rights and powers of public employers with respect to union organization and activities.)

In *City of Springfield* v. *Clouse*, 356 Mo. 1239, 206 S.W. 2d 539, 545, the court recognizing a distinction in relations between a municipality and its employees and those between labor and private industry said:

> Under our form of government, public office or employment never has been and cannot become a matter of bargaining and contract * * *. This is true because the whole matter of qualifications, tenure, compensation and working conditions for any public service, involves the exercise of legislative powers * * *. If such powers cannot be delegated, they surely cannot be bargained or contracted away; and certainly not by any administrative or executive officers who cannot have any legislative powers. Although executive and administrative officers may be vested with a certain amount of discretion and may be authorized to act or make regulations in accordance with certain fixed standards, nevertheless the matter of making such standards involves the exercise of legislative powers. Thus qualifications, tenure, compensation and working conditions of public officers and employees are wholly matters of lawmaking and cannot be the subject of bargaining or contract. Such bargaining could only be usurpation of legislative powers by executive officers; and, of course, no legislature could bind itself or its successor to make or continue any legislative act. Therefore, this section can only be construed to apply to employees in private industry where actual bargaining may be used from which valid contracts concerning terms and conditions of work may be made. It cannot apply to public employment where it could amount to no more than giving expression to desires for the lawmaker's consideration and guidance.

The court concluded, however, that this did not mean that public employees could not organize; that the right of citizens to assemble peaceably and organize for any proper purpose, to speak freely, and to present their views to public officers was preserved by the Federal and State Constitutions.

In *Norwalk Teachers' Associations* v. *Board of Education*, 138 Conn. 269, 83 a. 2d 482, 484, 31 A.L.R. 2d 1133, the court, while recognizing the right of public schoolteachers to organize as a union held that school officers could not bargain away discretionary powers vested in them to establish rules. It said:

> Under our system, the government is established by and run for all of the people, not for the benefit of any person or group. The profit motive, inherent in the principle of free enterprise, is absent. It should be the aim of every employee of the government to do his or her part to make it function as efficiently and economically as possible. The drastic remedy of the organized strike to enforce the demands of unions of government employees is in direct contravention of this principle. It has been so regarded by the heads of the executive departments of the States and the Nation. Most of the text writers refer to one or more of the following statements by three of our recent Presidents. They are quoted, for example, in I Labor Law Journal 612 (May, 1950): "There is no right to strike against public safety by anybody anywhere at any time" (Calvin Coolidge on the Boston police strike). This same strike was characterized by President Wilson as "an intolerable crime against civilization." President Franklin D. Roosevelt said in a letter to the president of the National Federation of Federal Employees on August 16, 1937: "Particularly, I want to emphasize my conviction that militant tactics have no place in the functions of any organization of Government employees . . . (A) strike of public employees manifests nothing less than an intent on their part to prevent or obstruct the operation of Government until their demands are satisfied. Such action, looking toward the paralysis of Government by those who have sworn to support it, is unthinkable and intolerable."
>
> (2) The resolution sought to be annulled is clearly repugnant to and in conflict with the constitutional amendment requiring that no persons be denied employment because of membership or nonmembership in a labor union if it applies to public employees. Defendants argue that the provisions of this right-to-work amendment are not so plain as to leave no room for construction and that by a process of practical construction we should hold that it does not include public employment. It is argued in support of this contention that:
>
> The amendment is in general terms and the duty of the court is to determine what the framers of the amendment and the people who adopted it, intended to bind by its provisions. The court, it appears to us, will take judicial notice of the times and circumstances under which the amendment was adopted. In South Dakota, in 1946, the question of the right of public employees to join unions had never been discussed publicly and was not a matter of the slightest public interest. The paramount issue at the close of World War II was the increased power and the infiltration of labor unions into every aspect of the Nation's economic activity, and the rapid spread of their closed shop and union shops doctrine, where failure to join the union would prohibit a man from working. The amendment was adopted at a time when unions and union power were on the ascendancy; the amendment was to delimit the authority of these unions to prevent workers from making a free choice about union membership. To assert otherwise is to dream up a figment of economic life that has never been present or discussed in the Legislature of the State of South Dakota or by the people generally who voted upon this amendment.

The Supreme Court of Arkansas in a recent decision, *Potts* v. *Hay*, 229 Ark. 830, 318 S.W. 2d 826, held that the words "No person shall be denied employment because of membership in a labor union" do not exclude public employment. It was argued in that case that the court should recognize the applicability of the rule of constitutional and statutory construction that general words do not include the State or its subdivision unless that intention is stated expressly or by necessary implication and hold that an implied exception excluded public employment. The court rejected this contention.

While the precise question is not discussed the Supreme Court of Florida in *Miami Water Works Local No. 654* v. *City of Miami*, 157 Fla. 44526 So. 2d 194, 165 A.L.R. 967, apparently assumed that the words "the right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization" in the constitution of that State applies to public employment. The constitutional provisions referred to include a proviso to the effect that the words above quoted "shall not be construed to deny or abridge the right of employees by and through a labor organization or labor union to bargain collectively with their employer." The court observed that this section of the constitution did not give the right of collective bargaining to any group. The proviso merely grants the right of collective bargaining otherwise conferred.

The court in *Beverly* v. *City of Dallas, Tex.*, Civ. App., 292 S.W. 2d 172, held an ordinance prohibiting the formation of unions among city officials and employees invalid as in conflict with a general statute providing "that no person shall be denied public employment by reason of membership or nonmembership in a labor organization.

In sustaining the validity of a statutory provision restricting collective bargaining with public employees the court said:

> The statute is very clear in forbidding collective bargaining, and the recognition of a union as a bargaining agent, and declaring null and void any contracts entered into between municipal authorities and any such organization on that basis; but because it permits public employees to present grievances individually or through a representative, the statute does not contradict itself * * *. The presentation of a grievance is in effect a unilateral procedure, whereas a contract or agreement resulting from collective bargaining must of necessity be a bilateral procedure culminating in a meeting of the minds involved and binding the parties to the agreement. The presentation of a grievance is simply what the words imply, and no more, and here it must be remembered that the privilege is extended only with the express restriction that strikes by public employees are illegal and unlawful, as is collective bargaining, so it is clear that the statute carefully prohibits striking and collective bargaining, but does permit the presentation of grievances, a unilateral proceeding resulting in no loss of sovereignty by the municipality. We think the statute is clear, unambiguous and not contradictory of itself.
>
> (3, 4) When the people amended Section 2, Article VI, of the constitution to provide that the "rights of persons to work" shall not be denied because of "membership or nonmembership" in a labor union, we think that the language is plain and unambiguous and that there is no occasion for interpretation. Language in a constitution, as well as words in a statute or contract, must be applied as it reads in the absence of ambiguity. State ex rel. *Payne* v. *Reeves*, 44 S.D. 568, 184 N.W. 993; *Elfring* v. *Paterson*, 66 S.D. 458, 285 N.W. 443. We hold that this constitutional amendment does not exclude public employment and that membership among city employees cannot be banned by municipal legislation or rule.
>
> It will be observed that under this amended section, the converse also obtains. Nonmembership in any union shall not operate to deny or abridge the right to work. A municipality cannot by legislative action or otherwise require union membership as a prerequisite to employment. As we have observed, distinctions exist in the relations between employees and a municipality and those between employees and an employer in private industry. What we have stated does not mean that a union of municipal employees possesses the rights of collective bargaining or the right to strike to enforce its demands.
>
> The judgment appealed from is reversed. All the judges concur.

Mr. President, I have taken the time to discuss and document that historic decision on the part of the South Dakota Supreme Court in support of the union's right to work within a municipality to point out something which is frequently ignored as we discuss right-to-work legislation. I point out that in the instant case South Dakota's right-to-work law made it possible for the unions to organize in an area where they would otherwise have been denied that right because the supreme court based its decision, as will be noted from the reference and documentation, solely on the conclusion that the right-to-work amendment also prevented an employer from denying his employees the right to organize.

I have spread it in the RECORD with its citation, with its background, and with its documentation, so that at least the lawyers among our body and those around the country who read the RECORD can find there the entire legal story reinforcing the argument of many, and in answer to the union that right-to-work legislation is a protection alike to the union and member, to the employer and to the great citizenry who comprise the bulk of this world politic.

The case of Levasseur against Wheeldon, in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., clearly establishes that legitimate union activities are protected by South Dakota's right-to-work law.

Earlier I mentioned the economic benefits of our right-to-work law. So far as I am concerned, the principle of individual freedom of choice is far more important than the economic benefits of a right-to-work law. Nevertheless, official Government figures do show that right-to-work States are progressing economically at a faster rate than non-right-to-work States. There are many reasons why this is so. Labor-management relations are better, and there are fewer work stoppages due to strikes.

Employers and employees seem to be happier and more content and become more productive workers when they are not subjected to compulsion and duress as a condition of holding their jobs and where no labor leader can threaten them with reprisals for failing to carry out some motivation of his own at the peril of otherwise losing their jobs.

Mr. President, happy people work harder and more productively than do unhappy people.

To indicate what has happened to South Dakota's economy under its right-to-work law, I cite the following figures from the U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, as reported in the publication, "Employment and Earnings," 1955 and March 1965 volumes.

Under the heading of "Average Weekly Earning of Production Workers" I wish to give the following facts:

South Dakota's average weekly earnings are currently $106.14, as compared with the national average of $102.68. The rate of increase over the last 10 years in South Dakota has been 44.7 percent, as compared with a national average of 44.3 percent, and a non-right-to-work State average of 42.8 percent. South Dakota has a higher weekly earning for production workers than 23 other States, among them being Idaho, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

Over the last 10 years, South Dakota has shown a higher percentage of increase in the average weekly earnings of production workers than have 20 States, among them being Idaho, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Washington State, and Wyoming.

I must say that the statistics were taken prior to the passage of the Wyoming right-to-work law.

Thus, South Dakota stands above the national average in weekly earnings and percentage of increase in earnings.

I shall quote from the Department of Labor report under the heading "Rate of Unemployment."

I am proud to point out to my distinguished colleagues that South Dakota ranks fourth in the Nation in having the lowest rate of unemployment. The first three places are all held by right-to-work States. South Dakota is tied for fourth place with Colorado, a non-right-to-work State. With the exception of Colorado, South Dakota has lower unemployment than any non-right-to-work State. Her rate of 3.3 percent is far lower than the national average of 4.7 percent, far lower than the non-right-to-work States average of 5 percent, and lower than the right-to-work States average of 4 percent. The source of this data on rates of unemployment is the Bureau of Economic Security, Department of Labor and Manpower Report to the President, table D–3, page 241.

Let us turn to personal income.

PERSONAL INCOME

South Dakota's rate of increase in personal income—1959–64—is higher than that of 28 States, among them being 22 non-right-to-work States: New Jersey, Michigan, Kentucky, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Missouri, Vermont, Louisiana, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Idaho, Washington, Rhode Island, New York, New Mexico, Illinois, Maine, Ohio, Montana, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

Again I point out that these figures were compiled by Government sources prior to the passage of the right-to-work law in the State of Wyoming.

South Dakota's rate of increase in personal income for the period cited was 28.1 percent as compared with the national average increase of 27.2 percent and the non-right-to-work State average of 25.5 percent.

The data on personal income come from the Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, August 1960; August 1964; and April 1965.

HOURLY EARNINGS BY MANUFACTURING WORKERS

South Dakota, from the period beginning 1953 and ending 1963, enjoyed a

51.4-percent increase in hourly earnings by manufacturing workers. This increase was considerably higher than the average increase for non-right-to-work States of 41.5 percent, and the national average of 43.1 percent. Source: Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Employment and Earnings Statistics for States and Areas," 1939–63.

PRODUCTION WORKERS

I turn now to production workers. The rate of increase in South Dakota for production workers from 1953 to 1962 was 37.5 percent. This very favorable increase was a far cry from the non-right-to-work State average of minus 14.1 percent and the national average of minus 10.2 percent. It was also well above the average of plus 3.9 percent for right-to-work States. The source of this information is the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

NEW MANUFACTURING JOBS

Let us analyze the situation from the standpoint of new manufacturing jobs, because I think we should hold the stethoscope to the economy of the various States from as many directions as we can and try to probe the facts as they actually obtain.

The rate of increase in the creation of new manufacturing jobs in South Dakota between 1953 and 1963 was 16.1 percent. The same statistics for non-right-to-work States show an average of minus 7.6 percent; for the national average, minus 3.3 percent. The average for right-to-work States during the same period cited was plus 12.8 percent. The source of this information is the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings Statistics for States and Areas, 1939 to 1963.

NONAGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEES

Now let us consider nonagricultural workers. South Dakota's rate of increase in the number of nonagricultural employees from 1953 to 1963 was 22.6 percent compared with a national average of only 12.6 percent and a non-right-to-work State average of 9.0 percent. The three top States in the creation rate for new jobs were all right-to-work States—Nevada, Arizona, and Florida. The source of this information is the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

VALUE OF LIFE INSURANCE IN FORCE

Let us now consider the value of life insurance in force. The rate of increase from 1953 to 1963 in the value of life insurance in force in South Dakota was 178.3 percent compared with the less favorable increase among non-right-to-work States of 132 percent and the national average increase of 140 percent for the same period. The source of this information is the Institute of Life Insurance: life insurance factbook.

VALUE ADDED BY MANUFACTURING

In the period between 1953 and 1962, the rate of increase in the value added by manufacturing for the State of South Dakota was 70.4 percent. This is far above the non-right-to-work State average of 41.5 percent and the national average of 47.5 percent. The source of the information is the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

PER CAPITA PERSONAL INCOME

We turn now to the per capita personal income. South Dakota's rate of increase from 1953 to 1963 in per capita personal income was 41.7 percent, favorably higher than the non-right-to-work State average of 35.4 percent and the national average of 47 percent.

The source of the information is the Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

I turn now to capital expenditures as another means of measuring the sturdiness of a State's economy. The rate of increase in capital expenditures from 1953 to 1962 in South Dakota was an amazing 433.3 percent, far above the average for non-right-to-work States during the same period of 27.2 percent and the national average of 29.8 percent. The average increase for right-to-work States during the period reported was 37.1 percent. The source of the information is the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

NUMBER OF INSURANCE POLICIES IN FORCE

I turn now to another analysis, the number of insurance policies in force in a State. This is another measure of the economic sturdiness in a State and of how well its employees and people are doing at any given juncture of the economic history.

In South Dakota, from 1953 to 1963, the increase in the number of insurance policies in force was 89.9 percent. This increase represents a much greater gain than those made on the average by non-right-to-work States, which was 26.8 percent, and a national average of 30.5 percent. The average among right-to-work States was 39.2 percent during the same period. The source of this information is the Institute of Life Insurance: life insurance factbook.

NUMBER OF RETAIL TRADE ESTABLISHMENTS

What about the number of retail trade establishments? Retail trade establishments fail or succeed dependent upon the trade capacity of customers to buy merchandise and pay for what they buy, and upon the customers having something left, after their necessary expenditures for livelihood, to buy other items for their homes or families. So, of course, the number of retail establishments is related to the amount of money that people who work for a living, as most of us do, have to spend.

The rate of increase in the number of retail trade establishments from 1954 to 1958 in South Dakota was 5 percent. The same statistics for the non-right-to-work States averaged 2.6 percent. The national average was 3.9 percent. The source of the information is the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Thus we see that the economic picture for a State that has a right-to-work law and that has brought about good labor-management relations looks even better when it is viewed alongside the economic development in other States. Certainly it is better when viewed in comparison with the devastation that followed the strike of transport workers in New York City, a strike which began when one union leader, Mike Quill, who I assume endorses the proposal to repeal section 14(b), showed utter contempt—we might even say enjoyable contempt; he seemed to enjoy registering it—for the judicial process by tearing up his court subpena before the television cameras and the eyes of the world.

Therefore, as a result of one man's action and his complete disregard for the public interest, a city, and, to a certain extent, a union, the Nation, and the whole country, were paralyzed. A strike occurred that, we are told, cost $100 million a day. Indeed, the total economic damage has been estimated to be $1.2 billion. I do not know how much the cost was, but all of us know that there was sizable damage to the economy of New York, which damage reached with its ramifications into many other States and many other areas of the country.

As a result of this strike, small stores closed and will remain closed permanently. Most of the businesses that remained open will be unable to recoup their losses, some of which losses ran as high as 80 percent. As usual, Uncle Sam will get it in the neck because their capacity, in fact, the necessity of their paying income taxes will be substantially reduced. There will be less money in the Federal Treasury with which to wage war in Vietnam or to repair the damages of conflict if peace can happily come or to carry on the great advantages of the Great Society and the war on poverty or do any other thing that government might be called upon to do.

As a result of one man's action, one union's action, one intemperate action in a State in which they do not have the protection of right-to-work legislation, we had great economic devastation and no cure to prevent its repetition has as yet been evolved.

Is that the kind of situation we are trying to create by repealing section 14(b), making it possible for this kind of intemperance and this kind of injustice to occur in other industries, in other communities, in other areas? Is this the uniform labor-management relations that repeal of section 14(b) is supposed to provide? Is this the type of respect for law and order that we will be fostering if we do away with right-to-work laws and thus compel laborers to join unions in which their dues support the activities of men such as Mike Quill in the instant case?

South Dakotans say "no" to those questions.

After a number of years' experience with the right-to-work law, how do the people of South Dakota now feel about this law? I mentioned earlier that in a South Dakota poll and in my personal and mail contacts with people back home in the State which I represent, the people had left absolutely no doubt in my mind as to their strong feelings that section 14(b) and the South Dakota right-to-work law must be retained.

Further proof of this can be found in the highly respected South Dakota poll, which is sponsored jointly by the Aberdeen American-News, published in Aberdeen, S. Dak., the South Dakota, Sioux Falls, Daily Argus-Leader, published in the largest city of our State—and the largest newspaper of a five-State area out that way—and the Watertown Public Opinion, published in Watertown, S. Dak.—these three great newspapers have developed what they call the South Dakota poll.

They utilize the usual scientific methods employed by poll takers in good repute everywhere. The poll is highly respected. Its predictions have been rather accurate in times past.

In mid-July of last year, the South Dakota poll made a scientific survey of opinion among the people of South Dakota on 14(b). It conclusively proved that the great majority of South Dakotans like the right-to-work law and are opposed to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. I read now from the published report of the South Dakota poll:

> Taft-Hartley's section 14(b), commonly referred to as the right-to-work clause, enables a State to pass a law barring the union shop system within that State.
>
> The union shop system permits union shop contracts between management and labor, which contracts require all workers to join the union after they have been hired for work in a unionized business.
>
> Nineteen States, including South Dakota, have laws prohibiting union shop contracts.

Parenthetically, they said the closed shop, which requires union membership before a worker is hired for work in a unionized business, is banned in all States by Federal law.

I continue to read:

> Were section 14(b) to be repealed by Congress, persons in South Dakota who choose to work in a unionized business where the union shop arrangement has been agreed upon by management and the union would be required to join the union after being employed.
>
> On the proposal now before Congress to repeal this section of the Taft-Hartley Act, three-fifths of the persons polled were opposed, about one-fifth favored repeal, and the other one-fifth indicated they had no opinion or that they did not understand the issue.
>
> The reponse was as follows:

	Percent
Favor repeal of section 14(b)	21
Oppose repeal of section 14(b)	60
Do not understand issue	10
No opinion	9

> In general farmers and residents of the West River country were strongest in their opposition to the repeal of section 14(b). Some 63 percent of the farmers polled opposed repeal, only 12 percent favored repeal, and another 25 percent either did not understand the issue or had no opinion. In the West River region 59 percent opposed repeal, and only 14 percent favored it.
>
> Rather interestingly, more persons in small towns than in the cities favored repeal of section 14(b), as the figures below indicate.

[In percent]

	Favor repeal	Oppose repeal	No opinion or do not understand issue
Farm	12	63	25
Town	40	50	10
City	21	63	16
East	23	60	17
West	14	59	27

In the South Dakota poll respondents were asked:

> Do you believe that a worker should be required to join a union in order to work in a unionized factory or business?

Seventy-one percent of the people answered "no"—they do not believe a worker should be required to join a union in order to hold his job in a unionized plant or firm. Only 22 percent were of the opinion that the employee should be required to join. Seven percent had no opinion.

The people of South Dakota are not against unions, just as I am not against unions. I believe they play an important role in our economic society. In the South Dakota poll, the people were asked:

> In general, do you approve of labor unions?

The majority—59 percent—said they do approve of unions, in general. Only 36 percent said they do not approve of labor unions. Five percent had no opinion.

This proves, I believe, that South Dakotans are not against unions. They are against compulsion. They are opposed to unions having the power to force men and women to become members against their will. They are pretty generally against the power of people in any walk of life, public or private, politician or organization leader, to shove them around. South Dakotans, Mr. President, have an avid regard and respect for their capacities for personal freedom and free choice.

In this the people of South Dakota are a bit like the people in all the other States. Other States may lack some of the independent spirit of South Dakota's citizens; I do not know. But I think there are elements of high spirit and independence, an affection for freedom and an affinity for liberty among the people of most of our States. Certainly I know those manifestations, Mr. President, are evident among young Americans in every State; and South Dakota is a young State, so I suppose we can say that the oldest person living in it is a young American. Anyhow, back home they have that young American affinity for freedom and liberty, and I like to think that that is still apparent throughout America generally.

In all events, national polls have repeatedly shown that the American people do not go along with union officials in their desire to be able to compel membership in unions by means of contracts with employers.

Another important indication of the way the people of South Dakota feel about 14(b) and right to work can be found in editorials in the State's newspapers. Opposition of the newspapers of South Dakota to repeal of 14(b) is almost universal, almost solid, as these newspaper editorials speak, reflecting not only their viewpoints, but I am sure what they feel to be the viewpoints of their subscribers, their leaders and the citizens of their communities. I have some typical editorials here from South Dakota newspapers, up-to-date comments by well-advised South Dakotans on what they believe to be the necessity of defeating this attempt, in this Congress, to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I have one in my hand, Mr. President, which is an editorial from the Rapid City Daily Journal under the heading "Who Has Right to Work?"

The Rapid City Daily Journal is published in the second largest city of South Dakota. It is the metropolis of the Black Hills. It is one of the great tourist centers of America. Over a million people visit Mount Rushmore National Park every year, and view the four great historic faces carved in the granite of Mount Rushmore. Three times that many people visit the Black Hills, used by one President as a summer White House and by others frequently as a point of rest and recreation, as they fish in the well-filled trout streams of the State and view the majestic mountains of the Black Hills, the largest, tallest mountains in the world, Mr. President, between the Rockies and the Alps of Switzerland.

And so the Rapid City Journal speaks with something of a significant thrust, representing the high-spirited people of western South Dakota. Here is what it says:

> The right-to-work laws in 20 States—

The correct number is now 19; I add that parenthetically because the editor was in error by 1 State—

> are under attack. One announced legislative objective of the AFL-CIO as Congress meets in the new year is repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.
>
> This section affirms the authority of States to enact right-to-work laws. The right is that an individual can work at his job whether or not he is a member of a union or any other organization.
>
> Among the 20 States—

I again add, the current number should now be 19—

> which have right-to-work laws is South Dakota. The section of the Federal law in question was passed by Congress in 1947. In that same year, South Dakotans approved such a right with an amendment to the State constitution.
>
> Admittedly the union movement has made great strides for the development of the American economy. Living conditions have improved. This country remains the wealthiest in all the world. Individual enterprise has accounted for many of the gains. Cooperative effort has stimulated progress.
>
> However, union demands for more power deserve some reflection on the part of thinking Americans. Where do the union chieftains cease and desist?
>
> It will take an act of Congress to change section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley measure.

The pressure is on the President and Congress.

Why should South Dakotans, or residents of any State be forced to join a union, or pay dues when they don't care for the idea or the elected local, State or national officials?

Curtailment of the power of the unions on a national scale would seem to be in order, rather than shrinking the rights of citizens in 20—

And I again say, Mr. President, the correct number is now 19—

or all 50 States.

Factually, the right to work in South Dakota is inhibited. Any major contract involves skilled union men who can walk off the job if the "scabs"—that's the nonunion men—become too numerous or fail to pay the dues.

However, the evidence provided by the U.S. Department of Labor shows that unions have continued to thrive where right-to-work laws are in effect. The average increase in wages has been higher. New manufacturing jobs have increased at a faster rate where union membership is voluntary, not compulsory.

May I interrupt the reading of the editorial, Mr. President, to say for the benefit of Senators who may have come in later, after I had related the tabular findings and comparisons of South Dakota as a right-to-work State in these various criteria of economic success, that they will find them a little earlier in his remarks, as I spelled out in detail how in the right-to-work State of South Dakota, among retail establishments, insurance policy holdings were increasing at a faster rate, that we are producing a greater soundness and a stability of economy, as measured by the various ramifications that one uses in trying to put together the picture of a sound economy.

I now revert to the reading of the editorial, but I did not wish Senators to fail to realize that there was documentation in the RECORD, and my hope for the very proper and wise communication and observations made by the editorial published in the Rapid City Daily Journal:

> Some can say that South Dakota has failed to catch up with labor trends. We know that right-to-work laws are being prepared now for Pennsylvania, California, and New Mexico.
>
> Supreme power should never belong to any group or individual—High Court Justices, union labor leaders, Congressmen, or Presidents—it should remain with the people.

Mr. President, turning now from one of our metropolitan dailies in South Dakota to one of our fine weekly newspapers in Milbank, S. Dak., in the Whetstone Valley where that county touches cheek to jowl the great State of Minnesota, from whence comes our Vice President, up in the Big Stone Lake fishing areas, where we have our fair quota of the 10,000 lakes that distinguish the landscape of Minnesota—up there where people live a pleasant life, where they have an industrial output combined with an agricultural output from the great Whetstone Valley, where people can look on this subject without bias or prejudice, there is published an editorial in the Milbank Herald Advocate, published by one of the fine women editors of America. She used to be a schoolteacher. Her name is Lucille Burgess.

Let us see what she has to say, commenting on this topic of great concern to all Americans. "To Join or Not Join" is the title of the editorial.

She writes in the Milbank Herald Advocate:

> The desk of the Herald Advocate over which passes all kinds of interesting mail usually has one or two pieces of literature dealing with the Taft-Hartley Act.
>
> Now we do not pretend to be the last word on the Taft-Hartley Act or even to be more than vaguely familiar with it and its provisions.
>
> However, in the past few months we have become aware that forces are at work to repeal section 14(b) of the act which is the provision that affirms the right of States to pass right-to-work laws.
>
> In President Johnson's state of the Union message last January, he stated that he would propose changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, including section 14(b).
>
> It seems to us, strictly in terms of commonsense and without going into any technicalities, the repeal of this law which gives States the right to prohibit compulsory union membership would be a mistake.
>
> In a country that at the moment is intensely interested in preventing discrimination, repeal of this law would be inviting a new kind of discrimination.

Mr. President, let me say parenthetically that we can always trust the intuitive sense of a lady to come up with an idea, an argument and an angle which has been too frequently neglected by those of the masculine sex who have commented and written on this subject.

To preserve the continuity, I read the sentence in the editorial again:

> In a country that at the moment is intensely interested in preventing discrimination, repeal of this law would be inviting a new kind of discrimination. It would make it mandatory for an employee who wishes to keep his job to be a union member whether or not he wished to be.
>
> We do not desire to argue here the merits of unionism. The point we wish to make is that if some individualist does not want to join a union, not joining should be his privilege in a free country.
>
> There is no 11th commandment that says "Thou Shalt Join the Union." Until there is, we heartily beseech our Congressmen to preserve the legislation on the books which guarantees an individual free choice in the matter.

Mr. President, I have much more that I should like to say on this subject, as to why I believe it to be unwise and unwarranted to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act at this time. However, because of the fact that it is snowing very heavily outside, and that some of our colleagues have dinner engagements in the most important house in town, I do not wish to inconvenience any Senator.

Consequently, I yield the floor at this time and shall continue my arguments against repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act on some later occasion, when it is more convenient for my colleagues.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota is very considerate. A snowstorm is in progress at this moment, which ordinarily would not be regarded as much of a storm by any one of the rugged citizens of South Dakota, or equally the rugged citizens of the State of Michigan, but it has been our experience in Washington——

Mr. TOWER. Or the rugged people of Texas.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe it would be in order to delete that latter.

Mr. HART. If the roll were called, I do not know what the verdict would be.

Mr. MUNDT. I have been advised that some of our colleagues have departed for home already because of the bad traffic conditions.

Mr. HART. Indeed, the Senator is correct. Washington succumbs most readily to the falling of snow.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in view of the heavy snowstorm outside, I believe that it is prudent to move at this time, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, January 27, 1966, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, January 26, 1966:

The Judiciary

Constance Baker Motley, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York vice Archie O. Dawson, deceased.

U.S. Attorney

Gilbert S. Merritt, Jr., of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years vice Kenneth Harwell, resigned.

U.S. Marshal

Anthony J. Furka, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years vice James R. Berry, resigned.

In the Navy

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving:

*Vice Adm. John L. Chew, U.S. Navy.

*Vice Adm. John J. Hyland, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. Frederick L. Ashworth, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officers, when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Vice Adm. Charles L. Melson, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. Edmund B. Taylor, U.S. Navy.

In the Marine Corps Reserve

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of major general subject to qualification therefore as provided by law:

Charles F. Duchein
Sidney S. McMath

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general subject to qualification therefore as provided by law:

Leland W. Smith
Arthur B. Hanson

---

* Officers hold ad interim appointments.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Salute to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day in the world, for the Republic of India celebrates the 16th anniversary of her independence. It is a great day in India because the promise of new leadership, in the person of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, India's new Prime Minister, hopefully will lead this magnificent country into the future with her head held high, full of confidence and enthusiasm.

This is an opportune time, therefore, Mr. Speaker, for us here to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, President of the Republic of India; to Her Excellency Mrs. Indira Gandhi, India's Prime Minister; and to His Excellency Braj Kumar Nehru, India's Ambassador to the United States.

Upon the shoulders of Mrs. Gandhi have fallen some weighty problems, but her faith in her country and her countrymen will give her the wisdom and guidance she will need to lead this great nation in these times. Our hopes and prayers go out to Mrs. Gandhi at this time. She follows in the illustrious footsteps of the late Prime Minister Shastri—but she, we are sure, will be able to continue the good work of this great man.

We join with our Indian brothers today in commemoration of a landmark in their political history—January 26, 1950, the day upon which the constitution of a free and independent India went into effect. That event marked the establishment of India as a Sovereign Democratic Republic, consisting of a Union of States. It represented a triumph for dedicated Indians who were determined to create a secular democracy in which every person would have the essentials of a decent government and in which inequalities would be reduced to a minimum.

Like our own Bill of Rights, the Indian Constitution named and guaranteed the basic rights of every citizen. It gave the right to vote to everyone 21 years of age and older. The constitution prohibited unequal treatment because of race, religion, social class, sex, or place of birth.

The 16 years that have passed since the Proclamation of the Republic have been as but an instant in the rich history of this 5,000-year-old land. In this period India has grappled heroically with mammoth difficulties. Extreme loyalties of religion and community have been divisive forces, impeding the coalescence of a strong national unity. The Indian economy has been beset with countless problems, in particular the inability to produce enough food for her 465 million people. The ravages of heart-rending poverty, illiteracy, and disease have been etched upon the face of India. The threat of further aggression by the Communist Chinese has added yet another obstacle to the tremendous task of achieving economic self-sufficiency.

Despite these great handicaps, the cumulative effect has been to produce relatively minor distortions in Indian democracy. India today can boast a vigorous press, free trade unions, a growing number of articulate intellectuals, and growing national unity. The ideals of the constitution have been held in reverence, and, more important, have been translated into meaningful action. Having just passed through the crucible of the loss of the great leader Lal Bahadur Shastri, India has again proved the mettle of its democratic system.

Today in this new year of 1966 the democratic way of life stands threatened by Communist aggression. We here in America may take comfort in viewing India as one nation of the vast and teeming Asian land mass that shines forth as a major functioning democracy. To this great land, Mr. Speaker, we send our congratulations and best wishes.

Los Angeles at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in early California, in the days of the dons and the ranchos, the visitor to a home was met with the traditional Spanish greeting of "Mi casa es su casa."—"My house is your house." This greeting has become the motto of a new civic organization, formed 4 years ago and known as "Los Angeles at Home." The warm hospitality implied in this salutation is being revived, and its recipient is the international tourist visiting in the Greater Los Angeles area.

The purpose of "Los Angeles at Home" is, of course, to enable the tourist to meet with to learn something of the American way of life, and for the host family, in turn, to learn about their guest's way of life. It makes possible an exchange of information concerning the differences and similarities in our peoples, our customs, and our nations, and thus strengthens friendship and understanding among the individuals and nations of the world.

Important, too, is the opportunity for the international tourist to spend a warm and delightful afternoon or evening in the home of a host family whose interests, hobbies, family, or business backgrounds are similar to their own. And over dinner or refreshments, around the fireplace, the pool, or in the patio they are able to discuss their mutual interests.

At the moment, "Los Angeles at Home" has over 700 host families on file covering a wide range of business, family backgrounds, and interests. These host families are drawn not only from the city and county of Los Angeles, but from the cities and towns in Orange, San Bernardino, Ventura, and Riverside counties—in short, from all of the Greater Los Angeles area.

In addition to these individual families, "Los Angeles at Home" has, too, the interest and support of many other civic organizations and clubs, as well as that of the newspapers, radio and television, governmental offices, the travel industry, and so forth.

In order to match up the tourist with a host family of similar interests, "Los Angeles at Home" asks the tourist to fill out certain forms which are then checked against the host family forms already on file. The length of the visit—it may be for the afternoon, for dinner and the evening, or for a few hours after dinner—is arranged to the mutual satisfaction of both the visitor and the host family. The type of entertainment is left entirely to the discretion of the host family. "Los Angeles at Home" can give its host families at least 24 hours notice so that they can make the necessary arrangements about picking up their guests at their hotel, and so forth.

There is no charge to the tourist for this service, nor does the host family receive any remuneration. The host families act solely out of a desire and interest to make the tourist feel welcome to the United States and to the Greater Los Angeles area. The organization is incorporated under the laws of the State of California as a nonprofit corporation and as such is supported financially by various civic-minded individuals, corporations, and foundations throughout the metropolitan area.

The guiding light of "Los Angeles at Home" is Mr. Donn Gift. It is through his untiring efforts that this program continues to flourish. Mr. Gift and all those who participate in the program deserve the thanks and admiration of all of us.

School Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, for the current fiscal year, it is estimated that from $400 to $415 million will be needed to meet all school districts' entitlement. Yet budget figures released Monday called for the appropriation of $183 million to be used during fiscal 1967 for the operation of school districts with students whose parents work on or live on Government installations.

This slash in funds for operation of the federally impacted school program is unjustified, inequitable, and a breach of promise on the part of the Federal Government. It indicates the problems we can anticipate as the Federal Government moves further toward taking over the financing of our schools.

This cut of more than 50 percent will leave many South Dakota school districts far short of necessary funds—funds they had been led to believe they would receive and had included in their budget estimates. They simply had not taken into account the fact that they are at the mercy of the all-powerful centralized Government in Washington whose whim it is to cut these essential funds to make room for more popular programs in this election year.

Taxation of Antitrust Treble Damage Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Internal Revenue Service rulings on private treble damage actions under the antitrust laws have given favored tax treatment to antitrust violators. These rulings have weakened the vigor of our antitrust policies, penalized the victims of unlawful predatory business practices, increased the tax burden on the general public, and benefited convicted antitrust criminals. I am introducing a bill that is designed to reaffirm Congress direction for an effective antitrust program and correct the mistakes that have been made by the Internal Revenue Service.

On July 24, 1964, the IRS promulgated Revenue Ruling 64–224 for the benefit of the electrical equipment manufacturers industry. This ruling permits amounts paid to persons for injuries resulting from antitrust violations to be deductible as "ordinary and necessary" business expense by the violator. When the IRS issued this regulation, Senator HART, as chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and of its Antitrust Subcommittee, jointly denounced the ruling as a tax giveaway, at the expense of other taxpayers, to corporations which had been found guilty of criminal antitrust violations. We pointed out that the ruling rewarded lawlessness, and that the Government would lose millions in tax dollars.

As a result of these and other protests, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation on November 18, 1964, under the leadership of Senator Harry F. Byrd and Representative WILBUR MILLS, decided to review the entire matter. The staff was requested to collect and summarize, for the use of the joint committee, relevant legislative materials and viewpoints of various groups of interested parties as to policies and probable consequences of the Revenue Ruling 64–224. I submitted an extensive analysis of the legislative history and relevant judicial decisions, which to my mind made it clear that the IRS ruling is erroneous and contrary to the policies established by Congress.

The Department of Justice submitted a weak and equivocal statement to the Joint Committee. In its statement, the Department of Justice pointed out that, although the IRS position was not one that the Department would have reached had it been charged with responsibility, and although the Department would have been prepared to defend in court a rule of complete nondeductibility, it nonetheless deferred to the position taken by the Treasury and relied upon Congress to be the final arbiter in balancing the competing antitrust and tax considerations. On November 1, 1965, the Joint Committee staff submitted its summary, without recommendation, to the Joint Committee for further consideration. The staff suggested, however, that legislation may be appropriate to correct errors made by the IRS.

We need legislation that clearly defines congressional intent as to the priority of the policy embodied in the antitrust laws over tax questions with respect to private antitrust treble damage actions. This will eliminate any possibility that the IRS in the future would again distort congressional policy through changes in its rulings.

The IRS ruling has its origin in one of the most callous antitrust cases to reach the courts: the price fixing and bid regulating cases in the early 1960's against General Electric Co., Westinghouse and other electrical equipment manufacturers. In these cases the Government indicted 20 companies for conspiring to fix prices in sales of electrical equipment to Government and to industry. The defendants admitted their responsibility and pleaded guilty to the charges. Substantial fines were imposed and several corporate officials were sent to jail. In the wake of these Government victories, more than 2,000 private cases were filed against General Electric Co., Westinghouse, and other electrical equipment manufacturers. Conservative estimates placed the potential total liability of the defendants in these private cases at nearly $300 million.

Since it reduces treble damages to approximately double damages, the effect of the IRS ruling is to award a gift of nearly $150 million to these admittedly guilty electrical equipment manufacturers. Other American taxpayers, who already have been victimized by the conspirators and required to pay higher prices for electrical equipment and for electrical service, must make up the loss in revenue that the Government suffers through the ruling.

Private actions to collect damages from antitrust violators traditionally have been relied upon as an important adjunct to antitrust law enforcement. To stimulate private actions, Congress authorized treble damages, with the intent, always, to provide an additional method to punish antitrust violators. Until the IRS made its ruling, no one believed that defendants, who had caused damages through violations of the antitrust laws, would be allowed to deduct treble damage payments as "ordinary and necessary" business expenses. There is a long history in our legislative and judicial precedents that establishes that a treble damage requirement is punitive in nature. To allow such damages in antitrust cases to be deducted under our tax laws frustrates the national policy that makes price fixing in interstate and foreign commerce a criminal offense.

Since its ruling became public, I consistently have protested the IRS gift to the electrical equipment manufacturers. During all of this time, I have hoped that the IRS would repudiate its ruling. I believe the IRS should, even at this late date, repudiate its ruling. Repudiation would correct their error, and at the same time would permit the companies to try the issue in court and in that forum establish, if they can, a right to a deduction. Unless the ruling is repudiated, however, no individual taxpayer can go to court to test its validity.

The IRS, however, seems to be more amenable to the argument of the antitrust conspirators. I have given up hope that the IRS will move to correct the situation. Legislation is required. The bill I introduce, of course, can only have prospective application. If the IRS would repudiate its ruling the effect would be retroactive and the electrical equipment companies would not enjoy this tax windfall. This cannot be accomplished by legislation.

In keeping with my conviction that legislation is needed to clarify and emphasize the overriding public policy involved in private treble damage antitrust actions, my bill also remedies IRS and judicial rulings as to the tax treatment of damages recovered by the plaintiff in a successful antitrust suit. At the present time, such recoveries are treated as income to the successful plaintiff. The effect of this ruling, which was affirmed by the Supreme Court in the Glenshaw case—*Commissioner of Internal Revenue* v. *Glenshaw Glass Co.,* 348 U.S. 426 (1954)—reduces the amount of damages the successful plaintiff is able to recover and retain. Reduction of this recovery lessens the incentive to bring private actions, and the Government loses the benefits of supplementary private antitrust enforcement. My bill makes it clear that recoveries in excess of damages sustained shall not be treated as income to the successful plaintiff.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 12319

A bill to amend section 4 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C., section 15), and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (15 U.S.C., sec. 15), is hereby amended by inserting "(a)" after Section 4, and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In any action pending or instituted under subsection (a) of this section on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, the amount recovered in excess of the damages sustained shall not be treated as income for purposes of any law of the United States imposing a tax on income. In any action pending or instituted under subsection (a) of this section or under section 4A of this Act on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, no payment made by any defendant pursuant to any judgment or settlement of such action shall be deductible as ordinary and necessary expense under any law of the United States imposing a tax on income."

Changes in Public Laws 815 and 874

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would amend Public Laws 815 and 874 in order to bring them more in line with their original purpose.

These laws had their genesis in late 1949 and early 1950 when the Subcommittee on Education of the House Education and Labor Committee conducted extensive hearings all across the country, the printed record of which extends to some 2,400 pages. In the report of that committee, it was stated that—

> Federal assistance as called for in these recommendations is restricted to meeting the Federal responsibility only in these affected school districts; it is not intended to provide assistance that would be available under proposals for general Federal aid.

Over the years since 1950, however, due largely to various amendments, the program has become a kind of general aid to education, "under a poor formula" as one authority put it. While I would be opposed on principle to a Federal program of general aid to education, if we are to have such a program it should be drawn up, introduced, and debated on its own merits. It should not be foisted off on this Congress and on the public by hacking up, amending, and distorting a bill designed to meet a limited and specific problem. It is with an eye toward eliminating some of the more serious inequities and unjustifiable provisions of these laws that I am proposing the following changes.

ELIMINATE ONE-HALF OF NATIONAL AVERAGE CONTRIBUTION RATE

First of all, my bill would eliminate the one-half of national contribution rate as an alternative basis for computing the "local contribution rate." At present, the local school district can use as its "local contribution rate" any one of three different figures—the amount spent per pupil from local revenue sources in "generally comparable" school districts within the State, one-half of the State average per pupil cost, or one-half of the national average per pupil cost in the continental United States.

This latter alternative should be eliminated since—

> Such a rate bears no reasonable relation to the revenue losses or financial burdens occasioned for a particular school district by Federal property tax exemption. Its effect, indeed, is a Federal payment of the full cost per "A" category pupil to many school districts which receive in addition substantial State aid for these same pupils. (Statement of Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education before the Select Subcommittee on Education, House Committee on Education and Labor, Apr. 2, 1963.)

The original purpose behind the one-half of national average contribution rate was to make the payments to school districts throughout the Nation more nearly equal. Before the amendment, there was a very wide discrepancy among payments to school districts in different States. This was due to the fact that Federal payments were based on local contribution rates, and in States where the State contribution to education was high, the local rates were low, and vice versa. It was felt by many to be inequitable for a State which contributed highly to education to be penalized by the terms of the act. Again, however, the present act is being confused with a program of general Federal aid to education.

As was said by Elliot L. Richardson, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1958:

> The relevant measure is that amount which will put the school district in the same situation as other school districts in the State.

The purpose of Public Laws 815 and 874 is to alleviate the burden caused by Federal activities; its purpose is not to equalize the quality of American education or to provide a gratuitous boon to fortunate school districts. This amendment would save $17 billion.

REDUCTION OF PAYMENTS FOR 3(b) "OUT" CHILDREN

The second change would provide that, in a situation where the parents work on tax-exempt Federal property but live in a school district other than the district in which the property is located, payment for each child would be reduced from 50 to 25 percent of the local contribution rate. Under the existing laws, all "B" category pupils are compensated for at the 50-percent rate, whether the Federal property is located within or without the district of residence. Yet, it is obvious that the burden is greater in the one case than in the other.

When both the Federal property and the residence are in the same school district—the B "in" pupils—school revenue per "B" pupil is cut one-half by reason of the Federal property tax exemption—retaining the other one-half which comes from the residential property. On the other hand, when the Federal property is located outside the district of residence, there is no reduction due to Federal tax exemption. In many States, however, the contribution to local school districts from State tax funds is fairly substantial. Tax-exempt Federal property located anywhere in the State would reduce this State contribution to the local district. To compensate for this reduction, this bill does not entirely eliminate payments for B "out" pupils, but rather provides that they will be compensated for at a rate of 25 percent of the local contribution rate.

In addition, if payments were reduced when the Federal installation is not in the school district, there would be an incentive to consolidate school districts, a procedure generally supported by educators and others who have concerned themselves with the problems of the American school system. This amendment would save $52,411,662.

THREE-PERCENT ABSORPTION REQUIREMENT

A third change would revive the 3-percent absorption requirement. In Public Law 874, as it stood in 1951, it was provided that the school district should absorb a number of federally connected students equal to 3 percent of average daily attendance, the theory being that the Federal installation brings certain benefits to the district which should offset to a certain extent the burden caused by the federally connected pupils. Implementation of this provision was postponed for a year in order to give the local school districts time to prepare for its effects. Yet, when it came time to put this section of the law into effect, the opposition of school district superintendents throughout the country was loud and vocal, since it would, of course, cut down, or in some cases eliminate, their allotment. As a result, the provision was again postponed and eventually eliminated. In its place, it was provided that there should be a 3-percent eligibility rather than an absorption requirement. Thus, a school district would receive payment for all federally connected pupils as soon as their number reached 3 percent of all pupils in average daily attendance. This provision is both inequitable in its effect and unjustifiable in terms of the original purpose of the laws. It is inequitable in that a district which has 3-percent federally connected pupils is compensated for all of them, while a district with 2.99 percent receives no help at all. What has been done, in effect, is to eliminate the absorption requirement in some cases and retain it in others. If the absorption requirement were revived, this inequitable situation would be remedied.

The provision is unjustifiable, since it fails to take into account the benefits which a Federal installation brings to a community. In the words of M. L. Reese, county manager, Montgomery County, Md., testifying in 1958 before the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

> The loss of assessable base resulting from incoming Federal installations is, to a great extent, offset by a general tendency of stimulation to local commerce and area property values.

Reviving the 3-percent absorption requirement would recognize these benefits. This amendment would save $44,111,023.

ELIMINATION OF PAYMENTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 874 WHEN PRESCRIBED ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS ARE NOT MET

A further provision of my bill would eliminate the so-called Purtell amendment. This amendment, approved in 1958, provided that a school district that has met the 3-percent—or 6-percent—eligibility requirement in any year but fails to meet the requirement in the next 2 succeeding years is still eligible for payment for the actual number of federally connected children in average daily attendance in the school district the first year, and for 50 percent of such payment the second year. This is designed to lessen the strain on the school budget which would result from a sudden elimination of Federal funds. With a 3-percent absorption requirement substituted for the present 3-percent eligibility requirement, such a phasing out would, of course, no longer be necessary. The school district would only be receiving payments for those students in excess of 3 percent, not for all students or for none as at present.

Yet, even if the 3-percent eligibility requirement were to be continued, the Purtell amendment could not be justified. According to L. G. Derthick, Commissioner of Education, testifying on June 9, 1959, before the Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor:

> This amendment is manifestly discriminatory as respects a school district which barely meets the 3-percent condition of eligibility in a given year and barely fails to meet that condition in a subsequent year, as against another school district which barely fails to meet such eligibility condition in either year.

Furthermore:

> Such phasing out of Federal payment is unnecessary since Section 3(f) of the law permits a 1-year continuance of payments in the case of a decrease in the number of federally connected children for which a school district had reasonably prepared in anticipation of eligibility for Federal payment when such decrease is due to a cessation in Federal activities. (Statement of Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, before the Select Subcommittee on Education, House Committee on Education and Labor, Apr. 2, 1963.)

Thus, the Federal Government would aid the local school district only when the need is a direct Federal responsibility. Again, it should be remembered that this is not a general Federal aid to education program based on need, but, rather, it is a limited program to fulfill a specific Federal responsibility. This amendment would save $528,467.

TO PREVENT THE REDUCTION OF STATE PAYMENT TO IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Finally, there are a number of States that reduce the local school district's entitlement from State funds when these local districts receive aid under the impacted areas program. The State of California is the best example of this. Under California law, 60 percent of the funds received by the local school districts under Public Law 874 are considered to be local resources. Since the State contribution to the local school district is based on the local resources of the district, this provision has the effect of cutting down the State contribution to the local district by an amount equal to 60 percent of their entitlement under Public Law 874. As a result, the Federal Government is not only aiding the impacted school district, but may be providing a form of general aid to education in the State if the State funds that would have been available to the impacted school districts, if they had received no Federal payments, are used for other education purposes in the State.

My bill provides that Public Law 874 payments to the local school district are to be reduced by an amount equal to the reduction in the State entitlement. The State would thus be deterred from reducing its payment to federally impacted school districts.

I firmly believe that if these changes in the impacted areas legislation are adopted, a long step will have been taken toward making these laws both more equitable and more in line with their original purpose.

"Christian Responsibility in the Political Order"—An Article by Congressman John Brademas, of Indiana, Together Magazine, December 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most thoughtful article concerning the relationship between the Christian faith and political action. The article, which appears in the December 1965 issue of Together, a publication of the Methodist Church, was written by our distinguished colleague from Indiana, the Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS.

Congressman BRADEMAS, himself a Methodist, spoke on this same subject earlier this year at the annual service in honor of Members of Congress at the Cleveland Park Congregational Church in Washington, D.C.

The text of Congressman BRADEMAS' article, "Christian Responsibility in the Political Order," follows:

CHRISTIAN RESPONSIBILITY IN THE POLITICAL ORDER

(By JOHN BRADEMAS, Congressman, Third District, Indiana)

It is less necessary than it once was to persuade Americans of the importance of politics in the modern world. We live, whether we like it or not, in a time when the lives of all of us are touched in some important way by the actions of government. Moreover, because of our country's immense power, the lives of millions of people all over the world are affected significantly by decisions of the officials in our Government.

I represent a congressional district in northern Indiana with nearly a half million people, and the problems they bring to my office typify the broad impact of government today: Social security and veteran's pension cases, small-business loans, defense-contract problems, manpower-retraining projects, new post offices, immigration bills.

Nearly 2 years ago, I experienced firsthand the ways in which the resources of the Federal Government can be mobilized to meet a crisis that directly touches the lives of thousands of people in a local community. I represent the district in which the Studebaker automobile plant was shut down, throwing several thousands of people out of work and creating serious human hardships as well as economic distress. But we were able to bring together assistance from an extraordinary variety of Federal agencies—and not even the local chamber of commerce was decrying Federal aid 2 years ago in South Bend, Ind.

We know, of course, that Government plays a most important role in the economy of every modern country. Two world wars, a depression, the cold war, and the general acceptance of the welfare state are the principal reasons for the vastly increased importance of government in the United States. A year ago I traveled extensively in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia, all Communist nations, where nearly the entire economic effort is under government direction. And in the world's newly developing nations, government is often the focal point not only of economic planning but of nearly every important decision that is made in the entire society.

My point is simple: in modern societies in nearly every part of the world, big government is here to stay.

But if government is an increasingly important factor in the lives of people, it is imperative, at least in a society that claims to be free, for government to be the servant, not the master of the citizens. And in a free society this means recognition of the central—and legitimate—place of politics, of competition and conflict, of struggle for control of power which government is.

Surely then, there can be no denying the significance of government. Similarly, most of us can give at least tacit assent to the proposition that every citizen in a democracy has some obligation to participate in politics.

OUR CONCERN AS CHRISTIANS

The essential question for us as Christians, however, is this: Why should we be concerned about politics, about government? Is there a religious responsibility incumbent upon Christians for action in the political order?

Some say no, that the Christian as an individual and the Christian church as an institution must stand aside from the hurly-burly of politics. Separation of church and state, they argue, is the same as separation of politics from religion.

I strongly disagree with this contention. Moreover, I often find it a thinly disguised argument for maintaining the status quo. I am profoundly afraid of preachers who never preach on anything but how to find personal happiness. The theme of the great World Conference of Christian Youth in Oslo some years ago was "Jesus Christ: Lord of All Life." This means that our religious faith must touch every dimension of man's existence—social, economic, and political as well as private and individual.

If this is true, we must then have a specifically Christian perspective on responsibility for action in the political order. Surely one of the reasons Christians have such a difficult time coming to grips with politics is that they lack a perspective which is intellectually honest, theologically consistent, and realistic in the world.

Some Christians suggest—in a kind of sentimental, utopian way—that if only all men were to become Christians, we would be able to resolve the many social and political problems that afflict mankind. But even if we were all Christians, there would still be Republicans and Democrats, business and labor, black and white. We still would have problems, for there still would be conflicts of geography, of interest, of viewpoint.

DILEMMA OF RELATIONSHIPS

The core of the dilemma, as I view it, is that many Christians do not understand how they can relate the law of love to the world of politics. On the one hand, they see Christian love, agape, represented by Christ on the cross—utterly self-sacrificing, self-giving, other regarding love. On the other hand, they see the calculating world of politics, where "accommodation," "negotiation," and "compromise" are the words we characteristically use to describe what happens, for example, in a Congress composed of 435 Representatives and 100 Senators, working with or against one President—not to mention the other participants in the governmental process. Yet these are precisely the words which we ought to use if we want to get something done.

But many Christians view these seemingly irreconcilable realms of religion and politics—of the selfless Christ on the cross and the horse-trading Congressman—and conclude that there can be no link, that the two worlds can have nothing to do with each other.

Let me put the same point—that never the twain of politics and religion can meet—another way in the words of Arthur E. Walmsley, an executive of the Protestant Episcopal Church whose field is Christian citizenship. Writing in "The Church in a Society of Abundance."[1] he says:

"In the new era, decisionmaking takes place increasingly within the context of ever larger structures: the modern corporation, the automated industry, the welfare state—group settings in which decisionmaking by teams or task forces reduces individual accountability to a minimum.

"How," he asks, "is power to be exercised responsibly in this setting? Traditional approaches of personal accountability, as expressed in the Protestant ethic, fail to come to grips with the nature of structure and context of the new era. * * * The humanization of the social order does not reduce itself, in situations such as this, to the categories of Christian love."

Christians, sensing the extraordinary complexity of the modern age, notes Walmsley, look with nostalgia to a simpler era when men made most of their important decisions face to face, and felt a sense of personal choice and personal accountability.

But we live in a different time, in a more vast and complicated society, where men's lives are determined in large measure by powers and principalities—corporations, government, unions—rather than by their next door neighbors or the family who lives down the road a piece.

What, then, has the law of love—of utterly un-self-regarding love—to say to such a world, to a President or a Congressman?

Does it say to withdraw? Does it say we must reject making decisions about the use of power in such a world? My answer is "No." My answer is that there is a link between the law of love and the practice of politics, a concept which relates the two. That concept is justice.

The concept of justice varies in human history, but I suggest that at the very least justice means guaranteeing to every man his due, assuring that he gets what is coming to him—what he is entitled to as a man.

JUSTICE IS NOT LOVE

Now justice is not the same as love. Love does not count or reckon—but justice does. Justice must be calculating. It is not love, therefore, but justice that should be the immediate objective of political action.

As Walmsley says, "The balance of the rights and responsibilities of one group against those of another involves issues of justice." This "balance of rights and responsibilities" of competing groups, of course, is the very stuff of politics. Justice, then, is not a hand-me-down kind of concept.

"Justice seen in this light," Walmsley declares, "is not a crude approximation of love but the means by which the Christian cooperates with the will of God precisely in the midst of life."

As Theologian Reinhold Niebuhr puts it, "justice is the instrument of love."

And as the late William Temple said: "Associations cannot love one another; a trade union cannot love an employers' federation, nor can one national state love another. The members of one may love the members of the other so far as opportunities of intercourse allow. That will help in negotiations; but it will not solve the problem of the relationships between the two groups. Consequently, the relevance of Christianity in these spheres is quite different from what many Christians suppose it to be. Christian charity manifests itself in the temporal order as a supernatural discernment of, and adhesion to, justice in relation to the equilibrium of power."[2]

Look at the greatest issue of our time here at home, civil rights, and listen to Martin Luther King:

"I'm not asking for a law to make the white man love me, just a law to restrain him from lynching me."

Listen to the language of legislation: parity for farmers, equitable tax laws, fair labor standards—and we hear echoes of the concept of justice.

Is love then irrelevant to political action? No. On the contrary, it is our love for our fellow man—commanded us by Christ—that generates in us a concern that our fellow man be treated justly. Love is the force that motivates our commitment to justice.

So we now have in the concept of justice, I believe, a link that binds together the worlds of Christian faith and political action—and does so in an intellectually honest, theologically consistent and realistic way.

MEN ARE SINNERS

Let me turn to yet another reason beyond the love commandment which imposes on us as Christians a religious responsibility to strive for justice among men.

It is that men are sinners—that men, you and I, tend to put ourselves rather than God at the center of life.

This is, of course, simply another way of stating the doctrine of original sin. It is this doctrine, rather than the idea that man is naturally good, that is the unarticulated view of human nature on which most politicians—at least the successful ones—proceed.

This is not, I must emphasize, a cynical view, not one that declares men are evil through and through.

You may recall Machiavelli's comment: "Whoever organizes a state and arranges laws for the government of it must presuppose that all men are wicked and that they will not fail to show their natural depravity whenever they have a clear opportunity, though possibly it may be concealed for a while."

Not so, for to paraphrase Niebuhr: Men are good enough to make democracy work. Men are bad enough to make democracy necessary.

It is in part this more skeptical but uncynical view of human nature that caused the Founding Fathers to write into the fabric of our American Constitution a system of checks and balances. We do elect Members of Congress and entrust them with certain powers, but for only 2 years. And even Senators of the United States are required to have their credentials reviewed every 6 years. The President has the veto power, but he can be overridden. Men are good enough to make democracy work but bad enough to make democracy—with all its checks and limitations on the rulers—necessary.

It is this propensity of men to injustice—to unwarranted self-seeking—that is a chief purpose of political action to curb and channel while at the same time promoting a wider degree of justice, a fair share for all men.

I do not say that all political questions can be resolved readily into simple issues of justice or injustice, for many problems facing government are primarily technical in nature, requiring expertise and know-how.

Nor do I say that all political issues have two equal sides although sometimes, as with civil rights, there is clearly greater weight on one side than the other.

THE POLITICIAN'S TASK

In my view, it is the task of the politician to seek in the given circumstances—with all the skill and imagination he can muster—the greatest measure of justice for all concerned.

I believe Christians have a particular obligation to seek justice for the disinherited. As Dean John C. Bennett of Union Theological Seminary has said, "Christ himself concentrated on the people of greatest need, the people whom respectable society neglected or despised." It is this aggressive caring for the people who cannot defend themselves which is essential when the Christian makes political judgments. It is, I suggest, at least one of the major motivations behind the present war on poverty.

The disinherited are now being heard both at home (witness the Negro revolt) and in the developing nations of the world. Paternalism will not do as an answer to this cry.

I have said that all men's lives are today immensely influenced by what governments do, and that Christians have a religious responsibility, motivated by love, to seek justice for their fellow men. I conclude, therefore, that if the church of Christ is to say anything to men today, it must speak to them not only in their individual and family capacities but also to the social, economic, and political dimensions of their existence.

Niebuhr tells the story of how, at the beginning of this century, the late Bishop Charles Williams of Michigan was approached by a young clergyman with a plan for organizing a Christian layman's league. Learning that the league's chief objective was to close all movie houses on Sunday, the bishop said, "I should think that could wait until you have solved the weightier matters of the law."

Niebuhr warns that: "The church, as does every other institution, sinks into triviality when it fails to deal with the weightier matters of the law, particularly the law of love or the basic concern of the self for the neighbor."

If the Christian church today fails to touch on the "weightier matters of the law"—on the outrageous treatment of Negroes in both North and South, on the paradox of poverty in the richest Nation in human history, on the slums still festering in our great cities, on the problems of devising a tolerable peace in a nuclear world—then on what matters will it touch?

If the church has nothing to say on these great issues, it has little of significance to say about anything, because these are the crucial issues of our time.

CHURCH VOICES ARE HEARD

Fortunately, voices are being heard within the church of Christ which speak out fearlessly and eloquently to urge the church and Christians as individuals to touch on the "weightier matters of the law."

We hear one such voice in Dr. King who, more than any other American of our time, has moved our country toward realization of the conviction which we vaunt in words: that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.

Indeed, I would single out two contemporary developments as the most influential forces shaping the present reawakening of social and political concern on the part of the Christian churches of America.

The first, without question, is the civil rights movement. The Christian churches were a long time awakening to the sin of segregation, but they were stabbed awake by the Negro revolution. Most Members of Congress in 1964 knew full well that the church leaders brought genuine religious commitment—and, I may say, some political muscle—to the battle for civil rights legislation. For the first time in a long time, we heard from the church on a major national issue—and it made a difference.

---

[1] Quotes from "The Church in a Society of Abundance" by Arthur E. Walmsley (Seabury Press, $3.95) used by permission of publisher.

[2] From "What Christians Stand For in the Secular World," as published in Student, 1944.

The other event that shook the world—Christian and non-Christian, Catholic and non-Catholic—was the papacy of John XXIII. Pope John gave new meaning and fresh urgency to the Christian's responsibility for the social and political order. Read his encyclicals on poverty, on race relations, on peace in the modern world, and you will find a spirit speaking with relevance and power to the "weightier matters of the law."

THE CHRISTIAN IN POLITICS

Although I do not advocate Christian political parties and although I find the phrase "Christian politician" suspect as both self-serving and inaccurate, it must be obvious that I believe Christians should get into politics.

For Christians, subject to the limitations of all men, can nonetheless be inspired by the law of love to enter the struggle for justice and be ready, even eager, to use political action as a legitimate weapon (but not the only one) in that struggle. The point is that politics, seen from a Christian perspective, can be a Christian vocation just as much as being a minister or missionary.

May I be bold enough to offer some guidelines to Christians in politics:

1. It is not sufficient to be a good Christian to be effective in politics. You must also be a good politician—that is, know your job.

2. You must have or develop a thick skin. The other day I chanced upon a sermon preached on an election day in Hartford, Conn., by one Nathan Strong. Mr. Strong's admonition to politicians nearly 175 years ago is. I think, worth repeating today:

"A ruler needs religion much more than his unofficered brethren, to support his mind under trials, and to guard him against temptations. When the respectable citizen rises from private into public life, he must expect to exchange quietness for trouble; honor, though alluring, has its bitterness and its dangers; enemies, before unknown, will rise up; the jealous will sift all his actions, and what man can be so guarded as to have his behavior escape censure? The ambitious, thinking him in the way of their own progress, will be his enemies. To support the mind under these evils, and lead it into the exercise of prudence and patience, religion is necessary."

3. All policies, societies, governments, and all politicians are under God's judgment. None must be absolutized or defiled as incarnating God's will—for none is righteous—no, not one. The Christian in politics will, therefore, always live under tension, always aware that he measures political achievements by standards that require ever greater effort. He can never be satisfied.

4. The Christian in politics must be outgoing and must actively seek justice and combat injustice. I should add, however, that there is no mandate on him to ride at full armor into every battle that comes along. If he does, he will soon deplete his forces and diminish his effectiveness. He must make realistic judgments on when and where to move.

5. The Christian in politics is armed with a unique understanding of human nature. He realizes that man is made in the image of God, yet prideful; he is aware of the role of self-interest in politics, of his own as well as that of others. He knows that, as an active participant in politics, he often will find himself in morally ambiguous situations. But as Dean Bennett said, "Instead of being unnerved by guilt or despair in their midst, Christians do know the experience of receiving grace and forgiveness while they take responsibility."[3]

It is this forgiving love of God which above all will sustain the Christian in politics as well as in every other work of life.

Statement by Vice President Hubert Humphrey at Associated Press Poverty Conference, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson, has called this Nation to arms to do battle on two distinct fields—to battle relentlessly against Communist aggression in South Vietnam and to wage a tireless battle against the poverty, misery, and ignorance which still grips 35 million of our fellow Americans.

Abroad, the forces of communism are learning that, even though the price for freedom comes high, the American people are willing and able to keep our commitment to its protection and preservation for friends and allies thousands of miles away.

Here at home, perhaps the greatest concentrated assault on poverty ever launched in man's recorded history is underway. Across this Nation, Job Corps centers are preparing young men and women to find useful roles in our society; neighborhood youth programs are taking young Americans off street corners and putting them into centers where they learn the skills of belonging and producing for society. On August 22. 1964, President Johnson signed into law the Economic Opportunity Act establishing the war on poverty. The Vice President of the United States, Hubert H. Humphrey, has been designated by the President to act as the coordinator of the various, vast Federal programs fighting shoulder to shoulder together in the war on poverty. On November 8, 1965, the Vice President, speaking at the Associated Press Poverty Conference, held in Washington, D.C., reviewed the first year of the war on poverty. His remarks at that occasion were noteworthy then and they hold a message for all Americans today. Under unanimous consent I insert the Vice President's remarks in the Record:

Opening Statement by Vice President Hubert Humphrey at Associated Press Poverty Conference, Washington, D.C., November 8, 1965

Last December the President informed the Cabinet-level Economic Opportunity Council, at its first meeting, that he had asked me "to take a leading role in the war on poverty—to be sure that this is a well-coordinated, concentrated attack on poverty throughout the country." The President also asked me to serve as Honorary Chairman of the Advisory Council established by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

In the past year, I have worked with Sargent Shriver and his effective staff in the Office of Economic Opportunity. I have traveled throughout America carrying the message that this administration intends to win the war on poverty.

I also have been doing some looking and listening regarding public reaction to the poverty program in its first year.

I think I can sum up public reaction by saying that the war on poverty has broad general support, but that there is also some misunderstanding about how it works, what it seeks to do, and how it ties into other public and private programs.

This is to be expected. Poverty has a wide range of causes and creates a wide range of problems. There is no single remedy for it.

No single program will meet all needs. There are at least three levels of actions required, and we have been moving on all three.

First, there is the need for stepped-up economic activity.

We are now in our 56th consecutive month of economic expansion—an expansion created by a positive partnership for prosperity between the public and private sectors.

GNP, wages, and profits are up. Unemployment is down. Prices are relatively stable.

We in Government have made our contribution to this expansion through careful use of fiscal and tax policy. We have pursued policies designed to avoid inflation. And we have, through economic development programs, sought to bring the benefits of economic expansion to all areas of the country.

Second, there is the need for programs for the aged, for widows and orphans, for the sick, and unemployed—for those who need society's immediate help.

In this past session of Congress we passed new and improved legislation for medical care, social security, housing, and social services.

Finally, there is the need for development of our human resources.

This is where the Economic Opportunity Act, with its nine new programs, comes in. But we must not overlook also our national investments in vocational education and manpower training, in the new education laws, the Older Americans Act, in health research—all aimed at providing opportunity for Americans to lift themselves to fuller, more productive lives.

I think it is important to understand that the war on poverty is much more than the Economic Opportunity Act. It is being waged on many fronts.

The OEO programs alone—in less than a year—have already reached into over a thousand communities, have directly involved millions of people.

In this first year there have been some mistakes. We can expect that mistakes will occur in a program this big. The question is, of course: Will we learn from our mistakes?

WE MUST DROP OR CHANGE PROGRAMS THAT DO NOT WORK

Under the direction of Dr. Joseph Kershaw, we are now giving every Federal poverty program, new as well as old, searching evaluation. If any program isn't helping to get people out of poverty, we must know. We cannot stay with it one day longer than necessary.

---

[3] Quote from "When Christians Make Political Decisions" by John C. Bennett, a Reflection Book (Association Press, 50 cents).

THE WAR ON POVERTY REQUIRES INTERAGENCY COOPERATION, AND WE HAVE BEEN GETTING IT

Last March I was widely quoted in the press after I had told a group that the poverty effort would require "interagency cooperation, the likes of which this city hasn't seen."

And I added "I hope it can be done peacefully but if it can't, it will be done."

Well, cooperation has proceeded peacefully. Federal agencies are pulling together, in the Job Corps program, in Project Head Start, and in many others. During the course of these sessions, you will see much evidence of this.

THE NEW PROGRAMS HAVE CAUSED SOME FRICTION IN OUR CITIES

One of my principal assignments is that of liaison with the Nation's mayors.

I know that the new community action programs have created some problems in the cities. Some of these have been difficult—but I am confident that they are all possible of solution.

In the great majority of cases, it has been possible to work out the kind of program that reflects both of these objectives: full utilization of the local government machinery and maximum feasible participation on the part of the poor themselves. I do not think that these are incompatible. Hundreds of communities have already proved this.

THE POVERTY PROGRAM IS NOT A CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM; BUT IT IS PART OF THE ANSWER TO THE CIVIL RIGHTS PROBLEM

Three out of every four poor Americans are white. But for the American Negro, poverty is a special problem.

In his historic address at Howard University, President Johnson told us that it isn't enough to open up doors of opportunity, that it must be possible for each person to walk through those doors.

The economic opportunity program can provide the important next step for millions of Americans previously denied opportunity.

THE WAR ON POVERTY HAS MOBILIZED NOT ONLY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, BUT EVERY SEGMENT OF OUR NATIONAL LIFE

Fourteen distinguished Americans from every walk of life have been serving on our National Advisory Council.

Industry leaders serve on the OEO Business Advisory Council.

Labor leaders serve on the Labor Advisory Council.

Every religious denomination in the country has joined in the effort, participating in official programs and increasing its private efforts.

The American Legion, the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts, the major women's organizations and human rights groups and civic clubs have all asked, "What can we do to help?"

For every Federal dollar and every official man-hour of effort in the war on poverty, there are several local or private dollars and man-hours. Our citizens are committed to winning this war.

A generation ago the American author Thomas Wolfe expressed the goal we work for:

"To every man his chance, to every man regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him—this * * * is the promise of America."

Today, the wealthiest and most powerful Nation on earth, we can make that promise come true.

REA Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget for fiscal 1967, recommending a reduction of $435 million from the $672 million REA Director Norman M. Clapp had requested, is not only serious, but at the same time the President has impounded $132 million presently unspent but seriously needed by REA for 1966.

This is no time to cripple REA when communication lines and extensions are urgently needed to provide electrical distribution to the farms of South Dakota and the Nation.

If the administration were actually making this cut in an effort to economize, then I would recommend that we tighten our belts and go along, but while he is cutting the heart out of REA and the farmer generally, he is asking for millions to pay the rent for city dwellers whose incomes vastly exceed the annual incomes of most farmers.

I shall continue to fight to help bring the farm standard of living up to somewhere near the standard of those the President would subsidize with rent payments from the Federal Treasury.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1966

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 26, 1966)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Roy S. Hollomon, minister, First Southern Baptist Church, Topeka, Kans., offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, we ask Thee today that Thy blessings shall be upon us as we face the tasks and responsibilities that are ours.

We invoke Thy guidance upon the President of the United States; upon the Congress, and upon the others who bear rule over us, as they face the grim realities of today's world. May they be given the grace and wisdom to steer the ship of state in such way that Thy divine favor shall rest upon it, for we know that Thou makest one nation to rise and another to fall.

May in every relationship righteousness be enthroned, as Thy word declares, and history confirms, "That righteousness exalteth a Nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

Bless today our men in Vietnam, Santo Domingo, and Korea, and the other danger spots of the world. May Thy comforting, sustaining grace be with them and with their loved ones, who so anxiously await the news from the fighting fronts.

Help us today as we seek for peace to hear the angel chorus as they sing, "Glory to God in the highest, and peace on earth, good will to men," and to know that it is only as Thou art glorified that we will have peace on earth.

In the name of Christ our Lord we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal be considered as approved.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wonder if the majority leader would change that a little, and ask that the reading of the Journal be waived.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well. A parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would that have the same connotation?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That would qualify it as having been read.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yesterday we had some corrections for Tuesday's Journal, and one or two I thought were important. We did not have full opportunity to examine the Journal of yesterday. I think at some place we could have blanket approval, but we would like to look at it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that if the reading is waived, that concludes action on the Journal, without objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the reading is waived, the Journal stands as approved; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It stands as approved.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does it preclude us from going back if perchance there is a correction in the Journal?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct. Action on the Journal is concluded if its reading is waived.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I inquire what the situation was yesterday with respect to Tuesday's Journal? We had left it open.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Action on Tuesday's Journal has been concluded.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Adjournment, of course, is virtually approval of the Journal.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the Senate recessed yesterday. I wondered if that had the same effect.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. When the Senate moved on to other business yesterday, after the discussion on the Journal, that concluded any action on the Journal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not too material.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour, and that statements during the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of nominations was submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland, and Charles M. Haar, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretaries of Housing and Urban Development.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roger W. Wilkins, of the District of Columbia, to be Director, Community Relations Service, for a term of 4 years.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS FROM THE COMPLETION OF BUSINESS FRIDAY, JANUARY 28, 1966, UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK A.M., SATURDAY, JANUARY 29, 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock Saturday morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it my understanding that after the morning hour, which will be devoted only to insertions and short speeches, the Senate will return to the pending business when it is laid down?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is automatic. The Senate will automatically return to the pending business.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 348)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Joint Economic Committee:

To the Congress of the United States:

A year ago I reported that we were "in the midst of the greatest upsurge of economic well-being in the history of any nation." That upsurge, now about to enter its sixth year, continues without let-up.

The value of our Nation's annual output of goods and services rose more than one-third from 1960 to 1965. Last year alone, our gross national product—GNP—made a record advance of $47 billion.

This swelling production has generated an unprecedented rise in the incomes of the American people. Total personal income in December was at an annual rate of $550 billion, up 37 percent in the past 5 years and 7½ percent in the latest 12 months.

In the past 5 years, the number of Americans at work increased by nearly 7 million; in 1965 alone, by about 2½ million. The rate of unemployment dropped from 6.6 percent in December 1960—and a high of 7.1 percent in May 1961—to 4.1 percent in December 1965.

And American jobs are better than ever before. The weekly take-home pay of the average manufacturing worker with three dependents has risen 26 percent in the past 5 years. In the last 12 months alone his gain was 4 percent.

The profits of our corporations, after taxes, last year were 67 percent ahead of their earnings 5 years earlier—up 20 percent over 1964.

And average farm income last year rose 23 percent, breaking all records.

Our Nation's industries, shops, and farms—our workers, owners of businesses, professional men and women—prosper today far beyond the dreams of any people, anytime, anywhere.

NEW ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

In the light of these unprecedented and continuing gains, some observers are posing questions not heard in almost a decade.

Will there be enough plant capacity to produce all the goods and services buyers will seek?

Can our employers find the labor they will require to man their production lines?

Can we avoid bottlenecks in major industries or key skills that would hamper our expansion?

Can we keep a destructive price-wage spiral from getting underway?

Can we move ahead with the Great Society programs and at the same time meet our needs for defense?

My confident answer to each of these questions is Yes.

But the fact these questions are seriously asked and require serious answers is proof enough that we are in a new economic environment. We are approaching full use of our resources, and this brings new problems.

To those who fear these new problems, I say this:

These are the problems we have been waiting to encounter for nearly 10 years.

These problems are the price of our success.

These are the welcome problems of prosperity.

Over the past 5 years we have faced very different economic problems. In meeting these problems we have learned that recessions are not inevitable; high production does not necessarily mean overproduction; expansion need not generate inflation or imbalances that make further expansion unsustainable; affluence has not sapped the inherent strength and dynamism of the American economy; automation need not create mass unemployment; millions who were unemployed are not unemployable; prudently expansionary fiscal policies can restore high employment; and domestic expansion can go hand in hand with strengthened external payments and a sound dollar.

We have learned how to achieve prosperity. Now we must sustain it, deal with its problems, and make the most of the opportunities it presents.

VIETNAM AND OUR ECONOMY

We face the challenges of prosperity while some 200,000 of our fellow citizens and billions of dollars of our resources are engaged in a bitter defense of freedom in Vietnam. The true costs of this conflict are death, pain, and grief; interrupted careers and separation from loved ones. They are incalculable. But the economic cost of Vietnam imposes no unbearable burden on our resources.

Vietnam does, however, add to the usual problems of maintaining balanced prosperity. It imposes special burdens on some industries, and raises, as well, uncertainties both for the fiscal planning of Government and the private planning of business. These uncertainties underscore the need for flexibility in Government policies and responsibility in private decisions.

Production for Vietnam accounts for less than 1½ percent of our GNP. These expenditures are a part of the total demand that provides a full market for our manpower and our production. But the private demands of consumers and businesses, and high-priority civilian programs of Government, could and would provide a far more welcome market for that output if there were no war in Vietnam. Our prosperity does not depend on our military effort.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ECONOMIC POLICY

In a time of high prosperity, economic policy faces new problems. But it is still guided by the basic principles that have served us so well.

Twenty years ago next month, the Employment Act of 1946—which prescribes this report—became law. The principles of our policy emerge from that act and from our two decades of experience under it.

The essential and revolutionary declaration of the Employment Act was that the Federal Government must accept a share of responsibility for the performance of the American economy. The nature of that share has been more and more clearly defined over the years, by the recommendations of four Presidents and the enactments of ten Congresses.

I see these as the main tasks of Federal economic policy today:

1. To attain full employment without inflation; to use fiscal and monetary policies to help to match total demand to our growing productive potential, while helping to speed the growth of that potential through education, research and development, manpower policies, and enlarged private and public investment;

2. To help to open the doors of opportunity to all, through developing human resources and removing barriers of discrimination, ignorance, and ill-health;

3. To help to solve social and economic problems that neither private action nor State and local governments can solve alone—an efficient transportation system, the protection of our environment, the health of our agriculture, the reconstruction of our cities;

4. To achieve and maintain equilibrium in the Nation's external payments, and to press for improvements in the international economic order;

5. To maintain and enhance healthy competition;

6. To achieve national purposes as far as possible by enlisting the voluntary cooperation of business, labor, and other groups.

Recognition of these responsibilities of the Federal Government neither lessens the responsibilities nor impairs the freedoms of individuals and private groups; nor does it challenge the authority of State and local governments.

The tasks involve new and growing problems of an increasingly complex and interdependent economy and society. Only the Federal Government can assume these tasks. But the Federal Government by itself cannot create prosperity, reduce unemployment, avoid inflation, balance our external accounts, restore our cities, strengthen agriculture, eliminate poverty, or make people healthy.

Only through a creative and cooperative partnership of all private interests and all levels of government—a creative Federalism—can our economic and social objectives be attained. This partnership has written the story of American success. And a new vitalization of this partnership and a new confidence in its effectiveness have produced the extraordinary economic and social gains of recent years.

OUR ECONOMIC GAINS

Our economy is so vast, and our progress has been so rapid, that it is difficult to keep our gains in proper perspective. Here are a few examples:

In only seven other countries of the world is total output in a year as large as the increase in our output last year.

Our stock of private plant and equipment, valued in constant prices, increased as much in 1965 alone as it did in the 4 years 1957 through 1960.

The increase in Federal cash receipts between fiscal years 1961 and 1967—in spite of $20 billion of tax cuts—will exceed the entire cash receipts of the Federal Government in any peacetime fiscal year prior to 1951.

JOBS, INCOMES, AND PRODUCTION

The register of our economic gains during 1965 starts with jobs: 2.4 million more, overall; 1 million more for teenagers; 350,000 more for Negroes; 900,000 more for women; 1.2 million more for blue-collar workers; 900,000 more on manufacturing payrolls; 450,000 more on State and local government payrolls; 1 million more in trade and services.

It continues with pay: average hourly earnings up 3 percent in manufacturing, 4½ percent in retail trade; average weekly earnings up 3½ percent in manufacturing, 3⅓ percent in trade.

Other forms of income rose, too: farm proprietors' average income up 22 percent; average income of owners of unincorporated businesses and professional workers up 7½ percent; total dividends paid up 12 percent.

And corporations prospered, with profits before taxes up 15 percent; profits after taxes up 20 percent; corporate retained earnings up 29 percent.

With more people earning, and earning more, total personal incomes rose $39 billion, or 7½ percent; aggregate consumers' incomes after taxes rose $34 billion, also 7½ percent.

Governmental units benefited from the surge of incomes.

Federal cash receipts rose $8½ billion.

State and local governments took in $4⅓ billion more, reducing the need for tax rate increases to meet their expanding burdens.

The higher incomes of individuals, businesses, and governments came from expanding production—year 1965 over year 1964:

Production of goods and services for consumers, up $29½ billion.

Production of new plants and machinery, up $9½ billion.

Production for use of the Federal Government, up $1½ billion.

Production for use of State and local governments, up $5 billion.

Production for additions to inventories, up $2½ billion.

Residential construction, no change.

Production for export (less imports), down $1½ billion.

Total production—GNP, up $47 billion.

We could produce $47 billion of additional output last year because:

We had a large net addition of 1.4 million to our labor force;

We put to work this entire net increment plus about 400,000 who were previously unemployed;

On the average, each employed person worked a few more hours during the year; and

Each man-hour worked in the private economy produced on the average 2.8 percent more output than in 1964.

Increased employment and higher productivity were possible because business investment had provided a substantial expansion of plant capacity; because the new and the previously existing capacity were used more fully than in the year before; and because our labor force was better educated and more skilled than ever before. Our efforts to equip the unskilled and inexperienced to take advantage of rapidly expanding job opportunities have been—and will continue to be—an investment in our productive capacity.

The enlarged market demands which called forth this higher output came from every sector. The two dominant forces, however, were the growing boom in business spending for new plant and equipment and the continued dependability of consumer spending, following close on consumer income. Excise tax cuts and larger social security benefits in 1965 helped to swell the income and buying of households. The tax cuts provided by the Revenue Act of 1964 were sustaining private demand all year. By year's end they had added $30 billion to GNP.

GAINS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

The disadvantaged and less fortunate members of our society also shared in our 1965 economic gains.

For the poor who were able to earn, there were lower unemployment, fuller work schedules, and higher pay.

For the poor who were capable of earning more, there were job training and help in finding jobs, improvements in education, and the breaking down of barriers of discrimination.

For the poor who could not earn, there were more adequate social security benefits, new medical programs, and better social services.

For the poor too young to earn, there were more effective education, assistance to enable them to stay in school, and better health services.

Between 1964 and 1965, an estimated 2.2 million persons moved above the poverty line. Millions of others, mostly children and young people, will have a better chance to break out of poverty in the years ahead as a result of the help they will receive from new Federal education, health, and antipoverty programs enacted in 1964 and 1965.

But 32 million Americans remain in poverty, and millions more are unable to realize their full economic potential. America's abundance leaves behind too many who are aged, who are stranded in declining rural areas, who are in broken families, who are uneducated or handicapped or victims of discrimination. Unemployment among Negroes remains twice that of whites. And an unemployment rate of 13 percent among teenagers means that too many youths find disappointment in moving from school into jobs.

The war on poverty, ignorance, ill health, discrimination, and inadequate opportunity must go forward.

STRENGTHENED PAYMENTS BALANCE

In 1965 we reduced our balance of payments deficit to less than half that in 1964 and 1963. We have shown a skeptical world that a voluntary program—relying on the patriotic cooperation of businesses and banks—could work.

We made substantial progress in 1965 despite the fact that our new program did not start until late in the first quarter of the year; despite increased responsibilities in Vietnam; despite a temporary decline in our trade surplus; despite conversion by the United Kingdom Government of more than $½ billion of U.S. securities and other assets.

Last year we moved forward toward payments balance without sacrificing our vital domestic or international objectives. And we intend to complete the job this year.

THE RECORD OF COSTS AND PRICES

Until a year ago, American costs and prices had been essentially unchanged since 1958. Last year, largely through a surge in agricultural and food prices, the record was blemished. Even so, we have not lost ground to our major competitors overseas, whose prices and costs have generally risen more than ours.

Some internationally traded raw materials—particularly metals and hides—are costing us more. And higher prices for petroleum products and some machinery have also nudged up our price indexes.

But labor costs—the most basic element in the structure of our costs—have barely moved, as gains in productivity have largely offset moderate increases in hourly labor costs.

In many major sectors of our economy, price stability is still the rule, and some important prices are still going down, in line with lower costs. In December, some of the wholesale prices that were lower than a year earlier were: fresh and dried fruits and vegetables, plant and animal fibers, coal, electric power, packaged beverage materials, manmade fibers, inedible fats and oils, paint materials, crude rubber, millwork, building paper and board, motor vehicles, heating equipment, household appliances, televisions, radios, phonographs, floor coverings, flat glass, gypsum products.

Many industries and markets have demonstrated that the gains of lower costs and rapidly rising productivity can be shared with consumers. Wholesale prices of the following categories of products in December averaged at least 5 percent lower than in 1957–59: fresh and dried fruits and vegetables, grains, plant and animal fibers, packaged beverage materials, manmade fibers, paint materials, drugs and pharmaceuticals, crude rubber, tires and tubes, plywood, building paper and board, heating equipment, household appliances, televisions, radios, and phonographs, asphalt roofing.

Those who proclaim inflation is already here have not turned over all the price tags.

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK FOR 1966

Demand will continue to grow rapidly in 1966 and production will respond. The vigor of investment spending demonstrates strong business confidence in the growing sales, rising profits, and firm operating rates which spur expansion and modernization. The rising defense needs of the Federal Government are an important new force in the economy. With growing support from Federal grant programs, State and local purchases will keep moving ahead. Rising consumer incomes from wages, dividends, interest, professional work, and farming will again largely be devoted to expenditures for better living.

These forces should add very nearly as much to our GNP in 1966 as the record gain of $47 billion last year. As the midpoint of a $10 billion range, $722 billion is the projected level of GNP in 1966. With that output, we foresee an extra $40 billion of spending and production for civilian needs, both private and public; unemployment shrinking below 4 percent, and below any yearly average rate since 1953; great advances in the productive capacity of our industries; further good gains in productivity; and full use, without overuse or strain, of our productive capacity.

FISCAL AND MONETARY POLICY

The fiscal program I recommend for 1966 aims at full employment without inflation. It is a responsible program. It recognizes that vigorous private demand and required defense spending could upset the balance of supply and demand so diligently pursued by fiscal and monetary policies in recent years, and now so effectively achieved.

Until this year, pursuit of this balance has pointed fiscal policies toward the stimulation of demand. Now a stimulus is no longer appropriate.

I have reviewed every program of Government to make room for the necessities of defense. I have sharply reduced or eliminated those civilian programs of lowest priority.

But, as I indicated in my state of the Union message, I am unwilling to declare a moratorium on our progress toward the Great Society. My budget will add $3.2 billion to our war against poverty, ignorance, and disease. Yet savings elsewhere will hold the rise in the administrative budget—apart from the added costs of Vietnam—to only $600 million.

Moreover, I am asking the Congress to enact promptly a combination of proposals affecting tax payments in the year ahead: a rescheduling of the January 1, 1966, and later excise tax reduction enacted last June for automobiles and telephone service; a graduated withholding system that will improve the pay-as-you-go basis of our personal income taxes without increasing tax rates or tax liabilities; a corresponding speed-up in payments of corporate income taxes this year and next, also without increasing tax rates or tax liabilities; and a method of paying self-employment social security taxes on a current basis.

These measures will let us stay close to a high-level balance between the revenues that the Federal Government draws out of the economy and the expenditures that it puts back into the spending stream, and to a high-level balance between total demand and the economy's capacity to produce. It is my judgment that this budget provides the appropriate fiscal environment for the maintenance of basic price stability with continued growth.

I will also look to the Federal Reserve System to provide assistance in promoting the objectives we all share: meeting the credit needs of a vigorous and growing economy, while preventing excessive credit flows that could carry the pace of expansion beyond prudent speed limits.

THE UNCERTAINTIES

We have made the best economic judgments we can. This year, they were unusually difficult. If the tax measures I am now proposing, in conjunction with the moderating influence of monetary policy, do not hold total demand within bounds of the Nation's productive capacity, I will not hesitate to ask for further fiscal restraints on private spending. Nor will I hesitate to ask for such further fiscal action if additional defense requirements demand it during the year. And I will welcome the opportunity to alter my budget in the event that a relaxation of international tensions permits lower defense outlays than are now foreseen.

Our defense needs are great; but our growth is far greater. The demands on our economy are strong; but its productive capabilities are enormous. Surprises surely lie ahead; but our ability to cope with change is strong and improving.

MAINTAINING COST-PRICE STABILITY IN 1966

One of the problems of prosperity we face in 1966 is that of achieving stability of prices and costs at full employment.

The basic precondition for price stability is a fiscal monetary policy that deters total demand for goods and services from outrunning potential supply. But history proclaims that something more is needed: a sense of responsibility to the public interest by labor and business in setting wages and prices.

The vigorous economy we foresee in 1966 will tempt labor unions to demand wage increases that would raise costs, and businesses to raise prices when profit margins are already fully adequate. Labor must remember that growing employment and productivity are the foundation of higher wages, and business that an expanding economy is the basic source of profit gains. These foundations must not be jeopardized.

The Federal Government does not have authority to impose ceilings on wages and prices.

But when 200,000 of our fellow citizens are risking their lives in the defense of freedom overseas, the Government's duty is to ask those who enjoy a comfortable prosperity at home to exercise responsibly their freedom to set prices and wages.

Foregoing the freedom to act irresponsibly is no real sacrifice. For irresponsible action can only bring on an inflation that would damage all—labor, business, and the national interest.

The attached Report of the Council of Economic Advisers contains a thorough discussion of its guideposts for noninflationary wage and price behavior. To maintain price stability in the expanding economy of 1966, it is vitally important that labor and industry follow these guideposts.

The public can expect that the responsible actions of labor and management will be strengthened and supplemented by all the policies of the Federal Government:

Manpower, education, and rehabilitation programs will continue to train the unemployed and to prepare our youth, increasing the supply of qualified workers and their productivity.

Where available, surplus Federal stockpiles will be used to prevent unnecessary shortages of materials and commodities.

Defense procurement, agricultural, and other policies will be adjusted where necessary to avoid contributing to instability of prices.

Fair Labor Standards legislation and Government pay increases should be consistent with the guideposts.

There are no general labor shortages in our economy now, and none should develop in the year ahead. But in some industries, occupations, and areas, limited stringencies are appearing.

Prompt and effective action will be taken to meet any problem of specific labor shortage. I have instructed the Secretary of Labor to take all possible and necessary steps. And I have asked all other Departments to cooperate in this effort.

It will not be easy to reconcile price stability and full employment. Some price movements reflect worldwide changes in supply and demand. But overall stability of costs and prices will be preserved in the year ahead, provided that during 1966 public policies maintain a balance between overall supply and demand and address themselves vigorously to any emerging sectoral imbalances, and business and labor accept the principles of the guideposts for noninflationary behavior.

We will have demonstrated that a free economy can both maintain full employment and avoid inflation—and do so without arbitrary controls.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICIES FOR 1966

These are the objectives of our international economic policies in 1966: to correct our remaining balance of payments deficit, so that the dollar will remain strong; to work toward reduction of trade barriers, so that all nations may reap the benefits of freer trade; to improve the international monetary system, so that it will continue to facilitate sound and orderly growth of the world economy; to press forward with the other fortunate nations in the great international task of our age: helping those countries now economically less advanced which are prepared to help themselves make rapid progress toward a better life in freedom.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Decisive progress was made in 1965 toward reducing our balance of payments deficit. Though the results for 1965 are gratifying, we cannot afford to relax. We have not yet balanced our external accounts.

For 1966, external balance is our goal. It requires that—

Business continue to cooperate wholeheartedly in following the strenghened guidelines governing capital flows announced in December;

Banks and financial institutions maintain their excellent performance of last year;

Businesses sell even more abroad this year, in spite of full domestic order books;

Business and labor keep costs and prices stable in order to maintain the competitiveness of our goods and services in international markets;

Government work vigorously to minimize the dollar drain abroad of its aid and defense programs as well as all other activities;

The Congress pass the tax legislation I recommended last year to enhance opportunities for foreigners to invest in the United States;

We intensify our efforts to encourage our own citizens and foreigners to travel in the United States. I am directing that high priority be given to these efforts.

TRADE

The year 1966 is the year when the world can take a giant step forward in liberalizing international trade by successfully concluding the Kennedy round of negotiations to reduce trade barriers on all classes of products. The resulting growth of world trade and world income will benefit all countries, developing as well as industrial. The United States will bend every effort to get meaningful negotiations back on the track. This great venture in international cooperation must not fail.

We shall continue our efforts to improve the trade prospects of the developing countries by helping to stabilize commodity trade, by supporting regional integration among them where practicable, by providing access to markets, and by giving positive assistance to export promotion.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

As we achieve and maintain balance in our external accounts, dollars will no longer add to international monetary reserves as they have in the past. We learned long ago that we cannot rely on gold alone. The free world must look to new sources of liquidity—rather than to deficits in the U.S. balance of payments—to support growing international trade and payments.

We are, therefore, pressing forward with other nations to assure the adequate and orderly growth of world monetary reserves; to improve the adjustment of imbalances by both surplus and deficit countries; to strengthen the monetary system that has served the world so well.

I hope that the major industrial nations—and then the entire community of free nations—will reach an agreement that will make creation of new reserve assets a deliberate decision of the community of nations to serve the economic welfare of all.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

We have molded our foreign assistance policies into more efficient tools with which to confront one of history's gravest challenges—the development of the impoverished but awakening and turbulent two-thirds of the world.

The United States stands ready to continue to assist those countries which have demonstrated their commitment to the task of moving their economies forward toward self-sustaining growth under freedom.

In recent years, I have consciously held back further increases in our foreign assistance request while we designed a lean but effective program to give maximum impact to each dollar we spend.

Today, we are ready to move forward with special emphasis on three areas in which the United States is particularly well qualified to help: agriculture, to stimulate food production where it fails to keep pace with spiraling populations; health, to strengthen millions who could contribute more fully to their own economic progress; education and training, to provide the modern skills needed for development.

URBAN PROBLEMS AND POLICIES

We are an urban society. In 1900, America's urban areas contained 30 million people, 40 percent of our population. By the year 2000, 250 million, 80 percent of our population, are likely to be urban. The quality of American life increasingly depends on the physical, economic, esthetic, and social qualities of our urban centers.

American cities possess some of the rarest treasures of art, the finest music and theater, the greatest universities, the loveliest parks, the most splendid vistas, the most elegant and luxurious living, in the entire world. Yet they also contain degrading poverty, revolting slums, incredible traffic congestion, bitter racial tensions, physical decay and ugliness, political disorganization, and rising crime and delinquency.

The Congress created last year a Department of Housing and Urban Development, giving it responsibilities for coordinating Federal programs affecting housing, urban areas, and urban people, and for administering many such programs. I have no intention of letting it become merely a housekeeping agency to supervise miscellaneous programs.

With the help of the finest minds in the Nation, we have been developing a program to rebuild—in cooperation with State and local governments, private agencies, business enterprises, and local citizens—the physical, institutional, and social environment of our urban areas. Each city should plan on an integrated basis for its own physical, economic, and social development. And where those plans are imaginative, farsighted, and efficient, the Federal Government should help to make them realities.

I am asking the Congress to consider proposed legislation to carry out these objectives. I am also preparing proposals for legislation to bar discrimination in the sale or rental of housing—a condition which has contributed to many urban problems.

TRANSPORTATION

The revolutionary changes in transportation technology of the past half century have not been matched by equal progress in our public policies or our Federal organization.

I am recommending the creation of a Department of Transportation to manage the vast Federal promotional programs in highways, waterways, air travel, and maritime affairs, and to take leadership in the development of new transportation policies in accord with current realities.

I am proposing again this year increased user charges on highways and aviation and the introduction of nominal user charges on inland waterways. Such charges will improve efficiency in the use of resources, and reimburse the Federal Government for a part of its expenditures which directly benefit the users of these facilities.

We spend billions of dollars in medical research each year to conquer disease and prolong life. Yet we still put up with the senseless slaughter of thousands of Americans on our highways.

Fifty thousand Americans met their death in traffic accidents during 1965. About 3½ million were injured. The economic cost of accidents is estimated at around $8 billion a year.

We can no longer ignore the problem of automobile safety. We can no longer procrastinate and hope that the situation will improve. I will propose new programs to protect the safety of our citizens and the efficient flow of our commerce.

CONTROLLING POLLUTION

Our means for attacking the shameful pollution of our environment were strengthened in the first session of this Congress by important new standard-setting authority over water quality and automotive exhausts.

Federal agencies have begun cleaning up the numerous and extensive sources of water pollution from their own facilities, in response to my Executive order. Despite budgetary stringency, expenditures for this purpose will be given high priority. I shall issue an Executive order covering air pollution from Federal installations.

I propose that, in cooperation with appropriate State and local authorities and private interests, we carry out projects to clean up several entire river basins, following the example of our efforts to clean up the Potomac. Special Federal financial assistance will be necessary; this should be conditioned on new financial and organizational arrangements by State and local authorities.

LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

UNION SECURITY AGREEMENTS

Strong and responsible collective bargaining is an important instrument of a free and healthy economy.

To improve its functioning and to make the national labor policy uniform throughout the country, I again urge the Congress to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

STRIKE EMERGENCIES

The recent transit strike in New York City illustrates our helplessness in preventing extreme disruption to the lives and livelihoods of a city of 8 million people. I intend to ask the Congress to consider measures that, without improperly invading State and local authority, will enable us to deal effectively with strikes that may cause irreparable damage to the national interest.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Our system of unemployment insurance has not kept pace with our advancing economy. The time to modernize it is now, when unemployment is low and the cost of improved protection can be readily absorbed. We need a program that will provide more realistic benefits, including benefits for more workers and for longer periods of joblessness; that will correct abuses and assure efficient and responsible administration; and that will broaden the system's tax base and strengthen its financing. I urge the Congress to enact such a program.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS

Millions of workers at the bottom of our wage scale still lack the protection of Federal minimum standards. At the same time, we need to reinforce this protection by raising the minimum wage.

I recommend the extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act to large numbers of additional workers. In enacting higher minimum wage levels, the Congress should consider carefully their effects on substandard incomes, on cost and price stability, and on the availability of job opportunities for marginal workers.

TAX REFORM AND SIMPLIFICATION

Against a background calling for fiscal restraint, I cannot this year endorse any specific legislative measure, however meritorious, involving significant net tax reduction. The danger of inflation from increased demand would be too great, and any special tax reduction now would postpone the time when we can achieve a meaningful general tax reduction.

Although tax reduction is not feasible this year, improvement of our tax system is a continuing need which will concern this Administration and which deserves the support of all Americans.

One major goal must be simplification of the tax law. Another aim must be a more equitable distribution of the tax load. The great variation of tax liability among persons with equivalent income or wealth must be reduced. Further, when tax reduction once again becomes feasible, particular attention must be given to relief of those at or near poverty levels of income.

Finally, we must review special tax preferences. In a fully employed economy, special tax benefits to stimulate some activities or investments mean that we will have less of other activities. Benefits that the Government extends through direct expenditures are periodically reviewed and often altered in the budget-appropriation process, but too little attention is given to reviewing particular tax benefits. These benefits, like all other activities of Government, must stand up to the tests of efficiency and fairness.

We must constantly seek improvements in the tax code in the interests of equity and of sound economic policy.

I welcome the concern over these problems shown by the chairmen of the tax committees of the Congress.

As a specific tax reform which can be accomplished this year, I call upon the Congress to deal with abuses of tax-exempt private foundations.

We must always be prepared to meet quickly any problems that arise in the path of continued, stable economic growth, whether the problems call for fiscal stimulus or fiscal restraint. Background tax studies by both the Congress and executive branch should therefore be adequate to permit quick decisions and prompt action to accommodate short-run cyclical changes. If quick action is ever needed, we should not have to begin a long debate on what the changes in taxes should be.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS IN OUR CHANGING ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

The vigor and soundness of our financial institutions are vital to the vigor and soundness of our economic expansion. Actions to ease unnecessarily restrictive regulations have been taken in the past; they have borne fruit in stronger competition and a more efficient flow of funds from savers to borrowers with the most urgent needs.

But appropriate regulations are clearly required to protect the safety of savings of American families, to assure the most efficient and equitable regulation of financial institutions, and to create still better channels for the flow of funds to borrowers.

For these reasons, I recommend congressional action on financial legislation to arm regulatory agencies with a wider range of effective enforcement remedies; strengthen statutory provisions dealing with savings and loan holding companies; increase the maximum amount of insurance coverage for bank deposits and savings and loan accounts; provide safeguards against conflict of interests in the management of these institutions; and make regulations applying to various types of institutions as parallel as possible; provide for Federal chartering of mutual savings banks.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

I have already asked for the cooperation of business and labor in preserving the stability of costs and prices. But the consumer also has a responsibility for holding the price line.

To fulfill his responsibility, the consumer must have access to clear, unambiguous information about products and services available for sale. This will enable him to reward with his patronage the most efficient producers and distributors, who offer the best value or the lowest price.

We should wait no longer to eliminate misleading and deceptive packaging and labeling practices which cause consumer confusion. The fair packaging and labeling bill should be enacted.

While the growth of consumer credit has contributed to our rising standard of living, confusing practices in disclosing credit rates and the cost of financing have made it difficult for consumers to shop for the best buy in credit.

Truth-in-lending legislation would provide consumers the necessary information, by requiring a clear statement of the cost of credit and the annual rate of interest.

Our legislation protecting the public from harmful drugs and cosmetics should be strengthened. I shall propose legislation for this purpose.

CONCLUSION

A few years ago, much was heard of the "European economic miracle." Today, across the Atlantic and around the world one hears once again of the "American economic miracle."

For the American economy, in the past 5 years, has demonstrated anew the confident vitality, the internal dynamism, and the enormous productivity which had long been its hallmark. We had settled for a while on what seemed a plateau of affluence; now, once again, there has been the strong thrust of progress—but a newly steady and balanced progress.

We have again shown the world what free men and a free economy can achieve. The peoples struggling toward economic development see with renewed interest that free markets and free economic choices can be a mighty engine of progress.

Moreover, there is new respect in the world for an America concerned with using its abundance to enhance the quality of human life: for a people who undertake a war on poverty along with the defense of freedom; who seek to restore their cities to greatness and to conserve the beauties of their landscape; who are determined to break down a centuries-old barrier of prejudice and injustice; who are resolved to lift the quality of education at every level; who are determined to promote and reward excellence in every endeavor; who have provided new health services and better social security for their older citizens; who offer to share their abundance and technical skills with a needy world.

The new vigor and progress of America can be a source of satisfaction. Yet we cannot rest on past accomplishments. Continuing problems challenge our determination and our resourcefulness.

Perhaps our most serious economic challenge in 1966 will be to preserve the essential stability of costs and prices which has contributed so significantly to our balanced progress.

I do not know what additional burdens of defense the American economy will be asked to assume in 1966. Whatever they are, they will be met, and they will be small relative to the growth of our abundance. But in an economy approaching full use of its resources, the new requirements of Vietnam make our task of maintaining price stability more difficult.

To insure against the risk of inflationary pressures, I have asked Americans to pay their taxes on a more nearly current basis, and to postpone a scheduled tax cut. If it should turn out that additional insurance is needed, then I am convinced that we should levy higher taxes rather than accept inflation—which is the most unjust and capricious form of taxation.

We know that we do not need to put our growing economy into a straight jacket, or to throw it into reverse. But the extent of the fiscal or monetary restraint that will be needed to avoid inflationary pressures will depend directly on the restraint and moderation exercised by those who have power over wages and prices.

I again ask every leader of labor and every businessman who has price or wage decisions to make in 1966 to remember that his decisions affect not alone the wages of his members or the returns of his stockholders. Shortsighted pursuit of short-run interests fails in the longer run to advance the interests of either labor or management. And it surely does not advance the interests of the Nation.

I am confident that the overwhelming majority of private decisions in 1966 will be sound and responsible—just as I am determined that public decisions will be fully responsible.

If they are, the American economic miracle will remain in 1966 the single most important force in the economic progress of mankind.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 27, 1966.

PROPOSED REVISION OF POSTAL RATES ON CERTAIN FOURTH-CLASS MAIL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE ANTI-BOLSHEVIST BLOC OF NATIONS, INC., PROTESTS CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I received yesterday from the Baltic people who have an association called the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevist Bloc of Nations, Inc., with headquarters in Chicago, a memorial which contains 6,000 signatures as a protest against the approval of the consular treaty with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which is presently on the Executive Calendar. I should like to have it filed under petitions and memorials, but I should like also to see it remain available, because there may be some Senators who would wish to come and inspect it. This organization went to a great deal of work and difficulty to obtain these names, and I should not like to see it shuttled off into a storeroom somewhere, where we cannot get at it.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The memorial will be received and appropriately referred, and will remain at the desk, temporarily, for the inspection of Senators.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated January 19, 1966, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2837. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, so as to prevent the loss of veteran pension benefits as the result of increases in social security benefits authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2838. A bill for the relief of Irene Snyder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 2839. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to allow the planting of soybeans on acreage diverted from cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 2840. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the establishment and development of the Arkansas Post National Memorial in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 2841. A bill for the relief of Jerssie T. Ramirez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2842. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER) (by request):

S. 2843. A bill to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S.J. Res. 130. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week of May 8 to May 14, 1966, as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. RIBICOFF when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZATION OF PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT AN INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "THE TECHNIQUES OF SOVIET PROPAGANDA"

Mr. DODD submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the pamphlet entitled "The Techniques of Soviet Propaganda," prepared for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, be printed as a Senate Document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed 20,000 additional copies of such Senate Document for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

ALLOWANCE OF SOYBEAN PRODUCTION ON ACREAGE DIVERTED FROM COTTON

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to allow the planting of soybeans on acreage diverted from cotton. I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

The most recent amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949, and the act to which this proposal is primarily directed, is the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. Title IV, the cotton section, of the 1965 act contains a section specifically naming the crops which can be produced on acreage diverted from cotton, upon the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. The bill which I am introducing today would add soybeans to the list of crops which may be approved by the Secretary for production upon this diverted acreage.

The Department of Agriculture favored including soybeans in the list when the agriculture bill was being considered by Congress last year. However, projections which were made at that time indicating greatly increased production, both on a yield per acre and an overall basis, resulted in Congress' omitting soybeans from the list.

The latest figures and projections available now indicate the per acre and overall production increase will be nowhere as great as was expected. In addition, consumption of soybeans, both domestically and for export, has been greater than was anticipated. The market for soybeans is very strong and the price is continuing to rise.

Mr. President, soybeans are an important source of proteins and the export of soybeans by farmers in our country is a valuable contribution to the diet of people abroad. Soybeans is also an important crop to the farmers in our country. The enactment of this proposal would be of untold value, not only to the cotton farmers of the United States who have cooperated under the cotton bill enacted last year, but also to the starving nations of the world.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2839) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to allow the planting of soybeans on acreage diverted from cotton, introduced by Mr. THURMOND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CITY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas.

President Johnson in his message to the Congress of January 26 said that this year of "1966 can be the year of rebirth for American cities." He has proposed a demonstration cities program which, in his words, "will offer qualifying cities of all sizes the promise of a new life for their people." I am privileged to introduce this legislation today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2842) to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2842

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Demonstration Cities Act of 1966".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that improving the quality of urban life is the most critical domestic problem facing the United States. The persistence of widespread urban slums and blight, the concentration of persons of low income in older urban areas, and the unmet needs for additional housing and community facilities and services arising from rapid expansion of our urban population have resulted in a marked deterioration in the environment of large numbers of our people while the Nation as a whole prospers.

The Congress further finds and declares that cities, both large and small, do not have adequate resources to deal effectively with the critical problems facing them, and that additional Federal assistance is essential to enable cities to plan, develop, and conduct programs to improve their physical environment, increase their supply of adequate housing for low- and moderate-income people, and provide educational and social services vital to health and welfare.

It is the purpose of this Act to provide additional financial and technical assistance to enable cities, both large and small, to plan, develop, and carry out programs to rebuild or revitalize large slum and blighted areas and expand and improve public programs and services available to the people who live in such areas.

It is further the purpose of this Act to provide the additional financial aid needed to enable cities to participate more effectively in existing Federal assistance programs.

It is further the purpose of this Act to assist cities to coordinate activities aided under existing Federal programs with other public and private actions in order to provide the most effective and economical concentration of Federal, State, local, and private efforts to improve the quality of urban life.

BASIC AUTHORITY

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make grants and provide technical assistance, as provided by this Act, to enable city demonstration agencies (as herein defined) to plan, develop, and carry out comprehensive city demonstration programs.

COMPREHENSIVE CITY DEMONSTRATIONS PROGRAMS

SEC. 4. (a) A "comprehensive city demonstration program" is a locally prepared and scheduled program for rebuilding or restoring entire sections and neighborhoods of slum and blighted areas through the concentrated and coordinated use of all available Federal aids and local private and governmental resources, including city-wide aids and resources necessary to improve the general welfare of the people living or working in the areas.

(b) A comprehensive city demonstration program is eligible for assistance under sections 6, 8, and 9 only if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the program is of sufficient magnitude in both physical and social dimensions (i) to remove or arrest blight and decay in entire sections or neighborhoods, (ii) to provide a substantial increase in the supply of standard housing of low and moderate cost, (iii) to make marked progress in serving the poor and disadvantaged people living in slum and blighted areas with a view to reducing educational disadvantages, dis-

ease, and enforced idleness, and (iv) to make a substantial impact on the sound development of the entire city;

(2) the rebuilding or restoration of sections or neighborhoods in accordance with the program will contribute to a well-balanced city with adequate public facilities (including those needed for transportation, education, and recreation), commercial facilities adequate to serve the residential areas, good access to industrial or other centers of employment, and housing for all income levels;

(3) the program provides for educational and social services necessary to serve the poor and disadvantaged in the area, widespread citizen participation in the program, maximum opportunities for employing residents of the area in all phases of the program, and enlarged opportunity for work and training;

(4) adequate local resources are, or will be, available for the completion of the program as scheduled;

(5) administrative machinery is available for carrying out the program on a consolidated and coordinated basis, the local governing body has approved the program, and local agencies whose cooperation is necessary to the success of the program have indicated their intent to furnish such cooperation;

(6) there exists a relocation plan meeting the requirements of the regulations referred to in section 9;

(7) the program is designed to assure maximum opportunity in the choice of housing accommodations by all citizens; and

(8) the program meets such additional requirements as the Secretary may establish to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) In making the determinations under subsection (b), the Secretary shall give maximum consideration to whether—

(1) substantive local laws, regulations, and other requirements are, or can be expected to be, consistent with the objectives of the program;

(2) the program will enhance neighborhoods by applying a high standard of design and will, as appropriate, maintain distinctive natural, historical, and cultural characteristics;

(3) the program is designed to make maximum use of new and improved technology and design, including cost reduction techniques;

(4) the program will encourage good community relations and counteract the segregation of housing by race or income; and

(5) the program is consistent with comprehensive planning for the entire urban or metropolitan area.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR PLANNING COMPREHENSIVE CITY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and to contract with, city demonstration agencies to pay 90 percent of the costs of planning and developing comprehensive city demonstration programs.

(b) Financial assistance will be provided under this section only if (1) the application for such assistance has been approved by the local governing body of the city, and (2) the Secretary has determined that there exist (i) administrative machinery through which coordination of all related planning activities of local agencies can be achieved and (ii) evidence that necessary cooperation of agencies engaged in related local planning can be obtained.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR APPROVED COMPREHENSIVE CITY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary shall review plans for comprehensive city demonstration programs in order to determine that (1) such plans satisfy the criteria for such programs set forth in section 4, and (2) the various projects or activities to be undertaken in connection with such programs are scheduled to be initiated within a reasonably short period of time.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and to contract with, city demonstration agencies to pay 80 percent of the costs of administering approved comprehensive city demonstration programs, but not the cost of administering any project or activity assisted under a Federal grant-in-aid program.

(c) To assist the city to carry out the projects or activities included within an approved comprehensive city demonstration program, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to the city demonstration agency of not to exceed 80 percent of the aggregate amount of non-Federal contributions otherwise required to be made to all projects or activities assisted by Federal grant-in-aid programs (as hereinafter defined) which are undertaken in connection with such demonstration program: *Provided*, That the amount of non-Federal contribution required for each project in a Federal grant-in-aid program shall be certified to the Secretary by the Federal department or agency (other than the Department of Housing and Urban Development) administering such program, and the Secretary shall accept such determination in computing the grants hereunder.

(d) Grant funds provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section may be used for projects or activities assisted under a Federal grant-in-aid program which are undertaken as part of an approved comprehensive city demonstration program, or for other projects or activities undertaken as part of such demonstration program. If used for projects or activities assisted under a Federal grant-in-aid program which are undertaken as part of such demonstration program, funds provided pursuant to subsection (c) shall be credited as part or all of the required non-Federal contribution to such projects or activities.

(e) The Secretary shall not make any grant under this section unless he has obtained satisfactory assurances that the locality will maintain, during the period an approved comprehensive city demonstration program is being carried out, a level of aggregate expenditures for activities similar to those being assisted under this section not less than the level of aggregate expenditures for such activities prior to initiation of the comprehensive city demonstration program.

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL COORDINATOR

SEC. 7. There shall be established for each locality having an approved comprehensive city demonstration program an office to be known as the Office of the Federal Coordinator headed by a Director who shall be designated by the Secretary. The Director shall perform such functions as the Secretary shall from time to time prescribe with respect to helping achieve the maximum effective coordination of Federal grant-in-aid programs undertaken in connection with comprehensive city demonstration programs. Nothing in this section shall be construed to vest in the Secretary any authority to exercise or delegate any function or duty vested by law in any department or agency of the Federal Government other than the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized to undertake such activities as he determines to be desirable to provide, either directly or by contracts or other arrangements, technical assistance to city demonstration agencies to assist such agencies in planning, developing, and administering comprehensive city demonstration programs.

RELOCATION REQUIREMENTS AND PAYMENTS

SEC. 9. (a) A comprehensive city demonstration program must include a plan for the relocation of individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations displaced or to be displaced in carrying out the city demonstration program. The relocation plan shall be consistent with regulations prescribed by the Secretary to assure that (1) the provisions and procedures included in the plan meet relocation standards equivalent to those prescribed under section 105(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to urban renewal projects assisted under title I of that Act, and (2) relocation activities are coordinated to the maximum extent feasible with the increase in the supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for families and individuals of low or moderate income, as provided under the comprehensive city demonstration program, or otherwise, in order to best maintain the available supply of such housing for all such families and individuals throughout the city.

(b) To the extent not otherwise authorized under any Federal law, financial assistance extended to a comprehensive city demonstration agency under section 6 shall include grants to cover the full cost of relocation payments, as herein defined. Such grants shall be in addition to other financial assistance extended to such agency under section 6.

The term "relocation payments" means payments by a comprehensive city demonstration agency to a displaced individual, family, business concern, or nonprofit organization which are made on such terms and conditions and subject to such limitations (to the extent applicable, but not including the date of displacement) as are provided for relocation payments, at the time such payments are approved, by sections 114 (b), (c), (d), and (e) of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to projects assisted under title I thereof.

(c) Subsection (b) shall not be applicable with respect to any displacement occurring prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

CONTINUED AVAILABILITY OF FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAM

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, unless hereafter enacted expressly in limitation of the provisions of this section, funds appropriated for a Federal grant-in-aid program which are reserved for any projects or activities assisted under such grant-in-aid program undertaken in connection with an approved comprehensive city demonstration program shall remain available until expended when so provided in appropriation acts.

CONSULTATION

SEC. 11. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, including the issuance of regulations, the Secretary shall consult with other Federal departments and agencies administering Federal grant-in-aid programs. The Secretary shall consult with each Federal department and agency affected by each comprehensive city demonstration program before entering into a commitment to make grants for such program under section 6.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Appropriations authorized under this Act shall remain available until expended when so provided in appropriation acts.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 13. As used in this Act—

(a) "Federal grant-in-aid program" means a program of Federal financial assistance other than loans and other than the assistance provided by this Act.

(b) "City Demonstration Agency" means the city or any local public agency established or designated by the local governing body to administer the comprehensive city demonstration program.

(c) "City" means any municipality (or two or more municipalities acting jointly) or, with respect to urban areas outside of incorporated municipalities, any county or other public body (or two or more acting jointly) having general governmental powers.

(d) "Local" agencies include State agencies and instrumentalities providing services or resources to a city or locality, and "local" resources include those provided to a city or locality by a State or its agency or instrumentality.

TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 14. (a) This Act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1971: *Provided*, That the functions, powers, duties, and authorities vested in the Secretary under this Act may be retained by the Secretary for the purpose of liquidating the affairs and functions conducted under this Act.

(b) The termination of this Act shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, commitment, or other obligation entered into pursuant to this Act prior to the date of such termination, or the taking of any action necessary to preserve or protect the interests of the United States in any amounts advanced or paid out in carrying on operations under this Act.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE DEMONSTRATION CITIES ACT OF 1966

Section 1. Short title: The bill would be entitled the "Demonstration Cities Act of 1966."

Section 2. Findings and declaration of purpose: This section contains congressional findings and statements of purpose.

Section 3. Basic authority: This section would authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants and provide technical assistance to enable city demonstration agencies to plan, develop, and carry out comprehensive city demonstration programs.

Section 4. Comprehensive city demonstration programs: This section would define the term "comprehensive city demonstration program" and establish criteria for such programs.

A "comprehensive city demonstration program" would be defined as a locally prepared and scheduled program for rebuilding or restoring entire sections and neighborhoods in slum and blighted areas through the concentrated and coordinated use of all available Federal aids and local private and governmental resources, including citywide aids and resources necessary to improve the general welfare of the people living or working in the areas.

A comprehensive city demonstration program would be eligible for assistance to carry out the program only if the Secretary determines that:

1. The program is of sufficient magnitude in both physical and social dimensions to remove or arrest blight and decay in entire sections or neighborhoods, provide a substantial increase in the supply of standard housing of low and moderate cost, make marked progress in serving the poor and disadvantaged people living in slum and blighted areas with a view to reducing educational disadvantages, disease, and enforced idleness, and make a substantial impact on the sound development of the entire city;

2. The rebuilding or restoration of sections or neighborhoods, in accordance with the program, will contribute to a well-balanced city with adequate public facilities (including those needed for transportation, education, and recreation), commercial facilities adequate to serve the residential areas, good access to industrial or other centers of employment, and housing for all income levels;

3. The program provides for educational and social services necessary to serve the poor and disadvantaged in the area, widespread citizen participation in the program, maximum opportunities for employing residents of the area in all phases of the program, and enlarged opportunity for work and training;

4. Adequate local resources are, or will be, available for the completion of the program as scheduled;

5. Administrative machinery is available for carrying out the program on a consolidated and coordinated basis, the local governing body has approved the program, and local agencies whose cooperation is necessary to the success of the program have indicated their intent to furnish such cooperation;

6. There exists a relocation plan meeting the requirements of the regulations referred to in section 9 of this bill;

7. The program is designed to assure maximum opportunity in the choice of housing accommodations by all citizens; and

8. The program meets such additional requirements as the Secretary may establish to carry out the purposes of the bill.

In addition, in determining whether a proposed comprehensive city demonstration program is eligible for assistance, this section would require the Secretary to give maximum consideration to whether (1) substantive local laws, regulations, and other requirements are, or can be expected to be, consistent with the objectives of the program; (2) the program will enhance neighborhoods by applying a high standard of design and will, as appropriate, maintain distinctive natural, historical, and cultural characteristics; (3) the program is designed to make maximum use of new and improved technology and design, including cost reduction techniques; (4) the program will encourage good community relations and counteract the segregation of housing by race or income; and (5) the program is consistent with comprehensive planning for the entire urban or metropolitan area.

Section 5. Financial assistance for planning comprehensive city demonstration programs: This section would authorize the Secretary to make grants to, or contract with, city demonstration agencies to pay 90 percent of the costs of planning and developing comprehensive city demonstration programs. Such financial assistance would be provided only if (1) the application for such assistance has been approved by the local governing body of the city, and (2) the Secretary has determined that there exist administrative machinery through which coordination of all related planning activities of local agencies can be achieved and evidence that necessary cooperation of agencies engaged in related local planning can be secured.

Section 6. Financial assistance for approved comprehensive city demonstration programs: This section would require the Secretary to review plans for comprehensive city demonstration programs and to extend grant assistance to approved programs.

Plans for comprehensive city demonstration programs would be reviewed in order to determine that, (1) such plans satisfy the criteria for comprehensive city demonstration programs set forth in section 4 of the bill; and (2) the various projects or activities to be undertaken under such programs are planned and scheduled to be initiated within a reasonably short period of time.

Grant assistance for approved comprehensive city demonstration programs would be available to pay 80 percent of the costs of administering such programs (but not including the costs of administering any project or activity assisted under a Federal grant-in-aid program). In addition, to assist the city to carry out the projects or activities included within an approved comprehensive city demonstration programs, the Secretary may make grants to the city demonstration agency of not to exceed 80 percent of the aggregate amount of non-Federal contributions required to be made by the locality to add projects or activities assisted by Federal grant-in-aid programs undertaken in connection with comprehensive city demonstration programs.

The amount of non-Federal contribution required for each such project or activity would be certified to the Secretary by the Federal department or agency administering the grant-in-aid program and the Secretary would be required to accept such determination in computing the amount of grants made under this section.

No grant could be made under this section unless the Secretary obtains satisfactory assurances that the locality will maintain, during the period an approved comprehensive city demonstration program is being carried out, its prior level of aggregate expenditures for activities similar to those assisted under this section.

Section 7. Office of the Federal coordinator: This section would establish for each locality having an approved comprehensive city demonstration program an Office of the Federal coordinator, to be headed by a director designated by the Secretary. The Director would be required to help achieve the maximum effective coordination of Federal grant-in-aid programs undertaken in connection with comprehensive city demonstration programs. The Secretary could not exercise or delegate any function or duty vested by law in any department or agency other than the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Section 8. Technical assistance: This section would authorize the Secretary to provide technical assistance to city demonstration agencies to assist such agencies in planning, developing, and administering comprehensive city demonstration programs.

Section 9. Relocation requirements and payments: This section would (1) require a relocation plan for individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations displaced or to be displaced in carrying out comprehensive city demonstration programs which assures the availability of adequate housing before people are displaced and requires, to the maximum extent feasible, the coordination of relocation activities with increases in the supply of standard housing suitable for displaced families; and (2) require relocation payments, in the amount and in the circumstances authorized by section 114 of the Housing Act of 1949, to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations displaced or to be displaced under comprehensive city demonstration programs.

Section 10. Continued availability of Federal grant-in-aid program funds: This section would provide that funds appropriated for a Federal grant-in-aid program which are reserved for any projects or activities assisted under a grant-in-aid program undertaken in connection with an approved comprehensive city demonstration program would remain available until expended when so provided in appropriation acts.

Section 11. Consultation: This section would require the Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of the bill, including the issuance of regulations, to consult with other Federal departments and agencies administering grant-in-aid programs. In addition, the Secretary would be required to consult with each Federal department and agency affected by each approved comprehensive city demonstration program before entering into a commitment to make grants for such programs under section 6 of the bill.

Section 12. Appropriations: This section would authorize to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the bill. All funds so appropriated would remain available until expended when so provided in appropriation acts.

Section 13. Definitions: This section would define terms used in the bill.

Section 14. Termination of authority: This section would provide that all authority conferred under the bill would terminate at the close of June 30, 1971.

Mr. INOUYE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill introduced earlier today by Senator Douglas, to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas, be held at the desk for additional cosponsors until close of business, Wednesday, February 2.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REVISION OF POSTAL RATES ON CERTAIN FOURTH-CLASS MAIL

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, by request of the Postmaster General, a bill to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail, and for other purposes.

This bill would increase the rates of postage on fourth-class parcels by about 9 percent per parcel and on fourth-class catalogs by about 12 percent. The bill also increases the size and weight limitations on parcels moving between first-class post offices. The bill retains the requirement established by the Congress that revenues from parcel post approximately equal costs, but removes the requirement of annual certification by the Postmaster General to the Secretary of the Treasury before the Post Office Department can spend funds appropriated to it by Congress.

Under present law, parcels moving between first-class post offices separated by more than 150 miles are limited to 20 pounds and 72 inches in length and girth combined. Parcels moving between first-class post offices separated by less than 150 miles may weigh as much as 40 pounds.

Parcels moving between other than first-class post offices and between first-class post offices and all other post offices or rural and star routes may weigh 70 pounds and measure 100 inches in length and girth combined.

The bill would change the size and weight limitations only on those parcels moving between first-class post offices. A standard weight of 40 pounds, regardless of zones, would be established for movements between first-class post offices, and the length and girth limitations would be changed from 72 inches to 100 inches.

Prior to the enactment of Public Law 88–51, the Postmaster General was required to certify in writing to the Secretary of the Treasury that parcel post revenues and costs did not vary by more than 4 percent, or if such variation existed, that he had submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission for approval a revision of rates to comply with the 4-percent requirement. Unless such certification was made, funds appropriated to the Post Office Department could not be withdrawn from the Treasury.

Public Law 88–51 suspended this restriction upon spending until June 30, 1966. The moratorium was established to provide Congress and the Post Office Department with adequate time to consider proposals to resolve a variety of problems in the field of parcel post mail.

The Post Office Department estimates that the enactment of this legislation would result in $107 million in additional revenues which would achieve a balance in parcel post costs and revenues.

I ask unanimous consent that the Postmaster General's letter of justification be printed in the Record following my remarks, and that the bill lay on the table for 10 days so that Senators interested in cosponsoring it may do so.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bill (S. 2843) to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Monroney (for himself and Mr. Brewster), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The letter presented by Mr. Monroney is as follows:

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: In 1963 this Department was faced with a financial crisis because of a statutory requirement that no funds appropriated for the Post Office could be withdrawn from the Treasury for any purpose unless steps had been taken to balance cost and revenue of the parcel post service within 4 percent. The Postmaster General, testifying that under the size and weight restrictions then prevailing no action which lay within his power could insure the break-even operation, turned to Congress for relief. Congress responded by voting a 3-year moratorium on the operation of the pertinent statute so that the Post Office could continue to function while a solution was sought to what had become a continuing parcel post financial crisis.

Nothing that has happened in the intervening 3 years will avoid a repetition of what again threatens, under existing law, to halt postal operations completely.

Obviously, therefore, the parcel post problem has claimed a large share of my attention during the last 3 months, as it had that of my predecessors. I have discussed this matter intensively with postal officials who have lived with the problem for many years, with the representatives of our employee organizations, with mailers, and with the heads of the major private companies engaged in carrying parcels.

As a result of the serious nature of this problem, I am therefore sending you as a matter of urgency our conclusions regarding parcel post. I also submit herewith draft legislation designed to modify those statutes governing fourth-class mail which the experience of 14 years has shown to be inadequate to the provision of good service to the public.

Our basic conclusions are three in number:

First, an efficient, reliable parcel post service (which I believe to be as important to the economic health of this country as is a modern highway system) can be achieved—with the help of Congress—without deviating from our philosophy of supporting maximum areas for free enterprise. Modern equipment, improved handling techniques, and such highly promising developments as the sectional centers, have amply demonstrated that the Post Office can meet the needs of the public. And new steps now being taken will further enhance that ability.

As you are aware, Mr. President, substantial service improvements have already been made in many parts of the country, the most recent stemming from President Johnson's order to restore 6-day parcel post delivery.

Second, while there are many conflicting viewpoints about the role of the parcel post service and many arguments concerning philosophy and method, it is now obvious to all familiar with the problem that a single clear fact runs through this dispute like a silver thread: the public interest is not being adequately served by the artificial limitations now imposed on the use of the postal service.

Before 1952, the size and weight limit for all parcel post was 100 inches and 70 pounds. It was a simple rule, easily understood and easily administered. Public Law 199 of the 82d Congress, however, reduced the weight limit to 20 pounds between first class post offices more than 150 miles apart, and to 40 pounds between first class offices closer together, and also imposed a 72 inch size limit on all such parcels while leaving the earlier standard for parcels sent to or from other classes of post offices or rural routes, for certain types of shipments (such as produce or seeds) and for shipments to or from any class of post office in Alaska, Hawaii, or involving members of the Armed Forces overseas. Since 7 out of 10 Americans live in communities served by first class post offices, the restriction has acted to deprive 140 million people of the same service enjoyed by rural residents, a service the post office is able and willing to provide.

Apart from the discrimination inherent in the present rule against the majority of Americans who live in urban areas, the first class office restrictions have caused untold confusion and frustration, and have absorbed an inordinate amount of employee time in attempting to clarify what many patrons consider capricious regulations promulgated by the Post Office. (Very few people seem to be aware that since 1952 regulations have been those required by an act of Congress.) This drain on employee time depresses overall efficiency and productivity.

Some representatives examples of the practical problems involved illuminate the common confusions resulting from the present system.

A couple wishes to send identical 25 pound Christmas gifts to the two sets of parents, both of which are served by first class offices. Since the husband's parents live 145 miles away, the gift can be mailed to them but not to the wife's parents who live 155 miles away.

A mail order firm found there was so much confusion about who could and who could not obtain a catalog item weighing slightly over 20 pounds that it eliminated the item from the catalog rather than continue to engage in profitless exchanges with irate customers.

A mother wanting to send an evening dress to a daughter at college finds that although it weighs only 12 pounds and is only 30 inches long, it cannot be mailed because the combinations of its dimensions (6 inches by 18 inches by 30 inches) exceeds the 72 inches length-plus-girth limitation. She can, however, mail it to her niece who lives in a town served by a second class post office.

The need to simplify our mail regulations is particularly important. At present, the extension of time consuming help in explaining the regulations forms a significant drain on postal clerk hours. Too often, this help also creates among patrons the feeling that the rules are arbitrary and discriminatory. In the business world the existing rules dampen the zeal of cooperation with the Department's programs for preprocessing of mail.

Discrimination, public confusion, and lowered levels of postal efficiency are but three of the penalties of the present law. There is another, equally severe. The present system has led as well to wasteful practices by businesses to which the present weight and distance regulations present a barrier to profitable operations, and which seek to circumvent it in a number of legal, but not economically logical ways. Some firms incur extra expense by splitting large orders into several small ones in order to mail them. When the cartons do not all arrive on the same date, the customer often believes he has been shorted and a long distance telephone call or correspondence exchange ensues. Other firms establish branches and then haul their parcels to within 150 miles of the destination to receive the 40-pound allowance. Still others deposit their over-20-pound parcels at second-class offices (often many miles from their plant), in order to use the mails. Almost all of these small offices are ill equipped to handle volume shipments. In a number of cases, the parcels are then transported back to post offices, which could not accept them originally, for onward distribution and dispatch.

There are several cases of record in which the added revenues from such shipments automatically converted a small post office into a first-class office. The local inhabitants as well as the business firm then incur the limitations imposed on shipments between first-class offices. When the business firm halts its shipments, the office reverts to second class and the cycle begins again.

Such practices are obviously wasteful, but the greatest cost is in the confidence of individual mailers and businessmen in the reliability of their government. The reaction of many businessmen toward the present system is summed up in the following excerpt from a letter:

"With today's extra burdens of lower profit margins, it just seems a shame that our own Government cannot help us small business firms by making it easier to do business than hinder us."

Third, our size and weight restrictions have a serious and continuing effect on parcel post financing by keeping out of the mails many parcels which have a favorable cost-revenue relationship. Our studies show that by excluding these parcels (up to 70 pounds) the present size and weight limitations add approximately $40 to $50 million a year to the parcel post deficit which must be made up by higher rates from other mailers of parcels in order that the service operates with the required "break-even" financing. In the 14 years that current size and weight limitations have been on the books therefore, the public has paid, in postage (or in taxes when break even was not attained) over $500 million which should have been earned by the heavier parcels excluded by the statute. Some of the parcel post users so penalized with higher rates were, of course, the rural and military patrons Congress intended to exempt from the restrictions of Public Law 199.

Thus we have a system not achieving what it was designed to achieve. We have a system producing results either never anticipated or in direct contradiction to what was expected. We have a system in fact in which the parcel mailer is paying more directly and indirectly for poor service than he would pay for good service.

Since the law states that parcel post revenue must be increased (or costs reduced) whenever costs exceed revenue by more than 4 percent and since much profitable business is excluded from the mails through the present size and weight limitations, the Department in the past has been forced to raise rates more often and to a greater extent than normal economic conditions would dictate. Such rate increases have had the dual effect of lowering volume while making it more difficult to narrow the gap between cost and income.

Thus, step by step, continuation of this process will produce a parcel post system at once too feeble to achieve the aims for which it was established, too burdensome on those individuals who have no other alternative; and too ineffective to be continued by any means short of a parcel post subsidy by Congress.

Not one of these fast approaching conditions is warranted, desirable, or inevitable.

I believe strongly that a subsidized parcel post service is not in the best interest of the Nation, and that service should derive its revenues from the mailers who use it. I believe strongly that mailers should not be discriminated against because of the location of their post office or the revenue class it falls into. I believe strongly that business should be served, not frustrated, by the postal service.

In view of these conditions, present and potential, Mr. President, I am submitting for your consideration the following recommendations which my staff and I believe will eliminate the most serious inconvenience to the public produced by the present rules, strengthen the financial base for operating the service, safeguard the interests of those private carriers who regard parcel post as a competitor, and simplify the calculation of postage on parcels.

Recommendation No. 1: I am proposing that a general size and weight limit of 40 pounds, 100 inches, be established between all first-class offices. This limit covers most of the casual mailings made by individuals, such as gifts, and the types of business mailings which presently suffer from the existing restrictions. I am not proposing a return to 70 pounds, even though such a move would benefit the Department financially, because there appears to be no clear public need and because we seek to minimize the impact on private express and truck services.

However, I am proposing retention of the 70-pound limit now provided for small offices and certain minor exceptions detailed in Public Law 199.

Recommendation No. 2: Congress has repeatedly indicated its determination that there should be fiscal responsibility in the management of the parcel post service. Mr. President, I agree with this view without reservation.

The best way to achieve this aim and to insure cost coverage, I suggest, is to leave with the Postmaster General his present authority over parcel post rates and continue the requirement that he certify periodically that he has taken those actions necessary to bring revenues into line with costs. Two modifications to the present certification procedure, however, will greatly facilitate the ability of the Postmaster General to make this certification without jeopardizing its effect. Therefore, I propose that the certification requirement be put on an annual basis, and that the certificate be made to the President and to the Congress, rather than to another member of the Cabinet as at present.

Recommendation No. 3: I have stated my conviction that parcel post revenues should cover costs. Let me say that I believe they can cover costs. We are faced this year with a zone-rated fourth-class deficit of $107 million, in part the effect of two Federal pay raises since the moratorium began. The size and weight adjustment requested above is expected to net the Department approximately $40 million. I am asking Congress to increase parcel post rates approximately 8 cents per parcel, in accordance with the rate schedule shown in the attached draft legislation. I am asking also that the rates for fourth-class catalogs be increased by approximately 12 percent, to add an additional $3 million in annual revenues. Together these changes applied to our present volume will provide approximately 100-percent cost coverage for zone-rated fourth-class mail.

However, I cannot stress too strongly that we will be at approximately break even with these increases only if our central recommendation for size and weight liberalization is approved. If Congress should fail to adopt that recommendation, however, a severe rate increase averaging about 14 cents per parcel would be needed immediately in order to permit us next year to meet the requirements of the law. In addition to the shock to the public and business, an increase of this magnitude would be counterproductive since, as experience has shown, volume declines after such heavy rate increases. This invariably drops us below the goal aimed at and necessary for full coverage and sets the stage for the next round of rate increases needed to meet the break-even point. Certainly, a large rate increase at this time would, I fear, damage the posture of the parcel post service and have other serious repercussions.

Recommendation No. 4: We are recommending two steps to simplify determination and purchase of postage for parcel post. The proposed rate schedule, unlike prior schedules, has all rates rounded to the nearest 5 cents or 10 cents, to simplify change making, especially at self-service postal units. The second change involves basing the parcel post zone on the distance between the originating and destination sectional center offices rather than the mailing and receiving post offices themselves. This change permits us to use the ZIP code as the key to the parcel post zone for any office in the country.

A simple one-page sheet relating any ZIP code to the correct parcel post zone will replace a complicated zone key that requires use of the Directory of Post Offices. The use of this ZIP code keyed method will substitute a system involving 552 units of area for the present system that involves 4,000 units of area. With the growing acceptance of ZIP code by the general public, this will materially simplify an individual's calculation of postage charges.

As you know, Mr. President, the moratorium on fourth-class mail certification expires June 30, 1966. I would appreciate consideration of the recommendations set forth in the attached bill so that definitive congressional action can be taken before that time.

Finally, Mr. President, I want you and the Congress to know that I will do everything possible to translate the will of Congress into effective programs. In consonance with that pledge, I plan to establish in the Department a permanent staff to coordinate all phases of our parcel post operation in such a manner that the quality of our parcel post service reaches and remains at the highest level.

I have directed that every device used by modern business be employed to improve the working conditions of our parcel post employees and the efficiency of our operation. Your action on these recommendations will materially assist me in my efforts to secure our mutual goals. I shall be most happy to meet with you at your convenience and discuss these or other aspects of a concern that I know you share fully—improving the effectiveness and service of the postal system.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that from the standpoint of the administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this legislative proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Lawrence F. O'Brien.

SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL AND PEDESTRIAN CONTROL PROGRAM

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the year 1965 has passed and with it the lives of an estimated 49,000 Americans who died in traffic accidents. Time and again this startling figure is mentioned in this very Chamber and in the newspapers and magazines throughout our country. Slowly America is awakening to the fact that traffic safety is one of the most critical problems we are faced with today.

As the traffic fatality rate continues to rise so does our concern for the elimination of the multiple causes which bring about its tragic results. This concern is shared by many of us here today, by other officials at the Federal and State level, industry leaders, and by many worthwhile civil-minded organizations. The causes are many: the driver, the vehicle, the roadway—through faulty engineering design, construction, or maintenance—lack of or improper signs, signals, and markings, and the pedestrian.

We recognize that no single attack, to the exclusion of all others, can possibly solve the problem. Today, however, I would like to single out two programs which have battled the fatality rate in a most successful fashion. One of these programs is obvious to us all, but I would venture to say that very few of us would realize the vital contribution of the School Safety Patrol.

The School Safety Patrol was conceived around 1916 and formally established by the Chicago Motor Club. It then was pioneered on a national scale in 1922 by the American Automobile Association. Since the inception of this program the traffic death rate of schoolchildren has dropped nearly one-half, while the death rate of other age groups has doubled.

What started as a local idea in Chicago has spread throughout the world. In the United States today over 900,000 boys and girls are serving in 40,000 schools protecting 19 million children, and some 156,000 patrol members are serving in 20 foreign countries. Since 1922 more than 16 million children have served as School Safety Patrol members safeguarding the lives of their fellow students. The School Safety Patrol program is an outstanding example of cooperation by school authorities, police departments, and motor clubs affiliated with the American Automobile Association.

The lifesaving results of this program are worthy of great tribute. Each year the AAA presents gold lifesaver medals to those young patrol heroes who have actually saved the life of a schoolmate in traffic danger. Last year these awards were presented by President Johnson at a White House ceremony, and I point with great pride to one young citizen so honored, 13-year-old David Hrdlicka, of Bridgeport, Conn. David incurred injury to himself by pushing a group of children from the path of a skidding automobile—this type of courage and devotion to duty is typical of the youth who are members of the schoolboy patrol.

Mr. President, the other program I speak of in our offense against the mounting traffic fatality rate is the "pedestrian control program." When we speak of the number of highway deaths many of us fail to realize that, of the total amount of people killed, almost 20 percent are pedestrians—and, in urban areas, this figure is 40 percent.

The pedestrian control program was instituted in 1937 by the American Automobile Association, and today there are 1,865 cities in 43 States actively participating in a nationwide effort to appraise and improve local pedestrian safety programs.

The latest available figures show that 8,900 pedestrians lost their lives in 1964, as contrasted with 8,300 in 1963. In spite of this rise however, the 1964 total represents a 42-percent drop from the 15,500 fatalities recorded in 1937, while all other traffic fatalities have increased 61 percent.

The 42-percent decrease in pedestrian deaths has been achieved despite tremendous exposure increases. For example, motor vehicle registration in 1937 was 29.7 million and jumped to 87.3 million in 1964—up 194 percent. Motor vehicle travel went from 271 billion miles in 1937 to 840 billion miles in 1964—up 210 percent. Population in 1937 was 128 million and increased to 193 million in 1964—up 51 percent.

Again, I can point with pride to my home State of Connecticut. Last year the city of Greenwich, along with Philadelphia and Wichita, were honored for their achievements in halting pedestrian deaths. The AAA national pedestrian program appraisal board saluted Greenwich for having achieved the highest contest score of any city in the Nation. A grand award winner for the third consecutive year, Greenwich has not had a pedestrian fatality since 1960.

These facts I have just brought to your attention are evidence of what can be done when a concerted effort has been concentrated at one of the factors contributing to traffic deaths. What needs to be done is obvious. We must continue and encourage the School Safety Patrol and the pedestrian control programs and also concentrate on the other symptoms which contribute to death on our Nation's streets and highways.

Mr. President, to bring further recognition to the efforts of those who have been a part of the School Safety Patrol program, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week of May 8 to May 14, 1966 as "National School Safety Patrol Week."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 130) to provide for the designation of the week of May 8 to May 14, 1966, as "National School Safety Patrol Week," introduced by Mr. Ribicoff, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina subsequently said: Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], who had to leave the floor, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 130, introduced today by him, be held at the desk for 5 days for additional cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILL

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators Ribicoff and Randolph may be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 127) designating April 9 of each year as "Sir Winston Churchill Day."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] as a cosponsor on the Scientific Manpower Utilization Act of 1965 (S. 2662).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69) authorizing additional expenditures by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

SCHOOL MILK SLASH HITS STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as I have indicated often before on the Senate floor, the action of the Bureau of the Budget in withholding $3 million Congress appropriated for the special milk program for schoolchildren is having serious repercussions in State educational agencies. This phony economy cut will force State and local school systems to either pass on the cut to the students or to assume additional costs which means diverting funds from other vital educational needs.

I intend over the next few days to read into the Record letters from State educators responsible for the school milk program indicating the degree of hardship this cutback is causing. I wish to begin with a brief excerpt from a letter from Mr. Earl Langkop, director of Missouri's School Food Services to the Department of Agriculture, to Mr. Dennis M. Doyle, Director, Midwest Area, U.S. Department of Agriculture Consumer and Marketing Service dated January 10, 1966. Mr. Langkop writes as follows:

> I am sure you can appreciate that such action by Federal regulation places State agencies in the position of being forced to

break their agreements with participating school administrators throughout the States. It is my understanding that the rates under the special milk program are spelled out in the legislation which brought this program about. We, in turn, inform our prospective participants of the rates established by law and require that they adjust their pricing to the children at a point that will reflect no more than 1 cent for in-school distribution cost. This, of course, is all done at the beginning of the school year.

Then, after all agreements are executed, price arrangements verified, and rates agreed upon, we are forced by a Federal agency regulation to break out word and insist that the schools discount our promised reimbursement rate by 5 percent beginning with the first month of the school year. Now, through your latest regulation mandate, you require that we further break our promise to our participants by requiring them to discount the rate established by law by 10 percent effective February 1.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Langkop's entire letter of January 10, 1966, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

January 10, 1966.

Mr. Dennis M. Doyle,
Director, Midwest Area, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Consumer and Marketing Service, Food Distribution, Chicago, Ill.

Dear Mr. Doyle: We are just now coming out from under the shock of your telegram of December 23, and following communications directing a further discounting of special milk program claims by 10 percent effective February 1.

I am sure you can appreciate that such action by Federal regulation places State agencies in the position of being forced to break their agreements with participating school administrators throughout the States. It is my understanding that the rates under the special milk program are spelled out in the legislation which brought this program about. We, in turn, inform our prospective participants of the rates established by law and require that they adjust their pricing to the children at a point that will reflect no more than 1 cent for in-school distribution cost. This, of course, is all done at the beginning of the school year.

Then, after all agreements are executed, price arrangements verified, and rates agreed upon, we are forced by a Federal agency regulation to break our word and insist that the schools discount our promised reimbursement rate by 5 percent beginning with the first month of the school year. Now, through your latest regulation mandate, you require that we further break our promise to our participants by requiring them to discount the rate established by law by 10 percent effective February 1.

As all State agencies are well aware, a part of this situation can be attributed to the fact that the Federal agency, charged with the administration of the program, not only failed to request an appropriation they well knew would be required to permit full financing under the law but also actually recommended a decrease in the amount appropriated for the previous year, and they well knew there would be a 3 to 4 percent expansion in the program during fiscal year 1966. We cannot overlook the fact that with a larger appropriation last year your department demanded a discounting of claims as a means of "living within the funds appropriated."

Let's take a look at what happened. Perhaps, upon orders from higher up, the U.S. Department of Agriculture recommended a $3 million decrease in the appropriation for the special milk program for fiscal year 1966. In acting on the appropriation or budget request for Agriculture, the House of Representatives went along with and approved the decreased appropriation recommended by the Department. When the bill reached the U.S. Senate, our Senators, in their wisdom, were aware of the fact that the budget recommendation would not be sufficient to carry out the intent of the law. The Senate, in turn, voted an appropriation of $108 million. This action and because of a lesser amount approved by the House resulted in a conference committee with a final agreement between the two resulting in an appropriation of $103 million. This, of course, is the same amount that was made available for use during fiscal year 1965 and did not take into consideration the increased participation anticipated for this fiscal year or the fact that your Department had, by regulation, declared Head Start programs, under the Office of Economic Opportunity, eligible for participation in the program.

In addition to the many problems involved at the State level in arranging the pricing at the school level to fall in line with regulations on in-school distribution cost, plus the fact that State departments of education are being forced, through the content of your telegram of December 23, to break their word and their agreements with participants throughout the States, we cannot help but wonder what the future holds on Federal programs for State agencies in the maintenance of good will, confidence, and public relations with local school administrators.

This will serve as our protest of the recent action taken which we can only interpret as an abrogation of legislative authority and one that is not in the best interests of the program or the people of this country. When it reaches the point where our duly elected representatives in Washington have no further voice in interpreting the needs of their constituents, well—what next? It appears significant that the action taken, supposedly by the Bureau of the Budget, and as announced in your telegram of December 23, is in an amount identical to the increase our elected representatives in Washington deemed necessary over and above the administration's request for the special milk program.

Yours very truly,
Earl M. Langkop,
Director, School Food Services.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if one takes this reaction and multiplies it a thousandfold one will get some idea of the effect the Department's proposed cut from $100 million to $21 million in fiscal 1967 will have. I intend to continue opposing both these cuts. Tomorrow I shall read into the Record a letter from the chief of Michigan's school lunch program.

INTEREST HIKE WRONG WAY TO FIGHT INFLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last Friday's Washington Post contained a most perceptive letter by ex-Representative Byron Johnson commenting on the Federal Reserve Board's recent interest rate increase, which Professor Johnson terms inflationary.

The letter indicated the need for better weapons to check inflation. In doing so Professor Johnson sharply critizes the interest rate hike as adding more than $1 billion a year to the Federal budget alone. He cites the increase in mortgage interest charges following the Board's action, stating:

> This inflation is in sharp contrast to the success the administration has had in fighting price increases in copper and aluminum, and containing steel price hikes.

The letter suggests a number of alternatives to interest rate increases including holding credit in check with "higher cash down payments, shorter amortization periods, and tighter credit eligibility standards." I strongly believe that the use of such noninflationary devices should be carefully considered by Congress. I am carefully investigating with the Federal Reserve Board the Treasury, and the Council of Economic Advisers the possibility of taking this approach.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Professor Johnson's letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 21, 1965]

Engine of Inflation

Homebuilders have experienced an increase of more than one-quarter of 1 percent in interest charges in the past 2 months. They expect mortgage charges to rise by the full one-half of 1 percent that the Federal Reserve initiated in December. The full hike in interest rates is already noted in Government bond markets, and other loan contracts. It can be expected to affect all loans.

This inflation, in housing alone, means that housing starts will be down at least 5 percent from last year. Yet marriage rates are climbing, and during the next 3 years, we will need to see housing starts climb at least 20 percent in order to house the new families formed as the bumper baby crop of the mid-1940's marry and seek housing.

This inflation is in sharp contrast to the success the administration has had in fighting price increases in copper and aluminum, and containing steel price hikes. The interest rate hike will ultimately add more than $1 billion a year to the Federal budget alone.

If the volume of money and credit threatens to become an engine of inflation, the Board has better weapons than this inflationary one. They can raise reserve ratios, for example. And if it is essential to hold credit in check (a point not clearly established when unemployment still rides at 4 percent), there are other devices, too. Higher cash downpayments, shorter amortization periods, and tighter credit eligibility standards can all be applied. Moreover, the Federal Reserve could do a better selective job, by tightening on credit on geographic areas and industrial areas where inflationary pressures were high, but by a more generous credit policy in areas still short of full participation in our national prosperity.

None of these controls, used when and where needed, is inflationary. It would be possible to apply them so as to encourage expansion without inflation. The time is now, before all the potential damage of the interest hike can develop, to reverse this inflationary engine. Let's revise the Federal Reserve, either by appointments or by law, so that it truly serves our national purpose.

Byron L. Johnson,
Vice Chairman,
National Council for Sound Monetary Policy.

RETIREMENT OF WALTER L. REYNOLDS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to Walter L. Reynolds, a very outstanding and a dedicated public servant, who retired at the beginning of this year as chief clerk and staff director of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. For Walter, this brings to a close a long and vigorous career on Capitol Hill, spanning the last 37 years. For the committee and for the U.S. Senate, it means the loss of a valued and faithful employee whose counsel and service will be greatly missed.

Walter Reynolds is, of course, well known to the Members of this body where he has long been regarded as a leading authority on the legislative process and congressional procedures. Over the years, he has been of great assistance to Senators, to the officers of the Senate, and to the leadership on both sides of the aisle. From time to time, his views in particular areas of government have been sought by the White House and by various agency and department heads.

Born in El Dorado, Ark., almost 66 years ago, he attended the Monticello Agricultural and Mechanical College in Monticello, Ark., Christian Brothers College in Memphis, and the University of Tennessee Law School.

Walter Reynolds began his career in the U.S. Congress in 1928 when he became legislative assistant to former Representative Hamilton Fish of New York. He served in this capacity from 1928 to 1930 and from 1932 through 1944. In 1930 and 1931, he was clerk of the House Special Committee To Investigate Communist Propaganda. His outstanding performance in that capacity is a matter of history and public record and he deserves much of the credit for his efforts to awaken the people of this Nation to the realities and dangers of international communism and its network of subversion in the United States and elsewhere.

Walter's service in the Senate began in 1945, when he joined the staff of the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] as legislative assistant. After completing 2 years in this position, Walter was appointed professional staff member of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, then known as the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department. At that time, the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was chairman and I was the ranking minority member.

During 1947 and 1948, Walter's work, knowledge, and devotion to duty were so outstanding that in 1949, when I assumed the chairmanship of the committee, I appointed him chief clerk and staff director.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed to the conclusion of these remarks. Let me advise my distinguished colleague and leader that I expect to occupy the floor for some time today, anyway, so that in order to help the continuity of my remarks I should like to proceed to their conclusion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Chair very much.

Mr. President, I might add that this was the first time, to my knowledge, that a chairman of a standing committee of the Senate had merged these two statutory positions, each of which involves a different set of duties and responsibilities. Of course, I must admit that I was fortunate in having found the one man, who in my judgment, had demonstrated, without any question, that he had both the administrative ability and the knowledge required to handle both jobs successfully.

There can be no question whatever that my confidence in Walter Reynolds' capacity has been vindicated. He has held these two positions and performed their functions with exceptional ability and great distinction for 17 years.

Under his direction, we have developed and trained one of the most outstanding professional staffs in the Senate; the recommendations of both the first and second Hoover Commissions were processed and implemented; numerous important studies and necessary reforms in budgeting and accounting have been accomplished; and studies were prepared which brought into clear focus the major issues involved in intergovernmental relations, government competition and private enterprise and numerous other matters within the committee's jurisdiction. Of course, he did not do all the work himself. The point is, however, that he identified the issues and areas which required study and legislative action, and planned and directed the performance of the work together with the staff which he had trained and developed.

Two other fields in which he performed yeoman service are executive reorganization and science and technology. With respect to reorganization, Walter planned and developed invaluable materials, studies, and reports which enabled not only the members of the Committee on Government Operations, but also all the Members of both Houses, as well as executive branch officials, to keep abreast of the manifold problems involved in executive reorganization, the progress made, and the work that remained to be performed.

Perhaps Walter's outstanding monument is the tremendous amount of pioneering work which he personally undertook in the field of science and technology. Having long been convinced that the various science activities carried on by our Government were inadequately coordinated and lacking in guidance and control, with my permission as chairman of the committee, he embarked upon a series of studies, designed to reorganize and coordinate these activities, involving billions of dollars annually, in order to assure that the taxpayers were getting their money's worth and the Nation's scientific requirements were met. His studies, reports, and documents, which first began to appear in 1958, have been and still are in demand throughout the Nation and even outside of it. Many of these have been reprinted, and much of the original material contained therein has been and still is being quoted widely by scientists, scholars, and management experts.

Mr. President, Walter Reynolds has been a tower of strength to me and to many others in the U.S. Senate. His intense loyalty, his initiative, experience, knowledge, and wisdom have become legend throughout the Government. His ability to analyze a problem and propose a solution has never ceased to amaze me. Never during the past 17 years has he said to me, "Senator, this is very difficult and I do not think it can be accomplished." On the contrary, Walter would usually say, "Senator, this is a difficult problem; this is how I believe it can be solved."

Mr. President, Walter Reynolds typifies the selfless, dedicated public servant who has helped to make this body the unique institution that it is. I am saddened, indeed, by his retirement, but there can be no question that he has earned it. I shall miss him, and I wish him and his charming, patient, and understanding wife, Clare, health, happiness, and everything else they may desire.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the Committee on Government Operations, expressing the deep appreciation and gratitude of the members for the faithful, dedicated, and highly competent services rendered to it and to them by Mr. Reynolds.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS OF THE U.S. SENATE PRESENTED TO WALTER L. REYNOLDS UPON HIS RETIREMENT AFTER 37 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE CONGRESS

Whereas Walter L. Reynolds has served the Congress of the United States for 37 years and this committee for 18 years, honorably, loyally, and faithfully; and

Whereas Walter L. Reynolds has performed the duties of the office of chief clerk and staff director untiringly, efficiently, and with outstanding devotion and high distinction; and

Whereas Walter L. Reynolds has, by virtue of his extraordinary knowledge and skill, made outstanding contributions to the efficient and effective operation of the U.S. Congress, and has unceasingly advanced the improvement of the legislative process and the development of legislation relative to the efficient and economical operation of both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government, in execution of the broad responsibilities of this committee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. Senate expresses to Walter L. Reynolds its deep appreciation and sincere gratitude for the unfailing excellency of his unparalleled efforts and contributions in discharging the obligations of this committee to the Senate of the United States and to the people of this Nation.

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Chairman; KARL E. MUNDT, Ranking Minority; JACOB K. JAVITS, MILWARD L. SIMPSON, HENRY M. JACKSON, SAM J. ERVIN, JR., ERNEST GRUENING, EDMUND S. MUSKIE, ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, FRED R. HARRIS, ROBERT F. KENNEDY, LEE METCALF, JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, CARL T. CURTIS.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield, I should like to say that I served on the Committee on Government Operations a

great many years ago when Walter Reynolds was on the staff of that committee.

I thought he was one of the most diligent staff members I have ever seen. He worked with a purpose and brought real knowledge and expertise to the job. He served both sides of the table in an excellent manner. I cannot recall how many times I called upon him for advice and suggestions in connection with the work of the committee. Always he brought sympathy, understanding, and unfailing courtesy to the job.

For that, I shall always be deeply appreciative of what he has done for the minority members on that committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I join with our distinguished chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], in regretfully taking note of the retirement of Walter L. Reynolds as chief clerk and staff director of that committee.

The writers of the U.S. Constitution envisioned that the Congress of the United States would be a separate governmental branch, coequal with the executive branch of the Government. It is imperative that Congress continue its separate checking and balancing role. And, if that is to be done, it will continue to require excellent staff work.

An older Member of the Senate told me soon after I came here that the longer I served here the more grateful I would become for the work of a good staff. I have certainly found that to be true in my own office and in the committees on which I serve.

As a newer member of the Government Operations Committee, I have been especially dependent upon Walter Reynolds for his expert advice and assistance in connection with my work on that committee, and I have found him more than equal to the responsibility. Walter has headed our professional staff on that committee, and he is a professional in the highest and best sense of that word and in the finest traditions of the Senate of the United States.

All of us shall miss him. We are fortunate that James R. Calloway has been elevated to the position Walter has held, and we are grateful that Walter has been able to spend some time with Mr. Calloway before his retirement. I know that Mr. Calloway will also do an exceptional job in this position.

So, all of us say, "Thanks a million to Walter L. Reynolds for dedicated public service and individual friendship, and we wish you health and happiness in the years ahead."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on December 31, Walter Reynolds retired after 37 years on Capitol Hill. I have had the good fortune to know and work with Walter Reynolds for much of that time.

In his long career of public service, Walter Reynolds has demonstrated fairness in judgment, steadiness of administration, reliability in handling difficult and delicate tasks of investigation and legislation, and unusual skill in working with Senators and staff.

Those of us serving as members of the Government Operations Committee are particularly going to miss Walter Reynolds. He has been our able adviser and stalwart collaborator in his capacity as chief clerk and staff director. He has served the committee, the Congress, and the country well.

I want to wish both Walter and Clare good fortune and good health as they leave official duty and start their well-earned retirement.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma concerning the retirement of Walter L. Reynolds.

When I came to the Senate in 1957, I was placed on the Committee on Government Operations and remained there until the late Senator Neely of West Virginia passed away in 1958.

When I went to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I was removed from the Committee on Government Operations.

In that short space of time, less than a year, I received much assistance from the staff of the committee on some matters which were extremely important to me as a new Senator. Had I stayed on that committee I would have benefited greatly from the professional work, leadership, and ability of Walter Reynolds.

I learned in that 1 year of service that we had a most valuable staff man in the person of Mr. Reynolds.

I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] for their words of commendation to Walter Reynolds.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have known Walt Reynolds for only a short time, but in that period I have come to respect his judgment, his patience, and temperament. It is with regret that I was informed of his departure from the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

Walt Reynolds was able staff director of that committee for 18 years. To his task he brought an open mind, a spirit of graciousness, and a keen insight into the affairs of Government. His departure will be deeply felt by the committee which concerns itself with the workings of the massive bureaucracy of the Federal Government.

I join my colleagues in wishing Walt Reynolds the very best that his record of service has entitled him. I know that his unbounded energy will find many outlets in the activities to which he will direct himself in his retirement.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, ever since I came to the Senate more than 11 years ago, Walter L. Reynolds has served as chief clerk and staff director on the Committee on Government Operations. This committee is one of the most important committees in the Senate. Its function can be divided into two categories; namely, first, to study bills relating to the structure and mechanism by which such structure operates in the Federal Government and, second, the power to investigate into the efficiency and economy of all branches and departments of the Federal Government.

As chief clerk and staff director of this important committee, Walter L. Reynolds has rendered services of signal value, not only to the committee but also to the Senate and the Nation.

At all times, he has worked unobtrusively, diligently, and faithfully in the performance of his very important duties. He has always done this with the finest spirit, and on all occasions has extended full cooperation to all members of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

I deeply regret to see Walter Reynolds retire from service to the committee as well as service to the Senate. At the same time, however, I recognize that he has merited retirement by reason of his long and faithful service.

In closing, I assure him that he can carry into retirement what well may be described as the supreme satisfaction of life; namely, the consciousness of a job well done.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I want to join many of my colleagues in calling attention to the fact that on December 21, 1965, Walter L. Reynolds, chief clerk and staff director of the Senate Committee on Government Operations and one of the Senate's most valuable staff members, retired after 37 years on Capitol Hill. This act concludes a lengthy and illustrious career of dedicated and notable service to the Congress and to the country.

Walter first came to Washington as legislative assistant and secretary to the late Hamilton Fish, and subsequently served as clerk to a special committee of the House of Representatives. After 16 years as a House staff member, he came to the Senate in 1944, first as a member of the staff of Senator FULBRIGHT, and, since 1949, as chief clerk and staff director of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

It has been in the latter capacity that I have come to know Walter Reynolds and to value his friendship and wise counsel. Although he has been involved in all aspects of governmental operations, his long-standing interest and constructive contributions in the field of science and technology deserve special commendation.

In short, Walter Reynolds has consistently exemplified dedicated and devoted public service. I wish him and Mrs. Reynolds continued success and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I could not let this day pass without expressing my good wishes to Walter L. Reynolds, chief clerk of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, who is retiring after 37 years of public service.

I wonder how many Senators and Congressmen, new to Capitol Hill, have benefited from the good counsel of this able and dedicated professional? Precise, methodical, always willing to give that extra bit of effort, Walter was both an inspiration and source of invaluable advice to all who worked with him. Through the exciting and difficult years that he served the Senate, this devoted gentleman unquestionably has forgotten more about the workings of the U.S.

Government than most of us will ever know.

We wish him and his wife, Clare, a richly deserved life of ease and good health, and we hope that they will return to visit us often.

A FREE AND INDEPENDENT UKRAINE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, January 22 marked the 48th anniversary of the proclamation issued at Kiev declaring the Ukraine to be a free and independent republic. All across our country this week Americans of Ukrainian descent are celebrating this anniversary, and dedicating themselves to the proposition that the Ukraine, now in bondage to the Soviet Union, will someday again be free.

The freedom which was proclaimed at Kiev in 1918 was short lived. By 1920 Red army troops had crushed and enslaved the new republic, and for more than four and a half decades the brave people of the Ukraine have suffered the iron rule of Soviet colonialism.

I have spoken out many times in behalf of the captive peoples of the Ukraine, and the other captive nations, and have been attacked both in Pravda and in the Soviet-Ukrainian magazine Literaturna-Ukraine for advocating a free and independent Ukraine. Their reactions show that the Soviets are not sure of their hold on their vast colonial empire, and that they do not want the world to be reminded of their crimes.

It is up to us, as free Americans, to repeat once again, and to continue repeating until there are no captive peoples, that we do not recognize the results of Soviet tyranny, and to declare with renewed vigor our belief that the people of the Ukraine and of all the captive nations will one day regain control of their own destinies and live in freedom.

JACK VAUGHN WELL QUALIFIED AS PEACE CORPS DIRECTOR

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the appointment of Jack Vaughn as Director of the Peace Corps promises to carry that program to new levels of achievement. Under the magnificent leadership of Sargent Shriver, the Peace Corps came from a fledgling proposal surrounded by skepticism to a full-fledged American institution with popular support in both political parties.

Mr. Vaughn has pledged himself to carry on the work begun under Sargent Shriver and to attempt improvements where he thinks they are necessary. That is a modest commitment but I am sure the sincerity behind it is as profound as any Mr. Vaughn has felt before in his Government career.

In order to acquaint my fellow Senators with the background of Mr. Vaughn, I have accumulated some biographical material that I think is appropriate.

Mr. Vaughn was sworn in March 22, 1965, as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress. He has a long background in hemispheric affairs and in private and public activities affecting the Latin American nations.

A native of Columbus, Mont., Mr. Vaughn spent part of his youth in Mexico, and later entered the University of Michigan where he obtained his A.B. degree in 1943.

After graduation he entered the U.S. Marine Corps as a private and rose to captain by the time of his discharge in 1946. He returned to the University of Michigan and took his M.A. degree with specialization in Latin American affairs.

Mr. Vaughn taught at both the University of Michigan and the University of Pennsylvania, but left academic life for service as a binational center director with the U.S. Information Agency. Between 1949 and 1952, he served in La Paz, Bolivia, and San Jose, Costa Rica.

In 1952 he joined the Foreign Operations Administration—FOA—as a program officer in Panama City, later serving in the same capacity in the International Cooperation Administration—ICA—mission in La Paz.

From 1958 to 1960, he was in ICA's Office for Program Planning and also taught at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. In 1960, he was assigned as ICA representative to the Federation of Mali and a year later became Director of the ICA Mission to the Republic of Senegal. In October of that year Vaughn was called to Washington to organize the Latin American programs of the Peace Corps. Under his direction the number of volunteers expanded from 123 to almost 3,000 and the use of community development was pioneered as a means of transforming both the countryside and the urban slums of the continent. In April 1964, he left the Peace Corps to return to Panama as American Ambassador.

A family man, Mr. Vaughn is married to the former Joanne Cordes Smith and they have two teenage daughters, Kathryn and Carol.

Mr. President, I am sure I am joined by my colleagues in wishing Mr. Vaughn well in his new position. We are confident that under his leadership, the Peace Corps will continue its many wonderful achievements in bringing a better life to people abroad.

STATEMENT ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the community development districts plan suggested by the President for rural areas will mean a vitally needed rural outreach for the poverty program. Many of the most beneficial community action programs, such as work with school dropouts and counseling programs, can only be performed in a district of reasonable size. Planning of the type made possible under the community development districts bill will tie together in an organized way those areas that should be working together to solve their common poverty problems.

By means of the President's community planning approach, a carefully designed plan for coping with unemployment, improving educational facilities, and making overall community improvements can be drawn up. With this as a starting point, and with the entire district organized to work together, an organized plan of attack on poverty equal in stature to plans already being developed in metropolitan areas can be worked out and presented to the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The community development districts will prevent our rural citizens from becoming the forgotten men and women of the war on poverty. It is a national solution to a national problem, and it deserves the support of Members from rural areas and metropolitan areas alike.

I was deeply concerned last year about the lack of adequate consideration for rural areas in the poverty program. Consequently, I am now very pleased that this new approach has been developed.

AMVETS OPPOSE CUTRATE GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today's cold-war veteran, serving an average of 2½ years, receives no readjustment assistance in any way comparable to that which has been clearly established as the norm for readjustment assistance in a period of required service in the Armed Forces, namely the educational and other types of readjustment assistance offered to our veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict.

Today's veteran is no less deserving of readjustment assistance than were our fighting men of those earlier periods; yet he receives nothing. The press has carried reports of administration support for a bill which is misdirected, misleading, and misses the mark. It would apply only to a very limited group of servicemen. The servicemen who are excluded are equally deserving.

The veterans' organizations of our Nation are aware of the great injustice which today's veteran receives at the hand of his Government, and they are also aware of the threat that this injustice will be made permanent by the enactment of a cutrate GI bill. On January 20 I placed in the RECORD a protest against this bill by Mr. Francis W. Stover, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I ask unanimous consent to place at this point in the RECORD two communications from the AMVETS, one a telegram to President Johnson dated January 20, 1966, and one, a letter to Administrator Driver of the Veterans' Administration, dated January 21, 1966, also protesting the cutrate bill. Both are signed by Ralph E. Hall, AMVETS able national commander.

These mounting protests from our veterans organizations are a clear sign that they are not going to stand for second-class treatment for the large majority of our cold-war veterans.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The administration's proposed cold war GI bill, H.R. 11985, as reported by the National Press Association would appear to be a much reduced version of benefits, for a dramatically reduced number of veterans and service personnel, than that which Amvets has consistently and by national convention mandates supported for the last 6 years. S. 9 introduced and supported by Senator Ralph Yarborough and passed by the U.S. Senate in each of the last three sessions of Congress embodies the views and features unreservedly supported by Amvets. The overwhelming evidence of the national benefits in a trained and educated citizenry and the verified tax revenue increase such GI-trained veterans have contributed to national income, must be considered as a true offset to any meaningful consideration of the allegedly high cost of the S. 9 version. We believe sincerely that limitation of eligibility by reason of service in particular geographical areas or theaters of operation would make administration of the benefits unjustifiably more difficult and costly. Also, we believe that such limitation would be basically unrealistic in view of the rapid turnover and rotation of military personnel which the main theater of operations today requires. In a conflict which may continue for the extended time envisaged by Secretary of Defense McNamara, a majority of draftees may expect to serve some period in a so-called hotspot theater. The exclusion of veterans who served from 1955 through 1963 would be unfairly discriminatory to a large number of veterans whose service was just as burdensome and required as great a personal sacrifice as those who would be eligible, proposed in the administration bill. The conditions of service today have made the distinction between wartime and peacetime service relatively meaningless. We do not favor such distinction. As national commander of Amvets may I say that our greatest anxiety with respect to H.R. 11985 is its complete departure from the concept of the Veterans' Administration as the one-stop agency for the administration of all veterans benefits, coming as it does on the heels of the relegation to private administration by the Prudential Insurance Co. of the recently enacted veteran insurance program in a contract-out basis. The erosion or phasing out of the Veterans' Administration cannot do other than create alarm for all concerned with the proper administration of veteran benefits and programs. We must respectfully suggest that you consider having the appropriate members of your staff concerned with this legislation give these points of issue their most serious reconsideration to the end that the best possible and fairest GI bill be enacted.

Ralph E. Hall,
Amvets National Commander.

Amvets National Headquarters,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1966.

Hon. William J. Driver,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Administrator: I have reviewed the coverage in the national press concerning the provisions contained in the President's proposed cold war GI bill, H.R. 11985.

I am particularly concerned, as national commander of the Amvets, with the apparent reduced version of benefits and the drastically reduced number of veterans and service personnel who will be eligible under the provisions of this bill.

As you know, Amvets has consistently and by national convention mandates for the past 6 years supported the GI cold war bill, S. 9, introduced by Senator Ralph W. Yarborough, which has been passed by the U.S. Senate in each of the past three sessions of Congress. Senator Yarborough's bill embodies the views and features unreservedly supported by Amvets.

Without question, the evidence is overwhelming with respect to the benefits our Nation has received from a trained and educated citizenry made possible by the GI benefits of World War II and the Korean conflict. The contributions these trained veterans have made to the national income through increased tax revenues cannot be questioned.

This prospective contribution by the new group of veterans who will be eligible under Senator Yarborough's bill must be considered a true offset to any meaningful consideration of the alleged high cost of a GI bill. Our past experience has shown that the cost of the GI bills of World War II and Korea was more than paid for by the veterans who were educated.

The limitations of eligibility to veterans with service in only designated "hotspots," would make administration of the President's proposed bill unjustifiably more difficult and costly. Also, in view of the rapid turnover and rotation of military personnel required by operations in Vietnam geographical or theater of operations limitation is basically unrealistic. Secretary McNamara has stated that the period of conflict may be prolonged, under such circumstances, a majority of servicemen can expect to serve some time in a hotspot area.

The exclusion of veterans who served from 1955 through 1963 would be unfairly discriminatory to a large number of veterans whose service was just as burdensome and required as great personal sacrifice as those who would be eligible in the proposed administration bill.

The conditions of service today have made the distinction between wartime and peacetime service relatively meaningless. We do not favor such a distinction.

We request your most serious reconsideration of the provisions of H.R. 11985 to the end that the Veterans' Administration be in a position to advise the President of the foregoing considerations so that the best possible and fairest GI bill for our veterans may be enacted at the earliest possible date.

Perhaps our greatest anxiety with respect to the administration bill is its complete departure from the concept of the VA, as the one-stop agency for the administration of all veterans' benefits, coming as it does on the heels of the private administration of veterans' insurance on a contract-out basis.

May we have your views concerning these points of issue at your earliest convenience?

Sincerely,

Ralph E. Hall,
National Commander.

BIG BROTHER—THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, during the congressional recess, a large number of editorials appeared throughout the country dealing with the right to privacy. I ask unanimous consent to have a few of the most thoughtful ones printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Oct. 27, 1965]

Pssst—Here's a Bill To Stop Snooping

Hardly a one of us will mind shouting from the housetops our approval of DeKalb Representative Elliott Levitas' proposed right-of-privacy bill.

One of the more disturbing developments of the last several years has been the shocking increase of snooping in our society—both governmental and private, official and freelance.

Much of the snooping is electronic, ranging from the wired-for-sound martini olive to those hear-it-all listening devices that can pick up conversations throughout the neighborhood.

Snooping always has ranked among the more despicable practices. Now, with the help of modern science and technology, the whole unsavory business is on the threshold of getting out of hand.

Representative Levitas emphasizes that his proposal would not interfere with legitimate police investigations.

"It would," he explains, "simply but an end to the potentiality of establishing a police state by means of electronic devices."

It often seems that little enough privacy is left as it is. The time to act to preserve what we have is now.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, Oct. 25, 1965]

Electronic Snooping

A thoroughly grotesque potential for trampling on people's rights is to be found in the lineup of snooping devices being turned out by the electronics industry. There is already strong evidence that they are being widely used.

One of the biggest wrongdoers has been government itself. Testimony before Congress, for example, showed that the Internal Revenue Service has made use of a variety of bugging devices, tapped phones and used "snooperscopes" to spy from a distance.

Such things can be of tremendous use to legitimate investigation both in law enforcement and in national security. But it is not for divisions of the government to use them at their discretion without regulation by law. And they should be banned to the individual to use to pry into someone else's affairs.

DeKalb Representative Elliott H. Levitas has said he will introduce a bill in the legislature to make it a crime to eavesdrop electronically. He wants an end to the unrestricted use of such devices by "well-meaning but misguided government officials in the overzealous prosecution of investigations."

And he wants a halt to the use of the gadgets "in the use of industrial and commercial spying, private blackmail, amateur detective work and the satisfaction of mentally sick curiosity-seekers."

The right of privacy is a solid principle of the U.S. Constitution. It must be protected from violation by old, standby methods and from the slickest that science can provide.

Congress and the States should crack down on the "big-brother's-watching-you" hazard which electronics have made possible.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 26, 1965]

Eavesdropping—Modern Style

A former antique dealer has in 3 years' time developed a multimillion-dollar spy apparatus business. The phenomenal growth of the espionage equipment industry, epitomized by this retail dealer's success, is worth more than our passing consideration.

Technical advances in the field of electronics point to a rosy future for those whose business (or pleasure) is spying. Present laws are wholly inadequate to counter misuse of the sophisticated equipment already on the market. To take into account some of the gadgets in prospect—in the effort to protect the right of privacy—will challenge the best legal thought of our day.

Currently, no laws curtail the manufacture, sale, or distribution of such devices. Certain Federal Communications Commission regulations pertain to their use but do not materially hinder their misuse.

A few States have legislation which in various ways restricts eavesdropping, but U.S. Supreme Court opinions would tend to indicate that if there is no physical intrusion of another's premises, there is no constitutional prohibition. Modern electronic devices easily bypass this limitation.

The use of electronic espionage and counterespionage equipment, apparently widespread among Government agencies, is by no means confined to officialdom. It is much more common in business and industry than many have realized. Furthermore, it is becoming not merely a temptation for the unduly curious but something of a national fad.

Already we have subminiature monitoring devices to slip under one's fingernail, sugar cube and olive and toothpick transmitters, the big brother briefcase (for firms to check on their salesmen), and many more. A private conversation can be monitored half way around the world by using telephone wires, even after the spied upon has ceased to use his phone.

Some talk of a device that can be beamed at a room several blocks away and reflect back a sound-accompanied television picture of everything happening in the room. Whether or not equipment of this sort is eventually perfected, the time for President and Congress to give the whole matter top priority attention is now.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal,
Nov. 8, 1965]

The Unsolved Problem of Wiretapping

Wiretapping, which has been described by various Supreme Court justices as "dirty business" and "insidious encroachment," remains an unsolved problem. It is used with increasing boldness by thousands of agencies and individuals. But evidence gained through its use cannot be presented in Federal courts or in more than a handful of State courts which have legalized the practice.

Its present status is confusing to conscientious law officers, advantageous to criminals and shakedown specialists, and deeply disturbing to the average citizen who has no way of knowing whether or to what extent his own privacy is being invaded.

Bills authorizing its controlled use subject to judicial control have been introduced in Congress repeatedly over the past decade. They have never managed to get beyond committee stage. The good bills do not permit law enforcement officials to go as far as they now go without any legislation, because even with the prohibition on wiretaps as evidence, the information so gained can be used or presented in other ways.

There would seem to be room for an investigation by an independent commission—the American Bar Association could help here—into the uses and abuses of electronic eavesdropping. How great an aid is it to the actual detection and conviction of criminals? How many people who are not criminals are subjected to this invasion of privacy for the convenience of officials? How many criminals use it as a routine part of their operations?

An answer to these and similar questions might put the problem of legislating to control wiretrapping in better perspective.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Express-News,
Nov. 21, 1965]

Privacy Rights Need Protection

The Congress should give high priority consideration to thorough review of the use of electronic devices to intrude upon individual privacy.

Insidious abuses of telephone service, electronic eavesdropping and similarly reprehensible practices need to be dealt with effectively and quickly.

For example, a telephone is installed at customer expense for his own convenience, not as a potential nuisance. To tolerate intrusions upon this service by recorded messages that can block the line or to allow the lines for abusive treatment of public figures is unthinkable.

A device available—but not in use apparently—can intrude upon private telephone service. This device initiates calls and may call back and, presumably, could effectively harass a customer and disrupt his phone service.

It should be outlawed.

Devices that have to be called by the customer are something else, again. There are useful services performed in this manner and because disagreeable political attacks are recorded for the curious listener is insufficient reason to stop them. The important thing is to prevent unwanted interference with telephone service and to stop snooping by electronic means.

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) World, Dec. 22, 1965]

Effective Watchdog

For months Senator Edward V. Long of Missouri has conducted investigations of governmental invasions of privacy through wiretapping.

Senator Long's committee, or at least its presence on the Washington scene, has had beneficial effects. The Post Office Department has submitted to new and strict regulations on the use of mail covers—a process under which certain citizens had their mail checked. The committee is responsible for congressional action forbidding the Internal Revenue Service to open first-class mail.

The hearings of the Long committee revealed that the mail of thousands of Americans had been or was being watched. It was also shown that the Food and Drug Administration was attracted to the policy of bugging and snooping devices and had minimum regard for the rights of individual citizens about whom it was suspicious.

In large part, the subcommittee's work clearly exposed the fact that too many medium and high level Government officials had been overzealous in conducting the investigative work of their offices. The Long investigation brought much of it, but perhaps not all, to a virtual halt.

Every American citizen ought to rejoice at the effective work performed by the Senator's hard-hitting investigative group. But this should not be the end of it; the work of the committee must not be forthwith abandoned so that, ultimately, officious governmental agencies will fall back into the same bad habits.

To many people, congressional investigative groups are either useless, politically motivated or of nuisance value. This has not been the case with Senator Long's committee, and every American who cherishes his individual rights of citizenship in a free country should appreciate the work that has been done.

For our part, the Long committee is perfectly welcome to continue in existence if for no other reason than to stand as a warning against those in Government who would exceed their authority.

COMMUNITY DISTRICTS—A SOUND PROPOSAL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the community development message submitted by President Johnson on Tuesday outlines an approach to rural planning and development that is badly needed and long overdue.

It makes sense to tie orderly and comprehensive planning of public services and development to the existing pattern of trading areas. Common interests within these areas are recognized and understood by the people.

A major effort now is underway to deal with the rural poverty and disadvantage so common across the country. Federal agencies are cooperating with the States in making available a wide range of new programs to stimulate economic growth and upgrade essential services. Yet, despite this commitment, progress often is slowed by the lack of sound local planning.

Small communities, of course, cannot afford the services of a professional planner. And it does not make sense to have Federal agencies financing one of these experts for each and every small community.

What is needed is area planning on a scale large enough to be efficient but small enough to be kept under control of the local people. The community development districts proposed in this message appear to meet both these tests.

Regional planning for a functional community built around a trading center should greatly increase effectiveness of available resources for economic growth and community development.

It can insure that the programs adopted add up to a mutually reinforcing and logical effort to solve a community's problems at minimum cost. And it can stretch thin resources in a way that would be impossible through fragmented, sporadic, and inconsistent efforts.

It is sound policy to give the States considerable responsibility in this planning, as this proposal does, and to require that they draw the lines of these districts. It also is sound policy to assure that the planning direction and later decisionmaking are left to representatives of the smaller units of government involved.

This proposed development district approach provides a new way for counties—too often faced with declining populations, outward migration that results in a high proportion of older citizens, and an eroding tax base—to work together to arrest or reverse these trends.

REA'S PROTEST DRASTIC REDUCTION IN 1966 AND 1967 LOAN FUNDS PROPOSED IN THE BUDGET

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the rural electrification cooperatives of America are alarmed by the proposal in the administration budget to reduce their loan funds far below the minimum necessary for them to maintain service.

Some time ago I proposed that we bring their 1966 loan funds up to the level of their needs by a supplemental appropriation.

The budget reveals that about $50 million of those funds is being impounded, or withheld, when the total is already inadequate.

For the information of Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to place in the Record a press release on the proposed budget action issued by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and the text of a telegram sent by the association's acting general manager to the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture John Baker, and REA Administrator Norman Clapp.

There being no objection, the press release and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., January 24.—The Nation's rural electric systems today told President Johnson his 1967 budget would "cut the heart out" of the rural electrification program.

In a telegram to the President, Jerry L. Anderson, acting general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, said the slash in funds comes at a time when the rural electric systems are faced with increasing need for growth capital to meet the power demands of rural people.

"The new budget calls not only for too little funds for fiscal 1967," Mr. Anderson said, "but we are shocked to learn that the administration plans to lend only a portion of the funds which Congress has already authorized for 1966."

He said "NRECA will use its full resources and will call upon those of all its allies in a fight to secure congressional approval of adequate funds for fiscal 1967."

He said the proposed 1967 budget level of $270 million available for REA electric loans includes only $220 million of new funds. The other $50 million would be obtained by withholding funds already approved for this fiscal year.

"These restrictions," he said, "flout the expressed will of Congress, would cripple the rural electrification program and would add to a loan backlog which is already at a record high."

Mr. Anderson said surveys show a need for $675 million in new capital for rural electric systems by the end of fiscal 1967.

"Rural electric systems are obligated to meet the full power needs of their areas," he said, "and adequate growth capital is as essential to them as to any other utility."

Mr. Anderson said the rural electric systems are urgently recommending to the President steps to "rectify this calamitous budget proposal." He said they include:

1. Asking for the issuance of a Presidential directive to the Budget Bureau and the REA to use the entire $402 million authorized for fiscal 1966 to the full extent of need.

2. An immediate REA deficiency loan fund authorization of $262 million to reduce the loan application backlog to manageable size.

3. An increase by Congress in the 1967 REA loan fund authorization or the establishment of an adequate contingency fund to be used as necessary for loans and not for window dressing.

"We also are urging the President to join with us in obtaining speedy passage of legislation to establish a supplemental financing program."

He explained the NRECA and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., a New York investment firm, recently completed a thorough study of future capital requirements of the rural electric systems. He said the study showed the need for funds from the private money market to supplement the Government loan program and a plan to establish a Federal bank for rural electric systems will be presented to the annual membership meeting in February.

"We have anticipated the need for supplemental capital and have taken steps to meet it but congressional action is necessary to put the new plan into effect. In the interim, the proposals made in this budget would cut the heart out of the rural electrification program."

"Over the past weeks," he stated, "we have repeatedly and clearly informed administration officials of the urgency of the loan fund problem and the consequences of such drastic proposals."

JANUARY 21, 1966.

Johnson administration budget which goes to Congress Monday cuts heart out of REA. Other Government loan programs are hit as hard or harder, but adequate financing is essential to a utility and productive capacity of rural areas depends on electricity.

Not only is REA new 1967 loan fund request totally inadequate ($220 million when need is for $675 million) but this year's loan program is also being emasculated. Briefly, administration plans to approve use of only $270 million out of $402 million Congress approved for current year. More than one-fourth of fiscal 1966 funds is being impounded: The $37 million we got released last June is now withheld; the $60 million contingency which Congress approved last fall is wiped out; and $35 million of 1966 regular authorization will not be loaned this year.

These restrictions flout the expressed will of Congress, would cripple the rural electrification program and would add to a loan backlog which is already at record high.

Over the past weeks we have repeatedly and clearly informed administration officials of the urgency of the loan fund problem and the consequences of such drastic proposals among those who have been the President's strongest supporters in rural America.

We are urging the President to take the following steps to rectify this calamitous budget proposal: (1) Issue a Presidential directive to Budget Bureau and REA to use the entire $402 million authorized for fiscal 1966 to full extent of need. (2) Press immediately for an REA deficiency loan fund authorization of $262 million to reduce the loan application backlog to manageable size. (3) Ask Congress either to increase requested 1967 REA loan fund authorization or establish adequate contingency fund to be used as necessary for loans and not window-dressing. (4) Join with us in obtaining speedy passage of legislation to establish our supplemental financing program.

Please contact your Members of Congress immediately and urge them to contact the President, Freeman, and Clapp in support of these four points.

NRECA will use its full resources and will call upon those of all its allies in a fight to secure congressional approval of adequate funds for fiscal 1967.

We are sending copies of this telegram to President Johnson, Secretary Freeman, Assistant Secretary Baker, and Administrator Clapp.

JERRY ANDERSON,
Acting General Manager.

THE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE UKRAINIAN REPUBLIC

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, Saturday, the 22d of January, marked the 48th anniversary of Independence Day of the Ukrainian Republic. Unfortunately, the small republic was unable to sustain its independence and became engulfed in the land mass of the Soviet Union. The hope of one day regaining independence still burns in the hearts and minds of Ukrainian citizens both in their native land and in other nations around the world, including the United States. The spirit of independence was encouraged somewhat in my own State of North Dakota Sunday, January 23, when Ukrainian Independence Day ceremonies were held in Bismarck, Mandan, Minot, and Dickinson by Americans of Ukrainian descent.

One of the Ukrainian leaders in North Dakota is Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, president of the North Dakota branch, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., who has done much in North Dakota to keep alive the spirit of independence and liberty.

North Dakota Gov. William L. Guy proclaimed January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day in North Dakota and I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR OF NORTH DAKOTA

Whereas on January 22, 1966, Ukrainians in North Dakota and throughout the free world will solemnly observe the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of a free Ukrainian state; and

Whereas after a defensive war lasting 4 years, the free Ukrainian state was destroyed in 1920 and a puppet regime of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was installed, later becoming a member state of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the once free Ukraine is now no more than a colony of Communist Russia and its vast human and economic resources are being exploited for the purpose of spreading communism; and

Whereas the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States of America have recognized the legitimate right of the Ukrainian people to freedom and national independence by respectively enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution in July 1959, which enumerated Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved and dominated by Communist Russia; and

Whereas some 25,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent now living in North Dakota have made significant contributions to both State and Nation;

Now, therefore, I, William L. Guy, Governor of the State of North Dakota, do hereby proclaim Saturday, January 22, 1966, as Ukrainian Independence Day in North Dakota and urge all citizens to demonstrate their sympathy with an understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian nation to again achieve its rightful inheritance of freedom and independence.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the great State of North Dakota to be affixed this 14th day of January 1966.

WILLIAM L. GUY,
Governor.

Attest:

BEN MEIER,
Secretary of State.

QUEST FOR GENUINE AND PERMANENT PEACE—ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, on last Veterans Day, November 11, the Vice President of the United States delivered an outstanding address at commemorative ceremonies held at Arlington Memorial Cemetery.

The Vice President chose the occasion to restate in clear and forceful language the broad policy that our country has consistently followed in the years since World War II in the quest for a genuine and permanent peace. This policy, as outlined by the Vice President, is based upon the maintenance of a military establishment powerful enough to meet the threat of any aggression and upon a demonstrated willingness on our part to resolve international conflict and tensions by any honorable and peaceful means.

He also took the appropriate occasion of Veterans Day, when we pay tribute to those heroes living and dead who have defended their country in time of war, to declare once again the reasons why we are involved in the bitter and frustrating war in Vietnam. In the words of the Vice President:

> We are not in Vietnam to establish any American colony or base. We are not there to enrich ourselves or to subjugate others to our will. We are in Vietnam to keep a commitment established by international treaty. We are there because, once again in history, it must be proved to aggressors that the price of their aggression comes far too high.

Mr. President, no man can foretell with certainty what future course the tragic events now unfolding in southeast Asia will take or what they will mean to the future of our country and the peace of the world. But I believe there is a forceful message in the Vice President's remarks to any who may doubt the determination and resolve of the American people. I recommend this Veterans Day speech to the Members of this body and to the readers of the Congressional Record, and ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted at this point in my remarks:

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey, Veterans Day, Arlington Memorial Cemetery, November 11, 1965

We meet today to honor brave men and deeds. We enjoy the freedom their valor won. On this resting ground of American heroes, we meet to examine the lessons of war. We meet to commemorate a day of peace.

When a nation sends its young men to war, it must be sure indeed that the cause is worth the terrible cost. In this century young Americans have given their lives in two world wars—and in conflict since—for a noble purpose: The cause of a just and lasting peace.

Have we learned the lessons of this century so that peace may finally be secured? When World War I ended 47 years ago today, it seemed that anything but peace was unthinkable. But the peace of World War I was lost when the free and strong nations of the West closed their eyes to international bullying in other places. It was lost when large nations justified the sacrifice of small nations to those playing the game of willful power.

Today we know that World War II began not in 1939 or 1941 but in the 1920's and 1930's when those who should have known better persuaded themselves that they were not their brothers' keepers.

It is now 20 years since the end of World II. These have not been years of peace. They have been years, rather, during which there has been an absence of world war.

There continues to be aggression and despotism in the world. And, often without benefit of fullest homage, American men continue to sacrifice their lives in distant places.

The danger of war—nuclear war—torments mankind. But that war has not occurred because, in these years, we have consciously and devotedly worked to win the peace.

We have dared to stand firm against those who would terrorize their neighbors.

We have extended the hand of cooperation to both the strong and weak, the rich and poor of the world. We have come to realize that anything that happens on this planet can and does affect us all. We have learned that there is no place to hide in a world which grows smaller day by day.

In Greece and Turkey, in Berlin, in Korea, in Vietnam, we have stood with other nations against aggression when those places could have been sacrificed as was the Sudetenland—and with the same probable end result.

Through the Marshall plan, point 4, the United Nations, the NATO alliance, the Organization of American States, and other international agencies and programs, we have made known our commitment to the interdependence of nations and international cooperation.

Through the maintenance of powerful military forces we have demonstrated our ability to meet aggression. Through patient and sometimes painful negotiation we have shown our determination to halt the arms race and control the atom.

But, above all, we have fulfilled the responsibility of leadership. We have not wavered. We have not turned inward. We have not withdrawn from the world. And we will not.

We know that mankind can destroy itself in one horrible nuclear holocaust. We know that one more totalitarian military adventure, one more exercise in international irresponsibility, can obliterate what man has created through the ages.

But, there are those who would have us turn away from the lessons of this century. They plead, as others have pled before, that mankind's plight in other places need not be our concern. We hear—even in Western nations scarred by centuries of war—the appeals of those who would turn modern nations away from interdependence and international cooperation. These voices must be rejected. Theirs is the counsel of despair and defeat.

Today in Vietnam we reaffirm our knowledge of the lessons of war.

As our President has said: "There are those who wonder why we have responsibility there * * * we have it for the same reason that we have a responsibility for the defense of Europe."

We are not in Vietnam to establish any American colony or base. We are not there to enrich ourselves or to subjugate others to our will. We are in Vietnam to keep a commitment established by international treaty. We are there because, once again in history, it must be proved to aggressors that the price of their aggression comes far too high.

The aggression we face in Vietnam is not one in which massed armies attack across national frontiers. It is one in which the battlefield is often the homes of men. It is one in which the innocent suffer to the pain of all of us.

The aggression in Vietnam is one which deals in organized assassination and terrorism yet masks itself as a war of liberation. It is waged by hard and callous men who seek to prove that force and Communist militancy can win the future—by men convinced that democratic societies are soft and weak and unable to meet their form of warfare.

To these, we say: Do not be misled. Do not misunderstand the processes of a free society. Do not mistake our respect for the right of dissent for internal division or lack of resolve.

We will remain in Vietnam until a just and lasting peace can be established there. At the same time we shall now—and after establishment of that peace—dedicate ourselves to creating conditions which will enable all the people of Vietnam, North and South, and all of southeast Asia to look forward to a tomorrow without danger of attack, without hunger, and with social justice and security.

There are times when American power must be used—when there is no alternative in face of determined aggression. But military power alone will not provide stability and security unless it is accompanied by political, social, and economic effort—and the promise to the people of a better life. And thus we work with the Vietnamese people toward that goal.

No, peace will not come through military victory alone. Nor will peace come by good intention. Peace comes to those who earn it—work for it—sacrifice for it.

Peace will be won only through the untiring practical efforts of this generation and others to follow—efforts to improve the conditions of man's life. It will be won only when all men realize that they share a common destiny on this planet. Peace will be won when starvation, ignorance, and injustice are eradicated from a world which has the resources to defeat them. There is no alternative to peace. Let us pursue it with perseverance and patience.

Four years ago John Kennedy stood in this place to give this message:

"There is no way to maintain the frontiers of freedom without cost and commitment and risk. There is no swift and easy path to peace in our generation. We cannot save ourselves by abandoning those who are associated with us, or rejecting our responsibilities."

Today his body lies in this place among others who have given their lives so that this lesson might be clear. Today that lesson is not lost.

Let us prepare ourselves for long and hard burdens ahead. Let it be written in history that in this time the lessons of history were heeded.

Today we heed the words of Lincoln, who hated war but waged it for the cause he knew was just:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in."

Let it be written that, when man's freedom was threatened, there were freemen willing to give their lives to preserve it.

GENERAL GRUENTHER, A DISTINGUISHED NEBRASKAN

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on Wednesday evening of this week, the Nebraska Society of Washington presented its annual Distinguished Nebraskan Award to Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, U.S. Army, retired, the illustrious former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe and later president of the American National Red Cross.

The presentation was made by our colleague, Senator Curtis, who is retiring after 3 years as a member of the Nebraska Society's board of governors. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of those remarks printed in the Record at the conclusion of my statement.

It is unfortunate that we do not have a copy of General Gruenther's extemporaneous response. It was witty, modest, and charming, as is the man who made it.

All Nebraskans share a great pride in General Gruenther and in his titanic contributions to the cause of peace. This dedicated soldier-humanitarian heightened that pride when he told us he always has and always will regard himself as a Nebraskan.

We were pleased, too, Mr. President to have a number of congratulatory messages sent to the president of our society, Mr. Kimon T. Karabatsos. I ask unanimous consent to have two of them,

one from former President Eisenhower and one from Governor Morrison of Nebraska, printed in the Record following Senator Curtis' splendid salute to General Gruenther.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tribute to Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther on the Occasion of the Award Dinner of the Nebraska State Society of Washington by Senator Carl T. Curtis, January 26, 1966

We are here to pay respectful tribute to a man who has earned the right to be called an outstanding American. As native sons of Nebraska, we are here to honor a great Nebraskan.

You have no doubt noticed, as I have, that men of high ability are seldom, if ever, one-track men. Though they carve distinguished careers in one field, they show extraordinary talents in many others. Sometimes they achieve top rank in one career after another. And, sometimes, as with our honored guest this evening, they manage several diversified careers—almost at one time—with no apparent strain.

It would be easy, at this point, to tell you that our guest was born in Platte Center, Nebr., in 1899, and then rattle off, in rapid succession the events and remarkable achievements which have marked his life. But somehow I feel that would not give you a true picture of the man. We will come closer to getting a three-dimensional view if, instead, we take a brief look at one or two incidents in each of the five careers which he has made for himself, simultaneously, or in rapid succession.

Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, the man we honor tonight, was born in Platte Center in 1899. I've been told that he carries in his pocket a silver dollar, minted in that year. Though why anyone with his phenomenal memory should need a reminder, I wouldn't know.

This fantastic memory, plus the keen intellect and facility for intense concentration which accompany it, are the combination which has helped General Gruenther in everything he has undertaken. The effect of this powerful combination was first demonstrated when he was graduated from West Point, fourth in his class, at the age of 18.

In times of peace and prosperity, it is not easy for even the finest junior officer to find rapid advancement. But Lieutenant Gruenther, who had married Grace Elizabeth Crum, of Jeffersonville, Ind., had an idea for supplementing his less than generous military income. He acquired a manual on how to play bridge. Soon he was recognized as one of the Nation's finest amateur players. And soon he was arranging and refereeing bridge matches, an activity which helped to provide for his wife and two sons. General Gruenther has retained his early skill at bridge, a talent which might have led some men to a professional career. General Gruenther, on the other hand, seems quite content to be the favorite partner of his longtime friend, general, and later President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

General Gruenther's second career began with the rumblings of World War II. In October 1941, Lieutenant Colonel Gruenther was named deputy chief of staff of the 3d Army. Brig. Gen. Dwight Eisenhower was chief of staff. Within months, Colonel Gruenther succeeded his friend as chief of staff of the 3d Army and within a year was again a deputy chief of staff, this time to General Eisenhower at Allied Command Headquarters, Europe.

In these assignments, and his final wartime post as chief of staff for Gen. Mark Clark's 5th Army, General Gruenther built an enviable reputation. Through his consummate skill in organization, his ability to forsee situations and his meticulous attention to detail in seeing that orders were carried out, he was both recognized and rewarded as the perfect staff officer. While he was, as yet, little known outside the military, inside he was already becoming known as the possessor of one of the greatest minds in the Army. By war's end, in 1945, he was the youngest of all the major generals.

Stage three concerns a new career—General Gruenther the planner. After 2 years as Deputy Commandant of the National War College, the general was appointed director of the joint staff which served as the working force of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the preparation of strategic and logistic plans for the Armed Forces.

During this period and in the 2 years between 1949 and 1951 when he served as Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans at Army Headquarters, most of the plans actually put in practice by the Army passed through his hands for approval.

When General Gruenther was appointed Chief of Staff of the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Powers in Europe, it appeared, as it had several times in the past, that he was destined to remain the smart, capable, and highly efficient No. 2 man on whom every commanding officer could depend without question. But that limited horizon, too, was soon to be broadened. In July 1953, he succeeded Gen. Matthew Ridgway as Supreme Allied Commander in Europe and commander in chief of the U.S. European Command. So began career No. 4.

Upon the shoulders of a supreme commander of allied forces rest many burdens, not the least of which is the task of maintaining good relations with dignitaries of many stripes. On one such occasion, General Gruenther put his fantastic memory to good use.

During a visit they had made to Allied headquarters, the general had met, quite casually, 180 members of the British Parliament. As things developed, it became necessary for General Gruenther to visit the House of Commons. In typical fashion, he included in his preparations an hour's study of the names and photographs of all 180 of the members he had met. When he arrived at Westminster, he recognized them all, addressed each one by name as he shook hands, and even made a few personal inquiries about their families.

Not too long after this incident in Commons, it was announced that President Eisenhower would pay a 1-hour visit to Allied headquarters in the near future for a conference. The subjects to be discussed were listed. Although it had no place on the list, General Gruenther immediately directed his staff to compile a chart showing the location of every unit, squad, and individual serviceman in the whole command.

The President arrived, the conference began. After about 50 minutes the listed subjects had been discussed. There mas a brief pause. The President broke the silence by asking the distribution of the forces—the staff officer, the planner, the supreme commander was ready. It was this kind of keenness and foresight that led Lord Ismay to call him "the greatest soldier-statesman I have met."

After 38 years of tremendous achievement you might think that General Gruenther would feel as Gen. George Marshall once put it, "I want to go and sit in a chair on my front porch. In about 6 or 8 weeks I'll begin to rock a little." But not General Gruenther—he was still looking for action and he found it.

There is an old adage among athletic coaches: "It's a lot easier to make a fine runner out of a boxer than it is to make a runner into a fine boxer." I submit that it is easier to make a great humanitarian out of a soldier than it is to make a fine soldier out of a humanitarian, especially when you are referring to our friend from Nebraska.

On January 1, 1958, the day after he retired from the Army, General Gruenther—with all the enthusiasm, fire and concentration he had demonstrated in the military—became the president of the American National Red Cross, and career No. 5 was born.

From the end of World War II to 1957 the trend in vountary contributions to the Red Cross and other organizations had been slowly, but steadily downward. With a larger population to serve in the face of rising costs, the Red Cross needed to reverse that trend. As always, it didn't take the general long to catch on. He soon became convinced that one of his principal missions in his new post was to tell the Red Cross story to people—lots of people. And he did just that.

In a little over 7 years—in addition to all his other administrative duties—General Gruenther crossed this country scores of times, visited Africa once, the Far East three times, South America three times, and Europe seven times, spreading the word wherever he went. All together he traveled about 700,000 miles and made more than 800 major addresses.

I'm sure by now you have guessed the result. Beginning in 1958, contributions to the Red Cross began to increase—and I'm happy to say they have continued to improve every year since. To tell you the truth, I don't think they would have dared to do anything else.

General Gruenther has been decorated by many nations including his own. He has been similarly honored by Red Cross societies of at least 9 nations and he has received honorary degrees from no fewer than 25 colleges and universities.

We know nothing of what new career and what new honors may await him in the future, but I can say with certainty that no recognition he ever receives will carry with it more true admiration, greater respect, or warmer affection than that he receives from all of us tonight.

Gettysburg, Pa.,
December 29, 1965.

Mr. Kimon T. Karabatsos,
Velsicol Chemical Corp.,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Karabatsos: I have been informed by Senators Hruska and Curtis that the Nebraska State Society of Washington is honoring my friend, Gen. Alfred Gruenther, with its annual Distinguished Nebraskan Award. Although it is impossible for me to attend the ceremony at which your society is presenting the award, I do want to join you, by means of this letter, in paying tribute to Alfred Gruenther.

In war and peace he has served his country in important posts, brilliantly, selflessly, and effectively. Joining the Army during World War I, he early established a record for efficiency that caused him to be classed among the most promising officers in the service. He fully lived up to the promise and in his final post, as commander in chief of military forces of NATO, he established an international reputation for fairness, integrity, and a profound understanding that commanded the admiration of both European and American governments.

On such a subject I could write volumes; possibly I should content myself with saying that in every position in which he has served he has established standards that no other has exceeded.

He is my intimate friend and I hope that at the dinner you will extend to him my warm personal greetings and my felicitations that he is to receive the award you are now giving him.

Sincerely,

Dwight D. Eisenhower.

P.S.—He is also a fair kind of bridge player and is the world's champion at revoking.

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lincoln, Nebr., January 26, 1966.

Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, distinguished Nebraskan: Your native State of Nebraska, always humbly proud of the meaningful influences for good which have been exerted by its many illustrious sons and daughters, is honored with you in your designation as a distinguished Nebraskan by the Nebraska State Society of Washington, D.C.

I am confident that your selection, gratifying though it may be to you, is a source of similar satisfaction, not only to all of your fellow Nebraskans, but also to all of those men and women of our Armed Forces who served with you in meeting the great responsibilities you encountered in your steady ascent up the stairway of service to your countrymen.

It must also be a source of high pleasure to those citizens of the nine foreign countries whose various decorations you wear as an attestation of their appreciation for your efforts in their behalf—and that of the entire free world—as Nebraska's "Pershing of Peace." For that, my friend, was your true role as the Chief of Staff of SHAPE, under that great general, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and as Supreme Allied Commander in Europe.

A distinguished Nebraskan you are, sir. And Nebraska is distinguished by the strength for military and American Red Cross humanitarian service which you drew from your Nebraska family and your native roots. Your fellow Nebraskans, everywhere, join in the accolades attendant upon your selection and in every best wish that all of the blessings of this good life, and of the freedom you helped to insure, may be yours throughout the years to come.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK B. MORRISON,
Governor of Nebraska.

THE GLORIES OF SPACE

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, from ancient times to the space age men of little vision have always preferred the petty pleasures of daily life to the glories of conquering new frontiers.

In the ancient world a minority of cowardly Athenians resisted the great crusade against Syracuse but happily were overridden, with the result that—despite the loss of the entire Athenian Army and the subsequent fall of Athenian democracy—history has been enriched by a saga of valor and self-sacrifice justly celebrated by scholars from Thucydides to Walter Lippmann.

History does not reveal its alternatives, but just suppose what might have happened if Leif Ericson had turned back from his odyssey across the fearsome North Atlantic and had left America to be discovered after all by Christopher Columbus.

And what if Columbus had been thwarted from his great adventure by a niggardly and penny-pinching Queen? In all probability America would not have been discovered in 1492 as history so manifestly intended; indeed, it might not have been discovered until 1502 or even 1592. So what? you ask. So what, indeed.

Or suppose the great Napoleon had been fainthearted and prudent and had stayed at home to fritter away the genius of the French nation on public works and public schools, on poetry and philosophy, and all the homebody tasks of converting the Revolution from dreams to reality. I can tell you what might have happened: the French might have gotten their liberty, equality, and fraternity but at the cruel cost of cheating millions of Europeans of the glorious deaths they died from Austerlitz to Waterloo. The costs to posterity stagger the imagination: Russia would have been denied an epic victory and Leo Tolstoy would not have been able to write "War and Peace"; America would not have fought its glorious War of 1812 and Francis Scott Key would not have been able to write "The Star-Spangled Banner" with the probable result that we would all still be singing "My Country 'Tis of Thee" to the hateful tune of "God Save the King."

Today the pettifogging troglodytes have turned their small-minded malice against America's great adventure in space. In their ignorance and parsimony they tell us that there is really no hurry about going to the moon when tens of millions of Americans must spend their lives in dirty, dangerous, and unhealthy cities, when hundreds of millions of children around the world—some even in America—go to bed hungry every night, when hundreds of millions more are condemned to degraded lives of poverty and early deaths of preventable diseases.

How tiresome these contentions are. How small minded and selfish and sentimental, how lacking in vision and idealism. To those Americans who grumble about voyages to the moon and the annual expenditure of $60 billion or more on weapons and rockets, I invoke the inspiring words of an ancient Egyptian slave who reproached a fellow slave for complaining about the chains and the beatings and the huge stones that had to be dragged across the desert to build the Pharoah's pyramid. "How tiresome you are to whine and complain," said the one slave to the other. "It is an honor to be associated with an enterprise of such magnitude."

Mr. President, a recent article in the great English journal, Punch, sternly but justly reproaches those Englishmen who would complain about giving up iron lungs and artificial limbs to provide the aluminum for rockets and space vehicles, "as if," as the article points out, "a nation's prestige lay in its free artificial legs, and not up there"—in the azure sky.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alan Coren's aptly titled article, "Like a Diamond in the Sky," which appeared in Punch on December 8, 1965, be reproduced in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIKE A DIAMOND IN THE SKY

(By Alan Coren)

Somewhere up in space the first French satellite is spinning round the world this morning. It could have been ours. Why is it not? Because we are run by dreary defeatists whose attitude to the challenge of this marvelous space age is always to say: "Impossible. It would cost too much." What sort of future do these people want for Britain? The future of a fourth-class nation, living placidly on free pills while its technology slides hopelessly behind the times? Is that what they think the British people want? If so they are very much mistaken. As the first government with the guts to test the matter will find out to its pleasure.

—SUNDAY EXPRESS.

"It's—it's magnificent," I cried. For it was. A mile away from us, across the reclaimed flatlands of Hackney Marshes, the rocket stood like a great silver panatella; and as the morning sun struck fire on its iridescent skin, a knot tightened in my throat. Here, a mere 28 years after that first Battle of Britain, Sunday, England stood poised on the threshold of infinity. I turned, blinking back sharp tears, and the Minister of Space squeezed my shoulder between his capable fingers.

"I thought you'd like it," he said.

I blew my nose.

"Forgive me, Minister," I said, "but we at Beaverbrook's have fought so hard, so long."

We looked for just a moment or two more, sighing a little. Then we climbed aboard the waiting gun carriage, and our 20 trusty Jamaicans set off at a spirited trot across the mud.

"Not," said the Minister, "that it hasn't meant enormous sacrifices. But then what is a government for, if not to make sacrifices in the name of its people for their own good?"

"Exactly," I said, clutching the side of the limber as the wheel jolted against some laborer's mouldering corpse. "To think how we used to loll in sickening self-satisfaction brought on by wishy-washy welfarism, by seditious socialism that—that——"

"That sought to reduce the greatest race on God's earth to its lowest common denominator?" said the Minister. He smiled. "I've always been a fan of yours."

"Thank you, sir," I murmured. "I can't tell you how wonderful it feels to have a government with guts at last. Who would have thought that the anti-intellectual platform would have been such a superb success?"

"You did," said the Minister. "God bless you."

The gun carriage passed into the shadow thrown by the rocket, and we dismounted. I looked up at it until my eyes ached.

"How amazing that it should be standing here, built and ready," I said, "only weeks after you came to power. What a slap in the face of the doubting Thomases. What a testament to the force of a government freed from the niggling trivialities and prevarications of the infamous twits that preceded it."

"Quite," said the Minister.

"But how did you come by the materials, the know-how, the coordination, the funds?"

He smiled.

"By guts, laddie," he said. He tapped the shining silver fin beside us. "And determination. There are 200 tons of aluminium here, for example, but, despite commitments elsewhere, we were able to requisition the necessary amount within 6 hours of assuming power. This shell, laddie, has been built out of 34 iron lungs, 18 pacemakers, and 944 artificial legs."

"What melting," I cried. "Why, there isn't a sign of a dial or a knee-joint anywhere. I'm astounded that we had such a stockpile of the things."

"We didn't," said the Minister. "They were actually in use. All over the country. By heaven, the transport problem alone looked insurmountable. But we solved it. With guts."

"How honored the cripples must have been," I said warmly, "to give up their limbs for the glory of England. Think, soon they will be able to look up at the shining speck in the evening sky and say: 'That's my foot orbiting there, for God and Britain.' Who knows, one day a British aluminium hand may even land on the moon."

The Minister of Space nodded vigorously.

"I weep," he said, "to think of all those years in which the wherewithal of Albion I lay dormant. As if a nation's prestige lay in its free artificial legs, and not"—his eyes turned upward to the azure sky—"up there. See that scaffolding? It was knocked up in a single night from requisitioned crutches. The government gave, and the government hath taken away. It is only right."

"In a single night." I gasped. "Who would have believed it?"

"Of course," said the Minister, "without the cooperation of the unions in allowing themselves to be dissolved, thereby making possible the 20-hour day and the employment of child labor, we might never have got Albion 1 off the drawing board at all. The Army did a wonderful job."

"The Army?"

"In helping the unions cooperate. God, it was fine, depending on the British Army again after all these years. The spirit of 1926 lives yet, laddie."

He took my arm, and led me through the happily toiling chain gangs toward a magnificent white skyscraper that towered up from the surrounding factories and hangars, a symbol of all that Britain would mean to the seventies. I could not help crying aloud at the splendor of the building.

"Yes," said the Minister reverently, "the finest materials, the finest craftsmanship, the finest universities and hospitals have gone into the Albion Tower. Who, to look at it today, could guess that only 2 months ago the Foreign Press accommodation block was Hatfield Comprehensive School? Indeed, that the pupils themselves had suddenly ceased to be unprofitable parasites on the state and were now taking an active part in our great space program by giving their services, nay, their lives even, in experimental laboratories throughout the Queendom."

"The plucky little subjects," I said. I felt my chin jut and my breast swell. "While we have such youths in England, to what new heights may we not aspire? Remember, who but our sturdy infant miners put British industry and power on the Victorian map?"

"Who indeed?" echoed the Minister. "They had guts in those days all right."

He took my arm and led me toward Albion Tower, past a long row of khaki chimneyed huts outside which stood a silent queue of old-age pensioners, whose only movement was a gradual shuffling forward into the buildings.

"Stout chaps," said the Minister. "Insisted on being useful in the only way open to them, instead of fawning on the state. Many of them fought in the Boer War, laddie; they know what self-sacrifice means to this country. Thanks to them, all equipment in the rocket will be bonded with the finest glue in the world. And pure British glue, at that."

From the skyscraper's roof we looked out across the dazzling ribbons of runway (saved, by sheer governmental guts, from becoming the London-Dover motorway) toward the vast acreage of the Hackney Experimental Station, a pentagon of shimmering concrete that emitted a dull, muted throbbing.

"How fine." I said. "How prestigious."

"True," answered the Minister, "yet if the Socialists had had their way, what is now perhaps the most advanced laboratory in the world for determining the genetic effects of cosmic radiation on fleas would have been no more than a fatuous project for replacing the Glasgow slums."

"And you can't convert a councilhouse into something capable of delivering a megadeath-potential warhead anywhere in the world, can you, sir?"

The Minister laid his hand over mine on the parapet.

"By heavens, laddie," he said softly, "I like your style."

A line of deep and ancient understanding threaded our eyes together.

"Thank you, sir," I whispered. "I only wish the Beaver were able to hear you say that."

And then, on some uncanny impulse, we both glanced suddenly at the sky.

"Could it be," murmured the Minister, almost inaudibly.

"Why not?" I said. "Orbiting, perhaps, amid the foreign junk, waiting to welcome his kith and kin into the fathomless void?"

"If only he were," cried the Minister. His hogskinned hand tightened on mine. "If only he were."

"Yes," I said. I felt a familiar quivering in my lip. "It would somehow make it all worth while, wouldn't it?"

FEDERAL SUBSIDIZATION OF RAILROAD COMMUTER OPERATIONS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to take but a few minutes to make a statement on a bill, S. 2804, introduced on January 20, 1966, which proposes Federal subsidization of railroad commuter operations throughout the United States. This bill is an extension of an earlier proposal which promotes Federal subsidies for urban transportation. We now are about to witness the entrance into the tent of the proverbial camel.

No doubt many other Members of Congress are wondering just how much this new subsidy program will cost the Nation's taxpayers; and they have every reason to wonder because even the sponsor of the proposal would not attempt to give us an estimate at this time. I realize, of course, that this represents one way of dealing with a situation, but let me emphasize quite emphatically that this is but one of many ways to deal with this situation.

Because of the successes achieved in other urban areas of the country on this very problem, I am compelled to challenge the concept of this measure—that is, the concept of having the Federal Government subsidize, on a wholesale basis, railroad commuter operations. And it is not just the fantastic cost involved that is startling—although you can be certain I am very concerned about that. There are, however, many disturbing aspects of this proposal which run contrary to the views of those of us who believe that this approach is not a necessary function of the National Government.

In the meantime, I call the Senate's attention to an article which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD January 14, 1966, telling of the success of the Chicago & North Western Railway commuter operations. I was quite impressed with what was achieved by the Chicago & North Western. It buttresses my viewpoint that there are, in fact, other ways of dealing with this situation. Federal subsidy is always the easiest way out. But in the long run it just delays a realistic and more appropriate solution.

Also bear in mind—and railroad management should heed this warning—once the Federal Government puts money into programs of this kind a lot of other things can happen which are not always compatible with the private enterprise philosophy, the most obvious being nationalization. And the railroads are the most vulnerable form of transport for this to happen.

It seems to me that instead of taking the easy way out by dipping further into our deficit-ridden Federal Treasury, the railroad commuter situation should be handled by the local governments involved, as it has been done in some areas of the country. If Cleveland, Chicago, and just recently Boston, can find a way out, then why should not the New York-New Jersey area be able to handle the problem?

Also, I fail to see how the New York City subway strike can be used as a basis for stimulating support of this proposal. The shame of that New York paralysis is that the public interest was completely disregarded by recalcitrant labor leaders. It would have happened regardless of where the subsidy came from. I shall ask to insert in the RECORD an article by Raymond Moley from the January 17 Newsweek which explains the New York situation rather well.

All that can be said—if I interpret this bill correctly—is that instead of striking against a city government, the unions will be able to strike against the Federal Government if rail commuter service is subsidized at the national level. Yes, a Federal subsidy would enlarge the pie a good deal and to give you an idea of how it could hurt, I shall also ask to insert in the RECORD another newspaper article telling about the troubles of the British Government-owned and Government-subsidized railroads. It gives us a clue of the things we can eventually expect in this country if the Federal rail commuter subsidy proposal is enacted. There are, of course, many other reasons why the Federal Government should not subsidize commuter rail operations. I will have a lot more to say about these in the weeks ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Why a Subsidy?" written by Raymond Moley, and published in the January 17, 1966, issue of Newsweek magazine, at page 88; an article entitled "British Railwaymen Call Strike February 14, Over Wage Dispute," published in the New York Times of January 20, 1966; and an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dealing with an article entitled "Chicago's Commuter Railroad Miracle."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek, Jan. 17, 1966]

WHY A SUBSIDY?

(By Raymond Moley)

A basic issue in the New York City transit crisis is whether those who use the subways and buses should pay for their ride, or whether the lines should be subsidized by the generality of taxpayers. That issue will survive the crisis for a long time.

As this country goes rushing along to the time when everybody pays for everybody else, the issue will proliferate to many other cities.

The New York City Transit Authority operates the city subways and buslines. According to the authority, the annual subsidies are these: $13,340,000 for policing, $20 million for carrying schoolchildren, and $100 million for capital costs. It is not clear whether the last figure includes debt service.

At the present time the TA is running a deficit of $62 million. It is required by law in such an instance to pay its way by raising the 15-cent fare. But under Former Mayor Wagner, such a levy on the riders was unthinkable. Hence, there has been a frantic search for more subsidies. If the costs should rise by more compensation for the transit workers, it has been assumed by all directly concerned that still more subsidies would be required.

PEACE BY PAYOFF

It is not unrealistic to say that these subsidies have been given to pay off the members of Michael Quill's Transport Workers, because their pay, which rose 55.4 percent over the past 10 years, is higher than in almost any comparable industry.

In a pretentious study by three members of the Harvard faculty published in a book, "The Urban Transportation Problem" (Harvard University Press, 1965), the authors devote many pages to subsidies. They conclude:

"Many times, it seems, currently proposed urban transit subsidies, when subjected to careful economic evaluation, appear to be internally inconsistent, ill-conceived, and often in conflict with other goals of government policies in urban areas.

"Whether or not such a transfer (subsidy from all taxpayers) is desirable depends in large measure on individual preferences and attitudes, which are mainly subjects for political evaluation and do not lend themselves to objective treatment by conventional economic theory."

This merely states in economic jargon what every literate New Yorker has known for 50 years. Fares are kept below cost of operation because city administrations want to please masses of voters and also to appease transport workers by higher pay.

In the days of Mayors Hylan and Walker the 5-cent fare was a fetish. In Wagner's time, the 15-cent fare was sacred.

During my early life I lived in Cleveland and witnessed 9 years of political struggle over streetcar fare. Finally, a device was adopted which protected the investment of the private owners of the lines and provided for fair fares. It took the matter out of politics, and it has remained out of politics. Buses supplanted electric streetcars, and rapid transit lines were built for long hauls.

FARE-BOX POLITICS

In 1942 the city acquired the properties of the transit company. The owners were paid off 10 years ahead of schedule out of revenues from the fare box. In the literature of the lines, this appears in bold type: "The cost of rapid transit lines, $35 million, is being paid by you, the rider."

Service and equipment are excellent. Riders are satisfied. There are no subsidies, and taxpayers are not levied upon for political gain. Cleveland is proud of this achievement.

The new mayor of New York, John V. Lindsay, has a slogan. He would make New York a proud city. He might run over to Cleveland and see what it takes to make a city proud of itself.

There are several other cities which have had the courage to raise fares. Chicago, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, and Baltimore have a 25-cent fare. Newark and Philadelphia charge 20 cents. And New York pays its motormen more than any of those cities.

New York's 15-cent fare is an anachronism. It has been a melancholy reminder of political cowardice and of repeated appeasement of the Transport Workers Union. Public transportation should be paid at the fare box.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 20, 1966]

BRITISH RAILWAYMEN CALL STRIKE FEBRUARY 14 OVER WAGE DISPUTE

LONDON, January 19.—Britain's railway workers decided today to go on strike next month over a pay dispute with the Government. The decision to strike at midnight, February 14, was announced by the executive of the National Union of Railwaymen.

It followed last week's rejection by the National Board for Prices and Incomes of the union's demands for wage increases beyond a 7-percent package offered by the board.

The strike decision apparently heralds the long-awaited showdown between the Labor Government and the trade unions over the Government's efforts to limit the price-wage spiral.

Although the union hierarchy has generally supported Labor's economic policies, the Government has been increasingly bedeviled by wage claims and flash strikes by individual unions, most recently by the bakery workers.

Last year there were sporadic slowdowns. The railwaymen's union last staged a strike, for 1 day only, in 1963. The last major tieup of the nation's railway system was in the general strike of 1926. The railways have been nationalized for nearly 20 years.

The executive of the National Union of Railwaymen announced that it would meet soon to coordinate policy with the two smaller railway unions—the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen and the Transport Salaried Staff Association. The three unions have a combined membership of 370,000.

The basic pay for a railwayman for a 42-hour week ranges from £10 18s ($30.50) for a porter to £16 19s ($47.50) for an express locomotive engineer and signal engineer. There are allowances and extra pay for weekend work.

The National Union of Railwaymen maintains that its members' wages lag behind the pay of comparable workers in other industries by nearly 10 percent. With the union's demand for higher pay goes a demand for a 40-hour week.

The strike notice also posed a threat to London's teeming transport service as National Union of Railwaymen workers are employed on the underground.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 14, 1966]

CHICAGO'S MIRACLE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, of great interest to me was an article which appeared in the January issue of Harper's entitled "Chicago's Commuter Railroad Miracle."

It is a brief description of the successful effort that has been made to restore satisfactory and profitable commuter railroad service in our Nation's third largest city.

And more importantly, it is the story of how bold, creative thinking and work can overcome great odds.

So many people, railroad men, public officials, and the general public, throw up their hands in despair over the seeming hopelessness of the commuter problem.

Obviously if people in the business and public officials are resigned to not solving commuter problems, nothing constructive will be done, or even tried.

I hope some of the commuter train "Cassandras" will read this article, for which I now ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CHICAGO'S MIRACLES: NOW A UNIQUE RAILROAD MAN IS MAKING MONEY OUT OF COMMUTERS—AND MAKES THEM LIKE IT

"(By Andred Schiller)

"The poor and the wealthy sleep side by side in the cities; the middle classes run back and forth to suburbia. The only trouble with the arrangement is that the cities are being strangled in ribbons of concrete and choked by automobiles. For most Americans, the really dramatic challenge of the 20th century is not how to establish a colony on Mars but how to find a parking space downtown; the threat that hangs over us is not instant annihilation by the atom but slow strangulation by the auto. Commuter railroads, instead of expanding prosperously to meet the burgeoning need for transportation, are collapsing one by one, victims of the automobile, the bus, the tides of history, and sometimes of downright mismanagement. The plight of the New Haven Railroad (and of its passengers) epitomizes the problem. Without transportation a city perishes. If private industry cannot do the job profitably must the government take it upon itself, as it must provide water and collect garbage?

"The answer almost everywhere is yes. But in the generally dismal scene there is a bit of cheer. One commuter line—only one—has transformed itself in a few years from a hopeless loser into a profitable business which is a model for the railroad industry. And the man who did it, Ben W. Heineman, was no railroad man at all but a successful corporation lawyer who fell into the job almost by accident. How was this miracle accomplished? Was it a freak, or is it possible that commuter traffic can make money, and nearly all the railroad presidents have been wrong all the time?

"Ben Walter Heineman, boss of the Chicago & North Western Railroad, is a complicated man who fits no stereotypes. He is balding, middle-aged, pleasant of face, but in no way striking. Ben Heineman is not obviously anything. He could be your corner druggist, but he happens to be the most successful railroad executive in the United States. But to say so does not describe him. His colleague, Wayne Johnston, president of the Illinois Central, is as archetypal a railroad tycoon as EVERETT DIRKSEN is a Senator. He travels about in his private railroad car—a relic of Chester A. Arthurian splendor—and his office, encrusted with railroading prints and equipped with a working cuspidor, he is attended by a solicitous Negro in a white porter's jacket. (I waited to hear Mr. Johnston call him George, but it never happened.) The Heineman office bespeaks the longhair—sleek furniture, abstract and impressionist paintings, an astounding collection of pipes.

"He is an authentic intellectual, a trustee of the University of Chicago, and chairman of the State board of higher education, not to mention an impressive catalog of civic responsibilities for which he somehow makes time. He lives in Kenwood, an integrated neighborhood in the University of Chicago area, in a handsomely restored old brick mansion. He is even a Democrat, who served as a special prosecuting attorney under Governor Stevenson and later as an organizer in his presidential campaigns. There is a persistent, uncontradicted rumor that he was offered, and refused, a high post in the Kennedy administration.

"But he eludes the stereotype of the intellectual Democrat. In command of the North

Western he has behaved, at times, more like old Commodore Vanderbilt than W. Averell Harriman. He has slashed ruthlessly at payrolls and he shows little sympathy for workers whose jobs have become obsolete. 'The unions claim that the fireman is necessary for safety. But in the old days, when the fireman has his head down shoveling coal, he wasn't a lookout. And you have only one man in the cab of a subway, or an electric train. Nobody complains about that.'

"When I asked him what, if anything, the Government ought to do to help the North Western, his answer was quick and sharp, 'Get off my back.' He is a man who, as the saying goes, would rather do it himself. And when he took over the line in its bleakest days he proved that private enterprise could go it alone.

"She was dying unloved

"A decade ago the CNW commuter line was like an alcoholic duchess expiring on skid row, still attired in silks and tiara. Riders with a taste for the antique loved the ancient intercity cars. The comfortable plush seats were stuffed with real horsehair, and through crazed, glass-thick varnish one could still see faintly the original walls, an exquisite mosaic of inland woods. Up ahead, a venerable coal burner huffed and puffed grandly through the suburbs.

"But most commuters were not nostalgic rail fans, and the old lady was dying ignominiously. Over the generations the car interiors had absorbed a hopeless quantity of soot and cinders. The windows were broken and the doors came off in your hand. The sheet-metal roofs were cracked. On a rainy day passengers sat under umbrellas—or if they had none, huddled miserably in the wet green velvet. Timetables were a gallant fiction. The first snowfall each year was enough to cause operations to collapse into a snarl. But in any weather, scheduled runs would simply be scratched because the engines could not be repaired in time. Nor did departure guarantee return. The leaking locomotives ('Old Soaks' the crews called them) would fall apart so regularly that the enginemen carried baling wire to hold the machinery together. On one famous day the cab fell off, leaving the engineer and fireman naked to the world.

"The North Western was not a carefree, romantic, bohemian railroad. The keynote was irritation and surliness, shared alike by passengers, crews, and management. When a train was canceled the next would be so crowded that the conductors couldn't get through the crowds in time to collect all the fares. Some of the conductors, in any case, were pocketing fares and the management was quite helpless to do anything about it. Morale was low. Trainmen didn't bother to wear white shirts; their vests were unbuttoned and their uniforms unpressed. Sometimes there were fistfights among the crewmen, and between passengers and crew. Unexplained stops were commonplace. Passengers were so accustomed to them that they didn't even bother to ask why the train wasn't going anywhere. But on one occasion, in 1952, after half-an-hour, even the North Western commuters began to wonder. Passengers wandered out to investigate and discovered that the cab was empty. The engineer and fireman were finally discovered in a nearby diner, eating their dinner. They explained to the angry passengers that, according to their contract, they were entitled to a bean hour and, by God, they were going to have it. The fact that they were only 20 minutes from the end of their run was just tough. The train could wait. The fury of the passengers was matched by the management, and the union as well, when the story broke. But what was there to do? The whole line was on the verge of collapse.

"By 1956, bankruptcy was imminent. The North Western was $212 million in debt while its common equity was worth only $22 million. Cash was draining out by unaccountable millions each month. At this desperate point a group of investors, who held among them 30 percent of C. & N.W. voting shares, demanded representation on the board of directors. To this end, they engaged a young lawyer, Ben W. Heineman, who had made a reputation for himself in railroad circles by having won, 2 years earlier, an unprecedented victory in a proxy fight against the Minneapolis & St. Louis. ('Misery and Still Limping,' they called that one.) When, in January of 1956, Heineman walked into the board room the stage was set for an explosive meeting and the beginning of a bitter battle for control of the dying railroad. Incredibly, no such thing happened. Heineman was able to convince the board of directors that he did not represent a group of financial ghouls who wanted only to pick the bones of the business before abandoning it—'special-situation men' is the euphemism of the trade—but a group, rather, which intended to revitalize the road. Adding conviction to the argument was Heineman's own astute management during the past 2 years of the M. & St. L. By the time he walked out of the room, the attorney had brought the board and his group to come to a final agreement; the investors were to get 5 of the 17 directors' seats, and Ben W. Heineman was named chairman of the board on April 1. He was just 42.

"First, turn off the faucets

"Things began to happen fast. Heineman's first step was to bring in as president and chief of operations Clyde J. Fitzpatrick, a veteran of 31 years on the Illinois Central, but himself only 47 years old. Together they went on a 6-week inspection tour. They looked, listened, and learned that the railroad was in an unbelievable mess. The patient, they decided, could be saved—but only if major surgery were performed immediately.

"Close to home was the sprawling Proviso freight yard. A sign boasted that it was the largest in the world. The new boss said, 'Tear it down.' He didn't want the biggest yard, but the most efficient. Part of the yard was dismantled, and the scrap brought in welcome cash. More important, 74 acres were released for valuable industrial development. But that was only the beginning. The North Western, since its chartering in 1836 (it is Chicago's oldest railroad), had acquired a considerable amount of real estate. The new management instituted a survey to find out just what they had (nobody really knew) and how to convert landholdings from taxeaters to income producers.

"The repair facilities were as outmoded as outhouses. Of 14 repair shops, only 2 were roofed. Expensive mechanics had to shovel snow to get to their work and then lie down in the slush to do it. In one shop the new managers found that the pistons of a diesel were being overhauled, even though they were barely broken in, simply because the company policy was to overhaul the engines every 3 years. Maintenance was promptly changed from a calendar to a mileage basis. and the scattering of inadequate repair facilities was scrapped. At a cost of $6 million, a modern assembly line shop was built in Clinton, Iowa. The investment yielded a quick return. The new shop could do everything, from overhauling the delicate watchlike mechanisms of airbrakes to building entire freight cars. Cars came out worth more than when new. There was even a school for mechanics.

"As for organization, Heineman's comment was succinct: 'Too damned much management.' The North Western was the last major railroad which still retained a departmental structure. Under this system, if a section of track in Wyoming, let us say, needed repair it would be reported to the head of maintenance-of-way in Chicago, and not to the local superintendent who was responsible for getting trains over that track. Heineman reorganized the railroad on a divisional system, in which the superintendent of each geographical division was totally responsible for everything within his purview. Whole echelons of administration were eliminated and control was tightly centralized. There was bloodletting on the bottom as well as the top. By the end of a year, one out of every six employees had been dropped from the payroll. One of the survivors, an engineer, put it this way, 'It was a quick, rough change. We can't get away with what we used to.'

"In those first few months, Heineman and Fitzpatrick were busy diagnosing the North Western's ailments and making long-range plans. But the urgent need was to stay alive long enough to put the plans into effect, running around and turning off faucets. The railroad, in those dying days, was so close to the bone of bankruptcy that the new management was reduced to selling rails for scrap simply to meet the payroll, which is like a starving man amputating his own leg and eating it.

"In this appalling situation, the new management decided to invest $50 million—much of it borrowed from the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.—to acquire new equipment for the commuter service. On the face of it, this was a lunatic act. No railroad had ever succeeded in making suburban service profitable. Even the North Western's prosperous neighbors—the Burlington, and the Illinois Central—were just breaking even on commuters. But for Heineman it was an inevitable decision. He gave his staff three alternatives. First: Get out of commuter service. But this was politically almost impossible, and socially unthinkable. Second: Go on as before. But this was economically impossible. Third: Since you're stuck with the job, do it right. It was a daring gamble.

"At the time of the takeover, suburban equipment consisted of cars and locomotives which had been demoted from the intercity trains. Scarcely anything was less than 30 years old and some cars were of turn-of-the-century vintage. Every major railroad had been dieselized by 1956—but not the North Western. Or so it seemed. But the fact was, as President Fitzpatrick put it, 'They were dieselized and didn't know it.' Diesel locomotives were laid up in the shops; two or three were being used as switch engines where one could have done the job. By keeping them running around the clock and using the rest elsewhere, by more efficient servicing and assignment, the line was dieselized in 40 days without buying a single locomotive.

"Even the old steam locomotives turned out to be an asset. Each one represented about $6,000 in scrap. But the old iron mastodons were relics, too, with a cash value to sentimentalists. The bells were advertised for sale—about 250 of them—and they can be seen and heard now all over the world; one, for example, became a dinner bell in a Michigan hunting lodge, another went to a bombed-out church in Greece.

"How to impress a commuter

"But you can't attract commuters simply by switching from coal to oil. You have to offer them transportation attractive enough to get them out of their automobiles. The odds against it are admittedly enormous. A recent Harris survey revealed that 90 percent of the Nation's commuters actually preferred to drive, even when public means were available. Heineman's gamble (and what would a horse player say of a $50 million bet against such odds?) was that commuter tickets can be sold by vigorous merchandising, just like soap flakes. But where the contents of one box of soap is largely indistinguishable from another, the commuter knows precisely what he is getting for his dollar. Trains either do or do not run on time; they are air conditioned or they are not. All the services are tangible. 'To make matters more difficult,' as Ben Heineman points out, 'we get the commuter at the two worst times of his day—early in the morning when he's grouchy, and in the evening when he's tired. How do you impress a commuter?'

"You give him swift, unobtrusive, and dependable service, more comfortable than his own car, and cheaper. And how do you achieve that? In the first place, it is necessary to decide what a commuter line is not. It is not, for example, a city bus or streetcar. It is not designed to stop every half-mile, nor to service in-city passengers. Accordingly, the North Western eliminated 22 of its local stations, almost all of them inside Chacago, over the objections of the affected neighborhoods. Merchants lost money and their aldermen made speeches, but Heineman got away with it. Why should his railroad, he asked, do the work of the Chicago Transit Authority? The North Western quite deliberately gave up 3,000 riders in order to give better service to the suburbs.

"A simple innovation—Clyde Fitzpatrick's idea—added trains to the timetable without buying a single car. Once a train had pulled into the final station, the 'relay' operation to get it headed out again required a switch engine, a turnaround, and a five-man crew working for half an hour. Why not equip the cars with little cabs for the engineers, like subway trains, with remote controls? Today the locomotive always stays at one end of the train, pulling on the trip out, pushing on the trip in. When the train gets to the station, or the end of the line, it's ready to go again in 10 minutes, and the relaying requires no switch engine or extra crew. The same number of trains are now able to make extra runs during the peak hours.

"The old coaches, too, were discarded, and new ones were designed to North Western specifications. They were double-decked, air conditioned, well lighted, comfortable, and meticulously clean. A typical 6-car train has 960 seats; it has required a 10-car train of the old coaches to provide the same number. And—very important—the dead weight per train was decreased by about 130 tons. In short, these new trains were hauling not equipment, but people.

"But would the people pay to ride these splendid new trains? In the age of the freeway, railroads have a precarious hold on their commuters. With each fare increase a certain number of passengers abandon the train for the highway, and the attempt to raise fares to a profitable level becomes a self-defeating treadmill. Once again, Ben Heineman took a step which flew in the face of all past experience. He raised the price of commutation tickets, not inch by inch over a period of years, but in one bold thrust.

"The pricing system is an antique—in fact, an accident. A century ago the railroads, which were then entirely in the business of hauling freight and intercity passengers, began the practice of picking up passengers at nearby stops as they approached the cities. The fare was set at an appropriate fraction of the distance traveled by the through passengers, and hence very low. But as the metropolises grew, two things happened. The little town became a suburb, and the casual pickup became a scheduled stop. During the same period, the private auto virtually destroyed the intercity passenger business.

"And so it came about that commuter service, which had begun as a bit of frosting on the cake, turned out to be the whole meal. And the railroads got sick on the diet. The fares had been frozen into a basic-price structure which now turned out to be inadequate. What Heineman asked—and in December of 1958, got—from the Illinois Commerce Commission, was not merely a fare hike but a fundamental change in the concept of what a commuter is supposed to get for his money. The decision marked a turning point in the historic function of the railroad as a passenger carrier. It is a revolutionary change which most of the railroads and the State regulatory bodies of this country do not yet grasp.

"Seats by the month

"Traditionally, when the passenger bought a ticket he was paying for a ride, and the cost of the ride (setting aside class) depended simply upon distance. But this won't work for a commuter line for the simple reason that every morning you must carry a great number of passengers into the city, and back again every evening—but in between, and on weekends, most of the equipment is doing nothing but adding to the total cost. The North Western's innovation was not to sell rides by the mile, but transportation by the month. When a man owns an apartment house he figures his total operating cost, and with this as a base he determines what a monthly rent must be. It is none of his business whether his tenants occupy their apartments constantly or leave them empty part of the time. And so when the North Western commuter buys a monthly ticket, he is entitled to unlimited access. He has rented a seat for the month.

"The theory is logical, but the question was, could the riders be persuaded to buy it? Heineman bet all the stockholders' money that they could. In the first place, he sought to stabilize the price charged for a ride. Since December 1963 the commuters have found Christmas cards on their seats each year, telling them that their Christmas present from the line was that there would be no rise in fares for the coming year. Furthermore, he promised that the money would be used to improve equipment and service; and that promise was kept. Finally, the new ticketing system turned out to be irresistibly convenient. If you are a North Western commuter, the mailman brings you your ticket a few days before the beginning of each month (and you have until the 10th to pay for it). The ticket has your name, address, and phone number on it, in case of loss. (One lady brought in a wad of gooey pulp, which was all that was left after her baby had chewed up her ticket. The ticket agent decided it was the right kind of paper and issued her a replacement.) The ticket itself is an IBM card, part of which goes into a computer. You merely show it to the conductor, who has no tickets to punch, no stubs to count. Now a train with 1,400 passengers can be operated by a few crew members. Some conductors resisted the change to flash tickets, not because it threatened technological unemployment but because the ticket punch (and the calloused hand) had been a status symbol.

"Aggressive advertising brought in new riders. For example, the North Western sponsored the traffic helicopter on radio station WGN. Twice a day the motorist, inching along miserably in a solid mass of metal from his suburb to the Loop, is given a collision-by-collision analysis of the tangle, followed by a suggestion that he'd really be better out of it if he rode the train. Many, in this period of maximum frustration, got the message.

"And the passengers were courted. Trainmen, who had to lose their old churlish ways, were sent through 'charm school.' There is no advertising in any North Western train. There isn't even an advertising slogan on the outside of the train for the line itself. There is no piped-in music, either in the train or in the stations. Each rider, having rented his space, is entitled to privacy, and to being treated like a trusted member of the family. For instance, on rainy days a cart full of umbrellas is set out in the center of the North Western station—'Rainstick Junction'—and any passenger is entitled to help himself. Also, he is expected to return it some sunny day. Only 1 out of 20 does so. Since these are unclaimed umbrellas from lost and found (and hence in endless supply), the company doesn't worry about it overmuch. 'Look at it this way,' one official told me. 'These people are stealing their own umbrellas. Maybe the fact that we stamp them makes them souvenirs, like hotel towels.'

"But the North Western steadfastly held to its policy of acting toward its patrons like a well-bred chauffeur rather than an ill-tempered landlord. It was a daring gamble—the $50 million invested was an important outlay—but it paid off. North Western riders today are like members of a club. Talk to any of them and they have nothing but admiration and praise for Ben Heineman. He runs their railroad.

"And it all translated into money. In 1956, the suburban service had a deficit of $2.1 million, but in 1964 it made a net profit of $706,000, and it is expected to earn over a million for 1965. This has happened despite the fact that in 1960 Chicago opened two major expressways, now called the Eisenhower and the Kennedy, each of which parallels the North Western tracks. As a result, revenues dropped sharply in 1961. Then, in 1962, just when the railroad was winning back some of its lost passengers, the telegraphers struck. Ben Heineman, despite his politics, behaved exactly like a railroad executive. He stubbornly refused to give in to telegraphers who, he said, had no messages to send, and he endured a 30-day shutdown. During this period he was cheered by letters of support from his suburban Republican patrons. He won the strike but lost the revenues.

"He also lost some of his employees' good will. Efficiency, like all beautiful things, has a sad underside. You don't hear it from the crewmen—not at first. Fremont Shultz (his real name), an engineer in whose cab I rode, admitted that the Heineman regime was tough and uncompromising. But he said it proudly; it reflected his own professional code. He understood that the rules of survival were stern. And, like Heineman himself, he saw things from the top. Engineers are the leading tenors of the company. But the chorus of lesser employees is all but mute.

"Although 1962 was a bad year, it was not altogether unlucky for Heineman and the stockholders. The expressways which hurt the North Western were actually fatal for two small commuter lines, the North Shore, and the Chicago, Aurora & Elgin. Upon their demise, the North Western inherited most of their passengers. Since 1963 the news has been progressively more cheerful. While the profits have been modest—and by General Motors standards even minuscule—the importance of this success story is not to be measured in money. Commuter rail transportation is the only basic industry in the United States which is actually going out of business. As our country is becoming more urbanized, transportation—upon which urban living utterly depends—is collapsing. Railroad men everywhere have given it up as hopeless and, as in the case of the Long Island and the New Haven, have sought Government support. If in a single case anyone can demonstrate that hauling passengers can be made profitable—as Ben Heineman has—then this is news of acute importance, not just for the railroads but for all of America, and indeed the world. Perhaps it is possible for cities to break free of the concrete noose in which they have been strangling themselves and to breathe again.

"With this in mind, I asked Mr. Heineman if the unprecedented success of the North Western suggested some formula that all other railroads could apply. Had he, in short, found 'the answer'? He looked amused at the question. (He has a reputation for business, in railroad circles, and of being overquick with advice. But this time—perhaps because he was speaking to an innocent layman—his answers were undogmatic.)

" 'No,' he said, 'There is no easy answer. No formula. What we've done here has worked here. It might be all wrong someplace else. For example, you couldn't use our double-decker coaches in New York. They wouldn't fit through most of the tunnels.'

"And what, I asked, about intercity passenger trains? Could the same good management revitalize that part of the industry? Here the answer was a flat 'No.' 'Ninety-one percent of all intercity travel today is by automobile, so that the whole transportation industry is fighting over just 9 percent. Airplanes are faster, buses are cheaper. All we have to offer is standby service. There's no future in the intercity train.'

"It was the only gloomy statement I heard from the lips of Ben Heineman—and history may soon prove him to be wrong. The new Tokyo-Osaka train, which attains speeds up to 130 mph, may yet find its counterpart in a Boston-Washington train. The U.S. Government, at any rate, has allocated funds to study the feasibility of such a project. The significance of such superspeed trains is clear; just as the commuter train satisfied a need in the metropolis of connecting the city with its outlying suburbs, so the trains of the future must satisfy a similar need for the megalopolis. A half-century ago it was unthinkable to commute from 30 miles out; in a few decades people who live in, say, the Gary-Chicago-Milwaukee area, or the Boston-New York-Washington area, will be commuters within those complexes.

"But if time proves Heineman wrong in this, he will admit it very quickly, and go on to profit by his error. 'We examine postulates,' he once said. 'We don't fall in love with them.' He is the kind of realist who wasn't too proud to buy a couple of airplanes in order to run his railroad.

"Despite his hopeless view of intercity train travel, Ben Heineman is a practical visionary. 'It isn't enough to run a railroad well,' he said. 'The average rider lives within 2½ miles from the station. When he gets to the city, he probably needs to ride a bus or a subway to get to his office. We need a transportation system that interlocks. We should have feeder buses, taxi stands, and parking lots at each suburban station. In the city, we need a subway belt that connects all the railroad stations. Ideally, there should be a transfer system so that a single fare takes a man from end to end with no fuss.'

" 'Can we do this in Chicago?'

" 'Absolutely. In fact we must. The mayor is for it. It's just a matter of getting moving.'

"As it turned out, this was no idle talk. Shortly after our interview, in October 1965, Mayor Richard Daley announced that the Federal Government had granted the city a million dollars to study a plan to tear down the elevated (that famous Loop) and to rebuild the subway so that it would link all the city's railroad stations. Ben Heineman has been preaching this for years.

"Could we junk it all?

"And so I asked him: If he had it in his power to build a dream railroad, what would it be like?

" 'Go to San Francisco,' he said, 'and you'll see it coming into being.' I did. The bay area rapid transit is fantastic. Trains will run (controlled by radar and computer only) at 80 miles per hour, 90 seconds apart. There are no straps to hang from because every passenger is guaranteed a seat (and a bucket seat at that). You will insert your credit card into the gate when you enter and again when you leave. At the end of the month the computer will mail you your transportation bill—like any other utility. The system will make every other line in the United States seem ancient and obsolete, for the excellent reason that it is. BART is the first transportation system to be designed, from the ground up, in half a century. Since the city of Philadelphia in 1907 designed its rapid transit system, there have only been additions and extensions to existing facilities.

" 'Why can't we do it in Chicago?' I asked Mr. Heineman.

" 'Because we already have existing rail transportation. We simply can't afford to junk all of it. San Francisco, luckily, had next to nothing. And that's not the whole story, either. We could do a great deal with automation. Modern technology is very sophisticated. But the unions would never let us get away with it.'

" 'Then what is the answer to the problem in those cities where there are existing, inadequate, or poorly patronized railroads? In short, how do you run a railroad?'

" 'Don't ask me. I don't know how to run a railroad; I know how to run this railroad. There are no problems in general, just specific problems.'

" 'All right—specifically. Do you think that government subsidies are a bad thing?'

" 'Not necessarily. If in a specific case it's the only thing to do.' He finished with a wave of his hand.

" 'In short, you are a pragmatist.'

"The tycoon smiled. 'Is there any other way to be?' "

INTEREST IN A WORLD FOOD PROGRAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, a splendid article by Mr. William K. Wyant, Jr., appeared in Sunday's St. Louis Post-Dispatch reporting the status of legislative efforts to enlarge our world food program.

The appearance of the article is another evidence of the unusual interest across the Nation in this proposal.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, for the article to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 23, 1966]

U.S. PLANS TO EXPAND FOOD FOR PEACE IN A WORLD WAR ON HUNGER—BOTH PARTIES IN CONGRESS SUPPORT LEGISLATION FOR MAKING MORE INTELLIGENT USE OF AMERICAN FARM ABUNDANCE AND TECHNICAL KNOW-HOW

(By William K. Wyant, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, January 22.—Congress and the Nation are now preoccupied with the cost of guns for war, but momentum is quietly building up behind a plan for expanding a different kind of American approach to world problems—food for peace.

The plan involves putting the agriculture richness of the United States to work, in a much more massive and direct way than heretofore, so that the hungry people of the earth may be fed.

In the past the Nation has made available its farm surplus—what was left in the larder. The new direction is to strike out the word "surplus" and make deliberate use of America's production to alleviate hunger and malnutrition.

Proponents want to more than double the present food-for-peace program now running at about $1.7 billion a year. They want to make it more flexible so the right types of food can be sent, and they want to give have-not nations more help in learning to feed themselves.

In his state of the Union message last week, President Lyndon B. Johnson appeared to have these purposes in mind when he spoke of a "new and daring" foreign-aid thrust aimed at attacking hunger, disease, and ignorance.

"We will place the matchless skill and the resources of our own great America, in farming and in fertilizers, at the service of those countries committed to developing a modern agriculture," he said.

Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, introduced legislation last June in which the grand design of a doubled food-for-peace effort was outlined. In the House this week, a bill moving forward the same objectives was introduced.

Food for peace has firm bipartisan support. In the Republican "state of the Union" message on Monday, House Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan, pointed out proudly that Public Law 480, under which the food program operates, dates from 1954 during the Eisenhower administration.

"World population increases are adding a new dimension to the problems of American agriculture and demand new thinking," FORD said. He urged the extension of food for peace, which expires this year unless renewed.

Background of the intensified interest in making more intelligent use of the Nation's farm abundance and its know-how is the awareness of world food experts and Government leaders that a food crisis may lie just ahead.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is very worried about it. An interagency task force report on food has been on the President's desk for some time. The expectation is that food shortages in Asia, Latin America, and Africa will get worse.

"Two-thirds of the world's peoples live in countries with nutritionally inadequate national average diets," says the Department of Agriculture. Population is zooming, and nations are running out of arable land.

Senator McGOVERN headed the food-for-peace program under the late President John F. Kennedy. His bill would authorize a gradual increase—starting with half a billion dollars additional the first year—and it would permit the Government to buy high protein enriched foods to augment those available as surplus.

Last Wednesday McGOVERN rose in the Senate and obtained approval for his bill, called the International Food and Nutrition Act to be transferred from the Foreign Relations Committee headed by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, to the Committee on Agriculture, of which Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, is chairman.

This was done with the consent of both FULBRIGHT and ELLENDER. McGOVERN said he had been assured by ELLENDER that hearings would be scheduled at an early date, probably in February.

It was also last Wednesday that North Carolina's Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, introduced a comparable bill he said would open a world war on hunger through extension and expansion of food for peace.

The Cooley bill is not as far-reaching as McGOVERN's. It would authorize an increase of a billion dollars a year in the program over the next 5 years in the movement of American food and fiber abroad. It would strike out the word "surplus" and substitute "available."

COOLEY explained to the House that his proposal would not limit American exports under Public Law 480—either sales for foreign currencies or donations to relieve distress—to surpluses. The program would not be restricted to crumbs from the heavily laden American table.

"We would make available * * *" Cooley said, "any agricultural commodity which we have in adequate supply and which is needed in the recipient countries—and if necessary our farmers will be asked to produce these commodities deliberately for such export purposes."

It is apparent that if the United States begins deliberately producing food to meet the food deficits of friendly nations rather than simply shipping them what the Government acquires through its support programs, the impact on farm policy will be great.

"We discard enough food to feed well any one of 50 nations in the underdeveloped world," Senator McGovern told his colleagues last June. "We pay our farmers enough for keeping surplus acreage idle to finance the shipping of millions of bushels of grain to hungry people overseas.

"We spend enough in storing and handling our annual surpluses to support a much expanded school lunch program overseas."

Cooley gave high praise to the President's reference to a worldwide attack on hunger in the state of the Union address. He said he expected to have public hearings on his bill early in February.

Last November Cooley wrote to President Johnson asking him to hold up on the new "cropland adjustment program" of the 1965 farm bill, under which 40 million acres of farmland might be taken out of production. Cooley said the program would drive people off the farms.

"The great opportunity now confronting us is to reverse the direction of all prior farm programs, which have repressed production to avoid surpluses," Cooley wrote, "and to set upon a new course of vast exportation of food and fiber as the best instrument of our own security, the well-being of rural America, and for banishing hunger from the free world."

President Johnson turned Cooley down. He said cropland adjustment would not cause the adverse effects feared by Cooley. Cooley later made public the exchange of correspondence.

When he introduced his bill this week, Cooley said he was not proposing that restraints on American farm production be removed forthwith. He conceded that the United States could not feed everybody.

"But," he said, "our farmers have mastered the arts of abundance and they can produce food and fiber, beyond our own needs, that can build the physical strength and morale of the population in many countries where these people work in the direction of self-sufficiency in agriculture."

In his speech at Independence, Mo., on Thursday, President Johnson spoke again of a major new attack on hunger. He indicated that the food assistance program would be used to encourage agriculturally backward nations to move toward self-sufficiency.

"We will direct our assistance program toward a cooperative effort to increase agricultural production. We will ask the countries which we help to make the necessary land reforms—to modernize marketing and distribution—and to invest greater energy and resources in farm production," Mr. Johnson said.

"In return, we will triple our assistance to investments in the powerful weapons of modern agriculture—from fertilizer to machinery—we will direct the efforts of our agricultural scientists to the special problems of the developing countries—to the development of new foods and concentrates. We will call for an international effort, including institutions like the World Bank, to expand the world supply of fertilizer," the President said.

There can be no quarreling, as the Nation prepares for a larger war in Vietnam, with the view expressed by both McGovern and Cooley that food can be a more effective weapon for peace than bombs—and certainly a less expensive one.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT THE DEDICATION OF CENTER OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY IN HONOR OF EDWARD R. MURROW

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, individuals who dedicate their lives to public service with courage, integrity and conviction make a mark on the history of the times that is long remembered and revered. Edward R. Murrow was unique as a reporter and as a public figure. When he spoke from Europe during the war, he spoke with the conviction of a man who saw and shared the terror of the times. As head of the U.S. Information Service, he made the voice of our Government the most respected, most honest, and most listened to voice in the world.

Recently the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy in Medford, Mass., dedicated its new center of public diplomacy in honor of Mr. Murrow. Vice President Humphrey, speaking at the dedication, captured the importance of the moment saying:

As one who understood the effect of the communications revolution on diplomacy in our time, Edward R. Murrow would rejoice that "public diplomacy" will not be the object of continuing study and reflection by serious students and scholars.

I ask unanimous consent that the excellent remarks of the Vice President be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey at Edward R. Murrow Center of Public Diplomacy, Medford, Mass., December 6, 1965

When President Johnson awarded Ed Murrow the Medal of Freedom—the highest civilian decoration this Nation has to bestow—the President's words summed up his career:

"A pioneer in education through mass communications, he has brought to all his endeavors the conviction that truth and personal integrity are the ultimate persuaders of men and nations."

Truth, and personal integrity. That was the legacy of Edward R. Murrow.

The man whom we honor today would approve of the educational innovation we inaugurate here: the Center of Public Diplomacy.

He would approve of the concept of the center; to bring together professors, foreign correspondents, Government officials, and graduate students for a probing exchange of views on the uses of public diplomacy.

He would approve of the center being located amidst the great universities of the Boston area.

He would approve of the center being here at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy—the first graduate school of international relations established in the United States.

His only objection would be to the fact that the center has been named after himself.

For Ed Murrow was one of the most selfless celebrities of our generation. In both broadcasting and Government—two public professions in which there is no surplus of modesty—he remained to the end a totally unpretentious person, modest, and even shy.

He was idolized by his fellow broadcasters and at one point something close to a Murrow cult began to emerge. When a network official felt it was going to bit too far, and announced that he was forming a "Murrow Isn't God Club," Ed promptly wrote to him, and applied for a charter membership.

Edward R. Murrow was a man, too, of courage and principle.

On one occasion, when a fellow broadcaster was attacked by a group of superpatriots, the man suddenly found himself on one of TV's infamous blacklists. Murrow promptly gave the man $7,500 to hire attorney Louis Nizer and initiate the libel suit that eventually cleared his name. "I'm not making a personal loan to you," said Murrow. "I am investing this money in America."

But if there is any special way that Ed Murrow would want to be remembered it would be expressed by the simple word "reporter."

Though he never would have admitted it, he virtually created radio and television reporting as we know it today.

Who can forget the drama of that solemn dateline: "This is London"?

For when he said: "This is London," it suddenly was London.

It was the real London and he had suddenly taken us there, out into the noisy terror of the streets, and down into the quiet fear of the bomb shelters.

We no longer simply heard about the war from our radios. We were made spectators at the scene. When he stood on a London rooftop during a Nazi raid, and said: "The English die with great dignity," it became more than merely news. We stood there on that rooftop with him, and we sensed that dignity.

Ed Murrow's wartime broadcasts were a whole new dimension in news reporting.

It was a dimension he was to broaden all during the rest of his life.

He often said in later years that broadcasting—both in radio and television—was essentially a transportation medium. It was not meant merely to inform. It was meant to carry the audience to the scene itself.

That is why Ed Murrow risked his life in 25 bombing missions over Germany. That is why he sailed up the English Channel in a minesweeper. That is why he stood in the horror of Buchenwald on the very day it was liberated.

For to Ed Murrow, to report meant to be there.

To us, now in 1965, all this may seem routine and obvious.

But Edward R. Murrow, as much as any single man in his time, made it all possible. As a mourning colleague put it at the time of his death, "He was an original and we shall not see his like again."

President Kennedy's appointment of Ed Murrow as Director of the U.S. Information Agency was widely applauded.

A few people were surprised that Edward R. Murrow should turn his back on all the gold and glamour of Madison Avenue and take on the headaches of a much maligned and misunderstood Government agency. But they did not know Ed Murrow.

He had been asked by the President to serve and believing that the public interest must come first, he was ready to serve. "Besides," as he told a friend later, "I had been criticizing bureaucrats all my adult life, and it was my turn to try."

The fact is that he had been in public life ever since he was graduated from college, as a pioneer in that new and powerful establishment that has been aptly called the fourth branch of government—the American press.

The appointment was a brilliant one. Ed Murrow understood, as well as any man in our century, the responsibility, and the power for good, of modern mass communication. He understood the relationship of that power to our open society.

He knew that the United States, as any open society, is a house with transparent walls. He knew that people who live in an open society should tell the truth about themselves.

In an open society as ours, the first principle of our public morality is that truth should be told.

As Lincoln once said: "Falsehood, especially if you have got a poor memory, is the worst enemy a fellow can have."

Propaganda, to be effective, must be believed. To be believed, it must be credible. To be credible, it must be true. If it is not, in the end it will not stand up.

The evil genius Joseph Goebbels taught us unfounded propaganda can be effective only if the big lie is so bold and monstrous as to appear uninventable. In an open society, people are incapable of believing that anyone could be capable of such perversity. A propagandist such as Goebbels can enjoy temporary triumphs in a totalitarian society. In a free society, the shallowness of his creed will be exposed.

Today, the whole world can see what is going on in this global goldfish bowl that is the United States. We have a candid free press. And American magazines, films, and television shows, for better or worse, go virtually everywhere overseas.

In this kind of open society, it is futile for a government to put out false propaganda. There are too many nongovernmental sources of information available to refute it.

The public official's words, as well as his actions, are inescapably subject to the searing scrutiny of the reporter, the pundit, and the scholar.

This includes the scrutiny of hundreds of foreign correspondents who are reporting back to their own nations every day. It includes the scrutiny of 80,000 foreign students, all of whom are writing home and most of whom will eventually be going home, to tell family and friends what America is really like.

Three and a half million American tourists go abroad every year. A million American military personnel and their dependents are stationed around the world. Over 30,000 American missionaries are scattered around the globe.

Each of these Americans becomes a kind of individual USIA to every person he meets overseas.

There is, then, not just one official Voice of America coming out of Washington. There is a whole, gigantic chorus of voices of America, a chorus of literally millions, who carry the story of the United States abroad. But this chorus is not under the baton of any minister of propaganda. Each American tells his own story, reflecting his own understanding of America.

The diversity of American life is represented in the picture presented to the world.

But in an era where diplomacy is practiced by private individuals as well as government officials, new responsibilities arise for all.

For the businessman who conducts negotiations abroad with foreign governments; for the scholar or writer lecturing in foreign lands; for the artist or scientist attending international festivals or conferences, there is an obligation to know one's country, to give an objective analysis, to be an effective advocate. And, might I add, to do this, we must know major languages of the world, which our educational system must be equipped to teach.

Ed Murrow excelled as a reporter because he knew the world which he was reporting. If the citizen diplomat is to excel he must know his country and the world he is addressing.

As one who understood the effect of the communications revolution on diplomacy in our time, Edward R. Murrow would rejoice that "public diplomacy" will now be the object of continuing study and reflection by serious students and scholars.

If four decades of public diplomacy have disappointed those who saw in Woodrow Wilson's "open diplomacy" the solution to all international disputes, it remains today—far more so than in Wilson's time—an important part of international relations.

In the United States two decades of world leadership have enhanced its importance. The exposure of Americans to foreign affairs has multiplied dramatically. Our military and political commitments around the world, our participation in hundreds of international organizations, the expansion of the Foreign Service, the development of the foreign aid agency and the Peace Corps have placed more Americans in a diplomatic role than was conceivable 20 years ago.

The enlargement of our foreign affairs machinery has been accompanied by a vastly enlarged public market for information on foreign affairs.

The result is that scholars and businessmen, labor leaders and foundation executives, and the average American citizen, too, are more deeply concerned and more vocal on international affairs than ever before.

As recent events have shown, American citizens today do not restrict their foreign affairs concerns to detached criticism of governmental action. They initiate public programs and public protests favoring one course of action or deriding another. They advocate freely and they dissent freely.

For those of us in Government, John Stuart Mill's advice is as valid today as when uttered a century ago: "We can never be sure that the opinion we are endeavoring to stifle is a false opinion; and if we were sure, stifling it would be an evil still."

And, thus, we must prize both advocacy and dissent. Without the right of dissent, the free debate essential to an enlightened consensus is impossible.

Oftentimes the views of the American people will be expressed through the Congress, which can exercise great influence on the conduct of foreign relations through resolutions and speeches as well as through the power of confirmation and of controlling expenditures. In conducting affairs of state at an important international conference, an American Secretary of State may find that a congressional resolution or a Senate committee investigation may determine the setting for action far more than any decision taken by the President of the United States. Congressional participation in diplomacy is now well accepted. But what precise role it is best suited to play remains a disputed issue—one which will merit the attention of scholars of this center of public diplomacy.

For my part, I do not fear the encroachments of Congress on the conduct of diplomacy. It is possible that during the first half of the century there did occur in Western societies a "functional derangement between the governed and the governors," an assumption by popular legislatures of powers they were ill equipped to exercise in the field of international affairs.

Today, under our presidential system an American President has the authority and the power he needs to determine the course of foreign policy.

Modern communications technology has aided what the Constitution intended, that the President take the lead in formulating and executing foreign policy. Strong Presidential leadership—combined with independent congressional initiatives—is what is needed in the age of public diplomacy.

When this is present, as it is today, there need be little fear of excessive congressional intervention.

And public diplomacy, however important it is destined to become, is not likely to supersede private diplomacy.

But the importance of public diplomacy has been enhanced by the communications revolution of our time. This has provided us with an electronic means of multiplying the human mind. We can, today, literally reach out and communicate, simultaneously, with millions of other minds.

One simple invention—the transistor radio—may have had more psychological impact on the world than any other single invention in the past century.

For the transistor radio, which in this country we still regard as a kind of toy, has suddenly become an immensely significant political instrument.

People everywhere today—on the plains and paddies of Asia, on the rolling grasslands of Africa, on the high slopes of the Andes, everywhere in our shrunken world, people are now within earshot of a transistor radio.

What is more, most of these people today in the nearly 50 new nations that have erupted onto the political scene since the end of World War II, have the franchise. Their village views are backed up by their village votes.

These people in the remote villages of the world may not be literate in the traditional sense. But they are politically conscious. They are in touch. They know what is going on. And they will help shape the future of mankind.

Through their village radios, they can now pick and choose from the world's political opinions.

What is true of the village transistor radio of today will be true of the village television set of tomorrow. Television is already in more than 90 countries of the world. It is now the fastest growing medium of communication on earth.

What does all this really mean?

It means that the communications explosion has vastly enlarged the role of public diplomacy. This is the instrument the Edward R. Murrow Center is going to study.

May it always be an instrument, in our country, for truth. May it always be an instrument used for man's betterment and emancipation.

In the words of Ed Murrow: "If truth must be our guide then dreams must be our goal. To the hunger of those masses yearning to be free and to learn, to this sleeping giant now stirring, that is so much of the world, we shall say: We share your dreams."

ALASKA'S VILLAGE PEOPLE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the American Indian and the Alaskan native have occupied an unusual position in the history of the United States. Much has been written and said about them and, as we all know, the so-called western is one of the most popular types of movie and television entertainment. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is entirely devoted to the Indian and Alaskan natives. Additionally, there are programs operating in other agencies for their welfare. Much has been written and said about these first residents of our country, but in spite of all the work being done with and for the Indians and the natives, little is known of exactly how they live, what they want, of their dreams and hopes.

Between December 5 and December 15, 1965, the Anchorage Daily News published a series of 11 articles entitled "Alaska's Village People." The series included a portrayal of the Alaskan natives from Barrow to Ketchikan. The series, to my mind, is one of the finest ever published about the Alaskan native.

The Anchorage Daily News has performed a useful service to the people of Alaska. It is the first time that the Alaskan native villagers have been brought to the attention of all of Alaska's citizens. I have the highest praise for the publisher, Norman C. Brown, the editor, Joe Rothstein, and the reporters, including Beverly and Edward Isenson, Kathy Colton, Janet Archibald, and Joe Rychetnik, many of whom I count as personal friends.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the series of 11 articles be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks so that people throughout the entire 50 States may have an opportunity to learn the reality and tragedy of the situation in which our Alaskan native people find themselves. In some respects "Alaska's Village People" tells the story of many of our Indian tribes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, we have done far too little to assist our American Indian and Alaskan natives to acquire social and educational skills which would enable them to take full advantage of modern American life. It is my hope that all Members of the Senate will take the time to read this outstanding series. Not only is it excellent from a historical and journalistic viewpoint, but it forces upon us the obligation to do some serious thinking about what we are trying to accomplish in behalf of these people.

Many Alaskan natives participate actively in the social and political life of the State. Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts are regularly elected to the legislature. The first president of the State senate was an Eskimo from Unalakleet. The second was an Indian from the southeastern village of Klawock. A newspaper in Fairbanks is edited by an Eskimo from Point Hope. One of our outstanding artists is an Eskimo. Many of our finest bush pilots are natives.

All Alaskans are proud of our native people, but I know of no one who believes we have done all we should. After reading "Alaska's Village People," I know you will agree with me that we must take strong and generous measures to give those people the education, vocational training, medical assistance, housing, and all other programs the rest of the Nation enjoys and to which they are entitled.

EXHIBIT 1

ALASKA'S VILLAGE PEOPLE

When people think of Alaska they think of the Eskimo. And well they should. For the Eskimo has mastered one of the most inhospitable areas on earth—the frozen tundra, the Arctic coastline, the unpredictable Bering Sea and its winter icepack.

Many express surprise that Alaska has other aboriginal cultures—the Aleut, the Indian—both of which also have endured in a land where life is not retained without considerable personal effort.

Each summer, thousands of visitors come North to see the Alaska native. He is a romantic figure in American legend. He appears on the cover of a popular ice cream bar. He is the symbol of the North.

But the Alaska native is also a living breathing human being who has been touched by Western civilization. And, like people from Sarawak to the edge of the Sahara—people who have lagged behind the advancement of human knowledge—he is increasingly anxious to share in the wealth and opportunity he sees about him.

Some Alaska natives successfully have made the transition from the old culture to the new. Most have not, despite the tens of millions of dollars spent annually by the Federal and State Governments in their behalf. Many live in conditions that match or surpass urban U.S. slums. Their educational progress remains well below that of nonnatives who share Alaska with them. Jobs are scarce in the village and job opportunities are not much better if they move to a larger settlement. The welfare check, in many cases, is a way of life.

Some argue that the Alaska native should not be encouraged to escape his past. But since the first whaling vessel reached the Alaska coast, the native has been increasingly unable to retain the purity of his culture. The past is fast closing in behind him. The future is not rapidly opening before him.

As a matter of national policy, the United States is committed to helping disadvantaged people around the globe to find a path toward economic self-sufficiency and personal dignity. It is equally committed to its own people in the North. But through past and present programs, it is not achieving its goals with any marked degree of success.

The conditions that exist today exist after decades of Federal involvement.

If the Alaska native were lazy, lacking in personal ambition or personal resources, he could not have survived here so long. He is a strong, generous, able individual. But today he is caught between two worlds and if his life is appalling and embarrassing to the nonnative observer, it can only be shamefully degrading to the individuals involved.

They are beginning to speak, after the long silence. And they are beginning to grow angry and impatient. It is a situation the U.S. Government must heed closely, not only for basic human reasons but for the international implications as well.

These people represent about one-fourth of Alaska's civilian population. As such, they can be either a tremendous economic burden or a great untapped reservoir of opportunity. Their future is perhaps the most critical problem the State of Alaska faces today.

It is for these reasons that the entire Daily News staff has been directed during the past few months toward gathering information about Alaska's village people. The series that begins today is the result of mountains of data carefully studied and countless interviews.

Many villages were visited, many were not. Many things are left unsaid because the job was so massive no newspaper, particularly an Alaskan newspaper, can touch every base in a study such as this.

The project taxed our resources to their outer limits. And the harder we worked and the more we learned, the more we realized how important it is to tell this story. We began with no preconceived ideas of right or wrong, praise or blame. Our aim when we began, and now, is only to call attention to this situation in an orderly accurate manner. If the result is greater understanding among our readers and leaders of the problems and its implications, we will be satisfied that we have achieved our purpose.—J.R.

PART 1. BETHEL

There are two movie theaters in Bethel. One is a big barnlike structure. The other is upstairs in the Northern Commercial Co. building. On Sunday night, when the daily 7 p.m. show conflicts with services at the Moravian Church, the theaters have another showing at 9 p.m. Movies are Bethel's most popular form of entertainment, barely edging basketball.

Basketball draws enthusiastic crowds to the Bethel National Guard Armory on Tuesday and Friday nights during the winter months. The players include homegrown boys, Public Health Service doctors, Bureau of Indian Affairs schoolteachers, local aircraft mechanics, and usually at least one lower Kuskokwim River bush pilot, just in from a day of delivering supplies or people to nearby villages.

And more than one player, in addition to admitting a foul, has had to lean over to his opponent and say, "excuse me, Reverend."

On the hardwood, they wear the typical basketball shorts and jerseys. But to the gallery, faces of most players are familiar; no printed program is needed.

For Bethel, despite being the transportation, commercial, and health center for southwest Alaska—about 100,000 square miles along and between the lower Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers—is a small town. Its estimated permanent population is 1,600. About 85 percent of the permanent residents are Alaska natives, primarily Eskimos.

They reside in Bethel because they were born in Bethel, or because they have migrated from a nearby delta village in search of economic opportunity or better living conditions. Bethel, Alaska, is not all they know. The movies convey to them the Western world, with its glamour and advantages and problems. There is the Sears catalog, too—the community's favorite reading material and an attractive window to life in that other world.

The people of the lower Kuskokwim and Yukon River deltas are suspended between their aboriginal past, which they cannot reject, and those bright lights of the new culture, which they cannot resist. Most of Alaska's 50,000 native people—Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians—share the difficulties of that cultural transition. Together they represent about one-fourth of the State's civilian population.

By any common standard or indicator used to measure poverty, most are impoverished. They earn less, have more limited education, and die younger than nonnatives. Poverty is the dominating feature of native Alaska life.

And southwest Alaska is the statistical capital. In the United States, the infant mortality rate for nonwhites, generally the Nation's poorest group, is about 40 for each 1,000 births. Southwest Alaska, in 1964, had an infant mortality rate of 67. The 1960 census showed the median formal education completed by persons over 25 in Alaska southwest area at between 2 and 3 years. That same census designated virtually all native homes in the area substandard. More than 70 percent of the families had incomes of $3,000 and under in 1963. Because of high transportation costs, the village dollar is worth about 40 cents compared with its Seattle value.

Bethel is the hub of the region. It is the area center for the Public Health Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and a National Guard scout battalion. Every day, weather permitting, a Northern Consolidated Airlines F-27 propjet arrives from Anchorage.

Situated on a bend in the Kuskokwim River, the community is 80 miles from the Bering Sea, about 10 feet above sea level. The Kuskokwim is Bethel's highway. Except during breakup and freezeup, the mighty river is a taxiway, runway and parking lot for planes which use floats in summer, skis in winter. Thousands of villagers receive supplies by river barge from here.

The Kuskokwim is also Bethel's master. Year by year it has been eating away at the banks of the town. Buildings have been moved often. Each year, after the spring breakup sends tons of ice downstream, Bethel's business district is flooded. Because of this condition, it has not been possible to construct a city sewage system or realistically assess the value of land.

Despite the ever-present Kuskokwim, water is a problem. A well recently was installed at a depth of 400 feet. That water costs between 2.5 and 4 cents a gallon, depending on the quantity purchased.

Mayor Art Nicholson drilled and owns the installation.

"Many people tell me it seems strange to see so much water in the wintertime," he says.

Before, the only water supply in winter was melted ice. That still is the supply for those who cannot afford the mayor's product or who live outside Bethel. Watering holes along Bethel's main streets are kept open by those who must carry it to their homes daily.

Bethel has electricity, but many cannot afford to use it. They burn kerosene lamps and gas lanterns instead. Most homes have oil stoves, but it is not uncommon to see women and children hauling sleds of wood scraps from construction projects or brush areas. Oil is expensive.

Among the first white men to settle in the area were the Moravian missionaries. They came in the late 1880's. And they have endured. Much community activity centers around the church. At Sunday night services, a native choir sings Christian hymns in Eskimo.

"But we have no young girls in our choir, only old women," one choir member pointed out.

Eskimo handcraft, such as dolls and yoyos made from fur and hide, and baskets woven from grasses, still are made in Bethel and outlying villages. Some are sold at area trading posts, and a wide variety is found at the Moravian book shop, operated by Mrs. D. C. Schattscheider.

"The art is dying out," she says, "how we wish they would preserve it."

Although the days of birdfeather parkas are gone forever and Sears catalog clothing is seen in the most remote villages, nearly all fur parkas and mukluks are made at home. Still very popular with the women, and worn by many youngsters, are fur parkas with colorful printed cotton shells.

Nearly every kind of canned food, dry staple and many frozen foods can be bought at Bethel stores. Poorer families exist almost exclusively on fish and wild game. A meal might consist of a bowl of boiled fish dipped in seal oil with bread and coffee.

Until a very few years ago, winter travel in the delta was mostly by dog sled. Now, winter land transportation is the mechanical snow cart. It is sold everywhere.

"I used to have a dog team," said a Bethel man, "and I loved my dogs. But this is much cheaper than feeding them. Easier to take care of, too."

For going great distances, the native uses the airplane. All day, planes fly low over Bethel, bush planes that land on rivers or frozen ice patches. Here is the lifeline to the nearby villages. Doctors and nurses travel it. So do schoolteachers and the U.S. mail.

The people of 66 villages look to Bethel for their supplies, their communication with and transportation to the world outside. They come to Bethel to be born and to die. They come in search of a better life, even though half of Bethel's men, 21 years or older, are not permanently employed.

Bethel is growing at a rate of about 10 percent each year. Much of this growth can be traced to resettlement by those who had made their homes in other delta villages, people who lived under circumstances which make Bethel more attractive.

PART 2. THE DELTA

On one wall was a picture of President Kennedy. On the opposite wall, above the only door of the one-room hut, was a picture of President Johnson.

The man and woman who lived here, in this tar paper framehouse in Nunapichuk, were obviously proud of these two possessions—pictures of their Presidents. But when the visitor admired the pictures, they could not express their pleasure, since they could not speak English.

There are dozens of Nunapichuks in southwest Alaska. And thousands inhabit them. They have an idea, a hint of modern America—their Nation. Meanwhile, the elements of their culture, the Eskimo culture, are slowly eroding.

About 350 people live in Nunapichuk. The population changes frequently and seasonally. Survival is a daily problem. There is the wind that whips across the flats from the Bering Sea. The temperature drops to well below zero in winter. Fish and game are scarce and becoming more so. The birth rate continues to increase and the death rate continues to decline. Because he is culturally immobile—because he has difficulty with English and is unfamiliar with most ways of earning a living—the Eskimo has few avenues of escape.

Village economy is virtually nonexistent. In winter, villagers fish through the ice. A few carve ivory figures and jewelry to trade at the village store.

During the summer salmon season in nearby Bristol Bay, many of them leave their homes to work in canneries or on the boats. Some find construction jobs. Some work for Government agencies. Most have no permanent source of income.

The land they inhabit is flat as a tabletop. It appears especially barren in winter, windswept and decked with snow. No trees grow here, except some scrub willows. The view is limitless.

Wooden boardwalks stretch like sidewalks between each house. Often, the name of the household is written above the door. Dogs are tied down around the yards and puppies frisk between homes.

In some homes, oil stoves stand next to wood stoves. Small willow branches are burned. They are not very suitable for heating. The Kuskokwim-Yukon Delta is supplied primarily from Bethel by air. Fuel oil transportation can cost $75 a barrel.

A recent survey of the area resulted in this profile of a typical southwest village home: one room, 15 feet wide by 18 feet long, or 270 square feet, with enclosed entryway. Six people live here. Their heat comes from a wood stove, their light from a gas lantern. The floor is made of rough planking. Water is carried from the nearest supply. Human waste is deposited in 5-gallon cans.

It is common to see wet clothing strung from wall to wall or fish hanging in the outer room to dry.

The exterior of these homes is tar paper over weathered wood or sometimes corrugated iron or aluminum.

Such conditions, of course, present health problems. Tuberculosis has been a scourge. The incidence in the Alaska native is the highest in the Nation. Millions of dollars have been spent by the State and Federal Governments to cure and prevent the disease. After a massive program was launched in the mid-1950's to wipe out tuberculosis in native communities, the rate dropped quickly. The number of new cases has increased since 1960 although it reached a new plateau this year.

The rod-shaped tubercule bacilli, spread by tiny droplets of a sneeze or cough, can rapidly reach an entire family sharing a single room. Patients may be treated and cured in modern hospitals, but when they return, it is to the same conditions. To exist without sufficient heating during the arctic or subarctic winter, the Eskimo is dependent upon his fur clothing and body heat for warmth. These conditions have a general tendency to spread skin infections and parasitic skin diseases.

These and other health problems exist not only in the villages of southwest Alaska, but in most Alaska native population centers. According to the State bureau of vital statistics, the 1959–61 death rate for Alaska whites was 4.60 per 1,000 population. For nonwhites it was 9.01. The Public Health Service estimates that today the tuberculosis rate among Alaska natives is 20 times greater than the rate for the general U.S. population.

Other problems are created by close living. Dr. Max Brewer, director of the Arctic Research Laboratory at Barrow, points to the situation of the 14-year-old girl who returns home from her first year at Mount Edgecumbe, a boarding high school at Sitka administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. At school modesty is emphasized as a virtue and she is given a certain degree of privacy. She returns home facing the prospect of taking a sponge bath in a room filled with people.

The BIA and State of Alaska operate grade schools in virtually every populated settlement. But where a child must share the faint glow of a gas lantern in the center of family affairs, home study is not an effective instrument of learning.

Many villagers of southwest Alaska fully recognize these problems. The 20th century has entered their lives in the form of books, films, visitors, and traveling youngsters off to boarding schools. Life still may be primitive, but the culture is not the same. Influences of education and economic opportunity, better health and longer lives are tugging at roots planted long ago, in a world other than the one that confronts them today.

Combined with the promise of better lives elsewhere is the probability of harder lives if they remain. The population is growing. The pressure on fish and game is increasing.

"When the fishing season is good," said the Kwigillingok Village councilman rather contemptuously, "many move to Bethel for the winter. They think they can afford to live like the gussuk"—the white man.

A doctor at the Public Health Service Hospital at Bethel estimated that 80 percent of the babies born in the southwest area are now born at the hospital. It is another reflection of the growing dependence on the community by the villagers.

The principal industry of Bethel is government—the new $6 million Public Health Service Hospital, the State-operated school, the State airport that brings in the plane each day from Anchorage, the Bureau of Indian Affairs area office, the National Guard Scout battalion headquarters.

The government, particularly the Federal Government, has been in the delta for decades, providing health services, education, welfare assistance, law enforcement, disaster relief, and other programs designed to soften the impact of cultural collision.

Despite past efforts, disease and mortality rates remain high, and educational achievement low. It is likely that the degree of poverty in Alaska's southwest is at the highest level of any region under the American flag.

Recently, Mrs. Marie McGuire, Commissioner of the U.S. Public Housing Administration, toured this area.

Her assessment: "I've never seen anything like it, even in the worst slums of our major cities."

PART 3. WHEN IN NOME

Life in the Arctic has never been easy.

It is not a lazy man's land. One cannot drowse away his time. No fruit trees provide a ready supply of food. There is no natural shelter. Many survive today the way their grandfathers did. They take to arctic waters in skin boats. They track and kill the walrus, the seal, and the whale. They fish through the arctic ice and pick summer berries. Unrelenting cold and hunger stand close outside the door. Death, on the drifting ice, in the blinding veil of a winter whiteout or the blizzard's bite, is an ever near neighbor.

Through the generations, the Eskimo has made his peace with his land and its hazards. But that is no longer good enough. Western civilization is crowding into the Arctic.

The northern Eskimo sends his children to school to learn that life need not be such a tenuous commodity. The children learn another language. They are taught different standards. In competition with the white man, the native tries to find work so that he can buy the food and clothing that once he hunted and the material advantages for which he has a growing appetite.

Nome is perhaps Alaska's most famous city. It is a legend of gold. Tens of thousands once camped there hoping to earn the wealth of a lifetime with one mining claim.

Nome in 1965 is a community of about 2,200. Three-fourths of the population is Eskimo. Here, for many decades, the old and new cultures have met. The meeting has been an outstanding success for the native.

Daisy Jack of Sandspit is caught between the old ways and the new. Sandspit, just outside Nome, is a far cry from the military fort that once stood on the site. Eight people live in the single room of the Jack's home. There is no electricity in Sandspit, no sewers, no water.

During the summer months, her husband Louis and their sons are able to find work in Nome.

"Not much work in winter," she says.

While her husband works in Nome, Daisy Jack spends the summer attempting to meet her family needs in the old way.

Salmon Lake lies about 38 miles from Nome. She goes there in summertime with members of the family to camp, catch fish, and pick berries. Last summer she says she was unable to catch enough fish to carry her family through the winter.

Daisy and Louis Jack evidently have accepted the changing conditions that are driving Eskimos into town and away from their old hunting economy.

"In early days, we could trade what we catch for what we need. Now, not so easy to do," Louis Jack claims.

"Better to come in town—no longer can live in country," his wife chimed in.

In town the children can go to school. Daisy believes that more education—and more jobs—are her people's major needs. Their Eskimo name is Aseuluk. They do not use it, but do not want to forget it, either. So they mention it to the visitor.

Strung out along the shore on the other side of Nome from Sandspit is the King Islander's village, a favorite target of tourists visiting the North. Here, too, the native faces a cultural and economic crisis.

King Island, a rocky perch in the Bering Strait, once was home to the King Island villagers who have achieved fame as hunters and ivory carvers. But as the years go by, fewer of the King Islanders return each year to their island home. Now, most of the villagers huddle together in Nome's shadow—jobless and undirected.

Some want to go back to their island. Some want to relocate to Cape Woolley, which lies between Nome and King Island. Some want to remain in Nome. For years, Paul Tiulana has urged relocation to Cape Woolley. Tiluana, until recently president of the village council, now appears somewhat discouraged about the move.

"The people still talk about it. Nobody wants to go against the move," he says.

But he knows that the white man's economy and ways have caught up with the King Islanders.

During the summer, tourists buy the islanders' carved ivory, stone, jade and wood. It provides an income, but not enough to put bread on their tables. The tourist season is short and the winter is long. To date, carving has been done on a hit-or-miss basis without direction.

Some of Nome's young Eskimos, however, are finding a place in the white man's world.

Young Billy Lee, for instance. At 17, the youth is an announcer at radio station KICY. It is a part-time job while he attends Nome High School. A native of Council, young Lee has lived in Nome for about 7 years. He was trained for his work by the station's manager.

"Not too many high school boys have part-time jobs," Lee admits. "Maybe 10 to 15 percent during winter. In summer time, maybe 50 to 60 percent hold the high school boys' work.

"I'm interested in pilot training. I hope to go to college," he says.

Employment and education are keys to the new world.

Employment and education—these are the recurrent themes of native hope.

"Employment is our biggest problem," Tiulana said.

"One of these days, I might take additional training," said an unemployed Sandspit youth who believes that had he finished school he would have no trouble finding work. But he didn't go on to school—and he says he doesn't know why.

Mrs. William Senungetuk of Nome is a fur sewer. Her son Ronald teaches at the University of Alaska. Any native who wants an education or a job can get it, she maintains.

James Savok, Jr., who works for the Alaska Highway Department in Nome agrees.

"If a person wants to advance himself, he can," says Savok. He earned his high school diploma during a 3-year stint in the Army.

Savok worked his way back to Alaska after his discharge. Why did he—and so many others return? His view:

"They get homesick, don't want to 'live by the clock,' their friendly, easy going ways are often turned against them. I used to say 'hi' to everybody. But I learned to turn it off outside. It's hard to have to go outside."

Despite the opportunities that may exist observation and statistics show that life is hard for most natives who remain.

In 1964, the infant mortality rate in Nome and the general surrounding area was 63.3 for each 1,000 population. The national average is 25 for each 1,000 population. Food costs 40 percent more in Nome stores than in Seattle. The average Nome area insured unemployment rate was about 20 percent in 1964. An estimated 95 percent of all housing in the Nome area was listed as substandard by the 1960 census. That same survey reported that persons 25 years and older had completed a median of 7.5 years of education.

The birth rate at Nome continues to exceed the State and national average, as it does in native communities throughout Alaska. The Bureau of Vital Statistics estimates the 1964 Alaska native birth rate at 43.6 for each 1,000 population. The U.S. average is 21.7. In September 1965, the birth rate in Alaska Public Health Service hospitals was 10.8 percent higher than in September 1964.

And more Eskimos continue to move to Nome from surrounding villages.

"There is nothing for them in the villages. They can no longer live off the land."

That observation comes from Eli Reyes, a Tlingit Indian from southeastern Alaska who manages the State employment office in Nome.

Recently, Dr. George Rogers, a noted Alaska economist, told a class at the University of Alaska: "Economic development is sometimes advanced as an automatic cure for poverty. Walter Heller's statement at the hearings on the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 noted, however, 'Clearly, we cannot rely on the general progress of the economy—or on job creating programs alone—to erase poverty in America.' New jobs would increase the number of exits from poverty, of course, but open exits mean little to those who cannot move—to the millions who are caught in the web of poverty through illiteracy, lack of skills, racial discrimination, broken homes, and ill health—conditions which are hardly touched by prosperity and growth."

"As related to poverty among Alaska's natives, the prospect of future economic development provides even less cause for complacency. In addition to adverse factors of lack of education and skills, racial discrimination, etc., the present geographic distribution of native population is heaviest in areas of the State which are away from the centers of economic development and anticipated future growth. Although there has been evidence of increasing geographic mobility among Alaska natives, they have traditionally remained within the major regions in which their ancestors lived.

"Coupled with the relatively high labor immobility of Alaska's natives, their recent rates of natural increase further work against the probability that general economic development will automatically take care of their condition of poverty. During the period from 1950 through 1963 rates of natural increases have been close to 4 percent per year for the State as a whole, and approach 5 percent in the southwest and interior regions. If we define economic progress in terms of per capita income growth, these rates of population increase far outstrip even the most optimistic projections of rates of economic output for the State."

(NOTE.—Anchorage Daily News Photographer Joe Rychetnik for many years was a trooper with Alaska's State Police. Once his assignment was Nome and surrounding areas. In the following article he describes some actual cases involving the administration of justice for Alaska's village people.)

When statehood brought in a new police organization, the trooper of the Alaska State Police, these men were posted to key villages and towns throughout the vastness of the State and told to set up and maintain regular patrols to the bush villages in their area. The troopers were to stop at each village and hold village council meetings and lecture students in the bush schools on the laws of Alaska and what the State police could do for them. Up until that time many places seldom saw a policeman. The territorial police and the deputies of the U.S. marshal's office often went on patrols but they were usually connected with a criminal complaint. The Governor wanted all the villages introduced to the law for their people's benefit.

I was the second trooper posted to Nome, following Sgt. Gene Morris, and had at that time an area from Barrow to the end of the second judicial district to patrol. My main patrol consisted of 30 villages. I would try to visit them once every 3 months. This isn't like a patrol car swinging by your block every 20 minutes but it was better than no patrol at all. Often weather and budgetary considerations would prevent a visit to a village for many months. On word of trouble the State police would make every effort to get into these remote places. The problem was that village people had a new conception of trouble, now that they had their own cop on the beat and these calls ended up more comic than tragic, when the investigation was complete.

Perhaps the most expensive run made during my posting in Nome was an emergency trip to Hooper Bay, which is well south of the mouth of the Yukon and generally covered by the trooper in Bethel. He was on leave and Nome Post was assigned to cover as we did when Kotzebue Post was vacant.

The call came in as a distress signal radioed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs teacher in Hooper Bay. There were no details, just a call for a trooper to come quick, that a serious crime had been committed. I tried to reach Hooper Bay over the BIA radio network but was unable to contact anyone. The Fairbanks detachment office agreed that I should go so I chartered a bush plane for the long trip down the Bering Sea coast.

The weather was bad, snow squalls all the way down Norton Sound to Unalakleet. The pilot decided he did not want to tackle the run down across the flooding mouth of the Yukon without floats so I released him at Unalakleet, hoping to use Wilfred Ryan's Cessna 185 on floats. Wilfred was expected back from Anchorage and I was waiting for him when I received another emergency call forwarded to me from Hooper Bay. Still no details, just a call for a trooper.

The only charter plane in Unalakleet was on wheels but the pilot agreed to take me and we left just after midnight. The flooding river looked ominous and when we reached Scammon Bay the weather was so bad, I ordered the plane back. We were flying just above the bay and with mountains just ahead, it looked foolish to take a chance. The next morning I started out again for Hooper Bay with a Northern Consolidated Airline twin Beechcraft on floats. We made it to Alakunuk before weather closed in.

The plane had to return to Bethel and waited for the weather to clear. While I was in Alakunuk I was able to reach Hooper Bay by radio and asked the BIA teacher for details of the trouble. She said that she could give no details over the radio, which only deepened the mystery.

Two days later a float plane from Bethel was able to get into Alakunuk and take me to Hooper Bay. We landed well out on the bay, and found the slough which ran up to the village choked with block ice. Three hours later, when the tide changed, a boat came out and I helped the villager pole through the floes to the landing. He knew nothing about any crime.

When I reached the school I found the teacher very disinterested in providing me with any information. I finally asked her to send one of her pupils out into the village to find the person who had complained to her. She refused to give me any details as to the problem, saying her regulations prohibited her from getting involved in village problems. All she did was make the radio call for help.

An hour later a short Eskimo man of about 35 years came in and sat down in the corner. I had to use the school storeroom. He was unable to speak English and was a bit hard of hearing. Another hour was spent locating a friend of his who would translate. After many preliminaries, I learned that the man had planned to go hunting seal and that a week before I arrived he had taken his kayak down to the shore and left in it a .32–20 lever action rifle, a loaf of bread, a pound of tea, a box of ammunition, and a pot which fitted on an old gasoline stove. He had returned to the village to get some rope and other gear and noticed that two men were near his boat. When he returned, the property was gone.

He was sure he knew who took the equipment and because his hunt was delayed and he had counted on getting many seals, he was mad and wanted the law to put these people in jail. He said, through his friend, that he was willing to testify, to sign a complaint, and to appear as a witness. He could identify the property by certain marks.

This Hooper Bay citizen was, in my opinion, just about the perfect kind of complainant. And he wanted action. A check with key villagers revealed that the two men suspected of this crime were no longer in town but had left on a boat. I obtained their description but had little hope of finding them until they returned home. There is no village policeman in Hooper Bay and no magistrate so chances were they would be free for some time and my complainant would forever bear the idea that the State police were really not much help. As it turned out he was right.

The problem with a complainant is that he has to complain formally before a magistrate or a deputy magistrate and there was none any closer than Marshall, on the Yukon River. The Eskimo citizen said he wanted to complain and he would go to Marshall, if necessary, but he had no funds for travel. The whole village was interested in this case now. The fellow was loaded aboard the float plane and we flew back to Alakunuk where weather and a leaking float kept us over night. The Eskimo had friends there and slept in bed. There were no spare beds for the trooper. I slept on the floor of the school storeroom, in my sleeping bag.

The next morning we flew to Marshall and were ferried across the mighty Yukon to the village. Ludwig Ost met us at his front door. He hadn't seen a trooper in several months and hadn't had any court business but was interested in seeing justice done. Before hearing any details he insisted on having lunch served. It was an excellent meal of fresh salmon from the river at his back door, and home-baked bread.

Through his housekeeper deputy magistrate Ost learned of the crime. He looked through his Alaska statutes and came up with "larceny from a boat," a felony. He agreed that the criminals should be brought before the bar of justice and issued two felony warrants which charged the men with the boat theft. He said that a kayak was a boat and that was good enough for me.

PART 4. COMPANY TOWN

Three-quarters of the white people here think they are colonials—and behave like it."

The speaker was a Federal employee at Kotzebue, a community of about 1,700, located 20 miles north of the Arctic Circle on Kotzebue Sound.

Government employees stationed at Kotzebue live inexpensively in warm, well-heated, and roomy modern quarters separated from the native sections of town. They have running water and sewers—almost unknown in other parts of the community.

Elsewhere in the United States, it might be known as a "company town." Here the company is the Government—the doctors and nurses, teachers, aviation technicians, DEW-Line workers and others who live in Kotzebue briefly and then rotate to another assignment.

The Government is "the company" for the western and northern coasts of Alaska.

In the southwest, at Bethel and the villages beyond, you do not hear much criticism of the Government colony: the well water and light plant, the one nice village home—the one belonging to the BIA schoolteacher.

But in Kotzebue, where the economy is beginning to jerk with a vitality of its own, the critics talk.

"The white man does not consider the Eskimo's pride," said a long-time bush pilot, who is married to a Kotzebue girl. "We should leave the people a little pride—not try to make professional Eskimos out of them."

"The only thing the white man has given the Eskimo that really has been effective is tuberculosis," said a young man.

From a white man came this opinion of the Kotzebue Eskimo: "The better people stay in the villages—only the malcontents come to Kotzebue."

There is a great deal of intermarriage in Kotzebue. About 14 percent of the population is nonnative, 25 percent is Eskimo and the remaining 61 percent is an ethnic mixture.

There is no adequate water supply to most of the town and no distribution system. Water is delivered by truck in summer and costs $1.50 to $2 a barrel. In wintertime, ice is cut from nearby Ice Lake, chipped and delivered at a cost of $10 to $11 a ton. Much of the town is without sewers.

But better days appear close by. A high school is being built by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It will be completed next year. Lyle Bowen, a member of the Kotzebue City Council, said, "This is going to have the biggest impact on Kotzebue of anything that has ever been done here."

Many students and their families are expected to gravitate to Kotzebue from nearby villages because of the high school.

About 150 miles east, at a community once known as Kobuk but lately renamed "Boronite" the Kennecott Copper Co. is planning a large mining operation. Approximately 400 to 500 jobs may be created. Kotzebue is likely to be the center of activity for this development.

The planning and preliminaries for both these projects has had an economic impact on Kotzebue.

Throughout the world it has been observed that as conditions improve for a disadvantaged people, as some achieve a higher level of education and economic prosperity, there is increased friction with the nonnative colonist.

An Eskimo girl attending the University of Alaska recently gave this answer when asked why she was attending a school of higher learning:

"Another reason I am going * * * is to help my people * * * (they) need help because they are losing their right to govern themselves. There is only one person, an Eskimo without a college education, who represents (my district). There are too many Caucasians who are not capable of representing the Eskimo fully."

A girl from a religious mission school said:

"My most important reason for wanting a college education is to help my fellow Eskimos to assume the responsibilities of running their own affairs in the State rather than to have white people coming from other States and running Alaska affairs * * * the pastor practically runs the lives of the villagers. By that I mean, the priest is usually the powerful one. Whatever he says, the village without question or objection takes it. I want to help teach the natives to get along and run their own affairs and not always depending upon the white man for solutions."

Lee H. Salisbury, a speech professor at the University of Alaska, recently told of a particularly spirited class discussion that went this way:

"When they don't trust us in high school (referring to their boarding schools) we don't trust ourselves."

Salisbury said: "Then came a description of how the rigidly structured schools from which they had come never allowed them to make their own decisions."

The comments:

"You bathe at a certain hour," "you eat at a certain time," "you must go to the library at a certain time, you get your mail at a certain time," "they lead us around by the hand * * * we want to grow up but they won't let us." "It's the same thing with our parents, they won't let them grow up, either."

Said Salisbury: "For 'they' we can substitute the government, the schools, the missionaries, in short—the establishment."

One of the most frequent, vocal, and popular voices of dissent from the native community belongs to Ralph Purdue, an Athapaskan Indian who owns and operates a jewelry shop in Fairbanks.

Purdue, without being present, recently was elected chairman of a statewide native organization established under the Economic Opportunity Act to assist with village development projects.

"My definition of the Bureau of Indian Affairs," says Purdue, "is a well-organized group of hypocrites."

His criticism of the BIA begins with education and extends through every phase of the Bureau's operation. He charges the BIA with running segregated schools and says the Bureau has turned its back on native proposals to end the situation.

Purdue presently is at the forefront of a drive to build a dormitory in Fairbanks for high school students. Both native and nonnative youths from rural areas could use the dormitory, allowing them to attend Fairbanks schools, he says.

Purdue maintains that the BIA high schools are inferior to State and borough schools. The BIA, Purdue asserts, does not have sufficient facilities to supply the natives' educational demands. He says nearly 1,000 natives were turned away from BIA-operated schools this year. This contrasts with the BIA contention that about 300 youths who applied were unable to attend high school because of a space shortage.

Purdue strongly condemns the Bureau's personnel policies. Good people are shipped out, he says. He cited one case involving a BIA official who was unable to secure BIA approval of a village light plant project. The official helped the villagers get a Small Business Administration loan to set up the plant. For his trouble, Purdue contends, the official was transferred out of Alaska.

Despite his biting, often bitter criticism of the BIA, Purdue admits he does not object to the principle of the Bureau. His objection is to its methods of operation.

"Whatever they're in stinks so much you can't touch it with a 10-foot pole," he declares.

Until recently, the only formally organized natives in Alaska were the Indians of southeastern with their 2,000 member Alaska Native Brotherhood and Sisterhood. The organization exerts a measure of influence through the panhandle and in State politics. But it has never grown statewide.

In November 1961, the Inupiat Paitot was created to serve the Eskimo North. Six months later the Tanana Chiefs' Council formed as a spokesman for the Athapaskar Indians of the interior. The Cook Inlet Native Association formed in Anchorage in March 1964.

The native community has had its own newspaper, the Tundra Times since October 1962. It has been a bimonthly publication but early in 1966 will publish weekly Howard Rock, a Point Hope Eskimo who edits the newspaper, says that it circulates through most villages in Alaska.

The president of the Cook Inlet Association is Emil Notti, an electronics engineer with the Bureau of Land Management. He shares Purdue's concern about the BIA.

The BIA, he says, has done an about face in past years under pressure of natives, public officials, press and better leadership among the native community.

"Natives are suspicious of the Bureau and there is a strong undercurrent in the villages to phase it out," he says. Notti is not sure he favors this idea. He believes it would leave a vacuum that no other agency nor the natives themselves could readily fill.

As the native achieves, his outlook seems to change regarding the nonnative influences that shape the life of his community. Perhaps, however, it is not so much of a change as it is a greater ability of expression.

More than any single agency of government, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has influenced life in the villages. And it is the BIA that generally is the target for the native's critical harpoon.

(NOTE.—The following is the second and final installment of an article by Daily News photographer Joe Rychetnik, a former State Police trooper whose beat was Alaska's bush country. Yesterday he described his attempts to reach Hooper Bay, on Alaska's southwest coast after being advised of a crime there. The crime was the theft of a kayak and other possessions of a village resident. The story resumes as he is about to track down the suspected thieves.)

By radio I checked with a cannery in Alakunuk and learned that the two men in question were working on a tender at the mouth of the Yukon. I ordered the float plane to take us back down the river, dropped the Eskimo off at the village and headed out to the mouth, hoping to land alongside, take the men into custody, and be back in time for lunch.

The pilot and I found the vessel. The men in question waved at us from the deck. But the pilot brought up the subject of jurisdiction.

With the river in flood, just where were we in relation to the sovereign State of Alaska. I knew there was a 3-mile limit to certain jurisdiction and heard about a ruling setting a 12-mile limit around Alaska territory and wondered where I stood with my two felony warrants and the felons in sight.

We flew back and forth measuring the distance with a chronometer and air speed indicator and the best figures showed that we were 12.5 miles from the first bit of Alaska terra firma. It would take more legal talent than I possessed to pull this arrest off so I decided we would wait for the vessel in Alakunuk. Upon landing there, the complainant was surprised when the two felons were not aboard. I learned then that the fish tender was not planning to come into port for awhile and perhaps not at all. The pilot had to get back to Bethel with his leaking float so we all went.

Bethel has courts, and police, and good communications. I reached my office in Fairbanks and explained the situation. They were sympathetic but could offer no solution to the problem of getting the complainant back to his home in Hooper Bay. There are no funds for this. Also the fellow had never been in Bethel. It was the biggest town he had ever seen and he was a bit frightened by the traffic. I put him into the only bed available in town, gave him $10 for food, and told him to see me in the morning. I slept on the floor of the bush airline office.

Early in the morning he woke me up and said he was ready to go home. The $10 had been spent on groceries, which he had in two big boxes, all tied for travel. I still had no idea how to get him home when a Bureau of Land Management pilot came in for information as to the strip at, just our luck, Hooper Bay. He said he had room in his amphibian for us and the man was home, all smiles, 3 hours later.

I was still a long way from Nome and with no regular flights from Bethel except to Anchorage, agreed to join the BLM plane crew on an inspection trip up the river. This was going to bring a trooper to places like Akiak Crow Village, and Aniak on the Kuskokwim River and Holy Cross on the Yukon, and later Shageluk and Holikachuk on the Innoko River. My Fairbanks boss was pleased at the thought of a budget-saving free ride, all in the general direction of Nome.

At Holikachuk a bright red amphibian landed and Alaska's secretary of state landed with a delegation of Bureau of Indian Affairs people and said he was headed for Unalakleet and Nome. If I wanted to join them, I could get a ride home, eventually. We overflew Unalakleet because of bad weather and I was home for dinner 10 days after my trip began.

In compiling the police report I noted that the total value of goods stolen from the kayak, according to the best information, was about $32. Our costs in making the investigation would run about $1,100. There seemed to be something wrong with Alaska justice, I thought.

A letter back from Fairbanks commented that the State of Alaska should have bought the villager a new rifle, a lifetime supply of ammunition, a new stove, pot, and even a kayak for that price. Couldn't I have convinced the villager that he hadn't lost too much?

I told the man at detachment headquarters that my Eskimo was poor and anyway, the fellow didn't want a new anything, he wanted to see justice done, just the way he was told it would be done by the State police when they came around to the villages.

As far as I know, the two larceny suspects are still at large but down in Hooper Bay there is one fellow who really got his tax-dollar's worth.

In my tour of bush duty I have seen courtrooms set up in village stores, where everyone but the magistrate would sit on upended cases of canned milk. I have heard complete trials in Eskimo before an Eskimo judge, where all the important points of procedure were followed but no clerk could ever put it down. None of these sessions were before anyone trained in the law. Just ordinary people, with perhaps a bit more education than their fellow villagers, doing the best they could. For service as a local judge, they receive $60 a month or a bit more.

Often a judge would have to be flown into a village with the trooper. Usually a parade of reluctant witnesses would describe the acts of one of their neighbors that would involve burglary, rape, assault with a deadly weapon, destruction of private property, and other offenses. The judge would wrap it all up in disorderly conduct, which it was if nothing else, and send the miscreant to the Nome jail for 30 days.

A serious bush case would get attention but often, during the early years after statehood, the local enforcement and prosecution budget was exhausted by having to fly everyone into Nome or Bethel or Fairbanks for an important trial. Troopers would be asked unofficially to settle things out in the bush without bringing felony charges that would demand a preliminary hearing, a grand jury, and a superior court trial, in some far away place where perhaps a plane load of witnesses would have to be kept in the big city for days at State expense.

One village magistrate summed it up fairly well during a trial on a disorderly conduct case up north. She went through the complete process of explaining the defendant's rights under the law, and went into the reading of charges all in Eskimo. The list involved drunkenness, fighting, destruction of property, resisting arrest, abusive and foul language, and disturbing the peace. The defendant began to object but the judge, who knew her people well, quieted him down with, "You wouldn't be here if you weren't guilty," and the trial went on to a 30 days in jail conclusion.

PART 5. DEPENDENCY

The Bureau of Indian Affairs estimates that it serves about 400,000 Indians and Eskimos throughout the United States.

Alaska, with its 250,000 people, has the smallest population of any State in the union. But its 50,000 Eskimos, Indians and Aleuts represent a sizable proportion of the nation's aboriginal community, 12.5 per cent.

To carry out its functions in Alaska, the BIA, during the budget year that ended June 30, 1965, spent about $18 million in Alaska. It employs 900 persons in its Alaska administrative area.

Well ahead of all other costs of Bureau operation is education—$7,985,465 in the 1964–65 budget year. Other major functions in 1964–65 and their costs: welfare, $1,709,945; road construction, $1,255,718; operation of the motorship *North Star III*, which supplies Alaska coastal villages and communities, $1,725,286.

The BIA's main office is at Juneau. From here the southeastern panhandle is served and statewide operations administered. It has field offices in Anchorage, Fairbanks, Nome and Bethel. It operates a full-time boarding high school at Mount Edgecumbe, near Sitka, and a boarding school at Wrangell for youngsters in the ninth grade and below. Eighty BIA grammer schools are sprinkled throughout the State. A total of 5,650 students attend the grade schools, 1,750 the boarding schools.

At the present time, the Alaska area office of the BIA has no appointed Director. The man who served from January 1, 1962 to November 1965, Robert L. Bennett, has been named Deputy Commissioner of the BIA in Washington, D.C.

Bennett, 53, is an Oneida Indian from Wisconsin. During his tenure in Alaska he commanded considerable personal respect from the native community. His organization, however, has been the object of increasing criticism from native leaders.

Bennett sees the BIA's role this way:

"The purpose of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Alaska is to help the native develop himself to participate in the social, economic and political structure of the State and the United States."

He believes that this can be done without the native having to give up culture and tradition.

"Our program," says Bennett, "is not directed toward encouraging young people to leave the village. We hope to train him sufficiently to permit him to make a free choice about the future. Many are trained to go home to the village or remain in Alaska with a needed skill."

The resistance to change, in Bennett's view, is considerable, though largely passive.

"The ties to the village are very strong," he says. "This gives young people and parents alike much concern about the future. One result is that failure expectancy among youth is very high. Children get a limited outlook from their parents. Children expect their parents to advise them, but the parents, in so many cases, have not participated in the life that surrounds them.

"Anyone with a teenage child knows that sometimes it is difficult to give advice on goals and the future. Think of the difficulty when the child returns from boarding school to the village. The parents then feel the full sense of this inadequacy.

"The development of any people any place must be inward. All of the programs in the world that can be brought to Alaska will not achieve results unless the people have some desire for development. The young people are motivated this way. They will take advantage of any improvement program offered to them. I don't think we should particularly disturb the older people well established in the native cultural pattern. But I think we shoud provide opportunities for the younger people."

In a recent speech, Bennett characterized the native situation this way:

"When a minority group meets a dominant group there is a period of struggle followed by a period of frustration, and adaptation by inclusion. The period of frustration is extended by dependency when people are not forced to make a decision or to live with the consequences of their decision."

When surveying the Alaska native's present position in society, many persons—native and nonnative—refer to dependency. And the next word you hear is "welfare."

In the 1964 fiscal year, the BIA provided general assistance to 8,905 Alaska natives, or slightly less than 20 percent of the total native population. The State of Alaska estimates that of 7,000 persons on its welfare rolls, 80 percent, or approximately 5,600, are natives.

Gordon Cavnar, who directs the BIA's Alaska welfare program, estimates that about 75 percent of those receiving general assistance would be employable. His welfare budget for 1965–66 is $1,766,104. The State of Alaska has $6.1 million earmarked for welfare.

The State provides welfare to natives and nonnatives alike. Native families receive welfare checks from the State when they qualify under such programs as old-age assistance and aid to families with dependent children. The BIA assists principally natives who qualify for general relief.

George P. Spartz, director of the State division of welfare, estimates that 90 percent of the aid to dependent children cases are native. In the old-age assistance and aid to the disabled programs, 70 percent are native, he says.

"Two-thirds of our caseload is outside major populated areas," says Spartz. "This is unusual, since in most States welfare is generally an urban problem."

While he describes relations between the State and Federal welfare agencies as good, dual responsibilities lead to problems, most of them for welfare applicants, he says.

"Often a person comes to us for help and has to be batted back and forth between agencies while we try to determine eligibility," says Spartz.

Roy Pagenkopf, public assistance supervisor for the State, believes more should be done to assist welfare applicants.

"To become anything more than a dole," he says, "we have to provide some other services to help people become self-sufficient."

Everyone who discusses it, including those most deeply involved in the program, believe welfare is a poor answer to existing problems of native poverty.

"Welfare is not the answer," says Levi Browning, State commissioner of health and welfare. "We should be working hard over the next couple of generations to make them, in fact, citizens. The answer is not handing and just enough dollars to keep body and soul together."

"By and large," says Pagenkopf, "very few people really want to be on welfare. They generally exhaust every resource they have and start way behind by the time they got to us."

Cavnar, the BIA Administrator, does not believe the welfare check in itself saps initiative, however.

"If there is an individual case affected in this manner," he says, "it is certainly the exception. It is no more true for welfare than for veterans' benefits, unemployment compensation and other programs of this nature.

"I think lack of employment is the cause for dependency. When the economy improves, people don't even ask for financial help. The native people of Alaska return checks when the situation changes. We've had cases where people write on the envelope, 'Thanks, we don't need it now,' and send it back."

And Bennett summed it up this way recently to a native audience:

"You have a right to be proud of your heritage—be it Indian, Eskimo or Aleut, no matter what—and you must take care that it is not destroyed by the despoiling effects of dependency on others, such as the Government, the State, or even your village.

"You should not allow your culture and traditions to become an object of charity by others to keep alive. Rather, you owe to society the responsibility of contributing the good things of your culture or way of life to the general society for the good of all."

How do you tell a man who needs food for his family—and is waiting for money he expects to get—that you cannot sell to him?

Credit is a troublesome problem to the men who manage native village stores.

Under the village's agreement with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the source of loans to establish stores, credit is not encouraged.

"It's difficult—sometimes a man has to wait a long time to get paid," according to Arthur N. Daniels of Elim, who has been a store manager for 10 years. "There should be some credit allowed.'

Robert Newlin of Noorvik said he tries "to hew pretty close to the line" of the agreement.

Newlin has been a store manager for 17 years.

The two men were attending a meeting of store managers held recently in Nome. Seventeen villages had been invited to take part in the management training meeting, first of its kind. A second meeting is planned for the Bethel area sometime in January.

If a man does not have money, he can resort to a sort of barter to buy at the store, according to Leo E. Murphy, manager of the Alaska Native Industries Cooperative Association.

Credit will be advanced for a carving or a skin, according to Murphy.

"We caution the store managers not to overvalue something brought in for trade," he said. An estimate of 50 to 60 percent of the final value of the object is desirable, he said.

When the item finally is sold, the remainder of what it brings in goes to the original owner, he said.

The loan program has been in operation in Alaska for 25 years, according to George S. Wilson, chief of the bureau's native stores and industries section.

During that time, between $2.5 and $3 million has been loaned out at 5.5 percent interest on 10-year loans. Sixty percent of these loans have been paid off and there are no loans delinquent at this time, he added

When stores do go under, the main reason usually is granting too much credit, Murphy said.

Another problem store managers must overcome is ordering sufficient supplies to last out their sale year. Orders are placed in January with delivery generally from July to September. Goods ordered must last through the summer of the following year.

Ordered in large quantities and shipped on the *North Star III*, the cost of freight for supplies is greatly reduced.

Village stores handle a wide variety of goods—minor drug items, food, clothing, hardware, fuel oil, outboard motors, guns and ammunition.

Years ago, dried foods were most popular, according to Newlin.

Today, canned foods which are easier to prepare are more in demand, he said.

Part 6. The School

The white man's schools have existed in Alaska for more than 180 years.

Russian schools taught Alaska's natives to be useful servants. Church schools brought their alien God. Only recently the needs of the native, rather than the white man, have dictated the scope of native education.

To educate the Alaska native child, since 1931 the U.S. Government has worked through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Bureau has more than $8 million included in its present budget for the operation of schools in Alaska. Additionally, it has two expensive school construction projects under way—new high schools at Kotzebue and Barrow.

It is a segregated system of education, segregation dictated largely by the distribution of Alaska's native population.

The Bureau operates 80 grade schools, a boarding school at Wrangell for 250 students in grades one through nine, and Mount Edgecumbe, a boarding high school at Sitka with room for 650 students. In addition, the Bureau arranges for Alaska native students to attend Chemawa, an ungraded high school at Salem, Oreg., which Alaska natives share with Navajo Indans.

The State of Alaska is in the business of native education, too. An equal number of native youngsters, perhaps slightly more, attend State operated public schools.

Eventually the State will administer all rural Alaska schools with Federal assistance. This general agreement exists at both State and Federal levels.

Money has been the determining factor in the relatively slow rate of school transfer. The BIA spends from $650 to $1,200 a year to maintain one native student in its day schools. The average is about $850. Boarding school costs per student are higher—$2,300. The State spends an estimated $650 per student annually in the schools it operates primarily for native children.

Because of distance, isolation and variations in class sizes, rural costs understandably are higher than urban education costs. Anchorage area schools spend only $586 per student and the program is considerably more varied.

An $8 million additional burden for rural education approximates 10 percent of the total current State budget for all programs, It is a venture the State is embracing cautiously.

And so, for the foreseeable present, the BIA and State will administer parallel educational systems in Alaska's villages and larger native communities.

Transfer of organizational responsibilities is not the only change apparent in native education. Those who have researched the subject have expressed second thoughts about what is taught, how it is taught, and where it is taught.

Reliable studies conducted in 1960 indicated that of native youths 14 to 19 years old, only 34 percent were enrolled in secondary schools. The University of Alaska reports that dropout rates as high as 60 percent of the total enrollment were found in BIA schools in grades 1 through 8.

University surveys have disclosed that of the Alaska native students who survive attrition rates of 60 percent in elementary school and 28 percent in high school, half will not complete their freshman year of college and less than 2 percent are likely to receive the baccalaureate degree at the end of 4 years.

Native enrollment at the university is presently 145, or about 9 percent of total university enrollment. The percentage has remained fairly constant during this decade.

There is a facility problem, too. Three hundred native youths who applied to Mount Edgecumbe this school year were turned down for lack of space.

Former Alaska BIA Director Robert L. Bennett admitted recently that "the demand for education has far exceeded educational space."

The space problem is receiving considerable attention. Two boarding high schools, with capacities for 210 students each, are being constructed at Kotzebue and Barrow. Plans are being made to expand Mount Edgecumbe to house 1,000 students rather than the present 650. The BIA estimates it has spent about $6 million in Alaska school construction within the past 4 years.

The State of Alaska also has aggressively challenged the space problem. With general obligation bond funds it has constructed the William E. Beltz vocational school at Nome and is planning a similar facility at Kodiak. Millions have been spent on rural school construction during the past 4 years, much of it in areas with primarily native populations.

Perhaps as important as the new classrooms is the changing concept of education which they reflect.

Construction of high schools at Kotzebue and Barrow, where building costs are the highest in the Nation, indicates an official view that the extra cost is necessary—that students are better off at home or more near home as they pursue their education.

The Nome vocational school, conceived by the State and financed through its first 2 years as a Federal Manpower Development and Training project, places considerable emphasis on the relationship between education and employment.

Courses at the school are set up after a review of job opportunities in the field have shown a need. Surveyors or mechanics or clerks are trained when employers indicate they have jobs available. Thus students are likely to find jobs when they graduate.

Other classes have included ivory carving, airport and other maintenance work.

While schools can be located and designed to better meet the apparent needs of the native student, the heart of the matter—what is taught—remains an elusive element in a satisfactory system of rural education.

Studies have indicated no noticeable differences of intellectual ability based on race. Yet after decades and generations of formal village education, achievement is a problem for those who remain in school, and those who remain represent a minority of youngsters eligible to attend.

Curricular adaptation to the native environment was one of the major recommendations made by a committee of educational experts who reviewed native education working under contract with the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In its report, issued in 1962 after extensive study of Alaska native secondary school dropouts, the committee said:

"Special instructional techniques must be utilized which deal specifically with teaching English to bilingual or non-English-speaking people. Students must be shown the relationship between their school work and their lives."

Other committee recommendations:

Standards of student promotion and grading based on the student's own abilities and background rather than imported standards.

Clearly organized programs to educate all the people of the village about the importance of the school.

Orientation for teachers entering this environment.

Greater reliance on the community and the students in establishing school rules and procedures.

A closer linking in the student's mind of the school experience and future employment possibilities.

In short, this report and others have encouraged development of native education that is more clearly, carefully and precisely conceived for the benefit of the Alaska native.

Philleo Nash is responsible for the operation of about 25 million worth of educational facilities for the Alaska native. And he says he'd like to get out of the business.

Nash is commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Nash and his Bureau is under constant fire because of the BIA schools. Many native leaders want the schools turned over to the State.

To this Nash says, "As far as I'm concerned, I can transfer the whole system tomorrow."

But he adds that the system is too costly to operate for the State to take over, at least at one crack.

In some cases, Nash said, the State has declined to take over BIA schools because they were "substandard." However, the BIA is moving to ease that obstacle. It has put about $6 million into school construction in the State within the last 4 years, according to Nash.

Nash also points to the expense of running a school in the Arctic as a major roadblock to a rapid transfer of BIA schools to the State.

Nash, an anthropologist of some note, is highly sensitive to charges that the BIA fosters segregation.

He says the BIA schools can hardly be otherwise. However, he adds that there is nothing in the law which prevents nonnatives from attending BIA schools, providing there is no other school for them to attend.

"I am ready to pay respects to the concept of public education, but not if the public isn't democratic," Nash says. He points out that public schools do not usually have native teachers or staff members.

"If we depend upon public high schools which are nominally integrated, we will get a group of nonfunctional high school graduates," he says.

He takes the view that special approaches have to be taken to stem the native dropout problem.

In fact, Nash says that nonnatives do go to BIA schools in some villages. They are required to pay tuition fees about equal to what school taxes would be, he says.

He stresses that BIA schools are charged with educating natives and are, therefore, located in native centers where few nonwhites live.

Nash is also quick to react to charges that the BIA schools provide substandard education. He maintains this is not the case. He says the BIA operates 27 day and boarding schools across the country. In the past 4 years, he says, the dropout rate in the BIA schools has decreased considerably compared with the rest of the Nation.

In 1965, 78 out of 100 natives were on hand for graduation from BIA schools, according to Nash.

"Do I know why? No," Nash says.

He claims the BIA has "done everything" to improve the schools and teaching.

Recruiting efforts have intensified; teachers are paid more; schools have been physically improved; more study on the part of BIA teachers has been encouraged, according to Nash.

He says the Bureau has also instituted an "active summer program" including arithmetic and English with emphasis on listening and speaking, reading and writing.

Beginning in 1961 a reorganization of the education and plant management sections of the Bureau made possible summer jobs for between 1,000 and 1,200 high school and college age native students. He attributes to this program much credit in reducing the dropout rate. And he expects the Job Corps program will have even greater impact.

Nash says it is his "curbstone opinion" that a lack of spending money and adequately stylish clothes are major reasons for native dropouts. When the students are given an opportunity to earn money in BIA or other programs, he says, they spend the money on clothes. Then, he says, they can "hold their heads up."

PART 7. THE TLINGITS

Southeast Alaska commonly is referred to as the State's banana belt.

Temperatures rarely dip below zero, often remain above freezing. Here there is no permafrost and few violent sharp-edged icy storms. Summer is mild and sometimes balmy.

From the air, the natural richness of the region is strikingly apparent—the huge spruce and hemlock forests, the almost tropical-looking islands that give the region somewhat the appearance of an unsolved jig-saw puzzle. The islands create a protected passage for ships. To the east are the snow-topped peaks that divide this sliver of Alaska from British Columbia.

Rainfall is considerable, particularly in the southern and mid-panhandle. It contributes to the growth of dense vegetation which supports deer and bear and provides a ready supply of berries.

The water is rich, too. Rich in salmon, trout and herring. The inland waterways, though sometimes made dangerous by rapidly changing weather conditions and local factors, generally provide a convenient, inexpensive highway for the commercial or sports fisherman.

This is the home of the Tlingit Indian (pronounced Klink-it). Here he once thrived on the resources of the land and sea. The spruce and hemlock provided an endless supply of wood for homes and utensils and vessels and totems. His culture was once so rich that to give away most of what he owned at a "potlach" was to gain the greatest possible prestige. It was not difficult for him to find additional wealth in a brief period of time.

As opposed to the relatively docile Eskimo, the Tlingit was aggressive. He fought the invading white man and other Indian tribes. He was the master of all he surveyed. His social structure was caste-like, involving nobility and slaves.

Sharing the panhandle with the ruling Tlingit was the Haida, who inhabited the southern end of Prince of Wales Island—the southernmost point of Alaska, and the Tsimpshian, who migrated from British Columbia led by an English missionary.

About 8,000 Tlingits live in southeast Alaska today. The Haidas and Tsimpshians each number about 1,000.

The days of dominance are over for the Tlingit. Today it is the white man who has the most material possessions and is best equipped to gain more. The salmon is not as plentiful and since his was largely a salmon-based economy, the Tlingit's economic fortunes have declined. He lives in Kake, Angoon, Klukwan, Klawock, and other communities which do not match the modern conditions available at neighboring largely nonnative communities such as Juneau, Sitka and Ketchikan.

Compared, however, with the contemporary Eskimo who populates the western and northern coasts of Alaska, and with the Athapascan Indians of the Interior, the Tlingit is far ahead on any scale of opportunity.

While average unemployment rates commonly are 20 to 30 percent of the total workforce in the village North, they are one-half to one-fourth that in the panhandle. The infant mortality rate, the number of substandard homes, educational achievement—all indicators of the life of a people—show progress for the southeastern Indian.

He is not isolated. The nearest modern town is a convenient boat trip away. Telephones are available. Living costs and transportation costs are cheaper than in the North Country. There is a great deal of cultural association with nonnatives and this has helped him overcome language barriers. Many natives have migrated to the city and integrated into city life. The southeastern villager sees the Western world—not on film or in the person of a visiting government official or tourist—but as a neighbor. And he is in a much better position than the villagers of the North to benefit from it.

Southeastern Alaska increasingly is more prosperous as an economic region. In recent years, pulp mills have been established at Ketchikan and Sitka and logging camps to feed them have been carved at many points in between. A third pulp mill is being planned for the Juneau area. The State's southeast marine highway system—regularly scheduled luxury ferries that ply the inside passage from Prince Rupert, B.C., in the south to the land highway system at Haines in the north—has provided many jobs and increased the volume of tourist dollars. While still a gamble, the summer salmon season no longer is a predictable failure, as it was through the fifties. Statehood has given more importance to Alaska government, and Juneau, as the State capital, has developed rapidly.

"Lots of people are coming back now," says Frank See, mayor of Hoonah.

"In the olden days," he says, "the young people went and never did return home. Now we keep the young people here."

Crab processing has helped take up the winter job void. A high school recently was established at Hoonah by the State of Alaska. Hoonah also has its eye on development of a sawmill, according to See.

About 700 people live in the village, which is 50 boat miles from Juneau. In 1945 fire destroyed most of the community. At the time, family clans, perhaps 10 to 15 of them, lived in one large house. When the village was rebuilt, it was done largely on a one-family basis. Most homes have three to five rooms, indoor plumbing and oil stoves. The village has applied under a Federal self-help program for construction of 45 single family units.

Frank See has been mayor of Hoonah for 7 years. In 1964 he was elected to the State legislature in a district encompassing the largely nonnative communities of Skagway and Haines and the native communities of Hoonah, Klukwan and Yakutat.

In November, See was elected grand president of the Alaska Native Brotherhood, an organization of about 2,000 which exerts considerable social influence on southeastern Indians and has a measure of statewide political importance.

See is one of many southeastern Indians who have achieved prominence. Frank Peratovich, or Klawock, is a longtime State legislator and two-term president of the State senate. His brother, Roy, is tribal affairs officer for the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Juneau and a member of the State Commission on Human Rights. The Reverend Walter Soboloff, a Juneau Protestant minister, is a powerful voice in native life and helped train a recent group of domestic peace corps volunteers for village work.

It was not too many years ago, during World War II and shortly thereafter, that the "white only" and "no natives allowed" signs could be seen on business establishments in Juneau and other southeastern communities. That type of discrimination, long outlawed by territorial legislation, no longer exists.

But ghettos of the past remain, even in Juneau. In the immediate downtown area is a huddle of homes known as the village. Poorer native families live there in unpainted, largely unimproved framehouses. For years the existence of the village was largely overlooked or taken for granted. The families have never had title to the land. They have lived all or most of their lives in downtown Juneau as legal squatters.

Now, however, progress is being made toward settling the ownership question.

Land ownership. To most southeastern natives, that is today's most important question.

The U.S. Court of Claims has ruled, in what is commonly known as the Haida-Tlingit case, that tribal members and their descendants are entitled to recover compensation from the United States for 18 million acres of southeastern Alaska land taken from them. Attorneys for the tribe and the Government are attempting to agree on what the land was worth at the time it was taken. Whatever the outcome, Federal payment undoubtedly will run into the millions of dollars. The court and Congress must both approve the final agreement. If no agreement is reached, both sides will have to march back into the courtroom to argue value.

Anticipating the large sum of money that is bound to result from this decision, southeastern natives have been attempting to develop a plan for distribution of the money. Some is likely to be released on a per capita basis to each qualified tribal member and descendant. The remainder will likely go into improvement programs for education, housing, community development, and other community needs.

Settlement of the Haida-Tlingit case will resolve the southeastern land claim question. But southeastern is Alaska's smallest identifiable land region.

In Alaska's vast interior, along its coasts, other claims have been entered by other people—the village people of the North.

That problem, the basic question of who has rights to much of Alaska's valuable land mass, is yet to be resolved.

Part 8. Land

When Congress approved the first Alaska Organic Act, in 1884, it said:

"The Indians or other persons * * * shall not be disturbed in the possession of any lands actually in their use or occupation or now claimed by them."

At the present time, the "Indians and other persons" of Alaska have entered claims for 122 million acres of land based on the foregoing congressional provision. That represents slight more than one-fifth of Alaska and possibly a majority of the valuable land area—the streambeds, river valleys, plains, and forests.

In 1884 Congress also reserved for itself the right to make the final decision on native land ownership. Today, 81 years later, that decision has not been made.

And so, most of Alaska, the largest State in the Nation, twice the size of Texas, one-fifth as large as all other States combined, is in legal limbo.

Increasingly, however, there is pressure for action.

With statehood, the State of Alaska gained the right to select more than 100 million acres of Federal domain for its own over a 25-year period. Predictably, the State has selected land which conflicts with village claims. They conflict on a total of 9,894,608 acres.

Altogether, native protests affect 15,668,168 acres of public and private land in Alaska. This represents an area larger than nine of the other 49 States. Some disputes involve native protests filed before statehood. Other protests came in response to State selection.

The present arbiter of the problem is the U.S. Department of Interior. Through its Bureau of Land Management, it is responsible for transferring Federal lands to the State under the selection program. But through its Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Department also is the guardian of native rights. Faced with the dual responsibility, the Department has refused to patent any lands in dispute. Until the ownership is settled, the State's land selection program is largely an academic exercise.

Most of the conflicts between State and native claims are in Alaska's interior region. Historically, the interior has been the home of the Athapascan Indian. He has fished and hunted and trapped along the watershed of the Yukon River, the upper regions of the Kuskokwim and the entire watershed area draining into Cook Inlet and the Gulf of Alaska.

The Athapascans have relied heavily on the Yukon salmon and the fur-bearing arctic fox, beaver and other animals that roam the area. They have roamed with them. While not nomadic, the interior village people have followed the salmon and set up summer fish camps. Their trap lines may extend sometimes 20 to 60 miles.

Roscoe Bell, director of the State division of lands, says at the Indian village of Minto, 40 miles west of Fairbanks, 80 percent of the cash economy is from trapping. He estimates that three our of four native families in the interior earn at least part of their income from trapping.

In a letter to Bell, Alex Solomon Jr., of Kaltag, wrote: "My father and me been using this trapline as far as I could remember. I want it registered soon as possible because there are some trappers moving in on the land so, I want protection for it."

Said Alfred Starr of Nenana: "Big payroll at Clear. No Indians from Nenana or Minto ever get job there. We want to know how we are going to make a living or our children will live. It look to us land only answer. Land as we use to use it. Hunting and trapping is the only answer about our living in years to come."

If an Alaska native lives in a populated area and wants to buy a home, he can. If he wants to buy available private land, he can. He need not ask anyone's approval, advice or permission.

Most Alaska natives, however, live in the villages. And if they intend to remain they can gain land only in two ways.

They can receive a native allotment of a maximum of 160 acres. It need not all be in one place. Some of the acreage may be at his home, some at his fish camp and the remainder at his trapline.

They may also claim title to a lot within a townsite.

Both programs have been relatively worthless to the Alaska native in the past, but rapidly are becoming important.

Recently, the Department of Interior ruled that the native allotment did not have to cover 160 adjoining acres. This reversed a longstanding Department policy. In July 1962, under the more restrictive provisions, only 100 grants of title had been made. Today 1,219 applications are on file in addition to a great many that already have been certified and approved.

Similarly, as with the native allotment, the townsite program was something less than an active influence in the past. Bogged down in conflicting rulings and interpretations on the meaning of the original Townsite Act, as recently as July 1962 only 31 native townsites had been surveyed and 69 additional requests were on file. Most administrative problems now have been cleared and as a result, about 200 communities have applied for townsite surveys.

Under both the native allotment and townsite programs, however, the native receives a restricted title to his land. He cannot sell it or dispose of it in any way. The only transfer that can be made is to his heirs.

The only unrestricted native titles have come from the State of Alaska. These were given to families at Port Lions, a new Aleut community constructed on Kodiak Island to replace one destroyed in the March 1964 earthquake.

The State is also considering legislation to register native traplines. A bill for that purpose was introduced at the 1965 session of the State legislature.

What lies beyond the trapline and fish camp and townsite, however, is an open question. Until it is resolved by Congress, the development of the vast interior reaches of Alaska and the lives of thousands of people who live there remain unsettled.

Robert L. Bennett, Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, expresses hope that the problem can be resolved outside the courtroom. Most natives affected undoubtedly hope so, too. In 1935 Congress first authorized a suit by the Tlingits and Haidas of southeastern Alaska for compensation to lands the tribes claimed were taken from them by the U.S. Government. Twenty-four years later the tribes finally received a favorable decision. And to this day the issue of how much compensation is involved remains unresolved, with another suit to determine value a possibility. Land claim cases generally are not settled with notable speed in court.

If the Government agrees that the native is entitled to the land which he occupies, it could involve title and fishing privileges along the Yukon, the giant river that carves Alaska in two. As the Yukon meanders, the fish camps change with it. Traps move. The interior Indian follows the fish and game about him.

Interior natives live in a land of trees, and trees they have used for building log homes. They burn wood to keep warm in a region where temperatures sometimes plummet to 60 degrees below zero. Some earn a bit from their traps and the remainder of their cash income as firefighters for the Bureau of Land Management. Many do not speak English well or at all.

The river provides both the salmon and the transportation route for barges which bring supplies and equipment.

Where the Yukon meets the Tanana River lies the community of Tanana, an important interior native center. This community has been influenced greatly by the white man. During gold rush days at the turn of the century, it was a stop for the miners. The Army's Fort Gibson was here. Today it has a Public Health Service hospital, a Federal Aviation Agency center, a White Alice communications site. The homes are neater in appearance to those in the city than to those in nearby villages. Some have lawns. Most are well kept.

Further downriver is Galena and Ruby and other communities not so well off economically. Upriver is Rampart.

Rampart is fast becoming one of the most well-known names in Alaska. If Congress allocates funds to construct a massive dam near the village—a proposal now receiving intensive study in Washington, D.C.—Rampart will be one of the most familiar names in the world. As proposed, the dam would generate more electrical capacity than any now in existence in the United States.

Its purpose would be to regulate the mighty Yukon, provide relatively inexpensive power to add to the Nation's supply, and at the same time be a massive influence on the economic development of Alaska. The reservoir created behind the dam would flood 9 villages, including Fort Yukon, a community of about 700. An estimated 2,000 natives would be forced to relocate.

The proposal has drawn mixed reactions from natives in the area and native leaders generally. Some have argued they do not want to leave a region that has been their home for generations. Others see Rampart as a tremendous benefit for Alaska natives, particularly interior natives, who would have greater job opportunities and better living conditions.

The Rampart question remains to be settled. So does the matter of native land claims throughout the State.

Pressures are rising for decisions on these two key matters—decisions that only Congress can make—decisions that may influence the future of Alaska's village people for generations to come.

Part 9. Top of the World

Point Barrow is a level land finger pointing off the northern boundary of the North American Continent.

Seven miles south is the community of Barrow. When you get there, you do not continue north unless your destination is the Arctic Ocean.

In a region of isolated villages, Barrow is perhaps most isolated. It is 480 miles northwest of Fairbanks, with the Brooks Range in between. There are few settlements along this northern coast or on the arctic slope of the Brooks Range. While tourists have been visiting Kotzebue and Nome for many years to see the northern Eskimo, only during the past few years have regularly scheduled flights brought the tourist to Barrow.

It is geographically the end of the earth, the top of the world.

But today, it also is economically on top of the world.

Since 1963 more than $7 million worth of construction projects have been completed or are nearing completion. For Barrow villagers, this has meant jobs and reasonably steady paychecks.

The Arctic Research Laboratory, a University of Alaska offshoot working under contract with the U.S. Navy and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, has been given dramatic assignments in recent years, many of them handled out of the laboratory's Barrow installation. Rockets have been launched from the tundra nearby. Ice islands have been located, manned, and supported from here.

A dam has been constructed to provide a permanent and reasonably usable supply of fresh water to the Government complex. By recent act of Congress, natural gas from a nearby naval petroleum reserve has been made available to villagers to replace expensive fuel oil. The townsite is being surveyed and village homes are being moved to form a normal street pattern. Electricity is now available at relatively inexpensive rates. The State has completed an airport which brings in Wien Airline F-27 prop-jets from Fairbanks. A high school is under construction.

In all, it has been a massive injection of progress for Barrow. Snow vehicles and light motorcycles block the entrance to the town movie theater on Saturday night when teenagers hold their weekly dance. The youths are well dressed in the latest teenage fashions.

The community outlook is positive. A group of young men have formed an organization called the Barrow Improvement Board. One of the organization's aims is to set up a system for picking up garbage and human waste and dispose of it away from the village. The board proposes scheduled pickups every day or second day. It is investigating the possibility of purchasing an incinerator to burn this refuse. At present, sewage is stored in 50 gallon drums.

About $5 million worth of recent construction was carried out by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. An estimated 60 percent of the total represents labor costs.

According to Harold Peoples, assistant chief construction supervisor for the BIA in Alaska, about 95 percent of the labor for the Barrow BIA projects was supplied by the village.

One of these projects was a 1,280-foot dam across the mouth of Nerravak Lagoon. The dam project was necessary, according to Peoples, to establish a fresh water supply source. Although the water is still brackish, it is now usable. The BIA has a water purification plant. Both service the Government complex.

Peoples said that since about October 1963, the BIA branch of plant design and construction has employed an average of from 80 to 110 villagers on its projects. The payroll, Peoples says, averages between $3,000 and $4,000 a day.

The BIA has a light plant which services both the Government buildings and the community through Barrow Utilities, and REA distribution system built with loans from the BIA as well as the Rural Electrification Administration. The village-run cooperative distributes gas taken from the petroleum reserve. Until recently the gas served only the Government complex because Federal law prohibited its use by private citizens. This led to situations where emergency supplies of oil would have to be airlifted to Barrow to help people who live side by side with an available, installed supply of gas. Transmission lines from the reserve are BIA facilities.

The high school is equipped with laboratories, home economics class facilities, a full-size gym, and workshops.

Construction of the new Public Health Service hospital and the State's airport had somewhat less of a direct economic impact on the village pocketbook. Few villagers were employed on these jobs. They were contracted to private firms and the hiring was done mainly in Fairbanks.

The hospital was about a $2 million project, not including other costs charged to it, but actually for its use as the dam.

In addition to the construction projects, villagers work at the Arctic Research Laboratory, which estimates its annual cost of labor and services in Barrow at $250,000.

Despite the economic and social progress of the community, problems remain. Housing is one. A visitor recently went to a frame home, 8 by 12 feet in size. Six people live there, along with a Honda, which stands between the shack's two beds.

Even where the family has an income, home construction is a difficult proposition. Because of permafrost, normal construction methods are impossible, and underground utilities are prohibitively expensive. The BIA spent $500,000 installing utilidors to service the Government complex—a limited area of the community. Federal home loan programs all require sewers and running water—flush toilets, in fact.

Standard practice for building a home in Barrow is to use a 5-year, 8.5-percent commercial bank loan. Even then, villagers have trouble.

In one case, a young, newly married electrician's assistant sought a loan to build a 912 square foot, 6-room house. He wanted $8,500 for 5 years. The total cost of the house was estimated at $11,000. He was turned down.

He and his wife were living with her family. Eleven people share a home measuring 18 by 24, 432 square feet.

In another case, a villager employed at the powerplant was turned down for a home construction loan. He had $700 and borrowed $3,000 from Tom Brower, Barrow's wealthiest resident and largest storekeeper. He built a 16 by 20 feet house on which he is making payments of about $300 a month out of a salary of $600.

FHA programs are not extended to the villages because standards conflict. Few homes in the Arctic would meet FHA minimum space standards, let alone plumbing standards.

Brower says he charges no interest on his loans and never has had a default.

"They claim it will take two to three generations to solve the problem of Alaska's villages," said one Barrow man. "Just looking at what has happened here in a few years, I don't think that has to be true."

Barrow is one example of a community that has quickly advanced with an injection of income and community facilities.

Tyonek is another.

About 50 air miles west of Anchorage, on the shore of Cook Inlet, Tyonek is in the fortunate position of being oil rich.

Ten years ago, villagers were on the verge of famine and Anchorage pilots flew rescue missions to aid them. Today the village treasury has been fattened by $12 million in oil lease sale returns.

The villagers are using their new wealth to improve their community. New homes are being completed. A new school is planned. There will be new furniture in the homes and streets outside their doors. The less than adequate water system is due to be enlarged.

To make certain the village spends its money wisely, the council sent one of the villagers to other States to learn how to handle community financial affairs. Some months ago, a delegation of villagers visited Indian communities in many States to find out how they were shaping their economies.

The money is being spent through the village council with the guidance of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Togiak, situated at the end of a narrow harbor on the southwest coast of Alaska, is another example of a community on the move.

Its primary source of income is the salmon which enters Togiak River. It also reaps a fur harvest from the foothills of the nearby Kuskokwim Mountain Range.

Recently the village launched a new venture. Three villagers applied for and received a supply of reindeer from nearby Nunivak Island where a large herd is managed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The animals were flown in by the Alaska Air National Guard and transferred to Hagenmeister Island by boat, a distance of 20 miles. Here, protected from wolves and other predators, the animals are free to roam about the island. When the reindeer population is sufficient, the villagers hope to bring to life a new industry.

Many villagers make in excess of $25,000 a year. There is no welfare. Although many homes are unpainted, they are large, well heated and in some cases have separate rooms for eating, sleeping, and living.

The village is split by an airstrip. On one side is the modern BIA school and housing for the teachers. About a dozen native families also have homes there. The buildings face Togiak Bay. Villagers on the other side have a small river running at the rear of their homes, providing an area in which to beach their boats and make repairs. Many homes have steam baths.

While most Alaska villages—particularly those in the interior, in the Yukon and Kuskokwim Deltas, and along the Bering Sea coast—are a world apart from what the Alaska city dweller would consider mid-20th century standards, there are exceptions to the rule. In some cases, they are dramatic exceptions—pocket revolutions that have occurred overnight with an injection of economic opportunity.

PART 10. IN THE CITY

"Figure out the problem of Anchorage's Fourth Avenue and its bars and you will have solved a problem for the whole State."

It sounded simple when put that way by a young Alaska Indian woman who has made her adjustment to urban living. Many Alaska natives do not—or cannot make such an adjustment.

Natives who leave their villages and come to the city want badly to be accepted, according to Emil Notti, president of the Cook Inlet Native Association. Notti, an Athapascan Indian from the Yukon River village of Ruby, is an electronics engineer with the Bureau of Land Management in Anchorage.

"Often they pattern their actions on those of white people they have met in their villages who feel getting drunk Saturday night is important," Notti said.

Not altogether true differed Mrs. Mae Stanley, an Indian woman whose husband works in construction.

Highly social in his village, the native "needs people," she said. When he trades a society where people do things together for the city where he walks alone, he is lost, she added.

"Lonesomeness drives him to Fourth Avenue," she continued. "Sooner or later he will meet somebody he knows there."

She said when she came to Anchorage, she used to walk down Fourth Avenue in hopes of finding a familiar face.

Loneliness is not the only obstacle the native newly arrived in the city must overcome. While the opportunity generally exists in the city, "The natives usually are not able to come forward and grasp it," says Notti.

"They're meek when they come out of the village. If somebody tells them 'no' when they go to ask for a job, they are not likely to come back. The few who makes it—they're good," he adds.

An estimated 4,500 natives live in Anchorage, an urban area of about 100,000. It is the largest single concentration of natives anywhere in Alaska.

Although there is no "native area" as such in Anchorage, there is lack of low-income housing in the community, forcing natives generally to live in overcrowded conditions here, Notti believes.

Many village people come to Anchorage for the first time as patients at the 380-bed Public Health Service hospital. Others are brought here to enter the Alaska Psychiatric Institute. Of 201 patients at the State mental institution, 113 presently are natives. This does not include the number of alcoholics receiving treatment.

"Many people feel alcoholism is one of the most serious native problems and it is a problem that affects their mental health," says Dr. Karl Bowman, director of the State division of mental health.

The Psychiatric Institute, he says, prefers to help alcoholics on an outpatient basis.

"We have to teach them to live in a world where alcohol is present," he says. "This can't be done by keeping them away from liquor."

Why is alcoholism such a problem for natives?

"When a primitive people are overcome by a higher culture," says Dr. Bowman, "unfortunately they do not react by taking the best from the new culture, but rather the worst. Alcoholism is an example of this."

Alcohol is a widespread native problem, not limited to Anchorage and the larger cities. Some villages have prohibited its use. Some have placed controls on it—operating a village liquor store with certain specified hours of business. Profits generally go to the village treasury for public improvements.

Where liquor is outlawed completely, bootlegging generally is an active business.

In the city, alcohol can quickly lead the native into other problems.

P. L. Severson, chief of correctional institutions for the State, says most natives who get in trouble with the law do so because of alcohol.

"When the crime isn't drunk and disorderly, it is usually petty theft or minor assault," he says. "Natives aren't much for crimes of violence."

Tom Drake, Severson's assistant, said population ratios show that natives aren't involved in serious crimes as much as nonnatives. Drake formerly served as superintendent of the Nome jail. He is half Eskimo.

Dr. Bowman believes the problems of mental distress which bring most Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts to the hospital result from one culture imposing itself on another.

"Originally," Dr. Bowman said, "the natives placed values on certain things. Then the white man came and the native found the values he had in the first place are part of his downfall when he is adapting to this new culture."

It is a "difficult adjustment" for them to make, Dr. Bowman said. He said it is hard for a people to discover their "inability" to make their "natural culture survive in its true form."

Alcoholism and mental disturbance—both afflictions are recognized as being common to the city native and the village native.

Perhaps not so widely recognized are the implications of the native birth rate.

For the period from 1952 through 1963, the crude rate of natural increase for Alaska's northwest ranged from 2.9 percent to 4 percent. In the interior it was 3.7 to 5.2 percent; in the southwest, 2 to 3.8; in southcentral 3.1 to 4.9 and in southeast 3.1 to 3.8.

Alaska economist Dr. George Rogers points out that these rates of natural increase are about the highest in the world. The United States in mid-1962 had an annual rate of natural increase of 1.6 percent. Europe had 0.9 percent. Central America, including the Caribbean, 2.9 percent, South America and southeast Asia, 2.7 percent. Southwest Asia 2.6 percent.

Neither the State nor the U.S. Public Health Service has undertaken an active program to encourage birth control.

Dr. Levi Browning, commissioner of the State department of health and welfare, says some State nurses on their own may give advice on birth control but his department cannot launch such a program until "backed up by law."

Dr. Holman Wherritt, Director of the Public Health Service in Alaska, said doctors may prescribe birth control procedures only on a medical basis.

"We really don't have a program," said Dr. Wherritt. "We're not trying to drum up trade, pass out literature, or start a campaign to control births. We're not trying to educate people and try to get them to use these (birth control) services."

Birth control, he said, "is a religious, legal, medical, social, and moral problem * * * an organization such as the Public Health Service has to be careful not to get involved." He said the service is not permitted to provide for families who have too many children.

"If a doctor does this, and I find out about it, he will hear from me," said Dr. Wherritt.

Mrs. Ella Craig, supervisory social worker for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Anchorage area, said the BIA has been instructed by the Department of the Interior to distribute information about birth control to natives.

She said: "Although we cannot distribute birth control means, we can still advise and give information.

"This is really not our job, but the PHS isn't allowed to distribute birth control information except for medical reasons. So we do what we can to help."

She said that many families show interest in finding out about birth control when they have come to her for another reason.

The village native and the city native share many problems. Often the city presents itself as an unsurmountable hurdle to the native in his attempt to span two cultures. But most native leaders agree that it is in the city that the native finds the greatest opportunity today.

He is fully equal under the law. His children go to local district schools. He can work and live where he pleases. There are few native ghettos and no government complex to wall off the two cultures.

And some have succeeded in integrating fully into the new life:

Ralph Perdue, president of the Tanana Chiefs Council and owner of a Fairbanks jewelry store.

Emil Notti, president of the Cook Inlet Native Association and electronics engineer for the Bureau of Land Management.

Roy Snyder, currently station mechanic foreman for the Federal Aviation Agency in Nome. A daughter is a practicing physician.

Flory Lekanof, a BIA schoolteacher, now assigned to Unalakleet. He has a master's degree in education.

Parker Nation, who grew up in a mission at Nenana and now works as a mechanic for the Federal Aviation Agency at Anchorage.

Walter Riley, who grew up at the same mission and is a truckdriver at Fort Richardson.

Gene Williams is a graduate of the University of Washington and now works at the Alaska Native Medical Center at Anchorage.

These and other natives have managed to carve a place for themselves in a largely nonnative society. They represent a growing middle class: people who can hold their own and speak their minds.

More and more, the native is speaking for himself.

The role and place of Alaska's native people in the State must be better understood—by native and nonnative alike, according to Gov. William Egan.

"They (the village people) must be treated as equal citizens of the State—equal in intelligence and ability," the Governor said.

It is needful, Egan said, that all Alaskans respect the capabilities of the native people and work toward building their confidence in their ability to operate their own projects without "somebody standing over them."

Egan said there is no question in his mind that the State could do a better job of operating schools for its native children than the Federal Government.

He stressed the "differences" that are fostered and continued under two separate programs of education, health and other services.

The sooner the State can assume full responsibility for the education of all of its children, the better off "all of us are going to be," Egan said.

He said the State is moving toward the takeover of additional Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. Eagan said he authorized that approximately 15 more such schools would come under State direction by the end of 1967.

Such a takeover is mainly a matter of financing, he said.

He said he is in favor of the Federal Government turning over annually to the State those funds it now uses to operate its programs.

Egan said he did not know of any other part of the country where such a program is in operation.

"The time has come, I think," the Governor added, "that a down-to-earth approach must be made in recognizing that all the citizens of the United States have an obligation to the people who live in the villages in the matter of education, welfare and health."

The Governor expressed the view that the series "The Village People," running in the Anchorage Daily News, takes an objective approach to the problem of the native.

"It reaches right down into the heart of the thing," Egan said.

Part 11. The Future

Yesterday's installment of "The Village People" was the last in the series.

What follows should not be considered a presentation of facts, but rather a presentation of opinion—the collective opinion of members of the Anchorage Daily News editorial staff.

It had not been our intention to conclude this series with recommendations. Our purpose has been to inform our readers about the Alaska native. He represents one-fourth the civilian population of Alaska. And he is rarely heard from.

But after months of study, travel, and conservation, we have formed some opinions and ideas. These we must publish also.

Most of Alaska's 50,000 Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians live in the villages. Some areas, some villages, are advancing under their own power. But the vast majority are not, particularly on the western coast and in the interior.

The population is increasing rapidly in an area where subsistence living—the historic life of the north—is consistently more difficult. The native can no longer live in the old way. And as he and his children become more acquainted with modern civilization, the old way no longer seems desirable.

In these areas poverty is a way of life—perhaps as deeply embedded as in any place under the American flag. Welfare checks take the place of jobs. Though there are schools, educational achievement remains low. Alcohol and tuberculosis take a tremendous toll. Most homes are substandard. There is a high expectancy of failure among the population.

This condition, it seems to us, is a national blind spot. For decades the Federal Government has been in the villages with schools and nurses and social workers. What exists today is self-evident proof that the present system is not sufficient. Decades of good intentions have not produced notable results. It eventually could be one of our greatest international embarrassments.

It does not seem to us that the problem is beyond solution or that any solution need be thought of in terms of generations. And it is not enough to say that the people must help themselves. The native people of Alaska have been among the most self-reliant on earth—their climate and way of life demanded it. What they lack now are the tools for becoming self-reliant in the new culture.

Historically the Bureau of Indian Affairs has administered to the Alaska native. It has provided his education, welfare, store loans, and other necessities. But no native leader today fails to be critical of the BIA. Among the people it is designed to serve, it apparently is discredited.

Something else is needed, probably the State of Alaska, which is moving slowly into the realm of native affairs—a transfer of power which generally draws native acceptance.

For the present, however, the State is finding it difficult to assume too large an economic burden in this respect. And some needs will be beyond the State's power to fulfill for years to come.

When the full transfer comes, the house should be in order. The only power to accomplish that now exists at the Federal level.

We believe that nothing less is required, immediately, than a Presidential commission for the Alaska native. Such a commission should be headed by a nationally respected figure. It should look at the record, talk to the native people, and transcend the authority of existing agencies to set up machinery for the restoration of the Alaska native to a place of equality and dignity.

There is precedent for it. After the March 1964 earthquake, the President organized a special reconstruction commission headed by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico. The Commission was ably staffed and went to work with determination. Because of it, agency lines were erased, bills were passed by Congress, and most recovery efforts—half a billion dollars worth—were accomplished rapidly.

That is what is needed for the Alaska native.

Here are some of the things such a commission could achieve:

Jobs: The U.S. Government is the primary employer of people in the Alaska bush country. Yet many of its most attractive jobs are beyond the reach of people in the area. Employees for the FAA or Weather Bureau or other installations are hired elsewhere, trained elsewhere, and sent to an Alaska outpost for temporary hardship duty. It is not inconceivable that local people could be hired, trained elsewhere, and returned home to permanent employment at no increased cost. By altering hiring practices, it seems that the U.S. Government could be a better employer of local people. It is certainly an area the State should consider, too. Alaska often speaks of its special situation in relation to other States. It should also recognize special situations within its borders.

The total problem will never be solved until the area had a sufficient economic base. By building roads and harbors in selected areas it would be possible to tap the natural resources of the regions involved and influence future development.

Education: The State should take over administration of all rural schools at the earliest possible time. This commission could help speed up the timetable by working out a program for financing this transfer.

A program for training native students to be teachers in their home villages or village area could be established. And if this required a reduction in minimum standards to be effective immediately, it seems that the benefits—having a person who understands the culture and the problems and who can be an example to the people—outweigh this consideration.

Land: A commission of this type could arrange for settling the longstanding Alaska land problem.

Birth control: This commission could do for the Alaska native what the United States is doing for underdeveloped nations of the world—provide information and assistance in birth control. No such program exists today for the Alaska native, whose birth rate is the highest in the world.

Housing: In some villages people who have good jobs cannot secure loans for home construction because the home—without water and sewage—would not meet FHA standards. In other villages few have jobs and live huddled together—perhaps a dozen to a house—in one room. There is a Federal housing program for virtually everyone in the United States except the Alaska native. Senator Bartlett has introduced legislation in Congress to correct this situation. The commission could give this measure significant backing.

Tourism: There is a tremendous potential for the Alaska native in Alaska's growing tourist industry. But he needs help in marketing his arts and crafts. The commission here could be of immediate assistance.

Welfare: While we did not survey the native welfare program closely enough to form hard and fast judgments, there are indications that it works against self-reliance, discourages natives from securing temporary jobs and encourages larger families, whether or not the mother is married. This program should be carefully reviewed to see whether the stated aims of the programs are being achieved.

Projects: Bethel is the economic, transportation, cultural, health, and communications center for 15,000 people in southwest Alaska villages. Its value is more than an appraisal of its permanent buildings and downtown land. As such, a decision as to whether the riverbanks should be protected to save the community seems outside the bounds of normal cost-benefit ratios established by the Corps of Engineers. Here is one project the special commission could undertake immediately. There are doubtless others similar in nature.

These are suggestions for a commission agenda. Together they would spell an end to the patronizing, paternalistic relationship that exists today and has existed for decades between the native and his Government. Federal help, yes. But Federal help designed to permit him to be self-reliant.

Until that occurs—until the native has opportunities for education, employment, and leadership equal to his paper rights—he will not be free.

He will be trapped on an invisible reservation, a reservation where he can remain alive but never has a chance to live.

It does not have to be that way. The Alaska native has too noble a heritage to be considered less than equal. He is too close to spanning the gap between cultures to endure the present situation much longer. Now is the time for action.

That's the way we, the staff of the Anchorage Daily News, see it.

SPEECH BY PRIME MINISTER KY BEFORE VIETNAM ARMED FORCES CONGRESS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague, Senator John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, for inserting into the Record the text of the important speech presented by Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky to the closing session of the Vietnam Armed Forces Congress on January 15, 1966.

Far from being a "tinhorn Asian dictator" as some Members of this body have unfairly characterized him, the Prime Minister of South Vietnam has proven himself a thoughtful and forceful leader.

Prime Minister Ky does not engage in wishful thinking in this speech. He recognizes the difficulties ahead, and is mindful of the areas of failure during the previous 200 days of his administration.

Yet his speech is an optimistic one precisely because his administration has achieved notable gains in many areas. He points out that in contrast to the military situation of 1 year ago, "allied troops have completely in hand the initiative of operations at every battlefront, and the tide of the war has turned in our favor."

General Ky is aware that the battle in Vietnam is not a military one alone.

Three rural electrification pilot cooperatives were established in Tuyen Duc, AF Giang, and Duc Tu.

Four hundred taxicabs and 200 trilambrettas were imported in part of the Government program to sell these vehicles on an installment basis to the drivers. A number of construction projects are now underway, and the public works and communications department built 554 single-story housing units at Vinh Hoi and Tan Qui Dong alone.

Nearly 460,434 refugees have been resettled and an educational reform movement has been launched. General Ky states:

> As another evidence of the Government's efforts in the rural education field, outstanding students from low-income families will be granted official scholarships thus enabling worthy students to complete their secondary education.

As his goals the Prime Minister calls for the defeat of the Vietcong, a stabilization of the economic situation and the building of democracy. A democracy building council will soon be set up, and plans for free elections have been made.

Those who idly compare General Ky and his Government with the tyranny he opposes are misreading history. It is time to make clear that although the South Vietnamese Government at this time may not be as strong or as representative or as democratic as we hope it will eventually be, that there will never be any hope of a free and democratic South Vietnam if communism is imposed upon the Vietnamese people.

There is no chance for a free election under communism, and there will be no land reform under communism, and no economic improvement for the people. There will simply be a brutal tyranny.

General Ky provides us with hope and a substantial record of achievement thus far. I, too, commend his words to the consideration of my colleagues.

BOB HOPE—NATIONAL TREASURE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, because of his continued and patriotic unselfishness over the Christmas holidays for a number of years, and the happiness he has brought to millions of people, in this country and all over the world, Bob Hope could well be the most popular man on earth.

Millions of young Americans will never forget the happiness of laughing with him while they were serving overseas; and as those who watched his show from South Vietnam the other evening saw, he can also be wise in serious comment.

All this was either well said or implied in a recent editorial in the Kansas City Star "Bob Hope Goes to War Again."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BOB HOPE GOES TO WAR AGAIN

Bob Hope kept seeing familiar faces during his Christmas visit to U.S. servicemen in Vietnam. The combat forces include many an oldtimer who, like Hope, is a veteran of three wars. At Da Nang the marine commander, Maj. Gen. Lewis W. Walt, remarked: "This is the third battlefield I've had the pleasure of meeting Bob Hope on." The other meetings were during World War II and in Korea.

We suppose that many a young American in Vietnam who wrote home about seeing the Hope troupe perform at Christmastime was not even born when his own father laughed at Bob's quips overseas during the Second World War. For 25 years the amazingly indefatigable Hope has been entertaining the troops. Every year brings another exhausting tour—Greenland, Berlin, Guantanamo, the Far East. Hope is as regular as Santa Claus, and funnier.

The man is a national treasure, bless him.

REPORT ON VIETNAM BY SENATOR SYMINGTON

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter written to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, on both of which committees I have the honor to serve, with respect to my trip to South Vietnam, be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hon. Richard B. Russell,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services
Hon. J. William Fulbright,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen: Attached is a 122-page report of my 10-day visit to South Vietnam, December 28–January 6 inclusive. I was accompanied by Lt. Col. Edward Peter, Army Legislative Liaison.

Also attached is a statement made upon my return January 10; plus a statement about the Central Intelligence Agency made on the floor January 14.

The table of contents summarizes the places visited, including a visit to Thailand.

In a previous visit the first part of December, as a member of the Eugene Black party incident to the signing of the Asian Development Bank agreement in Manila, I also went to Thailand, where I had two additional days with the Ambassador, the Central Intelligence people, and the military, visiting various bases incident to the functions of the latter.

On this first trip I also visited Japan; and in addition, the Philippines, Guam (from which the current B–52 strikes originate) and Hawaii.

In the latter State I was briefed by CINCPAC; also spent a day watching the realistic and effective training of the 25th Division in the mountains of Hawaii. Part of that division is now in South Vietnam.

Starting with Colonel Peter from Hawaii, we again visited Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Taiwan, Hong Kong and the United Arab Republic. A report on our visit to these countries is nearly completed and will be sent to you shortly.

In each country we discussed at length the international aspects of our current policies and programs with the U.S. Ambassadors and/or Ministers, with the representatives of the Central Intelligence Agency, and with the military; also with members of the other government in question.

Then we decided to fly back, rather than have the sharp edges of our impressions blurred by visits previously planned to Turkey, Naples, Germany, NATO in Paris, and Great Britain.

I am sending the attached report to the Defense Department, asking that as much as possible be declassified for publication.

Because so much has already been spoken and written about our past, present, and possible future actions in South Vietnam, it was felt that a day-to-day account of our activities might be the better way to make a report. Certain conclusions based on our findings, however, are listed as follows:

Cooperation and understanding between the services is excellent.

Representation of this Government by Ambassador Lodge is of the highest caliber. He is universally respected by the South Vietnamese Government as well as by our own civilian and military leaders.

General Westmoreland is handling the military operations in the highest tradition of the armed services. He also was a wise choice, especially because of his intense interest in the problems of the South Vietnamese civilians.

Morale in the military is high. Unless our mission becomes more clear, however, this might not continue at the same high level among lower echelons.

There are logistic shortages, some serious but none critical; and there has been a marked improvement in that condition during recent weeks. The future of adequate supplying depends primarily upon (a) the ability to improve the unloading of ships at the various ports and (b) the nature and degree of the planned buildup.

Once more, there is a clear demonstration of the vital importance of air power. The C-130 is literally priceless in a country with practically no railroad capacity and so many at least periodically interdicted roads. It is difficult to visualize today how past military operations were ever conducted without helicopters.

Air operations in South Vietnam in support of ground troops have been effective; in fact, no one believes the present operations could have been conducted at all without this air power (naval air strength and Army air strength are of course included).

Air operations against North Vietnam have been relatively ineffective to the point where these operations should not be resumed unless there is more target license; license to hit such military targets as powerplants, oil stores, docks, and so forth.

The long coastline of Vietnam gives full opportunity for utilization of our superior naval power. That superiority, however, is not being adequately utilized.

There should be programs to reduce, if not eliminate, the sanctuary aspects of Laos and Cambodia. Both countries are being utilized by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese to transport men and equipment to South Vietnam; and also as sanctuaries. In both countries there are Communist headquarters.

The current limited military operations are very expensive and can only become steadily more expensive. The United States is carrying this economic load with little assistance from any nation of the free world, and no assistance from most. These other countries should assume more of this cost in manpower and money.

Those who urge greater effort on the part of this administration to attain peace at the conference table—plus continued cessation of military effort—generally acknowledge that they are not suggesting the United States withdraw from South Vietnam.

In a world telescoped in time and space to the point where "every country is now in the next county," one in which "spheres of influence" is now a relatively obsolete term, these statements promote an unwillingness to negotiate, because others interpret in them a weakening of the will of this Nation to carry on the struggle.

If South Vietnam is not the right place to defend the free world against totalitarian aggression, we should retire from that country on the best terms possible. This would probably result in a Communist takeover of additional countries and would damage seriously the world position and status of the United States. That would be the price, but it would not be catastrophic.

If South Vietnam is the right place to defend the free world against totalitarian aggression, however, then that fact should be recognized in more practical fashion. We cannot continue indefinitely the plans and programs incident to the current holding operation. After 25 years of almost continuous war, the South Vietnamese have lost much of the best of their manhood. They are tired and the gigantic cost to us is also very costly to them.

This conflict constitutes the fourth time in 20 years that the United States accepted the splitting of the boundaries of a country; and then remained to bear most if not all of the cost—billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of people. Regardless of the wisdom of those decisions, the effect on our economy is inescapable.

In the current conflict we conscientiously consider how our moves may affect the actions of the Red Chinese. At times it would seem there is undue preoccupation with this question and it is fair to ask whether this strengthens or weakens our capacity for decision. If the latter is true, how much more so will it be true when a few years hence China becomes a nuclear power?

The time is approaching when we must decide—while the decision is still ours to make—whether we will move forward or move out. Whichever course we choose, we must take it with courage, with skill, and with realism. We must be equally realistic about the consequences of avoiding this difficult choice.

Sincerely,

STUART SYMINGTON.

SYMINGTON PREPARING REPORT ON TRIP TO VIETNAM AND PACIFIC AREAS

WASHINGTON, January 10.—Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, who returned to Washington last night following 6 weeks in the Pacific area, including an intensive 10 days in South Vietnam, started working today on a report he will file with the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. He is a member of both committees.

Commenting about his visit to Vietnam, SYMINGTON said: "Certain conclusions stand out—the high caliber and morale of our American representatives, civilian as well as military; the magnificent cooperation between the services, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, plus the great respect they have for each other; the improved cooperation and understanding, at all levels, under the leadership of General Ky and Ambassador Lodge, between the representatives of the Government of South Vietnam and our representatives."

The Missouri Senator said he planned to withhold further comment on Vietnam until completing his report for the committees.

Since Thanksgiving, SYMINGTON has visited foreign and U.S. officials and military missions not only in South Vietnam but also in Japan, Korea, Thailand, the Philippines, Okinawa, Taiwan and Hong Kong, Guam, Hawaii and Alaska.

In Vietnam, SYMINGTON'S inquiry included numerous trips in the field. He met with key commanders, combat troops, combat support and service units and also visited with U.S. servicemen in the hospitals. SYMINGTON arrived in Saigon on Tuesday morning, December 28, and left there Thursday afternoon, January 6.

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

During my recent trip abroad, I was afforded the opportunity of looking over the programs and activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in many countries. Prior to departure, I received extensive briefings from the Agency and during my trip talked in detail with all Agency representatives in the country in question, as has been my custom in past years when visiting abroad.

All felt the latter's programs were fully coordinated with United States policy of the Agency with every Ambassador. In every case, no exception, the Ambassador expressed his complete approval of the functioning of the Agency.

I found no instances of any kind where CIA activities were uncontrolled, or contrary to United States policy. Indeed it would appear difficult, if not impossible, for such uncontrolled activities to occur. This belief is based on existing coordination procedures and policy directives stemming from the Washington level, plus the controls applicable to field activities.

I have always been impressed, in my contacts with the Agency, with the integrity and professional competence of its representatives. Only twice, in over 10 years, have I found anything to the contrary. Based on the present rules, I doubt if those cases of disagreement could now be duplicated.

It is a pleasure, therefore, to present to the Senate the fact that I agree with Secretary Rusk who, in talking about CIA people, stated: "There is a good deal of gallantry and a high degree of competence in those who have to help us deal with that part of the struggle for freedom."

The Central Intelligence Agency has a difficult, and at times a very dangerous mission to perform. Not all men, or women, of this or any other agency, are perfect, and it is easy to criticize any group which cannot defend itself because of the nature of its work. Nevertheless it is my considered judgment that the American public should be proud of this organization and its people, a group who serve our country with unstinting devotion.

In addition to this brief report, which of necessity must be general, I am also reporting my findings and conclusions in more detail to Chairman RUSSELL and the Subcommittee for the CIA of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

SKI RESORTS OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, New Mexico has many assets, and one of them that is little known is its outstanding ski resorts. Alex Katz, a reporter for the Chicago Sun-Times, visited several of our winter resorts recently and came back filled with praise for what he found.

I ask unanimous consent that his report to the readers of the Sun-Times be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Jan. 21, 1966]

NEW MEXICO AREAS RISING AS TOP SKI RESORTS

(By Alex Katz)

SANTE FE, N. MEX.—In the minds of most Americans, New Mexico's image is one of glaring deserts and Indians who live in pueblos and sell silver jewelry to tourists.

But to a growing number of knowledgeable winter sports enthusiasts, New Mexico is becoming a skier's paradise without crowded slopes and long lift lines.

For years New Mexico's Department of Development has plugged the State's sunshine and climate. The sunshine and climate haven't changed, of course, but now attention is being given to snow-covered peaks that soar to 13,000 feet and the skiers they attract.

TOUGH SKI RUNS

Some of the toughest ski runs in the Nation can be found at Taos Ski Valley, 18 miles northeast of the famed artists' town of Taos.

This season Ernie Blake, the hard-working Swiss who operates Taos Ski Valley, installed a second double chair lift. The addition of this chair lift, 3,400 feet long, virtually doubles the amount of skiable terrain.

And what terrain!

A huge bowl, certain to afford excellent protected skiing all winter and into late spring is now accessible with the new lift.

On a tour of the bowl last week, this writer watched Blake thrust a ski pole, handle first, into the snow to record its depth. The 52-inch pole sank almost out of sight.

The headwall that rises above the bowl is something only experts should try. A few skiers have already offered a selection of names for the brute. Among them: Tuckerman's West, Reforma, and Kamikaze.

SOME CHANGES

Elsewhere in Taos Ski Valley, changes are being made. The new ski shop handles rentals and sales without a hitch. Down the road a condominium apartment building is being built to ease the housing demands and another is planned for next season at a spot directly above the beginners' area.

The Blake version of the United Nations continues to appeal to skiers who have learned that Taos Ski Valley offers a cosmopolitan approach to the sport. Five nations—the United States, Switzerland, France, Finland, and Germany—are represented in the 16-man ski school.

Only recently the State approved the establishment of the Taos Air Taxi which offers speedy flight service to Taos for skiers arriving at Albuquerque's new Sunport via Trans World Airlines jets.

Just 16 miles from Santa Fe, the oldest State capital in the Nation, is Santa Fe Ski Basin. Texans and Oklahomans in great numbers have discovered the pleasure of skiing at Santa Fe Ski Basin and enjoying the comforts of the accommodations in the nearby city.

Plans are underway for the construction of a lodge at the ski development.

EXTENDED SEASON

The base at Santa Fe Ski Basin is at an altitude of about 10,000 feet, assuring good snow conditions for an extended season. Four lifts serve the area: Two double chair lifts and two Pomalifts. Eleven major trails are spread across the slopes which have a vertical drop of up to 1,700 feet.

Harvey Chalker, well known to Chicago ski show visitors, is manager of the area. Kingsbury Pitcher, veteran in the field of ski area management, operates the ski development. A ski school with certified instructors is on duty daily and is augmented by a corps of associate certified teachers on weekends.

Residents of the booming city of Albuquerque merely have to drive 18 miles northeast to ski at Sandia Peak. A double chair lift soars 7,600 feet along the spine of this enormous mountain.

Better skiers will enjoy the Exhibition run, so named because it is directly below the chair lift line where every rider can check the style and technique of fellow skiers.

Most of the skiing at Sandia Peak will suit intermediates. The vertical drop on the Exhibition, Aspen, and Cibola runs is 1,750 feet.

SANDIA'S 30TH YEAR

This is Sandia Peak's 30th year of operation, and the highlight of the celebration should come in March when an aerial tramway, 2.7 miles long, is expected to go into operation.

The tramway will have two 60-passenger cars and will take skiers from the valley to the top of the ski area in only 10 minutes.

Three of the four major cables to carry the cars are in place. The fourth is ready for stringing with the aid of a helicopter.

A view from the top of Sandia Peak affords a spectacular glimpse of several mountain ranges, the city of Albuquerque, and the Rio Grande. The tram will operate all year.

Other ski areas in New Mexico include Red River, Sipapu, Raton, Sierra Blanca, and Cloudcroft. The skiing is excellent. The only problem is getting skiers to believe it.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, this year the President's Economic Report is able to present the welcome news that American agriculture is sharing fully in the great economic advance of the Nation's economy. One remarkable statistic sums up this progress: Last year, 1965, the net income of farm proprietors advanced by 23 percent. Rarely in our past history have farmers made that kind of progress in a single year.

The average net income of farmers is the most appropriate measure of farm prosperity. Gross farm income in billions of dollars pays no attention to the costs farmers incur in producing this gross income, nor to the number of farmers who must share in it. The old parity price ratios that used to be taken as a guide to farm prosperity pay no attention to the increase in farm productivity.

Agricultural policy is one of the most complex problems that this Nation or any nation faces. I say "any nation," because the United States is not alone in recognizing that its farm sector has special problems, and that the prosperity of agriculture cannot be left completely to the mechanical operation of a free market.

American farm policy, however, has clearly been moving in new directions—successful directions. Success is shown by the rise in farm incomes. And success is shown by the significant reduction in our surplus stocks of farm products. Judging by these results I should say that our farm policies are finally on the right track.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14 (b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending question, which is the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703 (b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and suggest that the staff be notified that it will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 15 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bible
Cannon
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Gruening
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McClellan
McIntyre
Monroney
Mundt
Muskie
Neuberger
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Talmadge
Thurmond
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] are necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Gore, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hill, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Morse, Mr. Morton, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Russell of South Carolina, Mr. Russell of Georgia, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Symington, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Williams of Delaware entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] is recognized.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator if I may do so without losing my rights to the floor and without the resumption of my speech being considered a second speech on the pending subject matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance in the Senate from now until Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Arkansas yield with the understanding that he shall not lose his rights to the floor and that his subsequent remarks will not be counted as a second speech?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield with that understanding.

THE TRUTH CONCERNING OUR ALLEGED COMMITMENT TO FIGHT A WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the statement is frequently made in the Senate, in the House of Representatives, and elsewhere that the United States is committed to the conflict in Vietnam. Because of this alleged commitment, it is stated we should not withdraw our forces from Vietnam, either withdrawing them altogether or withdrawing them to enclaves on the seacoast. In fact, Republican warhawks in the House of Representatives and militarists such as retired Gen. Curtis LeMay, who are urging acceleration, escalation, and expansion of our fighting in Vietnam by interdicting the port of Haiphong, bombing Hanoi, and even bombing Red China "back into the Stone Age" to quote warhawk former General LeMay, invariably talk about our commitment to defend South Vietnam against Communist aggression.

At this good hour we have approximately 200,000 men of our Armed Forces fighting in the steaming jungles and central highlands and along the coast of South Vietnam, and, in addition, nearly 60,000 men of our 7th Fleet are involved in this war off the South China Sea and our air forces have been bombing North Vietnam from bases in Thailand. We have approximately 30,000 men of our Armed Forces in Thailand.

They always talk of commitments made by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy and that we Americans must live up to those commitments. What are the facts? As a trial lawyer for 40 years and as chief criminal prosecuting attorney of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, many years before becoming a Senator of the United States, I dealt with facts. What commitments did President Eisenhower make? What commitments did President Kennedy make?

Our initial commitment to South Vietnam made by President Eisenhower in 1954 in a letter to the President of South Vietnam stated:

> I am instructing the American Ambassador * * * to examine with you * * * how an intelligent program of American aid * * * can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial.

He added:

> The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. * * * The U.S. Government hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government.

Can anyone claim that Prime Minister Ky of South Vietnam, who himself was born and reared in Hanoi, heads a strong, viable state? He claims to control only 700 of 2,600 villages in South Vietnam. He could not remain in power 1 month except for the operations of our Central Intelligence Agency and the support of our Armed Forces.

While General Eisenhower was President, the U.S. military advisory group to Vietnam was increased from a total of 327 in 1953 to 685 in 1961.

We have been withholding bombing of North Vietnam since before Christmas. I consider that President Johnson's decision in this particular was, and is, a wise decision. A military surrender to the United States will never produce acceptance of American presence in Asia by most Asiatics. It would be a legacy of ill will which we should not leave to future generations of Americans. Until Asiatics show more interest in defending themselves, then unilateral American involvement in Asia is doomed to failure. The ugly reality is that for the most part it is American GI's who are fighting and dying in Vietnam for the alleged defense of freedom in Asia. Can it be claimed by anyone that we Americans have a mandate from Almighty God to police the entire world?

Now, having made it crystal clear that President Eisenhower's commitment, so-called, was a very "iffy" commitment indeed, what commitment did the late President John F. Kennedy make?

President Kennedy said on September 3, 1963, shortly before his assassination:

> I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the Government to win popular support that the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists. We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort, and, in my opinion, in the last 2 months the Government had gotten out of touch with the people.

Also, on another occasion, our late, great President John F. Kennedy said:

> Transforming Vietnam into a Western redoubt is ridiculous.

Therefore, it is evident that we are not fighting a land war in southeast Asia because of commitments made by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy.

No matter how often we profess our intention to defend freedom in Vietnam, the increasing escalation of the war is raising grave doubts throughout Asia and elsewhere in the world as to the wisdom of our policy. Attacks with sophisticated weapons on unsophisticated and illiterate Asians is building a vast reservoir of anti-Americanism and misunderstanding of our country among the masses of people in Asia.

The primary reason for our being in Vietnam today is our proud refusal to admit a mistake in our attempt to make Vietnam a pro-American and an anti-Communist state. More than anything else, we are fighting to avoid admitting failure. As Walter Lippmann bluntly put it, "We are fighting to save face."

Recently, from September 28 to October 19, I was on an official mission in southeast Asia, being much of that time in Thailand and Vietnam. As stated by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], in a newsletter he writes and distributes as an additional service to his constituents, regarding his observations in Vietnam:

> Vietnam is a land of breathtaking seacoasts, green jungles, fertile rice paddies, picturesque mountains—a lovely Garden of Eden converted into a hell on earth by man's inhumanity to man.

The Senator from South Dakota is so right, and he stated our grim situation over there in very beautiful prose.

The statement frequently made that we are fighting in Vietnam because of the commitments made by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy lacks basis in fact. President Eisenhower's careful statement in 1954, when analyzed, demonstrates there was no commitment. The fact is that in January, when he left the Presidency only 685 military advisers were in Vietnam. This proves that he did not commit our Armed Forces to combat. Very definitely, President Eisenhower made no commitment; and the late President John F. Kennedy very bluntly stated, regarding war in Vietnam, that the people of Vietnam have to win that war against the Communists and in blunt language he gave the lie to those who claim that South Vietnam is strategically important to the defense of the United States. We lose face, Mr. President, by messing around in a civil war in the jungles and highlands in Vietnam.

Before I spent days on inspection trips into every area of South Vietnam, talked with officers and GI's at Air Force bases, witnessed an air strike in the iron triangle, and was briefed in South Vietnam, Thailand, Japan, and elsewhere, I had thought that the Vietcong fighting us in South Vietnam were Communists and infiltrators from the north. I learned that very definitely this is a civil war raging in Vietnam, that a large majority of the Vietcong fighting us are not infiltrators nor Communists from the north but are men born and reared in South Vietnam. Gen. Richard Stillwell stated that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting in the Mekong Delta were born and reared in that area. General Westmoreland stated to me that the bulk of the Vietcong forces fighting in South Vietnam was born and reared in South Vietnam.

It is obvious that the Saigon government of Prime Minister Ky controls less than one-fourth of the entire land area of South Vietnam. Furthermore, it appears that now when we have 200,000 men of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam, the Vietcong control more land area than they did before 1 year ago.

Very definitely, Vietnam is of no strategic importance to the defense of the United States. Very definitely we are involved in a civil war in Vietnam.

It is evident to me that the militarists, including members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and State Secretary Rusk, have been giving our President poor advice. Due to their advice and our bombing of North Vietnam the very precious lives of many young men piloting our war planes have been snuffed out and airplanes have been destroyed which cost taxpayers large sums of money. Yet, the results are not such as to justify this loss of lives and terrific loss of money due to planes destroyed by enemy action in North Vietnam.

Our President, instead of following poor advice, would be justified in continuing the pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. It was shocking to read the report in the Washington Post this morning that 18 of 20 Democratic and Republican leaders who had advised the President yesterday urged that he renew bombing in North Vietnam. He received very poor advice from 18 of those 20 advisers. He would do well to consult with 20 Senators of the United States, picking them at random, and there would be more than 2 of 20, I am sure, who would give him the proper advice.

Furthermore, our President, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, would be well advised if he were to listen and pay attention to the views of Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, former Chief of Staff of our Armed Forces—as a humble major, I served under him at the Anzio beachhead, and over the years I have admired and respected General Ridgway very much, indeed—and Gen. James M. Gavin who was Chief of U.S. Army Plans and Operations at the time of the French military disaster at Dienbienphu. Both General Gavin and General Ridgway assert that southeast Asia is the worst place in the world for us to engage in a land operation with hundreds of thousands of American citizens.

Furthermore, regarding the danger that this conflict might be expanded and escalated and that by your actions Communist China might enter into military combat with our forces, General Gavin stated—and incidentally, I was never more than a civilian in uniform during the 37 months I served in World War II, but certainly General Gavin's statement makes sense to anyone:

> Manchuria with its vast industrial complex, coal, and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its warmaking capacity. There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged if at all.

This makes sense to any layman. He says continuing bombing of North Vietnam including bombing of Hanoi, the capital, will add to our problems rather than detract from them.

We are in possession of bases on the coast of Vietnam and with our air power and the backing of warships of the 7th Fleet, we are readily able to maintain those bases against any attacks of the Vietcong. The U.S. forces now in Vietnam should continue the bombing pause against North Vietnam, under orders of the President of the United States, who is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. We should be thankful that the makers of our Constitution provided that in the United States, civilian authority must always be supreme over military authority. Our land forces, Mr. President, should be withdrawn to the coastal bases, and then we should seek to find a solution, through the International Control Commission, which is composed of representatives from Poland, India, and Canada, or through the United Nations, or by a conference in Geneva or elsewhere.

Historically, there is no such thing as North Vietnam and South Vietnam. The Geneva accords of 1954, which we agreed to, but which our representatives did not sign, stated:

> The military demarcation line at the 17th parallel is provisional and should not in any way be considered as constituting a political or territorial boundary.

If and when there are negotiations for a cease-fire or armistice, whether those negotiations are held in Geneva or in the military demarcation zone separating what is termed North and South Vietnam, or an Asiatic city, of course, delegates representing the Vietcong or National Liberation Front, so-called, must be seated along with delegates of the Hanoi government and delegates of the United States.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas very much for yielding to me.

VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me, under such conditions as he may prescribe?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, upon the same conditions as I have yielded to Senators who have preceded him.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend the Senator from Arkansas.

I should like to commend my friend, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], for the statement which he has just made on the current situation in Vietnam.

I find myself in complete agreement with the policy recommendations which he has made. I am also in accord with the recent statements of the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior member of the Republican Party in the Senate, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

In my judgment, the national interests of the United States would be best served by not renewing the bombing of North Vietnam at this time.

On January 24, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] stated that he was opposed to the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam by U.S. forces for the foreseeable future.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] stated that there should be an indefinite suspension of such bombings.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] endorsed the foregoing views by stating:

> The bombing should be suspended until it becomes perfectly clear that the Communist nations intend to fight the war to a finish.

I believe that I understand in some small degree the agony which the President of the United States is suffering, in being called upon by our constitutional system to make the difficult judgments which involve war or peace.

I have long held the view that the President is entitled to the greatest flexibility in dealing with the situation in Vietnam, and that he should be supported in his peace offensive.

Upon reading the morning newspapers, it now appears that the die is about to be cast, and that the bombings will be resumed.

To me, this is unfortunate, because I believe that every day we are approaching the point of no return in terms of an escalation of the war into a nuclear war—the third world war.

It may be, as Secretary McNamara has stated, that we have the nuclear potential to destroy both China and the Soviet

Union in one fell swoop. But even Secretary McNamara agrees that the destruction which would be wreaked upon the United States would be almost without measure.

Consequently, I would hope that we would have less loud talk about our nuclear capability for destroying our adversaries and more careful diplomacy which will result in either a mutual unilateral deescalation of the war, or in the alternative, a reconvening of the Geneva Conference, which would give us an opportunity to sit down and talk with all interested parties.

In this regard, I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Ohio that it is most important that we should be prepared to talk with representatives of the National Liberation Front.

The Secretary of State has stated that the Vietcong represent only a few hundred thousand of the 14 million people in South Vietnam. Nevertheless, they do hold most of the real estate in South Vietnam outside the larger cities. It may be true that a majority of the population does live in the area controlled by the Ky government, but in effect they are close to being confined in those cities because they cannot return to their own villages.

Mr. President, I point out again what the Senator from Ohio has stated both General Westmoreland and General Stillwell told him: that 80 percent of the individuals now fighting with the Vietcong—I believe it is some 263,000—originally came from South Vietnam. Although they are now fighting for what, to me, is a most mistaken cause—in fact, in many ways, a wicked cause—nonetheless, it is a cause in which they firmly believe; namely, to liberate their country—and it is their country—from what they believe to be the colonialism of a white Western nation, and also from a government in Saigon which is obviously not a purely democratic government.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield at that point?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I know that the Senator finds fault with the Government of South Vietnam, but let me suggest to the Senator that there are many governments that fail to conform to democratic processes. Our Government would hope to see a government installed there which would conform to democratic processes, but we are confronted with a choice: someone on our side, or a government which is a brutal, dictatorial regime, and which is communistic.

That is the choice. If we wish to choose communism and help them to take over southeast Asia, we can support that regime, and keep finding fault with the United States by making only slight criticism, or saying something to the effect that, after all, we believe that communism is a bad thing. But, Mr. President, we are going to be confronted with this decision many a time, as between a dictator who is against communism and one who is for communism. Which one do we want?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Louisiana has obviously been an advocate of military dictatorships for some time. It has always been his tactic to accuse those of us who do not favor military dictatorships of being soft on communism. There is nothing which he has said to me which alters that position.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I think the record will show that I have not been an advocate of military dictatorships. As between two dictators, I would rather be for one who was an anti-Communist rather than for one who was a pro-Communist, because the Communists are trying to destroy us.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is entitled to his view, which I regard as rather primitive. I do not agree with him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I will yield in a moment. Let me complete my sentence.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three articles which I believe state far more eloquently than I have been able to do the point of view of which I have expressed. One article is entitled "Military Influence and Viet Choices," published a few days ago in the Washington Post, and written by Marquis Childs; an article by Walter Lippmann, entitled "Well, What Can He Do?" published in the Washington Post of January 25, 1966; and finally, an advertisement which appeared in this morning's Philadelphia Inquirer, paid for by a large group of citizens from the City of Brotherly Love, entitled "The Bombing Pause."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

MILITARY INFLUENCE AND VIET CHOICES

(By Marquis Childs)

The ordeal that Lyndon Johnson is now enduring is unique in his experience. He finds himself caught in a situation in which all his extraordinary skill in maneuver and manipulation is of little avail. If the public man breaks out in irritation the reason is plain enough.

He is trying to find a way out of Vietnam that will not mean an enlarged war and the political consequences of committing much greater numbers of Americans on the ground in Vietnam. The score to date is certainly a big E for effort. But he labors under handicaps that could bring all this effort to naught.

Increasingly during the past year it has become evident that the decisions rest to an ever-larger degree with the military. Inspired reports coming out of Saigon apparently from high-ranking officers cast doubt on the President's peace offensive and hint at the need to resume bombing in the North. In today's war if there were a general of the stature and the dramatic flair of the late Douglas MacArthur, President Johnson might find himself confronted as a result of his restraints in the cause of peace with the kind of challenge that Harry S. Truman faced up to in the Korean war.

Civilian officials in the Pentagon, sharing with Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara doubts about the effectiveness of a large commitment of land forces, have watched with growing concern the way in which military dominance seems inevitable in Vietnam decisions. They trace this back to a step taken a year ago. That was when President Johnson ordered a battalion of Hawk missiles into South Vietnam.

Events since then have followed a classic military pattern. If you hold position A then you must also hold position B in order to protect position A. And having moved up to position B you require greatly increased logistical support and eventually, to be entirely secure, you must advance to position C.

The Hawks were introduced following one of the most shocking episodes of the Vietnam conflict. At the end of the truce of the lunar new year a year ago up to 50 Vietcong guerrillas infiltrated Camp Holloway Air Base near Pleiku. With mortar fire they killed 8 Americans, wounded 126 others, destroyed 9 helicopters and a transport plane and severely damaged 11 other planes. Three days later Vietcong terrorists blew up an American military barracks at Quinhon, killing at least 22 of the 40 Americans in the building.

This upcoming bloody anniversary underscores how critical is the present moment in the balance between a possible peace and a larger war. The Vietcong marked the beginning of the current new year truce with a barbarous attack on men, women, and children in a refugee camp. If they should end the truce as they did last year—and this may have happened even before these words are in print—with something like the Pleiku attack, President Johnson would find it hard to continue the present pause in the bombing of North Vietnam.

The Hawks, which the President ordered installed at the same time he authorized bombing in the North, are extraordinary complex weapons capable of firing on the average one surface-to-air missile every 5 seconds. The Marine 1st Light Antiaircraft Battalion at Danang, 380 miles northeast of Saigon, is equipped with six missile launchers each mounting three missiles, five complete radar units, three electronic vans, and seven generators with battery supply units. Meant to protect the big jet base at Danang from air attack, so far as is known they have not yet fired on an enemy plane.

This complex, put down in a primitive country where guerrilla fighters carry their weapons on their backs, points up the case made by the American military for more and more and more. To protect such a vulnerable complex, obviously the perimeter surrounding it must be pushed back to insure against infiltration and mortar fire. Supplying and maintaining such a complex in the hot, humid climate of Vietnam is in itself no small task. The unit's large radar screen covers a 17-mile area and the missile launcher locks onto a target in 3 seconds.

For a man of his temperamental intensity the President has shown remarkable patience. And those who work with him from day to day say that he has never let up on his determination to keep the important decisions in his own hands. Nevertheless, the very scale of the American commitment, as it grows from week to week and month to month, limits his choices.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 25, 1966]

WELL, WHAT CAN HE DO?

(By Walter Lippmann)

The reason why the peace offensive failed is most cogently revealed in the Mansfield report on the state of the war. Mr. Johnson has been trying to obtain by propaganda the victory which he has not been able to obtain on the battlefield—that is to say the acceptance in the whole of South Vietnam of a government which has lost control of a very large part of South Vietnam. The peace offensive was bound to fail, and the grave decisions which the President hoped to circumvent and avoid are now before him.

If he is to make these decisions wisely, he must recognize that in international politics peace settlements are possible only as and when they reflect ~~the real~~ balance of power. In the World War, for example, Churchill and Roosevelt had to settle with Stalin for a Soviet political frontier in the midst of Germany and of Europe. That is where the Red army had arrived when the peace negotiations began. The same principle will hold in Vietnam. There will be no settlement until the terms of peace reflect the military reality.

The President will be disappointed again and again as long as he and Secretary Rusk ask for a settlement which in effect demands that the defeat of the Saigon forces, be transmuted at the conference table into a victory for the Saigon forces. Nor should he indulge in any illusion that the informed opinion of mankind really thinks as Secretary Rusks talks merely because American envoys have been politely and sympathetically received in so many capitals.

What then should the President do? It is often said by the President's supporters that his critics propose no alternative to what he is doing. If that was ever true, it is no longer true today. It is not true since the Mansfield report and since the Gavin statement. The President should reduce his war aims, which today are impossibly high in the light of the conditions described in the Mansfield report. He should alter his strategy along the lines proposed by General Gavin, making it a holding operation pending the eventual negotiation of a political settlement.

The Mansfield report shows that Mr. Rusk's objective—the rule of General Ky or his successor over the whole of South Vietnam—is unattainable no matter how much the war is escalated. The burden of disproving the conclusions of the Mansfield report is on those who have been proved wrong about the escalation of last summer, on those who are now asking for another escalation in order to redeem their failure, on those who want to redouble the stakes in order to recoup their losses.

If the Mansfield report contains the truth of the matter, it follows inevitably that our war aims should be reduced and our strategy revised. We should put aside the hopeless task of searching out and destroying the Vietcong, and we should take our stand, as General Gavin advises, on a holding operation in the coastal cities.

This is not a policy for a glorious victory or for some kind of dazzling political triumph. It is no trick for pulling rabbits out of a hat. It is a formula for liquidating a mistake, for ending a war that cannot be won at any tolerable price, for cutting our losses before they escalate into bankruptcy, and for listening to commonsense rather than to war whoops and tomtoms.

Because we are neither omniscient nor omnipotent, we, even we Americans, cannot always win. But I cannot help feeling in my bones that a display of commonsense by a proud and imperious nation would be a good moral investment for the future.

The Bombing Pause

(Note.—Text of an advertisement which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 27, 1966, with names of sponsors.)

There is no logical limit to the war in Vietnam. If we resume bombing now we are committing ourselves to a war that has already widened into Laos and may widen further into Cambodia and Thailand.

We support the President in his stated purpose that we will negotiate with any group.

We feel that for our current diplomatic effort to gain momentum a pause in bombing of indefinite duration would be indispensable. The dangers of prolonging the pause in bombing cannot be greater than the dangers of resumption.

Now, while the pause in bombing continues, is the time to influence the debate on the war. Write to the President, your Senators and Representatives. This ad was paid for by a group of concerned Pennsylvanians.

Sponsors: Dr. Alexine Atherton, Miss Grace Bohr, Mr. J. Brodie, Mr. Edward Carleton, Jr., Dr. William Davidon, Mrs. Robert DeWitt, Mr. and Mrs. William Dockhorn, Mr. and Mrs. Phillip Edgerton, Miss Abbie Huston Evans, Mrs. Anna Fisher, Mr. and Mrs. G. M. Foley, Mrs. Bernard Friedberg, M.D., Miss Ellen S. Gersh, Dr. and Mrs. Harvey Glickman, Mrs. Peter Goodwin, Dr. Roberta B. Gonzales, M.D., Mrs. Mildred Greenberg, Dr. Marcel Gutwirth, Mr. and Mrs. John J. Hagedorn, Dr. Theodore Hetzel, Dr. Merwin W. Humphrey, Mrs. Jean Hopper, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Huntington, Miss Mary Hoxie Jones, Mr. and Mrs. Franklin Kavaler, Mr. Louis Kay, Mr. and Mrs. James N. Kise, Mr. Michael Lenard, Mr. and Mrs. John Lloyd, Dr. and Mrs. Gilbert N. Ling, M.D., Dr. and Mrs. Joseph Linsk, M.D., Dr. Jack Lubin, M.D., Mr. Samuel C. Maitin, Dr. and Mrs. John McCahab, M.D., Dr. Wallace T. McCaffrey, Mr. and Mrs. Mason McGinniss, Mrs. Margaret Y. Newbold, Dr. and Mrs. Hans Neville, M.D., Dr. Robert J. Osborn, Mr. and Mrs. Christopher Nicolson, Mr. and Mrs. Francis T. Nicolson, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Paulnier, Dr. and Mrs. Price Peterson, M.D., Mr. and Mrs. Robert Reifsnyder, Mrs. Kenneth Scott, Dr. Walter Selove, M.D., Dr. and Mrs. Arthur Shostak, Dr. Gerhard Speigler, Dr. and Mrs. Herbert Spiro, Miss Helen H. Striedieck, Mrs. Kathryn W. Trotta, Mr. and Mrs. John Van Sickle, Dr. and Mrs. John Withall, Mrs. C. Fenno Hoffman, Dr. and Mrs. Philip Jacob, Dr. Daniel S. Cheever, Dr. and Mrs. E. Wayne Marshall Jr., M.D., Mr. and Mrs. Conrad Hamerman, Dr. and Mrs. Henry J. Abraham, Dr. and Mrs. Herbert S. Levine, Mr. and Mrs. Richard K. Taylor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me ask the Senator a direct question: Assuming that the Senator had the choice of supporting two dictatorships, one which was a pro-Communist dictatorship and one which was an anti-Communist one, which one would he choose?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Louisiana always puts out a grade school question which assumes that an answer is either white or black. Of course, anyone would take the choice which is so obviously given in the Senator's loaded question. That is not the point. It would take several hours to make the point, and I do not want to argue with the Senator, whose choice is primitive.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator answered the question—I am not sure he answered the question, but if he answered the question—I am assuming, he has, under the circumstances stated, said that he would choose the anti-Communist dictator as against the pro-Communist dictator, which puts him in the situation of being a little primitive.

Mr. CLARK. Since the Senator is so excited, I think we should terminate the discussion.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY HONORING SENATOR DOUGLAS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech delivered by our present Vice President, the former Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, given at a dinner honoring our colleague, Senator Paul Douglas, on January 14, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey at Dinner Honoring Senator Paul Douglas, January 14, 1966

The central purpose of our gathering tonight is to press, beg, persuade, wheedle, cajole, and to draft Paul Douglas to run again for the U.S. Senate.

Paul Douglas is a giant of a man and a giant of a Senator. From whatever aspect you look at him, he towers over the political scene.

I speak of him first as a distinguished scholar, because that is how he began.

At Bowdoin College he won a Phi Beta Kappa key, despite working his way through college and playing center on the football team. He is a Ph. D. from Columbia University, and the holder of many honorary degrees.

He is the author of many books and articles on economics, and his colleagues have honored him by election to the presidency of the American Economic Association.

I speak next of Paul Douglas as a politician of principle, and a very practical and effective politician too. You in Chicago know his record in this city and State.

In the late 1920's, he investigated and exposed the Insull utility empire. He worked hard and successfully in this State for utilities regulation, old-age pensions, public housing, and unemployment insurance.

You know of his election in 1939 as an alderman for the fifth ward, and of the role of leadership he immediately assumed in the city's affairs. You know of his election as Senator in 1948, and his reelection in 1954 and 1960.

Coming from outside Chicago, however, I want to tell you that, as a loyal and hardworking member of the Democratic Party, Paul Douglas has spoken and worked for our candidates throughout the Nation.

I speak of Paul Douglas next as the legislator, with a record of solid achievement in the Congress second to none.

It was his bill which raised the minimum wage to a dollar an hour.

It was his bill which provided for the disclosure of union and management pension and welfare funds.

It was he who wrote the original Area Redevelopment Act, to bring industry and jobs to the depressed areas of this country. His name is on the new Economic Development Act, which updates and expands this program.

In the mid-1950's Paul Douglas, along with a small group of others (including a young Senator from Minnesota) proposed sweeping civil rights legislation to assure our Negro fellow citizens the full protection of the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution. In 1964, these proposals became the law of the land.

In 1960 Paul Douglas and a small group of others (again including a Senator from Minnesota) proposed that Federal registrars be sent into areas of the country where Negroes were effectively denied the right to vote. In 1965, these Douglas-Humphrey proposals became the law of the land.

In 1958, Paul Douglas proposed a general tax cut in order to bolster the economy, cut unemployment, and stimulate economic growth. His proposal was rejected by the Eisenhower administration—but under President Kennedy and President Johnson it became policy. And it has been eminently successful, too. Thanks largely to timely tax cuts, we have enjoyed the longest sustained economic growth in our history.

Back in the days when they had almost no chance of enactment, Paul Douglas was a sponsor or cosponsor of medicare, Federal aid to elementary education, aid to higher education, the immigration bill, the clean air bill, and the water pollution bill—to name only a few. Last year these became law—and he either drafted, sponsored or cosponsored almost every one of them.

There is no Member of the Senate today who has his name stamped on more major issues, major bills, and major legislation than Paul Douglas.

Just as important is the role he has played in defending the interests of the American people against harmful legislative proposals. When certain forces, which shall remain nameless, tried to upset the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision, it was Paul Douglas who led the fight to uphold and defend it.

He won that battle in 1964 and again in 1965—and, if need be, it will be won again in 1966.

He has killed more bad bills—bills to help special interests or secure a subsidy for the powerful—than any man in the Senate of the United States.

I speak now of Paul Douglas the man—of his loyalty to his friends, of his courage, of his straightforwardness, of his scrupulous integrity. This man disdains all fraud and pretense. He stands not only for truth in lending and truth in packaging, but for truth in people and above all truth to himself.

He is a man of conscience—a man who does right, and by his example makes it easier for others to do right. And let me add, he is no narrow, self-centered pedant. He is a devoted and enthusiastic connoisseur of literature and the arts.

He is not only great in mind and heart, but great in physical stamina as well. When I led the fight for the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the crucial test was our ability to answer the quorum calls which were made every 2 or 3 hours of the day, 5 days a week. These were strenuous times. And it was Paul Douglas who made the best record of any Senator in answering those quorum calls and thus breaking the filibuster. He answered 96 percent of the 280 quorum calls in the 1964 session of Congress—while, at the same time, he was making 8 or 10 speeches here in Illinois on weekends.

And when I think Paul Douglas, the human being, I am bound to think of his good wife Emily as well—a person of distinction in her own right, charming, intelligent, and gifted with a talent for getting things done.

Here is a real bargain—like the 2 for 1 sales we put on from time to time in our family drugstore. You elect one and you get two.

Finally, I speak of Paul Douglas the patriot—the man who, at the age of 50, enlisted as a private in the Marines. I recall that, while serving with the 1st Marine Division in the Pacific, he advanced through the ranks to lieutenant colonel, was twice wounded, and spent 14 months in hospitals. I recall the Bronze Star he was awarded for "heroic achievement in action."

The American Political Science Association, a professional organization with no partisan ax to grind, honored him with their Distinguished Service Award. They said that Paul Douglas "* * * has prophetically raised the eternal problems of human freedom and dignity in terms of our contemporary democratic society" and is a man " * * * rigorous intellect, a responsible independent defender of human rights, and a consistent advocate of social progress."

Here is the Senator of whom one of America's most distinguished living historians, Allen Nevins, wrote:

"Of all our Senators, none has written a more consistently elevated record of public service; none has so clearly combined intellectual distinction—technical expertness—with practical legislative power; none has set so high a moral example."

This is the man—Paul Douglas—whom your State and our Nation need in the Senate of the United States.

RENT SUBSIDIES

Mr. CLARK. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an interesting article under the byline of Mr. Stanley Penn, from the Wall Street Journal of January 24, 1966, dealing with an experimental rent subsidy program, which shows how well the rent subsidy program can work. I hope that, when the appropriate time comes later, we shall be able to reinstitute the rent subsidy program. Members will recall that this program was adopted by Congress last year but was then killed in the appropriations committees. I hope we shall be able to get an appropriation for this needed and desirable program, which has been supported by the President.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Subsidized Tenants—Some Poor Folk Reside in Middle-Class Homes With Help of U.S. Funds—They Grow More Responsible in Improved Environment; Johnson Seeks Wider Plan—A Contrast to Public Housing

(By Stanley Penn)

Boston.—A middle-aged Negro woman who lives in a comfortable four-bedroom apartment on this city's southwest side has a secret she closely guards from her neighbors—Uncle Sam pays $54 of her $127 monthly rent.

The woman, her husband and their seven children are part of a federally financed experiment to determine whether poor families can become more productive members of society if they are immersed in a middle-class environment.

Early returns indicate they can.

The Boston Housing Authority, which administers the experiment here, reports tenants receiving Federal rent subsidies—there are 40 such families in the 450-family experiment—clearly demonstrate more "social responsibility" than poor families living in public housing projects. Rent payments have been made promptly, the privately owned apartments have been kept in relatively good order and there have been no brushes with the law. This, of course, is often not the case in public housing.

FUEL FOR THE ADMINISTRATION

The apparent success of the Boston experiment is adding impetus to the Johnson administration's campaign to put such rent subsidy arrangements on a nationwide basis this year. The administration tried to push a broad-scale rent plan through Congress in 1965, but the lawmakers refused to vote the funds required, charging the eligibility rules were so loosely drawn up that persons far from poor could get subsidies.

Now, the administration has tightened up the requirements and passage by the reconvened Congress seems probable—unless greatly increased military needs should cause major cutbacks on the Great Society front.

President Johnson originally asked for $30 million for rent subsidies in the fiscal year ending June 30, and requested that the yearly payments be increased over a 4-year span to an annual rate of $150 million. Such a sum, it is estimated, would provide partial rent for about 375,000 low-income families. Under the plan, low-income tenants would pay a quarter of their wages for rent and the Federal subsidy would cover the rest. The President is expected to renew his plea for rent subsidy funds in today's budget message.

What families would qualify for the program would depend in part on the area of the country. A low income would be $3,500 or less in one region but $4,500 or more in another. The families would also have to be residing in housing judged by officials to be substandard, or be elderly persons, or physically handicapped or displaced by urban renewal or highway projects.

TOUGHER ELIGIBILITY

To tighten up on eligibility, the plan would require that a family could not have assets exceeding $2,000; under the previous proposal which Congress rejected, assets were allowed to total up to twice a family's annual income. Also, an elderly couple's assets now would be limited to $5,000, while before the maximum was set at three times an elderly family's income.

The Negro mother of seven in the apartment here is perhaps typical of the sort of person the administration hopes to help. Her husband works as a laborer, making only about $4,000 a year. Without the subsidy, the family clearly would not be able to afford the apartment.

"The children here are nicer and better behaved, and there's more room for my kids to play," she says. She admits that "keeping all these white walls clean is some job—in public housing the walls are darker and easier to keep looking clean." Also, she says, "I always got the 'super' (building superintendent) checking on me to see if things are all right." Still, she adds, "I manage to get the work done—I'd hate to give this big apartment up."

If this family's income increases, the rent subsidy will be reduced proportionately; if its income level eventually exceeds a specified ceiling, the family could continue living in the apartment but wouldn't get any subsidy. This continued-occupancy provision is a prime difference between the rent-subsidy plan and public housing, which requires a family to move out after its income reaches a stipulated level.

A NOTE OF CAUTION

While the Boston experiment is an apparent success, its administrators caution that participants in the plan here have been selected with somewhat more care than would probably be taken in any nationwide project.

"We looked for families with some sense of responsibility in conducting their affairs," says Jack Mahoney, an attorney for Development Corp. of America which manages two of the three garden-type apartment complexes in which subsidized tenants here live.

For such reasons as this, some critics of the nationwide rent-subsidy plan warn that it could well run into considerable problems.

"When you start bringing in thousands of low-income families, some of them from broken homes, others on welfare, you're going to have operating problems" not now evident in the Boston experiment, argues one real estate official familiar with the administration's plan. "You'll have to teach them how to use facilities properly. You may have to provide special police protection" for other tenants.

There are at least two other experimental rent-subsidy programs currently underway, and, like the program here, they indicate a nationwide plan probably would prove successful—though not without overcoming significant problems.

New York State already has selected more than 40 low-income families for rent subsidies, to be paid by the State, and enough State money has been authorized to accommodate 600 families eventually. In Washington, D.C., 50 low-income families are living in single-family houses leased with the aid of Federal funds from private landlords.

However, as in Boston, the low-income tenants in New York and Washington are being picked with greater care than might be exercised under a nationwide program.

"We are not taking any obvious problem families, nor are we taking any welfare families," says a New York State housing official. Because of the State's stringent eligibility standards, adds a private housing official who helps manage the New York program, "we've been having a tough time finding enough poor tenants to fill up the apartments that we've allotted. Many of the applicants are welfare cases. Others have a poor standard of living or a bad marital history or don't work regularly."

An official connected with the Washington experiment concedes, "We only wanted those who showed a real interest in moving in and were willing to mow lawns, remove snow, and other chores" they would not normally be faced with in public housing.

How could the problems posed by a less selective nationwide program best be tackled?

If the rent-subsidy experiments now under way are any indication, social workers would play a key role, Boston's Mr. Mahoney recalls, "A few of the low-income tenants weren't meeting their responsibilities in keeping their apartments clean. We got social workers to help us. For once or twice a week for 6 weeks, we had inspections. After that, there was considerable improvement."

The Washington project, using $13,000 contributed by charitable groups, hired a social worker to help its poor families. The social worker, Miss Mary Gruenheck, says, "Some of the families had never lived in houses before, just apartments, and they were overwhelmed with all the space. We had to show them how to use it properly."

Miss Gruenheck put some of the families in touch with the Salvation Army, where they acquired furniture, and on occasion she has lent some of them money to buy small items. She also has referred a few individuals to a nearby psychiatrist and recently helped a youngster over an emotional crisis, when his mother died and his father remarried.

An ancillary aim of the administration's rent-subsidy plan is to promote racial integration; some of its loudest congressional opponents, in face, are from the Deep South. Some skeptics contend, however, that in actual practice housing containing subsidized families rapidly would become all-Negro.

One private real estate official estimates that "Negro tenants in any development must be kept at no more than 30 to 35 percent of the total if whites are not to leave in large numbers." He contends any substantial influx of subsidized families, largely Negro, into existing middle-income housing will drive out a lot of whites and lead eventually to all-Negro apartment buildings.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Louisiana on the conditions previously requested and granted.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the war we are fighting in Vietnam is not an isolated event. It is an integral part of the struggle we have been waging for a very long time in many places in the world. We are not fighting merely to protect the people of South Vietnam from the overt and savage aggression of the Government at Hanoi. We are engaged in the continuing struggle to resist those who seek to establish the principle that might makes right; we seek to demonstrate our good faith to all those peoples of the free world with whom we have joined in commitments to resist aggression by those whose avowed aim is to dominate their neighbors by force of arms.

We are continuing to do in Vietnam essentially what we did in World War II when we joined in preventing the enslavement of the free world by the forces of power-mad dictators whose intentions to end democratic freedoms were made no less clear than the Communist rulers in Peiping make theirs today. Despite our fervent desire to see the end of violence in international affairs and the periodic success of the United Nations Organization in settling disputes by discussion, we soon found that aggression by force of arms could only be met by similar force. We were obliged to come to the assistance of the people of Iran, of Greece, of Turkey, of West Berlin, of South Korea, and of Formosa. We were convinced in each of these instances that our freedom ultimately depended upon the defeat of the aggression being carried out, or overtly threatened, and we were successful in turning away these threats.

We must have no less determination to help the people of South Vietnam defend themselves than we have demonstrated in defending the people of other lands in their struggles against aggressors. Our success there is no less important than it was in West Berlin and South Korea. As President Johnson has said so well:

> We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there is no one else.
>
> Nor would surrender in Vietnam bring peace, because we learned from Hitler at Munich that success only feeds the appetite of aggression. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another country, bringing with it perhaps even larger and crueler conflict, as we have learned from the lessons of history.

Although the prospect is not a happy one, Mr. President, it will do no good to try to delude ourselves. This Nation has faced difficult and dangerous situations many times in our history, and we shall face many more. So long as the Communist aggressors seek to dominate by force of arms other people who struggle to save their freedom, we must remain ready to face aggression if need be. To do otherwise would be folly, and contrary to the lessons of our past.

It will be a little less grim if we see the task in Vietnam in its true perspective—as another cruel, but necessary event in the long march of mankind toward a period when we can live in peace with all men. It has always been our heritage that we will fight to defend freedom. It is a high principle and one which carries a heavy price tag, but I for one do not intend to propose that we change it.

If these views make those who disagree describe me as a hawk instead of a dove, I shall not quarrel with the term. I believe that there is much hard fighting ahead before the dove of peace can find place to roost in Saigon, and it is the hawks, not the doves, who will have to do the fighting if freedom is to exist anywhere in southeast Asia.

Some of those who oppose our actions in coming to the defense of South Vietnam say that our action is illegal and that we have no right to have our forces engaged in battle there. Those who make this charge do so without proper knowledge of the authority which the President has under article II, section 2, of the Constitution, and they disregard the specific actions of the Congress in supporting the policy the President has been following in Vietnam.

In our history there have been at least 125 instances in which the President, without congressional authorization and in the absence of a declaration of war, has ordered the Armed Forces to take actions or to maintain positions abroad. This issue has been submitted for the judgment of the Congress and congressional support was expressed almost unanimously in the joint resolution of August 10, 1964. This resolution included the authorization to use our Armed Forces in southeast Asia.

Recently, more than 25 outstanding professors of law at universities throughout the country gave their emphatic support to the legality of the President's actions. These professors included eminent professors such as Professors Sohn and Baxter at Harvard University, Professor McDougall at Yale, Professor Bishop at the University of Michigan, and Professor Franklin at the University of Southern California. Specifically these professors endorsed the following statement:

> As teachers of international law we wish to affirm that the presence of U.S. forces in South Vietnam at the request of the Government of that country is lawful under general principles of international law and the United Nations Charter. The engagement of U.S. forces in hostilities at the request of the Government of South Vietnam is a legitimate use of force in defense of South Vietnam against aggression. We believe that the evidence indicates that the United States and South Vietnam are taking action that attacks neither the territorial integrity nor the political independence of the People's Republic—action that seeks only to terminate aggression originating in North Vietnam.

I have heard it suggested that a law school student who expressed such an opinion should be dismissed from the university. If that should be done practically all of the international lawyers in this country would have to be put out of business.

Others have urged that we wash our hands of this affair by dumping it into the lap of the United Nations. This proposal is clearly designed to abdicate our responsibilities, not only in Vietnam but in all of Asia. I cannot agree with this thinking.

We have placed ourselves on record before the world that we are dedicated to insure the freedom of the people of South Vietnam. We must keep those commitments as a matter of our own national responsibility.

We know that the President and Ambassador Goldberg have, of course, been using fully those facilities of the United Nations which can be useful under these circumstances. The facilities of private diplomacy are one of the principal assets of the United Nations and they will continue to be used fully.

Senators should remember that, when we requested the assistance of the United Nations in connection with the Tonkin Gulf affair last year, the only result was that Hanoi and Peiping denied the competence of the United Nations to deal with the matter.

A Senator recently charged that we are completely imposing our will upon the defenseless people of South Vietnam, who do not really wish our assistance. To those who make this charge, I urge that they read the remarkably able address of Prime Minister Ky on January 15 of this year. In what can be called an address on the state of the nation, Premier Ky honestly and forthrightly admits the difficulties and the shortcomings of his government.

He is no less forthright in stating the hopes and aspirations of the people:

> First of all, what do we really want?
>
> Such a question posed to any Vietnamese concerned with the fate of his compatriots and the honor of the nation and the happiness of the people in this part of the world—which means the happiness of each individual and each family—gets this unique and unvarying answer:
>
> Decidedly, not communism.
>
> To such an answer, no additional comment is needed.

That is exactly the answer that I give to those who, as did the Senator from Pennsylvania, recently suggested that there was something amiss with the South Vietnam Government.

It is not everything we would like it to be; neither is ours; and neither is that of many of our allies. But we do not want communism. We would much rather have what we have than what they have; and we are willing to fight and die to keep it that way.

It is fair enough to ask any of those who seek to criticize friends of ours around the world, friendly and allied governments which stand side by side with us in this case in our freedom, liberty, and independence in seeking to defend their own: Do they know any government they would prefer to have replaced by Communist government?

In my opinion, if any Senator wants to make that statement I do not believe the people will send him back to the Senate. I do not believe that is their opinion.

I continue to quote from Prime Minister Ky:

> There is no answer more eloquent than the blood of thousands of combatants who have sacrificed themselves for the survival of the fatherland from the Red imperialists' invasion.
>
> There is no reason stronger than the hardship endured by the Vietnamese combatants and civilians during the lifetime of one generation, the hardships of those who are determined to eradicate Communist ideology from this part of the world.
>
> There is no evidence more concrete than the flow of anti-Red refugees who prefer leaving behind all that is so dear to them: homes, rice fields, villages, rather than live shamefully under Communists' tyranny.
>
> We are determined not to be Communist.
>
> Such is the unanimous determination, the slogan of the whole Vietnamese population, yesterday, today and tomorrow, and until the day the Communist threat is eliminated from this country.
>
> But how do we get rid of this threat?
>
> There is no other alternative to the solution than to defeat the Communists and to rout them from their strongholds. We must defeat the Communists and exterminate communism. Otherwise, the Communists will exterminate us and enslave our people from our generation to our offspring's generation. No one can foresee when enslavement by Communists will end.
>
> * * * * *
>
> On this occasion, I deem it my duty to point out the traditional ideal and determination of the Vietnamese people which is to always cherish and seek peace but only a peace which will guarantee its freedom, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. Any other form of peace which fails to provide these guarantees, would only be a lure into slavery and one which the Vietnamese people, with their clearsightedness and courage, would crush down in order to proceed toward a genuine realistic peace.
>
> For those who still nurture doubts about this issue, I would say to them: "Our concept of peace is very simple. We have not provoked war, we have not declared war. The present war is an invasion from outside our country and one which at the outset was disguised as an internal struggle. But the disguise has been removed for a long time and the invader has uncovered himself. Now it is up to the invader from outside and his subversive henchmen within our country to end the invasion and subversion. Then peace would at once return to this part of the country. Thus, we would end the concern of so many nations, large and small, and of so many statesmen the world over. If the invaders, acting like a blind force, cannot restrain themselves, then it would be our duty and the duty of all those peace-loving people to combine efforts to contain their ambition. Otherwise, the last resort would be to 'outlaw them as peace saboteurs' in this peace-loving and freedom-loving part of this country."
>
> I deem it my duty also to express the sincere gratitude of all our people to all the countries and international organizations and statesman, as well as to all religious leaders, especially Pope Paul VI, who have demonstrated great concern over the plight of the Vietnamese people. I further want to insist that peace is workable only if it can guarantee national independence as well as the people's freedom of thought and human dignity.
>
> I also want to associate all my fellow citizens and comrades in arms to the acknowledgement that, under whatever circumstances, we should ourselves be responsible for our own destiny. No other nation is qualified and able to decide on our destiny, independently of our own will. For reasons of international solidarity, we have accepted and are grateful for the moral and material, military and economic assistance from the friendly countries. But never can we tolerate any interference harmful to our national sovereignty or any decision at variance without people's aspirations.

It certainly cannot be said that the people of South Vietnam have achieved political maturity and that they are untroubled by internal divisions. Nevertheless, the words of Premier Ky ring clear in terms of the efforts they are making to avoid being enslaved by the Communist forces from the north.

When we consider the problems with which his government has had to deal in the past 7 months, we should applaud and not condemn his efforts and accomplishments thus far. When he came to power, there were few indeed who ventured to predict that he would still be in power, or even in Saigon, at the beginning of another year.

Communist domination of South Vietnam would mean the destruction of those who are fighting there now for their freedom. The enemy who has killed or kidnaped almost 50,000 civilians during the past 5 years would certainly be merciless in dealing with those who might fall into his hands in the future. Dire indeed would be the fate of the more than 1½ million members of the Catholic faith who are now in South Vietnam.

When we record the toll of civilians who have fallen to the Vietcong, Mr. President, we should remember that they had only to promise their cooperation to avoid their fate. Yet they chose death, or, in many cases, a fate far worse than mere death, rather than yield to the enemy. A very large proportion of those killed or kidnaped were the local officials in key governmental posts or teachers working in the rural areas who stayed at their posts, knowing the dangers they were facing. When it is said that we are fighting a nationalistic war for our own purposes in southeast Asia, Mr. President, we dishonor the thousands of those brave South Vietnamese who have already sacrificed themselves.

The losses we are suffering among our own forces are heavy, and they are mounting constantly, but they are still small compared to the price paid by the South Vietnamese forces. From 1960 through 1965, the military forces of South Vietnam lost 35,186 men killed in action. During the same period, the total number of soldiers wounded in action, captured or missing, reached 126,103—and South Vietnam is a small country. We do not fight alone in South Vietnam, Mr. President, we fight with a people dedicated to defend their freedom who are still bearing the brunt of the battle, but against an invader who is bringing massive, and ever-increasing, forces across the border from the north.

It was also said that, regardless of our actions, the Asiatics will eliminate the white man from the entire area and that we should abjectly surrender now rather than delay the debacle. Those who propose this course are urging the abandonment of all our allies in Asia, and opening the doors to the rest of the free world. I emphatically disagree with this concept, but it is certainly true that we must take the long view in considering our obligations to our friends and allies in Asia.

We do not underestimate the dedication of the Chinese Communists to the task which they have set for themselves. It is no less than the elimination of freedom—first from the territories on their present borders, and then from the territories adjacent to these expanded borders, and on beyond these horizons.

We have already seen their efforts to leapfrog into Africa and Latin America. Their efforts to infiltrate these areas are continuing, but they have not been succeeding, and they will not succeed. One of the main reasons they are not succeeding and will not succeed is because we are standing firm in South Vietnam and intend to continue to stand firm there.

For myself, I urge the President to make even greater efforts to carry the battle to the enemy in every way that we can. If more troops are needed, if more ports and more supplies are needed, if greater assistance to the people of South Vietnam is required, we must provide all this and more. If this means that the President concludes that we must impose higher taxes in this country, and if this means we have to impose limitations upon our own economy in other ways, than I stand ready, as chairman, to urge these measures upon the members of the Finance Committee and upon the Members of the Senate.

I have not been before, and I am not now, an advocate of insufficient measures to gain an objective. History is altogether too full of instances of "too little, too late." I earnestly hope that this will not be the result of our efforts in southeast Asia.

I am frank to admit, Mr. President, that I have not always understood and accepted the importance of our willingness to support those who would fight for their freedom. I doubted the wisdom of the decision to assist Chiang Kai-shek in defending Quemoy and Matsu. Thus far, those islands have been held successfully and without great difficulty.

It cannot be said for certain, but I have also come to believe that greater support for Chiang on the mainland of China might have led to a vastly different situation in the whole of Asia. I have not forgotten that some of those who would have us abandon South Vietnam now said then that those we have come to know as vicious enemies of democratic freedoms everywhere were "agrarian reformers" who should be abetted in their conquest of China.

Various people in important governmental positions from time to time have sought to promote the idea that it would be necessary to yield Formosa to the Communists. They have been proved wrong. When we relate the struggle here in Vietnam to the larger struggle, it is clear to me that we must seek to deny Communist aggression in every area where the people are willing to fight in defense of their own freedom.

To permit any of these areas to fall to ruthless aggressions would be merely to whet the appetite of the aggressors, and set the stage for a larger and more fateful showdown somewhere else. When one looks at what Americans have been able to do in our history when confronted with far greater odds than those we now face in Vietnam, every American should be able to muster the fortitude to help this Nation fulfill its obligations there.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to observe for the RECORD that I have yielded rather generously to my colleagues from the time I had expected to use in the remarks that I shall now make.

I was glad to do so. I believe that there are far more important issues for the Senate to give its attention to, issues to which it owes its serious attention and which should take precedence over the matter which is the pending business before the Senate.

Mr. President, this issue was before the Senate in the closing days of the previous session. I spoke at some length at that time in opposition to the measure, as I shall do again today. My remarks at that time were made on the 7th day of October and will be found beginning on page 26206 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. Those who may be interested in all of the reasons I have for the position I am taking can read my remarks made at that time in conjunction with those that I shall now make and have an overall picture of the many potent reasons I have for my opposition to the pending measure.

The legislation now pending before the Congress to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, poses a grave issue that is of vital concern to every American citizen who values our heritage of freedom. Inextricably involved in this issue are basic and fundamental principles that are of the very essence of liberty. They constitute one of the most precious of our God-given and inalienable rights—the right to work and to earn a livelihood. They are among those rights which the Founding Fathers so cherished that they wisely enshrined them in our Federal Constitution as a "Bill of Rights" for all Americans.

Mr. President, we are witnessing a strange paradox in the U.S. Senate today. Some 200,000 American boys are fighting and risking their lives on foreign soil today in order that a government on the other side of the world and people in a strange land might retain their freedom and have a chance to establish a government which will conform to their wishes.

We are expending the blood of American youth in an attempt to secure that right to another government and another people while we are witnessing a battle waged in the Senate today by those who are attempting to destroy and take away from 40 million American workers their freedom of choice as to whether they will or will not join a union.

Mr. President, there are some 55 million industrial workers, or nonagricultural workers, in the United States who are eligible ostensibly to join a union. Seventeen million of those 55 million have chosen to do so. So far, 30 percent of them have chosen to do so, and the remaining 70 percent have elected not to do so.

Many areas of the country and many States have right-to-work laws. They have a freedom of choice and have exercised that choice and not joined unions. We are now waging a war against those who have not joined. And this is a form of war. A battle is now being waged on the floor of the U.S. Senate in an endeavor to compel some 40 million nonagricultural workers of this country to join a union in order to have the privilege and opportunity to work, to earn wages, and to earn a livelihood for themselves and for their families.

It is wrong. Congress would do well to give its attention to matters of urgency, to those matters which should take precedence and have priority over every other proposed piece of legislation or program that is essential. Certainly any essential matter should have precedence over matters which are dispensable. The legislation pending today is expendable and dispensable. It should never be here in time of war. It should not be here at any time because it is unjust. It is oppressive. It seeks to force American workers to pay tribute for a privilege that is their God-given right.

The repeal of section 14(b) would inevitably lead to a further erosion of the rights and liberties of millions of our citizens.

Section 14(b) does only one thing. It reserves to the people in each State of this Nation—not only my State, not only the 19 States which have right-to-work laws—the power to enact laws prohibiting both employers and labor unions from making compulsory unionism a condition of employment. That section does not in any way prohibit voluntary unionism. Nor does it permit the States to impose any restrictions upon the federally guaranteed right of employees to voluntarily join labor unions, to contribute financial and other support to them, and to bargain through them with employers in regard to wages, hours, and other conditions of employment.

No State is authorized to enact laws which would relieve employers of their federally imposed obligations to bargain with labor unions selected by their employees for such purposes, or which would prohibit such unions from achieving 100-percent membership among such employees through persuasion and a voluntary choice on the part of the employees.

I assert, Mr. President, without fear of successful contradiction and without fear that anyone will attempt any contradiction of this remark, that there is not a workingman in this Nation today who cannot voluntarily join a union if he wishes to do so. The choice is his. He can join before sundown, if he so desires.

In most instances, he has an opportunity to choose between unions, as to which union he will join. The unions have a right to present their case, to solicit membership, to argue their cause, to point out to the worker where it is to his advantage to join, to persuade him, to convince him. So far, they have failed to convince about 40 million American workers. Failing, Mr. President, in their efforts at solicitation and persuasion, the unions now seek the compulsory power of the law to say they must join or not work.

That is not Americanism. It is contrary to every concept of liberty that our

Founding Fathers conceived at the time of the Declaration of Independence—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They did not say, "provided you join a union," or "provided you join a church" or "provided you join the chamber of commerce."

They said, "the inalienable right to life." Mr. President, how can one have life without food? How can the workingman have food without wages? How can he have wages without employment?

What we propose to do here by compulsion is to make the American workers pay tribute for the privilege of earning bread for their families.

In brief, section 14(b) only permits State legislation which is limited to protecting workers by prohibiting compulsory unionism from being imposed upon them.

All the Federal Government has done is say that the States, if they will, if they wish to, may prohibit the imposition of compulsory unionism. My State did that. Nineteen other States of the Union have done that. I do not wish to take that right away from the States.

In the context of freedom and liberty, compulsion is an ugly word and compulsory association is the very antithesis of freedom. Thus, it is little wonder that proponents of repeal of section 14(b) attempt to substitute the term "union security" for compulsory unionism.

Where in our Constitution is there any basis for requiring compulsory membership in any organization? Churches are on a voluntary basis. Chambers of commerce are on a voluntary basis. Business associations are on a voluntary basis. Such organizations do not necessarily involve something as vital as the right to earn a living; but here we are attempting to place that right, not on a voluntary basis, but under a compulsory requirement, at the discretion and will of labor leaders.

But whatever substitute term they use, union security or any other such term, it cannot conceal the truth—the fact that it is compulsory unionism and nothing else but compulsory unionism that union leaders seek through the repeal of section 14(b).

STATE RIGHT-TO-WORK-LAWS

So long as section 14(b) remains the law of the land the States retain the power to enact legislation prohibiting compulsory unionism. Nineteen States have so acted and now have such statutes or constitutional provisions.

The even-handed protection which such enactments and such constitutional amendments afford to working men and women is exemplified by an amendment to the Arkansas constitution adopted in 1944. Mr. President, that was subsequent to my being elected to the U.S. Senate. It provides:

> SECTION 1. Discrimination for or against union labor prohibited: No person shall be denied employment because of membership in or affiliation with or resignation from a labor union, or because of refusal to join or affiliate with a labor union; nor shall any corporation or individual or association of any kind enter into any contract, written or oral, to exclude from employment members of a labor union or persons who refuse to join a labor union, or because of resignation from a labor union, nor shall any person against his will be compelled to pay dues to any labor organization as a prerequisite to or condition of employment.

Pursuant to that constitutional amendment, the Arkansas Legislature enacted the following statute:

> No person shall be denied employment because of membership in, or affiliation with, a labor union; nor shall any person be denied employment because of failure or refusal to join or affiliate with a labor union; nor shall any person, unless he shall voluntarily consent in writing to do so, be compelled to pay dues, or any other monetary consideration to any labor organization as a prerequisite to, or condition of, or continuance of employment.

In each instance, in the constitutional provision and in the statute that was enacted, it is asserted that no workingman, in effect, shall be denied employment because of membership in a union. In other words, an employer cannot say to him, "I will not employ you because you are a member of a union." If the employer does say that, he violates the law.

The same law provides that a workingman shall not be denied employment because he has not joined or does not choose to join a union.

What can be fairer to both sides of this issue?

Is that not a confession that unionism, on its own merits, does not have the appeal to persuade working people to do something on their own initiative to join it? I should think it should stand upon that basis, and that basis alone.

If it is good for the working people, and there is no bar; then they can join at will. But, so far, during all the years in which statutes favorable to labor have been enacted, and with all the power—and undue power—which has been granted labor unions and labor leaders, upon the basis of persuasion and, in some States, upon the basis of compulsion, they have been able to get only approximately 30 percent of the working people of this country to join a union.

Why? Not because they have not had every opportunity and every legitimate protection of Federal law to do so, but, somehow, they have failed to present convincingly to the workingman the merits of their case.

What is lacking?

Labor has the answer. They know what they lack on merit. Obviously, they do. But, instead of choosing to improve the merit of their appeal, they choose to ask the Federal Government to make it compulsory by statute.

Let me say, as I have said many times before, that if I were a workingman in a factory, or a laborer in some industry where there was a good union, I would probably wish to join the union.

Mr. President, I am not opposed to unionism. For the working people of this country, it has been a good thing, in many instances. Where it has been good, it will have its appeal on its merits. The workingman certainly has the right to choose, as anyone may choose what business he will enter, what profession, what vocation or avocation he would like to pursue. Millions of our fellow citizens are working people. They depend upon jobs in industry for a living. It is honorable to work for a living. But, I do not believe that we should say, because a man is an honest worker and happens to be working in a given industry, or happens to be a nonagricultural worker, that he should be compelled to join a union.

The Arkansas statute is eminently fair and reasonable because it treats union and nonunion workers equally. It in no way discriminates between the two, nor does it in any way discriminate with respect to race, creed, or color. It merely takes the middleground—it disallows coercion one way or the other. He is protected against the threat of coercion from either side. His right to choose is paramount. His right to choose is what is secured for him. He is protected in that right against coercion or compulsion or intimidation from either side. It says to the union that it may operate freely and unfettered but without the power to impose compulsory unionism on employees as a condition upon their right to work for a livelihood. And it says to the worker that you may follow your occupation without fear of coercion or threat from the union or the employer—you may freely join or refuse to join a union—the choice is left to the individual. And I submit, Mr. President, that this is exactly as it should be; that it is freedom's way, the right way, and the only way in which justice can be done.

Members of Congress are now being asked to fly in the face of reasonable statutes such as we now have in Arkansas and some 18 other States, and vote to put the blessing of the Federal Government upon the awesome power of compulsory unionism. Such a course of action would ignore all reason, logic and flout the Constitution itself. A vote to repeal section 14(b) is a vote against the individual liberties guaranteed by the Bill of Rights and it is a vote against the express reservation of powers in the people and the respective States under the 10th amendment to the Constitution. And, of course, a vote to repeal is a vote to further reinforce the monopolistic and tremendous economic power already permitted and enjoyed by labor organizations in this country.

The Arkansas right-to-work law—like the laws in sister States having similar laws—makes the worker a freeman, free to join a union if he desires, and free not to join or support a union if he so chooses. The choice is his and his alone. Take away the right of choice—as is proposed by the repeal of section 14(b)—and you take away his freedom. For when choice is denied, freedom is denied.

But now as a U.S. Senator, representing the people of my native State of Arkansas, I am now being implored by labor leaders to disregard my obligation to them, to violate their trust in me and vote here to repeal or nullify that amendment to their State constitution which they adopted by the ballot—by majority vote—just a few years ago. Mr. President, I shall not betray their trust, I shall keep faith with them. If and when they, the people of my State, want to repeal the State's right-to-work constitutional amendment, they can do it with the same process by which they adopted it—by the ballot, in a legal election. And it is not fair or right for the labor leaders of my State to ask me to do here what the people of Arkansas can do in an election anytime they want to do it.

They can get a petition and have a constitutional amendment referred to the people who adopted it. If they wish to wipe it off the statute books of Arkansas, they have the means and the tools to do it. They can refer the question to the people who adopted it. Let them pass on it again. The people of Arkansas adopted that constitutional amendment since they elected me to the U.S. Senate. Who am I to thwart their will, to thwart their determination in the form of an amendment that they have put into the State constitution? I refuse to do it. The labor leaders have the means to do it. They can use those means. They can begin right now. An election will be coming up. Let them petition and let the people give the answer. It is their constitution, not mine alone. I have no right to tear it asunder on the floor of the U.S. Senate. It is not up to me to contravene the constitution. What kind of Representative of my people would I be if I stood here today, or when the roll was called, and by my vote tore asunder what the people of my State have adopted and so far have not changed? Nor have they given any indication that they want to change it. So far they have not asked for an election on it. The labor leaders have this remedy. They have a recourse. That recourse is the legitimate way, the honest way, and the way of integrity though labor unions should not ask their Representative or Senator to break with the trust that they have reposed in them. The people of my State have refused to do this in an election, and I will refuse to do it here.

If the labor leaders of my State, who condemn me for voting here like a majority of our citizens voted in the State when Arkansas' constitutional amendment was adopted, truly believe in democracy and in the righteousness of their cause, let them secure a referendum, which they can do under Arkansas laws, and submit this issue of repeal to the people of Arkansas in an election.

So far as the State of Arkansas is concerned, if the labor leaders of my State can convince the people of the State to repeal that amendment, they will be gaining as much as if the bill the Senate is considering were passed. So this is not their last resort. This should not be their last resort. Their resort is to the people who adopted the amendment. And if the people turn them down, then they ought not ask me to turn down the people.

That is the fair thing for them to do. In voting against repeal of 14(b) I am voting in accordance with the will and wishes of a vast majority of Arkansas citizens.

Just last year the State Senate of Arkansas reaffirmed my State's position on the right-to-work issue by adopting a resolution stating that it is the consensus of the general assembly that the Arkansas delegation in the Congress of the United States should exert their full efforts to oppose the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. And, Mr. President, I intend to do just that. To do less would be to betray the faith and trust of my constitutents, and that I shall not do.

Mr. President, the resolution was inserted in the Record as a part of my remarks in my speech on October 7, 1965.

In safeguarding the individual's right to work free from discrimination or intimidation because of his membership or nonmembership in a labor union, we are protecting one of the most sacred of all individual rights and personal liberties that any person can possess. Also, by safeguarding the right to work we are protecting his right to live, to own property. In addition, by protecting him from discrimination because of his membership or nonmembership in a labor union we are protecting him in the exercise of his freedom of choice and freedom of association. The latter constitutes the very essence of individual liberty and the very foundation of our free society.

Mr. President, as I have previously stated, these rights are so precious that they are enshrined in the first 10 amendments to our Federal Constitution.

The courts have consistently upheld State right-to-work laws emphasizing the impartial treatment which they accord to union and nonunion employees alike. For example, Justice Black, speaking for the Supreme Court in *Lincoln Union* v. *Northwestern Co.* 335 U.S. 525 said:

> Under the State policy adopted by these laws employers must, other considerations being equal, give equal opportunities for remunerative work to union and nonunion members with discrimination against neither.

I have always thought Justice Black was a great liberal on the Court. I still think so. But this strikes at the very fundamentals of individual liberty.

Incredible as it may seem, it is the impartiality of such laws in their application to union and nonunion workers, which has aroused much of the antagonism which advocates of compulsory unionsm have toward them. That fact became evident in the Lincoln Union case, when spokesmen for the labor unions advanced the startling contention "that the right to work as a nonunionist is in no way equivalent to or the parallel of the right to work as a union member; that there exists no constitutional right to work as a nonunionist on the one hand while the right to maintain employment free from discrimination because of union memberships is constitutionally protected."

Mr. President, that was the argument of the unionists against a right-to-work law in the States. That is their argument as to the Constitution of the United States. That is the argument that was presented when the Court upheld the right-to-work law. They took a position that the Constitution required unionism if the union so said.

Refusing to accept this astounding doctrine, Justice Black then declared:

> There cannot be wrung from a constitutional right of workers to assemble to discuss improvement of their working standards, a further constitutional right to drive from remunerative employment all other persons who will not or cannot participate in union assemblies. The constitutional right of workers to assemble, to discuss and formulate plans for furthering their own self-interest in jobs cannot be construed as a constitutional guarantee that none shall get and hold jobs except those who will join in the assembly or will agree to abide by the assembly's plans.

In other words, they asked the Court to hold that unless a man joined the union he had no right to work.

Undeterred by the Supreme Court's decisions sustaining the constitutionality of right-to-work laws, the advocates of compulsory unionism are now attempting to secure their nullification through the repeal of section 14(b).

In other words, they sought in the courts to have declared unconstitutional laws that protected workers in their choice. They failed; and the opinion was written by one of the most liberal judges on the Supreme Court.

In their zeal to accomplish their objective they are insisting that this Congress override the majority will of the people of those States that have right-to-work laws and that it invade and usurp their sovereignty. They are demanding that Congress strike from the statute books and constitutions of those States, the only remaining legal barriers to the imposition of compulsory unionism throughout the length and breadth of this Nation.

If Congress accedes to those demands it will be granting labor bosses an unlimited license to impose compulsory unionism as a condition to meaningful employment anywhere in American industry. Power of such magnitude would grant union leaders complete monopoly and control over the most indispensable right that any man possesses, the right to work to earn the bread of life.

It is difficult to say who is more liberal, Justice Douglas or Justice Black.

Supreme Court Justice Douglas stated it well when he said:

> The right to work, I had assumed, was the most precious right that man possesses * * * to work means to eat, it also means to live (*Barsky* v. *Board of Regents*, 347 U.S. 442).

I do not believe I have exaggerated. I do not believe we would call Justice Douglas or Justice Black a union hater or liberal baiter. There is a fundamental question involved. Shall we confer upon a private association the power of government—it is a dictatorial power—to compel men to join a union before they can work? What is freedom? What kind of freedom are we fighting for overseas? We are told that we are fighting so that those people can have the choice of government, the kind of government that they want.

Is it not just as vital that working people in this country have the choice to join or not to join a union? I believe it is. I shall not take that right away from them.

Today the labor bosses seek control of all jobs. If we surrender this right, tomorrow they will seek control over industries. And then what will the future hold? Once the workers are captured and industries subdued it would be a simple matter to use the resulting voting and economic power to seek manipulation of public offices and through this device, control of the Government.

The possession of such a monopoly, of such exhorbitant powers, by any private group—labor or management—would corrupt the body politic and imperil the very foundations of our free society. It is little wonder, therefore, that even public government is constitutionally prohibited from exercising or possessing such extreme and dominant power.

In *Truax* v. *Rauch*, 239 U.S. 33, for example, the Supreme Court held that the Arizona State Legislature had exceeded its constitutional authority when it enacted a law which would have required employers to discriminate against aliens and favor U.S. citizens when hiring employees. Speaking for the Court in that case, the late Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes declared:

> It requires no argument to show that the right to work for a living in the common occupations of the community is of the very essence of the personal freedom and opportunity that it was the purpose of the 14th amendment to secure.

Unfortunately, we who have enjoyed the blessing of liberty to a greater degree than have the people of any other land, too often forget that every individual in our society owes his freedom from governmental oppression to the restraints which our Federal Constitution imposes upon the sovereign power of government. We would do well to remember that those restraints were placed there deliberately. The men who founded this Nation had experienced the tyranny of arbitrary power at the hands of an all-powerful ruler.

As the late Justice Frankfurter noted in AFL against American Sash Co.:

> Their concern for individual members of society, for whose well-being government is instituted, gave urgency to the fear that concentrated power would become arbitrary. It is a fear that the history of such power, even when professedly employed for democratic purposes, has hardly rendered unfounded.

In that same case, in upholding the constitutionality of State legislation prohibiting compulsory unionism, Justice Frankfurter went on to state:

> If concern for the individual justifies incorporating in the (Federal) Constitution itself devices to curb public authority, a legislative judgment that his protection requires the regulation of the private power of unions cannot be dismissed as insupportable.

Labor leaders who advocate repeal of section 14(b) frequently argue that State laws which prohibit the imposition of compulsory union membership as a condition of employment, violate the majority rule principle. They assert that when a labor union has been selected by a majority of employees in a bargaining unit to act as the representative of such unit, it is undemocratic to prohibit that union from entering into an agreement which would require union membership and dues from all employees as a condition of their continued employment.

Aside from the fact that the employees are generally not given an opportunity to vote on such questions by their union leaders, the fundamental fallacy of the argument is that there is nothing democratic about the arbitrary power of an unrestrained majority. Compulsory association, whether in a labor organization or in any other private organization, tramples upon the rights of those who do not choose to associate in or join such an organization. Freedom of choice is the highest form of individual liberty and freedom to associate or not to associate is the very essence of a free society. Power to compel association violates those fundamental rights of the individual and clearly constitutes a form of totalitarianism.

Clearly then, the unlimited power of a majority to force compulsory association upon a minority constitutes the very antithesis of the democratic principle of majority rule as it has always been understood in our society.

Those who urge upon us such distorted interpretations of the fundamental principles of our American system of democracy would have us forget that this Nation was founded by men who abhorred tyranny in all its forms and whatever its source. They believed that unlimited power whether in the hands of one, of the few, or of the many was "the very definition of tyranny."

Indeed, it was their abhorrence of unlimited power, and their concern for and devotion to the cause of liberty and the other inalienable rights of the individual, which prompted and inspired them to formulate and adopt our constitutional Bill of Rights. And as the late Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson declared:

> The very purpose of a bill of rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts.

I wonder who would favor denying of freedom of speech merely because a majority in a given organization said, "We do not believe in freedom of speech. Anything you wish to say, you will have to submit to us to be censored." Who would favor that? Freedom of speech is a constitutional right; it is an inalienable right; it is a basic right.

But now it is proposed to say, "You can talk, but you cannot work without paying." I do not know which is more precious. People can live without talking. I suppose they can live without expressing an opinion that would be controversial in any degree. But they cannot live without something to eat. Forty million workers in America today are earning something to eat for themselves and their families, and have chosen not to join a union. Now it is proposed to make them join. Is that liberty? Is that freedom? To me it seems more like compulsion and dictatorship. It has a little ring of tyranny in it.

"You must do what we tell you. You must support this institution. You must obey its laws and its edicts; otherwise you will not eat." The Federal Government is being asked to confer that power on unions. The Federal Government is being asked to take away the right of every State to protect workers against that kind of imposition.

Justice Jackson continued:

> One's right to life, liberty and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to votes; they depend on the outcome of no elections. (Speaking for the Supreme Court in *West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette*, 319 U.S. 1187.)

Mr. President, the right to work, the right to earn a livelihood, the right to obtain food and to eat should not depend upon the outcome of any election—whether it be a political or a labor union election—or on a contract made between an employer and representatives of a labor union.

We ought to be free, we ought to retain that liberty, we ought to retain that right. If the Constitution were ever interpreted as the Founding Fathers contend it should be, in accordance with their intent and purpose at the time it was written, we could not sustain union shop agreements.

During the past 40 years the Congress has conferred upon labor unions special privileges, immunities, and advantages which have not been extended to any other private organizations in our society. For example, they have been granted the right to act as the exclusive representatives of all employees in the units for which they bargain, even though those employees may not desire their representation and may prefer not to have it.

They have been given that authority. If a majority of those who work in a given industry join their union, that union has the authority to bargain for all the workers in that industry or plant, whether they are union members or whether they even want the union to bargain for them. We have given them that much power.

Now it is said, "Well, these other folks are freeloaders. They are free riders because they are not paying anything."

The other folks did not want to be free riders. They only wanted to be left alone. They did not seek this status or want it. It is being imposed upon them.

Labor unions today are almost completely immune from the injunctive power of our courts. In 31 of our sovereign States, unions are free to impose compulsory membership in their organizations and to require the payment of dues, fees, and assessments as conditions of employment. Often money collected from employees under compulsory union membership contracts has been used to promulgate and advance social, economic, and political programs and philosophies, and even political candidates to which the employees may be opposed.

Indeed, it is the freewheeling manner in which politically powerful and ambitious labor bosses sometimes have used their positions, and the dues collected under compulsory membership contracts, to promote various social, economic, and political causes which is responsible for much of the present resistance of workers to unionism. Those who advocate repeal of section 14(b) ignore this fact when they argue that compulsory unionism is essential to protect the unions from the so-called free rider.

The Constitution says nothing about protecting anyone from free riders. These people are not free riders. They are captive riders. They are not free enough to ride voluntarily. The ride is being imposed upon them. It is not by their choice.

Mr. President, I do not believe that I have said one thing here today about the Constitution or the problems that are involved here that is not sustained by many jurists throughout the country.

Much of the language that I have used here might well have been taken from the opinions and expressions of the judges themselves on this issue.

Judge Carter, of the Nebraska Supreme Court, exposed the fallacy of the "free rider" argument of compulsory unionists when he said:

> In some instances compulsory membership would compel support, financial and otherwise, of policies which an employee might deem objectionable from the standpoint of free government and the liberties of the individual under it. An employee may neither desire the benefits of such programs nor desire to contribute to their support. He may object to certain programs and activities of the union for reasons of his own and, consequently, not desire to contribute to their promulgation. To compel any employee to make involuntary contributions from his compensation for such purpose is a taking of his property without due process of law.

That is not my language. That is the language of the court.

Judge Carter further stated:

> We have prided ourselves in this country in the rights of free speech and free thought, rights which have been guaranteed to us by constitutional provision. Compulsory unionism infringes upon these rights and often encroaches upon the right of an individual to be free from coercion by others. To compel him to contribute to the support of economic or political programs adopted by a union, which may be abhorrent to him, is as constitutionally wrong as if similar programs were compelled by the employer. The fifth amendment protects against the forced appropriation of one's property for the support of ideals which he may desire to oppose. The right to work and to be compensated therefore is a fundamental principle in our democratic thinking. To force contributions against one's will in the manner here employed is a violation of his fundamental rights and privileges. It is a violation of "nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law," contained in the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.
>
> Constitutional guarantees exist in fair weather and in foul. They may be asserted by the minority against the majority and by the individual even against the power of Government. They may be asserted by an employee against his employer or a labor union, or both. An employee not only has the right to work, but he has the guaranteed right to have his earnings protected against confiscation against his will. Forcing an employee to join a union and to compel him to financially support principles, projects, policies, or programs in which he does not believe and does not want, is clearly a taking of his property without due process.

Mr. President, the most recent example of what can happen when undue and unchecked power is lodged in the hands of labor barons is the spectacle produced by Michael J. Quill in New York.

This arrogant labor boss had the effrontery to violate State law, to defy court orders, to ignore the public, and to wreak havoc on the economic well-being and individual welfare of the nearly 10 million Americans living in the world's greatest city. Think of it, the world's greatest city, the seat of world commerce and international finances, the site of the United Nations, brought to its knees by the arrogant acts of one man. One man possessed of power obviously beyond the needs of his union and obviously beyond his capacity to discharge in a responsible way and in the public interest. In this instance, it was special interest—not public interest that prevailed.

Michael J. Quill took the law in his own hands, and in the presence of a vast national television audience, he tore up a court order directing him to cut off the strike, a court order issued to enjoin the strike in a display of utter contempt for our judicial processes and then proceeded to declare that "the judge can drop dead in his black robes, we will not call off the strike."

Mr. President, I happened to witness that performance. I asked myself, would I be placing others in such position of power, if I take away from the worker the right to choose—just the right to choose—about whether he will join a union?

When Quill was jailed for his contemptuous action, his successor then audaciously declared that the union would keep the subways and buses idle until "hell freezes over" unless the city gave the union what it wanted.

Do we want that power enlarged upon? The New York strike involved only one local transport industry. Do we want it extended nationwide? Do we want to continue to enlarge these powers, putting such powers into irresponsible hands like this? If the American people do, they will have done it unto themselves. They will have no one else to blame.

Quill's defiant unreasonableness inflicted immeasurable and indescribable personal suffering and hardship upon millions of innocent people, and the economic losses caused by his strike have been estimated to run up to a billion dollars.

One other thought about it. The taxpayers of this Nation will help pay a part of the loss. Emergency loans have been made to small businesses and to others. I hope most of them will be repaid, and probably they will, but some of them will not. So because of one man's arbitrary, ruthless, "don't-give-a-damn" attitude, we are having to pay a part of the losses of that strike.

Think of this. Quill's original demands made a mockery of good faith negotiation, the touchstone of the collective bargaining process. The prize first sought by his striking Transport Workers Union included 76 demands calling for a $680 million package spread over a 2-year period. This demand called for an immediate 30-percent hourly pay increase for the union's 33,000 members; a 4-day, 32-hour workweek; 6 weeks' vacation after 1 year's service; and retirement at half pay after 25 years' service at any age. Mr. President, the original demands made by Baron Quill could have provided an estimated pay raise, taking all fringes into account, of $7,800 a year for each worker in his union. Certainly this is ridiculous on its face but it demonstrates how unlimited power can be used and abused when left in the irresponsible hands of a labor boss like Mr. Quill.

And this is the same man who used his vast reservoir of power to reject a proposal to keep the buses running through negotiations with a promise that benefits subsequently agreed upon would be made retroactive.

No, he would not accept that. He is willing to make many millions of people suffer to satisfy his own greed and arrogance. He rejected a proposal to submit the matter to arbitration or factfinding as a means of resolving the matter.

And Mr. Quill rejected as "peanuts" an offer to follow the administration's much heralded anti-inflation guidepost of a 3.2-percent increase.

Mr. President, Mr. Quill has clearly demonstrated that this Nation cannot afford to be subjected to the whims, the vagaries, and the will of one man, or of a few men. This Nation cannot afford one Michael J. Quill and I can assure you that I will not be a party to a proposal to perpetuate his breed through the instrumentality of repealing section 14(b). I urge that we consign this ill-advised legislation, this muddled measure, this "Quill's bill" to its rightful resting place—the scrap heap of unworthy legislation. Yes, Mr. President. Am I being too harsh in commenting on Mr. Quill's demands?

He does not care for the people; he does not care for the Government; he does not care for the suffering of individuals. All he wants is the privilege of saying, "I am Michael Quill. I am going to have my way. They are going to do what I say. I am the power."

Let us see what the President of the United States says about it.

This is what the President said about it:

> I do not believe any settlement which violates our wage-price guideposts—

That is the 3.2 percent to which I referred—

> to this extent is in the national interest.
>
> I know the people of New York must be relieved that the transit strike is settled and normal life has been restored. I share their feeling and I want to express my pride in the way that these people met the demands and pressure.
>
> Candor requires me to say that I am quite disturbed that essential services could be paralyzed for so long, and I am equally disturbed by the cost of the settlement.

Mr. President, that is power—power in the hands of irresponsible persons, in the hands of arrogant persons, in the hands of those who operate in a tyrannical fashion merely to gratify their own egoes.

Instead of considering the repeal of section 14(b) which would have the inevitable effect of adding to the mighty powers already enjoyed by unions, I urge Congress to consider legislation that would protect the citizens of our country from being subjected to the antics and impositions of a Michael Quill.

While we are at it, Mr. President, we might also consider enacting laws that will prevent pilfering and protect the billions of dollars now accumulated in union treasuries and in their pension and welfare funds, which rightfully belong to the rank-and-file union members. Just last summer, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations conducted an inquiry into the diversion of union pension and welfare funds of two labor unions—the Allied Trade Council and Teamster Local 815 in New York City. The record developed at those hearings established that the officials of those two unions looted pension and welfare funds, belonging to the workers, of $4 million. I have introduced legislation to protect these funds from such raids in the future. I feel that Congress would be well advised to consider that bill instead of the pending measure, and to remedy that situation, rather than to expend its time trying to give even greater power to men in a position to do such looting.

As a result of hearings conducted by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations I have offered legislation to outlaw strikes at our missile sites and other strategic defense facilities. I truly believe that we cannot afford the luxury of strikes at missile sites or other war plants when a war is in progress. I do not believe that I, in good conscience, if I were a worker in such a plant or site, could strike to delay production of some weapon, ammunition, or materiel that our fighting forces needed on the battlefield, and thereby subject them to greater dangers by causing a delay in the receipt by our fighting men of the weapons and instrumentalities which they so badly need. I do not believe that such a strike should be permitted.

We have courts to settle issues, to determine even the life and death of individuals, to determine whether a person should be at liberty or whether he should be in prison. I believe, therefore, that we should set up some kind of process—an arbitrary process, if we will—or some tribunal which we could entrust with power to resolve these issues where a strike is about to occur or has taken place in a defense or missile site where production of materiel is vitally needed in the war effort.

If we can trust the courts to send men to prison for life under due process of law, we certainly should be able to establish some tribunal that we can trust to do justice and equity to employer, employee, and the Government.

The record of irresponsibility compiled by some unions with respect to those vital programs certainly does not commend them for further and greater power than they already have. Instead, the situation cries out for remedy in this period of war and threatened peril. Therefore, I would urge Congress to lay aside the pending measure and consider the remedies proposed in these and other pending bills.

I would also suggest, Mr. President, that Congress might likewise consider, in lieu of the pending measure, legislation to make Federal antitrust laws applicable to certain activities of labor unions in the transportation industry so that Federal courts would be authorized to issue injunctions to restrain violations where necessary to protect the public interest and safety. The transportation industry is essential to this Nation's existence and continued progress and we should see to it that it is amply protected. During the past three sessions of Congress I have offered legislation to accomplish this purpose and it is still pending and awaiting action.

Mr. President, the raw and unrestricted power to impose compulsory unionism upon the right to work anywhere in American industry, is too awesome even for the best-intentioned leaders of organized labor to possess. But to put that frightening power within the reaches of some elements within the rank and file of labor or its leaders, as the repeal of section 14(b) would do, is unthinkable.

If section 14(b) is repealed, workers would be compelled to join unions that are under incompetent or questionable leadership, just as much so as it would compel them to join a union that is under efficient and honest leadership. The law of compulsion makes no distinction between good unions and bad unions.

If there happens to be a bad union or a union under dishonest and corrupt leadership in a given plant, and we were to repeal section 14(b), every worker would be compelled to join that union—corrupt or not corrupt, tyrannical or not tyrannical. He would have no choice. He would have to join and pay tribute, or he would not eat.

Today, in States having right-to-work laws such as Arkansas, workers have a choice and can refuse to become a member of a union that they believe to be a bad union, or of a union that they consider to be under corrupt leadership. If 14(b) is repealed, they will no longer have that right, instead they will be compelled to join.

Mr. President, I refuse to deny them the right to choose. I refuse to compel them to join. I therefore shall vote against repeal.

Mr. President, the arguments, the reasons, that can be presented in opposition to this proposal are really unlimited. Instances can be cited, case after case, circumstance after circumstance, principle upon principle, right and justice as we truly know it to be can be interposed as a defense in opposition to this proposal for time indefinite.

And so, if someone asks, "Why spend so much time on it?" it is because of the importance of the issue. If a resolution were before us to deny freedom of speech, would anyone want us to give it only passing opposition, and then let it be enacted? Some of us feel rather deeply about it.

The proposal before us strikes at depths that will leave wounds inflicted upon our body politic, on the rights of our people, that cannot be healed. The scars will be there as we exercise our rights in the future, as future generations come along to read the Declaration of Independence. And when they read of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, they will wonder when that ceased to be a fundamental principle upon which our Government rested. They will wonder when the change occurred. If they have enough curiosity to look at the record they will find that a part of that change occurred the day that the Senate passed this bill. They will find that was a part of the change that destroyed their liberty.

An important change should be debated; but the debate should go to the point of resisting such a change. As the proposal is made to compel union membership, it challenges us to prevent that compulsion from being imposed.

There are many elements on which I could speak at much greater length than I shall speak today, but I wish to give a few more examples.

For 3 years, the Senate Select Committee on Labor Racketeering listened to a parade of more than 1,400 witnesses detail stories of crime and corruption in the union movement. Stories of violence, bribery, extortion, and the exploitation of working people to dimensions that shocked the conscience. Regrettably, those hearings only disclosed these dispicable conditions, they could not dispel or dispose of them. There is still corruption in some labor unions today, and the record developed during our investigations leads to the inescapable conclusion that total compulsory unionism—which the repeal of section 14(b) would establish on a nationwide basis—and corruption sometimes go hand in hand.

For the greatest incidence of crime, corruption, and violence in organized labor was found by our committee to have occurred in those States not having right-to-work laws. Presently 31 States do not have such laws but—and this is important—so long as we keep section 14(b) on the books, the people in those States will have the authority to enact laws on this subject if and when they choose to do so. Repeal of that provision would take that right away from the States and thereby usurp their sovereignty on an issue which vitally concerns the fundamental rights of their citizens.

Under the present laws, the right to organize, the right to belong to a union, and the right to bargain collectively, are well protected. So it is clear that if a worker chooses not to join a union, or participate in its affairs, it is not because he cannot do so, rather it is because he will not, or does not choose to do so. The total number of nonagriculture production workers in America is estimated at 55 million. Of this number some 17 million, or 30 percent, are members of unions. Thus the vast majority of American industrial workers—almost 40 million of them, or 70 percent, have chosen not to join a union.

Six major labor organizations, with a combined membership in excess of 3 million, were clearly shown by our committee investigation to be substantially under the control and influence of evil and unscrupulous leaders. The account of corruption, gangsterism, embezzlement, looting, and outright theft of millions of dollars from the pension, welfare, and other union funds by corrupt leaders of those unions constitutes one of the most scandalous and shocking disclosures resulting from the Senate Select Committee's investigation. Yet these same unions, with many of those same corrupt leaders, still in positions of control over their affairs are continuing to function today as the bargaining representatives of millions of American workers.

One of those six unions, the Teamsters Union, is possibly the largest and most powerful labor organizations in the world. Its membership exceeds 1½ million, and its annual income is probably in excess of $100 million. And this very union—with many of the same corrupt elements who were exposed during our investigation, still in control of its affairs—is today possessed of such exorbitant power that it can, at any time its leaders choose, call a nationwide strike that would bring the operations of vast segments of American industry to an abrupt halt.

It could pull another Michael Quill involving all of the trucking industries in this country.

No one can convince me that we should add to the power which those corrupt unions and their unscrupulous leaders already possess by repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and thereby enlarging their authority to impose compulsory membership in their unions as a condition upon the right to work for a living.

I wish to emphasize that the only similarity between the corrupt labor organizations and their leaders, and the decent, honest, and loyal unions, and their honest, loyal officials, who I am proud to say, constitute the vast majority of unions in the union movement, is that both are treated alike under the law. Both enjoy the same special benefits, privileges, immunities, and exceptions under our laws. And both have the same unrestrained and tremendous powers that will be further enlarged if section 14(b) is repealed.

In other words, this power cannot be granted only to the good unions. When it is granted, it is granted to all unions, the good and the bad. It goes to those under honest leadership and those under the leadership of oppressors.

The more than 40,000 persons interviewed by our committee provided ample evidence that the scope of infiltration of organized labor by the forces of crime and corruption was far more widespread and extensive than anyone had believed possible.

Incidentally, Mr. President, in my remarks on October 7, 1965, to which I previously referred, I quoted statements made by Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO with respect to his shock and surprise at the amount of corruption and dishonesty that the committee had uncovered in labor unions.

To gain control of unions these forces used the tools of tyranny—e.g., forcing union membership on workers by making employers enter into compulsory membership contracts thereby delivering the employees against their will to the union; abrogating all democratic processes within the union and substituting complete dictatorial power by union officials; appointing known criminals and unreformed convicts to positions of authority and trust over rank-and-file union members; using union funds to bribe public officials; and extorting money from employers. Then, to maintain their tyrannical control over such unions, these unscrupulous forces frequently resorted to brute physical violence and threats of violence against union members and even against their families. Bombed businesses and dynamited homes were the hallmark of ruthless men who imposed their reign of terror over the rank-and-file members and undertook to silence anyone audacious enough to raise his voice in protest.

One means of controlling a subordinate local by an international labor organization is the use of a device known as a trusteeship. The international organization sends in a representative, who assumes complete control of the local organization no matter how unwanted the supervisor is or how thinly veiled is the excuse for his intervention. Until the passage of the Landrum-Griffin Act, there was an unlimited time during which this supervision could remain. While this condition exists today, although now regulated to a limited extent by law, the trustee or supervisor makes all decisions for the local.

The men have no further right, no further authority, no further voice in its affairs. The supervisor, the trustee, often have complete charge of the funds. He frequently is in complete control of all of the internal affairs of the local union during the period of the trusteeship. We found this device abused in numerous unions. As an illustration, the Operating Engineers Union which appeared before our subcommittee had one local—local 399, Chicago—under a trusteeship for almost 30 years. It would have been quite possible for a young man to have joined that union, worked his whole adult life and retired without ever having had an opportunity to vote on anything in this union, not even for the officers. A trusteeship was found to have been imposed on another union for 18 years, and the evidence showed conclusively that the treasury of that local was looted of millions of dollars while under such trusteeship. I certainly could not vote to force a man to join unions under that kind of leadership. If we take the choice away from them, that is in essence what we are doing. They will be compelled to join if such a situation is present.

Our committee also heard testimony about many hoodlums who found the ranks of labor a fertile source of income, a condition that still prevails in some areas. Two in particular come to my mind as having moved from other illegal fields into the labor rackets—Johnny Dioguardi and a cohort, Anthony—Tony Ducks—Corallo. Between them they controlled several unions in different internationals. While their operations varied, if anything else failed, force was employed to keep the members or the management in line. In some cases these men started off with nothing but a charter, and not a single member. They had only a paper charter. They would approach an employer and offer to sign a "sweetheart" contract with him in order to provide some semblance of a labor contract so that other union organizers would stay away. These contracts were always financially advantageous to the hoodlums and sometimes even to the employer, but they greatly depressed working conditions of the employees to whom such contracts applied. As a corollary to this, the hoodlums would simply terrorize small businessmen into making payoffs to them in return for labor peace.

How many thousands of workers were victimized by such exploitation no one knows. Because for every case that the committee was able to investigate, there were literally hundreds of complaints that could not be explored because of sheer lack of time and resources. But the cases covered revealed appalling stories of evil and abuses which were being perpetrated against our working men and women by persons who posed as labor leaders and friends of the workingman but were exposed as plain hoodlums seeking to enrich themselves at the expense of the working men and women whose interests they professed to represent and protect. No one can convince me that we should add the weapon of nationwide compulsory unionism to the already powerful arsenal possessed by such unions. For they already enjoy privileges far beyond any currently extended to any other private organization in this country. Indeed, organized labor's monopolistic position is unique among American institutions, and it has not yet proven that it merits the near unrestrained power it presently enjoys; much less has it earned the right to more.

Consider, for example, the 1964 election of officers held by the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, AFL–CIO. The union reported that Mr. James B. Carey, incumbent president, had been reelected by a majority of over 2,000 votes. But a recount by the Department of Labor showed that Mr. Carey actually lost the election by more than 20,000 votes.

I have already mentioned the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations conducted an inquiry into the diversion of union pension and welfare funds of the Allied Trade Council and Teamster Local 815 in New York City. The degree of democracy in local 815 was shown by its ballot, which offered only one candidate for each office.

The record of those hearings showed that the officials of those two unions looted pension and welfare funds belonging to thousands of rank-and-file union members, of $4 million.

Mind you, Mr. President, this was only last year. This was since the Select Committee on Labor-Management Relations conducted its series of hearings.

A substantial portion of this loot was used by those officials to establish lavish lifetime pensions for themselves and to speculate in the stock market for their own personal enrichment.

My recollection is that at least one of them established a lifetime retirement fund which would pay him $54,000 a year. He did pretty well for himself. The workers got nothing; their money was taken.

When called as witnesses to testify at the subcommittee's hearings about their conduct of the affairs of these unions, they refused to answer any and all questions directed to them by the members of the subcommittee, on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate them.

Yet, at this very moment those same individuals continued as officials of two labor unions which have collective bargaining contracts covering thousands of working men and women in the New York area.

Equally shocking is the fact that the limitations and inadequacies of existing laws make it highly questionable whether these corrupt officials can be successfully prosecuted, or whether the millions of dollars stolen from funds belonging to the rank-and-file members can ever be recovered.

The Department of Justice has advised the committee in a letter, after reviewing the transcript of the testimony and the files, that under existing law the Department cannot prosecute. So far as they know, under existing law the funds cannot be recovered because in the manipulation process $2 million of the $4 million wound up in two foreign corporations. The union leaders created two corporations, one in Liberia and the other in some other country. They are what are called research foundations, but they have engaged in no research. The money was placed in those corporations, and that is all that was done. The man who is operating the show was made the trustee of the funds, and it was then provided that he could name his successor, and that that successor could name his successor. In other words, it is an arrangement of a trustee in perpetuity.

The Department of Justice tells us that the money cannot be recovered. The Department tells us that it cannot prosecute. So instead of seeking to give such unions more power—and it cannot be denied that what is proposed is to give them more power; we shall be giving aid to the good and the bad alike—we ought to be processing the bill recommended by the committee to protect working people, instead of taking more of their rights from them.

Senators may ask why the members do not withdraw from these corrupt labor unions. The answer is that they cannot do so, if they want to retain their jobs.

They cannot; they would lose their jobs. They can be made to join a union and made to stay in it, and they are being made to stay in. They can do nothing about it. All they can do is pay their dues and do whatever else they are told, or be fined.

Because the collective bargaining agreements entered into with their employers by these unsavory labor officials are compulsory membership contracts which make it mandatory for all of the workers to join and pay dues to the union as a condition of employment. Any employee who dares to protest or challenge the actions of those corrupt union leaders would automatically imperil his livelihood and, in some instances, might even endanger his life.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that it is the position of the Senator from Arkansas that the powers now vested in labor leaders under existing laws are so great that abuses are frequently committed without any ability on the part of the Government to remedy the wrongs through criminal prosecution or otherwise?

Mr. McCLELLAN. As to the instance I have just cited, I am, in effect, quoting the Attorney General and the Department of Justice. We have inquired of the Department of Justice and the Department of Labor to see what more can be done. They have been unable to do anything to get the money back. No suit has been instituted. I believe I have in my possession a letter which I could place in the RECORD which states that the Department of Justice cannot prosecute because of insufficient evidence. There is no question about that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why could not some of the members of the union who feel that their funds have been improperly used withdraw from that particular union, join another union, and thus escape infringement upon their rights?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the particular union has a contract with the employer, the employees cannot join another union. They are bound by their contract.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would that mean that if the particular worker wanted to retain his job under the conditions which now prevail, he would have to suffer the abuses that have been perpetrated upon him beyond the improper use of the money which he has paid in as dues?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The money was paid in by the employer as a pension. The employer was forced to pay this money into the fund for the benefit of the workers. It was a part of the bargaining contract.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it correct that the union members are helpless under the present conditions? They either must suffer the wrong or find themselves without a job in an industry in which they have been trained?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe that is the inescapable conclusion. I do not know any other answer to the question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator familiar with recent decisions of the National Labor Relations Board dealing with the right of unions to provide, by regulations, penalties upon members unless the members fully comply with the regulations?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am familiar with some of those cases. I have some notations about those cases here in my notes, not in my prepared remarks.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is it correct that the National Labor Relations Board has ruled that a union member who crosses a picket line can be punished by the union through the imposition of a financial penalty?

Mr. McCLELLAN. My recollection is that the National Labor Relations Board sustained the union in the imposition of a $500 fine. That was in the case of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune, on August 6, 1954.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe that is the case. Is it also correct that the National Labor Relations Board has ruled that if a union member comes to Washington to protest a collective bargaining agreement that has been entered into and complains about the management of the union, he can be fined for violating the regulations in making his protest to the Washington officials?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is correct. I believe that question was involved in the Tawas Tube Products case.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Union members came here and filed a petition seeking to decertify their union so that the employers might join another union and thus get rid of a union that they felt was not responsive to the protection of their best interests.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would that mean that an American citizen who felt that his union had not been serving him properly would be prohibited from exercising his right to come to Washington in order to ask for a decertification of the union which he believed had not been properly serving him?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is correct. He would be fined and punished for undertaking to protest and to exercise what we would regard as his legitimate right to dissent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not know the status of the case about which I shall now ask the Senator. The case involves a union which, in its regulations, provides that anyone who absents himself from a meeting can be fined. A lady member of that union decided that she would rather go to church on Sunday morning than attend a union meeting. A fine was imposed upon her, and the fine was held to be valid.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is correct. That is the case of Mrs. Mary Ellen Benson. Incidentally, that case was reported in a newspaper in Lima, Ohio. The woman was fined $10.40 for going to church on Sunday morning instead of attending a union meeting.

The union insisted on holding its meetings at the hour of her church services on Sunday morning, and she was fined for going to church rather than to the union meeting.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What becomes of the rights of the citizen if a union has that power to control the members of its union?

Mr. McCLELLAN. These rights are being trampled on. The rights of the citizens of this country are being eroded away.

I have some notes here concerning that case.

The harsh disciplinary power of unions has even come between at least one worker and her religion. A Lima, Ohio, newspaper reported this case, which occurred in Milwaukee, Wis., as follows:

> Mrs. Mary Ellen Benson paid $10.40 in county court Thursday for going to church instead of union meeting. In a pretrial hearing, Judge Robert Miech decreed she must pay a $5 fine to the union and $5.40 in court costs for admittedly not complying with union bylaws that provided any member that misses three of five meetings be

fined. The union brought suit against Mrs. Benson when she balked at paying the fine. "The union meetings come on Sunday morning exactly at my church time," she said. "I've told them over and over again that I will never go to their meetings as long as they are on Sunday," she said. "And I still won't."

The judge conceded the praiseworthiness of her reason for missing the union meetings but said that it was clear that the United Papermakers Local 356, had the power to assess the fine.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If this lady wanted to retain her job, she either had to comply with the union rules and pay the penalty or give up her desire to go to church.

Mr. McCLELLAN. She had two alternatives. She could pay up or get out. I see no other alternative that she had.

This proposal would say that today a union can say when a person can go to church and what he must do to hold a job. The worker must pay tribute to the union. That is what it amounts to. It is as simple as that, and it is wrong.

That illustrates how powerful the unions are becoming and I do not believe it is right. It has gone to that extreme. We are being asked to further revise that power and force workers to join unions anywhere in the United States. I think it is beyond all reason and contrary to every concept that our Founding Fathers had when they established our country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not thought this out, but what would be the situation if the U.S. Government were to adopt a law and require that absence from church is mandatory to serve some economic program of the U.S. Government? Would such a law in the opinion of the Senator be valid; and if it be invalid under the Constitution because of interference with the right of a person to choose his religion, would it not mean that the union would have greater power than that of the U.S. Government?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not see how it can be interpreted in any other way. There is no other interpretation which can be placed upon it.

I do not think we could pass a law saying that nobody could go to church, for example, without paying a fine. How constitutional would it be?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The courts have said——

Mr. McCLELLAN. But a union could do it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank my distinguished friend. Mr. President, I was discussing conditions found in some labor unions, in which the welfare and pension funds had been looted; and I wish to say further, indeed, it is this very power to compel membership in and contributions to the labor unions which they control which has enabled corrupt union officials to entrench themselves in the organized labor movement and to exploit the workingman for his own purposes. It is this monopolistic and compulsory power over the individual's right to work for a living which has enabled them to impose a system of tryranny and virtual enslavement over hundreds of thousands of workers in this Nation.

One of the principal legal obstacles encountered today by such corrupt unions and their evil leaders are State right-to-work laws which prohibt the imposition of compulsory membership in a labor union as a condition of employment, and those laws would be nullified by the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

One is compelled to ask, then, can compulsory membership in a labor union dominated and controlled by dishonest officials be justified?

Mr. President, the answer is no. I expect to speak on this subject at some length on a future date, and therefore, until then, I only wish to state again for the Record and to remind my colleagues that we cannot and will not bestow the powers which would result from the repeal of 14(b) on the good unions only; we will be bestowing those powers on the bad as well.

So, Mr. President, I come to my conclusion today. We would not deny any man the right of free speech. Yet we deny him the right of free work. It is proposed to deny him the choice of whether he will join a union that is alleged to be—or it may be, for that matter—for his benefit and welfare, or whether he will be compelled to join.

I am opposed to compulsion, and I hope the Congress will never accede to the demands of those who would take that right of choice from their fellow man, on the penalty of denying him the bread of life.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 16 Leg.]

Aiken
Anderson
Bible
Clark
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Morse
Murphy
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. Allott, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hill, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Russell of Georgia, Mr. Scott, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Williams of Delaware entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, in many ways, I am surprised that those who advocate the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act would make renewed efforts to again force this matter through the Senate.

I am surprised for a number of reasons.

First of all, the efforts which were made last year to bring this matter before the Senate were defeated decisively.

Secondly, a great many things have happened since last year which give more than a strong indication that the American people are opposed to the repeal of section 14(b) and are afraid of the awesome power which will be put into the hands of a few labor bosses if 14(b) is stricken from the law books.

I would hope that those who are putting on so much pressure for the repeal of section 14(b) would stand back and take a long, thoughtful look at the public interests before pressing their point further.

During my entire adult life, I have been active in the business world, and I have given this whole matter a great deal of thought. If there is any one thing that stands out in all of the pros and cons of the arguments on both sides of the question, it is the fact that the overwhelming and overriding result of repeal of 14(b) would be the putting of awesome and dangerous power into the hands of a few people. When all the fat is cut away, this is the only purpose that repeal would serve.

So often in questions of this kind, there is a tendency to draw a line between the differences of management and labor. So often the argument is made that this proposition or that proposition is in favor of or against management or labor, and the lines of battle are drawn accordingly.

In the case of repeal of 14(b) there is no simple line of cleavage because ultimately the total effects will be felt much stronger by those who work in the factories than those who manage and own them. This is true because if section 14(b) is repealed it will give labor unions an ironclad rule over their members and in large part remove the bargaining and reasoning powers the members of unions now have within their own organizations.

In the final analysis, the repeal of section 14(b) will remove forever the choice the individual has in making a decision as to whether or not he should join a labor union. In my way of thinking, there is no doubt about the fact that this would have a disastrous effect on the rights of the individual members of labor unions.

Another thing that those who are pressing so hard for repeal of 14(b) should consider and consider carefully is the fact that those who oppose repeal are not trying to take anything away from organized labor that they have today. If closed shops are the ultimate goal of organized labor, and I can certainly understand that in some cases both management and labor may want a closed shop, there are existing procedures and adequate machinery already in the law which will enable organized labor to achieve its goals if these goals are correct and if they are in the best interests of the workingman, of management, and the public.

In my opinion, it cannot be emphasized too much that labor unions can, under existing law, achieve what they want to achieve if their purposes are right and their goals are sound.

I have heard the argument made many times that the chief reason many people want 14(b) repealed is that it is not right and proper for a person to enjoy the benefits of a union and not join it. This argument may be true, but I would be the last person in the world to argue that it is the Federal Government's duty or responsibility to sell the union members on the advantages of joining the union or of forcing them to join against their will. After all, whose job is it to sell the advantages of unionism? We can argue until we are blue in the face, but ultimately this task and responsibility must fall upon the shoulders of the unions themselves, and if indeed the advantages are there for the individual then I do not think the unions have any worry about the few who might not see the light of day and become cardcarrying members.

Over the years, I have had a number of letters from preachers concerning the repeal of section 15(b). Most of my communications from the clergy have been in opposition tc repeal of section 14(b), but a few have been in favor of repeal. I am sure that those who have deep feelings about the matter are sincere in their beliefs. But it is impossible for me to understand how one set of thinking is applied to a labor union, for example, and an entirely different approach is used concerning the question of joining a church. I have never known a preacher of any denomination to say to those who come to the doors of a church to worship that they first must join and pay an assessment in order to participate in the worship service and the other activities of the church. Regardless of denomination, if a church is meeting its obligations to the community and is offering services which are needed and desired, then it does not have to worry about who joins and who pays because the active members will be there not only to carry the load, but they will also be there to expand the cause.

In all sincerity, I look upon the mission of organized labor in the same way.

I have a very deep conviction that if the Federal Government attempts to contrive and fashion a system under which any man is forced to join any organization to earn a living then a real disservice and destruction of the workingman's place in our society will surely result.

As all of us know, a great deal of discussion has taken place in recent years about the question of individual rights of our citizens. I think that more so than on any other public question, there is almost unanimity on the basic question involved in the issue of right-to-work laws.

In almost all cases after all questions are weighed, the one point which emerges and stands out above all others is the simple one of the basic right of the individual to exercise his freedom of choice.

In this connection, I was very much impressed with the editorial which appeared in the Charlotte Observer of January 25, 1966. The editorial pointed out that once again efforts were being made to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. The editorial gave passing consideration to the political commitments involved and went on simply to state the heart of the issue once again, and I think the point the editorial made is worth repeating at this time. That point is as follows:

> The basic issue is a man's right to join or to refuse to join a union. That right should remain unimpaired. The union that must earn the allegiance of workers by its performance will be more responsible, more honest, more concerned about the rights of individuals and corporations, more considerate of the public interest.

In this fashion, the Charlotte Observer editorial wraps up the whole matter in a nice, neat package, and we can make any arguments we choose, but we must come back and make our own decision on this one central, overriding point. We cannot escape it.

I do not believe a successful argument can be made that any individual should be deprived of his right to work at a job available to him and for which he is qualified. Nor do I believe—and I am certain there is complete agreement among many here today—that any person or organization be permitted to coerce, to harm, or injure the individual or his family, or his property at home, at work or elsewhere, in any manner or action relating to his employment.

This is a declaration of belief, a most widely held one, I hope, in the basic and deeply rooted rights guaranteed our citizens under the 5th, 9th, and 14th amendments of the Constitution of the United States which implicitly protect the right to work since they prohibit the deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, and forbid abridgment of the privileges and immunities of our citizens. As so aptly stated by Justice Hughes, in *Truax* v. *Raich*, 239 U.S. 33 (1915):

> It requires no argument to show that the right to work for a living in the common occupations of the community is of the very essence of the personal freedom and opportunity that it was the purpose of the 14th amendment to secure.

It is my contention that right-to-work laws provide protection so that the inherent right of an individual to secure and hold a job shall not be abridged by a union security agreement entered into by the employer and the union. More properly stated, voluntary unionism embraces a concept of human liberty quite as fundamental as freedom of speech, religion, or assembly.

By the enactment of section 14(b), the Congress of the United States recognized and preserved to the citizens of the several States the right, if they so chose, to enact statutes or constitutional amendments protecting the freedom of choice of their individual citizens so that their very jobs and livelihood could not be placed in jeopardy through compulsion by an agreement entered into by an aggressive union and an acquiescent employer. The principle of voluntary unionism should not be open to compromise. Either one must believe in the freedom of individual choice or must accede to the view that it is proper to shackle the will of the unwilling employee through compulsive union devices.

Consider what some of our greatest liberal thinkers have had to say about the importance of human freedom which is involved in the cause of voluntary unionism. They certainly cannot be accused of being hostile to the labor movement. Samuel Gompers, one of the giants of American labor, saw, in his time, the issue much more clearly than some of his modern successors see it today. Gompers stated:

> I want to urge devotion to the fundamentals of human liberty, the principles of voluntarism. No lasting gain has ever come from compulsion. If we seek to force, we but tear apart that which, united, is invincible.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in the State right-to-work cases, quoted extensively from the late Justice Brandeis, who held that—

> The ideal condition for a union is to be strong and stable, and yet to have in the trade outside its own ranks an appreciable number of men who are nonunionists. Such a nucleus of unorganized labor will check oppression by the unions as the unions check oppression by the employer.

In 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a universal Declaration of Human Rights:

> ARTICLE XX
>
> 1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.
>
> 2. No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

RESUMPTION OF BOMBING IN VIETNAM

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing his right to the floor, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina may yield to me for the purpose of making remarks on another subject.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, with that understanding, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, both on and off the floor of the Senate in recent days, there has been a discussion which, if it cannot properly be described as a debate, is nonetheless a significant discussion with reference to our involvement in Vietnam. For the most part, the discussions have centered around the question of whether the bombing of North Vietnam should be resumed.

This is a proper point for the beginning of a much deeper and much more extensive discussion not only of Vietnam, but also of the whole function of America in history during this second half of the 20th century.

Our commitment in Vietnam is different from our commitment in the Korean war. It is also different from our commitment in World War II, when our objectives were clearly definable. On the basis of that kind of understanding and comprehension and intellectual judgment, we were able to make a quite full moral commitment to the achievement of those objectives.

The Vietnamese situation is quite different. It calls for a national debate, a national discussion, and a real searching of the mind and soul of America. It includes everyone who is concerned about the future of this country and its role. It concerns the people responsible for political action. It involves those responsible for making an intellectual judgment on the extent of our moral commitments.

I am encouraged by the growing response to this challenge throughout America today. We need to be on guard against being caught and committed to certain figures of speech, to a kind of ideological commitment which prevents us from making a fair and continuous and objective judgment. If we find ourselves in the position of trying to prove or disprove a metaphor, our position is little different from that of the historical determinists with reference to communism and any other ideology.

The particular point with reference to bombing North Vietnam comes to this: When the decision was made to begin the bombings, the argument was that it would accomplish two purposes—first, a military purpose, but, more important, a political or a diplomatic achievement.

Bombings have been stopped. The question now is whether they should be resumed. It is my position that the burden of proof is on two branches of the administration. The burden is on the Defense Department to prove, if it can, that the bombings in the past have had any significant military effect. The burden is also upon the State Department to prove that the bombings have had some kind of beneficial political or diplomatic effect. If the bombings have not had these benefits in the past, then at least it should be demonstrated to us that the resumption of such bombings would have a desirable military or political effect, or both.

It is my judgment that this has not been demonstrated with reference to the bombings in the past; and I have not yet been convinced that the resumption of bombing in North Vietnam would advance the military objectives, or that they would advance our political objectives.

The serious problem today is that we are called upon to make a kind of moral commitment to an objective or to a set of purposes which we do not clearly understand. There is a kind of imbalance between the understanding and the comprehension of the objective on the one hand and, on the other, the moral commitment which we are called upon to make.

I do not believe that a balance between those two can be restored only by Senate debate. This problem requires the attention of mind and spirit, the thoughts and prayers of the entire Nation. In recent days many Senators have suggested that bombings should not be resumed until there is greater clarification about how they are advancing our national objectives.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may direct a query to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota with the understanding that I do not lose my rights to the floor and with the further understanding that the resumption of my speech shall not be regarded as a second speech on the same subject matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I agree wholeheartedly with the observations of the Senator from Minnesota.

With reference to the bombing of North Vietnam, is it not true that Secretary McNamara and others say that, far from stopping the flow of North Vietnamese manpower into the theater of operations in the south, during all the months of bombings of North Vietnam, we have actually seen a very marked increase in the forces the North Vietnamese have thrown into the fray in the south?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator will recall that before the decision was made to start bombing North Vietnam, a number of Senators pointed out that the only way North Vietnam could respond to pressures of that kind would be on the ground. North Vietnam does not have the air power to retaliate effectively with air strikes so their one recourse to our bombings would be to commit more troops on the ground.

Does the Senator not feel that if we were to resume the bombing, the North Vietnamese would respond by greater efforts on the ground against our troops in the south?

Mr. McCARTHY. If we are to judge by what happened when bombings were undertaken in the past—and I would say this is the best information upon which we could make an estimate—it appears that the result of resumed or intensified bombing of North Vietnam, would be a substantial increase in ground forces used by the North Vietnamese.

Mr. McGOVERN. In reference to what the Senator has said concerning the confusion over our objectives in the Vietnamese conflict, one of the finest analyses of that problem was made in the Senate on yesterday by the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], when she directed attention to a number of apparent conflicts in our present policy.

Our policymakers say that we would like to restore the Geneva settlement of 1954. Among other things, that agreement stated very clearly that the 17th parallel which now divides North and South Vietnam was a temporary military demarcation and was not "in any way to be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary."

Yet, we seem to be interpreting this conflict as a war between two separate countries, one on each side of the 17th parallel. As the Senator from Oregon said yesterday, our policymakers seem to be saying that we stand upon the principle that there is no political or territorial boundary separating North and South Vietnam, but that we must stand and fight in South Vietnam because it has been invaded by North Vietnam.

This is the kind of confusion that disturbs people all over the country concerning our policy in Vietnam.

Mr. McCARTHY. The cessation of the bombing has been accompanied by at least some effort toward reaching a settlement. None of these efforts has amounted to anything very positive over the past 3 or 4 weeks. However, I do not believe there is evidence that these efforts have run out of whatever strength or hope they possess. One of them may still sprout into something that might be more than a mere hope. As long as this hope remains, and as long as we are not absolutely certain that we are suffering a military loss and not absolutely certain that there is no diplomatic good to be gained in refraining from bombing, we ought not to resume bombing.

Mr. McGOVERN. As the Senator knows, our Government, I think very wisely, has enlisted the help of 30 or 40 other governments around the world in the search for a peaceful settlement of the war. Some of them are governments in central and eastern Europe. They are seeking to assist us in reaching a diplomatic settlement in Vietnam.

We have persuaded countries such as Yugoslavia and many others that one would expect to be on the other side of this issue to assist in the peace offensive.

All those countries, as the Senator knows, are opposed to a resumption of the bombing. They feel that they need time to persuade the government in Hanoi and others who have an interest in this struggle that a reasonable settlement can be negotiated with our Government.

It would seem to me that if we have been willing to experiment for 5 or 6 years with a variety of military approaches, trying every strategy that anyone could think of to settle this conflict by military means, we ought to devote a few months of diplomacy to an effort to reach a settlement by some method other than bombing North Vietnam.

We have not stopped or slowed down our military effort in the south. As the Senator knows, the bombing has continued in South Vietnam. The ground action has continued. We have been putting in additional troops during the bombing pause in the north. So there has been no slowdown on our part of the military effort in the south. All our friends and our allies in other parts of the world are asking, at this point, is that we be patient while they join with us in trying to find some kind of a diplomatic breakthrough which may get discussions started.

It would seem to me that we should exercise at least as much patience and perseverance while the search for peace is going on as we have brought to the military effort over the past 5 or 6 years. That is especially true when, as the Senator points out, there is no evidence that the bombing attacks in the north have helped us, anyway. The only evidence we have is that there are more North Vietnamese soldiers fighting in the south today than there were when we started the bombing attacks last February.

We have not improved our diplomatic position, it seems to me, by the bombing attacks. Indeed, our whole policy is being seriously questioned in many other capitals around the world. There is almost united opposition around the world to a resumption of the bombing. I do not know how we can fly in the face of the clearly expressed position of many other friendly countries, including such important Asiatic nations as Japan, India, and Pakistan who have expressed strong opposition to a renewal of the bombing.

So I hope the Senator's remarks will receive the attention they deserve.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from North Carolina, without losing his right to the floor, would yield for me to add a name as cosponsor of a bill, and to make a brief comment and place a brief statement in the Record on the comments of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to my distinguished fellow Senator, reserving the right not to lose the floor, and that his remarks shall follow my remarks.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] for his thoughtful contribution to the dialog about our situation in Vietnam. The Senator from Minnesota, whenever he speaks, always makes a fruitful and creative contribution to our deliberations, and I am pleased to commend him for it.

I appreciate the trying circumstances in which we find ourselves in Vietnam, and the tremendous burden which is being borne by the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, in providing leadership under such circumstances.

I think it is clear that, in general, our country has three broad choices: One of them is to withdraw from Vietnam, a choice of which I do not approve. Another is to stay in Vietnam and continue to filibuster along, so to speak, without escalating the conflict in terms of our manpower on the ground or in the air. A third general alternative is to make a massive commitment to a land involvement in Asia, which, in order to impose a purely military solution, surely would require anywhere from 700,000 to a million men, in a bloody war, with the risk of bringing China into the conflict.

Out of these three choices, no one of which is a very desirable choice, I think this country is much better off to retain its present position, continue for the time being without the resumption of strategic bombing in the north, and continue to seek negotiations for an honorable settlement. It may very well be that political or military circumstances will develop which will necessitate the resumption of bombing in the north. If so, that decision can be made when the time comes. But for the time being, I think it would be the better part of wisdom to continue as the President has continued for the past few weeks without strategic bombing, and seeking to get to the conference table.

I conclude by again thanking the Senator from Minnesota for his very thoughtful contribution.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

I think we should note that the fact that many Senators have spoken out on the side of not resuming the bombing is not necessarily to be interpreted in any way against the Commander in Chief, who, we are assured and reassured, is trying to solve the problem. It would be no help to him if Senators who felt that bombing should not be resumed were to say they were in favor of bombing; and certainly it would be of no help to him if we were to say nothing to indicate our judgment.

The President is trying to make a hard decision. By letting him know the position taken by Members of the Senate in support of withholding bombing or of resuming bombing, we are being, in my judgment, of service to the President of the United States.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield another moment or two to me?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I, along with a large number of other Members of Congress, approved the President's decision for the cessation of bombing, and have approved his continuance of that policy.

The question being raised now is a tactical one, as to whether or not this is the best moment to resume bombing. I believe the Senator is perfectly correct, that what we are doing is discussing the issue of whether or not this is the best moment to resume bombing. I happen to believe that we would be better off if we continued for some further length of time exploring possible alternatives.

Mr. President, I made a statement on this matter on January 15. I ask unanimous consent that my statement of that date be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Nelson's Statement on Vietnam

January 15, 1966

There are no easy answers to the agonizing dilemma facing America in Vietnam. But of all the grim alternatives, it seems to me the wisest is to continue with great patience to seek a negotiated settlement while firmly refusing to escalate the conflict further. This is essentially a political and not a military conflict. It is a battle in Vietnam for the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese. It must be limited to Vietnam, and be fought by the Vietnamese if we are to have any realistic hope of an acceptable settlement. For along the open ended path of further escalation lies the specter of a major land war in Asia fought with U.S. troops, a war against which our best military minds—including the late Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur—have repeatedly warned us. It has long been my view that our commitment should never be expanded to make that conflict an American war. And in a major speech last May 6, I pointed out that, despite a tendency to characterize people as "hawks and doves," most Americans including most Members of Congress are united behind these major principles: There must be no major land war in Asia; the problems of Vietnam must be settled eventually by negotiations; and the main responsibility for stable government must rest with the South Vietnamese people.

The situation is even more dangerous today than it was in May. And the pressures to escalate the war are growing in many quarters. But I believe these cardinal principles should guide our policy. Even if a million American soldiers were to force all North Vietnamese units from South Vietnam and to suppress the Vietcong guerrillas with napalm and bayonets—even if we avoided an open clash with Red China—even then, when we withdrew as eventually we must, we would leave behind us only a charred, desolate country with little hope that it could maintain its independence one moment beyond the time we left.

There is no point in criticizing the mistakes of past policy. But it is crucial in looking toward the future to recall that our military advisers have been consistently overoptimistic when not actually dead wrong in their public statements of the Vietnamese situation. Secretary of Defense McNamara's estimate that the Americans could begin to pull out by Christmas 1965 is only the most famous example.

Those who look for a cheap victory through airpower should recall the glowing assurances last February that a few bombs on North Vietnam would quickly bring that country to the conference table in a tractable mood. If anything, the opposite has been the case.

George F. Kennan, the former Ambassador and noted foreign policy expert, has recently advocated an effort to deescalate the war, to simmer down the situation in Vietnam. In a world where a nuclear holocaust is a distinct possibility, the survival of us all depends on containing armed conflict to as narrow an area as possible. This is indeed sound advice.

President Johnson has taken a long step toward localizing the war and achieving negotiations by calling a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam. He deserves praise and support for his continued efforts to find peace in Vietnam.

It is crucial that the war in Vietnam not be allowed to escalate further. Now is the time to make every conscientious effort to deescalate the conflict. For in escalation there is no practical hope of achieving our aims in that unfortunate country and a very real possibility of an Asianwide war in which America would waste her resources and young men in a slaughter that could achieve nothing but those desperate conditions of chaos ideal for the spread of communism.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from North Carolina very much for his courtesy.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to repeat the latter part of my remarks on a declaration of human rights that was adopted by the United Nations in 1948.

In 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a Universal Declaration of Human Rights. I wish to state at this point that the very thing we have been debating here today; that is, the right-to-work laws, is a declaration of human rights, about work.

We are not talking about the kind of work that horses, mules, or some other animals do. We are talking about human rights and the right to work. The Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations declared in article XX, section 1:

> Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

Section 2 asserts:

> No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Even George Meany, who so strongly opposes right-to-work laws, when speaking to the United Nations in his initial address as a delegate, stated:

> The extent to which any society is truly humanitarian, democratic rather than paternalistic, depends in very large measure on the initiative and energy displayed by the voluntary organizations in the community, on the extent to which the people themselves through organizations of their own choice and direction mold the domestic and foreign policies of their country.

That statement was made in a speech to the United Nations concerning not only the United States but all the nations, which of course includes the people of this country.

Certainly this principle so ably enunciated by him can be related not only to such voluntary organizations as churches, service clubs, lodges, chambers of commerce, but also to union organizations as well.

President John F. Kennedy signed a law on March 15, 1961, which by clear implication recognized the inherent strength of the right-to-work principle. I refer to the Manpower Development and Training Act, which had received the prior endorsement of Secretary of Labor Goldberg, and to section 307 of the statute which provides:

> The selection of persons for training under this Act and for placement of such persons shall not be contingent upon such person's membership or nonmembership in a labor organization.

The nations of the world regard the United States as the citadel of democracy and individual liberty, an image which will be tarnished if, by legal recognition of compulsory unionism, we become, except for nations inside the Iron Curtain, the only major power to reject voluntarism. Compulsory unionism is prohibited by the constitutions, laws or judicial decisions of Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and Western Germany.

Proponents of the repeal of section 14(b) argue that they merely desire to create the situation where unions and employers may freely enter into compulsory membership contracts. As a practical matter the word "freely" is a misnomer. There is bargaining on wages and fringe benefits. There is no bargaining on the union shop, as applied particularly to the smaller employer. The employer is reduced to the position of saying yes or no. If he says no and sticks to it, he must expect a strike or picketing. A retailer, for example, is more vulnerable to strikes and picketing than employers in other industries. When pickets appear, it usually means the cutting off of incoming merchandise and thereby the ending of sales to his customers. When a store is shut down or customers do not cross a picket line, the merchant loses many customers whom he may never regain. Those lost sales are never recouped because competitors can satisfy the customer's needs.

Therefore, against his own conviction, a small merchant is easily forced to agree to compulsory membership and dues check off. So are some of the large retail organizations.

It is argued that employers often agree to compulsory membership in exchange for a better break on wage and fringe benefits—the so-called sweetheart contract.

Strange as it may seem, this is true. The unions get dues, the employer saves on payroll, and the employees lose. Furthermore, when recognition is based on a card check and the union does have a card majority, the employee has no additional loss. He has heard only the union arguments. There has been no free speech.

A March 15, 1965, article in the U.S. News & World Report states the present NLRB policy with respect to the right of employees and employers to an election. The cases cited by the author are recent and the trend to reliance upon card checks is increasing.

While Congress is struggling to secure the right to vote for all Americans, the NLRB is eliminating such right for the American workingman in determining union representation through the process of secret ballot elections.

The card check—at one time regarded as the preliminary to sweetheart contracts—has, in the Board's opinion, become most respectable.

In 1947, Congress clearly indicated its objection to card checks when it deleted from section 9(c) of the Taft-Hartley Act, "or utilize any other suitable method to ascertain such representatives."

A brief history of the landmark cases leading to the present NLRB policy follows: In *Joy Silk Mills* 24 LRRM 1548 decided September 13, 1949, the Board held that an employer may be required to bargain with a union without an election where:

First, the union has secured membership or authorization cards from the majority of the employees before demanding recognition; second, the employer insists upon an election not because of a good faith doubt of majority, but to gain time in which to dissipate that majority by unfair labor practices; and, third, the employer then embarks upon a campaign of unfair labor practices to destroy that majority.

It is hard to quarrel with the decision in Joy Silk and the hundreds of cases based thereon, although the act provides other methods of relief and the case marked a departure from the time-honored secret ballot election requirement. As a remedy to be used only in the most extreme cases of employer unfair labor practices, the decision can be supported.

The next landmark case was *Aiello Dairy*, 35 LRRM 1235, decided in December 1954. This case and many following cases based upon it hold that the union has alternative remedies. If the union knows that the employer is engaging in unfair labor practices which may destroy its card majority it may either file refusal to bargain charges or petition the NLRB for an election. It cannot do both. It cannot lose the election and then obtain bargaining rights by filing unfair labor practice charges.

In *Bernel Foam Products*, 56 LRRM 1039, decided in May 1964, the rule of election of remedies provided by the *Aiello Dairy* was reversed. The union lost the election by a vote of 55 to 34. It then filed refusal to bargain charges and the Board required the employer to bargain.

Briefly, the facts were: First, when the union demanded bargaining by the employer prior to the election, it had 53 of the 88 employees' signatures to membership or authorization cards; second, the union suggested a card check by a disinterested third party and the employer replied that he would not bargain without the majority first being established in a secret ballot election conducted by the NLRB: and the employer did commit unfair labor practices prior to the election.

A little noticed decision *Snow and Sons*, 49 LRRM 1228, decided in November 1961, fills out the background. In Snow and Sons the employer agreed to a card check against its payroll by a neutral third party. The card check showed that 31 of the 49 employees had signed cards. The employer then said he wanted a secret ballot election and refused to bargain. The Board ordered the employer to bargain with the union. The Board found no unfair labor practice, no conduct to destroy the majority. The employer did nothing—just demanded a secret ballot election. If the case is considered just as union versus employer, perhaps there is something wrong about the employer changing his mind. But what about the rights of the employees? Some of those 31 cards may have been forgeries. Some may have been signed just to obtain an election. Some may have been signed by employees who intended to vote against the union. Some may have been signed because others in the car pool signed. Some may have been signed by employees who did not know what they were signing. The list of motivation for card signing could go on indefinitely. It has been demonstrated on many occasions that one can stand on a street corner of any city and obtain signatures to any petition. True, in Snow and Sons the union had six cards more than a majority. But in more recent cases, a majority of one has been held sufficient.

In just 2 days—June 29 and 30, 1964—the Board decided three cases under the new rules. The cases were *Fleming and Sons*, 56 LRRM 1395; *Sabine Vending*, 56 LRMM 1386; and *Flomatic Corp.*, 56 LRRM 1391. In Flomatic there was not even a request for bargaining by the union. The union had a card majority when it wrote a letter to the employer saying that it would petition for an election if the employer did not reply to its request for a meeting. Two days later the union did file an election petition; the employer consented to an election and the union lost. The Board found the employer to have made mild, implied promises which a prior Board might well have considered to be "free speech." The Board required the employer to bargain with the union when and if it requested bargaining.

Two cases decided in February 1965, *Indiana Rayon*, 58 LRRM 1348, and *Purity Food Stores*, 58 LRRM 1294, illustrate the continuation of the trend. In Indiana Rayon the union had 119 cards in a unit of 236 on the day of its bargaining demand. The union filed an election petition and the employer consented to an election which the union lost by a vote of 120 to 85. The Board ordered bargaining, finding that the employer had committed minor violations of the act. There has not been sufficient review by the courts to determine just how far they will permit the Board to go in ordering bargaining on a card-determined majority, but generally they appear to support the Board. In *Winn-Dixie Stores*, 58 LRRM 2475, decided February 27, 1965, the Sixth Circuit affirmed the Board's bargaining order where the union had sent photostatic copies of cards to the employer with its bargaining demand.

The cards counted up to a majority of one. The cards could have been considered confusing because they stated both "authorization for representation under the NLRB 'and' hereby authorize—to represent me and in my behalf petition the NLRB for an election to determine bargaining rights." While there were some findings that the employer had exceeded his rights of free speech the court did not consider these findings in affirming the Board's order to bargain.

The Eighth Circuit in *Johnnie's Poultry*, 59 LRRM 2117, decided April 29, 1965, reversed the Board. The union had presented photostats of cards signed by 49 of 93 employees. The court threw out the Board's finding that the employer had violated the act in making an isolated antiunion statement in a friendly conversation with an employee some time before the union's organizational campaign began. However, the Court said that it had and would again in a proper case require an employer to bargain on the basis of a card check where the employer did not have a good faith doubt of the majority.

The Fifth Circuit in *Dan River Mills*, 45 LRRM 2539, reversed the Board on a card check determination of majority, holding that the employer had a good faith doubt and was entitled to have it resolved in an election.

The Ninth Circuit affirmed the Board's bargaining order in a card check case *Trimfit of California*, 33 LRRM 2705.

The Seventh Circuit reversed the Board in *Abrasive Salvage*, 47 LRRM 2397, finding that the cards were signed under the mistaken impression that they were merely to obtain an election. It is fairly clear that the NLRB has and will order bargaining in a naked case of majority by cards where the employer has not even discussed unionization with the employees. It is also fairly clear that a court will sustain such a ruling. It is true in most all cases the Board finds some violation of section 8(a)(1) of the act. However, this will happen to the most careful employer. During election campaigns, some supervisor more often than not goes further than the free speech provision permits. The most common is a simple question: "How do you stand on the union?" Many unions now instruct their organizers to obtain signatures of over 50 percent without bringing the campaign into the open and to the attention of the employer and then file refusal to bargain charges. In these cases, the employees never learn anything about the union because the employer is never able to use the free speech permitted by the act.

It is no answer to say that the employer can go into circumstances surrounding the signing and the fact of signing by questioning employees on the witness stand. It is a very time-consuming procedure. Also, few witnesses will admit they did not know what they were doing when they signed a card if they are later placed on the witness stand.

The NLRB has now extended its Joy Silk doctrine to the outermost limits. Any disinterested observer must agree that in many cases employees are thus given union representation which the majority did not wish. If section 14(b) of the statute is eliminated, that same majority may be forced into a union shop—compulsory membership—because the employer yields to the union's pressure for such a contract.

I consider this a disservice to employees. The NLRB line of decision also presents many problems for employers. Presented with a bargaining demand, the employer may agree to recognize the union. In so doing he has violated the law, if the union does not have a majority in fact. He may have violated the law if the agreement to recognize does not cover an appropriate unit. On the other hand, if he does not recognize the union which has a card majority he has violated the law.

To petition for a representation election the union must have cards signed by at least 30 percent of the eligible employees. If it does, an election may be ordered. Pending its conduct the union may get more card signatures. The election is held. The union loses by secret ballot and then petitions the Board that it had a majority card count prior to the election, but because of alleged coercion and intimidation by the employers, the employees voted against the union through fear of employer reprisals.

The NLRB then frequently sets aside the election results and orders the employers to recognize the union on the basis of the card count. The Board overlooks the fact that many employees sign cards without knowing what they are signing or are coerced into signing by union organizations visiting their homes. Many employees sign just to get the organizers off their backs, anticipating that they will have the opportunity of opposing the union through the secret ballot process.

The right to vote secretly as to who, if anyone, should bargain for him with his employer is just as fundamental a civil liberty as the right to employment if qualified—without regard to race, color, religion, or sex.

The failure of Congress to protect the employee's right to vote in secret ballot elections as to who will represent him is just as fundamental a right as his right to protect his freedom to work without compulsory union membership.

Simply because only 19 States out of 50 have such right-to-work statutes does not preclude the fact that the citizens of other States—through the democratic balloting process—may not wish to adopt such legislation in the future. To repeal section 14(b) would slam the door in the face of such States whose voting public may wish to adopt the right-to-work statute.

I again say that the States which have enacted such legislation have done so by the democratic voting process. If the principle is wrong and the employees in such States are being freely exploited, then it is the responsibility of the unions and other organizations of like mind to rectify the situation at the voting polls. Employees outnumber substantially the employers who cast votes.

I find it most significant that the New York Times, in an editorial on June 20, 1965, pointed up the vital defect in the Taft-Hartley law revolving around the so-called "sweetheart contract":

> Racketeers masquerading as union leaders have, over the years, enjoyed a privileged sanctuary under the Federal labor laws. Through connivance with employers seeking to immunize themselves against organizing drives by legitimate unions, underworld elements have been able to sign union-shop contracts giving them sole rights over workers who did not even know the name of the organizations they were being forced to join. Under the rules of the National Labor Relations Board, these "sweetheart" contracts have then operated as a wall to shut out bona fide unions.
>
> This defect in the Taft-Hartley Act has, unfortunately, attracted little attention in the current fight in Congress over repeal

> of section 14(b) authorizing State right-to-work laws. No organized lobby is pushing for writing into Federal law improved assurance that a wider role for the union shop will not mean more freedom for those who want to cooperate with sweatshop employers in denying workers honest representation.
>
> Thirty years after passage of the original Wagner Act, it is time to determine whether the law does really provide a shield for misrepresenters and exploiters. If it does, Congress should tear the shield away.

Let us now go back to the central issue. Section 14(b) is a four-line paragraph in the Taft-Hartley labor law which permits—if they see fit—States to have right-to-work laws forbidding any labor contract that makes a worker join a union to get or hold a job.

That is a very simple statement and I do not understand how anybody would want to do away with it.

Nineteen States now have these laws. All could be nullified in one swoop by repeal of section 14(b).

We have seen the intensified activity on the part of organized labor in the 89th Congress to repeal this all-important section.

If section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is repealed it would have enormous impact upon the business community. For one thing, it would increase the imbalance of power in the businessman's relations with unions, an imbalance which already is in the union's favor.

Today it is estimated that there are 17 million union members in an employee force of 70 million in the United States. Dues dollars paid by union members amount to approximately $1 billion per year. Of this amount Government reports show $410 million goes into staff payroll. Operating expenses, contingency funds, strike funds and investments no doubt take a large share. However, an extremely large amount of union dues money goes into political spending—either directly or indirectly.

With the repeal of section 14(b) unions would gain more bargaining power and get more control over jobs and the operation of the businesses of our Nation.

Mr. President, I am thoroughly convinced. I studied this situation for many hours during the past year, and years before that. I cannot understand why anyone who wishes to be completely fair with everybody would wish to impose any kind of law that would require a man to join anything he did not want to join.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Hawaii.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, consider the confirmation en bloc of two nominations reported today from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Charles M. Haar, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. INOUYE, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislature business.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 17 Leg.]

Anderson
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Case
Clark
Ervin
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Long, Mo.
McIntyre
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Hawaii.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. YARBOROUGH entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). A quorum is present.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, nothing has happened since this issue was before the Senate last year to alter my opposition to this attempt to deprive the States of jurisdiction to pass right-to-work laws.

But several things have happened to make this Congress look ridiculous for wasting its time on this bill while labor-management problems of far greater importance to the country as a whole go unnoticed.

Recently the life of New York City was disrupted for 12 days by an illegal strike of subway and bus workers, called in defiance of a court order.

Today we are threatened with a railroad strike, which could affect the health and welfare of the entire Nation.

And, yet, we stand here giving full priority to a comparatively insignificant section of the Taft-Hartley Law, which does nothing more than preserve the sovereign right of each State to decide for itself whether it will protect its workers from compulsory unionism.

I can understand why the unions place this bill at the top of their list, but I cannot understand the reasoning of congressional leaders who push this bill while more serious labor-management problems linger in committee.

The injunction process provided for in the Taft-Hartley law to enable the President to seek an 80-day "cooling off" period when major strikes threaten to endanger the health or safety of large areas, or the Nation, as a whole, has not proved adequate.

About a year ago, on February 4, I proposed one new weapon for dealing with major strikes. It was a bill to make subject to the antitrust laws strikes that unreasonably restrain trade or commerce among the States or with foreign nations.

I was prompted to act at that time because the seaports of the United States were tied up for the second time in 2 years by a dock strike. It was affecting our foreign trade as well as large segments of the domestic economy.

My bill is not confined to the transportation industry but I introduced it at that time because the dock strike demonstrated that a work stoppage in any part of the complex transportation setup adversely affects thousands of workers not directly concerned in the dispute. No action was taken on my bill.

The recent subway strike in New York, which kept hundreds of people from reaching their jobs and cost heavy losses to business establishments in the metropolis, has reawakened interest in the need for some better way of dealing with labor disputes of this kind.

The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] told the Senate a few days ago that existing laws have proved inadequate for dealing with strikes like the one which tied up New York, and he introduced an alternative solution.

If a board of inquiry was unable to effect an agreement within 30 days, the Javits plan would authorize the President to ask a Federal court to appoint a special receiver to operate the struck facilities.

Without committing myself on the merits of the Javits proposal, I mention it to show that Senators are becoming more aware of the need for some improvement in the machinery for dealing with major strikes.

President Johnson was also prompted to deal with the subject in his state of the Union message about 2 weeks ago. He said:

> I also intend to ask the Congress to consider measures which without improperly invading State and local authority will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest.

Although Mr. Johnson also asked for repeal of section 14(b), I see no reason why we should rush to comply with that recommendation without considering the more important request he made for action to deal with strikes "which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest."

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that the Senate should consider first things first. This bill should be returned to the Labor and Welfare Committee until the more essential changes in the Taft-Hartley law are considered.

Taking a stand against the repeal of section 14(b) is not a question of being against organized labor. It is not so much a labor issue as it is one of States rights. I have no desire to interfere with the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively, and there is no evidence that the right-to-work laws have injured unions.

But these laws have given workers in Virginia, and in 18 other States, the same right to decide for themselves whether they will join a union that they have to decide whether to join a church, a fraternal organization, or a political party.

The unions argue that once a majority in a plant votes for a particular labor organization, it becomes the bargaining agent for all the workers, and all should be forced to pay union dues. The supporters of compulsory membership call the nonmembers "free riders."

But on the other side of this coin is the fact that unions sought the right to be the sole bargaining agent whenever they get a majority in a representation election, and I am sure they would not willingly surrender this sole-bargainer role.

Mr. Donald Richberg, who for many years was a leading authority on labor legislation, put it best in a book he wrote about a decade ago, in which he declared:

> The nonmember is not a "free rider"; he is a captive passenger.

I believe that the Senate is justified in taking as much time as Senators feel to be necessary to debate this repeal bill, in view of the way the House rushed it to a vote last year.

It passed the other body after only 5 hours of debate and with no opportunity to offer amendments. Although the advocates of repeal say that their purpose is to establish a uniform Federal rule to govern union security agreements, they would not let the House consider an amendment to apply a uniform rule for dealing with religious freedom to this question of union membership.

When the bill was taken up in the House, Congress had only recently amended the social security law to permit persons to remain out of that system if to join social security would conflict with their religious beliefs.

In the selective military service laws, we have always granted the conscientious objector the opportunity to render noncombatant service in time of war.

But the House refused to consider an amendment granting similar relief to workers who have religious objections to joining a union.

The original desire of organized labor was to push the repeal of section 14(b) through both houses without amendment. But the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee recognized the inconsistency of not making some provision for the conscientious objector.

Accordingly, the committee has amended the House bill to allow religious objectors to remain out of unions provided they pay the equivalent of union dues and initiation fees to an appropriate charity.

Section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act of 1947,[1] known more generally as the "Taft-Hartley Act," reads as follows:

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or Territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or Territorial law.

Prior to its enactment, organized labor persistently advanced the claim that the Federal Government, by enactment of the Wagner Act, had preempted the field of union security, i.e., the States no longer had authority to prohibit or regulate union security arrangements, the chief devices being the "closed"[2] and "union"[3] shop agreements. This claim, however, advanced with much enthusiasm by labor, was entirely without foundation.

The Senate report[4] on the bill which was to become the Wagner Act summarized the effect of the act upon union security arrangements, in these words:

> The proviso attached to the third unfair-labor practice deals with the question of the closed shop. Propaganda has been widespread that this proviso attaches special legal sanctions to the closed shop or seeks to impose it upon all industry. This propaganda is absolutely false. The reason for the insertion of the proviso is as follows: According to some interpretations, the provision of section 7(a) of the National Industrial Recovery Act, assuring the freedom of employees "to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing," was deemed to illegalize the closed shop. The committee feels that this was not the intent of Congress when it wrote section 7(a); that it is not the intent of Congress today; and that it is not desirable to interfere in this drastic way with the laws of the several States on this subject.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In other words, the bill does nothing to facilitate closed-shop agreements or to make them legal in any State where they may be illegal; it does not interfere with the status quo on this debatable subject but leaves the way open to such agreements as might now legally be consummated * * *.[5]

Clearly, "under the Wagner Act, the closed shop, the hiring hall, the union shop, the permit system and all lesser forms of union security were legal;"[6] conversely "the Wagner Act did not affirmatively sanction the closed shop or other forms of union security."[7]

Despite the legislative history of the Wagner Act which indicated, although not spelling it out specifically, that the States were to "retain authority to prohibit or regulate"[8] union security arrangements, labor continued to argue that the Wagner Act prevented the States from legislating in this area.

Finally, in order to lay to rest, once and for all, union claims that the Federal Government had preempted the field of union security arrangements, section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted.

Section 14(b) expressly "empowers the State to prohibit union-security arrangements which, in the absence of State regulation, would be permitted by section 8 of the statute."[9]

As the legislative history of 14(b) suggests:

> Its purpose was not merely to sanction State regulations more restrictive than the Federal prohibitions but rather to preserve concurrent State regulation without regard to whether it supplemented or overlapped with the Federal scheme. In other words, the legislative history indicated that the purpose of section 14(b) was to preserve for the States the same power to deal with union-security, which they had under the Wagner Act.[10]

As a commentator has observed:

> The intent [of Taft-Hartley] was to protect the individual employee from domination by union officials.[11]

Congress, in its wisdom, decided that the best way to prevent this domination was to allow the citizens of a particular State, if they so desire, to say, "union membership shall not be a condition of gainful employment in this State."

By enacting section 14(b), Congress indicated its approval of the statement of Mr. Justice Brandeis, who, in New York Ice Co. against Liebmann[12] said, "to stay experimentation in things social and economic is a grave responsibility."[13]

Prior to the adoption of 14(b) in 1947, nine States[14] had prohibited, by constitutional amendment or statute, discrimination in employment because of membership or nonmembership in a labor union. Today, 10 additional States[15] have adopted such laws, known popularly as right-to-work laws.

Despite extensive litigation, not one of the 19 laws has been declared violative of the various State constitutions by the lower courts.[16]

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the event Congress should adopt the proposal before the Senate, and prevent the States from deciding whether they do or do not have right-to-work laws, what, if any, deterrents will be in existence against labor leaders making their reckless demands, their defiance of law and order, their paralyzing of the economy of the Nation, as was reflected by what happened in New York recently?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The answer to the question is that the deterrents will be none.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator subscribe to the thought that the only deterrents against such reckless conduct of labor leaders now is the threat of the States in which no right-to-work laws are in existence that if the labor leaders do step beyond the line of decency, those States may adopt right-to-work laws?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have some labor leaders as friends, and I do not want to designate all of them as being reckless; but I am sure that those can rightfully be called reckless who demand observation of union regulations and adopt the very strong procedure which the Senator from Ohio pointed out a while ago. They went so far as to fine a woman who went to church on Sunday when the union said that she must attend a union meeting on that day.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not want to answer the Senator's comment for fear of violating the rules under which he has the floor, but I am quite certain that an examination of that court decision——

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Ohio can ask me if it is not so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not so that an examination of the court decision would disclose that a union fined a woman worker because she did not attend a union meeting, but went to church, in violation of the union rules?

The union said that the woman had to pay the fine, and the U.S. court held that, as a member of the union, she was obligated to comply with the rules that she had to attend a union meeting, even though it prevented her from going to church in accordance with her conscience and desire.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In answer to my distinguished friend from Ohio, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] read into the RECORD today the very decision in which the court held that a union could fine a woman for going to church, which was in compliance with her religious conviction, rather than attending a meeting of the union. Fortunately, there was a minority opinion, in which, I believe, three justices concurred, which held that such a right on the part of the union would exceed the rights of the union under the Wagner Labor Relations Act. I am not sure but that minority opinion may become the majority opinion of that distinguished court eventually, because, with all due deference, it does not have much difficulty in reversing its decisions from time to time.

On a later occasion, if this unnecessary debate should be continued, I shall quote fully decisions bearing on this particular question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr President, reverting to my initial question, I would like the Senator from Virginia to search his mind and answer me if he can think of any method under which we can stop union leaders from paralyzing the economy of the Nation and penalizing members of the union, except by the threat that unless they stop, they may be faced with the prospect of the States adopting right-to-work laws. I ask the Senator from Virginia and the Members of the Senate on the floor to search their minds to see how they could deter union leaders except by a threat that, unless they hew to this line of decent Americanism, they may find themselves faced with a right-to-work law.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I would not say there is no other method. We could go communistic. Then the dictator would stop them. I believe in the democratic method of letting each sovereign State pass on the issue of whether a man shall be forced to join a union against his will. In all of the 19 States those laws have always been upheld. None of them have ever been set aside.

There is as much protection given to the man who wants to join the union as the man who does not want to join the union.

I believe that is the democratic way and the proper way to handle it. That is the reason why I am standing here today objecting to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I say to the Senator that I am standing with him shoulder to shoulder on this issue.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand that. I appreciate that, and I am sure the people of Ohio appreciate that.

More importantly, the Supreme Court of the United States has upheld the constitutionality of State right-to-work laws enacted pursuant to section 14(b).

The landmark cases were decided on January 3, 1949. The two cases, Lincoln Federal Labor Union against Northwestern Iron & Metal Co.,[17] and AFL against American Sash & Door Co.,[18] were consolidated for argument. Because of an additional issue raised in the American Sash case, two opinions were handed down, both by Mr. Justice Black.

The constitutionality of the laws of three States, North Carolina, Nebraska, and Arizona, were at issue in these cases, and the facts were similar.

The North Carolina law under attack provided:

> Any agreement or combination between any employer and any labor union or labor organization whereby persons not members of such union or organization shall be denied the right to work for said employer, or whereby such membership is made a condition of employment or continuation of employment by such employer, or whereby any such union or organization acquires an employment monopoly in any enterprise, is hereby declared to be against the public policy and an illegal combination or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce in the State of North Carolina.

The Nevada constitutional amendment attacked read:

> No person shall be denied employment because of membership in or affiliation with, or resignation or expulsion from a labor organization or because of refusal to join or affiliate with a labor organization; nor shall any individual or corporation or association of any kind enter into any contract, written or oral, to exclude persons from employment because of membership in or nonmembership in a labor organization.

And finally, the Arizona provision undergoing attack stated:

> No person shall be denied the opportunity to obtain or retain employment because of nonmembership in a labor organization, nor shall the State or any subdivision thereof, or any corporation, individual, or association of any kind enter into any agreement, written or oral, which excludes any person from employment or continuation of employment because of nonmembership in a labor organization.

The issues were described as follows:

> The Court has granted appeals from decisions of the supreme courts of Arizona, Nebraska, and North Carolina, in each of which substantially similar State laws prohibiting any form of union security agreement or arrangement were held not to contravene the Federal Constitution. The principle in each case is whether the law in question deprives the respective appellants of any federally protected right, and hence must be stricken down as being in violation of the Federal Constitution. Since the applicable legal principles are, for the most part, the same in each of the three cases, the respective applicants, with the consent of the respective appellees and with this Court's indulgence have joined together to present their arguments in one major brief.[19]

The attacks made on these laws were virtually the same in each case, as was the court's reasoning sustaining the laws. The union's chief contentions were:

> 1. State laws abridge the freedom of speech and the opportunities of unions and their members peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.[20]
>
> 2. That the State laws violate article I, section 10 of the U.S. Constitution, insofar as they impair the obligation of contracts.[21]
>
> 3. That the North Carolina and Nebraska laws deny unions and their members equal protection of the laws and thus offend the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment.[22] (Because of a difference in the language of the amendment in American Sash and that involved in the North Carolina and Nebraska cases, the Court considered separately the contention in American Sash that the Arizona amendment denied appellants equal protection of the laws and is discussed infra.)
>
> 4. It is contended that these State laws deprive appellants of their liberty without due process of law in violation of the 14th amendment.[23]

The Court rejected each of these four contentions. The reasoning of the Court is set forth in the paragraphs below.

The Court refused to accept the union's first amendment argument, stating:

> Nothing in the language of the laws indicates a purpose to prohibit speech, assembly, or petition. Precisely what these State laws

> do is to forbid employers acting alone, or in concert with labor organizations deliberately to restrict employment to none but union members.[24]

The Court, noting that the union did not contend that the laws involved forbid the full exercise of first amendment rights by unions or union members, stated that the union contention was that the State laws indirectly infringe upon constitutional rights of speech, assembly, and petition.

The Court said:

> While the basis of this contention is not entirely clear, it seems to rest on this line of reasoning: The right of unions and union members to demand that no nonunion members work along with union members is "indispensable to the right of self-organization and the association of workers to unions"; without a right of union members to refuse to work with nonunion members, there are "no means of eliminating the competition of the nonunion worker"; since, the reasoning continues, a closed shop is indispensable to achievement of sufficient union membership to put unions and employers on a full equality for collective bargaining, a closed shop is consequently "an indispensable concomitant" of "the right of employees to assembly into and associate together through labor organizations." Justification for such an expansive construction of the right to speak, assemble, and petition is then rested in part on appellants assertion that the right to work as a nonunionist is in no way equivalent to or the parallel of the right to work as a union member; that there exists no constitutional right to work as a nonunionist on the one hand while the right to maintain employment free from discrimination because of union membership is constitutionally protected. Cf. *Wallace Corporation* v. *Labor Board*, 323 U.S. 248.[25]

This contention was answered as follows:

> We deem it unnecessary to elaborate the numerous reasons for our rejection of this contention of appellants.
>
> * * * * *
>
> There cannot be wrung from a constitutional right of workers to assemble to discuss improvement of their own working standards, a further constitutional right to drive from remunerative employment all other persons who will not or cannot participate in union assemblies.
>
> * * * * *
>
> For where conduct affects the interests of other individuals and the general public, the legality of that conduct must be measured by whether the conduct conforms to valid law, even though the conduct is engaged in pursuant to plans of an assembly.[26]

As another court stated, in another context:

> Those 1st amendment rights incorporated into the 14th amendment, however, are not a license to trample upon the rights of others. They must be exercised responsibly and without depriving others of their rights, the enjoyment of which are equally as precious.[27]

The second contention of the unions, invoking the obligation of contracts provision of the Constitution, was given short shrift by the Court, which said:

> There is a suggestion though not elaborated in briefs that these State laws conflict with article I, section 10, of the U.S. Constitution, insofar as they impair the obligation of contracts made prior to their enactment. That this contention is without merit is now too clearly established to require discussion. See *Home Bldg. & Loan Assn.* v. *Blaisdell*, 290 U.S. 398, 436–439, and cases there cited. And also *Veix* v. *Sixth Ward Bldg. & Loan Assn.*, 310 U.S. 32, 38; *East New York Savings Bank* v. *Hahn*, 326 U.S. 230, 232.[28]

The equal protection contention, advanced by the unions, was answered as follows:

> Because the outlawed contracts are a useful incentive to the growth of union membership, it is said that these laws weaken the bargaining power of unions and correspondingly strengthen the power of employers. This may be true. But there are other matters to be considered. The State laws also make it impossible for an employer to make contracts with company unions which obligate the employer to refuse jobs to union members. In this respect, these State laws protect the employment opportunities of members of independent unions. See *Wallace Corporation* v. *Labor Board, supra*. This circumstance alone, without regard to others that need not be mentioned, is sufficient to support the State laws against a charge that they deny equal protection to unions as against employers and nonunion workers.
>
> It is also argued that the State laws do not provide protection for union members equal to that provided for nonunion members. But in identical language these State laws forbid employers to discriminate against union and nonunion members. Nebraska and North Carolina thus command equal employment opportunities for both groups of workers. It is precisely because these State laws command equal opportunities for both groups that appellants argue that the constitutionally protected rights of assembly and due process have been violated. For the constitutional protections surrounding these rights are relied on by appellants to support a contention that the Federal Constitution guarantees greater employment rights to union members than to nonunion members. This claim of appellants is itself a refutation of the contention that the Nebraska and North Carolina laws fail to afford protection to union members equal to the protection afforded nonunion workers.[29]

The Court elaborated at length on the fourth contention of the union, the contention involving the due process of law provision of the 14th amendment. Some of the more interesting comments include:

> Much of appellants' argument here seeks to establish that due process of law is denied employees and union men by that part of these State laws that forbids them to make contracts with the employer obligating him to refuse to hire or retain nonunion workers. But that part of these laws does no more than provide a method to aid enforcement of the heart of the laws, namely, their command that employers must not discriminate against either union or nonunion members because they are such. If the States have constitutional power to ban such discrimination by law, they also have power to ban contracts which if performed would bring about the prohibited discrimination. *Chicago, B. & Q.R. Co.* v. *McGuire*, 219 U.S. 549, 570, 571.[30]

The real issue, the decisive question to be answered under the due process contention, was stated to be:

> Does the due process clause forbid a State to pass laws clearly designed to safeguard the opportunity of nonunion workers to get and hold jobs, free from discrimination against them because they are nonunion workers? [31]

The Court then answered this question, stating that the unions ask of the Court that it return, at least in part, to an earlier philosophy of due process which had been "deliberately discarded." [32]

In tracing this earlier history, the following extracts are of interest:

> In 1907 this Court in *Adair* v. *United States*, 208 U.S. 161, considered the Federal law which prohibited discrimination against union workers * * *. This Court there held, over the dissents of Justices McKenna and Holmes, that the railroad, because of the due process clause of the fifth amendment, had a constitutional right to discriminate against union members and could therefore do so through use of yellow dog contracts. The chief reliance for this holding was *Lochner* v. *New York*, 198 U.S. 45, which had invalidated a New York law prescribing maximum hours for work in bakeries. This Court had found support for its Lochner holding in what had been said in *Allgeyer* v. *Louisiana*, 165 U.S. 578, a case on which appellants here strongly rely. There were strong dissents in the Adair and Lochner cases.
>
> In 1914 this Court reaffirmed the principles of the Adair case in *Coppage* v. *Kansas*, 236 U.S. 1, again over strong dissents, and held that a Kansas statute outlawing yellow dog contracts denied employers and employees a liberty to fix terms of employment. For this reason the law was held invalid under the due process clause.
>
> The Allgeyer-Lochner-Adair-Coppage constitutional doctrine was for some years followed by this Court. It was used to strike down laws fixing minimum wages and maximum hours in employment, laws fixing prices, and laws regulating business activities. See cases cited in *Olsen* v. *Nebraska*, 313 U.S. 236, 244–246, and *Osborn* v. *Ozlin*, 310 U.S. 53, 66–67. And the same constitutional philosophy was faithfully adhered to in *Adams* v. *Tanner*, 244 U.S. 590, a case strongly pressed upon us by appellants. In *Adams* v. *Tanner*, this Court with four justices dissenting struck down a State law absolutely prohibiting maintenance of private employment agencies. The majority found that such businesses were highly beneficial to the public and upon this conclusion held that the State was without power to proscribe them. Our holding and opinion in *Olsen* v. *Nebraska* supra, clearly undermined *Adams* v. *Tanner*.[33]

The Court went on to say that:

> This Court beginning at least as early as 1934, when the Nebbia case was decided, has steadily rejected the due process philosophy enunciated in the Adair-Coppage line of cases. In doing so it has consciously returned closer and closer to the earlier constitutional principle that States have power to legislate against what are found to be injurious practices in their internal commercial and business affairs * * *. Under this constitutional doctrine the due process clause is no longer to be so broadly construed that the Congress and State legislatures are put in a straitjacket when they attempt to suppress business and industrial conditions which they regard as offensive to the public welfare.[34]

The Court refused to go back in time to a discarded concept of due process, and the State right-to-work laws of North Carolina and Nebraska were upheld.

In the companion case of AFL against American Sash & Door Co., supra, for reasons given in the Lincoln Union case, the contentions of the union that "the Arizona amendment denies them freedom of speech, assembly or petition, impairs the obligation of their contracts, or deprives them of due process of law" [35] were rejected.

But the Court went on to answer one additional contention not raised in Lincoln Union. This contention was described as follows:

> The language of the Arizona amendment prohibits employment discrimination against nonunion workers, but it does not prohibit discrimination against union workers. It is argued that a failure to provide the same protection for union workers as that provided for nonunion workers places the union workers at a disadvantage, thus denying unions and their members the equal protection of Arizona's laws.[36]

The Court answered:

> Although the Arizona amendment does not itself expressly prohibit discrimination against union workers, that State has not left unions and union members without protection from discrimination on account of union membership. Prior to passage of this constitutional amendment, Arizona made it a misdemeanor for any person to coerce a worker to make a contract not to join, become or remain, a member of any labor organization as a condition of getting or holding a job in Arizona. A section of the Arizona code made every such contract (generally known as a yellow dog contract) void and unenforceable. Similarly, the Arizona constitutional amendment makes void and unenforceable contracts under which an employer agrees to discriminate against nonunion workers. Statutes implementing the amendment have provided as sanctions for its enforcement relief by injunction and suits for damages for discrimination practiced in violation of the amendment. Whether the same kind of sanctions would be afforded a union worker against whom an employer discriminated is not made clear by the opinion of the State supreme court in this case. But assuming that Arizona courts would not afford a remedy by injunction or suit for damages, we are unable to find any indication that Arizona's amendment and statutes are weighted on the side of nonunion as against union workers. We are satisfied that Arizona has attempted both in the anti-yellow-dog contract law and in the antidiscrimination constitutional amendment to strike at what were considered evils, to strike where those evils were most felt, and to strike in a manner that would effectively suppress the evils.
>
> In *Labor Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Corp.*, 301 U.S. 1, this Court considered a challenge to the National Labor Relations Act on the ground that it applied restraints against employers but did not apply similar restraints against wrongful conduct by employees. We there pointed out, at page 46, the general rule that "legislative authority exerted within its proper field, need not embrace all the evils within its reach."[37]

And so the right-to-work law of Arizona was also upheld.

Several comments by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, writing in concurrence of Mr. Justice Black's opinions for the Court, are worthy of a few minutes study, for they tend to explain many of the factors that must have been present in the minds of the Justices while arriving at a decision in the cases. A few are reprinted below:

> Concern for individual members of society, for whose well-being government is instituted, gave urgency to the fear that concentrated power would become arbitrary. It is a fear that the history of such power, even when professedly employed for democratic purposes, has hardly rendered unfounded.[38]
>
> * * * * *
>
> A union is no more than a medium through which individuals are able to act together; union power was begotten of individual helplessness. But that power can come into being only when, and continue to exist only so long as, individual aims are seen to be shared in common with the other members of the group.[39]

Perhaps the most important statement of Mr. Justice Frankfurter's is the one that follows, for it completely knocks the wind out of labor's argument that right-to-work laws mean the end of the labor movement:

> It is urged that the compromise which this legislation embodies is no compromise at all because fatal to the survival of organized labor. But can it be said that the legislators and the people of Arizona, Nebraska, and North Carolina could not in reason be skeptical of organized labor's insistence upon the necessity to its strength of power to compel rather than to persuade the allegiance of its reluctant members? In the past 50 years the total number of employed, counting salaried workers and the self-employed but not farmers or farm laborers, has not quite trebled, while total union membership has increased more than 33 times; at the time of the open-shop drive following the First World War, the ratio of organized to unorganized nonagricultural workers was about 1 to 9, and now it is almost 1 to 3.[40]

The Lincoln Union and American Sash cases are then the landmark cases upholding constitutionality of State right-to-work laws.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a list of footnotes in explanation of points I have made thus far in this speech.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOTNOTES

[1] 49 Stat. 449 as amended by Public Law 101, 80th Cong., 1st sess., 1947; and Public Law 257, 86th Cong., 1st sess., 1959; 29 U.S.C. secs. 151–168; FCA 29 secs. 151–168.

[2] Closed shop: Requires membership in the contracting union before a job applicant can be employed.

[3] Union shop: Such a clause does not require an employer to hire only union members; however, the contract makes it mandatory for the nonunion employee to become a member of the union within a prescribed period after his initial employment—usually 30 days.

[4] S. Rept. 573, 74th Cong., 1st sess.

[5] Id. at pp. 11–12.

[6] Rosenthal, "The National Labor Relations Act and Compulsory Unionism," 1954 Wis. L. Rev. 53, 55.

[7] Meltzer, "The Supreme Court, Congress and State Jurisdiction Over Labor Relations," Supplement—The University of Chicago Law School Record (December 1958) p. 108.

[8] Id.

[9] Id. at 108–109.

[10] Id. at 109.

[11] Rosenthal, supra n. 6, at p. 58.

[12] *New York Ice Co.* v. *Liebmann*, 285 U.S. 262.

[13] Id. at 311.

[14] Arizona, art. 2, sec. 35, constitution of Arizona, initiated constitutional amendment (effective Nov. 5, 1946); Arkansas, amendment 34, constitution of Arkansas (implemented by ch. 101, Statutes 1947—approved Feb. 19, 1947); Florida, amendment to sec. XII, Florida constitution (approved Nov. 7, 1944); Georgia, Code of Georgia Annotated, secs. 54.901–54.911, art. 140 (Mar. 27, 1947); Iowa, Iowa Code, ch. 736A., secs. 736A., 1–736A.8, acts 1947 (52 G.A.) ch. 296 (Apr. 28, 1947); Nebraska, secs. 13–15, art. 15 of the Nebraska constitution as added by amendment (Dec. 11, 1946); North Carolina, North Carolina code, ch. 95, art. 10 L. 1947, ch. 382 (Mar. 18, 1947; Tennessee, code, art. XLV, secs. 11412, 8–11412.13, Pub. chap. 36, L. 1947 (Feb. 21, 1947); and Virginia Code, secs. 40.68–40.74 (Jan. 12, 1947), as amended.

[15] Alabama, act No. 430, 1. 1953 (Aug. 28, 1953); Kansas, amendment to constitution (Nov. 4, 1958); Mississippi, statute, S.B. 1394, L. 1954 (Feb. 24, 1954), constitution amendment; (June 7, 1960); Nevada, secs. 1–8, ch. 1, L. 1953 (Dec. 4, 1952); North Dakota, sec. 34–0114, L. 1947 (June 29, 1948); South Carolina, S.B. 443, L. 1954 (Mar. 19, 1954); South Dakota, sec. 2, art. VI, S. Dak. constitution; Texas, art. 5207 A (Sept. 5, 1947); Utah, secs. 1–18, Utah right-to-work law (1955). Wyoming, SF–24, L. 1963 (May 18, 1963).

[16] See, for example, *Lewis* v. *Jackson and Squire, Inc.*, 86 F. Supp. 354 (D.C. Ark. 1949) app. dism'd. 181 F. 2d 1011; *A.F.L.* v. *Watson*, 60 F. Supp. 1010 (D.C. Fla. 1945), rev'd. on other grounds (327 U.S. 582); *Federal Firefighters of Oak Ridge* v. *Roane Anderson Co.*, 12 CCH Lab. Cas. 63782; *Construction & Gen. Labor Union* v. *Stephenson*, 148 Tex. 434, 225 S.W. 2d 958 (1950); and *Re. Opinion of Justices*, 142 Me. 420, 60 A. 2d 901.

[17] *Lincoln Federal Labor Union* v. *Northwestern Iron & Metal Co.*, 335 U.S. 525 (1949).

[18] *AFL* v. *American Sash & Door Co.*, 335 U.S. 538 (1949).

[19] Brief for Appellants, pp. 1–2, U.S. Supreme Court briefs and records, October term 1947.

[20] Lincoln, supra n, at 529.

[21] Id. at 531.

[22] Id. at 532.

[23] Id. at 533.

[24] Id. at 530.

[25] Id. at 530–31.

[26] Id. at 531.

[27] *Baines, et al.* v. *City of Danville, Virginia*, Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, Aug. 10, 1964.

[28] Lincoln, supra, n. 17, at 531–32.

[29] Id. at 532–33.

[30] Id. at 533.

[31] Id. at 534.

[32] Id. at 537.

[33] Id. at 534–35.

[34] Id. at 536–37.

[35] *American Sash,* supra n. 18, at 540.

[36] Id.

[37] *American Sash,* supra n. 18, at 540–42.

[38] Id. at 545.

[39] Id.

[40] *American Sash,* supra n. 18, at 547.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, Virginia, the home of the first permanent English settlement in North America, is rightfully known as the cradle of liberty for the Western Hemisphere.

With this heritage of freedom, handed down from generation to generation from the Jamestown pioneers, a Virginia Senator today finds it impossible to vote for legislation which would deny personal freedom to millions of workers.

From Virginia came the motivation for immortalizing in the U.S. Constitution the imperishable principle that liberty is the gift of God—not of government—and that government is intended to preserve liberty—not destroy it.

With this heritage, a Virginia Senator today is unable to support legislation which would ruthlessly demolish the right of workers to decide for themselves whether or not to join a union.

It was a Virginian, Patrick Henry, who shouted for people everywhere and forever to hear:

> Give me liberty or give me death.

For me to support this bill would be to break faith with the millions of Virginians who have breathed the invigorating air of liberty since the Jamestown Colony was settled in 1607, 358 years ago.

It also would betray other millions of Americans who have joined with Virginians in protecting and preserving—and luxuriating in—this spirit of freedom, which has made the United States the envy of the world.

It would violate the most sacred principles of such great Virginians as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and George Mason—to name but a few of the illustrious persons who worshiped at the shrine of liberty.

If there is one idea, more than any other, that represents the tradition of Virginia it is that of individual liberty.

Our heritage is one in which the dignity and worth of the individual soars far above any manmade institutions.

In this tradition, the Virginia right-to-work law provides a highly cherished guarantee to each worker, that he or she has the right to seek employment and to work at a chosen occupation without being compelled to join a labor union and pay dues to a labor union.

It guarantees the right to join and support a union—if this is desired by the employee.

It also guarantees the right not to be forced to join and support a union—if this is not desired by the employee.

The employee has the right to be guided toward a decision by his intelligence and by his conscience.

That, truly, is the Virginia way.

And that, truly, is the American way.

The right-to-work law is, therefore, essential in preserving Virginia's tradition of freedom in an age when, unfortunately, there is a frequent tendency to overlook and disregard individual rights.

Without this law, a combination of industrial corporations—if they so desired—and unions—if they so desired—could strip the individual worker of his God-given freedom of choice, force him into union membership, make him submit to union discipline, and pay a portion of his income to the union as a condition of retaining his job.

This cannot be permitted to happen in Virginia—and in the other 18 States with right-to-work laws.

And the other 31 States must not be denied the right—if they wish—to enact similar laws to spread freedom throughout the Nation.

But this right is in danger—in grave danger because of the pending bill.

The vast majority of the American people are with us in opposing the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Sixty-seven percent of the American people believe that no citizen should be forced to belong to a union in order to hold his job, according to a nationwide survey of public opinion by Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, N.J.

The Richmond Times-Dispatch has said "it would be a tragic day in American history" if the Senate should join the House in voting to repeal 14(b).

> The repeal—

The newspaper explained—

> would remove a critical barrier against infiltration of unions by Communist elements.
>
> In the 19 States which now have laws against compulsory union membership, a workingman has a right not to join a union, if, in his opinion, it is infiltrated or dominated by Communists.
>
> The danger of that happening, especially during a depression or recession, was greatly increased when the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a Federal law making it a crime for Communists to hold office in labor unions.

How did the right-to-work movement start? Why was it necessary in this "land of the free?"

The National Right-To-Work Committee, organized in 1955 to protect workers against compulsory unionism, traces the history of the movement as follows:

> The right-to-work movement began in the early 1940's as an expression of public disapproval of the compulsory membership power being exercised by labor unions with the sanction of Federal labor law.
>
> This power of unions to force working men and women into unions through contracts containing compulsory membership clauses was a full swing of the pendulum from the old yellow dog contracts at the turn of the century. In those, employers required employees to agree, as a condition of employment, they would not join unions.
>
> The old yellow dog contracts were outlawed in 1932 by the Norris-LaGuardia Act as an unconscionable infringement on the individual liberty of working men and women. At the same time, the Norris-LaGuardia Act clearly stipulated the right of workers not to join unions.
>
> The yellow dog contract returned in reverse in 1935 with the Wagner Act, which authorized closed shop contracts between unions and employers, requiring anyone seeking employment to join the union before he could be hired.

The first right-to-work laws were passed in 1944 in Florida and Arkansas. By public referendum these States amended their constitutions to declare that membership or nonmembership in a labor union should not be made a condition of the opportunity to work or to remain in the employment of an employer.

These, like other similar laws enacted later, restated the rights of workers to form unions and to bargain collectively. That is why I say these laws were not intended to destroy organized labor, but only to preserve individual freedom.

In 1946 Arizona and Nebraska passed right-to-work laws, and before the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted in 1947 five other States had followed suit. These were Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina, Georgia, and Iowa.

Congress debated thoroughly the question of whether right-to-work laws were a proper field of legislative activity for the States before it adopted section 14(b).

Before the end of 1947 two more States, South Dakota and Texas, had passed a right-to-work law. Other States now having right-to-work laws and the years of enactment are: North Dakota, 1948; Nevada, 1952; Alabama, 1953; Mississippi and South Carolina, 1954; Utah, 1955; Kansas, 1958; and Wyoming, 1963.

Action by these 19 States for right-to-work laws represents the will of 50 million citizens of those States.

And the other millions of citizens of the United States now have the right to enact similar legislation if they so desire.

Naturally, the right-to-work laws were tested in the courts by their opponents. The result of these court tests was as follows, according to the National Right-To-Work Committee:

> Authority of the States to enact right-to-work laws was fully upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Lincoln Union* v. *Northwestern* in 1949, and in the Schermerhorn decisions on December 2, 1963.
>
> The Supreme Court held that State laws which prohibit both compulsory union membership and the agency shop (in which employees are forced to pay the equivalent of dues to unions, even if not members) are valid and effective.
>
> The Nation's highest tribunal also held that power of enforcement of right-to-work laws rests with State courts. The Schermerhorn cases were a complete victory for proponents of voluntary unionism laws over the efforts of opponents to weaken or destroy them through the courts.

Let those who claim that State right-to-work laws are improper challenge them in the forum where they were enacted—the State legislatures.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What happens to the liberties of U.S. citizens when, under the law of this Government, a member of a union can be fined by the union when, as a worker trying to sustain himself in life, he produces more goods at his job than the union declares may be produced?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That strikes a very vital blow at the type of freedom we are supposed to have under the Constitution.

It also transfers cases from what we would be constrained to feel would be a fair and judicial process to a prejudiced private body which would pass sentence and impose a fine upon a member. In this process numerous provisions of our Constitution would be violated, provisions such as the right to a jury trial, the right of indictment, the right to be confronted by one's accuser, and the right to be tried by a jury of one's peers.

At a later time, I shall go quite fully into the question of the general phase of this bill as it affects constitutional rights.

At the moment, I shall merely say that it violates my concept of personal freedom, and it violates a law that Virginia passed in 1947.

I have told my labor friends who want me to vote for this bill, "If you think the law is wrong, the State legislature that passed the law is now in session. The forum that enacted the law is the forum in which you should test it. Ask the State legislature to repeal it, and do not ask me to try to force this proposal upon people in Virginia, who think they were right in the first instance."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does not the answer of the Senator mean that it is wrong and is a violation of individual freedom for any labor union to tell a worker, "Thus much you may produce, but you cannot go beyond that," even though the worker feels that he has been a laggard and that he has not been contributing within his ability?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I agree with my friend that no organization should have such power. Labor has pointed in all of its demands for increased pay to increased production. Our money has depreciated relatively little in the past 10 years compared with the currencies of major nations. It has decreased 15 percent. But if one takes 15 percent from a Government bond that has 30 or 40 years to run, it can be very harmful. What has kept our prices more or less stable has been that while we have increased wages a little faster than production, production has gone up.

Production has been going up at a rate of 3.5 or 4 percent a year. That is the reason why the President said:

> Let us keep the wage increases down to 3.5 percent a year.

Otherwise they violate the guideline.

An unfortunate trend that we have just discovered in the past year is that we have increaed the money supply of this Nation by 8 percent. That creates what the economists call the demand pull in inflation.

We have had what is called creeping inflation. It has been held down. Factories were not running at full capacity. We were not at war. We were not diverting our production to war, to be chewed up in the jungles. The enemy has shot down $1 billion worth of planes in the past year, and we must replace them.

We had increased production. Wages did not go up very much more than production. We were able to absorb, in the money supply, the money that the Government borrowed.

But now we have almost full production. We have labor going beyond the guidelines of 3½ percent on wages. Then we have a new injection of credit, bank check money and actual cash, going into the money stream.

Twice the rate of increased production—What does that mean? It means more dollars chasing fewer goods, and that is what the economists call the demand pull.

Let us think of our economy as a great warehouse. One man puts in shoes, one man puts in automobiles, and another man puts in something else. We issue tickets. What is a ticket? It is a dollar.

Suppose we had a pair of shoes in there, and it took ten tickets—$10—to get them, and instead of having those $10 out, we issue $20. It takes twice as many tickets to get the same type of shoes, and we must have the shoes.

I see in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER]. He is one of the great successful farmers of the Nation. He knows what has happened to hogs. The supply went down, but the people wanted to continue eating bacon. So what happened? Bacon went up to a dollar a pound and above. See the demand pull? They had the money, the hogs were not there, and they started bidding against each other to get that bacon.

That, of course, is what I am afraid of in this general economic picture. I am getting a little bit away from 14(b). I think we should be discussing the budget and the war, giving priority to the war and wondering how we can fight it without inflation. But in the great wisdom of those who run this debating society, or the greatest deliberative body in the world, whichever we may wish to call it, this is the time and place to take up the repeal of 14(b). Much as I had rather be doing something else, I am here to say that taking up 14(b) does not meet with my approval.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator answer another question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. If I can.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the union has a right to put a maximum limit upon how much a worker may produce, does it not follow that it also has the power to establish a minimum limit, below which he shall not produce?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think so. I think our courts were really wrong in the extent to which they said the LaGuardia amendment to the antitrust laws completely exempted unions from all antitrust laws. The Congress did not intend that. But the courts practically ruled that way, and at the present time, the unions can organize and bargain collectively for wages and working conditions—which I think is very proper. I am old enough to remember when the workingman really had it tough, when what Teddy Roosevelt used to call the malefactors of great wealth made it difficult for the workers in the coalfields and the mills and other industries. I am glad they are organized. I am glad they have power. But I believe they should use that power with due restraint and consideration of the public interest; and if there should be some arbitrary, reckless, selfish labor leaders, we ought to have some provision under the antitrust laws—they would all be tried in court, now, under the antitrust laws—where, when they have gone beyond the operation of a union to beat this Nation to its knees, restraints could be imposed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. BREWSTER. The distinguished senior Senator from Virginia has indicated that perhaps this is not the propitious time to discuss the repeal of 14(b), and that there are other pressing matters that should be considered by the U.S. Senate. I could not agree more that the situation in Vietnam and the President's budget should be taken up in the immediate future. Therefore, would not the senior Senator from Virginia agree that perhaps we should vote "yes" or "no" on the repeal of 14(b) at the earliest possible moment?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No; I think it would be much better to say that we do not have time for the Senator from Virginia to tell everybody how bad this bill is, and rather than take the time for him to do that, and discuss the constitutionality of it, we will drop this effort, or put it at the tail end of the program, and if we can keep a majority here after Labor Day, we will take it up then. That is the way I feel about it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it the position of the Senator from Virginia that before we vote, Members of the Senate should be informed about the dangers that reside in the proposal that has been made?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I suppose; and we cannot do that in a few hours every now and then. It will require a considerable period of time, and that is the reason I do not believe we have time to go into this matter fully. I hope that when the snow melts a little next week, and the weather clears up, the leadership will say, "This is an exercise in futility. We cannot get anywhere except to have some more talk. We cannot convince the believers in States' rights that they should lie down and play dead; they will not do it, and so we will drop this bill for the time being."

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM AS GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN SEES IT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I was much struck with Gen. James M. Gavin's letter which appears in the current Harper's magazine and find that he has articulated from a practical, military viewpoint many of the thoughts in my own mind.

I believe it to be an excellent article, and that its full flavor has not been conveyed by the shorter reports of it.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD, together with an editorial published in the Providence Journal of January 26, 1966. As the editorial states in its concluding sentence:

> General Gavin's practical questions have yet to be answered adequately.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COMMUNICATION ON VIETNAM

(In the following letter General Gavin presents the first basic criticism of the administration's policy in Vietnam by a major military figure. As an alternative, he urges the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnem, a halt in the escalation of the ground war, withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnam coast, and renewed efforts "to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva."

(General Gavin argues for such a change in policy on purely military grounds. His views on the Vietnam war cannot be taken lightly, since he has established a reputation during the last 30 years as one of America's leading strategic thinkers. At the time of the French defeat in Vietnam, he was chief of Plans and Operations for the Department of the Army, and his advice is generally believed to be largely responsible for the U.S. refusal to enter the southeast Asian conflict on a large scale at that time. He enlisted in the Army as a private in 1924 and rose to the rank of lieutenant general before his retirement in 1958; he had a distinguished combat career as a paratroop commander in World War II; and he served for a time as chief of Research and Development for the Army. After retirement he was Ambassador to France, and is now chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Arthur D. Little, Inc., an industrial research firm in Cambridge, Mass.

(He left the Pentagon because of disagreements on what was, in 1958, the basic military policy of the Eisenhower administration. His reasons for such disagreements were set forth in his book, "War and Peace in the Space Age," published by Harper & Row; as he indicates in the following letter, most of the changes he then urged have since been carried out.

(The editors hope that General Gavin's communication may stimulate a searching reexamination of American military and foreign policies by other public figures who are especially qualified by experience and training to discuss them. In the coming months Harper's hopes to publish further contributions to such a reappraisal.—The Editors.)

(By Gen. James M. Gavin)

Last November our Secretary of Defense, while in Vietnam, finally gave battlefield approval to the concept of sky cavalry. Harper's should take some pride in the fact that it published my article, "Cavalry, and I Don't Mean Horses," in 1954. That was the genesis of the idea for this new form of mobility for our ground forces. It was too revolutionary for acceptance in the Pentagon then, and Harper's performed a public service in helping advance the idea.

I would like to comment about the Vietnam situation further. I should emphasize at the outset that I am writing solely from a military-technical point of view. I was Chief of Plans and Operations in the Department of the Army when Dienbienphu brought the French endeavors in Vietnam to an end. The Chief of Staff, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, directed that we go into the situation quite thoroughly in case a decision should be made to send U.S. forces into the Hanoi Delta. As I recall, we were talking about the possibility of sending 8 divisions plus 35 engineer battalions and other auxiliary units. We had one or two old China hands on the staff at the time and the more we studied the situation the more we realized that we were, in fact, considering going to war with China, since she was supplying all the arms, ammunition, medical, and other supplies to Ho Chi Minh. If we would be, in fact, fighting China, then we were fighting her in the wrong place on terms entirely to her advantage. Manchuria, with its vast industrial complex, coal, and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its warmaking capacity. There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged, if at all.

I should emphasize at the outset that there are philosophical and moral aspects of the war in southeast Asia that are understandably disturbing to every thoughtful person. My comments, however, are based entirely upon a tactical evaluation of our efforts there. At the time of the French defeat, it seemed to us military planners that if an effort were made by the United States to secure Vietnam from Chinese military exploitation, and that if force on the scale that we were talking about were to be employed, then the Chinese would very likely reopen the fighting in Korea.

At the time, General Ridgway thought it prudent to bring this situation directly to the attention of President Eisenhower, pointing out that we should be prepared for a large-scale war if we were to make the initial large-scale commitment to the Hanoi Delta that we were thinking about. I thought at the time that it took great moral courage for General Ridgway to take this action, but he has never been a man to lack such courage. The President decided not to make the commitment and in his book, "Mandate for Change," he commented that to have gone to war under those conditions would have been "like hitting the tail of the snake rather than the head," which is a good analogy.

Today we have sufficient force in South Vietnam to hold several enclaves on the coast, where sea and air power can be made fully effective. By enclaves I suggest Camranh Bay, Danang, and similar areas where American bases are being established. However, we are stretching these resources beyond reason in our endeavors to secure the entire country of South Vietnam from the Vietcong penetration. This situation, of course, is caused by the growing Vietcong strength.

The time has come. therefore, when we simply have to make up our mind what we want to do and then provide the resources necessary to do it. If our objective is to secure all of South Vietnam, then forces should be deployed on the 17th parallel and along the Cambodian border adequate to do this. In view of the nature of the terrain, it might be necessary to extend our defenses on the 17th parallel to the Mekong River, and across part of Thailand. Such a course would take many times as much force as we now have in Vietnam.

To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnam troops into the South. Also, if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese volunteers and the reopening of the Korean front. This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course that we are now on.

On the other hand, if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks in North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva, we could very likely do so with the forces now available. Maintaining such enclaves while an effort is being made to solve the internal situation in Vietnam, and in the face of the terroristic war that would be waged against them, poses some serious problems, and the retention of some of the enclaves may prove to be unwise; but the problems that we would then have to deal with would be far less serious than those associated with an expansion of the conflict.

I do not for a moment think that if we should withdraw from Vietnam the next stop would be Waikiki. The Kra Peninsula, Thailand, and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontiers of Thailand. But we should be realistic about the dangers of the course that we are now on. A straightforward escalation of our land power in southeast Asia to meet every land-based challenge, while at the same time we leave China and Cambodia immune from attack poses some very forbidding prospects. I realize that our Secretary of State was recently quoted in the press as having said that "the idea of sanctuary is out." However, the initiative is not ours and there is an abundance of evidence now that both China and Cambodia are sanctuaries for Communist military strength that is used to support the Vietcong.

To get to the heart of the problem, I doubt that world opinion would tolerate the bombing and seizure of Manchuria. If the Chinese Communists continue on their present course of aggression and, at the same time, continue to develop more devastating weapons—and I refer to nuclear weapons—the time may come when China will bring upon herself a nuclear war. But that time is not here yet. In the meantime, we must do the best we can with the forces we have deployed to Vietnam, keeping in mind the true meaning of strategy in global affairs. Economics, science and technology, and world opinion will, in the long run, serve our strategic interests well if we handle our national resources wisely. On the other hand, tactical mistakes that are allowed to escalate at the initiative of an enemy could be disastrously costly. Since the advent of the space age, there has been a revolution in the nature of war and global conflict. The confrontation in Vietnam is the first test of our understanding of such change, or our lack of it. The measures that we now take in southeast Asia must stem from sagacity and thoughtfulness, and an awareness of the nature of strategy in this rapidly shrinking world.

Referring again to the sky cavalry concept, which we are now employing in South Vietnam, it is the kind of innovation that is generally unpopular in a conservative society and in the miltary establishment of such a society. But many more innovations, both technical and in management methods, must be found if we are to continue to survive as a free people. Merely making bigger bombs or using more of them is not the answer. So I hope that Harper's will continue to support innovative methods when they are suggested, as you did when you first published the idea of sky cavalry in 1954.

When I retired in 1958, I said that I would be happy to serve as a private in the Army if it were the kind of an Army that I wanted it to be. I think it is that kind of an Army now, and I would be happy to serve in it in any grade in Vietnam or anywhere else. It is doing a splendid job in Vietnam and needs the support of all of our people.

[From the Providence Journal, Jan. 26, 1966]

A New Perspective on the Vietnam War

A dispute between military men has put the question of war and peace in Vietnam into a practical new perspective.

Too many Americans regard the Vietnam controversy as simply a debate between pacificists—those who would seek peace at almost any price in almost any place—and those who believe the United States must be prepared to use force to stop communism wherever necessary. When the issue is put in this light, obviously most Americans, who are by-and-large not pacifists, must support the use of whatever force experts deem necessary to protect American vital interests. But the question of U.S. military involvement in Vietnam is not that simple.

Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin (retired), a brilliant combat commander in World War II and Korea and former Army chief of planning, has raised pertinent questions about administration Vietnam policy, not on pacifist grounds, but on the basis of a hardheaded assessment of military realities. In a letter to Harper's magazine, General Gavin made these points:

1. He disputed the "domino theory" of those who argue that a defeat in Vietnam would lead to an eventual fallback to Hawaii.
2. He argued that to resume and broaden the bombing of North Vietnam would add to our problems and would not stop the infiltration of troops from the north.
3. He warned that a large buildup of American troops in South Vietnam would invite the intervention of Chinese volunteers and reopening of Korean hostilities.
4. He recommended that the United States pull back to enclaves on the coast, which could he held by forces already available in Vietnam, while we seek a long-term solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva.

It should be noted that General Gavin made a thorough study of the advisability of introducing American forces into Vietnam in 1954 when the French effort to reestablish colonial rule there was collapsing. General

Gavin's negative report was accepted by President Eisenhower. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, who was Chief of Staff of the Army in 1954, also opposed intervention at that time and has endorsed General Gavin's renewed opposition to U.S. participation in this war on the Asian land mass.

The Gavin thesis has been challenged, however, as might be expected, by the current chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler. General Wheeler's rebuttal before a Senate commitee last Thursday is not impressive, at least not as it has been reported so far. He argued:

1. That bombing of the north is a "blue chip" in bargaining that we cannot afford to abandon.

This begs the question. General Gavin did not argue that bombing has no advantage but rather that it has more disadvantages—as, for example, the danger of bringing the Chinese or the Russians, or both, into the war.

2. That the proposal to hold only easily defended enclaves with American forces had been considered and abandoned.

Why was it abandoned? What has been the result of the alternative policy of sending American troops on offensive operations deep into Vietnamese territory? Many American lives have been lost, but no substantial territorial gains have been registered. What are the practical chances of success of an American clear-and-hold operation in an alien and unfriendly land? What would be the cost and how long would American troops have to stay? What would we have of worth if we won?

3. That the United States is not in Vietnam for colonial purposes like the French but merely to help the South Vietnamese protect their freedom.

It has become increasingly clear that U.S. forces have effectively taken over the war from the allies they are supposed to be supporting. Why is it that when U.S. troops launched their recent offensive into the Iron Triangle northwest of Saigon they didn't even advise the South Vietnamese of their plans until the last minute? Does it make sense to continue to help those who can't or won't help themselves; to send American troops into battle beside allies who can't be trusted to keep military secrets, let alone to stand and fight in a crisis?

4. That if we lose the war in Vietnam "we will have more wars of national liberation to face up to with the prospect of greater losses under less favorable conditions."

Could there be less favorable conditions than to take on a national liberation movement that has been seasoned in long years of battle against a colonial power whose place we have, in effect, taken; to fight 8,000 miles from home in a country that is contiguous to a rival great power and in a jungle war where our armor is at a disadvantage and where we can be indefinitely outnumbered; to fight in support of a corrupt, discredited regime against a Communist leader who happens also to be a national hero?

All peaceniks aside, does the Vietnamese war as it has been waged and as it may be waged again make any sense as a sound military venture for the United States? General Gavin's practical questions have yet to be answered adequately.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY TO AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES, JANUARY 20, 1966

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on January 20, 1966, I had the good fortune to dine with the American Council of Learned Societies and to hear the lucid, articulate, and well-thought-out speech of Vice President HUMPHREY. As always, the Vice President's words showed a remarkable depth of thought and breadth of knowledge. I particularly liked his emphasis on the importance of the generalist and of the value of the humanities in our national life.

Moreover, the Vice President is preeminently qualified to give such a speech as he is, himself, such an outstanding and distinguished example of the generalist or humanist—in sum, the universal man.

Because of the excellence of Vice President HUMPHREY'S speech, I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 20, 1966

It is good to be with you tonight and to join with you in celebrating the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. I have long valued and admired the work of your council and of its constituent organizations. To one of them, I owe a special obligation.

Some years ago, I received a thorough inservice training in the art of being a vice president—vice president of the American Political Science Association, that is. My good friend, Evron Kirkpatrick and his associates took me in charge, and shepherded me through my tenure in office. In fact, they even pronounced me fit for further service. How could I say no when the next offer of a vice presidency came my way?

For many years, men in public life have professed their love of the arts and humanities—and their profound regret that they could do nothing tangible to help them. But, thanks in large part to your stanch friends in the Congress, things have changed.

I know that Senator PELL, Senators JAVITS, CLARK, and GRUENING, Congressmen THOMPSON, FOGARTY, MOORHEAD, and WIDNALL, and many others share my pride tonight that the Congress has provided financial support for the arts and humanities.

In 1964 we did achieve a significant first step: the creation of the National Council on the Arts. But the establishment of a foundation, endowed with real money, still seemed remote then.

We had enthusiasm. But we didn't have the votes. Then came the 1st session of the 89th Congress. Thanks to determined leadership by President Johnson and skilled floor work by your friends in Congress, we did break through.

As you undoubtedly recall, the debates in Congress focused largely on the arts rather than the humanities. There were a variety of reasons for this. Nearly everyone considers himself a qualified critic of the arts—in the sense that, like Mr. Khrushchev, he knows what he likes and doesn't hesitate to say so.

Moreover, by their very nature, the performing arts are public in character and presuppose the existence of an audience. Their practitioners are public figures, and possess that quality we call glamour. But the practitioners of the humanities are, for the most part, free of the more dubious blessings of public attention.

Few laymen profess with confidence to know what they like in philosophy or linguistics—and fewer still to say so. Editorial writers, columnists, and commentators of all sorts are not constantly looking over your shoulders and advising you what to do and what not to do, what to say and what to leave unsaid—unless, of course, you write history about the living as well as the dead.

But even privacy can be pushed too far. As men and women who have dedicated your lives to the service of knowledge, you have every right to expect a reasonable degree of public understanding and recognition.

And, to look for a moment at the other side of the coin, now that the humanities have formally entered the competition for public funds, you have a certain responsibility to make clear to the public—and to your representatives here in Washington—some appreciation of what you do and why it is important.

The eloquent report of your Commission on the Humanities was a welcome step in this direction. And it is no exaggeration to say that this report won for the humanities an equal place in the new National Foundation. But the process of communication with the public and the Congress must be a continuing one. You can never assume that the case has been made once and for all.

Perhaps I, as an amateur humanist and a professional public servant, can be of some help here by telling you what I consider the vital contribution of the humanities to our national life.

First of all, a thorough grounding in the humanities sharpens, in the individual, the quality of choice. Choice is a vital part of all our lives, and nowhere is it more important than in government; indeed, a wise Frenchman has observed that "to govern is to choose." Each choice taken—indeed, even each choice deferred or avoided—has consequences reaching far into the future.

There is an abundance of specialists who can provide us with the facts relevant to decisions—the "what," the "where," the "when," and the "how." But when they have laid their facts upon the table, an essential factor is still missing: the "why." No narrow specialty or expertise can provide the full and essential grasp of the continuity of past, present, and future than the humanities do.

Let me make it clear: I do not believe that the humanities must be justified on the grounds of any immediate and practical consequences. In the most fundamental sense, they are good in themselves simply because they are the bearers and preservers of what we call civilization.

The historian who brings order out of the tangled record of the past, the critic who casts new light on a work of literature or painting or music, the philosopher who questions and clarifies our most basic assumptions—all of these serve to enrich our lives and to expand our vision. Together they constitute one of our most precious national resources.

One of the most important facts about the establishment of the new humanities endowment is that it does at last constitute a recognition of the humanities for their own sake. Humanist scholars, as you are well aware, have long received support from the Federal Government. But in the past this support was always justified in terms of something else: international cooperation, the improvement of the school curriculum, national defense, and so forth.

Now the President and Congress have gone on record as believing that the strengthening of the humanities as such is in the public interest. The National Government has, in effect, endorsed the words of your Commission on the Humanities: "Through the humanities we may seek intellectual humility, sensitivity to beauty, and emotional discipline. By them we may come to know the excitement of ideas, the power of imagination, and the unsuspected energies of the creative spirit."

Ultimately, the fate of the humanities must rest in the hands of devoted individuals: scholars who pursue their researches wherever they may lead—guided by their own intelligence and by the canons of scholarship itself. These individuals, in their singleminded dedication to their calling, may often be deaf to the cries of the marketplace and the forum—to the seductive voices of fashion and of expediency.

Certainly the American Council of Learned Societies may be proud of its long record of supporting worthy scholars despite the apparent lack of popular interest in what those scholars proposed to do. By maintaining and applying the most rigorous intellectual standards, often in defiance of fashion and of popular "trends," the ACLS has served the humanities and the Nation as well. But the history of the ACLS illustrates another principle I think is well worth mentioning on this occasion.

In every field of intellectual endeavor, in the sciences as well as the humanities, what today appears to be the most esoteric and impractical research may tomorrow prove to be of the utmost practical usefulness and importance. I stress "may" because I do not think that the case for basic research and scholarship in the humanities should be made to rest on claims of practical utility.

In this connection I think, for example, of your council's continuing interest in the study and understanding of languages. For many years, yours was the only organization in this country to offer encouragement and support for scholarly work in what were then rather patronizingly termed "exotic" languages. Suddenly, with our involvement in World War II, we found ourselves in urgent need of communication with peoples who spoke some of these languages.

Besides linguists, we also needed scholars whose knowledge of the basic structure of language enabled them to develop new and more effective techniques of language instruction for the Armed Forces.

The same story can be told of the development in this country of area studies, in which your Council has also played a leading role. Our possession of substantial numbers of highly trained and skilled experts on the peoples and cultures of Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Asia, Latin America, and Africa has turned out to be an invaluable national asset. The United States would simply not be able to discharge its worldwide responsibility adequately without them.

In both these cases, and others I could cite, the so-called impractical scholars turned out to be more farsighted than many of our public officials.

But this is neither surprising nor distressing. It is, in fact, as it should be. The scholar—by disposition, by training, and by situation—is peculiarly fitted to take the long, detached view of men and of societies. To do so is both his privilege and his responsibility. Whatever the pleasures of public life may be—and I assure you there are many—the opportunity for contemplation is seldom among them.

I am a man in public life and a man of affairs. As such, I envy your opportunity to ponder in depth and at length all the ramifications of human knowledge and experience. And I do hope that the program of the humanities endowment will include some opportunity for scholars to impart more directly and regularly their unique perspective and insights to those of us engaged in the business of governing and decisionmaking.

The establishment of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities marks the beginning of a new era for the humanities in America. If I might presume to give you a few words of advice as you enter it, I would simply say: "Be true to yourselves." I hope you will continue to do what seems important to you—guided by the internal logic of your work and your own high standards of scholarship.

I hope you will never succumb to the temptation to sacrifice that work and those standards to any transitory notions of expediency or popularity. And, in your corporate capacity as the representatives and the servants of our Nation's tens of thousands of humanist scholars, I hope you will always remember your responsibility to speak and to act for your constituency.

If your voice has been heard in the councils of government—and it has—it is because it has been the authentic voice of dedicated scholars. This must continue to be the case. By being true to themselves, scholars best serve not only their nations and their times, but all mankind as well.

"YOUTH IN THE REVOLUTIONARY WORLD OF TODAY"—SPEECH BY AMBASSADOR TO SPAIN, ANGIER BIDDLE DUKE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Angier Biddle Duke, our Ambassador to Spain, made a remarkable speech "Youth in the Revolutionary World of Today" at Barcelona, Spain, this past November 9, 1965.

His words, showing the interest of all our people as well as the intense personal interest of Presidents Johnson and Kennedy in the young people of our whole world, are very effective and very moving.

Because of my own interest in the problems of young people. I found this particular speech interesting and believe it will be equally approved by my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD. Let me add how singularly fortunate our country is to have in its service an Ambassador with the commonsense, experience, ideals, and ability that Angier Duke possesses.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH IN THE REVOLUTIONARY WORLD OF TODAY

(Speech by U.S. Ambassador to Spain, Angier Biddle Duke, at the Binational Center, Barcelona, November 9, 1965)

"There are four different characteristics of today's youth: its universality, its awareness of the future, its craving for action, and its sense of community." In these words Cardinal Bueno Monreal sums up the characteristics of the youth of Spain as he sees them today. All are qualities which pertain to, in varying degrees, the ideal of man. All qualities in varying degrees that have been the ideal of democratic man since the time of Aristotle. And yet, looking at the youth of today, the cardinal is moved to point them out to us as not just differences in degree, but rather, differences in the essential character of present day youth. That there are differences in essence, rather than in degree, is perhaps the result of the nature of the world into which youth has found itself educated, and the vast potential of opportunities from which each youth must ultimately make his own decisions concerning his own life. And any making of decisions implies the responsibility of the individual to himself and to his society.

Last summer there was a ceremony in a courtyard on Park Crescent, just south of Regents Park in London. It was the unveiling of Jacques Lifschitz' portrait bust of John F. Kennedy.

In a short talk, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY said it was appropriate that the statue was at the International Students' House. His brother had believed strongly, he said, that "those who have the advantage of an education have a responsibility to their country and to the world."

The youth of the world, it has been asserted, regarded President Kennedy as their leader.

Why? Perhaps because in him they recognized a person whose qualities kindled in each of them a sense of his own inherent worth. He loved to talk with young people at and from schools and universities. He welcomed their interest in public issues of great moment. Even when he knew that these issues were not nearly as simple as they seemed to some, he wanted the participation of youth.

As one who was privileged to accompany the late President at hundreds of events and meetings, some of major importance with world leaders, I remember vividly an early summer day on the White House lawn when he greeted hundreds of foreign students.

They were completing a year in the United States, attending high schools as part of the American field service exchange program, prior to returning to their home countries—Spain included. What the President said was spontaneous and informal. After his remarks there was an unforgettable reaction from the students, who seemed to identify themselves wholeheartedly with his hopeful and affirmative zest.

He appealed to them to look to the day in their home countries when they could undertake bold, generous actions, attacking stubborn old problems with renewed vigor. In their eagerness and enthusiasm, the students trampled over the small hedge dividing the law from the terrace and, struggling to touch him, they tore at his clothes and carried off his tie clasp, handkerchief, and buttons. He took all this most good naturedly as a sign of youthful exuberance.

Knowing young people so well, the late President sought to harness the tremendous force that lies in their energy and idealism to deal in a responsible manner with some of the myriad problems in a rapidly changing world. The Peace Corps reflects such a pragmatic synthesis of idealism and responsibility. In short order—within 40 days of his taking office—and to the dismay of those negativists who cannot envision idealism as a wellspring to action, the Peace Corps was set up on a pilot basis in March of 1961 under the direction of Sargent Shriver and a National Advisory Council headed by the then Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson. He hoped to have between 500 and 1,000 Americans in the field by the end of the year.

"It will not be easy," warned President Kennedy, proposing that young Americans go forth and live at the same level as the citizens of the countries to which they are sent, do the same work, eat the same food, speak the same language. He predicted however that "the number of those who wish to serve will be far greater than our capacity to absorb them."

The enthusiastic response to the Peace Corps concept—both from nations welcoming aid and from American youth—was overwhelming, and the Peace Corps has grown from its original small group to a body of some 19,000 volunteers today. This concept has stimulated other governments, especially in Europe, to encourage their young people to undertake similar responsibilities in the developing nations of the world. I am proud to say that my nephew, Anthony Duke, is today a Peace Corps volunteer in Uruguay.

John Kennedy's conviction that educated men and women have a special obligation, not only to themselves and to their families, but also to their communities, their nations and to the world, is the modern application of the ancient, honorable European principle of noblesse oblige. Where more than in Spain, with its deep-rooted traditions of the worthiness of the individual man in the equality of being, can such a principle apply?

As universalists you realize that you have more exacting and more exciting opportunities to fulfill your obligations than ever before. More than ever, your vistas go far beyond national boundaries or conventional ways of viewing problems. The European world, of which you are a part, is quickening to new life and vitality, poised on the threshold of great adventures in future progress. As believers in the future, you are willing to undertake the risks and to face the changes that are fundamental to that progress, because you believe that progress is both desirable and possible. As men of action you undertake both professionally and privately to create those conditions in which progress through change may be achieved, and as pragmatists you seek that change may be realized with the minimum of social stress and human dislocation.

The revolutionary world of today makes the conditions in which your parents and I grew up seem rather quaint. In numbers alone, the generation now being educated is massive. Because of revolutionary improvements in worldwide health conditions, more children survive to become youth and to grow to maturity. Latest United Nations estimates indicate that there are now 3.2 billion people on earth. Forty-five out of every hundred are less than 20 years of age. Moreover, the quality of education has improved as the frontiers of knowledge have expanded, so that you should—indeed, must—know more than we ever did.

The revolutionary world of today requires more emphasis on education; requires more education and better education. It is now widely believed that all youth has both the right and duty to receive an education. Dramatic campaigns for literacy among citizens of all ages have been conducted, one of the most successful having been carried out here in Spain. But, despite the best efforts of all concerned, far too many children of school age in this world never begin their education, and, even worse, increasing numbers do not complete even the primary grades. The implications of such phenomena for the future development of the nations of the world are obvious.

The educated leadership in many lands finds it increasingly difficult to interpret the problems of self-government to large numbers of unprepared, disadvantaged, or uneducated countrymen. In advancing industrial societies, where productive requirements relate directly to education, a growing fraction of unskilled citizens has little to offer the community.

At a conference on changing roles of youth in the developing nations, held last year at Howard University, Prof. Gabriel Almond, of Stanford University, summarized a 5-year study of attitudes in five countries. From thousands of interviews over a 5-year period, they found that education—more than any other factor—determines a person's sense of personal effectiveness.

Schooling makes the difference between one being a passive object, whose fate is wholly controlled by forces beyond his reach, and being an active person whose judgments and actions help determine his future. Educated people share a sense of being able to influence their governments, according to Dr. Almond, and have skills needed for such influence: information, and knowledge of how to use it. He calls secondary education the watershed, even though there is an added increment from university experience. Persons with a secondary education are strikingly different in outlook from those who have only primary schooling, or none at all.

This feeling of personal effectiveness is a link among educated people around the world. The educated Italian, for example, is found to be more like an educated American than either of them resembles the uneducated people of their own countries.

Before John Kennedy became President, he devoted much thought to the problems which beset a greatly changed world When he was a young Senator, he repeatedly called attention to what he termed "10 peaceful revolutions." These revolutions, he said, "are rocking our Nation and our world, reshaping our lives and remaking our destinies. These are the revolutions in our cities, on the farm, in the birthrate, in life expectancy, in technology—especially automation—in energy, in our standard of living, in weapons development, in the underdeveloped nations, and in nationalism."

He was aware that these revolutionary developments were occurring in a conflicting pair of powerful countercurrents. In 1957 he wrote in the quarterly journal, Foreign Affairs:

"International events today are subject to a double pull: a search for political identity by the new states and the search for unity among the established states of the world. As Europe draws in upon itself toward a common market and greater political integration, Africa, its former colonial estate, is breaking apart into new and emergent states. * * * The task is to strike a realistic balance between the legitimate appeals to national self-determination which pulsate through the uncommitted world and the gravitational pulls toward unity which grow from the technological and economic interdependence of modern states."

That the world is in flux and that in such a world youth—youthful nations and youthful people—have the key role to play has been recognized by an institution that has seen the passing of many centuries and the rise and fall of many empires. In New York last month at the United Nations, His Holiness Pope Paul VI stated: "Allow us to congratulate you on having the wisdom to open this Assembly to the young peoples, to the states which have recently attained independence and national freedom. Their presence is the proof of the universality and magnanimity which inform the principles of this institution."

John Kennedy stressed three other themes that may be of particular interest to you.

In March 1959, the year before he won election as President, speaking in Milwaukee, he said: "The next year, the next decade, and in all likelihood the next generation, will require more bravery and wisdom on our part than any period in our history."

Two months later, in Detroit, he said, "What we need now in this Nation most of all is a constant flow of new ideas."

In July 1959, he told the historian, James MacGregor Burns: "The best that the President can do is to track down the best talent he can get—people with ideas that are actionable."

Let me repeat these themes: your generation will need unprecedented bravery and wisdom, a constant flow of new ideas, and: political leadership must rely on people whose ideas are usable. This is important to all of us who are Kennedy's heirs. He respected the life of the mind. He demanded thinking for the sake of meeting the challenges of our time.

You, and all of us, are the children of his immortal spirit. Insofar as we can carry forward the values he helped make incandescent, his work endures.

The best teachers hold high the principle that ultimately all education is a process of self-education. As the great American writer of the 19th century, Mark Twain, put it, in a secular sense, "Faith is all right, but it is doubt that gets you an education." Your generation will probably make more great discoveries than any other has done, because of your questioning nature, accepting no precepts out of obedient rote.

American youth, like youth the world over, is not of one accord in its answers to the myriad of problems of its own and of the world. The important thing is that our youth recognize and face up to these problems and take on the responsibilities of dealing with them. As former Kennedy aid Theodore Sorenson said last week in Cleveland, Ohio: "One of President Kennedy's primary objectives was to make young people aware and concerned with the problems of the country and the world. He realized that this was going to bring with it a good deal of ferment and dissent. But this was the price he was willing to pay."

Americans think of their country as young. And yet the United States has the oldest government in terms of legitimate established succession of leadership. Given the infinite variety of human personalities, it should afford us no surprise that succeeding Presidents are rather different in their outward characteristics, even when they personify identical aims. Just as Mr. Truman, the first President whom it was my privilege to serve as an Ambassador, brought an entirely different universe of experience with him to the White House than Mr. Roosevelt, so does President Johnson have his highly personal, unique stamp which is every bit as authentically American as was President Kennedy's.

Lyndon B. Johnson's concern for youth, his determination to expand opportunities for young people, is so keen it approaches a ruling passion. In his incisive March 15 address on voting rights legislation, he concluded with a glimpse from the time when he had only recently concluded his formal education. What he said conveys to me that the idealism of youth need never become weaker as a man acquires maturity and reaches those prime years of his greatest powers. On March 15 President Johnson said:

"My first job after college was a teacher in Cotulla, Tex., in a small Mexican-American school. My students were poor, and they often came to class without breakfast and hungry. Few of them could speak English, and I couldn't speak much Spanish.

"I often walked home late in the afternoon after the classes were finished, wishing there was more that I could do. But all I knew was to teach them the little that I knew, hoping that it might help them against the hardships that lay ahead.

"I never thought then, in 1928, that I would be standing here in 1965," Lyndon Johnson said, speaking from the White House. "It never even occurred to me in my fondest dreams that I might have the chance to help the sons and daughters of those students. But now I do have that chance. I do not want to be the President who built empires, or sought grandeur, or extended dominion. I want to be the President who educated young people to the wonders of their world."

The wonders of your world are never ending and ever changing. As Plotinus wrote "The vision is for him who will see it." Go forth, clear eyed, and a better world may well be yours.

LOAN PROGRAM OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in these days of large aggregations of money, material, and men, there may be a tendency to overlook the problems of small States, small businesses, and the individuals themselves.

Therefore, I believe that it is appropriate to invite the attention of the Senate to a situation of this character which has been expressed to me as a matter of grave and deep concern by small businessmen from my own small State of Rhode Island.

As you know, the major program of assistance to small and growing businesses in this country is the loan program of the Small Business Administration. However, since October 11, the SBA has been required to refuse even to entertain applications for assistance under this program. As Senators will recall, this program was created by the then administration and the Congress in 1953.

In 1958, the presentation of a comprehensive study by the Federal Reserve System confirmed the special credit needs of small business for medium-term venture capital. This established the foundation for the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, which passed with the support of my colleagues who are here in the Senate

With the submission of the message which resulted in the Revenue Act of 1964, President Kennedy gave explicit recognition of the importance of the 4.9 million small business firms as "the very keystone of our competitive economy and its potential growth."

Secretary Fowler's testimony pointed out that small businesses have less ready access to capital markets and many depend most heavily for capital upon internally generated funds and are generally at a financial and competitive disadvantage.

This disadvantage was aggravated during the second half of 1965 by the progressive tightening of ordinary credit. The Federal Reserve System's action of December 5, of course, raised the interest rate at which small businesses are seeking to obtain credit at their local banks.

As the Federal Reserve itself has pointed out, lenders always tend to be selective to some degree and strict lending standards—require borrowers to shop most intensively to find lenders whose loan standards and terms they can meet, with some borrowers failing to find accommodations. This, in turn, increases the relative importance of the SBA as a lender of last resort. In this regard, I should like to quote the text of a telegram which was sent on December 22, 1965, by me to Ross B. Davis, Executive Administrator of the Small Business Administration:

> Greatly distressed about predicament of small businessmen who are unable to receive loan assistance from SBA. Situation in Rhode Island is critical as this State has just been removed from the labor surplus area category within the past several months for the first time in many years. To illustrate the dire emergency of this situation a Rhode Island small business firm that has presently a small SBA loan tried to obtain from Federal Government additional loan in order to fulfill a $50,000 defense supply agency award for a necessary defense requirement was unable to obtain SBA loan or other financial assistance and was forced to cancel award. Your loan guarantee program not applicable because of high prime rate of interest. Local banks not interested in participating. The primary function of SBA is to provide financial assistance to small businessmen. It is not fulfilling its legislative or moral responsibilities in Rhode Island area when it cannot process and fund small business loans. Please advise when this situation will be resolved.

It is my strong feeling that the self-reliance and entrepreneurship engendered by the small business segment of our economy are basic national values which should be encouraged in every way. I regret to say that the events of the past 4 months are, in my opinion, having a contrary and increasingly significant effect. It is thus my hope that it will be possible for the administration to take necessary action to rectify the situation in the near future.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, January 28, 1966, at 10 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 27 (legislative day, January 26), 1966:

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Roger W. Wilkins, of the District of Columbia, to be Director, Community Relations Service, for a term of 4 years.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Marshall P. Jones, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1 to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malawi.

Cecil B. Lyon, of New Hampshire, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ceylon, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Maldive Islands.

IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The nominations beginning Leon E. Woods to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, and ending Sidney L. Woollons to be a consul of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 14, 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Charles M. Haar, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse before offering the prayer: Psalms 119:165: *Great peace have they which love Thy law.*

O Lord, our God, whom we acknowledge as man's unfailing friend, his ever-present help, and everlasting hope, we admit that without Thee, life is winter bleak and barren, and there is no peace in our hearts.

We draw nigh unto Thee constrained and compelled by the weariness of our many needs and the wonder of Thy grace.

Give us a more vivid and vital sense of Thyself and may we be blessed with a greater appreciation of Thy power and joy which the world cannot bestow or bequeath unto us.

Grant unto our President, our Speaker, and the Members of this Congress the assurance that Thy mercies outnumber all their necessities and that Thou art following them with Thy loving kindness and will enable them to be Thy faithful servants.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which concurrence of the House is requested.

S. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 754, 81st Congress, appointed Mr. Emery L. Frazier to the Federal Records Council to fill the vacancy caused by the retirement of Mr. Felton M. Johnston.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 66-10.

ANOTHER TRAGEDY RESULTING FROM UNRESTRICTED SALES OF FIREARMS

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, a neighbor of mine was shot to death this week by a crazed teenage narcotic addict. Morris Weiss was killed while tending his clothing store on the lower East Side in New York. This man was the father of three young girls. He was held in the highest esteem of all who knew him. His death was purposeless. We mourn his departure.

Can we not find some redemption, however, in this tragedy? Can Congress not now mobilize itself and pass legislation that will render this kind of crime less likely? It has been more than 2 years since the death of a beloved President of the United States and we have still been unable to pass laws that would control the acquisition of firearms, so that a gun can still be bought as easily as a stick of chewing gum or a theater ticket. Are we so much the victims of pressure groups that we cannot take steps to prevent a repetition of the bleak tragedy of November 1963, to say nothing of the tragedy of Morris Weiss of 1966?

I implore my fellow Members of this body to see that Morris Weiss did not die in vain. I implore them as a memorial to Morris Weiss, as well as to John F. Kennedy, to cast off the foolish delusion that the right to walk into a store and buy an instrument of death is some sort of sacred American liberty. There are many bills currently before the Congress to control the sale of firearms. All have been languishing because of Congress' seeming indifference. How many more John Kennedys and Morris Weisses must die before we can become civilized enough to recognize that the law must contain the power to keep firearms out of irresponsible hands?

In extending my condolences to Mrs. Weiss and her children, I hope we must not wait much longer.

In this connection I shall introduce legislation.

THOMPSON DECISION SOUND

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice both deserve great credit for their promptness and care in their decision that the ashes of Robert G. Thompson, a convicted disloyal person, will not be interred at Arlington National Cemetery. Decisions of this type are not pleasant to make, particularly when the person who has turned his back on his country had previously contributed to the welfare of the country. But any other decision would have been an affront to the noble young men who gave so much of their lives for our country and who are buried there.

There is legislation pending in Congress which will undergird the decisions of the Department of Justice and give statutory basis to protect against such things in the future.

PROSPERITY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, just a very few years ago a group of conservative economists predicted that the gross national product of the United States would soon approach a trillion dollars. Many said this was impossible. Yet today it is anticipated that the gross national product in this year will approach three-fourths of a trillion dollars, a phenomenal growth for any society and any economy.

The President in his message, which will be read to the House in a few minutes, points up the policies which have made possible this tremendous growth in ours, the greatest nation on earth.

In his economic report, the President points to several important economic lessons we have learned in recent years. These include the demonstration that "recessions are not inevitable," and that "prudently expansionary fiscal policies can restore high employment." The President concludes that "we have learned how to achieve prosperity."

The record certainly testifies to the truth of that profound achievement. In less than 5 years, we have added $190 billion to our national output, a record $47 billion gain in the last year alone. Individuals added 7½ percent to their incomes just last year. Nonfarm employment grew by 2 million last year—the largest increase in any postwar year. Meanwhile, farm income has broken all previous records. Corporate profits have soared by two-thirds in the past 5 years—20 percent in 1965 alone.

Our great free economy produced these gains. But, in the 1950's, this same great economic system yielded a growth rate only half as large.

The vital difference is the use of Government policy to support rather than shackle the energies of our free enterprise system. The tax cuts of 1964 and 1965 gave our consumers and businessmen the income and the incentive to put our manpower and our industrial capacity to work. Once the Government stopped draining off private purchasing power, this Nation created jobs and markets, capital goods, and consumer goods in record quantity.

Labor and business now recognize a common interest in the growth of our national economy that far exceeds any conflicting interests in sharing the gains.

All Americans are shareholders in the greatest economic enterprise in the world—the American economy. We have all profited enormously from its progress in recent years. And from our success, we have learned how to avoid repetition of the costly and often tragic failures of the past.

SCHOOL LUNCH AND SPECIAL MILK PROGRAMS

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the President, in his budget message to the Congress, indicated his intention of redirecting the school lunch and special milk programs to focus more directly on disadvantaged children, helping to provide them with adequate and well-balanced meals.

Last session, I introduced a bill, H.R. 9339, which would fill a serious gap in the present lunch program by providing lunches during the summer months for needy children who, while school is in session, receive a noonday meal under the school lunch program. Hunger and poverty are not limited to the school term. During the summer months, these children, engaging in active play and other activities, are just as much in need of decent, nutritious, balanced meals as they are during the rest of the year.

Accordingly, I am looking forward to the specific proposals which the President will make in the hope that this need will be met by the new program. I intend to make a careful review of any proposal in this area since I believe that it is surely just as important to provide children at the poverty level with at least one proper meal a day throughout the entire year as it is to operate a general school lunch program serving both disadvantaged and other children, restricted to months during which school is in session.

NEW YORK STATEWIDE REFERENDUM ON LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the imminent likelihood that New York State is going to join New Hampshire in the ranks of States that have adopted the lottery idea for additional revenue.

Last year, both houses of the New York Legislature voted in favor of a statewide referendum on the lottery question. The word is that the new legislature is about to repeat this vote, fulfilling the requirement that the resolution calling for the referendum must pass two successive legislatures.

I commend the leaders of the great New York State Legislature for their social and financial sense of reality. I hope that their attitude is contagious, and spreads through the Congress.

Every Presidential budget received by the Congress makes a bigger and better case for the adoption of a lottery in the United States. I do not think that day is too far off.

Today the one State with a lottery has a delegation of two Members in this

House. Next year, the 2 States with a lottery will have 43 Congressmen, and the list will grow.

A national lottery is long overdue in the United States. I believe that a national lottery would be a $10-billion-a-year revenue producer. We could use it to reduce our $320 billion national debt, or at least to help pay our $12-billion-a-year interest charges on the national debt. If present budget items could be financed from lottery revenues, we could cut taxes.

New York State is lighting the path of social and financial commonsense. I urge the Congress to watch and learn.

DEMONSTRATION CITIES

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in his "demonstration cities" program unveiled yesterday, the President has proposed a coordinated assault on the tangled problems of metropolitan growth.

I welcome this determination to help our cities and towns get full benefit from existing Federal assistance by ending the bureaucratic conflicts, cutting the redtape, and resolving the obscurities of regulation which have crippled many programs in the past.

We have been reminded, however, that it is unhappily seldom possible to attain at any conference table what cannot be achieved on the battlefield. Before Federal programs can be fully coordinated in any single city or town of America the President should seek victory in the bureaucratic war in Washington, which has denied us the full benefit of so many Federal programs.

AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 69, authorizing additional expenditures by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 2]

Abbitt
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Baldwin
Bandstra
Bell
Blatnik
Brademas
Callaway
Cameron
Clancy
Clausen,
Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Conyers
Cooley
Craley
Cunningham
Dague
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Donohue
Duncan, Oreg.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Everett
Farnsley
Flynt
Foley
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Giaimo
Gibbons
Grabowski
Gray
Grider
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Helstoski
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Latta
Leggett
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Mackie
Matthews
Mize
Morse
Nix
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Philbin
Pool
Powell
Price
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts
Ronan
Roudebush
Roybal
Secrest
Shipley
Shriver
Sisk
Skubitz
Stephens
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Udall
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Weltner
Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 329 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

S. Con. Res. 69

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, established by Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to March 11, 1965, is hereby authorized, from February 1, 1966, through December 31, 1966, to expend not to exceed $140,000 from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 348)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Economic Committee and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

To the Congress of the United States:

A year ago I reported that we were "in the midst of the greatest upsurge of economic well-being in the history of any nation." That upsurge, now about to enter its 6th year, continues without letup.

The value of our Nation's annual output of goods and services rose more than one-third from 1960 to 1965. Last year alone, our gross national product—GNP—made a record advance of $47 billion.

This swelling production has generated an unprecedented rise in the incomes of the American people. Total personal income in December was at an annual rate of $550 billion, up 37 percent in the past 5 years and 7½ percent in the latest 12 months.

In the past 5 years, the number of Americans at work increased by nearly 7 million; in 1965 alone, by about 2½ million. The rate of unemployment dropped from 6.6 percent in December 1960—and a high of 7.1 percent in May 1961—to 4.1 percent in December 1965.

And American jobs are better than ever before. The weekly take-home pay of the average manufacturing worker with three dependents has risen 26 percent in the past 5 years. In the last 12 months alone his gain was 4 percent.

The profits of our corporations, after taxes, last year were 67 percent ahead of their earnings 5 years earlier—up 20 percent over 1964.

And average farm income last year rose 23 percent, breaking all records.

Our Nation's industries, shops, and farms—our workers, owners of businesses, professional men and women—prosper today far beyond the dreams of any people, any time, anywhere.

NEW ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

In the light of these unprecedented and continuing gains, some observers are posing questions not heard in almost a decade.

Will there be enough plant capacity to produce all the goods and services buyers will seek?

Can our employers find the labor they will require to man their production lines?

Can we avoid bottlenecks in major industries or key skills that would hamper our expansion?

Can we keep a destructive price-wage spiral from getting underway?

Can we move ahead with the Great Society programs and at the same time meet our needs for defense?

My confident answer to each of these questions is "Yes."

But the fact these questions are seriously asked and require serious answers is proof enough that we are in a new economic environment. We are approaching full use of our resources, and this brings new problems.

To those who fear these new problems, I say this:

These are the problems we have been waiting to encounter for nearly 10 years.

These problems are the price of our success.

These are the welcome problems of prosperity.

Over the past 5 years we have faced very different economic problems. In meeting these problems we have learned that recessions are not inevitable; high production does not necessarily mean overproduction; expansion need not generate inflation or imbalances that make further expansion unsustainable; affluence has not sapped the inherent strength and dynamism of the American economy; automation need not create mass unemployment; millions who were unemployed are not unemployable; prudently expansionary fiscal policies can restore high employment; and domestic expansion can go hand in hand with strengthened external payments and a sound dollar.

We have learned how to achieve prosperity. Now we must sustain it, deal with its problems, and make the most of the opportunities it presents.

VIETNAM AND OUR ECONOMY

We face the challenges of prosperity while some 200,000 of our fellow citizens and billions of dollars of our resources are engaged in a bitter defense of freedom in Vietnam. The true costs of this conflict are death, pain, and grief; interrupted careers and separation from loved ones. They are incalculable. But the economic cost of Vietnam imposes no unbearable burden on our resources.

Vietnam does, however, add to the usual problems of maintaining balanced prosperity. It imposes special burdens on some industries, and raises, as well, uncertainties both for the fiscal planning of Government and the private planning of business. These uncertainties underscore the need for flexibility in Government policies and responsibility in private decisions.

Production for Vietnam accounts for less than 1½ percent of our gross national product. These expenditures are a part of the total demand that provides a full market for our manpower and our production. But the private demands of consumers and businesses, and high-priority civilian programs of Government, could and would provide a far more welcome market for that output if there were no war in Vietnam. Our prosperity does not depend on our military effort.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ECONOMIC POLICY

In a time of high prosperity, economic policy faces new problems. But it is still guided by the basic principles that have served us so well.

Twenty years ago next month, the Employment Act of 1946—which prescribes this report—became law. The principles of our policy emerge from that act and from our two decades of experience under it.

The essential and revolutionary declaration of the Employment Act was that the Federal Government must accept a share of responsibility for the performance of the American economy. The nature of that share has been more and more clearly defined over the years, by the recommendations of 4 Presidents and the enactments of 10 Congresses.

I see these as the main tasks of Federal economic policy today:

1. To attain full employment without inflation; to use fiscal and monetary policies to help to match total demand to our growing productive potential, while helping to speed the growth of that potential through education, research and development, manpower policies, and enlarged private and public investment;

2. To help to open the doors of opportunity to all, through developing human resources and removing barriers of discrimination, ignorance, and ill health;

3. To help to solve social and economic problems that neither private action nor State and local governments can solve alone—an efficient transportation system, the protection of our environment, the health of our agriculture, the reconstruction of our cities;

4. To achieve and maintain equilibrium in the Nation's external payments, and to press for improvements in the international economic order;

5. To maintain and enhance healthy competition;

6. To achieve national purposes as far as possible by enlisting the voluntary cooperation of business, labor, and other groups.

Recognition of these responsibilities of the Federal Government neither lessens the responsibilities nor impairs the freedoms of individuals and private groups; nor does it challenge the authority of State and local governments.

The tasks involve new and growing problems of an increasingly complex and interdependent economy and society. Only the Federal Government can assume these tasks. But the Federal Government by itself cannot create prosperity, reduce unemployment, avoid inflation, balance our external accounts, restore our cities, strengthen agriculture, eliminate poverty, or make people healthy.

Only through a creative and cooperative partnership of all private interests and all levels of government—a creative federalism—can our economic and social objectives be attained. This partnership has written the story of American success. And a new vitalization of this partnership and a new confidence in its effectiveness have produced the extraordinary economic and social gains of recent years.

OUR ECONOMIC GAINS

Our economy is so vast, and our progress has been so rapid, that it is difficult to keep our gains in proper perspective. Here are a few examples:

In only seven other countries of the world is total output in a year as large as the increase in our output last year.

Our stock of private plant and equipment, valued in constant prices, increased as much in 1965 alone as it did in the 4 years 1957 through 1960.

The increase in Federal cash receipts between fiscal years 1961 and 1967—in spite of $20 billion of tax cuts—will exceed the entire cash receipts of the Federal Government in any peacetime fiscal year prior to 1951.

JOBS, INCOMES, AND PRODUCTION

The register of our economic gains during 1965 starts with jobs: 2.4 million more, overall; 1 million more for teenagers; 350,000 more for Negroes; 900,000 more for women; 1.2 million more for blue-collar workers; 900,000 more on manufacturing payrolls; 450,000 more on State and local government payrolls; 1 million more in trade and services.

It continues with pay: average hourly earnings up 3 percent in manufacturing, 4½ percent in retail trade; average weekly earnings up 3½ percent in manufacturing, 3⅓ percent in trade.

Other forms of income rose, too: farm proprietors' average income up 22 percent; average income of owners of unincorporated businesses and professional workers up 7½ percent; total dividends paid up 12 percent.

And corporations prospered, with profits before taxes up 15 percent; profits after taxes up 20 percent; corporate retained earnings up 29 percent.

With more people earning, and earning more, total personal incomes rose $39 billion, or 7½ percent; aggregate consumers' incomes after taxes rose $34 billion, also 7½ percent.

Governmental units benefited from the surge of incomes.

Federal cash receipts rose $8½ billion.

State and local governments took in $4⅓ billion more, reducing the need for tax rate increases to meet their expanding burdens.

The higher incomes of individuals, businesses, and governments came from expanding production (year 1965 over year 1964):

Production of goods and services for consumers, up $29½ billion.

Production of new plants and machinery, up $9½ billion.

Production for use of the Federal Government, up $1½ billion.

Production for use of State and local governments, up $5 billion.

Production for additions to inventories, up $2½ billion.

Residential construction, no change.

Production for export—less imports—down $1½ billion.

Total production—GNP—up $47 billion.

We could produce $47 billion of additional output last year because:

We had a large net addition of 1.4 million to our labor force;

We put to work this entire net increment plus about 400,000 who were previously unemployed;

On the average, each employed person worked a few more hours during the year; and

Each man-hour worked in the private economy produced on the average 2.8 percent more output than in 1964.

Increased employment and higher productivity were possible because business investment had provided a substantial expansion of plant capacity; because the new and the previously existing capacity were used more fully than in the year before; and because our labor force was better educated and more skilled than ever before. Our efforts to equip the unskilled and inexperienced to take advantage of rapidly expanding job opportunities have been—and will continue to be—an investment in our productive capacity.

The enlarged market demands which called forth this higher output came from every sector. The two dominant forces, however, were the growing boom in business spending for new plant and equipment and the continued dependability of consumer spending, following close on consumer income. Excise tax cuts and larger social security benefits in 1965 helped to swell the income and buying of households. The tax cuts provided by the Revenue Act of 1964 were sustaining private demand all year. By year's end they had added $30 billion to GNP.

GAINS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

The disadvantaged and less fortunate members of our society also shared in our 1965 economic gains.

For the poor who were able to earn, there were lower unemployment, fuller work schedules, and higher pay.

For the poor who were capable of earning more, there were job training and help in finding jobs, improvements in education, and the breaking down of barriers of discrimination.

For the poor who could not earn, there were more adequate social security benefits, new medical programs, and better social services.

For the poor too young to earn, there were more effective education, assistance to enable them to stay in school, and better health services.

Between 1964 and 1965, an estimated 2.2 million persons moved above the poverty line. Millions of others, mostly children and young people, will have a better chance to break out of poverty in the years ahead as a result of the help they will receive from new Federal education, health, and antipoverty programs enacted in 1964 and 1965.

But 32 million Americans remain in poverty, and millions more are unable to realize their full economic potential. America's abundance leaves behind too many who are aged, who are stranded in declining rural areas, who are in broken families, who are uneducated or handicapped or victims of discrimination. Unemployment among Negroes remains twice that of whites. And an unemployment rate of 13 percent among teenagers means that too many youths find disappointment in moving from school into jobs.

The war on poverty, ignorance, ill health, discrimination, and inadequate opportunity must go forward.

STRENGTHENING PAYMENTS BALANCE

In 1965 we reduced our balance-of-payments deficit to less than half that in 1964 and 1963. We have shown a skeptical world that a voluntary program—relying on the patriotic cooperation of businesses and banks—could work.

We made substantial progress in 1965 despite the fact that our new program did not start until late in the first quarter of the year; despite increased responsibilities in Vietnam; despite a temporary decline in our trade surplus; despite conversion by the United Kingdom Government of more than half a billion dollars of U.S. securities and other assets.

Last year we moved forward toward payments balance without sacrificing our vital domestic or international objectives. And we intend to complete the job this year.

THE RECORD OF COSTS AND PRICES

Until a year ago, American costs and prices had been essentially unchanged since 1958. Last year, largely through a surge in agricultural and food prices, the record was blemished. Even so, we have not lost ground to our major competitors overseas, whose prices and costs have generally risen more than ours.

Some internationally traded raw materials—particularly metals and hides—are costing us more. And higher prices for petroleum products and some machinery have also nudged up our price indexes.

But labor costs—the most basic element in the structure of our costs—have barely moved, as gains in productivity have largely offset moderate increases in hourly labor costs.

In many major sectors of our economy, price stability is still the rule, and some important prices are still going down, in line with lower costs. In December, some of the wholesale prices that were lower than a year earlier were: fresh and dried fruits and vegetables, plant and animal fibers, coal, electric power, packaged beverage materials, manmade fibers, inedible fats and oils, paint materials, crude rubber, millwork, building paper and board, motor vehicles, heating equipment, household appliances, televisions, radios, phonographs, floor coverings, flat glass, and gypsum products.

Many industries and markets have demonstrated that the gains of lower costs and rapidly rising productivity can be shared with consumers. Wholesale prices of the following categories of products in December averaged at least 5 percent lower than in 1957–59: fresh and dried fruits and vegetables, grains, plant and animal fibers, packaged beverage materials, manmade fibers, paint materials, drugs and pharmaceuticals, crude rubber, tires and tubes, plywood, building paper and board, heating equipment, household appliances, televisions, radios, and phonographs, and asphalt roofing.

Those who proclaim inflation is already here have not turned over all the price tags.

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK FOR 1966

Demand will continue to grow rapidly in 1966 and production will respond. The vigor of investment spending demonstrates strong business confidence in the growing sales, rising profits, and firm operating rates which spur expansion and modernization. The rising defense needs of the Federal Government are an important new force in the economy. With growing support from Federal grant programs, State and local purchases will keep moving ahead. Rising consumer incomes from wages, dividends, interest, professional work, and farming will again largely be devoted to expenditures for better living.

These forces should add very nearly as much to our GNP in 1966 as the record gain of $47 billion last year. As the midpoint of a $10 billion range, $722 billion is the projected level of GNP in 1966. With that output, we foresee an extra $40 billion of spending and production for civilian needs, both private and public; unemployment shrinking below 4 percent, and below any yearly average rate since 1953; great advances in the productive capacity of our industries; further good gains in productivity; and full use, without overuse or strain, of our productive capacity.

FISCAL AND MONETARY POLICY

The fiscal program I recommend for 1966 aims at full employment without inflation. It is a responsible program. It recognizes that vigorous private demand and required defense spending could upset the balance of supply and demand so diligently pursued by fiscal and monetary policies in recent years, and now so effectively achieved.

Until this year, pursuit of this balance has pointed fiscal policies toward the stimulation of demand. Now a stimulus is no longer appropriate.

I have reviewed every program of Government to make room for the necessities of defense. I have sharply reduced or eliminated those civilian programs of lowest priority.

But, as I indicated in my state of the Union message, I am unwilling to declare a moratorium on our progress toward the Great Society. My budget will add $3.2 billion to our war against poverty, ignorance, and disease. Yet savings elsewhere will hold the rise in the administrative budget—apart from the added costs of Vietnam—to only $600 million.

Moreover, I am asking the Congress to enact promptly a combination of proposals affecting tax payments in the year ahead: a rescheduling of the January 1, 1966, and later excise tax reduction enacted last June for automobiles and telephone service; a graduated withholding system that will improve the pay-as-you-go basis of our personal income taxes without increasing tax rates or tax liabilities; a corresponding speedup in payments of corporate income taxes this year and next, also without increasing tax rates or tax liabilities; and a method of paying self-employment social security taxes on a current basis.

These measures will let us stay close to a high-level balance between the revenues that the Federal Government draws out of the economy and the expenditures that it puts back into the spending stream, and to a high-level balance between total demand and the economy's capacity to produce. It is my judgment that this budget provides the appropriate fiscal environment for the maintenance of basic price stability with continued growth.

I will also look to the Federal Reserve System to provide assistance in promoting the objectives we all share: meeting the credit needs of a vigorous and growing economy, while preventing excessive credit flows that could carry the pace of expansion beyond prudent speed limits.

THE UNCERTAINTIES

We have made the best economic judgments we can. This year, they were unusually difficult. If the tax measures I am now proposing, in conjunction with the moderating influence of monetary policy, do not hold total demand within bounds of the Nation's productive capacity, I will not hesitate to ask for further fiscal restraints on private spending. Nor will I hesitate to ask for such further fiscal action if additional defense requirements demand it during the year. And I will welcome the opportunity to alter my budget in the event that a relaxation of international tensions permits lower defense outlays than are now foreseen.

Our defense needs are great; but our growth is far greater. The demands on our economy are strong; but its productive capabilities are enormous. Surprises surely lie ahead; but our ability to cope with change is strong and improving.

MAINTAINING COST-PRICE STABILITY IN 1966

One of the problems of prosperity we face in 1966 is that of achieving stability of prices and costs at full employment.

The basic precondition for price stability is a fiscal-monetary policy that deters total demand for goods and services from outrunning potential supply. But history proclaims that something more is needed: a sense of responsibility to the public interest by labor and business in setting wages and prices.

The vigorous economy we foresee in 1966 will tempt labor unions to demand wage increases that would raise costs, and businesses to raise prices when profit margins are already fully adequate. Labor must remember that growing employment and productivity are the foundation of higher wages, and business that an expanding economy is the basic source of profit gains. These foundations must not be jeopardized.

The Federal Government does not have authority to impose ceilings on wages and prices.

But when 200,000 of our fellow citizens are risking their lives in the defense of freedom overseas, the Government's duty is to ask those who enjoy a comfortable prosperity at home to exercise responsibly their freedom to set prices and wages.

Forgoing the freedom to act irresponsibly is no real sacrifice. For irresponsible action can only bring on an inflation that would damage all—labor, business, and the national interest.

The attached report of the Council of Economic Advisers contains a thorough discussion of its guideposts for noninflationary wage and price behavior. To maintain price stability in the expanding economy of 1966, it is vitally important that labor and industry follow these guideposts.

The public can expect that the responsible actions of labor and management will be strengthened and supplemented by all the policies of the Federal Government:

Manpower, education, and rehabilitation programs will continue to train the unemployed and to prepare our youth, increasing the supply of qualified workers and their productivity.

Where available, surplus Federal stockpiles will be used to prevent unnecessary shortages of materials and commodities.

Defense procurement, agricultural, and other policies will be adjusted where necessary to avoid contributing to instability of prices.

Fair labor standards legislation and Government pay increases should be consistent with the guideposts.

There are no general labor shortages in our economy now, and none should develop in the year ahead. But in some industries, occupations, and areas, limited stringencies are appearing.

Prompt and effective action will be taken to meet any problem of specific labor shortage. I have instructed the Secretary of Labor to take all possible and necessary steps. And I have asked all other departments to cooperate in this effort.

It will not be easy to reconcile price stability and full employment. Some price movements reflect worldwide changes in supply and demand. But overall stability of costs and prices will be preserved in the year ahead, provided that during 1966 public policies maintain a balance between overall supply and demand and address themselves vigorously to any emerging sectoral imbalances, and business and labor accept the principles of the guideposts for noninflationary behavior.

We will have demonstrated that a free economy can both maintain full employment and avoid inflation—and do so without arbitrary controls.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICIES FOR 1966

These are the objectives of our international economic policies in 1966: to correct our remaining balance-of-payments deficit, so that the dollar will remain strong; to work toward reduction of trade barriers, so that all nations may reap the benefits of freer trade; to improve the international monetary system, so that it will continue to facilitate sound and orderly growth of the world economy; to press forward with the other fortunate nations in the great international task of our age: helping those countries now economically less advanced which are prepared to help themselves make rapid progress toward a better life in freedom.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Decisive progress was made in 1965 toward reducing our balance-of-payments deficit. Though the results for 1965 are gratifying, we cannot afford to relax. We have not yet balanced our external accounts.

For 1966, external balance is our goal. It requires that—

Business continue to cooperate wholeheartedly in following the strengthened guidelines governing capital flows announced in December;

Banks and financial institutions maintain their excellent performance of last year;

Businesses sell even more abroad this year, in spite of full domestic order books;

Business and labor keep costs and prices stable in order to maintain the competitiveness of our goods and services in international markets;

Government work vigorously to minimize the dollar drain abroad of its aid and defense programs as well as all other activities;

The Congress pass the tax legislation I recommended last year to enhance opportunities for foreigners to invest in the United States;

We intensify our efforts to encourage our own citizens and foreigners to travel in the United States. I am directing that high priority be given to these efforts.

TRADE

The year 1966 is the year when the world can take a giant step forward in liberalizing international trade by successfully concluding the Kennedy round of negotiations to reduce trade barriers on all classes of products. The resulting growth of world trade and world income will benefit all countries, developing as well as industrial. The United States will bend every effort to get meaningful negotiations back on the track. This great venture in international cooperation must not fail.

We shall continue our efforts to improve the trade prospects of the developing countries by helping to stabilize commodity trade, by supporting regional integration among them where practicable, by providing access to markets, and by giving positive assistance to export promotion.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

As we achieve and maintain balance in our external accounts, dollars will no longer add to international monetary reserves as they have in the past. We learned long ago that we cannot rely on gold alone. The free world must look to new sources of liquidity—rather than to deficits in the U.S. balance of payments—to support growing international trade and payments.

We are, therefore, pressing forward with other nations to assure the adequate and orderly growth of world monetary reserves; to improve the adjustment of imbalances by both surplus and deficit countries; to strengthen the monetary system that has served the world so well.

I hope that the major industrial nations—and then the entire community of free nations—will reach an agreement that will make creation of new reserve assets a deliberate decision of the community of nations to serve the economic welfare of all.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

We have molded our foreign assistance policies into more efficient tools with which to confront one of history's gravest challenges—the development of the impoverished but awakening and turbulent two-thirds of the world.

The United States stands ready to continue to assist those countries which have demonstrated their commitment to the task of moving their economies forward toward self-sustaining growth under freedom.

In recent years, I have consciously held back further increases in our foreign assistance request while we designed a lean but effective program to give maximum impact to each dollar we spend.

Today, we are ready to move forward with special emphasis on three areas in which the United States is particularly well qualified to help: agriculture, to stimulate food production where it fails to keep pace with spiraling populations; health, to strengthen millions who could contribute more fully to their own economic progress; education and training, to provide the modern skills needed for development.

URBAN PROBLEMS AND POLICIES

We are an urban society. In 1900, America's urban areas contained 30 million people, 40 percent of our population. By the year 2000, 250 million, 80 percent of our population, are likely to be urban. The quality of American life increasingly depends on the physical, economic, esthetic, and social qualities of our urban centers.

American cities possess some of the rarest treasures of art, the finest music and theater, the greatest universities, the loveliest parks, the most splendid vistas, the most elegant and luxurious living, in the entire world. Yet they also contain degrading poverty, revolting slums, incredible traffic congestion, bitter racial tensions, physical decay and ugliness, political disorganization, and rising crime and delinquency.

The Congress created last year a Department of Housing and Urban Development, giving it responsibilities for coordinating Federal programs affecting housing, urban areas, and urban people, and for administering many such programs. I have no intention of letting it become merely a housekeeping agency to supervise miscellaneous programs.

With the help of the finest minds in the Nation, we have been developing a program to rebuild—in cooperation with State and local governments, private agencies, business enterprises, and local citizens—the physical, institutional, and social environment of our urban areas. Each city should plan on an integrated basis for its own physical, economic, and social development. And where those plans are imaginative, farsighted, and efficient, the Federal Government should help to make them realities.

I am asking the Congress to consider proposed legislation to carry out these objectives. I am also preparing proposals for legislation to bar discrimination in the sale or rental of housing—a condition which has contributed to many urban problems.

TRANSPORTATION

The revolutionary changes in transportation technology of the past half century have not been matched by equal progress in our public policies or our Federal organization.

I am recommending the creation of a Department of Transportation to manage the vast Federal promotional programs in highways, waterways, air travel, and maritime affairs, and to take leadership in the development of new transportation policies in accord with current realities.

I am proposing again this year increased user charges on highways and aviation and the introduction of nominal user charges on inland waterways. Such charges will improve efficiency in the use of resources, and reimburse the Federal Government for a part of its expenditures which directly benefit the users of these facilities.

We spend billions of dollars in medical research each year to conquer disease and prolong life. Yet we still put up with the senseless slaughter of thousands of Americans on our highways.

Fifty thousand Americans met their death in traffic accidents during 1965. About 3½ million were injured. The economic cost of accidents is estimated at around $8 billion a year.

We can no longer ignore the problem of automobile safety. We can no longer procrastinate and hope that the situation will improve. I will propose new programs to protect the safety of our citizens and the efficient flow of our commerce.

CONTROLLING POLLUTION

Our means for attacking the shameful pollution of our environment were strengthened in the first session of this Congress by important new standard-setting authority over water quality and automotive exhausts.

Federal agencies have begun cleaning up the numerous and extensive sources of water pollution from their own facilities, in response to my Executive order. Despite budgetary stringency, expenditures for this purpose will be given high priority. I shall issue an Executive order covering air pollution from Federal installations.

I propose that, in cooperation with appropriate State and local authorities and private interests, we carry out projects to clean up several entire river basins, following the example of our efforts to clean up the Potomac. Special Federal financial assistance will be necessary; this should be conditioned on new financial and organizational arrangements by State and local authorities.

LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

UNION SECURITY AGREEMENTS

Strong and responsible collective bargaining is an important instrument of a free and a healthy economy.

To improve its functioning and to make the national labor policy uniform throughout the country, I again urge the Congress to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

STRIKE EMERGENCIES

The recent transit strike in New York City illustrates our helplessness in preventing extreme disruption to the lives and livelihoods of a city of 8 million people. I intend to ask the Congress to consider measures that, without improperly invading State and local authority, will enable us to deal effectively with strikes that may cause irreparable damage to the national interest.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Our system of unemployment insurance has not kept pace with our advancing economy. The time to modernize it is now, when unemployment is low and the cost of improved protection can be readily absorbed. We need a program that will provide more realistic benefits, including benefits for more workers and for longer periods of joblessness; that will correct abuses and assure efficient and responsible administration; and that will broaden the system's tax base and strengthen its financing. I urge the Congress to enact such a program.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS

Millions of workers at the bottom of our wage scale still lack the protection of Federal minimum standards. At the same time, we need to reinforce this protection by raising the minimum wage.

I recommend the extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act to large numbers of additional workers. In enacting higher minimum-wage levels, the Congress should consider carefully their effects on substandard incomes, on cost and price stability, and on the availability of job opportunities for marginal workers.

TAX REFORM AND SIMPLIFICATION

Against a background calling for fiscal restraint, I cannot this year endorse any specific legislative measure, however meritorious, involving significant net tax reduction. The danger of inflation from increased demand would be too great, and any special tax reduction now would postpone the time when we can achieve a meaningful general tax reduction.

Although tax reduction is not feasible this year, improvement of our tax system is a continuing need which will concern this administration and which deserves the support of all Americans.

One major goal must be simplification of the tax law. Another aim must be a more equitable distribution of the tax load. The great variation of tax liability among persons with equivalent income or wealth must be reduced. Further, when tax reduction once again becomes feasible, particular attention must be given to relief of those at or near poverty levels of income.

Finally, we must review special tax preferences. In a fully employed economy, special tax benefits to stimulate some activities or investments mean that we will have less of other activities. Benefits that the Government extends through direct expenditures are periodically reviewed and often altered in the budget-appropriation process, but too little attention is given to reviewing particular tax benefits. These benefits, like all other activities of Government, must stand up to the tests of efficiency and fairness.

We must constantly seek improvements in the tax code in the interests of equity and of sound economic policy.

I welcome the concern over these problems shown by the chairmen of the tax committees of the Congress.

As a specific tax reform which can be accomplished this year, I call upon the Congress to deal with abuses of tax-exempt private foundations.

We must always be prepared to meet quickly any problems that arise in the path of continued, stable economic growth, whether the problems call for fiscal stimulus or fiscal restraint. Background tax studies by both the Congress and executive branch should therefore be adequate to permit quick decisions and prompt action to accommodate short-run cyclical changes. If quick action is ever needed, we should not have to begin a long debate on what the changes in taxes should be.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS IN OUR CHANGING ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

The vigor and soundness of our financial institutions are vital to the vigor and soundness of our economic expansion. Actions to ease unnecessarily restrictive regulations have been taken in the past; they have borne fruit in stronger competition and a more efficient flow of funds from savers to borrowers with the most urgent needs.

But appropriate regulations are clearly required to protect the safety of savings of American families, to assure the most efficient and equitable regulation of financial institutions, and to create still better channels for the flow of funds to borrowers.

For these reasons, I recommend congressional action on financial legislation to arm regulatory agencies with a wider range of effective enforcement remedies; strengthen statutory provisions dealing with savings and loan holding companies; increase the maximum amount of insurance coverage for bank deposits and savings and loan accounts; provide safeguards against conflict of interests in the management of these institutions; and make regulations applying to various types of institutions as parallel as possible; provide for Federal chartering of mutual savings banks.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

I have already asked for the cooperation of business and labor in preserving the stability of costs and prices. But the consumer also has a responsibility for holding the price line.

To fulfill his responsibility, the consumer must have access to clear, unambiguous information about products and services available for sale. This will enable him to reward with his patronage the most efficient producers and distributors, who offer the best value or the lowest price.

We should wait no longer to eliminate misleading and deceptive packaging and labeling practices which cause consumer confusion. The fair packaging and labeling bill should be enacted.

While the growth of consumer credit has contributed to our rising standard of living, confusing practices in disclosing credit rates and the cost of financing have made it difficult for consumers to shop for the best buy in credit.

Truth-in-lending legislation would provide consumers the necessary information, by requiring a clear statement of the cost of credit and the annual rate of interest.

Our legislation protecting the public from harmful drugs and cosmetics should be strengthened. I shall propose legislation for this purpose.

CONCLUSION

A few years ago, much was heard of the European economic miracle. Today, across the Atlantic and around the world one hears once again of the American economic miracle.

For the American economy, in the past 5 years, has demonstrated anew the confident vitality, the internal dynamism, and the enormous productivity which had long been its hallmark. We had settled for a while on what seemed a plateau of affluence; now, once again, there has been the strong thrust of progress—but a newly steady and balanced progress.

We have again shown the world what free men and a free economy can achieve. The peoples struggling toward economic development see with renewed interest that free markets and free economic choices can be a mighty engine of progress.

Moreover, there is new respect in the world for an America concerned with using its abundance to enhance the quality of human life: for a people who undertake a war on poverty along with the defense of freedom; who seek to restore their cities to greatness and to conserve the beauties of their landscape; who are determined to break down a centuries-old barrier of prejudice and injustice; who are resolved to lift the quality of education at every level; who are determined to promote and reward excellence in every endeavor; who have provided new health services and better social security for their older citizens; who offer to share their abundance and technical skills with a needy world.

The new vigor and progress of America can be a source of satisfaction. Yet we cannot rest on past accomplishments. Continuing problems challenge our determination and our resourcefulness.

Perhaps our most serious economic challenge in 1966 will be to preserve the essential stability of costs and prices which has contributed so significantly to our balanced progress.

I do not know what additional burdens of defense the American economy will be asked to assume in 1966. Whatever they are, they will be met, and they will be small relative to the growth of our abundance. But in an economy approaching full use of its resources, the new requirements of Vietnam make our task of maintaining price stability more difficult.

To insure against the risk of inflationary pressures, I have asked Americans to pay their taxes on a more nearly current basis, and to postpone a scheduled tax cut. If it should turn out that additional insurance is needed, then I am convinced that we should levy higher taxes rather that accept inflation—which is the most unjust and capricious form of taxation.

We know that we do not need to put our growing economy into a straitjacket, or to throw it into reverse. But the extent of the fiscal or monetary restraint that will be needed to avoid inflationary pressures will depend directly on the restraint and moderation exercised by those who have power over wages and prices.

I again ask every leader of labor and every businessman who has price or wage decisions to make in 1966 to remember that his decisions affect not alone the wages of his members or the returns of his stockholders. Shortsighted pursuit of short-run interests fails in the longer run to advance the interests of either labor or management. And it surely does not advance the interests of the Nation.

I am confident that the overwhelming majority of private decisions in 1966 will be sound and responsible—just as I am determined that public decisions will be fully responsible.

If they are, the American economic miracle will remain in 1966 the single most important force in the economic progress of mankind.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 27, 1966.

DISCUSSION OF THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the President transmitted to the Congress his economic report for 1966, reporting on the Nation's remarkable record of expansion to full employment, the maintenance of sound wage-price policies to prevent spiraling inflation, and progress toward strengthening our balance of payments. The President presents a program for the year ahead that promises to make possible further economic progress along these lines at home, while carrying the increasing burdens of our commitments in Vietnam.

The President's economic report, delivered to the Congress today, is nothing less that a great State paper. I recommend a careful reading of this report to every Member of Congress, and to every intelligent citizen. It is the key to a better understanding of how our economy works and what we must do to make it work more effectively.

Thus, the President's annual economic reports, including the reports of his Council of Economic Advisers, play a great educational role in our society. They clearly and objectively summarize the economic progress we have made, they point up the problems our economy faces, and they provide relevant and illuminating analysis of economic issues.

These reports in past years hold words out of such terms as GNP, fiscal policy, productivity, balance-of-payment deficit, and many others. They have brought to many a new understanding of such concepts as the cash and the national income account budgets of the Federal Government, the relationship between balance-of-payment deficits and outflows of gold, the notion of "fiscal drag," and many others.

The economic reports of recent years, and the policies based on them, have taught us why recessions are not inevitable; why in time of slack an unbalanced budget may be appropriate; why prices will rise if wage rates advance faster than labor productivity; how tax cuts can increase Government revenues; and, this year, why fiscal policy must shift from stimulating the economy to restraining it.

These economic reports represent one of the great educational enterprises of our time, in an area of knowledge in which better public understanding is vital to our future.

In accordance with the Employment Act, the President's economic report is referred to the Joint Economic Committee of which I have the honor of serving as chairman during this 89th Congress, and of which I have been a member since its creation in 1946. The law requires our committee to study the President's report and to report to the Congress by March 1 our findings and recommendations on it as a guide to the other committees of Congress.

We plan to begin hearings at once, opening on next Tuesday at 10 a.m. in room AE-1, the Capitol, hearing testimony from the President's Council of

Economic Advisers, led by its Chairman, Dr. Gardner Ackley. We will follow that with 7 or 8 days of hearings, with the witnesses including both Government officials and private individuals, as follows:

Wednesday, February 2, 10 a.m., room AE-1, the Capitol: Charles L. Schultze, Director, Bureau of the Budget.

Thursday, February 3, 10 a.m., room AE-1, the Capitol: Henry Hamill Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury.

Friday, February 4, 10 a.m., room AE-1, the Capitol: James G. Patton, national president, National Farmers Union.

Tuesday, February 8, 10 a.m., room 2128, Rayburn Office Building: W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor; Arthur M. Ross, Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Wednesday, February 9, 10 a.m., room 1202, New Senate Office Building: Walter Reuther, chairman, AFL-CIO Economic Policy Committee.

Wednesday, February 9, 2:30 p.m., room 1202, New Senate Office Building: Elisha Gray II, chairman, Whirlpool Corp.

Thursday, February 10, 10 a.m., room AE-1, the Capitol: Neil H. Jacoby, dean, Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California, Los Angeles; Richard A. Musgrave, professor of economics, Harvard University; Robert Solow, professor of economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Henry W. Briefs, chairman, Department of Economics, Georgetown University.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Texas in his statement.

ECONOMICS IN POLICYMAKING

Mr. Speaker, the last few years have witnessed an upsurge in the importance of economics that has matched the upsurge in the economy. President Johnson has appointed outstanding experts from the economics departments of the great universities to positions of responsibility in the Budget Bureau, the Federal Reserve Board, the Department of Commerce, AID, as well as to his Council of Economic Advisers. And he has adopted the formula of invigorating purchasing power to speed the economy's progress when it was lagging. The rewards have been dramatic for the entire Nation.

The logic of the economists' recommendations was inescapable and really very simple. The way to make full use of a nation's productive capacity is to give consumers and businessmen enough spendable income to buy the goods and services we can produce. The way to head off recession is to keep a balanced prosperity. The way to maintain price stability is to keep demand within the bounds of productive capacity, not letting imbalances develop.

These simple principles have long been in our textbooks. Now that they are in our policies we have learned that they really work. The theoretical conceptions of social scientists have been turned into better living standards for all our citizens. These principles have brought us toward full employment. They have achieved their mission but now they have a new assignment. Today's job is to maintain the balance of the economy. With the pressures of defense spending there is no call for stimulus from the tax side this year. Indeed, there must be a measure of restraint and that is what the President has requested. Nobody can hope to come up with a definite judgment about what is just the right amount of restraint. The President himself points to all the uncertainties in his economic report. But the President has demonstrated that he can take the best technical advice and turn it into the best practical policies. We can wish him and his economic advisers continued success this year as we commend them for their contribution to economic progress over the past 5 years.

AUTHORIZING THE EXPENDITURE OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I send to the desk a privileged report on House Resolution 665 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 665

Resolved, That, effective January 10, 1966, expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by section 18 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $425,000, including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "1965" and insert "1966".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have voted to provide funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities. However, if there is a record vote, I propose to vote against the funds today. I have taken the position in the past that where the House has established a standing committee, that committee should be given the benefit of any doubts I might have. Obviously, if that committee is to function it has to have funds.

However, Mr. Speaker, after having observed the manner in which activities of the committee were performed in its hearings in Chicago last May I have changed my mind. If that was a representative sample of the way it conducts its hearings, I do not think the committee serves a useful purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I followed those hearings quite closely, and I would say in all candor I do not know what the committee intended to accomplish in Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I read the long opening statement made by my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee [Mr. WILLIS]. If there was any relationship between the statement that he read into the RECORD and what the committee tried to do, it was purely coincidental.

Mr. Speaker, when the committee left Chicago its purpose was still wrapped in mystery. If one may use Winston Churchill's classic phrase about Russia, "It was a riddle, wrapped in a mystery, inside an enigma."

The chairman said the committee was seeking factual information respecting the activities of the Communist Party. If any such information was received it was not apparent to the public.

The only testimony taken at those hearings that did not result in the fifth amendment being presented by several of the witnesses, was the testimony given by the committee's own witnesses. They testified to the effect that they had heard in conversation with another person that the witnesses called before the committee in Chicago had been members of the Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the information they furnished is true or not. But I do not believe hearsay statements give the type of information on which the committee should act in an important matter of this kind where a person's liberty may be at stake.

Mr. Speaker, the point I make is this: This was not new evidence to the committee. The information that was testified to by its witnesses was information the committee had had in its possession for many years. It has been in its files for many years. The hearings were a rehash in public of information the committee knew in private.

What, then, was the purpose of calling these hearings in Chicago? Was it to educate the public? Was this the purpose of the committee—solely that of exposure?

Mr. Speaker, if this were the purpose of the committee, as I understand the law as stated in both the Watkins case and the Barenblatt case, the committee exceeded its authority.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court is clear on that particular point.

I shall not comment with reference to the conduct of the committee with respect to the treatment of the witnesses. This has already received the critical comment of the newspapers of Chicago.

Let it suffice to say I believe there is much that remains to be done by this House in drafting a code of procedures for its committees, particularly this committee, which will protect the rights of witnesses who appear before it.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked about this over the years. From time to time there have been revisions in the rules of this committee, but they are not nearly adequate. Much remains that has to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will look into this question in order to protect the rights of witnesses who appear, particularly when those witnesses are faced with the possibility of going to jail as a result of testimony which they give or which they do not give.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe sincerely that there is need for a committee of this House to exercise supervision over matters of internal security. However, I do not believe that committee is the Committee on Un-American Activities. I believe it is the Committee on the Judiciary, which now has jurisdiction over matters of espionage and sabotage. I have filed a bill designed to transfer the jurisdiction of this committee to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, the hearings of the Committee on the Judiciary are conducted with dignity and with decorum, without the explosiveness, without the fanfare and the exhibitionism that have marked the hearings of this Committee on Un-American Activities over many years.

In my view matters of the kind that are being presented by this committee and over which it has jurisdiction, should logically and reasonably be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

It will be argued, Mr. Speaker, that this committee investigation of the Klan will be jeopardized. I believe the Ku Klux Klan should be investigated and I voted for its investigation. At the time the investigation was authorized, I said I thought the investigation should be made by the Judiciary Committee, as it should be because that committee has jurisdiction over the Federal Criminal Code. The hearings and any recommendations of this committee will have to be referred to the Judiciary Committee for its consideration. It would be well for that committee to take jurisdiction as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have advanced, I shall vote today against this appropriation.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] for his forthright statement. While I intend to vote for this appropriation, I do want to join my colleague and I do hope the House will join him in his plea for setting up a code of procedures for the House Un-American Committee. There is no question, if you look at what happened in Chicago and perhaps in other parts of the country, that this committee has trampled upon the rights of individuals and has tried to prejudge them before an iota of evidence was formally before them. I think the gentleman from Illinois has made a strong case for an effective code to regulate the hearings of this committee. I think the cause of trying to ferret out those who would subvert the best interests of America is very often seriously impaired by the unjudicious conduct of the committee in its public treatment of witnesses. We Americans pride ourselves in our strong belief in the spirit of fairplay and justice. No one in this Chamber could ever accuse me of being soft on communism but just as hard as I work to defeat communism wherever it threatens our existence as free Americans whether at home or abroad, I would never see our country adopt the gunshot tactics of those we fight. We have seen witnesses called before the committee in open session and cross-examined without benefit of learning who their accusers are.

I do hope that a code of procedure, one that will protect the dignity of this House and the rights of witnesses, is going to be approved by this House as quickly as possible. I am certain the American people agree that Congress should have an instrument with which to legislate against the subversion of those who would destroy our freedom but I think the American people want this done within the basic safeguards of our Constitution. There is not a court in the country that would tolerate some of the quasi-judicial conduct demonstrated before the committee.

It is my hope the committee itself would enunciate a code of conduct to protect the highest standards of this Congress and our Constitution. I am certain our fight against subversion and subversives would be more productive and successful.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week we were advised that there would be no legislative business before the House this week, and certainly no controversial issues. Consequently, there are a number of Members I know who would have wanted to speak on this matter but who are not present today. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] for having so cogently stated the case against the Committee on Un-American Activities. I think he has pointed out, as it has been pointed heretofore, that this committee does exceed its jurisdiction and does abuse the rights of witnesses who are called before the committee.

Once again we are asked to appropriate funds for a legislative committee which throughout its history has shown that it does defy the Constitution and has failed to produce significant legislation. In over 27 years of its existence, it has produced exactly four pieces of legislation, and yet during this period of time its expenses have skyrocketed. It is now asking to have $425,000. If this is approved, it means the 89th Congress will have appropriated $845,000 to this committee—almost a million dollars. Compare that with today's requests which will come up later for $400,000 for the Committee on Education and Labor and $300,000 for the Committee on the Judiciary. Certainly, the two committees I have just mentioned are committees that have very important legislative functions to perform, but they have not come before us with a request anywhere near as large as that of the request of the Committee on Un-American Activities. This committee has repeatedly been one of the biggest spenders in the Congress. In the 88th Congress only four committees received more than its $660,000 appropriation. It spent more money than Interstate and Foreign Commerce, $597,450; Education and Labor, $475,700; Foreign Affairs, $222,500; and Armed Services, $150,000.

As for the committee's staffing, it has one of the largest staffs in the House of Representatives. During the period of the last 6 months of 1965, it employed a total of 56 people, the fourth largest staff in the House. It had a larger staff than such committees as Banking and Currency, 44; Judiciary, 38; and Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 37.

This money and this energy is not spent to promote legislation. It is spent to investigate and condemn ideas, ideologies, activities, and individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Legislature has no constitutional authority to act as a prosecutor or as a jury or as a court. Its function is to pass laws. This committee has constantly failed to do that.

If we look at the record of last year and the record of this legislative committee, there were 11,856 bills introduced in the House. An average of 593 bills were referred to each committee. Yet only 13 bills were referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities, the fourth most costly and the fourth most heavily staffed, and 10 of those 13 bills were identical. In other words, it had before it three legislative proposals and reported out one bill, the proposal to create a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy.

In the last analysis, the committee's inaction is really inevitable. It stems from the fact that the committee has no valid legislative function. The few bills that are referred to it properly belong within the jurisdiction of other committees. For instance, the two bills to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act, are almost identical with H.R. 5162. They all authorize the Federal Government to guard defense security systems. H.R. 5162 was referred to the Judiciary Committee; yet the bills to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act were sent to the Un-American Activities Committee. The bill to amend the Internal Security Act so as to provide closer court surveillance should also have been sent to the Judiciary Committee. Significantly, when a Freedom Academy bill was proposed in the Senate, it was appropriately referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Now one might wonder how so much money is spent. The committee would explain it away by saying the money is spent by a staff which must be very large and very, very careful to investigate every aspect of cases before the committee begins its hearings.

But the tragic truth is the committee is virtually never prepared to get information from its witnesses or to prove its charges.

In 1965 the committee held four hearings. Two of these—congressional testimony for the Freedom Academy and Miss Juanita Castro's description of Cuba presumably required little or no investigative work. The $420,000 and 56-man staff must have all been used for what our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], last year described as "extensive, unheralded work in advance of hearings so that our every move will, on the one hand, protect all of those concerned while on the other conform to very definite constitutional requisites."

The investigation in Chicago to which our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], referred makes it clear that the investigators are unable to furnish proof of the committee's accusations and that the committee is uninterested in protecting witnesses against unsubstantiated charges.

Let me read an account of the committee's activity which appeared in the Chicago Daily News last May 29. I think this account is significant because it shows the methods of this committee:

> On Thursday afternoon, Mrs. Laura Blough, 34, of San Francisco, was in the witness chair and already had pleaded the fifth amendment several times when Staff Counsel Alfred M. Nittle began:
>
> "It is the information of the committee that you were contacted by Dr. Stamler and advised by him that you were one of the persons chosen to give up your identity and move to other areas in case Communist leaders were put away."
>
> From there he went on to ask if Mrs. Blough was "aware that Dr. Stamler was one of those in charge of setting up the Communist Party underground" in the early 1950's.
>
> Up to this point no single witness under oath had so much as mentioned Stamler's name.
>
> Thus, he stood, identified as a Communist not in any testimony and not even in a statement of fact, but in a question.
>
> There was no way for Stamler to know where the information came from, no opportunity to confront his accuser.
>
> The treatment accorded Mrs. Hall and Mrs. Stamler was even more remarkable. They never were identified as Communists except by Nittle—and in questions, not statements.

That is from the Saturday, May 29, 1965, issue of the Chicago Daily News. That is the record of this committee.

The real purpose of such investigations, of course, is not legislation but propaganda. Though the committee later said that the hearings had produced useful material, almost all of it came from two witnesses, both of whom were, at one time or another, in the employ of the FBI. As for Dr. Stamler, the committee's staff, which is supposed to investigate all evidence so carefully before hearings commence, had not even tried to talk with him before he was subpenaed.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] stressed the propaganda function of the committee in a speech last spring which Mr. ASHBROOK read into the record. He said:

> Our purpose in having Miss Castro speak to the committee was to put in public record reliable information refuting the propaganda spread by the Cuban Government and the American students who had visited there since the revolution.

Another aspect of the committee's propaganda function is its distribution of literature. In past years I have noted that these publications have been printed at great cost to the Government. It is interesting that this year the committee curtailed its publishing activities somewhat, receiving $13,053 for printing expenses. I might note that the Committee on House Administration can take part of the credit for that achievement. Each of the five times funds were requested, the House Administration Committee recommended that there be printed precisely half as many pamphlets as the Un-American Activities Committee had sought.

Mr. Speaker, this year the Un-American Activities Committee altered its role somewhat by attacking the far right instead of the far left in its fourth hearing. Admittedly the investigation of the Ku Klux Klan makes for a cloudier case against the committee, since there is a clear need for effective Federal legislation to deal with violence.

But the proper forum in which to consider such legislation is the Judiciary Committee. The political beliefs of the Ku Klux Klan should not be the subject of a legislative investigation. What needs to be investigated are the Klan's criminal activities. As I said when this question was before us on last April 14, the goal should be the development of criminal laws to deal with those who are engaged in criminal acts to prevent civil rights activity. The Judiciary Committee has undeniable jurisdiction over civil rights legislation and Federal criminal statutes. It is no excuse to say that the Judiciary Committee was too busy to handle the investigation itself.

The goal of any investigation of the Klan should have been indelibly clear. It should be to come to grips with brutality and murder and to protect American citizens from acts of violence and physical injury, not from speech and propaganda. The investigation by the Un-American Activities Committee has blurred this goal. After years if ignoring the Klan, that it is now, in the view of the committee, "un-American" is irrelevant. The charge against the Klansmen is that they are murderers.

Mr. Speaker, this year the committee is asking more money than ever before to continue its traditional assault on civil liberties. The Chicago hearings once again demonstrated how wanton this assault can be. The Klan hearings can hardly be considered redemptive. It is time, as I have said on other occasions before the House, that we cease to underwrite the undermining of the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to oppose the yearly appropriation for the House Committee on Un-American Activities—$425,000, the largest appropriation in its 20-year history.

Continuously for the past two decades this House of Representatives, acting through this committee, has destroyed the lives and reputations of American citizens by publicly accusing them of conduct and associations the committee considers undesirable.

This is something the House of Representatives cannot do under the Constitution. This is a legislative trial proscribed in section 9, article I, as a bill of attainder.

It makes no difference if the victim is a Communist, a member of the Ku Klux Klan, or a member of any other organization considered subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In this country only the judiciary can punish and then only with a jury of 12 men, a lawyer, confrontation of accusers, and all the other safeguards that constitute due process.

The committee over and over calls witnesses and subjects them to publicity and exposure, in effect it convicts them of associations or ideas which are not crimes but which the committee feels are punishable regardless. Loss of reputation and job quickly follow as news of the latest House Committee on Un-American Activities trial is fed to the press.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill that will provide the House Committee on Un-American Activities with funds for still another year of attainder.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, every time the Committee on Un-American Activities undertakes an investigation, its members must expect some criticism, abuse, vilification and, sometimes, what are probably intended to be subtle threats, acts of harassment and intimidation. Our current investigation of the Ku Klux Klan organizations is no exception. As a matter of fact, in this investigation, we have encountered even more than the usual degree of employment of such tactics. Speaking for myself personally I would like to give a few illustrations.

Even before commencing the hearings on October 19, 1965, I was warned that it was planned that Klan members in large numbers would descend on my congressional district in an effort to defeat me. On the opening day of the hearings, however, I told Imperial Wizard Robert M. Shelton, of Tuscaloosa, Ala., that I would welcome that move and I challenged and dared him to undertake this project.

On the first day of the hearings, in the wee hours of the morning, there were rappings on the door of my apartment here in Washington every few minutes. I called the police. I cannot, with certainty, say who the intruders were, but I can say that whoever they were, like thieves in the dark, they disappeared before the arrival of the police.

Later on, in my congressional district, during the recess of Congress, I was scheduled to make an address in a certain building on the campus of a small college. Again, I received advance warning that I would have "visitors" on the occasion. And indeed I did. While I was addressing a group of very fine young American citizens, about 20 klansmen appeared. They milled around the building and 2 or 3 of them entered the hall. What they said about me was not very pretty. In fact, what they said was so filthy, dirty, vile, abusive, obscene, and so downright vulgar that I cannot repeat their remarks on the floor of this House.

A few days later, in my little hometown, again in the darkness of night, klansmen appeared and distributed newspaper-size fliers with their fiery cross on the front page. Over 50 of them were strewn on my front lawn. I was taught to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the cross is a symbol of humility, something to bear and not to burn or throw around with intent to terrorize.

Every day the mailman brings to my office and my home more of such abusive and insulting literature which I personally consider to be silly and juvenile, but which is intended, I suppose, according to the workings of the little minds of klansmen, to intimidate me and make me tremble. Big deal.

Night and day my phone rings, and when I answer or when my good wife answers, we hear a click, meaning a hang-up, incoherent insults, or just loud breathing. Again I say, "big deal."

The point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is this: These low tactics have not shaken the resolve of any member of the committee. And the fact that we have not been diverted from the job assigned to us, and will not be, has paid off. Here is why:

The greatest strength of klanism in America has been its secrecy. In fact, Mr. Shelton calls himself the imperial wizard of the "invisible" empire. But is that not a silly title now? The committee has ripped this veil of secrecy. The "invisible" empire is no longer so invisible.

And what has been the result? I can assure the Members of this body that the number of Klan meetings held has dropped. I can tell you that attendance at the fewer meetings that are being held has fallen off, that Klan members, and not only members but also Klan officials, are quitting. The fear of the Klan that pervaded certain areas is being dispelled. Former klansmen and Klan officials are not only turning against the Klan, but some have come forward to testify freely, voluntarily, and under oath, and have given the committee firsthand information about the planning and carrying out of some of the ugly and repulsive activities in which Klans engage. I feel certain that more klansmen and former klansmen will be doing the same. It has taken fortitude, courage, and "guts" for those who have taken this step to do this and then go back to brave the Klan. They have given the committee valuable information and have made a great contribution to their country and to this Congress by providing the facts on the basis of which the committee can recommend remedial and appropriate legislation.

I should like to conclude with this thought: My friends, I am an American citizen who hails from the South, and I am proud of it. But for the life of me I cannot conceive how joining, or believing in, radical, extreme, or hate groups of any kind, either on the right or on the left, can make me either a better American citizen or a better southerner. I know that all Members here, wherever they hail from, deep down in their hearts, feel the same way about it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as a vote of confidence, I do urge that the membership vote overwhelmingly to approve the budgetary requirements of the Committee on Un-American Activities for the year 1966, part of which is to be used to complete the current investigation I have mentioned.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. An allusion has been made that the rights of citizens have been trampled upon by your committee. Will the gentleman address himself briefly to that allusion?

Mr. WILLIS. Of course, that is one thing we have to endure on the floor. I do not know of any such practice.

Let me say this: The members of my staff and the lawyers on the committee know as well as they live that if, as a "fishing question," they would ask a person, "Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?" They would be fired in 5 minutes. No such thing is permitted. I have told the staff this many times before. I have stated this in the course of our public hearings and on other occasions. If a person is asked, "Are you now, or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?" it means that we have documentary evidence or sworn testimony so identifying him or confidential information from a reliable source to that effect. Unless we have one of these bases, I will not permit this question to be asked in any hearing.

Of course, one hears a great deal about the right of free speech and the denial of this and of that. Certainly there is no denial of free speech in our hearings. As a matter of fact, oftentimes—and the witnesses have a right to refuse to answer questions under certain circumstances, of course—some of them do not speak enough. We subpena them, hoping they will fully exercise their free speech rights, telling us at great length all they know about the matter we are investigating. But they do not do it. They voluntarily curb the exercise of their free speech. We do not do it.

Certain things have been said on the floor today about a witness concerning whom my lips are temporarily sealed. I cannot answer about certain individuals at this time and I am not going to do it. But let me tell you that I have never been party to and have never engaged in preparing an investigation unless I believed, after very careful study, that something ought to be done and had the unanimous approval of the committee to undertake the investigation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is responding to the question of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, and has indicated that there was no unfair allusion to Communist membership in connection with the questions which were asked by the counsel for the committee of the witnesses who appeared.

Mr. WILLIS. I said that if any "fishing questions" were asked, that lawyer would be fired.

Mr. YATES. Then I suggest, if I may, with due respect to the gentleman, that he ought to take a look at the transcript of the record made in Chicago, and look at his counsel's questions.

Mr. WILLIS. I was there. I presided. I know the record.

Mr. YATES. There were times when the gentleman did not preside.

Mr. WILLIS. Oh, yes; I have heard about that. I have heard of a certain letter being circulated, saying that on frequent occasions I was not there. Does the gentleman know what happened? I was absent for several hours one afternoon because I had pneumonia. The rest of the time I stuck with it, even though I was sick the 3 days of the hearings.

Mr. YATES. I am not criticizing the gentleman for not having been there. I know there are times when a Member must leave a committee hearing. The point I was making is that the question to which I have reference may have been asked in the gentleman's absence.

Mr. WILLIS. Do you know that it was? Is there anything else you would like to ask?

Mr. YATES. Yes, I should like to ask another question.

Mr. WILLIS. Please, my friend, let us not——

Mr. YATES. Let us not get emotional?

Mr. WILLIS. That is right.

Mr. YATES. Let us be dispassionate and objectives?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes.

Mr. YATES. Very well; let us try to get the facts. There is a reference in the proceedings, as reported by Chicago newspapers—I have not been able to get a transcript of the hearings, and therefore have not been able to verify this from the record——

Mr. WILLIS. Does the gentleman always believe everything he reads in the newspaper?

Mr. YATES. I thought I told the gentleman I could not obtain a transcript.

Of course, I would much prefer to be able to get a copy of the transcript, so that I could verify it; but I was not able to get it. Therefore, for lack of other authority, I went to the newspaper.

The question I should like to ask the gentleman is whether or not the newspaper story is true. I leave that to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIS. What is the newspaper story?

Mr. YATES. That the first question respecting membership of Dr. Stamler in the Communist Party was asked of another witness by your committee counsel, as to whether or not she knew or had heard that Dr. Stamler had been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. WILLIS. I chaired the session at which that witness appeared. Did the gentleman read my colloquy with that witness? The newspaper story is not true.

Mr. YATES. Again, I tell the gentleman the record of the proceedings has not been made available.

Mr. WILLIS. That hearing was public. The transcript is available to anyone who wants to read it.

Mr. YATES. I would like to. I wish you would make it available to me.

Mr. WILLIS. Because we had quite a discussion. If I recall—and I am speaking from memory—and the people involved have good lawyers—and I do not want to half-quote or misquote or take anything out of context—but, as I recall it, the transcript will show that that witness was at first expected voluntarily to testify and had so indicated before, and then at the last minute she invoked the fifth amendment, which was all right with me. She had the right to do so.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take any time during the consideration of this resolution today, but charges have been made here that the committee chaired by my valued and esteemed colleague from Louisiana has trampled on the rights of certain individuals. I do not think I can let this go and not defend the gentleman from Louisiana, ED WILLIS, and his committee. If there is a fairminded man in this House of Representatives it is ED WILLIS. I do not think he would put up for 1 minute with any member of his committee trampling on the rights of any individual for any reason.

Now, if being asked in closed or open hearings whether or not you are a Communist, or if you know or have heard whether or not another individual is a Communist is trampling on the rights of an individual, then the chips will have to fall where they will. Whoever the shoe fits will have to wear it. For the life of me I cannot understand why any American would be timid about answering such a question. It seems to me that only the un-American would be unresponsive. There is no timidity in me as far as being an American is concerned. I am proud of it. There is a great deal of difference between communism and Americanism. The responsibility of this committee is to seek out un-Americanism wherever they can find it. I support their efforts to do so. I said when we authorized the money to investigate the Ku Klux Klan that I was opposed to un-Americanism wherever it might be found. I reiterate that statement now, whether it be in the Ku Klux Klan, or in one of these leftwing groups who oppose American efforts in opposition to communism in Vietnam. I strongly advocate broadening this investigation to those leftwing groups. Then we will really find out whose ox is being gored.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution before us today.

Now I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman believe that any court would tolerate a question by counsel which incorporated a statement based upon hearsay in such a question? That is the issue, due process; the constitutional rights of witnesses.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The question which was posed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] earlier today did not necessarily involve hearsay. The question was "are you" or "do you know?" We all know that investigative procedures differ from due process in the courtroom.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, may I reply to the gentleman inasmuch as he used my name?

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, may I have a half minute, so I can clarify the record?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will read the remarks he has just made he will see that he justified the propriety for the committee to ask a question as to whether a witness knew or had heard that some other person was a member of the Communist Party. I think upon review, if the gentleman will look at it, he will see that he approved the use of hearsay testimony as evidence of the existence of a fact. When a congressional committee is allowed to accept gossip as truth, we have come a long way from our acceptance of and pride in the American system of justice.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I think the gentleman will find hearsay evidence produces more investigative evidence leading to convictions and brings more people into the courtroom than anything else. I have heard in law enforcement work a good reliable informer is worth a dozen clues any day. A good American will, I believe, gladly provide any information he has involving anyone un-American.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to my colleague from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Administration and its Subcommittee on Accounts, I should like to state that the committee approved unanimously the resolution calling for $425,000 for the next year's operation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I should also like to explain that the slight increase over the previous appropriation is merely to meet increases in costs caused by the Government-wide pay increase.

The Un-American Activities Committee has done a splendid job over the years investigating subversive organizations and persons allied with them so that the House would be in a position to legislate to meet threats to our way of life.

This year, while this committee has been investigating the Ku Klux Klan, the clamor of the claque of professional liberals against its continued operations has been stilled.

It would be my hope that if the next ox gored by the committee, say an investigation of the Black Muslims, is not as popular with the leftists, that they will, nevertheless, have the grace to remain silent as a tribute to the fact the committee has, and will, look into organizations of all creeds and colors which may jeopardize our Nation and its institutions. To many, the Communists, with whom we are fighting a war in Vietnam, are still the chief immediate danger to our internal security.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has, and is, serving the Congress and the American people well. I am sure it will continue to do so in the future.

I ask, therefore, that all Members of the House support this resolution which I have the honor to introduce.

At this time, at the request of my colleague from Alabama, I would like to yield to Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Klan subcommittee and of the full committee, I think the RECORD should reflect that the minority side of this committee fully support the chairman's request, and joins in it.

Also I would like to state as a member of the Klan subcommittee, and other subcommittees, that the chairman has at all times conducted our hearings in my presence in a manner that is judicious, dignified, and fair. This distinguished member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, and the chairman of four subcommittees of that committee, has set an example for dignity and fairness in congressional hearings in our day.

In seeking the necessary funds to complete the Klan investigation, the committee is simply completing an assigned task which the Congress overwhelmingly endorsed in its approval of appropriations for this purpose last year. In the balance of the requested budget are the funds necessary for the conduct of the committee's continuing work in the area of Communist subversion. Surely the Congress will once again reflect the tremendous support which this committee has among the people of our country, by voting to authorize this budget to permit the House Committee on Un-American Activities to fulfill its responsibilities to the American people in the field of internal security in 1966.

Mr. Speaker, I join in urging the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of the sugar bill last year the question of the Foreign Agents Registration Act came up. That is the act under which the foreign sugar lobby is required to register.

In the course of the discussion of that bill I offered an amendment which I hoped would be accepted and would have the effect of eliminating this very unfortunate lobby.

But the response I received from the gentleman who is chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities was that my amendment was not the way to go about the improvement of the situation with reference to the foreign sugar lobby; that the correct approach was to improve the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

Mr. Speaker, it so happens that this act originated in the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Therefore, I would like to ask the gentleman, the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, if as chairman of the committee or as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, we can hope that there will be some action soon to improve the Foreign Agents Registration Act?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. I am answering as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FINDLEY. Fine.

Mr. WILLIS. We did conduct hearings last year on that issue. As a matter of fact, this week I discussed the matter with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and we expect to move forward on that piece of legislation.

Mr. FINDLEY. May I ask the gentleman why the House Committee on Un-American Activities has not undertaken the improvement of the Foreign Agents Registration Act? If the committee would do so, it would certainly make this resolution all the more appealing to me.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman will have to ask the other body about this. That particular amendment to the Foreign Agents Registration Act was acted upon by the other body and it was sent to the House of Representatives for its action and then referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. That is the tenor of the amendments made to the act by the other body. The issue is different. Certainly, I imagine that my good friend would not intimate that whatever it is, the sugar lobby has nothing to do with communism. But, as I say, that is a different issue.

Mr. FINDLEY. I assume that the other body——

Mr. WILLIS. The tenor of the amendments proposed in the other body was along the line of the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FINDLEY. I realize that, but the act itself originated in the Un-American Activities Committee, and I assume that the action by the other body would not preclude your committee from initiating legislation to reform the act.

Mr. WILLIS. It would not preclude it, no.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and I yield back the balance of my time.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF].

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, much has been said both for and against the activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Today we vote for an appropriation for future activities, not the past. In the future, the role of the committee must be more clearly defined, and a set of operating rules laid down so that some of its egregious infringements upon guaranteed rights of our citizens shall not again be inflicted.

I have said in the past and reiterate that I believe this Nation has the duty to protect itself against those ideologies, internal as well as external, which would destroy our way of life, and weaken our ability to protect ourselves from our enemies. We must be ever vigilant against the spurious indoctrinations of both extreme right and left as they seek to enforce their dogma upon the American people.

The current investigation of the Ku Klux Klan is a necessary and important piece of work. It must continue. This is why I support the appropriation. The efforts of Chairman WILLIS, who has led this fight in spite of constant threats made against him by these masters of terrorist activities, deserve the highest praise. He has rendered outstanding service to those innocent citizens who have been persecuted and physically abused because of their desire to exercise the rights guaranteed them by our laws. He has torn off the mask of pseudo-respectability the Ku Klux Klan has sought to wear, and exposed them for what they are.

I feel that there are organizations in addition to Communists, their fronts, and the Ku Klux Klan, which must be looked into closely, as their continuing crusades of hatred and suspicion toward any and all who dare take issue with them, is an acid corroding the very principles upon which democracy depends most for its sustenance and support. For while the Ku Klux Klan masks itself in its best white business sheets and hides from the scrutiny of all upright men, there are other groups who foster fear, hatred, racism, intolerance, religious bigotry, and violence, desecrating the very essence of America. I decry both the Communist and other extremist groups whose principles are essentially un-American. These people wrap the American flag round themselves like a bathrobe, demeaning and destroying the ideals of this banner of freedom.

I am referring to organizations such as the John Birch Society, masquerading under the sinister cloak of secrecy and conspiracy; daring to bruit about the idea that this type of secret group is necessary in a society such as ours. As well, the Birch Society's efforts to infiltrate legitimate political organizations in order to bend them to their will, or destroy them from within cannot be tolerated within a pluralistic society. Their goal of imposing their distorted view of life upon the American people must be thwarted. Their efforts to infiltrate and destroy the two-party system have been decried by some members of the Republican Party as individuals, although the Republican Party has yet to censure them by name. Their fostering of the idea that anyone who disagrees with them is a traitor, is an attack upon the right of free discussion and the right to disagree. The Birch Society's fostering of the conspiracy theory of history is an insult to the intelligent, inquiring mind. We know our external enemies. Let us now know those within our gates.

Let us make the same effort to explore and expose the Birch Society as we are doing with the Ku Klux Klan. Let us expose those who try to stampede large numbers of our citizens into accepting totalitarian means to questionable ends, in the name of freedom. Here the House Un-American Activities Committee can perform a useful service. I ask that we direct the committee—not away from the Communists and their tools—but also to other dangerous threats. It is here that we can perform invaluable service by ferreting out groups who would warp the tenets of a true democracy. Let us not forget the lessons of the very recent past so quickly. Extremism in the pursuit of liberty is not a virtue. For extremism is a destroyer of liberty, not its preserver.

Let the House Un-American Activities Committee tear away the masks of the superpatriot, those of righteousness and selflessness that these false prophets don so adroitly. Let the committee act as it should—in the spirit of democracy—so that the greatest of our rights shall be guaranteed to the least of our citizens.

Finally, I feel that the House Judiciary Committee already has a mandate for this particular type of investigative activity. I hope that it will proceed along these lines as well.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in the early days of the first session of this Congress, I stood before you to oppose further appropriations for the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Once again we are requested, through appropriations, to sanction activities of this House standing committee, for which we are responsible.

I ask, as I have in the past, How long do we perpetuate the committee's dialog without a serious and responsible interchange of views on its record and role?

I protest the committee's practice of investigations which by their very nature are exercises in predestined futility aimed at exposure rather than legislation. This practice becomes even more shocking and unpalatable when the mere subpenaing of a witness before the committee brands him as suspect and an aura of guilt immediately surrounds him—regardless of his possible innocence.

American citizens under our free democratic system have a time-honored and constitutionally guaranteed privilege to petition their Government. Today we are faced with actual cases where our citizens are exercising this privilege in many areas of national concern. Marches against administration policy in Vietnam, civil rights demonstrations, labor-management disputes, arms control and nuclear proliferation, and peace demonstrations are all areas where, as Americans, our citizens have a right to make known their views.

Yet we are asked to sanction—no, support—the Committee on Un-American Activities which could indict these same citizens as un-American. No one has yet defined in clear legal terms the words "un-American." Voices raised offering alternatives to national actions in this time of national and international development and peril must not be silenced through fear of the "un-American" label. A belief in individual motives has been an important factor in the growth of our Nation. We should not lightly sanction any committee which through its repeated action would slur the motives of these individuals and groups by attaching an aura of guilt through mere congressional subpenaing.

I ask my colleagues, Is to disagree to be un-American? The ability to disagree freely without fear is one of the characteristics which distinguishes this Nation from controlled societies. I protest any unwarranted intervention in my constituents' right to plead a cause freely and without fear of defamation.

For these reasons, I oppose the requested appropriation and ask that the Congress carefully review the mandate of the committee.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the very existence of the Committee on Un-American Activities has had and will continue to have a salutary effect. The volume of legislation it produces is not a test of justification for its support.

This Congress has a responsibility to keep informed on un-American acts and intents in this country and this is our only machinery for doing so. Of course we have Federal agencies to investigate and prosecute subversive and seditious acts committed against our Government and I think a good job is done but the enforcement agencies do not and cannot fill the need of the Congress to be informed. In specifics the agencies are not supposed to act in this capacity.

This committee must be continued and the funds provided appear to be reasonable.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to granting the increased appropriations for the House Committee on Un-American Activities. When many necessary and worthwhile domestic programs are expected to be cut back in this session of Congress, I do not see how we can justify an increase in funds for this committee.

My primary objection to the HCUA is that its principal activities are not aimed at legislation, but rather at investigating and exposing individuals or organizations.

The committee has been in existence since 1938. Its record of legislative accomplishment is minuscule. Only three laws have resulted from bills reported out by the committee—the Internal Security Act of 1950, the Communist Control Act of 1954, and a bill passed in 1962 to eliminate an error in the 1950 act.

This meager set of laws has had little legal effect. The Internal Security Act of 1950 has not resulted in a single organization or individual registering under its major provision—The Subversive Activities Control Act—nor has anyone been imprisoned for failing to register. The 1954 Act has been utilized only once, and then unsuccessfully.

But if the committee has accomplished little in its legislative function, it has been active in its investigative function. Unfortunately, the investigative work by the committee has not been of the type that would assist in developing legislation.

Instead, the committee revives events that occurred decades ago, it publicizes information that has already been gathered in executive session. It spends day after day questioning witnesses who the committee knows will refuse to give any answers.

The HCUA has used methods which have outraged the communities where it has put on its hearings. The hearings conducted last year in Chicago followed the usual pattern of the committee. For 3 days the HCUA went through the motions of a public hearing, but only two witnesses testified and both of them were FBI informers, raking over material already in Government files. Three of Chicago's four daily newspapers, all of them normally Republican in their opinions, editorially condemned the committee's performance.

A congressional committee should not have as its primary concern the investigation and exposure of individuals. This is necessary not only to uphold our basic concepts of government, but for practical reasons. If there is a need to prosecute an individual, this should be done by law within constitutional limits with due process observed.

It is a legitimate function of Congress to be informed about the character and activity of the Communist Party or the Ku Klux Klan, or any other subversive organization.

But if this concern with subversive organizations is to result in useful legislation, the hearings and investigation should deal with such matters as the character of the organization and its activities, not merely in exposure which lies outside the authority of Congress.

As I have said in the past, I advocate transferring the activities of the HCUA to a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, where the results of hearings would be more likely to be directed toward legislation, rather than exposure for exposure's sake.

Because the committee has continued to harass individuals rather than pursue legitimate legislative inquiries, I feel that it would be a mistake for the Members of this House to grant increased appropriations for the activities of the HCUA.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is again called on to express itself in approving or disapproving of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. We are asked to do this by means of a vote on a resolution providing for funds for current operation of that committee. This is not a new question for me and on each occasion in prior years, I have voted against the committee's appropriation. I do so again today. The reason I oppose the committee is because I fundamentally disagree with the purpose of the committee as expressed by its own activities over the years. Its proceedings have always been controversial and seem to have been partially responsible for the riotous behavior often attendant to its proceedings.

Having said this, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it absolutely clear that I do not criticize the distinguished chairman of this committee or its members. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], is well known to me through our association on the Committee on the Judiciary to be an individual of great competence and fairness, and I wish to make it clear my opposition to the House Committee on Un-American Activities is based on institutional rather than personal grounds.

Mr. Speaker, some day I would hope that the House of Representatives in its wisdom would confer upon the Judiciary Committee responsibility for occasional legislative activity in the field of internal security matters and would, having done so, end the life of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Once this is done, the more contentious questions involving the individual constitutional freedoms arising out of the committee's existence can be disposed of finally.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed in favor of House Resolution 665 to provide operational funds for the House Un-American Activities Committee.

While the record shows that I am strongly opposed to unnecessary and unwarranted Government spending, I would under any circumstances consider the HUAC funds to be money well and properly spent. However, recent developments across the country have made me ever more aware of the need for this important committee. On the heels of all the recent anti-American and un-American demonstrations across the country, I was visited this week by an organization called the Committee To Abolish HUAC, who presented me with some literature stating their reasons for wanting to abolish the committee. Mr. Speaker, I was baffled. Nowhere among their various reasons—reasons such as "HUAC is unconstitutional"—did they seem to show the slightest interest in the committee's purpose: the protection of our people and our Nation through investigation of those who would bring us harm.

Events such as this, Mr. Speaker, make me ever more aware of our responsibility as representatives of the people to carry on the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the Members who, on February 25, 1965, first voted to recommit for further study and public hearings, and then, when this motion failed, to deny appropriations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Since that date the committee has conducted an investigation of the Ku Klux Klan. A number of members of the committee showed considerable courage—both political and personal—in undertaking this investigation. I compliment them on their commitment.

However, I believe that the benefits which may accrue from such an investigation would better have been found in the courts. Certainly if the police and the courts in the States in which the Klans are a powerful force had been as active, in controlling the illegal aspects of the Klans, as they could and should have been, then the recent investigations would have been unnecessary. In other words, an alteration of the judicial environment is clearly required in these States.

As I stated a year ago, I believe that any necessary functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities should be within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. I continue to hold that belief and, therefore, again will vote against the appropriations for this committee. Further, I believe that the criticisms leveled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], regarding the hearings held recently in Chicago, and the criticisms advanced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] regarding the lack of legislative role and product, are valid.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad fact that there are still those in this country who would equate my unwillingness to vote funds to this committee with an alleged "softness on communism." The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the opposite is true: my unwillingness to support what I believe to be the undemocratic procedures and, indeed, mandate, of this committee stems from my profound fear that the single condition which would make our Nation most vulnerable to subversion by antidemocratic forces would be our own abandonment of our country's historic principles of free speech and the presumption of innocence until guilt is proven. Shorn of these principles, Mr. Speaker, we are no better than our adversaries.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 299, nays 24, not voting 109, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—299

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Baring
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Culver
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Denton
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edwards, Ala.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Krebs
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Selden
Senner
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—24

Annunzio
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Diggs
Dingell
Dow
Duncan, Oreg.
Farbstein
Fraser
Gilbert
Green, Oreg.
Kastenmeier
Leggett
Mackie
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
Ottinger
Rees
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan
Scheuer
Vivian
Yates

NOT VOTING—109

Abbitt
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Baldwin
Barrett
Bell
Bingham
Blatnik
Brademas
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Chelf
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Clevenger
Collier
Conyers
Cooley
Craley
Cunningham
Dague
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Donohue
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Everett
Farnsley
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Fuqua
Giaimo
Gibbons
Grabowski
Gray
Grider
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Helstoski
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Latta
Long, La.
McCarthy
McClory
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Mailliard
Matthews
Mize
Moorhead
Morse
Nix
O'Brien
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Philbin
Pool
Powell
Price
Purcell
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts
Ronan
Roncalio
Roudebush
Secrest
Shipley
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Va.
Stephens
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Trimble
Udall
Vigorito
Watkins
Watson
Weltner
Wilson, Bob

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Bingham against.

Mr. Pool for, with Mr. Edwards of California against.

Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Resnick against.

Mr. Trimble for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Mr. Smith of Virginia for, with Mr. Ronan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Arends.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Clancy.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Don Clausen.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Price with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Calloway.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Mize.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Shipley.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Roncalio.
Mr. Weltner with Mr. Vigorito.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Hagen of California.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Farnsley.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. McVicker.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Jacobs.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. de la Garza.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Grider with Mr. Hathaway.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Powell.

Mr. SCHEUER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I send to the desk a privileged report on House Resolution 638 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 638

Resolved, That the additional expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 19 of the Eighty-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $300,000 including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study of investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

I would like to take this opportunity to say that I have been deeply disturbed by the Supreme Court decision in the case of the two Federal judges who apparently are feuding in Oklahoma. I know nothing of the merits or demerits of this controversy.

But if the regional judicial council has been armed with the authority, for all practical purposes, to impeach a Federal judge, it is high time the House Committee on the Judiciary or some other committee of the Congress started an investigation to find out why this power has been delegated or whether the power has been usurped by the judicial council. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that I am deeply disturbed by the fact that this jurist, Judge Chandler by name, has been stripped of all judicial duties but retains the title of a Federal judge and still draws $30,000 a year.

I see the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary on the floor. If the gentleman from Maryland would yield further, I would appreciate the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] at this time to tell the House when the judicial council was armed by the Congress with the power to strip a Federal judge of his prerogatives. I had always supposed that under the Constitution, the impeachment of a Federal judge rested with the Congress of the United States, the House of Representatives preferring charges and the Senate conducting the trial. Can the gentleman help us on this and in his answer give assurance that the Committee on the Judiciary will do something about this situation?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. Celler], to answer the question asked by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman from Iowa raises a very interesting question. When we adopted the legislation setting up the judicial councils in the various circuits, it was done for so-called housekeeping purposes and to improve judicial administration of the work of the courts.

There is a dispute as to whether or not the judicial council has the powers that the gentleman from Iowa refers to; namely, to strip a judge of almost all his judicial functions by depriving him of any assignment of any cases whatsoever. All he has now is the salary he receives and the name of judge, but I want to say to the gentleman that the matter has been before the Supreme Court of the United States on an application for a stay and the Supreme Court refused the interlocutory order. Until the Supreme Court acts, I do not think it would be meet or proper for the Committee on the Judiciary to intervene. We have an unvarying rule in the Committee on the Judiciary not to infringe upon the powers of courts if there is a proceeding in a court and we usually like to have the proceeding take its usual course rather than have the Committee on the Judiciary intervene or exercise or express its particular judgment on the particular matter or transaction in the judicial branch.

I would say to the gentleman, we have this matter in mind but we are waiting for the Supreme Court to render its decision and then we can take whatever appropriate action that will be necessary.

Mr. GROSS. Has not the Supreme Court already sustained the action of the regional judicial council?

Mr. CELLER. No, the Supreme Court merely denied a stay, leaving the matter before the judicial council. Judge Chandler had not received any notice, if I remember correctly, of the proceedings so that he could defend himself. The matter is resting there temporarily so that the council could provide a hearing after giving notice to the judge in question so that he could then come in and defend himself. As it was, he had no opportunity even to defend himself. I am not taking up the cudgels for the judge. I do not know what the details are, but I can tell the gentleman from Iowa that the Committee on the Judiciary will act as may be necessary and suitable in the premises. But I think we must and should wait until the Supreme Court takes final action in the matter.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the explanation made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged report on the resolution (H. Res. 633) providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, and by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up the resolution for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 633

Resolved, That the further expense of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) and H. Res. 110, Eighty-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Government Operations acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $800,000 including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, which shall be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittee within and without the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Administration Committee, I send to the desk a privileged report on House Resolution 634 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 634

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1966, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 94 by the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $400,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, strike out all language following "House" and insert a period.

Page 2, strike out lines 1 and 2 and insert the following language: "Of such amount $36,000 shall be available for each of six standing subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor, and not to exceed $184,000 shall be available to the Committee on Education and Labor. All amounts authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund by this resolution shall, in the case of each subcommittee, be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the subcommittee, cosigned by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration; in the case of the committee, such amount shall be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration."

Page 2, add:

"SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman from Maryland provide the House with some information with respect to the pending resolution? Would not the resolution give to the Labor and Education Committee for the 1st and 2d sessions of the 89th Congress more than $1 million?

Mr. FRIEDEL. At the 1st session of the 89th Congress $640,000 was authorized, which included $250,000 for the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Study of the Poverty Act.

Mr. GROSS. That was in addition to the $640,000, was it not?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No, that was included in the $640,000. This is just a nominal increase this year.

Mr. GROSS. So the amount is above $1 million for the two sessions of Congress?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Will there be filed and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the traveling expenses of the committee, including the expenses of the chairman?

Mr. FRIEDEL. They have to file a voucher for everything they do with the House Administration Committee. They are printed in pamphlet form and available through the House Administration Committee.

Mr. GROSS. One final question. Did the chairman of the House Labor and Education Committee appear before your committee in support of the resolution, or was he too busy to appear?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Well, he was out of town, I understand, when this measure was brought up.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman would not know whether he was in Puerto Rico?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I do not know where he was.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FRIEDEL. You are quite welcome.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Administration Committee, I send to the desk a privileged report on House Resolution 636 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 636

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by H. Res. 13 of the Eighty-ninth Congress, incurred by the select committee appointed to study and investigate the problems of small business, not to exceed $335,000 in addition to the unexpended balance of any sum heretofore made available for conducting such study and investigation, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation to be financed from such funds.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FOR FURTHER EXPENSES FOR STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 44, BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I send to the desk a privileged report on House Resolution 663, providing for further expenses for studies and investigations pursuant to House Resolution 44, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 663

Resolved, That, effective January 10, 1966, the further expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 44 by the Committee on the District of Columbia, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000 including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 11, add:

"SEC. 4. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 80, BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I send to the desk a privileged report on House Resolution 667, to provide additional funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 80, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 667

Resolved, That the further expenses of investigations and studies to be made pursuant to H. Res. 80 by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000, including expenditures for the employment of professional, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 151, BY THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I send to the desk a privileged report on House Resolution 686, to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 151, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 686

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 151 by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, not to exceed $85,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sums heretofore made available for conducting such studies and investigations, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 4. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROPOSAL TO INCLUDE SERVICES OF CHIROPRACTORS UNDER THE VOLUNTARY SECTION OF MEDICARE

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which would include the services of chiropractors under the voluntary section of medicare. As you are aware, the medicare bill became law with the exclusion of this health profession. Since its passage, the significance of this situation has become ever more apparent. It has come to my attention time and again that elder citizens who pay the additional premium under this section, wish the right to choose the health care they receive.

It seems a reasonable choice especially in view of the fact that chiropractors are examined and licensed in the various States.

The Senate included chiropractic services in the voluntary section of the bill last year by a strong vote. This would avail those elder citizens, who found chiropractic care helpful and beneficial, of the right to have their choice of health care covered under medicare.

The services of chiropractors were deleted from the final bill in the joint conference deliberations. As it now stands, the chiropractic profession is the only major healing art to be excluded from the act.

I respectfully submit the voluntary feature of the bill should include chiropractic health services as a matter of the choice of the patient. If there be a stipulation in this instance, it should be that the practitioner has been examined and duly licensed in that State in which he practices. Please bear in mind that in this section the patient pays part of the cost from his own funds.

We have countless requests from aged persons asking why is this health care, which they find so helpful, being denied them? The costs of assistance by the use of chiropractic care is comparatively less than medical treatment. When in the judgment of the practitioner, chiropractic treatment can be beneficial to the patient, the results have been excellent.

The number of chiropractic patients in this country is over a million. These are people who have found chiropractic to benefit their health, often when medical care has been unsuccessful. The elder of these patients paying social security for the greater part of their lives must not be denied the right to choose health care, licensed in their State, which they have found of assistance in maintaining good health. I know that in the 14th District of New Jersey there are many senior citizens who have availed themselves of the services of licensed chiropractors. I am sure that other Members have received much mail urging us to include chiropractors in the medicare section of the social security amendments. The free choice in the selection of health care is as paramount as the right to have adequate health care. The law assures the right to adequate care but denies the right of choice. In a free society this should not prevail and I trust you will safeguard this right.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE PARCEL POST SYSTEM

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House; today I have introduced legislation to provide long-needed improvements in the Nation's parcel post system and to place the service on a sound financial basis.

This bill which I have introduced contains these major provisions:

It removes a service discrimination against 70 percent of our people served by the first-class post offices who cannot mail a parcel of more than 20 pounds to another first-class post office if it is more than 150 miles away.

The weight limit becomes 40 pounds, the same as now permitted for parcels going less than 150 miles, thus providing much greater flexibility and better service for business and individual mailers.

It provides a uniform size limit for all parcels of 100 inches in length and girth combined, corresponding to present size limits of parcels mailed to or from smaller second-, third-, and fourth-class offices.

The changes in the size and weight limits because of operating efficiency and increased volume will reduce parcel post deficits by $40 million annually.

An additional $62 million annually will be provided by rate adjustments. ZIP code and handling economies bring the total to $107 million.

Last year, our subcommittee held extensive hearings on legislation on parcel post.

During those hearings, the Post Office Department said it would be prepared to submit recommendations early this year. It appears to me that this new legislation now meets the objections raised.

This legislation which I am introducing today, for example, meets objections of those who were against removal of the ratemaking authority vested in the Postmaster General and subject to ICC approval. This bill retains that authority.

This legislation would not change any of the beneficial provisions of the parcel post service already in effect for farmers and other mailers receiving goods mailed at large first-class post offices, or sending parcels to such offices from the smaller second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices.

In fact, those mailing to and from second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices would have been paying less for their parcel mailings if the Postal Service had in the past not missed out on a lot of revenue because of the size and weight limitations. It is estimated that these restrictions have cost mailers or taxpayers more than $500 million over the last 14 years in higher rates.

I intend to call hearings on this legislation at the earliest possible date, and I am hopeful of speedy action on this measure in this session.

The Postmaster General has advised the Congress of the urgency of firming up rate adjustments and the realistic public service changes needed in size and weight limits, as well as the importance of other features of this legislation as soon as possible.

The $40 million yield annually in size and weight revisions, it should be noted, will result from anticipated increases in parcel post volume, as well as increased efficiency in the handling of parcels that the revisions will make possible.

The need to provide better service to the public is another paramount consideration.

The present limitations have not made sense for a long time.

One of my constituents in Baton Rouge cannot mail a parcel at any time even to relatives in Dallas, or Austin, or San Antonio, or Little Rock, if it weighs more than 20 pounds. Sometimes they want the privilege of sending a parcel over 20 pounds. They have to split the thing up into two or maybe three parcels, with all that trouble.

Seventy percent of our people all over the country are served by these first-class post offices. Usually they want to mail parcels to persons living in other first-class post offices. And I see no reason in the world why my constituents in our first-class post office at Baton Rouge or Hammond should be subject to this—nor is there any reason why it should apply to the constituents that the Members of this House represent.

I do not believe that there has been a full understanding of this unreasonable restriction. If so, I am surprised that we have put up with it. For this reason, largely, and many other good reasons, I feel we should take prompt action on this bill.

LET'S BE FAIR WITH OUR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES THIS YEAR

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, again last year as this Congress was hurrying toward adjournment we failed to fulfill our commitment to our Federal employees that their salaries should be as comparable as possible to the salaries paid to employees in private industry for similar types and levels of work. In the closing hours of the last session the House receded from the position it had earlier taken in passing a reasonably decent pay raise bill for Federal employees. We accepted the watered-down version as handed to us by the other body, and again our dedicated Federal employees found themselves shortchanged at the comparability counter.

The only encouragement that was given to them were the numerous promises and commitments spoken in this House, in the other body, and at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue that next year things would be different, and that early action would be taken on legislation that would provide proper salary increases and adjustments in fringe benefits to bring our employees up to comparability.

Now is the time when we here must honor both our commitments of last year and the legislative commitment of full comparability that we enacted in 1962.

I have introduced a bill now pending before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee (H.R. 12240) that is designed to fulfill both these commitments. In brief, it provides for a 7-percent increase in the salaries of all postal and Federal employees effective July 1, 1966. Additionally, my bill will further liberalize the present overtime provisions of law affecting our one-half million postal employees. While the overtime provisions in my bill are not in some ways as liberal as those which this House did enact last year, they are a vast improvement over the watered-down provisions we were forced to accept from the other body and they will put postal employees in a more comparable overtime position with private industry employees.

Mr. Speaker, I simply do not believe that this Congress intends that our Federal employees should be in a position of helping to finance our tremendous defense effort and all other Federal spending programs by being required to work for wages below those paid by private employers. I repeat that we have a deep and a binding commitment to these people. We must discharge it as promptly as possible.

I intend to work for prompt action on my bill, H.R. 12240, and I sincerely welcome the support of my colleagues.

A COMMUNICATION ON VIETNAM FROM GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned by reports that the administration is about to resume the bombings of North Vietnam because of the lack of a positive response from Hanoi to the President's efforts to induce negotiations.

I strongly support the determined efforts the President has made to seek out other than military solutions to the painful war in Vietnam. I believe we ought to persevere in this effort and to employ every means at our command to create a climate favorable for bringing the Vietnam war to a peaceful and just settlement at the conference table.

I am unconvinced at this time that by resuming bombings such a climate for negotiations will be produced. Rather, I believe we ought to continue the peace offensive.

As Gen. James M. Gavin has argued so forcefully, resuming the bombings will add to our problems, not detract from them. I commend to my colleagues, General Gavin's assessment of our military posture in Vietnam as set forth in a letter written by him and published in the February issue of Harper's magazine. Following is the text of General Gavin's communication:

[From Harper's magazine, February 1966]

A COMMUNICATION ON VIETNAM FROM GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN

(NOTE.—In the following letter General Gavin presents the first basic criticism of the administration's policy in Vietnam by a major military figure. As an alternative, he urges the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam, a halt in the escalation of the ground war, withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnam coast, and renewed efforts "to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva."

(General Gavin argues for such a change in policy on purely military grounds. His views on the Vietnam war cannot be taken lightly, since he has established a reputation during the last 30 years as one of America's leading strategic thinkers. At the time of the French defeat in Vietnam he was Chief of Plans and Operations for the Department of the Army, and his advice is generally believed to be largely responsible for the U.S. refusal to enter the southeast Asian conflict on a large scale at that time. He enlisted in the Army as a private in 1924 and rose to the rank of lieutenant general before his retirement in 1958; he had a distinguished combat career as a paratroop commander in World War II; and he served for a time as Chief of Research and Development for the Army. After retirement he was Ambassador to France, and is now chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Arthur D. Little, Inc., an industrial research firm in Cambridge, Mass.

(He left the Pentagon because of disagreement on what was, in 1958, the basic military policy of the Eisenhower administration. His reasons for such disagreements were set forth in his book, "War and Peace in the Space Age," published by Harper & Row; as he indicates in the following letter, most of the changes he then urged have since been carried out.

(The editors hope that General Gavin's communication may stimulate a searching reexamination of American military and foreign policies by other public figures who are especially qualified by experience and training to discuss them. In the coming months Harper's hopes to publish further contributions to such a reappraisal.—THE EDITORS.)

Last November our Secretary of Defense, while in Vietnam, finally gave battlefield approval to the concept of sky cavalry. Harper's should take some pride in the fact that it published my article, "Cavalry, and I Don't Mean Horses," in 1954. That was the genesis of the idea for this new form of mobility for our ground forces. It was too revolutionary for acceptance in the Pentagon then, and Harper's performed a public service in helping advance the idea.

I would like to comment about the Vietnam situation further. I should emphasize at the outset that I am writing solely from a military-technical point of view. I was Chief of Plans and Operations in the Department of the Army when Dienbienphu brought the French endeavors in Vietnam to an end. The Chief of Staff, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, directed that we go into the situation quite thoroughly in case a decision should be made to send U.S. forces into the Hanoi Delta. As I recall, we were talking about the possibility of sending 8 divisions plus 35 engineer battalions and other auxiliary units. We had one or two old China hands on the staff at the time and the more we studied the situation the more we realized that we were, in fact, considering going to war with China, since she was supplying all the arms, ammunition, medical and other supplies to Ho Chi Minh. If we would be, in fact, fighting China, then we were fighting her in the wrong place on terms entirely to her advantage. Manchuria, with its vast industrial complex, coal, and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its war-making capacity. There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged, if at all.

I should emphasize at the outset that there are philosophical and moral aspects of the war in southeast Asia that are understandably disturbing to every thoughtful person. My comments, however, are based entirely upon a tactical evaluation of our efforts there. At the time of the French defeat, it seemed to us military planners that if an effort were made by the United States to secure Vietnam from Chinese military exploitation, and that if force on the scale that we were talking about were to be employed, then the Chinese would very likely reopen the fighting in Korea.

At the time, General Ridgway thought it prudent to bring this situation directly to the attention of President Eisenhower, pointing out that we should be prepared for a large-scale war if we were to make the initial large-scale commitment to the Hanoi Delta that we were thinking about. I thought at the time that it took great moral courage for General Ridgway to take this action, but he has never been a man to lack such courage. The President decided not to make the commitment and in his book "Mandate for Change," he commented that to have gone to war under those conditions would have been "like hitting the tail of the snake rather than the head," which is a good analogy.

Today we have sufficient force in South Vietnam to hold several enclaves on the coast, where sea and air power can be made fully effective. By enclaves I suggest Camranh Bay, Danang, and similar areas where American bases are being established. However, we are stretching these resources beyond reason in our endeavors to secure the entire country of South Vietnam from the Vietcong penetration. This situation, of course, is caused by the growing Vietcong strength.

The time has come, therefore, when we simply have to make up our mind what we want to do and then provide the resources necessary to do it. If our objective is to secure all of South Vietnam, then forces should be deployed on the 17th parallel and along the Cambodian border adequate to do this. In view of the nature of the terrain, it might be necessary to extend our defenses on the 17th parallel to the Mekong River, and across part of Thailand. Such a course would take many times as much force as we now have in Vietnam.

To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnam troops into the south. Also, if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese volunteers and the reopening of the Korean front. This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course that we are now on.

On the other hand, if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks in North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva, we could very likely do so with the forces now available. Maintaining such enclaves while an effort is being made to solve the internal situation in Vietnam, and in the face of the terroristic war that would be waged against them, poses some serious problems, and the retention of some of the enclaves may prove to be unwise; but the problems that we would then have to deal with would be far less serious than those associated with an expansion of the conflict.

I do not for a moment think that if we should withdraw from Vietnam the next stop would be Waikiki. The Kra Peninsula, Thailand, and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontiers of Thailand. But we should be realistic about the dangers of the course that we are now on. A straightforward escalation of our land power in southeast Asia to meet every land-based challenge, while at the same time we leave China and Cambodia immune from attack, poses some very forbidding prospects. I realize that our Secretary of State was recently quoted in the press as having said that "the idea of sanctuary is out." However, the initiative is not ours and there is an abundance of evidence now that both China and Cambodia are sanctuaries for Communist military strength that is used to support the Vietcong.

To get to the heart of the problem, I doubt that world opinion would tolerate the bombing and seizure of Manchuria. If the Chinese Communists continue on their present course of aggression and, at the same time, continue to develop more devastating weapons—and I refer to nuclear weapons—the time may come when China will bring upon herself a nuclear war. But that time is not here yet. In the meantime, we must do the best we can with the forces we have deployed to Vietnam, keeping in mind the true meaning of strategy in global affairs. Economics, science and technology, and world opinion will, in the long run, serve our strategic interests well if we handle our national resources wisely. On the other hand, tactical mistakes that are allowed to escalate at the initiative of an enemy could be disastrously costly. Since the advent of the space age, there has been a revolution in the nature of war and global conflict. The confrontation in Vietnam is the first test of our understanding of such change, or our lack of it. The measures that we now take in southeast Asia must stem from sagacity and thoughtfulness, and an awareness of the nature of strategy in this rapidly shrinking world.

Referring again to the sky cavalry concept, which we are now employing in South Vietnam, it is the kind of innovation that is generally unpopular in a conservative society, and in the military establishment of such a society. But many more innovations, both technical and in management methods, must be found if we are to continue to survive as a free people. Merely making bigger bombs or using more of them is not the answer. So I hope that Harper's will continue to support innovative methods when they are suggested, as you did when you first published the idea of sky cavalry in 1954.

When I retired in 1958, I said that I would be happy to serve as a private in the Army if it were the kind of an army that I wanted it to be. I think it is that kind of an Army now, and I would be happy to serve in it in any grade in Vietnam or anywhere else. It is doing a splendid job in Vietnam and needs the support of all our people.

JAMES M. GAVIN.

THE TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last year the Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held hearings on legislation to permit transportation of mail by common carrier motor vehicle. The hearings were in connection with H.R. 6472, a bill which I introduced on March 18, 1965. The purpose of that legislation was to allow the Post Office Department to ship mail between cities by truck on the same basis it now ships mail by train and plane.

During the course of last year's hearings, everyone concerned with the transportation of mail was given an opportunity to be heard. The hearings on H.R. 6472 cleared the air and, I believe, were very helpful. They demonstrated to me the urgent need for new legislation and paved the way for the introduction of a more practical legislative vehicle which I am introducing today. This legislative proposal would give the Postmaster General the authority to use regulated motor carriers on exactly the same basis as he now uses railroad service.

The purpose of my bill is to provide a means by which the Post Office Department can improve its lagging transportation services and of equal urgency to end a particularly onerous discrimination in the transportation of mail.

Motor carriers have been regulated by the Federal Government for over 30 years. In that 30-year time span, they have grown to be a vital and important part of our transportation system. The value of their service to private shippers in carrying a wide range of goods and commodities is an accepted fact of life. There can be no legitimate question raised as to their capability to handle the mail. It seems somewhat absurd that the Post Office Department is the only major entity using transportation services in the United States which cannot use regulated motor carriers in the manner in which they are best suited to serve the needs of that Department.

The Post Office Department is seeking greater flexibility in the transportation of mail in order to improve its service to the people of the United States. It seems to me that legislation of the kind I am introducing, would be an important element in their being able to achieve the widest latitude of flexibility. As a matter of fact, the representative of the Post Office Department closed his testimony last year with this kind of statement:

> I would like to emphasize the fact that it has been the position of the Department that a change in the law which would increase the flexibility of our management to cope with the complex matters we face today is what we would favor.

I should like to emphasize that the proposal put forth today would not require the Post Office Department to use any particular form of transportation. It would not favor one mode of transportation over another as has been the case for so many years. What it would do is to widen the Department's choice of available transportation service and, in so doing, would also wipe out the longstanding bar to the use of regulated motor carrier service—a service which the Post Office Department needs if it is to achieve its objective of better postal service for the American people.

IMPACT SCHOOL AID IN PERIL AGAIN

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, America's impact school aid program, authorized under Public Law 874, is in peril once again.

This program, as my colleagues know, provides supplementary funds for public schools in communities having Government installations with large numbers of Federal workers or military personnel. Because these installations and people contribute relatively little to local tax revenues, their presence imposes a special burden on local school districts. For nearly two decades, Public Law 874 has eased this burden, in many cases enabling heavily impacted school districts to remain solvent.

Despite the logic and fairness of this system, the periodic renewal of Public Law 874 has often encountered tough sledding in the executive branch and in Congress. During the 88th Congress, it will be recalled, many local school boards skirted bankruptcy before being saved by a 2-year extension of the program.

Like the beleaguered heroine of silent film serials, our impacted school districts are again being pushed to the edge of the cliff. I am informed that the Office of Education estimates a need for $416 million to maintain present levels of assistance during fiscal 1967. Against this estimate, the Budget Bureau proposes to allocate exactly $183 million.

I predict that at least half the Members will be hearing about this as frantic school superintendents begin to realize the impending crisis. Part of our problem stems from a recent change in criteria for eligibility which has qualified roughly a dozen more large cities to participate in impact aid. This occurs because the new standard qualifies school districts having 3 percent of its children from Government families, a sharp drop from the earlier requirement of 6 percent.

Yet in some highly concentrated defense areas, of which my San Diego County district is one, the impact may be nearer 20 percent. Obviously, if Public Law 874 aid is reduced by more than half, the result can only be catastrophic. School boards will be compelled to shorten their academic year—as indeed some were preparing to do late in 1964, when the impact funding was last in doubt. Curtailed building plans or faculty reductions could mean double sessions. Many boards would be forced to cut teacher pay—this, at a time we seek to make the teaching profession more attractive.

Clearly, this must not be allowed to happen. Yet if we let the Budget Bureau set our levels of assistance—if the Bureau's present plans are implemented—it is exactly what will happen.

We shall doubtless hear it said that Vietnam war expenditures impel budget reductions all down the line. In viewing today's opulent society, I say we are not yet reduced to paying for this war out of the schoolrooms of America—especially the schoolrooms serving those very communities with the most families engaged in defense-related activity.

To the Budget Bureau I say, look elsewhere with your computers and sharp pencils. Do not cheat children.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO SUPERVISE INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, authorization has been sought in the Senate to investigate the impact of the Central Intelligence Agency on U.S. foreign policy. In addition, a proposal has been introduced in the Senate to establish a joint Senate-House committee on a permanent basis to oversee CIA operations.

In line with these recent proposals, I want to call to your attention that in 1952, I first saw the need to establish a joint committee of Congress to supervise all intelligence activities; as a result, in 1953 I authorized the initial legislation proposing the establishment of a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters.

I sought the advice of the late Senator McMahon, of Connecticut, who so ably worked toward the establishment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Senator McMahon's words of advice along with much able legal assistance, aided me in writing House Concurrent Resolution 168, which I introduced on July 20, 1953. I continued to press for the adoption of this resolution in each succeeding Congress. The history surrounding this joint resolution is well established in congressional archives. It was numbered House Concurrent Resolution 29 in the 84th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 85th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 86th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 87th Congress; and House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 88th Congress.

Since the time of my introduction of this legislation, hundreds of Congressmen and Senators have adopted the resolution as their own. However, regrettably, a Congress has yet to act upon it. As a result, it is evident to me that there has been a lack of information on many critical issues until it has been too late. By way of example, lack of information has contributed importantly to the tragic incidences of the Hungarian revolution and the fall of the Diem regime.

I believe very strongly that the establishment of a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters is long overdue. Had this joint committee been established in the past, many of the problems involving U.S. intelligence would not be in the forefront of world news today.

I cannot state emphatically enough my belief in the need of such committee. For this reason, I have again written to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the gentleman from Virginia, Judge HOWARD SMITH, chairman of the Committee on Rules, to consider the number of similar resolutions introduced and to give their approval in order that this legislation may be brought to the floor.

Therefore, I urge that each and every one of my colleagues look into the need for such a resolution and act upon it in this 2d session of the 89th Congress.

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT FORESHADOWS ANOTHER YEAR OF PROGRESS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the remarkable performance of our national economy in recent years was not an accident. It represents a victory for all Americans. It is a particular victory for the administration, and a well-earned reward for its faith in the productive capacity and flexibility of the American economic system.

The President's strategy for invigorating the American economy received cheers from most Americans right from the start, 2 years ago. But skepticism and doubts were also heard. The fainthearted warned us that there was no room for expansion in an already prosperous economy. They saw bottlenecks in every industry. They saw the destruction of our price stability. They saw deterioration in our balance of payments. They were sure that the millions of unemployed were permanently unemployable.

Now the President's Economic Report brings us ringing proof that the skeptics were wrong. Unemployment has fallen from 5¾ percent of the labor force in late 1963 to near 4 percent today. Millions who once spent their time on hiring lines are now contributing to progress on the production line. The gains in employment have been especially marked for the less skilled and the disadvantaged members of our labor force. Two hundred and seventy thousand nonwhites and 560,000 teenagers were added to the employed last year. Businessmen are using their ingenuity to train and hire labor. Bottlenecks are so rare as to be remarkable. Our workers are taking full advantage of new opportunities for training and better jobs.

Industrial production has risen 15 percent in the past 2 years and is still not straining our productive capacity. As the Council's report makes clear, backlogs of orders have remained moderate, operating rates are generally staying within levels of peak efficiency, and businessmen now have the incentives and the funds to expand capacity to meet growing demand. Thus, we added $47 billion to our production last year while holding price increases below 2 percent. And we scored great gains in our balance of payments.

The President is predicting a repeat performance of last year's record gains in output and employment, and last year's price moderation. There will be doubters again. But most Americans will share the President's judgment, which has proved so right in the past 2 years. There is no reason to expect a retreat from the brilliant record of 1964 and 1965.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues legislation I have introduced to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. My proposal would extend for an additional year the eligibility of certain areas of our Nation to receive assistance with public works and development projects deemed essential to accelerate their future growth. Timing is a major factor, since many of the areas covered by this amendment stand to lose their eligibility for aid before their applications for assistance can be carefully examined and processed.

As you will recall, before this important act was passed by the House last August, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] was successful in his effort to have the bill amended so that areas having a history of substantial unemployment during the preceding calendar year would be eligible for benefits under title I. This action served as a stimulant to nearly 100 areas of our Nation which were not seriously depressed, but nevertheless not in the prosperous category and therefore in need of some outside help if their overall development plans were going to materialize in the not too distant future.

The approach of the so-called Sisk amendment made sense and received the support it deserved. I was enthusiastic in my response because I have long maintained that it is wrong for us to get so absorbed in our efforts to assist the chronically depressed areas that we neglect to make some provision to assist what I consider to be fringe areas; that is, those areas which, through the hard work, sound planning, and determined efforts of their people, have advanced from the designation as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and have their goals set even higher.

It is my strong belief that these areas on the move will reach the higher plateaus they are seeking if we will not suddenly withdraw our support as soon as we see signs of progress. As we all know, a kite rapidly ascending into the sky may experience a pronounced reversal in direction once the impetus of an outside force, beyond its control, disappears. The analogy is valid.

To illustrate the need for the amendment being discussed, I wish to relay to you the situation as it applies to the Utica-Rome labor market area within my congressional district. Let me hasten to add that many other areas, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, are faced with a near-identical situation. This matter is being thoroughly researched and I expect to have a list of these areas in the near future.

The Utica-Rome labor market, encompassing Oneida and Herkimer Counties, has had its share of hard knocks over the years, the most recent of which was the loss of several thousand jobs as a result of a Department of Defense decision to phase out a major mission located at Griffiss Air Force Base. Our people have a resiliency in them and although they do not easily accept action that has an adverse effect on the local economy, rather than continually lamenting about past misfortunes, they are searching for new and broader horizons. This is as it should be.

When the Public Works and Economic Development Act was passed, I received many telephone calls and letters from leaders in my district. They were pleased with the manner in which the bill was so amended because they could envision their plans for future progress receiving a shot in the arm in the form of Federal assistance for industrial parks and other such projects designed to attract new industry and additional jobs to boost the economy.

In comparison to some other areas of the country, Utica-Rome certainly could not be classified as depressed. Our leaders knew this and had just about ruled out the possibility of receiving aid from Washington for many proposals already on the drawing boards. However, they also knew that they must proceed with these plans if they were going to avoid the dark and dismal fate that had overtaken less fortunate areas of the Nation. They were faced with a dilemma that was less than encouraging when suddenly a key amendment to a major bill gave them new hope. Here, they thought, might be a partial solution to some of their financing problems. What happened?

Since the Department of Labor's review of the average annual unemployment statistics for the Utica-Rome labor market for 1964 revealed that the area had indeed had substantial unemployment for that year, classification as a title I area was automatic. As a result, the type of project approved and the amount of assistance authorized by the newly formed Economic Development Administration, would be dependent upon the merits of the particular project and whether or not the community or county or other body making application did so in accordance with EDA regulations.

At this point, it is important to explore some significant facts:

First, the Sisk amendment stipulated that the Department of Labor conduct an annual review to determine if the areas covered continue to meet the eligibility requirements for title I assistance. For example, all areas covered under title I will be reviewed by June of this year. If the unemployment figures for 1965 do not reveal that a given area remains in the substantial unemployment category, that area will lose its title I eligibility. In other words, the door for EDA assistance will be closed to those areas that have managed to get over the hump.

If you fail to thoroughly analyze this situation, there is a tendency to accept this approach as sound. Why help areas of moderate unemployment? Again, permit the use of another analogy. When you are rescuing someone who has fallen through the ice into a pond, you do not just pull him halfway out, you follow through with the job until you are certain the individual is on solid ground and can maneuver for himself. In other words, I say let us not penalize an area for making progress by withdrawing our support. If it has advanced from what I term the fringe stage and is heading in the direction of solid ground, let us stay with it a while longer to make certain it reaches that destination.

If the present plan for the annual review and the subsequent cutting off from eligibility of areas that have experienced a mild degree of success is carried through, then Utica-Rome and many other locations from coast to coast will be left on their own with a short-term record of employment stability. I believe—and from my conversations I know the majority of my colleagues share this view—steps should be taken to assist in the development and maintenance of sound local economies. In my judgment, a sound local economy is based, among other things, on a record of long-term employment stability. My proposed amendment will serve to assist many sections of the country in achieving this enviable goal because it will enable them to remain qualified for and likely to receive Federal aid for the very projects designed to accomplish that end.

Unless we take this action the intent of Congress regarding title I areas will not be carried out. I do not point an accusing finger at anyone since circumstances, not deliberate effort, of footdragging, are responsible for the delay. But, I do wish to emphasize that the individual areas, such as Utica-Rome, are completely absolved of any blame in the matter. These areas had a backlog of projects ready to submit to the Economic Development Administration for consideration as soon as the groundrules for administering the program were established and the project applications could be tailored to meet the requirements spelled out by the EDA.

As soon as it embarked upon this program, EDA made a determination that no area would be eligible for assistance unless it had on file an approved overall economic development program—OEDP. To quote from a document provided Members of Congress by the Economic Development Administration:

> No area may be designated (for assistance) unless it has an approved overall economic development program and no project may be approved unless it is consistent with such a program.

To review for just a moment, let us examine EDA's definition of an OEDP:

> A continuing process of area self-analysis, planning and action to create new economic activity and improve community facilities and services. It involves the establishment of development goals; and the organization of local citizens to do the job on a continuous basis.

I approve this approach to the problem in that it unequivocally states that assistance will not be granted on a hit-or-miss basis to hastily conceived projects, but rather will only be given to those projects that are well thought out and are consistent with a comprehensive, long-range area development plan.

Here was the picture as soon as the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 became law: Hundreds of areas across the country were encouraged to get their planning machinery in high gear because an assistance program had been approved and would soon be operating and those areas with a sound program for future progress, that is, for the purposes of this new agency, an approved overall economic development program, would be in position to maximize the benefits they would receive under the act.

Immediately, I provided the proper officials in my district with all available information on this promising program. I initiated continuing contact with the Economic Development Administration with a standing request that I be kept apprised of new developments as they occurred. Arrangements were made with EDA for the commissioner of planning for Oneida and Herkimer Counties to attend special Washington briefing by Secretary Foley on the new act. A conference was arranged for our commissioner of planning and members of my staff with Dr. Ben Chinitz, Director, Office of Regional Economic Development. All forces were put in motion and the officials at EDA were most cooperative. As a matter of fact, when the plans for the long-range development of Oneida and Herkimer Counties were outlined to Dr. Chinitz and his staff, they too were able to visualize a promising future for our area and shared enthusiasm for our approach. However, at that time, it was stipulated that action on any applications for assistance would not be forthcoming until an OEDP, in accordance with—yet to be defined—EDA regulations, was approved and on file.

Of course, it is not too difficult to imagine what happened. EDA was burdened with the many problems attendant upon the establishment of a new agency; a staff had to be recruited, regulations developed, inquiries answered. Consequently, there was an understandable delay in the issuance of guidelines to be used in drawing up an overall economic development program. In fact, such guidelines were not made available to my office until January 20 of this year. Immediately I forwarded these guidelines to an anxiously waiting planning staff back home who were ready, willing, and able to adjust an already developed OEDP to meet the just announced regulations. With these minor adjustments completed, everything became in order and the applications for assistance could be filed with EDA.

As we all know, these applications for assistance have to be carefully scrutinized at many levels. Projects have to be evaluated, cost estimates carefully analyzed, additional information—when required—obtained. All of this takes precious time. I think you can clearly see what is happening. The time for the first annual review, to determine an area's eligibility for assistance, is going to be upon us before the processing of applications for aid to many title I locations will be completed. In short, the intent of Congress to help areas help themselves will not be realized in many instances, because of a lack of time.

I strongly believe that action is both desired and needed to correct this situation and accordingly urge my colleagues to join me in support of my proposed amendment. Let us give these areas an extra year of life in order that they may be permitted to follow through with their respective programs to establish sound local economies and ultimately a stronger America.

THE HONORABLE OREN HARRIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that my native State of Arkansas down through the decades has been privileged to have been represented in the Congress by many distinguished men of great and lasting public stature.

While several names could be mentioned in this connection, I need only allude to the late, great majority leader of the Senate, Joseph T. Robinson, the late great Senator, the Honorable Thaddeus Carraway, to indicate the caliber of persons to whom reference is made. Our distinguished colleague, who is soon to leave this body, the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Oren Harris, in my opinion takes his place in this small but select group.

The luster of our State has been brightened and its heritage has been enriched by the service of our esteemed and admired colleague, who, after 25 years of dedicated and devoted work for the people of the State of Arkansas and the people of the United States, is now resigning to accept a position in the judicial branch. His place in the annals of our State as one of the great legislators of all time is assured.

Oren and I have been the closest of personal friends for nearly three decades. We have worked together on many difficult legislative problems, both State and National. We have witnessed and been a part of many great changes in our economy and our Government. As the chairman of one of the great committees of the House, Oren has left his imprint on our economy and on the laws of our country. Our State will miss Oren Harris' representation of it in this body; the Nation will miss Oren Harris, because he has been a truly great legislator and a sagacious, discerning, dedicated, and strong committee chairman. Over the years he has been an exemplary example for young people as well as his colleagues.

We can only consider ourselves fortunate that Oren's public service does not come to an end and that the legislative branch's loss will be the judiciary's gain.

From close personal contact with Oren Harris over a period of three decades, I have no hesitation in saying that no one within my acquaintanceship has served with greater distinction or more profound ability than Oren Harris. He brought great capability, character, and a high intelligence when he first came to office. He has grown in stature year by year since he first came here, and he takes to the judicial branch of the Government a rich experience, a profound knowledge of the law and, beyond all, a deep and abiding wisdom and mature judgment which, in my opinion, are qualities greatly needed in the judicial branch of the Government. His very presence will lend strength to the judiciary, and his judicial temperament, his understanding and appreciation of his fellow man will serve him well as he engages in his new duties.

We have over the years, observed with admiration and respect the manner in which Oren has handled business of the highly important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. His handling of committee bills has been superb. No one can explain more succinctly and yet comprehensively, the contents of a bill. He has been an outstanding legislator, a great chairman, a wonderful friend, and a fine statesman. I regret his decision to leave this body; I take solace in the fact that he will be serving in the judicial branch in our home State of Arkansas.

The bonds of friendship and mutual respect which have united us over the decades as we have served together in this body will continue as he goes to perform an equally outstanding service in another branch of our great Government. I wish him, Mrs. Harris, and their family well and join in an expression of hope that OREN will visit us here frequently so that we may further benefit from the warmth of his friendship and the strength of his mind and character.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is wholly fitting and proper that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] has obtained this time today in the House to pay tribute to a great American, our colleague, the Honorable OREN HARRIS. It has been a source of real gratification and pleasure to work with OREN HARRIS for more than a quarter of a century in this House. He is a real fixture in the House of Representatives. He possesses a very fine family. OREN HARRIS is a Christian gentleman, without hypocrisy. His constituents have been most considerate of OREN, but he in return has been an able, gifted, and effective Representative on behalf of his constituents. He has rendered superb service to the people of the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, Henry Drummond in his book "The Greatest Thing in the World," set out nine attributes of a perfect man, a good man. Those qualities enumerated by Mr. Drummond are: patience, kindness, generosity, humility, courtesy, unselfishness, good temper, sincerity, and guilelessness.

Mr. Speaker, OREN HARRIS possesses those qualities, each and all of them, in great abundance.

To possess guilelessness, that is the basic reason for the trust and the influence a person may have.

Mr. Speaker, OREN HARRIS thinks no evil. He exemplifies the teachings of the Master. Jesus saw Nathaniel coming to him and sayeth of him, "Behold a man in whom there is no guile," or words of similar import.

Mr. Speaker, OREN HARRIS is a leader among men. He is a versatile man. You find that he has interested himself in many fields of endeavor. He has excelled in all of them whether presiding over the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or as the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, whether it has to do with his work with the gymnasium of the House or the baseball team which he had headed so well in behalf of his party. He performed those duties with absolute fairness, without bias, and with full understanding of the attitude and feeling of others.

Mr. Speaker, OREN HARRIS believes that every question has two sides. He has all of the characteristics to make him an excellent—an outstanding—U.S. district judge. Although his district is being deprived of his services the State of Arkansas will be the beneficiary.

Mr. Speaker, I wish for him, Ruth, his daughter and son, and grandchildren Godspeed as he returns to his native State of Arkansas to continue his public service as the wearer of the toga of the judiciary.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, today we are paying tribute to one of Arkansas' great sons, our colleague, OREN HARRIS, who is leaving us to assume the responsibilities of a Federal judge in Arkansas.

I first saw OREN when we were prosecuting attorneys, he from the southwest corner of the State and I from the district in the northwest corner of the State. We were in Little Rock in a prosecuting attorneys' meeting. I was impressed with him then and have been impressed with him in the years since.

OREN was in the House of Representatives before I came in 1945. I have served with him and have admired him. He was one of the most able chairmen of this great body, and he is leaving his imprint upon the economy of our country not only in the field of transportation and communication but upon legislation pertaining to health.

We regret to see him go. However, our best wishes follow him and his devoted wife, Ruth, as they return home. May the years which lie ahead bring all that is good to them and their loved ones.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means, in his words of tribute to his colleague and our friend, OREN HARRIS.

OREN HARRIS is a strong member of one of the strongest delegations ever to serve in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, when OREN HARRIS leaves this body to begin a new career on the Federal bench, we will have lost one of our most dynamic Members and one of the most effective committee chairmen in the history of the House.

OREN has served here a quarter of a century. That he has done so much during these years is evidence of the dedication and industry which he has brought to his work. He has served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce since 1940 and as its chairman since 1957. No committee of the Congress deals more directly with the economics of American life, nor resolves more issues among competing economic interests. No committee has more to do with the health and well-being of our people. No committee has a wider range of jurisdiction. No committee more urgently requires a chairman of balance and judgment—one capable of leadership, strength, and good will. These are the qualities which OREN HARRIS combines with expertise in communications, transportation, fair trade, petroleum, and natural gas, and more recently public health. He has become the man who knows whether it be the Communications Satellite Corp., or securities.

The late Speaker Rayburn called OREN HARRIS "one of the great committee chairmen of all time." I know that compliment confirmed a judgment the Speaker had made many years ago when OREN first came to the House. Like all great men, OREN is always on top of his job. He knows what he is about. He has the courage to act or to wait as circumstances may dictate. He has the intelligence and understanding, the depth and strength of character that make a great committee chairman. He has won our admiration and respect and our hearts as well. We regret his departure; we will miss him. He goes to the Federal bench with the confidence of the President and the entire Congress. We know that OREN HARRIS will serve in the judicial system with the same distinction which has characterized his service in the House. We wish for him and Mrs. Harris the richest blessings of life.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the very distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on a previous occasion I made some remarks in the House when a very important bill was up which was reported out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, concerning our distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Throughout the entire history of our country, there have been many thousands of men and women who have served in this body. There have been many outstanding Members in the decades and generations of yesterday and there will be many in the decades and generations that lie ahead.

But there is no Member who has devoted himself more earnestly, more untiringly and in a more dedicated manner in the performance of his duties than our dear friend from Arkansas, OREN HARRIS. When he took the floor handling a bill from his committee, he commanded the respect, attention and friendship of all Members of the House.

I remember well not so long ago when OREN HARRIS had a bill coming up. He called to see me—I was then majority leader—about having a poll taken. I said to him, "OREN, I think the best poll is you when you are on the floor of the House." I said, "When your colleagues in the House of Representatives with the respect they have for you and the friendship they have for you, see you handling a bill on the floor of the House, instead of asking beforehand how they feel about a bill—and they might be uncertain—but when they see you fighting for the passage of a bill that is the best poll anyone could take."

When the bill came up, it passed without any difficulty confirming the judgment I had on that occasion which was based upon the great respect and friendship that the Members of the House of Representatives had then and do have now for Oren Harris—and not only for him personally but for him as a legislator.

So everything that is being said about Oren Harris is correct, but there is something else about Oren Harris that we hold near and dear. That is Oren Harris as a human being. He is one of the noblest minded men any of us have ever met. There is no one who represents to a nobler or higher degree humanly possible those nicer qualities of life that make up an understanding mind, particularly in relation to one's fellow human beings than the wonderful and beautiful and understanding mind possessed by Oren Harris.

That kind of mind is something that the person himself must develop and, yes, that kind of mind can be an inspiration to others. Oren Harris has developed within himself throughout the years those fine qualities of character that justify his being carried in the minds of his friends and numbered in their minds and the minds of all others as one of God's noblemen.

The House is going to lose by resignation and retirement from the House one of its most valued and, as I said, on the human level, one of its most treasured Members. He leaves us to enter upon another sphere of human activity in the public service of our country, having been appointed by President Johnson and confirmed by the Senate to the responsible position of a Federal judge. In that position he will carry with him those rich qualities he possesses, and he will add strength and prestige to the Federal judiciary.

I have often considered in my mind what represents, as near as is humanly possible, the perfect judge. None of us can be perfect, but we can approximate it as near as is humanly possible. I have pictured such a judge as one who has profound faith, who has deep moral values, and who recognizes that in his passing of judgment on his fellow men, the nearer he gets to the life and mind of Christ the Redeemer, the better judge he will be.

Oren Harris is one of those men. His deep faith, his intense moral outlook on life, the moral origin of his thinking and of his life will be carried by him into the courtroom, and those rich qualities will add strength and prestige to the Federal judiciary of our country.

Oren Harris will always be a Member of the House in the minds of those of us who have served with him. I hope that when he leaves here to take over his judicial position that his visits back to the House will be frequent. Whenever he comes back he will always be received in the minds of his colleagues as an active Member.

While I regret, in a sense, seeing Oren Harris leave the legislative branch of the Government, the judiciary branch will be enriched as a result of the experiences and contributions that he has made to the strength and progress of our country while he served in this branch, not only as a Member, but one of the outstanding Members who has ever served in the Congress of the United States.

So I join with the countless thousands of friends of Oren Harris and Mrs. Harris in extending to them my very best wishes for every future happiness and success.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, just about one quarter of a century ago a young attorney from El Dorado was elected to represent the Fourth Congressional District of Arkansas contiguous to the First Congressional District of Texas, and we have been good neighbors ever since. The line separating the States of Texas and Arkansas runs down State Line Avenue in my hometown of Texarkana and evenly divides the Federal building, courthouse, and post office, but there is no obvious division between the citizens of these two great States who mingle their lives as they do their shopping on both sides of the Texas-Arkansas line. In our part of the country, perhaps even more than in other sections because of our pioneering heritage, a man's neighbor is in fact more like a member of his family. Oren Harris has been just such a good friend to me, always ready to help with matters which would mutually benefit our constituencies, and because of his great abilities Oren was always a tower of strength and most effective in such matters.

Since we had both received our law degrees from Cumberland University and since we had both prepared for congressional careers by serving as prosecuting attorneys, I always felt a particular kinship with this hard-driving, tough-minded, indefatigable colleague whose energy and output seemed always to increase the more he was called upon to do. In Congress Oren Harris quickly reached a position which gave full scope to his immense natural abilities. As chairman of one of the most important committees of the House of Representatives, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Oren Harris constantly demonstrated his quick and sure grasp of the myriad issues running through our entire economic and social fabric. It is my impression that in solving so many problems with such spectacular success Oren Harris drew strength and guidance from sources which only he can thoroughly know, but his genius could only have been deep rooted in a wonderful family life with a fervent spiritual background. I have heard it said that no other Congressman so looks the part of poised intelligence and alert strength, strength to deal with adversaries where strength is needed, and subtlety to grasp every nuance in the rapid-fire exchange of argument or discussion. It is with great sorrow and regret that I see this compeer among Congressmen depart from our midst to assume the robes of a Federal judge. It is imperative, however, that the powers of mind and spirit that have so well served the House of Representatives and the Nation should continue to serve our country. Our one solace is that in this new field of endeavor Oren Harris will be called upon to make full use of his great abilities.

I fully endorse and approve everything that has been said about our departing colleague, the Honorable Oren Harris; and particularly what has been said by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills], who has known him so long, and by the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable John McCormack, and by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader, the Honorable Carl Albert.

A good neighbor and a great Congressman, Oren Harris continues to serve America.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia, the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's yielding to me at this time for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago a venerable and venerated American university constructed an archway at one of its main entrances. On one of the pedestals of the arch an inscription was carved: "Enter this gate and seek the way of honor, the light of truth, the will to work for men." Over the years, this inscription has confronted the eyes of thousands of young men. In some, it has sunk deep into their inmost consciousness, and quickened into life the seeds of greatness which are a part of the heritage of many men, perhaps of most men. It is an expression of the spirit of our sagacious and heroic forebears who built on this continent a new order of social organization, and nourished and guided it through two centuries of turbulent history.

It is indeed a fortunate nation that can still count among its statesmen men thoroughly imbued in that spirit which approaches so closely to the divine. They walk among us and we deal with them in numerous ways every day without being fully aware of their high worth to their age and generation. It often happens that only when our association with them is broken we come to a full realization of their contribution to the society of which they are a part.

No more conspicuous an illustration of this situation is in evidence today than the retiring chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Honorable Oren Harris, of Arkansas. When we consider the long laudable service he has rendered as chairman and as a member of the committee, and as leader in the majesty which hovers over this Supreme Legislature of the American people, we are impressed anew with the poet's lines:

> Honor has come back, as a king to earth,
> And paid his subjects with a royal wage;
> And nobleness walks in our ways again,
> And we have come into our heritage.

In the age in which our lot is cast, a necessary characteristic of a man who would advance the cause of idealism is a liberal streak of practicality.

When events seem to hang motionless in a timeless sea of time, idealism can pause to dream and contemplate. But when these events move swifter than a weaver's shuttle, action must follow close on stimulation. The world is full of conflicting demands. They will not wait for the slow process of analysis and adjudication. Right and wrong appear before us in almost identical garb. It is most difficult to distinguish between them. Happy is the legislator if by long and virtuous training he has learned to take honor as his guiding star and if his mind is so attuned to fundamental truth that he reacts toward the right as if by instinct.

Many issues have come under the keen scrutiny of Chairman Harris in the years of his leadership. We have not always agreed. To some of us at times truth and justice fell in a different line from his. Under his impassionate guidance, each of us has had his opportunity to present right as he saw it. We have never been uncertain as to where he stood. In the end, a decision was made under true democratic principles. And to that decision he stood as firmly as any of us, whether it was in accord with or opposed to his own judgment.

Now Oren Harris leaves us to assume other responsibilities. I cannot bring myself to say that they are greater responsibilities. But they are other responsibilities, and "national honor is national property of the highest value." We rejoice that in leaving the legislative branch he is not depriving the Nation of his ability, his judgment, and his fidelity to his trust. I shall miss him—as a friend, as a counselor, as a model of legislative competence and integrity. Oren Harris carries to the judiciary all the qualities of mind and heart and soul which have set him apart as a legislator. He is equal to the task that lies before him, for he is one of the selected few:

One in whom persuasion and belief
Had ripened into faith, and faith become
A passionate intuition.

If Providence wills it so, we shall hear of Oren Harris in the coming years. No position in the judicial branch of government is so exalted that his genius would not adorn it.

May the Lord which dwelleth in heaven watch over his going and coming from this day henceforth and forever.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Macdonald] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is my genuine pleasure to join the many friends who are today paying tribute to our distinguished friend from Arkansas, Representative Oren Harris.

While we can appreciate the great challenge that his new position as Federal court judge will bring to the gentleman from Arkansas, we also sincerely regret the loss of his years of experience and of his wisdom in dealing with the matters which have, and will, come before this body.

Mr. Speaker, since the time Oren announced his intended departure from Capitol Hill, there have been many tributes paid to him. These have come not only from those of us here in the Congress and from those constituents whom he has represented so ably for these past 25 years. But they have come also from the average American, who has benefited from the legislation which the gentleman from Arkansas has sponsored and championed here in the House.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, my remarks come from one who has had the great privilege and pleasure of calling Oren Harris my chairman. In fact, he has been chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee since my own second term as a Member of this distinguished body. I can truly say that it has been a pleasure to serve with such a gentleman as Chairman Harris for these past 11 years.

Many people forget that prior to his becoming chairman he was the strong right arm of another wonderful man, the late Honorable Percy Priest. His work for Congressman Priest was of the highest caliber and, as his later service as chairman could also be categorized, was "above and beyond the call of duty." He has always shown tremendous diligence in carrying out the work which confronts him as chairman of our great committee, and his complete understanding of the many and varied subject matters which come before that committee is truly a matter for admiration.

I have seen Chairman Harris under many circumstances—that of personal friend, traveling companion, and served under his leadership in the gym, where I saw him prove the theory of mens sana in corpore sano. And in observing him in these fields I have seen the very human side of Oren Harris as devoted husband and father and know him to be one of the nicest people that it has been my pleasure to have met through my service here in the Congress. I know that his guidance and advice will be missed by many on the committee, especially myself, for even when I have been in slight disagreement with my chairman, I have found after further study that the reasons he advanced for his positions were always cogent and well founded.

In expressing my personal regret at the loss from our ranks of our colleague, I can only wish for him the very best of good luck for the future. I am certain that he will bring to his new career that same sense of loyal dedication and commitment which has made him so outstanding a legislator, and I have every confidence that his past successes will be duplicated as well in his new capacity.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Springer] who is unavoidably detained and could not be here at this time, be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Matsunaga). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, having been a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for 16 years now, and the ranking minority member for 2, I feel that I have had the opportunity to observe and work with Oren Harris in a relationship which is unique and which qualifies me to make observations about him which few if any other Members of this body would be able to duplicate. Memories of this long association run together to blend those which are personal and those which are professional but it would be wrong, unfair, and misleading to try to separate out the qualities of this man, a warm human being, from those which made him a great committee chairman. They are one and the same.

It is common knowledge that Oren Harris ran a good committee. Those who might have profited by internal dissension therein were constantly doomed to disappointment and defeat. Not that the issues before it did not lend themselves to sharp and even bitter difference of opinion and conviction. They usually did. Some of the most complex, delicate, and controversial issues to reach this floor have come from Oren's committee. But they came here with the nearest thing to agreement among the members that great leadership, understanding, and high principled statesmanship could accomplish. Oren Harris never asked a man to abandon the interest of his constituents or his own personal convictions about an issue. He acknowledged the presence of these factors in every piece of legislation upon which we have worked. He went to great lengths to see that every member of his committee got the chance to have his say, to present his views and if it was possible he accommodated those views.

There have been times when members of our committee have been criticized by their colleagues. I know very well it has happened over here on the minority side, and I would wager that it happened across the aisle. We have been criticized for not fighting to the last ditch for some feature of a bill which the committee finally reported without dissent. Whether or not these critics were right I can say without reservation that had they been on our committee and subjected to the skill, the understanding, and the persuasion of Oren Harris they might have given up far more. Had such power and skill been used by a smaller man I would not now be proud to have acknowledged the influence he wielded. But I am glad of the record made by this outstanding legislator and I am proud of any part I may have had in the work he so ably accomplished.

Oren Harris worked harder at being a good chairman than anyone not closely allied with him could imagine. He wanted to be right and those around him could sense this easily. When the chairman told us that he had talked with interested parties or officials of executive departments and they had said thus and so or had agreed to certain things no one ever thought to question or double check. If he would tell his committee it was so—it was so. And being human he was not always 100 percent right. He was just wrong enough to make him human. And he was man enough at all times to be the first to recognize it. And even when he was wrong, his stature and integrity were so great that no one but a fool or a knave would stoop to question his motives.

That is the kind of man we are losing to the judiciary. It would be great for history and for our beloved country if this body could boast of a hundred Oren Harrises in our midst but such men do not come along every day. To have had once such man devote a quarter of a century to the vitally important business of this legislative body is probably more than we should expect. I for one am sorry to see it end but no man here has more truly earned the right to go on to new endeavors. And we might note that despite his deserving the best of everything he leaves only to continue to serve his country in another capacity. We are all better for having been associated with our colleague Oren Harris.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding to me. I would like to join with my colleagues in everything they have said about our colleague, Oren Harris. I would like to add only this: That if he conducts himself on the bench as he has in the House—and I know he will—no one appearing before his court will receive other than justice, because Oren Harris, as chairman of our committee, has always taken cognizance of both sides of the question. He has treated fairly all of those on the minority side. I know full well that Arkansas courts will be enriched by his presence. We will miss him. Godspeed to him.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Williams].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as the most senior member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have been privileged to work with Oren Harris on that committee longer than any other member. Having been associated with Oren Harris for some 18 years on that committee, and having sat next to him there for more than 10 years, I feel, Mr. Speaker, I am in a better position perhaps than any other member of that committee to evaluate the service of this great man.

Oren Harris has been an outstanding Representative of his constituency and the entire country. In my opinion he is the most skilled legislative mechanic I have known in my entire career in the House of Representatives. He is also one of the most productive Members ever to serve in this distinguished body.

Mr. Speaker, in our committee I have seen Oren Harris bring order out of what appeared to be hopeless chaos on many occasions. I have seen his skill in writing legislative language serve as the catalyst that brought warring factions within his committee and among the various industries into complete agreement and accord on issues previously deemed to be endlessly stalemated and deadlocked. His ability to bring accord out of controversy is almost uncanny, as if he might possess a sixth sense about legislation and issues.

Mr. Speaker, a recital of the legislative accomplishments of Oren Harris during his career in this body would fill volumes. I shall not attempt to enumerate them here. But as a legislator he has gained for himself a notable place in the history of our country. The fruits of his labors will inure to the lasting benefit of the people and to the Government of our country.

Mr. Speaker, as Oren Harris leaves this body to enter a new field of public service, I am sure that all who serve here will agree that the loss of the Congress is a significant gain for the judiciary. As the result of his education, experience, ability, temperament, and character, Oren Harris is eminently qualified for this new office and no doubt will make an equally distinguished and outstanding record there.

Mr. Speaker, as he leaves the Congress where he has served so well, our hopes and prayers go with him. Mrs. Williams and my family join me in wishing for Oren Harris and his lovely wife Ruth and their family a full measure of happiness and good fortune as they return to Arkansas to resume life there.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, some of us who have served in legislative bodies over a period of years look back and think of men that we remember because of their stature and ability. I know that I shall look back and when I do I also know that Oren Harris will stand tall among the men with whom I have served during the past 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of which he has been chairman through these years has produced a great amount of good legislation, legislation in the public interest. One of the observations that I have heard of our committee's work has been that minority views are seldom filed. The reason for that is because of the fact that the chairman has always been willing to listen to all members of the committee on both sides of the aisle, to weigh carefully the differences of opinion, and to iron them out. Therefore, when a bill came from that committee to the floor of the House, usually there was nearly total agreement on major points.

So now, Mr. Speaker, when Oren goes to a new field I am sure he will conduct himself commendably in that field as he has here in the Congress. I believe that the judiciary of our great country will be enriched by his service as the Nation has been enriched by his legislative prowess.

Mr. Speaker, we wish Oren Harris well in his new capacity and extend our best wishes to him and his lovely wife and family.

Mr. Speaker, I join with our colleagues again in congratulating him on his fine accomplishments.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a rare privilege indeed to have the opportunity of acknowledging the high regard one holds for a colleague while he is still with us and in the prime of life, but about to embark upon a new and exciting career.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that only those of us who have been privileged to serve with Oren Harris can fully appreciate the great skill which is being lost to this House of Representatives. Truly, the judiciary gains at the expense of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, my service on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce precisely spans the service of Oren Harris as chairman. I would be proud indeed, however many years I might serve as a Member of Congress, if I could look back upon a record half as productive, half as constructive as the record which Oren Harris has built during his 8 years as chairman of the truly great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The scope of the legislative jurisdiction of that committee is unmatched by any in the House of Representatives. The impact of significant new legislation written in the past few years will not be fully appreciated by any of us for many years yet to come. But I feel very secure in saying that no committee has more significantly aided the health, welfare, and progress of this Nation than that committee under Oren Harris.

I agree with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Williams] when he said that on many occasions order has been brought from chaos and that that which seemed impossible was finally made possible because of the unique skill of Oren Harris.

I can only wish for Oren and his wife many years of great happiness. I have not the slightest doubt that he will prove a truly great member of the Federal judiciary and he has my every good wish for his success.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Landrum].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, the record and the personal life of Oren Harris afford us a tremendous opportunity to study the sharp contrast between a man of influence and a man of power.

Not so many years ago a newcomer in the House of Representatives said to me in talking about various Members of the House he had met and seen in action that he understood and had observed that Mr. Harris of Arkansas was one of the most powerful men in the House of Representatives. I said, "No, you are absolutely wrong. He is not the most powerful or among the most powerful. Neither is he a man who would desire to be associated with that description of being powerful. Rather he is a man of influence." Distinguishing between those two terms, I said to him that Oren Harris is influential because he is a man of very strong character with great consideration for the ideas and feelings of others.

Second, he is a man of great influence because he is very thorough in carrying out his responsibilities as chairman of a very important committee.

Later, that same Member came to me and said, "I have listened to what you said to me some weeks ago and I have watched this gentleman from Arkansas in operation as chairman of this committee and in managing bills out of his committee on the floor of the House and I have discovered that he is really a man of influence and not a man of power."

OREN HARRIS is influential because he has been able and is able to develop a sort of confidence in all of the Members that led them to believe he is a man who would never mislead a fellow man.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a great privilege to me, as a matter of fact, a very valuable personal privilege to have had the opportunity to serve in this great body with a man of his distinction and his character. While I shall miss him personally and while I shall probably have to do my homework a little more vigorously than I have on some of the legislation that comes out of this committee since I will not have OREN HARRIS to depend on absolutely, I must say I am rather pleased to see a man of his high qualities and strong character go to the Federal bench. For the welfare of America cannot be anything but better as a result of this distinguished man's efforts on the bench.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure and a privilege to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas. This committee, under the leadership of OREN HARRIS, has made many substantial and important contributions to the well-being of the people of the United States and, as he dons his judicial robes, our chairman can certainly do so with the knowledge of a job well done in the legislative branch of our Government.

The people of the Fourth District of the great State of Arkansas chose wisely and well when they returned him to the U.S. Congress for 13 consecutive terms.

The Federal courts are acquiring an able and astute member who will add much to the prestige of the judiciary, but the gain to the judiciary is certainly a great loss to the legislative branch of our Government.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to OREN HARRIS; a man who has been one of the great legislators in the history of this House. It has been my pleasure to serve on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of which OREN has been chairman for the last 9 years, and during that time I have come to both admire and respect this great American.

One of the hallmarks of a great legislator is integrity. Another is thorough knowledge of the subject matter to be considered, and still another is a willingness to look at all sides of an issue and consider all opinions on a question. I have never known OREN HARRIS to deviate from maintaining these standards in his leadership of our committee. He has combined the power of his position with his own natural wisdom into a partnership of obvious success.

It is now 25 years since the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Arkansas sent OREN HARRIS to the U.S. Congress. He has served them and our Nation with great distinction and honor. Now he will leave us to take a position on the bench of the Federal District Court for Arkansas. I am sure he will continue to serve in this capacity with equal distinction.

If I were to name all of the legislation which has OREN's mark upon it this great body would be in session for many hours. What he guided through the House of Representatives in the 1st session of the 89th Congress is a most remarkable accomplishment in itself. The President called the 1st session of the 89th Congress the "Health Congress." If that is true, and I agree that it is, OREN HARRIS is Mr. Health. Under his leadership bills were passed which controlled the illegal traffic in drugs; set up a program to conquer heart, cancer, and stroke diseases; extended grants for health services to migratory workers; passed legislation to provide for the disposal of solid wastes and clean air control; extended this countries fight against mental illness by passing a bill which would allow for the staffing of community mental health centers; established a program to finance the construction of medical library facilities; and passed the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act which will improve on a broad basis the training facilities for this country's future doctors, dentists, public health personnel, pharmacists, optometrists, and podiatrists.

I could go on Mr. Speaker but it is really not necessary. The record OREN HARRIS has left will live for generations to come. Countless numbers of Americans can thank OREN HARRIS for benefits—which his wisdom and foresight have developed and will continue to develop in the future—particularly in the Transportation & Communications fields.

Each time a life is saved because of the health standards of this Nation, each time a program is enjoyed on UHF television, every spectator at every event in the District of Columbia Stadium, can thank in no small way OREN HARRIS for the part he played in the actions taken by the Congress on these matters. In the field of sports and in the devotion to his religion OREN HARRIS has been a leader. Only 2 weeks ago OREN received the Mr. Sam Award at the annual Touchdown Club banquet. This award is given to the person in Government who has made the greatest contribution to the world of sport.

In closing I want to say that OREN HARRIS has left his mark upon the House of Representatives and this Nation for many years to come. It has been a distinct pleasure and honor for me to have known and worked with OREN HARRIS these last 8 years. Both Mrs. Rogers and I wish to OREN and his wife all the good wishes, blessings, and happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing appreciation on behalf of the people of our country for the work of OREN HARRIS in the Congress. As a small boy, it was my privilege to live in what has now been for many years his congressional district and in his city. My father was his pastor and had the privilege of performing the marriage ceremony of Congressman HARRIS and his lovely wife. Through the years we, as his friends, have looked upon his work in Washington with deep pride and appreciation. In the brief time that it has been my privilege to serve in this House I have found in him the qualities that any Member of Congress would do well to emulate, an example that is worthy to follow. We all have reason to be grateful for his life and work in this body. His high ability, his Christian character, his great devotion to our country make him an inspiration to us all. His work in this House has been monumental. He shall be greatly missed.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN].

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, my Florida colleague, Mr. ROGERS, made reference to the interest Chairman HARRIS has always had in sports matters. So perhaps an allusion out of the sports world would not be inappropriate at this time. Football writers have frequently argued over who was the greatest all-American of all time, and they all have their own nominations. But you may recall that the great "Bronco" Nagurski played fullback on offense and tackle on defense. His coach once said of "Bronco" Nagurski that at any position he played, this man Nagurski could have made everybody's all-American team.

Most of what has been said about OREN HARRIS has turned thus far on his moral qualities, his integrity, and a sense of fairness which must place him almost in a rank with Solomon.

Another great pillar of his success has been his great and varied abilities.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has within its purview a wider scope of activities, surely, than has any other committee in the Congress.

From my observation there has been no subject before our committee—which dealt with such varied questions as the railroad work rules dispute, or the matters of thousands and thousands of tariffs which the transportation industries may set, or the field of broadcasting, about which I thought I knew something—no field in which I have seen any other member of the committee or of the specialized subcommittees who, in the final analysis, knew any more about the subject than the chairman of the full committee himself.

This is a man who, in the popular terminology, has done his "homework"; who has become literally an expert in scores of different fields; who was able to bring not only to the committee councils, but also to his contacts within these important industries, a knowledge which must have left them somewhat at a loss if trying to "put anything over" on him.

I cannot think of any assignment less choice than that of a lobbyist who might try to bring to Oren Harris something less than the truth. He would be caught up very quickly.

The committee, of course, is going to miss this mind, and the people of America will miss it in Congress. I can only add that in bringing these qualities to the Federal bench, the field of jurisprudence will be greatly enriched.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner.]

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be repetitious this afternoon as we say "Goodby" to Oren Harris from the hallowed House of Representatives, but I would be negligent indeed if I did not say from the dimensions of my heart that I concur with what has been said about my neighbor and my colleague.

I am perhaps a little more fortunate than are some of those who serve in the House of Representatives, inasmuch as my congressional district is joined to the north by Oren Harris' Fourth Congressional District of Arkansas.

I look forward to staying acquainted with Oren through the years.

Today his colleagues have said here that Oren has left firmly imprinted in the sands of time his footprints. I do not believe the winds or the tides which will follow in the years to come will prevail against them. I believe that firmly imprinted in the sands of time history will record that Oren Harris traveled this way, and it will record that society and mankind benefited from his journey.

The Federal bench will benefit from our loss. Mankind has already benefited from his services to his fellow man.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with others in paying my respects to the chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

It has been my privilege to work closely with Oren Harris in the fields in which our respective committees have an interest. I have never found him anything but highly cooperative and understanding, and it has been indeed a great pleasure to work with him.

Like the preceding speaker, I do not wish to be repetitive, because we can all subscribe to what has been said. But I am certain that in the years to come Oren can take great pleasure in knowing of the happiness he has brought to the people of this country through the great humanitarian legislation which was passed out of his committee and through this House under his superb leadership.

Like others, I wish him well. I perhaps am a little different from some—I am happy to make a contribution to the judiciary from the House of Representatives, in giving to it a man like Oren Harris, a humanist and an understanding man.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 24 years ago I came to the Congress of the United States. When I arrived here Oren Harris was already here. During that quarter of a century it has been my pleasure to serve in the House and my honor to serve in the same Congresses as Congressman Harris.

I want to express today my personal appreciation for his friendship and my admiration for his skill as a legislator. He is indeed to my mind one of the three or four top legislators in the House of Representatives.

It would be burdening the Record here to repeat the many pieces of legislation that Oren Harris has sponsored. He loved to draft a bill into being in his committee and bring it to the floor. I believe I can say that I have supported 99 percent of the legislation which he has produced because I thought it was good legislation. I cannot even remember the 1 percent that I was not able to support. That is how insignificant it was.

Oren Harris is not only a skilled legislator in bringing good legislation to the floor of the House, but he is skilled in securing the acceptance of that legislation by his colleagues.

It is true that in his leaving the Congress of the United States, Congress will lose one of the great legislators of our time, but the benefits of the legislation that he has sponsored and secured the acceptance of in this House will go on for untold generations to benefit and bless future millions.

Now he has been honored by receiving a high judicial appointment from the President of the United States. I want to express my complete confidence that he will bring to that position of eminence the same qualities of excellence in judicial decisions as he has brought to bear on his legislative decisions. The judiciary is also important. We who are in the legislative body ought to think of our body, of course, as being the most important, but under our system of government the judicial branch of our Government is also equally important. It is reassuring, I think, to many of us to know that a man of Oren Harris' accomplishments and his great qualities of heart and mind will be working on the judicial decisions on probably some of the very legislation which we pass in this body.

As he leaves this body I want to wish for him and his family the best that the good Lord may provide him in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Pickle].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, when the Honorable Oren Harris leaves these halls, a giant among us is departing from the scene of his greatest triumphs. Few men have made a greater contribution to legislative history than has Oren Harris.

Those of us who have been privileged to serve with him on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee know that we have had a chairman par excellence. I have said over and over that if we could recognize three men as being the most able Congressmen in this body, Oren Harris would easily be one of these three.

I might add here also that the other gentleman who occupies the microphone just across the aisle from me, the Honorable Wilbur Mills would be the second man, or at least one of these three. I dare say no other State can lay claim to that kind of recognition today, because it is most unusual.

Mr. Harris has handled more important legislation before this great body than perhaps any other chairman, and he has always handled it successfully and with great dignity. In committee meetings, he has ruled our committee—which handles so many broad jurisdictional matters over domestic agencies—with calmness, thoroughness and with complete knowledge of the facts involved. He is possessed with more general legislative knowledge than perhaps any man in this House, and he can, in truth of fact, remember more than most of us may ever know. I count it a high privilege to have had the opportunity to be first assigned to this committee and to be associated with this fine gentleman. Perhaps every committee member feels his chairman is the best—but I know for sure that none in this House is a better chairman or a finer man than Oren Harris.

While Judge Harris is firm and strong in his arguments, he is a most kindly man who knows how to deal fairly with all men and who is considerate of every individual who has ever appeared before his committee. Through and through, Oren Harris is a fine man. These United States are better for what he has contributed to the legislative process.

As he departs, we know that the history he has made will not likely be matched in a long time; and as he assumes his duties on the Federal bench, every man who has served with him individually knows that his own life has been enriched because of the association with Oren Harris and his lovely wife.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. Randall].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, coming on the floor a few moments ago, I did not realize until then comments were in progress on the departure of our beloved chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I could not forego the opportunity of expressing a few brief personal sentiments covering this great American.

Back in the early fifties many of us not then in Congress read with interest of the activities of the chairman of that great committee conducting its investigations, little realizing or dreaming—that one day we would have the opportunity to meet the man who presided over these hearings and who has conducted himself over the years with such great dignity and may I add with such great credit to this House of Representatives that he loves so much.

The many fine qualities possessed by our departing colleague have been enumerated in the past few moments, but I believe one of the qualities that may not have been mentioned is the fact that the chairman has been such a versatile man.

Not only has be been a great chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and a Member loved by all his fellow Members but he has proved himself in one of the most difficult jobs of any and that is when a Member serves as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. As I look back upon the many occasions during which he has served in that capacity I cannot recall another chairman who has handled as many of the most difficult pieces of legislation with the dispatch, fairness, and overall ability of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He has exhibited such outstanding ability on many occasions.

Yes, Oren Harris is a versatile man. He has played semipro baseball and is an athlete who has enjoyed the respect of fellow athletes. It has been said that one never gets to know a man very well until he engages with him in some form of recreation. Over in the gym—which Mr. Harris found time to visit, every member of that group recently expressed their tributes in similar manner we are expressing this afternoon.

Then, again, Mr. Speaker, on this quality called versatility is the fact Oren Harris is a member of the legal profession and has been an outstanding lawyer. There is something to being a good Federal judge, other than simply knowing the law. The gentleman from Arkansas knows the law. He knows civil law, also he has a good knowledge of criminal law from his service as prosecuting attorney. Beyond that, he is possessed of the kind of temperament which is so necessary, which could be called judicial temperament, and one of the most important essentials in performing the duties of a judge.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is so good that the person honored by these tributes has the privilege to be present in this Chamber this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure every one of us wishes for our departing friend, good health, and good fortune in the years that are ahead.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join in the tributes being paid today to an outstanding Member of this great body and an old and dear friend—the distinguished chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Hon. Oren Harris.

It has been my privilege to have known Chairman Harris since he was first elected to the 77th Congress and to have served with him as a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. During the period I served on the committee, I had an opportunity to observe his talent for leadership and the fine manner in which he conducted the affairs of the committee—a committee which considered much of the controversial and important legislation coming before the House in recent years. His keen intellect, fairness, and the ability to comprehend the most difficult and technical problems resulted in the enactment of many constructive pieces of legislation. A friendly, kindly man he was always available to those who sought his advice or assistance, and there are many here today who profited by his wise counsel. There is no man who has served in this House who is held in greater respect by his colleagues than Oren Harris.

Chairman Harris leaves us to assume the Federal bench where we know he will serve with great credit and distinction. The loss to the House and to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is a great one, but the Federal judiciary has gained a new member of which it can be justifiably proud.

As we gather today to say "goodbye" to our good friend and colleague and wish him well as he assumes his new duties, we are also saddened by the void in this Chamber his departure will leave. We hope that he will find happiness, contentment, and fulfillment in his new work and that he will find frequent occasion to return to visit with us here where he will always be assured of a warm welcome.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a touch of sadness on this occasion, for the time has come to bid farewell to one of our most esteemed colleagues.

For 25 years, Oren Harris has faithfully served not only the people of his own district in Arkansas but the entire Nation. During the last 9 years in which he has served as the distinguished chairman of one of the most important of our committees, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have come to know him as a respected leader, a dedicated colleague and, most important, as a most valued friend.

Oren has been responsible for helping to shape—and leading the cause—for some of the most important and socially significant legislation in recent years, such as the Mental Health Facilities Act, and other vital health legislation, which represents a bold and far-sighted approach to the health needs of our Nation. He has been instrumental in legislation ranging from air pollution control, aircraft operations and safety, Securities Act amendments, the communications satellite system and, of course, broadcasting, to drug production and safety. In fact, Oren has been responsible for legislation affecting almost every aspect of our citizens' lives. We, in Congress and the entire Nation, have come to admire and respect his outstanding ability.

But what has impressed me most about Oren Harris has been his extreme sense of fairness. No matter how full his schedule he has never been too busy to give full, thoughtful consideration to a colleague's problems, questions or viewpoints. He always found time to listen to every viewpoint. Oren always tried to consider every side of an issue before making a decision and, as chairman of the Commerce Committee, he was always fair and considerate in his leadership.

Now, Oren Harris leaves the Congress that he has served so faithfully, so well, to assume his duties as judge of the Federal courts in Arkansas. He brings to the bench a rich background of experience, as a former practicing attorney, as deputy prosecuting attorney and twice elected prosecuting attorney for the 13th Judicial District of Arkansas and as a brilliant legislator. He leaves behind an outstanding record of accomplishment. I know that he will show the same sense of dedication and the same great quality of fairness as he sits as judge that he displayed as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We will all miss the great warmth and the respected leadership of Oren Harris here in Congress but we all wish him well in his new assignment as judge.

President Johnson has made an excellent choice in naming our distinguished colleague to the Federal bench and I am sure he will add new laurels to his already illustrious record.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join with the many other friends of Oren Harris today, in expressing my personal admiration and commendation for the great career which he has enjoyed in the Congress.

I agree with all the comments made by my colleagues who have preceded me in paying tribute to our friend and colleague. I wish to especially comment on some of my own personal experiences during the past 12 years in working with Oren on various pieces of legislation.

I have had the opportunity to appear before his committee on more than one occasion where he has shown direct interest and concern in pending matters, and as all of us who have had this experience know, he was a most gracious chairman. He has shown personal interest on matters of concern to those of us from California, as I am sure he did also to the Members from the other States in the Nation.

I have noted a special quality with reference to Congressman Harris' dealings with legislation and that is, he never brings legislation to the floor until he is completely convinced that it is in the best interest of the country and he can give his complete support toward defending it. This indicates to me the great sincerity and deep conviction he brings to the floor concerning legislation.

I have had the opportunity to join with Oren on legislation dealing with education, health, transportation and communications and at times we have been in opposition on legislative matters, however, I can assure you, as I am sure others will agree, with the sincerity which Oren brought or displayed in his opposition that he was truly a worthy antagonist. By the very nature of the committee he chaired, a great deal of the legislation was controversial and I have been deeply impressed by his handling of matters and by his kindness and willingness to listen even though he might disagree with you on position.

Certainly, I will miss his presence, as I am sure we all will and as will his constituency from the great State of Arkansas, but in this instance, the judicial branch of the Government will be the richer for the great capability which he will bring to it. I wish for both Oren and Mrs. Harris much happiness and an enriching life in the future.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleagues and associate myself with their remarks in paying tribute to the distinguished service of our beloved colleague, Oren Harris—or shall I say, to Judge Oren Harris, of Arkansas.

Congressman Harris has served as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for a number of years. No committee has been more attuned to the public interest—no committee has had a larger volume of legislation—and no committee has served more citizens—than the committee which Oren Harris served as chairman.

I have mixed emotions as he leaves us. I regret deeply the fact that he no longer will be a colleague in the Congress and I know I shall miss him. And yet I am pleased and happy for him as he goes on to another great field of service in the Federal judiciary. We all love him and respect him and honor him—and we shall miss him and wish him well always.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, when Oren Harris retires next month as a Member of this Congress we will lose one of the most industrious, conscientious, and able Members.

During the years I have made several appearances before his committee while he was chairman and have always observed his remarkable fairness in dealing not only with his colleagues but with the public. By reason of his vast experience as a lawyer and as a member and chairman of the important Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the House of Representatives can ill afford to lose him as a Member.

His ability as a lawyer and his abundant experience in handling legislation pertaining to business, transportation and Congress generally, in addition to his sense of justice, qualify him in every way for his new field in the Federal judiciary.

We all wish him many years of good health and long service on the Federal bench.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join in this tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Oren Harris, as he leaves the House and embarks upon another path in his long and significant career of public service.

Compared to his 25 years, my three terms in the House are relatively brief, but my experience has been enriched by knowing him and by observing at first hand the competence, skill, and diligence he applies to the legislative process. I have learned a lot from him. Although Oren Harris and I have disagreed on certain public issues, I always found him fair, courteous, and helpful. I particularly recall the debate in 1962 over the Communications Satellite Corp. legislation. Oren Harris handled the administration's bill. I led the fight in the House against it. He was a worthy opponent in that debate and a master in handling a complicated subject. But that is characteristic of the man.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Oren Harris a happy and successful judicial career and extend my best wishes to him and his family.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives loses a Congressman's Congressman with Mr. Oren Harris leaving us to provide the judiciary with his keen mind, his objective capacity and his total fairness.

As generous with his time as with his talent, Mr. Harris has nothing but friends in this House because of the helping hand he is ready to extend at all times. I speak as a very freshman Member who came to this august body prepared to find senior Members so busy with their vast duties that they would have no time for the problems of the newcomers.

It did not take me long to find out this was not the case at all. It also did not take me long to find out that Oren Harris was particularly kind to new Members, lending that helping hand to interpret the intricacies of this legislative body.

He epitomizes the spirit of the Arkansas delegation—leaders all, men who serve their State and their Nation with integrity and courage. Arkansas can be as proud of her congressional delegation as we are loathe to see Oren Harris leave it.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to join my colleagues and add my words of praise of one worthy of any accolade we could bestow.

Words of tribute to Oren Harris pale in comparison with the record he has written by his own accomplishments and anything that I might say in his behalf would be inadequate when measured against the man himself.

It has been my great fortune to serve under him on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the third oldest and one of the most important bodies in the Congress. The Nation, indeed the world, is well acquainted with his leadership qualities and his guidance of this committee for the past quarter of a century.

He has been more than a chairman and a leader to me—and to many other junior members of the Commerce Committee. He has been our mentor, without ever having been pedantic or pedagogic. He has taught and led and guided by his own capable and able manner and demeanor in his high office and through his wise counsel and experience. Because of Oren Harris, I am a better Representative. I know others feel that he has helped them also, in countless ways.

That the Congress, and the Commerce Committee in particular, will miss the gentleman from Arkansas is a gross understatement. For I doubt that these Halls have ever seen a more effective practitioner of the art of legislation. But those of us who were fortunate enough to know him are better for his having been in our midst.

The Federal judiciary is receiving a man whose firmness and fairness and knowledge and skill in the law will reflect great credit on our system of jurisprudence.

Godspeed, Oren.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, Oren Harris, is to leave us soon, but I am delighted to have this opportunity to join in praise of his excellent service. He is indeed a gem among gems. The Arkansas delegation in Congress has no superiors and the presence of Oren Harris in that outstanding delegation is part of the reason why this is so.

I feel he will make an outstanding Federal judge; and I prophesy that he will be a judge's judge, just as he has been a legislator's legislator here in Congress. As a former practicing attorney myself, I have observed in the legal profession men known as lawyer's lawyers because of the excellence of their practice; and coming here to Congress, almost two decades ago, I observed that in Congress that Oren Harris typified a similar position, one which meant others in Congress came to him constantly for advice and counsel. I am happy to have been one of those who often conversed with him about the important things before our country and gained much by doing so. Part of the reason for his excellence of service in Congress is the thorough preparation which he gave to every issue he presented. But the reason most of us will miss him so greatly is not just because of this, but because of the warmth of his friendship. He is a treasured friend of every Member of Congress.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to pay my respect to the honorable gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman Oren Harris. It has been my pleasure to serve with him during his entire service here in this body. More than that, Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be able to number him among my close personal friends. I am sure that I have profited from that association.

Mr. Speaker, few men have served in this House during my tenure of more than 30 years who have made a greater impression upon the House, in such a brief span of tenure, than Oren Harris. As chairman of the important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, he has conducted the deliberations and work of that committee with exceptional ability and finesse. His conduct, backed by his ability both in the committee and on the floor of the House, has gained him the universal respect of Members on both sides of the aisle.

Oren Harris, by virtue of his chairmanship, frequently has appeared before my Rules Committee, seeking clearance for the legislation reported out of his committee to the floor of the House. Few men in the Congress who appeared before that committee had an equal knowledge of the legislative proposals brought before the committee than did this distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign

Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris]. He had always done his homework.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we all shall miss this able and knowledgeable Member of this body. I am not sure that if the House enjoyed the veto power over the actions of the President that the President enjoys over the actions of the House, that the membership of this body would not veto the President's appointment of this outstanding son of Arkansas—not because of their lack of appreciation of our colleague, but because of their appreciation and love for him. But be that as it may, we all salute Judge Harris on this his last day in this body and wish him much happiness in his new assignment.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, it has been my good fortune to represent, together with our beloved former Speaker, Joseph W. Martin, Jr., the people of southeastern Massachusetts and it is for them that I today join in paying tribute to Oren Harris, beloved chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Oren is the essence of integrity, and of fairness. He has presided over the committee with patience and with a sensitivity for the needs of our Nation and, at the same time, has sympathetically recognized the problems of the petitioners.

The American public has been most fortunate to have him as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—and now, the people of Arkansas are equally fortunate to have Oren Harris as presiding justice in the Federal district court.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Oren Harris is truly one of the greatest Members in the history of the House of Representatives. He has held high the principles and ideals which made our country great. He has added luster to the traditions and heritages of this the greatest deliberative body in the world. This, the people's institution, is more representative, more respected, more renowned throughout America because of the courage, the dedication, leadership, and devotion of this distinguished son of Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, I walked to the county fair in my hometown in 1928 and went to the Democratic booth and pinned on the lapel of my coat an Al Smith and Joe Robinson button. I remember following that year the campaign of Al Smith and especially that great son of Arkansas, Joe Robinson. Since that day Arkansas has contributed a leadership to this Nation second to that of no State in this Union. One of the most distinguished of these illustrious men is the one to whom we pay tribute today, Oren Harris.

I am a better Member of the Congress having known him and having associated with this great parliamentarian, this dynamic leader, with this Christian patriot and friend. I first remember Oren Harris as a member of the Vaughn Bible Class here in Washington. As a young man of 30 years, groping my way in the Nation's Capital, a friend directed me to this great Bible class. It has been my privilege to listen there to some of the greatest lessons dealing with the truths and facts of the Holy Bible as presented by Oren Harris.

Oren Harris, by rubbing elbows with the people, the average American, in his everyday walk of life, is imminently more qualified to sit on the exalted bench as a U.S. district judge. Seeking political office in the grassroots of our country, attending family reunions, observing the Sabbath Day, on the hustings, serving constitutents, being the servant of his fellow man and associating with his colleagues in the debates and deliberations in the Congress is a rich experience to carry with him as he wears the robes of the U.S. courts.

We will miss him here, but we wish him every success and much happiness as he begins a new career. Again, as he takes the oath to preserve and defend the Constitution of this country, our prayers, our hearts, and best wishes go with him.

Mrs. Dorn and my family join me in wishing for the distinguished chairman, his wife, Ruth, and his two fine children the very best always.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, the Federal bench will be greatly enriched, but this House will be impoverished, when our dear friend, Oren Harris, leaves to take up his new duties.

I know of no man who has graced the position that Oren Harris has held with more dignity, more fairness, and more just plain commonsense than he has. He has fielded a great many of the tough ones in his tenure as chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and he has fielded them cleanly and handled them deftly without too much fanfare and with no seeking of personal publicity. He has shown a rare ability to bring together dissidents and to bring out workable legislation.

These rare traits he takes to the Federal bench. They will stand him in good stead. The House just will not be the same with Oren Harris gone.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of our most esteemed Members. Oren Harris has served our Nation with honor and distinction during his 25 years as a Member of this body, and is one of the nicest people I have ever had the pleasure to know. For the past 9 years I have been privileged to serve under his able leadership on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. As chairman of that committee, no one could have devoted himself more earnestly and more untiringly than Oren, and the committee has made many substantial and important contributions to the citizens of this great country under his direction. He has commanded the respect of all his associates as an outstanding leader, a dedicated colleague, and a valued friend.

Oren's appointment as a Federal judge is eminently deserved, and I know he will continue to serve his country with equal credit and distinction in his new post. The Federal courts are gaining an able and astute member with a rich background of knowledge and experience. The House of Representatives is losing one of its greatest Members and one of the most dynamic chairmen to ever serve in the Congress. As he assumes his judicial duties, I join Oren's many friends in wishing for him and Mrs. Harris every happiness and success in the future.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago the people of the Fourth District of Arkansas sent to this body a bright, young and aggressive attorney from El Dorado, Ark. Ever since then the people of Arkansas and the United States have greatly benefited from the service here of the Honorable Oren Harris. Unfortunately, Oren is now leaving this body to assume a seat on the bench of the Federal District Court in Arkansas. The House of Representatives will sorely miss him.

For the past 8 years as chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee Oren Harris has originated, fought for, and succeeded in enactment of legislation which touches deeply upon the life of every person in this country. His investigative and legislative skills have led to progressive laws in fields ranging from the make believe world of radio and television to the very real worlds of public health, commerce, and transportation. Under his chairmanship the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—a very difficult one because of the sensitive and complex nature of its jurisdiction—has gained a stature seldom known in the history of this body.

I think I speak for all my colleagues here when I say that I am happy to see the Federal judiciary gain a member of Oren Harris' stature. And I think I also speak for them when I say I am sad to see Oren Harris leave the House of Representatives. We wish him godspeed and good fortune.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to have this opportunity to pay tribute to our colleague, Oren Harris. But it is also an occasion of regret, for no longer will the House have the benefit of his outstanding abilities and character and his effective, dedicated leadership.

For 25 years, Oren Harris has served his State and the Nation with rare distinction and capability.

When I came to the House in 1948, Oren Harris was one of the first colleagues I had the pleasure of meeting. As a freshman Representative, he guided and assisted me, with great kindness and generosity, in learning the duties of a Member of Congress. He has a multitude of friends and I am proud to count myself as one of them.

Through the years I have always respected his knowledge, his deep moral convictions, and his fine performance as both an individual Member of Congress and as chairman of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In this latter role, Oren Harris has developed and guided to enactment vital measures in many areas to better the lives of all Americans.

In thinking of Oren Harris, it is impossible not to recall the classical ideal of "a sound mind in a sound body." Not only on the House floor, but as a leader of the gymnasium brigade, he has given us an admirable example of living by this magnificent principle.

We will miss Oren Harris. But it is heartening to know that our judicial system will be strengthened by the wisdom, courage, and experience it will acquire with the addition of Oren Harris as a new Federal judge. My warm regards and best wishes go to Judge and Mrs. Harris as he undertakes this most important and challenging new task. I know he will discharge his responsibilities to reflect the highest credit on himself and the Federal bench.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1966, the House of Representatives will lose the services of one of its most able and dedicated Members with the resignation of the Honorable Oren Harris of Arkansas. However, this outstanding public servant will continue in the service of his country as a Federal judge.

It was my privilege to have served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under the brilliant leadership of Chairman Harris. During his tenure as chairman of this committee his diligent and effective efforts resulted in the passage of legislation essential to the progress of our country.

I am sure my colleagues will agree that the Federal judiciary will be well-served by the addition of this man who has proven his capacity for wisdom and courage during his 25 year service in the House of Representatives.

I join with my colleagues in extending to Judge Harris my warmest regards and best wishes in his new career.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the Record concerning the service of our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Matsunaga). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, if he desires it, to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, as I approach the well of this House for the last time, I do so with a profound feeling of gratitude and appreciation. I cannot express the feeling I have in my heart for the many warm expressions that have been made by my colleagues this afternoon, and on one or two previous occasions.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills], for having arranged this very heart-warming session this afternoon, in which friends whom I have known so well and with whom I have served have expressed their sentiments in regard to my service here.

Mr. Speaker, to have the respect and friendship of one's colleagues in my judgment is about the greatest reward one can experience as a result of his service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed feelings that I leave. I would confess that Ruth and I did a lot of soul searching before we made the decision to leave this post in which I have had the honor and privilege of serving for 25 years and 1 month. But after considering all of the facts and after considering our situation, we decided it would be the wise decision to make. So we did decide to leave and go back home.

I know we will be back home with friends and we will have the honor and the privilege and joy of associating with them day by day. But I also know I am going to miss the warm associations that it has been my privilege to have had here during these years.

I thank you from the bottom of my heart—each of you. I am very happy to have had this wonderful, rich, and rewarding experience.

You have no idea just how much has been going through my mind this afternoon. There are so many things I would like to say as I am about to take my leave, Mr. Speaker.

Right here in this Chamber, in these great Halls, the House of Representatives, is the future of America. As history is written and as time passes—and as we see others with even greater responsibilities in many ways, in different fields, we see the Members of this great institution come and go.

This is the strength of America, right here in these great Halls. Here in this Chamber is the conscience of America. This is America itself. When you walk into this Chamber as a Member of Congress, as I did on January 3, 1941, and as each of you did on whatever date you came here, there is something that instills itself in your life and in your heart and in your soul, that you know you are a part of the conscience of this great country and the future of this country depends on those who serve in this great body.

I love the House of Representatives and I regret, Mr. Speaker, in many ways that I am leaving this post. If it is possible to be sad, and to be happy at the same time, that would pretty much describe my feelings here today.

I am grateful for my colleagues on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We have labored together all these years. You have been a real inspiration. I appreciate the splendid cooperation that we have always had. I shall ever cherish the associations and the wonderful times we have had together.

Let me say to the great staff of the committee that I have worked with all these years, I shall always have a deep appreciation for their work and their cooperation. I pay my tribute to them. I know it is because of their loyalty and their devotion that we on the committee have been able to accomplish many of the legislative programs that we have brought to this House.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, I am grateful indeed to the employees of this House—to each of them. I thank you for the many courtesies you have extended to me. That includes all of the employees of the House of Representatives whether they are out here on the floor of the House or around the desk or back in the cloakrooms—wherever they may be. We appreciate your loyalty and devotion.

I think probably the most outstanding moment—and we have all had many of them in our experiences here—I think probably the most outstanding moment in my career was that evening in 1961 when, as you know, for some reason there was a growing complaint and criticism of the Congress.

It got beyond individual criticism. Not only I, but also many others, felt that it was a broad attack on the Congress itself, the institution. Since I was one of those who were involved in many of the attacks that were made—and they affected particularly committee chairmen and others—I took the well of the House that evening.

If I remember correctly, it was about 5 o'clock when we started. For 1 hour and 50 minutes I gave the best that I had in defense of and for the protection of the Congress itself as an institution.

I know that you who are here and those who will come to the Congress will provide not only the conscience for a greater America but also the strength, so that we will continue to have the greatest country in the world and be able to provide some of the joys, peace, and quiet of life with other nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, as I am about to leave, I wish to say that I think the hardest job I ever undertook was this morning. Since I shall assume a new phase of life on Thursday of next week. I did my best in formulating a letter to the great Governor of my State of Arkansas in which I am submitting my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives. And then immediately I dictated another letter to our great and distinguished Speaker in which I asked leave to inform him of my action, that as of next Wednesday, at the close of business, February 2, 1966, I will cease to be a Member of this great body.

I leave here with deep appreciation for the wonderful experiences I have had. I take with me many cherished memories that Ruth and I will have throughout our lives.

Mr. Speaker, again I thank you, and each and all of you from the bottom of my heart. I wish you Godspeed throughout the years ahead.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF JANUARY 31, 1966

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the majority leader if he will announce the program for the remainder of this week and next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, we have finished our business for this week. It will be my purpose to ask to go over after the program is announced.

In further response to the gentleman in reference to the program for next week, on Monday we have no anticipated legislative business.

Tuesday there will be a Private Calendar.

On Wednesday there will be seven contempt citations from the Committee on Un-American Activities. They are as follows: Robert M. Shelton, Calvin F. Craig, James Robertson Jones, Marshall R. Kornegay, Robert E. Scoggin, Robert Hudgins, George Franklin Dorsett.

On Thursday and the balance of the week we do not have any anticipated legislative business. But I would like to advise the Members that there is a possibility, under a reservation which we always make, of additional business next week. If business is ready for floor action, it will be programed. I do not anticipate any business on Monday. If legislation is ready at any time thereafter, it will be programed.

Next week, of course, we will have some messages from the White House. And, I say again, I make this announcement with the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman anticipate a rollcall vote on any of the contempt citations?

Mr. ALBERT. I am unable to advise the gentleman on that, although I believe it is entirely possible.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 1966

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Matsunaga). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations theoretically represents the aspirations of all people and all nations to develop a world of legitimate peace and true freedom.

Unfortunately, the United Nations is a far cry from the effective world body that it should be, and in my humble opinion, is deteriorating to the impotence of the old League of Nations. The only difference between the present U.N. and the old League of Nations is that the present world body is a much more expensive operation—since it is so heavily U.S. subsidized—and due to modern communications media is a much more effective propaganda forum than its predecessor.

One of the contributing reasons to the deterioration of the U.N. is the complete lack of leadership on the part of the United States, specifically since the advent of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. Neither Ambassador Stevenson nor present Ambassador Goldberg were allowed or evidently were inclined to come to grips with the financial chaos in the U.N. Neither were permitted nor possibly inclined to provide the leadership which the United States must produce to make the U.N. a viable body.

I include at this point in the Record as part of my remarks an article which is appearing in the January 29 edition of the Saturday Evening Post reporting on Mr. Goldberg's frustrations at the U.N.

"I'm Not Discouraged Either. Got It?"

(By Roger Kahn)

It is half a year now since Adlai Stevenson fell dead in a London street and a peddler's son was hired to replace him. (A complete surprise, said the New York Times, but a brilliant choice.) It has been a terrifying season for mankind, and Arthur Joseph Goldberg, the freshman American Ambassador to the United Nations, is walking shakily for the first time. On a damp November day, when the Rhodesian crisis was at issue before the great powers in the Security Council, Arthur Goldberg began to feel dizzy. He left the hall without help at the close of debate, but that evening he was unable to serve as host at a private showing of a film lionizing Stevenson. "To tell you the truth," Goldberg said afterward, "I thought I was having a damn stroke, right out there on the floor."

Actually Goldberg, who is not florid and certainly not apoplectic, was feeling the first effects of a virus infection in the middle ear. For days he suffered from vertigo that kept him in bed within the ambassadorial apartment in the Waldorf Towers, 42 floors above Manhattan. For weeks after that he had to navigate with such caution that every curbstone became an adventure.

It was an unsettling experience—people who have suffered from similar infections describe them as thoroughly unpleasant—perhaps particularly unsettling to a man with Goldberg's specific set of gears. Before the illness, his walk, like his manner, usually was described as jaunty or cocky, and he maintained a consistently exhausting pace without falling sick. "But this job at the U.N.," Goldberg says humbly, "is the toughest job I've ever had. Why, I've been able to have just five dinners alone with my wife since August. Five," Goldberg repeats, shaking his head for emphasis, but slowly, so as not to disturb his middle ear.

"The day," he says, "starts at 8 or so when I begin going over State Department reports. After that, staff meetings and meetings with ambassadors, foreign ministers, important men. Sometimes they can help me. Sometimes they want me to help them. Add to that my work on the floor or in the committees and the evening meetings and the formal dinners and the private ones. They're all a part of this job." Goldberg pauses before he concludes in a matter-of-fact way that muffles the impact of the words: "I can see now what brought Adlai down."

One does not really expect to hear Arthur Goldberg musing about mortality. Like so many others drafted into Government service by John Kennedy, he is devoutly young in heart. His background suggests a man totally involved in life. Getting ahead in life. Getting the most out of life. Being useful in life. Wanting 100 years of life. Goldberg has come very far very fast, playing within the rules, and by and large he likes what he has seen. He is proud of himself.

Before entering Government work he was a labor lawyer, the best labor lawyer, an incredibly persuasive man who earned in excess of $100,000 a year from union clients without losing the respect of big business. Enlisted as Secretary of Labor by John Kennedy, Goldberg immediately became one of Kennedy's "two or three most important Cabinet members." From the outset Kennedy consulted him not only on matters of labor, but on economics, defense, and personal headaches. When the President had that final soulful session during which he convinced an uncharacteristically coy brother to become Attorney General, the only other person in the room was persuasive Arthur Goldberg. "Arthur," suggests a friend, "could have come up with a reasonable response to anything Bobby might possibly have said, even if Bobby had wanted to say a lot."

After less than 2 years in the Cabinet, Goldberg ascended to the Supreme Court, following the late Felix Frankfurter, who in turn had followed the late Benjamin Cardozo to the Court's "Jewish seat," a reality which politicians often deny exists. He was 54 when he joined the bench, and the happy saga of Goldberg seemed to have reached a satisfactory conclusion. Before him stretched an honored and magisterial old age, enlivened by Seders, secular banquets, and Washington Redskin football games.

Goldberg was surprised last July when Lyndon Johnson asked him to become ambassador to the United Nations. "The first thing I did," he says, "was suggest to the President a number of Americans who might be more suitable for the job than I." A pragmatist, he was surprised but not struck dumb. Johnson invited Goldberg to fly with him to Stevenson's funeral, and in the presidential jet, on the way to the burial, Arthur Goldberg said yes, he was willing, yes, he would leave the bench, yes. "I thought," Goldberg says, "what the hell. The country has given me two wonderful jobs. I owe the country something for that. I can't say no, even if this job is a tough one."

No one questions Goldberg's integrity or memory, but some do point out, in the interest of completeness, that he was not divinely happy on the bench. "The secretary's phone rang all the time," Goldberg had remarked. "The justice's phone never rings." To someone else he had observed in surprise, "They don't even give you a car in this job." An outgoing, mobile man, Goldberg, some of his friends now suggest, was appointed to an introspective judicial job 10 years too soon.

Sending Goldberg to the United Nations is a good example of Lyndon Johnson's political genius. In Goldberg, Johnson found a man who had the immediate, almost automatic support of everyone dedicated to the U.N. Liberals talked of his forcefulness and assured one another that Goldberg would never bow to humiliations as Stevenson, however unhappily, had done. Conservatives, such as Everett McKinley Dirksen, a Seder guest of the Goldbergs', liked his practical bent. There was nothing "fuzzy in Arthur's thinking." Editorial writers, first noting that labor-management disputes were not exactly comparable to arguments between sovereign states, then observed that they were not exactly different either. Viva Goldberg is what the editorialists concluded. Thus Johnson had what he may value more than anything else: a national consensus cheering an unexpected move by Lyndon Johnson.

The President seems less sure of the international scene, and international observers seemed less sure of Arthur Goldberg. Arab delegates announced that they were going to consider him a Zionist, until he proved that he was not. ("We have transcripts of speeches he has made to B'nai B'rith," said one.) Others spoke of his inexperience in world affairs. Foreign diplomats deeply admired Adlai Stevenson, and it is doubtful that any new American ambassador who was not a bald, sad-faced, eloquent Princeton liberal could have won them over very easily.

Goldberg, a Crane Junior College man with a midwestern twang and a driving lawyer's bluntness, did not soon charm them. His first impression came in a formal public speech which displayed him at his worst. Generally, he makes no ringing phrases, his wit is slight and his references are legalistic, not classical. In this speech, his opening statement to the General Assembly, he compounded these negative qualities with such a superfluity of references to Johnson that a West European remarked, "We might have been listening to a Russian praising the Chairman."

Aware of his limitations as an orator, Goldberg proceeded to devote himself to that which he does best: meeting people singly or in small groups, head to head. There are 117 nations in the U.N., and the roster of delegates runs 193 pages long. (Goldberg remarked not long ago, "My God, I'm like a lawyer with 116 clients.") Meeting hundreds of delegates during a General Assembly session with more than 100 items on its agenda—"That's nearly 12,000 country positions on individual items"—provides some measure of the pace Goldberg found rough.

"I'd like to ask a rude question and a philosophical one," someone said to the Ambassador the other evening as the black limousine, license number S 201, drifted through Manhattan traffic toward the Waldorf-Astoria. It had been a long workday and it was going to be longer. Goldberg puffed his checks and nodded. "Go ahead."

"There are reports the President promised you something better, say the vice-presidency next time, if you'd take this job."

Goldberg waved his hand impatiently. "That's foolish," he said. "I left political life when I joined the Bench. What's the philosophical question?"

"Well, now that you've been here for a while, I was wondering what you thought of the future of the U.N. and the future of man in a nuclear age."

"That," Goldberg said slowly, "certainly is a philosophical question. It is the philosophical question." He stared toward the red telephone opposite him in the back of the limousine and seemed disinclined to answer further.

"Are you encouraged?"

"No," Goldberg said heavily. "I wouldn't say that. I'm not encouraged. Peace is such a fragile thing. It can be threatened in so many places in so many ways. I'm not encouraged, but you can say this: I'm not discouraged either. Got it? Don't say I'm encouraged. Say I'm not discouraged. That way you'll be about right."

The answer seemed to cheer him and he mentioned the party to which he was going later. "The ambassador who's giving it seemed to be in, uh, a bit of trouble with his foreign minister, and I gather the idea of the party is to impress the foreign minister, who's in town. Maybe we can all do ourselves a little good tonight."

The total good that Goldberg has done at the United Nations is difficult to evaluate after one Assembly session. Most of his work at the U.N. and in Washington involves continuing issues. Further, Goldberg himself is impressed to the point of awe with the mystique of diplomacy. He is so secretive about his private positions that he constantly disappoints liberal audiences who hope for hints of a dissent from Johnson's policy on Vietnam. Indeed, if the U.N. were not such a turbulent confluence of secondary sources, it might be hard to learn if Goldberg has done any real good at all. But certain ratings can be made.

Before the session even began, Goldberg was influential in working out a complicated financial compromise that permitted the General Assembly to take votes for the first time in almost a year. Ever since the Congo crisis began in 1960, the U.N. had gone deeper and deeper into debt as the Soviets and French refused to pay their share of the costs. When the United States insisted that the delinquent nations be deprived of their voting rights, the U.N. decided not to have any votes at all. "Very well," Goldberg said in effect. "We hold to the principle that the delinquents are wrong. But the U.N. has important things to do. We won't press our principle at this time." When Goldberg helps bring about a solution of this sort, he is generally able to get Johnson to go along with him.

Once the session convened, it confronted once again the problem of Communist China. Goldberg's efforts to block Peiping's entry were successful without being inspired. On the day that he spoke against China in the Assembly, debate and deportment on both sides were unimpressive.

A man from Cambodia, an oval of southeast Asia that lies between Thailand and Vietnam, spoke first. "If the U.N. continues to recognize the pseudo-government (National China) installed by the United States, this organization will flounder," he warned. Before leaving the podium he added in soft French that the CIA has been using South Vietnamese "disguised as agents of North Vietnam to commit acts of murder and rape."

The next speaker was Liu Chieh, the Ambassador from China, or at least that China which the U.N. recognizes, China minus 700 million people. Liu walked toward the head of the great hall, which is handsome in blue and gold even though on one slab wall someone has painted a white and red and black amoeba. As he neared the microphone, all over the floor men began slamming shut attaché cases, buckling satchels, getting up and walking out. They trudged noisily to exits near the rostrum. Before poor Liu could even utter "Mister President," he had lost almost half his audience. All of the Communists and some of the neutralists had gone. Liu could have spoken with the fire of Pericles over the dead of Athens and he still would not have reached half the world. What he did say, almost pathetically, was, "The civil war in China is not yet ended. Rebels are in control. But the basic traits of the Chinese people, reasonableness, moderation, tolerance will prevail."

Arthur Goldberg applauded Liu and then, after the walkers had returned, a martini or two to the good, he approached the microphones himself to defend the American position. This is the sort of thing that brought lines to Adlai Stevenson's face. Adlai Stevenson knew that Communist China existed. It wounded him to have to argue that it did not. But no hurt showed on Goldberg. He is an advocate, trained in the adversary system of law. I'll state my side, you state yours, and somewhere in between, a jury may find the truth. Goldberg was doing what every lawyer does—expounding and defending a position, which may not be the precise position he privately holds.

Loudly, in his flat Chicago voice, Goldberg told the General Assembly that admitting Communist China now would be yielding to blackmail. Logically and doggedly, he continued to make points that covered 12 single-spaced typewritten pages. He feared the Red Chinese might subvert the U.N. He feared that admission might encourage Peiping on its present path of violence. He spoke of self-determination, the Charter of the United Nations, goals of law and peace for all men and, without striking a single phrase of beauty, sat down to the applause of the delegates who could be expected in advance to applaud him.

And soon double-chinned, bow-tied, soft-voiced Nikolai Trofimovich Fedorenko was doing the same thing for the other side. "There is no need to examine what has been presented as argument by the United States," Fedorenko said. It was diffuse, he added, choleric and inconsistent. Those delegates who could be expected to applaud Fedorenko did so, and it would have been difficult to tell from the public performances that the two nations which probably would least like to see the extremists from Peiping seated on the Security Council are the Soviet Union and the United States. ("We worry," remarks a diplomat from the Soviet bloc, "that the Mao-ists might try to take apart the United Nations stone by stone.")

A few days later the General Assembly rejected Peiping by a tie vote of 47 to 47. This was victory for Goldberg without much satisfaction. "Every year," warned an African afterward, "China gets closer. Next year, you will see, they will get in."

"The position of the United States," Arthur Goldberg maintains, both feet holding the Johnson line, "is that until Communist China establishes itself as a peace-loving country, there is no place for it in the United Nations."

What Goldberg does concede, significantly, is that Red China is an important power beyond the U.N. He has put the United States on record as favoring universal disarmament, even if that means that American delegates must sit at the same bargaining table with Chinese Communists. This is a major step and a practical one. "We have to consider in any preparatory disarmament group," Goldberg says, "not only countries with nuclear weapons, but those with nuclear capability." The prospect of the United States and Russia disarming while Red China builds bombs chills the marrow, and Goldberg is generally credited with having brought President Johnson around to his point of view.

The largest new crisis that confronted the U.N. was Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence from Britain. Since the Rhodesian Government represents a handful of white settlers, the neighboring states of black Africa demanded that Britain intervene. Arthur Goldberg contributed some nicely ambiquous phrasing to the Security Council resolution that urged Great Britain to act. The council, whose membership included two African nations at the time, was in loose agreement that the proclamation of independence was deplorable and that it was Britain's place to override it. But debate stalled on the question of time. The Africans wanted immediate intervention. Britain wanted to begin with indirect pressures, such as embargoes. The Russians, meanwhile, wanted to talk about imperialist colonialism and the French wanted to abstain.

Just before the resolution, originally offered by Bolivia and Uruguay, came up for a vote, Goldberg reworked a critical phrase into utter ambiguity: "The Council," the resolution now read, "determines that the situation resulting from the proclamation of independence by the illegal authorities in Southern Rhodesia is extremely grave, that the United Kingdom Government should put an end to it and that its continuance in time constitutes a threat to international peace."

If the critical phrase had simply read "continuance," the British would have vetoed the entire resolution as a demand for immediate intervention. If the phrase had not mentioned any dangers of a continuance, the African nations, possibly with the Soviets joining, would have voted against the resolution. With continuance in time, the resolution passed, 12 to 0, France abstaining.

"I voted for this resolution," said Radhakrishna Ramani of Malaysia, in subsequent discussion, "but as finally adopted, it falls far below my Government's expectation of what ought to be done. I do not wish to diminish a tribute to the Ambassador of the United States, whose talent for persuasiveness is a special quality, but the final form of the text might mystify, if not wholly confuse, the world at large—and by the world I mean the English-speaking world. Continuance in time is inartistic, almost illiterate."

"I was, of course, very interested in the comments of Ambassador Ramani," Goldberg told the Council. "For myself, I would merely say that eloquence is always desirable, but I for one would gladly sacrifice grammar for agreement."

The greatest disagreement, the most dangerous condition confronting everyone, is, of course, the Vietnamese war. It is not Goldberg's war, any more than it is President Johnson's war. It is not a war that makes much sense to our allies. But it is a war—and a diplomatic position—behind which the United States has placed all of its prestige.

During much of the recent General Assembly meeting, the American delegates and the American position were ridiculed. "You have taken over half a man's house," said a neutralist, "and now you say to the man: 'Let's talk.' One does not talk with an intruder. One throws him out." The French were delighted to point out that the war was ridiculous, but after all, what could be expected of Americans? The Soviets were happy to discuss America's imperialist aggressions. In the corridors and lounges of the U.N. even our best friends hinted that we should get out.

Against such overwhelming world belief that the United States was blundering in Asia, Goldberg was not able to make many public debating points. He repeated Johnson's phrase that the United States was ready to negotiate on Vietnam anywhere, any time, without preconditions. Even as he did, U.N. lounges buzzed with a story that posthumously quoted Adlai Stevenson as saying the United States had turned down a negotiating offer, carefully arranged by U Thant, the Secretary General. Thant is esteemed in the U.N. and Stevenson was admired. No debating points could be made against a truly neutral world leader and a respected dead man.

But in private, Goldberg's great pragmatism, his instinct for the practical, and his mobility abruptly became important toward the conclusion of the Assembly meeting. Amintore Fanfani of Italy, the President of the Assembly, had heard quietly from two Italian intellectuals that Ho Chi Minh, the President of North Vietnam, was seriously interested in arranging a peaceful settlement. "If America agreed to a ceasefire," Ho reportedly told the two, "I'd be at the negotiating table the next day."

Fanfani quickly prepared a letter for Lyndon Johnson which he delivered to Goldberg, who dispatched it to the President at the Texas ranch. Things did not go smoothly. A newspaper printed the secret as a U.S. rejection of Ho's proposal; the State Department then announced that it was studying the Hanoi feeler. Diplomacy collapsed then, the victim of premature publicity. But it did not die, nor was it meaningless for the future. A few days later Arthur Goldberg was on television saying that now we were willing to consider the North Vietnamese points. "We may not agree with them," he said. "We have points of our own. But we are prepared in negotiations to discuss Hanoi's (four basic) points."

Thus, possibly, hopefully, the United Nations was able to move the Vietnam war away from escalation and toward the conference table.

Mr. Speaker, I specifically refer to Mr. Goldberg's statement that "I am like a lawyer with 116 clients." Mr. Speaker, there are 117 member nations of the U.N. Therefore, I ask if it is not the United States which is the one nation that Mr. Goldberg is not representing.

Would it not be possible for Mr. Goldberg to emphasize the fact that he is the representative of the United States to the United Nations, looking first after U.S. interests and not bending over backward to please 116 other incompatible clients, all of whom have their own Ambassadors and propaganda experts accredited to the U.N.?

I would hope the President of the United States would remind Mr. Goldberg that he is the U.S. Ambassador, perhaps coming directly to the point in their next conversation, and with his Washington adaptation of the Pedernales twang, say "Arthur, old chap, don't forget you are working for the United States."

VETERANS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the conflict in Vietnam is very much on the minds of all of us. And there are honest differences of opinion regarding just how we should be conducting our national effort there.

But there should be no argument with the idea that we owe a debt of gratitude to the young men who are risking their lives every day in support of what the President has outlined as our objectives in southeast Asia.

At the very least, these men are putting the national interest above their own safety. Many of them are doing so at considerable cost to themselves and to their families, and many are interrupting educational and career plans.

The situation is similar to that during World War II and the Korean conflict when the Congress provided assistance to these men in their return to civilian life. Millions of veteran were given educational help and other aids as they sought to take up normal pursuits of life again.

There is little serious argument with the value of these past GI bill programs. Not only were the men themselves helped, along with their families, but the Nation as a whole is better off in two ways.

First, we have the advantages derived as a result of these men having had educational opportunities so as to enlarge their contributions to the economic and social advancement of the country.

Second, according to the Veterans' Administration, the Government invested $19 billion in educational programs for veterans of World War II, and derived an estimated $20 billion return in additional income taxes alone as a result of the education benefits.

Clearly, we should provide a program of benefits for veterans of the current Vietnam conflict. I have introduced today a bill to do the job, and it is my hope that this proposal, along with others which have been advanced, will be accorded early consideration and action.

The bill is called the Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 1966. It is limited to educational and training programs.

We already have nearly 200,000 men involved in the Vietnam conflict, and many persons believe the number will be sharply increased, perhaps even doubled.

The time has come when we must realize the importance of extending to veterans of this war the same recognition the country gave to veterans of World War II and Korea.

It is not only morally, but economically right, that providing for the smooth and constructive return of a serviceman to a civilian economy is just as essential as it was to prepare him with the needed training and equipment to enable him to do a proper job in the Armed Forces.

HAVE A BROOM, MR. PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, last week when I submitted a bill to create a Select Subcommittee To Investigate the OEO, I said it was only the beginning. Today I am introducing further legislation to clean up the mess that has been made of America's poverty war, a resolution vesting certain authorities and duties in the Committee on Government Operations.

I propose today that the House, through its Committee on Government Operations, contract with an independent auditing firm to tell us in plain, nonpolitical language what has happened to the $2.3 billion the taxpayers have shoveled into the poverty program. The resolution further provides that one of the Nation's many fine management consultant firms be employed at the OEO to tell us what is wrong with its administrative structure and how it ought to be run.

We all hoped that by this time the poverty chiefs would have achieved some degree of organization, but everyday we hear of more and more bungling mismanagement. It is high time, since they cannot seem to get straightened out on their own, that we sent in a team of experts to tell them how to do it.

It has been quipped that the thinnest book in the Library of Congress is the directory of poor people who have been helped by the poverty program. It is a mighty expensive joke on the American taxpayer. For $2.3 billion, they have a right to expect that someone has been helped besides far-from-poverty-stricken political hacks and incapable administrators.

It is hard indeed to believe the sincerity of the President's promise to clean out waste and inefficiency in Government, when he announces as he did Monday, his plan to pour an additional $400 million more than last year into the poverty war. This will bring next year's expenditures to a grand $1.6 billion without any effort to clean up the mess they have made with the money we have already given them.

If the President really means what he said in the state of the Union message, here is his chance to prove it. In the interest of good government and economy, he should welcome the two studies I am proposing. But of much greater importance, in the humanitarian interest of really trying to help the poor, we should all work to clean up the poverty war mess.

If he really wants to clean house, here is the broom.

VETERANS' EQUITY BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, a considerable number of veterans are finding that their monthly pension benefits have been reduced or terminated as the result of enactment last session of a modest increase in monthly social security payments. The unfortunate situation created for such veterans in receipt of both veterans pension and monthly social security benefits must be rectified, and now is the time for proper legislative action.

Last year the Congress and the President respectively passed and approved into law a 7-percent increase in social security payments. The undesirable, inequitable result therefrom has been placement of a certain number of veterans just above one of the income limits set forth in law for entitlement to a specified rate of pension. In other words, the added monthly social security benefit was just enough to place them in a position to receive less pension than before, or none at all. It is estimated that 29,000 veterans found themselves in the adverse position where significantly more was lost in veterans pension than was gained by the Social Security Amendments of 1965.

Embarrassing as it appears, we must recognize, in the case of so many deserving veterans, survivors, and dependents, the existance of this unintentional but still very real hardship and inequity. We must not shirk our responsibility to correct the unwanted consequence of total income being lower now than before passage of increased social security benefits. When the direct and substantive increase in one Government monthly benefit brings about a greater reduction in another income supplement of Government, then the time has arrived for correction of such injustice—in this instance by congressional initiative.

Acting upon my belief that full and complete consideration should be given to the solution of their plight, I am today introducing a bill designed to relieve the veterans, widows, and their dependents adversely affected by the social security increase. This bill provides an appropriate raising of income limitations for veterans without affecting pension entitlement. It is my sincere desire that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will give this and similar proposals their earnest attention at the earliest possible time.

MARITIME POLICY: ANOTHER VIEWPOINT

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, the American merchant marine has been the subject of considerable study. A number of these issues were taken to the public forum during the 1st session of the 89th Congress. Needless to say, there has been considerable lack of unanimity among the various spokesmen.

One of the highpoints of this activity was the release last October of the controversial report of the Interagency Maritime Task Force entitled, "The Merchant Marine in National Defense and Trade: A Policy and a Program." The report represents but one point of view. It was prepared under the direction of the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. Assisting Mr. Boyd as a participant in the deliberations of the task force was the Honorable Nicholas Johnson, Maritime Administrator. Both of these gentlemen have taken to the public forum in recent months to promote and defend their viewpoint as expressed in the task force report.

In the interest of acquainting our Members with another viewpoint, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of a speech made by Mr. Peter N. Teige, vice president, American President Lines, Ltd. Mr. Teige made his remarks before the Propeller Club, port of Portland, on November 24, 1965. I would hope that all Members will heed Mr. Teige's warning of the dangers of further and undue procrastination by the Federal Government in discharging its role with respect to the American merchant marine.

The speech follows:

PROPOSED CHANGES IN NATIONAL MARITIME POLICY—A CRISIS FOR THE MERCHANT MARINE

(Remarks of Peter N. Teige, vice president, American President Lines, before the Propeller Club, port of Portland, on November 24, 1965)

Let me say at the outset how very pleased I am to have been invited by our neighboring city to the north to address your Propeller Club. It has been my experience that we have a particularly vigorous and vital maritime industry on the Pacific coast these days and that Portland is in the thick of the activity. Your steady progress here is apparent to any visitor. I would like also while I am here to pay tribute to Mr. Tom Guerin, the general manager of the Portland public docks.

As a member of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee he has been giving a great deal of his time and talents to the important work of that Committee. The whole industry should be grateful to him for this.

I want to talk with you today about a recent development in the unprecedented analysis, scrutiny, and study of the merchant marine that has been taking place in Washington over the past few years, and to point up the extraordinary threat this occurrence poses to our maritime industry. Specifically, I want to talk to you about the "Report of the Interagency Maritime Task Force on the Merchant Marine" which was issued last October 4, sometimes called the Boyd report, in recognition of the role played by Mr. Alan Boyd, our Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, in its preparation.

Let me say first that while I will be critical of the few portions of the report that we will have time to deal with today, this does not mean that I think the report is all bad. It is not. We must, however, talk about the parts of the report with which we disagree, for it is this process which will ripen these disputed portions so that they are ready for a wise and judicious disposition by the Congress and the executive branch of our Government. It is in this spirit of constructive criticism that I speak today.

Study of the merchant marine in this country is about as unusual as roses in Portland in the summertime. Just since 1945 we have had at least 14 studies of the merchant marine. Some of these studies were conducted by groups that included our most able citizens, including Marian Folsom, former treasurer of Eastman Kodak; K. T. Keeler, former head of General Motors production; James Black, former president of Pacific Gas & Electric Co.; Admiral Cochrane; Admiral Land; T. V. Houser, former chairman of Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Carter Burgess, chairman of American Machine & Foundry; General Gruenther; Dr. Deane W. Malott, president, Cornell University; Stuart T. Saunders, president, Pennsylvania Railroad, and others.

But the recently published report of the Interagency Task Force is something new. Unlike all of the other studies it proposes surprisingly drastic changes in the present order of things in the merchant marine and particularly in the program embodied in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. What is more, both the Maritime Administrator and the Under Secretary of Commerce are actively stumping the country to gain support for the report. In fact, I am advised that Mr. Johnson, our articulate and vigorous Maritime Administrator, will be here in Portland in the near future to speak, presumably on some aspect of this subject. This does not appear, therefore, to be a study report that will molder on the shelf—it will apparently be pressed by these vigorous, dedicated people upon the Congress and the White House as a new program for the merchant marine that should be adopted. Let me make two things clear about this situation before I go into some detail about the report. A broad, careful reexamination of our Government's merchant marine policy is laudable. Any 30-year-old Government program should be carefully scrutinized for its validity and effectiveness under today's conditions. Secondly, I have nothing but admiration for the vigorous and energetic manner in which our Maritime Administrator has tackled the job of reappraising the merchant marine. But, in the end, study, vigor, and energy are not enough. The proposals for change must make sense—they must help the industry not hurt it. It will be my task today, and I welcome it, to demonstrate that the task force report is not in many respects a sound proposal and that the planners who authored it have been long on energy and on sweeping innovation but short on good sense and knowledge of the industry they seek to rebuild.

To understand the task force report and what is wrong with it, we must review very briefly the course that has been followed by the merchant marine industry since World War II. The first portion of this era was highlighted by two facts—the merchant fleet of the United States had been tremendously expanded during the war and the merchant fleets of the traditional maritime countries of the world such as Norway, Greece, the United Kingdom, and Japan had been virtually eliminated by the war. As a result, for a period that really extends until after the Korean war in the early fifties, our war-inflated, U.S.-flag fleet carried a large part of our imports and exports. The tremendous exports of aid cargo needed for the rehabilitation of war-ravaged countries and later the exports of our manufactured goods eagerly sought by long-deprived foreign consumers were largely carried by U.S. vessels in this period.

But, by 1954 the traditional world merchant fleets were back in business and the inexorable and inevitable march of economic events began to take place. More and more new foreign-flag vessels appeared in our harbors and the participation by U.S.-flag vessels in the carriage of our cargos began to plummet. The process has gone on until now a point of stabilization has been reached. Of our dry bulk cargos, we are carrying about 5 percent on a tonnage basis; of our liner cargos, i.e., package-type cargos carried by common carriers operating on regular schedules, we are carrying about 35 percent by weight and about 37 percent on a revenue basis.

It is out of this set of circumstances that the interagency report has grown. Since this is so, let us examine exactly what it is that has happened to our merchant marine since 1946 and how these occurrences have been characterized by the economists and planners who have produced the task force report. In doing this we must remember, as is too often forgotten in Washington, that our merchant fleet is composed of a number of different segments, each with its own economic environment and problems. We have a dry cargo liner fleet engaged in foreign trade, a foreign trade dry bulk cargo fleet, a foreign trade tanker fleet (now virtually extinct) and then liners and tankers in the protected domestic trades. As I say, each of these are subject to different economic circumstances and, therefore, each of them has had a different fate in the post-war years. These differences are exceedingly important to note. Unless this is done by a merchant marine planner he will have resorted to a meat-axe instead of a rapier approach to the solution of the industry's ills.

Let us first talk about the dry cargo liner fleet engaged in foreign trade. (It should be pointed out that the report deals almost solely with shipping in the foreign trades, not in the domestic trades. I will do likewise in this discussion.) The basic point to remember here is that this is the only segment of the merchant marine that receives direct financial support from the Government. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which establishes a program of construction and operating subsidies is liner legislation. After considerable study by the Maritime Commission it was decided to concentrate on the development of a liner fleet rather than a tramp fleet or a foreign trade tanker fleet. Despite all the gloom and doom talk in Washington about the merchant marine, this liner program has been highly successful. As I've previously indicated, it carries over one-third of our liner-type cargo. There have been about 140 new vessels delivered or contracted for since the vessel replacement program under the 1936 act has been underway, costing the shipowners over $800 million after the Government had paid construction subsidy to the shipyards. By the completion of the present program, we will have built 300 vessels. We have now the second largest fleet of liner vessels in the world (second only to the United Kingdom), and we are building over 75 percent of the world's freighters of a speed of 20 knots or greater. Our new liner vessels are bigger and faster, have better cargo gear, better paint systems, more automation and the like than those of any other merchant fleet in the world.

This record would have been even better but for the failure of the Maritime Administration to permit a reasonable expansion of the liner fleet under the 1936 act program. Applications to build new liner vessels have been pending for several years before the Maritime Administration.

Now this strong, vigorous, and effective liner fleet doesn't sound like the same merchant marine that is being described by the Washington planners. What is it they are talking about, then, when they say our country has a fleet of wornout, obsolete vessels and is carrying only 8 percent of its cargo?

What they are doing is lumping together our liner fleet, which I have just described for you, and our bulk cargo fleet. Let's look at what has happened to this dry bulk cargo or tramp fleet since World War II. In the first place, the United States has never in modern times had much of a tramp or dry bulk cargo fleet. In 1938, for example, we only had 38 dry bulk cargo vessels and of these, 19 were small vessels of 2,000 to 6,000 tons of deadweight capacity. As I have indicated, the authors of the 1936 act did not provide for subsidization of bulk ships. So that is the most important thing to remember about the bulk fleet—it has received no direct subsidy, as the liners have. The other striking occurrence affecting this picture has been the tremendous growth of the movement of bulk cargoes in and out of our country in recent years. In 1951 we exported and imported 68 million tons of dry bulk cargoes. By 1963 it had risen to over 139 million tons—nearly doubling in slightly over a decade. During that time the number of U.S.-flag bulk ships did increase some, due to our cargo preference laws, but by 1964 we still only had about 85 bulk vessels in the foreign trade and most of these were old, obsolete Liberty vessels. In 1963, for example, we carried only 7 million tons of our total bulk cargo of 139 million tons. Now here is the arithmetic that, in my opinion, has caused much of the confusion among the Washington planners and their followers. The reasoning goes something like this. If we put the bulk cargo and the liner cargo carrying figures together our ships carry only a pitiful 8.5 percent of our total cargo. If we throw in the old bulk ships with the liners we have an inordinate number of obsolete ships. Therefore, in light of all of these merged facts and figures, there must be something wrong with our Government's entire merchant marine support program. The planners then proceed not only to suggest alleviation of the bulk cargo problem, which is the problem. They go on and change the long-standing liner support program even though it has been surprisingly successful.

I want to be fair to these planners, but I must speak out against this unsophisticated and undiscerning approach to our problems. Instead of simply moving to cure the bulk segment of our merchant marine where the poor cargo carryings and old ships are concentrated, they have jumped to the conclusion that the whole system is poor from one end to the other and must be drastically modified.

This lack of discernment is coupled with an extraordinary and cavalier appetite for change. It is praiseworthy when the executive branch of our Government takes a hard look at our older Federal programs that cost the taxpayer money. National needs and goals change; bureaucratic embellishments detour the original course of these programs. So I can only applaud the reexamination of the Government's merchant marine program which is now nearly 30 years old. But it doesn't follow because a program is now three decades old that it is per se in need of drastic change. Nor does it follow that those who question the need for such drastic change are dinosaurs or "blind, selfish interests". There is an old saying that one should never take down a fence without finding out why it was put there in the first place. This is sound advice to those now engaged in the study of our maritime industry.

The year 1936 may sound like ancient history to young men today. But they will be surprised to find that the planning and thought that went into the 1936 act is not now all obsolete. That act was, in retrospect, a rather extraordinary document. The country had floundered for 70 years trying to develop a sensible and workable merchant fleet program. It had gone through lump sum subsidies, subsidies for carrying cargo and subsidies for carrying mail. It had had its scandals and most of all, its failures. Then came the 1936 act. It had logic and symmetry. By providing a subsidy that would equalize the vessel and crew costs of U.S. operators with those of their foreign competitors, it was that rare legislative bird, a rational system for dealing with a difficult problem. It has withstood the test of years. It is not perfect; no program is. It can be improved; this should be done. But, its basic outline should be preserved because in the area to which it has so far been applied—the liner fleet—it has worked.

I don't have the time to tell you in any detail how the task force report does violence to the basic provisions of the act. But I do want to comment briefly on a couple of its salient points.

First, let me say that the whole underlying basis of the report seems to me to be faulty. At its very outset, the report grapples in a commendably forthright way with the fundamental question of the appropriate size of the merchant marine. It concludes that it should only be large enough to meet what are defined as the emergency needs of the United States. In short, the old policy set forth in the 1936 act that our fleet should be large enough to be both a military auxiliary and to carry a substantial portion of our commerce is swept away. The report with characteristic brevity (considering its importance, the report is short, only 51 pages) states that since our resources can be better used than in supporting a merchant fleet, only our "noneconomic" merchant fleet needs should be met. But I wonder if this isn't too pat and slick an answer to an exceedingly difficult problem. The world of today is an exceedingly complex one in which the United States functions as a great power and in which it is in conflict and competition not only in the political and military arenas but in the economic field. World economics, world politics, and world security matters are all intertwined. In such circumstances, who can say that an economic function such as a national capability to carry a respectable portion of one's own commerce by sea is not needed? Sea power is not so easily and neatly divisible between emergency, noneconomic needs, and nonemergency, economic purposes.

Another way of testing the theory is to look at the numbers of the fleet proposed by the report. It states that 400 liner-type vessels are now needed under the "emergency need" test. But, a footnote states, these are 400 vessels of an assumed speed of 15 knots and of a size of 600,000 bale cubic.

If the liner vessels in question are larger and faster, fewer would be needed. Since most vessels being built by the U.S. liner operators today have at least a 20-knot speed and over 700,000 bale cubic this emergency need figure would probably already be reduced to less than 300 ships. This is about the number of the subsidized liner vessels of today. Without getting into any secrets, it can be said that with a serious, but relatively small war going on, the Defense Department and our Maritime Administration have in recent months found it impossible to meet the tremendous cargo lift needs of our Vietnam operations without requiring our merchant fleet virtually to abandon its strategically important, hard-won position in the commercial carriage of cargoes to the foreign-flag lines. Even more significant, they have had the sobering experience of foreign-flag vessels, either because of the attitudes of foreign governments or, and this is an exceedingly important point, the political attitude of foreign crews, refusing to carry cargoes to Vietnam when they have been asked to do so by our military transportation establishment. One would think that this, too, would give the merchant marine planners cause to reexamine some of their premises.

The excuse for this skeletonized merchant fleet is Government economy—something in the abstract we all favor. But I strongly believe that our country as a great world power urgently needs a strong, well-balanced merchant fleet as a significant part of the combined economic, diplomatic, scientific, and military paraphernalia with which a great power operates in the world today. It needs it at least as much as, and probably more than, supersonic commercial aircraft or a man on the moon. And we can afford it.

But the agency in our Government responsible for seeing that this important sinew in our national body doesn't wither away must fight for the appropriations and support that will make this possible. This is what is done by the other departments of Government that have responsibility for development of important elements of our national strength such as in the air transport and the space fields. It is this pressure for attention to these policies that molds a proper overall Government spending allocation among these competing areas of national needs. But if the agency responsible for a really strong merchant marine has let the economists talk it out of clamoring for the maritime industry's share of our national resources which our security and strength requires, we are in a dangerous position indeed. Then the whole process gets out of kilter and our national interest is threatened.

The planners point out that shipping subsidies have increased over the years. Well, of course, they have. In the first place, our subsidized fleet has grown some in recent years, as it should have. But it has not grown to match our country's growth and needs. Our gross national product has increased an average of about 5 percent per year in the past decade; the number of subsidized vessels, however, has only increased at the rate of slightly over 1 percent per year. Even when the greater speed and carrying capacity of our newer vessels are considered, we have not kept up with our national growth. But in reckoning the cost of the Government subsidy program this increase in the size of our subsidized fleet and its productivity must be taken into account.

The subsidy costs are also higher than they were because wages of seamen and shipyard workers have gone up. But there's nothing unique about this either. The cost of virtually everything else the Government buys has been going up, too. Because the cost of its office buildings or aircraft carriers have increased over the years doesn't mean the Government's program in either field of acquisition is a failure. Yet this is the logic our maritime planners apply to our subsidy program.

This brings me to the other salient proposal of the task force report that I would like to discuss with you for a few moments. As you are aware, foreign-flag crew costs, because of the relative difference in our standards of living are presently four to five times lower than those of a U.S.-flag vessel. It is this difference which the operating-differential subsidy paid under the 1936 act seeks to erase. It is, in effect, a subsidy to our seamen and it enables a shipowner to compete though he uses a U.S. crew. This parity system has been the very basis of our successful liner program in this country. It has been rational, honest and fair; it has avoided the pitfalls of the abuses and the resulting scandals of other irrational subsidy systems. Now it is proposed that this all be changed. In its place there will be the planners' shiny, new creation—the incentive operating subsidy. I hope you will follow me for a moment through a short but technical discussion. If you do you will be rewarded by really understanding in the months ahead what some of the controversy is about.

This is how the new operating subsidy program will work. The Maritime Administration will determine how much differential subsidy has been paid over a base period to the operators serving a given trade area. This amount will then be divided into the gross revenue from cargo carrying earned by those operators in that area during that period. The result will be a determination of an amount of subsidy per revenue dollar earned. Let us say it is 25 cents per revenue dollar. During the next few years, until there is a recomputation, this amount would be paid an operator for each gross revenue dollar collected. That basically is the plan and I must confess I can't see that it has any redeeming feature.

Even a freshman economics student would see at once the distorting effect this sort of subsidy on gross revenue would have on the steamship economy. In the first place, the steamship business is a cyclical one. Annual gross revenues fluctuate considerably. Under this system we will have the spectacle of wild swings in the amount of subsidy paid the operators. In years of large revenues there will be large subsidies paid (I can hear the inquiring voice of the economy-minded Congressman now). And in poor years little subsidy will be paid. One couldn't have invented if one tried a long time a better way to bankrupt an industry.

Note also that since the subsidy would be paid on gross revenue, the operators would be impelled toward taking cargo that it is now uneconomic to take. Assume an operator of a high-speed, expensive liner vessel has space available and is offered cargo that it does not presently pay him to take because it is too low rated, is too expensive to load, and ties up the vessel too long. In the normal economic operation of the industry this cargo would find its way into a slower, older, lower cost vessel. This is as it should be. We don't carry coal in a DC-8. But if by taking this cargo the liner operator is to receive for each freight dollar a quarter or 50 cents subsidy, he may take the cargo. A 24-knot highly mechanized liner freighter shouldn't be sitting around filling up every nook and cranny with cheap cargoes that should be carried by less expensive and sophisticated means. I submit that this gross revenue subsidy will seriously distort the normal economic functioning of the shipping market and in the long run be wasteful of our resources.

It will also lead, it would seem to me, to weird results as far as rates are concerned. It is clear, for example, that the operators will want no more FIO rates where the shipper pays the cost of loading and discharging for this will reduce gross revenues and, hence, the incentive subsidy. Should the operators be put in a position where such finagling of rates and hence of subsidy is possible? One can see in the distance a whole new set of rules and regulations trying to control this situation following in the wake of this subsidy.

This subsidy based on gross revenue will also, together with the report's proposal on loosening of the present trade route system, encourage U.S. liner operators to forsake the trades that tend to have lower rated and FIO cargoes for those with higher rates. A trading area like Oregon and Washington should give considerable thought to the implication of that development.

Why has this strange subsidy proposal been made? It is the position of the planners that the present subsidy system leaves the operator without an incentive to be more productive and efficient. As a representative of steamship management, I find this a shocking suggestion. Under the parity system where the effect of the operating subsidy is to equalize an operator's costs with his foreign competitors, he has every reason to be as competitive as possible by having faster vessels, better cargo-handling facilities, quicker turnaround of vessels, stronger, more effective sales organizations and the like. Out of this competitive incentive has come the most modern and efficient ships in the world. What our planners don't seem to understand and our Government promotional organization chooses not to speak of with pride is that our subsidized U.S.-flag liner fleet has been the trailblazer in most of the new methods, new ship designs and new cargo gear developed in the world in recent years for use in the foreign trade liner business. My company, American President Lines, for example, has been using cargo containers in the foreign trade for over a decade. It is just in the last few years that the foreign lines have become interested in this growing method of operation. Heavy lift gear, stainless clad deep tanks, automated reefer equipment, mechanized hatch covers, gantry cranes for containers, triple hatches for vertical stowage, barge ships, bow thrusters, greater speed and size of liner vessels have all been American innovations in the liner business.

There is one element in the planners' theory on incentive that has at least a surface appearance of authenticity. This is that under the parity system, steamship management is encouraged to give up too easily to maritime labor. Let me state emphatically that the record doesn't support this at all. The final measure of management's resistance to labor's demands is the strike. Every time there is a strike, the employers in question have said "No" to a union demand. In the decade from 1953 through 1962 there were a total of 21 seagoing strikes against the subsidized operators. An average of 85,000 man-days a year were lost amounting to 0.7 percent of the total man-days worked. This compares with the national average of 0.2 percent.

In other words, our industry had seamen's strikes that in their effect exceeded the national average by 2½ times. The Labor Department has reported that no major industry group has a higher percent of strike-idled days than the offshore maritime industry and its seamen. I don't point to this with any pride. We are working hard with the unions to improve this lamentable situation. But it does seem to me to lay to rest this canard that the subsidized operators have been too easy in their seagoing labor negotiations. They have in fact been involved in strikes oftener and for longer than any other industry.

I should also point out the progress that is being made by the industry in the rationalization of manning aboard its ships. This is a difficult problem involving social consequences as well as vessel efficiency. Despite this fact, considerable progress in this field is being made, more than probably any other country except Japan where there is a shortage of seagoing labor and seagoing unions are weak. This automation and reduced manning activity was first generated by the subsidized companies, not the unsubsidized companies or the Maritime Administration.

All of this seems to me to eliminate the last element of the claim that our merchant marine lacks incentive. I can't resist at this point mentioning in passing that there are some restraints that do lessen our efficiency. These arise from the Maritime Administration's own rules and regulations. Time permits only a couple of examples. The Maritime Administration has inaugurated a program to standardize vessel construction. I can't think of anything that will do more to stultify ingenuity and invention in our industry. It prevents the operator who knows his trade route and its needs best from developing a vessel that will not only minimize costs but maximize revenues. Just one other example. One of the principle expenditures of manhours by the engine room personnel on a vessel is in the repair and maintenance of the substantial number of pumps, valves, and motors that are aboard.

Some of the operators have sought to upgrade materially the quality and life expectancy of this equipment so as to reduce this time-consuming work to help enable further crew reduction. Though the Maritime Administration is urging the operators to make further manning reductions, it at the same time refuses to authorize this upgrading of equipment because of its impact on competitive bidding and on construction subsidy costs. The report does propose some reduction and simplification of the Government regulation of our industry. We applaud this and hope that it will include sweeping away some of the policies, such as those just described, that are real hurdles to the development of an efficient and productive fleet.

There is much more to be said about the Task Force Report, but I can impose upon you no further. I hope you will get the report, read it, think about it, and express your views on it. We hope that its appearance will signal the beginning of the end of the reappraisal of the merchant marine that has been going on now for over 2 years. Like having a baby, it's wonderful to have one but it shouldn't take too long. We want to have the merchant marine program carefully reviewed, but if this process goes on too long and too vehemently it is destructive of the very industry which it seeks to preserve. The undiscerning and unfair criticisms of the industry that always seem to be on the fringes of every Washington inquiry, however sincere and conscientious the study itself may be, are destroying the morale of the industry.

So let us get on with the job of completing these studies; let all those affected promptly present their cases to the Congress, the White House, and the public, and then let the decisions that must be made be made quickly but carefully, so that we can all at last get back to the job of building a strong merchant fleet.

THE STUDENTS OF REVOLT

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, last September, I found worthy of calling to the attention of my colleagues a column from the San Francisco Examiner by Mr. Guy Wright. During the adjournment period, there appeared another of Mr. Wright's columns which I thought particularly noteworthy. The article follows:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Dec. 9, 1965]

THE STUDENTS OF REVOLT

(By Guy Wright)

One day in Santo Domingo I watched a fledgling demagog practicing his trade.

He was good at it. A handsome, strapping college boy, he stood with feet widespread, chin outthrust and harangued a mob of fellow students, whipping their emotions until they screamed and shook their anti-American banners.

Then, at his command, they went swarming down the street, disrupting traffic.

It was a textbook example of civil disobedience, and it must have made his professors proud.

On me it had an opposite effect. I came home from my Caribbean adventure convinced that the American college professor who encourages his students to practice civil disobedience is a fool playing with fire.

And I hold that to be true, professor, no matter what your cause. Unless what you want in this country is the chronic near-anarchy that prevails in Latin America, you had better stop telling those kids they have a moral right to break the law.

At the moment civil disobedience is the weapon of those who regard themselves as liberals, but they have no monopoly on it. Nazi stormtroopers also resorted to civil disobedience to destroy the Weimar Republic.

The seeds you are sowing, professor, could bring a similar reaction here. Long after your burning issues have faded, the pattern of lawbreaking that you espouse is likely to remain.

Latin America offers a sobering example of how this works.

Latin American universities traditionally lean far to the left. Latin American governments traditionally lean to the autocratic right, in most cases imposed by a coup.

Yet the people who impose and control these rightest governments are graduates of the leftist universities. How does it happen?

In the universities left-leaning professors preach the doctrine of civil disobedience. They encourage students to march on the national palace, to paint slogans on walls, to throw rocks at police in behalf of whatever liberal cause is fashionable at the moment.

As these students grow older, they move across the political spectrum from liberal to conservative, a normal phenomenon of the aging process. The only thing that remains constant is their belief, learned in college, that they have a right to throw rocks if they don't like the government.

By then, however, some have progressed from rock throwing to positions where they command troops, tanks, and planes.

The history of Latin America is sprinkled with men who began their careers as young liberals spouting popular revolution and finished as elderly reactionaries plotting military coups.

It could happen here, professor, if you keep preaching civil disobedience.

If a college student has a moral right to block a troop train because he believes war is wrong, how about some kookie general of the Doctor Strangelove type who convinces himself there are Communists under the President's bed? Isn't he morally justified in overthrowing the Government, in order to save it?

By following your credo, professor, Latin American generals have no trouble answering yes.

THE EPITOME OF GOVERNMENT INDECISIVENESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, over the past several months I have spoken out concerning the abysmal lack of Federal leadership in the American maritime industry. The industry has been buffeted about in a stormy sea of indecision and vacillation. But, today we have reached greater depths.

Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor for the Baltimore Sun, in an article appearing in today's issue of that paper has reported the opposition of the Honorable John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce, to the building of American-flag ships in foreign shipyards. Yet, within his own Department we have the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, and the Honorable Nicholas Johnson, Maritime Administrator, vigorously proposing that we build our ships abroad. Messrs. Boyd and Johnson, it will be recalled, were the principal authors of the report of the Interagency Maritime Task Force, which recommended foreign construction.

When such blatant inconsistency is prevalent within the very executive agency charged by law with the promotion of the American merchant marine, one need no longer wonder over one of the major causes of the plight of our marine industry. And, if the Members of the House are confused in light of this press report, just imagine the perplexity facing industry in dealing with such a chameleon.

I commend the reading of Mrs. Bentley's article to all Members of the Congress. She is probably one of the most able maritime reporters in this country today, and would hardly fall prey to erroneous reporting.

The article follows:

CONNOR HITS SHIPS POLICY—OPPOSES BUILDING U.S.-FLAG VESSELS IN FOREIGN YARDS

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON, January 25.—John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce, today confirmed that he opposes the building of American-flag ships in foreign shipyards.

Thus Secretary Connor, who also serves as chairman of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee, appears to stand alone in his own Department on this issue which has caused considerable controversy throughout the Nation in recent months.

Connor first revealed his feelings on this important matter at a private meeting of the Carolton Club last week. However, it was not until today that he confirmed that he had made the statement and this was his belief.

AID CONFIRMS VIEWS

Confirmation was made through an aid, who added that the Secretary has been opposed to foreign shipbuilding from the beginning—particularly since it would have an adverse effect on the balance of payments situation which he is striving to swing more in America's favor.

Furthermore, Secretary Connor said that if the Government had been fulfilling its obligations toward building up the merchant marine over the years, the balance of payments problem would be resolved because there would be adequate American-flag tonnage to haul American commerce.

If this problem had been given the same attention over the years as it is today with the full cooperation of labor and industry, there would not be a balance of payments problem, it was pointed out.

American-flag ships are carrying less than 9 percent of this Nation's vast foreign commerce tonnage, while nations like Norway are handling 17 percent.

The Secretary is for a stronger merchant marine and strong shipbuilding industry in the United States. It was said that he is mindful of the jobs involved in the shipyards and aboard the ships.

The entire program needs reorientation because the U.S. program is sufficient today, the Secretary's office noted, and added that it could be aided on a tripartite level.

Although Secretary Connor was quoted as having said at the Carlton Club that he was not in agreement with the Interagency Maritime task force report, he sent word that he did not make this statement.

BIG LOSS SEEN

However, it was noted that the crux of the task force study—of which the chairman was Alan S. Boyd, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation—is the emphasis on building American flag ships in foreign countries.

Another part of that report called for repairing American ships in foreign countries, which would mean the loss of $277 million a year to the ship repair industry of the United States, according to the Shipbuilders Council of America.

Labor and most steamship companies alike as well as the shipbuilding industry have taken a strong stand against the task force study and supported the recommendations of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee, which calls for a vastly expanded shipbuilding program in the United States and general enlargement of the American merchant marine so that it can transport at least 30 percent of this country's commerce.

The cost of such a program has been estimated at between $600 million and $1 billion annually.

The subsidy for the American merchant marine in fiscal 1966 was about $340 million. For fiscal 1967, the budget provides $289 million, the first year that there has been a sharp reduction in the budget for the Maritime Administration, which is an agency within the Department of Commerce.

ONLY 13 NEW SHIPS

In next year's budget, provision is made for the construction of only 13 new ships—and this number is based upon the transfers of certain funds now in reserve. Otherwise, the number will be 11. Thirteen is the smallest number of new ships built in any year since the replacement program got fully underway in 1958.

The replacement program now is said to be 90 ships behind schedule.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT DOLE BEFORE THE AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMAN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Kansas, ROBERT DOLE, made a very significant speech before the American National Cattleman's Association, at their annual convention in Kansas City, Mo. I was particularly interested in the speech for a number of reasons—Brooks Keogh, president of the American National Cattleman's Association is a native North Dakotan and an outstanding American who has given great leadership to this organization over the past 2 years, and BOB DOLE's remarks on this occasion are worthy, I think, of our colleagues' interest and attention since he dealt with the all-important problems facing us of adequate world food supply and maintaining a sound agriculture.

I would like to insert his remarks at this point in the RECORD, so that others may have the opportunity to study them:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN BOB DOLE, AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, 69TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, MUSIC HALL, MUNICIPAL AUDITORIUM, KANSAS CITY, MO., JANUARY 25, 1966

President Keogh, officers of the American Cattlemen's Association, my friend Bill McMillan, ladies and gentlemen, it is always a pleasure to meet with the members and friends of this great organization, as we share a belief in the same basic principles of freedom and opportunity. We share a deep concern over the continuing threats to those principles from within and without our country. Today we also share a common fear of continuing efforts by the Federal Government to control the production, merchandising, and pricing of agricultural commodities. American cattlemen have always played a leading role in resisting these efforts, though as we know, the fierce desire to impose and enforce Federal controls upon broad sections of the Nation's economy has never really died in many Washington minds. In fact, it is beginning to flame again.

PRICE CONTROLS

Within recent weeks, the aluminum, copper, and steel industries have had a taste of the same bitter medicine farmers have been gagging on for many years. Instant controls are enforced through naked Government power and resources. In the absence of any legislative authority to control metal prices, the administration has resorted to the dumping of Government-owned copper stockpiles, at well below world prices, and the threat of Federal contract award reprisals, as a means of invoking price ceilings.

In the case of such agricultural commodities as wheat and feed grains, the administration has flouted the expressed will of Congress by dumping Commodity Credit Corporation stocks for the avowed purpose of depressing prices and forcing farmers to participate in so-called voluntary crop control programs. When Congress wrote the CCC charter in 1948, that agency was charged with "stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices." Today, in my opinion, the greatest threat to farm income and price stability is CCC itself, with its vast accumulation of wheat, feed grains, cotton, and other commodities. These inventories hang like the Sword of Damocles over the price of every item.

Early this month it was announced that CCC was moving millions of bushels of corn from country to terminal points where it would be offered for sale. Shortly before that, it was announced the Government's stock of wheat—nearly 500 million bushels—would be offered for unrestricted use "to assure adequate market supplies." Secretary Freeman noted at that time that U.S. wheat stocks then totaled 1.5 billion bushels, with the prospect of a 700-million-bushel carryover on July 1, 1966. By that date, a new wheat crop estimated at 1.3 billion bushels or more will be moving to market. All of this would provide a total supply of 2 billion bushels for the new crop year—enough to meet domestic needs for at least 3 years or enough to meet domestic needs, plus foreseeable export demands for the 1966-67 marketing year, with a reasonably large reserve—perhaps 500 to 600 million bushels—still in hand.

The most important point, however, is that the offer to sell CCC stocks did not increase or decrease total U.S. wheat stocks by 1 bushel. Its immediate effect, as you know, was to break the price farmers could receive in the marketplace by several cents per bushel. Moreover, this was the intended effect of the announcement. It was a premeditated administrative price control action willfully designed to place a ceiling on the price of wheat.

On the very day the Government wheat dumping program was inaugurated, the Department of Agriculture reported the average price received by farmers for wheat was $1.40 per bushel, or 54 percent of parity. A wheat price ceiling at 54 percent of parity. This is all the more amazing when you reflect upon the fact we have administration pledged to price supports at not less than 90 percent of parity for wheat and other basic comodities. In all fairness, let me add that under the wheat certificate plan, the value of certificates and other payments should also be included; but based on the December 1965, prices, the complier will still receive only about 70 percent of parity on his total production, and the noncomplier, as stated, about 54 percent of parity. The dumping practices are designed to place a ceiling on the price of wheat and, in turn, prevent any increase in the price of bread, but the price of wheat itself would have to increase considerably to justify any increase in bread prices.

In view of efforts to control wheat prices, one can well imagine what administration leaders might be doing today if they had an inventory of beef and pork in their food stockpile. Hogs have been bringing 124 percent of parity—what a target this would be for the price controllers.

REMEMBER 1961

The so-called state of the Union message delivered Wednesday night, January 12, must have contained surprising news for the American farmer. I refer specifically to the ridiculous statistics cited to the effect that farm income is at an all-time high and is up 40 percent in the past 5 years and up 20 percent over last year. To start with, the word farm income means income per farm in the President's statement. Latest USDA figures indicate there are now 3,286,000 farms in the United States—some 670,000 less than in 1960. Obviously then, if there are fewer farms, the share per farm in the national income ple will be greater, this has been the case over the years. I would agree that farm income in 1965 exceeded the level of the previous year, primarily because of the increase in livestock prices, and secondly, the fact that direct government subsidies are increasing. In 1965, approximately 2.4 billion government dollars were paid to farmers, which is nearly quadruple the level of payments in 1960. While I certainly applaud increased farm income, I would suggest that a more reasonable management of government-held stocks would permit farm income to advance even further at the place it should—the marketplace. Improvements in this area might help the farmer retire farm debt which has increased more than 50 percent in the past 5 years. As many of you know, farm debt has been rising at a more rapid rate than either net farm income or land values which suggests that many farmers are forced to rely on credit at least in part—as a substitute for income.

As we reflect on increases in livestock prices, it would be well to remember that it was just 5 short years ago, in 1961, that Secretary Freeman and his top adviser, Dr. Willard Cochrane—later turned out to pasture—charged up Capitol Hill with their so-called supply management program in hand. That was the plan (H.R. 6400) which would have placed the entire agricultural economy, including the livestock industry, at the mercy of the professional planners in USDA. It was referred to by many as the triple-H plan, that is, the hens, hogs, and heifers control plan. In a later administration bill there were to be fines and jail sentences for farmers and ranchers who failed to keep proper books or refused to comply with other edicts of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Livestock producers should be eternally grateful that they escaped the fate in store for them. Congress stripped most of the proposed controls from the Freeman-Cochrane package. But there is nothing in the record to indicate the basic belief in a controlled livestock industry has been altered.

Where do you suppose cattle and hog prices would be today, what would be the state of the livestock industry, if the supply-management program had been in effect 5 years ago? To ask the question is to answer it.

Therefore, it is ironic to hear administration spokesmen claiming full credit for the current increase in net farm income—an increase brought about largely through improved livestock prices. As all of you know, it was ranchers and farmers themselves, through their own individual decisions, who increased their own incomes by making necessary adjustments in livestock marketings and numbers.

As a matter of fact, it was Government decisions and policies which gave livestock producers two of their roughest years in recent history during 1963 and 1964. Wholesale dumping of Government-owned feed grains a year earlier triggered unsound expansion of livestock numbers. Record-breaking imports of meat provided the additional supply factor which broke cattle prices to disaster levels.

This demonstrated again that even though your industry has succeeded in averting Government control and price-support programs, livestock producers are still subject to the fallout from supply management plans devised for other commodities. It is argued that the present feed-grain program is a voluntary one. Technically, this is true. But in many instances, the farmer's alternative to staying out of the program may impose such a harsh financial penalty that he is virtually forced to comply. The corngrower, for example, doesn't have to restrict his production. But when he goes to market with his corn, he finds the Government there ahead of him, dumping huge surpluses and depressing the free market price.

EFFECT OF CCC SALES

A research study by the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture, of which I am a member, found that the income of farmers from sales of corn alone would have been $370 million higher in the 1961–62 marketing year had it not been for the competitive dumping of nearly a billion bushels of Government-owned corn. This was, in effect, confirmed by the Secretary last year before the House Agriculture Committee. He said, "* * * we purposely sold in order to move our prices down far enough so that they would be way below the support level, the loan level, so that we could thereby get compliance. That was the whole intent and purpose and thrust of the program."

Is it the duty of a Secretary of Agriculture to beat down farm prices in order to drive farmers into compliance with Government programs? I believe his primary responsibility is to help protect our marketing system so that farmers can earn a fair return in the marketplace, rather than having to depend upon a Government check. Moreover, I am certain that most American farmers would prefer to have it that way. They know that the same government which can hand them something today can take it back, with interest, tomorrow.

Strong efforts were made during debate on the 1965 farm bill to restrict Commodity Credit Corporation's sales authority. It was proposed that the minimum level for CCC resales of grain be boosted from the current 105 percent of loan level to a higher figure. This would have increased prices received by farmers in free market. I might note that Republicans overwhelmingly supported the increase. Democrats overwhelmingly opposed it. Of course, the proposal lost.

The current wheat-dumping program should convince skeptics that Congress must place tighter restrictions on the Secretary's authority to dispose of CCC stocks. Many of us are fearful that another large corn-dumping operation may be undertaken this spring in an effort to break prices and club farmers into compliance with the feed grains program. This could have severe repercussions for the livestock industry in 1967-68.

A FOOD RESERVE

If Congress should fail to impose tighter restrictions on the Secretary's authority to dispose of commodity credit stocks, then the possibility of creating a strategic food reserve should be fully explored and implemented. While surpluses in grains may soon be nonexistent, adequate reserves must be maintained. A supply of basic foods, insulated from the market and also from the reach of the administration—regardless of the party in power—perhaps would provide the answer. This is not a new idea, but we have now reached that point where Congress should spell out not only the necessity of having an adequate food reserve, but how it should be handled and administered.

In my opinion, most of the reserves should be owned and managed by the grain trade with some type Government contract requiring a specific amount to be available at all times. Certainly any guidelines should insure that reserves do not become too large for, if this happens, then the Government would again be in a position of using them as a club or a price control weapon. If properly administered and properly insulated from the market, farmers would be better protected, surpluses would not overhang the market, and prices would tend to rise and fall without being depressed or stimulated by bureaucratic action.

Needless to say, we should stockpile only basic foods. Supplies should be kept in rural areas—where produced if practical—and kept under the control of the U.S. Government, not the United Nations or any other international group.

I know of a number of Congressmen who are hopeful that some such program may be established this year. I am now working with Congressman JAMES BATTIN, of Montana, in an effort to come up with some program acceptable to the administration. I understand we have 7 million pounds of goose feathers to stuff bedding for the Army stockpiled, but as yet, no insurance that our food reserves would be adequate in case of crop failure, or extended war in southeast Asia or elsewhere. Our present so-called surpluses could literally vanish in a hurry. We need assurance now not only for ourselves but for a hungry world.

WORLDWIDE FOOD DEMAND

The worldwide demand for food today is unprecedented. The Department of Agriculture recently reported that again in 1965 world food output did not keep up with world food needs. In the underdeveloped countries especially, food production is failing to keep pace with population growth. The world food gap is growing. Famine looms in India, where severe drought has desperately complicated an already serious food deficit. Under these circumstances, the administration should direct greater attention toward sharing accumulated domestic surpluses of food with hungry people in friendly countries and less attention to utilizing these stores as a device for beating down farm prices and forcing producers into compliance with crop control programs.

While I believe we must act, for humanitarian reasons if for no other, to relieve current food shortages among friendly people, I am also keenly aware of the fact that we cannot travel this road forever. The cold truth is that the United States alone cannot continue forever to make up the growing food deficit in India and other underdeveloped countries. Even though all production controls were lifted in the United States, within a very few years we would find ourselves unable to meet the constantly growing need for more food in India alone.

Last November I was privileged to attend the Food and Agriculture Conference in Rome, Italy, as a congressional adviser representing, along with Congressman OLSEN of Minnesota, the U.S. House of Representatives. It was an interesting experience, and provided an opportunity to meet with many agricultural leaders from other countries. I was particularly impressed with my visit with Dr. B. R. Sen, who is the Director General of FAO. Doctor Sen recounted his experience as the Indian Minister of Agriculture during the Calcutta famine in 1943. He explained the difficulty of describing such a calamity—and that it was something one almost had to witness to fully comprehend. He stated very bluntly that unless India receives substantial U.S. food assistance now and in the months ahead, a famine involving some 8 to 10 million Indians could develop this year. I might add he made it clear that he strongly supported the U.S. policy of making additional aid contingent upon expansion of Indian food production and other self-help measures. Doctor Sen also reflected the general concern expressed at the FAO Conference, that America might retrench and reduce its agricultural output and curtail its food aid programs under the new farm law. Doctor Sen stated that many agriculture leaders of other countries were fearful that a reduction in U.S. surpluses would mean a reduction in our efforts to help friendly countries meet their food needs.

This experience alone was an indication to me that the time has come to make drastic changes in our approach to the problem of world hunger. Yes, for the present, we can continue to help people with gifts of food, but we had better start now to help underdeveloped countries increase their own production.

It is quite obvious that American agricultural productivity cannot accommodate the foods needs of the world for any substance of time into the future. Three principal approaches were discussed at length at the FAO meeting as ways to bring the production of food into consonance with the increasing world population (1) the agricultural productivity of the developing nations must be improved, (2) the developed nations together—not America alone—must join hands toward helping the developing nations meet their food needs, and (3) population control, particularly in underdeveloped nations, must be used.

Of these three approaches, I think we must recognize the practical obstacles and limitations that exist.

Obviously there is a limit to what the United States and other developed agricultural nations can produce and distribute to other nations of the world. Humanitarianism must be accompanied by reason if we are to succeed. The mere production of food in developed nations isn't the complete answer. The question of how and who is to pay for their effort must also be answered. The history of mankind has seen no nation act as generously to her neighbors than has the United States of America. Certainly we will continue to do our part and more, but others must help in assuming the financial burdens of this humane effort.

There also are some very practical limitations in existence in regard to population control. We cannot expect to change centuries of religious and cultural traditions overnight and any efforts in this area must take full cognizance of the major religious faiths to which population control is a serious moral issue. I personally could not help but notice at the FAO meeting that population control was not at the moment a very practical and effective answer.

There are limitations, of course, on the capacity of underdeveloped countries to expand their output too. Lack of foreign exchange, illiteracy, poor transportation and marketing facilities, lack of storage and processing, inadequate fertilizer resources and ineffective land tenure are but several of a host of handicaps that exist. Yet in spite of these obstacles, we know local food production can be increased. The U.S. Department of Agriculture recently reported this. Secretary Freeman alluded to the Department's research in this area at the FAO Conference.

I agree, too, that food production can be expanded in developing nations. It not only can, it must.

No matter what approach is used, one thing is eminently clear—that is, there is a desperate need for know-how, knowledge which will serve in coaxing increased productivity from the lands, old and new. How this know-how best can be transmitted to those in need of it poses then as the critical concept that must be dealt with. If we review the fabulous productivity of American agriculture and the magic ingredients which have made it possible, we find that new techniques, new methods, new machinery and dissemination of technological advances from the laboratory to the farm, through the magical extension service, have combined to make America's agriculture second to none.

I would suggest then several approaches to meeting the need for expanded production of food by the underdeveloped nations themselves. Some of these aren't new ideas, but rather are refinements and a change in emphasis.

First off, as a general foreign policy, we should certainly predicate our assistance to foreign nations on the requirement that they improve and expand their own agriculture.

Second, we should coordinate our various technical assistance programs in agriculture. The Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, private agencies, the State Department, the Agriculture Department, and international agencies now have many overseas activities which often overlap each other and, thus, do not bring forth the maximum results possible.

For example, our agricultural attachés overseas do not have a direct say in the policies of AID in rendering agricultural assistance. It seems to me they should have a greater voice in this.

BREAD AND BUTTER CORPS

I would, therefore, suggest the establishment of a Bread and Butter Corps under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, to teach the people of food-short, free world countries, how to increase agricultural production. Many of these emerging nations have the soil, the manpower, and the climate to produce enough food for their own needs. What they lack primarily is technical know-how which could be supplied by us at a small fraction of the cost of our present food assistance programs. In other words, we would introduce the farmers of these countries to the aspects of extension service, the valuable connecting link between know nothing and know something.

Needless, to say, extreme care should be exercised in coordinating and in carrying out any such program, and first of all an accelerated program should be devised to provide a supply of technicians, with the help and cooperation of our land grant institutions throughout the country. The Federal Government could play an important role in stimulating participation in such a program by providing a modest bonus or subsidy for those colleges qualified to train and equip the needed technicians. The technicians need not necessarily have a college degree—but they would be highly trained to meet the demands of their assigned country or countries. Perhaps an intensified and accelerated program could properly prepare a technician in the "BBC" in 1 or 2 years. Only qualified persons would be assigned to a country, and the finished product could conceivably come from any walk of life prior to training—though farmers and others engaged in the field of agriculture might offer the best hope initially.

The subsidy would be conditioned on the performance of the technicians—upon completion of training—in developing countries that needed this training service.

With respect to maintenance and upkeep of American technicians abroad teaching extension work, some arrangement might well be effected to use some of the soft currencies generated under title I of Public Law 480 to help in this respect, particularly with respect to accommodating the expenses of living conditions, etc. In this way, some portions of the excess foreign currencies currently held in India, for example, might be put to practical usage.

And to firm this program up, the U.S. Government should deal directly with the government of the foreign country to whom the assistance was being extended, with America indicating the scope and intent of its effort and specifying what response it expected in return.

Other developed countries of the world must join hands with America in this effort, for this is not a responsibility of the United States alone. Countries like Canada, Australia, France, West Germany, and Britain also must get into the act in order for the program to have an effective and prompt impact.

In a like manner, these same developed countries must stand ready to open the doors on their bins of surplus to the developing countries, sharing with America the strain of feeding these hungry people. America must not act alone to fill empty stomachs while others act only to fill their purses—everybody must get into the act, or it will be a second rate performance.

Essentially, then this whole matter of food-for-a-hungry-world resolves itself into these principal points:

1. Famine in full scale is more in the near future than in the immediate future except in the case of India; hence, there is time to plan to meet the problem head on—but plans must be set in motion now.

2. Because the breadbasket of America is not sufficient unto the task of feeding a hungry world for time into the future, improved agricultural production must occur in the food deficit areas.

3. Know-how is an ingredient vital to this condition of improved agricultural production, and this knowledge must be applied, first, to increasing the yields of existing acres and, second, bringing new agricultural acres into production.

4. Better coordination of all existing programs is needed. The Republican Task Force on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, headed by the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman ODIN LANGEN, has made a concrete proposal in this area which should help. I have joined with nearly 70 of my Republican colleagues in the House in introducing this measure which calls for a bipartisan U.S. World Food Study Commission to make a complete inventory of all our agricultural assets, both human and material, and then make recommendations on how we can help to efficiently feed a free and healthy world.

5. The best way to implement know-how is through an extension service technique, a vital element in the miracle of the miraculous agricultural abundance in America. In this, American technicians should be trained and sent abroad into the lands of the developing countries to help them learn how to draw the most in production from the soil. The Federal Government might provide bonuses for agricultural colleges in order to meet this demand for technicians.

6. These technicians might be known as the Bread and Butter Corps, and they should be joined by other bands of technicians from other developed countries, which also should join with the United States in food gifts.

The emphasis would be upon production of foods which can be grown most quickly and efficiently. Wheat, rice, corn, fruits, vegetables, etc., are obviously the kind of crops which would be involved. What is needed is enough of the basic foods to avert hunger in these countries now. The butter and the T-bone steaks would be for the next century. It is my intention to offer a program along these lines as an amendment to the food-for-peace program which will be extended in Congress this year.

I doubt we have gone the limit in direct distribution of American food to the underdeveloped countries, but a self-help plan for increasing food production abroad is still the only possible way to avert widespread suffering and perhaps even famine in many of the underdeveloped free world countries.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, these are some of my thoughts as the 2d session of the 89th Congress gets underway. My remarks have been confined to the field of agriculture, and I need not tell you there are many, many other issues of grave importance to your association, to the Nation, and to the world, which Congress must grapple with this year. In my opinion, the most important domestic issue is that of legislative reapportionment, and close behind is the battle over section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. Outnumbered, but so far not outmaneuvered, that great Senator from Illinois, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, is making a valiant effort to salvage 14(b) and an equally valiant effort to push through Congress a constitutional amendment which would permit States to apportion one house on a bicameral State legislature, considering factors other than population.

I need not tell you how important both of these issues are to rural America, so I would suggest you contact your Representatives and Senators and urge them to support Senator DIRKSEN's efforts.

My allotted time has expired, and again I would thank Brooks Keogh and the members of your association for giving me this opportunity to appear on your program.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON OFFERS NEW VERSION OF HIS BILL FOR DAIRYMEN TO AUTHORIZE MARKETWIDE MILK PROMOTION PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress I introduced a bill—H.R. 6081—which sought to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to provide for the establishment of marketing research and development projects, advertising, and sales promotional and educational programs in Federal milk marketing orders. This bill would have permitted dairy farmers operating under Federal milk marketing orders to utilize their own money to sell their own product provided the program was first approved by two-thirds of the producers voting in a referendum on this issue.

I recently received a letter from Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman recommending against the enactment of this bill. One of the Department of Agriculture's main reservations regarding my bill was that there would be a spillover of benefits from research and promotional programs financed by producers in a Federal milk marketing order into areas in which dairy farmers were located who were not regulated under the Federal milk order program and who, therefore, would not contribute to the program cost.

However, I think it is immaterial whether or not there is a spillover of the benefits of such a program to other dairy farmers since the funds that would be used to carry out this program would belong to the dairy farmers who had voted to use their own money for these programs. Consequently, so long as the program undertaken is desired by those dairy farmers who voluntarily finance the program, any spillover of benefits is unimportant and, in fact, a benefit to all dairy farmers, including those who contributed to the program.

The Department of Agriculture further objected to H.R. 6081 because of the impact it would have on two private national advertising and research organizations whose operations are now facilitated by the Department of Agriculture. Yet, the Department of Agriculture has no legislative authority to support these two private promotional organizations and, further, I do not believe it should be a matter of concern to the Department of Agriculture what methods dairy farmers use to expend their own funds or who is responsible for their expenditure. It is not the Department of Agriculture's responsibility to insure that these private promotional organizations are the sole research and promotional tools available to dairy farmers when a majority of dairy farmers in any one Federal milk order' market desire otherwise.

The final reservation which the Department had to my bill was the "rather complex problems associated with the setting up of a series of individual agencies in numerous markets to handle the funds collected and to develop uniform and objective programs where the funds collected can be used effectively."

This seems to me to be an attempt to resist any change from the status quo. It is my contention that the Department of Agriculture should be willing to consider changes when they are proposed, especially when many dairy producers already have indicated their desire to be granted the permission my bill provides.

Although I do feel the Department's objections are overcome by a closer reading of H.R. 6081, I am today introducing an amended version of H.R. 6081 which, I feel, answers the reservations raised by the Department of Agriculture. This bill—H.R. 12386—would provide permissive authority for dairy farmers under any Federal milk marketing order to support advertising, nutritional, and economic research of milk and dairy products to be financed by uniform deductions from the dairy farmers' own milk checks.

In order for such a program to be instituted, it would be mandatory for the plan to be approved by two-thirds of the producers voting in a referendum called to consider this issue. Furthermore, under the terms of this amended version, funds obtained from these producer deductions would be turned over to an independent agency composed of producers and producer cooperative representatives. This agency would administer the funds in such a manner so as to fully utilize the techniques and services necessary to a successful research, promotion, and advertising program.

Projects and programs authorized under this bill may be either local or national in scope, as determined by the producers in the Federal order, but may not be international.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment provided for by this bill is one which will be of benefit to all dairy farmers and will in no way add to Government costs. In fact, should domestic consumption be increased by the programs authorized by this bill, Government costs in supporting milk and dairy products through the price support program would be substantially reduced. It is an amendment which a tremendous number of dairy farmers have consistently supported. This voluntary research and promotion program is endorsed by the National Milk Producers Federation which, through its cooperative association members, represents by far the vast majority of the Nation's dairy farmers. Furthermore, this bill is supported by the Federation's New York members, the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, Inc., and the Northeast Dairy Cooperative Federation, Inc., whose combined New York membership exceeds 30,000 dairy farmers. Since H.R. 12386 represents an attempt by dairy farmers to help themselves at no added cost to the Government or the consumer, I feel that H.R. 12386 should receive the favorable consideration of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in explaining the principal provisions of H.R. 12386, I am including with my remarks an analysis and a draft of the bill.

ANALYSIS OF H.R. 12386, A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT OF 1937

The purpose of this bill is to provide permissive authority to allow milk producers regulated by a Federal milk marketing order to support market research and development projects, advertising—excluding brand advertising—sales promotion, education, and other similar programs so as to encourage increased consumption of milk and its products. Such programs would be financed by uniform deductions from the dairy farmers' milk checks, provided the program was approved by two-thirds of the producers voting in a referendum called to consider such proposed program.

The bill would amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 concerning milk orders (7 U.S.C. 608c(5)) to:

First. Allow a hearing to be called at the request of dairy farmers regulated under a Federal milk marketing order to consider whether or not such dairy farmers desire to finance by uniform deductions from their milk checks sales promotion, market research and development projects, and advertising—exclusive of brand advertising—for milk and dairy products.

Second. Providing such proposal was first approved by two-thirds of the producers and their cooperatives in the Federal milk marketing order voting in a referendum, provide for the establishment of an agency organized by milk producers and producers' cooperative associations to be organized and operated as specified by standards and qualifications in the Federal milk marketing order.

Third. Establish maximum amounts of uniform deductions which must be first approved by a two-thirds vote of the producers and their cooperatives and that projects financed by these funds may be either local or national in scope, or both, as provided in the order, but shall not be international.

Fourth. Provide that funds collected under these programs shall be separately accounted for and shall be used only for the purposes for which they were collected.

Fifth. Insure that any program developed would go into effect only if approved by two-thirds of the producers voting in a referendum in the Federal milk marketing order. If producer approval is not given, since these programs are secondary to the basic provisions of the order, the rest of the order provisions would continue without change.

Mr. Speaker, the text of this legislative proposal follows:

H.R. 12386

A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended, by adding at the end of subsection 8c(5) the following new subparagraph (I):

"(I) Establishing or providing for the establishment of domestic marketing research and development projects, and advertising (excluding brand advertising), sales promotion, educational, and other similar programs, designed to improve or promote the domestic marketing and consumption of milk and its products, to be financed by producer deductions at a rate per hundredweight fixed in the order on all producer milk under the order. Such funds shall be paid to an agency organized by milk producers and producers' cooperative associations in such form and with such methods of operation as are specified in the order. Such agency may designate and employ persons and organizations engaged in such projects and programs who meet the standards and qualifications to be specified in the order. All funds collected under this subparagraph shall be separately accounted for and shall be used only for the purposes for which they were collected. Projects and programs authorized by this subparagraph may be either local or national in scope, or both, as provided in the order, but shall not be international. Order provisions under this subparagraph shall not become effective in any marketing order unless separately approved by producers in the same manner provided for the approval of marketing orders and may be terminated separately whenever the Secretary makes a determination with respect to such provisions as is provided for the termination of an order in subsection 8c(16)(B). Disapproval or termination of such order provisions shall not be considered disapproval of the order or of other terms of the order."

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTING

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, though a congressional districting bill was approved by this body on March 16, 1965, we are still without an act of Congress with which to answer an acute nationwide problem. The legislatures of several States are wrestling with redistricting—but are unsure if their actions will conform to national standards, or even if such national standards will be imposed.

Still under consideration by the Senate, several amendments to the House bill have been proposed, including one calling for a reduction in the maximum population deviation limit per district from 15 percent, as presently prescribed in the bill, to 10 percent. The effect of such a change will be profound, indeed, since the 10-percent limit will be exceeded by more than 25 percent of the Nation's congressional districts; more than twice the number of districts that would be held to be disproportionate under the 15-percent limit. I believe the following statistics comparing the effect of the 10- and 15-percent limits should be of interest to every Member of this body.

Alabama: A redistricting bill was passed at the 1965 regular session and signed by the Governor on August 26, 1965. A three-judge Federal court upheld the act October 4, 1965, against charges of population inequalities and of gerrymandering because of the partitioning of Jefferson County—Birmingham—between three districts. *Moore* v. *Moore,* Civil Action No. 3228-64, D.C.S.D. Ala. District population deviate from the average from minus 6 percent to plus 7.3 percent.

Alaska: The State has only one district.

Arizona: The fourth special session of the legislature adjourned recently without completing action on districting. A Federal court, *Klahr* v. *Goddard,* Civil Action No. 5112, D.C.D. Ariz., has heard arguments and is expected to redistrict the State shortly.

Arkansas: The 1965 legislature May 27, completed action on and the Governor, June 1, signed a redistricting bill creating four districts varying from the average from minus 0.6 percent to plus 1.6 percent.

California: The State supreme court on September 16, 1965, refused to direct redistricting prior to the 1966 elections on the ground that it had previously ordered reapportionment of assembly districts upon which congressional districts were based and that the legislature should have a reasonable time after such reapportionment to redistrict. *Silver* v. *Brown,* Sac. 7684, Calif. Sup. Ct.

Colorado: In April 1964, the State was redistricted.

Connecticut: In April 1964, the State was redistricted.

Delaware: The State has one Congressman.

Florida: The 1965 legislature in special session redistricted the State, completing action on July 2 and the Governor signed the bill on July 7.

Georgia: Following the decision in *Wesberry* v. *Sanders,* 376 U.S. 1 (1964), the legislature redistricted.

Hawaii: Both seats are filled in at-large elections. Both are currently held by Democrats.

Idaho: The State was redistricted in March 1965, setting up two districts which deviated from the average plus 9.4 percent.

Illinois: A panel of State supreme court justices with the concurrence of a three-judge Federal court redistricted the State on October 13, 1965. The State's high court is expected to enter a formal order directing the plan into effect when it reconvenes in November. District deviations from the average range from minus 6 percent to plus 7.5 percent.

Indiana: The legislature on March 5, 1965, completed action on a bill redistricting the State and the Governor signed it March 9.

Iowa: There has apparently been no legislative or court action on districting.

Kansas: Action was completed in March 1965, redistricting the State. Variations in district population from the average are from minus 9.6 percent to plus 8.4 percent.

Kentucky: Both the State supreme court and a Federal district court upheld the State's districting prior to the Wesberry decision. No subsequent action has apparently taken place.

Louisiana: A suit is apparently pending in Federal district court attacking the State's districting. *Harwell* v. *McKeithen,* Civil Action No. 3000, D.C.E.D. La.

Maine: No legislative or court action is apparently to be expected. The two districts vary from the average plus or minus 4.3 percent.

Maryland: Following Federal court action, the State was redistricted. However, the act has since been petitioned to referendum which under State law suspends the operation of the statute until the referendum has been held. It has been contended, however, that the statute's operation cannot be suspended since it was enacted pursuant to court order. Further litigation is expected to shed light on the matter. The chart shows the 1965 districting figures.

Massachusetts: Apparently no legislative or court action is expected.

Michigan: Following an adverse court decision, the State was redistricted in May 1964, creating 19 districts with population variations of minus 2.1 percent to plus 1.3 percent.

Minnesota: There has been apparently no court or legislative action on districting.

Mississippi: Suit was instituted in October 1965, by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party to invalidate the State's districting, both on population and racial gerrymandering grounds.

Missouri: After a Federal court invalidated the State's districts, the legislature redrew the boundaries, completing action on June 30, 1965. The population deviation ranges from minus 9.7 percent to plus 9.9 percent.

Montana: A Federal court redrew the boundaries of the State's two congressional districts on August 6, 1965, the population deviations being plus or minus 3.1 percent.

Nebraska: Apparently, no action has been taken.

Nevada: The State has only one Congressman.

New Hampshire: The State's two districts have a variation from the average of plus or minus 9.3 percent.

New Jersey: On May 21, 1965, a State superior court, Jones against Falcey, held the present districting unconstitutional. The regular 1966 session of the legislature is under order to revise district boundaries.

New Mexico: Both seats are filled in at-large elections and both are currently held by Democrats.

New York: The State's districting was upheld by the Supreme Court, *Wright* v. *Rockefeller,* 376 U.S. 52 (1964), against charges of racial gerrymandering. Apparently no further action has been taken.

North Carolina: A suit against the State's districting has been instituted in Federal court. A hearing is expected shortly and a special session of the legislature is possible next spring.

North Dakota: The deviation from the average of the State's two districts is plus or minus 5.4 percent.

Ohio: The legislature in special session in December 1964, redistricted the State.

Oklahoma: The legislature July 21, 1965, completed action on redistricting the State, overriding the Governor's veto of the bill. The district population deviations range from minus 3.1 percent to plus 4 percent.

Oregon: Following institution of suit in Federal court, the legislature in special session redistricted in May 1965. The population deviations of the new districts range from minus 8.6 percent to plus 6.3 percent.

Pennsylvania: There has apparently been no action lately.

Rhode Island: The State's two districts deviate from the average plus or minus 7 percent.

South Carolina: A suit was filed in Federal court in early 1965 but it apparently has not been pressed. The legislature may take up redistricting in special session next year. One county was switched from one district to another in 1964.

South Dakota: The State was redistricted in February 1965, creating two districts with deviations of plus or minus 3.4 percent.

Tennessee: Following institution of a court suit, the legislature redistricted the State in May 1965. The act is being challenged in court, both on grounds of population inequality and of gerrymandering, especially because of the partitioning of Shelby County—Memphis—into three districts.

Texas: The State's districting had been invalidated by the Federal courts. The legislature in May 1965, completed action on new districts, which have been challenged in court. District population variations are from plus or minus 9.7 percent.

Utah: The legislature in March 1965, redrew district boundaries, creating two districts with population deviations of plus or minus 1.5 percent.

Vermont: The State has a single Congressman.

Virginia: Following invalidation of the State's districts by the State supreme court, the legislature met in special session and redrew district boundaries, with population deviations ranging from minus 4.8 to plus 5.8 percent.

Washington: The district makeup was upheld by a Federal court in a pre-Wesberry opinion. No subsequent action has apparently taken place.

West Virginia: Apparently, no recent action has taken place.

Wisconsin: The State's 1964 redistricting created districts with a population variation of plus or minus 3.4 percent.

Wyoming: The State has a single Congressman.

State	District	Percent deviation	Incumbent's party
Arizona	1	+52.9	Republican.
	3	−54.3	Democrat.
California	1	+29.1	Republican.
	3	+21.6	Democrat.
	4	−24.9	Do.
	5	−27.0	Do.
	7	−19.4	Do.
	10	+11.3	Republican.
	13	−11.0	Do.
	16	+20.1	Democrat.
	18	+23.4	Do.
	21	−11.8	Do.
	27	−12.8	Republican.
	28	+42.4	Do.
	33	+21.8	Democrat.
	35	+14.5	Republican.
Colorado	1	+12.6	Democrat.
Connecticut	4	+14.1	Do.
Florida	3	+10.4	Do.
	11	+11.9	Do.
	12	+12.0	Do.
Georgia	6	+15.5	Do.
	7	+14.3	Do.
	8	−14.1	Do.
	9	−16.4	Do.
Indiana	7	−12.8	No incumbent.
Iowa	2	+12.3	Democrat
	7	−10.4	Do.
Kentucky	1	−19.2	Do.
	2	−17.6	Do.
	3	+40.8	Do.
	4	+10.3	Do.
	5	−15.9	Republican.
Louisiana	1	+10.4	Democrat.
	2	+22.7	Do.
	5	−15.3	Do.
	6	+31.7	Do.
	8	−35.2	Do.
Maryland	1	−14.9	Republican.
	2	+14.4	Democrat.
	3	+12.2	Do.
	7	+13.6	Do.
	8	−12.0	No incumbent.
Massachusetts	1	−12.3	Republican.
	9	+11.6	Democrat.
Minnesota	2	−12.0	Republican.
	4	+11.3	Democrat.
	5	+13.2	Do.
	7	−11.5	Republican.
Mississippi	1	−16.2	Democrat.
	2	+39.7	Do.
	4	−32.2	Republican.
Nebraska	1	+12.8	Democrat.
	2	−14.0	Republican.
New Jersey	1	+44.8	Do.
	2	−21.8	Democrat.
	4	+21.4	Do.
	6	+24.7	Republican.
	7	+37.4	Do.
	9	+11.5	Democrat.
	10	−24.8	Do.
	11	−23.7	Do.
	12	−10.5	Do.
	13	−36.5	Do.
	14	−36.9	Do.
New York	7	+12.3	Democrat.
	12	+15.1	Do.
	13	+11.2	Do.
	14	+13.3	Do.
	15	−14.3	Do.
	16	−13.8	Do.
	21	−11.8	Do.
	22	−12.1	Do.
	23	−13.6	Do.
	24	−14.4	Republican.
	29	+10.6	Democrat.
	30	+12.6	Republican.
	31	−13.7	Do.
North Carolina	1	−32.9	Democrat.
	2	−15.5	Do.
	4	+11.3	Do.
	6	+17.6	Do.
	8	+18.7	Republican.
	11	−12.8	Democrat.
Ohio	4	−12.4	Republican.
	5	−12.3	Do.
	9	+13.0	Democrat.
	12	−18.1	Republican.
	14	+13.2	Do.
	15	−13.0	No incumbent.
Pennsylvania	6	+31.8	Democrat.
	7	+31.9	Republican.
	8	+27.9	Do.
	9	+16.6	Do.
	10	−10.8	Do.
	11	−17.2	Democrat.
	13	+23.2	Republican.
	15	−27.7	Democrat.
	16	−15.7	Republican.
	21	−15.9	Democrat.
	22	−14.6	Republican.
	23	−11.0	Do.
South Carolina	2	+33.9	Do.
	3	−19.7	Democrat.
	5	−23.9	Do.
Tennessee	1	+11.4	Republican.
	2	+14.4	Do.
	3	+10.1	Do.
	6	−13.8	Democrat.
Washington	2	−10.1	Democrat.
	3	−16.0	Do.
	7	+25.2	Do.
West Virginia	2	−11.4	Do.
	4	+13.4	Do.
	5	−18.6	Do.

State	Summary of State congressional district populations which deviate from the mean by—			
	10.1 to 15 percent		More than 15 percent	
	Total	Districts	Total	Districts
Arizona			2	1, 3
California	5	10, 13, 21, 27, 35	9	1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 16, 18, 28, 33.
Colorado	1	1		
Connecticut	1	4		
Florida	3	3, 11, 12		
Georgia	2	7, 8	2	6, 9
Indiana	1	7		
Iowa	2	2, 7		
Kentucky	1	4	4	1, 2, 3, 5
Louisiana	2	1	4	2, 5, 6, 8
Maryland	5	1, 2, 3, 7, 8		
Massachusetts	2	1, 9		
Minnesota	4	2, 4, 5, 7		
Mississippi			3	1, 2, 4
Nebraska	2	1, 2		
New Jersey	2	9, 12	9	1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14
	12	7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 29, 30, 31	1	12
North Carolina	2	4, 11	4	1, 2, 6, 8
Ohio	5	4, 5, 9, 14, 15	1	12
Pennsylvania	3	10, 22, 23	9	6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 21
South Carolina			3	2, 3, 5
Tennessee	4	1, 2, 3, 6		
Washington	1	2	2	3, 7
West Virginia	2	2, 4	1	5

	10.1 to 15 percent deviation	More than 15 percent deviation
Districts with incumbent Republicans:		
Exceed mean	7	12
Less than mean	14	4
Districts with incumbent Democrats:		
Exceed mean	25	14
Less than mean	12	24
Districts with no incumbents:		
Exceed mean	0	0
Less than mean	3	0
Total districts affected within deviation grouping	61	54
Total States affected within deviation grouping	21	14

	10-percent deviation limit	15-percent deviation limit
Total districts affected	[1] 115	54
Total States affected	24	14

[1] The 61 districts falling between the 10- and 15-percent limits, plus the 54 which exceed the 15-percent limit.

AWARD TO ROBERT F. HAYES FOR OUTSTANDING FREE ENTERPRISE ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Carter] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, in 1965, the Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc., an organization chartered in the State of New York, made its annual awards for outstanding free enterprise achievements and one of the recipients of the award was a longtime personal friend of mine, Robert F. Hayes, a most enlightened industrialist who was born in Gamaliel, Ky., in my home county of Monroe.

In recognition of this outstanding award, I ask the unanimous consent of the House that the attached article containing a brief résumé of Mr. Hayes' rise from rags to riches be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Robert F. Hayes, who is now 61 years of age and resides at 1054 Lynwood Boulevard, Nashville, Tenn., is founder, president, and chairman of the Hayes Garment Co. of Nashville, Tenn., which has the following divisions: Hopkinsville Clothing Manufacturing Co., Hopkinsville, Ky.; Todd Manufacturing Co., Elkton, Ky.; Simpson Manufacturing Co., Franklin, Ky.; Tompkinsville Manufacturing Co., Tompkinsville, Ky.; Monroe Manufacturing Co., Gamaliel, Ky.; Roswell Manufacturing Co., Roswell and Alpharetta, Ga. Mr. Hayes is also the cofounder and chairman of the H–K Corp., Atlanta, Ga.

To be a recipient of the Free Enterprise Awards Association's 14th annual 1965 American Success Story Awards is an example of the success possible under America's free enterprise democracy.

Mr. Hayes was the son of a village merchant. He worked his way through high school and the University of Kentucky and earned a B.S. degree in engineering. He taught in a one-room rural school and worked for 2 years as a student engineer for General Electric Co., but lost his job in the depression. He then worked for a garment factory as a laborer, rag baler, working up to vice president in charge of production for four plants.

In 1949, Mr. Hayes left this secure position and risked his savings and borrowed money to start the Hayes Garment Co. with one small plant at Elkton, Ky. His hard work and leadership overcame many obstacles and competition. He developed new markets, products, installed new machinery, and built Hayes Garment to 8 plants employing 2,200 people.

Hayes Garment is now a leading maker of men's and boys' casual pants, utility and work wear with $24 million in sales through 5,000 retail stores nationwide. Hayes also makes work clothes for the rental laundry trade and its military work garments are distributed through post exchanges worldwide. Hayes is an exclusive licensee of the B.V.D. trademark in the men's and boys' casual pants, and work wear category in the United States and some foreign countries.

Still expanding, Robert F. Hayes is cofounder and chairman of the H–K Corp. in Atlanta, Ga., and has built its "Male" casual pants to national rcognition in the past 2 years. He is a devoted worker for civic and industry causes. He has been cited for his up-from-the-ranks career and leadership which has built thriving industries in his plant communities.

LESS TALK, MORE ACTION

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, there may be disagreement among Members on the size or extent of the new GI bill but there must be no more dragging of feet by anyone in the House against the prompt consideration of the poorly named or perhaps misnamed cold war GI bill of rights.

Approximately 100 such bills have been introduced during the 89th Congress. These differ as to effective dates, eligibility, termination dates, as well as the types of benefits provided. Some of the bills would go back to the termination of the Korean conflict and cover everyone who has been in the military service since that time. Some would provide for coverage of only those who serve in Vietnam. Others are broad enough to cover anyone who has served outside the United States. Some cover only educational or job training benefits while some provide for both school aid and housing loans. Others provide even for insurance and other items.

Generally speaking, the bills can be divided into two types: one group similar to S. 9, the bill the Senate passed last year, providing for Korean-type benefits with educational payments based on marital status and the number of dependents but with the differing requirement of 6 months' active duty as opposed to 90 days in the Korean bill.

The other classification of bills follows the provisions of H.R. 1006 and its companions. While the benefits are basically the same as S. 9, the difference lies in eligibility, by limiting benefits to post-Korean veterans who serve 90 days of active duty in "a combat zone." This group of bills is sometimes referred to as the "hot spot" bills.

Leaving out of account the shades of differences between the several bills, nearly everyone is in agreement the House Veterans Affairs Committee should proceed immediately to hold hearings. Such hearings would give a forum for those Members who have sponsored a particular bill to explain its merits. Hearings should continue for a reasonable length of time but then a report should be rendered forthwith to accompany some bill that can be made the subject of some further discussion on the floor of the House, but one which is acceptable enough to a majority of the membership that it can be speedily enacted into law.

I suppose the title of a bill does not make too much difference. However, it is my hope that we may dispense with such misleading descriptions as "Cold War Veterans Benefits Act" or "Cold War GI Bill" and instead try to find some more sensible description such as perhaps "Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act." Without going into the pros and cons of a declared war it is impossible to convince those engaged in the Vietnam fighting that this is not a real war.

It is positively impossible to explain such a technicality to a man pinned down with machinegun fire or surrounded by Vietcong guerrillas. Truly, Vietnam is as hot or even hotter than Korea or World War II.

The structure of our veterans laws which stretches over the past 200 years is based upon the concept of wartime as distinguished from peacetime service. This concept may have worked very well through period of World War II but let us remember prior to this war we had very few servicemen stationed outside the United States. Today this wartime-peacetime distinction is meaningless as any of our fighting men in southeast Asia are well able to explain very convincingly.

Whatever the differences may be between the many bills that have been introduced and whatever title may be employed to describe a bill's content the time has come to report some meaningful measure that can be debated and amended if need be on the floor of the House. Let us get on with this job. The time has come for less talk and more action.

PROGRAM TO REVAMP THE FOOD-FOR-PEACE APPROACH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Stalbaum], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, on the agricultural scene this year nothing has attracted more interest than the program to revamp our food-for-peace approach among the countries in the world.

Much of this enthusiasm is based on the emotional desire to help our less fortunate brethren.

Much also seems to stem from an embarrassment of our agricultural riches—a plenitude which for economic reasons in the past has obliged us to curb our production. Many who support an expansion of our foreign shipments of food through both commercial and food-for-peace channels look forward to the day when we can unleash our agricultural productivity and let America's farmers freely plant what they want. Those who support the program on this basis may be on the right track, but they may be right for the wrong reasons, especially if they feel that our American agricultural production can solve the hunger problem of the world.

The greatest need in this regard is not in the development of our own food production and potential, though this is necessary. Rather, it is to expand our assistance to help other nations which have the potential to develop their own agriculture. It is to this end that I have introduced legislation today.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has said:

Problems of staggering proportions face the densely populated underdeveloped countries

> of the world in their effort to keep food production in pace with population growth. Both land and time are running out for those countries.

Actually, as Dr. Raymond Ewell has stated:

> The world is on the threshhold of the biggest famine in history; yet, the problem is far bigger than the ability of American agriculture to meet it.

Food reserves in the United States are not as large as commonly believed and have been diminishing with rapidity. Because we have so long talked about the U.S. farm surpluses, few people are aware that these are now nearly gone. If we were to distribute our current food stocks to the needy of the world, they would be exhausted in a few weeks. A summary in U.S. News & World Report in their December 6, 1965, issue, indicated that the reserves of wheat and corn were near normal; that the stock of cheese was nearly gone; that dried milk in storage was an item in which the surplus was dwindling; and that the butter surplus was no longer a problem. Only in the case of cotton did they indicate that the supply was "high and rising."

While the desire to expand our American food production is most admirable in its own right, I am today proposing legislation which would supplement this. This, in my own opinion, is of far greater importance if we are to meet the problem of hunger in the world. This bill pertains to the role we can play in the development of other nations' agriculture.

Because the fullest utilization of our agricultural productivity does no more than dent the food gap in the world, it is necessary that countries be encouraged to develop their own agriculture. Encouragement, too, must be given to family planning programs.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, in addressing the FAO Conference in Rome on November 23, 1965, stated very succinctly:

> Victory in the war against hunger will be won when the newly developed nations have increased their agricultural productivity and overall economic growth so that they can produce or purchase enough to meet their needs and fulfill their demands.

"Give a man a fish, and he will eat for a day. Teach him how to fish, and he will eat for the rest of his life." This old Chinese proverb perfectly sums up the contrast between our continued use of food-for-peace programs and any efforts we make to develop the agricultural potential of other nations.

The general need to develop the agriculture of other countries appears axiomatic. As their income rises, their food consumption also rises, but with it is found a definite improvement in the quality of the diet. Many countries recognize that over-all prosperity can be attained and preserved only if measures are taken to strengthen their farming sector.

FAILURES IN OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Yet, in the past, we have found two very serious negative factors—factors working against agricultural development.

The first is the fact that industrial development often appears to have more glamour. Steel mills and hydroelectric plants loom larger in the eyes of the country's planners and leaders than other facilities which may be of more importance, simply because these show better. Yet, often, there is not a customer potential for the products which would come from such plants. Such economists, too, have not recognized the role agricultural development has played as a prelude to industrial development in many nations of the world, including our own.

The second factor which has been a dis-incentive to agricultural development has been the ability of foreign nations to obtain donated foods. This is not intended to minimize the role of such programs as food for peace, but it is readily evident that when a nation's resources are limited, planners can more readily ignore the agricultural phase of development and turn to others, simply because they know that the void in agriculture will be filled by imports through our Public Law 480 and other similar programs. Truly, therefore, more emphasis must be placed on having a nation's agricultural development tied to the contribution of our food to it.

In India, for example, a failure to develop their agriculture has placed her entire economy under a severe strain. This has happened in spite of the fact that statistically they show a growth in the national income, in investments, in gross national products, and in industrial production to say nothing about its population growth. Recent statements by India's spokesmen, such as Minister of Food and Agriculture Subramaniam, are now indicative that India has recognized its failure in building a breadbasket.

The GTA daily radio roundup, emanating from St. Paul, summed this up well on Monday, December 27, when it stated:

> There is more behind some of these moral food shortages than what you read in the headlines. It is very true that drought, flood and bad weather have caused many of the food shortages. It is also true that populations are increasing and that there are more mouths to feed. But, especially in countries where food shortages are most severe, there is another reason, and it is a long time neglect of agriculture.
>
> Some of those countries after World War II decided that they had to build industry, so they concentrated on that, and it was convenient to neglect agriculture. In fact, it was almost state policy in many countries to keep farm prices low and use cheap food and fiber as a source of new wealth to buy machines and build factories. Now, they are getting the bill for those long years of neglect.

Our own country's policy, especially in AID, has at times tended to go along with those nations' development of policies which have ignored agriculture, even when there was great agricultural potential. I am pleased to hear that this policy is now changing. The President's annual report on the foreign assistance program, sent to the Congress on January 17, contained the following encouraging sentences:

> We have agreed to extend technical assistance to countries asking for help on population programs. At the same time, our overseas missions have been directed to give priorities to projects for achieving better agriculture.

I am hopeful that all overseas missions will comply to the fullest with the President's words.

While it may seem "hard boiled," our foreign agricultural policy, including food for peace, must be more closely geared to the willingness of the other nations to develop its own agriculture and its practical planning to that end. Such nations must learn to realize that the manpower which is then released from the farms, and the customers created by an improved agriculture, provide a sound base for industrial development. Food for peace can help them during this transition period; it must not permit them to ignore the ultimate day of reckoning.

NEW LEGISLATION

The bill which I am now introducing considers our role in the agricultural development of other nations in four main categories. Basically, these are: First, the development of capital agricultural and agri-business facilities; second, the improvement of production methods; third, the conducting of research and study, and, fourth, the coordination of our activities with others interested in the same objective.

CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT

Capital development is a critical item, both in the general sense and in specifics. In many of these nations, per capita income is very low, averaging between $50 and $100 annually and rising very slowly. With this low income level, the diversion of funds for capital improvement becomes most difficult.

Construction of fertilizer plants and the availability of fertilizer is the capital item which arouses the most attention. Roswell Garst, the Iowa farmer whose farm was visited by Nikita Khrushchev in 1959, flatly states "that the world is not overpopulated as much as it is underfertilized." While others do not oversimplify to this degree, they do give top emphasis to this item.

Foreign Agriculture Report No. 11, "Man, Land, and Food," issued in November 1963, by USDA says flatly:

> The use of more fertilizer, in combination with other improved technology will undoubtedly be the single most important means of expanding output.

Others have pointed out that the use of fertilizer is important not only because of the benefits it gives but because of the visual impact in improved appearance and growth of crops in breaking down the entrenched resistance to new farm practices.

Most observers believe that the present fertilizer production in the world of some 33 million tons needs to be doubled within the next 15 years and almost tripled by the year 2000.

The fact that the expansion of fertilizer production in the world is in those areas in which fertilizer is already heavily used is part of the present problem. At present it is estimated that only 5 of the 33 million tons is used in such deficit areas. In his December 15 column, John Chamberlain states:

> While the underdeveloped world starves for lack of nitrates for fertilizer, the United

States, which already overproduces its crops, is about to go off on a great spree of ammonia plant building.

He points out that the present synthetic ammonia production in the United States of 8½ million tons a year will double to 17 million tons within a period of less than 30 months.

While it is recognized that there are difficulties in encouraging capital for this purpose in some of the countries, it is my personal opinion, recognizing the resources we can spend for development programs in other countries, that the construction of fertilizer plants and the education of farmers in the use of this item should have the top priority in our efforts to assist other countries in developing their agriculture.

One very important area in which capital is vitally needed is for storage facilities. Dr. Binay Sin, director general of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, in October 1965, in his extremely interesting letter No. 91 to ministers of agriculture, estimated that 25 percent of all produce is lost in food-deficient nations because of inadequate storage and handling facilities, losses due to enzymes, seed germination, the action of molds, bacteria, insects, grain-eating birds, rodents, and the effects of air and water on the commodities. These facilities, too, should be given a high priority in the use of capital.

There are other areas in which there are capital needs. The development of irrigation systems can well be considered, though the development of such systems must be carefully planned.

Construction of agricultural implement manufacturing plants to further the mechanization of farming is an area that could well be explored, but it must be remembered that any such manufactured implements must obviously be of a type which will be useful in the hands of a farmer who has not had the background and the technical know-how obtained by American farmers. Factories for the production of pesticides, an item showing results not as dramatic as that as the use of fertilizers but materially improving production, should also be considered. And, as agriculture develops and there is a greater share of the production available for market, processing facilities can be built. There is need for farm-to-market roads, though this tends to be considered more a part of the overall economic development than that directly related to agricultural development. Yet, we cannot ignore it.

IMPROVEMENT OF PRODUCTION METHODS

My second main area of consideration is the improvement of production methods. Basically, this involves education of the farmers, many of whom are illiterate. Undoubtedly the prime point under this heading might best be labeled "education." There are some, and I have had such people visit my congressional district, who contend that education is the panacea for the entire problem—that once the people have learned to read, they can learn to help themselves. While this oversimplifies the role, there is no denying that illiteracy has been a limiting factor on the ability of farmers of the underdeveloped countries to absorb new ideas. If we can show a peasant farmer through learning to read that it pays to be able to do so, there is no greater incentive that we can give him than to continue to become more literate. Especially is this true when he finds that his ability to read translates itself into improved income for himself.

Because of the limited land area available in the world, the means by which the greatest increase in food production can come about is in what is commonly referred to as "yield take-off". This is a point in the agricultural development of a nation at which a dramatic upward trend starts in the yield per acre of the crops which are raised. Of necessity this must depend on the use made by the farmers of the new techniques. It is in this area that education becomes extremely important. Many methods of education can be used and should be encouraged. Thomas Ware, chairman of the Freedom From Hunger Foundation, in appearing before the Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate on June 29, 1965, strongly urged the extended use of motion pictures for this purpose, pointing out that the traveling motion picture is a great social event and that farmers can be educated while they enjoy themselves through this device. Others point out that language texts should be so written that they teach improved techniques while they make the people more literate. Others urge the establishment of agricultural extension services with practical plots on farmers' farms to show what can be done with improved methods.

It is in this area that the establishment of a rural Peace Corps becomes basic to the program. This program, patterned after the well-known Peace Corps, would assist farmers in their efforts to improve their own techniques. This, in my opinion, is of major importance because it has been pointed out that the rapid technical growth and the need for professional agricultural workers, especially those needed to do adaptive research in the less-developed regions, may result in a worldwide shortage of these trained people in the near future.

Recognizing that there are not going to be enough technicians as such coming from colleges and universities to provide all the needed assistance, the establishment of a rural Peace Corps becomes most logical. We will, of necessity, have to rely on others who have had practical experience and who are willing to give of their knowledge and their time for projects of this sort. Such people, enlisted in a rural Peace Corps, can perform an extremely valuable service in assisting and developing the technical knowledge of the farmers of these other nations.

There are items other than the education of the farmers which can be considered. Increasing the tillable acreage is one. It is recognized, however, that in the broadest sense throughout the world this is not of major import. Certainly it cannot compare to the frontier development we saw in our own nation.

We can have people consider changing from export to domestic crops in order that they might feed themselves where this can be done without seriously disrupting the economy of that particular nation.

An important item is the development of a practical farm-credit system. This was given a high priority in a recent study, which also recognized the role that cooperatives could play in providing such credit as well as providing other agricultural services. Certainly credit systems such as now exist where farmers are in total bondage to moneylenders—sometimes for money borrowed for long-dead ancestors—and those systems were interest rates run as much as 100 percent or higher per year are not conducive to the expansion of agriculture. Closely tied to the matter of farm credit is the matter of land tenure. Where labor is plentiful and nonfarm jobs are limited in number, the ownership of land carries with it virtually complete control of those who must rely on the land for their living. Often, as tenants on such land increase their productivity the landlord increases the rent proportionately and the return as a result of improved yield and the use of new techniques goes not to the tenant but to the landlord. This can only discourage the person who has produced the commodity and, in so doing, hamper agricultural growth. Admittedly, the development of a good land tenure program is a touchy one for us as an outside nation. How far can we reasonably go in imposing drastic determinants on the plans of the nation we are assisting in this respect? Yet, we cannot overlook it.

Earlier we discussed the need for capital investment in certain types of plants such as those for producing fertilizer, pesticides for processing, and so forth. In this area of improvement of production methods it follows that we must encourage, through means I have indicated earlier, the use by farmers of such items as irrigation, fertilizing, multiple cropping, fallowing, the use of pesticides, improved seeds, mechanization, improved breeding, and soil conservation practices.

RESEARCH AND STUDY

My third main area is that of research and study. It is interesting to note virtually every observation on present-day research points out that agricultural technology has been developed almost entirely in—and for—the temperate regions. Unlike industry, this technology cannot be readily transferred to tropical climates, yet, it is basically in the tropical areas where the greatest food problems in the world arise. The National Citizens report of the Committee on Agriculture and Food points out that in 1960–62, the U.S. Government and international and regional agencies together spent less than $8 million in agricultural research in tropical Latin America—one of the most sensitive hunger areas in the world. During the same period, however, nearly $2 billion—250 times as much—went into agricultural research in the United States alone.

The plain fact is that few developing countries can devote the funds or have the trained personnel needed for agricultural research at a truly basic level, yet it is my belief that various institutions in our country could devote some of their research efforts to the needs of the tropical areas. I was pleased to hear my colleague, JOHN MACKIE, of Michigan, at the meeting of the Committee on World Food Crisis, point out that Michigan State University has created an Institute of International Agriculture and Nutrition which will direct its attention to developing the agriculture and related activities of developing nations throughout the world. It is my belief that more of this can be done by our own research facilities, either through subresearch stations in the tropical areas or through simulated tropical environments at their own units.

Research in other related areas, such as marine sources, cannot be overlooked in this crucial war on hunger. Dr. W. M. Chapman, director, Division of Resources, Ralston-Purina, states:

> The waters of the ocean represent the vastly abundant yet largely untapped source of food for the burgeoning population of the world. The world ocean is producing more humanly usable animal protein per year than the requirements of a population 10 times the size of the present one. Yet, most of this animal production by the ocean dies unused by man.

He concludes by pointing out that while we are using the production of the sea at a more rapid rate than the increase in the population, most of the gain has been going to industrialized countries, where it is not as vitally needed as in the food-deficient nations.

While much of the research can be rather broad-based in its application to tropical agriculture, we must recognize in the end that there must be adaptive research to fit it to the needs of each individual nation and its particular agricultural base.

COORDINATION AND COOPERATION

My final main point is that there must be coordination and cooperation of activities among all interested groups. The stakes are so high—the resources so limited—that duplication, insofar as possible, of efforts must be avoided. The Friends Committee on National Legislation gives this great recognition in their November 1964, newsletter, when they cover it in 4 of their 11 points. Because they are stated so succinctly, I repeat them here.

Point 3 is "expand work of international agencies concerned with agricultural production and distribution." Point 4 "eliminate roadblocks to full coordination of U.S. and U.N. programs." Point 9 "encourage business, industry, and farm organizations to do more." Point 10 "If the United States is to make an adequate contribution to meeting world needs, the churches and other volunteering agencies will have to supply much of the moral concern and popular support."

Special consideration must be given to the fine work being done in this area by F.A.O. of the United Nations covering technical assistance programs and special funds, UNICEF, and the Freedom from Hunger campaign.

It can also be stressed that this is a program which many business, industries, farm organizations, and others can and should support, if for no other reason than "It's good business for them." That there is a moral issue involved in allowing people to starve when we have the potential to face up to the problem through our own agricultural production and through the development of others—this moral question should certainly be a challenge to humanitarian and religious organizations.

My program at present would be carried out in a number of ways. It would permit the purchase of commodities other than those in surplus supply in America for use in the world. In this respect, it is similar to other legislation now being considered. It provides for paying auxiliary costs for food—such as processing, storage, transportation—on such commodities. It provides and allows for expansion of the Peace Corps to provide a Farmer's Peace Corps. It provides for rural technical assistance programs through AID and educational institutions and others interested in this activity. It provides for paying our share of operating costs of any of our agencies of the United Nations to carry out these programs.

It authorizes $500 million for this purpose for the fiscal year 1966. The amount of money so provided is identical to my earlier bill, H.R. 11628.

Greater emphasis, however, has been placed here on using such funds for assistance in developing other nations' agriculture, rather than in providing such funds for disposing of our own commodities. As I have studied this matter, it has become more and more evident to me that the development of other nations' agricultural facilities is the greatest challenge. It is where the greatest problem lies. While I have been one, along with many others, who has urged an increase in our American agricultural production to provide more of the needs of the hungry and underfed of the world, this alone, important as it is, could do no more than meet a part of this great problem. While I urge an increase in our own production for this purpose, even if we were to extend it to its fullest, it will not meet the need.

This is not to say that because it is not the major area of challenge that it should be ignored. We will need our extra food both during the transition period and as diets improve later as a supplement to other nations' own agriculture. This program should be continued and expanded.

Food for peace has been well accepted. As President Johnson pointed out when he sent Congress the annual Food for Peace Report on March 31:

> The food for peace program is one of the most inspiring enterprises ever undertaken by any nation in all of history—every American can be proud of it without regard to partisanship or political persuasion.

From 1954 until July of 1965, food for peace shipped 146 million tons of American commodities worth an estimated $14 billion. Many of us believe that our farm policy should be now modified to provide for further use of our American foods toward this end.

It was for this purpose that last year I introduced bill H.R. 11628. Senator MCGOVERN of North Dakota and Congressman MACKIE of Michigan have also stressed this approach. On January 10, the first day of the present congressional session, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, proposed a world war on hunger through extension and expansion of America's food for peace program.

Basically, all of us are considering a departure from the present policy of using only surplus commodities and switching rather to actually producing for this purpose. As Mr. COOLEY clearly stated, such a change would provide "deliberate production of food and fiber—to feed hungry people and to clothe those who are ragged, in friendly nations around the world." Such relief no longer would be limited to distribution of surplus U.S. food and fiber.

POPULATION PROBLEMS

Much of the problem we face, very simply stated, is population growth, which is increasing at a greater speed than the increase in the production of food and fiber.

Dr. Sen states:

> Either we take the fullest measures both to raise productivity and to stabilize population growth or we face a disaster of unprecedented magnitude.

I have long considered the efforts to adjust the population growth rate, particularly in the underprivileged nations, as being a third factor, equal in importance to the development of other nations' agriculture and the use of our own food resources. I have, however, not covered it in my legislation because I have wanted to concentrate on the agricultural development problem.

The U.S. News & World Report on October 4, 1965, headed an article "The World's Biggest Problem" and asked:

> How can the world feed all its people at the rate its population is growing? That is becoming the world's No. 1 problem.

Carol Streeter, editor of the Farm Journal, states in its October 1965 issue:

> A most urgent question of our time is one we haven't waked up to: How to keep half the world not just from being hungry, but from the threat of actual starvation.

Projection of population figures is astounding. In Latin America, it is expected that the population will nearly have tripled by the year 2000, from 250 million people to 650 million people. In Asia, by the year 1990, the population will be greater than the present population of the entire world.

In the entire history of the human race, it took until 1960 to reach a global population of 3 billion, but by the end of this century population will reach 6 billion, double the present figure. What had required millennia to achieve will be duplicated in the next 40 years.

Eighty-five percent of the increase in population will be in Africa, Asia, and Latin America areas which now suffer the greatest food deficiencies.

At the present time, it is estimated that over 10,000 people, mostly children, die daily through starvation or as a result of fatal diseases resulting from malnutrition.

Those who continue on and are not killed by starvation or malnutrition suffer both physically and mentally the rest of their lives. The best article which has come to my attention on this problem is by Gwen M. Schultz in Today's Health for October 1965, titled "More Children, More Hunger—The Nutritional Crisis in Latin America." After a discussion of marasmus and kwashiorkor, which the author labels as "the two must destructive childhood diseases of underdeveloped tropical and subtropical areas," she states, "protein shortages is a factor in both." The author, after pointing out the ravages of malnutrition, sums it up by saying:

> The starving who survives several years of such stress may suffer irreparable damage, physically, mentally, and psychologically. During these early years growth is retarded or parts of the body may grow normally and others not.

The dramatic figures on those who die tend to permit us to gloss over the much larger number who survive and continue through life half dead.

OVERWHELMING GENERAL SUPPORT

Nothing in years on the agricultural scene has created the interest which is being shown in the challenge of what can be done, particularly with our American resources on supplying food and fiber to those who are without.

Wayne Darrow, in his Washington Farmletter of December 31, states:

> By far the most important legislation of 1966 of significance to farm business will be a revamping of the food for peace program.

Norman Kraeft in the Daily Farm Business Service Management letter says:

> The war on hunger idea has swept like wildfire across America.

The Farmers Union Herald on December 20 states:

> The nearest thing in years to unanimous support for a program affecting American agriculture is building up behind the world food program.

The national farm organizations are considering it. In addition to the Farmers Union, the National Grange in their policies and programs for 1966 says:

> We endorse the food for peace program as part of our foreign policy.

The president of that organization, Herschel Newsom, is serving his second term as president of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers—IFAP—a 32-country organization promoting the food for hunger program. Charles Schuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, is now advocating a program known as marketing food for freedom, urging further use of American productive capacity in the world market.

AMERICA'S AGRICULTURAL POSSIBILITIES

While most observers recognize the desirability of a program of this type, there are those who are skeptical of it. Their primary concern stems from the belief that ultimately the development of the agriculture of other nations will reduce the potential outlets of our own agricultural production.

All evidence which I have found is contrary to this view. The Economic Research Service of the USDA points out that in five countries—Greece, Israel, Taiwan, Poland, and Spain—distribution of commodities under title I of the food for peace law dropped from $435 million in 1956 to $20 million in 1963. During this same period, commercial sales to those five nations increased from $682 million to $1.3 billion. This is an example of how, as we develop the economy of those nations, and as we develop their use of American food items, they change from being recipients of our surplus distribution programs to commercial buyers.

A recent study of 54 less-developed nations showed that for each 10-percent increase in their national income, there was an increase of 21 percent in their purchases of agricultural products from the United States.

Dr. Erven J. Long states as follows:

> The underdeveloped countries of Asia and Africa, with average per capital incomes of only about $100 per year, purchase annually only about 25¢ per person of American farm products. Japan, with per capita income of about $350 per year, purchases $4.70 of American farm commodities. Canada, with per capita income close to $1,600 buys $24 of our farm products per person each year—100 times as much as do the poor countries. And this in spite of the fact that Canada is itself a major exporter of farm products. Clearly, American farm prosperity would really go into orbit if the underdeveloped countries could attain the level of Canada—or even of Japan.
>
> The purchase by foreign countries of our agricultural products depends upon the level of their general economic development.

The matter is best summed up in a Foreign Agricultural Economic Report No. 24 "Foreign Economic and Market Potentials for U.S. Agricultural Products of the U.S. Department of Agriculture," issued in April of 1965, where in their summary they state:

> Rapid economic growth abroad will help maintain a steady growth in U.S. agricultural and total trade; economic stagnation and recessions abroad will brake trade expansion and reverse the current growth trend in U.S. exports. Under these conditions, market outlets for an increasing part of American agricultural products will become more and more dependent upon the rate of economic progress in other countries. And since the greatest market potential for U.S. agricultural products is in the developing countries, it would be in our own economic interest to help promote economic growth in these less-developed countries.

With all of this evidence of interest and support there seems little question that this Congress will pass some legislation in this field.

I am fearful, however, that so much attention will center on the use of our own agricultural production that any efforts to move toward legislation to assist other nations will be virtually ignored. Yet, I again stress: The best solutions will be obtained by our helping other nations develop their own agriculture.

My bill is offered basically as a starting point for consideration of legislation for this purpose. If it so serves, and if its introduction, along with these remarks, will have prompted Congress to move toward advancing our efforts to assist underdeveloped nations in developing their agricultural potentials, then this effort will have been worthwhile.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague makes an outstanding contribution in calling attention to the relationship of increasing nutrition and population control policies. Nothing could be more important to the future peace and happiness of the world than recognizing that food policy and population policy go hand in hand, and that starvation will be permanent unless we look at the total problem now.

The world faces a situation of dire emergency in regard to the feeding of all its people. The United States has for so long been able to send its surpluses abroad that it is hard to understand that these surpluses are all but depleted.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture says that if we "bring into production all cropland now diverted to nonproductive uses through acreage diversion programs we could produce an additional 40 million tons of grain in addition to the 175 million tons now being produced per year."

Prior to World War II the underdeveloped regions of Africa, Asia, and Latin America exported 11 million tons of grain per year to the developed regions, principally Western Europe. By 1964 these regions were importing grain at the rate of 25 million tons annually from the developed regions, largely North America. This flow of grain from the "haves" to the "have-nots" is expected to rise even more rapidly in the years just ahead.

Simple arithmetic exposes the fallacy of relying on increased U.S. food production alone. We cannot make up the world food deficit. It is imperative that farmers the world over be helped to improve their methods and yields. No less important is it that family planning information and programs be given strong support.

All programs of help to these countries, if they are to be effective, must offer assistance, upon request, in their family planning programs. To exclude such assistance will place us in the position of encouraging false hopes—of increasing, rather than decreasing, the "expectation gap" of the peoples in the developing parts of our planet.

FLOWERS AND GATE RECEIPTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, has L.B.J. run off with the gate receipts and spent it on flowers for Lady Bird? The two clippings shown below are from the January 20, 1966, issue of the Washington Evening Star. The headlines and first paragraphs of each story are as follows:

> ### Congress Democrats Still Await $800,000
>
> (By Walter Pincus)
>
> Congressional Democrats have begun to wonder—after 6 months of waiting—what has happened to about $800,000 collected from last June's recordbreaking $100-a-plate Democratic congressional dinner.
>
> Both the Senate and House Democratic Campaign Committees expected to share equally in disbursing the proceeds along with the Democratic National Committee. They have yet to receive either their share or an accounting of the money.
>
> Their concern for the money adds to the air of mystery that currently hangs over the handling of campaign funds at Democratic Party headquarters.
>
> ### Capital Beautification Gifts Over $800,000
>
> (By Roberta Hornig)
>
> Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson was told yesterday that more than $800,000 has been donated so far by persons from all over the country to help her make Washington a more beautiful city.

It is interesting to me to see that the Democrats have begun to worry about their money. The taxpayers have been doing it for the past 5 years—ever since the stable, peaceful days of the Eisenhower administration were replaced by the Government by crisis, inflationary policies, and the warfare abroad of the past two administrations.

Perhaps the taxpayers wonder why, despite serious worldwide military commitments, the administration continues to pamper Lady Bird's whims and pour tax dollars into beautification plans. For instance, all Members of Congress received a personal letter from the President dated January 17 with an 800-page book containing a full transcript of all the beauty sessions at lengthy White House conferences on natural beauty.

I find it difficult to understand the easy access to information on beauty while at the same time it is so difficult on some occasions to drag information out of the executive branch, or from agencies and departments that testify before our Appropriations Committee on the really important issues and problems confronting the country.

It appears that the philosophy of the administration is to make it easy to get information about how the administration wants to spend more tax money, but to make it as difficult as possible to find out how they are spending it on programs already in existence.

While we are spending money in Vietnam to defoliate, we are spending money at home to prove Lady Bird has a green thumb.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON OUR CITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to applaud President Johnson's determination to commit the Federal Government to a wider role in attacking the problems of our great urban centers. The President's message yesterday on cities contained the promise that, through expanded Federal help, our cities may truly be reborn.

While the President's proposals are all too modest in terms of the amount of money that will be made available to qualifying cities to embark on an ambitious program of rebuilding, I find the basic aspirations of the President's new look at our cities most encouraging.

Clearly, the President understands the magnitude of the problems of our cities in the area of slum housing, unemployment, poverty, and education. And I agree with him completely that heretofore "the size and scale of urban assistance has been too small and too widely dispersed."

He makes a valid point when he says:

> The goals of major Federal programs have often lacked cohesiveness. Some work for the revitalization of the central city. Some accelerate suburban growth. Some unite urban communities. Some disrupt them.

Last week, in a speech I delivered on January 21 at a conference of community leaders in Harlem, I proposed a massive program to aid our cities.

In my speech I said:

> Let us formulate an Appalachia program for urban America as we have done for rural America. I call on the administration to provide the tools that will enable us to achieve our goals in rebuilding the Harlem and East Harlem communities.
>
> The structure of the newly created Department of Housing and Urban Development is presently being formed.
>
> I propose a division within that Department to plan and administer a total program for depressed urban areas, coordinating all available Federal programs—housing, health, unemployment, public works, transportation, parks, and recreational facilities—to uplift and rebuild our urban areas. It would administer a new Federal aid program aimed specifically at eradicating the ghetto and the conditions which result from segregated housing patterns.
>
> If we are to overcome the social sickness of the ghetto—in Harlem and East Harlem, Chicago, Watts—Federal funds must be channeled directly into this urban Appalachia program. I suggest the Federal Government spend $9 out of every $10—the Federal Government financing 90 percent of the cost, the city 10 percent.
>
> We must have adequate funds for housing, although housing alone is not the answer.
>
> We must have adequate funds for education, although education alone is not the answer.
>
> We must have adequate funds for job-training, although jobs alone are not the answer.
>
> No one single program will cure the social sickness of the ghetto. It will require a bold, creative plan for human as well as physical renewal.

For too long, the Congress, dominated by rural interests and parochial concerns, has been guilty of burying its head in the sand when it has come to meeting on any meaningful scale the grave and complex problems of our metropolitan areas. The decay and blight of our cities and the terrible social problems this deterioration brings in its train did not happen overnight. The revitalization of our cities can not be accomplished simply by rebuilding the physical structures of a community or neighborhood. Social renewal must go hand in hand with physical renewal.

For that reason, I am encouraged that, in outlining the purposes of the demonstration cities program yesterday, President Johnson said that, while making "massive additions to the supply of low- and moderate-cost housing" it is proposed to combine "physical reconstruction and rehabilitation with effective social programs throughout the rebuilding process."

The demonstration cities program could release the talents and energies of those who can bring about a transformation of the American city as we know it.

The potential impact of this new program on our cities is enormous. The President stressed in his message that the complete array of Federal programs must be used and the attack must be a massive and comprehensive one.

In the face of the need, the recommended appropriation of only $2.3 billion over the next 6 years for these supplementary grants is a disappointment. We must think in bolder terms, in terms of larger amounts of Federal expenditures. The demonstration grant idea, which I have long advocated, is an admirable concept for funneling more money to our cities, but I would like to see more money gushing through this funnel.

Let us look at the President's request for $400 million for the demonstration cities program in comparison to the total amount of Federal funds appropriated for urban renewal since the inception of that program in 1949.

Since 1949, a total of $5.375 billion has been authorized for urban renewal. The city of New York has received an aggregate of $286 million. By July of 1968 the amount that will have been made available for urban renewal will be $7.6 billion.

The proposed $2.3 billion for these supplementary grants over a period of 6 years—$400 million a year—will not provide the genuinely massive effort that the rebuilding of our cities will require.

It is clear that this program is designed to apply to most American cities, creating a heavy demand on the available funds. The President's message states that "we shall take special care to see that urban communities of all sizes are included." This means a dilution of the new Federal money for the big cities so that a city like New York, in the long run, will not receive the kind of large-scale Federal help that is essential to eradicate its slums.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I would hope that New York City, the largest of the great metropolitan centers of this Nation, would be the first to submit a comprehensive plan to rebuild its neighborhoods. Let New York City be the first to receive planning funds under this program and let New York, containing as it does the communities of Harlem, East Harlem, and Bedford-Stuyvesant become the first demonstration city to embark on this great task.

Mr. Speaker, the President has proffered the cities the help, now it is up to those cities to seize this opportunity and capitalize on it.

SECRETARY McNAMARA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, for several years the most effective weapon in the Department of Defense has been Secretary McNamara's public relations department. For several years it has been grinding out an image, the image of a brilliant executive manager, master planner, supreme coordinator, computer user, whiz kid, and all-round superman, capable of doing no wrong.

There is not better testimony to the Secretary's success in the Public Relations war, than the fact that the image still has credibility, in spite of the overwhelming evidence to the contrary. If any military commander—serving under Mr. McNamara—had been proved so wrong, so often, by so far, he would long since have been retired to inactive duty, kicked upstairs, or put out to pasture. I say they have a requirement and duty to run the war under the Commander in Chief and the Congress.

Instead, many dedicated military leaders have left, while Secretary McNamara remains, heading the most important agency of the Government, whose success or failure may well determine our survival as a free nation.

Surely, the Nation can no longer afford to accept the fiction of the image builders, not when the facts speak so loudly for themselves.

At the outset, let me point out that I make these charges with no desire or thought of political gain or advantage, nor of personal animosity. The issue of national security is much too important for that. If other Members of Congress have remained mute for too long, so have I. In fact, the record will show that, on several occasions in the past, I have defended the Secretary's management, nerve, and abilities. On more than one occasion I have come to his defense; but computers cannot coordinate with Congress, or the training and dedication of those devoting a lifetime to the military—nor do they include prudence and judgment in their outputs.

I can only say that, in so doing, I do so because of the information and facts available to me as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, information and facts which in the framework of foresight were not always complete—information which all too often turned out to be misinformation provided by the Secretary, or others following his oppressive directives. Hindsight, however, is like 20-20 vision.

What, then, are the charges upon which this House should judge Secretary McNamara?

First. The Secretary has flouted the spoken and promised word of the President and the directives of the Congress in regard to the cutbacks in military construction, to the detriment of our defense—to say nothing of the morale of our troops.

He has grasped far more power than was ever envisioned under the Curtis-McCormack amendment to an appropriation bill, whose intent was primarily to coordinate operations, and not to shift from the services operational power and control.

He has virtually decimated the Reserve Forces of the United States, in spite of the will of the Congress, and contrary to the long-standing concept of the citizens militia from the time of the Minutemen on down, prior to, in the absence of, and without approval of the Congress.

He has erred repeatedly, yet in no instance has there been acknowledgment of these errors, an important attribute of the great is a reasonable degree of humility. The errors include a dozen different appraisals of the Vietnam situation, returning from each Vietnam visit with an incredibly naive view of the war, finding optimism where none existed, predicting troop cutbacks, when exactly the opposite was to occur; and in the wake of such false propaganda, leaving the American people unprepared for the bitter realities of the present situation.

He has flouted military experts, the Congress, and has toyed with our national defense by refusing any new follow-on aircraft for the strategic bomber or platform for strike and reconnaissance concept, finally disdainfully bowing to public pressure and compounding his TFX error into a trumped-up bomber.

He has established what amounts to a reign of terror in the news management policy of Arthur Sylvester, which glorifies the right to lie to the American public in the name of security. He has throttled subordinates who have serious concern over McNamara policy, and have the courage to express their views, even to the degree of requiring certificates of capability on the part of the Joint Chiefs.

He has ignored professional military advice on military matters, in favor of those whose recommendations have often been colored by obvious conflicts of interest, to wit, Messrs. Gilpatric and Korth, his selectees as Deputy in Defense and Secretary, U.S. Navy, respectively.

In the case of the TFX absurdity, he completely overruled the unanimous views of the Source Selection Board, and, aside from the conflict of interest of those whose advice he heeded, has given the Nation a "flying Edsel" in place of a manned bomber, to say nothing of an aircraft which the Navy probably cannot and will not be able to use aboard the CVA's. Imagine an aircraft with bombs slung under the variable design and mobile wings, folding for flying at supersonic speeds. Surely this contract award must rank as the greatest political boondoggle of our time.

Only 2 days after Congress adjourned last fall, he appointed Adam Yarmolinsky as Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, in spite of the Democrats of the Congress insisting there would be no funding, if he was appointed as Deputy Administrator of the Poverty Program by the White House.

He has successfully, by implication, inforce, or direction, stilled the voices of patriotic men in the military whose professional careers are at stake, in the event they express their honest dissent before congressional committees, or take issue with his decisions and judgment. He has usurped Executive privilege and attempted to play the other body against this one to suit his will and enhance the Executive power grab.

Only a few days ago, referring to the bombing lull in Vietnam, he had the audacity to say that increased use of and reconstitution of Mig 21's, airfields, AAA battalions, Chinese engineers and workers, rebuilding of road networks, the reconstruction of bridges and vital communication links, the increased aggression into South Vietnam and infiltration of regular North Vietnamese regiments of men and equipment, the escalation of new Sam missile sites, and the reconstruction of military warehouses in North Vietnam, all are a "small price" to pay for demonstrating to the world the sincerity of our desire for peace.

Since when are the lives of young Americans a small price to pay for the vicissitudes and uncertainties of some illusory world opinion? Should one American life be sacrificed in a frustrating effort to convince Ghana, or Tanzania, or some other far-removed land of unproved responsibility in the world of nations, that we seek only peace with honor, and respect for strength? It is our young men who are fighting and dying, not theirs. Is the rebuilding of an enemy's military potential and the greater loss of life we must assuredly suffer therefrom, a worthy trade-off for a world popularity poll?

Perhaps it was right for the President and his emissaries to circumscribe the globe in an effort to make clear to all nations our willingness to negotiate an honorable commitment, but certainly only so long as aggression is not rewarded. But, in the face of overwhelming evidence, almost from the start, that Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow were contemptuous of our efforts, did we, and do we now have to pay the price in American lives which McNamara so coldly views as "insignificant"?

Have we not yet learned the broken word and the convenient lie are tricks of the trade in all Communist hands? The Communists have already won an important military goal in the game of musical chairs, they have stopped air strikes on their avenues of approach to the south, thus increasing their ability to wage indefinite warfare against American forces.

Let me proceed with a further detailing of the charges against Secretary McNamara.

There is a saying that computers do not lie. Perhaps not. But computerized decisions are only as good as the data put into them. Let us take, for example, the fraud of cost reduction—

While the Defense budget has soared higher and higher one could hardly read a DOD press release over the past few years that did not convey impressions that Mr. McNamara was spending less and less. The more we spent, the more we saved; or so it was, and is alleged.

In 1961 the DOD budget, including all appropriations to Defense was $43.1 billion.

In 1962, it was $49.3 billion.

In 1963, it was $51.1 billion.

In 1964, it was $50.9 billion.

In 1965, it was $49.4 billion.

In 1966, it will be $63 billion, including the supplemental request.

If this is cost reduction, heaven help us if we ever have cost escalation. The McNamara "Department of Self-Defense" is a veritable factory of news releases stressing how he has cut billions there and millions here and personnel everywhere. It has given the air of credibility to the joke about the wife who told her husband she just saved $25 by buying a new coat, unneeded, but on sale.

In spite of his assurances to me in Armed Services Committee hearings that Navy munition stores were improving, a basic shortage is now revealed.

The McClellan committee in the other body proved the TFX award cost at least $415 million more than was necessary. In the case of the mohole, the estimate was doubled and the contractor selected was proved third in capability.

For all the induced adulation of Secretary McNamara, and the Whiz Kids efficiency, the Army's entire supply of a vital category of small arms munition was shut off by a single strike at a single plant, and this in time of undeclared, but deadly war. We have purchased boats from Scandanavia and Great Britain, while closing our own shipyards.

For all the talk about better manpower utilization, we have a request from the Secretary to authorize 94,000 additional civilian personnel in the DOD, an incredible example of the McNamara employment explosion.

Cost effectiveness is the McNamara way of justifying the construction of a conventional aircraft carrier—named for an assassinated President—destined to travel the seas in the nuclear age, dependent upon fuel from a fleet of oilers.

The conflicts of interest, which have been revealed in the firm of McNamara, Gilpatrick, and Korth, et al., and the amounts of money involved in their dealings are almost beyond comprehension, and they have all been well documented. The X-22 and the TFX awards are prime examples of both. These awards violate every principle of sound management. Professional military advice was overruled. The Source Selection Boards were overruled. Key staff were not advised of the contrary decisions, to wit—Admiral Anderson in the case of the X-22, General LeMay in the case of the TFX. Decisions were made by unskilled labor.

In the case of the X-22, Navy Secretary Korth allegedly removed himself from taking part in the decision, because he had been a member of the board of directors of the Bell Aerospace Corp., and president of the Continental National Bank of Fort Worth, Tex., which had dealings with Bell. Yet, he was later consulted by Deputy Secretary Gilpatric about Bell's management capability, and Gilpatric subsequently gave the award to Bell, reversing the recommendation of the Source Selection Board.

When the TFX award was announced, the same circumstances of conflict of interest prevailed, only the lines of influence were changed. Again the Source Selection Board was overruled by Gilpatric, whose ties with the winning contractor were later made known by the McClellan committee. In fact, the TFX award showed that the greater the scope of the decision, the less advice requested, the less advice followed.

Where conflicts of interest do not prevail, "doubletalk" does.

In spite of the exploding size of the Department of Defense, the amount of available military housing is steadily decreasing in inverse proportion. In fiscal 1966, McNamara requested 12,500 units of family housing, and notwithstanding congressional appropriations for 8,500 units, he has done a complete turnabout and no units will be constructed.

No new housing has been programed in the fiscal year 1967 budget. Instead, he states that 13,075 leased housing units will be requested. The maintenance of leased housing is more expensive than on-base housing, or the slack is picked up by the FHA. Adding to the expense is the cost of transportation to and from the base, as well as routine civil engineer maintenance. And how can an increased rental program alleviate the housing shortages in communities which have failed to provide adequate community support, which led to the housing shortage in the first place?

Controversial decisions affecting the Reserves, base closings, and military construction during escalated, albeit undeclared war, were implemented during brief periods of congressional adjournment.

Instead of making the hard decision to utilize Ready Reserve and/or National Guard units to replace in CONUS the active divisions and major units ordered overseas, he has relied on draftees and fillers, and time-consuming training for filler replacements, a costly and slow process.

National defense is a responsibility of the Congress under article 1, section 8, of the Constitution. The President does not sit in on congressional committee briefings. He seldom hears all sides of an issue because his eyes and ears on Defense Department matters are the eyes and ears of Defense Secretary, McNamara.

Some of the things that have happened cannot be changed, but many mistakes can still be rectified, if Congress possesses the will to do so. And the biggest mistake of all is the retention of Robert McNamara as Secretary of Defense.

It is time to no longer support mistakes at any level regardless of source or rationalization, but high time we untied the one arm lashed behind the backs of our men in South Vietnam, protect them from without and let them win—as indeed they will with proper command by the military, and in the field—not by computer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The hour is late, but I merely wish to say that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] has said some things this afternoon which badly needed to be said, and I commend him for doing so.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

NATION FIGHTS INFLATION

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as President Johnson has indicated, our Nation must stand stanchly against the disastrous tide of inflation. Like a mortal enemy that threatens to rob us of our productivity and strength, inflation poses one of our most serious threats to the Nation's solvency.

Virtually our entire Nation has recognized the need to be vigilant and effective in this important struggle. When the value of the dollar plunges, when purchasing power is diminished, virtually all of the gains made by labor and the increased productivity of industry are wiped out.

An interesting trend is developing in our Nation as business girds to cut waste and improve efficiency. With increasing regularity, the major companies are turning toward engineering, research, and efficiency companies to help them plan for smooth growth and development and for maximum economic productivity. These firms recognize their responsibility to labor and to the public and have one goal—to fight waste and resultant inflationary trends.

A national leader in this field is the United Research Co. of Woodcliff Lake, N.J. This firm, headed by C. Thomas Cahill, president, is pioneering in management control for companies across the Nation.

The company has developed unique planning and evaluating techniques and new methods for efficient assignment and control of work, improved customer service, better utilization of space, increased productivity, and the elimination of waste.

Mr. Cahill notes that these, and other factors, are keys to providing a sound foundation for growth for industry and commerce.

One interesting and extremely costly factor for industry is lost time by employees. Literally tens of millions of dollars are lost because of lost time in the structuring of a firm's production schedules.

For example, as United Research points out, many firms staff improperly in relation to work flow, thereby having the wrong numbers of employees report at the wrong time.

Many firms do not forecast the work load, and are thereby staffed incorrectly at varying times; other companies permit employees to select and evaluate their own work. As a result, vital matters are often delayed, causing a severe economic loss.

Other firms assign work without knowledge of the time required in which it can be completed. This often results in overburdening workers, inefficiencies, or overstaffing. The lost time problems are many and repeated. They include lack of followup by supervisors, misuse of skills, excess handling of paperwork, work or material not available, though employees are, and poor machine maintenance.

Industry is to be complimented for its constant quest for greater productivity, while at the same time protecting the rights of their employees. If our Nation is to move ahead in its battle against Communist ideologies, if we are to strengthen our economy and assert ourselves as the most productive, most efficient and most humane nation on earth, then we must search for new ways to achieve our goals of full employment without waste—a rising economy without inflation.

THE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, January 22, marked the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence and I wish to offer expressions of our deep friendship and kinship with the captive nation of 45 million people, the Ukraine.

Today I wish to pay tribute to those 45 million captive people and to those Ukrainian sons and daughters who have come to our shores and made such worthy contributions to our culture and heritage. The Ukrainian independence and freedom were shortlived, but commemorating this day serves as a brilliant reminder that the candle of freedom burns as brightly now, despite long years of tyranny, as it did in 1918. No tyranny can extinguish the desire for liberty that dwells within the heart. Ukrainians everywhere have retained their strong national feelings and they live and work in accordance with their heritage. One strong feeling has been uppermost in their minds and action—resistance to Soviet domination. Let us now reaffirm our own dedication to the freedom of all men and reassure the Ukrainian people, as well as all others who are held captive, that we have not forgotten, nor will we ever forget, that we do not consider their oppression and enslavement as final.

We know that the Ukraine has continued its internal battle for independence and we should not falter now, but should intensify our efforts to bring hope to those oppressed peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

I speak with great personal feeling, as one of Ukrainian descent, and therefore it gives me renewed strength to fight the cause of these depressed people, who have suffered untold hardships throughout these many years.

If we all join together in the effort and if the nations of the free world continue their support, some day the Ukraine and other captive nations will once again enjoy freedom, independence, and self-government.

AN INDEPENDENT APPRAISAL BY A RECOGNIZED EXPERT OF SECRETARY McNAMARA'S 5 IMPRESSIVE YEARS AS HEAD OF OUR DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Robert S. McNamara this month completes 5 years as Secretary of Defense, a longer period of time than any other person has served.

It is no secret, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. McNamara has not always been popular with all of the Members of the Congress. He has generated controversy and no doubt will continue to generate controversy.

But, in these 5 years, Mr. Speaker, Mr. McNamara has done one very impressive thing, he has succeeded in bringing into the hands of one man all of the reins of control and leadership of the Nation's vast and highly complex Defense Establishment. In a day when we hear over and over again the plea that Government streamline itself, that it get itself better organized, that it become efficient and get rid of costly and unnecessary programs, this has been an impressive achievement, indeed.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point an article dealing with Secretary McNamara's impressive record of achievement in 5 years in the Department of Defense. It is written by an acknowledged expert in military matters, Mr. Joseph L. Alsop, a writer, incidentally, who has not always approved of everything Secretary McNamara has done. It is a fair estimate, I believe, and it recognizes the impressive contribution which Mr. McNamara has made to the security and the strength of our country.

I include this article, which appeared in the Washington Post on January 26, 1966:

MCNAMARA UNDER ATTACK

(By Joseph Alsop)

Although due notice was given some time ago, the huge supplemental appropriation for the Vietnamese war will perhaps intensify the attack on Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. As so often, he will then be carrying the can for someone else—in this case, the President.

A different sort of man would have insisted that the President add a clear reminder of the coming supplemental defense request to his claim that the regular budget would be balanced within $1.8 billion. But McNamara is what he is—the ablest public servant to come to Washington this half century, but also the public servant least able to safeguard or even to explain himself.

The attack on him, at present centering in the House Armed Services Committee, is sordid in its motives, squalid in its leadership, and seamy in its methods. For example, he has lately been denounced for cutting back the Army's helicopter program in previous years, thereby causing a temporary shortage in Vietnam.

Modest cuts were indeed made, and are now to be regretted. But when McNamara took office, the U.S. Army had only a few more than 5,000 helicopters, almost all of them obsolete or obsolescent. McNamara personally ordered the study which led to a recommendation of far more air mobility for ground force units. And under the McNamara program, the Army had reached a strength of close to 8,500 helicopters, all of them of the best and latest models, before U.S. forces were committed on a large scale in Vietnam.

In any defense program, comprising many thousands of detailed decisions, there are always bound to be a few decisions that one would later like to revise in the light of subsequent events. Perhaps there are such decisions in the long list of McNamara's really staggering cuts in this year's defense spending, which in turn permitted the President to ask for a new defense budget of only $58.3 billion.

As always happens in wartime, the Joint Chiefs were in a mood for profusion this year, and if all their initial requests had been approved, the 1967 defense budget would have passed $70 billion. But McNamara did not do his budget cutting in the old, wrong way, by imposing a ceiling. He did it, rather, by asking again and again one very simple question:

"Does it contribute directly to success in Vietnam, and if not, why is it really needed now, when our economy is in grave danger of overheating?"

All sorts of projects, large and small—deployment of the Nike-X antimissile missile and improvements in bachelor officers' quarters, the Air Force's F-12 fighter and escort vessels for the Navy and plans to beautify Army posts—were ruthlessly deferred because they failed to meet the two tests proposed in McNamara's question to the Joint Chiefs. The Chiefs, one may surmise, were not at all happy about this.

Indeed, special advocates of this deferred project or that can now be expected to join the sniping at the Secretary of Defense. But before he closed the budget, be it noted, McNamara had the express agreement of all the Joint Chiefs, and of the Service Secretaries as well, that the finally approved program contained every dollar for every foreseeable need of the Vietnamese war.

This kind of singlemindedness and cool logic is of course a main cause for the attack on McNamara. Most people, notably on congressional committees, prefer nice fuzzy governmental decisions, made with more deference to antique vested interests than to the interests of the taxpayers. Yet no rational man can doubt that the standard McNamara set for this year's budget was 100 percent correct.

Furthermore, the overall results of McNamara's singlemindedness and cool logic are genuinely without parallel in the history of American administration. Consider the Army, once again. When McNamara took office, it had 11 divisions and 2 brigades, with only 1 or 2 crack outfits in hard training, and with all outfits exclusively equipped with Korean and even World War II leftovers.

Prior to the large-scale U.S. troop commitment in Vietnam, McNamara had virtually created a new U.S. Army, with 16 divisions and 10 independent brigades, all in the hardest training, and completely reequipped from underclothes to tanks, not to mention helicopters. The manpower of the Army—always speaking pre-Vietnam—had gone up about an eighth. Its combat strength, however, had been far more than doubled.

McNamara has in fact accomplished what amounts to a defense miracle—a great increase in fighting power, combined with a sharp decrease in the unit cost of defense. Of this accomplishment, moreover, Vietnam has been the acid test.

Bull Run to Cold Harbor has been the traditional American pattern. Until Vietnam, we have never in history varied from this pattern of a shockingly bad Army at the outset and a great Army at the end of the war. In Korea, new divisions going into combat for the first time normally lost at least one full regiment. But in Vietnam, completely green troops have been committed, under more difficult conditions than American troops have ever faced; and they have fought like battle-seasoned veterans, with glorious courage and brilliant success against heavy odds.

If this kind of success does not call forth our gratitude, what will?

NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to introduce a bill which will fill the largest unmet health need in the Nation today. It provides for the creation within the National Institutes of Health of a separate and distinct Institute to deal with what has aptly been called one of the most catastrophic, yet most neglected, of all human afflictions—the loss of sight.

The enactment of this bill into law—and the establishment of the National Eye Institute—will be the most important step ever taken to rid mankind of the scourge of blindness. It represents at long last our determination to employ the Nation's scientific capabilities to eradicate the causes of blindness—rather than to accept loss of vision as an inescapable calamity of Nature.

Since the beginning of time man has lived in fear of blindness, and with good reason. Look at the statistics.

Today, in this enlightened era of scientific discovery and medical advancement, more than 10 million people throughout the world are totally blind. In our own Nation, more than 1 million Americans are functionally blind, which means that they cannot read ordinary newspaper type, even with the aid of glasses. Another 1½ million are blind in one eye. Many millions more have serious permanent visual defects which modern science is powerless to prevent, and which too often cannot be corrected by surgical procedure, medical treatment, or the use of glasses. In all, 90 million Americans suffer from some ocular malfunction.

For some unknown reason, we have seemingly been content to consider sight expendable. We have a terrible fear of blindness, but we begin to think about preventive research only when vision begins to fail. And only then are we surprised to find how little is really known about the causes of blindness.

I would like to call your attention, if I may, to a Gallup public opinion survey whose findings were announced just last month. The survey disclosed that blindness ranks second only to cancer as the affliction most feared by the American people, more feared than heart disease, polio, tuberculosis, or the loss of limbs.

Yet less than half the people could even identify glaucoma as a disease of the eye, although glaucoma is one of the leading causes of blindness in the United States. More than a million Americans over 40 have glaucoma and do not know it. They are prime targets for eventual blindness. But most of them have never even heard of the disease.

I am told by the National Health Education Committee that incidence of cataract among people age 60 is nearly 60 percent. At age 80, it is almost 100 percent. Yet the Gallup survey disclosed that 1 out of 5 people have no idea what cataract is, and even the most educated have only a vague conception of what is involved in this disease.

Questions related to other important eye diseases find the public similarly uninformed. Uveitis, diabetic retinopathy, trachoma, amblyopia, myopia, detached retina, and other conditions that are the primary reasons for loss of vision, remain far removed from the realm of public awareness.

In a large measure the lack of public knowledge results from the fact that so little has been done in the field of eye research. Twenty-three percent of the people believe that accidents are the leading cause of blindness. I think it will surprise you, as it has surprised me, to learn that accidents account for only 5 percent of all blindness in the United States today. More than 80 percent of all loss of vision in this country results from diseases whose causes are unknown to science.

Is it any wonder then that blindness is rapidly increasing throughout our Nation today? Despite the alarming increase in incidence of eye diseases, despite the public's expressed desire that our burgeoning ranks of researchers turn more of their attention to this situation, and despite the fact that 80 percent of all blindness results from diseases whose causes are unknown to science, all too little is being done about it.

Dr. Jules C. Stein, board chairman of Research To Prevent Blindness, Inc., the leading voluntary health organization in the eye research field, told a scientific gathering in this city just a few weeks ago that visual disorders constitute one of the Nation's leading causes of disability, and pointed out that the true scope of the problem becomes more apparent when it is realized that one-tenth of all patients seen in American hospitals are eye patients. He emphasized that the great and growing number of blind persons is the result of their virtual excommunication from the benefits of the current science explosion.

Medical research has extended the lifespan so that most of us can look forward to living beyond seven decades. Must we achieve such a goal only to anticipate the real possibility that those golden extra years will be lived in a world which we cannot see? Shall we today, as legislators, accept the fact that the cost of blindness to this Nation has soared each year and will constantly rise with the alarming increase in visual failure? Shall we accept the tremendous cost, in both human and economic terms, as the price of our failure to support the kind of a research effort which has produced near miracles in other areas of medical science?

During the year 1963, the cost of caring for those already blind amounted to more than $1 billion a year. In the same year the money invested in eye research by both Government and private sources amounted to only $9 million. The only reason even this much was being spent was due to the action of the Congress in recognizing the potential of a branch of science which only 10 years ago was receiving little or nothing in either Federal or private support.

When the Congress made it possible for the science of ophthalmology to share somewhat in the magnificent research and research training activities of the National Institutes of Health, this distinguished body offered a tangible ray of hope for the conquest of this age-old affliction.

Across the Nation today we see the result of this small effort. Young, eager researchers have been trained and are taking their place beside the small but eminent group of ophthalmic scientists who have worked so long with insufficient laboratory space, insufficient equipment, insufficient manpower, and insufficient funds.

It is my conviction that eye research can no longer be a part-time occupation of the practicing ophthalmologist. The ophthalmic scientist of today sees new tools of modern technology being made available for highly sophisticated research in areas that once defied penetration by man. He knows that, given the tools, the space, and the trained assistance necessary to translate ideas into action, the mysteries that surround these blinding diseases may now—in this day—be unraveled.

The potential of modern ophthalmic science is almost limitless. The opportunity is ours today—as never before in the history of mankind—to explore exhaustively the entire scope of the visual function. We cannot seize this opportunity, we cannot realize the full potential of modern eye research, as long as we continue to relegate diseases of the eye to anything less than major consideration in our attack against disease.

The bill I now present is vital to the health and welfare of this Nation. It authorizes the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Secretary, to establish in the Public Health Service a National Eye Institute for the conduct and support of research and training relating to blinding eye diseases and visual disorders. This would include research and training in the special health problems relating to the mechanism of sight and visual function.

I have said that the American people are grossly uninformed on the problems of sight. Yet I know, and you know, that many of us live with a fear of blindness. It is possible that this fear has contributed to our inertia in the past, as dread of the word "cancer" once caused another generation to shun that problem. But a new day has dawned. This Congress, through its action in support of medical research, may help change the entire course of medical history and the history of man's relentless struggle against disease. It has done so, with great courage, already, with the passage of a national program to combat heart disease, cancer, and stroke. It has faced up to the challenge of chronic illness among the aging and enacted into law a far-reaching and humane program of health care for the elderly.

Now the time has come to confront one of the most tragic of all human illnesses: blindness and the diseases in which it has its origins.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to place before this House a bill which will help to move humanity out of the dark ages of despair and ignorance in the face of visual failure. If we act now, as I believe we should, the 89th Congress will add still another major achievement to its long and growing list.

In the last analysis, this could be the brightest and most memorable of them all.

DR. HUGH ELSBREE RETIRES

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the retirement of Dr. Hugh L. Elsbree from his position as Director of the Legislative Reference Service. For Dr. Elsbree this marks the culmination of a lifetime of devoted service as a distinguished educator, a trusted adviser, and a highly successful administrator.

Dr. Elsbree has been in the Federal service for more than 21 years of which 19 have been with the Library of Congress. Since 1958 he has served as Director of that aspect of the Library's operation with which we are most familiar, the Legislative Reference Service. During this 7 years, despite an ever-burgeoning workload, the doctor and his staff have provided extremely competent, highly efficient, and prompt service to Members of Congress, their staffs, and committees.

As the needs of the Congress have changed repeatedly over the years, the Service has been adroitly reshaped and remolded by its Director to meet our demands. This sensitivity to our changing needs has resulted in the relatively recent addition of the Science Policy Research Division. From personal experience I can attest to the expertise and ability of individuals Dr. Elsbree has brought into this Division.

Working under a cloak of anonymity, the Service has had a profound effect on the legislation enacted by the Congress. The Director and his able staff provide detailed analyses which clarify the issues, evaluate the alternatives, and pinpoint the strengths and weaknesses of proposed solutions. In announcing the Director's retirement, the Librarian of Congress, L. Quincy Mumford, rightly paid tribute to the standards of excellence which Dr. Elsbree set for reports and studies prepared for the Congress.

I know our colleagues join me in wishing Dr. Elsbree well in the years ahead and success in the endeavors upon which he is now about to embark.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, as the number of deaths on the Nation's highways continues to mount, responsible citizens everywhere demonstrate a growing concern.

At its November 1965 annual conference, the American Automobile Association, in adopting a major policy shift, called on the Federal Government to take the initiative in an attack on the highway safety problem. Also, the American Trial Lawyers Association has just completed an intense study of the causes of traffic deaths, and it too has requested the Federal Government to develop a traffic safety program. Both of these groups, as well as many others, strongly urge the adoption of minimum safety standards for all new vehicles shipped in interstate commerce.

In 1964, the Congress passed legislation requiring that new safety equipment be included in every vehicle purchased by the Federal Government. I am today introducing a bill which would extend those protections to the general public by requiring that the same safety features, as a minimum, be included in all new vehicles entering interstate commerce.

Several studies have concluded that these safety devices can well reduce the traffic death rate by as much as 40 percent. We all recognize the importance of other aspects of traffic safety, such as vehicle inspection, driver training, and law enforcement, but we must also strive to reduce the unsafe features of the vehicles themselves.

U.S. COMMITMENTS

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, these are days during which the lights burn late in the White House and in the Pentagon, and days during which the American public truly senses the importance of the crisis at hand.

These are days during which we devote ourselves to sincere prayer for our President and the national leadership, that they may be gifted by Almighty God with lucid minds, and diplomatic and effective tongues to enable them to fulfill their commitments to world security and pursue with equal vigor the attainment of a permanent and lasting peace.

From all sides, cries are heard. "Step up the war effort." "Reinstate the bombs." "Let's get on with the war." And, also, there are those who legalistically point out that we should have never been in the war in the first instance, and that we do injury to the cause of world peace by our presence in southeast Asia.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are some extreme views being volunteered throughout America; but I do believe that the majority views of the people of the United States of America support the military and diplomatic proposition that we have made commitments to our friends in the world who aspire to the attainment of peace and security, free from aggression, that we would protect them in their hour of need. And simply stated, Mr. Speaker, I interpret the will of the vast millions of Americans as, "Let us now fulfill those commitments. Let us indicate to the world Communist leaders that we intend to struggle so that freedom might survive, not only in Asia, but in the Middle East, in Europe, in Africa, in South America, or any other point selected by the international Communist conspiracy for an aggressive, revolutionary takeover."

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the point has been made in Hanoi, Peiping, Moscow, or Havana that the United States of America is going to adopt a world policy of militarily confronting communism as it seeks to engulf the world. Like it or not, imperialistic, totalitarian communism has made abundantly clear its intentions for world domination.

We are today a citadel of freedom and greatness because we have struggled and dedicated ourselves with consistency to the ideals of freedom and equality. We as a nation have not sought territorial or economic advantages. However, we have become the custodians of freedom in the world and have had responsibility for that freedom thrust upon us by a series of inexorable pressures of a shrunken world, in which prosperity lives side by side with poverty and abundance lives next door to starvation.

We do not need to be historians to realize that altruism and the milk of human kindness have seldom been synonomous with power in the world.

Arrogance, selfishness, and intolerance have been the marks of greatness in the empires and civilizations that have gone before; and they have to a large extent shaped the attitudes and the beliefs of the peoples of the emerging nations.

We are not perfect. We have made mistakes. Hindsight sometimes shows us that what we did in all sincerity could well have been different and better with more effective results.

However, the important international feature of our position as a nation is that we have tried.

We believe as a nation that strife and suffering and the human misery that it inevitably brings need not be an unavoidable pattern of life in a troubled world. We agree that given the climate and the will, the vast majority of the peoples of the world would rather live in peace.

We believe, however, that the only justification for having power is to use that power for good and not for evil.

We also believe that every generation of Americans has a duty to those who gave us what we have today, and to those whose futures depend upon our judgment and fortitude, to appreciate and to protect our birthright and our heritage.

Twelve thousand miles away, 180,000 Americans are engaged in a death struggle against an implacable enemy. Five years ago when the first inkling of what might come in Vietnam began to penetrate the minds of our people, there was great wretching and piety expressed in our land. Americans of all persuasions and positions made ringing speeches and wrote impressive prose on the commitment to the people of South Vietnam.

To paraphrase two well-known company slogans:

> Human progress is our most important product—

Or—

> You can be sure if it's the U.S. Marines.

To many, we were Sir Galahad and Don Quixote sallying forth to save the beautiful damsel.

We were righteous and we felt great. We were feeling the oats of nuclear power backing up our sense of decency; and most importantly, our casualties were nil.

Today the picture is different. Righteousness and piety have been desecrated by dirty red stains of blood—our blood, our boys' blood, our friends, our families.

Where now is the unanimity of purpose, where now are some of the ringing phrases and the flowery sentences that cluttered up our airwaves and splashed across the pages of our newspapers and magazines?

But happily, there are still more who have survived the reality of the difficulty of the engagement and who continue to believe that with greatness comes responsibility—and with responsibility comes hardship, pain, and sorrow.

Mr. Speaker, are our beliefs and philosophies toward mankind and each other able to flourish only under blue skies and warm sunshine with bellies full and with violins playing, "Let Me Call You Sweetheart," or are we still able, as strong Americans, courageous enough to follow our destinies when the storm clouds burst—will we be able to go on with determination and vigor in the struggle when the only sound on the horizon of the world is, "Medic, medic, medic"?

While this war in Vietnam is a complicated one behind all of the many issues there lies but one simple and urgent series of questions, and they are these: whether Red China intends to overthrow the governments of Asia and establish regimes or it does not.

Some believe it does not. I believe that it does.

Either Communist China will possess the military, economic, and political power over the next two decades to achieve this objective, or it will not.

Some believe it will not. I believe that it will.

And, finally, either it is essential to the national interest of the United States and the free world that Communist China be prevented from taking over all of Asia, or it is not.

Some—and I include here some eminent scholars—believe it is not. I believe that it is.

What, you may ask, is the evidence for these assumptions I have made about Chinese intentions and capabilities? I refer you to the Chinese themselves. For on September 3, 1965, they published a lengthy but utterly clear paper by Lin Piao, the Communist Chinese Vice Premier and Defense Minister. If there was any doubt about Chinese intentions, this paper dispelled that doubt. For it stated clearly, not only Peiping's intentions in Vietnam, but toward the United States as well; and finally, toward the ultimate expansion of world communism.

In China, Marshal Lin said, communism succeeded by capturing the countryside and then by encircling and destroying the cities.

He then defined the "cities of the world" as North America and Western Europe. The "rural areas," he asserted, are Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The global Communist movement, he stated, will first capture these rural areas of the world, and then ultimately encircle the cities of North America and Western Europe, until finally the United States and its allies are decisively defeated.

> Political power—

He wrote—

> grows out of the barrel of a gun.

I believe that Communist China is committed to the seizure of Asia.

I believe that Communist China will have the economic and military strength to attempt this seizure.

I believe that Communist China today has the same primitive Communist theology with which the Soviet Union was imbued 20 years ago. And, I believe that the military power of Communist China is far greater in proportion to her neighbors, than was the military power of the Soviets 20 years ago.

Communist China has stated her objectives. It is essential to the freedom and security of the United States that Communist China be denied these objectives.

What has this to do with Vietnam? Vietnam is a testing ground, just as Korea was a testing ground, and as Taiwan was a testing ground. It is as much a testing ground in 1966 as was Greece in 1947.

Will Laos stand if Vietnam falls? Would Thailand then be able to stand alone? And, with southeast Asia gone, what would be the survival chances of Malaysia, of India, of Burma? The question is vital, and I believe that the painful answer is obvious.

But the ultimate security of the United States is only one issue. There is also the question of our duty to others. Either this is a world to be governed by the rule of law, or it is a world to be governed by the law of the jungle. Either this is a world in which people may be free to decide their own destiny, or it is a world, in Marshal Lin's words, in which political power comes from the barrel of a gun.

Our American heritage grew from the concept of the natural rights of man and the dignity of the human spirit. Our history has not forsaken this heritage.

In 1947, President Truman said of Greece:

> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free people who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure.

We have not changed. The United States is determined to keep its commitment to the people of South Vietnam as it was determined to make its commitment to the people of Greece and of Western Europe.

Our American heritage grew from the concept that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. We have not changed. We are going to continue to make it clear to Hanoi and Peiping that terrorism, murder, subversion, and infiltration from the North will not succeed.

> To leave Vietnam to its fate—

President Johnson said—

> would shake the confidence of all these people in the value of the American commitments and in the value of America's word. The result would be increased unrest and instability, and even wider war.

We made a commitment to Western Europe and we have fulfilled that commitment. We made a commitment to southeast Asia, and we will fulfill that commitment.

There are those who say that we have no business in South Vietnam, that this is a civil war, an internal struggle, and that we are throttling the will of the people. Nothing could be more erroneous.

If this is a civil war, why is it that not one Government leader, Buddhist or Catholic, civilian or military, in office or out, has yet suggested capitulation? If this is a civil war, why is it that there is virtually no record of defection of South Vietnamese troops to the Vietcong? If this is a civil war, why have nine regiments of regular North Vietnamese troops infiltrated into South Vietnam? We are talking of 15,000 regular, trained, uniformed troops, not of guerrillas.

If this is a civil war, why have the North Vietnamese, supported by the Chinese Communists, launched an all-out drive to destroy the Army of South Vietnam and to bring down its Government? If this is a civil war, why is it directed, in every military detail, by Hanoi? If this is a civil war, why have railroads, highways, factories, agricultural stations, hospitals, and medical clinics been victims of Vietcong sabotage and attack?

Under the programs of the Government of South Vietnam, elementary school enrollments since 1955 have tripled. More than 8 million textbooks have been supplied. More than 3,000 rural classrooms have been built, college enrollments have increased sixfold.

If this is civil war, why have the Vietcong closed or destroyed hundreds of these schools, frustrating the education of South Vietnam's youth?

This is not civil war in Vietnam. It is aggression. It is an attempt to subjugate its conquest.

Consider the fact that last year alone the Vietcong killed outright more than 400 hamlet chiefs and other government officials and kidnaped another 100. Consider Vietcong bombings and sabotaging which killed more than 1,300 known Government civilians and consider the fact that the Vietcong kidnaped last year alone an additional 8,000.

In our country, in the same proportion, this would have meant more than 200,000 people killed or kidnaped in the year 1964 alone.

The uninformed say that this is a civil war and that the South Vietnamese will not fight, but the fact is that the troops of the Vietnamese are suffering casualties, when compared to their whole population, that are far greater than any suffered by this country in any war in our history.

The objectives of the Vietcong in the past were to disseminate the Government of South Vietnam and the Government forces and to cut the country in half.

Government forces had hundreds of cities and hamlets to defend and the Vietcong were free to choose the time and place of the attack. It was clear, therefore, that in early 1965 the Government of South Vietnam was in trouble and as a consequence, the pace of the war has quickened and the participation of the United States of America has steadily increased.

In his message to the Congress, President Johnson has said that all of the military action taken in the war in Vietnam has not ended the aggression directed from Hanoi and Peiping, but certainly the action taken by the United States of America has prevented its success.

One important thought for America to ponder was expressed in that state of the Union address when the President said that the aims of the enemy have been put out of reach by the skill, by the bravery of American soldiers and their allies, and very importantly, by the enduring courage of the South Vietnamese who have suffered casualties 8 to 1, 8 men of theirs to 1 of ours who have been lost.

Yes, it is clearly apparent by reason of this substantial sacrifice by the people of South Vietnam that they thirst for freedom just as much as we do and are willing to fight and die to attain it.

The enemy is no longer close to victory and time no longer is on his side, and throughout the world in governmental and particularly in diplomatic circles, there is no reason to doubt the American commitment to fight for the preservation of freedom in the world.

Yes, we have made a decision to stand firm as the President said. That decision to stand firm in the face of a moving Communist international menace has also been matched by our desire for peace.

There is in the world today a 1965 brand of isolationism. In 1941, this Nation supposedly abandoned an isolationist philosophy and awoke to the reality of the interdependence of nations in a changing world. We embarked upon a struggle against fascism in the world and all of its terror. We felt that the effects of fascism in the world directly imperiled our American security. We developed a constant foreign policy based upon broad new research concepts of international responsibility. Are the basic tenants of international reaction and the international realities of our time any different than the realities of 1941.

Can we afford to withdraw from Asia to bring our boys under the direction of Peiping, to engulf southeast Asia?

Can we by reason of the poor logistics of Africa and South America withdraw from concern?

I think not.

Our position of world responsibility moves us to different conclusions. The late President Kennedy once said there will be hours in which the burden of world leadership and responsibility will wear heavy upon the shoulders of the United States of America, and there will be those among us who would question, Is it worthwhile? Is the cost too high?

It is far easier for the moment to withdraw and to abdicate and concede. I believe that we are now living in an hour where such a decision has to be made. This Nation, as never before, needs the courage to persevere in the struggle against the menace of international communism.

The whole future of the world free society may be involved in the struggle of Vietnam if we withdraw in the face of force. Then we are not the champions that we say we are, supporting a world predicated on law and peace.

We are internationalists, not isolationists. We are anxious that the underlying philosophy of the American diplomatic procedure be predicated upon the theme—I am my brother's keeper.

Now, as never before, America needs clear, lucid minds, capable of looking beyond the nitpicking that is going on with respect to the Vietnam engagement. Now, as never before, let us destroy the discordant notes of the Monday morning quarterbacks who point out the diplomatic and military errors of our ways in Vietnam.

Let us recognize, not withstanding this criticism, that we must go forward to pursue a successful and victorious result in this war; and that while we respect the rights of the vocal minority among us who prey on, "Let us get out of Vietnam," let us with equal voice and vigor, shout out that there is substance, there is reason, there is cause for us to be there in the first instance, and there is reason to remain until such time as the integrity and freedom of people, very much like ourselves, is guaranteed and the aggressors are brought into control, to forsake the battlefield for the conference table and peace, peace of a lasting and permanent variety to be restored to this troubled area of the world.

THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hanna] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Banking and Currency has before it for consideration a bill which would authorize the United States to become a participant in the Asian Development Bank. We have high hopes that this legislation will soon be before this body for its consideration and, we expect, favorable treatment.

Out of the long and sometime painful experience we have accumulated in our foreign assistance programs dating back to 1946, the United States has learned some important facts. We have learned that loans, wherever at all feasible, are preferable to grants. We have learned that banking practices offer surer and healthier controls to bind funds to agreed projects than bureaucratic liaison. We have learned that it is better to involve the people we hope to help in the procedures of loan decision and loan servicing and to involve the money and other resources of the countries needing development. We have learned it is better to involve the capital and resources of other developed countries and to encourage their efforts where we can.

All of these lessons are put into practice in the Asian Development Bank. As we have found the responsibility, the enthusiasm, and the effectiveness of the Inter-American Development Bank grow and expand with the Latin American's realization that this was in large part their bank requiring their guidance, their funds, and their interests. So have we been eager to encourage the Asians to see this new financial institution as largely the creature of the countries most actively involved in its services and its benefits.

The United States will have a smaller portion of the burdens of this bank than in the other regional banking institutions for the Americas. Understandably, our participation in control is also less. This Bank hopes to start with $1 billion in capitalization, $650 million of which will be Asian and $350 million non-Asian. The United States will absorb $200 million of the $350 million non-Asian subscription. The Board of Governors will be the principal governing body. It is to be made up of 10 men, 7 to come from the Asian countries, and 3 from non-Asian participants.

Each country will subscribe its capital along the following pattern. First, one-half of the sum committed will be by guarantee or pledge. The credit of the country in other words will be available to the bank for borrowing purposes up to one-half of the amount of the committed capital. For the United States this amount is $100 million. Of the remaining one-half the Bank member must pay 50 percent or one-fourth of his total commitment in convertible currency or gold but such amount may be paid in five separate installments. For the United States this means that $50 million will be paid in dollars and, if made in five annual payments, amounts to $10 million per year. The remaining one-fourth may be paid in either local currency or by letter of credit or promissory note callable on demand. For the United States this means that the remaining $50 million may be met by annual letters of credit submitted to the bank in increments of $10 million.

This flexible system of capitalization makes it possible for the Bank to acquire a formidable line of credit and sufficient cash to make substantial loans to its applicants. At the same time no single organizer in the Bank will suffer a large impact in its exchange dollar holdings or impairment to its balance of payments. Each country among the organizers, Asian as well as non-Asian, will have made a significant commitment of its own local resources.

Mr. Speaker, we are greatly pleased to see this constructive expression of U.S. policy in the Pacific Community. You have heard this Member express before his hope that we would give equal attention and concern to the people and nations who enjoy with us the common boundary of the Pacific. I would hope to see a continuance of such programs and interests in the same progressive and constructive vein.

It is far past the time, Mr. Speaker, when the United States should have its resources, its prestige and its presence on the side of forces and factors that are building and improving the Pacific Community. It has been wisely said that it is not enough to be against injustice—you must help build justice. It is not enough to harass and oppose the oppressor; you must help and encourage the oppressed. We should participate in and plan for programs and institutions which enlarge the capacities of the free nations and their peoples; open and expand opportunities for human dignity and human progress.

The Asian Development Bank is a regional financial institution which can be an effective, constructive instrument for improvement and betterment. The United States should be and will be an important member in this Pacific Community Bank.

REPORT OF CHANGES IN THE HOUSE EMPLOYEES SCHEDULE AND THE HOUSE WAGE SCHEDULE

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Burleson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 89-301, approved October 29, 1965, provided a 3.6-percent increase in salaries of most Federal employees, including the legislative branch. To keep Members of the House informed, the changes in the House employees schedule, revised to comply with Public Law 89-301, are shown below:

House employees schedule—Per annum rates (effective Oct. 1, 1965)

House schedule levels	Steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	$4,144	$4,300	$4,455	$4,611	$4,766	$4,921	$5,077	$5,232	$5,388	$5,543	$5,854	$6,165
2	4,766	4,921	5,077	5,232	5,388	5,543	5,698	5,854	6,009	6,165	6,475	6,786
3	5,491	5,673	5,854	6,035	6,216	6,398	6,579	6,760	6,942	7,123	7,486	7,848
4	6,320	6,501	6,683	6,864	7,045	7,227	7,408	7,589	7,770	7,952	8,314	8,677
5	7,252	7,460	7,667	7,874	8,081	8,288	8,496	8,703	8,910	9,117	9,532	9,946
6	8,288	8,496	8,703	8,910	9,117	9,324	9,532	9,739	9,946	10,153	10,568	10,982
7	9,428	9,666	9,905	10,143	10,381	10,619	10,858	11,096	11,334	11,573	12,049	12,526
8	10,671	10,910	11,148	11,386	11,624	11,863	12,101	12,339	12,578	12,816	13,292	13,769
9	12,018	12,287	12,557	12,826	13,096	13,365	13,634	13,904	14,173	14,442	14,981	15,520
10	13,468	13,738	14,007	14,277	14,549	14,815	15,085	15,354	15,623	15,893	16,431	16,970
11	15,022	15,323	15,623	15,924	16,224	16,525	16,825	17,126	17,426	17,726	18,327	18,928
12	16,680	17,001	17,322	17,644	17,965	18,286	18,607	18,928	19,249	19,571	20,213	20,855
13	18,441	18,794	19,146	19,498	19,850	20,202	20,555	20,907	21,259	21,611	22,316	23,020

Pay rates of the House wage schedule—which follows—which covers positions in the blue collar category, were revised to keep House salaries in line with the recent increase in prevailing wage rates of similar positions in the metropolitan area of Washington, D.C.

House wage schedule—Per annum rates (effective Jan. 1, 1966)

House wage schedule	Steps		
	1	2	3
1	$3,541	$3,732	$3,923
2	4,163	4,378	4,593
3	4,784	5,024	5,287
4	5,359	5,646	5,933
5	5,980	6,291	6,602
6	6,244	6,578	6,913
7	6,531	6,866	7,200
8	6,818	7,176	7,535
9	7,081	7,464	7,846
10	7,368	7,751	8,133
11	7,727	8,133	8,540
12	8,085	8,516	8,947
13	8,468	8,923	9,377

SEWART AIR FORCE BASE VITAL TO REGION AND NATION

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert S. McNamara, the distinguished Secretary of Defense, has announced his plan to close Sewart Air Force Base in Rutherford County near Smyrna, Tenn.

In my judgment, this action is grossly ill advised and ill conceived. This decision is not responsive to the national defense effort nor to commitments made by Defense Department officials, including the Secretary himself, that the base would be permanent.

In this connection, I was pleased to testify before Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Armed Services Committee which is investigating the proposed closure.

I include my testimony and pertinent exhibits in the Record, believing them to be of great interest to my colleagues and to all of those concerned with our defense posture.

The testimony and exhibits follow:

Testimony of Representative Joe L. Evins, Democrat, of Tennessee, Before House Armed Services Subcommittee No. 4 on January 26, 1966, Regarding Proposal by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara To Close Sewart Air Force Base in Tennessee

Let me thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, for this opportunity to state the strong and conclusive case for the continuation of Sewart Air Force Base before this distinguished committee. Sewart Air Force Base is near Smyrna, in Rutherford County, Tenn., in the fourth district which I represent in Congress. Sewart's basic mission is to provide facilities for a tactical (C-130) troop carrier division headquarters, a troop carrier wing with three squadrons of C-130 aircraft, and a C-130 combat crew training group. In addition, an aerial port squadron, a communications detachment and a tactical hospital are located at Sewart Air Force Base.

As you know, Secretary of Defense McNamara has proposed that this most important troop carrier base be closed by July 1, 1970. Secretary McNamara is just as wrong in his proposal to close Sewart as he was when he announced in May 1963, relative to the Vietnamese conflict, that "the corner has been definitely turned toward victory."

He is just as wrong in his proposal to close Sewart as he was in October 1963, when he said, of the Vietnamese conflict, "The major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965."

He is just as wrong in his proposal to close Sewart as he was when he underestimated the number of helicopters that would be required by the Armed Services and when he underestimated the amount of ammunition that would be required.

At this point I request permission to introduce as exhibits telegrams sent last December to President Johnson, to Defense Secretary McNamara, and Air Force Secretary Brown.

SMITHVILLE, TENN.,
December 6, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: My attention has been called to the planned closure of Sewart Air Force Base at Smyrna, Tenn., in Rutherford County, in the district I represent.

This action on the part of the Secretary of Defense flies in the face of basic principles of efficiency, economy, and sound national defense policy.

At a time when this Nation is locked in a struggle against the aggressive forces of world communism in Vietnam, it seems patently ridiculous to close a modern and efficient troop carrier base like Sewart Air Force Base.

I have been assured repeatedly by officials of the Air Force and Department of Defense that Sewart Air Force Base is regarded as an essential, vital, and permanent base; that it is strategically located for the vital troop carrier mission it performs.

As I ponder this closure announcement, I feel somewhat like former Vice President Charles Dawes, who exclaimed on a similar occasion: "Hell and Maria. We're at war."

Mr. President, I supported your request for full appropriations for the Vietnam conflict. I have supported your policy in this regard. The news of the planned closure of Sewart shocks and disturbs me. I strongly urge that you direct the Secretary of Defense to rescind the closure in regard to Sewart Air Force Base in the national interest.

With highest esteem, kindest regards, and best wishes, I am

Sincerely your friend,
JOE L. EVINS,
Member of Congress.

SMITHVILLE, TENN.,
December 6, 1965.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.
Hon. HAROLD BROWN,
Secretary of the Air Force,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In connection with the announcement of plans to close a number of bases, I strongly protest the scheduled closure of Sewart Air Force Base in Smyrna, Rutherford County, Tenn., in the district I represent.

I have been assured repeatedly by officials of the Department of Defense and the Air Force that Sewart Air Force Base is regarded as an essential, vital, and permanent base; that it is strategically located for the vital troop carrier operation it performs.

As you know, the U.S. Government has spent millions in building and modernizing Sewart Air Force Base to make it a permanent facility. It is a modern facility equipped to play its role in modern warfare.

I strongly protest the proposal to close Sewart Air Force Base at a time when this Nation is locked in a struggle with world communism in Vietnam.

I strongly and vigorously urge that you reconsider and rescind this action as it relates to Sewart Air Force Base.

With kindest regards, I am

Very sincerely yours,
JOE L. EVINS,
Member of Congress.

Don't misunderstand me. Mr. McNamara has done a fine job generally and in the main as Secretary of Defense. But he moves fast—hits hard—makes quick decisions—and he is human and is subject to making mistakes. He made a mistake, in my opinion, in this case. He made a grave error in his evaluation of the importance of Sewart.

The Department of the Air Force has a substantial investment in Sewart Air Force Base. The value of real property—including facilities is $44,600,000. Its military complement is 4,200 and its civilian complement is 420. Its estimated annual military payroll is more than $23 million and its civilian payroll totals almost $3 million—a total of approximately $26 million.

Sewart was built originally in World War II but its facilities have undergone continuous expansion and improvement. It has two runways, totaling 8,000 and 5,500 feet in length, respectively.

It has undergone a continuing program of modernization which totals almost $3 million during the past 4 fiscal years.

In fiscal year 1963 these improvements were authorized:

A runway overrun	$158,000
Approach lighting	260,000
Total	418,000

In fiscal year 1964 these improvements were authorized:

Air control tower	$119,000
Refueling vehicle shop	114,000
Air conditioning of dormitories	45,000
Alteration of dormitories	473,000
Construction of officers quarters	632,000
Total	1,786,000

These improvements were authorized in fiscal year 1965:

Air conditioning of dormitories	$40,000
Construction of dormitory (85 percent completed)	422,000
Total	462,000

This pattern of improvement and modernization has been reinforced by repeated statements by officials of the Department of Defense and Department of the Air Force that Sewart is a permanent base with a continuing mission as a modern, vital troop carrier facility.

Secretary McNamara last year gave such assurances in writing. He has now executed an absolute reversal of his position which leads me to question his latest twist in judgment.

I have made a prolonged effort to obtain the data upon which the decision is made. I would like to introduce at this point correspondence in this regard: a letter from me dated December 22, 1965, requesting the data, a reply from Maj. Gen. Lawrence S. Lightner of the Air Force a month and 2 days later, on January 24, 1966; and a telegram sent by me to Secretary McNamara yesterday pointing out that the response by General Lightner was unresponsive.

In my telegram to Secretary McNamara I conclude by asking: "Mr. Secretary, why can you not provide the Congress with the information requested and deserved and needed? Could the reason be that the precise data which I requested is not available and the generalities you offer are conjectural?"

The basic position of Secretary McNamara appears to be that this modern facility which the Air Force has continued to improve with permanent facilities has suddenly become outmoded and obsolete. His position further is that it would be more economical to close Sewart and its troop carrier operations—for which it was tailor made—and shift those operations to old Strategic Air Command bases than to expand Sewart.

In my opinion, it would cost less to expand Sewart as a troop carrier operation than it will to revamp bases built for another purpose for a troop carrier mission.

It would appear that the figures offered by the Department of the Air Force are horseback "guestimates" which they cannot support by precise data. This is the only conclusion I can draw since the Department of Defense has refused to provide me with the figures upon which they base their conclusions.

Perhaps they fed their data into the same computer that came up with the predictions of the course of the Vietnamese conflict.

It is my contention that, if the base is closed as proposed, that subsequent improvements necessitated by conversion of SAC bases will be substantial. The Air Force estimates the one-time conversion cost at $868,000. That appears to be an extremely low estimate.

This base is, of course, important and vital to the economy of the area around it. Its closure would be a severe—and needless—blow to the region. But more than that: it is a modern, permanent operational base—vital and useful to the Nation.

To summarize—

Sewart Air Force Base is a vital, strategic base.

It has been considered a permanent base for years—and as late as last year.

It is strategically located.

It was tailored for troop carrier operations and issued as a staging area for many troops going to Vietnam.

The Department of Defense has an investment of more than $44 million in Sewart.

The Department of Defense has continued to make permanent improvements.

The sudden turnabout in the Department of Defense evaluation of Sewart is not reasoned.

It is not logical to close a modern troop carrier facility at a time when we are fighting in Vietnam.

It is not efficient. It just does not make good sense.

It is not good planning.

It is not reasonable or responsible.

The proposal to close Sewart represents caprice and snap judgment—and should be reversed and rescinded. The proposal to close Sewart represents computerized technology at its worst.

It is a mistake and must be corrected.

Your recommendation to this effect to the Secretary of Defense is requested and will be most appreciated. Such a decision will be in the public interest.

Mr. Chairman, I would like permission to file and introduce a number of resolutions, statements, and other expressions from the citizens of Murfreesboro, Smyrna and surrounding area, Rutherford County, who are concerned about this proposed action.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, gentlemen.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 22, 1965.

Hon. HAROLD BROWN,
Secretary of the Air Force,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In further reference to the projected closure of Sewart Air Force Base in the Fourth District of Tennessee which I represent, I would like to have the precise data upon which the decision was made to discontinue this modern, troop carrier facility.

In this connection please provide at your earliest convenience the cost efficiency analyses and other pertinent data. There is a serious question in my mind as to the feasibility of closing a base built and planned for troop carrier operations, and the transfer of those functions to two other bases originally intended as Strategic Air Command operations.

Your compliance with this request will be most appreciated and I reiterate my position that the decision to close Seward should be reconsidered and rescinded.

Kindest regards and best wishes to you and yours for the holiday season.

Very sincerely yours,

JOE L. EVINS,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 24, 1966.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: This is in response to your recent letter to Secretary Brown concerning the planned closure of Sewart Air Force Base.

In the development of the optimum operational and most economical deployment of the programed force, the feasibility of relocating other continuing missions to excess strategic bases was considered. Our objectives were to retain, within the realm of operational acceptability, those installations with the best and most modern facilities while declaring as excess relatively substandard and/or costly facilities.

Most of the existing facilities at Sewart Air Force Base were constructed during World War II and projected construction requirements over the next 5 years to eliminate deficiencies and replace substandard facilities total more than $12 million. In addition to these substantial savings in new construction costs at Sewart, recurring annual savings in facility maintenance costs will result from the use of the better condition facilities at the bases to which the Sewart functions will be located. The combination of the elimination of base support requirements associated with the B–52 units being eliminated at the bases to which the Sewart missions will move and the closure of Sewart AFB will result in total ultimate annual savings in operation and maintenance costs of $10.9 million.

The B–52 base facilities rendered excess by the bomber force reduction were constructed during the late 1950's and are some of the most modern in the U.S. Air Force. Most of these facilities are permanent, runways average 12,500 feet in length and 300 feet in width, and airfield pavings are stressed for the heaviest type aircraft use. These excellent facilities, constructed to support the heavy bomber mission, are more than ample and easily adaptable to the troop carrier mission.

One-time implementation costs which include personnel movements are estimated at $868,000. The relocation will permit retention of our best in-being facilities and the one-time costs will be quickly amortized by the $12 million cost avoidance.

We hope this information will be helpful.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE S. LIGHTNER,
Maj. Gen. USAF,
Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison.

JANUARY 25, 1966.

Hon. ROBERT MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The information which Maj. Gen. Lawrence S. Lightner, Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of Air Force, has supplied in letter dated January 24, 1966, is totally unresponsive to my request for the precise data upon which proposal was made by you to discontinue the modern troop carrier facility, Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tenn. Mr. Secretary, why can you not provide the Congress with the information requested and deserved and needed? Could the reason be that the precise data which I requested is not available and that the generalities you offer are conjectured?

With best regards,

JOE L. EVINS,
Member of Congress.

DEMONSTRATION CITIES

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's $2.3 billion proposal to remove blight and rehabilitate selected demonstration cities constitutes the most exciting domestic program to be submitted to this session of the 89th Congress.

The antipoverty program and the manpower retraining programs have been directed toward converting the undertrained unemployed for gainful employment. Urban renewal programs have unfortunately been directed toward the clearance of slums, redevelopment, and new construction not always aimed toward the rehabilitation and preservation of residential values.

President Johnson's new proposal is directed toward preserving the residential character of our inner cities and satellite cities as well. For the first time, a proposal calls for the full involvement and participation of urban residents in self-betterment programs.

If city neighborhoods are to thrive, they must offer better education, and first-rate community facilities and services. Parks and play areas, schools, child care, and community health facilities must be incorporated into neighborhood plans. These essential needs must be met where the people live now so that they can receive the benefits of these services without moving.

Just this week a delegation of community leaders from Cleveland organized in a project called Hope came to Washington seeking help for their neighborhood programs of housing rehabilitation in a mile-square area involving 30,000 people.

This is precisely the type of community involvement anticipated by President Johnson's recommendation. In Cleveland, we have a running start because of sincerely dedicated community leaders.

Since Project Hope exists outside of an urban renewal area, our first step is to obtain city action in designating the project area as a code enforcement area. This action will qualify individual property owners for Federal grants and loans under sections 221 D–3 of the 1965 Housing Act. With the completion of this step, we will plan to expand community facilities and create child care and community health facilities right within the rehabilitation project.

It is my hope that the pattern of community self-help manifested in Cleveland's Project Hope will extend to other portions of blighted areas in my city.

Project Hope in Cleveland is a demonstration project completely ready for Federal guidance help. Plans are currently underway to rehabilitate properties already acquired. The format has been established for extending the project which already complies with the 14 requisites outlined by President Johnson on Wednesday as follows:

First. The demonstration should be of sufficient magnitude both in its physical and social dimensions to arrest blight and decay in entire neighborhoods. It must make a substantial impact within the coming few years on the development of the entire city.

Second. The demonstration should bring about a change in the total environment of the area affected. It must provide schools, parks, playgrounds, community centers, and access to all necessary community facilities.

Third. The demonstration—from its beginning—should make use of every available social program. The human cost of reconstruction and relocation must be reduced. New opportunities for work and training must be offered.

Fourth. The demonstration should contribute to narrowing the housing gap between the deprived and the rest of the community. Major additions must be made to the supply of sound dwellings. Equal opportunity in the choice of housing must be assured to every race.

Fifth. The demonstration should offer maximum occasions for employing residents of the demonstration area in all phases of the program.

Sixth. The demonstration should foster the development of local and private initiative and widespread citizen participation—especially from the demonstration area—in the planning and execution of the program.

Seventh. The demonstration should take advantage of modern cost-reducing technologies without reducing the quality of the work. Neither the structure of real estate taxation, cumbersome building codes, nor inefficient building practices should deter rehabilitation or inflate project costs.

Eighth. The demonstration should make major improvements in the quality of the environment. There must be a high quality of design in new buildings, and attention to man's need for open spaces and attractive landscaping.

Ninth. The demonstration should make relocation housing available at costs commensurate with the incomes of those displaced by the project. Counseling services, moving expenses, and small business loans should be provided, together with assistance in job placement and retraining.

Tenth. The demonstration should be managed in each demonstration city by a single authority with adequate powers to carry out and coordinate all phases of the program. There must be a serious commitment to the project on the part of local, and where appropriate, State authorities. Where required to carry out the plan, agreements should be reached with neighboring communities.

Eleventh. The demonstration proposal should offer proof that adequate municipal appropriations and services are available and will be sustained throughout the demonstration period.

Twelfth. The demonstration should maintain or establish a residential character in the area.

Thirteenth. The demonstration should be consistent with existing development plans for the metropolitan areas involved. Transportation plans should coordinate every appropriate mode of city and regional transportation.

Fourteenth. The demonstration should extend for an initial 6-year period. It should maintain a schedule for the expeditious completion of the project.

THE DEMONSTRATION CITIES BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message on housing and urban development yesterday showed the farsighted understanding of American problems and potentials and the willingness to come to grips with our country's needs which are typical of him and his administration.

The bill I am introducing today, the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966, embodies the key point of that message which is the need for coordinating our housing and related problems and increasing Federal assistance to achieve their maximum effectiveness in cities of all sizes and in all parts of the country. The message also indicates that there will be some further administration proposals to perfect and improve our existing programs in this field.

The Committee on Banking and Currency is proud of its record in the field of housing and urban development legislation. We have carried out our responsibility conscientiously and with full consideration of every viewpoint. Over the years housing programs have been developed to meet the needs of cities and suburbs alike and small towns and rural areas as well as metropolitan areas. These programs have made a great contribution in improving our way of life, but there still remains much to be done. This bill and related legislation which will be considered this year will mark another great forward step toward achieving our ultimate goal of a decent home in a decent environment for every American family.

THE DEMONSTRATION CITIES BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Barrett] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas Wright Patman, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, in introducing the President's bill to give us a brand new weapon in our fight to revitalize and rebuild the cities and towns of America.

The Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 calls for a comprehensive and concentrated attack on urban decay and urban blight.

It goes far beyond the traditional urban renewal program by combining physical rehabilitation of slum areas with the social rehabilitation of our people who live in them.

For cities which participate the bill would extend very liberal grants as a supplement to existing grant programs.

It is a bill with vision, with hope, and with challenge. I urge my colleagues in the House to give this bill the closest study and to support us when the bill reaches the floor.

Just as the Congress concentrated the power of our housing and urban development programs by giving them cabinet status last year, this bill will enhance their effectiveness by greater coordination at the local level and a stepped-up level of Federal assistance.

Chairman Patman has asked me to begin hearings before my Subcommittee on Housing as soon as possible and we are already working to set up a schedule. The hearings will include not only the Demonstration Cities Act but other administration-proposed legislation which will be introduced shortly relating to housing and urban development.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Morse (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), through February 2, on account of official business attending the American Legislators Conference at Ditchley Park, England.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), through February 2, on account of official business attending the American Legislators Conference at Ditchley Park, England.

Mr. Mailliard (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), through February 2, on account of official business attending the American Legislators Conference at Ditchley Park, England.

Mr. McClory (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Ellsworth (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Reinecke (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Helstoski (at the request of Mr. Joelson), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. Roberts (at the request of Mr. Albert), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. Cleveland (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Del Clawson (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for 1 week, on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Ryan, for 15 minutes, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Williams, for 1 hour, on Thursday, February 3, 1966; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania), for 10 minutes, on Monday, January 31, 1966; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hall, for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Tenzer.

Mr. Pucinski.

Mr. Pickle.

Mr. Dorn and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Utt.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Stalbaum) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Todd.

Mr. Ottinger.

Mr. Farbstein.

Mr. Gonzalez.

Mr. Clevenger.

Mrs. Griffiths.

Mr. Jennings.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 31, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1949. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report on activities in the disposal of foreign excess property for the period January 1 through December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 81–152; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1950. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, transmitting the seventh annual report of the Commission, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86–380; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1951. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 143, *The Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, the Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri, Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa, et al., Petitioners,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1952. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 349, *Ute Tribe of the Uintah and Quray, Petitioners*, v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1953. A letter from the Chief Commissioners, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 195, *The Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri, Petitioners*, v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1954. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a request for the withdrawal and return of a certain case involving suspension of deportation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1955. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1227. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 665. Resolution authorizing the expenditures of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1228). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 638. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; without amendment (Rept. No. 1229). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 633. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1230). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 634. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 94; with amendments (Rept. No. 1231). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 636. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 13; without amendment (Rept. No. 1232). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 663. Resolution providing for further expenses for studies and investigations pursuant to House Resolution 44; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1233). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 667. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 80; without amendment (Rept. No. 1234). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 686. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 151; without amendment (Rept. No. 1235). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 12341. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 12342. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 12343. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 12344. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12345. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS:

H.R. 12346. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to poultry producers whose poultry products or eggs are removed from commercial markets because of contamination with pesticide chemicals or other derivatives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 12347. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide education and training for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 12348. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide for direct and guaranteed home and farm loans for certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 12349. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide education and training for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 12350. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, so as to authorize the establishment and operation of sea grant colleges and programs by initiating and supporting programs of education, training, and research in the marine sciences and a program of advisory services relating to activities in the marine sciences, to facilitate the use of the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf by participants carrying out these programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H.R. 12351. A bill to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 12352. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to Pinellas County, Fla., to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 12353. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 12354. A bill to authorize the expenditure of appropriated funds for insurance covering the operation of motor vehicles in foreign countries; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 12355. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 12356. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for establishment of special adjustment boards upon the request either of representatives of employees or of carriers to resolve disputes otherwise referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and to make all awards of such Board final; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12357. A bill to amend chapter 95 of title 39, United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 12358. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H.R. 12359. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GREIGG:

H.R. 12360. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to permit the sale of grain storage facilities to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 12361. A bill relating to the computation of the percentage depletion deduction in the case of porous tripoli; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 12362. A bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 12363. A bill to appropriate funds to complete preconstruction planning, to start site acquisition, and to initiate construction of the New Hope Reservoir project, North Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 12364. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase by 10 percent the income limitations imposed by that chapter on persons entitled to pensions thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 12365. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian

Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 12366. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to require each State to provide effectively for the care, custody, and welfare of abandoned children under its child-welfare services program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 12367. A bill to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 12368. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for podiatrists' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 12369. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the Military Order of the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 12370. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide education and training for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 12371. A bill to assist in the provision in Alaska of adequate housing for persons who are otherwise unable to finance such housing upon terms and conditions which they can afford, through a program encouraging mutual and self-help, self-government, and individual homeownership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 12372. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same benefits for employees of public hospitals with respect to certain pensions and profit-sharing plans as those presently provided for employees of private nonprofit hospitals, other charitable organizations, and public and private schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12373. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 12374. A bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 12375. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 12376. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to make discrimination because of age in employment an unlawful employment practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 12377. A bill to amend the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12378. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the period of presumption of service connection for certain cases of multiple sclerosis from 7 to 12 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12379. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 12380. A bill to amend the act providing financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families in order to provide financial assistance for the education of orphans and other children lacking parental support; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 12381. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax to offset losses of retired pay sustained by certain individuals who retired from the Armed Forces before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 12382. A bill to authorize assistance under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to certain property in San Francisco; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 12383. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims against the District of Columbia by officers and employees of the District of Columbia for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12384. A bill to provide for computation of disability retirement pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 12385. A bill to continue the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 12386. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12387. A bill to amend the public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 12388. A bill to amend the act of May 14, 1948, to revise the eligibility requirements for burial in national cemeteries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 12389. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the development of the Arkansas Post National Memorial; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 12390. A bill to amend the provisions of section 18 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to require the filing of tariffs by terminal operators; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 12391. A bill to facilitate the management, use, and public benefits from the Appalachian Trail, a scenic trail designed primarily for foot travel through natural or primitive areas, and extending generally from Maine to Georgia; to facilitate and promote Federal, State, local, and private cooperation and assistance for the promotion of the trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 12392. A bill to prescribe certain safety features for all motor vehicles manufactured for, sold, or shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 12393. A bill to facilitate the management, use, and public benefits from the Appalachian Trail, a scenic trail designed primarily for foot travel through natural or primitive areas, and extending generally from Maine to Georgia; to facilitate and promote Federal, State, local, and private cooperation and assistance for the promotion of the trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H.R. 12394. A bill to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain lands on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 12395. A bill to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 815. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate the week commencing May 1, 1966, as National Do-It-Yourself Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.J. Res. 816. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Con. Res. 567. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the full and free interchange of views and information by agencies of the Government shaping fiscal and monetary policy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. Con. Res. 568. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 569. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H. Res. 694. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Government Operations to conduct an investigation and study of the administration of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H. Res. 695. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Government Operations to conduct an investigation and study of the administration of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. Res. 696. Resolution to provide for additional expenses for the investigations and studies by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service authorized by House Resolution 245, 89th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Res. 697. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 35; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 12396. A bill for the relief of Elton P. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 12397. A bill for the relief of John Asimakopulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 12398. A bill for the relief of Rosario Maria Guerrero Lamotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12399. A bill for the relief of Estafano Giannareas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.R. 12400. A bill for the relief of Grace K. Foster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 12401. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Seerie Brander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12402. A bill for the relief of Patrick H. Lane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 12403. A bill for the relief of Chryssoula Manoussogianakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 12404. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Juana Blasina García Oliveras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 12405. A bill for the relief of Radomir and Ruzica Mihaljlovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12406. A bill for the relief of Miguel Pons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ukrainian Independence Day—Echo of a Great Freedom Fighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND F. CLEVENGER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to extend congratulations to the Ukraine on the 48th anniversary of its proclamation of independence. On that long-awaited day, January 22, 1918, Ukrainians experienced the exhilaration of freedom from Russian rule.

In keeping with our commemoration of this day, I would like to speak of one of the most eloquent and powerful voices of freedom—the Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko. His own life, in which he enjoyed personal liberty for only a few years, mirrors the struggle of the Ukraine to obtain—and keep—its freedom as a sovereign state.

The bard of the Ukraine was born a serf in 1814 and spent the first 24 years of his life in slavery. Not until 1838 was he granted his lifelong dream of freedom, being redeemed by the poet Vasili Zhukovsky and the painter Karl Bryullov. In 1840 his first work of poetry appeared in the form of a slender volume called the "Kobzar."

His advent into the literary world was sudden, startling, and swept his compatriots up in a wave of great admiration. Such poetry as flowed from the pen of this young man had not been known in the Ukraine before. His words were bright, singing, emotional, cloaked in the language of the Ukrainian folksong, but underneath their grace throbbed a heartfelt attack upon tyranny.

In 1845 the poet associated himself with a revolutionary society which was determined to create a great, free union of all Slavonic peoples. This led to his arrest in 1847 by agents of the czar and conscription into the army, in which he was forbidden to write or draw. Yet he continued to compose, writing poems in notebooks which he sewed together and hid in his boots. After 10 years he was pardoned, but remained under police supervision for the rest of his life.

Thus, of his 47 years, Shevchenko enjoyed only 9 years as a freeman. This finds a parallel in the history of his country, for, after achieving independence in 1918, the Ukraine again came under Russian domination in 1920.

Just as Taras Shevchenko kept the spirit of freedom burning throughout his years of captivity, so does the Ukraine today hold ever before it the hope of independence and of liberty for its people. We salute the Ukraine and join with her sons everywhere in the hope that their dreams of freedom for their homeland may soon be realized.

The Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's economic record during the past year was remarkable for combining unprecedented advances at home with a decisive improvement in our balance of payments with foreign countries. We cut the national deficit by more than half in a single year—from nearly $3 billion to little more than $1 billion. And the great forward stride in our international payments last year reaffirms the soundness of the American dollar.

This record is a tribute to the administration's voluntary program, and to the businessmen and bankers of this Nation who made it work. As the President's economic report points out, we cannot relax and claim victory; indeed, we must strive for further improvement this year. But we have clearly brought the balance-of-payments problem under control, and we have demonstrated that our progress in international payments can go hand in hand with full prosperity.

For years, many spokesmen abroad and a few here at home have urged a tight money policy to keep dollars from flowing overseas. We were urged to throttle all credit—domestic as well as foreign—in order to correct our payments imbalance. This counsel of despair would have meant a stagnant economy. The President and his advisers wisely rejected such advice and, instead, fashioned a successful strategy. The Government did its share directly by cutting the foreign exchange cost of essential military and aid programs to the very bone. Banks and businesses also did their share.

Bank loans to foreigners, which had increased $2½ billion in 1964, rose less than half a billion dollars in 1965, staying within the guidelines set by the Federal Reserve. Corporations returned to our shores more earnings from foreign subsidiaries, and brought back funds deposited in European banks. This cost them some earnings in 1965; but it preserved the longrun prospects for growing and healthy markets at home and abroad.

For 1966, we have a reinforced program. It should bring new gains by moderating the corporate programs for direct investment which remained high in 1965.

The Council of Economic Advisers report explains how our voluntary program works. It demonstrates that we are continuing to add to our investments and assets abroad, while holding their growth within bounds that preserve that soundness of the dollar. We can all look confidently forward to continued success of the President's strategy and to a growing world respect for the dollar.

Constance Baker Motley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted at President Johnson's selection of Mrs. Constance Baker Motley, for a seat on the Federal bench in the State of New York. Mrs. Motley, as you know, has been a dedicated responsible leader of the civil rights movement for many years. She has carried the fight for Negro rights into courts throughout the land and she has, by the brilliance of her mind as well as by her stunning presence, won the respect of friend and adversary. As president of the Borough of Manhattan she showed a capacity for administration and a profound understanding of social problems. Mrs. Motley's qualifications for a Federal judgeship are many, but perhaps the most important is that she is a magnificent lawyer, with a deep and sensitive feeling for the meaning of the law. The Federal judiciary will be richer for her presence.

I congratulate Mrs. Motley and I commend the President on this superb appointment.

Revision in Our Tax Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that revision in our tax structure is a must if we are to encourage the individual capital investment so necessary for providing jobs for our ever-increasing working force.

The amount of new risk capital required to keep our economy healthy at any given time is obviously related to population—to the demographic facts of births, deaths, longevity, retirement, and other germane matters over a period of time. As I read the figures, it now requires over $15,000 of new risk capital to bring one new little job into the world. An examination of the available data on babies growing up and wanting jobs, on automation's replacement of old jobs, with more costly new ones, and on inflation's toll on the cost of maintaining and replacing wornout or obsolete machinery, it would seem that we now need annually not only over $40 billion of new risk capital to meet our new job needs, but also at least another $40 billion of new capital each year to keep in good repair the tools of the jobs we already have.

This new capital can come directly or indirectly, from only one source—the invested savings of the individual citizen. And high taxes and unwise taxes which impede incentives to thrift, savings and investment, pose a serious threat to economic growth and full employment.

On the other hand, I well realize the fiscal plight of a Federal Treasury faced with a budget deficit of $8 billion and the inflationary consequences that might result at this time from intemperate tax reduction schemes that would merely shift our tax burdens from one group to another and thereby stifle economic growth and further choke off the reservoir from which all taxes must be paid—the excess margin of real productivity over consumption, which we call savings.

Nevertheless, there is one area of Federal tax reform which would go far toward encouraging equity investment in new and small businesses, creating new job opportunities and providing additional revenues to the Federal Government. This area exists in that portion of our Revenue Code which deals with taxation of so-called long-term capital gains. To begin with, this tax is a very poor revenue producer because of its voluntary nature and because of its unrealistic high rate.

It is my firm belief that this is an unwise, and an unfair tax. It is largely a levy on capital and not on income. It penalizes elderly owners of homes and farms who wish to sell and retire into smaller and less expensive quarters. It penalizes owners of investments who wish gradually to shift their holdings into more conservative securities as they gradually attain their less productive years. It prevents many constructive business transactions that would be in the public interest, especially the ability of small and weaker enterprises to merge with stronger organizations rather than be forced to discontinue operations which provide our citizens with jobs. And last, but not least, it has sterilized vast pools of risk capital, substantial portions of which otherwise would find their way into risk investment in new and small business ventures and thereby afford vast new employment opportunities, new productive capacity, and new sources of tax revenues to the Treasury.

It is for these reasons that I am introducing a resolution which provides that the alternate rate of tax on long-term capital gains be reduced from 25 percent to 12½ percent.

It is my firm conviction that this bill is a revenue-producing measure.

If this tax rate were so changed, investment in our economic system would receive substantial encouragement, new jobs would be created and the Treasury would actually gain revenues as a result thereof. After all, no one has to sell his capital assets, but a great many would willingly do so if the tax rate were made more realistic.

I welcome the bipartisan support of my colleagues in bringing this bill to early committee consideration, separate and apart from other revenue measures. I am sure the evidence produced before them at the attendant hearings will convince them of the wisdom of enacting this legislation.

New Cold War GI Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, today, I join my distinguished chairman and able colleague, Olin Teague, in introducing a new cold war GI bill of rights.

My recent visit to South Vietnam reemphasized to me the urgent need for this legislation. Servicemen in all branches of the service from private to General Westmoreland said this bill would boost the morale of our fighting men and is just and fair.

Mr. Speaker, the new features of this bill include a clarification of veterans preference rights, extension of wartime presumptions to chronic and tropical diseases, extension of medical care to nonservice-connected veterans, and payment of education and training fees for servicemen, who, after 2 years' service are still in uniform.

While visiting hospitals in Vietnam, I learned that over half the casualties suffered by our servicemen are a result of hepatitis, malaria, and countless jungle diseases.

This new bill would retain the educational, vocational training, and on-farm training, job counseling and placement, and loan features of the bill which I introduced earlier this year.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this new bill will have a better chance of final passage because it will have more widespread support in the Congress and among veterans' organizations.

The Small Business Administration Loan Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to authorize issuance and sale of participation interests based on certain pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes. Under the bill, proceeds from the sale of such participation certificates would be credited to the Small Business Administration's revolving loan fund.

On July 23, 1965, the Honorable Eugene Foley, then Administrator of the SBA, addressed a congressional forum on the Small Business Administration which I sponsored in the Fifth District of New York. The forum, held at the Freeport High School in Freeport, N.Y., was attended by more than 250 businessmen to learn more about the programs and services of the agency.

As a result of the forum, many businessmen on the south shore of Long Island applied for small business loans. While a large number of the loans were approved and the recipients are pleased with the services and programs offered, other applicants later in the year were told that a moratorium had been placed on all small business loans as a result of the hurricane disaster in New Orleans.

The proposed legislation would increase the efficiency and turnover of the revolving fund; reduce the need for additional congressional appropriations to the revolving fund as the demand for loans increase; and the increased availability of funds would prevent future moratoriums on the individual loan program as a result of disasters such as Hurricane Betsy.

This legislation was introduced in the Senate by Senator Proxmire and hearings were conducted by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last October, just prior to adjournment. Representative Wright Patman, the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee introduced the bill in the House.

Ninety-five percent of all businesses in the United States is small business and we should make every effort to strengthen the Small Business Administration programs and loan fund. In recent years the number of applicants for small business loans has more than doubled and Congress has appropriated additional amounts to the Small Business Administration revolving fund.

Last year the hurricane damage to small business was so great that a temporary freeze on all individual loans was announced. I believe the Congress should pass legislation to strengthen the existing programs and if necessary separate the individual loans fund from the disaster fund. By authorizing Small Business Administration to sell participating interests in such loans on the private market, we will strengthen the resources for small business loans.

This legislation does not require additional appropriations—rather it would reduce the necessity for continuous additions to the revolving fund.

Letter to President Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week 72 of our colleagues signed an excellent letter to the President urging him to continue efforts toward a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Vietnam. I was out of town at the time this letter was circulated or I would have been one of the original signators.

I associate myself with the views contained in that letter and so informed the President yesterday. I submit herewith the text of my letter to President Johnson.

JANUARY 26, 1966.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I would like to associate myself with the view expressed in the letter to you of January 21, 1966, signed by some 72 of my House colleagues. Unfortunately, I was out of town when it was sent or I, too, would have been an original signer.

I heartily endorse their support for your peace initiatives combined with your determination to show Peiping and Hanoi that their policy of aggression and subversion cannot succeed.

I join in their hope that you will continue unceasingly our efforts to bring the Vietnamese conflict to the conference table. We must always keep the burden of continuation of these hostilities on the Communists. I hope you will reconsider U Thant's proposal to acknowledge a Vietcong role in negotiations and in an interim government. This seems so eminently inevitable, sensible, and important to demonstrate the sincerity of our resolve to achieve peaceful settlement. I hope you will also reconsider bringing the conflict before the United Nations.

I feel you have the confidence of the vast majority of the people of this country in your thoughtful and restrained handling of this difficult and frustrating situation.

Very sincerely yours,
RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
Member of Congress.

Gen. Courtney Hicks Hodges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1966, at the age of 79, one of our Nation's most famous generals died in San Antonio, Tex.

Gen. Courtney Hodges was one of the heroes to defeat Nazi Germany in World War II. Under his command the famous 1st U.S. Army was the first to reach Paris and to enter Germany. It was elements of his army that crossed the bridge at Remagen. The 1st Army also captured Aachen, Germany, participated in the bloody battle of Hürtgen Forest in November 1944, and after 2 weeks of bitter fighting broke through in the Battle of the Bulge.

With his army he crossed the Rhine at Cologne on March 7, 1945. On April 15, 1945, he was promoted to a four star general.

General Hodges was born January 5, 1887 at Perry, Ga., the son of a newspaper publisher. After entering West Point at 17, Hodges dropped out because of difficulty with geometry. He promptly enlisted as a private in the 17th infantry at Fort McPherson. Three years later in 1909, he won a competitive examination and was commissioned a second lieutenant in the infantry. His career as an officer took him to the Mexican Border Expedition and both World Wars. He was regimental commander with the 5th Division in Larraine, Meuse-Argonne, and St. Mihiel offensives in World War I.

After the war, he was graduated from the Army Field Artillery School at Fort Sill, Okla., in 1920. He then became the first non-West Point graduate to become an instructor at the famed Military Academy. In 1944 General Hodges became deputy commander to Gen. Omar N. Bradley, then commanding general of the 1st U.S. Army.

When General Bradley took over the 12th Army Group, General Hodges took over the 1st Army. He was an officer who enjoyed democratic relations with his troops and once said: "We are a democracy and we have a democratic army. That is one of our great strongpoints." General Bradley characterized Hodges as "a spare, soft-voiced Georgian without temper, drama, or visible emotion, who was left behind in the European headline sweepstakes." Bradley also wrote that Hodges "was essentially a military technician whose faultless techniques and tactical knowledge made him one of the most skilled craftsmen of my entire command."

Among the numerous decorations earned by General Hodges in his 43-year-old career in peace and war were: Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters, Silver Star, and a number of foreign decorations including the Croix de Guerre with palm from France.

The following editorial from the San Antonio Express of January 18, 1966, very aptly describes the superb service that the late General Hodges has rendered to the people of this country:

GENERAL HODGES' SUPERB SERVICE

The names of Remagen Bridge, Aachen, the Hürtgen Forest, and "the Bulge" flashed back across the years this week in millions of minds at the news of the death of a distinguished American citizen and a superb general, Courtney Hicks Hodges.

General Hodges was an unassuming man but a man with almost boundless confidence rooted in competence. He commanded the U.S. 1st Army in its dramatic sweep across Europe during World War II. His commander, Gen. Omar Bradley of the wartime 12th Army Group, said of General Hodges that he was "essentially a military technician whose faultless technique and tactical knowledge made him one of the most skilled craftsmen of my entire command. He probably knew as much about infantry and training as any man in the Army."

The general was a career soldier, a veteran of both World Wars and holder of numerous medals, including the Distinguished Service Medal with two clusters and the Silver and the Bronze Stars, the latter two awarded for personal gallantry and bravery.

As a San Antonio citizen since 1949, he won widespread affection and admiration among this community's residents. Mrs. Hodges and other members of his family can take comfort in knowing that he served his country to the limits of his enormous capacity and that his countrymen and the free world are grateful for it.

Agriculture in Developing Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, today, the Honorable LYNN STALBAUM, of Wisconsin, my colleague, has introduced legislation to encourage improved methods of agriculture in the developing countries. I congratulate him and heartily endorse his efforts.

The world faces a situation of dire emergency in regard to the feeding of all its people. The United States has for so long been able to send its surpluses abroad that it is hard to understand that these surpluses are all but depleted.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture says that if we "bring into production all cropland now diverted to nonproductive uses through acreage diversion programs we could produce an additional 40 million tons of grain in addition to the 175 million tons now being produced per year."

Prior to World War II the underdeveloped regions of Africa, Asia, and Latin America exported 11 million tons of grain per year to the developed regions, principally Western Europe. By 1964 these regions were importing grain at the rate of 25 million tons annually from the developed regions, largely North America. This flow of grain from the "haves" to the "have-nots" is expected to rise even more rapidly in the years just ahead.

Simple arithmetic exposes the fallacy of relying on increased U.S. food production alone. We cannot make up the world food deficit. It is imperative that farmers the world over be helped to improve their methods and yields. No less important is it that family planning information and programs be given strong support.

Birth rates are rising at a rapid pace in the parts of the world which cannot feed its present populations. All programs of help to these countries must incorporate population control advice—else, instead of being helpful benefactors we will have come only to give false promises and to encourage false hopes.

The State of Controlled Thermonuclear Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House GOP conference committee on nuclear affairs, I am issuing a summary of the present state of controlled thermonuclear research to members of the conference which also may be of interest to others. The document also contains recommendations for improving U.S. efforts in this area and is reproduced below:

CONTROLLED THERMONUCLEAR FUSION STATUS REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

During two decades since the blasting birth of the Atomic Age at Hiroshima in 1945, man has made great progress harnessing the uranium atom for peaceful production of electricity. But while controlling and converting the power of the A-bomb to peaceful use has become reality, converting the H-bomb to peaceful use by controlling the release of its even greater energy to produce heat for generating electricity remains in the dream stage. In 1945 this accomplishment was predicted to be 20 years into the future. Today the prediction is still 20 years.

It has been estimated that the boundless reserve of hydrogen in the oceans of the globe—if it can ever be brought to man's disposal—will provide his energy requirements to infinity.

Uranium and plutonium atoms release their energy by fission—the process of breaking down into lighter elements. The weight lost converts into energy as predicted by Einstein's equation: $E=mc^2$. In contrast, hydrogen atoms release their energy by fusion—the process of combining, or fusing, together to form a larger atom, helium. The weight, or mass, converted to energy in the fusion process is greater than that involved in the fission process.

The resultant energy E, is considerably greater because c^2—the factor in the formula by which mass, m, is multiplied to calculate E—is a very large number. It is the speed of light—around 186,000 miles per second—times itself.

In addition to the advantage of drawing on a practically limitless fuel supply, controlled thermonuclear reactors possess at least two other substantial advantages: (1) They will not produce large quantities of radioactive waste as do existing reactors. (2) Their product is less easily diverted to weapons use.

The vast difficulty with controlling the process of thermonuclear fusion is that temperatures similar to that of the sun are needed to fuse hydrogen atoms together. Such temperatures can be achieved momentarily in an H-bomb. But achieving them indefinitely in a peaceful power-producing reactor is quite another matter. At such temperatures the hydrogen atoms become what is known as a plasma. The plasma is exceedingly unstable and hard to control. Its gyrations spread out, temperature is lost, and the fusion process stops.

No physical materials will stand up under the sun-like temperatures involved, and none can be used to confine the gyrations and instabilities of the plasma. Instead, scientists have been attempting to do it by the use of very strong magnetic forces which are impervious to heat. Our knowledge of these forces—and perhaps others which might be employed similarly—is still rudimentary. The principal effort of scientists engaged in thermonuclear research is aimed at learning how to employ such forces to stabilize plasma.

Once that is accomplished they will face the less complex, but nevertheless difficult, problem of devising a means to transform the heat released into usable electricity. This will involve using it to make steam to turn turboelectric generators or the development of thermionic and thermoelectric devices which transform heat directly to electricity by generating a steady stream of electrons to feed into the transmission lines bringing electricity to our homes and factories.

In the United States the Atomic Energy Commission supports controlled thermonuclear research at a level of about $21 million per year—about one-fifth the total world effort. The AEC believes that even though our expenditure is this fraction, the effective work we do amounts to about one-third the world's total. The other countries involved in this research are West Germany, France, Great Britain, and the U.S.S.R. During the past 4 years these countries have been expanding their work rapidly with new devices, new facilities and vigorous, youthful staffmen.

During the same period the U.S. budget has been static and largely inflexible. Unless the United States is to be overtaken and become second to other nations in this field, our expenditures must increase. We need to attract talented young scientists and engineers into it. The AEC's Ad Hoc Review Committee on U.S. Controlled Nuclear Fusion Programs, chaired by Prof. Raymond G. Herb of the University of Wisconsin, recommends at least doubling the numbers of scientists and engineers over the next 5 years. This projects, in budgetary terms, to an annual spending level considerably in excess of $100 million.

The AEC now carries on controlled thermonuclear research at four major laboratories: Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, and Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in California.

Programs also are being carried on without AEC support at the Naval Research Laboratory, at General Atomics Corp., at General Electric Corp., and at Aerojet General-Nucleonics Corp.

In addition to increasing the size of the U.S. effort, we should take immediate steps toward establishing a definite national center for plasma studies and controlled nuclear fusion research. The new center should have broadly based research programs with close ties to one or more universities so that it may play an important role in the teaching and preparation of students for careers in thermonuclear research. The Ad Hoc Review Committee concurs in this view.

Formal Statement of Professors of International Law to President Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a few misguided Americans are issuing irresponsible statements condemning our Nation's military action in the defense of South Vietnam. Fortunately, these demonstrations are slacking off because the country resents them. But, this militant minority of misfits, as a group, is still grabbing a great amount of publicity and headlines—in much the same manner as the "Man Bites Dog" story.

I know that every Member of this distinguished House of Representatives is disgusted and disturbed over these headline-hunting hoodlums who brazenly burn draft cards, demonstrating contempt for the country's courageous leadership.

They have castigated our countrymen as criminal aggressors who are violating international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

But, I was exceedingly proud when a group of distinguished professors of international law from 31 univercities throughout America recently sent to President Johnson a formal statement emphasizing the legality of our military assistance to the Republic of South Vietnam.

We hear very little about the fundamentals of established international law and order under which civilized nations of the world operate—compared to what we see, hear, and read from unqualified, irresponsible sources—so I proudly commend to my colleagues in the House the statement these distinguished professors of international law made through Dr. E. Ernest Goldstein, of the University of Texas School of Law, at Austin. It concerns the basic rights and responsibilities all sovereign nations have under customary international law as well as the Charter of the United Nations. The statement follows:

As teachers of international law we wish to affirm that the presence of U.S. forces in

South Vietnam at the request of the Government of that country is lawful under general principles of international law and the United Nations Charter. The engagement of U.S. forces in hostilities at the request of the Government of South Vietnam is a legitimate use of force in defense of South Vietnam against aggression. We believe that the evidence indicates that the United States and South Vietnam are taking action that attacks neither the territorial integrity nor the political independence of the People's Republic of Vietnam—action that seeks only to terminate aggression originating in North Vietnam.

Neill H. Alford, Jr., University of Virginia School of Law.

Gordon B. Baldwin, University of Wisconsin Law School.

M. Cherif Bassiouni, De Paul University College of Law.

Richard R. Baxter, Harvard University Law School.

William W. Bishop, Jr., University of Michigan Law School.

Pasco M. Bowman II, University of Georgia School of Law.

Brendan F. Brown, Loyola University School of Law, New Orleans.

Austin V. Clifford, Indiana University School of Law.

William T. Dean, Cornell Law School.

Gray L. Dorsey, Washington University School of Law.

Carl M. Franklin, University of Southern California School of Law.

Richard D. Gilliam, Jr., University of Kentucky College of Law.

David Ginsburg, Georgetown University Law Center.

E. Ernest Goldstein, University of Texas School of Law.

James F. Hogg, University of Minnesota Law School.

James L. Hughes, Cumberland Law School of Howard College.

Howard S. Levie, St. Louis University Law School.

W. T. Mallison, Jr., George Washington University Law School.

Myres S. McDougal, Yale Law School.

Claude B. Mickelwait, American University, Washington College of Law.

Lester B. Orfield, Indiana University School of Law.

Manfred Pieck, Creighton University School of Law.

John M. Raymond, University of Santa Clara School of Law.

Edward D. Re, St. John's University School of Law.

William H. Roberts, Catholic University of America School of Law.

Louis B. Sohn, Harvard University Law School.

Sherwood M. Sullivan, University of Nebraska College of Law.

Howard J. Taubenfeld, Southern Methodist University School of Law.

A. J. Thomas, Jr., Southern Methodist University School of Law.

W. J. Wagner, Indiana University School of Law.

Zigurds L. Zile, University of Wisconsin Law School.

Professor Goldstein suggested that the legal and factual propositions upon which the statement is based might be summarized as follows:

First. The Republic of South Vietnam is a recognized state.

Second. Each state has an inherent right of self defense, which may be exercised either individually or collectively, and this inherent right is recognized by the United Nations Charter for members and nonmembers alike.

Third. The actions of the People's Republic of North Vietnam constitute an armed attack sufficient to bring into play the inherent right of self defense.

Fourth. The Republic of South Vietnam has the right to ask for defense assistance from any state, including the United States of America, and such rendering of assistance is not aggression.

Mr. Speaker, the important thing we should remember is that South Vietnam has asked—over and over—for our help. That is why we are there. That is why we shall stay.

Asia Awakening to China Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal in its lead article of the editorial section for Sunday, January 16, 1966, carried the following account by our distinguished colleague, Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, knowledgeable and dynamic chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Congressman ZABLOCKI led a group of nine Congressmen on a recent 35-day study mission to 15 countries on the periphery of Communist China. I am sure his observations of conditions in that explosive area of the world are of interest to my colleagues, and I submit them for the RECORD for the benefit of the Members of the House and others.

ASIA AWAKENING TO CHINA THREAT

(By Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI)

To the eye of the American observer, the Far East often seems a kaleidoscope of chaotic and often puzzling patterns. It is all too easy, in such a situation, to retreat into stereotypes about what the Asians want and what they think about certain world issues. Such generalizations can be dangerous because they cause us to lose sight of the important racial, cultural, religious and political differences which exist among nations in the Far East.

A Tokyo workingman, for example, might have much more in common with a Milwaukee worker than with his counterpart in Thailand. The goal of our congressional study mission was to see things for ourselves. Of course, 5 weeks is insufficient time to conduct indepth surveys of every nation in Asia. It is long enough, however, to visit certain key countries and to benefit from the wisdom of top Asian statesmen and U.S. officials stationed in the area. This is what our delegation attempted to accomplish.

The dominant impression left with me by the trip is the increasing recognition in Asia of the dangers to peace and stability posed by Communist China. It is clear to most non-Communist Asians that the Peiping regime is determined to make all of Asia its sphere of influence.

In Thailand, Korea, Japan, India, and Taiwan, the realization is growing that the Chinese are a constant grave threat; that South Vietnam, as serious a situation as it is, constitutes only the current target for Communist expansionism in Asia, and that, if the Peiping-inspired efforts are successful in Vietnam, other countries soon will be under similar siege.

SHASTRI WAS WORRIED

The Thai Foreign Minister, Thanat Khoman, for example, informed us that infiltration of North Vietnamese into remote areas of northeast Thailand has been confirmed. A Thai "national liberation front" currently is in China waiting for an opportunity to begin widespread guerrilla action in Thailand, which has been a stanch friend of the West.

In our conversations with the late Prime Minister Shastri, that Indian leader voiced great concern about a recent Chinese military buildup on the northern borders. There is a grave danger that the Chinese may soon attempt to move into Sikkim, a small protectorate of India in the Himalayas.

("It is indeed tragic," Representative ZABLOCKI said last week after Shastri's death in Tashkent, "that in this time of strained world relations this great Asian leader should be taken from our ranks. In our recent meeting I found the Prime Minister dedicated to the welfare of the Indian people and the cause of world peace.")

In view of the Chinese threat, many Asian nations are taking steps to defend themselves against Communist aggression and subversion. The Indians are strengthening defenses along their northern borders. The Thai are sending increased numbers of police forces into their northeastern provinces, where they are most vulnerable to infiltration. The Nationalist Chinese on Taiwan have done an almost incredible job of creating a bulwark of strength against communism, with U.S. aid.

It was my good fortune to be able to visit Kinmen (Quemoy), the Nationalist-held island several miles off the Red China shore. Once simply a rocky peak jutting from the Pacific Ocean floor, the island today is a fortress of strength and a thorn in the side of the Peiping regime.

Only in Japan did we find a reluctance to arm against China. The antimilitary reaction to World War II still is strong. But the attitude of the Japanese toward taking a more dynamic, positive role in Asian affairs seems to be improving. We are given assurances at the highest levels that Japan will increase its economic assistance to the less developed nations of Asia during the coming years. Japan is expected to play a major role in the founding of the Asian Development Bank for financing long-term economic development.

ONLY UNITED STATES CURBS CHINA

The military and economic efforts of the free Asian countries cannot by themselves withstand the pressure from Red China. Without U.S. assistance, it is clear, these countries soon would fall under Communist domination. Only the United States stands between China and its goal of utter supremacy in Asia. That is why the Communists are so shrill in their demands that we withdraw from Vietnam and our other positions in Asia.

This was recognized by the Asian leaders to whom we spoke. None of them, it should be noted, believed the United States had "neocolonialist" ambitions or was any threat to their sovereignty. Most, in fact, would welcome increased American commitments.

It was disheartening, indeed, that the only persons from whom we heard "Get out of Vietnam" were Americans. These were the U.S. students who picketed our delegation outside the American Embassy in New Delhi. It is unfortunate that their learning experience in India did not dispel their ignorance over the strategic designs of Communist China.

Much of the instability in Asia, of course, is caused by the animosities between non-Communist nations. The prime example, of course, is the bitterness between India and Pakistan over Jammu-Kashmir. Our visit to both countries has convinced me that further conflict by these neighbors in south Asia would seriously harm their economies—to the benefit of Red China. Already both countries have been forced to divert funds to military uses which are desperately needed for economic development.

HEARTENING SIGNS

Yet despite the recent conflict, India and Pakistan have continued to cooperate on the huge Indus River Basin project which will conserve and eventually bring precious water to irrigate their farmlands. The need for water is being felt most keenly because south Asia experienced its most severe drought in a century last year, and widespread famine may result. It is vital that India and Pakistan somehow resolve their differences and get on with the job of making a better life for their people.

Our mission observed heartening evidence that longstanding grievances between Asian nations can be solved to the benefit of all.

We landed in Tokyo on the historic night when the Japanese Diet ratified the treaty restoring normal relations with South Korea. This pact will make possible fruitful cooperation between those countries. The United States has encouraged this action by two of our allies as a move which strengthens anti-Communist ties in the Far East.

Another example of regional cooperation is the Mekong River development project in which Thailand, Laos, South Vietnam, and even Cambodia are participating.

Still another example of Asian cooperation in the cause of freedom has been the contributions of Asian nations to the Vietnam war.

The South Koreans have provided an entire division for combat duty against the Vietcong and are proud of the distinguished service which their fighting forces have rendered.

Chiang Kai-shek—who is aging, but is still as alert as ever—was proud of the technical assistance which his government is giving to South Vietnam.

In the Philippines, we were assured by the new President, Ferdinand Marcos, and members of his government that the Philippine Legislature will soon take up the question of sending combat troops to Vietnam.

In Vietnam itself, it is evident that real progress has been made on the military front by the addition of U.S. combat troops to the Vietnamese fighting forces. Our soldiers have demonstrated their ability to cope with the type of hit-and-run guerrilla warfare at which the Vietcong are so adept. There is good evidence that the morale of the Communist guerrillas is sagging. At the same time, however, the increased infiltration of regular North Vietnamese troops has prevented any significant tipping of the balance in favor of the South Vietnamese.

The political situation in South Vietnam continues unstable. Although the government of General Ky has stayed in power for some time and has been prosecuting the war with more success than most of his predecessors, he is supported principally because there seems to be no other non-Communist alternative.

The lack of national unity among the South Vietnamese—certainly their most serious domestic problem—seems even more pronounced today than it did at the time of my last visit there in the fall of 1963, just prior to the overthrow of President Diem.

In summary, it is my conviction on the basis of my observations that the United States is going to be needed in Asia for some time to come. Regardless of the outcome in Vietnam, Peiping will remain aggressive and threatening.

The most important foreign policy problem which our Nation will have to meet during the coming decade is almost certain to be the containment of Communist China.

Closing the Educational Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY spoke to the Southern Regional Conference on Education last December. It was a significant and far-reaching address—and I wish to bring the text to the attention of my colleagues.

Vice President HUMPHREY spoke on the need to improve educational opportunities and outlined the many educational advances that can be expected as the result of legislation we approved in the last session of Congress. His remarks undoubtedly made a great impact upon the delegates to the conference.

Under unanimous consent I insert the text of the Vice President's remarks in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY AT THE SOUTHERN REGION CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION, RICHMOND, VA., DECEMBER 2, 1965

Let me open with a prediction: This conference will be remembered in the history of southern education and of southern progress.

There are two reasons.

First, the far-reaching legislation passed in the last session of Congress clearly marks 1965 as the threshold of a new era for all American education.

And second, the South itself is clearly in the opening phases of a new cycle of productive development—a new development which will in large measure be fostered and sustained by its educational resources.

The American people have always believed in education and have seen in it the hope of a new day. This has been particularly true of the South.

But while there has been great ambition for good education in the South, the economic realities have limited educational opportunity. This no longer must be so.

During the last 3 years the per capita income for the South has risen to almost $2,000—20 percent below the national level, but a far higher figure than ever before for the South.

The transition from an agricultural to an urban economy is rapidly changing the South, and the gap is closing between the region and the Nation.

The economic gap is closing. There must be, too, a closing of the educational gap.

The last Congress has been called the education Congress because of its many major new programs of Federal assistance to education. We have all been staggered by President Johnson's tremendous accomplishment in breaking logjams accumulated for 25 years and longer.

Taken together, these new laws will make for profound changes, not only in the educational world, but in the nature of our future economic and social life. New programs will offer tremendous stimulus to people and communities previously left behind.

Under these new circumstances you, as leaders in education, will occupy pivotal roles in your communities. Education's financial worries are not over—they never will be—but for the first time many of you will be able to "think big."

You will find that, in the councils of government, the educator will no longer be sitting below the salt. His chair will be moving closer to the head of the table.

The educator will cease to be regarded as the humble mendicant in the statehouse. Tomorrow the educator will be seen as the man who brings wealth into the community—and not just Federal money for aid to education. For education attracts and holds business and industry, and creates new resources.

The voice of education will carry new weight in your communities and in your States.

I am here today to congratulate you upon it. And if I were to offer one word of advice I would say this: Let no false modesty dissuade you from pressing your advantage.

The young people in your care are in some respects the luckiest generation in American history. Across the board, rich and poor, they will have opportunities for life preparation and self-development such as no previous generation ever enjoyed.

But if these young people are blessed with advantages, we should remember that in the years ahead they will also be confronted with challenges which will test every ounce of their new-found strength. For every Theseus that we raise up there will certainly be a Minotaur to slay.

Let us look at some of the challenges which face this new generation:

We are challenged first and foremost by the need to insure that history's mightiest instruments of destruction will never be used. We are challenged to pursue the cause of a just and enduring peace.

We are challenged by our need to comprehend and to master the wonders of science and technology. Of all the scientists who ever lived in all the history of mankind, 95 percent are now alive and working. We must channel scientific revolution toward the creation of a better life for ourselves and for our children.

We are challenged to lift the yoke of poverty from almost one-fifth of our fellow American citizens * * * to reverse that tragic equation which has too often decreed that poor shall beget poor and ignorance shall beget misery.

We are challenged to make our cities decent places in which to live and learn, to work and play. A vast sprawling motorized population—living impersonally with computerized institutions—must somehow again become a community.

People must know each other by name, respect each other and care for each other, as people, as neighbors. The alternative is mechanized, dehumanized chaos.

We have not yet begun to scratch the surface of this problem of retaining essential humanity in a vast new cybernetic wonderland of efficiency.

And, finally, we are challenged to make good the promise of our Constitution—to insure that all Americans shall, as citizens, have equal opportunity to enjoy the blessings of our Republic.

Education will help us broaden our productivity, should give the rising generation the tools to achieve a better life and should free it from burdens which have oppressed its parents: burdens of social disability and poverty and of self-defeating prejudice.

To meet these great challenges of our time, the Congress has laid the foundations of magnificent new educational programs. Members of Congress from the Southern

States have played a leading role in the struggle to enact this legislation. Under the formulas which Congress has promulgated, the Southern States will, as a group, gain most from this legislation.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act will help approximately 5 million educationally deprived children from low-income families. It authorizes grants to school districts in approximately 95 percent of the Nation's counties.

As you know, this act includes several important programs. It provides aid to low income districts—that is, districts with a substantial number of families with incomes of less than $2,000. Some $775 million this first year is earmarked for this type of grant.

Then there is an item of $100 million for school libraries and textbooks.

Another program provides for grants for supplementary education. There is a program for regional education libraries, and there is a program for grants to strengthen State departments of education.

Taken together, we expect the programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to bring $1.3 billion to education throughout the Nation during the first year of its operation.

Roughly a half billion dollars will be channeled into the elementary and secondary educational systems of the States represented at this conference.

Your States will benefit handsomely from this act. You will receive more than your proportionate income tax contributions.

This is as it should be. It is our national goal to achieve a general and even prosperity. And I think we should pay tribute here to legislators from high-income States who have consistently, over the last 25 years, worked to enact programs based on this kind of formula, even though they knew that it would cost their taxpayers more than the programs would bring into their States.

Now let us look at the sums which Congress has made available for higher education. The U.S. Government will make about a half billion dollars in grants during fiscal year 1966—the present fiscal year—under the Higher Education Act, 1965.

Under this act, the South will receive a total of almost $115 million out of a national total of $501 million.

Other Federal programs directly related to education will bring a total of almost $1.2 billion to education during the present fiscal year.

And more than a third of that total will come to your States.

Given this new assistance—and this new momentum—how can your educational institutions better discharge their responsibilities?

I have some strong opinions on that subject. I think that the educational institution must move back into the community. It must abandon some of its aspirations for isolation. It must be not a tower of ivory, but a tower of strength in the daily life of the people.

We must go back to the early European ideas of the university as part of the city, and away from the English idea—so prevalent here in the 1800's—that the institution of higher learning must be isolated from life by acres and acres of well-tended lawn.

You have a great deal to give to our cities, and your cities have a great deal to give you.

There are many community problems which would benefit more from research than from argument, and the university should be in the midst of all of them.

The learning of its faculty should always be at the service of the community. University expertise is urgently needed for the solution of dozens of complex problems—problems of transportation, of housing, of management, of law enforcement, of urban and area planning, of public welfare—yes, and of human relations. (The Higher Education Act, I might add, authorizes aid to colleges and universities entering into community service programs).

The college or university can become an integral, catalytic part of the growing partnership for constructive action increasingly seen today in America among government, business, labor, finance.

And, in participating in community affairs, the faculty will broaden its viewpoint and its sense of responsibility.

We have learned a great deal from our agricultural colleges, which have been closely related to the workaday needs of rural America for many years. We now have a State Technical Services Act which points toward greater usefulness to all parts of the community.

President Johnson has called it the "sleeper" of the 89th Congress.

Under this act, Government will put into the hands of private enterprise the latest fruits of research and development.

This new information will be made available to private business through 250 colleges and technical schools throughout the country.

This program will be administered by State and local officials close to the problems of their own areas.

As the President said, if we had passed this legislation 25 or 30 years ago, we might have prevented the economic problems of Appalachia today.

Here certainly is a creative opportunity for American education. This is the direction in which we must continue to move.

We need infusion, too, of more and more talented professors and teachers into schools where they are most needed. And this year's education legislation provides assistance toward this end.

For those in our society who most need education are too often today those least likely to receive it.

Students whose home environment is drab and dulling are, more likely than not, in educational environments equally drab and dulling. What hope for them in a world demanding excellence?

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides grants for innovations in our school system for new and effective teaching techniques which can lift these children—challenge them—stimulate them, before it is too late in their lives to do so.

In addition, the adventure of learning itself should be more broadly shared. The concept of clearly demarked school years—with the gates tightly shut after the graduate receives his diploma and returns his rented robes—is long outmoded. It does not fit into a way of life in which so many people have so much leisure, and so much interest in learning.

It does not fit in an era when so much of the subject matter of learning is also the subject matter of life. The relationship of the school to the individual must be a continuing one.

And this is true at the low end of the educational scale as well as the postgraduate end. The doors of the elementary schools, too, should always be open to everyone who can benefit by educational opportunity.

We are helping older people who want to achieve literacy and improve their job skills.

We are helping preschool youngsters from deprived homes to receive additional training so they can start their school years on the same level as children from more prosperous homes.

Project Head Start, in fact, will go down as one of the most successful educational programs ever undertaken in this country. For experience shows that children coming from homes of poverty and illiteracy are often too far behind to catch up in life even before they enter school. Intensive preschool programs can at least give them a more equal start.

People who, for one reason or another, have dropped out of school are encouraged to come back and resume their education.

And let me say that both President Johnson and I have very special feelings about programs of this kind, because both of us, as young men, found it necessary to drop out of school, to later return.

So let us stop thinking of schooling as a product packaged in tidy little 3- or 4-year cellophane-wrapped packages. Education is experience and experience is life. The school that lives in isolation is doomed to sterility and irrelevance.

Finally, may I say this: In the past and present, the South has given to America, and to the world, men and women of leadership. We must see to it that all the people of the South have a chance to obtain education that will allow them to develop their potentials for leadership.

There is a tremendous transition taking place in the South today. No other region of America has a greater opportunity.

The South has long led the Nation in a regional approach to graduate education. Is this not the time when a regional approach in all southern education might literally lift your States by their bootstraps?

We would welcome proposals or initiatives toward greater use of regional efforts in education, working with Federal programs.

We would welcome, in fact, any initiatives you might undertake for better education.

The great new Federal education programs enacted by the Congress do not mean Federal control of education. In fact, each act and title was written with the objective of stimulating State and local responsibility in education. For this is where it must come—locally and in the States.

Know the new laws. Then use them so that they best may fit the needs of your own schools, your own children.

Let us heed President Franklin Roosevelt who 32 years ago, in Savannah, Ga., quoted the words of John Stuart Mill:

"The unwise are those who bring nothing constructive to the process, and who greatly imperil the future of mankind, by leaving great questions to be fought out between ignorant change on one hand, and ignorant opposition to change, on the other."

Today all of us have the chance to be constructive. We have the chance to make change a force for good and enlightenment.

Let us recognize that the true source of national power is our power of intellect—of our wealth, of our wealth of ideas—of our resources, our resources of human skill and energy.

Let us accept the challenge of the time and prove ourselves to be among the wise people.

Demonstration Cities Act of 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation known as the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 and which, as stated by the President in his message the other day, can make 1966 the year of rebuilding America's cities.

History already will record President Johnson as one of the truly great Presidents of this country. But I should like to add that with the enactment of his impressive program for rebuilding America's urban areas, Mr. Johnson will make one of the most significant contributions toward the growth of America in the second half of the 20th century.

The last census shows that more than 78 percent of the American population now lives in this Nation's urban communities. This 78 percent of the American population actually occupies less than 1 percent of America's entire land area.

With the advent of technological and industrial growth, there can be no question that America's large cities are the very heartbeat of this Nation.

We are today confidently predicting a $1 trillion gross national product by 1975; and the overwhelming majority of this tremendous industrial expansion will occur in our Nation's urban areas.

I can think of no single proposal brought before this Congress during the past decade which will have a greater impact on rebuilding the backbone of America than the legislation proposed by President Johnson and incorporated in this Demonstration Cities Act of 1966.

President Johnson quite properly stated that this Congress can set in motion forces of change in great urban areas that will make our cities the masterpieces of our civilization.

It is my fervent prayer that Congress will not delay in approving this legislation.

Let me hasten to make one thing crystal clear. This legislation is not just another slum clearance project designed to serve only the less fortunate.

This is a bold, imaginative, all-encompassing proposal to make the life of every person living in a large city—whether he lives in the slums or in the silk-stocking districts—be able to enjoy the full pleasures of urban life on the scale never imagined before.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a district on the northwest side of Chicago which has the second highest per capita average income in the United States. My district for the most part is made of lovely homes and middle-income families. My district is far removed from the blighted areas of Chicago.

Yet, my constituents have as vital an interest in seeing that Chicago's depressed housing areas are eliminated as quickly as possible as the victims of this blight themselves.

For a large city cannot exist half prosperous, half slum; no more than the world can exist half slave and half free.

The homeowners of my community are now paying tremendously high real estate taxes only because large areas of Chicago are unable to carry their share of the load because of urban blight.

Aside from the moral obligation that we all have to eliminate blight, there is a material reward because as blight is removed and properties restored to the tax rolls the overall cost of government is more equitably distributed.

My constituents can look forward to the day when we can hope for a significant further reduction in the crime rate in Chicago as we eliminate blight and let all families live in dignity and comfort.

By rebuilding these huge areas of blight in our cities, we can reduce the cost of fire protection, police protection, and all the other social services that are required today.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that by rebuilding on a massive scale all the aspects of these communities, we can reduce the tragic cost of public welfare in America. Certainly in this day and age there can no longer be any doubt in anyone's mind that blight and all the social ills associated with it breed poverty.

We in the State of Illinois alone spend $680 million every 24 months on the cost of public welfare.

In Cook County alone we are spending in excess of $18 million every 30 days for public welfare.

We are now spending $1.7 billion on a Federal antipoverty program.

We are spending another $1.5 billion for additional remedial education for children whose families are in poverty.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation proposed by President Johnson will do more to eliminate poverty in America than any other single piece of legislation ever approved in this country.

It has been properly said that when a nation invests in a man it frees that man.

This modest proposal by President Johnson is the first step in helping give our cities the tools they need to eliminate blight and with it all the tragic circumstances and consequences that fester in areas of blight.

Mr. Speaker, the other day I confidently predicted that because of the dynamic antipoverty program now being carried on in Chicago, my city will be the first major city of the world to eliminate poverty.

No man in our generation has done more toward that goal than Chicago's mayor, Richard J. Daley.

I am confident that with the enactment of this additional legislation against poverty, Mayor Daley and the people of Chicago will make good our confidence that, indeed, Chicago shall become the first metropolis of the world free of blight and poverty.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the legislation I introduced today follow:

H.R. 12343

A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Demonstration Cities Act of 1966".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that improving the quality of urban life is the most critical domestic problem facing the United States. The persistence of widespread urban slums and blight, the concentration of persons of low income in older urban areas, and the unmet needs for additional housing and community facilities and services arising from rapid expansion of our urban population have resulted in a marked deterioration in the environment of large numbers of our people while the Nation as a whole prospers.

The Congress further finds and declares that cities, both large and small, do not have adequate resources to deal effectively with the critical problems facing them, and that additional Federal assistance is essential to enable cities to plan, develop, and conduct programs to improve their physical environment, increase their supply of adequate housing for low- and moderate-income people, and provide educational and social services vital to health and welfare.

It is the purpose of this Act to provide additional financial and technical assistance to enable cities, both large and small, to plan, develop, and carry out programs to rebuild or revitalize large slum and blighted areas and expand and improve public programs and services available to the people who live in such areas.

It is further the purpose of this Act to provide the additional financial aid needed to enable cities to participate more effectively in existing Federal assistance programs.

It is further the purpose of this Act to assist cities to coordinate activities aided under existing Federal programs with other public and private actions in order to provide the most effective and economical concentration of Federal, State, local, and private efforts to improve the quality of urban life.

BASIC AUTHORITY

Sec. 3. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make grants and provide technical assistance, as provided by this Act, to enable city demonstration agencies (as herein defined) to plan, develop, and carry out comprehensive city demonstration programs.

COMPREHENSIVE CITY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 4. (a) A "comprehensive city demonstration program" is a locally prepared and scheduled program for rebuilding or restoring entire sections and neighborhoods of slum and blighted areas through the concentrated and coordinated use of all available Federal aids and local private and governmental resources, including citywide aids and resources necessary to improve the general welfare of the people living or working in the areas.

(b) A comprehensive city demonstration program is eligible for assistance under sections 6, 8, and 9 only if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the program is of sufficient magnitude in both physical and social dimensions (i) to remove or arrest blight and decay in entire sections or neighborhoods, (ii) to provide a substantial increase in the supply of standard housing of low and moderate cost, (iii) to make marked progress in serving the poor and disadvantaged people living in slum and blighted areas with a view to reducing educational disadvantages, disease, and enforced idleness, and (iv) to make a substantial impact on the sound development of the entire city;

(2) the rebuilding or restoration of sections or neighborhoods in accordance with the program will contribute to a well-balanced city with adequate public facilities (including those needed for transportation, education, and recreation), commercial facilities adequate to serve the residential areas, good access to industrial or other

centers of employment, and housing for all income levels;

(3) the program provides for educational and social services necessary to serve the poor and disadvantaged in the area, widespread citizen participation in the program, maximum opportunities for employing residents of the area in all phases of the program, and enlarged opportunity for work and training;

(4) adequate local resources are, or will be, available for the completion of the program as scheduled;

(5) administrative machinery is available for carrying out the program on a consolidated and coordinated basis, the local governing body has approved the program, and local agencies whose cooperation is necessary to the success of the program have indicated their intent to furnish such cooperation.

(6) there exists a relocation plan meeting the requirements of the regulations referred to in section 9;

(7) the program is designed to assure maximum opportunity in the choice of housing accommodations by all citizens; and

(8) the program meets such additional requirements as the Secretary may establish to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) In making the determinations under subsection (b), the Secretary shall give maximum consideration to whether—

(1) substantive local laws, regulations, and other requirements are, or can be expected to be, consistent with the objectives of the program;

(2) the program will enhance neighborhoods by applying a high standard of design and will, as appropriate, maintain distinctive natural, historical, and cultural characteristics;

(3) the program is designed to make maximum use of new and improved technology and design, including cost reduction techniques:

(4) the program will encourage good community relations and counteract the segregation of housing by race or income; and

(5) the program is consistent with comprehensive planning for the entire urban or metropolitan area.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR PLANNING COMPREHENSIVE CITY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and to contract with, city demonstration agencies to pay 90 per centum of the costs of planning and developing comprehensive city demonstration programs.

(b) Financial assistance will be provided under this section only if (1) the application for such assistance has been approved by the local governing body of the city, and (2) the Secretary has determined that there exist (i) administrative machinery through which coordination of all related planning activities of local agencies can be achieved and (ii) evidence that necessary cooperation of agencies engaged in related local planning can be obtained.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR APPROVED COMPREHENSIVE CITY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary shall review plans for comprehensive city demonstration programs in order to determine that (1) such plans satisfy the criteria for such programs set forth in section 4, and (2) the various projects or activities to be undertaken in connection with such programs are scheduled to be initiated within a reasonably short period of time.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and to contract with, city demonstration agencies to pay 80 per centum of the costs of administering approved comprehensive city demonstration programs, but not the cost of administering any project or activity assisted under a Federal grant-in-aid program.

(c) To assist the city to carry out the projects or activities included within an approved comprehensive city demonstration program, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to the city demonstration agency of not to exceed 80 per centum of the aggregate amount of non-Federal contributions otherwise required to be made to all projects or activities assisted by Federal grant-in-aid programs: *Provided*, That the amount of non-Federal contribution required for each project in a Federal grant-in-aid program shall be certified to the Secretary by the Federal department or agency (other than the Department of Housing and Urban Development) administering such program, and the Secretary shall accept such determination in computing the grants hereunder.

(d) Grant funds provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section may be used for projects or activities assisted under a Federal grant-in-aid program which are undertaken as part of an approved comprehensive city demonstration program, or for other projects or activities undertaken as part of such demonstration program. If used for projects or activities assisted under a Federal grant-in-aid program which are undertaken as part of such demonstration program, funds provided pursuant to subsection (c) shall be credited as part or all of the required non-Federal contribution to such projects or activities.

(e) The Secretary shall not make any grant under this section unless he has obtained satisfactory assurances that the locality will maintain, during the period an approved comprehensive city demonstration program is being carried out, a level of aggregate expenditures for activities similar to those being assisted under this section not less than the level of aggregate expenditures for such activities prior to initiation of the comprehensive city demonstration program.

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL COORDINATOR

SEC. 7. There shall be established for each locality having an approved comprehensive city demonstration program an office to be known as the office of the Federal coordinator headed by a director who shall be designated by the Secretary. The director shall perform such functions as the Secretary shall from time to time prescribe with respect to helping achieve the maximum effective coordination of Federal grant-in-aid programs undertaken in connection with comprehensive city demonstration programs. Nothing in this section shall be construed to vest in the Secretary any authority to exercise or delegate any function or duty vested by law in any department or agency of the Federal Government other than the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized to undertake such activities as he determines to be desirable to provide, either directly or by contracts or other arrangements, technical assistance to city demonstration agencies to assist such agencies in planning, developing, and administering comprehensive city demonstration programs.

RELOCATION REQUIREMENTS AND PAYMENTS

SEC. 9. (a) A comprehensive city demonstration program must include a plan for the relocation of individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations displaced or to be displaced in carrying out the city demonstration program. The relocation plan shall be consistent with regulations prescribed by the Secretary to assure that (1) the provisions and procedures included in the plan meet relocation standards equivalent to those prescribed under section 105(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to urban renewal projects assisted under title I of that Act, and (2) relocation activities are coordinated to the maximum extent feasible with the increase in the supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for families and individuals of low or moderate income, as provided under the comprehensive city demonstration program, or otherwise, in order to best maintain the available supply of such housing for all such families and individuals throughout the city.

(b) To the extent not otherwise authorized under any Federal law, financial assistance extended to a comprehensive city demonstration agency under section 6 shall include grants to cover the full cost of relocation payments, as herein defined. Such grants shall be in addition to other financial assistance extended to such agency under section 6.

The term "relocation payments" means payments by a comprehensive city demonstration agency to a displaced individual, family, business concern, or nonprofit organization which are made on such terms and conditions and subject to such limitations (to the extent applicable, but not including the date of displacement) as are provided for relocation payments, at the time such payments are approved, by section 114 (b), (c), (d), and (e) of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to projects assisted under title I thereof.

(c) Subsection (b) shall not be applicable with respect to any displacement occurring prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

CONTINUED AVAILABILITY OF FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AIL PROGRAM

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, unless hereafter enacted expressly in limitation of the provisions of this section, funds appropriated for a Federal grant-in-aid program which are reserved for any projects or activities assisted under such grant-in-aid program undertaken in connection with an approved comprehensive city demonstration program shall remain available until expended when so provided in appropriation acts.

CONSULTATION

SEC. 11. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, including the issuance of regulations, the Secretary shall consult with other Federal departments and agencies administering Federal grant-in-aid programs. The Secretary shall consult with each Federal department and agency affected by each comprehensive city demonstration program before entering into a commitment to make grants for such program under section 6.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Appropriations authorized under this Act shall remain available until expended when so provided in appropriation acts.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 13. As used in this Act—

(a) "Federal grant-in-aid program" means a program of Federal financial assistance other than loans and other than the assistance provided by this Act.

(b) "City demonstration agency" means the city or any local public agency established or designated by the local governing body to administer the comprehensive city demonstration program.

(c) "City" means any municipality (or two or more municipalities acting jointly) or, with respect to urban areas outside of incorporated municipalities, any county or other public body (or two or more acting jointly) having general governmental powers.

(d) "Local" agencies include State agencies and instrumentalities providing services

or resources to a city or locality, and "local" resources include those provided to a city or locality by a State or its agency or instrumentality.

TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 14. (a) This Act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1971: *Provided*, That the functions, powers, duties, and authorities vested in the Secretary under this Act may be retained by the Secretary for the purpose of liquidating the affairs and functions conducted under this Act.

(b) The termination of this Act shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, commitment, or other obligation entered into pursuant to this Act prior to the date of such termination, or the taking of any action necessary to preserve or protect the interests of the United States in any amounts advanced or paid out in carrying on operations under this Act.